

Note on a sign-dependent regularity for the polyharmonic Dirichlet problem

Inka Schnieders* & Guido Sweers*

February 10, 2022

Abstract

A priori estimates for semilinear higher order elliptic equations usually have to deal with the absence of a maximum principle. This note presents some regularity estimates for the polyharmonic Dirichlet problem that will make a distinction between the influence on the solution of the positive and the negative part of the right-hand side.

Keywords: polyharmonic, m-laplace problem, higher order, sign-dependent regularity

Mathematics Subject Classification (MSC) 2020: primary 35J30, secondary 35B45, 35J86

1 Introduction and main result

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{2m,\gamma}$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and consider the Dirichlet problem for the poly-laplace operator:

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^m u = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = \frac{\partial}{\partial n} u = \dots = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial n}\right)^{m-1} u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Suppose that

$$f^+ := \max(0, f) \quad \text{and} \quad f^- := \max(0, -f) \quad (2)$$

is such that $f^+ \in L^{p_+}(\Omega)$ and $f^- \in L^{p_-}(\Omega)$ with $p_+, p_- \in (1, \infty)$. For the second order case, that is $m = 1$, one may use the maximum principle and solve

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u^\oplus = f^+ & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u^\oplus = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u^\ominus = f^- & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u^\ominus = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

separately to find $u = u^\oplus - u^\ominus$ for

$$0 \leq u^\oplus \in W^{2,p_+}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,p_+}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq u^\ominus \in W^{2,p_-}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,p_-}(\Omega),$$

with the usual regularity estimates ([2]):

$$\|u^\oplus\|_{W^{2m,p_+}(\Omega)} \leq c_{p_+} \|f^+\|_{L^{p_+}(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u^\ominus\|_{W^{2m,p_-}(\Omega)} \leq c_{p_-} \|f^-\|_{L^{p_-}(\Omega)}. \quad (3)$$

The constants will depend on Ω , but that dependence we will suppress in our notation.

Whenever $m \geq 2$ there is no maximum principle or, unless we have a special domain like a ball [3], a positivity preserving property in the sense that $f \geq 0$ in (1) would result in $u \geq 0$. Nevertheless, it is possible to find a result quite similar to (3) for the solution of (1). Such a separation of the regularity for the positive and negative part is something we need for a higher order semilinear problem that we consider in [9]. Since we believe it has some interest in itself, we present this sign-dependent regularity in this separate note.

Our main result for (1) with $m \in \mathbb{N}^{++} := \{2, 3, \dots\}$ is as follows:

*Department Mathematik/Informatik, Universität zu Köln, Weyertal 86-90, 50931 Köln, Germany, ischnied@math.uni-koeln.de, gsweers@math.uni-koeln.de

Theorem 1 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{2m,\gamma}$ and let $p_{\pm} \in (1, \infty)$. Suppose that $f = f^+ - f^-$ as in (2) with $f^+ \in L^{p_+}(\Omega)$ and $f^- \in L^{p_-}(\Omega)$. Then there exist constants $c_{p_+,m}, c_{p_-,m} > 0$, independent of f^+, f^- , such that the following holds. The unique solution u of (1) can be written as $u = u^{\oplus} - u^{\ominus}$, with*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq u^{\oplus} &\in W^{2m,p_+}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{m,p_+}(\Omega), \\ 0 \leq u^{\ominus} &\in W^{2m,p_-}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{m,p_-}(\Omega), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^{\oplus}\|_{W^{2m,p_+}(\Omega)} &\leq c_{p_+,m} \left(\|f^+\|_{L^{p_+}(\Omega)} + \|f^-\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \right), \\ \|u^{\ominus}\|_{W^{2m,p_-}(\Omega)} &\leq c_{p_-,m} \left(\|f^-\|_{L^{p_-}(\Omega)} + \|f^+\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Although we will construct u^{\oplus}, u^{\ominus} in a way such that u^{\oplus}, u^{\ominus} is unique, the statement in the theorem does not give uniqueness of this decomposition u^{\oplus}, u^{\ominus} . Since $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ with $p = \min\{p_-, p_+\} > 1$ and $\partial\Omega \in C^{2m,\gamma}$, the solution is unique in $W^{2m,p}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{m,p}(\Omega)$.

Generically $u^{\oplus} \neq u^+$, but since $u^+ = (u^{\oplus} - u^{\ominus})^+ \leq (u^{\oplus})^+ = u^{\oplus}$, we find that

$$-u^{\ominus} \leq -u^- \leq 0 \leq u^+ \leq u^{\oplus}. \quad (4)$$

With this estimate one also finds a signed Sobolev inequality. Setting

$$q_{n,m,p} := \frac{np}{n - 2mp} \quad (5)$$

we may combine with the Sobolev imbedding theorem, see [1, Theorem 4.12], to obtain the following:

Corollary 2 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be bounded with $\partial\Omega \in C^{2m,\gamma}$ and let $p_{\pm} \in (1, \infty)$. Suppose that $f = f^+ - f^-$ with $f^+ \in L^{p_+}(\Omega)$ and $f^- \in L^{p_-}(\Omega)$. Let u be the solution of (1) as in Theorem 1. Then the following holds:*

1. *If moreover $p_+ \leq \frac{n}{2m}$ (so $n > 2m$) and $q \in [1, q_{n,m,p_+}]$ with $q < \infty$, then there is $c'_{p_+,q,m} > 0$ such that*

$$\|u^+\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq c'_{p_+,q,m} \left(\|f^+\|_{L^{p_+}(\Omega)} + \|f^-\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \right).$$

2. *If moreover $p_+ > \frac{n}{2m}$, then there is $c'_{p_+,m} > 0$ such that*

$$\sup u \leq c'_{p_+,m} \left(\|f^+\|_{L^{p_+}(\Omega)} + \|f^-\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \right).$$

Similar results depending on p_- hold for u^- and $\sup(-u)$.

2 Relation to previous results

Since the fundamental contributions by Agmon, Douglis and Nirenberg [2] it is known, assuming that Ω is bounded with a smooth enough boundary, that for each $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ a solution of (1) satisfies $u \in W^{2m,p}(\Omega)$. Whenever the solution is unique, and with the $C^{2m,\gamma}$ -boundary the solution for (1) is unique for any $p \in (1, \infty)$, there exist $C_{m,p} > 0$, independent of f , such that

$$\|u\|_{W^{2m,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_{m,p} \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \quad (6)$$

Whenever $p \in (1, \frac{n}{2m})$, and such p exist when $n > 2m$, the Sobolev imbedding shows that for $q \leq q_{n,m,p}$, as in (5), a constant $C'_{m,p,q} > 0$ exists such that

$$\|u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C'_{m,p,q} \|u\|_{W^{2m,p}(\Omega)}.$$

Combining both estimates will lead to an estimate as in Corollary (2) but then without the sign. However, since $0 \leq u^+ \leq u^\oplus$ holds, one finds $\|u^+\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq \|u^\oplus\|_{L^q(\Omega)}$ and one is left with proving the result in Theorem 1.

For $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$ signed estimates as in the corollary will follow directly from the Riesz potential \mathcal{I}_{2m} , [8], for the Riesz potential solution of $(-\Delta)^m u = f$, when f goes to zero at ∞ in an appropriate sense. Indeed, see [10, Chapter V], that solution is given by

$$u(x) = (\mathcal{I}_{2m}f)(x) := \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}n-m)}{\pi^{\frac{1}{2}n}4^m\Gamma(m)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x-y|^{2m-n} f(y) dy. \quad (7)$$

Since the kernel in (7) is positive, it allows one to consider separately the influence of $f^+ \in L^{p+}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $f^- \in L^{p-}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $p_+, p_- \in (1, \frac{n}{2m})$. Indeed, on \mathbb{R}^n the function $u = u^\oplus - u^\ominus$ with

$$u^\oplus(x) := (\mathcal{I}_{2m}f^+)(x) \text{ and } u^\ominus(x) := (\mathcal{I}_{2m}f^-)(x)$$

is such that $u^\oplus \in L^{q+}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $u^\ominus \in L^{q-}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $q_\pm := q_{n,m,p_\pm}$.

On a bounded domain with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions the crucial ingredient that allows us to consider f^+ and f^- separately, comes from [4]. There one finds that the Green function $G_{\Omega,m}$ for (1), that is

$$u(x) = (\mathcal{G}f)(x) := \int_{\Omega} G_{\Omega,m}(x,y) f(y) dy \quad (8)$$

solves (1), is such that the following estimate holds for some $\tilde{c}_{1,\Omega}, \tilde{c}_{2,\Omega}, \tilde{c}_{3,\Omega} > 0$:

$$\tilde{c}_{1,\Omega} H(x,y) \leq G_{\Omega,m}(x,y) + \tilde{c}_{2,\Omega} d(x)^m d(y)^m \leq \tilde{c}_{3,\Omega} H(x,y) \quad (9)$$

with $H : \overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ defined by

$$H(x,y) = \begin{cases} |x-y|^{2m-n} \min\left(1, \frac{d(x)d(y)}{|x-y|^2}\right)^m & \text{for } n > 2m, \\ \log\left(1 + \left(\frac{d(x)d(y)}{|x-y|^2}\right)^m\right) & \text{for } n = 2m, \\ (d(x)d(y))^{m-n/2} \min\left(1, \frac{d(x)d(y)}{|x-y|^2}\right)^{n/2} & \text{for } n < 2m. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Here d is the distance to the boundary $\partial\Omega$:

$$d(x) = d(x, \partial\Omega) := \inf \{|x - x^*|; x^* \in \partial\Omega\}.$$

The estimate in (9) allows us to separate the solution operator in a signed singular part and a smooth bounded part. The singular part will have the same regularity properties as in (6) from [2], but the fixed sign allows us to separate f^+ and f^- .

One may wonder how general such signed regularity estimates may hold for higher order elliptic boundary value problems. Such estimates are known for pure powers of the negative laplacian $-\Delta$. Pure powers of second order elliptic operators with constant coefficients may be allowed and they may even be perturbed by small lower order terms. See [7]. However, a recent paper [5] shows examples of higher order elliptic operators, even with constant coefficients, for which the singularity at $x = y$ is sign-changing. Obviously for such a problem there is no estimate like (9) possible.

3 The proof

The distance function d is at most Lipschitz, even on C^∞ -domains. So as a first step we will replace $d(x)^m d(y)^m$ in (9) by a smoother function, namely by $w(x)w(y)$ where

$$w := e_1^m \quad (11)$$

and e_1 is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta e_1 = 1 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ e_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3 *This function w from (11) inherits the smoothness of the boundary $\partial\Omega$, in the sense that $\partial\Omega \in C^{2m,\gamma}$ implies $w \in C^{2m,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$. Moreover, there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that*

$$c_1 d(x)^m \leq w(x) \leq c_2 d(x)^m \text{ for all } x \in \Omega. \quad (12)$$

Proof. By the maximum principle and more precisely a uniform Hopf's boundary point lemma, which holds for $\partial\Omega \in C^{1,\gamma}$, one finds that a constant $C_H > 0$ exists with $e_1(x) \geq C_H d(x)$ for all $x \in \overline{\Omega}$. Since $e_1 \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$, one finds another constant $C_e > 0$ such that $e_1(x) \leq C_e d(x)$ for all $x \in \Omega$. By [6, Theorem 6.19] $e_1 \in C^{2m,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ and hence $w = e_1^m \in C^{2m,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ and satisfies (12). ■

Since the function $H(\cdot, \cdot)$ from (10) satisfies for some $C_{\text{GRS}} > 0$

$$H(x, y) \geq C_{\text{GRS}} (d(x)d(y))^m \text{ for all } x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$$

there exists $\hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2, \hat{c}_3 > 0$ such that the following variant of (9) holds:

$$\hat{c}_1 H(x, y) \leq G_{\Omega, m}(x, y) + \hat{c}_2 w(x) w(y) \leq \hat{c}_3 H(x, y). \quad (13)$$

We do not directly replace d in H by e_1 , but instead define the function $H_{\Omega, m} : \overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by

$$H_{\Omega, m}(x, y) := G_{\Omega, m}(x, y) + \hat{c}_2 w(x) w(y). \quad (14)$$

In the next theorem we will state some properties of the operator $\mathcal{H} : C(\overline{\Omega}) \rightarrow C(\overline{\Omega})$ defined by

$$(\mathcal{H}f)(x) := \int_{\Omega} H_{\Omega, m}(x, y) f(y) dy. \quad (15)$$

For later use we also set $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{H} - \mathcal{G}$, i.e.

$$(\mathcal{D}f)(x) := \hat{c}_2 w(x) \int_{\Omega} w(y) f(y) dy, \quad (16)$$

which is well-defined for $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ and bounded as operator from $L^1(\Omega)$ to $C^{2m,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$. Note that $w \in W_0^{m,q}(\Omega)$ for any $q \in (1, \infty)$ and hence \mathcal{D} can even be extended to $W^{-m,p}(\Omega) := \left(W_0^{m,p/(p-1)}(\Omega)\right)'$.

For $n > 2m$ one finds from (13) and (10) that there is $C_{2,\Omega,m} > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq H_{\Omega, m}(x, y) \leq C_{2,\Omega,m} |x - y|^{2m-n} \text{ for all } (x, y) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}, \quad (17)$$

Hence from the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev Theorem of fractional integration (see [10, Theorem 1, p. 119]) one finds the first two statements of:

Lemma 4 *Let Ω be a bounded domain and $\partial\Omega \in C^{2m,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and let $p \in [1, \infty)$. Then $\mathcal{H}f$ in (14)-(15) is well-defined for all $f \in L^p(\Omega)$:*

1. For all $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ the integral in (15) is absolute convergent for almost every $x \in \Omega$.

2. Suppose $n > 2m$. For all $p \in (1, \frac{n}{2m})$ and $q \in [1, \frac{np}{n-2mp}]$ there exist constants $C_{p,q} > 0$ independent of $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, such that

$$\|\mathcal{H}f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C_{p,q} \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \quad (18)$$

3. For all $p \geq 1$ with $p > \frac{n}{2m}$ there exist constants $C_p > 0$ independent of $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, such that

$$\|\mathcal{H}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_p \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \quad (19)$$

Proof. By (17) we find for $f \geq 0$ and f extended by 0 outside of Ω , that

$$0 \leq \mathcal{H}f \leq c_m \mathcal{I}_{2m}f$$

with $\mathcal{I}_{2m}f$ a Riesz potential of f defined in (7). By [10, Theorem 1, p. 119] the first item holds. Moreover, [10, Theorem 1, p. 119] also states that for $p \in (1, \frac{n}{2m})$ there exists $C_{\text{HLS},p,n,m} > 0$ such that

$$\|\mathcal{I}_{2m}f\|_{L^{\frac{np}{n-2mp}}(\Omega)} \leq C_{\text{HLS},p,n,m} \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \quad (20)$$

With (20) one finds (18) for positive f and $q = \frac{np}{n-2mp}$. Since Ω is bounded, the estimate holds for all $q \in [1, \frac{np}{n-2mp}]$. For general f one splits by $f = f^+ - f^-$, uses linearity, $\|f^\pm\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ and finds (18) with twice the constant for f with fixed sign.

If $n > 2m$ and $p > \frac{n}{2m}$, then the third item follows from (17) and the usual estimate by Hölder's inequality applied to the Riesz potential:

$$\|\mathcal{H}f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c'_m \sup_{x \in \Omega} \left\| |x - \cdot|^{2m-n} \right\|_{L^{p/(p-1)}(\Omega)} \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$$

For $n = 2m$ the logarithmic singularity lies in L^q for any $q < \infty$, which gives the estimate by Hölder for any $p > 1$. For $n < 2m$ the kernel of \mathcal{H} is uniformly bounded, which yields the estimate for $p = 1$ and hence for any $p \geq 1$. \blacksquare

Proposition 5 Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with $\partial\Omega \in C^{2m,\gamma}$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Let \mathcal{H} be defined by (15,14). Then for any $p \in (1, \infty)$ there exists $C_{m,p} > 0$ such that for all $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, it holds that $\mathcal{H}f \in W^{2m,p}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{m,p}(\Omega)$ and

$$\|\mathcal{H}f\|_{W^{2m,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_{m,p} \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \quad (21)$$

Proof. For $0 \leq f \in L^p(\Omega)$ let $f_\varepsilon := \varphi_\varepsilon * f \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ denote the usual mollification, with φ_ε the mollifier from Friedrichs and f extended by 0 outside of Ω . By Lemma 4 and suitable p, q , that is $\frac{1}{q} \geq \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2m}{n}$, one finds

$$\|\mathcal{H}f - \mathcal{H}f_\varepsilon\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C_{p,q} \|f - f_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \quad (22)$$

Also \mathcal{D} is well-defined for $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, which contains $L^p(\Omega)$, and since $w \in C^{2m,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ holds by Lemma 3, one even finds for some $c_m > 0$ that

$$\|\mathcal{D}f\|_{C^{2m,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq c_m \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \quad (23)$$

and hence also that

$$\|\mathcal{D}f - \mathcal{D}f_\varepsilon\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq c'_{m,p,q} \|f - f_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \quad (24)$$

Replacing f on the right-hand side of (1) by f_ε , we find as solution

$$\mathcal{G}f_\varepsilon = \mathcal{H}f_\varepsilon - \mathcal{D}f_\varepsilon. \quad (25)$$

Letting $u \in W^{2m,p}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{m,p}(\Omega)$ denote the solution of (1) for f on the right-hand side, we find by [2] that

$$\|u - \mathcal{G}f_\varepsilon\|_{W^{2m,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_{\text{ADN},2m,p} \|f - f_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } \varepsilon \downarrow 0.$$

From (22), (24) and (25) one finds

$$\|(\mathcal{H} - \mathcal{D})f - \mathcal{G}f_\varepsilon\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq c_{m,p,q} \|f - f_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } \varepsilon \downarrow 0.$$

Hence $(\mathcal{H} - \mathcal{D})f = u \in W^{2m,p}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{m,p}(\Omega)$. With $\mathcal{D}f \in C^{2m,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C_0^{m-1}(\overline{\Omega})$ one also finds

$$\mathcal{H}f \in W^{2m,p}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{m,p}(\Omega).$$

Moreover, there exists $C_{4,m,p} > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{H}f\|_{W^{2m,p}(\Omega)} &= \|u + \mathcal{D}f\|_{W^{2m,p}(\Omega)} \leq \|u\|_{W^{2m,p}(\Omega)} + \|\mathcal{D}f\|_{W^{2m,p}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C_{\text{ADN},2m,p} \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + c'_m \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C_{4,m,p} \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

■

It remains to combine these results to the statement of Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Since \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{D} preserve the sign, we may consider separately the solutions u_+ and u_- of

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^m u_\pm = f^\pm & \text{in } \Omega, \\ D^\alpha u_\pm = 0 \text{ for } |\alpha| < m & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Here u_\pm does not have a sign but just denotes the solution parts depending on the signed splitting of the right-hand side f^\pm . One finds

$$\begin{aligned} u_+(x) &= (\mathcal{H}f^+)(x) - (\mathcal{D}f^+)(x), \\ u_-(x) &= (\mathcal{H}f^-)(x) - (\mathcal{D}f^-)(x). \end{aligned}$$

So

$$u(x) = (\mathcal{H}f^+)(x) - (\mathcal{D}f^+)(x) - (\mathcal{H}f^-)(x) + (\mathcal{D}f^-)(x).$$

We split this expression into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} u^\oplus(x) &= (\mathcal{H}f^+)(x) + (\mathcal{D}f^-)(x), \\ u^\ominus(x) &= (\mathcal{H}f^-)(x) + (\mathcal{D}f^+)(x), \end{aligned}$$

and $u(x) = u^\oplus(x) - u^\ominus(x)$ with both parts u^\oplus, u^\ominus being nonnegative. For the \mathcal{H} -part of u^\oplus, u^\ominus we use the results of Proposition 5. The estimate in (23) takes care of the \mathcal{D} -part. ■

References

- [1] R.A. Adams, J.F. Fournier, Sobolev spaces. Second edition. Pure and Applied Mathematics 140, Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, 2003.
- [2] S. Agmon, A. Douglis, L. Nirenberg, Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions. I. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 12 (1959), 623–727.
- [3] T. Boggio, Sulle funzioni di Green d'ordinem. Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo 20, 97–135 (1905).
- [4] H.-Ch. Grunau, F. Robert and G. Sweers, Optimal estimates from below for biharmonic Green functions, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 139 (2011), 2151–2161.

- [5] H.-Ch. Grunau, G. Romani, G. Sweers, Differences between fundamental solutions of general higher order elliptic operators and of products of second order operators. *Math. Ann.* (2020).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-020-02015-3>
- [6] D. Gilbarg, N.S.Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. Reprint of the 1998 edition. *Classics in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [7] L. Pulst, Dominance of Positivity of the Green's Function associated to a Perturbed Polyharmonic Dirichlet Boundary Value Problem by Pointwise Estimates, Dissertation (2014).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.25673/4208>
- [8] M. Riesz, L'intégrale de Riemann-Liouville et le problème de Cauchy. *Acta Math.* 81 (1949), 1–223.
- [9] I. Schnieders, G. Sweers, Classical solutions up to the boundary to some higher order semilinear Dirichlet problems, preprint.
- [10] E.M. Stein, Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions. *Princeton Mathematical Series*, No. 30 Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1970.