

# QUANTITATIVE UNIQUENESS OF CONTINUATION RESULT RELATED TO HOPF'S LEMMA

MOURAD CHOULLI, FAOUZI TRIKI, AND QI XUE

**ABSTRACT.** The classical Hopf's lemma can be reformulated as uniqueness of continuation result. We aim in the present work to quantify this property. We show precisely that if a solution  $u$  of a divergence form elliptic equation attains its maximum at a boundary point  $x_0$  then both  $L^1$ -norms of  $u - u(x_0)$  on the domain and on the boundary are bounded, up to a multiplicative constant, by the exterior normal derivative at  $x_0$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\Omega$  be a  $C^{1,1}$  bounded domain of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  ( $n \geq 2$ ) with boundary  $\Gamma$ . All functions we consider are assumed to be real valued.

Fix  $\kappa > 1$ ,  $0 < \beta < 1$  and let  $\Sigma$  be the set of functions  $\sigma = (\sigma^{ij}) \in C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$  satisfying  $\sigma^{ji} = \sigma^{ij}$ ,  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ ,

$$\kappa^{-1}|\xi|^2 \leq \sigma\xi \cdot \xi \quad \text{for each } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{and} \quad \|\sigma\|_{C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})} \leq \kappa.$$

We associate to any  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  the operator  $L_\sigma$  acting as follows

$$L_\sigma u = -\operatorname{div}(\sigma \nabla u), \quad u \in C^2(\Omega).$$

Define

$$\mathcal{S} = \{u \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega}); L_\sigma u = 0 \text{ for some } \sigma \in \Sigma\}$$

and set

$$M(u) = \{x \in \overline{\Omega}; u(x) = \max_{\overline{\Omega}} u\}, \quad u \in \mathcal{S}.$$

When  $x \in \Gamma$  we denote by  $\nu(x)$  the unit normal vector to  $\Gamma$  pointing outward  $\Omega$ .

Let  $u \in \mathcal{S}$  so that  $\nabla u \neq 0$ . According to the strong maximum principle  $M(u) \subset \Gamma$  (e.g. [5, Theorem 3.5, page 35]) and by Hopf's Lemma<sup>1</sup>,  $\partial_\nu u(x) = \nabla u(x) \cdot \nu(x) > 0$  for any  $x \in M(u)$  (e.g. [5, Lemma 3.4, page 34]).

The first result of this kind goes back to the pioneering paper by Zaremba [11] and generalized later independently by Hopf [8] and Oleinik [9]. We refer to the nice historical survey in the introduction of [1] including results with less regularity on the domain and the coefficients of the operators under consideration.

Hopf's lemma can be rephrased as uniqueness of continuation result: let  $u \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $x_0 \in M(u)$ . If  $\partial_\nu u(x_0) = 0$  then  $u$  is identically equal to  $u(x_0)$ .

The following theorem quantify this uniqueness of continuation property.

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B50, 35C15, 35J08, 35J15.

*Key words and phrases.* Elliptic equation in divergence form, Hopf's lemma, maximum principle, uniqueness of continuation, Green's function, Poisson type kernel.

The authors are supported by the grant ANR-17-CE40-0029 of the French National Research Agency ANR (project MultiOnde).

<sup>1</sup>Also called Hopf-Oleinik-Zaremba's lemma or boundary point lemma.

**Theorem 1.1.** *For any  $u \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $x_0 \in M(u)$  we have*

$$(1.1) \quad \|u(x_0) - u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|u(x_0) - u\|_{L^1(\Gamma)},$$

$$(1.2) \quad \|u(x_0) - u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \|u(x_0) - u\|_{L^1(\Gamma)} \leq C \partial_\nu u(x_0),$$

where  $C = C(n, \Omega, \kappa, \beta) > 0$  is a generic constant.

We used  $C^{1,\beta}$ -regularity of the coefficients of the operator  $L_\sigma$  only in the two-sided inequality (2.8) (which is contained in [7, main Theorem in page 105]). For all other results  $C^{0,1}$ -regularity of the coefficients of the operator  $L_\sigma$  is sufficient. It is not known presently whether the result of [7, main Theorem in page 105] can be extended to coefficients with  $C^{0,1}$ -regularity.

To prove Theorem 1.1 we modify the proof of Hopf's lemma itself, we make use the integral representation

$$u(x) - u(x_0) = \int_{\Gamma} K_\sigma(x, y)(u(x) - u(x_0)) dS(y), \quad x \in \Omega,$$

where  $K_\sigma$  is Poisson type kernel associated to the operator  $L_\sigma$ . The proof is completed by showing beforehand two-sided inequality for  $K_\sigma$  involving the weakly singular kernel  $\text{dist}(x, \Gamma)|x - y|^{-n}$ .

Theorem 1.1 confirms numerical testing we obtained before. The details of these numerical testing are given in Appendix B.

The rest of this text is organized as follows. In Section 2 we collect some properties of the Green function associated to the operator  $L_\sigma$  and establish two-sided inequality for the Poisson type kernel  $K_\sigma$ . We give in Section 3 the proof of Theorem 1.1. We also added two appendices. Appendix A contains the proof of a regularity result we used in Section 2. While Appendix B is devoted to numerical testing.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Define, where  $\kappa > 1$ ,  $\Sigma_0$  as the set of functions  $\sigma = (\sigma^{ij}) \in C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$  satisfying  $\sigma^{ji} = \sigma^{ij}$ ,  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ ,

$$\kappa^{-1}|\xi|^2 \leq \sigma \xi \cdot \xi \quad \text{for each } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{and} \quad \|\sigma\|_{C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})} \leq \kappa.$$

It is worth noticing that according to Rademacher's theorem (e.g. [4, Theorem 2 in page 81])  $C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$  is continuously embedded in  $W^{1,\infty}(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ .

We associate to  $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$  the symmetric bounded and coercive bilinear form

$$\mathbf{a}_\sigma(u, v) = (\sigma \nabla u | \nabla v)_2, \quad u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega),$$

where  $(\cdot | \cdot)_2$  is the usual scalar product on  $L^2(\Omega)$ .

In this section we prove the following result, where

$$\mathcal{U} = \{(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Omega; x \neq y\}.$$

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$ . Then*

(1) *There exists a unique  $G_\sigma \in L^1(\Omega \times \Omega) \cap C^1(\mathcal{U})$  satisfying*

$$\mathbf{a}_\sigma(G_\sigma(\cdot, y), v) = v(y), \quad v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega), \quad y \in \Omega,$$

and  $G_\sigma(x, y) = G_\sigma(y, x)$ ,  $(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Omega$ .

(2) *Let  $\omega \Subset \omega_0 \Subset \Omega$ . Then  $G_\sigma(x, \cdot) \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \omega_0)$  for each  $x \in \Omega$ , where  $0 \leq \alpha = \alpha(n) < 1$  is a constant. We have in addition*

$$(2.1) \quad \|G_\sigma(x, \cdot)\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \omega_0)} \leq c \quad \text{for each } x \in \omega$$

and

$$(2.2) \quad \|G_\sigma(x_1, \cdot) - G_\sigma(x_2, \cdot)\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \omega_0)} \leq c|x_1 - x_2| \quad \text{for each } x_1, x_2 \in \omega,$$

where  $c = c(n, \Omega, \kappa, \omega, \omega_0) > 0$  is a generic constant.

Prior to proving this theorem we state a regularity result of the solution of the Dirichlet BVP associated to  $L_\sigma$ .

Denote by  $\gamma_0$  the bounded trace operator from  $H^1(\Omega)$  onto  $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$  defined by

$$\gamma_0 u = u|_\Gamma, \quad u \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$$

Let  $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$ ,  $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  and consider the BVP

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\sigma \nabla u) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \gamma_0 u = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then Lax-Milgram's lemma allows us to conclude that the BVP (2.3) has a unique variational solution  $u = u_\sigma(f) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ :

$$(2.4) \quad \mathbf{a}_\sigma(u, v) = (f|v)_2 \quad \text{for each } v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

**Theorem 2.2.** *For any  $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$  and  $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ ,  $u_\sigma(f) \in H^2(\Omega) \cap C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ , for some  $0 < \alpha = \alpha(n) < 1$ . Furthermore the following estimate holds*

$$(2.5) \quad \|u_\sigma(f)\|_{H^2(\Omega) \cap C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},$$

where  $C = C(n, \Omega, \kappa) > 0$  is a constant.

We give the proof Theorem 2.2 in Appendix A.

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* (1) is contained in [3, Proposition 24 in page 625 and Proposition 26 in page 629].

(2) Fix  $\omega \Subset \omega_0 \Subset \Omega$  and  $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \omega)$  satisfying  $\phi = 1$  in a neighborhood of  $\overline{\Omega} \setminus \omega_0$ . Then it is not difficult to check that  $\phi G_\sigma(x, \cdot)$ ,  $x \in \overline{\omega}$ , is the solution of the BVP (2.3) with

$$f = 2\sigma \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla G_\sigma(x, \cdot) + \sigma G_\sigma(x, \cdot) \Delta \phi.$$

In light of (1)  $f \in C(\Omega)$  and according to [6, Inequalities (i) and (iv) of Theorem 3.3 in page 305] we have  $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ . The expected result follows by applying Theorem 2.2. Furthermore from [6, Inequality (1.8) of Theorem 1.1 in page 305] and (2.5) we get

$$\|G_\sigma(x, \cdot)\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \omega_0)} \leq c, \quad x \in \overline{\omega}.$$

Here and henceforward  $c = c(n, \Omega, \omega, \omega_0, \kappa)$ .

Similarly, simple calculations show that  $\phi[G_\sigma(x_1, \cdot) - G_\sigma(x_2, \cdot)]$ ,  $x_1, x_2 \in \overline{\omega}$ , is the solution of the BVP (2.3) when

$$f = 2\sigma \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla [G_\sigma(x_1, \cdot) - G_\sigma(x_2, \cdot)] + \sigma [G_\sigma(x_1, \cdot) - G_\sigma(x_2, \cdot)] \Delta \phi.$$

In light of [6, Inequality (vi) of Theorem 3.3 in page 333] we get by applying the mean value theorem that

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c|x_1 - x_2|.$$

This inequality together with Theorem 2.2 yield

$$\|G_\sigma(x_1, \cdot) - G_\sigma(x_2, \cdot)\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \omega_0)} \leq c|x_1 - x_2|, \quad x_1, x_2 \in \overline{\omega}.$$

The proof is then complete.  $\square$

We denote hereafter by  $G$  the function  $G_\sigma$  when  $\sigma$  is identically equal to 1. As usual the Poisson kernel is given by

$$K(x, y) = -\partial_{\nu(y)}G(x, y), \quad x \in \Omega, y \in \Gamma.$$

Note that according to Theorem 2.1  $K \in C(\Omega \times \Gamma)$ .

From [12, Lemma 1 in page 21] we have the following two-sided inequality

$$(2.6) \quad \varkappa^{-1} \frac{\text{dist}(x, \Gamma)}{|x - y|^n} \leq K(x, y) \leq \varkappa \frac{\text{dist}(x, \Gamma)}{|x - y|^n}, \quad x \in \Omega, y \in \Gamma.$$

where  $\varkappa = \varkappa(n, \Omega) > 1$  is a constant.

Note that the domain in [12, Lemma 1 in page 21] is assumed to be of classe  $C^2$  in order to guarantee the uniform interior sphere property but we know that this property is in fact satisfied by  $C^{1,1}$ -domains (see Section 3).

In the sequel we use the following notation, where  $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$ ,

$$K_\sigma(x, y) = -\partial_{\nu(y)}G_\sigma(x, y), \quad x \in \Omega, y \in \Gamma.$$

Here again  $K_\sigma \in C(\Omega \times \Gamma)$  by Theorem 2.1.

**Proposition 2.1.** *For all  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  we have*

$$(2.7) \quad \varkappa^{-1} \frac{\text{dist}(x, \Gamma)}{|x - y|^n} \leq K_\sigma(x, y) \leq \varkappa \frac{\text{dist}(x, \Gamma)}{|x - y|^n}, \quad x \in \Omega, y \in \Gamma.$$

where  $\varkappa = \varkappa(n, \Omega, \kappa) > 1$  is a constant.

*Proof.* In this proof  $\varkappa = \varkappa(n, \Omega, \kappa) > 1$  is a generic constant. Let  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ . Then the following two sided inequality is contained in [7, main Theorem in page 105]

$$(2.8) \quad -\varkappa^{-1}G(x, y) \leq -G_\sigma(x, y) \leq -\varkappa G(x, y), \quad x, y \in \Omega.$$

Fix  $x \in \Omega$  and  $y_0 \in \Gamma$ . Then for sufficiently small  $t$  we have from (2.8)

$$\begin{aligned} \varkappa^{-1} \frac{-G(x, y_0 - t\nu(y_0)) + G(x, y_0)}{t} &\leq \frac{-G_\sigma(x, y_0 - t\nu(y_0)) + G_\sigma(x, y_0)}{t} \\ &\leq \varkappa \frac{-G(x, y_0 - t\nu(y_0)) + G(x, y_0)}{t}, \quad t > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $G(x, y_0) = G_\sigma(x, y_0) = 0$ . Passing to the limit when  $t$  goes to zero (observe that  $G(x, \cdot)$  and  $G_\sigma(x, \cdot)$  are  $C^1$  up to the boundary) we find

$$-\varkappa^{-1}\partial_{\nu(x)}G(x, y_0) \leq -\partial_{\nu(x)}G_\sigma(x, y_0) \leq -\varkappa\partial_{\nu(x)}G(x, y_0)$$

or equivalently

$$\varkappa^{-1}K(x, y_0) \leq K_\sigma(x, y_0) \leq \varkappa K(x, y_0).$$

We obtain the expected inequality by using (2.6).  $\square$

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In the sequel we use the fact that  $\Omega$ , which is  $C^{1,1}$ , admits the uniform interior sphere condition (e.g [2, Theorem 1.0.9, page 7]). This means that there exists  $r > 0$  so that for any  $x \in \Gamma$ , there exists  $\tilde{x} \in \Omega$  with the property that  $B(\tilde{x}, r) \subset \Omega$  and  $\partial B(\tilde{x}, r) \cap \Gamma = \{x\}$ .

Let  $u \in \mathcal{S}$  so that  $\nabla u \neq 0$  and pick  $x_0 \in M(u)$ . Note that if  $u$  is constant then (1.2) holds obviously.

Take  $\tilde{x}_0 \in \Omega$  with the property that  $B(\tilde{x}_0, r) \subset \Omega$  and  $\partial B(\tilde{x}_0, r) \cap \Gamma = \{x_0\}$ . As in the proof of Hopf's Lemma, we introduce the function, where  $0 < \rho < r$  is arbitrary fixed,

$$v(x) = e^{-\lambda|x-\tilde{x}_0|^2} - e^{-\lambda r^2} \quad \text{in } \omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; \rho < |x - \tilde{x}_0| < r\},$$

where the constant  $\lambda > 0$  is to determined hereafter.

Straightforward computations show

$$L_\sigma v \geq (4\lambda^2 \rho^2 \kappa^{-1} - c\lambda)e^{-\lambda r^2} \quad \text{in } \omega,$$

where  $c = c(\kappa, r)$  is a constant. We fix then  $\lambda = \lambda(\kappa, \rho, r)$  sufficiently large in such a way that  $L_\sigma v \geq 0$ .

In light of the strong maximum principle  $\max_{|x-\tilde{x}_0|=\rho} u < u(x_0)$ . Let then

$$\epsilon = \frac{u(x_0) - \max_{|x-\tilde{x}_0|=\rho} u}{e^{-\lambda \rho^2} - e^{-\lambda r^2}}$$

and

$$w(x) = u(x) - u(x_0) + \epsilon v(x) \quad x \in \omega.$$

Our choice of  $\epsilon$  guarantees that  $w \leq 0$  on  $\partial\omega$ . As  $L_\sigma w = \epsilon L_\sigma v \geq 0$  in  $\Omega$  we derive from the weak maximum principle that  $w \leq 0$  in  $\overline{\omega}$  (e.g. [5, Theorem 3.1, page 32]). But  $w(x_0) = 0$  which means that  $w$  achieves its maximum at  $x_0$ . In consequence  $\partial_\nu w(x_0) \geq 0$  and hence

$$\partial_\nu u(x_0) \geq -\epsilon \partial_\nu v(x_0) = 2r\epsilon\lambda e^{-\lambda r^2}.$$

In particular we have

$$(3.1) \quad \partial_\nu u(x_0) \geq \gamma \min_{|x-\tilde{x}_0|=\rho} (u(x_0) - u(x)),$$

where

$$\gamma = \frac{2r\lambda e^{-\lambda r^2}}{e^{-\lambda \rho^2} - e^{-\lambda r^2}}.$$

On the other hand, according to [3, formula (8.95) in page 628] we know that

$$(3.2) \quad u(x_0) - u(x) = \int_\Gamma K_\sigma(x, y)(u(x_0) - u(y))dS(y), \quad x \in \Omega,$$

which in light of the lower bound in (2.7) yields

$$(3.3) \quad \min_{|x-\tilde{x}_0|=\rho} (u(x_0) - u(x)) \geq C \int_\Gamma (u(x_0) - u(y))dS(y).$$

Here and until the rest of this proof  $C = C(n, \Omega, \kappa) > 0$  is a generic constant.

We obtain by putting together inequalities (3.1) and (3.3)

$$(3.4) \quad \int_\Gamma (u(x_0) - u(y))dS(y) \leq C \partial_\nu u(x_0).$$

Let  $\mathbf{d}$  be the diameter of  $\Omega$ . Then

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\text{dist}(x, \Gamma)}{|x - y|^n} dx \leq \int_\Omega \frac{dx}{|x - y|^{n-1}} \leq |\mathbb{S}^{n-1}| \mathbf{d} \quad \text{for all } y \in \Gamma.$$

This and the upper bound in (2.7) show that  $K_\sigma \in L^\infty(\Gamma, L^1(\Omega))$  with

$$(3.5) \quad \|K_\sigma\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma, L^1(\Omega))} \leq C.$$

Using again (3.2) we get by applying Fubini's theorem

$$\int_{\Omega} (u(x_0) - u(x)) dx = \int_{\Gamma} (u(x_0) - u(y)) dS(y) \int_{\Omega} K_{\sigma}(x, y) dx.$$

Therefore (3.5) gives

$$\int_{\Omega} (u(x_0) - u(x)) dx \leq C \int_{\Gamma} (u(x_0) - u(y)) dS(y),$$

which combined with (3.4) implies

$$\|u(x_0) - u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C \partial_{\nu} u(x_0).$$

Hence

$$\|u(x_0) - u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \|u(x_0) - u\|_{L^1(\Gamma)} \leq C \partial_{\nu} u(x_0),$$

as expected.

#### APPENDIX A. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

In all this proof  $C = C(n, \Omega, \kappa) > 0$  is a generic constant.

We denote Poincaré's constant of  $\Omega$  by  $\mathfrak{p}^2$ :

$$\|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \mathfrak{p} \|\nabla w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for each } w \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Let  $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$ ,  $f \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$  and  $u = u_{\sigma}(f)$ . We get in a straightforward manner by taking  $v = u$  in (2.4)

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \kappa \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

This inequality together with Poincaré's inequality give

$$(A.1) \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \mathfrak{p} \kappa \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

We can then apply [10, Theorem 8.53 in page 326] and its proof in order to conclude that  $u \in H^2(\Omega)$  and

$$(A.2) \quad \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

We now discuss  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity of  $u$ . To this purpose we shall use repeatedly [5, Theorem 9.14 in page 240 and Theorem 9.15 in page 241] concerning  $W^{2,p}$  elliptic regularity and the corresponding  $W^{2,p}$  a priori estimate.

Let us then consider first the case  $n = 2$ . In that case since  $H^1(\Omega)$  is continuously embedded in  $C(\overline{\Omega})$  we derive that

$$L_{\sigma} u = f \in L^p(\Omega), \quad 1 < p < \infty.$$

Whence  $u \in W^{2,p}(\Omega)$  and

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

This and (A.2) imply

$$(A.3) \quad \|u\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

For  $0 < s < 1$ , we can apply the preceding result with  $p_s = 2/(1-s)$ . Noting that  $W^{2,p_s}(\Omega)$  is continuously embedded in  $C^{1,s}(\overline{\Omega})$  we deduce that  $u \in C^{1,s}(\overline{\Omega})$  and from (A.3) we have

$$(A.4) \quad \|u\|_{C^{1,s}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C \|f\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}.$$

Similarly when  $n = 3$ , using that  $H^1(\Omega)$  is continuously embedded in  $L^6(\Omega)$ , we obtain that  $u \in W^{2,6}(\Omega)$ . But  $W^{2,6}(\Omega)$  is continuously embedded in  $C^{1,1/2}(\overline{\Omega})$ . Therefore  $u \in C^{1,1/2}(\overline{\Omega})$  and the following estimate holds

$$(A.5) \quad \|u\|_{C^{1,1/2}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

Assume that  $n \geq 4$  and let  $k_n \geq 1$  be the smallest integer  $k$  so that  $k \geq n/2 - 1$ . Define

$$p_1 = \frac{2n}{n-2} \quad p_k = \frac{np_{k-1}}{n-p_{k-1}}, \quad 2 \leq k \leq k_n.$$

It is then not hard to check that

$$p_k = \frac{2n}{n-2k} \quad 0 \leq k \leq k_n.$$

We proceed as before. First we use that  $H^1(\Omega)$  is continuously imbedded in  $L^{p_1}(\Omega)$  to derive that  $u \in W^{2,p_1}(\Omega)$  and

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,p_1}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^{p_1}(\Omega)}.$$

We use then that  $W^{1,p_1}(\Omega)$  is continuously embedded in  $L^{p_2}(\Omega)$  and we repeat the preceding argument in order to obtain that  $u \in W^{2,p_2}(\Omega)$  and

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,p_2}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^{p_2}(\Omega)}.$$

By induction in  $k$  we get at the end that  $u \in W^{2,p_{k_n}}(\Omega)$  and

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,p_{k_n}}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^{p_{k_n}}(\Omega)}.$$

When  $n = 2m+1$ ,  $m \geq 1$  then  $k_n = m$ . In that case as  $W^{2,p_{k_n}}(\Omega)$  is continuously embedded in  $C^{1,1/2}(\overline{\Omega})$  we obtain that  $u \in C^{1,1/2}(\overline{\Omega})$  and

$$(A.6) \quad \|u\|_{C^{1,1/2}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

If  $n = 2m$ ,  $m \geq 2$ , we have  $p_{k_n} = n$ . In particular  $u \in W^{2,n-1/2}(\Omega)$  and

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,n-1/2}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^{n-1/2}(\Omega)}.$$

Using that  $W^{2,n-1/2}(\Omega)$  is continuously embedded in  $L^{n(2n-1)}(\Omega)$  we get that  $u \in W^{2,n(2n-1)}(\Omega)$  and

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,n(2n-1)}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^{n-1/2}(\Omega)}.$$

We finally obtain  $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ , with  $\alpha = (2n-2)/(2n-1)$ , and

$$(A.7) \quad \|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

## APPENDIX B. NUMERICAL TESTING



We limit our numerical testing to (sufficiently smooth) isotropic  $\sigma$  with  $n = 2$ ,  $\Omega = B(0,1)$  and the following sequence of boundary conditions:

$$h_k(x_1, x_2) = \left( \frac{x_2 + 3}{4} \right)^{1/k}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ and } |(x_1, x_2)| = 1.$$

It is not hard to check that  $(h_k)$  converges uniformly on  $\mathbb{S}^1$  to the constant function equal to 1.

Denote by  $u_k$  the solution of the BVP

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\sigma \nabla u_k) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \gamma_0 u_k = h_k. \end{cases}$$

FIGURE 1. Different choices of the coefficient  $\sigma$ .FIGURE 2. Convergence of  $\|h(x_0) - h\|_{L^1(\Gamma)}$  with respect to the normal derivative  $\partial_\nu u(x_0)$ .

According to the maximum principle  $u_k$  attains its maximum at  $x_0 = (0, 1)$ .

We considered four different choices of the coefficient  $\sigma$  in Fig.1: linear, Gaussian, oscillating and realistic. We restrict the highest and lowest values to 4 and 1 respectively.

We observe in Fig.2 that  $\|h(x_0) - h\|_{L^1(\Gamma)}$  converges to 0 linearly as  $\partial_\nu u(x_0) \rightarrow 0$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. E. Apushkinskaya and A. I. Nazarov, A counterexample to the Hopf-Oleinik lemma (elliptic case), *Analysis PDE*, 9 (2) (2016) 439-458. [1](#)
- [2] S. Barb, Topics in geometric analysis with applications to partial differential equations, Thesis (Ph.D.)-University of Missouri - Columbia, 2009, 238 pp. [4](#)
- [3] R. Dautray, Robert and J.-L. Lions, Mathematical analysis and numerical methods for science and technology, Vol. 1, Physical origins and classical methods. With the collaboration of Ph. B  nilan, M. Cessenat, A. Gervat, A. Kavenoky and H. Lanchon. Translated from the French by Ian N. Sneddon. With a preface by Jean Teillac. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990. xviii+695 pp. [3](#), [5](#)



- [4] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, Measure theory and fine properties of functions, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1992. viii+268 pp. [2](#)
- [5] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, Springer, Berlin, 1998. [1](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [6] M. Grüter and K.-O. Widman, The Green function for uniformly elliptic equations, Manuscripta Math. 37 (3) (1982), 303-342. [3](#)
- [7] H. Hueber and M. Sieveking, Uniform bounds for quotients of Green functions on  $C^{1,1}$ -domains. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 32 (1) (1982), 105-117. [2](#), [4](#)
- [8] E. Hopf, A remark on linear elliptic differential equations of second order, Proc. American Math. Soc. 3 (5) (1952), 791-793. [1](#)
- [9] O. A. Oleinik, On properties of solutions of certain boundary problems for equations of elliptic type, Matematicheskii Sbornik, 72 (3) (1952) 695-702. [1](#)
- [10] M. Renardy and R.C. Rogers, An introduction to partial differential equations, Texts in Applied Mathematics 13, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993. xiv+428 pp. [6](#)
- [11] S. Zaremba, Sur un problème mixte relatif à l'équation de Laplace, Bull. Acad. Sci. Cracovie. Cl. Sci. Math. Nat. Ser. A (1910), 313-344. [1](#)
- [12] Z. X. Zhao, Uniform boundedness of conditional gauge and Schrödinger equations, Comm. Math. Phys. 93 (1) (1984), 9-31. [4](#)

UNIVERSITÉ DE LORRAINE, 34 COURS LÉOPOLD, 54052 NANCY CEDEX, FRANCE

*Email address:* [mourad.choulli@univ-lorraine.fr](mailto:mourad.choulli@univ-lorraine.fr)

LABORATOIRE JEAN KUNTZMANN, UMR CNRS 5224, UNIVERSITÉ GRENOBLE-ALPES, 700 AVENUE CENTRALE, 38401 SAINT-MARTIN-D'HÈRES, FRANCE

*Email address:* [faouzi.triki@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr](mailto:faouzi.triki@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr)

LABORATOIRE JEAN KUNTZMANN, UMR CNRS 5224, UNIVERSITÉ GRENOBLE-ALPES, 700 AVENUE CENTRALE, 38401 SAINT-MARTIN-D'HÈRES, FRANCE

*Email address:* [Qi.Xue@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr](mailto:Qi.Xue@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr)