

# SYMMETRY OF SOLUTIONS OF SOME SEMILINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS WITH SINGULAR NONLINEARITIES

A. CANINO\*, M. GRANDINETTI\* AND B. SCIUNZI\*

ABSTRACT. We consider positive solutions to the singular semilinear elliptic equation  $-\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\gamma} + f(u)$ , in bounded smooth domains, with zero Dirichlet boundary conditions.

We provide some weak and strong maximum principles for the  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  part of the solution (the solution  $u$  does generally not belong to  $H_0^1(\Omega)$ ), that allow to deduce symmetry and monotonicity properties of the solutions, via the *Moving Plane Method*.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study symmetry and monotonicity properties of the solutions to the problem

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\gamma} + f(u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

where  $\gamma > 0$ ,  $\Omega$  is a bounded smooth domain and  $u \in C(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ . Our main results will be proved under the following assumption

$(H_p)$   $f$  is locally Lipschitz continuous, non-decreasing,  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$  and  $f(0) \geq 0$ .

As a model problem we may consider solutions to  $-\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\gamma} + u^q$  with  $q > 0$ .

Since the pioneer results in [7] and [17], singular semilinear elliptic equations have been considered by several authors. We refer to [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16].

The variational characterization of problem (1.1) is not trivial. In fact, already in the case  $f \equiv 0$ , the condition  $\gamma < 3$  is necessary to have solutions in  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  and to have the associated energy functional  $I \neq +\infty$ , see [14]. A first attempt in this direction can be found in [11] in the case  $\gamma \leq 1$ .

Later in [5] a general approach was developed for any  $\gamma > 0$ . The main idea in [5], that will be a key ingredient in the present paper, is a translation of the energy functional and of the functions space used, based on the decomposition of the solutions of (1.1) as

$$(1.2) \quad u = u_0 + w$$

---

*Date:* September 26, 2018.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B01,35J61,35J75.

*Key words and phrases.* Singular semilinear equations, symmetry of solutions, moving plane method.

where  $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  and  $u_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$  is the solution to the problem:

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_0 = \frac{1}{u_0^\gamma} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_0 > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_0 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The solution  $u_0$  is unique (see Lemma 2.8 in [5]) and can be found via a sub-super solution method like in [5] or via a truncation argument as in [3]. It follows by the comparison argument used in the proof of [5] that the solution  $u_0$  is continuous up to the boundary and is bounded away from zero in the interior of  $\Omega$ . This latter information also follows by [3] where the solution  $u_0$  is obtained as the limit of an increasing sequence of positive solutions to a regularized problem.

The equation  $-\Delta u_0 = \frac{1}{u_0^\gamma}$  consequently can be understood in the weak distributional sense with test functions with compact support in  $\Omega$ , that is

$$(1.4) \quad \int_{\Omega} (Du_0, D\varphi) dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\varphi}{u_0^\gamma} dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega).$$

Actually, the solution is fulfilled in the classical sense in the interior of  $\Omega$  by standard regularity results, since  $u_0$  is strictly positive in the interior of the domain.

In any case, taking into account [14], for  $\gamma \geq 3$   $u_0$  does not belong to  $H_0^1(\Omega)$ , hence  $u$  does not belong to  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  too.

The proof of our symmetry result is based on the well known *Moving Plane Method* (see [15]), that was used in a clever way in the celebrated paper [9] in the semilinear nondegenerate case. Actually our proof is more similar to the one of [1] and is based on the weak comparison principle in small domains.

Because of the singular nature of our problem, we have to take care of two difficulties, namely:

- $u$  does not belong to  $H_0^1(\Omega)$ ,
- $\frac{1}{s^\gamma} + f(s)$  is not Lipschitz continuous at zero.

This causes that a straightforward modification of the moving plane technique is not possible in our setting and for this reason we need a new technique based on the decomposition in (1.2).

Let us state our symmetry result:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$  be a solution to (1.1) with  $f$  satisfying  $(H_p)$ . Assume that the domain  $\Omega$  is strictly convex w.r.t. the  $\nu$ -direction ( $\nu \in S^{N-1}$ ) and symmetric w.r.t.  $T_0^\nu$ , where*

$$T_0^\nu = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \cdot \nu = 0\}.$$

*Then  $u$  is symmetric w.r.t.  $T_0^\nu$  and non-decreasing w.r.t. the  $\nu$ -direction in  $\Omega_0^\nu$ , where*

$$\Omega_0^\nu = \{x \in \Omega : x \cdot \nu < 0\}.$$

*Moreover, if  $\Omega$  is a ball, then  $u$  is radially symmetric with  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}(r) < 0$  for  $r \neq 0$ .*

For the reader's convenience, we describe here below the scheme of the proof.

- (i) Since, by [3],  $u_0$  is the limit of a sequence  $u_n$  of solutions to a regularized problem (3.7), we deduce symmetry and monotonicity properties of  $u_n$ , and consequently of  $u_0$ , applying the moving plane procedure in a standard way to the regularized problem (3.7).
- (ii) By (i), recalling the decomposition in (1.2):  $u = u_0 + w$ , we are reduced to prove symmetry and monotonicity properties of  $w$ . To do this, in Section 4, we prove some comparison principles for  $w$  needed in the application of the moving plane procedure.
- (iii) In Section 5, we carry out the adaptation of the moving plane procedure to the study of the monotonicity and symmetry of  $w$ . It is worth emphasizing that the moving plane procedure is applied in our approach only to the  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  part of  $u$ . Note also that Theorem 1.1 is proved in Section 6 exploiting the more general result Proposition 5.1.

## 2. NOTATIONS

To state the next results we need some notations. Let  $\nu$  be a direction in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  with  $|\nu| = 1$ . Given a real number  $\lambda$  we set

$$T_\lambda^\nu = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \cdot \nu = \lambda\},$$

$$\Omega_\lambda^\nu = \{x \in \Omega : x \cdot \nu < \lambda\}$$

and

$$x_\lambda^\nu = R_\lambda^\nu(x) = x + 2(\lambda - x \cdot \nu)\nu,$$

that is the reflection through the hyperplane  $T_\lambda^\nu$ . Moreover we set

$$(\Omega_\lambda^\nu)' = R_\lambda^\nu(\Omega_\lambda^\nu).$$

Observe that  $(\Omega_\lambda^\nu)'$  may be not contained in  $\Omega$ . Also we take

$$a(\nu) = \inf_{x \in \Omega} x \cdot \nu.$$

When  $\lambda > a(\nu)$ , since  $\Omega_\lambda^\nu$  is nonempty, we set

$$\Lambda_1(\nu) = \{\lambda : (\Omega_t^\nu)' \subset \Omega \text{ for any } a(\nu) < t \leq \lambda\},$$

and

$$\lambda_1(\nu) = \sup \Lambda_1(\nu).$$

Moreover we set

$$u_\lambda^\nu(x) = u(x_\lambda^\nu),$$

for any  $a(\nu) < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(\nu)$ .

Recalling the decomposition of the solutions of (1.1) (see (1.2)) as

$$u = u_0 + w,$$

we set

$$u_{0\lambda}^\nu(x) = u_0(x_\lambda^\nu),$$

and

$$w_\lambda^\nu(x) = w(x_\lambda^\nu).$$

3. SYMMETRY PROPERTIES OF  $u_0$ 

Basing on the construction of the solution  $u_0$  of (1.3) we prove in this section some useful symmetry and monotonicity results for  $u_0$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $u_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$  be the solution to (1.3). Then, for any*

$$a(\nu) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\nu)$$

we have

$$(3.5) \quad u_0(x) < u_{0\lambda}^\nu(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_\lambda^\nu$$

and

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{\lambda_1(\nu)}^\nu.$$

*Proof.* Let  $u_n \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$  be the unique solution to

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_n = \frac{1}{(u_n + \frac{1}{n})^\gamma} & \text{for } x \in \Omega, \\ u_n > 0 & \text{for } x \in \Omega, \\ u_n = 0 & \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The existence of  $u_n$  was proved in [3] and the uniqueness follows by [5]. Since the problem is no more singular, by standard elliptic estimates it follows that  $u_n \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ . Therefore we can use the moving plane technique exactly as in [1, 9] to deduce that the statement of our proposition holds true for each  $u_n$ . By [3]  $u_n$  converges to  $u_0$  a.e. as  $n$  tends to infinity and therefore (3.5) follows passing to the limit. Finally in the same way

$$\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{\lambda_1(\nu)}^\nu,$$

and therefore (3.6) follows via the strong maximum principle.  $\square$

As a consequence of Proposition 3.1, we get

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $u_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$  be the solution of (1.3) and assume that the domain  $\Omega$  is strictly convex w.r.t. the  $\nu$ -direction ( $\nu \in S^{N-1}$ ) and symmetric w.r.t.  $T_0^\nu$ . Then  $u_0$  is symmetric w.r.t.  $T_0^\nu$  and non-decreasing w.r.t. the  $\nu$ -direction in  $\Omega_0^\nu$ . Moreover, if  $\Omega$  is a ball, then  $u_0$  is radially symmetric with  $\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial r}(r) < 0$  for  $r \neq 0$ .*

## 4. COMPARISON PRINCIPLES

Let us start with the following

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\gamma > 0$ . Consider the function*

$$g_\gamma(x, y, z, h) := x^\gamma(x+y)^\gamma(z+h)^\gamma + x^\gamma z^\gamma(z+h)^\gamma - z^\gamma(x+y)^\gamma(z+h)^\gamma - x^\gamma z^\gamma(x+y)^\gamma$$

and the domain  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  defined by

$$D := \left\{ (x, y, z, h) \mid 0 \leq x \leq z; 0 \leq h \leq y \right\}.$$

Then it follows that  $g_\gamma \leq 0$  in  $D$ .

*Proof.* Since  $x \leq z$ , by direct calculation we get

$$\frac{\partial g_\gamma}{\partial y}(x, y, z, h) = \gamma x^\gamma (x+y)^{\gamma-1} (z+h)^\gamma - \gamma z^\gamma (x+y)^{\gamma-1} (z+h)^\gamma - \gamma x^\gamma z^\gamma (x+y)^{\gamma-1} \leq 0$$

Therefore we are reduced to prove that  $g_\gamma \leq 0$  in  $D \cap \{h = y\}$ , that is

$$g_\gamma(x, y, z, y) = x^\gamma (x+y)^\gamma (z+y)^\gamma + x^\gamma z^\gamma (z+y)^\gamma - z^\gamma (x+y)^\gamma (z+y)^\gamma - x^\gamma z^\gamma (x+y)^\gamma \leq 0.$$

For  $x = 0$  the thesis follows immediately. For  $x > 0$  we note that

$$g_\gamma(x, y, z, y) = -\left(\frac{1}{x^\gamma} - \frac{1}{z^\gamma} + \frac{1}{(z+y)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(x+y)^\gamma}\right)(x^\gamma z^\gamma (z+y)^\gamma (x+y)^\gamma)$$

and the conclusion follows exploiting the fact that, for  $0 < x \leq z$  fixed, the function

$$\tilde{g}_\gamma(t) := x^{-\gamma} - z^{-\gamma} + (z+t)^{-\gamma} - (x+t)^{-\gamma}$$

is increasing in  $[0, \infty)$  and  $\tilde{g}_\gamma(0) = 0$ . □

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$  be a solution to problem (1.1) with  $\gamma > 0$ . Assume that  $\Omega$  is a bounded smooth domain and that  $f$  is locally Lipschitz continuous,  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$  and  $f(0) \geq 0$ . Let  $w$  be given by (1.2).*

*Then it follows*

$$w > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega.$$

*Proof.* Since  $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$  and  $u_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ , then  $w \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ . By hypothesis on  $f$ , it follows that  $u$  is a super-solution (following Definition 2.5 in [5]) to the equation

$$-\Delta v = \frac{1}{v^\gamma}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.8 in [5] we get that

$$u \geq u_0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \quad \text{and therefore} \quad w \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega.$$

Now let us show that  $w > 0$  in the interior of  $\Omega$  via the maximum principle exploited in regions where the problem is not singular. More precisely let us assume by contradiction that there exists a point  $x_0 \in \Omega$  such that  $w(x_0) = 0$  and let  $r = r(x_0) > 0$  such that  $B_r(x_0) \subset\subset \Omega$ . We have, in the classical sense, in  $B_r(x_0)$

$$-\Delta w = -\Delta u + \Delta u_0 = \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} + f(u) - \frac{1}{u_0^\gamma} \geq \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{u_0^\gamma}.$$

Since  $u_0(x_0) > 0$  we can assume that  $u_0$  is positive in  $B_r(x_0)$ . Therefore we get that

$$\frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{u_0^\gamma} = c(x) (u_0 + w - u_0) = c(x) w$$

for some bounded coefficient  $c(x)$ . Thus there exists  $\Lambda > 0$  such that  $\frac{1}{(u_0+w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{u_0^\gamma} + \Lambda w \geq 0$  in  $B_r(x_0)$ , so that

$$-\Delta w + \Lambda w \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_r(x_0).$$

By the strong maximum principle we get  $w \equiv 0$  in  $B_r(x_0)$  and by a covering argument that  $w \equiv 0$  in  $\Omega$ . But  $w \equiv 0$  in  $\Omega$  implies  $f = 0$  and we get a contradiction. □

**Proposition 4.3** (A strong maximum principle). *Let  $a(\nu) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\nu)$  and  $\Omega'$  a subdomain of  $\Omega'_\lambda$ . Assume that  $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$  is a solution to (1.1) with  $f$  satisfying  $(H_p)$ . Let  $w$  be given by (1.2) and assume that*

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega'.$$

Then it holds the alternative

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega' \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega'.$$

*Proof.* Let us use the short hand notation  $w_\nu := \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}$  and  $u_{0\nu} := \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \nu}$ . Since  $f' \geq 0$  a.e.<sup>1</sup> by assumption  $(H_p)$ ,  $u_{0\nu} \geq 0$  in  $\Omega'$  by Proposition 3.1,  $u \geq u_0$  by Lemma 4.2 and finally  $w_\nu \geq 0$  in  $\Omega'$  by assumption, differentiating the equation in (1.1) we get that  $w_\nu$  solves

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w_\nu &= -\frac{\gamma}{u^{\gamma+1}} w_\nu + f'(u)(w_\nu + u_{0\nu}) + \gamma \left( \frac{1}{u_0^{\gamma+1}} - \frac{1}{u^{\gamma+1}} \right) u_{0\nu} \\ &\geq -\frac{\gamma}{u^{\gamma+1}} w_\nu, \end{aligned}$$

We recall now that  $u$  is bounded away from zero in  $\Omega'$ , and therefore we find  $\Lambda > 0$  such that

$$-\Delta w_\nu \geq -\frac{\gamma}{u^{\gamma+1}} w_\nu \geq -\Lambda w_\nu,$$

so that the conclusion follows by the standard strong maximum principle [10]. □

**Proposition 4.4** (Weak Comparison Principle in small domains). *Let  $a(\nu) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\nu)$  and  $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega'_\lambda$ . Assume that  $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$  is a solution to (1.1) with  $f$  satisfying  $(H_p)$ . Let  $w$  be given by (1.2) and assume that*

$$w \leq w'_\lambda \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega'.$$

Then there exists a positive constant  $\delta = \delta(u, f)$  such that, if  $\mathcal{L}(\Omega') \leq \delta$ , then

$$w \leq w'_\lambda \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega'.$$

*Proof.* We have

$$(4.8) \quad -\Delta(u_0 + w) = \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} + f(u_0 + w) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega,$$

$$(4.9) \quad -\Delta(u_{0\lambda}' + w'_\lambda) = \frac{1}{(u_{0\lambda}' + w'_\lambda)^\gamma} + f(u_{0\lambda}' + w'_\lambda) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega,$$

Since  $(w - w'_\lambda)^+ \in H_0^1(\Omega')$  we can consider a sequence of positive functions  $\psi_n$  such that

$$\psi_n \in C_c^\infty(\Omega') \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_n \xrightarrow{H_0^1(\Omega')} (w - w'_\lambda)^+.$$

We can also assume that  $\text{supp } \psi_n \subseteq \text{supp } (w - w'_\lambda)^+$ . We plug  $\psi_n$  into the weak formulation of (4.8) and (4.9) and subtracting we get

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that, even if  $f'$  exist a.e., the term  $f'(u)(w_\nu + u_{0\nu})$  makes sense in the weak Sobolev meaning thanks to Stampacchia's Theorem.

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.10) \quad & \int_{\Omega'} (D(u_0 + w) - D(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu), D\psi_n) dx \\
 &= \int_{\Omega'} \left( \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} + f(u_0 + w) - \frac{1}{(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma} - f(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu) \right) \psi_n dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that  $u_0$  and  $u_{0\lambda}^\nu$  solve (1.3) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.11) \quad & \int_{\Omega'} (D(w - w_\lambda^\nu), D\psi_n) dx = \int_{\Omega'} \left( \frac{1}{(u_{0\lambda}^\nu)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0)^\gamma} + \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma} \right) \psi_n dx \\
 &+ \int_{\Omega'} \left( f(u_0 + w) - f(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu) \right) \psi_n dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $u_0 \leq u_{0\lambda}^\nu$  in  $\Omega_\lambda^\nu$  and  $w \geq w_\lambda^\nu$  on the support of  $\psi_n$ , by applying Lemma 4.1 with  $u_0 = x$ ,  $w = y$ ,  $u_{0\lambda}^\nu = z$  and  $w_\lambda^\nu = h$  we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (u_0)^\gamma (u_0 + w)^\gamma (u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma + (u_0)^\gamma (u_{0\lambda}^\nu)^\gamma (u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma \\
 & - (u_{0\lambda}^\nu)^\gamma (u_0 + w)^\gamma (u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma - (u_0)^\gamma (u_{0\lambda}^\nu)^\gamma (u_0 + w)^\gamma \leq 0
 \end{aligned}$$

and then  $\left( \frac{1}{(u_{0\lambda}^\nu)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0)^\gamma} + \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu)^\gamma} \right) \leq 0$ .

Therefore, by assumption  $(H_p)$ , we find a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.12) \quad & \int_{\Omega'} (D(w - w_\lambda^\nu), D\psi_n) dx \leq \int_{\Omega'} \left( f(u_0 + w) - f(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu) \right) \psi_n dx \\
 & \leq \int_{\Omega'} \left( f(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w) - f(u_{0\lambda}^\nu + w_\lambda^\nu) \right) \psi_n dx \leq C \int_{\Omega'} (w - w_\lambda^\nu) \psi_n dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

We now pass to the limit for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we get

$$\int_{\Omega'} |D(w - w_\lambda^\nu)^+|^2 dx \leq C \int_{\Omega'} |(w - w_\lambda^\nu)^+|^2 dx$$

and by Poincaré inequality

$$\int_{\Omega'} |D(w - w_\lambda^\nu)^+|^2 dx \leq C C_p(\Omega') \int_{\Omega'} |(w - w_\lambda^\nu)^+|^2 dx.$$

For  $\delta$  small it follows that  $C C_p(\Omega') < 1$  which shows that actually  $(w - w_\lambda^\nu)^+ = 0$  and the thesis follows. □

**Lemma 4.5** (Strong Comparison Principle). *Let  $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$  be a solution to problem (1.1), with  $f$  satisfying  $(H_p)$ . Let  $w$  be given by (1.2) and assume that, for some  $a(\nu) < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(\Omega)$ , we have*

$$w \leq w_\lambda^\nu \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_\lambda^\nu.$$

*Then  $w < w_\lambda^\nu$  in  $\Omega_\lambda^\nu$  unless  $w \equiv w_\lambda^\nu$  in  $\Omega_\lambda^\nu$ .*

*Proof.* Let us assume that there exists a point  $x_0 \in \Omega'_\lambda$  such that  $w(x_0) = w'_\lambda(x_0)$  and let  $r = r(x_0) > 0$  such that  $B_r(x_0) \subset\subset \Omega'_\lambda$ . We have, in the classical sense, in  $B_r(x_0)$

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & -\Delta(w'_\lambda - w) = -\Delta(u'_\lambda - u_0'_\lambda) + \Delta(u - u_0) \\ & = \left( \frac{1}{u_0'^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0'_\lambda)^\gamma} + \frac{1}{(u_0'_\lambda + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} \right) + \left( f(u_0'_\lambda + w'_\lambda) - f(u_0 + w) \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{(u_0'_\lambda + w'_\lambda)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0'_\lambda + w)^\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $f$  is non-decreasing by assumption,  $u_0 \leq u_0'_\lambda$  in  $\Omega'_\lambda$  by Proposition 3.1 and  $w \leq w'_\lambda$  in  $\Omega'_\lambda$ , we get

$$f(u_0'_\lambda + w'_\lambda) - f(u_0 + w) \geq 0.$$

Moreover, since for  $0 < a \leq b$  the function  $g(t) := a^{-\gamma} - b^{-\gamma} + (b+t)^{-\gamma} - (a+t)^{-\gamma}$  is increasing in  $[0, \infty)$ , we also have

$$\left( \frac{1}{u_0'^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0'_\lambda)^\gamma} + \frac{1}{(u_0'_\lambda + w)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0 + w)^\gamma} \right) \geq 0.$$

and by (4.13) we get

$$-\Delta(w'_\lambda - w) \geq \frac{1}{(u_0'_\lambda + w'_\lambda)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0'_\lambda + w)^\gamma}.$$

Since  $u_0'_\lambda(x_0) > 0$ , arguing as in Lemma 4.2, we find  $\Lambda > 0$  such that, eventually reducing  $r$ , it results  $\frac{1}{(u_0'_\lambda + w'_\lambda)^\gamma} - \frac{1}{(u_0'_\lambda + w)^\gamma} + \Lambda(w'_\lambda - w) \geq 0$  in  $B_r(x_0)$ , so that

$$-\Delta(w'_\lambda - w) + \Lambda(w'_\lambda - w) \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_r(x_0).$$

By the strong maximum principle [10] it follows  $w'_\lambda - w \equiv 0$  in  $B_r(x_0)$ , and by a covering argument  $w'_\lambda - w \equiv 0$  in  $\Omega'_\lambda$ , proving the result.  $\square$

## 5. SYMMETRY

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$  be a solution to (1.1). Let  $w$  be given by (1.2). Then, for any*

$$a(\nu) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\nu)$$

*we have*

$$(5.14) \quad w(x) < w'_\lambda(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega'_\lambda.$$

*Moreover*

$$(5.15) \quad \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Omega'_{\lambda_1(\nu)}.$$

*Finally, (5.14) and (5.15) hold true replacing  $w$  by  $u$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda > a(\nu)$ . Since  $w > 0$  in  $\Omega$  by Lemma 4.2 we have:

$$w \leq w'_\lambda \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega'_\lambda.$$

Therefore, assuming that  $\mathcal{L}(\Omega'_\lambda)$  is sufficiently small (say for  $\lambda - a(\nu)$  sufficiently small) so that Proposition 4.4 applies, we get

$$(5.16) \quad w \leq w'_\lambda \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega'_\lambda,$$



and actually  $w < w'_\lambda$  in  $\Omega'_\lambda$  by the Strong Comparison Principle (Lemma 4.5).

Let us define

$$\Lambda_0 = \{\lambda > a(\nu) : w \leq w'_t \text{ in } \Omega'_t \text{ for all } t \in (a(\nu), \lambda]\}$$

which is not empty thanks to (5.16). Also set

$$\lambda_0 = \sup \Lambda_0.$$

By the definition of  $\lambda_1(\nu)$ , to prove our result we have to show that actually  $\lambda_0 = \lambda_1(\nu)$ .

Assume otherwise that  $\lambda_0 < \lambda_1(\nu)$  and note that, by continuity, we obtain  $w \leq w'_{\lambda_0}$  in  $\Omega'_{\lambda_0}$ . By the Strong Comparison Principle (Lemma 4.5), it follows  $w < w'_{\lambda_0}$  in  $\Omega'_{\lambda_0}$  unless  $w = w'_{\lambda_0}$  in  $\Omega'_{\lambda_0}$ . Because of the zero Dirichlet boundary conditions and since  $w > 0$  in the interior of the domain, the case  $w \equiv w'_{\lambda_0}$  in  $\Omega'_{\lambda_0}$  is not possible. Thus  $w < w'_{\lambda_0}$  in  $\Omega'_{\lambda_0}$ .

We can now consider  $\delta$  given by Proposition 4.4 so that the Weak Comparison Principle holds true in any sub-domain  $\Omega'$  if  $\mathcal{L}(\Omega') \leq \delta$ . Fix a compact set  $\mathcal{K} \subset \Omega'_{\lambda_0}$  so that  $\mathcal{L}(\Omega'_{\lambda_0} \setminus \mathcal{K}) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ . By compactness we find  $\sigma > 0$  such that

$$w'_{\lambda_0} - w \geq 2\sigma > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{K}.$$

Take now  $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$  sufficiently small so that  $\lambda_0 + \bar{\varepsilon} < \lambda_1(\nu)$  and, for any  $0 < \varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$

- a)  $w'_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon} - w \geq \sigma > 0$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ ,
- b)  $\mathcal{L}(\Omega'_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon} \setminus \mathcal{K}) \leq \delta$ .

Taking into account a) it is now easy to check that, for any  $0 < \varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$ , we have that  $w \leq w'_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}$  on the boundary of  $\Omega'_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon} \setminus \mathcal{K}$ . Consequently, by b), we can apply the Weak Comparison Principle (Proposition 4.4) and deduce that

$$w \leq w'_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon} \quad \text{in } \Omega'_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon} \setminus \mathcal{K}.$$

Thus  $w \leq w'_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}$  in  $\Omega'_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}$  and by applying the Strong Comparison Principle (Lemma 4.5) we have  $w < w'_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}$  in  $\Omega'_{\lambda_0+\varepsilon}$ . We get a contradiction with the definition of  $\lambda_0$  and conclude that actually  $\lambda_0 = \lambda_1(\nu)$ . Then (5.14) is proved.

It follows now directly from simple geometric considerations and by (5.14) that  $w$  is monotone non-decreasing in  $\Omega'_{\lambda_1(\nu)}$  in the  $\nu$ -direction. This gives

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega'_{\lambda_1(\nu)},$$

so it is standard to deduce (5.15) from Proposition 4.3.

To prove that (5.14) and (5.15) hold true replacing  $w$  with  $u$ , just recall that

$$u = u_0 + w,$$

and exploit Proposition 3.1. □

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is now a direct consequence of Proposition 5.1. Observing that by assumption

$$\lambda_1(\nu) = 0,$$

we can apply Proposition 5.1 in the  $\nu$ -direction to get

$$u(x) \leq u'_{\lambda_1(\nu)}(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega'_0.$$

and in the  $(-\nu)$ -direction to get

$$u(x) \geq u_{\lambda_1(\nu)}^\nu(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_0^\nu.$$

Therefore  $u(x) \equiv u_{\lambda_1(\nu)}^\nu(x)$  in  $\Omega$ . The monotonicity of  $u$  follows by (5.15).

## REFERENCES

- [1] H. BERESTYCKI, L. NIRENBERG, On the method of moving planes and the sliding method. *Bulletin Soc. Brasil. de Mat Nova Ser*, **22**(1), 1–37, 1991.
- [2] L. BOCCARDO, A Dirichlet problem with singular and supercritical nonlinearities. *Non. Anal.*, **75**(12) (2012), 4436–4440.
- [3] L. BOCCARDO, AND L. ORSINA, Semilinear elliptic equations with singular nonlinearities. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, **37**(3-4) (2010), 363–380.
- [4] A. CANINO, Minimax methods for singular elliptic equations with an application to a jumping problem. *J. Differential Equations*, **221**(1) (2006), 210–223.
- [5] A. CANINO, AND M. DEGIOVANNI, A variational approach to a class of singular semilinear elliptic equations. *J. Convex Anal.*, **11**(1) (2004), 147–162.
- [6] A. CANINO, M. GRANDINETTI AND B. SCIUNZI, A jumping problem for some singular semilinear elliptic equations. *preprint*.
- [7] M.G. CRANDALL, P.H. RABINOWITZ AND L. TARTAR, On a Dirichlet problem with a singular nonlinearity. *Comm. P.D.E.*, **2** (1977), 193–222.
- [8] J. A. GATICA, V. OLIKER, P. WALTMAN, Singular nonlinear boundary value problems for second order ordinary differential equations. *J. Differential Equations*, **79** (1989), 62–78.
- [9] B. GIDAS, W. M. NI, AND L. NIRENBERG, Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **68** (1979), 209–243.
- [10] D. GILBARG, N. S. TRUDINGER, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. *Reprint of the 1998 Edition*, Springer.
- [11] N. HIRANO, C. SACCON, AND N. SHIOJI, Multiple existence of positive solutions for singular elliptic problems with concave and convex nonlinearities. *Adv. Diff. Eq.*, **9** (2004), 197–220.
- [12] N. HIRANO, C. SACCON, AND N. SHIOJI, Brezis-Nirenberg type theorems and multiplicity of positive solutions for a singular elliptic problem. *J. Differential Equations*, **245**(8) (2008), 1997–2037.
- [13] A.V. LAIR AND A.W. SHAKER, Classical and weak solutions of a singular semilinear elliptic problem, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **211**(2) (1977), 371–385.
- [14] A.C. LAZER, P.J. MCKENNA, On a singular nonlinear elliptic boundary-value problem. *Proc. AMS*, **111** (1991), 721–730.
- [15] J. SERRIN, A symmetry problem in potential theory. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal*, **43**(4), (1971), 304–318.
- [16] M.SQUASSINA, Boundary behavior for a singular quasi-linear elliptic equation. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **393**(2), (2012), 692–696.
- [17] C.A. STUART, Existence and approximation of solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations. *Math. Z.*, **147** (1976), 53–63.

\* DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNICAL, PONTE PIETRO BUCCI 31B, 87036 ARCAVACATA DI RENDE, COSENZA, ITALY.

*E-mail address*: canino@mat.unical.it, grandinetti@mat.unical.it, sciunzi@mat.unical.it