

# Critical Slope Lemmas

K.-Y. Lam

December 18, 2023

This note is the proof of the critical slope lemmas taken from Imbert and Monneau. The proof for the one-dimensional case is detailed in [1, Lemmas 2.9 & 2.10]. The multi-dimensional case, stated below, is contained in [2], but the proof is omitted. Here we supply the proof for the multi-dimensional case, which is essentially the same as the one-dimensional case.

Define  $X^+$  as the half space

$$X^+ = \{(t, x, y) : y \geq 0\}.$$

Fix a point  $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0) \in X^+$ , and define the 3-dimensional half ball

$$B_r^+ = B_r^+(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0) = \{(t, x, y) \in X^+ : |(t - \bar{t}, x - \bar{x}, y)| < r\}.$$

**Lemma 0.1** ([2, Lemma A.9]). *Let  $u : B_1^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a lower semicontinuous function and suppose  $\phi(t, x, y)$  is a test function that touches  $u(t, x, y)$  from below at some  $(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$ . Define the critical slope at  $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$*

$$\underline{p} = \sup\{p : \exists r > 0, u(t, x, y) \geq \phi(t, x, y) + py \text{ for all } (t, x, y) \in B_\delta^+(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)\}. \quad (0.1)$$

If  $\underline{p} < +\infty$ , and  $u$  is a viscosity supersolution of

$$u_t + H(u_x, u_y) = 0 \quad (0.2)$$

then

$$\phi_t(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0) + H(\phi_x(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0), \underline{p}) \geq 0. \quad (0.3)$$

*Remark 0.2.* Note that  $\underline{p}$  is well-defined as the existence of test function implies the set of subdifferential is nonempty.

*Proof.* By the definition of  $\underline{p}$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  and  $(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) \in B_{\delta/2}^+(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$  such that

$$u(t, x, y) \geq \phi(t, x, y) + (\underline{p} - \varepsilon)y \quad \text{for all } (t, x, y) \in B_\delta^+(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0), \quad (0.4)$$

$$u(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) \leq \phi(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, 0) + (\underline{p} + \varepsilon)y_\varepsilon. \quad (0.5)$$

Now consider a smooth function  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow [-1, 0]$  such that

$$\Psi(t, x, y) = 0 \quad \text{in } B_{1/2}(0), \quad \Psi(t, x, y) = -1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 B_1(0)$$

and define

$$\Phi(t, x, y) = \phi(t, x, y) + 2\varepsilon\Psi_\delta(t, x, y) + (\underline{p} + \varepsilon)y,$$

where  $\Psi_\delta(t, x, y) = \delta\Psi\left(\frac{t-\bar{t}}{\delta}, \frac{x-\bar{x}}{\delta}, \frac{y}{\delta}\right)$  is bounded in  $C^1$  uniformly in  $\delta$ . Then we have

$$\Phi(t, x, y) = \phi(t, x, 0) - 2\varepsilon\delta + (\underline{p} + \varepsilon)y \leq u(t, x, y) \quad \text{on } \partial B_\delta^+(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0) \cap \{y > 0\}, \quad (0.6)$$

which is satisfied on the curved part of the boundary of  $B_\delta^+(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$ .

$$\Phi(t, x, 0) \leq \phi(t, x, 0) \leq u(t, x, 0) \quad \text{on } \{(t, x, y) \in \partial B_\delta^+(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0) \cap \{y > 0\}\}, \quad (0.7)$$

which is satisfied on the hyperplane part of the boundary of  $B_\delta^+(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$ .

$$\Phi(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) = \phi(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) + (\underline{p} + \varepsilon)y_\varepsilon > u(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon). \quad (0.8)$$

It follows that  $u - \Phi$  has an interior maximum point  $\bar{P}_\varepsilon = (\bar{t}_\varepsilon, \bar{x}_\varepsilon, \bar{y}_\varepsilon) \in B_\delta^+(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$ , which implies

$$\phi_t(\bar{P}_\varepsilon) + 2\varepsilon(\Psi_\delta)_t(\bar{P}_\varepsilon) + H(\partial_x\phi(\bar{P}_\varepsilon) + 2\varepsilon(\Psi_\delta)_x(\bar{P}_\varepsilon), 2\varepsilon(\Psi_\delta)_y(\bar{P}_\varepsilon) + \underline{p} + \varepsilon) \geq 0.$$

Since  $|(\Psi_\delta)_t| + |\nabla\Psi_\delta|$  are uniformly bounded in  $\delta$ , we may take  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  to deduce (0.3).  $\square$

**Lemma 0.3** ([2, Lemma A.9]). *Let  $u : B_1^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a lower semicontinuous function and suppose  $\phi(t, x, y)$  is a test function that touches  $u(t, x, y)$  from below at some  $(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$ . Define the critical slope at  $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$*

$$\underline{p} = \sup\{p : \exists r > 0, u(t, x, y) \geq \phi(t, x, 0) + py \text{ for all } (t, x, y) \in B_\delta^+(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)\}. \quad (0.9)$$

If  $\underline{p} < +\infty$ , and  $u$  and is a viscosity supersolution of

$$u_t + H(u_x, u_y) = 0 \quad (0.10)$$

then

$$\phi_t(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0) + H(\phi_x(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0), \underline{p}) \geq 0. \quad (0.11)$$

**Lemma 0.4** ([2, Lemma A.10]). *Let  $u : B_1^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an upper semicontinuous function and suppose  $\phi(t, x, y)$  is a test function that touches  $u(t, x, y)$  from above at some  $(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$ . Define the critical slope at  $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$*

$$\bar{p} = \inf\{p : \exists r > 0, u(t, x, y) \leq \phi(t, x, 0) + py \text{ for all } (t, x, y) \in B_\delta^+(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)\}. \quad (0.12)$$

If  $\bar{p} > -\infty$ , and  $u$  and is a viscosity subsolution of (0.10), then

$$\phi_t(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0) + H(\phi_x(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0), \bar{p}) \leq 0. \quad (0.13)$$

Furthermore, if  $H$  is coercive and  $u$  satisfies the weak continuity assumption, namely,

$$\limsup_{(t,x,y) \rightarrow (\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)} u(t, x, y) = u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0) \quad (0.14)$$

then  $\bar{p} > -\infty$ .

*Proof.* We only prove that  $\underline{p} > -\infty$  since this is the main difference with the proof of the previous lemma.

Assume that  $\underline{p} = -\infty$ , then there exists  $p_n \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $r_n \searrow 0$  such that

$$\phi(t, x, 0) + p_n y \geq u(t, x, y) \quad \text{in } B_n = B_{r_n}^+.$$

By replacing  $\phi$  by  $\phi + (t - \bar{t})^2 + (x - \bar{x})^2 + y^2$  if necessary, we may assume that

$$u(t, x, y) < \phi(t, x, 0) + p_n y \quad \text{in } B_n = B_{r_n}^+ \setminus \{(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)\}. \quad (0.15)$$

In particular, there exists  $\delta_n > 0$  such that  $\phi(t, x, 0) + p_n y \geq u + \delta_n$  on the curved part of  $\partial B_{r_n}^+$ . Since  $u$  satisfies (0.14), there exists  $P_\varepsilon = (t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) \rightarrow \bar{P} = (\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$  such that  $y_\varepsilon > 0$  and  $u(P_\varepsilon) \rightarrow u(\bar{P})$ .

We now introduce the following perturbed test function

$$\Psi(t, x, y) = \phi(t, x, 0) + p_n y + \frac{|y_\varepsilon|^2}{y}.$$

Fix  $n$  and observe that  $\Psi > u$  on both the curved and flat part of  $\partial B_{r_n}^+$ . Let  $P'_\varepsilon = (t'_\varepsilon, x'_\varepsilon, y'_\varepsilon)$  be the minimum point of  $\Psi - u$  in  $\partial B_{r_n}^+$ , then

$$(\phi + p_n \cdot -u)(P'_\varepsilon) \leq (\Psi - u)(P'_\varepsilon) \leq (\Psi - u)(P_\varepsilon) \approx \phi(P_\varepsilon) - u(P_\varepsilon) + \frac{y_\varepsilon^2}{y_\varepsilon} + o(1) = o(1),$$

since  $\phi$  touches  $u$  from above at  $\bar{P}$ . It follows that the minimum point  $P'_\varepsilon$  is achieved in the interior, so

$$\phi_t(P'_\varepsilon) + H(\phi_x(P'_\varepsilon), p_n - \frac{y_\varepsilon^2}{y^2}) \leq 0.$$

Denote  $p_n^0 = \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (p_n - \frac{y_\varepsilon^2}{y^2}) \in [-\infty, 0]$ , then

$$\phi_t(\bar{P}) + H(\phi_x(\bar{P}), p_n^0) \leq 0,$$

which in particular implies  $p_n^0 > -\infty$  and is bounded uniformly from below, independent of  $n$ . It follos that  $\{p_n\}$  is also bounded from below, which is a contradiction. The proof is now complete.  $\square$

## 1 Restating the lemmas using super/subdifferentials

This can be equivalently stated in terms of subdifferential.

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $u : X^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , be given. We say that the constant vector  $(-\lambda, q, p)$  is an element of the set  $D_{X^+}^- u(P_0)$  (which is called the set of subdifferential of  $u$  at  $P_0 = (t_0, x_0, y_0)$ ) provided that there exists  $r_0 > 0$  such that

$$u(t, x, y) \geq u(t_0, x_0, y_0) + (-\lambda, q, p) \cdot (t - t_0, x - x_0, y - y_0) + o(|t - t_0| + |x - x_0| + |y - y_0|)$$

for  $(t, x, y) \in B_r(t_0, x_0, y_0) \cap X^+$ .

Similarly, we define the set  $D_{X^+}^+ u(P_0)$  of superdifferential of  $u$  at  $P_0$  by reversing the inequality.

**Lemma 1.2.** Let  $u : B_1^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a lower semicontinuous function and suppose  $D_{X^+}^- u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$  is nonempty. Fix an element  $(-\lambda_0, q_0, p_0) \in D_{X^+}^- u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$  at  $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$ , and define the critical slope

$$\underline{p} = \sup\{p : (-\lambda_0, q_0, p) \in D_{X^+}^- u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)\}. \quad (1.1)$$

If  $\underline{p} < +\infty$ , and  $u$  and is a viscosity supersolution of (0.10), then

$$-\lambda_0 + H(q_0, \underline{p}) \geq 0. \quad (1.2)$$

**Lemma 1.3.** *Let  $u : B_1^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a upper semicontinuous function and suppose  $D_{X^+}^+ u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$  is nonempty. Fix an element  $(-\lambda_0, q_0, p_0) \in D_{X^+}^+ u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$  at  $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)$ , and define the critical slope*

$$\bar{p} = \inf\{p : (-\lambda_0, q_0, p) \in D_{X^+}^+ u(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, 0)\}. \quad (1.3)$$

*If  $\bar{p} > -\infty$ , and  $u$  and is a viscosity subsolution of (0.10), then*

$$-\lambda_0 + H(q_0, \bar{p}) \leq 0. \quad (1.4)$$

*Furthermore,  $\bar{p} > -\infty$  is verified if  $u$  satisfies the weak continuity assumption.*

## References

- [1] Cyril Imbert and Régis Monneau. Flux-limited solutions for quasi-convex Hamilton-Jacobi equations on networks. Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4), 50(2):357–448, 2017.
- [2] Cyril Imbert and Régis Monneau. Quasi-convex Hamilton-Jacobi equations posed on junctions: the multi-dimensional case. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 37(12):6405–6435, 2017.