

On solutions to $-\Delta u = Vu$ near infinity

Yifei Pan and Yuan Zhang

Abstract

We investigate the unique continuation property and the sign changing behavior of weak solutions to $-\Delta u = Vu$ near infinity under certain conditions on the blow-up rate of the potential V near infinity.

1 Introduction

Given $V \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $n \geq 2$, we study properties of real-valued weak solutions to

$$-\Delta u = Vu \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

near infinity. Landis [26] conjectured that if $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then every bounded weak solution u such that $|u| \leq O(e^{-k|x|^{1+\epsilon}})$ near infinity for some $k > 0, \epsilon > 0$ must be identically 0. In [30], Meshkov constructed a nontrivial function u_0 which satisfies $|u_0| \leq O(e^{-k|x|^{\frac{4}{3}}})$ for some $k > 0$ and solves $-\Delta u = Vu$ for some complex-valued $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, thus disproving the Landis conjecture for the complex case. The conjecture has attracted much attention, particularly since the fundamental works of Bourgain-Kenig [4] and Kenig [21] in the real-valued case. See, for instance, [1, 7, 9, 25, 30, 32] and the references therein. Recently, Logunov, Malinnikova, Nadirashvili and Nazarov proved the full Landis conjecture when $n = 2$ in [28].

Motivated by the Landis conjecture, we first investigate the following unique continuation property at infinity. Denote by (r, θ) the polar coordinates, $r > 0, \theta \in S^{n-1}$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $V \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Assume further that when $|x| >> 1$, V is locally Lipschitz,*

$$V = O(|x|^M) \tag{1.1}$$

for some constant $M \in \mathbb{R}$, and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(r^2 V) \geq 0 \tag{1.2}$$

in terms of the polar coordinates (r, θ) . Let $u \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak solution to

$$-\Delta u = Vu \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

If $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^m \int_{|x| > r} |u|^2 = 0$ for each $m \geq 0$, then $u \equiv 0$.

Remark 1.2. *Although Theorem 1.1 is stated for solutions to $-\Delta u = Vu$ on the entire Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , our proof only requires properties near infinity. This applies similarly to the rest of the results in the paper. Therefore, all of our theorems remain valid with the domain \mathbb{R}^n replaced by any exterior domain $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$ for some compact subset K .*

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 35A02; Secondary 35B99, 32W05.

Key words and phrases. unique continuation property, Kelvin transform,

The $M = 0$ case in (1.1) corresponds to Landis's case. In comparison to the conjecture, while imposing an additional condition (1.2), we allow V to blow up in a finite order at infinity in (1.1). In conclusion, we obtain the unique continuation property by assuming that u vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense (see Section 2 for the definition) rather than to some negative exponential order at infinity. Along these lines, there has been fruitful investigation in the literature, though under the stronger superexponential decay rate assumption. For instance, Kenig, Silvestre, and Wang [25], and Davey, Kenig, and Wang [9] gave quantitative exponential decay lower bounds for solutions near infinity when $n = 2$ and $M = 0$. On the other hand, the works of Meshkov [30], Froese, Herbst, Hoffmann-Ostenhof and Hoffmann-Ostenhof [12], as well as Cruz-Sampedro [5], demonstrate the unique continuation for $-\Delta u = (V + \lambda)u$ with $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, by requiring $V = O(|x|^M)$ and $e^{\gamma|x|^{1+\frac{1}{3}\max\{0,1+2M\}}}u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $\gamma > 0$. Recently, Davey [8] improved this result by obtaining an exponential decay lower bound $|u(x)| \geq e^{-k|x|^{1+\frac{M}{2}(\ln|x|)^{\frac{3}{2}}}}$ for some $k > 0$ when $n = 2$. In the case when $V \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some large $p > 1$, Davey and Zhu [10, 11] also provided a similar exponential decay lower bound $|u(x)| \geq e^{-k|x|^\tau \ln|x|}$ for some constants $k, \tau > 0$ dependent on p .

Although every radial potential satisfying (1.2) can not change sign near infinity, there are many non-radial potentials that may change sign near infinity in the context of Theorem 1.1. See Remark 3.3. We note that in the case when $V \leq 0$ on the entire space \mathbb{R}^n , the unique continuation property is trivial for global solutions, due to the strong maximum principle. We refer the interested reader to a result by Davey [7] for more discussions on bounded sign-changing potentials in the plane. On the other hand, among other results, Arapostathis, Biswas, and Ganguly [1] and Rossi [32] recently proved the strong Landis conjecture with $\epsilon = 0$ for nonnegative solutions. Rossi [32] also proved the conjecture for radial potentials.

Regarding the unique continuation property, there are generally two methods to analyze the maximal order vanishing of the solutions. One method establishes some Carleman-type weighted integral inequalities, see [11, 17, 19, 22, 23, 33], etc. The other method introduced by Garofalo and Lin utilizes monotonicity of Almgren-type frequency functions in conjunction with doubling inequalities. For instance, [13, 14, 24, 34], etc. Our main tool of the proof involves a local unique continuation property presented by Agman and Nirenberg [2], as well as Li and Nirenberg [29], coupled with the application of the Kelvin transform which brings the equation from infinity to a punctured neighborhood of the origin. As the Kelvin transform introduces extra strong singularity at the origin, we will need the assumption (1.1) to resolve the singularity of the new equation at the origin (in Corollary 2.4). This assumption also reduces the regularity assumption of the solution to being merely in $L^2_{loc}(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ in Theorem 3.1. In fact, as demonstrated in Example 2 and Example 3, the unique continuation property fails at infinity in general if (1.1) and/or (1.2) is dropped.

One may also compare Theorem 1.1 with another unique continuation result in [15, Theorem 14.7.2] where $V = V_1 + \lambda$ with $\lambda > 0$ and $|V_1| \leq Cr^{-1}$ for some constant $C > 0$, under a stronger assumption where both u and ∇u vanish to infinite order at infinity in the L^2 sense. In fact, as a side product, one can immediately obtain

Corollary 1.3. *Given V satisfying all the assumptions as in Theorem 1.1, let $u \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak solution to*

$$-\Delta u - Vu = \lambda u \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

for some constant $\lambda \geq 0$. If $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^m \int_{|x|>r} |u|^2 = 0$ for each $m \geq 0$, then $u \equiv 0$.

In particular, Theorem 1.1 can be applied to infer the unique continuation property at infinity when the potential is homogeneous as follows. See also Example 4 for the construction of more

potentials that satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 1.4. *Let $V \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$ be a homogeneous function of order α on \mathbb{R}^n . Assume either $\alpha = 2$, or $\alpha > -2$ and $V \geq 0$ on \mathbb{R}^n , or $\alpha < -2$ and $V \leq 0$ on \mathbb{R}^n . Let $u \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak solution to*

$$-\Delta u = Vu \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

If $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^m \int_{|x|>r} |u|^2 = 0$ for each $m \geq 0$, then $u \equiv 0$.

Corollary 1.5. *Let $u \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be an eigenfunction of $-\Delta$ on \mathbb{R}^n with*

$$-\Delta u = c^2 u \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

for some constant c . Then u does not vanish to infinite order in the L^2 sense at ∞ . Namely, there exists some $N \geq 0$ such that $\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^N \int_{|x|>r} |u|^2 = \infty$.

Next, we study the sign changing behavior of bounded weak solutions near infinity. The following theorem states that when V satisfies certain integrability condition near infinity, then bounded weak solutions must change sign constantly near infinity.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $V \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Assume further that $V \geq 0$ when $|x| \gg 1$, $\int_{|x|>r} \frac{1}{|x|^{n+2}V} < \infty$ and $\int_{|x|>r} |x|^{4-2n}V = \infty$ for some $r \gg 1$. Then every non-constant bounded weak solution to*

$$-\Delta u = Vu \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

must change sign near ∞ . Namely, if $u \geq 0$ (or $u \leq 0$) when $|x| \gg 1$, then $u \equiv 0$.

As indicated by the following corollary, there exist ample examples for which the assumptions of the potential in Theorem 1.6 are satisfied.

Corollary 1.7. *Let $V \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$ be a positive homogeneous function of order α on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Let u be a bounded weak solution to*

$$-\Delta u = Vu \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

If $\alpha > -2$ when $n \leq 2$, or $\alpha \geq n - 4$ when $n \geq 3$, then u must change sign near ∞ .

According to Liouville's theorem, every bounded eigenfunction of Laplacian with respect to eigenvalue 0 (namely, harmonic function) must be a constant. The following theorem shows that bounded eigenfunctions with respect to nonzero eigenvalues will constantly change sign near infinity. As seen in the statement of Corollary 1.7, the order $\alpha = 0$ case is covered by this corollary only when $n \leq 4$. The remaining cases when $n \geq 5$ has to be dealt with through a different approach. See Section 4 for its proof.

Theorem 1.8. *Every bounded eigenfunction of $-\Delta$ with*

$$-\Delta u = c^2 u \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

for a constant $c \neq 0$ must change sign near ∞ .

Equivalently, the above theorem states that every bounded nonconstant eigenfunction is neither subharmonic nor superharmonic near infinity. Theorem 1.8 (and Theorem 1.5) fails in general for eigenfunctions with respect to negative eigenvalues, as indicated in the following example.

Example 1. Let $u_0(z)$ be a holomorphic solution on \mathbb{C} to the following modified Bessel equation

$$v''(z) + \frac{1}{z}v'(z) - v(z) = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{C}$$

such that its asymptotic behavior for $|\arg z| < \frac{\pi}{2}$ near ∞ is $u_0(z) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} z^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-z}$. See, for instance, [27, pp. 183]. Then $u_0(r)$ is a radial solution to

$$-\Delta u = -u \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Clearly, u_0 is a bounded eigenfunction with respect to eigenvalue -1 , and it does not change sign near ∞ .

Acknowledgement: The authors would like to thank the referees for very helpful suggestions.

2 Preliminaries

As mentioned in the introduction, when pulling the equation from infinity to the origin via the Kelvin transform, the procedure results in a new equation that carries singularity at the origin. The purpose of this section is to extend the new equation across the origin, and meanwhile resolve the singularity of weak solutions there. We shall also discuss properties of flat functions.

Denote by B_r the ball of radius r centered at 0 in \mathbb{R}^n . Given u on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1$, recall that the Kelvin transform of u is defined by $w(x) := \frac{1}{|x|^{n-2}} u\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right)$ on $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$. One of the properties for the Kelvin transform is that in the distribution sense,

$$\Delta w(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^{n+2}} \Delta u\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right) \quad \text{on } B_1 \setminus \{0\}. \quad (2.1)$$

In particular, the harmonicity is invariant under the Kelvin transform, a property that we will apply repeatedly.

Lemma 2.1. Let $V \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1)$, and $u \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1)$. Define

$$w(x) := \frac{1}{|x|^{n-2}} u\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad W(x) := \frac{1}{|x|^4} V\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right) \quad \text{on } B_1 \setminus \{0\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Then the following properties hold.

- (1) $W \in L_{loc}^\infty(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$, and $w \in L_{loc}^2(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$.
- (2) If $V = O(|x|^M)$ near ∞ for some constant M , then $W = O\left(\frac{1}{|x|^{M+4}}\right)$ near 0.
- (3) For every $r > 0$, one has

$$\int_{|x| > \frac{1}{r}} \frac{1}{|x|^{n+2} V} = \int_{|x| < r} \frac{1}{|x|^{n+2} W} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{|x| > \frac{1}{r}} |x|^{4-2n} V = \int_{|x| < r} W.$$

- (4) If

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^m \int_{|x| > r} |u|^2 = 0$$

for some constant $m \geq 0$, then $w \in L^2_{loc}(B_1)$ with

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-(m+4)} \int_{|x| < r} |w|^2 = 0.$$

(5) If u is a weak solution to

$$-\Delta u = Vu \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1,$$

then w is a weak solution to

$$-\Delta w = Ww \quad \text{on } B_1 \setminus \{0\}.$$

Proof. (1) and (2) are true by definition. For (3), we apply change of coordinates $x \rightarrow \frac{x}{|x|^2}$ to verify the equalities directly as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|x| < r} \frac{1}{|x|^{n+2}W} &= \int_{|x| < r} \frac{1}{|x|^{n-2}V\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right)} = \int_{|x| > \frac{1}{r}} \frac{|x|^{n-2}}{V(x)} |x|^{-2n} = \int_{|x| > \frac{1}{r}} \frac{1}{|x|^{n+2}V}; \\ \int_{|x| < r} W &= \int_{|x| < r} \frac{1}{|x|^4} V\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right) = \int_{|x| > \frac{1}{r}} |x|^4 V(x) |x|^{-2n} = \int_{|x| > \frac{1}{r}} |x|^{4-2n} V. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that the Jacobian of the coordinates change is $|x|^{-2n}$.

For the decay property of w in (4), by the same change of coordinates as above,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|x| < r} |w|^2 &= \int_{|x| < r} \frac{1}{|x|^{2n-4}} \left| u\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right) \right|^2 = \int_{|x| > \frac{1}{r}} |x|^{2n-4} |u(x)|^2 |x|^{-2n} \\ &= \int_{|x| > \frac{1}{r}} |x|^{-4} |u(x)|^2 \leq r^4 \int_{|x| > \frac{1}{r}} |u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by assumption, $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-m} \int_{|x| > \frac{1}{r}} |u|^2 = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^m \int_{|x| > r} |u|^2 = 0$. Hence

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-(m+4)} \int_{|x| < r} |w|^2 \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-m-4} r^4 \int_{|x| > \frac{1}{r}} |u|^2 = 0.$$

(5) follows from (2.1) by a straightforward computation: on $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$,

$$-\Delta w(x) = -\frac{1}{|x|^{n+2}} \Delta u\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right) = \frac{1}{|x|^{n+2}} V\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right) u\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right) = \frac{1}{|x|^4} V\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right) w(x) = W(x)w(x)$$

in the distribution sense. □

Next we extend the weak solutions across the singularity at the origin, with the help of a Harvey-Polking type (see [18]) lemma below for an isolated singularity. Throughout the rest of the paper we use the following notation: two quantities A and B are said to satisfy $A \lesssim B$, if $A \leq CB$ for some constant $C > 0$ that depends only possibly on n .

Lemma 2.2. *Let $P(x, D)$ be a linear differential operator of order l and $f \in L^1(B_1)$. If $u \in L^1(B_1)$ is a weak solution to $P(x, D)u = f$ on $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$ and*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-l} \int_{|x| < r} |u| = 0, \tag{2.3}$$

then u is a weak solution to $P(x, D)u = f$ on B_1 .

Proof. Let ϕ^r be a smooth function on B_1 such that $\phi^r = 1$ on $B_{\frac{r}{2}}$, $\phi^r = 0$ outside B_r and $|\nabla^k \phi^r| \lesssim r^{-k}$ on B_r , $k \leq l$. Then for any testing function ϕ on B_1 , $(1 - \phi^r)\phi$ is a testing function on $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$. Thus

$$\langle P(x, D)u - f, (1 - \phi^r)\phi \rangle = 0,$$

and so

$$\langle P(x, D)u - f, \phi \rangle = \langle P(x, D)u - f, \phi^r \phi \rangle = \langle u, {}^t P(x, D)(\phi^r \phi) \rangle - \langle f, \phi^r \phi \rangle.$$

Passing r to 0, since $f \in L^1(B_1)$,

$$\langle f, \phi^r \phi \rangle \lesssim \int_{B_r} |f| \rightarrow 0.$$

On the other hand, by assumption (2.3),

$$\langle u, {}^t P(x, D)(\phi^r \phi) \rangle \lesssim r^{-l} \int_{|x| < r} |u| \rightarrow 0.$$

We thus have the desired identity $\langle P(x, D)u - f, \phi \rangle = 0$. □

Lemma 2.3. *Let $W \in L_{loc}^\infty(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$, $W = O(\frac{1}{|x|^M})$ near 0 for some constant $M \geq 0$, and $w \in L_{loc}^2(B_1)$ be a weak solution to*

$$-\Delta w = Ww \quad \text{on } B_1 \setminus \{0\}.$$

If further

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-2M-3} \int_{|x| < r} |w|^2 = 0, \tag{2.4}$$

then $w \in W_{loc}^{2,2}(B_1) \cap W_{loc}^{2,p}(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ for all $p < \infty$, and w is a weak solution to

$$-\Delta w = Ww \quad \text{on } B_1.$$

Proof. First, for all $r \ll 1$, by (2.4)

$$\int_{|x| < r} |Ww|^2 \lesssim \int_{|x| < r} \frac{|w|^2}{|x|^{2M}} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{2^{-j-1}r < |x| < 2^{-j}r} \frac{|w|^2}{|x|^{2M}} \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{2(j+1)M} r^{-2M} \int_{|x| < 2^{-j}r} |w|^2 \leq Cr^3 \tag{2.5}$$

for some constant C dependent only on M . So $Ww \in L_{loc}^2(B_1)$. On the other hand, by Hölder inequality and (2.4) again,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-2} \int_{|x| < r} |w| \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-2+\frac{n}{2}} \left(\int_{|x| < r} |w|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \left(r^{-3} \int_{|x| < r} |w|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0.$$

As a consequence of the Harvey-Polking type Lemma 2.2, $-\Delta w = Ww$ holds true on B_1 in the distribution sense. PDE theory then tells that $w \in W_{loc}^{2,2}(B_1)$. In particular, $w \in L_{loc}^{p_0}(B_1)$ where $p_0 = \frac{2n}{n-4}$ if $n > 4$, or any number less than ∞ if $n \leq 4$ by the Sobolev embedding theorem.

Restricted on $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$, since $Ww \in L_{loc}^{p_0}(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$, we further have $w \in W_{loc}^{2,p_0}(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$. With a boot-strap argument, we eventually obtain $w \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ for all $p < \infty$. □

Corollary 2.4. Let $W \in L_{loc}^\infty(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$, $W = O(\frac{1}{|x|^M})$ near 0 for some constant M , and $w \in L_{loc}^2(B_1)$ be a weak solution to

$$-\Delta w = Ww \quad \text{on } B_1 \setminus \{0\},$$

If w vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at 0, then $w \in W_{loc}^{2,2}(B_1) \cap W_{loc}^{2,p}(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ for all $p < \infty$, and w is a weak solution to

$$-\Delta w = Ww \quad \text{on } B_1.$$

Proof. The $M \geq 0$ case follows directly from Lemma 2.3. For $M < 0$, we can reduce to the $M = 0$ case by noting that $W = O(\frac{1}{|x|^M}) = O(\frac{1}{|x|^0})$ near 0. \square

Next, we discuss properties of flat functions at 0. A function $w \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is said to vanish to infinite order (or, flat) in the L^2 sense at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ if for every $m \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-m} \int_{|x-x_0| < r} |w|^2 = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

In view of (the proof to) Lemma 2.1 (4), it makes sense to call that a function $u \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at infinity, if for every $m \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^m \int_{|x| > r} |u|^2 = 0.$$

Thus, as a consequence of Lemma 2.1 (4), if u vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at infinity, then w defined in (2.2) vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at 0.

In general the flatness of a function does not necessarily imply the flatness of its derivatives. For instance, $w(x) := e^{-\frac{1}{x^2}} \cos(e^{\frac{1}{x^2}})$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is flat at 0. However, the derivative w' is not even L_{loc}^1 at 0. On the other hand, the following lemma states that the flatness naturally passes onto its derivatives if w is a weak solution to $-\Delta w = Ww$ when W blows up at most in a finite order at 0. We shall need the following well-known inequality with proof provided below for completeness.

Lemma 2.5. Let $f \in W_{loc}^{2,2}(B_1)$. Then for any $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\int_{|x| < r} |\nabla f|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{|x| < 2r} |f|^2 + r^2 \int_{|x| < 2r} |\Delta f|^2. \quad (2.7)$$

Proof. Let ϕ be a nonnegative smooth function with compact support on B_{2r} such that $\phi = 1$ on B_r , $\phi \leq 1$ and $|\nabla^k \phi| \lesssim \frac{1}{r^k}$, $k \leq 2$ on B_{2r} . Since $\phi \nabla f = \nabla(\phi f) - f \nabla \phi$, we have

$$\int_{|x| < 2r} \phi^2 |\nabla f|^2 \leq 2 \int_{|x| < 2r} |f \nabla \phi|^2 + 2 \int_{|x| < 2r} |\nabla(\phi f)|^2.$$

Making use of Stokes' theorem to the second term on the right, one further has

$$\int_{|x| < 2r} \phi^2 |\nabla f|^2 \leq 2 \int_{|x| < 2r} |f \nabla \phi|^2 + 2 \int_{|x| < 2r} \phi |f| |\Delta(\phi f)|. \quad (2.8)$$

On the other hand, note that $\Delta(\phi f) = f\Delta\phi + \phi\Delta f + 2\nabla\phi \cdot \nabla f$. By the choice of ϕ and with a repeated application of the Schwartz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|x|<2r} \phi|f||\Delta(\phi f)| &\leq \int_{|x|<2r} \phi|f|^2|\Delta\phi| + \int_{|x|<2r} \phi^2|f||\Delta f| + 2 \int_{|x|<2r} \phi|f||\nabla\phi||\nabla f| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{|x|<2r} |f|^2 + \int_{|x|<2r} \frac{1}{r} |f| \cdot r |\Delta f| + \int_{|x|<2r} \phi |\nabla f| \cdot \frac{1}{r} |f| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{|x|<2r} |f|^2 + r^2 \int_{|x|<2r} |\Delta f|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \int_{|x|<2r} \phi^2 |\nabla f|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Combining (2.8)-(2.9), we have

$$\int_{|x|<2r} \phi^2 |\nabla f|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{|x|<2r} |f|^2 + r^2 \int_{|x|<2r} |\Delta f|^2,$$

from which (2.7) follows. □

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose $w \in L^2_{loc}(B_1)$ vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at 0. Then the following holds.*

(1) *If $f = O(\frac{1}{|x|^M})$ near 0 for some constant M , then $fw \in L^2$ near 0, and vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at 0.*

(2) *If w is a weak solution to*

$$-\Delta w = Ww \text{ on } B_1.$$

for some $W \in L^\infty_{loc}(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ such that $W = O(\frac{1}{|x|^M})$ near 0 for some constant M . Then ∇w vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at 0. In particular, $\nabla_\theta w$ and w_r with respect to the polar coordinates (r, θ) vanish to infinite order in the L^2 sense at 0.

Proof. (1) can be proved by making use of a similar argument as in (2.5), with the assumption (2.4) replaced by the L^2 flatness (2.6) of w at 0.

For (2), since w vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at 0, $w \in W^{2,2}_{loc}(B_1)$ by Corollary 2.4. On the other hand, by (1) Ww also vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at 0. Thus we apply (2.7) to w and obtain the flatness of ∇w in the L^2 sense.

That $\nabla_\theta w$ and w_r vanish to infinite order in the L^2 sense at 0 follows directly from the identity

$$|\nabla w|^2 = |w_r|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |\nabla_\theta w|^2$$

in terms of the polar coordinates (r, θ) . □

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose that $w \in L^2(B_1) \cap C(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ satisfies*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-1} \int_{|x|<r} |w|^2 = 0.$$

Then there exists $r_j \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\int_{|x|=r_j} |w|^2 \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. First note that by assumption, $\int_{|x|=r} |w|^2$ as a function of r is in $C((0, 1))$. By the mean-value theorem, for each $j \geq 1$, there exists $r_j \in (\frac{r}{2^j}, \frac{r}{2^{j-1}})$ such that

$$\int_{2^{-j}r < |x| < 2^{-j+1}r} |w|^2 = \int_{2^{-j}r}^{2^{-j+1}r} \int_{|x|=s} |w|^2 = 2^{-j}r \int_{|x|=r_j} |w|^2.$$

When $j \rightarrow \infty$, we have $r_j \rightarrow 0$ and thus by assumption,

$$\int_{|x|=r_j} |w|^2 \leq \frac{2^j}{r} \int_{2^{-j}r < |x| < 2^{-j+1}r} |w|^2 \leq 2(2^{-j+1}r)^{-1} \int_{|x| < 2^{-j+1}r} |w|^2 \rightarrow 0.$$

□

3 Unique continuation property at infinity

To prove Theorem 1.1, we shall make use of a unique continuation property near the origin that was established by Li and Nirenberg [29, Theorem 10] for smooth solutions without an assumption on the potential's growth near the singularity. However, to adapt its proof to our context of L^2 weak solutions, considerable modifications are needed in order for its application. It is also crucial to point out that a specific boundary term involving V in [29] can not be discarded, due to insufficient information on the blow-up rate of the potential near the origin in [29]. By imposing the additional assumption (1.1), we have the desired control of singularity for the potential near the origin when pulling to the origin by the Kelvin transform, so that the aforementioned boundary term can be managed. For clarification we are compelled to provide the detailed proof below.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $W \in L_{loc}^\infty(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ with $W = O(\frac{1}{|x|^M})$ near 0 for some constant M . Assume further there exists some $0 < r_0 < 1$ such that W is locally Lipschitz in $B_{r_0} \setminus \{0\}$ with $\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(r^2W) \leq 0$ on $0 < r < r_0$. Let $w \in L_{loc}^2(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ be a weak solution to*

$$-\Delta w = Ww \quad \text{on } B_1 \setminus \{0\}.$$

If w vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at 0, then $w \equiv 0$.

Proof. By Corollary 2.4, we have $w \in W_{loc}^{2,2}(B_1) \cap W_{loc}^{2,p}(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ for all $p < \infty$, and

$$-\Delta w = Ww \quad \text{on } B_1.$$

In particular, $w \in C^1(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ by Sobolev embedding theorem. Under the polar coordinates (r, θ) , $-\Delta w = Ww$ is written as

$$r^2 w_{rr} + (n-1)rw_r + \Delta_\theta w = -r^2 Ww, \quad 0 < r < 1, \quad \theta \in S^{n-1}.$$

Setting $r = e^s, s < 0$, then a direct computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} w_s &= w_r e^s = r w_r, \\ w_{ss} &= w_{rr} e^{2s} + w_r e^s = r^2 w_{rr} + r w_r. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$w_{ss} + (n-2)w_s + \Delta_\theta w = -e^{2s} Ww, \quad s < 0, \quad \theta \in S^{n-1}. \quad (3.1)$$

Now let $w = e^{as}v$ with $a = -\frac{n-2}{2}$. One can further verify that

$$\begin{aligned} w_s &= ae^{as}v + e^{as}v_s = e^{as}(av + v_s), \\ w_{ss} &= ae^{as}(av + v_s) + e^{as}(av_s + v_{ss}) = e^{as}(v_{ss} + 2av_s + a^2v). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging the above into (3.1), after simplification we obtain

$$v_{ss} + \Delta_\theta v = \left(-e^{2s}W + \frac{(n-2)^2}{2} \right) v := mv, \quad (3.2)$$

where $m = -e^{2s}W + \frac{(n-2)^2}{2}$. By assumption, there exists some $s_0 < 0$ such that

$$m_s = -(e^{2s}W)_s = -(r^2W)_r e^s \geq 0, \quad s < s_0. \quad (3.3)$$

On the other hand, by the assumption of the L^2 flatness of w at 0, we have $w_s (= rw_r)$ and $\nabla_\theta w$ vanish to infinite order in the L^2 sense at $r = 0$ by Lemma 2.6. Moreover, since $v = r^{-a}w$, one infers that $v_s = r^{-a}w_s - av$ and $\nabla_\theta v = r^a \nabla_\theta w$. Thus v_s and $\nabla_\theta v$ vanish to infinite order in the L^2 sense at $r = 0$ by Lemma 2.6 again. Similarly, as $m = O(\frac{1}{|x|^N})$ near $r = 0$ by definition, where $N := \max\{M-2, 0\}$, we also have $|m|^{\frac{1}{2}}v$ vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at $r = 0$. Thus applying Lemma 2.7 to $|v_s| + |\nabla_\theta v| + |m|^{\frac{1}{2}}v$, there exists $s_j \rightarrow -\infty$ such that

$$\int_{S^{n-1}} v_s^2|_{s=s_j} + \int_{S^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta v|^2|_{s=s_j} + \int_{S^{n-1}} |m|v^2|_{s=s_j} \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Multiply both sides of (3.2) by $2v_s$ and integrate from s_j to s about s and over S^{n-1} about θ . Then

$$\int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{s_j}^s 2v_s v_{ss} + 2 \int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{s_j}^s \Delta_\theta v v_s = 2 \int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{s_j}^s m v v_s \quad (3.5)$$

For the second term on the left hand, we use Green's theorem and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{s_j}^s \Delta_\theta v v_s &= -2 \int_{s_j}^s \int_{S^{n-1}} \nabla_\theta v \cdot \nabla_\theta v_s = - \int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{s_j}^s (|\nabla_\theta v|^2)_s \\ &= - \int_{S^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta v|^2 + \int_{S^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta v|^2|_{s=s_j} = \int_{S^{n-1}} v \Delta_\theta v + \int_{S^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta v|^2|_{s=s_j}. \end{aligned}$$

For the rest of the terms in (3.5), we compute directly to have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{s_j}^s 2v_s v_{ss} &= \int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{-\infty}^s (v_s^2)_s = \int_{S^{n-1}} v_s^2 - v_s^2|_{s=s_j}, \\ 2 \int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{s_j}^s m v v_s &= \int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{s_j}^s (m v^2)_s - \int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{s_j}^s m_s v^2 = \int_{S^{n-1}} m v^2 - \int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{s_j}^s m_s v^2 - \int_{S^{n-1}} m v^2|_{s=s_j} \end{aligned}$$

Altogether we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S^{n-1}} v_s^2 &= - \int_{S^{n-1}} v \Delta_\theta v + \int_{S^{n-1}} m v^2 - \int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{s_j}^s m_s v^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\int_{S^{n-1}} v_s^2|_{s=s_j} - \int_{S^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta v|^2|_{s=s_j} - \int_{S^{n-1}} m v^2|_{s=s_j} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here the last term $\int_{S^{n-1}} mv^2|_{s=s_j}$ could potentially be troublesome due to the presence of uncontrolled growth of W in m at $r = 0$, but seems to have been overlooked in [29]. As seen in (3.4), the additional assumption $W = O(\frac{1}{r^M})$ allows us to eliminate this term as $j \rightarrow \infty$. In detail, letting $s_j \rightarrow -\infty$, and making use of (3.3)-(3.4), we have

$$\int_{S^{n-1}} v_s^2 \leq - \int_{S^{n-1}} v \Delta_\theta v + \int_{S^{n-1}} mv^2. \quad (3.6)$$

Now we consider

$$\rho(s) = \int_{S^{n-1}} v^2(s, \theta) d\theta, \quad s < s_0.$$

We shall prove that

$$\rho_s^2 \leq \rho \rho_{ss}, \quad s < s_0. \quad (3.7)$$

In fact,

$$\rho_s = 2 \int_{S^{n-1}} v v_s,$$

and by (3.2),

$$\rho_{ss} = 2 \int_{S^{n-1}} v_s^2 + v v_{ss} = 2 \int_{S^{n-1}} v_s^2 + 2 \int_{S^{n-1}} v(-\Delta_\theta v + mv).$$

Making use of Hölder inequality and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s^2 &\leq 4 \int_{S^{n-1}} v^2 \int_{S^{n-1}} v_s^2 = 4\rho \int_{S^{n-1}} v_s^2 \\ &\leq \rho \left(2 \int_{S^{n-1}} v_s^2 + 2 \int_{S^{n-1}} v(-\Delta_\theta v) + 2 \int_{S^{n-1}} mv^2 \right) = \rho \rho_{ss}. \end{aligned}$$

(3.7) is proved. In particular, this implies that whenever $\rho > 0$,

$$(\log \rho)_{ss} \geq 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Assume by contradiction that there exists $\bar{s} < s_0$ such that $\rho(\bar{s}) > 0$. Let s^\sharp be the infimum of all \hat{s} such that $\rho > 0$ on the interval (\hat{s}, \bar{s}) . Then by (3.8),

$$\log \rho(s) \geq \log \rho(\bar{s}) + \frac{d}{ds} \log \rho(\bar{s})(s - \bar{s}), \quad s^\sharp < s < \bar{s}. \quad (3.9)$$

In particular, this implies that $\rho(s^\sharp) > 0$ whenever s^\sharp is finite, which would violate the choice of s^\sharp . Thus $s^\sharp = -\infty$. Namely, $\rho > 0$ for all $s < \bar{s}$. Consequently, by (3.9) there exists some C_1, C_2 such that $\rho(s) \geq C_1 e^{C_2 s}$ for all $s < \bar{s}$. Equivalently, for all $r < r_0 := e^{\bar{s}}$,

$$\int_{S^{n-1}} v^2 \geq C_1 r^{C_2}.$$

Recalling that $w = r^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} v$, we further have when $r \ll 1$,

$$\int_{|x|<r} w^2 = \int_0^r t^{n-1} \int_{S^{n-1}} w^2 = \int_0^r t^{n-1} t^{-n+2} \int_{S^{n-1}} v^2 \geq C_1 \int_0^r t^{1+C_2},$$

which is either infinite or $O(r^{2+C_2})$. This contradicts with the L^2 flatness of w at 0. Thus $\rho = 0$ for all $s < s_0$ and so is w on $|x| < e^{s_0}$. We further apply the classical unique continuation property for L^∞ potentials (see, for instance, [19]) to get $w \equiv 0$. □

Theorem 1.1 is a direct consequence of the above theorem after imposing the Kelvin transform.

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Apply the Kelvin transform to obtain w and W under the setting in Lemma 2.1. In order to apply Theorem 3.1, we only need to verify that $(r^2W)_r \leq 0$ for $0 < r \ll 1$. Clearly W is locally Lipschitz on $B_{r_0} \setminus \{0\}$ for some $r_0 > 0$. In terms of the polar coordinates (r, θ) ,

$$\begin{aligned} (r^2W)_r(r, \theta) &= \left(\frac{V(\frac{1}{r}, \theta)}{r^2} \right)_r = -\frac{2}{r^3}V\left(\frac{1}{r}, \theta\right) - \frac{1}{r^4}V_r\left(\frac{1}{r}, \theta\right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{r^2} \left(\frac{2}{r}V\left(\frac{1}{r}, \theta\right) + \frac{1}{r^2}V_r\left(\frac{1}{r}, \theta\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, when $r \ll 1$, by assumption

$$0 \leq (r^2V)_r\left(\frac{1}{r}, \theta\right) = (2rV + r^2V_r)\left(\frac{1}{r}, \theta\right) = \frac{2}{r}V\left(\frac{1}{r}, \theta\right) + \frac{1}{r^2}V_r\left(\frac{1}{r}, \theta\right).$$

So we have $(r^2W)_r \leq 0$. Theorem 3.1 thus applies to give $w = 0$ on B_1 . Then $u = 0$ outside B_1 . That $u = 0$ on B_1 is a direct consequence of the classical unique continuation property with L_{loc}^∞ potentials. □

Remark 3.2. An inspection of the proof to Theorem 1.1 indicates that the local Lipschitzian assumption of V in Theorem 1.1 can be weakened to merely assuming $V_r \in L_{loc}^\infty$ for $r \gg 1$ in the polar coordinates (r, θ) . This simple observation will be used in some of our later proofs and examples.

Remark 3.3. In the special case when V is radial near infinity, the assumption (1.2) actually implies that V does not change sign near infinity. In fact, according to (1.2), $V(r_2) \geq \frac{r_1^2}{r_2^2}V(r_1)$ for all $0 < r_1 < r_2$. Consequently, either $V(r) < 0$ for all $r \gg 1$, or if $V(r_0) \geq 0$ at some $r_0 > 0$, then $V(r) \geq 0$ for all $r > r_0$.

However, for general non-radial potentials, as there is no regularity assumption on V along the θ direction as mentioned in Remark 3.2, one can easily construct examples of V such that V has opposite signs along at least two θ directions. For instance, for each $(r, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_1$, let $V(r, \theta) = -\frac{1}{r^2}$ if $\theta \in (0, \pi]$, and $V(r, \theta) = r$ if $\theta \in (\pi, 2\pi]$. Clearly, this V satisfies (1.2) but changes sign near ∞ .

Proof of Corollary 1.3: In view of Theorem 1.1, we only need to verify that (1.1) and (1.2) hold with V replaced by $V + \lambda$ for $\lambda > 0$. Indeed, given V satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 1.1 and $\lambda > 0$, $V + \lambda = O(|x|^{\max\{M, 0\}})$ when $|x| \gg 1$. Moreover, it is straightforward to verify that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^2(V + \lambda)) = \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^2V) + 2\lambda r > 0, \quad r \gg 1.$$

The proof is complete. □

Proof of Corollary 1.4 and Corollary 1.5: Note that every homogeneous function in $L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$ is automatically Lipschitz along the r direction. In view of Theorem 1.1 and Remark 3.2, we just need to show that $(r^2V)_r \geq 0$ for Corollary 1.4. Since $V(r, \theta) = r^\alpha V(1, \theta)$ for $\theta \in S^{n-1}$, by a straight-forward computation we get

$$(r^2V)_r(r, \theta) = (r^{2+\alpha}V(1, \theta))_r = (2 + \alpha)r^{\alpha+1}V(1, \theta) = (2 + \alpha)rV(r, \theta).$$

This is always non-negative in either one of the three cases in the corollary. Corollary 1.4 is thus proved.

Corollary 1.5 is a special case of Corollary 1.4 with $\alpha = 0$ and $V = c^2 \geq 0$. Hence we immediately see that u does not vanish to infinite order in the L^2 sense at 0. In other words, there exists some $N > 0$, such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^N \int_{|x|>r} |u|^2 > 0$. Thus $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{N+1} \int_{|x|>r} |u|^2 = \infty$. \square

The following two examples show that the unique continuation at infinity in Theorem 1.1 fails if (1.1) and/or (1.2) is dropped.

Example 2. Given any C^2 function ϕ on $\mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ such that $\phi(r) = 1$ when $0 \leq r \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\phi(r) = r$ when $r \geq 1$, let $u = e^{-e^{\phi(r)}}$ on \mathbb{R}^n . Then u vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at ∞ and is a weak solution to

$$-\Delta u = Vu \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

with

$$V := -e^{2\phi(r)} (\phi'(r))^2 + \left(\phi''(r) + (\phi'(r))^2 + \frac{n-1}{r} \phi'(r) \right) e^{\phi(r)}.$$

Clearly, $V \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Note that $V = O(e^{2r})$ when $r \gg 1$.

Example 3. For every $\epsilon \geq 2$, the function $u = e^{-r^\epsilon}$ vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at ∞ , and is a weak solution to

$$-\Delta u = Vu \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

with

$$V := -\epsilon^2 r^{2\epsilon-2} + ((n-2)\epsilon + \epsilon^2) r^{\epsilon-2} \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Then $V = O(r^{2\epsilon-2})$ when $r \gg 1$. Note that a direct computation shows that when $r \gg 1$,

$$(r^2V)' = -r^{\epsilon-1} \epsilon (2\epsilon^2 r^\epsilon - (n-2)\epsilon - \epsilon^2) < 0.$$

On the other hand, it is worth pointing out that there are many functions satisfying the assumptions for V in Theorem 1.1. Thus the theorem can be readily applied to obtain the unique continuation property of $-\Delta u = Vu$ at infinity for such potentials.

Example 4. Given any measurable nonnegative function g on \mathbb{R}^n such that $g = O(|x|^M)$ for some constant M when $|x| \gg 1$, let $V(r, \theta) = \frac{1}{r^2} \int_1^r g(r, \theta) dr$ for a.e. (r, θ) in its polar coordinates. Then V satisfies all the assumptions in Theorem 1.1.

We end the section by providing a simple case of the Landis conjecture when the potential decays sufficiently near infinity.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $n \geq 2$ and $V = O(\frac{1}{|x|^M})$ near ∞ for some constant $M \geq 2$. Let $u \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak solution to*

$$-\Delta u = Vu \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

If $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^m \int_{|x|>r} |u|^2 = 0$ for each $m \geq 0$, then $u \equiv 0$. In particular, if V has compact support, then $u \equiv 0$ whenever u vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at ∞ .

Proof. Applying the Kelvin transform as in Lemma 2.1, we have

$$-\Delta w = Ww \quad \text{on } B_1 \setminus \{0\}$$

for w and W defined in (2.2). By Corollary 2.4, $w \in W^{2,2}_{loc}(B_1)$, vanishes to infinite order in the L^2 sense at 0, and satisfies $-\Delta w = Ww$ on B_1 . On the other hand, when $M \geq 2$, $W = O(|x|^{-4+M}) \leq O(|x|^{-2})$. According to the unique continuation property of [31] for potentials of the form $C|x|^{-2}$, we see that $w = 0$ on B_1 and thus $u \equiv 0$. □

The proof of Proposition 3.4 immediately yields the following unique continuation property for harmonic functions near infinity.

Corollary 3.5. *Suppose u is harmonic on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r_0}$ for some $r_0 \gg 1$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^m \int_{|x|>r} |u|^2 = 0$ for each $m \geq 0$. Then $u \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r_0}$. Namely, if $u \neq 0$ somewhere on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r_0}$, then there exists some $N \geq 0$ such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^N \int_{|x|>r} |u|^2 = \infty$.*

It is not clear to us but would be desirable to know if the flatness assumption of u at infinity in Proposition 3.4 could be relaxed to a finite order vanishing at infinity in particular when V has compact support. On the other hand, we point out that for the truncated domain $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r_0}$ in Corollary 3.5, the L^2 flatness assumption of u at infinity can not be weakened. In fact, the following simple example gives harmonic functions on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1$ that vanishes at infinity at any given order in the L^2 sense.

Example 5. *Let P_k be a homogeneous harmonic polynomial of degree $k \geq 0$ on \mathbb{R}^n . Then the function $u = \frac{1}{|x|^{n-2}} P_k\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right)$ is harmonic on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1$. Note that u is only of $O(\frac{1}{|x|^{k+n-2}})$ at ∞ . In particular, for each $m \geq 2k - 4 + n$,*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^m \int_{|x|>r} |u|^2 \neq 0$$

Proposition 3.4 can be compared with a uniqueness result of Chirka and Rosay [6] for $\bar{\partial}$, which states that for $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with compact support, any solution u to

$$\bar{\partial} u = Vu \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2$$

with $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} u = 0$ must vanish identically. Interestingly, the potential V in Meshkov's example [30] vanishes on a family of concentric annuli with radii going to infinity.

4 Sign changing property near infinity

Once again, we will use the Kelvin transform to convert the solution behavior at infinity to that near the origin. As seen in the previous sections, the order of the potential's singularity is changed as a result of the transform, which needs be taken care of in discretion.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $W \in L_{loc}^\infty(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$, $W \geq 0$ on B_1 ,*

$$W \notin L^1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{|x|^{n+2}W} \in L^1 \quad (4.1)$$

near 0. Let $w \in L_{loc}^1(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ be a weak solution to

$$-\Delta w = Ww \quad \text{on } B_1 \setminus \{0\}, \quad (4.2)$$

with

$$w = O\left(\frac{1}{|x|^{n-2}}\right) \quad (4.3)$$

near 0. If $w \geq 0$ (or $w \leq 0$) on B_1 , then $w \equiv 0$.

We first need the following preparation lemmas to resolute the singularity at 0.

Lemma 4.2. *For W and w in Theorem 4.1, one has*

$$Ww \in L_{loc}^1(B_1).$$

Proof. Since $Ww \in L_{loc}^1(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$, we only need to show that $Ww \in L^1$ near 0. Let ζ_ϵ be a cut-off function on B_1 such that $\zeta_\epsilon = 0$ when $|x| \leq \epsilon$ and $|x| \geq \frac{3}{4}$; $\zeta_\epsilon = 1$ when $2\epsilon \leq |x| \leq \frac{1}{2}$; $|\nabla^k \zeta_\epsilon| \lesssim \epsilon^{-k}$ on $\epsilon < |x| < 2\epsilon$, and $|\nabla^k \zeta_\epsilon| \lesssim 1$ on $\frac{1}{2} < |x| < \frac{3}{4}$, $k \leq 2$.

Since ζ_ϵ^4 is a testing function for $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$, we have by (4.2)

$$\int_{B_1} -\zeta_\epsilon^4 \Delta w = \int_{B_1} Ww \zeta_\epsilon^4. \quad (4.4)$$

The right hand side is nonnegative since $Ww \geq 0$ by assumption. Using Stokes' theorem, the left hand side

$$\int_{B_1} -\zeta_\epsilon^4 \Delta w = \int_{B_1} -w \Delta \zeta_\epsilon^4 = \int_{\epsilon < |x| < 2\epsilon} -w \Delta \zeta_\epsilon^4 + \int_{\frac{1}{2} < |x| < 1} -w \Delta \zeta_\epsilon^4. \quad (4.5)$$

Firstly,

$$\left| \int_{\frac{1}{2} < |x| < 1} -w \Delta \zeta_\epsilon^4 \right| \leq C_1 \quad (4.6)$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$. By the fact that $\Delta \zeta_\epsilon^4 = 4\zeta_\epsilon^2 (3|\nabla \zeta_\epsilon|^2 + \zeta_\epsilon \Delta \zeta_\epsilon)$ and Hölder inequality,

$$\left| \int_{\epsilon < |x| < 2\epsilon} w \Delta \zeta_\epsilon^4 \right| \lesssim \int_{\epsilon < |x| < 2\epsilon} \epsilon^{-2} w \zeta_\epsilon^2 \lesssim \int_{\epsilon < |x| < 2\epsilon} \frac{w \zeta_\epsilon^2}{|x|^2} \leq \left(\int_{\epsilon < |x| < 2\epsilon} Ww \zeta_\epsilon^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\epsilon < |x| < 2\epsilon} \frac{w}{|x|^4 W} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Note that

$$\frac{w}{|x|^4 W} \in L^1(B_{\frac{1}{2}}) \quad (4.7)$$

by (4.1) and (4.3). Then $\left(\int_{\epsilon < |x| < 2\epsilon} \frac{w}{|x|^4 W}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_2$ for a constant $C_2 > 0$ and thus

$$\left|\int_{\epsilon < |x| < 2\epsilon} w \Delta \zeta_\epsilon^4\right| \leq C_2 \left(\int_{\epsilon < |x| < 2\epsilon} W w \zeta_\epsilon^4\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_2 \left(\int_{B_1} W w \zeta_\epsilon^4\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (4.8)$$

Combining (4.4)-(4.8), we have for $A := \left(\int_{B_1} W w \zeta_\epsilon^4\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$,

$$A^2 \lesssim C_2 A + C_1.$$

This implies A is bounded by a constant dependent only on C_1 and C_2 . Passing ϵ to 0, we have the desired integrability property for Ww near 0. \square

Lemma 4.3. *For W and w in Theorem 4.1, we have w is a weak solution to*

$$-\Delta w = Ww \text{ on } B_1.$$

Proof. In view of Lemma 2.2, we only need to prove that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon^{-2} \int_{|x| < \epsilon} |w| = 0.$$

Indeed,

$$\epsilon^{-2} \int_{|x| < \epsilon} |w| \leq \int_{|x| < \epsilon} \frac{w}{|x|^2} \leq \left(\int_{|x| < \epsilon} Ww\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{|x| < \epsilon} \frac{w}{|x|^4 W}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which goes to zero as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ due to the facts that $Ww \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ in Lemma 4.2 and $\frac{w}{|x|^4 W} \in L^1_{loc}(B_1)$ in (4.7). Note that an inspection of the proof to Lemma 4.2 indicates that the assumption $W \notin L^1$ in Theorem 4.1 is actually not needed here. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1: Assume by contradiction that $w \not\equiv 0$. By Lemma 4.3, we have $-\Delta w = Ww$ on B_1 . In particular, $-\Delta w \geq 0$ on B_1 . Namely, w is a superharmonic function a.e. on B_1 . Consequently, w is lower semi-continuous on B_1 . Since $w \geq 0$ on B_1 , there exists some positive number γ_0 and a small neighborhood of 0, say, B_ϵ , such that $w \geq \gamma_0$ almost everywhere on B_ϵ . See, for instance, [16]. Noting that $W \geq 0$, we further have $-\Delta w \geq \gamma_0 W \geq 0$ on B_ϵ . Since $W \notin L^1$ near 0,

$$\int_{B_\epsilon} -\Delta w \geq \gamma_0 \int_{B_\epsilon} W = \infty.$$

However, this would contradict with the fact that $\int_{B_\epsilon} -\Delta w = \int_{B_\epsilon} Ww$, which is finite according to Lemma 4.2. With w replaced by $-w$, one can prove the case when $w \leq 0$ on B_1 . The proof is completed. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.6 and Corollary 1.7: After performing the Kelvin transform as in Lemma 2.1, we have by Lemma 2.1 (3) that W defined by (2.2) satisfy the assumption in Theorem 4.1. The rest of the proof to Theorem 1.6 is then a consequence of Theorem 4.1.

In the setting of Corollary 1.7, one can also directly verify that V satisfies both assumptions in Theorem 1.6 as long as $\alpha > -2$ and $\alpha \geq n - 4$. Thus Corollary 1.7 follows from Theorem 1.6. \square

In particular, as a consequence of Corollary 1.7, every non-trivial bounded weak solution to

$$-\Delta u = \frac{c^2}{|x|^\alpha} u \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

must change sign near infinity if $\alpha > -2$ for $n \leq 2$, or $\alpha \geq n - 4$ for $n \geq 3$.

As will be seen immediately, Theorem 4.1 only allows us to prove Theorem 1.8 when the dimension n is small. To cover the case of higher dimensions, we shall need the following variant of Kato's inequality:

Lemma 4.4. [3, 20] *let $w \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$, $f \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ and $-\Delta w \geq f$ on Ω in the distribution sense. Let $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz concave function with $0 \leq \phi' \leq C$ on \mathbb{R} . Then $\psi := \phi \circ w \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ and*

$$-\Delta \psi \geq \phi'(w)f \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

in the distribution sense.

Proof of Theorem 1.8: Repeating a similar procedure as in Lemma 2.1 with $V \equiv c^2$, it boils down to prove for $W := \frac{c^2}{|x|^4}$ on B_1 , every weak solution to $-\Delta w = Ww$ on $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$ must change sign in every neighborhood of 0. By replacing w by $-w$, this is further reduced to showing that every nonnegative weak solution to $-\Delta w = Ww$ on $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$ must be identically zero.

If $n \leq 4$, clearly $W \in L_{loc}^\infty(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$, $W \geq 0$, $W \notin L^1$ near 0, and $\frac{1}{|x|^{n+2}W} \in L^1(B_1)$. Moreover $w(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^{n-2}} u(\frac{x}{|x|^2}) = O(\frac{1}{|x|^{n-2}})$ near 0 by the boundedness assumption of u . If $w \geq 0$, then one can apply Theorem 4.1 to conclude that $w \equiv 0$.

For $n \geq 5$, assume by contradiction that $w \not\equiv 0$ on B_1 . Since $w \geq 0$ and $-\Delta w \geq 0$ on B_1 , we have $w \geq \gamma_0$ almost everywhere for some positive γ_0 on a small neighborhood B_ϵ of 0. Let $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function such that $\phi(s) = 0$ when $s \leq \gamma_0$; $\phi(s) = \log \frac{1}{\gamma_0} - \log \frac{1}{s}$ when $s \geq \gamma_0$. It is straight forward to verify that ϕ satisfies the assumption in Kato's inequality. Let $\psi := \phi \circ w$. Then

$$0 \leq \psi \leq \log \frac{1}{\gamma_0} \quad \text{on } B_1, \tag{4.9}$$

and

$$\psi = \log \frac{1}{\gamma_0} - \log \frac{1}{w} \quad \text{on } B_\epsilon.$$

By Kato's inequality,

$$-\Delta \psi \geq \phi'(w)Ww = \frac{c^2}{|x|^4} \quad \text{on } B_\epsilon.$$

On the other hand, note that $\Delta \left(\frac{1}{|x|^2} \right) = \frac{8-2n}{|x|^4}$. So $-\Delta \psi \geq \Delta \left(\frac{c^2}{(8-2n)|x|^2} \right)$ on B_ϵ , or equivalently,

$$-\Delta \left(\psi - \frac{c^2}{(2n-8)|x|^2} \right) \geq 0 \quad \text{on } B_\epsilon.$$

Due to the fact that $\psi - \frac{c^2}{(2n-8)|x|^2} \in L^1(B_\epsilon)$, there exists some constant $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\psi \geq \frac{c^2}{(2n-8)|x|^2} - \beta \quad \text{on } B_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}.$$

However, $2n-8 > 0$ when $n \geq 5$, which would imply that ψ is unbounded from above, contradicting (4.9). □

References

- [1] A. Arapostathis, A. Biswas, and D. Ganguly, *Some Liouville-type results for eigenfunctions of elliptic operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **371**(2019), no. 6, 4377–4409. [1](#), [2](#)
- [2] S. Agmon and L. Nirenberg, *Properties of solutions of ordinary differential equations in Banach space*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **16**(1963) 121–239. [2](#)
- [3] H. Brezis and X. Cabré, *Some simple nonlinear PDE’s without solutions*. Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Sez. B Artic. Ric. Mat. (8)**1**(1998), no. 2, 223–262. [17](#)
- [4] J. Bourgain and C. E. Kenig, *On localization in the continuous Anderson-Bernoulli model in higher dimension*. Invent. Math. **161**(2005), no. 2, 389–426. [1](#)
- [5] J. Cruz-Uribe, *Unique continuation at infinity of solutions to Schrödinger equations with complex-valued potentials*. Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. (2)**42**(1999), no.1, 143–153. [2](#)
- [6] E. Chirka and J.-P. Rosay, *Remarks on the proof of a generalized Hartogs lemma*. Ann. Polon. Math. **70**(1998), 43–47. [14](#)
- [7] B. Davey, *On Landis’ conjecture in the plane for some equations with sign-changing potentials*. Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **36** no. 5 (2020), 1571–1596. [1](#), [2](#)
- [8] B. Davey, *On Landis’ conjecture in the plane for potentials with growth*. Vietnam J. Math. **52** (2024), no. 3, 675–688. [2](#)
- [9] B. Davey, C. E. Kenig and J.-N. Wang, *On Landis’ conjecture in the plane when the potential has an exponentially decaying negative part*. Algebra i Analiz **31** no. 2 (2019), 204–226, translation in St. Petersburg Math. J. **31**(2020), no. 2, 337–353. [1](#), [2](#)
- [10] B. Davey and J. Zhu, *Quantitative uniqueness of solutions to second order elliptic equations with singular potentials in two dimensions*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, **57**(2018), no. 3, Paper No. 92, 27 pp. [2](#)
- [11] B. Davey and J. Zhu, *Quantitative uniqueness of solutions to second-order elliptic equations with singular lower order terms*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **44**(2019), no. 11, 1217–1251. [2](#)
- [12] R. Froese, I. Herbst, M. Hoffmann-Ostenhof and T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, *L^2 -lower bounds to solutions of one-body Schrödinger equations*. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, **95**(1983), no. 1-2, 25–38. [2](#)
- [13] N. Garofalo and F.-H. Lin, *Monotonicity properties of variational integrals, A_p weights and unique continuation*. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **35**(1986), no. 2, 245–268. [2](#)
- [14] N. Garofalo and F.-H. Lin, *Unique continuation for elliptic operators: a geometric-variational approach*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **40**(1987), no. 3, 347–366. [2](#)
- [15] L. Hörmander, *The analysis of linear partial differential operators. III*. Springer, Berlin, 2007, viii+525 pp. [2](#)
- [16] L. Hörmander, *Notion of convexity*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2007, viii+414 pp. [16](#)
- [17] L. Hörmander, *Uniqueness theorems for second order elliptic differential equations*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations. **8** (1983), no. 1, 21–64. [2](#)
- [18] R. Harvey and J. Polking, *Removable singularities of solutions of linear partial differential equations*. Acta Math. **125**(1970), 39–56. [5](#)
- [19] D. Jerison and C. E. Kenig, *Unique continuation and absence of positive eigenvalues for Schrödinger operators. With an appendix by E. M. Stein*. Ann. of Math. (2) **121**(1985), no. 3, 463–494. [2](#), [11](#)
- [20] T. Kato, *Schrödinger operators with singular potentials*. Israel J. Math. **13**(1972), 135–148. [17](#)
- [21] C. E. Kenig, *Some recent quantitative unique continuation theorems*. Séminaire: Équations aux Dérivées Partielles. 2005–2006, Sémin. Équ. Dériv. Partielles, École Polytech., Palaiseau, 2006, pp. Exp. No. XX, 12. [1](#)
- [22] C. E. Kenig, *Some recent applications of unique continuation, Recent Developments in Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*, Contemp. Math., vol. 439, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007, pp. 25–56. [2](#)
- [23] H. Koch and D. Tataru, *Carleman estimates and unique continuation for second-order elliptic equations with nonsmooth coefficients*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **54** (2001), no. 3, 339–360. [2](#)
- [24] I. Kukavica, *Quantitative uniqueness for second-order elliptic operators*. Duke Math. J. **91**(1998), no. 2, 225–240. [2](#)
- [25] C. Kenig, L. Silvestre and J.-N. Wang, *On Landis’ conjecture in the plane*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **40**(2015), no. 4, 766–789. [1](#), [2](#)
- [26] V. A. Kondratiev and E. M. Landis, *Qualitative theory of second-order linear partial differential equations*. Itogi Nauki i Tekhniki Sovrem. Probl. Mat. Fund. Naprav., 32, Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vsesoyuz. Inst. Nauchn. i Tekhn. Inform., Moscow, 1988, 99–215. [1](#)

- [27] Lecture notes. <https://appliedmath.brown.edu/sites/default/files/fractional/35%20TheBesselFunctions.pdf> 4
- [28] A. Logunov, E. Malinnikova, N. Nadirashvili and F. Nazarov, *The Landis conjecture on exponential decay*. Preprint. 1
- [29] Y. Li and L. Nirenberg, *A geometric problem and the Hopf lemma. II*. Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B **27**(2006), no. 2, 193–218. 2, 9, 11
- [30] V. Z. Meshkov, *On the possible rate of decrease at infinity of the solutions of second-order partial differential equations*. Mat. Sb. **182**(1991), no. 3, 364–383. Math. USSR-Sb. **72**(1992), no. 2, 343–361. 1, 2, 14
- [31] Y. Pan, *Unique continuation for Schrödinger operators with singular potentials*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations. **17**(1992), no. 5-6, 953–965. 14
- [32] L. Rossi, *The Landis conjecture with sharp rate of decay*. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **70**(2021), no. 1, 301–324. 1, 2
- [33] T. Wolff, *Recent work on sharp estimates in second order elliptic unique continuation problems*. Fourier Analysis and Partial Differential Equations (Miraflores de la Sierra, 1992), Stud. Adv. Math., CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 1995, pp. 99–128. 2
- [34] J. Zhu, *Quantitative uniqueness of elliptic equations*. Amer. J. Math. **138**(2016), no. 3, 733–762. 2

pan@pfw.edu,

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Purdue University Fort Wayne, Fort Wayne, IN 46805-1499, USA.

zhangyu@pfw.edu,

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Purdue University Fort Wayne, Fort Wayne, IN 46805-1499, USA.