

Fine singularity analysis of solutions to the Laplace equation

Adam Kubica

Faculty of Mathematics and Information Science
Warsaw University of Technology
ul. Koszykowa 75, 00-662 Warsaw, POLAND
A.Kubica@mini.pw.edu.pl

Piotr Rybka

Faculty of Mathematics, Informatics and Mechanics
The University of Warsaw
ul. Banacha 2, 02-097 Warsaw, POLAND
rybka@mimuw.edu.pl

July 9, 2018

Abstract

We present here a fine singularity analysis of solutions to the Laplace equation in special polygonal domains in the plane. We assume a piecewise constant Neumann data on one component of the boundary. Our motivation is to study the so-called Berg's effect [1], [3].

Keywords: singularities of harmonic functions, polygonal domains, piecewise constant Neumann data, Berg's effect

1 Introduction

We present here a fine singularity analysis of solutions to the Laplace equation in special polygonal domains in the plane. We assume a piecewise constant Neumann data on one connected component of the boundary.

This topic is rather well-studied so we have to explain carefully the purpose of this research. Here is our motivation, in [3] the author claimed that the so-called Berg's effect holds in the exterior of a straight circular cylinder in \mathbb{R}^3 . Roughly speaking, this means that if u is a harmonic function in the exterior of a straight, circular cylinder in \mathbb{R}^3 with Neumann data constant on the bases and the lateral surface, then its restriction to the boundary of the cylinder in question enjoys some monotonicity properties. We refer to [3] for the exact formulation. The point is that

the statement arises from the observation made by Berg in the 1930's, see [1], that if one grows regular polyhedral crystals from the salt solution in water, then the salt density restricted to the faces of the crystal is an increasing function of the distance from the center of the facet. The first attempt to explain this effect theoretically was done by Seeger [13]. However, until publication of [3] no one attempted to prove it in full generality.

However, P.Górka and A.Kubica pointed out that in [4] that the original argument is flawed. More precisely, the proof of [3, Lemma 1.] has a gap. This Lemma claims regularity of solutions to the Laplace equation up to the boundary. Thus, the question of validity of Berg's effect reopens.

Our ultimate goal is to settle the issue, but we will proceed in several stages. The purpose of the present paper is to make the first step toward understanding the problem in a two dimensional case. There is a separate problem of behavior of harmonic functions at infinity. So, in order to minimize unessential difficulties we will consider a bounded domain only. Here, we consider the following equation,

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega := R_2 \setminus \overline{R_1}, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial R_2, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \mathbf{n}} = u_n & \text{on } \partial R_1, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

We used here the following notation, $R_1 = (-r_1, r_1) \times (-r_2, r_2)$ and $R_2 = \lambda_0 R_1$ with $\lambda_0 > 1$, \mathbf{n} is the outer normal to Ω and

$$u_n = \begin{cases} a & \text{for } |x_2| = r_2, \\ b & \text{for } |x_1| = r_1. \end{cases}$$

The question, which we are going to address, is: What conditions must a and b satisfy to guarantee that u is singular? What are the conditions guaranteeing regularity of u ?

Despite the effort of many people to study singularities of solutions to elliptic problems (see [5], [2], [6], [7], [11]) such questions remain difficult. Partially, this is due to the fact that the available tools are too general. Namely, it is well known that if u is a solution to (1), then

$$u = v_r + c\phi, \quad (2)$$

where v_r is regular, i.e. $v_r \in H^2$, ϕ a singular, i.e. $\phi \in H^1 \setminus H^2$ and c is given by an integral formula involving boundary data u_n , see Lemma (2.1) for details. For practical purposes it is very difficult to check if c vanishes. Here are our results, where we address a planar bounded domain.

Theorem 1.1. *(a rectangle inside a scaled rectangle) Let us suppose that R_1 is a general rectangle as described earlier. There are unique numbers α_1, β_1 related with Ω such that $|\alpha_1| + |\beta_1| > 0$ and if u is a weak solution to (1), then*

$$u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \iff a\alpha_1 + b\beta_1 = 0.$$

Once we established Theorem 1.1 for a generic rectangle we may turn to a special case of a square.

Theorem 1.2. *(a square inside a scaled square) Let us suppose that R_1 is a square $R_1 = Q = (-R, R)^2$. If u is a weak solution to (1), then*

$$u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \iff a = b,$$

i.e. number α_1, α_2 from theorem 1.1 satisfy $\alpha_1 = -\alpha_2 \neq 0$.

At the technical level our results for bounded domains in the plain are proved by a very careful analysis of behavior of regular level sets of harmonic functions in $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. The boundary of Ω has exactly two connected components, which are polygons. We will call by Γ the inner part and $\tilde{\Gamma}$ the outer part of the boundary. In principle, the description of the singularities is well-known, see the fundamental monograph [5]. However, this description is not effective.

On a more fundamental level, our paper does not make Berg's effect invalid. It suggests that it is a rather rare phenomenon, which could be observed when crystals are near equilibrium with the environment. The above result strongly suggests that contrary to the claim made in [3] solutions to [3, eq. (2.2)] ingeneral are singular. But influence of the singularity on Berg's effect will be studied elsewhere.

2 Preliminaries

We first present facts on corner singularities of harmonic functions, then we will look at their level sets.

2.1 On singular solutions to Laplace equation

We introduce here the necessary notions and background material from [5]. We begin with the definition of the domain Ω . First, we set $R_1 = (-r_1, r_1) \times (-r_2, r_2)$, which will be the inner rectangle. We take any $\lambda_0 > 1$ and we set $R_2 = \lambda_0 R_1$. The domain of our harmonic functions is

$$\Omega = R_2 \setminus \overline{R_1} \equiv \lambda_0 R_1 \setminus \overline{R_1}.$$

The boundary of Ω consists of two connected components. For our purposes we will break it down even further. We shall write,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &= \partial R_1 = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3 \cup \Gamma_4 \cup S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3 \cup S_4, \\ \tilde{\Gamma} &= \partial R_2 = \tilde{\Gamma}_1 \cup \tilde{\Gamma}_2 \cup \tilde{\Gamma}_3 \cup \tilde{\Gamma}_4 \cup \tilde{S}_1 \cup \tilde{S}_2 \cup \tilde{S}_3 \cup \tilde{S}_4, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_i, \tilde{\Gamma}_i$ are sides of rectangles and S_i, \tilde{S}_i are their vertices, $i = 1, \dots, 4$. To be precise, we set $\Gamma_1 = \{(t, r_2) : t \in (-r_1, r_1)\}$, with the respective definition of $\tilde{\Gamma}_1$ and $\Gamma_2, \Gamma_3, \Gamma_4$ are the remaining sides of R_1 visited counterclockwise. $\tilde{\Gamma}_j, j = 2, 3, 4$ are respectively defined for R_2 . We also set $S_i = \overline{\Gamma_i} \cap \overline{\Gamma_{i+1}}$, with the understanding that $\Gamma_{4+1} = \Gamma_1$ and in the same manner we define \tilde{S}_j . The distance from vertex S_i is ϱ_i . We also set $\varrho = \min_{i=1, \dots, 4} \varrho_i$.

For $i = 2, 4$, we set θ_i to be the angle measured at S_i from Γ_i to Γ_{i+1} . At the same time for $i = 1, 3$, we set θ_i to be the angle measured from Γ_{i+1} to Γ_i . We denote by $\eta_i = \eta_i(\varrho_i)$ a cutoff function equal 1 in a neighborhood of S_i with support

in $B(S_i, \min\{r_1, r_2\})$. Furthermore, let ψ_i be a cutoff function equal to 1 in the neighborhood of Γ_i .

Before plunging into analysis of our problem, we state a more basic result.

Proposition 2.1. *Let us suppose that $\omega \in (\pi, 2\pi)$, then we set $U = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : r \in (0, r_0), \theta \in (0, \omega)\}$, where (r, θ) are polar coordinate in \mathbb{R}^2 . We assume that $S \in L^2(U)$ is a solution to the following problem,*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta S = 0 & \text{in } U, \\ \frac{\partial S}{\partial n} = 0 & \text{for } \theta = 0, \omega \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Then, there exist constants $c_{k,m}$ such that we have

$$S = c_{1,1} \sqrt{2/\omega} r^{-\pi/\omega} \cos \theta \pi / \omega + c_{1,0} 1/\sqrt{\omega} \ln r + c_{2,0}/\sqrt{\omega} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_{2,k} r^{k\pi/\omega} \cos \theta k \pi / \omega. \quad (4)$$

Moreover, for $l = 0, 1, \dots$ we have

$$\sum_{k \geq \frac{\omega l}{\pi}}^{\infty} c_{2,k} r^{k\pi/\omega} \cos \theta k \pi / \omega \in C^l(\bar{U}). \quad (5)$$

Remark 2.1. *For $\omega \in (0, \pi)$ the statement is changed by dropping the first term in right hand side of (4) and in (5) we get $C^{l+1}(\bar{U})$.*

Proof. Function S is smooth up to the boundary away from the origin, because it is harmonic inside U and can be harmonically continued across the boundary by even reflection. Thus, we have to establish its asymptotic behavior near origin. Without the loss of generality we may assume that $\|S\|_{L^2(U)} = 1$. Then we set $\varphi_k(\theta) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\omega}} \cos \theta k \pi / \omega$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ and $\varphi_0(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega}}$. Functions $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ form an orthonormal basis of $L^2(0, \omega)$, thus

$$S(r, \theta) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} w_k(r) \varphi_k(\theta), \quad (6)$$

for all $r \in (0, r_0)$. At the same time this series converges in $L^2(0, \omega)$. Its coefficients are given by the following formula,

$$w_k(r) = \int_0^{\omega} S(r, \theta) \varphi_k(\theta) d\theta.$$

From (3) we obtain an ODE for w_k :

$$w_k'' + \frac{w_k'}{r} - (k\pi/\omega)^2 \frac{w_k}{r^2} = 0, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots,$$

in other words

$$w_0(r) = c_{1,0} \ln r + c_{2,0}, \quad w_k(r) = c_{1,k} r^{-k\pi/\omega} + c_{2,k} r^{k\pi/\omega} \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (7)$$

We shall show that

$$c_{1,k} = 0 \quad \text{for } k > 1. \quad (8)$$

For this purpose we notice that $\int_0^{r_0} |w_k(r)|^2 r dr = \int_0^{r_0} \int_0^\omega |S(r, \theta) \varphi_k(\theta)|^2 r d\theta dr \leq \|S\|_{L^2(U)}^2 = 1$. On the other hand

$$\int_0^{r_0} |c_{1,k} r^{-k\pi/\omega}|^2 r dr = |c_{1,k}|^2 \frac{r^{2(1-k\pi/\omega)}}{2(1-k\pi/\omega)} \Big|_0^{r_0}.$$

This integral is finite, hence $c_{1,k} = 0$ or $1 - k\pi/\omega > 0$, which implies (8). Thus, from (6)-(8), we infer (4).

In order to see (5), we need estimates on coefficients $c_{2,k}$ for $k > 1$. For this purpose, we fix $\delta \in (0, r_0)$ and we set $a_k \equiv w_k(\delta) = \int_0^\omega S(\delta, \theta) \varphi_k(\theta) d\theta$. Then, it is easy to see that $|a_k| \leq C(\delta)$, because S is smooth away from the origin. Then, $w_k(\delta) = c_{2,k} \delta^{k\pi/\omega}$. Hence,

$$|c_{2,k}| \leq C(\delta) \delta^{-k\pi/\omega}. \quad (9)$$

In this way for $k \geq \omega l/\pi$, we obtain

$$\|D^l(c_{2,k} r^{k\pi/\omega} \cos \theta k\pi/\omega)\|_{C(U)} \leq C(l) k^l |c_{2,k}|.$$

We infer from (9) that the series $\sum_{k \geq \frac{\omega l}{\pi}}^\infty c_{2,k} r^{k\pi/\omega} \cos \theta k\pi/\omega$ converges in $C^l(\bar{U})$. \square

We shall introduce a couple of functions, which are necessary in the description of singularities of solutions to (1). The first one is \bar{S} .

Definition 2.1. (Very weak solution \bar{S}). Let $w \in H^1(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to the following problem,

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w = -\Delta(\sum_{i=1}^4 \eta_i \varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3} \theta_i) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial n} \Big|_\Gamma = 0 & \text{and} \quad w|_{\tilde{\Gamma}} = 0. \end{cases}$$

We notice that $\Delta(\sum_{i=1}^4 \eta_i \varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3} \theta_i) \in L^2(\Omega)$. We set

$$\tilde{S} = w + \sum_{i=1}^4 \eta_i \varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3} \theta_i, \quad (10)$$

hence, $0 \neq \tilde{S} \in L^2(\Omega)$. We finally define

$$\bar{S} = \tilde{S} / \|\tilde{S}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \equiv c_0 \tilde{S}. \quad (11)$$

The basic properties of \bar{S} are stated below.

Corollary 2.1. *Function \bar{S} , given by the above formula, is the only one, (up to the sign), with the following properties,*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \bar{S} = 0, \\ \frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial n} \Big|_\Gamma = 0, \\ \bar{S}|_{\tilde{\Gamma}} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

$$\|\overline{\overline{S}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1, \quad (13)$$

$$\overline{\overline{S}}(x, y) = \overline{\overline{S}}(-x, y) = \overline{\overline{S}}(x, -y) = \overline{\overline{S}}(-x, -y), \quad (14)$$

$$\overline{\overline{S}} \in L^2(\Omega) \setminus H^1(\Omega). \quad (15)$$

Proof. We claim that $\overline{\overline{S}}$ and $-\overline{\overline{S}}$ are the only functions satisfying (12)-(15). Indeed, from [8, Theorem 2] and [9, Corollary 6], we deduce that, \mathcal{V} , the space of functions which satisfy (12) and (15) is spanned by four linearly independent functions. Each of them corresponds to one non convex corner of Ω . Symmetries (14) reduce the dimension of \mathcal{V} to one and from (13) we get the claim. \square

We define the second important function.

Definition 2.2. (singular solution $\overline{\overline{S}}$). Let us suppose that $\overline{\overline{S}} \in L^2(\Omega)$ is given by Definition 2.1. Then $\overline{\overline{S}} \in H^1(\Omega)$ is a unique weak solution to the following equation,

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \overline{\overline{S}} = \overline{\overline{S}} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial \overline{\overline{S}}}{\partial n}|_{\Gamma} = 0, & \overline{\overline{S}}|_{\tilde{\Gamma}} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Having functions $\overline{\overline{S}}$ and $\overline{\overline{S}}$ at hand, we can provide a description of singular solutions to (1). In order to do this we introduce an auxiliary function

$$f = -a(y - r_2)\psi_1 + b(x + r_1)\psi_2 + a(y + r_2)\psi_3 - b(x - r_1)\psi_4 \in C^\infty(\Omega),$$

where ψ_i are cut off functions equal to one on some neighborhood of Γ_i and vanishing on $\tilde{\Gamma}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let us suppose that $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ is a unique weak solution to (1). Then u has the following form,*

$$u = u_r + (c_a + c_b)\overline{\overline{S}}, \quad u_r \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}),$$

where $c_a + c_b = -\int_{\Omega} \overline{\overline{S}} \Delta f$.

Proof. Such a decomposition is a general fact, see [8, Theorem 1]. Now, the point is to calculate $c_a + c_b$. Obviously, f satisfies boundary conditions (1_{2,3}). Now, let $v \in H^1(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to the problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v = -\Delta f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial n}|_{\Gamma} = 0, & v|_{\tilde{\Gamma}} = 0. \end{cases}$$

According to [8, Theorem 1] and its proof $v = v_r + c\overline{\overline{S}}$, where $v_r \in H^2(\Omega)$ and $\int_{\Omega} \Delta v_r \overline{\overline{S}} = 0$, where $\overline{\overline{S}}$ satisfies (12)-(15). Then it is easy to see that $c = -\int_{\Omega} \overline{\overline{S}} \Delta f$.

From the uniqueness of weak solutions we get $u = v + f$, so $u = v_r + f + c\overline{\overline{S}}$, where $v_r + f \in H^2(\Omega)$. From Proposition 2.1 we deduce that $v_r + f \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$. Finally, we see that $c_a + c_b = -\int_{\Omega} \overline{\overline{S}} \Delta f$, hence the proof is finished. \square

We shall see that despite a seemingly arbitrary choice of f , the definition of c is universal.

Proposition 2.2. Let us suppose that f is given above and $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is as in Definition 2.1. Then,

$$\int_{\Omega} \overline{\overline{S}} \Delta f = 2a \int_{\Gamma_1} \overline{\overline{S}} + 2b \int_{\Gamma_2} \overline{\overline{S}}. \quad (16)$$

Proof. The argument will be split in a number of steps.

Step 1. Let $\Omega_\delta = R_2 \setminus (-r_1 - \delta, r_1 + \delta) \times (-r_2 - \delta, r_2 + \delta)$. The regularity of f and the boundedness of Ω imply that $\overline{\overline{S}} \Delta f \in L^1(\Omega)$. Thus

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_\delta} \overline{\overline{S}} \Delta f = \int_{\Omega} \overline{\overline{S}} \Delta f.$$

At the same time, $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is harmonic in Ω_δ , so we have

$$\int_{\Omega_\delta} \overline{\overline{S}} \Delta f = \int_{\partial\Omega_\delta} \overline{\overline{S}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}} - \int_{\partial\Omega_\delta} \frac{\partial \overline{\overline{S}}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} f.$$

We split the boundary of $(-r_1 - \delta, r_1 + \delta) \times (-r_2 - \delta, r_2 + \delta)$ exactly in the same way as we did it earlier, so that we shall write $\partial\Omega_\delta = \overline{\Gamma}_1^\delta \cup \overline{\Gamma}_2^\delta \cup \overline{\Gamma}_3^\delta \cup \overline{\Gamma}_4^\delta \cup \tilde{\Gamma}$.

Step 2. We will prove that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\overline{\Gamma}_1^\delta} \overline{\overline{S}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}} = \int_{\Gamma_1} \overline{\overline{S}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}} = a \int_{\Gamma_1} \overline{\overline{S}}. \quad (17)$$

From Proposition 2.1 we deduce that $|\overline{\overline{S}}| \leq c_0 \varrho^{-\frac{2}{3}}$. Since by definition $|\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}}| \leq C$, then we also have $|\overline{\overline{S}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}}| \leq c \varrho^{-\frac{2}{3}}$, thus its integral over any segment of the length b is smaller than $6cb^{1/3}$. Therefore for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, such that for any $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$ the following estimate

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma_1^\delta \setminus ([-r_1 + \varepsilon_1, r_1 - \varepsilon_1] \times \{r_2 + \delta\})} \overline{\overline{S}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \right| + \left| \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus ([-r_1 + \varepsilon_1, r_1 - \varepsilon_1] \times \{r_2\})} \overline{\overline{S}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

holds. Moreover, for fixed ε_1 , we have

$$\overline{\overline{S}}(x, r_2 + \delta) \rightarrow \overline{\overline{S}}(x, r_2), \quad x \in [-r_1 + \varepsilon_1, r_1 - \varepsilon_1],$$

as δ converges to zero and the convergence is uniform, because $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is smooth away from vertices. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Gamma_1^\delta} \overline{\overline{S}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}} - \int_{\Gamma_1} \overline{\overline{S}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \right| &\leq \left| \int_{\Gamma_1^\delta \setminus ([-r_1 + \varepsilon_1, r_1 - \varepsilon_1] \times \{r_2 + \delta\})} \overline{\overline{S}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \right| + \left| \int_{\Gamma_1 \setminus ([-r_1 + \varepsilon_1, r_1 - \varepsilon_1] \times \{r_2\})} \overline{\overline{S}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \right| \\ &+ \left| \int_{\Gamma_1^\delta \cap ([-r_1 + \varepsilon_1, r_1 - \varepsilon_1] \times \{r_2 + \delta\})} \overline{\overline{S}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}} - \int_{\Gamma_1 \cap ([-r_1 + \varepsilon_1, r_1 - \varepsilon_1] \times \{r_2\})} \overline{\overline{S}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \right| \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

when δ goes to 0, as a result (17) holds.

The remaining cases of Γ_i for $i = 2, 3, 4$ are handled with in the same way.

Step 3. We claim that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Gamma_i^\delta} \frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} f = 0.$$

First, we will notice that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Gamma_i^\delta} \frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} f = \int_{\Gamma_i} \frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} f, \quad i = 1, \dots, 4.$$

By the definition of f , we get $|f| \leq c_0 \varrho$. On the other hand, using Proposition 2.1 we get $|\frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial \mathbf{n}}| \leq c_0 \varrho^{-\frac{5}{3}}$, hence $|\frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} f| \leq c \varrho^{-\frac{2}{3}}$. Therefore we may proceed as in Step 2 and calculate the above limit. Finally, we see that $\frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial \mathbf{n}}$ vanishes on Γ , hence the claim follows.

Step 4. Integrals over $\tilde{\Gamma}$ vanish, because the support of f does not intersect $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Considering the boundary values of $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{n}}$, we infer (16). \square

Corollary 2.2. *Let us suppose that $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ is a unique weak solution to (1). Then*

$$u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega}) \iff a \int_{\Gamma_1} \bar{S} + b \int_{\Gamma_2} \bar{S} = 0. \quad (18)$$

Proof. If $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ is the weak solution of (1), then necessarily $c_a + c_b = 0$, because $\bar{S} \notin C^1(\bar{\Omega})$. Then, from (16) we get $a \int_{\Gamma_1} \bar{S} + b \int_{\Gamma_2} \bar{S} = 0$. The other implication is obvious. \square

Remark 2.2. *We see that the issue of regularity of solution of problem (1) is reduced to calculating integrals $\int_{\Gamma_1} \bar{S}$ and $\int_{\Gamma_2} \bar{S}$. However, we can not do it directly. This is*

the main obstacle, related to that function \bar{S} is not given explicitly. In our further analysis we concentrate only on these integrals. More precisely, we will show that at least one function of $\bar{S}|_{\Gamma_1}, \bar{S}|_{\Gamma_2}$ is positive or negative. Then, at least one integral $\int_{\Gamma_1} \bar{S}$ or $\int_{\Gamma_2} \bar{S}$ is non zero. This means that the set of $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, for which the solution of (1) is regular, is just a straight line.

2.2 Very weak solutions

Lemma 2.2. *There is \mathcal{U} , a neighborhood of vertices S_i such that $\nabla \bar{S}(x, y) \neq 0$ in \mathcal{U} .*

Proof. In order to see this we recall the form of \bar{S} , see (10) and (11). We notice that in a sufficiently small neighborhood of vertices S_i the term $\nabla(\varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3} \theta_i)$ dominates

∇w . More precisely, from Proposition 2.1, we deduce that $w = \sum_{i=1}^4 c\eta_i \varrho_i^{\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3}\theta_i + h$, where h belongs to $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$. Therefore, we conclude that $\varrho_i^{\frac{1}{3}}|\nabla w| \leq c_1$, while $|\nabla(\varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3}\theta_i)| = \frac{2}{3}\varrho_i^{-\frac{5}{3}}$. Then, by the triangle inequality we have $|\nabla(\varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3}\theta_i)| - |\nabla w| \leq |\nabla \tilde{S}|$, as a result we see, $\varrho_i^{\frac{1}{3}}|\nabla(\varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3}\theta_i)| - \varrho_i^{\frac{1}{3}}|\nabla w| \leq \varrho_i^{\frac{1}{3}}|\nabla \tilde{S}|$. This implies that $\frac{2}{3}\varrho_i^{-\frac{4}{3}} - c_1 \leq \varrho_i^{\frac{1}{3}}|\nabla \tilde{S}|$, and then $\frac{2}{3}\varrho_i^{-\frac{4}{3}}(\varrho_i^{-\frac{4}{3}} - c_1) \leq |\nabla \tilde{S}|$, which means that for sufficiently small ϱ_i we have $\nabla \overline{S} \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *For each $k > 0$ there is $M > 0$ such that, if we define U^M by*

$$U^M = \bigcup_{i=1}^4 U_i^M,$$

where

$$U_i^M = \{(x, y) \in \Omega : \varrho_i \leq M^{-\frac{3}{2}} |\cos \frac{2}{3}\theta_i|^{\frac{3}{2}}\}, \quad (19)$$

then

$$|\overline{S}|_{U^M} > k. \quad (20)$$

Proof. Let us fix $k > 0$. We set U_i^M by formula (19). Obviously, function $|\varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3}\theta_i|$ is bounded below by M in U_i^M . Since w in the definition of \overline{S} is continuous in $\overline{\Omega}$, then the number $m = \max_{\Omega} |w|$ is well-defined. We recall the shorthand $c_0 = \|\tilde{S}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{-1}$. By the definition of U_i^M , on the set $U_i^M \cap \{\eta_i(\varrho_i) = 1\}$ we have

$$c_0 M \leq |c_0 \varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3}\theta_i| = |\overline{S} - c_0 w| \leq |\overline{S}| + c_0 m.$$

In other words,

$$c_0 M - c_0 m \leq |\overline{S}| \quad \text{on } U_i^M,$$

for M so large that $U_i^M \subseteq \{\eta_i(\varrho_i) = 1\}$. Finally, choosing a constant M so big that the left-hand-side of the above inequality is bigger than k , we get (20). \square

Lemma 2.4. *For each $k > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_2)$ function \overline{S} restricted to $\Omega \cap \partial B(S_i, \varepsilon) \setminus U_i^M$ is strictly decreasing with respect to the angle θ_i for all $i = 1, \dots, 4$.*

The constant M and sets U_i^M are given by Lemma 2.3.

Proof. Actually, in a neighborhood of S_i we have $\overline{S} = c_0 \varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3}\theta_i + c_0 w$. Let us recall that Proposition 2.1 implies that $\varrho_i^{\frac{1}{3}}|\nabla w|$ is bounded in $\overline{\Omega}$, hence the number $m_2 = \max_{\Omega} \varrho_i^{\frac{1}{3}}|\nabla w|$ is well-defined. We obviously have

$$\varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \overline{S} = -\frac{2}{3} c_0 \varrho_i^{-\frac{4}{3}} \sin \frac{2}{3}\theta_i + c_0 \varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} w,$$

where $\left| \varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} w \right| \leq \varrho_i^{\frac{1}{3}} |\nabla w| \leq m_2$. We recall that according to the definition of U_i^M , we have $M \geq \varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} |\cos \frac{2}{3} \theta_i|$ in $\Omega \setminus U_i^M$. As a result, $\frac{2}{3} \theta_i \in (\arccos(M \varrho_i^{\frac{2}{3}}), \arccos(-M \varrho_i^{\frac{2}{3}}))$. Then, on this interval, we have $\inf \sin \frac{2}{3} \theta_i = \sin(\arccos(M \varrho_i^{\frac{2}{3}})) > 0$. This implies that in a neighborhood of S_i for points not belonging to U_i^M , we have

$$-\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \overline{S} \geq \frac{2}{3} c_0 \varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \sin(\arccos(M \varrho_i^{\frac{2}{3}})) - \varrho_i^{\frac{2}{3}} c_0 m_2.$$

Certainly, the right-hand side of the above inequality monotonically grows to ∞ , when ϱ_i tends to zero. Thus, we may take any positive ε smaller than ε_2 defined by the following inequality $\frac{2}{3} \varepsilon_2^{-\frac{2}{3}} \sin(\arccos(M \varepsilon_2^{\frac{2}{3}})) - \varepsilon_2^{\frac{2}{3}} m_2 > 0$. \square

For $k \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by \widetilde{W}_k the level set, i.e.

$$\widetilde{W}_k = \{x \in \Omega : \overline{S}(x) = k\}. \quad (21)$$

The following Corollary describes the structure of level sets in a neighborhood of S_i .

Corollary 2.3. *For each vertex S_i , $i = 1, \dots, 4$ and for each $k \in \mathbb{R}$, there is $\varepsilon_3 > 0$ such that $\widetilde{W}_k \cap B(S_i, \varepsilon_3)$ is an analytic curve with one endpoint in S_i . Moreover, curve \widetilde{W}_k divides $\Omega \cap B(S_i, \varepsilon_3)$ into two parts: on one of them $\overline{S} > k$ and on the other $\overline{S} < k$.*

Proof. For fixed $k \in \mathbb{R}$ we consider the set \widetilde{W}_k . Then, using Proposition 2.1 we get $\varepsilon_3 > 0$ such that for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_3)$ the following conditions

$$\inf_{\Omega \cap \partial B(S_i, \varepsilon)} \overline{S} < -k, \quad k < \sup_{\Omega \cap \partial B(S_i, \varepsilon)} \overline{S}$$

hold. Let M and ε_2 be given by Lemma 2.3-2.4. Then we deduce that for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{\varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3\})$ the set $\widetilde{W}_k \cap \partial B(S_i, \varepsilon)$ consist of one point. Using implicit function theorem and Lemma 2.2 we conclude the first claim.

If we conduct the same argument as above, for two different numbers k , then we obtain the remaining part of the claim. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let us suppose that \overline{S} is given by Corollary 2.1. Then, the set $\{p \in \Omega : \nabla \overline{S}(p) = 0\}$ is finite.*

Proof. Indeed, \overline{S} is harmonic in simply connected domains $\Omega_{\pm} = \Omega \cap \{\pm x > -\varepsilon\}$, hence \overline{S} is a real part of a holomorphic function f_{\pm} in Ω_{\pm} . Then, the set $\{z = (x, y) \in \Omega_{\pm} : f'_{\pm}(z) = 0\}$ is isolated in Ω_{\pm} and from equality $f'(z) = u_x(x, y) - iu_y(x, y)$ we deduce that $\{p \in \Omega : \nabla \overline{S}(p) = 0\}$ is isolated in Ω . Suppose that this set is not finite. Then, there would be a sequence, $p_n \in \Omega$, such that $\nabla \overline{S}(p_n) = 0$ and necessarily $p_n \rightarrow p \in \partial \Omega$.

We can extend f (respectively, \overline{S}) across flat parts of the boundary to get a holomorphic continuation of f_{\pm} (respectively, harmonic continuation of \overline{S}). In this process we rule out the possibility that $p \in \partial \Omega \setminus \{S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4\}$. The proof is finished because from Lemma 2.2 we get $\nabla \overline{S} \neq 0$, in a neighborhood of S_i . \square

Now, we will analyze zero level sets.

Lemma 2.6. *There are analytic curves $L_k \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\widetilde{W}_0 = \bigcup_{k=1}^N L_k$. Moreover, for each k the endpoints of L_k belong to $\partial\Omega$, i.e. $\partial L_k \in \Gamma \cup \widetilde{\Gamma}$.*

Proof. From Lemma 2.5, we infer that there are finitely many points $\{p_m\}_{m=1}^{m_0}$ such that $\nabla \overline{S}(p_m) = 0$ and $p_m \in \widetilde{W}_0$. Therefore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ on the set $\widetilde{W}_0 \setminus \bigcup_{m=1}^{m_0} B(p_m, \varepsilon)$ we have $\nabla \overline{S} \neq 0$. Hence, from implicit function theorem each point of its set belongs to some analytic curve.

On the other hand, for ε small enough $\widetilde{W}_0 \cap B(p_m, \varepsilon)$ is a set of analytic curves which is analytically equivalent (see [10, Definition 2]) to $\{te^{i\varphi_l} : t \in (-1, 1), l = 1, \dots, l_0\}$, where $\varphi_l = \frac{(l-1)\pi + \frac{\pi}{2}}{l_0}$ (see [10, Theorem 1]). This proves the first part of the claim.

Finally, according to [10, Theorem 3], each analytic curve can be uniquely extended to the boundary of the domain. \square

Remark 2.3. *In the above proof number l_0 is the order of zero of holomorphic function $f(z)$ such that $f(p_m) = 0$ and $\operatorname{Re} f = \overline{S}$ in $B(p_m, \varepsilon)$.*

Lemma 2.7. *Let L be a connected subset of \widetilde{W}_0 with two endpoints on $\partial\Omega$. Then at least one of them is vertex S_i for an i in the range $1, \dots, 4$.*

Proof. Let us denote two endpoints of L by A, B , they belong to $\partial\Omega$. We will show that A or B is a vertex S_i . For this purpose we have to exclude all other possibilities. These are:

- 1) $A, B \in \widetilde{\Gamma}$;
- 2) $A \in \Gamma_i$ and $B \in \widetilde{\Gamma}$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$;
- 3) $A \in \Gamma_i$, $B \in \Gamma_j$, $i, j = 1, \dots, 4$.

We will study them one by one.

1) Let us suppose $A, B \in \widetilde{\Gamma}$. In this case, L together with a part of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ bound a nonempty open subset of Ω and \overline{S} is equal to zero on its boundary and is harmonic inside. Hence, $\overline{S} \equiv 0$, which is impossible.

2) Let us assume now, that $i = 1$, in the other cases we proceed similarly. We denote the reflection of A (respectively, B, L) with respect to $\{x = 0\}$ by A' (respectively, B', L'). We have to consider the following subcases:

a) $A \neq A'$. Then, L, L' , the part of Γ_1 connecting A and A' and the part of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ connecting B and B' bound a nonempty open subset of Ω where \overline{S} is harmonic. Thus, at least one of its extremal value is nonzero and necessarily it is located on Γ_1 , because \overline{S} vanishes on the other parts of the boundary of this set. However, by Hopf Lemma the normal derivative is nonzero at extremal points. This fact contradicts the definition \overline{S} .

b) $A = A'$ and $B \neq B'$. Then, L, L' and the part of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$, connecting B and B' , bound a nonempty open subset of Ω , where \overline{S} is harmonic and it vanishes on its boundary, but this is impossible.

c) $A = A', B = B'$ and $L \neq L'$. Then, L, L' bound a nonempty open subset of Ω , where \overline{S} is harmonic and it vanishes on its boundary, this is again impossible.

d) $L = L'$, i.e. $L \subseteq \{x = 0\}$. By definition, $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is symmetric with respect to $\{y = 0\}$, thus $\overline{\overline{S}}_{\{x=0\}} = 0$. Then, $\overline{\overline{S}}_{\{x>0\}}$ can be uniquely extended to a harmonic function in Ω by the odd reflection. On the other hand, $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is even with respect to $\{x = 0\}$. Therefore, $\overline{\overline{S}}_{\{x<0\}} \equiv 0$, which is a contradiction.

3) When $A \in \Gamma_i, B \in \Gamma_j, i, j = 1, \dots, 4$, we again consider subcases:

a) $i = j$. Then L and segment $\overline{AB} \subseteq \Gamma_i$ bound a nonempty open subset of Ω , where $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is harmonic. Therefore, at least one of its extremal value is nonzero and necessarily it is located on Γ_i . By Hopf Lemma the normal derivative is nonzero at this extremal point. This contradicts the definition $\overline{\overline{S}}$.

b) $j = i + 1$. If we denote the reflection of L (L' resp.) with respect to $\{y = 0\}$ by L'' (L''' resp.), then L, L', L'', L''' bound a neighborhood of vertices $\{S_l, l = 1, \dots, 4\}$. Outside of this neighborhood $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is bounded and harmonic and at least one of its extremal value is nonzero and necessary it is located on some Γ_l , but by Hopf Lemma the normal derivative is nonzero in the extremal point. This is a contradiction with the definition $\overline{\overline{S}}$.

c) $j = i + 2$. We argue as above.

After having considered all cases we reached the desired result. \square

Lemma 2.8. $\nabla \overline{\overline{S}}(p) \neq 0$ for all $p \in \widetilde{W}_0$.

Proof. Suppose that $\nabla \overline{\overline{S}}(p_0) = 0$ at $p_0 \in \widetilde{W}_0$. Then, (see [10, Theorem 1] and also Remark 2.3) p_0 is bifurcation point and it belongs to at least two analytic curves $L_k, L_{k'}$ given by Lemma 2.6. Hence, $\widetilde{L} \equiv L_k \cup L_{k'}$ is connected with four endpoints $\{A, B, C, D\} \subseteq \partial\Omega$. If $L \subseteq \widetilde{L}$ is connected with two endpoints, then from Lemma 2.7, we get that at least one of them is in $\{S_i : i = 1, \dots, 4\}$. Thus, we deduce that at most one of the endpoints $\{A, B, C, D\}$ is not in $\{S_i : i = 1, \dots, 4\}$. But then from symmetries, we conclude that all endpoints belong to $\{S_i : i = 1, \dots, 4\}$.

From Corollary 2.3 we deduce that L_k and $L_{k'}$ connect two different pairs of vertices $\{S_i : i = 1, \dots, 4\}$ and $p_0 \in L_k \cap L_{k'}$. It means that $L_k \cup L_{k'}$ bound some neighborhood of Γ and outside of it $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is harmonic and equal to zero on the boundary. This gives a contradiction. \square

Corollary 2.4. *Each analytic curve L_k from Lemma 2.6 has at least one endpoint in the set $\{S_i : i = 1, \dots, 4\}$. Moreover, $\widetilde{W}_0 = L_1 \cup L_2$ and endpoints of L_i are in vertices $S_i, i = 1, \dots, 4$ or $\widetilde{W}_0 = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3 \cup L_4$.*

Proof. If $p \in \widetilde{W}_0$, then from Lemma 2.6 p belongs to an analytic curve L_k with endpoints on $\partial\Omega$. Then, using Lemma 2.7, we deduce that at least one endpoint of L_k is S_i , for an index $i = 1, \dots, 4$. If the other endpoint is in some S_j for $i \neq j$, then \widetilde{W}_0 is a sum of two analytic curves. If it is not a case, then \widetilde{W}_0 is a sum of four analytic curves. \square

Lemma 2.9. *Let us suppose that $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is given by definition 2.2. We set $\alpha = \sup_{\Gamma_1} \overline{\overline{S}}$ and $\beta = \inf_{\Gamma_2} \overline{\overline{S}}$. Then $\alpha \leq 0$ or $\beta \geq 0$.*

Proof. We will analyze the structure of zero level set \widetilde{W}_0 . Let L_1 be the analytic curve given in Corollary 2.4, such that one its endpoint is in S_1 . Then, the second endpoint of L_1 may

a) be equal S_2 ; b) be equal S_4 ; c) belong to $\widetilde{\Gamma}$; d) belong to Γ_1 ; e) belong to Γ_4 . Other possibilities are eliminated by symmetries of $\overline{\overline{S}}$ and Lemma 2.8.

We will show that $\alpha \leq 0$ or $\beta \geq 0$ in all these cases (a)-(e).

a) Suppose that L_1 is a curve connecting S_1 and S_2 (see fig. 1). Then $\widetilde{W}_0 = L_1 \cup L_2$, where L_2 is an analytic curve connecting S_3 and S_4 . We denote an open subset of Ω which consists of two regions bounded by curves L_1, Γ_1 and L_2, Γ_3 (we use the symmetries of $\overline{\overline{S}}$) by U . We notice that function $\overline{\overline{S}}$ should be negative in U . Indeed, because otherwise function $\overline{\overline{S}}|_U$ would have a positive maximum located on Γ_1 . But this is not permitted by Hopf Lemma, because $\overline{\overline{S}}$ satisfies condition (12)₂. Furthermore, we deduce that $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is positive in $U^c \equiv \Omega \setminus \overline{U}$. This is indeed the case, because $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is positive in a neighborhood of S_1 , contained in U^c (see Corollary 2.3) and $\widetilde{W}_0 \cap U^c = \emptyset$, i.e. $\overline{\overline{S}}$ can not be negative by intermediate value theorem. Thus $\alpha \leq 0$ **and** $\beta \geq 0$.

b) Suppose that L_1 is a curve connecting S_1 and S_4 (see fig. 2). Then, proceeding analogously, we get $\alpha \leq 0$ **and** $\beta \geq 0$.




Fig. 1




Fig. 2

c) If L_1 connects S_1 and $\widetilde{\Gamma}$, then $\widetilde{W}_0 = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3 \cup L_4$, where L_i are analytic curves with one endpoint in S_i and the second one on $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ (see fig. 3). Hence, Ω is divided onto four regions. Arguing as earlier, we deduce that in the region above Γ_1 function $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is negative, but in the region on the right of Γ_4 function $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is positive. Thus $\alpha \leq 0$ **and** $\beta \geq 0$.

d) If the second endpoint of L_1 is on Γ_1 , then by symmetries of the problem, we deduce that $\widetilde{W}_0 = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3 \cup L_4$, where $L_i, i = 1, \dots, 4$ are analytic curves with one endpoint S_i and the second one in Γ_1 or Γ_3 (see fig. 4). Then, we denote an open subset of Ω , consisting of four regions bounded by curves $L_i, i = 1, \dots, 4$, by U . In set U^c function $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is positive, because there are points with this property in U^c and $\widetilde{W}_0 \cap U^c = \emptyset$. Thus, in this case we can only show that $\beta \geq 0$. Hence $\alpha \leq 0$ or $\beta \geq 0$.

e) If the second endpoint of L_1 is in Γ_4 , then proceeding similarly as above we deduce that $\alpha \leq 0$, hence $\alpha \leq 0$ or $\beta \geq 0$.

Therefore, in any case $\alpha \leq 0$ or $\beta \geq 0$ and the proof is finished.




Fig. 3




Fig. 4

□

Proof of theorem 1.1. Let us denote $\alpha_1 = \int_{\Gamma_1} \overline{\overline{S}}$ and $\beta_1 = \int_{\Gamma_2} \overline{\overline{S}}$. Then, from Lemma 2.9, we get $\alpha_1 < 0$ or $\beta_1 > 0$ and the claim follows Corollary 2.2.

□

2.3 A square inside a square

The situation is much simpler if we assume that $r_1 = r_2$, i.e. R_1 and R_2 are squares. Then, we can say more about properties of the very weak solutions $\overline{\overline{S}}$, because the domain Ω enjoys additional symmetry. Here is our first observation

Proposition 2.3. *If the rectangle R_1 in the definition of Ω is a square, i.e. $r_1 = r_2$, then $\overline{\overline{S}}(x, y) = -\overline{\overline{S}}(y, x)$. In particular, $\overline{\overline{S}}(x, x) = \overline{\overline{S}}(-x, x) = \overline{\overline{S}}(x, -x) = \overline{\overline{S}}(-x, -x) = 0$.*

Proof. After rotating function $\overline{\overline{S}}$ by angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$, i.e. after the change of variables $(x, y) \mapsto (-y, x)$, we get a function $\overline{\overline{S}}(-y, x)$ satisfying (12)-(15). Thus, by Corollary 2.1, we have $\overline{\overline{S}}(-y, x) = \overline{\overline{S}}(x, y)$ or $\overline{\overline{S}}(-y, x) = -\overline{\overline{S}}(x, y)$. More precisely, from (14), we have $\overline{\overline{S}}(y, x) = \overline{\overline{S}}(x, y)$ or $\overline{\overline{S}}(y, x) = -\overline{\overline{S}}(x, y)$. If the first possibility held, then from definition of $\overline{\overline{S}}$ we would get $w(x, y) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \eta_i \varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3}\theta_i = w(y, x) + \sum_{i=1}^4 \eta_i \varrho_i^{-\frac{2}{3}} \cos \frac{2}{3}(\frac{3}{2}\pi - \theta_i)$, which is impossible, because $\cos \frac{2}{3}\theta_i \neq \cos(\pi - \frac{2}{3}\theta_i)$. \square

Lemma 2.10. *Let us suppose that $\overline{\overline{S}}$ is given by Definition 2.2 and the rectangle R_1 in the definition of Ω is a square. We set $\alpha = \sup_{\Gamma_1} \overline{\overline{S}}$ and $\beta = \inf_{\Gamma_2} \overline{\overline{S}}$. Then $\alpha < 0$ and $\beta > 0$.*

Proof. From Corollary 2.4 and from the above proposition we deduce that \widetilde{W}_0 consists only of the four segments, each of them connects vertices S_i and \widetilde{S}_i , $i = 1, \dots, 4$ (see fig. 5).




Fig. 5.

Then, arguing as in part c) of the proof of Lemma 2.9, we get $\alpha \leq 0$ and $\beta \geq 0$. If $\alpha = 0$, then $\overline{\overline{S}}(p) = 0$ for some $p \in \Gamma_1$ and then p would be the extremal point for $\overline{\overline{S}}$, restricted to the subset of Ω , bounded by Γ_1 , $\widetilde{\Gamma}_1$ and segments $(\pm x, x)$, $x \in (r_1, \lambda_0 r_1)$. Therefore, by Hopf Lemma $\frac{\partial \overline{\overline{S}}}{\partial n}(p) > 0$, which contradicts (12)₂, hence $\alpha < 0$. Finally, from Proposition 2.3, we get $\beta = -\alpha > 0$. \square

Proof of theorem 1.2. Let us denote $\alpha_1 = \int_{\Gamma_1} \overline{S}$ and $\beta_1 = \int_{\Gamma_2} \overline{S}$. Then from Lemma 2.10 and Proposition 2.3 we get $\alpha_1 = -\beta_1 < 0$ and the claim follows Corollary 2.2. \square

Acknowledgment

This work has been supported by the European Union in the framework of European Social Fund through the Warsaw University of Technology Development Programme, realized by Center for Advanced Studies. Both authors were in part supported by NCN through 2011/01/B/ST1/01197 grant.

References

- [1] W.F.Berg, Crystal growth from solutions. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London A*, **164**, 79–95 (1938).
- [2] M.Dauge, *Elliptic boundary value problems on corner domains. Smoothness and asymptotics of solutions*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1341. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.
- [3] Y.Giga, P.Rybka, Berg’s Effect, *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.*, **13**, (2003), 625–637.
- [4] P.Górka, A.Kubica, private communication, 2004.
- [5] P. Grisvard, *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, Pitman, London, 1985.
- [6] V.A.Kondrat’ev, Boundary value problems for elliptic equations in domains with conical or angular points. *Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obšč.* **16**, 209–292 (1967).
- [7] V.A.Kozlov, V.G.Maz’ya, J.Rossmann, *Spectral problems associated with corner singularities of solutions to elliptic equations*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 85. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [8] A. Kubica, The regularity of weak and very weak solutions of the Poisson equation on polygonal domain with mixed boundary conditions (part I), *Appl. Math. (Warsaw)*, **31** (2004), no. 1, 443–456.
- [9] A. Kubica, The regularity of weak and very weak solutions of the Poisson equation on polygonal domain with mixed boundary conditions (part II), *Appl. Math. (Warsaw)*, **32** (2005), no. 1, 17–36.
- [10] Wen, Zhi Ying; Wu, Li Ming; Zhang, Yiping Set of zeros of harmonic functions of two variables. *Harmonic analysis (Tianjin, 1988)*, 196–203, Lecture Notes in Math., 1494, Springer, Berlin, 1991.
- [11] S.A.Nazarov, B.A.Plamenevsky, *Elliptic problems in domains with piecewise smooth boundaries*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1994.
- [12] A.Sard, The measure of the critical values of differentiable maps, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **48**, (1942), 883–890.
- [13] A.Seeger, Diffusion problems associated with the growth of crystals from dilute solution. *Philos. Mag.*, ser. 7 **44**, no 348, 1–13 (1953).