Theorem. Let $u \in L^{p}(\Omega), 1<p \leq+\infty$, the following properties are equivalent:
(i) $u \in W^{1, p}(\Omega)$
(ii) There exists a constant $c>0$ such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left|\int_{\Omega} u \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_{i}}\right| \leq C| | \phi \|_{L^{p^{\prime}}(\Omega)}, \quad \forall \phi \in C_{0}^{\infty}(\Omega), \\
i=1,2, \ldots N . \quad \frac{1}{p^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{P}=1 .
\end{gathered}
$$

(iii) There exists a constant $C>0$, such that for any open $w \subset \subset \Omega$ and any $h \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$, with $\operatorname{dis}\left(\omega, \Omega^{c}\right)>|h|$, we have $\left\|\tau_{h} u-u\right\|_{L^{p}(\omega)} \leq C|h|$

## Remarks:

1. In (ii) and (iii), $C$ can be taken to be equal to $\left\|\nabla_{u}\right\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)}$
2. When $p=1$, (ii) does not imply necessarily ( $i$ ), since functions satisfying (ii) and (iii) are functions of bounded variations, for which the derivatives, in the distributional sens, may be bounded measures. This class of functions is larger that $W^{1,1}(\Omega)$.
3. The proof of this theorem goes exactly like the one in dimension $N=1$.
4. If $\Omega$ is an open and convex. Then for $u \in W^{1,+\infty}(\Omega)$ we have for almost every $(x, y) \in \Omega$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
|u(x)-u(y)| \leq\|\nabla u\|_{\infty} \operatorname{dist}(x, y) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

hence $u$ has a continuous representative satisfying (1) for all $(x, y) \in \Omega$.
5. If $\Omega$ is connected and $\nabla u=0$ on $\Omega$, then $u$ is constant in $\Omega$.

Theorem (derivative of a product)
Suppose that $u, v \in W^{1, p}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega), \quad 1 \leq p \leq+\infty$. Then $u v \in W^{1, p}(\Omega) \cap$ $L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ such that

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}(u v)=u \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_{i}}+v \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}
$$

Proof. We only repeat the proof of a similar theorem in the case of $N=1$ by considering $1 \leq p<+\infty$ first. In this case we have $\left(u_{n}\right),\left(v_{n}\right)$ in $C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ such that

1. $u_{n} \longrightarrow u$ and $v_{n} \longrightarrow v$ in $L^{p}(\Omega)$ and hence a.e. in $\Omega$
2. $\nabla u_{n} \longrightarrow \nabla u$ and $\nabla v_{n} \longrightarrow \nabla u$ in $L^{p}(\omega), \forall w \subset \subset \Omega$
3. $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{\infty} \leq\|u\|_{\infty}, \quad\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{\infty} \leq\|v\|_{\infty}$.

So

$$
\int_{\Omega} u_{n} v_{n} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_{i}}=-\int_{\Omega}\left(u_{n} \frac{\partial v_{n}}{\partial x_{i}}+v_{n} \frac{\partial u_{n}}{\partial x_{i}}\right) \phi, \quad \forall \phi \in C_{0}^{\infty}(\Omega), \quad \forall i=1,2, \ldots, N .
$$

By letting $n \longrightarrow \infty$ and noting that $\operatorname{supp} \phi \subset \subset \Omega$ we easily see that

$$
\int_{\Omega} u_{n} v_{n} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_{i}}=-\int_{\Omega}\left(u \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_{i}}+v \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right) \phi, \quad \forall \phi \in C_{0}^{\infty}(\Omega), \quad \forall i=1,2, \ldots, N .
$$

hence $u v \in W^{1, p}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)$.
For $p=+\infty, \quad u, v \in W^{1, p}(\omega), \quad \forall p<\infty, \quad w \subset \subset \Omega$ and hence we repeat the same calculations.
Remark. It is necessary that $u$ and $v$ are in $L^{\infty}(\Omega)$. So that $u v \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$, since $u, v$ in $W^{1, p}(\Omega)$ are not necesarily bounded in higher dimension spaces.
Example. Let

$$
\begin{gathered}
u=(x, y, z)=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{x}{\left(x^{2}+y^{2}+z^{2}\right)} & , \quad(x, y, z) \neq(0,0,0) \\
0 & , \\
v=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{y}{x^{2}+y^{2}+z^{2}} & , \quad(x, y, z)=(0,0,0) \\
0 & , \\
0 \quad(x, y, z)=(0,0,0)
\end{array}\right.
\end{array} . \begin{array}{c}
\text { (x,0)}
\end{array}\right.
\end{gathered}
$$

One can easily verify that $u, v \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$, where $\Omega=\left\{(u, y, z) / x^{2}+y^{2}+z^{2}<1\right\}$. However

$$
u v=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{x y}{\left(x^{2}+y^{2}+z^{2}\right)^{2}} & , \quad(x, y, z) \neq(0,0,0) \\
0 & ,(x, y, z)=(0,0,0)
\end{array}\right.
$$

is not in $L^{\infty}(\Omega)$. In fact $u v \notin W^{1,1}(\Omega)$.
Theorem. (Derivative of a composition)
Suppose that $G \in C^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $G(0)=0$ and $\left|G^{\prime}(s)\right| \leq M \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $u \in W^{1, p}(\Omega)$, then Gou $\in W^{1, p}(\Omega)$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}(\text { Gou })=\left(G^{\prime} o u\right) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N, \tag{ii}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Since $\left|G^{\prime}(s)\right| \leq M$ and $G(0)=0, \forall s \in \mathbb{R}$, then $|G o u| \leq M|u|$. this implies that Gou $\in L^{p}(\Omega)$. and

$$
\left.\left\lvert\,\left(G^{\prime} \text { ou }\right) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}|\leq M| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right. \right\rvert\,, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N
$$

with $\left(G^{\prime} o u\right) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \in L^{p}(\Omega), \quad \forall i=1,2, \ldots, N$.
To verify (ii) in the weak sense, we first take $1 \leq p<\infty$. So we know that there exists a sequence $\left(u_{n}\right)$ in $C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ such that $u_{n} \longrightarrow u$ in $L^{p}(\Omega)$ and $\nabla u_{n} \longrightarrow \nabla u$ in $L^{p}(\omega), \quad \forall w \subset \subset \Omega$. So for $\phi \in C_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$ we have

$$
\int_{\Omega}\left(G_{0}\right) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_{i}}=-\int_{\Omega}\left(G^{\prime} o u_{n}\right) \phi \frac{\partial u_{n}}{\partial x_{i}}, \quad \forall i=1,2, \ldots, N .
$$

By taking $n$ to $\infty$ and using the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we obtain

$$
\int_{\Omega}(G o u) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_{i}}=-\int_{\Omega}\left(G^{\prime} o u\right) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \phi, \quad \forall i=1,2, \ldots, N .
$$

Thus we have Gou $\in W^{1, p}(\Omega)$ and (ii) holds.
For $p=+\infty$, we use the fact that $v \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ then $v \in L^{p}\left(\Omega^{\prime}\right), \quad \forall p<\infty, \quad \forall \Omega^{\prime} \subset \subset$ $\Omega$. We then repeat the above "usual" analysis.
Remark. If $\Omega$ is bounded then $G(0)=0$ is not necessary. Also if $p=+\infty$, we repeat the same analysis for $\Omega^{\prime}=\Omega$.

## 1 The Space $W^{m, p}(\Omega)$

Notation: Let $\alpha=\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{N}\right)$ with $\alpha_{i} \in \mathbb{N}, \forall i=1,2, \ldots N$, be a multi-index. We denote by

$$
D^{\alpha} u=\frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} u}{\partial x_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} \ldots \partial x_{N}^{\alpha_{N}}}, \text { where }|\alpha|=\alpha_{1}+\ldots+\alpha_{N}
$$

Definition. We define the Sobolev space, for $m \geq 2$,

$$
W^{m, p}(\Omega)=\left\{u \in L^{p}(\Omega) \text { such that } D^{\alpha} u \in L^{p}(\Omega), \quad \forall \alpha:|\alpha| \leq m\right\}
$$

This is the set of all $L^{p}$ functions, whose derivatives up to order $m$ are $L^{p}$ functions.
It is easy to see that

$$
W^{m, p}(\Omega)=\left\{u \in L^{p}(\Omega): \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \in W^{m-1, p}(\Omega), \quad \forall i=1,2, \ldots, N\right\}
$$

Remark. $D^{\alpha} u$ is a weak derivative of $u$; that is

$$
\int_{\Omega} u D^{\alpha} \phi=(-1)^{|\alpha|} \int_{\Omega} \phi D^{\alpha} u
$$

Proposition. $W^{m, p}(\Omega)$ equipped with the norm

$$
\|u\|_{m, p}=\|u\|_{p}+\sum_{1 \leq|\alpha| \leq m}\left\|D^{\alpha} u\right\|_{p}
$$

is a Banach space.
Proposition. $W^{m, p}(\Omega)$ is separable, for $1 \leq p<\infty$, and reflexive, for $1<p<\infty$.
If we denote by $H^{m}(\Omega)=W^{m, 2}(\Omega)$, then we have
Proposition. $H^{m}(\Omega)$ equipped with the scalar product

$$
\langle u, v\rangle=\int_{\Omega} u v+\sum_{1 \leq|\alpha| \leq m} \int_{\Omega} D^{\alpha} u D^{\alpha} v
$$

is a Hilbert space.

Remark. (Adams) For $\Omega$ sufficiently regular with a bounded boundary $\partial \Omega$, we have, $\forall \varepsilon>0$ and $1 \leq|\alpha| \leq m-1$ there exists $C>0$ such that

$$
\left\|D^{\alpha} u\right\|_{p} \leq \varepsilon \sum_{|\alpha|=m}\left\|D^{\alpha} u\right\|_{p}+C\|u\|_{p}, \quad \forall u \in W^{m, p}(\Omega)
$$

Consequently, we have in this case,

$$
\|u\|_{m, p}=\|u\|_{p}+\sum_{1 \alpha \mid=m}\left\|D^{\alpha} u\right\|_{p}
$$

is an equivalent norm for $W^{m, p}(\Omega)$.

## 2 Extension Operator

Suppose that $u \in W^{1, p}(\Omega)$. Sometimes it is more convenient to establish some properties by extending $u$ to $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ by a $W^{1, p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ function. This is, unfortunately, not always possible. However if $\Omega$ is regular this is may be possible.
Notations: Let $x=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{N-1}, x_{N}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$. We write

$$
x=\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right) \text { with } x^{\prime}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{N-1}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}
$$

We put

$$
\left|x^{\prime}\right|=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} x_{i}^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

and denote by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{R}_{+}^{N} & =\left\{x=\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right): x_{N}>0\right\}, \text { the upper hyperplane } \\
Q & =\left\{x=\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right):\left|x^{\prime}\right|<1 \text { and }\left|x_{N}\right|<1\right\}, \text { A square or cylinder } \\
Q_{+} & =Q \cap \mathbb{R}_{+}^{N} \\
Q_{0} & =\left\{x=\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right):\left|x^{\prime}\right|<1 \text { and } x_{N}=0\right\} \text { unit disk }
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition. An open subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{N}$ is said to be of class $C^{1}$ if for each $x \in \Gamma=\partial \Omega$, there exists a neighbourhood $U$ of $x$ in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ and a bijection $H: Q \longrightarrow U$ such that

$$
H \in C^{1}(\bar{Q}), \quad H^{-1} \in C^{1}(\bar{U}), \quad H\left(Q_{+}\right)=U \cap \Omega, \quad \text { and } H\left(Q_{0}\right)=U \cap \Gamma
$$

Notations. Let $f: Q_{+} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $f^{*}$ the extension by reflexion of $f$ on $Q$

$$
f^{*}\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right)= \begin{cases}f\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right), & x_{N}>0 \\ f\left(x^{\prime},-x_{N}\right), & x_{N}<0\end{cases}
$$

and

$$
f^{\#}\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right)= \begin{cases}f\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right), & x_{N}>0 \\ -f\left(x^{\prime},-x_{N}\right), & x_{N}<0\end{cases}
$$

Lemma. Let $u \in W^{1, p}\left(Q_{+}\right)$. Then the extension $u^{*}$ is in $W^{1, p}(Q)$ with

$$
\left\|u^{*}\right\|_{p} \leq 2\|u\|_{p}, \quad\left\|u^{*}\right\|_{W^{1, p}(Q)} \leq 2\|u\|_{W^{1, p}\left(Q_{+}\right)}
$$

Proof. We have to verify that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial u^{*}}{\partial x_{i}} & =\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right)^{*}, \quad \forall i=1,2, \ldots, N-1 \\
\frac{\partial u^{*}}{\partial x_{N}} & =\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{N}}\right)^{\#}
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $\eta$ be a $C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ function such that

$$
\eta(t)= \begin{cases}0, & t<\frac{1}{2} \\ 1, & t>1\end{cases}
$$

Define the sequence $\eta_{k}(t)=\eta(k t), \quad k=1,2,3, \ldots$ Let $\phi \in C_{0}^{1}(Q)$; so for $i=$ $1,2, \ldots, N-1$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{Q} u^{*} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_{i}}=\int_{Q_{+}} u \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_{i}}, \tag{iii}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\psi\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right)=\phi\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right)+\phi\left(x^{\prime},-x_{N}\right)
$$

$\psi$ is not necessarily in $C_{0}^{1}\left(Q_{+}\right)$but $\eta_{k}\left(x_{N}\right) \psi\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right)$ is in $C_{0}^{1}\left(Q_{+}\right)$and

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\left(\eta_{k} \psi\right)=\eta_{k} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_{i}}, \quad \forall i=1,2, \ldots, N-1 .
$$

Hence

$$
\int_{Q_{+}} \eta_{k} u \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_{i}}=-\int_{Q_{+}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \eta_{k} \psi, \quad \forall i=1,2, \ldots, N-1
$$

By using the dominated convergence theorem we get, as $k \longrightarrow \infty$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{Q_{+}} u \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_{i}}=-\int_{Q_{+}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \psi \tag{iv}
\end{equation*}
$$

By combining (iii) and (iv) we arrive at

$$
\int_{Q} u^{*} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_{i}}=-\int_{Q}\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right)^{*} \phi .
$$

Therefore

$$
\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right)^{*}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N-1
$$

are the derivatives of $u^{*}$. Also, for $\phi \in C_{0}^{1}(Q)$, we have

$$
\int_{Q} u^{*} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_{N}}=\int_{Q_{+}} u \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial x_{N}},
$$

where

$$
\chi\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right)=\phi\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right)-\phi\left(x^{\prime},-x_{N}\right)
$$

It is clear that $\chi\left(x^{\prime}, 0\right)=0$, so there exists $M>0$ such that

$$
\left|\chi\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right)\right| \leq M\left|x_{N}\right|, \quad \forall\left(x^{\prime}, x_{N}\right) \in Q
$$

Since $\eta_{k} \chi \in C_{0}^{1}\left(Q_{+}\right)$, we have

$$
\int_{Q_{+}} u \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{N}}\left(\eta_{k} \chi\right)=-\int_{Q_{+}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{N}} \eta_{k} \chi
$$

but

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{N}}\left(\eta_{k} \chi\right)=\eta_{k} \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial x_{N}}+k \eta^{\prime}\left(k x_{N}\right) \chi \\
&\left|\int_{Q_{+}} u k \eta^{\prime}\left(k x_{N}\right) \chi d x\right| \leq M C k\left|\int_{0<x_{N}<\frac{1}{k}} x_{N} u d x\right| \\
& \leq M C \int_{0<x_{N}<\frac{1}{k}}|u| d x \longrightarrow 0 \text { as } k \longrightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
\int_{Q_{+}} u \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial x_{N}}=-\int_{Q_{+}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{N}} \chi
$$

By noting that

$$
\int_{Q_{+}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{N}} \chi=\int_{Q}\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{N}}\right)^{\#} \phi
$$

we arrive at

$$
\int_{Q} u^{*} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_{N}}=-\int_{Q}\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{N}}\right)^{\#} \phi
$$

Hence $\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{N}}\right)^{\#}$ is the weak derivative of $u^{*}$ with respect to $x_{N}$.
Finally it is easy to verify that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|u^{*}\right\|_{L^{p}(Q)} & \leq 2\|u\|_{L^{p}\left(Q_{+}\right)} \\
\left\|u^{*}\right\|_{W^{1, p}(Q)} & \leq 2\|u\|_{W^{1, p}\left(Q_{+}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Remark. The above lemma holds if $Q_{+}$is replaced by $\mathbb{R}_{+}^{N}$; with no change in the proof.

