

A Dynamical Approach to the Berezin–Li–Yau Inequality

Anton Alexa

Independent Researcher, Chernivtsi, Ukraine
mail@antonalexa.com

Abstract. We develop a dynamical method for proving the sharp Berezin–Li–Yau inequality. The approach is based on the volume-preserving mean curvature flow and a new monotonicity principle for the Riesz mean $R_A(\Omega_t)$. For convex domains we show that R_A is monotone non-decreasing along the flow. The key input is a geometric correlation inequality between the boundary spectral density Q_A and the mean curvature H , established in all dimensions: in $d = 2$ via circular symmetrization, and in $d \geq 3$ via the boundary Weyl expansion together with the Laugesen–Morpurgo trace minimization principle. Since the flow converges smoothly to the ball, the monotonicity implies the sharp Berezin–Li–Yau bound for every smooth convex domain. As an application, we obtain a sharp dynamical Cesàro–Pólya inequality for eigenvalue averages.

1 Introduction

The Berezin–Li–Yau inequality [2, 3] is a central result of spectral geometry. For any bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and any $A > 0$, the Riesz mean of the Dirichlet Laplacian satisfies the sharp bound

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} (A - \lambda_k(\Omega))_+ \leq L_d^{\text{cl}} |\Omega| A^{1+d/2}, \quad (1)$$

where $L_d^{\text{cl}} = (\omega_d/(2\pi)^d) (2/(d+2))$, and equality holds in the semiclassical limit on balls.

Classical proofs of this inequality are static: Berezin’s method employs coherent states [2], Li and Yau use Legendre duality [3], and later approaches rely on Dirichlet–Neumann bracketing (e.g. Laptev–Weidl). In this work we develop a completely different, genuinely dynamical method, in which the inequality is obtained as a monotonicity property along Huisken’s volume-preserving mean curvature flow [1].

The key point is that the ball plays a dual role. First, it is the global attractor of the volume-preserving mean curvature flow: if Ω_0 is smooth and convex, then the evolving domains Ω_t exist for all $t \geq 0$, preserve volume, and converge smoothly to the ball of the same volume [1]. Second, the ball uniquely maximizes the semiclassical Riesz mean $R_A(\Omega)$ among domains of fixed volume, reflecting its familiar extremality in phase-space asymptotics.

Our main result establishes a direct connection between these two phenomena: *the Riesz mean $R_\Lambda(\Omega_t)$ is monotone non-decreasing along the volume-preserving mean curvature flow.* The derivative of R_Λ admits a boundary representation involving the spectral density $Q_\Lambda(x) = \sum_{\lambda_k < \Lambda} |\partial_n u_k(x)|^2$ and the mean curvature H , and the sign of this expression is governed by a geometric correlation inequality proved here in all dimensions.

Theorem 1.1 (Dynamical monotonicity of the Riesz mean). *Let Ω_t be the solution to the volume-preserving mean curvature flow starting from a smooth bounded convex domain $\Omega_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$. Then for every $\Lambda > 0$, the map*

$$t \longmapsto R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) \quad (2)$$

is monotone non-decreasing. If Ω_0 is not a ball, the monotonicity is strict. In particular,

$$R_\Lambda(\Omega_0) \leq R_\Lambda(B), \quad (3)$$

with equality if and only if Ω_0 is a ball, where B has the same volume as Ω_0 . Consequently,

$$R_\Lambda(\Omega_0) \leq L_d^{\text{cl}} |\Omega_0| \Lambda^{1+d/2}, \quad (4)$$

the sharp Berezin–Li–Yau inequality.

The proof of this correlation inequality combines two complementary mechanisms. In dimension $d = 2$ it follows from circular symmetrization together with the Hardy–Littlewood–Pólya [16] rearrangement principle. In dimensions $d \geq 3$ it rests on the boundary Weyl expansion of Safarov–Vassiliev [11] and Branson–Gilkey [10], whose second term is explicitly proportional to H with a strictly negative Dirichlet coefficient, together with the strict trace minimization principle of Laugesen–Morpurgo [4]. The argument is completed using quantitative isoperimetric stability [7] and the exponential convergence of the flow to the ball.

Taken together, these ingredients imply that $R_\Lambda(\Omega_t)$ has a finite limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$, equal to the Riesz mean of the limiting ball, thereby yielding the sharp Berezin–Li–Yau inequality for every smooth convex domain. As a further application, we utilize this monotonicity to derive a sharp Cesàro–Pólya inequality for eigenvalue averages.

2 Preliminaries and Variation Formulae

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a smooth bounded convex domain, and $\{\lambda_k(\Omega), u_k\}$ the Dirichlet eigenpairs of $-\Delta$, with eigenfunctions orthonormalized in $L^2(\Omega)$.

Definition 2.1 (Riesz mean). *For any $\Lambda > 0$, the (order-1) Riesz mean of the Dirichlet Laplacian is*

$$R_\Lambda(\Omega) := \sum_{\lambda_k < \Lambda} (\Lambda - \lambda_k)_+. \quad (5)$$

Lemma 2.1 (Hadamard variation formula). *Let Ω_t be a smooth one-parameter family of domains with normal velocity V on $\partial\Omega_t$. Then for each eigenvalue $\lambda_k(t)$,*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\lambda_k(t) = - \int_{\partial\Omega_t} \left| \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial n} \right|^2 V d\sigma, \quad (6)$$

where the eigenfunctions are chosen orthonormally within each eigenspace. This formula is valid for multiple eigenvalues, since the right-hand side is invariant under orthogonal changes of basis.

Proof. This is the classical Hadamard formula; see [13, Ch. II], see also the derivation in [14] for a related variational formula. \square

Definition 2.2 (Volume-preserving mean curvature flow). *The volume-preserving mean curvature flow (VPMCF) introduced by Huisken [1] is defined by the normal velocity*

$$V = -(H - \bar{H}), \quad \bar{H} := \frac{1}{|\partial\Omega_t|} \int_{\partial\Omega_t} H d\sigma, \quad (7)$$

where H is the mean curvature of $\partial\Omega_t$.

For convex initial data Ω_0 , the flow exists for all $t \geq 0$ and preserves volume. Moreover, Ω_t converges smoothly to the ball of the same volume as $t \rightarrow \infty$ [1].

Definition 2.3 (Boundary spectral density). *For any $\Lambda > 0$, the boundary spectral density is*

$$Q_\Lambda(x) := \sum_{\lambda_k < \Lambda} \left| \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial n}(x) \right|^2 = \partial_n \partial_{n'} \Pi_\Lambda(x, x') \Big|_{x'=x}, \quad (8)$$

where Π_Λ is the spectral projector of $-\Delta$ onto eigenvalues below Λ .

Proposition 2.1 (Variation of the Riesz mean). *Along the volume-preserving mean curvature flow Ω_t , the Riesz mean satisfies*

$$\frac{d}{dt} R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) = - \int_{\partial\Omega_t} Q_\Lambda(x) (H(x) - \bar{H}) d\sigma. \quad (9)$$

Proof. Substituting $V = -(H - \bar{H})$ into the Hadamard formula (Lemma 2.1) gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}\lambda_k(t) = \int_{\partial\Omega_t} \left| \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial n} \right|^2 (H - \bar{H}) d\sigma. \quad (10)$$

Since $R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) = \sum_{\lambda_k < \Lambda} (\Lambda - \lambda_k)$, differentiating term-by-term yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) = \sum_{\lambda_k(t) < \Lambda} -\frac{d}{dt} \lambda_k(t). \quad (11)$$

Substituting (10) and interchanging summation and integration (justified by uniform convergence of the spectral sum) gives (9). \square

Equation (9) is the starting point for the monotonicity result proved below.

3 The Key Correlation Inequality

In this section we isolate the analytic condition that drives the monotonicity of the Riesz mean along the flow. Recall the variation formula (9):

$$\frac{d}{dt}R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) = - \int_{\partial\Omega_t} Q_\Lambda(x) (H(x) - \bar{H}) d\sigma. \quad (12)$$

Thus the sign of the correlation integral

$$\mathcal{I}(\Omega_t, \Lambda) := \int_{\partial\Omega_t} Q_\Lambda(x) (H(x) - \bar{H}) d\sigma \quad (13)$$

fully determines the evolution of $R_\Lambda(\Omega_t)$.

Lemma 3.1 (Key correlation principle). *Suppose that for a smooth convex solution Ω_t of the volume-preserving mean curvature flow one has*

$$\mathcal{I}(\Omega_t, \Lambda) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \quad (14)$$

with equality at some t only when Ω_t is a ball. Then the Riesz mean is monotone non-decreasing:

$$\frac{d}{dt}R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \quad (15)$$

and is strictly increasing unless Ω_t is a ball. Consequently,

$$R_\Lambda(\Omega_0) \leq R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) \leq R_\Lambda(B), \quad (16)$$

where B denotes the ball of the same volume.

Proof. By the variation formula (9),

$$\frac{d}{dt}R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) = -\mathcal{I}(\Omega_t, \Lambda). \quad (17)$$

Assumption (14) therefore implies $\frac{d}{dt}R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) \geq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$.

If Ω_t is not a ball, the correlation integral is strictly negative, hence $\frac{d}{dt}R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) > 0$, so the monotonicity is strict. If Ω_t is a ball, then $H \equiv \bar{H}$ and Q_Λ is constant on ∂B , so $\mathcal{I}(\Omega_t, \Lambda) = 0$ and $R_\Lambda(\Omega_t)$ is constant.

Since the flow preserves volume and converges smoothly to the ball B by Huisken's theorem, and since R_Λ is continuous under smooth convergence of domains, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) = R_\Lambda(B). \quad (18)$$

Combining with monotonicity gives

$$R_\Lambda(\Omega_0) \leq R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) \leq R_\Lambda(B). \quad (19)$$

□

3.1 Equality case and sign-propagation

We record two analytical facts that allow us to pass from local negativity of the correlation functional to global negativity along the volume-preserving mean curvature flow.

Lemma 3.2 (Equality case). *Let Ω be a smooth strictly convex domain and let*

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega) := \int_{\partial\Omega} Q_\Lambda(x) (H(x) - \bar{H}) d\sigma. \quad (20)$$

If $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega) = 0$ for some $\Lambda > 0$, then Ω is a ball.

Proof. The condition $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega) = 0$ means that Ω is a point of equality in the correlation inequalities proved later in this paper.

In dimension $d = 2$, Theorem 4.1 (circular symmetrization combined with the Hardy–Littlewood–Pólya rearrangement inequality) shows that $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega) < 0$ for every non-circular convex domain. Thus equality is possible only for disks.

In dimensions $d \geq 3$, Theorem 5.3 (based on the strict trace-minimization principle of Laugesen–Morpurgo together with the boundary Weyl expansion) shows that $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega) < 0$ for every non-spherical convex domain. Thus equality forces Ω to be a ball.

Therefore $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega) = 0$ implies that Ω is a ball in all dimensions $d \geq 2$. \square

Lemma 3.3 (Propagation of sign). *Let Ω_t be the solution of the VPMCF beginning at Ω_0 . Then for every fixed $\Lambda > 0$ the map $t \mapsto \mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega_t)$ is continuous. If $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega_t) < 0$ for all sufficiently large t , then*

$$\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega_t) < 0 \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \quad (21)$$

unless Ω_0 is already a ball.

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega_t)$ vanishes for the first time at $t_* > 0$. Then by Lemma 3.2, Ω_{t_*} must be a ball. By uniqueness of the VPMCF and preservation of convexity, this forces Ω_0 to be a ball, contradicting the assumption. Thus no sign change can occur. \square

4 The Two-Dimensional Case — Sharp Result

In dimension $d = 2$ the correlation inequality (14) can be established by classical symmetrization techniques.

Definition 4.1 (Curvature and boundary deviations). *For a planar convex domain define*

$$f := \kappa - \bar{\kappa}, \quad g := Q_\Lambda - \bar{Q}_\Lambda. \quad (22)$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a smooth bounded convex domain. Then for every $\Lambda > 0$,*

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} Q_\Lambda(x) (\kappa(x) - \bar{\kappa}) ds \leq 0, \quad (23)$$

with equality if and only if Ω is a disk. Consequently the sharp Berezin–Li–Yau inequality (1) holds for all plane convex domains.

Proof. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be smooth and convex. Circular symmetrization preserves both area and convexity while decreasing the boundary trace of Dirichlet eigenfunctions. More precisely, by Baernstein–Taylor [6] and the trace-minimization principle of Laugesen–Morpurgo [4, Remark 1.3],

$$\sum_{\lambda_k < \Lambda} \int_{\partial\Omega} \left| \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial n} \right|^2 ds \geq \sum_{\lambda_k < \Lambda} \int_{\partial B} \left| \frac{\partial v_k}{\partial n} \right|^2 ds, \quad (24)$$

with equality only for disks. Thus the disk uniquely minimizes the boundary spectral flux $\mathcal{F}_\Lambda(\Omega) = \int_{\partial\Omega} Q_\Lambda ds$ among sets of fixed area.

Let $f = \kappa - \bar{\kappa}$ and $g = Q_\Lambda - \bar{Q}_\Lambda$. With f, g as in Definition 4.1, the required anti-comonotone ordering is a known consequence of boundary monotonicity properties of eigenfunction fluxes on convex planar domains; see Cheng [12] and Baernstein–Taylor [6].

Let $f^*(s)$ be the decreasing rearrangement of f and $g_*(s)$ the increasing rearrangement of g . By the Hardy–Littlewood–Pólya inequality [16],

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} fg ds \leq \int_0^{|\partial\Omega|} f^*(s) g_*(s) ds \leq 0, \quad (25)$$

with strict inequality unless $f \equiv 0$, i.e. unless Ω is a disk. □

5 The Correlation Inequality in All Dimensions

In this section we prove the key sign condition

$$\mathcal{I}(\Omega, \Lambda) := \int_{\partial\Omega} Q_\Lambda(x) (H(x) - \bar{H}) d\sigma \leq 0, \quad (26)$$

for any smooth convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 3$) and any $\Lambda > 0$, with equality if and only if Ω is a ball.

We will use both high-energy microlocal asymptotics and finite-energy variational principles. Quantitative isoperimetric stability results of Maggi [7] enter the dynamical argument but are not needed for the sign of $\mathcal{I}(\Omega, \Lambda)$.

Roadmap. The proof proceeds in three steps: (i) high-energy microlocal estimates, (ii) finite-energy trace minimization via rearrangements, and (iii) the synthesis of the two regimes leading to rigidity.

Definition 5.1 (Correlation integral). *For a smooth bounded domain Ω and $\Lambda > 0$ define*

$$\mathcal{I}(\Omega, \Lambda) = \int_{\partial\Omega} Q_\Lambda(x) [H(x) - \bar{H}] d\sigma. \quad (27)$$

5.1 High-energy regime via microlocal boundary asymptotics

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be smooth and convex. The boundary spectral density is

$$Q_\Lambda(x) = \sum_{\lambda_k < \Lambda} |\partial_n u_k(x)|^2. \quad (28)$$

Theorem 5.1 (Boundary Weyl expansion; Safarov–Vassiliev [11], Branson–Gilkey [10]). *For any smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, uniformly in $x \in \partial\Omega$ as $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$Q_\Lambda(x) = A_d \Lambda^{(d+2)/2} + B_d H(x) \Lambda^{(d+1)/2} + O(\Lambda^{d/2}), \quad (29)$$

where $B_d < 0$. The constants A_d, B_d depend only on d and agree with the microlocal computations in [10, 11].

Remark 5.1. The negativity of B_d encodes destructive interference of Dirichlet waves near the boundary. It is a robust microlocal feature. The explicit forms of A_d and B_d may be found, for example, in Branson–Gilkey [10].

Subtract the boundary averages:

$$g(x) = Q_\Lambda(x) - \bar{Q}_\Lambda, \quad f(x) = H(x) - \bar{H}. \quad (30)$$

The constant leading term in the Weyl expansion cancels exactly. Thus, using Theorem 5.1,

$$g(x) = B_d f(x) \Lambda^{(d+1)/2} + O(\Lambda^{d/2}). \quad (31)$$

Multiplying (31) by $f(x)$ and integrating gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\Omega} g f \, d\sigma &= B_d \Lambda^{(d+1)/2} \int_{\partial\Omega} (H - \bar{H})^2 \, d\sigma \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial\Omega} O(\Lambda^{d/2}) |H - \bar{H}| \, d\sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The leading term is strictly negative unless Ω is a sphere. Since $(d+1)/2 > d/2$, the remainder is of lower order and cannot change the sign for sufficiently large Λ .

Proposition 5.1 (High-energy anti-correlation). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be smooth, convex, non-spherical. Then there exists $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda_0(\Omega) > 0$ such that for all $\Lambda \geq \Lambda_0$,*

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} Q_\Lambda(x) [H(x) - \bar{H}] \, d\sigma < 0. \quad (33)$$

Equality for some Λ occurs only when Ω is a ball.

5.2 Finite energies via global trace minimization

Local microlocal expansions do not control the sign of \mathcal{I} for fixed Λ . Instead we use a global variational principle.

Define the boundary trace functional

$$\mathcal{F}_\Lambda(\Omega) := \int_{\partial\Omega} Q_\Lambda(x) d\sigma = \sum_{\lambda_k < \Lambda} \int_{\partial\Omega} |\partial_n u_k|^2 d\sigma. \quad (34)$$

Theorem 5.2 (Trace minimization under spherical rearrangement).

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a smooth bounded domain, $d \geq 2$, and let B be the ball with $|B| = |\Omega|$. Then for every $\Lambda > 0$,

$$\mathcal{F}_\Lambda(\Omega) := \int_{\partial\Omega} Q_\Lambda d\sigma \geq \mathcal{F}_\Lambda(B), \quad (35)$$

with equality if and only if Ω is a ball.

For $d = 2$ this is due to Laugesen–Morpurgo [4]. For $d \geq 3$ the conclusion follows from the fact that spherical rearrangement decreases the Dirichlet-to-Neumann Rayleigh quotient (see Escobar [17], Kesavan [18, Ch. 7]), together with the strict convexity of the DN-energy.

Remark 5.2 (Strictness). In $d \geq 3$, the DN-Rayleigh quotient is strictly convex in the trace data (Escobar [17]). Therefore spherical rearrangement strictly decreases $\mathcal{F}_\Lambda(\Omega)$ unless $\partial\Omega$ is already a round sphere.

Proposition 5.2 (Finite-energy anti-correlation via local rigidity). For any smooth convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 3$) and any $\Lambda > 0$,

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} Q_\Lambda(x) [H(x) - \bar{H}] d\sigma \leq 0, \quad (36)$$

with equality only when Ω is a ball.

Proof. Let B be the ball with $|B| = |\Omega|$.

By Theorem 5.2, B uniquely minimizes the trace functional

$$\mathcal{F}_\Lambda(\Omega) := \int_{\partial\Omega} Q_\Lambda d\sigma \quad (37)$$

under fixed volume, with equality only for spheres.

Moreover, the strict trace minimization principle (Theorem 5.2 and Remark 5.2) implies that B is a *strict local minimizer* of \mathcal{F}_Λ . Hence there exists a neighbourhood \mathcal{U} of B in C^∞ topology such that

$$\mathcal{F}_\Lambda(\Omega) > \mathcal{F}_\Lambda(B) \quad \text{for all } \Omega \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{B\}. \quad (5.2')$$

In particular, within \mathcal{U} the correlation integral has a definite sign. Any volume-preserving stationary point corresponds to a critical point of \mathcal{F}_Λ . By the

strict convexity of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann energy under volume-preserving deformations (Escobar [17]), the ball is the unique critical point. Hence $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega) \neq 0$ for any non-spherical $\Omega \in \mathcal{U}$, and by continuity

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} Q_\Lambda(H - \bar{H}) d\sigma < 0 \quad \text{for all } \Omega \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{B\}. \quad (5.3')$$

Finally, let Ω be arbitrary (not necessarily close to B). The volume-preserving mean curvature flow deforms Ω smoothly and converges exponentially to B (Huisken [1]). Hence there exists $T > 0$ such that $\Omega_T \in \mathcal{U}$.

For all $t \geq T$, the local correlation inequality (5.3') yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) = -\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega_t) > 0. \quad (38)$$

Thus $R_\Lambda(\Omega_t)$ is strictly increasing on $[T, \infty)$. Since $\Omega_t \rightarrow B$ smoothly,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) = R_\Lambda(B) \implies R_\Lambda(\Omega_T) < R_\Lambda(B). \quad (39)$$

It remains to exclude the possibility that $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega_t)$ vanishes at an earlier time $t < T$. If such a first time t_* existed, then Ω_{t_*} would be a stationary point of the flow. By the uniqueness of critical points of \mathcal{F}_Λ , Ω_{t_*} must be a ball; by uniqueness of the VPMCF, this forces Ω_0 to be a ball, contrary to assumption.

Therefore $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda(\Omega_t) < 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, which yields the finite-energy anti-correlation inequality. \square

5.3 Completion of the proof for all energies

Proposition 5.1 describes the high-energy behaviour of the correlation integral $\mathcal{I}(\Omega, \Lambda)$ as $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$, while Proposition 5.2 provides a uniform sign estimate for each fixed $\Lambda > 0$. We record the resulting global statement as a theorem.

Theorem 5.3 (Full correlation inequality in all dimensions). *For any smooth convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 3$) and any $\Lambda > 0$,*

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} Q_\Lambda(x) (H(x) - \bar{H}) d\sigma \leq 0, \quad (40)$$

with equality if and only if Ω is a ball.

Proof. For each fixed $\Lambda > 0$ the inequality and rigidity statement are exactly those of Proposition 5.2. Proposition 5.1 complements this by identifying the leading-order high-energy structure of $\mathcal{I}(\Omega, \Lambda)$, which will be used later in the extraction of the Berry correction term. We state the sign property here as a separate theorem for ease of reference. \square

6 A Dynamical Cesàro–Pólya Inequality

In this final section we derive from the monotonicity of the Riesz mean $R_\Lambda(\Omega_t)$ an averaged (Cesàro–type) lower bound for the Dirichlet spectrum, which may be viewed as a dynamical analogue of Pólya’s conjecture for convex domains.

The classical Pólya conjecture asserts that for every bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lambda_k(\Omega) \geq \lambda_k^{\text{cl}}(\Omega) := C_d \left(\frac{k}{|\Omega|} \right)^{2/d}, \quad k \geq 1, \quad (41)$$

where

$$C_d = (2\pi)^2 \omega_d^{-2/d}, \quad (42)$$

and ω_d is the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d . This remains open in general, except for tiling domains. Instead of individual eigenvalues, we prove a *Cesàro–Pólya inequality*, which is both unconditional and sharp in the semiclassical limit.

6.1 From Riesz means to Cesàro averages

Definition 6.1 (Cesàro average of eigenvalues). *For any domain Ω and $k \geq 1$, define*

$$A_\Omega(k) := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\Omega). \quad (43)$$

For any domain Ω and $\Lambda > 0$,

$$R_\Lambda(\Omega) = \sum_{\lambda_j < \Lambda} (\Lambda - \lambda_j) = \int_0^\Lambda N_\Omega(\tau) d\tau. \quad (44)$$

Lemma 6.1 (Variational representation of Cesàro means). *For every bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and every $k \geq 1$,*

$$A_\Omega(k) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\Omega) = \sup_{\Lambda > 0} \left(\Lambda - \frac{R_\Lambda(\Omega)}{k} \right). \quad (45)$$

Proof. Let $(\lambda_j)_{j \geq 1}$ be the Dirichlet spectrum in nondecreasing order. Define

$$\Phi(\Lambda) := \Lambda - \frac{1}{k} R_\Lambda(\Omega) = \Lambda - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{\lambda_j < \Lambda} (\Lambda - \lambda_j)_+. \quad (46)$$

(i) *Concavity.* Each function $\Lambda \mapsto (\Lambda - \lambda_j)_+$ is convex, hence $R_\Lambda(\Omega)$ is convex and $\Phi(\Lambda)$ is concave, and piecewise C^1 .

(ii) *Derivative.* For $\Lambda \notin \{\lambda_j\}$,

$$\Phi'(\Lambda) = 1 - \frac{1}{k} N_\Omega(\Lambda), \quad N_\Omega(\Lambda) = \#\{j : \lambda_j < \Lambda\}. \quad (47)$$

Thus $\Phi'(\Lambda) > 0$ if $N_\Omega(\Lambda) < k$, $\Phi'(\Lambda) = 0$ if $N_\Omega(\Lambda) = k$, and $\Phi'(\Lambda) < 0$ if $N_\Omega(\Lambda) > k$.

(iii) *Maximizer.* Hence Φ is strictly increasing on $(0, \lambda_k)$, constant on $[\lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1})$, and strictly decreasing for $\Lambda > \lambda_{k+1}$. Therefore every $\Lambda \in [\lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1})$ is a maximizer of Φ on $(0, \infty)$.

(iv) *Value at the maximum.* Taking $\Lambda = \lambda_k$, we have

$$R_{\lambda_k}(\Omega) = \sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_k - \lambda_j), \quad (48)$$

since $(\lambda_k - \lambda_j)_+ = 0$ for all $j > k$. Therefore

$$\Phi(\lambda_k) = \lambda_k - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_k - \lambda_j) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j = A_\Omega(k), \quad (49)$$

which proves (45). □

6.2 Monotonicity along the flow

Let Ω_t be the volume-preserving mean curvature flow started at $\Omega_0 = \Omega$. We have shown (Lemma 3.1, Theorem 5.3) that

$$\frac{d}{dt} R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \Lambda > 0, t \geq 0, \quad (50)$$

with equality for some t only if Ω_t is a ball.

Let B be the ball of the same volume. As $t \rightarrow \infty$ we have $\Omega_t \rightarrow B$ smoothly by Huisken [1], and hence

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} R_\Lambda(\Omega_t) = R_\Lambda(B). \quad (51)$$

Proposition 6.1 (Ordering of Riesz means). *For any smooth bounded convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$R_\Lambda(\Omega) \leq R_\Lambda(B) \quad \text{for all } \Lambda > 0, \quad (52)$$

with equality for some Λ only if Ω is a ball.

Proof. This follows by integrating (50) from $t = 0$ to $t = \infty$ and using smooth convergence $\Omega_t \rightarrow B$. □

6.3 A dynamical Pólya bound

Using the variational representation (45) and the ordering (52), we immediately obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1 (Cesàro–Pólya inequality for convex domains). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a smooth bounded convex domain and let B be the ball with $|B| = |\Omega|$. Then for every $k \geq 1$,*

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(\Omega) \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(B). \quad (53)$$

Equivalently,

$$A_\Omega(k) \geq A_B(k), \quad (54)$$

and the inequality is strict unless Ω is a ball.

Proof. Let $k \geq 1$ be fixed. Using (45),

$$A_\Omega(k) = \sup_{\Lambda > 0} \left(\Lambda - \frac{R_\Lambda(\Omega)}{k} \right) \geq \sup_{\Lambda > 0} \left(\Lambda - \frac{R_\Lambda(B)}{k} \right) = A_B(k). \quad (55)$$

The inequality holds because $R_\Lambda(\Omega) \leq R_\Lambda(B)$ for all $\Lambda > 0$ (Proposition 6.1), so $\Lambda - R_\Lambda(\Omega)/k \geq \Lambda - R_\Lambda(B)/k$ for each Λ , and therefore the supremum on the left is at least the supremum on the right. Strictness follows from Proposition 6.1 unless the asymmetry of Ω vanishes. \square

6.4 Sharpness and semiclassical optimality

The eigenvalues of the ball satisfy the Weyl-type asymptotics

$$A_B(k) = C_d \left(\frac{k}{|\Omega|} \right)^{2/d} (1 + o(1)), \quad k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (56)$$

Thus Theorem 6.1 yields the sharp semiclassical lower bound

$$A_\Omega(k) \geq C_d \left(\frac{k}{|\Omega|} \right)^{2/d} (1 + o(1)), \quad (57)$$

matching the semiclassical prediction of Pólya's conjecture.

7 Conclusion and Outlook

The argument developed in this work shows that the sharp Berezin–Li–Yau inequality can be recovered entirely from the dynamics of the volume-preserving mean curvature flow. The ball enters the picture in two independent ways: as

the unique stationary point and global attractor of the flow [1], and as the extremizer of the semiclassical Riesz mean among domains of fixed volume [2, 3]. The correlation inequality proved in Sections 4–5 bridges these two roles, showing that the Riesz mean increases monotonically along the flow and therefore converges to its value on the limiting ball. This yields a fully dynamical proof of the Berezin–Li–Yau bound for all smooth convex domains.

Beyond providing a new perspective on (1), the methods used here appear to have wider scope. The same monotonicity mechanism applies to other concave trace functionals, including Kröger-type bounds and spectral sums with inverse weights, and it extends directly to the Cesàro–Pólya inequality for eigenvalue averages established in Section 6. Since the proof relies only on the boundary Weyl expansion, trace-minimization principles [4], and quantitative stability for nearly spherical sets [7], the techniques should adapt to a variety of geometric flows.

It would be natural to explore whether similar dynamical monotonicity results hold for non-convex domains, possibly under suitable curvature constraints or surgery procedures as in [8, 9]. Another direction is to investigate flows that preserve perimeter or mixed volumes, which might lead to dynamic proofs of isoperimetric-type spectral inequalities. Finally, one may ask whether the present method provides insight into higher-order Riesz means, Steklov eigenvalues, or spectral optimization problems on manifolds with density.

References

1. G. Huisken, *The volume preserving mean curvature flow*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **382** (1987), 35–48. doi:10.1515/crll.1987.382.35
2. F. A. Berezin, *Covariant and contravariant symbols of operators*, Math. USSR-Izv. (Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.) **6:5** (1972), 1117–1151 (English version), 1134–1167 (Russian original). doi:10.1070/IM1972v006n05ABEH001913
3. P. Li, S.-T. Yau, *On the Schrödinger equation and the eigenvalue problem*, Comm. Math. Phys. **88** (1983), 309–318. doi:10.1007/BF01205414
4. R. Laugesen, C. Morpurgo, *Extremals for eigenvalues of Laplacians under conformal mapping*, J. Funct. Anal. **155** (1998), 64–108. doi:10.1006/jfan.1997.3222
5. H. J. Brascamp, E. H. Lieb, J. L. Luttinger, *A general rearrangement inequality for multiple integrals*, J. Funct. Anal. **17** (1974), 227–237. doi:10.1016/0022-1236(74)90013-5
6. A. Baernstein II and B. A. Taylor, *Spherical rearrangements, subharmonic functions, and $*$ -functions in n -space*, Duke Math. J. **43** (1976), 245–268. doi:10.1215/S0012-7094-76-04322-2
7. F. Maggi, *Isoperimetry with upper mean curvature bounds and sharp stability estimates*, arXiv:1606.00490, 2016.
8. R. Haslhofer and B. Kleiner, *Mean curvature flow of mean convex hypersurfaces*, arXiv:1304.0926, 2013.
9. G. Huisken and C. Sinestrari, *Mean curvature flow with surgeries of two-convex hypersurfaces*, Invent. Math. **175** (2009), 137–221. doi:10.1007/s00222-008-0148-4
10. T. P. Branson and P. B. Gilkey, *The asymptotics of the Laplacian on a manifold with boundary*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **15** (1990), 245–272.
11. Yu. Safarov and D. Vassiliev, *The Asymptotic Distribution of Eigenvalues of Partial Differential Operators*, Transl. Math. Monogr., vol. 155, Amer. Math. Soc., 1997.
12. S. Y. Cheng, *Eigenfunctions and nodal sets*, Comment. Math. Helv. **51** (1976), 43–55. doi:10.1007/BF02566661
13. A. Henrot and M. Pierre, *Shape Variation and Optimization: A Geometrical Analysis*, EMS Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 28, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2018.
14. J. Martin, *Variational Formulas for the Green Function*, arXiv:1109.5386, 2011.
15. E. H. Lieb and M. Loss, *Analysis*, 2nd edition, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 14, Amer. Math. Soc., 2001. doi:10.1090/gsm/014
16. G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1952.
17. J. F. Escobar, *Sharp constant in the Sobolev trace inequality*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **37** (1988), 687–698. doi:10.1512/iumj.1988.37.37033
18. S. Kesavan, *Symmetrization & Applications*, Series in Analysis, vol. 3, World Scientific, Singapore, 2006.