

On Nodal domains and spectral minimal partitions: new results and open problems

B. Helffer (Univ Paris-Sud and CNRS)

(After V. Bonnaillie-Noël, B. Helffer, T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof,
S. Terracini, G. Vial)

May 2009 in Vienna

Given a bounded open set Ω in \mathbb{R}^2 or in a Riemannian manifold and a partition of Ω by k open sets ω_j , we can consider the quantity $\max_j \lambda(\omega_j)$ where $\lambda(\omega_j)$ is the ground state energy of the Dirichlet realization of the Laplacian in ω_j . If we denote by $\mathfrak{L}_k(\Omega)$ the infimum over all the k -partitions of $\max_j \lambda(\omega_j)$, a minimal k -partition is then a partition which realizes the infimum.

Although the analysis is rather standard when $k = 2$ (we find the nodal domains of a second eigenfunction), the analysis of higher k 's becomes non trivial and quite interesting. In this talk, we would like to discuss the properties of minimal spectral partitions, illustrate the difficulties by considering simple cases like the disc, the rectangle or the sphere ($k = 3$) and will also exhibit the possible role of the hexagone in the asymptotic behavior as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ of $\mathfrak{L}_k(\Omega)$.

This work has started in collaboration with T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof and has been continued (published or to appear) with the coauthors mentioned above.

We consider mainly two-dimensional Laplacians operators in bounded domains. We would like to analyze the relations between the nodal domains of the eigenfunctions of the Dirichlet Laplacians and the partitions by k open sets D_i which are minimal in the sense that the maximum over the D_i 's of the ground state energy of the Dirichlet realization of the Laplacian in D_i is minimal.

Let Ω be a regular bounded domain (corners or cracks permitted)

Let us consider the Laplacian $H(\Omega)$ on a bounded regular domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with Dirichlet boundary condition. In the case of a Riemannian manifold we will consider the Laplace Beltrami operator. We denote by $\lambda_j(\Omega)$ the increasing sequence of its eigenvalues and by u_j some associated orthonormal basis of eigenfunctions. We know that the groundstate u_1 can be chosen to be strictly positive in Ω , but the other eigenfunctions u_k must have zerosets. We define for any function $u \in C_0^0(\overline{\Omega})$

$$N(u) = \overline{\{x \in \Omega \mid u(x) = 0\}} \quad (1)$$

and call the components of $\Omega \setminus N(u)$ the nodal domains of u . The number of nodal domains of such a function will be called $\mu(u)$.

We now introduce the notions of partition and minimal partition.

Definition 1

Let $1 \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$. We will call **partition** (or k -partition for indicating the cardinal of the partition) of Ω a family $\mathcal{D} = \{D_i\}_{i=1}^k$ of mutually disjoint sets such that

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^k D_i \subset \Omega. \quad (2)$$

We call it **open** if the D_i are open sets of Ω , **connected** if the D_i are connected.

We denote by \mathfrak{D}_k the set of open connected partitions.

Sometimes (at least for the proof) we have to relax this definition by considering quasi-open or measurable sets for the partitions.

We now introduce the notion of spectral minimal partition sequence.

Definition 2

For any integer $k \geq 1$, and for \mathcal{D} in \mathfrak{D}_k , we introduce

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{D}) = \max_i \lambda(D_i). \quad (3)$$

Then we define

$$\mathfrak{L}_k = \inf_{\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{D}_k} \Lambda(\mathcal{D}). \quad (4)$$

and call $\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{D}_k$ minimal if $\mathfrak{L}_k = \Lambda(\mathcal{D})$.

Remark A

If $k = 2$, it is rather well known (see [HH1] or [CTV3]) that \mathfrak{L}_2 is the second eigenvalue and the associated minimal 2-partition is a **nodal partition**, i.e. a partition whose elements are the nodal domains of some eigenfunction corresponding to λ_2 .

We discuss roughly the notion of regular and strong partition.

Definition 3

A partition $\mathcal{D} = \{D_i\}_{i=1}^k$ of Ω in \mathfrak{D}_k is called **strong** if

$$\text{Int}(\overline{\cup_i D_i}) \setminus \partial\Omega = \Omega. \quad (5)$$

Attached to a strong partition, we associate a closed set in $\overline{\Omega}$:

Definition 4 : "Nodal set"

$$N(\mathcal{D}) = \overline{\cup_i (\partial D_i \cap \Omega)}. \quad (6)$$

$N(\mathcal{D})$ plays the role of the nodal set (in the case of a nodal partition).

This leads us to introduce the set $\mathcal{R}(\Omega)$ of regular partitions (or nodal like) through the properties of the associated closed set.

Definition 5

- (i) There are finitely many distinct $x_i \in \Omega \cap N$ and associated positive integers ν_i with $\nu_i \geq 2$ s. t. near each of the x_i , N is the union of $\nu_i(x_i)$ smooth curves with one end at x_i and s. t. in the complement of these points in Ω , N is locally diffeomorphic to a regular curve.
- (ii) $\partial\Omega \cap N$ consists of a (possibly empty) finite set of points z_i , s.t. at each z_i , ρ_i , with $\rho_i \geq 1$ lines hit the boundary. Moreover, $\forall z_i \in \partial\Omega$, then N is near z_i the union of ρ_i distinct smooth half-curves which hit z_i .
- (iii) N has the **equal angle meeting property**

By equal angle meeting property, we mean that the half curves cross with equal angle at each critical point of N and also at the boundary together with the tangent to the boundary.

Figure 1





Figure: An example of regular strong bipartite partition with associated graph.

Figure 2





Figure: An example of regular strong nonbipartite partition with

It has been proved by Conti-Terracini-Verzini [CTV1, CTV2, CTV3] and Helffer–Hoffmann-Ostenhof–Terracini [HHOT1] that

Theorem 1

For any k , there exists a minimal regular k -partition. Moreover any minimal k -partition has a regular representative.

It has been proved by Conti-Terracini-Verzini [CTV1, CTV2, CTV3] and Helffer–Hoffmann-Ostenhof–Terracini [HHOT1] that

Theorem 1

For any k , there exists a minimal regular k -partition. Moreover any minimal k -partition has a regular representative.

Other proofs of somewhat weaker version of this statement have been given by Bucur, Henrot, F. H. Lin- Caffarelli.

A natural question is whether a minimal partition is the nodal partition induced by an eigenfunction.

A natural question is whether a minimal partition is the nodal partition induced by an eigenfunction.

We say that D_i, D_j are **neighbors** or $D_i \sim D_j$, if $D_{i,j} := \text{Int}(\overline{D_i \cup D_j}) \setminus \partial\Omega$ is connected.

A natural question is whether a minimal partition is the nodal partition induced by an eigenfunction.

We say that D_i, D_j are **neighbors** or $D_i \sim D_j$, if $D_{i,j} := \text{Int}(\overline{D_i \cup D_j}) \setminus \partial\Omega$ is connected.

We associate to each \mathcal{D} a **graph** $G(\mathcal{D})$ by associating to each D_i a vertex and to each pair $D_i \sim D_j$ an edge.

A natural question is whether a minimal partition is the nodal partition induced by an eigenfunction.

We say that D_i, D_j are **neighbors** or $D_i \sim D_j$, if $D_{i,j} := \text{Int}(\overline{D_i \cup D_j}) \setminus \partial\Omega$ is connected.

We associate to each \mathcal{D} a **graph** $G(\mathcal{D})$ by associating to each D_i a vertex and to each pair $D_i \sim D_j$ an edge.

We will say that the graph is **bipartite** if it can be colored by two colors (two neighbours having two different colors).

A natural question is whether a minimal partition is the nodal partition induced by an eigenfunction.

We say that D_i, D_j are **neighbors** or $D_i \sim D_j$, if $D_{i,j} := \text{Int}(\overline{D_i \cup D_j}) \setminus \partial\Omega$ is connected.

We associate to each \mathcal{D} a **graph** $G(\mathcal{D})$ by associating to each D_i a vertex and to each pair $D_i \sim D_j$ an edge.

We will say that the graph is **bipartite** if it can be colored by two colors (two neighbours having two different colors).

We recall that the graph associated to a collection of nodal domains of an eigenfunction is always bipartite.

We have now the following converse theorem ([HH1], [HHOT1]) :

Theorem 3

If the graph of the minimal partition is bipartite this is a nodal partition.

A natural question is now to determine how general is the previous situation.

Surprisingly this only occurs in the so called Courant-sharp situation.

The Courant nodal theorem says :

Theorem 4

Let $k \geq 1$, λ_k be the k -th eigenvalue and $E(\lambda_k)$ the eigenspace of $H(\Omega)$ associated to λ_k . Then, $\forall u \in E(\lambda_k) \setminus \{0\}$, $\mu(u) \leq k$.

Then we say that

Definition 6

u is Courant-sharp if

$$u \in E(\lambda_k) \setminus \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(u) = k .$$

For any integer $k \geq 1$, we denote by L_k the smallest eigenvalue whose eigenspace contains an eigenfunction with k nodal domains. We set $L_k = \infty$, if there are no eigenfunctions with k nodal domains.

In general, one can show, that

$$\lambda_k \leq \mathfrak{L}_k \leq L_k . \quad (7)$$

The last goal consists in giving the full picture of the equality cases :

Theorem 5

Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is regular.

If $\mathfrak{L}_k = L_k$ or $\mathfrak{L}_k = \lambda_k$ then

$$\lambda_k = \mathfrak{L}_k = L_k .$$

In addition, one can find in $E(\lambda_k)$ a Courant-sharp eigenfunction.

More generally we can consider (see in [HHOT1]) for $p \in [1, +\infty[$

$$\Lambda^p(\mathcal{D}) = \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_i \lambda(D_i)^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (8)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{L}_{k,p}(\Omega) = \inf_{\mathcal{D} \in \mathfrak{D}_k} \Lambda^p(\mathcal{D}). \quad (9)$$

We write $\mathfrak{L}_{k,\infty}(\Omega) = \mathfrak{L}_k(\Omega)$ and recall the monotonicity property

$$\mathfrak{L}_{k,p}(\Omega) \leq \mathfrak{L}_{k,q}(\Omega) \text{ if } p \leq q. \quad (10)$$

The notion of p -minimal k -partition can be extended accordingly, by minimizing $\Lambda^p(\mathcal{D})$.

Note that the inequalities can be strict ! Take a disjoint union of two disks (possibly related by a thin channel).

The inequality

$$\lambda_k(\Omega) \leq \mathfrak{L}_{k,\infty}(\Omega). \quad (11)$$

is replaced by the “fermionic” inequality

$$\frac{1}{k} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\Omega) \right) \leq \mathfrak{L}_{k,1}(\Omega). \quad (12)$$

This is optimal for disjoint union of k -disks with different (but close radius).

Open question:

Prove that for the disk

$$\mathfrak{L}_{2,1}(D) = \mathfrak{L}_{2,\infty}(D)$$

This is indeed the case for the sphere (Bishop).

Using Theorem 5, it is now easier to analyze the situation for the disk or for rectangles (at least in the irrational case), since we have just to check for which eigenvalues one can find associated Courant-sharp eigenfunctions.

In the case of the square, it is not too difficult to see that \mathfrak{L}_3 is strictly less than L_3 . We observe indeed that λ_4 is Courant-sharp, so $\mathfrak{L}_4 = \lambda_4$, and there is no eigenfunction corresponding to $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3$ with three nodal domains (by Courant's Theorem).

Restricting to the half-rectangle and assuming that there is a minimal partition which is symmetric with one of the symmetry axes of the square perpendicular to two opposite sides, one is reduced to analyze a family of Dirichlet-Neumann problems.

Numerical computations performed by V. Bonnaillie-Noël and G. Vial lead to a natural candidate for a symmetric minimal partition.

See <http://www.bretagne.ens-cachan.fr/math/Simulations/MinimalPartitions/>

Figure 3



Figure: Trace on the half-square of the candidate for the 3-partition of the square. The complete structure is obtained from the half square by symmetry with respect to the horizontal axis.

Here we describe some results [HH2] on the possible “topological” types of 3-partitions.

Proposition A

Let Ω be simply-connected and consider a minimal 3-partition $\mathcal{D} = (D_1, D_2, D_3)$ associated to \mathfrak{L}_3 and suppose that it is not bipartite.


Let

- ▶ $X(\mathcal{D})$ the singular points of $N(\mathcal{D}) \cap \Omega$
- ▶ $Y(\mathcal{D}) = N(\mathcal{D}) \cap \partial\Omega$.


Then there are three cases.

(a)


Type (a) (first subcase)



(b)



(c)




The proof of Proposition A relies essentially on Euler formula together with the property that the associated graph should be a triangle.

The proof of Proposition A relies essentially on Euler formula together with the property that the associated graph should be a triangle.

This leads (with some success) to analyze the minimal partition with some topological type. If in addition, we introduce some symmetries, this leads to guess some candidates for minimal partitions.

In the case of the disk, we have no proof that the minimal partition is the “Mercedes star”. But if we assume that the minimal 3-partition is of type (a), then a double covering argument shows that it is indeed the Mercedes star.

The logo Mercedes and associated graph



In the case of the square, we have no proof that the candidate described by Figure 3 is a minimal 3-partition.


In the case of the square, we have no proof that the candidate described by Figure 3 is a minimal 3-partition.

But if we assume that the minimal partition is of type (a) and has the symmetry, then numerical computations lead to the Figure 3. Numerics suggest more : the center of the square is the critical point of the partition.

Once this property is accepted, a double covering argument shows that this is the projection of a nodal partition on the covering


One can also try to look for a minimal partition having the symmetry with respect to the diagonal.

Figure 5 : Another candidate




One can also try to look for a minimal partition having the symmetry with respect to the diagonal.

Figure 5 : Another candidate




to compare with the former




One can also try to look for a minimal partition having the symmetry with respect to the diagonal.

Figure 5 : Another candidate



to compare with the former




THIS LEADS TO THE SAME VALUE OF $\Lambda(\mathcal{D})$.

So this strongly suggests that there is a continuous family of minimal 3-partitions of the square.

This can be explained by a double covering argument, which is analogous to the argument of isospectrality of Jakobson-Levitin-Nadirashvili-Polterovich [JNLP] and Levitin-Parnovski-Polterovich [LPP].

See also old papers by Bérard [Be1, Be2], Sunada [Su] ..., and the more recent paper by O. Parzanchevski and R. Band.

The spectrum on the double covering of the square



The cutoff is done on the half-line $\{x = 0, y > 0\}$. The first line describes the nodal sets of the first seven eigenfunctions on the first sheet.

The second line describes the nodal sets of the first seven eigenfunctions on the second sheet.

This picture has been obtained by V. Bonnaillie-Noël.

Here is an alternative approach to the double covering approach.

One considers the Aharonov-Bohm Laplacian in the square minus its center $\dot{\Omega} = \Omega \setminus \{0\}$, with the singularity of the potential at the center and normalized flux $\frac{1}{2}$.

The magnetic potential takes the form

$$\mathbf{A}(x, y) = (A_1, A_2) = \alpha \left(-\frac{y}{r^2}, \frac{x}{r^2} \right) . \quad (13)$$

Here is an alternative approach to the double covering approach.

One considers the Aharonov-Bohm Laplacian in the square minus its center $\dot{\Omega} = \Omega \setminus \{0\}$, with the singularity of the potential at the center and normalized flux $\frac{1}{2}$.

The magnetic potential takes the form

$$\mathbf{A}(x, y) = (A_1, A_2) = \alpha \left(-\frac{y}{r^2}, \frac{x}{r^2} \right) . \quad (13)$$

We know that the magnetic field vanishes and in any cutted domain (such that it becomes simply connected) one has

$$\mathbf{A}(x, y) = \alpha d\theta , \quad (14)$$

where

$$z = x + iy = r \exp i\theta . \quad (15)$$

Here is an alternative approach to the double covering approach.

One considers the Aharonov-Bohm Laplacian in the square minus its center $\dot{\Omega} = \Omega \setminus \{0\}$, with the singularity of the potential at the center and normalized flux $\frac{1}{2}$.

The magnetic potential takes the form

$$\mathbf{A}(x, y) = (A_1, A_2) = \alpha \left(-\frac{y}{r^2}, \frac{x}{r^2} \right) . \quad (13)$$

We know that the magnetic field vanishes and in any cutted domain (such that it becomes simply connected) one has

$$\mathbf{A}(x, y) = \alpha d\theta , \quad (14)$$

where

$$z = x + iy = r \exp i\theta . \quad (15)$$

Then the flux condition reads

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2} . \quad (16)$$

So the Aharonov-Bohm operator in any open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ is the Friedrichs extension starting from $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ and the associated differential operator is

$$-\Delta_{\mathbf{A}} := (D_x - A_1)^2 + (D_y - A_2)^2 . \quad (17)$$

So the Aharonov-Bohm operator in any open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ is the Friedrichs extension starting from $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ and the associated differential operator is

$$-\Delta_{\mathbf{A}} := (D_x - A_1)^2 + (D_y - A_2)^2. \quad (17)$$

In the case of the square, the operator commutes with the $\frac{\pi}{2}$ rotation.

So the Aharonov-Bohm operator in any open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ is the Friedrichs extension starting from $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ and the associated differential operator is

$$-\Delta_{\mathbf{A}} := (D_x - A_1)^2 + (D_y - A_2)^2. \quad (17)$$

In the case of the square, the operator commutes with the $\frac{\pi}{2}$ rotation.

In the case of rectangles, it commutes with the symmetries with respect to the main axes but these symmetries should be quantized by antilinear operators,

$$\Sigma_1 u(x, y) = i \overline{u(-x, y)}.$$

and

$$\Sigma_2 u(x, y) = \overline{u(x, -y)}.$$

This operator is preserving “real” functions in the following sense. We say (cf Helffer–M. and T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof–Owen) that a function u is K -real, if it satisfies

$$Ku = u, \quad (18)$$

where K is an anti-linear operator in the form

$$K = \exp i\theta \Gamma, \quad (19)$$

where

$$\Gamma u = \bar{u}. \quad (20)$$

This operator is preserving “real” functions in the following sense. We say (cf Helffer–M. and T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof–Owen) that a function u is K -real, if it satisfies

$$Ku = u, \quad (18)$$

where K is an anti-linear operator in the form

$$K = \exp i\theta \Gamma, \quad (19)$$

where

$$\Gamma u = \bar{u}. \quad (20)$$

The fact that $(-\Delta_{\mathbf{A}})$ preserves K -real eigenfunctions is an immediate consequence of

$$K \circ (-\Delta_{\mathbf{A}}) = (-\Delta_{\mathbf{A}}) \circ K. \quad (21)$$

It is easy to find a basis of K -real eigenfunctions. These eigenfunctions (which can be identified to real antisymmetric eigenfunctions of the Laplacian on a suitable double covering of the square) have a nice nodal structure,

- ▶ which is locally the same inside the punctured square as the nodal set of real eigenfunctions of the Laplacian,
- ▶ with the specific property that the number of lines arriving at the origine should be odd.

More generally a path of index one around the origine should always meet an odd number of nodal lines.

Lemma B

The multiplicity of any eigenvalue is at least 2.

Lemma B

The multiplicity of any eigenvalue is at least 2.

Proposition B

The following problems are isospectral :

- ▶ The Dirichlet problem for the Aharonov-Bohm operator on the punctured square.
- ▶ The Dirichlet-Neumann problem on the upper-half square.
- ▶ The Dirichlet-Neumann problem on the left-half square.
- ▶ The Dirichlet-Neumann problem on the upper diagonal-half square.

Remarks

- ▶ The guess for the square is that any nodal partition of a third K -real eigenfunction gives a minimal 3-partition.
- ▶ Numerics performed with Virginie Bonnaillie show that this is only true if the square is punctured at the center. Moreover the third eigenvalue is maximal there and has higher multiplicity.

Remarks

- ▶ The guess for the square is that any nodal partition of a third K -real eigenfunction gives a minimal 3-partition.
- ▶ Numerics performed with Virginie Bonnaillie show that this is only true if the square is punctured at the center. Moreover the third eigenvalue is maximal there and has higher multiplicity.

All the results or observations around the square and the rectangle arise from discussions with V. Bonnaillie-Noël, T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, S. Terracini, G. Verzini or G. Vial.

The problem for k large.

We mention two conjectures. The first one is that

Conjecture 1

The limit of $\mathfrak{L}_k(\Omega)/k$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ exists.

The second one is that this limit is more explicitly given by

Conjecture 2

$$|\Omega| \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\mathfrak{L}_k(\Omega)}{k} = \lambda_1(\text{Hexa}_1).$$

This last conjecture says in particular that the limit is independent of Ω if Ω is a regular domain.

Of course the optimality of the regular hexagonal tiling appears in various contexts in Physics. It is easy to show the upper bound in Conjecture 2 and Faber-Krahn gives a weaker lower bound involving the first eigenvalue on the disk. But we have at the moment no idea of any approach for proving this in our context. We have explored in [BHV] numerically why this conjecture looks numerically reasonable.

Other recent numerical computations devoted to $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{k} \mathcal{E}_{k,1}(\Omega)$ and to the asymptotic structure of the minimal partitions by Bucur-Oudet are very enlightening. The conjecture is also mentioned in Caffarelli-Lin.

The problem on the sphere

Let us mention one interesting conjecture on S^2 and a quite recent theorem.

We parametrize S^2 by the spherical coordinates $(\theta, \phi) \in [0, \pi] \times [-\pi, \pi]$ with $\theta = 0$ corresponding to the north pole, $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ corresponding to the equator and $\theta = \pi$ corresponding to the south pole.

There is a particular partition of S^2 corresponding to cutting S^2 by the half-hyperplanes $\phi = 0, \frac{2\pi}{3}, -\frac{2\pi}{3}$. We call this partition the Y -partition.

The conjecture due to C. Bishop-Friedland-Hayman is :

Conjecture

The Y -partition gives a minimal 3-partition for S^2 when minimizing $\frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda(D_j)$ over all the 3-partitions of S^2 .

The conjecture due to C. Bishop-Friedland-Hayman is :

Conjecture

The Y -partition gives a minimal 3-partition for S^2 when minimizing $\frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda(D_j)$ over all the 3-partitions of S^2 .

Actually one can have the same conjecture for $\max_j \lambda(D_j)$.
This conjecture is actually a consequence of the first conjecture but could be easier to prove.

This is indeed the case (Helfffer-T.Hoffmann-Ostenhof-Terracini).

Theorem

The Y -partition gives a minimal 3 -partition for S^2 when minimizing $\max_j \lambda(D_j)$ over all the 3 -partitions of S^2 .

The techniques developed in the previous parts give some insight on the second conjecture which has some similarity with the Mercedes star conjecture. A specific role is played by the proof that in the boundary of the 3 -partition we have two antipodal points. This involves Lusternik-Shnirelman's theorem.

We have seen that for the disk the minimal 4-partition for $\max_j \lambda(D_j)$ consists simply in the complement in the disk of the two perpendicular axes.

One could think that a minimal 4-partition of S^2 could be what is obtained by cutting S^2

- ▶ either by the two planes $\phi = 0$ and $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$
- ▶ or by the two planes $\phi = 0$ and $\phi = \frac{\pi}{2}$.

This is actually excluded by the following theorem.

Theorem

The minimal 4-partition on S^2 cannot be a nodal partition.

Hence, it is natural to conjecture (see for example [BHV, ?] but we first heard of this question from M. Van den Berg) that :

“Hexagonal” Conjecture on \mathbb{S}^2

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\mathfrak{L}_k(\mathbb{S}^2)}{k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\mathfrak{L}_{k,1}(\mathbb{S}^2)}{k} = \frac{1}{\text{Area}(\mathbb{S}^2)} \lambda(\text{Hexa}^1) .$$

The first equality in the conjecture corresponds to the idea, which is well illustrated in the recent paper by Bourdin-Bucur-Oudet [?] that, asymptotically as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, a minimal k -partition for Λ^p will correspond to D_j 's such that the $\lambda(D_j)$ are equal.

What can we say in the case of the torus \mathbb{T}^2 .

What can we say in higher dimension ?

For which Ω (with given area) is $\mathcal{L}_k(\Omega)$ minimal.



M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun.

Handbook of mathematical functions,

Volume 55 of Applied Math Series. National Bureau of Standards, 1964.



G. Alessandrini.

Critical points of solutions of elliptic equations in two variables.

Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4), 14(2):229–256 (1988).



G. Alessandrini.

Nodal lines of eigenfunctions of the fixed membrane problem in general convex domains.

Comment. Math. Helv., 69(1):142–154, 1994.



A. Ancona, B. Helffer, and T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof.

Nodal domain theorems à la Courant.

Documenta Mathematica, Vol. 9, p. 283-299 (2004).



P. BÉRARD.

Transplantation et isospectralité. I.
Math. Ann. **292**(3) (1992) 547–559.



P. BÉRARD.

Transplantation et isospectralité. II.
J. London Math. Soc. (2) **48**(3) (1993) 565–576.



V. Bonnaillie-Noël, B. Helffer and G. Vial.

Numerical simulations for nodal domains and spectral minimal partitions.

To appear in COCV.



V. Bonnaillie-Noël, B. Helffer and T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof.

spectral minimal partitions, Aharonov-Bohm hamiltonians and application the case of the rectangle.

To appear in Journal of Physics A.



M. Conti, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini.

An optimal partition problem related to nonlinear eigenvalues.
Journal of Functional Analysis 198, p. 160-196 (2003).



M. Conti, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini.

A variational problem for the spatial segregation of reaction-diffusion systems.

Indiana Univ. Math. J. 54, p. 779-815 (2005).



M. Conti, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini.

On a class of optimal partition problems related to the Fucik spectrum and to the monotonicity formula.

Calc. Var. 22, p. 45-72 (2005).



B. HELFFER, M. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF,
T. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, M. P. OWEN.

Nodal sets for groundstates of Schrödinger operators with zero magnetic field in non-simply connected domains.

Comm. Math. Phys. **202**(3) (1999) 629–649.



B. HELFFER, T. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF.

Converse spectral problems for nodal domains.

Mosc. Math. J. **7**(1) (2007) 67–84.



B. HELFFER, T. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF.

On spectral minimal partitions : the case of the disk.

To appear in CRM proceedings.

-  B. HELFFER, T. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, S. TERRACINI.
Nodal domains and spectral minimal partitions.
Preprint 2006, To appear in Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire (2008).
-  B. HELFFER, T. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, S. TERRACINI.
On spectral minimal partitions : the case of the sphere.
Submitted.
-  D. Jakobson, M. Levitin, N. Nadirashvili, I. Polterovic.
Spectral problems with mixed Dirichlet-Neumann boundary conditions: isospectrality and beyond.
J. Comput. Appl. Math. 194, 141-155, 2006.
-  M. Levitin, L. Parnovski, I. Polterovich.
Isospectral domains with mixed boundary conditions
[arXiv.math.SP/0510505b2](https://arxiv.org/abs/math.SP/0510505b2) 15 Mar2006.
-  A. Pleijel.
Remarks on Courant's nodal theorem.
Comm. Pure. Appl. Math., 9: 543–550, 1956.



O. PARZANCHEVSKI AND R. BAND.

Linear representations and isospectrality with boundary conditions.

arXiv:0806.1042v2 [math.SP] 7 June 2008.



T. SUNADA.

Riemannian coverings and isospectral manifolds.

Ann. of Math. (2) **121**(1) (1985) 169–186.

B. HELFFER: DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES, BAT. 425,
UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-SUD, 91 405 ORSAY CEDEX, FRANCE.

EMAIL: BERNARD.HELFFER@MATH.U-PSUD.FR