

Existence and Asymptotic Behavior of Solutions for a Class of Neumann Problems

ILMA MARQUES *

IMECC - UNICAMP,

Caixa Postal 6065.

13081-970 Campinas-SP, Brazil

E-mail: imarques@ime.unicamp.br

Abstract

In this paper we study the existence of solutions $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and their asymptotic behavior for the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\epsilon^2 \Delta_p u = f(u), & \text{in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where Δ_p is the p-Laplace operator.

*These results appear in the author's UNICAMP doctoral dissertation.

1 Introduction

In this paper we study the existence of nonconstant solutions and their asymptotic behavior for the following class of Neumann problem

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} -\epsilon^2 \Delta_p u = f(u), & \text{in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where Δ_p denotes the p -Laplace operator, $p \geq 2$, $\epsilon > 0$ is a small parameter, Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N ($N \geq 1$), with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}$ denotes the outward normal derivative of u on $\partial\Omega$. For that matter we make the following assumptions on the nonlinearity f :

(f_1) $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function of class C^1 , where a and b are zeros of the f ;

(f_2) f has exactly $2l + 1$ zeros, $a = a_1 < 0 = a_2 < a_3 < \dots < a_{2l+1} = b$ with $l = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ so that $f(a_i) = 0, \forall i$ and $f'(a_i) < 0$, if i odd;

(f_3) $\lim_{t \rightarrow a_{2l}} \frac{f(t-a_{2l})}{|t-a_{2l}|^{p-2}(t-a_{2l})} > 0$.

A function $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is said to be a weak solution of (1) if

$$\int_{\Omega} \epsilon^2 |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi dx - \int_{\Omega} f(u) \varphi dx = 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

It has been proved by Ko [8], that under hypotheses (f_1), (f_2), (f_3) with $l = 1, p = 2$ and

$$(f_4) \quad \left| \int_0^{a_1} f(t) dt \right| = \int_0^{a_3} f(t) dt$$

there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that problem (1) possesses one solution $a_1 \leq u_\epsilon \leq a_3$ for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$. His proof uses variational arguments. [8] also shows that the

nonconstant solution u_ϵ converge either to a_1 or a_3 a.e. on $\overline{\Omega}$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ using monotone iteration methods. The same problem had studied by Manríquez [10], who proved under hypotheses (f_1) , (f_2) , (f_3) , $p = 2$, $\epsilon = 1$,

$$(f_5) \quad |f(t)| \leq a|t|^\sigma + b \text{ with } 1 \leq \sigma < 2^* \text{ where } 2^* = 2N/(N-2) \text{ if } N > 2 \text{ and} \\ 2^* = \infty \text{ if } N = 2 \text{ or } N = 1$$

and

$$(f_6) \quad |f'(t)| \leq a|t|^\sigma + d \text{ with } 1 \leq \sigma < 2^* - 2$$

that problem (1) possesses at least $2l$ nonconstant solutions. His proof uses a combination of the variational and the topological degree arguments.

Using standard variational methods (local minimization and the Mountain Pass Theorem) we prove the existence of $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that problem (1) has at least l nonconstant solutions for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$. Using monotone iteration methods we show that the nonconstant solutions converge either a_l or a_{2l+1} a.e. on $\overline{\Omega}$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The hardest step of our proof is to show that the solutions u_ϵ given for Mountain Pass Theorem is different of a_i , if i even. In order to show this we use the existence of solutions and their asymptotic behavior for the problem (1) with Dirichlet boundary conditions, which we establish in Section 2.

Our main results are the following.

Theorem 1.1 *Suppose that f satisfies the assumptions (f_1) , (f_2) and (f_3) . Then, there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that, for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, problem (1) has at least*

l nonconstant solutions satisfying

$$a_1 < u_1(x) < a_3 < u_2(x) < a_5 < \dots < a_{2l-1} < u_l(x) < a_{2l+1},$$

where $l = 1, 2, 3, \dots$

Remark 1.1 From the Theorem of regularity of Tolksdorf ([11], Thm 1]) there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $u_l \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$.

Remark 1.2 The theorem 1.1 still is true if we consider the a_i 's negative for all $i \geq 3$, i.e., $a = a_{2l+1} < \dots < a_3 < a_2 = 0 < a_1 = b$. The condition $a_2 = 0$ is not essential; it only makes the presentation easies.

Theorem 1.2 Let f be satisfying the conditions (f_1) , (f_2) and (f_3) for $l = 1$ and let $u_\epsilon(x)$ a nonconstant solution of problem (1). Given any $\delta > 0$, let

$$\Omega^+(\epsilon, \delta) := \{x \in \Omega : 0 < u_\epsilon(x) < \delta < a_3\}$$

contain a open ball $B(x, w^*(\epsilon, \delta))$ centered at some $x = x(\epsilon, \delta) \in \Omega^+(\epsilon, \delta)$ whose radius $w^*(\epsilon, \delta)$ is the maximum of radii of open balls in $\Omega^+(\epsilon, \delta)$. Then

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} w^*(\epsilon, \delta) = 0.$$

2 Dirichlet Problem

To prove Theorem 1.1, we need to show the existence of solutions and their asymptotic behavior for the following Dirichlet problem

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} -\epsilon^2 \Delta_p u = f(u), & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

We prove the following Theorem.

Theorem 2.1 *Let f be a function satisfying the assumptions (f_1) , (f_2) and (f_3) with $l = 1$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that, for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, the Dirichlet problem (2) has a positive solution $0 < u_\epsilon < a_3$ in $\bar{\Omega}$ such that $u_\epsilon \rightarrow a_3$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in every compact subset of Ω , and a negative solution $a_1 < v_\epsilon < 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$ such that $v_\epsilon \rightarrow a_1$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ uniformly in every compact subset of Ω .*

2.1 Existence of Solutions

The prove is done in two steps.

Proposition 2.1 *Suppose that f satisfies the assumptions (f_1) , (f_2) and (f_3) with $l = 1$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that, for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, the Dirichlet problem (2) has a positive solution $0 < u_\epsilon < a_3$ in $\bar{\Omega}$ and a negative solution $a_1 < v_\epsilon < 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$.*

Proof: We start by proving the existence of a positive solution for problem (2).

Let $f_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$f_1(u) := \begin{cases} f(u), & \text{if } 0 \leq u \leq a_3 \\ 0, & \text{if } u \leq 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } u \geq a_3. \end{cases}$$

By (A_1) , we have that there exists $M > 0$ such that $f_1(t) + Mt$ is nondecreasing in t for $t \in [0, a_3]$.

Now, we consider the following auxiliary problem

$$(3) \quad \begin{cases} -\epsilon^2 \Delta_p u + Mu = f_1(u) + Mu, & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we will show the existence of a positive solution for problem (3) by using the method of lower and upper-solution. We prove this in three steps:

Step 1: Observe that the function $\bar{u}(x) \equiv a_3$, for $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ is a upper solution of (3).

Step 2: Construction of the lower solution of (3).

Let

$$\gamma = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_1(t)}{|t|^{p-2}t}$$

and λ_1 is the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta_p$ subject to the Dirichlet boundary condition.

It follows from (f_3) that given $\delta > 0$, (take $\delta < \gamma$), there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that for all $|t| \leq t_0$ we have

$$(4) \quad \gamma - \delta \leq \frac{f_1(t)}{|t|^{p-2}t}.$$

Let $\varphi_1 > 0$ an eigenfunction corresponding to the first eigenvalue λ_1 . Take $\beta > 0$ such that $|\beta\varphi_1(x)| \leq t_0$ and $\beta(\max_{\Omega} \varphi_1) < a_3$. By (4), we obtain

$$\gamma - \delta \leq \frac{f_1(\beta\varphi_1)}{|\beta\varphi_1|^{p-2}\beta\varphi_1}.$$

Choosing $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\epsilon_0^2\lambda_1 < \gamma - \delta$, we have that $\beta\varphi_1$ is a lower solution of problem (3) for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$.

Step 3: We will show that there exists a minimal (and, respectively, a maximal) weak solution u_* (resp. u^*) for problem (3), such that $\beta\varphi_1 = \underline{u} \leq u_* \leq \bar{u} = a_3$.

Consider the set

$$[\underline{u}, \bar{u}] := \{u \in L^\infty(\Omega) : \underline{u}(x) \leq u(x) \leq \bar{u}(x) \text{ a.e. in } \Omega\}$$

with the topology of a.e. convergence, and define the operator $S : [\underline{u}, \bar{u}] \rightarrow L^q(\Omega)$

by

$$Sv = f_1(v) + Mv \in L^\infty(\Omega) \subset L^q(\Omega), \forall v \in [\underline{u}, \bar{u}],$$

where q denotes the conjugate exponent to p , i.e., $1/p + 1/q = 1$. We get that

S is nondecreasing and bounded. Moreover, if $v_n, v \in [\underline{u}, \bar{u}]$, then

$$\| Sv_n - Sv \|_{L^q}^q = \int_{\Omega} | f_1(v_n) + Mv_n - f_1(v) - Mv |^q dx.$$

Let $v_n \rightarrow v$ a.e. in Ω . Applying the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem,

we obtain that $\| Sv_n - Sv \|_{L^q} \rightarrow 0$, and then S is continuous.

Define the operator $T : L^q(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $f \mapsto u$. T is continuous and nondecreasing.

Consider the continuous nondecreasing operator $F : [\underline{u}, \bar{u}] \rightarrow W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ defined by $F := ToS$, i.e., for a function $v \in [\underline{u}, \bar{u}]$, $F(v)$ is the unique weak solution of problem (3).

Writing $u_1 = F(\underline{u})$, $u^1 = F(\bar{u})$, we obtain that for all $\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}$, $\varphi \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_1|^{p-2} \nabla u_1 \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega} M u_1 \varphi &= \int_{\Omega} (f_1(\underline{u}) + M \underline{u}) \varphi \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \underline{u}|^{p-2} \nabla \underline{u} \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega} M \underline{u} \varphi \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u^1|^{p-2} \nabla u^1 \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega} M u^1 \varphi &= \int_{\Omega} (f_1(\bar{u}) + M \bar{u}) \varphi \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \bar{u}|^{p-2} \nabla \bar{u} \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega} M \bar{u} \varphi. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 2.2 of [3] and taking into account that F is nondecreasing, we obtain

$$\underline{u} \leq F(\underline{u}) \leq F(u) \leq F(\bar{u}) \leq \bar{u}, \text{ a.e. in } \Omega, \forall u \in [\underline{u}, \bar{u}].$$

Repeating the same reasoning, we can prove the existence of sequences (u^n) and (u_n) satisfying $u^0 = \bar{u}$, $u^{n+1} = F(u^n)$, $u_0 = \underline{u}$, $u_{n+1} = F(u_n)$ and, for every weak solution $u \in [\underline{u}, \bar{u}]$ of problem (3) with $\epsilon = 1$, we have

$$\underline{u} = u_0 \leq u_1 \leq \dots \leq u_n \leq u \leq u^n \leq \dots \leq u^1 \leq u^0 = \bar{u}, \text{ a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Then, $u_n \rightarrow u_*$, $u^n \rightarrow u^*$, a.e. in Ω , with $u_*, u^* \in [\underline{u}, \bar{u}]$, $u_* \leq u^*$ a.e. in Ω . Since $u_{n+1} = F(u_n) \rightarrow F(u_*)$, and $u^{n+1} = F(u^n) \rightarrow F(u^*)$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ by continuity of F , then $u_*, u^* \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with $u_* = F(u_*)$ and $u^* = F(u^*)$. This completes the proof. Then, u_* is minimal weak solution (respectively, u^* maximal weak solution) for (3) with $\epsilon = 1$ such that $u_*, u^* \in [\underline{u}, \bar{u}]$, for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$. In particular, every weak solution $u \in [\underline{u}, \bar{u}]$ of (3) with $\epsilon = 1$ satisfies also $u_* \leq u \leq u^*$, a.e. in Ω . Since the solutions u_* and u^* are between 0 and a_3 then u_* and u^* are solutions of (2). Therefore there exists a solution for the problem (2) $u_\epsilon := u_*$, for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ such that $u_\epsilon \in [\beta\varphi_1, a_3]$.

To prove the existence of the negative solution $v_\epsilon(x)$, where $a_1 \leq v_\epsilon(x) \leq 0$ it is enough to consider the truncation function $f_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$f_2(u) := \begin{cases} f(u), & \text{if } a_1 \leq u \leq 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } u \leq a_1 \\ 0, & \text{if } u \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

and then the proof follows similarly. \square

2.2 Asymptotic Behavior of the Solutions of the Dirichlet

Problem

We have the following proposition which shows the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of (2) as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proposition 2.2 *Let $0 < u_\epsilon < a_3$ be a positive solution of (2) and let $a_1 < v_\epsilon < 0$ be a negative solution of (2). Then*

- i) $u_\epsilon \rightarrow a_3$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on every compact subset of Ω ;
- ii) $v_\epsilon \rightarrow a_1$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on every compact subset of Ω .

Proof: i) The proof follows by adapting some arguments from Theorem 4 in [5].

First, observe that there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $u_\epsilon \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$, by using either Theorem 1 in [11] or Theorem 2 in [9].

Consider the function $f_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined at proof of the Proposition 2.1, and $\varphi_1 > 0$ an eigenfunction corresponding to the first eigenvalue λ_1 of $-\Delta_p$ in Ω subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions. From the Maximum Principle of Vázquez ([12], Thm 5]), we have $u_\epsilon > 0$ in Ω , $\frac{\partial u_\epsilon}{\partial \nu} < 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial \nu} < 0$ on $\partial\Omega$.

Consequently, there exist $\beta > 0$ such that for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, we have $u_\epsilon(x) \geq \beta\varphi_1$ and, for a given $\eta > 0$ there is C_η such that

$$(5) \quad u_\epsilon(x) \geq C_\eta > 0,$$

for all $x \in \Omega_\eta := \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \eta\}$. Take φ_1 such that $\|\varphi_1\| = 1$. Since u_ϵ is solution of (3) it follows that

$$(6) \quad \epsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_\epsilon|^{p-2} \nabla u_\epsilon \nabla \varphi dx = \int_{\Omega} f_1(u_\epsilon) \varphi dx, \quad \forall \varphi \geq 0, \varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

In particular, for $\varphi = \varphi_1$ we have

$$(7) \quad \epsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_\epsilon|^{p-2} \nabla u_\epsilon \nabla \varphi_1 dx = \int_{\Omega} f_1(u_\epsilon) \varphi_1 dx.$$

Claim: The expression in the left-hand side of (7) goes to zero as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In fact, observe that $0 < u_\epsilon \leq a_3$ and $f_1(u_\epsilon) \leq \tilde{C}$. Thus, using Hölder inequality and (6) with $\varphi = u_\epsilon(x)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_\epsilon|^{p-2} \nabla u_\epsilon \nabla \varphi_1 dx &\leq C \epsilon^2 \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\Omega} f_1(u_\epsilon) u_\epsilon dx \right)^{\frac{(p-1)}{p}} \\ &\leq \hat{C} \epsilon^{\frac{2}{p}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \text{ for some constant } \hat{C}. \end{aligned}$$

Define $d_\eta := \inf\{\varphi_1(x) : x \in \Omega_\eta\} > 0$. Then,

$$(8) \quad d_\eta \int_{\Omega_\eta} f_1(u_\epsilon) dx \leq \int_{\Omega_\eta} f_1(u_\epsilon) \varphi_1 dx < \int_{\Omega} f_1(u_\epsilon) \varphi_1 \rightarrow 0, \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Now suppose by contradiction that there are a number $C_1 > 0$ and a sequence $\epsilon_j \rightarrow 0$ such that the Lebesgue's measure of the sets

$$(9) \quad \Omega_{\eta,j} := \{x \in \Omega_\eta : u_{\epsilon_j}(x) < a_3 - \eta\}$$

are bounded from below by C_1 . It follows from (8) that

$$(10) \quad I_j := \int_{\Omega_{\eta,j}} f_1(u_{\epsilon_j}) dx \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon_j \rightarrow 0.$$

Observe that in $\Omega_{\eta,j}$, from (5) and (9), we have $C_\eta \leq u_{\epsilon_j} \leq a_3 - \eta$.

Since f_1 is bounded from below in the interval $[C_\eta, a_3 - \eta]$ by a number $d > 0$, from (9) it follows

$$I_j = \int_{\Omega_{\eta,j}} f_1(u_{\epsilon_j}) dx \geq d |\Omega_{\eta,j}| \geq dC_1,$$

which contradicts (10). Therefore, $|\Omega_{\eta,j}|$ is not bounded from below, i.e., $u_\epsilon(x) \rightarrow a_3$, on every compact subset of Ω as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

ii) It follows similarly as in the previous case i). □

Proof of Theorem 2.1: The proof follows directly from Propositions 2.1 and 2.2. □

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

The proof is done by using a version of the Mountain Pass Theorem, due a Hofer [7], and shows the existence of critical points of the mountain pass type.

3.1 A Particular Case

First, we prove a particular case of Theorem 1.1, that is case when f has only three zeros.

Theorem 3.1 *Let be f satisfying the assumptions (f_1) , (f_2) and (f_3) for $l = 1$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ so that, for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, there is at least one nonconstant solution u_ϵ for the problem (1) verifying $a_1 < u_\epsilon(x) < a_3$.*

In order to prove Theorem 3.1, we use the two lemmas below.

Lemma 3.1 *Let f satisfy the assumptions (f_1) , (f_2) and (f_3) for $l = 1$. Then there exist functions of class C^1 , $f_1 : (-\infty, a_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, $f_2 : [a_3, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^-$ and real numbers η_1 and β_1 such that:*

- (i) $f_1(a_1) = f(a_1)$, $f_1'(a_1) = f'(a_1)$ and $f_1(t) > 0$ for all $t \in (\eta_1, a_1)$;
- (ii) $f_2(a_3) = f(a_3)$, $f_2'(a_3) = f'(a_3)$ and $f_2(t) < 0$ for all $t \in (a_3, \beta_1)$;
- (iii) η_1 and β_1 are so that $\eta_1 < a_1 < a_3 < \beta_1$,

$$\int_{\eta_1}^{a_1} f_1(t) dt = \left| \int_{a_1}^0 f(t) dt \right|, \quad \left| \int_{a_3}^{\beta_1} f_2(t) dt \right| = \int_0^{a_3} f(t) dt$$

and for all $t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\eta_1 < t(1-t)a_3 + (a_3 - a_1)t + a_1 < \beta_1$$

and

$$\eta_1 < t(1-t)a_1 + (a_3 - a_1)t + a_1 < \beta_1.$$

Proof: We start proving the existence of η_1 .

We take

$$\alpha(t) := t(1-t)a_1 + (a_3 - a_1)t + a_1.$$

Thus, $0 = \frac{d}{dt}(\alpha(t)) = -2ta_1 + a_3$ if, and only if, $t = \frac{a_3}{2a_1}$. Moreover, since $a_1 < 0$ and $\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\alpha(t) = -2a_1$ it follows that $\alpha(\frac{a_3}{2a_1}) = \frac{a_3^2}{4a_1} + a_1$ is the minimal value of $\alpha(t)$. Now we define

$$\eta_1 := \frac{a_3^2}{4a_1} + 2a_1.$$

To prove the existence of β_1 , we take

$$\beta(t) := t(1-t)a_3 + (a_3 - a_1)t + a_1.$$

We note that $0 = \frac{d}{dt}(\beta(t)) = (1 - 2t)a_3 + a_3 - a_1$ if, and only if, $t = 1 - \frac{a_1}{2a_3}$. Since $\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\beta(t) = -2a_3$ and $a_3 > 0$, we have $\beta(1 - \frac{a_1}{2a_3}) = \frac{a_1^2}{4a_3} + a_3$ is maximal value of β . Now, we take

$$\beta_1 := \frac{a_1^2}{4a_3} + 2a_3.$$

Now, we are going to prove the existence of the function f_1 .

We take $g(t) = f'(a_1)(t - a_1)$ and ξ_1, ξ_2 functions of class C^1 so that $\xi_1 \equiv 1$ at a neighbourhood of a_1 , $\xi_2 \equiv 1$ at a neighbourhood of η_1 , $\xi_1(t) + \xi_2(t) = 1$ for all $t \in [\eta_1, a_1]$ and

$$\int_{\eta_1}^{a_1} g(t)\xi_1(t)dt < \left| \int_{a_1}^0 f(t)dt \right|.$$

Now, we choose $r > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\eta_1}^{a_1} [r\xi_2(t)g(t) + \xi_1(t)g(t)]dt = \left| \int_{a_1}^0 f(t)dt \right|.$$

We define $f_1 : (-\infty, a_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ by

$$f_1(t) := \begin{cases} r\xi_2(t)g(t) + \xi_1(t)g(t), & \eta_1 \leq t \leq a_1 \\ rf'(a_1)t - ra_1f'(a_1), & t \leq \eta_1. \end{cases}$$

We note that for $t \leq \eta_1$ the graph of f_1 is the tangent line to f_1 at the point $(\eta_1, f_1(\eta_1))$.

Finally, we prove the existence of f_2 .

We take $g(t) = f'(a_3)(t - a_3)$ and ξ_1, ξ_2 functions of class C^1 so that $\xi_1 \equiv 1$ at a neighbourhood of a_3 , $\xi_2 \equiv 1$ at a neighbourhood of β_1 , $\xi_1(t) + \xi_2(t) = 1$ for all $t \in [a_3, \beta_1]$ and

Now, we choose $r > 0$ such that

$$\left| \int_{a_3}^{\beta_1} [r\xi_2(t)g(t) + \xi_1(t)g(t)]dt \right| = \int_0^{a_3} f(t)dt.$$

We define $f_2 : [a_3, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^-$ by

$$f_2(t) := \begin{cases} r\xi_2(t)g(t) + \xi_1(t)g(t), & a_3 \leq t \leq \beta_1 \\ rf'(a_1)t - ra_1f'(a_1), & t \geq \beta_1. \end{cases}$$

We observe that for $t \geq \beta_1$ the graph of f_2 is the tangent line to f_2 at the point $(\beta_1, f_2(\beta_1))$.

Thus the proof of Lemma is concluded. \square

As consequence of the Maximum Principle we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2 *If u_ϵ is a nonconstant solution of the Neumann problem*

$$(11) \quad \begin{cases} -\epsilon^2 \Delta_p u = \widehat{f}(u), & x \in \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\widehat{f} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the function defined by

$$\widehat{f}(t) := \begin{cases} f(t), & a_1 \leq t \leq a_3 \\ f_1(t), & t \leq a_1 \\ f_2(t), & t \geq a_3, \end{cases}$$

where f_1 and f_2 are defined in Lemma 3.1. Then $a_1 \leq u_\epsilon \leq a_3$.

Proof: We start proving that $u_\epsilon \leq a_3$. In fact, let

$$v(x) := \begin{cases} u_\epsilon(x) - a_3, & \text{if } u_\epsilon(x) \geq a_3 \\ 0, & \text{if } u_\epsilon(x) < a_3 \end{cases}$$

and $\Omega_+ := \{x \in \Omega : u_\epsilon(x) \geq a_3\}$.

Notice that

$$\epsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_\epsilon|^{p-2} \nabla u_\epsilon \nabla v dx = \int_{\Omega} \widehat{f}(u_\epsilon) v dx = \int_{\Omega_+} f_2(u_\epsilon) v dx \leq 0.$$

So,

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^p \leq 0.$$

Thus, it follows that $|\nabla v| = 0$. Since u_{ϵ} is nonconstant, there exists $x \in \Omega$ where $u_{\epsilon}(x) < a_3$. So that, $v \equiv 0$. Therefore, $u_{\epsilon}(x) \leq a_3$, for all $x \in \Omega$.

Similarly, we have $a_1 \leq u_{\epsilon}$, by taking

$$w(x) := \begin{cases} u_{\epsilon}(x) - a_1, & u_{\epsilon}(x) \leq a_1 \\ 0, & u_{\epsilon}(x) > a_1 \end{cases}$$

and $\Omega_- := \{x \in \Omega : u_{\epsilon}(x) \leq a_1\}$.

This finishes the proof of the Lemma. \square

Thus, by Lemma 3.2, it follows that a solution for problem (11) is a solution for problem (1), since $f \equiv \widehat{f}$ in $[a_1, a_3]$. Therefore, to prove Theorem 3.1 it suffices to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2 *Let f satisfy the conditions (f_1) , (f_2) and (f_3) for $l = 1$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that, for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, problem (11) has at least one nonconstant solution u_{ϵ} .*

We consider the functional $J_{\epsilon} : W^{1,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$J_{\epsilon}(u) := \frac{\epsilon^2}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx - \int_{\Omega} \widehat{F}(u) dx,$$

where $\widehat{F}(u) := \int_0^u \widehat{f}(t) dt$.

By Sobolev imbedding this functional is well defined for $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Moreover, $J_{\epsilon} \in C^1(W^{1,p}(\Omega), \mathbb{R})$ with the derivative given by

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi dx - \int_{\Omega} \widehat{f}(u) \varphi dx, \quad \forall \varphi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

Thus, the critical points of J_ϵ are weak solutions of (11).

Lemma 3.3 *The functional J_ϵ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition.*

Proof: Let $(u_n) \subset W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be a sequence satisfying $J_\epsilon(u_n) \rightarrow c$ and $J'_\epsilon(u_n) \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence

$$(12) \quad |J_\epsilon(u_n)| = \left| \frac{\epsilon^2}{p} \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^p dx - \int_\Omega \widehat{F}(u_n) dx \right| \leq d \text{ for some } d > 0,$$

and

$$(13) \quad |J'_\epsilon(u_n)v| = \left| \epsilon^2 \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^{p-2} \nabla u_n \nabla v dx - \int_\Omega \widehat{f}(u_n)v dx \right| \leq \delta_n \|v\|,$$

for all $v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ where $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Claim: (u_n) is bounded. In fact, define

$$v_n(x) = \begin{cases} u_n(x) - \beta_1, & \text{if } u_n(x) \geq \beta_1, \\ 0, & \text{if } u_n(x) < \beta_1, \end{cases}$$

and $\Omega_1 := \{x \in \Omega : u_n(x) \geq \beta_1\}$.

By (13) we have

$$\left| \epsilon^2 \int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^p dx - \int_\Omega \widehat{f}(u_n)v_n dx \right| \leq \delta_n \|v_n\|.$$

Since $\widehat{f}(u_n) \leq -C$ in Ω_1 , it follows

$$(14) \quad \epsilon^2 \int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^p dx + C \int_\Omega v_n dx \leq \delta_n \|v_n\|$$

$$(15) \quad C \int_\Omega v_n dx \leq \delta_n \|v_n\|.$$

Define $w_n := \frac{v_n}{\|v_n\|}$. Hence, $\|w_n\| = 1$. Taking subsequence if necessary we can assume that $w_n \rightharpoonup w$ weakly in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $w_n \rightarrow w$ in $L^p(\Omega)$ and $w_n(x) \rightarrow$

$w(x)$ a.e. in Ω . Dividing (15) by $\|v_n\|$, we have

$$C \int_{\Omega} w_n dx \leq \delta_n.$$

Taking limits of both sides and observing that $w \geq 0$, we have $w \equiv 0$. Dividing

(14) by $\|v_n\|$ and taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that

$$(16) \quad \epsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla v_n|^p}{\|v_n\|} \rightarrow 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$1 = \|w_n\| = \epsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^p dx + \int_{\Omega} |w_n|^p.$$

Thus,

$$(17) \quad \epsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^p dx \rightarrow 1.$$

Multiplying and dividing (16) by $\|v_n\|^{p-1}$, we obtain

$$\|v_n\|^{p-1} \epsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla \left(\frac{v_n}{\|v_n\|} \right) \right|^p dx = \|v_n\|^{p-1} \epsilon^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^p dx \rightarrow 0.$$

Also, from (17) it follows that $\|v_n\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, $\|v_n\| \leq C$.

Next, define

$$z_n(x) := \begin{cases} u_n(x), & \text{if } \eta_1 \leq u_n(x) \leq \beta_1 \\ 0, & \text{if } \eta_1 \geq u_n(x) \\ 0, & \text{if } u_n(x) \geq \beta_1 \end{cases}$$

and $\Omega_2 := \{x \in \Omega : \eta_1 \leq u_n(x) \leq \beta_1\}$.

By a similar argument, we prove that $\|z_n\| \leq C$.

Finally, we consider the sequence

$$r_n(x) := \begin{cases} u_n(x) - \eta_1, & \text{if } u_n(x) \leq \eta_1 \\ 0, & \text{if } u_n(x) > \eta_1 \end{cases}$$

and the set $\Omega_3 := \{x \in \Omega : u_n(x) \leq \eta_1 < 0\}$.

Similarly, as in the previous case, we prove that $\|r_n\| \leq C$.

Let $u_n := v_n + z_n + r_n$. Then, we conclude that (u_n) is bounded in Ω . Also, using the Boccardo-Murat convergence lemma in [1], we obtain that J_ϵ satisfies the (PS) condition. \square

Lemma 3.4 *The functional J_ϵ is lower bounded.*

Proof: Let $\Omega_1 := \Omega_3 \cup \Omega_4$ and $\Omega_2 := \Omega_5 \cup \Omega_6$, with

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_3 &:= \{x \in \Omega : 0 \leq u(x) \leq a_3\}, & \Omega_4 &:= \{x \in \Omega : a_3 < u(x) < \infty\}, \\ \Omega_5 &:= \{x \in \Omega : a_1 \leq u(x) \leq 0\}, & \Omega_6 &:= \{x \in \Omega : -\infty < u(x) < a_1\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since, u is bounded in Ω_3 and in Ω_5 , we have

$$\int_{\Omega_1} \widehat{F}(u) dx = \int_{\Omega_3} \widehat{F}(u) dx + \int_{\Omega_4} \widehat{F}(u) dx < \widetilde{C} + \int_{\Omega_4} \widehat{F}(a_3) dx \leq C$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega_2} \widehat{F}(u) dx = \int_{\Omega_5} \widehat{F}(u) dx + \int_{\Omega_6} \widehat{F}(u) dx < \overline{C} + \int_{\Omega_6} \widehat{F}(a_1) dx < C.$$

Also,

$$\int_{\Omega} \widehat{F}(u) dx = \int_{\Omega_1} \widehat{F}(u) dx + \int_{\Omega_2} \widehat{F}(u) dx < C.$$

Hence,

$$J_\epsilon(u) \geq \frac{\epsilon^2}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx - C \geq -C.$$

Therefore, J_ϵ is lower bounded. \square

Lemma 3.5 a_i , with i odd, is strict local minimum of J_ϵ in $W^{1,p}$.

Proof: First of all, we will prove that J_ϵ has a local minimum in C^1 at a_i .

Let $\delta > 0$ such that $\widehat{F}(a_i) \geq \widehat{F}(t)$, for $|t - a_i| < \delta$, and let $u \in C^1$ so that $\|u(x) - a_i\|_{C^1} = \max\{|u(x) - a_i|, |u'(x) - a_i|\} \leq \delta$. We claim that there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $\Omega_\eta := \{x \in \Omega : |u(x) - a_i| > \eta\}$ has positive measure. In fact, let $u \in C^1(\Omega)$, $u \not\equiv a_i$. Then, there exists $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $u(x_0) \neq a_i$. Hence, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that either $u(x_0) > a_i + \eta$ or $u(x_0) < a_i - \eta$.

Since u is continuous there exists a ball $B_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(x_0)$ such that $|u(x) - a_i| > \eta$, for all $x \in B_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(x_0)$. Therefore, Ω_η has positive measure.

Now, we define $c_1 := \max\{\widehat{F}(a_i - \eta), \widehat{F}(a_i + \eta)\}$. Since, a_i a strict local maximum of \widehat{F} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \widehat{F}(u) dx &\leq \int_{\Omega_\eta} c_1 dx + \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_\eta} \widehat{F}(a_i) dx \\ &< \widehat{F}(a_i) \int_{\Omega_\eta} dx + \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_\eta} \widehat{F}(a_i) dx = \int_{\Omega} \widehat{F}(a_i) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$J_\epsilon(u) \geq - \int_{\Omega} \widehat{F}(u) dx > - \int_{\Omega} \widehat{F}(a_i) dx = J_\epsilon(a_i),$$

i.e., a_i is a strict local minimum of J_ϵ in C^1 .

Therefore, by Teorema 1.2 in [6] a_i is local minimum of J_ϵ in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

Without loss of generality, we suppose that a_i is strict local minimum of J_ϵ in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. On the contrary case, for all $\delta > 0$, there exist $v_\delta \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that $J_\epsilon(v_\delta) = J_\epsilon(a_i)$. So, v_δ is a critical point of J_ϵ in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. \square

We will use arguments of [4] in order to obtain the next lemma.

Lemma 3.6 *If a is a strict local minimum of J_ϵ , i.e.,*

$$(18) \quad J_\epsilon(a) < J_\epsilon(u)$$

for all $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that $0 < \|u - a\| < \delta_0$ for some $\delta_0 > 0$. Then, for any $0 < \alpha < \delta_0$,

$$(19) \quad \inf\{J_\epsilon(u) : u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) \text{ and } \|u - a\| = \alpha\} > J_\epsilon(a).$$

Proof: Assume by contradiction that the infimum in (19) is equal to $J_\epsilon(a)$ for some α with $0 < \alpha < \delta_0$. So there exists a sequence $u_n \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with $\|u_n - a\| = \alpha$ and, say, $J_\epsilon(u_n) \leq J_\epsilon(a) + \frac{1}{2n^2}$. Call

$$A := \{u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) : \alpha - \delta \leq \|u - a\| \leq \alpha + \delta\},$$

where $\delta > 0$ is chosen so that $0 < \alpha - \delta$ and $\alpha + \delta < \delta_0$. In view of our contradiction hypothesis and (18), it follows that $\inf\{J_\epsilon(u) : u \in A\} = J_\epsilon(a)$.

We now apply the Ekeland Variational principle to the functional J_ϵ on A in order to get the existence of $v_n \in A$ such that

$$(20) \quad J_\epsilon(v_n) \leq J_\epsilon(u_n),$$

$$(21) \quad \|v_n - u_n\| \leq \frac{1}{n},$$

$$(22) \quad J_\epsilon(v_n) \leq J_\epsilon(u) + \frac{1}{n}\|u - v_n\|, \quad \forall u \in A.$$

Our purpose is to show that v_n is a (PS) sequence for J_ϵ in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, i.e., $J_\epsilon(v_n) \leq C$ (which is obvious by (20)) and $J'_\epsilon(v_n) \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Once this is proved, we get, that v_n has a convergent subsequence. Denote this subsequence by v_n we have that $v_n \rightarrow v$ in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Notice that $v \in A$, since A is complete. Hence, $v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and therefore it satisfies $\|v - a\| = \alpha$ and $J_\epsilon(v) = J_\epsilon(a)$, which contradicts (18).

So in order to conclude the proof of Lemma 3.6 we will prove that $J'_\epsilon(v_n) \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Take $w \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and consider $u_t := v_n + tw$, for $n > 1/\delta$. We observe that for $|t|$ sufficiently small, $u_t = v_n + tw \in A$. Indeed

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|u_t - a\| = \|v_n - a\| \leq \|v_n - u_n\| + \|u_n - a\| \leq \frac{1}{n} + \alpha < \delta + \alpha.$$

On the other hand,

$$\|v_n - a\| \geq \|a - u_n\| - \|u_n - v_n\| \geq \alpha - \frac{1}{n} > \alpha - \delta.$$

Also, we can take $u = u_t$ in (22), and then, for $t > 0$,

$$(23) \quad \frac{J_\epsilon(v_n) - J_\epsilon(v_n + tw)}{t} \leq \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{t} \|v_n - tw - v_n\| \leq \frac{1}{nt} \|tw\|.$$

Taking the limit in (23) as $t \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $\langle J'_\epsilon(v_n), w \rangle \leq \frac{1}{n} \|w\|$. Consequently,

$$|\langle J'_\epsilon(v_n), w \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{n} \|w\|, \quad \forall w \in W^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

So, $J'_\epsilon(v_n) \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and the proof of the lemma is concluded. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2: We define

$$\Gamma := \{h \in C([0, 1], W^{1,p}(\Omega)) : h(0) = a_1 \text{ e } h(1) = a_3\}$$

and

$$\gamma_\epsilon := \inf_{h \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} J_\epsilon(h(t)).$$

By Lemma 3.6 $\gamma_\epsilon := \inf_{h \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} J_\epsilon(h(t)) > c = \max\{J_\epsilon(a_1), J_\epsilon(a_3)\}$.

Since J_ϵ satisfies the condition (PS), using the Mountain Pass Theorem by [7] it follows that there exist \bar{u} critical point of J_ϵ such that $J_\epsilon(\bar{u}) = \gamma_\epsilon$. If the critical points are not isolated in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ then there exist an infinite number of critical

points of J_ϵ . Otherwise, \bar{u} is of the mountain-pass type, see [7]. Since a_1 and a_3 are strict local minimum then $\bar{u} \neq a_1$ and $\bar{u} \neq a_3$. Therefore, in order to show the existence of a nonconstant critical point of J_ϵ , we only need to prove that $\gamma_\epsilon < 0$, since $J_\epsilon(0) = 0$.

We claim that $\gamma_\epsilon < 0$. In fact, we consider $B \subset \Omega$ an open ball in Ω and we define

$$u_0(x) := \begin{cases} v_\epsilon(x), & x \in \bar{B} \\ w_\epsilon(x), & x \in \bar{\Omega} \setminus \bar{B}, \end{cases}$$

where v_ϵ is the positive solution for the Dirichlet problem (2) in \bar{B} and w_ϵ is the negative solution for the Dirichlet problem (2) in $(\Omega \setminus \bar{B}) \cup \partial(\Omega \setminus \bar{B})$.

Since $\Omega \in C^1$ and the functions $v_\epsilon, w_\epsilon \in L^p(\Omega)$, it follows by Proposition IX.18 of [2] that $u_0 \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

Now, given $\epsilon > 0$ we consider the special path

$$h_\epsilon(t) := t(1-t)u_0(x) + (a_3 - a_1)t + a_1, \quad \text{in } \Gamma.$$

Then we claim that there exists a small number $\epsilon_0 > 0$, so that, for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and for all $t \in [0, 1]$ $\max_{t \geq 0} J_\epsilon(h_\epsilon(t)) < 0$. In fact, suppose by contradiction that there is no such a $\epsilon_0 > 0$. Then for any $\epsilon_0 > 0$ there is a $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ so that

$$(24) \quad J_\epsilon(h_\epsilon(t_\epsilon)) \geq 0,$$

for some $t_\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. Then choose a sequence (ϵ_k) so that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_k = 0, \quad J_{\epsilon_k}(h_{\epsilon_k}(t_{\epsilon_k})) \geq 0, \quad 0 \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow 0} t_{\epsilon_k} = \alpha \leq 1.$$

For simplicity we drop the indices and write $\epsilon_k = \epsilon$ and $t_{\epsilon_k} = t$. So

$$\begin{aligned} J_\epsilon(h_\epsilon(t)) &= \frac{\epsilon^2}{p} \int_B |\nabla h_\epsilon(t)|^p dx + \frac{\epsilon^2}{p} \int_{\Omega \setminus B} |\nabla h_\epsilon(t)|^p dx - \int_\Omega \widehat{F}(h_\epsilon(t)) dx \\ &= \frac{\epsilon^2}{p} t^p (1-t)^p \left(\int_B |\nabla v_\epsilon|^p dx + \int_{\Omega \setminus B} |\nabla w_\epsilon|^p dx \right) \\ &\quad - \int_\Omega \widehat{F}(t(1-t)u_0 + (a_3 - a_1)t + a_1) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\epsilon^2 \int_B |\nabla v_\epsilon|^p dx = \int_B \widehat{f}(v_\epsilon) v_\epsilon dx \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon^2 \int_{\Omega \setminus B} |\nabla w_\epsilon|^p dx = \int_{\Omega \setminus B} \widehat{f}(w_\epsilon) w_\epsilon dx$$

we get

$$(25) \quad \begin{aligned} J_\epsilon(h_\epsilon(t)) &= \frac{t^p (1-t)^p}{p} \left[\int_B \widehat{f}(v_\epsilon) v_\epsilon dx + \int_{\Omega \setminus B} \widehat{f}(w_\epsilon) w_\epsilon dx \right] \\ &\quad - \int_\Omega \widehat{F}(t(1-t)u_0 + (a_3 - a_1)t + a_1) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $v_\epsilon \rightarrow a_3$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on every compact subset of B and $w_\epsilon \rightarrow a_1$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on every compact subset of $\Omega \setminus B$, so

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_B \widehat{f}(v_\epsilon) v_\epsilon dx = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega \setminus B} \widehat{f}(w_\epsilon) w_\epsilon dx = 0.$$

If we take the limit on both sides of (25), it follows from the dominated convergence theorem and the above facts that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} J_\epsilon(h_\epsilon(t)) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[- \int_\Omega \widehat{F}(t(1-t)u_0(x, \epsilon) + (a_3 - a_1)t + a_1) dx \right] \\ &= -\widehat{F}(\alpha(1-\alpha)a_3 + (a_3 - a_1)\alpha + a_1)|B| \\ &\quad - \widehat{F}(\alpha(1-\alpha)a_1 + (a_3 - a_1)\alpha + a_1)|\Omega \setminus B|, \end{aligned}$$

where $|A|$ is the Lebesgue measure of $A \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$(26) \quad -\widehat{F}(\alpha(1-\alpha)a_3 + (a_3 - a_1)\alpha + a_1) \leq 0$$

and

$$(27) \quad -\widehat{F}(\alpha(1-\alpha)a_1 + (a_3 - a_1)\alpha + a_1) \leq 0.$$

In fact we have the strict inequalities below

$$-\widehat{F}(\alpha(1-\alpha)a_3 + (a_3 - a_1)\alpha + a_1) < 0 \quad \text{or} \quad -\widehat{F}(\alpha(1-\alpha)a_1 + (a_3 - a_1)\alpha + a_1) < 0.$$

Indeed, since

$$\eta_1 < \alpha(1-\alpha)a_3 + (a_3 - a_1)\alpha + a_1 < \beta_1,$$

$$\eta_1 < \alpha(1-\alpha)a_1 + (a_3 - a_1)\alpha + a_1 < \beta_1$$

and \widehat{F} is zero only at η_1 , 0 and β_1 , we conclude that if (26) and (27) are zero, then

$$\alpha(1-\alpha)a_3 + (a_3 - a_1)\alpha + a_1 = 0 = \alpha(1-\alpha)a_1 + (a_3 - a_1)\alpha + a_1,$$

i.e., $\alpha(1-\alpha)a_3 = \alpha(1-\alpha)a_1$. Since $a_3 \neq a_1$, then $\alpha(1-\alpha) = 0$, i.e., either $\alpha = 0$ or $\alpha = 1$. Hence either $\widehat{F}(a_1) = 0$ or $\widehat{F}(a_3) = 0$. Then either $a_1 = 0$ or $a_3 = 0$, which is impossible. Hence, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} J_\epsilon(h_\epsilon(t)) < 0$, which is in contradiction with (24). So we get finally that $\gamma_\epsilon < 0$. \square

Corollary 3.1 *Let f be satisfying (f_1) , (f_2) and (f_3) for $l = 1$ and let u_ϵ the nonconstant solution of (1) such that $J_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) = \gamma_\epsilon$. Then*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup J_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) < 0.$$

Proof: From the proof of Theorem 3.2 there exists a number ϵ_1 positive such that $J_\epsilon(h_{\epsilon_1}(t)) < 0$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$, where

$$h_{\epsilon_1}(t) = t(1-t)u_0(\epsilon_1) + (a_3 - a_1)t + a_1.$$

Hence, for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_1$, $J_\epsilon(h_{\epsilon_1}(t)) \leq J_{\epsilon_1}(h_{\epsilon_1}(t)) < 0$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$.

It follows from the intermediate value theorem that there exists $t_\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ such that $h_{\epsilon_1}(t_\epsilon) = u_\epsilon(x)$, since, $h_{\epsilon_1}(0) = a_1$, $h_{\epsilon_1}(1) = a_3$ and $a_1 \leq u_\epsilon(x) \leq a_3$. So $J_\epsilon(h_{\epsilon_1}(t_\epsilon)) = J_\epsilon(u_\epsilon(x))$, for some $t_\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, and so the assertion is true. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1: The proof follows directly from the Theorem 3.2 e Lemma 3.2. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1: For each $l = 1, 2, \dots$ we consider the function $\tilde{f} : [a_{2l-1} - a_{2l}, a_{2l+1} - a_{2l}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of class C^1 defined by $\tilde{f}(t) := f(t + a_{2l})$. Then from Theorem 3.1, the problem

$$(28) \quad \begin{cases} -\epsilon^2 \Delta_p v &= \tilde{f}(v), & x \in \Omega \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} &= 0, & x \in \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

has a nonconstant solution $v_l(x)$ such that $a_{2l-1} - a_{2l} < v_l(x) < a_{2l+1} - a_{2l}$, where $v = u - a_{2l}$. So, $u_l = v_l + a_{2l}$ is a nonconstant solution for the problem (1) with $a_{2l-1} < u_l < a_{2l+1}$.

Hence, there exists at least l nonconstants solutions for the problem (1) satisfy $a_1 < u_1(x) < a_3 < u_2(x) < a_5 < \dots < a_{2l-1} < u_l(x) < a_{2l+1}$. \square

4 Asymptotic Behavior of the Solutions of the Neumann Problem

We prove Theorem 1.2 which shows the limiting behavior of the nonconstant solutions of (1).

Proof of Theorem 1.2: Let $0 < \delta < a_3$. We shall prove by contradiction. Suppose that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} w^*(\epsilon, \delta) \neq 0$. Then, there is a convergent sequence $\{w^*(\epsilon_k, \delta)\}$ so that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} w^*(\epsilon_k, \delta) = \alpha_\delta > 0$. This means that, for each $\epsilon_k > 0$, there is $x_k = x(\epsilon_k, \delta) \in \Omega^+(\epsilon_k, \delta)$ so that the ball $B(x_k, \alpha_\delta)$, centered at the point x_k with the radius α_δ , is contained in $\Omega^+(\epsilon_k, \delta)$.

Notice that $u_\epsilon(x)$ is an upper solution of the Dirichlet problem

$$(29) \quad \begin{cases} -\epsilon_k^2 \Delta_p u = f(u), & \text{in } B(x_k, \alpha_\delta) \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial B(x_k, \alpha_\delta). \end{cases}$$

Claim: There are ϵ_{k_0} and $\beta > 0$ so that $\beta\varphi_1$ is a lower solution for the problem (29) for all $0 < \epsilon_k \leq \epsilon_{k_0}$, where φ_1 is an eigenfunction corresponding to the first eigenvalue λ_1 of $-\Delta_p$ in Ω subject to Dirichlet boundary condition. In fact, this follows similarly as in the step 2 in proof of the Proposition 2.1.

Also, from Theorem 2.1 we know that the problem (29) has a minimal solution u^* with $\beta\varphi_1 \leq u^* \leq u_\epsilon$ and so that $u^* \rightarrow a_3$ on every compact subset of $B(x_k, \alpha_\delta)$ as $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$. This leads to a contradiction for $\delta < a_3$. \square

Remark 4.1 *If we choose an open ball $B = B(x, w^*(\epsilon, \delta))$ centered at some point $x = x(\epsilon, \delta)$ whose radius $w^*(\epsilon, \delta)$ is the maximum of the radii of balls in*

$$\Omega^-(\epsilon, \delta) = \{x \in \Omega : a_1 < -\delta < u(x, \epsilon) < 0\}$$

we can prove, by a similar method, that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} w^(\epsilon, \delta) = 0$.*

Remark 4.2 *By a translation we can remark that Theorem 1.2 and remark 4.1 give us the asymptotic behavior of any solution $u_l(x)$ obtained in the Theorem 1.1.*

4.1 Examples

Example 4.1 Let $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$f(u) := \frac{|u|^{p-2}u(p-p|u|^p)}{(1+|u|^p)}.$$

Hence, f satisfies the conditions (f_1) , (f_2) , (f_3) , for $l = 1$, where $a_1 = -1$, $a_2 = 0$ and $a_3 = 1$.

So by Theorem 3.1 there is an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ so that the Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} -\epsilon^2 \Delta_p u = \frac{|u|^{p-2}u(p-p|u|^p)}{(1+|u|^p)}, & \text{in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

has a nonconstant solution $a_1 \leq u_\epsilon \leq a_3$ for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $p \geq 2$.

Example 4.2 Let $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $f(u) = u(a - u^2)$, where $a \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

Hence, f satisfies the conditions (f_1) , (f_2) , (f_3) , for $l = 1$, where $a_1 = -\sqrt{a}$, $a_2 = 0$ and $a_3 = \sqrt{a}$.

Since, by Theorem 1.1 there is $\epsilon_0 > 0$ so that the Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} -\epsilon^2 \Delta u = u(a - u^2), & \text{in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

has at least l nonconstant solutions satisfy

$$a_1 \leq u_1(x) \leq a_3 \leq u_2(x) \leq a_5 < \dots < u_l(x) < a_{2l+1}$$

for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$.

Example 4.3 Let $f : [-\pi, (2l-1)\pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $f(u) = \text{sen}(u)$. Hence, f

satisfies the conditions (f_1) , (f_2) , (f_3) , for $p = 2$, $l = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ where

$$a_1 = -\pi < a_2 = 0 < a_3 = \pi < \dots < a_{2l} = (2l-2)\pi < a_{2l+1} = (2l-1)\pi.$$

Hence, from Theorem 1.1 there is $\epsilon_0 > 0$ so that the Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} -\epsilon^2 \Delta u = \text{sen}(u), & \text{in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

has at least l nonconstant solutions satisfy

$$a_1 \leq u_1(x) \leq a_3 \leq u_2(x) \leq a_5 < \dots < u_l(x) < a_{2l+1}$$

for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$.

References

- [1] L. Boccardo, F. Murat, Almost Everywhere Convergence of the Gradients of Solutions to Elliptic and Parabolic Equations, *Nonlinear Analysis TMA*, 6 (1992) 581-597.
- [2] H. Brézis, *Analyse fonctionnelle théorie et applications*, Masson, Paris (1987).
- [3] A. Cañada, P. Drábek, J. Gamez, Existence of positive solutions for some problems with nonlinear diffusion, *Trans. AMS*, 349 (1997) 4231-4249.
- [4] M. Cuesta, D. G. De Figueiredo, J. P. Gossez, The beginning of the Fučík spectrum for the p-Laplacian, *J. Diff. Eqns.*, 159 (1999) 212-238.
- [5] D. G. De Figueiredo, On the existence of multiple ordered solutions of nonlinear eigenvalue problems, *Nonlinear Analysis TMA*, 11 (1987) 481-492.

- [6] J. P. García Azorero, I. Peral Alonso, J. J. Manfredi, Sobolev versus Hölder local minimizers and global multiplicity for some quasilinear elliptic equations, *Comm. Contemp. Math.*, 3 (2000) 385-404.
- [7] H. Hofer, A geometric description of the neighborhood of a critical point given by the mountain-pass theorem, *J. London Math. Soc.*, 31 (1985) 566-570.
- [8] B. S. Ko, The existence of nonconstant solutions of a class of semilinear elliptic Neumann problems with a small parameter, *Nonlinear Analysis TMA*, 28 (1997) 1249-1263.
- [9] G. M. Lieberman, Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations, *Nonlinear Analysis TMA*, 12 (1988) 1203-1219.
- [10] C. C. Manríquez, Existência e multiplicidade de soluções para certos problemas elípticos semilineares, Tese de Doutorado, UNICAMP, (1992).
- [11] P. Tolksdorf, Regularity for a more general class of quasilinear elliptic equations, *J. Diff. Eqns.*, 51 (1984) 126-150.
- [12] J. L. Vázquez, A strong maximum principle for quasilinear elliptic equations, *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 12 (1984) 191-202.