

**EXISTENCE OF A DEGENERATE SINGULARITY IN
THE HIGH ACTIVATION ENERGY LIMIT OF A
REACTION-DIFFUSION EQUATION**

GEORG S. WEISS AND GUANGHUI ZHANG

ABSTRACT. We consider the singular perturbation problem

$$\Delta u_\epsilon = \beta_\epsilon(u_\epsilon),$$

where $\beta_\epsilon(s) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\beta(\frac{s}{\epsilon})$, β is a Lipschitz continuous function such that $\beta > 0$ in $(0, 1)$, $\beta \equiv 0$ outside $(0, 1)$ and $\int_0^1 \beta(s) ds = \frac{1}{2}$.

We construct an example exhibiting a *degenerate singularity* as $\epsilon_k \searrow 0$. More precisely, there is a sequence of solutions $u_{\epsilon_k} \rightarrow u$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and there exists $x^0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ such that

$$\frac{u(x^0 + r \cdot)}{r} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } r \rightarrow 0.$$

Known results suggest that this singularity must be *unstable*, which makes it hard to capture analytically and numerically. Our result answers a question raised by Jean-Michel Roquejoffre at the FBP'08 in Stockholm.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we are concerned with the singular perturbation problem

$$(1.1) \quad \Delta u_\epsilon = \beta_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) \text{ in } \Omega,$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n , $\epsilon > 0$ and $\beta_\epsilon(s) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\beta(\frac{s}{\epsilon})$. Here β is a Lipschitz continuous function such that $\beta > 0$ in $(0, 1)$, $\beta \equiv 0$ outside $(0, 1)$ and $\int_0^1 \beta(s) ds = \frac{1}{2}$.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35R35, Secondary 35J60.

Key words and phrases. Free boundary, singular point, unstable singularity.

G.S. Weiss has been partially supported by the Grant-in-Aid 18740086 of the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.

This problem arises in the mathematical analysis of equidiffusional flames (see [3], [4]), in which case ϵ is proportional to the inverse of the activation energy.

Formally, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the solutions u_ϵ converge to a solution u of the free boundary problem

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta u &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega \setminus \partial\{u > 0\}, \\ u &= 0, \quad (u_\nu^+)^2 - (u_\nu^-)^2 = 1 && \text{on } \partial\{u > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

On a rigorous level, L. Caffarelli established a locally uniformly Lipschitz estimate for bounded solutions $\{u_\epsilon\}$ (see [5]). In [10], C. Lederman and N. Wolanski proved that u is a viscosity solution of (1.2). They also proved that u satisfies the free boundary condition in a pointwise sense at non-degenerate free boundary points at which there is an inward unit normal of $\{u > 0\}$ in the measure theoretic sense. Here “non-degenerate” means that

$$r^{-n-1} \int_{B_r(x)} u^+ \geq c > 0 \text{ for } r \leq r_0.$$

A related convergence result has been proved for the p -Laplace operator in [6].

From [1, Lemma 3.4] we know that all free boundary points of local minimizers are non-degenerate. This suggests that if there are degenerate free boundary points of a limit function u , then they must be unstable.

It has been known that cross-shaped free boundaries occur for domain variation solutions (see the Introduction of [12]), for example

$$u(x_1, x_2) = |x_1^2 - x_2^2| \text{ (cf. Figure 1).}$$

John Andersson suggested a triple junction example (see Figure 2) where the solution is homogeneous of degree $3/2$; domain variation solutions with a degree of homogeneity $\in (1, 3/2)$ are not possible.

However it is not so obvious whether these examples arise as limits of the reaction-diffusion equation (1.1). This is the question Jean-Michel Roquejoffre posed at the FBP’08 in Stockholm. The main result of the present paper gives a partial answer to that question:




FIGURE 1. Cross-like Singularity




FIGURE 2. Triple Junction Singularity

Theorem A. *There exist uniformly bounded solutions $u_{\epsilon_k} : B_1(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$, $u_{\epsilon_k} \rightarrow u$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and there is a degenerate free boundary point of u in $B_1(0)$. More precisely, there is $x^0 \in B_1(0) \cap \partial\{u > 0\}$ such that*


$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{u(x^0 + rx)}{r} = 0 \text{ for every } x \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Remark 6.5 shows that we may construct degenerate points with an arbitrarily high number of symmetry lines. See Figure 3 for an example with 4 symmetry lines.

Section 3 also suggests a *numerical* approach for the construction of this unstable solution which would be otherwise hard to capture.

2. NOTATION

Throughout this article \mathbb{R}^n will be equipped with the Euclidean inner product $x \cdot y$ and $B_r(x^0)$ will denote the open ball of center x^0 with

FIGURE 3. Imaginable ϵ -solution

radius r . When not specified, x^0 is assumed to be 0. We will use the polar coordinates (r, θ) in \mathbb{R}^2 . We use the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure \mathcal{L}^n and the m -dimensional Hausdorff measure \mathcal{H}^m . We shall often use abbreviations for inverse images like $\{u > 0\} := \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > 0\}$.

3. CONSTRUCTION OF ϵ -SOLUTIONS

We are going to use a method introduced in [2].

Let $K = \{(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) : 0 < r < 1, 0 < \theta < \pi/m\}$, where m is an integer ≥ 3 . For $g \in C^{\alpha_0}(\partial B_1 \cap \partial K)$, $\alpha_0 \geq \alpha > 0$, $C_g^\alpha(\bar{K})$ will denote the subspace of $C^\alpha(\bar{K})$ consisting of all functions with boundary values g on $\partial B_1 \cap \partial K$. We consider the following problem:

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta u(x) &= \beta_\epsilon(u(x) - u(0) + \epsilon) && \text{in } K, \\ u &= g && \text{on } \partial K \cap \partial B_1, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} &= 0 && \text{on } \partial K \setminus \partial B_1. \end{aligned}$$

Let $T = T_{\epsilon, g} : C_g^\alpha(\bar{K}) \rightarrow C_g^\alpha(\bar{K})$ be the operator defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta T(u) &= \beta_\epsilon(u(x) - u(0) + \epsilon) && \text{in } K, \\ T(u) &= g && \text{on } \partial K \cap \partial B_1, \\ \frac{\partial T(u)}{\partial \nu} &= 0 && \text{on } \partial K \setminus \partial B_1. \end{aligned}$$

Using Schauder's fixed point theorem, we can prove the existence of a solution of equation (3.1):

Proposition 3.1. *For each $g \in C^{\alpha_0}(\partial B_1 \cap \partial K)$, T has a fixed point $u_\epsilon \in C_g^\alpha(\bar{K})$ for some $\alpha > 0$ depending only on α_0 .*

Proof. Let $v \in C_g^\alpha(\bar{K})$, $F(x) = \beta_\epsilon(v(x) - v(0) + \epsilon)$. Then there is a $W^{1,2}(K)$ -solution u of the problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u &= F && \text{in } K, \\ u &= g && \text{on } \partial K \cap \partial B_1, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} &= 0 && \text{on } \partial K \setminus \partial B_1. \end{aligned}$$

We extend u to a function $\tilde{u} : B_1 \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by even reflection:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}(r, \pi/m + \theta) &= u(r, \pi/m - \theta), && \text{if } 0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/m, \\ \tilde{u}(r, j\pi/m + \theta) &= \tilde{u}(r, j\pi/m - \theta), && \text{if } 0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/m, \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2m - 1$. It follows that \tilde{u} is a solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \tilde{u} &= \tilde{F} && \text{in } B_1 \setminus \{0\}, \\ \tilde{u} &= \tilde{g} && \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{aligned}$$

where \tilde{F} and \tilde{g} are defined by even reflection. As the origin is a set of vanishing 2-capacity (see [7]), \tilde{u} is a weak solution of $\Delta \tilde{u} = \tilde{F}$ in B_1 .

Applying the regularity theory of elliptic equations (see for example [8, Corollary 9.29]), we see that $\tilde{u} \in C^\alpha(\bar{B}_1)$ for small α , and that $\|\tilde{u}\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)} \leq C$, where $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$ and C are constants depending on α_0 , $\|g\|_{C^{0,\alpha_0}}$ and $\|F\|_{L^\infty(K)}$. Hence T is a continuous compact linear operator from $C_g^\alpha(\bar{K})$ into itself for small $\alpha > 0$, and

$$\|T_{\epsilon,g}(w)\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{K})} \leq C$$

for every $\sigma \in [0, 1]$ and every solution of the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w &= \sigma \beta_\epsilon(w(x) - w(0) + \epsilon) && \text{in } K, \\ w &= g && \text{on } \partial K \cap \partial B_1, \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} &= 0 && \text{on } \partial K \setminus \partial B_1; \end{aligned}$$

here C is a constant depending only on g , β and ϵ .

From Schauder's fixed point theorem (see [8, Chapter 11]) we infer that $T_{\epsilon,g}$ has a fixed point $u_\epsilon \in C_g^\alpha(\bar{K})$. \square

4. CONVERGENCE

From now on all of our functions are defined in $B_1(0)$ by the above reflection. We choose one non-constant $g \in C^2(\bar{B})$.

Let $v_\epsilon(x) = u_\epsilon(x) - u_\epsilon(0) + \epsilon$. Then v_ϵ is a solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta v_\epsilon(x) &= \beta_\epsilon(v_\epsilon(x)) && \text{in } B_1, \\ v_\epsilon(0) &= \epsilon, \\ v_\epsilon &= g - u_\epsilon(0) + \epsilon && \text{on } \partial B_1. \end{aligned}$$

By the maximum principle, $|u_\epsilon(0)| \leq \|g\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}$, therefore $\|v_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\bar{B}_1)} \leq C$, where C depends only on $\|g\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}$.

First we state a result from [5] proving a uniform Lipschitz estimate.

Proposition 4.1. *Let w_ϵ be a family of solutions to $\Delta w_\epsilon = \beta_\epsilon(w_\epsilon)$ in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\|w_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C$ for some $C < \infty$. Let $K \subset \Omega$ be a compact set and let $\tau > 0$ be such that $B_\tau(x^0) \subset \Omega$ for every $x^0 \in K$. Then there exists a constant $L = L(\tau, C)$, such that*

$$|\nabla w_\epsilon(x)| \leq L \quad \text{for } x \in K.$$

If the boundary data is smooth enough, we have the following gradient estimate near the boundary (see [9]).

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and let $w_\epsilon \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ be a solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w_\epsilon(x) &= \beta_\epsilon(w_\epsilon(x)) && \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_\epsilon &= f && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $f \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$, $\|f\|_{C^2(\bar{\Omega})} < C_1$. Then there exist $\epsilon_0 > 0, C < \infty$ such that

$$|\nabla w_\epsilon(x)| \leq C(1 + |\log d(x, \partial\Omega)|)$$

for $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$, $x \in \Omega$, where $d(x, \partial\Omega)$ is the distance from x to the boundary of Ω .

Now we are ready to prove the convergence of $\{v_{\epsilon_i}\}$.

Proposition 4.3. *There exist a sequence $\{v_{\epsilon_i}\}$ and a locally Lipschitz continuous function v_0 such that*

1) $v_{\epsilon_i} \rightarrow v_0$ uniformly on \bar{B}_1 ,

- 2) $v_{\epsilon_i} \rightarrow v_0$ in $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_1)$,
 3) v_0 is harmonic in $B_1 \setminus \partial\{v_0 > 0\}$,
 4) $\Delta v_{\epsilon_i} \rightarrow \mu$ as measures on B_1 ; here μ is a locally finite non-negative measure supported on the free boundary $\partial\{v_0 > 0\}$. Therefore

$$\Delta v_0 = \mu \quad \text{in } B_1,$$

that is

$$\int_{B_1} \nabla v_0 \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx + \int_{B_1} \phi \, d\mu = 0$$

for every $\phi \in C_0^1(B_1)$.

- 5) $v_0(r, j\pi/m + \theta) = v_0(r, j\pi/m - \theta)$ for $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/m$ and $1 \leq j \leq 2m$.

Proof. 1) By Proposition 4.2, $\{v_\epsilon\}$ is equicontinuous. Since $\{v_\epsilon\}$ is uniformly bounded in $C^0(\bar{B}_1)$, by the Arzela-Ascoli theorem there is a sequence $\{v_{\epsilon_i}\}$ that converges to some v_0 in $C^0(\bar{B}_1)$. By Proposition 4.1, it is easy to see that v_0 is locally Lipschitz continuous.

2) For $0 \leq \eta \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$, we obtain from the local Lipschitz bound that

$$(4.1) \quad \int_{B_1} \eta |\nabla v_0|^2 \, dx \leq \liminf_{\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_1} \eta |\nabla v_{\epsilon_i}|^2 \, dx.$$

If we prove the converse inequality, the result will follow. Multiplying the ϵ_i -equation (1.1) by ηv_{ϵ_i} , we obtain that

$$\int_{B_1} v_{\epsilon_i} \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla v_{\epsilon_i} \, dx + \int_{B_1} \eta |\nabla v_{\epsilon_i}|^2 \, dx = - \int_{B_1} \eta v_{\epsilon_i} \beta_{\epsilon_i}(v_{\epsilon_i}) \, dx \leq 0.$$

Letting $\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$(4.2) \quad \limsup_{\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_1} \eta |\nabla v_{\epsilon_i}|^2 \, dx \leq - \int_{B_1} v_0 \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla v_0 \, dx.$$

For each $\delta > 0$, we define

$$v_\delta(x) = \begin{cases} v_0(x) - \delta, & \text{if } v_0(x) > \delta, \\ v_0(x) + \delta, & \text{if } v_0(x) < -\delta, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Multiplying the ϵ_i -equation by ηv_δ and integrating, we have

$$\int_{B_1} v_\delta \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla v_{\epsilon_i} \, dx + \int_{B_1} \eta \nabla v_\delta \cdot \nabla v_{\epsilon_i} \, dx = 0.$$

Letting $\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0$, it follows that

$$\int_{B_1} v_\delta \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla v_0 \, dx + \int_{B_1} \eta |\nabla v_\delta|^2 \, dx = 0,$$

and letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$\int_{B_1} v_0 \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla v_0 \, dx + \int_{B_1} \eta |\nabla v_0|^2 \, dx = 0.$$

Using (4.2), we obtain

$$(4.3) \quad \limsup_{\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_1} \eta |\nabla v_{\epsilon_i}|^2 \, dx \leq \int_{B_1} \eta |\nabla v_0|^2 \, dx.$$

Combining (4.1) and (4.3), we obtain

$$(4.4) \quad \lim_{\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_1} \eta |\nabla v_{\epsilon_i}|^2 \, dx = \int_{B_1} \eta |\nabla v_0|^2 \, dx,$$

which implies that

$$\eta^{1/2} \nabla v_{\epsilon_i} \rightarrow \eta^{1/2} \nabla v_0 \quad \text{in } L^2(B_1).$$

For η such that $\eta = 1$ in $D \subset\subset \Omega$, it follows that

$$\nabla v_{\epsilon_i} \rightarrow \nabla v_0 \quad \text{in } L^2(D).$$

Therefore $v_\epsilon \rightarrow v_0$ strongly in $W^{1,2}(D)$.

By a diagonal sequence argument, assertion 2) of the proposition follows.

3) Since v_0 is continuous, the sets $\{v_0 > 0\}$ and $\{v_0 < 0\}$ are open. Let $x^0 \in \{v_0 > 0\}$. From the fact that $v_{\epsilon_i} \rightarrow v_0$ uniformly on B_1 , there exist $r > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $v_{\epsilon_i}(x) \geq v_0(x^0)/2 > 0$ for $x \in B_r(x^0)$, $i \geq N$. Thus v_{ϵ_i} is harmonic in $B_r(x^0)$ for $i \geq N$ and the same fact holds for v_0 . In the same way we prove that v_0 is superharmonic in $\{v_0 \leq 0\}^0$. On the other hand, v_{ϵ_i} is subharmonic in B_1 , so that v_0 is also subharmonic. Therefore v_0 is harmonic in $\{v_0 \leq 0\}^0$ and 3) follows.

4) Multiplying equation $\Delta v_{\epsilon_i} = \beta_{\epsilon_i}(v_{\epsilon_i})$ by $\phi \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$ and integrating by parts, we get

$$\int_{B_1} \nabla v_{\epsilon_i} \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx + \int_{B_1} \beta_{\epsilon_i}(v_{\epsilon_i}) \phi \, dx = 0.$$

We know that $v_{\epsilon_i} \rightarrow v_0$ in $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_1)$, hence

$$(4.5) \quad \int_{B_1} \nabla v_{\epsilon_i} \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx \rightarrow \int_{B_1} \nabla v_0 \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx.$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_{B_1} \beta_{\epsilon_i}(v_{\epsilon_i}) \phi \, dx \leq C.$$

This L^1 -bound implies that there exists a locally finite non-negative measure μ such that for a subsequence which we still call $\{v_{\epsilon_i}\}$, $\beta_{\epsilon_i}(v_{\epsilon_i}) \rightarrow \mu$ as measures in B_1 . Passing to the limit in (4.5), we get

$$\int_{B_1} \nabla v_0 \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx + \int_{B_1} \phi \, d\mu = 0,$$

which implies

$$\Delta v_0 = \mu \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Since we know that v_0 is harmonic in $B_1 \setminus \partial\{v_0 > 0\}$, we conclude that $\text{supp } \mu \subset \partial\{v_0 > 0\}$.

5) follows from the fact that v_{ϵ_i} has been defined via even reflection. This property is preserved by the uniform limit v_0 . \square

Let $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(z) = \int_0^z \beta_\epsilon(s) \, ds$ and $\chi_\epsilon(x) = 2\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(v_\epsilon(x))$. It follows that $0 \leq \chi_\epsilon(x) \leq 1$, and the uniformly Lipschitz estimate for v_ϵ implies the relative compactness of χ_ϵ in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(B_1)$:

Proposition 4.4. $\{\chi_\epsilon\}$ is precompact in $L^1(D)$ for each $D \subset\subset B_1$.

Proof. By Proposition 4.1, there exists an $L > 0$ such that $\|\nabla v_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq L$, hence

$$\int_D |\nabla \chi_\epsilon| \, dx = 2 \int_D |\beta_\epsilon(v_\epsilon) \nabla v_\epsilon| \, dx \leq 2L \int_D \beta_\epsilon(v_\epsilon) \, dx \leq C.$$

Therefore $\{\chi_\epsilon\}$ is bounded in $W^{1,1}(D)$. By the Sobolev embedding theorem $\{\chi_\epsilon\}$ is precompact in $L^1(D)$. \square

Thus we may assume that $\chi_{\epsilon_i}(x) \rightarrow \chi_0(x)$ locally in L^1 . Similar to [12, Lemma 4.1], we have

Proposition 4.5. $\chi_0(x) \in \{0, 1\}$ for a.e. $x \in B_1$.

Proof. For $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$, $\mathcal{B}(s) = 2 \int_0^s \beta(t) dt$ and $A_\delta = \{x \in D \subset\subset B_1 : \chi_0 \in [2\delta, 1 - 2\delta]\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^2(A_\delta) &\leq \mathcal{L}^2(A_\delta \cap \{\chi_{\epsilon_m} \notin [\delta, 1 - \delta]\}) + \mathcal{L}^2(A_\delta \cap \{\mathcal{B}(\frac{v_{\epsilon_m}}{\epsilon_m}) \in [\delta, 1 - \delta]\}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{L}^2(D \cap \{|\chi_{\epsilon_m} - \chi_0| > \delta\}) + \mathcal{L}^2(D \cap \{\frac{v_{\epsilon_m}}{\epsilon_m} \in [\mathcal{B}^{-1}(\delta), \mathcal{B}^{-1}(1 - \delta)]\}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{L}^2(D \cap \{|\chi_{\epsilon_m} - \chi_0| > \delta\}) + C_1(\delta, \beta) \epsilon_m \int_D \beta_{\epsilon_m}(v_{\epsilon_m}) dx \\ &\leq \mathcal{L}^2(D \cap \{|\chi_{\epsilon_m} - \chi_0| > \delta\}) + C_2(\delta, \beta) \epsilon_m \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$. □

5. MONOTONICITY FORMULA

In this section we state a monotonicity formula proved in [13], which is a key tool in constructing a degenerate singularity.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $x^0 \in B_1$, and*

$$\Phi_\epsilon(r) = r^{-2} \int_{B_r(x^0)} |\nabla v_\epsilon|^2 + r^{-2} \int_{B_r(x^0)} \chi_\epsilon - r^{-3} \int_{\partial B_r(x^0)} v_\epsilon^2 d\mathcal{H}^1.$$

Then Φ_ϵ satisfies the monotonicity formula

$$\Phi_\epsilon(\sigma) - \Phi_\epsilon(\rho) \geq \int_\rho^\sigma r^{-2} \int_{\partial B_r(x^0)} 2(\nabla v_\epsilon \cdot \nu - \frac{v_\epsilon(x)}{r})^2 d\mathcal{H}^1 dr \quad \text{for } 0 < \rho < \sigma.$$

Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$\Phi(r) = r^{-2} \int_{B_r(x^0)} |\nabla v_0|^2 + r^{-2} \int_{B_r(x^0)} \chi_0 - r^{-3} \int_{\partial B_r(x^0)} v_0^2 d\mathcal{H}^1$$

satisfies the monotonicity formula

$$\Phi(\sigma) - \Phi(\rho) \geq \int_\rho^\sigma r^{-2} \int_{\partial B_r(x^0)} 2(\nabla v_0 \cdot \nu - \frac{v_0(x)}{r})^2 d\mathcal{H}^1 dr \quad \text{for } 0 < \rho < \sigma.$$

6. EXISTENCE OF A DEGENERATE FREE BOUNDARY POINT

In this section we are going to prove the existence of a degenerate singular free boundary point for v_0 . We start with some lemmas.

Lemma 6.1. *Let w be a solution of*

$$\Delta w = \beta_\epsilon(w) \text{ in } \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and let } \chi_\epsilon(x) = 2\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(w(x)).$$

Then

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 \operatorname{div} \phi - 2\nabla w D\phi \nabla w + \chi_\epsilon \operatorname{div} \phi \, dx = 0$$

for $\phi \in C_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. Integrating by parts, we get


$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^2 \operatorname{div} \phi - 2\nabla w D\phi \nabla w + \chi_\epsilon \operatorname{div} \phi \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial x_i} \right)^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial x_j} - 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial w}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial w}{\partial x_j} + \chi_\epsilon \operatorname{div} \phi \, dx \\ &= -2 \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \phi_j \frac{\partial w}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \phi_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial w}{\partial x_j} \right) + \beta_\epsilon(w) \nabla w \cdot \phi \, dx \\ &= 2 \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \phi_j \frac{\partial w}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x_j^2} - \beta_\epsilon(w) \nabla w \cdot \phi \, dx \\ &= 2 \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \phi (\Delta w - \beta_\epsilon(w)) \, dx \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 6.2. *If $v_0 \equiv 0$ in B_r for some $r > 0$, then $\chi_0 \equiv 1$ in B_r .*

Proof. By Lemma 6.1 we have

$$\int_{B_1} |\nabla v_{\epsilon_i}|^2 \operatorname{div} \phi - 2\nabla v_{\epsilon_i} D\phi \nabla v_{\epsilon_i} + \chi_{\epsilon_i} \operatorname{div} \phi \, dx = 0$$

FIGURE 4. The set P_i

for $\phi \in C_0^\infty(B_r; \mathbb{R}^2)$. Letting $\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0$, we obtain from the strong convergence of v_{ϵ_i} that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{B_1} |\nabla v_0|^2 \operatorname{div} \phi - 2 \nabla v_0 D\phi \nabla v_0 + \chi_0 \operatorname{div} \phi \, dx \\ &= \int_{B_r} \chi_0 \operatorname{div} \phi \, dx, \end{aligned}$$

hence $\chi_0 \equiv \text{const}$ in B_r . We know that $\chi_0(x) \in \{0, 1\}$ for a.e. $x \in B_1$, therefore $\chi_0(x) \equiv 0$ or $\chi_0(x) \equiv 1$ in B_r .

For $0 < c \leq 1/4$, let $P_i = \{x \in B_r : c\epsilon_i \leq v_{\epsilon_i}(x) \leq (1-c)\epsilon_i\}$ and $Q_i = \{x \in B_r : v_{\epsilon_i}(x) > c\epsilon_i\}$. Supposing towards a contradiction that $\chi_0 \equiv 0$ in B_r , and recalling that $\chi_{\epsilon_i} \rightarrow \chi_0$ in $L^1(B_r)$ we have

$$\mathcal{L}^2(Q_i) \leq \mathcal{L}^2(\{x : \chi_{\epsilon_i} > 2\mathcal{B}(c)\}) \rightarrow 0$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $\delta \in (0, r/4)$, $I_{\epsilon_i} = \{t : \delta \leq t \leq r, \min_{x \in \partial B_t} v_{\epsilon_i}(x) \geq \epsilon_i/2\}$ and $I_{\epsilon_i}^c = [\delta, r] \setminus I_{\epsilon_i}$. Then we have $\mathcal{L}^1(I_{\epsilon_i}) \leq \mathcal{L}^2(Q_i)/\delta \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, hence there exists an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\mathcal{L}^1(I_{\epsilon_i}^c) > r/2$ for $\epsilon_i < \epsilon_0$. As v_{ϵ_i} is subharmonic in B_1 , $\epsilon_i = v_{\epsilon_i}(0) \leq \max_{\partial B_t} v_{\epsilon_i}$ for every $t \in [0, r)$. It follows that for each $t \in I_{\epsilon_i}^c$, there exists a point $x_t^i \in \partial B_t$ such that $v_{\epsilon_i}(x_t^i) = \epsilon_i/2$ (cf. Figure 4). By the uniformly Lipschitz continuity of v_{ϵ_i} there exists a $d > 0$ independent of ϵ , such that $B_{d\epsilon_i}(x_t^i) \subset P_i$. Therefore

$$\mathcal{L}^2(P_i) \geq \mathcal{L}^2\left(\bigcup_{x_t^i \in I_{\epsilon_i}^c} B_{d\epsilon_i}(x_t^i)\right) \geq rd\epsilon_i/4.$$

On the other hand, since $\Delta v_{\epsilon_i} \rightarrow 0$ in B_r ,

$$\mathcal{L}^2(P_i)/\epsilon_i \leq C \int_{B_r} \beta_{\epsilon_i}(v_{\epsilon_i}) \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus we get a contradiction and therefore $\chi_0 \equiv 1$ in B_r . \square

Lemma 6.3. *Let $v_0(x^0) = 0$ for some $x^0 \in B_1$, $0 < r_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $v_{0k}(x) = \frac{v_0(x^0 + r_k x)}{r_k}$. Then there exists a blow-up limit v_{00} such that for a subsequence the following holds:*

- 1) $v_{0k} \rightarrow v_{00}$ in $C_{\text{loc}}^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for every $0 < \alpha < 1$, $\nabla v_{0k} \rightarrow \nabla v_{00}$ weakly* in $L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$,
- 2) $v_{0k} \rightarrow v_{00}$ in $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}$,
- 3) v_{00} is homogeneous of degree 1.

Proof. 1) Since $\nabla v_{0k}(x) = \nabla v_0(x_0 + r_k x)$, $\{v_{0k}\}$ is locally uniformly Lipschitz continuous in \mathbb{R}^2 and 1) follows.

2) Let $D \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Then there exists a $C < \infty$ such that $|\nabla v_{0k}(x)| < C$ in D , hence v_{0k} is bounded $W^{1,2}(D)$. It follows that there is a subsequence, which we still call v_{0k} , such that $v_{0k} \rightarrow v_{00}$ weakly in $W^{1,2}(D)$ and

$$\|v_{00}\|_{W^{1,2}(D)} \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v_{0k}\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}.$$

Since $\Delta v_0 = \mu$ and $\text{supp } \mu \subset \partial\{v_0 > 0\}$, we get

$$v_{0k}(x) \Delta v_{0k}(x) = 0.$$

Let $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta |\nabla v_{0k}|^2 = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_{0k} \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla v_{0k}$ and

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta |\nabla v_{0k}|^2 \leq - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_{00} \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla v_{00}.$$

For each $\delta > 0$, we define

$$v_\delta(x) = \begin{cases} v_{00}(x) - \delta, & \text{if } v_{00}(x) > \delta, \\ v_{00}(x) + \delta, & \text{if } v_{00}(x) < -\delta, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Multiplying the equation for v_{0k} by ηv_δ , we get

$$\eta(x) v_\delta(x) \Delta v_{0k}(x) = 0,$$

if k is large enough. Hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta \nabla v_\delta \cdot \nabla v_{0k} = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_\delta \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla v_{0k}.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta \nabla v_\delta \cdot \nabla v_{00} = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_\delta \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla v_{00},$$

and letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta |\nabla v_{00}|^2 = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_{00} \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla v_{00}.$$

Hence

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta |\nabla v_{0k}|^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta |\nabla v_{00}|^2$$

for every $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. It follows that $v_{0k} \rightarrow v_{00}$ in $W^{1,2}(D)$.

3) For $0 < R < S < \infty$,

$$\Phi(Rr_k) = R^{-2} \int_{B_R} |\nabla v_{0k}|^2 + \chi_0(r_k x) \, dx - R^{-3} \int_{\partial B_R} v_{0k}^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^1.$$

Since $v_0(x^0) = 0$ and v_0 is Lipschitz continuous, $\Phi(r)$ is bounded. Consequently we obtain from the monotonicity formula Proposition 5.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leftarrow \Phi(Sr_k) - \Phi(Rr_k) &= \int_R^S 2r^{-2} \int_{\partial B_r} (\nabla v_{0k} \cdot \nu - \frac{v_{0k}}{r})^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^1 \, dr \\ &= \int_{B_S \setminus B_R} 2|x|^{-4} (\nabla v_{0k}(x) \cdot x - v_{0k}(x))^2 \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that $\nabla v_{00}(x) \cdot x = v_{00}(x)$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^2 , hence v_{00} is homogeneous of degree 1. \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorem A of the Introduction.

Theorem 6.4. *There is a free boundary point $x^0 \in \partial\{v_0 > 0\}$ such that v_0 is degenerate at x^0 . More precisely,*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{v_0(x^0 + rx)}{r} = 0$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$.




FIGURE 5. Touching the Free Boundary

Proof. Case 1: $0 \notin \partial\{v_0 > 0\}$.

There exists an $r > 0$ such that $v_0(x) \leq 0$ in B_r . Since $v_0(0) = 0$, the subharmonicity of v_0 implies that $v_0 \equiv 0$ in B_r . Suppose that r is the largest number such that $v_0 \equiv 0$ in B_r . Noticing that $r < 1$ as the boundary values of v_0 are not constant. It follows that there is a point $x^0 \in \partial B_r$ such that $x^0 \in \partial\{v_0 > 0\}$ (cf. Figure 5).

By a translation and a rotation we may assume that $x^0 = 0$ and $v_0 \equiv 0$ in $B_r(-r, 0)$. Let v_{00} be a blow-up limit of v_0 at x^0 , i.e. the limit of $\frac{v_0(x^0 + r_k x)}{r_k}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We are going to show that $v_{00} \equiv 0$.

Suppose towards a contradiction that $v_{00} \not\equiv 0$ and let $S = \{v_{00} > 0\}$. Then v_{00} is harmonic in S . Moreover, we know from Lemma 6.3 that v_{00} is homogeneous of degree 1, so that, solving the resulting ODE for v_{00} , $v_{00} = cx \cdot \nu$ in S for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\nu \in \partial B_1$. Noticing that $v_{00} \equiv 0$ in the left half plane, we conclude that $v_{00} = c \max(0, x \cdot \nu)$, where $c > 0$ and $\nu = (1, 0)$.

Let $\chi_r(x) = \chi_0(rx)$ and let χ_{00} be the limit of χ_{r_k} of the above sequence $k \rightarrow \infty$. By Lemma 6.2, $\chi_0 \equiv 1$ in $B_r(-r, 0)$, hence $\chi_{00} \equiv 1$ in the left half plane. Moreover we know that $\chi_0(x) = 1$ if $v_0(x) > 0$, hence $\chi_{00} \equiv 1$ in the right half plane. Thus $\chi_{00}(x) \equiv 1$ in \mathbb{R}^2 .

From

$$0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla v_{00}|^2 \operatorname{div} \phi - 2 \nabla v_{00} D\phi \nabla v_{00} + \chi_{00} \operatorname{div} \phi \, dx$$

for every $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$, we infer that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla v_{00}|^2 \operatorname{div} \phi - 2 \nabla v_{00} D\phi \nabla v_{00} = 0$$

for every $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$. This however contradicts $v_{00} = c \max(0, x \cdot \nu)$. We conclude that the blow-up limit v_{00} must be the constant function 0 in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Case 2: $0 \in \partial\{v_0 > 0\}$.

Suppose towards a contradiction that a blow-up limit

$$v_{00} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v_0(s_j \cdot)}{s_j} \neq 0.$$

Similar to case 1, v_{00} must be of the form $cx \cdot \nu$ in some half plane; here ν is again a unit vector. On the other hand Proposition 4.3 5) — which incidentally is preserved under the blow-up limit — implies that there are at least two vectors $e^1 \neq e^2 \in \partial B_1$ and two half lines $\{\alpha e^1 : \alpha > 0\}$ and $\{\alpha e^2 : \alpha > 0\}$, such that $e^1 \cdot \nu > 0$, $\nabla v_{00} = \nabla v_{00} \cdot e^1 e^1$, $e^2 \cdot \nu > 0$ and $\nabla v_{00} = \nabla v_{00} \cdot e^2 e^2$ which is not possible for $v_{00}(x) = cx \cdot \nu$ unless $c = 0$. \square

Remark 6.5. Using methods in the forthcoming paper [11], it is actually possible to show that Case 1 in the proof of Theorem 6.4 cannot occur. More precisely, a degenerate point x^0 at which the set $\{v_0 = 0\}$ contains a disk touching x^0 is not possible.

Consequently the origin must in our example be a degenerate point. The fact that we can introduce many symmetry lines suggests that we can construct degenerate points with growth $\leq |x|^m$ in $B_{1/2}$ for any integer m .

REFERENCES

- [1] H. W. Alt and L. A. Caffarelli. Existence and regularity for a minimum problem with free boundary. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 325:105–144, 1981.
- [2] J. Andersson and G. S. Weiss. Cross-shaped and degenerate singularities in an unstable elliptic free boundary problem. *J. Differential Equations*, 228(2):633–640, 2006.
- [3] H. Berestycki, L. A. Caffarelli, and L. Nirenberg. Uniform estimates for regularization of free boundary problems. In *Analysis and partial differential equations*, volume 122 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, pages 567–619. Dekker, New York, 1990.
- [4] J. D. Buckmaster and G. S. S. Ludford. *Theory of laminar flames*. Cambridge Monographs on Mechanics and Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University

- Press, Cambridge, 1982. Electronic & Electrical Engineering Research Studies: Pattern Recognition & Image Processing Series, 2.
- [5] Luis A. Caffarelli. Uniform Lipschitz regularity of a singular perturbation problem. *Differential Integral Equations*, 8(7):1585–1590, 1995.
 - [6] D. Danielli, A. Petrosyan, and H. Shahgholian. A singular perturbation problem for the p -Laplace operator. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 52(2):457–476, 2003.
 - [7] J. Frehse. Capacity methods in the theory of partial differential equations. *Jahresber. Deutsch. Math.-Verein.*, 84(1):1–44, 1982.
 - [8] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, volume 224 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1983.
 - [9] Alex Gurevich. Boundary regularity for free boundary problems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 52(3):363–403, 1999.
 - [10] Claudia Lederman and Noemi Wolanski. Viscosity solutions and regularity of the free boundary for the limit of an elliptic two phase singular perturbation problem. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 27(2):253–288 (1999), 1998.
 - [11] E. Varvaruca and G. S. Weiss. A geometric proof of a generalized Stokes conjecture. *In preparation*.
 - [12] G. S. Weiss. A singular limit arising in combustion theory: fine properties of the free boundary. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 17(3):311–340, 2003.
 - [13] Georg S. Weiss. Partial regularity for weak solutions of an elliptic free boundary problem. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 23(3-4):439–455, 1998.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO,
3-8-1 KOMABA, MEGURO-KU, TOKYO-TO, 153-8914 JAPAN
E-mail address: gw@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO,
3-8-1 KOMABA, MEGURO-KU, TOKYO-TO, 153-8914 JAPAN
E-mail address: zhang@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp