Asymptotics for Sobolev extremals: the hyperdiffusive case

Grey Ercole

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais Belo Horizonte, MG, 30.123-970, Brazil grey@mat.ufmg.br

April 29, 2024

Abstract

Let Ω be a bounded, smooth domain of \mathbb{R}^N , $N \geq 2$. For p > N and $1 \leq q(p) < \infty$ set

$$\lambda_{p,q(p)} := \inf\left\{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \, \mathrm{d}x : u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \text{ and } \int_{\Omega} |u|^{q(p)} \, \mathrm{d}x = 1\right\}$$

and let $u_{p,q(p)}$ denote a corresponding positive extremal function. We show that if $\lim_{p\to\infty} q(p) = \infty$, then $\lim_{p\to\infty} \lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p} = \|d_{\Omega}\|_{\infty}^{-1}$, where d_{Ω} denotes the distance function to the boundary of Ω . Moreover, in the hyperdiffusive case: $\lim_{p\to\infty} \frac{q(p)}{p} = \infty$, we prove that each sequence $u_{p_n,q(p_n)}$, with $p_n \to \infty$, admits a subsequence converging uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$ to a viscosity solution to the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\infty} u = 0 & \text{in} \quad \Omega \setminus M \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial \Omega \\ u = 1 & \text{in} \quad M, \end{cases}$$

where M is a closed subset of the set of all maximum points of d_{Ω} .

2020 MSC: 35B40, 35J92, 35J94.

Keywords: Distance function, Infinity Laplacian, Sobolev constants.

1 Introduction

Let Ω be a smooth, bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^N , $N \geq 2$. For p > N and $1 \leq q < \infty$ let

$$\lambda_{p,q} := \inf \left\{ \|\nabla u\|_p^p : u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \text{ and } \|u\|_q = 1 \right\}$$
(1.1)

denote the Sobolev constant corresponding to the compact embedding $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^q(\Omega)$. Here and what follows $\|\cdot\|_r$ denotes the standard norm of the Lebesgue space $L^r(\Omega)$, $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, and $\|\nabla\cdot\|_p$ denotes the standard norm of the Sobolev space $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

As it is well known, $\lambda_{p,q}$ is achieved by a function $u_{p,q} \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ which is positive in Ω . Moreover, $u_{p,q}$ is a weak solution to the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda_{p,q} |u|^{q-2} u & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$
(1.2)

where $\Delta_p u := \operatorname{div} \left(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \right)$ is the *p*-Laplacian operator. A minimizer $u_{p,q}$ will referred in this paper as Sobolev extremal function.

In the sublinear case: $1 \le q \le p$, the function $u_{p,q}$ is the only positive minimizer to (1.1), but in general this uniqueness property does not hold in the superlinear case: $p < q < \infty$. For this matter we refer to the paper [3] by Brasco and Lindgren and references therein.

When q = p the homogeneous Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda |u|^{p-2} u & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$
(1.3)

has a positive weak solution u if and only if $\lambda = \lambda_{p,p}$ and $u = ku_{p,p}$, for some positive constant k. This problem is known as the eigenvalue problem for the Dirichlet p-Laplacian. In this context, $\lambda_{p,p}$ is known as the first eigenvalue since it is the least value of λ for which (1.3) has a nontrivial weak solution.

However, if $p \neq q$ the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda |u|^{q-2} u & \text{in } \Omega\\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$
(1.4)

is not homogeneous and this enables it to have at least one positive weak solution for each $\lambda > 0$. Actually, if $1 \leq q < p$ the problem (1.4) has a unique positive solution u_{λ} which is given by the expression

$$u_{\lambda} = \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_{p,q}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q-p}} u_{p,q} \tag{1.5}$$

where $u_{p,q}$ is the only positive Sobolev extremal function.

If q > p the problem (1.4) might have multiple weak solutions for each $\lambda > 0$. Among them, those obtained by Nehari method, that is, as minimizers of the energy functional

$$E_{\lambda}(u) := \frac{1}{p} \|\nabla u\|_{p}^{p} - \frac{\lambda}{q} \|u\|_{q}^{q}$$

on the Nehari manifold

$$N_{\lambda} := \left\{ u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) : \|\nabla u\|_p^p = \lambda \|u\|_q^q \right\}$$

It turns out that such minimizers are of the form (1.5) for some Sobolev extremal function $u_{p,q}$.

In [13], Juutinen, Lindqvist and Manfredi studied the asymptotic behavior, as $p \to \infty$, of the pair $(\lambda_{p,p}, u_{p,p})$. They first deduced that the infimum

$$\Lambda_{\infty} := \inf \left\{ \left\| \nabla u \right\|_{\infty} : u \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \text{ and } \left\| u \right\|_{\infty} = 1 \right\}$$
(1.6)

is achieved by $d_{\Omega}/\|d_{\Omega}\|_{\infty}$, where d_{Ω} denotes the distance function to the boundary of Ω :

$$d_{\Omega}(x) := \inf_{y \in \partial \Omega} |x - y|, \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

Thus,

$$\Lambda_{\infty} = \left\| \nabla (d_{\Omega} / \left\| d_{\Omega} \right\|_{\infty}) \right\|_{\infty} = \frac{\left\| \nabla d_{\Omega} \right\|_{\infty}}{\left\| d_{\Omega} \right\|_{\infty}} = \frac{1}{\left\| d_{\Omega} \right\|_{\infty}}.$$

(We recall that $d_{\Omega} \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $|\nabla d_{\Omega}| = 1$ a.e. in Ω . Moreover, $||d_{\Omega}||_{\infty}$ is the inradius of Ω , i.e. the radius of the greatest ball inscribed in Ω .)

Still in [13], Juutinen, Lindqvist and Manfredi, showed that

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} (\lambda_{p,p})^{1/p} = \Lambda_{\infty}$$

and proved that any sequence (u_{p_n,p_n}) , with $p_n \to \infty$, admits a subsequence converging uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$ to a function $u_{\infty} \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ which is a positive minimizer in (1.6), that is,

$$u_{\infty} > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad ||u_{\infty}||_{\infty} = 1, \text{ and } \Lambda_{\infty} = ||\nabla u_{\infty}||_{\infty}.$$

Moreover, they proved that u_{∞} is a viscosity solution to the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} \min\{|\nabla u| - \Lambda_{\infty} u, -\Delta_{\infty} u\} = 0 & \text{in} \quad \Omega\\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$
(1.7)

where

$$\Delta_{\infty} u := \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} u_{x_i} u_{x_j} u_{x_i x_j}$$

denotes the infinity Laplacian.

These results were independently obtained by Fukagai, Ito and Narukawa in [11], where the asymptotic behavior (as $p \to \infty$) of the higher eigenvalues of the Dirichlet *p*-Laplacian was also studied.

The value $\Lambda_{\infty} = ||d_{\Omega}||_{\infty}^{-1}$ has been referred in the literature as the first eigenvalue for the infinity Laplacian and the Dirichlet problem (taken in the viscosity sense)

$$\begin{cases} \min\{|\nabla u| - \Lambda u, -\Delta_{\infty} u\} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

has been referred as the eigenvalue problem for the infinity Laplacian in Ω .

Charro and Peral in [4] (q(p) < p) and Charro and Parini in [5] (q(p) > p), studied the asymptotic behavior, as $p \to \infty$, of the positive weak solutions u_p to the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \mu_p |u|^{q(p)-2} u & \text{in } \Omega\\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$
(1.8)

where $\mu_p > 0$ is such that

$$\Lambda := \lim_{p \to \infty} (\mu_p)^{1/p} \in (0, \infty).$$
(1.9)

In both papers it is assumed that q = q(p) varies with p in such way that $Q \in (0, \infty)$, where

$$Q := \lim_{p \to \infty} \frac{q(p)}{p}.$$

In [4] it is considered the subdiffusive case: $Q \in (0, 1)$ whereas in [5] it is considered the superdiffusive case: $Q \in [1, \infty)$. The weak solution u_p to (1.8)-(1.9) studied in [5] is obtained by the Nehari method.

In both works it is proved that any sequence u_{p_n} , with $p_n \to \infty$, admits a subsequence converging uniformly to a viscosity solution to the problem

$$\begin{cases} \min\left\{|\nabla u| - \Lambda u^Q, -\Delta_{\infty} u\right\} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega\\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$
(1.10)

In this paper we first derived the following result related to the asymptotic behavior of $\lambda_{p,q(p)}$ and $u_{p,q(p)}$, as $p \to \infty$.

Theorem 1.1 If

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} q(p) = \infty, \tag{1.11}$$

then

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p} = \Lambda_{\infty} \quad and \quad \lim_{p \to \infty} \left\| u_{p,q(p)} \right\|_{\infty} = 1.$$
(1.12)

Moreover, each sequence $(u_{p_n,q(p_n)})$, with $p_n \to \infty$, admits a subsequence that converges uniformly to a function $u_{\infty} \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ which enjoys the following properties:

- 1. $0 \leq u_{\infty}(x) \leq \Lambda_{\infty} d_{\Omega}(x)$ for all $x \in \overline{\Omega}$.
- 2. $\|u_{\infty}\|_{\infty} = 1$ and $\Lambda_{\infty} = \|\nabla u_{\infty}\|_{\infty}$.
- 3. $M := \{x \in \Omega : u_{\infty}(x) = 1\} \subseteq M_{\Omega} := \{x \in \Omega : d_{\Omega}(x) = ||d_{\Omega}||_{\infty}\}.$
- 4. u_{∞} infinity superharmonic in Ω and (consequently) positive in Ω .

Note from item 2 above that the function u_{∞} is also a solution to the minimization problem given by (1.6).

As far as we know, the first limit in (1.12) was not yet observed in the literature (except in the case q(p) = p as described above). Such limit combined with the results by Charro-Peral in [4] and Charro-Parini in [5] determine the asymptotic behavior of $\lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p}$ and $u_{p,q(p)}$, as $p \to \infty$, whenever $Q \in (0, \infty)$.

Our main result, stated in the sequence, focuses on the limit problem satisfied by the limit function u_{∞} in the case not yet treated in the literature, which we call *hyperdiffusive* case: $Q = \infty$.

Theorem 1.2 If

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} \frac{q(p)}{p} = \infty, \tag{1.13}$$

then the function $u_{\infty} \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ obtained in Theorem 1.1 is a viscosity solution to the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\infty} u = 0 & in \quad \Omega \setminus M \\ u = 0 & on \quad \partial \Omega \\ u = 1 & in \quad M. \end{cases}$$
(1.14)

Moreover,

$$u_{\infty} = \frac{d_{\Omega}}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{\infty}} \tag{1.15}$$

if and only if

$$M = M_{\Omega} = \Sigma_{\Omega} \tag{1.16}$$

where

 $\Sigma_{\Omega} := \{ x \in \Omega : d_{\Omega} \text{ is not differentiable at } x \}.$

We recall that Σ_{Ω} , known as the ridge set of Ω , is precisely the set of all points of Ω whose distance to the boundary is achieved at least two points in $\partial\Omega$, so that Σ_{Ω} contains M_{Ω} . A consequence of Theorem 1.2 is that the equality (1.15) is not possible if Σ_{Ω} is larger than M_{Ω} , as it is the case of a square and other polygons. We emphasize that the closed set M is given abstractly as the set of maximum points of u_{∞} , but it enjoys the property of being a subset of M_{Ω} . We also observe that u_{∞} might depend on particular subsequences of the family $(u_{p,q(p)})$, the same occurring with M. However, the uniqueness of u_{∞} is guaranteed whenever $M = M_{\Omega}$ as the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\infty} u = 0 & \text{in} \quad \Omega \setminus M_{\Omega} \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial \Omega \\ u = 1 & \text{on} \quad M_{\Omega} \end{cases}$$
(1.17)

has a unique viscosity solution according to the comparison principle by Jensen in [12] (note that $\partial(\Omega \setminus M_{\Omega}) = \partial\Omega \cup M_{\Omega}$). Thus, if $M = M_{\Omega}$ then u_{∞} must be the uniform limit of the whole family $(u_{p,q(p)})$. The simplest case is when M_{Ω} is a singleton, and it occurs when Ω is a ball or a square, for instance.

If M_{Ω} is not a singleton, the determination of M or even the verification that M is a proper subset of M_{Ω} seems to be a hard task as it would require a deeper analysis of the extremal Sobolev functions $u_{p,q(p)}$ under suitable assumptions on Ω (possibly involving geometric aspects such as convexity or special symmetries).

Inspecting carefully [4] one can verify that, in view of the first limit in (1.12), the results obtained by Charro and Peral described above are also valid for $\mu_p = \lambda_{p,q(p)}$ when Q = 0, but under the hypothesis (1.11). More precisely, such results show that the family $(u_{p,q(p)})$ converges uniformly to $u_{\infty} = \Lambda_{\infty} d_{\Omega}$ as

$$1 \le q(p) < p$$
, $\lim_{p \to \infty} q(p) = \infty$ and $\lim_{p \to \infty} \frac{q(p)}{p} = 0$.

The uniqueness of u_{∞} is guaranteed by the fact (see [12, Theorem 2.1]) that $\Lambda_{\infty} d_{\Omega}$ is the only viscosity solution to the problem

$$\begin{cases} \min\{|\nabla u| - \Lambda_{\infty}, -\Delta_{\infty}u\} = 0 & \text{in} \quad \Omega\\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

In order to complement our analysis on the asymptotic behavior of $\lambda_{p,q(p)}$ and $u_{p,q(p)}$ we prove the following result related to Q = 0.

Proposition 1.3 If

 $r := \lim_{p \to \infty} q(p) \in [1, \infty), \tag{1.18}$

then

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p} = \frac{1}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{r}}$$

and

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} u_{p,q(p)} = \frac{d_{\Omega}}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_r} \quad uniformly \ in \ \overline{\Omega}.$$

Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 1.3 are proved in Section 2.

2 Proofs

2.1 Preliminaries

Let us recall the concept of viscosity solution to the partial differential equation (PDE)

$$F(u, \nabla u, D^2 u) = 0 \tag{2.1}$$

where $F : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{S}^N$ is a continuous function, with \mathbb{S}^N denoting the set of all real symmetric matrices of order $N \times N$.

In the sequel, $B(x_0)$ will denote a ball centered at x_0 .

Definitions 2.1 Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded domain and let $u \in C(D)$. We say that:

1. u is a viscosity supersolution to (2.1) in D if, for each $x_0 \in D$ and each ball $B(x_0) \subset D$ one has

$$F(\phi(x_0), \nabla\phi(x_0), D^2\phi(x_0)) \ge 0$$

for every $\phi \in C^2(B(x_0))$ such that

$$\phi(x) - u(x) < 0 = \phi(x_0) - u(x_0) \text{ for all } x \in B(x_0) \setminus \{x_0\}.$$

2. u is a viscosity subsolution to (2.1) in D if, for each $x_0 \in D$ and each ball $B(x_0) \subset D$ one has

$$F(\phi(x_0), \nabla \phi(x_0), D^2 \phi(x_0)) \le 0$$

for every $\phi \in C^2(B(x_0))$ such that

$$\phi(x) - u(x) > 0 = \phi(x_0) - u(x_0) \text{ for all } x \in B(x_0) \setminus \{x_0\}.$$

3. u is a viscosity solution to (2.1) in D if u is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution to F in D.

We say that $u \in C(D)$ is infinity harmonic in D if u is a viscosity solution to the PDE

$$-\Delta_{\infty}u = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

in D. If u is a viscosity supersolution (subsolution) to (2.2) in D we say that u is infinity superharmonic (subharmonic) in D and use $-\Delta_{\infty} u \ge 0$ ($-\Delta_{\infty} u \le 0$) in D as notation.

The following result is well known (see [2, Theorem 1] and [15, Corollary 4.5]).

Lemma 2.2 Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded domain and let $u \in C(D)$. If u is a nonnegative and $-\Delta_{\infty} u \ge 0$ in D, then either $u \equiv 0$ in D or u > 0 in D.

By a viscosity solution to the Dirichlet problem (1.14) we mean a function $u \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ that is infinity harmonic in $\Omega \setminus M$ and such that: u = 0 on $\partial\Omega$ and u = 1 on M.

We observe that

$$\Delta_p u = (p-2) \left| \nabla u \right|^{p-4} \left\{ \frac{1}{p-2} \left| \nabla u \right|^2 \Delta u + \Delta_\infty u \right\}$$

for a function of class C^2 . Thus, in the viscosity solution approach the partial differential equation in (1.2) is usually written as

$$-(p-2) |\nabla u|^{p-4} \left\{ \frac{1}{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 \Delta u + \Delta_{\infty} u \right\} - \lambda_{p,q} |u|^{q-2} u = 0.$$
(2.3)

By a viscosity solution to (1.2) we mean a viscosity solution $u \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ to (2.3) that vanishes on $\partial\Omega$. We will make use of the following known facts stated in form of lemmas. **Lemma 2.3** Let $p_n \to \infty$ and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $u_n \in W_0^{1,p_n}(\Omega)$ be nonnegative in Ω . Suppose that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \|\nabla u_n\|_{p_n} \le C.$$

There exists a subsequence of (u_n) converging uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$ to a function $u_{\infty} \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ such that

$$0 \le u_{\infty}(x) \le \|\nabla u\|_{\infty} \, d_{\Omega}(x) \le C d_{\Omega}(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \overline{\Omega}$$

Lemma 2.4 For each p > N the embedding $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C(\overline{\Omega})$ is compact and the infimum

$$\Lambda_p := \inf \left\{ \|\nabla u\|_p : u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \quad and \quad \|u\|_{\infty} = 1 \right\}$$

is reached at a function $u_p \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C^{0,1-\frac{N}{p}}(\overline{\Omega})$. Moreover (see [8]),

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} \Lambda_p = \Lambda_{\infty}.$$
 (2.4)

We recall that $u_{p,q(p)}$ denotes a Sobolev extremal function corresponding to $\lambda_{p,q(p)}$, that is, a positive minimizer of the constrained problem (1.1), with q = q(p). Therefore, $u_{p,q(p)} \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to (1.2), with q = q(p). Moreover,

$$u_{p,q(p)} > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \ \left\| u_{p,q(p)} \right\|_{q(p)} = 1, \text{ and } \lambda_{p,q(p)} = \left\| \nabla u_{p,q(p)} \right\|_{p}^{p}.$$
 (2.5)

The proof of the next lemma follows directly from the proof of Lemma 1.8 in [13], where the case q(p) = p is treated.

Lemma 2.5 The Sobolev extremal function $u_{p,q(p)}$ is a viscosity solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda_{p,q(p)} |u|^{q(p)-2} u & \text{in } \Omega\\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.6 The function $d_{\Omega}/\|d_{\Omega}\|_{\infty}$ is the only viscosity solution to (1.17) if and only if $\Sigma_{\Omega} = M_{\Omega}$.

Proof. It is well known (see [1], [6, Corollary 3.4]) that $-\Delta_{\infty} d_{\Omega} = 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \Sigma_{\Omega}$ in the viscosity sense. Hence, if $\Sigma_{\Omega} = M_{\Omega}$ then $d_{\Omega} / ||d_{\Omega}||_{\infty}$ is the only viscosity solution to (1.17).

Inversely, if $d_{\Omega}/\|d_{\Omega}\|_{\infty}$ is the viscosity solution to (1.17), then it is differentiable in $\Omega \setminus M_{\Omega}$ as it is infinity harmonic on this set (see [10, Theorem 3.2]). It follows that $\Sigma_{\Omega} = M_{\Omega}$.

In order to simplify the notation in the proofs, in the sequel we will denote $u_{p_n,q(p_n)}$ by u_n and $\lambda_{p_n,q(p_n)}$ by λ_n , whenever $p_n \to \infty$.

2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Proof. It follows from (2.5) that

$$\lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p} = \left\| \nabla u_{p,q(p)} \right\|_{p} \ge \Lambda_{p} \left\| u_{p,q(p)} \right\|_{\infty} \ge \Lambda_{p} \left| \Omega \right|^{-1/q(p)}$$
(2.6)

where we have used that

$$\Lambda_{p} \leq \frac{\left\|\nabla u_{p,q(p)}\right\|_{p}}{\left\|u_{p,q(p)}\right\|_{\infty}} \text{ and } 1 = \left\|u_{p,q(p)}\right\|_{q(p)} \leq \left\|u_{p,q(p)}\right\|_{\infty} |\Omega|^{1/q(p)}.$$

Hence, combining (2.4) with (2.6) we get, on the one hand,

$$\Lambda_{\infty} = \lim_{p \to \infty} \Lambda_p \le \lim_{p \to \infty} |\Omega|^{1/q(p)} \liminf_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p} = \liminf_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p}.$$
(2.7)

On the other hand, as

$$\lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p} \le \frac{\|\nabla d_{\Omega}\|_{p}}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{q(p)}} = \frac{|\Omega|^{1/p}}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{q(p)}}$$

we obtain

$$\limsup_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p} \le \lim_{p \to \infty} \frac{|\Omega|^{1/p}}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{q(p)}} = \frac{1}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{\infty}} = \Lambda_{\infty}.$$
(2.8)

Gathering (2.7) and (2.8) we conclude the proof of the first limit in (1.12). Hence, returning to (2.6) and taking (2.4) into account again, we get the second limit in (1.12).

Now, let $p_n \to \infty$. As $\|\nabla u_n\|_{p_n} = \lambda_n^{1/p_n} \to \Lambda_\infty$ it follows from (2.8) and Lemma 2.3 that, up to a subsequence, $u_n \to u_\infty \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$, with

$$0 \le u_{\infty}(x) \le \|\nabla u_{\infty}\|_{\infty} d_{\Omega}(x) \le \Lambda_{\infty} d_{\Omega}(x) \text{ for all } x \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

The uniform convergence and the second limit in (1.12) imply that

$$\|u_{\infty}\|_{\infty} = 1$$

Therefore,

$$\left\|\nabla u_{\infty}\right\|_{\infty} \leq \Lambda_{\infty} \leq \frac{\left\|\nabla u_{\infty}\right\|_{\infty}}{\left\|u_{\infty}\right\|_{\infty}} = \left\|\nabla u_{\infty}\right\|_{\infty},$$

so that

$$\left\|\nabla u_{\infty}\right\|_{\infty} = \Lambda_{\infty}$$

completing thus the proof of items 1 and 2.

The proof of item 3 is direct: if $x_0 \in M$, then

$$1 = u_{\infty}(x_0) \le \Lambda_{\infty} d_{\Omega}(x_0) = \frac{d_{\Omega}(x_0)}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{\infty}} \le 1$$

so that $x_0 \in M_{\Omega}$.

In order to prove item 4, let us first verify that $-\Delta_{\infty}u_{\infty} \ge 0$ in Ω . Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and fix a ball $B(x_0) \subset \Omega$ and a function $\phi \in C^2(B(x_0))$ such that

$$\phi(x) - u_{\infty}(x) < 0 = \phi(x_0) - u_{\infty}(x_0)$$
 for all $x \in B(x_0) \setminus \{x_0\}$.

If $|\nabla \phi(x_0)| = 0$, then we have trivially that $-\Delta_{\infty} \phi(x_0) = 0$. Thus, we can assume that $|\nabla \phi(x_0)| > 0$. As $u_n \to u_{\infty}$ uniformly, there exists a sequence $(x_n) \subset \Omega$ such that $x_n \to x_0$ and

$$\phi(x) - u_n(x) < 0 = \phi(x_n) - u_n(x_n) \text{ for all } x \in B(x_n) \setminus \{x_n\}.$$

(See [14, Lemma 4.5]). We can also assume that $|\nabla \phi(x_n)| > 0$.

Owing to Lemma 2.5,

$$-\Delta_{p_n}\phi(x_n) \ge \lambda_n \phi(x_n)^{q_n-1} = \lambda_n u_n(x_n)^{q_n-1} \ge 0,$$

that is,

$$-(p_n-2)\left|\nabla\phi(x_n)\right|^{p_n-4}\left\{\frac{1}{p_n-2}\left|\nabla\phi(x_n)\right|^2\Delta\phi(x_n)+\Delta_{\infty}\phi(x_n)\right\}\geq 0.$$

It follows that

$$-\Delta_{\infty}\phi(x_n) \ge \frac{1}{p_n - 2} \left|\nabla\phi(x_n)\right|^2 \Delta\phi(x_n)$$

and hence, after letting $n \to \infty$, we obtain

$$-\Delta_{\infty}\phi(x_0) \ge |\nabla\phi(x_0)|^2 \,\Delta\phi(x_0) \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{p_n - 2} = 0.$$

This shows that $-\Delta_{\infty}u_{\infty} \ge 0$ in Ω and in addition proves that $u_{\infty} > 0$ in Ω according to Lemma 2.2.

2.3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Proof. According to item 4 of Theorem 1.1, $-\Delta_{\infty}u_{\infty} \ge 0$ in $\Omega \setminus M$. Thus, as $u_{\infty} = 0$ on Ω and $u_{\infty} = 1$ on M, it remains to prove that $-\Delta_{\infty}u_{\infty} \le 0$ in $\Omega \setminus M$. At this point we use (1.13), a stronger hypothesis than (1.11).

We recall that

$$M := \{ x \in \Omega : u_{\infty}(x) = 1 \} \subseteq M_{\Omega} := \{ x \in \Omega : d_{\Omega}(x) = \| d_{\Omega} \|_{\infty} \},\$$

so that $\Omega \setminus M$ is an open set.

Let us fix $x_0 \in \Omega \setminus M$, a ball $B(x_0) \subset \Omega \setminus M$, and a function $\phi \in C^2(B(x_0))$ such that

$$\phi(x) - u_{\infty}(x) > 0 = \phi(x_0) - u_{\infty}(x_0)$$
 for all $x \in B(x_0) \setminus \{x_0\}$.

If $|\nabla \phi(x_0)| = 0$ then we obtain directly that $-\Delta_{\infty} \phi(x_0) = 0$. Thus, we assume that $|\nabla \phi(x_0)| > 0$. Let $p_n \to \infty$ be such that $u_n \to u_{\infty}$ uniformly. We recall from (1.12) and (1.13) that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \lambda_n^{1/p_n} = \Lambda_{\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{q_n}{p_n} = \infty.$$
(2.9)

The uniform convergence $u_n \to u_\infty$ guarantees the existence of a sequence $(x_n) \subset \Omega \setminus M$ such that $x_n \to x_0$ and

$$\phi(x) - u_n(x) > 0 = \phi(x_n) - u_n(x_n) \text{ for all } x \in B(x_n) \setminus \{x_n\}.$$

As $|\nabla \phi(x_0)| > 0$ and $0 < u_{\infty}(x_0) < 1$ we can assume that $|\nabla \phi(x_n)| > 0$ and

$$0 < a \le u_n(x_n) \le b < 1 \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{2.10}$$

where the constants a and b are uniform with respect to n.

Using again Lemma 2.5 we have

$$-(p_n-2)\left|\nabla\phi(x_n)\right|^{p_n-4}\left\{\frac{\left|\nabla\phi(x_n)\right|^2}{p_n-2}\Delta\phi(x_n)+\Delta_{\infty}\phi(x_n)\right\}\leq\lambda_n\phi(x_n)^{q_n-1}=\lambda_nu_n(x_n)^{q_n-1}.$$

Hence, after rearranging terms we obtain

$$-\frac{|\nabla\phi(x_n)|^2}{p_n - 2}\Delta\phi(x_n) - \Delta_{\infty}\phi(x_n) \le \frac{1}{p_n - 2} \left[\frac{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{p_n - 4}} u_n(x_n)^{\frac{q_n - 1}{p_n - 4}}}{|\nabla\phi(x_n)|}\right]^{p_n - 4}.$$
(2.11)

Combining (2.9) and (2.10) we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{p_n - 4}} u_n(x_n)^{\frac{q_n - 1}{p_n - 4}}}{|\nabla \phi(x_n)|} = \frac{\Lambda_\infty}{|\nabla \phi(x_0)|} \lim_{n \to \infty} u_n(x_n)^{\frac{q_n - 1}{p_n - 4}} = 0$$

so that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{p_n - 2} \left[\frac{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{p_n - 4}} u_n(x_n)^{\frac{q_n - 1}{p_n - 4}}}{|\nabla \phi(x_n)|} \right]^{p_n - 4} = 0.$$

As

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left\{ -\frac{1}{p_n - 2} \left| \nabla \phi(x_n) \right|^2 \Delta \phi(x_n) - \Delta_{\infty} \phi(x_n) \right\} = -\Delta_{\infty} \phi(x_0)$$

we conclude, after letting $n \to \infty$ in (2.11), that

$$-\Delta_{\infty}\phi(x_0) \le 0.$$

This shows that u_{∞} is subharmonic in $\Omega \setminus M$ and finishes the proof that u_{∞} is harmonic in $\Omega \setminus M$.

The first equality in (1.16) implies that u_{∞} is a viscosity solution to (1.17) and by Lemma 2.6 the second equality in (1.16) implies that $d_{\Omega}/||d_{\Omega}||_{\infty}$ is also a viscosity solution to the same problem. Thus, by uniqueness $u_{\infty} = d_{\Omega}/||d_{\Omega}||_{\infty}$.

Inversely, if $u_{\infty} = d_{\Omega} / \|d_{\Omega}\|_{\infty}$ in $\Omega \setminus M$, then d_{Ω} is harmonic and, therefore, differentiable in $\Omega \setminus M$. Consequently, $M = \Sigma_{\Omega}$ and this implies that $\Sigma_{\Omega} = M_{\Omega}$ (as $M \subseteq M_{\Omega} \subseteq \Sigma_{\Omega}$).

Remark 2.7 The equalities in (1.16) hold for a ball $B_R(x_0)$, since $M_{B_R(x_0)} = \Sigma_{B_R(x_0)} = \{x_0\}$. Hence, it follows from (1.15) that

$$u_{\infty}(x) = 1 - \frac{|x - x_0|}{R}$$
 for all $x \in B_R(x_0)$

Remark 2.8 The limiting behavior of a family $(v_{p,\Lambda})_{p>N}$ of weak solutions to (1.8)-(1.9) obtained by the Nehari method does not depend on Λ in the hyperdiffusive case. In fact, according to (1.5) one has

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} v_{p,q(p)} = \left(\frac{\lambda_{p,q(p)}}{\mu_p}\right)^{\frac{1}{q(p)-p}} u_{p,q(p)} = \lim_{p \to \infty} u_{p,q(p)}$$

as (1.13) yields

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_{p,q(p)}}{\mu_p}\right)^{\frac{1}{q-p}} = \lim_{p \to \infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_{p,q(p)}}{\mu_p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \frac{\frac{1}{q(p)}}{p-1} = \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\infty}}{\Lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{p \to \infty} \frac{1}{q(p)}} = 1.$$

2.3.1 Proof of Proposition 1.3

Proof. The simpler case in which the function q(p) is constant, say $q(p) \equiv s \in [1, \infty)$, has already been proved in [9, Theorem 4.2]. According to that result,

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{p,s}^{1/p} = \frac{1}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_s} \tag{2.12}$$

and

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} u_{p,s} = \frac{d_{\Omega}}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{s}} \quad \text{uniformly in } \overline{\Omega}.$$
(2.13)

In the sequence we combine (2.12)-(2.13) with the following fact: the function $q \mapsto |\Omega|^{\frac{p}{q}} \lambda_{p,q}$ is strictly decreasing, for each fixed $p \in [1, \infty)$. This monotonicity result was proved for 1 in [7,Proposition 2], but the proof given there also works for <math>p > N.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrarily fixed. Owing to (1.18) we have that $q(p) < r + \epsilon$ for all p sufficiently large, say $p > p_0$. Hence, according to the above mentioned monotonicity result we have

$$\lambda_{p,r+\epsilon} \left|\Omega\right|^{\frac{p}{r+\epsilon}-\frac{p}{q(p)}} \le \lambda_{p,q(p)} \text{ for all } p > p_0$$

so that

$$\frac{|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{r+\epsilon}-\frac{1}{r}}}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{r+\epsilon}} \le \liminf_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p}.$$

Letting $\epsilon \to 0$, we obtain on the one hand

$$\frac{1}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{r}} \le \liminf_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p}.$$
(2.14)

On the other hand, the inequality

$$\lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p} \le \frac{\|\nabla d_{\Omega}\|_{p}}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{q(p)}} = \frac{|\Omega|^{1/p}}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{q(p)}}$$

lead us to the estimate

$$\limsup_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p} \le \frac{1}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_r}.$$
(2.15)

Combining (2.14) and (2.15) we conclude that

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p} = \frac{1}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_r}$$

Now, let $p_n \to \infty$. As $\lambda_{p,q(p)}^{1/p} = \|\nabla u_{p,q(p)}\|_p$, Lemma 2.3 and (2.15) imply that, up to a subsequence, $u_{p_n,q(p_n)}$ converges uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$ to a function $u_{\infty} \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$0 \le u_{\infty} \le \frac{d_{\Omega}}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_{r}} \text{ in } \overline{\Omega}.$$
(2.16)

The uniform convergence and (1.18) yield

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left\| u_{p_n, q(p_n)} \right\|_r = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left\| u_{p_n, q(p_n)} \right\|_{q(p_n)} = \left\| u_{\infty} \right\|_r.$$

Hence, recalling that $\|u_{p_n,q(p_n)}\|_{q(p_n)} = 1$, we have that $\|u_{\infty}\|_r = 1$, which combined with (2.16) yields $u_{\infty} \equiv \frac{d_{\Omega}}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_r}$.

As the limit function u_{∞} is always the same, we conclude that

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} u_{p,q(p)} = \frac{d_{\Omega}}{\|d_{\Omega}\|_r} \quad \text{uniformly in } \overline{\Omega}.$$

As already mentioned in the Introduction, the solution u_p to (1.8)-(1.9) studied by Charro and Parini in [5] is a minimizer of energy functional

$$u \mapsto \frac{1}{p} \|\nabla u\|_p^p - \frac{\mu_p}{q(p)} \|u\|_{q(p)}^{q(p)}$$

on the Nehari manifold

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mu_p} := \left\{ w \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) : \|\nabla w\|_p^p = \mu_p \, \|w\|_{q(p)}^{q(p)} \right\}.$$

Therefore, such a solution can also be obtained by scaling a Sobolev extremal function $u_{p,q(p)}$, that is,

$$u_p = \left(\frac{\lambda_{p,q(p)}}{\mu_p}\right)^{\frac{1}{q(p)-p}} u_{p,q(p)}.$$
(2.17)

According to the first limit in (1.12), one has

$$\lim_{p \to \infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_{p,q(p)}}{\mu_p} \right)^{\frac{1}{q(p)-p}} = \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\infty}}{\Lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{Q-1}}.$$

These facts show that our analysis can be applied to the solutions studied by Charro and Parini in [5] to recover the same results as them, since the scaled function

$$\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\infty}}{\Lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{Q-1}} u_{\infty} = \lim_{p \to \infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_{p,q(p)}}{\mu_p}\right)^{\frac{1}{q(p)-p}} u_{p,q(p)}$$

solves (1.10) in the viscosity sense. The same holds with respect to the results by Charro and Peral in [4] as the only solution to (1.8)-(1.9) is also given by (2.17).

Acknowledgments

The author thanks the support of Fapemig/Brazil (RED-00133-21) and CNPq/Brazil (305578/2020-0).

References

- [1] G. Aronsson: Extension of functions satisfying Lipschitz conditions, Ark. Mat. 6 (1967) 551–561.
- [2] T. Bhattacharya: An elementary proof of the Harnack inequality for non-negative infinitysuperharmonic functions, Electron. J. Differential Equations **2001.44** (2001) 1-8.
- [3] L. Brasco, E. Lindgren: Uniqueness of extremals for some sharp Poincaré-Sobolev constants, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 376 (2023) 3541–3584.

- [4] F. Charro, I. Peral: Limits branch of solutions as $p \to \infty$ for a family of subdiffusive problems related to the *p*-Laplacian. Comm. Part. Diff. Equ. **32** (2007) 1965–1981.
- [5] F. Charro, E. Parini: Limits as $p \to \infty$ of *p*-Laplacian problems with a superdiffusive power-type nonlinearity: positive and sign-changing solutions. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **372** (2010) 629–644.
- [6] M. G. Crandall, L. C. Evans, R. F. Gariepy: Optimal Lipschitz extensions and the infinity Laplacian, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 13 (2001) 123–139.
- [7] G. Ercole: Absolute continuity of the best Sobolev constant, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 404 (2013) 420-428.
- [8] G. Ercole, G. Pereira: Asymptotics for the best Sobolev constants and their extremal functions, Math. Nachr. 289 (2016) 1433–1449.
- [9] G. Ercole, G.A. Pereira, V.M. Magalhães: The limiting behavior of constrained minimizers in Orlicz-Sobolev spaces, J. Anal. Math. 147 (2022) 271–296.
- [10] L.C. Evans, K.S. Charles: Everywhere differentiability of infinity harmonic functions, Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ. 42 (2011): 289–299.
- [11] N. Fukagai, M. Ito, K. Narukawa: Limit as $p \to \infty$ of *p*-Laplace eigenvalue problems and L^{∞} inequality of the Poincaré type, Differ. Integral Equ. **12** (1999) 183–206.
- [12] R. Jensen: Uniqueness of Lipschitz extensions minimizing the sup norm of the gradient. Arch. Ration.
 Mech. Anal. 123 (1993) 51–74.
- [13] P. Juutinen, P. Lindqvist, and J. Manfredi: The ∞-eigenvalue problem, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 148 (1999) 89–105.
- [14] P. Lindqvist: Notes on the infinity Laplace equation, BCAM SpringerBriefs in Mathematics, Springer, 2016.
- [15] J. Manfredi, P. Lindqvist: Note on ∞ -superharmonic functions, Rev. Mat. Complut. **10** (1997) 471–480.