

A TWO-PHASE PROBLEM WITH ROBIN CONDITIONS ON THE FREE BOUNDARY

SERENA GUARINO LO BIANCO, DOMENICO ANGELO LA MANNA, BOZHIDAR VELICHKOV

ABSTRACT. We study for the first time a two-phase free boundary problem in which the solution satisfies a Robin boundary condition. We consider the case in which the solution is continuous across the free boundary and we prove an existence and a regularity result for minimizers of the associated variational problem. Finally, in the appendix, we give an example of a class of Steiner symmetric minimizers.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a fixed a constant $\beta > 0$ and a smooth bounded open set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, we consider the functional

$$J_\beta(u, \Omega) = \int_D |\nabla u|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\partial^* \Omega} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1},$$

defined on the couples (u, Ω) , where $u \in H^1(D)$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a set of finite perimeter in the sense of De Giorgi (see Section 2) and $\partial^* \Omega$ denotes the reduced boundary of Ω (see Section 2). Recall that, when Ω is smooth, $\partial^* \Omega$ is the topological boundary of Ω .

In this paper we study the existence and the regularity of minimizers of the functional J_β among all couples (u, Ω) , which are fixed outside the domain D . Precisely, throughout the paper, we fix a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of finite perimeter, a constants $m > 0$ and a function

$$v \in H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad \text{such that} \quad v \geq m \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^d \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\partial^* E} v^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} < +\infty;$$

we define the admissible sets

$$\mathcal{V} = \{u \in H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^d) : u - v \in H_0^1(D)\},$$

$$\mathcal{E} = \{\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d : \text{Per}(\Omega) < +\infty \text{ and } \Omega = E \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus D\},$$

and we consider the variational minimization problem

$$\min \{J_\beta(u, \Omega) : u \in \mathcal{V}, \Omega \in \mathcal{E}\}. \quad (1.1)$$

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1 (Existence and regularity of minimizers). *Let $\beta > 0$, $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, v , E , \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{E} be as above. Then the following holds.*

- (i) *There is a dimensional constant C_d such that if $\beta^d |D| \leq C_d$, then there exists a solution $(u, \Omega) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{E}$ to the variational problem (1.2).*
- (ii) *If (u, Ω) is a solution to (1.2), then the boundary $\partial\Omega \cap D$ can be decomposed as the disjoint union of a regular part $\text{Reg}(\partial\Omega^*)$ and a singular part $\text{Sing}(\partial\Omega)$, where :*
 - *$\text{Reg}(\partial\Omega)$ is a relatively open subset of $\partial\Omega^*$ and is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ smooth manifold;*
 - *$\text{Sing}(\partial\Omega)$ is a closed set, which is empty if $d \leq 7$, discrete if $d = 8$, and of Hausdorff dimension $d - 8$, if $d > 8$.*
- (iii) *Let (u, Ω) be a solution to (1.2). Then, u is Hölder continuous and bounded from below in D .*

1.1. Outline of the proof and organization of the paper. The main difficulty in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is to prove the existence of a minimizing couple (u, Ω) and to show that the function u is Hölder continuous and bounded from below in D . Indeed, from the Hölder continuity and the non-degeneracy of u , we can deduce that Ω is an almost-minimizer of the perimeter and the claim (ii) follows by a classical regularity result for almost-minimizers (see Section 5).

The existence of a solution (u, Ω) and the regularity of u (Hölder regularity and non-degeneracy) are treated simulatenously. The reason is that if (u_n, Ω_n) is a minimizing sequence for (1.2), then in order to get the compactness of Ω_n , we need a uniform bound (from above) on the perimeter $\text{Per}(\Omega_n)$, for which we need the functions u_n to be bounded from below. Now, notice that we cannot simply replace u_n by $u_n \vee \varepsilon$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$; this is due to the fact that the second term in J_β is increasing in u :

$$\int_{\partial^* \Omega_n} u_n^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \leq \int_{\partial^* \Omega_n} (\varepsilon \vee u_n)^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}.$$

Thus, we select a minimizing sequence which is in some sense optimal. Precisely, we take (u_n, Ω_n) to be solution of the auxiliary problem

$$\min \left\{ J_\beta(u, \Omega) : u \in \mathcal{V}, \Omega \in \mathcal{E}, u \geq \frac{1}{n} \text{ in } D \right\}, \quad (1.2)$$

for which the existence of an optimal set is much easier (see Section 3, Proposition 3.1). Still, we do not have a uniform (independent from n) bound from below for the functions u_n , so we still miss the uniform bound on the preimeter of Ω_n .

On the other hand, we are able to prove that the sequence u_n is uniformly Hölder continuous in D (see Section 3, Lemma 3.5). This allows to extract a subsequence u_n that converges locally uniformly in D to a non-negative Hölder continuous function $u_\infty : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (see Section 4). Now, on each of the sets $\{u_\infty > t\}$, $t > 0$, the sequence Ω_n has uniformly bounded perimeter. This allows to extract a subsequence Ω_n that converges pointwise almost-everywhere on $\{u_\infty > 0\}$ to some Ω_∞ . Thus, we have constructed our candidate for a solution: $(u_\infty, \Omega_\infty)$.

In order to prove that $(u_\infty, \Omega_\infty)$ is an admissible competitor in (1.2), we need to show that Ω_∞ has finite perimeter. We do this in Section 4. We first use the optimality of (u_n, Ω_n) to prove that $(u_\infty, \Omega_\infty)$ is optimal when compared to a special class of competitors. This optimality condition can be written as (we refer to Lemma 4.1 for the precise statment) :

$$J_\beta(u_\infty, \Omega_\infty) \leq J_\beta(u_t, \Omega_t) \quad \text{where} \quad u_t = u_\infty \vee t \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_t = \Omega_\infty \setminus \{u_\infty \leq t\}, \quad (1.3)$$

for any $t > 0$. Next, from this special optimality condition we deduce that the function u_∞ is bounded from below (see Proposition 4.2). From this, in Section 4, we deduce that Ω_∞ has finite perimeter in \mathbb{R}^d and that the couple $(u_\infty, \Omega_\infty)$ is a solution to (1.2).

Finally, in the Appendix, we give an example of a class of minimizers in domains D that are symmetric with respect to the hyperplane $\{x_d = 0\}$.

1.2. On the non-degeneracy of u_∞ and the hypothesis in Theorem 1.1 (i). We notice that the competitors (u_t, Ω_t) in (1.3) are the two-phase analogue of the ones used by Caffarelli and Kriventsov in [2], where the authors study a one-phase version of (1.2). Nevertheless, the functional in [2] involves the measure of Ω , which means that the optimality condition there corresponds to

$$J_\beta(u, \Omega) + \bar{C}|\Omega \cap \{u \leq t\}| \leq J_\beta(u_t, \Omega_t) \quad \text{where} \quad u_t = u \vee t \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_t = \Omega \setminus \{u \leq t\},$$

where $\bar{C} > 0$. The presence of the constant \bar{C} allows to prove the bound from below by using a differential inequality for a suitably chosen function $f(t)$, which is given in terms of u and $\{u < t\}$ (see Proposition 4.2 and [2, Theorem 3.2]). In Proposition 4.2, we exploit the same idea, but since we do not have the constant \bar{C} , we can only conclude that $f(t) \geq \varepsilon t$

(which is not in contradiction with the fact that $f(t)$ is defined for every $t > 0$). So, we continue, and we use this lower bound to obtain a bound of the form

$$c \leq \beta^{1/2} \text{Per}(\{u < t\})^{1/2} |\{u < t\}|^{1/2} \quad \text{for every } t > 0,$$

where $u := u_\infty$ and c is a constant depending on β and d . Then, we notice that this entails

$$c \leq \beta^{3/4} \text{Per}(\{u < t\})^{1/4} |\{u < t\}|^{3/4} \quad \text{for every } t > 0.$$

and we use an iteration procedure to get that

$$c \leq \beta^{1-1/2^n} \text{Per}(\{u < t\})^{1/2^n} |\{u < t\}|^{1-1/2^n} \quad \text{for every } t > 0.$$

Passing to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get that if u is not bounded away from zero, then

$$c \leq \beta |\{u < t\}| \leq \beta |D| \quad \text{for every } t > 0. \quad (1.4)$$

We use this estimate in Section 4, where we choose the constant C_d from (i) Theorem 1.1 in such a way that (1.4) fails.

1.3. One-phase and two-phase problems with Robin boundary conditions. The problem (1.2) is the first instance of a two-phase free boundary problem with Robin boundary conditions. Precisely, we notice that if Ω is a fixed set with smooth boundary and if u minimizes the functional $J_\beta(\cdot, \Omega)$ in $H^1(D)$, then the functions

$$u_+ := u \quad \text{on } \overline{\Omega} \quad \text{and} \quad u_- := u \quad \text{on } D \setminus \Omega,$$

are harmonic respectively in Ω and $D \setminus \overline{\Omega}$, and satisfy the following conditions on $\partial\Omega \cap D$:

$$u_+ = u_- \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{\partial u_+}{\partial \nu_+} + \frac{\beta}{2} u_+ \right) + \left(\frac{\partial u_-}{\partial \nu_-} + \frac{\beta}{2} u_- \right) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap D, \quad (1.5)$$

where ν_+ and ν_- are the exterior and the interior normals to $\partial\Omega$. Notice that (1.5) is a two-phase counterpart of the one-phase problem

$$\Delta u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + \beta u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap D, \quad (1.6)$$

which was studied by Bucur-Luckhaus in [1] and Caffarelli-Kriventsov in [2]. As explained in [2], the Robin condition in (1.6) naturally arises in the physical situation in which the heat diffuses freely in Ω , the temperature is set to be zero on the surface $\partial\Omega$, which is separated from the interior of Ω by an infinitesimal insulator. The two-phase problem (1.5) also may be interpreted in this way, in this case the heat diffuses freely both inside Ω and outside, in $D \setminus \overline{\Omega}$; the temperature is set to be zero on the surface $\partial\Omega$, which is insulated from both sides; the continuity of the temperature means that the heat transfer is allowed also across $\partial\Omega$, which happens for instance if the surface $\partial\Omega$ is replaced by a very thin (infinitesimal) net.

Even if the problems in [1]-[2] and in the present paper lead to the free boundary conditions of the same type, the techniques are completely different. For instance, the problem studied in [1]-[2] is a free discontinuity problem as the function u jumps from positive in Ω to zero in $D \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. Thus, the corresponding variational minimization problem can be naturally stated in the class of SBV functions, which clearly influences both the existence and the regularity techniques; roughly speaking, the existence is obtained through a compactness theorem in the SBV class, while the regularity relies on techniques related to the Mumford-Shah functional.

In our case, the class of SBV functions is not the natural space in which to work. This is due to the fact we cannot prevent the formation of discontinuities along minimizing sequences, which means that the limit might not satisfy the continuity condition in (1.5). Thus, we cannot rely on any advanced compactness results and we have to prove the existence of a solution from scratch. On the other hand, as explained in Section 1.1, once we know that an optimal couple (u, Ω) exists, and that u is non-degenerate and Hölder

continuous, the regularity of the free boundary $\partial\Omega$ follows immediately since the set Ω becomes an almost-minimizer of the perimeter.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Sets of finite perimeter. Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open set in \mathbb{R}^d . We recall that the set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is said to have a *finite perimeter in A* if

$$\text{Per}(E, A) = \sup \left\{ \int_A \text{div } \xi(x) dx : \xi \in C_c^1(A; \mathbb{R}^d), \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |\xi(x)| \leq 1 \right\}, \quad (2.1)$$

is finite. We say that E has a *locally finite perimeter in A*, if for every open set $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\overline{B} \subset A$, we have that $\text{Per}(E, B) < \infty$. We say that E is of *finite perimeter* if

$$\text{Per}(E) := \text{Per}(E, \mathbb{R}^d) < +\infty.$$

By the De Giorgi structure theorem (see for instance [7, Theorem II.4.9]), if the set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ has locally finite perimeter in A , then there is a set $\partial^*E \subset A \cap \partial E$ called *reduced boundary* such that

$$\text{Per}(E, B) = \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(B \cap \partial^*E) \quad \text{for every set } B \subset\subset A,$$

where \mathcal{H}^{d-1} is the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure in \mathbb{R}^d . Moreover, there is a \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -measurable map $\nu_E : \partial^*E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, called *generalized normal* such that $|\nu_E| = 1$ and

$$\int_E \text{div } \xi(x) dx = \int_{\partial^*E} \nu_E \cdot \xi d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \quad \text{for every } \xi \in C_c^1(A; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

2.2. Capacity and traces of Sobolev functions. We define the capacity (or the 2-capacity) of a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ as

$$\text{cap}(E) = \inf \left\{ \|u\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 : u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d), u \geq 1 \text{ in a neighborhood of } E \right\}.$$

It is well-known that the sets of zero capacity have zero $(d-1)$ -Hausdorff measure (see for instance [4, Section 4.7.2, Theorem 4]) :

$$\text{If } \text{cap}(E) = 0, \quad \text{then } \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(E) = 0.$$

Moreover, the Sobolev functions are defined up to a set of zero capacity (i.e. *quasi-everywhere*), that is, if $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is an open set and $u \in H^1(A)$, then there is a set $\mathcal{N}_u \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\text{cap}(\mathcal{N}_u) = 0$ and

$$u(x_0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r(x_0)} u(x) dx \quad \text{for every } x_0 \in A \setminus \mathcal{N}_u.$$

Moreover, for every function $u \in H^1(A)$ there is a sequence $u_n \in C^\infty(A) \cap H^1(A)$ and a set $\mathcal{N} \subset A$ of zero capacity such that:

- u_n converges to u strongly in $H^1(A)$;
- $u(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n(x)$ for every $x \in A \setminus (\mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{N}_u)$.

In particular, if $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a set of locally finite perimeter in the open set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and if $u \in H^1(A)$, then the function u^2 is defined \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -almost everywhere on ∂^*E and is \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -measurable on ∂^*E . Thus, the integral

$$\mathcal{I}(u, E) := \int_{A \cap \partial^*E} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \quad \text{is well-defined.}$$

In the next subsection, we will go through the main properties of this functional, which we will need in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

2.3. Properties of the functional \mathcal{I} . We first notice that we can use an integration by parts to write \mathcal{I} as in (2.1).

Lemma 2.1. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a set of locally finite perimeter in the open set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $u \in H^1(A)$ be locally bounded in A . Then, the following holds.*

(i) *For every $\xi \in C_c^1(A; \mathbb{R}^d)$ we have*

$$\int_{A \cap \partial^* E} (\xi \cdot \nu_E) u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \int_A \operatorname{div}(u^2 \xi) dx. \quad (2.2)$$

(ii) *We have the formula*

$$\int_{A \cap \partial^* E} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \sup \left\{ \int_{A \cap \partial^* E} (\xi \cdot \nu_E) u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} : \xi \in C_c^1(A; \mathbb{R}^d), |\xi| \leq 1 \right\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. The first claim follows by a classical approximation argument with functions of the form $\phi_n * u$, where ϕ_n is a sequence of mollifiers. In order to prove claim (ii), we notice that

$$\int_{A \cap \partial^* E} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \leq \sup \left\{ \int_{A \cap \partial^* E} (\xi \cdot \nu_E) u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} : \xi \in C_c^1(A; \mathbb{R}^d), |\xi| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Thus, it is sufficient to find a sequence $\xi_n \in C_c^1(A; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $|\xi_n| \leq 1$, such that

$$\int_{A \cap \partial^* E} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A \cap \partial^* E} (\xi_n \cdot \nu_E) u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}.$$

Let A_n be a sequence of open sets such that $A_n \subset \subset A$ and $\mathbb{1}_{A_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_A$. Then

$$\int_{A \cap \partial^* E} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_n \cap \partial^* E} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}.$$

Setting $M_n = \sup_{A_n} u^2$, we can find $\xi_n \in C_c^1(A; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $|\xi_n| \leq 1$, and

$$0 \leq \operatorname{Per}(E, A_n) - \int_{\partial^* E} (\xi_n \cdot \nu_E) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \leq \frac{1}{nM_n}.$$

In particular, this implies that

$$0 \leq \int_{A_n \cap \partial^* E} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} - \int_{A_n \cap \partial^* E} (\xi_n \cdot \nu_E) u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \leq \frac{1}{n},$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.2 (Main semicontinuity lemma). *Suppose that $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded open set and that $h : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a non-negative function in $L^1(A)$. Let $u_n \in H^1(A)$ be a sequence of functions and $\Omega_n \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a sequence of sets of locally finite perimeter in A such that:*

- (a) $0 \leq u_n \leq h$ in A , for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (b) there is a function $u_\infty \in H^1(A)$ such that u_n converges to u_∞ weakly in $H^1(A)$ and pointwise almost-everywhere in A ;
- (c) there is a set $\Omega_\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of locally finite perimeter in A such that the sequence of characteristic functions $\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_n}$ converges to $\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\infty}$ pointwise almost-everywhere in A .

Then,

$$\int_{A \cap \partial^* \Omega_\infty} u_\infty^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A \cap \partial^* \Omega_n} u_n^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}. \quad (2.4)$$

Proof. Notice that, for every $u \in H^1(A)$ and every set of finite perimeter Ω , we have

$$\int_{A \cap \partial^* \Omega} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \sup \left\{ \int_{A \cap \partial^* \Omega} (\xi \cdot \nu_\Omega) u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} : \xi \in C_c^1(A; \mathbb{R}^d), |\xi| \leq 1 \right\},$$

where ν_Ω denotes the exterior normal to $\partial^* \Omega$. We use the notation

$$\nu_n := \nu_{\Omega_n} \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_\infty := \nu_{\Omega_\infty}.$$

Let now $\xi \in C_c^1(A; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $|\xi| \leq 1$ be fixed. By the divergence theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A \cap \partial^* \Omega_n} u_n^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A \cap \Omega_n} \operatorname{div}(u_n^2 \xi) dx = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_A \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_n} \operatorname{div}(u_n^2 \xi) dx \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_A \left(2(u_n \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_n} \xi) \cdot \nabla u_n + (u_n \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_n}) (u_n \operatorname{div} \xi) \right) dx \\ &= \int_A \left(2(u_\infty \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\infty} \xi) \cdot \nabla u_\infty + (u_\infty \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\infty}) (u_\infty \operatorname{div} \xi) \right) dx \\ &= \int_{A \cap \Omega_\infty} \operatorname{div}(u_\infty^2 \xi) dx = \int_{A \cap \partial^* \Omega_\infty} (\xi \cdot \nu_\infty) u_\infty^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where in order to pass to the limit we used that the sequence $u_n \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_n}$ converges strongly in $L_{loc}^2(A)$ to $u_\infty \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\infty}$, as a consequence of the fact that it converges pointwise a.e. and is bounded by h . Now, taking the supremum over ξ , we get (2.4). \square

3. A FAMILY OF APPROXIMATING PROBLEMS

We use the notations $D, \beta, E, v, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{V}$ from Section 1. Moreover, we fix a constant

$$\varepsilon \in [0, m),$$

where m is the lower bound of the function v , and we consider the auxiliary problem

$$\min \{ J_\beta(\Omega, u) : \Omega \in \mathcal{E}, u \in \mathcal{V}, u \geq \varepsilon \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d \}. \quad (3.1)$$

Proposition 3.1 (Existence of a solution). *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{V} be as above. Then, for every $0 < \varepsilon < m$, there is a solution to the problem (3.1).*

Proof. Let (u_n, Ω_n) be a minimizing sequence for (3.1). Since

$$\int_D |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \int_{\partial^* \Omega_n} u_n^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = J_\beta(u_n, \Omega_n) \leq J_\beta(v, E),$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\int_D |\nabla u_n|^2 dx \leq J_\beta(v, E) \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{Per}(\Omega_n) \leq \frac{1}{\beta \varepsilon^2} J_\beta(v, E).$$

Thus, there are subsequences u_n and Ω_n such that:

- u_n converges strongly in $L^2(D)$, weakly in $H^1(D)$ and pointwise almost-everywhere to a function $u_\infty \in H^1(D)$;
- $\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_n}$ converges to $\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\infty}$ strongly in $L^1(D)$ and pointwise almost-everywhere.

Moreover, we can assume that $u_n \leq h$ on D , where h is the harmonic function :

$$\Delta h = 0 \quad \text{in } D, \quad h - v \in H_0^1(D).$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D |\nabla u_n|^2 dx &= \int_D |\nabla(u_n \wedge h)|^2 dx + \int_D |\nabla(u_n \vee h)|^2 dx - \int_D |\nabla h|^2 dx \geq \int_D |\nabla(u_n \wedge h)|^2 dx, \\ \text{and} \quad \int_{\partial^* \Omega} u_n^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} &\geq \int_{\partial^* \Omega} (u_n \wedge h)^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives that

$$J_\beta(u_n \wedge h, \Omega_n) \leq J_\beta(u_n, \Omega_n).$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$J_\beta(u_n \vee 0, \Omega_n) \leq J_\beta(u_n, \Omega_n).$$

Thus, we can assume that $0 \leq u_n \leq h$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and so the hypotheses of Lemma 2.2 are satisfied, which means that (2.4) holds. Moreover, by the semicontinuity of the H^1 norm we have

$$\int_D |\nabla u_\infty|^2 dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_D |\nabla u_n|^2 dx,$$

which finally implies that

$$J_\beta(u_\infty, \Omega_\infty) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_\beta(u_n, \Omega_n). \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.2 (Subharmonicity of the solutions). *Let $m > 0$, $\beta > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in [0, m)$ be fixed. Let the function $u_\varepsilon \in H^1(D)$ and the set of finite perimeter Ω_ε be such that the couple $(u_\varepsilon, \Omega_\varepsilon)$ is a solution to the problem (3.1). Then u_ε is subharmonic in D and there is a positive Radon measure μ_ε such that*

$$-\int_D \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \varphi dx = \int_D \varphi d\mu_\varepsilon \quad \text{for every } \varphi \in H_0^1(D).$$

Remark 3.3. μ_ε is the distributional Laplacian of u_ε . We will use the notation $\mu_\varepsilon = \Delta u_\varepsilon$.

Proof. Let $\varphi \leq u_\varepsilon$ be a function in $H^1(D)$ such that $\varphi = u_\varepsilon$ on ∂D . Then, testing the optimality of $(u_\varepsilon, \Omega_\varepsilon)$ with $(\varphi \vee \varepsilon, \Omega_\varepsilon)$ and using the fact that $u_\varepsilon \geq \varphi \vee \varepsilon$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx &\geq \int_D |\nabla(\varphi \vee \varepsilon)|^2 dx \\ &\geq \int_D |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 dx + \int_{\partial^* \Omega_\varepsilon} u_\varepsilon^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} - \int_{\partial^* \Omega_\varepsilon} (\varphi \vee \varepsilon)^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \geq \int_D |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

We will next show that the family of solutions $\{u_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0, m)}$ is uniformly Hölder continuous. We will use the following result.

Lemma 3.4 (A general condition for the Hölder continuity). *Let D be a bounded open set in \mathbb{R}^d and let $h \in L_{loc}^\infty(D)$. Suppose that $u \in H^1(D)$ is such that*

- (a) $0 \leq u \leq h$ in D ;
- (b) u is subharmonic in D ;
- (c) there are constants $K > 0$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$\Delta u(B_r(x_0)) \leq K r^{d-1-\alpha} \quad \text{for every } x_0 \in \overline{D}_\delta \quad \text{and every } 0 < r < \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\delta > 0$ and

$$D_\delta := \{x \in D : \text{dist}(x, \partial D) > \delta\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Then, there is a constant C depending on δ , h , α and K such that

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq C|x - y|^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2-\alpha}} \quad \text{for every } x, y \in \overline{D}_\delta.$$

Proof. The proof is standard and we give it here only for the sake of completeness. We first notice that the following formula is true for every subharmonic function $u \in H^1(D)$ and for every $x_0 \in D$ and $0 < s < t < \text{dist}(x_0, \partial D)$.

$$\int_{\partial B_t(x_0)} u d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} - \int_{\partial B_s(x_0)} u d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \frac{1}{d\omega_d} \int_s^t r^{1-d} \Delta u(B_r(x_0)) dr.$$

In particular, the function

$$r \mapsto \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} u d\mathcal{H}^{d-1},$$

is monotone and we can define the function u pointwise everywhere as

$$u(x_0) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} u d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}.$$

As a consequence, for every $R < \text{dist}(x_0, \partial D)$, we have

$$\int_{\partial B_R(x_0)} u d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} - u(x_0) = \frac{1}{d\omega_d} \int_0^R r^{1-d} \Delta u(B_r(x_0)) dr.$$

Now, applying (3.2), and integrating in r , we get that if $x_0 \in \overline{D}_\delta$ and $R < \frac{\delta}{2}$, then

$$0 \leq \int_{\partial B_R(x_0)} u d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} - u(x_0) \leq C R^{1-\alpha} \quad \text{where} \quad C := \frac{K}{d\omega_d(1-\alpha)}, \quad (3.4)$$

which, by the subharmonicity of u , implies

$$0 \leq \int_{B_R(x_0)} u dx - u(x_0) \leq C R^{1-\alpha}. \quad (3.5)$$

Let now $x_0, y_0 \in \overline{D}_\delta$ be such that

$$|x_0 - y_0| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad R := |x_0 - y_0|^\gamma \leq \frac{\delta}{4},$$

where $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ will be chosen later.

Now, since $B_R(x_0) \subset B_{R+|x_0-y_0|}(y_0) \subset B_{2R}(y_0) \subset D$, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_0) - u(y_0) &\leq \int_{B_R(x_0)} u(x) dx - u(y_0) \leq \frac{(R + |x_0 - y_0|)^d}{R^d} \int_{B_{R+|x_0-y_0|}(y_0)} u(x) dx - u(y_0) \\ &= (1 + |x_0 - y_0|^{1-\gamma})^d \int_{B_{R+|x_0-y_0|}(y_0)} u(x) dx - u(y_0) \\ &\leq \left(1 + d2^{d-1}|x_0 - y_0|^{1-\gamma}\right) \int_{B_{R+|x_0-y_0|}(y_0)} u(x) dx - u(y_0), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used that $|x_0 - y_0|^{1-\gamma} \leq 1$. Now, using (3.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_0) - u(y_0) &\leq \left(\int_{B_{R+|x_0-y_0|}(y_0)} u(x) dx - u(y_0) \right) + d2^{d-1}|x_0 - y_0|^{1-\gamma} \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{2R}(y_0))} \\ &\leq C(R + |x_0 - y_0|)^{1-\alpha} + d2^{d-1}|x_0 - y_0|^{1-\gamma} \|h\|_{L^\infty(B_{2R}(y_0))} \\ &\leq \left(2C + d2^{d-1}M_{\delta/2}\right) |x_0 - y_0|^{1-\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

where $M_{\delta/2}$ is the maximum of h on the set $\overline{D}_{\delta/2}$ and where we choose $\gamma = \frac{1}{2-\alpha}$, which

implies that $\gamma(1-\alpha) = 1-\gamma$ and $1-\gamma = \frac{1-\alpha}{2-\alpha}$. \square

Proposition 3.5 (Hölder continuity of the solution). *Let $m > 0$, $\beta > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in [0, m)$ be fixed. Let the function $u_\varepsilon \in H^1(D)$ and the set of finite perimeter Ω_ε be such that the couple $(u_\varepsilon, \Omega_\varepsilon)$ is a solution to the problem (3.1) with some $v \in H^1(D)$ and $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for every $\delta > 0$, there is a constant C depending on D , δ and v (but not on ε) such that*

$$|u_\varepsilon(x) - u_\varepsilon(y)| \leq C|x - y|^{1/3} \quad \text{for every} \quad x, y \in D_\delta.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, we have that u_ε is subharmonic and, in particular, $0 \leq u_\varepsilon \leq h$ in D , where h is the harmonic extension of v in D . Thus, it is sufficient to prove that (3.2) holds. Let $x_0 \in \overline{D}_\delta$ and $R \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$. Let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_{3R/2}(x_0))$ be such that

$$\varphi = 1 \quad \text{on} \quad B_R(x_0), \quad |\nabla \varphi| \leq \frac{3}{R} \quad \text{in} \quad B_{3R/2}(x_0).$$

Now, we test the optimality of $(u_\varepsilon, \Omega_\varepsilon)$ with $(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon, \tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$, where

$$\tilde{u}_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon + R^{1/2}\varphi \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon = \Omega_\varepsilon \cup B_{3R/2}(x_0).$$

Thus, we get

$$\int_D |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\partial^* \Omega_\varepsilon} u_\varepsilon^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \leq \int_D |\nabla \tilde{u}_\varepsilon|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\partial^* \tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon} \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial^* \tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon} \tilde{u}_\varepsilon^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} &\leq \int_{\partial^* \Omega_\varepsilon \setminus B_{3R/2}(x_0)} u_\varepsilon^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_{\partial B_{3R/2}(x_0)} u_\varepsilon^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ &\leq \int_{\partial^* \Omega_\varepsilon} u_\varepsilon^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + C_d R^{d-1} M_{\delta/4}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $M_\rho := \sup \{h(x) : x \in \overline{D}_\rho\}$. Thus, we obtain

$$2R^{1/2} \int_{B_{3R/2}(x_0)} -\nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \varphi dx \leq R \int_{B_{3R/2}(x_0)} |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx + \beta C_d R^{d-1} M_{\delta/4}^2 \leq C_d (1 + \beta M_{\delta/4}^2) R^{d-1},$$

which implies that

$$\Delta u_\varepsilon(B_R(x_0)) \leq C_d (1 + \beta M_{\delta/4}^2) R^{d-3/2},$$

which concludes the proof of (3.2) with $\alpha = 1/2$. \square

4. EXISTENCE OF AN OPTIMAL SET

4.1. Definition of (u_0, Ω_0) . Now, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, m)$, we consider the solution $(u_\varepsilon, \Omega_\varepsilon)$ of (3.1). As a consequence of Proposition (3.5), we can find a sequence $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and a function $u_0 \in H^1(D) \cap C^{0,1/3}(D)$ such that :

- u_{ε_n} converges to u_0 uniformly on every set D_δ , $\delta > 0$, where D_δ is defined in (3.3);
- u_{ε_n} converges to u_0 strongly in $L^2(D)$;
- u_{ε_n} converges to u_0 weakly in $H^1(D)$.

Our aim in this section is to show that u_0 is a solution to (1.2).

The construction of Ω_0 is more delicate. First, we fix $t > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ and we notice that the perimeter of Ω_{ε_n} is bounded on the open set $\{u_0 > t\} \cap D_\delta$. Indeed, the uniform convergence of u_{ε_n} to u_0 implies that, for n large enough ($n \geq N_{t,\delta}$, for some fixed $N_{t,\delta} \in \mathbb{N}$),

$$u_{\varepsilon_n} \geq \frac{t}{2} \quad \text{on} \quad D_\delta \cap \{u_0 > t\}.$$

Thus, we have

$$J_\beta(v, E) \geq \beta \int_{D_\delta \cap \{u_0 > t\} \cap \partial^* \Omega_{\varepsilon_n}} u_{\varepsilon_n}^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \geq \frac{\beta t^2}{2} \text{Per}(\Omega_{\varepsilon_n}; D_\delta \cap \{u_0 > t\}).$$

Now, if we choose t such that $\text{Per}(\{u_0 > t\}) < \infty$ (which, by the co-area formula, is true for almost-every $t > 0$), then we have that

$$\text{Per}(\Omega_{\varepsilon_n} \cap \{u_0 > t\} \cap D_\delta) \leq C_{t,\delta} \quad \text{for every} \quad n \geq N_{t,\delta},$$

for some constant $C_{t,\delta} > 0$. Now, since all the sets $\Omega_{\varepsilon_n} \cap \{u_0 > t\} \cap D_\delta$ are contained in D and have uniformly bounded perimeter, we can find a set Ω_0 and a subsequence for which

$$\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_{\varepsilon_n} \cap \{u_0 > t\} \cap D_\delta}(x) \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_0 \cap \{u_0 > t\} \cap D_\delta}(x) \quad \text{for almost-every} \quad x \in D.$$

Thus, by a diagonal sequence argument, we can extract a subsequence of ε_n (still denoted by ε_n) and we can define the set $\Omega_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ as the pointwise limit

$$\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_0}(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_{\varepsilon_n} \cap \{u_0 > 0\}}(x) \quad \text{for almost-every} \quad x \in \{u_0 > 0\},$$

and we notice that, by construction, $\Omega_0 \subset \{u_0 > 0\}$. Notice that, we do not know a priori that Ω_0 has finite perimeter. We only know that

$$\text{Per}(\Omega_0 \cap \{u_0 > t\} \cap D_\delta) < \infty \quad \text{for every} \quad \delta > 0 \quad \text{and almost-every} \quad t > 0.$$

which means that $\Omega_0 \cap \{u_0 > t\}$ has locally finite perimeter in D for almost-every $t > 0$.

4.2. An optimality condition. As pointed out above, we do not know if the couple (u_0, Ω_0) is even an admissible competitor for (1.2) (we need to show that $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{E}$). Nevertheless, we can still prove that it satisfies a suitable optimality condition.

Lemma 4.1 (The optimality condition at the limit). *Let u_0 and Ω_0 be as in Section 4.1. Then, for almost-every $t > 0$, we have*

$$\int_{\{u_0 < t\}} |\nabla u_0|^2 dx \leq \beta t^2 \text{Per}(\{u_0 < t\}). \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. Let now $t > 0$ be fixed and such that the set $\{u_0 < t\}$ has finite perimeter. Then, for n large enough, we can use the couple $(u_0 \vee t, \Omega_0 \cap \{u_0 < t\})$ to test the optimality of $(u_{\varepsilon_n}, \Omega_{\varepsilon_n})$. For the sake of simplicity, we write $u_{\varepsilon_n} = u_n$, $\Omega_{\varepsilon_n} = \Omega_n$, $u_0 = u$ and $\Omega_0 = \Omega$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\{u > t\} \cap \partial^* \Omega_n} u_n^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ \leq \int_D |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\partial^* \Omega_n} u_n^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ \leq \int_D |\nabla(u \vee t)|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\partial^*(\Omega \cup \{u < t\})} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ \leq \int_D |\nabla(u \vee t)|^2 dx + \beta t^2 \text{Per}(\{u < t\}) + \beta \int_{\{u > t\} \cap \partial^* \Omega} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Now, by the weak convergence of u_n to u , we get that

$$\int_D |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_D |\nabla u_n|^2 dx.$$

On the other hand, setting $U_{t,\delta}$ to be the open set

$$U_{t,\delta} = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus (\overline{D}_\delta \cap \{u \leq t\}),$$

for some fixed $\delta > 0$, and applying Lemma 2.2, we have that

$$\int_{U_{t,\delta} \cap \partial^* \Omega} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{U_{t,\delta} \cap \partial^* \Omega_n} u_n^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{u > t\} \cap \partial^* \Omega_n} u_n^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}.$$

Taking the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, by the monotone convergence theorem, we get that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{U_{t,\delta} \cap \partial^* \Omega} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus (D \cap \{u \leq t\})) \cap \partial^* \Omega} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$$

Now since

$$u(x) = h(x) \quad \text{for quasi-every } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus D \quad \text{and for } \mathcal{H}^{d-1}\text{-almost-every } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus D,$$

and since $h \geq m > t$ on ∂D , we have that

$$\int_{(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus (D \cap \{u \leq t\})) \cap \partial^* \Omega} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \int_{\{u > t\} \cap \partial^* \Omega} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}. \quad (4.3)$$

Thus, we get that

$$\int_{\{u > t\} \cap \partial^* \Omega} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D \cap \{u > t\} \cap \partial^* \Omega_n} u_n^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}. \quad (4.4)$$

Now, using (4.4) and (4.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_D |\nabla u|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\{u>t\} \cap \partial^* \Omega} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ & \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_D |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\{u>t\} \cap \partial^* \Omega_n} u_n^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ & \leq \int_D |\nabla(u \vee t)|^2 dx + \beta t^2 \text{Per}(\{u < t\}) + \beta \int_{\{u>t\} \cap \partial^* \Omega} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives (4.1). \square

4.3. Non-degeneracy. The crucial observation in this section is that the functions u satisfying the optimality condition (4.1) are non-degenerate in the sense of the following proposition.

Proposition 4.2 (Non-degeneracy). *Let $\beta > 0$, $m > 0$, D be a bounded open set of \mathbb{R}^d and $u \in H^1(D)$ be a non-negative function in D such that $u \geq m$ on ∂D . Let $\Omega \subset D$ be a set of finite perimeter in D . Suppose that u and Ω satisfy the optimality condition*

$$\int_{\Omega_t} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq \beta t^2 \text{Per}(\Omega_t) \quad \text{where} \quad \Omega_t = \{u < t\}, \quad (4.5)$$

for almost-every $t \in (0, m)$. Then, one of the following is true.

- (i) $|\Omega_t| = 0$ for some $t > 0$.
- (ii) There is a dimensional constant $C_d > 0$ such that

$$\beta^{-d} C_d \leq |\Omega_t| \quad \text{for every} \quad t \in (0, m). \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. We suppose that (i) does not hold, that is,

$$|\Omega_t| > 0 \quad \text{for every} \quad t > 0.$$

We will prove (ii). Let first $t \in (0, m)$ be fixed. By the co-area formula, the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the optimality condition (4.5), we get

$$\int_{\Omega_t} |\nabla u| = \int_0^t \text{Per}(\Omega_s) ds \leq \left(\int_{\Omega_t} |\nabla u|^2 \right)^{1/2} |\Omega_t|^{1/2} \leq t \beta^{1/2} \text{Per}(\Omega_t)^{1/2} |\Omega_t|^{1/2}. \quad (4.7)$$

We now set

$$f(t) := \int_0^t \text{Per}(\Omega_s) ds = \int_{\Omega_t} |\nabla u| dx.$$

We will first estimate $f(t)$ from below.

Step 1. Non-degeneracy of f . By the isoperimetric inequality and (4.7), there is a dimensional constant C_d such that

$$\int_0^t \text{Per}(\Omega_s) ds \leq t \beta^{1/2} C_d \text{Per}(\Omega_t)^{\frac{2d-1}{2d-2}}.$$

Using the definition of f , we can re-write this inequality as

$$f(t)^{\frac{2d-2}{2d-1}} \leq t^{\frac{2d-2}{2d-1}} (\beta^{1/2} C_d)^{\frac{2d-2}{2d-1}} f'(t).$$

After rearranging the terms and integrating from 0 to t , we obtain

$$f(t)^{\frac{1}{2d-1}} - f(0)^{\frac{1}{2d-1}} \geq \frac{t^{\frac{1}{2d-1}}}{(\beta^{1/2} C_d)^{\frac{2d-2}{2d-1}}}.$$

Now, since u is non-negative in D , we have that $f(0) = 0$. Thus

$$f(t) \geq \frac{t}{(\beta^{1/2} C_d)^{2d-2}}.$$

Setting

$$C = (\beta C_d)^{1-d}, \quad (4.8)$$

we obtain the lower bound

$$f(t) \geq Ct.$$

In particular, as a consequence of (4.7), we get that

$$C \leq \beta^{1/2} \text{Per}(\Omega_t)^{1/2} |\Omega_t|^{1/2}. \quad (4.9)$$

Step 2. *Non-degeneracy of $|\Omega_t|$.* Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be fixed. Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \text{Per}(\Omega_s)^\alpha |\Omega_s|^{1-\alpha} ds &\leq \left(\int_0^t \text{Per}(\Omega_s) ds \right)^\alpha \left(\int_0^t |\Omega_s| ds \right)^{1-\alpha} \\ &\leq \left(t \beta^{1/2} \text{Per}(\Omega_t)^{1/2} |\Omega_t|^{1/2} \right)^\alpha \left(t |\Omega_t| \right)^{1-\alpha} = t \beta^{\alpha/2} \text{Per}(\Omega_t)^{\alpha/2} |\Omega_t|^{1-\alpha/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain that for fixed $T \in (0, m)$ and $C > 0$, the following implication holds :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{If } C &\leq \text{Per}(\Omega_t)^\alpha |\Omega_t|^{1-\alpha} \quad \text{for every } t \in (0, T), \\ \text{then } C &\leq \beta^{\alpha/2} \text{Per}(\Omega_t)^{\alpha/2} |\Omega_t|^{1-\alpha/2} \quad \text{for every } t \in (0, T). \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

We claim that, for every $n \geq 1$ and every $t \in (0, m)$, we have the inequality

$$C \leq \beta^{1-1/2^n} \text{Per}(\Omega_t)^{1/2^n} |\Omega_t|^{1-1/2^n}. \quad (4.11)$$

In order to prove (4.3), we argue by induction on n . When $n = 1$, (4.3) is precisely (4.9). In order to prove that the claim for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ implies the same claim for $n + 1$, we apply (4.10) for $\alpha = 2^{-n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which gives precisely (4.3) with $n + 1$. This concludes the proof of (4.3). Next, passing to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that

$$C \leq \beta |\Omega_t| \quad \text{for every } t \in (0, T),$$

which gives the claim, since C is given by (4.8). \square

4.4. Existence of a solution. We are now in position to prove that the couple (u_0, Ω_0) , constructed in Section 4.1, is a solution to (1.2).

Proposition 4.3 (Existence of a solution). *There is a dimensional constant $C_d > 0$ such that if D is a bounded open set of \mathbb{R}^d , and if $\beta > 0$ is given constant such that*

$$\beta^d |D| \leq C_d, \quad (4.12)$$

then the following holds.

For every set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of finite perimeter and every $v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying

$$v \geq m \quad \text{on } D \quad \text{for some constant } m > 0,$$

there is a solution (u, Ω) of the problem (1.2).

Proof. Let (u_0, Ω_0) be as in Section 4.1. Then, by Lemma 4.1, (u_0, Ω_0) satisfies the optimality condition (4.5). We now apply Proposition 4.2. Since claim (ii) of Proposition 4.2 cannot hold by the hypothesis (4.12), we get that $u_0 \geq t$ in D , for some $t > 0$. In particular, this means that Ω_0 has finite perimeter in D . Precisely, for every $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Per}(\Omega_0; D_\delta) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Per}(\Omega_{\varepsilon_n}; D_\delta) \leq \frac{4}{t^2} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D_\delta \cap \partial^* \Omega_{\varepsilon_n}} u_{\varepsilon_n}^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ &\leq \frac{4}{\beta t^2} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_\beta(u_{\varepsilon_n}, \Omega_{\varepsilon_n}) \leq \frac{4}{\beta t^2} J_\beta(v, E). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$\text{Per}(\Omega_0; D) \leq \frac{4}{\beta t^2} J_\beta(v, E).$$

In particular, this implies that Ω_0 is a set of finite perimeter in \mathbb{R}^d . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Per}(\Omega_0) &\leq \text{Per}(\Omega_0; D) + 2\text{Per}(D) + \text{Per}(\Omega_0; \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{D}) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{\beta t^2} J_\beta(v, E) + 2\text{Per}(D) + \text{Per}(E; \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{D}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the couple (u_0, Ω_0) is admissible in (1.2); it now remains to prove that it is optimal. Let $\tilde{u} \in H^1(D)$ be non-negative on D and such that $u - v \in H_0^1(D)$. Let $\tilde{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a set of finite perimeter such that $\tilde{\Omega} = E$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus D$. It is sufficient to prove that

$$J_\beta(u_0, \Omega_0) \leq J_\beta(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega}).$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed. We now use the couple $(\tilde{u} \vee \varepsilon, \tilde{\Omega})$ to test the optimality of $(u_{\varepsilon_n}, \Omega_{\varepsilon_n})$:

$$J_\beta(u_{\varepsilon_n}, \Omega_{\varepsilon_n}) \leq J_\beta(\tilde{u} \vee \varepsilon, \tilde{\Omega}).$$

Passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$J_\beta(u_{\varepsilon_n}, \Omega_{\varepsilon_n}) \leq J_\beta(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega}).$$

Now, Lemma 2.2 and the semicontinuity of the H^1 norm gives that $J_\beta(u_0, \Omega_0) \leq J_\beta(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega})$, which concludes the proof. \square

5. REGULARITY OF THE OPTIMAL SET

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that (u, Ω) is a solution to (1.2) such that*

$$u \geq t \quad \text{in } D, \quad \text{for some } t > 0.$$

Then, the boundary $\partial\Omega \cap D$ can be decomposed as the disjoint union of a regular part $\text{Reg}(\partial\Omega)$ and a singular part $\text{Sing}(\partial\Omega)$, where

- (i) $\text{Reg}(\partial\Omega)$ is a relatively open subset of $\partial\Omega$ and is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ smooth manifold;
- (ii) $\text{Sing}(\partial\Omega)$ is a closed set, which is empty if $d \leq 7$, discrete if $d = 8$, and of Hausdorff dimension $d - 8$, if $d > 8$.

Proof. We first notice that by Lemma 3.4, $u \in C^{0,1/3}(D)$. Let $\delta > 0$, $x_0 \in D_\delta$ and $r < \delta/2$. We consider a set $\Omega' \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\Omega' \Delta \Omega \subset \subset B_r(x_0)$. Testing the optimality of (u, Ω) against (u, Ω') we get that

$$\int_{B_r(x_0) \cap \partial^* \Omega} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \leq \int_{B_r(x_0) \cap \partial^* \Omega'} u^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1},$$

which implies that

$$\left(\min_{B_r(x_0)} u^2 \right) \text{Per}(\Omega; B_r(x_0)) \leq \left(\max_{B_r(x_0)} u^2 \right) \text{Per}(\Omega'; B_r(x_0)).$$

By regularity of u , we have that

$$\max_{B_r(x_0)} u^2 \leq \min_{B_r(x_0)} u^2 + Cr^{1/3} \leq \left(\min_{B_r(x_0)} u^2 \right) \left(1 + \frac{C}{t} r^{1/3} \right),$$

where in the second inequality, we used that $u \geq t > 0$. Thus, we obtain

$$\text{Per}(\Omega; B_r(x_0)) \leq \left(1 + \frac{C}{t} r^{1/3} \right) \text{Per}(\Omega'; B_r(x_0)),$$

which proves that Ω is an almost-minimizer of the perimeter in D . \square

APPENDIX A. EXAMPLES OF MINIMIZERS

In this section, we use a calibration argument to prove that if $E = \{x_d > 0\}$ and $v \equiv 1$, then in any Steiner symmetric set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the solution (Ω, u) is unique, u is even with respect to the hyperplane $\{x_d = 0\}$ and Ω is precisely the half-space E . Our main result is the following.

Proposition A.1. *Let D be an open set, Steiner symmetric with respect to the hyperplane $\{x_d = 0\}$. Let E be the half-ball $E = B \cap \{x_d > 0\}$, for some large ball B containing D , and let $v \equiv 1$. Then there is a unique solution (u, Ω) to (1.2), where $\Omega = E$, u is positive and even with respect to $\{x_d = 0\}$ and solves the equation*

$$\Delta u = 0 \quad \text{in } \{x_d > 0\} \cap D, \quad \partial_{x_d} u = \frac{1}{2}\beta u \quad \text{on } D \cap \{x_d = 0\}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{E}$ be given. We will prove that

$$J_\beta(u, \Omega) \leq J_\beta(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega}),$$

with an equality, if and only if, $(u, \Omega) = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega})$. First, we notice that, since $J_\beta(1 \wedge \tilde{u} \vee 0, \tilde{\Omega}) \leq J_\beta(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega})$, we can suppose that $0 \leq \tilde{u} \leq 1$. We then write \tilde{u} as $\tilde{u} = 1 - \varphi$ for some $\varphi \in H_0^1(D)$ such that $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$ and we define the function $\tilde{u}_* = 1 - \varphi_*$, where $\varphi_* \in H_0^1(D)$ is the Steiner symmetrization of φ . We will show that

$$J_\beta(\tilde{u}_*, \Omega) \leq J_\beta(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\Omega}) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Indeed, it is well-known that the Steiner symmetrization decreases the Dirichlet energy:

$$\int_D |\nabla \tilde{u}_*|^2 dx = \int_D |\nabla \varphi_*|^2 dx \leq \int_D |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx = \int_D |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 dx.$$

In order to estimate also the second term of the energy J_β , we use a calibration-type argument. We first notice that, by construction, along every line orthogonal to $\{x_d = 0\}$, the symmetrized function achieves its maximum in zero. Precisely

$$\varphi(x', x_d) \leq \sup_{x_d} \varphi(x', x_d) = \varphi_*(x', 0).$$

Thus, by the definition of \tilde{u}_* , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B \cap \partial \tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{u}^2(x', x_d) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} &\geq \int_{B \cap \partial \tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{u}_*^2(x', 0) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \geq \int_{B \cap \partial \tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{u}_*^2(x', 0) \nu_{\tilde{\Omega}} \cdot e_d d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ &= \int_{B \cap \partial \Omega} \tilde{u}_*^2(x', 0) \nu_\Omega \cdot (-e_d) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_{\Omega \Delta \tilde{\Omega}} \operatorname{div}(\tilde{u}_*^2(x', 0) e_d) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where in order to get the last equality we used the divergence theorem in $\Omega \Delta \tilde{\Omega}$. Now, we notice that $\operatorname{div}(\tilde{u}_*^2(x', 0) e_d) = 0$ and that $\nu_\Omega = -e_d$. Thus, we get

$$\int_{B \cap \partial \tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{u}^2(x', x_d) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \geq \int_{B \cap \partial \Omega} \tilde{u}_*^2 d\mathcal{H}^{d-1},$$

which concludes the proof of (A.2). Finally, we notice that the problem

$$\min \left\{ J_\beta(u, \Omega) : u \in H^1(D \cap \{x_d > 0\}), \quad u = 1 \text{ on } \partial D \cap \{x_d > 0\} \right\},$$

has a unique solution u , which is Steiner symmetric, non-negative and satisfies (A.1). \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The first author was partially supported by PRIN 2017 *Nonlinear Differential Problems via Variational, Topological and Set-valued Methods* (Grant 2017AYM8XW). The second author was partially supported by the Academy of Finland grant 314227. The third author has been partially supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement VAREG, No. 853404).

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Bucur, S. Luckhaus. *Monotonicity formula and regularity for general free discontinuity problems*. Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **211** (2014), 489–511.
- [2] L. A. Caffarelli, D. Kriventsov. *A free boundary problem related to thermal insulation*. Comm. PDE **41** (7) (2016), 1149–1182.
- [3] Ennio De Giorgi. *Frontiere orientate di misura minima*. Seminario di Matematica della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, 1960-61. Editrice Tecnico Scientifica, Pisa (1961).
- [4] L. C. Evans, R. F. Gariepy. *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2nd revised edition (2015).
- [5] E. Giusti. *Minimal surfaces and functions of bounded variations*. Birkhäuser, Boston (1984).
- [6] D. Kriventsov. *A free boundary problem related to thermal insulation: flat implies smooth*. Calc. Var. PDE **58** (2019).
- [7] F. Maggi. *Sets of finite perimeter and geometric variational problems: an introduction to Geometric Measure Theory*. Cambridge University Press **135** (2012).

SERENA GUARINO LO BIANCO, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI “FEDERICO II”, DIPARTIMENTO DI AGRARIA, VIA UNIVERSITÀ 100, 80055 PORTICI (NA), ITALIA.

E-mail address: `serena.guarinolobianco@unina.it`

DOMENICO ANGELO LA MANNA, UNIVERSITY OF JYVASKYLÄ, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, P.O. BOX 35 (MAD) FI-40014, FINLAND

E-mail address: `domenicolamanna@hotmail.it`

BOZHIDAR VELICHOV, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI FEDERICO II, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E APPLICAZIONI “R. CACCIOPOLI”, VIA CINTIA, MONTE S. ANGELO - 80126 NAPOLI, ITALIA

E-mail address: `bozhidar.velichkov@gmail.com`