

# ON THE (GROWING) GAP BETWEEN DIRICHLET AND NEUMANN EIGENVALUES

PEDRO FREITAS

ABSTRACT. We provide an answer to a question raised by Levine and Weinberger in their 1986 paper concerning the difference between Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues of the Laplacian on bounded domains in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . More precisely, we show that for a certain class of domains there exists a sequence  $p(k)$  such that  $\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k+p(k)}$  for sufficiently large  $k$ . This sequence, which is given explicitly, grows with  $k^{1-1/n}$  as  $k$  goes to infinity, which we conjecture to be optimal, and may be chosen independently of the domain. We also prove the existence of a sequence, now not given explicitly and only of order  $k^{1-3/n}$  but valid for bounded Lipschitz domains in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  ( $n \geq 4$ ), for which a similar inequality holds for all  $k$ . From these results and the analysis of some particular examples we formulate a conjecture for general Euclidean domains.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalue problems for the Laplacian on a bounded domain  $\Omega$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  defined by

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u + \lambda u = 0, & x \in \Omega \\ u = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

and

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta v + \mu v = 0, & x \in \Omega \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

respectively, where  $\nu$  denotes the outer unit normal on the boundary of  $\Omega$ . We shall denote the corresponding spectra by  $\Sigma_D$  and  $\Sigma_N$ , respectively, and write the eigenvalues as

$$0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots$$

and

$$0 = \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots$$

The study of inequalities of the type  $\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k+m}$  for all  $k$  and some fixed  $m$  dates at least as far back as the work of Payne in 1955, who showed that  $\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k+2}$  for planar convex domains with a sufficiently smooth boundary [P55]. It took about thirty years for this result to be generalised to higher dimensions by Aviles [A86] and Levine and Weinberger [LW86] in 1986. Among other

---

*Date:* May 29, 2024.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35P15 Secondary: 35P20.

results where the curvature of the boundary plays a key role, it is shown in [LW86] that for smooth bounded convex domains in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  we have

$$(1.3) \quad \lambda_k \geq \mu_{k+n}.$$

The other main development in this direction was made by Friedlander in 1991, who proved a conjecture of Payne's (see [L88, P91]), namely, that

$$(1.4) \quad \lambda_k > \mu_{k+1}$$

for all bounded sufficiently smooth domains  $\Omega$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  [F91] – a different proof that extended this result to domains for which an embedding condition is satisfied was later given by Filonov [F05]; see also Remark 1.9 in [S08], observing that Filonov's proof holds for general domains.

In this paper we shall consider two aspects related to inequalities between Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues. The first of these is motivated by a question posed at the end of [LW86], asking whether inequality (1.3) may be replaced by a better inequality of the form

$$(1.5) \quad \lambda_k > \mu_{\phi(n,k)}$$

for convex  $n$ -dimensional domains. See also the comments in the second to last paragraph on page 44 of [M91], referring to the behaviour for large  $k$ . To address this question, we consider the two-term Weyl asymptotics for eigenvalues of problems (1.1) and (1.2), namely,

$$(1.6) \quad \lambda_k = c_0 k^{2/n} + c_1 k^{1/n} + o(k^{1/n})$$

and

$$\mu_k = c_0 k^{2/n} - c_1 k^{1/n} + o(k^{1/n}),$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Here

$$c_0 = \frac{4\pi^2}{(\omega_n |\Omega|)^{2/n}} \quad \text{and} \quad c_1 = \frac{2\pi^2 \omega_{n-1} |\partial\Omega|}{n (\omega_n |\Omega|)^{1+1/n}}$$

where  $\omega_n$  denotes the volume of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and, with a slight abuse of notation,  $|\Omega|$  and  $|\partial\Omega|$  denote the  $n$ - and  $(n-1)$ -volume of  $\Omega$  and  $\partial\Omega$ , respectively. The above asymptotics hold under a *non-periodicity condition* on the set of the billiard orbits defined on  $\Omega$ , namely, that the set of such orbits which are periodic has measure zero – see [SV97] for precise definitions and statements. This yields that for domains for which these two-term asymptotics are valid, such as convex domains with an analytic boundary or convex polyhedra, the difference between Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues satisfies

$$\lambda_k - \mu_k = 2c_1 k^{1/n} + o(k^{1/n}),$$

growing to infinity with  $k$  and thus suggesting that it might be possible to determine an increasing sequence of natural numbers  $p = p(k)$  for which  $\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k+p(k)}$ . As far as we are aware, all existing results for differences between Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues pertain to a fixed gap between the corresponding Dirichlet and Neumann indexes. One of the aims of this paper is thus to provide a first answer to Levine and Weinberger's question and show that *better inequalities* of the form (1.5) are indeed possible in dimensions two and higher. More precisely, we shall prove that there exists an index function  $\phi(n, k) = k + p(k)$  with the sequence  $p(k)$  of order  $k^{1-1/n}$  and independent of the domain, such that  $\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k+p(k)}$  for all sufficiently large values of  $k$  – see Theorem 2.1 for the precise formulation of this result.

For general Lipschitz domains and in dimensions higher than three, we show that there exists a sequence  $p(k)$  such that  $\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k+p(k)}$  for all  $k$ , as a direct consequence of a result of Safarov and Filonov's for the difference between the counting functions for Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues. However, now  $p$  depends on an unspecified constant and its asymptotic behaviour is slightly worse than that of the sequence above – see Theorem 2.2 and Remark 2.4 for a discussion of the two results.

The second aspect we consider concerning this type of inequality turns up as a consequence of the proof of Theorem 2.1. Together with the above two-term asymptotic expansions, it turns out that another key ingredient appearing in the proof of Theorem 2.1 is the Euclidean geometric isoperimetric inequality, namely,

$$(1.7) \quad |\partial\Omega| \geq n |\Omega|^{1-1/n} \omega_n^{1/n}.$$

This points in the direction that convexity might not be a crucial condition, or that at least it might be possible to hope for a result of this type for all bounded domains. A role of the isoperimetric inequality is to determine the form of the asymptotic behaviour of  $p$  as  $k$  goes to infinity. This connection was also noted in [CMS19] with respect to the number of Neumann eigenvalues which are smaller than or equal to the first Dirichlet eigenvalue. We note further that the proof of the results for rectangles given in Section 3.1, now valid for all  $k$ , also makes the corresponding relation between the perimeter and area of a rectangle appear explicitly. In fact one of the results we obtain is of the form

$$\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k + \left\lfloor P \sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi A}} \right\rfloor} \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

where  $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$  denotes the floor function, with  $P$  and  $A$  the perimeter and area of the rectangle, respectively. This points in the direction that the larger the isoperimetric constant associated with the rectangle, the larger the gap between the indexes of the corresponding Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues appearing in the inequalities. It is possible to do variations on these inequalities, either emphasising the dependence on the side-lengths of the rectangle or on obtaining inequalities which are independent of these – see Section 3.1 for other results.

On the other hand, it is known that inequalities of this type between Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues in some non-Euclidean settings such as spheres, may not hold and may, in fact, be reversed – see the results and discussions in [AL97], [L88] and [M91]; in particular, the second and third papers both refer back to a result that may be found in [C84], namely, that for geodesic disks on  $\mathbb{S}^n$  whose radius is strictly between  $\pi/2$  and  $\pi$ , we have  $\lambda_1 < \mu_2$ . Note that for these disks the non-periodicity condition is not satisfied, again suggesting this to be a relevant condition. We also have that the isoperimetric inequality satisfied by domains on  $\mathbb{S}^n$  is, of course, not the same as that in  $n$ -Euclidean space but, as we shall see in Section 3.3, this by itself will not be an obstacle for inequalities analogous to those in Euclidean space to hold.

Based on the combination of results obtained we believe that the two key ingredients mentioned above and which appear in the proof of Theorem 2.1 are decisive factors for a result of this type to hold. As such, we formulate the following conjecture for general Euclidean bounded domains – note that the non-periodicity condition is conjectured to hold for general Euclidean domains.

**Conjecture 1.** Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then its Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues satisfy the inequalities

$$\lambda_k(\Omega) \geq \mu_{k+p(k)}(\Omega), \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

where  $p(k) = \left\lfloor \frac{n\omega_{n-1}}{2\omega_n^{1-2/n}} k^{1-1/n} \right\rfloor$ . Furthermore, the power  $1 - 1/n$  is optimal.

In essence, this is stating that Theorem 2.1 holds for all positive integer  $k$ , and that the power in  $k$  given there cannot be improved.

It is also possible to formulate other conjectures with a sequence  $p$  depending on the isoperimetric constant of the given domain. As an example, consider the following conjecture which, for simplicity, is only stated in the planar case. This is now essentially the result for rectangles in Theorem 3.1, already mentioned above.

**Conjecture 2.** Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded planar domain with perimeter  $P$  and area  $A$ . Then its Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues satisfy the inequalities  $\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k+\left\lfloor P\sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi A}} \right\rfloor}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Remark 1.1.** As has been pointed out in [BLP09], the claim made in [LW86] that for the annular sector given by

$$D = \{(r, \theta) : 1 < r < 2 \wedge 0 < \theta < 3\pi/2\}$$

we have  $\mu_3 > \lambda_1$  is incorrect – note that if this were not the case, it would immediately prove both conjectures wrong. As is well known, both the Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues of  $D$  may be obtained by separation of variables and then solving the resulting equations involving the Bessel functions  $J_{2k/3}$ ,  $J_{2k/3\pm 1}$ ,  $Y_{2k/3}$  and  $Y_{2k/3\pm 1}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . The first Dirichlet eigenvalue is given by  $\lambda_1(D) \approx 9.96001$ , while the corresponding Neumann eigenvalues are (approximately) given by

$$\{0, 0.204718, 0.811126, 1.79721, 3.13054, 4.77455, 6.69575, 8.86914, 10.2181, 10.4649\}.$$

We thus see that the first Neumann eigenvalue to be larger than  $\lambda_1(D)$  is  $\mu_9(D)$ . We further note that this behaviour is not very different from what one has for a rectangle with side lengths 1 and  $9\pi/4$ , corresponding to a rectangle with the same perimeter and area as the annular sector. In this case  $\lambda_1 = \pi^2 + 16/81 \approx 10.0671$ , and the first ten Neumann eigenvalues are (approximately) given by

$$\{0., 0.197531, 0.790123, 1.77778, 3.16049, 4.93827, 7.11111, 9.67901, 9.8696, 10.0671\},$$

showing that  $\mu_{10}$  is now the first Neumann eigenvalue to equal  $\lambda_1$ .

## 2. GENERAL RESULTS FOR EUCLIDEAN DOMAINS

In this section we provide what might be called proof-of-concept results, the first of which requiring the non-periodicity condition to hold, and valid only for sufficiently large enough values of the indexes.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded domain satisfying the non-periodicity condition and which is not a ball. Then there exists  $k^* = k^*(\Omega)$  such that*

$$\lambda_k(\Omega) \geq \mu_{k+p}(\Omega), \text{ for all } k \geq k^*$$

$$\text{where } p = \left\lfloor \frac{n\omega_{n-1}}{2\omega_n^{1-2/n}} k^{1-1/n} \right\rfloor.$$

*Proof.* From

$$\lambda_k = c_0 k^{2/n} + c_1 k^{1/n} + r_D(k)$$

and

$$\mu_k = c_0 k^{2/n} - c_1 k^{1/n} + r_N(k)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{k+p} &= c_0(k+p)^{2/n} - c_1(k+p)^{1/n} + r_N(k) \\ &= c_0 k^{2/n} \left(1 + \frac{p}{k}\right)^{2/n} - c_1 k^{1/n} \left(1 + \frac{p}{k}\right)^{1/n} + r_N(k) \\ &= c_0 k^{2/n} + c_1 k^{1/n} + r_D(k) \\ &\quad + c_0 k^{2/n} \left[ \left(1 + \frac{p}{k}\right)^{2/n} - 1 \right] - c_1 k^{1/n} \left[ 1 + \left(1 + \frac{p}{k}\right)^{1/n} \right] + r_N(k) - r_D(k) \\ &= \lambda_k + c_0 k^{2/n} \left[ \left(1 + \frac{p}{k}\right)^{2/n} - 1 \right] - c_1 k^{1/n} \left[ 1 + \left(1 + \frac{p}{k}\right)^{1/n} \right] + r_N(k) - r_D(k). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\lambda_k - \mu_{k+p} = r_D(k) - r_N(k) + \underbrace{c_1 k^{1/n} \left[ 1 + \left(1 + \frac{p}{k}\right)^{1/n} \right] - c_0 k^{2/n} \left[ \left(1 + \frac{p}{k}\right)^{2/n} - 1 \right]}_{g(n,k,p)}.$$

The remainder of the proof is divided into two parts. We shall first derive a condition for the term  $g(n, k, p)$  on the right to be positive, and then show that this is satisfied by the expression for  $p$  given above. We then show that this gives a term of order  $k^{1/n}$ , and is thus larger than the difference  $r_D(k) - r_N(k) = o(k^{1/n})$  for sufficiently large  $k$ .

Letting  $x = (k+p)^{1/n}$  we may write  $g$  as

$$\begin{aligned} g(n, k, p) &= c_1 (k^{1/n} + x) - c_0 (x^2 - k^{2/n}) \\ (2.1) \quad &= -c_0 x^2 + c_1 x + (c_0 k^{2/n} + c_1 k^{1/n}). \end{aligned}$$

This will be positive if

$$\begin{aligned} (0 \leq) x &\leq \frac{c_1 + \sqrt{c_1^2 + 4k^{1/n}(c_0 k^{1/n} + c_1)c_0}}{2c_0} \\ &= \frac{c_1}{c_0} + k^{1/n}. \end{aligned}$$

We thus have that  $p$  must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} p &\leq \left( \frac{c_1}{c_0} + k^{1/n} \right)^n - k \\ &= \left[ \frac{\omega_{n-1} |\partial\Omega|}{2n (\omega_n |\Omega|)^{1-1/n}} + k^{1/n} \right]^n - k \end{aligned}$$

From the Euclidean geometric isoperimetric inequality (1.7) we have that the right-hand side above satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \frac{\omega_{n-1} |\partial\Omega|}{2n (\omega_n |\Omega|)^{1-1/n}} + k^{1/n} \right]^n - k &\geq \left( \frac{\omega_{n-1}}{2\omega_n^{1-1/(2n)}} + k^{1/n} \right)^n - k \\ &= k \left[ \left( 1 + \frac{\omega_{n-1}}{2\omega_n^{1-2/n}} \times \frac{1}{k^{1/n}} \right)^n - 1 \right] \\ &> k \left( 1 + \frac{n\omega_{n-1}}{2\omega_n^{1-2/n}} \times \frac{1}{k^{1/n}} - 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{n\omega_{n-1}}{2\omega_n^{1-2/n}} \times k^{1-1/n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the strict inequality comes from applying Bernoulli's inequality with  $n$  greater than or equal to two. From this it follows that if we take  $p$  to satisfy

$$(2.2) \quad p = \left\lfloor \frac{n\omega_{n-1}}{2\omega_n^{1-2/n}} k^{1-1/n} \right\rfloor$$

then  $g$  is a strictly positive function. It remains to prove that the resulting term when  $p$  takes on this value is of order  $k^{1/n}$ . We first note that from (2.1) it follows that  $g$  will be strictly decreasing in  $p$  for sufficiently large  $k$ . Thus, showing that this will be of order  $k^{1/n}$  for a value of  $p$  larger than that given by (2.2) will imply the desired result. From

$$p = \left\lfloor \frac{n\omega_{n-1}}{2\omega_n^{1-2/n}} k^{1-1/n} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{n\omega_{n-1}}{2\omega_n^{1-2/n}} k^{1-1/n} \leq n \frac{c_1}{c_0} k^{1-1/n}$$

we see that it is enough to prove the asymptotic behaviour for  $g\left(n, k, n \frac{c_1}{c_0} k^{1-1/n}\right)$ . Writing

$$g\left(n, k, n \frac{c_1}{c_0} k^{1-1/n}\right) = c_1 k^{1/n} \left[ 1 + \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha}{k^{1/n}} \right)^{1/n} \right] - c_0 k^{2/n} \left[ \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha}{k^{1/n}} \right)^{2/n} - 1 \right]$$

with  $\alpha = \frac{n\omega_{n-1}}{2\omega_n^{1-1/n}}$ , we then have

$$\begin{aligned} g\left(n, k, n \frac{c_1}{c_0} k^{1-1/n}\right) &\approx k^{1/n} \left[ c_1 + c_1 \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha}{nk^{1/n}} + \dots \right) - c_0 k^{1/n} \left( 1 + \frac{2\alpha}{nk^{1/n}} + \dots - 1 \right) \right] \\ &= k^{1/n} \left( 2c_1 + \frac{\alpha}{nk^{1/n}} - 2 \frac{\alpha c_0}{n} + \dots \right) \\ &= 2 \left( c_1 - \frac{\alpha c_0}{n} \right) k^{1/n} + O(1), \end{aligned}$$

as  $k$  goes to infinity. Since  $\alpha < \frac{nc_1}{c_0}$ , provided  $\Omega$  is not a ball, the coefficient affecting the leading term  $k^{1/n}$  is strictly positive, proving the result.  $\square$

**Remark 2.1.** We believe the exclusion of the ball from the result to be a purely technical matter.

**Remark 2.2.** We have

$$\frac{n\omega_{n-1}}{2\omega_n^{1-2/n}} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}4^{\frac{1}{n}-1}n \left(n\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)\right)^{\frac{n-2}{n}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)} \approx e\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}n + o(\sqrt{n}) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This means that for large  $n$  we cannot expect this sequence  $p$  to be optimal when  $k$  is one, at least for convex domains for which we know that (1.3) holds.

**Remark 2.3.** Since the asymptotic behaviour of eigenvalues of the Laplace operator with Robin boundary conditions follows the same behaviour as the two-term asymptotics for the Neumann problem, the above result also holds for Robin boundary conditions of the form  $\partial u/\partial \nu + \beta u = 0$  with positive  $\beta$ . However, in this case and since for any given integer  $m$ , by making  $\beta$  large enough, we can make the first  $m$  eigenvalues of the Robin spectrum as close to the corresponding first  $m$  Dirichlet eigenvalues as we want, we cannot expect any such set of inequalities to be valid for all  $k$  without imposing any further restrictions. When  $\beta$  is allowed to be negative, then it was shown in [GM09] that Friedlander's inequalities (1.4) continue to hold, and that this also extends to more general (nonlocal) Robin boundary conditions.

Using the result of Safarov and Filonov's for the difference  $N_N(\lambda) - N_D(\lambda)$  mentioned in the Introduction [SF10], we may prove a result for all  $k$  and general Lipschitz domains. The price to pay is that this does not provide an explicit constant and the asymptotic growth in  $k$  is weaker.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  ( $n \geq 4$ ) with a Lipschitz boundary. Then there exists a positive constant  $C_\Omega$  such that*

$$\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k+\lfloor C_\Omega k^{1-3/n} \rfloor}$$

for all positive integer  $k$ .

**Remark 2.4.** This result has the advantage that it does hold for all  $k$  and general Lipschitz domains. On the other hand, and apart from requiring  $n$  greater than or equal to four to provide relevant information, the constant  $C_\Omega$  is not explicit and the exponent  $1 - 3/n$  is smaller than the corresponding  $1 - 1/n$  exponent in Theorem 2.1. The latter exponent corresponds to the conjecture mentioned in Remark 4.3 in [SF10].

*Proof.* Define the Dirichlet and Neumann counting functions by

$$(2.3) \quad N_D(\lambda) = \#\{\lambda_k \in \Sigma_D : \lambda_k < \lambda\} \quad \text{and} \quad N_N(\lambda) = \#\{\mu_k \in \Sigma_N : \mu_k < \lambda\} .$$

We now start from a consequence of Theorem 4.1 in [SF10], namely equation (4.3) in that paper that states that for Lipschitz domains in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  there exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega)$  such that these functions satisfy

$$N_N(\lambda) - N_D(\lambda) \geq C(\Omega)\lambda^{(n-3)/2}$$

for all positive values of  $\lambda$ . Take  $\lambda \in (\lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1})$  for some  $k$ . Then  $N_D(\lambda) = k$  and we have from [LY83] that  $\lambda$  satisfies

$$\lambda > \lambda_k \geq \frac{n}{n+2} c_0 k^{2/n},$$

where  $c_0$  is the same constant as in the first term in the Weyl asymptotics (1.6). Hence

$$N_N(\lambda) \geq k + C(\Omega) \left( \frac{n}{n+2} c_0 \right)^{(n-3)/2} k^{(n-3)/n} = k + C_\Omega k^{1-3/n},$$

for some constant  $C_\Omega$ . We thus conclude that

$$\lambda \geq \mu_{N_N(\lambda)} \geq \mu_{k+C_\Omega k^{1-3/n}}$$

and since we may take  $\lambda$  arbitrarily close to  $\lambda_k$  we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

### 3. TWO-DIMENSIONAL EXAMPLES

The purpose of this section is to explore further examples illustrating the type of results that may be expected to hold. For simplicity we have restricted ourselves to the planar case.

**3.1. Rectangles.** We begin by giving two different results for rectangles to illustrate what may (and may not) be expected for general domains. Similar results may be obtained for higher dimensions, essentially in the same way but with the calculations becoming more involved.

**Theorem 3.1.** *For any rectangle and all positive integer  $k$  we have  $\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k + \left\lfloor P \sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi A}} \right\rfloor}$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.4. Let  $R$  be a rectangle with side lengths  $a$  and  $b$ . The Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues of  $R$  are given by

$$\lambda_k = \pi^2 \left( \frac{q^2}{a^2} + \frac{r^2}{b^2} \right), q, r \in \mathbb{N}$$

and

$$\mu_k = \pi^2 \left( \frac{q^2}{a^2} + \frac{r^2}{b^2} \right), q, r \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

As usual we associate this with an integer lattice counting problem on the plane  $qr$ . With  $N_D$  and  $N_N$  the counting functions defined by (2.3) we have that the difference between these two functions is now given precisely by the number of points on the positive  $q$  and  $r$  axes plus one (corresponding to the zero Neumann eigenvalue). More precisely,

$$N_N(\lambda) - N_D(\lambda) = 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{a\sqrt{\lambda}}{\pi} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{b\sqrt{\lambda}}{\pi} \right\rfloor.$$



We now proceed exactly as before, except that since rectangles satisfy Pólya's conjecture we have the stronger inequality  $\lambda_k \geq 4\pi k/(ab)$  yielding

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.1) \quad N_N(\lambda) &\geq k + 1 + \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{\frac{ak}{b\pi}} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{\frac{bk}{a\pi}} \right\rfloor \\
 &= k + \left\lfloor 2 \left( \frac{a+b}{\sqrt{ab}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi}} \right\rfloor \\
 &= k + \left\lfloor P \sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi A}} \right\rfloor.
 \end{aligned}$$

The remaining part of the proof now follows as before.  $\square$

Following in a similar path, but then considering some exceptional cases separately, it is possible to derive a result independent of the dimensions of the rectangle.

**Theorem 3.2.** *For any rectangle and all positive integer  $k$  the corresponding eigenvalues satisfy*

$$\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k+\lfloor 2\sqrt{k} \rfloor+1}.$$

*Proof.* For simplicity we shall fix the area of the rectangle to be one, and take side lengths to equal  $b = 1/a \leq 1 \leq a$ . As in the proof of Theorem 3.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 N_N(\lambda) - N_D(\lambda) &= 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{a\sqrt{\lambda}}{\pi} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{a\pi} \right\rfloor \\
 &\geq 1 + \left\lfloor 2a\sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi}} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{2}{a}\sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi}} \right\rfloor.
 \end{aligned}$$

We want to prove that the functions  $g_k : [1, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  defined by

$$g_k(a) = \left\lfloor 2a\sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi}} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{2}{a}\sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi}} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{k} \right\rfloor$$

are non-negative for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We shall break the proof into several cases.

First we observe that if  $a \geq \sqrt{\pi}$  we have  $\left\lfloor 2a\sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi}} \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{k} \right\rfloor$  and  $g_k(a) \geq 0$ .

Using  $\lfloor x \rfloor + \lfloor y \rfloor + 1 \geq \lfloor x + y \rfloor$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 g_k(a) &\geq \left\lfloor 2 \left( a + \frac{1}{a} \right) \sqrt{\frac{k}{\pi}} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{k} \right\rfloor - 1 \\
 &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{4}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{k} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{k} \right\rfloor - 1 \\
 &= \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{k} + \left( \frac{4}{\sqrt{\pi}} - 2 \right) \sqrt{k} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{k} \right\rfloor - 1
 \end{aligned}$$

and so the results holds if  $\left(\frac{4}{\sqrt{\pi}} - 2\right) \sqrt{k} \geq 1$ , which is equivalent to  $k \geq \frac{\pi}{(4 - 2\sqrt{\pi})^2} \approx 15.2$ .

It remains thus to prove the result for  $k = 1, \dots, 15$  and  $1 \leq a < \sqrt{\pi}$ . If we analyse the original function  $g_k$  for  $a \in [1, \sqrt{\pi})$  and  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 15$  we see that non-negativity fails for  $k = 1, 3, 4, 7, 9$  – see Figure 1; a rigorous analysis may be carried out for each case, but since this is similar to what is presented below for the five exceptional values of  $k$ , we skip those calculations here. In order to prove the result in these cases, we will use a stronger inequality




FIGURE 1. Graphs of  $g_k(a)$  for  $a \in [1, \sqrt{\pi})$  and  $k = 1, \dots, 15$ .

than Pólya's, namely, we shall estimate each of these eigenvalues by their optimal values under an area restriction. This problem was considered in [AF13], and the optimal values  $a_k^*$  and  $\lambda_k^*$  for the values of  $k$  mentioned above are given in Table 1. Using each of these values as a

$k$	1	3	4	7	9
$(a_k^*)^4$	1	1	$\frac{8}{3}$	$\frac{7}{3}$	$\frac{3}{2}$
$\lambda_k^*$	$2\pi^2$	$5\pi^2$	$\frac{35\pi^2}{2\sqrt{6}}$	$\frac{55\pi^2}{\sqrt{21}}$	$\frac{35\pi^2}{\sqrt{6}}$

TABLE 1. Optimal values  $a_k^*$  and  $\lambda_k^*$  for  $k = 1, 3, 4, 7, 9$  (taken from [AF13]).

lower bound for the corresponding eigenvalue, it is possible to obtain stronger bounds for the difference  $N_N(\lambda) - N_D(\lambda) = N_N(\lambda) - k$ .

$k = 1$ : We have  $\lambda_1 \geq 2\pi^2$  which, when replaced in the original expression for  $N_N$  with  $N_D = 1$ , yields  $N_N(\lambda) \geq 1 + 1 + \lfloor \sqrt{2}a \rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{2}}{a} \right\rfloor$ . Possible transition points occur when  $a$  equals either  $m\sqrt{2}$  or  $\sqrt{2}/m$  for positive integer  $m$ , these being the only points that need to be checked, and only when yielding values between 1 and  $\sqrt{\pi}$ . Since

$$\lfloor \sqrt{2}a \rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{2}}{a} \right\rfloor = \begin{cases} 1 + 1 = 2, & 1 \leq a < \sqrt{2} \\ 0 + 2 = 2, & \sqrt{2} \leq a < 3/\sqrt{2} \\ \geq 3, & 3/\sqrt{2} \leq a \end{cases}$$

we obtain that  $N_N(\lambda) \geq 1 + 1 + 2 = 4$ . Note that  $3/\sqrt{2} > \sqrt{\pi}$  and so we do not actually need the last line in the above calculations.

$k = 3$ : Now  $\lambda_3 \geq 5\pi^2$  and  $N_N(\lambda) \geq 3 + 1 + \lfloor \sqrt{5}a \rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{5}}{a} \right\rfloor$ . Since  $3 + 1 + \lfloor 2\sqrt{3} \rfloor = 7$ , we need to show that  $\lfloor \sqrt{5}a \rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{5}}{a} \right\rfloor \geq 3$ , which follows from

$$\lfloor \sqrt{5}a \rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{5}}{a} \right\rfloor = \begin{cases} 2 + 2 = 4, & 1 \leq a < \sqrt{5}/2 \\ 1 + 2 = 3, & \sqrt{5}/2 \leq a < 3/\sqrt{5} \\ 1 + 3 = 4, & 3/\sqrt{5} \leq a < 4/\sqrt{5} \\ 1 + 4 = 5, & 4/\sqrt{5} \leq a < \sqrt{5} \\ \geq 5, & a \geq \sqrt{5} \end{cases}.$$

Again, since  $4/\sqrt{5} \approx 1.789 > 1.772 \approx \sqrt{\pi}$  we only need the first three lines. From now on, we will only present the calculations for  $a < \sqrt{\pi}$ .

$k = 4$ :  $\lambda_4 \geq \frac{35\pi^2}{2\sqrt{6}}$  and we need to show that  $\left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{35}}{\sqrt{2} 6^{1/4}} a \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{35}}{\sqrt{2} 6^{1/4} a} \right\rfloor \geq 4$ .

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{35}}{\sqrt{2} 6^{1/4}} a \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{35}}{\sqrt{2} 6^{1/4} a} \right\rfloor = \begin{cases} 4, & 1 \leq a < \frac{3\sqrt{2} 6^{1/4}}{\sqrt{35}} \\ 5, & \frac{3\sqrt{2} 6^{1/4}}{\sqrt{35}} \leq a < \frac{\sqrt{35}}{2\sqrt{2} 6^{1/4}} \\ 4, & \frac{\sqrt{35}}{2\sqrt{2} 6^{1/4}} \leq a < \frac{4\sqrt{2} 6^{1/4}}{\sqrt{35}} \\ 5, & \frac{4\sqrt{2} 6^{1/4}}{\sqrt{35}} \leq a < \sqrt{\pi} \end{cases}.$$

$k = 7$ :  $\lambda_7 \geq \frac{55\pi^2}{\sqrt{21}}$  and we need to show that  $\left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{55}}{21^{1/4}} a \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{55}}{21^{1/4} a} \right\rfloor \geq 5$ .

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{55}}{21^{1/4}} a \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{55}}{21^{1/4} a} \right\rfloor = \begin{cases} 6, & 1 \leq a < \frac{5 \times 21^{1/4}}{\sqrt{55}} \\ 7, & \frac{5 \times 21^{1/4}}{\sqrt{55}} \leq a < \sqrt{\pi} \end{cases}.$$

$k = 9$ :  $\lambda_9 \geq \frac{35\pi^2}{\sqrt{6}}$  and we need to show that  $\left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{35}}{6^{1/4}} a \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{35}}{6^{1/4} a} \right\rfloor \geq 6$ .

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{35}}{6^{1/4}} a \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{35}}{6^{1/4} a} \right\rfloor = \begin{cases} 6, & 1 \leq a < \frac{4 \times 6^{1/4}}{\sqrt{35}} \\ 7, & \frac{4 \times 6^{1/4}}{\sqrt{35}} \leq a < \frac{\sqrt{35}}{3 \times 6^{1/4}} \\ 6, & \frac{\sqrt{35}}{3 \times 6^{1/4}} \leq a < \frac{5 \times 6^{1/4}}{\sqrt{35}} \\ 7, & \frac{5 \times 6^{1/4}}{\sqrt{35}} \leq a < \frac{6 \times 6^{1/4}}{\sqrt{35}} \\ 8, & \frac{6 \times 6^{1/4}}{\sqrt{35}} \leq a < \sqrt{\pi} \end{cases}.$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

Note that while for long thin rectangles Theorem 3.1 gives a stronger result, Theorem 3.2 provides a better value for some values of  $k$ . In particular, while in general using the former result we can only ensure that for  $\lambda_1 \geq \mu_3$ , the later result yields  $\lambda_1 \geq \mu_4$  directly. While it would still be possible to recover this last inequality for the square, for instance, from (3.1) in the proof of Theorem 3.1, to prove it for general rectangles would require an analysis similar to what was carried out in the proof of Theorem 3.2. In Figure 2 we show the first 1,000 values for the differences  $\lambda_k - \mu_{k+p(k)}$  for the square with the sequences  $p(k)$  given by (3.1), and Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.




FIGURE 2. Graphs of the differences of the eigenvalues of the square for (from left to right)  $p(k) = 1 + \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{\frac{ak}{b\pi}} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{\frac{bk}{a\pi}} \right\rfloor$ ,  $p(k) = \left\lfloor P\sqrt{k}/(\pi A) \right\rfloor$  and  $p(k) = \left\lfloor 2\sqrt{k} \right\rfloor + 1$ .

**3.2. General planar domains.** The application of Bernoulli's inequality in the proof of Theorem 2.1 limits the powers of  $n$  appearing in that result. By considering the two-dimensional case we can actually easily do that calculation explicitly with all the terms and recover the same inequality as in Theorem 3.2, except now only for sufficiently large  $k$ . In fact, this result cannot hold for the first Dirichlet eigenvalue of the disk as  $\lambda_1(D) < \mu_4(D)$ , and hence it cannot hold for the first eigenvalue of domains sufficiently close to the disk either (in an appropriate sense).

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded planar domain satisfying the non-periodicity condition and which is not a disk. Then there exists  $k^* = k^*(\Omega)$  such that*

$$\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k+\lfloor \sqrt{2k} \rfloor + 1}, \text{ for all } k \geq k^*.$$

*Proof.* The proof proceeds in the same way as that of Theorem 2.1 to obtain

$$\lambda_k - \mu_{k+p} = r_D(k) - r_N(k+p) + \frac{2\sqrt{\pi}}{A} \underbrace{\left[ \left( \sqrt{k+p} + \sqrt{k} \right) \frac{P}{\sqrt{A}} - 2p\sqrt{\pi} \right]}_{g(k,p)},$$

where  $P$  and  $A$  denote the perimeter and area of  $\Omega$ , respectively. The function  $g(k, p)$  will be non-negative if

$$(0 <) p \leq \frac{P^2}{4\pi A} + \frac{P}{\sqrt{\pi A}} \sqrt{k}.$$

From the two-dimensional isoperimetric inequality we have that the right-hand side above satisfies

$$\frac{P^2}{4\pi A} + \frac{P}{\sqrt{\pi A}} \sqrt{k} \geq 1 + 2\sqrt{k}$$

and we will thus take  $p = \lfloor 2\sqrt{k} \rfloor + 1 \leq 2\sqrt{k} + 1$ , concluding that  $g(k, \lfloor 2\sqrt{k} \rfloor + 1) \geq 0$ . Finally, note that we may write

$$g(k, 2\sqrt{k} + 1) = \left( \frac{P}{\sqrt{A}} - 2\sqrt{\pi} \right) (2\sqrt{k} + 1)$$

showing that, except possibly for the disk,  $g(k, \lfloor 2\sqrt{k} \rfloor + 1)$  is of order  $k^{1/2}$ . □

Note that the actual form of the isoperimetric inequality, at least in the proof above, is important only to determine the form of the expression for  $p$ . Once this has been done, the dominant term will always be of order  $\sqrt{k}$ , except for domains giving equality in the isoperimetric inequality.

**3.3. The sphere  $\mathbb{S}^2$ .** Proceeding in the same way as above for planar domains, it is possible to derive a similar result for domains on the sphere that also satisfy the non-periodicity condition. The resulting expressions are now more involved, mirroring the version of the isoperimetric inequality on  $\mathbb{S}^2$ , namely, [Le51]

$$P^2 \geq 4\pi A - A^2.$$

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $\Omega \subsetneq \mathbb{S}^2$  be a domain satisfying the non-periodicity condition and which is not a geodesic disk. Then there exists  $k^* = k^*(\Omega)$  such that*

$$\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k+p(k)}, \text{ for all } k \geq k^*,$$

where  $p$  is given by

$$p(k) = \left\lfloor 1 - \frac{A}{4\pi} + 2\sqrt{1 - \frac{A}{4\pi}} \sqrt{k} \right\rfloor.$$

*Proof.* The proof proceeds in the same way as that for Theorem 3.3.  $\square$

As mentioned in the Introduction, geodesic disks on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  with radius larger than or equal to  $\pi/2$  do not satisfy the non-periodicity condition. On the other hand, those with radius smaller than  $\pi/2$  do, and again we would expect these to satisfy the above inequality.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to acknowledge several exchanges with Mark Ashbaugh concerning this problem and, in particular, for having mentioned [L88] and other relevant articles. We are also indebted to Pedro Antunes for a numerical check on the eigenvalues of the annular sector example. This work was partially supported by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (Portugal) through project UIDB/00208/2020.

#### REFERENCES

- [AF13] P.R.S. Antunes and P. Freitas, Optimal spectral rectangles and lattice ellipses, *Proc. Royal Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **469** (2013), 20120492.
- [AL97] M. Ashbaugh and H.A. Levine, Inequalities for Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues of the Laplacian for domains on spheres, *Journ. Équ. Dériv. Partielles* (1997), 1–15.
- [A86] P. Aviles, Symmetry theorems related to Pompeiu’s problem, *Amer. J. Math.* **108** (1986), 1023–1036.
- [BLP09] R. Benguria, M. Levitin and L Parnowski, Fourier transform, null variety, and Laplacian’s eigenvalues, *J. Funct. Anal.* **257** (2009) 2088–2123.
- [C84] I. Chavel, *Eigenvalues in Riemannian geometry, Pure and Applied Mathematics* **115**. Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, FL, 1984.
- [CMS19] G. Cox, S. MacLachlan and L. Steeves, Isoperimetric relations between Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues, preprint arXiv:1906.10061v1.
- [F05] N. Filonov. On an inequality between Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues for the Laplace operator, *Algebra Anal.* **16** (2004), 172–176; English translation in *St. Petersburg Math. J.* **16** (2005), 413–416.
- [F91] L. Friedlander, Some inequalities between Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **116** (1991), 153–160.
- [GM09] F. Gesztesy and M. Mitrea, Nonlocal Robin Laplacians and some remarks on a paper by Filonov on eigenvalue inequalities, *J. Differential Eq.* **247** (2009), 2871–2896.
- [L88] H.A. Levine, Some remarks on inequalities between Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues, *Maximum Principles and Eigenvalue Problems in Partial Differential Equations*, P.W. Schaefer, editor, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, vol. 175, Longman Scientific and Technical, Harlow, Essex, United Kingdom, 1988, pp. 121–133.
- [LW86] H.A. Levine and H.F. Weinberger, Inequalities between Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **94** (1986), 193–208.
- [Le51] P. Levy, *Problèmes Concrets d’Analyse Fonctionnelle* Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1951.
- [LY83] P. Li and S.-T. Yau, On the Schrödinger equation and the eigenvalue problem. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **88** (1983), 309–318.
- [M91] R. Mazzeo, Remarks on a paper of L. Friedlander concerning inequalities between Neumann and Dirichlet eigenvalues, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, **4** (1991), 41–48.
- [P55] L.E. Payne, Inequalities for eigenvalues of membranes and plates, *J. Rational Mech. Anal.* **4** (1955), 517–529.
- [P91] L.E. Payne, Some comments on the past fifty years of isoperimetric inequalities, *Inequalities: Fifty Years On from Hardy, Littlewood, and Polya*, W.N. Everitt, editor, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1991, pp. 143–161.

- [S08] Y. Safarov, On the comparison of the Dirichlet and Neumann counting functions, In *Spectral Theory of Differential Operators: M.Sh. Birman 80th Anniversary Collection* (T. Suslina, D. Yafaev eds.), Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, vol. 225, Providence, RI (2008), 191–204.
- [SF10] Yu. G. Safarov and N.D. Filonov, Asymptotic estimates for the difference between Dirichlet and Neumann counting functions. (Russian. Russian summary) *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen* **44** (2010), 54–64; translation in *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **44** (2010), 286–294.
- [SV97] Yu. Safarov and D. Vassiliev, *The asymptotic distribution of eigenvalues of partial differential operators*, American Mathematical Society, series Translations of Mathematical Monographs, **155**, 1997.

GRUPO DE FÍSICA MATEMÁTICA, INSTITUTO SUPERIOR TÉCNICO, UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA, AV. ROVISCO PAIS, 1049-001 LISBOA, PORTUGAL

*Email address:* `pedrodefreitas@tecnico.ulisboa.pt`