

“Potato kugel” for nuclear forces and a small one for acoustic waves

Nikolay Kuznetsov

Laboratory for Mathematical Modelling of Wave Phenomena,
Institute for Problems in Mechanical Engineering, Russian Academy of Sciences,
V.O., Bol’shoy pr. 61, St Petersburg 199178, Russian Federation
E-mail: nikolay.g.kuznetsov@gmail.com

Abstract

The “potato kugel” theorem of Aharonov, Schiffer and Zalcman, which concerns an inverse property of harmonic functions, is extended to the settings of the modified Helmholtz and Helmholtz equations that describe nuclear forces and acoustic waves respectively.

1 Introduction

Analytic characterization of balls in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^m by means of harmonic functions has a long history; it started in the 1960s, in the pioneering notes [4], [5], and shortly afterwards Kuran [7] obtained the following general result:

Theorem K. *Let D be a domain (= connected open set) of finite (Lebesgue) measure in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^m where $m \geq 2$. Suppose that there exists a point P_0 in D such that, for every function h harmonic in D and integrable over D , the volume mean of h over D equals $h(P_0)$. Then D is an open ball (disk when $m = 2$) centred at P_0 .*

Presumably, the paper [6] was the first one in which this theorem was referred to as the property of harmonic functions inverse to the mean value identity for balls. The term became widely accepted. A slight modification of Kuran’s considerations shows that his theorem is valid even if D is disconnected; see the survey article [13], p. 377, which also contains some improvements of Kuran’s theorem, and a discussion of its applications and of possible similar results involving certain averages over ∂D , when D is a bounded domain.

Another approach to harmonic characterization of balls was developed by Aharonov, Schiffer and Zalcman [1] (the origin of a rather unusual title of their paper is explained in Zalcman’s comment; see [15], p. 497). They proved the following:

Theorem ASZ. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, $m \geq 3$, be a bounded open set. If the equality*

$$\int_D |y - x|^{2-m} dy = \frac{a}{|x|^{m-2}} + b$$

holds with suitable real constants a and b for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus D$, then D is an open ball centred at the origin, $a = |D|$ and $b = 0$.

Here and below $|D|$ stands for the volume of D (area if $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$). Since $|y - x|^{-1}$ is a fundamental solution of the Laplace equation for $m = 3$, this theorem answers in the affirmative the following question posed to the authors of [1]:

Let D be a homogeneous, compact, connected “potato” in space, which gravitationally attracts each point outside it as if all its mass were concentrated at a single point. Does this guarantee that D is a ball centred at this point?

Later, Lanconelli [12] extended Theorem ASZ to the sub-Laplacian setting, and in the recent article [2], an improvement of Theorem ASZ was obtained. It relaxes the original restriction imposed on D , and a more natural identity is used to guarantee that D is a ball:

Theorem ASZ' [Cupini, Lanconelli]. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, $m \geq 3$, be an open set such that $|D| < \infty$. If for some $x_0 \in D$ the identity*

$$|D|^{-1} \int_D |y - x|^{2-m} dy = |x_0 - x|^{2-m} \quad (1)$$

holds for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus D$, then D is an open ball centred at x_0 .

The recent survey [10] complements [13] providing coverage for other results in this area; in particular, various characterizations of balls via harmonic functions as well as characterizations of other domains (strips, annuli etc.) are given. Moreover, a characterization of balls via solutions to the modified Helmholtz equation

$$\nabla^2 u - \mu^2 u = 0, \quad \mu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (2)$$

is considered. Here and below, $\nabla = (\partial_1, \dots, \partial_m)$, $\partial_i = \partial/\partial x_i$, denotes the gradient operator. The most important application of this equation is in the theory of nuclear forces; it was developed by Yukawa in his Nobel Prize winning paper [18]. See also [3], where (2) is referred to as the Yukawa equation and its solutions are called *panharmonic functions*—abbreviation used below. Since the mentioned characterization of balls obtained in [8] is closely related to one of the results proved in this paper, we begin with its formulation, but introduce some notation before that.

Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ be a point in \mathbb{R}^m , $m \geq 2$, by $B_r(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : |y - x| < r\}$ we denote the open ball of radius r centred at x (just B_r , if centred at the origin). The ball is called admissible with respect to a domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ provided $\overline{B_r(x)} \subset D$. If D has finite Lebesgue measure and a function f is integrable over D , then

$$M(f, D) = \frac{1}{|D|} \int_D f(x) dx$$

is its volume mean value over D . The volume of B_r is $|B_r| = \omega_m r^m$, where

$$\omega_m = 2 \pi^{m/2} / [m \Gamma(m/2)]$$

is the volume of the unit ball; here Γ denotes the Gamma function. A dilated copy of a domain D is $D_r = D \cup [\cup_{x \in \partial D} B_r(x)]$. Thus, the distance from ∂D_r to D is equal to r .

Now, we formulate an analogue of Theorem K, which was proved in [8].

Theorem 1. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, $m \geq 2$, be a bounded domain, whose complement is connected, and let $r > 0$ be such that $|B_r| = |D|$. If for a point $x_0 \in D$ and some $\mu > 0$ the identity*

$$u(x_0) a_m^+(\mu r) = M(u, D), \quad \text{where } a_m^+(t) = \Gamma\left(\frac{m}{2} + 1\right) \frac{I_{m/2}(t)}{(t/2)^{m/2}},$$

holds for every positive function u panharmonic in D_r , then $D = B_r(x_0)$.

As usual, I_ν denotes the modified Bessel function of order ν . Its well-known properties (see [16], pp. 79, 80) imply that $a_m^+(t)$ increases monotonically for $t \in [0, \infty)$ from $a_m^+(0) = 1$ to infinity. In the three-dimensional case related to nuclear forces, $a_3^+(t) = \sqrt{2\pi} I_{3/2}(t)/t^{3/2}$.

Clearly, Theorem 1 is inverse of the *m-dimensional mean value property*

$$a_m^+(\mu r) u(x) = M(u, B_r(x)), \quad (3)$$

which holds for every admissible ball $B_r(x)$ provided $u \in C^2(D) \cap L^1(D)$ solves (2) in D . Identity (3) was recently obtained by the author [9], but it was a surprise to discover that only mean value formulae for spheres and circles were known earlier for panharmonic functions. As early as 1896, C. Neumann [14], Ch. 9, Sect. 3, derived the following formula for spheres in \mathbb{R}^3

$$a_1^+(\mu r) u(x) = M(u, \partial B_r(x)),$$

where $a_1^+(\mu r) = \sinh(\mu r)/(\mu r)$. Much later, Duffin [3], pp. 111-112, independently rediscovered the same proof, but in \mathbb{R}^2 with $a_1^+(t)$ replaced by $a_0^+(t) = I_0(t)$.

In order to reformulate the question quoted above for nuclear setting we recall that Yukawa [18], p. 49, described a source of nuclear force located at $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with the help of the following potential

$$E_\mu^-(x, y) = \frac{\exp\{-\mu|x-y|\}}{|x-y|}, \quad \mu > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{y\}, \quad (4)$$

which is a nonnegative fundamental solution of equation (2) decaying rapidly with the distance. Another fundamental solution of this equation grows with the distance, namely:

$$E_\mu^+(x, y) = \frac{\exp\{\mu|x-y|\}}{|x-y|}, \quad \mu > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{y\}. \quad (5)$$

The existence of two linearly independent fundamental solutions distinguishes (2) from the Laplace equation.

For every $r > 0$ and arbitrary $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$, these fundamental solutions define two families of integrable panharmonic functions

$$B_r(x_0) \ni y \mapsto E_\mu^\pm(y, x) \quad \text{parametrised by } x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_r(x_0).$$

The mean value property (3) yields that

$$a_3^+(\mu r) E_\mu^\pm(x, x_0) = M(E_\mu^\pm(\cdot, x), B_r(x_0)) \quad (6)$$

for every element of these families. This identity is analogous to (1) with D changed to $B_r(x_0)$, but involves the factor $a_3^+(\mu r) > 1$ on the left-hand side. Now, in view of Theorem ASZ' and identity (6), it is natural to expect that the following assertion is true.

Theorem 2. Let “potato” occupy a bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, whose complement is connected, and let r be such that $|B_r| = |D|$. If for some $x_0 \in D$ the mean value identity

$$a_3^+(\mu r) E_\mu^\pm(x, x_0) = M(E_\mu^\pm(\cdot, x), D) \quad (7)$$

holds for every $x \notin D$ and for each fundamental solution of equation (2), then $D = B_r(x_0)$.

It occurs that a characterisation of balls analogous to Theorem 1 is valid for meta-harmonic functions; the term is just an abbreviation for ‘solution to the Helmholtz equation’

$$\nabla^2 u + \lambda^2 u = 0, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (8)$$

I. N. Vekua introduced it in 1943, in his still widely cited article, which was also published as Appendix 2 to the monograph [17]. In the following assertion proved recently, J_ν is the Bessel function of order ν , whereas its n th positive zero is denoted by $j_{\nu,n}$.

Theorem 3 ([11]). Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, $m \geq 2$, be a bounded domain, whose complement is connected, and let $r > 0$ be such that $|B_r| = |D|$. Suppose that there exists a point $x_0 \in D$ such that for some $\lambda > 0$ the identity

$$u(x_0) a_m^-(\lambda r) = M(u, D), \quad \text{where } a_m^-(t) = \Gamma\left(\frac{m}{2} + 1\right) \frac{J_{m/2}(t)}{(t/2)^{m/2}},$$

holds for every function u metaharmonic in D_r . If also

$$D \subset B_{r_0}(x_0), \quad \text{where } \lambda r_0 = j_{m/2,1}, \quad (9)$$

then $D = B_r(x_0)$.

Remark 1. For a fixed $\lambda > 0$, the assertion is applicable only to domains, whose volume is less than or equal to $|B_{r_0}|$, where $\lambda r_0 = j_{m/2,1}$. Indeed, every such domain must lie within a ball of radius r_0 , and this distinguishes the last theorem from Theorem 1, imposing no restriction on the domain’s volume.

The reason for restriction (9) is as follows. The function $a_{m-2}^-(t)$ used in the proof of Theorem 3 oscillates about zero, and so only an interval near the origin, where a_{m-2}^- decreases monotonically, can be used. On the opposite, $a_{m-2}^+(t)$ used in the similar proof of Theorem 1 is greater than or equal to unity and increases monotonically.

Like Theorem 1, the last theorem is inverse of the m -dimensional mean value property

$$a_m^-(\lambda r) u(x) = M(u, B_r(x)), \quad (10)$$

which holds for every admissible ball $B_r(x)$ provided $u \in C^2(D) \cap L^1(D)$ solves (8) in D . Identity (10) was also obtained by the author [9] only recently.

The existence of two linearly independent fundamental solutions is another feature common to equations (2) and (8), but unlike (4) and (5) the solutions of (8), namely,

$$E_\lambda^\pm(x, y) = \frac{\exp\{\pm i\lambda|x-y|\}}{|x-y|}, \quad \lambda > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{y\}, \quad (11)$$

are complex-valued, thus allowing to describe outgoing and incoming acoustic waves in the time domain; see [17], Appendix 2.

As in the panharmonic case, for every $r > 0$ and arbitrary $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$, the fundamental solutions (11) define two families of integrable metaharmonic functions

$$B_r(x_0) \ni y \mapsto E_\lambda^\pm(y, x) \quad \text{parametrised by } x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_r(x_0).$$

The mean value property (10) yields that

$$a_3^-(\lambda r) E_\lambda^\pm(x, x_0) = M(E_\lambda^\pm(\cdot, x), B_r(x_0)) \quad (12)$$

for every element of these families. This identity is analogous to (1) with D changed to $B_r(x_0)$, but involves the factor $a_3^-(\lambda r) < 1$ on the left-hand side, which is positive on the interval $(0, j_{3/2,1})$ and then changes sign. In view of Theorem ASZ' and identity (12), it is natural to expect that the following assertion is true.

Theorem 4. *Let “potato” occupy a bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, whose complement is connected, and let r be such that $|B_r| = |D|$. If for some $x_0 \in D$ condition (9) is fulfilled for $m = 3$ and some $\lambda > 0$, and the mean value identity*

$$a_3^-(\lambda r) E_\lambda^\pm(x, x_0) = M(E_\lambda^\pm(\cdot, x), D) \quad (13)$$

holds for every $x \notin D$ and for each fundamental solution of equation (8), then $D = B_r(x_0)$.

Remark 2. In the acoustical case with a fixed wave number $\lambda > 0$, a restriction on the size of “potato” D is imposed by condition (9). Namely, the volume of D must be less than or equal to $|B_{r_0}|$, where $\lambda r_0 = j_{3/2,1}$; moreover, every such domain must lie within a ball of radius r_0 .

2 Proof of Theorems 2 and 4

Proof of Theorem 2. Since $E_\mu^+(x, x_0)$ and $E_\mu^-(x, x_0)$ satisfy (7) for every $x \notin D$, the same is true for every linear combination of these fundamental solutions. In particular,

$$|D| a_3^+(\mu r) \frac{\sinh(\mu|x - x_0|)}{\mu|x - x_0|} = \int_D \frac{\sinh(\mu|x - y|)}{\mu|x - y|} dy \quad \text{for every } x \notin D.$$

Moreover, the identity is valid throughout \mathbb{R}^3 , because we have real-analytic functions of x on both sides (a consequence of the analyticity of $z^{-1} \sinh z$), and so we substitute $x = x_0$, thus obtaining

$$|D| a_3^+(\mu r) = \int_D \frac{\sinh(\mu|x_0 - y|)}{\mu|x_0 - y|} dy.$$

Let us relocate, without loss of generality, the domain D so that x_0 coincides with the origin, which simplifies the identity to

$$|D| a_3^+(\mu r) = \int_D U_+(y) dy, \quad \text{where } U_+(y) = \frac{\sinh(\mu|y|)}{\mu|y|}. \quad (14)$$

On the other hand, the mean value property (3) is valid for U_+ over B_r :

$$|B_r| a_3^+(\mu r) = \int_{B_r} U_+(y) \, dy. \quad (15)$$

If we assume that $D \neq B_r$, then $G_i = D \setminus \overline{B_r}$ and $G_e = B_r \setminus \overline{D}$ are bounded open sets such that $|G_e| = |G_i| \neq 0$, which follows from the assumptions made about D and r . Then, subtracting (15) from (14), we obtain

$$0 = \int_{G_i} U_+(y) \, dy - \int_{G_e} U_+(y) \, dy > 0.$$

Indeed, the difference is positive since $U_+(y)$ (positive and monotonically increasing with $|y|$) is greater than $[U_+(y)]_{|y|=r}$ in G_i and less than $[U_+(y)]_{|y|=r}$ in G_e , whereas $|G_i| = |G_e|$. The obtained contradiction proves the result. \square

Remark 3. The final part of this proof repeats literally the argument used in the proof of Theorem 1; see [8], p. 947.

Proof of Theorem 4. In the acoustical case, we suppose, without loss of generality, that D is located so that x_0 coincides with the origin, and consider the following linear combination of $E_\lambda^-(y, 0)$ and $E_\lambda^+(y, 0)$:

$$U_-(y) = \frac{\sin(\lambda|y|)}{\lambda|y|},$$

As in the proof of Theorem 2, we arrive at the following consequence of (13)

$$|D| a_3^-(\lambda r) = \int_D U_-(y) \, dy, \quad (16)$$

where the condition $U_-(0) = 1$ is taken into account; cf. (14). Again, assuming that $D \neq B_r$, we consider the bounded open sets $G_i = D \setminus \overline{B_r}$ and $G_e = B_r \setminus \overline{D}$ such that $|G_e| = |G_i| \neq 0$; a consequence of the assumptions made about D and r .

To obtain a contradiction we write the mean value property (10) for U_- over B_r :

$$|B_r| a_3^-(\lambda r) = \int_{B_r} U_-(y) \, dy. \quad (17)$$

Subtracting (17) from (16) and using the definition of r , we obtain

$$0 = \int_{G_i} U_-(y) \, dy - \int_{G_e} U_-(y) \, dy < 0.$$

Indeed, $U_-(y)$ monotonically decreases with $|y|$ in the whole D because $D \subset B_{r_0}$. Therefore, the difference is negative because $U_-(y)$ is strictly greater than $[U_-(y)]_{|y|=r}$ in G_e and strictly less than this value in G_i , whereas $|G_i| = |G_e|$. The obtained contradiction proves the theorem. \square

Remark 4. Here, the argument is similar to that in the proof of Theorem 2; indeed, both rely on monotonicity of a certain solution to the corresponding equation. However, there is an essential distinction between the two theorems concerning the size of a domain. Indeed, no restriction on the size is imposed in Theorem 2. However, the radially symmetric function U_- decreases monotonically near the origin, but only when $\lambda|y|$ belongs to a bounded interval adjacent to zero, for which reason condition (9) is imposed in Theorem 4.

References

- [1] D. Aharonov, M. M. Schiffer, L. Zalcman, “Potato kugel”, *Israel J. Math.* **40** (1981), 331–339.
- [2] G. Cupini, E. Lanconelli, “On the harmonic characterization of domains via mean value formulas”, *Le Matematiche* **75** (2020), 331–352.
- [3] R. J. Duffin, “Yukawan potential theory”, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **35**, 105–130 (1971).
- [4] B. Epstein, “On the mean-value property of harmonic functions”, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **13** (1962), 830.
- [5] B. Epstein, M. M. Schiffer, “On the mean-value property of harmonic functions”, *J. Analyse Math.* **14** (1965), 109–111.
- [6] W. Hansen, I. Netuka, “Inverse mean value property of harmonic functions”, *Math. Ann.* **297** (1993), 147–156. Corrigendum: *Math. Ann.* **303** (1995), 373–375.
- [7] Ü, Kuran, “On the mean value property of harmonic functions”, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **4** (1972), 311–312.
- [8] N. Kuznetsov, “Characterization of balls via solutions of the modified Helmholtz equation,” *Comptes Rendus Math.* **359** (2021), 945–948.
- [9] N. Kuznetsov, “Mean value properties of solutions to the Helmholtz and modified Helmholtz equations”, *J. Math. Sci.* **257** (2021), 673–683.
- [10] N. Kuznetsov, “Inverse mean value properties (a survey)”, *J. Math. Sci.* **262** (2022), 275–290; see also preprint arXiv:2203.10601.
- [11] N. Kuznetsov, “Inverse mean value property of metaharmonic functions”, *J. Math. Sci.* (accepted); see also preprint arXiv:2203.14833.
- [12] E. Lanconelli, ““Potato kugel” for sub-Laplacians”, *Israel J. Math.* **194** (2013), 277–283.
- [13] I. Netuka, J. Veselý, “Mean value property and harmonic functions”, *Classical and Modern Potential Theory and Applications*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1994, pp. 359–398.
- [14] C. Neumann, *Allgemeine Untersuchungen über das Newtonsche Prinzip der Fernwirkungen*, Teubner, Leipzig, 1896.
- [15] M. M. Schiffer, *Selected Papers. Vol. 2*. P. Duren, L. Zalcman (eds.) Springer, New York et al., 2014.
- [16] G. N. Watson, *A Treatise on the Theory of Bessel Functions*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1944.
- [17] I. N. Vekua, *New Methods for Solving Elliptic Equations*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1967.
- [18] H. Yukawa, “On the interaction of elementary particles,” *Proc. Phys.-Math. Soc. Japan* **17** (1935), 48–57.