

MINIMAL CONVEX COMBINATIONS OF THREE SEQUENTIAL LAPLACE-DIRICHLET EIGENVALUES

BRAXTON OSTING AND CHIU-YEN KAO

ABSTRACT. We study the shape optimization problem where the objective function is a convex combination of three sequential Laplace-Dirichlet eigenvalues. That is, for $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta \geq 0$, and $\alpha + \beta \leq 1$, we consider $\inf \{ \alpha \lambda_k(\Omega) + \beta \lambda_{k+1}(\Omega) + (1 - \alpha - \beta) \lambda_{k+2}(\Omega) : \Omega \text{ open set in } \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ and } |\Omega| \leq 1 \}$. Here $\lambda_k(\Omega)$ denotes the k -th Laplace-Dirichlet eigenvalue and $|\cdot|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure. For $k = 1, 2$, the minimal values and minimizers are computed explicitly when the set of admissible domains is restricted to the disjoint union of balls. For star-shaped domains with smooth boundary, we show that for $k = 1$ and $\alpha + 2\beta \leq 1$, the ball is a local minimum. For $k = 1, 2$, several properties of minimizers are studied computationally, including uniqueness, connectivity, symmetry, and eigenvalue multiplicity.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be an open, bounded domain and $\{(\lambda_k(\Omega), \psi_k(\mathbf{x}; \Omega))\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ denote the eigenpairs of the Laplace-Dirichlet operator for the domain Ω (listed with multiplicity), satisfying

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} -\Delta \psi(\mathbf{x}) &= \lambda \psi(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} &\in \Omega, \\ \psi(\mathbf{x}) &= 0, & \mathbf{x} &\in \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

The eigenvalues $\lambda_k(\Omega)$ are characterized by the Courant-Fischer formulation

$$(1.2) \quad \lambda_k(\Omega) = \min_{\substack{E_k \subset H_0^1(\Omega) \\ \text{subspace of dim } k}} \max_{\psi \in E_k, \psi \neq 0} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \psi|^2 d\Omega}{\int_{\Omega} \psi^2 d\Omega},$$

where E_k is in general a k -dimensional subspace of $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and at the minimizer, $E_k = \text{span}(\{\psi_j(\mathbf{x}; \Omega)\}_{j=1}^k)$. The ratio in (1.2) is referred to as the Rayleigh quotient. General references for Laplace-Dirichlet eigenvalues can be found in [5, 6, 8].

In this work, we consider the shape optimization problem where the objective function is a convex combination of three sequential Laplace-Dirichlet eigenvalues. That is, we consider the following (α, β) -parameterized optimization problem:

$$(1.3) \quad C_{\alpha, \beta}^{j*} = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{A}} C_{\alpha, \beta}^j(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Omega}_{\alpha, \beta}^j = \{\Omega \in \mathcal{A} : C_{\alpha, \beta}^j(\Omega) = C_{\alpha, \beta}^{j*}\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T &:= \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0, \alpha + \beta \leq 1\}, \\ \mathcal{A} &:= \{\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 : \Omega \text{ quasi-open and } |\Omega| \leq 1\}, \\ C_{\alpha, \beta}^j(\Omega) &:= \alpha \lambda_j(\Omega) + \beta \lambda_{j+1}(\Omega) + (1 - \alpha - \beta) \lambda_{j+2}(\Omega), \quad (\alpha, \beta) \in T \text{ and } \Omega \in \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned}$$

We will also consider several reduced admissible classes. Let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$, be the set of balls, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{B} := \{\Omega \in \mathcal{A} : \Omega \text{ is a ball}\}.$$

Date: October 30, 2012.

Key words and phrases. shape optimization, Laplacian eigenvalues, Dirichlet boundary condition, and isoperimetric problems.

We'll use the notation $\mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$ to denote the class of domains consisting of the disjoint union of two balls. We say a domain Ω is F_N representable if

$$(1.4) \quad \Omega = \{(r, \theta) : r \leq R_N(\theta), \theta \in [0, 2\pi]\}, \quad \text{where } R_N(\theta) = \sum_{k=-N}^N a_k e^{ik\theta} \text{ and } a_{-k} = \overline{a_k}.$$

Define the set of all F_N representable domains by

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{F}_N = \{\Omega \in \mathcal{A} : \Omega \text{ is } F_N \text{ representable}\}.$$

Note that \mathcal{F}_∞ is the class of star-shaped, bounded domains with smooth boundary. Finally, we use the notation $\mathcal{F}_N \sqcup \mathcal{F}_N$ to denote the class of domains consisting of the disjoint union of two F_N representable domains.

In what follows, we give previous results for this problem and state our own results with an outline of this paper.

Previous Results. The simplest problem of the general form (1.3) is the minimization of a single eigenvalue, i.e.,

$$\min_{\Omega} \lambda_j = \min_{\Omega \in \mathcal{A}} C_{1,0}^j(\Omega).$$

The existence of a minimizer for general j was recently shown to exist and have finite perimeter [10, 4]. It is well known that among all open, two-dimensional domains of equal area, the unique minimizer of $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ is a ball (Faber-Krahn inequality) and the unique minimizer of $\lambda_2(\Omega)$ is the disjoint union of two equal-area balls (Krahn-Szegö inequality); see [6]. Wolf and Keller [15] showed the minimizer of $\lambda_3(\Omega)$ is connected and that a ball is a local minimizer. It remains as a conjecture that a ball is a global minimizer of $\lambda_3(\Omega)$; see [6]. The minimizer of $\lambda_4(\Omega)$ is conjectured to be the disjoint union of two balls with radii which have ratio $j_{0,1}/j_{1,1}$ where $j_{m,n}$ is the n -th zero of the m -th order Bessel function J_m ; see [6]. There are no theoretical results for the explicit optimal shapes for $j \geq 5$, however there are several computational studies in this area. In [13], minimizers for the first ten Laplace-Dirichlet eigenvalues were found numerically. Here, a level set approach was used to represent the domain and a relaxed formulation of the Laplace-Dirichlet problem was used to compute the eigenvalues. In [2], the same problem for $j \leq 15$ was studied using a high-accuracy meshless method for the eigenpair computation and the boundaries were parameterized using Fourier coefficients. The results were very similar to those in [13], except that an improved domain was found for the seventh eigenvalue. It was also observed that the minimizer for the thirteenth eigenvalue is not symmetric. The multiplicity of λ_j for the optimal domains was also investigated.

The shape optimization problem where the objective function is a convex combination of two sequential Laplace-Dirichlet eigenvalues, i.e., taking $\alpha + \beta = 1$ in $C_{\alpha,\beta}^j$:

$$(1.6) \quad \min_{\Omega \in \mathcal{A}} C_{\alpha,1-\alpha}^j(\Omega) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in [0, 1],$$

has also been studied. In [15], the range of the first two Laplace-Dirichlet eigenvalues $(\lambda_1(\Omega), \lambda_2(\Omega))$ for a planar domain Ω of unit area was explored. The boundary of the range consists of the two rays $\{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) : \lambda_2 = \lambda_1 \text{ and } \lambda_1 \geq \pi j_{0,1}^2\}$ and $\{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) : \lambda_2 = \frac{j_{1,1}^2}{j_{0,1}^2} \lambda_1 \text{ and } \lambda_2 \geq 2\pi j_{0,1}^2\}$ and a curve connecting their endpoints which was determined numerically by studying (1.6) with $j = 1$. It was observed computationally that for $\alpha > 0$, the minimizer is connected, while it is known that for $\alpha = 0$, the minimizer is the disjoint union of two equal-area balls (Krahn-Szegö inequality). Thus, there is a topological change in the minimizer as $\alpha \downarrow 0$. In [1], the means of sequential eigenvalues are studied, i.e., (1.6) with $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0.5)$, and the connectivity of optimal domains is investigated. In particular, for $j = 1$ and 2, using an argument similar to that of Wolf and Keller [15], it is established that the minimizers are connected. In [12], (1.6) is studied and it is shown $C_{\alpha,1-\alpha}^{j*}$ is a Lipschitz continuous, non-increasing, concave function of α and the minimizer is upper hemicontinuous in α . Furthermore, for $j \leq 5$, properties of the minimizer (e.g., the number of connected components) are

studied computationally as a function of α . For $j = 2$, it is shown that for $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, the ball is a local minimizer.

The present work is motivated by [7], where (1.3) is considered for $j = 1$. They show that a minimizer of $C_{\alpha,\beta}^1$ has no more than 2 connected components and prove that for a subset of $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$, the minimizer is connected. They also conjecture that the minimizer of (1.3) for $j = 1$ is connected unless $\beta = 1$.

For a more extensive discussion of related work in this area, please consult [12].

Results and Outline. In §2 we give some continuity results for the minimum values and minimizers of $C_{\alpha,\beta}^j(\Omega)$ over the admissible class \mathcal{A} . We also show (in Prop. 2) that a ball is a local minimizer of $C_{\alpha,\beta}^j(\Omega)$ for $\alpha + 2\beta \leq 1$ in the admissible class \mathcal{F}_∞ . In §3, we discuss the minimizers of $C_{\alpha,\beta}^j(\Omega)$ over the admissible class, $\mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$, consisting of the disjoint union of balls. Here, the solution can be written explicitly in terms of zeros of Bessel functions. In §4, we describe a computational method for minimizing $C_{\alpha,\beta}^j(\Omega)$ over the admissible class, $\mathcal{F}_N \sqcup \mathcal{F}_N$, consisting of the disjoint union of two F_N representable domains. The method is used to numerically investigate several properties of the minimizers for (1.3). In particular, for $j = 1$ and 2, we answer the following questions (1) For what values of $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$ is the minimizer unique, have symmetry, or is connected? (2) Are there values $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$ for which the minimizer does not vary continuously? (3) For varying values of $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$, what are the multiplicities of the first few Dirichlet-Laplacian eigenvalues for the minimizing domains? (4) For what values of $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$ does the optimal solution agree with the optimizer over the admissible class $\mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$? In §5, we conclude with a brief discussion.

2. RESULTS FOR THE MINIMUM OF $C_{\alpha,\beta}^j(\Omega)$ OVER THE ADMISSIBLE SETS \mathcal{A} AND \mathcal{F}_∞

In this section we give some analytical results for the shape optimization problem of minimizing $C_{\alpha,\beta}^j(\Omega)$ over the admissible classes \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{F}_∞ .

Since $C_{\alpha,\beta}^j(\Omega)$ is a non-decreasing and Lipschitz continuous function of the Laplace-Dirichlet eigenvalues, the recent results of [4, 10] show that the infimum in (1.3) exists and that every minimizer has finite perimeter. For a parameterized optimization function, such as in (1.3), the optimal value and minimizing set, when viewed as a function of the parameter, inherit some continuity properties from the objective function. We make these statements precise for (1.3) in the following proposition, which is a direct generalization of [12, Prop. 1] and we state without proof. Recall that a set valued function $\Gamma: A \rightarrow B$ is *upper hemicontinuous* at a point $a \in A$ if for all sequences $\{a_n\}_n$ such that $a_n \rightarrow a$ and all sequences $\{b_n\}_n$ such that $b_n \in \Gamma(a_n)$, there exist a $b \in \Gamma(a)$ such that $b_n \rightarrow b$.

Proposition 1. *Consider the (α, β) -parameterized shape optimization problem (1.3). For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ the following statements hold:*

- (1) For each $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$, $C_{\alpha,\beta}^{j,*}$ exists and $\hat{\Omega}_{\alpha,\beta}^j$ is a non-empty and closed set. Furthermore, every $\Omega \in \hat{\Omega}_{\alpha,\beta}^j$ has finite perimeter.
- (2) The optimal value, $C_{\alpha,\beta}^{j,*}$, is a non-increasing, Lipschitz continuous, and concave function in both α and β .
- (3) As a set-valued function of (α, β) , $\hat{\Omega}_{\alpha,\beta}^j$ is upper hemicontinuous.

We now restrict our attention to $\mathcal{F}_\infty \subset \mathcal{A}$, the class of domains which are star-shaped and bounded with smooth boundary. The following proposition shows that for $j = 1$ and a large subset of (α, β) -values in T , the ball is a local minimizer. Our computational results, presented in §4, suggest it is a global minimizer.

Proposition 2. *The ball is a local minimizer of $C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(\Omega)$ over the admissible class \mathcal{F}_∞ for the set $\{(\alpha, \beta) \in T: \alpha + 2\beta \leq 1\}$.*

Proof. Our proof is a generalization of the proof that the ball is a local minimum of $\lambda_3(\Omega)$ given in [15, Thm. 8.3], to which we refer the reader for details. Consider the nearly circular domain $\Omega_\epsilon = \{(r, \theta) : r < R(\theta, \epsilon), \theta \in [0, 2\pi]\}$, where

$$R(\theta, \epsilon) := 1 + \epsilon \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} a_k e^{ik\theta} + \epsilon^2 \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} b_k e^{ik\theta} + O(\epsilon^3), \quad a_n = \overline{a_{-n}} \text{ and } b_n = \overline{b_{-n}}.$$

Using the asymptotic formulas for $|\Omega_\epsilon| \lambda_k(\Omega_\epsilon)$ given in [15, App.A], the following holds. If $a_2 \neq 0$,

$$(2.1) \quad C_{\alpha, \beta}^1(\Omega_\epsilon) = \pi [\alpha j_{0,1}^2 + (1 - \alpha) j_{1,1}^2] + 2\epsilon \pi j_{1,1}^2 (1 - \alpha - 2\beta) |a_2| + O(\epsilon^2)$$

and if $a_2 = 0$,

$$(2.2) \quad C_{\alpha, \beta}^1(\Omega_\epsilon) = \pi [\alpha j_{0,1}^2 + (1 - \alpha) j_{1,1}^2] + A\alpha\epsilon^2 + B(1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2 + (1 - \alpha - 2\beta)C\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= 4\pi j_{0,1}^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(1 + j_{0,1} \frac{J'_n(j_{0,1})}{J_n(j_{0,1})} \right) |a_n|^2 \\ B &= 2\pi j_{1,1}^2 \sum_{\ell} \left(1 + j_{1,1} \frac{J'_{\ell-1}(j_{1,1})}{J_{\ell-1}(j_{1,1})} \right) |a_\ell|^2 \\ C &= 2\pi j_{1,1}^2 \left| b_2 - \sum_{\ell} \left(\frac{1}{2} + j_{1,1} \frac{J'_\ell(j_{1,1})}{J_\ell(j_{1,1})} \right) a_{1+\ell} a_{1-\ell} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Here, A and B are both non-negative constants, dependent on $\{a_n\}$, which vanish only if $a_n = 0$ for all n . C is a non-negative constant, dependent on both $\{a_n\}$ and b_2 . In both (2.1) and (2.2), if $\alpha + 2\beta \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, any perturbation of the ball increases $C_{\alpha, \beta}^1$, showing that the ball is a local minimizer. \square

3. MINIMUM OF $C_{\alpha, \beta}^1(\Omega)$ AND $C_{\alpha, \beta}^2(\Omega)$ OVER THE UNION OF TWO DISJOINT BALLS, $\mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$

Consider the disjoint union of two balls, $D_r \in \mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$, with radii given by $r_1 := r$ and $r_2 := \sqrt{\pi^{-1} - r^2}$ where $r^2 \in [0, (2\pi)^{-1}]$. Note that the measure of D_r is exactly one and that the second ball is larger than the first. The first eigenfunction is supported in the larger ball, so

$$\lambda_1(D_r) = \pi(1 - \pi r^2)^{-1} j_{0,1}^2.$$

The second, third, and fourth eigenvalues depend on the ratio of the ball sizes. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2(D_r) = \lambda_3(D_r) &= \frac{\pi j_{1,1}^2}{1 - \pi r^2} \text{ and } \lambda_4(D_r) = \frac{\pi j_{2,1}^2}{1 - \pi r^2} \quad \text{for } r^2 \in I_1 := \left[0, \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{j_{0,1}^2}{j_{2,1}^2 + j_{0,1}^2} \right] \\ \lambda_2(D_r) = \lambda_3(D_r) &= \frac{\pi j_{1,1}^2}{1 - \pi r^2} \text{ and } \lambda_4(D_r) = \frac{j_{0,1}^2}{r^2} \quad \text{for } r^2 \in I_2 := \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \frac{j_{0,1}^2}{j_{2,1}^2 + j_{0,1}^2}, \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{j_{0,1}^2}{j_{1,1}^2 + j_{0,1}^2} \right] \\ \lambda_2(D_r) &= \frac{j_{0,1}^2}{r^2} \text{ and } \lambda_3(D_r) = \lambda_4(D_r) = \frac{\pi j_{1,1}^2}{1 - \pi r^2} \quad \text{for } r^2 \in I_3 := \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \frac{j_{0,1}^2}{j_{1,1}^2 + j_{0,1}^2}, \frac{1}{2\pi} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For the domain D_r , the convex combination of eigenvalues of the first three eigenvalues, $C_{\alpha, \beta}^1$, is

$$(3.1) \quad C_{\alpha, \beta}^1(D_r) = \begin{cases} [\alpha j_{0,1}^2 + (1 - \alpha) j_{1,1}^2] \frac{\pi}{1 - \pi r^2} & \text{for } r^2 \in I_1 \cup I_2 \\ \beta \frac{j_{0,1}^2}{r^2} + [\alpha j_{0,1}^2 + (1 - \alpha - \beta) j_{1,1}^2] \frac{\pi}{1 - \pi r^2} & \text{for } r^2 \in I_3 \end{cases}$$




FIGURE 3.1. **(left)** The value of $C_{\alpha,\beta}^{1o} := \inf\{C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(D_r) : r^2 \in [0, (2\pi)^{-1}]\}$ and **(right)** the corresponding optimal parameter r for $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$. See Prop. 3 and §3.

and the convex combination of eigenvalues of the second through fourth eigenvalues, $C_{\alpha,\beta}^2$, is

$$(3.2) \quad C_{\alpha,\beta}^2(D_r) = \begin{cases} (\alpha + \beta) \frac{\pi j_{1,1}^2}{1 - \pi r^2} + (1 - \alpha - \beta) \frac{\pi j_{2,1}^2}{1 - \pi r^2} & \text{for } r^2 \in I_1 \\ (\alpha + \beta) \frac{\pi j_{1,1}^2}{1 - \pi r^2} + (1 - \alpha - \beta) \frac{j_{0,1}^2}{r^2} & \text{for } r^2 \in I_2 \\ \alpha \frac{j_{0,1}^2}{r^2} + (1 - \alpha) \frac{\pi j_{1,1}^2}{1 - \pi r^2} & \text{for } r^2 \in I_3. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 3. Define the partition, $T = T_1^1 \cup T_2^1$, by

$$\begin{aligned} T_1^1 &:= \{(\alpha, \beta) \in T : \beta \leq \frac{j_{1,1}^2}{2(j_{1,1}^2 - j_{0,1}^2)} - \frac{\alpha}{2}\} \\ T_2^1 &:= \{(\alpha, \beta) \in T : \beta > \frac{j_{1,1}^2}{2(j_{1,1}^2 - j_{0,1}^2)} - \frac{\alpha}{2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then for $C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(D_r)$ as defined in (3.1),

$$\min_{r^2 \in [0, (2\pi)^{-1}]} C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(D_r) \equiv C_{\alpha,\beta}^{1o} = \begin{cases} \pi (\alpha j_{0,1}^2 + (1 - \alpha) j_{1,1}^2) & \text{if } (\alpha, \beta) \in T_1^1 \\ 2\pi ((\alpha + \beta) j_{0,1}^2 + (1 - \alpha - \beta) j_{1,1}^2) & \text{if } (\alpha, \beta) \in T_2^1 \end{cases}$$

with minimizer given by

$$r^2 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (\alpha, \beta) \in T_1^1 \\ \frac{1}{2\pi} & \text{if } (\alpha, \beta) \in T_2^1 \end{cases}.$$

Remark 4. The optimal objective function values, $C_{\alpha,\beta}^{1o}$, and corresponding optimal parameters, r , are plotted in Fig. 3.1 for $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$. The optimal objective function values for particular values $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$ are given in Table 1(top).

Remark 5. In Prop. 3, we consider only the disjoint union of two balls. However, [7] has shown that the minimizer has no more than two connected components, so in fact, we are considering the disjoint union of an arbitrary number of balls.

Proof. We first note that the value of $C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(D_r)$ for $r^2 \in I_1 \cup I_2$ is a monotone increasing function in r . Thus the minimum occurs for $r = 0$, which implies the minimizer over this interval is a single ball, D_0 . The optimal value is $C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(D_0) = \pi(\alpha j_{0,1}^2 + (1-\alpha)j_{1,1}^2)$. For fixed $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$, we now find the radius r which minimizes $C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(D_r)$ for $r^2 \in I_3$. Since $C_{\alpha,\beta}^1$ is a continuous function, this occurs at critical values, r , where either $\frac{dC_{\alpha,\beta}^1(D_r)}{dr} = 0$ or values where $C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(D_r)$ is not differentiable. For the interval I_3 , the critical radius r_1^* , satisfying $\frac{dC_{\alpha,\beta}^1(D_r)}{dr} = 0$, is

$$r_1^{*2} = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\sqrt{\beta}j_{0,1}}{\sqrt{\beta}j_{0,1} + \sqrt{\alpha j_{0,1}^2 + (1-\alpha-\beta)j_{1,1}^2}}.$$

Thus we consider the following three critical values

$$(3.3) \quad C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(D_r) = \begin{cases} C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(D_0) = \pi(\alpha j_{0,1}^2 + (1-\alpha)j_{1,1}^2) & \text{if } r^2 = 0 \\ \pi \left(\sqrt{\beta}j_{0,1} + \sqrt{\alpha j_{0,1}^2 + (1-\alpha-\beta)j_{1,1}^2} \right)^2 & \text{if } r^2 = r_1^{*2} \\ 2\pi((\alpha+\beta)j_{0,1}^2 + (1-\alpha-\beta)j_{1,1}^2) & \text{if } r^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \end{cases}.$$

The result now follows from a comparison of the values in (3.3). \square

Proposition 6. Denote $Q = [Q_L, Q_R] = \left[\frac{j_{0,1}^2}{j_{1,1}^2 + j_{0,1}^2}, \frac{j_{1,1}^2}{j_{1,1}^2 + j_{0,1}^2} \right]$. We define the partition, $T = T_1^2 \cup T_2^2 \cup T_3^2 \cup T_4^2$, by

$$T_1^2 := \{(\alpha, \beta) \in T: \beta \leq \frac{\alpha j_{1,1}^2 + (1-\alpha)j_{2,1}^2 - (\sqrt{\alpha}j_{0,1} + \sqrt{1-\alpha}j_{1,1})^2}{(j_{2,1}^2 - j_{1,1}^2)} \text{ and } \alpha \in Q\}$$

$$T_2^2 := \{(\alpha, \beta) \in T: \beta \leq \frac{(3j_{1,1}^2 - 2j_{0,1}^2 - j_{2,1}^2)\alpha - (2j_{1,1}^2 - j_{2,1}^2)}{(j_{2,1}^2 - j_{1,1}^2)} \text{ and } \alpha \geq Q_R\}$$

$$T_3^2 := \{(\alpha, \beta) \in T: \beta \geq \frac{j_{2,1}^2 - j_{1,1}^2 - j_{0,1}^2}{j_{2,1}^2 - j_{1,1}^2} - \alpha \text{ and } \alpha \leq Q_L,$$

$$\beta \geq \frac{\alpha j_{1,1}^2 + (1-\alpha)j_{2,1}^2 - (\sqrt{\alpha}j_{0,1} + \sqrt{1-\alpha}j_{1,1})^2}{(j_{2,1}^2 - j_{1,1}^2)} \text{ and } \alpha \in Q,$$

$$\beta \geq \frac{(3j_{1,1}^2 - 2j_{0,1}^2 - j_{2,1}^2)\alpha - (2j_{1,1}^2 - j_{2,1}^2)}{(j_{2,1}^2 - j_{1,1}^2)} \text{ and } \alpha \geq Q_R\}$$

$$T_4^2 := \{(\alpha, \beta) \in T: \beta \leq \frac{j_{2,1}^2 - j_{1,1}^2 - j_{0,1}^2}{j_{2,1}^2 - j_{1,1}^2} - \alpha \text{ and } \alpha \leq Q_L\}$$

Then for $C_{\alpha,\beta}^2(D_r)$ as defined in (3.2),

$$\min_{r^2 \in [0, (2\pi)^{-1}]} C_{\alpha,\beta}^2(D_r) \equiv C_{\alpha,\beta}^{2\circ} = \begin{cases} \pi(\sqrt{\alpha}j_{0,1} + \sqrt{1-\alpha}j_{1,1})^2 & (\alpha, \beta) \in T_1^2 \\ 2\pi(\alpha j_{0,1}^2 + (1-\alpha)j_{1,1}^2) & (\alpha, \beta) \in T_2^2 \\ \pi((\alpha+\beta)j_{1,1}^2 + (1-\alpha-\beta)j_{2,1}^2) & (\alpha, \beta) \in T_3^2 \\ \pi(j_{1,1}^2 + j_{0,1}^2) & (\alpha, \beta) \in T_4^2 \end{cases}$$

with minimizer given by

$$r^2 = \begin{cases} \pi(\sqrt{\alpha}j_{0,1} + \sqrt{1-\alpha}j_{1,1})^2 & (\alpha, \beta) \in T_1^2 \\ \frac{1}{2\pi} & (\alpha, \beta) \in T_2^2 \\ 0 & (\alpha, \beta) \in T_3^2 \\ \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{j_{0,1}^2}{j_{1,1}^2 + j_{0,1}^2} & (\alpha, \beta) \in T_4^2 \end{cases}.$$




FIGURE 3.2. **(left)** The value of $C_{\alpha,\beta}^{2o} := \inf\{C_{\alpha,\beta}^2(D_r) : r^2 \in [0, (2\pi)^{-1}]\}$ and **(right)** the corresponding optimal parameter r for $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$. See Prop. 6 and §3.

Remark 7. The optimal objective function values, $C_{\alpha,\beta}^{2o}$, and corresponding optimal parameters, r , are plotted in Fig. 3.2 for $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$. The optimal objective function values for particular values $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$ are given in Table 2(top).

Proof. We first note that the value of $C_{\alpha,\beta}^2(D_r)$, as defined in (3.2), for $r^2 \in I_1$ is a monotone increasing function in r . Thus, the minimum occurs for $r = 0$, indicating the optimal domain is a single ball D_0 . The optimal value is $C_{\alpha,\beta}^2(D_0) = (\alpha + \beta)\pi j_{1,1}^2 + (1 - \alpha - \beta)\pi j_{2,1}^2$. For fixed $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$, we now find the radius r which minimizes $C_{\alpha,\beta}^2(D_r)$ for $r^2 \in I_2$ and I_3 . For the interval I_2 , the critical radius r_2^* satisfying $\frac{dC_{\alpha,\beta}^2(D_r)}{dr} = 0$ is

$$r_2^{*2} = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\sqrt{(1 - \alpha - \beta)}j_{0,1}}{\sqrt{(1 - \alpha - \beta)}j_{0,1} + \sqrt{(\alpha + \beta)}j_{1,1}}.$$

For the interval I_3 , the critical radius r_3^* satisfying $\frac{dC_{\alpha,\beta}^2(D_r)}{dr} = 0$ is

$$r_3^{*2} = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}j_{0,1}}{\sqrt{\alpha}j_{0,1} + \sqrt{1 - \alpha}j_{1,1}}.$$

Thus, we consider the following five critical values

$$(3.4) \quad C_{\alpha,\beta}^2(D_r) = \begin{cases} \pi((\alpha + \beta)j_{1,1}^2 + (1 - \alpha - \beta)j_{2,1}^2) & \text{if } r^2 = 0 \\ \pi(\sqrt{(1 - \alpha - \beta)}j_{0,1} + \sqrt{(\alpha + \beta)}j_{1,1})^2 & \text{if } r^2 = r_2^{*2} \\ \pi(j_{1,1}^2 + j_{0,1}^2) & \text{if } r^2 = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{j_{0,1}^2}{j_{1,1}^2 + j_{0,1}^2} \\ \pi(\sqrt{\alpha}j_{0,1} + \sqrt{1 - \alpha}j_{1,1})^2 & \text{if } r^2 = r_3^{*2} \\ 2\pi(\alpha j_{0,1}^2 + (1 - \alpha)j_{1,1}^2) & \text{if } r^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \end{cases}$$

The result now follows from a comparison of the values in (3.4). \square

Remark 8. Along the curve separating T_3^2 from $T_1^2 \cup T_2^2 \cup T_4^2$, there are two minimizers: one with a single connected component and the other with two connected components.

4. COMPUTATIONAL METHOD AND RESULTS

In this section, we consider the minimization of $C_{\alpha,\beta}^j(\Omega)$ over the class $\mathcal{F}_N \sqcup \mathcal{F}_N$, where \mathcal{F}_N is defined in (1.5),

$$(4.1) \quad C_{\alpha,\beta}^{j*} = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{F}_N} C_{\alpha,\beta}^j(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Omega}_{\alpha,\beta}^j = \{\Omega \in \mathcal{F}_N \sqcup \mathcal{F}_N : C_{\alpha,\beta}^j(\Omega) = C_{\alpha,\beta}^{j*}\}.$$

We first describe a computational method for the solution of (4.1). In brief, a boundary integral method is used for the solution of the eigenvalue problem (1.1) and a line search-based BFGS method is used for the solution of (4.1). Similar algorithms appear in [11, 2, 1]. We then present some computational results for (4.1).

Computational methods. The numerical optimization method is initialized with a choice of Fourier coefficients $\{a_k\}_{k=0}^N$ in (1.4). We use $N = 10$ coefficients and choose the coefficients either randomly or using the results from a previous computation. For a given domain, the first several eigenpairs are computed using the Matlab toolbox `mppack` [3]. The weighted-Neumann-to-Dirichlet scaling method is chosen with the argument `'ntd'` and $M = 100$ quadrature points are used. For the optimization problem (4.1), we use the line-search-based BFGS algorithm implemented in `HANSO` [14]. This quasi-Newton method has proven to be effective for non-smooth optimization problems such as (4.1) [9]. If λ_j is simple, the derivatives of $\lambda_j(\Omega)$ with respect to the coefficients a_k describing Ω can be found in, e.g., [11] and are given by

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{\partial \lambda_j}{\partial a_k} = - \int_0^{2\pi} R_N(\theta) e^{ik\theta} |\nabla \psi_j(R_N(\theta), \theta)|^2 d\theta.$$

In our computations, the Neumann data, ∇u_j , is evaluated at the quadrature points and the integral in (4.2) is evaluated via quadrature. We remark that while the derivative of an eigenvalue with higher multiplicity can be computed (see, e.g., [6]), in numerical computations roundoff error causes all eigenvalues to be simple.

To address the questions considered in this paper, we solve the (α, β) -parameterized optimization problem (4.1) for many (≈ 300) values (α, β) . We find the method described above to be extremely effective for this. Solving (4.1) requires on the order of 40 BFGS iterations, each requiring approximately 1-7 eigenvalue solutions for the line search. The solution to (4.1) takes approximately 2 minutes using Matlab 2012b on a 2.0 GHz Intel Core i7 Duo desktop computer with 8GB of RAM.

Computational results. For $j = 1$ and 2, we use the computational method described above to solve (4.1) for approximately 50 specified values $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$. The results for $j = 1$ are displayed in Table 1(bottom) and Figure 5.1. The results for $j = 2$ are displayed in Table 2(bottom) and Figure 5.2. All reported values are rounded to four significant digits. Note that all values attained for the admissible class $\mathcal{F}_{10} \sqcup \mathcal{F}_{10}$ are at least as small as those for balls, $\mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$. In what follows, we refer to numerically computed solutions as minimizers.

For $j = 1$, we observe the following.

- (1) For (α, β) -values in the region $\{(\alpha, \beta) \in T : \alpha + 2\beta \leq 1\}$, the optimal solution is a ball. The ball is shown to be a local minimizer in Prop. 2 (proven in §2).
- (2) (Connectivity.) We observe that the optimal domain has one connected component except for $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 1)$. This supports a conjecture of Iversen and Mazzoleni [7].
- (3) We observe that the minimizer is unique and continuously varies with respect to α and β .
- (4) (Symmetry.) For all (α, β) values considered, the minimizer has two axis of symmetry.
- (5) (Eigenvalue multiplicity.) For (α, β) -values in the region $\{(\alpha, \beta) \in T : \alpha + 2\beta \leq 1\}$, the optimal solution is a ball with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 < \lambda_4$. For $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 1)$, the optimal solution is two balls of equal measure with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 = \lambda_4$. For all other (α, β) -values considered, the first four eigenvalues of the optimal domain are each simple.

- (6) (Comparison to Prop. 3.) For $\Omega \in \mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in T_1^1$ as defined in Prop. 3, the optimal shape is a ball with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 < \lambda_4$. For $(\alpha, \beta) \in T_2^1$, the minimizer is the disjoint union of two balls of equal measure with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 = \lambda_4$.

For $j = 2$, we observe the following.

- (1) For $\alpha + \beta = 1$ and $0 \leq \beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, the ball is a local minimizer. This follows from the identity $C_{\beta, 1-\beta}^2 = C_{0,\beta}^1$ for $\beta \in [0, 1]$ and Prop. 2.
- (2) (Connectivity.) We observe that the optimal domain has one connected component except for $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 0)$ and in a neighborhood of $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0)$. We conjecture that the (α, β) -region containing $(1, 0)$ with disconnected minimizer consists only of the isolated point $(1, 0)$. To investigate the region near $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0)$ further, we solve (4.1) 121 additional times for a selection of values $(\alpha, \beta) \in [0, 0.1] \times [0, 0.5] \subset T$. The optimal values and minimizers are plotted in Fig. 5.3. The black line is the intersection of the linear interpolation of obj. function values for one- and two-component regions. We observe that the optimal shape has two connected components for $\alpha \lesssim 0.03$ and $\beta \lesssim 0.4$.
- (3) We observe that the minimizer is unique except along the (α, β) -curve shown in 5.3(left) separating the minimizers with one and two connected components. For (α, β) values on this curve, the optimal set $\hat{\Omega}_{\alpha,\beta}^2$ consist of a domain with one connected component and a two-connected component domain. Away from the curve, the minimizer varies continuously with respect to α and β .
- (4) (Symmetry.) For all (α, β) values considered, connected minimizers have two axis of symmetry. The disconnected minimizers for (α, β) values near $(0, 0)$ have only one axis of symmetry.
- (5) (Eigenvalue multiplicity.) For (α, β) -values in the region $\{(\alpha, \beta) \in T: \alpha + \beta = 1, \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$, the optimal solution is a ball with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 < \lambda_4 = \lambda_5$. For (α, β) -values in the region $\{(\alpha, \beta) \in T: \alpha \lesssim 0.03, \beta \lesssim 0.4\}$, the solution is the disjoint union of two balls of different measure with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 < \lambda_5$. For $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 0)$, the optimal solution is two balls of equal measure with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = \lambda_5 = \lambda_6$. For all other (α, β) -values considered, the first five eigenvalues of the optimal domain are each simple.
- (6) (Comparison to Prop. 6.) For $\Omega \in \mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in T_1^2 \cup T_2^2 \cup T_4^2$ as defined in Prop. 6, the optimal shape has two connected components. For the more general admissible class $\mathcal{F}_N \sqcup \mathcal{F}_N$ however, the region where the optimal shape has two connected components is relatively small. For example, for $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0)$, the optimal union of balls has two components while the minimizer over $\mathcal{F}_N \sqcup \mathcal{F}_N$ has just one. In Figure 3.2, the minimizer has $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 < \lambda_5$ in region T_1^2 , $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = \lambda_5 = \lambda_6$ in region T_2^2 , $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 < \lambda_4 = \lambda_5$ in region T_3^2 , and $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 < \lambda_5$ in region T_4^2 .

When comparison is available, our results agree with those for minimizing single eigenvalues [13, 2], the mean of sequential eigenvalues [1], and convex combinations of two sequential eigenvalues [15, 12]. In particular, we recover the results

$$\lambda_1^* = \pi j_{0,1}^2 \approx 18.17, \quad \lambda_2^* = 2\pi j_{0,1}^2 \approx 36.34, \quad \lambda_3^* = \pi j_{1,1}^2 \approx 46.12, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_4^* = \pi(j_{1,1}^2 + j_{0,1}^2) \approx 64.29.$$

In [12], we numerically observed that for $j = 2 : 5$, $C_{\alpha, 1-\alpha}^{j*}$ is constant on the interval $\alpha \in [0, \delta]$ for some constant $\delta = \delta(j) > 0$. Recalling the identity $C_{\alpha, 1-\alpha}^{j+1} = C_{0,\alpha}^j$, in the present context, this implies that $C_{\alpha,\beta}^{j*}$ is constant on the line segments $\{(\alpha, \beta): \alpha + \beta = 1, \alpha \in [0, \delta]\}$ and $\{(\alpha, \beta): \alpha = 0, \beta \in [0, \delta]\}$ for $j = 2, 3, 4$. For these larger j -values, it would be interesting to see whether these line segments can be extended to regions $\alpha + \beta < 1$ and $\alpha > 0$ respectively.

5. DISCUSSION AND FURTHER DIRECTIONS

We have studied the shape optimization problem of minimizing the convex combination of three sequential Laplace-Dirichlet eigenvalues, $C_{\alpha,\beta}^j(\Omega) := \alpha\lambda_j(\Omega) + \beta\lambda_{j+1}(\Omega) + (1 - \alpha - \beta)\lambda_{j+2}(\Omega)$ over

several different admissible sets. In particular, we compare the values and minimizers of $C_{\alpha,\beta}^j(\Omega)$ for $j = 1, 2$ for the two admissible sets: disjoint unions of domains with smooth boundary, $\mathcal{F}_N \sqcup \mathcal{F}_N$, and disjoint unions of balls, $\mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$. We have tried to catalogue properties of the optimizers in hope that our observations stimulate interesting future analytical development in this area.

We conclude with a brief qualitative comparison of the computational method used in the present work and the method recently introduced in [12]. There are two primary differences between these two approaches: (i) in the present work the eigenvalue problem is solved using boundary integral methods, while in [12] it is solved using finite element methods and (ii) in the present work, we have represented the domain using Fourier coefficients, while in [12] the domain is represented using the level set method. We have found the finite element method to be more robust, but much slower and less accurate than the boundary element method. The level set method has the advantage of not fixing the topology of the domain. However, currently available methods for solving the eigenvalue problem require either extracting points on the boundary or a parameterization of the boundary. Thus, each iteration of a gradient-based optimization method requires a rootfinding algorithm to find approximate points on the boundary. We view the problem of finding a method which utilizes the level-set function representation of the domain, but doesn't require such rootfinding at each iteration to be a challenging extension of this work.




FIGURE 5.1. **(left)** The value of $\inf\{C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(\Omega): \Omega \in \mathcal{F}_{10} \sqcup \mathcal{F}_{10}\}$ and **(right)** corresponding minimizer for $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$. The values where (4.1) was solved are indicated with an ‘x’. Other values are obtained by linear interpolation. See §4.

1	36.34								
0.875	43.33	36.34							
0.75	46.12	42.63	36.34						
0.625	46.12	42.63	39.14	35.64					
0.5	46.12	42.63	39.14	35.64	32.15				
0.375	46.12	42.63	39.14	35.64	32.15	28.65			
0.25	46.12	42.63	39.14	35.64	32.15	28.65	25.16		
0.125	46.12	42.63	39.14	35.64	32.15	28.65	25.16	21.66	
0	46.12	42.63	39.14	35.64	32.15	28.65	25.16	21.66	18.17
β/α	0	0.125	0.25	0.375	0.5	0.625	0.75	0.875	1

1	36.34								
0.875	40.09	35.49							
0.75	43.17	38.80	33.85						
0.625	45.73	41.64	37.12	31.85					
0.5	46.12	42.52	38.67	34.44	29.60				
0.375	46.12	42.63	39.14	35.51	31.57	27.12			
0.25	46.12	42.63	39.14	35.64	32.15	28.49	24.42		
0.125	46.12	42.63	39.14	35.64	32.15	28.65	25.16	21.46	
0	46.12	42.63	39.14	35.64	32.15	28.65	25.16	21.66	18.17
β/α	0	0.125	0.25	0.375	0.5	0.625	0.75	0.875	1

TABLE 1. **(top)** The value of $\inf\{C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(\Omega): \Omega \in \mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{B}\}$ and **(bottom)** $\inf\{C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(\Omega): \Omega \in \mathcal{F}_{10} \sqcup \mathcal{F}_{10}\}$ for $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$. Blue entries are values for which Prop. 2 implies the ball is a local minimizer of $C_{\alpha,\beta}^1(\Omega)$ over \mathcal{F}_{∞} . See §4.




FIGURE 5.2. **(left)** The value of $\inf\{C_{\alpha,\beta}^2(\Omega): \Omega \in \mathcal{F}_{10} \sqcup \mathcal{F}_{10}\}$ and **(right)** corresponding minimizer for $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$. The values where (4.1) was solved are indicated with an ‘x’. Other values are obtained by linear interpolation. See §4.

1	46.12								
0.875	50.72	46.12							
0.75	55.31	50.72	46.12						
0.625	59.90	55.31	50.72	46.12					
0.5	64.29	59.90	55.31	50.72	46.12				
0.375	64.29	64.29	59.90	55.31	50.72	46.12			
0.25	64.29	64.29	64.29	59.90	55.31	50.72	46.12		
0.125	64.29	64.29	64.29	63.67	59.90	55.31	50.32	43.33	
0	64.29	64.29	64.29	63.67	61.10	56.68	50.32	43.33	36.34
β/α	0	0.125	0.25	0.375	0.5	0.625	0.75	0.875	1

1	46.12								
0.875	50.55	46.12							
0.75	54.69	50.55	46.12						
0.625	58.60	54.69	50.55	46.12					
0.5	62.29	58.60	54.69	50.55	46.12				
0.375	64.29	61.50	57.95	54.16	50.10	45.73			
0.25	64.29	62.02	58.91	55.65	52.17	48.45	43.17		
0.125	64.29	62.02	58.91	55.71	52.43	49.05	45.54	40.09	
0	64.29	62.02	58.91	55.71	52.43	49.05	45.57	41.97	36.34
β/α	0	0.125	0.25	0.375	0.5	0.625	0.75	0.875	1

TABLE 2. **(top)** The value of $\inf\{C_{\alpha,\beta}^2(\Omega): \Omega \in \mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{B}\}$ and **(bottom)** $\inf\{C_{\alpha,\beta}^2(\Omega): \Omega \in \mathcal{F}_{10} \sqcup \mathcal{F}_{10}\}$ for $(\alpha, \beta) \in T$. Using the identity $C_{\beta,1-\beta}^2 = C_{0,\beta}^1$ for $\beta \in [0, 1]$, Prop. 2 applies to the blue entries, i.e., the ball is a local minimizer. See §4.




FIGURE 5.3. An enlargement of the (α, β) -region near $(0, 0)$ in Fig. 5.2.

Acknowledgements. Braxton Osting is partially supported by a National Science Foundation (NSF) Postdoctoral Fellowship DMS-11-03959 and Chiu-Yen Kao is partially supported by NSF DMS-1216742. We would like to thank Mette Iversen for sharing with us a preliminary draft of [7].

REFERENCES

- [1] P. R. S. Antunes. Optimization of sums and quotients of Dirichlet-Laplacian eigenvalues. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 2012. preprint.
- [2] P. R.S. Antunes and P. Freitas. Numerical optimization of low eigenvalues of the Dirichlet and Neumann Laplacians. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, in press, 2012.
- [3] T. Betcke and A. Barnett. mpspack, a MATLAB toolbox to solve Helmholtz PDE, wave scattering, and eigenvalue problems using particular solutions and integral equations, 2012.
- [4] D. Bucur. Minimization of the k-th eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian. preprint, 2011.
- [5] R. Courant and D. Hilbert. *Methods of mathematical physics. Vol. I*. Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, N.Y., 1953.
- [6] A. Henrot. *Extremum Problems for Eigenvalues of Elliptic Operators*. Birkhäuser Verlag, 2006.
- [7] M. Iversen and D. Mazzoleni. Minimizing convex combinations of low eigenvalues. 2012.
- [8] J. R. Kuttler and V. G. Sigillito. Eigenvalues of the Laplacian in two dimensions. *SIAM Review*, 26(2):163–193, 1984.
- [9] A. S. Lewis and M. L. Overton. Nonsmooth optimization via BFGS. submitted to *SIAM J. Optim.*, 2009.
- [10] D. Mazzoleni and A. Pratelli. Existence of minimizers for spectral problems. preprint CVGMT, 2011.
- [11] B. Osting. Optimization of spectral functions of Dirichlet-Laplacian eigenvalues. *J. Comp. Phys.*, 229(22):8578–8590, 2010.
- [12] B. Osting and C. Y. Kao. Minimal convex combinations of sequential Laplace-Dirichlet eigenvalues. 2012.
- [13] E. Oudet. Numerical minimization of eigenmodes of a membrane with respect to the domain. *ESAIM: Control, Optimization and Calculus of Variations*, 10:315–335, 2004.
- [14] Michael L. Overton. HANSO: Hybrid algorithm for non-smooth optimization, 2012.
- [15] S. A. Wolf and J. B. Keller. Range of the first two eigenvalues of the Laplacian. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 447:397–412, 1994.

E-mail address: braxton@math.ucla.edu, Ckao@claremontmckenna.edu.

OSTING: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CA 90095, KAO: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, CLAREMONT MCKENNA COLLEGE, CA 91711.