

A note on Kazdan-Warner equation on networks

Fabio Camilli* Claudio Marchi†

version: September 19, 2019

Abstract

We investigate the Kazdan-Warner equation on a network. In this case, the differential equation is defined on each edge, while appropriate transition conditions of Kirchhoff type are prescribed at the vertices. We show that the Kazdan-Warner theory extends to the present setting and we study also the critical case.

MSC 2010: 35A15, 35J60, 35R02.

Keywords: Kazdan-Warner equation, network, Kirchhoff condition.

1 Introduction

The Kazdan-Warner equation

$$\Delta u = c - he^u, \quad (1.1)$$

where c is a constant and h a given function, was introduced in [5] in connection with the problem of prescribing the Gaussian curvature of a compact manifold M . The solvability of (1.1) depends on the sign of c . Let \bar{h} denote the average of h on M . In [5], it is shown that

- (i) if $c = 0$ and $h \not\equiv 0$, then (1.1) is solvable if and only if h changes sign and $\bar{h} < 0$;
- (ii) if $c > 0$, then (1.1) is solvable if and only if the set $\{h > 0\}$ is not empty;
- (iii) if $c < 0$, if (1.1) is solvable, then $\bar{h} < 0$. For $\bar{h} < 0$, there exists a constant $-\infty \leq c(h) < 0$ such that (1.1) is solvable for any $c \in (c(h), 0)$ and not solvable for any $c < c(h)$. Moreover $c(h) = -\infty$ if and only if $h \leq 0$ in M .

If $c < 0$, $c = c(h)$ is not included in the previous cases and deserves a particular attention. It has been shown in [1] that, if $c(h) > -\infty$, then (1.1) can be also solved for $c = c(h)$.

The previous theory has been recently extended in [3, 4] to the case of a connected, finite graph. Here the Laplacian is replaced by a finite difference operator, the so-called graph Laplacian, and most of the effort is to reproduce in a finite dimensional setting some crucial properties as the Maximum Principle and the Moser-Trudinger inequality.

An intermediate situation between a compact manifold and a finite graph is given by a network Γ , which is given by a finite collection of vertices connected by continuous non-self-intersecting edges. The differential equation (1.1) is defined on each edge, while appropriate transition conditions of Kirchhoff type are prescribed at the vertices. In this paper, we obtain the same conclusions of the manifold and finite graph cases, showing that the Kazdan-Warner theory remains unchanged for different classes of manifolds, also non regular such as in the case of networks. To prove these results, we shall adapt the method by Kazdan Warner [5, Thm5.3] (see also [4, Thm2]) and, for the critical case, some techniques of [1, 3] with some specific arguments for networks.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some notations and preliminary results. In Sections 3, 4 and 5, we study respectively the cases $c = 0$, $c > 0$ and $c < 0$. In Section 5, we also discuss the critical case $c = c(h)$.

*Dip. di Scienze di Base e Applicate per l'Ingegneria, Sapienza Università di Roma, via Scarpa 16, 00161 Roma, Italy, (e-mail: fabio.camilli@uniroma1.it)

†Dip. di Ingegneria dell'Informazione, Università di Padova, via Gradenigo 6/B, 35131 Padova, Italy (claudio.marchi@unipd.it).

2 Notations, definitions and preliminary results

A network $\Gamma = (V, E)$ is a finite collection of points $V := \{v_i\}_{i \in I}$ in \mathbb{R}^n connected by continuous non-self-intersecting edges $E := \{e_j\}_{j \in J}$, where any two edges can only have intersection at a vertex. For $i \in I$ we set

$$Inc_i := \{j \in J : e_j \text{ is incident to } v_i\}.$$

A coordinate $\pi_j : [0, l_j] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, with $l_j > 0$, is chosen to parameterize e_j , i.e. $e_j := \pi_j((0, l_j))$. We assume that Γ is finite and connected and we denote with $|\Gamma|$ the sum of lengths of the edges e_j , $j \in J$.

For a function $u : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we denote by $u_j : [0, l_j] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the restriction of u to e_j , i.e. $u(x) = u_j(y)$ for $x \in e_j$, $y = \pi_j^{-1}(x) \in (0, l_j)$. Given $v_i \in V$, we denote by $\partial_j u(v_i)$ the oriented derivative at v_i along the arc e_j defined by

$$\partial_j u(v_i) = \lim_{x \in e_j, x \rightarrow v_i} \frac{u(\pi_j^{-1}(x)) - u(\pi_j^{-1}(v_i))}{|\pi_j^{-1}(x) - \pi_j^{-1}(v_i)|},$$

if the limit exists, where π_j is the parametrization of arc e_j . For a function $\phi : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $A \subset \Gamma$, we set

$$\int_A \phi(x) dx := \sum_j \int_{(0, l_j) \cap \pi_j^{-1}(A)} \phi(r) dr.$$

A function u is said continuous on Γ if it is continuous with respect to the subspace topology of Γ , i.e. $u_j \in C([0, l_j])$ for any $j \in J$ and $u_j(\pi_j^{-1}(v_i)) = u_k(\pi_k^{-1}(v_i))$ for any $i \in I$, $j, k \in Inc_i$.

We introduce some functional spaces for functions defined on the network. The space $L^p(\Gamma)$, $p \geq 1$, consists of the functions that are measurable and p -integrable on each edge e_j , $j \in J$. We set

$$\|f\|_{L^p} := \left(\sum_{j \in J} \|f_j\|_{L^p(e_j)}^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

The space $L^\infty(\Gamma)$ consists of the functions that are measurable and bounded on each edge e_j , $j \in J$. We set

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty} := \sup_{j \in J} \|f_j\|_{L^\infty(e_j)}.$$

The Sobolev space $W^{k,p}(\Gamma)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \geq 1$, consists of all continuous functions on Γ that belong to $W^{k,p}(e_j)$ for each $j \in J$. We set

$$\|f\|_{W^{k,p}} := \left(\sum_{l=0}^k \|\partial^l f\|_{L^p}^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

As usual we set $H^k(\Gamma) := W^{k,2}(\Gamma)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The space $C^k(\Gamma)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ consists of all continuous functions on Γ that belongs to $C^k(e_j)$ for $j \in J$. The space $C^k(\Gamma)$ is a Banach space with the norm

$$\|f\|_{C^k} = \max_{\beta \leq k} \|\partial^\beta f\|_{L^\infty}.$$

The following proposition gives a Poincaré inequality for the network

Lemma 2.1 *For every function $f \in H^1(\Gamma)$ with $\int_\Gamma f(x) dx = 0$, there holds*

- (i) $|f(x)| \leq \sqrt{|\Gamma|} \|\partial f\|_{L^2}$;
- (ii) $\int_\Gamma f^2(x) dx \leq |\Gamma|^2 \int_\Gamma |\partial f(x)|^2 dx$.

PROOF By definition of H^1 , the function f is continuous on Γ , hence there exists a point $x_0 \in \Gamma$ such that $f(x_0) = 0$. Since Γ is connected, for any point $x \in \Gamma$ there exists a path $\gamma : (0, r) \rightarrow \Gamma$ on the network such that $\gamma(0) = x_0$, $\gamma(r) = x$, $|\gamma'(s)| = 1$ and $r \leq |\Gamma|$. Hence, we have

$$|f(x)| = |f(x_0) + \int_0^r (f \circ \gamma)'(s) ds| \leq \int_0^r |\partial f(\gamma(s))| ds \leq \sqrt{r} \|\partial f\|_{L^2(\gamma)} \leq \sqrt{|\Gamma|} \|\partial f\|_{L^2}.$$

We deduce that

$$\int_{\Gamma} f^2(x) dx \leq \int_{\Gamma} |\Gamma| \|\partial f\|_{L^2}^2 dx \leq |\Gamma|^2 \|\partial f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

□

We also give an analogous of the Trudinger-Moser inequality for the networks.

Lemma 2.2 *For any $\beta, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant C (depending only on β, δ and the network) such that, for all functions $f \in H^1(\Gamma)$ with $\int_{\Gamma} |\partial f|^2 \leq \delta$ and $\int_{\Gamma} f = 0$, there holds*

$$\int_{\Gamma} e^{\beta f^2(x)} dx \leq C.$$

PROOF We adapt the arguments of [4, Lemma7]. The case $\beta \leq 0$ is obvious because Γ has a bounded total length. Fix $\beta > 0$ and consider a function f as in the statement. By Lemma (2.1)-(i) and by the assumption $\|\partial f\|_2^2 \leq \delta$, we have

$$\int_{\Gamma} e^{\beta f^2(x)} dx \leq \int_{\Gamma} e^{\beta |\Gamma| \|\partial f\|_2^2} dx \leq e^{\beta |\Gamma| \delta} |\Gamma|.$$

□

We consider the Kazdan-Warner equation on the network Γ

$$\begin{cases} \partial^2 u = c - h e^u, & \text{if } x \in e_j, j \in J, \\ u_j(v_i) = u_k(v_i), & j, k \in \text{Inc}_i, v_i \in V, \\ \sum_{j \in \text{Inc}_i} \partial_j u(v_i) = 0, & v_i \in V, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where c is given constant and h is a continuous function on Γ . Note that the Kazdan-Warner equation is defined on each edge, while at the vertices we impose the continuity of u and the Kirchhoff condition, a classical condition for differential equations defined on networks (see [6, 7]).

Definition 2.1 (a) *A strong solution to problem (2.1) is a function $u \in C^2(\Gamma)$ which satisfies (2.1) in a pointwise manner.*

(b) *A weak solution to problem (2.1) is a function $u \in H^1(\Gamma)$ such that*

$$\int_{\Gamma} \partial u \partial \phi dx = -c \int_{\Gamma} \phi dx + \int_{\Gamma} h e^u \phi dx \quad \forall \phi \in H^1(\Gamma). \quad (2.2)$$

Remark 2.1 *One can easily check that, if $u \in C^2(\Gamma)$ is a weak solution of (2.1), then it is also a strong solution. Moreover, any weak solution of (2.1) is also a strong solution. Actually, a weak solution u fulfills $\partial^2 u = c - h e^u$ in distributional sense inside each edge e_j . The right hand side of this equality is continuous, hence, by standard theory, $u \in C^2(e_j)$ for every $j \in J$. Being a weak solution, u also belongs to $H^1(\Gamma)$; in conclusion $u \in C^2(\Gamma)$.*

In the next three sections, we discuss the solvability of (2.1) in the cases $c = 0$, $c > 0$ and $c < 0$.

3 The Kazdan-Warner equation with case $c = 0$

Theorem 3.1 *Assume $c = 0$ and $h \not\equiv 0$. Then problem (2.1) has a solution u if and only if h changes sign and $\int_{\Gamma} h < 0$.*

PROOF Assume that u is a solution to problem (2.1) with $c = 0$. We note that the hypothesis $h \not\equiv 0$ prevents u to be constant. We multiply the differential equation in (2.1) by $\phi \equiv 1$ and integrate on Γ ; taking advantage of the Kirchoff condition, we get $\int_{\Gamma} h e^u dx = 0$ which implies that h must change sign. Multiplying $e^{-u} \partial^2 u = -h$ by $\phi \equiv 1$ and integrating on Γ , we get

$$\int_{\Gamma} (\partial u)^2 e^{-u} dx + \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j \in Inc_i} e^{-u(v_i)} \partial_j u(v_i) = - \int_{\Gamma} h dx.$$

Taking advantage of the Kirchoff condition and of the continuity of u at each vertex, we obtain

$$\int_{\Gamma} (\partial u)^2 e^{-u} dx = - \int_{\Gamma} h dx.$$

Since u cannot be constant, we deduce $\int_{\Gamma} h dx < 0$.

Conversely, we prove that, for any h which changes sign and satisfies $\int_{\Gamma} h < 0$, there exists a solution to (2.1). We define the set

$$B := \left\{ v \in H^1(\Gamma) \mid \int_{\Gamma} h e^v dx = 0, \int_{\Gamma} v dx = 0 \right\}.$$

We claim that B is not empty. Since h changes sign, there exists a point $x_0 \in \Gamma$ such that $h(x_0) > 0$. By the continuity of h , without any loss of generality, we can assume $x_0 \in e_{\bar{j}}$ for some $\bar{j} \in J$; namely, there exist $\bar{j} \in J$ and $y_0 \in (0, l_{\bar{j}})$ such that $h_{\bar{j}}(y_0) > 0$. Moreover, still by the continuity of h , there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $(y_0 - \varepsilon, y_0 + \varepsilon) \subset (0, l_{\bar{j}})$ and $h_{\bar{j}}(y) > h_{\bar{j}}(y_0)/2$ for all $y \in (y_0 - \varepsilon, y_0 + \varepsilon)$. Consider a function $w \in C^2(\Gamma)$ such that: $w_{\bar{j}}(y) = 1$ if $y \in (y_0 - \varepsilon/2, y_0 + \varepsilon/2)$, $w_{\bar{j}}(y) = 0$ if $y \notin (y_0 - \varepsilon, y_0 + \varepsilon)$ and $w_j \equiv 0$ if $j \in J \setminus \{\bar{j}\}$. For $\ell > 0$, the function $w_{\ell}(\cdot) := \ell w(\cdot)$ fulfills

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Gamma} h e^{w_{\ell}} dx &= \int_{e_{\bar{j}}} h e^{w_{\ell}} dx + \sum_{j \in J \setminus \{\bar{j}\}} \int_{e_j} h e^{w_{\ell}} dx \geq \int_{y_0 - \varepsilon/2}^{y_0 + \varepsilon/2} h(y) e^{w_{\ell}(y)} dy - \int_{\Gamma} |h| dx \\ &\geq \frac{\varepsilon h_{\bar{j}}(y_0) e^{\ell}}{2} - \int_{\Gamma} |h| dx > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

provided that ℓ is sufficiently large. On the other hand, for $\ell = 0$ we have $w_0(x) \equiv 0$ and, by assumptions,

$$\int_{\Gamma} h e^{w_0(x)} dx = \int_{\Gamma} h dx < 0.$$

Therefore there exists $\ell_0 > 0$ such that $\int_{\Gamma} h e^{w_{\ell_0}} = 0$. Hence the function $\hat{w}(\cdot) := w_{\ell_0}(\cdot) - \int_{\Gamma} w_{\ell_0} / |\Gamma|$ belongs to B and the claim is proved.

Consider the functional

$$\mathcal{J}(v) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Gamma} |\partial v|^2 dx, \quad \forall v \in B.$$

Let $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a minimizing sequence for \mathcal{J} , i.e. $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{J}(v_n) = \inf_B \mathcal{J}$. By Lemma 2.1-(ii), possibly passing to a subsequence, we have that the functions v_n are uniformly bounded in $H^1(\Gamma)$. We deduce that there exists $\bar{u} \in H^1(\Gamma)$ such that, as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, $v_n \rightharpoonup \bar{u}$ weakly in $H^1(\Gamma)$ and $v_n \rightarrow \bar{u}$ uniformly on Γ . In particular, we get that \bar{u} belongs to B and it is a minimizer of \mathcal{J} on B .

We claim that \bar{u} is a strong solution to problem (2.1). Actually, by standard Lagrangian multiplier theory, there exist $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left. \frac{d}{dt} \left(\mathcal{J}(\bar{u} + t\phi) - \lambda \int_{\Gamma} h e^{\bar{u} + t\phi} dx - \mu \int_{\Gamma} (\bar{u} + t\phi) dx \right) \right|_{t=0} \\ &= \int_{\Gamma} \partial \bar{u} \partial \phi dx - \lambda \int_{\Gamma} h e^{\bar{u}} \phi dx - \mu \int_{\Gamma} \phi dx, \end{aligned}$$

for every $\phi \in H^1(\Gamma)$. Choosing $\phi \equiv 1$, since $\bar{u} \in B$, we get $\mu = 0$. Arguing as in Remark 2.1, inside each edge e_j , there holds $\partial^2 \bar{u} + \lambda h e^{\bar{u}} = 0$ in distributional sense. By the continuity of \bar{u} , we infer that $\bar{u} \in C^2(e_j)$ and, since $\bar{u} \in H^1(\Gamma)$, also that $\bar{u} \in C^2(\Gamma)$. Moreover, \bar{u} is a strong solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial^2 \bar{u} = -\lambda h e^{\bar{u}} & \text{if } x \in e_j, j \in J \\ \sum_{j \in \text{Inc}_i} \partial_j \bar{u}(v_i) = 0 & v_i \in V \\ \bar{u}_j(v_i) = \bar{u}_k(v_i) & j, k \in \text{Inc}_i, v_i \in V. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

We claim $\lambda > 0$. The function \bar{u} also solves $e^{-\bar{u}} \partial^2 \bar{u} = -\lambda h$; integrating this relation, by Kirchoff and continuity conditions, we get

$$\int_{\Gamma} (\partial \bar{u})^2 e^{-\bar{u}} dx = -\lambda \int_{\Gamma} h dx.$$

Let us first prove that the left hand side of this equality is positive. We proceed by contradiction assuming $\int_{\Gamma} (\partial \bar{u})^2 e^{-\bar{u}} = 0$. Hence, $\partial \bar{u} \equiv 0$ and, in particular, \bar{u} is constant. Since $\bar{u} \in B$, we get $e^{\bar{u}} \int_{\Gamma} h = 0$ contradicting the assumption $\int_{\Gamma} h < 0$. Therefore, the left hand side in the last equality is positive; again by virtue of $\int_{\Gamma} h < 0$, the constant λ must be positive. Finally, the function $u(\cdot) := \bar{u}(\cdot) + c$ with $c := \log(\lambda)$ is a strong solution to (2.1). \square

4 The Kazdan-Warner equation with case $c > 0$

Theorem 4.1 *Assume $c > 0$. Then problem (2.1) has a solution u if and only if h is positive somewhere.*

PROOF Assume that u is a solution of (2.1); choosing $\phi \equiv 1$ as test function in (2.2), we get $\int_{\Gamma} h e^u = c|\Gamma| > 0$. Hence, $\{x \in \Gamma \mid h(x) > 0\} \neq \emptyset$.

Conversely, for any $h \in C^0(\Gamma)$ with $\{h > 0\} \neq \emptyset$, we prove that the problem (2.1) admits at least one solution. To this end, it is expedient to introduce the set

$$B := \left\{ v \in H^1(\Gamma) \mid \int_{\Gamma} h e^v dx = c|\Gamma| \right\}.$$

We claim that B is not empty. For $\ell \geq 0$, we introduce the function w_{ℓ} as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 while, for $\ell \leq 0$, we set $\bar{w}_{\ell} \equiv \ell$. Since $w_0 \equiv \bar{w}_0$, the function

$$g(\ell) := \begin{cases} \int_{\Gamma} h e^{w_{\ell}} dx & \text{if } \ell \geq 0 \\ \int_{\Gamma} h e^{\bar{w}_{\ell}} dx & \text{if } \ell < 0 \end{cases}$$

is well defined and continuous, it fulfills $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow +\infty} g(\ell) = +\infty$ (by virtue of the estimate (3.1)) and $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow -\infty} g(\ell) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow -\infty} e^{\ell} \int_{\Gamma} h = 0$. Hence, there exists $\bar{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(\bar{\ell}) = c|\Gamma|$ namely, $B \neq \emptyset$.

We consider the functional

$$\mathcal{J}(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Gamma} |\partial u|^2 dx + c \int_{\Gamma} u dx, \quad \forall u \in B.$$

As a first step, let us prove that \mathcal{J} is bounded from below. To this end, for any $u \in B$, we set $\bar{u} := \int_{\Gamma} u / |\Gamma|$ and $v := u - \bar{u}$. Note $\int_{\Gamma} v = 0$ and $\partial v \equiv \partial u$. Since $u \in B$, it holds $\int_{\Gamma} h e^v dx = c|\Gamma|e^{-\bar{u}}$ which implies $\bar{u} = \log(c|\Gamma|) - \log(\int_{\Gamma} h e^v dx)$; replacing this equality in the definition of \mathcal{J} , we get

$$\mathcal{J}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \|\partial u\|_2^2 + c|\Gamma| \log(c|\Gamma|) - c|\Gamma| \log\left(\int_{\Gamma} h e^v dx\right). \quad (4.1)$$

Let us now estimate $\int_{\Gamma} h e^v$; if v is constant then, by $\int_{\Gamma} v = 0$, it must be $v \equiv 0$ and, in particular $\int_{\Gamma} h e^v = \int_{\Gamma} h$. For v nonconstant, it is expedient to introduce the function $\tilde{v} := v / \|\partial v\|_2$ which verifies: $\tilde{v} \in H^1(\Gamma)$, $\int_{\Gamma} \tilde{v} = 0$ and $\|\partial \tilde{v}\|_2 = 1$. Lemma 2.1-(ii) and Lemma 2.2 guarantee that, for any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a constant K_{β} (depending only on β) such that

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_2 \leq |\Gamma|, \quad \int_{\Gamma} e^{\beta \tilde{v}^2(x)} dx \leq K_{\beta}.$$

For every ε positive, for $\beta_{\varepsilon} := 1/(4\varepsilon)$, there holds

$$\int_{\Gamma} h e^v dx \leq \|h\|_{\infty} \int_{\Gamma} e^{\varepsilon \|\partial v\|_2^2 + \frac{v^2}{4\varepsilon \|\partial v\|_2^2}} dx \leq \|h\|_{\infty} e^{\varepsilon \|\partial v\|_2^2} K_{\beta_{\varepsilon}}.$$

Replacing this estimate in (4.1), we obtain

$$\mathcal{J}(u) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\partial u\|_2^2 + c|\Gamma| [\log(c|\Gamma|) - \varepsilon \|\partial u\|_2^2 - \log(\|h\|_{\infty} K_{\beta_{\varepsilon}})]$$

and, in particular, for $\varepsilon_0 := \frac{1}{4c|\Gamma|}$,

$$\mathcal{J}(u) \geq \frac{1}{4} \|\partial u\|_2^2 + c|\Gamma| [\log(c|\Gamma|) - \log(\|h\|_{\infty} K_{\beta_{\varepsilon_0}})]. \quad (4.2)$$

Hence, the proof that \mathcal{J} is bounded from below is accomplished.

Let $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a minimizing sequence for \mathcal{J} ; set $\bar{u}_n := \int_{\Gamma} u_n / |\Gamma|$ and $v_n := u_n - \bar{u}_n$; hence $\partial u_n \equiv \partial v_n$ and, by estimate (4.2), ∂v_n is bounded in $L^2(\Gamma)$, uniformly in n . By Lemma (2.1)-(ii), also v_n is uniformly bounded in $L^2(\Gamma)$ and, therefore, the functions v_n are uniformly bounded in $H^1(\Gamma)$. Moreover, by the definition of \mathcal{J} , we get that $\int_{\Gamma} u_n$ are uniformly bounded and consequently also \bar{u}_n are uniformly bounded. Being $u_n = v_n + \bar{u}_n$, also the functions u_n are uniformly bounded in $H^1(\Gamma)$. Possibly passing to a subsequence, there exists $u \in H^1(\Gamma)$ such that, as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in the weak topology of $H^1(\Gamma)$, $u_n \rightarrow u$ uniformly, $u \in B$ and $\mathcal{J}(u) = \min_B \mathcal{J}$.

We claim that u is a solution to (2.1). By standard Lagrangian theory, there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for every $\phi \in H^1(\Gamma)$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_{\Gamma} \frac{\partial(u+t\phi)^2}{2} dx + c \int_{\Gamma} (u+t\phi) dx - \lambda \left(c|\Gamma| - \int_{\Gamma} h e^{u+t\phi} dx \right) \right) \Big|_{t=0} \\ &= \int_{\Gamma} \partial u \partial \phi dx + c \int_{\Gamma} \phi dx - \lambda \int_{\Gamma} h e^u \phi dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Choosing $\phi \equiv 1$, we get $c|\Gamma| = \lambda \int_{\Gamma} h e^u$; since $u \in B$, we get $\lambda = 1$. In conclusion, relation (4.3) with $\lambda = 1$ is equivalent to the definition of weak solution to (2.1). \square

5 The Kazdan-Warner equation with case $c < 0$

Theorem 5.1 *Assume $c < 0$. Then*

- (i) *If (2.1) has a solution, then $\int_{\Gamma} h < 0$.*
- (ii) *If $\int_{\Gamma} h < 0$, then there exists a constant $c(h) \in [-\infty, 0)$ such that (2.1) has a solution for any $c(h) < c < 0$ and no solution for $c < c(h)$.*

(iii) For $\int_{\Gamma} h < 0$, let $c(h)$ be defined as in (ii). Then, $c(h) = -\infty$ if and only if $h \leq 0$ in Γ .

We introduce the definition of upper and lower solution to (2.1).

Definition 5.1 A function $u \in C^2(\Gamma)$ is said to be a lower (respectively, an upper) solution of (2.1) if

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \partial^2 u - c + he^u \geq 0 \quad \text{if } x \in e_j, j \in J, \\ \sum_{j \in Inc_i} \partial_j u(v_i) \geq 0 \quad v_i \in V, \end{array} \right. \quad \left(\text{resp., } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \partial^2 u - c + he^u \leq 0 \quad \text{if } x \in e_j, j \in J, \\ \sum_{j \in Inc_i} \partial_j u(v_i) \leq 0 \quad v_i \in V \end{array} \right. \right).$$

In order to prove Theorem 5.1, we need some preliminary results.

Lemma 5.1 If there exist a lower solution u_- and an upper solution u_+ of (2.1) such that $u_- \leq u_+$, then there exists a solution u of (2.1) such that $u_- \leq u \leq u_+$.

PROOF Set $k_1(x) = \max\{1, -h(x)\}$ and $k(x) = k_1(x)e^{u_+(x)}$ and consider the sequence of function $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined inductively as $u_0 = u_+$ and u_n the solution of

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{L}u_{n+1} = f(x, u_n) - ku_n \quad \text{if } x \in e_j, j \in J \\ \sum_{j \in Inc_i} \partial_j u(v_i) = 0 \quad v_i \in V \end{array} \right. \quad (5.1)$$

where $\mathcal{L}u = \partial^2 u - ku$ and $f(x, u) = c - h(x)e^u$. We first observe that the sequence $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is well defined: indeed, since $k(x) \geq e^{-\|u_+\|_\infty}$, (5.1) admits a unique strong solution u_n for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (see [2, Prop.10]). Moreover, we claim that

$$u_- \leq u_{n+1} \leq u_n \leq u_+, \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (5.2)$$

Since

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{L}(u_1 - u_0) = f(x, u_0) - ku_0 - \partial^2 u_0 + ku_0 \geq 0, \quad x \in e_j, j \in J \\ \sum_{j \in Inc_i} \partial_j (u_1 - u_0)(v_i) \geq 0, \quad v_i \in V \end{array} \right.$$

the inequality $u_1 \leq u_0 = u_+$ on Γ follows immediately by the Maximum Principle (see [2, Prop.12]). Assuming inductively that $u_n \leq u_{n-1}$, we have for $x \in e_j, j \in J$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(u_{n+1} - u_n) &= k(x)(u_{n-1} - u_n) + h(x)(e^{u_{n-1}} - e^{u_n}) \\ &\geq k_1(x)e^{u_+(x)}(u_{n-1} - u_n) - k_1(x)(e^{u_{n-1}} - e^{u_n}) \\ &\geq k_1(x)(e^{u_+(x)} - e^{\xi(x)})(u_{n-1} - u_n), \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi(x) \in [u_n(x), u_{n-1}(x)]$. By induction, we have $u_+ \geq u_{n-1}$ and, recalling the condition at the vertices, we get

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{L}(u_{n+1} - u_n) \geq 0 \quad x \in e_j, j \in J, \\ \sum_{j \in Inc_i} \partial_j (u_{n+1} - u_n)(v_i) \geq 0 \quad v_i \in V; \end{array} \right.$$

we conclude again by the Maximum Principle that $u_{n+1} \leq u_n$ in Γ . We finally observe that, arguing as before, we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{L}(u_- - u_{n+1}) \geq k(x)(u_n - u_-) + h(x)(e^{u_n} - e^{u_-}) \geq 0 \quad x \in e_j, j \in J, \\ \sum_{j \in Inc_i} \partial_j (u_- - u_{n+1})(v_i) \geq 0 \quad v_i \in V, \end{array} \right.$$

and therefore $u_- \leq u_{n+1}$ on Γ for all n . Hence the claim (5.2) is proved.

By [2, Prop.10] there exists a positive constant C (independent of n) such that $\|u_n\|_{H^1} \leq C$ and, in particular, $\|u_n\|_\infty \leq C$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the first equation in (2.1) and (5.2), we deduce $\|u_n\|_{H^2} \leq C$. The Ascoli-Arzelà's Theorem yields that, up to passing to a subsequence, $\{u_n\}$ converges uniformly to a function $u \in H^1(\Gamma)$ which is a weak solution to (2.1) with $u_- \leq u \leq u_+$. Finally, by Remark 2.1, u is a classical solution to (2.1). \square

In the next lemma, we show that (2.1) admits a lower solution u_- for any $c < 0$.

Lemma 5.2 *If $c < 0$, there exists a lower solution u_- of (2.1).*

PROOF Set $u_- \equiv -A$ for some constant $A > 0$. Then, the function u_- fulfills the Kirchhoff condition in (2.1) and also

$$\partial^2 u_-(x) - c + h(x)e^{u_-(x)} = -c + h(x)e^{-A} \geq 0 \quad x \in e_j, j \in J$$

for A sufficiently large. Hence u_- is a lower solution to (2.1). \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 5.1 Assume that there exists a solution u of (2.1). Then, multiplying (2.1) by the test function $\phi \equiv 1$, integrating on Γ and taking advantage of the Kirchhoff condition and the continuity of u at the vertices, we get

$$-\int_{\Gamma} h(x) dx = \int_{\Gamma} (\partial u(x))^2 e^{-u(x)} dx - c \int_{\Gamma} e^{-u(x)} dx > 0$$

and therefore (i).

We now assume that $\int_{\Gamma} h(x) dx < 0$. Recall that, by Lemma 5.1 and 5.2, (2.1) has a solution if and only if there exists an upper solution u_+ to the problem. Moreover it is easy to see that, if u_+ is an upper solution for a given $\bar{c} < 0$, then it is also an upper solution for any c such that $\bar{c} \leq c < 0$. Hence it follows that there exists a constant $c(h)$ with $-\infty \leq c(h) \leq 0$ such that (2.1) admits a solution for $c > c(h)$ and no solution for $c < c(h)$.

We show that $c(h) < 0$. Let $m \in C^2(\Gamma)$ be a solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial^2 m(x) = \int_{\Gamma} h(x) dx - h(x) & \text{if } x \in e_j, j \in J, \\ \sum_{j \in Inc_i} \partial_j m(v_i) = 0 & v_i \in V, \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

(existence of a weak solution is proved in [2, Prop.13], while the regularity follows by Remark 2.1) and a a positive constant such that

$$\max_{x \in \Gamma} |e^{am(x)} - 1| \leq \frac{-\int_{\Gamma} h(x) dx}{2\|h(x)\|_{\infty}}.$$

We define $b = \ln(a)$, $c = \frac{1}{2}a \int_{\Gamma} h(x) dx$ and $u_+(x) = am(x) + b$. Then $c < 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^2 u_+(x) - c + h(x)e^{u_+(x)} &= ah(x)(e^{am(x)} - 1) + \frac{a \int_{\Gamma} h(x) dx}{2} \\ &\leq a\|h(x)\|_{\infty} |e^{am(x)} - 1| + \frac{a \int_{\Gamma} h(x) dx}{2} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by (5.3), u_+ is continuous and verifies the Kirchhoff condition because m enjoys the same properties. Hence u_+ is an upper solution and therefore we conclude that

$$c(h) \leq \frac{a}{2} \int_{\Gamma} h(x) dx < 0.$$

We finally prove (iii). Note that $\int h < 0$ ensures $h \not\equiv 0$.

We first show that, if $h \leq 0$ in Γ , then (2.1) is solvable for any $c < 0$ and therefore $c(h) = -\infty$. Fixed $c < 0$, let m be a solution of (5.3) and choose two constants a, b such that $a \int_{\Gamma} h(x) dx < c$ and $e^{am(x)+b} - a > 0$ for $x \in \Gamma$. We show that the function $u_+(x) = am(x) + b$ is an upper solution of (2.1). Indeed, there holds

$$\partial^2 u_+(x) - c + h(x)e^{u_+(x)} = a \int_{\Gamma} h(x) dx - ah(x) - c + h(x)e^{am(x)+b} \leq h(x)(e^{am(x)+b} - a) \leq 0$$

while the continuity and the Kirchhoff conditions for u_+ come again from those of m . Hence u_+ is an upper solution to (2.1) and therefore, for any $c < 0$, there exists a solution to (2.1).

Conversely, let us prove that $c(h) = -\infty$ implies $h \leq 0$ in Γ . To this end, as in [3, Thm2.3], we argue by contradiction assuming that $\{h > 0\}$ is not empty. For any $c < 0$, let u be a solution to (2.1) (whose existence is ensured by $c(h) = -\infty$) and let $\phi_c \in C^2(\Gamma)$ be a solution to problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial^2 \phi_c + c\phi_c = h & \text{if } x \in e_j, j \in J, \\ \sum_{j \in Inc_i} \partial_j \phi_c(v_i) = 0 & v_i \in V \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

(whose existence is ensured by [2, Prop.10]). We claim

$$\phi_c(x) \geq e^{-u(x)} > 0 \quad \forall x \in \Gamma.$$

In order to prove this relation, by the Maximum Principle ([2, Prop.12]), it suffices to prove that e^{-u} is a lower solution to (5.4). Actually, there holds

$$\partial^2(e^{-u}) + ce^{-u} = e^{-u}[-\partial^2 u + |\partial u|^2 + c] = e^{-u}[he^u + |\partial u|^2] \geq h;$$

moreover, e^{-u} is continuous and satisfies the Kirchhoff condition because u does it. Hence, our claim is proved.

Furthermore, we have $\lim_{c \rightarrow -\infty} c\phi_c(x) = h(x)$ for any $x \in \Gamma$ because $(I - \partial^2)$ is a maximal monotone operator when coupled with Kirchhoff condition. Finally this property contradicts $\phi_c \geq 0$ in $\{h > 0\}$. \square

5.1 The critical case $c = c(h)$

Proposition 5.1 *For $\int_{\Gamma} h < 0$ and $c(h) > -\infty$, problem (2.1) with $c = c(h)$ admits a solution.*

PROOF Note that Theorem 5.1-(iii) ensures that h changes sign (and obviously, $h \not\equiv 0$). Given a decreasing sequence $\{c_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $c(h) < c_k < 0$ converging to $c(h)$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, we consider

$$\begin{cases} \partial^2 u = c_k - he^u, & \text{if } x \in e_j, j \in J, \\ \sum_{j \in Inc_i} \partial_j u(v_i) = 0, & v_i \in V. \end{cases} \quad (5.5)$$

The idea is to show that a sequence of continuous solutions u_k of (5.5), appropriately chosen, converges for $k \rightarrow \infty$ to a solution of (2.1) with $c = c(h)$.

Lemma 5.3 *For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist a lower solution $\phi_k \equiv -A \in \mathbb{R}$ and an upper solution ψ_k to (5.5) with $\psi_k > \phi_k$.*

PROOF To show the existence of a lower solution, it suffices to argue as in Lemma 5.2 choosing A sufficiently large so that

$$-c_k + h(x)e^{-A} \geq -c_k - \|h\|_{\infty}e^{-A} =: \delta > 0. \quad (5.6)$$

For the upper solution, we choose ψ_k as a solution to (2.1) with c replaced by any $\tilde{c}_k \in (c(h), c_k)$ (whose existence is established in Theorem 5.1).

Finally, it remains to prove the inequality $\psi_k > -A$. Denoted by \tilde{x} a minimum point of ψ_k on Γ , we claim that $\psi_k(\tilde{x}) > -A$.

Assume first that $\tilde{x} \in e_j$ for some $j \in J$. The first equation in (2.1) yields:

$$h(\tilde{x})e^{\psi_k(\tilde{x})} = \tilde{c}_k - \partial^2 \psi_k(\tilde{x}) \leq \tilde{c}_k < 0$$

and, in particular,

$$h(\tilde{x}) < 0.$$

On the other hand, the function $\phi_k \equiv -A$ satisfies

$$h(\tilde{x})e^{-A} > \tilde{c}_k.$$

The last three relations give: $e^{\psi_k(\tilde{x})} - e^{-A} > 0$, which is equivalent to $\psi_k(\tilde{x}) > -A$. Assume now $\tilde{x} = v_i$ for some $i \in I$ and, for later contradiction, $\psi_k(v_i) \leq -A$. We observe that, for any $j \in \text{Inc}_i$, the restriction of ψ_k to e_j attains its minimum at v_i and, consequently, $\partial_j \psi_k(v_i) \geq 0$. Taking into account the Kirchhoff condition in (2.1), we deduce

$$\partial_j \psi_k(v_i) = 0 \quad \forall j \in \text{Inc}_i.$$

On the other hand, by (5.6) and the continuity of h , there exists $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{c}_k + \|h\|_\infty e^{-A+\eta} < -\delta/2. \quad (5.7)$$

Moreover, by the continuity of ψ_k and $\psi_k(v_i) \leq -A$, (5.7) ensures

$$\partial_j^2 \psi_k(x) = \tilde{c}_k - h(x)e^{\psi_k(x)} \leq \tilde{c}_k + \|h\|_\infty e^{-A+\eta} < -\delta/2 < 0$$

for any $x \in e_j$ sufficiently near v_i . In conclusion, near v_i , the function $\partial_j \psi_k$ is strictly decreasing with $\partial_j \psi_k(v_i) = 0$ and therefore ψ_k is strictly decreasing. This fact contradicts that ψ_k attains its minimum at v_i . \square

Lemma 5.4 *Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The minimum of the problem*

$$\inf\{\mathcal{I}_k(u) : u \in H^1(\Gamma), -A \leq u(x) \leq \psi_k(x) \quad \forall x \in \Gamma\} \quad (5.8)$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_k(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_\Gamma |\partial u|^2 dx + c_k \int_\Gamma u dx - \int_\Gamma h e^u dx,$$

is attained by some function \bar{u} with

$$-A < \bar{u} < \psi_k. \quad (5.9)$$

Moreover \bar{u} is a solution of (5.5).

PROOF Let $\{v_n\}_n$ be a minimizing sequence for \mathcal{I}_k . Then there holds: $\mathcal{I}_k \leq \mathcal{I}_k(-A) = c_k(-A)|\Gamma| - e^{-A} \int_\Gamma h \leq C$, for some constant C (independent of k). Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C \geq \mathcal{I}_k(v_n) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_\Gamma |\partial v_n|^2 dx + c_k \int_\Gamma v_n dx - \int_\Gamma h e^{v_n} dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Gamma |\partial v_n|^2 dx + c_k \int_\Gamma \psi_k dx - \|h\|_\infty \int_\Gamma e^{\psi_k} dx, \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

where the inequality is due to the constraint $-A \leq v_n \leq \psi_k$. We deduce that $\|\partial v_n\|_2$ are uniformly bounded; on the other hand, also $\|v_n\|_\infty$ are uniformly bounded. Therefore, the sequence $\{v_n\}_n$ is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\Gamma)$. We infer that, possibly passing to a subsequence, there exists $\bar{u} \in H^1(\Gamma)$ with $-A \leq \bar{u} \leq \psi_k$ such that: $v_n \rightarrow \bar{u}$ uniformly and $v_n \rightharpoonup \bar{u}$ weak in H^1 . By the lower semicontinuity of \mathcal{I}_k , we get $\mathcal{I}_k(\bar{u}) \leq \liminf_n \mathcal{I}_k(v_n)$, hence \bar{u} is minimum for (5.8). The inequality (5.9) is a consequence of the Maximum Principle. Finally, by standard Lagrange multipliers method, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{I}_k(\bar{u} + t\phi)|_{t=0} = 0$$

for any $\phi \in H^1(\Gamma)$, from which we get (2.2). Arguing as in Remark 2.1, we get that \bar{u} is a strong solution to (5.5). \square

We can now conclude the proof of Proposition 5.1. Denote by u_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a solution of (5.5) given by Lemma 5.4. Assume for the moment that the sequence $\{u_k\}_k$ is bounded in $H^1(\Gamma)$. Hence there exists $u \in H^1(\Gamma)$ such that, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, up to a subsequence, $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ in the weak topology of $H^1(\Gamma)$ and $u_k \rightarrow u$ uniformly. Passing to the limit in the weak formulation of (5.5), we get that u is a weak, and therefore also a strong, solution to (2.1) with $c = c(h)$.

It remains to prove that $\{u_k\}_k$ is bounded in H^1 . To this end, fix $0 < \delta < \max_\Gamma h$, an interval D inside some edge e_j such that $D \subset \{h(x) \geq \delta\}$ and a point $\bar{x} \in D$; by the same arguments of [1, pag.743] (note that we can use [1, Lemma2.1] because any solution of the equation in D is also a solution in a 2-dimensional domain), we get that the u_k 's are uniformly bounded in D . Therefore, the functions $w_k(x) := u_k(x) - u_k(\bar{x})$ satisfy $w_k(\bar{x}) = 0$ and there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that $|u_k(\bar{x})| \leq C_1$ for any k . Arguing as in Lemma 2.1-(i), we get: $\|w_k\|_\infty \leq |\Gamma|^{1/2} \|\partial w_k\|_2 = |\Gamma|^{1/2} \|\partial u_k\|_2$ and, we deduce

$$\|u_k\|_\infty \leq |u_k(\bar{x})| + \|w_k\|_\infty \leq C_1 + |\Gamma|^{1/2} \|\partial u_k\|_2. \quad (5.11)$$

On the other hand, choosing $\phi \equiv 1$ as test function in the weak formulation of (5.5), we get

$$\int_\Gamma h e^{u_k} dx = c_k |\Gamma|. \quad (5.12)$$

Since c_k are negative, relations (5.10) with $v_n = u_k$ and (5.12) entail

$$\begin{aligned} C &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Gamma |\partial u_k|^2 dx + c_k \int_\Gamma u_k dx - \int_\Gamma h e^{u_k} dx \geq \frac{\|\partial u_k\|_2^2}{2} + c_k \int_\Gamma |u_k| dx - c_k |\Gamma| \\ &\geq \frac{\|\partial u_k\|_2^2}{2} + c_k C_1 |\Gamma| + c_k |\Gamma|^{3/2} \|\partial u_k\|_2 - c_k |\Gamma| \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (5.11). Hence, ∂u_k are uniformly bounded in L^2 ; by (5.11), the u_k 's are uniformly bounded in L^∞ and consequently also in H^1 . \square

Acknowledgements. The second author is member of Indam-Gnampa and he has been partially supported by the fondazione Cariparo project ‘‘Nonlinear partial differential equations: asymptotic problems and Mean Field Games’’.

References

- [1] W. Chen and C. Li, Gaussian curvature in the negative case. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 131 (2003), no. 3, 741-744.
- [2] F. Camilli and C. Marchi, Stationary Mean Field Games systems defined on networks. SIAM J. Control Optim. 54 (2016), no. 2, 1085-1103.
- [3] H. Ge, Kazdan-Warner equation on graph in the negative case. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 453 (2017), no. 2, 1022-1027.
- [4] A. Grigor'yan, Y. Lin and Y. Yang, Kazdan-Warner equation on graph. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 55 (2016), no. 4, art. 92.
- [5] J.L. Kazdan and F.W. Warner, Curvature functions for compact 2-manifolds. Ann. of Math. (2) 99 (1974), 14-47.
- [6] D. Mugnolo, *Semigroups Methods for Evolution Equations on Networks*. Understanding Complex Systems, Springer, Berlin, 2014.
- [7] Yu.V. Pokornyi and A.V. Borovskikh, Differential equations on networks (geometric graphs). J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.) 119 (2004), no. 6, 691-718.
- [8] X. Zhang and Y. Chang, p -th Kazdan-Warner equation on graph in the negative case. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 466 (2018), no. 1, 400-407.