

ON A BERNOULLI-TYPE OVERDETERMINED FREE BOUNDARY PROBLEM

MURAT AKMAN, AGNID BANERJEE, AND MARIANA SMIT VEGA GARCIA

ABSTRACT. In this article we study a Bernoulli-type free boundary problem and generalize a work of Henrot and Shahgholian in [26] to \mathcal{A} -harmonic PDEs. These are quasi-linear elliptic PDEs whose structure is modelled on the p -Laplace equation for a fixed $1 < p < \infty$. In particular, we show that if K is a bounded convex set satisfying the interior ball condition and $c > 0$ is a given constant, then there exists a unique convex domain Ω with $K \subset \Omega$ and a function u which is \mathcal{A} -harmonic in $\Omega \setminus K$, has continuous boundary values 1 on ∂K and 0 on $\partial\Omega$, such that $|\nabla u| = c$ on $\partial\Omega$. Moreover, $\partial\Omega$ is $C^{1,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$, and it is smooth provided \mathcal{A} is smooth in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. We also show that the super level sets $\{u > t\}$ are convex for $t \in (0, 1)$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and statement of main results	1
2. Notation and Preparatory Lemmas	5
3. Proof of Theorem 1.4	11
3.1. A technique of Beurling	14
3.2. Final Proof of Theorem 1.4	17
References	19

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULTS

Classical Bernoulli free-boundary problems arise in electrostatics, fluid dynamics, optimal insulation, and electro chemistry. In the case of electrostatics, the task is to design an annular condenser consisting of a prescribed boundary component ∂E , and an unknown boundary component $\partial\Omega$ (where $\Omega \subset E$), such that the electric field ∇u is constant in magnitude on the surface $\partial\Omega$ of the second conductor (see [20, 19] for treatment of this problem and applications). This leads to the existence of the

Date: November 7, 2019.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35R35, 35A01, 35J92, 35J25, 35J70.

Key words and phrases. Quasilinear elliptic equations and p -Laplacian, Degenerate elliptic equations, Free boundary problems, Bernoulli-type free boundary problems.

following *interior Bernoulli free-boundary* (will be denoted by **(IBFB)**) problem:

$$(1.1) \quad (\mathbf{IBFB}) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = 0 & \text{in } E \setminus \bar{\Omega}, \\ u = 1 & \text{on } \partial E, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ |\nabla u| = a & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

for some given constant $a > 0$. The constraint $|\nabla u| = a$ is called *Bernoulli's law*.

Here Bernoulli's law $|\nabla u| = a$ should be understood in the following sense:

$$\liminf_{y \rightarrow x, y \in E \setminus \bar{\Omega}} |\nabla u(y)| = \limsup_{y \rightarrow x, y \in E \setminus \bar{\Omega}} |\nabla u(y)| = a \quad \text{for every } x \in \partial\Omega.$$

The existence and uniqueness of this problem can be stated in the following manner: *is there a domain Ω with $\Omega \subset E$ and a potential $u : E \setminus \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (1.2)? If so, is the couple (Ω, u) unique?*

The *exterior Bernoulli free-boundary problem* (**(EBFB)** problem for short) is defined in a similar fashion: *is there a couple (Ω, u) such that $E \subset \Omega$ and (1.2) below holds?*

$$(1.2) \quad (\mathbf{EBFB}) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \bar{E}, \\ u = 1 & \text{on } \partial E, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ |\nabla u| = a & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

In this paper our main goal is to generalize the work of [26] on the **(EBFB)** for \mathcal{A} -harmonic PDEs (see the definition below in (1.6)), proving existence and uniqueness of (Ω, u) and showing that $\partial\Omega$ is $C^{2,\alpha}$ (see Theorem 1.4).

Regarding the existing literature, the existence of solutions to the **(EBFB)** problem was obtained by Alt and Caffarelli in [9] by variational methods, and by Beurling [12] using sub-super solution methods in the plane. The reader is also referred to results of Acker in [3, 2] concerning the uniqueness and monotonicity of this problem.

If we assume E to be convex and require Ω to be convex as well, the question of existence and uniqueness of a pair satisfying (1.2) in the plane was answered affirmatively by Tepper in [35], by Hamilton in [23] both by using conformal mappings, and by Kawohl in [28], using different methods. In higher dimensions, convexity and uniqueness of Ω were shown by Henrot and Shahgholian in [25]. Under a convexity assumption on E , the **(EBFB)** problem was also studied by Henrot and Shahgholian in [26], where they proved existence of a pair (Ω, u) satisfying (1.2) without assuming E to be bounded or regular. When E is bounded, it was shown in [26] that the **(EBFB)** problem has a unique solution, and the same result was obtained independently by Acker and Meyer in [1].

Neither existence nor uniqueness is always true in the **(IBFB)** case. In the plane, existence of a pair (Ω, u) satisfying (1.1) was obtained by Lavrentèv in [30], Beurling in [12], and Daniljuk in [15]. A higher dimensional result was proved by Alt and Caffarelli in [9], and under certain assumptions Henrot and Shahgholian proved in [25] that the mean curvature of $\partial\Omega$ is positive for any connected component. In [25],

it was shown that if the **(IBFB)** problem admits a solution and E is convex, then Ω is also convex.

For further discussion of the problems we consider, we shall first introduce the p -Laplace equation:

$$\Delta_p u = \nabla \cdot (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) = |\nabla u|^{p-4} [|\nabla u|^2 \Delta u + (p-2) \sum_{i,j=1}^n u_{x_i} u_{x_j} u_{x_i x_j}].$$

Here p is fixed with $1 < p < \infty$, $|\nabla u| = (u_{x_1}^2 + \dots + u_{x_n}^2)^{1/2}$, and $\nabla \cdot$ is the divergence operator.

It is well-known that, in general, solutions of the p -Laplace equation do not enjoy second order derivatives in the classical sense, therefore solutions to these equations have to be understood as *weak solutions*. That is, given a bounded, connected open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, u is a p -harmonic function in Ω provided $u > 0$ in Ω and u is in the Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(U)$ for each open set U with $\bar{U} \subset \Omega$ and

$$(1.3) \quad \int_U |\nabla u|^{p-2} \langle \nabla u, \nabla \eta \rangle dx = 0 \quad \text{whenever} \quad \eta \in W_0^{1,p}(U).$$

In the above paragraph $W^{1,p}(U)$ denotes the space of equivalence classes of functions h with *distributional gradient* ∇h both of which are p integrable in U , and $W_0^{1,p}$ denotes the closure of C_0^∞ in the $W^{1,p}$ norm.

In [27], the p -Laplace operator was treated in the **(IBFB)** case:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_p u = 0 & \text{in } E \setminus \Omega, \\ u = 1 & \text{on } \partial E, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Omega, \\ |\nabla u| = a & \text{on } \partial \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Existence of a solution, and regularity (that is, $\partial \Omega$ is $C^{2,\alpha}$) were shown in that article.

The authors of [25] proved uniqueness and convexity of the **(EBFB)** problem if the Laplace operator is replaced by a general nonlinear operator \mathcal{L} of the form $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}u = \mathcal{F}(x, u, \nabla u, \nabla^2 u)$, if the operator \mathcal{L} satisfies certain properties (see section 4 in that article).

In this article we consider the **(EBFB)** problem when the underlying PDE is the so called \mathcal{A} -harmonic PDE. We introduce this nonlinear elliptic equation in what follows.

Definition 1.1. Let $p, \alpha \in (1, \infty)$ be fixed and

$$\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n) : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n,$$

be such that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\eta)$ has continuous partial derivatives in η_k for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. We say that the function \mathcal{A} belongs to the class $M_p(\alpha)$ if the following two conditions are satisfied whenever $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$:

$$(i) \quad \alpha^{-1} |\eta|^{p-2} |\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\eta) \xi_i \xi_j \leq \alpha |\eta|^{p-2} |\xi|^2,$$

(ii) \mathcal{A} is $p - 1$ homogeneous, i.e., $\mathcal{A}(\eta) = |\eta|^{p-1} \mathcal{A}(\eta/|\eta|)$.

We set $\mathcal{A}(0) = 0$ and note that Definition 1.1 (i) and (ii) imply

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} c^{-1}(|\eta| + |\eta'|)^{p-2} |\eta - \eta'|^2 &\leq \langle \mathcal{A}(\eta) - \mathcal{A}(\eta'), \eta - \eta' \rangle \\ &\leq c |\eta - \eta'|^2 (|\eta| + |\eta'|)^{p-2} \end{aligned}$$

whenever $\eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. We will additionally assume that there exists $1 \leq \Lambda < \infty$ such that

$$(1.5) \quad \left| \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\eta) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\eta') \right| \leq \Lambda |\eta - \eta'| |\eta|^{p-3}$$

whenever $0 < |\eta| \leq 2|\eta'|$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Definition 1.2. Given an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{A} \in M_p(\alpha)$, one says that u is \mathcal{A} -harmonic in Ω , and we write $\nabla \cdot \mathcal{A}(\nabla u) = 0$, provided $u > 0$ in Ω , $u \in W^{1,p}(U)$ for each open set U with $\bar{U} \subset \Omega$ and

$$(1.6) \quad \int \langle \mathcal{A}(\nabla u(x)), \nabla \eta(x) \rangle dx = 0 \quad \text{whenever } \eta \in W_0^{1,p}(U).$$

For more about PDEs of this type the reader is referred to [24]. Notice that when $\mathcal{A}(\eta) = \eta$ then (1.6) is the usual Laplace's equation, and when $\mathcal{A}(\eta) = |\eta|^{p-2} \eta$ then (1.6) becomes the p-Laplace equation.

Definition 1.3. We say that a set K satisfies *interior ball condition* if

$$(1.7) \quad \text{for each } x_0 \in \partial D, \text{ there is a ball } B(z, \delta) \subset D \text{ with } x_0 \in \overline{B(z, \delta)}$$

for some $\delta > 0$.

Our main goal is to generalize the work of Henrot and Shahgholian in [26] on the **(EBFB)** problem to \mathcal{A} -harmonic PDEs. In particular, we show that

Theorem 1.4. *Let $c > 0$ be a given constant and K be a bounded convex domain satisfying the interior ball condition. Then there exist a unique convex domain Ω with $K \subset \Omega$ and function u satisfying*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \nabla \cdot \mathcal{A}(\nabla u) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \setminus \bar{K}. \\ u \text{ has continuous boundary values } 1 \text{ on } \partial K \text{ and } 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega. \\ \text{the superlevel sets } \{u > t\} \text{ are convex for every } t \in (0, 1). \\ |\nabla u| = c \text{ on } \partial \Omega. \end{array} \right.$$

Moreover, $\partial \Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Furthermore we have that $\partial \Omega$ is smooth provided \mathcal{A} is smooth.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In section 2, we gather some known results concerning the regularity of \mathcal{A} -harmonic functions that are relevant for our work. We also show that the levels of u are convex if K is convex by adapting an idea of Lewis [31]. In section 3, using a method of Beurling (see also [26]), we prove the existence result in Theorem 1.4. Uniqueness in Theorem 1.4 will essentially follow from [25].

Finally the regularity result in Theorem 1.4 is obtained using ideas inspired by the work of Vogel in [37].

2. NOTATION AND PREPARATORY LEMMAS

Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ denote points in \mathbb{R}^n and let \bar{E} , ∂E , be the closure and boundary of the set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the usual inner product in \mathbb{R}^n and $|x|^2 = \langle x, x \rangle$. Let $d(E, F)$ denote the distance between the sets E and F . Let $B(x, r)$ be the open ball centered at x with radius $r > 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n and dx denote the Lebesgue n -measure in \mathbb{R}^n . Given $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ an open set and q with $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, let $W^{1,q}(U)$ denote equivalence classes of functions $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with distributional gradient $\nabla h = \langle h_{x_1}, \dots, h_{x_n} \rangle$, both of which are q -integrable in U with Sobolev norm

$$\|h\|_{W^{1,q}(U)}^q = \int_U (|h|^q + |\nabla h|^q) dx.$$

Let $C_0^\infty(U)$ be the set of infinitely differentiable functions with compact support in U and let $W_0^{1,q}(U)$ be the closure of $C_0^\infty(U)$ in the norm of $W^{1,q}(U)$.

In the sequel, c will denote a positive constant ≥ 1 (not necessarily the same at each occurrence), which may depend only on p, n, α, Λ unless otherwise stated. In general, $c(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ denotes a positive constant ≥ 1 which may depend only on $p, n, \alpha, \Lambda, a_1, \dots, a_n$, which is not necessarily the same at each occurrence. By $A \approx B$ we mean that A/B is bounded above and below by positive constants depending only on p, n, α, Λ . Finally, in this section we will always assume that $1 < p < \infty$, and $r > 0$.

We next introduce the notion of the *Hausdorff measure*. To this end, let $\hat{r}_0 > 0$ be given, and let $0 < \delta < \hat{r}_0$ be fixed. Let $\text{diam}(\cdot)$ denote the diameter of a set and let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a given Borel set. For an arbitrary integer $k > 0$, we define the (δ, k) -*Hausdorff content* of E in the usual way:

$$\mathcal{H}_\delta^k(E) := \inf \left\{ \sum_i r_i^k : E \subset \bigcup_i B(x_i, r_i) \text{ with } r_i < \delta \right\}.$$

Here the infimum is taken over all possible covers $\{B(x_i, r_i)\}$ of E . Then the *Hausdorff k -measure* of E is defined by

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{H}^k(E) := \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\delta^k(E).$$

Lemma 2.1. *Given p with $1 < p < \infty$, assume that $\mathcal{A} \in M_p(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha > 1$. Let u be an \mathcal{A} -harmonic function in $B(w, 4r)$. Then*

$$(a) \quad r^{p-n} \int_{B(w, r/2)} |\nabla u|^p dx \leq c \max_{B(w, r)} u^p.$$

$$(b) \quad \max_{B(w, r)} u \leq c \min_{B(w, r)} u.$$

Moreover, there exists $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ depending on p, n, α such that if $x, y \in B(w, r)$ then

$$(c) |u(x) - u(y)| \leq c(|x - y|/r)^\gamma \max_{B(w, 2r)} u.$$

For a proof of Lemma 2.1 see [34].

Lemma 2.2. *Given p with $1 < p < \infty$, assume that $\mathcal{A} \in M_p(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha > 1$. Let u be an \mathcal{A} -harmonic function in $B(w, 4r)$. Then u has a representative locally in $W^{1,p}(B(w, 4r))$ with Hölder continuous partial derivatives in $B(w, 4r)$ (also denoted u), and there exist $\beta \in (0, 1]$ and $c \geq 1$ depending only on p, n, α such that if $x, y \in B(w, r)$ then*

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} (i) \quad & |\nabla u(x) - \nabla u(y)| \leq c(|x - y|/r)^\beta \max_{B(w, r)} |\nabla u| \leq cr^{-1}(|x - y|/r)^\beta u(w). \\ (ii) \quad & \int_{B(w, r)} \sum_{i,j=1}^n |\nabla u|^{p-2} |u_{x_i x_j}|^2 dx \leq cr^{n-p-2} u(w). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if

$$\gamma r^{-1} u \leq |\nabla u| \leq \gamma^{-1} r^{-1} u \quad \text{on } B(w, 2r)$$

for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and (1.5) holds then u has Hölder continuous second partial derivatives in $B(w, r)$ and there exists $\theta \in (0, 1), \bar{c} \geq 1$, depending only on the data and γ such that if $x, y \in B(w, r/2)$, then

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \left[\sum_{i,j=1}^n (u_{x_i x_j}(x) - u_{y_i y_j}(y))^2 \right]^{1/2} &\leq \bar{c} (|x - y|/r)^\theta \max_{B(w, r)} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n |u_{x_i x_j}| \right) \\ &\leq \bar{c}^2 r^n (|x - y|/r)^\theta \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n \int_{B(w, 2r)} u_{x_i x_j}^2 r dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \bar{c}^3 r^{-2} (|x - y|/r)^\theta u(w). \end{aligned}$$

A proof of (2.2) can be found in [36]. Estimate (2.3) follows from (2.2), the added assumptions and Schauder type estimates (see [22]).

We will make use of following lemma when we rotate our coordinate system. A proof of it can be found in [32, Lemma 2.15].

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain and let p with $1 < p < \infty$ be given. Let $\mathcal{A} \in M_p(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha > 1$ and u be \mathcal{A} -harmonic in Ω . If $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the composition of a translation and a dilation, then*

$$\hat{u}(z) = u(F(z)) \text{ is } \mathcal{A}\text{-harmonic in } F^{-1}(\Omega).$$

Moreover, if $\tilde{F} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the composition of a translation, a dilation, and a rotation then

$$\tilde{u}(z) = u(F(z)) \text{ is } \hat{\mathcal{A}}\text{-harmonic in } \tilde{F}^{-1}(\Omega) \quad \text{for some } \hat{\mathcal{A}} \in M_p(\alpha).$$

In what follows we make observations that will be useful throughout the paper (see also [7, 8] for a similar computation). Define

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{L}(\eta, \xi) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} [b_{ij}(\eta)\xi_{x_j}], \quad \text{where } b_{ij}(\eta) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\eta).$$

When $\eta = \nabla u$ we will write $\mathcal{L}(\eta, \xi) = \mathcal{L}_u \xi$, and when $\xi = \nabla w$ we will write $\mathcal{L}_u \xi = \mathcal{L}_u w$. We next show that if u is \mathcal{A} -harmonic in Ω , then $\xi = u$ and $\xi = u_{x_k}$ (for $k = 1, \dots, n$) are both weak solutions to $\mathcal{L}_u \xi = 0$.

We first see that if u is \mathcal{A} -harmonic then

$$\mathcal{L}_u u = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla u) u_{x_j} \right] = 0.$$

Indeed, using the $(p-1)$ -homogeneity of \mathcal{A} in Definition 1.1 we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_u u = (p-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \mathcal{A}_i(\nabla u) = (p-1) \nabla \cdot \mathcal{A}(\nabla u) = 0.$$

To show that $\mathcal{L}_u u_{x_k} = 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$, using Lemma 2.2 we first get $u \in W^{2,2}(\Omega)$. Then it follows that

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{L}_u u_{x_k} = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla u) u_{x_k x_j} \right] = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \nabla \cdot \mathcal{A}(\nabla u) = 0.$$

Note that above argument should be understood in the weak sense. Using these two observations and the structural assumptions on \mathcal{A} from Definition 1.1 we also conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_u(|\nabla u|^2) &= \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla u) (u_{x_1}^2 + \dots + u_{x_n}^2)_{x_j} \right] = 2 \sum_{i,j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla u) u_{x_k} u_{x_k x_j} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(2.5)}{=} 2 \sum_{i,j,k=1}^n \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\nabla u) u_{x_k x_i} u_{x_k x_j} \geq 2\alpha^{-1} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n (u_{x_i x_j})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using this observation we conclude

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{L}_u(|\nabla u|^2) \geq c^{-1} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n (u_{x_i x_j})^2.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let Ω be a domain, K be a bounded, closed, convex set with $K \subset \Omega$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $\alpha > 1$ be given. Let $\mathcal{A} \in M_p(\alpha)$ and u be \mathcal{A} -harmonic in $\Omega \setminus K$ with $u = 1$ on ∂K . If K satisfies interior ball property then there exists $c_* \geq 1$, depending only on p, n, α, r_0 such that if $x \in \Omega \setminus K$*

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} (a) \quad &c_* \langle \nabla u(x), z - x \rangle \geq u(x), \\ (b) \quad &c_*^{-1} |x|^{\frac{1-n}{p-1}} \leq |\nabla u(x)| \leq c_* |x|^{\frac{1-n}{p-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. A proof of this lemma can be found in [4] when $1 < p < n$ and in [6] when $n \leq p < \infty$. Proof uses Lemmas 2.2, 2.1, and 2.3. Also a barrier type argument has been used as in [32, Section 2] and [8, Section 4]. We skip the details. \square

Now let u be a \mathcal{A} -harmonic function in $\Omega \setminus K$ where $K \subset \Omega$, it is continuous on \mathbb{R}^n with $u \equiv 1$ on K and $u \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$. The following lemma establishes the convexity of the superlevel sets $\{u > t\}$ when both K and Ω are convex. We note that such a result plays a crucial role in the uniqueness assertion in Theorem 1.4. In the case of p -Laplacian, such a result was first established by Lewis in [31] following Gabriel's [21] ideas. Here we adapt the techniques in [31] and [4] to our situation. We also refer to the interesting paper [13] for a different proof in the case of the Laplacian.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $K \subset \Omega$ be such that K, Ω are convex and let u be \mathcal{A} -harmonic in $\Omega \setminus K$, continuous on \mathbb{R}^n with $u \equiv 1$ on K and $u \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$. If K satisfies interior ball condition then for each $t \in (0, 1)$, the set $\{x \in \Omega : u(x) > t\}$ is convex.*

Proof. We note from (2.7) and Lemma 2.2 that

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{cases} |\nabla u| \neq 0, \\ u \text{ has Hölder continuous second partial derivatives on compact subsets of } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Our proof of Lemma 2.5 is by contradiction, following the proof in [31, section 4]. We define for $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mathbf{u}(\hat{x}) = \sup_{\hat{x} = \lambda \hat{y} + (1-\lambda)\hat{z}, \lambda \in [0,1]} \min_{\hat{y}, \hat{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{u(\hat{y}), u(\hat{z})\}.$$

Notice that $u \leq \mathbf{u}$, $\mathbf{u} \equiv 1$ in K and $\mathbf{u} \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$. It suffices to show that $\mathbf{u} = u$. If that were not true, then from the convexity of K , continuity of u , and the fact that as $w \rightarrow w_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $u(w) \rightarrow 0$, we would conclude that there must exist $\epsilon > 0$, and $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that

$$(2.9) \quad 0 < \mathbf{u}^{1+\epsilon}(x_0) - u(x_0) = \max_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathbf{u}^{1+\epsilon} - u).$$

For ease of writing we write $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}^{1+\epsilon}$ and $v = u^{1+\epsilon}$. There exist $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $y_0, z_0 \in \Omega \setminus \{x_0\}$ with

$$(2.10) \quad x_0 = \lambda y_0 + (1 - \lambda)z_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}(x_0) = \min\{v(y_0), v(z_0)\}.$$

We first show that

$$(2.11) \quad v(y_0) = v(z_0).$$

Assume for contradiction, for instance, that $v(y_0) < v(z_0)$. Since $u \leq \mathbf{u}$, $u(x_0) \leq u(y_0) = \mathbf{u}(x_0) < u(z_0)$. By continuity, if z is in a small enough neighborhood of z_0 , then $u(z) > u(y_0) + (u(z_0) - u(y_0))/2$. Since $|\nabla u| \neq 0$ in Ω , we can choose y' close enough to y_0 so that $u(y') > u(y_0)$ and also such that after connecting y' and x_0 by a line, we can pick a corresponding z' in the previous neighborhood of z_0 . In this manner $\mathbf{u}(x_0) \geq \min\{u(y'), u(z')\} > u(y_0) = \mathbf{u}(x_0)$, a contradiction. Thus (2.11) is true.

Next we prove that

$$(2.12) \quad \xi = \frac{\nabla v(y_0)}{|\nabla v(y_0)|} = \frac{\nabla v(z_0)}{|\nabla v(z_0)|} = \frac{\nabla u(x_0)}{|\nabla u(x_0)|}$$

Indeed, let us show that

$$\frac{\nabla v(y_0)}{|\nabla v(y_0)|} = \frac{\nabla v(x_0)}{|\nabla v(x_0)|}.$$

Let y not be on the line through y_0 and z_0 and be such that $\nabla v(y_0) \cdot (y - y_0) > 0$. Draw the line through y and z_0 and denote by x its intersection with the line originating at x_0 with direction $y - y_0$. One has that $v(y) > v(y_0)$ for y close to y_0 . Therefore $\tilde{v}(x_0) \leq \tilde{v}(x)$, for y near y_0 . From (2.9) we conclude $u(x) \geq u(x_0)$, for y close to y_0 , hence $\nabla u(x_0) \cdot (y - y_0) \geq 0$ whenever $\nabla v(y_0) \cdot (y - y_0) > 0$, showing that $\nabla u(x_0)$ and $\nabla v(y_0)$ point in the same direction.

To simplify our notation, let

$$A = |\nabla v(y_0)|, \quad B = |\nabla v(z_0)|, \quad C = |\nabla u(x_0)|, \quad a = |x_0 - y_0|, \quad b = |x_0 - z_0|.$$

Let $\eta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ be such that $\xi \cdot \eta > 0$. From (2.8) we can write

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} v(y_0 + \rho\eta) &= v(y_0) + A_1\rho + A_2\rho^2 + o(\rho^2), \\ v(z_0 + \rho\eta) &= v(z_0) + B_1\rho + B_2\rho^2 + o(\rho^2), \\ u(x_0 + \rho\eta) &= u(x_0) + C_1\rho + C_2\rho^2 + o(\rho^2) \end{aligned}$$

as $\rho \rightarrow 0$. Also

$$A_1/A = B_1/B = C_1/C = \xi \cdot \eta,$$

where the coefficients and $o(\rho^2)$ depend on η . Given η with $\xi \cdot \eta > 0$ and ρ_1 sufficiently small we see from (2.8) that the inverse function theorem can be used to obtain ρ_2 with

$$v\left(y_0 + \frac{\rho_1}{A}\eta\right) = v\left(z_0 + \frac{\rho_2}{B}\eta\right).$$

We conclude as $\rho_1 \rightarrow 0$ that

$$(2.14) \quad \rho_2 = \rho_1 + \frac{B}{B_1} \left(\frac{A_2}{A^2} - \frac{B_2}{B^2} \right) \rho_1^2 + o(\rho_1^2).$$

Now from geometry we see that $\lambda = \frac{b}{a+b}$ so

$$x = x_0 + \eta \frac{[\rho_1 \frac{b}{A} + \rho_2 \frac{a}{B}]}{a+b} = \lambda(y_0 + \frac{\rho_1}{A}\eta) + (1-\lambda)(z_0 + \frac{\rho_2}{B}\eta).$$

From this equality and Taylor's theorem for second derivatives we have

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{aligned} u(x) - u(x_0) &= C_1 \left[\rho_1 \frac{\lambda}{A} + \rho_2 \frac{(1-\lambda)}{B} \right] + C_2 \left[\rho_1 \frac{\lambda}{A} + \rho_2 \frac{(1-\lambda)}{B} \right]^2 \\ &= C_1 \rho_1 \frac{(1-\lambda)A + \lambda B}{AB} + C_1 \frac{(1-\lambda)}{B_1} \left(\frac{A_2}{A^2} - \frac{B_2}{B^2} \right) \rho_1^2 \\ &\quad + C_2 \rho_1^2 \left(\frac{(1-\lambda)A + \lambda B}{AB} \right)^2 + o(\rho_1^2). \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$v(y_0 + \frac{\rho_1}{A}\eta) - u(x) \leq \mathbf{v}(x) - u(x) \leq \mathbf{v}(x_0) - u(x_0) = v(y_0) - u(x_0).$$

Hence the mapping

$$\rho_1 \rightarrow v(y_0 + \frac{\rho_1}{A}\eta) - u(x)$$

has a maximum at $\rho_1 = 0$. Using the Taylor expansion for $v(y_0 + \frac{\rho_1}{A}\eta)$ in (2.13) and $u(x)$ in (2.15) we have

$$\begin{aligned} v(y_0 + \frac{\rho_1}{A}\eta) - u(x) &= v(y_0) + \frac{A_1}{A}\rho_1 + \frac{A_2}{A^2}\rho_1^2 - u(x_0) \\ &\quad - C_1\rho_1 \frac{(1-\lambda)A + \lambda B}{AB} - \frac{C_1}{a+b} \frac{a}{B_1} \left(\frac{A_2}{A^2} - \frac{B_2}{B^2} \right) \rho_1^2 \\ &\quad - C_2\rho_1^2 \left(\frac{(1-\lambda)A + \lambda B}{AB} \right)^2 + o(\rho_1^2) \end{aligned}$$

Now from the calculus second derivative test, the coefficient of ρ_1 should be zero and the coefficient of ρ_1^2 should be non-positive. Hence combining terms we get

$$\frac{A_1}{A} = C_1 \frac{(1-\lambda)A + \lambda B}{AB}$$

so taking $\eta = \xi$ we arrive first at

$$(2.16) \quad \frac{1}{C} = \frac{(1-\lambda)A + \lambda B}{AB} = \frac{(1-\lambda)}{B} + \frac{\lambda}{A}.$$

Second using (2.16) in the ρ_1^2 term we find that

$$(2.17) \quad 0 \geq \frac{A_2}{A^2} - C_1 \frac{(1-\lambda)}{B_1} \left(\frac{A_2}{A^2} - \frac{B_2}{B^2} \right) - \frac{C_2}{C^2}.$$

Using $C_1/B_1 = C/B$ and doing some arithmetic in (2.17) we obtain

$$(2.18) \quad 0 \geq (1-K) \frac{A_2}{A^2} + K \frac{B_2}{B^2} - \frac{C_2}{C^2}$$

where

$$K = \frac{(1-\lambda)A}{(1-\lambda)A + \lambda B} < 1.$$

We now focus on (2.18) by writing A_1, B_1, C_1 in terms of derivatives of u and v ;

$$(2.19) \quad 0 \geq \sum_{i,j=1}^n \left[\frac{(1-K)}{A^2} v_{x_i x_j}(y_0) + \frac{K}{B^2} v_{x_i x_j}(z_0) - \frac{u_{x_i x_j}(x_0)}{C^2} \right] \eta_i \eta_j.$$

From symmetry and continuity considerations we observe that (2.19) holds whenever $\eta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Thus if

$$w(x) = -\frac{(1-K)}{A^2} v(y_0 + x) - \frac{K}{B^2} v(z_0 + x) + \frac{u_{x_i x_j}(x_0 + x)}{C^2},$$

then the Hessian matrix of w at $x = 0$ is positive semi-definite, i.e., $(w_{x_i x_j}(0))$ has non-negative eigenvalues. Also from (i) of Definition 1.1 we see that if

$$a_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j}(\xi) + \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_j}{\partial \eta_i}(\xi) \right], \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n,$$

then (a_{ij}) is positive definite. From these two observations we conclude that

$$(2.20) \quad \text{trace} \left(((a_{ij}) \cdot (w_{x_i x_j}(0))) \right) \geq 0.$$

To obtain a contradiction we observe from (1.6), the divergence theorem, (2.18), and $p - 2$ homogeneity of partial derivatives of \mathcal{A}_i , that

$$(2.21) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij} u_{x_j x_i} = |\nabla u|^{2-p} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j} (\nabla u) u_{x_j x_i} = 0 \text{ at } x_0, y_0, z_0.$$

Moreover from the definition of v we have

$$(2.22) \quad \begin{aligned} v_{x_i} &= (u^{1+\epsilon})_{x_i} = (1 + \epsilon) u^\epsilon u_{x_i} \\ v_{x_i x_j} &= (1 + \epsilon) \epsilon u^{\epsilon-1} u_{x_i} u_{x_j} + (1 + \epsilon) u^\epsilon u_{x_i x_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.21), (2.22), we find that

$$(2.23) \quad \begin{aligned} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij} v_{x_j x_i} &= \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j} (\nabla u) [(1 + \epsilon) u^{\epsilon-1} u_{x_j} u_{x_i} + (1 + \epsilon) u^\epsilon u_{x_j x_i}] \\ &= (1 + \epsilon) \epsilon u^{\epsilon-1} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j} (\nabla u) u_{x_j} u_{x_i} + (1 + \epsilon) u^\epsilon \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i}{\partial \eta_j} (\nabla u) u_{x_j x_i} \\ &\geq \alpha^{-1} (1 + \epsilon) \epsilon u^{\epsilon-1} |\nabla u|^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 + 0 > 0 \end{aligned}$$

at points y_0 and z_0 (∇u is also evaluated at these points). Using (2.21), (2.23), we conclude that

$$(2.24) \quad \text{trace} \left(((a_{ij}) \cdot (w_{x_i x_j}(0))) \right) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij} w_{x_i x_j}(0) < 0.$$

(2.24) and (2.20) contradict each other. The proof of Lemma 2.5 is now complete. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

In this section we give a proof of Theorem 1.4 by a method of *Beurling*, inspired by Henrot and Shahgholian in [26]. To this end, Let K be a convex domain and let $P_{x_0, a}$ denote the hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^n passing through x_0 with the normal $a \neq 0$ pointing away from K .

A *supporting hyperplane to K at boundary point x_0* is a plane satisfying

$$P_{x_0, a} := \{x : a^T x = a^T x_0\}$$

where $a \neq 0$ and $a^T x \leq a^T x_0$ for all $x \in K$. By the supporting hyperplane theorem it is known that there exists a supporting hyperplane at every boundary point of a convex set K . Let Ω be another convex set containing K .

For each $x \in \partial K$ there exists a point $y_x \in \partial\Omega \cap \{z : a \cdot (z - x) > 0\}$ satisfying $a \cdot (y_x - x) = \max a \cdot (z - x)$, where maximum is taken over the set $\partial\Omega \cap \{z : a \cdot (z - x) > 0\}$.

We will work on convex ring domains. That is, let D_1 and D_2 be two convex domains satisfying $D_1 \subset \overline{D_1} \subset D_2$. We first need an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let D_1, D_2 be two convex domains with $D_1 \subset \overline{D_1} \subset D_2$. Let u be \mathcal{A} -capacitary potential of $D_2 \setminus D_1$, that is,*

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \cdot \mathcal{A}(\nabla u) = 0 & \text{in } D_2 \setminus \overline{D_1}, \\ u = c_1 & \text{on } \partial D_1, \\ u = c_2 & \text{on } \partial D_2, \end{cases}$$

where $c_1 > c_2 \geq 0$ are given constants. Then

$$\limsup_{\substack{z \rightarrow x \\ z \in D_2 \setminus \overline{D_1}}} |\nabla u(z)| \geq \limsup_{\substack{z \rightarrow y_x \\ z \in D_2 \setminus \overline{D_1}}} |\nabla u(z)|$$

for all $x \in \partial D_1$.

Proof. Without loss of generality assume that $c_1 = 1$ and $c_2 = 0$ as we may using the the translation and dilation invariance of (1.6). Now let $x \in \partial D_1$ and also first assume that ∂D_1 is not C^1 at x . Note that locally near x , u can be approximated by functions u^ϵ , which are solutions to a uniformly elliptic PDE in non-divergence form with ellipticity bounds independent of ϵ (see [5, section 2.3]). This later fact follows from the structural assumptions on \mathcal{A} as in (i) in Definition 1.1. Then it follows from [33] that there exists a barrier v to such linear equations with $v(x) = u^\epsilon(x) = u(x)$, $v \leq u^\epsilon$ near x and moreover $|\nabla v(x)| = \infty$. Thus it follows that $|\nabla u(x)| = \infty$. Likewise, if ∂D_2 is not C^1 at y_x , then similarly it follows from [33] that there exists an upper barrier v such that $v(y_x) = u(y_x)$ and $v \geq u$ locally near y_x and such that $|\nabla v(y_x)| = 0$. Then it follows that $|\nabla u(y_x)| = 0$, which gives the desired result. Thus in view of the above discussion, we may now restrict our attention to the case when x, y_x are in the regular part of ∂D_1 and ∂D_2 respectively. Let $x \in \partial D_1$ be fixed and let y_x be the associated point on ∂D_2 as described above. Let $P = P_{x,a}$ be a supporting plane at x to D_1 .

Note that $D_1 \subset \{P < 0\}$ and let $D'_2 := D_2 \cap \{P > 0\}$. By Lemma 2.3, we may assume that $P = \{x_n = 0\}$. Indeed, otherwise after a rotation we have $P = \{x_n = 0\}$; we first prove the present lemma for \tilde{u} which is $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ -harmonic for some $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \in M_p(\alpha)$ and follow by transferring everything back to u . Hence assume $P = \{x_n = 0\}$ and define $v = u + \alpha x_n$, where

$$\alpha = \limsup_{\substack{z \rightarrow y_x \\ z \in D_2 \setminus \overline{D_1}}} |\nabla u(z)| - \epsilon,$$

with $\epsilon > 0$ small. Since $\mathcal{L}u = \mathcal{L}v = 0$ in D'_2 , v attains its maximum on $\partial D'_2$. By the construction of D'_2 , the maximum of v is either at x or y_x . If the maximum were at




FIGURE 1. The supporting place $P = P_{x,a}$ and the domains D_1 and D_2 .

y_x , then

$$0 \leq \limsup_{\substack{z \rightarrow y_x \\ z \in D_2 \setminus \overline{D_1}}} \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_n}(z) = - \limsup_{\substack{z \rightarrow y_x \\ z \in D_2 \setminus \overline{D_1}}} |\nabla u(z)| + \alpha = -\epsilon < 0.$$

It follows that v attains its maximum at x , hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq - \limsup_{\substack{z \rightarrow x \\ z \in D_2 \setminus \overline{D_1}}} \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_n}(z) = \limsup_{\substack{z \rightarrow x \\ z \in D_2 \setminus \overline{D_1}}} |\nabla u(z)| - \alpha \\ &= \limsup_{\substack{z \rightarrow x \\ z \in D_2 \setminus \overline{D_1}}} |\nabla u(z)| - \limsup_{\substack{z \rightarrow y_x \\ z \in D_2 \setminus \overline{D_1}}} |\nabla u(z)| + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We then conclude the validity of the lemma. \square

We next show that if D_1 satisfies the so called *the interior ball property* as in (1.7) then the \mathcal{A} -capacitary function u as above has bounded gradient.

Lemma 3.2. *Let D_1, D_2 be as in Lemma 3.1 and let $d_0 = \min d(\partial D_2, D_1)$. Assume also that D_1 satisfies the interior ball property as in (1.7) with constant r_0 . Then there is a constant $M = M(d_0, r_0, n)$ such that*

$$|\nabla u| \leq M \text{ in } D_2 \setminus \overline{D_1}.$$

Proof. In view of (2.6), it is enough to show that $|\nabla u| \leq M$ on $\partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2$.

We first take care of points on ∂D_2 . Without loss of generality take $c_1 = 1, c_2 = 0$ as (1.6) is invariant under translation and dilation. Let $x \in \partial D_2$ be fixed. By rotation, assume, by Lemma 2.3, that $x_n = 0$ is a supporting hyperplane to ∂D_2 at x with $D_2 \subset \{x_n > 0\}$ and prove the present lemma for \tilde{u} which is $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ -harmonic for some $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \in M_p(\alpha)$ and transfer the result back to u . Therefore, without loss of generality $x_n = 0$ is a supporting hyperplane. There exists a supporting hyperplane $x_n = d$ to ∂D_1 for which $D_1 \subset \{x_n > d\}$. Let $\tilde{D}_2 = D_2 \cap \{0 < x_n < d\}$ and let $\tilde{u} = x_n/d$. Basic comparison principle applied to positive weak solutions of \mathcal{A} -harmonic PDEs gives

$u \leq \tilde{u}$ in \tilde{D}_2 . This observation and the fact that $u(x) = \tilde{u}(x)$ implies

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leq |\nabla \tilde{u}(x)| \leq \frac{1}{d} \leq \frac{1}{d_0}.$$

This gives the desired results for points on ∂D_2 .

In order to show the same estimates for points on ∂D_1 , we proceed as follows. We first construct a barrier as we did in the proof of Lemma 2.4 and then we prove that Lemma 3.1 holds for u_ϵ . Finally, using Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 we conclude that Lemma 3.1 holds for u as well. \square

3.1. A technique of Beurling. In this subsection we give a brief introduction to a technique used by Beurling in [11] and in [26] as well. To this end, recall that K is a convex domain and let

$$\mathcal{C} := \{\Omega \text{ convex bounded open subset of } \mathbb{R}^n \text{ with } K \subset \Omega\}.$$

Let u_Ω denote the \mathcal{A} -capacitary potential for $\Omega \setminus K$ whenever $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$. Following [27], we also define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G} &:= \{\Omega \in \mathcal{C} : \liminf_{y \rightarrow x, y \in \Omega} |\nabla u_\Omega(y)| \geq c \text{ for all } x \in \partial\Omega\}, \\ \mathcal{G}_0 &:= \{\Omega \in \mathcal{C} : \liminf_{y \rightarrow x, y \in \Omega} |\nabla u_\Omega(y)| > c \text{ for all } x \in \partial\Omega\}, \\ \mathcal{B} &:= \{\Omega \in \mathcal{C} : \limsup_{y \rightarrow x, y \in \Omega} |\nabla u_\Omega(y)| \leq c \text{ for all } x \in \partial\Omega\}. \end{aligned}$$

In the language of Beurling, \mathcal{G} is the collection of “subsolutions” and \mathcal{B} is the collection of “supersolutions”. Our aim is to show that $\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$. To this end, we will make some observations.

Lemma 3.3. *\mathcal{B} is closed under intersection. That is, if $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ then $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 \in \mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. We will use the comparison principle for non-negative \mathcal{A} -harmonic functions. Let u_{Ω_i} for $i = 1, 2$ be \mathcal{A} -capacitary functions for $\Omega_i \in \mathcal{B}$. By the comparison principle, we have $u_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2} \leq \min\{u_{\Omega_1}, u_{\Omega_2}\}$ in $(\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2) \setminus K$. Furthermore, $\partial(\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2) \subset \partial\Omega_1 \cap \partial\Omega_2$, hence given $x \in \partial(\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2)$ we can assume without loss of generality $x \in \partial\Omega_1$. Then $u_{\Omega_1}(x) = 0 = u_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2}(x)$ and thereupon one concludes that

$$\limsup_{y \rightarrow x, y \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2} |\nabla u_{\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2}(y)| \leq \limsup_{y \rightarrow x, y \in \Omega_1} |\nabla u_{\Omega_1}| \leq c.$$

Therefore $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 \in \mathcal{B}$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.3. \square

Our next goal is to show the “stability” of \mathcal{B} .

Lemma 3.4. *Assume K satisfies the interior ball property. Let $\Omega_1 \supset \Omega_2 \supset \dots$ be a decreasing sequence of domains in \mathcal{B} . Let*

$$\Omega = \bigcap_n \overline{\Omega_n}.$$

Assume $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$. Then $\Omega \in \mathcal{B}$.

Proof. Let $\Omega_1 \supset \Omega_2 \supset \dots$ be a sequence of domains in \mathcal{B} and let $\{u_k\}$ be a sequence of capacity \mathcal{A} -harmonic functions for $\{\Omega_k\}$ respectively. Then $0 \leq u_k \leq 1$. Moreover, by Lemmas 2.1, 2.2, and 3.2 it follows that $\{u_k, \nabla u_k\}$ converges uniformly on compact subsets of $\Omega \setminus \overline{K}$ to $\{u, \nabla u\}$ where u is a \mathcal{A} -harmonic function in $\Omega \setminus K$. The proof that u is indeed the capacity \mathcal{A} -harmonic function for $\Omega \setminus K$ essentially follows from the convergence of Ω_n to Ω in the Hausdorff distance sense and Lemma 2.4.

We next show that $\Omega \in \mathcal{B}$. To this end, let $M = \max_k(\sup |\nabla u_k|) < \infty$, by Lemma 3.2. Let $0 < \delta_k$ be such that $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\frac{|\nabla u_k|^2 - c^2}{M^2} - \frac{1}{k} \leq 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \{u_k = \delta_k\}.$$

Consider

$$\frac{u_k - \delta_k}{1 - 2\delta_k},$$

which is non-negative in $\{u_k > \delta_k\} \setminus \{u_k < 1 - \delta_k\}$ and has zero boundary values on $\{u_k = \delta_k\}$. Recall definition (2.4). By (2.6) applied to $\frac{|\nabla u_k|^2 - c^2}{M^2} - \frac{1}{k}$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{u_k} \left(\frac{|\nabla u_k|^2 - c^2}{M^2} - \frac{1}{k} \right) \geq 0 = \mathcal{L}_{u_k} \left(\frac{u_k - \delta_k}{1 - 2\delta_k} \right)$$

in $\{u_k > \delta_k\} \setminus \{u_k < 1 - \delta_k\}$. On the other hand, on $\{u_k = \delta_k\}$ we have

$$\frac{|\nabla u_k|^2 - c^2}{M^2} - \frac{1}{k} \leq 0 = \frac{u_k - \delta_k}{1 - 2\delta_k}.$$

Furthermore, on $\{u_k = 1 - \delta_k\} \cap \{u_k \geq \delta_k\}$ we have

$$\frac{|\nabla u_k|^2 - c^2}{M^2} - \frac{1}{k} \leq 1 = \frac{u_k - \delta_k}{1 - 2\delta_k}.$$

It follows that

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{|\nabla u_k|^2 - c^2}{M^2} - \frac{1}{k} \leq \frac{u_k - \delta_k}{1 - 2\delta_k} \quad \text{in} \quad \{u_k > \delta_k\} \setminus \{u_k < 1 - \delta_k\}.$$

Given $\epsilon > 0$ one can find a neighborhood U_ϵ of $\partial\Omega$ such that

$$u_k \leq \epsilon \quad \text{in} \quad U_\epsilon.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using (3.1) we obtain

$$\frac{|\nabla u_k|^2 - c^2}{M^2} - \frac{1}{k} \rightarrow \frac{|\nabla u|^2 - c^2}{M^2} \leq u \leq \epsilon \quad \text{as} \quad k \rightarrow \infty$$

uniformly on compact subsets of $U_\epsilon \cap \Omega$. By letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we conclude the proof of the Lemma. \square

As a consequence of Lemma 3.4, we claim that if \mathcal{G}_0 is not empty and for $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ the set $\{\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{B}; \overline{\Omega_0} \subset \tilde{\Omega}\}$ is not empty, then there exists a domain $\Omega \in \{\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{B}; \overline{\Omega_0} \subset \tilde{\Omega}\}$ with the property that

$$(3.2) \quad \text{if } \hat{\Omega} \in \{\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{B}; \overline{\Omega_0} \subset \tilde{\Omega}\} \text{ and } \hat{\Omega} \subset \Omega, \text{ then } \hat{\Omega} = \Omega.$$

Such a domain Ω will be called *minimal element* in $\{\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{B}; \overline{\Omega_0} \subset \tilde{\Omega}\}$. For simplicity, define

$$\mathcal{C}_0 := \{\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{B}; \overline{\Omega_0} \subset \tilde{\Omega}\}.$$

To prove our claim, let

$$I = \bigcap_i \tilde{\Omega}_i \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{\Omega}_i \in \mathcal{C}_0.$$

Write $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\Omega}_i$, with $\tilde{\Omega}_i \in \mathcal{C}_0$. Let $\Omega_1 = \tilde{\Omega}_1$ and $\Omega_{k+1} = \tilde{\Omega}_{k+1} \cap \Omega_k$ for $k = 2, 3, \dots$. Then each Ω_k is convex and $\Omega_k \in \mathcal{B}$ by Lemma 3.3. Applying Lemma 3.4 to $\{\Omega_n\}$ we conclude that

$$\Omega = \bigcap_n \overline{\Omega_n} \in \mathcal{B}.$$

This finishes the proof of our claim.

We proceed by studying the behavior of capacity \mathcal{A} -harmonic functions on extremal points of Ω . To set the stage, let Ω be the minimal element in \mathcal{C}_0 . A point $x \in \partial\Omega$ is called *extremal point* if there exists a supporting hyperplane to Ω touching $\partial\Omega$ at x only. Let E_Ω denote the set of extremal points of Ω .

Lemma 3.5. *Let Ω be a minimal element in the class \mathcal{C}_0 and let $x \in \overline{E_\Omega}$. Then*

$$\limsup_{\substack{y \rightarrow x \\ y \in \Omega}} |\nabla u_\Omega(y)| = c.$$

Proof. The proof will be a contradiction argument. To this end, suppose there exists $y_0 \in \overline{E_\Omega}$ with

$$\limsup_{\substack{y \rightarrow y_0 \\ y \in \Omega}} |\nabla u_\Omega(y)| = c(1 - 4\tilde{\alpha}).$$

for some $\tilde{\alpha} > 0$. By the Hölder continuity of ∇u_Ω there exists a neighborhood \mathcal{N} of $\partial\Omega$ with $y_0 \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying that

$$(3.3) \quad |\nabla u_\Omega(x)| \leq c(1 - \tilde{\alpha}) \text{ for every } x \in \mathcal{N} \cap \Omega.$$

Assume that $y_0 \in E_\Omega$. Otherwise, we may choose a sequence in E_Ω converging to y_0 with the above property.

Let $d > 0$ and let P_d be a plane such that $d(y_0, P_d) = d$ with $P_d \cap \Omega \subset \mathcal{N}$. Notice that without loss of generality, by Lemma 2.3 we may assume that $y_0 = 0$, $P_d = \{x_n = d\}$. Otherwise, we rotate our coordinate system, work with \hat{u} , which is $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ -harmonic for some $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \in M_p(\alpha)$, and at the end transfer everything back to u_Ω .

Hence assume $y_0 = 0$, $P_d = \{x_n = d\}$, let $\epsilon > 0$ and define $\Omega_\epsilon = \Omega \setminus \{x_n \leq \epsilon\}$. Assume ϵ is small enough so that $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega_\epsilon$. Let u_ϵ be the \mathcal{A} -capacity function for $\Omega_\epsilon \setminus K$. As $u_\epsilon \leq u_\Omega$ on $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$, by the comparison principle for non-negative \mathcal{A} -harmonic functions we have

$$(3.4) \quad 0 \leq u_\epsilon \leq u_\Omega \text{ in } \Omega_\epsilon.$$

It follows that we have

$$(3.5) \quad \limsup |\nabla u_\epsilon| \leq \limsup |\nabla u_\Omega| \leq c \text{ on } \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega_\epsilon.$$

At the points where $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega_\epsilon$ is not C^1 we claim that $|\nabla u_\epsilon| = 0$. This can be done as in [4, Section 7] by considering $\mathcal{A}(\eta, \delta)$ to obtain a uniformly elliptic equation in divergence form and v_ϵ^δ which is $\mathcal{A}(\eta, \delta)$ -harmonic in Ω_ϵ . Once again repeating following [4, Section 7], one concludes that $|\nabla v_\epsilon^\delta| = 0$ and thereupon letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ we obtain our claim.

Using (3.3) and (3.4) we have

$$(3.6) \quad \max_{P_d \cap \Omega} u_\epsilon \leq \max_{P_d \cap \Omega} u_\Omega \leq d \sup_{\{0 \leq x_n \leq d\} \cap \Omega} |\nabla u_\Omega| \leq dc(1 - \tilde{\alpha})$$

Let now

$$v := u_\epsilon + \frac{dc(1 - \tilde{\alpha})}{d - \epsilon}(d - x_n)$$

and note that

$$\mathcal{L}_{u_\epsilon} v = \mathcal{L}_{u_\epsilon} u_\epsilon = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_\epsilon \cap \{x_n < d\}.$$

Thereupon we conclude that v takes its maximum on the boundary of $\Omega_\epsilon \cap \{x_n < d\}$. Moreover, using (3.6) we obtain

$$v \leq c(1 - \tilde{\alpha})d \text{ on } \partial(\Omega_\epsilon \cap \{x_n < d\}) \text{ and } v = dc(1 - \tilde{\alpha}) \text{ on } P_\epsilon,$$

as

$$\partial(\Omega_\epsilon \cap \{x_n < d\}) \subset P_d \cup P_\epsilon \cup (\partial\Omega \cap \{\epsilon < x_n < d\})$$

Hence we have

$$0 \geq \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_n} = |\nabla u_\epsilon| - \frac{c(1 - \tilde{\alpha})d}{d - \epsilon} \text{ on } P_\epsilon.$$

By choosing $\epsilon \leq \tilde{\alpha}d$, we obtain $|\nabla u_\epsilon| \leq c$ on P_ϵ . In view of this result and (3.5) we have $\Omega_\epsilon \in \mathcal{B}$ and by construction $\Omega_\epsilon \subset \Omega$. By (3.2) we conclude that $\Omega = \Omega_\epsilon$ which is a contradiction, hence the proof of Lemma 3.5 is complete. \square

We next observe that if Ω is a minimal element in the class \mathcal{C}_0 and let u_Ω be the \mathcal{A} -capacitary function for $\Omega \setminus K$ then

$$(3.7) \quad |\nabla u_\Omega(x)| \geq c \text{ for all } x \in \Omega \setminus K.$$

To prove (3.7) we use the fact that for every $0 < t < 1$, $\{x \in \Omega : u_\Omega > t\}$ is a convex set due to Lemma 2.5. The conclusion follows by applying Lemma 3.1 to $\{x \in \Omega : u_\Omega > t\}$ and Ω , and using Lemma 3.5.

3.2. Final Proof of Theorem 1.4. We split the proof into two steps, existence of Ω and uniqueness of Ω .

3.2.1. Existence of Ω : In order to prove Theorem 1.4 we show that there exist domains Ω_0 and Ω_1 such that $\overline{\Omega_0} \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and $\Omega_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega_1$. Then from (3.2) there exists a minimal element $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_0$ and by using (3.7) we have $\Omega \in \mathcal{G}$. In view of the definitions of \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{B} , this would lead to the existence portion of Theorem 1.4 is true. Hence to finish the proof of existence, it remains to show the existence of $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and $\Omega_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\overline{\Omega_0} \subset \Omega_1$.

Existence of $\Omega_1 \in \mathcal{B}$: For this, choose R_0 large enough so that $K \subset B_{R_0}$. Let $R > R_0$ large to be fixed below. Without loss of generality assume $0 \in K$. Let u_R be the \mathcal{A} -capacitary function for $B(0, R) \setminus K$. Using (b) in Lemma 2.4 we can choose R sufficiently large so that

$$|\nabla u_R(x)| \leq c_* |x|^{\frac{1-n}{p-1}} = c_* R^{\frac{1-n}{p-1}} \leq c.$$

Therefore, $\Omega_1 = B(0, R) \in \mathcal{B}$.

Existence of $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$: Let $R > 0$ be as above and u_R be the capacitary function for $B(0, R) \setminus K$. We first observe from the smoothness of $B(0, R)$ and Lemma 3.1 that there is a constant $C > 0$ and a neighbourhood U of ∂K such that

$$|\nabla u_R| \geq C \text{ in } U \setminus K.$$

For a given t , $0 < t < 1$, let $\Omega_t = \{x \in B(0, R) : u_R(x) > 1-t\}$. Then the capacitary function for Ω_t is

$$u_{\Omega_t}(x) = \frac{u_R - (1-t)}{t}.$$

By choosing t sufficiently small we have on $\partial\Omega_t$

$$|\nabla u_{\Omega_t}| = \frac{|\nabla u_R|}{t} \geq \frac{C}{t} \geq c$$

Therefore, $\Omega_0 := \Omega_t \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and $\overline{\Omega_0} \subset \Omega_1$

In view of these two observations and our earlier remarks, the existence of Ω is done.

3.2.2. *Uniqueness of Ω .* This will follow from [25], where uniqueness was shown for the Laplace equation, and nonlinear elliptic differential equations satisfying properties (i)-(iv) given below, by using the Lavrentèv principle. In order to make use of this result for nonlinear elliptic equations, one needs to have four conditions (see section 4 in [25]);

(3.8)

- (i) The PDE is weakly elliptic and satisfies the comparison principle.
- (ii) If u is a solution, then rotations and translations are also solutions to some weakly elliptic PDE satisfying comparison principle.
- (iii) $u = x_n$ is a solution.
- (iv) If Ω and K are both convex and if u_Ω is the \mathcal{A} -capacitary function for $\Omega \setminus K$, then levels of u are convex; $\Omega_t = \{x \in \Omega; u(x) = t\}$ is convex.

Here (i) in (3.8) follows from the structural assumption on \mathcal{A} , (ii) follows from Lemma 2.3. Regarding (iii), it is clear that $u = x_n$ is \mathcal{A} -harmonic, and (iv) follows from Lemma 2.5.

3.2.3. *Proof of $\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$.* To obtain the $C^{1,\gamma}$ regularity of Ω , one repeats the arguments of Vogel [37], which rely on the machinery of [9] and [10].

Furthermore, it follows from applying the Hodograph transform that if $\mathcal{A} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$, then $\partial\Omega \in C^\infty$, see [14, 29]. We notice that an interesting alternative method to obtain higher regularity has recently been done in [18], where the authors prove higher order boundary Harnack estimates. See also [17, 16] in the context of thin obstacle problems.

Now the proof of Theorem 1.4 is complete.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Acker and R. Meyer. A free boundary problem for the p -Laplacian: uniqueness, convexity, and successive approximation of solutions. *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, pages No. 08, approx. 20 pp. (electronic), 1995. (Cited on page 2.)
- [2] Andrew Acker. Interior free boundary problems for the Laplace equation. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 75(2):157–168, 1980/81. (Cited on page 2.)
- [3] Andrew Acker. Uniqueness and monotonicity of solutions for the interior Bernoulli free boundary problem in the convex, n -dimensional case. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 13(12):1409–1425, 1989. (Cited on page 2.)
- [4] M. Akman, J. Gong, J. Hineman, J. Lewis, and A. Vogel. The Brunn-Minkowski inequality and a Minkowski problem for nonlinear capacity. *arXiv:1709.00447, To appear in the Memoirs of the AMS*, 2017. (Cited on pages 8 and 17.)
- [5] Murat Akman. On the dimension of a certain measure in the plane. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.*, 39(1):187–209, 2014. (Cited on page 12.)
- [6] Murat Akman, John Lewis, Olli Saari, and Andrew Vogel. The brunn-minkowski inequality and a minkowski problem for \mathcal{A} -harmonic green’s function, 2018. (Cited on page 8.)
- [7] Murat Akman, John Lewis, and Andrew Vogel. On the logarithm of the minimizing integrand for certain variational problems in two dimensions. *Anal. Math. Phys.*, 2(1):79–88, 2012. (Cited on page 7.)
- [8] Murat Akman, John Lewis, and Andrew Vogel. σ -finiteness of elliptic measures for quasilinear elliptic PDE in space. *Adv. Math.*, 309:512–557, 2017. (Cited on pages 7 and 8.)
- [9] H. W. Alt and L. A. Caffarelli. Existence and regularity for a minimum problem with free boundary. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 325:105–144, 1981. (Cited on pages 2 and 19.)
- [10] Hans Wilhelm Alt, Luis A. Caffarelli, and Avner Friedman. A free boundary problem for quasilinear elliptic equations. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 11(1):1–44, 1984. (Cited on page 19.)
- [11] Björn Bennewitz. Non-uniqueness in a free boundary problem. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 24(2):567–595, 2008. (Cited on page 14.)
- [12] A. Beurling. On free boundary problems for the laplace equation. *Seminars on analytic functions I, Institute Advance Studies Seminars*, 345:248–263, 1975. (Cited on page 2.)
- [13] Luis A. Caffarelli and Joel Spruck. Convexity properties of solutions to some classical variational problems. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 7(11):1337–1379, 1982. (Cited on page 8.)
- [14] Kinderlehrer D. and Nirenberg L. Regularity in free boundary problems. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.*, 4(2):373–391, 1977. (Cited on page 19.)
- [15] Ī. Ī. Daniljuk. *On integral functionals with a variable domain of integration*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R. I., 1976. Translated from the Russian by M. K. Nestell. (Cited on page 2.)
- [16] D. De Silva and O. Savin. C^∞ regularity of certain thin free boundaries. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 64(5):1575–1608, 2015. (Cited on page 19.)

- [17] D. De Silva and O. Savin. Boundary harnack estimates in slit domains and applications to thin free boundary problems. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 32(3):891–912, 2016. (Cited on page 19.)
- [18] Daniela De Silva and Ovidiu Savin. A note on higher regularity boundary harnack inequality. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 35(12), 2014. (Cited on page 19.)
- [19] M. Flucher and M. Rumpf. Bernoulli’s free-boundary problem, qualitative theory and numerical approximation. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 486:165–204, 1997. (Cited on page 1.)
- [20] Martin Flucher. *Variational problems with concentration*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 36. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1999. (Cited on page 1.)
- [21] R. M. Gabriel. A result concerning convex level surfaces of 3-dimensional harmonic functions. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 32:286–294, 1957. (Cited on page 8.)
- [22] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition. (Cited on page 6.)
- [23] Richard S. Hamilton. The inverse function theorem of Nash and Moser. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 7(1):65–222, 1982. (Cited on page 2.)
- [24] Juha Heinonen, Tero Kilpeläinen, and Olli Martio. *Nonlinear potential theory of degenerate elliptic equations*. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2006. Unabridged republication of the 1993 original. (Cited on page 4.)
- [25] Antoine Henrot and Henrik Shahgholian. Convexity of free boundaries with Bernoulli type boundary condition. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 28(5):815–823, 1997. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 4, and 18.)
- [26] Antoine Henrot and Henrik Shahgholian. Existence of classical solutions to a free boundary problem for the p -Laplace operator. I. The exterior convex case. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 521:85–97, 2000. (Cited on pages 1, 2, 4, 11, and 14.)
- [27] Antoine Henrot and Henrik Shahgholian. Existence of classical solutions to a free boundary problem for the p -Laplace operator. II. The interior convex case. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 49(1):311–323, 2000. (Cited on pages 3 and 14.)
- [28] Bernhard Kawohl. *Rearrangements and convexity of level sets in PDE*, volume 1150 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985. (Cited on page 2.)
- [29] D. Kinderlehrer, L. Nirenberg, and J. Spruck. Regularity in elliptic free boundary problems. *J. Analyse Math.*, 34:86–119, 1978. (Cited on page 19.)
- [30] M. A. Lavrentèv. *Variational methods for boundary value problems for systems of elliptic equations*. Authorized translation from the Russian edited by J. R. M. Radok. P. Noordhoff, Ltd., Groningen, 1963. (Cited on page 2.)
- [31] John L. Lewis. Capacitary functions in convex rings. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 66(3):201–224, 1977. (Cited on pages 4 and 8.)
- [32] John L. Lewis, Niklas Lundström, and Kaj Nyström. Boundary Harnack inequalities for operators of p -Laplace type in Reifenberg flat domains. In *Perspectives in partial differential equations, harmonic analysis and applications*, volume 79 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 229–266. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008. (Cited on pages 6 and 8.)
- [33] Keith Miller. Barriers on cones for uniformly elliptic operators. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 76, 1967. (Cited on page 12.)
- [34] James Serrin. A symmetry problem in potential theory. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 43:304–318, 1971. (Cited on page 6.)
- [35] David E. Tepper. Free boundary problem. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 5:841–846, 1974. (Cited on page 2.)
- [36] Peter Tolksdorf. Regularity for a more general class of quasilinear elliptic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 51(1):126–150, 1984. (Cited on page 6.)
- [37] Andrew L. Vogel. Symmetry and regularity for general regions having a solution to certain overdetermined boundary value problems. *Atti Sem. Mat. Fis. Univ. Modena*, 40(2):443–484, 1992. (Cited on pages 5 and 19.)

Murat Akman, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX, WIVENHOE PARK, COLCHESTER, ESSEX CO4 3SQ, UK

Email address: `murat.akman@essex.ac.uk`

Agnid Banerjee, TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH, CENTER FOR APPLICABLE MATHEMATICS, BANGALORE-560065, INDIA

Email address: `agnidban@gmail.com`

Mariana Smit Vega Garcia, WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY. DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BH230, BELLINGHAM, WA 98225, USA

Email address: `Mariana.SmitVegaGarcia@wwu.edu`