arXiv:2002.05889v1 [math.AP] 14 Feb 2020

On the solvability of a two-dimensional Ventcel problem with variable coefficients

Antonio Greco* and Giuseppe Viglialoro

Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica
Università di Cagliari. Via Ospedale 72. 09124, Cagliari (Italy)

Abstract

This paper deals with the following mixed boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ u_\nu - a_2\,\Delta_\tau u + a_0\,u = g & \text{on } \Gamma_\nu, \end{cases} \tag{$\Diamond$}$$

where Ω is some bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^2$ with $\partial\Omega = \Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_\nu$, ν indicating the normal unit vector to Γ_ν and Δ_τ the Laplace–Beltrami operator along Γ_ν. Additionally, $f(\mathbf{x})$, $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$, $a_2(\mathbf{x})$, $a_0(\mathbf{x})$ and $g(\mathbf{x})$ are convenient functions defined on Ω, Γ_D and Γ_ν, and $\mathbf{x} = (x, y)$ denotes a two-dimensional array. Under suitable assumptions on the data, we first give the definition of a weak solution u to the problem and then we prove that it is uniquely solvable. Further, in the spirit of [18], we consider a particular case of ($\Diamond$) arising in real-world applications: we discuss the resulting model and provide an explicit solution.
Key-words: Ventcel boundary condition, Laplace–Beltrami operator, composite Sobolev spaces, well-posedness.
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35J25, 35M12, 35A01, 35A02.

1 Introduction and motivations

An increasing interest is currently being devoted to the Ventcel problem, which originates in the pioneering papers by Ventcel [16, 17] and Feller [6, 7], and has been recently investigated by several authors (see, for instance, [1, 4, 10, 12] and the references therein).

The Ventcel problem is a boundary-value problem of mixed type whose peculiarity relies in the fact that one of the boundary conditions involves a second-order

*Corresponding author: greco@unica.it

differentiation of the solution along a portion of the boundary; more specifically, the order of the intrinsic derivative along this part equals the one of the interior differential operator. This non-standard relation arises when modeling physical phenomena: from heat conduction processes with a heat source on the boundary to fluid-structure interaction problems (the reader can find a deep overview on these topics in [10, Section 1], and in other references therein listed). Furthermore, as far as our precise interest is concerned, the mentioned singular boundary condition also appears when looking for the equilibrium, in planar elasticity, of a prestressed membrane whose boundary is composed of rigid and cable elements. In particular, the membrane-cable interface equilibrium results in a Ventcel-type boundary condition; this is physically and mathematically discussed in [18]. More exactly, the mixed boundary value problem modeling the equilibrium of the membrane is addressed in [18] by means of a numerical strategy, leaving the theoretical questions concerning the existence and uniqueness of solutions open. This challenge was the initial motivation of our investigation, whose aim is proving such well-posedness (so giving a more complete picture on the issue) and also considering more general cases than that in [18] and not included in the known literature. In order to clarify their complementary roles, Appendix §A at the end of the paper includes some details correlating this present article and [18] as well as an example of an explicit resolution.

1.1 Formulation of the problem: some known results

Following the notation in [1] and [12], for some bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, with Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$, let Γ_ν be an open subset of $\partial\Omega$ having positive measure and such that $\Gamma_D = \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_\nu$ also has positive measure. For a convenient function $f = f(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, and boundary data $\varphi = \varphi(\mathbf{x})$ and $g = g(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma_\nu$, as well as for variable coefficients $a_2 = a_2(\mathbf{x})$ and $a_0 = a_0(\mathbf{x})$, with $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma_\nu$, we are interested in the Ventcel mixed boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f & \text{in } \Omega; \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \Gamma_D; \\ u_\nu - a_2\, \Delta_\tau\, u + a_0\, u = g & \text{on } \Gamma_\nu, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where Δ_τ is the Laplace–Beltrami operator on Γ_ν and the subscript $(\cdot)_\nu$ indicates the outward normal derivative on Γ_ν.

In order to frame our contribution in terms of what is already available in the literature, we mention some known results concerning problem (1.1):

- For $\Gamma_D = \emptyset$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with $d \geq 2$, $a_0 = \alpha > 0$ (constant), $a_2 = -\beta$ (constant) and $g \equiv 0$, well-posedness has been established independently of the sign of β: see [1] (the notation is taken from there).

- For $\Gamma_D = \emptyset$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with $d \geq 2$, $a_0 = \alpha > 0$ (constant) and $a_2 = \beta > 0$ (constant), regularity results and finite element analysis are presented in [10].

- For $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with $d = 3$, $a_0 = 0$, $a_2 = 1$ (constant) and $\varphi \equiv 0$, regularity results and a priori error analysis in polyhedral domains are obtained in [12].

1.2 Presentation of the main result: novelties and difficulties

In accordance with the previous premises, we intend to enhance the mathematical theory tied to problem (1.1) by extending some of the results summarized in the above items to the case where the coefficients associated to the Laplace–Beltrami operator effectively depend on the spatial variable. Our bibliographic research did not show any result in this direction so that, since taking a_2 explicitly varying with $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ leads to certain technical complexities, we understand that the corresponding analysis represents a novelty in the field deserving to be studied. Such an analysis deals with existence and uniqueness of a weak solution to problem (1.1) under suitable assumptions on the given functions f, g, φ and the spatial-dependent coefficients a_2 and a_0. In particular, to formulate the main claim of our work we first have to set the following precise assumption:

Assumption 1.1.

(1) *Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain (an open, connected set) in the plane, whose boundary $\partial\Omega$ properly contains a finite number $N \geq 1$ of simple C^1-curves Γ_i, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, satisfying $\Gamma_i \cap \Gamma_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$.*

(2) *By a C^1-curve Γ_i we mean the trace of a function $r = r_i(s)$ belonging to the class $C^1([0, L_i], \mathbb{R}^2)$ and satisfying $|r_i'(s)| = 1$ in the interval $[0, L_i]$. Thus, $L_i > 0$ is the length of Γ_i, and the tangent unit vector $\tau = \partial/\partial s$, as well as the outward unit vector ν extend by continuity from the interior of Γ_i to its endpoints.*

(3) *Each curve Γ_i is simple in the sense that the equality $r(s_1) = r(s_2)$ may hold for $s_1 < s_2$ only if $s_1 = 0$ and $s_2 = L$. We allow the case when $r_i(0) = r_i(L_i)$, i.e., Γ_i is a closed curve, but in such a case we require $r_i'(0) = r_i'(L_i)$: thus, τ and ν have a unique extension to the (coinciding) endpoints.*

(4) *The notation Γ_i° stands for the interior of Γ_i, which is defined as follows: $\Gamma_i^\circ = \Gamma_i \setminus \{ r_i(0), r_i(L_i) \}$ if $r_i(0) \neq r_i(L_i)$, and $\Gamma_i^\circ = \Gamma_i$ if $r_i(0) = r_i(L_i)$. We also define the open subset $\Gamma_\nu = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \Gamma_i^\circ \subset \partial\Omega$, and we assume that the closed subset $\Gamma_D = \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_\nu$ has a positive length.*

Example 1.2. *A domain fulfilling the above structure is, for instance, the annulus $\Omega = B_{R_1}(0) \setminus \overline{B}_{R_0}(0)$, with $0 < R_0 < R_1$. We may let $\Gamma_\nu = \partial B_{R_0}(0)$ and $\Gamma_D = \partial B_{R_1}(0)$, as well as $\Gamma_\nu = \partial B_{R_1}(0)$ and $\Gamma_D = \partial B_{R_0}(0)$: the last case is considered in [1, Section 2.1.2]. Another example is the square $\Omega = (0,1) \times (1,2)$, $\Gamma_i = [0,1] \times \{ i \}$, $i = 1, 2$ and $\Gamma_D = \{ 0, 1 \} \times [1, 2]$.*

In view of the above, our result is hence summarized in this

Theorem 1.3. *Let Assumption 1.1 be complied and $\varphi\colon \Gamma_D \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy a uniform Lipschitz condition. Then for any $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, $g \in L^2(\Gamma_\nu)$, $0 < a_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Gamma_\nu)$ and $0 \le a_0 \in L^\infty(\Gamma_\nu)$, problem (1.1) admits a unique weak solution.*

Remark 1.4. *Taking Assumption 1.1 (2) into account, the derivative $(u(r_i(s)))' = du(r_i(s))/ds$ of a smooth function u is denoted with $\nabla_\tau u$, the intrinsic gradient of u on Γ_i, and the second derivative $(u(r_i(s)))'' = d^2u(r_i(s))/ds^2$ with $\Delta_\tau u$, the Laplace–Beltrami operator on Γ_i. For shortness, we also write u_s and u_{ss} in place of $\nabla_\tau u$ and $\Delta_\tau u$, respectively.*

As to the first cornerstone issue (see Definition 3.2 given below), taking a_2 in a suitable function space gives the third condition in (1.1) a variational structure: namely, the condition becomes

$$u_\nu - \nabla_\tau (a_2 \nabla_\tau u) + \nabla_\tau a_2 \nabla_\tau u + a_0 u = g \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_\nu.$$

Secondly, when a_2 is constant, the coercivity of the bilinear form associated to the definition of a weak solution is essentially automatic, while in the non-constant case coercivity is gained (as shown in Lemma 4.2) by adding a convenient term to both sides of the functional equation resulting from the weak formulation of problem (1.1) so to obtain a compact resolvent operator, successively used to invoke the Fredholm alternative. The weak formulation of the problem also relies on the existence of a sufficient regular lifting of the boundary data to the whole domain: in order to make this paper self-contained, we give details in Lemma 3.1.

1.3 Non-local interpretation of the problem

To the sake of scientific completeness, we shortly mention that problem (1.1) can be rephrased in terms of a suitable non-local operator. The idea is that if the domain Ω and the boundary data φ, ψ are sufficiently smooth, then the solution u of the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f & \text{in } \Omega; \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \Gamma_D; \\ u = \psi & \text{on } \Gamma_\nu, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

is uniquely determined, and differentiable on Γ_ν. If the boundary value φ on Γ_D is kept fixed, and ψ is let vary, then the outward derivative u_ν along Γ_ν can be thought of as the outcome of an operator: namely the operator $L\colon \psi \mapsto u_\nu$, usually called *the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator* (a related operator is the *Steklov-Poincaré operator* defined in [14, pp. 3-4]). The Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator is considered in detail in [3] in the case when the bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is replaced by the half-space in $\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times (0, +\infty) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \ge 2$, and $\Gamma_D = \emptyset$. In the present case, instead, the operator L acts on functions defined on the bounded, possibly non-straight and disconnected curve Γ_ν. Such an operator is non-local in the sense that any modification of the given function ψ in a small neighborhood of any point $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Gamma_\nu$ implies

a consequent modification of the outcome u_ν on the whole Γ_ν. Under convenient assumptions, the Ventcel problem (1.1) is equivalent to the single equation

$$L\psi - a_2\,\Delta_\tau\,\psi + a_0\,\psi = g \quad \text{on } \Gamma_\nu. \tag{1.3}$$

Indeed, if u is any solution of problem (1.1), then its trace $\psi = u|_{\Gamma_\nu}$ solves equation (1.3) because $L\psi = u_\nu$. Conversely, if ψ is any solution of equation (1.3), then the solution u of the Dirichlet problem (1.2), which is used in the definition of L, is also a solution of the Ventcel problem (1.1). The peculiarity of equation (1.3) lies in the fact that the non-local operator L and the (local) Laplace–Beltrami operator are compared to each other. This approach will not be developed in the present paper; nonetheless, the transformation of a Ventcel problem into a single non-local equation is investigated in detail in [1, Section 2.2.1].

2 Poincaré-type inequalities

In this section we establish some estimates that resemble the well-known Poincaré inequality, and play a key role in the subsequent proof of uniqueness of the weak solution to problem (1.1). In particular, in Lemma 2.4 we also prove an interesting Poincaré inequality for the composite Sobolev space V_0 defined in (2.3).

Lemma 2.1 (Poincaré-type inequality in a bounded interval)**.** *Let (a,b) be a bounded interval on the real line, and let $v \in H^1((a,b))$. Since v has a continuous extension to the closed interval $[a,b]$, we may define*

$$v_0 = \min_{[a,b]} v, \qquad v_1 = \max_{[a,b]} v, \qquad \tilde{I} = \{\, s \in [a,b] \mid v_0 < v(s) < v_1 \}.$$

We claim that

$$\int_{\tilde{I}} \big(v(s) - v_0\big)^2\,ds \le |\tilde{I}|^2 \int_{\tilde{I}} (v'(s))^2\,ds, \tag{2.1}$$

where $|\tilde{I}|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of $\tilde{I}$.

Proof. If $\tilde{I} = \emptyset$, i.e., if v is constant, then (2.1) obviously holds. Otherwise we argue as follows. Let $s_0 \in [a,b]$ be any point such that $v(s) = v_0$. By the fundamental theorem of calculus we get the estimate

$$v(s) - v_0 \le \int_{s_0}^{s} |v'(t)|\,dt \le \|v'\|_{L^1((a,b))}.$$

By [8, Lemma 7.7] we have $v' = 0$ almost everywhere in $(a,b) \setminus \tilde{I}$, and hence we may replace $L^1((a,b))$ with $L^1(\tilde{I})$ in the inequality above, thus getting

$$v(s) - \inf_{(a,b)} v \le \|v'\|_{L^1(\tilde{I})}.$$

An application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality on the set $\tilde{I}$ yields $\|v'\|_{L^1(\tilde{I})} \leq \|1\|_{L^2(\tilde{I})} \|v'\|_{L^2(\tilde{I})} = |\tilde{I}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v'\|_{L^2(\tilde{I})}$. This and the preceding inequality yield the pointwise estimate

$$\big(v(s) - v_0\big)^2 \leq |\tilde{I}| \, \|v'\|^2_{L^2(\tilde{I})},$$

and (2.1) follows by integration on $\tilde{I}$. □

Corollary 2.2 (Poincaré-type inequality on a simple C^1-curve)**.** *Let Γ be the trace of a function $r = r(s)$ belonging to the class $C^1([0,L],\mathbb{R}^d)$, $L \in (0,+\infty)$, $d \geq 2$, and satisfying $|r'(s)| = 1$ in $[0,L]$. Assume that Γ is a simple curve satisfying Assumption 1.1 (3). Since each $w \in H^1(\Gamma)$ has a continuous representative, we may define*

$$w_0 = \min_{\Gamma} w, \qquad w_1 = \max_{\Gamma} w, \qquad \tilde{\Gamma} = \{\, \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma \mid w_0 < w(\mathbf{x}) < w_1 \,\}.$$

We claim that

$$\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \big(w(r(s)) - w_0\big)^2 \, ds \leq |\tilde{\Gamma}|^2 \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} |\nabla_\tau w(r(s))|^2 \, ds, \tag{2.2}$$

where $|\tilde{\Gamma}|$ denotes the Hausdorff measure of $\tilde{\Gamma}$.

Proof. Let $(a,b) = (0,L)$ and $v(s) = w(r(s))$. Since $|r'(s)| = 1$, the Hausdorff measure (or total length) of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ equals the Lebesgue measure of the set $\tilde{I}$ in Lemma 2.1. Furthermore, by the definition of the intrinsic gradient $\nabla_\tau w$ (see Remark 1.4) we have $|\nabla_\tau w(s)| = |v'(s)|$, and the conclusion is accomplished through inequality (2.1). □

In order to define an appropriate functional setting where facing problem (1.1), it is convenient to introduce the following vector spaces on a domain Ω satisfying Assumption 1.1:

$$V = \{\, v \in H^1(\Omega) \mid v_{|\Gamma_\nu} \in H^1(\Gamma_\nu) \,\},$$

and

$$V_0 = \{\, v \in H^1(\Omega) \mid v_{|\Gamma_\nu} \in H^1_0(\Gamma_\nu),\ v_{|\Gamma_D} = 0 \,\}, \tag{2.3}$$

both endowed with the norm

$$\|v\|^2_V := \int_\Omega |Du|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_\Omega u^2 \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau u|^2 \, ds + \int_{\Gamma_\nu} u^2 \, ds \tag{2.4}$$

where $Du = Du(x,y) = (u_x(x,y), u_y(x,y))$ is the gradient of u. We have:

Lemma 2.3 (Poincaré inequality for V_0)**.** *Let Ω and Γ_ν be as in Assumption 1.1, and let V_0 be given by (2.3). There exists a constant $L > 0$ such that the inequality $\|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} \leq L \, \|Dv\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ holds for every $v \in V_0$.*

Proof. By the usual Poincaré inequality (see [15, Theorem 7.91]), there exists a constant C_P such that $\|v\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C_P \|Dv\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Furthermore, by the trace inequality [15, Theorem 7.82] we also have $\|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} \leq C \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ for a convenient C, and the conclusion follows. □

Remark 2.4. *Some care is needed when dealing with the Poincaré inequality in the space V_0: in particular, it is not to be expected that $\|w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} \leq C \|\nabla_\tau w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)}$ for some constant C and for all $w \in V_0$. To construct a counterexample, let us consider the annulus $\Omega = B_{R_1}(0) \setminus \overline{B}_{R_0}(0)$, with $\Gamma_\nu = \partial B_{R_1}(0)$ and $\Gamma_D = \partial B_{R_0}(0)$ as in Example 1.2. The radial function $w(\mathbf{x}) = (|\mathbf{x}| - R_0)/(R_1 - R_0)$ belongs to V_0 and satisfies $\|w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} = |\Gamma_1|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ as well as $\|\nabla_\tau w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} = 0$. Hence a constant C as above cannot exist.*

3 Definition of weak solutions

As a consequence of Lemma 2.3, and by means of the two-dimensional Poncaré inequality, the following norm on V_0 (recall the definition in (2.3))

$$\|v\|_{V_0}^2 := \int_\Omega |Du|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau u|^2 \, ds \tag{3.1}$$

is equivalent to (2.4), and standard procedures show that $(V_0, \|\cdot\|_{V_0})$ is a weighted Sobolev space (see, for instance, [1, 4, 12]). On the other hand, we also need that the Dirichlet datum $\varphi\colon \Gamma_D \to \mathbb{R}$ in problem (1.1) has a lifting $\tilde{\varphi} \in V$, i.e., we need that φ is the trace on Γ_D of some $\tilde{\varphi} \in V$. Before proceeding further, we give a sufficient condition for φ to satisfy such a requirement:

Lemma 3.1 (Existence of a lifting)**.** *Let Assumption 1.1 be complied. If $\varphi\colon \Gamma_D \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies a uniform Lipschitz condition, then there exists $\tilde{\varphi} \in V$ such that $\varphi = \tilde{\varphi}|_{\Gamma_D}$.*

Proof. By McShane's lemma [11, Theorem 1], there exists a uniformly Lipschitz function $\tilde{\varphi}\colon \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ coinciding with φ on Γ_D. In particular, the restriction $\tilde{\varphi}|_{\Gamma_\nu}$ belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{1,\infty}(\Gamma_\nu) \subset H^1(\Gamma_\nu)$, and therefore $\tilde{\varphi} \in V$. □

3.1 The inhomogeneous problem

Following [5, (10), p. 314] and [8, (8.3)], we allow f and g be given by $f = f_1 + \operatorname{div} \mathbf{f}_2$ and $g = g_1 + \nabla_\tau g_2$. Such equalities are intended in the weak sense: namely, every choice of $f_1 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$, $\mathbf{f}_2 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $g_1, g_2 \in L^2(\Gamma_\nu)$ gives rise to two linear, continuous operators L_f, L_g acting on the function space V_0 through

$$L_f\colon w \mapsto \int_\Omega (f_1 \, w - \mathbf{f}_2 \cdot Dw) \, d\mathbf{x}, \qquad L_g\colon w \mapsto \int_{\Gamma_\nu} (g_1 \, w - g_2 \, \nabla_\tau w) \, ds.$$

For shortness, we let $\mathcal{L}w$ be the sum of the two operators above:

$$\mathcal{L}w = L_f + L_g.$$

If the boundary datum $\varphi\colon \Gamma_D \to \mathbb{R}$ has a lifting $\tilde{\varphi} \in V$, we may define the function space

$$V_\varphi = \{\, u \in H^1(\Omega) \mid u - \tilde{\varphi} \in V_0 \,\}$$

and give the definition of weak solution of problem (1.1):

Definition 3.2 (Weak solution of the inhomogeneous problem)**.** *Let Assumption 1.1 be complied and let* $f_1 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$, $\mathbf{f}_2 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$, $g_1, g_2 \in L^2(\Gamma_\nu)$, $a_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Gamma_\nu)$ *and* $a_0 \in L^\infty(\Gamma_\nu)$. *Suppose that* $\varphi\colon \Gamma_D \to \mathbb{R}$ *has a lifting* $\tilde{\varphi} \in V$. *A weak solution of problem (1.1) is a function* $u \in V_\varphi$ *such that for every* $w \in V_0$ *the following equality holds:*

$$\int_\Omega Du \cdot Dw \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Gamma_\nu} \Big(\big(a_2 \, \nabla_\tau w + w \, \nabla_\tau a_2\big) \, \nabla_\tau u + a_0 \, uw \Big) ds = \mathcal{L}w. \tag{3.2}$$

The definition is motivated by the following property:

Proposition 3.3. *Let Assumption 1.1 be complied and* $f \in C^0(\Omega)$, $g \in C^0(\Gamma_\nu)$, $a_2 \in C^1(\Gamma_\nu)$, $a_0 \in C^0(\Gamma_\nu)$ *and* $\varphi \in C^1(\Gamma_D)$. *Any function* $u \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ *is a weak solution of problem (1.1) if and only if the three equalities in (1.1) hold pointwise.*

Proof. Step 1. Let us prepare an identity to be used afterwards. By the product rule, for every $w \in V_0$ we have $\nabla_\tau\big((a_2\, w)\, \nabla_\tau u\big) = \nabla_\tau(a_2\, w)\, \nabla_\tau u + a_2\, w\, \Delta_\tau u$ in the weak sense on Γ_i, $i = 1, \dots, N$, as well as $\nabla_\tau(a_2\, w) = a_2\, \nabla_\tau w + w\, \nabla_\tau a_2$; hence

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Gamma_i} \big(a_2 \, \nabla_\tau w + w \, \nabla_\tau a_2\big) \, \nabla_\tau u \, ds &= \int_{\Gamma_i} \nabla_\tau(a_2\, w)\, \nabla_\tau u \, ds \\ &= \int_{\Gamma_i} \nabla_\tau\big((a_2\, w)\, \nabla_\tau u\big)\, ds - \int_{\Gamma_i} a_2\, w\, \Delta_\tau u \, ds. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Furthermore, by the fundamental theorem of calculus we also have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Gamma_i} \nabla_\tau\big((a_2\, w)\, \nabla_\tau u\big)\, ds = \\ &\quad a_2(r_i(L_i))\, w(r_i(L_i))\, \nabla_\tau u(r_i(L_i)) - a_2(r_i(0))\, w(r_i(0))\, \nabla_\tau u(r_i(0)) \end{aligned}$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, N$. If $r_i(0) = r_i(L_i)$, then the right-hand side obviously vanishes. If, instead, $r_i(0) \neq r_i(L_i)$, then $w(r_i(0)) = w(r_i(L_i)) = 0$ because $w \in H^1_0(\Gamma_i)$. Consequently, we arrive at

$$\int_{\Gamma_i} \nabla_\tau\big((a_2\, w)\, \nabla_\tau u\big)\, ds = 0 \text{ for every } i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Plugging this into (3.3), and summing over i leads to the identity

$$\int_{\Gamma_\nu} \big(a_2 \, \nabla_\tau w + w \, \nabla_\tau a_2\big) \, \nabla_\tau u \, ds = - \int_{\Gamma_\nu} a_2\, w\, \Delta_\tau u \, ds. \tag{3.4}$$

Step 2. Suppose that $u \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ is a weak solution of problem (1.1). Then by the definition of a weak solution we have $u \in V_\varphi$ and therefore $u = \varphi$ pointwise on Γ_D (cf. [9, Corollary 1.5.1.6]). Moreover, since $C_c^1(\Omega) \subset V_0$, we may take any $\psi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$ and let $w = \psi$ in (3.2), thus obtaining

$$\int_\Omega Du \cdot D\psi \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_\Omega f\psi \, d\mathbf{x} \quad \forall \psi \in C_c^1(\Omega),$$

which implies

$$-\Delta u = f \text{ in } \Omega \tag{3.5}$$

(see, for instance, [2, Step D, p. 293]). In order to prove the last equality in (1.1), we start from an arbitrary Lipschitz function $\eta \in W^{1,\infty}(\Gamma_\nu) \cap H_0^1(\Gamma_\nu)$ and we define $w = \eta$ on Γ_ν, $w = 0$ on Γ_D. Thus, w is Lipschitz continuous on $\partial\Omega$ and therefore, as mentioned in the proof of Lemma 3.1, it has a Lipschitz continuous lifting to the whole plane $\mathbb{R}^2$. We denote such a lifting again by w, for simplicity, and observe that $w \in V_0$. Multiplying both sides of (3.5) by w, and integrating by parts we obtain

$$\int_\Omega Du \cdot Dw \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\Gamma_\nu} wu_\nu \, ds = \int_\Omega fw \, d\mathbf{x}. \tag{3.6}$$

Recall that identity (3.2) holds for all $w \in V_0$ by assumption. By comparing (3.2) with the equality above, we deduce that

$$\int_{\Gamma_\nu} \Big(wu_\nu + \big(a_2 \nabla_\tau w + w \nabla_\tau a_2\big) \nabla_\tau u + a_0 uw \Big) ds = \int_{\Gamma_\nu} gw \, ds. \tag{3.7}$$

Since $w = \eta$ on Γ_ν, this and the identity (3.4) yield

$$\int_{\Gamma_\nu} \Big(\eta u_\nu - a_2 \eta \Delta_\tau u + a_0 u\eta \Big) ds = \int_{\Gamma_\nu} g\eta \, ds, \tag{3.8}$$

and the last equality in (1.1) follows from the fundamental lemma of the calculus of variations (see [2, Corollary 4.24]).

Step 3. Conversely, assume that a function $u \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfies the three equalities in (1.1) pointwise. Then $u \in V_\varphi$ (see again [9, Corollary 1.5.1.6], or also Theorem 9.17 and the subsequent Remark 19 in [2]). To proceed further, we multiply (3.5) by an arbitrary test function $w \in V_0$ and integrate by parts, thus obtaining (3.6). On the other side, multiplying the last equality in (1.1) by the same arbitrary w, and integrating over Γ_ν we get (3.8). This and the identity (3.4) produce (3.7), which summed to (3.6) leads to (3.2), and the proof is complete. □

3.2 The homogeneous problem

With the aid of the lifting $\tilde{\varphi} \in V$ of the boundary datum $\varphi \colon \Gamma_D \to \mathbb{R}$, we may reduce the inhomogeneous problem (1.1) to the homogeneous one

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v = f_{\tilde{\varphi}} & \text{in } \Omega; \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D; \\ v_\nu - a_2 \Delta_\tau v + a_0 v = g_{\tilde{\varphi}} & \text{on } \Gamma_\nu, \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

where $f_{\tilde{\varphi}}, g_{\tilde{\varphi}}$ denote the linear, continuous operators on V_0, respectively defined as

$$f_{\tilde{\varphi}}\colon w \mapsto L_f(w) - \int_\Omega D\tilde{\varphi}\cdot Dw\,d\mathbf{x},$$

$$g_{\tilde{\varphi}}\colon w \mapsto L_g(w) - \int_{\Gamma_\nu}\Big(a_0\,\tilde{\varphi}\,w + \big(a_2\,\nabla_\tau w + w\,\nabla_\tau a_2\big)\,\nabla_\tau\tilde{\varphi}\Big)\,ds.$$

Remark 3.4. *Any function $u \in V_{\tilde{\varphi}}$ is a weak solution of problem (1.1) if and only if the function $v = u - \tilde{\varphi} \in V_0$ is a weak solution of problem (3.9). For simplicity, in the sequel we will show that problem (1.1) is uniquely solvable by proving existence and uniqueness of a weak solution of problem (3.9).*

4 Unique solvability of the inhomogeneous problem: proof of Theorem 1.3

In this section we will focus on the analysis concerning the existence and uniqueness of solutions to problem (3.9). To this aim we first define, for any $a_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Gamma_\nu)$ and $a_0 \in L^\infty(\Gamma_\nu)$, some values which will be used throughout the main proofs. Precisely, we set

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_2 := \inf\limits_{\Gamma_\nu} a_2 > 0, \quad \Lambda_2 := \sup\limits_{\Gamma_\nu} a_2, \quad M := \sup\limits_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau a_2|\,, \\ \lambda_0 := \inf\limits_{\Gamma_\nu} a_0 \geq 0, \quad \Lambda_0 := \sup\limits_{\Gamma_\nu} a_0. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

4.1 Uniqueness of the solution

Lemma 4.1 (Uniqueness of the solution of the homogeneous problem)**.** *Let Assumption 1.1 be complied. Suppose that $0 < a_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Gamma_\nu)$ and $0 \leq a_0 \in L^\infty(\Gamma_\nu)$. If $v \in V_0$ satisfies*

$$\int_\Omega Dv\cdot Dw\,d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Gamma_\nu}\Big(\big(a_2\,\nabla_\tau w + w\,\nabla_\tau a_2\big)\,\nabla_\tau v + a_0\,vw\Big)\,ds = 0 \tag{4.2}$$

for every $w \in V_0$, then v vanishes almost everywhere in Ω.

Proof. Before proceeding further, observe that if $v \in V_0$ fulfills relation (4.2) for every $w \in V_0$, and if furthermore $\nabla_\tau v$ vanishes a.e. on Γ_ν, then

$$\int_\Omega Dv\cdot Dw\,d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Gamma_\nu} a_0\,vw\,ds = 0.$$

In such a case, choosing $w = v$ and recalling that $a_0 \geq 0$ on Γ_ν, it follows that $v = 0$. Hence, in order to prove the lemma, we consider an arbitrary $v \in V_0$ satisfying (4.2) for every $w \in V_0$, and show that $\nabla_\tau v = 0$ a.e. on Γ_ν. Suppose, by contradiction, that there exists a positive integer $N_1 \leq N$ such that the oscillation ω_i given by

$$\omega_i = \max_{\Gamma_i} v - \min_{\Gamma_i} v$$

is positive if and only if $i \le N_1$ (see Figure 1). Since N_1 is a finite number, there exists a positive ε_0 such that $\omega_i \ge \varepsilon_0$ for every $i \le N_1$. Observe that at least one of the following two inequalities must hold:

$$\mu_1 := \max_{1\le i\le N_1} \max_{\Gamma_i} v > 0; \qquad \min_{1\le i\le N_1} \min_{\Gamma_i} v < 0.$$

We consider the first case, the second one being analogous. Furthermore, without loss of generality we assume that μ_1 is attained on Γ_1. By the definition of μ_1 and ε_0, for every $i = 1, \dots, N_1$ we have

$$\min_{\Gamma_i} v \le \max_{\Gamma_i} v - \varepsilon_0 \le \mu_1 - \varepsilon_0$$

and therefore

$$\min_{\Gamma_1} v \le \max_{1\le i\le N_1} \min_{\Gamma_i} v =: \mu_0 \le \mu_1 - \varepsilon_0 < \mu_1 = \max_{\Gamma_1} v. \tag{4.3}$$

Arguing as in [8, Theorem 8.1] and in [13, Theorem 3.2.1], let us define $\mu_0^+ = \max\{\,\mu_0, 0\,\}$ and choose a real number k in the open interval (μ_0^+, μ_1). Consider




Figure 1: Sample profile of v on the (rectified) curves Γ_1, Γ_2 ($N_1 = 1$)

the function $w = (v - k)^+$. Since k is positive, we have $w \in V_0$. Apart from a negligible set, the gradient Dw in Ω is given by

$$Dw(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} Dv(\mathbf{x}), & \text{if } v(\mathbf{x}) > k, \\ 0, & \text{if } v(\mathbf{x}) \le k, \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

and a similar representation holds for $\nabla_\tau w$ on Γ_ν. In particular, we have

$$\nabla_\tau w\, \nabla_\tau v = |\nabla_\tau w|^2, \qquad w\, \nabla_\tau v = w\, \nabla_\tau w \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma_\nu.$$

As a consequence of position (4.4), the first integral in (4.2) is non-negative, and hence

$$\int_{\Gamma_\nu} \left(a_2 \nabla_\tau w + w\, \nabla_\tau a_2\right) \nabla_\tau v\, ds + \int_{\Gamma_\nu} a_0\, vw\, ds \le 0. \tag{4.5}$$

Let us focus on the product vw. By definition, the function $w = (v - k)^+$ is either positive or zero. When w vanishes, the product vw obviously vanishes. When w

is positive, instead, $v - k$ is also positive and therefore $v > k > 0$. In conclusion, we have $vw \geq 0$ on Γ_ν. Since $a_0 \geq 0$, it follows that the last integral in (4.5) is non-negative, and therefore we arrive at

$$\int_{\Gamma_\nu} a_2 \, |\nabla_\tau \, w|^2 \, ds \leq \int_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau \, a_2| \, |\nabla_\tau \, w| \, w \, ds.$$

Let $C = \max\{\, 1, \, M/\lambda_2 \,\}$, where M, λ_2 are as in (4.1). In particular, we are assuming $\lambda_2 > 0$ (ellipticity). With this notation, we may write

$$\int_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau \, w|^2 \, ds \leq C \int_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau \, w| \, w \, ds. \tag{4.6}$$

We aim to replace the domain of integration Γ_ν with the set $\tilde{\Gamma} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_1} \tilde{\Gamma}_i$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Gamma}_i &= \{\, \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma_i \mid 0 < w(\mathbf{x}) < \max_{\Gamma_i} w \,\} \\ &= \{\, \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma_i \mid k < v(\mathbf{x}) < \max_{\Gamma_i} v \,\}, \;\; i = 1, \ldots, N_1. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, $\tilde{\Gamma}_i$ is a (possibly empty) relatively open subset of Γ_i. Furthermore, the equality $\|\nabla_\tau \, w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Gamma}_i)} = \|\nabla_\tau \, w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_i)}$ holds because $\nabla_\tau \, w$ vanishes almost everywhere in $\Gamma_i \setminus \tilde{\Gamma}_i$ (see [8, Lemma 7.7]). Since $\nabla_\tau \, w = 0$ on Γ_i for $i > N_1$, inequality (4.6) implies

$$\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} |\nabla_\tau \, w|^2 \, ds \leq C \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} |\nabla_\tau \, w| \, w \, ds. \tag{4.7}$$

In order to estimate the last integral, using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ we get

$$\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} |\nabla_\tau \, w| \, w \, ds \leq \|\nabla_\tau \, w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Gamma})} \, \|w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Gamma})}.$$

By (4.3), $\nabla_\tau \, w$ cannot vanish identically in $\tilde{\Gamma}_1$, hence $\|\nabla_\tau \, w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Gamma})} > 0$. Thus, the inequality above and (4.7) imply

$$\|\nabla_\tau \, w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Gamma})} \leq C \, \|w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Gamma})}. \tag{4.8}$$

Let us estimate the last term. For every $i = 1, \ldots, N_1$ we have $k > \mu_0^+ \geq \min_{\Gamma_i} v$, and consequently $\min_{\Gamma_i} w = 0$. Hence by relation (2.2) we get $\|w\|^2_{L^2(\tilde{\Gamma}_i)} \leq |\tilde{\Gamma}_i|^2 \, \|\nabla_\tau \, w\|^2_{L^2(\tilde{\Gamma}_i)}$, and by summation over $i = 1, \ldots, N_1$

$$\|w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Gamma})} \leq |\tilde{\Gamma}| \, \|\nabla_\tau \, w\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Gamma})}.$$

This and (4.8) imply $C \, |\tilde{\Gamma}| \geq 1$. By contrast, we now check that $|\tilde{\Gamma}| \searrow 0$ as $k \nearrow \mu_1$. To see this, it suffices to observe that when k increases, the corresponding set

$\tilde{\Gamma} = \tilde{\Gamma}(k)$ describes a decreasing family of open subsets of Γ_ν with finite Hausdorff measure, and by the continuity of the measure we have

$$\lim_{k \nearrow \mu_1} |\tilde{\Gamma}(k)| = \left| \bigcap_{k \in (\mu_0^+, \mu_1)} \tilde{\Gamma}(k) \right| = |\emptyset| = 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Thereafter, the unique function $v \in V_0$ satisfying (4.2) for every $w \in V_0$ is the null function. □

4.2 Existence of a solution

Let us now turn our attention to the question concerning the existence of solutions to the homogeneous problem (3.9). To this aim, we have to recall that the composite Sobolev space V_0 introduced in (2.3) was endowed with the norm (3.1). We first start with this

Lemma 4.2. *Let Assumption 1.1 be complied. Suppose that* $0 < a_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Gamma_\nu)$, $a_0 \in L^\infty(\Gamma_\nu)$ *and for* V_0 *as in* (2.3) *let us consider the bilinear form* $\mathfrak{B} \colon V_0 \times V_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ *given by*

$$\mathfrak{B}(v,w) = \int_\Omega Dv \cdot Dw \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Gamma_\nu} a_2 \, \nabla_\tau v \, \nabla_\tau w \, ds + \int_{\Gamma_\nu} (\nabla_\tau \, a_2 \, \nabla_\tau v) w \, ds + \int_{\Gamma_\nu} a_0 \, vw \, ds.$$

Then, for λ_0, λ_2 *and* M *defined in* (4.1) *the bilinear form*

$$\mathfrak{B}_{\sigma_0}(v,w) := \begin{cases} \mathfrak{B}(v,w) + \sigma_0 \int_{\Gamma_\nu} vw \, ds & \text{if } \sigma_0 > 0, \\ \mathfrak{B}(v,w) & \text{if } \sigma_0 \le 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{where} \quad \sigma_0 = \frac{M^2}{2\lambda_2} - \lambda_0,$$

is continuous and coercive.

Proof. Part 1. Continuity. From the definition of $\mathfrak{B}$, we directly have by means of the the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and (4.1)

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{B}(v,w)| &\le \int_\Omega |Dv \cdot Dw| \, d\mathbf{x} + \Lambda_2 \int_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau v| |\nabla_\tau w| \, ds \\ &\quad + M \int_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau \, v| \, |w| \, ds + \Lambda_0 \int_{\Gamma_\nu} |v| \, |w| \, ds \\ &\le \|Dv\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \, \|Dw\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \Lambda_2 \, \|\nabla_\tau \, v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} \, \|\nabla_\tau \, w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} \\ &\quad + M \, \|\nabla_\tau \, v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} \, \|w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} + \Lambda_0 \, \|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} \, \|w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

On the other hand, applications of Lemma 2.3 lead to $\|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} \le L \, \|Dv\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and $\|w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} \le L \, \|Dw\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. These inequalities in conjunction with (4.9) yield for some positive k

$$|\mathfrak{B}(v,w)| \le k \, \|v\|_{V_0} \, \|w\|_{V_0}.$$

Further, for all $v, w \in V_0$ we similarly have

$$\int_{\Gamma_\nu} vw ds \leq \|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)} \|w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\nu)}.$$

As an immediate consequence of this, by invoking again Lemma 2.3, as well as recalling definition (3.1), it holds that

$$|\mathfrak{B}_{\sigma_0}(v,w)| \leq |\mathfrak{B}(v,w)| + \left|\sigma_0 \int_{\Gamma_\nu} vw ds\right| \leq L_1 \|v\|_{V_0} \|w\|_{V_0} \quad \text{for all } v, w \in V_0,$$

where L_1 is some positive constant. Hence $\mathfrak{B}_{\sigma_0}$ is continuous.

Part 2. Coercivity. Again in light of positions (4.1) we directly have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Gamma_\nu} a_2 |\nabla_\tau v|^2 \, ds + \int_{\Gamma_\nu} (\nabla_\tau a_2 \nabla_\tau v) \, v \, ds + \int_{\Gamma_\nu} a_0 v^2 \, ds \\ &\geq \lambda_2 \int_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau v|^2 \, ds - M \int_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau v| \, |v| \, ds + \lambda_0 \int_{\Gamma_\nu} v^2 \, ds. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Now if $M = 0$ then $\sigma_0 \leq 0$ and therefore

$$\mathfrak{B}_{\sigma_0}(v,v) = \mathfrak{B}(v,v) \geq \int_\Omega |Dv|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} + \lambda_2 \int_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau v|^2 \, ds \geq L_2 \|v\|^2_{V_0}$$

where $L_2 = \min\{1, \lambda_2\} > 0$, hence $\mathfrak{B}_{\sigma_0}$ is coercive. If, instead, $M > 0$, then we let $\varepsilon = \lambda_2/(2M)$ in the Young inequality and obtain $|\nabla_\tau v| \, |v| \leq \varepsilon |\nabla_\tau v|^2 + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon} v^2$. By plugging such an estimate into (4.10), we arrive at

$$\mathfrak{B}(v,v) \geq \int_\Omega |Dv|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \int_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau v|^2 \, ds - \left(\frac{M^2}{2\lambda_2} - \lambda_0\right) \int_{\Gamma_\nu} v^2 \, ds$$

and for $L_3 = \min\{1, \frac{\lambda_2}{2}\} > 0$ we may write

$$\mathfrak{B}_{\sigma_0}(v,v) \geq \int_\Omega |Dv|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \int_{\Gamma_\nu} |\nabla_\tau v|^2 \, ds \geq L_3 \|v\|^2_{V_0}.$$

Hence $\mathfrak{B}_{\sigma_0}$ is coercive also in this case, and the proof is complete. □

Lemma 4.3 (Unique solvability of the homogeneous problem)**.** *Let Assumption 1.1 be complied. Suppose that* $0 < a_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Gamma_\nu)$ *and* $0 \leq a_0 \in L^\infty(\Gamma_\nu)$*. Then problem* (3.9) *admits a unique weak solution.*

Proof. We rely on the properties of the bilinear form $\mathfrak{B}_{\sigma_0}(v,w)$ introduced in Lemma 4.2. For $\sigma_0 \leq 0$, equation (3.2) may be rewritten as $\mathfrak{B}_{\sigma_0}(v,w) = \mathcal{L}w$, and existence and uniqueness of the solution v follow immediately from the Lax-Milgram theorem. If, instead, $\sigma_0 > 0$, then we invoke the Fredholm alternative [8, Theorem 5.3] (see also [5, Section D.5]). To be precise, solving equation (3.2) is equivalent to finding $v \in V_0$ such that

$$\mathfrak{B}_{\sigma_0}(v,w) = \mathcal{L}w + \sigma_0 \int_{\Gamma_\nu} vw \, ds \quad \forall \, w \in V_0. \tag{4.11}$$

By the Lax-Milgram theorem we may define the linear, continuous operator $T\colon V_0^* \to V_0$ given by $T(L) = v_L$, where v_L is the unique solution of the equation $\mathfrak{B}_{\sigma_0}(v,w) = Lw$ in the unknown v. For every $v \in V_0$ we also define the linear, continuous operator $I_v \in V_0^*$ given by

$$I_v\, w = \int_{\Gamma_\nu} vw\, ds.$$

Consequently, relation (4.11) can be rewritten as

$$v = T(\mathcal{L}) + \sigma_0\, T(I_v).$$

Existence and uniqueness of a solution v follow from the Fredholm alternative provided we ensure that

(i) the homogeneous equation $v = \sigma_0\, T(I_v)$ has only the trivial solution;

(ii) the operator $K\colon v \mapsto T(I_v)$ is compact.

Condition (i) was already established in Lemma 4.1. To check (ii), take a bounded sequence (v_n) in V_0. By Lemma 2.3, the traces $v_{n|\Gamma_\nu}$ are uniformly bounded in $H_0^1(\Gamma_\nu)$, hence there exists a subsequence of functions still denoted by v_n whose traces on Γ_ν converge to some v_∞ in $L^2(\Gamma_\nu)$. Henceforth, the operators I_{v_n} converge to I_{v_∞} in the norm of the dual space V_0^*. Since the operator T is continuous, the sequence of functions $K(v_n) = T(I_{v_n})$ converges in V_0. In conclusion, K is a compact operator, and the lemma follows from the Fredholm theorem. □

As a consequence of all the above preparations, we finally can prove our main statement:

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The assumption on φ implies by means of Lemma 3.1 the existence of a lifting $\tilde{\varphi} \in V$. Hence, the considerations presented in Remark 3.4 convert problem (1.1) into a homogeneous problem having the form (3.9). Finally, Lemma 4.3 ensures its unique solvability. □

A An application to the equilibrium problem for a prestressed membrane

As announced in §1, let us dedicate to the interplay between **Equilibrium Problem 1** in [18, Section 3.1] and problem (1.1), exactly by presenting the formulation of the former in terms of the nomenclature employed in the present paper. We consider a plane domain Ω satisfying Assumption 1.1, and we restrict to the case when Γ_ν is a curve parametrized by a vector-valued function $r(t) = (x(t), y(t))$ belonging to $C^2((t_0,t_1)) \cap C^1([t_0,t_1])$ and satisfying $r'(t) \neq 0$ for all t in some bounded interval $[t_0,t_1]$ on the real line, with $t_0 < t_1$.

Expression of the Laplace-Beltrami operator. Let us consider a function $u \in C^2((\Omega \cup \Gamma_\nu)$, and recall that the arc length along the curve Γ_ν is given by

$$s(t) = \int_{t_0}^{t} \sqrt{(x'(\xi))^2 + (y'(\xi))^2}\, d\xi.$$

Since $r'(t) \neq 0$, the function $s(t)$ admits a smooth inverse $t = t(s)$, so yielding (recall Remark 1.4) the following representation of the Laplace–Beltrami operator of u along the one-dimensional manifold Γ_ν:

$$\Delta_\tau u = u_{ss} = \frac{d^2}{ds^2}\, u(x(t(s)),\, y(t(s))). \tag{A.1}$$

It is essential for our purposes to express $\Delta_\tau u$ in terms of the partial derivatives of u with respect to the Cartesian coordinates x, y, the outward derivative u_ν, and the curvature κ of the curve Γ_ν, given by

$$\kappa(t) = \frac{x'(t)\, y''(t) - y'(t)\, x''(t)}{\big((x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2\big)^{3/2}}, \quad t \in (t_0, t_1). \tag{A.2}$$

To this purpose, we will make use of this obvious identity

$$\frac{d}{dt} = \sqrt{(x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2}\, \frac{d}{ds}. \tag{A.3}$$

Furthermore, for every point $(x, y) = (x(t), y(t)) \in \Gamma_\nu$, and by introducing the tangent unit vector to Γ_ν

$$\tau := \tau(t) = \frac{(x'(t), y'(t))}{\sqrt{(x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2}}, \quad t \in (t_0, t_1), \tag{A.4}$$

we let

$$\begin{aligned} u_\tau &= \tau \cdot Du(x(t), y(t)) \\ &= \frac{x'(t)\, u_x(x(t), y(t)) + y'(t)\, u_y(x(t), y(t))}{\sqrt{(x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2}}, \quad t \in (t_0, t_1), \end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\tau\tau} &= \tau \cdot D^2 u(x(t), y(t))\, \tau^T \\ &= \frac{(x'(t))^2\, u_{xx}(x(t), y(t)) + 2\, x'(t)\, y'(t)\, u_{xy}(x(t), y(t))}{(x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{(y'(t))^2\, u_{yy}(x(t), y(t))}{(x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2}, \quad t \in (t_0, t_1), \end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

where $Du(x, y) = (u_x(x, y),\, u_y(x, y))$ is the gradient of u, $D^2u(x, y)$ the Hessian matrix and τ^T the transposed of τ. The following lemma shows the relation between u_{ss}, $u_{\tau\tau}$ and the outward derivative of u on Γ_ν, explicitly given by

$$u_\nu = \frac{x'(t)\, u_y(x(t), y(t)) - y'(t)\, u_x(x(t), y(t))}{\sqrt{(x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2}}, \quad t \in (t_0, t_1). \tag{A.7}$$

Lemma A.1. *If $u \in C^2(\Omega \cup \Gamma_\nu)$, then $u_{ss} = u_{\tau\tau} + \kappa(t)\, u_\nu$ on Γ_ν.*

Proof. By computing the derivative in the right-hand side of $u_s = \frac{d}{ds}\, u(x(t(s)), y(t(s)))$, and taking (A.3) into account, we find for all $t \in (t_0, t_1)$

$$\sqrt{(x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2}\; u_s = x'(t)\, u_x(x(t), y(t)) + y'(t)\, u_y(x(t), y(t)), \tag{A.8}$$

which in particular shows due to (A.5) that $u_s = u_\tau$. Differentiating both sides of (A.8) with respect to t yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{x'(t)\, x''(t) + y'(t)\, y''(t)}{\sqrt{(x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2}}\, u_s + \big((x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2\big)\, u_{ss} \\
&= (x'(t))^2\, u_{xx}(x(t), y(t)) + 2\, x'(t)\, y'(t)\, u_{xy}(x(t), y(t)) + (y'(t))^2\, u_{yy}(x(t), y(t)) \\
&\quad + x''(t)\, u_x(x(t), y(t)) + y''(t)\, u_y(x(t), y(t)), \quad t \in (t_0, t_1).
\end{aligned}$$

By dividing both sides by $(x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2$ and using relation (A.6), the last equality becomes, on (t_0, t_1),

$$\frac{x'(t)\, x''(t) + y'(t)\, y''(t)}{((x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\, u_s + u_{ss} = u_{\tau\tau} + \frac{x''(t)\, u_x(x(t), y(t)) + y''(t)\, u_y(x(t), y(t))}{(x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2}.$$

Finally, taking (A.2) and (A.8) into consideration, we arrive at

$$u_{ss} = u_{\tau\tau} + \kappa(t)\, \frac{x'(t)\, u_y(x(t), y(t)) - y'(t)\, u_x(x(t), y(t))}{\sqrt{(x'(t))^2 + (y'(t))^2}}, \quad t \in (t_0, t_1),$$

and the lemma follows thanks to (A.7). □

Setting the domain. In view of the example below we assume strict convexity of the curve Γ_ν, in the sense that $\kappa(t) > 0$ for all $t \in (t_0, t_1)$. We also suppose

$$x(t_0) < 0, \quad x(t_1) > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad x'(t), y(t) > 0 \text{ for all } t \in (t_0, t_1).$$

By setting

$$\begin{cases}
\Gamma_\nu = \{\, (x(t), y(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid t \in (t_0, t_1) \,\}, \\
\Gamma_D = \{\, (x(t_0), t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid 0 \le t \le y(t_0) \,\} \\
\qquad\quad \cup \{\, (t, 0)) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid t \in (x(t_0), x(t_1)) \,\} \\
\qquad\quad \cup \{\, (x(t_1), t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid 0 \le t \le y(t_1) \,\},
\end{cases} \tag{A.9}$$

we consider the planar, non-empty, open and bounded domain Ω, uniquely determined by the condition $\partial\Omega = \Gamma_\nu \cup \Gamma_D$. In these circumstances, the equilibrium of a prestressed membrane obeys an elliptic equation in Ω for the unknown $u\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ (whose graph represents the shape of the membrane) endowed with a classical Dirichlet condition on Γ_D (rigid boundaries, with their own stiffness), which basically fixes the shape of the membrane on the portion Γ_D, and a Ventcel-type one on Γ_ν (non-rigid boundaries, *without any stiffness*), idealizing the physical equilibrium for cable elements.

The mixed boundary value problem. As discussed in [18, Section 2.2.2], the introduction of a cable boundary as a structural element providing equilibrium to a membrane requires a restriction on its shape, which is modeled by the convexity assumption $\kappa(t) > 0$, and the so-called *cable-membrane compatibility equation* $u_{\tau\tau} = 0$ along Γ_ν (see [18, relation (5)] for a particular parametrization of Γ_ν). Recalling Lemma A.1 and relation (A.1), we have

$$u_{\tau\tau} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad u_\nu - \frac{1}{\kappa(x)}\,\Delta_\tau u = 0.$$

Now consider the most simplified case of **Equilibrium Problem 1** in [18, Section 3.1], which is obtained when $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = c\mathbf{1}$. The problem corresponds to the equilibrium of a membrane tensioned with the same stress $c > 0$ in the two main orthogonal directions and not exposed to external loads. The comments above make such a problem read as follows: fixed a sufficiently regular function $\varphi\colon \Gamma_D \to \mathbb{R}$, find u such that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega; \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \Gamma_D; \\ u_\nu - \frac{1}{\kappa(x)}\,\Delta_\tau u = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_\nu. \end{cases}$$

This is manifestly a special case of problem (1.1), which is well-posed by virtue of Theorem 1.3.

Example of an explicit solution. For $r(t) = (x(t), y(t))$ with

$$(x(t), y(t)) = \frac{(t, 1)}{(2 - \rho(t))^{\frac{2}{3}}\,(1 + \rho(t))^{\frac{1}{3}}}, \quad \rho(t) = \sqrt{1 + t^2}, \quad t \in (-1, 1),$$

let us define Γ_ν, Γ_D as in (A.9), so that the domain Ω is the open and bounded set with boundary $\partial\Omega = \Gamma_\nu \cup \Gamma_D$. By differentiation we find

$$\begin{cases} x'(t) = y(t) + t\,y'(t), \\ y'(t) = t\,(2 - \rho(t))^{-\frac{5}{3}}\,(1 + \rho(t))^{-\frac{4}{3}} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} x''(t) = 2y'(t) + t\,y''(t) \\ y''(t) = (\rho(t))^{-1}\,(2 - \rho(t))^{-\frac{8}{3}}\,(1 + \rho(t))^{-\frac{7}{3}}\,(1 - \rho + 2\rho^3) \end{cases}$$

In order to compute $\kappa(t)$ from (A.2), we prepare the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} x'(t)\,y''(t) - y'(t)\,x''(t) &= y(t)\,y''(t) - 2(y'(t))^2 \\ &= (\rho(t))^{-1}\,(2 - \rho(t))^{-\frac{10}{3}}\,(1 + \rho(t))^{-\frac{5}{3}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(x'(t))^2+(y'(t))^2 &= y^2(t)+2t\,y(t)\,y'(t)+\rho^2(t)\,(y'(t))^2\\ &= 2\rho(t)\,(2-\rho(t))^{-\frac{10}{3}}\,(1+\rho(t))^{-\frac{5}{3}}\end{aligned}$$

which imply

$$\kappa(t)=\frac{(2-\rho(t))^{\frac{5}{3}}\,(1+\rho(t))^{\frac{5}{6}}}{2^{\frac{3}{2}}\,\rho^{\frac{5}{2}}(t)}>0,\quad t\in(-1,1).$$

The tangent unit vector to Γ_ν, whose expression is found in (A.4), reads as

$$\tau=\frac{\big(y(t)+t\,y'(t),\,y'(t)\big)}{(2\rho(t))^{\frac{1}{2}}\,(2-\rho(t))^{\frac{5}{3}}\,(1+\rho(t))^{\frac{5}{6}}}=\frac{(1+\rho(t),\,t)}{\sqrt{2\rho(t)\,(1+\rho(t))}},\quad t\in(-1,1).$$

Additionally, let us give on Ω the smooth function $u(\mathbf{x})=u(x,y)=x^3-3xy^2$. We obviously have

$$D^2u(x,y)=6\begin{pmatrix}x & -y\\ -y & -x\end{pmatrix}\quad\forall\,\mathbf{x}\in\Omega,$$

and therefore

$$D^2u(x(t),y(t))=6\,y(t)\begin{pmatrix}t & -1\\ -1 & -t\end{pmatrix},\quad t\in(-1,1),$$

from the expression of τ it is entailed that (recall (A.6)) $u_{\tau\tau}=0$ for all t in $(-1,1)$; henceforth, we conclude that u classically solves

$$\begin{cases}\Delta u=0 & \text{in }\Omega;\\ u(x,0)=x^3 & \text{for } x\in(x(-1),x(1));\\ u(x(-1),y)=-\dfrac{1}{2}-\dfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}+\dfrac{3y^2}{\big(2-\sqrt{2}\big)^{2/3}\,\big(1+\sqrt{2}\big)^{1/3}} & \text{for } y\in[x(-1),y];\\ u(x(1),y)=\dfrac{1}{2}+\dfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}-\dfrac{3y^2}{\big(2-\sqrt{2}\big)^{2/3}\,\big(1+\sqrt{2}\big)^{1/3}} & \text{for } y\in[x(1),y];\\ u_{\tau\tau}=u_\nu-\dfrac{1}{\kappa(t)}\,\Delta_\tau u=0 & \text{on }\Gamma_\nu.\end{cases}$$

Acknowledgements

The authors are members of the Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM) and are partially supported by the research projects *Integro-differential Equations and Non-Local Problems*, funded by Fondazione di Sardegna (2017). GV is partially supported by MIUR (Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research) Prin 2017 *Nonlinear Differential Problems via Variational, Topological and Set-valued Methods* (Grant Number: 2017AYM8XW).

References

[1] V. Bonnaillie-Noël, M. Dambrine, F. Hérau, and G. Vial. On generalized Ventcel's type boundary conditions for Laplace operator in a bounded domain. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 42(2):931–945, 2010.

[2] H. Brezis. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*. Universitext. Springer, New York, 2011.

[3] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre. An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian. *Comm. Part. Diff. Eq.*, 32(7-9):1245–1260, 2007.

[4] S. Creo, M. R. Lancia, A. Nazarov, and P. Vernole. On two-dimensional nonlocal Venttsel' problems in piecewise smooth domains. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S.*, 12(1):57–64, 2019.

[5] L. C. Evans. *Partial Differential Equations*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2010.

[6] W. Feller. The parabolic differential equations and the associated semi-groups of transformations. *Ann. of Math.*, 55:468–519, 1952.

[7] W. Feller. Generalized second order differential operators and their lateral conditions. *Illinois J. Math.*, 1:459–504, 1957.

[8] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order, 2nd ed.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.

[9] P. Grisvard. *Elliptic Problems in Nonsmooth Domains*. Pitman, Boston, 1985.

[10] T. Kashiwabara, C. M. Colciago, L. Dedè, and A. Quarteroni. Well-posedness, regularity, and convergence analysis of the finite element approximation of a generalized Robin boundary value problem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 53(1):105–126, 2015.

[11] E. J. McShane. Extension of range of functions. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 40 (12):837–842, 1934.

[12] S. Nicaise, H. Li, and A. Mazzucato. Regularity and a priori error analysis of a Ventcel problem in polyhedral domains. *Math. Method. Appl. Sci.*, 40(5):1625–1636, 2017.

[13] P. Pucci and J. Serrin. *The Maximum Principle*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications, volume 73. Birkhäuser, 2007.

[14] A. Quarteroni and A. Valli. *Domain Decomposition Methods for Partial Differential Equations*. Clarendon Press, 1999.

[15] S. Salsa. *Partial Differential Equations in Action. From Modelling to Theory, 3rd ed.* Springer International Publishing, Switzerland, 2016.

[16] A. D. Ventcel'. Semigroups of operators that correspond to a generalized differential operator of second order. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)*, 111:269–272, 1956.

[17] A. Venttsel'. On boundary conditions for multidimensional diffusion processes. *Theor. Probab. Appl.*, 4(2):164–177, 1959.

[18] G. Viglialoro, A. González, and J. Murcia. A mixed finite-element finite-difference method to solve the equilibrium equations of a prestressed membrane having boundary cables. *Int. J. Comput. Math.*, 94(5):933–945, 2017.