

ON THE FUNDAMENTAL EIGENVALUE GAP OF STURM-LIOUVILLE OPERATORS

MOHAMMED AHRAMI, ZAKARIA EL ALLALI, AND EVANS M. HARRELL II

ABSTRACT. We use methods of direct optimization as in [9] to find the minimizers of the fundamental gap of Sturm-Liouville operators on an interval, under the constraint that the potential is of single-well form and that the weight function is of single-barrier form, and under similar constraints expressed in terms of convexity.

1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of this article is to find optimal estimates, under constraints on the form of the coefficient functions in (1), for the *fundamental eigenvalue gap* $\Gamma := \lambda_2 - \lambda_1$ of the Sturm-Liouville equation

$$(1) \quad H(p, q)u := -\frac{d}{dx} \left(p(x) \frac{du}{dx} \right) + V(x)u = \lambda w(x)u$$

on a finite interval, with self-adjoint boundary conditions. According to [21], §8.4, one may impose any separated homogeneous boundary conditions of the form

$$\begin{aligned} u(0) \cos \alpha - (pu')(0) \sin \alpha &= 0 \\ u(\pi) \cos \beta - (pu')(\pi) \sin \beta &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $0 \leq \alpha, \beta < \pi$, to make H self-adjoint; the interval has been standardized as $[0, \pi]$ without loss of generality. To keep the exposition simple we restrict to Dirichlet boundary conditions, i.e., $u(0) = u(\pi) = 0$, although our techniques also work with other self-adjoint boundary conditions, with suitable changes. Some further simplifications will be imposed below.

The quantity Γ is of interest as the ionization energy in quantum theory, and sharp bounds for natural categories of potential energies $V(x)$ that prevent its collapse, especially single-well and convex $V(x)$, have been studied since the 1980s; cf. [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13, 14, 18] and references therein. The problem of maximizing Γ not only casts light on the physical problem of ionization, but is interesting as a mathematical problem in its own right.

Most prior work has assumed or emphasized the case where both $p(x)$ and the weight $w(x)$ are held constant. Liouville transformations allow one to convert (1) into equivalent equations with different $p(x)$, $V(x)$, and $w(x)$, but in general only one of these three functions can be eliminated. In the first three sections of this article we standardize with $p(x) \equiv 1$, and recall how the Liouville transformation works in an appendix. In summary, these remarks allow us to concentrate on the problem

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} -u'' + V(x)u = \lambda w(x)u, & x \in [0, \pi] \\ u(0) = u(\pi) = 0 \end{cases}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 34L15, 34B27, 35J60, 35B05.

Key words and phrases. Fundamental spectral gap, eigenvalue estimates, Sturm-Liouville operators, single-well potential, Dirichlet boundary conditions .

in the following two sections.

In [2], for the problem (2) with Dirichlet conditions, Ashbaugh and Benguria proved that the optimal lower bound for Γ for symmetric single-well potentials is achieved if and only if V is constant on $(0, \pi)$. In [18] Lavine considered the class of convex potentials on $[0, \pi]$ and proved, with either Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions, that the constant potential function minimizes Γ . Later Horváth [13] returned with Lavine's methods to the problem of single-well potentials, but without symmetry assumptions, and again showed that the constant potential was optimal with some restrictions on the transition point, and in 2015 Yu and Yang [20] extended Horváth's result by allowing other transition points and both Dirichlet and Neumann conditions. More recently El Allali and Harrell [9] used direct optimization methods to prove sharp lower bounds for Γ with general single-well potential $V(x)$, without any restriction on the transition point $a \in [0, \pi]$, and obtained similar results in the case where the potential is convex. El Allali and Harrell were furthermore able to analyze the case where $V = V_0 + V_1$, where V_0 is a fixed background potential energy and V_1 is assumed either single-well or convex. In contrast to the earlier studies of single-well potentials, which restrict the transition point in one way or other, the minimizing single-well potentials they found are in general step functions and *not* necessarily constant, unless extra conditions are imposed. In the classic case where $p = 1$ they recovered with different arguments the result of Lavine that Γ is uniquely minimized among convex V by the constant, and in the case of single-well potentials, with no restrictions on the position of the minimum, they obtained a new, sharp bound, that $\Gamma > 2.04575\dots$. Some further related articles are Huang's discussion of the eigenvalue gap [15] and eigenvalue ratio [16] for the vibrating string with symmetric densities, i.e., allowing variable $p(x)$, and the works of Ashbaugh and Benguria [4], Huang and Law [17], and Horváth and Kiss [14], which include other expressions related to the low-lying eigenvalues such as eigenvalue ratios like $\frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_1}$.

2. SIMPLE PROPERTIES OF THE FUNDAMENTAL GAP Γ

We shall use expressions such as $\lambda_k(V, w)$ and $\Gamma(V, w) = \lambda_2(V, w) - \lambda_1(V, w)$ to indicate the dependence on the fundamental gap on coefficients in (2) with respect to which we wish to optimize. In this section we review and slightly extend some useful observations about Γ that are familiar from previous sources such as [2, 18, 9]. Most importantly, there is an explicit formula for the first derivative with respect to perturbations of V and w :

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that $V(\cdot, t)$ and $w(\cdot, t)$ are one-parameter families of real-valued, locally L^1 functions, with $\inf V(x, \kappa) > -\infty$, $C \geq w(x, \kappa) \geq \frac{1}{C}$ for some $C > 0$, and $\frac{\partial V}{\partial \kappa}(x, \kappa)$ and $\frac{\partial w}{\partial \kappa}(x, \kappa) \in L^1(0, \pi)$. Then*

$$\frac{d\lambda_n(\kappa)}{d\kappa} = -\lambda_n \int_0^\pi \frac{\partial w}{\partial \kappa}(x, \kappa) u_n^2(x, \kappa) dx + \int_0^\pi \frac{\partial V}{\partial \kappa}(x, \kappa) u_n^2(x, \kappa) dx.$$

Proof. Because $\frac{\partial V}{\partial \kappa}$ and $\frac{\partial w}{\partial \kappa}$ are relatively bounded perturbations, Kato's theory of analytic perturbations applies, and since the eigenvalues with separated homogeneous boundary conditions are simple, this justifies the use of a formal expansion to calculate the effect of the perturbation, à la Feynman-Hellmann: Denoting $\dot{u} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \kappa}$, differentiation of (2) with respect to κ gives

$$\dot{u}_n'' + (\dot{\lambda}_n w + \lambda_n \dot{w} - \dot{V})u_n + (\lambda_n w - V)\dot{u}_n = 0.$$

We multiply the equation above by $u_n(x, \kappa)$ and integrate with respect to x from 0 to π . This yields

$$\int_0^\pi \dot{u}_n'' u_n dx + \int_0^\pi (\lambda_n w - V) \dot{u}_n u_n dx = - \int_0^\pi (\dot{\lambda}_n w + \lambda_n \dot{w} - \dot{V}) u_n^2 dx.$$

Observing that $u_n(\lambda_n w - V) = -u_n''$,

$$\int_0^\pi \dot{u}_n'' u_n dx - \int_0^\pi \dot{u}_n u_n'' dx = - \int_0^\pi (\dot{\lambda}_n w + \lambda_n \dot{w} - \dot{V}) u_n^2 dx.$$

Integrating by parts twice yields

$$[\dot{u}_n' u_n]_0^\pi - \int_0^\pi \dot{u}_n' u_n' dx - [\dot{u}_n' u_n']_0^\pi + \int_0^\pi \dot{u}_n' u_n' dx = - \int_0^\pi (\dot{\lambda}_n w + \lambda_n \dot{w} - \dot{V}) u_n^2 dx,$$

with boundary conditions $u_n(0, t) = u_n(\pi, t) = 0$. This gives

$$- \int_0^\pi (\dot{\lambda}_n w + \lambda_n \dot{w} - \dot{V}) u_n^2 dx = 0,$$

so that

$$\dot{\lambda}_n \int_0^\pi u_n^2 w dx = -\lambda_n \int_0^\pi \dot{w} u_n^2 dx + \int_0^\pi \dot{V} u_n^2 dx.$$

Noting that $\int_0^\pi w u_n^2 dx = 1$,

$$\dot{\lambda}_n = -\lambda_n \int_0^\pi \dot{w} u_n^2 dx + \int_0^\pi \dot{V} u_n^2 dx.$$

□

We next adapt the monotonicity argument of [2, 9] to incorporate the weight:

Lemma 2.2. *Consider the problem (2) with the same assumptions on V and w as in Lemma 2.1. Without loss of generality we standardize the first two normalized eigenfunctions so that $u_{1,2}(x) > 0$ for $0 < x < \epsilon$ for some ϵ . Then:*

- (1) $\frac{u_2}{u_1}$ is decreasing on $(0, \pi)$.
- (2) The equation $|u_1(x)| = |u_2(x)|$ has either one or two solutions on $(0, \pi)$.
- (3) There exist two points x_- and x_+ $0 \leq x_- < x_+ \leq \pi$, at least one of which is interior to $(0, \pi)$, such that $u_1^2(x) > u_2^2(x)$ on (x_-, x_+) and $u_1^2(x) \leq u_2^2(x)$ on $(x_-, x_+)^c$.
- (4) The equation $\lambda_1 |u_1^2(x)| = \lambda_2 |u_2^2(x)|$ has either one or two solutions on $(0, \pi)$.
- (5) There exist two points \hat{x}_- and \hat{x}_+ $0 \leq \hat{x}_- < \hat{x}_+ \leq \pi$, at least one of which is interior to $(0, \pi)$, such that $\lambda_1 u_1^2(x) > \lambda_2 u_2^2(x)$ on (\hat{x}_-, \hat{x}_+) and $\lambda_1 u_1^2(x) \leq \lambda_2 u_2^2(x)$ on $(\hat{x}_-, \hat{x}_+)^c$.

Proof. We first show that $\left(\frac{u_2}{u_1}\right)' < 0$ for $0 < x < x_0$, where $u_2(x_0) = 0$ and hence that there can be at most one value $x_- \in (0, x_0)$ for which $u_1(x_-) = u_2(x_-)$.

The Wronskian is by definition

$$W(x) = u_1(x)u_2'(x) - u_2(x)u_1'(x).$$

Thus with the weight in (2),

$$W'(x) = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)w(x)u_1(x)u_2(x),$$

and for the the quotient $v(x) := \frac{u_2(x)}{u_1(x)}$,

$$v'(x) = \frac{u_1(x)u_2'(x) - u_2(x)u_1'(x)}{u_1^2(x)} = \frac{W(x)}{u_1^2(x)}.$$

Hence

$$(3) \quad v'(x) = \frac{1}{u_1^2(x)} \int_0^x (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)w(t)u_1(t)u_2(t)dt < 0,$$

since $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ and $u_1, u_2 > 0$ on $(0, x_0)$.

Suppose that there exist distinct $\alpha_{1,2} \in (0, x_0)$ such that

$$u_2(\alpha_i) = u_1(\alpha_i), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Then $v(\alpha_1) = v(\alpha_2)$. By Rolle's theorem there exists $\xi \in (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \subset (0, x_0)$ such that: $v'(\xi) = 0$, but this contradicts (3).

Since u_2 vanishes at a unique point x_0 and the same argument can be carried out after the change of variables $x \rightarrow \pi - x$ and an adjustment of the sign of u_2 , it follows that $\left(\frac{u_2}{u_1}\right)$ is strictly monotonic on (x_0, π) and that there is at most one value $x_+ \in (x_0, \pi)$ for which $u_1(x_+) = u_2(x_+)$.

At least one of the points $x_{\pm} \in (0, \pi)$, because if $x_- = 0$ and $x_+ = \pi$ then $u_1(x) > |u_2(x)|$ for all $x \in (0, \pi)$, which would contradict $\|u_1\|_2 = \|u_2\|_2$. \square

3. CHARACTERIZATION OF OPTIMIZERS

In this section, we determine the explicit form of the gap-minimizing potential and density function of problem (2), closely following the strategy of [9].

3.1. The class of single-well potentials and single-barrier densities.

Definition 3.1. *Let $1 < M \leq \infty$. The function V is called a single-well function if V is non-increasing on $[0, a]$ and non-decreasing on $[a, \pi]$, for some $a \in [0, \pi]$. The point a is called a transition point (with no assumption of uniqueness). The notation below will be used through this article:*

$$SW_{[0,\pi],M} = \{V(x) : 0 \leq V(x) \leq M, \text{ where } V \text{ is a single-well function on } [0, \pi]\}.$$

Definition 3.2. *Let $0 < N_{<} \leq N_{>} < \infty$. The function w is called a single-barrier density if w is non-decreasing on $[0, b]$ and non-increasing on $[b, \pi]$ for some $b \in [0, \pi]$. The following notation will be used through this article:*

$$SB_{[0,\pi],N_{<},N_{>}} = \{w(x) : N_{<} \leq w(x) \leq N_{>}, \text{ where } w \text{ is a single-barrier density on } [0, \pi]\}.$$

Definition 3.3. *Consider the Sturm Liouville problem*

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} -u'' + (V_0(x) + V(x))u &= \lambda w(x)u \\ u(0) = u(\pi) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where V is a single-well function and w is a single-barrier density. The background potential V_0 is assumed bounded and measurable. If there exist $V_* \in W_{[0,\pi],M}$ and $w_* \in SB_{[0,\pi],N_{<},N_{>}}$ such that

$$\Gamma(V_*, w_*) = \inf (\Gamma(V, w), V \in SW_{[0,\pi],M}, w \in SB_{[0,\pi],N_{<},N_{>}}),$$

then we call the function V_* an optimal potential and the function w_* an optimal density for problem (4).

As in [9], we will use compactness of the sets SW and SB , following from a theorem of Helly:

Proposition 3.1. *For any sequence $f_n \in \Lambda$, ($\Lambda = SW$ or SB with any fixed positive $M, N_{<,>}$), there exist a subsequence f_{n_k} and a function f_* such that $f_{n_k}(x) \rightarrow f_*(x) \in \Lambda$ for a.e. x .*

For the proof, see [9], Proposition 2.1.

Corollary 3.1. *There exist a potential $V_* \in SW_{[0,\pi],M}$ and a density $w_* \in SB_{[0,\pi],N_{<},N_{>}}$ that minimize $\Gamma[V, w]$.*

Proof. According to Proposition 3.1, since the gap $\Gamma[V, w]$ is positive, there exist minimizing sequences $(V_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Lambda$ and $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Lambda$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (\lambda_2(V_n, w_n) - \lambda_1(V_n, w_n)) = \inf\{\lambda_2(V, w) - \lambda_1(V, w); V, w \in \Lambda\}.$$

By Proposition 3.1 we may pass to subsequences in Λ that converge pointwise a.e. to limits $V_* \in \Lambda$ and $w_* \in \Lambda$:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} V_n = V_* \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} w_n = w_*$$

By the dominated convergence theorem these sequences also converge in $L^1(0, \pi)$. Hence by continuity of Γ with respect to relatively bounded perturbations,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (\lambda_2(V_n, w_n) - \lambda_1(V_n, w_n)) = \inf\{\lambda_2(V, w) - \lambda_1(V, w); V, w \in \Lambda\} = \lambda_2(V_*, w_*) - \lambda_1(V_*, w_*).$$

□

Theorem 3.1. *For any piecewise continuous, strictly positive weight function w , the optimal potential V_* is a step function. For any piecewise continuous potential function V , the optimal weight w_* is a step function. The same is true for jointly optimal V_* and w_* . In each case the optimizers have the following characterization:*

- (1) $V_*(x) = 0$ a.e. on a connected component of $\{x : u_2^2(x) > u_1^2(x)\}$ and on the complement of that interval, $V_*(x) = \max(V_*)$ a.e.
- (2) $w_*(x) = N_{>}$ a.e. on a connected component of $\{x : \lambda_2 u_2^2(x) > \lambda_1 u_1^2(x)\}$ and on the complement of that interval, $w_*(x) = \min(w_*)$ a.e.

Proof. Let $V_* \in SW_{[0,\pi],M}$ and $w_* \in SB_{[0,\pi],N_{<},N_{>}}$ be the minimizing potential and density guaranteed by the lemma.

We can characterize V_* with the same argument as was used in [9], since Lemma 2.2 allows for the possibility of variable weight. We repeat it here to make the proof self-contained, and to point out a key difference. By Lemma 2.2 there exist x_{\pm} : $0 \leq x_- < x_+ \leq \pi$, for which

$$\begin{aligned} u_2^2(x) &> u_1^2(x) \text{ on } (0, x_-) \cup (x_+, \pi) \quad (\text{one of these intervals may be vacuous}) \\ u_1^2(x) &> u_2^2(x) \text{ on } (x_-, x_+). \end{aligned}$$

We define a family of single-well potentials by perturbing V_* so that

$$V(x, \kappa) = \kappa V_1(x) + (1 - \kappa)V_*(x) \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

Next, we work out the explicit form of V_* in two cases, beginning with

(i) $x_- \leq a < x_+$. For definiteness we arrange by reflecting if necessary that $0 < x_- \leq a \leq x_+$, $V_*(x_+) \geq V_*(x_-)$, and V_* is nondecreasing for $x \geq x_+$. In this case we proceed in two stages. First, let

$$V_1(x) = \begin{cases} V_*(x_-) & \text{on } (0, a) \\ V_*(x_+) & \text{on } (a, \pi). \end{cases}$$

We observe that $V_1 \in SW_{[0,\pi],M}$ has been chosen so that $V(x, \kappa) \in SW_{[0,\pi],M}$ and $V_1(x)$ has the opposite sign to $u_2^2(x, 0) - u_1^2(x, 0)$ a.e.

By the Feynman-Hellmann formula, at $\kappa = 0$,

$$(5) \quad \frac{d(\lambda_2(0) - \lambda_1(0))}{d\kappa} = \int_0^\pi [V_1(x) - V_*(x)][u_2^2(x, 0) - u_1^2(x, 0)]dx.$$

Since V_* is a minimizer and

$$\begin{aligned} [V_1(x) - V_*(x)][u_2^2(x, 0) - u_1^2(x, 0)]dx &\leq 0, \\ 0 &\leq \frac{d(\lambda_2(0) - \lambda_1(0))}{dt} \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the integrand in (5) equals 0 a.e. Thus $V_1(x) = V_*(x)$ a.e. on $[0, \pi]$. I.e., $V_*(x) = V_*(x_+)\chi_{(a,\pi)}$ a.e. But if $a > x_-$ the alternative choice

$$V_1(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{on } (0, x_-) \\ V_*(x_+) & \text{on } (x_-, \pi) \end{cases}$$

is also valid, ensuring that $V(x, \kappa) \in SW_{[0,\pi],M}$ and that $V_1(x)$ has the opposite sign to $u_2^2(x, 0) - u_1^2(x, 0)$ a.e. We are thus led to the conclusion that $V_*(x) = V_*(x_+)\chi_{(x,\pi)}$ a.e. In particular, for $M > 0$ the unique transition point is $a = x_-$.

(ii) Secondly, suppose that $a < x_-$; the case when $x_+ < a$, is similar. Let

$$V_1(x) = \begin{cases} V_*(a) & \text{on } (0, x_-) \\ V_*(x_+) & \text{on } (x_-, \pi). \end{cases}$$

Then $V_1 \in SW_{[0,\pi],M}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(x) - V_*(x) &\geq 0 \text{ on } (0, x_-) \cup (x_+, \pi) \\ &\leq 0 \text{ on } (x_-, x_+). \end{aligned}$$

We note that $V(x, t) \in SW_{[0,\pi],M}$, and by the optimality of V_* ,

$$0 \leq \frac{d(\lambda_2(0) - \lambda_1(0))}{dt} \leq 0.$$

Hence, as before we conclude that $V_1(x) = V_*(x)$ on $[0, \pi]$. Indeed, since we have concluded that $V_*(a) = V_*(x_-)$, we may as well redefine a as x_- , which reduces case (ii) to case (i). In conclusion all optimal V_* must be step functions with a unique jump coinciding with either x_- or x_+ .

In [9], where the weight was constant, it was possible to conclude that V_* was of the form $M\chi_I(x)$ for an interval I by relying on the fact that adding a constant to the potential function does not change the gap Γ . With a variable weight we are only able to conclude that in general $V_* = C\chi_I(x)$ for an undetermined constant $C \leq M$.

It remains to characterize the optimal weight w_* by a similar argument applied to w for fixed V . Just as before, we can use Lemma 2.2 to conclude that there exist \hat{x}_\pm : $0 \leq \hat{x}_- < \hat{x}_+ \leq \pi$, satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2 u_2^2(x) &> \lambda_1 u_1^2(x) \text{ on } (0, \hat{x}_-) \cup (\hat{x}_+, \pi) \\ \lambda_1 u_1^2(x) &> \lambda_2 u_2^2(x) \text{ on } (\hat{x}_-, \hat{x}_+). \end{aligned}$$

Given an optimal w_* , we extend it to a family of weights by

$$w(x, \kappa) = t w_1(x) + (1 - \kappa) w_*(x) \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

There are again two cases, beginning with

(i) $\hat{x}_- \leq b < \hat{x}_+$. As before we can arrange a convenient orientation by reflecting if necessary. We thus posit that $0 < \hat{x}_- \leq b \leq \hat{x}_+$, $w_*(\hat{x}_+) \leq w_*(\hat{x}_-)$, and w_* is nonincreasing for $x \geq \hat{x}_+$. If we let

$$w_1(x) = \begin{cases} w_*(\hat{x}_-) & \text{on } (0, b) \\ w_*(\hat{x}_+) & \text{on } (b, \pi), \end{cases}$$

then $w(x, \kappa) \in SB_{[0, \pi], N_<, N_>}$ and $w_1(x)$ has the opposite sign to $\lambda_1 u_1^2(x, 0) - \lambda_2 u_2^2(x, 0)$ a.e.

Fixing V and differentiating the eigenvalues at $\kappa = 0$ by the Feynman-Hellman formula,

$$\frac{d(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)}{d\kappa} = \int_0^\pi [w_1(x) - w_*(x)][\lambda_1 u_1^2(x, 0) - \lambda_2 u_2^2(x, 0)] dx.$$

By the optimality of w_* and since

$$\begin{aligned} [w_1(x) - w_*(x)][\lambda_1 u_1^2(x, 0) - \lambda_2 u_2^2(x, 0)] dx &\leq 0, \\ 0 &\leq \frac{d(\lambda_2(0) - \lambda_1(0))}{d\kappa} \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

implies that $w_1(x) = w_*(x)$ a.e. on $[0, \pi]$.

In conclusion the optimal w_* must be a step function with at most one jump, located at b . If $b > \hat{x}_-$, then the alternative choice

$$w_1(x) = \begin{cases} N_> & \text{on } (0, \hat{x}_-) \\ w_*(\hat{x}_+) & \text{on } (\hat{x}_-, \pi) \end{cases}$$

still ensures that $w(x, \kappa) \in SW_{[0, \pi], M}$ and $w_1(x)$ and has the opposite sign to $\lambda_1 u_1^2(x, 0) - \lambda_2 u_2^2(x, 0)$ a.e. We are thus led to the conclusion that $w_*(x) = N_>$ a.e. for $x < \hat{x}_-$ and $w_*(x) = w_*(x_+)$ a.e. for $x > \hat{x}_-$. In particular, for $N_> > N_<$ the unique transition point is $b = \hat{x}_-$.

(ii) Secondly, suppose that $b < \hat{x}_-$; the case when $\hat{x}_+ < b$ is similar. Let

$$w_1(x) = \begin{cases} N_> & \text{on } (0, \hat{x}_-) \\ w_*(\hat{x}_+) & \text{on } (\hat{x}_-, \pi). \end{cases}$$

We have $w_1 \in SB_{[0, \pi], N_<, N_>}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} w_1(x) - w_*(x) &\leq 0 \text{ on } (0, \hat{x}_-) \cup (\hat{x}_+, \pi) \\ &\geq 0 \text{ on } (\hat{x}_-, \hat{x}_+). \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $w(x, t) \in SB_{[0, \pi], N_<, N_>}$ and using the optimality of w_* ,

$$0 \leq \frac{d(\lambda_2(0) - \lambda_1(0))}{d\kappa} \leq 0.$$

We conclude that $w_1(x) = w_*(x)$ a.e. on $[0, \pi]$. As with the characterization of V , this means that we can now suppose that $b = \hat{x}_-$ is a transition point, reducing this case to case (i). □

Theorem 3.2. *The eigenvalues of the Sturm-Liouville problem (2) correspond to the real roots of the transcendental equation*

$$\eta \tan(z(\pi - \hat{x}_-)) = -z \tan \left[\eta(\hat{x}_- - x_-) + \arctan \left(\frac{\eta}{t} \tan(tx_-) \right) \right] \quad \text{if } \lambda > \frac{\max(V_*)}{\min(w_*)},$$

where $\eta := \sqrt{\lambda N_> - \max(V_*)}$, $z := \sqrt{\lambda \min(w_*) - \max(V_*)}$, and $t := \sqrt{\lambda N_>}$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, the optimal potential V_* must be of the form

$$V_*(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{on } (0, x_-) \\ \max(V_*) & \text{on } (x_-, \pi), \end{cases}$$

and the optimal density w_* must be of the form

$$w_*(x) = \begin{cases} N_{>} & \text{on } (0, \hat{x}_-) \\ \min(w_*) & \text{on } (\hat{x}_-, \pi). \end{cases}$$

The eigenfunctions are given by

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha_1 \sin(tx) & \text{on } (0, x_-) \\ \beta_1 \sin(\eta(x - x_-)) + \beta_2 \cos(\eta(x - x_-)) & \text{on } (x_-, \hat{x}_-) \\ \alpha_2 \sin(z(\pi - x)) & \text{on } (\hat{x}_-, \pi). \end{cases}$$

Where $\eta = \sqrt{\lambda N_{>} - \max(V_*)}$, $z = \sqrt{\lambda \min(w_*) - \max(V_*)}$, $t = \sqrt{\lambda N_{>}}$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$ are real constants, with $\beta_1 \neq 0$.

Continuity of u at x_- gives

$$\beta_2 = \alpha_1 \sin(tx_-)$$

and continuity of u' at x_- gives

$$\beta_1 = \frac{t\alpha_1}{\eta} \cos(tx_-).$$

Then

$$\frac{\beta_2}{\beta_1} = \frac{\eta}{t} \tan(tx_-).$$

Continuity of u at \hat{x}_- gives

$$\alpha_1 \left(\frac{t}{\eta} \cos(tx_-) \sin(\eta(\hat{x}_- - x_-)) + \sin(tx_-) \cos(\eta(\hat{x}_- - x_-)) \right) = \alpha_2 \sin(z(\pi - \hat{x}_-)).$$

It follows that

$$\frac{t\alpha_1}{\eta} \cos(tx_-) \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{\eta}{t} \tan(tx_-)\right)^2} \sin\left(\eta(\hat{x}_- - x_-) + \arctan\left(\frac{\eta}{t} \tan(tx_-)\right)\right) = \alpha_2 \sin(z(\pi - \hat{x}_-)),$$

and by the continuity of u' at \hat{x}_- ,

$$\alpha_1 \eta \left(\frac{t}{\eta} \cos(tx_-) \cos(\eta(\hat{x}_- - x_-)) - \sin(tx_-) \sin(\eta(\hat{x}_- - x_-)) \right) = -\alpha_2 z \cos(z(\pi - \hat{x}_-)).$$

Therefore,

$$\alpha_1 t \cos(tx_-) \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{\eta}{t} \tan(tx_-)\right)^2} \cos\left(\eta(\hat{x}_- - x_-) + \arctan\left(\frac{\eta}{t} \tan(tx_-)\right)\right) = -\alpha_2 z \cos(z(\pi - \hat{x}_-)).$$

Then

$$\eta \tan(z(\pi - \hat{x}_-)) = -z \tan\left[\eta(\hat{x}_- - x_-) + \arctan\left(\frac{\eta}{t} \tan(tx_-)\right)\right].$$

This ends the proof. \square

4. LIOUVILLE TRANSFORM OF STURM-LIOUVILLE OPERATORS

In this section we apply Lavine's estimate on the fundamental gap to the Sturm-Liouville equation (2),

$$-u'' + V(x)u = \lambda w(x)u, \quad x \in [0, \pi].$$

The eigenvalues of (2) coincide with these of the corresponding eigenvalue problem in Liouville normal form,

$$(6) \quad \frac{d^2\eta}{d\xi^2} + (\lambda - \psi(\xi))\eta = 0 \quad \text{on } [0, L],$$

where $\psi(\xi)$ is the Liouville potential defined by

$$(7) \quad \psi(\xi) = \frac{w''}{4w^2} - \frac{5(w')^2}{16w^3} + \frac{V}{w},$$

with $L = \int_0^\pi \sqrt{w(t)}dt$. (For background on the Liouville transform we refer to [22]). In particular we have:

$$\Gamma[V, w] = \Gamma[\psi].$$

Proposition 4.1. *If the Liouville potential ψ given by (7) of the Sturm-Liouville problem (6) is convex, then*

$$\Gamma[V, w] \geq \frac{3\pi^2}{\left(\int_0^\pi \sqrt{w(t)}dt\right)^2},$$

and equality is obtained if and only if ψ is constant.

Proof. If the Liouville potential ψ of the Sturm-Liouville problem (6) is convex, then by [18], we have

$$\Gamma[V, w] \geq \frac{3\pi^2}{L^2}.$$

Because the interval $[0, \pi]$ is transformed to $[0, L]$ with $L = \int_0^\pi \sqrt{w(t)}dt$. Thus

$$\Gamma[V, w] \geq \frac{3\pi^2}{\left(\int_0^\pi \sqrt{w(t)}dt\right)^2}.$$

□

Remark 4.1. *To see that convexity of V is not required for Proposition 4.1, consider the example $V(x) = -x^2$. Let $w(x) = x^2 \neq \text{const}$, then $\psi''(\xi) = \frac{3x^2-25}{x^6} \geq 0$ on $[5, 6]$. On this interval the Liouville potential ψ is convex and hence Proposition 4.1 is applicable, so*

$$\Gamma[V, w] \geq \frac{3\pi^2}{\left(\int_5^6 \sqrt{w(t)}dt\right)^2},$$

i.e.

$$\Gamma[V, w] \geq 0.978803 \dots$$

Proposition 4.2. *Consider the Sturm-Liouville problem (2) with positive density function $w \in C^2(0, \pi)$ and continuous convex potential V on $[0, \pi]$. If the fundamental gap satisfies*

$$\Gamma[V, w] = 3\pi^2 \left(\int_0^\pi \sqrt{w(t)}dt \right)^{-2}$$

Then

$$\frac{w^{(3)}}{4w^2} - \frac{w''w'}{2w^3} - \frac{10w^{(3)}}{16w^3} + \frac{15w'^3}{16w^4} + \frac{V'}{w} - \frac{Vw'}{w^2} = 0.$$

for all $x \in [0, \pi]$.

Proof. If the fundamental gap satisfies

$$\Gamma[V, w] = 3\pi^2 \left(\int_0^\pi \sqrt{w(t)} dt \right)^{-2}$$

then the Liouville potential ψ is constant, in which case $\psi' = 0$. Therefore

$$\frac{w^{(3)}}{4w^2} - \frac{w''w'}{2w^3} - \frac{10w^{(3)}}{16w^3} + \frac{15w'^3}{16w^4} + \frac{V'}{w} - \frac{Vw'}{w^2} = 0.$$

□

Proposition 4.3. *The Liouville potential ψ corresponding to (2) is convex if*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{w^{(4)}}{4w^2} - \frac{w^{(3)}w'}{w^3} - \frac{w''^2}{2w^3} + \frac{3w''w'^2}{2w^4} - \frac{10}{16} \left[\frac{w^{(4)}}{w^3} - \frac{3w^{(3)}w'}{w^4} \right] \\ & + \frac{15}{16} \left[\frac{3w'^2w''}{w^4} - \frac{4w'^4}{w^5} \right] + \frac{V''}{w} - \frac{V'w'}{w^2} - \frac{V'w' + Vw''}{w^2} + \frac{2w'^2V}{w^3} \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

on $[0, \pi]$.

Proof. To analyze the convexity of ψ , we will apply the nonnegativity criterion for the second derivative. To differentiate the Liouville potential we make use of the chain rule. In particular,

$$\frac{d\psi}{d\xi} = \sqrt{g} \frac{d\psi}{dx}.$$

If $g = 1$ then ψ is convex, so $\frac{d^2\psi}{dx^2} \geq 0$.

As a consequence

$$\frac{d\psi}{d\xi} = \frac{w^{(3)}}{4w^2} - \frac{w''w'}{2w^3} - \frac{10w^{(3)}}{16w^3} + \frac{15w'^3}{16w^4} + \frac{V'}{w} - \frac{Vw'}{w^2}.$$

This yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2\psi}{d\xi^2} &= \frac{w^{(4)}}{4w^2} - \frac{w^{(3)}w'}{w^3} - \frac{w''^2}{2w^3} + \frac{3w''w'^2}{2w^4} - \frac{10}{16} \left[\frac{w^{(4)}}{w^3} - \frac{3w^{(3)}w'}{w^4} \right] \\ &+ \frac{15}{16} \left[\frac{3w'^2w''}{w^4} - \frac{4w'^4}{w^5} \right] + \frac{V''}{w} - \frac{V'w'}{w^2} - \frac{V'w' + Vw''}{w^2} + \frac{2w'^2V}{w^3}. \end{aligned}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Ahrami and Z. El Allali, Lower bounds on the fundamental spectral gap with Robin boundary conditions, 2021 UNC Greensboro PDE Conference. Electron. J. Diff. Eqns. Conf. 26 (2022), pp 1-11.
- [2] M. Ashbaugh and R. Benguria, Optimal lower bound for the gap between the first two eigenvalues of one-dimensional Schrödinger operators with symmetric single-well potentials, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 105 (1989), 419–424.
- [3] M. S. Ashbaugh and R. Svirsky, Periodic potentials with minimal energy bands, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 114 (1992) 69–77.
- [4] M. Ashbaugh and R. Benguria, Optimal bounds for ratios of eigenvalues of one-dimensional Schrödinger operators with Dirichlet boundary conditions and positive potentials, Comm. Math. Phys., 124 (1989), 403–415.
- [5] M. S. Ashbaugh, E. M. Harrell II, and R. Svirsky, On minimal and maximal eigenvalue gaps and their causes, Pac. J. Math. 147 (1991) 1–24.
- [6] Y. H. Cheng, S. Y. Kung, C. K. Law and W. C. Lian, The dual eigenvalue problems for the Sturm-Liouville system, Computers and Mathematics with Applications, 60 (2010) 2556–2563.

- [7] M. S. Ashbaugh and E. M. Harrell II, Perturbation theory for shape resonances and large barrier potentials, Commun. Math. Phys. 83 (1982) 151–170.
- [8] J. L. Doob, Measure theory, Graduate Texts in Mathematics (143), 1994 Springer.
- [9] Z. El Allali and E. M. Harrell II, Optimal bounds on the fundamental spectral gap with single-well potentials, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 150,(2022), 57–587.
- [10] G. Bognár and O. Dosly, The ratio of eigenvalues of the Dirichlet eigenvalue problem for equations with one-dimensional p-Laplacian, Abstract and Applied Analysis, 2010 (2010).
- [11] T. Kato, Perturbation theory for linear operator, 1980 Springer-Verlag.
- [12] M. J. Huang, On the eigenvalue ratio for vibrating strings, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 127 (1999) 1805–1813.
- [13] M. Horváth, On the first two eigenvalues of Sturm-Liouville operators, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 131 4 (2002) 1215–1224.
- [14] M. Horváth and M. Kiss, A bound for ratios of eigenvalues of Schrödinger operators with single-well potentials, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 134 (2006) 1425–1434.
- [15] M. J. Huang, The eigenvalue gap for vibrating strings with symmetric densities, Acta Math. Hungar., 117 (2007) 341–348.
- [16] M. J. Huang, A note on the eigenvalues ratio of vibrating strings, Acta Math. Hungar., 123 (2009) 265–271.
- [17] M. J. Huang and C. K. Law, Eigenvalue ratios for the regular Sturm-Liouville system, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 124 (1996) 1427–1436.
- [18] R. Lavine, The eigenvalue gap for one-dimensional convex potentials, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 1994; 121, 815–821.
- [19] R. Svirsky, Maximally resonant potentials subject to p-Norm constraints, Pac. J. Math. 129, 357–374 (1987).
- [20] X. J. Yu and C. F. Yang, The gap between the first two eigenvalues of Schrödinger operators with single-well potential, Appl. Math. Comp. 268 (2015) 275–283.
- [21] J. Weidmann, Linear operators in Hilbert spaces, volume 68 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1980. Translated from the German by Joseph Szücs.
- [22] Garrett Birkhoff and Gian-Carlo Rota, Ordinary Differential Equations, 4th Edition. New York: Wiley, 1989. See Chapter 10, section 9.
- [23] A. Zettl Strum-Liouville theory, American Mathematical Society, 2005.

TEAM OF MODELING AND SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MULTIDISCIPLINARY FACULTY OF NADOR, UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMMED FIRST, MOROCCO
Email address: m.ahrami@ump.ac.ma

TEAM OF MODELING AND SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MULTIDISCIPLINARY FACULTY OF NADOR, UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMMED FIRST, MOROCCO
Email address: z.elallali@ump.ma

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, ATLANTA GA 30332-0160, USA
Email address: harrell@math.gatech.edu