

# The Mean Value Theorem for Divergence Form Elliptic Operators

Ivan Blank and Zheng Hao

March 19, 2019

## Abstract

In 1963, Littman, Stampacchia, and Weinberger proved a mean value theorem for elliptic operators in divergence form with bounded measurable coefficients. In the Fermi lectures in 1998, Caffarelli stated a much simpler mean value theorem for the same situation, but did not include the details of the proof. We show all of the nontrivial details needed to prove the formula stated by Caffarelli.

## 1 Introduction

Based on the ubiquitous nature of the mean value theorem in problems involving the Laplacian, it is clear that an analogous formula for a general divergence form elliptic operator would necessarily be very useful. In [LSW], Littman, Stampacchia, and Weinberger stated a mean value theorem for a general divergence form operator,  $L$ . If  $\mu$  is a nonnegative measure on  $\Omega$  and  $u$  is the solution to:

$$\begin{aligned} Lu &= \mu & \text{in } \Omega \\ &0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

and  $G(x, y)$  is the Green's function for  $L$  on  $\Omega$  then Equation 8.3 in their paper states that  $u(y)$  is equal to

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2a} \int_{a \leq G \leq 3a} u(x) a^{ij}(x) D_{x_i} G(x, y) D_{x_j} G(x, y) dx \tag{1.2}$$

almost everywhere, and this limit is nondecreasing. The pointwise definition of  $u$  given by this equation is necessarily lower semi-continuous. There are a few reasons why this formula is not as nice as the basic mean value formulas for Laplace's equation. First, it is a weighted average and not a simple average. Second, it is not an average over a ball or something which is even

homeomorphic to a ball. Third, it requires knowledge of derivatives of the Green's function.

A simpler formula was stated by Caffarelli in [C]. That formula provides an increasing family of sets,  $D_R(x_0)$ , which are each comparable to  $B_R$  and such that for a supersolution to  $Lu = 0$  the average:

$$\frac{1}{|D_R(x_0)|} \int_{D_R(x_0)} u(x) dx$$

is nondecreasing as  $R \rightarrow 0$ . On the other hand, Caffarelli did not provide any details about showing the existence of an important test function used in the proof of this result, and showing the existence of this function turns out to be nontrivial. This paper grew out of an effort to prove rigorously all of the details of the mean value theorem that Caffarelli asserted in [C].

## 2 Assumptions

We assume that  $a^{ij}(x)$  satisfy

$$a^{ij} \equiv a^{ji} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \lambda |\xi|^2 \leq a^{ij} \xi_i \xi_j \leq \Lambda |\xi|^2 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n, \xi \neq 0,$$

and to ease the exposition, we assume that  $n \geq 3$ . Throughout the entire paper,  $n, \lambda$ , and  $\Lambda$  will remain fixed, and so we will omit all dependence on these constants in the statements of our theorems. We define the divergence form elliptic operator

$$L := D_j a^{ij}(x) D_i, \tag{2.1}$$

or, in other words, for a function  $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$  and  $f \in L^2(\Omega)$  we say “ $Lu = f$  in  $\Omega$ ” if for any  $\phi \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$  we have:

$$- \int_{\Omega} a^{ij}(x) D_i u D_j \phi = \int_{\Omega} g \phi. \tag{2.2}$$

(Notice that with our sign conventions we can have  $L = \Delta$  but not  $L = -\Delta$ .) With our operator  $L$  we let  $G(x, y)$  denote the Green's function for all of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and observe that the existence of  $G$  is guaranteed by the work of Littman, Stampacchia, and Weinberger. (See [LSW].)

Let

$$\begin{aligned} C_{sm,r} &:= \min_{x \in \partial B_r} G(x, 0) \\ C_{big,r} &:= \max_{x \in \partial B_r} G(x, 0) \\ G_{sm,r}(x) &:= \min\{G(x, 0), C_{sm,r}\} \end{aligned}$$

and observe that  $G_{sm,r} \in W^{1,2}(B_M)$  by results from [LSW] combined with the Cacciopoli Energy Estimate. We also know that there is an  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  such that  $G_{sm,r} \in C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{B_M})$  by the De Giorgi-Nash-Moser theorem. (See [GT] or [HL] for example.) For  $M$  large enough to guarantee that  $G_{sm}(x) := G_{sm,1}(x) \equiv G(x, 0)$  on  $\partial B_M$ , we define:

$$H_{M,G} := \{w \in W^{1,2}(B_M) : w - G_{sm} \in W_0^{1,2}(B_M)\}$$

and

$$K_{M,G} := \{w \in H_{M,G} : w(x) \leq G(x, 0) \text{ for all } x \in B_M\}.$$

(The existence of such an  $M$  follows from [LSW], and henceforth any constant  $M$  will be large enough so that  $G_{sm,1}(x) \equiv G(x, 0)$  on  $\partial B_M$ .)

Define:

$$\Phi_\epsilon(t) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } t \geq 0 \\ -\epsilon^{-1}t & \text{for } t \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

$$J(w, \Omega) := \int_\Omega (a^{ij} D_i w D_j w - 2R^{-n}w), \text{ and}$$

$$J_\epsilon(w, \Omega) := \int_\Omega (a^{ij} D_i w D_j w - 2R^{-n}w + 2\Phi_\epsilon(G - w)).$$

### 3 The PDE Satisfied by Minimizers

There are two main points to this section. First, we deal with the comparatively simple task of getting existence, uniqueness, and continuity of certain minimizers to our functionals in the relevant sets. Second, and more importantly we show that the minimizer is the solution of an obstacle type free boundary problem.

**3.1 Theorem** (Existence and Uniqueness).

$$\text{Let } \ell_0 := \inf_{w \in K_{M,G}} J(w, B_M) \text{ and}$$

$$\text{let } \ell_\epsilon := \inf_{w \in H_{M,G}} J_\epsilon(w, B_M).$$

*Then there exists a unique  $w_0 \in K_{M,G}$  such that  $J(w_0, B_M) = \ell_0$ , and there exists a unique  $w_\epsilon \in H_{M,G}$  such that  $J_\epsilon(w_\epsilon, B_M) = \ell_\epsilon$ .*

**Proof.** Both of these results follow by a straightforward application of the direct method of the Calculus of Variations. ■

**3.2 Remark.** Notice that we cannot simply minimize either of our functionals on all of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  instead of  $B_M$  as the Green's function is not integrable at infinity. Indeed, if we replace  $B_M$  with  $\mathbb{R}^n$  then

$$\ell_0 = \ell_\epsilon = -\infty$$

and so there are many technical problems.

**3.3 Theorem** (Continuity). *For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , the function  $w_\epsilon$  is continuous on  $\overline{B_M}$ .*

See Chapter 7 of [G].

**3.4 Lemma.** *There exists  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $C < \infty$ , such that  $w_0 \leq C$  in  $B_\epsilon$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\bar{w}$  minimize  $J(w, B_M)$  among functions  $w \in H_{M,G}$ . Then we have

$$w_0 \leq \bar{w}.$$

Set  $b := C_{big,M} = \max_{\partial B_M} G(x, 0)$ , and let  $w_b$  minimize  $J(w, B_M)$  among  $w \in W^{1,2}(B_M)$  with

$$w - b \in W_0^{1,2}(B_M).$$

Then by the weak maximum principle, we have

$$\bar{w} \leq w_b.$$

Next define  $\ell(x)$  by

$$\ell(x) := b + R^{-n} \left( \frac{M^2 - |x|^2}{4n} \right) \leq b + \frac{R^{-n}M^2}{4n} < \infty. \quad (3.1)$$

With this definition, we can observe that  $\ell$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ell &= -\frac{R^{-n}}{2}, \text{ in } B_M \quad \text{and} \\ \ell &\equiv b := \max_{\partial B_M} G \text{ on } \partial B_M. \end{aligned}$$

Now let  $\tilde{\alpha}$  be  $b + \frac{R^{-n}M^2}{4n}$ . By Corollary 7.1 in [LSW] applied to  $w_b - b$  and  $\ell - b$ , we have

$$w_b \leq b + K(\ell - b) \leq b + K\tilde{\alpha} < \infty.$$

Chaining everything together gives us

$$w_0 \leq b + K\tilde{\alpha} < \infty.$$

■

**3.5 Lemma.** *If  $0 < \epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_2$ , then*

$$w_{\epsilon_1} \leq w_{\epsilon_2}.$$

*Proof.* Assume  $0 < \epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_2$ , and assume that

$$\Omega_1 := \{w_{\epsilon_1} > w_{\epsilon_2}\}$$

is not empty. Since  $w_{\epsilon_1} = w_{\epsilon_2}$  on  $\partial B_M$ , since  $\Omega_1 \subset B_M$ , and since  $w_{\epsilon_1}$  and  $w_{\epsilon_2}$  are continuous functions, we know that  $w_{\epsilon_1} = w_{\epsilon_2}$  on  $\partial\Omega_1$ . Then it is clear that among functions with the same data on  $\partial\Omega_1$ ,  $w_{\epsilon_1}$  and  $w_{\epsilon_2}$  are minimizers of  $J_{\epsilon_1}(\cdot, \Omega_1)$  and  $J_{\epsilon_2}(\cdot, \Omega_1)$  respectively. Since we will restrict our attention to  $\Omega_1$  for the rest of this proof, we will use  $J_\epsilon(w)$  to denote  $J_\epsilon(w, \Omega_1)$ .

$J_{\epsilon_2}(w_{\epsilon_2}) \leq J_{\epsilon_2}(w_{\epsilon_1})$  implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_1} a^{ij} D_i w_{\epsilon_2} D_j w_{\epsilon_2} - 2R^{-n} w_{\epsilon_2} + 2\Phi_{\epsilon_2}(G - w_{\epsilon_2}) \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega_1} a^{ij} D_i w_{\epsilon_1} D_j w_{\epsilon_1} - 2R^{-n} w_{\epsilon_1} + 2\Phi_{\epsilon_2}(G - w_{\epsilon_1}), \end{aligned}$$

and by rearranging this inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_1} (a^{ij} D_i w_{\epsilon_2} D_j w_{\epsilon_2} - 2R^{-n} w_{\epsilon_2}) - \int_{\Omega_1} (a^{ij} D_i w_{\epsilon_1} D_j w_{\epsilon_1} - 2R^{-n} w_{\epsilon_1}) \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega_1} 2\Phi_{\epsilon_2}(G - w_{\epsilon_1}) - 2\Phi_{\epsilon_2}(G - w_{\epsilon_2}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & J_{\epsilon_1}(w_{\epsilon_2}) - J_{\epsilon_1}(w_{\epsilon_1}) \\ & = \int_{\Omega_1} a^{ij} D_i w_{\epsilon_2} D_j w_{\epsilon_2} - 2R^{-n} w_{\epsilon_2} + 2\Phi_{\epsilon_1}(G - w_{\epsilon_2}) \\ & \quad - \int_{\Omega_1} a^{ij} D_i w_{\epsilon_1} D_j w_{\epsilon_1} - 2R^{-n} w_{\epsilon_1} + 2\Phi_{\epsilon_1}(G - w_{\epsilon_1}) \\ & \leq 2 \int_{\Omega_1} [\Phi_{\epsilon_2}(G - w_{\epsilon_1}) - \Phi_{\epsilon_2}(G - w_{\epsilon_2})] \\ & \quad - 2 \int_{\Omega_1} [\Phi_{\epsilon_1}(G - w_{\epsilon_1}) - \Phi_{\epsilon_1}(G - w_{\epsilon_2})] \\ & < 0 \end{aligned}$$

since  $G - w_{\epsilon_1} < G - w_{\epsilon_2}$  in  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Phi_{\epsilon_1}$  decreases as fast or faster than  $\Phi_{\epsilon_2}$  decreases everywhere. This inequality contradicts the fact that  $w_{\epsilon_1}$  is the minimizer of  $J_{\epsilon_1}(w)$ . Therefore,  $w_{\epsilon_1} \leq w_{\epsilon_2}$  everywhere in  $\Omega$ .  $\blacksquare$

**3.6 Lemma.**  $w_0 \leq w_\epsilon$  for every  $\epsilon > 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $S := \{w_0 > w_\epsilon\}$  be a nonempty set, let  $w_1 := \min\{w_0, w_\epsilon\}$ , and let  $w_2 := \max\{w_0, w_\epsilon\}$ . It follows that  $w_1 \leq G$  and both  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  belong to  $W^{1,2}(B_M)$ . Since  $\Phi_\epsilon \geq 0$ , we know that for any  $\Omega \subset B_M$  we have

$$J(w, \Omega) \leq J_\epsilon(w, \Omega) \quad (3.2)$$

for any permissible  $w$ . We also know that since  $w_0 \leq G$  we have:

$$J(w_0, \Omega) = J_\epsilon(w_0, \Omega) . \quad (3.3)$$

Now we estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} J_\epsilon(w_1, B_M) &= J_\epsilon(w_1, S) + J_\epsilon(w_1, S^c) \\ &= J_\epsilon(w_\epsilon, S) + J_\epsilon(w_0, S^c) \\ &= J_\epsilon(w_\epsilon, B_M) - J_\epsilon(w_\epsilon, S^c) + J_\epsilon(w_0, S^c) \\ &\leq J_\epsilon(w_2, B_M) - J_\epsilon(w_\epsilon, S^c) + J_\epsilon(w_0, S^c) \\ &= J_\epsilon(w_0, S) + J_\epsilon(w_\epsilon, S^c) - J_\epsilon(w_\epsilon, S^c) + J_\epsilon(w_0, S^c) \\ &= J_\epsilon(w_0, S) + J_\epsilon(w_0, S^c) \\ &= J_\epsilon(w_0, B_M) . \end{aligned}$$

Now by combining this inequality with Equations (3.2) and (3.3), we get:

$$J(w_1, B_M) \leq J_\epsilon(w_1, B_M) \leq J_\epsilon(w_0, B_M) = J(w_0, B_M) ,$$

but if  $S$  is nonempty, then this inequality contradicts the fact that  $w_0$  is the unique minimizer of  $J$  among functions in  $K_{M,G}$ . ■

Now, since  $w_\epsilon$  decreases as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , and since the  $w_\epsilon$ 's are bounded from below by  $w_0$ , there exists

$$\tilde{w} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} w_\epsilon$$

and  $w_0 \leq \tilde{w}$ .

**3.7 Lemma.** *With the definitions as above,  $\tilde{w} \leq G$  almost everywhere.*

*Proof.* This fact is fairly obvious, and the proof is fairly straightforward, so we supply only a sketch.

Suppose not. Then there exists an  $\alpha > 0$  such that

$$\tilde{S} := \{\tilde{w} - G \geq \alpha\}$$

has positive measure. On this set we automatically have  $w_\epsilon - G \geq \alpha$ . We compute  $J_\epsilon(w_\epsilon, B_M)$  and send  $\epsilon$  to zero. We will get  $J_\epsilon(w_\epsilon, B_M) \rightarrow \infty$  which gives us a contradiction. ■

**3.8 Lemma.**  $\tilde{w} = w_0$  in  $W^{1,2}(B_M)$ .

*Proof.* Since for any  $\epsilon$ ,  $w_\epsilon$  is the minimizer of  $J_\epsilon(w, B_M)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_\epsilon(w_\epsilon, B_M) &\leq J_\epsilon(w_0, B_M) \\ &\leq \int_{B_M} a^{ij} D_i w_0 D_j w_0 - 2R^{-n} w_0 + 2\Phi_\epsilon(G - w_\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

and after canceling the terms with  $\Phi_\epsilon$  we have:

$$\int_{B_M} a^{ij} D_i w_\epsilon D_j w_\epsilon - 2R^{-n} w_\epsilon \leq \int_{B_M} a^{ij} D_i w_0 D_j w_0 - 2R^{-n} w_0.$$

Letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  gives us

$$J(\tilde{w}, B_M) \leq J(w_0, B_M).$$

However, by Proposition (3.7),  $\tilde{w}$  is a permissible competitor for the problem  $\inf_{w \in K_{M,G}} J(w, B_M)$ , so we have

$$J(w_0, B_M) \leq J(\tilde{w}, B_M).$$

Therefore

$$J(w_0, B_M) = J(\tilde{w}, B_M),$$

and then by uniqueness,  $\tilde{w} = w_0$ . ■

Let  $W$  solve:

$$\begin{cases} L(w) = -\chi_{\{w < G\}} R^{-n} & \text{in } B_M \\ w = G_{sm} & \text{on } \partial B_M. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

**3.9 Lemma.**  $W \leq G$  in  $B_M$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\Omega = \{W > G\}$  and  $u := W - G$ . Since  $G$  is infinite at 0, and since  $W$  is bounded, and both  $G$  and  $W$  are continuous, we know there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\Omega \cap B_\epsilon = \emptyset$ . Then if  $\Omega \neq \emptyset$ , then  $u$  has a positive maximum in the interior of  $\Omega$ . However, since  $L(W) = L(G) = 0$  in  $\Omega$ , we would get a contradiction from the weak maximum principle. Therefore, we have  $W \leq G$  in  $B_M$ . ■

**3.10 Lemma.**  $\tilde{w} \geq W$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to show  $w_\epsilon \geq W$ , for any  $\epsilon$ . Suppose for the sake of obtaining a contradiction that there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  and a point  $x_0$  where  $w_\epsilon - W$  has a negative local minimum. So  $w_\epsilon(x_0) < W(x_0) \leq G(x_0)$ . Let  $\Omega := \{w_\epsilon < W\}$  and observe that  $w_\epsilon = W$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . Then  $x_0$  is an interior point of  $\Omega$  and

$$L(w_\epsilon) = -R^{-n} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

However

$$L(W - w_\epsilon) \geq -R^{-n} + R^{-n} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (3.5)$$

By the weak maximum principle, the minimum can not be attained at an interior point, and so we have a contradiction.  $\blacksquare$

**3.11 Lemma.**  $w_0 = \tilde{w} = W$ , and so  $w_0$  and  $\tilde{w}$  are continuous.

*Proof.* We already showed that  $w_0 = \tilde{w}$  in lemma (3.8). By lemma (3.10), in the set where  $W = G$ , we have

$$W = \tilde{w} = G. \quad (3.6)$$

Let  $\Omega_1 := \{W < G\}$ , it suffices to show  $\tilde{w} = W$  in  $\Omega_1$ . By definition of  $W$ ,  $L(W) = -R^{-n}$  in  $\Omega_1$ .

Using the fact that  $w_0$  is the minimizer, the standard argument in the calculus of variations leads to  $L(w_0) \geq -R^{-n}$ . Therefore

$$L(\tilde{w} - W) = L(w_0 - W) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } B_M. \quad (3.7)$$

Notice that on  $\partial\Omega_1$ ,  $W = \tilde{w} = G$ . By weak maximum principle, we have

$$\tilde{w} = W \quad \text{in } \Omega_1. \quad (3.8)$$

$\blacksquare$

Using the last lemma along with our definition of  $W$  (see Equation (3.4)) we can now state the following theorem.

**3.12 Theorem** (The PDE satisfied by  $w_0$ ). *The minimizing function  $w_0$  satisfies the following boundary value problem:*

$$\begin{cases} L(w_0) = -\chi_{\{w_0 < G\}} R^{-n} & \text{in } B_M \\ w_0 = G_{sm} & \text{on } \partial B_M. \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

Finally, we need the following nondegeneracy result for the obstacle problem.



**3.13 Theorem** (Nondegeneracy). *We assume that  $w$  satisfies:*

$$L(w) = \chi_{\{w>0\}} \quad \text{in } B_1 \quad \text{and } w \geq 0 . \quad (3.10)$$

*There exists a constant  $C = C(n, \lambda, \Lambda) > 0$  such that if  $0 \in \overline{\{w > 0\}}$ , then for any  $r \leq 1$  we have*

$$\sup_{x \in B_r} w(x) \geq Cr^2 . \quad (3.11)$$

The proof of this theorem is found in [BH].

## 4 Minimizers Become Independent of $M$

At this point we are no longer interested in the functions from the last section, with the exception of  $w_0$ . On the other hand, we now care about the dependence of  $w_0$  on the radius of the ball on which it is a minimizer. Accordingly, we reintroduce the dependence of  $w_0$  on  $M$ , and so we will let  $w_M$  be the minimizer of  $J(w, B_M)$  within  $K(M, G)$ , and consider the behavior as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . As we observed in Remark (3.2), it is not possible to start by minimizing our functional on all of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , so we have to get the key function, “ $V_R$ ,” mentioned by Caffarelli on page 9 of [C] by taking a limit over increasing sets. Note that by Theorem (3.12) we know that  $w_M$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} L(w_M) = -\chi_{\{G>w_M\}} R^{-n} & \text{in } B_M \\ w_M = G_{sm} & \text{on } \partial B_M . \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

The theorem that we wish to prove in this section is the following:

**4.1 Theorem** (Independence from  $M$ ). *There exists  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  such that if  $M_j > M$  for  $j = 1, 2$ , then*

$$w_{M_1} \equiv w_{M_2} \quad \text{within } B_M$$

and

$$w_{M_1} \equiv w_{M_2} \equiv G \quad \text{within } B_{M+1} \setminus B_M .$$

Furthermore, we can choose  $M$  such that  $M < C(n, \lambda, \Lambda) \cdot R$ .

This Theorem is an immediate consequence of the following Theorem:

**4.2 Theorem** (Boundedness of the Noncontact Set). *There exists a constant  $C = C(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$  such that for any  $M \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\{w_M \neq G\} \subset B_{CR} . \quad (4.2)$$

*Proof.* First of all, if  $M \leq CR$ , then there is nothing to prove. For all  $M > 1$  the function  $W := G - w_M$  will satisfy:

$$L(W) = R^{-n} \chi_{\{W > 0\}}, \text{ and } 0 \leq W \leq G \text{ in } B_1^c. \quad (4.3)$$

If the conclusion to the theorem is false, then there exists a large  $M$  and a large  $C$  such that

$$x_0 \in FB(W) \cap \{B_{M/2} \setminus B_{CR}\}.$$

Let  $K := |x_0|/3$ . By the nondegeneracy result (scaled appropriately), we can then say that

$$\sup_{B_K(x_0)} W(x) \geq CR^{-n} K^2 > CK^{2-n} \geq \sup_{B_K(x_0)} G(x) \quad (4.4)$$

which gives us a contradiction since  $W \leq G$  everywhere. Now note that in order to avoid the contradiction, we must have

$$CR^{-n} K^2 \leq CK^{2-n},$$

and this leads to

$$K \leq CR$$

which means that  $|x_0|$  must be less than  $CR$ . In other words,  $FB(W) \subset B_{CR}$ . ■

At this point, we already know that when  $M$  is sufficiently large, the set  $\{G > w_M\}$  is contained in  $B_{CR}$ . Then by uniqueness, the set will stay the same for any bigger  $M$ . Therefore, it makes sense to define  $w_R$  to be the solution of

$$Lw = -R^{-n} \chi_{\{w < G\}} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n \quad (4.5)$$

among functions  $w \leq G$  with  $w = G$  at infinity. Note that we can now obtain the function, “ $V_R$ ,” that Caffarelli uses on page 9 of [C]. The relationship is simply:

$$V_R = w_R - G. \quad (4.6)$$

## 5 The Mean Value Theorem

Finally, we can turn to the Mean Value Theorem.

**5.1 Lemma** (Ordering of Sets). *For any  $R < S$ , we have*

$$\{w_R < G\} \subset \{w_S < G\}. \quad (5.1)$$

*Proof.* Let  $B_M$  be a ball that contains both  $\{w_R < G\}$  and  $\{w_S < G\}$ . Then by the discussion in Section 2, we know  $w_R$  minimizes

$$\int_{B_M} a^{ij} D_i w D_j w - 2w R^{-n}$$

and  $w_S$  minimizes

$$\int_{B_M} a^{ij} D_i w D_j w - 2w S^{-n}.$$

Let  $\Omega_1 \subset\subset B_M$  be the set  $\{w_S > w_R\}$ . Then it follows that

$$\int_{\Omega_1} a^{ij} D_i w_S D_j w_S - 2w_S S^{-n} \leq \int_{\Omega_1} a^{ij} D_i w_R D_j w_R - 2w_R S^{-n}, \quad (5.2)$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_1} a^{ij} D_i w_S D_j w_S &\leq \int_{\Omega_1} a^{ij} D_i w_R D_j w_R + 2S^{-n} \int_{\Omega_1} (w_S - w_R) \\ &< \int_{\Omega_1} a^{ij} D_i w_R D_j w_R + 2R^{-n} \int_{\Omega_1} (w_S - w_R). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since  $w_S \equiv w_R$  on  $\partial\Omega_1$ , and

$$\int_{\Omega_1} a^{ij} D_i w_S D_j w_S - 2w_S R^{-n} < \int_{\Omega_1} a^{ij} D_i w_R D_j w_R - 2w_R R^{-n}, \quad (5.3)$$

we contradict the fact that  $w_R$  is the minimizer of  $\int a^{ij} D_i w D_j w - 2w R^{-n}$ . ■

**5.2 Lemma.** *There exists a constant  $c = c(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$  such that*

$$B_{cR} \subset \{G > w_R\}.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma (3.4) we already know that there exists a constant

$$C = C(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$$

such that  $w_1(0) \leq C$ . Then it is not hard to show that

$$\|w_1\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/2})} \leq \tilde{C}. \quad (5.4)$$

By [LSW] for any elliptic operator  $L$  with given  $\lambda$  and  $\Lambda$ , we have

$$\frac{c_1}{|x|^{n-2}} \leq G(x) \leq \frac{c_2}{|x|^{n-2}}. \quad (5.5)$$

By combining the last two equations it follows that there exists a constant  $c = c(n, \lambda, \Lambda)$  such that

$$B_c \subset \{G > w_1\}.$$

It remains to show that this inclusion scales correctly.

Let  $v_R := G - w_R$  (so  $v_R = -V_R$ ). Then  $v_R$  satisfies

$$Lv_R = \delta - R^{-n}\chi_{\{v_R > 0\}} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.6)$$

Now observe that by scaling our operator  $L$  appropriately, we get an operator  $\tilde{L}$  with the same ellipticity constants as  $L$ , such that

$$\tilde{L}(R^{n-2}v_R(Rx)) = \delta - \chi_{\{v_R(Rx) > 0\}}. \quad (5.7)$$

So we have

$$B_c \subset \left\{x \mid v_R(Rx) > 0\right\},$$

which implies

$$B_{cR} \subset \left\{v_R(x) > 0\right\}. \quad (5.8)$$

■

Suppose  $v$  is a supersolution to

$$Lv = 0,$$

i.e.  $Lv \leq 0$ . Then for any  $\phi \geq 0$ , we have

$$\int_{\Omega} vL\phi \leq 0. \quad (5.9)$$

If  $R < S$ , then we know that  $w_R \geq w_S$ , and so the function  $\phi = w_R - w_S$  is a permissible test function. We also know:

$$L\phi = R^{-n}\chi_{\{G > w_R\}} - S^{-n}\chi_{\{G > w_S\}}. \quad (5.10)$$

By observing that  $v \equiv 1$  is both a supersolution and a subsolution and by plugging in our  $\phi$ , we arrive at

$$R^{-n}|\{G > w_R\}| = S^{-n}|\{G > w_S\}|, \quad (5.11)$$

and this implies

$$L\phi = C \left[ \frac{1}{|\{G > w_R\}|} \chi_{\{G > w_R\}} - \frac{1}{|\{G > w_S\}|} \chi_{\{G > w_S\}} \right]. \quad (5.12)$$

Now, Equation (5.9) implies

$$0 \geq \int_{\Omega} vL\phi = C \left[ \frac{1}{|\{G > w_R\}|} \int_{\{G > w_R\}} v - \frac{1}{|\{G > w_S\}|} \int_{\{G > w_S\}} v \right]. \quad (5.13)$$

Therefore, we have established the following theorem:

**5.3 Theorem** (Mean Value Theorem for Divergence Form Elliptic PDE). *Let  $L$  be any divergence form elliptic operator with ellipticity  $\lambda, \Lambda$ . For any  $x_0 \in \Omega$ , there exists an increasing family  $D_R(x_0)$  which satisfies the following:*

1.  $B_{cR}(x_0) \subset D_R(x_0) \subset B_{CR}(x_0)$ , with  $c, C$  depending only on  $n, \lambda$  and  $\Lambda$ .
2. For any  $v$  satisfying  $Lv \geq 0$  and  $R < S$ , we have

$$v(x_0) \leq \frac{1}{|D_R(x_0)|} \int_{|D_R(x_0)|} v \leq \frac{1}{|D_S(x_0)|} \int_{D_S(x_0)} v. \quad (5.14)$$

As on pages 9 and 10 of [C], (and as Littman, Stampacchia, and Weinberger already observed using their own mean value theorem,) we have the following corollary:

**5.4 Corollary** (Semicontinuous Representative). *Any supersolution  $v$ , has a unique pointwise defined representative as*

$$v(x_0) := \lim_{R \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{|D_R(x_0)|} \int_{|D_R(x_0)|} v(x) dx. \quad (5.15)$$

*This representative is lower semicontinuous:*

$$v(x_0) \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} v(x) \quad (5.16)$$

*for any  $x_0$  in the domain.*

We can also show the following analogue of G.C. Evans' Theorem:

**5.5 Corollary** (Analogue of Evans' Theorem). *Let  $v$  be a supersolution to  $Lv = 0$ , and suppose that  $v$  restricted to the support of  $Lv$  is continuous. Then the representative of  $v$  given by Equation (5.16) is continuous.*

**Proof.** This proof is almost identical to the proof given on pages 10 and 11 of [C] for  $L = \Delta$ . ■

## 6 Acknowledgements

We are indebted to both Luis Caffarelli and Luis Silvestri for very useful conversations.

## References

- [BH] I. Blank and Z. Hao, The obstacle problem for elliptic operators in divergence form, preprint.
- [C] L.A. Caffarelli, The Obstacle Problem. The Fermi Lectures, Accademia Nazionale Dei Lincei Scuola Normale Superiore, 1998.
- [GT] D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger, Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, 1983.
- [G] E. Giusti, Direct Methods in the Calculus of Variations, World Scientific, 2003.
- [HL] Q. Han and F. Lin, Elliptic Partial Differential Equations, AMS, 2000.
- [LSW] W. Littman, G. Stampacchia, and H.F. Weinberger, Regular points for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients, *Ann. Scuola. Norm. Sup. Pisa. Cl. Sci.*, 17(1963), no. 1-2, 43–77.