

Regularity and existence for semilinear mixed local-nonlocal equations with variable singularities and measure data

Sanjit Biswas* and Prashanta Garain†

February 27, 2025

Abstract

This article proves the existence and regularity of weak solutions for a class of mixed local-nonlocal problems with singular nonlinearities. We examine both the purely singular problem and perturbed singular problems. A central contribution of this work is the inclusion of a variable singular exponent in the context of measure-valued data. Another notable feature is that the source terms in both the purely singular and perturbed components can simultaneously take the form of measures. To the best of our knowledge, this phenomenon is new, even in the case of a constant singular exponent.

Keywords: Mixed local-nonlocal singular equation, existence, regularity, variable exponent, measure data.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35M10, 35M12, 35J75, 35R06, 35R11, 35B65

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Functional setting and main results	5
2.1	Existence results	9
2.2	Regularity results	11
3	Proof of existence results	12
3.1	Proof of Theorem 2.12	12
3.2	Proof of Theorem 2.13	15
3.3	Proof of Theorem 2.16	15

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur-208016, Uttar Pradesh, India, Email: sanjitbiswas410@gmail.com

†(Corresponding author) Department of Mathematical Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Berhampur, 760010, Odisha, India, Email: pgarain92@gmail.com

4	Proof of regularity results	16
5	Appendix	16
5.1	Approximate problem	16
5.2	A priori estimates for Theorem 2.12 and Theorem 2.13	19
5.3	A priori estimates for Theorem 2.16	24
5.4	A priori estimates for regularity results	27

1 Introduction

In this article, we explore the existence and regularity properties of weak solutions for the following mixed local-nonlocal measure data problem with variable singular exponent

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}u := -\mathcal{A}u + \mathcal{B}u = \frac{\nu}{u^{\delta(x)}} + \mu \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 2$ is a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary. Here $\mathcal{A}u = \operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla u)$, where $A : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N^2}$ is a bounded elliptic matrix satisfying

$$\alpha|\xi|^2 \leq A(x)\xi \cdot \xi, \quad |A(x)| \leq \beta, \quad (1.2)$$

for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and for almost every $x \in \Omega$, for some constants $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$. Further, \mathcal{B} represents the nonlocal Laplace operator defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{B}u = \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u(x) - u(y))K(x, y) dy,$$

where P.V. denotes the principal value and K is a symmetric kernel in x and y that satisfies

$$\frac{\Lambda^{-1}}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} \leq K(x, y) \leq \frac{\Lambda}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} \quad (1.3)$$

for some constant $\Lambda \geq 1$ and $0 < s < 1$. Notably, if we take $A(x) = I$ and $K(x, y) = |x - y|^{-N-2s}$, the operators \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} reduces to the usual Laplace operator $-\Delta$ and the fractional Laplace operator $(-\Delta)^s$ respectively and consequently, the operator \mathcal{M} simplifies to the mixed local-nonlocal Laplace operator $-\Delta + (-\Delta)^s$. Hence, equation (1.1) serves as an extension of the following mixed local-nonlocal singular problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (-\Delta)^s u = \frac{\nu}{u^{\delta}} + \mu \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

We assume that μ and ν are non-negative bounded Radon measures on Ω , with ν not being identically zero. Further, we assume that $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a continuous function. The positivity of δ leads to a blow-up of the nonlinearity in (1.1) near the origin, a phenomenon referred to as singularity. Consequently, equation (1.1) encompasses a broad spectrum of mixed

singular problems, including both constant and variable exponent singular nonlinearities with measure data.

In the purely local case, the singular Laplace equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{f}{u^{\delta(x)}} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \text{ and } u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

is widely studied for both the constant and variable exponent δ . When δ is a positive constant, existence of a unique classical solution is obtained in [21] under the assumption that $\partial\Omega$ is of class C^3 and $f \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \setminus \{0\}$ is non-negative. Indeed, authors in [21] obtained existence results for more general singularity and more general operator. For constant $\delta > 0$, existence of weak solutions is also obtained in [14]. Moreover, when f is a non-negative bounded Radon measure on Ω , existence results can be found in [45]. When δ is a variable, for some positive $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ with $m \geq 1$, existence results are established in [19] in the semilinear case and for the associated quasilinear equations, we refer the reader to [1, 6, 30] and the references therein.

Further, the perturbed singular Laplace equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{f}{u^{\delta(x)}} + g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

is also studied. When δ is a positive constant and both f, g are some non-negative integrable functions, multiplicity of weak solutions is obtained in [2, 3] and the references therein. In this concern, when f is some non-negative integrable function and g is some non-negative bounded Radon measure, existence results are established in [42] and the references therein. Further, measure data problems for Laplace equation is studied in [23, 43].

In the purely nonlocal case, the singular fractional Laplace equation

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u = \frac{f}{u^{\delta(x)}} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

is also widely studied. Indeed, when δ is a positive constant, existence of a unique classical solution is established in [28], provided $0 < \delta < 1$ and $f = 1$ in a bounded smooth domain Ω . The case of any $\delta > 0$ is tackled in [17] to obtain weak solutions, where the nonlinear version of (1.7) is also studied. When f is a non-negative bounded Radon measure, existence results can be found in [36] and the references therein. When δ is a variable, existence and regularity results are obtained in [34] for the semilinear and quasilinear cases, provided $f \in L^m(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ is non-negative for some $m \geq 1$.

Further, existence results for the perturbed singular fractional Laplace equation

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u = \frac{f}{u^{\delta(x)}} + g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

is proved in [36], provided δ is a positive constant, f is some non-negative integrable function and g is some non-negative bounded Radon measure on Ω . For variable δ , we refer to [46] in the semilinear case and in the quasilinear case, see [34] and the references therein.

In the recent years, mixed local-nonlocal problems has drawn a great attention due to its wide range of applications in biology, stochastic processes, image processing etc., see [26] and the references therein. The non-singular mixed local-nonlocal problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (-\Delta)^s u = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

is studied concerning existence, regularity and several other qualitative properties in [8, 12, 49] in the presence of integrable functions f . Further, the nonlinear analogue of equation (1.9) is also studied in [24, 31, 32, 33, 50] and the references therein. Equation (1.9) is recently studied in the presence of measure f in [16, 20].

When δ is a positive constant, the purely singular mixed local-nonlocal problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (-\Delta)^s u = \frac{f}{u^{\delta(x)}} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

is studied in [4, 29, 38] concerning existence, regularity and the quasilinear version of (1.10) is studied in [35]. For variable exponent δ , existence and regularity is obtained in [11, 31] and the references therein.

The perturbed mixed local-nonlocal problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (-\Delta)^s u = \frac{f}{u^{\delta(x)}} + g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

is also studied in [29] and the references therein, provided $0 < \delta < 1$ is a constant. Recently the case $\delta \geq 1$ is also settled in [5], where the authors studied the quasilinear analogue of (1.11) as well.

Very recently, equation (1.11) is studied in [7], when δ is a positive constant, f is a positive integrable function and g is a non-negative bounded Radon measure in Ω . To the best of our knowledge, mixed local-nonlocal problems are not understood in the presence of a measure data with variable singular exponent. Our main purpose in this article is to fill this gap. We would like to emphasize that some of our results are valid, even when both f and g are measures. As far as we are aware, such phenomenon is new even in the constant singular exponent case. Further, we remark that the operator \mathcal{M} is more general than the mixed operator $-\Delta + (-\Delta)^s$ and therefore, our main results are valid for the more general mixed equation (1.1).

To demonstrate our main results, we adopt the approximation approach outlined in [14, 42, 45]. Specifically, we establish the existence of solutions to the approximated problem using fixed point arguments. Subsequently, we take the limit, which necessitates several a

priori estimates. These estimates are derived by selecting appropriate test functions for the approximated problem.

The structure of this article is as follows: Section 2 presents the functional framework and states the main results. Sections 3 and 4 are dedicated to the proofs of the existence and regularity results respectively. Finally, in the appendix section 5, approximate problem is studied and a priori estimates of the approximate solutions are established, which are useful for proving our existence and regularity results.

Notations: For the rest of the paper, unless otherwise mentioned, we will use the following notations and assumptions:

- For $k, s \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $T_k(s) = \max\{-k, \min\{s, k\}\}$ and $G_k(s) = (|s| - k)^+ \operatorname{sgn}(s)$.
- For a measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $|A|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of A . Moreover, for a function $u : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define $u^+ := \max\{u, 0\}$ and $u^- := \max\{-u, 0\}$.
- For $\sigma > 1$, we define the conjugate exponent of σ by $\sigma' = \frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}$.
- C denotes a positive constant, whose value may change from line to line or even in the same line.
- For a measurable function f over a measurable set S and given constants c, d , we write $c \leq u \leq d$ in S to mean that $c \leq u \leq d$ a.e. in S .
- $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 2$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain.
- For open sets ω and Ω of \mathbb{R}^N , $N \geq 2$ by the notation $\omega \Subset \Omega$, we mean that $\bar{\omega}$ is a compact subset of Ω .

2 Functional setting and main results

The Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for $1 < p < \infty$, is defined to be the space of functions $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in $L^p(\Omega)$ such that the partial derivatives $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$ exist in the weak sense and belong to $L^p(\Omega)$. The space $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a Banach space (see [27]) equipped with the norm:

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} = \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where $\nabla u = \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_N}\right)$. The fractional Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ for $0 < s < 1 < p < \infty$, is defined by

$$W^{s,p}(\Omega) = \left\{ u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : u \in L^p(\Omega), \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^{\frac{N}{p} + s}} \in L^p(\Omega \times \Omega) \right\}$$

under the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)} = \left(\int_{\Omega} |u(x)|^p dx + \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

We refer to [25] and the references therein for more details on fractional Sobolev spaces. Due to the mixed behavior of our equations, following [9, 10, 48], we consider the space

$$W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) = \{u \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) : u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega\}$$

under the norm

$$\|u\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} = \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Using Lemma 2.2, we observe that the norm $\|u\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}$ defined above is equivalent to the norm $\|u\| = \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$. Let $0 < s \leq 1 < p < \infty$. Then we say that $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{s,p}(\Omega)$ if $u \in W^{s,p}(K)$ for every $K \Subset \Omega$.

We define Marcinkiewicz space $M^q(\Omega)$ as the set of all measurable functions $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that there exists $C > 0$,

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |u(x)| > t\}| \leq \frac{C}{t^q}, \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

Note that for a bounded domain Ω , it is enough to have this inequality for all $t \geq t_0$ for some $t_0 > 0$. The following embeddings are continuous

$$L^q(\Omega) \hookrightarrow M^q(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{q-\eta}(\Omega), \quad (2.1)$$

for any $\eta \in (0, q - 1]$. For more details, see [40] and the references therein.

For the next result, we refer to [25, Proposition 2.2].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $0 < s < 1 < p < \infty$. Then there exists a positive constant $C = C(N, p, s)$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}$$

for every $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

The following result is taken from [15, Lemma 2.1], which follows from Lemma 2.1 above.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $0 < s < 1 < p < \infty$. There exists a constant $C = C(N, p, s, \Omega) > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx \quad (2.2)$$

for every $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

For the subsequent Sobolev embedding, refer to [27], for instance.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. Then the embedding operators*

$$W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \begin{cases} L^t(\Omega), & \text{for } t \in [1, p^*], \text{ if } 1 < p < N, \\ L^t(\Omega), & \text{for } t \in [1, \infty), \text{ if } p = N, \\ L^\infty(\Omega), & \text{if } p > N \end{cases}$$

are continuous. Moreover, they are compact except for $t = p^*$ if $1 < p < N$. Here $p^* = \frac{Np}{N-p}$ if $1 < p < N$.

Along the lines of the proof of [18, Proposition 2.3], the result stated below holds.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $0 < s < 1 < p < \infty$ and $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^1(\Omega)$ and $u = 0$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$. Then for any $\phi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u(x) - u(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))K(x, y) dx dy < \infty.$$

The following result from [45, Theorem 2.1] will be useful to prove our existence theorems.

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $L^1(\Omega)$ such that $f_n \rightharpoonup f$ weakly in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that g_n converges to g in a.e. in Ω and weak* in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f_n g_n dx = \int_{\Omega} f g dx.$$

Next, we mention some preliminary results related to measures (see [13, 22, 45]). We define $M(\Omega)$ as a set of all signed Radon measures on Ω with bounded total variation (as usual, identified with a linear map $u \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} u d\mu$ on $C(\overline{\Omega})$). If $\nu \in M(\Omega)$ is a non-negative Radon measure then by the Lebesgue's decomposition theorem [47, page 384], we have

$$\nu = \nu_a + \nu_s,$$

where ν_a is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and ν_s is singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure. By the Radon-Nikodym theorem [47, page 382], there exists a non-negative Lebesgue measurable function f such that for every measurable set $E \subset \Omega$,

$$\nu_a(E) = \int_E f dx.$$

Furthermore, if ν is bounded then $f \in L^1(\Omega)$. If the function f is not identically zero function, then we say that ν is non-singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure, otherwise it is called purely singular measure.

Let us now review the definition of p -capacity, which will help us to characterize the data in our problem (see [37]). Suppose $p > 1$, then for a compact set $K \subset \Omega$, the p -capacity of K is denoted by $\text{cap}_p(K)$ and defined as

$$\text{cap}_p(K) := \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^p dx : \phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega), \phi \geq \chi_K \right\},$$

where

$$\chi_K(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in K, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For an open set $U \subset \Omega$, the p -capacity is defined by

$$\text{cap}_p(U) := \sup \{ \text{cap}_p(K) : K \subset U \text{ is compact} \}.$$

Finally, the p -capacity of any subset B of Ω is defined by

$$\text{cap}_p(B) := \inf \{ \text{cap}_p(U) : U \text{ is an open set in } \Omega \text{ containing } B \}.$$

We say a measure $\nu \in M(\Omega)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to p -capacity if the following holds: $\nu(E) = 0$ for every $E \subset \Omega$ such that $\text{cap}_p(E) = 0$. We define

$$M_0^p(\Omega) = \{ \nu \in M(\Omega) : \nu \text{ is absolutely continuous with respect to } p\text{-capacity} \}.$$

One can observe that if $1 < p_1 < p_2$, then $M_0^{p_1}(\Omega) \subset M_0^{p_2}(\Omega)$.

The following characterization from [13, Theorem 2.1] is very useful for us.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $\nu \in M_0^p(\Omega)$. Then there exists $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $G \in (L^{p'}(\Omega))^N$ such that $\nu = f - \text{div}(G) \in L^1(\Omega) + W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$ in $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ (space of distributions). Furthermore, if ν is non-negative then f is non-negative.*

Next, we define the notion of weak solutions of the problem (1.1).

Definition 2.7. *Let $0 < s < 1 < q < \infty$ and $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a continuous function. Suppose that μ and ν are two non-negative bounded Radon measures on Ω such that $\nu \in M_0^q(\Omega)$. We say that $u \in W_{loc}^{1,q}(\Omega) \cap L^1(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of the equation (1.1) if $u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$ and*

- (a) *for every $\omega \Subset \Omega$, there exists a constant $C(\omega) > 0$ such that $u \geq C(\omega) > 0$ in ω and*
- (b) *for every $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} A(x) \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u(x) - u(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y)) K(x, y) \, dx dy \\ = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\phi}{u^{\delta(x)}} \, d\nu + \int_{\Omega} \phi \, d\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Remark 2.8. *We remark that Definition 2.7 is well stated. More precisely, if $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ and $K = \text{supp } \phi$, since $|A(x)| \leq \beta$, we have*

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} A(x) \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx \right| \leq \beta \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^1(K)} < \infty.$$

Moreover, combining Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.4, it follows that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u(x) - u(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y)) K(x, y) \, dx dy \right| < \infty.$$

Since $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ and μ is a non-negative Radon measure, therefore

$$\int_{\Omega} \phi \, d\mu < \infty.$$

Furthermore, as in [45, Remark 3.2], since $\nu \in M_0^q(\Omega)$, so $\nu \in L^1(\Omega) + W^{-1,q'}(\Omega)$ (see Lemma 2.6) and due to the above property (a) along with that $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, we have $\frac{\phi}{u^{\delta(x)}} \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. By keeping this fact in mind, with a little abuse of notation we denote

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{\phi}{u^{\delta(x)}} \, d\nu := \left\langle \nu, \frac{\phi}{u^{\delta(x)}} \right\rangle_{L^1(\Omega) + W^{-1,q'}(\Omega), W_0^{1,q}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

The following approximation result is very useful for our justification [13, 41, 45].

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\nu = f - \operatorname{div}(G)$ be a non-negative bounded Radon measure in $M_0^p(\Omega)$ for some $1 < p < \infty$, where $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $G \in (L^{p'}(\Omega))^N$. Then there exists a sequence of non-negative functions $\{\nu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in L^2(\Omega)$ in Ω such that*

1. $\nu_n = f_n - \operatorname{div}(G_n)$ in $D'(\Omega)$ and
2. $\{\nu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$,

where $f_n \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that $f_n \rightharpoonup f$ weakly in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly in $(L^{p'}(\Omega))^N$.

Definition 2.10. *A sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset M(\Omega)$ is said to converge to a measure $\mu \in M(\Omega)$ in narrow topology if for every $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \phi d\mu_n = \int_{\Omega} \phi d\mu.$$

Before stating our main results below, we define the condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) below.

Condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) : We say that a continuous function $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, satisfies the condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) , if there exist $\delta_* \geq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\delta(x) \leq \delta_*$ for every $x \in \Omega_\epsilon$, where $\Omega_\epsilon := \{y \in \Omega : \operatorname{dist}(y, \partial\Omega) < \epsilon\}$.

Remark 2.11. *We observe that, if a continuous function $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ satisfies the condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) for some $\delta_* \geq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$, then for every $\gamma \geq \delta_*$, the function δ satisfies the condition $(P_{\epsilon, \gamma})$. Therefore, δ_* is not uniquely determined by δ . Moreover, by the continuity of δ , it follows that $\max_{\partial\Omega} \delta \leq \delta_*$. Furthermore, if $M > \max_{\partial\Omega} \delta$, then from [19, page 493], it follows that there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\delta \leq M$ in Ω_ϵ and hence, one can choose $\delta_* = \max\{1, M\}$.*

We state our main results only for the case $N > 2$. However, we would like to emphasize that analogous results also hold for $N = 2$, by taking into account Lemma 2.3 and following the lines of proof as those for the main results. More precisely, for $N = 2$, exact statement for Theorems 2.12-2.13 will be valid and analogous statements will hold for remaining main results.

First, we state our main existence results which reads as follows:

2.1 Existence results

Theorem 2.12. *(Variable singular exponent) Let $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a continuous function which is locally Lipschitz continuous in Ω and satisfies the condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) for some $\delta_* \geq 1$ and for some $\epsilon > 0$. Let $1 < p < \frac{N}{N-1}$ and suppose that ν, μ are non-negative bounded Radon measures on Ω such that $\nu \in M_0^p(\Omega)$ and ν is non-singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Then the problem (1.1) admits a weak solution $u \in W_{\operatorname{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^1(\Omega)$ in the sense of Definition 2.7 such that*

- (i) If $\delta_* = 1$, then $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.
- (ii) If $\delta_* > 1$, then $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that $T_k(u) \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $T_k^{\frac{\delta_*+1}{2}}(u) \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ for every $k > 0$.

If ν turns out to be an integrable function, then we do not require δ to be locally Lipschitz continuous in Ω . In this case the result is stated as follows:

Theorem 2.13. (Variable singular exponent) Let $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a continuous function satisfying the condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) for some $\delta_* \geq 1$ and for some $\epsilon > 0$. Assume that $\nu \in L^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ is a non-negative function in Ω and μ is a non-negative bounded Radon measure on Ω . Then for every $1 < p < \frac{N}{N-1}$, the equation (1.1) admits a weak solution $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^1(\Omega)$ in the sense of the Definition 2.7 such that

- (i) If $\delta_* = 1$, then $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.
- (ii) If $\delta_* > 1$, then $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that $T_k(u) \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $T_k^{\frac{\delta_*+1}{2}}(u) \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ for every $k > 0$.

Remark 2.14. Theorem 2.13 extends [7, Theorem 1.1] to the variable exponent case and to more general class of mixed operators \mathcal{M} .

Remark 2.15. We observe that, under the hypotheses in Theorems 2.12 and 2.13, for every $\gamma \geq \delta_*$ and $k > 0$, the function $T_k(u)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}}$ belongs to $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ in Theorems 2.12 and 2.13.

Our next result tells that when μ turns out to be a function and the function δ is constant, then we can relax the condition on ν to obtain the existence of a solution.

Theorem 2.16. (Constant singular exponent) Assume that $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a constant function. We define

$$q = \begin{cases} \frac{N(\delta+1)}{N+\delta-1}, & \text{if } 0 < \delta < 1, \\ 2, & \text{if } \delta \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Let $\mu \in L^{\frac{N(\delta+1)}{N+2\delta}}(\Omega)$ be a non-negative function in Ω . Further, assume that $\nu \in M_0^q(\Omega)$ is a non-negative bounded Radon measure on Ω such that ν is non-singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Then the equation (1.1) admits a weak solution $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,q}(\Omega) \cap L^1(\Omega)$ in the sense of Definition 2.7 such that

- (i) If $0 < \delta \leq 1$, then $u \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$.
- (ii) If $\delta > 1$, then $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ such that $u^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}} \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$.

Remark 2.17. One can observe along the lines of the proofs of our main existence results that Theorems 2.12-2.16 holds even for the purely local equation that can be obtained by replacing \mathcal{M} with the operator \mathcal{A} in the equation (1.1) where $\mathcal{A}u = \text{div}(A(x)\nabla u)$ with $A : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N^2}$ a bounded elliptic matrix satisfying (1.2). To the best of our knowledge, such results are new even in the purely local case.

Our main regularity results are stated below.

2.2 Regularity results

Theorem 2.18. (Constant singular exponent) Let $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ be a constant function and $\nu \in L^r(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$, $\mu \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $r, m \geq 1$ be two non-negative functions in Ω . Suppose u is the weak solution of the problem (1.1) obtained in Theorem 2.13. Then the following conclusions hold:

- (i) If $r > \frac{N}{2}$, $m > \frac{N}{2}$, then $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.
- (ii) If $r > \frac{N}{2}$, $1 < m < \frac{N}{2}$, then $u \in L^{m^{**}}(\Omega)$, where $m^{**} = \frac{Nm}{N-2m}$.
- (iii) If $1 \leq r < \frac{N}{2}$, $m > \frac{N}{2}$, then $u \in L^{\frac{Nr(\delta+1)}{N-2r}}(\Omega)$.
- (iv) If $1 \leq r < \frac{N}{2}$, $1 < m < \frac{N}{2}$, then $u \in L^{q_1}(\Omega)$, where $q_1 = \min \left\{ m^{**}, \frac{Nr(\delta+1)}{N-2r} \right\}$ with $m^{**} = \frac{Nm}{N-2m}$.

Theorem 2.19. (Constant singular exponent) Let $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ be a constant function and $\nu \in L^r(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$, $\mu \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $r, m \geq 1$ be two non-negative functions in Ω . Suppose u is the weak solution of the problem (1.1) obtained in Theorem 2.13. Then the following conclusions hold:

- (i) If $r > \frac{N}{2}$, $m > \frac{N}{2}$, then $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.
- (ii) If $r > \frac{N}{2}$, $1 < m < \frac{N}{2}$, then $u \in L^{m^{**}}(\Omega)$, where $m^{**} = \frac{Nm}{N-2m}$.
- (iii) If $\left(\frac{2^*}{(1-\delta)} \right)' \leq r < \frac{N}{2}$, $m > \frac{N}{2}$, then $u \in L^{\frac{Nr(\delta+1)}{N-2r}}(\Omega)$.
- (iv) If $\left(\frac{2^*}{(1-\delta)} \right)' \leq r < \frac{N}{2}$, $1 < m < \frac{N}{2}$, then $u \in L^{q_2}(\Omega)$, where $q_2 = \min \left\{ m^{**}, \frac{Nr(\delta+1)}{N-2r} \right\}$ with $m^{**} = \frac{Nm}{N-2m}$.

Theorem 2.20. (Variable singular exponent) Let $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a continuous function and satisfying the condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) for some $\delta_* \geq 1$ and for some $\epsilon > 0$. Assume that $\nu \in L^r(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ and $\mu \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $r, m \geq 1$ are non-negative functions in Ω . Suppose u is the weak solution of the problem (1.1) obtained in Theorem 2.13. Then the following conclusions hold:

- (i) If $r > \frac{N}{2}$, $m > \frac{N}{2}$, then $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.
- (ii) If $r > \frac{N}{2}$, $1 < m < \frac{N}{2}$, then $u \in L^{m^{**}}(\Omega)$, where $m^{**} = \frac{Nm}{N-2m}$.
- (iii) If $\frac{N(\delta_*+1)}{N+2\delta_*} \leq r < \frac{N}{2}$, $m > \frac{N}{2}$, then $u \in L^{r^{**}}(\Omega)$, where $r^{**} = \frac{Nr}{N-2r}$.
- (iv) If $\frac{N(\delta_*+1)}{N+2\delta_*} \leq r < \frac{N}{2}$, $1 < m < \frac{N}{2}$, then $u \in L^{q_3}(\Omega)$, where $q_3 = \min \{ m^{**}, r^{**} \}$ with $m^{**} = \frac{Nm}{N-2m}$ and $r^{**} = \frac{Nr}{N-2r}$.

3 Proof of existence results

3.1 Proof of Theorem 2.12

Suppose that $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a continuous function which is locally Lipschitz continuous in Ω and satisfies the condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) for some $\delta_* \geq 1$ and for some $\epsilon > 0$. We prove the result when $\delta_* = 1$ and when $\delta_* > 1$ separately.

Assume that $\nu \in M_0^p(\Omega)$ for some $1 < p < \frac{N}{N-1}$, is a non-singular, non-negative bounded Radon measure on Ω and μ is a non-negative bounded Radon measure on Ω . Due to Lebesgue's decomposition theorem [47, page 384], $\nu = \nu_a + \nu_s$, where ν_a is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and ν_s is singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure. By the Radon-Nikodym theorem [47, page 382], there exists a non-negative $f \in L^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ such that for every measurable set $E \subset \Omega$, $\nu_a(E) = \int_E f dx$.

Since $\nu \in M_0^p(\Omega)$ and $0 \leq \nu_s \leq \nu$, we have $\nu_s \in M_0^p(\Omega)$. By Theorem 2.6, there exists $0 \leq H \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $G \in (L^{p'}(\Omega))^N$ such that $\nu_s = H - \operatorname{div} G$ (in distributional sense). Furthermore, there exists a sequence of non-negative functions $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2(\Omega)$ in Ω such that $\|h_n\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n and $h_n = H_n - \operatorname{div} G_n$ in $D'(\Omega)$, where $H_n \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that $H_n \rightharpoonup H$ weakly in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly in $(L^{p'}(\Omega))^N$ (see Lemma 2.9). Since μ is a non-negative bounded Radon measure on Ω , there exists a non-negative sequence $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\|g_n\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n and $g_n \rightarrow \mu$ in the narrow topology ([44, Theorem A.7]). For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the following approximation of the given equation (1.1):

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}u = \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} + g_n & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

By Lemma 5.1, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a unique weak solution $u_n \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ to the equation (3.1) such that for every $\omega \Subset \Omega$, there exists a constant $C(\omega) > 0$ (independent of n) such that $u_n \geq C(\omega)$ in ω for all n . By the weak formulation of (3.1), for every $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} A(x) \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla \phi dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_n(x) - u_n(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y)) K(x, y) dx dy \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{T_n(f)\phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} dx + \int_{\Omega} \frac{H_n \phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} dx + \int_{\Omega} G_n \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{\phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \right) dx \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} \phi g_n dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

We pass to the limit in (3.2) for the cases $\delta_* = 1$ and $\delta_* > 1$ below.

- (i) Let $\delta_* = 1$. By Lemma 5.2-(a), there exists a subsequence of $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, still denoted by $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $u_n \rightarrow u$

pointwise a.e. in Ω . Since $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, for every $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} A(x) \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx = \int_{\Omega} A(x) \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx, \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_n(x) - u_n(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))K(x, y) \, dx dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u(x) - u(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))K(x, y) \, dx dy. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover, since $g_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ in the narrow topology, for every $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \phi g_n \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \phi d\mu. \quad (3.5)$$

Let $\omega = \text{supp } \phi$, then there exists a constant $C = C(\omega) > 0$ (independent of n) such that $u_n \geq C$ in ω , for all n . Since $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, from the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{T_n(f)\phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{f\phi}{u^{\delta(x)}} \, dx \quad \forall \phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega). \quad (3.6)$$

Since $H_n \rightharpoonup H$ weakly in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $\frac{\phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \rightarrow \frac{\phi}{u^{\delta(x)}}$ pointwise a.e. in Ω and weak* in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, by Theorem 2.5, it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{H_n \phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{H \phi}{u^{\delta(x)}} \, dx. \quad (3.7)$$

We only have to pass the limit in the second last term of (3.2). We observe that for every $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} G_n \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{\phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \right) \, dx &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{G_n \cdot \nabla \phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \frac{G_n \cdot \nabla \delta(x)}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \log \left(u_n + \frac{1}{n} \right) \phi \, dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} \frac{\delta(x) G_n \cdot \nabla u_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)+1}} \phi \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

The facts $G_n \rightarrow G$ strongly in $(L^{p'}(\Omega))^N$ and $\frac{\nabla \phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \rightarrow \frac{\nabla \phi}{u^{\delta(x)}}$ strongly in $(L^p(\Omega))^N$ are used to deduce that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{G_n \cdot \nabla \phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{G \cdot \nabla \phi}{u^{\delta(x)}} \, dx. \quad (3.9)$$

Moreover, since $\frac{\delta(x)\phi \nabla u_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)+1}} \rightharpoonup \frac{\delta(x)\phi \nabla u}{u^{\delta(x)+1}}$ weakly in $(L^p(\Omega))^N$, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\delta(x) G_n \cdot \nabla u_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)+1}} \phi \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\delta(x) G \cdot \nabla u}{u^{\delta(x)+1}} \phi \, dx. \quad (3.10)$$

In order to pass to the limit in the second last integral in (3.8), we use the local Lipschitz continuity of δ in Ω . To be more precise, we use the fact $|\nabla\delta| \in L^\infty(\omega)$ to apply Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, where $\omega = \text{supp } \phi$. Define $r := \min_{\overline{\Omega}} \delta(x) > 0$ and observe that $\frac{\log x}{x^r}$ is bounded on $[C, \infty)$, where $C > 0$ is a uniform lower bound of u_n in ω . We notice that

$$\left| \frac{G_n \cdot \nabla \delta(x)}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \log \left(u_n + \frac{1}{n} \right) \phi \right| = \left| \left(\frac{\phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)-r}} \right) \left(\frac{\log \left(u_n + \frac{1}{n} \right)}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^r} \right) G_n \cdot \nabla \delta \right| \leq C |G_n|,$$

in ω . Using this together with the fact $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |G_n| = \int_{\Omega} |G|$, we conclude

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{G_n \cdot \nabla \delta(x)}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \log \left(u_n + \frac{1}{n} \right) \phi \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{G \cdot \nabla \delta}{u^{\delta(x)}} \log u \, \phi \, dx. \quad (3.11)$$

Combining (3.9)-(3.11), the identity (3.8) leads to

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} G_n \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{\phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \right) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} G \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{\phi}{u^{\delta(x)}} \right) \, dx. \quad (3.12)$$

Thus, letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in both sides of the equality (3.2) and using (3.3)-(3.7) and (3.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} A(x) \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u(x) - u(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y)) K(x, y) \, dx dy \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{f \phi}{u^{\delta(x)}} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \frac{H \phi}{u^{\delta(x)}} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} G \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{\phi}{u^{\delta(x)}} \right) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \phi \, d\mu \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{\phi}{u^{\delta(x)}} \, d\nu + \int_{\Omega} \phi \, d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of the equation (1.1).

(ii) Let $\delta_* > 1$. We apply Lemma 5.2-(b) and conclude that there exists a subsequence of $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, still denoted by $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ weakly in } W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega), \\ u_n \rightarrow u \text{ pointwise a.e. in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

In this case by repeating the similar proof as in (i) above, one can pass to the limit in all the integral of the R.H.S. in (3.2) except the second integral, which is nonlocal. In order to pass to the limit there, by Lemma 5.2, since the sequence $\left\{ T_1^{\frac{\delta_*+1}{2}}(u_n) \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$, by a similar argument as in [17, Theorem 3.6], we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (T_1(u_n)(x) - T_1(u_n)(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y)) K(x, y) \, dx dy = \\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (T_1(u)(x) - T_1(u)(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y)) K(x, y) \, dx dy. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 5.2, since $\{G_1(u_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, up to a subsequence we have $G_1(u_n) \rightharpoonup G_1(u)$ weakly in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (G_1(u_n)(x) - G_1(u_n)(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))K(x, y) dx dy = \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (G_1(u)(x) - G_1(u)(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))K(x, y) dx dy. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Combining (3.13) and (3.14) and using the fact $u_n = T_1(u_n) + G_1(u_n)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_n(x) - u_n(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))K(x, y) dx dy = \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u(x) - u(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))K(x, y) dx dy. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ on both sides of the identity (3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} A(x) \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u(x) - u(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))K(x, y) dx dy \\ = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\phi}{u^\delta} d\nu + \int_{\Omega} \phi d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ solves the equation (1.1). Moreover, by Lemma 5.2-(b) and Lemma 2.3, one has the sequence $\{G_1(u_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$. Taking this into account along with the fact that $|T_1(u_n)| \leq 1$ in Ω and $u_n = T_1(u_n) + G_1(u_n)$, we obtain that $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$. Thus, by Fatou's Lemma, it follows that $u \in L^1(\Omega)$. Furthermore, using Lemma 5.2-(b) one obtain that $T_k(u) \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ such that $T_k^{\frac{\delta_*+1}{2}}(u) \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ for every $k > 0$.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2.13

Suppose that $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a continuous function satisfying the condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) for some $\delta_* \geq 1$ and for some $\epsilon > 0$. Since $\nu \in L^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ is a non-negative, therefore $\nu \in M_0^p(\Omega)$ for every $1 < p < \frac{N}{N-1}$. Moreover, since $\nu_s = 0$, hence the gradient of δ does not appear, so the locally Lipschitz continuity of δ is not required here. Thus taking into account Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2, the proof follows along the lines of the proof of Theorem 2.12.

3.3 Proof of Theorem 2.16

Since $\nu \in M_0^q(\Omega)$ is a non-negative bounded Radon measure on Ω , which is non-singular with respect to Lebesgue measure, using the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.12, we can find a non-negative function $f \in L^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ and a sequence of non-negative functions $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2(\Omega)$ with the same properties found in the proof of Theorem 2.12 except that the exponent p there will be replaced with the above exponent q here. Taking this into account,

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the following approximation of the equation (1.1):

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}u = \frac{T_n(f)+h_n}{(u+\frac{1}{n})^\delta} + T_n(\mu) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.16)$$

where $\mu \in L^{\frac{N(\delta+1)}{N+2\delta}}(\Omega)$ is a non-negative function in Ω . Finally, we pass to the limit in the weak formulation of (3.16) to conclude the result. This follows by taking into account Lemma 5.1, Lemma 5.3-(a), (b) along with Lemma 5.3-(c) and proceeding along the lines of the proof of Theorem 2.12.

4 Proof of regularity results

Proof of Theorem 2.18:

(i) If $r, m > \frac{N}{2}$, then by Lemma 5.4, Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.8, we conclude that $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Since the solution u , obtained in Theorem 2.12 is the pointwise limit of u_n , we have $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

(ii) If $r > \frac{N}{2}$, $1 < m < \frac{N}{2}$, then by Lemma 5.4, Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.8, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{m^{**}} dx \leq C,$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Since $u_n \rightarrow u$ pointwise a.e. in Ω , by Fatou's Lemma, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |u|^{m^{**}} dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{m^{**}} dx \leq C,$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Hence, $u \in L^{m^{**}}(\Omega)$.

Proofs of part (iii)-(iv) follows in a similar way by taking into account Lemma 5.4, Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.8.

Proof of Theorem 2.19: The proof follows from Lemma 5.4, Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.7.

Proof of Theorem 2.20: The proof follows from Lemma 5.4, Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.6.

5 Appendix

5.1 Approximate problem

Throughout this subsection, we assume that $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a continuous function. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and we define $T_n(f(x)) = \min\{f(x), n\}$, where $f \in L^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ is a non-negative function in Ω . Further, we assume that $h_n, g_n \in L^2(\Omega)$ are non-negative functions in Ω . Then for each fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the following approximated problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}u = \frac{T_n(f)+h_n}{(u+\frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} + g_n & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

Lemma 5.1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a unique weak solution $u_n \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ of the equation (5.1). Moreover, for every $\omega \Subset \Omega$, there exists a constant $C(\omega) > 0$ (independent of n) such that $u_n \geq C(\omega)$ in ω for all n .*

Proof. Existence: Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the Lax-Milgram theorem [27, page 315], we define a map $\Theta : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ by $\Theta v = w$, where w is the unique solution of the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}w = \frac{T_n(f)+h_n}{(|v|+\frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} + g_n & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

First, we claim that Θ is continuous. To this end, let $\{v_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2(\Omega)$ be such that $v_k \rightarrow v$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$. We claim that $w_k := \Theta v_k$ converges to $w := \Theta v$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. It suffices to show that every subsequence of $\{w_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a further subsequence that converges to w strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$. Our claim is that $\{w_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a subsequence that converges to w in $L^2(\Omega)$ and the proof for any other subsequence of $\{w_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is similar. Since $v_k \rightarrow v$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$, there exists a subsequence of $\{v_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, still denoted $\{v_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $v_k \rightarrow v$ pointwise a.e. in Ω . Since the equation (5.2) is linear, we have

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}(w_k - w) = \frac{T_n(f)+h_n}{(|v_k|+\frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} - \frac{T_n(f)+h_n}{(|v|+\frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_k - w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

We choose $\phi = (w_k - w)$ as test function in the weak formulation of (5.3) and apply (1.2), (1.3) to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(w_k - w)|^2 dx + \Lambda^{-1} \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{((w_k - w)(x) - (w_k - w)(y))^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} \\ \leq \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(|v_k| + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} - \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(|v| + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \right) (w_k - w) dx \\ \leq \left\| \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(|v_k| + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} - \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(|v| + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|w_k - w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.3 in the above estimate, we get

$$\|w_k - w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \left\| \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(|v_k| + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} - \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(|v| + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad (5.4)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of k . Now since

$$\left| \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(|v_k| + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \right|^2 \leq 2 \left(\|n^{\delta(x)}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 |T_n(f) + h_n|^2 \right) \in L^1(\Omega),$$

by the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(|v_k| + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} = \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(|v| + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}}$$

strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$. Hence, (5.4) implies $w_k \rightarrow w$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ and consequently Θ is continuous.

Now, we show that Θ is compact. In this concern, let $\{v_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a bounded sequence in $L^2(\Omega)$ and $w_k := \Theta v_k$. Incorporating w_k as a test function in the weak formulation of (5.2) with $(v, w) = (v_k, w_k)$ and applying (1.2), (1.3), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_k|^2 dx + \underbrace{\Lambda^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(w_k(x) - w_k(y))^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(|v_k| + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} + g_n \right) w_k dx \\ &\leq C \|T_n(f) + h_n + g_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|w_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \|T_n(f) + h_n + g_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla w_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent on k . To obtain the last inequality we have again used Lemma 2.3). The inequality (5.5) yields

$$\|\nabla w_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|T_n(f) + h_n + g_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of k . Thus, since $h_n, g_n \in L^2(\Omega)$, the above estimates yields that the sequence $\{w_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. By Lemma 2.3, the sequence $\{w_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a convergent subsequence in $L^2(\Omega)$. This proves that Θ is compact. Using the same argument above, we observe that there exists a radius $R > 0$ such that the ball of radius R in $L^2(\Omega)$ is invariant under the mapping Θ . Hence, one can exploit Schauder's fixed point theorem to conclude the existence of a fixed point of the map Θ , i.e., there exists $u_n \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}u_n = \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(|u_n| + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} + g_n & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_n = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

We put $\phi = -u_n^-$ in the weak formulation of the above equation (5.6) and obtain $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n^-|^2 dx \leq 0$ that gives $u_n^- = 0$ in Ω and hence $u_n \geq 0$ in Ω . By [31, Theorem 3.10], we have $u_n > 0$ in Ω and consequently it is a weak solution of the equation (5.1).

Uniqueness: Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose u_n and \tilde{u}_n in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ are two weak solutions of the equation (5.1). Thus, $w = u_n - \tilde{u}_n$ is a weak solution of the equation

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}w = \left(\frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} - \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(\tilde{u}_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

Choosing $\phi = w^+$ as a test function in the weak formulation of (5.7) and utilizing (1.2), (1.3) we obtain

$$\alpha \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w^+|^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} - \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(\tilde{u}_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \right) w^+ dx \leq 0, \quad (5.8)$$

which reveals that $w^+ = 0$ in Ω . Consequently, $u_n \leq \tilde{u}_n$ in Ω . Interchanging the roles of u_n and \tilde{u}_n , we obtain $\tilde{u}_n \leq u_n$ in Ω . This proves that the equation (5.1) admits a unique weak solution $u_n \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$.

Uniform positivity: Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. To obtain a uniform lower bound of u_n , we compare u_n with the solution $w \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ of the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}w = \frac{T_1(f)}{(w+1)^{\delta(x)}} \text{ in } \Omega, \\ w = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \text{ and } w > 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.9)$$

Existence of such function w follows from [31, Lemma 4.6]. By incorporating the test function $\psi = (w - u_n)^+$ in the weak formulations of (5.1), (5.9) and subtracting one from the other, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} A(x) \nabla(w - u_n) \cdot \nabla \psi \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} ((w - u_n)(x) - (w - u_n)(y))(\psi(x) - \psi(y)) K(x, y) \, dx \, dy \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{T_1(f)\psi}{(w+1)^{\delta(x)}} \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \frac{T_n(f)\psi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \frac{h_n\psi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \, dx - \int_{\Omega} g_n\psi \, dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{(w+1)^{\delta(x)}} - \frac{1}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \right) T_n(f)\psi \, dx \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the property (1.2) and (1.3), we have

$$\alpha \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \psi|^2 \, dx + \underbrace{\Lambda^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{((w - u_n)(x) - (w - u_n)(y))(\psi(x) - \psi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} \, dx \, dy}_{\geq 0} \leq 0,$$

which implies

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \psi|^2 \, dx \leq 0.$$

Thus, $\psi = 0$ in Ω and hence $u_n \geq w$ in Ω . Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is arbitrary, this inequality holds for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, from [31, Lemma 4.6], we can conclude that for every $\omega \Subset \Omega$, there exists a constant $C(\omega) > 0$ such that $w \geq C(\omega)$ in ω and consequently, $u_n \geq C(\omega)$ in ω for all n . \square

5.2 A priori estimates for Theorem 2.12 and Theorem 2.13

The following uniform boundness results will be useful for the proofs of Theorem 2.12 and Theorem 2.13.

Lemma 5.2. (*Uniform boundedness*) Assume that the function $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is continuous which satisfies the condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) for some $\delta_* \geq 1$ and for some $\epsilon > 0$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that the solution of (5.1) obtained in Lemma 5.1 is denoted by u_n . If the sequences of non-negative functions $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2(\Omega)$ in Ω are uniformly bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$, then the following conclusions hold:

- (a) If $\delta_* = 1$, then the sequence $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ for every $1 < q < \frac{N}{N-1}$.
- (b) If $\delta_* > 1$, then the sequence $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,q}(\Omega) \cap L^1(\Omega)$ for every $1 < q < \frac{N}{N-1}$. Moreover, the sequences $\{G_k(u_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\{T_k(u_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\left\{T_k^{\frac{\delta_*+1}{2}}(u_n)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$, $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ respectively for every fixed $k > 0$ and $1 < q < \frac{N}{N-1}$.

Proof. (a) We assume $\delta_* = 1$, which means that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $0 < \delta(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \Omega_\epsilon$. We shall prove that $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ for every $1 < q < \frac{N}{N-1}$. Due to the fact (2.1), it is sufficient to prove that $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $M^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)$. Since Ω is bounded, it is enough to estimate the measure, $|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u_n| \geq t\}|$ for all $t \geq 1$. For any $l, t \geq 1$, we observe that

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u_n| \geq t\}| \leq \underbrace{|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u_n| \geq t, u_n \leq l\}|}_{=I_2} + \underbrace{|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u_n| \geq t, u_n \geq l\}|}_{=I_1}. \quad (5.10)$$

Estimate of I_1 : For $l \geq 1$, using $\phi = T_l(u_n)$ as a test function in the weak formulation of the equation (5.1) along with (1.2) and (1.3), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha \int_{\Omega} |\nabla T_l(u_n)|^2 dx + \Lambda^{-1} \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(u_n(x) - u_n(y))(T_l(u_n(x)) - T_l(u_n(y)))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} T_l(u_n) dx + \int_{\Omega} T_l(u_n) g_n dx \\ & \leq \underbrace{\int_{\Omega} \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} T_l(u_n) dx}_{=J_1} + l \|g_n\|_{L^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

We observe that, since $T_l(s)$ is an increasing function in s , the nonlocal integral above become non-negative. Using the condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) and by Lemma 5.1, the fact $u_n \geq C$

in $\Omega \cap \Omega_\epsilon^c$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n , one has

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &= \int_{\Omega \cap \Omega_\epsilon^c} \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} T_l(u_n) dx + \int_{\{x \in \Omega_\epsilon : u_n(x) \geq 1\}} \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} T_l(u_n) dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\{x \in \Omega_\epsilon : u_n(x) < 1\}} \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} T_l(u_n) dx \\
&\leq l \|C^{-\delta(x)}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} (T_n(f) + h_n) dx + \int_{\{x \in \Omega_\epsilon : u_n(x) \geq 1\}} (T_n(f) + h_n) T_l(u_n) dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\{x \in \Omega_\epsilon : u_n(x) < 1\}} (T_n(f) + h_n) \left(u_n + \frac{1}{n}\right)^{1-\delta(x)} dx \\
&\leq l \|C^{-\delta(x)}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} (f + h_n) dx + l \int_{\{x \in \Omega_\epsilon : u_n(x) \geq 1\}} (f + h_n) dx \\
&\quad + \|2^{1-\delta(x)}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\{x \in \Omega_\epsilon : u_n(x) < 1\}} (f + h_n) dx \\
&\leq C(l+1),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n . To obtain the last inequality above, we have used the uniform L^1 bound of h_n . It follows from (5.11) and (5.12) along with the uniform L^1 bound of g_n that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla T_l(u_n)|^2 dx \leq C(l+1), \tag{5.13}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n . By Lemma 2.3, one has

$$\left(\int_{\{x \in \Omega : u_n(x) \geq l\}} |T_l(u_n)|^{2^*} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*}} \leq C(l+1),$$

where $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$. Here $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n . This yields

$$|\{x \in \Omega : u_n(x) \geq l\}|^{\frac{2}{2^*}} \leq \frac{C}{l} \left(1 + \frac{1}{l}\right) \leq \frac{C}{l}.$$

Thus, there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of n such that

$$I_1 \leq |\{x \in \Omega : u_n(x) \geq l\}| \leq \frac{C}{l^{\frac{N}{N-2}}}, \text{ for all } l \geq 1. \tag{5.14}$$

Estimate of I_2 : For any $t \geq 1$ and $l \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u_n| \geq t, u_n \leq l\}| \leq \frac{1}{t^2} \int_{\{x \in \Omega : u_n \leq l\}} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx \\
&\leq \frac{1}{t^2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla T_l(u_n)|^2 dx \leq \frac{Cl}{t^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{l}\right) \leq \frac{Cl}{t^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n . To obtain the second last inequality we have used (5.13). Thus, combining (5.14) and (5.15), we conclude from (5.10) that there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of n such that

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u_n| \geq t\}| \leq C \left(\frac{1}{l^{\frac{N}{N-2}}} + \frac{l}{t^2} \right), \text{ for all } l, t \geq 1. \tag{5.16}$$

In particular, choosing $l = t^{\frac{N-2}{N-1}}$ in (5.16) gives that

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla u_n| \geq t\}| \leq \frac{C}{t^{\frac{N}{N-1}}} \text{ for all } t \geq 1, \quad (5.17)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Thus using the embedding (2.1) in (5.17), it follows that the sequence $\{|\nabla u_n|\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^q(\Omega)$ for every $1 < q < \frac{N}{N-1}$ and consequently, the sequence $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ for every $1 < q < \frac{N}{N-1}$.

(b) We assume there exist $\delta_* > 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $0 < \delta(x) \leq \delta_*$ for all $x \in \Omega_\epsilon$.

Claim 1: For every fixed $k > 0$, the sequence $\{G_k(u_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ for every $1 < q < \frac{N}{N-1}$.

To this end, similar to part (a) above, we estimate the measure $|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla G_k(u_n)| \geq t\}|$ for all $t \geq 1$. Let $l > 0$. Then, we observe that

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla G_k(u_n)| \geq t\}| \quad (5.18)$$

$$\leq \underbrace{|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla G_k(u_n)| \geq t, G_k(u_n) \leq l\}|}_{I_2} + \underbrace{|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla G_k(u_n)| \geq t, G_k(u_n) \geq l\}|}_{I_1}. \quad (5.19)$$

We estimate I_1 and I_2 using the same approach as in part (a) above.

Estimate of I_1 : By taking the test function $\phi = T_l(G_k(u_n))$ in the weak formulation of (5.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} A(x) \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla T_l(G_k(u_n)) dx + \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_n(x) - u_n(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y)) K(x, y) dx dy}_{\geq 0} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{(T_n(f) + h_n)}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} T_l(G_k(u_n)) dx + \int_{\Omega} g_n T_l(G_k(u_n)) dx \\ &\leq l \left\| \frac{1}{k^{\delta(x)}} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} (T_n(f) + h_n) dx + l \int_{\Omega} g_n \\ &\leq Cl(\|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \|h_n\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \|g_n\|_{L^1(\Omega)}) \leq Cl, \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

where the constant $C > 0$ is independent of n . We observe that, since $T_l(s)$ is an increasing function in s , the nonlocal integral above becomes non-negative. We have used the fact that $u_n \geq k$ in $\text{supp } T_l(G_k(u_n))$ to obtain the first inequality in (5.20) above. Then the above inequality (5.20) together with (1.2) leads to

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla T_l(G_k(u_n))|^2 dx \leq Cl, \quad (5.21)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n . Using Lemma 2.3, we deduce

$$|\{x \in \Omega : G_k(u_n) \geq l\}|^{\frac{2}{2^*}} \leq \frac{1}{l^2} \left(\int_{\Omega} |T_l(G_k(u_n))|^{2^*} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*}} \leq \frac{1}{l^2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla T_l(G_k(u_n))|^2 dx \leq \frac{C}{l},$$

that is,

$$|\{x \in \Omega : G_k(u_n) \geq l\}| \leq \frac{C}{l^{\frac{N}{N-2}}},$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n , where $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$. Hence,

$$I_1 = |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla G_k(u_n)| \geq t, G_k(u_n) \geq l\}| \leq \frac{C}{l^{\frac{N}{N-2}}}, \quad (5.22)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n .

Estimate of I_2 : Using the inequality (5.21), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 = |\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla G_k(u_n)| \geq t, G_k(u_n) \leq l\}| &\leq \frac{1}{t^2} \int_{\{x \in \Omega : G_k(u_n) \leq l\}} |\nabla G_k(u_n)|^2 dx \quad (5.23) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t^2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla T_l(G_k(u_n))|^2 dx \leq \frac{Cl}{t^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n .

For $t \geq 1$, choosing $l = t^{\frac{N-2}{N-1}}$ in (5.22) and (5.23) and using these two inequalities in (5.18), we get

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |\nabla G_k(u_n)| \geq t\}| \leq \frac{C}{t^{\frac{N}{N-1}}},$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . This completes the proof of Claim 1.

Claim 2: For every fixed $k > 0$, the sequences $\{T_k(u_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\left\{T_k(u_n)^{\frac{\delta_*+1}{2}}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are uniformly bounded in $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ respectively.

By choosing $\phi = T_k^{\delta_*}(u_n)$ into the weak formulation of (5.1) and making use of the properties (1.2) and (1.3), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{4\alpha\delta_*}{(\delta_*+1)^2} \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla T_k^{\frac{\delta_*+1}{2}}(u_n) \right|^2 dx + \underbrace{\Lambda^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(u_n(x) - u_n(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} T_k^{\delta_*}(u_n) dx + \int_{\Omega} T_k^{\delta_*}(u_n) g_n dx. \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} T_k^{\delta_*}(u_n) dx + k^{\delta_*} \int_{\Omega} g_n dx. \quad (5.24) \end{aligned}$$

Using the condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) and by Lemma 5.1, the fact $u_n \geq C$ in $\Omega \cap \Omega_{\epsilon}^c$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} T_k^{\delta_*}(u_n) dx &= \int_{\Omega \cap \Omega_{\epsilon}^c} \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} T_k^{\delta_*}(u_n) dx \\
&+ \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{\epsilon} : u_n(x) \geq 1\}} \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} T_k^{\delta_*}(u_n) dx + \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{\epsilon} : u_n(x) < 1\}} \frac{T_n(f) + h_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} T_k^{\delta_*}(u_n) dx \\
&\leq \|C^{-\delta(x)}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} k^{\delta_*} \int_{\Omega} (T_n(f) + h_n) dx + k^{\delta_*} \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{\epsilon} : u_n(x) \geq 1\}} (T_n(f) + h_n) dx \\
&+ \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{\epsilon} : u_n(x) < 1\}} (T_n(f) + h_n) \left(u_n + \frac{1}{n}\right)^{\delta_* - \delta(x)} dx \\
&\leq \|C^{-\delta(x)}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} k^{\delta_*} \int_{\Omega} (f + h_n) dx + k^{\delta_*} \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{\epsilon} : u_n(x) \geq 1\}} (f + h_n) dx \\
&+ \|2^{\delta_* - \delta(x)}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{\epsilon} : u_n(x) < 1\}} (f + h_n) dx \\
&\leq C(k^{\delta_*} + 1),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n . To obtain the last inequality above, we have used the facts $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ and that $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$. Using the estimate (5.25) and uniform $L^1(\Omega)$ bound of g_n , (5.24) yields

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla T_k^{\frac{\delta_* + 1}{2}}(u_n) \right|^2 dx \leq C(k^{\delta_*} + 1), \tag{5.26}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n . Hence, the sequence $\left\{ T_k(u_n)^{\frac{\delta_* + 1}{2}} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ for every fixed $k > 0$. Moreover, since for every $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists a constant $C(\omega) > 0$ (independent of n) such that $u_n \geq C(\omega)$ for all n , therefore using (5.26), we obtain

$$C(\omega)^{\delta_* - 1} \int_{\omega} |\nabla T_k(u_n)|^2 dx \leq \int_{\omega} u_n^{\delta_* - 1} |\nabla T_k(u_n)|^2 dx = \int_{\Omega} T_k^{\delta_* - 1}(u_n) |\nabla T_k(u_n)|^2 dx \leq C,$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n . Hence, $\{T_k(u_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega)$. This completes the proof of Claim 2.

Finally, since $u_n = T_1(u_n) + G_1(u_n)$, using Claim 1 and Claim 2, it follows that the sequence $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,q}(\Omega) \cap L^1(\Omega)$ for every $1 < q < \frac{N}{N-1}$. \square

5.3 A priori estimates for Theorem 2.16

Lemma 5.3. *Assume that the function $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a constant function. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and define $g_n(x) = T_n(g(x)) = \min\{g(x), n\}$ in (5.1), where $g \in L^{\frac{N(\delta+1)}{N+2\delta}}(\Omega)$ is a non-negative function in Ω . Suppose that the solution of (5.1) obtained in Lemma 5.1 is denoted by u_n . Assume that the sequence of non-negative functions $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2(\Omega)$ in Ω is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$. Then the following conclusions hold:*

- (a) If $\delta = 1$, then $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$.
- (b) If $0 < \delta < 1$, then $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$, where $q = \frac{N(\delta+1)}{N+\delta-1}$.
- (c) If $\delta > 1$, then $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Moreover, $\left\{u_n^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$.

Proof. (a) Choosing u_n as a test function in the weak formulation of (5.1) and applying the properties (1.2), (1.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \Lambda^{-1} \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(u_n(x) - u_n(y))^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} \\ \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{(T_n(f) + h_n)u_n}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})} dx + \int_{\Omega} g_n u_n dx. \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

Using Hölder's inequality along with Lemma 2.3 in (5.27), it follows that

$$\alpha \|u_n\|_{W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)}^2 \leq \int_{\Omega} (f + h_n) dx + \int_{\Omega} g u_n dx \leq C + \|g\|_{L^{(2^*)}'(\Omega)} \|u_n\|_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \leq C(1 + \|u_n\|_{W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)}),$$

where C is a constant independent of n . Hence the sequence $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$.

- (b) If $0 < \delta < 1$, then for $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{n}$, choosing $\phi = (u_n + \epsilon)^{\delta} - \epsilon^{\delta}$ as a test function in the weak formulation of (5.1) and using the properties (1.2), (1.3), we obtain

$$\alpha \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla (u_n + \epsilon)^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}} \right|^2 dx + \Lambda^{-1} \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(u_n(x) - u_n(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} \quad (5.28)$$

$$\leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{(T_n(f) + h_n)\phi}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta}} dx + \int_{\Omega} g_n \phi dx \quad (5.29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \int_{\Omega} (T_n(f) + h_n) dx + \int_{\Omega} g(u_n + \epsilon)^{\delta} dx \\ &\leq C + \int_{\Omega} g(u_n + \epsilon)^{\delta} dx, \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

where C is a constant independent of n . Using Hölder inequality, (5.28) yields

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla (u_n + \epsilon)^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}} \right|^2 dx \leq C \left[1 + \left(\int_{\Omega} (u_n + \epsilon)^{\frac{2^*(\delta+1)}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2\delta}{2^*(\delta+1)}} \|g\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \right], \quad (5.31)$$

where $r = \frac{N(\delta+1)}{N+2\delta}$ and $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n . Here $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$. Applying Lemma 2.3 in (5.31), we have

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} |u_n + \epsilon|^{\frac{2^*(\delta+1)}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*}} \leq C \left[1 + \left(\int_{\Omega} (u_n + \epsilon)^{\frac{2^*(\delta+1)}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2\delta}{2^*(\delta+1)}} \|g\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \right], \quad (5.32)$$

where C is a constant independent of n . Hence, there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of n such that

$$\int_{\Omega} |u_n + \epsilon|^{\frac{2^*(\delta+1)}{2}} dx \leq C. \quad (5.33)$$

Using (5.33) in (5.31), we arrive at

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u_n|^2}{(u_n + \epsilon)^{(1-\delta)}} dx \leq C, \quad (5.34)$$

where C is a constant independent of n . Now, for any $1 < p < 2$, using Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^p dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u_n|^p}{(u_n + \epsilon)^{\frac{(1-\delta)p}{2}}} (u_n + \epsilon)^{\frac{(1-\delta)p}{2}} dx \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u_n|^2}{(u_n + \epsilon)^{(1-\delta)}} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} (u_n + \epsilon)^{\frac{(1-\delta)p}{2-p}} dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}} \\ &\leq C \left(\int_{\Omega} (u_n + \epsilon)^{\frac{(1-\delta)p}{2-p}} dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

where C is a constant independent of n . We choose $1 < p < 2$ such that $\frac{(1-\delta)p}{2-p} = \frac{2^*(\delta+1)}{2}$, i.e., $p = \frac{N(\delta+1)}{N+\delta-1} = q$. Note that $1 < q < 2$, since $N > 2$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Hence, the proof follows from (5.33) and (5.35).

- (c) Let $k > 0$, then we choose $T_k^\delta(u_n)$ as a test function in the weak formulation of the equation (5.1) with $\delta > 1$ and apply (1.2), (1.3) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \delta \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla T_k^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}}(u_n) \right|^2 dx &+ \underbrace{\Lambda^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(u_n(x) - u_n(y))(T_k^\delta(u_n(x)) - T_k^\delta(u_n(y)))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{T_k^\delta(u_n)(T_n(f) + h_n)}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^\delta} dx + \int_{\Omega} g_n T_k^\delta(u_n) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact $T_k(s) \leq s$ for every $k, s > 0$, the above identity yields

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla T_k^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}}(u_n) \right|^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} (T_n(f) + h_n) dx + \int_{\Omega} g T_k^\delta(u_n) dx. \quad (5.36)$$

Using Hölder's inequality and the fact that $\|T_n(f) + h_n\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$ is uniformly bounded, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla T_k^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}}(u_n) \right|^2 dx \leq C + \|g\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} |T_k(u_n)|^s dx \right)^{\frac{\delta}{s}}, \quad (5.37)$$

where $s = \frac{2^*(\delta+1)}{2}$, $r = \frac{N(\delta+1)}{N+2\delta}$ and $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n, k . Here $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$. Applying Lemma 2.3 in (5.37), we obtain

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} |T_k(u_n)|^s dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*}} \leq C \left(1 + \|g\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} |T_k(u_n)|^s dx \right)^{\frac{\delta}{s}} \right). \quad (5.38)$$

Since $\frac{2}{2^*} > \frac{\delta}{s} = \frac{2\delta}{2^*(\delta+1)}$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ (independent of n, k) such

$$\int_{\Omega} |T_k(u_n)|^s dx \leq C \text{ for all } n, k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus by using (5.37) and Fatou's lemma, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla u_n^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}} \right|^2 dx \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla T_k^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}}(u_n) \right|^2 dx \leq C (1 + \|g\|_{L^r(\Omega)}),$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n . Hence, the sequence $\left\{ u_n^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Now, for every $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists $C(\omega) > 0$ (independent of n) such that $u_n \geq C(\omega)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus,

$$\int_{\omega} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\omega} \left| \nabla u_n^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}} \right|^2 u_n^{1-\delta} dx \leq \frac{1}{C(\omega)^{\delta-1}} \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla u_n^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}} \right|^2 dx \leq \tilde{C}(\omega).$$

This completes the proof of the Lemma. □

5.4 A priori estimates for regularity results

In this subsection, unless otherwise mentioned, we assume that $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a continuous function and $f \in L^r(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ and $g \in L^m(\Omega)$ for some $r, m \geq 1$ are two non-negative functions in Ω .

By Lemma 5.1 and proceeding along the lines of the proof of [35, Lemma 3.1], for each fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the existence of a unique weak solution $u_n \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ of the equation

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}u_n = \frac{T_n(f)}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} + T_n(g) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_n > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \text{ and } u_n = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.39)$$

Moreover, for each fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by [35, Lemma 3.2] there exists a unique weak solution $v_n \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ of the problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}v_n = \frac{T_n(f)}{(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v_n > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \text{ and } v_n = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.40)$$

and by [35, Lemma 3.1], there exists a unique weak solution $w_n \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ solving

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}w_n = T_n(g) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_n > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \text{ and } w_n = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \end{cases} \quad (5.41)$$

respectively.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that $u_n, v_n, w_n \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ are solutions of the problem (5.39), (5.40) and (5.41) respectively. If $\{w_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are uniformly bounded in $L^a(\Omega)$ and $L^b(\Omega)$ respectively for some $a, b \geq 1$, then $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^c(\Omega)$, where $c = \min\{a, b\}$.*

Proof. The function $\tilde{u}_n := (u_n - v_n - w_n)$ satisfies the following equation

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}\tilde{u}_n = T_n(f) \left(\frac{1}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} - \frac{1}{(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \tilde{u}_n = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.42)$$

By putting the test function $\phi = \tilde{u}_n^+$ in the weak formulation of (5.42) and applying (1.2), (1.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{u}_n^+|^2 dx + \underbrace{\Lambda^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(\tilde{u}_n(x) - \tilde{u}_n(y))(\tilde{u}_n^+(x) - \tilde{u}_n^+(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega} T_n(f) \left(\frac{1}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} - \frac{1}{(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} \right) \tilde{u}_n^+ dx \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{u}_n^+|^2 dx \leq 0,$$

that is $\tilde{u}_n^+ = 0$ in Ω . Therefore, $u_n \leq v_n + w_n$ in Ω and hence $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^c(\Omega)$. \square

The following regularity result for the above solution w_n of the equation (5.41) is highly significant for our argument.

Lemma 5.5. *Assume that $g \in L^m(\Omega)$ be a non-negative function in Ω for some $m > 1$. Then the above solution w_n to the equation (5.41) satisfies the following conclusions:*

- (a) *If $m > \frac{N}{2}$, then $\{w_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$.*
- (b) *If $1 < m < \frac{N}{2}$, then $\{w_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^{m^{**}}(\Omega)$, where $m^{**} = \frac{Nm}{N-2m}$.*

Proof. (a) For $k \geq 1$, taking $\phi = (w_n - k)^+$ as a test function in weak formulation of the equation (5.41) and applying (1.2), (1.3), we deduce

$$\alpha \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx + \underbrace{\Lambda^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(w_n(x) - w_n(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} \leq \int_{\Omega} T_n(g) \phi dx,$$

which implies

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} g \phi dx, \quad (5.43)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Using Lemma 2.3 and the generalized Hölder's inequality in the above inequality (5.43), we get

$$\begin{aligned} C \left(\int_{\Omega} |\phi|^{2^*} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*}} &\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} g |\phi| dx \\ &\leq C \|g\|_{L^m(\Omega)} \|\phi\|_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} |\{x \in \Omega : w_n \geq k\}|^{1-\frac{1}{m}-\frac{1}{2^*}}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\int_{\Omega} |\phi|^{2^*} dx \leq C \|g\|_{L^m(\Omega)}^{2^*} |\{x \in \Omega : w_n \geq k\}|^{2^*(1-\frac{1}{m}-\frac{1}{2^*})}, \quad (5.44)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n and $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$. Define $S(k) := \{x \in \Omega : w_n(x) \geq k\}$ for all $k \geq 1$. Now, for $1 \leq k \leq h$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |S(h)|(h-k)^{2^*} &= \int_{S(h)} |h-k|^{2^*} dx \leq \int_{S(k)} |(w_n-k)^+|^{2^*} dx = \int_{\Omega} |\phi|^{2^*} dx \\ &\leq C \|g\|_{L^m(\Omega)}^{2^*} |\{x \in \Omega : w_n \geq k\}|^{2^*(1-\frac{1}{m}-\frac{1}{2^*})} \\ &= C \|g\|_{L^m(\Omega)}^{2^*} |S(k)|^{2^*(1-\frac{1}{m}-\frac{1}{2^*})}, \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$|S(h)| \leq \frac{C \|g\|_{L^m(\Omega)}^{2^*}}{(h-k)^{2^*}} |S(k)|^{\alpha},$$

where $\alpha = 2^*(1-\frac{1}{m}-\frac{1}{2^*}) > 1$ as $m > \frac{N}{2}$. Thus, by [39, Lemma B.1], there exists $C > 0$ (independent of n) such that $\|w_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C$ in Ω , for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

- (b) For $\epsilon > 0$, treating $\phi = (w_n + \epsilon)^\gamma - \epsilon^\gamma$ ($\gamma > 0$ to be determined later) as a test function in the weak formulation of (5.41) and using (1.2), (1.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla (w_n + \epsilon)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}} \right|^2 dx + \Lambda^{-1} \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(w_n(x) - w_n(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} \\ \leq \int_{\Omega} T_n(g) \phi dx, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla (w_n + \epsilon)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}} \right|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} g (w_n + \epsilon)^\gamma dx \leq C \|g\|_{L^m(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} (w_n + \epsilon)^{m'\gamma} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{m'}},$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Using Lemma 2.3, we get

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} (w_n + \epsilon)^{\frac{2^*(\gamma+1)}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*}} \leq C \|g\|_{L^m(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} (w_n + \epsilon)^{m'\gamma} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{m'}}, \quad (5.45)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n and $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$. We choose $\gamma > 0$ such that $\frac{2^*(\gamma+1)}{2} = m'\gamma$, i.e. $\gamma = \frac{N(m-1)}{(N-2m)}$. Therefore, $m'\gamma = \frac{Nm}{N-2m} = m^{**}$. Since $1 < m < \frac{N}{2}$, one has

$$\int_{\Omega} (w_n + \epsilon)^{m^{**}} dx \leq C,$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of n . Finally, by Fatou's Lemma, the result follows. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a continuous function satisfying (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) for some $\delta_* \geq 1$ and for some $\epsilon > 0$. Let $f \in L^r(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ be a non-negative function in Ω for some $r \geq 1$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let v_n be the unique weak solution of the problem (5.40). Then the following conclusions hold:*

- (a) *If $r > \frac{N}{2}$, then the sequence $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$.*
- (b) *If $\frac{N(\delta_*+1)}{N+2\delta_*} \leq r < \frac{N}{2}$, then the sequence $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^{r^{**}}(\Omega)$, where $r^{**} = \frac{Nr}{N-2r}$.*

Proof. (a) For $k \geq 1$, incorporating the test function $\phi = (v_n - k)^+$ in the weak formulation of the equation (5.40) and using (1.2), (1.3), we obtain

$$\alpha \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx + \underbrace{\Lambda^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(v_n(x) - v_n(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{\phi T_n(f)}{(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} dx. \quad (5.46)$$

Since $v_n \geq k \geq 1$ on $\text{supp } \phi$, we have $|\frac{\phi}{(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}}| \leq \phi$ on $\text{supp } \phi$. Thus, (5.46) yields

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} \phi f dx, \quad (5.47)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Rest of the proof follows in a similar way to the Lemma 5.5-(a).

- (b) Since $v_n \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we choose the test function $\phi = v_n^\gamma$ ($\gamma \geq \delta_*$ to be determined later) in the weak formulation of (5.40) and apply the properties (1.2), (1.3) to get

$$\alpha \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla v_n^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}} \right|^2 dx + \underbrace{\Lambda^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(v_n(x) - v_n(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{\phi T_n(f)}{(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} dx. \quad (5.48)$$

Now, using the condition (P_{ϵ, δ_*}) , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} \frac{\phi T_n(f)}{(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} dx &\leq \int_{\Omega \cap \Omega_{\epsilon}^c} \frac{v_n^{\gamma} f}{(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} dx + \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{\epsilon} : v_n \leq 1\}} \frac{v_n^{\gamma} f}{(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{\epsilon} : v_n > 1\}} \frac{v_n^{\gamma} f}{(v_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\delta(x)}} dx \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{1}{C(\epsilon)^{\delta(x)}} \right\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} v_n^{\gamma} f dx + \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{\epsilon} : v_n \leq 1\}} v_n^{\gamma - \delta(x)} f dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{\epsilon} : v_n > 1\}} v_n^{\gamma} f dx \\
&\leq C \left(\int_{\Omega} v_n^{\gamma} f dx + \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{\epsilon} : v_n \leq 1\}} f dx + \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{\epsilon} : v_n > 1\}} v_n^{\gamma} f dx \right) \\
&\leq C \left(\int_{\Omega} v_n^{\gamma} f dx + \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \right) \\
&\leq C \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \left[1 + \left(\int_{\Omega} |v_n|^{r'\gamma} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \right], \tag{5.49}
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Combining (5.48) and (5.49) we deduce

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla v_n^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}} \right|^2 dx \leq C \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \left[1 + \left(\int_{\Omega} |v_n|^{r'\gamma} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \right],$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . By Lemma 2.3, we obtain

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} |v_n|^{\frac{2^*(\gamma+1)}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \left[1 + \left(\int_{\Omega} |v_n|^{r'\gamma} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \right], \tag{5.50}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Here $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$. We choose γ such that $\frac{2^*(\gamma+1)}{2} = r'\gamma$, i.e., $\gamma = \frac{N(r-1)}{(N-2r)}$. Since $\frac{N(\delta_*+1)}{N+2\delta_*} \leq r < \frac{N}{2}$, we have $\gamma \geq \delta_*$ and $\frac{1}{r'} < \frac{2}{2^*}$. Thus inequality (5.50) gives that $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^{r^{**}}(\Omega)$, where $r^{**} = \frac{Nr}{N-2r}$. □

For Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.8 below, we assume that $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a constant function.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $0 < \delta < 1$ and suppose that $f \in L^r(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ is a non-negative function in Ω for some $r \geq 1$. For each fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let v_n be the unique weak solution of the problem (5.40). Then the following conclusions hold:*

- (a) *If $r > \frac{N}{2}$, then the sequence $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^{\infty}(\Omega)$.*
- (b) *If $\left(\frac{2^*}{1-\delta}\right)' \leq r < \frac{N}{2}$, then the sequence $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^s(\Omega)$, where $s = \frac{Nr(\delta+1)}{N-2r}$.*

Proof. (a) The proof follows from Lemma 5.6.

(b) To begin with, we consider the case $r = \left(\frac{2^*}{1-\delta}\right)'$. By incorporating v_n as a test function in the weak formulation in (5.40) and applying (1.2), (1.3) to deduce

$$\alpha \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} f v_n^{1-\delta} dx \leq \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \|v_n\|_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}^{1-\delta} \leq \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \|v_n\|_{W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)}^{1-\delta},$$

which yields $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Thus, by Lemma 2.3, $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^{2^*}(\Omega)$. This proves the conclusion for $r = \left(\frac{2^*}{1-\delta}\right)'$. For the case $\left(\frac{2^*}{1-\delta}\right)' < r < \frac{N}{2}$, we put $v_n^{2\gamma-1}$ ($\gamma > 1$ to be determined later) as a test function in the weak formulation of the equation (5.40) and obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n^\gamma|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} v_n^{2\gamma-\delta-1} f dx \leq C \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} v_n^{r'(2\gamma-\delta-1)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}},$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . By Lemma 2.3, we infer that

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} v_n^{2^*\gamma} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} v_n^{r'(2\gamma-\delta-1)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}}, \quad (5.51)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Here $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$. We choose γ in such a way that $2^*\gamma = r'(2\gamma - \delta - 1)$, i.e., $\gamma = \frac{r(\delta+1)(N-2)}{2(N-2r)} > 1$ (since $r > \left(\frac{2^*}{1-\delta}\right)'$). From the fact $r < \frac{N}{2}$ and (5.51) we can conclude that $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^s(\Omega)$ with $s = \frac{Nr(\delta+1)}{(N-2r)}$. \square

Lemma 5.8. *Let $\delta \geq 1$ and suppose that $f \in L^r(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ is a non-negative function in Ω for some $r \geq 1$. For each fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let v_n be unique weak solution of the problem (5.40). Then the following conclusions hold:*

- (a) *If $r > \frac{N}{2}$, then the sequence $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$.*
- (b) *If $1 \leq r < \frac{N}{2}$, then the sequence $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^s(\Omega)$, where $s = \frac{Nr(\delta+1)}{N-2r}$.*

Proof. (a) The proof follows from Lemma 5.6.

(b) We divide the proof into two cases $\delta = 1$ and $\delta > 1$.

Case-I: Suppose $\delta = 1$. If $r = 1$, then by taking into account Lemma 2.3, the conclusion follows by choosing test function v_n in the weak formulation of (5.40) and using (1.2), (1.3). Let us assume that $r > 1$. By incorporating the test function $\phi = v_n^{2\gamma-1}$ ($\gamma > 1$ to be determined later) in the weak formulation of (5.40) and utilizing (1.2), (1.3), we get

$$\alpha \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n^\gamma|^2 dx + \Lambda^{-1} \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(v_n(x) - v_n(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}_{\geq 0} \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{\phi T_n(f)}{(v_n + \frac{1}{n})} dx,$$

which reveals that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n^\gamma|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} v_n^{2\gamma-2} f dx \leq C \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} v_n^{2r'(\gamma-1)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Applying Lemma 2.3 in the above estimate, one has

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} v_n^{2^*\gamma} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} v_n^{2r'(\gamma-1)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}}, \quad (5.52)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Here $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$. We choose γ such that $2^*\gamma = 2r'(\gamma-1)$, i.e., $\gamma = \frac{r(N-2)}{N-2r} > 1$. Using $r < \frac{N}{2}$, the inequality (5.52) gives that $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^s(\Omega)$, where $s = \frac{2Nr}{N-2r}$.

Case-II: We suppose $\delta > 1$. When $r = 1$, by choosing v_n^δ as a test function in the weak formulation of (5.40) and using the properties (1.2), (1.3), we conclude that $\{v_n^{\frac{\delta+1}{2}}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Then by Lemma 2.3, the result follows for $r = 1$. Therefore, let us assume $1 < r < \frac{N}{2}$. Treating $v_n^{2\gamma-1}$ ($\gamma > \frac{\delta+1}{2}$ to be determined later) as a test function in the weak formulation of the equation (5.40), we deduce

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n^\gamma|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} v_n^{2\gamma-\delta-1} f dx \leq C \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} v_n^{r'(2\gamma-\delta-1)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}},$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Applying Lemma 2.3 in the above estimate, we get

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} v_n^{2^*\gamma} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} v_n^{r'(2\gamma-\delta-1)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}}, \quad (5.53)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n and $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$. We choose γ in such a way that $2^*\gamma = r'(2\gamma-\delta-1)$, i.e., $\gamma = \frac{r(\delta+1)(N-2)}{2(N-2r)} > \frac{\delta+1}{2}$ (since $r > 1$). From the fact $r < \frac{N}{2}$ and (5.53) we conclude that $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^s(\Omega)$ with $s = \frac{Nr(\delta+1)}{(N-2r)}$. This completes the proof. \square

Acknowledgement

P. Garain thanks IISER Berhampur for the Seed grant: IISERBPR/RD/OO/2024/15, Date: February 08, 2024.

References

- [1] Claudianor O. Alves, Carlos Alberto Santos, and Thiago Willians Siqueira. Uniqueness in $W_{loc}^{1,p(x)}(\Omega)$ and continuity up to portions of the boundary of positive solutions for a strongly-singular elliptic problem. *J. Differential Equations*, 269(12):11279–11327, 2020.

- [2] David Arcoya and Lucio Boccardo. Multiplicity of solutions for a Dirichlet problem with a singular and a supercritical nonlinearities. *Differential Integral Equations*, 26(1-2):119–128, 2013.
- [3] David Arcoya and Lourdes Moreno-Mérida. Multiplicity of solutions for a Dirichlet problem with a strongly singular nonlinearity. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 95:281–291, 2014.
- [4] Rakesh Arora and Vicentiu D. Radulescu. Combined effects in mixed local-nonlocal stationary problems. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Section A Mathematics. Published online 2023:1-47*, 2023.
- [5] Kaushik Bal and Stuti Das. Multiplicity of solutions for mixed local-nonlocal elliptic equations with singular nonlinearity. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2405.05832, May 2024.
- [6] Kaushik Bal, Prashanta Garain, and Tuhina Mukherjee. On an anisotropic p -Laplace equation with variable singular exponent. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 26(11-12):535–562, 2021.
- [7] Souvik Bhowmick and Sekhar Ghosh. Existence results for mixed local and nonlocal elliptic equations involving singularity and nonregular data. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2410.04441, October 2024.
- [8] Stefano Biagi, Serena Dipierro, Enrico Valdinoci, and Eugenio Vecchi. Mixed local and nonlocal elliptic operators: regularity and maximum principles. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 47(3):585–629, 2022.
- [9] Stefano Biagi, Serena Dipierro, Enrico Valdinoci, and Eugenio Vecchi. A Hong-Krahn-Szegő inequality for mixed local and nonlocal operators. *Math. Eng. (Springfield)*, 5(1):25, 2023. Id/No 14.
- [10] Stefano Biagi, Dimitri Mugnai, and Eugenio Vecchi. A Brezis-Oswald approach for mixed local and nonlocal operators. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 26(2):28, 2024. Id/No 2250057.
- [11] Kheireddine Biroud. Mixed local and nonlocal equation with singular nonlinearity having variable exponent. *J. Pseudo-Differ. Oper. Appl.*, 14(1):Paper No. 13, 24, 2023.
- [12] Anup Biswas, Mitesh Modasiya, and Abhrojyoti Sen. Boundary regularity of mixed local-nonlocal operators and its application. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 202(2):679–710, 2023.
- [13] Lucio Boccardo, Thierry Gallouët, and Luigi Orsina. Existence and uniqueness of entropy solutions for nonlinear elliptic equations with measure data. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 13(5):539–551, 1996.
- [14] Lucio Boccardo and Luigi Orsina. Semilinear elliptic equations with singular nonlinearities. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 37(3-4):363–380, 2010.

- [15] S. Buccheri, J. V. da Silva, and L. H. de Miranda. A system of local/nonlocal p -laplacians: the eigenvalue problem and its asymptotic limit as $p \rightarrow \infty$. *Asymptotic Anal.*, 128(2):149–181, 2022.
- [16] Sun-Sig Byun and Kyeong Song. Mixed local and nonlocal equations with measure data. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 62(1):Paper No. 14, 35, 2023.
- [17] Annamaria Canino, Luigi Montoro, Berardino Sciunzi, and Marco Squassina. Nonlocal problems with singular nonlinearity. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 141(3):223–250, 2017.
- [18] Annamaria Canino, Luigi Montoro, Berardino Sciunzi, and Alessandro Trombetta. Variational properties of nonlocal singular problems. *Nonlinearity*, 36(8):4034–4052, 2023.
- [19] José Carmona and Pedro J. Martínez-Aparicio. A singular semilinear elliptic equation with a variable exponent. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 16(3):491–498, 2016.
- [20] Iwona Chlebicka, Kyeong Song, Yeonghun Youn, and Anna Zatorska-Goldstein. Riesz potential estimates for mixed local-nonlocal problems with measure data. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2401.04549, January 2024.
- [21] M. G. Crandall, P. H. Rabinowitz, and L. Tartar. On a Dirichlet problem with a singular nonlinearity. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 2(2):193–222, 1977.
- [22] Gianni Dal Maso, François Murat, Luigi Orsina, and Alain Prignet. Renormalized solutions of elliptic equations with general measure data. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 28(4):741–808, 1999.
- [23] Linda Maria De Cave and Francescantonio Oliva. Elliptic equations with general singular lower order term and measure data. *Nonlinear Anal., Theory Methods Appl., Ser. A, Theory Methods*, 128:391–411, 2015.
- [24] Cristiana De Filippis and Giuseppe Mingione. Gradient regularity in mixed local and nonlocal problems. *Math. Ann.*, 388(1):261–328, 2024.
- [25] Eleonora Di Nezza, Giampiero Palatucci, and Enrico Valdinoci. Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 136(5):521–573, 2012.
- [26] Serena Dipierro and Enrico Valdinoci. Description of an ecological niche for a mixed local/nonlocal dispersal: an evolution equation and a new Neumann condition arising from the superposition of Brownian and Lévy processes. *Phys. A*, 575:Paper No. 126052, 20, 2021.
- [27] Lawrence C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*, volume 19 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2010.

- [28] Yanqin Fang. Existence, Uniqueness of Positive Solution to a Fractional Laplacians with Singular Nonlinearity. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1403.3149, March 2014.
- [29] Prashanta Garain. On a class of mixed local and nonlocal semilinear elliptic equation with singular nonlinearity. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 33(7):Paper No. 212, 20, 2023.
- [30] Prashanta Garain. On the regularity and existence of weak solutions for a class of degenerate singular elliptic problem. *Manuscripta Math.*, 174(1-2):141–158, 2024.
- [31] Prashanta Garain, Wontae Kim, and Juha Kinnunen. On the regularity theory for mixed anisotropic and nonlocal p -Laplace equations and its applications to singular problems. *Forum Math.*, 36(3):697–715, 2024.
- [32] Prashanta Garain and Juha Kinnunen. On the regularity theory for mixed local and nonlocal quasilinear elliptic equations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 375(8):5393–5423, 2022.
- [33] Prashanta Garain and Erik Lindgren. Higher Hölder regularity for mixed local and non-local degenerate elliptic equations. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 62(2):Paper No. 67, 36, 2023.
- [34] Prashanta Garain and Tuhina Mukherjee. Quasilinear nonlocal elliptic problems with variable singular exponent. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 19(11):5059–5075, 2020.
- [35] Prashanta Garain and Alexander Ukhlov. Mixed local and nonlocal Sobolev inequalities with extremal and associated quasilinear singular elliptic problems. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 223:Paper No. 113022, 35, 2022.
- [36] Sekhar Ghosh, Debajyoti Choudhuri, and Ratan Kr. Giri. Singular nonlocal problem involving measure data. *Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 50(1):187–209, 2019.
- [37] Juha Heinonen, Tero Kilpeläinen, and Olli Martio. *Nonlinear potential theory of degenerate elliptic equations*. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2006. Unabridged republication of the 1993 original.
- [38] Shuibo Huang and Hichem Hajaiej. Lazer-McKenna type problem involving mixed local and nonlocal elliptic operators. *Nonlinear Differential Equations and Applications*, 03 2023.
- [39] David Kinderlehrer and Guido Stampacchia. *An introduction to variational inequalities and their applications*, volume 31 of *Classics in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2000. Reprint of the 1980 original.
- [40] Joseph Marcinkiewicz. Sur l’interpolation d’opérations. *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris*, 208:1272–1273, 1939.

- [41] F. Murat and A. Porretta. Stability properties, existence, and nonexistence of renormalized solutions for elliptic equations with measure data. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 27(11-12):2267–2310, 2002.
- [42] Francescantonio Oliva and Francesco Petitta. On singular elliptic equations with measure sources. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 22(1):289–308, 2016.
- [43] Francescantonio Oliva and Francesco Petitta. Finite and infinite energy solutions of singular elliptic problems: existence and uniqueness. *J. Differ. Equations*, 264(1):311–340, 2018.
- [44] Francescantonio Oliva and Francesco Petitta. Singular elliptic pdes: an extensive overview, 2024.
- [45] Luigi Orsina and Francesco Petitta. A Lazer-McKenna type problem with measures. *Differential Integral Equations*, 29(1-2):19–36, 2016.
- [46] Ambesh Kumar Pandey and Rasmita Kar. Existence of solutions to semilinear elliptic equations with variable exponent singularity. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, 53(3):903–913, 2023.
- [47] Halsey Royden and Patrick Michael Fitzpatrick. *Real analysis*. China Machine Press, 2010.
- [48] Ariel M. Salort and Eugenio Vecchi. On the mixed local-nonlocal Hénon equation. *Differ. Integral Equ.*, 35(11-12):795–818, 2022.
- [49] Xifeng Su, Enrico Valdinoci, Yuanhong Wei, and Jiwen Zhang. On some regularity properties of mixed local and nonlocal elliptic equations. *J. Differ. Equations*, 416:576–613, 2025.
- [50] Jiaxiang Zhang and Shenzhou Zheng. The solvability and regularity results for elliptic equations involving mixed local and nonlocal p -Laplacian. *J. Elliptic Parabol. Equ.*, 10(2):1097–1122, 2024.