Liouville-Gelfand type problems for the N-Laplacian on bounded domains of $I\!R^N$

Elves A. de B. e Silva*
Departamento de Matemática, Universidade de Brasília, 70910-900 Brasília, DF, Brazil
Sérgio H. M. Soares**
Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Estadual Paulista, 15054-000 S.J. do Rio Preto, SP, Brazil

Abstract

In this article it is used minimax methods to study the existence and multiplicity of solutions for the N-Laplacian equation on bounded domains of $I\!R^N$, with Dirichlet boundary conditions, when the nonlinearity has exponential growth. The subcritical and critical case are considered.

1 Introduction

In this article, we study the existence and multiplicity of solutions for a solutions for the following quasilinear elliptic problem

$$(P)_\lambda \qquad \begin{cases} -\Delta_N u = -\mathrm{div}(|\nabla u|^{N-2}\nabla u) = \lambda f(x,u), \ \text{in } \Omega, \\ \quad u \geq 0, \ \text{in } \Omega, \\ \quad u = 0, \ \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a bounded smooth domain in $I\!R^N (N \geq 2)$ with boundary $\partial\Omega$, $\lambda > 0$ is a real parameter, and the nonlinearity $f(x,s)$ satisfies

(f_1) $f : \bar{\Omega} \times I\!R \to I\!R$ is a continuous function and $f(x,0) > 0$, for every $x \in \Omega$,

and the growth condition

$(f)_{\alpha_0}$ There exists $\alpha_0 \geq 0$ such that

* Research partially supported by CNPq under grant n^0 307014/89-4
** Research partially supported by PICD/CAPES

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{|f(x,s)|}{\exp(\alpha s^{N/N-1})} = \begin{cases} 0, \ \forall\ \alpha > \alpha_0, \ \text{unif. on } \bar{\Omega}, \\ +\infty, \ \forall\ \alpha < \alpha_0, \ \text{unif. on } \bar{\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

In the literature [1, 10, 11], $f(x,s)$ is said to have subcritical or critical growth when $\alpha_0 = 0$ or $\alpha_0 > 0$, respectively. We note that such notion is motivated by Trudinger-Moser estimates [17, 23] which provide

$$\exp(\alpha |u|^{N/N-1}) \in L^1(\Omega), \ \forall\ u \in W_0^{1,N}(\Omega), \ \forall\ \alpha > 0, \tag{1.1}$$

and

$$\sup_{||u||_{W_0^{1,N}} \leq 1} \int_\Omega \exp(\alpha |u|^{N/N-1})\, dx \leq C(N) \in I\!R, \ \forall\ \alpha \leq \alpha_N = N w_{N-1}^{\frac{1}{N-1}}, \tag{1.2}$$

where w_k is the volume of S^k. We also observe that a typical and relevant case to be considered for problem $(P)_\lambda$ is given by $f(x,s) = \exp(\alpha_0 s^{N/N-1})$.

In our first result, we establish the existence of a solution for $(P)_\lambda$ when $\lambda > 0$ is sufficiently small,

Theorem 1.1 *Suppose $f(x,s)$ satisfies (f_1) and $(f)_{\alpha_0}$. Then, there exists $\overline{\lambda} > 0$ such that problem $(P)_\lambda$ possesses at least one solution for every $\lambda \in (0, \overline{\lambda})$.*

To obtain the existence of a second solution for problem $(P)_\lambda$ in the subcritical case, we assume that $f(x,s)$ satisfies

(f_2) There are constants $\theta > N$ and $R > 0$ such that

$$0 < \theta F(x,s) \leq s f(x,s), \ \forall\ x \in \bar{\Omega}, \ s \geq R.$$

Theorem 1.2 *(Second solution: Subcritical case) Suppose $f(x,s)$ satisfies (f_1), (f_2) and $(f)_{\alpha_0}$, with $\alpha_0 = 0$. Then, there exists $\overline{\lambda} > 0$ such that problem $(P)_\lambda$ possesses at least two solutions for every $\lambda \in (0, \overline{\lambda})$.*

Note that (f_2) is the version of the famous Ambrosetti-Rabinowitz condition [3] for the N-Laplacian. It implies, in particular, that $f(x,s)/s^N \to \infty$, as $s \to \infty$, uniformly on $\bar{\Omega}$.

In our next result, we provide the existence of two solutions for $(P)_\lambda$ when $f(x,s)$ has critical growth. In that case, we shall need to suppose a stronger version of condition (f_2),

$(\hat{f}_2)$ For every $\theta > N$, there exists $R(\theta) > 0$ such that

$$0 < \theta F(x,s) \leq s f(x,s), \forall\ x \in \bar{\Omega}, \ s \geq R(\theta).$$

Assuming the following further restriction on the growth of $f(x,s)$,

(f_3) There exists an open set $\hat{\Omega} \subset \Omega$ such that

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \inf_{x\in\hat{\Omega}} \frac{f(x,s)}{\exp(\alpha_0 s^{N/N-1})} = \infty,$$

we obtain

Theorem 1.3 *(Second solution: Critical case) Suppose $f(x,s)$ satisfies (f_1), $(\hat{f}_2)$, (f_3) and $(f)_{\alpha_0}$, with $\alpha_0 > 0$. Then, there exists $\overline{\lambda} > 0$ such that problem $(P)_\lambda$ possesses at least two solutions for every $\lambda \in (0, \overline{\lambda})$.*

Exploiting the convexity of the primitive $F(x,s)$, in our final result we are able to consider a weaker version of (f_3), obtaining the same conclusion of Theorem 1.3. More specifically, we suppose

$(\hat{f}_3)$ There exist an open set $\hat{\Omega} \subset \Omega$

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \inf_{x\in\hat{\Omega}} \frac{f(x,s)s^\beta}{\exp(\alpha_0 s^{N/N-1})} = \infty,$$

where $\beta = \frac{1}{2(N-1)}$ if $N = 3$, and $\beta = \frac{1}{N-1}$ otherwise.

(f_4) $F(x,.)$ is convex on $[0,\infty)$ for every $x \in \hat{\Omega} \subset \Omega$, $\hat{\Omega}$ given by $(\hat{f}_3)$,

Theorem 1.4 *(Second solution: Convex Critical case) Suppose $f(x,s)$ satisfies (f_1), $(\hat{f}_2)$, $(\hat{f}_3)$, (f_4) and $(f)_{\alpha_0}$, with $\alpha_0 > 0$. Then, there exists $\overline{\lambda} > 0$ such that problem $(P)_\lambda$ possesses at least two solutions for every $\lambda \in (0, \overline{\lambda})$.*

We observe that Theorem 1.4 establishes the existence of two solutions of $(P)_\lambda$ for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small when $f(x,s) = \exp(\alpha_0 s^{N/N-1})$.

As it is well known, the classical Liouville-Gelfand problem is given by

$$(LG)_\lambda \qquad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda e^u, \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u > 0, \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in $I\!R^N (N \geq 1)$ with boundary $\partial\Omega$, and $\lambda > 0$ is a real parameter. First considered by Liouville [16], for the case $N = 1$, and afterwards by Bratu [4], for $N = 2$, and Gelfand [13], for $N \geq 1$, this problem has been extensively studied during the last three decades (See [7, 8, 12] and references therein). As observed in [12], problem $(LG)_\lambda$ is of great relevance since it appears in mathematical models associated with astrophysical phenomena and to problems in combustion reactions.

In [8], Crandall and Rabinowitz used bifurcation theory to establish the existence of one solution for problem $(LG)_\lambda$, for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small, and a nonlinearity $f(x,s)$ replacing e^s. In [8] no growth restriction on $f(x,s)$ is assumed. To obtain such result, those authors assume $f(x,s) \in C^3(\Omega \times I\!R, I\!R)$, $f_s(x,0) > 0$ and $f_{ss}(x,s) > 0$, for every $x \in \Omega$ and $s > 0$ Supposing that $f(x,s)$ has a subcritical growth, they show that this solution is a local minimum for the associated functional. Then, using critical point theory, they are able to prove the existence of a second solution. We note that Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 improve the last mentioned result of [8] when $N = 2$ since they allow $f(x,s)$ to have critical growth. In particular, we may consider $f(x,s) = e^{s^2}$.

In [12], Garcia Azorero and Peral Alonso proved the existence of solutions for $(LG)_\lambda$, with $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small, when the Laplacian is replaced by a p-Laplacian operator. The nonexistence of solutions for $(LG)_\lambda$ for this more general class of operators, when $\lambda > 0$ is sufficiently large, was also established in [12]. We should also mention the article by Clément, Figueiredo and Mitidieri [7], where the exact number of solutions for an operator more general that the p-Laplacian is established when Ω is an open ball of $I\!R^N$. In [7], it is not assumed any growth restriction on $f(x,s)$.

We note that the solutions mentioned in Theorems 1.1–1.4 are weak solutions of $(P)_\lambda$ (See [19]). We also observe that in this article, we use minimax methods to derive such solutions.

To prove Theorem 1.1, we first provide an abstract result that establishes the existence of a critical point for a functional of class C^1 defined on a real Banach space assuming a version of the famous Palais-Smale condition for the weak topology (See Definitions and Proposition 2.2 in Section 2). Motivated by the argument used in [18], we prove that the associated functional satisfies such condition under hypotheses (f_1) and $(f)_{\alpha_0}$. Taking $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small, we are able to apply the mentioned abstract result. In our proof of Theorem 1.2, we use condition (f_2) to verify that the associated functional satisfies the Palais-Smale condition. As in [8], this provides the existence of a second solution for $(P)_\lambda$ via the Mountain Pass Theorem [3].

In the proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4, we argue by contradiction, assuming that Theorem 1.1 provides the only possible solution of $(P)_\lambda$. This assumption and condition $(\hat{f}_2)$ allow us to use the argument of Brezis and Nirenberg [6] and a result of Lions [15] to verify that the associated functional satisfies the Palais-Smale condition on a given interval of the real line.We use conditions (f_3) and $(\hat{f}_3)$, respectively, to establish that the level associated with the Mountain Pass Theorem belongs to this interval. As in the proof of Theorem 1.2, that implies the existence of a second solution.

Finally, we should mention that the existence of a nonzero solution for $(P)_\lambda$ when $f(x,0) \equiv 0$ has been intensively studied in recent years (See [1, 2, 10, 11] and references therein) . As it is shown in [1] (See also [10]), when $f(x,s) \geq 0$, for $s \geq 0$, a weaker version of (f_3) may be considered. We also observe that our method may be used to improve such results since in those articles a stronger version of $(\hat{f}_2)$ is assumed. Condition (f_3) can also be used in that setting to study the case where $f(x,s)$ may assume negative values.

The article is organized in the following way: In Section 2, we introduce the notion of Palais-Smale condition for the weak topology and establish two abstract results which are used to prove our results. There, we also recall the variational framework associated with $(P)_\lambda$ and state a version of Trudinger-Moser inequality (1.2) for $W^{1,N}(\Omega)$ when Ω is an open ball in $I\!R^N$. In section 2, we also state a result by Lions [15] that will be used, via contradiction, to verify $(PS)_c$, for c below a given level, when condition $(f)_{\alpha_0}$ holds with $\alpha_0 > 0$. In Section 3, we prove the weak version of Palais-Smale condition for the associated functional. In Section 4, we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. In Section 5 we establish the estimates that are used to prove Theorem 1.3. In Section 6, we prove Theorem 1.3. In Section 7, we establish the estimates for the associated functional when conditions $(\hat{f}_3)$ and (f_4) are assumed. There, we also present the proof of Theorem 1.4. In Appendix A, we prove the Trundinger-Moser inequality mentioned in Section 2. Finally, in Appendix B, we prove an inequality for vector fields on $I\!R^N$, used in Section 7 to establish the necessary estimates.

2 Preliminaries

Given E a real Banach space and Φ a functional of class C^1 on E, we recall that Φ satisfies Palais-Smale condition at level $c \in I\!R$ [Denoted $(PS)_c$] on an open set $\mathcal{O} \subset E$ if every sequence $(u_n) \subset \mathcal{O}$ for which (i) $\Phi(u_n) \to c$ and (ii) $\Phi'(u_n) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, possesses a converging subsequence. We also observe that Φ satisfies $(PS)_c$ if it satisfies $(\mathrm{PS})_c$ on E, and we say that Φ satisfies (PS) when it satisfies $(PS)_c$ for every $c \in I\!R$. Finally, we note that every sequence $(u_n) \subset E$ satisfying (i) and (ii) is called a Palais-Smale [(PS)] sequence.

To establish the existence of a critical point when the functional is bounded from below on a closed convex subsets of E, we introduce a version of the Palais-Smale condition for the weak topology.

Definition 2.1 *Given $c \in I\!R$, we say that $\Phi \in C^1(E, I\!R)$ satisfies the $(wPS)_c$ on $A \subset E$ if every sequence $(u_n) \subset A$ for which $\Phi(u_n) \to c$ and $\Phi'(u_n) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, possesses a subsequence converging weakly to a critical point of Φ. We say that Φ satisfies (wPS) on A if Φ satisfies $(wPS)_c$ on A, for every $c \in I\!R$. When Φ satisfies (wPS) on E, we simply say that Φ satisfies (wPS).*

Assuming

(Φ_1) There exist a closed bounded set $A \subset E$, constants $\gamma \leq b \in I\!R$, and $u_0 \in \overset{\circ}{A}$ such that

(i) $\Phi(u) \geq \gamma, \ \forall \ u \in A$,
(ii) $\Phi(u) \geq b \geq \Phi(u_0), \ \forall \ u \in \partial A$,

we define

$$c_1 = \inf_{u \in A} \Phi(u). \tag{2.1}$$

The following abstract result provides a critical point for Φ under conditions (Φ_1) and (wPS).

Proposition 2.2 *Let E be a real Banach space. Suppose $\Phi \in C^1(E, I\!R)$ satisfies (Φ_1), with A a closed bounded convex subset of E. Then, Φ possesses a critical point $u \in A$ provided it satisfies $(wPS)_{c_1}$ on A.*

Proof: Arguing by contradiction, we suppose that Φ does not have a critical point $u \in A$. Under this assumption, we claim that Φ satisfies $(PS)_{c_1}$ on $\overset{\circ}{A}$. Effectively, given a sequence $(u_n) \subset \overset{\circ}{A}$ such that $\Phi(u_n) \to c_1$ and $\Phi'(u_n) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, by $(wPS)_{c_1}$, (u_n) possesses a subsequence converging weakly to a critical point u. Furthermore, $u \in A$ since A is a closed convex subset of E. This contradicts our assumption and proves the claim.

We note that $\gamma \leq c_1 \leq \Phi(u_0)$. If $c_1 = \Phi(u_0)$, the conclusion is immediate. Thus, we may assume $c_1 < \Phi(u_0) \leq b$. In this case, we take $0 < \bar{\varepsilon} < \Phi(u_0) - c_1$. Then, we argue as in Proposition 2.7 of [19], using a local version of the Deformation Lemma [21], to obtain a contradiction with the definition of c_1. Proposition 2.2 is proved. ■

Remark 2.3 *When Φ satisfies $(PS)_{c_1}$ on $\overset{\circ}{A}$, the second part of the proof of Proposition 2.2 shows that actually Φ possesses a local minimum $u \in \overset{\circ}{A}$ such that $\Phi(u) = c_1$.*

Taking $b \in I\!R$ and A, given by (Φ_1), we consider

(Φ_2) There exists $e \in E \setminus A$ such that

$$\Phi(e) \leq b \leq \Phi(u), \ \forall \ u \in \partial A,$$

and we define

$$c_2 = \inf_{g \in \Gamma} \max_{u \in g} \Phi(u) \geq b,$$

where

$$\Gamma = \{g \in C([0,1], E); \quad g(0) = u_0, \quad g(1) = e\}.$$

As a consequence of Proposition 2.2, Remark 2.3 and the argument employed in [21], we obtain the following version of the Mountain Pass Theorem [3].

Proposition 2.4 *Let E be a real Banach space. Suppose $\Phi \in C^1(E, I\!R)$ satisfies (Φ_1), with A closed and convex subset of E, and (Φ_2). Then, Φ possesses at least two critical points provided it satisfies $(PS)_c$, for every $c \leq c_2$.*

Proof: By Proposition 2.2 and Remark 2.3, Φ possesses a local minimum $u_1 \in \overset{\circ}{A}$ such that $\Phi(u_1) = c_1$. Furthermore, if Φ does not have any critical point on ∂A, we may invoke the local version of the Deformation Lemma [21] one more time to obtain a neighbourhood V of u_0 and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $u_0 \in V$, $e \notin V$ and

$$c_1 \leq \max\{\Phi(u_0), \Phi(e)\} < \inf_{u \in \partial A} \Phi(u) + \epsilon \ \leq \inf_{u \in \partial V} \Phi(u) \leq c_2.$$

Consequently, by the Mountain Pass Theorem [3], c_2 is a critical value of Φ. The proposition is proved. ∎

Observe that when $c_1 = c_2$, by the above proof, Φ must have a critical point $u \in \partial A$ such that $\Phi(u) = c_1$.

Now, we recall the variational framework associated with problem $(P)_\lambda$. Considering the Sobolev space $W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ endowed with the norm

$$\|u\| = \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^N \, dx \right)^{1/N}, \ \forall \, u \in W_0^{1,N}(\Omega),$$

the functional associated with $(P)_\lambda$ $I_\lambda : W_0^{1,N}(\Omega) \to I\!R$ is given by

$$I_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{N} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^N \, dx - \lambda \int_\Omega F(x,u) \, dx, \ \forall \, u \in W_0^{1,N}(\Omega), \tag{2.2}$$

where we assume $f(x,s) = f(x,0)$, for every $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, $s < 0$, and we take $F(x,s) = \int_0^s f(x,t) \, dt$, for $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, $s \in I\!R$. Under the hypothesis $(f)_{\alpha_0}$, the functional I_λ is well defined and belongs to $C^1(W_0^{1,N}(\Omega), I\!R)$ (See [1, 10]). Furthermore,

$$I'_\lambda(u)v = \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{N-2} \nabla u \nabla v \, dx - \lambda \int_\Omega f(x,u) v \, dx, \ \forall \, u, v \in W_0^{1,N}(\Omega).$$

Thus, every critical point of I_λ is a weak solution of $(P)_\lambda$.

We also remark that if $f(x,s)$ satisfies conditions (f_1) and $(f)_{\alpha_0}$, then, for every $\beta > \alpha_0$, there exists $C = C(\beta) > 0$ such that

$$\max\{|f(x,s)|, |F(x,s)|\} \leq C \exp(\beta |s|^{\frac{N}{N-1}}), \ \forall \, x \in \bar{\Omega}, \ s \geq 0. \tag{2.3}$$

As a direct consequence of (1.1) and (2.3), we obtain that $F(x,u(x)) \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $f(x,u(x)) \in L^q(\Omega)$, for every $q \geq 1$, whenever $u \in W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$.

The following lemma establishes a version of Trudinger-Moser inequality (1.2) for $W^{1,N}(\Omega)$ when Ω is an open ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

Lemma 2.5 *Let $B(x_0,R)$ be an open ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with radius $R>0$ and center $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Then, there exist constants $\hat{\alpha} = \hat{\alpha}(N) > 0$ and $C(N,R) > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{B(x_0,R)} \exp(\hat{\alpha}|u|^{N/N-1})\, dx \leq C(N,R),$$

for every $u \in W^{1,N}(B(x_0,R))$ such that $\|u\|_{W^{1,N}(B(x_0,R))} \leq 1$.

Proof: For the sake of completeness, we present the proof of Lemma 2.5 in Appendix A.■

Finally, we state a theorem due to Lions [15] which will be essential to verify, via contradiction, that the functional I_λ satisfies $(PS)_c$, for c below a given level, when $f(x,s)$ satisfies the critical growth condition.

Theorem 2.6 *Let $\{u_n \in W_0^{1,N}(\Omega) \mid \|u_n\| = 1\}$ be a sequence in $W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ converging weakly to a nonzero function u. Then, for every $0 < p < (1 - \|u\|^N)^{\frac{-1}{N-1}}$, we have*

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \int_\Omega \exp\left(p\alpha_N |u_n|^{\frac{N}{N-1}}\right) dx < \infty.$$

3 (wPS) condition

In this section, we shall prove a technical result that will be used to establish (wPS) condition for the functional $I_\lambda(u)$, defined by (2.2), when the nonlinearity $f(x,s)$ satisfies the critical growth condition,

(f_5) There exist $\alpha, C > 0$ such that

$$|f(x,s)| \leq C \exp\left(\alpha |s|^{\frac{N}{N-1}}\right), \ \forall\, x \in \bar{\Omega}, \ s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Our objective is to verify that any bounded sequence $(u_n) \subset W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ such that $I'_\lambda(u_n) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, possesses a subsequence converging weakly to a solution of $(P)_\lambda$. Such result provides (wPS) condition for the functional I_λ.

Considering that next result is independent of the parameter $\lambda > 0$, we denote by (P) and I the problem $(P)_\lambda$ and the functional I_λ, respectively.

The proof of the following proposition is based on the argument used in [18] for the Neumann problem (See also [10]).

Proposition 3.1 *Let Ω be a bounded smooth domain in $I\!R^N$. Suppose $f(x,s) \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times I\!R, I\!R)$ satisfies (f_5). Then, any bounded sequence $(u_n) \subset W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ such that $I'(u_n) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, possesses a subsequence converging weakly to a solution of (P).*

Remark 3.2 *(i) Note that Proposition 3.1 generalizes to the N-Laplacian a well known fact for the Laplacian operator on $\Omega \subset I\!R^N$, $N > 2$, when the nonlinearity $f(x,s)$ satisfies the polynomial critical growth condition. (ii) We also observe that in Proposition 3.1 it is not assumed that (u_n) is a Palais-Smale sequence since $I(u_n)$ may be unbounded. (iii) Finally, we note that in [22], we prove a similar result for the p-Laplacian on $\Omega = I\!R^N$.*

The proof of Proposition 3.1 will be carried out in a series of steps. First, by the Sobolev Embedding Theorem, Banach-Alaoglu Theorem and the characterization of $C(\bar{\Omega})^*$, given by the Riesz Representation Theorem [20], we may suppose that there exist $u \in W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\bar{\Omega})$, the space of regular Borel measure on $\bar{\Omega}$, such that

$$\begin{cases} u_n \rightharpoonup u, \ \text{weakly in } W_0^{1,N}(\Omega), \\ |\nabla u_n|^N \rightharpoonup \mu, \ \text{weakly}* \text{ in } \mathcal{M}(\bar{\Omega}), \\ u_n \to u, \ \text{strongly in } L^p(\Omega), \ 1 \le p < \infty, \\ u_n(x) \to u(x), \ \text{a. e. in } \Omega, \\ |u_n(x)| \le h_p(x), \ \text{a. e. in } \Omega, \ \text{where } h_p \in L^p(\Omega), \ 1 \le p < \infty. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

Now, we fix $0 < \sigma < \infty$ such that $\alpha \sigma^{\frac{N}{N-1}} < \hat{\alpha}$, with $\hat{\alpha}$ given by Lemma 2.5. Setting $\Omega_\sigma = \{x \in \Omega \mid \mu(x) \ge \sigma\}$, we have that Ω_σ is a finite set since μ is a bounded nonnegative measure on $\bar{\Omega}$. Furthermore,

Lemma 3.3 *Let $K \subset (\Omega \setminus \Omega_\sigma)$ be a compact set. Then, there exist $q > 1$ and $M = M(K) > 0$ such that*

$$\int_K |f(x, u_n(x))|^q \, dx \le M, \ \forall \ n \in I\!N.$$

<u>Proof:</u> To prove such result, we take $q > 1$ such that $\alpha q \sigma^{\frac{N}{N-1}} < \hat{\alpha}$ and consider $r_1 = \text{dist}(K, \partial\Omega \cup \Omega_\sigma) > 0$, the distance between K and $\partial\Omega \cup \Omega_\sigma$. For every $x \in K$, there exists $0 < r_x < r_1$ such that

$$\mu(B(x, 2r_x)) + \|u\|^N_{L^N(B(x,2r_x))} < \sigma^N. \tag{3.2}$$

Using the compactness of K, we find $j \in I\!N$ so that

$$K \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{j} B(x_i, r_{x_i}) \equiv \bigcup_{i=1}^{j} B_i. \tag{3.3}$$

Applying (3.1) and (3.2), we find $n_0 \in I\!N$ such that

$$\|u_n\|^N_{W^{1,N}(B_i)} \le \sigma^N, \ \forall\, n \ge n_0, \ 1 \le i \le j.$$

Consequently, from Lemma 2.5, (f_5), (3.3) and our choice of q, there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\int_K |f(x, u_n(x))|^q dx \le \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{B_i} \exp\left(\hat{\alpha}\left(\frac{|u_n(x)|}{\|u_n\|_{W^{1,N}(B_i)}}\right)^{\frac{N}{N-1}}\right) dx \le M,$$

for every $n \ge n_0$. This proves the lemma. ∎

Lemma 3.4 *Let $K \subset (\Omega \setminus \Omega_\sigma)$ be a compact set. Then, $\nabla u_n \to \nabla u$, strongly in $(L^N(K))^N$, as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof: Taking $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_\sigma)$ such that $\psi \equiv 1$, on K, and $0 \le \psi \le 1$, and considering that

$$(|a|^{N-2}a - |b|^{N-2}b) \cdot (a - b) \ge 2^{2-N}|a - b|^N, \ \forall\, a, b \in I\!R^N, \tag{3.4}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &2^{2-N}\|\nabla u_n - \nabla u\|^N_{L^N(K)} \le \\ &\le \int_\Omega \left[(|\nabla u_n|^{N-2}\nabla u_n - |\nabla u|^{N-2}\nabla u).(\nabla u_n - \nabla u)\right] \psi\, dx = \\ &= \int_\Omega \Big[|\nabla u_n|^N \psi - |\nabla u_n|^{N-2}(\nabla u_n.\nabla u)\psi - \\ &- |\nabla u|^{N-2}(\nabla u.\nabla(u_n - u))\psi\Big]\, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

As $I'(u_n) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, we have

$$\int_\Omega \left[|\nabla u_n|^{N-2}\left((\nabla u_n.\nabla u)\psi + (\nabla u_n.\nabla\psi)u\right) - \psi f(x, u_n)u\right] dx = o(1), \tag{3.6}$$

as $n \to \infty$. Moreover, since (ψu_n) is a bounded sequence in $W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$, we also have

$$\int_\Omega \left[|\nabla u_n|^N \psi + |\nabla u_n|^{N-2}(\nabla u_n.\nabla\psi)u_n - \psi f(x, u_n)u_n\right] dx = o(1), \tag{3.7}$$

as $n \to \infty$. Combining (3.5)-(3.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &2^{2-N}\|\nabla u_n - \nabla u\|^N_{L^N(K)} \le \\ &\le \int_\Omega \psi f(x, u_n)(u_n - u)\, dx + \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^{N-2}(u - u_n)(\nabla u_n.\nabla\psi)\, dx + \\ &+ \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{N-2}(\nabla u.\nabla(u - u_n))\psi\, dx + o(1), \ \text{as } n \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 3.3, for the compact set supp$\psi \subset (\Omega \backslash \Omega_\sigma)$, and using Hölder's inequality, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&2^{2-N}\|\nabla u_n - \nabla u\|^N_{L^N(K)} \leq \\
&\leq \|psi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} M^{\frac{1}{q}} \|u_n - u\|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-1}}(\Omega)} + \|\nabla\psi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\nabla u_n\|^{N-1}_{L^N(\Omega)} \|u - u_n\|_{L^N(\Omega)} + \\
&+ \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{N-2}\psi(\nabla u.\nabla(u - u_n))\, dx + o(1), \text{ as } n \to \infty.
\end{aligned}
$$

The hypothesis that $(u_n) \subset W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ is bounded and (3.1) show that $\nabla u_n \to \nabla u$, strongly in $(L^N(K))^N$, as desired. The lemma is proved. ∎

As a direct consequence of Lemma 3.4, we have

Corollary 3.5 *The sequence $(u_n) \subset W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ possesses a subsequence (u_{n_i}) satisfying $\nabla u_{n_i}(x) \to \nabla u(x)$, for almost every $x \in \Omega$.*

The following Lemma shows that $I'(u)$ restricted to $W_0^{1,N}(\Omega \setminus \Omega_\sigma)$ is the null operator.

Lemma 3.6

$$
(I'(u), \phi) = \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{N-2}(\nabla u.\nabla\phi)\, dx - \int_\Omega f(x,u)\phi\, dx = 0, \tag{3.8}
$$

for every $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_\sigma)$.

<u>**Proof:**</u> Given $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega \backslash \Omega_\sigma)$, by Hölder's inequality and the fact that $(u_n) \subset W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ is a bounded sequence, we have that $(|\nabla u_{n_i}|^{N-2}\nabla u_{n_i}.\nabla\phi)$ is a family of uniformly integrable functions in $L^1(\Omega)$. Thus, by Vitali's Theorem [20] and Corollary 3.5, we get

$$
\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{n_i}|^{N-2}(\nabla u_{n_i}.\nabla\phi)\, dx \to \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{N-2}(\nabla u.\nabla\phi)\, dx, \text{ as } i \to \infty. \tag{3.9}
$$

We also assert that

$$
\int_\Omega f(x, u_{n_i})\phi\, dx \to \int_\Omega f(x,u)\phi\, dx, \text{ as } i \to \infty, \tag{3.10}
$$

for every $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_\sigma)$. Effectively, by Lemma 3.3, there exist $q > 1$ and $M_1 > 0$ so that

$$
\int_{K_2} |f(x, u_n)|^q\, dx \leq M_1, \tag{3.11}
$$

where $K_2 = \text{supp}\phi$. Given $\epsilon > 0$, from (3.1) and Egoroff's Theorem, there exists $E \subset \Omega$ such that $|E| < \epsilon$ and $u_n(x) \to u(x)$, uniformly on $(\Omega \setminus E)$. Using Hölder's inequality, (3.11), and (f_5), we get $M_2 > 0$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\int_\Omega (f(x,u_n) - f(x,u))\phi\,dx| \le \\
&\le \int_{\Omega\setminus E} |f(x,u_n) - f(x,u)||\phi|\,dx + M_2 \epsilon^{\frac{q-1}{q}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

As $\epsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small and $f(x, u_n(x)) \to f(x, u(x))$, uniformly on $\Omega \setminus E$, we derive (3.10). Now, we use (3.9), (3.10) and the fact that $I'(u_n) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, to verify that (3.8) holds. ■

In the following, we conclude the proof of Proposition 3.1. In view of (1.1), (f_5) and the density of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in $W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$, it suffices to show that relation (3.8) holds for every $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$.

Given $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\text{supp}\phi \cap \Omega_\sigma \neq \emptyset$, we take $K = \text{supp}\phi$, $\hat{\Omega}_\sigma = \Omega_\sigma \cap K = \{y_1, \ldots, y_l\}$, $1 \le l \le j$, and $r_1 > 0$ such that $2r_1 < |y_i - y_m|$, $i \neq m$, and $2r_1 < \text{dist}(K, \partial\Omega)$. We consider, $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ such that $0 \le \psi \le 1$, $\psi \equiv 1$, on $[0, 1]$, and $\psi \equiv 0$, on $[2, \infty)$, and we define

$$
\psi_{i,r}(x) = \psi(\frac{|x - y_i|}{r}),\ \forall\ x \in \Omega,\ 1 \le i \le l,\ 0 < r < r_1.
$$

We also set $\psi_{l+1,r}(x) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{l} \psi_{i,r}(x)$, for every $x \in \Omega$. Hence, $\phi(x) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{l+1} \phi\psi_{i,r}(x)$ and $\phi\psi_{l+1,r} \in C_0^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_\sigma)$. From Lemma 3.6, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(I'(u), \phi) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{N-2} (\nabla u, \nabla(\phi\psi_{i,r}))\,dx - \\
&- \sum_{i=1}^{l} \int_\Omega f(x,u)\phi\psi_{i,r}\,dx,\ \forall\ 0 < r < r_1.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.12}
$$

Applying Hölder's inequality, for every $1 \le i \le l$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{N-2} (\nabla u . \nabla(\phi\psi_{i,r}))\,dx| \le \\
&\left[\int_{B_i} |\nabla u|^N\,dx\right]^{\frac{N-1}{N}} \Big[\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\psi_{i,r}\|_{L^N(B_i)} + \\
&+ \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\nabla\psi_{i,r}\|_{L^N(B_i)}\Big],
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.13}
$$

where $B_i \equiv B(y_i, 2r)$, $0 < r < r_1$. On the other hand, from the first Trudinger-Moser inequality (1.1) and (f_5), we find $M_3 > 0$ such that, for every $1 \le i \le l$,

$$
|\int_\Omega f(x,u)\phi\psi_{i,r}\,dx| \le M_3 \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} |B_i|^{\frac{N-1}{2N}} \|\psi_{i,r}\|_{L^N(\Omega)}.
\tag{3.14}
$$

We use our definition of $\psi_{i,r}$ to get $M_4 > 0$ so that

$$
\|\psi_{i,r}\|_{W^{1,N}(B_i)} \le M_4,\ \forall\ 0 < r < r_1,\ 1 \le i \le l.
$$

Consequently, given $\epsilon > 0$, by Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, (3.13) and (3.14), we find $0 < r_2 < r_1$ so that

$$\begin{cases} |\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{N-2}(\nabla u.\nabla(\phi\psi_{i,r}))\,dx| < \epsilon, \\ |\int_\Omega f(x,u)\phi\psi_{i,r}\,dx| < \epsilon,\ \forall\ 1 \le i \le l,\ 0 < r < r_2. \end{cases} \tag{3.15}$$

for every $0 < r < r_2$, $1 \le i \le l$. From (3.12), (3.15) and the fact that $\epsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small, we obtain that (3.8) holds for every $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. This concludes the proof of Proposition 3.1. ■

As a direct consequence of Proposition 3.1, we have the following results:

Corollary 3.7 *Let Ω be a bounded smooth domain in $I\!R^N$. Suppose that $f(x,s) \in C(\bar\Omega \times I\!R, I\!R)$ satisfies (f_5). Then, I satisfies (wPS) on A, for every bounded set $A \subset W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$.*

Corollary 3.8 *Let Ω be a bounded smooth domain in $I\!R^N$. Suppose that $f(x,s) \in C(\bar\Omega \times I\!R, I\!R)$ satisfies (f_5). Then, I satisfies (wPS) provided every (PS) sequence associated with I possesses a bounded subsequence.*

4 Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

In this section, we apply the abstract results described in Section 2 to prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.1: The weak solution of problem (P_λ) will be established with the aid of Proposition 2.2. For this, it suffices to verify that I_λ, for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small, satisfies (Φ_1) and $(wPS)_{c_1}$ on the closure of $B(0,\rho)$, denoted by $B[0,\rho]$, for some appropriate value of $\rho > 0$.

Given $\beta > \alpha_0$, we take $\rho \in \left(0, \left(\frac{\alpha_N}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{N-1}{N}}\right)$ and use (2.3) to obtain $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} I_\lambda(u) &\ge \tfrac{1}{N}||u||^N - \lambda C_1 \textstyle\int_\Omega \exp(\beta|u|^{\frac{N}{N-1}})\,dx = \\ &= \tfrac{1}{N}||u||^N - \lambda C_1 \textstyle\int_\Omega \exp\left(\beta||u||^{\frac{N}{N-1}}\left(\frac{|u|}{||u||}\right)^{\frac{N}{N-1}}\right)dx, \end{aligned}$$

for every $u \in W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ such that $\|u\| \le \rho$. Hence, by Trudinger-Moser inequality (1.2), we find $C_2(N) > 0$ such that

$$I_\lambda(u) \ge \frac{1}{N}\|u\|^N - \lambda C_2(N),$$

for every $u \in B[0,\rho]$.

Taking $\overline{\lambda} = N^{-1}C_2(N)^{-1}\rho^N$, $u_0 = 0$, $\gamma = -\overline{\lambda}C_2(N)$, $b = 0$, and considering $c_\lambda = c_1$, c_1 given by (2.1), we have that I_λ satisfies condition (Φ_1), for every $0 < \lambda < \bar\lambda$.

Finally, we observe that conditions (f_1), $(f)_{\alpha_0}$ and Corollary 3.7 imply that I_λ satisfies (wPS) condition on $B[0,\rho]$. Theorem 1.1 is proved. ■

Before proving Theorem 1.2, we note that, from (f_1) and (f_2), there exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$F(x,s) \geq C|s|^\theta - C, \ \forall\ x \in \bar{\Omega},\ s \geq 0. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2: Considering $\overline{\lambda} > 0$, given in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we have that the functional I_λ satisfies (Φ_1), for every $\lambda \in (0, \overline{\lambda})$. Thus, by Proposition 2.4 , it suffices to verify that I_λ satisfies (Φ_2) and (PS) for such values of λ.

Choosing $u \in W_0^{1,N}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $u(x) > 0$, for every $x \in \Omega$, from (4.1), we obtain

$$I_\lambda(tu) \leq \frac{t^N}{N}||u||^N - \lambda C t^\theta \int_\Omega u^\theta\, dx + C|\Omega|.$$

Therefore, $I_\lambda(tu) \to -\infty$, as $t \to +\infty$, since $C > 0$ and $\theta > N$. Consequently, I_λ satisfies Φ_2.

Now, we shall verify that I_λ satisfies (PS). Let $(u_n) \subset W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ be a sequence such that $(I_\lambda(u_n)) \subset I\!\!R$ is bounded, and $I'_\lambda(u_n) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, i.e,

$$|\frac{1}{N}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^N\, dx - \lambda \int_\Omega F(x,u_n)\, dx| \leq C < \infty\ ,\ \forall\ n \in I\!\!N, \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$|\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^{N-2}\nabla u_n \nabla v\, dx - \lambda \int_\Omega f(x,u_n) v\, dx| \leq \varepsilon_n ||v||, \tag{4.3}$$

for every $v \in W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$, where $\varepsilon_n \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$. Taking $\theta > N$, given by (f_2), we use (4.2) and (4.3) to get

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^N\, dx - \lambda \int_\Omega (\theta F(x,u_n) - f(x,u_n)u_n)\, dx \leq C + \varepsilon_n ||u_n||.$$

From this inequality, (f_2), and our definition of $f(x,s)$ for $s \leq 0$, we conclude that (u_n) is a bounded sequence in $W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$. Consequently, we may assume that

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u \ \text{ weakly in } \ W_0^{1,N}(\Omega), \ \ u_n \to u \ \text{ strongly in } \ L^q(\Omega),\ \forall\ q > 1.$$

From (4.3), with $v = u_n - u$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\{\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^{N-2}\nabla u_n \nabla(u_n - u)\, dx - \lambda \int_\Omega f(x,u_n)(u_n-u)\, dx\} = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Using Hölder's inequality, we may estimate the second integral in the above equation,

$$|\int_\Omega f(x,u_n)(u_n-u)\,dx| \le (\int_\Omega |f(x,u_n)|^p\,dx)^{1/p}||u_n-u||_{L^q},$$

where $p,q>1$ are fixed with $\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p}=1$. Noting that (u_n) is a bounded sequence, we may find $\beta>\alpha_0=0$ such that $\beta p||u_n||^{N/N-1}<\alpha_N$, for every $n\in I\!N$. Hence, by (2.3), we have

$$\int_\Omega |f(x,u_n)(u_n-u)|dx \le C\Big\{\int_\Omega \exp\Big(p\beta||u_n||^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\frac{|u_n|}{||u_n||})^{\frac{N}{N-1}}\Big)\Big\}^{\frac{1}{p}}||u_n-u||_{L^q}.$$

Thus, by Trudinger-Moser inequality (1.2), we obtain $C_2>0$ such that

$$|\int_\Omega f(x,u_n)(u_n-u)\,dx| \le C_2||u_n-u||_{L^q}.$$

Since $u_n\to u$ strongly in $L^q(\Omega)$, from (4.4) and the above inequality, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^{N-2}\nabla u_n\nabla(u_n-u)\,dx=0.$$

On the other hand,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{N-2}\nabla u\nabla(u_n-u)\,dx=0,$$

because $u_n\rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$. Consequently,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int(|\nabla u_n|^{N-2}\nabla u_n-|\nabla u|^{N-2}\nabla u)(\nabla u_n-\nabla u)\,dx=0.$$

Thus, by inequality (3.4), we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n-\nabla u|^N\,dx=0.$$

This implies that I_λ satisfies (PS) condition. Theorem 1.2 is proved. ■

Remark 4.1 *As it is shown in [9] (See also [14].), any solution of $(P)_\lambda$ is in $C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$, for $N\ge 3$, and in $C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega)$, for $N=2$.*

5 Estimates

We start this section with the definition of Moser functions (See [17]). Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $R > 0$ be such that the ball $B(x_0, R)$ of radius R centered at x_0 is contained in Ω. The Moser functions are defined for $0 < r < R$ by

$$M_r(x) = \frac{1}{w_{N-1}^{1/N}} \begin{cases} (\log \frac{R}{r})^{\frac{N-1}{N}}, & if \quad 0 \leq |x - x_0| \leq r, \\ \frac{\log(\frac{R}{|x-x_0|})}{(\log \frac{R}{r})^{1/N}}, & if \quad r \leq |x - x_0| \leq R, \\ 0, & if \quad |x - x_0| \geq R. \end{cases}$$

Then, $M_r \in W_0^{1,N}(\Omega), ||M_r|| = 1$ and supp (M_r) is contained in $B(x_0, R)$. Considering $\hat{\Omega}$ given by (f_3), we take $x_0 \in \hat{\Omega}$ and consider the Moser sequence $M_n(x) = M_{\frac{R_n}{n}}(x)$ where $R_n = (\log n)^{\frac{1-N}{N}}$, for every $n \in I\!N$. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $\text{supp}(M_n) \subset \hat{\Omega}$, for every $n \in I\!N$.

Taking $\bar{\lambda} > 0$ and u_λ, for $\lambda \in (0, \bar{\lambda})$, given in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we have

Proposition 5.1 *Suppose $f(x, s)$ satisfies $(f_1), (f)_{\alpha_0}$, with $\alpha_0 > 0$, and (f_3). Then, for every $\lambda \in (0, \bar{\lambda})$, there exists $n \in I\!N$ such that*

$$\max\{I_\lambda(u_\lambda + tM_n) \mid t \geq 0\} < I_\lambda(u_\lambda) + \frac{1}{N}(\frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_0})^{N-1}.$$

The proof of Proposition 5.1 will be carried out through the verification of several steps. First, we suppose by contradiction that, for every n, we have

$$\max\{I_\lambda(u_\lambda + tM_n) \mid t \geq 0\} \geq I_\lambda(u_\lambda) + \frac{1}{N}(\frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_0})^{N-1}. \tag{5.1}$$

Now, we apply the argument employed in the proof of Theorem 1.2 to conclude that $I_\lambda(u_\lambda + tM_n) \to -\infty$, as $t \to \infty$, for every $n \in I\!N$. Thus, there exists $t_n > 0$ such that

$$I_\lambda(u_\lambda + t_n M_n) = \max\{I_\lambda(u_\lambda + tM_n) \mid t \geq 0\}. \tag{5.2}$$

The following lemmas provide estimates for the value of t_n.

Lemma 5.2 *The sequence $(t_n) \subset I\!R$ is bounded.*

Proof: Since $\dfrac{d}{dt}[I_\lambda(u_\lambda + tM_n)] = 0$ for $t = t_n$, it follows that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla(u_\lambda + t_n M_n)|^{N-2}\nabla(u_\lambda + t_n M_n)\cdot\nabla M_n\,dx = \lambda\int_\Omega f(x, u_\lambda + t_n M_n)M_n\,dx.$$

Invoking Holder's inequality, we obtain

$$\|u_\lambda + t_n M_n\|^{N-1} \geq \lambda\int_\Omega f(x, u_\lambda + t_n M_n)M_n\,dx. \tag{5.3}$$

We observe that given $M > 0$, from (f_3), there exists a positive constant C such that

$$f(x,s) \geq M\exp(\alpha_0|s|^{N/N-1}) - C, \quad \forall\ s \geq 0, x \in \hat{\Omega}. \tag{5.4}$$

Thus, from (5.3)-(5.4), the definition of the function M_n and the nonnegativity of u_λ, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_\lambda + t_n M_n\|^{N-1} &\geq \lambda M\int_{B(x_0,R_n)}\exp(\alpha_0|t_n M_n|^{\frac{N}{N-1}})M_n\,dx\\ &- \lambda C\int_{B(x_0,R_n)} M_n\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of the function M_n one more time, we find $\hat{C} > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_\lambda + M_n\|^{N-1} &\geq \lambda M\int_{B(x_0,\frac{R_n}{n})}\exp(\alpha_0|t_n M_n|^{\frac{N}{N-1}})M_n\,dx\\ -\lambda\hat{C}R_n^N &= \frac{\lambda M w_{N-1}^{\frac{N-1}{N}}}{N}\exp\left[\left(\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_N}t_n^{\frac{N}{N-1}} - 1\right)N\log n\right]R_n^N(\log n)^{\frac{N-1}{N}}\\ -\lambda\hat{C}R_n^N.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, from the definition of R_n, we get

$$\|u_\lambda + M_n\|^{N-1} \geq \frac{\lambda M w_{N-1}^{\frac{N-1}{N}}}{N}\exp\left[\left(\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_N}t_n^{\frac{N}{N-1}} - 1\right)N\log n\right] - \lambda\hat{C}R_n^N. \tag{5.5}$$

Since $R_n \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, from (5.5), we conclude that $(t_n) \subset I\!\!R$ is a bounded sequence. Lemma 5.2 is proved. ■

Lemma 5.3 *There exist a positive constant $C = C(\lambda, \alpha_0, N)$ and $n_0 \in I\!\!N$ such that*

$$t_n^{N/N-1} \geq \frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_0} - \frac{CR_n^N}{(\log n)^{1/N}},\ \forall\ n \geq n_0.$$

Proof: From equation (5.1),

$$I_\lambda(u_\lambda) + \frac{1}{N}(\frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_0})^{N-1} \leq \frac{1}{N}\int_\Omega |\nabla(u_\lambda + t_n M_n)|^N\, dx - \lambda \int_\Omega F(x, u_\lambda + t_n M_n)\, dx.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_0}\right)^{N-1} &\leq \frac{t_n^N}{N} - \lambda \int_\Omega (F(x, u_\lambda + t_n M_n) - F(x, u_\lambda))\, dx + \\ &+ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \binom{N}{k} t_n^k \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^{N-k} |\nabla M_n|^k\, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$F(x, u_\lambda + t_n M_n) - F(x, u_\lambda) = \int_0^{t_n M_n} f(x, s + u_\lambda)\, ds \geq -m t_n M_n,$$

where $m \geq 0$ is given by (f_1) and $(f)_{\alpha_0}$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_0}\right)^{N-1} &\leq \frac{t_n^N}{N} + \lambda m t_n \int_\Omega M_n dx + \\ &+ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \binom{N}{k} t_n^k \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^{N-k} |\nabla M_n|^k\, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

On the other hand, from the definition of the sequence (M_n), we have

$$\int_\Omega M_n\, dx = \frac{R_n^N w_{N-1}^{\frac{N-1}{N}}}{N} \left\{ \frac{2(\log n)^{\frac{N-1}{N}}}{n^N} + \frac{1}{N}(1 - \frac{1}{n^N})\frac{1}{(\log n)^{1/N}} \right\} \tag{5.7}$$

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^{n-k} |\nabla M_n|^k\, dx \leq C(N, n, \lambda, k) \frac{1}{(\log n)^{k/N}}, \tag{5.8}$$

where $C(N, n, \lambda, k) = \frac{R_n^{Nk} w_{N-1}^{(1-\frac{k}{N})}}{(N-k)}(1 - \frac{1}{n^{N-k}})||\nabla u_\lambda||_{L^\infty}^{N-k}$.

Using (5.6)-(5.8) and Lemma 5.2, we find a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$t_n^{N/N-1} \geq (\frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_0})(1 - \frac{C(\frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_0})^{N-1} R_n^N}{(\log N)^{1/n}})^{1/(N-1)}.$$

A direct application of Mean Value Theorem to the function $h(s) = (1-s)^{1/(N-1)}$ on the above relation provides the conclusion of Lemma 5.3. ∎

Now, we shall use Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 to derive the desired contradiction. From (5.5), Lemma 5.3 and the definition of R_n, we obtain

$$\|u_\lambda + t_n M_n\|^{N-1} \geq \frac{\lambda M w_{N-1}^{\frac{N-1}{N}}}{N} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha_0 C N}{\alpha_N}\right) - \lambda \hat{C} R_n^N.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\lambda M w_{N-1}^{\frac{N-1}{N}}}{N} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha_0 C N}{\alpha_N}\right) \leq (\|u_\lambda\| + t_n)^{N-1} + \lambda \hat{C} R_n^N.$$

But, this contradicts Lemma 5.2, since M can be arbitrarily chosen and $R_n \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$. Proposition 5.1 is proved. ■

6 Theorem 1.3

In this section, after the verification of some preliminary results, we prove Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 6.1 *Suppose $f(x,s)$ satisfies (f_1), $(\hat{f}_2)$ and $(f)_{\alpha_0}$. Then, any (PS) sequence $(u_n) \subset W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ associated with I_λ possesses a subsequence (u_{n_i}) converging weakly in $W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ to a solution u of $(P)_\lambda$. Furthermore,*

$$\int_\Omega F(x, u_{n_i}(x))\, dx \to \int_\Omega F(x, u(x))\, dx, \ \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Remark 6.2 *We note that Lemma 6.1 also holds when $f(x,s)$ satisfies $(\hat{f}_2)$ and $(f)_{\alpha_0}$ for $s \leq -R(\theta)$, and $s \leq 0$, respectively.*

Proof: Consider a sequence $(u_n) \subset W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} I_\lambda(u_n) \to c, \\ I'_\lambda(u_n) \to 0, \ \text{as } n \to \infty. \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

Arguing as in Section 4, we obtain that (u_n) is a bounded sequence. Therefore, by Proposition 3.1, there exists a subsequence, that we continue to denote by (u_n), converging weakly in $W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ to a solution u of $(P)_\lambda$. Moreover, we may assume that $u_n(x) \to u(x)$, for almost every $x \in \Omega$. From (6.1) and (f_1), we get

$$\|u_n^-\|^N \leq \|u_n^-\|^N + \lambda \int_\Omega f(x,0) u_n^-(x)\, dx \leq \|I'_\lambda(u_n)\| \|u_n^-\| \to 0, \tag{6.2}$$

as $n \to \infty$. Hence, $u_n(x) \to u(x) \geq 0$, as $n \to \infty$, for almost every $x \in \Omega$. Now, we fix $\theta_1 > N$, and we consider $R_1 = R(\theta_1) > 0$ given by $(\hat{f}_2)$. From (6.1) and $(\hat{f}_2)$, we find $M_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\{|u_n(x)|\geq R_1\}} \left[\frac{1}{\theta_1} f(x,u_n(x))u_n(x) - F(x,u_n(x))\right] dx \leq M_1. \tag{6.3}$$

Observing that $|\{x \in \Omega \mid u_n(x) \leq -R_1\}| \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, from (2.3), (6.2), (6.3) and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\int_{\{u_n^+(x)\geq R_1\}} \left[\frac{1}{\theta_1} f(x,u_n^+(x))u_n^+(x) - F(x,u_n^+(x))\right] dx \leq M_1. \tag{6.4}$$

Given $\epsilon > 0$, we take $\theta_2 > \theta_1$ such that $\frac{\theta_1 M_1}{\theta_2 - \theta_1} \leq \epsilon$ and $R_2 > \max\{R_1, R(\theta_2)\}$, $R(\theta_2)$ given by $(\hat{f}_2)$. Applying (6.4) and $(\hat{f}_2)$, we obtain

$$\int_{\{u_n^+(x)\geq R_2\}} |F(x,u_n^+(x))|\, dx \leq \epsilon. \tag{6.5}$$

Applying Egoroff's Theorem, we find $E \subset \Omega$ such that $|E| < \epsilon$ and $u_n(x) \to u(x)$, as $n \to \infty$, uniformly on $(\Omega \setminus E)$. Hence, from (2.3) and (6.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\textstyle\int_\Omega [F(x,u_n(x)) - F(x,u(x))]\, dx \leq \\ &\leq \textstyle\int_E |F(x,u_n^+(x))|\, dx + \int_E |F(x,u(x))|\, dx + o(1), \text{ as } n \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

Fixed $q > 1$, we use (2.3) and Hölder's inequality to get $M_2 > 0$ such that

$$\int_E |F(x,u(x))|\, dx \leq M_2 \epsilon^{\frac{1}{q}}. \tag{6.7}$$

From (6.5), (6.7) and Lesbegue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\textstyle\int_E |F(x,u_n^+(x))|\, dx \leq \epsilon + \int_{E\cap\{0\leq u_n(x)\leq R_2\}} |F(x,u_n^+(x))|\, dx \leq \\ &\leq \epsilon + \textstyle\int_{E\cap\{0\leq u_n(x)\leq R_2\}} |F(x,u(x))|\, dx + o(1) \leq \\ &\leq \epsilon + M_2\epsilon^{\frac{1}{q}} + o(1), \text{ as } n \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality, (6.6), (6.7) and the fact that $\epsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily provide the conclusion of the proof of Lemma 6.1. ■

Considering $c_\lambda = I_\lambda(u_\lambda) + \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_0}\right)^{N-1}$, with u_λ given by the proof of Theorem 1.1, we shall verify that I_λ satisfies (PS) condition below the level c_λ, whenever we suppose that $u = u_\lambda$ is the only possible solution of $(P)_\lambda$.

Lemma 6.3 *Suppose $f(x,s)$ satisfies (f_1), (f_{α_0}), with $\alpha_0 > 0$, and $(\hat{f}_2)$. Assume that u_λ is the only possible solution of $(P)_\lambda$, for $0 < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}$. Then, I_λ satisfies $(PS)_c$, for every $c < c_\lambda = I_\lambda(u_\lambda) + \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_0}\right)^{N-1}$.*

Proof: Let $(u_n) \subset W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ be a sequence such that

$$\begin{cases} I_\lambda(u_n) \to c < c_\lambda, \\ I'_\lambda(u_n) \to 0, \text{ as, } n \to \infty. \end{cases} \tag{6.8}$$

Since u_λ is the only solution of $(P)_\lambda$, by Lemma 6.1, we may assume that $u_n \rightharpoonup u_\lambda$, as $n \to \infty$, weakly in $W_0^{1,N}(\Omega)$ and

$$\int_\Omega F(x, u_n(x))\, dx \to \int_\Omega F(x, u_\lambda(x))\, dx, \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{6.9}$$

From (6.8) and (6.9), we have

$$\|u_n\|^N \to N\left(c + \lambda \int_\Omega F(x, u_\lambda(x))\, dx\right), \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{6.10}$$

Taking $v_n = \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|}$, we get that

$$v_n \rightharpoonup v = \frac{u_\lambda}{[N(c+d)]^{\frac{1}{N}}},$$

where $d = \lambda \int_\Omega F(x, u_\lambda(x))\, dx$. Considering $\beta > \alpha_0$ such that

$$c < I_\lambda(u_\lambda) + \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{\alpha_N}{\beta}\right)^{N-1}, \tag{6.11}$$

by (2.3), we find $q > 1$ and $C > 0$ so that

$$|f(x,s)|^q \le C \exp\left(\beta |s|^{\frac{N}{N-1}}\right), \ \forall\, x \in \Omega,\ s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Thus,

$$\int_\Omega |f(x, u_n(x))|^q\, dx \le C \int_\Omega \exp\left(\beta \|u_n\|^{\frac{N}{N-1}} |v_n(x)|^{\frac{N}{N-1}}\right) dx, \tag{6.12}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, by (6.11),

$$1 - \|v\|^N < \left(\frac{\alpha_N}{\beta}\right)^{N-1} \frac{1}{N(c+d)}.$$

Consequently, from (6.10), there exists $p > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\beta}{\alpha_N}\|u_n\|^{\frac{N}{N-1}} < p < \left(1 - \|v\|^N\right)^{\frac{-1}{N-1}}.$$

Hence, by Theorem 2.6 and (6.12), there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\int_\Omega |f(x, u_n(x))|^q\, dx \le M, \ \forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Applying Egoroff's Theorem, the above inequaltiy and the argument employed in the proof of Proposition 3.1, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega f(x,u_n(x))u_n(x)\,dx \to \int_\Omega f(x,u_\lambda(x))u_\lambda(x)\,dx, \text{ as } n\to\infty.$$

Therefore, by (6.8),

$$\|u_n\|^N \to \lambda\int_\Omega f(x,u_\lambda(x))u_\lambda(x)\,dx = \|u_\lambda\|^N.$$

The Lemma 6.3 is proved. ■

Now, we may conclude the proof of Theorem 1.3. Arguing by contradiction, we suppose that u_λ, for $0<\lambda<\bar{\lambda}$, is the only possible solution of $(P)_\lambda$. By Lemma 6.3, I_λ satisfies $(PS)_c$ for every $c<c_\lambda$. Furthermore, by the argument employed in the proof of Theorem 1.1, I_λ satisfies (Φ_1) on $B[0,\rho]$, for $\rho>0$ sufficiently small. Hence, Proposition 2.2 and Remark 2.3 imply $u_\lambda \in \overset{\circ}{B}[0,\rho]$. Invoking Propositions 5.1 and 2.4 and Lemma 6.3, we conclude that I_λ possesses at least two critical points. However, this contradicts the fact that u_λ is the only critical point of I_λ. Theorem 1.3 is proved. ■

7 Theorem 1.4

In this section we establish a proof of Theorem 1.4. The key ingredient is the verification of Proposition 5.1 under conditions $(\hat{f}_3)$ and (f_4). To obtain such result we exploit the convexity of the function $F(x,s)$ and the fact that u_λ, for $\lambda\in(0,\bar{\lambda})$, is a solution of $(P)_\lambda$.

First, we state a basic result that will be used in our estimates.

Lemma 7.1 *Let $a,b\in I\!R^N, N\geq 2$, and $\langle .,.\rangle$ the standard scalar product in $I\!R^N$. Then, there exists a nonnegative polynomial $p_N(x,y)$ ($p_2\equiv 0$) such that*

$$|a+b|^N \leq |a|^N + N|a|^{N-2}\langle a,b\rangle + |b|^N + p_N(|a|,|b|). \tag{7.1}$$

Furthermore, the smallest exponent of the variable y of $p_N(x,y)$ is $3/2$ for $N=3$ and 2 for $N\geq 4$, and the greatest exponent of y is strictly smaller than N.

Proof: We present a proof of Lemma 7.1 in Appendix B. ■

Now, we are ready to establish the version of Proposition 5.1. Consider β, $\hat{\Omega}$ given by $(\hat{f}_3)$. Let $x_0\in\hat{\Omega}$ and the Moser sequence associated $M_n = M_{\frac{R_n}{n}}$, where $R_n = (\log n)^{-\frac{(N-1)(1-\beta)}{N^2}}$ if $N\geq 3$, and $R_n=R$ if $N=2$, where $R>0$ is chosen so that $B(x_0,R)\subset\hat{\Omega}$.

Proposition 7.2 *Suppose $f(x,s)$ satisfies $(f_1), (f)_{\alpha_0}$, with $\alpha_0 > 0$, $(\hat{f}_3)$, and (f_4). Then, for every $\lambda \in (0, \bar{\lambda})$, there exists $n \in I\!N$ such that*

$$\max\{I_\lambda(u_\lambda + tM_n) \mid t \geq 0\} < I_\lambda(u_\lambda) + \frac{1}{N}(\frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_0})^{N-1}.$$

Arguing as in the proof of Proposition 5.1, we suppose by contradiction that for every $n \in I\!N$, (5.1) holds. As before, there exists $t_n \in I\!R$ satisfying equation (5.2). The following two results are versions of Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 for this new situation.

Lemma 7.3 *The sequence $(t_n) \subset I\!R$ is bounded.*

<u>Proof:</u> Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 5.2, we have that equation (5.3) must hold. By (f_1) and (f_4), for every $x \in \hat{\Omega}$, the function $f(x,.)$ is positive on $[0,\infty)$ and nondecreasing. Thus, from (5.3),

$$\|u_\lambda + t_n M_n\|^{N-1} \geq \lambda \int_{B(x_0, \frac{R_n}{n})} f(x, t_n M_n) M_n \, dx. \tag{7.2}$$

Now, by $(\hat{f}_3)$, given $M > 0$ there exists $R_M > 0$ such that

$$s^\beta f(x,s) \geq M \exp(\alpha_o s^{\frac{N}{N-1}}), \ \forall \ s \geq R_M, x \in \hat{\Omega}. \tag{7.3}$$

Consequently, by the definition of M_n, for n sufficiently large, we get

$$\begin{aligned} t_n \|u_\lambda + t_n M_n\|^{N-1} \ &\geq \ \lambda M w_{N-1}^{\frac{N-1}{N}} \exp \left[\left(\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_N} t_n^{\frac{N}{N-1}} - 1 + \frac{\log R_n^N}{N \log n} + \right. \right. \\ &+ \ \left. \left. \frac{(N-1)(1-\beta)\log(\log n)}{N \log n} \right) N \log n \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, from definition of R_n, we have

$$\frac{\log R_n^N}{N \log n} = \frac{(\beta - 1)(N-1)\log(\log n)}{N \log n} \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Thus, we conclude that $(t_n) \subset I\!R$ is a bounded sequence. The lemma is proved. ∎

Lemma 7.4 *There exist $n_0 > 0$, and a postive constant $C(\lambda, \alpha_0, N) \geq 0$ $(C(\lambda, \alpha_0, 2) = 0)$ such that*

$$t_n^{N/N-1} \geq \frac{\alpha_N}{\alpha_0} - \frac{C R_n^N}{(\log n)^{\gamma/N}}, \quad \forall \ n \geq n_0,$$

where $\gamma = 3/2$ if $N = 3$, and $\gamma = 2$ if $N \geq 4$.

Proof: From equations (5.1)-(5.2), we have

$$I_\lambda(u_\lambda) + \frac{1}{N}(\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_N})^{N-1} \leq I_\lambda(u_\lambda + t_n M_n).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{N}(\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_N})^{N-1} &\leq \frac{1}{N}\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_\lambda + \nabla(t_n M_n)|^N - |\nabla u_\lambda|^N)\,dx \\ &- \lambda\int_\Omega (F(x,u_\lambda + t_n M_n) - F(x,u_\lambda))\,dx. \qquad (7.4)\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 7.1 with $a = \nabla u_\lambda(x)$, and $b = \nabla(t_n M_n(x))$, we have

$$\int_\Omega \Big(|\nabla u_\lambda + \nabla(t_n M_N)|^N - |\nabla u_\lambda|^N\Big)\,dx \leq \qquad (7.5)$$

$$\int_\Omega \Big(N|\nabla u_\lambda|^{N-2}\nabla u_\lambda \nabla(t_n M_n) + |\nabla(t_n M_n)|^N + p_{{}_N}(|\nabla u_\lambda|, |\nabla(t_n M_n)|)\Big)\,dx.$$

From (7.4), (7.5), $\|M_n\| = 1$, and the fact that u_λ is a solution of $(P)_\lambda$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{N}(\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_N})^{N-1} &\leq \frac{t_n^N}{N} - \lambda\int_\Omega [(F(x,u_\lambda + t_n M_n) - F(x,u_\lambda) - f(x,u_\lambda)t_n M_n) \\ &+ p_{{}_N}(|\nabla u_\lambda|, |\nabla(t_n M_n)|)]\,dx. \qquad (7.6)\end{aligned}$$

Hence, from (7.6) and (f_4), we get

$$\frac{1}{N}(\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_N})^{N-1} \leq \frac{t_n^N}{N} + \int_\Omega p_{{}_N}(|\nabla u_\lambda|, |\nabla(t_n M_n)|)\,dx. \qquad (7.7)$$

In the particular case $N = 2$, from Lemma 7.1, we have that $p_2 = 0$. From (7.7), we obtain

$$t_n^{\frac{N}{N-1}} \geq \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_N}.$$

Thus, it suffices to consider $N \geq 3$. Using the definition of the function M_n, we obtain the following estimates

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^l |\nabla M_n|^k\,dx \leq \|\nabla u_\lambda\|^l_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \frac{R_n^N w_{N-1}^{\frac{N-k}{N}}}{(N-k)(\log n)^{\frac{k}{N}}},\ \forall\, l \geq 0,\ 1 \leq k < N. \qquad (7.8)$$

Now, from (7.8), Lemma 7.3, and the definition of the polynomial $p_{{}_N}(x,y)$ (See Lemma 7.1.), there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\int_\Omega p_{{}_N}(|\nabla u_\lambda|, |\nabla(t_n M_n)|)\,dx \leq \frac{CR_n^N}{(\log n)^{\gamma/N}}, \qquad (7.9)$$

where $\gamma = 3/2$, for $N = 3$, and $\gamma = 2$, for $N \geq 4$. Hence, from (7.7), (7.9), we have

$$\frac{t_n^N}{N} \geq \frac{1}{N}(\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_N})^{N-1} - \frac{CR_n^N}{(\log n)^{\frac{\gamma}{N}}}.$$

Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 5.2, we get the conclusion of Lemma 7.4. ■

To prove Proposition 7.2, we use Lemmas 7.3 and 7.4 to derive the desired contradiction. From (7.2) and (7.3), for n sufficiently large, we have

$$t_n^\beta \|u_\lambda + t_n M_n\| \geq \lambda M \int_{B(x_0, \frac{R_n}{N})} \exp(\alpha_0 |t_n M_n|^{\frac{N}{N-1}}) M_n^{1-\beta}\, dx.$$

Using the definition of M_n and Lemma 7.4, we get

$$t_n^\beta \|u_\lambda + t_n M_n\| \geq \lambda M w_{N-1}^{\frac{N-(1-\beta)}{N}} \exp\left(\frac{-NCR_n^N \log n}{(\log n)^{\gamma/N}}\right) R_n^N (\log n)^{\frac{(N-1)(1-\beta)}{N}}, \tag{7.10}$$

for $N \geq 3$, and

$$t_n^\beta \|u_\lambda + t_n M_n\| \geq \lambda M w_{N-1}^{\frac{N-1}{N}} R^N \exp[(\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_N} t_n^{\frac{N}{N-1}} - 1) N \log n] \geq \lambda M w_{N-1}^{\frac{N-1}{N}} R^N, \tag{7.11}$$

for $N = 2$.

From the definition of R_n, we obtain

$$R_n^N (\log n)^{\frac{(N-1)(1-\beta)}{N}} = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{R_n^N \log n}{(\log n)^{\gamma/N}} = 1. \tag{7.12}$$

From (7.10) or (7.11) and (7.12), we have a contradiction because the left hand sides of (7.10) and (7.11) are bounded and M can be chosen arbitrarily large. This proves Proposition 7.2. ■

Finally, we observe that the proof of Theorem 1.4 follows the same argument employed in the proof of Theorem 1.3, with Proposition 7.2 replacing Proposition 5.1.

8 Appendix A

In this Appendix, we prove Lemma 2.5. First, we note that, without loss of generality, we may suppose $B(x_0, R) = B(0, R) \equiv B_R$.

Setting $u_M = \frac{1}{B_R} \int_{B_R} u(x)\, dx$, we may apply Lemma 7.16 in [14] to find $C = C(N) > 0$ such that

$$|u(x) - u_M| \leq C(N) \int_{B_R} \frac{|\nabla u(y)|}{|x-y|^{N-1}}\, dy, \text{ a. e. in } B_R.$$

Taking $v(x) = u(x) - u_M$, $h \in L^p(B_R)$, $p > 1$, $q = \frac{p}{p-1}$, and we use Hölder's inequality, as in [23], to obtain

$$\int_{B_R} |h(x)||v(x)|\,dx \leq$$
$$\leq C(N)\left[\int\int_{B_R\times B_R} \frac{|h(x)|}{|x-y|^{N-\frac{1}{q}}}\,dxdy\right]^{\frac{N-1}{N}} \left[\int\int_{B_R\times B_R} \frac{|\nabla u(x)|^N |h(x)|}{|x-y|^{\frac{N-1}{q}}}\,dxdy\right]^{\frac{1}{N}}.$$

Observing that the diameter of B_R is equal to $2R$, we get a constant $C_1(N) > 0$ such that

$$\int\int_{B_R\times B_R} \frac{|h(x)|}{|x-y|^{N-\frac{1}{q}}}\,dxdy \leq C_1(N) q \|h\|_{L^p(B_R)} R^{\frac{N+1}{q}}.$$

Applying Hölder's inequality one more time, we find $C_2(N) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{B_R} \frac{|h(x)|}{|x-y|^{\frac{N-1}{q}}}\,dx \leq C_2(N)\|h\|_{L^p(B_R)} R^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Combining the above inequalities, we find $C_3(N) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{B_R} |h(x)||v(x)|\,dx \leq C_3(N) q^{\frac{N-1}{N}} R^{\frac{N}{q}} \|h\|_{L^p(B_R)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^N(B_R)},$$

for every $h \in L^p(B_R)$. Therefore,

$$\|v\|_{L^q(B_R)} \leq C_3(N) q^{\frac{N-1}{N}} R^{\frac{N}{q}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^N(B_R)},$$

for every $q > 1$. Consequently, there exists $C_4(N) > 0$ so that

$$\int_{B_R} |u - u_M|^{\frac{Nq}{N-1}}\,dx \leq C_4(N) q^q R^N,$$

whenever $u \in W^{1,N}(B_R)$, $\|u\|_{W^{1,N}(B_R)} \leq 1$. Now, we use the power series expansion of $\psi(t) = e^t$ and the above inequality to derive

$$\int_{B_R} \exp(\alpha |u - u_M|^{\frac{N}{N-1}})\,dx \leq$$
$$\leq |B_R| + \alpha \int_{B_R} |u - u_M|^{\frac{N}{N-1}}\,dx + R^N \sum_{q=2}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^q C_4(N)^q q^q}{q!},$$

if $\|u\|_{W^{1,N}(B_R)} \leq 1$. Hence, there exist $\hat{\alpha} = \hat{\alpha}(N) > 0$, and $C_5(N) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{B_R} \exp\left(\hat{\alpha} 2^{\frac{1}{N}} |u - u_M|^{\frac{N}{N-1}}\right)\,dx \leq C_5(N) R^N + \hat{\alpha} 2^{\frac{1}{N-1}} \|u - u_M\|^{\frac{N}{N-1}}_{L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(B_R)}.$$

Since
$$|u_M| \leq C_6(N)R^{-1}\|u\|^{L^N(B_R)}, \ \forall \ u \in W^{1,N}(B_R),$$
for some $C_6(N) > 0$, we may use the convexity of the function $\psi(t) = t^{\frac{N}{N-1}}$ to obtain $C(N,R) > 0$ such that
$$\int_{B_R} \exp\left(\hat{\alpha}|u|^{\frac{N}{N-1}}\right) \, dx \leq C(N,R),$$
for every $u \in W^{1,N}(B_R)$ satisfying $\|u\|_{W^{1,N}(B_R)} \leq 1$. Lemma 2.5 is proved. ■

9 Appendix B

In this Appendix we prove Lemma 7.1. First, we establish an inequality that will be necessary in the sequel.

Lemma 9.1 *Let x, y be real numbers with $x > 0$ and $x + y \geq 0$. Consider $k = \frac{N}{2}$, where $N \in I\!N$, and $N \geq 3$. Then, there exist nonnegative constants C_1, C_2 such that*
$$(x+y)^k \leq x^k + kx^{k-1}y + |y|^k + C_1 x|y|^{k-1} + C_2 x^{k-2}y^2.$$
Furthermore, $C_1 = C_2 = 0$ if $N = 3$ and 4, and $C_1 = 0$ when $N = 5$.

Proof: Since $x > 0$ and $(x+y)^k = x^k(1+yx^{-1})^k$, it suffices to consider $(1+z)^k$ for every $z \geq -1$.

(i) Case $N = 3$. Let $g(z) = 1+\frac{3}{2}z+|z|^{\frac{3}{2}}-(1+z)^{\frac{3}{2}}$, for every $z \geq -1$. We must show that the function g is nonnegative. Direct calculation shows that $g'(z) \geq 0$ for every $z \geq 0$, and $g(0) = 0$. When $z \in [-1, 0]$, we consider $r = |z|$. Thus, $g(z) = h(r) = 1-\frac{3}{2}r+r^{\frac{3}{2}}-(1-r)^{\frac{3}{2}}$, and $h'(r) \geq 0$, and $h(0) = 0$. Hence, $g(z) \geq 0$ for every $z \geq -1$.

(ii) Case $N = 4$. The proof is immediate.

(iii) Case $N = 5$. Consider the polynomial function:
$$P(z) = (1+z)^{\frac{5}{2}} - (1 + \frac{5}{2}z + |z|^{\frac{5}{2}}).$$
By L'Hospital's Theorem, we have
$$\lim_{|z|\to 0} \frac{P(z)}{z^2} = \frac{15}{8}.$$
Moreover, by Mean Value Theorem, we get
$$\lim_{|z|\to \infty} \frac{P(z)}{z^2} = 0.$$

Consequently, there exists a nonnegative constant C such that

$$(1+z)^k \le 1 + \frac{5}{2}z + |z|^{\frac{5}{2}} + Cz^2, \ \forall\ z \in I\!R.$$

(iv) Case $N \ge 6$. Consider the polynomial function:

$$P_k(z) = (1+z)^k - (1 + kz + |z|^k), \text{ where } k = \frac{N}{2}, \text{ and } z \ge -1.$$

Arguing as above, we have

$$\lim_{|z|\to 0} \frac{P_k(z)}{z^2} = \frac{k(k-1)}{2},$$

and

$$\lim_{|z|\to\infty} \frac{P_k(z)}{|z|^{k-1}} = k.$$

Consequently, there exist nonegative constants C_1, C_2 such that

$$(1+z)^k \le 1 + kz + |z|^k + C_1|z|^{k-1} + C_2 z^2, \ \forall\ z \in I\!R.$$

Lemma 7.3 is proved. ■

Proof of Lemma 7.1: The proof is immediate when $N = 2$. Thus, it suffices to verify the lemma for $N \ge 3$. Writing

$$|a+b|^N = (|a+b|^2)^{N/2} = (|a|^2 + 2\langle a,b\rangle + |b|^2)^{N/2},$$

and using Lemma 9.1 with $x = |a|^2$, and $y = 2\langle a,b\rangle + |b|^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |a+b|^N &\le |a|^N + N|a|^{N-2}\langle a,b\rangle + \frac{N}{2}|a|^{N-2}|b|^2 + (2|a||b| + |b|^2)^{N/2} + \\ &+ 2^{(N-2)/2}C_1|a|^2(2|a||b|)^{(N-2)/2} + 2^{(N-2)/2}C_1|a|^2|b|^{N-2} + \\ &+ 4C_2|a|^{N-2}|b|^2 + 4C_2|a|^{N-3}|b|^3 + C_2|a|^{N-4}|b|^4. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 9.1 one more time, we obtain

$$|a+b|^N \le |a|^N + N|a|^{N-2}\langle a,b\rangle + |b|^N + p_{_N}(|a|,|b|),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p_{_N}(|a|,|b|) &= (\frac{N}{2} + 4C_2)|a|^{N-2}|b|^2 + N2^{(N-4)/2}|a|^{(N-2)/2}|b|^{(N+2)/2} + \\ &+ 2^{N-2}C_1|a|^{(N+2)/2}|b|^{(N-2)/2} + 2^{(N-2)/2}C_1|a|^2|b|^{N-2} + \\ &+ 2^{N/2}|a|^{N/2}|b|^{N/2} + 2^{(N-4)/2}C_2|a|^{(N-4)/2}|b|^{(N+4)/2} + \\ &+ 2C_1|a||b|^{N-1} + 4C_2|a|^{N-3}|b|^3 + C_2|a|^{N-4}|b|^4. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $C_1 = C_2 = 0$ if $N = 3$ and 5, and $C_1 = 0$ when $N = 5$, from the definition of $p_{_N}$ we conclude that the smallest exponent of $|b|$ is $3/2$, for $N = 3$, and 2, for $N \ge 4$, and the greatest exponent of $|b|$ is strictly smaller than N. Lemma 7.1 is proved. ■

References

[1] Adimurthi, *Existence of positive solutions of the semilinear Dirichlet problems with critical growth for the N-Laplacian*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa 17 (1990), 393-413.

[2] Adimurthi, and Yadava, S.L., *Multiplicity results for semilinear elliptic equations in a bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^2$ involving critical exponent*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa 17 (1990), 481-504.

[3] Ambrosetti, A., and Rabinowitz, P.H., *Dual variational methods in critical point theory and applications*, J. Funct. Anal. 14, (1973), 349-381.

[4] Bratu, G., *Sur les équations intégrales non linéaires*, Bull. Soc. Math. de France 42 (1914), 113-142.

[5] Brezis, H., *Opérateurs maximaux monotones et semi-groupes de contraction dans les espaces de Hilbert*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1973.

[6] Brezis, H., and Nirenberg, L., *Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical exponents*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 36 (1983), 437-477.

[7] Clément, P., Figueiredo, D.G. de, and Mitidieri, E., *Quasilinear elliptic equations with critical exponents*, TMNA 7 (1996), 133-170.

[8] Crandall, M.G., and Rabinowitz, P.H., *Some continuation and variational methods for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic eigenvalue problems*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 58 (1975), 201-218.

[9] Di Benedetto, E., *$C^{1,\alpha}$ local regularity of weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations*, Nonlinear Analysis 7,8 (1983), 827-850.

[10] do Ó, J.M.B., *Quasilinear elliptic equations with exponential nonlinearities*, Comm. Appl. Nonlinear Anal. 3 (1995), 63-72.

[11] Figueiredo, D.G. de, Miyagaki, O.H., and Ruf, B., *Elliptic equations in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with nonlinearites in the critical growth range*, Calculus of Variations and PDE 3 (1995), 139-153.

[12] Garcia Azorero, J., and Peral Alonso, I., *On an Emden-Fowler type equation*, Nonlinear Analysis 18 (1992), 1085-1997.

[13] Gelfand, I.M., *Some problems in the theory of quasi-linear equations*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. 29 (1963), 295-381.

[14] Gilbarg, D., and Trudinger, N.S., *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, 2^{nd} edition, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York - Tokio, 1983.

[15] Lions, P.L., *The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The limit case*, Revista Mat. Iberoamericana 1(1) (1985), 145-201

[16] Liouville, J., *Sur l'equation aux différences partielles* $\frac{d^2 \log \lambda}{dudv} \pm \frac{\lambda}{a^2} = 0$, J. Math. Pures Appl. 18 (1853), 71-72.

[17] Moser, J., *A sharp form of an inequality by N. Trudinger*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 20 (1971), 1077 -1092.

[18] Panda, R., *On semilinear Neumann problems with critical growth for the N-Laplacian*, Nonlinear Analysis 8 (1996), 1347-1366.

[19] Rabinowitz, P.H., *Minimax methods in critical point theory with applications to diff. equations*, CBMS Regional Confer. Ser. in Math. n$^{\underline{\text{o}}}$ 65, Am. Math. Soc. Providence, RI (1986).

[20] Rudin, W., *Real and complex analysis*, 3^{d} edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1987.

[21] Silva, E.A.B., *Linking theorems and applications to semilinear problems at resonance*, Nonlinear Analysis 16 (1991), 455-477.

[22] Silva, E.A.B., and Soares, S.H.M., *Quasilinear Dirichlet problems in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with critical growth*, Preprint, 1998.

[23] Trudinger, N., *On imbedding into Orlicz spaces and some applications*, J. Math. Mech. 17 (1967), 473-484.