

# LIOUVILLE TYPE RESULTS FOR PERIODIC AND ALMOST PERIODIC ELLIPTIC OPERATORS

LUCA ROSSI

ABSTRACT. The main feature of this paper concerns extensions of the Liouville theorem to the following class of elliptic equations in non-divergence form:

$$a_{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}u + b_i(x)\partial_i u + c(x)u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

with  $c \leq 0$ . We show that the Liouville property holds (that is, the space of bounded solutions has at most dimension one) if the coefficients  $a_{ij}$ ,  $b_i$  and  $c$  are periodic, with the same period, and it does not hold in general if the coefficients are only almost periodic. The Liouville property for periodic operators was already proved in [11], using homogenization technics and Floquet theory. Here, we follow a completely different and more direct approach, deriving the Liouville property from the following result, which is of independent interest: any bounded solution of

$$-a_{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}u - b_i(x)\partial_i u - c(x)u = f(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

with  $c \leq 0$  and  $a_{ij}$ ,  $b_i$ ,  $c$ ,  $f$  periodic in the same variable, with the same period, is periodic in that variable. In contrast, bounded solutions of almost periodic equations with nonpositive zero order coefficient are not necessarily almost periodic, as we explicitly show with a counterexample. We further consider the problem of almost periodicity of bounded solutions of equations with periodic coefficients and almost periodic term  $f$ . Finally, we establish analogous results to those mentioned above for either Dirichlet or oblique derivative problems in general unbounded periodic domains.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Main results.** We are interested in the study of bounded solutions of linear elliptic equations of the type

$$(1) \quad -Lu = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where

$$Lu = a_{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}u + b_i(x)\partial_i u + c(x)u$$

(the convention is adopted for summation on repeated indices). We want to find in particular necessary and sufficient conditions under which the Liouville property holds. In analogy with the classical result for harmonic functions, we say that the Liouville property holds if the space of bounded solutions has at most dimension one.

Throughout the paper, the matrix field  $(a_{ij})_{ij}$  is assumed to be symmetric and uniformly elliptic, that is,

$$\forall x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad \underline{a}|\xi|^2 \leq a_{ij}(x)\xi_i\xi_j \leq \bar{a}|\xi|^2,$$

for some constants  $0 < \underline{a} \leq \bar{a}$ . We further require that  $a_{ij}, b_i, c, f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and that the  $a_{ij}$  are uniformly continuous in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . We consider in particular operators with periodic or *almost periodic* coefficients.

We say that a function  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is periodic in the  $m$ -th variable,  $m \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , with period  $l_m > 0$ , if  $\phi(x + l_m e_m) = \phi(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , where  $(e_1, \dots, e_N)$  denotes the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . If  $\phi$  is periodic in all the variables we say that it is periodic, with period  $(l_1, \dots, l_N)$ . A linear operator is said to be periodic (resp. periodic in the  $m$ -th variable) if all its coefficients are periodic (resp. periodic in the  $m$ -th variable) with the same period.

The crucial step to prove the Liouville property consists in showing that the periodicity of the operator is inherited by bounded solutions.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $u$  be a bounded solution of (1), with  $L$  and  $f$  periodic in the  $m$ -th variable, with the same period  $l_m$ , and  $c \leq 0$ . Then,  $u$  is periodic in the  $m$ -th variable, with period  $l_m$ .*

As a consequence, if  $L$  and  $f$  are periodic (in all the variables) with the same period, then all bounded solutions are periodic. In particular, they admit global maximum and minimum and then the strong maximum principle yields the following Liouville type result:

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $u$  be a bounded solution of*

$$(2) \quad Lu = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

*with  $L$  periodic and  $c \leq 0$ . Then, two possibilities occur:*

- 1)  $c \equiv 0$  and  $u$  is constant;
- 2)  $c \not\equiv 0$  and  $u \equiv 0$ .

Clearly, without the assumption  $c \leq 0$  the Liouville property no longer holds in general, even in the case of constant coefficients. As an example, the space of solutions of  $-u'' + u = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  is generated by  $u_1 = \sin x$  and  $u_2 = \cos x$ . However, condition  $c \leq 0$  is not necessary and can be relaxed by  $\lambda_p(-L) \geq 0$ , where  $\lambda_p(-L)$  denotes the *periodic principal eigenvalue* of  $-L$ . Henceforth,  $\lambda_p(-L)$  will always stand for the periodic principal eigenvalue of  $-L$  (in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ) and  $\varphi_p$  for the associated principal eigenfunction (see Section 2 for the definitions).

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $u$  be a bounded solution of (1), with  $L$  and  $f$  periodic, with the same period  $(l_1, \dots, l_N)$ .*

- (i) *if  $\lambda_p(-L) \geq 0$  then  $u$  is periodic, with period  $(l_1, \dots, l_N)$ ;*
- (ii) *if  $\lambda_p(-L) = 0$  and either  $f \leq 0$  or  $f \geq 0$  then  $u \equiv k\varphi_p$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $f \equiv 0$ ;*
- (iii) *if  $\lambda_p(-L) \geq 0$  and  $f \equiv 0$  then  $u \equiv k\varphi_p$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

Theorem 1.2 part (ii) applies in particular when  $c \equiv 0$ , while part (iii) extends Corollary 1 (see Remark 1 below). Moreover, statement (iii) implies the uniqueness of bounded solutions of (1) when  $\lambda_p(-L) > 0$  (cf. Corollary 2).

We further consider the problem of the validity of the Liouville property if we relax the periodicity assumptions on  $a_{ij}$ ,  $b_i$ ,  $c$  and  $f$ . A natural generalization of periodic functions of a single real variable are *almost periodic* functions, introduced by Bohr [6]. This notion can be readily extended to functions of several variables through a characterization of *continuous almost periodic* functions due to Bochner [4] (see also [5]).

**Definition 1.3.** We say that a function  $\phi \in C(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is almost periodic (a. p.) if from any arbitrary sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  can be extracted a subsequence  $(x_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $(\phi(x + x_{n_k}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges uniformly in  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ .

It is straightforward to check that continuous periodic functions are a. p. (this is no longer true if we drop the continuity assumption). We say that a linear operator is a. p. if its coefficients are a. p.

By explicitly constructing a counterexample, we show that the Liouville type result of Corollary 1 does not hold if we relax the assumption  $L$  periodic by  $L$  a. p.

**Counterexample.** There exists an a. p. function  $b : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the space of bounded solutions of

$$(3) \quad u'' + b(x)u' = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}$$

has dimension 2, generated by the function  $u_1 \equiv 1$  and a function  $u_2$  which is not a. p.

This also shows that bounded solutions of a. p. equations with nonpositive zero order term may not be a. p., in contrast with what happens for periodicity (cf. Theorem 1.1). Actually, the function  $b$  in Counterexample 1.1 is *limit periodic*, that is, it is the uniform limit of a sequence of continuous periodic functions (see Definition 3.1 below). Limit periodic functions are a subset of a. p. functions because, as it is easily seen from Definition 1.3, the space of a. p. functions is closed with respect to the  $L^\infty$  norm (see e. g. [1], [7]).

Next, we look for sufficient conditions under which bounded solutions of (1) are a. p. We derive the following

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $u$  be a bounded solution of (1), with  $L$  periodic and  $f$  a. p.*

- (i) *if  $\lambda_p(-L) \geq 0$  then  $u$  is a. p.;*
- (ii) *if  $\lambda_p(-L) = 0$  and either  $f \leq 0$  or  $f \geq 0$  then  $u \equiv k\varphi_p$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $f \equiv 0$ .*

Lastly, we prove results analogous to Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 for the Dirichlet and the oblique derivative problems in periodic domains. Uniqueness results are obtained as consequences.

**1.2. Survey of related results.** Avellaneda and Lin [2], and also Moser and Struwe [14], gave a characterization of polynomial growing solutions of the self-adjoint equation

$$\partial_i(a_{ij}(x)\partial_j u) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

with  $a_{ij}$  periodic. This characterization - proved using some homogenization techniques - implies the Liouville property as a particular case. The results of [2] and [14] have been recently improved by Kuchment and Pinchover [11] to the general non-self-adjoint equation (2), with  $L$  periodic (see also Li and Wang [12] for the case  $b_i \equiv 0$ ). Following an approach based on the Floquet theory, they proved that the Liouville property holds if the *generalized principal eigenvalue*  $\lambda_1(-L)$  is nonnegative (we refer to [3] and the references therein for the definition of  $\lambda_1(-L)$  and its relation with  $\lambda_p(-L)$ ). Since  $\lambda_1(-L) \geq \lambda_p(-L)$  and equality may not hold if  $L$  is not self-adjoint, the Liouville type result of [11] turns out to be more general than Theorem 1.2 statement (iii) presented here, except for the fact that the operators considered in [11] have smooth coefficients. We remark that the result of [11] does not hold anymore if one relaxes the periodicity assumption, because it can be proved that the operator in Counterexample 1.1 satisfies  $\lambda_1(-L) = 0$ .

To our knowledge, no results about operators periodic in just one variable, such as Theorem 1.1, have been previously obtained.

There is a vast literature on the problem of almost periodicity of bounded solutions of linear equations with a. p. coefficients (see e. g. [1], [7], [15], [10]). In almost all of the cases, ordinary differential equations or systems are considered, often of first order type. As emphasized in [13], some authors made use in proofs of the claim that any bounded solution in  $\mathbb{R}$  of a second order linear equation with a. p. coefficients has to be a. p. This claim is false, as shown by Counterexample 1.1 and also by a counterexample in [13]. There, the authors constructed an a. p. function  $c(x)$  such that the equation

$$u'' + c(x)u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R},$$

admits bounded solutions which are not a. p. In their case, the space of bounded solutions has dimension one and then the Liouville property holds. They also addressed the following open question: if every solution of a linear equation in  $\mathbb{R}$  with a. p. coefficients is bounded are all solutions necessarily a. p.? Counterexample 1.1 shows that the answer is no. A negative answer was also given in [9], where it is exhibited a class of linear ordinary differential equations of order  $n \geq 2$  for which all solutions are bounded in  $\mathbb{R}$ , yet no nontrivial solution is a. p. Thus, this also provides an example where the Liouville property does not hold, but it is not interesting in this sense because the zero order term considered is not nonpositive.

**1.3. Organization of the paper.** In Section 2, we consider the case  $L$  and  $f$  periodic and we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. In order to prove the periodicity of any bounded solution  $u$ , we show that the difference between  $u$  and its translation by one period is identically equal to 0. This can be done by passing to a limit equation and making use of a supersolution  $v$  with positive infimum. We take  $v \equiv 1$  in the case of Theorem 1.1 and  $v \equiv \varphi_p$  in the case of Theorem 1.2. We further prove Corollary 1 as well as the existence and uniqueness of bounded solutions of (1) when  $\lambda_p(-L) > 0$ .

Section 3 is devoted to the construction of the function  $b$  of Counterexample 1.1, which will be defined by an explicit recursive formula.

Theorem 1.4 is proved in Section 4. The basic idea to prove statement (i) is that, up to subsequences, any subsequence of a given sequence of translations of  $u$  converges to a solution of the same equation. Also, one can come back to the original equation by translating in the opposite direction. Then, the result follows from Theorem 1.2 part (iii).

In Sections 5, we derive results analogous to Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 for the Dirichlet and the oblique derivative problems in periodic domains. There, the periodic principal eigenvalue  $\lambda_p$  is replaced respectively by  $\lambda_{p,D}$  (see Section 5.1) and  $\lambda_{p,N}$  (see Section 5.2) which take into account the boundary conditions. Existence and uniqueness results are also presented.

## 2. $L$ AND $f$ PERIODIC

Let us preliminarily reclaim the notion of periodic principal eigenvalue and eigenfunction. If  $L$  is periodic then the Krein Rutman theory yields the existence of a unique real number  $\lambda$ , called periodic principal eigenvalue of  $-L$  (in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ), such that

the eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} -L\varphi = \lambda\varphi & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \\ \varphi \text{ is periodic, with the same period as } L \end{cases}$$

admits positive solutions. Furthermore, the positive solution  $\varphi$  is unique up to a multiplicative constant, and it is called periodic principal eigenfunction. We denote by  $\lambda_p(-L)$  and  $\varphi_p$  respectively the periodic principal eigenvalue and eigenfunction of  $-L$ .

The next result will be used to prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Assume that the operator  $L$  and the function  $f$  are periodic in the  $m$ -th variable, with the same period  $l_m$ . If there exists a function  $v$  satisfying*

$$\inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} v > 0, \quad -Lv = \phi \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

for some nonnegative function  $\phi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , then any bounded solution  $u$  of (1) is periodic in the  $m$ -th variable, with period  $l_m$ .

*Proof.* Let  $u$  be a bounded solution of (1). Define the function

$$w(x) := \frac{u(x + l_m e_m) - u(x)}{v(x)}.$$

We want to show that  $w \leq 0$ . Assume, by way of contradiction, that  $k := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} w(x) > 0$  and consider a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  such that  $w(x_n) \rightarrow k$ . Define  $u_n(x) := u(x + x_n)$ . Since  $\|u_n\|_\infty = \|u\|_\infty$ , the interior elliptic estimates together with the Rellich-Kondrachov compactness theorem imply that the sequence  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges (up to subsequences) in  $W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and weakly in  $W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , for any  $p \geq 1$ , to a function  $u_\infty$  such that  $\|u_\infty\|_\infty \leq \|u\|_\infty$ . Thus, denoting with  $\tilde{a}_{ij}, \tilde{b}_i, \tilde{c}$  and  $\tilde{f}$  the weak limit in  $L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$  of a converging subsequence respectively of  $a_{ij}(x + x_n)$ ,  $b_i(x + x_n)$ ,  $c(x + x_n)$  and  $f(x + x_n)$ , it follows that

$$-\tilde{L}u_\infty := -\tilde{a}_{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}u_\infty - \tilde{b}_i(x)\partial_i u_\infty - \tilde{c}(x)u_\infty = \tilde{f} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N$$

(for the weak convergence of  $a_{ij}(\cdot + x_n)\partial_{ij}u_n$  to  $\tilde{a}_{ij}\partial_{ij}u_\infty$  one uses the fact that, up to subsequences,  $a_{ij}(\cdot + x_n) \rightarrow \tilde{a}_{ij}$  also locally uniformly thanks to the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem). Furthermore, always up to subsequences, the real sequence  $(v(x_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $(u_\infty(l_m e_m) - u_\infty(0))/k$  and then the functions  $v_n(x) := v(x + x_n)$  are locally uniformly bounded by Harnack's inequality. Consequently, (a subsequence of)  $v_n$  converges locally uniformly to a positive function  $v_\infty$  such that

$$-\tilde{L}v_\infty \geq 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

The function  $w_\infty(x) := (u_\infty(x + l_m e_m) - u_\infty(x))/v_\infty(x)$  reaches its maximum  $k$  at 0. The periodicity assumption on  $f$  - which is inherited by  $\tilde{f}$  - yields

$$-\tilde{L}(v_\infty w_\infty) = -\tilde{L}(u_\infty(\cdot + l_m e_m) - u_\infty(\cdot)) = \tilde{f}(\cdot + l_m e_m) - \tilde{f}(\cdot) = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Therefore,

$$0 = -\frac{\tilde{L}(v_\infty w_\infty)}{v_\infty} = -\tilde{M}w_\infty - \frac{\tilde{L}v_\infty}{v_\infty}w_\infty \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where the operator  $\tilde{M}$  is defined by

$$\tilde{M}\phi := \tilde{a}_{ij}\partial_{ij}\phi + (2v_\infty^{-1}\tilde{a}_{ij}\partial_j v_\infty + \tilde{b}_i)\partial_i \phi.$$

Since the term  $(\tilde{L}v_\infty)/v_\infty$  is nonpositive, we can apply the strong maximum principle to the function  $w_\infty$  (see e. g. [8]) and derive

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad u_\infty(x + l_m e_m) = u_\infty(x) + kv_\infty(x).$$

It follows in particular that, for  $h \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$u_\infty(hl_m e_m) \geq u_\infty(0) + hk \inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} v,$$

which is a contradiction because  $u_\infty$  is bounded. We have shown that  $w \leq 0$ , that is,  $u(x + l_m e_m) \leq u(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . The opposite inequality can be obtained by replacing  $l_m$  with  $-l_m$  and proceeding as before.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Since the function  $v \equiv 1$  satisfies

$$\inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} v > 0, \quad -Lv = -c(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

the statement immediately follows from Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

Let us turn directly to the proof of Theorem 1.2. Corollary 1 will be derived as a consequence.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* (i) The function  $v := \varphi_p$  satisfies

$$\inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} v > 0, \quad -Lv = \phi \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

with  $\phi := \lambda_p(-L)\varphi_p \geq 0$ . Hence, the statement is a consequence of Lemma 2.1.

(ii) Up to replace  $u$  with  $-u$ , it is not restrictive to assume that  $f \leq 0$ . Set

$$k := \sup \frac{u}{\varphi_p}.$$

Since  $u$  is periodic by (i) - with the same period  $(l_1, \dots, l_N)$  as  $\varphi_p$  - it follows that there exists  $x_0 \in [0, l_1) \times \dots \times [0, l_N)$  such that the nonnegative function  $w := k\varphi_p - u$  vanishes at  $x_0$ . Furthermore,

$$-Lw = k\lambda_p(-L)\varphi_p - f \geq 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Therefore, the strong maximum principle yields  $w \equiv 0$ , that is  $u \equiv k\varphi_p$  and  $f \equiv 0$ .

(iii) Assume that  $\sup u \geq 0$  (otherwise replace  $u$  with  $-u$ ). Proceeding as in (ii), one can find a constant  $k \geq 0$  such that the function  $w(x) := k\varphi_p(x) - u(x)$  is nonnegative, vanishes at some point  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and satisfies  $-Lw = k\lambda_p(-L)\varphi_p \geq 0$ . Once again, the strong maximum principle implies  $w \equiv 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 1.** If  $L$  is periodic and  $c \equiv 0$  then  $\lambda_p(-L) = 0$ , with  $\varphi_p \equiv 1$ . Hence, Theorem 1.2 part (ii) implies that any bounded solution of (1) with either  $f \leq 0$  or  $f \geq 0$  is constant and  $f \equiv 0$ .

If  $L$  is periodic and  $c \leq 0$  then, by simply computing  $-L\varphi_p$  at a maximum point of  $\varphi_p$ , one sees that  $\lambda_p(-L) \geq 0$ . Therefore, Theorem 1.2 part (iii) applies.

Statement (iii) of Theorem 1.2 yields the following uniqueness result.

**Corollary 2.** *If  $L$  is periodic and  $\lambda_p(-L) > 0$  then (1) admits at most one bounded solution. If in addition  $f$  is also periodic, with the same period as  $L$ , then such a solution does exist and it is periodic.*

*Proof.* Assume that (1) admits two bounded solutions  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ . Applying Theorem 1.2 part (iii) with  $u = u_1 - u_2$  we get  $u_1 - u_2 = k\varphi_p$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ . Hence, by trivial computation,

$$0 = -L(u_1 - u_2) = k\lambda_p(-L)\varphi_p,$$

that is,  $k = 0$ .

Assume now that  $f$  is periodic. Standard elliptic theory implies that, for  $\gamma > \|c\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}$ , the operator  $(-L + \gamma)^{-1}$  is well defined and is compact on the space of periodic  $L^2_{loc}$  functions equipped with the  $L^2((0, l_1) \times \cdots \times (0, l_N))$  norm. Since the unique periodic solution of the homogeneous equation  $Lu = 0$  is  $u \equiv 0$ , owing to the uniqueness result, the existence of a periodic solution of (1) follows from the Fredholm alternative.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.* If  $c \equiv 0$  then  $\varphi_p \equiv 1$ , with  $\lambda_p(-L) = 0$ . Hence, Theorem 1.2 part (iii) implies that  $u$  is constant. If  $c \not\equiv 0$  then, applying the strong maximum principle to the function  $\varphi_p$ , one sees that  $\lambda_p(-L) > 0$ . Therefore,  $u \equiv 0$  by Corollary 2.  $\square$

### 3. $L$ ALMOST PERIODIC

This section is devoted to the construction of Counterexample 1.1.

**Remark 2.** Note that, by the uniqueness of solutions of the Cauchy problem, any non-constant solution of (3) must be strictly monotone.

We first construct a discontinuous function  $\sigma$ , then we modify it to obtain a Lipschitz continuous limit periodic function  $b$ . Let us reclaim the definition of limit periodic functions, which are a proper subset of a. p. functions.

**Definition 3.1.** We say that a function  $\phi \in C(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is limit periodic if there exists a sequence of continuous periodic functions converging uniformly to  $\phi$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

We start defining  $\sigma$  on the interval  $(-1, 1]$ :

$$\sigma(x) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } -1 < x \leq 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } 0 < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Then in  $(-3, 3]$  setting

$$\forall x \in (-3, -1], \quad \sigma(x) = \sigma(x+2) - 1,$$

$$\forall x \in (1, 3], \quad \sigma(x) = \sigma(x-2) + 1,$$

and, by iteration,

$$(4) \quad \forall x \in (-3^{n+1}, -3^n], \quad \sigma(x) = \sigma(x + 2 \cdot 3^n) - \frac{1}{(n+1)^2},$$

$$(5) \quad \forall x \in (3^n, 3^{n+1}], \quad \sigma(x) = \sigma(x - 2 \cdot 3^n) + \frac{1}{(n+1)^2}.$$

By construction, the function  $\sigma$  satisfies  $\|\sigma\|_\infty = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty n^{-2}$ , and it is odd except for the set  $\mathbb{Z}$ , in the sense that  $\sigma(-x) = -\sigma(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ .

**Proposition 1.** *There exists a sequence of bounded periodic functions  $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converging uniformly to  $\sigma$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  and such that*

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \phi_n \in C(\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}), \quad \phi_n \text{ has period } 2 \cdot 3^n.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $x \in (-3^n, 3^n]$  set  $\phi_n(x) := \sigma(x)$ , then extend  $\phi_n$  to the whole real line by periodicity, with period  $2 \cdot 3^n$ . We claim that

$$\|\sigma - \phi_n\|_\infty \leq \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2},$$

which would conclude the proof. We prove our claim by a recursive argument, showing that the property

$$(\mathcal{P}_i) \quad \forall x \in (-3^{n+i}, 3^{n+i}], \quad |\sigma(x) - \phi_n(x)| \leq \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+i} \frac{1}{k^2}$$

holds for every  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let us check  $(\mathcal{P}_1)$ . By (4) and (5) we get

$$\sigma(x) = \begin{cases} \sigma(x + 2 \cdot 3^n) - \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} & \text{if } -3^{n+1} < x \leq -3^n \\ \phi_n(x) & \text{if } -3^n < x \leq 3^n \\ \sigma(x - 2 \cdot 3^n) + \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} & \text{if } 3^n < x \leq 3^{n+1}. \end{cases}$$

Property  $(\mathcal{P}_1)$  then follows from the periodicity of  $\phi_n$ .

Assume now that  $(\mathcal{P}_i)$  holds for some  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $x \in (-3^{n+i+1}, 3^{n+i+1}]$ . If  $x \in (-3^{n+i}, 3^{n+i}]$  then

$$|\sigma(x) - \phi_n(x)| \leq \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+i} \frac{1}{k^2} \leq \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+i+1} \frac{1}{k^2}.$$

Otherwise, set

$$y := \begin{cases} x + 2 \cdot 3^{n+i} & \text{if } x < 0 \\ x - 2 \cdot 3^{n+i} & \text{if } x > 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $y \in (-3^{n+i}, 3^{n+i}]$  and  $|x - y| = 2 \cdot 3^{n+i}$ . Thus, (4), (5),  $(\mathcal{P}_i)$  and the periodicity of  $\phi_n$  yield

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma(x) - \phi_n(x)| &\leq |\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)| + |\sigma(y) - \phi_n(y)| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(n+i+1)^2} + \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+i} \frac{1}{k^2} \\ &= \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+i+1} \frac{1}{k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

This means that  $(\mathcal{P}_{i+1})$  holds and then the proof is concluded.  $\square$

Note that  $\sigma$  is not limit periodic because it is discontinuous on  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

**Proposition 2.** *The function  $\sigma$  satisfies*

$$(6) \quad \forall x \geq 1, \quad \int_0^x \sigma(t) dt \geq \frac{x}{2(\log_3 x + 1)^2}.$$

*Proof.* For  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ , define  $F(y) := \int_0^y \sigma(t) dt$ . Let us preliminarily show that, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the following formula holds:

$$(7) \quad \forall y \in [0, 3^n], \quad F(y) \geq \frac{y}{2n^2}.$$



We shall do it by iteration on  $n$ . It is immediately seen that (7) holds for  $n = 1$ . Assume that (7) holds for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We want to prove that (7) holds with  $n$  replaced by  $n + 1$ . If  $y \in [0, 3^n]$  then

$$F(y) \geq \frac{y}{2n^2} \geq \frac{y}{2(n+1)^2}.$$

If  $y \in (3^n, 2 \cdot 3^n]$  then, by computation,

$$F(y) = F(2 \cdot 3^n - y) + \int_{2 \cdot 3^n - y}^y \sigma(t) dt \geq \frac{2 \cdot 3^n - y}{2n^2} + \int_{-(y-3^n)}^{y-3^n} \sigma(\tau + 3^n) d\tau.$$

Using property (5), one sees that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-(y-3^n)}^{y-3^n} \sigma(\tau + 3^n) d\tau &= \int_{-(y-3^n)}^0 \sigma(\tau + 3^n) d\tau + \int_0^{y-3^n} \sigma(\tau - 3^n) d\tau + \frac{y-3^n}{(n+1)^2} \\ &= \frac{y-3^n}{(n+1)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because  $\sigma$  is odd except in the set  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Hence,

$$F(y) \geq \frac{2 \cdot 3^n - y}{2n^2} + \frac{y-3^n}{(n+1)^2} \geq \frac{y}{2(n+1)^2}.$$

Let now  $y \in (2 \cdot 3^n, 3^{n+1}]$ . Since  $F(2 \cdot 3^n) \geq 3^n(n+1)^{-2}$ , as we have seen before, and (5) holds, it follows that

$$F(y) = F(2 \cdot 3^n) + \int_{2 \cdot 3^n}^y \sigma(t) dt \geq \frac{3^n}{(n+1)^2} + F(y - 2 \cdot 3^n) + \frac{y - 2 \cdot 3^n}{(n+1)^2}.$$

Using the hypothesis (7) we then get

$$F(y) \geq \frac{y-3^n}{(n+1)^2} + \frac{y-2 \cdot 3^n}{2n^2} \geq \frac{y}{2(n+1)^2}.$$

We have proved that (7) holds for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consider now  $x \geq 1$ . We can find an integer  $n = n(x)$  such that  $x \in [3^{n-1}, 3^n)$ . Applying (7) we get  $F(x) \geq x(2n^2)^{-1}$ . Therefore, since  $n \leq \log_3 x + 1$ , we infer that

$$F(x) \geq \frac{x}{2(\log_3 x + 1)^2}.$$

□

In order to define the function  $b$ , we introduce the following auxiliary function  $z \in C(\mathbb{R})$  vanishing on  $\mathbb{Z}$ :  $z(x) := 2|x|$  if  $x \in [-1/2, 1/2]$ , and it is extended by periodicity with period 1 outside  $[-1/2, 1/2]$ . Then we set

$$b(x) := \sigma(x)z(x).$$

The definition of  $b$  is easier to understand by its graph (see Figure 1).


**Proposition 3.** *The function  $b$  is odd and limit periodic.*

*Proof.* Let us check that  $b$  is odd. For  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$  we find  $b(-x) = 0 = -b(x)$ , while, for  $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$b(-x) = \sigma(-x)z(-x) = -\sigma(x)z(x) = -b(x).$$

In order to prove that  $b$  is limit periodic, consider the sequence of periodic functions  $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  given by Proposition 1. Then define

$$\psi_n(x) := \phi_n(x)z(x).$$

FIGURE 1. graphs of  $\sigma$  and  $b$ 

Clearly, the functions  $\psi_n$  are continuous (because  $z$  vanishes on  $\mathbb{Z}$ ) and periodic, with period  $2 \cdot 3^n$  (because  $z$  has period 1). Also, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$|b - \psi_n| = |\sigma - \phi_n|z \leq |\sigma - \phi_n|.$$

Therefore,  $\psi_n$  converges uniformly to  $b$  as  $n$  goes to infinity.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.** *All solutions of (3) are bounded and they are generated by  $u_1 \equiv 1$  and a non-a. p. function  $u_2$ .*

*Proof.* The two-dimensional space of solutions of (3) is generated by  $u_1 \equiv 1$  and

$$u_2(x) := \int_0^x \exp\left(-\int_0^y b(t)dt\right) dy.$$

Since  $u_2$  is strictly increasing, it cannot be a. p. So, to prove the statement it only remains to show that  $u_2$  is bounded. By construction, it is clear that, for  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\int_0^m b(t)dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^m \sigma(t)dt.$$

Consequently, by (6), we get for  $x \geq 1$

$$\int_0^x b(t)dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{[x]} \sigma(t)dt + \int_{[x]}^x b(t)dt \geq \frac{x-1}{4(\log_3 x + 1)^2} - \|b\|_\infty$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq u_2(x) &\leq e^{\|b\|_\infty} \int_0^x \exp\left(-\frac{y-1}{4(\log_3 y + 1)^2}\right) dy \\ &\leq e^{\|b\|_\infty} \int_0^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{y-1}{4(\log_3 y + 1)^2}\right) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $b$  is odd, it follows that  $u_2$  is odd too and then it is bounded on  $\mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.** The function  $b = \sigma z$  we have constructed before is uniformly Lipschitz continuous, with Lipschitz constant equal to  $2\|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$ . Actually, one could use a suitable  $C^\infty$  function instead of  $z$  in order to obtain a function  $b \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ .

**Remark 4.** The reason why the Liouville property fails to hold in the a. p. case is that, as shown by the previous counterexample, an a. p. linear equation with nonpositive zero order coefficient may admit non-a. p. bounded solutions in the whole space. Instead, the space of a. p. solutions of (2), with  $c \leq 0$  and without any almost periodicity assumptions on  $L$ , has at most dimension one, that is, the Liouville property holds if all bounded solutions are a. p. More precisely, the result of Corollary 1 holds true if one requires  $u$  to be a. p., even by dropping the periodicity assumption on  $L$ . To see this, consider an a. p. solution  $u$  of (2). Up to replace  $u$  with  $-u$ , we can assume that  $U := \sup u \geq 0$ . Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  such that  $u(x_n) \rightarrow U$ . Then, up to subsequences, the functions  $u_n(x) := u(x + x_n)$  converge locally uniformly in  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$  to a solution  $u_\infty$  of a linear equation  $-\tilde{L} = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , with nonpositive zero order term (see the arguments in the proof of Lemma 2.1). The strong maximum principle then yields  $u_\infty \equiv U$ . Since the convergence of a subsequence of  $u_n$  is also uniform in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , by the almost periodicity of  $u$ , we find that  $u \equiv U$ . Therefore, the conclusion of Corollary 1 holds.

#### 4. $L$ PERIODIC AND $f$ ALMOST PERIODIC

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* (i) consider an arbitrary sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Since  $a_{ij}$ ,  $b_i$ ,  $c$  and  $f$  are a. p. (because periodic functions are in particular a. p.) there exists a subsequence of  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  (that we still call  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ) such that  $a_{ij}(x+x_n)$ ,  $b_i(x+x_n)$ ,  $c(x+x_n)$  and  $f(x+x_n)$  converge uniformly in  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . We claim that  $u(x+x_n)$  converges uniformly in  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$  too. Assume, by contradiction, that this is not the case. Then, there exist  $\varepsilon > 0$ , a sequence  $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and two subsequences  $(x_n^1)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(x_n^2)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that

$$(8) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad |u(z_n + x_n^1) - u(z_n + x_n^2)| > \varepsilon.$$

For  $j = 1, 2$  set  $(\xi_n^j)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} := (z_n + x_n^j)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Applying again the definition of almost periodicity, we can find a common sequence  $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  such that, for  $j = 1, 2$ , the functions  $a_{ij}(x + \xi_{n_k}^j)$ ,  $b_i(x + \xi_{n_k}^j)$ ,  $c(x + \xi_{n_k}^j)$  and  $f(x + \xi_{n_k}^j)$  converge respectively to some functions  $a_{ij}^j$ ,  $b_i^j$ ,  $c^j$  and  $f^j$ , uniformly in  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . Since  $f(y + x_n)$  converges uniformly in  $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , we have that

$$f^1(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(x + z_{n_k} + x_{n_k}^1) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(x + z_{n_k} + x_{n_k}^2) = f^2(x) =: \tilde{f}(x).$$

Similarly,  $a_{ij}^1 = a_{ij}^2$ ,  $b_i^1 = b_i^2$  and  $c^1 = c^2$ . Let  $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $[0, l_1] \times \dots \times [0, l_N]$  such that  $y_k + \xi_{n_k}^1 \in \prod_{i=1}^N l_i \mathbb{Z}$  and let  $y$  be the limit of (a subsequence of)  $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Thanks to the periodicity of  $L$ , we have that

$$a_{ij}(\cdot - y) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{ij}(\cdot - y_k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{ij}(\cdot + \xi_{n_k}^1) = a_{ij}^1.$$

Hence,  $a_{ij}^1 = a_{ij}^2 = a_{ij}(\cdot - y)$  and, analogously,  $b_i^1 = b_i^2 = b_i(\cdot - y)$  and  $c^1 = c^2 = c(\cdot - y)$ . By standard elliptic estimates and compact injection theorem, it follows that there exists a subsequence of  $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  (that we still call  $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ) such that, for  $j = 1, 2$ , the functions  $u(\cdot + \xi_{k_n}^j)$  converge locally uniformly and weakly in  $W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , for  $p \geq 1$ , to some functions  $u^j$  such that

$$(9) \quad \inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} u \leq u^j \leq \sup_{\mathbb{R}^N} u, \quad -L_y u^j = \tilde{f} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where

$$L_y := a_{ij}(x - y)\partial_{ij} + b_i(x - y)\partial_i + c(x - y).$$

Clearly, if  $\varphi_p$  is the periodic principal eigenfunction of  $-L$ , then  $\varphi_p(\cdot - y)$  is the periodic principal eigenfunction of  $-L_y$ . This shows that  $\lambda_p(-L_y) = \lambda_p(-L) \geq 0$ . Since  $-L_y(u^1 - u^2) = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , statement (iii) of Theorem 1.2 yields

$$(10) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad u^1(x) - u^2(x) \equiv k\varphi_p(x - y),$$

for some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ . We want to prove that  $k = 0$ . For  $j = 1, 2$  we find that

$$f(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f((x - \xi_{n_k}^j) + \xi_{n_k}^j) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{f}(x - \xi_{n_k}^j)$$

and also

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{ij}(x - y - \xi_{n_k}^j) = a_{ij}(x), \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} b_i(x - y - \xi_{n_k}^j) = b_i(x), \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} c(x - y - \xi_{n_k}^j) = c(x),$$

uniformly in  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . Therefore, with the usual arguments, we deduce that, for  $j = 1, 2$ ,  $u^j(x - \xi_{n_k}^j)$  converges (up to subsequences) locally uniformly to a function  $v^j$  such that

$$\inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^j \leq v^j \leq \sup_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^j, \quad -Lv^j = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Hence,  $-L(u - v^j) = 0$  and then again Theorem 1.2 part (iii) yields the existence of a constant  $h^j \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $u - v^j \equiv h^j \varphi_p$ . Since  $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} u \leq v^j \leq \sup_{\mathbb{R}^N} u$  by (9), we infer that  $h^1 = h^2 = 0$ , that is  $v^1 \equiv v^2 \equiv u$ . Consequently,

$$\inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^1 = \inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^2 = \inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} u, \quad \sup_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^1 = \sup_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^2 = \sup_{\mathbb{R}^N} u$$

and then, thanks to (10),  $u_1 \equiv u_2$ . This is a contradiction because, by (8),  $|u^1(0) - u^2(0)| \geq \varepsilon$ .

(ii) Even if it means replacing  $u$  with  $-u$ , it is not restrictive to assume that  $f \leq 0$ . Set

$$k := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x)}{\varphi_p(x)}$$

and  $v(x) := k\varphi_p(x) - u(x)$ . We have that  $v \geq 0$  and there exists a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(x_n) = 0$ . Arguing as above, we find that (up to subsequences)  $v(\cdot + x_n)$  converges weakly in  $W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , for  $p \geq 1$ , to a nonnegative function  $\tilde{v}$  satisfying

$$-\tau_y a_{ij}(x) \partial_{ij} \tilde{v} - \tau_y b_i(x) \partial_i \tilde{v} - \tau_y c(x) \tilde{v} \geq 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

for some  $y \in [0, l_1] \times \cdots \times [0, l_N]$ . Furthermore,  $\tilde{v}$  is nonnegative and vanishes in 0. Applying the strong maximum principle, we get  $\tilde{v} \equiv 0$ . On the other hand,  $v$  is a. p. by statement (i). Therefore,  $v(x + x_n)$  converges to 0 uniformly in  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , that is  $v \equiv 0$ .  $\square$

We conclude this section with a result concerning solutions of (1) with  $L$  periodic and  $f$  a. p. in just one variable, that is  $x_m \mapsto f(x_1, \dots, x_m, \dots, x_N)$  is a. p. for any  $(x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}, x_{m+1}, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $L$  be a periodic operator such that  $\lambda_p(-L) \geq 0$  and let  $f$  be an uniformly continuous function a. p. in one of its variables. Then, any bounded solution of (1) is a. p. in that variable.*

Thanks to the next consideration, the proof of Theorem 4.1 is essentially the same as that of Theorem 1.4 part (i).

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an uniformly continuous function a. p. in the  $m$ -th variable. Then, from any real sequence  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  can be extracted a subsequence  $(s_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that, for all  $(x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}, x_{m+1}, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ , the sequence  $(\phi(x_1, \dots, x_m + s_{n_k}, \dots, x_N))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges uniformly in  $x_m \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of the Arzela-Ascoli theorem. For simplicity, consider the case  $m = 1$ . Let  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Since for any  $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{N-1}$  there exists a subsequence  $(s_n^q)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $(\phi(y + s_n^q, q))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges uniformly in  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ , using a diagonal method we can find a common subsequence  $(s_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $(\phi(y + s_{n_k}, q))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges uniformly in  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ , for every  $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{N-1}$ . Let  $z \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ . Using the uniform continuity of  $\phi$ , for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  we can find  $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{N-1}$  such that

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R}, \quad |\phi(y, z) - \phi(y, q)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Therefore,

$$|\phi(y + s_{n_k}, z) - \phi(y + s_{n_h}, z)| < \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon + |\phi(y + s_{n_k}, q) - \phi(y + s_{n_h}, q)| < \varepsilon$$

for  $h, k$  big enough, independent from  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.** Statement (i) of Theorem 1.4 does not follow from Theorem 4.1 because there exist functions which are a. p. in each variable without being a. p. in the sense of Definition 1.3. For example, the function  $\phi(x, y) = \sin(xy)$  is periodic in each variable but it is not a. p. Indeed, it is known that any a. p. function is uniformly continuous (see e. g. [1]) while  $\phi$  is not.

## 5. GENERAL PERIODIC DOMAINS

Henceforth,  $\Omega$  denotes an unbounded smooth domain in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  satisfying the following periodicity assumption:

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad \Omega + \{l_i e_i\} = \Omega,$$

where  $l_1, \dots, l_N$  are positive constants. The symbol  $\nu$  stands for the outer unit normal vector field to  $\Omega$ .

We make the same regularity and ellipticity assumptions as in the whole space case:  $a_{ij}, b_i, c, f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ , the  $a_{ij}$  are uniformly continuous in  $\Omega$  and there exist two constants  $0 < \underline{a} \leq \bar{a}$  such that

$$\forall x \in \Omega, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad \underline{a}|\xi|^2 \leq a_{ij}(x)\xi_i\xi_j \leq \bar{a}|\xi|^2.$$

In the sequel, when we say that a function or an operator is periodic (resp. periodic in the  $m$ -th variable) we mean that it has the same period  $(l_1, \dots, l_N)$  (resp.  $l_m$ ) as  $\Omega$ .

**5.1. Dirichlet problem.** We deal with the Dirichlet problem

$$(11) \quad \begin{cases} -Lu = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

where  $g$  is a given function in  $W^{2,\infty}(\partial\Omega)$ .

If the operator  $L$  is periodic then we denote by  $\lambda_{p,D}$  and  $\varphi_{p,D}$  respectively the periodic principal eigenvalue and eigenfunction of  $-L$  in  $\Omega$ , with Dirichlet boundary conditions. We recall that  $\lambda_{p,D}$  is the unique real number such that the problem

$$\begin{cases} -L\varphi_{p,D} = \lambda_{p,D}\varphi_{p,D} & \text{in } \Omega \\ \varphi_{p,D} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

admits a solution  $\varphi_{p,D}$  (unique up to a multiplicative constant) which is positive in  $\Omega$  and periodic.

The next result is the analogue of Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $u$  be a bounded solution of (11), with  $L$ ,  $f$  and  $g$  periodic in the  $m$ -th variable and  $c \leq 0$ . Then,  $u$  is periodic in the  $m$ -th variable.*

*Proof.* We proceed similarly to the proof of Lemma 2.1, with  $v \equiv 1$ . Define the function

$$w(x) := u(x + l_m e_m) - u(x)$$

and assume by a contradiction that  $k := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} w(x) > 0$ . Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\Omega$  be such that  $w(x_n) \rightarrow k$  and consider a sequence  $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{Z}l_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}l_N$  such that  $y_n := x_n - z_n \in [0, l_1) \times \cdots \times [0, l_N)$ . Thanks to elliptic estimates up to the boundary, the sequence  $u_n(x) := u(x + z_n)$  converges (up to subsequences) in  $W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\overline{\Omega})$  and weakly in  $W_{loc}^{2,p}(\Omega)$ , for any  $p \geq 1$ , to a function  $u_\infty$  such that  $\|u_\infty\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}$  and

$$-\tilde{L}u_\infty := -\tilde{a}_{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}u_\infty - \tilde{b}_i(x)\partial_i u_\infty - \tilde{c}(x)u_\infty = \tilde{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where  $\tilde{a}_{ij}, \tilde{b}_i, \tilde{c}$  and  $\tilde{f}$  are the weak limit in  $L_{loc}^p(\Omega)$  of a converging subsequence respectively of  $a_{ij}(x + z_n)$ ,  $b_i(x + z_n)$ ,  $c(x + z_n)$  and  $f(x + z_n)$ . Hence, the function  $w_\infty(x) := u_\infty(x + l_m e_m) - u_\infty(x)$  satisfies

$$-\tilde{L}w_\infty = \tilde{f}(\cdot + l_m e_m) - \tilde{f}(\cdot) = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Moreover, since  $w \equiv 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and  $w \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ , it follows that  $y_n$  converges (up to subsequences) to a certain point  $y_\infty \in \Omega$  in which  $w_\infty$  reaches its maximum value  $k$ . Since  $\tilde{c} \leq 0$ , the strong maximum principle yields  $w_\infty \equiv k$  in  $\Omega$ , that is,

$$\forall x \in \Omega, \quad u_\infty(x + l_m e_m) = u_\infty(x) + k.$$

Therefore, for  $h \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$u_\infty(y_\infty + h l_m e_m) = u_\infty(y_\infty) + h k,$$

which is a contradiction because  $u_\infty$  is bounded. The inequality  $u(x + l_m e_m) \geq u(x)$  can be obtained by replacing  $l_m$  with  $-l_m$  and proceeding as before.  $\square$

In order to prove our Liouville type results, we will make use of the following consideration

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $v_1 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$  and  $v_2 \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ , with  $\nabla v_2$  uniformly continuous in  $\overline{\Omega}$ , be such that*

$$v_1 \leq v_2 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \inf_{\partial\Omega} \partial_\nu v_2 < 0,$$

$$(12) \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0, \quad \inf\{v_2(x) : \text{dist}(x, \Omega^c) > \varepsilon\} > 0.$$

*Then, there exists a positive constant  $k$  such that  $k v_2 \geq v_1$  in  $\Omega$ .*

*Proof.* Assume, by way of contradiction, that there exists a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\Omega$  such that  $n v_2(x_n) < v_1(x_n)$ . Hence, as  $n$  goes to infinity,  $v_2(x_n) \rightarrow 0$  and then  $\text{dist}(x_n, \partial\Omega) \rightarrow 0$  by (12). For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let us denote by  $y_n$  a projection of  $x_n$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . Since  $\nabla v_2$  is uniformly continuous in  $\overline{\Omega}$  and  $\inf_{\partial\Omega} \partial_\nu v_2 < 0$ , it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v_1(x_n) - v_1(y_n)}{|x_n - y_n|} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n v_2(x_n) - v_2(y_n)}{|x_n - y_n|} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \frac{v_2(x_n) - v_2(y_n)}{|x_n - y_n|} = +\infty,$$

which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $u$  be a bounded solution of (11), with  $L$ ,  $f$  and  $g$  periodic.*

- (i) *if  $\lambda_{p,D}(-L) \geq 0$  then  $u$  is periodic;*
- (ii) *if  $\lambda_{p,D}(-L) = 0$  and either  $f, g \leq 0$  or  $f, g \geq 0$  then  $u \equiv k\varphi_{p,D}$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $f, g \equiv 0$ ;*
- (iii) *if  $\lambda_{p,D}(-L) \geq 0$  and  $f, g \equiv 0$  then  $u \equiv k\varphi_{p,D}$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* (i) Fix  $m \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  and set

$$\psi(x) := u(x + l_m e_m) - u(x).$$

Let us check that the functions  $v_1 = \psi$  and  $v_2 = \varphi_{p,D}$  fulfill the hypotheses of Lemma 5.2. Elliptic estimates up to the boundary and embedding theorem yield  $\psi \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$  and  $\varphi_{p,D} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ , for any  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . Moreover,  $\psi = \varphi_{p,D} = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and  $\partial_\nu \varphi_{p,D} < 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$  by Hopf's lemma. Therefore, the hypotheses of Lemma 5.2 are satisfied owing to the periodicity of  $\varphi_{p,D}$ . As a consequence, there exists  $k > 0$  such that  $k\varphi_{p,D} \geq \psi$ . Define

$$k^* := \inf\{k > 0 : k\varphi_{p,D} \geq \psi\}.$$

Assume by contradiction that  $k^* > 0$ . The function  $w := k^* \varphi_{p,D} - \psi$  is nonnegative by definition of  $k^*$ . We distinguish two different cases.

Case 1:  $w$  satisfies (12).

If  $\inf_{\partial\Omega} \partial_\nu w \geq 0$  then there exists a sequence  $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{Z}l_1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}l_N$  and a sequence  $(\eta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\partial\Omega$  converging to some  $\eta_\infty$  such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \partial_\nu w(\eta_n + \xi_n) \geq 0.$$

With usual arguments, we can find a subsequence of  $w(\cdot + \xi_n)$  converging locally uniformly in  $\overline{\Omega}$  to a nonnegative function  $w^*$  satisfying

$$-Lw^* \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad w^* = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \partial_\nu w^*(\eta_\infty) \geq 0.$$

By Hopf's lemma it follows that  $w^* \equiv 0$ , which is impossible because  $w$  satisfies (12). This means that  $\inf_{\partial\Omega} \partial_\nu w < 0$ . Therefore, we can apply Lemma 5.2 with  $v_1 = \psi$  and  $v_2 = w$  and find another positive constant  $h$  such that  $hw \geq \psi$  in  $\Omega$ . That is,

$$\frac{h}{h+1} k^* \varphi_{p,D} \geq \psi,$$

which contradicts the definition of  $k^*$ .

Case 2:  $w$  does not satisfies (12).

There exist then a sequence  $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{Z}l_1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}l_N$  and a sequence  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\Omega$  converging to some  $y_\infty \in \Omega$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} w(y_n + z_n) = 0.$$

The functions  $u_n(x) := u(x + z_n)$  converge (up to subsequences) locally uniformly to a function  $\tilde{u}$  satisfying (11). Hence,  $w(x + z_n)$  converges to  $\tilde{w}(x) = k^* \varphi_{p,D}(x) - \tilde{u}(x + l_m e_m) + \tilde{u}(x)$ , which is nonnegative, vanishes on  $y_\infty$  and satisfies  $-L\tilde{w} \geq 0$  in  $\Omega$ . The strong maximum principle yields  $\tilde{w} \equiv 0$ . That is,  $\tilde{u}(x + l_m e_m) - \tilde{u}(x) = k^* \varphi_{p,D}(x)$ , which is impossible because  $\tilde{u}$  is bounded.

We have shown that  $k^* = 0$ , that is  $u(x + l_m e_m) \leq u(x)$ . The converse inequality is obtained by replacing  $l_m$  with  $-l_m$ .

(ii) Up to replace  $u$  with  $-u$ , it is not restrictive to assume that  $f, g \leq 0$ . Hence,  $u \leq \varphi_{p,D}$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . Thanks to Lemma 5.2, applied to  $v_1 = u$  and  $v_2 = \varphi_{p,D}$ , there

exists  $k > 0$  such that  $k\varphi_{p,D} \geq u$ . Set

$$k^* := \inf\{k \in \mathbb{R} : k\varphi_{p,D} \geq u\}.$$

The function  $w := k^*\varphi_{p,D} - u$  is nonnegative, periodic, by (i), and satisfies

$$-Lw = -f \geq 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

If  $w \equiv 0$  then the statement is proved, otherwise  $w > 0$  in  $\Omega$  by the strong maximum principle. In this case, for any  $x \in \partial\Omega$  such that  $w(x) = 0$ , the Hopf lemma yields  $\partial_\nu w(x) < 0$ . Therefore, applying once again Lemma 5.2, this time with  $v_1 = \varphi_{p,D}$  and  $v_2 = w$ , we find another positive constant  $h$  such that  $hw \geq \varphi_{p,D}$ . Consequently,  $(k^* - h^{-1})\varphi_{p,D} \geq u$  which contradicts the definition of  $k^*$ .

(iii) It is not restrictive to assume that  $\sup_\Omega u \geq 0$  (if not, replace  $u$  with  $-u$ ). We proceed exactly as in the proof of (ii). Now, the constant  $k^*$  is nonnegative and then the function  $w := k^*\varphi_{p,D} - u$  satisfies

$$-Lw = k^*\lambda_{p,D}(-L)\varphi_{p,D} \geq 0.$$

The statement then follows as before.  $\square$

An immediate consequence of Theorem 5.3 part (iii) is the following uniqueness result.

**Corollary 3.** *If  $L$  is periodic and  $\lambda_{p,D}(-L) > 0$  then problem (11) admits at most one bounded solution. If in addition  $f$  and  $g$  are also periodic, then the solution does exist and it is periodic.*

*Proof.* Assume that (11) admits two solutions  $u_1, u_2$ . Applying Theorem 5.3 part (iii) to the function  $u = u_1 - u_2$  we get  $u \equiv k\varphi_{p,D}$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ . Therefore,

$$0 = -Lu = k\lambda_{p,D}(-L)\varphi_{p,D},$$

which yields  $k = 0$ .

As for Corollary 2, the existence result follows from the Fredholm alternative because, by the previous step, the unique periodic solution of (11) with  $f \equiv g \equiv 0$  is  $u \equiv 0$ .  $\square$

We point out that if  $c \leq 0$  then  $\lambda_{p,D}(-L) > 0$ . This is easily seen by applying the strong maximum principle to the periodic principal eigenfunction  $\varphi_{p,D}$ . Hence, the uniqueness result of Corollary 3 applies. Instead, in the whole space case,  $c \leq 0$  does not yield  $\lambda_p(-L) > 0$ , but only  $\lambda_p(-L) \geq 0$ , and we cannot apply Corollary 2 (indeed, (1) may admit infinite many bounded solutions, cf. Corollary 1).

**5.2. Oblique derivative problem.** We consider now the oblique derivative problem

$$(13) \quad \begin{cases} -Lu = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ \mathcal{N}u = h & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\mathcal{N}u = \alpha(x)u + \beta(x) \cdot \nabla u,$$

with

$$\alpha, \beta \in W^{1,\infty}(\partial\Omega), \quad \alpha \geq 0, \quad \inf_{x \in \partial\Omega} \beta(x) \cdot \nu(x) > 0.$$

The function  $h$  is always assumed to belong to  $W^{1,\infty}(\partial\Omega)$ .

If the operators  $L$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  are periodic then  $\lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}$  and  $\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}$  denote respectively the periodic principal eigenvalue and eigenfunction of  $-L$  in  $\Omega$ , with oblique derivative



boundary conditions. That is,  $\lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}$  is the unique (real) number such that the eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} -L\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}} = \lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}} & \text{in } \Omega \\ \mathcal{N}\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

admits a positive periodic solution  $\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}$  (unique up to a multiplicative constant).

The methods used to prove our results are exactly the same as in Section 2, the following lemma being the analogue of Lemma 2.1. While in the whole space case we used interior elliptic estimates, here we need  $W^{2,p}$  estimates up to the boundary (for which we refer for instance to [16]).

**Lemma 5.4.** *Assume that the operators  $L$ ,  $\mathcal{N}$  and the functions  $f$ ,  $h$  are periodic in the  $m$ -th variable. If there exists a function  $v$  satisfying*

$$\inf_{\Omega} v > 0, \quad \begin{cases} -Lv = \phi & \text{in } \Omega \\ \mathcal{N}v = \zeta & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

for some nonnegative functions  $\phi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $\zeta \in W^{1,\infty}(\partial\Omega)$ , then any bounded solution of (13) is periodic in the  $m$ -th variable.

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Lemma 2.1 and we will skip some details. Here, one translates the functions  $u$ ,  $v$  and the other terms by  $z_n$  instead of  $x_n$ , where  $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is the sequence in  $\mathbb{Z}l_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}l_N$  such that  $y_n := x_n - z_n \in [0, l_1) \times \cdots \times [0, l_N)$ . Then, the only situation which is not covered by the arguments in the whole space is when  $w_\infty < k$  in  $\Omega$  and  $y_n$  converges (up to subsequences) to some  $y_\infty \in \partial\Omega$ . Let us show that this cannot occur. Let  $\alpha^*$  and  $\beta^*$  be the limits of (subsequences of)  $\alpha(y_\infty + z_n)$  and  $\beta(y_\infty + z_n)$  respectively. Clearly,

$$\alpha^* \geq 0, \quad \beta^* \cdot \nu(y_\infty) > 0.$$

Thus, since  $w_\infty$  is a solution of a linear elliptic equation with nonpositive zero order term achieving a positive maximum at  $y_\infty$ , the Hopf lemma yields  $\beta^* \cdot \nabla w_\infty(y_\infty) > 0$ . This is impossible, because

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \alpha^*(u_\infty(y_\infty + l_m e_m) - u_\infty(y_\infty)) + \beta^* \cdot \nabla(u_\infty(y_\infty + l_m e_m) - u_\infty(y_\infty)) \\ &= \alpha^*(w_\infty v_\infty)(y_\infty) + \beta^* \cdot \nabla(w_\infty v_\infty)(y_\infty) \\ &= v_\infty(y_\infty)(\alpha^* w_\infty(y_\infty) + \beta^* \cdot \nabla w_\infty(y_\infty)) + k\beta^* \cdot \nabla w_\infty(y_\infty) \\ &\geq k\beta^* \cdot \nabla w_\infty(y_\infty) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Applying Lemma 5.4 with  $v \equiv 1$  we immediately get

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $u$  be a bounded solution of (13), with  $L$ ,  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $f$  and  $h$  periodic in the  $m$ -th variable and  $c \leq 0$ . Then,  $u$  is periodic in the  $m$ -th variable.*

**Theorem 5.6.** *Let  $u$  be a bounded solution of (13), with  $L$ ,  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $f$  and  $h$  periodic.*

- (i) *if  $\lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}(-L) \geq 0$  then  $u$  is periodic;*
- (ii) *if  $\lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}(-L) = 0$  and either  $f, h \leq 0$  or  $f, h \geq 0$  then  $u \equiv k\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $f, h \equiv 0$ ;*
- (iii) *if  $\lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}(-L) \geq 0$  and  $f, h \equiv 0$  then  $u \equiv k\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* First, we show that

$$\inf_{\Omega} \varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}} > 0,$$

no matter what the sign of  $\lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}(-L)$  is. Indeed, otherwise, by the periodicity and the positivity of  $\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}$  in  $\Omega$  there exists  $y \in \partial\Omega$  such that  $\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}(y) = 0$ . Hence,

$$0 = \mathcal{N}\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}(y) = \beta(y) \cdot \nabla\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}(y),$$

which contradicts the Hopf lemma.

(i) The statement follows by applying Lemma 5.4 with  $v = \varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}$ .

(ii)-(iii) We can argue exactly as in the proof of Theorem 1.2 part (ii) and (iii). The only different situation would be if  $w > 0$  in  $\Omega$  and  $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ . In this case, we would get

$$\beta(x_0) \cdot \nabla w(x_0) = \mathcal{N}w(x_0) = -\mathcal{N}u(x_0) = -h(x_0) \geq 0$$

(we recall that it is not restrictive to assume that  $f, h \leq 0$ ). Once again, this is in contradiction with the Hopf lemma.  $\square$

We remark that if  $c \equiv \alpha \equiv 0$  then  $\lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}(-L) = 0$ , with  $\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}} \equiv 1$ . Therefore, Theorem 5.6 part (ii) applies.

As a consequence of Theorem 5.6 we get the uniqueness result.

**Corollary 4.** *If  $L$  is periodic and  $\lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}(-L) > 0$  then problem (13) admits at most one bounded solution. If in addition  $f$  and  $h$  are also periodic, then such a solution does exist and it is periodic.*

*Proof.* If (13) admits two solutions  $u_1, u_2$  then Theorem 5.6 part (iii) yields  $u_1 - u_2 \equiv k\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ . Therefore,

$$0 = -L(u_1 - u_2) = k\lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}(-L)\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}},$$

that is,  $k = 0$ .

Since the unique bounded solution of (13) with  $f \equiv h \equiv 0$  is  $u \equiv 0$ , thanks to the uniqueness result, the Fredholm alternative yields the existence of a periodic solution.  $\square$

We conclude with the Liouville type result corresponding to Corollary 1.

**Corollary 5.** *Let  $u$  be a bounded solution of*

$$(14) \quad \begin{cases} -Lu = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ \mathcal{N}u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

with  $L, \mathcal{N}$  periodic and  $c \leq 0$ . Then, two possibilities occur:

- 1)  $c \equiv 0, \alpha \equiv 0$  and  $u$  is constant;
- 2) at least one between  $c$  and  $\alpha$  does not vanish identically and  $u \equiv 0$ .

*Proof.* If  $c \equiv \alpha \equiv 0$  then  $\lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}(-L) = 0$  and  $\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}} \equiv 1$ . Consequently,  $u$  is constant by Theorem 5.6 part (iii). If  $\alpha - c \not\equiv 0$  we claim that  $\lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}(-L) > 0$ . Then,  $u \equiv 0$  by the uniqueness result of Corollary 2. To prove the claim, assume by contradiction that  $\lambda_{p,\mathcal{N}}(-L) \leq 0$ . The strong maximum principle implies that either  $\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}} \equiv 1$ , or  $\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}$  has a strict maximum at a point  $y \in \partial\Omega$ . In the first case, we get  $c \equiv 0$  and  $\alpha \equiv 0$ , while, in the second one, the Hopf lemma yields

$$0 = \alpha(y)\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}(y) + \beta(y) \cdot \nabla\varphi_{p,\mathcal{N}}(y) > 0.$$

Therefore, both cases are ruled out and the claim is proved.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] L. AMERIO AND G. PROUSE, *Almost-periodic functions and functional equations*, Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York, 1971.
- [2] M. AVELLANEDA AND F.-H. LIN, *Un théorème de Liouville pour des équations elliptiques à coefficients périodiques*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., 309 (1989), pp. 245–250.
- [3] H. BERESTYCKI AND L. ROSSI, *On the principal eigenvalue of elliptic operators in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and applications*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), 8 (2006), pp. 195–215.
- [4] S. BOCHNER, *Beiträge zur Theorie der fastperiodischen Funktionen*, Math. Ann., 96 (1927), pp. 119–147.
- [5] ———, *A new approach to almost periodicity*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 48 (1962), pp. 2039–2043.
- [6] H. BOHR, *Zur Theorie der Fastperiodischen Funktionen*, Acta Math., 46 (1925), pp. 101–214. II. Zusammenhang der fastperiodischen Funktionen mit Funktionen von unendlich vielen Variablen; gleichmässige Approximation durch trigonometrische Summen.
- [7] A. M. FINK, *Almost periodic differential equations*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1974. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 377.
- [8] D. GILBARG AND N. S. TRUDINGER, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, vol. 224 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second ed., 1983.
- [9] Z. HU AND A. B. MINGARELLI, *On a question in the theory of almost periodic differential equations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 127 (1999), pp. 2665–2670.
- [10] ———, *Almost periodicity of solutions for almost periodic evolution equations*, Differential Integral Equations, 18 (2005), pp. 469–480.
- [11] P. KUCHMENT AND Y. PINCHOVER, *Integral representations and Liouville theorems for solutions of periodic elliptic equations*, J. Funct. Anal., 181 (2001), pp. 402–446.
- [12] P. LI AND J. WANG, *Polynomial growth solutions of uniformly elliptic operators of non-divergence form*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 129 (2001), pp. 3691–3699 (electronic).
- [13] A. B. MINGARELLI, F. Q. PU, AND L. ZHENG, *A counterexample in the theory of almost periodic differential equations*, Rocky Mountain J. Math., 25 (1995), pp. 437–440. Second Geoffrey J. Butler Memorial Conference in Differential Equations and Mathematical Biology (Edmonton, AB, 1992).
- [14] J. MOSER AND M. STRUWE, *On a Liouville-type theorem for linear and nonlinear elliptic differential equations on a torus*, Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. (N.S.), 23 (1992), pp. 1–20.
- [15] V. Q. PHÓNG, *Stability and almost periodicity of trajectories of periodic processes*, J. Differential Equations, 115 (1995), pp. 402–415.
- [16] G. M. TROIANIELLO, *Elliptic differential equations and obstacle problems*, Plenum Press, New York, 1987.