

An optimal pointwise Morrey-Sobolev inequality

Grey Ercole^a and Gilberto A. Pereira^b

^a Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG, 30.123-970, Brazil
grey@mat.ufmg.br

^b Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto, Ouro Preto, MG, 35.400-000, Brazil.
gilberto.pereira@ufop.edu.br

April 21, 2020

Abstract

Let Ω be a bounded, smooth domain of \mathbb{R}^N , $N \geq 1$. For each $p > N$ we study the optimal function $s = s_p$ in the pointwise inequality

$$|v(x)| \leq s(x) \|\nabla v\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad \forall (x, v) \in \overline{\Omega} \times W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

We show that $s_p \in C_0^{0,1-(N/p)}(\overline{\Omega})$ and that s_p converges pointwise to the distance function to the boundary, as $p \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, we prove that if Ω is convex, then s_p is concave and has a unique maximum point.

2010 AMS Classification: 35D40; 35J70; 35P30.

Keywords: Dirac delta distribution, infinity Laplacian, Morrey-Sobolev inequality.

1 Introduction

The well-known Morrey's inequality in \mathbb{R}^N states that if $p > N$ then

$$|v(x) - v(y)| \leq C_{p,N} |x - y|^{1-(N/p)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N \quad \text{and} \quad v \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad (1)$$

where $C_{p,N}$ is a positive constant depending only on p and N , whose optimal value is still unknown for $N \geq 2$.

For $N = 1$ the optimal constant $C_{p,1}$ in (1) is known to be 1 and, for $N \geq 2$, expressions that appear in standard proofs of (1) are

$$C_{p,N} = \frac{2pN}{p-N} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{p,N} = \frac{C(N)}{\sqrt[p]{N\omega_N}} \left(\frac{p-1}{p-N} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}, \quad (2)$$

where $C(N)$ is a constant depending only on N and ω_N is the N -dimensional volume of the unit ball.

Now, let Ω be a bounded, smooth domain of \mathbb{R}^N and let d_Ω denote the distance function to the boundary $\partial\Omega$, that is,

$$d_\Omega(x) := \inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} |x - y|, \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

Taking an arbitrary $y \in \partial\Omega$ in (1) one arrives at the following pointwise inequality

$$|v(x)| \leq C_{p,N} (d_\Omega(x))^{1-(N/p)} \|\nabla v\|_p, \quad \forall (x, v) \in \overline{\Omega} \times W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \quad (3)$$

where, for $N < p \leq \infty$, $\|\cdot\|_p$ stands for the standard norm of $L^p(\Omega)$ (a notation that will be kept throughout the paper).

Note that $(d_\Omega)^{1-(N/p)} \in C_0^{0,1-(N/p)}(\overline{\Omega})$, the space of the functions that vanish on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ and are $(1 - (N/p))$ -Hölder continuous in $\overline{\Omega}$.

Passing to the maximum values in (3) we arrive at the well-known Morrey-Sobolev inequality

$$\|v\|_\infty \leq C_{p,N,\Omega} \|\nabla v\|_p, \quad \forall v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \quad (4)$$

where the constant $C_{p,N,\Omega}$ depends only on p, N and Ω .

In this paper we study the function

$$s_p(x) := \begin{cases} \sup \left\{ |v(x)| / \|\nabla v\|_p : v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\} \right\} & \text{if } x \in \Omega \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

which is the optimal function in the pointwise (version of) Morrey-Sobolev inequality

$$|v(x)| \leq s(x) \|\nabla v\|_p, \quad \forall (x, v) \in \overline{\Omega} \times W_0^{1,p}(\Omega). \quad (6)$$

Clearly, s_p satisfies (6) and if $s : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfies (6), then $s_p \leq s$ pointwise in $\overline{\Omega}$. This fact and (3) imply that

$$0 < s_p(x) \leq C_{p,N} (d_\Omega(x))^{1-(N/p)} \quad \forall x \in \Omega, \quad (7)$$

for every constant $C_{p,N}$ satisfying (1). Therefore, s_p is continuous at the boundary points.

In Section 2 (see Theorem 2.5) we show that for each $x \in \Omega$ given, there exists a (unique) function $u_p \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ that is positive in Ω , assumes the maximum value 1 uniquely at x and satisfies

$$s_p(x) = (\|\nabla u_p\|_p)^{-1}. \quad (8)$$

Using these facts and (7) we prove that $s_p \in C_0^{0,1-(N/p)}(\overline{\Omega})$.

We emphasize that, actually (see Remark 2.7),

$$s_p(x) = (G_p(x; x))^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad u_p(y) = \frac{G_p(y; x)}{G_p(x; x)}, \quad \forall y \in \Omega,$$

where $G_p(\cdot; x)$ denotes the Green function of the p -Laplacian in Ω with pole at x .

Alternatively, as it can be noticed from [5],

$$s_p(x) = (\text{cap}_p(\{x\}, \Omega))^{-\frac{1}{p}}$$

for each $x \in \Omega$, where

$$\text{cap}_p(\{x\}, \Omega) := \inf \left\{ \|\nabla u\|_p^p : u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega), \quad u(x) \geq 1 \right\}$$

denotes the p -capacity of the punctured domain $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$. Hence, as consequence of (8), u_p is the p -capacitary function corresponding to $\text{cap}_p(\{x\}, \Omega)$.

Still in Section 2 (see Corollary 2.8), we derive an explicit expression of s_p for the unidimensional case, where Ω is an interval. We also argue that in the case where Ω is a multidimensional ball the function s_p is radially symmetric and radially decreasing. Even though, it seems to be very difficult to derive an explicit expression for s_p in this case. We recall that an explicit expression for the Green function of the p -Laplacian for a ball is not available if $p > 2$.

In Section 3 (see Proposition 3.2) we prove that

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} s_p(x) = d_\Omega(x), \quad \forall x \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

Moreover, for each $x \in \Omega$ we show that the function u_p satisfying (8) converges uniformly, as $p \rightarrow \infty$, to a function $u_\infty \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ that is infinity harmonic in the punctured domain $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$ (see Theorem 3.4).

In Section 4 (see Theorem 4.2), we prove that if Ω is convex, then the function s_p is concave and has a unique maximum point. The concavity proof is adapted from arguments developed by Hynd and Lindgren [4]. The uniqueness of the maximum point is a direct consequence of their main result: the extremal functions for the Morrey-Sobolev inequality (4) are scalar multiple of each other and achieve the maximum value uniquely at a same point.

2 The optimal function

In this section, Ω is a bounded, smooth domain of \mathbb{R}^N and $p > N \geq 1$. For each $x \in \Omega$ we define

$$\mathcal{M}_p(x) := \{v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) : |v(x)| = \|v\|_\infty = 1\}$$

and

$$\mu_p(x) := \min_{v \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)} \|\nabla v\|_p^p. \tag{9}$$

We recall that the Dirac Delta distribution δ_x is the linear functional defined by

$$\langle \delta_x, \phi \rangle := \phi(x), \quad \forall \phi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

Actually, by virtue of (4), δ_x belongs to the dual of $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, commonly denoted by $W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$, $(1/p) + (1/p') = 1$.

Proposition 2.1 *Let $x \in \Omega$ be fixed. There exists $v \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)$ such that*

$$\mu_p(x) = \|\nabla v\|_p^p. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Let $\{v_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}_p(x)$ be such that $\|\nabla v_n\|_p^p \rightarrow \mu_p(x)$. As $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is reflexive and compactly embedded in $C(\overline{\Omega})$ we can assume, without loss of generality, that

$$v_n \rightharpoonup v \quad \text{weakly in } W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad v_n \rightarrow v \quad \text{uniformly in } C(\overline{\Omega}),$$

for some $v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$. As $\|v_n\|_\infty = |v_n(x)| = 1$, the uniform convergence implies that $v \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)$. Hence, (10) follows since the weak convergence yields

$$\mu_p(x) \leq \|\nabla v\|_p^p \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla v_n\|_p^p = \mu_p(x).$$

■

Proposition 2.2 *Let $x \in \Omega$ be fixed and let $u_p \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be the only weak solution of the Dirichlet problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \mu_p(x)\delta_x & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Then, $u_p \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)$, is strictly positive in Ω , attains its maximum value only at x and

$$\mu_p(x) = \|\nabla u_p\|_p^p.$$

Proof. The existence and the uniqueness of u_p follow from the bijectivity of the duality mapping (see [2]) from $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ into $W_0^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$ given by

$$u \mapsto \langle -\Delta_p u, \phi \rangle := \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi dx.$$

Thus, since $\mu_p(x)\delta_x \in W_0^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$, there exists a unique function $u_p \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^{p-2} \nabla u_p \cdot \nabla \phi dy = \mu_p(x)\phi(x), \quad \forall \phi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \quad (12)$$

which means that u_p is the only weak solution of (11).

Taking an arbitrary nonnegative test function ϕ in (12) we conclude, by the weak comparison principle, that $u_p \geq 0$ in Ω . Since $\mu_p(x) > 0$, the identity (12) also guarantees that u_p is not the null function. Using $\phi = u_p$ in (12) we obtain

$$\mu_p(x)u_p(x) = \|\nabla u_p\|_p^p. \quad (13)$$

Moreover, considering in (12) an arbitrary test function ϕ supported in the punctured domain $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$ we can see that u_p is p -harmonic in this domain (i.e. $\Delta_p u_p = 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$ in the weak sense). It follows that the minimum and maximum values of u_p are necessarily attained on the boundary $\partial\Omega \cup \{x\}$ of $(\Omega \setminus \{x\})$ (see [9]). Consequently (recalling that $u_p = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$),

$$0 < u_p(y) < u_p(x) = \|u_p\|_\infty \quad \forall y \in \Omega \setminus \{x\}.$$

Combining (13) with the definition of $\mu_p(x)$ in (9) and observing that $u_p / \|u_p\|_\infty \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)$ we arrive at

$$\frac{\|\nabla u_p\|_p^p}{u_p(x)} = \mu_p(x) \leq \frac{\|\nabla u_p\|_p^p}{\|u_p\|_\infty^p},$$

from which follows that $\|u_p\|_\infty \leq 1$.

Now, let $v \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)$ such that $\mu_p(x) = \|\nabla v\|_p^p$ (the existence of v comes from the previous proposition). As $|v| \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)$ and $\|\nabla |v|\|_p = \|\nabla v\|_p = \mu_p(x)$ we can take $\phi = |v|$ in (12) and use Hölder inequality to find

$$\mu_p(x) = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_p|^{p-2} \nabla u_p \cdot \nabla |v| \, dy \leq \|\nabla u_p\|_p^{p-1} \|\nabla |v|\|_p = \|\nabla u_p\|_p^{p-1} (\mu_p(x))^{1/p}. \quad (14)$$

Consequently,

$$\mu_p(x) \leq \|\nabla u_p\|_p^p,$$

an inequality that, in view of (13), implies that $u_p(x) \geq 1$. It follows that $\|u_p\|_\infty = 1$ (recall that $\|u_p\|_\infty = u_p(x)$ and $\|u_p\|_\infty \leq 1$). This shows that $u_p \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)$ and, in view of (13), yields

$$\mu_p(x) = \|\nabla u_p\|_p^p.$$

Hence, Hölder's inequality in (14) becomes an equality and this implies that $u_p = |v|$. As $u_p > 0$ in Ω , we conclude that v does not change sign in Ω , so that either $v = u_p$ or $v = -u_p$. ■

In the sequel, s_p denotes the best function in the pointwise inequality (6), defined by (5).

Corollary 2.3 *One has*

$$s_p(x) = (\mu_p(x))^{-1/p}, \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Proof. Let $u_p \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)$ given by Proposition 2.2 and take an arbitrary $v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$. We have, by Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_p(x) |v(x)| &= |\mu_p(x)v(x)| \\ &= \left| \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_p|^{p-2} \nabla u_p \cdot \nabla v \, dy \right| \leq \|\nabla u_p\|_p^{p-1} \|\nabla v\|_p = (\mu_p(x))^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \|\nabla v\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $(\mu_p(x))^{-1/p} \geq |v(x)| / \|\nabla v\|_p$. The arbitrariness of v and (5) imply that $(\mu_p(x))^{-1/p} \geq s_p(x)$.

Recalling that $(\mu_p(x))^{-1/p} = |u_p(x)| / \|\nabla u_p\|_p$ and that $|u_p(x)| / \|\nabla u_p\|_p \leq s_p(x)$ we conclude that $s_p(x) = (\mu_p(x))^{-1/p}$. ■

Corollary 2.4 *One has*

$$|s_p(x) - s_p(y)| \leq C_{p,N} |x - y|^{1-(N/p)}, \quad \forall x, y \in \overline{\Omega}, \quad (15)$$

for every constant $C_{p,N}$ satisfying (1). Consequently, $s_p \in C_0^{0,1-(N/p)}(\overline{\Omega})$.

Proof. Obviously, (15) implies that $s_p \in C_0^{0,1-(N/p)}(\overline{\Omega})$. So, let us prove (15).

Let $x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$. If $y \in \partial\Omega$, then (7) yields

$$|s_p(x) - s_p(y)| = s_p(x) \leq C_{p,N} (d_\Omega(x))^{1-(N/p)} \leq C_{p,N} |x - y|^{1-(N/p)}.$$

Likewise, (15) holds if $x \in \partial\Omega$.

Now, we assume that $x, y \in \Omega$. Let $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be a positive function such that

$$u(x) = s_p(x) \|\nabla u\|_p$$

(take u a positive multiple of the function $u_p \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)$ given by Proposition 2.2). As

$$u(y) \leq s_p(y) \|\nabla u\|_p$$

we have, in view of (1),

$$(s_p(x) - s_p(y)) \|\nabla u\|_p \leq u(x) - u(y) \leq |u(x) - u(y)| \leq C_{p,N} |x - y|^{1-(N/p)} \|\nabla u\|_p.$$

As $\|\nabla u\|_p > 0$ we get

$$s_p(x) - s_p(y) \leq C_{p,N} |x - y|^{1-(N/p)}.$$

Analogously, by taking a function $v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that $v(y) = s_p(y) \|\nabla v\|_p$ we arrive at the inequality

$$s_p(y) - s_p(x) \leq C_{p,N} |x - y|^{1-(N/p)},$$

completing thus the proof. ■

We summarize the main results above in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.5 *Let $x \in \Omega$ be fixed and let $u_p \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be the only weak solution of*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = (s_p(x))^{-p} \delta_x & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Then, $u_p \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)$, is strictly positive in Ω , attains its maximum value only at x , and

$$s_p(x) = (\|\nabla u_p\|_p)^{-1}.$$

Moreover,

$$(a) \quad |v(x)| \leq s_p(x) \|\nabla v\|_p, \quad \forall (x, v) \in \overline{\Omega} \times W_0^{1,p}(\Omega);$$

$$(b) \quad |v(x)| = s_p(x) \|\nabla v\|_p \text{ if, and only if, } v \text{ is a scalar multiple of } u_p;$$

$$(c) \quad s_p \in C_0^{0,1-(N/p)}(\overline{\Omega}).$$

Proposition 2.6 Let $x \in \Omega$, $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $\mu > 0$ be such that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \mu \delta_x & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

If $u(x) = 1$ then,

$$u = u_p \quad \text{and} \quad \mu = (s_p(x))^{-p},$$

where u_p denotes the only solution of (16).

Proof. Since $\|\nabla u\|_p^p = \mu$ and $s_p(x) = (\|\nabla u_p\|_p)^{-1}$, Hölder's inequality yields

$$\mu = \mu u_p(x) = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla u_p dy \leq \|\nabla u\|_p^{p-1} \|\nabla u_p\|_p = \mu^{\frac{p-1}{p}} (s_p(x))^{-1},$$

so that $\mu^{1/p} \leq (s_p(x))^{-1}$. Using this and recalling that $u(x) = 1$ we have

$$1 = u(x) \leq s_p(x) \|\nabla u\|_p = s_p(x) \mu^{1/p} \leq 1.$$

Therefore, $\mu = (s_p(x))^{-p}$ and, by uniqueness, $u = u_p$. ■

Remark 2.7 For each $x \in \Omega$ let $G_p(\cdot; x)$ denote the Green function of the p -Laplacian in Ω with pole at x . That is, $G_p(\cdot; x)$ is the (only) solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \delta_x & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where δ_x denotes the Dirac delta distribution supported at x . Since $G_p(x; x)/G_p(x; x) = 1$ and

$$-\Delta_p(G_p(\cdot; x)/G_p(x; x)) = G_p(x; x)^{1-p} \delta_x$$

an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.6 is that

$$s_p(x) = (G_p(x; x))^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad u_p(y) = \frac{G_p(y; x)}{G_p(x; x)}, \quad \forall y \in \Omega.$$

In the unidimensional case, s_p and u_p are given by explicit expressions, as the following corollary shows.

Corollary 2.8 Let $p > N = 1$ and $\Omega = (a, b)$. For each $x \in (a, b)$ one has

$$s_p(x) = ((x-a)^{1-p} + (b-x)^{1-p})^{-1/p} \tag{17}$$

and

$$u_p(y) := \begin{cases} (y-a)(x-a)^{-1} & \text{if } a \leq y \leq x \\ (b-y)(b-x)^{-1} & \text{if } x \leq y \leq b. \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

Proof. Let μ be the right-hand side of (17) raised to $-p$, that is,

$$\mu = \left((x-a)^{1-p} + (b-x)^{1-p} \right).$$

Let u be expressed by the right-hand side of (18). Clearly, $\mu > 0$ and $u(x) = 1$.

For $\phi \in W_0^{1,p}((a,b))$ given, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b |u'|^{p-2} u' \phi' dy &= \int_a^x (x-a)^{1-p} \phi' dy - \int_x^b (b-x)^{1-p} \phi' dy \\ &= (x-a)^{1-p} \int_a^x \phi' dy - (b-x)^{1-p} \int_x^b \phi' dy \\ &= \left((x-a)^{1-p} + (b-x)^{1-p} \right) \phi(x) = \mu \phi(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, according to Proposition 2.6, $\mu = (s_p(x))^{-p}$ and $u = u_p$. ■

(Note that s_p is symmetric with respect to $\bar{x} := (a+b)/2$. It is also simple to check that s_p is concave.)

We end this section with some remarks on the case where $\Omega = B_R(0)$, the N -dimensional ball ($N \geq 2$) centered at the origin with radius R . In this case, the function $x \mapsto s_p(x)$ is radially symmetric: $s_p(x) = s_p(y)$ whenever $|x| = |y|$. Indeed, by using an orthogonal change of variable one can see that the only positive maximizer of $s_p(x)$ in $\mathcal{M}_p(x)$ is a rotation of the only positive maximizer of $s_p(y)$ in $\mathcal{M}_p(y)$. Note that the function u_p corresponding to $x \neq 0$ cannot be radial since x is its unique maximum point.

On the other hand, u_p is radial when $x = 0$. By the way,

$$s_p(0) = \frac{R^{1-(N/p)}}{\sqrt[p]{N\omega_N}} \left(\frac{p-1}{p-N} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad u_p(y) = 1 - (|y|/R)^{\frac{p-N}{p-1}} \quad \forall y \in B_R(0),$$

since the best constant in the Morrey-Sobolev inequality (4) for $B_R(0)$ is given by the first expression above and its corresponding extremal functions are scalar multiples of the function given by the second expression above (see [3, 9]).

As consequence of Theorem 4.2 (Section 4), the function s_p is concave and assumes its maximum value uniquely at 0. Hence, we conclude that s_p is radially decreasing.

Even knowing these properties of s_p it seems to be very difficult to compute this function explicitly (at $x \neq 0$). Note that the Green function G_p of the p -Laplacian for a ball is not known if $p > 2$.

3 Asymptotics as $p \rightarrow \infty$

An immediate lower bound to the function s_p comes from its definition (5), by taking $v = d_\Omega$ (and recalling that $|\nabla d_\Omega| = 1$ in Ω):

$$d_\Omega(x) |\Omega|^{-\frac{1}{p}} \leq s_p(x), \quad \forall x \in \bar{\Omega}. \quad (19)$$

Lemma 3.1 For each fixed $x \in \overline{\Omega}$, the function $p \mapsto s_p(x) |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is nonincreasing and

$$d_\Omega(x) \leq s(x) := \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} s_p(x) = \inf_{q > N} s_q(x) |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{q}}. \quad (20)$$

Proof. Let $N < p_1 < p_2$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$ let $u_i \in \mathcal{M}_{p_i}(x)$ be such that

$$\mu_{p_i}(x) = \|\nabla u_i\|_{p_i}^{p_i}.$$

Since $\mathcal{M}_{p_2}(x) \subset \mathcal{M}_{p_1}(x)$ we obtain, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\mu_{p_1}(x) \leq \|\nabla u_2\|_{p_1}^{p_1} \leq \|\nabla u_2\|_{p_2}^{p_1} |\Omega|^{1 - \frac{p_1}{p_2}} = (\mu_{p_2}(x))^{p_1/p_2} |\Omega|^{1 - \frac{p_1}{p_2}}.$$

This means that

$$s_{p_2}(x) |\Omega|^{1/p_2} = (\mu_{p_2}(x))^{-1/p_2} |\Omega|^{1/p_2} \leq (\mu_{p_1}(x))^{-1/p_1} |\Omega|^{1/p_1} = s_{p_1}(x) |\Omega|^{1/p_1}.$$

It follows that

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} s_p(x) |\Omega|^{1/p} = \inf_{q > N} s_q(x) |\Omega|^{1/q}.$$

Hence, since $s_p(x) = (s_p(x) |\Omega|^{1/p}) |\Omega|^{-1/p}$, the limit $s(x)$ in (20) exists and coincides with the above limit. The first inequality in (20) then follows by letting $p \rightarrow \infty$ in (19). ■

The next result shows that the inequality in (20) is, in fact, an equality.

Proposition 3.2 Let $x \in \Omega$ be fixed and, for each $p > N$, let $u_p \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)$ be the positive function such that $s_p(x) = (\|\nabla u_p\|_p)^{-1}$. We claim that every sequence $\{u_{p_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, with $p_n \rightarrow \infty$, admits a subsequence $\{u_{p_{n_j}}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging uniformly to a nonnegative function $u_\infty \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$u_\infty(x) = \|u_\infty\|_\infty = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla u_\infty\|_\infty = (d_\Omega(x))^{-1}.$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} s_p(x) = d_\Omega(x), \quad \forall x \in \overline{\Omega}. \quad (21)$$

Proof. Let $\{p_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (N, \infty)$ be such that $p_n \rightarrow \infty$ and fix $r > N$. There exists $n_0 > N$ such that $p_n > r$ for every $n > n_0$. Hence, by Hölder's inequality and (20),

$$\|\nabla u_{p_n}\|_r \leq \|\nabla u_{p_n}\|_{p_n} |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{p_n}} = (s_{p_n}(x))^{-1} |\Omega|^{-1/p_n} |\Omega|^{1/r}, \quad \forall n > n_0. \quad (22)$$

That is, $\{u_{p_n}\}_{n > n_0}$ is bounded in $W_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$.

Therefore, we can assume (passing to a subsequence if necessary) that u_{p_n} converges to a nonnegative function $u_\infty \in W_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ uniformly in $C(\overline{\Omega})$ and weakly in $W_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$. The uniform convergence implies that $u_\infty(x) = \|u_\infty\|_\infty = 1$ (recall that $\|u_{p_n}\|_\infty = u_{p_n}(x) = 1$, since $u_{p_n} \in S_{p_n}^1(x)$) whereas the weak convergence and (22) yield

$$\|\nabla u_\infty\|_r \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla u_{p_n}\|_r \leq |\Omega|^{1/r} (s(x))^{-1}. \quad (23)$$

Moreover, using Morrey's inequality (1) with the first expression in (2), we obtain in sequence

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{p_n}(y) - u_{p_n}(z)| &\leq \frac{2Np_n}{p_n - N} \|\nabla u_{p_n}\|_{p_n} |y - z|^{1-(N/p)} \\ &= \frac{2Np_n}{p_n - N} (s_{p_n}(x))^{-1} |y - z|^{1-(N/p)}, \quad \forall y, z \in \overline{\Omega}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|u_\infty(y) - u_\infty(z)| \leq 2N(s(x))^{-1} |y - z|, \quad \forall y, z \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

It follows that $u_\infty \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$, so that its Lipschitz constant is $\|\nabla u_\infty\|_\infty$.

The arbitrariness of $r > N$ allows us to let $r \rightarrow \infty$ in (23) to conclude that

$$\|\nabla u_\infty\|_\infty = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla u_\infty\|_r \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |\Omega|^{1/r} (s(x))^{-1} = (s(x))^{-1}. \quad (24)$$

Now, picking $y \in \partial\Omega$ such that $d_\Omega(x) = |x - y|$, we obtain from (24)

$$1 = u_\infty(x) = u_\infty(x) - u_\infty(y) \leq \|\nabla u_\infty\|_\infty |x - y| = \|\nabla u_\infty\|_\infty d_\Omega(x) \leq d_\Omega(x) (s(x))^{-1} \leq 1,$$

from which follows that $s(x) = d_\Omega(x) = (\|\nabla u_\infty\|_\infty)^{-1}$. ■

Remark 3.3 *It is known that d_Ω is concave whenever Ω is convex. This fact can be proved directly, but it also follows from Theorem 4.2 (Section 4) and (21).*

Following step by step the proof of Theorem 3.11 of [3] we can show that u_∞ is a viscosity solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_\infty u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \{x\} \\ u = d_\Omega/d_\Omega(x) & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cup \{x\}, \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

where

$$\Delta_\infty u := \sum_{i,j=1}^N u_{x_i} u_{x_j} u_{x_i x_j}$$

is the infinity Laplacian operator. (We refer to [8] to the concept of viscosity solution.)

It turns out that (25) has a unique viscosity solution $u \in C(\overline{\Omega})$. This uniqueness result follows from the comparison principle for the ∞ -harmonic equation in the domain $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$, which can be quoted from [1, 6].

Therefore, u_∞ is the uniform limit of the family $\{u_p\}_{p>N}$, as $p \rightarrow \infty$ (which means: $u_{p_n} \rightarrow u_\infty$ uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$, for any sequence $\{u_{p_n}\}$ with $p_n \rightarrow \infty$). Actually, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.4 *Let $x \in \Omega$ be fixed and, for each $p > N$, let $u_p \in \mathcal{M}_p(x)$ be the positive function such that $s_p(x) = (\|\nabla u_p\|_p)^{-1}$. The function $u_\infty \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ is the uniform limit in $\overline{\Omega}$ of the family $\{u_p\}$, as $p \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, u_∞ is strictly positive in Ω , attains its maximum value 1 uniquely at x and is the only viscosity solution of (25).*

Proof. Since $u_\infty(x) = 1 > 0$ and $u_\infty = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, the strict positiveness of u_∞ in $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$ follows from the Harnack's inequality for the ∞ -harmonic equation in balls contained in $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$, as proved in [10].

To prove that u_∞ attains its maximum value 1 uniquely at x we apply the comparison principle for the ∞ -harmonic equation by using the function

$$v(y) := 1 - m^{-1}|y - x|, \quad y \in \Omega$$

where $m := \max\{|y - x| : y \in \partial\Omega\}$.

In fact, as it is easy to check, $\Delta_\infty v = 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$ and $u_\infty \leq v$ on $\partial(\Omega \setminus \{x\}) = \{x\} \cup \partial\Omega$. Therefore, since $\Delta_\infty u_\infty = 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$ the comparison principle yields

$$u_\infty(y) \leq v(y) = 1 - m^{-1}|y - x| < 1 = \|u_\infty\|_\infty, \quad \forall y \in \Omega \setminus \{x\}.$$

■

Remark 3.5 *When Ω is convex u_p is nondecreasing with respect to p in $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$ (see [5, Lemma 2.4]): if $N < p_1 < p_2$ then $u_{p_1}(y) \leq u_{p_2}(y)$ for all $y \in \Omega \setminus \{x\}$. Thus, in this case, the convergence of $u_p \rightarrow u_\infty$ is also monotone.*

As for the unidimensional case, we observe from (18) that $u_p = u_\infty$. So, we can verify directly that $\Delta_\infty u_\infty = 0$ in $(a, x_0) \cup (x_0, b)$.

4 Concavity

In this section we assume that Ω is convex and, based on the arguments developed in Section 4 of [4], we show that the function s_p is concave. The case $N = 1$ follows from a simple analysis of the expression 17. So, we consider $p > N \geq 2$ in this section.

Remark 4.1 *As we are assuming that Ω is convex, for each $x \in \Omega$ the punctured domain $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$ fits in the definition of convex ring considered by Lewis in [7]. As mentioned in the Introduction, the positive minimizer u_p of $\mu_p(x)$ on $\mathcal{M}_p(x)$, given by Proposition 2.1, is the p -capacitary function of $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$. Thus, according to Theorem 1 of [7], u_p is real analytic in $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$ and $|\nabla u_p| \neq 0$ in this domain. Moreover (see Proposition 2.8 and Remark 2.9 of [4])*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow x} \frac{|u_p(y) - 1|}{|y - x|^{\frac{p-N}{p-1}}} = \frac{p-1}{p-N} \left(\frac{\mu_p(x)}{N\omega_N} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{y \rightarrow x} |\nabla u_p(y)| |y - x|^{\frac{N-1}{p-1}} = \left(\frac{\mu_p(x)}{N\omega_N} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}.$$

Theorem 4.2 *If Ω is a bounded, convex domain of \mathbb{R}^N , then the function s_p is concave in Ω .*

Proof. Since

$$s_p = (\mu_p)^{-1/p} = \left((\mu_p)^{-1/(p-N)} \right)^{(p-N)/p} \quad \text{and} \quad (p-N)/p \in (0, 1)$$

the concavity of s_p follows once we prove that $(\mu_p)^{-1/(p-N)}$ is concave.

Thus, in order to prove the concavity of $(\mu_p)^{-1/(p-N)}$ we fix $x_0, x_1 \in \Omega$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and define

$$x_\rho := (1 - \rho)x_0 + \rho x_1.$$

Let $u_0 \in \mathcal{M}_p(x_0)$, $u_1 \in \mathcal{M}_p(x_1)$ and $u_\rho \in \mathcal{M}_p(x_\rho)$ denote the normalized, positive minimizers of $\mu_p(x_0)$, $\mu_p(x_1)$ and $\mu_p(x_\rho)$, respectively.

In the sequel we consider the ρ -Minkowski combination of u_0 and u_1 , defined by

$$v_\rho(z) := \sup \left\{ \min \{u_0(x), u_1(y)\} : z = (1 - \rho)x + \rho y, \quad x, y \in \overline{\Omega} \right\}.$$

It is known that $v_\rho \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Actually, $v_\rho \in \mathcal{M}_p(x_\rho)$ since $v_\rho(x_\rho) = \|v_\rho\|_\infty = 1$ (which is easy to verify). Hence,

$$\mu_p(x_\rho) \leq \|\nabla v_\rho\|_p^p.$$

Following the first three steps of the proof of Lemma 4.2 of [4] we can show that

$$\mu_p(x_\rho) \leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\partial B_r(x_\rho)} |\nabla v_\rho|^{p-1} d\sigma \quad (26)$$

and

$$v_\rho \leq u_\rho \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (27)$$

Now, by adapting the remaining of the proof of Lemma 4.2 of [4] we prove in the sequel that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow x_\rho} |\nabla v_\rho(x)|^{p-1} |x - x_\rho|^{N-1} \leq \left[N\omega_N (\mu_p(x_\rho))^{\frac{N-1}{p-N}} \left(\frac{1-\rho}{(\mu_p(x_0))^{\frac{1}{p-N}}} + \frac{\rho}{(\mu_p(x_1))^{\frac{1}{p-N}}} \right)^{p-1} \right]^{-1}. \quad (28)$$

Assuming this for a moment, noticing that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\partial B_r(x_\rho)} |\nabla v_\rho|^{p-1} d\sigma \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} N\omega_N |\nabla v_\rho(z)|^{p-1} |z - x_\rho|^{N-1},$$

and taking (26) and (28) into account we arrive at

$$\mu_p(x_\rho) \leq \left[(\mu_p(x_\rho))^{\frac{N-1}{p-N}} \left(\frac{1-\rho}{(\mu_p(x_0))^{\frac{1}{p-N}}} + \frac{\rho}{(\mu_p(x_1))^{\frac{1}{p-N}}} \right)^{p-1} \right]^{-1},$$

which leads to

$$(\mu_p(x_\rho))^{-1} \geq (\mu_p(x_\rho))^{\frac{N-1}{p-N}} \left(\frac{1-\rho}{(\mu_p(x_0))^{\frac{1}{p-N}}} + \frac{\rho}{(\mu_p(x_1))^{\frac{1}{p-N}}} \right)^{p-1},$$

or, equivalently, to

$$(\mu_p(x_\rho))^{-\frac{1}{p-N}} \geq (1-\rho)(\mu_p(x_0))^{-\frac{1}{p-N}} + \rho(\mu_p(x_1))^{-\frac{1}{p-N}}.$$

This shows that the function $x \mapsto (\mu_p)^{-1/(p-N)}$ is concave.

To prove (28) let us take $z_n \rightarrow x_\rho$ with $z_n \neq x_\rho$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough. Properties of the function v_ρ (see Proposition 4.1 of [4]), guarantee the existence of sequences (x_n) and (y_n) such that

$$\begin{aligned} z_n &= (1 - \rho)x_n + \rho y_n \\ v_\rho(z_n) &= u_0(x_n) = u_1(y_n) \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{|\nabla v_\rho(z_n)|} = \frac{1 - \rho}{|\nabla u_0(x_n)|} + \frac{\rho}{|\nabla u_1(y_n)|}.$$

Since Ω is bounded, we can assume that the sequences (x_n) and (y_n) are convergent, say $x_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ and $y_n \rightarrow \bar{y}$. It follows from (29) that

$$1 = v_\rho(x_\rho) = u_0(\bar{x}) = u_1(\bar{y})$$

where the first equality comes from the fact that $z_n \rightarrow x_\rho$. Noting that 1 is the maximum value of both u_0 and u_1 , assumed only at x_0 and x_1 , respectively, we conclude that $\bar{x} = x_0$ and $\bar{y} = x_1$. Thus, $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ and $y_n \rightarrow x_1$.

Combining (27) with (29) we have

$$\frac{|x_n - x_0|^{\frac{p-N}{p-1}}}{1 - u_0(x_n)} \frac{1 - u_\rho(z_n)}{|z_n - x_\rho|^{\frac{p-N}{p-1}}} \leq \frac{|x_n - x_0|^{\frac{p-N}{p-1}}}{1 - u_0(x_n)} \frac{1 - v_\rho(z_n)}{|z_n - x_\rho|^{\frac{p-N}{p-1}}} = \left(\frac{|x_n - x_0|}{|z_n - x_\rho|} \right)^{\frac{p-N}{p-1}}.$$

Thus, it follows from Remark 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \left((\mu_p(x_0))^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \right)^{-1} \left((\mu_p(x_\rho))^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \right) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_n - x_0|^{\frac{p-N}{p-1}}}{1 - u_0(x_n)} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - u_\rho(z_n)}{|z_n - x_\rho|^{\frac{p-N}{p-1}}} \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{|x_n - x_0|}{|z_n - x_\rho|} \right)^{\frac{p-N}{p-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\left(\frac{\mu_p(x_\rho)}{\mu_p(x_0)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-N}} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_n - x_0|}{|z_n - x_\rho|}.$$

Likewise, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{\mu_p(x_\rho)}{\mu_p(x_1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-N}} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|y_n - x_1|}{|z_n - x_\rho|}.$$

Hence, as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\nabla v_\rho(z_n)| |z_n - x_\rho|^{\frac{N-1}{p-1}}} &= \frac{1 - \rho}{|\nabla u_0(x_n)| |z_n - x_\rho|^{\frac{N-1}{p-1}}} + \frac{\rho}{|\nabla u_1(y_n)| |z_n - x_\rho|^{\frac{N-1}{p-1}}} \\ &= \left(\frac{|x_n - x_0|}{|z_n - x_\rho|} \right)^{\frac{N-1}{p-1}} \frac{1 - \rho}{|\nabla u_0(x_n)| |x_n - x_0|^{\frac{N-1}{p-1}}} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{|y_n - x_1|}{|z_n - x_\rho|} \right)^{\frac{N-1}{p-1}} \frac{\rho}{|\nabla u_1(y_n)| |y_n - x_1|^{\frac{N-1}{p-1}}}, \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\nabla v_\rho(z_n)| |z_n - x_\rho|^{\frac{N-1}{p-1}}} &\geq \left(\frac{\mu_p(x_\rho)}{\mu_p(x_0)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-N} \frac{N-1}{p-1}} \left(\frac{N\omega_N}{\mu_p(x_0)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} (1 - \rho) \\
&+ \left(\frac{\mu_p(x_\rho)}{\mu_p(x_1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-N} \frac{N-1}{p-1}} \left(\frac{N\omega_N}{\mu_p(x_1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \rho \\
&= (N\omega_N)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} (\mu_p(x_\rho))^{\frac{1}{p-N} \frac{N-1}{p-1}} \left(\frac{1 - \rho}{(\mu_p(x_0))^{\frac{1}{p-N}}} + \frac{\rho}{(\mu_p(x_1))^{\frac{1}{p-N}}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Inequality (28) then follows from the arbitrariness of $z_n \rightarrow x_\rho$. ■

5 Acknowledgments

The first author thanks the support of Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Minas Gerais - Fapemig/Brazil (CEX-APQ-03372-16 and PPM-00137-18) and Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico - CNPq/Brazil (306815/2017-6 and 422806/2018-8). The second author thanks the support of Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Capes/Brazil (Finance Code 001).

References

- [1] Barles, G., Busca, J.: Existence and comparison results for fully nonlinear degenerate elliptic equations without zeroth-order term, *Comm. PDE* **26** (2001) 2323–2337.
- [2] Dinca, G., Jebelean, P., Mawhin, J.: Variational and topological methods for Dirichlet problems with p-Laplacian, *Port. Math.* **58** (2001) 339–378.
- [3] Ercole, G., Pereira, G.: Asymptotics for the best Sobolev constants and their extremal functions, *Math. Nachr.* **289** (2016) 1433–1449.
- [4] Hynd, R., Lindgren, E.: Extremal functions for Morrey’s inequality in convex domains, *Math. Ann.* **375** (2019) 1721–1743.
- [5] Janfalk, U.: Behaviour in the limit, as $p \rightarrow \infty$, of minimizers of functionals involving p-Dirichlet integrals. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **27** (1996) 341–360.
- [6] Jensen, R.: Uniqueness of Lipschitz extensions: minimizing the sup norm of the gradient, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **123** (1993) 51–74.
- [7] Lewis, J.: Capacitary functions in convex rings, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **66** (1977) 201–224.

- [8] Lindqvist, P.: Notes on the infinity Laplace equation. SpringerBriefs in Mathematics. BCAM Basque Center for Applied Mathematics, Springer, Bilbao, 2016.
- [9] Lindqvist, P.: Notes on the p-Laplace equation (2nd edition). No. 161. University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, 2017.
- [10] Lindqvist, P., Manfredi, J.: The Harnack inequality for ∞ -harmonic functions, Electron. J. Differential Equations 1995 No. 4 (1995) 1–5.