

A complete class of domains under Hausdorff-Pompeiu distance

Donghui Yang

Department of Mathematics, Central China Normal University,
Wuhan, Hubei, 430079, P.R.of China
donghyang@mail.ccn.edu.cn

Abstract

In this paper we obtain a new class of domains and we prove the class is complete under the Hausdorff-Pompeiu distance.

Key words. class of domains, Hausdorff-Pompeiu distance

AMS subject classifications. 49Q10, 65K10.

1 Introduction

There are many complete classes of domains under Hausdorff-Pompeiu distance have been found(See [1], [2], [4], [5], [7], [10], [11] etc.) We also can see more cases in the books [3], [6], [8], [9] etc. In this paper, we define a new class of domains and show it complete under the Hausdorff-Pompeiu distance.

We call a domain (connected open set) $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ satisfies property (C_M) , if for any $x, y \in \Omega$ there exists a connected compact set K such that $x, y \in K$ and $\bigcup_{z \in K} B(z, \frac{d^*}{M}) \subset \Omega$, here $d^* = \min\{\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega), \text{dist}(y, \partial\Omega)\}$ and $M > 1$ is a given constant. Here and throughout this paper we denote $B(z, r)$ an open ball with center z and radius r , $\text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the Euclidean metric in \mathbb{R}^k .

For given $R > 0$ small enough, we define

$$\mathcal{C}_{M,R} = \{\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k; B(x_\Omega, R) \subset \Omega \subset\subset B^*, \Omega \text{ is a domain and satisfy the property } (C_M)\},$$

where B^* is a bounded domain and x_Ω is some point in Ω .

¹The authors were supported by NSFC 10901069.

The topology on $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ is induced by the Hausdorff-Pompeiu distance between the complementary sets, i.e., for any $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$,

$$\rho(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \max\left\{ \sup_{x \in \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_1} \text{dist}(x, \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_2), \sup_{y \in \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_2} \text{dist}(\overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_1, y) \right\}. \quad (1.1)$$

We denote by Hlim , the limit in the sense of (1.1).

In this work, we obtain the following main result about the family $\mathcal{C}_{M,\rho}$:

Theorem 2.1 If $\{\Omega_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, then there exists a subsequence $\{\Omega_{m_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of $\{\Omega_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ such that

$$\text{Hlim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_{m_k} = \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}.$$

i.e., $(\mathcal{C}_{M,R}, \rho)$ is a compact metric space.

2 Proof of the main result

We shall use the following notations:

$$\delta(K_1, K_2) = \max\left\{ \sup_{x \in K_1} d(x, K_2), \sup_{y \in K_2} d(K_1, y) \right\},$$

where K_1 and K_2 are compact subsets in \mathbb{R}^k . Following from the definitions of ρ, δ , we obtain that $\rho(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \delta(\overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_1, \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_2)$ for any open sets $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \subset B^*$, hence we also call δ the Hausdorff-Pompeiu distance.

Remark 2.1 If $A, A_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$, be compact subsets in \mathbb{R}^k and $\delta(A_n, A) \rightarrow 0$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$), then by the definition of δ we obtain that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $N(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for all $m \geq N(\epsilon)$ we have $A \subset \bigcup_{x \in A_m} B(x, \epsilon)$ and $A_m \subset \bigcup_{x \in A} B(x, \epsilon)$.

The following Lemma 2.1-Lemma 2.4 were given and proved in [3], [6], [8], [9]. Which will be used in this paper.

Lemma 2.1 Let $A, A_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$, be compact subsets in \mathbb{R}^k such that $\delta(A_n, A) \rightarrow 0$, then A is the set of all accumulation points of the sequences $\{x_n\}$ such that $x_n \in A_n$ for each n .

Lemma 2.2 Let $\mathcal{O} = \{C \subset \mathbb{R}^k; C \text{ is compact}\}$. Then (\mathcal{O}, δ) is a locally compact and complete metric space.

Lemma 2.3 Let $A, \tilde{A}, A_n, \tilde{A}_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$, be compact subsets in \mathbb{R}^k such that $\delta(A_n, A) \rightarrow 0$ and $\delta(\tilde{A}_n, \tilde{A}) \rightarrow 0$. Suppose that $A_n \subset \tilde{A}_n$ for each n , Then $A \subset \tilde{A}$.

Lemma 2.4 (Γ -property for $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$) Assume that $\{\Omega_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ and $\Omega_0 = \text{Hlim}\Omega_n$. Then for each open subset K satisfying $\overline{K} \subset \Omega_0$, there exists a positive integer n_K (depending on K) such that $\overline{K} \subset \Omega_n$ for all $n \geq n_K$.

The next Lemma 2.5 is clear, but we show it in the following.

Lemma 2.5 Let $\{x_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\{r_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be such that $r_n \geq r_0 > 0$ and $\text{Hlim}B(x_n, r_n) = D \subset \mathbb{R}^k$. Then there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset D$ and $x_n \rightarrow x_0 (n \rightarrow \infty)$.

Proof Since $B(x_n, r_n) \subset B^*$ and B^* is a bounded subset in \mathbb{R}^k , there exists a subsequence of $\{x_n\}$, still denoted by itself, such that

$$x_n \rightarrow x_0 \tag{2.1}$$

for some $x_0 \in \overline{B^*}$.

We claim that

$$B(x_0, r_0) \subset D. \tag{2.2}$$

By contradiction, we assume that there did exist $y_0 \in B(x_0, r_0)$ and $y_0 \notin D$. Since $D = \text{Hlim}B(x_n, r_n)$, i.e., $\delta(\overline{B^*} \setminus B(x_n, r_n), \overline{B^*} \setminus D) \rightarrow 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that there exists a sequence $\{y_n\}$ satisfying

$$y_n \in \overline{B^*} \setminus B(x_n, r_n) \text{ and } y_n \rightarrow y_0. \tag{2.3}$$

Hence

$$d(y_n, x_n) \geq r_n \geq r_0.$$

By (2.1) and (2.3) we may pass to the limit for $n \rightarrow \infty$ to get

$$d(y_0, x_0) \geq r_0,$$

which leads to a contradiction and implies (2.2) as desired. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.6 Let $\{K_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of connected compact sets and $\text{Hlim} K_n = K$, where $K_n \subset B^*$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, then K is also connected compact set.

Proof Following from Lemma 2.2 we obtain K is a compact set.

Now we show that K is a connected set. Otherwise, there exist at least two components in K , denote one of these by K_1 , and $K_2 = K \setminus K_1$, then K_1, K_2 are compact, which shows that $l_0 \equiv \text{dist}(K_1, K_2) > 0$. Since $K_n \subset \bigcup_{z \in K} B(z, \frac{l_0}{4}) =$

$[\bigcup_{z \in K_1} B(z, \frac{l_0}{4})] \cup [\bigcup_{z \in K_2} B(z, \frac{l_0}{4})]$ for n large enough according to Remark 2.1, following from $[\bigcup_{z \in K_1} B(z, \frac{l_0}{4})] \cap [\bigcup_{z \in K_2} B(z, \frac{l_0}{4})] = \emptyset$ and connectedness of K_n we obtain that the contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.7 Let Ω be a bounded domain and $d(K) \equiv \text{dist}(K, \partial\Omega)$, where $K \subset \Omega$ is a nonempty compact sets. Then for all nonempty compact sets $K_1, K_2 \subset \Omega$, we have

$$|d(K_1) - d(K_2)| \leq \delta(K_1, K_2).$$

In other words, $d(K)$ is continuous at any compact set K ($K \subset \Omega$) under the Hausdorff-Pompeiu distance.

Proof We assume $d(K_1) \leq d(K_2)$, then we only need to show $d(K_2) \leq d(K_1) + \delta(K_1, K_2)$. Since $K_1, \partial\Omega$ are compact, there exist $x_1 \in K_1, y_1 \in \partial\Omega$ such that $d(K_1) = |x_1 - y_1|$. Note that $|x_1 - x_2| = \text{dist}(x_1, K_2) \leq \sup_{z \in K_1} \text{dist}(z, K_2) \leq \delta(K_1, K_2)$ since K_2 is compact, where $x_2 \in K_2$. Hence we have $d(K_2) = \text{dist}(K_2, \partial\Omega) \leq |x_2 - y_1| \leq |x_2 - x_1| + |x_1 - y_1| \leq \text{dist}(K_2, x_1) + |x_1 - y_1| \leq \delta(K_1, K_2) + d(K_1)$. \square

The main result in this paper is as follows.

Theorem 2.1 If $\{\Omega_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, then there exists a subsequence $\{\Omega_{m_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of $\{\Omega_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ such that

$$\text{Hlim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_{m_k} = \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}.$$

i.e., $(\mathcal{C}_{M,R}, \rho)$ is a compact metric space.

Proof 1°. Ω is not empty.

By the definition of $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, there exists $B(x_m, R) \subset \Omega_m$ for every $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Now we consider the sequence of domains $\{B(x_m, R)\}_{m=1}^\infty$, by Lemma 2.5 we obtain that there exists $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $B(x_0, R) \subset \text{Hlim} B(x_n, R) = D \subset \Omega$ and $x_n \rightarrow x_0 (n \rightarrow \infty)$. Let $\tilde{A}_m = \overline{B^*} \setminus B(x_m, R)$, $\tilde{A} = \overline{B^*} \setminus D$; $A_m = \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_m$, $A = \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega$. Then $\delta(A_m, A) \rightarrow 0$ and $\delta(\tilde{A}_m, \tilde{A}) \rightarrow 0$, by Lemma 2.3 we get $B(x_0, R) \subset D \subset \Omega$ and which show that Ω is not empty.

2°. Ω is a domain.

Otherwise, there exists at least two components in Ω , we denote one of components of Ω by Ω_1 and $\Omega_2 = \Omega \setminus \Omega_1$. Obviously, $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 = \emptyset$ and Ω_1, Ω_2 are open sets as well. There exist two points x_1, x_2 and $d^* > 0$ with $B(x_1, d^*) \subset \Omega_1$ and $B(x_2, d^*) \subset \Omega_2$, here $d^* = \min\{\text{dist}(x_1, \partial\Omega_1), \text{dist}(x_2, \partial\Omega_2)\}$. For any fixed $0 < r_0 < d^*$, we have $\overline{B(x_1, r_0)} \cup \overline{B(x_2, r_0)} \subset B(x_1, d^*) \cup B(x_2, d^*) \subset \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 = \Omega$, by Lemma 2.4 there

exists $N_0 > 0$ such that for all $m \geq N_0$ we have $\overline{B(x_1, r_0) \cup B(x_2, r_0)} \subset \Omega_m$, especially, $B(x_1, r_0) \cup B(x_2, r_0) \subset \Omega_m$. By the definition of $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, there exists a connected compact set K_m with $x_1, x_2 \in K_m$ and $d_m^* = \min\{\text{dist}(x_1, \partial\Omega_m), \text{dist}(x_2, \partial\Omega_m)\} > r_0$ and $\bigcup_{z \in K_m} B(z, \frac{d_m^*}{M}) \subset \Omega_m$ for every $m \geq N_0$. Since $K_m \not\subset \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$ by $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 = \emptyset$, there exists some $y_m \in K_m \setminus \Omega$ for every $m \geq N_0$, then we obtain a sequence of points $\{y_m\}_{m=N_0}^\infty$ and $\{y_m\}_{m=N_0}^\infty \cap \Omega = \emptyset$. Since $\{y_m\}_{m=N_0}^\infty \subset B^*$ and B^* is bounded, there exists a subsequence of $\{y_m\}_{m=N_0}^\infty$ (still denoted $\{y_m\}_{m=N_0}^\infty$) and $y_0 \notin \Omega$ such that $y_m \rightarrow y_0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Now we consider the ball $B(y_0, \frac{r_0}{2M})$. Since $y_m \rightarrow y_0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, there exists $N_1 > 0$ such that for all $m \geq N_1$ we have $|y_m - y_0| < \frac{r_0}{2M}$. According to $\bigcup_{z \in K_m} B(z, \frac{r_0}{M}) \subset \Omega_m$ we get $B(y_m, \frac{r_0}{M}) \subset \Omega_m$, furthermore, $B(y_0, \frac{r_0}{2M}) \subset \Omega_m$ for all $m \geq N = \max\{N_0, N_1\}$. By the same argument with step 1° we get $B(y_0, \frac{r_0}{2M}) \subset \Omega$, which contradict to $y_0 \notin \Omega$ and we prove that Ω is a domain.

3°. Ω satisfies the property (C_M) .

For any $x, y \in \Omega$, we set

$$d_0 \equiv \sup\{d(K); K \text{ is a connected compact set, } x, y \in K \text{ and } \bigcup_{z \in K} B(z, d) \subset \Omega\}.$$

Now let $\{K_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ be a sequence such that $d(K_m) \rightarrow d_0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Since $K_m \subset B^*$ ($m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$) there exist a set K_0 and a subsequence of $\{K_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ (still denoted $\{K_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$) such that $\delta(K_m, K_0) \rightarrow 0$. Following from Lemma 2.6 we get K_0 is a connected compact set, and by Lemma 2.1 we obtain that $x, y \in K_0$. Finally, by Lemma 2.7 we get $d(K_0) = d_0$.

Claim 1: $\bigcup_{z \in K_0} B(z, d_0) \subset \Omega$.

Proof of Claim 1: Fix $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N_2 > 0$ such that for any $m \geq N_2$ we have $K_0 \subset \bigcup_{z \in K_m} B(z, \frac{\epsilon}{2})$. On the other hand, since $d(K_m) \rightarrow d_0$ ($m \rightarrow \infty$),

there exists $N_3 > 0$ such that for any $m \geq N_3$ we have $d_0 - d(K_m) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Hence

$\bigcup_{z \in K_0} B(z, d_0 - \epsilon) \subset \bigcup_{z \in K_m} B(z, d(K_m)) \subset \Omega$ for all $m \geq \max\{N_2, N_3\}$, and we obtain the Claim 1 by letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

In the next, we will show that $d_0 \geq \frac{d^*}{M}$, where $d^* = \min\{\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega), \text{dist}(y, \partial\Omega)\}$.

Since $\overline{B(x, r)}, \overline{B(y, r)} \subset \Omega$ for any given $0 < r < d^*$, there exists $N_4 > 0$ such that for all $m \geq N_4$ we have $\overline{B(x, r)}, \overline{B(y, r)} \subset \Omega_m$. Hence there exists $Q_m \subset \Omega_m$ such

that $x, y \in Q_m$ and $\bigcup_{z \in Q_m} B(z, \frac{r}{M}) \subset \Omega_m$ for every $m \geq N(r)$ by $\Omega_m \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, here Q_m is a connected compact set. By Lemma 2.2 we obtain that there exist a set Q_0 and a subsequence of $\{Q_m\}_{m=N(r)}^\infty$ (still denoted $\{Q_m\}$) such that $\delta(Q_m, Q_0) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By Lemma 2.6 we know that Q_0 is also a connected compact set, and by Lemma 2.1 we obtain that $x, y \in Q_0$.

claim 2: $\bigcup_{z \in Q_0} B(z, \frac{r}{M}) \subset \Omega$.

Proof of claim 2: Otherwise, we take $x^* \in [\bigcup_{z \in Q_0} B(z, \frac{r}{M})] \setminus \Omega$, then there exists $z^* \in Q_0$ such that $|x^* - z^*| = \text{dist}(x, Q_0)$. Denote $\epsilon^* = |x^* - z^*|$, then $B(x^*, \frac{\epsilon^*}{4}) \subset \bigcup_{z \in Q_0} B(z, \frac{r}{M} - \frac{\epsilon^*}{2})$. By Remark 2.1 we know that $Q_0 \subset \bigcup_{z \in Q_m} B(z, \frac{\epsilon^*}{4})$ for all $m \geq N_5 \equiv \max\{N_4, N(\epsilon^*)\}$, and so we get $B(x^*, \frac{\epsilon^*}{4}) \subset \bigcup_{z \in Q_m} B(z, \frac{r}{M}) \subset \Omega_m$ for all $m \geq N^*$, by the same argument with step 1° we obtain $B(x^*, \frac{\epsilon^*}{4}) \subset \Omega$. Which is a contradiction since $x^* \notin \Omega$.

Since $0 < r < d^*$ is arbitrary, letting $r \rightarrow d^*$ we get $\bigcup_{z \in Q_0} B(z, \frac{d^*}{M}) \subset \Omega$. By the definition of d_0 we obtain $d_0 \geq \frac{d^*}{M}$. Which implies Ω satisfies (C_M) .

4°. Following from 1°, 2°, 3°, we have proved the Theorem 2.1. □

Remarks 2.2

(i) In the Theorem 2.1, the assumption of the ball $B(x_\Omega, R) \subset \Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ is just for preserving the nonempty limit under Hausdorff-Pompeiu distance.

(ii) The property (C_M) make the domains converge to the domain, which is a fundamental property of a class of domains.

(iii) We also can discuss γ -convergence on $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ if we add more properties to this class. (γ -convergence can be found in the references [2]-[11].) But we can not discuss the γ -convergence here, since some domains in $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ may be very "bad". For example, there are standard cusps domains (see [1]) in $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$.

(iv) There is an interesting question we comment here. Replace the property (C_M) by (C'_M) : for any $x, y \in \Omega$ there exists a continuous curve $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Omega$ such that $x = c(0), y = c(1)$ and $\bigcup_{z \in c([0,1])} B(z, \frac{d^*}{M}) \subset \Omega$, here $d^* = \min\{\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega), \text{dist}(y, \partial\Omega)\}$ and $M > 1$ is a given constant. Is $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ a compact metric space as well?

References

- [1] A. Adams, Sobolev Spaces, Academic Press, New York, 2003.
- [2] D. Bucur and J. P. Zolésio, N-dimensiona shape optimization under capacity constraints, *J. Differential Equations*, 123(2) (1995), 504-522.
- [3] D. Bucur and G. Buttazzo, Variational Methods in Shape Optimization Problems, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2005.
- [4] G. Buttazzo and P. Guasoni, Shape optimization problems over classes of convex domains, *J. Convex Anal.*, 4(1997), 343-351.
- [5] D. Chenaïs, On the existence of a solution in a domain identification problem, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 52 (1975), 189-219.
- [6] A. Henrot, Extremum Problems for Eigenvalues of Elliptic Operators, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2006.
- [7] G. Dal Maso and U. Mosco, Wiener's criterion and Γ -convergence, *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 15 (1987), 15-63.
- [8] O. Pironneau, Optimal Shape Design for Elliptic Systems, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984.
- [9] R. Schneider, Convex Bodies: The Brunn-Minkowski Theory, Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1993.
- [10] V. Šverák, On optimal shape design, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 72(1993), 537-551.
- [11] Gengsheng Wang and Donghui Yang, Decomposition of vector-valued divergence free Sobolev functions and shape optimization for stationary Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 33 (2008), no. 1-3, 429–449.

A new compact class of open sets under Hausdorff distance and shape optimization

Donghui Yang

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central China Normal University,
430079, Wuhan, People's Republic of China
donghyang@mail.cnu.edu.cn

Abstract

In this paper we obtain a new class of open sets, and we prove the class is compact under the Hausdorff distance, then we prove the existence of solutions of some shape optimization for elliptic equations.

1 Introduction

There are many papers concerning existence theory for shape optimization problems. There are several types of results: using regularity assumptions for the boundary of the unknown open sets (see [4], [5], [9], [11]), using certain capacity constraints (see [3], [7], [10]) or using the notion of a generalization perimeter and constraints or penalty terms constructed with it (see [1], [2], [3], [7]). In general, for the shape optimization problems, we must give a class of open sets and prove the class is complete under the Hausdorff distance in the first place, and then we should prove that the shape optimization problems have at least one solutions.

In this work, we give a new class of open sets, and we prove the class is compact under the Hausdorff distance, then we prove the existence of solutions of some shape optimization for elliptic equations.

Let $B^* \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ be a bounded domain. On the space $H_0^1(B^*)$ we consider the norm $\|u\|_{H_0^1(B^*)} = \left(\int_{B^*} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Let be given a smooth symmetric matrix $A \in M_{k \times k}(C^1(\overline{B^*}))$, $A = A^T$ (where A^T represent the transformation of the matrix A), and

$$\alpha|\xi|^2 \leq \langle A.\xi, \xi \rangle, \quad (1)$$

¹The author was supported by NSFC 10901069.

where $0 < \alpha$ is a constant. We define the associated operator $\mathcal{A} : H_0^1(B^*) \rightarrow H^{-1}(B^*)$:

$$\mathcal{A} = \operatorname{div}(A \cdot \nabla). \quad (2)$$

For any open set $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ ($\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ will define later), we consider the Dirichlet problem in Ω :

$$u \in H_0^1(\Omega), \quad -\mathcal{A}u_\Omega = f \quad (3)$$

in the variational sense, i.e.,

$$\int_{\Omega} \langle A \cdot \nabla u_\Omega, \nabla \phi \rangle dx = \langle f|_{\Omega}, \phi \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)} \quad \forall \phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \quad (4)$$

with $f \in H^{-1}(B^*)$ and $f|_{\Omega}$ denoting the restriction of the distribution f to the open set Ω .

Because $H_0^1(\Omega) = cl_{H_0^1(B^*)}(C_0^\infty(\Omega))$, then (4) has a unique solution $u_\Omega \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, which we can extend with zero on $B^* - \Omega$, to u_Ω^0 , and $u_\Omega^0 \in H_0^1(B^*)$, $\|u_\Omega^0\|_{H_0^1(B^*)} = \|u_\Omega\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$.

When we consider the solution of (3), we will implicitly take its extension u_Ω^0 . We shall study the following shape optimization problem

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}} J(\Omega) \equiv \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{B^*} |u_\Omega - g|^2 dx \right\}. \quad (P)$$

In the following, we give the definition of $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$.

We call a open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ with property (C_M) , if for any $x, y \in \Omega$, there exists a connected compact set K with $x, y \in K$, such that $K \subset \Omega$ and $\bigcup_{z \in K} B(z, \frac{d^*}{M}) \subset \Omega$, here $d^* = \min\{\operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega), \operatorname{dist}(y, \partial\Omega)\}$ and $M > 1$ is a given constant. Here and throughout this paper we denote $B(z, r)$ an open ball with center z and radius r .

For given $R > 0$ small enough, we define

$$\mathcal{C}_{M,R} = \{\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k; B(x_\Omega, R) \subset \Omega \subset B^*, \Omega \text{ is a open set and satisfy the property } (C_M)\},$$

where B^* is a bounded domain and x_Ω is some point in Ω .

The topology on $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ is induced by the Hausdorff distance between the complementary sets, i.e., for any $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$,

$$\rho(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \max\left\{ \sup_{x \in \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_1} \operatorname{dist}(x, \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_2), \sup_{y \in \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_2} \operatorname{dist}(\overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_1, y) \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where $\text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the Euclidean metric in \mathbb{R}^N . We denote by Hlim , the limit in the sense of (5).

In this work, we obtain the following main result about the family $\mathcal{C}_{M,\rho}$:

Theorem 2.1 If $\{\Omega_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, then there exists a subsequence $\{\Omega_{m_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of $\{\Omega_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ such that

$$\text{Hlim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_{m_k} = \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}.$$

i.e., $(\mathcal{C}_{M,R}, \rho)$ is a compact metric space.

We note that there are many compact classes of open sets under Hausdorff distance have been found (See [1], [2], [4], [5], [6], [8], [10], [11], [12] etc.). We also can see more cases in the books [3], [7], [9] etc. But the class of the open sets $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ has never appeared in any other place.

By Theorem 2.1, we obtain the existence of the optimal solutions for problem (P):

Theorem 3.1 The shape optimization problem (P) has at least one solution.

2 Compactness of $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$

We shall use the following notations:

$$\delta(K_1, K_2) = \max\left\{\sup_{x \in K_1} \text{dist}(x, K_2), \sup_{y \in K_2} \text{dist}(K_1, y)\right\},$$

where K_1 and K_2 are compact subsets in \mathbb{R}^k . Following from the definitions of ρ, δ , we obtain that $\rho(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \delta(\overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_1, \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_2)$ for any open sets $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \subset B^*$, hence we also call δ the Hausdorff distance.

The following results were given and proved in [3], [7], [9]. Which will be used in this paper.

Lemma 2.1 Let $A, A_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$, be compact subsets in \mathbb{R}^k such that $\delta(A_n, A) \rightarrow 0$, then A is the set of all accumulation points of the sequences $\{x_n\}$ such that $x_n \in A_n$ for each n .

Remark 2.1 Following from Lemma 2.1 and the definition of δ , we obtain that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $N(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for all $m \geq N(\epsilon)$ we have $A \subset \bigcup_{x \in A_m} B(x, \epsilon)$ and $A_m \subset \bigcup_{x \in A} B(x, \epsilon)$.

Lemma 2.2 Let $A, \tilde{A}, A_n, \tilde{A}_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$, be compact subsets in \mathbb{R}^k such that $\delta(A_n, A) \rightarrow 0$ and $\delta(\tilde{A}_n, \tilde{A}) \rightarrow 0$. Suppose that $A_n \subset \tilde{A}_n$ for each n , Then $A \subset \tilde{A}$.

Lemma 2.3 (Γ -property for $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$) Assume that $\{\Omega_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ and $\Omega_0 = \text{Hlim}\Omega_n$. Then for each open subset K satisfying $\overline{K} \subset \Omega_0$, there exists a positive integer n_K (depending on K) such that $\overline{K} \subset \Omega_n$ for all $n \geq n_K$.

Lemma 2.4 If $\Omega_n \subset B^*$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are open bounded sets, there exists $\Omega \subset B^*$, open, such that $\Omega = \text{Hlim}\Omega_n$, on a subsequence. In particular, let $\mathcal{O} = \{C \subset B^*; C \neq \emptyset, C \text{ is compact}\}$. Then (\mathcal{O}, δ) is a compact metric space.

The next Lemma 2.5 is clearly, but we show it in the following.

Lemma 2.5 Let $\{x_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\{r_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be such that $r_n \geq r_0 > 0$ and $\text{Hlim}B(x_n, r_n) = D \subset \mathbb{R}^k$. Then there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $B(x_0, r_0) \subset D$ and $x_n \rightarrow x_0 (n \rightarrow \infty)$.

Proof Since $B(x_n, r_n) \subset B^*$ and B^* is a bounded subset in \mathbb{R}^k , there exists a subsequence of $\{x_n\}$, still denoted by itself, such that

$$x_n \rightarrow x_0 \tag{6}$$

for some $x_0 \in \overline{B^*}$.

We claim that

$$B(x_0, r_0) \subset D. \tag{7}$$

By contradiction, we assume that there did exist $y_0 \in B(x_0, r_0)$ and $y_0 \notin D$. Since $D = \text{Hlim}B(x_n, r_n)$, i.e., $\delta(\overline{B^*} \setminus B(x_n, r_n), \overline{B^*} \setminus D) \rightarrow 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that there exists a sequence $\{y_n\}$ satisfying

$$y_n \in \overline{B^*} \setminus B(x_n, r_n) \text{ and } y_n \rightarrow y_0. \tag{8}$$

Hence

$$d(y_n, x_n) \geq r_n \geq r_0.$$

By (6) and (8) we may pass to the limit for $n \rightarrow \infty$ to get

$$d(y_0, x_0) \geq r_0,$$

which leads to a contradiction and implies (7) as desired. This completes the proof.

□

Lemma 2.6 Let $\{K_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of connected compact sets and $\text{Hlim} K_n = K$, where $K_n \subset B^*$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, then K is also connected compact set.

Proof By Lemma 2.4, we obtain that K is compact.

Now we show that K is a connected set. Otherwise, there exist at least two components in K , denote one of these by K_1 , and $K_2 = K \setminus K_1$, then K_1, K_2 are compact, which shows that $l_0 \equiv \text{dist}(K_1, K_2) > 0$. Since $K_n \subset \bigcup_{z \in K} B(z, \frac{l_0}{4}) = [\bigcup_{z \in K_1} B(z, \frac{l_0}{4})] \cup [\bigcup_{z \in K_2} B(z, \frac{l_0}{4})]$ for n large enough, following from $[\bigcup_{z \in K_1} B(z, \frac{l_0}{4})] \cap [\bigcup_{z \in K_2} B(z, \frac{l_0}{4})] = \emptyset$ and connectedness of K_n we obtain the contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.7 Let Ω be a bounded open set and $d(K) \equiv \text{dist}(K, \partial\Omega)$, where $K \subset \Omega$ be compact sets. Then for all compact sets $K_1, K_2 \subset \Omega$, we have

$$|d(K_1) - d(K_2)| \leq \delta(K_1, K_2).$$

Proof We assume $d(K_1) \leq d(K_2)$, then we only need to show $d(K_2) \leq d(K_1) + \delta(K_1, K_2)$. Since $K_1, \partial\Omega$ are compact, there exist $x_1 \in K_1, y_1 \in \partial\Omega$ such that $d(K_1) = |x_1 - y_1|$. Note that $\text{dist}(x_1, K_2) \leq \sup_{z \in K_1} \text{dist}(z, K_2) \leq \delta(K_1, K_2)$, we obtain $d(K_2) = \text{dist}(K_2, \partial\Omega) \leq \text{dist}(K_2, y_1) \leq \text{dist}(K_2, x_1) + |x_1 - y_1| \leq d(K_1) + \delta(K_1, K_2)$. \square

The main result in this paper is as follows.

Theorem 2.1 If $\{\Omega_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, then there exists a subsequence $\{\Omega_{m_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of $\{\Omega_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ such that

$$\text{Hlim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_{m_k} = \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}.$$

i.e., $(\mathcal{C}_{M,R}, \rho)$ is a compact metric space.

Proof By Lemma 2.4 we know that there exists $\Omega \subset B^*$ and a subsequence $\{\Omega_{m_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of $\{\Omega_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ such that $\text{Hlim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_{m_k} = \Omega$, without loss of generality, we still denote $\text{Hlim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_m = \Omega$. So we only need to prove that $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$.

In order to prove that $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, we separate it to the following steps.

1°. Ω is not empty.

By the definition of $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, there exists $B(x_m, R) \subset \Omega_m$ for every $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Now we consider the sequence of open sets $\{B(x_m, R)\}_{m=1}^\infty$, by Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.5 we obtain that there exists $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $B(x_0, R) \subset \text{Hlim} B(x_n, R) = D \subset \Omega$ and $x_n \rightarrow x_0 (n \rightarrow \infty)$. Let $\tilde{A}_m = \overline{B^*} \setminus B(x_m, R), \tilde{A} = \overline{B^*} \setminus D; A_m = \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_m, A = \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega$. Then $\delta(A_m, A) \rightarrow 0$ and $\delta(\tilde{A}_m, \tilde{A}) \rightarrow 0$, by Lemma 2.2 we get $B(x_0, R) \subset D \subset \Omega$ and which show that Ω is not empty.

2°. Ω is connected.

Otherwise, there exists at least two components in Ω , we denote two of components

of Ω by Ω_1, Ω_2 . Obviously, $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 = \emptyset$. Since Ω_1, Ω_2 are all open sets, there exist two points $x_1 \in \Omega_1, x_2 \in \Omega_2$ and $d > 0$ such that $B(x_1, d) \subset \Omega_1$ and $B(x_2, d) \subset \Omega_2$, here $d^* = \min\{\text{dist}(x_1, \partial\Omega_1), \text{dist}(x_2, \partial\Omega_2)\}$. For any $0 < r_0 < d^*$, by Lemma 2.3 there exists $N_0 > 0$ such that for all $m \geq N_0$ we have $\overline{B(x_1, r_0) \cup B(x_2, r_0)} \subset \Omega_m$, furthermore, $B(x_1, r_0) \cup B(x_2, r_0) \subset \Omega_m$. By the definition of $\mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, there exists a connected compact set K_m for every $m \geq N_0$ such that $x_1, x_2 \in K_m$ and $\bigcup_{z \in K_m} B(z, \frac{r_0}{M}) \subset \Omega_m$. Since $K_m \not\subset \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$ by $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 = \emptyset$, there exists some $y_m \in K_m \setminus \Omega$ for every $m \geq N_0$, then we obtain a sequence of points $\{y_m\}_{m=N_0}^\infty$ and $\{y_m\}_{m=N_0}^\infty \cap \Omega = \emptyset$. Since $\{y_m\}_{m=N_0}^\infty \subset B^*$ and B^* is bounded, there exists a subsequence of $\{y_m\}_{m=N_0}^\infty$, denote by itself, and $y_0 \notin \Omega$ such that $y_m \rightarrow y_0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Now we consider the ball $B(y_0, \frac{r_0}{2M})$. Since $y_m \rightarrow y_0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, there exists $N_1 > 0$ such that for all $m \geq N_1$ we have $|y_m - y_0| < \frac{r_0}{2M}$. On the other hand, by $\bigcup_{z \in K_m} B(z, \frac{r_0}{M}) \subset \Omega_m$ we get $B(y_m, \frac{r_0}{M}) \subset \Omega_m$, hence, $B(y_0, \frac{r_0}{2M}) \subset \Omega_m$ for all $m \geq N = \max\{N_0, N_1\}$. By the same argument with step 1° or by Lemma 2.2 we get $B(y_0, \frac{r_0}{2M}) \subset \Omega$, hence $B(y_0, \frac{d^*}{2M}) \subset \Omega$ by letting $r_0 \rightarrow d^*$, which contradict to $y_0 \notin \Omega$ and we prove that Ω is connected.

3°. $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$.

We only need to prove that Ω satisfies the property (C_M) .

(1). For any $x, y \in \Omega$, we set

$$d_0 \equiv d_0(x, y) \equiv \sup\{d(K); K \text{ is connected compact set and } x, y \in K, \bigcup_{z \in K} B(z, d) \subset \Omega\}.$$

We note that Ω is a local path connected set (since Ω is an open set) and connected (by step 2°), then Ω is a path connected set by the point topological theory. Hence for any $x, y \in \Omega$ there exist at least one path $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Omega$ such that $f(0) = x, f(1) = y$. Which implies $d_0 = d_0(x, y)$ exists.

Let $\{K_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ be a sequence such that $d(K_m) \rightarrow d_0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ by Lemma 2.4. Since $K_m \subset B^*$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, there exist a set K_0 and a subsequence of $\{K_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$, still denote by itself, such that $\delta(K_m, K_0) \rightarrow 0$. By Lemma 2.7 we know that $d(K)$ is a continuous function about K under Hausdorff distance, hence $d(K_0) = d_0$.

Following from Lemma 2.6 we get K_0 is a connected compact set, and by Lemma 2.1 we obtain that $x, y \in K_0$.

(2). We claim that $\bigcup_{z \in K_0} B(z, d_0) \subset \Omega$.

If the Claim is false, there exists a point $x_0 \in [\bigcup_{z \in K_0} B(z, d_0)] \setminus \Omega$. We assume $\text{dist}(x_0, K_0) = |x_0 - z_0|$, here $z_0 \in K_0$, and denote $\epsilon_0 = d_0 - |x_0 - z_0|$, then $B(x_0, \frac{\epsilon_0}{4}) \subset \bigcup_{z \in K_0} B(z, d_0 - \frac{3\epsilon_0}{4})$. But $K_0 \subset \bigcup_{z \in K_m} B(z, \frac{\epsilon_0}{4})$ for m large enough (see Remark 2.1), we get $B(x_0, \frac{\epsilon_0}{4}) \subset \bigcup_{z \in K_m} B(z, d(K_m)) \subset \Omega_m$ for $d_0 - d(K_m) < \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}$, then by the same argument with step 1° we obtain $B(x_0, \frac{\epsilon_0}{4}) \subset \Omega$. Which is a contradiction since $x_0 \notin \Omega$.

(3). We show that $d_0 \geq \frac{d^*}{M}$, where $d^* = \min\{\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega), \text{dist}(y, \partial\Omega)\}$.

Since $\overline{B(x, r)}, \overline{B(y, r)} \subset \Omega$ for any given $0 < r < d^*$, there exists $N(r) > 0$ such that for all $m \geq N(r)$ we have $\overline{B(x, r)}, \overline{B(y, r)} \subset \Omega_m$. Hence there exists $Q_m \subset \Omega_m$ such that $\bigcup_{z \in Q_m} B(z, \frac{r}{M}) \subset \Omega_m$ for every $m \geq N(r)$ by $\Omega_m \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$, here Q_m is a connected compact set. By Lemma 2.4 we obtain that there exist a set Q_0 and a subsequence of $\{Q_m\}_{m=N(r)}^\infty$, still denote by itself, such that $\delta(Q_m, Q_0) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By Lemma 2.6 we know that Q_0 is also a connected compact set.

Now claim: $\bigcup_{z \in Q_0} B(z, \frac{r}{M}) \subset \Omega$.

Otherwise, we take $x^* \in [\bigcup_{z \in Q_0} B(z, \frac{r}{M})] \setminus \Omega$, then there exists $z^* \in Q_0$ such that $|x^* - z^*| = \text{dist}(x^*, Q_0)$. Denote $\epsilon^* = \frac{r}{M} - |x^* - z^*|$, then $B(x^*, \frac{\epsilon^*}{2}) \subset \bigcup_{z \in Q_0} B(z, \frac{r}{M} - \frac{\epsilon^*}{2})$.

By Remark 2.1 we know that $Q_0 \subset \bigcup_{z \in Q_m} B(z, \frac{\epsilon^*}{2})$ for all $m \geq N^* = \max\{N(r), N(\epsilon^*)\}$,

and we get $B(x^*, \frac{\epsilon^*}{2}) \subset \bigcup_{z \in Q_m} B(z, \frac{r}{M}) \subset \Omega_m$ for all $m \geq N^*$, by the same argument with step 1° we obtain $B(x^*, \frac{\epsilon^*}{2}) \subset \Omega$. Which is a contradiction since $x^* \notin \Omega$.

Since $0 < r < d^*$ is arbitrary, letting $r \rightarrow d^*$ we get $\bigcup_{z \in Q_0} B(z, \frac{d^*}{M}) \subset \Omega$. By the definition of d_0 we obtain $d_0 \geq \frac{d^*}{M}$. Which implies $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$.

4°. Following from 1°, 2°, 3°, we have proved the Theorem 2.1. \square

3 Existence of shape optimization

In this section, we shall prove the existence of problems (P).

Theorem 3.1. The shape optimization problem (P) has at least one solution.

Proof. Throughout the proof of Theorem 3.1, we shall use $spt(u)$ to denote the support of u .

Let $d = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}} J(\Omega) = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{B^*} |u_\Omega - g|^2 dx \right\}$. It is obvious that $d > -\infty$. Then there exists a sequence $\{\Omega_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ such that

$$d = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_{B^*} |u_m - g|^2 dx, \quad (9)$$

where $u_m \equiv u_{\Omega_m}$ is the weak solution of (3). By Theorem 2.1, there exist a subsequence of $\{\Omega_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, still denoted by itself, and $\Omega^* \in \mathcal{C}_{M,R}$ such that $\Omega^* = \text{Hlim} \Omega_n$.

By taking $u = u_m$, $\Omega = \Omega_m$ in (4), we get

$$\int_{\Omega_m} \langle A \cdot \nabla u_m, \nabla \phi \rangle dx = \langle f|_{\Omega_m}, \phi \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Omega_m) \times H_0^1(\Omega_m)} \quad \forall \phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_m)$$

Since $u_m \in H_0^1(\Omega_m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \int_{\Omega_m} |\nabla u_m|^2 dx &\leq \int_{\Omega_m} \langle A \cdot \nabla u_m, \nabla u_m \rangle dx \\ &= \langle f|_{\Omega_m}, u_m \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Omega_m) \times H_0^1(\Omega_m)} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{H^{-1}(B^*)} \cdot \|u_m\|_{H_0^1(\Omega_m)} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

by (1), which implies that

$$\int_{\Omega_m} |\nabla u_m|^2 dx \leq C,$$

here and throughout the proof of Theorem 3.1, C denotes several positive constants independent of m . Let

$$\hat{u}_m(x) = \begin{cases} u_m(x) & \text{in } \Omega_m, \\ 0 & \text{in } B^* - \Omega_m, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

then $\{\hat{u}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is bounded in $H_0^1(B^*)$. Hence there exists subsequence of $\{\hat{u}_m\}$, still denoted by itself, such that

$$\hat{u}_m \rightarrow \hat{u} \text{ weakly in } H_0^1(B^*) \text{ and strongly in } L^2(B^*) \quad (12)$$

for some $\hat{u} \in H_0^1(B^*)$.

Now we claim that

$$\hat{u}(x) \in H_0^1(\Omega^*). \quad (13)$$

In fact, we only need to show that

$$\hat{u}(x) = 0 \text{ a.e. in } B^* \setminus \overline{\Omega^*}. \quad (14)$$

Indeed, for any open subset K satisfying $\overline{K} \subset B^* \setminus \overline{\Omega^*}$, denote $l_d = \text{dist}(\overline{K}, \overline{\Omega^*})$, since $\Omega^* = \text{Hlim} \Omega_n$, i.e., $\delta(\overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_m, \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega^*) \rightarrow 0$, which implies that for every $0 < \frac{l_d}{4}$ there exists an integer $m_0 > 0$ such that for any $n \geq n_0$ we have $\delta(\overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_m, \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega^*) < \frac{l_d}{4}$. Hence by the definition of $\delta(\cdot, \cdot)$ we have

$$\sup_{x \in \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega} d(x, \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_m) < \frac{l_d}{4}, \quad \forall m \geq m_0.$$

i.e., $\overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega^* \subset \{y \in \mathbb{R}^k; d(y, \overline{B^*} \setminus \Omega_m) < \frac{l_d}{4}\}$. So we obtain

$$\{y \in \Omega_m; d(y, \partial\Omega_m) > \frac{l_d}{4}\} \subset \Omega^*, \quad \forall m \geq m_0.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\{y \in \mathbb{R}^k; d(y, \partial\Omega^*) < \frac{l_d}{2}\}, \quad \forall m \geq m_0.$$

Hence $\overline{K} \subset B^* \setminus \overline{\Omega_m}$, $\forall m \geq m_0$. Thus

$$\int_K |\hat{u}(x)|^2 dx = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_K |\hat{u}_m(x)|^2 dx \leq \overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B^* \setminus \overline{\Omega_m}} |\hat{u}_m(x)|^2 dx = 0,$$

which implies that $\hat{u}(x) = 0$ a.e. in K . Since $K \subset \overline{K} \subset B^* \setminus \overline{\Omega^*}$ is arbitrary, (14) and consequently (13) follow.

Then we claim that

$$\int_{\Omega^*} \langle A \cdot \nabla \hat{u}, \nabla \phi \rangle dx = \langle f|_{\Omega^*}, \phi \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Omega^*) \times H_0^1(\Omega^*)} \quad \forall \phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega^*) \quad (15)$$

i.e.,

$$\int_{\text{spt}(\phi)} \langle A \cdot \nabla \hat{u}, \nabla \phi \rangle dx = \langle f|_{\text{spt}(\phi)}, \phi \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Omega^*) \times H_0^1(\Omega^*)}$$

for each $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega^*)$.

Let

$$\hat{\phi} = \begin{cases} \phi & \text{in } \Omega^*, \\ 0 & \text{in } B^* - \overline{\Omega^*}, \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

by Lemma 2.3, there exists a positive integer $m_1(\phi)$, such that

$$\text{spt}(\hat{\phi}) = \text{spt}(\phi) \subset \Omega_m, \quad \text{for all } m \geq m_1(\phi).$$

Then for each $m \geq m_1(\phi)$, $\hat{\phi} \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_m)$. So by (4), we have

$$\int_{\Omega_m} \langle A \cdot \nabla \hat{u}_m, \nabla \hat{\phi} \rangle dx = \langle f|_{\Omega_m}, \hat{\phi} \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Omega_m) \times H_0^1(\Omega_m)}$$

which, together with (16), implies

$$\int_{\Omega_m} \langle A \cdot \nabla \hat{u}_m, \nabla \phi \rangle dx = \langle f|_{\Omega_m}, \phi \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Omega_m) \times H_0^1(\Omega_m)}$$

passing to the limit for $m \rightarrow \infty$ and using (12) we get (15).

Finally, we claim that

$$d \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B^*} |\hat{u} - g|^2 dx. \quad (17)$$

We notice that

$$\hat{u}_m \rightarrow \hat{u} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(B^*).$$

Hence we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{B^*} |\hat{u}_m - g|^2 \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \int_{B^*} |\hat{u} - g|^2.$$

and by (9) we get

$$d = \frac{1}{2} \int_{B^*} |\hat{u} - g|^2.$$

i.e. (17) holds.

Following from (13), (15) and (17) we obtain that Ω^* is a solution of problem (P). This completes the proof. \square

References

- [1] D. Bucur and J. P. Zolésio, Wiener's criterion and shape continuity for the Dirichlet problem, *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital.*, B 11(4)(1997), 757-771.
- [2] D. Bucur and J. P. Zolésio, N-dimensiona shape optimization under capacity constraints, *J. Differential Equations*, 123(2) (1995), 504-522.
- [3] D. Bucur and G. Buttazzo, *Variational Methods in Shape Optimization Problems*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2005.
- [4] G. Buttazzo and P. Guasoni, Shape optimization problems over classes of convex domains, *J. Convex Anal.*, 4(1997), 343-351.
- [5] D. Chenaïs, On the existence of a solution in a domain identification problem, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 52 (1975), 189-219.
- [6] D. Chenaïs, Homéomorphisme entre ouverts lipschitziens, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, 118(4) (1978), 343-398.
- [7] A. Henrot, *Extremum Problems for Eigenvalues of Elliptic Operators*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2006.
- [8] G. Dal Maso and U. Mosco, Wiener's criterion and Γ -convergence, *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 15 (1987), 15-63.
- [9] O. Pironneau, *Optimal Shape Design for Elliptic Systems*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984.
- [10] V. Šverák, On optimal shape design, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 72(1993), 537-551.
- [11] D. Tiba, A property of Sobolev spaces and existence in optimal design, *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 47(2003), pp. 45-58.
- [12] Gengsheng Wang and Donghui Yang, Decomposition of vector-valued divergence free Sobolev functions and shape optimization for stationary Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 33 (2008), no. 1-3, 429-449.