The limit as $p \to \infty$ in a two-phase free boundary problem for the p-Laplacian

Julio D. Rossi
Departamento De Análisis Matemático
Universidad De Alicante
Ap. Correos 99, 03080 Alicante, Spain

Peiyong Wang
Department of Mathematics
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48202

February 25, 2014

Abstract

In this paper, we study the limit as p goes to infinity of a minimizer of a variational problem that is a two-phase free boundary problem of phase transition for the p-Laplacian. Under a geometric compatibility condition, we prove that this limit is a solution of a free boundary problem for the ∞-Laplacian. When the compatibility condition does not hold, we prove that there still exists a uniform limit that is a solution of a minimization problem for the Lipschitz constant. Moreover, we provide, in the latter case, an example that shows that the free boundary condition can be lost in the limit.

AMS Classifications: 35J92, 35R35, 35J60, 35J62

Keywords: Two-phase free boundary problem, phase transition, variational principle, p-Laplacian, infinity Laplacian.

1 Introduction.

Given a bounded Lipschitz domain Ω in $\mathbb{R}^n$, we consider a two-phase free boundary problem of phase transition for the p-Laplacian. More precisely, we minimize the functional

$$J_p(u) = \int_\Omega \frac{1}{p}|\nabla u(x)|^p + Q^p(x)\lambda(u(x))\,dx, \tag{1.1}$$

subject to the boundary condition $u - \sigma \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, where an indicator function

$$\lambda(s) = \begin{cases} \lambda_1^p & \text{if } s > 0, \\ \lambda_2^p & \text{if } s \le 0, \end{cases}$$

with $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > 0$, a continuous weight function $Q(x) > 0$, and boundary data $\sigma \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ are given. We denote by $Lip(\sigma)$ the Lipschitz constant of σ and we assume without the loss of generality that $Lip(\sigma) = Lip(\sigma\mid_{\partial\Omega})$, as we can just take σ as the absolute minimizing Lipschitz extension of its boundary data (see [1] for the existence of such an absolute minimizing Lipchitz extension).

There is a minimizer of (1.1), which is proved in Lemma 2.1 in the next section. A minimizer is a weak solution to the p-Laplace equation in the positive and negative domains, namely

$$-\Delta_p u_p = -\mathrm{div}(|\nabla u_p|^{p-2}\nabla u_p) = 0, \qquad \text{in } \{u_p > 0\} \cup \{u_p < 0\},$$

satisfying the Dirichlet boundary condition $u\mid_{\partial\Omega} = \sigma$, and, under the assumption that the "flat region" where $u_p = 0$ is of measure zero, the minimizer satisfies the free boundary condition

$$(u^+_{p,\nu})^p - (u^-_{p,\nu})^p = \frac{p}{p-1}(\lambda_1^p - \lambda_2^p)$$

at every regular point in a weak sense, as stated in Lemma 2.4. For study on free boundary problems involving quasilinear equations like the one considered here, there is a long list of references, among which we would like to refer the reader to [2], [4], [5], [6], [7], [9], [10], [11], [12], and [13].

Our main concern in this paper is to study the limit as $p \to \infty$ of the minimizers.

First, to clarify the statements and the discussion, we assume that $Q(x) = 1$. Let us consider the three terms that appear in (1.1),

$$\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p, \qquad \lambda_1^p|\{u > 0\}| \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lambda_2^p|\{u < 0\}|. \tag{1.2}$$

As $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$, the third term is not the leading one as $p \to \infty$. Between the first two, the one that dominates as $p \to \infty$ depends on the relation between $Lip(\sigma)$ and λ_1. When $\lambda_1 \geq Lip(\sigma)$, it is the second term that dominates, and this implies that when we take $p \to \infty$ we get a limit function whose gradient, or equivalently its Lipschitz constant, is not greater than λ_1, and that minimizes the measure of its positive set. Therefore, we are led to consider the following two-phase minimization problem:

$$\begin{cases} \text{Minimize } |\{u(x) > 0\}| & \text{subject to } Lip(u) \leq \lambda_1,\ u = \sigma \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \text{ with} \\ \triangle_\infty u = 0 & \text{in } \{u > 0\} \cup \{u < 0\}, \\ u = 0, \quad u^+_\nu = \lambda_1 & \text{on } \partial\{u > 0\} \cap \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

where ν is the normal to the free boundary $\partial\{u > 0\} \cap \Omega$ pointing inward of the positive set $\{u > 0\}$.

That the ruling equation for the limit configuration is the infinity Laplace equation $-\Delta_\infty u = -\langle D^2 u Du, Du\rangle = 0$ is due to the fact that infinity harmonic functions, the viscosity solutions to the equation $-\Delta_\infty u = 0$, appear naturally as the limit of p-harmonic functions, the viscosity solutions to the p-Laplace equation $\Delta_p u = \mathrm{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) = 0$ (see [3] and the survey [1]).

This discussion leads us to believe that when $Lip(\sigma) \le \lambda_1$ the limit as $p \to \infty$ of the minimizers of (1.1) is a solution to (1.3), which constitutes the first part of the next theorem.

The case $Lip(\sigma) > \lambda_1$ is different, since in this case the leading term of the three in (1.2) is the first one. Here we can also prove that there is a uniform limit, but it could happen that this limit is just the absolute minimizing Lipschitz extension of σ to the inside of Ω and hence there is no free boundary that survives in the limit. This is exactly what happens in a one-dimensional example, Example 2.14.

We summarize the results mentioned above in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1 *Assume that $Q = 1$. Let u_p be a minimizer of* (1.1)*, then there exists a continuous function u_∞ such that, for a subsequence denoted still by $\{u_p\}$,*

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} u_p = u_\infty,$$

uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$. In addition,

(i) if $Lip(\sigma) \le \lambda_1$, let

$$P = \bigcup_{z\in\partial\Omega, \sigma(z)>0} B_{\sigma(z)/\lambda_1}(z),$$

then the limit u_∞ is a solution to (1.3) *and its positive set verifies*

$$P \subset \{u_\infty > 0\}, \ |P| = |\{u_\infty > 0\}|, \ \text{and } \partial\{u_\infty > 0\} \cap \Omega \subset \partial P \cap \Omega. \quad (1.4)$$

Moreover, in this case, the limit u_∞ satisfies the free boundary condition $u_\nu^+ = \lambda_1$ along the free boundary $\partial\{u_\infty > 0\} \cap \Omega$ in the sense that, if $x_0 \in \partial\{u_\infty > 0\} \cap \Omega$ is a regular free boundary point, then

$$\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0} \frac{u_\infty(x_0 - \epsilon\nu) - u_\infty(x_0)}{\epsilon} = \lambda_1.$$

where ν is a external normal vector to the set $\{u_\infty > 0\}$ at x_0.

(ii) if $Lip(\sigma) > \lambda_1$, then u_∞ is a minimal Lipschitz extension of σ. That is, it minimizes the Lipschitz constant in Ω subject to the boundary data σ, or equivalently,

$$Lip(u_\infty) = \min_{v=\sigma \text{ on } \partial\Omega} Lip(v).$$

Moreover, in this case, it can happen that the free boundary condition is lost in the limit, that is, the limit u_∞ may be independent of λ_1 and λ_2 as shown by the one-dimensional example (2.14).

In both cases, the limit u_∞ is also a viscosity solution to the infinity Laplace equation $\triangle_\infty u = 0$ in $\{u > 0\} \cup \{u < 0\}$.

Remark 1.2 The properties of the positive set for the limit given in (1.4) are given in terms of the set P that is exactly the positive set of the function

$$v_\infty(x) = \max_{z\in\partial\Omega, \sigma(z)>0} (\sigma(z) - \lambda_1|x - z|)_+. \tag{1.5}$$

Also note that we have that $\{u_\infty > 0\} = \{v_\infty > 0\} \cup Z$ for a set Z of measure zero, and the free boundary of u_∞ is included in the boundary of the positive set of v_∞.

Remark 1.3 If we consider the same problem with λ_1, λ_2 instead of λ_1^p, λ_2^p in the definition of $\lambda(u)$, our arguments show that u_p converges uniformly to a limit, u_∞, that is a solution of

$$\begin{array}{ll} \displaystyle\min_{Lip(u)\leq 1, u=\sigma \text{ on } \partial\Omega} \lambda_1|\{u > 0\}| + \lambda_2|\{u < 0\}|, & \text{if } Lip(\sigma) \leq 1, \\ \displaystyle\min_{u=\sigma \text{ on } \partial\Omega} Lip(u), & \text{if } Lip(\sigma) > 1. \end{array}$$

The case $Q \neq 1$ is different since we have again three terms that in this case are the following

$$\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p, \qquad \lambda_1^p \int_{\{u>0\}} Q^p(x)\,dx \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lambda_2^p \int_{\{u\leq 0\}} Q^p(x)\,dx.$$

Note that now the third term can be dominant depending on the size of Q even if $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$.

In this case we can also show uniform convergence and that the limit is a solution to a minimization problem as stated below.

Theorem 1.4 *Let u_p be a minimizer of* (1.1)*, then, for a subsequence $\{u_{p_k}\}$ of $\{u_p\}$, it holds that*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} u_{p_k} = u_\infty$$

uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$. In addition, the limit u_∞ is a solution to the minimization problem

$$\min_{u\in A,\, u|_{\partial\Omega}=\sigma} \max\Big\{Lip(u), \lambda_1\|Q\|_{L^\infty(u>0)}, \lambda_2\|Q\|_{L^\infty(u\le 0)}\Big\},$$

where $A = \Big\{u \,:\, Lip(u) \le \max\{Lip(\sigma), \lambda_1\|Q\|_{L^\infty(\sigma>0)}, \lambda_2\|Q\|_{L^\infty(\sigma\le 0)}\}\Big\}$.

As in Theorem 1.1, the free boundary may be lost in the limit.

2 Proof of the main theorems.

2.1 The two-phase problem for the p-Laplacian for finite p.

First we prove the existence of a minimizer of (1.1) for a fixed p in $[1,\infty)$.

Lemma 2.1 *There exists a minimizer of the variational problem* (1.1).

Proof. Without the loss of generality, one may assume the domain Ω is bounded. Take a minimizing sequence $\{u^k\}$ of J_p. Then

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} J_p(u^k) \le J_p(\sigma).$$

So $\{u^k\}$ is a bounded sequence in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, since $\int_\Omega |\nabla u^k|^p \le pJ_p(u^k)$. As a result, one may conclude that, for a subsequence denoted still by $\{u^k\}$,

$$u^k \to v \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(\Omega)$$

$$u^k \to v \text{ a. e. in } \Omega \qquad\qquad \text{and}$$

$$Q^p(x)\lambda^p(u^k) \to q(x) \text{ weakly star in } L^\infty_{loc}(\Omega),$$

where

$$q(x) \begin{cases} = Q^p(x)\lambda^p(v) & \text{if } v \ne 0 \\ \ge Q^p(x)\lambda^p(v) & \text{if } v = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then Fatou's Lemma implies that

$$\begin{aligned} J_p(v) &= \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^p + Q^p(x)\lambda^p(v) \\ &\le \liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u^k|^p + Q^p(x)\lambda^p(u^k) \\ &= \liminf_{k\to\infty} J_p(u^k). \end{aligned}$$

So v is a minimizer of J_p, since clearly $v - \sigma \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. $\square$

Remark 2.2 The previous proof also works if Ω is unbounded, one may simply replace Ω by $\Omega \cap B_R$ for all large balls B_R in the above argument and send R to ∞.

Remark 2.3 The uniqueness of a minimizer of the variational problem does not hold. In fact, one may take $\Omega = B$, the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and take the simplest boundary data $\sigma = 1$ on $\partial\Omega$.

Next, we take $u_0 \equiv 1$ on Ω. Then $J_p(u_0) = \frac{1}{p}\lambda_2^p \omega_n$, where ω_n is the volume of the unit ball.

Suppose there is a unique minimizer u_1 of the functional J_p. Then u_1 is radially symmetric. So there is an $s \in (0,1)$ such that $u_1 \equiv 0$ on B_s, and $\triangle_p u_1 \equiv 0$ in $B \backslash B_s$. A simple computation gives that

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} a|x|^{\frac{p-n}{p-1}} + b, & \text{if } s \le |x| \le 1 \\ 0, & \text{if } |x| < s, \end{cases}$$

where a and b satisfy $a + b = 1$ and $as^{\frac{p-n}{p-1}} + b = 0$. Then

$$J_p(u_0) - J_p(u_1) = \frac{1}{p}(\lambda_2^p - \lambda_1^p)\omega_n s^n - \frac{1}{p}|a|^p \left|\frac{p-n}{p-1}\right|^p \frac{p-1}{p-n}(1 - s^{\frac{p-n}{p-1}}) n\omega_n.$$

If one carefully chooses the values of λ_1 and λ_2, one can make this difference equal to 0. The details are very similar to those in the computation contained in [8] and hence we omit the details. So one ends up with two distinct minimizers u_0 and u_1.

Lemma 2.4 *Let $Q = 1$. Suppose that u_p is a minimizer of J_p, and that*

$$|\{x : u_p(x) = 0\}| = 0.$$

Then u_p satisfies the free boundary condition

$$(u_{p,\nu}^+)^p - (u_{p,\nu}^-)^p = \frac{p}{p-1}(\lambda_1^p - \lambda_2^p)$$

in the weak sense, that is,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\partial\{u_p > \epsilon\}} (\frac{p-1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p - \lambda_1^p)\eta \cdot \nu + \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \int_{\partial\{u_p < -\delta\}} (\frac{p-1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p - \lambda_2^p)\eta \cdot \nu = 0$$

for any smooth function $\eta \in C_0^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Here ν always denotes the external normal to a given domain.

Proof. Take $x_\epsilon = \tau_\epsilon(x) = x + \epsilon\eta$ for $x \in \Omega$, and define $u_\epsilon(x_\epsilon) = u_p(x)$. So

$$u_\epsilon(x) = u_p(\tau_\epsilon^{-1}x),$$

$$\nabla u_\epsilon(x) = (D\tau_\epsilon^{-1}(x))\nabla u_p(\tau_\epsilon^{-1}x),$$

and

$$(D\tau_\epsilon^{-1})(x) = (D\tau_\epsilon)^{-1}(\tau_\epsilon^{-1}x) = (I+\epsilon\nabla\eta)^{-1}(\tau_\epsilon^{-1}x) = I-\epsilon D\eta(\tau_\epsilon^{-1}x)+O(\epsilon^2).$$

We will also use the following identities

$$|(I-\epsilon D\eta+O(\epsilon^2))\nabla u_p|^p = |\nabla u_p|^p - \epsilon p|\nabla u_p|^{p-2} < D\eta\nabla u_p, \nabla u_p > +O(\epsilon^2)$$

and

$$\det(I+\epsilon D\eta) = 1+\epsilon\ tr(D\eta)+O(\epsilon^2),$$

where $tr(D\eta) = \nabla\cdot\eta$.

The minimality of $J_p(u_p)$ then implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&0 \le J_p(u_\epsilon) - J_p(u_p)\\
&= \int_\Omega \frac{1}{p}|D\tau_\epsilon^{-1}(x)\nabla u_p(\tau_\epsilon^{-1}x)|^p + \lambda(u_p(\tau_\epsilon^{-1}))dx - \int_\Omega \frac{1}{p}|\nabla u|^p + \lambda(u)\\
&= \int_\Omega \frac{1}{p}|(D\tau_\epsilon)^{-1}(\tau_\epsilon^{-1}x)\nabla u_p(\tau_\epsilon^{-1}x)|^p + \lambda(u_p(\tau_\epsilon^{-1}x))dx - \int_\Omega \frac{1}{p}|\nabla u|^p + \lambda(u)\\
&= \int_\Omega \{\frac{1}{p}|(D\tau_\epsilon)^{-1}(x)\nabla u_p(x)|^p + \lambda(u_p(x))\}\det(D\tau_\epsilon)dx - \int_\Omega \frac{1}{p}|\nabla u|^p + \lambda(u)\\
&= \int_\Omega \frac{1}{p}|(I-\epsilon D\eta+O(\epsilon^2))\nabla u_p|^p\det(I+\epsilon\nabla\eta) + \lambda(u_p(x))\det(I+\epsilon D\eta)dx\\
&\qquad - \int_\Omega \frac{1}{p}|\nabla u|^p + \lambda(u)\\
&= \int_\Omega \frac{1}{p}\{|\nabla u_p|^p - \epsilon p|\nabla u_p|^{p-2} < D\eta\nabla u_p, \nabla u_p > +O(\epsilon^2)\}\\
&\qquad \{1+\epsilon\ tr(D\eta)+O(\epsilon^2)\}dx + \int_\Omega \lambda(u_p)(1+\epsilon\ tr(D\eta)+O(\epsilon^2))dx\\
&\qquad - \int_\Omega \frac{1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p + \lambda(u_p)dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&0 \le J_p(u_\epsilon) - J_p(u_p) \\
&= \epsilon \int_\Omega \frac{1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p \ tr(D\eta) - |\nabla u_p|^{p-2}\langle D\eta \nabla u_p, \nabla u_p\rangle \\
&\qquad +\lambda(u_p)\ tr(D\eta)dx + O(\epsilon^2) \\
&= \epsilon \int_\Omega \{\frac{1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p + \lambda(u_p)\}\ tr(D\eta) - |\nabla u_p|^{p-2}\langle D\eta \nabla u_p, \nabla u_p\rangle dx + O(\epsilon^2).
\end{aligned}
$$

As ϵ could be any small number, positive as well as negative, the linear term in ϵ must be zero in the preceding inequality. Hence

$$
\int_\Omega \Big\{\frac{1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p + \lambda(u_p)\Big\}\nabla \cdot \eta - |\nabla u_p|^{p-2}\langle D\eta \nabla u_p, \nabla u_p\rangle = 0.
$$

The left-hand-side of the preceding equation is given by, on account of the assumption that $|\{u_p = 0\}| = 0$,

$$
\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0, \delta\downarrow 0} \int_{\Omega\setminus\{-\delta<u_p<\epsilon\}} \Big\{\frac{1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p + \lambda(u_p)\Big\}\nabla \cdot \eta - |\nabla u_p|^{p-2}\langle D\eta \nabla u_p, \nabla u_p\rangle.
$$

If u_p is of class C^2, then the preceding left-hand-side is equal to

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0, \delta\downarrow 0} \int_{\Omega\setminus\{-\delta<u_p<\epsilon\}} \nabla \cdot \{(\frac{1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p + \lambda(u_p))\eta - \eta \cdot \nabla u_p |\nabla u_p|^{p-2}\nabla u_p\} \\
&= \lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0} \int_{\partial\{u_p>\epsilon\}} (\frac{1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p + \lambda_1^p)\eta \cdot \nu - \eta \cdot \nabla u_p |\nabla u_p|^{p-2}\nabla u_p \cdot \nu dH^{n-1} \\
&\qquad + \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} \int_{\partial\{u_p<-\delta\}} (\frac{1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p + \lambda_2^p)\eta \cdot \nu - \eta \cdot \nabla u_p |\nabla u_p|^{p-2}\nabla u_p \cdot \nu dH^{n-1} \\
&= -\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0} \int_{\partial\{u_p>\epsilon\}} (\frac{p-1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p - \lambda_1^p)\eta \cdot \nu dH^{n-1} \\
&\qquad - \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} \int_{\partial\{u_p<-\delta\}} (\frac{p-1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p - \lambda_2^p)\eta \cdot \nu dH^{n-1},
\end{aligned}
$$

the second equation being the application of the divergence theorem.

If u_p is not of class C^2, one may replace u_p by any mollified approximation $u_p * \xi_n$ for a sequence of compactly supported C^∞ functions ξ_n approximating the identity in the above computation, and then take limit as ξ_n approaches the Dirac measure. Therefore, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \{\frac{1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p + \lambda(u_p)\}\nabla\cdot\eta - |\nabla u_p|^{p-2} < D\eta\nabla u_p, \nabla u_p > \\
&= -\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\int_{\partial\{u_p>\epsilon\}} (\frac{p-1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p - \lambda_1^p)\eta\cdot\nu dH^{n-1} \\
&\quad -\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\int_{\partial\{u_p<-\delta\}} (\frac{p-1}{p}|\nabla u_p|^p - \lambda_2^p)\eta\cdot\nu dH^{n-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is finished. □

Remark 2.5 The above lemma does not imply that the conditions

$$u_{p,\nu}^+ = \left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\lambda_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad u_{p,\nu}^- = \left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\lambda_2$$

hold along the free boundary $\partial\{u_p > 0\}$ in any sense. In fact, if one defines a new functional

$$\tilde{J}_p(u) = \int_\Omega \frac{1}{p}|\nabla u|^p + \tilde{\lambda}(u)dx,$$

where

$$\tilde{\lambda}(s) = \begin{cases} \mu_1^p & \text{if } s > 0; \\ \mu_2^p & \text{if } s \le 0, \end{cases}$$

and $\mu_1^p - \mu_2^p = \lambda_1^p - \lambda_2^p$. Then $\tilde{J}_p(u) = J_p(u) + (\mu_1^p - \lambda_1^p)|\Omega|$, and hence a minimizer of J_p is also a minimizer of $\tilde{J}_p$. Clearly, $u_{p,\nu}^+ = (\frac{p}{p-1})^{\frac{1}{p}}\lambda_1$ and $u_{p,\nu}^+ = (\frac{p}{p-1})^{\frac{1}{p}}\mu_1$ cannot both hold at the same time unless $\lambda_1 = \mu_1$.

Remark 2.6 Note that the assumption

$$|\{u_p(x) = 0\}| = 0$$

is needed here. As the one-dimensional example, namely Example 2.14, shows, there are configurations of data, Ω, σ, λ_1 and λ_2, such that a zero flat region occurs.

Remark 2.7 In symbol, if one takes limit of the the free boundary condition $(u_{p,\nu}^+)^p - (u_{p,\nu}^-)^p = \frac{p}{p-1}(\lambda_1^p - \lambda_2^p)$ as p tends to infinity, one gets the free boundary condition $u_\nu^+ = \lambda_1$ for a possible limit function u_∞. It is surprising that the limiting free boundary condition is essentially a one-phase condition, and whether this free boundary condition holds depends on the Lipschitz constant of the boundary data. On the other hand, the limit function u_∞ verifies more than just the infinity Laplace equation and the free boundary condition. It is a solution of a minimization problem on the measure of the positive set, which will be stated in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Remark 2.8 This problem can be scaled as follows: if u is a minimizer of J_p with constants λ_1, λ_2 and boundary data σ, then $u_k(x) = u(x)/k$, for $k > 0$, is a minimizer for J_p with constants λ_1/k, λ_2/k and boundary data $\sigma_k(x) = \sigma(x)/k$. Moreover if $0 \in \Omega$ and if we let $u_k(x) = u(x/k)$ then we obtain a minimizer for J_p in the domain $\Omega_k = k\Omega$ with constants λ_1/k, λ_2/k and boundary data $\sigma_k(x) = \sigma(x/k)$. Note that in the latter case, the Lipschitz constant of σ_k is equal to the Lipschitz constant of σ over k.

2.2 The limit as $p \to \infty$ for $Q = 1$.

Our next result shows that there is a precise bound for the L^p-norm of the gradient of a minimizer.

Lemma 2.9 *Assume that $Q = 1$. Let u_p be a minimizer of J_p. Then*

$$\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C(p, \sigma, \Omega, \lambda_1),$$

where

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} C(p, \sigma, \Omega, \lambda_1) = \begin{cases} \lambda_1 & \text{if } Lip(\sigma) \leq \lambda_1; \\ Lip(\sigma) & \text{if } Lip(\sigma) > \lambda_1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. One easily gets from $J_p(u_p) \leq J_p(\sigma)$ that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla \sigma|^p + p \int_\Omega \lambda(\sigma) \leq (Lip(\sigma))^p |\Omega| + p\lambda_1^p |\Omega|.$$

The result follows from this inequality by taking the constant to be

$$C(p, \sigma, \Omega, \lambda_1) = [(Lip(\sigma))^p |\Omega| + p\lambda_1^p |\Omega|]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

$\square$

Lemma 2.10 *Assume that $Q = 1$. There is a uniform limit u_∞ of a subsequence of $\{u_p\}_p$, as $p \to \infty$. Moreover, the limit u_∞ satisfies*

$$u_\infty = \sigma \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

and $u_\infty \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ *with*

$$\|\nabla u_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \begin{cases} \lambda_1 & \text{if } Lip(\sigma) \leq \lambda_1 \\ Lip(\sigma) & \text{if } Lip(\sigma) > \lambda_1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Fix q and let $p > q$. Using Hölder's inequality and Lemma 2.9, one gets

$$\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq |\Omega|^{\frac{p-q}{qp}} \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq |\Omega|^{\frac{p-q}{qp}} C(p, \sigma, \Omega, \lambda_1). \tag{2.1}$$

Hence $\{u_p\}_{p>q}$ is bounded in $W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ and hence there is a weakly convergent subsequence, still denoted by $\{u_p\}$, such that

$$u_p \to u_\infty \text{ weakly in } W^{1,q}(\Omega) \text{ and uniformly on } \overline{\Omega}.$$

Using a diagonal procedure one can assume that this convergence is verified for all integer q.

Clearly, $u_\infty = \sigma$ on $\partial\Omega$. In addition, if one sends p to ∞ in the estimate (2.1), one gets

$$\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{q}} \lim_{p\to\infty} C(p, \sigma, \Omega, \lambda_1).$$

The result follows from here by sending q to ∞. $\square$

Lemma 2.11 *The limit* u_∞ *is a viscosity solution to* $-\bigtriangleup_\infty u_\infty = 0$ *in the set* $\{u_\infty > 0\} \cup \{u_\infty < 0\}$.

Proof. In a ball $B \subseteq \{u_\infty > 0\}$, $u_p > 0$ for all sufficiently large p thanks to the uniform convergence of the subsequence. So $-\bigtriangleup_p u_p = 0$ in B, which implies, by passing to limit uniformly, $-\bigtriangleup_\infty u_\infty = 0$ in the viscosity sense in B. The case in $\{u_\infty < 0\}$ follows similarly. $\square$

Now we are ready to prove our result concerning the limit as $p \to \infty$ when $Q \equiv 1$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First, we assume that $Lip(\sigma) \leq \lambda_1$. Our goal is to show that u_∞ is a solution to (1.3) and that its positive set is given by

$$\{u_\infty > 0\} = \bigcup_{z\in\partial\Omega, \sigma(z)>0} B_{\sigma(z)/\lambda_1}(z) \cup Z,$$

for a set Z of measure zero.

Let us consider

$$v_\infty(x) = \max_{z\in\partial\Omega,\sigma(z)>0} (\sigma(z) - \lambda_1|x - z|)_+.$$

Note that we have that

$$\|\nabla v_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega\cap\{v_\infty>0\})} = \lambda_1.$$

It follows that $u_\infty \geq v_\infty$ in the set $\{v_\infty > 0\}$, since $\|\nabla u_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \lambda_1$ and $u_\infty = v_\infty$ on $\partial\Omega$. If this is not the case, there is a point $x_0 \in \{v_\infty > 0\}$ such that $u_\infty(x_0) < v_\infty(x_0)$. Then, from the definition of v_∞, we conclude the existence of a point $z_0 \in \partial\Omega$ with $\sigma(z_0) > 0$ such that

$$v_\infty(x_0) = \max_{z\in\partial\Omega,\sigma(z)>0} (\sigma(z) - \lambda_1|x_0 - z|)_+ = (\sigma(z_0) - \lambda_1|x_0 - z_0|)_+.$$

Without the loss of generality, we may take $z_0 \in \partial\Omega$ to be the closest point to x_0 on the segment $[x_0, z_0]$. In fact, suppose there is a point $z_1 \in \partial\Omega\cap[x_0, z_0)$. Then

$$\sigma(z_1) - \lambda_1|x_0 - z_1| \geq \sigma(z_0) - \lambda_1|x_0 - z_0| \tag{2.2}$$

or equivalently

$$\sigma(z_1) - \sigma(z_0) \geq -\lambda_1|z_1 - z_0| \tag{2.3}$$

as a result of the assumption $Lip(\sigma) \leq \lambda_1$, and hence one can take the closest point on $\partial\Omega \cap [x_0, z_0]$ to replace z_0.

Note that, as $u_\infty = v_\infty = \sigma$ on $\partial\Omega$ we get

$$u_\infty(z_0) - u_\infty(x_0) > v_\infty(z_0) - v_\infty(x_0) = \lambda_1|x_0 - z_0|,$$

a contradiction to the fact $\|\nabla u_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \lambda_1$. Therefore we conclude that $u_\infty \geq v_\infty$ in the set $\{v_\infty > 0\}$ and hence

$$\bigcup_{z\in\partial\Omega,\sigma(z)>0} B_{\sigma(z)/\lambda_1}(z) = \{v_\infty > 0\} \subseteq \{u_\infty > 0\}.$$

In the following, we characterize the limit function u_∞ through a variational problem.

As before, u_p is a minimizer of the functional J_p. Take any Lipschitz continuous function θ_∞ with Lipschitz constant less than or equal to λ_1, which verifies $\theta_\infty = \sigma$ on $\partial\Omega$. Note that σ is such a function. The function

θ_∞ can be taken as a competitor for u_p for the functional J_p, and hence we obtain

$$\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p + \int_\Omega \lambda(u_p) \le \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla \theta_\infty|^p + \int_\Omega \lambda(\theta_\infty).$$

Hence

$$\int_{u_p>0} \lambda_1^p \le \frac{1}{p}\lambda_1^p|\Omega| + \int_{\{\theta_\infty>0\}} \lambda_1^p + \int_{\{\theta_\infty<0\}} \lambda_2^p.$$

Therefore

$$|\{u_p>0\}| \le \frac{1}{p}|\Omega| + |\{\theta_\infty>0\}| + |\Omega|\frac{\lambda_2^p}{\lambda_1^p}. \tag{2.4}$$

Now we observe that

$$\{u_\infty>0\} = \bigcup_{\eta>0}\{u_\infty>\eta\}.$$

Hence,

$$|\{u_\infty>0\}| = \lim_{\eta\to 0}|\{u_\infty>\eta\}|,$$

and then, given any $\epsilon>0$, one can find an $\eta>0$ such that

$$|\{u_\infty>0\}| - |\{u_\infty>\eta\}| \le \epsilon.$$

Now we observe that, from the uniform convergence of u_p to u_∞, one gets

$$\{u_\infty>\eta\} \subset \{u_p>0\}$$

for every $p\ge p_0$, and hence

$$|\{u_\infty>0\}| \le |\{u_\infty>\eta\}| + \epsilon \le |\{u_p>0\}| + \epsilon.$$

We conclude that, since ϵ is arbitrary,

$$|\{u_\infty>0\}| \le \liminf_{p\to\infty}|\{u_p>0\}|.$$

With this in mind we can take limit in (2.4) as $p\to\infty$ and we get

$$|\{u_\infty>0\}| \le |\{\theta_\infty>0\}|,$$

for any Lipschitz continuous function θ_∞ with Lipschitz constant less than or equal to λ_1 that verifies $\theta_\infty=\sigma$ on $\partial\Omega$.

Therefore we have that any uniform limit of u_p is a solution of the minimization problem of

$$\text{minimizing } |\{u>0\}|, \quad \text{subject to } \; Lip(u)\le\lambda_1,\ u|_{\partial\Omega}=\sigma \tag{2.5}$$

We observe that v_∞ satisfies the hypothesis imposed on θ_∞. Therefore, we conclude that

$$|\{v_\infty > 0\}| \geq |\{u_\infty > 0\}|.$$

As a result, both v_∞ and u_∞ are solutions to the minimization problem (2.5), and

$$\{u_\infty > 0\} = \{v_\infty > 0\} \cup Z$$

for a set Z of measure zero, due to the fact that $\{v_\infty > 0\} \subseteq \{u_\infty > 0\}$.

Next, we assume that $\lambda_1 < Lip(\sigma)$. Take any Lipschitz continuous function θ_∞ such that $\theta_\infty = \sigma$ on $\partial\Omega$. Note that σ is such a function, and that $Lip(\theta_\infty) \geq Lip(\sigma)$ for any such θ_∞. This function θ_∞ can be viewed as a competitor for u_p in the minimization problem for the functional J_p and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p + \lambda_1^p|\{u_p > 0\}| + \lambda_2^p|\{u_p \leq 0\}|\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\qquad \leq \left(\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla \theta_\infty|^p + \lambda_1^p|\{\theta_\infty > 0\}| + \lambda_2^p|\{\theta_\infty \leq 0\}|\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\left(\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla \theta_\infty|^p + \lambda_1^p|\{\theta_\infty > 0\}| + \lambda_2^p|\{\theta_\infty \leq 0\}|\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

On account of the reason stated in the proof of Lemma 2.10, one may conclude that

$$Lip(u_\infty) \leq \liminf_{p\to\infty} \left(\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

In addition, since θ_∞ is Lipschitz, one gets

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} \left(\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla \theta_\infty|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = Lip(\theta_\infty).$$

Using the above two inequalities and one equation and the fact that $Lip(\theta_\infty) \geq Lip(\sigma) > \lambda_1 > \lambda_2$, one gets

$$Lip(u_\infty) \leq Lip(\theta_\infty).$$

Therefore we conclude that u_∞ is a minimizer of the Lipschitz norm $Lip(u)$ over the region Ω in the set of Lipschitz functions that take on the boundary value σ on $\partial\Omega$.

To finish the proof, we show that, when $Lip(\sigma) \leq \lambda_1$, there is a boundary condition on the boundary of the set $\{u_\infty > 0\} \cap \Omega$. In fact, we show that the limit u_∞ satisfies $u_\nu^+ = \lambda_1$ on $\partial\{u_\infty > 0\} \cap \Omega$ in the sense that, if $x_0 \in \partial\{u_\infty > 0\} \cap \Omega$ then

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{u_\infty(x_0 - \epsilon\nu) - u_\infty(x_0)}{\epsilon} = \lambda_1,$$

where ν is a external normal vector to the set $\{u_\infty > 0\}$ at x_0.

We have the explicit form for the positive set of the limit

$$\{u_\infty > 0\} \supseteq P = \bigcup_{z \in \partial\Omega, \sigma(z) > 0} B_{\sigma(z)/\lambda_1}(z) = \{v_\infty > 0\}.$$

Hence, given $x_0 \in \partial\{u_\infty > 0\} \cap \Omega \subset P \cap \Omega$, there exists a $z_0 \in \partial\Omega \cap \{z : \sigma(z) > 0\}$ such that

$$0 = u_\infty(x_0) = \max_{z \in \partial\Omega, \sigma(z) > 0} (\sigma(z) - \lambda_1 |x - z|)_+ = \sigma(z_0) - \lambda_1 |x_0 - z_0|.$$

Take

$$\nu = \frac{x_0 - z_0}{|x_0 - z_0|}.$$

We have that ν is a normal exterior vector to the set $\{u_\infty > 0\}$ (in fact we have that $\{x \in \Omega : \sigma(z_0) - \lambda_1 |x - z_0| > 0\} \subset \{u_\infty > 0\}$).

By the same arguments used before we have that for any $\epsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$u_\infty(x_0 - \epsilon\nu) \geq \sigma(z_0) - \lambda_1 |x_0 - z_0 - \epsilon\nu| = \sigma(z_0) - \lambda_1(|x_0 - z_0| - \epsilon)$$

and, from the fact that $Lip(u_\infty) \leq \lambda_1$ and the explicit formulas we obtain

$$\lambda_1 \geq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{u_\infty(x_0 - \epsilon\nu) - u_\infty(x_0)}{\epsilon} \geq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_1 \epsilon}{\epsilon} = \lambda_1,$$

as we wanted to show. $\square$

Remark 2.12 Note that if we have that u_∞ is ∞-harmonic in $\Omega \setminus \overline{\{u_\infty > 0\}}$ since it has boundary data σ on $\partial\Omega \cap \partial(\Omega \setminus \overline{\{u_\infty > 0\}})$ and 0 on $\Omega \cap \partial\{u_\infty > 0\}$, we get that the limit is unique.

Also note that up to this point we only had uniform convergence of a subsequence of u_p but if we have uniqueness of the limit (and this holds u_∞ is ∞-harmonic in $\Omega \setminus \{u_\infty > 0\}$), we have convergence of the whole family u_p as $p \to \infty$.

Remark 2.13 If we call z_p the p-harmonic function, $-\Delta_p z_p = 0$, with boundary conditions $z_p = \sigma$ then we have that

$$u_p \leq z_p$$

and passing to the limit we conclude that

$$u_\infty \leq z_\infty$$

where z_∞ is the AMLE of $\sigma\mid_{\partial\Omega}$. This implies that

$$\{u_\infty > 0\} \subset \{z_\infty > 0\}.$$

And in fact, when $\lambda_1 \geq Lip(\sigma)$ we have obtained this property in the previous proof, but this inclusion holds also for the case $\lambda_1 < Lip(\sigma)$.

The explicit formula that we have for the limit in the positive set in the case $Lip(\sigma) \leq \lambda_1$ is monotone decreasing with λ_1. Therefore the positive set of the limit decreases as λ_1 increases in this case.

In general we do not have a two-sided free boundary condition as the following example shows (in fact in this simple $1-d$ example one can see all the features described in the general case in Theorem 1.1).

Example 2.14 The $1-d$ example. Let us solve the problem in $\Omega = (0,1)$ with boundary conditions $u_p(0) = \sigma_0 > 0$ and $u_p(1) = \sigma_1 < 0$.

Recall that the functional that we want to minimize is given by

$$J_p(u) = \frac{1}{p}\int_0^1 |u'|^p + \lambda_1^p|\{u > 0\}| + \lambda_2^p|\{u < 0\}|.$$

First, let us tackle the case in which we have a flat zero region. That is, there are two points

$$0 < x_p^+ < x_p^- < 1$$

such that

$$u_p \equiv 0, \qquad \text{in } (x_p^+, x_p^-).$$

In this case the energy is minimized by a function of the form

$$u_p(x) = \begin{cases} -\dfrac{\sigma_0}{x_p^+}(x - x_p^+), & x \in (0, x_p^+), \\ 0, & x \in [x_p^+, x_p^-], \\ \dfrac{\sigma_1}{1 - x_p^-}(x - x_p^-), & x \in (x_p^-, 1), \end{cases}$$

and is given by

$$J_p(u_p) = \frac{1}{p}\sigma_0^p(x_p^+)^{1-p} + \frac{1}{p}|\sigma_1|^p(1-x_p^-)^{1-p} + \lambda_1^p x_p^+ + \lambda_2^p(1-x_p^-).$$

Since J_p attains its minimum at u_p we get that

$$x_p^+ = \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \frac{\sigma_0}{\lambda_1} \qquad \text{and} \qquad 1-x_p^- = \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \frac{|\sigma_1|}{\lambda_2}.$$

As we have assumed that $0 < x_p^+ < x_p^- < 1$ we conclude that a solution with a zero region exists if and only if

$$\frac{\sigma_0}{\lambda_1} - \frac{\sigma_1}{\lambda_2} < 1.$$

In this case the limit as $p \to \infty$ of x_p^+ and x_p^- are given by

$$x_\infty^+ = \frac{\sigma_0}{\lambda_1} \qquad \text{and} \qquad x_\infty^- = \frac{|\sigma_1|}{\lambda_2}$$

and hence the limit of u_p is

$$u_\infty(x) = \begin{cases} -\lambda_1(x - x_\infty^+), & x \in (0, x_\infty^+), \\ 0, & x \in [x_\infty^+, x_\infty^-], \\ -\lambda_2(x - x_\infty^-), & x \in (x_\infty^-, 1), \end{cases}$$

Now, assume that there is no flat zero region, that is, $x_p^+ = x_p^-$. We have that u_p vanishes at only one point, that we call $x_p \in (0,1)$, that must verify

$$\left|\frac{\sigma_0}{x_p}\right|^p - \left|\frac{\sigma_1}{1-x_p}\right|^p = \frac{p}{p-1}\left(\lambda_1^p - \lambda_2^p\right). \tag{2.6}$$

Once this point is fixed then u_p is given by

$$u_p(x) = \begin{cases} \sigma_0 - \dfrac{\sigma_0}{x_p}x, & x \in (0, x_p) \\ \sigma_1 - \dfrac{\sigma_1}{1-x_p}(1-x), & x \in (x_p, 1). \end{cases}$$

Since x_p is bounded we can extract a converging subsequence $x_p \to x_\infty$. Now, we just take the limit in (2.6),

$$\left|\frac{\sigma_0}{x_p}\right|^p \left(1 - \left|\frac{\sigma_1 x_p}{\sigma_0(1-x_p)}\right|^p\right) = \frac{p}{p-1}\left(\lambda_1^p - \lambda_2^p\right) \sim \lambda_1^p$$

to obtain

$$\frac{\sigma_0}{x_\infty} = \lambda_1,$$

this can be done provided that

$$\frac{-\sigma_1 x_\infty}{\sigma_0(1 - x_\infty)} < 1,$$

that is,

$$\frac{-\sigma_1}{\lambda_1(1 - \frac{\sigma_0}{\lambda_1})} < 1,$$

that holds if and only if

$$\frac{-\sigma_1}{\lambda_1 - \sigma_0} < 1,$$

that is,

$$\sigma_0 - \sigma_1 < \lambda_1,$$

and hence u_∞ (the uniform limit of the u_p) is uniquely determined and is given by

$$u_\infty(x) = \begin{cases} \sigma_0 - \dfrac{\sigma_0}{x_\infty} x, & x \in (0, x_\infty) \\ \sigma_1 - \dfrac{\sigma_1}{1 - x_\infty}(1 - x), & x \in (x_\infty, 1). \end{cases}$$

In the case $\sigma_0 - \sigma_1 \geq \lambda_1$ we get from our previous results that u_∞ is a Lipschitz function with boundary values σ_0 and σ_1 and Lipschitz constants less or equal to $\sigma_0 - \sigma_1$ so the only possibility is the strait line,

$$u_\infty(x) = \sigma_0 + (\sigma_1 - \sigma_0)x.$$

Note that in this case we lost the free boundary condition since the limit does not depends on λ_1 and λ_2.

Summarizing, we have:

- If
$$\frac{\sigma_0}{\lambda_1} - \frac{\sigma_1}{\lambda_2} < 1$$
then there is a zero flat region for large p (and also for $p = \infty$).

- If
$$\frac{\sigma_0}{\lambda_1} - \frac{\sigma_1}{\lambda_2} \geq 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sigma_0 - \sigma_1 < \lambda_1$$
there is no flat region for p large and the limit problem shows a free boundary condition governed by λ_1.

- If
$$\sigma_0 - \sigma_1 \geq \lambda_1$$
there is no flat region for large p and in the limit the free boundary condition is lost (the limit is just the AMLE (in this simple 1−d case the strait line)).

2.3 The limit as $p \to \infty$ for $Q \neq 1$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. First, we obtain the analogous to Lemma 2.9. We observe that using σ as a competitor for u_p we get $J_p(u_p) \leq J_p(\sigma)$ and hence

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla \sigma|^p + p \int_\Omega Q^p \lambda(\sigma)$$
$$\leq (Lip(\sigma))^p |\Omega| + p\lambda_1^p \|Q\|^p_{L^\infty(\{\sigma>0\})} |\{\sigma > 0\}| + p\lambda_2^p \|Q\|^p_{L^\infty(\{\sigma\leq 0\})} |\{\sigma \leq 0\}|.$$

Then
$$\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C(p, \sigma),$$
where
$$\lim_{p\to\infty} C(p,\sigma) = \max\{Lip(\sigma); \lambda_1 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\{\sigma>0\})}; \lambda_2 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\{\sigma\leq 0\})}\}.$$

From this fact we can (arguing as in Lemma 2.10) obtain that there is a uniform limit, u_∞, of a subsequence of $\{u_p\}_p$, as $p \to \infty$. Moreover, the limit u_∞ satisfies
$$u_\infty = \sigma \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$
and $u_\infty \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ with
$$\|\nabla u_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \max\{Lip(\sigma); \lambda_1 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\{\sigma>0\})}; \lambda_2 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\{\sigma\leq 0\})}\}.$$

Now let us look for a variational problem verified by u_∞. To this end, let us consider
$$A = \Big\{ u \,:\, Lip(u) \leq \max\{Lip(\sigma); \lambda_1 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\sigma>0)}; \lambda_2 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\sigma\leq 0)}\} \Big\}$$

We have that u_p is a minimizer of the functional J_p. Take any $\theta_\infty \in A$ such that $\theta_\infty = \sigma$ on $\partial\Omega$ (note that σ verifies this, so the set of such functions is not empty). This function θ_∞ can be viewed as a competitor for u_p and we obtain

$$\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p + \int_\Omega Q^p \lambda(u_p) \leq \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla \theta_\infty|^p + \int_\Omega Q^p \lambda(\theta_\infty).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p + \lambda_1^p \int_{\{u_p>0\}} Q^p + \lambda_2^p \int_{\{u_p\leq 0\}} Q^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ \leq \left(\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla \theta_\infty|^p + \lambda_1^p \int_{\{\theta_\infty>0\}} Q^p + \lambda_2^p \int_{\{\theta_\infty\leq 0\}} Q^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Since

$$\limsup_{p\to\infty}(a_p+b_p+c_p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \max\left\{\limsup_{p\to\infty}(a_p)^{\frac{1}{p}}; \limsup_{p\to\infty}(b_p)^{\frac{1}{p}}; \limsup_{p\to\infty}(c_p)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right\}$$

we have that the limsup of the right hand side in (2.7) is bounded by

$$\max\Big\{Lip(\theta_\infty); \lambda_1\|Q\|_{L^\infty(\theta_\infty>0)}; \lambda_2\|Q\|_{L^\infty(\theta_\infty\leq 0)}\Big\}.$$

Therefore, from (2.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\max\left\{\liminf_{p\to\infty}\left(\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}; \liminf_{p\to\infty}\left(\lambda_1^p\int_{\{u_p>0\}} Q^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right\} \\ \leq \max\Big\{Lip(\theta_\infty); \lambda_1\|Q\|_{L^\infty(\theta_\infty>0)}; \lambda_2\|Q\|_{L^\infty(\theta_\infty\leq 0)}\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

From our previous discussion we have that

$$Lip(u_\infty) \leq \liminf_{p\to\infty}\left(\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_p|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

and hence we get

$$Lip(u_\infty) \leq \max\Big\{Lip(\theta_\infty); \lambda_1\|Q\|_{L^\infty(\theta_\infty>0)}; \lambda_2\|Q\|_{L^\infty(\theta_\infty\leq 0)}\Big\}.$$

Now, using that Q is continuous, given $\epsilon>0$, one fixes $\eta>0$ such that

$$\big|\|Q\|_{L^\infty(\{u_\infty>0\})} - \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\{u_\infty>\eta\})}\big| \leq \epsilon.$$

We observe that, from the uniform convergence of u_p to u_∞, one gets

$$\{u_\infty > \eta\} \subset \{u_p > 0\}$$

for every $p \geq p_0$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\{u_\infty>0\})} &\leq \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\{u_\infty>\eta\})} + \epsilon \leq \lim_{p\to\infty} \left(\int_{\{u_\infty>\eta\}} Q^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \epsilon \\ &\leq \liminf_{p\to\infty} \left(\int_{\{u_p>0\}} Q^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that, since ϵ is arbitrary,

$$\lambda_1 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\{u_\infty>0\})} \leq \liminf_{p\to\infty} \left(\lambda_1^p \int_{\{u_p>0\}} Q^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

and hence from (2.8) we get

$$\lambda_1 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\{u_\infty>0\})} \leq \max \Big\{ Lip(\theta_\infty); \lambda_1 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\theta_\infty>0)}; \lambda_2 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\theta_\infty\leq 0)} \Big\}.$$

To finish the proof we need a bound for

$$\lambda_2 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\{u_\infty\leq 0\})}.$$

This task is different from the previous one since we can not assert that the sets $\{u_\infty \leq 0\}$ and $\{u_p \leq 0\}$ are similar from the uniform convergence.

From (2.7) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\lambda_1^p \int_{\{u_p>0\}} Q^p + \lambda_2^p \int_{\{u_p\leq 0\}} Q^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\qquad \leq \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_\Omega |\nabla \theta_\infty|^p + \lambda_1^p \int_{\{\theta_\infty>0\}} Q^p + \lambda_2^p \int_{\{\theta_\infty\leq 0\}} Q^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Using that $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ and that $\Omega = \{u_p > 0\} \cap \{u_p \leq 0\}$ we get

$$\left(\lambda_2^p \int_{\{u_\infty\leq 0\}} Q^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(\lambda_1^p \int_{\{u_p>0\}} Q^p + \lambda_2^p \int_{\{u_p\leq 0\}} Q^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Taking $p \to \infty$, using (2.9) and our previous argument, we obtain

$$\lambda_2 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\{u_\infty \le 0\})} \le \lim_{p\to\infty} \left(\lambda_2^p \int_{\{u_\infty \le 0\}} Q^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

$$\le \limsup_{p\to\infty} \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_\Omega |\nabla \theta_\infty|^p + \lambda_1^p \int_{\{\theta_\infty > 0\}} Q^p + \lambda_2^p \int_{\{\theta_\infty \le 0\}} Q^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

$$\le \max \Big\{ Lip(\theta_\infty); \lambda_1 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\theta_\infty > 0)}; \lambda_2 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\theta_\infty \le 0)} \Big\}.$$

Therefore, collecting all these bounds, we have obtained that any uniform limit of u_p is a solution of the minimization problem

$$\min_{u \in A,\, u|_{\partial\Omega} = \sigma} \max \Big\{ Lip(u); \lambda_1 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(u>0)}; \lambda_2 \|Q\|_{L^\infty(u \le 0)} \Big\}. \tag{2.10}$$

□

Remark 2.15 Remark that the limit problem be scaled as follows: if u is a solution to the limit problem with constants λ_1, λ_2 and boundary datum σ, then $u_k(x) = ku(x)$, for $k > 0$, is a also a solution with constants λ_1/k, λ_2/k and boundary datum $\sigma_k(x) = \sigma(x)/k$. Moreover if we let $u_k(x) = u(x/k)$ then we obtain a solution in the domain $\Omega_k = k\Omega$ with constants λ_1/k, λ_2/k and boundary datum $\sigma_k(x) = \sigma(x/k)$. Note that the Lipschitz constant of σ_k is the Lipschitz constant of σ over k. These facts are easy consequences of Remark 2.8 or can be obtained directly by scaling the limit minimization problem (2.10) as described above.

Acknowledgments: JDR is partially supported by MEC MTM2010-18128 and MTM2011-27998 (Spain) and PW is partially supported by a Simons Collaboration Grant for Mathematicians. The idea of this paper was originated in a talk between the authors at a mini-workshop on the p-Laplacian at Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach. The authors want to thank MFO and the organizers of the mini-workshop for providing the opportunity and for their hospitality.

References

[1] G. Aronsson, M.G. Crandall and P. Juutinen, *A tour of the theory of absolutely minimizing functions*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 41 (2004), 439–505.

[2] A. Acker and R. Meyer. *A free boundary problem for the p-Laplacian: uniqueness, convexity, and successive approximation of solutions.* Electron. J. Differential Equations **1995**, No. 08, 20 pp. (electronic).

[3] T. Bhattacharya, E. Di Benedetto and J. J. Manfredi, *Limits as $p \to \infty$ of $\Delta_p u_p = f$ and related extremal problems.* Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino, (1991), 15–68.

[4] D. Danielli and A. Petrosyan, *A minimum problem with free boundary for a degenerate quasilinear operator.* Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **23** (2005), no. 1, 97–124.

[5] J. Fernández Bonder, S. Martínez, and N. Wolanski, *An optimization problem with volume constraint for a degenerate quasilinear operator.* J. Differential Equations **227** (2006), no. 1, 80–101.

[6] A. Henrot and H. Shahgholian, *Existence of classical solutions to a free boundary problem for the p-Laplace operator. I. The exterior convex case.* J. Reine Angew. Math. **521** (2000), 85–97.

[7] A. Henrot and H. Shahgholian, *Existence of classical solutions to a free boundary problem for the p-Laplace operator. II. The interior convex case.* Indiana Univ. Math. J. **49** (2000), no. 1, 311–323.

[8] G. Lu and P. Wang. *On the uniqueness of a viscosity solution of a two-phase free boundary problem*, J. Funct. Anal. 258(2010), No.8, 2817-2833.

[9] J.J. Manfredi, A. Petrosyan and H. Shahgholian, *A free boundary problem for ∞-Laplace equation.* Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **14** (2002), no. 3, 359–384.

[10] S. Martinez, *An optimization problem with volume constrain in Orlicz spaces.* J. Math. Anal. Appl., 340 (2008), no. 2, 14071421.

[11] S. Martinez and N. Wolanski, *A minimum problem with free boundary in Orlicz spaces*, Adv. Mathematics 218 (2008), no. 6, 19141971.

[12] K. Oliveira and E. V. Teixeira, *An optimization problem with free boundary governed by a degenerate quasilinear operator.* Differential Integral Equations **19** (2006), no. 9, 1061–1080.

[13] E. V. Teixeira, *The nonlinear optimization problem in heat conduction.* Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **24** (2005), no. 1, 21–46.