

Resolutivity and invariance for the Perron method for degenerate equations of divergence type

Anders Björn

*Department of Mathematics, Linköping University, SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden
anders.bjorn@liu.se, ORCID: 0000-0002-9677-8321*

Jana Björn

*Department of Mathematics, Linköping University, SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden
jana.bjorn@liu.se, ORCID: 0000-0002-1238-6751*

Abubakar Mwasa

*Department of Mathematics, Linköping University, SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden
Department of Mathematics, Busitema University, P.O.Box 236, Tororo, Uganda
abubakar.mwasa@liu.se, a.mwasa@yahoo.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-4077-3115*

Abstract

We consider Perron solutions to the Dirichlet problem for the quasilinear elliptic equation $\operatorname{div} \mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u) = 0$ in a bounded open set $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$. The vector-valued function \mathcal{A} satisfies the standard ellipticity assumptions with a parameter $1 < p < \infty$ and a p -admissible weight w . We show that arbitrary perturbations on sets of (p, w) -capacity zero of continuous (and certain quasi-continuous) boundary data f are resolute and that the Perron solutions for f and such perturbations coincide. As a consequence, we prove that the Perron solution with continuous boundary data is the unique bounded solution that takes the required boundary data outside a set of (p, w) -capacity zero.

Key words and phrases: capacity, degenerate quasilinear elliptic equation of divergence type, Dirichlet problem, Perron solution, quasicontinuous function, resolute.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): Primary: 35J66, Secondary: 31C45, 35J25, 35J92.

1. Introduction

We consider the Dirichlet problem for quasilinear elliptic equations of the form

$$\operatorname{div} \mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u) = 0 \tag{1.1}$$

in a bounded nonempty open subset Ω of the n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbf{R}^n . The mapping $\mathcal{A} : \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ satisfies the standard ellipticity assumptions with a parameter $1 < p < \infty$ and a p -admissible weight as in Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [7, Chapter 3].

The Dirichlet problem amounts to finding a solution of the partial differential equation in Ω with prescribed boundary data on the boundary of Ω . One of the most useful approaches to solving the Dirichlet problem in Ω with arbitrary boundary

data f is the Perron method. This method was introduced by Perron [11] and independently Remak [12] in 1923 for the Laplace equation $\Delta u = 0$ in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$. It gives an upper and a lower Perron solution (see Definition 3.2) and when the two coincide, we get a suitable solution Pf of the Dirichlet problem and f is called *resolutive*.

The Perron method for linear equations in Euclidean domains was studied by BreLOT [5], where a complete characterization of resolutive functions was given in terms of the harmonic measure. The Perron method was later extended to nonlinear equations. Granlund–Lindqvist–Martio [6] were the first to use the Perron method to study the nonlinear equation

$$\operatorname{div}(\nabla_q F(x, \nabla u)) = 0$$

(where $\nabla_q F$ stands for the gradient of F with respect to the second variable). This is a special type of equation (1.1), including the p -Laplace equation

$$\Delta_p u := \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) = 0. \quad (1.2)$$

Lindqvist–Martio [10] studied boundary regularity of (1.1) in the unweighted case and also showed that continuous boundary data f are resolutive when $p > n - 1$. Kilpeläinen [8] extended the resolutive to general p , which in turn was extended to weighted \mathbf{R}^n by Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [7]. More recently, the Perron method was used to study p -harmonic functions in the metric setting, see [1]–[4].

In this paper, we consider the weighted equation

$$\operatorname{div} \mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u) = 0$$

and show that arbitrary perturbations on sets of (p, w) -capacity zero of continuous boundary data f are resolutive and that the Perron solution for f and such perturbations coincide, see Theorem 3.9. In Proposition 3.8, we also obtain, as a by-product, that Perron solutions of perturbations of Lipschitz boundary data f are the same as the Sobolev solution of f . This perturbation result, as well as the equality of the Perron and Sobolev solutions, holds also for quasicontinuous representatives of Sobolev functions, see Theorem 4.2.

Moreover, we prove in Theorem 3.12 that the Perron solution for the equation (1.1) with continuous boundary data is the *unique* bounded solution of (1.1) that takes the required boundary data outside a set of (p, w) -capacity zero. A somewhat weaker uniqueness result is proved for quasicontinuous Sobolev functions in Corollary 4.5.

Much as we use Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [7] as the principal literature for this paper, our proof of resolutive for continuous boundary data is quite different from the one considered in [7]. In particular, we do not use exhaustions by regular domains. The obstacle problem for the operator $\operatorname{div} \mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u)$ and a convergence theorem for obstacle problems play a crucial role in the proof of our main results.

For p -harmonic functions, i.e. solutions of the p -Laplace equation (1.2), most of the results in this paper follow from Björn–Björn–Shanmugalingam [2], [3], where this was proved for p -energy minimizers in metric spaces. The proofs here have been inspired by [2] and [3], but have been adapted to the usual Sobolev spaces to make them more accessible for people not familiar with the nonlinear potential theory on metric spaces and Sobolev spaces based on upper gradients. They also apply to the more general \mathcal{A} -harmonic functions, defined by equations rather than minimization problems.

Acknowledgement. A. B and J. B. were partially supported by the Swedish Research Council grants 2016-03424 resp. 621-2014-3974 and 2018-04106. A. M. was supported by the SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency)

project 316-2014 “Capacity building in Mathematics and its applications” under the SIDA bilateral program with the Makerere University 2015–2020, contribution No. 51180060.

2. Notation and preliminaries

In this section, we present the basic notation and definitions that will be needed in this paper. Throughout, we assume that Ω is a bounded nonempty open subset of the n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbf{R}^n , $n \geq 2$, and $1 < p < \infty$. We use $\partial\Omega$ and $\bar{\Omega}$ to denote the boundary and the closure of Ω , respectively.

We write x to mean a point $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and for a function v which is infinitely many times continuously differentiable, i.e. $v \in C^\infty(\Omega)$, we write $\nabla v = (\partial_1 v, \dots, \partial_n v)$ for the gradient of v . We follow Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [7] as the primary reference for the material in this paper.

First, we give the definition of a weighted Sobolev space, which is crucial when studying degenerate elliptic differential equations, see [7] and Kilpeläinen [9].

Definition 2.1. The *weighted Sobolev space* $H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ is defined to be the completion of the set of all $v \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$\|v\|_{H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)} = \left(\int_{\Omega} (|v|^p + |\nabla v|^p) w \, dx \right)^{1/p} < \infty$$

with respect to the norm $\|v\|_{H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)}$, where w is the weight function which we define later.

The space $H_0^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ is the completion of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in $H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ while a function v is in $H_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ if and only if it belongs to $H^{1,p}(\Omega', w)$ for every open set $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$. As usual, $E \Subset \Omega$ if \bar{E} is a compact subset of Ω and

$$C_0^\infty(\Omega) = \{v \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R}^n) : \text{supp } v \Subset \Omega\}.$$

Throughout the paper, the mapping $\mathcal{A} : \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$, defining the elliptic operator (1.1), satisfies the following assumptions with a parameter $1 < p < \infty$, a p -admissible weight $w(x)$ and for some constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$, see [7, (3.3)–(3.7)]:

First, assume that $\mathcal{A}(x, q)$ is measurable in x for every $q \in \mathbf{R}^n$, and continuous in q for a.e. $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$. Also, for all $q \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and a.e. $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$, the following hold

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(x, q) \cdot q &\geq \alpha w(x) |q|^p \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{A}(x, q)| \leq \beta w(x) |q|^{p-1}, \quad (2.1) \\ (\mathcal{A}(x, q_1) - \mathcal{A}(x, q_2)) \cdot (q_1 - q_2) &> 0 \quad \text{for } q_1, q_2 \in \mathbf{R}^n, \quad q_1 \neq q_2, \\ \mathcal{A}(x, \lambda q) &= \lambda |\lambda|^{p-2} \mathcal{A}(x, q) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbf{R}, \quad \lambda \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.2. A function $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ is said to be a (*weak*) *solution* of (1.1) in Ω if for all test functions $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, the following integral identity holds

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

A function $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ is said to be a *supersolution* of (1.1) in Ω if for all nonnegative functions $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$,

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx \geq 0.$$

A function u is a *subsolution* of (1.1) if $-u$ is a supersolution of (1.1).

The sum of two (super)solutions is in general not a (super)solution. However, if u and v are two (super)solutions, then $\min\{u, v\}$ is a supersolution, see [7, Theorem 3.23]. If u is a supersolution and $a, b \in \mathbf{R}$, then $au + b$ is a supersolution provided that $a \geq 0$.

It is rather straightforward that u is a solution if and only if it is both a sub- and a supersolution, see [7, bottom p. 58]. By [7, Theorems 3.70 and 6.6], every solution u has a Hölder continuous representative v (i.e. $v = u$ a.e.).

Definition 2.3. A function u is \mathcal{A} -harmonic in Ω if it is a continuous weak solution of (1.1) in Ω .

We remark that \mathcal{A} -harmonic functions do not in general form a linear space. However, if u is \mathcal{A} -harmonic and $a, b \in \mathbf{R}$, then $au + b$ is also \mathcal{A} -harmonic. Nonnegative \mathcal{A} -harmonic functions u in a connected open set Ω satisfy Harnack's inequality $\sup_K u \leq c \inf_K u$ whenever $K \subset \Omega$ is compact, with the constant c depending on K , see [7, Section 6.2].

Definition 2.4. A weight w on \mathbf{R}^n is a nonnegative locally integrable function. We say that a weight w is p -admissible with $p \geq 1$ if the associated measure $d\mu = w dx$ is doubling and supports a p -Poincaré inequality, see [7, Chapters 1 and 20].

For instance, weights belonging to the Muckenhoupt class A_p are p -admissible as exhibited for example by Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [7] and Kilpeläinen [9]. By a weight $w \in A_p$ we mean that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all balls $B \subset \mathbf{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_B w(x) dx \right) \left(\int_B w(x)^{1/(1-p)} dx \right)^{p-1} &\leq C|B|^p, & \text{if } 1 < p < \infty, \\ \int_B w(x) dx &\leq C|B| \operatorname{ess\,inf}_B w, & \text{if } p = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $|B|$ is the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure of B .

We follow [7, Section 2.35] defining the Sobolev capacity as follows.

Definition 2.5. Let E be a subset of \mathbf{R}^n . The Sobolev (p, w) -capacity of E is

$$C_{p,w}(E) = \inf \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} (|u|^p + |\nabla u|^p) w dx,$$

where the infimum is taken over all $u \in H^{1,p}(\mathbf{R}^n, w)$ such that $u = 1$ in an open set containing E .

The Sobolev (p, w) -capacity is a monotone, subadditive set function. It follows directly from the definition that for all $E \subset \mathbf{R}^n$,

$$C_{p,w}(E) = \inf_{\substack{G \supset E \\ G \text{ open}}} C_{p,w}(G). \quad (2.3)$$

In particular, if $C_{p,w}(E) = 0$ then there exist open sets $U_j \supset E$ with $C_{p,w}(U_j) \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. For details, we refer the interested reader to [7, Section 2.1]. A property is said to hold *quasi*everywhere (abbreviated q.e.), if it holds for every point outside a set of Sobolev (p, w) -capacity zero.

3. Perron solutions and resolutivity

In order to discuss the Perron solutions for (1.1), we first recall the following basic results from Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [7, Chapters 7 and 9].

Definition 3.1. A function $u : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is \mathcal{A} -superharmonic in Ω if

- (i) u is lower semicontinuous,
- (ii) u is not identically ∞ in any component of Ω ,
- (iii) for every open $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$ and all functions $v \in C(\overline{\Omega}')$ which are \mathcal{A} -harmonic in Ω' , we have $v \leq u$ in Ω' whenever $v \leq u$ on $\partial\Omega'$.

A function $u : \Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ is \mathcal{A} -subharmonic in Ω if $-u$ is \mathcal{A} -superharmonic in Ω .

Let u and v be \mathcal{A} -superharmonic. Then $au + b$ and $\min\{u, v\}$ are \mathcal{A} -superharmonic whenever $a \geq 0$ and b are real numbers, but in general $u + v$ is not \mathcal{A} -superharmonic, see [7, Lemmas 7.1 and 7.2].

We briefly state how supersolutions and \mathcal{A} -superharmonic functions are related. It is proved in [7, Theorem 7.16] that if u is a supersolution of (1.1) and

$$u^*(x) = \operatorname{ess\,lim\,inf}_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u(y) \quad \text{for every } x \in \Omega, \quad (3.1)$$

then $u^* = u$ a.e. and u^* is \mathcal{A} -superharmonic. Conversely, if u is an \mathcal{A} -superharmonic function in Ω , then $u^* = u$ in Ω . If moreover, u is locally bounded from above, then $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ and u is a supersolution of (1.1) in Ω , see [7, Corollary 7.20]. That is, every supersolution has an \mathcal{A} -superharmonic representative and locally bounded \mathcal{A} -superharmonic functions are supersolutions.

Definition 3.2. Given a function $f : \partial\Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$, let \mathcal{U}_f be the set of all \mathcal{A} -superharmonic functions u on Ω bounded from below such that

$$\liminf_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u(y) \geq f(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial\Omega.$$

The *upper Perron solution* $\overline{P}f$ of f is defined by

$$\overline{P}f(x) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_f} u(x), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Analogously, let \mathcal{L}_f be the set of all \mathcal{A} -subharmonic functions v on Ω bounded from above such that

$$\limsup_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} v(y) \leq f(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial\Omega.$$

The *lower Perron solution* $\underline{P}f$ of f is defined by

$$\underline{P}f(x) = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{L}_f} v(x), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

We remark that if $\mathcal{U}_f = \emptyset$, then $\overline{P}f \equiv \infty$ and if $\mathcal{L}_f = \emptyset$, then $\underline{P}f \equiv -\infty$. In every component Ω' of Ω , $\overline{P}f$ (and $\underline{P}f$) is either \mathcal{A} -harmonic or identically $\pm\infty$ in Ω' , see [7, Theorem 9.2].

If $\overline{P}f = \underline{P}f$ is \mathcal{A} -harmonic, then f is said to be *resolutive* with respect to Ω . In this case, we write $Pf := \overline{P}f$. Continuous functions f are resolutive by [7, Theorem 9.25].

The following comparison principle shows that $\underline{P}f \leq \overline{P}f$.

Theorem 3.3. ([7, Comparison principle 7.6]) *Assume that u is \mathcal{A} -superharmonic and that v is \mathcal{A} -subharmonic in Ω . If*

$$\limsup_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} v(y) \leq \liminf_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u(y) \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial\Omega,$$

and if both sides are not simultaneously ∞ or $-\infty$, then $v \leq u$ in Ω .

We follow [7, Chapter 3] giving the following definition.

Definition 3.4. Let $\psi : \Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ and $f \in H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$. Let

$$\mathcal{K}_{\psi,f}(\Omega) = \{v \in H^{1,p}(\Omega, w) : v - f \in H_0^{1,p}(\Omega, w) \text{ and } v \geq \psi \text{ a.e in } \Omega\}.$$

A function $u \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi,f}(\Omega)$ is a *solution of the obstacle problem* in Ω with obstacle ψ and boundary data f if

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}(x, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla(v - u) dx \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{K}_{\psi,f}(\Omega).$$

In particular, a solution u of the obstacle problem for $\mathcal{K}_{\psi,u}(\Omega)$ with $\psi \equiv -\infty$ is a solution of (1.1). By considering $v = u + \varphi$ with $0 \leq \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, it is easily seen that the solution u of the obstacle problem is always a supersolution of (1.1) in Ω . Conversely, a supersolution u in Ω is always a solution of the obstacle problem for $\mathcal{K}_{u,u}(\Omega')$ for all open sets $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$. Moreover, a solution u of (1.1) is a solution of the obstacle problem for $\mathcal{K}_{\psi,u}(\Omega')$ with $\psi \equiv -\infty$ for all $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$, see [7, Section 3.19].

By [7, Theorem 3.21], there is an almost everywhere (a.e) unique solution u of the obstacle problem whenever $\mathcal{K}_{\psi,f}(\Omega)$ is nonempty. Furthermore, by defining u^* as in (3.1) we get a *lower semicontinuously regularized solution* in the same equivalence class as u , see [7, Theorem 3.63].

We call u^* the *lower semicontinuous (lsc) regularization* of u . Moreover, with $\psi \equiv -\infty$, the lsc-regularization of the solution of the obstacle problem for $\mathcal{K}_{\psi,f}(\Omega)$ provides us with the \mathcal{A} -harmonic extension Hf of f in Ω , that is, $Hf - f \in H_0^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ and Hf is \mathcal{A} -harmonic. The continuity of Hf in Ω is guaranteed by [7, Theorem 3.70].

Definition 3.5. A point $x \in \partial\Omega$ is *Sobolev regular* if, for every $f \in H^{1,p}(\Omega, w) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$, the \mathcal{A} -harmonic function Hf in Ω with $Hf - f \in H_0^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ satisfies

$$\lim_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} Hf(y) = f(x).$$

Furthermore, $x \in \partial\Omega$ is *regular* if

$$\lim_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} Pf(y) = f(x) \quad \text{for all } f \in C(\partial\Omega).$$

If $x \in \partial\Omega$ is not (Sobolev) regular, then it is (Sobolev) *irregular*.

By [7, Theorem 9.20], x is regular if and only if it is Sobolev regular, we will therefore just say “regular” from now on. By the Kellogg property [7, Theorem 8.10 and 9.11], the set of irregular points on $\partial\Omega$ has Sobolev (p, w) -capacity zero.

The following result is due to Björn–Björn–Shanmugalingam [2, Lemma 5.3]. Here it is slightly modified to suite our context. For completeness and the reader’s convenience, the proof is included.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\{U_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a decreasing sequence of open sets in \mathbf{R}^n such that $C_{p,w}(U_k) < 2^{-kp}$. Then there exists a decreasing sequence of nonnegative functions $\{\psi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ such that for all $j, m = 1, 2, \dots$,*

$$\|\psi_j\|_{H^{1,p}(\mathbf{R}^n, w)} < 2^{-j} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_j \geq m \text{ in } U_{j+m}.$$

In particular, $\psi_j = \infty$ on $\bigcap_{k=1}^\infty U_k$.

Proof. Since $C_{p,w}(U_k) < 2^{-kp}$, by Definition 2.5 there exist $\varphi_k \in H^{1,p}(\mathbf{R}^n, w)$ such that $\varphi_k = 1$ in U_k and $\|\varphi_k\|_{H^{1,p}(\mathbf{R}^n, w)} < 2^{-k}$. Replacing φ_k by its positive part $\max\{\varphi_k, 0\}$, we can assume that each φ_k is nonnegative. Define

$$\psi_j = \sum_{k=j+1}^\infty \varphi_k, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots$$

Then

$$\|\psi_j\|_{H^{1,p}(\mathbf{R}^n, w)} \leq \sum_{k=j+1}^{\infty} \|\varphi_k\|_{H^{1,p}(\mathbf{R}^n, w)} < \sum_{k=j+1}^{\infty} 2^{-k} = 2^{-j}.$$

Since $\varphi_k \geq 1$ on each U_k and $U_k \supset U_{j+m}$ when $j+1 \leq k \leq j+m$, it follows that $\psi_j \geq m$ in U_{j+m} . \square

We will need the following convergence theorem due to Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [7, Theorem 3.79] in order to prove the next proposition.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $\{\psi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be an a.e. decreasing sequence of functions in $H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ such that $\psi_j \rightarrow \psi$ in $H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$. Let $u_j \in H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ be a solution of the obstacle problem for $\mathcal{K}_{\psi_j, \psi_j}(\Omega)$. Then there exists a function $u \in H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ such that the sequence u_j decreases a.e. in Ω to u and u is a solution of the obstacle problem for $\mathcal{K}_{\psi, \psi}(\Omega)$.*

Proposition 3.8. *Let the function f be Lipschitz on $\bar{\Omega}$ and $h : \partial\Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ be such that $h = 0$ q.e. on $\partial\Omega$. Then both f and $f + h$ are resolute and*

$$P(f + h) = Pf = Hf.$$

Proof. Since f is Lipschitz and Ω bounded, we get that $f \in H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$. First, we assume that $f \geq 0$. Let $I_p \subset \partial\Omega$ be the set of all irregular points. Let $E = \{x \in \partial\Omega : h(x) \neq 0\}$. Then by the Kellogg property [7, Theorem 8.10], we have $C_{p,w}(I_p \cup E) = 0$. Using (2.3), we can find a decreasing sequence $\{U_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of bounded open sets in \mathbf{R}^n such that $I_p \cup E \subset U_k$ and $C_{p,w}(U_k) < 2^{-kp}$. Consider the decreasing sequence of nonnegative functions $\{\psi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ given in Lemma 3.6.

Let u_j be the lsc-regularized solution of the obstacle problem with obstacle and boundary data $f_j = Hf + \psi_j$, see [7, Theorems 3.21 and 3.63]. Let m be a positive integer. By the comparison principle [7, Lemma 3.18], we have that $Hf \geq 0$ and hence by Lemma 3.6,

$$f_j = Hf + \psi_j \geq \psi_j \geq m \quad \text{in } U_{j+m} \cap \Omega.$$

In particular, $u_j \geq f_j \geq m$ a.e. in $U_{j+m} \cap \Omega$ and since u_j is lsc-regularized, we have that

$$u_j \geq m \quad \text{everywhere in } U_{j+m} \cap \Omega. \quad (3.2)$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \partial\Omega$ be arbitrary. If $x \notin U_{j+m}$, then x is a regular point and thus Hf is continuous at x . Hence, there is a neighbourhood V_x of x such that

$$Hf(y) \geq f(x) - \varepsilon = (f + h)(x) - \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } y \in V_x \cap \Omega.$$

As $\psi_j \geq 0$, we have that $f_j = Hf + \psi_j \geq Hf$. So,

$$u_j(y) \geq f_j(y) \geq (f + h)(x) - \varepsilon \quad \text{for a.e. } y \in V_x \cap \Omega.$$

Since u_j is lsc-regularized, we get

$$u_j(y) \geq (f + h)(x) - \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } y \in V_x \cap \Omega.$$

And if $x \in U_{j+m}$, we instead let $V_x = U_{j+m}$. Then $u_j \geq m$ in $V_x \cap \Omega$ by (3.2).

Consequently, for all $x \in \partial\Omega$, we have

$$u_j(y) \geq \min\{(f + h)(x) - \varepsilon, m\} \quad \text{for all } y \in V_x \cap \Omega.$$

Thus,

$$\liminf_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u_j(y) \geq \min\{(f + h)(x) - \varepsilon, m\} \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial\Omega. \quad (3.3)$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $m \rightarrow \infty$ yields

$$\liminf_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u_j(y) \geq (f+h)(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial\Omega.$$

Since u_j is \mathcal{A} -superharmonic and nonnegative, we conclude that $u_j \in \mathcal{U}_{f+h}(\Omega)$, and thus $u_j \geq \bar{P}(f+h)$. As Hf is the solution of the obstacle problem for $\mathcal{K}_{Hf, Hf}(\Omega)$, we get by Theorem 3.7 that the sequence u_j decreases a.e. to Hf in Ω . Thus, $Hf \geq \bar{P}(f+h)$ a.e. in Ω . But Hf and $\bar{P}(f+h)$ are continuous, so we have that for all Lipschitz functions $f \geq 0$,

$$Hf \geq \bar{P}(f+h) \quad \text{everywhere in } \Omega. \quad (3.4)$$

Next, let f be an arbitrary Lipschitz function on $\bar{\Omega}$. Since f is bounded, there exists a constant $c \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $f+c \geq 0$. By the definition of Hf and of Perron solutions we see that

$$H(f+c) = Hf + c \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{P}(f+h+c) = \bar{P}(f+h) + c.$$

This together with (3.4) shows that

$$Hf = H(f+c) - c \geq \bar{P}(f+h+c) - c = \bar{P}(f+h),$$

i.e. (3.4) holds for arbitrary Lipschitz functions f . Applying it to $-f$ and $-h$ gives us that

$$Hf = -H(-f) \leq -\bar{P}(-f-h) = \underline{P}(f+h).$$

Together with the inequality $\underline{P}(f+h) \leq \bar{P}(f+h)$, implied by Theorem 3.3, we get that

$$Hf \leq \underline{P}(f+h) \leq \bar{P}(f+h) \leq Hf,$$

and thus $P(f+h) = Hf$ and $f+h$ is resolutive. Finally, letting $h=0$, it follows directly that f is resolutive and $Pf = Hf$. \square

It is now possible to extend the resolutive results to continuous functions. This gives us an alternative way of solving the Dirichlet problem with prescribed continuous boundary data.

Theorem 3.9. *Let $f \in C(\partial\Omega)$ and $h : \partial\Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ be such that $h=0$ q.e. on $\partial\Omega$. Then both f and $f+h$ are resolutive and $P(f+h) = Pf$.*

Proof. Since continuous functions can be approximated uniformly by Lipschitz functions, we have that there exists a sequence $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of Lipschitz functions such that

$$f_k - 2^{-k} \leq f \leq f_k + 2^{-k} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \quad (3.5)$$

From Definition 3.2 it follows that

$$\bar{P}f_k - 2^{-k} \leq \bar{P}f \leq \bar{P}f_k + 2^{-k} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

i.e. the functions $\bar{P}f_k$ converge uniformly to $\bar{P}f$ in Ω as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Using (3.5), we also obtain similar inequalities for $\underline{P}f, \bar{P}(f+h)$ and $\underline{P}(f+h)$ in terms of $\underline{P}f_k, \bar{P}(f_k+h)$ and $\underline{P}(f_k+h)$, respectively. By Proposition 3.8, we have that f_k and f_k+h are resolutive and moreover $P(f_k+h) = Pf_k$. Using the resolutive of f_k+h , we have

$$\bar{P}(f+h) - 2^{-k} \leq \bar{P}(f_k+h) = \underline{P}(f_k+h) \leq \underline{P}(f+h) + 2^{-k} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

from which it follows that

$$0 \leq \bar{P}(f+h) - \underline{P}(f+h) \leq 2^{1-k} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ shows that $f + h$ is resolvable. In the same way, f is resolvable. Next, we have from (3.5) that

$$P(f + h) - 2^{-k} \leq P(f_k + h) = Pf_k \leq Pf + 2^{-k} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

from which we get

$$P(f + h) - Pf \leq 2^{1-k}.$$

Similarly,

$$Pf - P(f + h) \leq 2^{1-k}.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ shows that $P(f + h) = Pf$. \square

If u is a bounded \mathcal{A} -harmonic function in Ω such that

$$f(x) = \lim_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u(y) \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial\Omega,$$

then $u \in \mathcal{U}_f \cap \mathcal{L}_f$. Thus,

$$u \leq \underline{P}f \leq \bar{P}f \leq u,$$

and so f is resolvable and $u = Pf$, see [7, p. 169]. Using Theorem 3.9, we can now generalize this fact and deduce the following uniqueness result.

Corollary 3.10. *Let $f \in C(\partial\Omega)$. Assume that u is bounded and \mathcal{A} -harmonic in Ω and that there is a set $E \subset \partial\Omega$ with $C_{p,w}(E) = 0$ such that*

$$\lim_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u(y) = f(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial\Omega \setminus E.$$

Then $u = Pf$ in Ω .

Proof. Add a sufficiently large constant to both f and u , and then rescale the new values of f and u so that $0 \leq f \leq 1$ and $0 \leq u \leq 1$. Since u is bounded and \mathcal{A} -harmonic in Ω , we have that $u \in \mathcal{L}_{f+\chi_E}$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}_{f-\chi_E}$. Thus, by Theorem 3.9, we get that

$$u \leq \underline{P}(f + \chi_E) = Pf = \bar{P}(f - \chi_E) \leq u \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad \square$$

Remark 3.11. The word *bounded* is essential for the above uniqueness result to hold. Otherwise it fails. For instance, the Poisson kernel

$$\frac{1 - |z|^2}{|1 - z|^2}$$

with a pole at 1 is a harmonic function in the unit disc $B(0, 1) \subset \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{R}^2$, which is zero on $\partial B(0, 1) \setminus \{1\}$.

The Kellogg property [7, Theorem 9.11] together with Corollary 3.10, yields the following uniqueness result.

Theorem 3.12. *Let $f \in C(\partial\Omega)$. Then there exists a unique bounded \mathcal{A} -harmonic function u in Ω such that*

$$\lim_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u(y) = f(x) \quad \text{for q.e. } x \in \partial\Omega, \quad (3.6)$$

moreover $u = Pf$.

Proof. By the Kellogg property [7, Theorem 9.11] and Theorem 3.9, we have that $u = Pf$ satisfies (3.6). On the other hand, if u satisfies (3.6), then Corollary 3.10 shows that $u = Pf$. \square

4. Quasicontinuous functions

One of the useful properties of the Sobolev space $H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ is that every function in $H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ has a (p, w) -quasicontinuous representative which is unique upto sets of (p, w) -capacity zero, see [7, Theorem 4.4].

Definition 4.1. A function $v : \Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ is (p, w) -quasicontinuous in Ω if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an open set G such that $C_{p,w}(G) < \varepsilon$ and the restriction of v to $\Omega \setminus G$ is finite valued and continuous.

It follows from the outer regularity (2.3) of $C_{p,w}$ that if v is quasicontinuous and $\bar{v} = v$ q.e. then \bar{v} is also quasicontinuous.

Refining the techniques in Section 3, we can obtain the following result.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ be a (p, w) -quasicontinuous function in \mathbf{R}^n such that $f \in H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$. Let $h : \partial\Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ be such that $h = 0$ q.e. on $\partial\Omega$. Then $f + h$ and f are resolutive and $P(f + h) = Pf = Hf$.*

In $f + h$ we can interpret $\pm\infty \mp \infty$ arbitrarily in $[-\infty, \infty]$. Before the proof of Theorem 4.2, we give the following two lemmas which may be of independent interest.

Lemma 4.3. *Let f be as in Theorem 4.2. Then its \mathcal{A} -harmonic extension Hf , extended by f outside Ω , is (p, w) -quasicontinuous in \mathbf{R}^n .*

Proof. Define $v := Hf - f$ and extend it by zero outside Ω . Then $v \in H_0^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$. By [7, Theorem 4.5], there is a (p, w) -quasicontinuous function \bar{v} in \mathbf{R}^n such that $\bar{v} = v$ a.e. in Ω and $\bar{v} = 0$ q.e. in the complement of Ω . Recall that Hf is a continuous function in Ω and f is assumed to be (p, w) -quasicontinuous in Ω . This clearly means that v is also (p, w) -quasicontinuous in Ω . It then follows from [7, Theorem 4.12] that $v = \bar{v}$ q.e. in Ω . We know that $v = 0$ outside the set Ω . Thus, we can conclude that $\bar{v} = v$ q.e. in \mathbf{R}^n . Finally, by (2.3), since \bar{v} is (p, w) -quasicontinuous in \mathbf{R}^n , so is v and hence also $f + v$, which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a decreasing sequence of functions in $H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ such that $f_j \rightarrow f$ in $H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$. Then the sequence Hf_j decreases to Hf in Ω .*

Proof. By the comparison principle [7, Lemma 3.18], we have for all $j = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$u_j := Hf_j \geq Hf_{j+1} \geq \dots \geq Hf \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Thus $u(x) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} u_j(x)$ exists for all $x \in \Omega$ and $u(x) \geq Hf(x)$. Note that Hf is continuous in Ω and so the sequence u_j is locally bounded from below in Ω . By [7, Theorem 3.77], u is a supersolution in Ω . Similarly, [7, Theorem 3.75] applied to $-u_j$ shows that u is a subsolution. Hence u is a solution of (1.1) in Ω , see [7, bottom p. 58].

To conclude the proof, we need to show that $u - f \in H_0^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$. We know that $u_j - f_j \rightarrow u - f$ pointwise a.e. and $u_j - f_j \in H_0^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$. Because of [7, Lemma 1.32], it is sufficient to show that $u_j - f_j$ is a bounded sequence in $H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$.

Using the Poincaré inequality [7, (1.5)] we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_j - f_j\|_{H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)} &\leq C_\Omega \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_j - \nabla f_j|^p w \, dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq C_\Omega \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_j|^p w \, dx \right)^{1/p} + C_\Omega \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla f_j|^p w \, dx \right)^{1/p}, \end{aligned}$$

where C_Ω is a constant which depends on Ω . Since u_j is a solution and \mathcal{A} satisfies the ellipticity conditions (2.1), testing (2.2) with $\varphi = u_j - f_j$ yields

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_j|^p w \, dx \right)^{1/p} \leq C \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla f_j|^p w \, dx \right)^{1/p},$$

where C is a constant depending on the structure constants α and β in (2.1). Therefore,

$$\|u_j - f_j\|_{H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)} \leq C' \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla f_j|^p w \, dx \right)^{1/p} \leq C' \|f_j\|_{H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)} \leq M < \infty,$$

since the sequence $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is bounded in $H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$. This shows that $u_j - f_j$ is bounded in $H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$. Consequently, by [7, Lemma 1.32], $u - f \in H_0^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ and $u = Hf$ by uniqueness, cf. [7, Theorem 3.17]. \square

We now prove Theorem 4.2 and refer the reader to closely look at the proof of Proposition 3.8 to fill in details where needed.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. First assume that $f \geq 0$ and so $Hf \geq 0$. Define $u := Hf$ extended by f outside Ω . By Lemma 4.3, u is (p, w) -quasicontinuous in \mathbf{R}^n . Let $\{U_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a decreasing sequence of bounded open sets in \mathbf{R}^n such that $C_{p,w}(U_k) < 2^{-kp}$, $h = 0$ outside U_k and u restricted to $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus U_k$ is continuous. Let u_j be the lsc-regularized solution of the obstacle problem with the obstacle and boundary data $f_j = u + \psi_j$, where ψ_j are as in Lemma 3.6, $j = 1, 2, \dots$. As in the proof of Proposition 3.8 we get

$$u_j \geq m \quad \text{everywhere in } U_{j+m} \cap \Omega. \quad (4.1)$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \partial\Omega$ be arbitrary. If $x \in \partial\Omega \setminus U_{j+m}$, then by quasicontinuity, u restricted to $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus U_{j+m}$ is continuous at x . Thus, there is a neighbourhood V_x of x such that

$$Hf(y) = u(y) \geq u(x) - \varepsilon = f(x) - \varepsilon = (f + h)(x) - \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } y \in (V_x \cap \Omega) \setminus U_{j+m}.$$

Since $\psi_j \geq 0$, we get $f_j(y) \geq u(y) = Hf(y)$ and so,

$$u_j(y) \geq f_j(y) \geq (f + h)(x) - \varepsilon \quad \text{for a.e. } y \in (V_x \cap \Omega) \setminus U_{j+m}. \quad (4.2)$$

If $x \in U_{j+m}$, let $V_x = \emptyset$. Then by (4.1) and (4.2), we get for all $x \in \partial\Omega$,

$$u_j(y) \geq \min\{(f + h)(x) - \varepsilon, m\} \quad \text{for a.e. } y \in (V_x \cup U_{j+m}) \cap \Omega$$

Since u_j is lsc-regularized, we have

$$u_j(y) \geq \min\{(f + h)(x) - \varepsilon, m\} \quad \text{for all } y \in (V_x \cup U_{j+m}) \cap \Omega,$$

and consequently, (3.3) follows. Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $m \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that $u_j \in \mathcal{U}_{f+h}(\Omega)$. Continuing as in Proposition 3.8, we can conclude that

$$\overline{P}(f + h) \leq Hf \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad (4.3)$$

holds for all quasicontinuous $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ in $H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ that are nonnegative (or merely bounded from below).

Now if $f \in H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ is arbitrary, then by (4.3) together with Lemma 4.4 we have that

$$\overline{P}(f + h) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} \overline{P}(\max\{f, k\} + h) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} H \max\{f, k\} = Hf \quad \text{q.e. in } \Omega.$$

Thus, (4.3) holds for any $f \in H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$ and applying it to $-f$ and $-h$ together with the inequality $\underline{P}(f + h) \leq \overline{P}(f + h)$, concludes the proof. \square

Unlike for continuous boundary data in Theorem 3.9, for quasicontinuous boundary data it is in general impossible to have $\lim_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} Pf(y) = f(x)$ for q.e. $x \in \partial\Omega$, see Example 4.6 below. However, we get the following uniqueness result as a consequence of Theorem 4.2.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ be a (p, w) -quasicontinuous function in \mathbf{R}^n such that $f \in H^{1,p}(\Omega, w)$. Assume that u is a bounded \mathcal{A} -harmonic function in Ω and that there is a set $E \subset \partial\Omega$ with $C_{p,w}(E) = 0$ such that*

$$\lim_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u(y) = f(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial\Omega \setminus E.$$

Then $u = Pf$.

Proof. Since u is a bounded \mathcal{A} -harmonic function in Ω , we have that $u \in \mathcal{L}_{f+\infty\chi_E}$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}_{f-\infty\chi_E}$. Thus by Theorem 4.2, we get that

$$u \leq \underline{P}(f + \infty\chi_E) = Pf = \bar{P}(f - \infty\chi_E) \leq u \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad \square$$

The following example shows that in many situations there is a bounded quasicontinuous function $f \in H^{1,p}(\mathbf{R}^n, w)$ such that no function u satisfies

$$\lim_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u(y) = f(x) \quad \text{for q.e. } x \in \partial\Omega.$$

In particular it is impossible for the Perron solution Pf to attain these quasicontinuous boundary data q.e.

Example 4.6. Assume that $\partial\Omega$ contains a dense countable sequence $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of points with $C_{p,w}(\{x_j\}) = 0$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$. As Ω is bounded it follows from [7, Corollary 2.39 and Lemma 2.46] that $C_{p,w}(\partial\Omega) > 0$. Using (2.3), we can then find $r_j > 0$ so small that $C_{p,w}(B(x_j, r_j)) < 3^{-j}C_{p,w}(\partial\Omega)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$.

By [7, Corollary 2.39], each x_j has zero variational (p, w) -capacity, and hence, by the definition of the variational capacity [7, p. 27] there is $f_j \in C_0^\infty(B(x_j, r_j))$ such that $f_j(x_j) = 1$ and $\|f_j\|_{H^{1,p}(\mathbf{R}^n, w)} < 2^{-j}$. Then

$$f := \sum_{j=1}^\infty \max\{f_j, 0\} \in H^{1,p}(\mathbf{R}^n, w).$$

Since the partial sums of f are continuous and coincide with f outside the open sets $\bigcup_{j \geq k} B(x_j, r_j)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, with arbitrarily small (p, w) -capacity, we see that f is quasicontinuous. For each j there is $r'_j < r_j$ such that $f_j \geq \frac{1}{2}$ in $B(x_j, r'_j)$. Thus

$$f \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{ in } G' = \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty B(x_j, r'_j) \quad \text{and} \quad f = 0 \text{ outside } G = \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty B(x_j, r_j).$$

Note that $C_{p,w}(G) < \sum_{j=1}^\infty 3^{-j}C_{p,w}(\partial\Omega) < C_{p,w}(\partial\Omega)$. Also let

$$S = \{x \in \partial\Omega : \text{there is } r > 0 \text{ such that } C_{p,w}(B(x, r) \cap \partial\Omega) = 0\},$$

which is the largest relatively open subset of $\partial\Omega$ with $C_{p,w}(S) = 0$.

Finally, assume that $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is such that

$$\tilde{u}(x) := \lim_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u(y) = f(x) \quad \text{for q.e. } x \in \partial\Omega. \quad (4.4)$$

In particular $\tilde{u} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ q.e. in $G' \cap \partial\Omega$, and thus in a dense subset of $\partial\Omega \setminus S$. It follows that

$$\limsup_{\Omega \ni y \rightarrow x} u(y) \geq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial\Omega \setminus S.$$

But this violates the assumption that $\tilde{u}(x) = f(x) = 0$ q.e. in $\partial\Omega \setminus G$, since $C_{p,w}(\partial\Omega \setminus G) > 0$. Hence there is no function u satisfying (4.4).

Replacing f by $\min\{f, 1\}$ yields a similar bounded counterexample.

References

1. BJÖRN, A. and BJÖRN, J., *Nonlinear Potential Theory on Metric Spaces*, EMS Tracts Math. 17, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2011. [2](#)
2. BJÖRN, A., BJÖRN, J. and SHANMUGALINGAM, N., The Perron method for p -harmonic functions in metric spaces, *J. Differential Equations* **195** (2003), 398–429. [2](#), [6](#)
3. BJÖRN, A., BJÖRN, J. and SHANMUGALINGAM, N., The Dirichlet problem for p -harmonic functions with respect to the Mazurkiewicz boundary, and new capacities, *J. Differential Equations* **259** (2015), 3078–3114. [2](#)
4. BJÖRN, A., BJÖRN, J. and SJÖDIN, T., The Dirichlet problem for p -harmonic functions with respect to arbitrary compactifications, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* **34** (2018), 1323–1360. [2](#)
5. BRELOT, M., Familles de Perron et problème de Dirichlet, *Acta Litt. Sci. Szeged* **9** (1939), 133–153. [2](#)
6. GRANLUND, S., LINDQVIST, P. and MARTIO, O., Note on the PWB-method in the nonlinear case, *Pacific J. Math* **125** (1986), 381–395. [2](#)
7. HEINONEN, J., KILPELÄINEN, T. and MARTIO, O., *Nonlinear Potential Theory of Degenerate Elliptic Equations*, 2nd ed., Dover, Mineola, NY, 2006. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#)
8. KILPELÄINEN, T., Potential theory for supersolutions of degenerate elliptic equations, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **38** (1989), 253–275. [2](#)
9. KILPELÄINEN, T., Weighted Sobolev spaces and capacity, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* **19** (1994), 95–113. [3](#), [4](#)
10. LINDQVIST, P. and MARTIO, O., Two theorems of N. Wiener for solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations, *Acta Math.* **155** (1985), 153–171. [2](#)
11. PERRON, O., Eine neue Behandlung der ersten Randwertaufgabe für $\Delta u = 0$, *Math. Z.* **18** (1923), 42–54. [2](#)
12. REMAK, R., Über potentialkonvexe Funktionen, *Math. Z.* **20** (1924), 126–130. [2](#)