Steiner symmetrization for anisotropic quasilinear equations via partial discretization

F. Brock* J.I. Díaz†‡ A. Ferone§ D. Gómez-Castro†‡ A. Mercaldo¶

December 5, 2019

Abstract

In this paper we obtain comparison results for the quasilinear equation $-\Delta_{p,x}u - u_{yy} = f$ with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions by Steiner rearrangement in variable x, thus solving a long open problem. In fact, we study a broader class of anisotropic problems. Our approach is based on a finite-differences discretization in y, and the proof of a comparison principle for the discrete version of the auxiliary problem $AU - U_{yy} \leq \int_0^s f$, where $AU = -(-n\omega_n^{1/n} s^{1/n'} U_{ss})^{p-1}$. We show that this operator is T-accretive in L^∞. We extend our results for $-\Delta_{p,x}$ to general operators of the form $-\operatorname{div}(a(|\nabla_x u|)\nabla_x u)$ where a is non-decreasing and behaves like $|\cdot|^{p-2}$ at infinity.

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to extend the result on [4] to a class of nonlinear elliptic problems whose prototype is

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{p,x}u - u_{yy} = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,. \end{cases} \tag{0.1}$$

For the sake of simplicity, in this paper we focus on the case

$$\Omega = \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2\,, \qquad \Omega_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \text{ open, bounded of class } \mathcal{C}^2 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Omega_2 = (0,1). \tag{0.2}$$

We denote $-\Delta_{p,x}u = -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla_x u|^{p-2}\nabla_x u)$ where $\nabla_x u = (\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}, \cdots, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_n})$. Such problem can be regarded as anisotropic since the growth of the operator with respect to the partial derivatives of u in x and y is governed by different powers (see, e.g. [6, Chapter 1, Section 4.2]).

Very often, in many relevant applications, the materials and phenomena have an important *anisotropy*, presenting different properties in different directions, in contrast to the more usual isotropy property. Anisotropy leads to mathematical models presenting peculiar constitutive laws which corresponds to material's physical or mechanical properties with different behaviour according the directions. The spectrum of fields in which such situations arise is very wide: Computer Science (e.g. Image processing), Physics (e.g. Atmospheric Radiative Transfer), Chemistry (e.g. Materials Science [31]), Geophysics and Geology, Engineering (e.g. wastewater reactors [20]) or Neuroscience.

Commonly, this anisotropy comes as a diffusion operator D which is described by three principal different directional coefficients. This is the case, for example, of thermal and electrical conductivity in heterogeneous media (e.g. for the diffusion of Ni in Olivine) or of study of cristal (see [40, 22]). Moreover, many of the recent innovations in the field of electroceramics have exploited the anisotropy of nonlinearities modelling different material properties such as electric field, mechanical stress or temperature (see, e.g. [31, Chapter 15]). We also mention here that it is well-known that homogenisation techniques generate anisotropic diffusion limit problems (see, e.g., [26, 41], and its references).

From the mathematical point of view, it is useful to get some relations between the solution of a nonlinear anisotropic boundary value problem and the solution of a similar problem, posed in a simpler geometry, for

*Institute of Mathematics, University of Rostock
†Departamento de Análisis Matemático y Matemática Aplicada, Universidad Complutense de Madrid
‡Instituto de Matemática Interdisciplinar, Universidad Complutense de Madrid
§Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Università della Campania "Luigi Vanvitelli"
¶Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni "R. Caccioppoli", Università di Napoli Federico II

which we can compute explicit information. In order to obtain as much information as possible, we would like for this second problem to be as similar as possible to the original one. This philosophy was developed in the framework of linear second order reaction-diffusion problems by means of the so-called Steiner rearrangement since the nineties of the past century (see, e.g. [1, 4, 5]). This approach has proved specially useful for the study of the qualitative behaviour of solutions (see, e.g. [6, Chapter 1, Section 4.2]). Nevertheless, the class of operators for which Steiner rearrangement has been applied is limited, due to technical difficulties. The question of whether it can be applied to non-linear second order problems "split" as operators in x and y, such as (0.1), has been open for 15 years. A related question (but developed with different techniques) concerns anisotropic symmetrisation (see, for example, [2, 38]).

The main goal of this paper is to present new ideas when considering such type of anisotropic nonlinear diffusion operator, trying to extend the main result on [4] to this nonlinear framework. For the moment being, the peculiar formulation we will consider will use the crucial assumption that the diffusion is linear in at least one direction, nevertheless we hope that the ideas could be adapted also without this technical requirement.

In the seventies, G. Talenti developed symmetrization techniques in pioonering papers [34, 35] (see also [39, 27]) that allow to obtain a priori estimates on problems of the form

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u) = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,. \end{cases}$$

where Ω is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and the function a is monotone satisfying the ellipticity condition

$$a(\xi)\xi \geq |\xi|^p\,, \qquad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Estimates of u in L^p norms can be derived by estimating the same norm of the solution v to the spherically symmetric problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p v = f^\star & \text{in } \Omega^\star \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega^\star\,. \end{cases} \tag{0.3}$$

where $\Omega^\star$ is the ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$ centered at zero having the same Lebesgue measure of Ω, $f^\star$ is the Schwarz rearrangement of f, that is the the spherically symmetric function, decreasing with respect to $|x|$, whose level sets $\{x \in \Omega : |f^\star(x)| > t\}$ have the same measure of the corresponding level sets of f, $\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > t\}$. We will introduce it formally below.

G. Talenti's approach has been successfully extended in various directions such as, for example, operators having lower order terms, degenerate operators, parabolic equations, different boundary value problems (see, [3, 5, 19, 36, 37] and references therein).

To state the main results of this paper we need to introduce some definitions. Given a bounded set $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we define its Schwarz symmetrisation, $\omega^\star$, as the unique ball centred at 0 such that $\mathcal{L}^n(\omega^\star) = \mathcal{L}^n(\omega)$ where $\mathcal{L}^n(\omega)$ denotes the n-dimensional Lebesgue measure of the set ω. For an open bounded set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N \equiv \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, the y-section of Ω is denoted by Ω_y and defined by $\Omega_y := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : (x, y) \in \Omega\}$ and we define the Steiner-symmetrised version of Ω as

$$\Omega^\# = \bigcup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} (\Omega_y)^\star \times \{y\}.$$

When it does not lead to confusion we use the notation $|\omega|$ for the Lebesgue measure of ω of adequate dimension.

If u is a function defined in $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N \equiv \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we consider the function

$$x \in \Omega_y \mapsto u(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{0.4}$$

The distribution function and the decreasing rearrangement of this function (0.4) are the so-called *distribution function (in codimension n)* of u and its *decreasing rearrangement (in codimension n)* respectively, i.e.

$$\mu_u(t, y) = \mathcal{L}^n\left(\{x \in \Omega_y : u(x, y) > t\}\right), \qquad (t, y) \in [0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^m$$

and

$$u^*(s, y) = \sup\{t \geq 0 : \mu_u(t, y) > s\}\,, \quad (s, y) \in \Omega_y^* \times \mathbb{R}^m\,,$$

respectively, where ω_n is the measure of the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$. We define the *Steiner symmetrised version of* u as

$$u^{\#}(x,y) = u^*(\omega_n|x|^n, y), \qquad (x,y) \in \Omega^{\#}.$$

Notice that it is spherically symmetric in x, and radially non-increasing in this variable. When there is no y variable (i.e. $m = 0$), this is called the *Schwarz symmetrised version of* u.

G. Talenti developed the theory with no y variable ($m = 0$). The Steiner symmetrisation ($m > 0$) is studied in [1, 4, 5, 8] for the case of linear elliptic operators. The type of comparison results that can be found in the literature are

$$u^*(s) \le v^*(s)\,, \qquad \text{when } m = 0,$$

or

$$\int_0^s u^*(\tau, y)\, d\tau \le \int_0^s v^*(\tau, y)\, d\tau\,, \qquad \text{when } m > 0,$$

for a.e. $s \in (0, |\Omega|)$ and a.e. in $y \in \Omega_2$, which easily imply the a priori estimate on u in L^p or Orlicz norms. Similar results for $m > 0$ have also been proven in a more recent paper [13] by using a simpler approach; Neumann boundary value problems have been studied in [21] (see also [15]). The implications of these kinds of mass comparison are deep. For example, for any $q \ge 1$ it allow us to have estimates on the L^q norm of u

$$\int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} |u(x,y)|^q dx dy \le \int_{\Omega_1^\star \times \Omega_2} |v(x,y)|^q dx dy.$$

This is useful because the radially symmetric problem can often be estimated easily by direct techniques.

1 Main result and structure of the paper

We propose a new approach, that covers a wider class of problems of the form

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}_x \Big(a(|\nabla_x u|)\nabla_x u\Big) - u_{yy} = f & \text{in } \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)\,. \end{cases} \tag{P}$$

where

$$a : (0, +\infty) \to (0, +\infty) \text{ such that } \beta(t) = \begin{cases} a(t)t & t > 0 \\ 0 & t = 0 \end{cases} \text{ is continuous and non-decreasing} \tag{H$_1$}$$

and, for some $C_2 > C_1 > 0$ and $p > 1$

$$C_1(t^p - 1) \le \beta(t)t, \qquad \beta(t) \le C_2(t^{p-1} + 1). \tag{H$_2$}$$

Notice that the solution of (P) is a minimiser of the energy

$$J(u) = \int_\Omega \Big(B(|\nabla_x u|) + |\nabla_y u|^2 - fu\Big) dx\, dy \tag{1.1}$$

where

$$B(t) = \int_0^t \beta(s) ds. \tag{1.2}$$

Since β is non-decreasing, $u \mapsto \int_\Omega B(|\nabla_x u|)$ is convex. On the other hand, $\int_\Omega |\nabla_y u|^2$ is strictly convex in $L^2(\Omega_1; H_0^1(\Omega_2))$, we deduce that J is strictly convex. Therefore, a unique weak solution of (P) exists. The natural space of solutions for this problem is precisely

$$X^p(\Omega) = \{u \in W_0^{1,1}(\Omega) : |\nabla_x u| \in L^p(\Omega), |\nabla_y u| \in L^2(\Omega)\}.$$

If one does not introduce condition (H$_2$) then the energy must be found in the Orliz class $B(|\nabla_x u|) \in L^1(\Omega)$ (see, e.g., [35]).

Our aim is to prove the following result

Theorem 1.1. *Let a satisfy* (H_1) *and* (H_2), $0 \le f \in L^{\max\{2,p\}}(\Omega)$, $u \in X^p(\Omega)$ *be the weak solution of the problem* (P) *and* $v \in X^p(\Omega^\#)$ *be the solution of the symmetrised problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}_x(a(|\nabla_x v|)\nabla_x v) - v_{yy} = f^\# & \text{in } \Omega^\# \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega^\#\,. \end{cases} \tag{P$^\#$}$$

Then, for the decreasing rearrangements u^* and v^* we have the following mass comparison:

$$\int_0^s u^*(\sigma, y)d\sigma \le \int_0^s v^*(\sigma, y)d\sigma\,, \qquad \text{for all } s \in [0, |\Omega_1|] \text{ and for a.e. } y \in \Omega_2\,. \tag{1.3}$$

Since it is known that the rearrangement is continuous from $L^1(\Omega) \to L^1(\Omega_1^* \times \Omega_2)$, we preserve (1.3) by using approximate problems such that the solutions converge to u and v at least in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $L^1(\Omega^\#)$.

The structure of the proof is as follows. We consider first, in Section 2, the case for a smooth function $\beta \equiv \beta_\varepsilon$ satisfying elliptic conditions, i.e.

$$\beta \in \mathcal{C}^1([0,+\infty)) \qquad \text{with} \quad \beta(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta' : [0,+\infty) \to \left[\varepsilon, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right] \text{ for some } \varepsilon > 0. \tag{H$_\varepsilon$}$$

Following more or less classical arguments, we show that the solution of (P) under (H_1) and (H_2) can be approximated by problems with $a(t) \equiv a_\varepsilon(t) = \beta_\varepsilon(t)/t$ and β_ε satisfying (H$_\varepsilon$).

Under assumptions (H$_\varepsilon$) we discretize in the y derivative, to obtain a family of problems

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}_x\left(a(|\nabla_x u_j|)\nabla_x u_j\right) - \dfrac{u_{j+1} - 2u_j + u_{j-1}}{h^2} = f_j & \text{in } \Omega_1, \\ u_j = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_1, \quad j = 1, \cdots, N, \\ u_0 = u_{N+1} \equiv 0 & \text{in } \Omega_1, \end{cases} \tag{P$_h$}$$

where

$$(N+1)h = 1. \tag{1.4}$$

We will show that we recover solutions of (P) as $h \to 0$. Due to (H$_\varepsilon$) we can use $p = 2$ in the study of (P$_h$). Analogously to (P), we will show in Section 2.1 that the solution of (P$_h$) is a minimiser of

$$J_h(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\Omega_1} B(|\nabla_x u_j|)\,dx + \sum_{i=0}^N \int_{\Omega_1} \left(\frac{u_{j+1} - u_j}{h}\right)^2 dx - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\Omega_1} f_j u_j\,dx\,, \tag{1.5}$$

where

$$\mathbf{u} = (u_j) \in X_N(\Omega_1) = \{\mathbf{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega_1)^{N+2} : u_0 = u_{N+1} = 0\} = \{0_{H_0^1}\} \times H_0^1(\Omega_1)^N \times \{0_{H_0^1}\}. \tag{1.6}$$

We will explain the construction of this energy functional, and provide an existence and uniqueness result for the case of smooth β.
Since we want to apply rearrangement properties of smooth functions, we devote some time to the regularity of the solution of this system. In order to study regularity of solutions of each u_j, we can move the discrete Laplacian to the right hand side, and recover a problem of the form

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(a(|\nabla w|)\nabla w) = g & \text{in } \Omega_1, \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_1. \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

Existence, uniqueness and regularity for this problem has been studied in a series of recent papers by Cianchi and Maz'ya (e.g. [16, 17]) under the assumption that a is smooth and has some type of coercitivity

$$a \in \mathcal{C}^1(0,+\infty), \qquad i_a = \inf_{t>0} \frac{ta'(t)}{a(t)} > -1, \qquad s_a = \sup_{t>0} \frac{ta'(t)}{a(t)} < \infty. \tag{CM}$$

They show that (CM) is sufficient to imply (H_1) and (H_2). We will apply their results for the a regularisation of a, and we will pass to the limit for general operators. Notice that (CM) holds directly for the case of the p-Laplace operator.

In this setting we will easily prove, in Section 2.2, comparison results in a very classical manner: we rearrange each equation and apply a comparison argument for the system (P_h). We define

$$U_j(s) = \int_0^s u_j^*(\sigma)d\sigma, \qquad V_j(s) = \int_0^s v_j^*(\sigma)d\sigma, \qquad F_j(s) = \int_0^s f_j(\sigma)d\sigma$$

and, for $j \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$, we have that U_j is a weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} \beta\left(-n\omega_n^{1/n} s^{1/n'} \dfrac{d^2U_j}{ds^2}\right) - \dfrac{U_{j+1} - 2U_j + U_{j-1}}{h^2} \le F_j \quad \text{in } \Omega_1^*, \\ \dfrac{dU_j}{ds}(0) = U_j(|\Omega_1|) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{$\underline{\mathrm{P}_h^*}$}$$

in the sense that U_j, $s^{1/n'} \frac{d^2U_j}{ds^2} \in L^\infty(\Omega_1^*)$ and the equation is satisfied almost everywhere. We will show that V_j solves the same problem, except that the above differential inequalities become equalities (see (P_h^*) below). Due to regularity of u_j that we will prove, we recover some regularity of U_j. This regularity is sufficient to apply accretivity results for $(\underline{\mathrm{P}_h^*})$ in L^∞. We devote Section 2.3 to prove this result, from which we deduce $U_j \le V_j$ for every j. This is precisely the mass comparison we sought, at least for (P_h). We devote Section 2.4 to showing that we can pass to the limit as $h \to 0$, and recover solutions of the original problem. In Section 2.5, we pass to the limit as $h \to 0$ in the comparison, thus proving the comparison under assumptions (H_ε). Then, in Section 3 we use an approximation argument to prove the main result in the general setting.

2 Smooth elliptic case

In this part, we assume (H_ε). This immediately implies that $\varepsilon t \le \beta(t) \le t/\varepsilon$, so (H_2) holds with $p = 2$. The aim of this section is to prove

Theorem 2.1. *Let a satisfy (H_1) and (H_ε), $0 \le f \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\Omega)$ and let $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the weak solution of the problem (P) and $v \in H_0^1(\Omega^\#)$ be the solution of the symmetrised problem $(\mathrm{P}^\#)$. Then, we have the following mass comparison:*

$$\int_0^s u^*(\sigma, y)ds \le \int_0^s v^*(\sigma, y)dy\,, \qquad \text{for all } s \in [0, |\Omega_1|] \text{ and for a.e. } y \in \Omega_2\,. \tag{2.1}$$

Until Section 2.4, variable y is not present, and so we denote ∇_x simply by ∇.

2.1 Existence, uniqueness and regularity of solutions of the discrete problem (P_h)

We say that a function $\mathbf{u} \in X_N(\Omega_1)$ is a *weak solution* of (P_h) if

$$\int_{\Omega_1} a(\nabla u_j)\nabla u_j \cdot \nabla\varphi_j - \int_{\Omega_1} \frac{u_{j+1} - 2u_j + u_{j-1}}{h^2}\varphi_j = \int_\Omega f_j\varphi_j, \quad \forall j \in \{1, \cdots, N\} \ \ \forall \boldsymbol{\varphi} \in X_N(\Omega_1).$$

Notice that, for $\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\varphi} \in X_N(\Omega_1)$ we have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{-u_{j+1} + 2u_j - u_{j-1}}{h^2}\varphi_j = \sum_{j=0}^N \frac{u_{j+1} - u_j}{h}\frac{\varphi_{j+1} - \varphi_j}{h} = \sum_{j=1}^N u_j \frac{-\varphi_{j+1} + 2\varphi_j - \varphi_{j-1}}{h^2}. \tag{2.2}$$

Hence, it is easy to see that we can write equivalently the weak formulations

$$\int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{j=1}^N a(\nabla u_j)\nabla u_j \cdot \nabla\varphi_j + \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{j=0}^N \frac{u_{j+1} - u_j}{h}\frac{\varphi_{j+1} - \varphi_j}{h} = \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{j=1}^N f_j\varphi_j, \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{j=1}^N a(\nabla u_j)\nabla u_j \cdot \nabla\varphi_j + \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{j=1}^N u_j \frac{-\varphi_{j+1} + 2\varphi_j - \varphi_{j-1}}{h^2} = \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{j=1}^N f_j\varphi_j. \tag{2.4}$$

Proposition 2.1. *Assume (H_ε), and let $\mathbf{f} = (f_j) \in L^2(\Omega)^N$ where $f_j \ge 0$. Then, there exists a unique $\mathbf{u} = (u_j) \in X_N(\Omega_1)$ where $u_j \ge 0$ satisfy (2.3). It also satisfies (2.4) and is the global minimiser in $X_N(\Omega_1)$ of J_h given by (1.5).*

Proof. Since $B'' = \beta' \geq \varepsilon$, B is strictly convex, quadratic and bounded from below. Hence J_h has a unique minimiser. Applying (2.2) and reproducing the proof we deduce that the Euler-Lagrange equations for J_h are precisely (P_h). To check that $u_j \neq 0$ we use $\varphi_j = (u_j)_-$ as a test function, to deduce $u_- = 0$. □

One of the advantages of having discretised in y, is that for every j we move the right hand side

$$-\operatorname{div}\Big(a(|\nabla u_j|)|\nabla u_j|\Big) = F_j = f_j + \frac{u_{j+1} - 2u_j + u_{j-1}}{h} \qquad \text{in } \Omega_1.$$

This a system of equations. It is called diagonal since the j-th equation only includes the gradient of u_j. The coupling F_j is linear in $\mathbf{u}$. It is proven in [29, Theorem 2] that, if $\mathbf{f} \in L^\infty(\Omega_1)^N$ then $\mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(\Omega_1)^N$.

From the series of papers by Cianchi and Maz'ya we recover some regularity results. In particular, in [16] the authors prove that, for the solution w of (1.7), we have

$$\|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)} \leq C\beta^{-1}\left(\|g\|_{L^{n,1}(\Omega_1)}\right), \tag{2.5}$$

and in [17] they prove

$$a(|\nabla w|)\nabla w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_1) \iff g \in L^2(\Omega_1). \tag{2.6}$$

Notice that

$$\frac{ta'(t)}{a(t)} = \frac{t\beta'(t)}{\beta(t)} - 1.$$

Since $\varepsilon \leq \beta' \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ and $\beta(0) = 0$, we have that $\varepsilon t \leq \beta(t) \leq t/\varepsilon$ and hence $1 \leq \frac{t\beta'(t)}{\beta} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}$. Therefore, (H_ε) implies (CM). Applying these two results, and the fact that $u_j \in L^2(\Omega_1)$ by the minimisation argument, we have

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\mathbf{f} \in L^\infty(\Omega_1)^N$. Then, the unique weak solution of (P_h) is in $W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega_1)^{N+2}$ and*

$$a(|\nabla u_j|)\nabla u_j \in H^1(\Omega_1). \tag{2.7}$$

2.2 Rearrangement of (P_h) to a problem (P_h^*)

Our aim is to compare (P_h) with its rearranged problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}_x\Big(a(|\nabla v_j|)\nabla v_j\Big) - \dfrac{v_{j+1} - 2v_j + v_{j-1}}{h^2} = f_j^\star & \text{in } \Omega_1^\star, \\ v_j = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_1^\star,\ j = 1, \cdots, N, \\ v_0 = v_{N+1} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_1^\star. \end{cases} \tag{$\mathrm{P}_h^\#$}$$

Arguing as before, it has a unique solution $\mathbf{v} \in X_N(\Omega_1^\star)$. For every $q \in [1, \infty]$ we denote by $q' := \frac{q}{q-1}$ its conjugate exponent.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{C}_c(\Omega_1)^N$ and let $\mathbf{u} \in X_N(\Omega_1)$ and $\mathbf{v} \in X_N(\Omega_1^\star)$ be the unique solutions of (P_h) and $(\mathrm{P}_h^\#)$ respectively. Define, for every $j \in \{0, \cdots, N+1\}$*

$$U_j(s) = \int_0^s u_j^*(\sigma)\, d\sigma, \qquad V_j(s) = \int_0^s v_j^*(\sigma)\, d\sigma, \qquad F_j(s) = \int_0^s f_j^*(\sigma) d\sigma.$$

Then, for every $j \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$, U_j and V_j are in $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega_1^*})$ and satisfy

$$s^{1/n'}\,\frac{d^2U_j}{ds^2}, \quad s^{1/n'}\,\frac{d^2V_j}{ds^2} \in L^\infty(\Omega_1^*). \tag{2.8}$$

Moreover $\mathbf{U} = (U_j)$ is a solution of $(\underline{\mathrm{P}_h^*})$ and $\mathbf{V} = (V_j)$ is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} \beta\left(-n\omega_n^{1/n} s^{1/n'}\,\dfrac{d^2V_j}{ds^2}\right) - \dfrac{V_{j+1} - 2V_j + V_{j-1}}{h^2} = F_j \quad \text{in } \Omega_1^*, \\ \dfrac{dV_j}{ds}(0) = V_j(|\Omega_1|) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{P_h^*}$$

Also, $U_0 = U_{N+1} = V_0 = V_{N+1} = 0$.

Before we proceed to the proof, we recall some classical results of rearrangement theory.

2.2.1 Some Schwarz rearrangement results

For the discrete problem there is no y variable, and so we can apply standard results from Schwarz rearrangement. Consider $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ non-negative. We define the Schwarz rearrangement

$$u^\star(x) = u^*(\omega_n |x|^n), \qquad \text{for } x \in \Omega^\star. \tag{2.9}$$

The relation between u^* and μ is the following

$$\mu(u^*(s)) = |\{x \in \Omega : u(x) > u^*(s)\}| \le s \le |\{x \in \Omega : u(x) \ge u^*(s)\}| = \mu(u^*(s)^-)$$

and equalities hold if and only if μ is continuous or, equivalently, if u^* has no flat zone. Since μ is monotone, the set of discontinuities is, at most, countable, hence has measure zero.

The rearrangement of u is constructed so that, for any $A \subset \Omega$,

$$\int_A u(x)dx \le \int_0^{|A|} u^*(\sigma)d\sigma,$$

and, for a.e. $s \in \Omega^*$

$$\int_{u>u^*(s)} u\,dx = \int_0^s u^*(\sigma)d\sigma.$$

It is well known that if $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, for some $1 \le p \le \infty$, then also $u^\star \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega^\star)$, and, by the classical Pólya-Szegö inequality, the L^p norm is preserved while the $W^{1,p}$ norm is reduced (see for example [7, 12, 11, 14] and the references therein), in the sense that

$$\int_\Omega a(|\nabla u|)|\nabla u|^2 dx \ge \int_{\Omega^\star} a(|\nabla u^\star|)|\nabla u^\star|^2 dx\,. \tag{2.10}$$

Inequality (2.10) is a consequence of the classical co-area formula and of the following inequalities (see, for example, [35])

$$\int_{u(\cdot)=t} a(|\nabla u|)|\nabla u|\,d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \ge \int_{u^\star(\cdot)=t} a(|\nabla u^\star|)|\nabla u^\star|\,d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}, \qquad \forall t > 0. \tag{2.11}$$

By definition, we easily deduce that

$$|\nabla u^\star(x)| = \left[\left(-\frac{du^*}{ds}(s,y)\right) n\omega_n^{1/n} s^{1/n'}\right]\Bigg|_{s=\omega_n|x|^n} \qquad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega^\star, \tag{2.12}$$

and then (2.11) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{u(\cdot)=t} a(|\nabla u|)|\nabla u|\,d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \\
&\qquad \ge a(|\nabla u^\star|)|\nabla u^\star|\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\left(\{x : u^\star(x) = t\}\right) \\
&\qquad = \beta(|\nabla u^\star|)|\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\left(\{x : u^\star(x) = t\}\right) \\
&\qquad = \beta\left(-n\omega_n^{1/n} s^{1/n'} \frac{du^*}{ds}(s,y)\right)\Bigg|_{s=\mu(t)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Lemma 2.1. *Let $u \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_1)$. Then, u^* is differentiable a.e. and*

$$0 \le -s^{1/n'} \frac{du^*}{ds} \in L^\infty(\Omega_1^*).$$

If, furthermore, $a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u \in H^1(\Omega_1)$ then, for a.e. $s \in \Omega_1^*$, we have

$$-\int_{u>u^*(s)} \operatorname{div}\left(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u\right) dx \ge \beta\left(-n\omega_n^{1/n} s^{1/n'} \frac{du^*}{ds}(s)\right).$$

Proof. We split the proof in several steps.

Step 1. $u \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\Omega)$**.** By the divergence theorem, for a.e. $s \in \Omega_1^*$ the outer normal to $\{x : u(x) > u^*(s)\}$ is given by

$$\nu(x) = -\frac{\nabla u(x)}{|\nabla u(x)|} \qquad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^{n-1}\text{-a.e. } x \in \{u = u^*(s)\},$$

we get

$$-\int_{u>u^*(s_0)} \operatorname{div}_x \left(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u(x)\right)\, dx = \int_{u=u^*(s_0)} a(|\nabla u|)|\nabla u(x)|\, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}. \tag{2.14}$$

Taking (2.13) into account, we prove the result.

Step 2. General case. Let u be as in the statement. Since u is Lipschitz continuous and vanishes on the boundary, by [23] then $u^\star$ is Lipschitz continuous. In particular $s^{1/n'}du^*/ds \in L^\infty(\Omega^*)$. There exists a sequence $u_k \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_k &\to u \qquad \text{in } L^1(\overline{\Omega}) \\ \nabla u_k &\overset{\star}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla u \qquad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega)^n \\ a(|\nabla u_k|)\nabla u_k &\rightharpoonup a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u \quad \text{in } H^1(\Omega)^n. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2a. Convergence of the rearranged term We prove that

$$\beta\left(-n\omega_n^{1/n} s^{1/n'} \frac{du_k^*}{ds}(s)\right) \rightharpoonup \beta\left(-n\omega_n^{1/n} s^{1/n'} \frac{du^*}{ds}(s)\right) \qquad \text{in } L^1(\Omega^*). \tag{2.15}$$

It is clear that $\|s^{1/n'}du_k^*/ds\|_{L^\infty} \le C$, hence, up to a subsequence (still denoted by u_k)

$$s^{1/n'} \frac{du_k^*}{ds} \overset{\star}{\rightharpoonup} \xi \qquad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega^*).$$

Since $u_k \to u$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ we have $u_k^* \to u$ in $L^1(\Omega^*)$. Hence, for φ such that $s^{1/n'}\varphi \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega^*)$ we have

$$\int_{\Omega_1^*} \xi\varphi = \lim_k \int_{\Omega_1^*} s^{1/n'} \frac{du_k^*}{ds}\varphi = -\lim_k \int_{\Omega_1^*} u_k^* \frac{d}{ds}(s^{1/n'}\varphi) = -\int_{\Omega_1^*} u^* \frac{d}{ds}(s^{1/n'}\varphi) = \int_{\Omega_1^*} s^{1/n'} \frac{du^*}{ds}\varphi.$$

Hence,

$$\xi = s^{1/n'} \frac{du^*}{ds}.$$

Since β is Lipschitz, this implies that, up to a further subsequence, we recover (2.15).

Step 2b. Convergence of the divergence term Let us prove that

$$-\int_{\{u_k>u_k^*(\cdot)\}} \operatorname{div}\Big(a(|\nabla u_k|)\nabla u_k\Big)\, dx \longrightarrow -\int_{\{u>u_k^*(\cdot)\}} \operatorname{div}\Big(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u\Big)\, dx, \qquad \text{in } L^1(\Omega^*). \tag{2.16}$$

Consider the map

$$s \in \Omega_1^* \mapsto F_k(s) = -\int_{\{u_k>u_k^*(s)\}} \operatorname{div}\Big(a(|\nabla u_k|)\nabla u_k\Big)\, dx = -\int_\Omega \operatorname{div}\Big(a(|\nabla u_k|)\nabla u_k\Big)\, \chi_{\{u_k>u_k^*(s)\}}\, dx.$$

We have that $\operatorname{div}\Big(a(|\nabla u_k|)\nabla u_k\Big)$ converges weakly in L^2. Let us prove that, for a.e. $s \in \Omega^*$

$$\chi_{\{u_k>u_k^*(s)\}} \longrightarrow \chi_{\{u>u^*(s)\}} \text{ in } L^2(\Omega). \tag{2.17}$$

First, let us prove the convergence a.e. $x \in \Omega$: if, s is such that

$$\lim_k u_k^*(s) = u^*(s) \tag{2.18}$$

then

$$\left\{x \in \Omega : \lim_k \chi_{\{u_k>u_k^*(s)\}}(x) \ne \chi_{\{u>u^*(s)\}}(x)\right\} \subset \{x \in \Omega : u(x) \ne u^*(s)\}.$$

Indeed, let $s \in \Omega^*$ and $x \in \Omega$ be such that $u(x) < u^*(s)$. Take $\varepsilon = (u^*(s) - u(x))/4$. For $k \geq k_\varepsilon$ large enough $|u_k^*(s) - u^*(s)| \leq \varepsilon$ and (since u_k converges in $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})$), $|u_k(x) - u(x)| \leq \varepsilon$. But then $u_k(x) < u_k^*(s)$. Hence $\chi_{\{u_k > u_k^*(s)\}}(x) = \chi_{\{u > u^*(s)\}}(x)$. The same holds for the limit. We can repeat the same argument if $u(x) > u^*(s)$.
Since $u_k^* \to u^*$ in $L^1(\Omega^*)$, up to a subsequence, $u_k^* \to u^*$ a.e. Hence, (2.18) holds a.e. On the other hand,

$$\mathcal{L}^n\{x \in \Omega : u(x) \neq u^*(s)\} = \mu(u^*(s)^-) - \mu(u^*(s)).$$

Since u^* and μ are monotone functions, the set of s such that $\mu(u^*(s))$ is discontinuous at s is countable. Hence, the set of s such that (2.17) does not hold has measure 0.
Since the sequence is pointwise bounded by 1, due the Dominated Convergence Theorem we have (2.17). Hence, as $k \to +\infty$,

$$F_k(s) = -\int_\Omega \operatorname{div}\Big(a(|\nabla u_k|)\nabla u_k\Big)\chi_{\{u_k > u_k^*(s)\}}\,dx \longrightarrow -\int_\Omega \operatorname{div}\Big(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u\Big)\chi_{\{u > u^*(s)\}}\,dx, \qquad \text{a.e. } s \in \Omega^*.$$

It is clear that

$$|F_k(s)| \leq \int_\Omega \Big|\operatorname{div}\Big(a(|\nabla u_k|)\nabla u_k\Big)\Big|\,dx \leq C.$$

Since we have the pointwise limit, due to the dominated convergence theorem, we recover (2.16).

Step 2c. Comparison of the limits We apply Step 1 to this final subsequence. We have that

$$-\int_{\{u > u_k^*(s)\}} \operatorname{div}\Big(a(|\nabla u_k|)\nabla u_k\Big)\,dx \geq \beta\left(-n\omega_n^{1/n} s^{1/n'} \frac{du_k^*}{ds}(s)\right), \qquad \text{a.e. } s \in \Omega^*$$

and both sequences converge weakly in $L^1(\Omega^*)$. Applying Lemma A.1 the proof is complete. □

2.2.2 Proof of Proposition 2.2

We proceed as in [35] for the ∇, and using standard inequalities for the rest. By Lemma 2.1 we have (2.8).

To check that the inequality of ($\underline{\mathrm{P}_h^*}$) is satisfied, for $s \in [0, |\Omega_1|]$ we can integrate over the level set of u_j

$$-\int_{u_j > u_j^*(s)} \operatorname{div}\Big(a(|\nabla u_j|)\nabla u_j(x)\Big)\,dx \tag{2.19}$$

$$+\int_{u_j > u_j^*(s)} \frac{-u_{j+1} + 2u_j - u_{j-1}}{h^2}dx \tag{2.20}$$

$$= \int_{u_j > u_j^*(s)} f_j(x)dx\,. \tag{2.21}$$

Notice that, due to (2.7) is, (2.19) is well defined. Let us consider separately the three quantities which appear above. As regards to (2.19), we apply Lemma 2.1, and hence, for a.e. $s \in \Omega_1^*$

$$-\int_{u_j > u_j^*(s)} \left(\operatorname{div}_x\left(a(|\nabla u_j|)\nabla u_j\right)\right)\,dx \geq \beta\left(-n\omega_n^{1/n} s^{1/n'} \frac{\partial u_j^*}{\partial s}(s)\right). \tag{2.22}$$

As regards to the term (2.20), it is a standard rearrangement inequality that

$$\int_{u_j > u_j^*(s)} u_k \leq \int_0^s u_k^*, \qquad \forall k$$

and

$$\int_{u_j > u_j^*(s)} u_j = \int_0^s u_j^*,$$

so that we get

$$\int_{u_j > u_j^*(s)} \frac{-u_{j+1} + 2u_j - u_{j-1}}{h^2}dx \geq \int_0^s \frac{-u_{j+1}^* + 2u_j^* - u_{j-1}^*}{h^2}dx. \tag{2.23}$$

Finally as regards (2.21), by a classical property of rearrangements we get

$$\int_{u_j>u_j^*(s)} f_j(x)\,dx \le \int_0^s f_j^*(\sigma)\,d\sigma\,. \tag{2.24}$$

Collecting (2.22)-(2.24) we get that the function U_j is a weak solution of $(\underline{\mathrm{P}_h^*})$ with $\frac{d^2U_j}{ds^2} \in L^\infty$. This completes the proof for U_j.
Analogously, the same arguments apply to the equation in $(\mathrm{P}_h^\#)$: since the solution v_j equals $v_j^\#$, then all the inequalities in (2.22)-(2.24) hold as equalities. □

2.3 Comparison principle for (P_h^*). Mass comparison for (P_h)

The aim of this section is to prove the following

Proposition 2.3. *Let* **U** *and* **V** *be as in Proposition 2.2. Then $U_j \le V_j$ for all j. Hence*

$$\int_0^s u_j^* \le \int_0^s v_j^* \qquad \forall j,\ \text{a.e. } s \in [0,|\Omega_1|]. \tag{2.25}$$

For the analysis of (P_h^*) we improve and close some open question raised in some previous literature concerning Hilbert spaces or reflexive Banach spaces [32, 33, 10]. The keystone is to prove the so-called T-accretivity in L^∞ of some suitable operator. This is inspired in the proof of [19, Theorem 1]. Let us consider the operator

$$AU = \beta\left(-n\omega_n^{1/n} s^{1/n'}\,\frac{d^2U}{ds^2}\right),$$

defined in the domain

$$D(A) = \left\{U \in L^\infty(\Omega_1^*) : s^{1/n'}\,\frac{d^2U}{ds^2} \in L^\infty(\Omega_1^*),\ \frac{dU}{ds}(0) = 0,\ U(|\Omega_1|) = 0\right\}.$$

2.3.1 The operator A is T-accretive in L^∞

Let us prove that A is T-accretive in L^∞.

Lemma 2.2. *Let β be non-decreasing. Then, for all $U, V \in D(A)$ and $\lambda > 0$, we have that*

$$\left\|(U-V)_+\right\|_{L^\infty} \le \left\|\Big(U - V + \lambda(AU - AV)\Big)_+\right\|_{L^\infty}. \tag{2.26}$$

Proof. For the length of this section let $L = |\Omega_1|$. We check that

$$AU = \beta\left(-\gamma U_{ss}\right), \qquad \gamma \asymp s^{1/n'}.$$

There is an inverse operator

$$\begin{cases} AU = F \text{ in } (0,L) \\ U_s(0) = U(L) = 0. \end{cases}$$

We consider the even extension

$$\widetilde{U}(s) = \begin{cases} U(s) & s \in [0,L), \\ U(-s) & s \in (-L,0). \end{cases}$$

Since $U_s(0) = 0$, $\widetilde{U}(s)$ is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{A}\widetilde{U} = \widetilde{F} \text{ in } (-L,L), \\ \widetilde{U}(-L) = \widetilde{U}(L) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\widetilde{A}\widetilde{U} = \beta(-\widetilde{\gamma}\widetilde{U}_{ss}),$$

and $\widetilde{\gamma}$ and $\widetilde{F}$ are the even extensions of γ and F. Notice that, $\widetilde{A}\widetilde{U} \in L^\infty(-L,L)$ if and only if $\gamma U_{ss} \in L^\infty(0,L)$. Furthermore, since $\gamma^{-1} \in L^1(\Omega)$, if $\gamma U_{ss} \in L^\infty(0,L)$ then $U_{ss} = \gamma^{-1}\gamma U_{ss} \in L^1(0,L)$. We can solve for U_{ss}:

$$-\widetilde{U}_{ss} = \widetilde{\gamma}^{-1}\beta^{-1}(\widetilde{F}) = \gamma^{-1}\beta^{-1}(\widetilde{A}\widetilde{U}), \tag{2.27}$$

where $\widetilde{\gamma}^{-1} > 0$ and β^{-1} is non-decreasing. $\gamma^{-1} = s^{-1/n'}$ is only singular at 0, which does not affect the a.e. equalities.

Suppose (2.26) does not hold. Then, for some U, V and $\lambda > 0$ there exists $\mu > 0$ small such that

$$\|(U-V)_+\|_{L^\infty} - \mu > \|(U - V + \lambda(AU - AV))_+\|_{L^\infty} \geq 0.$$

Thus $\|(U-V)_+\|_{L^\infty} > \mu > 0$. The same holds for the even extension

$$\|(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V})_+\|_{L^\infty} - \mu > \|(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V} + \lambda(\widetilde{A}\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{A}\widetilde{V}))_+\|_{L^\infty} \geq 0.$$

Define the closed set of positive measure

$$\Omega_+ = \{s \in (-L, L) : (\widetilde{U}(s) - \widetilde{V}(s))_+ \geq -\mu + \|(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V})_+\|_{L^\infty}\}.$$

Notice that, in Ω_+ we have $\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V} > 0$. In particular, $\Omega_+ \Subset (-L, L)$. This set is selected so that

$$\|(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V})_+\|_{L^\infty(-L,L)} = \max_{\Omega_+}(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V})_+ = \max_{\Omega_+}(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V}).$$

In Ω_+ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{U}(s) - \widetilde{V}(s) = (\widetilde{U}(s) - \widetilde{V}(s))_+ &\geq -\mu + \|(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V})_+\|_{L^\infty} \\
&> \|(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V} + \lambda(\widetilde{A}\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{A}\widetilde{V}))_+\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\geq \Big(\widetilde{U}(s) - \widetilde{V}(s) + \lambda(\widetilde{A}\widetilde{U}(s) - \widetilde{A}\widetilde{V}(s))\Big)_+ \\
&\geq \widetilde{U}(s) - \widetilde{V}(s) + \lambda(\widetilde{A}\widetilde{U}(s) - \widetilde{A}\widetilde{V}(s)).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\widetilde{A}\widetilde{U} < \widetilde{A}\widetilde{V} \text{ a.e. in } \Omega_+.$$

Then, due to (2.27), $-\widetilde{U}_{ss} \leq -\widetilde{V}_{ss}$ a.e. in Ω_+. Since $AU, AV \in L^\infty(0, L)$ we have that

$$0 \geq -(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V})_{ss} \in L^1(\Omega_+).$$

Due to the maximum principle and the continuity of $\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V}$, the maximum of $\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V}$ is attained in $\partial\Omega_+$. Therefore

$$-\mu + \|(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V})_+\|_{L^\infty} = \max_{\partial\Omega_+}(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V}) = \max_{\Omega_+}(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V}) = \max_{\Omega_+}(\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V})_+ = \|\widetilde{U} - \widetilde{V}\|_{L^\infty}.$$

This is a contradiction. The proof is complete. □

2.3.2 Proof of Proposition 2.3

Due to ($\underline{\mathrm{P}_h^*}$) and ($\mathrm{P}_h^*$) we have

$$\frac{h^2}{2}(AU_j - AV_j) + (U_j - V_j) \leq \frac{1}{2}(U_{j+1} - V_{j+1}) + \frac{1}{2}(U_{j-1} - V_{j-1}).$$

Applying Lemma 2.2

$$\|(U_j - V_j)_+\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|(U_{j+1} - V_{j+1})_+\|_{L^\infty} + \frac{1}{2}\|(U_{j-1} - V_{j-1})_+\|_{L^\infty}.$$

We can rewrite this as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 & & & \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ & & & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \|(U_1 - V_1)_+\|_{L^\infty} \\ \vdots \\ \|(U_N - V_N)_+\|_{L^\infty} \end{pmatrix} \leq \mathbf{0} \tag{2.28}$$

where the inequality holds coordinate by coordinate. Let us call the matrix D_2 and denote the vector by x in (2.28). Notice that the vector components are non-negative. We have the Cholesky decomposition

$$D_2 = C^t C, \qquad \text{where } C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & & & \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ & & & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Multiplying (2.28) by x, we obtain

$$0 \le \|Cx\|_2^2 = x^t C^t C x = x^t A x \le 0.$$

Therefore $\|(U_j - V_j)_+\|_{L^\infty} = 0$. Hence $U_j \le V_j$. □

Remark 1. Notice that, in the proof, we use that the coefficient of the discrete Laplacian are non-positive outside the diagonal. More involved arguments can be applied overcoming this issue.

2.4 Convergence of the solutions of (P_h) to the solution of (P) as $h \to 0$

From now on we use again the notation ∇_x. Our aim is prove that we can pass to the limit $u^h \to u$ at least in $L^1(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$. This will be sufficient to show that the comparison of masses is preserved.

We make use of the *floor function*:

$$\lfloor z \rfloor = \min\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : k \ge z\}$$

i.e. $\lfloor z \rfloor = k$ means $k \le z < k+1$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$ and β satisfy (H_ε). Let u denote the solution of (P). Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $h = 1/(N+1)$,*

$$f_j(x) = f(x, jh),$$

define $\mathbf{u}^h = (u_j^h)$ the unique solution of (P_h) with data $\mathbf{f} = (f_j)$ and let

$$u^h(x,y) = u^h_{\lfloor y/h \rfloor}(x).$$

Then

1. *u^h is a bounded sequence in $L^2(\Omega_2; H_0^1(\Omega_1))$.*
2. *$u^h \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $L^2(\Omega_2; H_0^1(\Omega_1))$ as $h = \frac{1}{N+1} \to 0$.*

Proof. Let us check that u^h is a bounded sequence in $L^2(\Omega_2; H_0^1(\Omega_1))$. We compute

$$\int_{\Omega_2} \left(\int_{\Omega_1} |\nabla_x u^h(x,y)|^2 dx \right)^2 dy = \sum_{j=1}^N h \left(\int_{\Omega_1} |\nabla_x u_j^h(x)|^2 dx \right)^2.$$

Furthermore we easily obtain that

$$\varepsilon \int_{\Omega_1} |\nabla_x u_j^h(x,y)|^2 dx \le \int_{\Omega_1} a(\nabla_x u_j^h) |\nabla_x u_j^h|^2 \le \int_{\Omega_1} f_j u_j^h, \quad j = 1, \dots, N.$$

Hence the sequence u^h is bounded in $L^2(\Omega_2, H_0^1(\Omega_1))$. Thus, there exists $u \in L^2(\Omega_2; H_0^1(\Omega_1))$ such that

$$u^h \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } L^2(\Omega_2; H_0^1(\Omega_1)).$$

Let us check that u is a solution of (P). Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^4(\overline{\Omega}) \cap \mathcal{C}_0(\overline{\Omega})$. Going back to the weak formulation (2.4) we select $\varphi_j(x) = \varphi(x, jh)$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{j=1}^N a(\nabla_x u^h(x,jh)) \nabla_x u^h(x,jh) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi(x,jh) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{j=1}^N u^h(x,jh) \frac{-\varphi(x,(j+1)h) + 2\varphi(x,jh) - \varphi(x,(j-1)h)}{h^2} dx \\ &\quad = \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{j=1}^N f(x,jh)\varphi(x,jh) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

Notice that, by construction

$$u^h(x,y) = u^h\left(x, h\left\lfloor \frac{y}{h}\right\rfloor\right).$$

Let us introduce the following piecewise constant functions in y,

$$\varphi^h(x,y) = \varphi\left(x, h\left\lfloor \frac{y}{h}\right\rfloor\right), \qquad f^h(x,y) = f\left(x, h\left\lfloor \frac{y}{h}\right\rfloor\right) = f_{\lfloor y/h\rfloor}(x)$$

and

$$-(\Delta_y^h\varphi)(x,y) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{-\varphi\left(x, h(\lfloor \frac{y}{h}\rfloor + 1)\right) + 2\varphi\left(x, h\lfloor \frac{y}{h}\rfloor\right) - \varphi\left(x, h(\lfloor \frac{y}{h}\rfloor - 1)\right)}{h^2} & 1 \le \left\lfloor \dfrac{y}{h}\right\rfloor \le N, \\ 0 & \left\lfloor \dfrac{y}{h}\right\rfloor = 0. \end{cases}$$

All these functions are constant for $y \in [hj, h(j+1))$. If g^h is constant in $y \in [hj, h(j+1))$ we have that

$$g^h(x, jh) = \frac{1}{h}\int_{jh}^{(j+1)h} g(x,y)dy.$$

If, furthermore, $g^h(x,0) = 0$ we have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} g^h(x,jh) = \frac{1}{h}\int_0^1 g(x,y)dy.$$

Hence, by multiplying by h, we can write (2.29) as

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_1}\int_{\Omega_2} a(\nabla_x u^h(x,y))\nabla_x u^h(x,y)\cdot\nabla_x\varphi^h(x,y)dxdy - \int_{\Omega_1}\int_{\Omega_2} u^h(x,y)(\Delta_y^h\varphi)(x,y)dxdy \\ = \int_{\Omega_1}\int_{\Omega_2} f^h(x,y)\varphi^h(x,y)dxdy. \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

For a Lipschitz function g, $g^h(x,y) = g\left(x, h\left\lfloor \frac{y}{h}\right\rfloor\right)$ converges uniformly to g

$$\left|g^h(x,y) - g(x,y)\right| = \left|g\left(x, h\left\lfloor \frac{y}{h}\right\rfloor\right) - g(x,y)\right| \le L\left|h\left\lfloor \frac{y}{h}\right\rfloor - y\right| \le Lh.$$

Hence $\nabla_x\varphi^h$, φ^h and f^h converge strongly in $L^2(\Omega_1\times\Omega_2)$. Now we deal with the operator $-\Delta_y^h$.
The classical finite difference estimate for $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^4(\overline{\Omega})$ gives us that

$$\left|\frac{\varphi(x,y+h) - 2\varphi(x,y) + \varphi(x,y-h)}{h^2} + \frac{\partial^2\varphi}{\partial y^2}(x,y)\right| \le Ch^2\left\|\frac{\partial^4\varphi}{\partial y^4}\right\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Therefore

$$\|\Delta_y^h\varphi - \Delta_y\varphi\|_{L^\infty} \to 0. \tag{2.31}$$

So we can pass to the limit in (2.30). Therefore, u is a solution of (P) in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_1}\int_{\Omega_2} a(\nabla_x w(x,y))\nabla_x u(x,y)\cdot\nabla_x\varphi(x,y)dxdy - \int_{\Omega_1}\int_{\Omega_2} w(x,y)\Delta_y\varphi(x,y)dxdy \\ = \int_{\Omega_1}\int_{\Omega_2} f(x,y)\varphi(x,y)dxdy. \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

Let ρ_ε be a sequence of mollifiers, taking $\varphi_\varepsilon = \rho_\varepsilon * w$ we deduce that $\nabla_y w \in L^2(\Omega)$. By approximation, we can use any test function $\varphi \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Integrating by parts, we deduce that u is the unique weak solution of (P). □

2.5 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Let $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\Omega)$. We construct the sequence given by Theorem 2.3. We have that $u^h \to u$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ as $h \to 0$. Analogously for $\Omega^\#$ we have that $v^h \to v$ in $L^1(\Omega^\#)$. Therefore $(u^h)^* \to u^*$ and $(v^h)^* \to v^*$ in $L^1(\Omega_1^*\times\Omega_2)$. Due to Proposition 2.3 we have that

$$\int_0^s (u^h)^*(\sigma,y)d\sigma \le \int_0^s (v^h)^*(\sigma,y)d\sigma, \qquad \forall s \in (0, |\Omega_1|), y \in \Omega_2.$$

Passing to the limit we recover the result.

3 Proof of the comparison result: Theorem 1.1

Let us consider the Yosida approximation of β, for $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\beta_\varepsilon(t) = \beta\Big((I + \varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(t)\Big).$$

Some of its properties are given by Proposition B.1. We will follow and argument similar to [9, Theorem 2.15], with some modifications. Let us consider $\beta_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in \mathcal{C}^1$ approximating β_ε uniformly and still satisfying (H_1) and (B.2).

We also consider a sequence $f_\delta \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$f_\delta \rightharpoonup f \text{ in } L^{\max\{2,p\}}(\Omega) \text{ as } \delta \to 0.$$

Step 1. For f_δ and $\beta_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \varepsilon t$ Let us define

$$a_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) = \frac{\beta_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) + \varepsilon t}{t}.$$

We construct the corresponding solutions $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and $v_{\varepsilon,\delta}$. Applying Theorem 2.1 we have that

$$\int_0^s u^*_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\sigma, y)d\sigma \le \int_0^s v^*_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\sigma, y)d\sigma, \qquad \text{a.e. } (s, y) \in \Omega_1^* \times \Omega_2.$$

Using $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ as test function we have that

$$C\int_\Omega \Big((I + \varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(|\nabla_x u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|)\Big)^p + \varepsilon\int_\Omega |\nabla_x u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^2 + \int_\Omega |\nabla_y u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^2 \le C\|f_\delta\|_{L^{\max\{2,p\}}}\|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^{\min\{2,p'\}}}.$$

Due to the Poincaré inequality in the variable y, we have that

$$C\int_\Omega \Big((I + \varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(|\nabla_x u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|)\Big)^p + \varepsilon\int_\Omega |\nabla_x u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^2 + \int_\Omega |\nabla_y u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^2 \le C\|f_\delta\|_{L^{\max\{2,p\}}}. \tag{3.1}$$

and a similar bound for $v_{\varepsilon,\delta}$. Here we are in the hypothesis (CM), hence we can apply [16, Lemma 4.2] to show that $a_{\varepsilon,\delta}(|\xi|)\xi$ is a monotone operator

$$\Big(a_{\varepsilon,\delta}(|\xi|)\xi - a_{\varepsilon,\delta}(|\eta|)\eta\Big)\cdot(\xi - \eta) \ge 0, \qquad \forall \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Since $a_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ is monotone, we can write the weak formulation in an appropriate way by applying the old trick of Minty [30]: if A is a monotone operator and $Au = f$, then for all test functions φ we have $0 \le (Au - A\varphi, u - \varphi) = (f - A\varphi, u - \varphi)$ hence

$$(A\varphi, \varphi - u) \ge (f, \varphi - u).$$

One then recovers the equation by letting $\varphi = u + \lambda\psi$, so $\lambda(A(u + \lambda\psi), \psi) \ge \lambda(f, \psi)$. As $\lambda \to 0^+$ one has $(Au, \psi) \ge (f, \psi)$, while as $\lambda \to 0^-$ one has $(Au, \psi) \le (f, \psi)$. Hence $(Au, \psi) = (f, \psi)$, or $Au = f$.

In our setting, this reads

$$\int_\Omega a_{\varepsilon,\delta}(|\nabla_x\varphi|)\nabla_x\varphi\cdot\nabla_x(\varphi - u_{\varepsilon,\delta}) + \int_\Omega \nabla_y\varphi\cdot\nabla_y(\varphi - u_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \ge \int_\Omega f(\varphi - u_{\varepsilon,\delta}), \qquad \forall\varphi \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega).$$

Step 2. For f and $\beta_\varepsilon + \varepsilon t$. We pass to the limit as $\delta \to 0$. We have that $u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ uniformly and $\beta_{\varepsilon,\delta} \to \beta_\varepsilon$ uniformly. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\varepsilon,\delta} &\to u_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega),\\ \nabla_y u_{\varepsilon,\delta} &\rightharpoonup \nabla_y u_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega)^n,\\ \nabla_x u_{\varepsilon,\delta} &\rightharpoonup \nabla_x u_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega)^n. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$a_\varepsilon(t) = \frac{\beta_\varepsilon(t) + \varepsilon t}{t}.$$

In order to obtain an equation for u_ε, let us compute the limit of $a_{\varepsilon,\delta}(|\nabla_x\varphi|)\nabla_x\varphi$ for $\varphi \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$. Here and below, since $|a_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\xi)\xi| = \beta_{\varepsilon,\delta}(|\xi|) + \varepsilon|\xi|, |a_\varepsilon(\xi)\xi| = \beta_\varepsilon(|\xi|) + \varepsilon|\xi|$ and $|a(\xi)\xi| = \beta(|\xi|)$ are continuous at 0 and vanish, we only need to check the points where $\nabla_x\varphi \neq 0$. We have

$$a_{\varepsilon,\delta}(|\nabla_x\varphi|)\nabla_x\varphi = \frac{\beta_{\varepsilon,\delta}(|\nabla_x\varphi|) + \varepsilon|\nabla_x\varphi|}{|\nabla_x\varphi|}\nabla_x\varphi \longrightarrow \frac{\beta_\varepsilon(|\nabla_x\varphi|) + \varepsilon|\nabla_x\varphi|}{|\nabla_x\varphi|}\nabla_x\varphi = a_\varepsilon(|\nabla_x\varphi|)\nabla_x\varphi, \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Since the sequence is uniformly bounded, we can pass to the limit and recover

$$\int_\Omega a_\varepsilon(|\nabla_x\varphi|)\nabla_x\varphi \cdot \nabla_x(\varphi - u_\varepsilon) + \int_\Omega \nabla_y\varphi \cdot \nabla_y(\varphi - u_\varepsilon) \geq \int_\Omega f(\varphi - u_\varepsilon), \qquad \forall\varphi \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega).$$

Step 2a. Weak formulation for u_ε We apply Minty's argument to obtain the solution. We must prove the continuity of the operator. By approximation, it is sufficient to choose $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, since, due to the fact that β_ε is Lipschitz, we have that

$$a_\varepsilon(|\nabla_x\varphi|)\nabla_x\varphi \in L^2(\Omega)^n, \qquad \forall\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Let us take as test function $\varphi_\lambda = u + \lambda\psi$ where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. As $\lambda \to 0$, it is clear that

$$\nabla_x u + \lambda\nabla_x\psi \to \nabla_x u \qquad \text{as } \lambda \to 0 \text{ a.e. and in } L^2(\Omega).$$

Hence, since β_ε is continuous and in view of the a.e. convergence and the uniform bounds, we get

$$a_\varepsilon(|\nabla_x\varphi_\lambda|)\nabla_x\varphi_\lambda = \frac{\beta_\varepsilon(|\nabla_x\varphi_\lambda|) + \varepsilon|\nabla_x\varphi_\lambda|}{|\nabla_x\varphi_\lambda|}\nabla_x\varphi_\lambda \longrightarrow \frac{\beta_\varepsilon(|\nabla_x u|) + \varepsilon|\nabla_x u|}{|\nabla_x u|}\nabla_x u = a_\varepsilon(|\nabla_x u|)\nabla_x u \quad \text{ in } L^2(\Omega)^n,$$

as $\lambda \to 0$. Then, passing to the limit as $\lambda \to 0^\pm$ we have,

$$\int_\Omega a_\varepsilon(|\nabla_x u_\varepsilon|)\nabla_x u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla_x\psi + \int_\Omega \nabla_y u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla_y\psi = \int_\Omega f\psi, \qquad \forall\psi \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Step 2b. Uniform estimates We can take $\psi = u_\varepsilon$ as a test function and we recover, as before

$$c\int_\Omega \Big((I + \varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(|\nabla_x u_\varepsilon|)\Big)^p + \varepsilon\int_\Omega |\nabla_x u_\varepsilon|^2 + \int_\Omega |\nabla_y u_\varepsilon|^2 \leq C. \tag{3.2}$$

Equivalent results apply to $v_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and v_ε.

Step 2c. Mass comparison Since we can pass to the limit in $L^1(\Omega)$, we have the mass comparison

$$\int_0^s u_\varepsilon^*(\sigma, y)d\sigma \leq \int_0^s v_\varepsilon^*(\sigma, y)d\sigma, \qquad \text{a.e. } (s, y) \in \Omega_1^* \times \Omega_2.$$

Step 3. For f and β. Due to the uniform bound (3.2), up a to subsequence, we have, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned} u_\varepsilon &\to u \quad \text{ in } L^2(\Omega), \\ \nabla_y u_\varepsilon &\rightharpoonup \nabla_y u \quad \text{ in } L^2(\Omega)^n, \\ \frac{(I + \varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(|\nabla_x u_\varepsilon|)}{|\nabla_x u_\varepsilon|}\nabla_x u_\varepsilon &\rightharpoonup \eta \quad \text{ in } L^p(\Omega)^n, \end{aligned}$$

and the corresponding convergences for v_ε and v.

Let us study the equation satisfied by u. Notice that,

$$a_\varepsilon(|\nabla_x\varphi|)\nabla_x\varphi = \left(\beta\Big((I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(|\nabla_x\varphi|)\Big) + \varepsilon|\nabla_x\varphi|\right)\frac{\nabla_x\varphi}{|\nabla_x\varphi|} \longrightarrow \beta(|\nabla_x\varphi|)\frac{\nabla_x\varphi}{|\nabla_x\varphi|} = a(|\nabla_x\varphi|)\nabla_x\varphi \qquad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

since, by Proposition B.1, we have $(I + \varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(\nabla_x\varphi) \to \nabla_x\varphi$ a.e. and β is continuous. Since the sequence is clearly uniformly bounded, we have that the convergence is strong in $L^q(\Omega)$ for any $1 \leq q < +\infty$. This implies that u is satisfies

$$\int_\Omega a(|\nabla_x\varphi|)\nabla_x\varphi \cdot (\eta - \nabla_x\varphi) + \int_\Omega \nabla_y\varphi \cdot \nabla_y(u - \varphi) \geq \int_\Omega f(u - \varphi), \qquad \forall\varphi \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$$

and the analogous for v.
Let us now show that $\eta = \nabla_x u$. Due to Proposition B.1 we have that

$$\left| \frac{(I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(|\nabla_x u_\varepsilon|)}{|\nabla_x u_\varepsilon|} \nabla_x u_\varepsilon - \nabla_x u_\varepsilon \right| = \left| (I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(|\nabla_x u_\varepsilon|) - |\nabla_x u_\varepsilon| \right| = \varepsilon \beta_\varepsilon(|\nabla_x u_\varepsilon|). \tag{3.3}$$

Therefore

$$\frac{(I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(|\nabla_x u_\varepsilon|)}{|\nabla_x u_\varepsilon|} \nabla_x u_\varepsilon - \nabla_x u_\varepsilon \longrightarrow 0 \text{ in } L^{p'}(\Omega)^n.$$

Hence

$$\nabla_x u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \eta \text{ in } L^{\min\{p,p'\}}(\Omega)^n.$$

Then, for any $\varphi \in W^{2,\infty} \cap W_0^{1,\infty}$

$$\int_\Omega (\eta - \nabla_x u)\nabla_x \varphi = \lim_\varepsilon \int_\Omega (\nabla_x u_\varepsilon - \nabla_x u)\nabla_x \varphi = -\lim_\varepsilon \int_\Omega (u_\varepsilon - u)\Delta_x \varphi = 0,$$

so

$$\nabla_x u = \eta \in L^p(\Omega).$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\int_\Omega a(|\nabla_x \varphi|)\nabla_x \varphi \cdot \nabla_x(\varphi - u) + \int_\Omega \nabla_y \varphi \cdot \nabla_y(\varphi - u) \geq \int_\Omega f(\varphi - u), \qquad \forall \varphi \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega). \tag{3.4}$$

Reproducing Step 2a of this proof, where $H_0^1(\Omega)$ is replaced by $X^p(\Omega)$ and $L^2(\Omega)$ by $L^p(\Omega)$ and $L^{p'}(\Omega)$ as convenient, we have that

$$\int_\Omega a(|\nabla_x u|)\nabla_x u \cdot \nabla_x \psi + \int_\Omega \nabla_y u \cdot \nabla_y \psi = \int_\Omega f\psi, \qquad \forall \psi \in X^p(\Omega).$$

Proceeding analogously for v we have obtained the solution of (P) and ($\mathrm{P}^\#$). Since the limit has been taken in L^1, the mass comparison is preserved,

$$\int_0^s u^*(\sigma, y)d\sigma \leq \int_0^s v^*(\sigma, y)d\sigma, \qquad \text{a.e. } (s,y) \in \Omega_1^* \times \Omega_2.$$

This completes the proof. □

4 Extensions, generalizations and open problems

By some technical adaptations of the proof we will prove in an upcoming paper the following generalisations:

1. Consider as β a multivalued maximal monotone graphs. Then, (H_2) becomes

$$C(t^p - 1) \leq tw, \qquad w \leq \frac{1}{C}(t^{p-1} + 1), \qquad \forall w \in \beta(t). \tag{4.1}$$

   The approximation argument follows as in [9, Theorem 2.15].

2. Case of $\Omega_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ with $n_2 > 1$. The finite-differences approach still works, although with some modifications. The boundary nodes are no longer $j = 0, N$, and the structure of the matrix D_2 in (2.28) is more complicated. Some regularity assumptions on Ω will be required for the convergence of the finite difference scheme.

3. Case of Ω not a product, but any general domain in $\mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2}$. Then, one needs to replace Ω_1 by the cuts $\Omega_y = \Omega \cap \{(x,y) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ and rearrange in each of them. This introduces some additional technical difficulties.

4. Some more general operators in y can be studied. For example, operators of the form $-\operatorname{div}(A(y)\nabla_y u)$, under some assumptions on $A(y)$.

5. The boundary condtion $u = 0$ in $\partial\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ is a known requirement for the rearrangement. However, one could set a Neumann boundary condition on $\Omega_1 \times \partial\Omega_2$. Our method can be adapted to this case by considering a discretisation of $\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}$ at the first and last nodes.

6. One could add a zero order term, as in [20].

There are some alternative approaches that could prove succesful, and perhaps more direct, although they require stronger theory. They could be applied to more general operators in y.

1. The structure ($\underline{\mathrm{P}_h^*}$) shows that $U(s,y) = \int_0^s u(\sigma,y)d\sigma$ is such that $s^{1/n'}\partial^2 U/\partial s^2 \in L^\infty$ and $\nabla_y U \in L^2$ and a solution of
$$\begin{cases} \beta\left(-n\omega_n^{1/n} s^{1/n'} \dfrac{\partial^2 U}{\partial s^2}\right) - \Delta_y U \le F & \Omega_1^* \times \Omega_2 \\ \dfrac{\partial U}{\partial s}(0,y) = 0, \quad U(|\Omega_1|,y) = 0, & y \in \Omega_2 \\ U(s,y) = 0 & \Omega_1^* \times \partial\Omega_2. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$
There is a comparison principle for viscosity solutions of this problem (see [18]). Then the difficulty is to show that U is a viscosity solution. We have avoided this difficulty through the discretisation in y. For the linear case, the fact that weak regular solutions are viscosity solutions is a well-known fact (see [24]). Some recent works show that this is also the case for the p-Laplace operator [25, 28]

2. A natural replacement of the finite differences are the finite elements. One can consider a mesh over an approximate domain $(\Omega_2)_h$, and a basis (φ_j^h) over the mesh and writes an approximate solution
$$u^h(x,y) = \sum_{j=1}^N u_j^h(x)\varphi_j^h(y), \qquad f_h(x,y) = \sum_{j=1}^N f_j^h(x)\varphi_j^h(y) \quad \text{where} \quad f_j^h(x) = \int_{\Omega_2} f(x,y)\varphi_j^h(y)dy.$$
The problem is written as a system of boundary value problems in s, a solution of which exists by minimization. Via rearrangement one obtains functions
$$\int_0^s (u^h)^*(\sigma,y)d\sigma \le \sum_{j=1}^N \int_0^s (u_j^h)^*(\sigma)\varphi_j^h(y)d\sigma$$
$$U(s,y) = \int_0^s (u^h)^*(\sigma,y)d\sigma = \sum_{j=1}^N \int_0^s (u_j^h)^*(\sigma,y)d\sigma\ \varphi_j(y) = \sum_{i=1}^N U_j(s)\varphi_j(y).$$
This should lead to a discrete problem in U_j that still preserves the comparison principle.

A A weak and a.e. convergence lemma

Lemma A.1. *Assume that $f_k, g_k \in L^1(\Omega)$ are such that $f_k \le g_k$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and $f_k \rightharpoonup f$ and $g_k \rightharpoonup g$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. Then $f \le g$.*

Proof. Let $0 \le \varphi = \mathrm{sign}_+(f-g) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then
$$0 \ge \lim_k \int_\Omega (f_k - g_k)\varphi = \int_\Omega (f-g)\varphi = \int_\Omega (f-g)_+ \ge 0.$$
Then $(f-g)_+ = 0$, that is $f \le g$. □

B Properties of the Yosida approximation

Proposition B.1. *Let $\beta : [0,+\infty) \to [0,+\infty)$ be continuous non-decreasing and let I be the identity operator $I(t) = t$. Then:*

1. *$(I + \varepsilon\beta) : [0,+\infty) \to [0,+\infty)$ is a strictly increasing continuous bijection.*
2. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\beta_\varepsilon = \beta \circ (I + \varepsilon\beta)^{-1}$ is non-decreasing and Lipschitz continuous with constant $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$.*

3. We have that $(I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(t) \to t$ *for every* t*. In fact*

$$t - (I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(t) = \varepsilon\beta_\varepsilon(t). \tag{B.1}$$

4. If a *satisfies* (H_2) *then*

$$C\Big(|(I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(t)|^p - 1\Big) \le \beta_\varepsilon(t)t, \qquad \beta_\varepsilon(t) \le C(t^{p-1}+1). \tag{B.2}$$

Proof. 1. The continuity of $I+\varepsilon\beta$ is obvious. Further, $I+\varepsilon\beta$ is strictly increasing: for $t > s$ there holds $t+\varepsilon\beta(t) \ge t+\varepsilon\beta(s) > s+\varepsilon\beta(s)$. Since $(I+\varepsilon\beta)(0) = 0$, we have (as $t \to +\infty$) $(I+\varepsilon\beta)(t) = t+\varepsilon\beta(t) \ge t \to +\infty$ and hence $(I+\varepsilon\beta)([0,+\infty)) = [0,+\infty)$.

2. Let $t \ge s$. Then $\tau = (I+\beta)^{-1}(t) \ge (I+\beta)^{-1}(s) = \gamma$ and

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon}(\tau - \gamma + \varepsilon(\beta(\tau) - \beta(\gamma))) \ge \beta(\tau) - \beta(\gamma) \ge 0.$$

Hence

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big(\tau + \varepsilon\beta(\tau) - (\gamma + \varepsilon\beta(\gamma))\Big) \ge \beta(\tau) - \beta(\gamma) \ge 0.$$

Going back to the original variables $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}(t-s) \ge \beta_\varepsilon(t) - \beta_\varepsilon(s) \ge 0$. Similarly one proceeds for $t \le s$.

3. Letting, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\tau = (I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(t)$ we have that

$$t - (I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(t) = (\tau + \varepsilon\beta(\tau)) - t = \varepsilon\beta(\tau) = \varepsilon\beta_\varepsilon(t).$$

For t fixed $\beta_\varepsilon(t) = \beta((I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(t)) \le \beta(t)$. Hence, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the difference tends to 0.

4. Let $t \ge 0$ and $\tau = (I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(t)$. First, we have that

$$\beta_\varepsilon(t) = \beta((I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(t)) \le \beta(t) \le \frac{1}{C}(t^{p-1}+1).$$

On the other hand $t = \tau + \varepsilon\beta(\tau) \ge \tau$, hence

$$\beta_\varepsilon(t)t = \beta((I+\varepsilon\beta)^{-1}(t))t = \beta(\tau)t \ge \beta(\tau)\tau \ge C(\tau^p - 1).$$

This completes the proof. □

Acknowledgements

The research of J.I. Díaz and D. Gómez-Castro was partially supported by the project ref. MTM2017-85449-P of the Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades – Agencia Estatal de Investigación (Spain).
The research of D. Gómez-Castro was partially supported by grant PGC2018-098440-B-I00 from the Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades – Agencia Estatal de Investigación (Spain).
The research of A. Mercaldo was partially supported by Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM).

References

[1] A. Alvino, J. I. Díaz, P.-L. Lions, and G. Trombetti. Équations elliptiques et symètrisation de Steiner. *CR Acad. Sci. Paris*, 314:1015–1020, 1992.

[2] A. Alvino, V. Ferone, G. Trombetti, and P.-L. Lions. Convex symmetrization and applications. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 14(2):275–293, 1997.

[3] A. Alvino and G. Trombetti. A class of degenerate nonlinear elliptic equations. *Ricerche Mat.*, 29(2):193–212, 1980.

[4] A. Alvino, G. Trombetti, J. I. Díaz, and P. L. Lions. Elliptic equations and Steiner symmetrization. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 49(3):217–236, 1996.

[5] A. Alvino, G. Trombetti, and P. L. Lions. Comparison results for elliptic and parabolic equations via Schwarz symmetrization. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 7(2):37–65, 1990.

[6] S. N. Antontsev, J. I. Díaz, and S. Shmarev. *Energy Methods for Free Boundary Problems*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2002.

[7] A. Baernstein and B. A. Taylor. Spherical rearrangements, subharmonic functions, and *-functions in n-space. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 43(2):245–268, 1976.

[8] C. Bandle and B. Kawohl. Application de la symétrization de steiner aux problèmes de poisson. Preprint, 1992.

[9] V. Barbu. *Nonlinear Differential Equations of Monotone Types in Banach Spaces*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2010.

[10] P. Benilan and P. Spiteri. Discretisation par schema implicite d'un probleme abstrait $d^2u/dt^2 \in Au$ sur $[0,1]$, $u(0) = u_0, u(1) = u_1$. *Publications Mathematiques de Besanson. Analysis nonlineaire.*, 10:93–100, 1987.

[11] F. Brock. Continuous Steiner-Symmetrization. *Math. Nach.*, 172:25–48, 1995.

[12] F. Brock. Continuous rearrangement and symmetry of solutions of elliptic problems. *Proceedings of the Indian Academy of Sciences: Mathematical Sciences*, 110(2):157–204, 2000.

[13] F. Brock, F. Chiacchio, A. Ferone, and A. Mercaldo. New Pólya–Szegö-type inequalities and an alternative approach to comparison results for PDE's. *Advances in Mathematics*, 336:316–334, 2018.

[14] A. Burchard. Steiner symmetrization is continuous in $W ^{1,p}$. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 7(5):823–860, 1997.

[15] F. Chiacchio. Estimates for the first eigenfunction of linear eigenvalue problems via Steiner symmetrization. *Publ. Mat.*, 53(1):47–71, 2009.

[16] A. Cianchi and V. G. Maz'ya. Global Boundedness of the Gradient for a Class of Nonlinear Elliptic Systems. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 212(1):129–177, 2014.

[17] A. Cianchi and V. G. Maz'ya. Second-Order Two-Sided Estimates in Nonlinear Elliptic Problems. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 229(2):569–599, 2018.

[18] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii, and P.-L. Lions. User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order Partial Differential Equation. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 27(1):1–67, 1992.

[19] J. I. Díaz. *Simetrización de problemas parabólicos no lineales: aplicación a ecuaciones de reacción-difusión*, volume XXVIII. Memorias de la Real Academia de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales, Madrid, 1991.

[20] J. I. Díaz and D. Gómez-Castro. On the Effectiveness of Wastewater Cylindrical Reactors: an Analysis Through Steiner Symmetrization. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, 173(3), 2016.

[21] V. Ferone and A. Mercaldo. Neumann problems and Steiner symmetrization. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 30(10-12):1537–1553, 2005.

[22] I. Fonseca. The Wulff theorem revisited. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 432(1884):125–145, 1991.

[23] F. W. Gehring. Symmetrization of Rings in Space. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 101(3):499, 1961.

[24] H. Ishii. On the equivalence of two notions of weak solutions, viscosity solutions and distribution solutions. *Funkcial. Ekvac*, 38:101–120, 1995.

[25] P. Juutinen, P. Lindqvist, and J. J. Manfredi. On the Equivalence of Viscosity Solutions and Weak Solutions for a Quasi-Linear Equation. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 33(3):699–717, 2003.

[26] P. L. Lions and P. E. Souganidis. Homogenization of degenerate second-order PDE in periodic and almost periodic environments and applications. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincare (C) Analyse Non Lineaire*, 22(5):667–677, 2005.

[27] V. G. Maz'ja. Weak solutions of the Dirichlet and Neumann problems. *Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obšč.*, 20:137–172, 1969.

[28] M. Medina and P. Ochoa. On viscosity and weak solutions for non-homogeneous p-Laplace equations. *Advances in Nonlinear Analysis*, 8(1):468–481, 2019.

[29] M. Meier. Boundedness and integrability properties of weak solutions of quasilinear elliptic systems). *Journal fur die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik*, 1982(333):191–220, 1982.

[30] G. J. Minty. Monotone (nonlinear) operators in Hilbert space. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 29(3):341–346, 1962.

[31] R. E. Newnham. *Properties of materials: anisotropy, symmetry, structure*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.

[32] E. I. Poffald and S. Reich. A Quasi-Autonomous Second-Order Differential Inclusion. *Trends in Theory and Practice of Non-Linear Analysis*, pages 387–392, 1985.

[33] S. Reich and I. Shafrir. An existence theorem for a difference inclusion in general Banach spaces. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 160(2):406–412, 1991.

[34] G. Talenti. Elliptic equations and rearrangements. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 3(4):697–718, 1976.

[35] G. Talenti. Nonlinear Elliptic Equations, Rearrangements of Functions and Orlicz Spaces. *Applicable Analysis*, 6(4):319–320, 1977.

[36] G. Talenti. Linear elliptic p.d.e.'s: level sets, rearrangements and a priori estimates of solutions. *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. B (6)*, 4(3):917–949, 1985.

[37] G. Talenti. The art of rearranging. *Milan J. Math.*, 84(1):105–157, 2016.

[38] J. Van Schaftingen. Anisotropic symmetrization. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincare (C) Non Linear Analysis*, 23(4):539–565, 2006.

[39] H. F. Weinberger. Symmetrization in uniformly elliptic problems. In *Studies in mathematical analysis and related topics*, pages 424–428. Stanford Univ. Press, Stanford, Calif., 1962.

[40] G. Wulff. Zur Frage der Geschwindigkeit des Wachsturms und der Auflösung der Krystallflächen. *Z. Kristallographie*, 34:449530, 1901.

[41] V. V. Zhikov. On the homogenization technique for variational problems. *Functional Analysis and its Applications*, 33(1):11–24, 1999.