

# Uniqueness and positivity issues in a quasilinear indefinite problem <sup>\*†</sup>

Uriel Kaufmann<sup>‡</sup>, Humberto Ramos Quoirin<sup>§</sup>, Kenichiro Umezū<sup>¶</sup>

July 21, 2020

## Abstract

We consider the problem

$$(P_\lambda) \quad -\Delta_p u = \lambda u^{p-1} + a(x)u^{q-1}, \quad u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

under Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions. Here  $\Omega$  is a smooth bounded domain of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  ( $N \geq 1$ ),  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $1 < q < p$ , and  $a \in C(\overline{\Omega})$  changes sign. These conditions enable the existence of dead core solutions for this problem, which may admit multiple nontrivial solutions. We show that for  $\lambda < 0$  the functional

$$I_\lambda(u) := \int_\Omega \left( \frac{1}{p} |\nabla u|^p - \frac{\lambda}{p} |u|^p - \frac{1}{q} a(x) |u|^q \right),$$

defined in  $X = W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  or  $X = W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ , has *exactly* one nonnegative global minimizer, and this one is the *only* solution of  $(P_\lambda)$  being positive in  $\Omega_a^+$  (the set where  $a > 0$ ). In particular, this problem has at most one positive solution for  $\lambda < 0$ . Under some condition on  $a$ , the above uniqueness result fails for some values of  $\lambda > 0$  as we obtain, besides the ground state solution, a *second* solution positive in  $\Omega_a^+$ . We also provide conditions on  $\lambda$ ,  $a$  and  $q$  such that these solutions become positive in  $\Omega$ , and analyze the formation of dead cores for a generic solution.

## 1 Introduction and main results

Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded and smooth domain of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  with  $N \geq 1$ . We deal with the problem

$$(P_\lambda) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda u^{p-1} + a(x)u^{q-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{B}u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

<sup>\*</sup>2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 35J25, 35J62, 35J92.

<sup>†</sup>*Key words and phrases*. quasilinear, indefinite, sublinear, uniqueness.

<sup>‡</sup>FaMAF-CIEM (CONICET), Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Medina Allende s/n, Ciudad Universitaria, 5000 Córdoba, Argentina. *E-mail address*: kaufmann@mate.uncor.edu

<sup>§</sup>CIEM-FaMAF, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, (5000) Córdoba, Argentina. *E-mail address*: humbertorq@gmail.com

<sup>¶</sup>Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Education, Ibaraki University, Mito 310-8512, Japan. *E-mail address*: kenichiro.umezu.math@vc.ibaraki.ac.jp

where  $\Delta_p$  is the  $p$ -Laplacian operator,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $a \in C(\overline{\Omega})$  changes sign and  $1 < q < p$ , which is the so-called *subhomogeneous* (or *sublinear* if  $p = 2$ ) case.

We consider either Dirichlet ( $\mathbf{B}u = u$ ) or Neumann ( $\mathbf{B}u = \partial_\nu u$ , where  $\nu$  is the outward unit normal to  $\partial\Omega$ ) homogeneous boundary conditions. Solutions of  $(P_\lambda)$  are understood in the weak sense, i.e. as nonnegative critical points of the energy functional

$$I_\lambda(u) := \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{p} |\nabla u|^p - \frac{\lambda}{p} |u|^p - \frac{1}{q} a(x) |u|^q \right), \quad u \in X,$$

where  $X = W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  in the Dirichlet case, and  $X = W^{1,p}(\Omega)$  in the Neumann case. Standard regularity results for quasilinear elliptic equations [18, 33] show that such solutions are in  $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . If, in addition,  $u > 0$  in  $\Omega$ , then we call it a *positive solution* of  $(P_\lambda)$ . We are particularly interested in *ground state* solutions (or *least energy solutions*) of  $(P_\lambda)$ , i.e. solutions  $u$  such that  $I_\lambda(u) \leq I_\lambda(v)$  for any solution  $v$  of  $(P_\lambda)$ .

The most striking feature of  $(P_\lambda)$  under the above conditions on  $a$  and  $q$  is the possible occurrence of *dead cores* (or *free boundaries*), i.e. regions where solutions vanish (see [16] for a survey on this subject). As a matter of fact [16, Proposition 1.11] shows that every solution of  $(P_0)$  has a dead core if  $a$  is too negative in some part of  $\Omega$  (see also [5, 6, 24, 26] for some examples of dead core solutions with  $p = 2$ ). Whenever it occurs, this phenomenon provides a rich structure to  $S_\lambda$ , the set of nontrivial solutions of  $(P_\lambda)$ , as a dead core solution may generate multiple elements in  $S_\lambda$  (see Remarks 1.3(3) and 1.9 below). This scenario is considerably different from the Dirichlet one for  $(P_0)$  and  $a > 0$  (the *strictly definite* case, see [12, 17]) or  $a \geq 0$  (the *definite* case, see [22]). Indeed, in view of the strong maximum principle and the Hopf Lemma [35], which apply in this situation, we have  $S_\lambda \subset \mathcal{P}^\circ$ , where

$$\mathcal{P}^\circ := \begin{cases} \{u \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega}) : u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \partial_\nu u < 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\} & \text{if } \mathbf{B}u = u, \\ \{u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) : u > 0 \text{ on } \overline{\Omega}\} & \text{if } \mathbf{B}u = \partial_\nu u. \end{cases}$$

Since in this case  $(P_0)$  has at most one solution in  $\mathcal{P}^\circ$ , one deduces that  $S_0$  is a singleton.

Note that for  $q \geq p$  (the *superhomogeneous* and *homogeneous* cases) we also have  $S_\lambda \subset \mathcal{P}^\circ$ , even if  $a$  changes sign (the *indefinite* case). However, in such situation  $S_\lambda$  is not a singleton in general. We refer to [2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 23, 34] for an overview of  $(P_\lambda)$  in the superhomogeneous indefinite case.

We shall proceed with the investigation carried out in [30] for  $(P_0)$ . For an account on this problem when  $p = 2$ , we refer to the recent review paper [28]. In the sequel we state and discuss our main results.

## 1.1 Uniqueness for $\lambda < 0$

In [30] we proved that  $I_0$  has a unique nonnegative global minimizer, and this one turns out to be the only solution of  $(P_0)$  positive in

$$\Omega_a^+ := \{x \in \Omega : a(x) > 0\}.$$

In particular, uniqueness of positive solutions holds for  $(P_0)$ . We extend this result to any  $\lambda < 0$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *Assume that  $\lambda < 0$ . Then  $(P_\lambda)$  has exactly one ground state solution  $U_+ = U_+(\lambda)$ , which has the following properties:*

1.  $U_+$  is the unique nonnegative global minimizer of  $I_\lambda$ .
2.  $U_+$  is the only solution of  $(P_\lambda)$  such that  $U_+ > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ .
3. The map  $\lambda \mapsto U_+(\lambda)$  is increasing and continuous from  $(-\infty, 0)$  to  $X$ , and  $U_+(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$  in  $X$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow -\infty$ .

From Theorem 1.1, we infer:

**Corollary 1.2.** *Assume that  $\lambda < 0$ . Then:*

1.  $(P_\lambda)$  has at most one positive solution (which is  $U_+$ , whenever it exists).
2. If  $\Omega_a^+$  is connected then  $U_+$  is the unique nontrivial solution of  $(P_\lambda)$ .

**Remark 1.3.**

1. Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 are, to the best of our knowledge, new for  $p \neq 2$ , for both Dirichlet and Neumann problems. Furthermore, several results therein are new even for the Dirichlet problem with  $p = 2$ . We refer the reader to [1, Theorem 1.1] and [13], for previous results with  $p = 2$ , in the Neumann and Dirichlet cases, respectively.
2. A natural question arising in connection with Theorem 1.1(2) is whether  $U_+$  is a positive solution. Keeping  $\lambda \leq 0$ ,  $q$ , and  $a^+$  (the positive part of  $a$ ) fixed, Theorem 1.8 below implies that  $U_+$  has a dead core if, roughly speaking,  $a^-$  (the negative part of  $a$ ) is large enough. On the other hand,  $U_+$  becomes a positive solution as  $a^-$  gets close to 0, see Proposition 4.6. The positivity of  $U_+$  also holds for  $q$  close (and smaller than)  $p$ , and for  $\lambda$  close (and smaller than) 0 in the Neumann case if  $\int_\Omega a > 0$ , cf. Theorems 1.6 and 4.1 below.
3. When  $\Omega_a^+$  is disconnected Remark 1.9 below shows that, for any  $\lambda \leq 0$ ,  $(P_\lambda)$  may have multiple solutions satisfying  $u \not\equiv 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ , so Theorem 1.1(2) does *not* hold with ' $U_+ > 0$ ' replaced by ' $U_+ \not\equiv 0$ '. In particular, suppose that  $\Omega_a^+ = \cup_{i \in I} \Omega_i$ , where  $\Omega_i$  are connected and open, and  $J \subsetneq I$ . Then  $(P_\lambda)$  may have several solutions positive in  $\cup_{i \in J} \Omega_i$ , so Theorem 1.1(2) does *not* hold with ' $\Omega_a^+$ ' replaced by ' $\cup_{i \in J} \Omega_i$ '. Some concrete examples where these multiplicity results appear for  $(P_0)$  and  $p = 2$  can be found in the proofs of [25, Theorem 1.4(ii)] and [26, Proposition 5.1]. Let us also mention that these features were already observed in [5, 6].
4. The assertion in Theorem 1.1(3) holds also in  $(-\infty, 0]$  for the Dirichlet problem, and for the Neumann one if  $\int_\Omega a < 0$ . If  $\int_\Omega a > 0$  then  $U_+(\lambda)$  blows up as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0^-$ , see Proposition 3.7, Remark 3.8, and Section 4.

Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 follow a long history of uniqueness results for subhomogeneous and sublinear type problems, dating back at least to [32]. The existence and uniqueness of a nontrivial solution for the Dirichlet problem with  $\lambda \leq 0$  and  $a > 0$  in  $\Omega$  has been established in [12] for  $p = 2$  and in [17] for

$p > 1$  (see also [7]). The indefinite case proves to be more delicate to handle, as shown in [1, Theorem 1.1], [5, Theorem 2.3], [6, Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.1], [15, Theorem 2.1], which hold for  $p = 2$  (see also [30, Theorem A] for a precise description of these results when  $\lambda = 0$ ). The proofs of these uniqueness results, which hold also for sublinear nonlinearities that are not powerlike, are rather direct and make use of the strong maximum principle. Here we shall proceed as in [30] and follow an undirect strategy, relying on the combination of the following results for  $\lambda \leq 0$ :

- ground state solutions minimize  $I_\lambda$  over the open set

$$\mathcal{A}_+ := \left\{ u \in X : \int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^q > 0 \right\} \quad (1.1)$$

(see Lemma 2.3);

- there is a one-to-one correspondence between minimizers of  $I_\lambda$  over  $\mathcal{A}_+$  and nonnegative minimizers for  $m_+ = m_+(\lambda) := \inf_{\mathcal{S}_+} E_\lambda$ , where

$$E_\lambda(u) := \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^p - \lambda|u|^p), \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_+ = \mathcal{S}_+(a, q) := \left\{ u \in X : \int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^q = 1 \right\}$$

(see Lemma 2.5);

- $m_+$  is achieved by *exactly* one nonnegative minimizer (see Proposition 3.1).
- ground state solutions are the *only* ones being positive in  $\Omega_a^+$  (see Proposition 3.6). This result is proved via a generalized Picone's inequality (see Lemma 3.4).

## 1.2 A nonuniqueness result for $\lambda > 0$

We consider now  $(P_\lambda)$  with  $\lambda > 0$ . Here the values

$$\lambda_1 := \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p : u \in X, \int_{\Omega} |u|^p = 1 \right\}$$

and

$$\lambda^* = \lambda^*(a, q) := \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p : u \in X, \int_{\Omega} |u|^p = 1, \int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^q \geq 0 \right\}$$

play important roles. It is readily seen that  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda^*$  are achieved. Moreover:

1.  $\lambda_1$  is the first nonnegative eigenvalue of the problem

$$-\Delta_p u = \lambda|u|^{p-2}u, \quad u \in X,$$

and is achieved by a unique  $\phi_1 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$  such that  $\int_{\Omega} \phi_1^p = 1$ .

2.  $\lambda^* \geq \lambda_1$  with strict inequality if, and only if,  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q < 0$ .
3. If  $X = W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  then  $\lambda_1 > 0$ . If  $X = W^{1,p}(\Omega)$  then  $\lambda_1 = 0$  and  $\phi_1 \equiv |\Omega|^{-\frac{1}{p}}$ . In this case the condition  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q < 0$  reads  $\int_{\Omega} a < 0$ .

Let us give some insight on this case by briefly describing the geometry of  $I_{\lambda}$ . Note that

$$I_{\lambda}(u) = \frac{1}{p}E_{\lambda}(u) - \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^q,$$

where  $E_{\lambda}$  is given by (1.2). Since  $q < p$  and  $E_{\lambda}$  is coercive for  $\lambda < \lambda_1$ , one readily sees that  $I_{\lambda}$  is coercive, and consequently has a global minimizer  $U_+$  for  $\lambda < \lambda_1$ . One may easily show that  $U_+ \in \mathcal{A}_+$ , i.e.

$$I_{\lambda}(U_+) = \min I_{\lambda} = \min_{\mathcal{A}_+} I_{\lambda} \quad \text{for } \lambda < \lambda_1.$$

More generally, any nontrivial solution of  $(P_{\lambda})$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}_+$  if  $\lambda \leq \lambda_1$  (see Proposition 3.9).

When  $\lambda > \lambda_1$  the functional  $I_{\lambda}$  becomes unbounded from below, since  $E_{\lambda}(t\phi_1) \rightarrow -\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . However,  $E_{\lambda}$  is coercive in  $\mathcal{A}_+$  for  $\lambda < \lambda^*$ , so that  $\min_{\mathcal{A}_+} I_{\lambda}$  is achieved by some nonnegative minimizer, still denoted by  $U_+$ , for  $\lambda < \lambda^*$  (see Lemma 2.3). Since  $\mathcal{A}_+$  is open,  $U_+$  is a local minimizer of  $I_{\lambda}$ , and therefore a solution of  $(P_{\lambda})$ . Recall that if  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1 < 0$  then  $\lambda^* > \lambda_1$ , so that in this case  $\min_{\mathcal{A}_+} I_{\lambda}$  persists for  $\lambda_1 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ . As already observed, one may also obtain  $U_+$  by minimizing  $E_{\lambda}$  over the  $C^1$  manifold  $\mathcal{S}_+$ , up to some rescaling. When  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q < 0$  and  $\lambda_1 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ , a similar procedure shall provide us with a second solution  $U_-$ , since in this case, setting

$$\mathcal{S}_- = \mathcal{S}_-(a, q) := \left\{ u \in X : \int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^q = -1 \right\},$$

one can show that  $m_- = m_-(\lambda) := \inf_{\mathcal{S}_-} E_{\lambda}$  is achieved and negative. The solution  $U_-$  clearly belongs to the negative counterpart of  $\mathcal{A}_+$ , namely

$$\mathcal{A}_- := \left\{ u \in X : \int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^q < 0 \right\}.$$

More precisely, it belongs to

$$E_{\lambda}^- := \{u \in X : E_{\lambda}(u) < 0\},$$

which is a subset of  $\mathcal{A}_-$  for  $\lambda_1 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ .

We shall see that  $U_- > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ , and therefore uniqueness of solutions positive in  $\Omega_a^+$  breaks down in this case. Let us set

$$\Omega_a^- := \{x \in \Omega : a(x) < 0\}.$$

The above discussion leads to the following result:

**Theorem 1.4.** *Assume that  $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ . Then:*

1.  $(P_{\lambda})$  has a ground state solution  $U_+ = U_+(\lambda)$ . Moreover,  $U_+ > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$  and  $I_{\lambda}(U_+) = \min_{\mathcal{A}_+} I_{\lambda}$ . In particular,  $U_+$  is a local minimizer of  $I_{\lambda}$ .

2. If  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q < 0$  and  $\lambda > \lambda_1$  then  $(P_{\lambda})$  has a second solution  $U_- = U_-(\lambda)$  satisfying  $U_- > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ . Moreover  $U_- \not\equiv 0$  in  $\Omega_a^-$ , and

$$I_{\lambda}(U_-) = \min_{u \in E_{\lambda}^-} \max_{t > 0} I_{\lambda}(tu) = \inf_{u \neq 0} \sup_{t > 0} I_{\lambda}(tu). \quad (1.3)$$

**Remark 1.5.**

1. The first equality in (1.3) shows that  $U_-$  can be seen as a ground state solution over  $\mathcal{A}_-$ , since it has minimal energy among solutions in this set (see Lemma 2.6).
2. Theorem 1.4 is consistent with [1, Theorem 1.1] and [13], which deal with the Neumann and Dirichlet cases of  $(P_{\lambda})$  when  $p = 2$ , respectively. Let us mention that a multiplicity phenomenon in  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_1 + \delta)$ , for some  $\delta > 0$ , also occurs in the superhomogeneous and subcritical case  $p < q \leq p^*$  under the condition  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q < 0$ , cf. [2, 8, 34] for  $p = 2$ , and [10, 23] for  $p > 1$ . Here  $p^*$  denotes the Sobolev critical exponent.
3. One may ask how large is  $\lambda^*$  to estimate the domain of existence for  $U_+$  and  $U_-$ . In this regard, it is not difficult to see that  $\lambda^* \rightarrow \infty$  as the support of  $a^-$  increases towards  $\Omega$  (see Remark 2.7).

### 1.3 Positivity vs dead core formation

Whenever they exist,  $U_{\pm}$  eventually become positive as  $q$  approaches  $p$  (keeping  $a$  and  $\lambda$  fixed). This result is proved via a continuity property (already used in [30]) showing that, up to some normalization,  $U_{\pm}$  converge to a nonnegative solution of  $(P_{\lambda})$  with  $q = p$ . For this purpose we show that  $\lambda^*(q)$  converges to  $\lambda^*(p)$  as  $q \rightarrow p^-$  (see Proposition 4.4).

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $a$  and  $\lambda < \lambda^*(a, p)$  be fixed. There exists  $q_0 = q_0(\lambda, a) \in [1, p)$  such that  $U_+ \in \mathcal{P}^{\circ}$  for  $q_0 < q < p$ . If  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^p < 0$  and  $\lambda_1 < \lambda < \lambda^*(p)$  then the same conclusion holds for  $U_-$ . In particular, in this case  $(P_{\lambda})$  has two solutions in  $\mathcal{P}^{\circ}$  for  $q_0 < q < p$ .*

**Remark 1.7.** The positivity of  $U_+$  (respect.  $U_-$ ) can also be deduced for  $\lambda$  close and smaller than  $\lambda_1$  (respect. larger than  $\lambda_1$ ) if  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^p > 0$  (respect.  $< 0$ ), see Theorem 4.1, and also if  $a^-$  is small enough, cf. Proposition 4.6. To the best of our knowledge, the existence of positive solutions provided by these results is new for  $p \neq 2$  and  $\lambda \neq 0$ .

On the other hand, solutions of  $(P_0)$  develop a dead core as  $a^-$  increases, cf. [16, Proposition 1.11] (see also [30, Theorem E] and [21, Theorem 3.2] for a simpler statement with  $p = 2$ ). We show that the dead core formation also occurs for other values of  $\lambda$  and that in certain situations the dead core approximates to  $\Omega_a^-$  when  $a^-$  tends to  $\infty$ .

**Theorem 1.8.** *Assume that  $a \in C(\overline{\Omega})$  changes sign,  $\Omega' \Subset \Omega_a^-$ , and  $a_n := a^+ - na^-$ . If either  $\lambda \leq 0$  or  $p = 2$  and  $\lambda \leq \lambda_1$ , then there exists  $n_0 > 0$  such that any solution of  $(P_{\lambda, a_n})$  vanishes in  $\Omega'$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ .*

Theorem 1.8 is proved by comparing solutions of  $(P_\lambda)$  with a local barrier function obtained by a perturbation of  $|x - x_0|^{\frac{2p}{p-q}}$  with  $x_0 \in \Omega'$ . Note that this power is not the usual one (see e.g. [16, Proposition 1.11]), namely,  $|x - x_0|^{\frac{p}{p-q}}$ . This comparison is done using the weak comparison principle for the operator  $u \mapsto -\Delta_p u - \lambda u^{p-1}$  (defined on  $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ ), which breaks down when  $\lambda > 0$  and  $p \neq 2$  (see [19, Corollary 8]). It is an interesting open question whether this result still holds for  $p \neq 2$  and  $\lambda > 0$ .

**Remark 1.9.** Let either  $\lambda \leq 0$  or  $p = 2$  and  $\lambda \leq \lambda_1$ . Using Theorem 1.8 one can find examples of solutions of  $(P_\lambda)$  vanishing in a prescribed number of connected components of  $\Omega_a^+$ . This situation can be readily checked in the one-dimensional case: let  $\Omega := (b, c)$  and  $a \in C(\overline{\Omega})$  with  $\Omega_a^+ = (b, b + \frac{\delta}{2}) \cup (c - \frac{\delta}{2}, c)$ , for some  $\delta > 0$  small. If  $a$  is sufficiently negative in  $(b + \frac{\delta}{2}, c - \frac{\delta}{2})$  then any solution of  $(P_\lambda)$  vanishes in  $[b + \delta, c - \delta]$ . It follows that  $U_+$  is a two-bumps solution, i.e.  $U_+ = U_1 + U_2$ , with  $U_1, U_2 \geq 0$  in  $\Omega$ ,  $\text{supp } U_1 \subset [b, b + \delta]$ , and  $\text{supp } U_2 \subset [c - \delta, c]$ . Since  $N = 1$  (and thus  $(P_\lambda)$  holds pointwisely), we can easily check that  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  solve  $(P_\lambda)$ . This procedure also applies if  $\Omega_a^+$  has finitely many connected components, to obtain a solution vanishing in a prescribed number of these components, and also when  $N > 1$  provided that  $p = 2$  and  $\lambda \leq \lambda_1$ .




Figure 1: A ground state solution having a dead core

### Final remarks

One may check that besides Theorem 1.6, the results above still hold if  $\Omega$  is a nonsmooth bounded domain. These results also remain valid if  $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ , if we set  $\Omega_a^\pm$  as the largest open sets where  $a \gtrless 0$  a.e. (assuming in addition that  $\text{essinf}_\Omega a^- > 0$  in Theorem 1.8). Furthermore, the methods used in this article allow us to derive similar results for the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = a(x)u^{q-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ |\nabla u|^{p-2} \partial_\nu u = \lambda u^{p-1} & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

We refer to [27, 29] for an investigation of this problem with  $p = 2$ .

The outline of this article is the following: In Section 2 we show the equivalence between ground state solutions and nonnegative minimizers of  $m_+$  and we prove Theorem 1.4. Section 3 is devoted to the uniqueness results in Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2. Section 4 is devoted to positivity results, whereas in Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.8.

## Notation

Throughout this paper, we use the following notation:

- $a^\pm := \max(\pm a, 0)$ .
- $\Omega_f^+ := \{x \in \Omega : f(x) > 0\}$  and  $\Omega_f^- := \{x \in \Omega : f(x) < 0\}$ , for  $f \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ .
- Given  $r > 1$ , we denote by  $\|\cdot\|_r$  the usual norm in  $L^r(\Omega)$  and by  $\|\cdot\|$  the usual norm in  $X$ , i.e.  $\|u\| = \|\nabla u\|_p$  if  $X = W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  and  $\|u\| = \|\nabla u\|_p + \|u\|_p$  if  $X = W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ .
- Strong and weak convergences are denoted by  $\rightarrow$  and  $\rightharpoonup$ , respectively.
- Given  $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ , the integral  $\int_\Omega f$  is considered with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Equalities and inequalities involving  $f$  shall be understood holding *a.e.*

## 2 Ground states and constrained minimizers

The next result will be used repeatedly throughout this paper:

### Lemma 2.1.

1. The maps  $u \mapsto \int_\Omega |u|^p$  and  $u \mapsto \int_\Omega a|u|^q$  are weakly continuous on  $X$ , i.e. if  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $X$  then  $\int_\Omega |u_n|^p \rightarrow \int_\Omega |u|^p$  and  $\int_\Omega a|u_n|^q \rightarrow \int_\Omega a|u|^q$ .
2. Assume that  $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda \leq \lambda^*$  with  $\int_\Omega a\phi_1^q > 0$  if  $\lambda = \lambda^*$ . If  $\{u_n\} \subset X$  is such that  $\{\int_\Omega a|u_n|^q\}$  is bounded and  $\limsup E_{\lambda_n}(u_n) < \infty$ , then  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded in  $X$ .
3. For any  $\lambda < \lambda^*$  there exists  $C_\lambda = C_\lambda(a) > 0$  such that  $E_\lambda(u) \geq C_\lambda \|u\|^p$  for every  $u \in \overline{\mathcal{A}_+}$  (the closure of  $\mathcal{A}_+$  in  $X$ ).
4. If  $u$  and  $v$  solve  $(P_\lambda)$  with  $u \equiv tv$  for some  $t > 0$ , and  $\int_\Omega au^q \neq 0$ , then  $u \equiv v$ .

*Proof.*

1. It follows from the compactness of the Sobolev embedding  $X \subset L^t(\Omega)$  for  $t \in (1, p^*)$ .
2. If  $\{u_n\}$  is unbounded in  $X$  then we can assume that  $\|u_n\| \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $v_n := \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|} \rightharpoonup v_0$  in  $X$ , for some  $v_0$ . It follows that  $\int_\Omega a|v_0|^q = \lim \int_\Omega a|v_n|^q = 0$  and  $E_\lambda(v_0) \leq \liminf E_{\lambda_n}(v_n) \leq \limsup E_{\lambda_n}(v_n) \leq 0$ . If  $v_0 \equiv 0$  then we find that  $E_{\lambda_n}(v_n) \rightarrow 0$ , so that  $v_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $X$ , which is impossible. Thus  $v_0 \neq 0$ . If  $\lambda < \lambda^*$  then we find that  $E_\lambda(v_0) > 0$ , a contradiction. Moreover,



if  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q > 0$  and  $\lambda = \lambda^* = \lambda_1$ , then  $E_{\lambda_1}(v_0) = 0$ , so that  $v_0 = c\phi_1$ , for some  $c \neq 0$ , which contradicts  $\int_{\Omega} a|v_0|^q = 0$ . Therefore  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded in  $X$ .

3. First of all, note that  $\overline{\mathcal{A}_+} = \{u \in X : \int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^q \geq 0\}$ . Assume by contradiction that  $\{u_n\} \subset \overline{\mathcal{A}_+}$  with  $E_{\lambda}(u_n) \leq \frac{1}{n}\|u_n\|^p$ . Then  $v_n := \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|}$  satisfies  $E_{\lambda}(v_n) \leq \frac{1}{n}$  and  $\int_{\Omega} a|v_n|^q \geq 0$  for every  $n$ . We may assume, for some  $v_0 \in X$ , that  $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$  in  $X$ . Thus  $E_{\lambda}(v_0) \leq 0$  and  $\int_{\Omega} a|v_0|^q \geq 0$ . Moreover, if  $v_0 \equiv 0$  then  $\limsup E_{\lambda}(v_n) \leq E_{\lambda}(v_0)$ , so that  $v_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $X$ , which is impossible. Hence  $v_0 \neq 0$ , and from  $E_{\lambda}(v_0) \leq 0$  we infer that

$$\lambda \geq \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_0|^p}{\int_{\Omega} v_0^p} \geq \lambda^*,$$

a contradiction.

4. Since  $u$  and  $v$  solve  $(P_{\lambda})$ , we have  $E_{\lambda}(u) = \int_{\Omega} au^q \neq 0$  and  $E_{\lambda}(v) = \int_{\Omega} av^q$ . From  $u \equiv tv$  we deduce, using the first equality, that  $t^{p-q}E_{\lambda}(v) = \int_{\Omega} av^q \neq 0$ , which clearly yields  $t = 1$ .

□

**Remark 2.2.** Note that Lemma 2.1(3) says in particular that if  $\lambda < \lambda^*$  then  $E_{\lambda}(u) > 0$  for every  $u \neq 0$  such that  $\int_{\Omega} a|u|^q \geq 0$ . This result will be used repeatedly.

Let us introduce

$$M = M(\lambda) := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{A}_+} I_{\lambda}(u)$$

and recall that

$$m_{\pm} = m_{\pm}(\lambda) := \inf_{v \in \mathcal{S}_{\pm}} E_{\lambda}(v).$$

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $\lambda < \lambda^*$ . Then:*

1. *There exists  $U_+ = U_+(\lambda) \in \mathcal{A}_+$  such that  $U_+ \geq 0$  and  $I_{\lambda}(U_+) = M < 0$ . Any such  $U_+$  is a ground state solution of  $(P_{\lambda})$ .*
2. *There exists  $V_{\pm} = V_{\pm}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{S}_{\pm}$  such that  $V_{\pm} \geq 0$  and  $E_{\lambda}(V_{\pm}) = m_{\pm}$ . Moreover:*

- (a)  *$m_+ > 0$  and  $(m_+)^{\frac{-1}{p-q}}V$  is a solution of  $(P_{\lambda})$  for any  $V \geq 0$  achieving  $m_+$ .*
- (b) *if  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q < 0$  and  $\lambda > \lambda_1$  then  $m_- < 0$  and  $U_- := (-m_-)^{\frac{-1}{p-q}}V$  is a solution of  $(P_{\lambda})$  for any  $V \geq 0$  achieving  $m_-$ .*

*Proof.*

1. First of all, taking any  $u \in \mathcal{A}_+$  we see that  $I_{\lambda}(tu) < 0$  for  $t > 0$  small enough. Thus  $M < 0$ . By Lemma 2.1(3), we know that

$$I_{\lambda}(u) \geq C_{\lambda}\|u\|^p - C\|u\|^q \tag{2.1}$$

for some  $C, C_\lambda > 0$  and every  $u \in \mathcal{A}_+$ . Thus  $I_\lambda$  is bounded from below in  $\mathcal{A}_+$ . Let us take  $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{A}_+$  such that  $I_\lambda(u_n) \rightarrow M$ . From (2.1) we see that  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded, so we may assume that  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_0$  in  $X$ , so that  $I_\lambda(u_0) \leq M < 0$ , since  $I_\lambda$  is weakly lower semicontinuous. Moreover,  $\int_\Omega a|u_0|^q \geq 0$  and  $u_0 \not\equiv 0$ . Since  $\lambda < \lambda^*(q)$ , we find that  $E_\lambda(u_0) \geq 0$ . If  $\int_\Omega a|u_0|^q = 0$  then we get  $I_\lambda(u_0) = E_\lambda(u_0) \geq 0$ , a contradiction. Therefore  $u_0 \in \mathcal{A}_+$  and  $I_\lambda(u_0) = M$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}_+$  is open, we see that  $u_0$  is a local minimizer, and consequently a critical point of  $I_\lambda$ . As  $I_\lambda(u) = I_\lambda(|u|)$ , we can choose  $u_0$  nonnegative. We set  $U_+ := u_0$ . Finally, if  $u$  is a solution of  $(P_\lambda)$  and  $u \notin \mathcal{A}^+$  then  $I_\lambda(u) = \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) \int_\Omega au^q \geq 0 > I_\lambda(U_+)$ , i.e.  $U_+$  is a ground state solution of  $(P_\lambda)$ .

2. First of all, since  $\mathcal{S}_+ \subset \mathcal{A}_+$ , by Lemma 2.1(3) we know that  $m_+ \geq 0$ . Moreover Lemma 2.1(2) (with  $\lambda_n = \lambda$  for all  $n$ ) implies that  $m_- \neq -\infty$  and any minimizing sequence for  $m_\pm$  is bounded in  $X$ . Since  $E_\lambda$  is weakly lower semi-continuous and  $\mathcal{S}_\pm$  are weakly closed in  $X$ , a standard compactness argument shows that there exist  $V_\pm = V_\pm(\lambda) \in \mathcal{S}_\pm$  such that  $E_\lambda(V_\pm) = m_\pm$ . Moreover since  $E_\lambda(V_\pm) = E_\lambda(|V_\pm|)$ , we can take  $V_\pm \geq 0$ . Since  $V_+ \not\equiv 0$ , we find by Lemma 2.1(3) that  $m_+ > 0$ . If  $\int_\Omega a\phi_1^q < 0$  then  $(-\int_\Omega a\phi_1^q)^{-\frac{1}{q}} \phi_1 \in \mathcal{S}_-$ , and if  $\lambda > \lambda_1$  then  $E_\lambda(\phi_1) < 0$ , so that  $m_- \leq \frac{E_\lambda(\phi_1)}{(-\int_\Omega a\phi_1^q)^{\frac{p}{q}}} < 0$ . Finally, by the Lagrange multipliers rule,  $V_\pm$  solve

$$-\Delta_p V_\pm = \lambda V_\pm^{p-1} + \alpha_\pm a V_\pm^{q-1}$$

for some  $\alpha_\pm \in \mathbb{R}$ . It follows that  $E_\lambda(V_\pm) = \pm\alpha_\pm$ , i.e.  $\alpha_\pm = \pm m_\pm$ . Thanks to the homogeneity of the equation above, we see that  $(\pm m_\pm)^{\frac{-1}{p-q}} V_\pm$  solve  $(P_\lambda)$ . Since the above argument applies to any  $V \geq 0$  achieving  $m_+$  or  $m_-$ , this concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** The condition  $\lambda < \lambda^*$  is nearly optimal for  $M$  to be achieved and  $m_+$  to be positive, as  $M = -\infty$  and  $m_+ < 0$  for  $\lambda > \lambda^*$ . Indeed, let  $u_0 \geq 0$  achieve  $\lambda^*$ , so that  $E_\lambda(u_0) < 0$  for  $\lambda > \lambda^*$ . We choose some nontrivial  $\psi \geq 0$  supported in  $\Omega_a^+$ , and set  $u_s = u_0 + s\psi$ . Then  $\int_\Omega au_s^q > 0$  and  $E_\lambda(u_s) < 0$  for  $s > 0$  small enough. It follows that  $u_s \in \mathcal{A}_+$ , so that  $tu_s \in \mathcal{A}_+$ , and  $I_\lambda(tu_s) = \frac{t^p}{p} E_\lambda(u_s) - \frac{t^q}{q} \int_\Omega au_s^q \rightarrow -\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , which yields the first assertion. The second one follows from  $m_+ \leq \frac{E_\lambda(u_s)}{(\int_\Omega au_s^q)^{\frac{p}{q}}} < 0$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $\lambda < \lambda^*$ . Then:*

1. *If  $M$  is achieved by  $U$  then  $m_+$  is achieved by  $(\int_\Omega aU^q)^{-\frac{1}{q}} U$ .*
2. *If  $m_+$  is achieved by  $V$  then  $M$  is achieved by  $tV$ , for some  $t > 0$ .*
3. *If  $m_+$  is achieved by  $V_+ \geq 0$  then  $V_+ > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ . In a similar way, if  $m_- < 0$  then  $V_- > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ , and moreover  $V_- \not\equiv 0$  in  $\Omega_a^-$ .*
4. *If  $M$  is achieved by  $U \geq 0$  then  $U > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ .*

*Proof.*

1. Let  $U \in \mathcal{A}_+$  be such that  $I_\lambda(U) = M$  and  $V \in \mathcal{S}_+$  be such that  $E_\lambda(V) = m_+$ . Then, for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p}E_\lambda(U) - \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} a|U|^q &= I_\lambda(U) \leq I_\lambda(tV) \\ &= \frac{t^p}{p}E_\lambda(V) - \frac{t^q}{q} \int_{\Omega} a|V|^q = \frac{t^p}{p}m_+ - \frac{t^q}{q}. \end{aligned}$$

We choose  $t = t_0 := (\int_{\Omega} a|U|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}$ , so that

$$\frac{1}{p}E_\lambda(U) - \frac{t_0^q}{q} \leq \frac{t_0^p}{p}m_+ - \frac{t_0^q}{q}.$$

Thus  $E_\lambda(t_0^{-1}U) \leq m_+$ , which yields the desired conclusion.

2. We use a similar trick. Let  $U \in \mathcal{A}_+$  be such that  $I_\lambda(U) = M$ , and set  $t_0$  as in (1). Note that

$$I_\lambda(t_0V) = \frac{t_0^p}{p}E_\lambda(V) - \frac{t_0^q}{q} \leq \frac{t_0^p}{p}E_\lambda(t_0^{-1}U) - \frac{t_0^q}{q} = \frac{E_\lambda(U)}{p} - \frac{t_0^q}{q} = M,$$

and since  $t_0V \in \mathcal{A}_+$ , we have  $I_\lambda(tV) = M$ .

3. Assume by contradiction that  $V_\pm(x_0) = 0$  for some  $x_0 \in \Omega_a^+$ . Then, by the strong maximum principle [35],  $V_\pm \equiv 0$  in a ball  $B \subset \Omega_a^+$ . We choose then  $\phi \in C_0^\infty(B)$  with  $\phi \geq 0, \neq 0$ , and extend it by zero to  $\Omega$ . Note that  $V_\pm + t\phi \in \mathcal{A}_\pm$  for  $t > 0$  small enough. Moreover,

$$\frac{E_\lambda(V_\pm + t\phi)}{(\pm \int_{\Omega} a|V_\pm + t\phi|^q)^{\frac{p}{q}}} = \frac{m_\pm + t^p E_\lambda(\phi)}{(1 \pm t^q \int_{\Omega} a\phi^q)^{\frac{p}{q}}} < m_\pm$$

for  $t > 0$  small enough, providing us with a contradiction. Indeed, note that the above inequality holds if, and only if,

$$E_\lambda(\phi) < m_\pm \frac{(1 \pm t^q \int_{\Omega} a\phi^q)^{\frac{p}{q}} - 1}{t^p},$$

which holds for  $t > 0$  small enough, since  $m_\pm \geq 0$  and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{(1 \pm t^q \int_{\Omega} a\phi^q)^{\frac{p}{q}} - 1}{t^p} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{(1 \pm t^q \int_{\Omega} a\phi^q)^{\frac{p}{q}-1} (\pm \int_{\Omega} a\phi^q)}{t^{p-q}} = \pm\infty.$$

Finally, it is clear that  $V_- \not\equiv 0$  in  $\Omega_a^-$  since  $V_- \in \mathcal{S}_-$ .

4. It follows directly from items (1) and (3). □

**Lemma 2.6.** *Assume that  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q < 0$  and  $\lambda_1 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ . If  $m_-$  is achieved by  $V$  then  $I_\lambda((-m_-)^{\frac{-1}{p-q}}V) = \inf_{u \neq 0} \sup_{t > 0} I_\lambda(tu) = \min_{u \in E_\lambda^-} \max_{t > 0} I_\lambda(tu) > 0$ . In particular,  $(-m_-)^{\frac{-1}{p-q}}V$  has the least energy among solutions in  $\mathcal{A}_-$ .*

*Proof.* First of all, note that  $\sup_{t>0} I_\lambda(tu) = \infty$  if  $u \neq 0$  and  $E_\lambda(u) \geq 0$ . Thus we shall consider this supremum for  $u \in E_\lambda^-$ , in which case  $u \in \mathcal{A}_-$  (since  $\lambda < \lambda^*(q)$ ) and  $\sup_{t>0} I_\lambda(tu) = \max_{t>0} I_\lambda(tu) > 0$ . Set  $i_u(t) := I_\lambda(tu)$ . Then  $i_u$  has a unique global maximum point  $t_0(u) := \left(\frac{\int_\Omega a|u|^q}{E_\lambda(u)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-q}}$  and

$$\max_{t>0} I_\lambda(tu) = i_u(t_0(u)) = \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \frac{\left(-\int_\Omega a|u|^q\right)^{\frac{p}{p-q}}}{\left(-E_\lambda(u)\right)^{\frac{q}{p-q}}}. \quad (2.2)$$

On the other hand, set  $U := t_0(V)V$ . Note that  $t_0(V) = (-m_-)^{\frac{-1}{p-q}}$ . From (2.2) we see that

$$I_\lambda(U) = I_\lambda(t_0(V)V) = \max_{t>0} I_\lambda(tV) = \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}\right) (-m_-)^{\frac{-q}{p-q}}.$$

Now, if  $u \in \mathcal{A}_-$  then  $m_- \leq \frac{E_\lambda(u)}{\left(-\int_\Omega a|u|^q\right)^{\frac{q}{p-q}}}$ , so that

$$(-m_-)^{\frac{-q}{p-q}} \leq \frac{\left(-\int_\Omega a|u|^q\right)^{\frac{p}{p-q}}}{\left(-E_\lambda(u)\right)^{\frac{q}{p-q}}}.$$

Thus  $I_\lambda(U) \leq \max_{t>0} I_\lambda(tu)$  for every  $u \in E_\lambda^-$ . In addition, equality holds when  $u = U$ . Finally, if  $u \in \mathcal{A}_-$  solves  $(P_\lambda)$  then  $u \in E_\lambda^-$  and  $I_\lambda(u) = \max_{t>0} I_\lambda(tu)$ , so  $I_\lambda(U) \leq I_\lambda(u)$ , as claimed.  $\square$

**Remark 2.7.** Let  $\{a_n\}$  be a sequence such that  $a_n \rightarrow a$  in  $C(\overline{\Omega})$  with  $a < 0$  in  $\Omega$ . Then  $\lambda^*(a_n) \rightarrow \infty$ . Indeed, otherwise we can assume that  $\lambda^*(a_n)$  remains bounded. It follows that if  $u_n$  achieve  $\lambda^*(a_n)$  then  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded in  $X$  and we can assume that  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $X$ . Thus  $\int_\Omega |u|^p = 1$  and  $\int_\Omega a|u|^q = \lim \int_\Omega a_n |u_n|^q \geq 0$ . But since  $a < 0$  in  $\Omega$  we must have  $u \equiv 0$ , contradicting  $\int_\Omega |u|^p = 1$ .

### 3 Uniqueness results

The following result extends [30, Proposition 2.3], which applies to the case  $\lambda = 0$  and is just a reformulation of [31, Theorem 1.1]. We rely here on a *hidden convexity* property, namely, the fact that  $|\nabla u|^p$  is convex along the path  $(tu^q + (1-t)v^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}$  with  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $0 \leq u, v \in X$ , cf. [11, Proposition 2.6].

**Proposition 3.1.** *If  $\lambda < 0$  then  $m_+$  is achieved by exactly one  $V_+ \geq 0$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed as in [30, Proposition 2.3]. Assume that  $V_1, V_2 \geq 0$ ,  $V_1, V_2 \in \mathcal{S}_+$  and  $E_\lambda(V_1) = E_\lambda(V_2) = m_+$ . Then  $W := \left(\frac{V_1^q + V_2^q}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$  satisfies  $W \in \mathcal{S}_+$ , and (as shown in [30, Proposition 2.3])

$$|\nabla W|^p \leq \frac{1}{2} (|\nabla V_1|^p + |\nabla V_2|^p),$$

with strict inequality in the set

$$F := \{x \in \Omega_{V_1}^+ \cup \Omega_{V_2}^+ : V_1(x) \neq V_2(x), |\nabla V_1(x)| + |\nabla V_2(x)| \neq 0\}.$$

Moreover, by convexity we have

$$W^p = \left( \frac{V_1^q + V_2^q}{2} \right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \leq \frac{V_1^p + V_2^p}{2}.$$

Hence, since  $\lambda \leq 0$ , we find that

$$E_\lambda(W) \leq \frac{1}{2} (E_\lambda(V_1) + E_\lambda(V_2)) = m_+,$$

with strict inequality if  $|F| > 0$ . Thus  $|F| = 0$ , so that for almost every  $x \in \Omega$  we have

$$V_1(x) = V_2(x) \quad \text{or} \quad \nabla V_1(x) = \nabla V_2(x) = 0.$$

In particular,  $\nabla V_1 = \nabla V_2$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ , so  $V_1 \equiv V_2 + C$ , for some constant  $C$ . If  $C \neq 0$  then, from the alternative above, we have  $\nabla V_1 = \nabla V_2 = 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ , which is impossible. Therefore  $V_1 \equiv V_2$ , and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.2.** *If  $\lambda < 0$  then  $M$  is achieved by exactly one  $U_+ = U_+(\lambda) \geq 0$ , namely,  $U_+ \equiv m_+^{-\frac{1}{p-q}} V_+$ , where  $V_+$  is the unique nonnegative minimizer associated to  $m_+$ .*

*Proof.* If  $U \geq 0$  achieves  $M$ , then  $U$  solves  $(P_\lambda)$ . Moreover, by Lemma 2.5(1) we know that  $(\int_\Omega aU^q)^{-\frac{1}{q}} U$  achieves  $m_+$  and so, from Proposition 3.1, we have  $U \equiv tV_+$ , with  $t = (\int_\Omega aU^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}$ . On the other hand, by Lemma 2.3(2-a) we know that  $m_+^{-\frac{1}{p-q}} V_+$  also solves  $(P_\lambda)$ . Since  $\int_\Omega aU^q > 0$ , Lemma 2.1(4) yields that  $U \equiv m_+^{-\frac{1}{p-q}} V_+$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.3.** For  $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*$  we still have a nonnegative minimizer  $V_+$  for  $m_+$ , but we don't know if this one is unique. In any case  $U_+ = m_+^{-\frac{1}{p-q}} V_+$  still provides a minimizer for  $M$ .

Let us show that  $U_+$  is the only solution of  $(P_\lambda)$  satisfying  $U_+ > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$  when  $\lambda < 0$ . We follow the argument of [11, Theorem 5.1], which deals with the case  $a \equiv 1$  and  $\lambda = 0$ . The following two inequalities shall be used:

**Lemma 3.4** (Generalized Picone's identity). *If  $u, v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$  with  $u > 0$  and  $v \geq 0$  then*

$$|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left( \frac{v^q}{u^{q-1}} \right) \leq |\nabla u|^{p-q} |\nabla v|^q.$$

The previous lemma is a particular case of [11, Proposition 2.9].

**Lemma 3.5.** *We have  $b^{1-t} c^t + d^{1-t} e^t \leq (b+d)^{1-t} (c+e)^t$  for any  $b, c, d, e > 0$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ .*

*Proof.* Note that setting  $x := \frac{b}{d}$  and  $y := \frac{c}{e}$  the above inequality reads  $x^{1-t} y^t + 1 \leq (x+1)^{1-t} (y+1)^t$ . We fix  $y$  and  $t$ , and set  $f(x) := (x+1)^{1-t} (y+1)^t - x^{1-t} y^t - 1$ . One may easily check that  $f$  has a global minimum at  $x = y$ , and  $f(y) = 0$ , which yields the desired inequality.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.6.** *If  $\lambda < 0$  then  $U_+$  is the only solution of  $(P_\lambda)$  such that  $U_+ > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u$  be a solution of  $(P_\lambda)$  such that  $u > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ , and  $\epsilon > 0$ . We take  $\frac{V_+^q}{(u+\epsilon)^{q-1}}$  as test function in  $(P_\lambda)$ , so that

$$\int_{\Omega} a \left( \frac{u}{u+\epsilon} \right)^{q-1} V_+^q + \lambda \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \frac{V_+^q}{(u+\epsilon)^{q-1}} = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left( \frac{V_+^q}{(u+\epsilon)^{q-1}} \right).$$

By Lemma 3.4 (with  $\sigma = q$  and  $u + \epsilon$  instead of  $u$ ) we have

$$\int_{\Omega} a \left( \frac{u}{u+\epsilon} \right)^{q-1} V_+^q + \lambda \int_{\Omega} u^{p-1} \frac{V_+^q}{(u+\epsilon)^{q-1}} \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-q} |\nabla V_+|^q.$$

Note that  $\frac{u}{u+\epsilon} \rightarrow \chi_{\Omega_u^+}$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , where  $\chi$  denotes the characteristic function. Thus, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we find that

$$\int_{\Omega_u^+} a V_+^q + \lambda \int_{\Omega} u^{p-q} V_+^q \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-q} |\nabla V_+|^q.$$

Now, by Holder's inequality we find that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-q} |\nabla V_+|^q \leq \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{p-q}{p}} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla V_+|^p \right)^{\frac{q}{p}}$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} u^{p-q} V_+^q \leq \left( \int_{\Omega} u^p \right)^{\frac{p-q}{p}} \left( \int_{\Omega} V_+^p \right)^{\frac{q}{p}},$$

so that

$$\int_{\Omega_u^+} a V_+^q \leq \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{p-q}{p}} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla V_+|^p \right)^{\frac{q}{p}} - \lambda \left( \int_{\Omega} u^p \right)^{\frac{p-q}{p}} \left( \int_{\Omega} V_+^p \right)^{\frac{q}{p}}.$$

In addition, since  $u > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ , we have  $a \leq 0$  in  $\Omega \setminus \Omega_u^+$ , which implies that

$$\int_{\Omega_u^+} a V_+^q = 1 - \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_u^+} a V_+^q \geq 1,$$

and therefore

$$1 \leq \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{p-q}{p}} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla V_+|^p \right)^{\frac{q}{p}} + \left( -\lambda \int_{\Omega} u^p \right)^{\frac{p-q}{p}} \left( -\lambda \int_{\Omega} V_+^p \right)^{\frac{q}{p}}.$$

From Lemma 3.5, it follows that

$$1 \leq E_\lambda(u)^{\frac{p-q}{p}} E_\lambda(V_+)^{\frac{q}{p}} = m_+^{\frac{q}{p}} E_\lambda(u)^{\frac{p-q}{p}}, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad E_\lambda(u)^{1-\frac{q}{p}} \leq m.$$

Now, since  $u$  solves  $(P_\lambda)$ , we have  $E_\lambda(u) = \int_{\Omega} a u^q$ , so the latter inequality yields

$$E_\lambda \left( \left( \int_{\Omega} a u^q \right)^{-\frac{1}{q}} u \right) = \frac{E_\lambda(u)}{\left( \int_{\Omega} a u^q \right)^{\frac{q}{q}}} \leq m_+,$$

and by Proposition 3.1, we must have  $\left( \int_{\Omega} a u^q \right)^{-\frac{1}{q}} u \equiv V_+$ . By Corollary 3.2, we deduce that  $u$  and  $U_+$  are multiple of each other. Since both solve  $(P_\lambda)$  and  $\int_{\Omega} a u^q > 0$ , Lemma 2.1(4) says that  $u \equiv U_+$ .  $\square$

In the next result we shall use the weak sub-supersolutions method. If  $\mathbf{B}u = u$  then we say that  $0 \leq u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$  is a *supersolution* of  $(P_\lambda)$  whenever

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \phi \geq \int_{\Omega} (\lambda u^{p-1} + a u^{q-1}) \phi \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \phi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \quad (3.1)$$

and we say that  $0 \leq u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  is a *subsolution* of  $(P_\lambda)$  whenever

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \phi \leq \int_{\Omega} (\lambda u^{p-1} + a u^{q-1}) \phi \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \phi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega). \quad (3.2)$$

Note that we impose the subsolution to lie in  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  since we are seeking for nonnegative solutions of  $(P_\lambda)$ . Similarly, if  $\mathbf{B}u = \partial_\nu u$  then  $0 \leq u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$  is a *supersolution* of  $(P_\lambda)$  whenever (3.1) holds for all  $0 \leq \phi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ , and  $0 \leq u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$  is a *subsolution* of  $(P_\lambda)$  if (3.2) holds for all  $0 \leq \phi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ .

For  $f, g \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ , we write  $f < g$  if  $f \leq g$  and  $f \neq g$  in  $\bar{\Omega}$ .

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $U_+(\lambda)$  be the unique nonnegative global minimizer of  $I_\lambda$  for  $\lambda < 0$ . Then:*

1.  $U_+(\lambda) < U_+(\lambda')$  if  $\lambda < \lambda' < 0$ .
2.  $U_+(\lambda) \rightarrow U_+(\lambda_0)$  in  $X$  if  $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0 < 0$ .
3.  $U_+(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$  in  $X$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow -\infty$ .

*Proof.*

1. Let  $\lambda < \lambda' < 0$ . Then  $U_+(\lambda)$  is a (strict) weak subsolution of  $(P_{\lambda'})$ . On the other hand, since  $\lambda' < 0$ , any sufficiently large constant is a weak supersolution larger than  $U_+(\lambda)$ . By the weak sub-supersolutions method, we find a solution  $u$  of  $(P_{\lambda'})$  with  $u \geq U_+(\lambda)$ . In particular  $u > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$  and, by Proposition 3.6, we find that  $u \equiv U_+(\lambda')$ , which yields the conclusion.
2. Let  $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda_0 < 0$ . Since the sequence  $U_n := U_+(\lambda_n)$  stays bounded in  $C(\bar{\Omega})$ , it is bounded in  $X$ , and up to a subsequence, we have  $U_n \rightarrow U_0$  in  $X$ , for some  $U_0 \geq 0$ . Taking  $U_n - U_0$  as test function in  $(P_{\lambda_n})$  we find that  $U_n \rightarrow U_0$  in  $X$ . As  $\{U_n\}$  is positive and bounded away from zero in  $\Omega_a^+$ , we have  $U_0 > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ . Finally, since  $U_0$  solves  $(P_{\lambda_0})$  and  $\lambda_0 < 0$ , by uniqueness we must have  $U_0 \equiv U_+(\lambda_0)$ .
3. Arguing as in the previous item, we know that  $U_\lambda = U_+(\lambda)$  stays bounded in  $C(\bar{\Omega})$ , and thus in  $X$ , as  $\lambda \rightarrow -\infty$ , so

$$\int_{\Omega} U_\lambda^p = \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla U_\lambda|^p - \int_{\Omega} a U_\lambda^q \right) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $\lambda \rightarrow -\infty$ . Hence  $U_\lambda \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^p(\Omega)$ . Finally, since  $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla U_\lambda|^p \leq \int_{\Omega} a U_\lambda^q$  we have  $U_\lambda \rightarrow 0$  in  $X$ .

□

**Remark 3.8.** In the Dirichlet case  $(P_0)$  has a unique ground state solution, and this one is the only solution of  $(P_0)$  positive in  $\Omega_a^+$ , cf. [30, Theorem 1.1]. So the increasingness and continuity of  $U_+(\lambda)$  hold in  $(-\infty, 0]$ . The same conclusion applies to the Neumann problem if we assume  $\int_{\Omega} a < 0$ .

**Proposition 3.9.**

1. Any nontrivial weak subsolution of  $(P_{\lambda})$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}_+$  for  $\lambda \leq \lambda_1$ .
2. If  $\Omega_a^+$  is connected then  $U_+$  is the unique nontrivial solution of  $(P_{\lambda})$  for  $\lambda < 0$ . The same conclusion holds for  $\lambda = 0$  if  $\int_{\Omega} a < 0$  when  $X = W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ .

*Proof.*

1. We use the relation  $0 \leq E_{\lambda}(u) \leq \int_{\Omega} au^q$ , which holds for any weak subsolution with  $\lambda \leq \lambda_1$ . Moreover,  $E_{\lambda}(u) = 0$  only if  $\lambda = \lambda_1$  and  $u$  is an eigenfunction associated to  $\lambda_1$ , which is not possible since such eigenfunctions are positive in  $\Omega$  and  $a^- \not\equiv 0$ .
2. If  $\Omega_a^+$  is connected and  $u \not\equiv 0$  solves  $(P_{\lambda})$  with  $\lambda \leq 0$  then, since  $u \in \mathcal{A}_+$ , we have  $u \not\equiv 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ . By the strong maximum principle [35], we see that  $u > 0$  in  $\Omega_a^+$ . If  $\lambda < 0$  then Proposition 3.6 yields the conclusion. For  $\lambda = 0$  we make use of [30, Proposition 2.7].

□

## 4 Asymptotics and positivity results

Under the condition  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q > 0$  we show that  $U_+(\lambda)$  blows up and we provide an asymptotic expression for it as  $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1^-$ . A similar result holds for  $U_-(\lambda)$ . As a consequence we can deduce their positivity for  $\lambda$  close to  $\lambda_1$ .

**Theorem 4.1.**

1. If  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q > 0$  then  $U_+(\lambda) \sim m_+(\lambda)^{-\frac{1}{p-q}} \left(\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q\right)^{-\frac{1}{q}} \phi_1$  in  $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1^-$ , i.e.

$$m_+(\lambda)^{\frac{1}{p-q}} U_+(\lambda) \rightarrow \left(\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q\right)^{-\frac{1}{q}} \phi_1 \quad \text{in } C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1^-.$$

Moreover  $m_+$  is continuous with respect to  $\lambda$  and  $m_+(\lambda_1) = 0$ , so that  $\min_K U_+(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty$  for any compact  $K \subset \Omega$ . In particular,  $U_+(\lambda) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$  for  $\lambda$  close enough to (and smaller than)  $\lambda_1$ .

2. If  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q < 0$  then  $U_-(\lambda) \sim (-m_-(\lambda))^{-\frac{1}{p-q}} \left(-\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q\right)^{-\frac{1}{q}} \phi_1$  in  $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1^+$ , i.e.

$$(-m_-(\lambda))^{\frac{1}{p-q}} U_-(\lambda) \rightarrow \left(-\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q\right)^{-\frac{1}{q}} \phi_1 \quad \text{in } C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1^+,$$

and similar statements as in (1) hold for  $U_-$ .



Theorem 4.1 is a consequence of Corollary 3.2 and the following result:

**Proposition 4.2.**

1. If  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q > 0$  then  $V_+(\lambda) \rightarrow (\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q)^{-\frac{1}{q}} \phi_1$  in  $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1^-$ .
2. If  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q < 0$  then  $V_-(\lambda) \rightarrow (-\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q)^{-\frac{1}{q}} \phi_1$  in  $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1^+$ .

*Proof.* We shall prove only (1), since the proof of (2) is similar. Recall that  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q > 0$  implies that  $\lambda^* = \lambda_1$ . Note also that  $\lambda \mapsto m_+(\lambda)$  is continuous (since it is a concave map) and  $m_+(\lambda_1) = 0$ . Let  $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda_1^-$  and  $v_n := V_+(\lambda_n)$ . Then  $E_{\lambda_n}(v_n) = m_+(\lambda_n) \rightarrow 0$ . By Lemma 2.1(2) we know that  $\{v_n\}$  is bounded in  $X$ , and we may assume that  $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$  in  $X$ . We find that  $\int_{\Omega} av_0^q = 1$  and

$$E_{\lambda_1}(v_0) \leq \lim E_{\lambda_n}(v_n) = 0 \leq E_{\lambda_1}(v_0),$$

i.e.  $E_{\lambda_n}(v_n) \rightarrow E_{\lambda_1}(v_0) = 0$ . It follows that  $v_n \rightarrow v_0$  in  $X$  and  $v_0 = c\phi_1$  for some  $c > 0$ . From  $\int_{\Omega} av_0^q = 1$  we infer that  $c = (\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q)^{-\frac{1}{q}}$ . Finally, by standard regularity (e.g. [4, Lemma 2.3]), we obtain the convergence in  $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.3.**

1. A ‘bifurcation from infinity’ result as Theorem 4.1 has been established in [1, 13] for  $p = 2$ . Moreover, in [1] the author also deduces that the bifurcating solutions are positive. However, these works do not provide the asymptotics of the bifurcating solutions. Note also that such result does not hold in the indefinite superlinear case ( $p = 2$ ), under some further restrictions on  $a$  and  $q$ , in view of the *a priori* bounds established in [3, 8] for positive solutions of  $(P_{\lambda})$ .
2. Note that for the Neumann problem we have  $\phi_1 > 0$  on  $\overline{\Omega}$ , so  $\min_{\overline{\Omega}} U_{\pm}(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0^{\mp}$  if  $\int_{\Omega} a \gtrless 0$ .

We prove now that nonnegative minimizers associated to  $m_{\pm}$  are positive when  $q$  is close to  $p$ . To be more precise, they lie in  $\mathcal{P}^{\circ}$ .

First we need the following result:

**Proposition 4.4.**  $\lambda^*(p) = \lim_{q \rightarrow p^-} \lambda^*(q)$

*Proof.* Let  $q_n \rightarrow p^-$  and  $\lambda^*(q_n) = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^p$  with  $\int_{\Omega} |u_n|^p = 1$  and  $\int_{\Omega} a|u_n|^{q_n} \geq 0$ . Then  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded in  $X$ , so we can assume that  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_0$  in  $X$ , for some  $u_0$ . It follows that  $\int_{\Omega} |u_0|^p = 1$  and  $\int_{\Omega} au_0^p = \lim \int_{\Omega} au_n^{q_n} \geq 0$ , so that

$$\lambda^*(p) \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_0|^p \leq \liminf \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^p = \liminf \lambda^*(q_n).$$

Let now  $u$  be such that  $\lambda^*(p) = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p$ ,  $\int_{\Omega} |u|^p = 1$  and  $\int_{\Omega} a|u|^p \geq 0$ . We choose some  $B \subset \Omega_a^+$  and  $\psi \in C_0^1(B)$  such that  $\psi > 0$  in  $B$ . Then  $\int_{\Omega} a|u+t\psi|^p > 0$  for any  $t > 0$ , so that  $\lim \int_{\Omega} a|u+t\psi|^{q_n} > 0$  for any  $t > 0$ . It follows that  $\limsup \lambda^*(q_n) \leq \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u+t\psi)|^p}{\int_{\Omega} |u+t\psi|^p}$  for any  $t > 0$ . Letting  $t \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain  $\limsup \lambda^*(q_n) \leq \lambda^*(p)$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

Since  $q$  is not fixed anymore, we shall write  $m_{\pm} = m_{\pm}(q)$ .

**Proposition 4.5.** *For any  $\lambda < \lambda^*(p)$  there exists  $q_0 = q_0(\lambda, a) \in [1, p)$  such that any nonnegative minimizer associated to  $m_+(q)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{P}^\circ$  for  $q \in (q_0, p)$ . The same conclusion holds for nonnegative minimizers associated to  $m_-(q)$  if  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^p < 0$  and  $\lambda_1 < \lambda < \lambda^*(p)$ . Moreover, one can choose  $q_0(\lambda, a)$  as a decreasing function of  $\lambda$  for  $\lambda < 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda < \lambda^*(p)$ . By Proposition 4.4 we know that  $\lambda < \lambda^*(q)$  for  $q$  close enough to  $p$ . Assume by contradiction that there exists a sequence  $q_n \rightarrow p^-$  and a sequence  $\{v_n\} \subset \mathcal{S}_+$  with  $0 \leq v_n \notin \mathcal{P}^\circ$  and  $E_\lambda(v_n) = m_n := m_+(q_n)$ . Let us fix  $\phi \in X$  such that  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi^p = 1$ . Then  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi^{q_n} \rightarrow 1$ , and it follows that

$$0 < m_n \leq E_\lambda \left( \left( \int_{\Omega} a\phi^{q_n} \right)^{-\frac{1}{q_n}} \phi \right) \rightarrow E_\lambda(\phi),$$

i.e.  $\{m_n\}$  is bounded. By Lemma 2.1(2) we know that  $\{v_n\}$  is bounded in  $X$ , and we can assume that  $v_n \rightarrow v_0$  in  $X$ , and  $\int_{\Omega} av_0^p = \lim \int_{\Omega} av_n^{q_n} = 1$ , so that  $v_0 \not\equiv 0$ . Note also that  $v_n$  solves

$$-\Delta_p v_n = \lambda v_n^{p-1} + m_n a v_n^{q_n-1}, \quad v_n \in X.$$

Taking  $v_n - v_0$  as test function in this equation, we see that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^{p-2} \nabla v_n \nabla (v_n - v_0) \rightarrow 0.$$

By the  $(S_+)$  property of the  $p$ -Laplacian, we deduce that  $v_n \rightarrow v_0$  in  $X$ . Since  $\{m_n\}$  is bounded, we can assume that  $m_n \rightarrow m_0$  for some  $m_0 \geq 0$ . Taking the limit in the above equation, we see that  $v_0 \geq 0$  solves

$$-\Delta_p v_0 = \lambda v_0^{p-1} + m_0 a v_0^{p-1}, \quad v_0 \in X.$$

Since the strong maximum principle applies to this equation, we infer that  $v_0 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ . Finally, by elliptic regularity, we find that  $v_n \rightarrow v_0$  in  $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$  and consequently  $v_n \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$  for  $n$  large enough, which yields a contradiction. Therefore, setting

$$q_0(\lambda) := \inf\{q_0 \in (1, p) : \text{nonnegative minimizers for } m_+(q) \text{ lie in } \mathcal{P}^\circ \forall q \in (q_0, p)\},$$

we have proved that  $1 \leq q_0(\lambda) < p$ . Thanks to Corollary 3.2, for  $\lambda < 0$  we have

$$q_0(\lambda) = \inf\{q_0 \in (1, p) : U_+(\lambda, q) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ \forall q \in (q_0, p)\}.$$

Moreover, if  $\lambda < \lambda' < 0$  then, by Proposition 3.7,  $U_+(\lambda, q) \leq U_+(\lambda', q)$ , so that  $U_+(\lambda', q) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$  for  $q_0(\lambda) < q < p$ . It follows that  $q_0(\lambda') \leq q_0(\lambda)$ .

Assume now that  $\int_{\Omega} a\phi_1^q < 0$ , and  $\{v_n\} \subset \mathcal{S}_-$ , with  $0 \leq v_n \notin \mathcal{P}^\circ$  and  $E_\lambda(v_n) = m_n := m_-(\lambda, q_n)$  for every  $n$ . Since  $\lambda_1 < \lambda < \lambda^*(p)$  we have  $m_n < 0$  for every  $n$ . From Lemma 2.1(2) we deduce that  $\{v_n\}$  is bounded in  $X$ . Arguing as in the first part of the proof we reach a contradiction.  $\square$

Let us prove now that  $U_+$  becomes positive as  $a^-$  approaches zero. We fix  $\lambda < \lambda_1$ ,  $q$  and  $a$ . Set, for  $\delta > 0$ ,  $a_\delta := a^+ - \delta a^-$ , and

$$M_\delta := \inf \left\{ I_\delta(u) : u \in X, \int_\Omega a_\delta |u|^q > 0 \right\},$$

where

$$I_\delta(u) := \frac{1}{p} E_\lambda(u) - \frac{1}{q} \int_\Omega a_\delta(x) |u|^q$$

for  $u \in X$ .

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $\lambda < \lambda_1$  and  $a \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ . There exists  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that any nonnegative minimizer associated to  $M_\delta$  belongs to  $\mathcal{P}^\circ$  for  $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ .*

*Proof.* For  $\delta > 0$  small enough we have  $\int_\Omega a_\delta \phi_1^q \geq 0$ , and thus  $\lambda^*(a_\delta) = \lambda_1$ . It follows that  $M_\delta$  is achieved by  $U_+(\delta)$ . Assume by contradiction that  $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$  and  $u_n := U_+(\delta_n) \notin \mathcal{P}^\circ$ . By Lemma 2.1(3) we have

$$C_\lambda \|u_n\|^p \leq E_\lambda(u_n) \leq \int_\Omega a^+ u_n^q \leq C \|u_n\|^q$$

for some  $C, C_\lambda > 0$  and every  $n$ , so that  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded in  $X$ . We can assume that  $u_n \rightharpoonup u_0$  in  $X$ . Taking  $u_n - u_0$  as test function in the equation solved by  $u_n$ , we obtain that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^{p-2} \nabla u_n \nabla (u_n - u_0) \rightarrow 0.$$

By the  $(S_+)$  property of the  $p$ -Laplacian, we infer that  $u_n \rightarrow u_0$  in  $X$ , and by elliptic regularity, we have  $u_n \rightarrow u_0$  in  $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ . Since  $a_n \rightarrow a^+$  in  $C(\overline{\Omega})$ , we see that  $u_0$  solves

$$-\Delta_p u_0 = \lambda u_0^{p-1} + a^+(x) u_0^{q-1}, \quad u_0 \geq 0, \quad u_0 \in X.$$

By the strong maximum principle, we have either  $u_0 \equiv 0$  or  $u_0 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ . Let us show that  $u_0 \not\equiv 0$ , in which case we obtain a contradiction with  $u_n \notin \mathcal{P}^\circ$ . Recall that  $u_n$  is the unique nonnegative global minimizer of  $I_{\delta_n}$ . Let  $U$  be the unique positive global minimizer (cf. [17]) of

$$I_0(u) = \frac{1}{p} E_\lambda(u) - \frac{1}{q} \int_\Omega a^+(x) |u|^q, \quad u \in X.$$

Then

$$I_0(u_0) = \lim I_{\delta_n}(u_n) \leq \lim I_{\delta_n}(U) = I_0(U) < 0,$$

which shows that  $u_0 \equiv U \not\equiv 0$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 4.7.** It is clear that the previous result does not apply to  $U_-$  since this solution exists only if  $\int_\Omega a \phi_1^q < 0$ , which prevents  $a^-$  to be arbitrarily small. Similarly, it does not apply to  $U_+$  if  $\lambda > \lambda_1$ , since in this case, for  $\delta > 0$  small, we have  $\lambda_1 = \lambda^*$  and consequently  $M_\delta$  is not achieved (see Remark 2.4).

## 5 Dead core solutions

We prove now Theorem 1.8, which is a direct consequence of Proposition 5.2 below. Let us stress the dependence on  $a$  and write  $\lambda^*(a)$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_+(a)$ ,  $U_+(a)$ , and  $(P_{\lambda,a})$  instead of  $\lambda^*$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_+$ ,  $U_+$ , and  $(P_\lambda)$  respectively ( $q$  is fixed).

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $a \in C(\overline{\Omega})$  and  $\lambda < \lambda^*(a)$ . There exists a constant  $K = K(\lambda, a) > 0$  such that any weak subsolution  $u$  of  $(P_{\lambda,a})$  lying in  $\mathcal{A}_+(a)$  satisfies  $\|u\|_\infty \leq K$ .*

*Proof.* If  $u \in \mathcal{A}_+(a)$  is a subsolution of  $(P_{\lambda,a})$  then by Lemma 2.1 (3), we have

$$C_\lambda(a)\|u\|^p \leq E_\lambda(u) \leq \int_\Omega au^q \leq C(a)\|u\|^q,$$

for some  $C_\lambda(a), C(a) > 0$ . Thus  $\|u\| \leq (C(a)C_\lambda(a)^{-1})^{\frac{1}{p-q}}$ , and by a bootstrap argument we get the conclusion.  $\square$

Let  $\lambda_* = \lambda_*(a) := \inf \{ \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p : u \in X, \int_\Omega |u|^p = 1, a^- u \equiv 0 \}$ . Note that  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda^*(a) \leq \lambda_*(a)$ . Recall that  $\Omega_a^- := \{x \in \Omega : a < 0\}$ . The next result is based on the comparison of a given solution with a local barrier function vanishing in a prescribed set.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Assume that  $a \in C(\overline{\Omega})$  changes sign,  $\Omega' \Subset \Omega_a^-$ , and  $a_n := a^+ - na^-$ . There exists  $n_0 = n_0(a, p, q, N, \Omega', \lambda) > 0$  such that any solution of  $(P_{\lambda, a_n})$  lying in  $\mathcal{A}_+(a_n)$  vanishes in  $\Omega'$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ , provided one of the following conditions hold:*

1.  $\lambda \leq 0$  (in this case  $n_0$  does not depend on  $\lambda$ ).
2.  $p = 2$  and  $\lambda < \lambda_*(a)$ .

*Proof.* The proof is inspired by the computations in [21, Theorem 3.2].

1. Let  $B = B_R(x_0)$  be a ball with  $B \Subset \Omega_a^-$ . Let  $n > 0$  be large so that  $\int_\Omega a_n \phi_1^q < 0$  (and so,  $\lambda^*(a_n) > 0$ ), and let  $u_n \in \mathcal{A}_+(a_n)$  be a solution of  $(P_{\lambda, a_n})$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}u_n := -\Delta_p u_n - \lambda u_n^{p-1} = -na^- u_n^{q-1}$  in  $B$ . For  $k > 0$  and  $\beta > 1$  to be chosen later, let us define

$$w(x) := k \left( |x - x_0|^2 - t^2 \right)^\beta \quad \text{where } 0 \leq t < R, \quad t \leq |x - x_0| \leq R.$$

In order to avoid overloading the notation, we set  $r := |x - x_0|$  and write  $w = w(r) = k(r^2 - t^2)^\beta$ . We have that

$$|\nabla w|^{p-2} \nabla w = (2k\beta)^{p-1} (r^2 - t^2)^{(\beta-1)(p-1)} r^{p-2} (x - x_0)$$

and so, after some computations we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} \left( |\nabla w|^{p-2} \nabla w \right) &= (2k\beta)^{p-1} (r^2 - t^2)^{\beta(p-1)-p} r^{p-2} [2(\beta-1)(p-1)r^2 \\ &\quad + (p-2+N)(r^2 - t^2)]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since  $\lambda \leq 0$ , for  $t \leq r \leq R$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}w &\geq -\Delta_p w & (5.1) \\ &\geq -(2k\beta)^{p-1} (r^2 - t^2)^{\beta(p-1)-p} R^{p-2} [2(\beta-1)(p-1)R^2 \\ &\quad + (p-2+N)(R^2 - t^2)]. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now choose

$$\beta := \frac{p}{p-q}, \quad 0 < \underline{a} := \min_{\overline{B}} a^-, \quad \text{and} \quad (5.2)$$

$$k := \left( \frac{n\underline{a}}{(2\beta)^{p-1} R^{p-2} (2(\beta-1)(p-1)R^2 + (p-2+N)(R^2 - t^2))} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-q}}.$$

We observe that  $\beta(p-1) - p = \beta(q-1)$ . Taking into account this, (5.1) and (5.2), one can check that  $\mathcal{L}w \geq -na^-w^{q-1}$  in  $B \setminus B_t(x_0)$ . We now extend  $w$  by zero to the whole  $\overline{B}$ . Then  $w \in C^1(\overline{B})$ ,  $w'(t) = 0$  and hence, in the weak sense,  $\mathcal{L}w \geq -na^-w^{q-1}$  in  $B$ . Also, by (5.2) and Lemma 5.1 (applied with  $a_n$  and 0 in place of  $a$  and  $\lambda$ , respectively), enlarging  $n$  if necessary, we may assume that  $w > u_n$  on  $\partial B$ . We claim that, for such  $n$ ,  $w \geq u_n$  in  $B$ . Indeed, if this does not happen then  $\mathcal{O} := \{x \in B : w(x) < u_n(x)\} \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $w > u_n$  on  $\partial B$  it holds that  $w = u_n$  on  $\partial\mathcal{O}$ . Also,  $\mathcal{L}w \geq \mathcal{L}u_n$  in  $\mathcal{O}$ . Now, since  $\lambda \leq 0$ , the weak comparison principle (see e.g. [14, Theorem 1.2(a)]) applies to  $\mathcal{L}$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  and says that  $w \geq u_n$  in  $\mathcal{O}$ , a contradiction. Hence,  $w \geq u_n$  in  $B$  as claimed and, in particular,  $u_n \equiv 0$  in  $B_t(x_0)$ .

Finally, let  $\Omega' \Subset \Omega_a^-$  and set  $\delta := \text{dist}(\overline{\Omega'}, \partial\Omega_a^-) > 0$ . Take a finite covering of  $\Omega'$  of open balls  $B_{x_i}(t)$ , where  $t := \delta/2$ . Now set  $R := t + \varepsilon$ , with  $0 < \varepsilon < \delta/2$ . Then  $\Omega' \subset \cup B_{x_i}(t)$  and  $\cup B_{x_i}(R) \Subset \Omega_a^-$ , and hence item (1) follows from the above part of the proof.

2. We proceed similarly. We may assume that  $0 < \lambda < \lambda_*(a)$ . We first observe that  $\lambda^*(a_n) \rightarrow \lambda_*(a)$  when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Indeed, first note that  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda^*(a_n) \leq \lambda_*(a)$  for every  $n$ . Let  $z_n \geq 0$  achieve  $\lambda^*(a_n)$ , i.e.

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla z_n|^2 = \lambda^*(a_n), \quad \int_{\Omega} z_n^2 = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} a_n z_n^q \geq 0.$$

Then  $\{z_n\}$  is bounded in  $X$ , so we may assume that  $z_n \rightharpoonup z_0$  in  $X$ , for some  $z_0$ . From  $\int_{\Omega} a_n z_n^q \geq 0$  we deduce that

$$\int_{\Omega} a^- z_n^q \leq \frac{1}{n} \int_{\Omega} a^+ z_n^q \leq \frac{C}{n},$$

so that  $\int_{\Omega} a^- z_0^q = 0$ . Hence  $a^- z_0 \equiv 0$ , which yields

$$\lambda_*(a) \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla z_0|^2 \leq \lim \lambda^*(a_n) \leq \lambda_*(a),$$

i.e.  $\lambda_*(a) = \lim \lambda^*(a_n)$ . Let  $u_n \in \mathcal{A}_+(a_n)$  be a solution of  $(P_{\lambda, a_n})$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}u_n := -\Delta u_n - \lambda u_n = -na^-u_n^{q-1}$  in  $\Omega_a^-$ . By the above paragraph, taking  $n$  large enough we may assume that  $\lambda < \lambda^*(a_n)$ . Now, let  $B = B_R(x_0) \Subset$

$\Omega_a^-$  be a ball with  $R > 0$  small, so that  $\lambda < \lambda_1(B)$ . Define  $w \in C^1(\overline{B})$  as in item (1), with  $\beta$  and  $\underline{a}$  as in (5.2), and

$$k := \left( \frac{n\underline{a}}{2\beta((\beta-1)2R^2 + N(R^2 - t^2)) + \lambda(R^2 - t^2)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2-q}}. \quad (5.3)$$

After some computations we obtain, for  $t \leq r \leq R$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}w &= -k(r^2 - t^2)^{\beta-2} \left[ 2\beta((\beta-1)2r^2 + N(r^2 - t^2)) + \lambda(r^2 - t^2)^2 \right] \\ &\geq -k(r^2 - t^2)^{\beta-2} \left[ 2\beta((\beta-1)2R^2 + N(R^2 - t^2)) + \lambda(R^2 - t^2)^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Hence, since  $\beta(q-1) = \beta - 2$ , taking into account (5.3) and (5.4) we infer that  $\mathcal{L}w \geq -na^-wu^{q-1}$  in weak sense in  $B$ . Now, recalling that  $\lambda < \min(\lambda^*(a_n), \lambda_1(B))$  and  $\lambda_1(B) < \lambda_1(\mathcal{O})$  we may use Lemma 5.1 and apply the weak maximum principle to  $\mathcal{L}$  in  $\mathcal{O}$ . So, as in (1) we deduce that, enlarging  $n$  if necessary,  $w \geq u_n$  in  $B$  and therefore  $u_n \equiv 0$  in  $B_t(x_0)$ . The rest of the proof follows as in (1).  $\square$

**Remark 5.3.** One can easily see from the proof above that Theorem 1.8 and Proposition 5.2 are in fact true for nonnegative weak subsolutions of  $(P_{\lambda, a_n})$ .

## References

- [1] S. Alama, *Semilinear elliptic equations with sublinear indefinite nonlinearities*, Adv. Differential Equations **4** (1999), 813–842.
- [2] S. Alama, G. Tarantello, *On semilinear elliptic equations with indefinite nonlinearities*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **1** (1993), 439–475.
- [3] H. Amann, J. López-Gómez, *A priori bounds and multiple solutions for superlinear indefinite elliptic problems*, J. Differential Equations **146** (1998), 336–374.
- [4] D. Arcoya, D. Ruiz, *The Ambrosetti-Prodi problem for the  $p$ -Laplacian operator*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **31** (2006), 849–865.
- [5] C. Bandle, M. Pozio, A. Tesei, *The asymptotic behavior of the solutions of degenerate parabolic equations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **303** (1987), 487–501.
- [6] C. Bandle, M. Pozio, A. Tesei, *Existence and uniqueness of solutions of nonlinear Neumann problems*, Math. Z. **199** (1988), 257–278.
- [7] M. Belloni, B. Kawohl, *A direct uniqueness proof for equations involving the  $p$ -Laplace operator*, Manuscripta Math. **109** (2002), 229–231.
- [8] H. Berestycki, I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta, L. Nirenberg, *Superlinear indefinite elliptic problems and nonlinear Liouville theorems*, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. **4** (1994), 59–78.

- [9] H. Berestycki, I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta, L. Nirenberg, *Variational methods for indefinite superlinear homogeneous elliptic problems*, NoDEA Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. **2** (1995), 553–572.
- [10] I. Birindelli, F. Demengel, *Existence of solutions for semi-linear equations involving the  $p$ -Laplacian: the non coercive case*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **20** (2004), 343–366.
- [11] L. Brasco, G. Franzina, *Convexity properties of Dirichlet integrals and Picone-type inequalities*, Kodai Math. J. **37** (2014), 769–799.
- [12] H. Brezis, L. Oswald, *Remarks on sublinear elliptic equations*, Nonlinear Anal. **10** (1986), 55–64.
- [13] K.J. Brown, *The Nehari manifold for a semilinear elliptic equation involving a sublinear term*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **22** (2005), 483–494.
- [14] L. Damascelli, *Comparison theorems for some quasilinear degenerate elliptic operators and applications to symmetry and monotonicity results*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **15** (1998), 493–516.
- [15] M. Delgado, A. Suárez, *On the uniqueness of positive solution of an elliptic equation*, Appl. Math. Lett. **18** (2005), 1089–1093.
- [16] J. I. Díaz, *Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations and Free Boundaries. Vol.I. Elliptic equations*. Research Notes in Mathematics **106**, Pitman, London, 1985, 323 pp.
- [17] J.I. Díaz, J.E. Saa, *Existence et unicité de solutions positives pour certaines équations elliptiques quasilineaires. (French) [Existence and uniqueness of positive solutions of some quasilinear elliptic equations]* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **305** (1987), 521–524.
- [18] E. DiBenedetto,  *$C^{1+\alpha}$  local regularity of weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations*, Nonlinear Anal. **7** (1983), 827–850.
- [19] J. García-Melián, J. Sabina de Lis, *Maximum and comparison principles for operators involving the  $p$ -Laplacian*, J. Math Anal. Appl. **218** (1998), 49–65.
- [20] M. Guedda, L. Veron, *Quasilinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents*, Nonlinear Anal. **13** (1989), 879–902.
- [21] T. Godoy, U. Kaufmann, *Existence of strictly positive solutions for sublinear elliptic problems in bounded domains*, Adv. Nonlinear Stud. **14** (2014), 353–359.
- [22] T. Idogawa, M. Otani, *The first eigenvalues of some abstract elliptic operators*, Funkcialaj Ekvacioj **38** (1995), 1–9.
- [23] Y. Il'yasov, *On positive solutions of indefinite elliptic equations*, Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences-Series I-Mathematics **333** (2001), 533–538.

- [24] U. Kaufmann, H. Ramos Quoirin, K. Umezu, *Positivity results for indefinite sublinear elliptic problems via a continuity argument*, J. Differential Equations **263** (2017), 4481–4502.
- [25] U. Kaufmann, H. Ramos Quoirin, K. Umezu, *Positive solutions of an elliptic Neumann problem with a sublinear indefinite nonlinearity*, NoDEA Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. **25** (2018), Art. 12, 34 pp.
- [26] U. Kaufmann, H. Ramos Quoirin, K. Umezu, *A curve of positive solutions for an indefinite sublinear Dirichlet problem*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **40** (2020), 617–645.
- [27] U. Kaufmann, H. Ramos Quoirin, K. Umezu, *Nonnegative solutions of an indefinite sublinear Robin problem I: positivity, exact multiplicity, and existence of a subcontinuum*, Annali di Matematica (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10231-020-00954-x>
- [28] U. Kaufmann, H. Ramos Quoirin, K. Umezu, *Past and recent contributions to indefinite sublinear elliptic problems*, to appear in Rendiconti dell'Istituto di Matematica dell'Università di Trieste (2020). arXiv:2004.01284
- [29] U. Kaufmann, H. Ramos Quoirin, K. Umezu, *Nonnegative solutions of an indefinite sublinear Robin problem II: local and global exactness results*. arXiv:2001.09315
- [30] U. Kaufmann, H. Ramos Quoirin, K. Umezu, *Uniqueness and sign properties of minimizers in a quasilinear indefinite problem*, arXiv:2001.11318.
- [31] B. Kawohl, M. Lucia, S. Prashanth, *Simplicity of the principal eigenvalue for indefinite quasilinear problems*, Adv. Differential Equations, **12** (2007), 407–434.
- [32] H. B. Keller, D. S. Cohen, *Some positive problems in nonlinear heat conduction*, J. Math. Mech. **16** (1967), 1361–1376.
- [33] G. M. Lieberman, *Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations*, Nonlinear Anal. **12** (1988), 1203–1219.
- [34] T. Ouyang, *On the positive solutions of semilinear equations  $\Delta u + \lambda u + hu^p = 0$  on compact manifolds II*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **40** (1991), 1083–1141.
- [35] J.L. Vázquez, *A strong maximum principle for some quasilinear elliptic equations*. Appl. Math. Optim. **12** (1984), 191–202.