

ON MILNOR'S CRITERION FOR DECIDING WHETHER A SURFACE IS HYPERBOLIC OR PARABOLIC FOR BIHARMONIC FUNCTIONS

JOHN E. BRAVO AND JEAN C. CORTISSOZ

ABSTRACT. In this paper we generalise a celebrated result of Milnor that characterises whether a rotationally symmetric surface is parabolic or hyperbolic to the case of biharmonic functions.

Key words: Liouville's Theorem; bounded harmonic functions

AMS 2010 *Mathematics subject classification:* Primary 31C05, 53C21

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	3
2.1. A uniqueness theorem for biharmonic functions	5
3. A proof of Theorems 2 and 3	6
3.1. Theorem 2	6
3.2. Theorem 3	9
References	11

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1977 Milnor in [5] published a criterion (which according to himself surprised him), based on the curvature to decide whether \mathbb{R}^2 with a metric of the form

$$(1) \quad g = dr^2 + \phi(r)^2 d\theta^2.$$

was either hyperbolic (it admits bounded nonconstant harmonic functions) or parabolic (every bounded harmonic function must be constant). Namely he showed the following.

Theorem 1. *Let \mathbb{R}^2 with a complete metric of the form (1). If the curvature is greater than or equal to $-1/r^2 \log r$, then every bounded harmonic function must be constant. On the other hand, if there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that the curvature outside a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 is less than or equal to $-(1 + \epsilon)/r^2 \log r$, then there are non constant bounded harmonic functions.*

Of course, we need to define what is understood by a harmonic function in a surface with an arbitrary metric, and, incidentally, what we mean by a metric. This we shall do in Section 2, but for now, let us think that we are in \mathbb{R}^2 with its classical Euclidean structure, which in our context corresponds to having $\phi(r) = r$. In this case, in cartesian (not polar coordinates), the Laplacian, which depends for its definition on the metric given to \mathbb{R}^2 , is given (as the reader most probably knows) by

$$\Delta = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2},$$

and a function is harmonic if $\Delta u = 0$. The case of \mathbb{R}^2 with the usual metric, corresponds to curvature 0 (for the definition of curvature see Section 2), and Milnor's result generalizes Liouville's theorem: bounded harmonic functions are constant.

After Milnor's work, very little has been done regarding how the behaviour of biharmonic functions is affected by curvature. Let us introduce the relevant jargon. We say that a function u is k -harmonic if

$$(-\Delta)^k u = 0.$$

For instance, when $k = 1$, we recover the usual harmonic functions, and when $k = 2$, we have

$$\Delta^2 u = 0,$$

that is, we have the biharmonic functions. In general, we call the family of functions for $k \geq 2$ polyharmonic.

It is well known that in the euclidean case any bounded polyharmonic function is constant. There are several ways of proving this result, one of them, and perhaps the shortest, is using the theory of tempered distributions and the Fourier transform (see [4, 8]).

It is our purpose in this paper to extend Milnor's criteria to the family of biharmonic functions. Indeed, we shall first show the following.

Theorem 2. *Let \mathbb{R}^2 with a metric*

$$g = dr^2 + \phi(r)^2 d\theta^2.$$

with $\phi(r)$ so that the metric is smoothly extendable up to the origin (that is $\phi(0) = 0$, $\phi'(0) = 1$, and all the even derivatives of ϕ vanish at the origin). If outside of a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 the curvature satisfies $K \geq -\frac{1}{r^2 \log r}$ and $\phi(r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, then any bounded biharmonic function is constant.

The proof of this result is based on the method of separation of variables and Plancherel's theorem. This theorem can be generalised to the case of polyharmonic functions, but in our attempt to make our exposition clear, we have only included the proof in the case of biharmonic functions.

By refining the methods employed in the proof of Theorem 2, we arrive at the following result.

Theorem 3. *Let \mathbb{R}^2 with a metric*

$$g = dr^2 + \phi(r)^2 d\theta^2,$$

with $\phi(r)$ nondecreasing outside a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 and so that the metric is extendable up to the origin.

Assume that there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that outside a compact set the curvature K satisfies $K \leq -r^{2+\epsilon}$, then there are bounded biharmonic functions that are not harmonic. On the other hand, if there are positive numbers $\eta > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that outside a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 it holds that $-\eta r^2 \leq K \leq -\frac{1+\epsilon}{r^2 \log r}$, then any bounded biharmonic function must be harmonic.

This theorem is clearly a generalization of the second part of Milnor's theorem; however it contains a significant surprise: there is region, namely when the curvature is in between $-\eta r^2$ and $-\frac{1+\epsilon}{r^2 \log r}$ for $\epsilon > 0$, where bounded biharmonic functions must be harmonic, which can be also be seen as a Liouville-type theorem.

This paper originated from a question posed to the second author by Michael Ruzhansky during a talk. As it this question was connected to Milnor's celebrated result, we decided to write this paper to answer Ruzhansky's question -which was a bit more general, at least in the case of a rotationally symmetric surface which is still interesting and contains some surprises as well. Although this paper may look somewhat technical (at a first glance), the computations are elementary as they only need Calculus (including a bit of differential equations) and elementary Fourier Analysis; we have included a quick primer on basic Riemannian Geometry of rotationally symmetric surfaces so that even a reader without much knowledge on this subject may follow our arguments and even get interested in this beautiful area of Mathematics.

2. PRELIMINARIES

To make this paper readable and an introduction to the subject, we want to introduce the basic concepts of Riemannian geometry needed to understand the results of this paper. The reader may also consult [2], where such an introduction is also given. We shall work with polar coordinates (r, θ) in \mathbb{R}^2 . Thus, given any vector v_p anchored at a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ different from the origin, it can be decomposed in its radial and tangential component to the circle of radius r as

$$v_p = a \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + b \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta},$$

where a and b are the respective radial and tangent components, and at (x, y) in cartesian coordinates, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} = x\mathbf{i} + y\mathbf{j}, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} = -y\mathbf{i} + x\mathbf{j},$$

where \mathbf{i} and \mathbf{j} represent the unit coordinate vectors in the direction of the coordinate axes.

We say that the g metric is given at $p = (r, \theta)$ by

$$g = dr^2 + \phi(r)^2 d\theta^2,$$

if at that point we make the assignment

$$g(v_p, v_p) = \|v_p\|^2 = a^2 + b^2\phi(r)^2.$$

If $\phi(0) = 1$ and all its even derivatives $\phi^{(2k)}(0) = 0$, then g can be smoothly extended up to the origin. As familiar cases, when $\phi(r) = r$ we obtain the usual euclidean metric, and when $\phi(r) = \sinh r$ we have the hyperbolic plane.

The curvature for a metric g can be computed and turns out to be

$$K = -\frac{\phi''}{\phi}.$$

Given a smooth metric g defined in \mathbb{R}^2 , the Laplacian is defined by

$$(2) \quad \Delta = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{\phi'}{\phi} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{\phi^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2}.$$

As the metric can be smoothly extended to the origin, so can be the Laplacian. It is also interesting to point out that when the metric is smooth, it can be shown that any polyharmonic function in \mathbb{R}^2 is smooth (see Chapter 3 in [7])

Also, we will need the following Comparison Theorem due to Sturm (see [2]).

Lemma 1 (Comparison Lemma). *Let $h, f : [a, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be C^2 functions. If $\frac{f''}{f}(r) \leq \frac{h''}{h}(r)$, $r > a$, and $\frac{f'}{f}(a) \leq \frac{h'}{h}(a)$ then $\frac{f'}{f}(r) \leq \frac{h'}{h}(r)$ for $r > a$.*

Let us examine some important consequences of the Comparison Lemma that will be useful later. For instance, if $K \geq -\frac{1}{r^2 \log r}$ outside of a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 and ϕ is nondecreasing, then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi'(r)}{\phi(r)} = 0.$$

Indeed, the inequality assumed for the curvature implies the inequality

$$\frac{\phi''}{\phi} \leq \frac{1}{r^2 \log r},$$

for $r > R_0 \geq 1$. Let $\psi = (r - R_0 + 1) \log(r - R_0 + 1)$ for $r > R_0 \geq 1$. Then we can compute

$$\frac{\psi'(r)}{\psi(r)} = \frac{\log(r - R_0 + 1) + 1}{(r - R_0 + 1) \log(r - R_0 + 1)},$$

and

$$\frac{\psi''(r)}{\psi(r)} = \frac{1}{(r - R_0 + 1)^2 \log(r - R_0 + 1)}.$$

Observe then that for $\eta > 0$ small,

$$\frac{\phi'(R_0 + \eta)}{\phi(R_0)} \leq \frac{\psi'(R_0 + \eta)}{\psi(R_0 + \eta)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\phi''(r)}{\phi(r)} \leq \frac{\psi''(r)}{\psi(r)}.$$

By the Comparison Lemma then for $r > R_0$

$$0 \leq \frac{\phi'(r)}{\phi(r)} \leq \frac{\psi'(r)}{\psi(r)},$$

and our claim follows by the Squeeze Theorem.

2.1. A uniqueness theorem for biharmonic functions. Here we need to introduce a Maximum Principle for a special elliptic system, which of course could be made more general, but which is more than enough for our purposes. The main application is a uniqueness theorem for solutions to systems that we shall need below.

Consider the following system

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Delta v = u & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $u, v \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$. Notice that v is biharmonic and that any biharmonic function can be written this way. Consider the expression

$$w = \frac{1}{2}(u^2 + \alpha v^2).$$

A calculation shows that

$$\Delta w = \alpha uv + |\nabla u|^2 + \alpha |\nabla v|^2.$$

We can estimate as follows. Use the Peter-Paul inequality

$$uv \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\alpha}}u^2 + \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{2}v^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}w,$$

and replace in the expression above to get

$$\Delta w \geq -\sqrt{\alpha}w + |\nabla u|^2 + \alpha |\nabla v|^2 \geq -\sqrt{\alpha}w.$$

Let f_1 the first Dirichlet eigenfunction for the Laplacian on a domain $\Omega' \supset \Omega$. Then, as is well known, we can take $f_1 > 0$. A calculation shows that

$$\Delta \left(\frac{w}{f_1} \right) = \frac{\Delta w}{f_1} - 2\nabla \left(\frac{w}{f_1} \right) + \lambda_1^2 \frac{w}{f_1} + 4 \left(\frac{|\nabla f_1|}{f_1} \right)^2 \frac{w}{f_1},$$

and we obtain the differential inequality

$$\Delta \left(\frac{w}{f_1} \right) + \nabla \left(\frac{w}{f_1} \right) \geq (-\sqrt{\alpha} + \lambda_1^2) \frac{w}{f_1}.$$

Thus, if $\alpha > 0$ is small enough then $-\sqrt{\alpha} + \lambda_1^2 > 0$, and hence, by the maximum principle (Theorem 6, Chapter 2, p. 64 in [6]) if $w/f_1 = 0$ on the boundary of Ω , then $w/f_1 = 0$ in Ω , and hence $w = 0$ in Ω .

From the previous discussion follows the following.

Lemma 2. *Let u and v biharmonic functions defined in Ω and C^2 in an open neighborhood of $\bar{\Omega}$. If $u = v$ and $\Delta u = \Delta v$ in $\partial\Omega$, then $u = v$ in Ω .*

3. A PROOF OF THEOREMS 2 AND 3

3.1. Theorem 2. In [3] it is shown that to solve the equation

$$(3) \quad \Delta u = 0 \quad \text{on } M.$$

Let us recall the procedure. We use separation of variables and for an integer m we write a solution to (3) as

$$u = \varphi_m(r) e^{im\theta}.$$

This consideration, using (2) leads to an ordinary differential equation for φ_m , namely

$$(4) \quad \varphi_m''(r) + \frac{\phi'}{\phi} \varphi_m'(r) - \frac{m^2}{\phi^2} \varphi_m(r) = 0.$$

It is easy to show that a (non-singular) solution is given in this case by

$$\varphi_m(r) = \exp \left(\int_1^r \frac{|m|}{\phi(s)} ds \right).$$

From this we arrive at the following fact. Any harmonic function on M can be written as

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi_m(r) e^{im\theta}.$$

We want to apply the same method to write any biharmonic function defined on M as a Fourier series. That is, we want to find all possible solutions to the equation

$$\Delta^2 u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2,$$

and to write them explicitly as a Fourier series. To attempt a solution, we shall write the previous equation as a system. That is we want to find a solution to the system

$$(5) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta v = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \\ \Delta u = v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \end{cases}$$

Notice that if u is part of a solution to the system above, then u must be biharmonic. If we write our attempt for a solution as $v = \psi_m(r) e^{im\theta}$ for

an integer m , with $u = \varphi_m(r) e^{im\theta}$, which is known to be harmonic, then $\psi_m(r)$ must satisfy the equation

$$(6) \quad \psi_m''(r) + \frac{\phi'}{\phi} \psi_m'(r) - \frac{m^2}{\phi^2} \psi_m(r) = \varphi_m(r).$$

Since φ_m is a solution to the homogeneous equation (that is, when the righthandside of (6) is 0), we can use reduction of order to compute ψ_m . So we look for a solution to (6) of the form $z(r) \varphi_m(r)$. Then z satisfies an equation

$$(7) \quad z'' + \left(\frac{2|m|}{\phi} + \frac{\phi'}{\phi} \right) z' = 1,$$

where we have used the fact that

$$\varphi_m' = \frac{|m|}{\phi} \varphi_m.$$

Solving for z , we obtain

$$z(r) = \int_0^r \frac{1}{\phi(s) \varphi_{2m}(s)} \int_0^s \phi(t) \varphi_{2m}(t) dt ds.$$

Therefore the pair $v = \varphi_m(r)$, $u = \psi_m(r) = z(r) \varphi_m(r)$ solves the system (5).

Next, we show that any biharmonic function $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ can be written as a Fourier series

$$(8) \quad \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} (c_m \varphi_m(r) + d_m \psi_m(r)) e^{im\theta}.$$

To do so, given a biharmonic u we can solve the following boundary value problem on ∂B_R .

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 v = 0 & \text{in } B_R, \\ v = u|_{\partial B_R} & \text{on } \partial B_R, \\ \Delta v = \Delta u|_{\partial B_R} & \text{on } \partial B_R. \end{cases}$$

The function v can be represented using a Fourier expansion. Indeed, to satisfy the boundary conditions we need to solve for the coefficients c_m and d_m . Observe that if u_R can be represented as

$$u_R = \sum \alpha_m e^{im\theta},$$

and Δu_R can be represented as

$$\Delta u_R = \sum \beta_m e^{im\theta}.$$

This leads us to the following system of equations.

$$\begin{cases} c_m \varphi_m(R) + d_m \psi_m(R) = \alpha_m \\ d_m \varphi_m(R) = \beta_m, \end{cases}$$

a system which can clearly be solved. By uniqueness, $u = v$ on B_R , and hence, when restricted to B_R , u is represented by the Fourier series above.

If we consider a ball $B_{R'} \supset B_R$. Using the procedure employed above, we have a representation for u on $B_{R'}$ as a Fourier series

$$(9) \quad \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} (c'_m \varphi_m(r) + d'_m \psi_m(r)) e^{im\theta}.$$

But this would also be a representation for u on B_R , and hence, by uniqueness,

$$c'_m = c_m, \quad d'_m = d_m.$$

Our claim immediately follows.

The following lemma establishes, under a condition on the curvature, a relation between the ψ_m and its respective φ_m , namely, that ψ_m is much larger than φ_m .

Lemma 3. *If $K \geq -\frac{1}{r^2 \log r}$ outside of a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 , and $\phi \rightarrow \infty$, then $z(r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. We actually show that, under the hypothesis,

$$\frac{1}{\phi(s) \varphi_{2m}(s)} \int_0^s \phi(t) \varphi_{2m}(t) dt \rightarrow \infty$$

as $s \rightarrow \infty$. To do this, we use L'Hôpital's rule.

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\phi(s) \varphi_{2m}(s)} \int_0^s \phi(t) \varphi_{2m}(t) dt &= \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi(s) \varphi_{2m}(s)}{\phi'(s) \varphi_{2m}(s) + 2m \varphi_{2m}(s)} \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\frac{\phi'(s)}{\phi(s)} + \frac{2m}{\phi}}, \end{aligned}$$

and using that the hypothesis on the curvature implies that $\phi'/\phi \rightarrow 0$, the result follows. \square

Once we have that any biharmonic function u can be represented as a Fourier expansion (8), a proof of Theorem 2 can be given as follows.

Using Plancherel's theorem, we can compute

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\partial B_R)}^2 = \sum_m \int_0^{2\pi} |c_m \varphi_m(r) + d_m \psi_m(r)|^2 \phi(r) dr.$$

If u is bounded, then

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\partial B_R)}^2 = O(1) \phi(r).$$

Under the assumption that $K \geq -\frac{1}{r^2 \log r}$, by Lemma 3 (since $\psi_m = z\varphi_m$)

$$\varphi_m(r) = o(\psi_m(r)),$$

from which we get that, if m is such that $d_m \neq 0$, then

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\partial B_R)}^2 \geq c \psi_m(r)^2 \phi(r)$$

and since $\psi_m(r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, we reach a contradiction. Thus, we must have that $d_m = 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. On the other hand, it must also hold that $c_m = 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, because as it is shown in [1], when $K \geq -1/r^2 \log r$, it also holds that $\varphi_m(r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.

3.2. Theorem 3. Next we present a proof of the criterion à la Milnor. Here the estimates are much more delicate. We begin with a somewhat technical but useful lemma that relates a bound on the curvature with the behavior of the function ϕ .

Lemma 4. • If $K(r) \leq -r^{2+\epsilon}$ then there exists a constant $B > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\phi(s)} \int_0^s \phi(\sigma) d\sigma \leq e^{-Bs^{2+\epsilon}} \int_0^r e^{Bt^{2+\epsilon}} dt.$$

• If $K(r) \geq -Mr^2$, $M > 0$, then there exists a constant $B > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\phi(s)} \int_0^s \phi(\sigma) d\sigma \geq e^{-Bs^2} \int_0^r e^{Bt^2} dt.$$

Proof. Let

$$\psi(s) = \frac{1}{\phi(s)} \int_0^s \phi(\sigma) d\sigma.$$

Then we can compute

$$\psi'(s) = 1 - \frac{\phi'(s)}{\phi(s)} \psi(s).$$

Using the Comparison Lemma we have that $\phi'/\phi \geq ar^{1+\epsilon}$. Indeed, consider the function $\zeta(r) = e^{\delta r^{2+\epsilon}}$. A calculation shows that

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta} = \delta(2+\epsilon)r^{1+\epsilon},$$

and

$$\frac{\zeta''}{\zeta} = \delta^2(2+\epsilon)r^{2+2\epsilon} + \delta(2+\epsilon)(1+\epsilon)r^\epsilon.$$

Let R_0 be such that if $r \geq R_0$, $K \leq -r^{2+\epsilon}$. Pick $\delta > 0$ small enough so that

$$\frac{\phi'}{\phi}(R_0) \geq \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(R_0),$$

and that

$$\frac{\phi''}{\phi}(r) \geq r^{2+\epsilon} \geq \frac{\zeta''}{\zeta}(r), \quad \text{on } r \geq R_0.$$

From the Comparison Lemma follows our claim. We thus get the differential inequality

$$\psi'(s) + ar^{1+\epsilon}\psi(s) \leq 1.$$

From this differential inequality follows that

$$\psi(r) \leq \frac{1}{e^{\frac{a}{2+\epsilon}r^{2+\epsilon}}} \int_{R_0}^r e^{\frac{a}{2+\epsilon}s^{2+\epsilon}} ds + \frac{e^{\frac{a}{2+\epsilon}R_0^{2+\epsilon}}}{e^{\frac{a}{2+\epsilon}r^{2+\epsilon}}} \psi(R_0).$$

In the second case $\phi'/\phi \leq r$. The proof is similar to the previous one, but this time we take $\zeta(r) = e^{Ar^2}$. In this case

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta} = 2Ar, \quad \frac{\zeta''}{\zeta} = 4A^2r^2 + 2A$$

If R_0 is such that when $r \geq R_0$, $K \geq -Mr^2$, then by taking $A > 0$ large enough we may assume that

$$\frac{\phi'}{\phi}(R_0) \leq \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(R_0),$$

and that on $r \geq R_0$

$$\frac{\phi''}{\phi}(r) \leq Mr^2 \leq \frac{\zeta''}{\zeta}(r).$$

Using the Comparison lemma, we obtain that on $r \geq R_0$ the inequality $\phi'/\phi \leq 2Ar$. From this it follows that ψ satisfies the differential inequality

$$\psi' + 2Ar\psi \geq 1,$$

from which the inequality

$$\psi(r) \geq \frac{1}{e^{Ar^2}} \int_{R_0}^r e^{As^2} ds + \frac{e^{AR_0^2}}{e^{Ar^2}} \psi(R_0).$$

□

From the previous theorem we find that, for $r > 0$ large enough, there are constants $c, C > 0$ such that for $\epsilon \geq 0$,

$$\frac{c}{s^{1+\epsilon}} \leq e^{-As^{2+\epsilon}} \int_0^r e^{At^{2+\epsilon}} dt \leq \frac{C}{s^{1+\epsilon}}.$$

To prove this inequality, we recur to L'Hôpital's rule. Indeed, we can compute as follows

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^r e^{At^{2+\epsilon}} dt}{\frac{e^{As^{2+\epsilon}}}{s^{1+\epsilon}}} = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{As^{2+\epsilon}}}{(2+\epsilon)Ae^{As^{2+\epsilon}} - \frac{(1+\epsilon)e^{s^{2+\epsilon}}}{s^{2+\epsilon}}} = \frac{1}{(2+\epsilon)A}.$$

From this computation, our assertion follows. Using the previous calculation and Lemma 4, we get the following.

Theorem 4. • *If $K(r) \leq -r^{2+\epsilon}$ with $\epsilon > 0$ then*

$$\frac{1}{\phi(s)} \int_0^s \phi(\sigma) d\sigma \leq \frac{C}{s^{1+\epsilon}},$$

and hence $z(r)$ remains uniformly bounded.

- If $K(r) \geq -\eta r^2$, $\eta > 0$, then

$$\frac{1}{\phi(s)} \int_0^s \phi(\sigma) d\sigma \geq \frac{c}{s},$$

and hence $z(r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 4 is enough to give a proof of Theorem 3. Indeed, Theorem 4 shows that if the curvature is $\leq -r^{2+\epsilon}$ outside a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 then $\psi_m \leq C\varphi_m$, and hence, both remain bounded (here we use the fact that if for $\epsilon > 0$, outside a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 , $K \leq -(1+\epsilon)/r^2 \log r$, and ϕ is eventually nondecreasing, then the φ_m 's are bounded [3]). Thus, there are biharmonic functions that are not harmonic, namely the functions $\psi_m(r) e^{im\theta}$ with $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. On the other hand, if the curvature is larger or equal than $-\eta r^2$ outside a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^2 , then the ψ_m 's are unbounded, and as we have shown before, then if u is biharmonic and bounded, then the coefficients d_m in its representation must be zero, and it immediately follows that it must be harmonic.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. E. Bravo and J. C. Cortissoz, On March's criterion for transience on rotationally symmetric manifolds, arXiv:2305.17501 (2023), to appear in the Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society.
- [2] J. C. Cortissoz, *A note on harmonic functions on surfaces*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **123** (9), 884–893 (2016).
- [3] J. C. Cortissoz, *An Observation on the Dirichlet problem at infinity in Riemannian cones*, Nagoya Math. J., 250 (2023), 352–364.
- [4] Huilgol, R. R. On Liouville's theorem for biharmonic functions, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 20 (1971), 37–39.
- [5] J. Milnor, *On deciding whether a surface is parabolic or hyperbolic*, Amer. Math. Monthly **84**, 43–46 (1977).
- [6] M. H. Protter and H. F. Weinberger, *Maximum Principles in Differential Equations*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs (1967), 172–173.
- [7] Schechter, M. *Modern methods in partial differential equations. An introduction* McGraw-Hill International Book Co., New York-Bogotá-Auckland, 1977. xiv+245 pp.
- [8] Weck, N. Liouville theorems for linear elliptic systems. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A94(1983), no.3-4, 309–322.

Email address: `jcortiss@uniandes.edu.co`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSIDAD DE LOS ANDES, BOGOTÁ DC, COLOMBIA