

## INEQUALITIES FOR THE MINIMAL EIGENVALUE OF THE LAPLACIAN IN AN ANNULUS

A. G. RAMM AND P. N. SHIVAKUMAR

*(communicated by J. Pečarić)*

*Abstract.* We discuss the behavior of the minimal eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of the Dirichlet Laplacian in the domain  $D_1 \setminus D_2 := D$  (an annulus) where  $D_1$  is a circular disc and  $D_2 \subset D_1$  is a smaller circular disc. It is conjectured that the minimal eigenvalue  $\lambda$  has a maximum value when  $D_2$  is a concentric disc. If  $h$  is a displacement of the center of the disc  $D_2$  and  $\lambda(h)$  is the corresponding minimal eigenvalue, then  $\frac{d\lambda(h)}{dh} < 0$  so that  $\lambda(h)$  is minimal when  $\partial D_2$  touches  $\partial D_1$ , where  $\partial D$  is the boundary of  $D$ . Numerical results are given to back the conjecture. Upper and lower bounds are given for  $\lambda(h)$ .

### 1. Introduction

Let  $D_1$  be a disc on  $\mathbf{R}^2$ , centered at the origin, of radius 1,  $D_2 \subset D_1$  be a disc of radius  $a < 1$ , the center  $(h, 0)$  of which is at the distance  $h$  from the origin. Denote by  $\lambda(h)$  the minimal Dirichlet eigenvalue of the Laplacian in the annulus  $D := D_h := D_1 \setminus D_2$ .

In this paper the following conjecture is formulated and partly justified:

CONJECTURE C.. *The minimal eigenvalue  $\lambda(h)$  is a monotonically decreasing function of  $h$  on the interval  $0 \leq h \leq 1 - a$ . In particular*

$$(1.1) \quad \lambda(0) > \lambda(h), \quad h > 0.$$

Let  $\dot{\lambda} := \frac{d\lambda}{dh}$  and let  $S$  denote  $\partial D_2$ , the boundary of  $D_2$ .

The following results are given to back this conjecture:

LEMMA 1. *One has*

$$(1.2) \quad \dot{\lambda} = \int_S u_N^2 N_1 ds,$$

---

*Mathematics subject classification* (1991): 35J05, 35P15.

*Key words and phrases:* Inequalities, estimation of eigenvalues, perturbation theory.

where  $N$  is the unit normal to  $S = S_h$  pointing into the annulus  $D_h$ ,  $N_1$  is the projection of  $N$  onto  $x_1$ -axis,  $u_N$  is the normal derivative of  $u$ , and  $u(x) = u(x_1, x_2)$  is the normalized in  $L^2(D)$  eigenfunction corresponding to the first eigenvalue  $\lambda$  :

$$(1.3) \quad \Delta u + \lambda u = 0 \quad \text{in } D, \quad u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2 := \partial D,$$

$$(1.4) \quad \|u\|_{L^2(D)} = 1.$$

It is argued at the end of Section 2 that

$$(1.5) \quad \hat{\lambda} < 0 \quad \text{if} \quad 0 < h < 1 - a.$$

In Lemma 2 below we give upper and lower bounds (1.6) for  $\lambda(h)$ . These bounds are practically convenient, especially for small  $h$ .

Let  $D(r)$  be the disc  $|x| \leq r$ ,  $\mu(r)$  be the first Dirichlet eigenvalue of the Laplacian in  $D_1 \setminus D(r)$ , and in Section 3 (1.5) is illustrated by numerical results.

LEMMA 2. *One has*

$$(1.6) \quad \mu(a - h) < \lambda(h) < \mu(a + h), \quad 0 < h < 1 - a.$$

In section 2 proofs are given.

## 2. Proofs

*Proof of Lemma 2.* Lemma 2 is an immediate consequence of the variational principle for  $\lambda$  since  $D(a + h) \subset D_h \subset D(a - h)$ . Note that  $\mu(b)$ ,  $a \leq b < 1$ , can be calculated efficiently. Indeed, by symmetry the first eigenfunction  $\phi$  of the Dirichlet Laplacian in  $D_1 \setminus D(b)$  depends on the radial variable  $r = |x|$  only, and solves the problem

$$(2.1) \quad \phi'' + \frac{1}{r}\phi' + \mu\phi = 0, \quad b \leq r \leq 1; \quad \phi(b) = \phi(1) = 0.$$

Thus

$$(2.2) \quad \phi = c_1 J_0(\sqrt{\mu}r) + c_2 N_0(\sqrt{\mu}r),$$

where  $J_0$  and  $N_0$  are the Bessel functions, and  $c_1, c_2$  are constants. The boundary conditions (2.1) are satisfied if  $\mu = \mu(b) > 0$  is a positive root of the equation:

$$(2.3) \quad J_0(\sqrt{\mu}b)N_0(\sqrt{\mu}) - J_0(\sqrt{\mu})N_0(\sqrt{\mu}b) = 0.$$

The smallest positive root  $\mu = \mu(b)$  of (2.3) is the desired first eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian in  $D_1 \setminus D(b)$ . Equation (2.3) can be solved numerically. This makes (1.6) an efficient estimate of  $\lambda(h)$ , especially for small  $h > 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 1.* We use the known technique based on the domain derivative [1].

It is known that  $\lambda(h)$  is continuously differentiable with respect to  $h$  [2]. Let  $\dot{u} = \frac{du}{dh}$ , where  $u$  solves (1.3)-(1.4). Differentiate the equation and the boundary condition (1.3) with respect to  $h$  and get

$$(2.4) \quad \Delta \dot{u} + \lambda \dot{u} = -\dot{\lambda} u \quad \text{in} \quad D = D_h,$$

$$(2.5) \quad \dot{u} + u_N N_1 = 0 \text{ on } S = S_h.$$

Multiply (2.4) by  $u$ , (1.3) by  $\dot{u}$ , subtract, integrate over  $D = D_h$ , use Green's formula, and (2.5) and get:

$$(2.6) \quad \dot{\lambda} \int_D u^2 dx = \int_S (u \dot{u}_N - \dot{u} u_N) ds = \int_S u_N^2 N_1 ds.$$

From (2.6) and (1.4) one gets (1.2). Lemma 1 is proved.  $\square$

It follows from (1.2) by symmetry that  $\dot{\lambda}(0) = 0$ . Indeed, if  $h = 0$ , then  $u_N^2|_{S_0} = \text{const}$  by symmetry, and  $\int_{S_0} N_1 ds = 0$ .

If  $h > 0$ , then  $u_N^2$  on the half circle  $S_h^+$ , the part of the boundary of  $S_h$  which is closer to  $\partial D_1$ , is likely to be less than on the other half  $S_h^-$  of  $S_h$ , while  $N_1 > 0$  on  $S_h^+$  and  $N_1 < 0$  on  $S_h^-$ . Moreover,  $|N_1|$  is the same at the symmetric points of  $S_h^+$  and  $S_h^-$ , where the axis of symmetry is the vertical diameter of  $D_2$ . Therefore one expects  $\dot{\lambda}(h) < 0$  for  $h > 0$ , which is the conjecture  $C$ .

### 3. Numerical Results

We use a finite element method to calculate  $u_N^2$  at a number of nodal points  $\varphi$  on  $\partial D_2$ , where  $\varphi$  is the angle between the radial line at the positive  $x_1$ -axis. Due to symmetry, it is sufficient to consider  $0 \leq \varphi \leq \pi$ . The following tables give values for  $u_N^2$  for various values of  $h$  and  $\varphi$ . The last row gives  $\lambda(h)$  for different values of  $h$ .

Table 1  
 Values for  $u_N^2$   
 $a = 0.1$        $\lambda(0) = 10.98324859$

$\varphi$	$h = 0.1$	$h = 0.3$	$h = 0.6$	$h = 0.8$
0°	0.18340156	0.08997194	0.03502936	0.00538128
15°	0.18586555	0.09354750	0.03875921	0.00792279
30°	0.19312533	0.10408993	0.04977909	0.01615017
45°	0.20478642	0.12105508	0.06745736	0.03118122
60°	0.22019869	0.14357017	0.09052611	0.05294918
75°	0.23846941	0.17048691	0.11728631	0.07901455
90°	0.25848609	0.20042583	0.14624640	0.10706183
105°	0.27895498	0.23176494	0.17645804	0.13678539
120°	0.29846292	0.26256868	0.20707716	0.16793719
135°	0.31556947	0.29053976	0.23653390	0.19964213
150°	0.32892971	0.31313057	0.26197403	0.22879649
165°	0.33743644	0.32789921	0.27954557	0.24990529
180°	0.34035750	0.33304454	0.28585725	0.25766770
$\lambda(h)$	10.51624800	8.76956649	6.91928150	6.21431318

Table 2  
 Values for  $u_N^2$   
 $a = 0.3$        $\lambda(0) = 19.46950428$

$\varphi$	$h = 0.1$	$h = 0.3$	$h = 0.6$
0°	0.04651448	0.00601084	0.00006665
15°	0.05078040	0.00792264	0.00029224
30°	0.06389146	0.01432651	0.00162487
45°	0.08665951	0.02711431	0.00616138
60°	0.12001996	0.04901522	0.01734345
75°	0.16444947	0.08285892	0.03916871
90°	0.21927390	0.13049149	0.07481155
105°	0.28204163	0.19150347	0.12521694
120°	0.34820007	0.26211532	0.18784387
135°	0.41130766	0.33475001	0.25580537
150°	0.46389778	0.39885669	0.31827254
165°	0.49888764	0.44319924	0.36272535
180°	0.51117180	0.45907590	0.37887932
$\lambda(h)$	17.00607073	12.31240018	8.54494014

Table 3  
 Values for  $u_N^2$   
 $a = 0.6$        $\lambda(0) = 61.2854372$

$\varphi$	$h = 0.1$	$h = 0.3$
$0^\circ$	0.00010994	0.00000018
$15^\circ$	0.00025775	0.00000144
$30^\circ$	0.00101252	0.00002268
$45^\circ$	0.00370221	0.00026580
$60^\circ$	0.01190759	0.00195778
$75^\circ$	0.03332159	0.00947178
$90^\circ$	0.08086609	0.03287792
$105^\circ$	0.17026477	0.08782665
$120^\circ$	0.32267905	0.18896048
$135^\circ$	0.49728793	0.33653240
$150^\circ$	0.69311417	0.50402714
$165^\circ$	0.84533543	0.64040281
$180^\circ$	0.90307061	0.69330938
$\lambda(h)$	42.71463081	23.79696055

In all the cases above,  $u_N^2$  increases in value as  $\varphi$  increases from zero to  $\pi$ , thereby confirming that  $\hat{\lambda} < 0$  (see formula (2.6)). From the above tables we also note that for fixed  $a$ ,  $\lambda(h)$  is a decreasing function of  $h$ , and that  $\lambda(h) < \lambda(0)$  for  $h > 0$  thus confirming the Conjecture C.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. SOKOLOWSKI, J. ZOLEZIO, *Introduction to shape optimization*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1992.  
 [2] T. KATO, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1966.

(Received March 3, 1998)

A. G. Ramm  
 Department of Mathematics  
 Kansas State University  
 Manhattan, KS 66506-2602  
 USA  
 e-mail: ramm@math.ksu.edu

P. N. Shivakumar  
 Department of Applied Mathematics  
 and Institute of Industrial Mathematical Sciences  
 University of Manitoba  
 Winnipeg  
 Manitoba R3T 2N2  
 Canada  
 e-mail: shivaku@cc.umanitoba.ca