# On the torsion function with mixed boundary conditions

M. van den Berg School of Mathematics, University of Bristol Fry Building, Woodland Road, Bristol BS8 1UG United Kingdom mamvdb@bristol.ac.uk

Tom Carroll
Department of Mathematics
University College Cork
Cork, Ireland
t.carroll@ucc.ie

14 June 2020

#### Abstract

Let D be a non-empty open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $m\geq 2$ , with boundary  $\partial D$ , with finite Lebesgue measure |D|, and which satisfies a parabolic Harnack principle. Let K be a compact, non-polar subset of D. We obtain the leading asymptotic behaviour as  $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$  of the  $L^\infty$  norm of the torsion function with a Neumann boundary condition on  $\partial D$ , and a Dirichlet boundary condition on  $\partial(\varepsilon K)$ , in terms of the first eigenvalue of the Laplacian with corresponding boundary conditions. These estimates quantify those of Burdzy, Chen and Marshall who showed that  $D\setminus K$  is a non-trap domain.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 35J25, 35J05, 35P15.

**Keywords**: Torsion function, Dirichlet boundary condition, Neumann boundary condition.

### 1 Introduction and main results

Let D be an open, non-empty set in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $m \geq 2$ , with finite Lebesgue measure |D|, and let  $K \subset D$  be a compact set with boundary  $\partial K$ , and with positive logarithmic capacity if m = 2 or with positive Newtonian capacity cap (K) if  $m \geq 3$ . Let  $u_{K,D}$  be the solution of

$$-\Delta u = 1$$

with Dirichlet boundary condition

$$u(x) = 0, x \in \partial K, \tag{1}$$

and Neumann boundary condition

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial u}(x) = 0, x \in \partial D,$$
 (2)

where  $\nu$  is the inward normal. Boundary conditions (1) and (2) have to be understood in the weak sense. In particular (1) holds for all regular points of  $\partial K$ . Let  $\pi_D(x,y;t)$ ,  $x \in D$ ,  $y \in D$ , t > 0 denote the Neumann heat kernel for D. We say that the parabolic Harnack principle (PHP for short) holds in D if for some  $t_0 \in (0,\infty)$  there exists  $c_0 = c_0(D,t_0) < \infty$ , such that

$$\pi_D(x, y; t) \le c_0 \pi_D(v, w; t), t \ge t_0, x, y, v, w \in D.$$

See also [8]. As was pointed out in [4], PHP is equivalent to the following assertion: there exist  $t_1 \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $c_1 < \infty$ ,  $c_2 > 0$  depending on D such that

$$\sup_{x,y\in D} \left| \pi_D(x,y;t) - \frac{1}{|D|} \right| \le c_1 e^{-c_2 t}, \ t \ge t_1.$$
 (3)

It was shown in [4] that if D satisfies PHP then  $u_{K,D}$  is bounded, and  $D \setminus K$  is a non-trap domain. In Theorem 1 below we quantify this statement in terms of the first eigenvalue  $\lambda(K,D)$  of the Laplacian with boundary conditions (1) and (2) in the case where K is scaled down by a factor  $\varepsilon$  with respect to a fixed point (the origin) in D.

Estimates of this type are well known for the torsion function  $u_{\Omega}$  for an open set  $\Omega$  satisfying a 0 Dirichlet boundary condition on  $\partial\Omega$ . In [2] it was shown that  $u_{\Omega} \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$  if and only if  $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$ . If the latter holds then

$$\lambda(\Omega)^{-1} \le ||u_{\Omega}||_{\infty} \le \mathfrak{c}_m \lambda(\Omega)^{-1},$$

where  $\mathfrak{c}_m$  is the sharp constant defined by

$$\mathfrak{c}_m = \sup \{ \lambda(\Omega) \| u_{\Omega} \|_{\infty} : \Omega \text{ open in } \mathbb{R}^m, \lambda(\Omega) > 0 \},$$

and  $\|\cdot\|_p$  denotes the standard  $L^p$  norm,  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ .

In [2] it was shown that  $\mathfrak{c}_m \leq 4 + 3m \log 2$ . This bound has been improved since. See for example [5] and [10]. For general open, non-empty, and connected D, and a non-empty compact subset  $K \subset D$  one does not have boundedness of  $u_{K,D}$ . Examples of these trap domains were given in [4].

**Theorem 1.** Let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $m \geq 2$ , be open, non-empty, containing the origin, and let D satisfy the parabolic Harnack principle. If K is a non-polar compact subset of D, then for  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ ,

$$\lambda(\varepsilon K, D) \|u_{\varepsilon K, D}\|_{\infty} = \begin{cases} 1 + O((\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{-1/2}), & m = 2, \\ 1 + O(\varepsilon^{(m-2)/2}), & m \ge 3, \end{cases}$$
(4)

where  $\varepsilon K = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \varepsilon^{-1}y \in K\}$ . Furthermore for any non-polar compact set  $K \subset D$ ,

$$||u_{K,D}||_{\infty} \ge \frac{1}{\lambda(K,D)}.$$
 (5)

It was shown in Theorem 2.5(i) in [4] that if (3) holds, then the Neumann Laplacian on D has discrete spectrum. Sufficient geometric conditions for D to satisfy the PHP were obtained in, for example, Corollary 2.7 of [4]. Conversely PHP implies some geometric and spectral properties of D. The proposition below is of independent interest.

**Proposition 2.** Let D be open, non-empty, with  $|D| < \infty$ . If (3) holds then we have the following.

- (i) D is connected.
- (ii) The first eigenvalue of the Neumann Laplacian acting in  $L^2(D)$  has multiplicity 1.

(iii) 
$$\mu(B) \left(\frac{|B|}{|D|}\right)^{2/m} \ge \mu(D) \ge c_2, \tag{6}$$

where  $\mu(D)$  is the first non-zero eigenvalue of the Neumann Laplacian acting in  $L^2(D)$ , and B is a ball of radius 1 in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ .

#### 2 Proof of Theorem 1

In this section we prove Theorem 1.

*Proof.* Let  $\pi_{K,D}(x,y;t)$ ,  $x \in D \setminus K$ ,  $y \in D \setminus K$ , t > 0 denote the heat kernel with a Neumann boundary condition on  $\partial D$ , and with a 0 Dirichlet boundary condition on  $\partial K$ . We have for  $\delta \in (0,1)$ ,

$$u_{K,D}(x) = \int_{0}^{\infty} dt \int_{D\backslash K} dy \, \pi_{K,D}(x,y;t)$$

$$= \int_{0}^{t_{1}/(1-\delta)} dt \int_{D\backslash K} dy \, \pi_{K,D}(x,y;t) + \int_{t_{1}/(1-\delta)}^{\infty} dt \int_{D\backslash K} dy \, \pi_{K,D}(x,y;t)$$

$$\leq \int_{0}^{t_{1}/(1-\delta)} dt \int_{D\backslash K} dy \, \pi_{D}(x,y;t) + \int_{t_{1}/(1-\delta)}^{\infty} dt \int_{D\backslash K} dy \, \pi_{K,D}(x,y;t)$$

$$\leq \frac{t_{1}}{1-\delta} + \int_{t_{1}/(1-\delta)}^{\infty} dt \int_{D\backslash K} dy \, \pi_{K,D}(x,y;t). \tag{7}$$

By the heat semigroup property, and by Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality,

$$\pi_{K,D}(x,y;t) = \int_{D\backslash K} \pi_{K,D}(x,z;t/2) \,\pi_{K,D}(z,y;t/2) \,dz$$

$$\leq \left(\int_{D\backslash K} \pi_{K,D}(x,z;t/2)^2 \,dz\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{D\backslash K} \pi_{K,D}(z,y;t/2)^2 \,dz\right)^{1/2}$$

$$= \left(\pi_{K,D}(x,x;t) \,\pi_{K,D}(y,y;t)\right)^{1/2}.$$
(8)

By the spectral theorem we have

$$\pi_{K,D}(x,x;t) \le e^{-\delta t \lambda(K,D)} \pi_{K,D}(x,x;(1-\delta)t).$$
 (9)

By (8) and (9),

$$\left(\pi_{K,D}(x,y;t)\right)^{\delta} \leq e^{-\delta^{2}t\lambda(K,D)} \left(\pi_{K,D}(x,x;(1-\delta)t)\pi_{K,D}(y,y;(1-\delta)t)\right)^{\delta/2} 
\leq e^{-\delta^{2}t\lambda(K,D)} \sup_{x,y\in D} \left(\pi_{K,D}(x,y;(1-\delta)t)\right)^{\delta} 
\leq e^{-\delta^{2}t\lambda(K,D)} \sup_{x,y\in D} \left(\pi_{D}(x,y;(1-\delta)t)\right)^{\delta}.$$
(10)

By (3),

$$(\pi_D(x, y; (1 - \delta)t))^{\delta} \le \left(\frac{1}{|D|} + c_1 e^{-c_2(1 - \delta)t}\right)^{\delta}$$
$$\le \frac{1}{|D|^{\delta}} + c_1^{\delta} e^{-c_2\delta(1 - \delta)t}, \ t \ge \frac{t_1}{1 - \delta}.$$

This, together with (10), gives

$$\left(\pi_{K,D}(x,y;t)\right)^{\delta} \le e^{-\delta^2 t \lambda(K,D)} \left(\frac{1}{|D|^{\delta}} + c_1^{\delta} e^{-c_2 \delta(1-\delta)t}\right), \ t \ge \frac{t_1}{1-\delta}. \tag{11}$$

We obtain by (11), and by Hölder's inequality,

$$\int_{t_{1}/(1-\delta)}^{\infty} dt \int_{D\backslash K} dy \, \pi_{K,D}(x,y;t) 
\leq \int_{t_{1}/(1-\delta)}^{\infty} dt \int_{D\backslash K} dy \, \left(\pi_{K,D}(x,y;t)\right)^{1-\delta} e^{-\delta^{2}t\lambda(K,D)} \left(\frac{1}{|D|^{\delta}} + c_{1}^{\delta}e^{-c_{2}\delta(1-\delta)t}\right) 
\leq \int_{t_{1}/(1-\delta)}^{\infty} dt \int_{D} dy \, \left(\pi_{D}(x,y;t)\right)^{1-\delta} e^{-\delta^{2}t\lambda(K,D)} \left(\frac{1}{|D|^{\delta}} + c_{1}^{\delta}e^{-c_{2}\delta(1-\delta)t}\right) 
\leq \int_{t_{1}/(1-\delta)}^{\infty} dt \, \left(\int_{D} dy \, \pi_{D}(x,y;t)\right)^{1-\delta} |D|^{\delta} e^{-\delta^{2}t\lambda(K,D)} \left(\frac{1}{|D|^{\delta}} + c_{1}^{\delta}e^{-c_{2}\delta(1-\delta)t}\right) 
= \frac{1}{\delta^{2}\lambda(K,D)} e^{-\delta^{2}t_{1}\lambda(K,D)/(1-\delta)} 
+ c_{1}^{\delta}|D|^{\delta} \left(c_{2}\delta(1-\delta) + \delta^{2}\lambda(K,D)\right)^{-1} e^{-t_{1}(\delta c_{2} + \delta^{2}\lambda(K,D)/(1-\delta))} 
\leq \frac{1}{\delta^{2}\lambda(K,D)} + \frac{c_{1}^{\delta}|D|^{\delta}}{c_{2}\delta(1-\delta)}. \tag{12}$$

By (7) and (12),

$$u_{K,D}(x)\lambda(K,D) \le \delta^{-2} + \left(\frac{t_1}{1-\delta} + \frac{c_1^{\delta}|D|^{\delta}}{c_2\delta(1-\delta)}\right)\lambda(K,D).$$

By taking the supremum over all  $x \in D \setminus K$  we obtain

$$||u_{K,D}||_{\infty}\lambda(K,D) \leq \delta^{-2} + \left(\frac{t_1}{1-\delta} + \frac{c_1^{\delta}|D|^{\delta}}{c_2\delta(1-\delta)}\right)\lambda(K,D).$$

Hence for  $\delta \in (0,1)$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ ,

$$||u_{\varepsilon K,D}||_{\infty} \lambda(\varepsilon K,D) \le \delta^{-2} + \left(\frac{t_1}{1-\delta} + \frac{c_1^{\delta}|D|^{\delta}}{c_2\delta(1-\delta)}\right) \lambda(\varepsilon K,D).$$
 (13)

In the lemma below we obtain an upper bound for the rate at which  $\lambda(\varepsilon K, D) \downarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ .

**Lemma 3.** If D is open, non-empty in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $m \geq 3$ , with  $|D| < \infty$ , and if  $K \subset D$  with cap (K) > 0 then

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^{2-m} \lambda(\varepsilon K, D) \le \frac{\operatorname{cap}(K)}{|D|}.$$
 (14)

If D is open, non-empty in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , with  $|D| < \infty$ , and if  $K \subset D$  has strictly positive logarithmic capacity, then

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left( \log \varepsilon^{-1} \right) \lambda(\varepsilon K, D) \le \frac{2\pi}{|D|}. \tag{15}$$

We note that (i) the constants in the right-hand sides of (14) and (15) are well-known and sharp (see for example [7]), (ii) both formulae hold for arbitrary open and connected sets D with  $|D| < \infty$ , and without any regularity assumptions on  $\partial D$ . We now choose

$$\delta = 1 - |D|^{1/m} \lambda(\varepsilon K, D)^{1/2}. \tag{16}$$

Then  $\delta \in (0,1)$  for all  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small. By (13) and (16),

$$||u_{\varepsilon K,D}||_{\infty} \lambda(\varepsilon K, D) \le 1 + O(\lambda(\varepsilon K, D)^{1/2}).$$
 (17)

The proof of (5) is similar to the one of Theorem 5 in [3], and Theorem 1, (0.5) in [1]. Let  $\psi$  denote the normalised first eigenfunction (positive) of the Laplacian with Neumann and Dirichlet boundary conditions on  $\partial D$  and  $\partial K$  respectively, suppressing both K and D dependence. We have by Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality that  $\int_{D\setminus K} \psi \leq |D\setminus K|^{1/2}$ . Using

$$\psi \frac{\partial u_{K,D}}{\partial \nu} = u_{K,D} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial D \cup \partial K,$$

we obtain by Green's formula,

$$\lambda(K,D)\|u_{K,D}\|_{\infty} \int_{D\backslash K} \psi \ge \lambda(K,D) \int_{D\backslash K} u_{K,D} \psi = -\int_{D\backslash K} u_{K,D} \Delta \psi$$
$$= -\int_{D\backslash K} \psi \Delta u_{K,D} = \int_{D\backslash K} \psi.$$

This implies the assertion.

Finally (4) follows by (5), (17), and Lemma 3.

# 3 Proof of Lemma 3 and Proposition 2

Proof of Lemma 3. Recall that  $0 \in D$ , and so

$$R = \min\{|y| : y \in \partial D\} > 0.$$

Since K is compact,

$$R_K = \max\{|x| : x \in K\} < \infty.$$

Let

$$\varepsilon_1 = \min\left\{1, \frac{R}{R_K}\right\}.$$

If  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$  then  $\varepsilon K \subset B(0; R)$ . See [9] for estimates related to the proof of Lemma 3. First we consider the case  $m \geq 3$ . Let  $\mu_K$  denote the equilibrium measure of K in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , and let

$$\phi_K(x) = \frac{\Gamma((m-2)/2)}{4\pi^{m/2}} \int_K \mu_K(dy) |x-y|^{2-m}.$$

Then  $\phi_K(x) = 1$ ,  $x \in K$ ,  $0 < \phi_K < 1$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus K$ , and  $\phi_K$  is smooth on the complement of K. We use  $1 - \phi_K$  as a trial function in the Rayleigh-Ritz characterisation of  $\lambda(K, D)$ . This gives

$$\lambda(K, D) = \inf_{u \in H^{1}(D), u|_{K} = 0} \frac{\int_{D \setminus K} |\nabla u|^{2}}{\int_{D \setminus K} u^{2}}$$

$$\leq \frac{\int_{D \setminus K} |\nabla \phi_{K}|^{2}}{\int_{D \setminus K} (1 - \phi_{K})^{2}}$$

$$\leq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{m} \setminus K} |\nabla \phi_{K}|^{2}}{\int_{D \setminus K} (1 - \phi_{K})^{2}}$$

$$= \frac{\operatorname{cap}(K)}{\int_{D \setminus K} (1 - \phi_{K})^{2}}.$$
(18)

It remains to bound the denominator in the right-hand side of (18) from below. Since we will apply this lower bound with  $\varepsilon_1 K$  rather than K itself, we assume that  $K \subset B(0; R)$ . We let  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . It is a standard fact that the capacitary potential is monotone increasing in K. In particular,

$$\phi_K(x) \le \phi_{B(0;R)}(x) = \min \left\{ 1, \left( \frac{R}{|x|} \right)^{m-2} \right\}.$$

Hence

$$\int_{D\backslash K} (1 - \phi_K)^2 \ge (1 - \alpha)^2 \int_{\{\phi_K(x) \le \alpha\} \cap D} 1$$

$$\ge (1 - \alpha)^2 (|D| - |\{\phi_{B(0;R)}(x) > \alpha\}|)$$

$$\ge (1 - \alpha)^2 (|D| - \alpha^{-m/(m-2)} \omega_m R^m), \tag{19}$$

where  $\omega_m = |B_1(0)|$ . We choose  $\alpha$  such that

$$\alpha = \alpha^{-m/(m-2)} \frac{|B(0;R)|}{|D|}.$$
 (20)

This, together with (18), (19), and (20) implies

$$\lambda(K, D) \le \frac{\operatorname{cap}(K)}{|D|} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{|B(0; R)|}{|D|} \right)^{(m-2)/(2(m-1))} \right)^{-3}. \tag{21}$$

In particular for  $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ ,  $\varepsilon \varepsilon_1 K \subseteq \varepsilon B(0;R)$ , and this together with (21) gives

$$\lambda(\varepsilon\varepsilon_1 K, D) \le \frac{\operatorname{cap}(\varepsilon\varepsilon_1 K)}{|D|} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\varepsilon|B(0; R)|}{|D|}\right)^{(m-2)/(2(m-1))}\right)^{-3}.$$
 (22)

Formula (14) follows by (22), and scaling of the Newtonian capacity,

$$\operatorname{cap}(\varepsilon K) = \varepsilon^{m-2} \operatorname{cap}(K).$$

Next we consider the planar case m=2. We use Hadamard's method of descent so as to avoid logarithmic potential theory. See for example p.51 in [9]. Let  $h \geq R$ , and consider the cylinder  $(D \setminus K) \times (0,h) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ . Then the first eigenvalue of the Laplacian acting in  $L^2(D \setminus K)$  with Dirichlet boundary condition on  $\partial K$ , and Neumann boundary condition on  $\partial D$  is precisely equal to the first eigenvalue of the Laplacian acting in  $L^2((D \setminus K) \times (0,h))$  with Dirichlet boundary condition on  $\partial (K \times (0,h))$ , and Neumann boundary condition on  $\partial (D \times (0,h)) \setminus \partial (K \times (0,h))$ . We apply (21) to the setting above and obtain by monotonicity of Newtonian capacity,

$$\lambda(\varepsilon\varepsilon_1 K, D) \le \lambda(\varepsilon B(0; R), D)$$

$$\le \frac{\operatorname{cap}(B(0; \varepsilon R) \times (0, h))}{|D|h} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\varepsilon |B(0; R)|}{|D|}\right)^{1/4}\right)^{-3}. \tag{23}$$

To obtain an upper bound on cap  $(B(0; \varepsilon R) \times (0, h))$  we let  $C(R', h') \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  be an ellipsoid with a circular cross section of radius R' and axis h'. Then for a suitable translation and rotation  $C(R', h') \supset B(0; \varepsilon R) \times (0, h)$  provided

$$\frac{h^2}{h'^2} + \frac{(\varepsilon R)^2}{R'^2} \le 1. \tag{24}$$

We let  $\alpha \in (0,1)$  be arbitrary, and choose

$$R' = \varepsilon^{-\alpha}(\varepsilon R),\tag{25}$$

and

$$h' = \left(1 - \varepsilon^{2\alpha}\right)^{-1/2} h. \tag{26}$$

The choice (25)–(26) satisfies (24). For  $\frac{h'}{R'} \to \infty$ , or equivalently  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  with h fixed, we have by formula (12) on p.260 in [6],

$$\operatorname{cap}(C(R', h')) = \frac{2\pi h'}{\log(h'/R')} (1 + o(1))$$

$$\leq \frac{2\pi h}{\left(1 - \varepsilon^{2\alpha}\right)^{1/2} \log(h/R')} (1 + o(1))$$

$$\leq \frac{2\pi h}{\left(1 - \alpha\right) \left(1 - \varepsilon^{2\alpha}\right)^{1/2} \log \varepsilon^{-1}} (1 + o(1)).$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\operatorname{cap}(B(0;\varepsilon R)\times(0,h))}{|D|h} \le \frac{2\pi}{(1-\alpha)|D|\log\varepsilon^{-1}}(1+o(1)).$$

By (23),

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left( \log \varepsilon^{-1} \right) \lambda(\varepsilon \varepsilon_1 K, D) \le \frac{2\pi}{(1 - \alpha)|D|}.$$

Since  $\alpha \in (0,1)$  was arbitrary, this completes the proof of the case m=2.

Proof of Proposition 2. To prove (i) we recall that, since D is open, D is a countable union of open components. Suppose that this union contains at least two elements, one of which is C. Then both C and  $D \setminus C$  are open and nonempty. Let  $1_A$  denote the indicator function of a set A. From (3) we obtain,

$$\left| \int_C dy \, \pi_D(x, y; t) - \frac{|C|}{|D|} \right| \le c_1 |C| e^{-c_2 t}, \, t \ge t_1, \, x \in D.$$

We note that

$$q_{C,D}(x;t) = \int_C dy \, \pi_D(x,y;t)$$

is the solution of the heat equation

$$\Delta q = \frac{\partial q}{\partial t},$$

with initial condition

$$q(x;0) = 1_C(x),$$

and with a Neumann (insulating) boundary condition on  $\partial D$ . It follows that

$$q_{C,D}(x;t) = 1_C(x), t > 0.$$

From (3) we have

$$\left|1 - \frac{|C|}{|D|}\right| \le c_1 |C| e^{-c_2 t}, \ t \ge t_1, \ x \in C.$$

We conclude that, by taking the limit  $t \to \infty$ , |C| = |D|. Since  $C \subset D$ ,  $|D \setminus C| = 0$ . This contradicts  $D \setminus C$  is open and non-empty. This in turn implies that D consists of just one component C. Hence C is connected. This implies assertion (ii). To prove (iii) we have that (3) implies

$$\int_D dx \, \pi_D(x, x; t) \le 1 + c_1 |D| e^{-c_2 t}, \, t \ge t_1.$$

Hence the Neumann heat semigroup is trace-class, and

$$1 + e^{-t\mu(D)} \le \int_D dx \, \pi_D(x, x; t) \le 1 + c_1 |D| e^{-c_2 t}, \, t \ge t_1.$$
 (27)

Taking the limit  $t \to \infty$  in (27) implies the second inequality in (6). The first inequality in (6) is due to Weinberger [11].

## Acknowledgements

MvdB acknowledges support by the Leverhulme Trust through Emeritus Fellowship EM-2018-011-9.

## References

- [1] R. Bañuelos, T. Carroll, Brownian motion and the fundamental frequency of a drum. Duke Math. J. **75**, 575–602 (1994)
- [2] M. van den Berg, T. Carroll, Hardy inequality and  $L^p$  estimates for the torsion function. Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 41, 980–986 (2009)
- [3] M. van den Berg, Estimates for the torsion function and Sobolev constants. Potential Analysis **36**, 607–616 (2012)
- [4] K. Burdzy, Z.-Q. Chen, D. E. Marshall, Traps for reflected Brownian motion. Math. Z. 252, 103–132 (2006)
- [5] T. Giorgi, R. G. Smits, Principal eigenvalue estimates via the supremum of torsion. Indiana Univ. Math. J. 59, 987–1011 (2010)
- [6] K. Itô, H. P. McKean, Diffusion processes and their sample paths. Second printing, corrected. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 125. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York (1974)
- [7] S. Ozawa, The first eigenvalue of the Laplacian on two-dimensional Riemannian manifolds. Tohoku Math. J. **34**, 7–14 (1982)
- [8] L. Saloff-Coste, Precise estimates on the rate at which certain diffusions tend to equilibrium. Math. Z. **217**, 641–677 (1994)
- [9] M. E. Taylor, Estimate on the fundamental frequency of a drum. Duke Math. J. 46, 447–453 (1979)
- [10] H. Vogt,  $L_{\infty}$  estimates for the torsion function and  $L_{\infty}$  growth of semi-groups satisfying Gaussian bounds. Potential Anal. **51**, 37–47 (2019)
- [11] H. F. Weinberger, An isoperimetric inequality for the N-dimensional free membrane problem. J. Rational Mech. Anal. 5, 633–636 (1956)