Nontrivial solutions for a a class of singular problems

Marcelo Montenegro
Universidade Estadual de Campinas

Elves A. B. Silva
Universidade de Brasília

Introduction

Introduction

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \left(-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^{p}\right) \chi_{\{u>0\}} & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

Introduction

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \left(-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p\right) \chi_{\{u>0\}} & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

- Ω is a bounded smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 1$

Introduction

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \left(-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p\right)\chi_{\{u>0\}} & \text{in } \Omega \\ \quad u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

- Ω is a bounded smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 1$
- $0 < \beta < 1$, $0 < p < 1$, $\lambda > 0$

Introduction

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \left(-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^{p}\right) \chi_{\{u>0\}} & \text{in } \Omega \\ \quad u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

- Ω is a bounded smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 1$
- $0 < \beta < 1$, $0 < p < 1$, $\lambda > 0$

- This problem has been studied in several articles: Choi- Lazer - McKenna, Cîrstea - Ghergu - Radulescu, Dávila, Dávila - Montenegro, Diaz - Morel - Oswald

Introduction

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \left(-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p\right) \chi_{\{u>0\}} & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

- Ω is a bounded smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 1$
- $0 < \beta < 1$, $0 < p < 1$, $\lambda > 0$
- This problem has been studied in several articles: Choi- Lazer - McKenna, Cîrstea - Ghergu - Radulescu, Dávila, Dávila - Montenegro, Diaz - Morel - Oswald
- By a solution we mean a function $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ satisfying (1) in the weak sense, that is,

Introduction

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \left(-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p\right) \chi_{\{u>0\}} & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \qquad (1)$$

- Ω is a bounded smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 1$
- $0 < \beta < 1$, $0 < p < 1$, $\lambda > 0$

- This problem has been studied in several articles: Choi- Lazer - McKenna, Cîrstea - Ghergu - Radulescu, Dávila, Dávila - Montenegro, Diaz - Morel - Oswald
- By a solution we mean a function $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ satisfying (1) in the weak sense, that is,

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u \nabla \varphi = \int_{\{u>0\}} \Big(- \frac{1}{u^\beta} + \lambda u^p \Big) \varphi$$

for every $\varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$.

- There are a few recent papers using variational methods for studying an equation with a positive singular nonlinearity on the right hand side

- There are a few recent papers using variational methods for studying an equation with a positive singular nonlinearity on the right hand side
$-\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\beta} + \lambda u^p,$

- There are a few recent papers using variational methods for studying an equation with a positive singular nonlinearity on the right hand side
  $-\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\beta} + \lambda u^p$,
- Canino, Canino - Degiovanni, Hirano - Saccon - Shioji, Perera - —, Long - Sun - Wu, Gonçalves - Santos

- There are a few recent papers using variational methods for studying an equation with a positive singular nonlinearity on the right hand side
  $-\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\beta} + \lambda u^p,$
- Canino, Canino - Degiovanni, Hirano - Saccon - Shioji, Perera - —, Long - Sun - Wu, Gonçalves - Santos
- Boccardo for related results

- There are a few recent papers using variational methods for studying an equation with a positive singular nonlinearity on the right hand side
$-\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\beta} + \lambda u^p$,
- Canino, Canino - Degiovanni, Hirano - Saccon - Shioji, Perera - —, Long - Sun - Wu, Gonçalves - Santos
- Boccardo for related results
- Crandall - Rabinowitz - Tartar: the existence of one solution via bifurcation theory

- There are a few recent papers using variational methods for studying an equation with a positive singular nonlinearity on the right hand side
  $-\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\beta} + \lambda u^p$,
- Canino, Canino - Degiovanni, Hirano - Saccon - Shioji, Perera - —, Long - Sun - Wu, Gonçalves - Santos
- Boccardo for related results
- Crandall - Rabinowitz - Tartar: the existence of one solution via bifurcation theory

Existence of two solutions

Theorem 1

Problem (1) has two distinct nontrivial solutions for $\lambda > 0$ large.

Perturbed Problem

Perturbed Problem

Consider the perturbation

$$g_\varepsilon(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{t^q}{(t+\varepsilon)^{q+\beta}} \text{ for } t \geq 0 \\ 0 \text{ for } t < 0, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

Perturbed Problem

Consider the perturbation

$$g_\varepsilon(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{t^q}{(t+\varepsilon)^{q+\beta}} \text{ for } t \geq 0 \\ 0 \text{ for } t < 0, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where $0 < q < p < 1$

Perturbed Problem

Consider the perturbation

$$g_\varepsilon(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{t^q}{(t+\varepsilon)^{q+\beta}} & \text{for } t \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{for } t < 0, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where $0 < q < p < 1$ and the corresponding perturbed problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_\varepsilon(u) = \lambda u^p & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Perturbed Problem

Consider the perturbation

$$g_\varepsilon(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{t^q}{(t+\varepsilon)^{q+\beta}} \text{ for } t \geq 0 \\ 0 \text{ for } t < 0, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where $0 < q < p < 1$ and the corresponding perturbed problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_\varepsilon(u) = \lambda u^p & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

The associated functional $I_\varepsilon \in C^1(H_0^1(\Omega), \mathbb{R})$ is given by

Perturbed Problem

Consider the perturbation

$$g_\varepsilon(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{t^q}{(t+\varepsilon)^{q+\beta}} & \text{for } t \geq 0 \\ 0 \text{ for } t < 0, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where $0 < q < p < 1$ and the corresponding perturbed problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_\varepsilon(u) = \lambda u^p & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

The associated functional $I_\varepsilon \in C^1(H_0^1(\Omega), \mathbb{R})$ is given by

$$I_\varepsilon(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 + \int_\Omega G_\varepsilon(u) - \frac{\lambda}{p+1}\int_\Omega (u^+)^{p+1}$$

where $G_\varepsilon(u) = \int_0^t g_\varepsilon(s)ds \geq 0$.

Two solutions for the perturbed problem

Two solutions for the perturbed problem

Lemma 1

For every $\lambda > 0$, *there is* $\rho > 0$ *such that,* $I_\varepsilon(u) \geq \frac{1}{4}\rho^2$ *whenever* $\|u\|_{H_0^1} = \rho$ *and* $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.

Two solutions for the perturbed problem

Lemma 1
For every $\lambda > 0$*, there is* $\rho > 0$ *such that,* $I_\varepsilon(u) \geq \frac{1}{4}\rho^2$ *whenever* $\|u\|_{H_0^1} = \rho$ *and* $0 < \varepsilon < 1$*.*

Lemma 2
For $\lambda > 0$ *large enough, we have* $I_\varepsilon(\varphi_1) < b < 0$*.*

Two solutions for the perturbed problem

Lemma 1

For every $\lambda > 0$*, there is* $\rho > 0$ *such that,* $I_\varepsilon(u) \geq \frac{1}{4}\rho^2$ *whenever* $\|u\|_{H_0^1} = \rho$ *and* $0 < \varepsilon < 1$*.*

Lemma 2

For $\lambda > 0$ *large enough, we have* $I_\varepsilon(\varphi_1) < b < 0$*.*

Here, $\varphi_1 > 0$ is the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Two solutions for the perturbed problem

Lemma 1

For every $\lambda > 0$, *there is* $\rho > 0$ *such that,* $I_\varepsilon(u) \geq \frac{1}{4}\rho^2$ *whenever* $\|u\|_{H_0^1} = \rho$ *and* $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.

Lemma 2

For $\lambda > 0$ *large enough, we have* $I_\varepsilon(\varphi_1) < b < 0$.

Here, $\varphi_1 > 0$ is the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Proposition 1

For $\lambda > 0$ large enough, and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$; there is $b < 0$ and a global minimizer $u_\varepsilon^1 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^1) < b$.

Proposition 1

For $\lambda > 0$ *large enough, and* $0 < \varepsilon < 1$*; there is* $b < 0$ *and a global minimizer* $u_\varepsilon^1 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ *with* $I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^1) < b$*.*

Proposition 2

For $\lambda > 0$ *large enough, and* $0 < \varepsilon < 1$*; there is* $a > 0$ *and a critical point* $u_\varepsilon^2 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ *of mountain pass type such that* $I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2) > a$*.*

Concluding Remarks for the Perturbed Problem

Fix $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently large.

Concluding Remarks for the Perturbed Problem

Fix $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently large.
The critical values $c_\varepsilon^1 = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^1)$ and $c_\varepsilon^2 = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2)$ satisfy

$$-\infty < \beta \leq c_1^\varepsilon \leq b < 0 < a \leq c_2^\varepsilon \leq \alpha < \infty \tag{4}$$

Concluding Remarks for the Perturbed Problem

Fix $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently large.
The critical values $c_\varepsilon^1 = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^1)$ and $c_\varepsilon^2 = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2)$ satisfy

$$-\infty < \beta \leq c_1^\varepsilon \leq b < 0 < a \leq c_2^\varepsilon \leq \alpha < \infty \qquad (4)$$

where the constants β, b, a do not depend on $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.

Concluding Remarks for the Perturbed Problem

Fix $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently large.
The critical values $c_\varepsilon^1 = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^1)$ and $c_\varepsilon^2 = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2)$ satisfy

$$-\infty < \beta \leq c_1^\varepsilon \leq b < 0 < a \leq c_2^\varepsilon \leq \alpha < \infty \qquad (4)$$

where the constants β, b, a do not depend on $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.
Claim: the upper bound α is independent of $\varepsilon > 0$.

Concluding Remarks for the Perturbed Problem

Fix $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently large.
The critical values $c_\varepsilon^1 = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^1)$ and $c_\varepsilon^2 = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2)$ satisfy

$$-\infty < \beta \leq c_1^\varepsilon \leq b < 0 < a \leq c_2^\varepsilon \leq \alpha < \infty \tag{4}$$

where the constants β, b, a do not depend on $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.
Claim: the upper bound α is independent of $\varepsilon > 0$.
Observe that the solutions u_ε of (3) are a priori bounded:

Concluding Remarks for the Perturbed Problem

Fix $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently large.
The critical values $c_\varepsilon^1 = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^1)$ and $c_\varepsilon^2 = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2)$ satisfy

$$-\infty < \beta \leq c_1^\varepsilon \leq b < 0 < a \leq c_2^\varepsilon \leq \alpha < \infty \qquad (4)$$

where the constants β, b, a do not depend on $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.
Claim: the upper bound α is independent of $\varepsilon > 0$.
Observe that the solutions u_ε of (3) are a priori bounded: multiply (3) by u_ε, integrate, discard the term involving g_ε and use the Sobolev imbedding, to obtain

$$c(\Omega)\Big(\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}\Big)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \le \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \le \lambda \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}.$$

$$c(\Omega)\Big(\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}\Big)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \le \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \le \lambda \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}.$$

Since $0 < p < 1$, a bootstrap argument implies that the norms $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ are bounded independent of ε.

$$c(\Omega)\Big(\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}\Big)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \le \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \le \lambda \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}.$$

Since $0 < p < 1$, a bootstrap argument implies that the norms $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ are bounded independent of ε. From this, $c_2^\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2) \le \alpha$, with $\alpha > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$.

$$c(\Omega)\Big(\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}\Big)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \le \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \le \lambda \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}.$$

Since $0 < p < 1$, a bootstrap argument implies that the norms $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ are bounded independent of ε.

From this, $c_2^\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2) \le \alpha$, with $\alpha > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$. The claim is proved.

$$c(\Omega)\Big(\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}\Big)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \le \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \le \lambda \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}.$$

Since $0 < p < 1$, a bootstrap argument implies that the norms $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ are bounded independent of ε.
From this, $c_2^\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2) \le \alpha$, with $\alpha > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$. The claim is proved.
Now, let $\varepsilon \to 0$.

$$c(\Omega)\Big(\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}\Big)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \leq \lambda \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}.$$

Since $0 < p < 1$, a bootstrap argument implies that the norms $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ are bounded independent of ε.

From this, $c_2^\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2) \leq \alpha$, with $\alpha > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$. The claim is proved.

Now, let $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Then $c_\varepsilon^1 \to c_1$, $c_\varepsilon^2 \to c_2$ with

$$\beta \leq c_1 \leq b < 0 < a \leq c_2 \leq \alpha,$$

$$c(\Omega)\Big(\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}\Big)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \leq \lambda \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}.$$

Since $0 < p < 1$, a bootstrap argument implies that the norms $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ are bounded independent of ε.

From this, $c_2^\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2) \leq \alpha$, with $\alpha > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$. The claim is proved.

Now, let $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Then $c_\varepsilon^1 \to c_1$, $c_\varepsilon^2 \to c_2$ with

$$\beta \leq c_1 \leq b < 0 < a \leq c_2 \leq \alpha,$$

Moreover,

$$c(\Omega)\Big(\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}\Big)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \leq \lambda \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}.$$

Since $0 < p < 1$, a bootstrap argument implies that the norms $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ are bounded independent of ε.
From this, $c_2^\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2) \leq \alpha$, with $\alpha > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$. The claim is proved.
Now, let $\varepsilon \to 0$.
Then $c_\varepsilon^1 \to c_1$, $c_\varepsilon^2 \to c_2$ with

$$\beta \leq c_1 \leq b < 0 < a \leq c_2 \leq \alpha,$$

Moreover, $u_\varepsilon^1 \to u^1$ and $u_\varepsilon^2 \to u^2$ a.e., since solutions of (3) are a priori bounded.

$$c(\Omega)\Big(\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}\Big)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \leq \lambda \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}.$$

Since $0 < p < 1$, a bootstrap argument implies that the norms $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ are bounded independent of ε.
From this, $c_2^\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2) \leq \alpha$, with $\alpha > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$. The claim is proved.
Now, let $\varepsilon \to 0$.
Then $c_\varepsilon^1 \to c_1$, $c_\varepsilon^2 \to c_2$ with

$$\beta \leq c_1 \leq b < 0 < a \leq c_2 \leq \alpha,$$

Moreover, $u_\varepsilon^1 \to u^1$ and $u_\varepsilon^2 \to u^2$ a.e., since solutions of (3) are a priori bounded. We also have, $u^1 \neq u^2$ a.e. and they are nontrivial and nonnegative.

$$c(\Omega)\Big(\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}\Big)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \leq \lambda \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}.$$

Since $0 < p < 1$, a bootstrap argument implies that the norms $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ are bounded independent of ε.
From this, $c_2^\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2) \leq \alpha$, with $\alpha > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$. The claim is proved.
Now, let $\varepsilon \to 0$.
Then $c_\varepsilon^1 \to c_1$, $c_\varepsilon^2 \to c_2$ with

$$\beta \leq c_1 \leq b < 0 < a \leq c_2 \leq \alpha,$$

Moreover, $u_\varepsilon^1 \to u^1$ and $u_\varepsilon^2 \to u^2$ a.e., since solutions of (3) are a priori bounded. We also have, $u^1 \neq u^2$ a.e. and they are nontrivial and nonnegative.
Our objective is to obtain gradient estimates for solutions of (3).

$$c(\Omega)\Big(\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}\Big)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \le \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \le \lambda \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}.$$

Since $0 < p < 1$, a bootstrap argument implies that the norms $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ are bounded independent of ε.
From this, $c_2^\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2) \le \alpha$, with $\alpha > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$. The claim is proved.
Now, let $\varepsilon \to 0$.
Then $c_\varepsilon^1 \to c_1$, $c_\varepsilon^2 \to c_2$ with

$$\beta \le c_1 \le b < 0 < a \le c_2 \le \alpha,$$

Moreover, $u_\varepsilon^1 \to u^1$ and $u_\varepsilon^2 \to u^2$ a.e., since solutions of (3) are a priori bounded. We also have, $u^1 \ne u^2$ a.e. and they are nontrivial and nonnegative.
Our objective is to obtain gradient estimates for solutions of (3).
Then, taking $\varepsilon \to 0$,

$$c(\Omega)\Big(\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}\Big)^{\frac{2}{p+1}} \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \leq \lambda \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon^{p+1}.$$

Since $0 < p < 1$, a bootstrap argument implies that the norms $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ are bounded independent of ε.
From this, $c_2^\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon^2) \leq \alpha$, with $\alpha > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$. The claim is proved.
Now, let $\varepsilon \to 0$.
Then $c_\varepsilon^1 \to c_1$, $c_\varepsilon^2 \to c_2$ with

$$\beta \leq c_1 \leq b < 0 < a \leq c_2 \leq \alpha,$$

Moreover, $u_\varepsilon^1 \to u^1$ and $u_\varepsilon^2 \to u^2$ a.e., since solutions of (3) are a priori bounded. We also have, $u^1 \neq u^2$ a.e. and they are nontrivial and nonnegative.
Our objective is to obtain gradient estimates for solutions of (3). Then, taking $\varepsilon \to 0$, we show that the functions u_1 and u_2 are solutions of (1).

Gradient Estimates

Gradient Estimates

Let the weight ψ be such that

$$\psi \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}),\ \psi > 0 \text{ in } \Omega,\ \psi = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \text{ and } \frac{|\nabla \psi|^2}{\psi} \text{ is bounded in } \Omega.$$

Gradient Estimates

Let the weight ψ be such that

$$\psi \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}),\ \psi > 0 \text{ in } \Omega,\ \psi = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \text{ and } \frac{|\nabla \psi|^2}{\psi} \text{ is bounded in } \Omega.$$

Observe that $\psi = \varphi_1^2$ is a possible example.

Gradient Estimates

Let the weight ψ be such that

$$\psi \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}),\ \psi > 0 \text{ in } \Omega,\ \psi = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \text{ and } \frac{|\nabla \psi|^2}{\psi} \text{ is bounded in } \Omega.$$

Observe that $\psi = \varphi_1^2$ is a possible example.

Lemma 3

If u_ε is a solution of (3), then there is a constant $M > 0$ independent of ε such that

$$\psi(x)|\nabla u_\varepsilon(x)|^2 \leq M(u_\varepsilon(x)^{1-\beta} + u_\varepsilon(x)) \quad \forall x \in \Omega,$$

where M depends only on Ω, N, β, ψ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$.

- The proof of this lemma is based on an argument by Dávila - Montenegro.

- The proof of this lemma is based on an argument by Dávila - Montenegro.
- Remark that a nontrivial solution u_ε of (3) is nonnegative and belongs to $C^2(\overline{\Omega})$. However, we cannot use the maximum principle to ensure that u_ε is positive or identically zero, since $u^{q-1}/(u+\varepsilon)^{q+\beta}$ is singular when $u \sim 0$.

- The proof of this lemma is based on an argument by Dávila - Montenegro.
- Remark that a nontrivial solution u_ε of (3) is nonnegative and belongs to $C^2(\overline{\Omega})$. However, we cannot use the maximum principle to ensure that u_ε is positive or identically zero, since $u^{q-1}/(u+\varepsilon)^{q+\beta}$ is singular when $u \sim 0$.
- Consider the functions

$$w = \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{Z(u)}, \qquad v = w\psi,$$

where $Z(u_\varepsilon) = u_\varepsilon^{1-\beta} + u_\varepsilon + \delta$, with $\delta > 0$, in order to have $Z > 0$.

- The proof of this lemma is based on an argument by Dávila - Montenegro.
- Remark that a nontrivial solution u_ε of (3) is nonnegative and belongs to $C^2(\overline{\Omega})$. However, we cannot use the maximum principle to ensure that u_ε is positive or identically zero, since $u^{q-1}/(u+\varepsilon)^{q+\beta}$ is singular when $u \sim 0$.
- Consider the functions

$$w = \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{Z(u)}, \qquad v = w\psi,$$

where $Z(u_\varepsilon) = u_\varepsilon^{1-\beta} + u_\varepsilon + \delta$, with $\delta > 0$, in order to have $Z > 0$. In the end of the proof, we let $\delta \to 0$.

- The proof of this lemma is based on an argument by Dávila - Montenegro.
- Remark that a nontrivial solution u_ε of (3) is nonnegative and belongs to $C^2(\overline{\Omega})$. However, we cannot use the maximum principle to ensure that u_ε is positive or identically zero, since $u^{q-1}/(u+\varepsilon)^{q+\beta}$ is singular when $u \sim 0$.
- Consider the functions

$$w = \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{Z(u)}, \qquad v = w\psi,$$

where $Z(u_\varepsilon) = u_\varepsilon^{1-\beta} + u_\varepsilon + \delta$, with $\delta > 0$, in order to have $Z > 0$. In the end of the proof, we let $\delta \to 0$.
- We also use the fact that a nontrivial solution u_ε of (3) belongs to C^3 on a neighborhood of every point where it is positive

Next result shows that u_ε converges in C^1_{loc} to some u which is in $C^{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}}_{loc}$.

Next result shows that u_ε converges in C^1_{loc} to some u which is in $C^{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}}_{loc}$.

Lemma 4

For any $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ there exists C such that

$$|\nabla u_\varepsilon(x) - \nabla u_\varepsilon(y)| \leq C|x-y|^{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}} \quad \forall x, y \in \Omega'.$$

The constant C depends only on Ω, N, β, p, $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, but not on ε.

Considering u, a weak limit of solutions u_ε of (3),

Lemma 5

$\frac{1}{u^\beta}\chi_{\Omega_+} \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$, *where* $\Omega_+ = \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > 0\}$.

Considering u, a weak limit of solutions u_ε of (3),

Lemma 5

$\frac{1}{u^\beta}\chi_{\Omega_+} \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$, *where* $\Omega_+ = \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > 0\}$.

- The proof is done by choosing appropriate test functions for the perturbed problem.

Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $0 \le \eta \le 1$, $\eta(s) = 0$ for $s \le 1/2$, $\eta(s) = 1$ for $s \ge 1$.

Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $0 \le \eta \le 1$, $\eta(s) = 0$ for $s \le 1/2$, $\eta(s) = 1$ for $s \ge 1$.
Given $\varphi \in C^1_c(\Omega)$,

Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\eta(s) = 0$ for $s \leq 1/2$, $\eta(s) = 1$ for $s \geq 1$.
Given $\varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$, for $m > 0$, we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) = \int_{\hat{\Omega}} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m), \qquad (5)$$

Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\eta(s) = 0$ for $s \leq 1/2$, $\eta(s) = 1$ for $s \geq 1$.
Given $\varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$, for $m > 0$, we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) = \int_{\hat{\Omega}} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m), \qquad (5)$$

where $\hat{\Omega}$ is an open set such that $\overline{\hat{\Omega}} \subset \Omega$ and support$(\varphi) \subset \hat{\Omega}$.

Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\eta(s) = 0$ for $s \leq 1/2$, $\eta(s) = 1$ for $s \geq 1$.
Given $\varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$, for $m > 0$, we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) = \int_{\hat{\Omega}} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m), \qquad (5)$$

where $\hat{\Omega}$ is an open set such that $\overline{\hat{\Omega}} \subset \Omega$ and support$(\varphi) \subset \hat{\Omega}$.
Set $\Omega_0 = \Omega_+ \cap \hat{\Omega}$.

Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $0 \le \eta \le 1$, $\eta(s) = 0$ for $s \le 1/2$, $\eta(s) = 1$ for $s \ge 1$.
Given $\varphi \in C^1_c(\Omega)$, for $m > 0$, we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) = \int_{\hat{\Omega}} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m), \qquad (5)$$

where $\hat{\Omega}$ is an open set such that $\overline{\hat{\Omega}} \subset \Omega$ and support$(\varphi) \subset \hat{\Omega}$.
Set $\Omega_0 = \Omega_+ \cap \hat{\Omega}$.
Since $u_\varepsilon \longrightarrow u$ in $C^1_{loc}(\Omega)$,

Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $0 \le \eta \le 1$, $\eta(s) = 0$ for $s \le 1/2$, $\eta(s) = 1$ for $s \ge 1$.
Given $\varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$, for $m > 0$, we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) = \int_{\hat{\Omega}} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m), \qquad (5)$$

where $\hat{\Omega}$ is an open set such that $\overline{\hat{\Omega}} \subset \Omega$ and support$(\varphi) \subset \hat{\Omega}$.
Set $\Omega_0 = \Omega_+ \cap \hat{\Omega}$.
Since $u_\varepsilon \longrightarrow u$ in $C^1_{loc}(\Omega)$, for every given $m > 0$, there is an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$u_\varepsilon(x) \le m/2, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_+ \text{ and } 0 < \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0. \qquad (6)$$

Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $0 \le \eta \le 1$, $\eta(s) = 0$ for $s \le 1/2$, $\eta(s) = 1$ for $s \ge 1$.
Given $\varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$, for $m > 0$, we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) = \int_{\hat{\Omega}} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m), \tag{5}$$

where $\hat{\Omega}$ is an open set such that $\overline{\hat{\Omega}} \subset \Omega$ and support$(\varphi) \subset \hat{\Omega}$.
Set $\Omega_0 = \Omega_+ \cap \hat{\Omega}$.
Since $u_\varepsilon \longrightarrow u$ in $C^1_{loc}(\Omega)$, for every given $m > 0$, there is an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$u_\varepsilon(x) \le m/2, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_+ \text{ and } 0 < \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0. \tag{6}$$

Taking $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$,

Taking $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, We split the previous integral as

$$A_\varepsilon := \int_{\Omega_0} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)$$

and

$$B_\varepsilon := \int_{\hat{\Omega}\setminus\Omega_0} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m).$$

Taking $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, We split the previous integral as

$$A_\varepsilon := \int_{\Omega_0} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)$$

and

$$B_\varepsilon := \int_{\hat{\Omega}\setminus\Omega_0} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m).$$

Clearly, $B_\varepsilon = 0$ by (6) and the definition of η.

Taking $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, We split the previous integral as

$$A_\varepsilon := \int_{\Omega_0} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)$$

and

$$B_\varepsilon := \int_{\hat{\Omega}\setminus\Omega_0} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m).$$

Clearly, $B_\varepsilon = 0$ by (6) and the definition of η. Moreover,

$$A_\varepsilon \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi\eta(u/m) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

Taking $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, We split the previous integral as

$$A_\varepsilon := \int_{\Omega_0} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)$$

and

$$B_\varepsilon := \int_{\hat{\Omega}\setminus\Omega_0} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m).$$

Clearly, $B_\varepsilon = 0$ by (6) and the definition of η. Moreover,

$$A_\varepsilon \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi\eta(u/m) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

If $u \le m/4$, for a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $u_\varepsilon \le m/2$. The integral A_ε restricted to this set is zero.

Taking $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, We split the previous integral as

$$A_\varepsilon := \int_{\Omega_0} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)$$

and

$$B_\varepsilon := \int_{\hat{\Omega}\setminus\Omega_0} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m).$$

Clearly, $B_\varepsilon = 0$ by (6) and the definition of η. Moreover,

$$A_\varepsilon \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi\eta(u/m) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

If $u \leq m/4$, for a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $u_\varepsilon \leq m/2$. The integral A_ε restricted to this set is zero.
If $u > m/4$, we have $u_\varepsilon \geq m/8$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough.

Taking $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, We split the previous integral as

$$A_\varepsilon := \int_{\Omega_0} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)$$

and

$$B_\varepsilon := \int_{\hat{\Omega}\setminus\Omega_0} (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m).$$

Clearly, $B_\varepsilon = 0$ by (6) and the definition of η. Moreover,

$$A_\varepsilon \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi\eta(u/m) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

If $u \leq m/4$, for a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $u_\varepsilon \leq m/2$. The integral A_ε restricted to this set is zero.
If $u > m/4$, we have $u_\varepsilon \geq m/8$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. Then, we apply the Dominated Convergence Theorem.

Now we take a second limit as $m \to 0$ to conclude that

Now we take a second limit as $m \to 0$ to conclude that

$$A_\varepsilon \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0 \quad \text{(and then as } m \to 0\text{)}$$

Now we take a second limit as $m \to 0$ to conclude that

$$A_\varepsilon \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0 \quad \text{(and then as } m \to 0)$$

Note that $\eta(u/m) \leq 1$ and $-u^{-\beta} + u^p \in L^1(\Omega_0)$.

Now we take a second limit as $m \to 0$ to conclude that

$$A_\varepsilon \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0 \quad \text{(and then as } m \to 0\text{)}$$

Note that $\eta(u/m) \leq 1$ and $-u^{-\beta} + u^p \in L^1(\Omega_0)$.
Now,

Now we take a second limit as $m \to 0$ to conclude that

$$A_\varepsilon \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0 \quad \text{(and then as } m \to 0)$$

Note that $\eta(u/m) \leq 1$ and $-u^{-\beta} + u^p \in L^1(\Omega_0)$.
Now, considering the first integral in (5),

Now we take a second limit as $m \to 0$ to conclude that

$$A_\varepsilon \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0 \quad \text{(and then as } m \to 0)$$

Note that $\eta(u/m) \leq 1$ and $-u^{-\beta} + u^p \in L^1(\Omega_0)$.
Now, considering the first integral in (5), we set

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) := H_\varepsilon + J_\varepsilon.$$

Now we take a second limit as $m \to 0$ to conclude that

$$A_\varepsilon \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0 \quad \text{(and then as } m \to 0)$$

Note that $\eta(u/m) \leq 1$ and $-u^{-\beta} + u^p \in L^1(\Omega_0)$.
Now, considering the first integral in (5), we set

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) := H_\varepsilon + J_\varepsilon.$$

Clearly,

$$H_\varepsilon := \int_\Omega (\nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla\varphi)\eta(u_\varepsilon/m) \to \int_{\Omega_0} (\nabla u \nabla\varphi)\eta(u/m) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

and

Now we take a second limit as $m \to 0$ to conclude that

$$A_\varepsilon \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0 \quad \text{(and then as } m \to 0)$$

Note that $\eta(u/m) \leq 1$ and $-u^{-\beta} + u^p \in L^1(\Omega_0)$.
Now, considering the first integral in (5), we set

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi \eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) := H_\varepsilon + J_\varepsilon.$$

Clearly,

$$H_\varepsilon := \int_\Omega (\nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla \varphi)\eta(u_\varepsilon/m) \to \int_{\Omega_0} (\nabla u \nabla \varphi)\eta(u/m) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega_0} (\nabla u \nabla \varphi)\eta(u/m) \to \int_{\Omega_0} \nabla u \nabla \varphi \quad \text{as } m \to 0,$$

Now we take a second limit as $m \to 0$ to conclude that

$$A_\varepsilon \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0 \quad \text{(and then as } m \to 0)$$

Note that $\eta(u/m) \leq 1$ and $-u^{-\beta} + u^p \in L^1(\Omega_0)$.
Now, considering the first integral in (5), we set

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) := H_\varepsilon + J_\varepsilon.$$

Clearly,

$$H_\varepsilon := \int_\Omega (\nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla\varphi)\eta(u_\varepsilon/m) \to \int_{\Omega_0} (\nabla u \nabla\varphi)\eta(u/m) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega_0} (\nabla u \nabla\varphi)\eta(u/m) \to \int_{\Omega_0} \nabla u \nabla\varphi \quad \text{as } m \to 0,$$

by the Dominated Convergence Theorem.

We assert that

$$J_\varepsilon := \int_{\Omega_0} \frac{|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2}{m} \eta'(u_\varepsilon/m)\varphi \to 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0 \quad \text{(and then as } m \to 0\text{).}$$

We assert that

$$J_\varepsilon := \int_{\Omega_0} \frac{|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2}{m} \eta'(u_\varepsilon/m)\varphi \to 0 \quad \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0 \quad \text{(and then as } m \to 0).$$

By the estimate $|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \leq M(u_\varepsilon^{1-\beta} + u_\varepsilon)$ in Ω_0 (provided by Lemma 3), we obtain

$$|J_\varepsilon| \leq M \int_{\Omega_0 \cap \{\frac{m}{2} \leq u_\varepsilon \leq m\}} \frac{(u_\varepsilon^{1-\beta} + u_\varepsilon)}{m} \eta'(u_\varepsilon/m)\varphi \to$$

$$\to M \int_{\Omega_0 \cap \{\frac{m}{2} \leq u \leq m\}} \frac{(u^{1-\beta} + u)}{m} \eta'(u/m)\varphi \quad \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0,$$

but this last integral goes to 0 as $m \to 0$.

We have shown that,

We have shown that, as $\varepsilon \longrightarrow 0$ and $m \longrightarrow 0$,

We have shown that, as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $m \to 0$,

$$\int_{\Omega} (-g_{\varepsilon}(u_{\varepsilon}) + \lambda u_{\varepsilon}^{p})\varphi\eta(u_{\varepsilon}/m) \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^{p})\varphi$$

and

We have shown that, as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $m \to 0$,

$$\int_\Omega (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m) \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi$$

and

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) \to \int_\Omega \nabla u \nabla\varphi$$

We have shown that, as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $m \to 0$,

$$\int_\Omega (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m) \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi$$

and

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) \to \int_\Omega \nabla u \nabla\varphi$$

Combining these facts with (5), we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u \nabla \varphi = \int_{\{u>0\}} \big(-\frac{1}{u^\beta} + \lambda u^p\big)\varphi$$

for every $\varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$.

We have shown that, as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $m \to 0$,

$$\int_\Omega (-g_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + \lambda u_\varepsilon^p)\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m) \to \int_{\Omega_0} (-u^{-\beta} + \lambda u^p)\varphi$$

and

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_\varepsilon \nabla(\varphi\eta(u_\varepsilon/m)) \to \int_\Omega \nabla u \nabla\varphi$$

Combining these facts with (5), we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u \nabla \varphi = \int_{\{u>0\}} \Big(-\frac{1}{u^\beta} + \lambda u^p\Big)\varphi$$

for every $\varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$.
This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.

The existence of a positive solution

The existence of a positive solution

Our second result reads as follows.

The existence of a positive solution

Our second result reads as follows.

Theorem 2

Problem (1) *has a positive solution for* $\lambda > 0$ *large.*

Our second result reads as follows.

Theorem 2

Problem (1) *has a positive solution for* $\lambda > 0$ *large.*

- We are unable to prove that one of the solutions of Theorem 1 is positive.

The existence of a positive solution

Our second result reads as follows.

Theorem 2

Problem (1) *has a positive solution for* $\lambda > 0$ *large.*

- We are unable to prove that one of the solutions of Theorem 1 is positive. We believe that one of them is positive and the other one vanishes somewhere in Ω.

Our second result reads as follows.

Theorem 2

Problem (1) *has a positive solution for* $\lambda > 0$ *large.*

- We are unable to prove that one of the solutions of Theorem 1 is positive. We believe that one of them is positive and the other one vanishes somewhere in Ω. This would be in agreement with the result for the radial problem proved by Ouyang - Shi - Yao.

- Theorem 2 is related to a result by Dávila:

- Theorem 2 is related to a result by Dávila: for λ grater than a precise constant, the maximal solution u_λ is a strict local minimizer I in the convex subset of $H_0^1(\Omega)$ of nonnegative functions in Ω.

Proof of Theorem 2

Proof of Theorem 2

Associated with problem (1) we have the functional $I : H_0^1(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$I(u) = \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2 - F(u^+),$$

where $f(u) = -\frac{1}{u^\beta} + \lambda u^p$ and $F(u) = \int_0^u f(s)ds$.

It is known (Dávila-Montenegro) that $\underline{u} = c\varphi_1^{\frac{2}{1+\beta}}$ is a subsolution (if λ is large) for the problem (1), which in our new notation is

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f(u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Take a sequence of smooth domains

$$\emptyset \neq \Omega_1 \subset\subset \Omega_2 ... \subset\subset \Omega$$

such that $\Omega = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Omega_k$.
Define the truncated function

$$\hat{f}(u) = \begin{cases} f(\underline{u}(x)) \text{ for} & s \leq \underline{u}(x) \\ f(s) \text{ for} & s \geq \underline{u}(x) \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

Consider the truncated problems on each domain Ω_k,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_k = \hat{f}(u_k) & \text{in } \Omega_k \\ u_k = \underline{u}(x) & \text{on } \partial\Omega_k. \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

In order to find a solution to (9) we consider the translated problem for $v_k = u_k - \underline{u}$ with homogeneous boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v_k = \hat{f}(v_k + \underline{u}) - \Delta \underline{u} & \text{in } \Omega_k \\ v_k = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_k. \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

Define the functional $\tilde{I}_k : H_0^1(\Omega_k) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{I}_k(v) = \int_{\Omega_k} \frac{1}{2}|\nabla v|^2 - \tilde{F}(v) + \nabla \underline{u} \nabla v,$$

here

$$\tilde{F}(v) = \int_0^v \hat{f}(t^+ + \underline{u})dt.$$

Notice that

$$\tilde{F}(v) = \begin{cases} f(\underline{u}(x))v \text{ for } & v \leq 0 \\ \hat{F}(v + \underline{u}) - \hat{F}(\underline{u}) \text{ for } & v > 0 \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

where $\hat{F}(s) = \int_0^s \hat{f}(t)dt$.

- $\tilde{I}_k$ is coercive and satisfies the Palais-Smale condition.

- $\tilde{I}_k$ is coercive and satisfies the Palais-Smale condition.
- There is $v_k \in H_0^1(\Omega_k)$ such that

$$\tilde{I}_k(v_k) = \inf_{v \in H_0^1(\Omega_k)} \tilde{I}_k(v).$$

- $\tilde{I}_k$ is coercive and satisfies the Palais-Smale condition.
- There is $v_k \in H_0^1(\Omega_k)$ such that

$$\tilde{I}_k(v_k) = \inf_{v \in H_0^1(\Omega_k)} \tilde{I}_k(v).$$

- $u_k = v_k + \underline{u}$ is a solution of (9).
- $v_k \geq 0$ on Ω_k (by the maximum principle since $\underline{u}$ is a subsolution).
- Given k_0, $\|v_k\|_{H_0^1(\Omega_{k_0})}$ is bounded for every $k \geq k_0$.

Taking a subsequence, we obtain

- $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$,
- $u_k \to u$ in L^σ for $1 \leq \sigma < 2N/(N-2)$,
- $u_k \to u$ a.e in Ω.
- Hence $\underline{u} \leq u$ in Ω.

Let φ be a test function in $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. There is a $k' > 0$ and a bounded domain Ω' such that *support*$(\varphi) \subset\subset \Omega' \subset\subset \Omega_k$ for every $k \geq k'$. Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega'} \nabla u_k \nabla \varphi = \int_{\Omega'} f(u_k)\varphi \quad \text{for every } k \geq k'.$$

Letting $k \to \infty$ we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega'} \nabla u \nabla \varphi = \int_{\Omega'} f(u)\varphi.$$

This last integral also holds in Ω, so u is a weak solution.

Let φ be a test function in $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. There is a $k' > 0$ and a bounded domain Ω' such that *support*$(\varphi) \subset\subset \Omega' \subset\subset \Omega_k$ for every $k \geq k'$. Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega'} \nabla u_k \nabla \varphi = \int_{\Omega'} f(u_k)\varphi \quad \text{for every } k \geq k'.$$

Letting $k \to \infty$ we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega'} \nabla u \nabla \varphi = \int_{\Omega'} f(u)\varphi.$$

This last integral also holds in Ω, so u is a weak solution.