

STABILITY FOR THE SOBOLEV INEQUALITY IN CONES

GIULIO CIRAULO, FILOMENA PACELLA, AND CAMILLA CHIARA POLVARA

ABSTRACT. We prove a quantitative Sobolev inequality in cones of Bianchi-Egnell type, which implies a stability property. Our result holds for any cone as long as the minimizers of the Sobolev quotient are nondegenerate, which is the case of most cones. When the minimizers are the classical bubbles we have more precise results. Finally, we show that local estimates are not enough to get the optimal constant for the quantitative Sobolev inequality.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we discuss a Sobolev inequality in cones with the aim of providing a quantitative version of it. Let D be a smooth domain on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{N-1} in \mathbb{R}^N , $N \geq 3$ and let Σ_D be the cone spanned by D , i.e.:

$$\Sigma_D = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N; x = sq, s \in (0, +\infty), q \in D\}, \quad (1.1)$$

and assume that it is a Lipschitz cone. We consider the Sobolev space:

$$\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D) = \{u \in L^{2^*}(\Sigma_D) : |\nabla u| \in L^2(\Sigma_D)\},$$

where $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$ is the critical exponent, and the corresponding Sobolev quotient:

$$Q_D(u) = \frac{\left(\int_{\Sigma_D} |\nabla u|^2 dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\left(\int_{\Sigma_D} |u|^{2^*} dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*}}}, \quad u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D), u \neq 0. \quad (1.2)$$

In [8, Theorem 3.3 and Proposition 2.7] it is proved that if D is strictly contained in the hemisphere $\mathbb{S}_+^{N-1} = \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \cap \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_N, x_N > 0)\}$ then the infimum:

$$S_D = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D) \setminus \{0\}} Q_D(u) \quad (1.3)$$

is achieved.

Thus from now on we assume that $\bar{D} \subset \mathbb{S}_+^{N-1}$, so that the following Sobolev inequality holds:

$$\|\nabla \varphi\|_2 \geq S_D \|\varphi\|_{2^*}, \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D), \quad (1.4)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_q$ denotes the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^q(\Sigma_D)}$ and S_D is the “best constant” for it.

When $D = \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, i.e. the cone is the whole \mathbb{R}^N , it is well known that the best constant for the corresponding Sobolev inequality is achieved by the radial functions (usually called bubbles):

$$U(c, x) = c(1 + |x|^2)^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \quad c \in \mathbb{R} \quad (1.5)$$

as well as by any translation or rescaling of them. Actually, these functions are the only minimizers of the Sobolev quotient in \mathbb{R}^N and they are also the only positive solutions in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ of the critical equation:

$$-\Delta u = u^{2^*-1} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (1.6)$$

Since the bubbles are radial functions, they belong to the space $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$, for any $D \subset \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, and hence it is natural to ask whether or not they are minimizers for (1.3). Moreover, it is well known that they solve the Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = u^{2^*-1} & \text{in } \Sigma_D \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Sigma_D \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 49J40, 26D10, 35A23, 35J91, 35B33.

Key words and phrases. Sobolev inequality in cones, quantitative estimates, nonradial minimizers.

and are the only radial solutions of (1.7). Thus we wonder if they are the only positive solutions of (1.7). The answers to the above questions depend on the cone, i.e. on the domain $D \subset \mathbb{S}_+^{N-1}$ which spans Σ_D .

In fact, if the cone is convex it can be proved that the only minimizers for (1.3) are the bubbles. This is a consequence of an isoperimetric inequality obtained in [15] (see also [19], [10], [4]) and of the corresponding symmetrization technique in cones ([16], [17]). The same symmetry result holds in almost convex cones by the extension of the isoperimetric inequality of [2].

Concerning (1.7) it was proved in [16] that if the cone is convex then the only positive solutions are the bubbles. This result was recently generalized in [6].

On the contrary break of symmetry results have been proved in [7] showing the existence of nonradial minimizer for (1.3), and hence also of nonradial positive solutions of (1.7), whenever the cone Σ_D is such that $\lambda_1(D) < N - 1$, where $\lambda_1(D)$ is the first nontrivial Neumann eigenvalue on D of the Laplace-Beltrami operator $-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}}$. Note that for any convex domain $D \subset \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ it holds $\lambda_1(D) > N - 1$.

Hence it is natural to ask whether the condition $\lambda_1(D) \geq N - 1$ would represent a threshold to get radial symmetry for (1.3) and (1.7). This is an open question and we conjecture that the answer should be affirmative.

Thus for the Sobolev inequality (1.3) we have two different scenarios: either the only minimizers are bubbles or there are nonradial minimizers. In the last case, there could be even infinitely many nonradial “independent” minimizers, where by the word independent we mean not obtained by one fixed minimizer by rescaling or multiplication by a constant. Let us observe that since the cone Σ_D has its vertex at the origin and D is smooth we do not have invariance by translation. If the cone was not smooth, for example, if $\Sigma_D = \mathbb{R}^{N-k} \times C$ where $C \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is a cone which does not contain straight lines, then there would be invariance with respect to suitable translations. This does not add particular difficulties to the proof of our results and we prefer to neglect this case.

The aim of the present paper is to show a quantitative version of the Sobolev inequality (1.2). Inspired by a famous inequality obtained by Bianchi and Egnell in [3] in \mathbb{R}^N we aim at estimating the Sobolev “deficit” for a generic function $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ in terms of the distance of φ from the minimizers.

To be more precise let us consider a fixed minimizer V for (1.4) such that $\|\nabla V\|_2 = 1$ and the rescaled functions:

$$V_s(x) = sV(s^{\frac{2}{N-2}}x), \quad s \in (0, +\infty). \quad (1.8)$$

Obviously V_s are still minimizers for (1.4) and so it is any function $cV_s, c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Thus we define the 2-dimensional manifold:

$$\mathcal{M}_V = \{cV_s(x), c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, s \in \mathbb{R}^+\}$$

and the distance of a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ from \mathcal{M}_V :

$$d(\varphi, \mathcal{M}_V) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{M}_V} \|\nabla(\varphi - u)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_D)} = \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, s \in \mathbb{R}^+} \|\nabla(\varphi - cV_s)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_D)}.$$

In what follows we consider nondegenerate minimizers whose definition is given in Section 2, (Definition 2.4). Our main result is the following

Theorem 1.1. *Let Σ_D be a cone as in (1.1), with $\bar{D} \subset \mathbb{S}_+^{N-1}$ and assume that every minimizer for (1.3) is nondegenerate. Then*

- (1) *up to rescaling and multiplication by a constant, there exists only a finite number of minimizers that we denote by $V^{(1)}, \dots, V^{(m)}, m \in \mathbb{N}^+$ with $\|\nabla V^{(i)}\|_2 = 1, i = 1, \dots, m$.*
- (2) *there exists a positive constant C_D such that the following quantitative Sobolev inequality holds*

$$\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 - S_D^2 \|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2 \geq C_D \left(\min_{i=1, \dots, m} d(\varphi, \mathcal{M}_{V^{(i)}})^2 \right), \quad (1.9)$$

for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D) \setminus \{0\}$.

It is important to stress that the above inequality is valid whatever the minimizers are, as long as they are nondegenerate, which is the case of most cones, since generically all eigenvalues of the associated operator \mathcal{L}_V are simple (see [12]). In the case when the minimizers are the bubbles then their nondegeneracy holds in any cone Σ_D for which $\lambda_1(D) > N - 1$, see Corollary 2.8. The previous theorem can be considered as a stability result for the Sobolev inequality (1.4), because it claims that if the “deficit” $\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 - \hat{S}_D^2 \|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2$ is very small for some $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ then φ must be very close to one of the minimizers and the distance from it can be estimated uniformly by the deficit.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 follows the approach of [3]. To quantify the Sobolev deficit we first get an expansion of it for functions which are close to some of the manifolds of minimizers. This works for

nondegenerate local minimizers, using also the spectral analysis of the operators $\mathcal{L}_{V^{(i)}}$. This provides a local estimate of the Sobolev deficit involving the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}_{V^{(i)}}$. Once we have this the conclusion follows by a compactness argument.

The local estimate also provides an upper bound for the constant C_D in (1.9) which we can assume to be the optimal one, i.e.

$$C_D = \inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m \mathcal{M}_{V^{(i)}}} \frac{\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 - \hat{S}_D^2 \|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2}{\min_{i=1, \dots, m} d(\varphi, \mathcal{M}_{V^{(i)}})^2} \quad (1.10)$$

Indeed by Lemma 3.2 we get:

$$C_D \leq \min_{i=2, \dots, m} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_2^i}{\mu_3^i} \right). \quad (1.11)$$

where $\mu_k^i, k \in \mathbb{N}$ are the eigenvalues of the weighted operators $\mathcal{L}_{V^{(i)}}$. In the case when the only minimizers for (1.3) are the bubbles then (1.11) becomes:

$$C_D \leq C_D^* \quad (1.12)$$

where C_D^* is an explicit constant computed in Corollary 3.3.

When $D = \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ then $C_D^* = \frac{4}{N+4}$ and it is proved in [13] that the inequality (1.12) is strict. In Section 3 we get a similar result showing that (1.11) is strict when $N = 3, 4, 5$ or when $N \geq 6$, the only minimizers for (1.3) are the bubbles, $\lambda_1(D) \geq 2N$ and D has some symmetries (see Theorem 3.7).

Moreover, again for $D = \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, it is proved in [14] that C_D is achieved. We believe that this is true also in any cone Σ_D , whenever the minimizers are nondegenerate and we plan to study this question in a future research.

Finally, interesting estimates for C_D have been proved in [9] when $D = \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, obtaining also an alternative proof of the Bianchi Egnell result. However, these estimates strongly exploit the explicit form of the bubbles and their radial symmetry. Some similar result should be obtained when the minimizers for (1.3) in Σ_D are the bubbles, though the proof could be much more involved since D is not S^{N-1} but any domain on S_+^{N-1} .

Organization of the paper. In Section 2 we study the spectrum of the weighted operator \mathcal{L}_V and prove some preliminary results both for a generic minimizer V and for the case when the minimizers are the bubbles. In Section 3 we prove a local estimate of the Sobolev deficit from which the proof of Theorem 1.1 derives. In the same Section, we show that the strict inequality in (1.12) holds for some symmetric cones. Finally, a short Appendix explains how to compute the radial eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_V , when V is a bubble.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Bruno Premoselli for interesting conversations which helped to improve our results. Research partially supported by Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM). G. C. has been supported by the Research Project of the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MUR) Prin 2022 "Partial differential equations and related geometric-functional inequalities", grant number 20229M52AS004. F.P. and C.C.P. have been supported by PRIN 2022 PNRR project 2022AKNSE4-Next Generation EU "Variational and Analytical aspects of Geometric PDEs", funded by the European Union.

2. SPECTRAL ANALYSIS

2.1. The case of a generic local minimizer. Let V be a local minimizer of the Sobolev quotient (1.2) and consider the space $L^2(V^{2^*-2})$, that is given by the functions v such that

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-2} v^2 < \infty.$$

From [7, Proposition 3.1], we know that V is bounded, of class $C^2(\Sigma_D \setminus \{0\})$ and $V \leq C|x|^{2-N}$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$.

We start with a preliminary result.

Proposition 2.1 (Hardy inequality). *Let $N \geq 3$ and let Σ_D be given by (1.1). For any $u \in H_0^1(\Sigma_D \cup \Gamma_1)$, and for any $\epsilon \geq 0$ it holds*

$$\frac{(N-4+2\epsilon)^2}{4} \int_{\Sigma_D} \frac{u^2}{|x|^{4-2\epsilon}} dx \leq \int_{\Sigma_D} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|x|^{2-2\epsilon}} dx, \quad (2.1)$$

Proof. We apply a classical argument used to prove Hardy-type inequalities (see for example [5]). Given $u \in C_c^\infty(\bar{\Sigma}_D \setminus \{0\})$, for any $\epsilon \geq 0$ it holds

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} \left| \frac{\nabla u}{|x|^{1-\epsilon}} + t \frac{x}{|x|^{3-\epsilon}} u \right|^2 dx \geq 0$$

that is

$$0 \leq \int_{\Sigma_D} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|x|^{2-2\epsilon}} dx + t^2 \int_{\Sigma_D} \frac{u^2}{|x|^{4-2\epsilon}} dx + 2t \int_{\Sigma_D} u \frac{x \cdot \nabla u}{|x|^{4-2\epsilon}} dx. \quad (2.2)$$

Now we consider

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \int_{\Sigma_D} u \frac{x \cdot \nabla u}{|x|^{4-2\epsilon}} dx &= \int_{\Sigma_D} \operatorname{div} \left(u^2 \frac{x}{|x|^{4-2\epsilon}} \right) dx - \int_{\Sigma_D} u^2 \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{x}{|x|^{4-2\epsilon}} \right) dx \\ &= 0 - (N - 4 + 2\epsilon) \int_{\Sigma_D} \frac{u^2}{|x|^{4-2\epsilon}} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Substituting (2.3) in (2.2) we get

$$0 \leq \int_{\Sigma_D} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|x|^{2-2\epsilon}} dx + t^2 \int_{\Sigma_D} \frac{u^2}{|x|^{4-2\epsilon}} dx - (N - 4 + 2\epsilon)t \int_{\Sigma_D} \frac{u^2}{|x|^{4-2\epsilon}} dx,$$

that is

$$(N - 4 + 2\epsilon - t)t \int_{\Sigma_D} \frac{u^2}{|x|^{4-2\epsilon}} dx \leq \int_{\Sigma_D} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|x|^{2-2\epsilon}} dx.$$

An optimization in t yields that the best possible choice of the constant on the l.h.s. is given by

$$\frac{(N - 4 + 2\epsilon)^2}{4} \int_{\Sigma_D} \frac{u^2}{|x|^{4-2\epsilon}} dx \leq \int_{\Sigma_D} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|x|^{2-2\epsilon}} dx,$$

and we conclude the proof. \square

Next we study the spectrum of the operator $\mathcal{L}_V = V^{2-2^*} \Delta$ on $L^2(V^{2^*-2})$.

Lemma 2.2. $\mathcal{L}_V = V^{2-2^*} \Delta$ on $L^2(V^{2^*-2})$ has discrete spectrum.

Proof. This follows from the fact that the embedding $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D) \hookrightarrow L^2(V^{2^*-2})$ is compact, and hence the spectrum is discrete, which can be proved as in [11, Corollaries 6.2 and 6.3]. We notice that in [11, Corollaries 6.2], Rellich-Kondrachov compact embedding theorem and the Hardy type inequality are used. In our setting, the Rellich-Kondrachov Theorem holds, while the validity of Hardy inequality is proved in Proposition 2.1. For $N \neq 4$ we take $\epsilon = 0$ in Proposition 2.1 and proceed in the same way as in [11, Corollaries 6.2] noticing that $V \in L_{loc}^1(\Sigma_D)$ and $V \leq C|x|^{2-N}$ for $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ with $C > 0$ (see [8]). For $N = 4$ we take $\epsilon > 0$ and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_D \setminus B_k} \frac{u^2}{|x|^4} &\leq \frac{1}{k^{2\epsilon}} \int_{\Sigma_D \setminus B_k} \frac{u^2}{|x|^{4-2\epsilon}} \leq \frac{4}{(N - 4 + 2\epsilon)^2} \frac{1}{k^{2\epsilon}} \int_{\Sigma_D \setminus B_k} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|x|^{2+2\epsilon}} dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 k^{2\epsilon}} \int_{\Sigma_D \setminus B_k} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|x|^{2-2\epsilon}} dx \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 k^2} \int_{\Sigma_D \setminus B_k} |\nabla u|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then we conclude as in [11, Corollaries 6.2 and 6.3]. \square

Let \mathbb{N}_+ be the set of positive natural numbers, we denote by μ_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$ the eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_V , i.e.

$$\begin{cases} -V^{2-2^*} \Delta v = \mu_i v & \text{in } \Sigma_D \\ \partial_\nu v = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Sigma_D \\ v \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D). \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

We notice that the eigenvalues of (2.4) are the same if, instead of considering V , we consider a rescaled minimizer V_s . Indeed let μ_s be an eigenvalue of (2.4) corresponding to V_s with s fixed and $\psi(x)$ being the related eigenfunction, namely

$$-\Delta \psi = \mu_s V_s^{2^*-2} \psi.$$

We take as a coordinate $y = s^{-\frac{2}{N-2}} x$, then we call $\tilde{\psi}(x) := \psi(y)$ and we see that $\tilde{\psi}$ satisfies

$$-\Delta \tilde{\psi}(x) = -s^{-\frac{4}{N-2}} \Delta \psi(s^{-\frac{2}{N-2}} x) = \mu_s V(s^{-\frac{2}{N-2}} s^{-\frac{2}{N-2}} x) \psi(s^{-\frac{2}{N-2}} x) = \mu_s V^{2^*-2}(x) \tilde{\psi}(x).$$

Then we can conclude that the eigenvalues do not depend on s .

Thus we can assume that $s = 1$ and let $V_s = V$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let V be a local minimizer of the Sobolev quotient, and let*

$$S_V := \frac{\|\nabla V\|_{L^2(\Sigma_D)}}{\|V\|_{L^{2^*}(\Sigma_D)}}.$$

Then for the eigenvalue problem (2.4), we have

(i) $\mu_1 = S_V^{2^*}$ is simple with eigenfunction V ;

(ii) $\mu_2 = (2^* - 1)S_V^{2^*}$ and a corresponding eigenfunction is $\partial_s V_s|_{s=1}$ (V_s as in (1.8)).

Proof. We can suppose w.l.o.g. that $\|\nabla V\|_{\Sigma_D}^2 = 1$. We compute the second variation of

$$\mathcal{F}(u) = \frac{\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Sigma_D)}}{\|u\|_{L^{2^*}(\Sigma_D)}},$$

in V . We have that for any $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} (V + t\eta)^{2^*} = \int_{\Sigma_D} (V)^{2^*} + 2^*t \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-1}\eta + 2^*(2^* - 1)t^2 \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-2}\eta^2 + o(t^2),$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} (V + t\eta)^{2^*} \right)^{-\frac{2}{2^*}} &= \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} (V)^{2^*} \right)^{-\frac{2}{2^*}} \left(1 - \frac{2t \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-1}\eta}{\int_{\Sigma_D} (V)^{2^*}} - \frac{t^2(2^* - 1) \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-2}\eta^2}{\int_{\Sigma_D} (V)^{2^*}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2^* \left(1 + \frac{2}{2^*}\right) t^2 \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-1}\eta \right)^2}{\left(\int_{\Sigma_D} (V)^{2^*} \right)^2} \right) + o(t^2), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} (V + t\eta)^{2^*} \right)^{-\frac{2}{2^*}} &= S_V^2 \left(1 - S_V^{2^*} \left(2t \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-1}\eta + t^2(2^* - 1) \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-2}\eta^2 \right) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + S_V^{2^*} 2^* \left(1 + \frac{2}{2^*} \right) t^2 \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-1}\eta \right)^2 \right) + o(t^2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Since

$$\|\nabla(V + t\eta)\|_2^2 = 1 + 2t \int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla V \cdot \nabla \eta + t^2 \int_{\Sigma_D} |\nabla \eta|^2 \quad (2.6)$$

from (2.5) and (2.6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(V + t\eta)\|_2^2 \|V + t\eta\|_{2^*}^{-\frac{2}{2^*}} &= S_V^2 + 2t S_V^2 \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla V \cdot \nabla \eta - S_V^{2^*} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-1}\eta \right) + t^2 S_V^2 \left\{ \int_{\Sigma_D} |\nabla \eta|^2 + \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 4S_V^{2^*} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-1}\eta \int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla V \cdot \nabla \eta + S_V^{2^*} \left(-(2^* - 1) \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-2}\eta^2 + S_V^{2^*} (2^* + 2) \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-1}\eta \right)^2 \right) \right\} + o(t^2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus for the first variation $\mathcal{F}'(V)$ we have

$$\langle \mathcal{F}'(V), \eta \rangle = 2S_V^2 \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla V \cdot \nabla \eta - S_V^{2^*} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-1}\eta \right) = 0 \quad \forall \eta \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D) \quad (2.7)$$

because V is a local minimizer. The second variation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_V(\eta) &:= \int_{\Sigma_D} |\nabla \eta|^2 - 4S_V^{2^*} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-1}\eta \int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla V \cdot \nabla \eta + \\ &\quad + S_V^{2^*} \left(-(2^* - 1) \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-2}\eta^2 + S_V^{2^*} (2^* + 2) \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-1}\eta \right)^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

and we have $Q_V(\eta) \geq 0$ for any $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ because V is a local minimizer. From (2.7) we get

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla V \cdot \nabla \eta = S_V^{2^*} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-1}\eta, \quad (2.9)$$

so, by substituting in (2.8) and by using $Q_V(\eta) \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} |\nabla \eta|^2 + (2^* - 2)S_V^{2^*} \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla V \cdot \nabla \eta \right)^2 - S_V^{2^*} (2^* - 1) \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-2}\eta^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall \eta \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D). \quad (2.10)$$

From (2.9) we have that $\mu = S_V^{2^*}$ is an eigenvalue, with eigenfunction V . Since $V > 0$, from the variational characterization of eigenvalues we deduce that $\mu = S_V^{2^*}$ is the first eigenvalue. Indeed all other eigenfunctions must be orthogonal to V and, therefore, they must be sign changing. Note that $Q_V(V) = 0$, as it follows from (2.8). Observe that since each rescaled function V_s satisfies

$$-\Delta V_s = S_V^{2^*} V_s^{2^*-1},$$

by differentiating with respect to s we get

$$-\Delta \partial_s V_s = S_V^{2^*} (2^* - 1) V_s^{2^*-2} \partial_s V_s,$$

because $S_{V_s} = S_V$. This implies that $\partial_s V_s$ is an eigenfunction with eigenvalue $S_V^{2^*} (2^* - 1)$ and $Q_V(\partial_s V_s) = 0$ as it is easy to deduce from (2.8). Suppose that there exists an eigenvalue $\bar{\mu}$ such that $S_V^{2^*} < \bar{\mu} < (2^* - 1) S_V^{2^*}$ then there exists also an eigenfunction $\bar{\psi}$ orthogonal to the first eigenfunction V such that

$$-\Delta \bar{\psi} = \bar{\mu} V^{2^*-2} \bar{\psi}.$$

From (2.10) we must have

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} |\nabla \bar{\psi}|^2 + (2^* - 2) S_V^{2^*} \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla V \cdot \nabla \bar{\psi} \right)^2 - S_V^{2^*} (2^* - 1) \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-2} \bar{\psi}^2 \geq 0$$

but, from the orthogonality condition and the definition of $\bar{\psi}$, this is equivalent to

$$\left(\bar{\mu} - S_V^{2^*} (2^* - 1) \right) \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-2} \bar{\psi}^2 \geq 0,$$

which is true if and only if $\bar{\mu} \geq (2^* - 1) S_V^{2^*}$, a contradiction. Then we conclude that $\mu_2 = S_V^{2^*} (2^* - 1)$ and a second eigenfunction is given by $\partial_s V_s$. \square

Definition 2.4. We say that a local minimizer V is **nondegenerate** if the second variation Q_V vanishes only on the 2-dimensional subspace spanned by $\{V, \partial_s V_s|_{s=1}\}$. Equivalently, $Q_V(\psi) > 0$ for any ψ orthogonal to $\{V, \partial_s V_s|_{s=1}\}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\bar{\Sigma}_D)$.

Remark 2.5. If V is nondegenerate, then the second eigenvalue μ_2 is simple. Indeed, consider the second eigenfunction $\partial_s V_s|_{s=1}$, then $Q_V(\partial_s V_s|_{s=1}) = 0$ as it is easy to see from (2.8). Suppose that there exists another independent eigenfunction ψ , with eigenvalue $(2^* - 1) S_V^{2^*}$, then ψ is orthogonal to the first eigenfunction V and

$$Q_V(\psi) = \int_{\Sigma_D} |\nabla \psi|^2 - (2^* - 1) S_V^{2^*} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-2} \eta^2 = 0,$$

hence V would be degenerate.

2.2. The case of the bubble. We consider the case in which the local minimizer is the bubble U :

$$U(x) := k_0 (1 + |x|^2)^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \quad (2.11)$$

where k_0 is a constant such that $\|\nabla U\|_2 = 1$ (see Remark 2.9 below). The rescaled bubbles will be denoted by

$$U_s(x) := sU(s^{\frac{2}{N-2}}x).$$

To describe the spectrum of the operator \mathcal{L}_U we need to know the Neumann eigenvalues $\lambda_j(D)$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, of the Laplace-Beltrami operator $-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}}$ on D , i.e. we consider the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} Y_j = \lambda_j Y_j & \text{on } D \\ \partial_{\nu_D} Y_j = 0 & \text{on } \partial D. \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

It is well known that $(-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}})^{-1}$ is compact and selfadjoint in $L^2(D)$ and admits a sequence of eigenvalues

$$0 = \lambda_0 < \lambda_1(D) \leq \dots \lambda_j \leq \dots \quad (2.13)$$

and corresponding eigenfunctions $Y_j(\theta) \in L^2(D)$ (where θ is the system of coordinates on D induced by the spherical coordinates in \mathbb{R}^N) which form a Hilbert basis for $L^2(D)$ and such that

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}} Y_j(\theta) = \lambda_j Y_j(\theta), \quad \theta \in D, \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$\int_D \nabla_\theta Y_j(\theta) \cdot \nabla_\theta Y_i(\theta) d\sigma(\theta) = 0 \quad \text{for } i \neq j,$$

where we denote by ∇_θ the gradient with respect to $\theta \in D$.

In particular, the first eigenvalue is $\lambda_0 = 0$ and the corresponding eigenfunction is constant. The second eigenvalue $\lambda_1(D) > 0$ has eigenspace generated by Y_1 .

We denote by S_U the Sobolev quotient $Q_D(U)$ (see (1.2)).

In what follows we consider problem (2.4) with U instead of a generic local minimizer V

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v + \mu U^{2^*-2}v = 0 & \text{in } \Sigma_D \\ \partial_\nu v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Sigma_D \\ v \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D). \end{cases} \quad (2.15)$$

Proposition 2.6. *Let μ be an eigenvalue of (2.15), and let ψ be a corresponding eigenfunction. Then $\psi = R(r)Y_j(\theta)$ where $Y_j(\theta), j \in \mathbb{N}$ is an eigenfunction of (2.12) corresponding to $\lambda_j(D)$ and R is a solution to:*

$$\begin{cases} (r^{N-1}R)' + r^{N-1}(-\lambda_j(D)r^{-2} + \mu U^{2^*-2})R = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \\ (r^{N-1}R'(r))(0) = 0 \\ R(r) = o(r^{2-N+\epsilon}) \text{ as } r \rightarrow +\infty \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$. Conversely, if R is a solution to (2.16) for some $\lambda_j(D)$ and μ , then $R(r)Y_j(\theta)$ is an eigenfunction of (2.15) with μ as corresponding eigenvalue.

Proof. Let μ be fixed and let $\psi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ be an eigenfunction associated to μ , i.e. ψ is a solution to (2.15). Since $\{Y_j\}$ is an orthonormal base on $L^2(D)$, by using polar coordinates and separation of variables we can write

$$\psi(r, \theta) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \hat{\psi}_j(r)Y_j(\theta)$$

for $r \in (0, \infty)$ and $\theta \in D \subset \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, where

$$\hat{\psi}_j(r) := \int_D \psi(r, \theta)Y_j(\theta)d\sigma(\theta). \quad (2.17)$$

Since $\psi \neq 0$, there exists $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\hat{\psi}_j(r) \neq 0$ and we can write

$$\int_0^\infty r^{N-1}\hat{\psi}_j'\varphi' dr = \int_0^\infty \int_D r^{N-1}\psi'Y_j(\theta)\varphi'drd\sigma(\theta) = \int_0^\infty \int_D r^{N-1}\psi' \left(Y_j(\theta)\varphi \right)' drd\sigma(\theta)$$

for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$. We recall that $\nabla\psi = (\psi', r^{-2}\nabla_\theta\psi)$ and hence

$$\nabla\psi \cdot \nabla \left(Y_j(\theta)\varphi \right) = \psi' \left(Y_j(\theta)\varphi \right)' + r^2 \frac{1}{r^4} \nabla_\theta\psi \cdot \nabla_\theta(Y_j(\theta)\varphi)$$

since ψ is a solution to (2.15) and U is radial, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty r^{N-1}\hat{\psi}_j'\varphi' dr &= - \int_0^\infty \int_D r^{N-3}\nabla_\theta\psi \cdot \nabla_\theta(Y_j(\theta)\varphi)drd\sigma(\theta) \\ &\quad + \mu \int_0^\infty \int_D r^{N-1}U^{2^*-2}\psi Y_j(\theta)\varphi drd\sigma(\theta). \end{aligned}$$

From (2.17), (2.12) and by using integration by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty r^{N-1}\hat{\psi}_j'\varphi' dr &= - \int_0^\infty r^{N-3}dr \int_D \nabla_\theta(\psi\varphi) \cdot \nabla_\theta Y_j(\theta)d\sigma(\theta) + \mu \int_0^\infty r^{N-1}U^{2^*-2}\hat{\psi}_j\varphi dr \\ &= - \lambda_j(D) \int_0^\infty r^{N-3}\hat{\psi}_j\varphi dr + \mu \int_0^\infty r^{N-1}U^{2^*-2}\hat{\psi}_j\varphi dr. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have proved that $\hat{\psi}_j$ is a weak solution to

$$-(r^{N-1}(\hat{\psi}_j)')' - \mu r^{N-1}U^{2^*-2}\hat{\psi}_j = -\lambda_j(D)r^{N-3}\hat{\psi}_j \quad \text{for } r \in (0, \infty). \quad (2.18)$$

Hence we set $R = \hat{\psi}_j$ and we need to prove that the boundary conditions in (2.16) hold. To prove that $R(r) = o(r^{2-N})$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ we refer to [11, Lemma 6.6]. In this lemma, the authors prove that for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$R(r) \leq Cr^{2-N+\epsilon}$$

for any $r > r_0$ with $r_0 > 0$ fixed.

We are left to prove that $(r^{N-1}R'(r))(0) = 0$ for which we refer to the proof of [11, Lemma 6.4, (1)].

This concludes the proof of the first implication.

The reverse implication holds as well. Namely, if we consider the problem (2.16) with eigenvalue μ with associated eigenfunction $\psi^{rad} \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ and for some $\lambda_j(D)$, then the function

$$\Psi := \psi^{rad}(r)Y_j(\theta)$$

is such that $\Psi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$.

Moreover Ψ weakly solves (2.15) corresponding to μ . Indeed for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla \Psi \cdot \nabla \varphi dx &= \int_{\Sigma_D} \Psi' \varphi' + \frac{1}{r^2} \nabla_{\theta} \Psi \cdot \nabla_{\theta} \varphi dx = \\ &= \int_D Y_j(\theta) d\sigma(\theta) \int_0^1 r^{N-1} (\psi^{rad})' \varphi' dr + \int_0^1 r^{N-3} \psi^{rad} dr \int_D \nabla_{\theta} Y_j \cdot \nabla_{\theta} \varphi d\sigma(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

and from (2.16) and (2.14) it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla \Psi \cdot \nabla \varphi dx &= \int_D Y_j(\theta) d\sigma(\theta) \int_0^{\infty} r^{N-1} (\mu U^{2^*-2} - \lambda_j(D) r^{-2}) \psi^{rad} \varphi dr + \\ &\quad + \int_0^{\infty} r^{N-3} \psi^{rad} dr \lambda_j(D) \int_D Y_j(\theta) \varphi d\sigma(\theta) = \int_{\Sigma_D} \mu U^{2^*-2} \Psi \varphi dx, \end{aligned}$$

and then Ψ weakly solves (2.15) corresponding to μ .

The fact that $\partial_{\nu} \Psi = 0$ on $\partial \Sigma_D$ directly follows from the condition $\partial_{\nu} Y_j(\theta) = 0$ on ∂D . \square

Proposition 2.7. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be such that*

$$(k-1)(k+N-3) < \lambda_1(D) < k(k+N-2). \quad (2.19)$$

Then each eigenvalue μ_i of (2.15), with $i = 1, \dots, k$, is simple and is given by

$$\mu_i = \left((i-1)(i+N-2) \frac{4}{N(N-2)} + 1 \right) S_U^{2^*},$$

while

$$\mu_{k+1} = \frac{S_U^{2^*}}{N(N-2)} \sqrt{(N-2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)} \left(2 + \sqrt{(N-2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)} \right).$$

Moreover, $\psi_i = R_i(r)Y_0(\theta)$ is an eigenfunction of (2.15) corresponding to μ_i , for any $i = 1, \dots, k$, where

$$R_i = \frac{P_i(|x|^2)}{(1+|x|^2)^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}$$

and $P_i(|x|^2)$ are given as in the Appendix (A.4). Instead an eigenfunction corresponding to μ_{k+1} is given by $\psi_{k+1} = R_{k+1}Y_1(\theta)$ where

$$R_{k+1} = (|x|^2 + 1)^{1 - \frac{N}{2} - \beta(\lambda_1(D))} |x|^{\beta(\lambda_1(D))}$$

with $2\beta(\lambda_1(D)) = -(N-2) + \sqrt{(N-2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)}$ and Y_1 is an eigenfunction of (2.12) corresponding to $\lambda_1(D)$.

The proof is postponed after the following Corollary.

Corollary 2.8. *If D is such that $\lambda_1(D) > N-1$ then*

- (i) $\mu_1 = S_U^{2^*}$ is simple with eigenfunction U_s ;
- (ii) $\mu_2 = (2^* - 1)S_U^{2^*}$ is simple with eigenfunction $\partial_s U_s|_{s=1}$.
- (iii)

$$\mu_3 = \begin{cases} \frac{S_U^{2^*}}{N(N-2)} \sqrt{(N-2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)} \left(2 + \sqrt{(N-2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)} \right) & \text{for } N-1 < \lambda_1(D) \leq 2N \\ \frac{(N+4)(N+2)}{N(N-2)} S_U^{2^*} \text{ (and is simple)} & \text{for } \lambda_1(D) > 2N. \end{cases}$$

Moreover if $N-1 < \lambda_1(D) \leq 2N$ a third eigenfunction ψ_3 is given by

$$\psi_3 = (|x|^2 + 1)^{1 - \frac{N}{2} - \beta(\lambda_1(D))} |x|^{\beta(\lambda_1(D))} Y_1$$

where $2\beta(\lambda_1(D)) = -(N-2) + \sqrt{(N-2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)}$ and Y_1 is an eigenfunction of (2.12) corresponding to $\lambda_1(D)$. Instead for $\lambda_1(D) > 2N$, the third eigenfunction is given by

$$\psi_3 = (N-2(N+2)|x|^2 + N|x|^4)(1+|x|^2)^{-\frac{N}{2}-1}.$$

Proof. Note that if $\lambda_1(D) \in (N-1, 2N)$ we have $k = 2$ in Proposition 2.7, while if $\lambda_1(D) > 2N$ then (2.19) holds for some $k \geq 3$. Hence the thesis directly follows from Proposition 2.7. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.7. We study the eigenvalue problem (2.15). We write the eigenvalue equation in (2.15) by using spherical coordinates:

$$v'' + (N-1)\frac{v'}{r} + \frac{1}{r^2}\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}}v + \mu U^{2^*-2}v = 0, \quad (2.20)$$

where v' denotes the derivative of v with respect to r and $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}}$ denotes the Laplace-Beltrami operator on \mathbb{S}^{N-1} . From Proposition 2.6, we can look for solutions of (2.20) by using separation of variables: let $v = R(r)Y(\theta)$ be a solution to (2.20), then it holds

$$Y(R'' + (N-1)\frac{R'}{r}) + \frac{1}{r^2}R\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}}Y + \mu U^{2^*-2}RY = 0,$$

and hence, also taking into account that $\partial_\nu v = 0$ on $\partial\Sigma_D$, we obtain that Y is an eigenfunction of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}}Y + \lambda Y = 0 & \text{on } D \\ \partial_{\nu_D}Y = 0 & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases} \quad (2.21)$$

while R satisfies

$$\begin{cases} R'' + \frac{N-1}{r}R' - \frac{\lambda}{r^2}R + \mu U^{2^*-2}R = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \\ (r^{N-1}R'(r))(0) = 0 \\ R(r) = o(r^{2-N+\epsilon}) \quad \forall \epsilon > 0 \text{ as } r \rightarrow +\infty. \end{cases} \quad (2.22)$$

We consider (2.22). To shorten the notation we write λ_j instead of $\lambda_j(D)$. Thanks to the explicit expression of U , we can write the problem in the following Sturm Liouville form:

$$\begin{cases} (r^{N-1}R')' + r^{N-1}(-\lambda r^{-2} + \mu k_0^{2^*-2}(1+r^2)^{-2})R = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \\ (r^{N-1}R'(r))(0) = 0 \\ R(r) = o(r^{2-N+\epsilon}) \quad \forall \epsilon > 0 \text{ as } r \rightarrow +\infty. \end{cases} \quad (2.23)$$

Taking $\lambda = \lambda_j = \lambda_j(D)$, for $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ we denote by μ_{k,λ_j} , $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the sequence of eigenvalues of (2.23) obtained in correspondence of λ_j and denote by R_i^j the corresponding eigenfunction.

Case $j = 0$ i.e. $\lambda_0 = 0$. The problem becomes:

$$\begin{cases} (r^{N-1}R')' + r^{N-1}\mu_{k,\lambda_0}k_0^{2^*-2}(1+r^2)^{-2}R = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \\ (r^{N-1}R'(r))(0) = 0 \\ R(r) = o(r^{2-N+\epsilon}) \quad \forall \epsilon > 0 \text{ as } r \rightarrow +\infty. \end{cases} \quad (2.24)$$

From Appendix A we know that the eigenvalues are given by

$$\mu_{k,\lambda_0} = \left((k-1)(k+N-2)\frac{4}{N(N-2)} + 1 \right) S^{2^*}, \quad (2.25)$$

with corresponding eigenfunctions

$$R_{k,\lambda_0} = \frac{P_k(|x|^2)}{(1+|x|^2)^{\frac{N}{2}+k-2}}.$$

In particular, after some computations, we get that:

$$R_{1,\lambda_0} = U_s, \quad R_{2,\lambda_0} = \partial_s U_s, \quad R_{3,\lambda_0} = \frac{N-2(N+2)|x|^2 + N|x|^4}{(1+|x|^2)^{\frac{N}{2}+1}}.$$

Case $j = 1$. In this case we look for an eigenfunction of (2.23) of the following form

$$R_{\lambda_1(D)} = (1+r^2)^{1-\frac{N}{2}-\beta}r^\beta,$$

for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. From (2.23) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(r^{N-1} \left(\left(1 - \frac{N}{2} - \beta \right) (1+r^2)^{-\frac{N}{2}-\beta} 2r^{\beta+1} + \beta (1+r^2)^{1-\frac{N}{2}-\beta} r^{\beta-1} \right) \right)' + \\ & + r^{N-1} (-\lambda r^{-2} + \mu k_0^{2^*-2} (1+r^2)^{-2}) (1+r^2)^{1-\frac{N}{2}-\beta} r^\beta = 0 \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$r^{N-3+\beta} (1+r^2)^{-\frac{N}{2}-\beta-1} \left[(N-1) \left(\left(1 - \frac{N}{2} - \beta \right) (1+r^2) 2r^2 + \beta (1+r^2)^2 \right) + \right.$$

$$+ \left((-2 + N + 2\beta)(N + 2\beta)r^4 + (2\beta + 1)(2 - N - 2\beta)(1 + r^2)r^2 + (\beta - 1)\beta(1 + r^2)^2 \right) + \\ - \lambda_1(D)(1 + r^2)^2 + \mu k_0^{2^*-2} r^2 \Big] = 0.$$

Hence, β must satisfy

$$\begin{cases} r^4 \left((2 - N + \beta)(N - 1 - N - 2\beta + 2\beta + 1) + \beta(N - 1) + \beta(\beta - 1) - \lambda_1(D) \right) = 0 \\ r^2 \left((N - 1)(2 - N) + (2\beta + 1)(2 - N - 2\beta) + 2(\beta - 1)\beta - 2\lambda + \mu k_0^{2^*-2} \right) = 0 \\ \beta^2 + \beta(N - 2) - \lambda_1(D) = 0, \end{cases}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} N(2 - N) - 4(N - 1)\beta - 4\beta^2 + \mu k_0^{2^*-2} = 0 \\ \beta^2 + \beta(N - 2) - \lambda_1(D) = 0, \end{cases}$$

and hence

$$\begin{cases} \mu k_0^{2^*-2} = (2\beta + N)(2\beta + N - 2) \\ \beta^2 + \beta(N - 2) - \lambda_1(D) = 0. \end{cases}$$

This implies that

$$R_{\lambda_1(D)}(r) = (r^2 + 1)^{1 - \frac{N}{2} - \beta(\lambda_1(D))} r^{\beta(\lambda_1(D))},$$

with

$$\begin{cases} 2\beta(\lambda_1(D)) = -(N - 2) + \sqrt{(N - 2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)} \\ k_0^{\frac{4}{N-2}} \mu = \sqrt{(N - 2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)} (2 + \sqrt{(N - 2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)}), \end{cases} \quad (2.26)$$

and we notice that $R_{\lambda_1(D)}$ is an eigenfunction with no interior zeros, so it is the first one, i.e. it is R_{1,λ_1} corresponding to μ_{1,λ_1} . Since $k_0^{2^*-2} = S^{-2^*} N(N - 2)$ (see Remark 2.9 below) we can write (2.26) in the following way:

$$\begin{cases} 2\beta(\lambda_1(D)) = -(N - 2) + \sqrt{(N - 2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)} \\ \mu_{1,\lambda_1(D)} = \frac{S_U^{2^*}}{N(N-2)} \sqrt{(N - 2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)} (2 + \sqrt{(N - 2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)}). \end{cases} \quad (2.27)$$

Note that $\mu_{1,\lambda_1(D)}$ is increasing in $\lambda_1(D)$.

Conclusion: The conclusion follows by noticing that if $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ is such that

$$(k - 1)(k + N - 3) < \lambda_1(D) < k(k + N - 2)$$

then

$$\mu_{k,\lambda_0} < \mu_{1,\lambda_1(D)} \leq \mu_{k+1,\lambda_0}.$$

From this computation, (2.25) and (2.27) we get the conclusion. \square

Remark 2.9. We notice that $k_0^{2^*-2} = S_U^{-2^*} N(N - 2)$, where k_0 is the constant such that $\|\nabla U\|_2 = 1$. Indeed from the definition of U it holds

$$\nabla U = -(N - 2)k_0(1 + |x|^2)^{-\frac{N}{2}} x.$$

then

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} (1 + |x|^2)^{-N} |x|^2 = \frac{1}{k_0^2(N - 2)^2}. \quad (2.28)$$

Now (1.2) yields

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} (1 + |x|^2)^{-N} = \left(\frac{1}{S_U k_0} \right)^{\frac{2N}{N-2}}. \quad (2.29)$$

Using radial coordinates and integrating by parts the radial terms we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_D} (1 + |x|^2)^{-N} |x|^2 dx &= \int_D d\omega \int_0^\infty \frac{r^{N+1}}{(1 + r^2)^N} dr \\ &= \frac{N}{2(N - 1)} \int_D d\omega \int_0^\infty \frac{r^{N-1}}{(1 + r^2)^{N-1}} dr = \frac{N}{2(N - 1)} \int_{\Sigma_D} (1 + |x|^2)^{-N+1} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

Then from (2.28), (2.29) and (2.30) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k_0^2(N-2)^2} &= \int_{\Sigma_D} (1+|x|^2)^{-N} |x|^2 = \int_{\Sigma_D} (1+|x|^2)^{-N+1} - \int_{\Sigma_D} (1+|x|^2)^{-N} \\ &= \frac{2(N-1)}{N} \frac{1}{k_0^2(N-2)^2} - (S_U k_0)^{\frac{-2N}{N-2}}, \end{aligned}$$

namely

$$k_0^{2^*-2} = S_U^{-2^*} N(N-2).$$

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

In this section we argue as in [3]. Let us start by observing that, for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ and for any local minimizer V with $\|\nabla V\|_2 = 1$ we have:

$$d(\varphi, \mathcal{M}_V) \leq \|\nabla \varphi\|_2. \quad (3.1)$$

This easily follows from the definition of the distance

$$d(\varphi, \mathcal{M}_V)^2 = \inf_{c,s} \left(\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 + c^2 - 2c \int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla V_s dx \right) \leq \inf_s \left(\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 - 2 \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla V_s dx \right)^2 \right) \leq \|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2$$

where we minimized w.r.t. c .

In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we start with the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let V be a nondegenerate local minimizer with $\|\nabla V\|_2 = 1$. Then any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ such that $d(\varphi, \mathcal{M}_V) < \|\varphi\|_2$ can be written as*

$$\varphi = c_0 V_{s_0} + dv$$

where c_0, s_0 are such that

$$d := d(\varphi, \mathcal{M}_V)^2 = \|\nabla(\varphi - c_0 V_{s_0})\|_2^2, \quad c_0^2 = \|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 - d^2,$$

and v satisfies

$$\|\nabla v\|_2 = 1, \quad v \perp \text{span}[V_{s_0}, \partial_s V_{s_0}], \quad \int_{\Sigma_D} V_{s_0}^{2^*-2} v^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{\mu_3}$$

where μ_3 is defined as in (2.15).

Proof. We denote \mathcal{M}_V simply by \mathcal{M} and recall that it is a 2-dimensional manifold embedded in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$:

$$\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^+ \ni (c, s) \rightarrow cV_s \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D).$$

For any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ the distance of φ to the manifold \mathcal{M} is given by

$$d(\varphi, \mathcal{M})^2 = \inf_{c,s} \|\nabla(\varphi - cV_s)\|_2^2 = \inf_{c,s} \left(\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 + c^2 - 2 \int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla cV_s dx \right), \quad (3.2)$$

where we used the fact that $\|\nabla V_s\|_2 = 1$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Since $d(\varphi, \mathcal{M}) < \|\nabla \varphi\|_2$ then the infimum above is attained at a point $(c_0, s_0) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+$, with $c_0 \neq 0$. Since $\mathcal{M} \setminus \{0\}$ is a smooth manifold we must have $(\varphi - c_0 V_{s_0}) \perp T\mathcal{M}_{c_0 V_{s_0}}$, which is the two-dimensional tangent space to \mathcal{M} at the point $c_0 V_{s_0} \in \mathcal{M}_V$. It is spanned by

$$T\mathcal{M}_{c_0 V_{s_0}} = \text{span}[V_{s_0}, \partial_s V_s|_{s_0}]. \quad (3.3)$$

From Lemma 2.2 we know that the spectrum of the operator $\mathcal{L}_{V_{s_0}}$ is discrete and by the min-max characterization we have

$$\mu_3 \leq \frac{\int_{\Sigma_D} |\nabla \omega|^2 dx}{\int_{\Sigma_D} V_{s_0}^{2^*-2} \omega^2 dx}, \quad \forall \omega \perp \text{span}[V_{s_0}, \partial_s V_s|_{s_0}],$$

since V_{s_0} and $\partial_s V_s|_{s_0}$ are the first and second eigenfunction of the operator $\mathcal{L}_{V_{s_0}}$ (see Proposition 2.3), with equality attained if ω is the third eigenfunction. Then, from (3.3) we get

$$\mu_3 \leq \frac{\int_{\Sigma_D} |\nabla \omega|^2 dx}{\int_{\Sigma_D} V_{s_0}^{2^*-2} \omega^2 dx}, \quad \forall \omega \perp T\mathcal{M}_{c_0 V_{s_0}}. \quad (3.4)$$

From Proposition 2.3 we know that

$$\mu_1 = S_{V_{s_0}}^{2^*}, \quad \mu_2 = (2^* - 1) S_{V_{s_0}}^{2^*},$$

and that all eigenvalues are independent of s .

Let $d = d(\varphi, \mathcal{M})$. Since $(\varphi - c_0 V_{s_0}) \perp T\mathcal{M}_{c_0 V_{s_0}}$ we can write

$$\varphi = c_0 V_{s_0} + dv,$$

where v has norm 1 in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ and is orthogonal to the tangent space $T\mathcal{M}_{c_0 V_{s_0}}$. Hence, since $c_0 V_{s_0}$ minimizes the distance of φ from \mathcal{M} , we have the following orthogonality conditions

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla v \cdot \nabla V_{s_0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla v \cdot \nabla(\partial_s V_s|_{s_0}) = 0, \quad (3.5)$$

and from (3.2) we obtain

$$d^2 = \|\nabla\varphi\|_2^2 + c_0^2 - 2 \int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla\varphi \cdot \nabla c_0 V_{s_0} dx = \|\nabla\varphi\|_2^2 - c_0^2, \quad (3.6)$$

where we have used that $\|\nabla V_{s_0}\|_2 = 1$. Moreover, since V_{s_0} and $\partial_s V_s|_{s_0}$ are eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{L}_{V_{s_0}}$, we also have

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} v V_{s_0}^{2^*-1} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Sigma_D} v V_{s_0}^{2^*-2} \partial_s V_s|_{s_0} = 0. \quad (3.7)$$

□

Proposition 3.2. *Let V be a nondegenerate local minimizer, then the following inequality holds*

$$\|\nabla\varphi\|_2^2 - S_V^2 \|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2 \geq d^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_3}\right) + o(d^2),$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ with $d(\varphi, \mathcal{M}_V) < \|\nabla\varphi\|_2$. Moreover the coefficient of the second order term is sharp.

Proof. As before we assume that $\|\nabla V\|_2 = 1$ and by Lemma 3.1 we can write $\varphi = c_0 V_{s_0} + dv$. An expansion in d yields

$$|\varphi|^{2^*} = (c_0 V_{s_0} + dv)^{2^*} = (c_0 V_{s_0})^{2^*} + 2^*(c_0 V_{s_0})^{2^*-1} dv + \frac{2^*(2^*-1)}{2} (c_0 V_{s_0})^{2^*-2} (dv)^2 + o(d^2),$$

and then

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} |\varphi|^{2^*} dx = c_0^{2^*} S_V^{-2^*} + d^{2^*} c_0^{2^*-1} \int_{\Sigma_D} V_{s_0}^{2^*-1} v dx + d^2 \frac{2^*(2^*-1)}{2} c_0^{2^*-2} \int_{\Sigma_D} V_{s_0}^{2^*-2} v^2 dx + o(d^2). \quad (3.8)$$

From (3.7), (3.4) and $\|\nabla v\|_2 = 1$, we obtain

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} |\varphi|^{2^*} dx \leq c_0^{2^*} S_V^{-2^*} + d^2 c_0^{2^*-2} \frac{2^*(2^*-1)}{2} \frac{1}{\mu_3} + o(d^2) \quad (3.9)$$

Thus, since $\mu_2 = (2^*-1)S_V^{2^*}$, we get

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} |\varphi|^{2^*} dx \leq c_0^{2^*} S_V^{-2^*} \left(1 + d^2 c_0^{-2} \frac{2^* \mu_2}{2 \mu_3} + o(d^2)\right).$$

and then

$$\|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2 \leq c_0^2 S_V^{-2} \left(1 + d^2 c_0^{-2} \frac{2^* \mu_2}{2 \mu_3} + o(d^2)\right)^{\frac{2}{2^*}}.$$

Again, an expansion in d yields

$$\|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2 \leq c_0^2 S_V^{-2} + d^2 S_V^{-2} \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_3} + o(d^2),$$

and from (3.6) we obtain

$$\|\nabla\varphi\|_2^2 - S_V^2 \|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2 \geq d^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_3}\right) + o(d^2). \quad (3.10)$$

Now we show that the coefficient of the second order term of (3.10) is sharp. Let $\bar{\varphi} = V + \alpha w_3$ where w_3 is a third eigenfunction of \mathcal{L}_V with $\|\nabla w_3\|_2 = 1$ and $\alpha > 0$ is small. Now

$$d(\bar{\varphi}, \mathcal{M}_V)^2 = \inf_{c,s} \left(\|\nabla\bar{\varphi}\|_2^2 + c^2 - 2c \int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla\bar{\varphi} \cdot \nabla V_s dx \right) = \inf_s \left(\|\nabla\bar{\varphi}\|_2^2 - \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla\bar{\varphi} \cdot \nabla V_s dx \right)^2 \right), \quad (3.11)$$

where the last equality follows from the minimization in c . Since w_3 is a third eigenfunction and V is a first one, then $w_3 \perp V$ and we have

$$\|\nabla\bar{\varphi}\|_2^2 = \|\nabla V\|_2^2 + \alpha^2 \|\nabla w_3\|_2^2 = 1 + \alpha^2.$$

Then from (3.11) we get that

$$d(\bar{\varphi}, \mathcal{M})^2 = \inf_s \left(1 + \alpha^2 - \left(\int_{\Sigma_D} \nabla(V + \alpha\omega_3) \cdot \nabla V_s dx \right)^2 \right).$$

From this, it is easy to see that for α small the closest point on \mathcal{M}_V is V and $d(\bar{\varphi}, \mathcal{M}) = \alpha$. Since w_3 is a third eigenfunction, then

$$\mu_3 = \frac{\int_{\Sigma_D} |\nabla w_3|^2 dx}{\int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-2} w_3^2 dx},$$

and from (3.8) we have

$$\|\nabla \bar{\varphi}\|_2^2 - S_V^2 \|\bar{\varphi}\|_{2^*}^2 = d^2 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_3} \right) + o(d^2),$$

which implies that the constant of the second order term of (3.10) is sharp and completes the proof. \square

From Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 2.7 we obtain the following Corollary.

Corollary 3.3. *Let Σ_D be a cone such that $\lambda_1(D) > N - 1$, then the bubble U is a nondegenerate local minimizer, and the following inequality holds*

$$\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 - S_U^2 \|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2 \geq c_* d(\varphi, \mathcal{M})^2 + o(d(\varphi, \mathcal{M})^2), \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$c_* = \begin{cases} \frac{2\sqrt{N^2+4(\lambda_1(D)-N+1)}-2N+4(\lambda_1(D)-N+1)}{\sqrt{N^2+4(\lambda_1(D)-N+1)}(2+\sqrt{N^2+4(\lambda_1(D)-N+1)})} & N-1 < \lambda_1(D) \leq 2N \\ \frac{4}{N+4} & \lambda_1(D) > 2N \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ with $d(\varphi, \mathcal{M}) < \|\nabla \varphi\|_2$.

Proof. From Proposition 3.2 we know that the thesis holds with

$$c^* = 1 - \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_3} \quad (3.14)$$

where μ_2, μ_3 are respectively the second and the third eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_U . From Proposition 2.7 we know that $\mu_2 = (2^* - 1)S_U^{2^*}$ and

$$\mu_3 = \begin{cases} \frac{S_U^{2^*}}{N(N-2)} \sqrt{(N-2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)} \left(2 + \sqrt{(N-2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)} \right) & \text{for } N-1 < \lambda_1(D) \leq 2N \\ \frac{(N+4)(N+2)}{N(N-2)} S_U^{2^*} & \text{for } \lambda_1(D) > 2N. \end{cases}$$

substituting in (3.14) we get the conclusion. \square

Remark 3.4. Denoting \mathcal{M}_U simply by \mathcal{M} , notice that if $\lambda_1(D) \leq N - 1$ then (3.12) is meaningless since c_* becomes non positive. Indeed, if $\lambda_1(D) < N - 1$ by arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 and considering the spectral results obtained in Proposition 2.7, we get the following inequality

$$\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 - S_U^2 \|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2 \geq \left(1 - \frac{(2^* - 1)S_U^{2^*}}{\mu_2} \right) d(\varphi, \mathcal{M})^2 + o(d(\varphi, \mathcal{M})^2),$$

where

$$\mu_2 = \frac{S_U^{2^*}}{N(N-2)} \sqrt{(N-2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)} (2 + \sqrt{(N-2)^2 + 4\lambda_1(D)}) \leq (2^* - 1)S_U^{2^*}$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ with $d(\varphi, \mathcal{M}) < \|\nabla \varphi\|_2$, and in this case we obtain that

$$\left(1 - \frac{(2^* - 1)S_U^{2^*}}{\mu_2} \right) < 0.$$

If $\lambda_1(D) = N - 1$ we have that

$$\mu_2 = (2^* - 1)S_U^{2^*}$$

and then

$$\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 - S_U^2 \|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2 \geq o(d(\varphi, \mathcal{M})^2).$$

As a matter of fact in [7] it is proved that when $\lambda_1(D) < N - 1$ the bubble cannot be a local minimizer.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. **1)** We argue by contradiction. Suppose that there exists an infinite number of nondegenerate global minimizers $V^{(i)}, i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\|\nabla V\|_2 = 1$. From [8] we know that up to a subsequence, it converges in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$ to a minimizer \bar{V} which must be nondegenerate and hence isolated. Then

$$d(V^{(i)}, \mathcal{M}_{\bar{V}}) \rightarrow 0$$

which contradicts that \bar{V} is isolated.

2) We argue by contradiction. Assume that (1.9) does not hold. Then, using the Sobolev inequality

$$\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 \geq S_D^2 \|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2 \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$$

we can find a sequence $\{\varphi_k\}, k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\frac{\|\nabla \varphi_k\|_2^2 - S_D^2 \|\varphi_k\|_{2^*}^2}{\min_{i=1, \dots, m} d(\varphi_k, \mathcal{M}_{V^{(i)}})^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.15)$$

By homogeneity, we can assume that $\|\nabla \varphi_k\|_2 = 1$. Since for all i we have $d(\varphi_k, \mathcal{M}_{V^{(i)}}) \leq \|\nabla \varphi_k\|_2 = 1$, up to a subsequence, we can assume that $\min_i d(\varphi_k, \mathcal{M}_{V^{(i)}}) \rightarrow \bar{d} \in [0, 1]$. If $\bar{d} = 0$ then Lemma 3.2 holds for some $\mathcal{M}_{V^{(j)}}$, and we get a contradiction. The other possibility is $0 < \bar{d} \leq 1$. In this case, we must have

$$\|\nabla \varphi_k\|_2^2 - \hat{S}^2 \|\varphi_k\|_{2^*}^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.16)$$

which implies that φ_k is a minimizing sequence, and then it converges to a minimizer \bar{V} (see [8]), which belongs to $\mathcal{M}_{V^{(j)}}$ for some j . This implies

$$\min_i d(\varphi_k, \mathcal{M}_{V^{(i)}}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Corollary 3.5. *Let Σ_D be a cone as in (1.1) such that the Sobolev quotient Q_D admits a unique nondegenerate global minimizer V up to rescaling and multiplication by a constant. Then the following quantitative Sobolev inequality holds*

$$\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 - S_D^2 \|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2 \geq C_D d(\varphi, \mathcal{M}_V)^2, \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D) \quad (3.17)$$

for some positive constant $C_D > 0$.

Corollary 3.6. *Let Σ_D be a cone as in (1.1) such that the only global minimizer, up to rescaling and multiplication by a constant, is the bubble U and assume that $\lambda_1(D) > N - 1$. Then the following quantitative Sobolev inequality holds for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D)$*

$$\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 - S_D^2 \|\varphi\|_{2^*}^2 \geq C_D d(\varphi, \mathcal{M})^2, \quad (3.18)$$

where $0 < C_D \leq c^*$, where c^* is given by (3.13).

As pointed out in the introduction, Corollary 3.6 holds when the cone is convex or almost convex.

Proof. The proof follows from Corollary 3.3 and Theorem 1.1. \square

By Proposition 3.2 we have that the sharp constant C_D for the quantitative inequality defined in (1.10) is not greater than $\min_{i=1, \dots, m} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_2^i}{\mu_3^i}\right)$. We conclude by showing that the inequality is strict.

Theorem 3.7. *Let Σ_D be a cone, with $\bar{D} \subset \mathbb{S}_+^{N-1}$, and assume that every minimizer is nondegenerate. Let $V^{(1)}, \dots, V^{(m)}$ and C_D be as in (1.10), then if either:*

(1) $N = 3, 4, 5$,

or

(2) $N \geq 6$, Σ_D is such that the only minimizers are the bubbles, $\lambda_1(D) \geq 2N$ and D is symmetric w.r.t. two coordinates x_i, x_j for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$,

then

$$C_D < \min_{i=2, \dots, m} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_2^i}{\mu_3^i}\right).$$

Proof. Let V be one of the minimizers $V^{(1)}, \dots, V^{(m)}$, with $\|\nabla V\|_2 = 1$. We consider test functions of the form

$$f_\varepsilon = V + \varepsilon\rho,$$

for ε small and $\rho \in T_{\mathcal{M}_V}^\perp$ satisfies a specific choice described below.

The orthogonality relation, and the fact that $-\Delta V = S_V^{2^*} V^{2^*-1}$ easily imply

$$\|\nabla f_\varepsilon\|_2^2 = \|\nabla V\|_2^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla \rho\|_2^2.$$

A Taylor expansion in ε up to the fourth order yields

$$\begin{aligned} (V + \varepsilon\rho)^{2^*} &= V^{2^*} + \varepsilon 2^* V^{2^*-1} \rho + \varepsilon^2 \frac{2^*(2^*-1)}{2} V^{2^*-2} \rho^2 + \varepsilon^3 \frac{2^*(2^*-1)(2^*-2)}{6} V^{2^*-3} \rho^3 + \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^4 \frac{2^*(2^*-1)(2^*-2)(2^*-3)}{24} V^{2^*-4} \rho^4 + o(\varepsilon^4), \end{aligned}$$

and using the orthogonality property $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V^{2^*-1} \rho \, dx = 0$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|V + \varepsilon\rho\|_{2^*}^2 &= \|V\|_{2^*}^2 + \varepsilon^2 (2^*-1) \|V\|_{2^*}^{2-2^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V^{2^*-2} \rho^2 \, dx + \varepsilon^3 \frac{(2^*-1)(2^*-2)}{3} \|V\|_{2^*}^{2-2^*} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-3} \rho^3 \, dx + \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^4 \frac{(2^*-1)(2^*-2)(2^*-3)}{12} \|V\|_{2^*}^{2-2^*} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-4} \rho^4 \, dx + o(\varepsilon^4). \end{aligned}$$

Now taking ρ as a third eigenfunction of the operator \mathcal{L}_V with $\|\nabla \rho\|_2 = 1$ and remembering that $\|V\|_{2^*} = S_V^{-1}$, we have that the numerator of the quotient in (1.10) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f_\varepsilon\|_2^2 - S_D^2 \|f_\varepsilon\|_{2^*}^2 &= \left(1 - \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_3}\right) \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla \rho\|_2^2 - \varepsilon^3 S_D^{2^*} \frac{(2^*-1)(2^*-2)}{3} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-3} \rho^3 \, dx \\ &\quad - \varepsilon^4 S_D^{2^*} \frac{(2^*-1)(2^*-2)(2^*-3)}{12} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-4} \rho^4 \, dx + o(\varepsilon^4), \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

where μ_2 and μ_3 are the second and the third eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_V . As in the proof of Proposition 3.2 we have that for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, the minimum distance $\min_{i=1, \dots, m} \text{dist}(f_\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_{V^{(i)}})$ is achieved at V , hence

$$\text{dist}(f_\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_V)^2 = \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla \rho\|_2^2 = \varepsilon^2.$$

Hence, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, by (3.19) we have that

$$\frac{\|\nabla f_\varepsilon\|_2^2 - S_D^2 \|f_\varepsilon\|_{2^*}^2}{\varepsilon^2} < 1 - \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_3},$$

provided that for ε small enough

$$-\varepsilon^3 S_D^{2^*} \frac{(2^*-1)(2^*-2)}{3} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-3} \rho^3 \, dx - \varepsilon^4 S_D^{2^*} \frac{(2^*-1)(2^*-2)(2^*-3)}{12} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-4} \rho^4 \, dx + o(\varepsilon^4) < 0,$$

that is

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-3} \rho^3 \, dx + \varepsilon \frac{(2^*-3)}{4} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-4} \rho^4 \, dx + o(\varepsilon) > 0. \quad (3.20)$$

Case 1): $N=3,4,5$. If ρ is such that

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-3} \rho^3 \, dx \neq 0$$

then we get the conclusion for ε small taking either ρ or $-\rho$, which is still a third eigenfunction. If ρ is such that

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-3} \rho^3 \, dx = 0 \quad (3.21)$$

then we need

$$\varepsilon \frac{(2^*-3)}{4} \int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-4} \rho^4 \, dx + o(\varepsilon) > 0.$$

This is true for ε small enough, because for $N = 3, 4, 5$ we have $2^* > 3$.

Case 2): $\lambda_1(D) \geq 2N$, the only minimizers are the bubbles and D is symmetric with respect to two coordinates x_i, x_j , $i, j \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$. Then for U as in (2.11) we know from the Appendix and Corollary 2.8, that the third eigenfunctions of \mathcal{L}_U are given by $\rho(x) = U(x)\tilde{\rho}(\pi^{-1}(x))$ where π is the

stereographic projection and, $\tilde{\rho}$ is a homogeneous harmonic polynomial of degree two. Then we call $\omega = \pi^{-1}(x)$ and we consider

$$\tilde{\rho}(\omega) = \omega_i \omega_j + \omega_i \omega_l + \omega_j \omega_l$$

where ω_l is any coordinate such that $l \neq i$ and $l \neq j$.

Then, by calling $\Omega = \pi^{-1}(\Sigma_D)$, we have that exists a constant $C(N) > 0$ (depending only on N),

$$\int_{\Sigma_D} V^{2^*-3} \rho^3 = C(N) \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\rho}(\omega)^3 d\omega = C(N) \int_{\Omega} \omega_i^2 \omega_j^2 \omega_l^2 > 0$$

since the monomial containing $\omega_i, \omega_i^3, \omega_j, \omega_j^3$ are odd and we suppose that the domain is symmetric with respect to those coordinates. \square

APPENDIX A. AN EIGENVALUE PROBLEM

In this Appendix, we study the following eigenvalue problem:

$$\begin{cases} (r^{N-1} R)' + r^{N-1} \mu_{k, \lambda_0} k_0^{2^*-2} (1+r^2)^{-2} R = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \\ (r^{N-1} R'(r))(0) = 0 \\ R(r) = o(r^{2-N+\epsilon}) \quad \forall \epsilon > 0 \text{ as } r \rightarrow +\infty. \end{cases}$$

We notice that studying this problem is the same as looking for the eigenvalues, corresponding to radial eigenfunctions, of the problem

$$\begin{cases} -U^{2-2^*} \Delta v_k = \mu_{k, \lambda_0} v_k & \text{in } \Sigma_D \\ \partial_\nu v = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Sigma_D \\ v \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\Sigma_D). \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

As in [18, Section 2], we apply the transformation

$$\tilde{v}(y) = \frac{v}{U}(\pi(y)) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

for $y \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^N$, where π is the stereographic projection from the North pole and $\Omega = \pi^{-1}(\Sigma_D)$. In Cartesian coordinates, the projection from the north pole is given by:

$$y_0 = \frac{|x|^2 - 1}{|x|^2 + 1} \quad \text{and} \quad y_i = \frac{2x_i}{|x|^2 + 1},$$

where x_1, \dots, x_N are the coordinates of $x \in \Sigma_D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, and y_0, \dots, y_N are the coordinates of $y \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$. Since

$$\left(\Delta_{g_0} + \frac{N(N-2)}{4} \right) \tilde{v}(y) = U(\pi(y))^{1-2^*} \Delta v(\pi(y))$$

where g_0 is the metric on the sphere induced by the euclidean one in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} , then the equation (A.1) becomes

$$-\Delta_{g_0} \tilde{v}(y) = \frac{N(N-2)}{4} \left(S^{-2^*} \mu_{k, \lambda_0} - 1 \right) \tilde{v}, \quad \text{in } \Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^N. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

This is the eigenvalue problem for the Laplacian on the set Ω on the sphere. We are looking for radial eigenfunction of (A.1) that through the transformation (A.2), are the eigenfunctions of the Laplacian on Ω that depend only on the y_0 coordinate. Since we are looking for the radial one and we have the Neumann boundary condition, we are interested in the eigenfunction of $-\Delta_{g_0}$ that depends on y_0 on the whole sphere \mathbb{S}^N . It is known that if we have a harmonic, homogeneous, polynomial of degree $k-1$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, then it is an eigenfunction corresponding to the eigenvalue $(k-1)(k+N-2)$. From [1, pag. 85] we also know that the $(k-1)$ -th partial derivative of $|y|^{1-N}$ will give us an harmonic homogeneous polynomial of degree $k-1$. Then if we consider

$$\partial_{y_0}^{k-1} |y|^{1-N}$$

we obtain a radial eigenfunction corresponding to the $(k-1)$ -th eigenvalue.

For $k=1$ we have

$$\tilde{V}^{(1)}(x) = |y|^{1-N} = 1,$$

for $k=2$

$$\tilde{v}_2(x) = \partial_{y_0} |y|^{1-N} = (1-N)|y|^{-N-1} y_0 = 2(1-N) \frac{|x|^2 - 1}{|x|^2 + 1},$$

for $k=3$

$$\tilde{v}_3(x) = \partial_{y_0}^2 |y|^{1-N} = (N-1)(N+1)|y|^{-N-3} y_0^2 - (N-1)|y|^{-N-1} =$$

$$= (N-1) \frac{N(|x|^4 + 1) - 2(N+2)|x|^2}{(|x|^2 + 1)^2}.$$

Then from the transformation $\tilde{v}(y) = \frac{v}{V}(\pi(y))$ we get that, up to a constant,

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(1)} &= U, \quad v_2 = k_0(1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{-N}{2}}(1 - |x|^2) = \partial_s V_{s=1}, \\ v_3 &= k_0(1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{-N-2}{2}}(N|x|^4 - 2(N+2)|x|^2 + N). \end{aligned}$$

and more generally

$$v_k U^{-1} = (\partial_{y_0}^k |y|^{1-N})(\pi^{-1}(x)) := P_i(|x|^2). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Then we get that the eigenvalues μ_{k,λ_0} of (A.1) satisfy

$$\frac{N(N-2)}{4} \left(S^{-2^*} \mu_{k,\lambda_0} - 1 \right) = (k-1)(k+N-2)$$

and then they are given by

$$\mu_{k,\lambda_0} = \left((k-1)(k+N-2) \frac{4}{N(N-2)} + 1 \right) S^{2^*}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

In particular, for $k=1$ we obtain

$$\mu_{1,\lambda_0} = S^{2^*},$$

for $k=2$

$$\mu_{2,\lambda_0} = (2^* - 1) S^{2^*},$$

and for $k=3$

$$\mu_{3,\lambda_0} = \frac{(N+4)(N+2)}{N(N-2)} S^{2^*}.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Axler, P. Bourdon, and W. Ramey, *Harmonic Function Theory Second. Ed.*, Springer, 2001.
- [2] E. Baer and A. Figalli, *Characterization of isoperimetric sets inside almost-convex cones*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems, **37** (2017), 1–14.
- [3] G. Bianchi and H. Egnell, *A Note on the Sobolev Inequality*, Journal of Functional Analysis, **100** (1991), no. 1, 18–24.
- [4] X. Cabré, X. Ros-Oton, and J. Serra, *Sharp isoperimetric inequalities via the ABP method*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), **18** (2016), 2971–2998.
- [5] F. Catrina and Z.Q. Wang, *On the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequalities: sharp constants, existence (and nonexistence), and symmetry of extremal functions*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math., **54** (2001), no. 2, 229–258.
- [6] G. Ciraolo, A. Figalli, and A. Roncoroni, *Symmetry results for critical anisotropic p -Laplacian equations in convex cones*, Geom. Funct. Anal., **30** (2020), 770–803.
- [7] G. Ciraolo, F. Pacella, and C.C. Polvara, *Symmetry breaking and instability for semilinear elliptic equations in spherical sectors and cones*, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, **187** (2024), no. 3, 138–170.
- [8] M. Clapp and F. Pacella, *Existence of nonradial positive and nodal solutions to a critical Neumann problem in a cone*, Mathematics in Engineering, **3** (3) (2021), 1–15.
- [9] J. Dolbeault, M.J. Esteban, A. Figalli, R.L. Frank, and M. Loss, *Sharp stability for Sobolev and log-Sobolev inequalities, with optimal dimensional dependence*, arXiv:2209.08651 (2022).
- [10] A. Figalli and E. Indrei, *A sharp stability result for the relative isoperimetric inequality inside convex cones*, J. Geom. Anal., **23** (2013), 938–969.
- [11] A. Figalli and R. Neumayer, *Gradient Stability for the Sobolev Inequality: The Case $p \geq 2$* , Journal of the European Mathematical Society, **21** (2019), no. 2, 319–354.
- [12] D. Henry, *Perturbation of the Boundary in Boundary-Value Problems of Partial Differential Equations*, London Mathematical Society, **318**, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [13] T. König, *On the sharp constant in the Bianchi–Egnell stability inequality*, Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society, (2023).
- [14] T. König, *Stability for the Sobolev inequality: Existence of a minimizer*, Journal of the European Mathematical Society, (2025).
- [15] P.L. Lions and F. Pacella, *Isoperimetric inequalities for convex cones*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **109** (2) (1990), 477–485.

- [16] P.L. Lions, F. Pacella, and M. Tricarico, *Best constants in Sobolev inequalities for functions vanishing on some part of the boundary and related questions*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **37** (1988), 301–324.
- [17] F. Pacella and G. Tralli, *Overdetermined problems and constant mean curvature surfaces in cones*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam., **36 (3)** (2020), 841–867.
- [18] B. Premoselli, *A Priori Estimates for Finite-Energy Sign-Changing Blowing-Up Solutions of Critical Elliptic Equations*, International Mathematics Research Notices, **2024** (2024), 5212–5273.
- [19] M. Ritoré and C. Rosales, *Existence and characterization of regions minimizing perimeter under a volume constraint inside euclidean cones*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **356 (11)** (2004), 4601–4622.

G. CIRAOLLO. DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA “FEDERIGO ENRIQUES”, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI MILANO, VIA CESARE SALDINI 50, 20133 MILANO, ITALY

Email address: `giulio.ciraolo@unimi.it`

F. PACELLA. DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA “GUIDO CASTELNUOVO”, SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA, P.LE ALDO MORO 2, 00185 ROMA, ITALY

Email address: `filomena.pacella@uniroma1.it`

C.C. POLVARA. DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA “GUIDO CASTELNUOVO”, SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA, P.LE ALDO MORO 2, 00185 ROMA, ITALY

Email address: `camilla.polvara@uniroma1.it`