Lower bound for the number of critical points of minimal spectral k-partitions for k large.

BERNARD HELFFER

Laboratoire de mathématiques (UMR 8628), Université Paris-Sud, Bâtiment 425, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France,

Laboratoire de Mathématiques Jean Leray, Université de Nantes, E-mail: bernard.helffer@math.u-psud.fr

26 March 2015

Abstract

In a recent paper with Thomas Hoffmann-Ostenhof, we proved that the number of critical points ν_k in the boundary set of a k-minimal partition tends to $+\infty$ as $k \to +\infty$. In this note, we show that ν_k increases linearly with k as suggested by a hexagonal conjecture about the asymptotic behavior of the energy of these minimal partitions. As the original proof by Pleijel, this involves Faber-Krahn's inequality and Weyl's formula, but this time, due to the magnetic characterization of the minimal partitions, we have to establish a Weyl's formula for Aharonov-Bohm operator controlled with respect to a k-dependent number of poles.

1 Introduction

We consider the Dirichlet Laplacian in a bounded regular domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. In [10] we have analyzed the elations between the nodal domains of the realvalued eigenfunctions of this Laplacian and the partitions of Ω by k disjoint open sets D_i which are minimal in the sense that the maximum over the D_i 's of the ground state energy (or smallest eigenvalue) of the Dirichlet realization of the Laplacian in D_i is minimal. We denote by $(\lambda_j(\Omega))_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ the non decreasing sequence of its eigenvalues and by ϕ_j some associated orthonormal basis of real-valued eigenfunctions. The groundstate ϕ_1 can be chosen to be strictly positive in Ω , but the other eigenfunctions ϕ_j (j >1) must have non empty zeroset in Ω . By the zero-set of a real-valued continuous function u on $\overline{\Omega}$, we mean $N(u) = \{x \in \Omega \mid u(x) = 0\}$ and call the components of $\Omega \setminus N(u)$ the nodal domains of u. The number of nodal domains of u is called $\mu(u)$. These $\mu(u)$ nodal domains define a k-partition of Ω , with $k = \mu(u)$.

We recall that the Courant nodal Theorem [6] says that, for $k \geq 1$, and if $E(\lambda_k)$ denotes the eigenspace associated with λ_k , then, for all real-valued $u \in E(\lambda_k) \setminus \{0\}, \ \mu(u) \leq k$.

A theorem due to Pleijel [14] in 1956 says that this cannot be true when the dimension (here we consider the 2D-case) is larger than one. In the next section, we describe the link of these results with the question of spectral minimal partitions which were introduced by Helffer–Hoffmann-Ostenhof– Terracini [10].

2 Minimal spectral partitions

We now introduce for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ $(k \geq 1)$, the notion of k-partition. We call *k*-partition of Ω a family $\mathcal{D} = \{D_i\}_{i=1}^k$ of mutually disjoint sets in Ω . We denote by $\mathcal{D}_k(\Omega)$ the set of open connected partitions of Ω . We now introduce the notion of energy of the partition \mathcal{D} by

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{D}) = \max_{i} \lambda(D_i) \,. \tag{2.1}$$

Then we define for any k the minimal energy in Ω by

$$\mathfrak{L}_k(\Omega) = \inf_{\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{O}_k} \Lambda(\mathcal{D}).$$
(2.2)

and call $\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{O}_k$ a minimal k-partition if $\mathfrak{L}_k = \Lambda(\mathcal{D})$. We associate with a partition its **boundary set**:

$$N(\mathcal{D}) = \overline{\bigcup_i \left(\partial D_i \cap \Omega\right)} \,. \tag{2.3}$$

The properties of the boundary of a minimal partition are quite close to the properties of nodal sets can be described in the following way:

- (i) Except for finitely many distinct $X_i \in \Omega \cap N$ in the neighborhood of which N is the union of $\nu_i = \nu(X_i)$ smooth curves ($\nu_i \ge 3$) with one end at X_i , N is locally diffeomorphic to a regular curve.
- (ii) $\partial \Omega \cap N$ consists of a (possibly empty) finite set of points Y_i . Moreover N is near Y_i the union of ρ_i distinct smooth half-curves which hit Y_i .

(iii) N has the equal angle meeting property¹

The X_i are called the critical points and define the set X(N). A particular role is played by $X^{odd}(N)$ corresponding to the critical points for which ν_i is odd.

It has been proved by Conti-Terracini-Verzini (existence) and Helffer– Hoffmann-Ostenhof–Terracini (regularity) (see [10] and references therein) that for any k, there exists a minimal regular k-partition, and moreover that any minimal k-partition has a regular representative².

In a recent paper with Thomas Hoffmann-Ostenhof [9], we proved that the number of odd critical points of a minimal k-partition \mathcal{D}_k

$$\nu_k := \# X^{odd}(N(\mathcal{D}_k)) \tag{2.4}$$

tends to $+\infty$ as $k \to +\infty$.

In this note, we will show that it increases linearly with k as suggested by the hexagonal conjecture as discussed in [2, 4, 3, 9]. This conjecture says that

$$A(\Omega)\lim_{k \to +\infty} \frac{\mathfrak{L}_k(\Omega)}{k} = \lambda(\operatorname{Hexa}_1), \qquad (2.5)$$

where Hexa_1 denotes the regular hexagon of area 1 and $A(\Omega)$ denotes the area of Ω .

Behind this conjecture, there is the idea that k-minimal partitions will look (except at the boundary where one can imagine that pentagons will appear) as the intersection with Ω of a tiling by hexagons of area $\frac{1}{k}A(\Omega)$.

The proof presented here gives not only a better result but is at the end simpler, although based on the deep magnetic characterization of minimal partitions of [8] which will be recalled in the next section.

3 Aharonov-Bohm operators and magnetic characterization.

Let us recall some definitions about the Aharonov-Bohm Hamiltonian in an open set Ω (for short **AB**X-Hamiltonian) with a singularity at $X \in \Omega$ as considered in [11, 1]. We denote by $X = (x_0, y_0)$ the coordinates of the pole and consider the magnetic potential with flux at $X: \Phi = \pi$, defined in

 $^{^{1}}$ The half curves meet with equal angle at each critical point of N and also at the boundary together with the tangent to the boundary.

²possibly after a modification of the open sets of the partition by capacity 0 subsets.

$$\dot{\Omega_X} = \Omega \setminus \{X\}:$$

$$\mathbf{A}^X(x,y) = (A_1^X(x,y), A_2^X(x,y)) = \frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{y-y_0}{r^2}, \frac{x-x_0}{r^2}\right). \quad (3.1)$$

The **AB**X-Hamiltonian is defined by considering the Friedrichs extension starting from $C_0^{\infty}(\dot{\Omega}_X)$ and the associated differential operator is

$$-\Delta_{\mathbf{A}^X} := (D_x - A_1^X)^2 + (D_y - A_2^X)^2 \text{ with } D_x = -i\partial_x \text{ and } D_y = -i\partial_y.$$
(3.2)

Let K_X be the antilinear operator $K_X = e^{i\theta_X} \Gamma$, with $(x - x_0) + i(y - y_0) = \sqrt{|x - x_0|^2 + |y - y_0|^2} e^{i\theta_X}$, θ_X such that $d\theta_X = 2\mathbf{A}^X$, and where Γ is the complex conjugation operator $\Gamma u = \bar{u}$. A function u is called K_X -real, if $K_X u = u$. The operator $-\Delta_{\mathbf{A}^X}$ is preserving the K_X -real functions and we can consider a basis of K_X -real eigenfunctions. Hence we only analyze the restriction of the $\mathbf{AB}X$ -Hamiltonian to the K_X -real space $L^2_{K_X}$ where

$$L^{2}_{K_{X}}(\dot{\Omega}_{X}) = \{ u \in L^{2}(\dot{\Omega}_{X}) , K_{X} u = u \}.$$

This construction can be extended to the case of a configuration with ℓ distinct points X_1, \ldots, X_ℓ (putting a flux π at each of these points). We just take as magnetic potential

$$\mathbf{A}^X = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{A}^{X_j}$$
, where $X = (X_1, \dots, X_{\ell})$.

We can also construct the antilinear operator K_X , where θ_X is replaced by a multivalued-function ϕ_X such that $d\phi_X = 2\mathbf{A}^X$. We can then consider the real subspace of the K_X -real functions in $L^2_{K_X}(\dot{\Omega}_X)$. It was shown in [11] and [1] that the K_X -real eigenfunctions have a regular nodal set (like the eigenfunctions of the Dirichlet Laplacian) with the exception that at each singular point X_j $(j = 1, \ldots, \ell)$ an odd number of half-lines meet.

The next theorem which is the most interesting part of the magnetic characterization of the minimal partitions given in [8] will play a basic role in the proof of our main theorem.

Theorem 3.1 [Helffer–Hoffmann-Ostenhof]

Let Ω be simply connected. If \mathcal{D} is a k-minimal partition of Ω , then, by choosing $(X_1, \ldots, X_\ell) = X^{odd}(N(\mathcal{D}))$, \mathcal{D} is the nodal partition of some k-th K_X -real eigenfunction of the Aharonov-Bohm Laplacian associated with $\dot{\Omega}_X$.

4 Analysis of the critical sets in the large limit case

We can now state our main theorem, which improves (2.4) as proved in [9].

Theorem 4.1 (Main theorem)

Let $(\mathcal{D}_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of regular minimal k-partitions. Then there exists $c_0 > 0$ and k_0 such that for $k \ge k_0$,

$$\nu_k := \# X^{odd}(N(\mathcal{D}_k)) \ge c_0 k \,.$$

Proof

The proof is inspired by the proof of Pleijel's theorem, with the particularity that the operator, which is now the Aharonov-Bohm operator will depend on k. For each \mathcal{D}_k , we consider the corresponding Aharonov-Bohm operator as constructed in Theorem 3.1.

We come back to the proof of the lower bound of the Weyl's formula but we will make a partition in squares depending on

$$\lambda = \mathfrak{L}_k$$
.

We introduce a square Q_p of size $t/\sqrt{\lambda}$ with $t \ge 1$ which will be chosen large enough (independently of k) and will be determined later. Having in mind the standard proof of the Weyl's formula (see for example [7]), we recall the following proposition

Proposition 4.2

If \mathcal{D} is a partition of Ω , then

$$\sum_{i} n(\lambda, D_i) \le n(\lambda, \Omega) .$$
(4.1)

Here $n(\lambda, \Omega)$ is the counting function of the eigenvalues $< \lambda$ of $H(\Omega)$. This proposition is actually present in the proofs of the asymptotics of the counting function. We will apply this proposition in the case of Aharonov-Bohm operators $H := -\Delta_{\mathbf{A}^X}$ restricted to K_X -real L^2 spaces. H(D) means the Dirichlet realization (obtained via the Friedrichs extension theorem) of $-\Delta_{\mathbf{A}^X}$ in an open set $D \subset \Omega$.

Remark 4.3 Note that if no pole belongs to D (a pole on ∂D is permitted) and if D is simply connected, then H(D) is unitary equivalent (the magnetic potential can be gauged away) to the Dirichlet Laplacian in D. We refer to [1, 12, 13] for a careful analysis of the domains of the involved operators.

We now consider a maximal partition of Ω with squares Q_p of size $t/\sqrt{\lambda}$ with the additional rule that the squares should not contain the odd critical points of \mathcal{D}_k .

The area $A(\Omega_{k,t,\lambda})$, where $\Omega_{k,t,\lambda}$ is the union of these squares, satisfies

$$A(\Omega_{k,t,\lambda}) \ge A(\Omega) - \ell t^2 / \lambda - C(t,\Omega) \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}.$$

The second term on the right hand side estimates from above the area of the squares containing a critical point and the last term takes account of the effect of the boundary.

Note that this lower bound of $A(\Omega_{k,t,\lambda})$ leads to the estimate of the cardinal of the squares using $\#\{Q_p\} = A(\Omega_{k,t,\lambda})\frac{\lambda}{t^2}$. In each of the squares, because (as recalled in Remark 4.3) the magnetic Laplacian is isospectral to the usual Laplacian, we have (after a dilation argument) :

$$n(\lambda, Q_p) = n\left(t, (0, 1)^2\right) \,.$$

Hence we need to find a lower bound of $n(t) := n(t, (0, 1)^2)$, the number of eigenvalues less than t^2 for the standard Dirichlet Laplacian in the fixed unit square.

We know, that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists t such that

$$n(t) \ge (1-\epsilon)\frac{1}{4\pi}t^2$$
. (4.2)

This leads, using Proposition 4.2 for $H = -\Delta_{\mathbf{A}^X}$ (remember that X is given by the magnetic characterization of \mathcal{D}_k) and applying (4.2) in each square, to the lower bound as $k \to +\infty$,

$$k = n(\mathfrak{L}_k, \Omega) \ge \left(\frac{1}{4\pi}(1-\epsilon)t^2\right) \left(A(\Omega) - \ell t^2/\mathfrak{L}_k + o(1)\right) \left(\frac{\mathfrak{L}_k}{t^2}\right)$$
(4.3)

Let us recall from [10] the following consequence of Faber-Krahn's inequality

$$A(\Omega)\frac{\mathfrak{L}_k(\Omega)}{k} \ge \pi \mathbf{j}^2 \,, \tag{4.4}$$

where $\mathbf{j} \sim 2.405$ is the first zero of the first Bessel function.

Dividing (4.3) by k and using (4.4), we get, as $k \to +\infty$

$$1 \ge \frac{\mathbf{j}^2}{4} (1 - \epsilon) (1 - \frac{\ell}{k} t^2 \pi^{-1} \mathbf{j}^{-2}) (1 + o(1)).$$

If we assume that the number ℓ of critical points satisfies

$$\ell \leq \alpha k$$
, for some $\alpha > 0$,

we get

$$1 \ge \frac{\mathbf{j}^2}{4} (1 - \epsilon) (1 - \alpha t^2 \pi^{-1} \mathbf{j}^{-2}) (1 + o(1)).$$
(4.5)

We see that if ϵ is small enough (this determines $t=t(\epsilon))$ and αt^2 is small enough such that

$$\frac{\mathbf{j}^2}{4}(1-\epsilon)(1-\alpha t^2\pi^{-1}\mathbf{j}^{-2}) > 1$$

(this gives the condition on α), we will get a contradiction for k large.

As recalled in [9], Euler's formula implies that for a minimal k-partition \mathcal{D} of a simply connected domain Ω the cardinal of $X^{odd}(N(\mathcal{D}))$ satisfies

$$#X^{odd}(N(\mathcal{D})) \le 2k - 4.$$

$$(4.6)$$

This estimate seems optimal and is compatible with the hexagonal conjecture, which, for critical points, will read

Conjecture 4.4

$$\lim_{k \to +\infty} \frac{\# X^{odd}(N(\mathcal{D}_k))}{k} = 2.$$
(4.7)

5 Explicit lower bounds

Looking at the proof of the main theorem, the contradiction is obtained if (4.5) is satisfied. Using the universal lower bound for n(t) (see for example [14]), we have, if $t \ge 2$

$$n(t) > \frac{1}{4\pi}t^2 - \frac{2}{\pi^2}t + \frac{1}{\pi^2}.$$
(5.1)

We look for $t = t(\epsilon) \ge 2$ such that

$$\frac{1}{4\pi}t^2 - \frac{2}{\pi^2}t + \frac{1}{\pi^2} \ge (1-\epsilon)\frac{1}{4\pi}t^2 \,,$$

which leads to the condition

$$\epsilon \frac{1}{4\pi} t^2 - \frac{2}{\pi^2} t + \frac{1}{\pi^2} \ge 0.$$
(5.2)

We can choose $t(\epsilon) = \max(2, \frac{8}{\epsilon \pi})$. We then get a condition on α through (4.5). For some admissible ϵ , i.e satisfying:

$$\frac{\mathbf{j}^2}{4}(1-\epsilon) > 1\,,$$

the proof works if $\alpha < c_0(\epsilon)$, with $c_0(\epsilon)$ solution of

$$1 = \frac{\mathbf{j}^2}{4} (1 - \epsilon) (1 - c_0(\epsilon) t(\epsilon)^2 \pi^{-1} \mathbf{j}^{-2}).$$
 (5.3)

Hence the c_0 announced in the theorem can be chosen as

$$c_0 := \sup_{\epsilon \in (0, 1-4/\mathbf{j}^2)} c_0(\epsilon) \,,$$

It remains to determine this sup. Note that $1 - 4/\mathbf{j}^2 \sim 0, 36$. Hence we can assume $t(\epsilon) = \frac{8}{\epsilon \pi}$ and get for $c_0(\epsilon)$ the equation

$$c_0(\epsilon) = \epsilon^2 2^{-6} \pi^3 \mathbf{j}^2 \left(1 - \frac{4}{\mathbf{j}^2 (1 - \epsilon)} \right) .$$
(5.4)

But $c_0(\epsilon)$ being 0 at the ends of the interval $(0, 1 - 4/\mathbf{j}^2))$, the maximum is obtained inside by looking at the zero of the derivative with respect to ϵ . We get

$$\epsilon_{max} = (1 - \mathbf{j}^{-2}) - \sqrt{(1 - \mathbf{j}^{-2})^2 - (1 - 4\mathbf{j}^{-2})} = (1 - \mathbf{j}^{-2}) - \mathbf{j}^{-2}\sqrt{1 + 2\mathbf{j}^2}.$$
(5.5)

and

$$c_0 = 2^{-6} \mathbf{j}^{-2} \pi^3 \left((\mathbf{j}^4 + 10\mathbf{j}^2 - 2) - 2(2\mathbf{j}^2 + 1)\sqrt{1 + 2\mathbf{j}^2} \right).$$
(5.6)

Numerics with **j** replaced by its approximation gives $c_0 \sim 0.014$. This is extremely small and very far from from the conjectured value 2 !

Remark 5.1 One can actually in (5.6) replace \mathbf{j}^2 by $\frac{A(\Omega)}{\pi} \liminf \frac{\mathfrak{L}_k}{k}$. The constant \mathbf{j}^2 appears indeed only through (4.4). Because of the monotonicity of c_0 as a function of \mathbf{j}^2 which results of the definition of c_0 as a sup. any improvement of a lower bound for $\frac{A(\Omega)}{\pi} \liminf \frac{\mathfrak{L}_k}{k}$ will lead to a corresponding improvment of c_0 .

Acknowledgements.

I would like to thank T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof for former discussions on the subject, V. Felli and L. Abatangelo for inviting me to give a course on the subject in Milano (February 2015) and the Isaac Newton Institute where the final version of this note was completed, the author being Simons Foundation visiting Fellow there.

References

- B. Alziary, J. Fleckinger-Pellé, P. Takáč. Eigenfunctions and Hardy inequalities for a magnetic Schrödinger operator in ℝ². Math. Methods Appl. Sci. 26(13), 1093–1136 (2003).
- [2] V. Bonnaillie-Noël, B. Helffer, and G. Vial. Numerical simulations for nodal domains and spectral minimal partitions. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc.Var. DOI:10.1051/cocv:2008074 (2008).
- B. Bourdin, D. Bucur, and E. Oudet. Optimal partitions for eigenvalues. SIAM J. Sci. Comp. 31(6) 4100-4114 (2009).

- [4] L.A. Caffarelli and F.H. Lin. An optimal partition problem for eigenvalues. Journal of Scientific Computing 31(1/2), DOI: 10.1007/s10915-006-9114.8 (2007).
- [5] M. Conti, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini. A variational problem for the spatial segregation of reaction-diffusion systems. Indiana Univ. Math. J. 54 (2005), p. 779-815.
- [6] R. Courant. Ein allgemeiner Satz zur Theorie der Eigenfunktionen selbstadjungierter Differentialausdrücke, Nachr. Ges. Göttingen (1923), 81-84.
- [7] R. Courant and D. Hilbert. Methods of Mathematical Physics, Vol. 1. New York (1953).
- [8] B. Helffer and T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof. On a magnetic characterization of spectral minimal partitions. JEMS 15, 2081–2092 (2013).
- [9] B. Helffer and T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof. A review on large k minimal spectral k-partitions and Pleijel's Theorem. Proceedings of the congress in honour of J. Ralston. Contemporary Mathematics, Vol. 640 (in press).
- [10] B. Helffer, T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, and S. Terracini. Nodal domains and spectral minimal partitions. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 26, 101–138 (2009).
- [11] B. Helffer, M. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, and M. P. Owen. Nodal sets for groundstates of Schrödinger operators with zero magnetic field in non-simply connected domains. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 202(3) (1999), p. 629-649.
- [12] C. Léna. Eigenvalues variations for Aharonov-Bohm operators. J. Math. Phys. 56, 011502 (2015).
- [13] B. Noris and S. Terracini. Nodal sets of magnetic Schrödinger operators of Aharonov-Bohm type and energy minimizing partitions. Indiana Univ. Math. J., 59(4) :1361-1403, 2010.
- [14] A. Pleijel. Remarks on Courant's nodal theorem. Comm. Pure. Appl. Math. 9, 543–550 (1956).