WEIGHTED HARDY INEQUALITY WITH HIGHER DIMENSIONAL SINGULARITY ON THE BOUNDARY

MOUHAMED MOUSTAPHA FALL AND FETHI MAHMOUDI

Abstract. Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 3$ and let Σ_k be a closed smooth submanifold of $\partial\Omega$ of dimension $1 \leq k \leq N-2$. In this paper we study the weighted Hardy inequality with weight function singular on Σ_k. In particular we provide necessary and sufficient conditions for existence of minimizers.

Key Words: Hardy inequality, extremals, existence, non-existence, Fermi coordinates.

1. Introduction

Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 2$ and let Σ_k be a smooth closed submanifold of $\partial\Omega$ with dimension $0 \leq k \leq N-1$. Here Σ_0 is a single point and $\Sigma_{N-1} = \partial\Omega$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, consider the problem of finding minimizers for the quotient:

$$\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) := \inf_{u \in H^1_0(\Omega)} \frac{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 p \, dx - \lambda \int_\Omega \delta^{-2} |u|^2 \eta \, dx}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega \delta^{-2} |u|^2 q \, dx}, \tag{1}$$

where $\delta(x) := \mathrm{dist}(x, \Sigma_k)$ is the distance function to Σ_k and where the weights p, q and η satisfy

$$p, q \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}), \qquad p, q > 0 \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega}, \qquad \eta > 0 \quad \text{in } \overline{\Omega} \setminus \Sigma_k, \qquad \eta \in Lip(\overline{\Omega}) \tag{2}$$

and

$$\max_{\Sigma_k} \frac{q}{p} = 1, \qquad \eta = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Sigma_k \,. \tag{3}$$

We put

$$I_k = \int_{\Sigma_k} \frac{d\sigma}{\sqrt{1 - (q(\sigma)/p(\sigma))}}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N-1 \quad \text{and} \quad I_0 = \infty. \tag{4}$$

It was shown by Brezis and Marcus in [4] that there exists λ^* such that if $\lambda > \lambda^*$ then $\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_{N-1}) < \frac{1}{4}$ and it is attained while for $\lambda \leq \lambda^*$, $\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_{N-1}) = \frac{1}{4}$ and it is not achieved for every $\lambda < \lambda^*$. The critical case $\lambda = \lambda^*$ was studied by Brezis, Marcus and Shafrir in [5], where they proved that $\mu_{\lambda^*}(\Omega, \Sigma_{N-1})$ admits a minimizer if and only if $I_{N-1} < \infty$. The case where $k = 0$ (Σ_0 is reduced to a point on the boundary) was treated by the first author in [10] and the same conclusions hold true.
Here we obtain the following

Theorem 1.1. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 3$ and let $\Sigma_k \subset \partial\Omega$ be a closed submanifold of dimension $k \in [1, N-2]$. Assume that the weight functions p, q and η satisfy* (2) *and* (3). *Then, there exists $\lambda^* = \lambda^*(p, q, \eta, \Omega, \Sigma_k)$ such that*

$$\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) = \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}, \quad \forall \lambda \leq \lambda^*,$$
$$\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) < \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}, \quad \forall \lambda > \lambda^*.$$

The infimum $\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k)$ is attained if $\lambda > \lambda^*$ and it is not attained when $\lambda < \lambda^*$.

Concerning the critical case we get

Theorem 1.2. *Let λ^* be given by Theorem 1.1 and consider I_k defined in* (4). *Then $\mu_{\lambda^*}(\Omega, \Sigma_k)$ is achieved if and only if $I_k < \infty$.*

By choosing $p = q \equiv 1$ and $\eta = \delta^2$, we obtain the following consequence of the above theorems.

Corollary 1.3. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 3$ and $\Sigma_k \subset \partial\Omega$ be a closed submanifold of dimension $k \in \{1, \cdots, N-2\}$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, put*

$$\nu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) = \inf_{u \in H^1_0(\Omega)} \frac{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \, dx - \lambda \int_\Omega |u|^2 \, dx}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega \delta^{-2} |u|^2 \, dx},$$

Then, there exists $\bar{\lambda} = \bar{\lambda}(\Omega, \Sigma_k)$ such that

$$\nu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) = \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}, \quad \forall \lambda \leq \bar{\lambda},$$
$$\nu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) < \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}, \quad \forall \lambda > \bar{\lambda}.$$

Moreover $\nu_\lambda(\Omega,\Sigma_k)$ *is attained if and only if* $\lambda > \bar\lambda$.

The proof of the above theorems are mainly based on the construction of appropriate sharp H^1-subsolution and H^1-supersolutions for the corresponding operator

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda := -\Delta - \frac{(N-k)^2}{4} q\delta^{-2} + \lambda\delta^{-2}\eta$$

(with $p \equiv 1$). These super-sub-solutions are perturbations of an approximate "virtual" ground-state for the Hardy constant $\frac{(N-k)^2}{4}$ near Σ_k. For that we will consider the *projection distance* function $\tilde\delta$ defined near Σ_k as

$$\tilde\delta(x) := \sqrt{|\mathrm{dist}^{\partial\Omega}(\overline{x},\Sigma_k)|^2 + |x-\overline{x}|^2},$$

where $\overline{x}$ is the orthogonal projection of x on $\partial\Omega$ and $\mathrm{dist}^{\partial\Omega}(\cdot,\Sigma_{\mathrm{k}})$ is the geodesic distance to Σ_k on $\partial\Omega$ endowed with the induced metric. While the distances δ and $\tilde\delta$ are equivalent, $\Delta\delta$ and $\Delta\tilde\delta$ differ and δ does not, in general, provide the right approximate solution for $k \le N-2$. Letting $d_{\partial\Omega} = \mathrm{dist}(\cdot,\partial\Omega)$, we have

$$\tilde\delta(x) := \sqrt{|\mathrm{dist}^{\partial\Omega}(\overline{x},\Sigma_k)|^2 + d_{\partial\Omega}(x)^2}.$$

Our approximate virtual ground-state near Σ_k reads then as

$$x \mapsto d_{\partial\Omega}(x)\,\tilde\delta^{\frac{k-N}{2}}(x). \tag{5}$$

In some appropriate Fermi coordinates $y = (y^1, y^2, \dots, y^{N-k}, y^{N-k+1}, \dots, y^N) = (\tilde y, \bar y) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $\tilde y = (y^1, y^2, \dots, y^{N-k}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$ (see next section for precise definition), the function in (5) then becomes

$$y \mapsto y^1 |\tilde y|^{\frac{k-N}{2}}$$

which is the "virtual" ground-state for the Hardy constant $\frac{(N-k)^2}{4}$ in the flat case $\Sigma_k = \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$. We refer to Section 2 for more details about the constructions of the super-sub-solutions.

The proof of the existence part in Theorem 1.2 is inspired from [5]. It amounts to obtain a uniform control of a specific minimizing sequence for $\mu_{\lambda^*}(\Omega,\Sigma_k)$ near Σ_k via the H^1-super-solution constructed.

We mention that the existence and non-existence of extremals for (1) and related problems were studied in [1, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19] and some references therein. We would like to mention that some of the results in this paper might of interest in the study of semilinear equations with a Hardy potential singular at a submanifold of the boundary. We refer to [9, 2, 3], where existence and nonexistence for semilinear problems were studied via the method of super/sub-solutions.

2. Preliminaries and Notations

In this section we collect some notations and conventions we are going to use throughout the paper.

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 3$, with boundary $\mathcal{M} := \partial\mathcal{U}$ a smooth closed hypersurface of $\mathbb{R}^N$. Assume that $\mathcal{M}$ contains a smooth closed submanifold Σ_k of dimension $1 \leq k \leq N-2$. In the following, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we let $d(x)$ be the distance function of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\delta(x)$ the distance function of Σ_k. We denote by $N_{\mathcal{M}}$ the unit normal vector field of $\mathcal{M}$ pointed into $\mathcal{U}$.
Given $P \in \Sigma_k$, the tangent space $T_P\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ at P splits as

$$T_P\mathcal{M} = T_P\Sigma_k \oplus N_P\Sigma_k,$$

where $T_P\Sigma_k$ is the tangent space of Σ_k and $N_P\Sigma_k$ stands for the normal space of $T_P\Sigma_k$ at P. We assume that the basis of these subspaces are spanned respectively by $\big(E_a\big)_{a=N-k+1,\cdots,N}$ and $\big(E_i\big)_{i=2,\cdots,N-k}$. We will assume that $N_{\mathcal{M}}(P) = E_1$.

A neighborhood of P in Σ_k can be parameterized via the map

$$\bar{y} \mapsto f^P(\bar{y}) = \mathrm{Exp}_P^{\Sigma_k}\Big(\sum_{a=N-k+1}^{N} y^a E_a\Big),$$

where, $\bar{y} = (y^{N-k+1}, \cdots, y^N)$ and where $\mathrm{Exp}_P^{\Sigma_k}$ is the exponential map at P in Σ_k endowed with the metric induced by $\mathcal{M}$. Next we extend $(E_i)_{i=2,\cdots,N-k}$ to an orthonormal frame $(X_i)_{i=2,\cdots,N-k}$ in a neighborhood of P. We can therefore define the parameterization of a neighborhood of P in $\mathcal{M}$ via the mapping

$$(\breve{y}, \bar{y}) \mapsto h^P_{\mathcal{M}}(\breve{y}, \bar{y}) := \mathrm{Exp}^{\mathcal{M}}_{f^P(\bar{y})}\left(\sum_{i=2}^{N-k} y^i X_i\right),$$

with $\breve{y} = (y^2, \cdots, y^{N-k})$ and $\mathrm{Exp}^{\mathcal{M}}_Q$ is the exponential map at Q in $\mathcal{M}$ endowed with the metric induced by $\mathbb{R}^N$. We now have a parameterization of a neighborhood of P in $\mathbb{R}^N$ defined via the above Fermi coordinates by the map

$$y = (y^1, \breve{y}, \bar{y}) \mapsto F^P_{\mathcal{M}}(y^1, \breve{y}, \bar{y}) = h^P_{\mathcal{M}}(\breve{y}, \bar{y}) + y^1 N_{\mathcal{M}}(h^P_{\mathcal{M}}(\breve{y}, \bar{y})).$$

Next we denote by g the metric induced by $F^P_{\mathcal{M}}$ whose components are defined by

$$g_{\alpha\beta}(y) = \langle \partial_\alpha F^P_{\mathcal{M}}(y), \partial_\beta F^P_{\mathcal{M}}(y)\rangle.$$

Then we have the following expansions (see for instance [14])

$$\begin{aligned} &g_{11}(y) = 1 && \\ &g_{1\beta}(y) = 0, && \text{for } \beta = 2, \cdots, N \\ &g_{\alpha\beta}(y) = \delta_{\alpha\beta} + \mathcal{O}(|\tilde{y}|), && \text{for } \alpha, \beta = 2, \cdots, N, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $\tilde{y} = (y^1, \breve{y})$ and $\mathcal{O}(r^m)$ is a smooth function in the variable y which is uniformly bounded by a constant (depending only $\mathcal{M}$ and Σ_k) times r^m.

In concordance to the above coordinates, we will consider the "half"-geodesic neighborhood contained in $\mathcal{U}$ around Σ_k of radius ρ

$$\mathcal{U}_\rho(\Sigma_k) := \{x \in \mathcal{U} : \quad \tilde{\delta}(x) < \rho\}, \tag{7}$$

with $\tilde{\delta}$ is the projection distance function given by

$$\tilde{\delta}(x) := \sqrt{|\text{dist}^{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{x}, \Sigma_k)|^2 + |x - \overline{x}|^2},$$

where $\overline{x}$ is the orthogonal projection of x on $\mathcal{M}$ and $\text{dist}^{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot, \Sigma_{\text{k}})$ is the geodesic distance to Σ_k on $\mathcal{M}$ with the induced metric. Observe that

$$\tilde{\delta}(F^P_{\mathcal{M}}(y)) = |\tilde{y}|, \tag{8}$$

where $\tilde{y} = (y^1, \breve{y})$. We also define $\sigma(\overline{x})$ to be the orthogonal projection of $\overline{x}$ on Σ_k within $\mathcal{M}$. Letting

$$\hat{\delta}(\overline{x}) := \text{dist}^{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{x}, \Sigma_k),$$

one has

$$\overline{x} = \text{Exp}^{\mathcal{M}}_{\sigma(\overline{x})}(\hat{\delta}\, \nabla \hat{\delta}) \quad \text{or equivalently} \quad \sigma(\overline{x}) = \text{Exp}^{\mathcal{M}}_{\overline{x}}(-\hat{\delta}\, \nabla \hat{\delta}).$$

Next we observe that

$$\tilde{\delta}(x) = \sqrt{\hat{\delta}^2(\bar{x}) + d^2(x)}. \tag{9}$$

In addition it can be easily checked via the implicit function theorem that there exists a positive constant $\beta_0 = \beta_0(\Sigma_k, \Omega)$ such that $\tilde{\delta} \in C^\infty(\mathcal{U}_{\beta_0}(\Sigma_k))$.

It is clear that for ρ sufficiently small, there exists a finite number of Lipschitz open sets $(T_i)_{1\leq i\leq N_0}$ such that

$$T_i \cap T_j = \emptyset \quad \text{for } i \neq j \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{U}_\rho(\Sigma_k) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_0} \overline{T_i}.$$

We may assume that each T_i is chosen, using the above coordinates, so that

$$T_i = F_{\mathcal{M}}^{p_i}(B_+^{N-k}(0,\rho) \times D_i) \quad \text{with } p_i \in \Sigma_k,$$

where the D_i's are Lipschitz disjoint open sets of $\mathbb{R}^k$ such that

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{N_0} \overline{f^{p_i}(D_i)} = \Sigma_k.$$

In the above setting we have

Lemma 2.1. *As $\tilde\delta \to 0$, the following expansions hold*

(1) $\delta^2 = \tilde\delta^2(1+O(\tilde\delta))$,
(2) $\nabla\tilde\delta \cdot \nabla d = \dfrac{d}{\tilde\delta}$,
(3) $|\nabla\tilde\delta| = 1 + O(\tilde\delta)$,
(4) $\Delta\tilde\delta = \frac{N-k-1}{\tilde\delta} + O(1)$,

where $O(r^m)$ is a function for which there exists a constant $C = C(\mathcal{M},\Sigma_k)$ such that

$$|O(r^m)| \leq C r^m.$$

Proof.

(1) Let $P \in \Sigma_k$. With an abuse of notation, we write $x(y) = F_{\mathcal{M}}^{P}(y)$ and we set

$$\vartheta(y) := \frac{1}{2}\delta^2(x(y)).$$

The function ϑ is smooth in a small neighborhood of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and Taylor expansion yields

$$\begin{aligned}\vartheta(y) &= \vartheta(0,\bar y)\tilde y + \nabla\vartheta(0,\bar y)[\tilde y] + \frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\vartheta(0,\bar y)[\tilde y,\tilde y] + \mathcal{O}(\|\tilde y\|^3)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\vartheta(0,\bar y)[\tilde y,\tilde y] + \mathcal{O}(\|\tilde y\|^3). \qquad (10)\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact that $x(0,\bar{y}) \in \Sigma_k$ so that $\delta(x(0,\bar{y})) = 0$. We write

$$\nabla^2\vartheta(0,\bar{y})[\tilde{y},\tilde{y}] = \sum_{i,l=1}^{N-k} \Lambda_{il} y^i y^l,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{il} &:= \frac{\partial^2 \vartheta}{\partial y^i \partial y^l} /_{\tilde{y}=0} \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial y^l}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}(\frac{1}{2}\delta^2(x)\frac{\partial x^j}{\partial y^i})\right)/_{\tilde{y}=0} \\
&= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^s}(\frac{1}{2}\delta^2)(x)\frac{\partial x^j}{\partial y^i}\frac{\partial x^s}{\partial y^l}/_{\tilde{y}=0} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}(\delta^2)(x)\frac{\partial^2 x^s}{\partial y^i \partial y^l}/_{\tilde{y}=0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now using the fact that

$$\frac{\partial x^s}{\partial y^l}/_{\tilde{y}=0} = g_{ls} = \delta_{ls} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}(\delta^2)(x)/_{\tilde{y}=0} = 0,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{il} y^i y^l &= y^i y^s \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^s}(\frac{1}{2}\delta^2)(x)/_{\tilde{y}=0} \\
&= |\tilde{y}|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that the matrix $\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^s}(\frac{1}{2}\delta^2)(x)/_{\tilde{y}=0}\right)_{1\le i,s\le N}$ is the matrix of the orthogonal projection onto the normal space of $T_{f^P(\bar{y})}\Sigma_k$. Hence using (10), we get

$$\delta^2(x(y)) = |\tilde{y}|^2 + \mathcal{O}(|\tilde{y}|^3).$$

This together with (8) prove the first expansion.

(2) Thanks to (8) and (6), we infer that

$$\nabla\tilde{\delta}\cdot\nabla d(x(y)) = \frac{\partial\tilde{\delta}(x(y))}{\partial y^1} = \frac{y^1}{|\tilde{y}|} = \frac{d(x(y))}{\tilde{\delta}(x(y))}$$

as desired.

(3) We observe that

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{\delta}}{\partial x^\tau}\frac{\partial\tilde{\delta}}{\partial x^\tau}(x(y)) = g^{\tau\alpha}(y)g^{\tau\beta}(y)\frac{\partial\tilde{\delta}(x(y))}{\partial y^\alpha}\frac{\partial\tilde{\delta}(x(y))}{\partial y^\beta},$$

where $(g^{\alpha\beta})_{\alpha,\beta=1,\dots,N}$ is the inverse of the matrix $(g_{\alpha\beta})_{\alpha,\beta=1,\dots,N}$. Therefore using (8) and (6), we get the result.

(4) Finally using the expansion of the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_g, see Lemma 3.3 in [16], applied to (8), we get the last estimate.

□

In the following of – only – this section, $q : \overline{\mathcal{U}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that

$$q \in C^2(\overline{\mathcal{U}}), \quad \text{and} \quad q \le 1 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_k. \tag{11}$$

Let $M, a \in \mathbb{R}$, we consider the function

$$W_{a,M,q}(x) = X_a(\tilde{\delta}(x))\, e^{M d(x)}\, d(x)\, \tilde{\delta}(x)^{\alpha(x)}, \tag{12}$$

where

$$X_a(t) = (-\log(t))^a \quad 0 < t < 1$$

and

$$\alpha(x) = \frac{k-N}{2} + \frac{N-k}{2}\sqrt{1 - q(\sigma(\bar{x})) + \tilde{\delta}(x)}.$$

In the above setting, the following useful result holds.

Lemma 2.2. *As $\delta \to 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta W_{a,M,q} &= -\frac{(N-k)^2}{4}\, q\, \delta^{-2}\, W_{a,M,q} - 2\, a\, \sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}}\, X_{-1}(\delta)\, \delta^{-2}\, W_{a,M,q} \\ &+ a(a-1)\, X_{-2}(\delta)\, \delta^{-2}\, W_{a,M,q} + \frac{h+2M}{d}\, W_{a,M,q} + O(|\log(\delta)|\, \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}})\, W_{a,M,q},\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}(x) = \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}\left(1 - q(\sigma(\overline{x})) + \tilde{\delta}(x)\right)$ and $h = \Delta d$. Here the lower order term satisfies

$$|O(r)| \le C|r|,$$

where C is a positive constant only depending on $a, M, \Sigma_k, \mathcal{U}$ and $\|q\|_{C^2(\mathcal{U})}$.

Proof. We put $s = \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}$. Let $w = \tilde{\delta}(x)^{\alpha(x)}$ then the following formula can be easily verified

$$\Delta w = w\Big(\Delta \log(w) + |\nabla \log(w)|^2\Big). \tag{13}$$

Since

$$\log(w) = \alpha \log(\tilde{\delta}),$$

we get

$$\Delta \log(w) = \Delta\alpha \log(\tilde{\delta}) + 2\nabla\alpha \cdot \nabla(\log(\tilde{\delta})) + \alpha\Delta \log(\tilde{\delta}). \tag{14}$$

We have

$$\Delta\alpha = \Delta\sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}} = \sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}} \left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta \log(\tilde{\alpha}) + \frac{1}{4}|\nabla \log(\tilde{\alpha})|^2\right), \tag{15}$$

$$\nabla \log(\tilde{\alpha}) = \frac{\nabla\tilde{\alpha}}{\tilde{\alpha}} = \frac{-s\nabla(q \circ \sigma) + s\nabla\tilde{\delta}}{\tilde{\alpha}}$$

and using the formula (13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta \log(\tilde{\alpha}) &= \frac{\Delta\tilde{\alpha}}{\tilde{\alpha}} - \frac{|\nabla\tilde{\alpha}|^2}{\tilde{\alpha}^2} \\ &= \frac{-s\Delta(q \circ \sigma) + s\Delta\tilde{\delta}}{\tilde{\alpha}} - \frac{s^2|\nabla(q \circ \sigma)|^2 + s^2|\nabla\tilde{\delta}|^2}{\tilde{\alpha}^2} + 2s^2\frac{\nabla(q \circ \sigma) \cdot \nabla\tilde{\delta}}{\tilde{\alpha}^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Putting the above in (15), we deduce that

$$\Delta\alpha = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}}}\bigg(- s\Delta(q \circ \sigma) + s\Delta\tilde{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{s^2|\nabla(q \circ \sigma)|^2 + s^2|\nabla\tilde{\delta}|^2 - 2s^2\nabla(q \circ \sigma) \cdot \nabla\tilde{\delta}}{\tilde{\alpha}}\bigg). \tag{16}$$

Using Lemma 2.1 and the fact that q is in $C^2(\overline{\mathcal{U}})$, together with (16) we get

$$\Delta\alpha = O(\tilde{\delta}^{-\frac{3}{2}}). \tag{17}$$

On the other hand

$$\nabla\alpha = \nabla\sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\nabla\tilde{\alpha}}{\sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}}} = -\frac{s}{2\sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}}}\nabla(q \circ \sigma) + \frac{s}{2}\frac{\nabla\tilde{\delta}}{\sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}}}$$

so that

$$\nabla\alpha \cdot \nabla\tilde{\delta} = -\frac{s}{2\sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}}}\nabla(q \circ \sigma) \cdot \nabla\tilde{\delta} + \frac{s}{2}\frac{|\nabla\tilde{\delta}|^2}{\sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}}} = O(\tilde{\delta}^{-\frac{1}{2}})$$

and from which we deduce that

$$\nabla\alpha \cdot \nabla \log(\tilde{\delta}) = \frac{1}{\tilde{\delta}}\nabla\alpha \cdot \nabla\tilde{\delta} = O(\tilde{\delta}^{-\frac{3}{2}}). \tag{18}$$

By Lemma 2.1 we have that

$$\alpha\Delta \log(\tilde{\delta}) = \alpha\,\frac{N - k - 2}{\tilde{\delta}^2}\,(1 + O(\tilde{\delta})).$$

Taking back the above estimate together with (18) and (17) in (14), we get

$$\Delta \log(w) = \alpha \frac{N-k-2}{\tilde{\delta}^2}(1+O(\tilde{\delta})) + O(|\log(\tilde{\delta})|\tilde{\delta}^{-\frac{3}{2}}). \tag{19}$$

We also have

$$\nabla(\log(w)) = \nabla(\alpha \log(\tilde{\delta})) = \alpha \frac{\nabla\tilde{\delta}}{\tilde{\delta}} + \log(\tilde{\delta})\nabla\alpha$$

and thus

$$|\nabla(\log(w))|^2 = \frac{\alpha^2}{\tilde{\delta}^2} + \frac{2\alpha\log(\tilde{\delta})}{\tilde{\delta}}\nabla\tilde{\delta}\cdot\nabla\alpha + |\log(\tilde{\delta})|^2|\nabla\alpha|^2 = \frac{\alpha^2}{\tilde{\delta}^2} + O(|\log(\tilde{\delta})|\tilde{\delta}^{-\frac{3}{2}}).$$

Putting this together with (19) in (13), we conclude that

$$\frac{\Delta w}{w} = \alpha \frac{N-k-2}{\tilde{\delta}^2} + \frac{\alpha^2}{\tilde{\delta}^2} + O(|\log(\tilde{\delta})|\,\tilde{\delta}^{-\frac{3}{2}}). \tag{20}$$

Now we define the function

$$v(x) := d(x)\,w(x),$$

where we recall that d is the distance function to the boundary of $\mathcal{U}$. It is clear that

$$\Delta v = w\Delta d + d\Delta w + 2\nabla d\cdot\nabla w. \tag{21}$$

Notice that

$$\nabla w = w\,\nabla\log(w) = w\left(\log(\tilde{\delta})\nabla\alpha + \alpha\frac{\nabla\tilde{\delta}}{\tilde{\delta}}\right)$$

and so

$$\nabla d\cdot\nabla w = w\left(\log(\tilde{\delta})\nabla d\cdot\nabla\alpha + \frac{\alpha}{\tilde{\delta}}\nabla d\cdot\nabla\tilde{\delta}\right). \tag{22}$$

Recall the second assertion of Lemma 2.1 that we rewrite as

$$\nabla d\cdot\nabla\tilde{\delta} = \frac{d}{\tilde{\delta}}. \tag{23}$$

Therefore

$$\nabla d\cdot\nabla\alpha = \nabla d\cdot\left(-\frac{s}{2\sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}}}\nabla(q\circ\sigma) + \frac{s}{2}\frac{\nabla\tilde{\delta}}{\sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}}}\right) = \frac{s}{2\sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}}}\frac{d}{\tilde{\delta}} - \frac{s}{2\sqrt{\tilde{\alpha}}}\nabla d\cdot\nabla(q\circ\sigma). \tag{24}$$

Notice that if x is in a neighborhood of some point $P\in\Sigma_k$ one has

$$\nabla d\cdot\nabla(q\circ\sigma)(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y^1}q(\sigma(\overline{x})) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y^1}q(f^P(\overline{y})) = 0.$$

This with (24) and (23) in (22) give

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla d \cdot \nabla w &= w \left(O(\tilde{\delta}^{-\frac{3}{2}} |\log(\tilde{\delta})|)\, d + \frac{\alpha}{\tilde{\delta}^2}\, d \right) \\ &= v \left(O(\tilde{\delta}^{-\frac{3}{2}} |\log(\tilde{\delta})|) + \frac{\alpha}{\tilde{\delta}^2} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

From (20), (21) and (25) (recalling the expression of α above), we get immediately

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta v &= \left(\alpha \frac{N-k}{\tilde{\delta}^2} + \frac{\alpha^2}{\tilde{\delta}^2} \right) v + O(|\log(\tilde{\delta})|\, \tilde{\delta}^{-\frac{3}{2}})\, v + \frac{h}{d}\, v \\ &= \left(-\frac{(N-k)^2}{4} \frac{q(x)}{\tilde{\delta}^2} + O(|\log(\tilde{\delta})|\, \tilde{\delta}^{-\frac{3}{2}}) \right) v + \frac{h}{d}\, v, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where $h = \Delta d$. Here we have used the fact that $|q(x) - q(\sigma(\bar{x}))| \le C\tilde{\delta}(x)$ for x in a neighborhood of Σ_k.
Recall that

$$W_{a,M,q}(x) = X_a(\tilde{\delta}(x))\, e^{Md(x)}\, v(x), \quad \text{ with } \quad X_a(\tilde{\delta}(x)) := (-\log(\tilde{\delta}(x)))^a,$$

where M and a are two real numbers. We have

$$\Delta W_{a,M,q} = X_a(\tilde{\delta})\, \Delta(e^{Md}\, v) + 2\nabla X_a(\tilde{\delta}) \cdot \nabla(e^{Md}\, v) + e^{Md}\, v\, \Delta X_a(\tilde{\delta})$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta W_{a,M,q} &= X_a(\tilde{\delta}) e^{Md}\, \Delta v + X_a(\tilde{\delta}) \Delta(e^{Md})\, v + 2X_a(\tilde{\delta}) \nabla v \cdot \nabla(e^{Md}) \\ &\quad + 2\nabla X_a(\tilde{\delta}) \cdot \left(v\, \nabla(e^{Md}) + e^{Md} \nabla v \right) + e^{Md}\, v\, \Delta X_a(\tilde{\delta}). \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

We shall estimate term by term the above expression.
First we have form (26)

$$X_a(\tilde{\delta}) e^{Md}\, \Delta v = -\frac{(N-k)^2}{4} \frac{q}{\tilde{\delta}^2}\, W_{a,M,q} + \frac{h}{d}\, W_{a,M,q} + O(|\log(\tilde{\delta})|\, \tilde{\delta}^{-\frac{3}{2}})\, W_{a,M,q}. \tag{28}$$

It is plain that

$$X_a(\tilde{\delta})\, \Delta(e^{Md})\, v = O(1)\, W_{a,M,q}. \tag{29}$$

It is clear that

$$\nabla v = w\, \nabla d + d\, \nabla w = w\, \nabla d + d \left(\log(\tilde{\delta})\, \nabla \alpha + \alpha \frac{\nabla \tilde{\delta}}{\tilde{\delta}} \right) w. \tag{30}$$

From which and (23) we get

$$\begin{aligned} X_a(\tilde\delta)\,\nabla v\cdot\nabla(e^{Md}) &= M\,X_a(\tilde\delta)\,e^{Md}\,w\left\{|\nabla d|^2+d\,\left(\log(\tilde\delta)\,\nabla d\cdot\nabla\alpha+\frac{\alpha}{\tilde\delta}\nabla\tilde\delta\cdot\nabla d\right)\right\}\\ &= M\,X_a(\tilde\delta)\,e^{Md}\,w\left\{1+O(|\log(\tilde\delta)|\,\tilde\delta^{-\frac12})\,d+O(\tilde\delta^{-1})\,d\right\}\\ &= W_{a,M,q}\,\left\{\frac{M}{d}+O(|\log(\tilde\delta)|\,\tilde\delta^{-1})\right\}. \qquad (31)\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\nabla(X_a(\tilde\delta))=-a\,\frac{\nabla\tilde\delta}{\tilde\delta}X_{a-1}(\tilde\delta).$$

This with (30) and (23) imply that

$$\nabla X_a(\tilde\delta)\cdot\left(v\,\nabla(e^{Md})+e^{Md}\nabla v\right)=-\frac{a(\alpha+1)}{\tilde\delta^2}\,X_{-1}\,W_{a,M,q}+O(|\log(\tilde\delta)|\tilde\delta^{-\frac32})\,W_{a,M,q}. \qquad (32)$$

By Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\Delta(X_a(\tilde\delta))=\frac{a}{\tilde\delta^2}X_{a-1}(\tilde\delta)\{2+k-N+O(\tilde\delta)\}+\frac{a(a-1)}{\tilde\delta^2}X_{a-2}(\tilde\delta).$$

Therefore we obtain

$$e^{Md}v\Delta(X_a(\tilde\delta))=\frac{a}{\tilde\delta^2}\{2+k-N+O(\tilde\delta)\}\,X_{-1}\,W_{a,M,q}+\frac{a(a-1)}{\tilde\delta^2}X_{-2}\,W_{a,M,q}. \qquad (33)$$

Collecting (28), (29), (31), (32) and (33) in the expression (27), we get as $\tilde\delta\to 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta W_{a,M,q} &= -\frac{(N-k)^2}{4}\,q\,\tilde\delta^{-2}\,W_{a,M,q}-2\,a\,\sqrt{\tilde\alpha}\,X_{-1}(\tilde\delta)\,\tilde\delta^{-2}\,W_{a,M,q}\\ &+\ a(a-1)\,X_{-2}(\tilde\delta)\,\tilde\delta^{-2}\,W_{a,M,q}+\frac{h+2M}{d}\,W_{a,M,q}+O(|\log(\tilde\delta)|\,\tilde\delta^{-\frac32})\,W_{a,M,q}.\end{aligned}$$

The conclusion of the lemma follows at once from the first assertion of Lemma 2.1. □

2.1. **Construction of a subsolution.** For $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\eta\in Lip(\overline{\mathcal{U}})$ with $\eta=0$ on Σ_k, we define the operator

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda:=-\Delta-\frac{(N-k)^2}{4}\,q\,\delta^{-2}+\lambda\,\eta\,\delta^{-2}, \qquad (34)$$

where q is as in (11). We have the following lemma

Lemma 2.3. *There exist two positive constants M_0, β_0 such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0)$ the function $V_\varepsilon := W_{-1,M_0,q} + W_{0,M_0,q-\varepsilon}$ (see (12)) satisfies*

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda V_\varepsilon \le 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{U}_\beta, \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in [0,1). \tag{35}$$

Moreover $V_\varepsilon \in H^1(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$ for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and in addition

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}_\beta} \frac{V_0^2}{\delta^2}\,dx \ge C \int_{\Sigma_k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-q(\sigma)}}\,d\sigma. \tag{36}$$

Proof. Let β_1 be a positive small real number so that d is smooth in $\mathcal{U}_{\beta_1}$. We choose

$$M_0 = \max_{x \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_1}} |h(x)| + 1.$$

Using this and Lemma 2.2, for some $\beta \in (0, \beta_1)$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda W_{-1,M_0,q} \le \left(-2\delta^{-2}\, X_{-2} + C|\log(\delta)|\,\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} + |\lambda|\eta\delta^{-2}\right) W_{-1,M_0,q} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{U}_\beta. \tag{37}$$

Using the fact that the function η vanishes on Σ_k (this implies in particular that $|\eta| \le C\delta$ in $\mathcal{U}_\beta$), we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda(W_{-1,M_0,q}) \le -\delta^{-2}\, X_{-2}\, W_{-1,M_0,q} = -\delta^{-2}\, X_{-3}\, W_{0,M_0,q} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{U}_\beta,$$

for β sufficiently small. Again by Lemma 2.2, and similar arguments as above, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda W_{0,M_0,q-\varepsilon} \le C|\log(\delta)|\,\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}\, W_{0,M_0,q-\varepsilon} \le C|\log(\delta)|\,\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}\, W_{0,M_0,q} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{U}_\beta, \tag{38}$$

for any $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$. Therefore we get

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda\left(W_{-1,M_0,q} + W_{0,M_0,q-\varepsilon}\right) \le 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{U}_\beta,$$

if β is small. This proves (35).
The proof of the fact that $W_{a,M_0,q} \in H^1(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$, for any $a < -\frac{1}{2}$ and $W_{0,M_0,q-\varepsilon} \in H^1(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$, for $\varepsilon > 0$ can be easily checked using polar coordinates (by assuming without any loss of generality that $M_0 = 0$ and $q \equiv 1$), we therefore skip it.
We now prove the last statement of the theorem. Using Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathcal{U}_\beta} \frac{V_0^2}{\delta^2}\,dx &\geq \int_{\mathcal{U}_\beta} \frac{W_{0,M_0,q}^2}{\delta^2}\,dx \\
&\geq C\int_{\mathcal{U}_\beta(\Sigma_k)} d^2(x)\tilde{\delta}(x)^{2\alpha(x)-2}\,dx \\
&\geq C\sum_{i=1}^{N_0}\int_{T_i} d^2(x)\tilde{\delta}(x)^{2\alpha(x)-2}\,dx \\
&= C\sum_{i=1}^{N_0}\int_{B_+^{N-k}(0,\beta)\times D_i} (y^1)^2\,|\tilde{y}|^{2\alpha(F_{\mathcal{M}}^{p_i}(y))-2}\,|\mathrm{Jac}(F_{\mathcal{M}}^{p_i})|(y)\,dy \\
&\geq C\sum_{i=1}^{N_0}\int_{B_+^{N-k}(0,\beta)\times D_i} (y^1)^2\,|\tilde{y}|^{k-N-2+(N-k)\sqrt{1-q(f^{p_i}(\bar{y}))}}\;|\tilde{y}|^{-\sqrt{|\tilde{y}|}}\,dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that $|\mathrm{Jac}(F_{\mathcal{M}}^{p_i})|(y) \geq C$. Observe that

$$|\tilde{y}|^{-\sqrt{|\tilde{y}|}} \geq C > 0 \quad \text{as } |\tilde{y}| \to 0.$$

Using polar coordinates, the above integral becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathcal{U}_\beta} \frac{V_0^2}{\delta^2}\,dx &\geq C\sum_{i=1}^{N_0}\int_{D_i}\int_{S_+^{N-k-1}}\left(\frac{y^1}{|\tilde{y}|}\right)^2 d\theta\int_0^\beta r^{-1+(N-k)\sqrt{1-q(f^{p_i}(\bar{y}))}}\,d\bar{y} \\
&\geq C\sum_{i=1}^{N_0}\int_{D_i}\int_0^{r_{i_1}} r^{-1+(N-k)\sqrt{1-q(f^{p_i}(\bar{y}))}}\,|\mathrm{Jac}(f^{p_i})|(\bar{y})\,d\bar{y}.
\end{aligned}$$

We therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathcal{U}_\beta} \frac{V_0^2}{\delta^2}\,dx &\geq C\int_{\Sigma_k}\int_0^\beta r^{-1+(N-k)\sqrt{1-q(\sigma)}}\,dr\,d\sigma \\
&\geq C\int_{\Sigma_k}\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-q(\sigma)}}\,d\sigma.
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. □

2.2. **Construction of a supersolution.** In this subsection we provide a supersolution for the operator $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ defined in (34). We prove

Lemma 2.4. *There exist constants $\beta_0 > 0$, $M_1 < 0$, $M_0 > 0$ (the constant M_0 is as in Lemma 2.3) such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0)$ the function $U := W_{0,M_1,q} - W_{-1,M_0,q} > 0$ in $\mathcal{U}_\beta$ and satisfies*

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda U_a \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{U}_\beta. \tag{39}$$

Moreover $U \in H^1(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$ provided

$$\int_{\Sigma_k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-q(\sigma)}}\, d\sigma < +\infty. \tag{40}$$

Proof. We consider β_1 as in the beginning of the proof of Lemma 2.3 and we define

$$M_1 = -\frac{1}{2} \max_{x \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_1}} |h(x)| - 1. \tag{41}$$

Since

$$U(x) = (e^{M_1 d(x)} - e^{M_0 d(x)} X_{-1}(\tilde{\delta}(x)))d(x)\tilde{\delta}(x)^{\alpha(x)},$$

it follows that $U > 0$ in $\mathcal{U}_\beta$ for $\beta > 0$ sufficiently small. By (41) and Lemma 2.2, we get

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda W_{0,M_1,q} \geq \left(-C|\log(\delta)|\,\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} - |\lambda|\eta\delta^{-2}\right) W_{0,M_1,q}.$$

Using (37) we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda(-W_{-1,M_0,q}) \geq \left(2\delta^{-2}X_{-2} - C|\log(\delta)|\,\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} - |\lambda|\eta\delta^{-2}\right) W_{-1,M_0,q}.$$

Taking the sum of the two above inequalities, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda U \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{U}_\beta,$$

which holds true because $|\eta| \leq C\delta$ in $\mathcal{U}_\beta$. Hence we get readily (39).
Our next task is to prove that $U \in H^1(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$ provided (40) holds, to do so it is enough to show that $W_{0,M_1,q} \in H^1(\mathcal{U}_\beta)$ provided (40) holds.

We argue as in the proof of Lemma 2.3. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{U}_\beta}|\nabla W_{0,M_1,q}|^2 &\leq C\int_{\mathcal{U}_\beta} d^2(x)\tilde{\delta}(x)^{2\alpha(x)-2}\,dx\\ &\leq C\sum_{i=1}^{N_0}\int_{B_+^{N-k}(0,\beta)\times D_i} d^2(F_{\mathcal{M}}^{p_i}(y))\tilde{\delta}(F_{\mathcal{M}}^{p_i}(y))^{2\alpha(F_{\mathcal{M}}^{p_i}(y))-2}|\mathrm{Jac}(F_{\mathcal{M}}^{p_i})|(y)dy\\ &\leq C\sum_{i=1}^{N_0}\int_{B_+^{N-k}(0,\beta)\times D_i}(y^1)^2\,|\tilde{y}|^{2\alpha(F_{\mathcal{M}}^{p_i}(y))-2}\,|\mathrm{Jac}(F_{\mathcal{M}}^{p_i})|(y)\,dy\\ &\leq C\sum_{i=1}^{N_0}\int_{B_+^{N-k}(0,\beta)\times D_i}(y^1)^2\,|\tilde{y}|^{k-N-2+(N-k)\sqrt{1-q(f^{p_i}(\bar{y}))}}\,|\tilde{y}|^{-\sqrt{|\tilde{y}|}}\,dy.\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that $|\mathrm{Jac}(F_{\mathcal{M}}^{p_i})|(y)\leq C$. Note that

$$|\tilde{y}|^{-\sqrt{|\tilde{y}|}}\leq C \quad \text{as } |\tilde{y}|\to 0.$$

Using polar coordinates, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{U}_\beta}|\nabla W_{0,M_1,q}|^2 &\leq C\sum_{i=1}^{N_0}\int_{D_i}\int_{S_+^{N-k-1}}\left(\frac{y^1}{|\tilde{y}|}\right)^2 d\theta\int_0^\beta r^{-1+(N-k)\sqrt{1-q(f^{p_i}(\bar{y}))}}\,dr\,d\bar{y}\\ &\leq C\sum_{i=1}^{N_0}\int_{D_i}\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-q(f^{p_i}(\bar{y}))}}\,d\bar{y}.\end{aligned}$$

Racalling that $|\mathrm{Jac}(f^{p_i})|(\bar{y})=1+O(|\bar{y}|)$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{N_0}\int_{D_i}\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-q(f^{p_i}(\bar{y}))}}\,d\bar{y} &\leq C\sum_{i=1}^{N_0}\int_{D_i}\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-q(f^{p_i}(\bar{y}))}}\,|\mathrm{Jac}(f)|(\bar{y})\,d\bar{y}\\ &= C\int_{\Sigma_k}\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-q(\sigma)}}\,d\sigma.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}_\beta}|\nabla W_{0,M_1,q}|^2\,dx \leq C\int_{\Sigma_k}\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-q(\sigma)}}\,d\sigma$$

and the lemma follows at once. □

3. Existence of λ^*

We start with the following local improved Hardy inequality.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Ω be a smooth domain and assume that $\partial\Omega$ contains a smooth closed submanifold Σ_k of dimension $1 \le k \le N-2$. Assume that p, q and η satisfy (2) and (3). Then there exist constants $\beta_0 > 0$ and $c > 0$ depending only on $\Omega, \Sigma_k, q, \eta$ and p such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0)$ the inequality*

$$\int_{\Omega_\beta} p|\nabla u|^2\, dx - \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}\int_{\Omega_\beta} q\frac{|u|^2}{\delta^2}\, dx \ge c\int_{\Omega_\beta} \frac{|u|^2}{\delta^2|\log(\delta)|^2}\, dx$$

holds for all $u \in H_0^1(\Omega_\beta)$.

Proof. We use the notations in Section 2 with $\mathcal{U} = \Omega$ and $\mathcal{M} = \partial\Omega$.
Fix $\beta_1 > 0$ small and

$$M_2 = -\frac{1}{2}\max_{x\in\overline{\Omega}_{\beta_1}} (|h(x)| + |\nabla p \cdot \nabla d|) - 1. \tag{42}$$

Since $\frac{p}{q} \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\left|\frac{p(x)}{q(x)} - \frac{p(\sigma(\bar{x}))}{q(\sigma(\bar{x}))}\right| \le C\delta(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega_\beta, \tag{43}$$

for small $\beta > 0$. Hence by (3) there exits a constant $C' > 0$ such that

$$p(x) \ge q(x) - C'\delta(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega_\beta. \tag{44}$$

Consider $W_{\frac{1}{2},M_2,1}$ (in Lemma 2.2 with $q \equiv 1$). For all $\beta > 0$ small, we set

$$\tilde{w}(x) = W_{\frac{1}{2},M_2,1}(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_\beta. \tag{45}$$

Notice that $\operatorname{div}(p\nabla\tilde{w}) = p\Delta\tilde{w} + \nabla p \cdot \nabla\tilde{w}$. By Lemma 2.2, we have

$$-\frac{\operatorname{div}(p\nabla\tilde{w})}{\tilde{w}} \ge \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}\, p\delta^{-2} + \frac{p}{4}\delta^{-2}X_{-2}(\delta) + O(|\log(\delta)|\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}) \text{ in } \Omega_\beta.$$

This together with (44) yields

$$-\frac{\operatorname{div}(p\nabla\tilde{w})}{\tilde{w}} \ge \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}\, q\delta^{-2} + \frac{c_0}{4}\delta^{-2}X_{-2}(\delta) + O(|\log(\delta)|\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}) \text{ in } \Omega_\beta,$$

with $c_0 = \min_{\overline{\Omega_{\beta_1}}} p > 0$. Therefore

$$-\frac{\operatorname{div}(p\nabla\tilde{w})}{\tilde{w}} \ge \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}\, q\delta^{-2} + c\,\delta^{-2}X_{-2}(\delta) \text{ in } \Omega_\beta, \tag{46}$$

for some positive constant c depending only on $\Omega, \Sigma_k, q, \eta$ and p.

Let $u \in C^\infty_c(\Omega_\beta)$ and put $\psi = \frac{u}{\tilde{w}}$. Then one has $|\nabla u|^2 = |\tilde{w}\nabla\psi|^2 + |\psi\nabla\tilde{w}|^2 + \nabla(\psi^2)\cdot\tilde{w}\nabla\tilde{w}$. Therefore $|\nabla u|^2 p = |\tilde{w}\nabla\psi|^2 p + p\nabla\tilde{w}\cdot\nabla(\tilde{w}\psi^2)$. Integrating by parts, we get

$$\int_{\Omega_\beta} |\nabla u|^2 p\, dx = \int_{\Omega_\beta} |\tilde{w}\nabla\psi|^2 p\, dx + \int_{\Omega_\beta}\left(-\frac{\operatorname{div}(p\nabla\tilde{w})}{\tilde{w}}\right) u^2\, dx.$$

Putting (46) in the above equality, we get the result. □

We next prove the following result

Lemma 3.2. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain and assume that $\partial\Omega$ contains a smooth closed submanifold Σ_k of dimension $1 \le k \le N-2$. Assume that (2) and (3) hold. Then there exists $\lambda^* = \lambda^*(\Omega, \Sigma_k, p, q, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) = \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}, \qquad \forall \lambda \le \lambda^*,$$
$$\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) < \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}, \qquad \forall \lambda > \lambda^*.$$

Proof. We devide the proof in two steps
Step 1: We claim that:

$$\sup_{\lambda\in\mathbb{R}} \mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) \le \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}. \tag{47}$$

Indeed, we know that $\nu_0(\mathbb{R}^N_+, \mathbb{R}^k) = \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}$, see [15] for instance. Given $\tau > 0$, we let $u_\tau \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^N_+)$ be such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N_+} |\nabla u_\tau|^2\, dy \le \left(\frac{(N-k)^2}{4} + \tau\right)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N_+} |\tilde{y}|^{-2} u_\tau^2\, dy. \tag{48}$$

By (3), we can let $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_k$ be such that

$$q(\sigma_0) = p(\sigma_0).$$

Now, given $r > 0$, we let $\rho_r > 0$ such that for all $x \in B(\sigma_0, \rho_r) \cap \Omega$

$$p(x) \le (1+r)q(\sigma_0), \quad q(x) \ge (1-r)q(\sigma_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(x) \le r. \tag{49}$$

We choose Fermi coordinates near $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_k$ given by the map $F^{\sigma_0}_{\partial\Omega}$ (as in Section 2) and we choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ small such that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,

$$\Lambda_{\varepsilon,\rho,r,\tau} := F^{\sigma_0}_{\partial\Omega}(\varepsilon\,\mathrm{Supp}(\mathrm{u}_\tau)) \subset B(\sigma_0, \rho_r) \cap \Omega$$

and we define the following test function

$$v(x) = \varepsilon^{\frac{2-N}{2}} u_\tau \left(\varepsilon^{-1} (F^{\sigma_0}_{\partial\Omega})^{-1}(x)\right), \quad x \in \Lambda_{\varepsilon,\rho,r,\tau}.$$

Clearly, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, we have that $v \in C^\infty_c(\Omega)$ and thus by a change of variable, (49) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) &\leq \frac{\displaystyle\int_\Omega p|\nabla v|^2\, dx + \lambda \int_\Omega \delta^{-2} \eta v^2\, dx}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega q(x)\, \delta^{-2}\, v^2\, dx} \\
&\leq \frac{(1+r)\displaystyle\int_{\Lambda_{\varepsilon,\rho,r,\tau}} |\nabla v|^2\, dx}{(1-r)\displaystyle\int_{\Lambda_{\varepsilon,\rho,r,\tau}} \delta^{-2}\, v^2\, dx} + \frac{r|\lambda|}{(1-r)q(\sigma_0)} \\
&\leq \frac{(1+r)\displaystyle\int_{\Lambda_{\varepsilon,\rho,r,\tau}} |\nabla v|^2\, dx}{(1-cr)\displaystyle\int_{\Lambda_{\varepsilon,\rho,r,\tau}} \tilde{\delta}^{-2}\, v^2\, dx} + \frac{r|\lambda|}{(1-r)q(\sigma_0)} \\
&\leq \frac{(1+r)\varepsilon^{2-N}\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^N_+} \varepsilon^{-2} (g^\varepsilon)^{ij} \partial_i u_\tau \partial_j u_\tau |\sqrt{|g^\varepsilon|}(y)\, dy}{(1-cr)\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^N_+} \varepsilon^{2-N}\, |\varepsilon\tilde{y}|^{-2}\, u_\tau^2\, \sqrt{|g^\varepsilon|}(\tilde{y})\, dy} + \frac{cr}{1-r},
\end{aligned}$$

where g^ε is the scaled metric with components $g^\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}(y) = \varepsilon^{-2}\langle \partial_\alpha F^{\sigma_0}_{\partial\Omega}(\varepsilon y), \partial_\beta F^{\sigma_0}_{\partial\Omega}(\varepsilon y)\rangle$ for $\alpha, \beta = 1, \ldots, N$ and where we have used the fact that $\tilde{\delta}(F^{\sigma_0}_{\partial\Omega}(\varepsilon y)) = |\varepsilon\tilde{y}|^2$ for every $\tilde{y}$ in the support of u_τ. Since the scaled metric g^ε expands a $g^\varepsilon = I + O(\varepsilon)$ on the support of u_τ, we deduce that

$$\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) \leq \frac{1+r}{1-cr}\, \frac{1+c\varepsilon}{1-c\varepsilon}\, \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^N_+} |\nabla u_\tau|^2\, dy}{\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^N_+} |\tilde{y}|^{-2}\, u_\tau^2\, dy} + \frac{cr}{1-r},$$

where c is a positive constant depending only on Ω, p, q, η and Σ_k. Hence by (48) we conclude

$$\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) \quad \leq \quad \frac{1+r}{1-cr}\,\frac{1+c\varepsilon}{1-c\varepsilon}\left(\frac{(N-k)^2}{4}+\tau\right)+\frac{cr}{1-r}.$$

Taking the limit in ε, then in r and then in τ, the claim follows.

Step 2: We claim that there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu_{\tilde{\lambda}}(\Omega, \Sigma_k) \geq \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}$.

Thanks to Lemma 3.1, the proof uses a standard argument of cut-off function and integration by parts (see [4]) and we can obtain

$$\int_\Omega \delta^{-2} u^2 q\, dx \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 p\, dx + C \int_\Omega \delta^{-2} u^2 \eta\, dx \quad \forall u \in C^\infty_c(\Omega),$$

for some constant $C > 0$. We skip the details. The claim now follows by choosing $\tilde{\lambda} = -C$

Finally, noticing that $\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k)$ is decreasing in λ, we can set

$$\lambda^* := \sup\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \,:\, \mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) = \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}\right\} \tag{50}$$

so that $\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k) < \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}$ for all $\lambda > \lambda^*$. □

4. Non-existence result

Lemma 4.1. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 3$, and let Σ_k be a smooth closed submanifold of $\partial\Omega$ of dimension k with $1 \leq k \leq N-2$. Then, there exist bounded smooth domains $\Omega^\pm$ such that $\Omega^+ \subset \Omega \subset \Omega^-$ and*

$$\partial\Omega^+ \cap \partial\Omega = \partial\Omega^- \cap \partial\Omega = \Sigma_k.$$

Proof. Consider the maps

$$x \mapsto g^\pm(x) := d_{\partial\Omega}(x) \pm \frac{1}{2}\,\delta^2(x),$$

where $d_{\partial\Omega}$ is the distance function to $\partial\Omega$. For some $\beta_1 > 0$ small, $g^\pm$ are smooth in Ω_{β_1} and since $|\nabla g^\pm| \geq C > 0$ on Σ_k, by the implicit function theorem, the sets

$$\{x \in \Omega_\beta \,:\, g^\pm = 0\}$$

are smooth $(N-1)$-dimensional submanifolds of $\mathbb{R}^N$, for some $\beta > 0$ small. In addition, by construction, they can be taken to be part of the boundaries of smooth bounded domains $\Omega^\pm$ with $\Omega^+ \subset \Omega \subset \Omega^-$ and such that

$$\partial\Omega^+ \cap \partial\Omega = \partial\Omega^- \cap \partial\Omega = \Sigma_k.$$

The prove then follows at once. □

Now, we prove the following non-existence result.

Theorem 4.2. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$ and let Σ_k be a smooth closed submanifold of $\partial\Omega$ of dimension k with $1 \le k \le N-2$ and let $\lambda \ge 0$. Assume that p, q and η satisfy* (2) *and* (3). *Suppose that $u \in H^1_0(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ is a non-negative function satisfying*

$$-\mathrm{div}(p\nabla u) - \frac{(N-k)^2}{4} q\delta^{-2}u \ge -\lambda\eta\delta^{-2}u \quad \text{in } \Omega. \tag{51}$$

If $\int_{\Sigma_k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-p(\sigma)/q(\sigma)}} d\sigma = +\infty$ then $u \equiv 0$.

Proof. We first assume that $p \equiv 1$. Let Ω^+ be the set given by Lemma 4.1. We will use the notations in Section 2 with $\mathcal{U} = \Omega^+$ and $\mathcal{M} = \partial\Omega^+$. For $\beta > 0$ small we define

$$\Omega^+_\beta := \{x \in \Omega^+ : \quad \delta(x) < \beta\}.$$

We suppose by contradiction that u does not vanish identically near Σ_k and satisfies (51) so that $u > 0$ in Ω_β by the maximum principle, for some $\beta > 0$ small.
Consider the subsolution V_ε defined in Lemma 2.3 which satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda V_\varepsilon \le 0 \quad \text{ in } \Omega^+_\beta, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0,1). \tag{52}$$

Notice that $\overline{\partial\Omega^+_\beta \cap \Omega^+} \subset \Omega$ thus, for $\beta > 0$ small, we can choose $R > 0$ (independent on ε) so that

$$R V_\varepsilon \le R V_0 \le u \quad \text{ on } \overline{\partial\Omega^+_\beta \cap \Omega^+} \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0,1).$$

Again by Lemma 2.3, setting $v_\varepsilon = R V_\varepsilon - u$, it turns out that $v^+_\varepsilon = \max(v_\varepsilon, 0) \in H^1_0(\Omega^+_\beta)$ because $V_\varepsilon = 0$ on $\partial\Omega^+_\beta \setminus \overline{\partial\Omega^+_\beta \cap \Omega^+}$. Moreover by (51) and (52),

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda v_\varepsilon \le 0 \quad \text{ in } \Omega^+_\beta, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0,1).$$

Multiplying the above inequality by v_ε^+ and integrating by parts yields

$$\int_{\Omega_\beta^+} |\nabla v_\varepsilon^+|^2\, dx - \frac{(N-k)^2}{4} \int_{\Omega_\beta^+} \delta^{-2} q |v_\varepsilon^+|^2\, dx + \lambda \int_{\Omega_\beta^+} \eta \delta^{-2} |v_\varepsilon^+|^2\, dx \le 0.$$

But then Lemma 3.1 implies that $v_\varepsilon^+ = 0$ in Ω_β^+ provided β small enough because $|\eta| \le C\delta$ near Σ_k. Therefore $u \ge R\, V_\varepsilon$ for every $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. In particular $u \ge R\, V_0$. Hence we obtain from Lemma 2.3 that

$$\infty > \int_{\Omega_\beta^+} \frac{u^2}{\delta^2} \ge R^2 \int_{\Omega_\beta^+} \frac{V_0^2}{\delta^2} \ge \int_{\Sigma_k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-q(\sigma)}} d\sigma$$

which leads to a contradiction. We deduce that $u \equiv 0$ in Ω_β^+. Thus by the maximum principle $u \equiv 0$ in Ω.
For the general case $p \neq 1$, we argue as in [5] by setting

$$\tilde{u} = \sqrt{p} u. \tag{53}$$

This function satisfies

$$-\Delta \tilde{u} - \frac{(N-k)^2}{4} \frac{q}{p} \delta^{-2} \tilde{u} \ge -\lambda \frac{\eta}{p} \delta^{-2} \tilde{u} + \left(-\frac{\Delta p}{2p} + \frac{|\nabla p|^2}{4p^2} \right) \tilde{u} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Hence since $p \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ and $p > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$, we get the same conclusions as in the case $p \equiv 1$ and q replaced by q/p. □

5. Existence of minimizers for $\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k)$

Theorem 5.1. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$ and let Σ_k be a smooth closed submanifold of $\partial\Omega$ of dimension k with $1 \le k \le N-2$. Assume that p, q and η satisfy* (2) *and* (3)*. Then $\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k)$ is achieved for every $\lambda < \lambda^*$.*

Proof. The proof follows the same argument of [4] by taking into account the fact that $\eta = 0$ on Σ_k so we skip it. □

Next, we prove the existence of minimizers in the critical case $\lambda = \lambda_*$.

Theorem 5.2. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$ and let Σ_k be a smooth closed submanifold of $\partial\Omega$ of dimension k with $1 \leq k \leq N-2$. Assume that p, q and η satisfy* (2) *and* (3)*. If $\int_{\Sigma_k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-p(\sigma)/q(\sigma)}} d\sigma < \infty$ then $\mu_{\lambda^*} = \mu_{\lambda^*}(\Omega, \Sigma_k)$ is achieved.*

Proof. We first consider the case $p \equiv 1$.
Let λ_n be a sequence of real numbers decreasing to λ^*. By Theorem 5.1, there exits u_n minimizers for $\mu_{\lambda_n} = \mu_{\lambda_n}(\Omega, \Sigma_k)$ so that

$$-\Delta u_n - \mu_{\lambda_n} \delta^{-2} q u_n = -\lambda_n \delta^{-2} \eta u_n \quad \text{ in } \Omega. \tag{54}$$

We may assume that $u_n \geq 0$ in Ω. We may also assume that $\|\nabla u_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1$. Hence $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in $H^1_0(\Omega)$ and $u_n \to u$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ and pointwise. Let $\Omega^- \supset \Omega$ be the set given by Lemma 4.1. We will use the notations in Section 2 with $\mathcal{U} = \Omega^-$ and $\mathcal{M} = \partial\Omega^-$. It will be understood that q is extended to a function in $C^2(\overline{\Omega^-})$. For $\beta > 0$ small we define

$$\Omega^-_\beta := \{x \in \Omega^- : \quad \delta(x) < \beta\}.$$

We have that

$$\Delta u_n + b_n(x)\, u_n = 0 \quad \text{ in } \Omega,$$

with $|b_n| \leq C$ in $\overline{\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega^-_{\frac{\beta}{2}}}}$ for all integer n. Thus by standard elliptic regularity theory,

$$u_n \leq C \qquad \text{in } \overline{\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega^-_{\frac{\beta}{2}}}}. \tag{55}$$

We consider the supersolution U in Lemma 2.4. We shall show that there exits a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$u_n \leq CU \quad \text{ in } \overline{\Omega^-_\beta}. \tag{56}$$

Notice that $\overline{\Omega \cap \partial\Omega^-_\beta} \subset \Omega^-$ thus by (55), we can choose $C > 0$ so that for any n

$$u_n \leq C\,U \quad \text{ on } \overline{\Omega \cap \partial\Omega^-_\beta}.$$

Again by Lemma 2.4, setting $v_n = u_n - C\,U$, it turns out that $v_n^+ = \max(v_n, 0) \in H^1_0(\Omega^-_\beta)$ because $u_n = 0$ on $\partial\Omega \cap \Omega^-_\beta$. Hence we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_n} v_n \leq -C(\mu_{\lambda^*} - \mu_n) qU - C(\lambda^* - \lambda_n)\eta U \leq 0 \quad \text{ in } \Omega^-_\beta \cap \Omega.$$

Multiplying the above inequality by v_n^+ and integrating by parts yields

$$\int_{\Omega_\beta^-} |\nabla v_n^+|^2\,dx - \mu_{\lambda_n}\int_{\Omega_\beta^-} \delta^{-2} q|v_n^+|^2\,dx + \lambda_n\int_{\Omega_\beta^-} \eta\delta^{-2}|v_n^+|^2\,dx \le 0.$$

Hence Lemma 3.1 implies that

$$C\int_{\Omega_\beta^-} \delta^{-2}X_{-2}|v_n^+|^2\,dx + \lambda_n\int_{\Omega_\beta^-} \eta\delta^{-2}|v_n^+|^2\,dx \le 0.$$

Since λ_n is bounded, we can choose $\beta > 0$ small (independent of n) such that $v_n^+ \equiv 0$ on Ω_β^- (recall that $|\eta| \le C\delta$). Thus we obtain (56).
Now since $u_n \to u$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, we get by the dominated convergence theorem and (56), that

$$\delta^{-1}u_n \to \delta^{-1}u \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega).$$

Since u_n satisfies

$$1 = \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^2 = \mu_{\lambda_n}\int_\Omega \delta^{-2}qu_n^2 + \lambda_n\int_\Omega \delta^{-2}\eta u_n^2,$$

taking the limit, we have $1 = \mu_{\lambda^*}\int_\Omega \delta^{-2}qu^2 + \lambda^*\int_\Omega \delta^{-2}\eta u^2$. Hence $u \ne 0$ and it is a minimizer for $\mu_{\lambda^*} = \frac{(N-k)^2}{4}$.
For the general case $p \ne 1$, we can use the same transformation as in (53). So (56) holds and the same argument as a above carries over. □

6. Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Combining Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 5.1, it remains only to check the case $\lambda < \lambda^*$. But this is an easy consequence of the definition of λ^* and of $\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k)$, see [[4], Section 3]. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2: Existence is proved in Theorem 5.2 for $I_k < \infty$. Since the absolute value of any minimizer for $\mu_\lambda(\Omega, \Sigma_k)$ is also a minimizer, we can apply Theorem 4.2 to infer that $\mu_{\lambda^*}(\Omega, \Sigma_k)$ is never achieved as soon as $I_k = \infty$. □

Acknowledgments

This work started when the first author was visiting CMM, Universidad de Chile. He is grateful for their kind hospitality. M. M. Fall is supported by the Alexander-von-Humboldt Foundation. F. Mahmoudi is supported by the Fondecyt proyect n: 1100164 and Fondo Basal CMM.

References

[1] Adimurthi and Sandeep K., Existence and non-existence of the first eigenvalue of the perturbed Hardy-Sobolev operator. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 132 (2002), no. 5, 1021-1043.

[2] Bandle C., Moroz V.. Reichel W., Large solutions to semilinear elliptic equations with Hardy potential and exponential nonlinearity. Around the research of Vladimir Maz'ya. II, 1-22, Int. Math. Ser. (N. Y.), 12, Springer, New York, 2010.

[3] Bandle C., Moroz V.. Reichel W., 'Boundary blowup' type sub-solutions to semilinear elliptic equations with Hardy potential. J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) 77 (2008), no. 2, 503-523.

[4] Brezis H. and Marcus M., Hardy's inequalities revisited. Dedicated to Ennio De Giorgi. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) 25 (1997), no. 1-2, 217-237.

[5] Brezis H., Marcus M. and Shafrir I., Extermal functions for Hardy's inequality with weight, J. Funct. Anal. 171 (2000), 177-191.

[6] Caldiroli P., Musina R., On a class of 2-dimensional singular elliptic problems. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 131 (2001), 479-497.

[7] Caldiroli P., Musina R., Stationary states for a two-dimensional singular Schrödinger equation. Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Sez. B Artic. Ric. Mat. (8) 4-B (2001), 609-633.

[8] Cazacu C., On Hardy inequalities with singularities on the boundary. C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 349 (2011), no. 5-6, 273-277.

[9] Fall M. M., Nonexistence of distributional supersolutions of a semilinear elliptic equation with Hardy potential. To appear in J. Funct. Anal. http://arxiv.org/abs/1105.5886.

[10] Fall M. M., On the Hardy-Poincaré inequality with boundary singularities. Commun. Contemp. Math., 14, 1250019, 2012.

[11] Fall M. M., A note on Hardy's inequalities with boundary singularities. Nonlinear Anal. 75 (2012) no. 2, 951-963.

[12] Fall M. M., Musina R., Hardy-Poincaré inequalities with boundary singularities. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh. A 142, 1-18, 2012.

[13] Fall M. M., Musina R., Sharp nonexistence results for a linear elliptic inequality involving Hardy and Leray potentials. Journal of Inequalities and Applications, vol. 2011, Article ID 917201, 21 pages, 2011. doi:10.1155/2011/917201.

[14] Fall M. M., Mahmoudi F., Hypersurfaces with free boundary and large constant mean curvature: concentration along submanifolds. Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) 7 (2008), no. 3, 407–446.

[15] Filippas S., Tertikas A. and Tidblom J., On the structure of Hardy-Sobolev-Maz'ya inequalities. J. Eur. Math. Soc., 11(6), (2009), 1165-1185.

[16] Mahmoudi F., Malchiodi A., Concentration on minimal submanifolds for a singularly perturbed Neumann problem, Adv. in Math. 209 (2007) 460-525.

[17] Nazarov A. I., Hardy-Sobolev Inequalities in a cone, J. Math. Sciences, 132, (2006), (4), 419-427.

[18] Nazarov A. I., Dirichlet and Neumann problems to critical Emden-Fowler type equations. J. Glob. Optim. (2008) 40, 289-303.

[19] Pinchover Y., Tintarev K., Existence of minimizers for Schrödinger operators under domain perturbations with application to Hardy's inequality. Indiana Univ. Math. J. 54 (2005), 1061-1074.

M.M. Fall - Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Institut für Mathematik. Robert-Mayer-Str. 10 D-60054 Frankfurt, Germany.

E-mail address: fall@math.uni-frankfurt.de

F. Mahmoudi - Departamento de Ingenieria Matemática and CMM, Universidad de Chile, Casilla 170 Correo 3, Santiago, Chile.

E-mail address: fmahmoudi@dim.uchile.cl