CORRECTION TO "ON THE FREE BOUNDARY OF A QUASI-VARIATIONAL INEQUALITY ARISING IN A PROBLEM OF QUALITY CONTROL"

BY

AVNER FRIEDMAN

In the proof of Theorem 4.1 of [1] we stated that $\partial z/\partial y_l > 0$ on ∂C_{δ} ; this is true if ∂C_{δ} lies in Ω_{δ} , but may possibly be false at points of $\partial C_{\delta} \cap \partial \Omega_{\delta}$. Thus the proof of Theorem 4.1 yields only the weaker result:

THEOREM 4.1'. If (4.1), (4.2) hold then \overline{C} cannot lie in the interior of R_{n-1}^+ , that is, \overline{C} must intersect ∂R_{n-1}^+ .

Stronger assertions about the continuation set C can be proved under additional restrictions on the $q_{i,j}$. Recall that we are dealing with the variational inequality for $w = u - \psi$:

$$w < 0, -Lw < \frac{1}{Y} \sum_{i=1}^{n} B_{i} y_{i} \left(Y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_{i}, y_{1} \equiv 1 \right),$$

$$w \left(-Lw - \frac{1}{Y} \sum_{i=1}^{n} B_{i} y_{i} \right) = 0 (1)$$

in R_{n-1}^+ $(y = (y_2, \ldots, y_n)$ belongs to R_{n-1}^+ if and only if $y_i > 0$ for 2 < i < n) under the assumptions:

$$B_i > 0 \quad \text{if } 2 \le i \le n, \quad B_1 < 0$$
 (2)

(if $B_1 > 0$ then $C = \emptyset$), where

$$Lw = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^{n} \mu_{ij} y_i y_j \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} + \sum_{j=2}^{n} b_j \frac{\partial w}{\partial y_j} - \alpha w,$$

$$b_j = \frac{1}{Y} \sum_{i=2}^{n} \mu_{ij} y_i y_j + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (q_{i,j} - q_{i,1}) y_i,$$

$$\mu_{ii} = (\lambda_i - \lambda_1) \cdot (\lambda_i - \lambda_1).$$

We shall now assume that

$$\mu_{ij} = \mu_i \delta_{ij}, \qquad \mu_i > 0, \tag{3}$$

$$q_{l,i} = 0 \quad \text{if } l > j. \tag{4}$$

Then (see (4.5) of [1]), each $w_l = \partial z/\partial y_l$ (z = Yw) satisfies in C_δ an inhomogeneous elliptic equation to which the minimum principle applies, provided we already know that $w_{l+1} > 0, \ldots, w_n > 0$. Thus, we can establish by induction that $w_n > 0$,

Received by the editors March 12, 1979.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 35J65, 35J70, 93E20; Secondary 35J25, 90B99.

 $w_{n-1} > 0, \ldots, w_k > 0$ provided we can verify these inequalities on the boundary of Ω_{δ} .

To do this we specialize to

$$\Omega_{\delta} = \left\{ y; y_i > \delta \text{ for } 2 \le i \le n, \sum_{i=2}^{n} y_i = \frac{1}{\delta} \right\}.$$

Denote by $\partial_0 \Omega_\delta$ the part of $\partial \Omega_\delta$ where $\sum y_i = \delta$, and by $\partial_1 \Omega_\delta$ the remaining part of $\partial \Omega_\delta$. We chose the boundary values of z as follows:

$$z = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial_0 \Omega_{\delta},$$

$$z = \gamma \left(\sum_{j=2}^n y_j - \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \quad \text{on } \partial_1 \Omega_{\delta}, \quad \gamma > 0.$$
(5)

Then

$$z < 0,$$
 $\frac{\partial z}{\partial y_i} > 0,$ $\frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial y_i^2} = 0$ on $\partial_1 \Omega_\delta \cap \{ y_j = \delta \}, j \neq i.$ (6)

We choose γ sufficiently small so that $\gamma |q_{i,j}| < \frac{1}{2}B_i$ (2 < j < n). Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\substack{j=2\\i\neq l}}^{n} q_{i,j} y_i \frac{\partial z}{\partial y_j} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=2}^{n} B_i y_i > 0 \quad \text{on } y_l = \delta.$$
 (7)

Further, if δ is sufficiently small,

$$-\alpha z + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=2}^{n} B_{i} y_{i} > -B_{1} \quad \text{on } \partial_{1} \Omega_{\delta}. \tag{8}$$

Since

$$\sum_{j=2}^{n} q_{i,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} q_{ij} = 0 \quad \text{if } i > 1, \quad \sum_{j=2}^{n} q_{1,j} > 0,$$

we have

$$-\frac{z}{Y} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=2}^{n} q_{i,j} y_{i} > 0.$$
 (9)

We finally recall [1] that z satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=2}^{n} \mu_{i} \frac{\partial^{2} z}{\partial y_{i}^{2}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=2}^{n} q_{i,j} y_{i} \frac{\partial z}{\partial y_{i}} - \frac{z}{Y} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=2}^{n} q_{i,j} y_{i} = \alpha z - \sum_{i=1}^{n} B_{i} y_{i}. \quad (10)$$

Assume now that

$$q_{i,n} = 0$$
 $(1 \le i \le n)$. (11)

Since z=0 on $\partial_0\Omega_\delta$, z<0 in Ω_δ , we have $w_n=\partial z/\partial y_n>0$ on $\partial_0\Omega_\delta$. On $y_i=\delta$, $i< n,\ w_n>0$ by (6). Since w_n cannot take a negative minimum in C_δ , it follows that $w_n>0$ in C_δ if we can show that w_n cannot take a negative minimum at any point $y^0\in \overline{C_\delta}$ which lies in $y_n=\delta$. Suppose it does; then $w_n(y^0)<0$ and

$$\partial^2 z/\partial y_n^2 > 0 \quad \text{at } y^0. \tag{12}$$

In view of (11) the coefficient of $\partial z/\partial y_n$ in (10) vanishes. Using also (12), (7) with

l = n, (6), (8), (9), we conclude that the left-hand side of (10) is larger than the right-hand side; a contradiction.

We have thus proved that $w_n > 0$ in C_δ . Similarly we can prove that if $q_{i,n-1} = 0$ $(1 \le i \le n)$ then $w_{n-1} > 0$, etc. We sum up:

THEOREM 1. Assume that (3), (4) hold and that $q_{i,m} = 0$ if $1 \le i \le n$, $k \le m \le n$. Then for any $j, k \le j \le n$, there exists a function $\Psi_j(y_2, \ldots, y_{j-1}, y_{j+1}, \ldots, y_n)$ such that $y = (y_2, \ldots, y_n)$ belongs to C if and only if

$$y_j < \Psi_j(y_2, \ldots, y_{j-1}, y_{j+1}, \ldots, y_n).$$

COROLLARY 2. If $q_{i,j} = 0$ $(1 \le i, j \le n)$ then the assertions of Corollary 4.2 and Theorem 5.1 of [1] are valid.

REFERENCES

1. A. Friedman, On the free boundary of a quasi-variational inequality arising in a problem of quality control, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 246 (1978), 95-110.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201