

Counterexamples to the comparison principle in the special Lagrangian potential equation

Karl K. Brustad

Abstract. For each $k = 0, \dots, n$ we construct a continuous *phase* f_k , with $f_k(0) = (n - 2k)\frac{\pi}{2}$, and viscosity sub- and supersolutions v_k, u_k , of the elliptic PDE $\sum_{i=1}^n \arctan(\lambda_i(\mathcal{H}w)) = f_k(x)$ such that $v_k - u_k$ has an isolated maximum at the origin.

It has been an open question whether the comparison principle would hold in this second order equation for arbitrary continuous phases $f: \mathbb{R}^n \supseteq \Omega \rightarrow (-n\pi/2, n\pi/2)$. Our examples show it does not.

1. Introduction

The *special Lagrangian potential operator* is the mapping $F: \mathcal{S}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$F(X) := \sum_{i=1}^n \arctan(\lambda_i(X))$$

where $\lambda_1(X) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(X)$ are the eigenvalues of the symmetric $n \times n$ matrix X . The corresponding equation

$$F(\mathcal{H}w) = f(x) \tag{1.1}$$

in $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, including the autonomous version

$$F(\mathcal{H}w) = \theta, \tag{1.2}$$

has attained much interest since it was introduced in [HL82]. For a right-hand side constant $\theta \in (-n\pi/2, n\pi/2)$ the solutions of (1.2) have a nice geometrical interpretation. The graph of the gradient ∇w in $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is a *special Lagrangian manifold*. i.e., it is a Lagrangian manifold of minimal area. See [HL21] and the references therein.

Recently, [CP21] were able to prove the comparison principle for (1.1) when f is continuous and avoids the *special phase values*

$$\theta_k := (n - 2k)\frac{\pi}{2}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n - 1.$$

In Section 3 we show that their proof can be somewhat simplified by applying a result in [Bru22] valid for equations on the generic form (1.1). However, our main purpose of this short note is to demonstrate how the comparison principle may fail when $\theta_k \in f(\Omega)$. Interestingly, the comparison principle is valid in (1.2) for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. This follows immediately from the facts that $X \leq Y$ implies $\lambda_i(X) \leq \lambda_i(Y)$, $\lambda_i(X + \tau I) = \lambda_i(X) + \tau$, and that arctan is strictly increasing. Thus, F is elliptic and $F(X + \tau I) > F(X)$ for all $X \in \mathcal{S}^n$, $\tau > 0$. See for example Proposition 2.6 in [Bru22].

In our construction of the counterexamples, we shall take advantage of a couple of symmetries in F . Firstly, as $F(X)$ only depends on the eigenvalues of X , we have $F(QXQ^\top) = F(X)$ for every orthogonal matrix Q . Secondly, since arctan is odd – and since $\lambda_i(-X) = -\lambda_{n-i+1}(X)$ and the different eigenvalues are treated equally by F – it follows that F is odd as well. Moreover, we shall make use of the $n \times n$ exchange matrix

$$J := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & 1 \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 1 & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is the corresponding matrix to the reverse order permutation on the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Obviously, J is symmetric and orthogonal.

2. The counterexamples

For $k = 0, \dots, n$, define $v_k, u_k \in C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as

$$v_k(x) := \frac{1}{4} - \sum_{i=1}^k |x_i| + \sum_{i=k+1}^n \frac{1}{2} |x_i|^{3/2},$$

$$u_k(x) := -v_{n-k}(Jx),$$

and let $f_k \in C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the continuous extension of

$$f_k(x) := - \sum_{i=1}^k \arctan\left(\frac{3}{8}|x_i|^{-1/2}\right) + \sum_{i=k+1}^n \arctan\left(\frac{3}{8}|x_i|^{-1/2}\right), \quad x_i \neq 0.$$

Observe that

$$f_k(0) = -k\frac{\pi}{2} + (n - k)\frac{\pi}{2} = \theta_k.$$

Proposition 2.1. *The functions v_k and u_k are, respectively, viscosity sub- and supersolutions of the equation*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \arctan(\lambda_i(\mathcal{H}w)) = f_k(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (2.1)$$

Proof. Away from the axes, v_k is smooth with Hessian matrix

$$\mathcal{H}v_k(x) = \frac{3}{8} \operatorname{diag}(0 \dots, 0, |x_{k+1}|^{-1/2}, \dots, |x_n|^{-1/2})$$

and, clearly, $F(\mathcal{H}v_k(x)) = 0 + \sum_{i=k+1}^n \arctan\left(\frac{3}{8}|x_i|^{-1/2}\right) \geq f_k(x)$.

Let ϕ be a C^2 test function touching v_k from above at a point $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We may assume that $x_i^* \neq 0$ for all $i > k$ since no touching is possible otherwise. Thus $\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathcal{H}\phi(x^*) \mathbf{e}_i \geq \frac{3}{8}|x_i^*|^{-1/2}$, $i = k+1, \dots, n$, and the top $n-k$ eigenvalues of $\mathcal{H}\phi(x^*)$ are larger than $\frac{3}{8}|x_i^*|^{-1/2}$ (respectively, in some order). Likewise, for each $i \leq k$ with $x_i^* \neq 0$ we have $\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathcal{H}\phi(x^*) \mathbf{e}_i \geq 0$ and an additional eigenvalue of $\mathcal{H}\phi(x^*)$ is non-negative. The remaining second order directional derivatives of ϕ at x^* may be arbitrarily negative, providing no bound on the smallest eigenvalues, but that does not matter since

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathcal{H}\phi(x^*)) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \arctan(\lambda_i(\mathcal{H}\phi(x^*))) \\ &\geq \sum_{\substack{i \leq k \\ x_i^* = 0}} -\frac{\pi}{2} + \sum_{\substack{i \leq k \\ x_i^* \neq 0}} 0 + \sum_{i > k} c(x_i^*), \quad c(t) := \arctan\left(\frac{3}{8}|t|^{-1/2}\right), \\ &\geq \sum_{\substack{i \leq k \\ x_i^* = 0}} -\frac{\pi}{2} - \sum_{\substack{i \leq k \\ x_i^* \neq 0}} c(x_i^*) + \sum_{i > k} c(x_i^*) \\ &= f_k(x^*). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that v_k is a subsolution of (2.1) in \mathbb{R}^n for all $k = 0, \dots, n$.

In order to prove that $u_k(x) = -v_{n-k}(Jx)$ is a supersolution, we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} -f_{n-k}(Jx) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} c((Jx)_i) - \sum_{i=n-k+1}^n c((Jx)_i) \\ &= - \sum_{i=n-k+1}^n c(x_{n+1-i}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} c(x_{n+1-i}) \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^k c(x_j) + \sum_{j=k+1}^n c(x_j), \quad j := n+1-i, \\ &= f_k(x). \end{aligned}$$

Now, let ψ be a test function touching u_k from below at $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $\phi(x) := -\psi(Jx)$ touches v_{n-k} from above at Jx^* because $\phi(Jx) = -\psi(x) \geq -u_k(x) = v_{n-k}(Jx)$ for Jx close to Jx^* , and $\phi(Jx^*) = -\psi(x^*) = -u_k(x^*) = v_{n-k}(Jx^*)$. Thus, $F(\mathcal{H}\phi(Jx^*)) \geq f_{n-k}(Jx^*)$. Therefore, since F is odd, rotationally invariant, and $\mathcal{H}\psi(x) = -J\mathcal{H}\phi(Jx)J$,

$$F(\mathcal{H}\psi(x^*)) = -F(\mathcal{H}\phi(Jx^*)) \leq -f_{n-k}(Jx^*) = f_k(x^*)$$

as claimed. \square

We obviously have $v_k(0) - u_k(0) = 1/2 > 0$. In order to create a counterexample to the comparison principle it only remains to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} -u_k(x) &= v_{n-k}(Jx) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} |x_{n+1-i}| + \sum_{i=n-k+1}^n \frac{1}{2} |x_{n+1-i}|^{3/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} - \sum_{j=k+1}^n |x_j| + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{2} |x_j|^{3/2} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} v_k(x) - u_k(x) &= \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} |x_i|^{3/2} - |x_i| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} |x_i| \left(|x_i|^{1/2} - 2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

independently of k . If we take the domain to be the unit ball in the infinity-norm,

$$\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x_i| < 1\},$$

it follows that $v_k(x) - u_k(x) \leq 0$ whenever $|x|_\infty \leq 1$ and when there is at least one index j such that $|x_j| = 1$. That is, for $x \in \partial\Omega$.

Remark 2.1. There is nothing special about the exponent $3/2$ in the sub- and supersolutions. If we adjust the phase accordingly, any number strictly between 1 and 2 would do.

Remark 2.2. The subsolutions v_k are not supersolutions and the supersolutions u_k are not subsolutions. Thus, the question of uniqueness of *solutions* in the Dirichlet problem is still open.

The ideas behind the above constructions are all contained, and therefore best illustrated, by the case $n = 2$, $k = 1$. Then also $n - k = 1$ and, dropping the subscript 1 yields,

$$\begin{aligned} v(x, y) &= \frac{1}{4} - |x| + \frac{1}{2} |y|^{3/2}, \\ u(x, y) &= -v(y, x) = -\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2} |x|^{3/2} + |y|, \end{aligned}$$

with phase

$$f(x, y) = \begin{cases} -\arctan(\frac{3}{8}|x|^{-1/2}) + \arctan(\frac{3}{8}|y|^{-1/2}), & x \neq 0, y \neq 0, \\ -\pi/2 + \arctan(\frac{3}{8}|y|^{-1/2}), & x = 0, y \neq 0, \\ -\arctan(\frac{3}{8}|x|^{-1/2}) + \pi/2, & x \neq 0, y = 0, \\ 0, & x = 0, y = 0. \end{cases}$$


In addition to the difference

$$v(x, y) - u(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} |x| \left(|x|^{1/2} - 2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} |y| \left(|y|^{1/2} - 2 \right)$$

the graph of these functions over the square


$$\Omega := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| < 1, |y| < 1\}$$

are shown in Figure 1.



(A) $v(x, y) = \frac{1}{4} - |x| + \frac{1}{2}|y|^{3/2}$.

(B) $u(x, y) = -v(y, x)$.



(C) The difference $v - u$ has a strict interior maximum in $\overline{\Omega}$.

(D) The phase f is continuous, but not differentiable on the axes.

FIGURE 1. The case $n = 2$, $k = 1$ in the square Ω .

3. An alternative proof of the comparison principle when the phase does not attain the special values

Theorem 6.18 [CP21] establish the comparison principle for the equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \arctan(\lambda_i(\mathcal{H}w)) = f(x)$$

in every open and bounded $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ whenever $f \in C(\Omega)$, $\theta_n < f < \theta_0$, and

$$\theta_k := (n - 2k) \frac{\pi}{2} \notin f(\Omega), \quad k = 1, \dots, n - 1.$$

The main idea in our proof, as conducted in Example 2.2 in [Bru22], is the same as in [CP21]. Namely, to reach a contradiction when, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, $|\lambda_i(X_j)| \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ for some sequence $X_j \in \mathcal{S}^n$. Our contribution is to show how this follows almost immediately from a general result for equations on the form $F(\mathcal{H}w) = f(x)$. For convenience, we reproduce the proof below.

Note that the pathological situation when f takes values outside the interval $[\theta_n, \theta_0]$ comes for free: If, say $f > \theta_0$ somewhere in Ω , the comparison principle vacuously holds since the equation will have no subsolutions. On the other hand, the case $\theta_0 \in f(\Omega)$, which is covered by our counterexample, is not pathological. For example, one can easily confirm that $w(x) = |x|^{3/2}$ is a viscosity *solution* to the equation in \mathbb{R}^n when the right-hand side is the continuous extension of $f(x) := F(\mathcal{H}w(x))$.

Assume that

$$\theta_k \notin f(\Omega) \subseteq [\theta_n, \theta_0] \tag{3.1}$$

for all $k = 0, \dots, n$. Proposition 2.7 in [Bru22] states that the comparison principle will hold if whenever $X_j \in \mathcal{S}^n$ is a sequence such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} F(X_j) = \theta \in f(\Omega)$, then

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} F(X_j + \tau I) > \theta$$

for every $\tau > 0$. Suppose to the contrary that this is not true. Then there are numbers $\theta \in f(\Omega)$ and $\tau > 0$, and a sequence $X_j \in \mathcal{S}^n$ with $F(X_j) \rightarrow \theta$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} F(X_j + \tau I) - F(X_j) \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \arctan(\lambda_i(X_j) + \tau) - \arctan(\lambda_i(X_j)) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which – since \arctan is strictly increasing – is possible only if each $\lambda_i(X_j)$ is unbounded as $j \rightarrow \infty$. There is thus a subsequence (still indexed by j) such that either $\lambda_i(X_j) \rightarrow +\infty$ or $\lambda_i(X_j) \rightarrow -\infty$. But this is a contradiction of (3.1) as

$$f(\Omega) \ni \theta = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} F(X_j) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \arctan(\lambda_i(X_j)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \pm \frac{\pi}{2} = \theta_k$$

for some $k = 0, \dots, n$.

References

- [Bru22] Karl K. Brustad. On the comparison principle for second order elliptic equations without first and zeroth order terms (preprint). *arxiv: 2008.08399. To appear in Nonlinear Differential Equation and Applications*, 2022.

- [CP21] Marco Cirant and Kevin R. Payne. Comparison principles for viscosity solutions of elliptic branches of fully nonlinear equations independent of the gradient. *Math. Eng.*, 3(4):Paper No. 030, 45, 2021.
- [HL82] Reese Harvey and H. Blaine Lawson, Jr. Calibrated geometries. *Acta Math.*, 148:47–157, 1982.
- [HL21] F. Reese Harvey and H. Blaine Lawson, Jr. Pseudoconvexity for the special Lagrangian potential equation. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 60(1):Paper No. 6, 37, 2021.

Karl K. Brustad
Frostavegen 1691
7633 Frosta
Norway
e-mail: brustadkarl@gmail.com