

# CONCENTRATION OF CONES IN THE ALT-PHILLIPS PROBLEM

OVIDIU SAVIN AND HUI YU

ABSTRACT. We study minimizing cones in the Alt-Phillips problem when the exponent  $\gamma$  is close to 1.

When  $\gamma$  converges to 1, we show that the cones concentrate around *symmetric* solutions to the classical obstacle problem. To be precise, the limiting profiles are radial in a subspace and invariant in directions perpendicular to that subspace.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For an exponent  $\gamma \in [0, 2)$ , the *Alt-Phillips problem* studies minimizers of the following energy

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{E}_\gamma(u; \Omega) := \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} + u^\gamma \chi_{\{u>0\}},$$

where  $\Omega$  is a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $u$  is a *non-negative* function.

Since its introduction by Phillips [P] and Alt-Phillips [AP], this problem has received intense attention in the past few decades. See, for instance, [AS, B, DS, FeRo, FeY, KSP, WY]. For a minimizer  $u$ , the focus is on regularity properties of its *free boundary*  $\partial\{u > 0\}$ , separating the *positive set*  $\{u > 0\}$  from the *contact set*  $\{u = 0\}$ . Thanks to Weiss [W], the infinitesimal behavior of the free boundary is given by homogeneous minimizers, known as *minimizing cones*.

The simplest cone is the *flat cone*, the one-dimensional minimizer of (1.1) that vanishes on a half space (see (2.3)). If a minimizer  $u$  is close to the flat cone, then its free boundary  $\partial\{u > 0\}$  is smooth [AP, D, DS, ReRo]. For certain ranges of  $d$  and  $\gamma$ , the only minimizing cone is the flat cone [AP, CJK, JS].

In general, there are non-flat minimizing cones for (1.1), known as *singular cones* [DJ, SY2]. They provide singularity models for this problem. Unfortunately, very little is known about these cones. As a result, we face serious challenges in the study of singular free boundary points for general  $\gamma$ .

The exception is when  $\gamma = 1$ , corresponding to the *classical obstacle problem*. For this problem, homogeneous solutions are fully classified [C, PSU]. This leads to a lot of developments on the singular part of the free boundary [C, CSV, FRoSe, FSe, L, M, SY1].

To be precise, cones in the classical obstacle problem belong to two families (see Proposition 2.7). One family consists of flat cones, known as *half-space solutions* in this problem. They are of the form

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{1}{2}[(x \cdot e)_+]^2 \quad \text{for some unit vector } e.$$

The other family consists of singular cones, known as *parabola solutions*. These solutions are of the form

$$(1.3) \quad \frac{1}{2}x \cdot Ax, \text{ where } A \geq 0 \text{ and } \text{trace}(A) = 1.$$

Note that half-space solutions and parabola solutions each form a connected family. Even modulo rotational symmetry, there are infinitely many parabola solutions. We also remark that the contact set of any parabola solution, being a proper subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , has zero measure. See, for instance, Proposition 2.2.

To understand cones in the Alt-Phillips problem (1.1), it is natural to first consider the situation when  $\gamma$  is close to 1.

Recently, we constructed axially symmetric cones to (1.1), when  $\gamma < 1$  is close to 1 and  $d \geq 4$  [SY2]. For each  $\gamma$  in this range, there is a cone whose contact set has zero measure, similar to parabola solutions in the obstacle problem (see (1.3)). Interestingly, there is also a cone whose contact set has positive measure, similar to the De Silva-Jerison cone [DJ] in the Alt-Caffarelli problem ( $\gamma = 0$ ). This is the first free boundary problem that allows both possibilities.

This shows that singular cones for (1.1), even when  $\gamma$  is close to 1, exhibit rich and complicated behavior.

As  $\gamma \rightarrow 1$ , minimizing cones for (1.1) concentrate around cones for the obstacle problem (see Proposition 2.8). Surprisingly, only cones with strong symmetric properties can show up as limits of cones to (1.1) when  $\gamma \rightarrow 1$ .

To be precise, for  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$ , we define

$$(1.4) \quad P_0(x) := \frac{1}{2}[(x_1)_+]^2,$$

and

$$(1.5) \quad P_k(x) := \frac{1}{2k} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} x_j^2 \text{ for } k = 1, 2, \dots, d.$$

Our **main result** reads

**Theorem 1.1.** *Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $\eta > 0$ , depending only on  $\varepsilon$  and the dimension  $d$ , such that if  $u$  is a minimizing cone for the Alt-Phillips problem (1.1) with*

$$\gamma \in (1 - \eta, 1) \cup (1, 1 + \eta),$$

*then, up to a rotation, we have*

$$\|u - P_k\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} < \varepsilon$$

*for some  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$ .*

*Remark 1.2.* To the knowledge of the authors, this is the first result on concentration-induced symmetry in free boundary problems.

The cones in (1.5) are fully radial in a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and invariant along directions perpendicular to this subspace.

For each integer  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$ , up to a rotation, there is exactly one cone,  $P_k$ , that can show up as a limiting profile with

$$\dim(\{P_k = 0\}) = d - k.$$

The heart of Theorem 1.1 is the following integral inequality on parabola solutions in (1.3). This inequality is stable in the natural topology of our problem (see Lemma 4.1), and the equality case captures cones with symmetry from (1.5).

**Lemma 1.3.** *Suppose that  $p$  is a parabola solution to the classical obstacle problem in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  from (1.3), then*

$$\int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla p|^2}{p} \left( p - \frac{1}{2d} |x|^2 \right) \geq 0.$$

*The equality holds if and only if, up to a rotation,*

$$p = P_k$$

*for some  $k = 1, 2, \dots, d$  from (1.5).*

This paper is **structure as follows**.

In Section 2, we collect some preliminaries on the Alt-Phillips problem (1.1) and introduce some notations. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Lemma 1.3. With this, we prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 4.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In Subsection 2.1, we collect some useful facts about the Alt-Phillips functional in (1.1). We then transform the minimizers to a different form, to take advantage of the proximity of  $\gamma$  to 1. Properties of this transformed solution are presented in Subsection 2.2. In Subsection 2.3, we recall properties of the classical obstacle problem.

**2.1. The Alt-Phillips functional.** Recall the Alt-Phillips functional  $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$  from (1.1). In this work, we focus on the case when  $\gamma$  is close to 1. In particular, we always assume

$$\gamma \in [1/2, 3/2].$$

Suppose that  $u$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$  in  $B_1$ , then it satisfies the *Euler-Lagrange equation* (see [AP])

$$(2.1) \quad \Delta u = \gamma u^{\gamma-1} \chi_{\{u>0\}}, \quad u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

For each  $\gamma$ , we define the *scaling parameter* as

$$(2.2) \quad \beta := \frac{2}{2-\gamma} = 2 - \frac{2(1-\gamma)}{2-\gamma}.$$

When  $\gamma$  is close to 1, this parameter  $\beta$  is close to 2.

The scaling parameter arises from the symmetry of  $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$ . To be precise, for each  $r > 0$ , if we take

$$u_r(x) := r^{-\beta} u(rx),$$

then we have

$$\mathcal{E}_\gamma(u_r; B_1) = r^{2-2\beta-d} \mathcal{E}_\gamma(u; B_r).$$

In particular, if  $u$  is a non-trivial minimizing cone for  $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$  in (1.1), then  $u$  must be  *$\beta$ -homogeneous*. As a consequence, the flat cone for  $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$  is of the form

$$(2.3) \quad u(x) = c_\gamma [(x \cdot e)_+]^\beta \text{ for some unit vector } e,$$

where the coefficient  $c_\gamma$  satisfies  $c_\gamma^{2-\gamma} = (2-\gamma)^2/2$ .

Compactness of minimizers follows from the following:

**Theorem 2.1** (See [AP]). *Suppose that  $u$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$  from (1.1) in  $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ .*

*If  $0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ , then there is a dimensional constant  $C_d$  such that*

- (1) *If  $\gamma \in [1/2, 1]$ , then  $\|u\|_{C^{1,\beta-1}(B_{1/2})} \leq C_d$ ;*
- (2) *If  $\gamma \in (1, 3/2]$ , then  $\|u\|_{C^{2,\beta-2}(B_{1/2})} \leq C_d$ .*

*Moreover, we have*

$$\sup_{B_{1/2} \cap \{u > 0\}} |\nabla u|^2 / u^\gamma + \sup_{B_{1/2} \cap \{u > 0\}} |D^2 u| / u^{\gamma-1} \leq C_d.$$

Recall the parameter  $\beta$  from (2.2).

When  $\gamma \geq 1$ , the following dichotomy is a consequence of the convexity of global solutions:

**Proposition 2.2** ([B, C, PSU, WY]). *If  $u$  is a minimizing cone for  $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$  in (1.1) with  $\gamma \in [1, 2]$ , then either  $u$  is the flat cone in (2.3), or  $\{u = 0\}$  has zero measure.*

**2.2. The transformed solution.** Suppose  $v$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$  in (1.1), we define the *transformed solution* as

$$(2.4) \quad u := \frac{1}{\gamma(2-\gamma)} v^{\frac{2}{\beta}},$$

where  $\beta$  is from (2.2). If  $v$  is  $\beta$ -homogeneous, then  $u$  is 2-homogeneous. The flat cone in (2.3) is transformed to

$$(2.5) \quad u(x) = \frac{2-\gamma}{2\gamma} [(x \cdot e)_+]^2,$$

where  $e$  is a unit vector.

To simplify our exposition, we introduce the class of transformed cones:

**Definition 2.3.** Suppose that  $v$  is a minimizing cone for  $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$  from (1.1) with  $\gamma \in [1/2, 3/2]$ , and that  $u$  is related to  $v$  as in (2.4).

Then we call  $u$  a *transformed cone* for  $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$ , and write

$$u \in \mathcal{K}(\gamma).$$

Following (2.1) and Theorem 2.1, we have

**Proposition 2.4.** *Suppose that  $u \in \mathcal{K}(\gamma)$  with  $\gamma \in [1/2, 3/2]$ .*

*Then  $u$  is a 2-homogeneous solution to*

$$(2.6) \quad \Delta u + \frac{\beta-2}{2} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u} = \chi_{\{u > 0\}}, \quad u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

*Moreover, we have*

$$u \in C_{loc}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

*with*

$$|\nabla u|^2 / u + |D^2 u| \leq C_d \quad \text{in } \{u > 0\}$$

*for a dimensional constant  $C_d$ .*

Recall the scaling parameter  $\beta$  from (2.2).

Following Proposition 2.2, we have

**Proposition 2.5.** *Suppose that  $u \in \mathcal{K}(\gamma)$  with  $\gamma \in [1, 3/2]$ , then either  $u$  is the flat cone in (2.5), or  $\{u = 0\}$  has zero measure.*

**2.3. The obstacle problem.** When  $\gamma = 1$ , the Alt-Phillips functional  $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$  in (1.1) becomes the energy for the classical obstacle problem [C, PSU].

For this exponent, the scaling parameter in (2.2) satisfies  $\beta = 2$ . The equation in (2.6) takes the simple form

$$\Delta u = \chi_{\{u>0\}}, \quad u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We have seen half-space solutions and parabola solutions in (1.2) and (1.3). Recall the cones with symmetry from (1.4) and (1.5). For brevity, we introduce the following notations:

**Definition 2.6.** The collection of half-space solutions for the classical obstacle problem is denoted by  $\mathcal{HS}$ , namely,

$$\mathcal{HS} := \left\{ \frac{1}{2}[(x \cdot e)_+]^2 : e \in \mathbb{R}^d, |e| = 1 \right\}.$$

The collection of parabola solutions is denoted by  $\mathcal{P}$ , namely,

$$\mathcal{P} := \left\{ \frac{1}{2}x \cdot Ax : A \geq 0, \text{ trace}(A) = 1 \right\}.$$

The collection of parabola solutions with symmetry is denoted by  $\mathcal{SP}$ , namely,

$$\mathcal{SP} := \{p \in \mathcal{P} : \text{ up to a rotation, } p = P_k \text{ for some } k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\} \text{ from (1.5)}\}.$$

Recall the space of cones  $\mathcal{K}(\gamma)$  from Definition 2.3. We have

**Proposition 2.7** (See [C, PSU]). *Suppose that  $u \in \mathcal{K}(2)$ . Then  $u \in \mathcal{HS} \cup \mathcal{P}$ .*

Proposition 2.4 provides enough compactness for the following:

**Proposition 2.8.** *Given a sequence  $u_n \in \mathcal{K}(\gamma_n)$  (see Definition 2.3) with  $\gamma_n \rightarrow 1$ , we have, up to a subsequence,*

$$u_n \rightarrow u_\infty \text{ locally uniformly in } \mathbb{R}^d$$

for some  $u_\infty \in \mathcal{K}(1)$ ,

### 3. AN INTEGRAL INEQUALITY

This section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 1.3.

The following allows us to perform an induction on the dimension  $d$ :

**Lemma 3.1.** *For  $d \geq 2$ , suppose that  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  is invariant in the  $e_d$ -direction, that is,*

$$p(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = q(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{d-1}),$$

for some  $q \in \mathcal{P}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ .

Then

$$\int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla p|^2}{p} \left( p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2 \right) = \alpha_d \int_{\partial B_1 \cap \{x_d=0\}} \frac{|\nabla q|^2}{q} \cdot \left( q - \frac{1}{2(d-1)}|(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{d-1})|^2 \right)$$

for a positive dimensional constant  $\alpha_d$ .

Recall the space of parabola solutions  $\mathcal{P}$  from Definition 2.6.

*Proof.* Introduce a variable  $\theta \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$  such that

$$x_d = \sin(\theta) \text{ on } \partial B_1,$$

then we have

$$(3.1) \quad \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla p|^2}{p} \left(p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2\right) = \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \int_{\partial B_1 \cap \{\theta=s\}} \frac{|\nabla p|^2}{p} \left(p - \frac{1}{2d}\right) dH^{d-2} ds$$

Along  $\partial B_1 \cap \{\theta = s\}$ , since  $p$  is independent of  $x_d$  and is 2-homogeneous, we have

$$\frac{|\nabla p|^2}{p} \Big|_{\theta=s} = \frac{|\nabla q|^2}{q} \Big|_{\theta=0}, \quad \text{and} \quad p|_{\theta=s} = q|_{\theta=0} \cdot \cos^2(s).$$

As a result, we have

$$\int_{\partial B_1 \cap \{\theta=s\}} \frac{|\nabla p|^2}{p} \left(p - \frac{1}{2d}\right) dH^{d-2} = \int_{\partial B_1 \cap \{\theta=0\}} \frac{|\nabla q|^2}{q} \cdot \left(q \cos^2(s) - \frac{1}{2d}\right) \cos^{d-2}(s) dH^{d-2}.$$

Putting this into (3.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla p|^2}{p} \left(p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2\right) &= \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \cos^d(s) ds \cdot \int_{\partial B_1 \cap \{\theta=0\}} \frac{|\nabla q|^2}{q} q \\ &\quad - \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \cos^{d-2}(s) ds \cdot \int_{\partial B_1 \cap \{\theta=0\}} \frac{|\nabla q|^2}{q} \frac{1}{2d}. \end{aligned}$$

With the recursive formula  $\int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \cos^d(s) ds = \frac{d-1}{d} \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \cos^{d-2}(s) ds$ , we conclude

$$\int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla p|^2}{p} \left(p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2\right) = \frac{d-1}{d} \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \cos^{d-2}(s) ds \cdot \int_{\partial B_1 \cap \{x_d=0\}} \frac{|\nabla q|^2}{q} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{2(d-1)}\right).$$

□

Recall the radial solution  $P_d$  from (1.5)

$$(3.2) \quad P_d(x) = \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2.$$

To connect  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  (see Definition 2.6) to a solution that is degenerate along an axis, define

$$(3.3) \quad p_t(x) := tp(x) + (1-t)P_d(x) \quad \text{for } t \geq 0.$$

As long as  $p_t \geq 0$ , we have  $p_t \in \mathcal{P}$ . In particular, this holds for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

Correspondingly, we define

$$(3.4) \quad Q(t) := \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla p_t|^2}{p_t} \left(p_t - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2\right) \quad \text{as long as } p_t \geq 0.$$

Following Proposition 2.4, the integrand is bounded by a dimensional constant.

To prove Lemma 1.3 is to show that  $Q(1) \geq 0$ , and to characterize the equality case.

We give an alternative expression of this quantity  $Q$ :

**Lemma 3.2.** *For  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ , let  $p_t$  and  $Q$  be as in (3.3) and (3.4). Then we have*

$$Q(t) = t^2 \cdot \left[ \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla_\tau p|^2 + 4 \int_{\partial B_1} (p - P_d)^2 - \frac{1}{2d} \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla_\tau p|^2}{p_t} \right]$$

as long as  $p_t \geq 0$ .

Here  $\nabla_\tau$  denotes the gradient along directions tangential to  $\partial B_1$ .

Recall the class  $\mathcal{P}$  from Definition 2.6. Recall the radial solution  $P_d$  from (3.2).

*Proof.* With (3.4), we have

$$(3.5) \quad Q(t) = \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla p_t|^2 - \frac{1}{2d} \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla p_t|^2}{p_t}.$$

Note that  $|\nabla p_t|^2 = |\frac{\partial}{\partial r} p_t|^2 + |\nabla_{\tau} p_t|^2$ . With the homogeneity of  $p_t$ , we see that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial r} p_t = 2p_t$  on  $\partial B_1$ . With (3.3), we see that  $|\nabla_{\tau} p_t| = t|\nabla_{\tau} p|$ . As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla p_t|^2 &= 4p_t^2 + t^2 |\nabla_{\tau} p|^2 \\ &= 4p_t P_d + 4tp_t(p - P_d) + t^2 |\nabla_{\tau} p|^2 \\ &= \frac{4}{2d} p_t + 4tp_t(p - P_d) + t^2 |\nabla_{\tau} p|^2 \quad \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{|\nabla p_t|^2}{p_t} = 4p_t + t^2 \frac{|\nabla_{\tau} p|^2}{p_t} \quad \text{on } \partial B_1.$$

Putting these into (3.5), we get

$$(3.6) \quad Q(t) = t^2 \cdot \left[ \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla_{\tau} p|^2 - \frac{1}{2d} \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla_{\tau} p|^2}{p_t} \right] + 4t \int_{\partial B_1} p_t(p - P_d).$$

From (3.3), we see that  $p_t = tp + \frac{1}{2d}(1-t)$  on  $\partial B_1$ . Since  $(p - P_d)$  is a 2-homogeneous harmonic function, we have  $\int_{\partial B_1} (p - P_d) = 0$ . Thus the last integral in (3.6) satisfies

$$\int_{\partial B_1} p_t(p - P_d) = t \int_{\partial B_1} p(p - P_d) = t \int_{\partial B_1} (p - P_d)^2.$$

Combining this with (3.6), we get the desired expansion of  $Q$ .  $\square$

We now give the proof of Lemma 1.3:

*Proof of Lemma 1.3.* We argue by an induction on the dimension  $d$ .

In  $\mathbb{R}^1$ , there is only one parabola solution, namely,  $x^2/2$ . The conclusion follows.

Suppose that we have established Lemma 1.3 in dimensions  $1, 2, \dots, d-1$ , below we prove the result in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

For  $p_t$  from (3.3), define

$$(3.7) \quad \bar{t} := \sup\{t : p_t \geq 0 \text{ on } \partial B_1\}.$$

Since  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  (see Definition 2.6), we have

$$\bar{t} \geq 1.$$

Moreover, by definition of  $\bar{t}$ , we have

$$p_{\bar{t}} \in \mathcal{P} \quad \text{with} \quad p_{\bar{t}}(e) = 0$$

at some  $e \in \partial B_1$ . This implies that  $p_{\bar{t}}$  is invariant along the  $e$ -direction. Our induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.1 give, for the quantity  $Q$  in (3.4),

$$(3.8) \quad Q(\bar{t}) \geq 0, \quad \text{and equality holds only when } p_{\bar{t}} \in \mathcal{SP}.$$

Recall the space of symmetric cones  $\mathcal{SP}$  from Definition 2.6.

Based on the value of  $\bar{t}$  in (3.7), we consider two cases.

If  $\bar{t} = 1$ , then  $p = p_{\bar{t}}$ . The desired conclusion follows by (3.8).

It remains to consider the case when  $\bar{t} > 1$ .

In this case, define

$$(3.9) \quad q(t) := Q(t)/t^2 = \int_{\partial B_1} |\nabla_\tau p|^2 + 4 \int_{\partial B_1} (p - P_d)^2 - \frac{1}{2d} \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla_\tau p|^2}{p_t},$$

where we used Lemma 3.2.

With (3.3), we have  $p_0 = \frac{1}{2d}$  on  $\partial B_1$ . This implies

$$(3.10) \quad q(0) = 4 \int_{\partial B_1} (p - P_d)^2 \geq 0.$$

At  $\bar{t} > 1$ , we have

$$(3.11) \quad q(\bar{t}) = Q(\bar{t})/\bar{t}^2 \geq 0$$

by (3.8).

Moreover, direct computation with (3.3) and (3.9) gives, for  $t \in (0, \bar{t})$ ,

$$q''(t) = -\frac{1}{d} \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla_\tau p|^2}{p_t^3} (p - P_d)^2 \leq 0.$$

Together with (3.10) and (3.11), this implies

$$q(1) \geq 0.$$

With (3.4) and (3.9), this gives the desired inequality

$$(3.12) \quad \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla p|^2}{p} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2) = Q(1) = q(1) \geq 0.$$

The equality case in (3.12) forces the equality in (3.10), this implies

$$p = P_d = \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2.$$

□

#### 4. CONCENTRATION AROUND CONES WITH SYMMETRY

In this section, we give the proof of our main result, Theorem 1.1.

The first ingredient is the stability of the quantity in Lemma 1.3:

**Lemma 4.1.** *Suppose  $u \in \mathcal{K}(\gamma)$  with  $\gamma \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1) \cup (1, \frac{3}{2}]$  satisfies*

$$(4.1) \quad \|u - p\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(B_1)} < \frac{1}{4d}$$

for some  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ .

Then

$$\int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2) \leq C_d \|u - p\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(B_1)}$$

for a dimensional constant  $C_d$ .

Recall the spaces of cones,  $\mathcal{K}(\gamma)$  and  $\mathcal{P}$ , from Definition 2.3 and Definition 2.6.



*Proof. Step 1: Consequence of Green's identity.*

With the 2-homogeneity of  $u$ ,  $p$  and  $\frac{1}{2d}|x|^2$ , and the harmonicity of  $(p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2)\Delta(u - p) &= \int_{\partial B_1} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2)\nabla(u - p) \cdot \nu - (u - p)\nabla(p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2) \cdot \nu \\ &= 2 \int_{\partial B_1} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2)(u - p) - (u - p)(p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

With Proposition 2.4 and the definition of  $\mathcal{P}$ , the difference  $(u - p)$  solves

$$(4.2) \quad \Delta(u - p) = -\chi_{\{u=0\}} + \frac{2-\beta}{2} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Combining these two equations and using the homogeneity of the functions, we have

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{2-\beta}{2} \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2) = \int_{\partial B_1} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2) \chi_{\{u=0\}}.$$

*Step 2: The case when  $\gamma > 1$ .*

In this case, Proposition 2.5 implies that either  $u = \frac{2-\gamma}{2\gamma} [(x \cdot e)_+]^2$  or  $\{u = 0\}$  has zero measure. The former possibility is ruled out by (4.1). Combining this with (4.3) and  $\beta \neq 2$  (see (2.2)), we get

$$\int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2) = 0,$$

completing the proof in this case.

*Step 3: The case when  $\gamma < 1$ .*

With (4.1), we have  $p < \frac{1}{4d}$  on  $\{u = 0\} \cap B_1$ . With the bound on  $|\nabla u|^2/u$  in Proposition 2.4, we use (4.3) to get

$$\int_{\partial B_1} \chi_{\{u=0\}} \leq C_d |2 - \beta|.$$

Together with (4.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2-\beta}{2} \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2) &\leq \int_{\partial B_1} p \chi_{\{u=0\}} \\ &\leq \|u - p\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(B_1)} \int_{\partial B_1} \chi_{\{u=0\}} \\ &\leq C_d |2 - \beta| \cdot \|u - p\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(B_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

From (2.2), we see that  $2 - \beta > 0$  in this case. Thus

$$\int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2) \leq C_d \|u - p\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(B_1)}.$$

□

As a consequence, we have

**Corollary 4.2.** *For  $\gamma_n \neq 1$  with  $\gamma_n \rightarrow 1$ , suppose that a sequence  $u_n \in \mathcal{K}(\gamma_n)$  satisfies*

$$u_n \rightarrow p \text{ locally uniformly in } \mathbb{R}^d \text{ for some } p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

*Then  $p \in \mathcal{SP}$ .*

Recall the spaces of cones,  $\mathcal{K}(\gamma)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{SP}$ , from Definition 2.3 and Definition 2.6.

*Proof.* With Proposition 2.4, we see that  $u_n \rightarrow p$  locally uniformly in  $C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

With  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ , we see that, up to a rotation, we have  $p \geq \frac{1}{2d}x_1^2$ . Given  $\eta > 0$ , for large  $n$ , we have  $u_n(x) > \frac{1}{4d}\eta^2$  when  $|x_1| \geq \eta$ .

As a result, we have

$$\int_{\partial B_1 \cap \{|x_1| \geq \eta\}} \frac{|\nabla p|^2}{p} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2) = \lim \int_{\partial B_1 \cap \{|x_1| \geq \eta\}} \frac{|\nabla u_n|^2}{u_n} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2).$$

Meanwhile, Proposition 2.4 implies that the integrals on  $\partial B_1 \cap \{|x_1| \leq \eta\}$  is controlled by  $C_d \eta$  for some dimensional constant  $C_d$ . Thus we have

$$\int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla p|^2}{p} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2) \leq \limsup \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{|\nabla u_n|^2}{u_n} (p - \frac{1}{2d}|x|^2) + C_d \eta \leq C_d \eta.$$

The last inequality follows from Lemma 4.1.

Sending  $\eta \rightarrow 0$ , the conclusion follows from the equality case in Lemma 1.3.  $\square$

With this, we give the proof of our main result:

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Suppose the theorem is false, then for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we find a sequence  $\{v_n\}$ , each being a minimizing cone to (1.1) with exponent  $\gamma_n$  such that

$$\gamma_n \neq 1 \text{ for all } n, \quad \gamma_n \rightarrow 1,$$

but

$$(4.4) \quad \|v_n - p\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \geq \varepsilon$$

for all  $p \in \mathcal{HS} \cup \mathcal{SP}$  (see Definition 2.6) and all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Suppose that  $u_n$  is related to  $v_n$  by (2.4). It is elementary to see from (2.2) and (2.4) that  $\lim_n \|u_n - v_n\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} = 0$ . As a consequence of (4.4), for all large  $n$ , we have

$$(4.5) \quad \|u_n - p\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \geq \varepsilon/2$$

for all  $p \in \mathcal{HS} \cup \mathcal{SP}$ .

With Proposition 2.7 and Proposition 2.8, we have, up to a subsequence,

$$u_n \rightarrow u_\infty \text{ locally uniformly in } \mathbb{R}^d$$

for some  $u_\infty \in \mathcal{HS}$  or  $u \in \mathcal{P}$  (see Definition 2.6). The first possibility is ruled out by (4.5). Thus  $u_\infty \in \mathcal{P}$ .

In this case, Corollary 4.2 implies that  $u_\infty \in \mathcal{SP}$ , contradicting (4.5).  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [AP] H. W. Alt, D. Phillips, *A free boundary problem for semilinear elliptic equations*, J. Reine Angew. Math., 368 (1986), 63-107.
- [AS] A. Audrito, J. Serra, *Interface regularity for semilinear one-phase problems*, Adv. Math., 403 (2022), Paper No. 108380.
- [B] L. Bonorino, *Regularity of the free boundary for some elliptic and parabolic problems. I*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 26 (2001), no. 1-2, 175-203.
- [C] L. Caffarelli, *The obstacle problem revisited*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl., 4 (1998), 383-402.
- [CJK] L. Caffarelli, D. Jerison, C. Kenig, C. *Global energy minimizers for free boundary problems and full regularity in three dimensions*, Contemp. Math., 350 (2004), 83-97.
- [CSV] M. Colombo, L. Spolaor, B. Velichkov, *A logarithmic isoperimetric inequality for the obstacle problem*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 28 (2018), 1029-1061.
- [D] D. De Silva, *Free boundary regularity for a problem with right hand side*, Interfaces Free Bound., 13 (2011), no. 2, 223-238.
- [DJ] D. De Silva, D. Jerison, *A singular energy minimizing free boundary*, J. Reine Angew. Math., 635 (2009), 1-21.
- [DS] D. De Silva, O. Savin, *On certain degenerate one-phase free boundary problems*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 53 (2021), no. 1, 649-680.
- [FeRo] X. Fernández-Real, X. Ros-Oton, *On global solutions to semilinear elliptic equations related to the one-phase free boundary problem*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. A, 39 (2019), no. 12, 6945-6959.
- [FeY] X. Fernández-Real, H. Yu, *Generic properties in free boundary problems*, Preprint: arXiv:2308.13209.
- [FRoSe] A. Figalli, X. Ros-Oton, J. Serra, *Generic regularity of free boundaries for the obstacle problem*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. 132 (2020), 181-292.
- [FSe] A. Figalli, J. Serra, *On the fine structure of the free boundary for the classical obstacle problem*, Invent. Math. 215 (2019), 311-366.
- [JS] D. Jerison, O. Savin, *Some remarks on stability on cones for the one-phase free boundary problem*, Geom. Funct. Anal., 25 (2015), no. 4, 1240-1257.
- [KSP] A. Karakhanyan, T. Sanz-Perela, *Stable cones in the Alt-Phillips free boundary problem*, Preprint: arXiv:2403.13059.
- [L] K. Lee, *Obstacle problems for the fully nonlinear elliptic operators*, Thesis (Ph. D.), New York University, 1998.
- [M] R. Monneau, *On the number of singularities for the obstacle problem in two dimensions*, J. Geom. Anal. 13 (2003), 359-389.
- [P] D. Phillips, *A minimization problem and the regularity of solutions in the presence of a free boundary*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 32 (1983), no. 1, 1-17.
- [PSU] A. Petrosyan, H. Shahgholian, N. Uraltseva, *Regularity of free boundaries in obstacle-type problems*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 136, AMS Providence RI, 2012.
- [ReRo] D. Restrepo, X. Ros-Oton,  *$C^\infty$  regularity in semilinear free boundary problems*, Preprint: arXiv:2407.20426.
- [SY1] O. Savin, H. Yu, *Regularity of the singular set in the fully nonlinear obstacle problem*, J. Eur. Math. Soc., 25 (2023), no. 2, 571-610.
- [SY2] O. Savin, H. Yu, *Stable and minimizing cones in the Alt-Phillips problem*, Preprint: arXiv:2502.18192.
- [W] G. S. Weiss, *Partial regularity for weak solutions of an elliptic free boundary problem*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 23 (1998), no. 3-4, 439-455.
- [WY] Y. Wu, H. Yu, *On the fully nonlinear Alt-Phillips equation*, Int. Math. Res. Not., 2022, no. 11, 8540-8570.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, USA

*Email address:* savin@math.columbia.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE, SINGAPORE

*Email address:* huiyu@nus.edu.sg