

# *A priori* estimates of minimizers of an integral functional extending the variational Strong Maximum Principle

Vladimir V. Goncharov, Telma J. Santos

CIMA, Departamento de Matemática, Universidade de Évora

27<sup>th</sup> IFIP TC7 Conference 2013 on System Modelling and Optimization  
Côte d'Azur, France  
June, 29 - July, 3, 2015

- **Inf (Sup)-convolution** with a gauge function
- Variational properties of the Inf (Sup)-convolution
- **Strong Maximum Principle**. Traditional settings
- Variational generalizations. From harmonic functions to convolutions
- The problem with a linear perturbation
- ***A priori estimates*** of minimizers near nonextremum points
- **"Cross-gap" extension** of the Variational Strong Maximum Principle
- Back to the **limit case**. Example
- References

# Inf (Sup)-convolution with a gauge function

This is the continuation of my talk given 2 years ago at the IFIP Conference in Klagenfurt dedicated to various properties of Inf-Convolutions

So, let me start with basic notations. Given a nonempty closed set  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $a > 0$  the **Inf-convolution** of a function  $\theta : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with a gauge function  $\rho_{F^0}(\cdot)$  is defined as

$$u_{\theta, F}^+(x) := \inf_{y \in C} \{ \theta(y) + a \rho_{F^0}(x - y) \} \quad (1)$$

Here  $F$  is a compact convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $0 \in \text{int } F$  (a **gauge**),  $F^0$  means the **polar set** for  $F$  and

$$\rho_{F^0}(\xi) := \inf \{ \lambda > 0 : \xi \in \lambda F^0 \}$$

Similarly, the **Sup-convolution** is

$$u_{\theta, F}^-(x) := \sup_{y \in C} \{ \theta(y) - a \rho_{F^0}(y - x) \} \quad (2)$$

# Inf (Sup)-convolution with a gauge function

Under some supplementary condition on  $\theta$  or/and  $C$  the Inf (Sup)-convolution above can be seen as a **viscosity solution** of a **Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation**, or as the **Minimal Time** necessary to achieve  $C$  by trajectories of some associated differential inclusion

We are interested instead in the "minimal" (respectively, "maximal") property of this function among all the minimizers of some "elliptic" Variational Problem

# Variational properties of the Inf (Sup)-convolution

Namely, given an **open bounded connected region**  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  containing  $C$  and a **lower semicontinuous convex function**  $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{+\infty\}$  with  $f(0) = 0$  let us consider the **integral functional**

$$u(\cdot) \mapsto \int_{\Omega} f(\rho_F(\nabla u(x))) \, dx \quad (3)$$

In order to formulate the first (**comparison** or **extension**) result we assume also  $\Omega$  to be convex and the boundary  $\partial F$  to be smooth

Denote by

$$a := \sup f^{-1}(0)$$

Consider a closed (not necessarily convex) subset  $C \subset \Omega$  and a function  $\theta(\cdot)$  defined on  $C$  with a kind of **slope condition**:

$$\theta(x) - \theta(y) \leq a\rho_{F^0}(x - y), \quad x, y \in C \quad (4)$$

# Variational properties of the Inf (Sup)-convolution

Then the following result holds

## Theorem A

The Inf-convolution  $u_{\theta, F}^+(\cdot)$  is a **minimizer** of the functional (3) on  $u_0(\cdot) + \mathbf{W}_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$ , which is **maximal** among all the minimizers with the same boundary condition. In other words,

If  $\bar{u}(\cdot)$  is a **continuous admissible minimizer** of (3) on  $u_0(\cdot) + \mathbf{W}_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$  such that

$$(i) \quad \bar{u}(x) = u_{\theta, F}^+(x) = \theta(x) \quad \forall x \in C$$

$$(ii) \quad \bar{u}(x) \geq u_{\theta, F}^+(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega$$

then

$$\bar{u}(x) \equiv u_{\theta, F}^+(x), \quad x \in \Omega$$

# Variational properties of the Inf (Sup)-convolution

Similarly,

## Theorem A'

The Sup-convolution  $u_{\theta,F}^-(\cdot)$  is a **minimizer** of the functional (3) on  $u_0(\cdot) + \mathbf{W}_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$  for a given boundary function  $u_0(\cdot)$ , which is **minimal** among all the minimizers in the following sense:

If  $\bar{u}(\cdot)$  is a **continuous admissible minimizer** of (3) on  $u_0(\cdot) + \mathbf{W}_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$  such that

$$(i) \quad \bar{u}(x) = u_{\theta,F}^-(x) = \theta(x) \quad \forall x \in C$$

$$(ii) \quad \bar{u}(x) \leq u_{\theta,F}^-(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega$$

then

$$\bar{u}(x) \equiv u_{\theta,F}^-(x), \quad x \in \Omega$$

# Strong Maximum Principle. Traditional settings

The results above can be considered as a natural extension of the **Strong Maximum Principle** for elliptic equations/variational problems

Let us follow the way from the classic setting for harmonic functions to Theorems above

The **Strong Maximum Principle** (SMP) for the **harmonic functions** (solutions of the **Laplace equation**  $\Delta u = 0$ ):

if a harmonic (in some open connected domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ) function **attends its minimum** (maximum) in an interior point  $x_0 \in \Omega$  then it is **constant**



# Strong Maximum Principle. Traditional settings

Next, since  $\Delta u = 0$  is the **Euler-Lagrange equation** in the problem of minimization of the functional

$$1/2 \int_{\Omega} \|\nabla u(x)\|^2 dx,$$

one can formulate the **Variational Strong Maximum Principle** by substituting in the place of  $\frac{1}{2}t^2$  in the functional above any **convex lower semicontinuous function**  $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{+\infty\}$  with  $f(0) = 0$

So we have the **rotationally invariant** functional

$$\int_{\Omega} f(\|\nabla u(x)\|) dx \tag{5}$$

# Strong Maximum Principle. Traditional settings

Then, the **Variational SMP** can be formulated as follows

Given an open bounded connected region  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  there is **no continuous nonconstant minimizer** of the functional (5) on  $u_0(\cdot) + \mathbf{W}_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$  admitting its **minimal** (maximal) value in  $\Omega$ ,

or, equivalently,

if a **continuous nonnegative** (nonpositive) **minimizer**  $u(\cdot)$  of (5) on  $u_0(\cdot) + \mathbf{W}_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$  touches zero at some point  $x_0 \in \Omega$  then  **$u(x) \equiv 0$**

# Strong Maximum Principle. Traditional settings

The necessary and sufficient conditions guaranteeing the validity of the Variational SMP for (5) were proposed by [A. Cellina in 2002](#):

$$(H_1) \quad \partial f^*(0) = \{0\} \quad (\text{strict convexity at } 0)$$

$$(H_2) \quad \partial f(0) = \{0\} \quad (\text{smoothness at } 0)$$

Here  $f^*$  means the [Legendre-Fenchel transform](#) of  $f$

**First** we slightly extend the Cellina's result to the functional with a general gauge-type symmetry:

$$\int_{\Omega} f(\rho_F(\nabla u(x))) dx \quad (6)$$

where  $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a closed convex bounded set with  $0 \in \text{int}F$ , and  $\rho_F(\cdot)$  is the **Minkowski functional** associated to  $F$

# Variational generalizations

Then we assume that the hypothesis  $(H_1)$  fails, i.e.,

$$\partial f^*(0) = f^{-1}(0) = [-a, a]$$

for some  $a > 0$  (the function  $f(\cdot)$  is extended symmetrically to  $\mathbb{R}$ )

In this case SMP in the traditional sense is obviously wrong, but it can be extended by considering in the place of the identical zero (or constant) another "test" function, namely,

$$\theta + a \rho_{F^0}(x - x_0)$$

where  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $x_0 \in \Omega$

This is a particular case of the Inf-convolution when the set  $C = \{x_0\}$

# Variational generalizations

We have the following **local result**

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and a **continuous minimizer**  $\bar{u}(\cdot)$  of the functional (6) on  $u_0(\cdot) + \mathbf{W}_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$  be such that for some  $x_0 \in \Omega$  and  $\delta > 0$

$$\bar{u}(x) \geq \bar{u}(x_0) + a\rho_{F^0}(x - x_0) \quad \forall x \in x_0 + \delta F^0 \subset \Omega$$

Then

$$\bar{u}(x) = \bar{u}(x_0) + a\rho_{F^0}(x - x_0) \quad \forall x \in x_0 + \frac{\delta}{\|F\| \|F^0\| + 1} F^0$$

Here  $\|F\|$  and  $\|F^0\|$  are the radii of the spheres centred at the origin circumscribed around  $F$  and inscribed into  $F$ , respectively

# Variational generalizations

The previous result can be formulated **globally** whenever the gauge  $F$  has smooth boundary (equivalently,  $\rho_F(\xi)$  is differentiable at each  $\xi \neq 0$ , or  $F^0$  is rotund) and the region  $\Omega$  is **densely star-shaped** w.r.t.  $x_0 \in \Omega$  (in particular,  $\Omega$  can be **convex**)

$\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is said to be **densely star-shaped** w.r.t.  $x_0 \in \Omega$  if  $\Omega \subset \overline{\text{Star}_\Omega(x_0)}$  where

$$\text{Star}_\Omega(x_0) := \{x : \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)x_0 \in \Omega \text{ for all } \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$$

# Variational generalizations

Namely, under these hypotheses

the inequality

$$\bar{u}(x) \geq \bar{u}(x_0) + a\rho_{F^0}(x - x_0) \quad \forall x \in \Omega$$

implies that

$$\bar{u}(x) = \bar{u}(x_0) + a\rho_{F^0}(x - x_0) \quad \forall x \in \Omega$$

Observe that if  $a = 0$  then one immediately obtains from above the **traditional Variational SMP** (although under some supplementary assumptions such as the **star-sharpness of  $\Omega$** )

Simple examples show that the latter assumption can not be avoided



# Variational generalizations

Considering in the place of a singleton  $\{x_0\}$  an arbitrary nonempty closed subset  $C \subset \Omega$  and in the place of a real number  $\theta$  a Lipschitz continuous function  $\theta(\cdot)$  defined on  $C$  and satisfying the slope condition (4) the generalized Strong Maximum Principle admits form of an **Extremal Extention Principle** (from a **barrier** inside  $\Omega$ ) as formulated above

But for this we need to assume the set  $\Omega$  to be **convex** and  $F$  to have **smooth boundary**

# The problem with a linear perturbation

Let us extend now the SMP in another way by considering the same "elliptic" integral functional but with **linear perturbations**:

$$\int_{\Omega} [f(\rho_F(\nabla u(x))) + \sigma u(x)] dx \quad (7)$$

or

$$\int_{\Omega} [f(\rho_F(\nabla u(x))) - \sigma u(x)] dx \quad (8)$$

with some real  $\sigma > 0$

In the case  $f \circ \rho_F(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \|\xi\|^2$  the **Euler-Lagrange equation** for the problems (7) and (8) is the **Poisson equation** (with the constant non zero right-hand side)

$$\Delta u(x) = \pm \sigma$$

# The problem with a linear perturbation

We are interested in the following: how far the minimizers in (7) and (8) defer from the minimizers in the homogeneous case (with  $\sigma = 0$ ) in their extreme properties

In other words, we want to obtain some **estimates** of minimizers in a neighbourhood of their local minimum or maximum points that in the limit case ( $\sigma = 0$ ) would turn back the standart SMP (or its extensions)

# The problem with a linear perturbation

Indeed, such estimates can be made by using a class of *a priori* minimizers in the problems (7) and (8) found by A. Cellina in 2007

Namely A. Cellina proved that the functions

$$\omega_{x_0, k}^+(x) := \frac{n}{\sigma} f^* \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \rho_{F^0}(x - x_0) \right) + k$$

(respectively,

$$\omega_{x_0, k}^-(x) := -\frac{n}{\sigma} f^* \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \rho_{F^0}(x_0 - x) \right) + k),$$

$x_0 \in \Omega$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ , minimize the functional (7) (respectively, (8)) on the class of Sobolev functions with the same boundary conditions

Here  $f^*(\cdot)$  means the [Legendre-Fenchel conjugate](#) of  $f(\cdot)$  (symmetrically extended to  $\mathbb{R}$ )

# The problem with a linear perturbation

In order to be defined on whole  $\Omega$  the following inclusions, naturally, should hold:

$$\Omega \subset x_0 \pm b \cdot \frac{n}{\sigma} F^0 \quad (9)$$

where  $b := \sup(\text{dom} f^*)$  (equivalently,  $b > 0$  is such that  $f(\cdot)$  is affine on  $[b, +\infty[$ )

So, if  $\Omega$  is enough small (or  $b > 0$  is enough large, in particular, if  $b = +\infty$ , i.e.,  $f(\cdot)$  never becomes affine) then  $x_0$  satisfying the conditions (9) exist

# A priori estimates of minimizers near nonextremum points

**First**, by using the solutions  $\omega_{x_0, k}^{\pm}(\cdot)$  we obtain the following estimates of minimizers near their nonextremum points

Let  $u(\cdot)$  be a **continuous minimizer** in the problem (7),  $\beta > 0$  be small enough and  $x_0 \in \Omega$  satisfying the inclusion (9) be not a local maximum point of  $u(\cdot)$  in the sense that

$$u(x_0) < k - \frac{n}{\sigma} f^* \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \beta \right)$$

where

$$k := \max_{x \in x_0 + \beta F^0} u(x)$$

Then

$$u(x) \leq k - \frac{n}{\sigma} \left[ f^* \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \beta \right) - f^* \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \rho_{F^0}(x - x_0) \right) \right]$$

for all  $x \in x_0 + \beta F^0 \subset \Omega$  (i.e.,  $\rho_{F^0}(x - x_0) \leq \beta$ )

# A priori estimates of minimizers near nonextremum points

Similarly,

If  $u(\cdot)$  is a **continuous minimizer** in (8),  $\beta > 0$  is small enough and  $x_0 \in \Omega$  is not a local minimum of  $u(\cdot)$  and, moreover,

$$u(x_0) > k + \frac{n}{\sigma} f^* \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \beta \right)$$

where

$$k := \min_{x \in x_0 - \beta F^0} u(x),$$

then

$$u(x) \geq k + \frac{n}{\sigma} \left[ f^* \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \beta \right) - f^* \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \rho_{F^0}(x_0 - x) \right) \right]$$

for all  $x \in x_0 - \beta F^0 \subset \Omega$  ( $\rho_{F^0}(x_0 - x) \leq \beta$ )

# "Cross-gap" extension of the Variational SMP

Finally, from the above estimates we deduce the following **estimate**

- Let  $u(\cdot)$  be a **continuous minimizer** in the problem (7). If  $x_0 \in \Omega$  is a **local maximum** point of  $u(\cdot)$ , namely, there is  $\delta > 0$  with  $u(x_0) \geq u(x)$  for all  $x \in x_0 - \delta F^0 \subset \Omega$ . Then, in a slightly smaller neighbourhood of  $x_0$  (namely, in  $x_0 - \frac{\delta}{1+\|F\|}\|F^0\| F^0$ ) the inequality

$$u(x) \geq u(x_0) - \frac{n}{\sigma} f^* \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \rho_{F^0}(x_0 - x) \right) \quad (10)$$

holds



# "Cross-gap" extension of the Variational SMP

And, **symmetrically**,

- If  $u(\cdot)$  is a **continuous minimizer** in the problem (8) and  $x_0 \in \Omega$  is a **local minimum** point of  $u(\cdot)$  (with some  $\delta > 0$  we have  $u(x_0) \leq u(x)$  for all  $x \in x_0 + \delta F^0 \subset \Omega$ ), then

$$u(x) \leq u(x_0) + \frac{n}{\sigma} f^* \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \rho_{F^0}(x - x_0) \right) \quad (11)$$

for all  $x \in x_0 + \frac{\delta}{1 + \|F\| \|F^0\|} F^0$

Observe that the right-hand side of the inequality (10) (for a minimizer of the functional with the **positive perturbation**  $\sigma u(x)$ ) is exactly  $\omega_{x_0, u(x_0)}^-(x)$  (a Cellina's minimizer of the functional with the **negative perturbation**  $-\sigma u(x)$ ) and **vice versa**

# "Cross-gap" extension of the Variational SMP

So, close to extremum points of a continuous minimizer  $u(\cdot)$  (**maximum or minimum, respectively, depending on sign of the perturbation**) we have a gap between  $u(x_0)$  and

$$u(x_0) + \frac{n}{\sigma} f^* \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \rho_{F^0}(x - x_0) \right),$$

or

$$u(x_0) - \frac{n}{\sigma} f^* \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \rho_{F^0}(x_0 - x) \right)$$

containing the values of  $u(\cdot)$

## Back to the limit case. Example

This "cross-gap" shrinks to zero (i.e., to validity of the traditional SMP) as  $\sigma \rightarrow 0_{\pm}$  whenever the conjugate  $f^*$  is differentiable at the origin and  $(f^*)'(0) = 0$  (equivalently,  $f$  is strictly convex at the origin, or  $f^{-1}(0) = \{0\}$ )

If, instead,  $f^{-1}(0) = [-a, a]$ ,  $a > 0$ , then  $f^*$  is affine ( $= \pm at$ ) near the origin. Therefore, the "cross-gap" is reduced to the interval between  $u(x_0)$  and

$$u(x_0) \pm a\rho_{F^0}(\pm(x - x_0))$$

This, in turn, easily implies the (local) extreme properties of the convolutions (with  $C = \{x_0\}$ ) what we talked about at the beginning

## Back to the limit case. Example

Let  $p > 1$  and  $q > 1$  be its conjugate number, i.e.,  $1/p + 1/q = 1$ . Consider the function  $f(t) = \frac{t^p}{p}$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , which satisfies all the standing assumptions and whose conjugate is  $f^*(t) = \frac{t^q}{q}$ ,  $t \geq 0$

Let us given a **continuous minimizer**  $u(\cdot)$  in the problem

$$\text{Minimize } \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{1}{p} \|\nabla u(x)\|^p + \sigma u(x) \right] dx : u(\cdot) \in \bar{u}(\cdot) + \mathbf{W}_0^{1,1}(\Omega) \right\}$$

Assuming that  $x_0 \in \Omega$  is a **local maximum** point of  $u(\cdot)$  from the above result we conclude that near  $x_0$  this minimizer satisfies a **lower estimate**

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_0) \geq u(x) &\geq u(x_0) - \frac{1}{q} \frac{n}{\sigma} \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \|x - x_0\| \right)^q \\ &= u(x_0) - \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \right)^{q-1} \|x - x_0\|^q \end{aligned}$$

# Back to the limit case. Example

Symmetrically,

If  $u(\cdot)$  is a **continuous minimizer** in

$$\text{Minimize } \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{1}{p} \|\nabla u(x)\|^p - \sigma u(x) \right] dx : u(\cdot) \in \bar{u}(\cdot) + \mathbf{W}_0^{1,1}(\Omega) \right\},$$

and  $x_0 \in \Omega$  is a **local minimum** point of  $u(\cdot)$  we have the following **(upper) estimate**, which holds in a neighbourhood of  $x_0$ :

$$u(x_0) \leq u(x) \leq u(x_0) + \left( \frac{\sigma}{n} \right)^{q-1} \|x - x_0\|^q$$

- A. Cellina, On the Strong Maximum Principle, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **130** (2002), 413-418
- A. Cellina, Uniqueness and comparison results for functionals depending on  $u$  and  $\nabla u$ , *SIAM J. on Control and Optim.* **46** (2007), 711-716
- V. V. Goncharov, T. J. Santos, Local estimates for minimizers of some convex integral functional of the gradient and the Strong Maximum Principle, *Set-Valued and Var. Anal.* **19** (2011), 179-202

MERCI BEAUCOUP DE VOTRE ATTENTION