

FABER-KRAHN INEQUALITY FOR ANISOTROPIC EIGENVALUE PROBLEMS WITH ROBIN BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

FRANCESCO DELLA PIETRA AND NUNZIA GAVITONE

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study the main properties of the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ and its eigenfunctions of a class of highly nonlinear elliptic operators in a bounded Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, assuming a Robin boundary condition. Moreover, we prove a Faber-Krahn inequality for $\lambda_1(\Omega)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$. This paper is devoted to the study of the following problem:

$$(1.1) \quad \lambda_1(\Omega) = \min_{\substack{u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) \\ u \neq 0}} J(u),$$

where

$$(1.2) \quad J(u) = \frac{\int_{\Omega} [H(Du)]^p dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} |u|^p H(\nu) d\sigma}{\int_{\Omega} |u|^p dx},$$

$1 < p < +\infty$, ν is the outer normal to $\partial\Omega$, and β is a fixed positive number. Moreover, we suppose that H is a sufficiently smooth norm of \mathbb{R}^n (see Sections 2 and 3 for the precise assumptions). The minimizers of (1.1) satisfy the equation

$$(1.3) \quad -\operatorname{div}([H(Du)]^{p-1} H_{\xi}(Du)) = \lambda_1(\Omega) |u|^{p-2} u \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

with Robin conditions on the boundary:

$$(1.4) \quad [H(Du)]^{p-1} H_{\xi}(Du) \cdot \nu + \beta H(\nu) |u|^{p-2} u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

The operator in (1.3) reduces to the p -Laplacian when H is the Euclidean norm of \mathbb{R}^n . For a general norm H , it is an anisotropic, highly nonlinear operator, and it has attracted an increasing interest in last years. We refer, for example, to [1, 20, 24] ($p = 2$) and [4, 6, 19, 22] ($1 < p < +\infty$) where Dirichlet boundary conditions are considered. Moreover, for Neumann boundary values see, for instance, [18, 36] ($p = 2$), while overdetermined problems are studied in [12, 35] ($p = 2$). In this paper we are interested in considering the eigenvalue problem (1.3) with the Robin boundary conditions (1.4). In particular, our main objective is to obtain a Faber-Krahn inequality by studying the shape optimization problem

$$(1.5) \quad \min_{|\Omega|=m} \lambda_1(\Omega)$$

among all the Lipschitz domains with given measure $m > 0$. To study problem (1.5), we first have to investigate the basic properties of the first eigenvalue and of the relative eigenfunctions of (1.3), (1.4), as existence, sign, simplicity and regularity.

Date: February 27, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35P15, 35P30, 35J60 .

Key words and phrases. Eigenvalue problems, nonlinear elliptic equations, Faber-Krahn inequality, Wulff shape.

In the Euclidean case, problem (1.1) reduces to

$$\lambda_{1,\varepsilon}(\Omega) = \min_{\substack{u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |Du|^p dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} |u|^p d\sigma}{\int_{\Omega} |u|^p dx},$$

and the minimizers satisfy the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|Du|^{p-2} Du) = \lambda_{1,\varepsilon}(\Omega) |u|^{p-2} u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ |Du|^{p-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + \beta |u|^{p-2} u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

In such a case, problem (1.5) has been first investigated by Bossel for $p = 2$, when Ω varies among smooth domains of \mathbb{R}^2 with fixed measure. More precisely, in [7] she proved that

$$(1.6) \quad \lambda_{1,\varepsilon}(\Omega) \geq \lambda_{1,\varepsilon}(B),$$

where B is a disk such that $|B| = |\Omega|$. This result has been generalized to any dimension $n \geq 2$ for Lipschitz domains in [17]. As regards the case $1 < p < +\infty$, the inequality (1.6) has been proved by [16] for smooth domains, and by [9] in the case of Lipschitz domains. The equality cases are also addressed in [9, 16]. As regards the case $\beta < 0$, we refer the reader to [25] and the references therein.

In the anisotropic case, our result reads as follows. Let H^o be the polar function of H , and denote by \mathcal{W}_R the Wulff shape, that is the R -sublevel set of H^o , such that $|\mathcal{W}_R| = |\Omega|$ (see Section 2 for the definitions). If $\Omega \neq \mathcal{W}_R$ is a Lipschitz set of \mathbb{R}^n , then

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) > \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_R).$$

Hence, the unique minimizer of (1.5) is the Wulff shape. Such result relies in the so-called anisotropic isoperimetric inequality (see for example [1]), and it is in agreement with the Faber-Krahn inequality for the first eigenvalue of (1.3) in the homogeneous Dirichlet case (see [4]).

As a matter of fact, we may ask if the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ is bounded from above in terms of the Lebesgue measure of Ω . Indeed, in the Euclidean setting, this is the case for the first nonvanishing Neumann Laplacian eigenvalue (see [37], and also [8, 11] for related results), but this does not happen for the first Dirichlet Laplacian eigenvalue. In this order of ideas, by a result given in [29] it follows that the first Robin Laplacian eigenvalue among the sets of fixed measure is unbounded from above. Here we prove a lower bound for the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ of our anisotropic Robin problem in a convex set $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ in terms of the anisotropic inradius of Ω . This will imply that, among all Lipschitz sets with fixed measure $m > 0$,

$$\sup_{|\Omega|=m} \lambda_1(\Omega) = +\infty.$$

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some basic definitions and properties of H and of its polar function H^o . In Section 3, we state and prove some properties of the first eigenvalue of (1.3), (1.4). More precisely, under suitable assumptions on H , we show that there exists a first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ which is simple. Moreover, we prove that the first eigenfunctions are in $C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$, for some $0 < \alpha < 1$. Furthermore, a solution of the eigenvalue problem is a first eigenfunction if and only if it has a fixed sign. In Section 4 we investigate the eigenvalue problem when Ω is a Wulff shape, while in Section 5 we give a representation formula for $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ by means of the level sets of the first eigenfunctions. Using such results, in Section 6 we state precisely the main result and give a proof.

2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

Let $H : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$, $n \geq 2$, be a $C^2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$ function such that

$$(2.1) \quad H(t\xi) = |t|H(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall t \in \mathbb{R},$$

and such that any level set $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : H(\xi) \leq t\}$, with $t > 0$ is strictly convex.

Moreover, suppose that there exist two positive constants $a \leq b$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad a|\xi| \leq H(\xi) \leq b|\xi|, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Remark 2.1. We stress that the homogeneity of H and the convexity of its level sets imply the convexity of H . Indeed, by (2.1), it is sufficient to show that, for any $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$,

$$(2.3) \quad H(\xi_1 + \xi_2) \leq H(\xi_1) + H(\xi_2).$$

By the convexity of the level sets, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H\left(\frac{\xi_1}{H(\xi_1) + H(\xi_2)} + \frac{\xi_2}{H(\xi_1) + H(\xi_2)}\right) &= \\ &= H\left(\frac{H(\xi_1)}{H(\xi_1) + H(\xi_2)} \frac{\xi_1}{H(\xi_1)} + \frac{H(\xi_2)}{H(\xi_1) + H(\xi_2)} \frac{\xi_2}{H(\xi_2)}\right) \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

and by (2.1) we get (2.3).

We define the polar function $H^o : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ of H as

$$H^o(v) = \sup_{\xi \neq 0} \frac{\xi \cdot v}{H(\xi)}.$$

It is easy to verify that also H^o is a convex function which satisfies properties (2.1) and (2.2). Furthermore,

$$(2.4) \quad H(v) = \sup_{\xi \neq 0} \frac{\xi \cdot v}{H^o(\xi)}.$$

The set

$$\mathcal{W} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : H^o(\xi) < 1\}$$

is the so-called Wulff shape centered at the origin. We put $\kappa_n = |\mathcal{W}|$, where $|\mathcal{W}|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of \mathcal{W} . More generally, we denote with $\mathcal{W}_r(x_0)$ the set $r\mathcal{W} + x_0$, that is the Wulff shape centered at x_0 with measure $\kappa_n r^n$, and $\mathcal{W}_r(0) = \mathcal{W}_r$.

The following properties of H and H^o hold true (see for example [3]):

$$(2.5) \quad H_\xi(\xi) \cdot \xi = H(\xi), \quad H_\xi^o(\xi) \cdot \xi = H^o(\xi),$$

$$(2.6) \quad H(H_\xi^o(\xi)) = H^o(H_\xi(\xi)) = 1, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\},$$

$$(2.7) \quad H^o(\xi)H_\xi(H_\xi^o(\xi)) = H(\xi)H_\xi^o(H_\xi(\xi)) = \xi, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}.$$

Definition 2.1 (Anisotropic area functional and perimeter ([2,10])). Let M be an oriented $(n-1)$ -dimensional hypersurface in \mathbb{R}^n . The anisotropic area functional of M is

$$\sigma_H(M) := \int_M H(\nu) d\sigma,$$

where ν denotes the outer normal to M and σ is the $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure.

The anisotropic area of a set M is finite if and only if the usual Euclidean hypersurface area $\sigma(M)$ is finite. Indeed, by property (2.2) we have that

$$\alpha \sigma(M) \leq \sigma_H(M) \leq \gamma \sigma(M).$$

An isoperimetric inequality for the anisotropic area holds, namely for $K \subset M$ open set of \mathbb{R}^n with Lipschitz boundary,

$$(2.8) \quad \sigma_H(\partial K) \geq n\kappa_n^{\frac{1}{n}}|K|^{1-\frac{1}{n}},$$

and the equality holds if and only if K is homothetic to a Wulff shape (see for example [10], [15], [26], [1]). We stress that in [21] an isoperimetric inequality for the anisotropic relative perimeter in the plane is studied.

Let Ω be a bounded open set of \mathbb{R}^n , and $d_H(x)$ the anisotropic distance of a point $x \in \Omega$ to the boundary $\partial\Omega$, that is

$$(2.9) \quad d_H(x) = \inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} H^o(x - y).$$

By the property (2.6), the distance function $d_H(x)$ satisfies

$$(2.10) \quad H(Dd_H(x)) = 1.$$

Finally, we recall that when Ω is convex $d_H(x)$ is concave. In a natural way, the anisotropic inradius of a convex, bounded open set Ω is the value

$$(2.11) \quad R_{H,\Omega} = \sup\{d_H(x), x \in \Omega\}$$

For further properties of the anisotropic distance function we refer the reader to [13].

3. THE FIRST EIGENVALUE PROBLEM

In this section we prove some properties of the minimizers of (1.1), which are the weak solutions of the following Robin boundary value problem:

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(F_p(Du)) = \lambda_1(\Omega)|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ F_p(Du) \cdot \nu + \beta H(\nu)|u|^{p-2}u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

where

$$F_p(Du) := [H(Du)]^{p-1}H_\xi(Du).$$

For weak solution of problem (3.1) we mean a function $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad \int_{\Omega} F_p(Du) \cdot D\psi \, dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} u^{p-1}\psi H(\nu) \, d\sigma = \lambda_1(\Omega) \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p-2}u \psi \, dx, \quad \psi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

Obviously, $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ in (1.1) (and then in (3.1)) depends also on β . In general, we will consider $\beta > 0$ fixed. Anyway, when it will be necessary, to emphasize the dependence on β we will denote the first eigenvalue of (3.1) with $\lambda_1(\Omega, \beta)$.

For the Euclidean case we refer to [31], where the eigenvalue problem for the p -Laplacian under several boundary conditions is considered.

From now on, we assume that H is a convex function as in Section 2, assuming also that it verifies the following hypothesis:

$$(3.3) \quad H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}), \text{ with } \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_j} ([H(\eta)]^{p-1} H_{\xi_i}(\eta)) \xi_i \xi_j \geq \gamma |\eta|^{p-2} |\xi|^2,$$

for some positive constant γ , for any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Theorem 3.1. *There exists a function $u_p \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ which realizes the minimum in (1.1), and satisfies the problem (3.1). Moreover, $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ is the first eigenvalue of (3.1), and the first eigenfunctions are positive (or negative) in Ω .*

Proof. The proof makes use of standard arguments. We briefly recall the main steps. The direct method of the Calculus of Variations guarantees that the infimum in (1.1) is attained at a function $u_p \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. We may assume that $u_p \geq 0$, being also $|u_p|$ a minimizer in (1.1). Moreover, the function u_p is a weak solution of (3.1). In order to obtain that $u_p \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$, we first claim that a L^∞ -estimate for u_p holds. To get the claim, we take $\varphi = [T_M(u_p)]^{kp+1}$ as test function, with k, M positive numbers, and $T_M(s) = \min\{s, M\}$, $s \geq 0$. Using (2.5) and (2.2), we easily get

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(kp+1) \int_{u_p \leq M} |Du_p|^p u_p^{kp} dx &\leq \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} F_p(Du_p) \cdot D\varphi dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} u_p^{p-1} \varphi H(\nu) d\sigma \leq \\ &\leq \lambda_1(\Omega) \int_{\Omega} u_p^{p(k+1)} dx, \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\int_{\Omega} |D T_M(u_p)^{k+1}|^p dx + \int_{\Omega} [T_M(u_p)]^{p(k+1)} dx \leq \left(\frac{(k+1)^p}{\alpha(kp+1)} \lambda_1(\Omega) + 1 \right) \int_{\Omega} u_p^{p(k+1)} dx.$$

Applying the Sobolev inequality and the Fatou lemma, we get that

$$\|u_p\|_{(k+1)p^*} \leq S^{\frac{1}{k+1}} \left(\frac{(k+1)^p}{kp+1} \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega)}{\alpha} + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{p(k+1)}} \|u_p\|_{(k+1)p},$$

where S is the Sobolev constant. Using the standard Moser iteration technique for the L^p -norms, we get the claim. For sake of completeness, we give the complete proof (see also [27]).

First of all, we have that there exists a constant c independent of k such that

$$\left(\frac{(k+1)^p}{kp+1} \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega)}{\alpha} + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{p\sqrt{k+1}}} \leq c.$$

Then,

$$(3.4) \quad \|u_p\|_{(k+1)p^*} \leq S^{\frac{1}{k+1}} c^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{k+1}}} \|u_p\|_{(k+1)p}.$$

Choosing k_n in (3.4) such that $(k_1+1)p = p^*$, and k_n , $n \geq 2$, such that $(k_n+1)p = (k_{n-1}+1)p^*$, by induction we obtain

$$\|u_p\|_{(k_n+1)p^*} \leq S^{\frac{1}{k_n+1}} c^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{k_n+1}}} \|u_p\|_{(k_{n-1}+1)p^*}.$$

Hence, using iteratively the above inequality, we get

$$\|u_p\|_{(k_n+1)p^*} \leq S^{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{k_i+1}} c^{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{k_i+1}}} \|u_p\|_{p^*}.$$

Being $k_n+1 = (p^*/p)^n$, and $p^*/p > 1$, it follows that for any $n \geq 1$

$$(3.5) \quad \|u_p\|_{(k_n+1)p^*} \leq C \|u\|_{p^*},$$

as $r_n = (k_n+1)p^* \rightarrow +\infty$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. The estimates in (3.5) imply that $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Indeed, if by contradiction the exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and $A \subset \Omega$ with positive measure such that $|u| > C\|u\|_{p^*} + \varepsilon = K$ in A , we have

$$\liminf_n \|u\|_{r_n} \geq \liminf_n \left(\int_A K^{r_n} \right)^{\frac{1}{r_n}} = K > C\|u\|_{p^*},$$

which is in contrast with (3.5).

Now the L^∞ -estimate, the hypothesis (3.3) and the properties of H allow to apply standard regularity results (see [23], [33]), in order to obtain that $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$. As matter of fact, as observed in [9] it is possible to follow the argument in [30, pages 466-467] to get the

continuity of u_p up to the boundary. Finally, u_p is strictly positive in Ω by the Harnack inequality (see [34]). \square

Theorem 3.2. *The first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ of (3.1) is simple, that is the relative eigenfunctions are unique up to a multiplicative constant.*

Proof. We follow the idea of [4, 5]. Let v, w two positive minimizers of (1.1) in Ω such that $\|v\|_p = \|w\|_p = 1$, and consider $\eta_t = (tv^p + (1-t)w^p)^{1/p}$, with $t \in [0, 1]$. Obviously, $\|\eta_t\|_p = 1$. Moreover, using the homogeneity and the convexity of H we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
 [H(D\eta_t)]^p &= \eta_t^p \left[H \left(t \left(\frac{v}{\eta_t} \right)^p \frac{Dv}{v} + (1-t) \left(\frac{w}{\eta_t} \right)^p \frac{Dw}{w} \right) \right]^p \\
 &= \eta_t^p \left[H \left(s(x) \frac{Dv}{v} + (1-s(x)) \frac{Dw}{w} \right) \right]^p \\
 (3.6) \quad &\leq \eta_t^p \left[s(x) H \left(\frac{Dv}{v} \right) + (1-s(x)) H \left(\frac{Dw}{w} \right) \right]^p \\
 &\leq tv^p \left[H \left(\frac{Dv}{v} \right) \right]^p + (1-t)w^p \left[H \left(\frac{Dw}{w} \right) \right]^p \\
 &= t[H(Dv)]^p + (1-t)[H(Dw)]^p.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, recalling (1.2), the inequalities in (3.6) and the definition of η_t give that

$$J(\eta_t) \leq tJ(v) + (1-t)J(w) = \lambda_1(\Omega),$$

and then η_t is a minimizer for J . This implies that the inequalities in (3.6) become equalities. The equality between the third and the fourth row of (3.6) holds if and only if $H(Dv/v) = H(Dw/w)$. Hence, the strict convexity of the level sets of H guarantees from the equalities in (3.6) that $Dv/v = Dw/w$ in Ω , that is v/w is constant. The norm constraint on v and w implies the uniqueness, and this concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.1. We stress that the nonnegative solution $u_p \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ of (3.1) we found by Theorem 3.1 cannot be identically zero on $\partial\Omega$. Indeed, in such a case, taking $\psi = 1$ as test function in (3.2), we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} u_p^{p-1} dx = 0,$$

contradicting the positivity of u_p in Ω . As a matter of fact, if we suppose $\partial\Omega$ to be a connected C^2 manifold, then the Hopf boundary point Lemma holds (see [14]), which implies that u cannot vanish on $\partial\Omega$.

Theorem 3.3. *Any nonnegative function $v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $v \not\equiv 0$, which satisfies, in the sense of (3.2),*

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(F_p(Dv)) = \lambda v^{p-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ F_p(Dv) \cdot \nu + \beta H(v) v^{p-1} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

is a first eigenfunction of (3.7), that is $\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega)$ and $v = u_p$, where u_p is given in Theorem 3.1, up to multiplicative constant.

For analogous results in the Dirichlet case, see for example [28] and the references therein.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. The same arguments of Theorem 3.1 allow to prove that the given nonnegative solution v of (3.7) is in $C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ and it is positive in Ω . Moreover, the function $u_p \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies

$$(3.8) \quad \int_{\Omega} [H(Du_p)]^p dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} u_p^p H(v) d\sigma = \lambda_1(\Omega) \int_{\Omega} u_p^p dx,$$

while, choosing $u_p^p/(v + \varepsilon)^{p-1}$, with $\varepsilon > 0$, as test function for v , we get

$$(3.9) \quad \int_{\Omega} p \left[H\left(\frac{u_p}{v + \varepsilon} Dv\right) \right]^{p-1} H_{\xi}(Dv) \cdot Du_p dx - (p-1) \int_{\Omega} \left[H\left(\frac{u_p}{v + \varepsilon} Dv\right) \right]^p dx + \\ + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{v^{p-1}}{(v + \varepsilon)^{p-1}} u_p^p H(\nu) d\sigma = \lambda \int_{\Omega} \frac{v^{p-1}}{(v + \varepsilon)^{p-1}} u_p^p dx.$$

Subtracting (3.9) by (3.8), being H_{ξ} zero homogeneous, and observing that $v/(v + \varepsilon) \leq 1$, we get

$$\int_{\Omega} \left\{ [H(Du_p)]^p - F_p\left(\frac{u_p}{v + \varepsilon} Dv\right) \cdot Du_p + (p-1) \left[H\left(\frac{u_p}{v + \varepsilon} Dv\right) \right]^p \right\} dx \leq \\ \leq \int_{\Omega} \left[\lambda_1(\Omega) - \frac{v^{p-1}}{(v + \varepsilon)^{p-1}} \lambda \right] u_p^p dx.$$

The convexity of H^p guarantees that the left-hand side in the above inequality is nonnegative. Hence, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the monotone convergence gives that

$$(\lambda_1(\Omega) - \lambda) \int_{\Omega} u_p^p dx \geq 0,$$

and this can hold if and only if $\lambda \leq \lambda_1(\Omega)$. Being $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ the smallest possible eigenvalue, necessarily we have that $\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega)$. The uniqueness of the first eigenfunction implies that, up to some positive multiplicative constant, $v = u_p$. \square

In order to show a lower bound for $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ when Ω is a convex set of \mathbb{R}^n in terms of the anisotropic inradius of Ω , we need an Hardy-type inequality for functions which, in general, do not vanish on the boundary. To this aim, we impose further regularity on H . More precisely, we assume also that

$$(3.10) \quad \partial W = \{x: H^o(x) = 1\} \text{ has positive Gaussian curvature in any point.}$$

If Ω is C^2 , this assumption ensures that the anisotropic distance from the boundary of Ω is C^2 in a tubular neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ (see for instance [13]).

Lemma 3.1. *Let Ω be a bounded convex open set of \mathbb{R}^n with C^2 boundary and suppose that H^o satisfies also (3.10). Then, for any $\alpha > 0$ and $\vartheta > 0$, the following Hardy-type inequality holds:*

$$(3.11) \quad \int_{\Omega} [H(Du)]^p dx + \vartheta^{p-1} \int_{\partial\Omega} |u|^p H(\nu) d\sigma \geq (p-1)(\alpha\vartheta)^{p-1} (1 - \alpha\vartheta) \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^p}{(d_H + \alpha)^p} dx,$$

where $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and d_H is the anisotropic distance from the boundary of Ω , defined in (2.9).

Proof. It sufficient to prove the thesis for $u \geq 0$. Moreover, using an approximation argument, we can suppose that $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$. For δ positive, let us define $H_{\delta}(\xi) = H^{\delta}(\xi) + \delta$, where H^{δ} is the δ -mollification of H . By the convexity of $H(\xi)$, the function H^{δ} is convex and we have, for any $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$[H_{\delta}(\xi_1)]^p \geq [H_{\delta}(\xi_2)]^p + p[H_{\delta}(\xi_2)]^{p-1} (H_{\delta})_{\xi}(\xi_2) \cdot (\xi_1 - \xi_2).$$

We apply the above inequality to $\xi_1 = Du$ and $\xi_2 = \frac{\alpha\vartheta u}{d^{\varepsilon} + \alpha} Dd^{\varepsilon}$, where $\alpha > 0$, $\vartheta > 0$, and d^{ε} is the ε -mollification of d_H . The convexity of Ω gives that the function d_H , and then d^{ε} , are

concave functions. We have:

$$(3.12) \quad \int_{\Omega} [H_{\delta}(Du)]^p dx \geq (\alpha\vartheta)^p \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^p} [H_{\delta}(Dd^{\epsilon})]^p dx + \\ + p(\alpha\vartheta)^{p-1} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^{p-1}} [H_{\delta}(Dd^{\epsilon})]^{p-1} (H_{\delta})_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon}) \cdot Du dx + \\ - p(\alpha\vartheta)^p \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^p} [H_{\delta}(Dd^{\epsilon})]^{p-1} (H_{\delta})_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon}) \cdot Dd^{\epsilon} dx$$

Passing to the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and using (2.5), the sum of the first and the third terms in the right-hand side of (3.12) converge to

$$-(p-1)(\alpha\vartheta)^p \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^p} [H(Dd^{\epsilon})]^p dx.$$

Moreover, by the divergence theorem we have that

$$(3.13) \quad p \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^{p-1}} [H_{\delta}(Dd^{\epsilon})]^{p-1} (H_{\delta})_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon}) \cdot Du dx = \\ = \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^{p-1}} (H_{\delta}^p)_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon}) \cdot D(u^p) dx = \\ = \frac{1}{p} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^{p-1}} (H_{\delta}^p)_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon}) \cdot \nu d\sigma - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} u^p \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{(H_{\delta}^p)_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon})}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^{p-1}} \right) dx = \\ = \frac{1}{p} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^{p-1}} (H_{\delta}^p)_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon}) \cdot \nu d\sigma - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d_H + \alpha)^{p-1}} \operatorname{div}((H_{\delta}^p)_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon})) dx + \\ + \frac{p-1}{p} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^p} (H_{\delta}^p)_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon}) \cdot Dd^{\epsilon} dx \geq \\ \geq \frac{1}{p} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^{p-1}} (H_{\delta}^p)_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon}) \cdot \nu d\sigma + \frac{p-1}{p} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^p} (H_{\delta}^p)_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon}) \cdot Dd^{\epsilon} dx$$

Last inequality follows from the fact that $-\operatorname{div}((H_{\delta}^p)_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon}))$ is nonnegative. Indeed, it is the trace of the product of the matrices $[(H_{\delta}^p)_{\xi\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon})]$ and $[-D^2d^{\epsilon}]$, which are both positive semidefinite, being H_{δ}^p convex and d^{ϵ} concave.

Passing to the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in (3.13), and using (2.5), we get

$$p \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^{p-1}}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^{p-1}} [H(Dd^{\epsilon})]^{p-1} (H)_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon}) \cdot Du dx \geq \\ \geq \frac{1}{p} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^{p-1}} (H^p)_{\xi}(Dd^{\epsilon}) \cdot \nu d\sigma + (p-1) \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^p} [H(Dd^{\epsilon})]^p dx$$

Then, as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in (3.12), the above computations gives that

$$(3.14) \quad \int_{\Omega} [H(Du)]^p dx - \frac{(\alpha\vartheta)^{p-1}}{p} \int_{\partial\Omega} u^p (H^p)_{\xi} \left(\frac{Dd^{\epsilon}}{d^{\epsilon} + \alpha} \right) \cdot \nu d\sigma \geq \\ \geq (p-1)(\alpha\vartheta)^{p-1} (1 - \alpha\vartheta) \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d^{\epsilon} + \alpha)^p} [H(Dd^{\epsilon})]^p dx.$$

Now we pass to the limit for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Recalling that under our assumptions d_H is C^2 in a tubular neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$, by uniform convergence we get

$$(3.15) \quad \int_{\Omega} [H(Du)]^p dx - (\alpha\vartheta)^{p-1} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d_H + \alpha)^{p-1}} [H(Dd_H)]^{p-1} H_{\xi}(Dd_H) \cdot \nu d\sigma \geq \\ \geq (p-1)(\alpha\vartheta)^{p-1} (1 - \alpha\vartheta) \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^p}{(d_H + \alpha)^p} [H(Dd_H)]^p dx.$$

Being $H(Dd_H) = 1$ a.e. in Ω , and $d_H = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, choosing $\vartheta^{p-1} = \beta$, and recalling that $\nu = -Dd_H/|Dd_H|$ on $\partial\Omega$, by (2.1) and (2.5) we get the thesis. \square

An immediate application of the previous Lemma is the following result.

Proposition 3.1. *If Ω is a convex set of \mathbb{R}^n with C^2 boundary and if H satisfies also (3.10), then*

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) \geq \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^p \frac{\beta}{R_{H,\Omega} \left(1 + \beta^{\frac{1}{p-1}} R_{H,\Omega}\right)^{p-1}},$$

where $R_{H,\Omega}$ is the anisotropic inradius of Ω , as defined in (2.11).

Proof. Let $\beta = \vartheta^{p-1}$. Then, by (3.11) and the definitions of $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ and of the anisotropic inradius $R_{H,\Omega}$ we get that

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) \geq \frac{(p-1)\beta}{(R_{H,\Omega} + \alpha)^p} (1 - \beta^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \alpha) \alpha^{p-1}.$$

Then, maximizing the right-hand side of the above inequality we obtain that

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) \geq \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^p \frac{\beta}{R_{H,\Omega} \left(1 + \beta^{\frac{1}{p-1}} R_{H,\Omega}\right)^{p-1}}.$$

\square

Remark 3.2. As a consequence of the previous Proposition, we have that

$$\sup_{|\Omega|=m} \lambda_1(\Omega) = +\infty.$$

among all the Lipschitz domains with given measure $m > 0$.

Finally, we have the following scaling property.

Proposition 3.2. *For any $t > 0$, we have that $\lambda_1(t\Omega, \beta) = t^{-p} \lambda_1(\Omega, t^{p-1}\beta)$.*

Proof. By the homogeneity of H , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(t\Omega, \beta) &= \min_{\substack{v \in W^{1,p}(t\Omega) \\ v \neq 0}} \frac{\int_{t\Omega} [H(Dv(x))]^p dx + \beta \int_{\partial(t\Omega)} |v(x)|^p H(\nu(x)) d\sigma(x)}{\int_{t\Omega} |v(x)|^p dx} \\ &= \min_{\substack{u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{t^{n-p} \int_{\Omega} [H(Du(y))]^p dy + t^{n-1} \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} |u(y)|^p H(\nu(y)) d\sigma(y)}{t^n \int_{\Omega} |u(y)|^p dy} \\ &= t^{-p} \lambda_1(\Omega, t^{p-1}\beta). \end{aligned}$$

\square

4. THE EIGENVALUE PROBLEM IN THE ANISOTROPIC RADIAL CASE

In this section we study the properties of the minimizers of (1.1) when Ω is homothetic to the Wulff shape, that is, for $R > 0$, the functions v_p such that

$$(4.1) \quad J(v_p) = \min_{\substack{u \in W^{1,p}(\mathcal{W}_R) \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{\int_{\mathcal{W}_R} [H(Du)]^p dx + \beta \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_R} |u|^p H(\nu) d\sigma}{\int_{\mathcal{W}_R} |u|^p dx},$$

where $\mathcal{W}_R = R\mathcal{W} = \{x: H^o(x) < R\}$, with $R > 0$, and \mathcal{W} is the Wulff shape centered at the origin. By Theorem 3.1, such functions solve the following problem:

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(F_p(Dv)) = \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_R)|v|^{p-2}v & \text{in } \mathcal{W}_R, \\ F_p(Dv) \cdot \nu + \beta H(\nu)|v|^{p-2}v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{W}_R. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let $v_p \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ be a positive solution of problem (4.2). Then, there exists a decreasing function $\varrho_p = \varrho_p(r)$, $r \in [0, R]$, such that $\varrho_p \in C^\infty(0, R) \cap C^1([0, R])$, and*

$$\begin{cases} v_p(x) = \varrho_p(H^o(x)), & x \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_R, \\ \varrho_p'(0) = 0, \\ -(-\varrho_p'(R))^{p-1} + \beta(\varrho_p(R))^{p-1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let B_R be the Euclidean ball centered at the origin, $B_R = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n: |x| < R\}$, and consider the p -Laplace eigenvalue problem in B_R , that is (4.2) with $H(\xi) = |\xi|$:

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p w = \lambda_{1,\mathcal{E}}(B_R)|w|^{p-2}w & \text{in } B_R, \\ |Dw|^{p-2}\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} + \beta|w|^{p-2}w = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_R, \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda_{1,\mathcal{E}}(B_R)$ denotes the first eigenvalue. It is known (see, for example, [16]) that problem (4.3) admits a positive radially decreasing solution $w_p(x) = \varrho_p(|x|)$, $0 \leq |x| \leq R$, such that $\varrho_p \in C^\infty(0, R) \cap C^1([0, R])$ and verifies

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{cases} -(p-1)(-\varrho_p'(r))^{p-2}\varrho_p''(r) + \frac{n-1}{r}(-\varrho_p'(r))^{p-1} = \lambda_{1,\mathcal{E}}(B_R)\varrho_p(r)^{p-1}, & r \in]0, R[, \\ \varrho_p'(0) = 0, \\ -(-\varrho_p'(R))^{p-1} + \beta\varrho_p(R)^{p-1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Let $v_p(x) = \varrho_p(H^o(x))$, $x \in \mathcal{W}_R$. Using properties (2.5)–(2.7), for $x \in \mathcal{W}_R \setminus \{0\}$ we have that

$$H(Dv_p(x)) = -\varrho_p'(H^o(x))H(DH^o(x)) = -\varrho_p'(H^o(x)),$$

and

$$DH(Dv_p(x)) = -DH(DH^o(x)) = -\frac{x}{H^o(x)},$$

which imply that

$$(4.5) \quad F_p(Dv_p) = -(-\varrho_p'(H^o(x)))^{p-1}\frac{x}{H^o(x)},$$

and then, by (4.4),

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div}(F_p(Dv_p)) &= -(p-1)(-\varrho_p'(H^o(x)))^{p-2}\varrho_p''(H^o(x)) + \frac{n-1}{H^o(x)}(-\varrho_p'(H^o(x)))^{p-1} \\ &= \lambda_{1,\mathcal{E}}(B_R)v_p(x)^{p-1} \quad \text{for } x \in \mathcal{W}_R \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

As regards the boundary condition, observing that $\nu(x) = DH^o(x)/|DH^o(x)|$, by (4.5), the properties (2.5), (2.6), and (4.4) we have that

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} F_p(v_p(x)) \cdot \nu(x) + \beta H(\nu(x))v_p(x)^{p-1} &= \frac{1}{|DH^o(x)|} \left(-(-\varrho_p'(R))^{p-1} + \beta\varrho_p(R)^{p-1} \right) \\ &= 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \partial\mathcal{W}_R. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, integrating (4.6) on $\mathcal{W}_R \setminus \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon$, we can use the divergence theorem and the boundary condition (4.7), and let ε going to 0, obtaining that v_p verifies

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(F_p(Dv_p)) = \lambda_{1,\mathcal{E}}(B_R)v_p^{p-1} & \text{in } \mathcal{W}_R, \\ F_p(Dv) \cdot \nu + \beta H(\nu)v_p^{p-1} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{W}_R. \end{cases}$$

But Theorem 3.3 guarantees that a positive solution of (4.8) has to be a first eigenfunction, and

$$\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_R) = \lambda_{1,\mathcal{E}}(B_R).$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 4.1. We observe that the proof of the above theorem shows that, for any convex function H we can consider, the first eigenvalue in the ball $\mathcal{W}_R = \{H^o(x) < R\}$ is the same, and coincides with the first eigenvalue for the p -Laplacian problem (4.3) in the Euclidean ball B_R (with the same R).

Next two lemmata will be useful in the proof of the main result. Their proofs are analogous to the ones obtained in [9]. For the sake of completeness, we write them in details.

Lemma 4.1. *If $0 < r < s$, then $\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_r) > \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_s)$.*

Proof. Let v_p a minimizer of (4.1), with $R = r$, and take $w(x) = v_p(\frac{r}{s}x)$, $x \in \mathcal{W}_s$. Then, by the homogeneity of H we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_s) &\leq \frac{\int_{\mathcal{W}_s} [H(Dw)]^p dx + \beta \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_s} |w|^p H(\nu) d\sigma}{\int_{\mathcal{W}_s} |w|^p dx} \\ &= \frac{\left(\frac{r}{s}\right)^p \int_{\mathcal{W}_r} [H(Dv_p)]^p dx + \beta \frac{r}{s} \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_r} |v_p|^p H(\nu) d\sigma}{\int_{\mathcal{W}_r} |v_p|^p dx} \\ &< \frac{\int_{\mathcal{W}_r} [H(Dv_p)]^p dx + \beta \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_r} |v_p|^p H(\nu) d\sigma}{\int_{\mathcal{W}_r} |v_p|^p dx} = \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_r) \end{aligned}$$

\square

We stress that by (4.4), if $v_p(x) = \varrho_p(H^o(x))$ is the positive solution in \mathcal{W}_R we found in Theorem 4.1, we have that, for $x \in \partial\mathcal{W}_R$,

$$\beta = \frac{[H(Dv_p(x))]^{p-1}}{v_p(x)^{p-1}}.$$

Then, for every $0 \leq r \leq R$, we define

$$(4.9) \quad \beta_r = \frac{[H(Dv_p(x))]^{p-1}}{v_p(x)^{p-1}}, \quad \text{for } H^o(x) = r.$$

Let us observe that $\beta_0 = 0$ and $\beta_R = \beta$.

Lemma 4.2. *If $0 \leq r < s \leq R$, then $\beta_r < \beta_s$.*

Proof. We first observe that, similarly as in the proof of Theorem 4.1, for $0 < r < R$, the function v_p is such that

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(F_p(Dv_p)) = \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_R) v_p^{p-1} & \text{in } \mathcal{W}_r, \\ F_p(Dv_p) \cdot \nu + \beta_r H(\nu) v_p^{p-1} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{W}_r. \end{cases}$$

Then, denoted by $\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_r, \beta_r)$ the first eigenvalue in \mathcal{W}_r with $\beta = \beta_r$, by Theorem 3.3 we have necessarily $\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_R) = \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_r, \beta_r)$ for all $r \in]0, R]$. Hence, by Lemma 4.1 we obtain, for $0 < r < s \leq R$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\int_{\mathcal{W}_r} [H(Dv_p)]^p dx + \beta_r \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_r} v_p^p H(\nu) d\sigma}{\int_{\mathcal{W}_r} v_p^p dx} &= \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_r, \beta_r) = \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_s, \beta_s) < \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_r, \beta_s) \leq \\ &\leq \frac{\int_{\mathcal{W}_r} [H(Dv_p)]^p dx + \beta_s \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_r} v_p^p H(\nu) d\sigma}{\int_{\mathcal{W}_r} v_p^p dx}, \end{aligned}$$

and then $\beta_r < \beta_s$. □

5. A REPRESENTATION FORMULA FOR $\lambda_1(\Omega)$

Now we prove a level set representation formula for the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega)$. To this aim, we will use the following notation. Let \tilde{u}_p be the first positive eigenfunction such that $\max \tilde{u}_p = 1$. Then, for $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} U_t &= \{x \in \Omega : \tilde{u}_p > t\}, \\ S_t &= \{x \in \Omega : \tilde{u}_p = t\}, \\ \Gamma_t &= \{x \in \partial\Omega : \tilde{u}_p > t\}. \end{aligned}$$

First of all, it is worth to observe that the anisotropic areas of the sets ∂U_t , S_t and Γ_t , defined in 2.1, are related in the following way.

Lemma 5.1. *There exists a countable set $\mathcal{Q} \subset]0, 1[$ such that*

$$(5.1) \quad \sigma_H(\partial U_t) \leq \sigma_H(\Gamma_t) + \sigma_H(S_t), \quad \forall t \in]0, 1[\setminus \mathcal{Q}.$$

Proof. The proof follows similarly as in [9]. The continuity up to the boundary of the eigenfunction \tilde{u}_p , given in Theorem 3.1, guarantees that

$$\partial U_t \cap \Omega \subseteq S_t, \quad \partial U_t \cap \partial\Omega \subseteq \tilde{\Gamma}_t$$

for any $t \in [0, 1]$, where $\tilde{\Gamma}_t = \{x \in \partial\Omega : \tilde{u}_p \geq t\}$. Moreover, by [32, Section 1.2.3] we have that

$$\int_0^\infty \sigma_H(\Gamma_t) dt = \int_0^\infty \sigma_H(\tilde{\Gamma}_t) dt = \int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{u}_p d\sigma_H \leq \sigma_H(\partial\Omega) < +\infty.$$

Hence $\sigma_H(\Gamma_t) \leq \sigma_H(\tilde{\Gamma}_t) < +\infty$ and then $\sigma_H(\Gamma_t) = \sigma_H(\tilde{\Gamma}_t)$ for a.e. $t \in [0, 1]$. Moreover, being $\sigma_H(\Gamma_t)$ and $\sigma_H(\tilde{\Gamma}_t)$ monotone decreasing in t , they are continuous in $[0, 1]$ up to a countable set \mathcal{Q} . Hence,

$$\sigma_H(\partial U_t) = \sigma_H(\partial U_t \cap \Omega) + \sigma_H(\partial U_t \cap \partial\Omega) \leq \sigma_H(S_t) + \sigma_H(\Gamma_t),$$

for all $t \in [0, 1] \setminus \mathcal{Q}$. □

If we formally divide both terms in the equation in (3.1) by \tilde{u}_p^{p-1} , and integrate in U_t , by (2.5) and the boundary condition we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.2) \quad \lambda_1(\Omega)|U_t| &= \int_{U_t} \frac{-\operatorname{div}(F_p(D\tilde{u}_p))}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}} dx = \\
 &= -(p-1) \int_{U_t} \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^{p-1} H_\xi(D\tilde{u}_p) \cdot D\tilde{u}_p}{\tilde{u}_p^p} dx - \int_{\partial U_t} \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^{p-1}}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}} H_\xi(D\tilde{u}_p) \cdot \nu d\sigma = \\
 &= -(p-1) \int_{U_t} \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^p}{\tilde{u}_p^p} dx + \int_{S_t} \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^{p-1}}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}} H(\nu) d\sigma + \beta \int_{\Gamma_t} H(\nu) d\sigma = \\
 &= |U_t| \mathcal{F}_\Omega \left(U_t, \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^{p-1}}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}} \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{F}_\Omega(U_t, \varphi) = \frac{1}{|U_t|} \left(-(p-1) \int_{U_t} \varphi^{p'} dx + \int_{S_t} \varphi H(\nu) d\sigma + \beta \int_{\Gamma_t} H(\nu) d\sigma \right),$$

with φ nonnegative measurable function in Ω . The formal computations in (5.2) give a representation formula of $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ which will be rigorously proved in the result below.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\tilde{u}_p \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ be the positive minimizer of (1.1) such that $\max \tilde{u}_p = 1$. Then, for a.e. $t \in]0, 1[$,*

$$(5.4) \quad \lambda_1(\Omega) = \mathcal{F}_\Omega \left(U_t, \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^{p-1}}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}} \right).$$

Proof. Let $0 < \varepsilon < t < 1$, and

$$\psi_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \tilde{u}_p \leq t \\ \frac{u-t}{\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}} & \text{if } t < \tilde{u}_p < t + \varepsilon \\ \frac{1}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}} & \text{if } \tilde{u}_p \geq t + \varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

The functions ψ_ε are in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and increasingly converge to $\tilde{u}_p^{-(p-1)} \chi_{U_t}$ as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$. Moreover,

$$D\psi_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \tilde{u}_p < t \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left((p-1) \frac{t}{\tilde{u}_p} + 2 - p \right) \frac{D\tilde{u}_p}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}} & \text{if } t < \tilde{u}_p < t + \varepsilon \\ -(p-1) \frac{D\tilde{u}_p}{\tilde{u}_p^p} & \text{if } \tilde{u}_p > t + \varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

Then, choosing ψ_ε as test function in (3.2), we get that the first integral is

$$\begin{aligned}
 &-(p-1) \int_{U_{t+\varepsilon}} \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^p}{\tilde{u}_p^p} dx + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{U_t \setminus U_{t+\varepsilon}} \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^p}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}} \left((p-1) \frac{t}{\tilde{u}_p} + 2 - p \right) dx = \\
 &= -(p-1) \int_{U_{t+\varepsilon}} \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^p}{\tilde{u}_p^p} dx + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_t^{t+\varepsilon} \left((p-1) \frac{t}{\tau} + 2 - p \right) \int_{S_\tau} \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^{p-1}}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}} H(\nu) d\sigma,
 \end{aligned}$$

where last equality follows by the coarea formula. Then, reasoning similarly as in [9], we get that

$$\int_\Omega [H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^{p-1} H_\xi(D\tilde{u}_p) \cdot D\psi_\varepsilon dx \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} -(p-1) \int_{U_t} \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^p}{\tilde{u}_p^p} dx + \int_{S_t} \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^{p-1}}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}} H(\nu) d\sigma.$$

As regards the other two integrals in (3.2), we have that

$$\beta \int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{u}_p^{p-1} \psi_\varepsilon H(\nu) d\sigma = \beta \int_{\Gamma_{t+\varepsilon}} H(\nu) d\sigma + \beta \int_{\Gamma_t \setminus \Gamma_{t+\varepsilon}} \frac{u-t}{\varepsilon} H(\nu) d\sigma \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \beta \int_{\Gamma_t} H(\nu) d\sigma,$$

and, by monotone convergence theorem and the definition of ψ_ε ,

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) \int_{\Omega} \tilde{u}_p^{p-1} \psi_\varepsilon dx \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lambda_1(\Omega) |U_t|.$$

Summing the three limits, we get (5.4). \square

Theorem 5.2. *Let φ be a nonnegative function in Ω such that $\varphi \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$. If $\varphi \neq [H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^{p-1}/\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}$, where \tilde{u}_p is the eigenfunction given in Theorem 5.1, and \mathcal{F}_Ω is the functional defined in (5.3), then there exists a set $S \subset]0, 1[$ with positive measure such that for every $t \in S$ it holds that*

$$(5.5) \quad \lambda_1(\Omega) > \mathcal{F}_\Omega(U_t, \varphi).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the one obtained in [9], and we only sketch it here. It can be divided in two main steps. First, we claim that, if

$$w(x) := \varphi - \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^{p-1}}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}}, \quad I(t) := \int_{U_t} w \frac{H(D\tilde{u}_p)}{\tilde{u}_p} dx,$$

then $I:]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is locally absolutely continuous and

$$(5.6) \quad \mathcal{F}_\Omega(U_t, \varphi) \leq \lambda_1(\Omega) - \frac{1}{|U_t| t^{p-1}} \left(\frac{d}{dt} t^p I(t) \right),$$

for almost every $t \in]0, 1[$. Second, we show that the derivative in (5.6) is strictly positive in a subset of $]0, 1[$ of positive measure.

In order to prove (5.6), writing the representation formula (5.4) in terms of w , it follows that, for a.e. $t \in]0, 1[$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_\Omega(U_t, \varphi) &= \lambda_1(\Omega) + \frac{1}{|U_t|} \left(\int_{S_t} w H(\nu) d\sigma - (p-1) \int_{U_t} \left(\varphi^{p'} - \frac{[H(D\tilde{u}_p)]^p}{\tilde{u}_p^p} \right) dx \right) \\ (5.7) \quad &\leq \lambda_1(\Omega) + \frac{1}{|U_t|} \left(\int_{S_t} w H(\nu) d\sigma - p \int_{U_t} w \frac{H(D\tilde{u}_p)}{\tilde{u}_p} dx \right) \\ &= \lambda_1(\Omega) + \frac{1}{|U_t|} \left(\int_{S_t} w H(\nu) d\sigma - p I(t) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality in (5.7) follows from the inequality $\varphi^{p'} \geq v^{p'} + p' v^{p'-1}(\varphi - v)$, with $\varphi, v \geq 0$. Applying the coarea formula, it is possible to rewrite $I(t)$ as

$$I(t) = \int_{U_t} w \frac{H(D\tilde{u}_p)}{\tilde{u}_p} dx = \int_t^1 \frac{1}{\tau} d\tau \int_{S_\tau} w H(\nu) d\sigma.$$

This assures that $I(t)$ is locally absolutely continuous in $]0, 1[$ and, for almost every $t \in]0, 1[$ we have

$$-\frac{d}{dt}(t^p I(t)) = t^{p-1} \left(\int_{S_t} w H(\nu) d\sigma - p I(t) \right).$$

Substituting in (5.7), the inequality (5.6) follows. In order to conclude the proof, arguing by contradiction exactly as in [9, Theorem 3.2], it is possible to show that $G(t) := t^p I(t)$ has positive derivative in a set of positive measure. Together with (5.6), this implies (5.5). \square

6. MAIN RESULT

Now we are in position to state and prove the desired Faber-Krahn inequality.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be a bounded Lipschitz domain, and $H: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ a function with strictly convex sublevel sets which satisfies (2.1), (2.2), and (3.3). Then,*

$$(6.1) \quad \lambda_1(\Omega) \geq \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_R),$$

where \mathcal{W}_R is the Wulff shape centered at the origin such that $|\mathcal{W}_R| = |\Omega|$. The equality holds if and only if Ω is a Wulff shape.

Proof. The first step in order to prove the result is to construct a suitable test function in Ω for (5.3). Let v_p be a positive eigenfunction of the anisotropic radial problem (4.2) in \mathcal{W}_R . By Theorem 4.1, v_p is a function depending only by $H^o(x)$, and then we are able to define, as in (4.9), the function

$$\beta_r = \varphi_\star(x) = \frac{[H(Dv_p(x))]^{p-1}}{v_p(x)^{p-1}}, \quad \text{with } x \in \overline{\mathcal{W}_R}, \text{ i.e. } H^o(x) = r \in [0, R].$$

As before, let \tilde{u}_p be the first eigenfunction of (3.1) in Ω such that $\|\tilde{u}_p\|_\infty = 1$. Using the same notation of Section 5, for any $t \in]0, 1[$ we consider $\mathcal{W}_{r(t)}$, the Wulff shape centered at the origin, where $r(t)$ is the positive number such that $|U_t| = |\mathcal{W}_{r(t)}|$. Then, for $x \in \Omega$ and $\tilde{u}_p(x) = t$, we define

$$\varphi(x) := \beta_{r(t)}.$$

Similarly as in [9], φ is a measurable function. Thanks to this test function, we can compare $\mathcal{F}_\Omega(U_t, \varphi)$ with $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{W}_R}(B_{r(t)}, \varphi_\star)$. Indeed, we claim that

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_\Omega(U_t, \varphi) &\geq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_{r(t)}|} \left(-(p-1) \int_{\mathcal{W}_{r(t)}} \varphi_\star^{p'} dx + \int_{\partial \mathcal{W}_r} \varphi_\star H(\nu) d\sigma \right) \\ &= \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{W}_R}(\mathcal{W}_{r(t)}, \varphi_\star) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in]0, 1[\setminus \mathcal{Q}$, where \mathcal{Q} is the set of Lemma 5.1. In order to show (6.2), we first observe that by [32, Section 1.2.3], being $|U_t| = |\mathcal{W}_{r(t)}|$ for all $t \in]0, 1[$

$$(6.3) \quad \int_{U_t} \varphi^{p'} dx = \int_{\mathcal{W}_{r(t)}} \varphi_\star^{p'} dx.$$

Moreover, the anisotropic isoperimetric inequality (2.8), Lemma 5.1 and being, by Lemma 4.2, $\beta_{r(t)} \leq \beta$ for any t , we have that

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\partial \mathcal{W}_{r(t)}} \varphi_\star H(\nu) d\sigma &= \beta_{r(t)} \sigma_H(\partial \mathcal{W}_{r(t)}) \leq \\ &\leq \beta_{r(t)} \sigma_H(\partial U_t) \leq \beta_{r(t)} \sigma_H(S_t) + \beta_{r(t)} \sigma_H(\Gamma_t) \leq \int_{S_t} \varphi H(\nu) d\sigma + \beta \int_{\Gamma_t} H(\nu) d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, joining (6.3) and (6.4) we get (6.2). Then, applying the level set representation formula (5.4) in the anisotropic radial case, and (5.5), by (6.2) we get

$$\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_R) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{W}_R}(\mathcal{W}_{r(t)}, \varphi_\star) \leq \mathcal{F}_\Omega(U_t, \varphi) \leq \lambda_1(\Omega)$$

for some $t \in]0, 1[$, which gives (6.1).

In order to conclude the proof, we study the equality case. Let us suppose that $\lambda_1(\Omega) = \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_R)$.

We first claim that, for a.e. $t \in]0, 1[$, U_t is homothetic to a Wulff shape. Indeed, by (5.5) and (6.2)

$$\lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_R) = \lambda_1(\Omega) \geq \mathcal{F}_\Omega(U_t, \varphi) \geq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{W}_R}(\mathcal{W}_{r(t)}, \varphi_\star) = \lambda_1(\mathcal{W}_R)$$

for t in a set of positive measure $S \subset]0, 1[$. Then by Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 it follows necessarily that $\varphi = \frac{H(D\tilde{u}_p)^{p-1}}{\tilde{u}_p^{p-1}}$. This implies that for almost every $t \in]0, 1[$, the equality in (6.2) and in (6.4) holds. In particular, $\sigma_H(\partial\mathcal{W}_{r(t)}) = \sigma_H(\partial U_t)$ for a.e. t . By the equality case in the anisotropic isoperimetric inequality, we get the claim. Since U_t , $t \in]0, 1[$ are nested sets all homothetic to Wulff shapes, it follows that also $\Omega = \bigcup_{t \in]0, 1[} U_t$ is homothetic to a Wulff shape, up to a measure zero set. The Lipschitz assumption on the boundary of Ω guarantees that $\Omega = \mathcal{W}_R$, up to translations. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Alvino, V. Ferone, P.-L. Lions, and G. Trombetti. Convex symmetrization and applications. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 14(2):275–293, 1997.
- [2] B. Andrews. Volume-preserving Anisotropic Mean Curvature Flow. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 50(2):783–827, 2001.
- [3] G. Bellettini and M. Paolini. Anisotropic motion by mean curvature in the context of Finsler geometry. *Hokkaido Math. J.*, 25:537–566, 1996.
- [4] M. Belloni, V. Ferone, and B. Kawohl. Isoperimetric inequalities, Wulff shape and related questions for strongly nonlinear elliptic operators. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Physik (ZAMP)*, 54(5):771–783, 2003.
- [5] M. Belloni and B. Kawohl. A direct uniqueness proof for equations involving the p -Laplace operator. *Manuscripta Math.*, 109(2):229–231, 2002.
- [6] M. Belloni, B. Kawohl, and P. Juutinen. The p -Laplace eigenvalue problem as $p \rightarrow \infty$ in a Finsler metric. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 8(1):123–138, 2006.
- [7] M.-H. Bossel. Membranes élastiquement liés: extension du théorème de Rayleigh-Faber-Krahn et de l'inégalité de Cheeger. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 302(1):47–50, 1986.
- [8] B. Brandolini, F. Chiacchio, and C. Trombetti. Optimal lower bounds for eigenvalues of linear and nonlinear Neumann problems. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1302.1795>, pages 1–14.
- [9] D. Bucur and D. Daners. An alternative approach to the Faber-Krahn inequality for Robin problems. *Calc. Var.*, 37:75–86, 2010.
- [10] H. Busemann. The Isoperimetric Problem for Minkowski Area. *Amer. J. Math.*, 71:743–762, 1949.
- [11] F. Chiacchio and G. Di Blasio. Isoperimetric inequalities for the first Neumann eigenvalue in Gauss space. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré (C) Non Linear Analysis*, 29(2):199–216, Mar. 2012.
- [12] A. Cianchi and P. Salani. Overdetermined anisotropic elliptic problems. *Math. Ann.*, 345(4):859–881, 2009.
- [13] G. Crasta and A. Malusa. The distance function from the boundary in a Minkowski space. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 359(12):5725–5759, 2007.
- [14] M. Cuesta and P. Takáč. A strong comparison principle for positive solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Differential Integral Equations*, 13:721–746, 2000.
- [15] B. Dacorogna and C.-E. Pfister. Wulff theorem and best constant in Sobolev inequality. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 71(2):97–118, 1992.
- [16] Q.-y. Dai and Y.-x. Fu. Faber-Krahn inequality for Robin problems involving p -Laplacian. *Acta Mathematica Applicatae Sinica, English Series*, 27:13–28, 2011.
- [17] D. Daners. A Faber-Krahn inequality for Robin problems in any space dimension. *Mathematische Annalen*, 335:767–785, June 2006.
- [18] F. Della Pietra and N. Gavitone. Symmetrization for Neumann anisotropic problems and related questions. *Advanced Nonlinear Stud.*, 12(2):219–235, 2012.
- [19] F. Della Pietra and N. Gavitone. Anisotropic elliptic equations with general growth in the gradient and Hardy-type potentials. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 255:3788–3810, 2013.
- [20] F. Della Pietra and N. Gavitone. Anisotropic elliptic problems involving Hardy-type potentials. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 397(2):800–813, 2013.
- [21] F. Della Pietra and N. Gavitone. Relative isoperimetric inequality in the plane: the anisotropic case. *J. Convex. Anal.*, 20(1):157–180, 2013.
- [22] F. Della Pietra and N. Gavitone. Sharp bounds for the first eigenvalue and the torsional rigidity related to some anisotropic operators. *Math. Nachr.*, 2013.
- [23] E. DiBenedetto. $C^{1+\alpha}$ local regularity of weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 7(8):827–850, 1983.
- [24] V. Ferone and B. Kawohl. Remarks on a Finsler-Laplacian. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 137(1):247–253, 2009.

- [25] V. Ferone, C. Nitsch, and C. Trombetti. On a conjectured reverse Faber-Krahn inequality for a Steklov-type Laplacian eigenvalue. *arXiv:1307.3788*, pages 1–22, 2013.
- [26] I. Fonseca and S. Müller. A uniqueness proof for the Wulff theorem. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 119(1-2):125–136, 1991.
- [27] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Springer-Verlag, second edition, 1983.
- [28] B. Kawohl, M. Lucia, and S. Prashanth. Simplicity of the principal eigenvalue for indefinite quasilinear problems. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 12(4):407–434, 2007.
- [29] H. Kovařík. On the Lowest Eigenvalue of Laplace Operators with Mixed Boundary Conditions. *Journal of Geometric Analysis* DOI: 10.1007/s12220-012-9383-4, pages 1–17, 2012.
- [30] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya and N. N. Ural'tseva. *Linear and quasilinear elliptic equations*. Translated from the Russian by Scripta Technica, Inc. Translation editor: Leon Ehrenpreis. Academic Press, New York, 1968.
- [31] A. Lê. Eigenvalue problems for the p -Laplacian. *Nonlinear Analysis: T.M.A.*, 64(5):1057–1099, 2006.
- [32] V. G. Maz'ya. *Sobolev spaces*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [33] P. Tolksdorf. Regularity for a more general class of quasilinear elliptic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 51(1):126–150, 1984.
- [34] N. Trudinger. On Harnack type inequalities and their application to quasilinear elliptic equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 20:721–747, 1967.
- [35] G. Wang and C. Xia. A Characterization of the Wulff Shape by an Overdetermined Anisotropic PDE. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 199(1):99–115, Apr. 2010.
- [36] G. Wang and C. Xia. An optimal anisotropic Poincaré inequality for convex domains. *Pacific J. Math.*, 258(2):305–326, 2012.
- [37] H. Weinberger. An Isoperimetric Inequality for the N -dimensional free membrane problem. *J. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 5(4):633–636, 1956.

FRANCESCO DELLA PIETRA, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI “FEDERICO II”, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E APPLICAZIONI “R. CACCIOPOLI”, COMPLESSO DI MONTE SANT’ANGELO, VIA CINTIA, 80126 NAPOLI, ITALIA.

E-mail address: f.dellapietra@unina.it

NUNZIA GAVITONE, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI “FEDERICO II”, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E APPLICAZIONI “R. CACCIOPOLI”, COMPLESSO DI MONTE SANT’ANGELO, VIA CINTIA, 80126 NAPOLI, ITALIA.

E-mail address: nunzia.gavitone@unina.it