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Analisi matematica. - Multivalued non-positone problems. Nota di David Arcoya e Marco Calahorrano, presentata (*) dal Corrisp. A. Ambrosetti.

Abstract. - In this note, the existence of non-negative solutions for some multivalued non-positone elliptic problems is studied.
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#### Abstract

Rlassunto. - Problemi di tipo «non-positone» a multivalori. In questa nota si studia la esistenza di soluzioni non negative di certi problemi a multivalori ellittici non lineari.


## 0 . Introduction

In this paper, we will consider the boundary value problem,

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\Delta u=f(u) \text { in } \Omega, \quad u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{0.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Omega$ is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ and $f:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a $C^{1}$-function with $f(0)<0$ (non-positone).

Recently, Brown et al. [4] have proved a result of non-existence of non-negative radial solutions of ( 0.1 ), when $\Omega$ is a ball and $f$ is a superlinear and increasing function. In concrete, it is proved there that, if $f=\lambda g$ with $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, then there exists $\lambda_{0}>0$ such that ( 0.1 ) has no such solutions for all $\lambda \geqslant \lambda_{0}$. For existence of at least one positive solution for $\lambda$ sufficiently small, see [5].

Motivated by this result, we will study here the existence of non-negative solutions of the multivalued problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\Delta u(x) \in \bar{f}(u(x)) \text { a.e. } \Omega, \quad u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega, \quad u \geqslant 0 \text { in } \Omega \tag{0.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\bar{f}$ is the multivalued function defined by

$$
\bar{f}(u)= \begin{cases}{[f(0), 0],} & \text { if } t=0 ; \\ f(t), & \text { if } t>0\end{cases}
$$

In contrast with [4], we will prove the existence of i) one non-zero $C^{1}$-solution of (0.2) if $f$ is superlinear (with no further restrictions); ii) two non-zero and distinct solutions of ( 0.2 ) if $f$ is asymptotically linear (not at resonance) verifying some additional condition.

There have been some works on elliptic problems with discontinuous nonlinearities where a suitable direct variational approach is used ([1], [6] and [10]). However, here we find more convenient (at least, in the superlinear case) to work on the approximating problems

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\Delta u=f_{n}(u) \text { in } \Omega, \quad u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{0.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

(*) Nella seduta del 9 dicembre 1989.
where $f_{n}$ is a sequence of functions which «converges» in some sense to $f$ and $f_{n}(0)=0$. A convenient choice of $f_{n}$ permits us to prove the existence of solutions of ( 0.3 ), which are necessarily positive. A simple limiting procedure allows us to obtain solutions of (0.2).

## 1. The sub-linear case

Let $\Omega$ be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ with smooth boundary and $f:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a $C^{1}$-function with $f(0)<0$. To study the problem (0.2) we consider the existence of non-zero solutions of the boundary value problem,

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\Delta u(x) \in \hat{f}(u(x)) \text { a.e. } x \in \Omega, \quad u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega, \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\hat{f}$ is the multivalued function defined by:

$$
\hat{f}(t)= \begin{cases}0, & \text { if } t<0 \\ {[f(0), 0],} & \text { if } t=0 \\ f(t), & \text { if } t>0\end{cases}
$$

By a solution of (1.1) we mean a function $u \in C^{1}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^{2}\left(\Omega^{*}\right)$ with $\Omega^{*}=\{x \in \Omega / u(x) \neq$ $\neq 0\}$ and verifying (1.1). (Observe that $\Delta u(x)$ is well-defined in $\Omega^{*} \cup(\Omega-\bar{\Omega} *)$ ).

Notice that all solutions $u$ of (1.1) are non-negative by the maximum principle; so they are solutions of (0.2). However, in contrast with [2] (where the case $f(0) \geqslant 0$ is studied) we cannot deduce that $u>0$ in $\Omega$.

In this section we will assume:
$\left(f_{1}\right) f(0)<0$ and there exists $\theta>0$ such that $f(\theta)=0$, with $f$ increasing in $[0, \theta]$.
$\left(f_{2}\right) f(s) \leqslant \alpha s+\beta$, with $\beta \in \mathbb{R}, 0 \leqslant \alpha<\lambda_{1}$, where $\lambda_{1}$ denotes the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ on $\Omega$ with zero Dirichlet boundary conditions.

We will take a positive eigenfunction $\phi_{1}$ associated to $\lambda_{1}$ such that: $\left\|\phi_{1}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}=1$.
Let $\sigma=\left\|\phi_{1}\right\|_{\infty}\|\Omega\|^{1 / 2}$. (We denote $|\Omega| \equiv$ meas $\Omega$ ).
$\left(f_{3}\right)$ There exists $s_{0}, s_{1}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that
i) $\theta<s_{0}<s_{1} / \sigma, \gamma>\left[\lambda_{1} s_{1}^{2}-2 f(0) \theta \sigma^{2}\right]\left(s_{1}^{2}-s_{0}^{2} \sigma^{2}\right)^{-1} \equiv \gamma^{*}$;
ii) $f(s) \geqslant 0 \quad \forall s \in\left(\theta, s_{0}\right) \quad$ and $\quad f(s) \geqslant \gamma s \forall s \in\left(s_{0}, s_{1}\right)$.

Remarks 1.1. a) A sufficient condition to assumption $i)$ of $\left(f_{3}\right)$ is
$\left.i^{\prime}\right) \theta<s_{0}<\left(s_{1}^{2}-1\right)^{1 / 2} \sigma^{-1}, \gamma>\lambda_{1} s_{1}^{2}-2 f(0) \theta \sigma^{2}$.
b) Notice that $\gamma^{*}>\lambda_{1}$, hence the meaning of $\left(f_{3}\right)$ is, roughly, that $f(s) \gg \lambda_{1} s$ on a suitable interval $\left(s_{0}, s_{1}\right)$.

To study (1.1) we consider the sequence of problems:

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\Delta u=f_{n}(u) \text { in } \Omega, \quad u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f_{n}: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is of class $C^{1}$ and verifies $f_{n}(t)=f(t) \quad \forall t>1 / n, f_{n}(t)=0 \quad \forall t \leqslant 0$, $f_{n}(t) \geqslant f(t) \forall t \in(0,1 / n]$, for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

Changing $\beta$, if it is necessary, we can suppose the next uniform estimate for all $f_{n}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{n}(s) \leqslant \alpha s+\beta: \quad \forall s \geqslant 0 \text { and } 0<\beta \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proposition 1.2. Let us assume $\left(f_{1-3}\right)$. For all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ the problem (1.2) has at least two nontrivial classical solutions $u_{n} \neq v_{n}$ verifying:
i) $u_{n}(x), v_{n}(x)>0, \forall x \in \Omega$. ii) $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{\infty},\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{\infty}>\theta$.

Proof. Let $E:=H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$ be the usual Sobolev space, $\left(\right.$ with $\left.\|u\|_{E}^{2}=\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u(x)|^{2} d x\right)$.
We define the $C^{1}$-functionals $I_{n}: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by setting:

$$
I_{n}(u)=\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{2} d x-\int_{\Omega} F_{n}(u) d x, \quad \forall u \in E,
$$

where $F_{n}(t)=\int_{0}^{t} f_{n}(s) d s$.
It is well-known that the critical points of $I_{n}$ are classical solutions of (1.2) and that (1.3) implies that $I_{n}$ is coercive and verifies the Palais-Smale condition [3]. Because of this, $I_{n}$ attains its infimum on a function $u_{n}$. Moreover, since $f_{n}^{\prime}(0)=0, I_{n}$ has a local minimum at 0 .

On the other hand, let $\phi=s_{1} \phi_{1}\left(\left\|\phi_{1}\right\|_{\infty}\right)^{-1}$.
By $\left(f_{3}\right)$,

1) $\|\phi\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}>\theta|\Omega|^{1 / 2}$;
2) $\theta<s_{0}<\|\phi\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}|\Omega|^{-1 / 2} \quad$ and

$$
\gamma>\left[\lambda_{1} \int_{\Omega} \phi^{2}(x) d x-2 f(0) \theta|\Omega|\right]\left[\int_{\Omega} \phi^{2}(x) d x-s_{0}^{2}|\Omega|\right]^{-1}
$$

3) $f(s) \geqslant 0 \forall s \in\left(\theta,\|\phi\|_{\infty}\right) \quad$ and $\quad f(s) \geqslant \gamma s \forall s \in\left(s_{0},\|\phi\|_{\infty}\right)$.

By 3),

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{n}(s) \geqslant \int_{0}^{\theta} f(t) d t+\frac{\gamma}{2}\left(s^{2}-s_{0}^{2}\right), \quad \forall s \in\left(s_{0},\|\phi\|_{\infty}\right) \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\Omega^{\prime}=\left\{x \in \Omega / \phi(x) \geqslant s_{0}\right\}$. Notice that $\Omega^{\prime} \neq \emptyset$, otherwise, $\phi(x)<s_{0} \forall x \in \Omega$ implies $\|\phi\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}<s_{0}|\Omega|^{1 / 2}$, in contradiction with 1 ).

By (1.4), we have:

$$
\int_{\Omega^{\prime}} F_{n}(\phi(x)) d x \geqslant \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_{\Omega^{\prime}}\left(\phi^{2}(x)-s_{0}^{2}\right) d x+\left(\int_{0}^{\theta} f(t) d t\right)\left|\Omega^{\prime}\right|
$$

Moreover,

$$
\int_{\Omega-\Omega^{\prime}} F_{n}(\phi(x)) d x \geqslant \int_{\Omega-\Omega^{\prime}}\left(\int_{0}^{\theta} f(t) d t\right) d x \geqslant\left(\int_{0}^{\theta} f(t) d t\right)\left|\Omega-\Omega^{\prime}\right|
$$

Hence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I_{n}(\phi)=\frac{\lambda_{1}}{2} \int_{\Omega} \phi^{2}(x) d x-\int_{\Omega} F_{n}(\phi(x)) d x \leqslant \\
& \leqslant \frac{\lambda_{1}}{2} \int_{\Omega} \phi^{2}(x) d x-\frac{\gamma}{2} \int_{\Omega^{\prime}}\left(\phi^{2}(x)-s_{0}^{2}\right) d x-\left(\int_{0}^{\theta} f(t) d t\right)|\Omega| \leqslant \\
& \leqslant \frac{\lambda_{1}}{2} \int_{\Omega} \phi^{2}(x) d x-\frac{\gamma}{2} \int_{\Omega}\left(\phi^{2}(x)-s_{0}^{2}\right) d x-\left(\int_{0}^{\theta} f(t) d t\right)|\Omega| \equiv \delta_{0} .
\end{aligned}
$$

By 2), it follows that $I_{n}(\phi) \leqslant \delta_{0}<0$. So, all hypotheses of Mountain Pass Theorem [3], are verified and $I_{n}$ has another critical point $v_{n}$. In addition, there results

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{n}\left(u_{n}\right) \leqslant \delta_{0}<0<I_{n}\left(v_{n}\right) \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies that $u_{n} \neq v_{n}$, are non zero solutions of (1.2). Finally, simple applications of minimum and maximum principles imply i) and ii).

In order to obtain solutions of (1.1), we need the next lemma:
Lemma 1.3. Under the bypotheses $\left(f_{1-3}\right)$, the sequences $\left\{u_{n}\right\},\left\{v_{n}\right\}$ bave subsequences $\left\{u_{n_{k}}\right\},\left\{v_{n_{k}}\right\}$ such that $\left\{u_{n_{k}}\right\} \rightarrow u_{0},\left\{v_{n_{k}}\right\} \rightarrow v_{0}$ in $C^{1+\nu}(\bar{\Omega})$, with $0<\nu<1$.

Proof. By (1.3), we obtain an a priori estimate $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{E},\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{E} \leqslant \beta|\Omega|^{1 / 2}\left[\left(1-\alpha / \lambda_{1}\right) \lambda_{1}\right]^{-1}$; $\forall n \in \mathbf{N}$, and using usual bootstrap arguments we obtain converging subsequences of $\left\{u_{n}\right\},\left\{v_{n}\right\}$ in $C^{1+\nu}(\bar{\Omega})$

From now on, we denote $\left\{u_{n_{k}}\right\} \equiv\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ and $\left\{v_{n_{k}}\right\} \equiv\left\{v_{n}\right\}$.
Theorem 1.4. Let us assume ( $f_{1-3}$ ). There exist at least two distinct, non-negative and non-zero solutions of (1.1).

Proof. Let $u_{0}, v_{0}$ be given by Lemma 1.3. Clearly, $u_{0}, v_{0}$ are non-negative and nonzero by Proposition 1.2-ii) and Lemma 1.3.

Notice that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{n}(t)=F(t) \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$, where

$$
F(t)= \begin{cases}0, & \text { if } t<0 \\ \int_{0}^{t} f(s) d s, & \text { if } t \geqslant 0\end{cases}
$$

So, by Lemma 1.3 and the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem:
and

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega}\left|\nabla u_{n}(x)\right|^{2} d x=\int_{\Omega}\left|\nabla u_{0}(x)\right|^{2} d x
$$

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} F_{n}\left(u_{n}(x)\right) d x=\int_{\Omega} F\left(u_{0}(x)\right) d x
$$

Then $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{n}\left(u_{n}\right)=I\left(u_{0}\right)$, where

$$
I(u):=\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega}|\nabla u(x)|^{2} d x-\int_{\Omega} F(u(x)) d x .
$$

Similar arguments prove $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{n}\left(v_{n}\right)=I\left(v_{0}\right)$. Hence, by (1.5) $I\left(u_{0}\right) \leqslant \delta_{0}<0 \leqslant I\left(v_{0}\right)$ and $u_{0} \neq v_{0}$.

In order to prove that $u_{0}, v_{0}$ are solutions of (1.1), we observe that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)=f(x) \text { if } \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n}=x>0
$$

Then, if $\Omega^{*}=\left\{x \in \Omega / u_{0}(x) \neq 0\right\}$,

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{n}\left(u_{n}(x)\right)=f\left(u_{0}(x)\right) \quad \forall x \in \Omega^{*} .
$$

So that, for all $u \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\Omega^{*}\right)$, the equalities

$$
\int_{\Omega^{*}} \nabla u_{n}(x) \nabla u(x) d x+\int_{\Omega^{*}} f_{n}\left(u_{n}(x)\right) u(x) d x=0
$$

and Lemma 1.3 imply

$$
\int_{\Omega^{*}} \nabla u_{0}(x) \nabla u(x) d x+\int_{\Omega^{*}} f\left(u_{0}(x)\right) u(x) d x=0 .
$$

In particular, $u_{0} \in C^{2}\left(\Omega^{*}\right)$ and $-\Delta u_{0}(x)=f(u(x))$, in $\Omega^{*}$.
Finally, by a Morrey-Stampacchia theorem (see [9, Theorem 3.2.2, p. 69]), we have also $-\Delta u_{0}(x)=0$ a.e. $\Omega-\overline{\Omega^{*}}$, and so $u_{0}$ is a solution of (1.1).

The same ideas show $v_{0}$ is another solution of (1.1).
Remark 1.5. Observe that our technique can be combined with some symmetry properties of the domain. More precisely, if $\Omega$ is symmetric in the sense of Steiner [8] (i.e. $\Omega$ is simmetric with respect to a plane, for instance $x_{1}=0$, and convex in the variable $x_{1}$ ), we deduce [7] that $u_{n}, v_{n}$ are symmetric (in the sense of Steiner). Hence, their limits $u_{0}, v_{0}$ (which are solutions of (1.1) as it has been proved) are symmetric also.

## 2. The superlinear case

Our method for study (1.1) can be useful to prove existence of solutions for other hypotheses on $f$. For instance, the superlinear case. We assume:
$\left(f_{4}\right)$ There exist $a_{1}, a_{2} \geqslant 0$ such that

$$
|f(s)| \leqslant \begin{cases}a_{1}+a_{2}|s|^{\mu}, & \text { if } N>2 \\ a_{1} \exp (\phi(s)), \quad \text { with } \quad \phi(s) s^{-2} \rightarrow 0(|s| \rightarrow \infty), & \text { if } N=2,\end{cases}
$$

where $0 \leqslant \mu<(N+2)(N-2)^{-1}$.
( $f_{5}$ ) There exist $\rho>2$ and $r \geqslant 0$ such that $0<\rho F(s) \leqslant s f(s) \forall s \geqslant r$.
Theorem 2.1. Let us assume $\left(f_{1}\right),\left(f_{4-5}\right)$. Then, the problem (1.1) bas at least one nonnegative and nonzero solution.

Proof. Let $f_{n}, F_{n}, F, I_{n}$ and $I$ be functions like in section 1 . Since by $\left(f_{4}\right)$ (see [3])

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow+\infty} I\left(t \phi_{1}\right)=-\infty,
$$

we deduce that there exists $t_{0}>0$ such that $I_{n}\left(t_{0} \phi_{1}\right) \leqslant I\left(t_{0} \phi_{1}\right)<0$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.
Moreover, $f_{n}$ satisfies $\left(f_{5}\right)$ and $f_{n}^{\prime}(0)=0$. Then $I_{n}$ verifies all hypotheses of the

Mountain Pass Theorem [3] with $\bar{e}=t_{0} \phi_{1}$ (independently of $n \in \mathbf{N}$ ). Consequently, it has a critical point $u_{n}$ such that

$$
0<I_{n}\left(u_{n}\right) \leqslant \max _{t \in[0,1]} I_{n}(t \bar{e}) \leqslant \max _{t \in[0,1]} I(t \bar{e}) \equiv M, \quad u_{n}>0 \quad \text { in } \Omega, \quad\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{\infty}>\theta
$$

for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.
In order to prove an a priori estimate of $u_{n}$, observe that

$$
M \geqslant I_{n}\left(u_{n}\right)=I_{n}\left(u_{n}\right)-\frac{1}{\rho} I_{n}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}=\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{\rho}\right)\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{E}^{2}+\int_{\Omega}\left[\frac{f_{n}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}}{\rho}-F_{n}\left(u_{n}\right)\right] d x .
$$

Since $f_{n} \geqslant f$ and $\left|F_{n}(u)-F(u)\right| \leqslant-f(0) u \forall u \geqslant 0$, we deduce

$$
M \geqslant\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{\rho}\right)\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{E}^{2}+\int_{\Omega}\left[\frac{f\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}}{\rho}-F\left(u_{n}\right)\right] d x+f(0) \int_{\Omega} u_{n} d x
$$

By $\left(f_{5}\right)$, it follows $M \geqslant(1 / 2-1 / \rho)\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{E}^{2}-k\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{E}-c$ where $k, c>0$, and hence $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is bounded in $E$.

Then a limiting procedure and similar arguments to those of Theorem 1.4 conclude the proof.

Remarks 2.2. a) Notice that from the results of [5] if, in addition to $\left(f_{1}\right),\left(f_{4-5}\right)$, we assume that $f$ is non-increasing, we can consider a «small» ball $B \subset \Omega$ and a positive solution $u$ of $-\Delta u=f(u)$ in $B, u=0$ on $\partial \Omega$.

Hence, the extension zero in $\Omega-B$ yields a weak solution $u$ of $-\Delta u \in \hat{f}(u)$ a.e. in $\Omega, u=0$ on $\partial \Omega$.

We remark that this procedure gives us solutions which may be not of class $C^{1}$ (see [5, Theorem 1.1]).
b) Observe also that in the case that $\Omega=B(r)$ is the ball of radius $r$ centered at $x=0$ and under the conditions of $a$ ), we know by [4] that there exists $r^{*}>0$ such that the problem $-\Delta u=f(u)$ in $B(r), u=0$ on $\partial B(r)$ has no radial nonnegative solutions for $r>r^{*}$.

On the other side, we have obtained, see Theorem 2.1 and Remark 1.5, the existence of one $C^{1}$-radial non-negative solution of the multivalued problem (1.1), for all $r>0$. This proves the existence of an $r_{0}$ and a positive radial solution $u$ of $-\Delta u=f(u)$ in $B\left(r_{0}\right), u=0$ on $\partial B\left(r_{0}\right)$ such that $u^{\prime}\left(r_{0}\right)=0$ (we denote $u(s)=$ $=u(|x|), x \in B(r))$. This kind of solutions differ from those of [5] where $u^{\prime}\left(r_{0}\right)<0$.
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