

Boundary Regularity and Compactness for Overdetermined Problems

Ivan Blank
Henrik Shahgholian

March 27, 2002

Abstract

Let D be either the unit ball $B_1(0)$ or the half ball $B_1^+(0)$, let f be a strictly positive and continuous function, and let u and $\Omega \subset D$ solve the following overdetermined problem:

$$\Delta u(x) = \chi_\Omega(x)f(x) \text{ in } D, \quad 0 \in \partial\Omega, \quad u = |\nabla u| = 0 \text{ in } \Omega^c,$$

where χ_Ω denotes the characteristic function of Ω , Ω^c denotes the set $D \setminus \Omega$, and the equation is satisfied in the sense of distributions. When $D = B_1^+(0)$, then we impose in addition that

$$u(x) \equiv 0 \text{ on } \{ (x', x_n) \mid x_n = 0 \}.$$

We show that a fairly mild thickness assumption on Ω^c will ensure enough compactness on u to give us “blow-up” limits, and we show how this compactness leads to regularity of $\partial\Omega$. In the case where f is positive and Lipschitz, the methods developed in Caffarelli, Karp, and Shahgholian (2000) lead to regularity of $\partial\Omega$ under a weaker thickness assumption.

1 Introduction

In this paper we study the regularity properties of solutions to certain overdetermined problems which are similar to the obstacle problem, but which do not have a sign assumption. Specifically, we assume that we are given a domain $\Omega \subset D$, where D is the unit ball $B_1(0)$, or the half ball $B_1^+(0)$, and a function u which satisfies:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \Delta u(x) &= \chi_\Omega(x)f(x) \text{ in } D, \\ u = |\nabla u| &= 0 \text{ in } \Omega^c = D \setminus \Omega, \\ 0 &\in \partial\Omega. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (1.1)$$

Here f is a positive continuous function. In the case where D is a half ball, we impose the additional assumption on the boundary:

$$u(x) \equiv 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \{ (x', x_n) \mid x_n = 0 \}. \quad (1.2)$$

We want to examine the smoothness of $\partial\Omega$.

These problems have been studied in many recent papers with either constant f or with $u \geq 0$. (See for example [B], [CKS], and [SU].) These types of problems have also arisen in various problems of mathematical physics. In the case without the fixed boundary this type of problem comes up in geophysics and inverse potential theory (see [I], [M], and [St]). Problems where a free boundary comes into contact with a fixed boundary appear in filtration, and motion by mean curvature with nonconvex obstacles.

Before we can state our results, we need some definitions. We will fix $0 < \lambda \leq \mu$ and we will assume that all constants are automatically allowed to depend on λ , μ , and n in addition to any other dependence which is indicated. (In other words, if we state that a constant depends on only α , for example, then it is actually allowed to depend on α , λ , μ , and n .) Any nonnegative increasing function defined on the nonnegative real numbers which fixes zero is called a *modulus of continuity*. If σ is a modulus of continuity, then we define $\mathcal{P}_r(M, \sigma)$ to be the set of functions u which satisfy

1. Equation (1.1) with $D = B_r$, and a continuous function f which satisfies

$$\lambda \leq f \leq \mu \quad \text{and} \quad |f(x) - f(y)| \leq \sigma(\|x - y\|),$$

(the f and the Ω from Equation (1.1) are allowed to depend on u)

2. $|u| \leq M$ in D .

For such a function u we will say that the function “ f ” and the domain “ Ω ” correspond to u , and refer to Ω as the *nonzero set* for u and its complement will be called the *zero set*. We define $\mathcal{P}_r^+(M, \sigma)$ like $\mathcal{P}_r(M, \sigma)$ but with $D := B_r^+$, and with Equation (1.2) also assumed. For the situation on the half ball we distinguish different parts of the boundary of Ω as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} XB(u) &:= \partial\Omega \cap \{x_n = 0\} && \text{the fixed boundary,} \\ FB(u) &:= \partial\Omega \cap \{x_n > 0\} \setminus \partial B_1 && \text{the free boundary, and} \\ IB(u) &:= \overline{XB(u)} \cap \overline{FB(u)} && \text{the interface.} \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

We will assume that the origin is part of the free boundary or the interface in all of the sets of functions we define for the sake of simplicity of notation, but the equations themselves are translation invariant.

For a bounded set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we define its *minimum diameter* (denoted $m.d.(S)$) to be the infimum among the distances between pairs of parallel hyperplanes enclosing S . We use the minimum diameter to define two “thickness” conditions which we will use repeatedly.

1.1 Definition ((ϵ, r)-Thickness). We will say that a point x of the free boundary is (ϵ, r)-*thick* if

$$\inf_{r \geq s > 0} \frac{m.d.(\{\Omega^c \cup D^c\} \cap B_s(x))}{s} \geq \epsilon. \quad (1.4)$$

(Better terminology might be that *the zero set is (ϵ, r)-thick at x* , but we prefer brevity.)

1.2 Definition ((ϵ, r)-Pthickness). We will say that an x of the interface is (ϵ, r)-*Pthick* if

$$\inf_{r \geq s > 0} \frac{m.d.(Proj_{\{x_n=0\}}(\Omega^c \cap B_s(x)))}{s} \geq \epsilon, \quad (1.5)$$

where $Proj_\pi(S)$ is the orthogonal projection of a set S into the plane π , and our minimum diameter in (1.5) is taken with respect to $n - 2$ dimensional planes in $\{x_n = 0\}$.

For $\epsilon > 0$, we define $\mathcal{P}_r^0(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ to be the $u \in \mathcal{P}_r(M, \sigma)$ such that 0 is ($\epsilon, r/4$)-*thick*, and we define $\mathcal{P}_r^{0,+}(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ to be the $u \in \mathcal{P}_r^+(M, \sigma)$ such that 0 is ($\epsilon, r/4$)-*Pthick*.

1.3 Theorem (Quadratic Growth). *If either $u \in \mathcal{P}_1^0(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ or $u \in \mathcal{P}_1^{0,+}(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$, then there exists a constant γ which depends on only M, σ , and ϵ such that for any $x \in B_{1/4}$ (or $B_{1/4}^+$ as appropriate)*

$$|u(x)| \leq \gamma \|x\|^2. \quad (1.6)$$

1.4 Remark (First Generalization). Our proof of the theorem above will not use the continuity or the positivity of f . It only requires $f \in L^\infty$.

1.5 Remark (Second Generalization). Our use of the minimum diameter condition to get quadratic growth should be compared with the capacity density condition of [KS] which also gives a quadratic bound. Note also that we can use [KS] to weaken our condition (1.4) to one where the sum of the scaled minimum diameter and the capacity is always greater than ϵ .

We define $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_r(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ to be the set of functions $u \in \mathcal{P}_r(M, \sigma)$ whose free boundary points within $r/2$ of the origin are all ($\epsilon, r/4$)-*thick*.

1.6 Theorem (Nonnegativity Near Ω^c). *If $u \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_1(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$, then there exists a constant α depending on M, σ , and ϵ such that $u \geq 0$ in an α neighborhood of $\partial\Omega \cap B_{1/4}$.*

1.7 Remark (Necessity of Thickness for Nonnegativity). Examples where u becomes negative can be found in the literature. Examples where Ω^c has codimension of at least two can be given explicitly by $2x^2 - y^2$ in \mathbb{R}^3 or (for the contact problem) by $x^2 + xy$ in the set $\{x \geq 0\}$. On the other hand, in [KN] (387–390) there are local examples (of codimension one) where $\partial\Omega$ is given by the curves

$$x_2 = \pm x_1^{\gamma/2}, \quad 0 \leq x_1 \leq 1 \quad (1.7)$$

where $\gamma = 4k + 3$. These examples can be adapted for the problem where there is contact with a fixed boundary, and a description of a way to produce such an adaptation can be found in [SU].

After these theorems have been established, we will be able to invoke the results of the first author in [B] to conclude the following corollary. Before we state it, however, we define some notions of flatness. Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a compact set, and let $\gamma > 0$. Then S is γ -Reifenberg flat if there exists a constant $R > 0$ such that for every $x \in S$ and every $r \in (0, R]$ we have a hyperplane $L(x, r)$ containing x such that

$$D(L(x, r) \cap B_r(x), S \cap B_r(x)) \leq 2r\gamma. \quad (1.8)$$

Here D denotes the Hausdorff distance: If $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$D(A, B) := \max \left\{ \sup_{a \in A} d(a, B), \sup_{b \in B} d(b, A) \right\}. \quad (1.9)$$

We also define the following quantity, which we call the *modulus of flatness*, to get a more quantitative and uniform measure of flatness:

$$\theta(r) := \sup_{0 < \rho \leq r} \left(\sup_{x \in S} \frac{D(L(x, \rho) \cap B_\rho(x), S \cap B_\rho(x))}{\rho} \right). \quad (1.10)$$

Finally, we will say that S is a *Reifenberg vanishing set*, if

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \theta(r) = 0. \quad (1.11)$$

Reifenberg flatness was introduced by Reifenberg in 1960 (see [R]), and has appeared implicitly in the work of Kenig and Toro relating boundary regularity to the regularity of the Poisson kernel (see [KT] and [T]).

1.8 Corollary (Boundary Regularity). *If $u \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_1(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$, then $\partial\Omega \cap B_{1/4}$ is a Reifenberg vanishing set with σ as its modulus of flatness, and in particular we can conclude the following:*

1. For any $x \in \partial\Omega \cap B_{1/4}$

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\Omega^c \cap B_s(x)|}{|B_s|} = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (1.12)$$

2. If σ is a Hölder modulus, then $\partial\Omega \cap B_{1/4}$ is $C^{1,\alpha}$.

3. If σ is a Dini modulus (i.e. $\int_0^1 (\sigma(r)/r) dr < \infty$), then $\partial\Omega \cap B_{1/4}$ is C^1 .

Incidentally, even in the case where we assume that $u \geq 0$, we still need a thickness assumption on Ω^c to get regularity. Schaeffer constructed counter-examples in [Sc] when no thickness is assumed, and Caffarelli's celebrated results in [C1] and [C2] showed that for Hölder continuous and positive f , Ω^c would be either $C^{1,\alpha}$ or "cusp-like" at any given point of its boundary. (In fact $\gamma = 4k + 1$ in Equation (1.7) admits nonnegative solutions.) For functions f which are not Dini continuous the counter-example due to the first author in [B] shows that given our assumptions above, our conclusions are sharp. (Whether the hypotheses we have above can be weakened is a subject of further investigation.)

From Theorem (1.3) combined with the characterization of global solutions found in Theorem B of [SU] we obtain the following corollary by a simple blow-up argument.


1.9 Corollary (Free and Fixed Boundaries Touch Tangentially). *If $u \in \mathcal{P}_1^{0,+}(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$, then there exists a modulus of continuity ψ , and a positive constant γ which depend on only M, σ , and ϵ , such that*

$$\partial\Omega \cap B_\gamma \subset \{ (x', x_n) : x_n \leq \|x'\| \psi(\|x'\|) \}. \quad (1.13)$$

1.10 Remark. The proof of this corollary does not use more than the fact that the fixed boundary, $\{ x_n = 0 \}$, is a C^1 manifold. In [SU] the fixed boundary has to be C^3 in order to prove the necessary compactness, but here we can assume only C^1 as we get our compactness from the assumption on thickness of the zero set Ω^c .

In [SU] the fact that the free boundary touches the fixed boundary tangentially leads to a proof that $\partial\Omega$ is C^1 in a neighborhood of the point of contact. In the current situation, the counter-example in [B] can be adapted to show that even though the free boundary touches the fixed boundary tangentially, it will not in general be C^1 in a neighborhood of zero if the Laplacian is not Dini continuous. The counter-example in question is a function which satisfies $\Delta w = \chi_\Omega f$ for a nonnegative continuous function f , and a set Ω which has density 1/2 on every point of its boundary, but which "spins" an infinite number of times around zero. In particular (since $w \geq 0$), Caffarelli's free

boundary regularity alternative of [C1] and [C2] does not hold in its classical form. To adapt the example to suit our purposes, it needs to be iterated at a sequence of boundary points which converge to zero. The following picture shows how to construct the counter-example for the current situation, and the details of the computation are essentially contained in [B].



In the Dini case we establish C^1 contact between the fixed and free boundaries with a very mild smoothness condition. We let $\delta(x)$ denote the distance from a free boundary point x to the fixed boundary, $XB(u)$. (Note that in general we expect $\delta(x) > x_n$.) We define one final class of functions before we state our corollary. Let $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_r^+(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ be the set of functions $u \in \mathcal{P}_r^+(M, \sigma)$ such that all $x \in FB(u) \cap B_\epsilon$, are $(\epsilon, \delta(x)\epsilon)$ -thick, and all $x \in IB(u) \cap B_{r/2}$, are $(\epsilon, r/4)$ -Pthick.

1.11 Corollary (C^1 Contact in the Dini Case). *Suppose $u \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_r^+(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$, and σ is a Dini modulus of continuity. Then the boundary of Ω is C^1 in a neighborhood of the origin, where the C^1 norm of the local parametrization and the size of the neighborhood will depend on M, σ , and ϵ .*

1.12 Remark. The presence of the $\delta(x)$ term in the thickness assumption allows this condition to degenerate as we approach the fixed boundary. Allowing $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega = \Omega^c \cup D^c$ instead of just $\Omega^c = B_1^+(0) \setminus \Omega$ in Equation (1.4) is necessary for the fixed boundary case because Corollary (1.9) guarantees that otherwise this equation would never be satisfied by free boundary points sufficiently close to the fixed boundary.

2 Compactness

Proof of Theorem (1.3). We first deal with the case when $u \in \mathcal{P}_1^0(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$. Fix ϵ , M , and n , and define the following notation:

$$S_j(u) := \sup_{B_{2^{-j}}} |u| \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{S}_r(u) := \sup_{B_r} |u|.$$

We claim that there exists a constant γ such that

$$S_{j+1}(u) \leq \max \left\{ \frac{\gamma 2^{-2j}}{4}, \frac{S_j(u)}{4^1}, \dots, \frac{S_0(u)}{4^{j+1}} \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

for all j and for all $u \in \mathcal{P}_1^0(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$. In this case we have $\tilde{S}_r(u) \leq \gamma r^2$, which is all we need. So we will suppose that equation (2.1) does not hold. In this case, there exists a sequence $\{u_j\} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_1(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$, and a sequence of integers $\{k_j\}$ such that

$$S_{k_j+1}(u_j) > \max \left\{ \frac{j 2^{-2k_j}}{4}, \frac{S_{k_j}(u_j)}{4^1}, \dots, \frac{S_0(u_j)}{4^{k_j+1}} \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Note that since $|u_j| \leq M$, we can conclude that we must have $k_j \rightarrow \infty$. Now define

$$v_j(x) := \frac{u_j(2^{-k_j}x)}{S_{k_j+1}(u_j)}, \quad (2.3)$$

and observe that in $B_{2^{k_j}}$ we have

$$|\Delta v_j| \leq \frac{\|f\|_\infty}{j} \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.4)$$

and in B_{2^m} (for $0 \leq m \leq k_j$) we have

$$|v_j(x)| \leq \frac{S_{k_j-m}(u_j)}{S_{k_j+1}(u_j)} \leq 4(2^m)^2. \quad (2.5)$$

Thus, for $\|x\| \geq 1$ we have $|v_j(x)| \leq C\|x\|^2$, but we also have the following nondegeneracy: $\|v_j\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/2})} = 1$. After a rotation of coordinates we have $v_j \rightarrow v_0$ with $\Delta v_0 = 0$, $v_0(0) = |\nabla v_0(0)| = 0$, and $v_0(\frac{e_1}{2}) = 1$. v_0 is a harmonic polynomial of degree 2. On the other hand,

$$m.d.(\{v_0 = |\nabla v_0| \equiv 0\} \cap B_1) \geq \epsilon, \quad (2.6)$$

since $\limsup \Omega^\epsilon(v_j) \subset \{v_0 = |\nabla v_0| \equiv 0\}$. But now we have a contradiction, since a quadratic harmonic polynomial cannot satisfy equation (2.6) unless it is identically zero.

The case when $u \in \mathcal{P}_1^{0,+}(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ is very similar. In order to conclude that we have a quadratic harmonic polynomial in this case after the blow up, it is useful to reflect it in an odd fashion across the plane $\{x_n = 0\}$, and use the fact that $|\Delta u| \leq \|f\|_\infty$ in B_1 . The contradiction comes from Equation (1.5) for $\Omega^c(v_0)$.
Q.E.D.

As a consequence, we obtain “blow-up” limits, and a uniform rate of convergence to these limits. First we define a rescaling:

$$u_s(x) := s^2 u(x/s) \quad (2.7)$$

and note that by Theorem (1.3) all of the “ \mathcal{P} ” classes are closed under this rescaling for $s > 1$.

2.1 Proposition (Convergence to Global Solutions). *Suppose that $u \in \mathcal{P}_r^0(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ or $\mathcal{P}_r^{0,+}(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ with f and Ω denoting the corresponding Laplacian and nonzero set. Then there exists a function u_0 defined on either \mathbb{R}^n or the half-space \mathbb{R}_+^n according to our assumption about u (with a nonzero set Ω_0) whose growth is no worse than quadratic, and which satisfies:*

1. $\Delta u_0 = f(0)\chi_{\Omega_0}$,
2. $u_0 = |\nabla u_0| = 0$ in Ω_0^c , and
3. $0 \in \partial\Omega_0$,

and there exists a sequence $\{s_k\} \rightarrow \infty$ such that $u_{s_k} \rightarrow u_0$ uniformly in $C^{1,\alpha}$ on any compact set.

The proof is standard so we omit it. By noting that either

$$\liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m.d.(\Omega_0^c \cap B_R)}{R} \geq \epsilon > 0$$

or

$$\liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m.d.(Proj_{\{x_n=0\}}(\Omega_0^c \cap B_R))}{R} \geq \epsilon > 0$$

and invoking either Theorem II of [CKS] or Theorem B of [SU] according to which case we are considering, the following proposition is immediate.

2.2 Corollary. *With u_0 as in the previous proposition, after a rotation of coordinates we have*

$$u_0(x) = \frac{f(0)}{2}(x_n^+)^2.$$

Now Corollary (1.9) follows by a simple proof by contradiction.

2.3 Proposition (Convergence of Nonzero Sets). *There exists a modulus of continuity ψ which depends on M , σ , and ϵ such that for any $u \in \mathcal{P}_1^0(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ (where $u_s(x) := s^2 u(x/s)$ and Ω_s is the corresponding nonzero set) we have the estimate:*

$$\left| \frac{|\Omega \cap B_{1/s}|}{|B_{1/s}|} - \frac{1}{2} \right| = \left| \frac{|\Omega_s \cap B_1|}{|B_1|} - \frac{1}{2} \right| \leq \psi\left(\frac{1}{s}\right). \quad (2.8)$$

Proof. Suppose such a ψ does not exist. Then there exists a sequence of $u_k \in \mathcal{P}_1^0(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$, a sequence of real numbers $s_k \rightarrow \infty$, and a $\delta > 0$ such that if $v_k(x) := s_k^2 u_k(x/s_k)$, and $\tilde{\Omega}_k$ is the corresponding nonzero set, then

$$\left| \frac{|\tilde{\Omega}_k \cap B_1|}{|B_1|} - \frac{1}{2} \right| \geq \delta. \quad (2.9)$$

Now take a subsequence of the v_k such that $f_k(0)$ converges. Again for simplicity, we assume that it converges to 1. Now by the same argument as in the proof of Proposition (2.1) we can produce a global solution u_0 such that $v_k \rightarrow u_0$. We will have a constant \tilde{M} such that $u_0 \in \mathcal{P}_r(\tilde{M}r^2, \sigma \equiv 0)$ for all $r > 0$ and furthermore since $\limsup \tilde{\Omega}_j^c \subset \Omega_0^c$, u_0 will inherit the following property from the v_k : The zero set Ω_0^c will satisfy

$$\liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m.d.(\Omega_0^c \cap B_R)}{R} \geq \epsilon > 0. \quad (2.10)$$

Now by using equation (2.10) and applying Theorem II from [CKS] again, we can conclude that in the right coordinate system $u_0(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x_n^+)^2$. Finally, we can now get a contradiction with equation (2.9) above by using standard non-degeneracy statements based on the weak maximum principle. (See equation (4.1) of [CKS] for example.)

Q.E.D.

2.4 Remark. In fact, the argument above shows more: If we let $\Omega^+ := \{ u > 0 \}$ and $\Omega^- := \{ u < 0 \}$, then with the same hypotheses as above we will have:

$$\left| \frac{|\Omega^+ \cap B_r|}{|B_r|} - \frac{1}{2} \right|, \quad \left| \frac{|\Omega^c \cap B_r|}{|B_r|} - \frac{1}{2} \right|, \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{|\Omega^- \cap B_r|}{|B_r|} \right|$$

all bounded by $\psi(r)$.

3 Nonnegativity

Proof of Theorem (1.6). The crucial observation in the proof of this theorem, is that if $u \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ and $\tilde{y} \in \partial\Omega \cap B_{1/4}$ then

$$\tilde{u}(x) := 16u\left(\frac{x}{4} + \tilde{y}\right) \in \mathcal{P}_1^0(4M, \sigma, \epsilon) \quad (3.1)$$

and so we can apply proposition (2.3) in a manner independent of u and independent of \tilde{y} . We wish to argue by contradiction, and note that by the translation just mentioned, it will suffice to assume that there exists a sequence of functions $\{u_k\} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_1(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ and a sequence of points $\{x_k\} \subset \Omega_k$ (where Ω_k is the nonzero set for u_k) with

1. $u_k(x_k) < 0$, and
2. $x_k \rightarrow 0 \in \partial\Omega_k$.

Now we claim, that if we take k sufficiently large, then there exists a sequence $\{y_k\} \subset \partial\Omega_k$ with the following properties:

1. $\text{dist}(x_k, \partial\Omega_k) = \text{dist}(x_k, y_k)$ so y_k is one of the points in $\partial\Omega_k$ which is “closest” to x_k ,
2. $\text{dist}(y_k, 0) < \tilde{\epsilon}$ which will be a very small constant independent of k , and
3. if $r_k := \text{dist}(x_k, y_k)$, then


$$\left| \frac{|B_{r_k/2}(y_k) \cap \Omega_k|}{|B_{r_k/2}|} - \frac{1}{2} \right| \leq \tilde{\epsilon}. \quad (3.2)$$

The first two properties are fairly straightforward if k is sufficiently large. The fact that $\tilde{\epsilon}$ is still independent of u_k and k , and $\tilde{\epsilon}$ is also still as small as we like even after the assertion of the third property follows from equation (3.1) and from the fact that ψ is independent of u in proposition (2.3).

Now we make some rescalings and rename some things. We call \tilde{u}_k the function in $\mathcal{P}_2^0(4M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ obtained by rescaling x_k to e_1 and y_k to 0, so $\tilde{u}_k(x)$ is the rotation of the function

$$w_k(x) := \frac{1}{(r_k)^2} u_k(y_k - r_k x)$$

which gives $\tilde{u}_k(e_1) = r_k^{-2} u_k(x_k) < 0$. Since $y_k \in \partial\Omega_k$, we now have $0 \in \partial\tilde{\Omega}_k$, where $\tilde{\Omega}_k$ is the nonzero set of \tilde{u}_k . At this point we have the following picture:



The dotted horizontal lines are in a region which must lie in $\tilde{\Omega}_k$ and the vertical striped region is a subset of $\tilde{\Omega}_k^c$ and has measure within $\tilde{\epsilon}$ of $\frac{1}{2}|B_{1/2}|$. After taking a limit we converge to $u_0(x) = \gamma(x_1^+)^2$ (for some constant γ), which contradicts the fact that $u_0(e_1) \leq 0$.

Q.E.D.

To prove Corollary (1.8) we observe that near the boundary we now have a solution of the obstacle problem. In particular, we can invoke the results from [B] immediately. (For a recent treatment of the obstacle problem see [C3] and [B].)

Before we prove Corollary (1.11), we prove a preliminary lemma.

3.1 Lemma (Convergence of Normals at the Fixed Boundary). *Let $u \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_r^+(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$ and let σ be a Dini modulus. Then there exists a $\rho_0 = \rho_0(M, \sigma, \epsilon) > 0$ and a modulus of continuity ω_1 which also depends only on M, σ , and ϵ , such that if $n(x)$ is the interior unit normal at x (the normal must exist by Corollary (1.8)), then*

$$\|n(x) - e_n\| \leq \omega_1(\delta(x)) \quad (3.3)$$

(recall that $\delta(x)$ is the distance from x to the fixed boundary, $\partial\Omega \cap \{x_n = 0\}$), and $\partial\Omega(u) \cap B_{\rho_0}$ is a graph in the e_n direction.

Proof. It suffices to prove Equation (3.3). To this end, we fix $\zeta > 0$ and show that once $\delta(x)$ is sufficiently small (where x is a point in a free boundary in our class, $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_r^+(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$) we have

$$\|n(x) - e_n\| \leq \zeta \quad (3.4)$$

We take a sequence $\{u_k\} \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_r^+(M, \sigma, \epsilon)$, and a sequence $\{x^k\} \in \partial\Omega(u_k)$ which converges to zero, and we denote the corresponding sequence of normals by $\{n_k\}$. Let y^k be one of the points of $XB := \{x_n = 0\} \cap \overline{\Omega(u_k)}$ which is closest to x^k . Define

$$U_k(x) := \frac{u_k(\delta(x^k)x + y^k)}{\delta(x^k)^2}, \quad (3.5)$$

and define

$$X^k := \frac{x^k - y^k}{\delta(x^k)}. \quad (3.6)$$

Note that the normal to the free boundary at X^k is still n_k , note that $|X^k| = 1$, and note that if we extend U_k to be 0 in $\{x_n \leq 0\}$, then it is a solution of the local problem in a ball of radius one around X^k .

Our rescaling has eliminated the $\delta(x)$ term which appears in our assumptions, and so we have a uniform thickness of our zero set in a neighborhood of X^k . Because of the uniform thickness we have, we can apply Theorem (1.6)

to conclude that $U_k \geq 0$ in a uniform neighborhood of X^k , and at that point, Theorem 7.2 of [B] shows that if x is a free boundary point in a small (but uniform) neighborhood around X^k and n is its normal vector, then

$$\|n - n_k\| \leq C \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sigma(\delta(x_k)2^{-m}) \leq C \int_0^1 \frac{\sigma(\delta(x_k)t)}{t} dt. \quad (3.7)$$

By Corollary (1.9) we know that $X_n^k \leq \psi(\delta(x_k))$, where ψ is the modulus of continuity given in that corollary. On the other hand, we know that the free boundary cannot touch $x_n = 0$ within $B_1(X^k)$. This fact along with Equation (3.7) leads to an estimate of the form $\|n_k - e_n\| \leq \zeta$, if $\delta(x_k)$ is sufficiently small.

Q.E.D.

Proof of Theorem (1.11). Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Choose d sufficiently small to ensure that (with ω_1 as given in the previous lemma) $\omega_1(d) \leq \epsilon/2$. If x and y are two points on the free boundary, with $\delta(x)$ and $\delta(y)$ less than d , and $n(x)$ and $n(y)$ are the corresponding normal vectors, then by the previous lemma we get

$$\|n(x) - n(y)\| \leq \|n(x) - e_n\| + \|e_n - n(y)\| \leq \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2. \quad (3.8)$$

Now if $\delta(x)$ and $\delta(y)$ are both greater than $d/2$, then by assumption we have a uniform thickness estimate, and therefore we can apply Theorem 7.2 of [B] to conclude that we have a uniform modulus of continuity of the normal vectors which we will call ω_2 . Let η be chosen small enough so that $\omega_2(\eta) \leq \epsilon$. If x and y are free boundary points, and

$$\|x - y\| \leq \min\{d/2, \eta\} \quad (3.9)$$

then either $\delta(x)$ and $\delta(y)$ will both be less than d and Equation (3.8) will apply, or $\delta(x)$ and $\delta(y)$ will both be more than $d/2$ and we can use ω_2 to get the desired result.

Q.E.D.

Acknowledgements

Ivan Blank wishes to thank the Göran Gustafsson Foundation for a visit to the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm, and Derek Hansen for a useful conversation. Henrik Shahgholian was supported by the Swedish Natural Science Research Council.

References

- [B] I. Blank, Sharp results for the regularity and stability of the free boundary in the obstacle problem, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 50(2001), no. 3, 1077–1112.
- [C1] L.A. Caffarelli, The regularity of free boundaries in higher dimensions, *Acta Math.*, 139(1977), no. 3-4, 155–184.
- [C2] L.A. Caffarelli, Compactness methods in free boundary problems, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 5(1980), no. 4, 427–448.
- [C3] L.A. Caffarelli, The obstacle problem revisited, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 4(1998), no. 4-5, 383–402.
- [CKS] L.A. Caffarelli, L. Karp, and H. Shahgholian, Regularity of a free boundary with application to the Pompeiu problem, *Ann. of Math.*, (2)151(2000), no. 1, 269–292.
- [I] V. Isakov, Inverse Source Problems, AMS Math. Surveys and Monographs 34, Providence, Rhode Island, 1990.
- [KN] D. Kinderlehrer and L. Nirenberg, Regularity in free boundary value problems, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa.*, 4(1977), 373–391.
- [KS] L. Karp and H. Shahgholian, On the optimal growth of functions with bounded Laplacian, *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, 2000(2000), no. 3, 1–9.
- [KT] C.E. Kenig and T. Toro, Harmonic measures and Poisson Kernels, *Ann. of Math.*, (2)150(1999), no. 2, 369–454.
- [M] A.S. Margulis, Potential theory for L^p -densities and its applications to inverse problems of gravimetry, Theory and Practice of Gravitational and Magnetic Fields Interpretation in USSR, Naukova Dumka Press, Kiev, 1983, 188–197 (Russian).
- [R] E.R. Reifenberg, Solution of the Plateau Problem for m -dimensional surfaces of varying topological type, *Acta Math.*, 104(1960), 1–92.
- [Sc] D.G. Schaeffer, Some examples of singularities in a free boundary, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa.*, 4(1977), 133–144.
- [St] V.N. Strakhov, The inverse logarithmic potential problem for contact surface, *Physics of the Solid Earth*, 10(1974), 104–114 [translated from Russian].
- [SU] H. Shahgholian and N. Uraltseva, Regularity properties of a free boundary near contact points with the fix boundary, to appear in *Duke Univ. Math. J.*
- [T] T. Toro, Doubling and flatness: geometry of measures, *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 44(1997), no. 9, 1087–1094.

Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019

E-mail address: blanki@math.rutgers.edu

Department of Mathematics, Royal Institute of Technology, 100 44
Stockholm, Sweden

E-mail address: henriks@math.kth.se