

A MONOTONICITY FORMULA FOR A CLASSICAL FREE BOUNDARY PROBLEM

ARAM L. KARAKHANYAN

ABSTRACT. We construct a monotonicity formula for the free boundary problem of the form $\Delta u = \mu$, where μ is a Radon measure. It implies that the blow up limits of solutions are homogenous functions of degree one. The first formula is new even for classical Laplace operator.

Our method of proof uses a careful application of the strong maximum principle.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this note we construct a monotonicity formula for the local minimizers of the functional

$$J(u) = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 + \lambda \chi_{\{u>0\}},$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and χ_D is the characteristic function of a set D . Our main result is

Theorem 1.1. *Let u be a local minimizer of J , and $0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$, then*

$$(1.1) \quad K(r) = \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} \chi_{\{u>0\}}$$

is a monotone non-decreasing function of R . Furthermore, K is constant if and only if the set $\{u > 0\}$ is a cone and u is a homogeneous function of degree one.

There are a number of monotonicity formulae for this problem, see [AP86], [ACF84a], [Spr83], [Wei98]. However, I believe that the monotonicity of $K(r)$ has not been proved in the literature even for the classical Alt-Caffarelli problem [AC81]. In view of the Allard monotonicity formula [Sim83], $K(R)$ is the natural density function that enjoys monotonicity. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is hinging on a local analysis of the free boundary structure by employing the strong maximum principle.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35R35, 35K05, 35K55.

2. THE MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE

We use a slightly general set up. Let $F(t) : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, $F(t) \in C^{2,1}[0, \infty]$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{F}_1) \quad & F(0) = 0, \quad c_0 \leq F'(t) \leq C_0, \\ (\mathbf{F}_2) \quad & 0 \leq F''(t) \leq \frac{C_0}{1+t}, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constants c_0, C_0 , see [ACF84b] page 2. Let

$$(2.1) \quad J_F = \int_{\Omega} F(|\nabla u|^2) + \lambda \chi_{\{u>0\}}$$

Note that $\operatorname{div}(F'(|\nabla u|^2)\nabla u)$ is a measure supported on the boundary of the set $\{u > 0\}$. If u is a local minimizer of J_F , then $a_{ij}u_{ij} = 0$ in $\Omega^+ = \{u > 0\} \cap \Omega$, where $a_{ij} = F'(|\nabla u|^2)\delta_{ij} + 2F''(|\nabla u|^2)u_i u_j$, see [ACF84b]. Recall the free boundary condition is of the form

$$(2.2) \quad 2|\nabla u|^2 F'(|\nabla u|^2) - F(|\nabla u|^2) = \lambda,$$

see [ACF84b]. Consequently $|\nabla u| = \lambda^*$ on the free boundary, for some constant λ^* determined from the above condition. Throughout this paper we assume that $\lambda^* = 1$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $u \in C^3(\Omega)$ be a solution to $a_{ij}u_{ij} = 0$ in Ω , where $a_{ij} = F'(|\nabla u|^2)\delta_{ij} + 2F''(|\nabla u|^2)u_i u_j$. Then the function $w(x) = \nabla u(x) \cdot x - u(x)$ satisfies*

$$(2.3) \quad a_{ij}w_{ij} = b \cdot \nabla w,$$

where

$$(2.4) \quad b = -2 \{ [F''(|\nabla u|^2)\Delta u + 2F'''(|\nabla u|^2)\nabla u D^2 u \nabla u] \nabla u + 2F''(|\nabla u|^2)\nabla u D^2 u \}.$$

Remark 2.2. If F is a linear function, i.e. $a_{ij}u_{ij} = \Delta u$, then $b = 0$.

Proof. The derivatives of w can be readily computed as follows

$$(2.5) \quad w_i = u_{mi}x_m,$$

$$(2.6) \quad w_{ij} = u_{mij}x_m + u_{ij}.$$

Contracting the Hessian $D^2 w$ with the coefficient matrix a_{ij} and using the equation $a_{ij}u_{ij} = 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij}w_{ij} &= a_{ij}u_{mij}x_m + a_{ij}u_{ij} = \\ &= a_{ij}u_{mij}x_m \\ &= -\partial_{x_m}(a_{ij})u_{ij}x_m. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of a_{ij} we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{x_m}(a_{ij}) &= \partial_{x_m}(F'\delta_{ij} + 2F''u_iu_j) \\ &= 2F''\nabla u\nabla u_m\delta_{ij} + 4F'''\nabla u\nabla u_mu_iu_j + 2F''(u_{im}u_j + u_iu_{mj}).\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}-\frac{1}{2}\partial_{x_m}(a_{ij})u_{ij}x_m &= -F''\nabla u(\nabla u_mx_m)\Delta u - 2F'''\nabla uD^2u\nabla u(\nabla u_mx_m)\nabla u \\ &\quad - 2F''\nabla uD^2u(\nabla u_mx_m) \\ &= -\left\{ [F''(|\nabla u|^2)\Delta u + 2F'''(|\nabla u|^2)\nabla uD^2u\nabla u] \nabla u \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2F''(|\nabla u|^2)\nabla uD^2u \right\} \cdot \nabla w \\ &= \frac{b}{2} \cdot \nabla w.\end{aligned}$$

We use the notation

$$(2.7) \quad b := -\left\{ [F''(|\nabla u|^2)\Delta u + 2F'''(|\nabla u|^2)\nabla uD^2u\nabla u] \nabla u + 2F''(|\nabla u|^2)\nabla uD^2u \right\}$$

Therefore,

$$(2.8) \quad \partial_{x_m}(a_{ij})u_{ij}x_m = -b \cdot \nabla w = -b \cdot (\nabla u_mx_m),$$

and the result follows. \square

As a direct consequence of the strong maximum principle we have

Corollary 2.3. *If $0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$, and w achieves a local maximum or minimum in Ω^+ , then $w = 0$ throughout Ω^+ , and Ω^+ is a cone.*

Proof. If w achieves a local maximum or minimum in Ω^+ , then by the strong maximum principle w must be constant throughout Ω^+ . Since $w(0) = 0$, it follows that $w = 0$ throughout Ω^+ , and hence u is homogeneous of degree one, i.e. $u(tx) = tu(x)$, for any $t > 0$ and Ω^+ is a cone. \square

Proposition 2.4. *Let u be a local minimizer of J and $0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$, and assume that $b \cdot x \leq 0$ for any local minimizer having zero on its free boundary. Here b is defined by (2.7). Then for any $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ we have*

$$(2.9) \quad \limsup_{\substack{x \rightarrow x_0 \\ x \in \{u > 0\}}} \left(\nabla u \cdot \frac{x}{|x|} - \frac{u(x)}{|x|} \right) \geq 0.$$

Proof. Suppose (2.9) fails, then for some $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ we must have that

$$(2.10) \quad \limsup_{\substack{x \rightarrow x_0 \\ x \in \{u > 0\}}} \left(\nabla u(x) \cdot \frac{x}{|x|} - \frac{u(x)}{|x|} \right) = -\ell^2 < 0.$$

Let $x_k \in \{u > 0\}$, $x_k \rightarrow x_0$, and

$$(2.11) \quad \lim_{x_k \rightarrow x_0} \left(\nabla u(x_k) \cdot \frac{x_k}{|x_k|} - \frac{u(x_k)}{|x_k|} \right) = -\ell^2 < 0.$$

Let $y_k \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ be the closest point to x_k on the free boundary. Denote $\rho_k = |x_k - y_k|$. We consider three cases:

Case 1: $\frac{|y_k|}{\rho_k} \rightarrow 0$,

Case 2: $\frac{|y_k|}{\rho_k} \rightarrow a \neq 0$,

Case 3: $\frac{|y_k|}{\rho_k} \rightarrow \infty$.

2.1. Case 1: We introduce the function $u_k(y) = \frac{u(x_k + \rho_k y)}{\rho_k}$. Since $\rho_k = |x_k - y_k| \leq |x_k - x_0| \rightarrow 0$, it follows that we can employ a customary compactness argument and show that for a subsequence $u_k(x) \rightarrow \bar{u}(x)$, and $\bar{u}(x)$ is a local minimizer of J , see [ACF84b]. Moreover, since $x = y_k + \rho_k y \rightarrow x_0$ for $y \in B_2$, and

$$\frac{y_k + \rho_k y}{|y_k + \rho_k y|} = \frac{\frac{y_k}{\rho_k} + y}{\left| \frac{y_k}{\rho_k} + y \right|} \rightarrow \frac{y}{|y|}, \quad \frac{\rho_k}{|y_k + \rho_k y|} = \frac{1}{\left| \frac{y_k}{\rho_k} + y \right|} \rightarrow \frac{1}{|y|},$$

we get from (2.10) that

$$(2.12) \quad \nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot \frac{y}{|y|} - \frac{\bar{u}(y)}{|y|} \leq -\ell^2.$$

Moreover, by construction, there is a point $y_0 \in \{u_0 > 0\}$, $|y_0| = 1$, such that $B_1(y_0) \in \{\bar{u} > 0\}$, $0 \in \partial B_1(y_0) \cap \partial\{\bar{u} > 0\}$ and

$$(2.13) \quad \nabla \bar{u}(y_0) \cdot \frac{y_0}{|y_0|} - \frac{\bar{u}(y_0)}{|y_0|} = -\ell^2.$$

Introduce, $v(y) = \frac{\bar{u}(y)}{|y|} - \nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot \frac{y}{|y|}$. Then it follows from (2.12) and (2.13), that $v(y) \geq \ell^2$ in $B_1(y_0) \subset \{\bar{u} > 0\}$ and $v(y_0) = \ell^2$. Therefore, v has a local minimum at y_0 . We next show that $v(y)$ is constant in the connected component of $\{\bar{u} > 0\}$ containing y_0 . To see this we employ the strong maximum principle. First observe that

$$\begin{aligned} v_i &= \frac{\bar{u}_i}{|y|} - \frac{\bar{u}_i y_i}{|y|^3} - \frac{\bar{u}_{mi} y_m + \bar{u}_i}{|y|} + \frac{\bar{u}_m y_m y_i}{|y|^3} \\ &= -\frac{\bar{u}_i y_i}{|y|^3} - \frac{\bar{u}_{mi} y_m}{|y|} + \frac{\bar{u}_m y_m y_i}{|y|^3} \\ &= -\frac{v y_i}{|y|^2} - \frac{\bar{u}_{mi} y_m}{|y|}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we compute the Hessian

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{ij} &= -\frac{\bar{u}_{mij}y_m}{|y|} - \frac{\bar{u}_{ij}}{|y|} + \frac{\bar{u}_{mi}y_my_j}{|y|^3} \\
&\quad + \frac{\bar{u}_{mj}y_my_i + \bar{u}_m\delta_{mj}y_i + \bar{u}_my_m\delta_{ij}}{|y|^3} - 3\frac{\bar{u}_my_my_iy_j}{|y|^5} \\
&\quad - \frac{\bar{u}_jy_i}{|y|^3} - \frac{\bar{u}\delta_{ij}}{|y|^3} + 3\frac{\bar{u}y_iy_j}{|y|^5} \\
&= -\frac{\bar{u}_{mij}y_m}{|y|} - \frac{\bar{u}_{ij}}{|y|} + \frac{\bar{u}_{mi}y_my_j + \bar{u}_{mj}y_my_i}{|y|^3} - \frac{\delta_{ij}}{|y|^3}(\bar{u} - \bar{u}_my_m) \\
&\quad + 3\frac{y_iy_j}{|y|^5}(\bar{u} - \bar{u}_my_m).
\end{aligned}$$

After contracting the Hessian with the matrix a_{ij} we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{ij}v_{ij} &= -\frac{1}{|y|}a_{ij}\bar{u}_{ijm}y_m - \frac{1}{|y|}a_{ij}\bar{u}_{ij} + \frac{2}{|y|^3}a_{ij}y_j(\bar{u}_{mi}y_m) \\
&\quad + \left(3\frac{a_{ij}y_iy_j}{|y|^5} - \frac{\text{Trace}a_{ij}}{|y|^3}\right)(\bar{u} - \nabla\bar{u}\cdot y) \\
&= \frac{1}{|y|}\partial_{y_m}(a_{ij})\bar{u}_{ij}y_m + \frac{2}{|y|^3}a_{ij}y_j(\bar{u}_{mi}y_m) \\
&\quad + \left(3\frac{a_{ij}y_iy_j}{|y|^5} - \frac{\text{Trace}a_{ij}}{|y|^3}\right)(\bar{u} - \nabla\bar{u}\cdot y) \\
&= -b\cdot\frac{\nabla\bar{u}_my_m}{|y|} + \frac{2}{|y|^3}a_{ij}y_j(\bar{u}_{mi}y_m) \\
&\quad + \frac{v}{|y|^2}\left(3\frac{a_{ij}y_iy_j}{|y|^2} - \text{Trace}a_{ij}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where to get the last line we used (2.8). From the computation of the first derivatives we see that $\nabla v = -\frac{y}{|y|^3}v - \frac{\nabla\bar{u}_my_m}{|y|}$, hence $a_{ij}v_{ij}$ can be simplified as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{ij}v_{ij} &= b\cdot\left[\nabla v + \frac{y}{|y|^3}v\right] - \frac{2}{|y|^2}a_{ij}y_j\left[v_i + \frac{y_i}{|y|^2}v\right] \\
&\quad + \frac{v}{|y|^2}\left(3\frac{a_{ij}y_iy_j}{|y|^2} - \text{Trace}a_{ij}\right) \\
&= \tilde{b}\cdot\nabla v + cv,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{b}^k = b^k - \frac{2a_{kj}y_j}{|y|^2}, \quad c = \frac{b\cdot y}{|y|^3} - \frac{2a_{ij}y_iy_j}{|y|^4} + \frac{1}{|y|^2}\left(3\frac{a_{ij}y_iy_j}{|y|^2} - \text{Trace}a_{ij}\right).$$

Decomposing $c = c^+ - c^-$ into positive and negative parts, and noting that $v \geq \ell^2 > 0$ it follows that

$$a_{ij}v_{ij} = \tilde{b}\cdot\nabla v + c^+v - c^-v \leq \tilde{b}\cdot\nabla v + c^+v,$$

or equivalently

$$a_{ij}v_{ij} - \tilde{b} \cdot \nabla v - c^+ v \leq 0.$$

Since by assumption $b \cdot y \leq 0$, it follows that $c \leq \frac{1}{|y|^2} \left(\frac{a_{ij}y_i y_j}{|y|^2} - \text{Trace} a_{ij} \right) \leq 0$. Consequently, $c^+ = 0$. Note that for the Laplace operator $b \equiv 0$.

Hence from the strong maximum principle we conclude that $v(y) = \ell^2$ for any $y \in \{\bar{u} > 0\}$.

In order to finish the proof for the Case 1, we will show that $\ell^2 \neq 0$ contradicts the fact that the mean curvature of the the smooth portions of free boundary is positive, see Appendix. On the smooth portion of the free boundary the condition $v = \ell^2$ means that $\nabla \bar{u} \cdot y = -\ell^2 |y|$. Note that $\nabla \bar{u}$ is the unit normal pointing into $\{\bar{u} > 0\}$. Let $y(s)$ be an arc-length parametrization of a planar curve in the free boundary near some regular point, say $z_0 \neq 0$, and $z_0 = y(0)$. Then $N \cdot y(s) = -\ell^2 |y(s)|$, where $N(s) = \nabla \bar{u}(y(s))$ is the unit normal on the curve pointing into $\{\bar{u} > 0\}$. Differentiating in arc-length parameter s yields

$$\dot{N} \cdot y + N \cdot \dot{y} = -\ell^2 \frac{\dot{y} \cdot y}{|y|}.$$

Since $\dot{y} = \tau$ is the unit tangent we get that $N \cdot \dot{y} = 0$, and from the Frenet equations $\dot{N} = -k\tau$, $\dot{\tau} = kN$, we can rewrite the last equation in the following equivalent form

$$-k\tau \cdot y = -\ell^2 \frac{\tau \cdot y}{|y|}.$$

Cancelling $\tau \cdot y$ and choosing $\dot{y}(0)$ as a principal direction we see that

$$(2.14) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} -k_i = -(n-1) \frac{\ell^2}{|y|}.$$

Differentiating $\bar{u}(y(s)) = 0$ twice in s we obtain $\bar{u}_{\tau\tau} + \nabla \bar{u} \cdot \dot{\tau} = 0$. In the principal coordinate system coordinates, at z_0 , the equation $a_{ij} \bar{u}_{ij} = 0$ yields $F'(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \bar{u}_{\tau_i \tau_i} + (F'(1) + 2F''(1)) \bar{u}_{NN} = 0$. From here we infer that at z_0

$$(2.15) \quad - \left(1 + 2 \frac{F''(1)}{F'(1)} \right) \bar{u}_{NN} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \bar{u}_{\tau_i \tau_i} = - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} N \cdot \dot{\tau}_i = - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} k_i = -(n-1) \frac{\ell^2}{|y|}.$$

Since $h(y) = \nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot N(z_0)$ has its maximum achieved at the boundary point z_0 , then from Hopf's lemma it follows that $\partial_{-N_0} h > 0$ at z_0 , or equivalently $\bar{u}_{N_0 N_0} < 0$, where $N_0 = N(z_0)$. This yields

$$-(n-1) \frac{\ell^2}{|y|} > 0,$$

which is a contradiction.

2.2. Case 2: As for the Case 2, we first observe that the blow up limit \bar{u} of $u_k(y) = \frac{u(y_k + y\rho_k)}{\rho_k}$, $y \in B_2$, satisfies the inequality

$$\nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot \frac{E_0 + y/a}{|E_0 + y/a|} - \bar{u}(y) \frac{1/a}{|E_0 + y/a|} \leq -\ell^2,$$

with equality holding at some interior point y_0 such that $B_1(y_0) \subset \{\bar{u} > 0\}$. Observe that

$$(2.16) \quad \frac{x_k + y\rho_k}{|x_k + y\rho_k|} = \frac{\frac{x_k}{|x_k|} + y\frac{\rho_k}{|y_k|}}{\left| \frac{x_k}{|x_k|} + y\frac{\rho_k}{|y_k|} \right|} \rightarrow \frac{E_0 + y/a}{|E_0 + y/a|},$$

$$(2.17) \quad \frac{\rho_k}{|x_k + y\rho_k|} = \frac{\frac{\rho_k}{|y_k|}}{\left| \frac{x_k}{|x_k|} + y\frac{\rho_k}{|y_k|} \right|} \rightarrow \frac{1/a}{|E_0 + y/a|},$$

for some unit vector E_0 .

Setting $U(z) = u(a(z - E_0))$, $z = E_0 + y/a$, we can reduce this case to to the previous one, since $\nabla U \cdot \frac{z}{|z|} - \frac{U(z)}{|z|} \leq -a\ell^2$, with equality holding at some interior point of $\{U > 0\}$, and hence preceding proof applies to this case too. After applying the strong maximum principle one can see that

$$(2.18) \quad \nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot \frac{E_0 + y/a}{|E_0 + y/a|} - \bar{u}(y) \frac{1/a}{|E_0 + y/a|} = -\ell^2,$$

in $\{\bar{u} > 0\}$. From this point on, we can either proceed like in the previous case, or, alternatively, one may consider the blow out limit, i.e. taking $y = z_0 + Rz$, where $z_0 \in \partial\{\bar{u} > 0\}$ and let $R \rightarrow \infty$. It is obvious that the scaled functions $\bar{u}_R(z) = \bar{u}(z_0 + Rz)/R$ are local minimizer, hence applying a customary compactness argument, one readily verifies that for any sequence $R_k \rightarrow \infty$, there is a subsequence still denoted by R_k , so that the functions $\bar{u}_k(z) = \bar{u}(z_0 + R_k z)/R_k$ converge locally uniformly to a local minimizer \bar{u}^∞ , such that

$$(2.19) \quad \nabla \bar{u}^\infty(z) \cdot \frac{z}{|z|} - \bar{u}^\infty(z) \frac{1}{|z|} = -\ell^2.$$

This, as we have seen in the proof of the previous case, yields that $\ell = 0$, and this finishes the argument for Case 2.

2.3. Case 3: For the remaining case, $\frac{|y_k|}{\rho_k} \rightarrow \infty$, we first assume that $x_0 \neq 0$. Let $\sigma_k = |x_0 - y_k|$ and take $x = x_0 + \sigma_k y$, $y \in B_2$. The scaled function $u_k(y) = u(x_0 + \sigma_k y)/\sigma_k$, for a suitable subsequence, converge to a local minimizer \bar{u} , such that for $y \in B_2 \cap \{\bar{u} > 0\}$,

$$\nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot x_0 \leq -\ell^2 |x_0|.$$

Hence for $e_0 = -\frac{x_0}{|x_0|}$, we have $\nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot e_0 \geq \ell^2$. We infer from here that the minimizer \bar{u} is strictly monotone near the free boundary point

$y_0 \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{y_k}{\sigma_k}$, for a suitable subsequence. Applying the flatness implies $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity theory [Fel01], we see that $\partial\{\bar{u} > 0\}$ is smooth near y_0 . Consequently, from the convergence of $\partial\{u_k > 0\}$ to $\partial\{\bar{u} > 0\}$ in the Hausdorff distance [ACF84b], it follows that the free boundaries $\partial\{u_k > 0\}$ are uniformly smooth near $y_k \in \partial\{u_k > 0\}$. Therefore, by construction, there is a point $y_0 \in \partial B_1 \cap \partial\{\bar{u} > 0\}$ such that

$$(2.20) \quad \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow y_0 \\ y \in \{\bar{u} > 0\}}} (\nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot x_0) = -\ell^2 |x_0| < 0.$$

It follows that y_0 is a maximum point for $h(y) = \nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot x_0$. Letting $N = \nabla \bar{u}(y_0)$, the inner unit normal pointing into $\{\bar{u} > 0\}$, we see from the Hopf lemma that $\partial_{-N} h(y_0) > 0$. Decomposing $x_0 = \alpha N + \beta T$, where $T \perp N$, we see that

$$0 < \partial_{-N} h(y_0) = \alpha(-\bar{u}_{NN}(y_0)) - \beta \bar{u}_{NT}(y_0).$$

The last term on the right hand side vanishes at y_0 . Indeed, let $y(s)$ be an arc-length parametrized curve such that $y(0) = y_0$, and $\dot{y}(0) = T$. Differentiating the free boundary condition $|\nabla \bar{u}(y(s))|^2 = 1$ in s , we obtain that $\bar{u}_{NT}(y_0) = 0$. Furthermore, from $\nabla \bar{u}(y_0) \cdot x_0 < 0$ we get that $\alpha < 0$, and from the mean curvature equation $-\bar{u}_{NN}(y_0) > 0$ (see the Appendix), it follows that $\alpha(-\bar{u}_{NN}(y_0)) < 0$. This is in contradiction with $\partial_{-N} h(y_0) > 0$.

Finally, assume that $x_0 = 0$. In this case, we scale u by $\sigma_k = |y_k| \rightarrow 0$, then, as before, we can employ the same procedure to construct a blow up limit $\bar{u}(y)$, such that \bar{u} is a local minimizer and

$$(2.21) \quad \nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot \frac{y}{|y|} - \bar{u}(y) \frac{1}{|y|} \leq -\ell^2, \quad y \in B_1 \cap \{\bar{u} > 0\}.$$

On the regular free boundary points $\nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot y \leq -\ell^2 |y|$. Introduce the density function

$$(2.22) \quad K(r) = \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} \chi_{\{u > 0\}}.$$

Since $\Gamma := \partial\{\bar{u} > 0\}$ has locally finite perimeter and the reduced boundary is a dense open subset, it follows from the divergence theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Gamma \cap B_R} \nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot y &= - \left[\int_{\Gamma \cap B_R} -\nabla \bar{u} \cdot x + \int_{\{\bar{u} > 0\} \cap \partial B_R} \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot x \right] + \int_{\{\bar{u} > 0\} \cap \partial B_R} \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot x \\ &= - \int_{B_R \cap \{\bar{u} > 0\}} \operatorname{div} x + \int_{\{\bar{u} > 0\} \cap \partial B_R} \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot x \\ &= -n \int_{B_R} \chi_{\{\bar{u} > 0\}} + R \int_{\partial B_R} \chi_{\{\bar{u} > 0\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we infer the formula

$$(2.23) \quad \frac{dK}{dR} = \frac{1}{R^{n+1}} \int_{\Gamma \cap B_R} \nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot y$$

which, in view of $\nabla \bar{u}(y) \cdot y \leq -\ell^2 |y|$, satisfied \mathcal{H}^{n-1} a.e. on the free boundary, states that $K(R)$ is a non increasing bounded function. For any sequence of positive numbers $R_k \rightarrow 0$ and two positive numbers $a < b$ we observe that the following formula is true

$$(2.24) \quad \int_a^b \frac{dR}{R^{n+1}} \int_{\Gamma_k \cap B_R} \nabla \bar{u}_k(x) \cdot x = K(bR_k) - K(aR_k) \rightarrow 0$$

where $\bar{u}_k(y) = \bar{u}(R_k y)/R_k$ and $\Gamma_k = \partial\{u_k > 0\}$. Using a standard compactness argument we can conclude that there is a limit \bar{u}_0 , such that

$$(2.25) \quad \int_a^b \frac{dR}{R^{n+1}} \int_{\Gamma_0 \cap B_R} \nabla \bar{u}_0(x) \cdot x = 0$$

Moreover, (2.21) translates to \bar{u}_0 , and we get that on $\Gamma_0 = \partial\{\bar{u}_0 > 0\}$ the inequality $\nabla \bar{u}_0(y) \cdot y \leq -\ell^2 |y|$ holds \mathcal{H}^{n-1} a.e., thus

$$(2.26) \quad 0 \leq \int_a^b \frac{dR}{R^{n+1}} \int_{\Gamma_0 \cap B_R} \ell^2 |y| \leq - \int_a^b \frac{dR}{R^{n+1}} \int_{\Gamma_0 \cap B_R} \nabla \bar{u}_0(x) \cdot x = 0.$$

This, yields $\ell = 0$ and we finish the proof. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Recalling (2.23) we see that

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{dK}{dr} = \frac{1}{r^{n+1}} \int_{\Gamma \cap B_r} \nabla u(x) \cdot x.$$

It follows from Proposition 2.4 that $K'(r) \geq 0$ because on the regular portion of the free boundary $\nabla u \cdot x \geq 0$, and hence \mathcal{H}^{n-1} a.e. on $\partial\{u > 0\}$. Repeating the argument in the proof of Case 3, we see that for any blow up of u at 0 we must have $\nabla u_0(x) \cdot x = 0$, \mathcal{H}^{n-1} a.e. on $\partial\{u_0 > 0\}$. Now the homogeneity of u_0 follows from Lemma 4.2.

4. APPENDIX

It is well known that the mean curvature of the free boundary is a positive multiple of $-\partial_{NN}^2 u$ at the regular free boundary points [Kar21]. Combining this with Hopf's lemma we can prove that some local properties of the regular free boundary points instantaneously become global.

Lemma 4.1. *Let u be a blow up limit of a local minimizer, and $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ is a regular point of the free boundary. Then either u is a linear function in $\{u > 0\}$ or $-\partial_{NN}^2 u(x_0) > 0$, where $N = \nabla u(x_0)$.*

Proof. Since u is a blow up limit then it follows from [ACF84b] that $|\nabla u| \leq 1$, with equality on the regular free boundary points. Let $N = \nabla u(x_0)$ be the inner unit normal point to Ω^+ , then $h(x) = \nabla u(x) \cdot N$ achieves its maximum at x_0 . From Hopf's lemma it follows that $\partial_{-N} h(x_0) > 0$, or equivalently, $-\partial_{NN}^2 u(x_0) > 0$ unless h is constant. The latter case implies that near x_0 the free boundary is a piece of a hyperplane, and consequently there is a linear function $L(x)$ such that $a_{ij}(u - L)_{ij} = 0$ in $\{u > 0\}$ near the planar piece of the free boundary. Applying Hopf's lemma to $u - L$ one more time the result follows. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let u be as in previous lemma. Moreover, let us assume that $\nabla u(x) \cdot x = 0$ for $x \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ in some neighborhood of a regular free boundary point x_0 . Then u is a homogeneous function of degree one on the component of the positivity set containing x_0 on its boundary.*

Proof. Let $N = \nabla u(z)$, z close to x_0 , then $\partial_N w(z) = ND^2(z)z = 0$, where $w(x) = \nabla u(x) \cdot x - u(x)$. Indeed, since $z \cdot N = 0$, it follows that z is a tangential direction at z . Differentiating the free boundary condition $|\nabla u|^2 = 1$ in tangential directions, we see that $u_{NT}(z) = 0$ for any tangential direction T , and the claim follows. This shows that $w(z) = |\nabla w(z)| = 0$ for every z close to x_0 . By Proposition 2.1 $w(x) = \nabla u(x) \cdot x - u(x)$ solves the uniformly elliptic equation $a_{ij}w_{ij} = b \cdot \nabla w$. Consequently, $w = 0$ as claimed. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author was partially supported by EPSRC grant EP/S03157X/1 Mean curvature measure of free boundary.

REFERENCES

- [AC81] H. W. Alt and L. A. Caffarelli, *Existence and regularity for a minimum problem with free boundary*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **325** (1981), 105–144. MR618549 [↑1](#)
- [AP86] H. W. Alt and D. Phillips, *A free boundary problem for semilinear elliptic equations*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **368** (1986), 63–107. MR850615 [↑1](#)
- [ACF84a] H. W. Alt, L. A. Caffarelli, and A. Friedman, *Variational problems with two phases and their free boundaries*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **282** (1984), no. 2, 431–461, DOI 10.2307/1999245. MR732100 [↑1](#)
- [ACF84b] ———, *A free boundary problem for quasilinear elliptic equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **11** (1984), no. 1, 1–44. MR752578 [↑2, 4, 8, 10](#)
- [Fel01] M. Feldman, *Regularity of Lipschitz free boundaries in two-phase problems for fully nonlinear elliptic equations*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **50** (2001), no. 3, 1171–1200, DOI 10.1512/iumj.2001.50.1921. MR1871352 [↑8](#)
- [Kar21] A. Karakhanyan, *Full and partial regularity for a class of nonlinear free boundary problems*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire **38** (2021), no. 4, 981–999, DOI 10.1016/j.anihpc.2020.09.008. MR4266232 [↑9](#)

- [Sim83] L. Simon, *Lectures on geometric measure theory*, Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University, vol. 3, Australian National University, Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Canberra, 1983. [MR756417](#) ↑1
- [Spr83] J. Spruck, *Uniqueness in a diffusion model of population biology*, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **8** (1983), no. 15, 1605–1620, DOI [10.1080/03605308308820317](#). [MR729195](#) ↑1
- [Wei98] 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, DOI [10.1080/03605309808821352](#). [MR1620644](#) ↑1

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, EH9 3FD, UK
Email address: aram6k@gmail.com