

On the optimal domain for minimizing the buckling load of a clamped plate

Kathrin Stollenwerk*

Abstract We prove the existence of an optimal domain for minimizing the buckling load among all, possibly unbounded, open subsets of \mathbb{R}^n ($n \geq 2$) with given measure. Our approach is based on the extension of a 2-dimensional existence result of Ashbaugh and Bucur and on the idea of Alt and Caffarelli to focus on the eigenfunction.

Key words: buckling load, clamped plate, optimization of shapes

MSC2010: 49Q10

1 Introduction

We consider the following variational problem. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set and define

$$\mathcal{R}(v, \Omega) := \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\Delta v|^2 dx}{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 dx}$$

for $v \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega)$. If the denominator vanishes, we set $\mathcal{R}(v, \Omega) = \infty$. The buckling load of the clamped plate Ω is defined as

$$\Lambda(\Omega) := \min\{\mathcal{R}(v, \Omega) : v \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega)\}.$$

In 1951, Polya and Szegő conjectured that the ball minimizes the buckling load among all open sets of given measure (see [11]). It is still an open question to confirm their conjecture. Up to now, there are only partial results known.

If there exists a smooth, bounded, connected and simply connected open set Ω which minimizes the buckling load among all open sets of given measure in \mathbb{R}^n , it is known that Ω is a ball (see [14, 13]).

In [12], the existence of an optimal domain for minimizing the buckling load among all open sets of a given measure which are contained in a sufficiently large ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n = 2, 3$, is proven. However, [12] does not provide any information about the regularity of the achieved optimal domain.

*Email: stollenwerk@instmath.rwth-aachen.de

Ashbaugh and Bucur proved the existence of a plane optimal domain for minimizing Λ in two different settings [3]. On the one hand, they prove the existence of a minimizer in the family of connected and simply connected open sets of given measure in \mathbb{R}^2 . On the other hand, they find an optimal set $\tilde{\Omega}$ for minimizing a relaxed version of the buckling load among all open sets of given measure in \mathbb{R}^2 .

In the present paper, we will adapt a part of the approach by Ashbaugh and Bucur. Therefore, let us briefly summarize their idea. For $\omega_0 > 0$ let us denote

$$\mathcal{O}_{\omega_0} := \{\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 : \Omega \text{ open}, |\Omega| \leq \omega_0\},$$

where $|\Omega|$ denotes the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Ashbaugh and Bucur start from a minimizing sequence $(\Omega_k)_k \subset \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$ and the sequence $(u_k)_k$ of corresponding normalized buckling eigenfunctions $u_k \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega_k)$. Applying a concentration-compactness lemma they deduce the existence of a limit function $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{R}(u, \mathbb{R}^2) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}(u_k, \Omega_k) = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(\Omega_k) = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}} \Lambda(\Omega).$$

Since $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, Sobolev's embedding theory implies that u is continuous and the set

$$\tilde{\Omega} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : u(x) \neq 0\}$$

is an open set. Moreover, the strong L^2 -convergence of u_k to u implies that $|\tilde{\Omega}| \leq \omega_0$. Hence, $\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$. At this point the authors face the difficulty that their ansatz does not provide any further information about $\tilde{\Omega}$ and u except that $\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$ and u is continuous. In particular, they cannot conclude that $u \in W_0^{2,2}(\tilde{\Omega})$. They circumvent that problem by introducing the relaxed Sobolev space $\tilde{W}_0^{2,2}(\tilde{\Omega})$ by

$$\tilde{W}_0^{2,2}(\tilde{\Omega}) := \{v \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^2) : v = 0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega\}$$

and the relaxed buckling load by

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(\Omega) := \min_{v \in \tilde{W}_0^{2,2}(\Omega)} \mathcal{R}(v, \Omega).$$

By construction, $u \in \tilde{W}_0^{2,2}(\tilde{\Omega})$ and, consequently, $\tilde{\Omega}$ minimizes $\tilde{\Lambda}$ in \mathcal{O}_{ω_0} , i.e.

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(\tilde{\Omega}) \stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \mathcal{R}(u, \tilde{\Omega}) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}(u_k, \Omega_k) = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}} \Lambda(\Omega) = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}} \tilde{\Lambda}(\Omega),$$

where [3, Theorem 3.1] provides the last equation.

In this paper, we will adapt the idea of Ashbaugh and Bucur in [3] and extend it to arbitrary dimension. Contrary to their construction via $\tilde{W}^{2,2}$ we prove higher regularity of the limit function u . Thereby we follow the idea of Alt and Caffarelli in [2]. We will find that the first order derivatives of u are α -Hölder continuous in \mathbb{R}^n for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Recall (c.f. [1, Th. 9.1.3] or [7, Sec. 3.3.5]) that for an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $v \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ there holds

$v \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega)$ if $v = |\nabla v| = 0$ pointwise in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$.

Consequently, the Hölder continuity of the first order derivatives of u implies that $u \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega^*)$ for

$$\Omega^* := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : u(x) \neq 0 \text{ and } \nabla u(x) \neq 0\}.$$

In addition, Ω^* satisfies $|\Omega^*| = \omega_0$ and we deduce that Ω^* minimizes the buckling load among all open sets of given measure in \mathbb{R}^n .

Moreover, we will show that the minimizer Ω^* is connected.

2 Existence of a minimizer

For $\omega_0 > 0$ we denote the class of admissible sets by

$$\mathcal{O}_{\omega_0} := \{\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n : \Omega \text{ open, } |\Omega| \leq \omega_0\},$$

where $|\Omega|$ denotes the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$.

Our aim is to prove the existence of a set $\Omega^* \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$ which minimizes Λ in \mathcal{O}_{ω_0} . In the beginning, we follow the idea of [3].

Let $(\Omega_k)_k \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$ be a minimizing sequence for the buckling load, i.e.

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(\Omega_k) = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}} \Lambda(\Omega) =: \Lambda_{\omega_0}.$$

By $u_k \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega_k)$ we denote the normalized buckling eigenfunction on Ω_k . Hence, u_k satisfies

$$\int_{\Omega_k} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx = 1 \text{ and } \Lambda(\Omega_k) = \int_{\Omega_k} |\Delta u_k|^2 dx$$

We now apply the approach by Ashbaugh and Bucur from [3] to show that $(u_k)_k$ converges weakly to a limit function u in $W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

We will use the following concentration-compactness lemma (see [3, 9]) adapted to our setting.

Lemma 1. *Let $(\Omega_k)_k \subset \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$ be a minimizing sequence for the buckling load in \mathcal{O}_{ω_0} and $(u_k)_k$ be the sequence of corresponding eigenfunctions. Then there exists a subsequence $(u_k)_k$ such that one of the three following situations occurs.*

1. **Compactness.** $\exists (y_k)_k \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $\exists R < \infty$ and

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad \int_{B_R(y_k)} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

2. **Vanishing.** $\forall R \in (0, \infty)$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \int_{B_R(y)} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx = 0.$$

3. **Dichotomy.** *There exists an $\beta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ there exist two bounded sequences $(u_k^1)_k, (u_k^2)_k \subset H^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that:*

- (a) $\|\nabla u_k - \nabla u_k^1 - \nabla u_k^2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \delta(\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0^+,$
- (b) $|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u_k^1|^2 dx - \beta| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u_k^2|^2 dx - (1 - \beta)| \rightarrow 0,$
- (c) $\text{dist}(\text{supp}(u_k^1), \text{supp}(u_k^2)) \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \infty,$
- (d) $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\Delta u_k|^2 - |\Delta u_k^1|^2 - |\Delta u_k^2|^2 dx \right] \geq 0.$

Proof. As mentioned in the proof of [3, Lemma 3.5] the proof is done by considering the concentration function

$$R \rightarrow Q_k(R) := \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \int_{B_R(y)} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx$$

for $R \in [0, \infty)$ and following the same steps as in [9]. \square

We will see that for the sequence of eigenfunctions $(u_k)_k$ the case of vanishing and dichotomy cannot occur. Hence, $(u_k)_k$ contains a subsequence, which we again denote by $(u_k)_k$, for which the case of compactness holds true. This compactness will imply the weak convergence of u_k to a limit function u in $W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Moreover, the compactness yields that u_k converges to u strongly in $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

The case of dichotomy can be disproved in exactly the same way as in [3]. For the sake of brevity, we forgo the repetition of this argument.

In order to disprove the case of vanishing we slightly differ from [3]. Nevertheless, we adopt the following lemma [4, Lemma 3.3] (or [8, Lemma 6]) which is used in [3] and which we will apply to disprove the vanishing, as well.

Lemma 2. *Let $(w_k)_k$ be a bounded sequence in $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\|w_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 1$ and $w_k \in W_0^{1,2}(D_k)$ for a $D_k \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$. There exists a sequence of vectors $(y_k)_k \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the sequence $(w_k(\cdot + y_k))_k$ does not possess a subsequence converging weakly to zero in $W_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Now let us assume that for a subsequence of $(u_k)_k$, again denoted by $(u_k)_k$, the case of vanishing occurs. Hence, for every $R > 0$ there holds

$$(2) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \int_{B_R(y)} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx = 0.$$

Since there holds $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 1$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain for at least one $1 \leq l_k \leq n$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\partial_{l_k} u_k|^2 dx \geq \frac{1}{n}.$$

We now consider the sequence $(\partial_{l_k} u_k)_k$. Then $\partial_{l_k} u_k \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega_k)$ and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \|\partial_{l_k} u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} := c_k.$$

The sequence $(v_k)_k$ given by $v_k := c_k^{-1} \partial_{l_k} u_k$ then satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 2. Consequently, there exists a sequence $(y_k)_k \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the sequence $(v_k(\cdot + y_k))_k \subset W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ does not posses a subsequence which converges weakly to zero in $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. However, the sequence $(v_k(\cdot + y_k))_k$ is uniformly bounded in $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ because of the normalization. Hence, there exists a $v \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that a subsequence of $(v_k(\cdot + y_k))_k$ converges weakly in $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to v . In particular, there holds

$$v_k(\cdot + y_k) \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} v \text{ in } W^{1,2}(B_R(0)) \text{ for every } R > 0$$

and

$$v_k(\cdot + y_k) \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} v \text{ in } L^2(B_R(0)) \text{ for every } R > 0.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{L^2(B_R(0))}^2 &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|v_k(\cdot + y_k)\|_{L^2(B_R(0))}^2 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{c_k^2} \int_{B_R(0)} |\partial_l u_k(x + y_k)|^2 dx \\ &\leq n \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R(y)} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx \\ &\leq n \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \int_{B_R(y)} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx \stackrel{(2)}{=} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $v = 0$ in $L^2(B_R(0))$ and since v is the weak limit of $v_k(\cdot + y_k)$ this is a contradiction to Lemma 2. Therefore, the case of vanishing cannot occur.

Consequently, the case of compactness must occur. Following the lines of [3] we find that there exists a sequence $(y_k)_k \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and an $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$(3) \quad u_k(\cdot + y_k) \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

and, since we are in the compactness case of Lemma 1,

$$(4) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u|^2 dx = 1.$$

From now on, we set

$$u_k = u_k(\cdot + y_k) \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_k = \Omega_k + y_k,$$

where $(y_k)_k$ is given above. This is possible without loss of generality because of the translational invariance of the buckling load.

We now show that u_k converges strongly to u in $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Since this observation will be crucial for constructing an optimal domain in Section 2.2, we give a detailed proof although we follow the lines of [3].

Lemma 3. *There holds*

$$u_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} u \text{ in } W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Proof. We use the notation above. Recall, that $u_k = u_k(\cdot + y_k)$ and $\Omega_k = \Omega_k + y_k$. Then we get from (4)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u - \nabla u_k|^2 dx = 2 - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla u \cdot \nabla u_k dx$$

and the weak convergence of $(u_k)_k$ to u in $W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u - \nabla u_k|^2 dx \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Thus, $(\nabla u_k)_k$ converges to ∇u in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and, in particular, $(\nabla u_k)_k$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Now let $l, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $u_l - u_k \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega_l \cup \Omega_k)$ and applying Poincaré's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_l \cup \Omega_k} (u_l - u_k)^2 dx &\leq \left(\frac{|\Omega_l \cup \Omega_k|}{\omega_n} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \int_{\Omega_l \cup \Omega_k} |\nabla(u_l - u_k)|^2 dx \\ &\leq \left(\frac{2\omega_0}{\omega_n} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \int_{\Omega_l \cup \Omega_k} |\nabla(u_l - u_k)|^2 dx \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $(u_k)_k$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which converges weakly in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to u . Consequently, $u_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} u$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This proves the claim. \square

As a consequence of (3) and Lemma 3 we obtain that

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{R}(u, \mathbb{R}^n) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}(u_k, \Omega_k) = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}} \Lambda(\Omega).$$

The following proposition summarizes what we have achieved so far.

Proposition 1. *Let $(\Omega_k)_k \subset \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$ be a minimizing sequence for the buckling load in \mathcal{O}_{ω_0} and $(u_k)_k$ be the sequence of corresponding normalized eigenfunctions. Then there exists a sequence $(y_k)_k \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $u_k(\cdot + y_k)$ is a normalized eigenfunction on $\Omega_k + y_k$ and, denoting $u_k = u_k(\cdot + y_k)$ and $\Omega_k = \Omega_k + y_k$, there exists a subsequence, again denoted by $(u_k)_k$, and an $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with*

1. u is normalized by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u|^2 dx = 1.$$

2. $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ in $W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as k tends to ∞ .

3. $u_k \rightarrow u$ in $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as k tends to ∞ .

4. There holds $\mathcal{R}(u, \mathbb{R}^n) \leq \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}} \Lambda(\Omega)$.

Recall that in [3] only the two dimensional case is considered. Consequently, the limit function u is continuous due to Sobolev's embedding theory. Hence, the set

$$\tilde{\Omega} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : u(x) \neq 0\}$$

is an open set and the strong L^2 -convergence of u_k to u implies that $\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$.

Here, we consider arbitrary dimension. Hence, we need another method to prove regularity of the function u . Inspired by [2], our approach is based on a careful analysis of the function u . This will be done in the next section.

2.1 Regularity of the limit function

Our first aim is to show that u has got Hölder continuous first order derivatives. This will be done by using Morrey's Dirichlet Growth Theorem (see Theorem 1) and a bootstrapping argument based on ideas of Q. Han and F. Lin in [6].

From now on, we consider a minimizing sequence $(\Omega_k)_k \subset \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$ such that there holds

$$(6) \quad \Lambda_{\omega_0} := \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}} \Lambda(\Omega) \leq \Lambda(\Omega_k) \leq \Lambda_{\omega_0} + \frac{1}{k} \text{ for every } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We want to apply the following version of Morrey's Dirichlet Growth Theorem to the first order derivatives of u .

Theorem 1. *Let $v \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ such that for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and every $0 < r \leq r_0$ there holds*

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla v|^2 dx \leq M \cdot r^{n-2+2\alpha}.$$

Then v is α -Hölder continuous almost everywhere in \mathbb{R}^n and for almost every $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there holds

$$\frac{|v(x_1) - v(x_2)|}{|x_1 - x_2|^\alpha} \leq C(\alpha) \cdot M.$$

For a proof of this theorem we refer to [10, Theorem 3.5.2], e.g.. Hence, we need a L^2 -estimate for the second order derivatives of u in every ball $B_r(x_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

The following lemmata are preparatory for the proof of Theorem 2, which is the main theorem of this section. Before we start, note that by scaling there holds

$$(7) \quad \Lambda_{\omega_0} \leq \left(\frac{\omega_n}{\omega_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \Lambda(B_1) \leq C(n, \omega_0),$$

where B_1 denotes the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n .

Lemma 4. Let $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the limit function according to Proposition 1 and $0 < R \leq 1$. There exists a constant $C = C(n, \omega_0) > 0$ such that for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there holds

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} |\Delta(u - v_0)|^2 dx \leq C(n, \omega_0) \left(R^n + \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right),$$

where $v_0 \in W^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))$ with $v_0 - u \in W_0^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))$ and $\Delta^2 v_0 = 0$ in $B_R(x_0)$.

Proof. The proof is done in three steps.

Step 1. We choose $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ arbitrary, but fixed. Let $v_k \in W^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))$ with $v_k - u_k \in W_0^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))$ and $\Delta^2 v_k = 0$ in $B_R(x_0)$. If $B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega_k = \emptyset$, u_k and v_k vanish in $B_R(x_0)$. Consequently, we obtain

$$(8) \quad \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\Delta(u_k - v_k)|^2 dx = 0.$$

If $B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega_k \neq \emptyset$, we set

$$\hat{u}_k = \begin{cases} u_k, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(x_0) \\ v_k, & \text{in } B_R(x_0) \end{cases}.$$

Note that $\Omega_k \cup B_R(x_0)$ is an open set and that $\hat{u}_k \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega_k \cup B_R(x_0))$. Let us first consider the case $|\Omega_k \cup B_R(x_0)| \leq \omega_0$. Hence, $\Omega_k \cup B_R(x_0) \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$ and there holds

$$\Lambda_{\omega_0} = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}} \Lambda(\Omega) \leq \Lambda(\Omega_k \cup B_R(x_0)) \leq \mathcal{R}(\hat{u}_k, \mathbb{R}^n)$$

since $\hat{u}_k \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega_k \cup B_R(x_0))$. Rearranging terms and applying the definition of \hat{u}_k yields

$$(9) \quad \Lambda_{\omega_0} \left(1 - \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx \right) \leq \Lambda(\Omega_k) - \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\Delta u_k|^2 - |\Delta v_k|^2 dx.$$

Since $v_k - u_k \in W_0^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))$ and v_k is biharmonic in $B_R(x_0)$, there holds

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} |\Delta u_k|^2 - |\Delta v_k|^2 dx = \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2(u_k - v_k)|^2 dx.$$

We rearrange terms in (9) and obtain

$$(10) \quad \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2(u_k - v_k)|^2 dx \leq \Lambda(\Omega_k) - \Lambda_{\omega_0} + \Lambda_{\omega_0} \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx.$$

Let us now assume that $|\Omega_k \cup B_R(x_0)| > \omega_0$. Then we set

$$(11) \quad \mu_k := \left(\frac{|\Omega_k| + |B_R|}{|\Omega_k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

and find that $\mu_k^{-1} \cdot (\Omega_k \cup B_R(x_0)) \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$. Recall that for every $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t > 0$ the buckling load satisfies

$$(12) \quad \Lambda(M) = t^2 \Lambda(tM).$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\Lambda_{\omega_0} \leq \Lambda(\mu_k^{-1}(\Omega_k \cup B_R(x_0))) = \mu_k^2 \Lambda(\Omega_k \cup B_R(x_0)) \leq \mu_k^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{u}_k, \mathbb{R}^n).$$

and, subsequently,

$$(13) \quad \mu_k^2 \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2(u_k - v_k)|^2 dx \leq \mu_k^2 \Lambda(\Omega_k) - \Lambda_{\omega_0} + \Lambda_{\omega_0} \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx.$$

Since $\mu_k > 1$, we can collect the estimates (8), (10) and (13) in the following way: for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there holds

$$(14) \quad \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2(u_k - v_k)|^2 dx \leq \mu_k^2 \Lambda(\Omega_k) - \Lambda_{\omega_0} + \Lambda_{\omega_0} \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx.$$

Step 2. We want to understand the limit as k tends to ∞ on both sides of (14). This needs some preparation. First, recall that we choose a minimizing sequence $(\Omega_k)_k$ such that (6) holds. Then applying (12) yields

$$\Lambda_{\omega_0} \leq \Lambda \left(\left(\frac{\omega_0}{|\Omega_k|} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \Omega_k \right) = \left(\frac{|\Omega_k|}{\omega_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \Lambda(\Omega_k) \stackrel{(6)}{\leq} \left(\frac{|\Omega_k|}{\omega_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \left(\Lambda_{\omega_0} + \frac{1}{k} \right).$$

Rearranging terms yields

$$0 \leq \Lambda_{\omega_0} \left(1 - \left(\frac{|\Omega_k|}{\omega_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \right) \leq \left(\frac{|\Omega_k|}{\omega_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \frac{1}{k} \leq \frac{1}{k}.$$

Thus, there holds $|\Omega_k| \rightarrow \omega_0$ as k tends to ∞ . This immediately implies that

$$\mu_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 + \frac{|B_R|}{\omega_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

where μ_k is given in (11). In addition, recall that $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ in $W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and, therefore, $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ in $W^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))$. Since for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there holds

$$\|u_k - v_k\|_{W^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))}^2 \leq 4 \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2 u_k|^2 dx \leq 4 \|u_k\|_{W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 \leq C$$

and

$$\|v_k\|_{W^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))} \leq \|u_k - v_k\|_{W^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))} + \|u_k\|_{W^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))} \leq C,$$

there exists a $v_0 \in W^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))$ such that

$$v_k \rightharpoonup v_0 \text{ in } W^{2,2}(B_R(x_0)) \text{ and } v_0 - u \in W_0^{2,2}(B_R(x_0)).$$

Moreover, for every $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_R(x_0))$ there holds

$$0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R(x_0)} \Delta v_k \Delta \phi \, dx = \int_{B_R(x_0)} \Delta v_0 \Delta \phi \, dx$$

because v_k is biharmonic in $B_R(x_0)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and the weak convergence of v_k to v_0 in $W^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))$. Hence, v_0 is biharmonic in $B_R(x_0)$.

Step 3. We take the \liminf on both sides of (14). Since $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ in $W_0^{2,2}(B_r(x_0))$, this leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2(u - v_0)|^2 \, dx &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2(u_k - v_k)|^2 \, dx \\ &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mu_k^2 \Lambda(\Omega_k) - \Lambda_{\omega_0} + \Lambda_{\omega_0} \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u_k|^2 \, dx \right) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{|B_R|}{\omega_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \Lambda_{\omega_0} - \Lambda_{\omega_0} + \Lambda_{\omega_0} \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \\ &\leq C(n, \omega_0) \left(R^n + \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. \square

Now let $v_0 \in W^{2,2}(B_R(x_0))$ be the function from Lemma 4 and $0 < r \leq R$. Then there obviously holds

$$(15) \quad \int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 \, dx \leq 2 \int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 v_0|^2 \, dx + 2 \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2(u - v_0)|^2 \, dx$$

and applying Lemma 4 yields

$$(16) \quad \int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 \, dx \leq 2 \int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 v_0|^2 \, dx + C(n, \omega_0) \left(R^n + \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \right).$$

In order to estimate the first summand on the right hand side of the above inequality we cite Lemma 2.1 from [12].

Lemma 5. *Using the notation above there exists a constant $C = C(n) > 0$ such that for $0 < r \leq R$ there holds*

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 v_0|^2 \leq C(n) \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^n \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx.$$

The constant C does not depend on r, R or x_0 , but on the dimension n .

Thus, (16) becomes

$$(17) \quad \int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \leq C(n) \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^n \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx + C(n, \omega_0) \left(R^n + \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right).$$

This estimate will be the starting point for the bootstrapping argument which will lead to the Hölder-continuity of the first order derivatives of u .

From [5, Chapter III, Lemma 2.1] we cite the next lemma.

Lemma 6. *Let Φ be a nonnegative and nondecreasing function on $[0, R]$. Suppose that there exist positive constants $\gamma, \alpha, \kappa, \beta$, $\beta < \alpha$, such that for all $0 \leq r \leq R \leq R_0$*

$$\Phi(r) \leq \gamma \left[\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\alpha + \delta \right] \Phi(R) + \kappa R^\beta.$$

Then there exist positive constants $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\gamma, \alpha, \beta)$ and $C = C(\gamma, \alpha, \beta)$ such that if $\delta < \delta_0$, for all $0 \leq r \leq R \leq R_0$ we have

$$\Phi(r) \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\beta \left[\Phi(R) + \kappa R^\beta \right].$$

The following lemma is based on ideas of [6, Chapter 3]. It will be the crucial observation for the bootstrapping.

Lemma 7. *Suppose that for each $0 \leq r \leq 1$ there holds*

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \leq M r^\mu,$$

where $M > 0$ and $\mu \in [0, n)$. Then there exists a constant $C(n) > 0$ such that for each $0 \leq r \leq 1$

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C(n, M) r^\lambda,$$

where $\lambda = \mu + 2$ if $\mu < n - 2$ and λ is arbitrary in $(0, n)$ if $n - 2 \leq \mu < n$.

Proof. Let $0 \leq r \leq s \leq 1$. For a function $w \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we set

$$(w)_{r,x_0} := \oint_{B_r(x_0)} w \, dx = \frac{1}{|B_r(x_0)|} \int_{B_r(x_0)} w \, dx.$$

Using this notation we write

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\partial_i u - (\partial_i u)_{s,x_0} + (\partial_i u)_{s,x_0}|^2 dx.$$

Then Young's inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_{B_r(x_0)} (\partial_i u)_{s,x_0}^2 dx + \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\partial_i u - (\partial_i u)_{s,x_0}|^2 dx \right) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left(|B_r| \left(\oint_{B_s(x_0)} \partial_i u \, dx \right)^2 + \int_{B_s(x_0)} |\partial_i u - (\partial_i u)_{s,x_0}|^2 dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Hölder's and a local version of Poincaré's inequality, we find that

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C(n) \left[\left(\frac{r}{s} \right)^n \int_{B_s(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx + s^2 \int_{B_s(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \right],$$

where the constant C only depends on n . By assumption, we can proceed to

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C(n) \left[\left(\frac{r}{s} \right)^n \int_{B_s(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx + M s^{\mu+2} \right].$$

Now Lemma 6 implies that for each $0 \leq r \leq s \leq 1$ there holds

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C(n) \left(\frac{r}{s} \right)^\lambda \left[\int_{B_s(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx + M s^\lambda \right].$$

where $\lambda = \mu + 2$ if $\mu < n - 2$ and λ is arbitrary in $(0, n)$ if $n - 2 \leq \mu < n$. Choosing $s = 1$, we deduce

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C(n, M) r^\lambda.$$

□

Now we are able to prove the Hölder continuity of the first order derivatives of u .

Theorem 2. *Let u be the limit function u according to Proposition 1. The first order derivatives of u according are α -Hölder continuous almost everywhere on \mathbb{R}^n for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.*

Proof. Our aim is to show that for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and every $0 < r \leq 1$ there holds

$$(18) \quad \int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \leq C(n, \omega_0) r^{n-2+2\alpha}.$$

Then Theorem 1 finishes the proof. Let us choose $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $0 < r \leq R \leq 1$ and recall estimate (17):

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \leq C(n) \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^n \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx + C(n, \omega_0) \left(R^n + \int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right).$$

We will improve this estimate using a bootstrap argument based on Lemma 7. Note that for every $0 < r \leq 1$ there holds

$$(19) \quad \int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \leq \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 = \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 r^0.$$

Then Lemma 7 implies that for every $0 < r \leq 1$ there holds

$$(20) \quad \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq C(n, \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}) r^{\lambda_0},$$

where $\lambda_0 \in (0, n)$ if $n = 2$ and $\lambda_0 = 2$ if $n \geq 3$. We insert this estimate (17). Since $R \leq 1$ we obtain

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \leq C(n) \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^2 \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx + C(n, \omega_0, \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}) R^{\lambda_0}$$

for every $0 < r \leq R$. Applying Lemma 6, we obtain

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^{\lambda_0} \left(\int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx + C(n, \omega_0, \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}) R^{\lambda_0} \right)$$

for every $0 < r \leq R$. Choosing $R = 1$ leads to

$$(21) \quad \int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \leq C(n, \omega_0, \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}) r^{\lambda_0}$$

for every $0 < r \leq 1$. If $n = 2$, this is (18).

If $n \geq 3$, (21) is an improvement of estimate (19). Recall that here holds $\lambda_0 = 2$. We again apply Lemma 7 and obtain for every $0 < r \leq 1$

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \leq C(n, \omega_0, \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}) r^{\lambda_1},$$

where $\lambda_1 \in (0, n)$ if $n \in \{3, 4\}$ and $\lambda_1 = 4$ if $n \geq 5$. Together with estimate (17) we find that

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \leq C(n) \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^n \int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx + C(n, \omega_0, \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}) R^{\lambda_1}$$

for every $0 < r \leq R \leq 1$. Then Lemma 6 implies

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \leq C \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{\lambda_1} \left(\int_{B_R(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx + C(n, \omega_0, \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}) R^{\lambda_1} \right)$$

and choosing $R = 1$ there holds

$$(22) \quad \int_{B_r(x_0)} |D^2 u|^2 dx \leq C(n, \omega_0, \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}) r^{\lambda_1}$$

for every $0 < r \leq 1$. For $n \in \{3, 4\}$, estimate (22) and Theorem 1 proves the claim.

If $n \geq 6$, we repeat the argumentation since (22) is an improvement of (21). Repeating this process proves the claim after finite many steps for every $n \geq 2$. \square

Due to Theorem 2 the limit function u has a unique representative in $W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ which is continuous in \mathbb{R}^n and which has α -Hölder continuous first order derivatives in \mathbb{R}^n for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. From now on, we rename this representative as u and focus on this function.

2.2 The minimizing domain

The regularity of u , which we achieved in the previous section, enables us to construct an optimal domain for minimizing the buckling load in \mathcal{O}_{ω_0} . Recall that there holds (see (5))

$$\mathcal{R}(u, \mathbb{R}^n) \leq \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}} \Lambda(\Omega).$$

If $u \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega^*)$ for a suitable set $\Omega^* \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$, this set Ω^* is the desired minimizer. Thus, the challenge is to construct a suitable Ω^* .

Let us define

$$\tilde{\Omega} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : u(x) \neq 0\} \text{ and } \hat{\Omega} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\nabla u(x)| > 0\}.$$

Since u and ∇u are continuous on \mathbb{R}^n , $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $\hat{\Omega}$ are open sets. By definition of $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $\hat{\Omega}$, u vanishes outside $\tilde{\Omega}$ and ∇u vanishes outside $\hat{\Omega}$. Now let $(\Omega_k)_k \subset \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$ be a minimizing sequence and $(u_k)_k \subset W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the corresponding sequence of eigenfunctions according to Proposition 1. Then the strong L^2 -convergence from u_k to u implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u - u_k)^2 dx &= \int_{\Omega_k} (u - u_k)^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_k^c} u^2 dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega_k} (u - u_k)^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_k^c \cap \tilde{\Omega}} u^2 dx \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, there holds $|\Omega_k^c \cap \tilde{\Omega}| \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0$ since u cannot vanish in $\Omega_k^c \cap \tilde{\Omega}$. Analogously, the strong L^2 -convergence of ∇u_k to ∇u yields $|\Omega_k^c \cap \hat{\Omega}| \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0$. Now we denote

$$(23) \quad \Omega^* := \tilde{\Omega} \cup \hat{\Omega} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : u(x) \neq 0 \text{ or } |\nabla u(x)| \neq 0\}.$$

Note that Ω^* is an open set. In addition, we find that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\Omega^*| &= |\Omega^* \cap \Omega_k| + |\Omega^* \cap \Omega_k^c| \\ &\leq \underbrace{|\Omega_k|}_{\leq \omega_0} + |\tilde{\Omega} \cap \Omega_k^c| + |\hat{\Omega} \cap \Omega_k^c|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, letting k tend to infinity, we obtain $|\Omega^*| \leq \omega_0$ and there holds $\Omega^* \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$. By construction, u and ∇u vanish in every point in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega^*$.

The following corollary guarantees that $u \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega^*)$. For the proof of this corollary we refer to [1, Th. 9.1.3] or [7, Sec. 3.3.5].

Corollary 1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an arbitrary open set and $v \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. If v and its first order derivatives vanish pointwise in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$, then $u \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega)$.*

Now we can prove our main theorem.

Theorem 3. *The set Ω^* given by (23) minimizes the buckling load Λ in \mathcal{O}_{ω_0} .*

Proof. Recall that there holds

$$\mathcal{R}(u, \mathbb{R}^n) \stackrel{(5)}{\leq} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}(u_k, \Omega_k) = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}} \Lambda(\Omega).$$

Since $\Omega^* \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$ and $u \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega^*)$ there holds

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}} \Lambda(\Omega) \leq \Lambda(\Omega^*) \leq \mathcal{R}(u, \Omega^*) = \mathcal{R}(u, \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Obviously, this means that

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}} \Lambda(\Omega) = \Lambda(\Omega^*) = \mathcal{R}(u, \mathbb{R}^n).$$

□

Due to the scaling property of the buckling load, the following corollary holds true.

Corollary 2. *Let $\Omega^* \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$ minimize the buckling load Λ in \mathcal{O}_{ω_0} . Then Ω^* satisfies $|\tilde{\Omega}| = \omega_0$.*

As a consequence of Corollary 2, the set Ω^* is connected.

Corollary 3. *The set Ω^* given by (23) is connected.*

Proof. Let us assume that Ω^* consists of the two connected components Ω_1 and Ω_2 with $|\Omega_k| > 0$ for $k = 1, 2$. By u_k we denote the eigenfunction u restricted to Ω_k , i.e.

$$u_k := \begin{cases} u, & \text{in } \Omega_k \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Since $\Omega_k \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$, the minimality of Ω^* for Λ implies

$$\Lambda(\Omega^*) = \mathcal{R}(u, \Omega^*) \leq \Lambda(\Omega_1) \leq \mathcal{R}(u_1, \Omega_1).$$

Rearranging terms and using that $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega^*)} = 1$ we obtain

$$\left(\int_{\Omega_1} |\Delta u_1|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_2} |\Delta u_2|^2 dx \right) \left(1 - \int_{\Omega_2} |\nabla u_2|^2 dx \right) \leq \int_{\Omega_1} |\Delta u_1|^2 dx.$$

Hence,

$$\int_{\Omega_2} |\Delta u_2|^2 \leq \Lambda(\Omega^*) \int_{\Omega_2} |\nabla u_2|^2 dx \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{R}(u_2, \Omega_2) \leq \Lambda(\Omega^*).$$

Then there holds

$$\Lambda(\Omega_2) \leq \mathcal{R}(u_2, \Omega_2) \leq \Lambda(\Omega^*)$$

and Ω_2 is a minimizer of Λ in \mathcal{O}_{ω_0} . However, since $|\Omega_2| < \omega_0$, this is a contradiction to Corollary 2. \square

Summing up, we found an optimal domain $\Omega^* \in \mathcal{O}_{\omega_0}$ for minimizing the buckling load in \mathcal{O}_{ω_0} . The set Ω^* is open, connected and satisfies $|\Omega^*| = \omega_0$. Classical variational arguments show that u solves

$$\Delta^2 u + \Lambda(\Omega^*) \Delta u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega^*.$$

Acknowledgement The author is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) - project number 396521072.

References

- [1] D. R. Adams and L. I. Hedberg. *Function spaces and potential theory*, volume 314 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [2] H. W. Alt and L. A. Caffarelli. Existence and regularity for a minimum problem with free boundary. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 325:105–144, 1981.
- [3] M. S. Ashbaugh and D. Bucur. On the isoperimetric inequality for the buckling of a clamped plate. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, 54(5):756–770, 2003. Special issue dedicated to Lawrence E. Payne.
- [4] D. Bucur and N. Varchon. Global minimizing domains for the first eigenvalue of an elliptic operator with non-constant coefficients. *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, pages No. 36, 10, 2000.
- [5] M. Giaquinta. *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations and nonlinear elliptic systems*, volume 105 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1983.
- [6] Q. Han and F. Lin. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations*, volume 1 of *Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, 1997.
- [7] A. Henrot and M. Pierre. *Shape variation and optimization*, volume 28 of *EMS Tracts in Mathematics*. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2018.
- [8] E. H. Lieb. On the lowest eigenvalue of the Laplacian for the intersection of two domains. *Invent. Math.*, 74(3):441–448, 1983.
- [9] P.-L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case. I. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 1(2):109–145, 1984.
- [10] C. B. Morrey. *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations*. Springer, Berlin [u.a], 1966.
- [11] G. Polya and G. Szegő. *Isoperimetric Inequalities in Mathematical Physics*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, no. 27. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1951.
- [12] K. Stollenwerk. Optimal shape of a domain which minimizes the first buckling eigenvalue. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 55(1):Art. 5, 29, 2016.
- [13] K. Stollenwerk and A. Wagner. Optimality conditions for the buckling of a clamped plate. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 432(1):254–273, 2015.
- [14] B. Willms. An isoperimetric inequality for the buckling of a clamped plate. *Lecture at the Oberwolfach meeting on 'Qualitative properties of PDE' (organized by H. Berestycki, B. Kawohl and G. Talenti)*, Feb. 1995.