

PDE notes: Sobolev space, taught by Sungjin Oh

Zhen Huang

March 7, 2022

Important references: Sungjin's lectures, his notes ([OH \[2021\]](#)) and Lawrence Evans' book ([Evans \[2010\]](#)).

Contents

1	Sobolev spaces	1
2	A digression on functional analysis	3
3	Approximation(density) theorems and extension theorem	5
4	Trace theorem	8
5	Sobolev-type inequalities (1)	10
6	Sobolev-type inequalities (2)	13
7	Compactness of Sobolev embedding	16
8	Poincare-type inequality	18

1 Sobolev spaces

We start by introducing the Sobolev norms. We require the readers to have knowledge about the distribution space $\mathcal{D}'(U)$. If you don't, just think of $\mathcal{D}'(U)$ for now as the function space that is big enough to include all the functions of our interest.

Definition 1.1 (Sobolev norm). *Let $u \in \mathcal{D}'(U)$, U is an open subset in \mathbb{R}^d . The k -th order L^p -based Sobolev norm of u is defined as*

$$\|u\|_{W^{k,p}(U)} = \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq k} \|D^\alpha u\|_{L^p} \quad (1)$$

Here α is the multi-index, $D^\alpha u$ is distributional derivatives (or, derivatives in the weak sense).

For the Sobolev norm to be finite, we need $D^\alpha u \in L^p$. The definition of Sobolev spaces follow naturally.

Definition 1.2 (Sobolev spaces). *Sobolev spaces $W^{k,p}(U)$ is defined as*

$$W^{k,p}(U) = \{u \in \mathcal{D}'(U) : \|u\|_{W^{k,p}(U)} < +\infty\} \quad (2)$$

and is called the L^p -Sobolev space of order K on U .

Let $C_c^\infty(U)$ be the space of compactly supported smooth functions. It is a subset of $W^{k,p}(U)$. We define its closure in $W^{k,p}(U)$ as

Definition 1.3 ($W_0^{k,p}(U)$). *$W_0^{k,p}(U)$ is defined as the closure of $C_c^\infty(U)$ (with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{W^{k,p}}$)*

$$W_0^{k,p}(U) = \overline{C_c^\infty(U)} \subseteq W^{k,p}(U) \quad (3)$$

This is the set of $u \in W^{k,p}(U)$ that vanishes (to appropriate orders) on ∂U .

For $p = 2$, we introduce the following notation:

$$H^k(U) = W^{k,2}(U), \quad H_0^k(U) = W_0^{k,2}(U) \quad (4)$$

Now we are ready to discuss some preliminary properties of Sobolev spaces.

Theorem 1.1 (Sobolev spaces are Banach space). *For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$,*

$$\begin{aligned} (W^{k,p}(U), \|\cdot\|_{W^{k,p}}) & \text{ is a Banach space.} \\ (W_0^{k,p}(U), \|\cdot\|_{W^{k,p}}) & \text{ is a Banach space.} \end{aligned}$$

The proof of this is first to verify that $\|u\|_{W^{k,p}(U)}$ is a norm. Then, assert that for a Cauchy sequence $\{u_m\}$ in $W^{k,p}(U)$, $\{u_m\}$ and $D^\alpha u_m$ have limit in L^p , denoted as u and u_α . Finally, verify that $D^\alpha u = u_\alpha$.

It is straightforward to have:

Theorem 1.2 ($H^k(U), H_0^k(U)$ is Hilbert space). *For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$,*

$$\begin{aligned} (H^k(U), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle) & \text{ is a Hilbert space.} \\ (H_0^k(U), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle) & \text{ is a Hilbert space.} \end{aligned}$$

We then have the Fourier analytic characterization of $H^k(U)$:

Theorem 1.3 (Fourier analytic characterization of $H^k(U)$). *For $u \in H^k(U)$, we have*

$$\|u\|_{H^k} \simeq \|\hat{u}\|_{L^2} + \| |\xi|^k \hat{u} \|_{L^2} \simeq \left\| \left(1 + |\xi|^2\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \hat{u} \right\|_{L^2}. \quad (5)$$

Here we use the notation that $A \simeq B \Leftrightarrow \exists c_1, c_2 > 0, A \leq c_1 B \text{ \& } B \leq c_2 A$.

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is left as an exercise.

Now we define the negative order Sobolev spaces:

Definition 1.4 (negative order Sobolev spaces). For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $1 < p < +\infty$, we define the negative order Sobolev norm:

$$\|u\|_{W^{-k,p}(U)} = \inf \left\{ \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq k} \|g_\alpha\|_{L^p} : u = \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq k} D^\alpha g_\alpha \right\} \quad (6)$$

and the negative order Sobolev Spaces:

$$W^{-k,p}(U) = \{u \in \mathcal{D}'(U) : u = \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq k} D^\alpha g_\alpha, g_\alpha \in L^p(U)\}. \quad (7)$$

$W^{-k,p}(U)$ is a Banach space. The proof of this is left as an exercise.

If $g \in L^p$, then $D_{x^1} g \in W^{-1,p}(U)$. If $u \in W^{k,p}(U)$, then $D_{x^j} g \in W^{k-1,p}(U)$.

Acutually, the negative order Sobolev spaces serves as some kind of dual space:

Theorem 1.4. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $1 < p < \infty$, $\frac{1}{p'} + \frac{1}{p} = 1$, we have

$$\left(W_0^{k,p}(U)\right)^* = W^{-k,p'}(U)$$

Proof. (1) We first prove $W^{-k,p'}(U) \subseteq \left(W_0^{k,p}(U)\right)^*$. For $v \in W^{-k,p'}(U)$, there exists g_α such that $v = \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq k} D^\alpha g_\alpha$. Then for $u \in W_0^{k,p}(U)$, we have:

$$\langle v, u \rangle = \int v u dx = \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq k} \int D^\alpha g_\alpha u dx = \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq k} \int (-1)^{|\alpha|} g_\alpha D^\alpha u dx \leq \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq k} \|g_\alpha\|_{L^{p'}} \|D^\alpha u\|_{L^p} \quad (8)$$

We pick the g_α such as $\sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq k} \|g_\alpha\|_{L^{p'}} \leq 2\|v\|_{W^{-k,p'}(U)}$, then $\langle v, u \rangle \leq C\|v\|_{W^{-k,p'}(U)}\|u\|_{W^{k,p}(U)}$. This means v as a linear operator is bounded.

(2) Now we prove $\left(W_0^{k,p}(U)\right)^* \subseteq W^{-k,p'}(U)$. The idea is Hahn-Banach theorem, which states that for a normed vector space X , $Y \subseteq X$, if $\ell : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a linear bounded functional on Y , i.e $|\ell(u)| \leq c\|u\|$, then there exists an extension $\tilde{\ell} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\tilde{\ell}(u) \leq c\|u\|$ and $\tilde{\ell}|_Y = \ell$.

Let $\ell : W_0^{k,p}(U) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded linear functional on $W_0^{k,p}(U)$.

Define $T : C_c^\infty(U) \rightarrow L^p(U)^{\oplus K(k)}$ as $u \mapsto (u, D_{x^1} u, \dots, D_{x^d} u, \dots, D^\alpha u)$. Then $\|Tu\| \leq C\|u\|_{W^{k,p}}$, and T is injective. Moreover, $T : (C_c^\infty(U), \|\cdot\|_{W^{k,p}}) \rightarrow (T(C_c^\infty(U)), \|\cdot\|)$ is an isomorphism. Then we can define $\tilde{\ell} : T(C_c^\infty(U)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where:

$$\tilde{\ell}(Tu) = \ell(u)$$

us also bounded. Then according to Hahn-Banach, $\tilde{\ell}$ could be extended to $\tilde{\tilde{\ell}} : L^p(U)^{\oplus K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which is also bounded. $\tilde{\tilde{\ell}} \in (L^p(U)^{\oplus K})^*$, which means that there exists $\tilde{g}_\alpha \in L^{p'}(U)$, such that

$$\tilde{\tilde{\ell}}(\tilde{u}) = \sum_{\alpha} \langle \tilde{g}_\alpha, \tilde{u}_\alpha \rangle$$

Then for $u \in C_c^\infty(U)$, $\ell(u) = \tilde{\ell}(Tu) = \tilde{\tilde{\ell}}(Tu) = \sum_{\alpha} \langle \tilde{g}_\alpha, (Tu)_\alpha \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \langle \tilde{g}_\alpha, D^\alpha u \rangle$. Therefore let $g_\alpha = (-1)^{|\alpha|} \tilde{g}_\alpha$, we have

$$\ell(u) = \langle v, u \rangle = \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq k} (-1)^{|\alpha|} \langle g_\alpha, D^\alpha u \rangle = \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq k} \langle D^\alpha g_\alpha, u \rangle$$

which completes the proof. \square

2 A digression on functional analysis

Let X, Y be Banach spaces. $P : X \rightarrow Y$. We are often concerned with the following two problems:

- Existence: For $f \in Y$, is there $u \in X$, such that $Pu = f$?
- Uniqueness: If $u, u' \in X$, $Pu = Pu'$, is $u = u'$? This is equivalent to if $Pu = 0$, is $u = 0$?

P would be a linear differential operator, such as $-\Delta$ or \square . We often prove the a-priori estimate for a PDE, i.e. if $u \in X$, $Pu = f$, then $\|u\|_X \leq c\|f\|_Y$.

These two problems (existence and uniqueness) are related to each other by duality.

Theorem 2.1. *Let X, Y be Banach spaces, $P : X \rightarrow Y$ is bounded linear operator. Denote $P^* : Y^* \rightarrow X^*$ as the adjoint of P , i.e.*

$$\langle v, Pu \rangle = \langle P^*v, u \rangle, \quad \forall u \in X, \forall v \in Y^*$$

Suppose $\exists C > 0$ s.t.

$$\|u\|_X \leq C\|Pu\|_Y, \forall u \in X$$

then

- (Uniqueness for $Pu = f$) If $u \in X$, $Pu = 0$, then $u = 0$.
- (Existence for $P^*v = g$) $\forall g \in X^*$, $\exists v \in Y^*$, s.t. $P^*v = g$ and $\|v\|_{Y^*} \leq C\|g\|_{X^*}$. (C is the same constant as above.)

Proof. The proof for the first part is straightforward. We focus on the second part.

Our goal is to find $v \in Y^*$ such that $P^*v = g$, which means $\langle g, u \rangle = \langle P^*v, u \rangle = \langle v, Pu \rangle$ for any u . This motivates us to define $\ell : P(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\ell(Pu) = \langle g, u \rangle$$

This is well-defined since P is injective. We want to prove ℓ is bounded on $P(X)$, and then we can use Hahn-Banach theorem.

Actually, $|\ell(Pu)| = |\langle g, u \rangle| \leq \|g\|_{X^*}\|u\|_X \leq C\|g\|_{X^*}\|Pu\|_Y$. Then according to Hahn-Banach theorem, $\exists v \in Y^*$ as an extension of ℓ , s.t. $\langle v, Pu \rangle = \langle g, u \rangle$ and $\|v\|_{Y^*} \leq C\|g\|_{X^*}$ \square

Now, how about existence theorem for $Pu = f$? Let's find an easy way out, and assume that X is reflexive. (i.e. $X \rightarrow (X^*)^* : u \mapsto (u' \mapsto \langle u^*, u' \rangle)$ is an isomorphism.)

Theorem 2.2. *Let X, Y be Banach spaces, $P : X \rightarrow Y$ is bounded linear operator. X is reflexive. Suppose*

$$\|v\|_{Y^*} \leq C\|P^*v\|_{X^*}$$

then

- (Uniqueness for $P^*v = g$) If $v \in Y^*$, $P^*v = 0$, then $v = 0$.
- (Existence for $Pu = f$) $\forall f \in Y$, $\exists u \in X$, s.t. $Pu = f$ and $\|u\|_X \leq C\|f\|_Y$. (C is the same constant as above.)

The proof is similar as above. Note that all sobolev spaces $W_0^{k,p}(U)$, $1 < p < \infty$ are reflexive. This is left as an exercise. Also note that

$$(\text{Ran } P)^\perp = \ker P^* \quad \ker P = {}^\perp(\text{Ran } P^*)$$

Here for $U \subseteq Y$, we define $U^\perp = \{v \in Y^* : \langle v, f \rangle = 0 \quad \forall f \in U\}$. And for $V \subseteq X^*$, we define ${}^\perp V = \{u \in X : \langle g, u \rangle = 0 \quad \forall g \in V\}$. As a consequence, if $\ker P^* = 0$, then ¹

$$(\text{Ran } P)^\perp = \{0\} \iff \overline{\text{Ran } P} = Y$$

¹Please review the proof of this in functional analysis.

In finite dimensions, $\overline{\text{Ran } P} = \text{Ran } P$. In infinite dimensions, $\overline{\text{Ran } P} = \text{Ran } P$ not necessarily holds.

Now we demonstrate that $\|v\|_{Y^*} \leq C\|P^*v\|_{X^*}$ is not too much to ask.

Theorem 2.3. *X, Y are Banach spaces, $P : X \rightarrow Y$ is bounded linear operator. If $P(X) = Y$, then there exists some $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|v\|_{Y^*} \leq C\|P^*v\|_{X^*}$$

Proof. By the open mapping theorem, $P(B_x)$ is open and $0 \in P(B_x)$. Then there exists $c > 0$, s.t. $cB_Y \subseteq P(B_x)$. Then we have

$$\|P^*v\|_{X^*} = \sup_{u: \|u\|_X \leq 1} |\langle P^*v, u \rangle| = \sup_{f \in P(B_x)} |\langle v, f \rangle| \geq \sup_{f \in cB_Y} |\langle v, f \rangle| = c\|v\|_{Y^*}$$

□

We use the above results on an example. Consider

$$\begin{cases} -u'' = f & \text{in } (0, 1) \\ u = 0 & \text{at } x = 0, 1 \end{cases}$$

We want to discuss its solvability in $H_0^1((0, 1))$.

- Recall that $\|u\|_{H^1}^2 = \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u'\|_{L^2}^2$. and $(H_0^1((0, 1)))^* = H^{-1}(0, 1)$. In this case $X = H_0^1((0, 1))$, $Y = H^{-1}(0, 1)$, $Pu = -u''$. Therefore we want to prove $\|u\|_{H^1} \leq c\|f\|_{H^{-1}}$ where $f = -u''$, $u \in H_0^1((0, 1))$.

Proof. We only need to consider $u \in C_c^\infty((0, 1))$, according to the approximation theorem that we will introduce later. We have

$$\int -u''u dx = \int f u dx$$

and $\int -u''u dx = \int (u')^2 dx$. Note that there is no boundary term since $u \in C_c^\infty((0, 1))$.

For $\|u\|_{L^2}$, we have

$$u(x) = \int_0^x u'(x') dx'$$

then $|u(x)| \leq \int_0^1 |u'(x')| dx' \leq \|u'\|_{L^2}$. The second inequality is because of Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Then $\int_0^1 |u(x)|^2 dx \leq \sup_{(0,1)} |u|^2 \leq \|u'\|_{L^2}^2$. Therefore

$$\|u\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C\langle f, u \rangle \leq C\|f\|_{H^{-1}}\|u\|_{H^1}$$

□

- With this section's first theorem, we have if $-u'' = 0$ and $u \in H_0^1((0, 1))$ then $u = 0$.
- Let's compute P^* . $\langle P^*v, u \rangle = \langle v, Pu \rangle$ for all $v \in (H^{-1})^*$, $u \in H_0^1$. Note that by reflexivity of H_0^1 , we have $(H^{-1})^* = H_0^1$. Then

$$\langle v, Pu \rangle = \int_0^1 v(-u'') dx = \int_0^1 v' u' dx = \int_0^1 -v'' u dx$$

Therefore $P^*v = -v''$, $Y^* = H_0^1((0, 1))$, $X^* = H^{-1}((0, 1))$. Then according to the second theorem, we have $\forall f \in H^{-1}$, $\exists u \in H_0^1$, s.t. $Pu = f$.

3 Approximation(density) theorems and extension theorem

The main tools of approximation theorems are convolution, mollifiers and smooth partition of unity.

Lemma 3.1 (Mollifiers). *Let φ be a smooth and compactly supported function. $\int \varphi dx = 1$. Mollifiers are defined as*

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^d} \varphi\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)$$

Note that $\int \varphi_\varepsilon = 1$. For $u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, we have

$$\|\varphi_\varepsilon * u - u\|_{L^p} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$

where

$$\varphi_\varepsilon * u = \int \varphi_\varepsilon(x-y)u(y)dy$$

Here $\varphi_\varepsilon * u$ is C^∞ .

Proof. The key of the proof is continuity of translation on L^p , i.e. for $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $u \in L^p$, define translation τ_z as

$$\tau_z u(x) = u(x-z)$$

and we have $\lim_{|z| \rightarrow 0} \|\tau_z u - u\|_{L^p} = 0$ ². Then

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_\varepsilon * u)(x) - u(x) &= \int u(x-y)\varphi_\varepsilon(y)dy - u(x) = \int (u(x-y) - u(x))\varphi_\varepsilon(y)dy \\ \|\varphi_\varepsilon * u - u\|_{L^p} &= \left\| \int (u(x-y) - u(x))\varphi_\varepsilon(y)dy \right\|_{L^p} \\ &\leq \int \|u(\cdot - y) - u(\cdot)\|_{L^p} |\varphi_\varepsilon(y)|dy = \int \|u(\cdot - \varepsilon y) - u(\cdot)\|_{L^p} |\varphi(y)|dy \end{aligned}$$

Therefore as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\|u(\cdot - \varepsilon y) - u(\cdot)\|_{L^p} |\varphi(y)|$ goes to 0 (pointwise). Then according to Dominated Convergence theorem, the above integral goes to 0. \square

Lemma 3.2 (Smooth partition of unity). ³ $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is an open covering of U in \mathbb{R}^d . Then there exists a smooth partition of unity $\{\chi_\alpha\}$ on U subordinate to $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$, i.e.:

- $\sum_\alpha \chi_\alpha(x) = 1$ on U , and $\forall x \in U$, \exists only finitely many nonzero $\chi_\alpha(x)$.
- $\text{supp } \chi_\alpha \subseteq U_\alpha$.
- χ_α is smooth.

Approximation theorems basically says that: given $u \in W^{k,p}(U)$, we want to approximate it with something *better*, for example smooth and/or has a nice support property.

We first state the approximation theorem in \mathbb{R}^d .

Theorem 3.1 (approximation theorem in \mathbb{R}^d). For integer $k \geq 0$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, we have

- $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$;
- $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$

Proof. The proof of the first part is a straightforward application of mollification. The proof of the second part is done by approximating with $f\chi(\frac{\cdot}{R})$, $R \rightarrow \infty$. The detail of this is left as an exercise. \square

²Please find the proof of this in real analysis.

³Please find the proof this in point-set topology.

Now we turn to the approximation in open subset U . A local approximation is obvious through mollification (See Theorem 1 in Evans 5.3). Let's look at a global approximation.

Theorem 3.2 (Global approximation theorem for open set U). *For integer $k \geq 0$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, let U be any open subset of \mathbb{R}^d . Then $C^\infty(U)$ is dense in $W^{k,p}(U)$.*

Proof. For $u \in W^{k,p}(U)$, fix $\varepsilon > 0$. We want to find $v \in C^\infty(U)$ s.t.

$$\|u - v\|_{W^{k,p}} \leq C\varepsilon$$

where C is an independent constant.

Step 1: Define

$$U_j = \{x \in U : \text{dist}(x, \partial U) > \frac{1}{j}\}, \quad V_j = U_{j+3} \setminus \bar{U}_{j+1}, \quad j \geq 1$$

Then we have $U \subseteq \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} V_j$. (with a good open set V_0) Then $\exists \chi_j$ being smooth parts of identity that is subordinate to V_j :

$$u = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} u \chi_j = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} u_j$$

With $\text{supp } \chi_j \subseteq V_j$, then $\text{supp } u_j = \text{supp } u \chi_j \subseteq V_j$, therefore u_j is $W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Step 2: With a smooth $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\int \varphi = 1$, $\text{supp}(\varphi) \subseteq B_1(0)$, then we have mollifier

$$\varphi_{\varepsilon_j} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_j^d} \varphi\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon_j}\right)$$

Here $\text{supp}(\varphi_j) \subseteq B_{\varepsilon_j}(0)$. Then we define $v_j = \varphi_{\varepsilon_j} * u_j$, $v = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} v_j$. ε_j is taken to satisfy

$$\|u_j - v_j\|_{W^{k,p}} \leq 2^{-j} \varepsilon, \quad \text{supp}(v_j) \subseteq U_{j+3} \setminus \bar{U}_j$$

Then v is well-defined and smooth because for any open set $V \subset\subset U$ there are at most finitely many nonzero terms in the sum. And

$$\|v - u\|_{W^{k,p}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|v_j - u_j\|_{W^{k,p}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \varepsilon = \varepsilon$$

□

What if we want to approximate u with smooth functions on \bar{U} ? The answer is yes we can as long as \bar{U} has a good enough boundary. Let us first define what is $C^\infty(\bar{U})$:

Definition 3.1 ($C^\infty(\bar{U})$). $C^\infty(\bar{U})$ is defined as

$$C^\infty(\bar{U}) = \{u : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : u \text{ is the restriction to } U \text{ of a smooth function } \tilde{u} \in C^\infty(\tilde{U}), U \subset \tilde{U}\}$$

and recall the definition of boundary being C^k :

Definition 3.2 (C^k boundary). ∂U is of class C^k if $\forall x_0 \in \partial U$, $\exists \gamma = \gamma(x_0) > 0$, s.t. up to relabeling the variables,

$$B_r(x_0) \cap U = \{x \in B_r(x_0) : x^d > \gamma(x^1, \dots, x^{d-1})\}$$

for some C^k function $\gamma = \gamma(x^1, \dots, x^{d-1})$ on $B_r(x_0) \cap \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \{x_0^d\}$.

Theorem 3.3 (Global approximation theorem for bounded open set U with $C^\infty(\bar{U})$). *For integer $k \geq 0$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, let U be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d with boundary ∂U of class C^1 , then $C^\infty(\bar{U})$ is dense in $W^{k,p}(U)$.*

Proof. Step 1: By the definition of C^1 -regularity of ∂U , ∂U can be covered by balls $\{U_k = B_{r_k}(x_k)\}_{k=1}^K$ in each of which U can be represented as the region above some C^1 graph. Since ∂U is compact (why?), then K is finite.

Let U_0 be an open set that contains $U \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^K U_k$, then $\{U_0, U_1, \dots, U_K\}$ is an open covering of U . Let $\{\chi_k\}_{k=0}^K$ be a smooth partition of identity subordinate to $\{U_k\}_{k=0}^K$, and with that, for $u \in W^{k,p}(U)$, we have

$$u = \sum_{k=0}^K u \chi_k =: u_0 + \sum_{k=1}^K u_k$$

u_0 is compactly supported, for which we can use mollification to approximate.

We will focus on a single u_k .

Step 2: Let $\varepsilon > 0$. We want to approximate u_k , whose support is $B_{r_k}(x_k)$. Without loss of generality, we assume $x_k = 0$. Denote u_k, U_k as u, U . We will use a two-step approximation:

$$\|u - v\| \leq \|u - w_\eta\| + \|w_\eta - v\|$$

Here $w_\eta(x) = u(x + \eta e_d)$, $e_d = (0, \dots, 0, 1)^T$. For η small enough, we have (because of continuity of translation in L^p)

$$\|u - w_\eta\|_{W^{k,p}(U \cap B_{r_0}(0))} < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$$

And let $v = \varphi_\delta * w_\eta$. With δ small enough, v is well-defined on $V = B_{r_k/2}(0)$. More importantly $v \in C^\infty(\overline{V} \cap \{x^d > \gamma(x_1, \dots, x^{d-1})\})$. Then take r_k in step 1 as $r_k/2$ here, we are done. \square

Now we discuss extension theorem. Extension theorem is a tool to deal with $u \in W^{k,p}(U)$, where U is a bounded domain.

Theorem 3.4 (Extension). *For $k \geq 0$ nonnegative integer, $1 \leq p < \infty$, U is a bounded domain with C^k boundary. V is an open set such that $\bar{U} \subset V$. Then $\exists \mathcal{E} : W^{k,p}(U) \rightarrow W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, such that*

- (Extension) $\mathcal{E}u|_U = u$,
- (linear and bounded) \mathcal{E} is linear and

$$\|\mathcal{E}u\|_{W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|u\|_{W^{k,p}(U)}$$

- (support prescription) $\text{supp } \mathcal{E}u \subset V$.

Proof. It suffices to only consider $u \in C^\infty(\bar{U})$ (by density theorem and the linear and bounded property of \mathcal{E}).

Step 1: reduction to the half-ball case.

As in approximation theorem for bounded domain, we construct U_0, U_1, \dots, U_k and $\chi_0, \chi_1, \dots, \chi_k$. Define $u_k = \chi_k u$. Note that u_0 is already in $W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\text{supp } u_0 \subset U_0 \subset V$. For $k > 1$, $\text{supp } u_k \subset U_k \cap U$. Observe that if we define

$$\begin{cases} y^j = x^j - x_k^j, & j = 1, \dots, d-1 \\ y^d = x^d - \gamma(x^1, \dots, x^{d-1}) \end{cases}$$

Then $U_k \cap U$ gets mapped into $\tilde{U} = \{y \in B_{\tilde{r}}(0) : y^d > 0\}$. Note that $x \mapsto y$ is C^k , and u_k smooth, $u_k(y) = u_k(x(y))$ satisfies that

$$\|u_k(y)\|_{W_y^{k,p}(\tilde{U})} \leq C \|u_k(x)\|_{W_x^{k,p}}$$

according to the chain rule.

Step 2: extension in the half-ball case. $U = B_r^+(0)$, $W = B_{r/2}^+(0)$, $\text{supp } u \subset W$. The idea is higher order reflection method. Consider

$$\tilde{u} = \begin{cases} u, & x^d > 0 \\ \sum_{i=0}^K \alpha_j u(x^1, \dots, x^{d-1}, -\beta_i x^d), & x^d < 0 \end{cases}$$

where $0 < \beta_j < 1$ but not yet determined. We need to match the normal derivatives on $\{x^d = 0\}$ up to order k . Note that

$$\partial_{x^d}^j (u(x^1, \dots, x^{d-1}, -\beta_i x^d)) = (-1)^j \beta_i^j (\partial_{x^d}^j u)(x^1, \dots, x^{d-1}, -\beta_i x^d)$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{cases} u(x^1, \dots, x^{d-1}, 0+) = \sum_{j=0}^k \alpha_j u(x^1, \dots, x^{d-1}, 0+) \\ \partial_{x^d} u(x^1, \dots, x^{d-1}, 0+) = \sum_{j=0}^k \alpha_j (-\beta_j) (\partial_{x^d} u)(x^1, \dots, x^{d-1}, 0+) \\ \dots \\ \partial_{x^d}^k u(x^1, \dots, x^{d-1}, 0+) = \sum_{j=0}^k \alpha_j (-\beta_j)^k (\partial_{x^d}^k u)(x^1, \dots, x^{d-1}, 0+) \end{cases}$$

which means

$$\begin{cases} 1 = \sum_{j=0}^k \alpha_j \\ 1 = \sum_{j=0}^k \alpha_j (-\beta_j) \\ \vdots \\ 1 = \sum_{j=0}^k \alpha_j (-\beta_j)^k \end{cases}$$

and as long as all β_j are distinct, then there exists such α_j to satisfy this equation system. (Recall the property of Vandermonde matrix.)

Finally, use an appropriate smooth cutoff χ_V (s.t. $\chi_V = 1$ on U and $\text{supp } \chi_V \subset V$) to define $\mathcal{E}u$, i.e. $\mathcal{E}u = \chi_V \tilde{u}$.⁴ \square

4 Trace theorem

For $u \in C(\bar{U})$, we can restrict it to ∂U and define $u|_{\partial U}$. We define such an operation as $\text{tr}_{\partial U}$, where $\text{tr}_{\partial U} u = u|_{\partial U}$. Note that $\text{tr}_{\partial U} u = u|_{\partial U}$ is linear. We are concerned that whether we can have such an operation for general $u \in W^{1,p}(U)$.

Theorem 4.1 (trace theorem, non-sharp). *U bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^d . ∂U is C^1 , $1 \leq p < \infty$. Then for $u \in C^1(\bar{U})$, we have*

$$\|\text{tr}_{\partial U} u\|_{L^p(\partial U)} \leq C \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(U)}$$

Note that as a consequence, $\text{tr}_{\partial U}$ is extended (uniquely) by continuity (and density theorem) to $\text{tr}_{\partial U} : W^{1,p}(U) \rightarrow L^p(\partial U)$. We call $\text{tr}_{\partial U} u$ the trace of u on ∂U .

⁴Please check that this mapping is bounded in the sense that $\|u\|_{W^{k,p}(U)} \leq C \|u\|_{W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$.

Proof. Same as before, we reduce to the case of half ball $B(0, r)$. Let ξ be a cutoff function that is 1 on $B(0, \frac{r}{2})$ and supported on $B(0, r)$. Let $(x', 0) = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, 0) \in \{x_n = 0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial U \cap B(0, r/2)} |u|^p dx' &\leq \int_{\{x_n=0\} \cap B(0, r/2)} \xi |u|^p dx' = - \int_{B_+(0, r)} (\xi |u|^p)_{x_n} dx \\ &= - \int_{B_+(0, r)} |u|^p \xi_{x_n} + p |u|^{p-1} (\text{sgn } u) u_{x_n} \xi dx \leq C \int_{B_+(0, r)} |u|^p + |Du|^p dx \end{aligned}$$

□

A nontrivial result of the trace operator is that

Theorem 4.2. *For bounded domain U , ∂U being C^1 , $u \in W^{1,p}(U)$, we have*

$$u \in W_0^{1,p}(U) \Leftrightarrow \text{tr}_{\partial U} u = 0 \text{ on } \partial U$$

The detailed proof of this could be found on Evans. We focus now on understanding the sharp trace theorem in a restricted setting. Let $p = 2$, we will use Fourier transform:

$$\begin{cases} U = \mathbb{R}_+^d = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x^d > 0\} \\ \partial U = \{(x', 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \end{cases}$$

Recall that

$$\|u\|_{H^k}^2 \simeq \|(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{k}{2}} \hat{u}\|_{L_\xi^2}^2, k \geq 0$$

where k could be any positive real number. In this way, we have defined the fractional (L^2 -based) Sobolev spaces.

Theorem 4.3 (sharp trace theorem). *For $u \in C^1(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^d}) \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$, we have*

$$\|\text{tr}_{\partial U} u\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})} \leq C \|u\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^d)}$$

Proof. Take $u \in C^1(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^d}) \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$. Using the extension like before, $\exists \tilde{u} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq c \|u\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^d)}$$

We have

$$\text{tr}_{\partial U} u(x') = \tilde{u}(x', 0) = \int \mathcal{F}_{x^d} \tilde{u}(x', \xi_d) \frac{d\xi_d}{2\pi}$$

where \mathcal{F} represents the Fourier transform. We have

$$\mathcal{F}_{x'} \text{tr}_{\partial U} u(\xi') = \int \mathcal{F} \tilde{u}(\xi', \xi_d) \frac{d\xi_d}{2\pi}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{tr}_{\partial U} u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})} &\sim \|(1 + |\xi'|^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \mathcal{F}_{x'} \text{tr}_{\partial U} \tilde{u}(\xi')\|_{L_{\xi'}^2} \\ &= \left\| (1 + |\xi'|^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \int \mathcal{F} \tilde{u}(\xi', \xi_d) \frac{d\xi_d}{2\pi} \right\|_{L_{\xi'}^2} \\ &= \left\| \int \frac{(1 + |\xi'|^2)^{\frac{s}{2}}}{(1 + |\xi'|^2 + \xi_d^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} (1 + |\xi'|^2 + \xi_d^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{F} \tilde{u}(\xi', \xi_d) \frac{d\xi_d}{2\pi} \right\|_{L_{\xi'}^2} \\ &\leq \left\| \left(\int \frac{(1 + |\xi'|^2)^s}{(1 + |\xi'|^2 + \xi_d^2)} d\xi_d \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(1 + |\xi'|^2 + \xi_d^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{F} \tilde{u}\|_{L_{\xi_d}^2} \right\|_{L_{\xi'}^2} \\ &\leq \sup_{\xi' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \left(\int \frac{(1 + |\xi'|^2)^s}{(1 + |\xi'|^2 + \xi_d^2)} d\xi_d \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(1 + |\xi'|^2 + \xi_d^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{F} \tilde{u}\|_{L_{\xi}^2} \end{aligned}$$

When $s \leq 1/2$, the first term on the right hand side is bounded. □

It turns out that the image of $\text{tr}_{\partial U}$ is exactly $H^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Theorem 4.4 (Existence of extension from ∂U). \exists bounded linear map $\text{ext}_{\partial U} : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$, s.t. $\text{tr}_{\partial U} \cdot \text{ext}_{\partial U} = \text{id}$.

Proof. For $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})$, consider $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $\eta = 1$ for $|s| < 1$, $\eta = 0$ for $|s| > 2$. Define $u = \text{ext}_{\partial U} g$ using the following way:

$$\mathcal{F}_{x'} u(\xi', x^d) = \eta(x^d) e^{-x^d |\xi'|} \hat{g}(\xi')$$

we want to verify that $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$. First consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_1 u\|_{L^2}^2 + \cdots + \|\partial_{d-1} u\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \left\| (1 + |\xi'|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{F}_{x'} u(\xi', x^d) \right\|_{L_{\xi'}^2, L_{x^d}^2}^2 \\ &= \left\| (1 + |\xi'|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta(x^d) e^{-x^d |\xi'|} \hat{g}(\xi') \right\|_{L_{\xi'}^2, L_{x^d}^2}^2 \\ &= \left\| (1 + |\xi'|^2)^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\eta(x^d) e^{-x^d |\xi'|}\|_{L_{x^d}^2} (1 + |\xi'|^2)^{\frac{1}{4}} \hat{g}(\xi') \right\|_{L_{\xi'}^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$(1 + |\xi'|^2)^{\frac{1}{4}} \hat{g}(\xi')$ is bounded since $g \in H^{1/2}$, and $(1 + |\xi'|^2)^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\eta(x^d) e^{-x^d |\xi'|}\|_{L_{x^d}^2}$ is bounded with some calculations. Now we only need to verify $\partial_{x^d} u \in L^2$. We have

$$\partial_{x^d} u = \partial_{x^d} (\eta(x^d) v) = \eta'(x^d) v + \eta \partial_{x^d} v, \quad \mathcal{F}_{x'} v = e^{-x^d |\xi'|} \hat{g}(\xi').$$

It is very natural to have $\|\eta'(x^d) v\|_{L^2} \leq C \|v\|_{L^2(x^d \supp \eta)}$. Then let's look at the second term:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta \partial_{x^d} v\|_{L_{x'}^2, L_{x^d}^2} &= \left\| \eta \partial_{x^d} (e^{-x^d |\xi'|} \hat{g}(\xi')) \right\|_{L_{\xi'}^2, L_{x^d}^2} \\ &= \left\| \eta |\xi'| e^{-x^d |\xi'|} \hat{g}(\xi') \right\|_{L_{\xi'}^2, L_{x^d}^2} = \|\eta |\xi'| \mathcal{F}_{x'} u\|_{L_{\xi'}^2, L_{x^d}^2} \leq C \|g\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}} \end{aligned}$$

Now we are done. □

5 Sobolev-type inequalities (1)

Sobolev-type inequalities are quantitative generations of fundamental theorem of calculus, which use derivatives to control function. Below we will prove them for smooth functions, and then according to density theorems, these inequalities hold in the corresponding Sobolev spaces.

For now we consider $W^{1,p}(U)$, $U \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We will see that we have to talk about the following three cases separately:

$$1 \leq p < d, \quad d < p \leq \infty, \quad p = d$$

For now we look at the case $1 \leq p < d$. We want something like

$$\|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

A natural question would be what's the relation between p and q . If the above equation holds, then consider $u_\lambda(x) = u(\lambda x)$, then

$$\|u_\lambda\|_{L^q} = \left(\int |u(\lambda x)|^q dx \right)^{1/q} = \lambda^{-d/q} \|u\|_{L^q}, \quad \|Du_\lambda\|_{L^p} = \left(\int |\lambda Du(\lambda x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} = \lambda^{(p-d)/p} \|Du\|_{L^p}$$

Therefore we need $-d/q = (p-d)/p$. In other words,

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{d}$$

From here we can also see that $p < d$ is necessary. Below for $1 \leq p < d$, the Sobolev conjugate of p is always defined as

$$p^* = \frac{dp}{d-p}$$

Theorem 5.1 (Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev inequality). *For $1 \leq p < d$ (which makes $d \geq 2$), $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exists constant C depending only on d, p such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} \leq C \|Du\|_{L^1}$$

We introduce the following notation:

$$(x^1, \dots, \widehat{x^j}, \dots, x^d) = (x^1, \dots, x^{j-1}, x^{j+1}, \dots, x^d)$$

To prove this theorem we need the following lemma

Lemma 5.1 (Loomis-Whitney inequality). *For $d \geq 2$, $j = 1, \dots, d$, and $f_j = f_j(x^1, \dots, \widehat{x^j}, \dots, x^d)$. Then we have*

$$\left\| \prod_{j=1}^d f_j \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \prod_{j=1}^d \|f_j\|_{L^{d-1}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}$$

We first prove the lemma.

Proof. Integrate in each variable, and then use Holder's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \int \left| \prod_{j=1}^d f_j \right| dx^1 &= |f_1| \int |f_2| \dots |f_d| dx^1 \leq |f_1| \|f_2\|_{L_{x^1}^{d-1}} \dots \|f_d\|_{L_{x^1}^{d-1}} \\ \iint \left| \prod_{j=1}^d f_j \right| dx^1 dx^2 &\leq \int |f_1| \|f_2\|_{L_{x^1}^{d-1}} \dots \|f_d\|_{L_{x^1}^{d-1}} dx^2 = \|f_2\|_{L_{x^1}^{d-1}} \|f_1\|_{L_{x^2}^{d-1}} \|f_3\|_{L_{x^1 x^2}^{d-1}} \dots \|f_d\|_{L_{x^1 x^2}^{d-1}} \\ &\dots \\ \int \dots \int \left| \prod_{j=1}^d f_j \right| dx^1 \dots dx^d &\leq \prod_{j=1}^d \|f_j\|_{L_{x^1, \dots, \widehat{x^j}, \dots, x^d}^{d-1}} \end{aligned}$$

□

Note that L-W inequality has the following geometric meaning. For $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\pi_j(E) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x^j = 0, \exists (x^j)', s.t. (x^1, \dots, (x^j)', \dots, x^d) \in E\}$. Can we bound the measure of E by $|\pi_j(E)|$? Yes!

$$|E| = \int 1_E dx \leq \int \prod_{j=1}^d 1_{\pi_j(E)}(x^1, \dots, \widehat{x^j}, \dots, x^d) dx \leq \prod_{j=1}^d |\pi_j(E)|^{\frac{1}{d-1}}$$

The second inequality is the L-W inequality.

Now we are ready to prove the original theorem.

Proof. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) &= \int_{-\infty}^{x^j} \partial_{x^j} u(x^1, \dots, x^{j-1}, y, x^{j+1}, \dots, x^d) dy \\ |u(x)| &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |Du(x^1, \dots, x^{j-1}, y, x^{j+1}, \dots, x^d)| dy := \widetilde{f_j}(x^1, \dots, \widehat{x^j}, \dots, x^d) \\ |u(x)| &\leq \left(\prod_{j=1}^d \widetilde{f_j} \right)^{1/d}, \quad |u(x)|^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \leq \prod_{j=1}^d \widetilde{f_j}^{\frac{1}{d-1}} := \prod_{j=1}^d f_j \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}^{\frac{d}{d-1}} &= \int |u|^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \leq \int \prod_{j=1}^d f_j \leq \prod_{j=1}^d \|f_j\|_{L^{d-1}} = \prod_{j=1}^d \left(\int |f_j|^{d-1} dx^1 \cdots dx^{\widehat{j}} \cdots dx^d \right)^{\frac{1}{d-1}} \\ &\leq \left(\int |Du| \right)^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \leq \|Du\|_{L^1}^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we naturally have the following theorem.

Theorem 5.2 (Sobolev inequalities for L^p -based spaces). *For $1 \leq p < d$ (which makes $d \geq 2$), $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exists constant C depending only on d, p such that*

$$\|u\|_{L^{p^*}} \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p}$$

Proof. Let $v = |u|^q$, where $q\frac{d}{d-1} = p^*$. Then $|Dv| = q|u|^{q-1}|Du|$. (Note that this requires justification.) Then,

$$\|u\|_{L^{p^*}}^{p^*} = \int |u|^{p^*} dx = \int |v|^{\frac{d}{d-1}} dx \leq \left(\int |Dv| dx \right)^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \simeq \left(\int |u|^{q-1} |Du| dx \right)^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \leq (\| |u|^{q-1} \|_{L^{p^*}} \|Du\|_{L^p})^{\frac{d}{d-1}}$$

Here $\| |u|^{q-1} \|_{L^{p^*}} = (\int |u|^{(q-1)p^*} dx)^{1/p^*} = (\int |u|^{p^*} dx)^{1/p^*}$, where $p^* = p/(p-1)$. The rest is easy to check. □

Theorem 5.3 (Estimates for $W^{1,p}$). *For $1 \leq p < d$ (which makes $d \geq 2$), we have:*

- For $u \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\|u\|_{L^{p^*}} \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p}$,
- U is a bounded domain, with ∂U being C^1 , for $u \in W^{1,p}(U)$, we have

$$\|u\|_{L^{p^*}(U)} \leq C \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(U)}$$

Sketch of the proof. For the first part, we can use density theorem of C_c^∞ in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For the second theorem, we need to first use extension theorem then use density theorem. Note that G-N-S inequality only works for C_c^∞ functions. □

We have another further result for $W_0^{1,p}(U)$:

Theorem 5.4 (Estimates for $W_0^{1,p}(U)$). *For $1 \leq p < d$ (which makes $d \geq 2$), U is a bounded domain. For $u \in W_0^{1,p}(U)$, we have*

$$\|u\|_{L^q(U)} \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p(U)}, \quad \forall 1 \leq q \leq p^*$$

Note that the difference from the previous theorem is that the right hand side is $\|Du\|_{L^p(U)}$ instead of $\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(U)}$. The proof of this theorem requires the approximation of C_c^∞ directly, without extension. Particularly, we have

$$\|u\|_{L^p(U)} \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p(U)}$$

This is called Poincare-Fredrich inequality, one of the Poincare-type inequalities.

6 Sobolev-type inequalities (2)

Now we discuss what happened if $p \geq d$. Consider $u \in C^\infty(U)$, we have

$$u(y) - u(x) = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{ds} u(x + s(y-x)) ds, \quad \frac{d}{ds} u(x + s(y-x)) = (y-x) \cdot Du(x + s(y-x))$$

For $r > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |u(y) - u(x)| dy &\leq \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} \int_0^1 \left| \frac{d}{ds} u(x + s(y-x)) \right| ds dy \\ &\leq C' \frac{1}{r^d} \int_{B_r(x)} \int_0^1 |(y-x)| |Du(x + s(y-x))| ds dy \\ &\leq C' \frac{1}{r^d} \int_0^r d\rho \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d\omega \int_0^1 ds (\rho |Du(x + s\rho\omega)| \rho^{d-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 ds \int_0^r d\rho |Du(x + s\rho\omega)| \rho^d \quad (t = s\rho) \\ &= \int_0^1 ds \int_0^{sr} \frac{dt}{s} |Du(x + t\omega)| \left(\frac{t}{s}\right)^d \\ &= \int_0^r dt \int_{t/r}^1 ds \frac{1}{s^{d+1}} t^d |Du(x + t\omega)| \leq c \int_0^r r^d |Du(x + t\omega)| dt \end{aligned}$$

Then we can continue the previous inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} (u(x) - u(y)) dy &\leq C' \frac{1}{r^d} \int_0^r d\rho \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d\omega \int_0^1 ds (\rho |Du(x + s\rho\omega)| \rho^{d-1}) \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d\omega \int_0^r |Du(x + t\omega)| dt = C \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{|Du|}{|x-y|^{d-1}} dy \end{aligned}$$

In other words, we have proved the following lemma:

Lemma 6.1. *For $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $d \geq 2$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |u(x) - u(y)| dy \leq C \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{|Du|}{|x-z|^{d-1}} dz$$

With this we have the following theorem for $p > d$:

Theorem 6.1. *For $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $d \geq 2$, let $\alpha = 1 - \frac{d}{p}$, then we have*

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq C|x-y|^\alpha \|Du\|_{L^p}$$

Proof. Let $r = |x-y|$. Let $W = B(x, r) \cap B(y, r)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x) - u(y)| &= \frac{1}{|W|} \int_W |u(x) - u(y)| dz \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|W|} \int_W |u(x) - u(z)| dz + \frac{1}{|W|} \int_W |u(y) - u(z)| dz \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|W|} \int_{B_r(x)} |u(x) - u(z)| dz + \frac{1}{|W|} \int_{B_r(y)} |u(y) - u(z)| dz \\ &= \frac{|B_r(x)|}{|W|} \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |u(x) - u(z)| dz + \frac{|B_r(y)|}{|W|} \frac{1}{|B_r(y)|} \int_{B_r(y)} |u(y) - u(z)| dz \\ &\leq C \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{|Du|}{|x-z|^{d-1}} dz \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p(B_r(x))} \left\| \frac{1}{|x-z|^{d-1}} \right\|_{L^{p'}} \leq C' \|Du\|_{L^p} |x-y|^\alpha \end{aligned}$$

□

In order to carry on, we introduce the definition of Holder space:

Definition 6.1 (Holder space). *The Holder semi-norm is defined as*

$$[u]_{C^\alpha(U)} = \sup_{x,y \in U, x \neq y} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha}$$

$[u]_{C^\alpha(U)}$ is a semi-norm since $[u]_{C^\alpha(U)}$ doesn't mean $u = 0$. Therefore, we define Holder norm $\|u\|_{C^\alpha(U)}$ as

$$\|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(U)} = [u]_{C^{0,\alpha}(U)} + \|u\|_{L^\infty}$$

and correspondingly, we can define the Holder space

$$C^{0,\alpha}(U) = \{u \in C(U), \|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} < \infty\}$$

This definition could be generalized to define Holder space $C^{k,\alpha}$:

$$C^{k,\alpha}(U) = \{u \in C^k(U), \|D^\beta u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} < \infty, \forall \beta, |\beta| = k\}$$

Now we are ready to prove the following inequality:

Theorem 6.2 (Morrey's inequality). $d \geq 2$. For U bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^d with C^1 boundary, $p > d$, if $u \in W^{1,p}(U)$, then $u \in C^{0,\alpha}(U)$ with $\alpha = 1 - \frac{d}{p}$, and we have

$$\|u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(U)} \leq C \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(U)}$$

Proof. By extension and density theorem, it suffices to consider $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\text{supp } u \subset V$, V is a bounded set such that $\bar{U} \subset V$. According to the previous theorem, we have $[u]_{C^\alpha(V)} \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p}$. It remains to show

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|u\|_{W^{1,p}}$$

Since

$$\left| u(x) - \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r(x)} u(z) dz \right| \leq \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r(x)} |u(x) - u(z)| dz \leq C \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{|Du|}{|x - z|^{d-1}} dz \leq C r^\alpha \|Du\|_{L^p(B_r(x))}$$

Take $r = 1$, we have

$$|u(x)| \leq c \int_{B_1(x)} |u(z)| dz + C \|Du\|_{L^p(B_r(x))} \leq C' \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(U)}$$

□

For $p = d$, the above theorem break down since $W^{1,d}(U)$ is not a subset of $L^\infty(U)$. A counterexample is that $d = 2$, $U = B_1(0)$, and

$$u = \log(\log(10 + \frac{1}{|x|}))$$

In other words, $L^\infty(U)$ is not big enough. One remedy is to consider the bounded mean oscillation (BMO) space.

Definition 6.2 (BMO). For $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(U)$, we define

$$[u]_{BMO} = \sup_{B_r(x_0) \subset U} \frac{1}{|B_r(x_0)|} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left| u(z) - \frac{1}{|B_r(x_0)|} \int_{B_r(x_0)} u(y) dy \right| dz$$

and recall the famous Hardy-Littlewood theorem, which we'll use later:

Theorem 6.3 (Hardy-Littlewood). For $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(U)$, $Mu(x)$ is defined as

$$Mu(x) = \sup_{r>0} \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |u|$$

It is obvious that $|Mu| \leq \|u\|_{L^\infty}$. Moreover, for all $1 < p < \infty$, we have

$$\|Mu\|_{L^p} \leq C\|u\|_{L^p}$$

Then we have the following theorem:

Theorem 6.4. $U = \mathbb{R}^d$, $u = L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $d \geq 2$, then $[u]_{BMO} < \infty$ and

$$[u]_{BMO} \leq C\|u\|_{W^{1,d}}$$

Proof. We postpone the proof of $[u]_{BMO} < \infty$ for now. Here we'll prove

$$[u]_{BMO} \leq C\|Du\|_{L^d}$$

Fix $B_r(x)$, we want to prove $\exists c$ independent of $B_r(x)$ and u , such that

$$\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} \left| u(z) - \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} u(y) dy \right| dz \leq C\|Du\|_{L^d}$$

we have:

$$\begin{aligned} LHS &= \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} \left| \frac{1}{|B_r(z)|} \int_{B_r(z)} u(z) dy - \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} u(y) dy \right| dz \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|^2} \int_{B_r(x)} \int_{B_{2r}(z)} |u(z) - u(y)| dy dz \\ &\leq C' \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} \int_{B_{2r}(z)} \frac{|Du(y)|}{|z-y|^{d-1}} dy dz \end{aligned}$$

One might think of using Young's inequality:

$$\|f * g\|_{L^r} \leq \|f\|_{L^p} \|g\|_{L^q}, \quad 1 + \frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q}$$

However, this fails since $\frac{1}{|z-x|^{d-1}} \notin L^q$. We will need the famous dyadic decomposition and Hardy-Littlewood theorem. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{2r}(z)} \frac{|Du(y)|}{|z-y|^{d-1}} dy &\leq \sum_{2^k \leq 2r} \int_{A_k} \frac{1}{(2^k)^{d-1}} |Du(y)| dy, \quad A_k = \{2^k \leq |z-y| \leq 2^{k+1}\} \\ &\leq \sum_{2^k \leq 2r} \frac{1}{(2^k)^{d-1}} \int_{B_{2^k}(z)} |Du(y)| dy \leq C_2 \sum_{2^k \leq 2r} 2^k M(|Du|)(z) \end{aligned}$$

where $M(|Du|)$ is the Hardy-littlewood function of Du . Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} \int_{B_{2r}(z)} \frac{|Du(y)|}{|z-y|^{d-1}} dy dz \\ &\leq C_2 \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} dz \sum_{2^k \leq 2r} 2^k M(|Du|)(z) \\ &\leq C_3 \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} r M(|Du|)(z) dz = C''' r \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} M(|Du|)(z) dz \\ &\leq C_3 \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} r \|M(|Du|)\|_{L^d(B_r(x))} \|1\|_{L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}(B_r(x))} = C_4 \|M(|Du|)\|_{L^d(B_r(x))} \leq C\|Du\|_{L^d} \end{aligned}$$

where we use the Hardy-Littlewood inequality in the last step. \square

7 Compactness of Sobolev embedding

Definition 7.1 (Compact operator). $T : X \rightarrow Y$, X, Y are Banach spaces. T is a compact operator, if $T(B_X)$ is precompact, or equivalently, \forall bounded sequence $\{x_n\} \subset X$, $\{Tx_n\}$ has a convergent subsequence.

Definition 7.2 (Compact embedding). Consider an embedding $l : X \rightarrow Y$, where $X \subset Y$ and l is a bounded linear injective mapping. We say that X is compactly embedded in Y if and only if l is compact as a mapping, i.e. \forall bounded sequence $\{x_n\} \subset X$, it has a convergent subsequence with respect to $\|\cdot\|_Y$.

Since we have $W^{1,p}(U) \subset L^p(U)$, it is natural to ask whether such embedding is compact.

A natural starting point to discuss compactness is the Arzela-Ascoli theorem:

Theorem 7.1 (Arzela-Ascoli). K is compact set, $F \subset C(K)$, if

1. (Local boundedness) $\forall x \in K, \exists M_x > 0$, s.t. $\forall f \in F, |f(x)| \leq M_x$ holds.
2. (Equicontinuity) $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0, \forall f \in F, |f(x) - f(y)| < \varepsilon$ if $|x - y| < \delta$.

Then F has a convergent subsequence. (uniformly)

Let us first discuss the compactness of the embedding of Holder spaces.

Theorem 7.2 (Compactness of embedding $C^{0,\alpha}(U) \subset C^{0,\alpha'}(U)$, $0 < \alpha' < \alpha < 1$). U is a bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^d , $0 < \alpha' < \alpha < 1$. Then the embedding $C^{0,\alpha}(U) \subset C^{0,\alpha'}(U)$ is compact.

Proof. Step 1: Using Arzela-Ascoli, we know that $C^{0,\alpha}(U) \subset C(U)$ is a compact embedding.

Step 2: according to step 1, if $\{u_n\} \subset C^{0,\alpha}(U)$, s.t. $\|u_n\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \leq M$, \exists subsequence u_{n_j} s.t. $\{u_{n_j}\} \subset C(U)$, $u_{n_j} \rightarrow u_\infty$ in $C(U)$. We claim that in fact $\|u_{n_j} - u_\infty\|_{C^{0,\alpha'}} \rightarrow 0$ when $j \rightarrow \infty$.

Since

$$\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x - y|^{\alpha'}} \leq \left(\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} \right)^{\frac{\alpha'}{\alpha}} (|v(x)| + |v(y)|)^{1 - \frac{\alpha'}{\alpha}}$$

therefore $\forall v \in C^{0,\alpha'}(U)$,

$$[v]_{C^{0,\alpha'}} \leq c \|v\|_{L^\infty}^{1 - \frac{\alpha'}{\alpha}} [v]_{C^{0,\alpha}}^{\frac{\alpha'}{\alpha}}$$

then

$$[u_{n_j} - u_\infty]_{C^{0,\alpha'}} \leq c \|u_{n_j} - u_\infty\|_{L^\infty}^{1 - \frac{\alpha'}{\alpha}} [u_{n_j} - u_\infty]_{C^{0,\alpha}}^{\frac{\alpha'}{\alpha}}$$

On the right hand side, the first term goes to 0, the second term is bounded, and we are done. \square

Our main theorem would be proving that for $1 \leq p < d$, the embedding $W^{1,p}(U) \subset L^q(U)$ is compact, where $1 \leq q < p^*$. We'll need the following lemma:

Lemma 7.1 (Mollifier). Recall that if $v \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\int \varphi = 1$, $\varphi_\varepsilon * v \rightarrow v$ ($\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) in L^p . Now consider $v \in W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and for φ assume that $\int x^\alpha \varphi dx = 0$ for $1 \leq |\alpha| \leq k$. Then we have

$$\|\varphi_\varepsilon * v - v\|_{L^p} \leq C \varepsilon^k \|\partial^{(k)} v\|_{L^p}$$

Proof. We'll only prove this in the case of $k = 1$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B_1(0)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_\varepsilon * v)(x) - v(x) &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon^d} \int_{B(x,\varepsilon)} \eta\left(\frac{x-z}{\varepsilon}\right) (v(z) - v(x)) dz \\ &= \int_{B(0,1)} \varphi(y) (v(x - \varepsilon y) - v(x)) dy \\ &= \int_{B(0,1)} \varphi(y) \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} v(x - \varepsilon ty) dt dy \\ &= -\varepsilon \int_{B(0,1)} \varphi(y) \int_0^1 Du(x - \varepsilon ty) \cdot y dt dy \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\int |(\varphi_\varepsilon * v)(x) - v(x)|^p dx &= \varepsilon^p \int \left(\int_{B(0,1)} \varphi(y) \int_0^1 Du(x - \varepsilon ty) \cdot y dt dy \right)^p dx \\
&\leq \varepsilon^p \int \left(\int_0^1 \int_{B(0,1)} \varphi(y) |Dv(x - \varepsilon ty)| dy dt \right)^p dx \\
&\leq C_1 \varepsilon^p \left(\int_0^1 \int \int_{B(0,1)} \varphi(y)^p |Dv(x - \varepsilon ty)|^p dy dx dt \right) \\
&\leq C_2 \varepsilon^p \int |Dv|^p dx = C_2 \varepsilon^p \|Dv\|_{L^p}^p
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\|\varphi_\varepsilon * v - v\|_{L^p} \leq C\varepsilon \|Dv\|_{L^p}$$

□

Theorem 7.3 (Rellich-Kondrachov compactness theorem). *For $d \geq 2$, U bounded in \mathbb{R}^d with C^1 boundary, the embedding $W^{1,p}(U) \subset L^q(U)$ is compact, for $1 \leq q < p^*$. (Recall the Sobolev inequality of $W^{1,p}(U) \subset L^{p^*}(U)$.)*

Proof. Step 1: reduce to compactness of $W^{1,p}(U) \rightarrow L^p(U)$:

- Case 1: $p \geq q \geq 1$, with U being bounded, we have $\|v\|_{L^q(U)} \leq |U|^{1/q-1/p} \|v\|_{L^p}$.
- Case 2: $p < q < p^*$, we have

$$\|v\|_{L^q(U)} \leq \|v\|_{L^p(U)}^\theta \|v\|_{L^{p^*}(U)}^{1-\theta}, \quad \frac{d}{q} = \frac{d}{p}\theta + \frac{d}{p^*}(1-\theta)$$

where on the right hand side, the second term is bounded by the Sobolev inequality and the first term is bounded by the compactness result of $W^{1,p}(U) \rightarrow L^p(U)$.

Step 2: prove compactness of $W^{1,p}(U) \rightarrow L^p(U)$. Note that this argument is applied to any p .

Given $\{u_n\} \subset W^{1,p}(U)$, $\|u_n\|_{W^{1,p}(U)} \leq M < \infty$. By extension, $\exists \tilde{u}_n$, an extension of u_n , such that

$$\|\tilde{u}_n\|_{W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|u_n\|_{W^{1,p}(U)} \leq CM$$

and $\text{supp } \tilde{u}_n \subset V$ (V is bounded open, $U \subset V$). Introduce $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\int \varphi = 1$, and we have

$$\tilde{u}_n = \varphi_\varepsilon * \tilde{u}_n + (\tilde{u}_n - \varphi_\varepsilon * \tilde{u}_n)$$

By lemma, we know that $\|(\tilde{u}_n - \varphi_\varepsilon * \tilde{u}_n)\|_{L^p} \leq C\varepsilon M$, independent of n . For $v_{n,\varepsilon} = \varphi_\varepsilon * \tilde{u}_n$ for each fixed ε , we have

$$\|v_{n,\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla v_{n,\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_\varepsilon M$$

because of Holder inequality

$$\left| \int \varphi_\varepsilon(x-y) \tilde{u}_n(y) dy \right| \leq \|\tilde{u}_n\|_{L^p} \|\varphi_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p'}} = C_\varepsilon \|\tilde{u}_n\|_{L^p}$$

and also $v_{n,\varepsilon}$ for fixed ε satisfy the condition of using Arzela-Ascoli theorem.

Therefore any l , \exists a subsequence $\{\tilde{u}_{n_k^l}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and a ε_l , such that

- $\|\tilde{u}_{n_k^l} - \varphi_{\varepsilon_l} * \tilde{u}_{n_k^l}\|_{L^p} < 2^{-l}$;
- $\|v_{n_k^l, \varepsilon_l} - v_{n_{k'}^l, \varepsilon_l}\| < 2^{-k}$, for all $k', k'' \geq k$. (This follows from Arzela-Ascoli theorem.)

Then use a diagonal argument, we have constructed a sequence $\{\tilde{u}_{n_i}\}$ such that it is a Cauchy sequence in L^p . □

A direct result is that

Theorem 7.4. *The embedding of $W^{1,p}(U) \rightarrow L^p(U)$ is compact for any p for bounded U with C^1 boundary. The embedding of $W_0^{1,p}(U) \rightarrow L^p(U)$ is compact for any p for bounded U .*

8 Poincare-type inequality

Poincare-type inequality refers to the type of inequality that uses the regularity of Du to control u , with some additional conditions to fix the inequality.

Theorem 8.1 (Poincare). $1 \leq p < \infty$, let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with C^1 boundary, then for $u \in W^{1,p}(U)$ with $\int u dx = 0$, we have

$$\|u\|_{L^p(U)} \leq C_U \|Du\|_{L^p(U)}$$

Proof using compactness. We argue by contradiction.

Assume that for n , $\exists u_n$, $\|u_n\|_{L^p} \geq n \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^p}$, and $u_n \in W^{1,p}$, $\int u_n = 0$. By normalization, without loss of generality, let $\|u_n\|_{L^p} = 1$, then $\|\nabla u_n\|_{L^p} \leq \frac{1}{n}$. Therefore the $W^{1,p}$ norm of $\|u_n\|$ is bounded, by Rellich-Kondrachov theorem (and something else), there exists a subsequence, still denoted by $\{u_n\}$, such that

- $u_n \rightarrow u_\infty$ in L^p . This implies that $\|u_n\|_{L^p} \rightarrow \|u_\infty\|_{L^p} = 1$.
- $Du_n \rightharpoonup Du$ weakly. Since $\|Du_n\|_{L^p} \rightarrow 0$, this implies that $Du = 0$, then u is a constant. Recall that $u_n \rightarrow u_\infty$ in L^p , therefore $\int u_n dx \rightarrow \int u dx$, and we knew that $\int u dx = 0$. Therefore $u = 0$.

Contradiction is achieved. □

Using this, we can prove that

$$\left\| u - \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} u dx \right\|_{L^p(B(x,r))} \leq Cr \|Du\|_{L^p(B(x,r))}$$

where C is independent of x, r . This implies that for $u \in W^{1,d}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have $u \in BMO$.

We have covered Poincare-Fredrich inequality. Another type of Poincare inequality is the Hardy's inequality:

Theorem 8.2. For $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $d > 2$, we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{|x|} u \right\|_{L^2} \leq C \|Du\|_{L^2}$$

Proof. Using polar coordinate, we only need to prove

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{r^2} u^2 r^{d-1} dr \leq C \int |\partial_r u|^2 r^{d-1} dr$$

Consider that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_0^\infty \left(\partial_r u + \frac{\alpha}{r} u \right)^2 r^{d-1} dr = \int_0^\infty \left((\partial_r u)^2 + \frac{2\alpha}{r} u \partial_r u + \frac{\alpha^2}{r^2} u^2 \right) r^{d-1} dr \\ &= \int_0^\infty (\partial_r u)^2 r^{d-1} dr + \alpha^2 \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{r^2} u^2 r^{d-1} dr + \alpha \int_0^\infty \partial_r (u^2) r^{d-2} dr \\ &= \int_0^\infty (\partial_r u)^2 r^{d-1} dr - ((d-2)\alpha - \alpha^2) \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{r^2} u^2 r^{d-1} dr \end{aligned}$$

Plug in $\alpha = \frac{d-2}{2}$, we have

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{r^2} u^2 r^{d-1} dr \leq \left(\frac{2}{d-2} \right)^2 \int |\partial_r u|^2 r^{d-1} dr$$

□

⁵How to prove the general form of Hardy's inequality?

Problems

Sobolev space and functional analysis

1. Prove the Fourier characterization theorem. (Theorem 1.3). (Theorem 8 in Evans 5.8).
2. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $1 < p < +\infty$, prove that $W^{-k,p}(U)$ is a Banach space.
3. (a) Let X be a normed vector space and Y a linear subspace of X . Show that $\pi : X^* \rightarrow Y^*$, $x^* \mapsto x^*|_Y$ is surjective. [Hint: Use Hahn-Banach.]
 (b) Let X be a normed vector space, Y a linear subspace of X , and $x \in X$. Then $x \in \bar{Y}$ if and only if $\langle x^*, x \rangle = 0$ for all $x^* \in Y^\perp$, where $Y^\perp = \ker \pi$.
 [Hint: For the if direction, suppose that $x \notin \bar{Y}$. Construct $x^* \in Y^\perp$ such that $\langle x^*, x \rangle \neq 0$ by defining a suitable linear functional on the subspace $Y + \{tx \in X : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and applying Hahn-Banach.]
 (c) Show that if X is reflexive and $Y \subseteq X$ is a closed subspace of X , then Y is reflexive.
 [Hint: Given $y^{**} \in Y^{**}$, use the reflexivity of X to find an element $y \in X$ such that $y^{**}(\pi(x^*)) = \langle x^*, y \rangle$ for each $x^* \in X^*$. Show that $y \in \bar{Y}$ using (b) and that $y^{**}(y^*) = y^*(y)$ for every $y^* \in Y^*$ using (a).]
4. Let k be a nonnegative integer, U an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d and $1 < p < \infty$. Show that $W^{k,p}(U)$ and $W_0^{k,p}(U)$ are reflexive. [Hint: Use 1.]
5. (a) Show that if U is an open convex subset of \mathbb{R}^d , then $W^{1,\infty}(U)$ coincides with the space of all Lipschitz functions on U .
 (b) (Evans 5.13) Give an example of an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and a function $u \in W^{1,\infty}(U)$, such that u is not Lipschitz continuous on U . (Hint: Take U to be the open unit disk in \mathbb{R}^2 , with a slit removed.)
6. For $s > n/2$, prove that
 - (a) (Evans 5.20) if $u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with the bound

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

- (b) (Evans 5.21) if $u, v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then $u, v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with the bound

$$\|uv\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)}\|v\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

Approximation(density) theorems and extension theorem

1. (Evans 5.11) Suppose U is connected open set and $u \in W^{1,p}(U)$ satisfies

$$Du = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } U$$

Prove u is constant a.e. in U .

2. Let k be a nonnegative integer and $1 \leq p < \infty$. Prove $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ from $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
3. (1) (Evans 5.9) Integrate by parts to prove the interpolation inequality:

$$\|Du\|_{L^2} \leq C\|u\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|D^2u\|_{L^2}^{1/2}$$

for all $u \in C_c^\infty(U)$. Assume U is bounded, ∂U is smooth, and prove this inequality if $u \in H^2(U) \cap H_0^1(U)$. (Hint: Take sequences $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset C_c^\infty(U)$ converging to u in $H_0^1(U)$ and $\{w_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset C^\infty(\bar{U})$ converging to u in $H^2(U)$.)

(2) (Evans 5.10a) Integrate by parts to prove

$$\|Du\|_{L^p} \leq C \|u\|_{L^p}^{1/2} \|D^2u\|_{L^p}^{1/2}$$

for $2 \leq p < \infty$ and all $u \in C_c^\infty(U)$. (Hint: $\int_U |Du|^p dx = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_U u_{x_i} u_{x_i} |Du|^{p-2} dx$.)

(3) (Evans 5.10b) Prove

$$\|Du\|_{L^{2p}} \leq C \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{1/2} \|D^2u\|_{L^p}^{1/2}$$

for $1 \leq p < \infty$ and all $u \in C_c^\infty(U)$.

4. (Evans 5.17, Chain Rule) Assume $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is C^1 , with F' bounded. Suppose U is bounded and $u \in W^{1,p}(U)$ for some $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Show

$$v := F(u) \in W^{1,p}(U) \text{ and } v_{x_i} = F'(u) u_{x_i} \quad (i = 1, \dots, n).$$

(Hint: Use that any sequence that converges in L^p has a subsequence that converges point-wise a.e.)

Then use this to prove Evans 5.18.

Trace theorem

1. (Evans 5.7) Assume that U is bounded and there exists a smooth vector field α such that $\alpha \cdot \nu \geq 1$ along ∂U , where ν as usual denotes the outward unit normal. Assume $1 \leq p < \infty$. Apply the Gauss-Green Theorem to $\int_{\partial U} |u|^p \alpha \cdot \nu dS$, to derive a new proof of the trace inequality

$$\int_{\partial U} |u|^p dS \leq C \int_U |Du|^p + |u|^p dx$$

for all $u \in C^1(\bar{U})$.

2. (Evans 5.8) Let U be bounded, with a C^1 boundary. Show that a "typical" function $u \in L^p(U)$ ($1 \leq p < \infty$) does not have a trace on ∂U . More precisely, prove that there does not exist a bounded linear operator

$$T : L^p(U) \rightarrow L^p(\partial U)$$

such that $Tu = u|_{\partial U}$ whenever $u \in C(\bar{U}) \cap L^p(U)$.

3. (Evans 5.14) Verify that

$$u(x) = \log \log \left(2 + \frac{1}{|x|} \right) \quad \text{on } U = B_1(0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$$

belongs to $W^{1,2}(U)$ but not in $L^\infty(U)$.

4. This problem demonstrates that the trace theorem fails when the codomain does not have a positive regularity index.

(1) Show that for $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $\text{tr}^{(2)} u(z) = u(0, 0, z)$ is well-defined as an element in $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$\|u(0, 0, x^3)\|_{W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

(2) Show, however, that $\text{tr}^{(2)} : W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$. [Hint: Consider $u = v(x^1, x^2) w(x^3)$, and rescale the x^1, x^2 variables to reduce the problem to contradicting the $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ embedding. Then use Problem 2 to produce a sequence of v 's that contradicts $\text{tr}^{(2)} : W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$.]

Sobolev inequality

1. (Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev fractional integration inequality) Let $d \geq 2$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $0 < s < d$. For any $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, show that

$$\left\| \int \frac{|u(y)|}{|x-y|^s} dy \right\|_{L_x^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_s \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

where q is determined by $\frac{d}{q} + d - s = \frac{d}{p}$.

2. Let $d \geq 2$, $1 < p < d$. Use the above result to give a different proof of the Sobolev inequality

$$\|u\|_{L^{p^*}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_{p,d} \|Du\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \quad \text{for all } u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

where p^* is determined by $\frac{d}{p^*} = \frac{d}{p} - 1$.

3. (1) (Evans 5.1) U is an open subset, prove that $C_{k,\alpha}(\bar{U})$ ($\alpha < 1$) is a Banach space.
 (2) Let U be an open and connected subset of \mathbb{R}^d . Show that if u is "Hölder of order α with $\alpha > 1$ ", i.e., if there exists $\alpha > 1$ such that

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq C|x - y|^\alpha \quad \text{for all } x, y \in U,$$

then $u = \text{const.}$

- (3) (Evans 5.2) U is an open subset, $0 < \beta < \gamma \leq 1$, prove the interpolation inequality:

$$\|u\|_{C^{0,\gamma}(U)} \leq \|u\|_{C^{0,\beta}(U)}^{\frac{1-\gamma}{1-\beta}} \|u\|_{C^{0,1}(U)}^{\frac{\gamma-\beta}{1-\beta}}$$

4. (Theorem 4 in Evans 5.8, Characterization of $W^{1,\infty}$). Prove the following statement: let U be open and bounded, with ∂U of class C^1 . Then $u : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz continuous if and only if $u \in W^{1,\infty}(U)$.
 5. Prove Theorem 5 in Evans 5.8.

Poincare-type inequality

1. Fix $\alpha > 0$ and let $U = B_1(0)$. Show that there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending only on d and α , such that

$$\int_U u^2 dx \leq C \int_U |Du|^2 dx$$

provided

$$|\{x \in U : u(x) = 0\}| \geq \alpha, \quad u \in H^1(U)$$

2. Prove the following Hardy's inequality: let $1 \leq p < d$ and $u \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then $r^{-1}u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and

$$\|r^{-1}u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

where C depends only on d and p .

3. Prove the following Hardy's inequality: Assume $n \geq 3$ and $r > 0$. Suppose that $u \in H^1(B(0, r))$. Then $\frac{u}{|x|} \in L^2(B(0, r))$, with the estimate

$$\int_{B(0,r)} \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx \leq C \int_{B(0,r)} |Du|^2 + \frac{u^2}{r^2} dx$$

4. Prove the following Hardy's inequality: let U be a bounded C^1 domain. For any $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $u \in W_0^{1,p}(U)$, we have

$$\|\text{dist}(\cdot, \partial U)^{-1} u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

where C depends only on d, p and U .

[Hint: by density, we may assume that $u \in C_c^\infty(U)$. By a smooth partition of unity, boundary straightening (as in the proof of density theorem), it suffices to prove the following statement: For $u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$, we have $\|(x^d)^{-1} u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}_+^d)} \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}_+^d)}.$]

5. Prove the following result [Theorem 3 in Evans 5.9] of difference quotients, which will be useful in studying elliptic equations. Assume $u : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a locally summable function and $V \subset\subset U$. The i^{th} -difference quotient of size h is

$$D_i^h u(x) = \frac{u(x + he_i) - u(x)}{h} \quad (i = 1, \dots, n)$$

for $x \in V$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}, 0 < |h| < \text{dist}(V, \partial U)$. And we define $D^h u := (D_1^h u, \dots, D_n^h u)$.

- (1) Suppose $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $u \in W^{1,p}(U)$. Then for each $V \subset\subset U$

$$\|D^h u\|_{L^p(V)} \leq C \|Du\|_{L^p(U)}$$

for some constant C and all $0 < |h| < \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(V, \partial U)$.

- (2) Assume $1 < p < \infty, u \in L^p(V)$, and there exists a constant C such that

$$\|D^h u\|_{L^p(V)} \leq C$$

for all $0 < |h| < \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(V, \partial U)$. Then

$$u \in W^{1,p}(V), \quad \text{with} \quad \|Du\|_{L^p(V)} \leq C.$$

- (3) (Evans 5.12) Show that (ii) is false for $p = 1$ (counterexample in previous problems).

References

- L. C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*, volume 19. American Mathematical Soc., 2010.
- S.-J. OH. Lecture notes for math 222a. 2021. URL <https://math.berkeley.edu/~sjoh/pdfs/notes-math222a.pdf>.