

Estimates for sums of eigenvalues of the free plate with nonzero Poisson's ratio

Shan Li, Jing Mao*

Faculty of Mathematics and Statistics,
Key Laboratory of Applied Mathematics of Hubei Province,
Hubei University, Wuhan 430062, China
Email: jiner120@163.com

Abstract

By using the Fourier transform, we successfully give Kröger-type estimates for sums of eigenvalues of the free plate (under tension and with nonzero Poisson's ratio) in terms of the dimension of the ambient space, the volume of the domain, the tension parameter and the Poisson's ratio.

1 Introduction

For a bounded domain Ω in the Euclidean n -space \mathbb{R}^n with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, $n \geq 2$, the classical free membrane problem with the Neumann boundary condition is actually the following boundary value problem (BVP for short)

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + \mu u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \vec{\nu}} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where Δ is the Laplacian and $\vec{\nu}$ denotes the outward unit normal vector of $\partial\Omega$. It is well-known that Δ in (1.1) only has discrete spectrum and all the elements (i.e., eigenvalues), with finite multiplicity, in its spectrum can be listed non-decreasingly as follows

$$0 = \mu_1(\Omega) < \mu_2(\Omega) \leq \mu_3(\Omega) \leq \dots \uparrow \infty.$$

For the BVP (1.1), there are so many interesting and existing estimates for Neumann eigenvalues $\mu_i(\Omega)$. Here, we would like to mention the following two facts:

- (Szegő [7, 8], Weinberg [9]) *Among all domains with fixed volume, the lowest nonzero Neumann eigenvalue $\mu_2(\Omega)$ is maximized by a ball.*

*Corresponding author

MSC 2020: 35P15, 53C42.

Key Words: Eigenvalues; Fourier transform; The bi-Laplace operator; Free plate problem; Poisson's ratio.

- (Kröger [5]) *Estimates*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i(\Omega) \leq (2\pi)^2 \frac{n}{n+2} (w_n |\Omega|)^{\frac{2}{n}} m^{\frac{n+2}{n}}, \quad m \geq 1$$

and

$$\mu_{m+1}(\Omega) \leq (2\pi)^2 \left(\frac{n+2}{2w_n |\Omega|} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} m^{\frac{2}{n}}, \quad m \geq 0$$

hold, where $|\Omega|$, w_n denote the volume of Ω and the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n , respectively.

Consider the following eigenvalue problem of free plate under tension

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 u - \tau \Delta u = \Lambda u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \bar{\nu}^2} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \tau \frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{\nu}} - \operatorname{div}_{\partial\Omega} (\operatorname{Proj}_{\partial\Omega} [(D^2 u) \bar{\nu}]) - \frac{\partial \Delta u}{\partial \bar{\nu}} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where Δ^2 is the bi-Laplace operator in $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\operatorname{div}_{\partial\Omega}$ is the surface divergence on $\partial\Omega$, the operator $\operatorname{Proj}_{\partial\Omega}$ projects onto the space tangent to $\partial\Omega$, $D^2 u$ denotes the Hessian matrix, and other same symbols have the same meanings as those in (1.1). Physically, when $n = 2$, Ω is the shape of a homogeneous, isotropic plate, and the parameter τ is the ratio of lateral tension to flexural rigidity of the plate. Positive τ corresponds to a plate under tension, while negative τ gives us a plate under compression. Chasman [2, Section 4] proved that if $\tau \geq 0$, the operator $\Delta^2 - \tau \Delta$ in the BVP (1.2) has the discrete spectrum and all the eigenvalues, with finite multiplicity, in this spectrum can be listed non-decreasingly as follows

$$0 = \Lambda_1(\Omega) < \Lambda_2(\Omega) \leq \Lambda_3(\Omega) \leq \dots \uparrow \infty.$$

Moreover, Chasman [2, Theorem 1] showed that:

- Among all domains with fixed volume, the lowest nonzero eigenvalue $\Lambda_2(\Omega)$ for a free plate under tension (i.e., $\tau > 0$) is maximized by a ball.

Could one expect Kröger-type estimates for $\Lambda_i(\Omega)$ of the BVP (1.2) provided $\tau \geq 0$?

Very recently, Brandolini, Chiacchio and Langford [1, Theorem 1 and Corollary 2] gave a positive answer to the above question.

After getting the important isoperimetric inequality for $\Lambda_2(\Omega)$ of a free plate under tension, Chasman considered the following eigenvalue problem of free plate under tension and *with nonzero Poisson's ratio*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 u - \tau \Delta u = \Gamma u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ (1 - \sigma) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \bar{\nu}^2} + \sigma \Delta u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \tau \frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{\nu}} - (1 - \sigma) \operatorname{div}_{\partial\Omega} (\operatorname{Proj}_{\partial\Omega} [(D^2 u) \bar{\nu}]) - \frac{\partial \Delta u}{\partial \bar{\nu}} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where σ is the Poisson's ratio¹ and other same symbols have the same meanings as those in (1.2). Typically, σ is taken to be $\sigma \in [0, 0.5]$ for real-world materials, although a class of materials known as auxetics have negative Poisson's ratio. However, in order to be assured of coercivity of the sesquilinear form $a(u, v)$ defined by (2.1) (see also [3, Section 4]), one needs to require $\sigma \in (-1/(n-1), 1)$. Chasman [3, Section 4] explained that if $\tau \geq 0$ and $\sigma \in (-1/(n-1), 1)$, the operator $\Delta^2 - \tau\Delta$ in the BVP (1.3) has the discrete spectrum and all the eigenvalues², with finite multiplicity, in this spectrum can be listed non-decreasingly as follows

$$0 = \Gamma_1(\Omega) < \Gamma_2(\Omega) \leq \Gamma_3(\Omega) \leq \dots \uparrow \infty.$$

He also proved that similar to $\Lambda_2(\Omega)$, the ball with the same volume maximizes $\Gamma_2(\Omega)$ if the free plate is under tension and one of the followings holds:

- $n = 2$ and $\sigma > -51/97$ or $\tau \geq 3(\sigma - 1)/(\sigma + 1)$,
- $n = 3$,
- $n \geq 4$ and $\sigma \leq 0$ or $\tau \geq (n+2)/2$.

However, numerical and analytic evidences suggest that this fact should hold for $\tau > 0$, $\sigma \in (-1/(n-1), 1)$ – see [3, Section 8] for details. Based on this, Chasman [3] conjectured:

- *Among all domains with fixed volume, the lowest nonzero eigenvalue $\Gamma_2(\Omega)$ for a free plate under tension, with Poisson's ratio $\sigma \in (-1/(n-1), 1)$, is maximized by a ball.*

This conjecture is open, and the best partial answers so far are due to Chasman [2, 3].

Inspired by Brandolini-Chiacchio-Langford's Kröger-type estimates for $\Lambda_i(\Omega)$ and Chasman's Szegő-Weinberg type isoperimetric inequalities for $\Lambda_2(\Omega)$ and $\Gamma_2(\Omega)$, one might ask

Question. *Is it possible to get Kröger-type estimates for $\Gamma_i(\Omega)$ of the BVP (1.3) ?*

The answer is positive. In fact, we can prove:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a smooth bounded domain, and let $\Gamma_j(\Omega)$ be the j -th eigenvalue of the BVP (1.3). If $\tau \geq 0$ and $\sigma \in (-1/(n-1), 1)$, then*

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \Gamma_j(\Omega) \leq (2\pi)^4 \frac{n}{n+4} \left(\frac{1}{w_n |\Omega|} \right)^{\frac{4}{n}} m^{\frac{n+4}{4}} + \tau (2\pi)^2 \frac{n}{n+2} \left(\frac{1}{w_n |\Omega|} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} m^{\frac{n+2}{2}},$$

where, as before, $|\Omega|$, w_n denote the volume of Ω and the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n , respectively.

Inspired by the proof of Theorem 1.1 shown in Section 3 below, one can also get the following estimates.

¹ Poisson's ratio is a property of the material of the plate. Usually, if a material is stretched in one direction, it contracts in the orthogonal directions. In such situation, the value σ is a ratio of the strains. However, some materials expand in the orthogonal directions rather than contracting, and then have $\sigma < 0$, which leads to the situation that they are called auxetic.

² See also **FACT** in Section 2 for the reason why $\Gamma_i(\Omega)$ is nonnegative provided $\tau \geq 0$ and $\sigma \in (-1/(n-1), 1)$.

Corollary 1.2. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 1.1, we have:*

(1) *If $\tau > 0$, then*

$$\Gamma_{m+1}(\Omega) \leq \min_{r > 2\pi \left(\frac{m}{w_n|\Omega|}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}} \frac{nw_n|\Omega| \left(\frac{r^{n+4}}{n+4} + \tau \frac{r^{n+2}}{n+2}\right)}{w_n|\Omega|r^n - (2\pi)^nm}, \quad m \geq 0.$$

(2) *If $\tau = 0$, then*

$$\Gamma_{m+1}(\Omega) \leq (2\pi)^4 \left(\frac{m(n+4)}{4w_n|\Omega|}\right)^{\frac{4}{n}}, \quad m \geq 0.$$

Remark 1.3. (1) When $\tau \geq 0$, $\sigma \in [0, 1)$, the above three estimates have been shown in [4, Theorem 1.4]. Speaking in other words, Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 here can be seen as an extension of [4, Theorem 1.4].

(2) Chasman's conjecture mentioned above (i.e., the Szegő-Weinberg type isoperimetric inequality for $\Gamma_2(\Omega)$) and his partial answer to this conjecture tell us that conclusions for the BVP (1.2) might not be transferred to the case of the BVP (1.3) directly, that is to say, *for the eigenvalue problem of free plate under tension, sometimes, there exists difference between the zero Poisson's ratio case and the nonzero case*. Based on this fact, it is attractive that we can also get Kröger-type estimates for the BVP (1.3) under suitable assumptions.

(3) It is surprising that the Kröger-type upper bounds given in Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 are the same as those in [1, Theorem 1 and Corollary 2] for eigenvalues of the BVP (1.2). *This gives an example that sometimes there does not exist obvious difference between the zero Poisson's ratio case and the nonzero case*.

2 Boundary conditions

In this section, we would like to give an explanation to the rationality of boundary conditions such that one can understand the BVP (1.3) well.

As shown in [3], the sesquilinear form associated with the free plate problem (1.3) is defined as follows

$$a(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} \left[(1 - \sigma) \sum_{i,j=1}^n \overline{u_{x_i x_j}} v_{x_i x_j} + \sigma \overline{\Delta u} \Delta v + \tau \overline{Du} \cdot Dv \right] dx, \quad u, v \in H^2(\Omega), \quad (2.1)$$

where D is the gradient operator on Ω , and other symbols have the same meanings as before. Moreover, for the BVP (1.3), its generalized Rayleigh quotient $Q[u]$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned} Q[u] &:= \frac{\int_{\Omega} [(1 - \sigma)|D^2 u|^2 + \sigma(\Delta u)^2 + \tau|Du|^2] dx}{\int_{\Omega} |Du|^2 dx} \\ &= \frac{a(u, u)}{\|u\|_{L^2}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For the rest part of this section, we would consider the BVP (1.3) in the case $\tau \geq 0$ and $\sigma \in (-1/(n-1), 1)$. In fact, if $\tau \geq 0$ and $\sigma \in (-1/(n-1), 1)$, Chasman [3, Section 4] showed that

$a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is coercive, all eigenvalues $\Gamma_i(\Omega)$ is nonnegative and the corresponding eigenfunctions are *real-valued* and smooth on $\overline{\Omega}$. Hence, under the assumptions $\tau \geq 0$ and $\sigma \in (-1/(n-1), 1)$, one can neglect the effect of conjugate part of the form $a(u, v)$, that is to say, if $\tau \geq 0$ and $\sigma \in (-1/(n-1), 1)$, one can rewrite $a(u, v)$ as

$$a(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} \left[(1 - \sigma) \sum_{i,j=1}^n u_{x_i x_j} v_{x_i x_j} + \sigma \Delta u \Delta v + \tau Du \cdot Dv \right] dx, \quad u, v \in H^2(\Omega)$$

directly. In fact, about the BVP (1.3), one has the following fundamental fact:

- **FACT.** Let $u_i \in H^2(\Omega)$ be the eigenfunction of the i -th eigenvalue $\Gamma_i(\Omega)$, $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m$, $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Then one has

$$0 \leq \Gamma_{m+1}(\Omega) = \inf \left\{ \frac{a(u, u)}{\|u\|_{L^2}^2} \mid u \in H^2(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} uu_i dx = 0 \right\}$$

provided $\tau \geq 0$ and $\sigma \in (-1/(n-1), 1)$.

Proof. The characterization of $\Gamma_{m+1}(\Omega)$ (i.e., the equality case) can be easily obtained by variational method and the fact that eigenfunctions belonging to different eigenvalues are orthogonal with each other. If $\tau \geq 0$, $\sigma \in [0, 1)$, then the form $a(u, u)$ is obviously nonnegative, which implies the nonnegativity of $\Gamma_{m+1}(\Omega)$ naturally. If $\tau \geq 0$, $\sigma \in (-1/(n-1), 0)$, then by using [3, FACT1], one has

$$\begin{aligned} a(u, u) &\geq (1 - \sigma) \int_{\Omega} |D^2 u|^2 dx + n\sigma \int_{\Omega} |D^2 u|^2 dx + \tau \int_{\Omega} |Du|^2 dx \\ &= (1 + (n-1)\sigma) \int_{\Omega} |D^2 u|^2 dx + \tau \int_{\Omega} |Du|^2 dx \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the nonnegativity of $\Gamma_{m+1}(\Omega)$. Our **FACT** follows. \square

If u is the weak solution of (1.3), then we have

$$a(u, v) = \Gamma \int_{\Omega} uv dx, \quad u, v \in H^2(\Omega). \quad (2.2)$$

By direct calculation, one can obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \overline{Du} \cdot Dv dx = \int_{\partial\Omega} v \frac{\partial u}{\partial \vec{\nu}} ds - \int_{\Omega} v \Delta u dx$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \overline{u_{x_i x_j}} v_{x_i x_j} dx \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \left[Dv \cdot ((D^2 u) \cdot \vec{\nu}) - v \frac{\partial(\Delta u)}{\partial \vec{\nu}} \right] ds + \int_{\Omega} (\Delta^2 u) v dx \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \left[\frac{\partial v}{\partial \vec{\nu}} \cdot \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \vec{\nu}^2} - v \operatorname{div}_{\partial\Omega} (\operatorname{Proj}_{\partial\Omega} [(D^2 u) \vec{\nu}]) - v \frac{\partial(\Delta u)}{\partial \vec{\nu}} \right] ds + \int_{\Omega} (\Delta^2 u) v dx. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (2.1) and (2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} [(1-\sigma)(\Delta^2 u)v - \tau v \Delta u - \Gamma uv] dx + \sigma \int_{\Omega} \Delta v \overline{\Delta u} dx + \\ & \int_{\partial\Omega} \left\{ (1-\sigma) \left[\frac{\partial v}{\partial \vec{\nu}} \cdot \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \vec{\nu}^2} - v \operatorname{div}_{\partial\Omega} (\operatorname{Proj}_{\partial\Omega} [(D^2 u) \vec{\nu}]) - v \frac{\partial(\Delta u)}{\partial \vec{\nu}} \right] + \tau v \frac{\partial u}{\partial \vec{\nu}} \right\} ds \\ & = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Besides, applying the divergence theorem, one can easily get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \Delta v \overline{\Delta u} dx &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \Delta u \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vec{\nu}} ds - \int_{\Omega} D(\Delta u) \cdot Dv dx \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \Delta u \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vec{\nu}} ds - \left[\int_{\partial\Omega} v \frac{\partial(\Delta u)}{\partial \vec{\nu}} ds - \int_{\Omega} (\Delta^2 u) v dx \right] \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \left(\Delta u \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vec{\nu}} - v \frac{\partial(\Delta u)}{\partial \vec{\nu}} \right) ds + \int_{\Omega} (\Delta^2 u) v dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Combining (2.3) and (2.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (\Delta^2 u - \tau \Delta u - \Gamma u) v dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vec{\nu}} \left[(1-\sigma) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \vec{\nu}^2} + \sigma \Delta u \right] ds + \\ & \int_{\partial\Omega} v \left[\tau \frac{\partial u}{\partial \vec{\nu}} - (1-\sigma) \operatorname{div}_{\partial\Omega} (\operatorname{Proj}_{\partial\Omega} [(D^2 u) \vec{\nu}]) - \frac{\partial(\Delta u)}{\partial \vec{\nu}} \right] ds \\ & = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

In (2.5), taking $v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ to be a test function and observing that any smooth function $v \in C^\infty(\partial\Omega)$ can be extended to $C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\frac{\partial v}{\partial \vec{\nu}} = 0$ along the boundary $\partial\Omega$, one knows that the equation $\Delta^2 u - \tau \Delta u - \Gamma u = 0$ holds in Ω , together with two boundary conditions

$$(1-\sigma) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \vec{\nu}^2} + \sigma \Delta u = 0$$

and

$$\tau \frac{\partial u}{\partial \vec{\nu}} - (1-\sigma) \operatorname{div}_{\partial\Omega} (\operatorname{Proj}_{\partial\Omega} [(D^2 u) \vec{\nu}]) - \frac{\partial(\Delta u)}{\partial \vec{\nu}} = 0$$

in $\partial\Omega$, which is the BVP (1.3) exactly.

3 Proof of the main result

Now, we would like to use the method introduced in [5] to derive the estimate given in Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_m$ represent the orthogonal eigenfunctions in $H^2(\Omega)$ corresponding to $\Gamma_1(\Omega), \Gamma_2(\Omega), \dots, \Gamma_m(\Omega)$. Define

$$\Phi(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^m \phi_j(x) \phi_j(y), \quad x, y \in \Omega.$$

Let $\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)$ be the Fourier transform of Φ in the variable x , that is to say,

$$\widehat{\Phi}(z, y) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \int_{\Omega} \Phi(x, y) e^{ix \cdot z} dx.$$

Hence, one has

$$(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \widehat{\Phi}(z, y) = \sum_{j=1}^m \phi_j(y) \int_{\Omega} e^{iz \cdot x} \cdot \phi_j(x) dx.$$

Set $h_z(y) = e^{iy \cdot z}$ and define $\rho(z, y) := h_z(y) - (2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \widehat{\Phi}(z, y)$. It is easy to verify $\rho(z, y) \in H^2(\Omega)$. Using $\rho(z, y)$ as the test function in the generalized Rayleigh quotient Q yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{m+1}(\Omega) \leq Q[\rho(z, y)] &= \frac{\int_{\Omega} [(1-\sigma)|D^2\rho|^2 + \sigma(\Delta\rho)^2 + \tau|D\rho|^2] dy}{\int_{\Omega} \rho^2 dy} \\ &= \frac{(1-\sigma) \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j,k=1}^n |\rho(z, y)_{y_j y_k}|^2 dy + \sigma \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=1}^n |\rho(z, y)_{y_j y_j}|^2 dy + \tau \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=1}^n |\rho(z, y)_{y_j}|^2 dy}{\int_{\Omega} \rho^2 dy}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides of the above inequality by the denominator and integrating over $B_r = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |z| < r\}$ result into

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{m+1}(\Omega) \leq \inf_r \left\{ \frac{(1-\sigma) \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j,k=1}^n |\rho(z, y)_{y_j y_k}|^2 dy dz + \sigma \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=1}^n |\rho(z, y)_{y_j y_j}|^2 dy dz}{\int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \rho^2 dy dz} + \right. \\ \left. \frac{\tau \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=1}^n |\rho(z, y)_{y_j}|^2 dy dz}{\int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \rho^2 dy dz} \right\} \\ := \inf_r \left\{ \frac{N}{D} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the infimum is taken over the set $\left\{ r \mid r > 2\pi \left(\frac{m}{w_n |\Omega|} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right\}$. In order to get the conclusion, we need to estimate the numerator N and the denominator D . By (11) of [1], one has

$$D = w_n |\Omega| r^n - (2\pi)^n \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{B_r} |\widehat{\phi}_j(z)|^2 dz. \quad (3.1)$$

Rewrite N as follows

$$N = I_1 + I_2 + I_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \sum_{j,k=1}^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} (1-\sigma) |h_z(y)_{y_j y_k}|^2 dy dz + \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \sigma |h_z(y)_{y_j y_j}|^2 dy dz + \\ &\quad \tau \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} |h_z(y)_{y_j}|^2 dy dz, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= -2(1-\sigma)(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \sum_{j,k=1}^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} h_z(y)_{y_j y_k} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_k}} dy dz \right\} - \\
&\quad 2\sigma(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} h_z(y)_{y_j y_j} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}} dy dz \right\} - \\
&\quad 2\tau(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} h_z(y)_{y_j} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j}} dy dz \right\}, \\
I_3 &= (2\pi)^n \sum_{j,k=1}^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} (1-\sigma) |\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_k}|^2 dy dz + \\
&\quad (2\pi)^n \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \sigma |\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}|^2 dy dz + (2\pi)^n \tau \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} |\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j}|^2 dy dz.
\end{aligned}$$

For I_1 , using the facts

$$|h_z(y)| = |e^{iy \cdot z}| = 1, \quad |h_z(y)_{y_j}| = |z_j|, \quad |h_z(y)_{y_j y_k}| = |z_j| |z_k|,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} [(1-\sigma)|z|^4 + \sigma|z|^4 + \tau|z|^2] dy dz \\
&= n\omega_n |\Omega| \left(\frac{r^{n+4}}{n+4} + \tau \frac{r^{n+2}}{n+2} \right). \tag{3.2}
\end{aligned}$$

For I_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= -2(1-\sigma)(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \sum_{j,k=1}^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} h_z(y)_{y_j y_k} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}} dy dz \right\} \\
&\quad - 2\sigma(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} h_z(y)_{y_j y_j} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}} dy dz \right\} \\
&\quad - 2\tau(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} h_z(y)_{y_j} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j}} dy dz \right\} \\
&= -2(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{j,k=1}^n h_z(y)_{y_j y_k} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_k}} + \tau \sum_{j=1}^n h_z(y)_{y_j} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j}} \right) dy dz \right\} \\
&\quad + 2\sigma(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{j,k=1}^n h_z(y)_{y_j y_k} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_k}} - \sum_{j=1}^n h_z(y)_{y_j y_j} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}} \right) dy dz \right\} \\
&= 2\sigma(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{j,k=1}^n h_z(y)_{y_j y_k} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_k}} - \sum_{j=1}^n h_z(y)_{y_j y_j} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}} \right) dy dz \right\} \\
&\quad - 2(2\pi)^n \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{B_r} \Gamma_j(\Omega) |\widehat{\phi}_j(z)|^2 dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\widehat{\Phi}(z, y) = \sum_{j=1}^m \widehat{\phi}_j(z) \phi_j(y)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\sigma(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{j,k=1}^n h_z(y)_{y_j y_k} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_k}} - \sum_{j=1}^n h_z(y)_{y_j y_j} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}} \right) dy dz \right\} \\ &= 2\sigma(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \left(h_z(y) \overline{\Delta_y^2 \widehat{\Phi}(z, y)} - h_z(y) \overline{\Delta_y^2 \widehat{\Phi}(z, y)} \right) dy dz \right\} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can obtain

$$I_2 = -2(2\pi)^n \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{B_r} \Gamma_j(\Omega) |\widehat{\phi}_j(z)|^2 dz. \quad (3.3)$$

Finally, for I_3 , one has

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= (2\pi)^n \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{j,k=1}^n (1-\sigma) |\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_k}|^2 + \sigma \sum_{j=1}^n |\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}|^2 + \tau \sum_{j=1}^n |\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j}|^2 \right) dy dz \\ &= (2\pi)^n \sum_{l=1}^m \Gamma_l(\Omega) \int_{B_r} |\widehat{\phi}_l(z)|^2 dz - (2\pi)^n \sigma \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j,k=1}^n |\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_k}|^2 dy dz + \\ &\quad (2\pi)^n \sigma \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=1}^n |\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}|^2 dy dz. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & - (2\pi)^n \sigma \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j,k=1}^n |\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_k}|^2 dy dz + (2\pi)^n \sigma \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=1}^n |\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}|^2 dy dz \\ &= - (2\pi)^n \sigma \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j,k=1}^n \widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_k} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_k}} dy dz + (2\pi)^n \sigma \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=1}^n \widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j} \overline{\widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}} dy dz \\ &= - (2\pi)^n \sigma \int_{B_r} \int_{\Omega} \left(\widehat{\Phi}(z, y) \overline{\Delta_y^2 \widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}} - \widehat{\Phi}(z, y) \overline{\Delta_y^2 \widehat{\Phi}(z, y)_{y_j y_j}} \right) dy dz \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can deduce that

$$I_3 = (2\pi)^n \sum_{l=1}^m \Gamma_l(\Omega) \int_{B_r} |\widehat{\phi}_l(z)|^2 dz. \quad (3.4)$$

Combining (3.2)-(3.4), it is easy to know

$$N = n w_n |\Omega| \left(\frac{r^{n+4}}{n+4} + \tau \frac{r^{n+2}}{n+2} \right) - (2\pi)^n \sum_{l=1}^m \Gamma_l(\Omega) \int_{B_r} |\widehat{\phi}_l(z)|^2 dz,$$

which, together with (3.1), implies

$$\Gamma_{m+1}(\Omega) \leq \inf_{r > 2\pi \left(\frac{m}{w_n|\Omega|}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}} \left\{ \frac{\frac{nw_n}{(2\pi)^n}|\Omega| \left(\frac{r^{n+4}}{n+4} + \tau \frac{r^{n+2}}{n+2}\right) - \sum_{l=1}^m \Gamma_l(\Omega) \int_{B_r} |\widehat{\phi}_l(z)|^2 dz}{\frac{w_n|\Omega|r^n}{(2\pi)^n} - \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{B_r} |\widehat{\phi}_j(z)|^2 dz} \right\}. \quad (3.5)$$

By Plancherel's Theorem, one has

$$\int_{B_r} |\widehat{\phi}_j(z)|^2 \leq 1 \quad (3.6)$$

for each j . Applying **FACT** in Section 2 (equivalently, the nonnegativity of eigenvalues), (3.6) and [1, Lemma A1] (see also [6]) to (3.5) yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \Gamma_j(\Omega) \leq \inf_{r > 2\pi \left(\frac{m}{w_n|\Omega|}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}} \left\{ \frac{nw_n}{(2\pi)^n}|\Omega| \left(\frac{r^{n+4}}{n+4} + \tau \frac{r^{n+2}}{n+2}\right) \right\}.$$

The estimate in Theorem 1.1 follows directly by letting $r \rightarrow 2\pi \left(\frac{m}{w_n|\Omega|}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}$. \square

Finally, we have:

Proof of Corollary 1.2. It follows from (3.5) and (3.6) that

$$\Gamma_{m+1}(\Omega) \leq \inf_{r > 2\pi \left(\frac{m}{w_n|\Omega|}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}} \left\{ \frac{\frac{nw_n}{(2\pi)^n}|\Omega| \left(\frac{r^{n+4}}{n+4} + \tau \frac{r^{n+2}}{n+2}\right)}{\frac{w_n|\Omega|r^n}{(2\pi)^n} - m} \right\},$$

which is the first estimate in Corollary 1.2. Define a function $F(r)$ as

$$F(r) := \frac{\frac{nw_n}{(2\pi)^n}|\Omega| \left(\frac{r^{n+4}}{n+4} + \tau \frac{r^{n+2}}{n+2}\right)}{\frac{w_n|\Omega|r^n}{(2\pi)^n} - m}, \quad r > 2\pi \left(\frac{m}{w_n|\Omega|}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

If $\tau = 0$, then

$$F'(r) = [w_n|\Omega|r^n - m(2\pi)^n]^{-2} \cdot \left\{ nw_n|\Omega|r^{n+3} (w_n|\Omega|r^n - m(2\pi)^n) - nw_n|\Omega|r^{n-1} \frac{n}{n+4} w_n|\Omega|r^{n+4} \right\}.$$

Solving the equation $F'(r) = 0$ yields its solution $r_0 = 2\pi \left(\frac{m(n+4)}{4w_n|\Omega|}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}$. The second estimate in Corollary 1.2 follows directly by using the fact $\Gamma_{m+1}(\Omega) \leq F(r_0)$. \square

Acknowledgments

This work is partially supported by the NSF of China (Grant Nos. 11801496 and 11926352), the Fok Ying-Tung Education Foundation (China) and Hubei Key Laboratory of Applied Mathematics (Hubei University).

References

- [1] B. Brandolini, F. Chiacchio, J.-J. Langford, *Estimates for sums of eigenvalues of the free plate via the fourier transform*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. **19**(1) (2020) 113–122.
- [2] L.-M. Chasman, *An isoperimetric inequality for fundamental tones of free plates*, Commun. Math. Phys. **303** (2011) 421–449.
- [3] L.-M. Chasman, *An isoperimetric inequality for fundamental tones of free plates with nonzero Poisson's ratio*, Applicable Analysis **95** (2016) 1700–1735.
- [4] F. Du, J. Mao, Q.-L. Wang, C.-Y. Xia, Y. Zhao, *Estimates for eigenvalues of the Neumann and Steklov problems*, available online at arXiv:1902.08998.
- [5] P. Kröger, *Estimates for sums of eigenvalues of the Laplacian*, J. Funct. Anal. **126**(1) (1994) 217–227.
- [6] L. Li, L. Tang, *Some upper bounds for sums of eigenvalues of the Neumann Laplacian*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **134** (2006) 3301–3307.
- [7] G. Szegő, *On membranes and plates*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **36** (1950) 210–216.
- [8] G. Szegő, *Note to my paper “On membranes and plates”*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **44** (1958) 314–316.
- [9] H.-F. Weinberg, *An isoperimetric inequality for the N-dimensional free membrane problem*, J. Rational Mech. Anal. **5** (1956) 633–636.