

Zeitschrift: Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici
Herausgeber: Schweizerische Mathematische Gesellschaft
Band: 68 (1993)

Artikel: A regularity criterion for positive weak solutions of $- \Delta u = u \dots$
Autor: Pacard, F.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-51761>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 29.03.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

A regularity criterion for positive weak solutions of $-\Delta u = u^\alpha$

F. PACARD

1. Introduction

Let Ω be an open of $\mathbb{R}^n$, in this paper we want to study the regularity of positive weak solutions of

$$-\Delta u = u^\alpha, \tag{1}$$

where $\alpha > 1$ and $u \in L^\alpha(\Omega)$.

We only assume that u is a solution of (1) in the sense of distributions, i.e. for every $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)$ with compact support in Ω , we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \Delta \phi(x) u(x) \, dx = - \int_{\Omega} \phi(x) u^\alpha(x) \, dx.$$

The fact that we have assumed that the solution u is positive is crucial. Obviously, weak solutions of (1) have no reason to be regular on all of Ω and examples of singular solutions are given in [1], [2] and [5].

Define S to be the set of points $x \in \Omega$ for which u is not bounded in any neighborhood V of x in Ω . Let us notice that if u , solution of (1), is bounded in a neighborhood of a point $x_0 \in \Omega$, then the classical theory of regularity shows us that u is in fact regular in a neighborhood of x_0 . With this definition, S the set of singularities of u , is a closed subset of Ω .

The problem is to determine the structure of S . This structure can be very complicated as the recent work of R. Schoen and S. T. Yau [8] shows in the case of the critical exponent $\alpha = (n+2)/(n-2)$.

A reasonable conjecture seems to be the following:

The Hausdorff dimension of the set of singularities is less than or equal to

$$n - \frac{2\alpha}{\alpha - 1}, \quad \text{if } \alpha \geq \frac{n}{n-2}.$$

Let us notice that in the case where $\alpha < n/(n-2)$, a classical bootstrap argument shows that weak solutions of (1) are in fact regular.

For $u \in L^1(\Omega)$, we define the map $I_{n-2}u(x) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ by

$$I_{n-2}u(x) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{u(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2}} dy.$$

Multiplied by a suitable constant, $I_{n-2}u$ is nothing else than the Poisson kernel of u .

We can now give the principal result of our paper:

THEOREM 1. *For $\alpha \geq n/(n-2)$, let u be a positive weak solution of (1) and suppose that the map $I_{n-2}u^{\alpha-1} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ defined as above is continuous from Ω into $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. Then the Hausdorff dimension of the singular set of u is less than or equal to $n - 2\alpha/(\alpha - 1)$.*

Let us emphasize that we allow $I_{n-2}u^{\alpha-1}$ to take infinite values.

2. Intermediate results

The result given in the first part is an easy corollary of some stronger results that we give just after this definition:

DEFINITION 1. Let $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. We define the jump of f at the point $x \in \Omega$ by

$$S(f)(x) = \overline{\lim}_{y \rightarrow x} f(y) - \underline{\lim}_{y \rightarrow x} f(y).$$

We add the following convention: If $\underline{\lim}_{y \rightarrow x} f(y) = +\infty$, then $S(f)(x) = 0$.

We can now state our ϵ -regularity result:

PROPOSITION 1. *Let $\alpha \geq n/(n-2)$. There exists a constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any positive weak solution u of (1) the following holds:*

If

$$S(I_{n-2}u^{\alpha-1})(x) \leq \epsilon_0,$$

$$I_{n-2}u^{\alpha-1}(x) < +\infty,$$

and if

$$\overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{R^\lambda} \int_{B(x, R)} u^\alpha(y) dy < \epsilon_0,$$

then u is regular in a neighborhood of x .

Using this proposition we prove:

COROLLARY 1. *Let $\alpha \geq n/(n-2)$ and let $\epsilon_0 > 0$ be the constant given in Proposition 1. Assume that for all $x \in \Omega$ there holds $S(I_{n-2}u^{\alpha-1})(x) \leq \epsilon_0$. Then the Hausdorff dimension of the singular set of u is less than or equal to $n - 2\alpha/(\alpha - 1)$.*

Notice that if we assume, as in Theorem 1, that the map

$$I_{n-2}u^{\alpha-1} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$$

is continuous from Ω into $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, this implies that for all $x \in \Omega$, there holds $S(I_{n-2}u^{\alpha-1})(x) = 0$. Thus Theorem 1 is a consequence of Corollary 1.

3. Proof of the results

The proof of the results is divided in a series of lemmas in order to simplify the reading.

The first lemma is an easy estimate that has already been used in [6]:

LEMMA 1. *Let u be a weak solution of (1) on Ω . Then for almost every $x \in \Omega$ we have the estimate*

$$u(x) \leq \frac{1}{\omega_n r^n} \int_{B(x, r)} u(y) dy + \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n} \int_{B(x, r)} \frac{u^\alpha(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2}} dy,$$

where ω_n is the volume of the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $r < \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$.

Using the fact that u is a solution of (1), we can write for almost every $x \in \Omega$

$$\frac{d}{ds} \left(\frac{1}{s^{n-1}} \int_{\partial B(x, s)} u(y) d\sigma + \frac{1}{n-2} \int_0^s (t^{2-n} - s^{2-n}) \left(\int_{\partial B(x, t)} u^\alpha(y) d\sigma \right) dt \right) = 0.$$

Integrating from s to s' we derive the following formula

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s^{n-1}} \int_{\partial B(x, s)} u(y) d\sigma + \frac{1}{n-2} \int_0^s (t^{2-n} - s^{2-n}) \left(\int_{\partial B(x, t)} u^\alpha(y) d\sigma \right) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{s'^{n-1}} \int_{\partial B(x, s')} u(y) d\sigma + \frac{1}{n-2} \int_0^{s'} (t^{2-n} - s'^{2-n}) \left(\int_{\partial B(x, t)} u^\alpha(y) d\sigma \right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit when s' goes to 0 we obtain the estimate

$$s^{n-1} u(x) \leq \frac{1}{n\omega_n} \int_{\partial B(x, s)} u(y) d\sigma + \frac{s^{n-1}}{n(n-2)\omega_n} \int_{B(x, s)} \frac{u^\alpha(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2}} dy.$$

Then we integrate this inequality on $(0, r)$ in order to obtain the inequality of Lemma 1.

Multiplying the inequality obtained in the last lemma by $u^{\alpha-1}(x)$ and integrating on the ball of center x and radius r we obtain the lemma:

LEMMA 2. *Let u be a positive weak solution of (1) on Ω , then there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that for any $x \in \Omega$ and for any sufficiently small number $r > 0$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|B(x, r)|} \int_{B(x, r)} u^\alpha(y) dy &\leq c_0 \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{|B(x, 2r)|} \int_{B(x, 2r)} u^{\alpha-1}(y) dy \right)^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{|B(x, 2r)|} \int_{B(x, 2r)} u^\alpha(y) \left(\int_{B(y, 2r)} \frac{u^{\alpha-1}(z)}{|z-y|^{n-2}} dz \right) dy \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

If we apply now the Proposition 1.1, page 122 of [4], we obtain the following reverse Hölder inequality:

LEMMA 3. *Let u be a positive weak solution of (1) on Ω and assume that there exists some $R_0 > 0$ such that for all $x \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < R_0$ we have*

$$\int_{B(x, R_0)} \frac{u^{\alpha-1}(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2}} dy < \frac{1}{2c_0},$$

where c_0 is the constant given in the last lemma. Then there exist $\beta > \alpha$ and a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that for all $x \in \Omega$ and for all $r < R_0/2$ we have

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{|B(x, r)|} \int_{B(x, r)} u^\beta(y) dy \right\}^{1/\beta} \leq c_1 \left\{ \frac{1}{|B(x, 2r)|} \int_{B(x, 2r)} u^\alpha(y) dy \right\}^{1/\alpha}.$$

We now make the following assumption on solutions u of (1):

(H) There exists some $R_0 > 0$ for which

$$\int_{B(x, R_0)} \frac{u^{\alpha-1}(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2}} dy < \frac{1}{2c_0},$$

for all $x \in \Omega$.

Under the hypothesis (H) we can prove the lemma:

LEMMA 4. *There are some constants $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that, for any positive weak solution u of (1) satisfying (H), any $x \in \Omega$ and any $R < R_0$ for which*

$$\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > 2R_0$$

the following holds. If

$$\int_{B(x, R)} u^\alpha(y) dy < \epsilon_0^\alpha R^\lambda,$$

where $\lambda = n - 2\alpha/(\alpha - 1)$, then

$$\frac{1}{(\theta R)^\lambda} \int_{B(x, \theta R)} u^\alpha(y) dy \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R^\lambda} \int_{B(x, R)} u^\alpha(y) dy.$$

We prove this lemma by contradiction. Let us assume that, for some suitably chosen $\theta > 0$, there exists a sequence $\epsilon_n > 0$ going to 0, a sequence u_n of positive weak solutions of (1) satisfying (H), a sequence of points $x_n \in \Omega$ and a sequence of radii $R_n < R_0$ such that

$$\text{dist}(x_n, \partial\Omega) < 2R_0,$$

$$\frac{1}{(\theta R_n)^\lambda} \int_{B(x_n, R_n \theta)} u_n^\alpha(y) dy \geq \epsilon_n^\alpha / 2$$

and

$$\frac{1}{R_n^\lambda} \int_{B(x_n, R_n)} u_n^\alpha(y) dy = \epsilon_n^\alpha.$$

Define $v_n(x) = R_n^{2/(\alpha-1)} u_n(x_n + R_n x)$ and notice that v_n is a weak positive solution of (1) on $B(0, 2)$.

Moreover, the following estimates hold

$$\frac{1}{\theta^\lambda} \int_{B(0, \theta)} v_n^\alpha(y) dy \geq \epsilon_n^\alpha / 2$$

and

$$\int_{B(0, 1)} v_n^\alpha(y) dy = \epsilon_n^\alpha.$$

In addition, from (H), for all $x \in B(0, 1)$, we have the inequality

$$\int_{B(x, 1)} \frac{v_n^{\alpha-1}(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2}} dy < \frac{1}{2c_0}.$$

Thus, the reverse Hölder inequality that has been proved in Lemma 3 holds for the sequence v_n on $B(0, 1)$. We deduce from this that the sequence $w_n = v_n / \epsilon_n$ is solution of the equation $-\Delta w_n = \epsilon_n^{\alpha-1} w_n^\alpha$ and satisfies

$$\left(\int_{B(0, 1/2)} w_n^\beta(y) dy \right)^{1/\beta} \leq c_1 \left(\int_{B(0, 1)} w_n^\alpha(y) dy \right)^{1/\alpha},$$

$$\frac{1}{\theta^\lambda} \int_{B(0, \theta)} w_n^\alpha(y) dy \geq 1/2$$

and

$$\int_{B(0, 1)} w_n^\alpha(y) dy = 1.$$

The sequence w_n being bounded in $L^\beta(B(0, 1/2))$ and in $L^\alpha(B(0, 1))$, we can take a subsequence, that we will still denote by w_n , such that

$$w_n \rightarrow w \text{ strongly in } L^1(B(0, 1)),$$

$$w_n \rightarrow w \text{ almost everywhere in } B(0, 1),$$

$$w_n \rightharpoonup w \text{ weakly in } L^\alpha(B(0, 1)),$$

$$w_n \rightarrow w \text{ strongly in } L^\alpha(B(0, 1/2)).$$

Let us notice that, passing to the limit in the equation satisfied by w_n , we get $\Delta w = 0$ in $B(0, 1)$ and also $w \geq 0$.

Passing to the weak limit we finally derive the estimate

$$\int_{B(0, 1)} w^\alpha(x) dx \leq 1.$$

w being harmonic, we deduce from this information that for all $x \in B(0, 1/2)$ we can write

$$w(x) = \frac{1}{|B(x, 1/2)|} \int_{B(x, 1/2)} w(y) dy,$$

whence we get the inequality

$$\frac{1}{\theta^\lambda} \int_{B(0, \theta)} w^\alpha(y) dy \leq c_2 \theta^{n-\lambda} \left(\int_{B(0, 1)} w(y) dy \right)^\alpha.$$

Holder's inequality allows us to conclude that

$$\frac{1}{\theta^\lambda} \int_{B(0, \theta)} w^\alpha(y) dy \leq c_3 \theta^{n-\lambda} \int_{B(0, 1)} w^\alpha(y) dy \leq c_3 \theta^{n-\lambda}.$$

If at the beginning we choose θ such that $c_3 \theta^{n-\lambda} < 1/2$ we obtain a contradiction. Hence with this choice the hypothesis cannot be true and this proves the lemma.

We are now able to state a partial regularity result:

LEMMA 5. *Any u positive weak solution of (1) satisfying (H) is regular on Ω except for a closed set whose Hausdorff dimension is less than or equal to $n - 2\alpha/(\alpha - 1)$.*

Choose $\Omega' \subset \subset \Omega$. In assumption (H), up to a reduction of R_0 , we can assume that $R_0 < \text{dist}(\Omega', \partial\Omega)$. Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$ be the constant obtained in the former lemma and define

$$S = \left\{ x \in \Omega' / \forall R < R_0 \int_{B(x, R)} u^\alpha(y) dy \geq \epsilon_0^\alpha R^\lambda \right\}.$$

The set S is closed in Ω' and has Hausdorff dimension less than or equal to $n - 2\alpha/(\alpha - 1)$.

Take some point x_0 in $\Omega' \setminus S$. By definition of S , there exists some $R_1 < R_0$ such that

$$\int_{B(x, R_1)} u^\alpha(y) dy < \epsilon_0^\alpha R_1^\lambda,$$

for all x in some neighborhood of x_0 .

The assumptions of Lemma 4 are satisfied in some neighborhood of x_0 , so we can conclude that in some neighborhood of x_0 , we have

$$\frac{1}{(\theta R_1)^\lambda} \int_{B(x, \theta R_1)} u^\alpha(y) dy \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R_1^\lambda} \int_{B(x, R_1)} u^\alpha(y) dy.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, page 95 of [4], we claim that there exist some constants $\mu > \lambda$ and $c > 0$ for which

$$\int_{B(x, R)} u^\alpha(y) dy < cR^\mu,$$

for all x in some neighborhood of x_0 and for all $R < R_0$.

In fact we obtain by induction that, in some neighborhood of x_0 , we have

$$\frac{1}{(\theta^k R_1)^\lambda} \int_{B(x, \theta^k R_1)} u^\alpha(y) dy \leq 2^{-k} \frac{1}{R_1^\lambda} \int_{B(x, R_1)} u^\alpha(y) dy,$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Choosing $\mu > \lambda$ such that $\theta^{\mu-\lambda} > \frac{1}{2}$ we derive that for some constant $c > 0$ we have

$$\int_{B(x, \theta^k R_1)} u^\alpha(y) dy \leq c(\theta^k R_1)^\mu,$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, from which we derive the claim.

Therefore there exists a neighborhood $\omega \subset \Omega' \setminus S$ of x_0 such that $u \in L^{\alpha, \mu}(\omega)$. In a previous paper [7] we had obtained the following regularity criterion for weak solutions of (1):

THEOREM 2. *If $u \in L^{\alpha, \mu}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of (1) and if $\mu > n - 2\alpha/(\alpha - 1)$ then u is regular in all $\Omega' \subset \subset \Omega$.*

For a definition of $L^{\alpha, \mu}(\Omega)$ see [3] or [4].

Using this result we can conclude that u is regular in a neighborhood of x_0 . This finishes the proof of the lemma.

We can now derive the results stated in the second part of this paper.

Proof of Proposition 1. Proposition 1 is a simple consequence of Lemma 5.

On one hand, assume that the hypotheses of the proposition are satisfied at $x_0 \in \Omega$. Therefore there exists some $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{B(x_0, R_0)} \frac{u^{\alpha-1}(y)}{|x_0 - y|^{n-2}} dy < \epsilon_0.$$

On the other hand, for all x, x' in some neighborhood of x_0 we have

$$\left| \int_{B(x, R_0)} \frac{u^{\alpha-1}(y)}{|x - y|^{n-2}} dy - \int_{B(x', R_0)} \frac{u^{\alpha-1}(y)}{|x' - y|^{n-2}} dy \right| \leq 2\epsilon_0.$$

Finally the map

$$x \rightarrow \int_{\Omega \setminus B(x, R_0)} \frac{u^{\alpha-1}(y)}{|x - y|^{n-2}} dy,$$

is continuous in some neighborhood of x_0 . We deduce from all this the existence of a neighborhood $\omega \subset \Omega$ of x_0 such that, for all $x \in \omega$

$$\int_{B(x, R_0)} \frac{u^{\alpha-1}(y)}{|x - y|^{n-2}} dy < 4\epsilon_0.$$

Choosing ϵ_0 small enough, the conclusion of the proposition is then a simple application of the proof of Lemma 5.

Remark. In the case where $\alpha \geq 2$ we can drop the assumption $\int_{B(x, R)} u^\alpha(x) dx < \epsilon_0^\alpha R^\lambda$. In fact if $I_{n-2} u^{\alpha-1}(x) < +\infty$ then for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exist some $R > 0$ such that

$$\int_{B(x, 2R)} \frac{u^{\alpha-1}(y)}{|x - y|^{n-2}} dy < \epsilon.$$

So, we derive the estimate

$$\int_{B(x, 2R)} u^{\alpha-1}(x) dx < \epsilon(2R)^{n-2}.$$

Since $\alpha \geq 2$, Hölder's inequality gives us

$$\int_{B(x, 2R)} u(y) dy \leq \left(\int_{B(x, 2R)} u^{\alpha-1}(y) dy \right)^{1/(\alpha-1)} |B(x, 2R)|^{1-1/(\alpha-1)}.$$

Therefore

$$\int_{B(x, 2R)} u(y) dy \leq c_4 \epsilon^{1/(\alpha-1)} R^{\lambda+2}.$$

Now, in a previous paper [7] we have proved that there exists some constant $c_5 > 0$, depending only on the dimension of the space such that

$$R^2 \int_{B(x, R)} u^\alpha(y) dy \leq c_5 \int_{B(x, 2R)} u(y) dy,$$

for every positive weak solution of (1). The last two inequalities allow us to estimate

$$\int_{B(x, R)} u^\alpha(y) dy \leq c_6 \epsilon^{1/(\alpha-1)} R^\lambda,$$

for some constant $c_6 > 0$ depending only on the dimension of the space. Choosing $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\epsilon_0^\alpha > c_6 \epsilon^{1/(\alpha-1)}$ we get the desired estimate.

We are now left with the proof of Corollary 1.

Proof of Corollary 1. It is sufficient to show that the set of points x in Ω where $I_{n-2} u^{\alpha-1}(x) = +\infty$ forms a set of Hausdorff dimension less than or equal to $n - 2\alpha/(\alpha - 1)$. Denote by E this set, $u^{\alpha-1} \in L^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)}(\Omega)$, using the definition of the Riesz capacity, we deduce from this [9] that $R_{2, \alpha/(\alpha-1)}(E) = 0$, thus the Hausdorff dimension of E is less than or equal to $n - 2\alpha/(\alpha - 1)$. The result of Corollary 1 is then a consequence of Proposition 1.

4. General remarks

In order to find a regularity criterion for weak positive solutions of (1) one could be tempted to consider the natural quantity

$$\frac{1}{R^\lambda} \int_{B(x, R)} u^\alpha(y) dy,$$

where $\lambda = n - 2\alpha/(\alpha - 1)$, and conjecture that if this quantity is small enough then u is regular in some neighborhood of x . Unfortunately this conjecture does not hold in general as can be shown using the examples given in [5]. In the last pages of their paper the authors display all the radial positive solutions of (1) in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and if

$$\alpha \in \left(\frac{n}{n-2}, \frac{n+2}{n-2} \right)$$

then they show that there exists a positive radial solution u of (1) which is singular at 0 (i.e. $u(x)$ behaves like $C/|x|^{2/(\alpha-1)}$ near $x = 0$) and regular at ∞ (i.e. $u(x)$ behaves like $c/|x|^{n-2}$ near ∞). For some parameter δ we consider the family $u_\delta(x) = \delta^{2/(\alpha-1)}u(\delta x)$. It is easy to see that u_δ is a weak positive solution of (1) having a singularity at the origin and that the quantity

$$\frac{1}{R^\lambda} \int_{B(0, R)} u_\delta^\alpha(y) dy,$$

can be made as small as we want if δ is chosen large enough.

We finish this paper by giving some open question:

If u is a positive weak solution of (1) and if, for some $x_0 \in \Omega$, the following condition is satisfied

$$I_{n-2} u^{\alpha-1}(x_0) < +\infty,$$

is $I_{n-2} u^{\alpha-1}(x)$ continuous at x_0 ?

Let us observe that a positive answer to this conjecture would prove the conjecture stated in the introduction.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. AVILES. *Local behaviour of solutions of some elliptic equations*. Comm. Math. Phys. 108 (1987) p. 177–192.
- [2] L. A. CAFFARELLI, B. GIDAS and J. SPRUCK. *Asymptotic symmetry and local behaviour of semi-linear elliptic equations with critical Sobolev exponent*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. XLII (1989) p. 271–297.
- [3] S. CAMPANATO. *Proprieta di inclusione per spazi di Morrey*. Ricerche Mat. 12 (1963) p. 67–86.
- [4] M. GIAQUINTA. *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations and nonlinear analysis*. Annals of Mathematical Studies 105.
- [5] B. GIDAS and J. SPRUCK. *Global and local behaviour of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. XXXIV (1981) p. 525–598.

- [6] A. M. HINZ and H. KOLF. *Subsolution estimates and Harnack inequality for Schrodinger operators*. Journal fur die Reine und Angew. Math. 404 (1990) p. 118–202.
- [7] F. PACARD. *A note on the regularity of weak positive solutions of $-\Delta u = u^\alpha$* . To appear in Houston Journal of Math.
- [8] R. SCHOEN and S. T. YAU. *Conformally flat manifolds, Kleinian groups and scalar curvature*. Inv. Math. 92 (1988) p. 47–72.
- [9] W. P. ZIEMER. *Weakly Differentiable Functions*. Graduate texts in Mathematics. Springer–Verlag 120.

*Ecole Nationale des Ponts et
Chaussées CERGNE
La Courtine
F-93167 Noisy-le-Grand Cédex*

Received November 13, 1991