

Critical points of solutions of elliptic equations in divergence form in planar non simply connected domains with smooth or nonsmooth boundary

Rolando Magnanini ^{*}, Serge Nicaise [†], Madeline Chauvier [‡]

November 17, 2025

Abstract

We study the critical points of the solution of second elliptic equations in divergence and diagonal form with a bounded and positive definite coefficient, under the assumption that the statement of the Hopf lemma holds (sign assumptions on its normal derivatives) along the boundary. The proof combines the argument principle introduced in [4] for elliptic equations with the representation formula (using quasi-conformal mappings) for operators in divergence form in simply connected domains [5]. The case of a degenerate coefficient is also treated where we combine the level lines technique and the maximum principle with the argument principle. Finally, some numerical experiments on illustrative examples are presented.

AMS (MOS) subject classification: 35J25, 35B38, 58E05

Key Words: Critical points, level lines, elliptic equations in divergence form

1 Introduction

Recently the engineering community has an increasing interest of the transmission of electricity using direct current, because the production of this type of current grows due to the increase of the production of the renewable energies and the direct current is more suitable for the long distance transport. The simplest mathematical model used by this community [27, 7, 9, 18, 6] is the ion flow field in the ambient of conductors, that is actually governed by Poisson's equation and the current density conservation equation set in a region Ω of the plane:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta\varphi = \rho, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div}(\rho\nabla\varphi) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

^{*}Università degli Studi di Firenze, Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica U. Dini, Viale Morgagni 67/A, 50134 Firenze, Italy, rolando.magnanini@unifi.it

[†]Université Polytechnique Hauts-de-France, CÉRAMATHS/DMATHS and FR CNRS 2037, F-59313 - Valenciennes Cedex 9 France, Serge.Nicaise@uphf.fr

[‡]Université Polytechnique Hauts-de-France, CÉRAMATHS/DMATHS and FR CNRS 2037, F-59313 - Valenciennes Cedex 9 France and Département de Mathématique, Université de Mons, place du parc 20, B-7000 Mons, Belgium, Madeline.CHAUVIER@umons.ac.be




Figure 1: An illustrative configuration

where the variable φ represents the electric potential and the variable ρ the space charge density (that for physical reasons has to be non negative) are the two unknowns. The domain Ω corresponds to the air surrounding the conductors above the ground and should be an unbounded domain, but for computational reasons it is reduced to a bounded one. It is admitted [27, 7, 9, 18, 6] that this system of nonlinear partial differential equations is completed with the Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} \varphi = 1, & \text{on } \Gamma_c, \\ \varphi = 0, & \text{on } \Gamma_d, \end{cases}$$

and the Neumann condition

$$(1.3) \quad \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial n} = E_0, \text{ on } \Gamma_c,$$

where $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial n}$ denotes the exterior normal derivative and E_0 is a positive constant. Here, Γ_c represents the boundary of the conductor and Γ_d represents the truncated boundary between air and ground. The two boundaries are such that $\partial\Omega = \Gamma_c \cup \Gamma_d$ and $\Gamma_c \cap \Gamma_d = \emptyset$, see Figure 1 for an illustrative configuration.

This problem is studied in [8], where in its full generality the existence of a solution of (1.1),(1.2) is proved, some properties of the solution are given, and a numerical algorithm based on the minimisation of a functional is proposed to find an approximation of such a solution. In the engineering community, another algorithm is proposed to find an approximated solution. It is based on the resolution of the first equation from (1.1) by a finite element method and then on the resolution of the second equation by using the method of characteristic (see [27, 7, 17, 29, 30]), transforming it as follows:

$$(1.4) \quad 0 = \operatorname{div}(\rho \nabla \varphi) = \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla \rho + \rho \Delta \varphi = \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla \rho - \rho^2.$$

But such a method can be implemented only if the set of points $v \in \bar{\Omega}$ where $\nabla \varphi(v)$ is zero is finite. The goal of the present paper is therefore to give the exact value of the number of critical points of φ (i.e. points v such that $\nabla \varphi(v) = (0, 0)^\top$) for some domains Ω and under appropriate and natural conditions on ρ , namely either $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ is uniformly positive or is uniformly positive except near the corners of the exterior boundary of the domain where it can tend to zero. This degenerate case is completely natural if the exterior boundary has a corner v , because by the second boundary condition from (1.2), $\nabla \varphi(v) = (0, 0)^\top$, assuming that φ is smooth enough. Hence the transport equation (1.4) implies that ρ tends to zero along a characteristic line that hits a corner.

Our main results are based on the study of the critical points of the solution of the second equation from (1.1),

$$(1.5) \quad \operatorname{div}(\rho \nabla \varphi) = 0, \text{ in } \Omega,$$

subject to the Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{cases} \varphi = 1, & \text{on } \Gamma_c, \\ \varphi = 0, & \text{on } \Gamma_d, \end{cases}$$

and under the assumption that the statement of the Hopf lemma holds (sign assumptions on its normal derivatives) along $\partial\Omega$. Their proofs actually combine the argument principle introduced in [4] for elliptic equations with the representation formula (using quasi-conformal mappings) for operators in divergence form in simply connected domains [5], allowing to characterize the level lines of the solutions of (1.5). Such results are already known for the Laplace equation (corresponding to $\rho = 1$) [4], for linear or quasilinear second order operators in non-divergence form [2, 3, 12, 13], for $\rho \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ [1], or $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ but for Ω simply connected [5]. However, to the best of our knowledge, the case of non simply connected domains and ρ only in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ (and even degenerate) is not yet treated.

Let us further notice that combining some conformal mapping transformation and the level lines technique, we also prove that the Hopf lemma holds for the solution of (1.5) with the Dirichlet boundary conditions (1.6) under some regularity assumptions on the boundary of Ω and the assumption that $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ is uniformly bounded from below. Such a result holds if $\partial\Omega$ is smooth enough and $\rho \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$, with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, see [15, Lemma 7] or [25, Theorem 1.1]. In the opposite case, it can be wrong, but the counterexamples from the literature recalled in [25] do not enter in our setting.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we present the problem and formulate the required assumptions on its solution, namely that Hopf lemma holds on the exterior/interior boundary. In Section 3, using local quasi-conformal changes of variables, we show that the critical points of the solution are isolated. Based on the argument principle, we prove in Section 4 that the number of critical points inside the domain is equal to the number of connected components of the obstacles minus 1. Section 5 is devoted to the extension of our results to the case of degenerate density, there we combine the level lines technique and the maximum principle with the argument principle. In Section 6, under some regularity assumptions on the exterior/interior boundary, we prove the Hopf lemma on the exterior/interior boundary with the help of level lines technique. Finally in Section 7 some numerical tests on illustrative examples are presented. Since the main concerns of this paper are the characterization of the critical points, the proof that conformal mappings preserve elliptic equations in divergence and diagonal form is postponed to Appendix A.

Let us finish this introduction with some notation used in the remainder of the paper: The usual Sobolev space of order $s > 0$ in an open set Ω of the plane is denoted by $H^s(\Omega)$. The set $\mathbb{N}$ (resp. $\mathbb{N}^*$) is the set of non negative (resp. positive) integers.

2 Setting of the problem and assumptions

Let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded connected open set and $\mathcal{B}$ be the finite union of open simply connected domains $B_1, \dots, B_M \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, with pairwise disjoint closures. Suppose that $\bar{\mathcal{B}} \subset \mathcal{O}$ and set $\Omega = \mathcal{O} \setminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}$.

It is clear that Ω is connected. We assume that the boundary of $\mathcal{B}$ is $C^{1,1}$. We further assume that the boundary of $\mathcal{O}$ is smooth except at a finite number of points, which we call vertices, in the following sense:

(A1) either the boundary of $\mathcal{O}$ is $C^{1,1}$, in which case we set $I = 0$, or the boundary of $\mathcal{O}$ is $C^{1,1}$, except at a finite number of points $v_i \in \partial\mathcal{O}$, $i = 1, \dots, I$, with $I \in \mathbb{N}^*$. In that last case, the boundary of Ω coincides locally with the image by a conformal map of a quarter plane (when we identify $\mathbb{R}^2$ with $\mathbb{C}$). Namely there exist a neighbourhood U_i of v_i in $\mathbb{C}$, an open, non empty, simply connected and bounded set V_i of $\mathbb{C}$ such that $0 \in V_i$ and a conformal mapping

$$\Phi_i : V_i \cap Q \rightarrow U_i \cap \Omega,$$

where

$$Q := \{w \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(w) > 0, \operatorname{Im}(w) > 0\}.$$

By convention, if the boundary of $\mathcal{O}$ is $C^{1,1}$, we take $I = 0$.

We assume that the conductivity $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfies the bound

$$(2.1) \quad \delta \leq \rho \text{ a.e. in } \Omega,$$

for some positive real number δ .

Now we consider the unique weak solution $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ of

$$(2.2) \quad \operatorname{div}(\rho \nabla u) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

with the boundary conditions

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} u = 1 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{B}, \\ u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O}. \end{cases}$$

In the whole paper, we assume that this solution belongs to $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$. This assumption is motivated by the following regularity property of a solution $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$ of (1.1) with the Dirichlet boundary condition (1.6). Indeed thanks to elliptic regularity results, $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$ is also a solution of the first equation in (1.1), with the Dirichlet boundary condition (1.6). Thus, φ turns out to be in $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$, for all $p \geq 2$, due to the assumptions on Ω and ρ . Hence, $\varphi \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$.

Remark 2.1. Using a smooth lifting for the boundary condition on $\partial\mathcal{B}$, by [21, Theorem 1], the solution $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ of (2.2)-(2.3) belongs to $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for some $p > 2$, hence belongs to $C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$, for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (see [24] for an optimal interior regularity result). If $\rho \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ for some $q \geq 2$ and Ω has a C^2 boundary, some $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ estimates, with $p > 1$ are also available in [10, 23]. However, when the coefficient ρ shows some simple jump discontinuities, the solution is expected to be Lipschitz continuous. Indeed if the discontinuities are made of a finite union of disjoint smooth curves that do not intersect the boundary and the coefficient ρ is smooth on each relevant subdomain, then this solution is piecewise in $W^{2,p}$ with $p > 2$ (see [28] for instance). Thus, the solution is piecewise C^1 (in the sense that the gradient is continuous except across the discontinuity curves), and in particular is Lipschitz continuous. For instance, in [19], the first author of this paper explicitly computed the series solution of the Dirichlet problem in a ball in the case in which the coefficient is radially symmetric and has a finite number of jump discontinuities and showed that the solution is indeed Lipschitz continuous. For piecewise smooth coefficients that may cross or may intersect the boundary, some regularity results in the form of a decomposition into a regular part that is piecewise in $W^{2,p}$, with $p > 2$, and explicit singular functions are also available in [22]. In such a case, the solution is still piecewise C^1 except eventually at the crossing points, but it is no more Lipschitz continuous in general.

As Ω is connected, due to the boundary conditions (2.3), u cannot be constant and therefore the strong maximum principle (see [16, Theorems 8.1 and 8.19] for instance) yields that

$$(2.4) \quad 0 < u < 1 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

This property implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_n u &\leq 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O}, \\ \partial_n u &\geq 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{B}, \end{aligned}$$

but we will assume more. Namely we assume that the statement of Hopf lemma holds on the sets $\partial\mathcal{O} \setminus \cup_{i=1}^I \{v_i\}$ ¹ and $\partial\mathcal{B}$:

$$(2.5) \quad \partial_n u < 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O} \setminus \cup_{i=1}^I \{v_i\},$$

$$(2.6) \quad \partial_n u > 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{B}.$$

Remark 2.2. For the applications to system (1.1), the assumptions (2.5) and (2.6) are natural. Indeed for a solution $\varphi \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ of (1.1) and (1.6), condition (2.5) holds by applying [16, Lemma 3.4] to the first equation of (1.1) with the boundary conditions (1.6). On the contrary (2.6) holds by applying [15, Lemma 7] or [25, Theorem 1.1] to the second equation of (1.1) with the boundary conditions (1.6) under the assumption that $\rho \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$, with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. We shall show in Section 6 that these properties remain valid under some regularity assumptions on $\partial\mathcal{O}$ and $\partial\mathcal{B}$.

Remark 2.3. The results below remain valid if the boundary conditions (2.3) are replaced by

$$\begin{cases} u = a \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{B}, \\ u = b \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O}, \end{cases}$$

where a, b are two positive real numbers such that $a > b$. Indeed, it suffices to apply our results to $\frac{u-b}{a-b}$ that satisfies (2.2) and (2.3).

3 The critical points are isolated

Let us recall the next definition.

Definition 3.1. A point $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ is a (geometric) critical point of $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ if and only if

$$\nabla u(x) = 0.$$

3.1 Case of a $C^{1,1}$ exterior boundary

Lemma 3.2. Assume that the solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) belongs to $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ and satisfies (2.5) and (2.6). If $\partial\mathcal{O}$ is $C^{1,1}$, then u has a finite number of critical points in Ω (and no critical point on $\partial\Omega$).

¹If $\partial\mathcal{O}$ is $C^{1,1}$, then $\mathcal{O}$ has no corner, and therefore $\cup_{i=1}^0 \{v_i\} = \emptyset$

Proof. Due to the assumptions (2.5) and (2.6) and the regularity $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$, there exists a neighbourhood W of $\partial\Omega$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad \nabla u \neq (0, 0)^\top \text{ on } W \cap \bar{\Omega}.$$

Now we cover Ω by overlapping patches Ω_j , $j = 1, \dots, J$ that are simply connected with a Lipschitz boundary, and such that the surface measures of $\Omega_j \cap \partial\mathcal{B}$ and $\Omega_j \cap \partial\mathcal{O}$ are positive, for all $j = 1, \dots, J$. Then we can apply [5, Lemma 2.5 and the following remark] to u restricted to Ω_j (since u cannot be constant) to deduce that the critical points of u in Ω_j are isolated without accumulation point inside Ω_j (they could accumulate near the boundary of Ω_j).

We conclude by observing that the Ω_j 's overlap among them and with $W \cap \bar{\Omega}$. ■

3.2 Case of a piecewise $C^{1,1}$ exterior boundary

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that the solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) belongs to $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ and satisfies (2.5) and (2.6). If **(A1)** holds with $I \geq 1$, then u has a finite number of critical points in Ω , and the sole critical points of u on $\partial\Omega$ are the vertices v_i , $i = 1, \dots, I$.*

Proof. Under the assumption **(A1)** with $I \geq 1$, the arguments of the proof of Lemma 3.2 only fail in a neighbourhood of v_i , $i = 1, \dots, I$. Notice that **(A1)** with $I \geq 1$ and the second boundary condition from (2.3) yield that

$$\nabla u(v_i) = (0, 0)^\top, \forall i = 1, \dots, I.$$

Hence for any $i = 1, \dots, I$, we only have to show that there exists $\delta_i > 0$ such that u has only v_i as critical point in $\bar{\Omega} \cap B(v_i, \delta_i)$. For that purpose, we fix $i = 1, \dots, I$ and drop the index i for shortness. Then we proceed in three steps:

Step 1: Straighten the edges: Using the mapping Φ from the assumption **(A1)**, we denote by

$$\rho^*(w) = \rho(\Phi(w)), \forall w \in V^* := V \cap Q,$$

and

$$u^*(w) = u(\Phi(w)), \forall w \in \bar{V}^*.$$

By Lemma A.1, $u^* \in C^1(\bar{V}^*)$ is a solution of

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(\rho^* \nabla u^*) = 0 & \text{in } V^*, \\ u^* = 0 & \text{on } \partial V^* \cap \partial Q. \end{cases}$$

Step 2: Odd reflection with respect to the axis $\operatorname{Re}(w) = 0$: With the notation $w \equiv (x_1, y_1)$, with $x_1, y_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$V^{**} = \{(x_1, y_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (|x_1|, y_1) \in V^*\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{**}(x_1, y_1) &= \begin{cases} \rho^*(x_1, y_1) & \text{if } (x_1, y_1) \in V^*, \\ \rho^*(-x_1, y_1) & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\ u^{**}(x_1, y_1) &= \begin{cases} u^*(x_1, y_1) & \text{if } (x_1, y_1) \in \bar{V}^*, \\ -u^*(-x_1, y_1) & \text{if } (x_1, y_1) \in \bar{V}^{**} \setminus \bar{V}^*. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We directly check that $u^{**} \in H^1(V^{**}) \cap C(\overline{V^{**}})$ is a solution of

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(\rho^{**} \nabla u^{**}) = 0 & \text{in } V^{**}, \\ u^{**} = 0 & \text{on } \partial V^{**} \cap \partial \pi_+, \end{cases}$$

where $\pi_+ := \{(x_1, y_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y_1 > 0\}$ is the right-hand half-plane.

Step 3: Odd reflection with respect to the axis $\operatorname{Im}(w) = 0$: As before, by setting

$$V^{***} = \{(x_1, y_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (|x_1|, |y_1|) \in V^{**}\},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{***}(x_1, y_1) &= \begin{cases} \rho^{**}(x_1, y_1) & \text{if } (x_1, y_1) \in V^{**}, \\ \rho^{**}(x_1, -y_1) & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\ u^{***}(x_1, y_1) &= \begin{cases} u^{**}(x_1, y_1) & \text{if } (x_1, y_1) \in \overline{V^{**}}, \\ -u^{**}(x_1, -y_1) & \text{if } (x_1, y_1) \in \overline{V^{***}} \setminus \overline{V^{**}}, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

we find that $u^{***} \in H^1(V^{***}) \cap C(\overline{V^{***}})$ and is a solution of

$$(3.4) \quad \operatorname{div}(\rho^{***} \nabla u^{***}) = 0 \text{ in } V^{***}.$$

Note that by construction and the second boundary condition from (2.3), $u^{***} = 0$ on the segments $S_1 := V^{***} \cap \{x_1 = 0\}$ and $S_2 = V^{***} \cap \{y_1 = 0\}$, while due to (2.4),

$$(3.5) \quad 0 < |u^{***}| < 1 \text{ on } \overline{V^{***}} \setminus (S_1 \cup S_2).$$

Applying [5, Theorem 2.1] to u^{***} in V^{***} , we deduce that the critical points of u^{***} in V^{***} are isolated without accumulation points inside V^{***} . Hence in a sufficiently small neighbourhood W^{***} of 0 (in $\mathbb{R}^2$), the sole critical point of u^{***} in $V^{***} \cap W^{***}$ is 0.

Coming back to u , there are no other critical points of u near v . $\blacksquare$

4 Number of critical points inside the domain

The goal of this section is to prove that, under our original assumptions, the number of critical points in Ω of the solution u of problem (2.2)-(2.3) is exactly the number of connected components of $\mathcal{B}$ minus 1. Our proof is based on the argument principle.

Let us start with the notion of index.

Definition 4.1. Let $u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ be a solution of (2.2)-(2.3). Let $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ be a simply connected domain with a Lipschitz boundary, and let $D \subset \subset \Omega'$. If u has no geometric critical points on ∂D , then the index of u in D is defined by

$$(4.1) \quad I(D, u) = I(\chi(D), h) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{+\partial\chi(D)} d\arg(\nabla h),$$

where χ is the quasi-conformal mapping from Ω' to the unit ball $B_1(0)$ built up in [5, Theorem 2.1] such that $h = u \circ \chi^{-1}$ is harmonic in $B_1(0)$. In other words, $-2\pi I(D, u)$ is the increase of the angle $\arg(\nabla h)$ along the contour $+\partial\chi(D)$ oriented counterclockwise.

Moreover, we define the geometric index of u at $z_0 \in \Omega$ as

$$(4.2) \quad I(z_0, u) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} I(B_r(z_0), u).$$

As h is harmonic, $I(B_1(0), h)$ is the number of critical points of h inside $B_1(0)$ (when counted according to their multiplicities), and hence the number critical points of u inside D .

It turns out that the C^1 regularity of u leads to the invariance of the index, namely the next result holds.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ be a solution of (2.2)-(2.3). Let $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ be a simply connected domain with a Lipschitz boundary, and let $D \subset \subset \Omega'$. Assume further that u has no geometric critical points on ∂D , then*

$$(4.3) \quad I(D, u) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{+\partial D} d \arg(\nabla u).$$

Proof. As quasi-conformal mappings are orientation-preserving mappings, the quasi-conformal mapping χ does not change the increase of the argument, when passing from ∇u to ∇h . More precisely, the chain rule yields

$$\partial_z u(z) = [\partial_w h](\chi(z))[\partial_z \chi](z),$$

where w is the space variable in $B(0, 1)$. Thus, by using the properties of the logarithm,

$$-\arg(\nabla u) = -\arg[(\nabla h) \circ \chi] + \arg(\partial_z \chi).$$

But our assumption on u guarantees that $[\partial_w h] \circ \chi$ is different from zero in a neighbourhood of ∂D , therefore $\partial_z \chi$ is continuous on ∂D , does not vanish on ∂D and varies continuously with orientation preserved. This implies that $\partial_z \chi$ returns to its initial value after a full turn, or equivalently

$$\int_{+\partial D} d \arg(\partial_z \chi) = 0.$$

These two last identities and (4.1) prove (4.3). ■

Theorem 4.3. *Assume that the solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) belongs to $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ and satisfies (2.5) and (2.6). Then, recalling that M is the number of simply connected components of $\mathcal{B}$, u has $M - 1$ critical points in Ω (when counted according to their multiplicities).*

Proof. By Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, we fix $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that the set

$$\Omega_\varepsilon = \{x \in \Omega : \varepsilon < u(x) < 1 - \varepsilon\},$$

is such that $\nabla u \neq (0, 0)^\top$ in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$. Hence as $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$, by the implicit function theorem, Ω_ε has a C^1 boundary. Further again for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, due to (2.5) and (2.6), we will have

$$(4.4) \quad \partial_n u < 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_\varepsilon^{\text{ext}} := \{x \in \Omega : u(x) = \varepsilon\},$$

$$(4.5) \quad \partial_n u > 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_\varepsilon^{\text{int}} := \{x \in \Omega : u(x) = 1 - \varepsilon\}.$$

Now since the result of [5] is based on oriented contour integrals (cfr Lemma 4.2), we proceed locally on simply connected oriented and disjoint patches D_k , $k = 1, \dots, K$ of Ω_ε , whose union is Ω_ε . Since the critical points of u are finite, without loss of generality, we can further assume that $\partial D_k \cap \partial D_{k'}$, with $k \neq k'$, has no critical point of u . Further for each $k = 1, \dots, K$, we can assume

that each D_k is included into a larger simply connected open set Ω'_k included into Ω . Therefore the total number N of critical points of u in Ω is equal to the total number of critical points of u in Ω_ε and by Lemma 4.2, N is given by

$$N = \sum_{k=1}^K I(D_k, u).$$

Since on this sum, the contribution on $\partial D_k \cap \partial D_{k'}$ cancels, we get

$$N = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{+\partial\Omega_\varepsilon} d \arg(\nabla u).$$

Finally using (4.4), (4.5) and the boundary conditions on u on $\Gamma_\varepsilon^{\text{ext}}$ and $\Gamma_\varepsilon^{\text{int}}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{+\Gamma_\varepsilon^{\text{ext}}} d \arg(\nabla u) &= -1, \\ \int_{+\Gamma_\varepsilon^{\text{int}}} d \arg(\nabla u) &= M. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that M is the number of connected components of $\mathcal{B}$. This implies that $N = M - 1$. ■

5 Degenerate density in case of piecewise $C^{1,1}$ exterior boundary

In this section, we assume that **(A1)** holds with $I \geq 1$. As explained in the introduction, in that case, $\rho(x)$ should tend to zero as x approaches the corner v_i . Therefore we are weakening the assumption (2.1) in the following way

$$(5.1) \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \delta_\varepsilon > 0 : \delta_\varepsilon \leq \rho \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \setminus \cup_{i=1}^I \bar{B}(v_i, \varepsilon).$$

In that situation, (2.4) does not follow from the maximum principle in Ω , but it can be restored with the sole assumption that u is positive in Ω , as the next Lemma shows.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that the solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) belongs to $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ and that*

$$(5.2) \quad u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Then (2.4) remains valid.

Proof. Since u is continuous in $\bar{\Omega}$ and is zero on $\partial\mathcal{O}$, given $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ small enough such that

$$0 \leq u(x) \leq \kappa, \forall x \in \cup_{i=1}^I (\bar{B}(v_i, \varepsilon_1) \cap \bar{\Omega}).$$

Hence we can apply the maximum principle (see [16, Theorems 8.1 and 8.19] for instance) to u in $\Omega_{\varepsilon_1} := \Omega \setminus \cup_{i=1}^I \bar{B}(v_i, \varepsilon_1)$ to find

$$0 < u < 1 \text{ in } \Omega_{\varepsilon_1}.$$

Then the two above properties yield $u < 1$ in Ω . ■

Remark 5.2. For the applications to system (1.1), the assumption (5.2) is natural. Indeed if $\varphi \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ is solution of (1.1) and (1.6), then applying [16, Theorem 2.2] to the first equation of (1.1), we find that $\varphi > 0$ in Ω .

5.1 Critical points are isolated

Now the statement of Lemma 3.3 slightly differs and allows accumulation points near the corners.

Lemma 5.3. *Let the assumptions **(A1)** with $I \geq 1$ and (5.1) hold. Assume that the solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) belongs to $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ and satisfies (2.5), (2.6), and (5.2). Then u has isolated critical points in $\bar{\Omega}$ that can accumulate near the corners.*

Proof. It suffices to apply the arguments of the proof of Lemma 3.2 in $\Omega \setminus \cup_{i=1}^I \bar{B}(v_i, \varepsilon)$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$. ■

5.2 Number of critical points inside the domain

Since we cannot directly use the argument principle, we first combine the use of the level lines and the maximum principle. This allows us to show that the number of critical points in Ω is finite and hence use the argument principle.

If $z_0 \in \Omega$ is a critical point of index $I(z_0, u)$ of a solution $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ of (2.2)-(2.3), we recall from [5, Lemma 2.5] that there exists a neighborhood $U \subset \Omega$ of z_0 such that the level line

$$L(z_0, u) := \{x \in \Omega : u(x) = u(z_0)\},$$

is made of $I(z_0, u) + 1$ simple arcs, whose pairwise intersection consists of $\{z_0\}$. Note further that in this neighborhood, $u - u(z_0)$ changes its sign when crossing one half-arc (due to [20, §2.1] and [5, Theorem 2.1]). Then if $I(z_0, u) \geq 1$, the sub-level set

$$S_-(z_0, u) = \{x \in \Omega : u(x) < u(z_0)\},$$

and the super-level set

$$S_+(z_0, u) := \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > u(z_0)\}$$

can be decomposed into different open, connected, disjoint and non empty subsets, their number being possibly infinite. Let us show that this is not the case and further give some specific properties of these connected sets.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $z_0 \in \Omega$ be a critical point of index $I(z_0, u) \geq 1$ of a solution $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ of (2.2)-(2.3). Then we have that*

1. $S_-(z_0, u)$ is connected, and its boundary contains the boundary of $\mathcal{O}$.
2. the set $S_+(z_0, u)$ is made of a finite number $K_+(z_0, u)$ of connected and disjoint non empty subsets,

$$S_+(z_0, u) = \cup_{k=1}^{K_+(z_0, u)} S_{k,+}(z_0, u),$$

and for all $k = 1, \dots, K_+(z_0, u)$, the boundary of $S_{k,+}(z_0, u)$ contains the boundary of at least one B_m .

Consequently,

$$(5.3) \quad K_+(z_0, u) \leq M.$$

Further we have that

$$(5.4) \quad K_+(z_0, u) \geq I(z_0, u) + 1,$$

and therefore

$$(5.5) \quad I(z_0, u) \leq M - 1.$$

Proof. As $z_0 \in \Omega$, then $u(z_0) \in (0, 1)$ due to (2.4), and by the boundary condition (2.3), we get

$$(5.6) \quad L(z_0, u) \subset \Omega.$$

This directly implies that for any open, connected, and non empty component V_- of $S_-(z_0, u)$ (resp. V_+ of $S_+(z_0, u)$), $\overline{V_\pm}$ cannot be included into Ω . Indeed, if $\overline{V_\pm} \subset \Omega$, then its boundary would be included into $L(z_0, u)$. Hence using the maximum principle on u in $\overline{V_\pm}$, we deduce that $u = u(z_0)$ in $V_\pm$, which contradicts Lemma 5.3. The assertions concerning the sets $S_-(z_0, u)$ and $S_+(z_0, u)$ and the bound on $K_+(z_0, u)$ directly follow from these properties. Now (5.4) directly follows from the behavior of $u - u(z_0)$ in a neighborhood of z_0 described previously, because in that neighborhood there are $I(z_0, u) + 1$ open disjoint sets where $u - u(z_0) > 0$. ■

Theorem 5.5. *Let the assumptions (A1) with $I \geq 1$ and (5.1) hold. Assume that the solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) belongs to $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ and satisfies (2.5), (2.6), and (5.2). Then recalling that M is the number of simply connected components of $\mathcal{B}$, u has $M - 1$ critical points in Ω (when counted according to their multiplicities).*

Proof. 1. If $\mathcal{B}$ is simply connected, then $M = 1$, and hence the bound (5.5) directly forbids the existence of $z_0 \in \Omega$ such that $I(z_0, u) \geq 1$.

2. Assume now that $M \geq 2$, and that u has a critical point $z_0 \in \Omega$ of index $I(z_0, u) \geq 1$. Then we consider the set of all critical points $z_j \in \Omega$ of index $I(z_j, u) \geq 1$ such that $u(z_j) = u(z_0)$, $j = 1, \dots, J$, with $J \in \mathbb{N}$. We use the convention that $J = 0$ when such critical points do not exist.

Now assume that there exists another critical point $z^* \in \Omega$ of index $I(z^*, u) \geq 1$. Then we can distinguish between the following two cases:

- (i) if $u(z^*) < u(z_0)$, then $L(z^*, u)$ is contained in $S_-(z_0, u)$. Therefore, $S_-(z^*, u) \subset S_-(z_0, u)$ and the boundary of one $S_{k,+}(z^*, u)$, with $k \geq 1$, say $S_{1,+}(z^*, u)$, contains $\partial\mathcal{B}$, otherwise $L(z^*, u)$ would cross $L(z_0, u)$. This means that the boundary of $S_{2,+}(z^*, u)$ is contained in $L(z^*, u)$, and this is impossible, due to the maximum principle.
- (ii) if $u(z^*) > u(z_0)$ then, on one hand, $L(z^*, u)$ is contained in one $S_{k,+}(z_0, u)$, with $k \geq 1$ and, on the other hand, since the boundary of $S_-(z^*, u)$ contains $\partial\mathcal{O}$, $L(z^*, u)$ has to cross $L(z_0, u)$. This is a contradiction.

In conclusion such a critical point z^* does not exist, and therefore u has a finite number of critical points in Ω . This implies that we can now apply the arguments of the proof of Theorem 4.3, by simply taking the simply connected open sets Ω'_k contained in $\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^I \overline{B}(v_i, \varepsilon')$, with $\varepsilon' > 0$ small enough. ■

6 Checking the Hopf lemma on the exterior/interior boundary

As already mentioned in the introduction, we recall that the Hopf lemma may not hold when ρ is not Hölder continuous. Thus, in this section we give some sufficient conditions on the regularity of the boundary of $\mathcal{O}$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}$) that guarantee that (2.5) (resp. (2.6)) holds. More precisely, we suppose that the boundary of $\mathcal{O}$ is piecewise analytic, except at a finite number of points, where the interior angle formed by the two tangents is equal to $\frac{\pi}{2}$. Namely, we assume the following two conditions and (A1).

(A2) There exist $a_i \in \partial\mathcal{O} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^I \{v_j\}$, $i = I+1, \dots, I+J$, with $J \in \mathbb{N}^*$, where the boundary coincides locally with the image by a conformal map of a half plane (identifying $\mathbb{R}^2$ with $\mathbb{C}$). Namely, there exist a neighbourhood U_i of a_i in $\mathbb{C}$, an open, non empty, simply connected and bounded set V_i of $\mathbb{C}$ such that $0 \in V_i$ and a conformal mapping

$$\Phi_i : V_i \cap \sigma_+ \rightarrow U_i \cap \Omega,$$

where $\sigma_+ := \{(x_1, y_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 > 0\}$ is the right-hand half-plane.

(A3) The set $\cup_{i=1}^{I+J} \overline{U_i} \cap \overline{\Omega}$ is covering the whole boundary of $\mathcal{O}$.

Theorem 6.1 (Hopf lemma on the exterior boundary). *Assume that conditions **(A2)** to **(A3)** are satisfied, together with **(A1)**. Suppose that $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and assume that (2.1) holds. Let $u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ be the solution of (2.2)-(2.3). Then (2.5) holds.*

Proof. 1. Let us start by proving (2.5) when **(A2)** to **(A3)** are satisfied and $\partial\mathcal{O}$ is $C^{1,1}$.

a. For a point a_i , with $i \geq 1$, we first straighten the boundary of $U_i \cap \mathcal{O}$ by means of the conformal map Φ_i . This procedure directly leads to problem (3.3). Hence an odd reflection with respect to the axis $\text{Re}(w) = 0$ leads to the solution $u^{***} \in H^1(V^{***})$ of (3.4) that satisfies $u^{***} = 0$ on the segment $S_1 := \overline{V^{***}} \cap \{x_1 = 0\}$ and

$$0 < |u^{***}| < 1 \text{ on } \overline{V^{***}} \setminus S_1.$$

Hence by [5, Lemma 2.5] we conclude that $\nabla u^{***} \neq (0, 0)^\top$ along S_1 and consequently $\nabla u \neq (0, 0)^\top$ along $U_i \cap \partial\mathcal{O}$.

b. Conclusion: By the assumption **(A3)**,

$$\nabla u \neq (0, 0)^\top \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O},$$

and as the second boundary condition from (2.3) implies that the tangential derivative is zero on $\partial\mathcal{O}$, we can conclude that (2.5) holds.

2. We now prove (2.5) when **(A1)** with $I \geq 1$, **(A2)** and **(A3)** are satisfied.

a. For a point a_i , with $i \geq I+1$, the arguments of point 1 yield $\nabla u \neq (0, 0)^\top$ along $U_i \cap \partial\mathcal{O}$.

b. For a corner v_i , $i = 1, \dots, I$, we follow the arguments of the proof of Lemma 3.3. More precisely, with the different changes of variables, we arrive at showing that $u^{***} \in H^1(V^{***})$ and is a solution of (3.4) that satisfies (3.5) and that $u^{***} = 0$ on the segments $S_1 := \overline{V^{***}} \cap \{x_1 = 0\}$ and $S_2 = \overline{V^{***}} \cap \{y_1 = 0\}$. This implies that 0 is a critical point of u^{***} and by [5, Lemma 2.5] applied to u^{***} in V^{***} , the points of $S_1 \setminus \{0\}$ and $S_2 \setminus \{0\}$ cannot be critical points of index ≥ 1 . Hence $\nabla u^{***} \neq (0, 0)^\top$ along $S_1 \setminus \{0\}$ and $S_2 \setminus \{0\}$. Coming back to u , we get that $\nabla u \neq (0, 0)^\top$

along $(U_i \cap \partial\mathcal{O}) \setminus \{v_i\}$.

c. Conclusion: By the assumption **(A3)**,

$$\nabla u \neq (0, 0)^\top \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{O} \setminus \cup_{i=1}^I \{v_i\},$$

and as the second boundary condition from (2.3) implies that the tangential derivative is zero on $\partial\mathcal{O} \setminus \cup_{i=1}^I \{v_i\}$, we can conclude that (2.5) holds. ■

This result actually extends to the case of a degenerate density.

Corollary 6.2. *Let the assumptions **(A1)** with $I \geq 1$, **(A2)** and **(A3)** be satisfied and assume that (5.1) holds. Let $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ be the solution of (2.2)-(2.3) that satisfies (5.2). Then (2.5) holds.*

Proof. Only step 1 of the previous Theorem has to be adapted. Indeed in the first step, the sole difference is that the density ρ^{***} in (3.4) degenerates near 0. But due to (5.1), we can apply [5, Lemma 2.5] in the simply connected domains

$$V^{***} \cap \{(x_1, y_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y_1 > -|x_1|\} \setminus B(0, \varepsilon),$$

and

$$V^{***} \cap \{(x_1, y_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y_1 < |x_1|\} \setminus B(0, \varepsilon),$$

with $\varepsilon > 0$ as small as we want, to deduce that $\nabla u^{***} \neq (0, 0)^\top$ along $S_1 \setminus B(0, \varepsilon)$ and $S_2 \setminus B(0, \varepsilon)$. As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, we deduce as before that $\nabla u^{***} \neq (0, 0)^\top$ along $S_1 \setminus \{0\}$ and $S_2 \setminus \{0\}$. ■

Obviously adapting the assumptions **(A2)** to **(A3)** to $\partial\mathcal{B}$, we directly get (2.6). More precisely, we require:

(A4) there exist $v_k^* \in \partial\mathcal{B}$, $k = 1, \dots, J$, with $K \in \mathbb{N}^*$, where the boundary coincides locally with the image by a conformal map of a half plane (identifying $\mathbb{R}^2$ with $\mathbb{C}$), namely there exist a neighbourhood U_k^* of v_k^* in $\mathbb{C}$, an open, non empty, simply connected and bounded set V_k^* of $\mathbb{C}$ such that $0 \in V_k^*$ and a conformal mapping

$$\Phi_k^* : V_k^* \cap \pi_+ \rightarrow U_k^* \cap \Omega.$$

(A5) The set $\cup_{k=1}^K \overline{U_k^* \cap \Omega}$ is covering the whole boundary of $\mathcal{B}$.

Corollary 6.3 (Hopf lemma on the interior boundary). *Let the assumptions **(A4)** to **(A5)** be satisfied and assume that (5.1) holds. Let $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ be the solution of (2.2)-(2.3) that satisfies (5.2). Then (2.6) holds.*

Proof. We apply the above arguments to $1 - u$. ■

7 Numerical illustrations

In this section, we present different numerical tests that confirm our theoretical results. To compute the numerical approximation of the solution of (2.2)-(2.3) with different values of ρ , we use the Finite Element Method with the help of the library *Netgen* [26] from *python*. Here we restrict ourselves to piecewise $\mathbb{P}_1$ finite elements with a mesh of meshsize $h = 0.005$.

7.1 An annulus

We first start with the case of an annulus Ω of center 0, of interior radius 0.05 and exterior radius 1, where Γ_c corresponds to the boundary of the disc $D(0, 0.05)$ and Γ_d corresponds to the boundary of the disc $D(0, 1)$. We first take for ρ the smooth function and uniformly bounded from below:

$$\rho(x_1, x_2) = x_1^2 + 1/8.$$

In this situation, the solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) clearly belongs to $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ by standard regularity results. Further as mentionned in the introduction as $\rho \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$, the assumptions (2.5), (2.6) are satisfied. Therefore by Theorem 4.3, u has no critical points in Ω . We then compute an approximation of this solution using the numerical scheme described above. In Figure 2, we have shown 20 level lines of u and a gradient map on a coarse mesh. Both figures confirm that u has indeed no critical points in Ω .




Figure 2: An annulus and a smooth ρ : 20 level lines (left) and a gradient map (right)

In Figure 3, we can see that the same phenomenon occurs for the same domain Ω and the choice of

$$\rho(x_1, x_2) = |x_1| + 1/8,$$

that is only Lipschitz, but is still uniformly bounded from below. With such a choice using odd and even reflections with respect to the x_1 axis, we can show that the solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) belongs to $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$, while it satisfies (2.5), (2.6) due to the Lipschitz property of ρ .

7.2 The unit disc with three holes

Now we consider the domain $\Omega = B(0, 1) \setminus \cup_{i=1}^3 \bar{B}(c_i, 0.01)$, where

$$c_1 = (0.5, 0), c_2 = 0.5(\cos(2\pi/3), \sin(2\pi/3)), c_3 = 0.5(\cos(4\pi/3), \sin(4\pi/3)),$$

and take first the smooth function and uniformly bounded from below:

$$(7.1) \quad \rho(x_1, x_2) = x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 1.$$




Figure 3: An annulus and a nonsmooth ρ : 20 level lines (left) and a gradient map (right)

Clearly the assumptions on the solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) in Theorem 4.3 are satisfied and therefore u has two critical points in $\bar{\Omega}$. But the choice of ρ and of the holes imply that this solution is invariant by a rotation of $2\pi/3$, therefore $(0,0)$ is the unique critical point of geometric index 2. Again, we have computed an approximation of this solution and 20 level lines and a gradient map on a coarse mesh of u are presented in Figure 4 and suggest that indeed the critical point of u in Ω is $(0,0)$.




Figure 4: The unit ball with 3 holes and a smooth ρ : 20 level lines (left) and a gradient map (right)

For the same configuration, we have also tested the case

$$\rho(x_1, x_2) = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2},$$

that is not covered by our theory because ρ degenerates at an interior point of the domain. Nevertheless a solution of problem (2.2)-(2.3) exists in some weighted Sobolev space, see [14, 11] for instance, and Figure 5 suggests that the unique critical point of u in Ω is $(0,0)$.




Figure 5: The unit ball with 3 holes and a degenerate ρ : 20 level lines (left) and a gradient map (right)

7.3 A half-disc with one hole

Now we consider the domain $\Omega = B_+ \setminus \bar{B}((0, 0), 0.01)$, where

$$(7.2) \quad B_+ = \{(x_1, x_2) \in B((0, -1), 2) : x_1 > -1\},$$

and we first take ρ defined by (7.1). Again as ρ is smooth, the assumptions on the solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) in Theorem 4.3 are satisfied, and therefore u has no critical points in Ω . This property is confirmed by Figures 6.




Figure 6: A half-disc with 1 hole and a smooth ρ : 20 level lines (left) and a gradient map (right)

Let us now take

$$\rho(x_1, x_2) = \sqrt{(x_1 - 2)^2 + (x_2 + 1)^2},$$

that degenerates at the vertex $(2, -1)$ of Ω but satisfies (5.1). In such a case, a solution of problem (2.2)-(2.3) exists in some weighted Sobolev space, see again [14, 11] for instance, hence its C^1 regularity is not guaranteed. Nevertheless Figure 7 seems to indicate that the solution has no critical points in Ω .




Figure 7: A half-disc with 1 hole and a degenerate ρ : 20 level lines (left) and a gradient map (right)

7.4 An half-disc with three holes

Now we consider the domain $\Omega = B_+ \setminus \cup_{i=1}^3 \bar{B}(c_i, 0.01)$, where B_+ is given by (7.2), $c_1 = (-0.5, 0)$, $c_2 = (0, -0.5)$, and $c_3 = (0.5, 0)$ and take ρ defined by (7.1). Again as ρ is smooth, the assumptions on the solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) in Theorem 4.3 are satisfied, and therefore u has two critical points in Ω . This property is confirmed by Figure 8 where the critical points seem to be near $(-0.25, -0.25)$ and $(0.25, -0.25)$.




Figure 8: A half-disc with 3 holes and a smooth ρ : 20 level lines (left) and a gradient map (right)

7.5 An annulus with discontinuous coefficients

In this last subsection, we want to treat the case where the coefficient ρ is discontinuous. In this case, as mentionned in section 2, the solution of (2.2)-(2.3) is in general no more in $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$, see Remark 2.1. Therefore even if we are slightly outside our regularity assumptions, we want to check analytically or numerically if the solution of (2.2)-(2.3) may have or not critical points for with a piececewise constant coefficient ρ .

For that purpose, we consider the annulus of subsection 7.1 and take different choices of ρ .

The first choice consists in taking a radially symmetric coefficient ρ , namely

$$\rho(x) = \begin{cases} \rho_- & \text{if } r_0 < |x| < r_1, \\ \rho_+ & \text{if } r_1 < |x| < 1, \end{cases}$$

where ρ_-, ρ_+ are two positive real numbers and $0 < r_0 < r_1 < 1$ (here r_0 can be arbitrary). In that case, we readily check that the exact solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) is radial and is given in polar coordinates (r, θ) by

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} 1 + a_- \ln\left(\frac{r}{r_0}\right) & \text{if } r_0 < r < r_1, \\ a_+ \ln r & \text{if } r_1 < r < 1, \end{cases}$$

where

$$a_+ = \frac{\rho_-}{\rho_+} a_- \text{ and } a_- = \left(\frac{\rho_-}{\rho_+} \ln r_1 - \ln\left(\frac{r_1}{r_0}\right) \right)^{-1}$$

are both negative. This implies that

$$\nabla u(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{a_-}{r} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } r_0 < r < r_1, \\ \frac{a_+}{r} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } r_1 < r < 1, \end{cases}$$

which means that u has no critical points, see Figure 9 for an illustration with $r_0 = 0.05$, $r_1 = 0.5$, $\rho_- = 1$, and $\rho_+ = 21$.

The second choice consists in taking a non radially symmetric coefficient ρ , namely

$$\rho(x) = \begin{cases} \rho_- & \text{if } y < y_1, \\ \rho_+ & \text{if } y > y_1, \end{cases}$$

where y_1 is a real number in $(-1, 1)$. In the case $y_1 = 0$, we readily check that the exact solution u of (2.2)-(2.3) is radial and is given in polar coordinates (r, θ) by

$$u(x) = \frac{\ln r}{\ln 0.05}.$$

In other words, it is independent of ρ_- and ρ_+ and has no critical points. If y_1 is different from 0, there is no analytic expression of the solution. We therefore perform a numerical simulation with $y_1 = 0.5$ that corresponds to the case when the line of discontinuity of ρ does not cut the interior boundary, $\rho_- = 1$, and $\rho_+ = 1001$. The level lines and the gradient map (again on a coarse mesh) are presented in Figure 10, and indicate that again u has no critical points. Further even if the solution is singular at the intersecting points between the exterior boundary and the line of discontinuity of ρ (see Remark 2.1), the singular behavior seems to be very weak and therefore the influence of the line of discontinuity on the level lines is weak.




Figure 9: The solution u (left) and $\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}$ (right) with respect to r for a radially discontinuous coefficients

Finally we consider the case where the line of discontinuity cuts the interior boundary. In that case the solution is also singular at the intersecting points between the interior boundary and the line of discontinuity (see Remark 2.1). For the annulus from subsection 7.1, by taking $y_1 = 0.025$ we obtain unsatisfactory numerical experiments probably due to the singular behavior of the solution and the fact that the radius of the interior ball is too small. Hence we perform a test with an interior ball of radius 0.5 and the line of discontinuity of ρ equal to $y = 0.35$, $\rho_- = 1$, and $\rho_+ = 1001$. From the obtained level lines and the gradient map (again on a coarse mesh) shown in Figure 11, the influence of the line discontinuity on the level lines is much more apparent, but again it seems that u has no critical points.

Acknowledgements

R. Magnanini is partially supported by the PRIN grant n. 20229M52AS of the Italian Ministry of University (MUR) by the Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM). M. Chauvier and S. Nicaise are grateful to Prof. Christophe Troestler (Université de Mons, Belgium) and J. Venel (Université Polytechnique Hauts-de-France, France) for valuable discussions on the topic of this paper.

A Conformal mappings preserve elliptic equations in divergence and diagonal form

Let U be an open and non empty set of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and let $\rho \in L^\infty(U)$ be such that

$$(A.1) \quad \rho \geq 0 \text{ a.e. in } U.$$

Let $u \in H^1(U)$ be a weak solution of

$$\operatorname{div}(\rho \nabla u) = 0 \text{ in } U,$$




Figure 10: An annulus with a piecewise constant ρ (discontinuous far from the interior boundary): 20 level lines (left) and a gradient map (right)

in the sense that

$$(A.2) \quad \int_U \rho \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dxdy = 0, \forall v \in H_0^1(U).$$

Let $F : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a conformal mapping and define functions $\hat{u}, \hat{\rho} : F(U) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by setting $u(z) = \hat{u}(F(z))$ and $\rho(z) = \hat{\rho}(F(z))$. The next lemma shows that $\hat{u}$ is a weak solution of

$$(A.3) \quad \operatorname{div}(\hat{\rho} \nabla \hat{u}) = 0 \text{ in } F(U).$$

Lemma A.1. *Under the previous assumptions, $\hat{u} \in H^1(\hat{U})$ is a weak solution of (A.3), in the sense that*

$$(A.4) \quad \int_{\hat{U}} \hat{\rho} \nabla \hat{u} \cdot \nabla \hat{v} = 0, \forall \hat{v} \in H_0^1(\hat{U}).$$

Proof. Let us first take $u, v \in C_0^1(U)$. Notice that in complex notation $\nabla u \cdot \nabla v = 4 \operatorname{Re}(\partial_z u \partial_{\bar{z}} v)$. By the chain rule, we have that $\partial_z u = (\partial_\zeta \hat{u}) F'(z)$, since F is holomorphic. Here, we use the change of variable: $\zeta = \xi + i\eta = F(x + iy) = F(z)$. Thus, we deduce that

$$\nabla u \cdot \nabla v = 4 \operatorname{Re}(\partial_\zeta \hat{u} \partial_{\bar{\zeta}} \hat{v}) |F'|^2 = (\nabla \hat{u} \cdot \nabla \hat{v}) |F'|^2.$$

Therefore, being as $|F'|^2 \, dxdy = d\xi d\eta$, we have that

$$0 = \int_U \rho \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dxdy = \int_{F(U)} \hat{\rho} \nabla \hat{u} \cdot \nabla \hat{v} \, d\xi d\eta.$$

Notice that $u, v \in H_0^1(U)$ if and only if $\hat{u}, \hat{v} \in H_0^1(F(U))$. Thus, the desired conclusion follows by density from the last identity. $\blacksquare$




Figure 11: An annulus with a piecewise constant ρ (discontinuous line cuts the interior boundary): 20 level lines (left) and a gradient map (right)

References

- [1] G. Alessandrini. An identification problem for an elliptic equation in two variables. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 145:265–295, 1986.
- [2] G. Alessandrini. Critical points of solutions of elliptic equations in two variables. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 14(2):229–256 (1988), 1987.
- [3] G. Alessandrini, D. Lupo, and E. Rosset. Local behavior and geometric properties of solutions to degenerate quasilinear elliptic equations in the plane. *Appl. Anal.*, 50(3-4):191–215, 1993.
- [4] G. Alessandrini and R. Magnanini. The index of isolated critical points and solutions of elliptic equations in the plane. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 19(4):567–589, 1992.
- [5] G. Alessandrini and R. Magnanini. Elliptic equations in divergence form, geometric critical points of solutions, and Stekloff eigenfunctions. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 25(5):1259–1268, 1994.
- [6] F. Amoroso, Vitantonio; Lattarulo. *Filamentary ion flow : theory and experiments*. Wiley-IEEE Press, 01 2014.
- [7] A. Butler, Z. Cendes, and J. Hoburg. Interfacing the finite-element method with the method of characteristics in self-consistent electrostatic field models. *Industry Applications, IEEE Transactions on*, 25:533 – 538, 06 1989.
- [8] M. Chauvier, S. Nicaise, C. Troestler, and J. Venel. An existence result and simulations of a space charges problem applied to HVDC transmission lines. in preparation, 2025.
- [9] S. Cristina, G. Dinelli, and M. Feliziani. Numerical computation of corona space charge and v-i characteristic in dc electrostatic precipitators. *Industry Applications, IEEE Transactions on*, 27:147 – 153, 02 1991.
- [10] D. Cruz-Uribe, K. Moen, and S. Rodney. Regularity results for weak solutions of elliptic PDEs below the natural exponent. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 195(3):725–740, 2016.

- [11] V. De Cicco and M. A. Vivaldi. Harnack inequalities for Fuchsian type weighted elliptic equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 21(9-10):1321–1347, 1996.
- [12] H. Deng, H. Liu, and L. Tian. Critical points of solutions to a quasilinear elliptic equation with nonhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. *J. Differential Equations*, 265(9):4133–4157, 2018.
- [13] H. Deng, H. Liu, and X. Yang. Critical points of solutions to a kind of linear elliptic equations in multiply connected domains. *Israel J. Math.*, 249(2):935–971, 2022.
- [14] E. B. Fabes, C. E. Kenig, and R. P. Serapioni. The local regularity of solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 7(1):77–116, 1982.
- [15] R. Finn and D. Gilbarg. Asymptotic behavior and uniqueness of plane subsonic flows. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 10:23–63, 1957.
- [16] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*. Springer, Berlin – Heidelberg – New York, 1977.
- [17] T. Guillod, M. Pfeiffer, and C. Franck. Improved coupled ion-flow field calculation method for ac/dc hybrid overhead power lines. *Power Delivery, IEEE Transactions on*, 29:2493–2501, 12 2014.
- [18] J. Lobry. A new numerical scheme for the simulation of corona fields. *Magnetics, IEEE Transactions on*, 50:541–544, 02 2014.
- [19] R. Magnanini. Sulla lipschitzianità delle soluzioni di equazioni ellittiche con coefficienti radiali. (The Lipschitz property of the solutions of elliptic equations with radial coefficients). *Le Matematiche (Catania)*, 35(1-2):311–324 (1983), 1980. (In Italian).
- [20] R. Magnanini. An introduction to the study of critical points of solutions of elliptic and parabolic equations. *Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste*, 48:121–166, 2016.
- [21] N. G. Meyers. An L^p -estimate for the gradient of solutions of second order elliptic divergence equations. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3)*, 17:189–206, 1963.
- [22] S. Nicaise and A.-M. Sändig. General interface problems I. *Math. Methods in the Appl. Sc.*, 17:395–429, 1994.
- [23] M. Perelmutter. Second order regularity of solutions of elliptic equations in divergence form with sobolev coefficients. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata (1923 -)*, 04 2025.
- [24] L. C. Piccinini and S. Spagnolo. On the Hölder continuity of solutions of second order elliptic equations in two variables. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3)*, 26:391–402, 1972.
- [25] J. C. Sabina de Lis. Hopf maximum principle revisited. *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, pages No. 115, 9, 2015.
- [26] J. Schöberl. Netgen/ngsolve. <https://ngsolve.org/>, 2022.
- [27] M. P. Sharma and V. Janiszewski. Analysis of corona losses on dc transmission lines: I-unipolar lines. *IEEE Trans. Power App. Syst.*, 88:718–731, 05 1969.

- [28] Z. G. Šeftel. Estimates in L_p of solutions of elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients and satisfying general boundary conditions and conjugacy conditions. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 149:48–51.
- [29] F. Xiao, B. Zhang, J. Mo, and H. Jinliang. Calculation of 3-d ion flow field at the crossing of hvdc transmission lines by method of characteristics. *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, PP:1–1, 08 2017.
- [30] B. Zhang, J. Mo, H. Yin, and H. Jinliang. Calculation of ion flow field around hvdc bipolar transmission lines by method of characteristics. *Magnetics, IEEE Transactions on*, 51:1–4, 03 2015.