# On an old conjecture of Almgren

Michael Goldman

CNRS, LJLL, Université de Paris

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

# The problem

For  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$  convex and coercive,  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^+$  convex one-homogeneous i.e.  $\Phi(\lambda x) = |\lambda| \Phi(x)$ , with  $\Phi > 0$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$  and V > 0 we consider



Conjecture (Almgren): every minimizer is convex.

# The problem

For  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$  convex and coercive,  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^+$  convex one-homogeneous i.e.  $\Phi(\lambda x) = |\lambda| \Phi(x)$ , with  $\Phi > 0$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$  and V > 0 we consider



Conjecture (Almgren): every minimizer is convex.

To avoid some complications, we will assume g strictly convex.

This models equilibrium shapes of liquid drops/ crystals in the presence of an external field  $(-\nabla g)$ . See e.g. Herring

We also consider the problem without volume constraint:

$$\min_{E} \int_{\partial E} \Phi(\nu) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_{E} g dx \qquad (P)$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

which appears in Almgren-Taylor-Wang scheme for MCF.

#### Notation

We let

$$P_{\Phi}(E) = \int_{\partial E} \Phi(\nu) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}.$$

When  $\Phi = |\cdot|$  this is just the perimeter (denoted by P(E)). We also define

$$\mathcal{G}(E) = \int_E g dx.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

 $\implies$  we minimize  $\mathcal{F}(E) = P_{\Phi}(E) + \mathcal{G}(E)$ .

### The case g = 0

Let

$$W = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x \cdot \nu \leq \Phi(\nu) \quad \forall |\nu| = 1\}.$$

This is the Wulff shape associated to  $\Phi$ .

Theorem (Wulff, Dinghas, Taylor, Fonseca, Müller)

Up to translation W is the unique minimizer of

$$\min_{|E|=|W|} P_{\Phi}(E).$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

In particular: W is convex

# Idea of proofs

Various proofs:

- symmetrization for  $P_{\Phi} = P$ : De Giorgi
- Brunn-Minkowski: Dinghas, Taylor, Fonseca
- Optimal transport: Gromov, Figalli-Maggi-Pratelli

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Second variation: Barbosa-Do Carmo

▶ ...

No 'direct' proof of convexity.

For V > 0, let  $t_V$  be such that  $|\{g \le t_V\}| = V$  then the **convex** set  $\{g \le t_V\}$  minimizes

$$\min_{E|=V} \int_E g dx$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Scaling

For  $\lambda > 0$ ,

$$\mathcal{F}(\lambda E) = \lambda^{d-1} P_{\Phi}(E) + \lambda^d \int_E g(\lambda x) dx$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

• for  $V \ll 1$ ,  $P_{\Phi}(E)$  dominates and  $E \sim W$ 

• for  $V \gg 1$ ,  $\mathcal{G}(E)$  dominates and  $E \sim \{g \leq t\}$ .

# Terminology

- If W is polyhedral we say that  $\Phi$  is crystalline
- We say that  $\Phi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$  is uniformly elliptic if

$$\langle D^2 \Phi(\nu) \xi, \xi \rangle \ge |\xi - \langle \nu, \xi \rangle \nu|^2 \qquad \forall |\xi| = |\nu| = 1.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

In this case W is uniformly convex and  $C^2$ .

### General properties of minimizers

Recall:  $\Phi \gtrsim |\cdot|$  convex one-homogeneous and g convex coercive,  $\mathcal{F} = P_{\Phi} + \mathcal{G}$  with  $P_{\Phi}(E) = \int_{\partial E} \Phi(\nu)$  and  $\mathcal{G}(E) = \int_{E} g$ 

 $\min_{|E|=V} \mathcal{F}(E) \quad (P_V) \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{E} \mathcal{F}(E) \quad (P)$ 

- ► There always exist minimizers for (P<sub>V</sub>) and (P). Every such minimizer is bounded.
- Every minimizer satisfies densities estimates  $\Longrightarrow E \sim \mathring{E}$ .
- P<sub>Φ</sub>(F) ≥ P<sub>Φ</sub>(E) if F ⊃ E (E is outward minimizing the perimeter).
- If  $\Phi \in C^{3,\alpha}$  is uniformly elliptic and  $g \in C^{1,\alpha}$ , then  $\exists \Sigma$  with  $\mathcal{H}^{d-3}(\Sigma) = 0$  and such that  $\partial E \setminus \Sigma$  is  $C^{3,\alpha}$

# Notation from differential geometry

For a smooth (d-1)-manifold  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

- D is the gradient in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and abla is the tangential gradient
- A is the second fondamental form
- $H^{\Phi} = \operatorname{div}_{M}(D\Phi(\nu)) = tr(D^{2}\Phi(\nu)A)$  is the anisotropic mean curvature

• if  $\Phi = |\cdot|$ ,  $H^{\Phi} = H$  is the classical mean curvature.

#### First and second variation for (P)

If E is a minimizer of (P) and Φ is uniformly elliptic then
1) First variation: H<sup>Φ</sup> + g = 0 on ∂E\Σ
2) Second variation: for φ ∈ C<sup>1</sup><sub>c</sub>(∂E\Σ),

$$\int_{\partial E \setminus \Sigma} \langle D^2 \Phi(\nu) \nabla \varphi, \nabla \varphi \rangle - tr(D^2 \Phi(\nu) A^2) \varphi^2 + D_{\nu} g \varphi^2 \ge 0$$
(1)

If *E* satisfies (1) for every  $\varphi \in C_c^1(\partial E \setminus \Sigma)$ , we say that it is **stable**.

Rk: if  $\Phi = |\cdot|$ , then (1) reads:

$$\int_{\partial E \setminus \Sigma} |\nabla \varphi|^2 - tr(A^2)\varphi^2 + D_{\nu}g\,\varphi^2 \ge 0.$$

# First and second variation for $(P_V)$

If *E* is a minimizer of  $(P_V)$  and  $\Phi$  is uniformly elliptic then 1) First variation:  $\exists \mu \in \mathbb{R}$  s.t.  $H^{\Phi} + g = \mu$  on  $\partial E \setminus \Sigma$ 2) Second variation: for  $\varphi \in C_c^1(\partial E \setminus \Sigma)$  with  $\int_{\partial E} \varphi = 0$ ,

$$\int_{\partial E \setminus \Sigma} \langle D^2 \Phi(\nu) \nabla \varphi, \nabla \varphi \rangle - tr(D^2 \Phi(\nu) A^2) \varphi^2 + D_{\nu} g \varphi^2 \ge 0$$

#### A first remark

If E is minimizing (P) or (P<sub>V</sub>),  $P_{\Phi}(F) \ge P_{\Phi}(E)$  if  $F \supset E \Longrightarrow E$  is mean convex i.e.  $H^{\Phi} \ge 0$ .

# A second (important) remark

If *E* is a minimizer of  $(P_V)$  with **disconnected** boundary, then at least one connected component of  $\partial E$  is **stable**.



Otherwise  $\exists \varphi_1, \varphi_2$  with  $\int_{\partial E_1} \varphi_1 = -\int_{\partial E_2} \varphi_2 > 0$  s.t.  $\varphi = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2$  satisfies

$$\int_{\partial E \setminus \Sigma} \langle D^2 \Phi(\nu) \nabla \varphi, \nabla \varphi \rangle - tr(D^2 \Phi(\nu) A^2) \varphi^2 + D_{\nu} g \varphi^2 < 0$$

Convexity for d = 2

#### Theorem (McCann, Okikiolu)

If d = 2, for every g,  $\Phi$  and V > 0, every minimizer of  $(P_V)$  can be decomposed as  $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} E_i$  where  $|E_i| = m_i$  with  $m_i \neq m_j$  and  $E_i$  is **convex** and is the **unique** minimizer of

$$\min_{K|=m_i, K \text{ convex}} \mathcal{F}(E).$$

Idea of proof: since *E* mean convex  $\implies E_i$  convex. Uniqueness follows from OT argument (displacement convexity)

# The case $V \ll 1$

#### Theorem (Figalli-Maggi+Figalli-Zhang)

Assume  $V \ll 1$  then

- i) *E* is connected and  $E \sim W$ . In particular if d = 2 and  $V \ll 1 \implies E$  convex and unique (cf McCann).
- ii) if  $\Phi$  is crystalline  $\implies E$  convex polytope with sides parallel to W.

iii) 
$$g \in C^1$$
,  $\Phi \in C^{2,\alpha}$  unif. elliptic  $\Longrightarrow E$  is convex.

Rk: Result more quantitative. Proof relies on quant. isoper. inequality. Quantitative version of iii) uses second variation argument inspired by Barbosa-Do Carmo.

## The case $V \gg 1$

#### Theorem (Caselles-Chambolle)

 $\forall \ \Phi \ \text{and} \ g, \ \text{if} \ V \gg 1$  the minimizer of

$$\min_{E|=V} \int_{\partial E} \Phi(\nu) + \int_{E} g \qquad (P_V$$

#### is unique and convex.

Rk: this Theorem is not explicitely stated.

## Idea of proof

• for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , every minimizer  $E_t$  of

$$\min_{E} P_{\Phi}(E) + \int_{E} (g - t) \qquad (P^t)$$

is a minimizer of  $(P_V)$  for  $V = |E_t|$ .

If u is the local minimizer of

$$\int \Phi(Du) + \frac{1}{2} \int (u-g)^2,$$

then it is **unique** and **convex**. Convexity follows from Alvarez-Lasry-Lions.

▶ For every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $E_t = \{u < t\}$  is the unique solution of  $(P^t)$ .

 $\implies$  minimizer of  $(P_V)$  is unique and convex for  $V > |\{\min u\}|$ .

- ► Observe that the proof of Caselles-Chambolle works in the regime where (P<sub>V</sub>) ~→ (P).
- Also proves that solutions of (P) are generically unique and convex.

# The case $V \sim 1$

#### Theorem (G.-De Philippis)

If  $\Phi \in C^{3,\alpha}$  uniformly elliptic and  $g \in C^{1,\alpha}$  then for every minimizer E of  $(P_V)$ ,  $\partial E$  is **connected**.

Combining with mean convexity (cf McCann)

#### Corollary

If d = 2,  $\Phi \in C^{3,\alpha}$  uniformly elliptic and  $g \in C^{1,\alpha}$ , then E is convex and unique.

#### Also

#### Theorem (G.-De Philippis)

If  $\Phi \in C^{3,\alpha}$  uniformly elliptic and  $g \in C^{1,\alpha}$  then every minimizer of (P) is convex.

## Idea of the proof:

The idea is to consider the two-point function

$$S(x,y) = \langle \nu(x), y - x \rangle$$
  $x \in \partial E \setminus \Sigma, y \in \partial E$ 

and then

$$S(x) = \sup_{\partial E} S(x, y) = \sup_{\partial E} \langle \nu(x), y - x \rangle.$$

We have  $S \ge 0$  and  $S \equiv 0 \iff E$  convex.



Similar (but different) two-point functions introduced by Andrews to show preservation of interior ball condition by MCF, see also solution of Lawson's conjecture by Brendle.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Also reminiscent of doubling of the variable trick for viscosity solutions.

### The Jacobi operator

Let

$$L_{\Phi}\varphi = \operatorname{div}_{\partial E}(D^{2}\Phi(\nu)\nabla\varphi) + \operatorname{Tr}(D^{2}\Phi(\nu)A^{2})\varphi$$

so that stability rewrites as

$$\int_{\partial E \setminus \Sigma} (-L_{\Phi}\varphi)\varphi + D_{\nu}g\varphi^2 \geq 0$$

<u>Aim</u>: prove that for minimizers of (P) or  $(P_V)$ , S gives a negative variation i.e.

$$\int_{\partial E \setminus \Sigma} (-L_{\Phi}S)S + D_{\nu}gS^2 < 0$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

unless  $S \equiv 0$ .

## Main Lemma

Recall: 
$$H^{\Phi} = \operatorname{div}_{\partial E}(D\Phi(\nu)) = tr(D^{2}\Phi(\nu)A).$$

#### Lemma

If E is a minimizer of (P) or (P<sub>V</sub>) then for  $\bar{x} \in \partial E \setminus \Sigma$  if  $S(\bar{x}) = S(\bar{x}, \bar{y}), \ \bar{y} \in \partial E \setminus \Sigma$  and

$$L_{\Phi}S(\bar{x}) \ge H^{\Phi}(\bar{x}) - H^{\Phi}(\bar{y}) + \langle \nabla H^{\Phi}(\bar{x}), \bar{y} - \bar{x} \rangle$$
(2)

in the viscosity sense.

Rk: minimality only used to get  $\bar{y} \in \partial E \setminus \Sigma$ . Under this condition (2) always holds.

#### Idea of proof

For  $\varphi \in C^2(\partial E \setminus \Sigma)$  s.t.  $\varphi(x) - S(x) \ge \varphi(\bar{x}) - S(\bar{x})$ , the function  $G(x, y) = \varphi(x) - S(x, y)$ 

is minimal at  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ . Indeed, since  $S(x) = \sup_{y} S(x, y)$ ,

$$egin{aligned} G(x,y) &= arphi(x) - S(x,y) \geq arphi(x) - S(x) \ &\geq arphi(ar{x}) - S(ar{x}) = arphi(ar{x}) - S(ar{x},ar{y}) = G(ar{x},ar{y}) \end{aligned}$$

Use 1st and 2nd order optimality conditions i.e.  $\nabla_x G(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \nabla_y G(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = 0$  and  $\nabla^2_{x,y} G(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \ge 0$  and in particular

$$(
abla_x^i+
abla_y^i)(
abla_x^i+
abla_y^i)G(ar x,ar y)\geq 0.$$

#### From Lemma to negative variation

Recall: E critical point  $\Longrightarrow H^{\Phi} + g = \mu$  for  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ . Differentiating we get  $\nabla H^{\Phi}(\bar{x}) = -\nabla g(\bar{x})$ , Lemma  $\Longrightarrow$ 

$$egin{aligned} & L_{\Phi}S(ar{x}) \geq H^{\Phi}(ar{x}) - H^{\Phi}(ar{y}) + \langle 
abla H^{\Phi}(ar{x}), ar{y} - ar{x} 
angle \ &= g(ar{y}) - g(ar{x}) - \langle 
abla g(ar{x}), ar{y} - ar{x} 
angle \end{aligned}$$

Since  $D_{\nu}g(\bar{x})S(\bar{x}) = D_{\nu}g(\bar{x})\langle \nu, \bar{y} - \bar{x} 
angle$  and  $Dg = \nabla g + (D_{\nu}g)\nu$ ,

$$L_\Phi S(ar x) - D_
u g(ar x) S(ar x) \geq g(ar y) - g(ar x) - \langle Dg(ar x), ar y - ar x 
angle \geq 0$$

where last line used convexity of g.

Multiply by (-S) and integrate to get negative second variation.

## Conclusion of the proof:

- If E minimizes (P) then E is stable and we can use S as test for the stability to get S ≡ 0 ⇒ E convex.
- ▶ If *E* minimizes ( $P_V$ ), *E* must not be stable and *S* is not admissible (since  $\int_{\partial E} S \neq 0$ ). However, if  $\partial E$  disconnected, one of its component must be stable  $\implies E$  is convex  $\implies \partial E$  is connected.

Rk: Minimality just used for regularity issues. If E is a smooth stable critical point then same proof applies.

## Question about uniqueness

Question: For d = 2 and for  $V \gg 1$ , minimizers are unique, is it the case for every V > 0?

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

If YES then for  $\Phi$  uniformly elliptic maybe convexity can be obtained by a continuity argument.

### Some related problems:

Sessile drops (Taylor-Almgren):  $g = x_d$ ,  $\sigma > 0$ 

$$\min_{|E|=V,E\subset\mathbb{R}^d_+}\int_{\partial E\cap\mathbb{R}^d_+}\Phi(\nu)d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}+\int_E x_ddx+\sigma\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial E\cap\{x_d=0\})$$

▶ Isoperimetric problem inside convex bodies:  $\Omega$  convex,  $g = I_{\Omega}$ 

$$\min_{|E|=V,E\subset\Omega}P_{\Phi}(E)$$

If  $\Omega$  bounded then  $V \ll 1$  minimizer = Wulff shape, if  $V \gg 1$  minimizer is unique and convex (Alter-Caselles-Chambolle).

Relative isoperimetric problem inside convex bodies: Ω convex

$$\min_{E|=V}\int_{\partial E\cap\Omega}\Phi(\nu)d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}.$$

If  $\Omega$  bounded  $\Longrightarrow \partial E$  connected (Sternberg-Zumbrun via stability). Conjecture:  $\partial E \cap \Omega$  smooth (see S-Z, Jerison).

# Semi-linear elliptic PDE

For  $\Omega_0\subset\Omega_1$  convex sets, two-point (or more) functions have been used in Korevaar, Caffarelli-Spruck ... to study level-set convexity of solutions to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = f(u) & \text{in } \Omega_1 \backslash \Omega_0 \\ u = 1 & \text{on } \partial \Omega_0 \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Omega_1. \end{cases}$$
(3)

In particular, Weinkove used  $S(x, y) = \langle Du(x) - Du(y), x - y \rangle$ restricted to  $\{u(x) = u(y)\}$ .

In general, by Hamel-Nadirashvili-Sire, solutions of (3) are not level-set convex but

Conjecture : if u is a solution of (3) which is stable i.e.

$$\int_{\Omega_1\setminus\Omega_0} |
abla arphi|^2 + f'(u) arphi^2 \geq 0 \qquad orall arphi \in C^1_c(\Omega_1\setminus\Omega_0)$$

then *u* is **level-set convex** (see Cabré-Chanillo).

Thank you for your attention.