

SUBLINEAR ELLIPTIC PROBLEMS UNDER RADIALITY. HARMONIC NA GROUPS AND EUCLIDEAN SPACES.

EWA DAMEK, GHARDALLOU ZEINEB

DEPARTEMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WROCLAW UNIVERSITY, 50-384 WROCLAW, PLAC GRUNWALDZKI 2/4,
POLAND

FACULTY OF SCIENCES OF TUNIS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS AND APPLICATIONS,
UNIVERSITY TUNIS EL MANAR, LR11ES11, 2092 EL MANAR, TUNIS, TUNISIA

1

Abstract Let \mathcal{L} be the Laplace operator on \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 3$ or the Laplace Beltrami operator on the harmonic NA group (in particular on a rank one noncompact symmetric space). For the equation $\mathcal{L}u - \varphi(\cdot, u) = 0$ we give necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of entire bounded or large solutions under the hypothesis of radiality of φ with respect to the first variable. A Harnack-type inequality for positive continuous solutions is also proved.

Keywords. Sublinear elliptic problems; Harnack-type inequality; Damek-Ricci spaces; Entire solutions; Large solutions; Radiality.

Mathematic Subject Classification (2010): Primary: 35J08, 35J61, 53C35, 58J05; Secondary: 22E30, 43A80, 53C35.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathcal{L} be the Laplace operator on \mathbb{R}^d or the Laplace-Beltrami operator on a harmonic NA group². We are interested in nonnegative entire solutions to

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{L}u(x) - \varphi(x, u(x)) = 0, \quad x \in S,$$

where S is either Euclidean \mathbb{R}^d or harmonic NA and $\varphi : S \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is radial with respect to the first variable. As a Riemannian manifold harmonic NA group is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^d with an appropriate Riemannian metric and it has global geodesic coordinates. Therefore, radiality means that $\varphi(x, t) = \varphi(d(0, x), t)$ where d is the Riemannian distance on harmonic NA or Euclidean distance on \mathbb{R}^d . The behavior of radial objects is very similar on both spaces and so we may apply a unified approach.

Our aim is to give necessary and sufficient conditions for existence of entire solutions bounded or “large” under the hypothesis of radiality. A solution u to (1.1) is called *large* if $u(x) \rightarrow \infty$ when $d(x, 0) \rightarrow \infty$. The characterization we obtain is easily formulated in terms of φ , the condition is straightforward to check and the whole problem is nicely linked to the geometry of the harmonic space NA . Since non compact rank one symmetric spaces are among harmonic NA groups, the results we obtain apply also to the Laplace Beltrami

¹ The first author was supported by the NCN Grant UMO-2014/15/B/ST1/00060.

²Such groups are also called Damek-Ricci spaces and the family includes the rank one noncompact symmetric spaces. For their basic properties see Section 3.

operator there. In particular, the equation

$$Lu - u^\gamma, \quad \gamma \leq 1$$

on rank a one non compact symmetric space does not have a bounded solution, but it has a radial large solution.

Large solutions i.e. the boundary blow-up problems are of considerable interest due to its several scientific applications in different fields. Such problems arise in the study of Riemannian geometry [9], non-Newtonian fluids [2], the subsonic motion of a gas [26] and the electric potential in some bodies [23].

The vast majority of papers studying similar problems consider the equation $\Delta u + g(x, u) = 0$, for the Laplace operator Δ on \mathbb{R}^d . Variety of hypotheses on g have been supposed and various questions have been asked (see e.g. [11] for comprehensive references). In general the semilinear term is not nonnegative or radial with respect to the first variable. Let us abandon for a moment radiality of φ but stick to $\varphi \geq 0$. Then under mild conditions bounded entire solutions of (1.1) can be fully characterized and linked to the bounded \mathcal{L} -harmonic functions (see [14] for more general elliptic operators or Section 2). Secondly, entire bounded and large solutions cannot exist at the same time [11]. Therefore, a neat characterization of existence of this two types of solutions is essential.

Throughout this paper, we assume as little regularity of φ as possible but we want φ to be nondecreasing with respect to the second variable. This allows us to apply a quite general potential theoretical approach [4, 12, 14]. To summarize, our assumptions are:

- (H_1) : For every $t_0 \in [0, +\infty)$, $x \mapsto \varphi(x, t_0) \in K_d^{loc}(\Omega)$ i.e. it is locally in the Kato class. ³
- (H_2) : For every $x_0 \in \Omega$, $t \mapsto \varphi(x_0, t)$ is continuous increasing on $[0, +\infty)$
- (H_3) : $\varphi(x, t) = 0$ for every $x \in \Omega$ and $t \leq 0$.

(H_1) makes φ locally integrable against the fundamental solution to \mathcal{L} which plays a crucial role in our approach. (H_3) is a technical extension of φ to $(-\infty, 0]$ needed as a tool. (H_2) is motivated by the previous results for Δ [13, 19, 22], where $\varphi(x, t) = p(x)\psi(t)$ and $\psi(t) = t^\gamma$ or ψ satisfies so called Keller-Osserman condition. Moreover, under $(H_1) - (H_3)$ we have full description of bounded solutions provided the Green potential of φ is finite, see (2.3) in Section 2.

Equation (1.1) with \mathcal{L} being the Laplace operator Δ on \mathbb{R}^d has been studied with the semilinear part of the form $\varphi(x, t) = p(x)u^\alpha + q(x)u^\beta$, p, q positive functions, $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$ or, more generally, $\varphi(x, t) = p(x)f(u) + q(x)g(u)$ [3, 5, 12, 13, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25]. Then conditions for existence or nonexistence of large solutions are formulated in terms of $\int_0^\infty rh(r)dr$ being finite or infinite, where $h(r)$ is one of the functions: $\max_{|x|=r} p(x)$, $\max_{|x|=r} q(x)$, $\min_{|x|=r} p(x)$, $\min_{|x|=r} q(x)$, [13, 20]. So it makes sense to consider first the radial case. If $\varphi(x, t) = p(x)t^\gamma$, $\gamma < 1$, p is radial, locally bounded then

$$\Delta u - p(x)u^\gamma = 0$$

³We say that a Borel measurable function p on Ω is locally in the Kato class in Ω if

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \sup_{x \in D} \int_{D \cap \{|x-y| \leq \alpha\}} \frac{|p(y)|}{|x-y|^{d-2}} dy = 0$$

for every open bounded set satisfying $D \subset \Omega$.

has an entire large solution if and only if

$$\int_0^\infty rp(r)dr = \infty,$$

[13], see also [22]. Otherwise (1.6) has an entire bounded solution. We obtain here a similar characterization under weaker conditions on φ both on NA and \mathbb{R}^d which generalizes also existing results for the Euclidean case.

For radial φ we write $\varphi(r, t) = \varphi(x, t)$, where $r = d(x, 0)$. Let

$$(1.2) \quad I\varphi(\cdot, c) = \int_0^\infty r\varphi(r, c) dr,$$

for φ on Euclidean S , while for φ on harmonic S we write

$$(1.3) \quad I\varphi(\cdot, c) = \int_0^\infty \varphi(r, c) dr.$$

We prove that (1.1) has always an entire solution. Being bounded or large depend essentially on the growth of $\varphi(\cdot, c)$ measured by $I\varphi(\cdot, c)$ (see Section 2):

Theorem 1. *Suppose that $\varphi(s, t) = p(s)\psi(t)$, satisfies (H_2) - (H_3) , $p \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^\infty(S)$ is radial and there is $c > 0$ such that*

$$(1.4) \quad \psi(t) \leq c(t + 1).$$

Then (1.1) has always an entire radial solution. Moreover, there is a bounded solution if and only if $I(p) < \infty$ and there is a large solution if and only if $I(p) = \infty$.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that (H_1) - (H_3) are satisfied and φ is radial with respect to the first variable. Suppose further that*

(H_4) : For every $x_0 \in \Omega$, $t \mapsto \varphi(x_0, t)$ is concave on $[0, +\infty[$.

Then (1.1) has always an entire radial solution. Moreover, there is a bounded solution if and only if there exists $c > 0$ such that, $I\varphi(\cdot, c) < \infty$ and there is a large solution if and only if for every $c > 0$, $I\varphi(\cdot, c) = \infty$.

Theorems 1 and 2 show that large solution and bounded non zero solutions cannot exist at the same time as it is already proved in [11] for general elliptic operator. Also, Theorems 1 and 2 give a nice characterization of existence of bounded and large solutions. Theorem 1 and 2 follow directly from Theorems 4, 7, 17. The techniques developed before in [11], [14] allow us to go beyond nonlinearity being t^γ or even concavity.

Notice that sublinear ψ , (1.4) satisfies the “so called” Keller-Osserman condition [18, 24]

$$(1.5) \quad \int_1^\infty \left[\int_0^s \psi(t)dt \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} ds = \infty$$

that somehow fits well into the large solution problem. Namely for $p = 1$ and ψ positive continuous Keller [18] and Osserman [24] proved (1.5) is a necessary and sufficient condition to have an entire spherically symmetric solution to

$$(1.6) \quad \Delta u - p\psi(u) = 0.$$

Lair [19] extended this to the case where function p is continuous positive spherically symmetric and ψ is nonnegative continuous nondecreasing vanishing at origin, satisfying (1.5).

They proved that (1.6) has always an entire solution, but there is no such complete characterization of both cases (bounded or large) as we have here under the stronger assumption (1.4).

The difference in $I\varphi(\cdot, c)$ for \mathbb{R}^d (1.2) and for NA (1.3) is due to the properties of the fundamental solution G to \mathcal{L} on each space. More precisely, in both spaces G is radial. On \mathbb{R}^d , $G(x) = a_d|x|^{-d+2}$ where a_d is a constant depending only on the dimension. For NA , the precise estimate for G is obtained in Theorems 20 and 21. Using radially on NA group as it is usually done on \mathbb{R}^d , we obtain that (2.3) is equivalent to $I\varphi(\cdot, c)$ being finite for some c . Properties of harmonic NA groups as well as of G are discussed in Section 3.

To prove our results we need a Harnack-type inequality. It holds for general elliptic operators and it is proved in the last section. More precisely, we have the following theorem

Theorem 3. *Let L be a second order elliptic operator with smooth coefficients defined on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 3$, $L1 \leq 0$. Assume that $\varphi : \Omega \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ is a positive function increasing with respect to the second variable satisfying*

$$(H'_1) \quad \varphi(x, u) \leq p(x)(u + 1), \quad \text{where } p \in \mathcal{K}_d^{loc}(\Omega).^4$$

Then for every compact set R in Ω there exists a constant $C_R > 0$ such that for every positive solution of the equation

$$(1.7) \quad Lu - \varphi(\cdot, u) = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

we have

$$\sup_{x \in R} u(x) \leq C_R(1 + \inf_{x \in R} u(x)).$$

Theorem 3 was proved in [8] for Δ and $\varphi(x, u) = p(x)u^\gamma$, $0 < \gamma < 1$. It turns out that potential theory for L and a sublinearity of φ are completely sufficient to follow their approach.

At last, the authors want to express their gratitude to Krzysztof Bogdan, Konrad Kolesko, Mohamed Selmi and Mohamed Sifi for their helpful and kindly suggestions.

2. BOUNDED AND LARGE SOLUTION UNDER RADIALITY

This section contains our main results about bounded and large solutions. Some theorems and lemmas holds for general elliptic operators with smooth coefficients. So, as before, we will use for them notation L , while \mathcal{L} is reserved for the Laplace Beltrami operator on S .

2.1. Elliptic operators with smooth coefficients. Let Ω be an open domain. We say that Ω is *Greenian* if there is a function $G_\Omega(x, y)$ smooth on $\Omega \times \Omega \setminus \{(x, x) : x \in \Omega\}$ such that for every $y \in \Omega$

$$(2.1) \quad LG_\Omega(\cdot, y) = -\delta_y, \quad \text{in the sense of distributions,}$$

and

$$(2.2) \quad G_\Omega(\cdot, y), \quad \text{is a potential,}$$

i.e. every positive L -harmonic function h such that $h(x) \leq G_\Omega(x, y)$ is equal 0. We write

$$G_\Omega(\varphi(\cdot, c))(x) = \int_\Omega G_\Omega(x, y)\varphi(y, c) dy.$$

⁴If (H_3) and (H_4) are satisfied then $\varphi(x, t) \leq t\varphi(x, 1)$ for $t \geq 1$, which means that (H_1) - (H_4) imply (H'_1) .

Bounded solutions to (1.7) for a second order elliptic operator L with smooth coefficients were described in [14]. Suppose that $L1 \leq 0$ and φ satisfies (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) . Assume further that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 3$) and

$$(2.3) \quad \text{there are } c > 0, x \in S \text{ such that } G_\Omega(\varphi(\cdot, c))(x) < \infty^5.$$

Then positive continuous solutions of (1.7) bounded by c are in one-to-one correspondence with positive L -harmonic functions bounded by c given by

$$(2.4) \quad h = u + G_\Omega(\varphi(\cdot, u)), \text{ in } \Omega.$$

For a bounded regular domain Ω and $f \in C(\partial\Omega)$, $f \geq 0$ (2.4) becomes

$$(2.5) \quad h_\Omega = u + G_\Omega(\varphi(\cdot, u)), \text{ in } \Omega.$$

where h_Ω is the L -harmonic function in Ω having f as its boundary values ⁶. We will write $u = U_\Omega^\varphi f$. (2.4) and (2.5) allow us, in what follows, to go beyond $\varphi(x, t) = p(x)t^\gamma$.

2.2. Bounded solutions for \mathcal{L} under $(H_1) - (H_3)$. Existence of bounded solutions is characterized as follows:

Theorem 4. *Suppose that $(H_1) - (H_3)$ are satisfied for \mathcal{L} and φ is radial with respect to the first variable. Then (1.1) has a nontrivial nonnegative bounded solution if and only if*

$$(2.6) \quad \text{there exists } c_0 > 0 \text{ such that } I\varphi(\cdot, c_0) < \infty.$$

Moreover, if (2.6) is satisfied then there is a radial bounded solution.

Remark 5. For $\mathcal{L} = \Delta$, $\varphi(x, t) = p(x)t^\gamma$ and $p \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (locally in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$) Theorem 4 was proved in [13]. See also [22] for Hölder continuous p .

Remark 6. Let G be the fundamental solution to \mathcal{L} . Notice that $I\varphi(\cdot, c_0) < \infty$ is equivalent to $G(\varphi(\cdot, c_0)) < \infty$ both on Euclidean and harmonic space, which follows from writing the volume element in radial coordinates, see (3.3). Indeed, on NA ,

$$\begin{aligned} G(\varphi(\cdot, c_0))(0) &= \int_{NA} G(0, s)\varphi(s, c_0) dm_L(s) \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} G(r)\varphi(r, c_0)2^{p+q} \sinh\left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^{p+q} \cosh\left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^q dr \end{aligned}$$

and in view of Theorem 20, $G(r) \approx e^{-Qr}$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, the last inequality is finite iff $I\varphi(\cdot, c_0) < \infty$. For \mathbb{R}^d we use estimates for the fundamental solution and we proceed in the same way.

Proof of Theorem 4. Sufficiency of (2.6) follows directly from (2.4) and Remark (6). So it remains to prove its necessity. We will do it for NA . For the Euclidean space it goes in the same way: one has to use the formula for the fundamental solution there.

Suppose that (1.1) has a nontrivial nonnegative bounded solution w and let

$$(2.7) \quad B_n = \{s \in NA : d(s, 0) < n\}.$$

⁵Then $G_\Omega(\varphi(\cdot, c))$ is finite at any point because φ is locally in the Kato class.

⁶ In a bounded regular domain (H_1) implies that $G_\Omega(\varphi(\cdot, c))$ vanishes on $\partial\Omega$

By Lemma 24, for every $c > 0$, $U_{B_n}^\varphi c$ is a radial solution of (1.1) in B_n . Also if $c \geq \sup_{NA} w$, then $u = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} U_{B_n}^\varphi c$ is a nontrivial solution. Moreover, u is \mathcal{L} -subharmonic radial in NA , hence, by the maximum principle for elliptic operators, it follows that

$$(2.8) \quad u(x) \leq u(x_0), \quad \text{if } d(x, 0) \leq d(x_0, 0).$$

We fix r_0 such that $u(r_0) > 0$. Then

$$0 \leq \varphi(r, u(r_0)) \leq \varphi(r, u(r)), \quad \text{for } r \geq r_0.$$

In addition, $h_u = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} H_{D_n} u$ is a positive bounded \mathcal{L} -harmonic function such that

$$h_u = u + G(\varphi(\cdot, u)), \quad \text{in } NA.$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} G(\varphi(\cdot, u))(0) &= \int_{NA} G(0, s) \varphi(s, u(s)) dm_L(s) \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} G(r) \varphi(r, u(r)) 2^{p+q} \sinh\left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^{p+q} \cosh\left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^q dr. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\int_{r_0}^{+\infty} G(r) \varphi(r, u(r_0)) 2^{p+q} \sinh\left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^{p+q} \cosh\left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^q dr < \infty.$$

And by the estimate $G(r) \approx e^{-Qr}$ for large r and (H_1) , the conclusion follows with $c_0 = u(r_0)$. \square

2.3. Large solutions under $(H_1) - (H_4)$. Now we assume that φ is concave with respect to the second variable and we characterize existence of large solutions. The theorem is as follows

Theorem 7. *Suppose that $(H_1) - (H_4)$ are satisfied and φ is radial with respect to the first variable. Then there exists a large solution to (1.1) if and only if*

$$(2.9) \quad \text{for every } c > 0, \quad I\varphi(\cdot, c) = \infty.$$

Moreover, if (2.9) is satisfied then there is a radial large solution.

Remark 8. *As before, $I\varphi(\cdot, c) = \infty$ is equivalent to $G(\varphi(\cdot, c))(0) = +\infty$, which implies that $G\varphi(\cdot, c)$ is identically infinity.*

Remark 9. *For $\mathcal{L} = \Delta$, $\varphi(x, t) = p(x)t^\gamma$ and $p \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ Theorem 7 was proved in [13]. See also [22] for continuous p . As before, the results of [14] and [11] allow us, in what follows, to go beyond $\varphi(x, t) = p(x)t^\gamma$.*

The main ingredients of the proof of Theorem 7 are Theorem 10, below, see [11] and Lemma 12. For the latter we need a Harnack type inequality which is proved in the last section. Both Theorem 10 and Lemma 12 hold for general elliptic operators.

Theorem 10. *(see [11]) Let L be a second order elliptic operator with smooth coefficients defined on a Green domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 3$, satisfying $L1 = 0$. Suppose that $(H_1) - (H_4)$ hold and that there is a bounded solution to*

$$Lu(x) - \varphi(x, u(x)) = 0.$$

Then there is no large solution.

Proof of Theorem 7. Necessity of 2.9 follows from Theorem 4. In fact, by Theorem 4, if there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that $I\varphi(\cdot, c_0) < \infty$ then (1.1) has a nontrivial nonnegative bounded solution in S . We conclude by the Theorem 10, that there is no large solution of (1.1).

Now let us focus on sufficiency. We assume $I\varphi(\cdot, c) = \infty$ for every $c > 0$ and we prove that for every $\alpha > 0$ there exists u nonnegative radial solution of (1.1) such that $u(0) = \alpha$ and $\lim_{d(s) \rightarrow \infty} u(s) = +\infty$.

Let z_n be defined as in Lemma 12 for B_n , see (2.7). So there exists $\nu > 0$ such that $z_n(\nu) = \alpha$. Let $\lambda_n = \inf\{\lambda > 0, z_n(\lambda) = \alpha\}$ and $u_n = U_{B_n}^\varphi \lambda_n$. As a result, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $u_n(0) = \alpha = u_{n+1}(0)$. Also u_n, u_{n+1} are both continuous radial solutions in B_n . By Corollary 14, $u_n = u_{n+1}$ in B_n . We conclude that $u = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} u_n$ is also a radial solution and $u(0) = \alpha$.

Now it remains to prove that $\lim_{d(s) \rightarrow \infty} u(s) = +\infty$. According to Theorem 4, if for every $c > 0$, $I\varphi(\cdot, c) = \infty$ then there is no “bounded nontrivial solution”. Though, u is nontrivial, so u is unbounded. Also, u is radial \mathcal{L} -subharmonic, hence by (2.8), $\lim_{d(s) \rightarrow \infty} u(s) = +\infty$. \square

2.4. Useful Lemmas. This section contains a few lemma used already in the proof of Theorems 4 and 7. We begin with a comparison principle. For $L = \Delta$ it was proved in [12], the general case is similar, see [14]. $\mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ denotes the space of functions locally integrable on Ω .

Lemma 11. *Let L be an elliptic operator with smooth coefficients defined in Ω . Suppose that φ satisfies (H_2) . Let $u, v \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ such that $Lu, Lv \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\Omega)$. If*

$$Lu - \varphi(\cdot, u) \leq Lv - \varphi(\cdot, v), \text{ in } \Omega,$$

in the sense of distributions and

$$\liminf_{\substack{x \rightarrow y \\ y \in \partial\Omega}} (u - v)(x) \geq 0.$$

Then:

$$u - v \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Lemma 12. *Let L be an elliptic operator with smooth coefficients defined in a bounded regular domain D , $x_0 \in D$ and suppose that φ satisfies $(H_1) - (H_3)$. For $x_0 \in D$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we define*

$$z(\lambda) = U_D^\varphi \lambda(x_0).$$

Then

(a) $z(0) = 0$.

(b) For every $\lambda \geq \nu \geq 0$,

$$0 \leq z(\lambda) - z(\nu) \leq \lambda - \nu.$$

(c) We suppose in addition that φ satisfies (H_4) (resp. (H'_1)) then $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} z(\lambda) = +\infty$.

Proof.

(a) If $\lambda = 0$ then $U_D^\varphi \lambda = 0$, consequently $z(0) = 0$.

(b) By Lemma 11, if $\lambda \geq \nu \geq 0$ then $U_D^\varphi \lambda \geq U_D^\varphi \nu$ and hence

$$0 \leq z(\lambda) - z(\nu).$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} z(\lambda) - z(\nu) &= U_D^\varphi \lambda(x_0) - U_D^\varphi \nu(x_0) \\ &= (\lambda - G_D(\varphi(\cdot, U_D^\varphi \lambda))(x_0)) - (\nu - G_D(\varphi(\cdot, U_D^\varphi \nu))(x_0)) \\ &= (\lambda - \nu) + G_D(\varphi(\cdot, U_D^\varphi \nu))(x_0) - \varphi(\cdot, U_D^\varphi \lambda)(x_0) \leq \lambda - \nu. \end{aligned}$$

because φ is increasing with respect to the second variable and so $\varphi(\cdot, U_D^\varphi \nu) - \varphi(\cdot, U_D^\varphi \lambda) \leq 0$.

(c) Suppose first that φ satisfies (H_4) . Let $\lambda \geq 1$ and $y \in D$ such that $U_D^\varphi 1(y) \neq 0$. Then by Theorem 3 there exists a constant $c > 0$ independent on λ such that

$$U_D^\varphi \lambda(y) \leq c(U_D^\varphi \lambda(x_0) + 1).$$

Also, by concavity and Lemma 11:

$$\lambda U_D^\varphi 1(y) \leq U_D^\varphi \lambda(y).$$

Consequently

$$\lambda U_D^\varphi 1(y) \leq c(z(\lambda) + 1).$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} z(\lambda) = +\infty.$$

Suppose now that φ satisfies (H'_1) , by Theorem 4 in [11] there is φ_1 such that $\varphi(x, t) \leq \varphi_1(x, t)$ and φ_1 satisfies (H_1) - (H_4) . Let $\lambda \geq 0$ and

$$z_1(\lambda) = U_D^{\varphi_1} \lambda(x_0), \quad u = U_D^\varphi \lambda, \quad \text{et } v = U_D^{\varphi_1} \lambda.$$

Since $Lv - \varphi(\cdot, v) \geq 0$ then by Lemma 11

$$v \leq u, \quad \text{in } D.$$

Consequently

$$z_1(\lambda) \leq z(\lambda).$$

and we conclude that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} z(\lambda) = +\infty.$$

□

We need also a lemma that gives comparison between radial sub-solutions and super-solutions to (1.1) in

$$(2.10) \quad B_R = \{x \in S : d(x, 0) < R\}.$$

We follow arguments from [13].

Lemma 13. *Assume that φ satisfies (H_1) - (H_4) . Let $u, v \in \mathcal{C}(B_R)$ be radially symmetric such that $\mathcal{L}u, \mathcal{L}v \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(B_R)$ and $v > 0$ in $B_R \setminus \{0\}$. We suppose that*

$$\mathcal{L}u - \varphi(\cdot, u) \leq \mathcal{L}v - \varphi(\cdot, v) \quad \text{in } B_R,$$

and

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{u(x)}{v(x)} \leq 1.$$

Then:

$$u - v \leq 0 \text{ in } B_R.$$

Proof. Let $0 < r < R$. Since u and v are constant on ∂B_r we may denote $\alpha = \frac{u(x)}{v(x)}$ if $x \in \partial B_r$. Suppose that $\alpha > 1$ and define $w = \alpha v$. Using concavity and $\varphi(\cdot, 0) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}w - \varphi(\cdot, w) &= \alpha \mathcal{L}v - \varphi(\cdot, \alpha w) \\ &\geq \alpha \mathcal{L}v - \alpha \varphi(\cdot, v) \\ &\geq \mathcal{L}v - \varphi(\cdot, v) \end{aligned}$$

In addition $w = u$ on ∂B_r . Consequently, by Lemma 11, $w \leq u$ in B_r . As a result, $1 < \alpha \leq \frac{u(x)}{v(x)}$ on $B_R \setminus \{0\}$. Though, $\liminf_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{u(x)}{v(x)} \leq 1$ which gives a contradiction. Finally, we conclude that $\alpha \leq 1$ and $u \leq v$ in B_R . □

Consequently, we can deduce the following corollary:

Corollary 14. *Suppose that the assumptions of Lemma 13 are satisfied in \mathbb{R}^d on in a ball B_R only. Then If u, v are radially symmetric both solutions to (1.1) in S , $u(0) = v(0)$ then $u = v$ in S .*

2.5. Large solutions without concavity. First we notice that condition (2.9) remains sufficient for existence of large solutions without assumption (H_4) . Indeed, we have

Theorem 15. *Let $\varphi(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^\infty(S)$ for every $t > 0$ radially symmetric with respect to the first variable satisfying (H'_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) ⁷. If for every $c > 0$, $I\varphi(\cdot, c) = \infty$ then there exists a radial large solution of (1.1).*

We intend to proceed as in the proof of Theorem 7 but it is not so easy to construct a global non trivial solution as the limit of solutions u_n in B_n . However, given a sequence of solutions of (1.1) which coincide at one point, we prove that there exists a subsequence which converges uniformly to a solution of (1.1).

Lemma 16. *Let $\varphi(\cdot, c) \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^\infty(S)$ for every $c > 0$ and suppose that (H'_1) , (H_2) and (H_3) are satisfied. Given $\alpha > 0$ and $x_0 \in S$ let u_n be a solution of (1.1) in B_n satisfying $u_n(x_0) = \alpha$. Then there exists a subsequence (u_{n_k}) that converges uniformly to a solution u of (1.1) in S and satisfying $u(x_0) = \alpha$.*

Proof. We will use Arzela-Ascoli theorem to prove the existence of such a sequence. Let D be a regular bounded domain and let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\overline{D} \subset B_{n_0}$ and $x_0 \in D$. We begin by equicontinuity of $\{u_n, n > n_0\}$ in \overline{D} . It is enough to prove that there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $n > n_0$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$

$$(2.11) \quad \left| \sup_{x \in \overline{D}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} u_n(x) \right| \leq C.$$

We have

$$u_n + G_{B_{n_0}}(\varphi(\cdot, u_n)) = H_{B_{n_0}} u_n = h'_n, \text{ in } B_{n_0}.$$

⁷ See introduction for (H'_1) .

Moreover, in B_{n_0} we have $G_{B_{n_0}}(\varphi(\cdot, u_n)) = G(\varphi(\cdot, u_n^r)) - g_n$, where g_n is an \mathcal{L} -harmonic nonnegative function, u_n^r is u_n restricted to B_{n_0} and

$$G(\varphi(\cdot, u_n^r)) = \int_{B_{n_0}} G(x, y) \varphi(y, u_n(y)) dm_L(y).$$

Therefore,

$$u_n + G(\varphi(\cdot, u_n^r)) = h'_n + g_n = h_n.$$

By Harnack inequality for \mathcal{L} there is $\beta > 0$ such that for every $x \in \overline{D}$ and $n > n_0$

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} h_n(x) \right| \leq \beta \inf_{y \in \overline{D}} h_n(y).$$

Also

$$0 \leq h_n(x) \leq \sup_{y \in B_{n_0}} u_n(y).$$

Furthermore, by Theorem 3 there exists $\gamma > 0$

$$(2.12) \quad \sup_{x \in B_{n_0}} u_n(x) \leq \gamma(1 + u_n(x_0)) = \gamma(1 + \alpha), \quad \text{for } n > n_0.$$

Hence,

$$\sup_{x \in \overline{D}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} h_n(x) \right| \leq \beta \gamma (1 + \alpha) \quad \text{for } n > n_0.$$

Secondly, we are going to prove that there is $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$(2.13) \quad \left| \sup_{x \in \overline{D}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} G(\varphi(\cdot, u_n^r))(x) \right| \leq C_1$$

for every $n > n_0$. In view of (3.6),

$$(2.14) \quad \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} G(x, y) \right| \leq C|x - y|^{-d+1}.$$

Indeed, in a bounded domain we may replace left-invariant derivatives by the partial ones and the Riemannian distance by the euclidean distance using the identification of harmonic NA with \mathbb{R}^d described in Section 3. We have the same estimate for G corresponding to the Laplace operator in \mathbb{R}^d . Observe, that (2.12) together with $\varphi(\cdot, c) \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^\infty(S)$ implies $\varphi(\cdot, u_n)$ is uniformly bounded in B_{n_0} . Hence

$$(2.15) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} G(\varphi(\cdot, u_n^r))(x) = \int_{B_{n_0}} \frac{\partial G(x, y)}{\partial x_i} \varphi(y, u_n(y)) dm_L(y), \quad \text{for } x \in B_{n_0}.$$

Therefore,

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} G(\varphi(\cdot, u_n^r))(x) \right| \leq \sup_{x \in B_{n_0}} \varphi(x, \gamma(1 + \alpha)) \int_{B_{n_0}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} G(x, y) \right| dm_L(y)$$

which is bounded independently of n .

Consequently, (2.13) follows and we conclude (2.11). Therefore, the family of functions $\{u_n, n > n_0\}$ is equicontinuous uniformly bounded on \overline{D} . By Arzela-Ascoli theorem there exists a subsequence (u_{n_k}) that converges uniformly on \overline{D} . Hence, by Lemma 8 in [14], $v_0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} u_{n_k}$ is a solution of (1.7) in D satisfying $v_0(x_0) = \alpha$.

The argument presented above applies to $D = B_n$ for any n . So we start with $D = D_1$ and we construct a subsequence (u_{n_k}) converging uniformly on D_1 to a solution of (1.7). Then we pass to $D = D_2$ and we select out of (u_{n_k}) an analogous subsequence for D_2 . We conclude by the diagonal method. \square

Proof of Theorem 15. Let $\alpha > 0$. We prove that there exists u nonnegative radial solution of (1.1) such that $u(0) = \alpha$ and $\lim_{d(s) \rightarrow \infty} u(s) = +\infty$. Let z_n be defined as in Lemma 12 for B_n , see (2.7). So there exists $\nu > 0$ such that $z_n(\nu) = \alpha$. Let $\lambda_n = \inf\{\lambda > 0, z_n(\lambda) = \alpha\}$ and $u_n = U_{B_n}^\varphi \lambda_n$. As a result, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $u_n(0) = \alpha = u_{n+1}(0)$. Also u_n, u_{n+1} are both continuous radial solutions in B_n . By Lemma 16, there exists a subsequence (u_{n_k}) that converges uniformly to a radial solution u of (1.1) satisfying $u(0) = \alpha$.

Now it remains to prove that $\lim_{d(s) \rightarrow \infty} u(s) = \infty$. In view of Theorem 4, if for every $c > 0$, $I\varphi(\cdot, c) = \infty$ then there is no ‘‘bounded nontrivial solution’’ in S . Though, u is nontrivial, so u is unbounded in S . Also, u is radial \mathcal{L} -subharmonic, so u is increasing, consequently $\lim_{d(s) \rightarrow \infty} u(s) = \infty$. \square

For the full characterization we need a little bit more about φ .

Theorem 17. *Suppose that $\varphi(s, t) = p(s)\psi(t)$, satisfies $(H_2), (H_3)$ and $p \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^\infty(S)$ is radial and $\psi(t) \leq c(t+1)$. Then there is a large solution to (1.1) if and only if $I(p) = \infty$. Moreover, if the latter is satisfied there is a radial large solution.*

In this case we make use of the following analogue of Theorem 10, see [11].

Theorem 18. *Let L be a second order elliptic operator with smooth coefficients defined on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 3$, satisfying $L1 = 0$. Suppose that $\varphi(x, t) = p(x)\psi(t)$, $(H'_1), (H_2), (H_3)$ hold and that there is a bounded solution to (1.1). Then there is no large solution.*

Proof of Theorem 17. Sufficiency of $I(p) = \infty$ is guaranteed by Theorem 15. It is enough now to prove that existence of a large solution implies $I(p) = \infty$. Suppose that this is not true i.e there is a large solution and $I(p) < \infty$. Hence there is a nontrivial nonnegative bounded solution of equation (1.1). But then, by Theorem 18 there is no large solution for (1.1). This gives a contradiction. \square

3. NA GROUPS AND THE FUNDAMENTAL SOLUTION FOR \mathcal{L} .

3.1. Basic structure of $S = NA$. In this section, we recall briefly the structure of NA groups. For more details we refer to [1, 6, 10, 27].

Let \mathfrak{n} be a two step nilpotent Lie algebra, equipped with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Denote by \mathfrak{z} the center of \mathfrak{n} i.e. $\mathfrak{z} = \{a \in \mathfrak{n}, \forall x \in \mathfrak{n} [a, x] = 0_{\mathfrak{n}}\}$ and \mathfrak{v} be the orthogonal complement of \mathfrak{z} in \mathfrak{n} . Consequently, $[\mathfrak{n}, \mathfrak{z}] = 0_{\mathfrak{n}}$, $[\mathfrak{n}, \mathfrak{n}] \subset \mathfrak{z}$ and $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{z} \oplus \mathfrak{v}$.

Additionally we suppose that for every $z \in \mathfrak{z}$ there is a linear map $J_z : \mathfrak{v} \rightarrow \mathfrak{v}$ satisfying

$$(3.1) \quad \langle J_z(v), v' \rangle = \langle z, [v, v'] \rangle, \text{ for every } v, v' \in \mathfrak{v},$$

and

$$(3.2) \quad J_z \circ J_z(v) = -|z|^2 v = -\langle z, z \rangle v, \text{ for every } v \in \mathfrak{v}.$$

Then \mathfrak{n} is called a *Lie algebra of Heisenberg type*. We denote

$$p = \dim \mathfrak{v}, \quad q = \dim \mathfrak{z}.$$

The corresponding Lie group N is called a *Heisenberg Lie group*. Via the exponential map, we shall identify \mathfrak{n} and N , hence the multiplication in $N \equiv \mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{z} \oplus \mathfrak{v}$ reads

$$x.x' = x + x' + \frac{1}{2}[x, x'].$$

We consider the semi-direct product $S = NA = N \ltimes \mathbb{R}_+^*$ defined by

$$(v, z, a).(v', z', a') = (v + a^{\frac{1}{2}}v', z + az' + \frac{1}{2}a^{\frac{1}{2}}[v, v'], aa'),$$

for every $v, v' \in \mathfrak{v}$, $z, z' \in \mathfrak{z}$, $a, a' \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$. NA is a solvable Lie group, with the corresponding Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{v} \oplus \mathfrak{z} \oplus \mathbb{R}$. Let d be the left invariant Riemannian distance on NA induced by the inner product

$$\langle (v, z, l), (v', z', l') \rangle_{0_s} = \langle v, v' \rangle + \langle z, z' \rangle + ll',$$

defined originally on $T_{0_s}(NA) = \mathfrak{s}^8$. Then the corresponding Riemannian volume is given by

$$dm_L = a^{-Q} dX dZ \frac{da}{a},$$

where $Q = \frac{p}{2} + q$ is the homogeneous dimension on N . dm_L is at the same time a left invariant Haar measure on NA .

NA has global geodesic coordinates i.e. for $s \in NA$ we may write $s = (r, \theta)$, where $r = d(s, 0_s)$, θ belongs to the unit sphere in $\mathfrak{s} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}$ and the above decomposition is a diffeomorphism. The Riemannian volume in geodesic coordinates $s = (r, \theta)$ is given by

$$(3.3) \quad dm_L(s) = 2^{p+q} (\sinh(\frac{r}{2}))^{p+q} (\cosh(\frac{r}{2}))^q dr d\rho_0(\theta),$$

where $d\rho_0(\theta)$ is the surface measure on the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1} .

Let \mathcal{L} be the Laplace-Beltrami-operator in NA . It is symmetric with respect to dm_L and it can be written as

$$\mathcal{L} = L_0 + L_1,$$

where

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} L_0 &= (1 - Q)a\partial_a + a^2\partial_a^2 + a(a + \frac{1}{4}|X|^2)\Delta_Z + a\Delta_X \\ L_1 &= a^2 \sum_{m+1}^{m+k} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle [X, e_i], e_r \rangle \partial_r \partial_i. \end{aligned}$$

Δ_X, Δ_Z are the Laplace operators on \mathfrak{v} and \mathfrak{z} respectively, e_1, \dots, e_m is an orthonormal basis of \mathfrak{v} and e_{m+1}, \dots, e_{m+k} is an orthonormal basis of \mathfrak{z} .

If a function f depends only on $|X|, Z$ and a then $L_1 f = 0$ Hence, the radial part of L is given by

$$\begin{aligned} L_{rad} &= \partial_r^2 + \left(\frac{p+q}{2} \coth(\frac{r}{2}) + \frac{q}{2} \tanh(\frac{r}{2}) \right) \partial_r \\ &= \partial_r^2 + \left(\frac{p}{2} \coth(\frac{r}{2}) + q \coth(r) \right) \partial_r. \end{aligned}$$

⁸ 0_s is the neutral element of S .

3.2. Estimates of the fundamental solution. Let $h_t(s, s_1)$ be the heat kernel for \mathcal{L} . Then

$$h_t(s, s_1) = h_t(s_1^{-1}s, 0_s),$$

$$h_t(s, 0_s) = h_t(d(s, 0_s))$$

is radial and we have the following estimate proved in [1], section 5.

Theorem 19. *Let $r = r(s) = d(0_s, s)$. Then*

$$h_t(r) \asymp t^{-\frac{3}{2}}(1+r)\left(1 + \frac{1+r}{t}\right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{Qr}{2} - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right), \quad r \geq 0, t > 0.$$

Theorem 19 will be now used to prove precise estimates of the fundamental solution

$$G(r) = \int_0^{+\infty} h_t(r) dt$$

for \mathcal{L} .

Theorem 20. *There are $c > 0$ and $d > 0$ such that*

$$c \exp(-Qr) \leq G(r) \leq d \exp(-Qr), \quad r \geq 1.$$

Proof. We have

$$1 \leq 1 + \frac{1+r}{t}, \quad r \geq 0, t > 0.$$

Then by Theorem 19, there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$c_1(1+r) \exp\left(-\frac{Qr}{2}\right) \int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt \leq G(r), \quad r > 0.$$

In addition, according to [28] p.97:

$$\int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt = (4\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} g_{3, \frac{Q^2}{4}}(r),$$

where $g_{n, \lambda}$ is the Green function of $\Delta - \lambda$ in \mathbb{R}^n . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} g_{3, \frac{Q^2}{4}}(r) &= \frac{Q^2}{4} g_{3,1}\left(\left(\frac{Q^2}{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}r\right) \\ &= \frac{Q}{2} \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{1}{r} \exp\left(-\frac{Qr}{2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt = (4\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{Q}{2r} \exp\left(-\frac{Qr}{2}\right).$$

Consequently, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$c \exp(-Qr) \leq G(r), \quad r > 0.$$

Let us now focus on the upper estimate. As above, we use the estimate of Theorem 19. We divide the integral into two parts: $]1+r, +\infty[$ and $]0, 1+r[$. For the first interval,

$$\begin{aligned} t \geq 1+r &\Rightarrow 1 \geq \frac{1+r}{t} \\ &\Rightarrow 2 \geq \frac{1+r}{t} + 1 \\ &\Rightarrow 2^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \geq \left(\frac{1+r}{t} + 1\right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then there exists $d_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{r+1}^{+\infty} h_t(r) dt \leq d_1(1+r) \exp\left(-\frac{Qr}{2}\right) \int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt, \quad r > 0.$$

Though as before:

$$\int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt = (4\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{Q}{2r} \exp\left(-\frac{Qr}{2}\right), \quad r > 0.$$

As a result, there exists $d_2 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{r+1}^{+\infty} h_t(r) dt \leq d_2 \frac{1+r}{r} \exp(-Qr), \quad r > 0.$$

Furthermore, $r \mapsto \frac{1+r}{r}$ is bounded on $[1, +\infty[$, which implies that

$$\int_{r+1}^{+\infty} h_t(r) dt \leq d_3 \exp(-Qr), \quad r \geq 1.$$

Secondly,

$$\begin{aligned} t \leq 1+r &\Rightarrow 1 \leq \frac{1+r}{t} \\ &\Rightarrow 1 + \frac{1+r}{t} \leq 2 \frac{1+r}{t} \\ &\Rightarrow \left(1 + \frac{1+r}{t}\right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \leq 2^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \left(\frac{1+r}{t}\right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists $d_4 > 0$ such that,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{1+r} h_t(r) dt &\leq d_4(1+r)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Qr}{2}\right) \int_0^{1+r} t^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt, \quad r > 0 \\ &\leq d_4(1+r)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Qr}{2}\right) \int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt, \quad r > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Again according to [28] p.97,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt &= (4\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} g_{n, \frac{Q^2}{4}}(r) \\ &= (4\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{Q^2}{4}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} g_{n,1}\left(\frac{Q}{2}r\right) \\ &\underset{r \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} (4\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{Q^2}{4}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}} \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{Qr}{2}\right)}{\left(\frac{Qr}{2}\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $r \mapsto \frac{1+r}{r}$ is bounded on $[1, +\infty[$, we get that there is a constant $d > 0$ such that

$$G(r) \leq d \exp(-Qr), \quad r \geq 1.$$

□

Theorem 21. *For $0 < r \leq 1$ we have the following estimate for G and the left-invariant gradient of ∇G :*

$$(3.5) \quad G(r) \asymp r^{2-n},$$

$$(3.6) \quad \nabla G(r) \leq Cr^{1-n}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\frac{1+r}{t} \leq 1 + \frac{1+r}{t}, \quad r \geq 0, t > 0,$$

then by Theorem 19 there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$c_1(1+r) \int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{1+r}{t}\right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{Qr}{2} - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt \leq G(r), \quad r > 0.$$

Furthermore,

$$1 \leq 1+r, \quad r > 0,$$

and

$$\exp\left(-\frac{Q}{2}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{Qr}{2}\right), \quad 0 < r \leq 1.$$

So there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$c_2 \int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt \leq G(r), \quad 0 < r \leq 1.$$

Though, according to [28], and using same notation as in the preceding theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt &= (4\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} g_{n, \frac{Q^2}{4}}(r) \\ &= (4\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{Q^2}{4}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} g_{n,1}\left(\frac{Q}{2}r\right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition,

$$g_{n,1}(r) \underset{r \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \frac{1}{4\pi^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \gamma\left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right) \frac{1}{r^{n-2}}.$$

So there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$c r^{2-n} \leq G(r), \quad 0 < r \leq 1.$$

Now, let us focus on the upper estimates: As above, we use estimates of Theorem 19. We divide the integral into two parts: $]1+r, +\infty[$ and $]0, 1+r[$. At first,

$$\begin{aligned} t \geq 1+r &\Rightarrow 1 \geq \frac{1+r}{t} \\ &\Rightarrow 2^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \geq \left(\frac{1+r}{t} + 1\right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then there exists $d_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{r+1}^{+\infty} h_t(r) dt \leq d_1(1+r) \exp\left(-\frac{Qr}{2}\right) \int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt \quad r > 0.$$

Though according to [28] as before:

$$\int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt = (4\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{Q}{2r} \exp\left(-\frac{Qr}{2}\right), \quad r > 0.$$

However, for $0 < r \leq 1$,

$$r^{-1} \leq r^{2-n},$$

so

$$\int_{r+1}^{+\infty} h_t(r) dt \leq d_2 r^{2-n}$$

for some $d_2 > 0$. Secondly,

$$\begin{aligned} t \leq 1+r &\Rightarrow 1 \leq \frac{1+r}{t} \\ &\Rightarrow \left(1 + \frac{1+r}{t}\right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \leq 2^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \left(\frac{1+r}{t}\right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists $d_3 > 0$ such that,

$$\int_0^{1+r} h_t(r) dt \leq d_3 \int_0^{1+r} t^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt, \quad 1 \geq r > 0.$$

As before,

$$\int_0^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^2}{4}t - \frac{r^2}{4t}\right) dt = (4\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{Q^2}{4}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} g_{n,1}\left(\frac{Q}{2}r\right).$$

In addition,

$$g_{n,1}(r) \underset{r \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \frac{1}{4\pi^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \gamma\left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right) \frac{1}{r^{n-2}}.$$

Hence, there exists $d_3 > 0$ such that,

$$\int_0^{1+r} h_t(r) dt \leq d_3 r^{2-n}$$

and we get (3.5). (3.6) follows directly from the estimate for the gradient of h_t contained in [1], Corollary 5.49 and a similar calculation as above. \square

3.3. The Green kernel. Let

$$G(s, s_1) = G(s_1^{-1}s), \quad \text{for } s, s_1 \in NA.$$

Then $G(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Green function for \mathcal{L} on NA i.e. (2.1) and (2.2) are satisfied with respect to the measure dm_L .

$$G(f) = \int_{NA} G(s, s_1) f(s_1) dm_L(s_1)$$

is the Green operator i.e

$$\mathcal{L}(G(f)) = -f,$$

for $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(S)$. The proof of the above properties is standard provided all the integrals are well defined which follows, in particular, from the estimates included in Theorems 19, 20 and 21.

Now we prove that the Green operator preserves radially as it does on the Euclidean space. Let G_B be the Green function for $B = B_R$, see (2.10) Then

$$G_B(s, s_1) = G(s, s_1) - \tilde{h}(s, s_1),$$

where for a fixed s_1 , $\tilde{h}(\cdot, s_1)$ is the \mathcal{L} -harmonic function in B with the boundary value $G(\cdot, s_1)$.

Theorem 22. *If a continuous function f is radial then $G_B f$ is radial too.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that

$$G_B(f) = M(G_B f),$$

where for a continuous function u

$$M(u)(r) = \frac{1}{\sigma_e(r)} \int_{S_e(r)} u(r, \theta) dr d\rho_0(\theta).$$

Here $d\rho_0$ is the surface measure on the unit sphere in \mathfrak{s} and $\sigma_e(r)$ is the measure of the sphere $S_e(r)$. In addition NA is a harmonic manifold so

$$\mathcal{L}(M(u)) = M(\mathcal{L}(u)),$$

see [27]. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(M(G_B f)) &= M(\mathcal{L}(G_B f)) \\ &= M(-f) \end{aligned}$$

But if f is radial then $M(f) = f$. As a result

$$\mathcal{L}(G_B f - M(G_B f)) = 0, \text{ in } B.$$

Moreover, $G_B f = 0$ that on the boundary ∂B of B and so is $M(G_B f)$ on ∂B . We conclude that

$$G_B f = M(G_B f).$$

□

Corollary 23. *Let f be a radial continuous function in NA such that Gf is well defined. Then Gf is radial too.*

Proof. We have $Gf = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} G_{B_n} f$. Hence by the preceding proposition Gf is radial on NA as well. □

We finish this section by proving that if φ is radial then U_B^φ is radial as well. The statement holds both for the Euclidean space and NA and it follows from the fact that the Green operator preserves radially. More precisely, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 24. *We assume that φ satisfies (H_1) - (H_3) and radial with respect to the first variable. Then for every $c > 0$ there exists a unique $u \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{B})$ radial on B such that*

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u = \varphi(\cdot, u), & \text{in } B; \\ u = c, & \text{on } \partial B, \end{cases}$$

Furthermore,

$$u + G_B(\varphi(\cdot, u)) = c, \text{ in } B.$$

Proof. The proof is the same as in [14].
Let $\alpha = \min\{c - G_B(\varphi(\cdot, c))(s), s \in NA\}$ and

$$\mathcal{K} = \{u \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{B}), \alpha \leq u \leq c, u \text{ is radial in } B\}.$$

\mathcal{K} is nonempty, closed for the uniform norm and convex. We consider

$$\begin{aligned} T : \mathcal{C}(\overline{B}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\overline{B}) \\ u &\mapsto c - G_B(\varphi(\cdot, u)). \end{aligned}$$

and we prove that $T(\mathcal{K}) \subset \mathcal{K}$. Then Schauder theorem implies that T has a fixed point in \mathcal{K} i.e. a radial positive solution of (3.7). \square

4. HARNACK-TYPE INEQUALITY

In this section we will prove Theorem 3 - the Harnack-type inequality⁹. The proof is based on the following three lemmas. First we need to compare the Green function for L with the one for the Laplace operator Δ on balls $B_r(a) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - a\| < r\}$ of small radii contained in Ω . More precisely, we intend to compare $G_{B_r}^L$ with $G_{B_r}^\Delta$ uniformly, provided the centers of the balls do not approach $\partial\Omega$.

Lemma 25. *Let \overline{D} be a compact subset of Ω such that $\text{dist}(\overline{D}, \partial\Omega) = 2r_0$ for some $r_0 > 0$. There is a constant $M > 0$ such that for every $r \leq r_0$ and for every ball $B_r = B(a, r)$, $a \in \overline{D}$*

$$(4.1) \quad M^{-1}G_{B_r}^\Delta(x, y) \leq G_{B_r}^L(x, y) \leq M G_{B_r}^\Delta(x, y), \quad x, y \in B_r,$$

where $G_{B_r}^L$ is the Green function for L in B_r .

The next lemma is the Harnack inequality for positive L -harmonic functions in $B(a, r)$ with a constant independent of a and r .

Lemma 26. *Under the same hypotheses as in Lemma 25, there exists a constant $M_1 > 0$ such that for every $r \in [0, r_0[$ and for every positive L -harmonic function h in $B(a, r)$*

$$(4.2) \quad \sup_{x \in B(a, \frac{r}{4})} h(x) \leq M_1 \inf_{x \in B(a, \frac{r}{4})} h(x).$$

Finally, we need the following control of potentials:

Lemma 27. *Let $p \in \mathcal{K}_d^{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$, $p \geq 0$ and let s be a positive superharmonic function. Then, under the same hypotheses as in Lemma 25, for every $r \in [0, r_0]$ and $a \in \overline{D}$*

$$G_{B_r}^L(ps)(x) \leq 2M^3 c_d s(x) \sup_{y \in B_r} \int_{B_r} G_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\Delta(y, z) p(z) dz, \quad x \in B_r,$$

where $B_r = B(a, r)$ and c_d is a constant depending only on the dimension as in Lemma 30 below.

⁹See introduction.

4.1. **Proof of Theorem 3.** Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3. In fact we prove a stronger statement - a uniform Harnack-type inequality for a family of small balls. Then a standard compactness argument will do. We follow the ideas of [7].

Theorem 28. *Under the same hypotheses as in Theorem 3 and Lemma 25, there exist a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $r \leq r_0$, every ball $B = B(a, r)$, $a \in \overline{D}$ and every positive solution of (1.7) in B we have*

$$(4.3) \quad \sup_{x \in B(a, \frac{r}{4})} u(x) \leq C(1 + \inf_{x \in B(a, \frac{r}{4})} u(x)).$$

Proof. Let r_0 be such that the assumptions of Lemma 25 are satisfied. We can impose in addition that $r_0 \leq 1$. Let M the constant in (4.1). We have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{x \in B(a, r)} \int_{B(a, r)} G_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\Delta(x, z) p(z) dz = 0,$$

where p is as in (H'_1) . Hence making r_0 possibly smaller we may conclude that for every $r \in]0, r_0]$

$$(4.4) \quad \max(2M^3 c_d, M/2) \sup_{x \in B} \int_B G_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\Delta(x, z) p(z) dz \leq 1/2,$$

Let $x, y \in B(a, \frac{r}{4}) \subset B = B(a, r)$ and u be a positive solution of (1.7) in $B(a, r)$. Then

$$u(x) = H_B u(x) - G_B^L(\varphi(\cdot, u))(x) \leq H_B u(x).$$

Let now M_1 be the constant in (4.2). Since $H_B u$ is an L -harmonic function in $B(a, r)$ then for every $x, y \in B(a, \frac{r}{4})$

$$(4.5) \quad H_B u(x) \leq M_1 H_B u(y).$$

In addition, by (H'_1)

$$\begin{aligned} H_B u(y) &= u(y) + G_B^L(\varphi(\cdot, u))(y) \leq u(y) + G_B^L(\varphi(\cdot, H_B u))(y) \\ &\leq u(y) + G_B^L(p(H_B u + 1))(y) \\ &\leq u(y) + G_B^L(p H_B u)(y) + G_B^L(p)(y) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Lemma 27

$$G_B^L(p H_B u)(y) \leq 2M^3 c_d H_B u(y) \sup_{x \in B} \int_B G_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\Delta(x, z) p(z) dz,$$

So by (4.4)

$$H_B u(y) \leq u(y) + 1/2 H_B u(y) + G_B^L(p)(y).$$

Multiplying both sides by 2, we get:

$$H_B u(y) \leq 2u(y) + 2G_B^L(p)(y).$$

Furthermore, applying Lemma 25 and (4.4) again, we have

$$G_B^L(p)(y) \leq M G_B^\Delta(p)(y) \leq 1.$$

Consequently

$$H_B u(y) \leq 2u(y) + 2.$$

By (4.5) we conclude

$$u(x) \leq 2M_1(u(y) + 1), \quad x, y \in B(a, \frac{r}{4}).$$

□

4.2. Proofs of lemmas. To obtain a uniform comparison (4.1) for small balls we will use Theorem 29 below. Suppose we have a family $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda, \alpha}$ of second order strictly elliptic operators on \mathbb{R}^d having α -Hölder coefficients and λ the ellipticity constant. By the α -Hölder norm of a bounded function f we mean here

$$\|f\|_\alpha = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)| + \sup_{x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha}.$$

We assume that $0 < \lambda < 1$. $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{F}_{\lambda, \alpha}$ is of the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i, j} a_{i, j}(x) \partial_i \partial_j + \sum_i b_i(x) \partial_i + c(x),$$

where $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$, for every $x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$a_{ij}(x) \xi_i \xi_j \geq \lambda |\xi|^2$$

and

$$\|a_{ij}\|_\alpha, \|b_i\|_\alpha, \|c\|_\alpha \leq \lambda^{-1}.$$

The main ingredient in the proof of Lemma 25 is the following theorem

Theorem 29. ([17]) *Suppose λ is fixed. For every bounded $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ domain D there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$C^{-1} G_D^\Delta \leq G_D^\mathcal{L} \leq C G_D^\Delta, \quad \text{on } D \times D.$$

for every $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{F}_{\lambda, \alpha}$.

Proof of Lemma 25. Without loss of generality we may assume that $L \in \mathcal{F}_{\lambda, \alpha}$. Indeed, L , defined originally on Ω , may be extended to an operator $\tilde{L} \in \mathcal{F}_{\lambda, \alpha}$ in the way that $\tilde{L} = L$ in $\bigcup_{a \in \overline{D}} B(a, r_0)$.

Fix $a_0 \in \overline{D}$. For $B_1 = B(a_0, r_0)$, (4.1) follows directly from Theorem 29. To get the same statement for $B(a, rr_0)$ one needs to consider the family of operators

$$(4.6) \quad L_r = \sum_{i, j} a_{i, j}(\psi_r(x)) \partial_i \partial_j + r \sum_i b_i(\psi_r(x)) \partial_i + r^2 c(\psi_r(x)), \quad r \leq 1$$

on $B_1 = B(a_0, r_0)$ where

$$\psi_r : B_1 \rightarrow B_r = B(a, rr_0) \quad \text{is given by} \quad \psi_r(x) = a + r(x - a_0).$$

Since $L_r \in \mathcal{F}_{\lambda, \alpha}$, the estimate in (4.1) on B_1 for the whole class of operators L_r is uniform, i.e.

$$(4.7) \quad C^{-1} G_{B_1}^\Delta(x, y) \leq G_{B_1}^{L_r}(x, y) \leq C G_{B_1}^\Delta(x, y), \quad x, y \in B_1.$$

In addition, if u is a L -harmonic function on B_r then $u \circ \psi_r$ is L_r -harmonic on B_1 i.e. $L_r(u \circ \psi_r)(x) = r^2(Lu)(\psi_r(x))$, $x \in B_1$. It follows that

$$G_{B_r}^L(x, y) = r^{-d+2} G_{B_1}^{L_r}(\psi_r^{-1}(x), \psi_r^{-1}(y)), \quad x, y \in B_r,$$

where

$$\psi_r^{-1} : B_r \rightarrow B_1$$

is the inverse function to ψ_r . Moreover, $\Delta_r = \Delta$, so we have the same for $G_{B_r}^\Delta$. Finally, replacing $G_{B_1}^{L_r}$, $G_{B_1}^\Delta$ in (4.7) by $G_{B_r}^L$, $G_{B_r}^\Delta$ we get (4.1). \square

Lemma 26 follows from the classical Harnack inequality for elliptic operators, see [16], p.189. To get the constant independent of r we use the same family of operators L_r .

Due to Lemma 25 we are able to conclude a version of 3-G theorem for L adopted to our setting:

Lemma 30. *Suppose that the assumptions of Lemma 25 are satisfied and $B = B(a, r)$. Then for every open ball B in \mathbb{R}^d and a Radon positive measure ν , we have*

$$(4.8) \quad \int_B G_B^L(x, z) G_B^L(z, y) \nu(dz) \leq 2M^3 c_d G_B^L(x, y) \gamma_\nu(B),$$

where

$$\gamma_\nu(B) = \sup_{x \in B} \int_B G_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\Delta(x, z) \nu(dz)$$

and c_d is a constant depending only on the dimension.

(4.8) follows directly from an analogous statement for G_B^Δ , see [8], p.132:

$$\int_B G_B^\Delta(x, z) G_B^\Delta(z, y) \nu(dz) \leq 2c_d G_B^\Delta(x, y) \gamma_\nu(B).$$

Finally, we are able to prove Lemma 27

Proof. Let λ a positive Radon measure and $q(z) = \int_B G_B^L(z, y) \lambda(dy)$ By Lemma 30 applied to $p(z) dz$ instead of $\nu(dz)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G_B^L(pq)(x) &= \int_B G_B^L(x, z) p(z) \left(\int_B G_B^L(z, y) \lambda(dy) \right) dz \\ &= \int_B \int_B G_B^L(x, z) G_B^L(z, y) p(z) dz \lambda(dy) \\ &\leq 2M^3 c_d \int_B G_B^L(x, y) \sup_{x \in B} \left(\int_B G_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\Delta(x, z) p(z) dz \right) \lambda(dy) \\ &= 2M^3 c_d q(x) \left(\sup_{x \in B} \int_B G_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\Delta(x, z) p(z) dz \right) \end{aligned}$$

Or s is the limit of locally integrable increasing potentials (s_n) in B which can be written

$$s_n(x) = \int_B G_B^L(x, y) \lambda_n(dy), \text{ where } \lambda_n \text{ is a positive Radon measure.}$$

Then by integration with respect to dy , we can conclude for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$G_B^L(p s_n)(x) \leq 2M^3 c_d s_n(x) \sup_{x \in B} \int_B G_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\Delta(x, z) p(z) dz,$$

and by the monotone convergence theorem we deduce the result. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J.P. Anker, E. Damek, C. Yacoub, Spherical Analysis of Harmonic AN Groups, Estratto dagli Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Scienze Fisiche e Matematiche-Serie IV. Vol. XXIII. Fasc. 4(1996).
- [2] G. Astarita, G. Marrucci, Principles of non-Newtonian fluid mechanics, McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- [3] R. Atar, S. Athreya and Z-Q. Chen, *Exit time, Green function and semilinear elliptic equations*, Electronic Journal of Probability 14 (2009), 50-71.
- [4] A. Baalal and W. Hansen, *Nonlinear perturbation of bayage spaces*, Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Mathematica 27 (2002), 163-172.
- [5] C. Bandle and M. Marcus, *Large solutions of semilinear elliptic equations: existence, uniqueness and asymptotic behaviour*, Journal d'Analyse Mathématique 58 (1992), 9-24.
- [6] J. Berndt, F. Tricerri, L. Vanhecke, Generalized Heisenberg groups and Damek-Ricci harmonic space, Lecture note in Mathematics number 1598, Springer-Verlag 1995.
- [7] A. Boukricha, Harnack inequality for nonlinear harmonic spaces, Math Ann. 317 (3) (2000), 567-583.
- [8] A. Boukricha, W. Hansen and H. Hueber, Continuous solutions of the generalized Schrödinger equation and perturbation of harmonic spaces , Expo.Math.5 (1987), 97-135.
- [9] K-S. Cheng, W-M. Ni, On the Structure of the Conformal Scalar Curvature Equation on \mathbb{R}^n , Indiana University Mathematics Journal, Vol. 41, No. 1 (Spring, 1992), pp. 261-278.
- [10] E. Damek, F. Ricci, Harmonic analysis on solvable extensions of H-type groups, The Journal of Geometric Analysis Volume 2, Number 3, 1992.
- [11] E. Damek, Z. Ghardallou, Large versus bounded solutions to sublinear elliptic problems, arXiv:1710.04922
- [12] K. El Mabrouk, Entire bounded solutions for a class of sublinear elliptic equations, Nonlinear Anal.58 (1-2)(2004)205-218.
- [13] K. El Mabrouk, W.Hansen, Nonradial large solutions of sublinear elliptic problems, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **330** (2007)1025-1041.
- [14] Z. Ghardallou, Positive solutions to sublinear elliptic problem, arXiv:1604.00633 (Accepted for publication in Colloquium Mathematicum on 31 January 2018)
- [15] Z. Ghardallou, Thèse: Positive solutions to some nonlinear elliptic problems, (2016).
- [16] D. Gilbarg, N.S. Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, Springer-Verlag(1977).
- [17] H. Hueber, M. Sieveking, Uniform bounds for quotients of Green functions on $C^{1,1}$ -domains, Annales de l'institut Fourier, **32**, **1**(1982) 105-117.
- [18] J.B. Keller, "On solution $\Delta u = f(u)$," Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 10:503-510 (1957).
- [19] A.V. Lair, Large solutions of semilinear elliptic equations under the Keller-Osserman condition, J.Math.Anal.Appl.**328**, (2007), 1247-1254.
- [20] A.V. Lair, *Large solutions of mixed sublinear/superlinear elliptic equations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 346 (2008), 99-106.
- [21] A. Lair, A. Mohammed, *Entire large solutions of semilinear elliptic equations of mixed type*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. **8**, (2009), no 5,1607-1618.
- [22] A.V. Lair, A.W. Wood, Large solutions of sublinear elliptic equations, Nonlinear Anal.**39**, (2000), 745-753.
- [23] A.C. Lazer, P.J. McKenna, On a problem of Bieberbach and Rademacher, Nonlinear Anal. 21 (1993) 327-335.
- [24] R. Osserman, "On the inequality $\Delta u \geq f(u)$," Pacific J. Math., 7:1641-1647 (1957).
- [25] A. Mohammed, *On ground state solutions to mixed type singular semi-linear elliptic equations*, Advances Nonlinear Studies 10 (2010), 231-244.
- [26] S. L. Pohzaev, The Dirichlet problem for the equation $u = u^2$, Soviet Math.Dokl. 1(1960)1143-1146.
- [27] F. Rouvière, Espaces de Damek-Ricci, géométrie et analyse, Séminère et congrès 7, (2003).
- [28] M. Selmi, Thèse: Perturbation et comparaison des résolvantes et des semi-groupes, (1992).