

HOMOLOGY OF SPECTRAL MINIMAL PARTITIONS

GREGORY BERKOLAIKO, YAIZA CANZANI, GRAHAM COX, AND JEREMY L. MARZUOLA

ABSTRACT. A spectral minimal partition of a manifold is its decomposition into disjoint open sets that minimizes a spectral energy functional. It is known that bipartite spectral minimal partitions coincide with nodal partitions of Courant-sharp Laplacian eigenfunctions. However, almost all minimal partitions are non-bipartite. To study those, we define a modified Laplacian operator and prove that the nodal partitions of its Courant-sharp eigenfunctions are minimal within a certain topological class of partitions. This yields new results in the non-bipartite case and recovers the above known result in the bipartite case. Our approach is based on tools from algebraic topology, which we illustrate by a number of examples where the topological types of partitions are characterized by relative homology.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let M be a compact, oriented surface, with or without boundary, endowed with a Riemannian metric. A k -partition of M is a mutually disjoint collection $P = \{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^k$ of nonempty, open, connected subsets of M . Letting $\lambda_1(\Omega_i)$ denote the smallest eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian on Ω_i , we define the *energy*

$$\Lambda(P) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \lambda_1(\Omega_i) \tag{1.1}$$

and say that P is *minimal* if $\Lambda(P) \leq \Lambda(\tilde{P})$ for every k -partition \tilde{P} .

Minimal partitions arise in a wide variety of applications. They first appeared in the study of free boundary variational problems [1] and spatially segregated solutions to reaction–diffusion systems [8,9]. In [24] minimal partitions were considered in relation to ground states of multi-component Bose–Einstein condensates, and in [20] a version of the minimal spectral partition problem was used to prove the existence of spectral gaps for ergodic reversible Markov operators. In [21], spectral minimal partitions on manifolds have been shown to arise as a high density limit of related partitioning schemes proposed on graphs [22, 26, 27].

It is known that minimal k -partitions exist for each k and are suitably regular; see [18] and references therein. However, rigorously finding minimal partitions is quite difficult in general. An important result is the following, where we recall that a partition is *bipartite* if each of the domains Ω_i can be assigned one of two colors in such a way that neighboring domains have different colors (Ω_i and Ω_j are *neighbors* if $\text{int}(\overline{\Omega_i \cup \Omega_j}) \neq \Omega_i \cup \Omega_j$).

Theorem 1.1 (Helffer, Hoffmann-Ostenhof, Terracini [18]). *A bipartite k -partition is minimal if and only if it is the nodal partition of a k -th (i.e. Courant sharp) eigenfunction of the Laplacian.*




FIGURE 1.1. The conjectured (but unproven) minimal 3-partition of the disk.

See (1.3) for the precise definition of Courant sharp. A given Riemannian manifold can only have a finite number of Courant sharp eigenfunctions [23], so it follows that most minimal partitions are not bipartite, but rigorously identifying them is a difficult problem. For instance, while it is known that the minimal 3-partitions of the square and the disk cannot be bipartite, and the minimizing partitions have been conjectured, they have not been rigorously verified except in the presence of a priori assumptions on their structure. See [6] for a relatively up-to-date summary of the literature.

Our main result, Theorem 1.6, extends Theorem 1.1 to the non-bipartite case by establishing minimality within a certain class of related partitions. This class is defined using a concept from algebraic topology, namely the homology class of the *boundary set* $\partial P = \cup_i \overline{\Omega_i} \setminus \overline{\partial M}$ of a partition $P = \{\Omega_i\}$. We thus develop a new tool for studying non-bipartite partitions and also provide further insight into the bipartite case, as bipartite partitions are precisely those partitions whose boundary sets are null homologous.

To describe the partitions under consideration, recall that a C^1 curve is said to be *regular* if its velocity never vanishes.

Definition 1.2. Let M be a compact surface with piecewise C^1 (or empty) boundary. A closed set $\Gamma \subset M$ is a *piecewise C^1 cut* if it is the image of a finite set of regular C^1 curves that intersect one other (and ∂M) transversely, and only do so at their endpoints.

Remark 1.3. The C^1 assumption simplifies exposition and is justified by the fact that the boundary set of a minimal partition is a piecewise C^1 cut [18]. However, the constructions and results described here extend to cuts Γ that are merely continuous, see Section 5.

We also need non-bipartite versions of “nodal partitions” and “Courant sharp eigenfunctions” that were introduced in [4]. Given a piecewise C^1 cut Γ , we define an operator $-\Delta^\Gamma$ acting as the (positive-definite) Laplacian on the space of functions on M satisfying anti-continuity conditions across Γ . The precise definition, which we give in Section 2, is complicated by the fact that Definition 1.2 allows Γ to have cracks. In the special case that each component Ω_i of the corresponding partition is a Lipschitz domain, the restrictions $u_i = u|_{\Omega_i}$ of any

function u in the domain of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ are required to satisfy¹

$$u_i|_{\partial\Omega_i\cap\partial\Omega_j} = -u_j|_{\partial\Omega_i\cap\partial\Omega_j}, \quad \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial \nu_i} \Big|_{\partial\Omega_i\cap\partial\Omega_j} = \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial \nu_j} \Big|_{\partial\Omega_i\cap\partial\Omega_j} \quad (1.2)$$

whenever Ω_i and Ω_j are neighbors; ν_i denotes the outward unit normal to Ω_i , and we impose Dirichlet boundary conditions on ∂M if it is nonempty.

Let $\{\lambda_n(\Gamma)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ denote the eigenvalues of $-\Delta^\Gamma$, listed in increasing order and repeated according to their multiplicity. If ψ is an eigenfunction with eigenvalue λ_ψ , we define its *spectral position*

$$\ell(\psi) = \min\{n : \lambda_n(\Gamma) = \lambda_\psi\}. \quad (1.3)$$

Defining the *nodal domains* of ψ to be the connected components of $\{x \in M : \psi(x) \neq 0\}$, it follows from [4, Thm. 1.7] that ψ has at most $\ell(\psi)$ nodal domains. We say that ψ is *Courant sharp* if it has exactly $\ell(\psi)$ nodal domains. We also define the *nodal partition* P_ψ of ψ to be the partition of M whose components are the nodal domains of ψ .

Remark 1.4. If P is bipartite, then $-\Delta^{\partial P}$ is unitarily equivalent to the Laplacian and [4, Thm. 1.7] reduces to Courant's nodal domain theorem [10, §VI.6]; see Remark 2.3 for details.

Our main result is that the nodal partition of a Courant-sharp eigenfunction of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ minimizes energy within a certain topological class of partitions, which we now specify. The following definition requires some notation and terminology from algebraic topology, which will be developed in Section 3.

Definition 1.5. Piecewise C^1 cuts Γ_1 and Γ_2 are *homologous* if they are represented by singular 1-chains γ_1 and γ_2 for which $[\gamma_1 - \gamma_2] = 0 \in H_1(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

A more intuitive formulation is the following: If $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ is also a piecewise C^1 cut, then Γ_1 is homologous to Γ_2 if and only if the closure of the symmetric difference,

$$\overline{\Gamma_1 \Delta \Gamma_2} = \overline{(\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2) \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2)},$$

is the boundary set of a bipartite partition; see Figure 1.2 for an illustration and Theorem 3.3 for a precise statement. In particular, letting $\Gamma_2 = \emptyset$, we see that Γ_1 is *null homologous* if and only if it is the boundary set of a bipartite partition.

Let \mathcal{P}_k denote the set of all k -partitions of M . For any piecewise C^1 cut Γ and positive integer k we define

$$\mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma) = \{\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k : \partial\tilde{P} \text{ contains a piecewise } C^1 \text{ cut homologous to } \Gamma\}. \quad (1.4)$$

If $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$, then $\partial\tilde{P}$ contains a piecewise C^1 cut homologous to Γ , say $\tilde{\Gamma}$, but no regularity is assumed for the rest of the boundary set. For instance, if Γ is null homologous, then we can choose $\tilde{\Gamma} = \emptyset$ to conclude that $\mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$ contains *all* k -partitions. We also note that if an eigenfunction ψ of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ has k nodal domains and P_ψ is its nodal partition, then $P_\psi \in \mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$ (see Lemma 4.4 for further details).

¹The second equation is also an anti-continuity condition, since $\nu_i = -\nu_j$ on the common boundary.




FIGURE 1.2. The boundary set of the Mercedes star partition, Figure 1.1, is homologous to Γ_1 and Γ_2 but not Γ_3 .

Our main result compares the k th eigenvalue, $\lambda_k(\Gamma)$, of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ to the energy of any $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$. The following is a special case of the more general Theorem 5.3, which we will formulate and prove in Section 5.

Theorem 1.6. *If Γ is a piecewise C^1 cut and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

$$\lambda_k(\Gamma) \leq \inf \{ \Lambda(\tilde{P}) : \tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma) \}, \quad (1.5)$$

with $\lambda_k(\Gamma) = \Lambda(\tilde{P})$ if and only if \tilde{P} is the nodal partition of an eigenfunction of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ with eigenvalue $\lambda_k(\Gamma)$.

In particular, if ψ is a Courant-sharp eigenfunction of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ with k nodal domains (and therefore $\ell(\psi) = k$), then $\Lambda(P_\psi) \leq \Lambda(\tilde{P})$ for all $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$.

That is, the nodal partition P of a Courant-sharp eigenfunction for $-\Delta^\Gamma$ minimizes energy within the class of partitions $\mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$. When P is bipartite the set $\mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$ consists of *all* k -partitions, and nodal partitions of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ eigenfunctions are nodal partitions of Laplacian eigenfunctions, so we recover one direction of Theorem 1.1 as a special case.

If $\lambda_k(\Gamma)$ is a simple eigenvalue of $-\Delta^\Gamma$, we have $\Lambda(P) < \Lambda(\tilde{P})$ for all $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma) \setminus \{P\}$. In general, the characterization of equality in Theorem 1.6 is difficult to apply, as it requires knowing all of the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $-\Delta^\Gamma$. Our next result gives a sufficient condition for inequality that is topological in nature.

Corollary 1.7. *Let $P \in \mathcal{P}_k$ be the nodal partition of a Courant-sharp eigenfunction of $-\Delta^\Gamma$. If the boundary set of $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$ is a piecewise C^1 cut that is not homologous to Γ , then $\Lambda(P) < \Lambda(\tilde{P})$. In particular, if $P \in \mathcal{P}_k$ is the nodal partition of a Courant-sharp Laplacian eigenfunction, then it has strictly lower energy than any non-bipartite k -partition.*

In Section 6 we apply Theorem 1.6 and Corollary 1.7 to partitions of the disk, sphere, torus and cylinder. For now, we mention just one example, to give an idea of the kind of results we obtain.

Theorem 1.8. *The Mercedes star partition is minimal among all 3-partitions whose boundary set contains a curve from the origin to the boundary of the disk. Moreover, it has strictly lower energy than any 3-partition whose boundary set contains such a curve but is not homologous to it.*

For instance, the set Γ_3 shown in Figure 1.2 contains a curve from the origin to the boundary of the disk, but Γ_3 is not homologous to this curve, therefore the corresponding 3-partition has strictly greater energy than the Mercedes star partition. (Equivalently, Γ_3 is not homologous to the boundary set of the Mercedes star partition but contains a subset that is, namely the set Γ_2 shown in Figure 1.2.)

Remark 1.9. Theorem 1.8 should be compared to the results for the disk in [5, 15], where it is shown that *if* the boundary set of the *minimal* 3-partition has only one singular point, or contains the origin, then it must be the Mercedes star. While our topological hypothesis is more restrictive, we make no a priori assumptions about the structure of the minimizer. That is, we show that the Mercedes star minimizes energy within a certain topological class of partitions, whether or not that class contains a minimal partition. As a byproduct, we deduce the existence of a minimizer *in this class*.

The remaining applications have a similar flavor — starting from Courant-sharp eigenfunctions for a given $-\Delta^\Gamma$, we construct partitions that minimize energy within a certain topological class. This does not require us to make any a priori assumptions on the structure of the minimal k -partition, nor does it require us to know that the constrained optimization problem (minimizing energy within a given topological class) has a minimum.

Finally, we remark that while Theorem 1.6 can likely be reformulated and proved using the “double covering” construction² of [14], the homological approach developed in this paper has several advantages: (i) the tools of algebraic topology can be brought to bear on the problem of minimal partitions; (ii) the topological hypotheses of our theorems are formulated on the original manifold and do not involve lifting to the double cover (which is easy to construct and visualize in concrete examples but rather abstract in general); (iii) the partition Laplacian $-\Delta^\Gamma$ is easier to analyze, visualize and prepare for numerical computations, since it is defined on the smooth manifold M , rather than its branched double cover.

Outline. In Section 2 we define the operator $-\Delta^\Gamma$ and state its relevant properties (to be proved later), which we then use to prove Theorem 1.6. In Section 3 we review some topological concepts and use them to clarify Definition 1.5. In Section 4 we prove the technical results from Section 2 and hence complete the proof of Theorem 1.6. Corollary 1.7 is proved in Section 4.3. In Section 5 we generalize all of our results to partitions with

²Here one introduces a suitable branched double cover of M and considers the Laplacian restricted to anti-symmetric functions on the resulting singular manifold.




FIGURE 2.1. The slit in Γ has been eliminated in the set $\tilde{\Gamma}$ by adding an extra segment, so each connected component of $M^o \setminus \tilde{\Gamma}$ is a Lipschitz domain.

continuous, rather than piecewise C^1 , boundary sets. Finally, in Section 6 we apply our results to partitions of the disk, sphere, torus and cylinder.

2. THE PARTITION LAPLACIAN AND PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

We define $-\Delta^\Gamma$ in Section 2.1 and then characterize its dependence on Γ in Proposition 2.2, which will be proved in Section 4. In Section 2.2 we use Proposition 2.2 to prove Theorem 1.6.

2.1. The partition Laplacian. Let Γ be a piecewise C^1 cut. For convenience we write $M^o = M \setminus \partial M$. To define $-\Delta^\Gamma$, we need to define *traces* (restrictions to Γ) for functions in the Sobolev space $W^{1,2}(M^o \setminus \Gamma)$. Definition 1.2 allows a subdomain to lie on both sides of its boundary, as in Figure 2.1, so a given Ω_i may not be a Lipschitz domain.

We therefore extend Γ to a piecewise C^1 cut $\tilde{\Gamma}$ such that each component of $M^o \setminus \tilde{\Gamma}$ lies on one side of its boundary, and hence is a Lipschitz domain. See [12, §1.7]), and also [2], where similar techniques were used to study Neumann domains.

Label the components of $M^o \setminus \tilde{\Gamma}$ by $\{\tilde{\Omega}_i\}$. A regular segment $\Gamma_a \subset \Gamma$ will be contained in $\partial\tilde{\Omega}_i \cap \partial\tilde{\Omega}_j$ for unique $i \neq j$. Since the subdomains $\tilde{\Omega}_i$ and $\tilde{\Omega}_j$ are Lipschitz, for any function $u \in W^{1,2}(M^o \setminus \Gamma)$ we can define two traces,

$$u_i|_{\Gamma_a}, u_j|_{\Gamma_a} \in W^{1/2,2}(\Gamma_a), \quad (2.1)$$

where $u_i = u|_{\tilde{\Omega}_i}$. These traces do not depend on the choice of extension $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Similarly, since ∂M is piecewise C^1 , it can be decomposed into a finite set of regular C^1 curves, each contained in the boundary of a unique $\tilde{\Omega}_i$. For every such $\tilde{\Omega}_i$, which we call a *boundary subdomain*, the restriction $u_i|_{\partial M \cap \partial\tilde{\Omega}_i}$ is thus well defined.

Definition 2.1. $u \in W^{1,2}(M^o \setminus \Gamma)$ is *continuous across* $\Gamma_a \subset \Gamma$ if $u_i|_{\Gamma_a} = u_j|_{\Gamma_a}$, and is *anti-continuous across* Γ_a if $u_i|_{\Gamma_a} = -u_j|_{\Gamma_a}$. It is *(anti)continuous across* Γ if it is (anti)continuous across each Γ_a . It *vanishes on* ∂M if $u_i|_{\partial M \cap \partial\tilde{\Omega}_i} = 0$ for every boundary subdomain $\tilde{\Omega}_i$.

We now define

$$W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma) = \left\{ u \in W^{1,2}(M^o \setminus \Gamma) : u \text{ vanishes on } \partial M \text{ and is anti-continuous across } \Gamma \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

This is a closed subspace of $W^{1,2}(M^\circ \setminus \Gamma)$ and hence is complete. When Γ is empty it coincides with $W_0^{1,2}(M^\circ)$.

Letting dV denote the Riemannian volume form on M , \cdot the inner product, and setting $u_i = u|_{\Omega_i}$, we define the bilinear form

$$b_\Gamma(u, v) = \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\Omega_i} (\nabla u_i \cdot \nabla v_i) dV, \quad \text{dom}(b_\Gamma) = W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma), \quad (2.3)$$

where $\{\Omega_i\}$ are the connected components of $M^\circ \setminus \Gamma$. The form b_Γ is nonnegative and hence lower semibounded. It is a closed form, because $W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma)$ is a closed subspace of $W^{1,2}(M^\circ \setminus \Gamma)$ and hence is complete. It thus generates a self-adjoint operator on $L^2(M)$, which we denote by $-\Delta^\Gamma$, via the representation theorem for semibounded forms; see, for instance [25, Thm 10.7]. Note that $\Gamma = \emptyset$ corresponds to the Dirichlet Laplacian on M .

Since each Ω_i is a Lipschitz domain, we have that $W^{1,2}(\Omega_i)$ is compactly embedded in $L^2(\Omega_i)$, from which it follows that $W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma)$ is compactly embedded in $L^2(M)$. As a result, $-\Delta^\Gamma$ has compact resolvent, so its spectrum consists of isolated eigenvalues of finite multiplicity. Writing the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ as $(\phi_n(\Gamma), \lambda_n(\Gamma))$, we have the variational characterization

$$\lambda_n(\Gamma) = \min \left\{ \frac{b_\Gamma(\phi, \phi)}{\int_M \phi^2 dV} : \phi \in \{\phi_1(\Gamma), \dots, \phi_{n-1}(\Gamma)\}^\perp \cap H_0^1(M; \Gamma) \setminus \{0\} \right\}. \quad (2.4)$$

The minimum is achieved if and only if ϕ is an eigenfunction for the eigenvalue $\lambda_n(\Gamma)$.

Having defined $-\Delta^\Gamma$, we now describe its dependence on the cut Γ .

Proposition 2.2. *If Γ_1 and Γ_2 are homologous, then $-\Delta^{\Gamma_1}$ and $-\Delta^{\Gamma_2}$ are unitarily equivalent. That is, there is a unitary operator Φ on $L^2(M)$ that maps $W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma_1)$ onto $W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma_2)$ and satisfies*

$$b_{\Gamma_2}(\Phi u, \Phi v) = b_{\Gamma_1}(u, v) \quad (2.5)$$

for all $u, v \in W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma_1)$. Moreover, the unitary transformation Φ preserves nodal sets of eigenfunctions, i.e., $\{u = 0\} = \{\Phi u = 0\}$ if $-\Delta^{\Gamma_1} u = \lambda u$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

This is the most technical result of the paper. The proof is somewhat delicate because Γ_1 and Γ_2 need not be related in a nice way. While it is assumed that the curves in Γ_1 intersect one another transversely, and likewise for the curves in Γ_2 , it is possible that some curve in Γ_1 intersects a curve in Γ_2 tangentially, in which case $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ is not a piecewise C^1 cut. This makes it difficult to compare the domains of the operators $-\Delta^{\Gamma_1}$ and $-\Delta^{\Gamma_2}$. We will resolve this issue in Section 4 using a transversality argument.

Remark 2.3. If P is bipartite, then $-\Delta^{\partial P}$ is unitarily equivalent to the Laplacian and we get half of Theorem 1.1 as a special case of Theorem 1.6.

2.2. Proof of main theorem. We now show how Proposition 2.2 implies Theorem 1.6. The proof is similar to that of [18, Prop. 5.5], which covers the bipartite case.

Let Γ be a piecewise C^1 cut and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Starting with a partition $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$, we use its groundstates to build a test function for the Rayleigh quotient in (2.4) and hence obtain an upper bound on $\lambda_k(\Gamma)$. The difficulty in the non-bipartite case is producing a test function in $W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma)$, since the groundstates coming from \tilde{P} are continuous, rather than anti-continuous, across Γ . We resolve this by modifying the groundstates on regions bounded by Γ and $\partial\tilde{P}$. This is where the hypothesis $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$ is used.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let $\tilde{P} = \{\tilde{\Omega}_i\}$ be an arbitrary partition in $\mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$, with $\tilde{\psi}_i$ denoting the groundstate for the Dirichlet Laplacian on $\tilde{\Omega}_i$, extended by zero to the rest of M and normalized so that

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_i} |\nabla \tilde{\psi}_i|^2 dV = \lambda_1(\tilde{\Omega}_i). \quad (2.6)$$

Since $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$, there exists a subset $\tilde{\Gamma} \subset \partial\tilde{P}$ that is homologous to Γ . Since $\tilde{\psi}_i$ vanishes on $\partial\tilde{P}$, it is anti-continuous across $\tilde{\Gamma}$, therefore $\tilde{\psi}_i \in W_0^{1,2}(M; \tilde{\Gamma})$. Since $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is homologous to Γ , by Proposition 2.2 there is a unitary operator Φ acting on $L^2(M)$ so that $\Phi(W_0^{1,2}(M; \tilde{\Gamma})) = W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma)$. Then, letting $\psi_i = \Phi\tilde{\psi}_i \in W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma)$, we obtain

$$b_\Gamma(\psi_i, \psi_i) = b_{\tilde{\Gamma}}(\tilde{\psi}_i, \tilde{\psi}_i) = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_i} |\nabla \tilde{\psi}_i|^2 dV = \lambda_1(\tilde{\Omega}_i). \quad (2.7)$$

Now choose nonzero real numbers c_1, \dots, c_k so that the linear combination $\phi = c_1\psi_1 + \dots + c_k\psi_k$ is orthogonal to the first $k-1$ eigenfunctions of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ and hence is a valid test function for (2.4). Since the ψ_i have mutually disjoint supports, we can use (2.4) and (2.7) to compute

$$\lambda_k(P) \leq \frac{b_\Gamma(\phi, \phi)}{\int_M \phi^2 dV} = \frac{c_1^2 \lambda_1(\tilde{\Omega}_1) + \dots + c_k^2 \lambda_1(\tilde{\Omega}_k)}{c_1^2 + \dots + c_k^2} \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \lambda_1(\tilde{\Omega}_i) = \Lambda(\tilde{P}), \quad (2.8)$$

as claimed.

If $\lambda_k(\Gamma) = \Lambda(\tilde{P})$, then the inequalities in (2.8) are all equalities. From the case of equality in (2.4) we see that $\phi = c_1\psi_1 + \dots + c_k\psi_k$ must be an eigenfunction of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ for the eigenvalue $\lambda_k(\Gamma)$, so \tilde{P} is the nodal partition of an eigenfunction of $-\Delta^\Gamma$, for the eigenvalue $\lambda_k(\Gamma)$. Conversely, if \tilde{P} is the nodal partition of an eigenfunction for the eigenvalue $\lambda_k(\Gamma)$, each subdomain has groundstate energy $\lambda_1(\tilde{\Omega}_i) = \lambda_k(\Gamma)$ and hence \tilde{P} has energy $\Lambda(\tilde{P}) = \lambda_k(\Gamma)$. The same argument shows that if P is a k -partition generated by a Courant-sharp eigenfunction of $-\Delta^\Gamma$, then $\Lambda(P) = \lambda_k(\Gamma)$ and so $\Lambda(P) \leq \Lambda(\tilde{P})$ for all $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$. \square

3. HOMOLOGY OF CUTS

We now elaborate on Definition 1.5. After reviewing some concepts from algebraic topology, we explain how piecewise C^1 cuts, Γ_1 and Γ_2 , can be represented by singular 1-chains, γ_1 and γ_2 respectively. This representation is not unique, but we will see that the condition $[\gamma_1 - \gamma_2] = 0 \in H_1(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is independent of this choice, and so Definition 1.5 is meaningful. Note that we have $\gamma_1 - \gamma_2 = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$, as our coefficients lie in \mathbb{Z}_2 . See [13, Ch. 2] for an introduction to the definitions and tools used here.

In Section 3.3 we give an equivalent formulation of Definition 1.5 for a sufficiently regular pair of cuts, and in Section 3.4 we discuss the relationship between homology and the set of odd points for a cut.

3.1. Definitions. Letting $\Delta^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the standard n -simplex, we recall that a singular n -simplex is a continuous map $\Delta^n \rightarrow M$. In particular, a singular 0-simplex corresponds to a point in M and a singular 1-simplex is a parameterized curve. A singular n -chain is a (finite) formal sum of singular n -simplices with coefficients in \mathbb{Z}_2 , so the set of these, denoted $C_n(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, is the free \mathbb{Z}_2 -module generated by the singular n -simplices.

For each n there exists a boundary map $\partial_n: C_n(M; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow C_{n-1}(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with the property that $\partial_n \partial_{n+1} = 0$. For instance, viewing a continuous curve $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ as an element of $C_1(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, we have $\partial_1 \gamma = \gamma(1) - \gamma(0) \in C_0(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

Defining the quotient groups $C_n(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2) = C_n(M; \mathbb{Z}_2) / C_n(\partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, we see that each ∂_n descends to a boundary map $\partial_n: C_n(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow C_{n-1}(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ again satisfying $\partial_n \partial_{n+1} = 0$. The relative homology groups are given by $H_n(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2) = \ker(\partial_n) / \text{im}(\partial_{n+1})$ for each n . In particular, $H_1(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ consists of equivalence classes of relative 1-cycles, i.e., 1-chains $\gamma \in C_1(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ for which $\partial_1 \gamma \in C_0(\partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

The homology class of a relative 1-cycle γ is denoted by $[\gamma] \in H_1(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Note that $[\gamma] = 0$ if and only if $\gamma = \partial_2 \omega + \beta$ for some $\omega \in C_2(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $\beta \in C_1(\partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. We say that two 1-chains γ_1 and γ_2 are *homologous* if $[\gamma_1 - \gamma_2] = 0$. For this to hold it is necessary that $\gamma_1 - \gamma_2$ to be a relative 1-cycle, that is, $\partial_1 \gamma_1 - \partial_1 \gamma_2 \in C_0(\partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. This condition is not sufficient: see the example in Figure 3.2, where a relative 1-cycle Γ_2 is not null-homologous.

3.2. The homology class of a piecewise C^1 cut. Given a partition, we are interested in the homology class of its boundary set. If Γ is a piecewise C^1 cut, in the sense of Definition 1.2, then it can be viewed as a singular 1-chain. More precisely, given a finite collection $\{\gamma_a\}$ of regular C^1 curves that can only intersect at their end points, whose image is Γ , we define $\gamma = \sum_a \gamma_a \in C_1(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. This 1-chain is said to *represent* Γ .

A cut Γ can be represented by many different chains. This does not matter for the following reason.

Lemma 3.1. *If $\gamma, \tilde{\gamma}: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ are continuous, then their concatenation $\gamma * \tilde{\gamma}$ is homologous to $\gamma + \tilde{\gamma}$. If $\tau: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a homeomorphism, then $\gamma \circ \tau$ is homologous to γ .*

We omit the proof, which is standard, but note that the second statement relies on the fact that we are using \mathbb{Z}_2 coefficients, and thus have $\gamma = -\gamma$ as 1-chains, since τ was not assumed to preserve orientation.

It follows from Lemma 3.1 that all representatives of the same cut are homologous. Therefore, if two cuts Γ_1 and Γ_2 can be represented by homologous 1-chains, any other representatives of Γ_1 and Γ_2 will also be homologous, and so Definition 1.5 is meaningful.

3.3. Homology and bipartiteness. In this section we reformulate Definition 1.5 for pairs of cuts satisfying a compatibility condition. While more restrictive than the original definition, this formulation is more geometric in nature and suffices for many applications; see Figure 1.2 for examples.

Definition 3.2. Piecewise C^1 cuts Γ_1 and Γ_2 are *compatible* if $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ is a piecewise C^1 cut.

To understand why such a condition is needed, consider $\gamma_1, \gamma_2: [-1, 1] \rightarrow [-1, 1]^2$ given by

$$\gamma_1(t) = (t, 0), \quad \gamma_2(t) = \begin{cases} (t, e^{-1/t^2} \sin(1/t)), & t \neq 0, \\ (0, 0), & t = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

These are C^∞ regular curves, thus each of their images is a piecewise C^1 cut, but the same is not true of their union, due to the infinitely many intersections of γ_1 and γ_2 .

We recall that a partition $P = \{\Omega_i\}$ is *bipartite* if each of the Ω_i can be assigned one of two colors so that neighboring domains have different colors, where Ω_i and Ω_j are *neighbors* if $\text{int}(\overline{\Omega_i \cup \Omega_j}) \neq \Omega_i \cup \Omega_j$. Note that a domain with a slit always neighbors itself, therefore any partition that contains such a domain cannot be bipartite. For instance, the partition with boundary set Γ_2 in Figure 1.2 is not bipartite, even though it only has one component.

Theorem 3.3. *Compatible cuts Γ_1 and Γ_2 are homologous if and only if $\overline{\Gamma_1 \Delta \Gamma_2}$ is the boundary set of a bipartite partition.*

To prove our main results it suffices to know this theorem when Γ_1 and Γ_2 intersect transversely; this special case will be used in the proof of Lemma 4.2 below. We have chosen to formulate and prove the result in the more general context of compatible cuts as this gives further geometric insight into Definition 1.5, and in particular applies to all of the examples shown in Figure 1.2.

To prove Theorem 3.3, we start with a technical result about compatible cuts.

Lemma 3.4. *If Γ_1 and Γ_2 are compatible, then $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ can be parameterized by regular C^1 curves $\{\gamma_a\}_{a \in A}$ such that the image of each γ_a is contained in $\overline{\Gamma_1 \setminus \Gamma_2}$, $\overline{\Gamma_2 \setminus \Gamma_1}$ or $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2$.*

Proof. By assumption, $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ is the union of the images of a finite set of curves that only intersect at their endpoints. Subdividing if necessary, we can assume that none of these curves contain an endpoint of either Γ_1 or Γ_2 in its interior. Let $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ denote one such curve. If the interior $\gamma((0, 1))$ is contained in $\Gamma_1 \setminus \Gamma_2$ or $\Gamma_2 \setminus \Gamma_1$, then there is nothing to prove. Therefore, we just need to show that if $\gamma((0, 1))$ intersects Γ_1 and Γ_2 , then it is contained in $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2$.

We claim that if $\gamma((0, 1))$ intersects Γ_1 , then $\gamma((0, 1)) \subset \Gamma_1$ (and likewise for Γ_2). Equivalently, the set $I_1 = \{t \in (0, 1) : \gamma(t) \in \Gamma_1\}$ is equal to $(0, 1)$. To see this, it suffices to show that this set is relatively open and closed in $(0, 1)$; the latter property follows immediately from continuity of γ_1 .

To show that I_1 is relatively open, let $t_* \in I_1$. This means there is a curve $\gamma_1: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ in Γ_1 and $t_1 \in [0, 1]$ for which $\gamma_1(t_1) = \gamma(t_*)$. Since the interior of γ does not contain an




FIGURE 3.1. Triangulating $\overline{\Omega}_1$ and $\overline{\Omega}_2$ does not necessarily give a valid triangulation of M (center), but this can always be refined to produce a triangulation (right), as in the proof of Proposition 3.6.

endpoint of any curve in Γ_1 , we must have $t_1 \in (0, 1)$. Moreover, we claim that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\gamma_1([t_1 - \delta, t_1 + \delta]) \subset \gamma((0, 1)). \quad (3.2)$$

Suppose the claim does not hold. Then, for all δ , the restriction of γ_1 to $[t_1 - \delta, t_1 + \delta]$ will intersect some curve in $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ other than γ , say $\hat{\gamma}$. Since for δ small enough $\gamma_1([t_1 - \delta, t_1 + \delta])$ does not intersect the endpoints of γ , then $\hat{\gamma}$ must intersect the interior of γ , yielding a contradiction.

Since γ_1 is a regular curve and (3.2) holds, it follows from the implicit function theorem that $\gamma_1([t_1 - \delta, t_1 + \delta]) \subset \gamma((0, 1))$ is an open neighborhood of $\gamma(t_*)$, and hence contains $\gamma(t)$ for all t in some neighborhood of t_* . This proves that I_1 is open, as claimed. \square

We next give a homological interpretation of the symmetric difference.

Proposition 3.5. *Compatible cuts Γ_1 and Γ_2 are homologous if and only if $\overline{\Gamma_1 \Delta \Gamma_2}$ is null homologous.*

Proof. Parameterize $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ by curves $\{\gamma_a\}_{a \in A}$ as in Lemma 3.4. Defining $A_1 = \{a \in A : \text{Im } \gamma_a \subset \Gamma_1\}$ and likewise for A_2 , we have $A = A_1 \cup A_2$ and $A_1 \cap A_2 = \{a \in A : \text{Im } \gamma_a \subset \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2\}$. It follows that $\gamma_1 = \sum_{a \in A_1} \gamma_a$ represents Γ_1 and similarly for $\gamma_2 = \sum_{a \in A_2} \gamma_a$. Since our coefficients are in \mathbb{Z}_2 , we have

$$\gamma_1 - \gamma_2 = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = \sum_{a \in A_1} \gamma_a + \sum_{a \in A_2} \gamma_a = \sum_{a \in A_1 \Delta A_2} \gamma_a, \quad (3.3)$$

because each γ_a with $a \in A_1 \cap A_2$ appears in the sum exactly twice and hence cancels. The chain on the right-hand side represents $\overline{\Gamma_1 \Delta \Gamma_2}$, so we conclude that $[\gamma_1 - \gamma_2] = 0$ if and only if $\overline{\Gamma_1 \Delta \Gamma_2}$ is null homologous. \square

Theorem 3.3 is then an immediate consequence of the following.

Proposition 3.6. *A piecewise C^1 cut $\Gamma \subset M$ is null homologous if and only if it is the boundary set of a bipartite partition.*

The proof uses simplicial (rather than singular) homology, with a triangulation of M that is adapted to Γ . While the simplicial approach is convenient for studying a fixed cut, Definition 1.5 requires us to compare arbitrary cuts, a flexibility afforded by singular homology.

Proof. Let $P = \{\Omega_i\}$ denote the partition whose subdomains are the connected components of $M^\circ \setminus \Gamma$. Triangulating each $\overline{\Omega}_i$ and then subdividing as needed (see Figure 3.1), we obtain a triangulation of M with the following properties:

- The interior of each 2-simplex is contained in some Ω_i .
- There is a subset of 1-simplices whose union is Γ .
- Each 1-simplex satisfies exactly one of the following:
 - (a) it is a face of two distinct 2-simplices; or
 - (b) it is contained in ∂M .

Writing the sets of 1- and 2-simplices as $K^{(1)}$ and $K^{(2)}$, respectively, let

$$\gamma = \sum_{\tau \in K_\Gamma^{(1)}} \tau, \quad K_\Gamma^{(1)} = \{\tau \in K^{(1)} : \tau \subset \Gamma\}. \quad (3.4)$$

The isomorphism $H_1^\Delta(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H_1(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ between simplicial and singular homology identifies γ with a singular 1-chain representing Γ . Therefore, it suffices to show that P is bipartite if and only if $[\gamma] = 0 \in H_1^\Delta(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. To prove this, we show that the following are equivalent:

- (1) P is bipartite.
- (2) There exists $K_\Gamma^{(2)} \subset K^{(2)}$ such that

$$\tau \subset \Gamma \iff \tau \text{ is a face of some 2-simplices } \sigma \in K_\Gamma^{(2)} \text{ and } \tilde{\sigma} \notin K_\Gamma^{(2)}. \quad (3.5)$$

- (3) $[\gamma] = 0 \in H_1^\Delta(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

Note that the condition in (2) means that each 1-simplex in the boundary set Γ is the face of two different 2-simplices, exactly one of which is in $K_\Gamma^{(2)}$.

We first prove (1) implies (2). If P is bipartite, then each Ω_i , and hence the interior of each 2-simplex, is colored red or blue. Let $K_\Gamma^{(2)} = \{\sigma \in K^{(2)} : \text{int } \sigma \text{ is blue}\}$. If $\tau \subset \Gamma$, then it is not contained in ∂M , and hence is the face of two distinct 2-simplices, σ and $\tilde{\sigma}$, whose interiors are contained in subdomains Ω_i and Ω_j . These subdomains are neighbors, and hence have different colors, so exactly one of $\sigma, \tilde{\sigma}$ is contained in $K_\Gamma^{(2)}$. This proves (\Rightarrow) in (3.5), and (\Leftarrow) is immediate.

Next, we show that (2) implies (1). If $K_\Gamma^{(2)} \subset K^{(2)}$ satisfies (3.5), we will define a coloring of P by declaring that Ω_i is “blue” if it contains the interior of some $\sigma \in K_\Gamma^{(2)}$. To see that this is well defined, we must show that the set $K_{\Omega_i}^{(2)} = \{\sigma \in K^{(2)} : \text{int } \sigma \subset \Omega_i\}$ is contained in either $K_\Gamma^{(2)}$ or its complement. If $\sigma, \tilde{\sigma} \in K_{\Omega_i}^{(2)}$ have a common face that is not contained in Γ , it follows from (3.5) that σ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are both in $K_\Gamma^{(2)}$ or both in its complement. Since $\overline{\Omega}_i$ is connected, we conclude that $K_\Gamma^{(2)}$ either contains $K_{\Omega_i}^{(2)}$ or is disjoint from it.




FIGURE 3.2. Two cuts of the annulus that have $\Gamma_{1,\text{odd}} = \Gamma_{2,\text{odd}} = \emptyset$ but are not homologous.

We now declare Ω_i to be “blue” if $K_{\Omega_i}^{(2)} \subset K_{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ and “red” otherwise. Suppose Ω_i and Ω_j are neighbors, so there exist 2-simplices σ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ with interiors in Ω_i and Ω_j , respectively, having a common face contained in the boundary set Γ . It follows from (3.5) that one of $\sigma, \tilde{\sigma}$ is contained in $K_{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ and the other is not. This means Ω_i and Ω_j have different colors, so we conclude that P is bipartite, thus completing the proof that (1) is equivalent to (2).

Next, we show that (2) implies (3). If $K_{\Gamma}^{(2)} \subset K^{(2)}$ satisfying (3.5) exists, we define

$$\bar{\sigma} = \sum_{\sigma \in K_{\Gamma}^{(2)}} \sigma. \quad (3.6)$$

From (3.5) we know that every 1-simplex that is not in Γ is either in ∂M or is the face of an even number of 2-simplices in $K_{\Gamma}^{(2)}$. It follows that $\partial\bar{\sigma} - \gamma$ is a sum of 1-simplices contained in ∂M , therefore γ is null homologous relative to ∂M .

Finally, we show that (3) implies (2). If $[\gamma] = 0 \in H_1^{\Delta}(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, then there is a 2-chain $\bar{\sigma}$ for which $\partial\bar{\sigma} - \gamma$ is supported in ∂M . Defining $K_{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ to be the set of 2-simplices appearing in $\bar{\sigma}$, we conclude that every 1-simplex in γ must be a face of exactly one 2-simplex in $K_{\Gamma}^{(2)}$, so (3.5) holds. \square

3.4. Homology and odd points. Given a piecewise C^1 cut Γ , we let Γ_{odd} denote the set of points in the interior of M where an odd number of curves terminate. The following observation relates this to Definition 1.5.

Proposition 3.7. *If Γ_1 is homologous to Γ_2 , then $\Gamma_{1,\text{odd}} = \Gamma_{2,\text{odd}}$.*

That is, a necessary condition for Γ_1 and Γ_2 to be homologous is that they have the same odd points. This is not, however, a sufficient condition, as shown in Figure 3.2. The proposition is an immediate consequence of the following lemma, which also makes it clear why $\Gamma_{1,\text{odd}} = \Gamma_{2,\text{odd}}$ is not sufficient.

Lemma 3.8. *Let γ_1 and γ_2 represent Γ and Γ_2 . The difference $\gamma_1 - \gamma_2$ is a relative 1-cycle if and only if $\Gamma_{1,\text{odd}} = \Gamma_{2,\text{odd}}$.*

In other words, $\Gamma_{1,\text{odd}} = \Gamma_{2,\text{odd}}$ ensures the homology class $[\gamma_1 - \gamma_2] \in H_1(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is defined, but does not guarantee that it is zero except in the case that $H_1(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is

trivial. This explains the presence of the annulus in Figure 3.2—no such example is possible on a simply connected domain.

The proof of Lemma 3.8 is a direct consequence of the definition of ∂_1 and the fact that the endpoints of the curves in γ_1 and γ_2 will cancel in pairs, regardless of orientation, since we are using \mathbb{Z}_2 coefficients.

4. HOMOLOGY AND UNITARY EQUIVALENCE

In this section we prove Proposition 2.2. The case when Γ_1 and Γ_2 intersect transversely uses the equivalent characterization of homology in Theorem 3.3 and is presented in Section 4.1. The general case is presented in Section 4.2 and uses a transversality argument. We prove Corollary 1.7 in Section 4.3.

4.1. The transverse case. The following characterization is useful for comparing partitions.

Lemma 4.1. *If Γ_1 and Γ_2 are piecewise C^1 cuts that intersect transversely, then*

$$W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma_1) = \left\{ u \in W^{1,2}(M^o \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2)) : u \text{ vanishes on } \partial M, \text{ is continuous across } \Gamma_2, \text{ and is anti-continuous across } \Gamma_1 \right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. Let $u \in W^{1,2}(M^o \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2))$. Comparing (2.2) and (4.1), it suffices to prove that u is contained in $W^{1,2}(M^o \setminus \Gamma_1)$ if and only if it is continuous across Γ_2 . This follows immediately from the definition of the weak derivative and integration by parts. \square

Using this, we prove a special case of Proposition 2.2.

Lemma 4.2. *If Γ_1 and Γ_2 are homologous and intersect transversely, then $-\Delta^{\Gamma_1}$ and $-\Delta^{\Gamma_2}$ are unitarily equivalent. That is, there is a unitary operator Φ on $L^2(M)$ that maps $W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma_1)$ onto $W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma_2)$ and satisfies*

$$b_{\Gamma_2}(\Phi u, \Phi v) = b_{\Gamma_1}(u, v)$$

for all $u, v \in W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma_1)$.

Proof. For convenience we set $\Gamma = \overline{\Gamma_1 \Delta \Gamma_2} = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$. Since Γ_1 and Γ_2 are homologous, Γ is the boundary set of a bipartite partition, by Theorem 3.3. Denoting this partition by $P = \{\Omega_i\}$, we let U_+ and U_- denote the union of the blue and red subdomains, respectively, and then define $\Phi: L^2(M) \rightarrow L^2(M)$ by

$$\Phi u = \begin{cases} u & \text{on } U_+, \\ -u & \text{on } U_-. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

This is an isometric isomorphism of $L^2(M)$ by design.

Suppose $u \in W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma_1)$. By Lemma 4.1 we have $u \in W^{1,2}(M^o \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2))$, u vanishes on ∂M , is continuous across Γ_2 , and is anti-continuous across Γ_1 . Since every connected

component of $M^o \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2)$ is contained in either U_+ or U_- , we see that Φu belongs to $W^{1,2}(M^o \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2))$ and still vanishes on ∂M . Therefore, the desired conclusion will follow by applying Lemma 4.1 with the roles of Γ_1 and Γ_2 reversed, if we show that Φu is continuous across Γ_1 and anti-continuous across Γ_2 .

Now consider a smooth segment $\Gamma_* \subset \Gamma$. Since Γ_* is contained in $\partial\Omega_i \cap \partial\Omega_j$ for some i and j , Ω_i and Ω_j are neighbors. Using that P is bipartite, Ω_i and Ω_j must have different colors, so one is contained in U_+ and the other is in U_- . It follows that Φ changes the sign of u on exactly one side of Γ_* . Recalling that $\Gamma = \overline{\Gamma_1 \Delta \Gamma_2}$, there are two cases to consider:

- (1) $\Gamma_* \subset \Gamma_1$: u is anti-continuous across Γ_* , therefore Φu is continuous across Γ_* .
- (2) $\Gamma_* \subset \Gamma_2$: u is continuous across Γ_* , therefore Φu is anti-continuous across Γ_* .

This implies $\Phi u \in W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma_2)$, and it follows immediately that $b_{\Gamma_2}(\Phi u, \Phi v) = b_{\Gamma_1}(u, v)$ for all $u, v \in W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma_1)$. The same argument shows that Φ^{-1} maps $W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma_2)$ into $W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma_1)$ and completes the proof. \square

4.2. The general case. The following result allows us to reduce the proof of Proposition 2.2 to the special case already considered in Lemma 4.2.

Proposition 4.3. *Given piecewise C^1 cuts Γ_1 and Γ_2 , there is a piecewise C^1 cut $\tilde{\Gamma}$ that is homologous to Γ_1 and intersects Γ_1 and Γ_2 transversely.*

Proof. We construct $\tilde{\Gamma}$ by deforming each segment of Γ_1 via a fixed endpoint homotopy. This guarantees $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is homologous to Γ_1 . Moreover, we shall see that $\tilde{\Gamma}$ can be assumed to lie in an arbitrarily small tubular neighborhood of Γ_1 .

Consider a regular C^1 curve $\gamma_1: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ that is part of Γ_1 . Without loss of generality (subdividing if necessary), we can assume $\gamma_1(0) \neq \gamma_1(1)$. Choosing a normal direction along γ_1 and letting t denote the distance in this direction, we obtain coordinates (s, t) in a tubular neighborhood of γ_1 , with respect to which γ_1 is given by $\{(s, 0) : s \in [0, 1]\}$. Equivalently, it is the graph of the function $t(s) = 0$.

For sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, the deformed graph

$$t_\epsilon(s) = \begin{cases} \epsilon s, & 0 \leq s < \frac{1}{2}, \\ \epsilon(1-s), & \frac{1}{2} \leq s \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

will be transverse to Γ_1 , Γ_2 and ∂M at both endpoints, and hence for s in some neighborhood $[0, \delta) \cup (1 - \delta, 1]$. On the other hand, the parametric transversality theorem (see, for instance, [11, Lem. II.4.6]) guarantees that the ‘‘shifted’’ curve $t(s) = t_*$ intersects Γ_1 , Γ_2 and ∂M transversely for almost all t_* . Therefore, there exists $\delta_* \in (0, \delta)$ such that the graph of

$$\tilde{t}(s) = \begin{cases} \epsilon s, & 0 \leq s < \delta_*, \\ \epsilon \delta_*, & \delta_* \leq s \leq 1 - \delta_*, \\ \epsilon(1-s), & 1 - \delta_* < s \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$



FIGURE 4.1. The graph of t_ϵ intersects Γ_1 , Γ_2 and ∂M transversely for $s \in [0, \delta) \cup (1 - \delta, 1]$, whereas the constant t_* does so for all $s \in [0, 1]$. Gluing these together at some $\delta_* \in (0, \delta)$, we obtain a curve that has the same endpoints as γ_1 and intersects Γ_1 , Γ_2 and ∂M transversely for all $s \in [0, 1]$.

intersects Γ_1 , Γ_2 and ∂M transversely. It follows immediately from (4.4) that this curve is homotopic (with fixed endpoints) to γ_1 , and hence is homologous to γ_1 .

To complete the proof we repeat the argument inductively, homotoping each segment of Γ_1 so that it is transverse to Γ_1 , Γ_2 , ∂M and the previously modified segments of Γ_1 . \square

We are finally ready to prove our main proposition.

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Suppose Γ_1 and Γ_2 are homologous. Using Proposition 4.3 we can find a piecewise C^1 cut $\tilde{\Gamma}$ that is homologous to Γ_1 (and hence to Γ_2) and intersects both Γ_1 and Γ_2 transversely. Now Lemma 4.2 implies that $-\Delta^{\Gamma_1}$ and $-\Delta^{\Gamma_2}$ are both unitarily equivalent to $-\Delta^{\tilde{\Gamma}}$, so the result follows because unitary equivalence is transitive. \square

To recap, we have now established Proposition 2.2 and thus Theorem 1.6 which was derived from Proposition 2.2 in Section 2.2.

4.3. The case of equality: proof of Corollary 1.7. Corollary 1.7 is an immediate consequence of the following.

Lemma 4.4. *Let Γ be a piecewise C^1 cut. If \tilde{P} is the nodal partition of an eigenfunction of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ and $\partial\tilde{P}$ is a piecewise C^1 cut, then $\partial\tilde{P}$ is homologous to Γ .*

In the proof it will be important to keep in mind that an eigenfunction of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ does not necessarily change sign across its zero set, but can change sign without being zero, on account of the discontinuity across Γ . That is, the set where the eigenfunction changes sign need not coincide with its zero set.

Proof. Using Proposition 4.3, we can obtain a cut $\hat{\Gamma}$ that is homologous to Γ and intersects $\partial\tilde{P}$ transversely. The operators $-\Delta^\Gamma$ and $-\Delta^{\hat{\Gamma}}$ are unitarily equivalent by Proposition 2.2. Moreover, the unitary map Φ , defined in (4.2), preserves zero sets, therefore $\partial\tilde{P}$ is the nodal partition of an eigenfunction of $-\Delta^{\hat{\Gamma}}$.

We thus assume for the rest of the proof that Γ intersects $\partial\tilde{P}$ transversely. By Theorem 3.3, it suffices to show that $\Gamma \cup \partial\tilde{P}$ is the boundary set of a bipartite partition. Let ψ denote the eigenfunction of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ whose nodal partition is \tilde{P} . It is only possible for ψ to change sign where it equals zero or is discontinuous, i.e., on the set $\Gamma \cup \partial\tilde{P}$. Since Γ and $\partial\tilde{P}$ intersect transversely, there are two possibilities, shown in Figure 4.2:




FIGURE 4.2. The graph of ψ along a curve transverse to $\Gamma \cup \partial\tilde{P}$, showing that it only changes sign on the symmetric difference $\overline{\Gamma \Delta \partial\tilde{P}}$, as in Lemma 4.4 and Remark 4.5.

- (1) $\partial\tilde{P} \setminus \Gamma$: ψ is zero and its normal derivative is continuous, so ψ changes sign;
- (2) $\Gamma \setminus \partial\tilde{P}$: ψ is nonzero and anti-continuous, so it changes sign;

It follows that $\Gamma \cup \partial\tilde{P} = \overline{\Gamma \Delta \partial\tilde{P}}$ is precisely the set where ψ changes sign, therefore it is the boundary set of a bipartite partition. \square

Remark 4.5. In the proof of Lemma 4.4 we only needed to consider the case that Γ and $\partial\tilde{P}$ intersect transversely. Nonetheless, it is instructive to consider what happens when $\Gamma \cap \partial\tilde{P}$ contains a curve segment. The eigenfunction ψ will vanish on this segment (because it is contained in the nodal set $\partial\tilde{P}$) and the normal derivative of ψ will be anti-continuous (because it is contained in Γ), thus ψ will not change sign across this segment. See Figure 4.2.

5. DEFINING PARTITION EIGENVALUES FOR CONTINUOUS CUTS

We now relax the regularity hypotheses in Theorem 1.6, replacing Γ by an arbitrary 1-chain and resulting in the more general Theorem 5.3. To remove the assumption that Γ is piecewise C^1 , we use the fact that the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_n(\Gamma)\}$ of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ and the nodal domains of the corresponding eigenfunctions only depend on the homology class of Γ . This means we can define “eigenvalues” and “nodal partitions” for any singular 1-chain by deforming it to a piecewise C^1 cut and then considering the eigenvalues and nodal domains of the corresponding cut Laplacian. Allowing $\partial\tilde{P}$ to be less regular, on the other hand, is more delicate, and requires an approximation argument which is given in Lemma 5.4.

Recalling the notion of a piecewise C^1 cut from Definition 1.2 and a singular 1-chain from Section 3.1, we have the following.

Lemma 5.1. *Every singular 1-chain $\gamma \in C_1(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is homologous to a finite sum of regular C^1 curves $\{\tilde{\gamma}_a\}$ that intersect one another (and ∂M) transversely, and only do so at their endpoints. Each of these curves can be taken to lie in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of γ .*

By a slight abuse of terminology we will say that γ is homologous to the piecewise C^1 cut generated by the $\tilde{\gamma}_a$.

Proof. Write $\gamma = \sum_a \gamma_a$, where each γ_a is a continuous curve in M . It is standard that each γ_a is homotopic (with fixed endpoints) to a smooth curve $\hat{\gamma}_a$, and this approximation can

be done in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of γ_a . Since there are only finitely many $\hat{\gamma}_a$, we can deform them one at a time, using Proposition 4.3, so that they intersect one another and ∂M transversely. Subdividing if necessary, we can assume that these intersections only occur at the endpoints. \square

We can now give our main definition.

Definition 5.2. Fix $\gamma \in C_1(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and let Γ be a piecewise C^1 cut homologous to γ .

- (1) The *eigenvalues* of γ are the numbers $\lambda_n(\gamma) = \lambda_n(\Gamma)$, $n \geq 1$.
- (2) A partition of M is γ -nodal if it is the nodal partition of an eigenfunction of $-\Delta^\Gamma$.
- (3) A γ -nodal k -partition, corresponding to an eigenvalue λ_* , is *Courant sharp* if $k = \min\{n : \lambda_n(\gamma) = \lambda_*\}$.

Lemma 5.1 guarantees that such a Γ exists, and Proposition 2.2 ensures that the corresponding eigenvalues and nodal partitions do not depend on the choice of Γ . It follows that homologous 1-chains $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in C_1(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ have the same eigenvalues and nodal partitions.

Analogous to (1.4), we define

$$\mathcal{P}_k^0(\gamma) = \{\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k : \partial\tilde{P} \text{ contains the image of a 1-chain that is homologous to } \gamma\}. \quad (5.1)$$

Since the curves in a 1-chain are just assumed to be continuous, the boundary set of a partition in $\mathcal{P}_k^0(\gamma)$ can be quite irregular. Therefore, even if a 1-chain γ represents a piecewise C^1 cut Γ , the set $\mathcal{P}_k^0(\gamma)$ is larger than the set $\mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma)$ defined in (1.4).

This means the following result is stronger³ than Theorem 1.6, no matter how regular γ is.

Theorem 5.3. *If $\gamma \in C_1(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

$$\lambda_k(\gamma) \leq \inf \{\Lambda(\tilde{P}) : \tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k^0(\gamma)\}, \quad (5.2)$$

with $\lambda_k(\gamma) = \Lambda(\tilde{P})$ if and only if \tilde{P} is a γ -nodal partition with eigenvalue $\lambda_k(\gamma)$. In particular, if $P \in \mathcal{P}_k$ is a Courant sharp γ -nodal partition, then $\Lambda(P) \leq \Lambda(\tilde{P})$ for all $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k^0(\gamma)$.

The proof is similar to that of Theorem 1.6, with one crucial difference. The boundary set $\partial\tilde{P}$ contains the image of a 1-chain $\tilde{\gamma}$ that is homologous to γ , but since $\tilde{\gamma}$ is not assumed to represent a piecewise C^1 cut, we cannot directly use Proposition 2.2 to transform a \tilde{P} -ground state into a test function for the cut Laplacian, as was done above. We instead use the following.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\gamma \in C_1(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and suppose $\tilde{P} = \{\tilde{\Omega}_i\} \in \mathcal{P}_k^0(\gamma)$. For any piecewise C^1 cut Γ that is homologous to γ , there is a unitary operator Φ on $L^2(M)$ that maps $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k W_0^{1,2}(\tilde{\Omega}_i)$ into $W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma)$ and satisfies*

$$b_\Gamma(\Phi u, \Phi u) = \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_i} |\nabla u_i|^2 dV \quad (5.3)$$

³Except when Γ is null homologous, in which case $\mathcal{P}_k(\Gamma) = \mathcal{P}_k^0(\gamma) = \mathcal{P}_k$ is the set of all k -partitions and the two theorems are equivalent.

for all $u = (u_1, \dots, u_k) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^k W_0^{1,2}(\tilde{\Omega}_i)$.

In the special case that $\partial\tilde{P}$ contains a piecewise C^1 cut, say $\tilde{\Gamma}$, that is homologous to Γ , then $\bigoplus_i W_0^{1,2}(\tilde{\Omega}_i)$ can be identified with a subspace of $W_0^{1,2}(M; \tilde{\Gamma})$ and Lemma 5.4 follows directly from Proposition 2.2.

Proof. We first define Φ on $C_0^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}_i)$ for a fixed i . Let $\{K_n\}$ be a collection of compact sets in $\tilde{\Omega}_i$ with $K_1 \subset K_2 \subset \dots$ and $\bigcup_n K_n = \tilde{\Omega}_i$, and let $\tilde{\Gamma}$ denote the subset of $\partial\tilde{P}$ that is homologous to Γ . For each n we can use Lemma 5.1 to find a piecewise C^1 cut, $\tilde{\Gamma}_n$, that is homologous to $\tilde{\Gamma}$ (and hence to Γ) and is disjoint from K_n .

By Proposition 2.2 there is a unitary operator Φ_n on $L^2(M)$ that maps $W_0^{1,2}(M; \tilde{\Gamma}_n)$ onto $W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma)$ and satisfies

$$b_\Gamma(\Phi_n u, \Phi_n v) = b_{\tilde{\Gamma}_n}(u, v) \quad (5.4)$$

for all $u, v \in W_0^{1,2}(M; \tilde{\Gamma}_n)$. Changing the signs of some of the Φ_n if necessary, we can assume that if $\text{supp } u \subset K_m$ for some m , then $\Phi_n u = \Phi_m u$ for all $n \geq m$. Thus for any $u_i \in C_0^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}_i)$ we define

$$\Phi^i u_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_n u_i. \quad (5.5)$$

The limit exists in $W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma)$ because it is eventually constant.

Since each Φ_n is a unitary map on $L^2(M)$, we get $\|\Phi^i u_i\|_{L^2(M)} = \|u_i\|_{L^2(M)}$. Moreover, since $\text{supp } u_i$ will be contained in a single connected component of $M^o \setminus \tilde{\Gamma}_n$ for large enough n , we have from (5.4) that

$$b_\Gamma(\Phi^i u_i, \Phi^i u_i) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_\Gamma(\Phi_n u_i, \Phi_n u_i) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{\tilde{\Gamma}_n}(u_i, u_i) = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_i} |\nabla u_i|^2 dV. \quad (5.6)$$

By continuity we can therefore extend Φ^i to a bounded linear map $W_0^{1,2}(\tilde{\Omega}_i) \rightarrow W_0^{1,2}(M; \Gamma)$ that satisfies (5.6). Repeating for each i and letting $\Phi = \bigoplus_i \Phi_i$ completes the proof. \square

With this lemma at our disposal, the rest of the proof of Theorem 5.3 is identical to that of Theorem 1.6.

6. APPLICATIONS

We now give some applications of Theorem 1.6 (more precisely, its generalization Theorem 5.3) and Corollary 1.7, one of which was already stated in the introduction. A common theme here is that the topological hypotheses of the theorem are reduced to the computations of relative homology groups. Note that by Poincaré–Lefschetz duality we have $H_1(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong H^1(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$; see, for instance, [13, Thm. 3.34].

6.1. The disk. We consider radial partitions of the disk $M = \{(x, y) : x^2 + y^2 \leq 1\}$, as in Figure 6.1. The radial k -partition is only Courant sharp for the corresponding partition Laplacian when $1 \leq k \leq 5$. In particular, the radial partitions for $k = 1, 2, 4$ are bipartite and hence minimal, but the minimal 3- and 5-partitions of the disk are not bipartite [18,




FIGURE 6.1. Radial 3- and 5-partitions of the disk.

Prop. 9.2]. The radial configurations shown in Figure 6.1 are each minimal within a certain topological class of partitions, by Theorem 5.3, so they are plausible candidates for the minima.

We now describe the classes in which they are minimal. The result for $k = 3$ appeared as Theorem 1.8 in the introduction; for convenience we restate it here.

Theorem 6.1. *The radial k -partition, $k \in \{3, 5\}$, is minimal among all k -partitions whose boundary set contains a curve from the origin to the boundary of the disk. Moreover, it has strictly lower energy than any k -partition whose boundary set contains such a curve but is not homologous to it.*

Proof. Let P denote the radial k -partition in question. This is a nodal partition for $-\Delta^\Gamma$, where $\Gamma = \{0\} \times [0, 1]$. Suppose \tilde{P} is a k -partition whose nodal set contains a curve from the origin to some point on the boundary. Denoting this curve by $\tilde{\Gamma}$, we see that the concatenation of Γ with $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is a curve with both endpoints on the boundary. This means $\Gamma - \tilde{\Gamma}$ is a relative 1-cycle, and hence is null-homologous because $H_1(D, \partial D; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is trivial, so the result follows from Theorem 5.3. \square

6.2. The sphere. Now consider the 3-partition of S^2 given by the meridians 0° , 120° and -120° . In [19] this is called the **Y**-partition, and it was shown to be the unique (up to rotations) minimal 3-partition of the sphere. To the best of our knowledge, this is the only rigorously known example of a non-bipartite minimal partition. There are two main steps in the proof:

- (i) If the boundary set of a minimal 3-partition of S^2 contains two antipodal points, then it is (up to rotation) the **Y**-partition.
- (ii) The boundary set of any minimal 3-partition of S^2 contains two antipodal points.

On the other hand, Theorem 5.3 easily implies the following, since $H_1(S^2; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is trivial.

Theorem 6.2. *The **Y**-partition is minimal among all 3-partitions whose boundary set contains a curve joining two antipodal points. Moreover, it has strictly lower energy than any 3-partition whose boundary set contains such a curve but is not homologous to it.*

In light of the results in [19], Theorem 6.2 is not new. However, it provides a different route to the proof of minimality of the **Y**-partition, by showing that *any* 3-partition whose

boundary set contains a curve joining two antipodal points⁴ has energy at least as big as the \mathbf{Y} -partition. That is, Theorem 6.2 is neither a stronger nor weaker statement than (i), but yields the same conclusion when combined with (ii).

6.3. The torus. Following [17], we let $\mathbb{T}(1, b)$ denote the 2-torus obtained by identifying opposite sides of $[0, 1] \times [0, b]$, and let $P_k(b)$ denote the k -partition of $\mathbb{T}(1, b)$ generated by k uniformly spaced vertical loops, $\{i/k\} \times S^1$.

It is known that $P_k(b)$ is minimal only when b is sufficiently small, so it is natural to ask where the transition occurs, i.e., what is the value of

$$b_k = \sup \{b : P_k(b) \text{ is a minimal partition of } \mathbb{T}(1, b)\}. \quad (6.1)$$

In [17] it was shown that $b_k = 2/k$ if k is even and

$$\frac{1}{k} \leq b_k \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{k^2 - 1}} \quad (6.2)$$

if k is odd. In [7] the lower bound was improved to $b_k \geq b_k^S$ for some number⁵ satisfying $1/k < b_k^S < 1/\sqrt{k^2 - 1}$, and it was conjectured that b_k is given by the upper bound in (6.2).

Defining a ‘‘vertical loop’’ to be a closed curve that winds about $\mathbb{T}(1, b)$ once in the y direction but zero times in the x direction, we get the following from Theorem 5.3.

Theorem 6.3. *If $k \geq 3$ is odd and $0 < b \leq 2/\sqrt{k^2 - 1}$, then $P_k(b)$ is minimal among all k -partitions whose boundary set contains a vertical loop. Moreover, it has strictly lower energy than any k -partition whose boundary set contains such a loop but is not homologous to it.*

Proof. It is easily verified that $P_k(b)$ is the nodal partition of an eigenfunction of $-\Delta^\Gamma$, where $\Gamma = \{0\} \times S^1$, and it is Courant sharp if and only if $b \leq 2/\sqrt{k^2 - 1}$. To complete the proof we observe that a vertical loop is precisely a curve that is homologous to Γ . \square

Since $P_k(b)$ is a nodal partition, we can conclude from [3, Thm. 6] that it locally minimizes the energy Λ for $b < 2/\sqrt{k^2 - 1}$ but not for $b > 2/\sqrt{k^2 - 1}$. This gives an alternate proof of the upper bound on b_k in (6.2), and in fact gives the stronger result that $P_k(b)$ is not even a *local* minimum for b larger than this value.

A result equivalent to Theorem 6.3 was shown in [7, Prop. 2.7] by a double covering argument. The equivalence follows from the observation that a k -partition of $\mathbb{T}(1, b)$ lifts to a $2k$ -partition of the double cover $\mathbb{T}(2, b)$ if and only if its boundary set contains a vertical loop.

6.4. The cylinder. The thin cylinder with Neumann boundary conditions was studied in [16], but no results are known for the corresponding Dirichlet problem. We consider $\mathbb{C}(1, b) = S^1 \times (0, b)$, where S^1 is the circle with length 1, so the Laplacian eigenfunctions are

$$\cos(2m\pi x) \sin\left(\frac{n\pi y}{b}\right), \quad m \geq 0, \quad n \geq 1, \quad \sin(2m\pi x) \sin\left(\frac{n\pi y}{b}\right), \quad m, n \geq 1, \quad (6.3)$$

⁴If the boundary set of a non-bipartite 3-partition of S^2 contains two antipodal points, then it necessarily contains a curve joining them, by [19, Prop 4.3].

⁵The number b_k^S is defined by an eigenvalue optimization problem on the strip $\mathbb{R} \times (0, b)$; see [7, Eq. (1.4)].

with eigenvalues $\lambda_{m,n} = (2m\pi)^2 + (n\pi/b)^2$.

We let $P_k(b)$ denote the k -partition of $\mathbb{C}(1, b)$ generated by k uniformly spaced vertical lines, $\{i/k\} \times [0, b]$. When k is even this is a nodal partition of a Laplacian eigenfunction, namely $\sin(k\pi x) \sin(\pi y/b)$, and it is easily shown that it is Courant sharp, and hence minimal, if and only if $b \leq \sqrt{3}/k$.

The case k odd is more interesting.

Theorem 6.4. *If $k \geq 3$ is odd and $0 < b \leq \sqrt{3/(k^2 - 1)}$, then $P_k(b)$ is minimal among all k -partitions whose nodal set contains a curve between the two boundary circles. Moreover, it has strictly lower energy than any k -partition whose boundary set contains such a curve but is not homologous to it.*

On the other hand, it follows from [3, Thm. 6] that for $b > \sqrt{3/(k^2 - 1)}$ the partition $P_k(b)$ is not even a local minimum.

Proof. Consider $-\Delta^\Gamma$ with $\Gamma = \{0\} \times S^1$. The eigenfunctions are given by (6.3) but with $m = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{5}{2}, \dots$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, therefore $P_k(b)$ is the nodal partition of the eigenfunction $\sin(k\pi x) \sin(\pi y/b)$, which has $m = \frac{k}{2}$ and $n = 1$. To see when this is Courant sharp, we note that $\lambda_{k/2,1}$ is the k th eigenvalue of $-\Delta^\Gamma$ if and only if $\lambda_{k/2,1} \leq \lambda_{1/2,2}$, which is equivalent to $k^2 + b^{-2} \leq 1 + 4b^{-2}$ and hence to $b \leq \sqrt{3/(k^2 - 1)}$. Finally, we note that $H_1(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ is generated by a curve between the inner and outer boundaries, therefore any such curve must be homologous to Γ . \square

Remark 6.5. In [16] it is shown that the nodal set of a minimal 3-partition of a sufficiently thin cylinder, with Neumann conditions on the external boundary, must contain a curve between the two boundary circles. It is essential to the proof that the groundstates of the partition satisfy mixed Dirichlet/Neumann boundary conditions (on the internal/external boundary, respectively), therefore the argument does not work for the Dirichlet problem.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank Tom Baird, Bernard Helffer and Peter Kuchment for helpful comments and discussions. G.B. acknowledges the support of NSF Grant DMS-2247473. Y.C. was supported by NSF CAREER Grant DMS-2045494. G.C. acknowledges the support of NSERC grant RGPIN-2017-04259. J.L.M. acknowledges support from the NSF through NSF Applied Math Grant DMS-2307384 and NSF FRG grant DMS-2152289. The authors are grateful to the AIM SQuaRE program for hosting them and supporting the initiation of this project.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. W. ALT, L. A. CAFFARELLI, AND A. FRIEDMAN, *Variational problems with two phases and their free boundaries*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 282 (1984), pp. 431–461.
- [2] R. BAND, G. COX, AND S. K. EGGER, *Defining the spectral position of a Neumann domain*, Anal. PDE, 16 (2023), pp. 2147–2171.
- [3] G. BERKOLAIKO, Y. CANZANI, G. COX, AND J. MARZUOLA, *Stability of spectral partitions and the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 61 (2022), pp. Paper No. 203, 17.

- [4] G. BERKOLAIKO, G. COX, B. HELFFER, AND M. SUNDQVIST, *Computing nodal deficiency with a refined Dirichlet-to-Neumann map*, J. Geom. Anal., 32 (2022), pp. Paper No. 246, 36.
- [5] V. BONNAILLIE-NOËL AND B. HELFFER, *On spectral minimal partitions: the disk revisited*, Ann. Univ. Buchar. Math. Ser., 4(LXII) (2013), pp. 321–342.
- [6] ———, *Nodal and spectral minimal partitions—the state of the art in 2016*, in Shape optimization and spectral theory, De Gruyter Open, Warsaw, 2017, pp. 353–397.
- [7] V. BONNAILLIE-NOËL AND C. LÉNA, *Spectral minimal partitions for a family of tori*, Exp. Math., 26 (2017), pp. 381–395.
- [8] M. CONTI, S. TERRACINI, AND G. VERZINI, *On a class of optimal partition problems related to the Fučík spectrum and to the monotonicity formulae*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 22 (2005), pp. 45–72.
- [9] ———, *A variational problem for the spatial segregation of reaction-diffusion systems*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 54 (2005), pp. 779–815.
- [10] R. COURANT AND D. HILBERT, *Methods of mathematical physics. Vol. I*, Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, N.Y., 1953.
- [11] M. GOLUBITSKY AND V. GUILLEMIN, *Stable mappings and their singularities*, vol. 14 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1973.
- [12] P. GRISVARD, *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, vol. 69 of Classics in Applied Mathematics, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2011.
- [13] A. HATCHER, *Algebraic topology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [14] B. HELFFER, M. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, T. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, AND M. P. OWEN, *Nodal sets for groundstates of Schrödinger operators with zero magnetic field in non-simply connected domains*, Comm. Math. Phys., 202 (1999), pp. 629–649.
- [15] B. HELFFER AND T. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, *On minimal partitions: new properties and applications to the disk*, in Spectrum and dynamics, vol. 52 of CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010, pp. 119–135.
- [16] ———, *Spectral minimal partitions for a thin strip on a cylinder or a thin annulus like domain with Neumann condition*, in Operator methods in mathematical physics, vol. 227 of Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2013, pp. 107–115.
- [17] ———, *Minimal partitions for anisotropic tori*, J. Spectr. Theory, 4 (2014), pp. 221–233.
- [18] B. HELFFER, T. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, AND S. TERRACINI, *Nodal domains and spectral minimal partitions*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 26 (2009), pp. 101–138.
- [19] B. HELFFER, T. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, AND S. TERRACINI, *On spectral minimal partitions: the case of the sphere*, in Around the Research of Vladimir Maz’ya III, Springer, 2010, pp. 153–178.
- [20] L. MICLO, *On hyperboundedness and spectrum of Markov operators*, Inventiones mathematicae, 200 (2015), pp. 311–343.
- [21] B. OSTING AND T. H. REEB, *Consistency of Dirichlet partitions*, SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis, 49 (2017), pp. 4251–4274.
- [22] B. OSTING, C. D. WHITE, AND É. OUDET, *Minimal Dirichlet energy partitions for graphs*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 36 (2014), pp. A1635–A1651.
- [23] Å. PLEIJEL, *Remarks on Courant’s nodal line theorem*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 9 (1956), pp. 543–550.
- [24] J. ROYO-LETELIER, *Segregation and symmetry breaking of strongly coupled two-component Bose–Einstein condensates in a harmonic trap*, Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations, 49 (2014), pp. 103–124.
- [25] K. SCHMÜDGEN, *Unbounded self-adjoint operators on Hilbert space*, vol. 265 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, Dordrecht, 2012.
- [26] D. WANG AND B. OSTING, *A diffusion generated method for computing Dirichlet partitions*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, 351 (2019), pp. 302–316.

- [27] D. ZOSSO, B. OSTING, AND S. J. OSHER, *A Dirichlet energy criterion for graph-based image segmentation*, in 2015 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshop (ICDMW), IEEE, 2015, pp. 821–830.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE STATION, TX 77843-3368, USA

Email address: berko@math.tamu.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL, PHILLIPS HALL, CHAPEL HILL, NC 27599, USA

Email address: canzani@email.unc.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND, ST. JOHN'S, NL A1C 5S7, CANADA

Email address: gcox@mun.ca

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL, PHILLIPS HALL, CHAPEL HILL, NC 27599, USA

Email address: marzuola@math.unc.edu