

Multiplicity for a strongly singular quasilinear problem via bifurcation theory

Carlos Alberto Santos^{a,*} Jacques Giacomoni^b
Lais Santos^c

^a *Universidade de Brasília, Departamento de Matemática
70910-900, Brasília - DF - Brazil*

^b *Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, LMAP (UMR E2S-UPPA CNRS 5142)
Bat. IPRA, Avenue de l'Université F-64013 Pau, France*

^c *Universidade de Viçosa, Departamento de Matemática
CEP 36570.000, Viçosa - MG, Brazil*

e-mails: csantos@unb.br, jacques.giacomoni@univ-pau.fr, lais.msantos@ufv.br

Abstract

A p -Laplacian elliptic problem in the presence of both strongly singular and $(p-1)$ -superlinear nonlinearities is considered. We employ bifurcation theory, approximation techniques and sub-supersolution method to establish the existence of an unbounded branch of positive solutions, which is bounded in positive λ -direction and bifurcates from infinity at $\lambda = 0$. As consequence of the bifurcation result, we determine intervals of existence, nonexistence and, in particular cases, global multiplicity.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classifications: 35J25, 35J62, 35J75, 35J92

Key words: Strongly singular nonlinearities, $(p-1)$ -superlinear terms, Bifurcation theory, Comparison Principle for $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ -sub and supersolutions.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we investigate the existence of an unbounded connected branch of solutions for the following λ -parameter problem

$$(P) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda(u^{-\delta} + u^q) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 2$) is a smooth bounded domain, $\Delta_p u = \text{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u)$ is the p -Laplacian operator, $1 < p < \infty$, $q > p-1$, $\delta > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ is a real parameter.

As a consequence of the singular nature at zero of the source term considered in (P) , the solutions of (P) are not smooth up to the boundary (see Theorem 2 in [28]). In fact, for $\delta \geq (2p-1)/(p-1)$ the gradient blows up near the boundary in such a way that no solution belongs to $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ (see Corollary 3.6 in [33]), but $u^\gamma \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for some $\gamma > \gamma(\delta) > 1$. The interested reader can consult [10] and [25] for more details about a optimal $\gamma(\delta)$. For this reason, we adopt the following definition.

*Carlos Alberto Santos acknowledges the support of CNPq/Brazil Proc. N^o 311562/2020 – 5.

Definition 1.1 We say that u is a solution for (P) if $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$, $u > 0$ in Ω , $(u - \varepsilon)^+ \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi dx = \lambda \int_{\Omega} (u^{-\delta} + u^q) \varphi dx \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega). \quad (1.1)$$

Singular problems appear in non-newtonian fluids models, turbulent flows in porous media, glaciology and many other contexts and have been widely investigated since the remarkable work of Crandall, Rabinowitz and Tartar [13] (see also reviews on the subject [23] and [26]). Concerning problems like

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda u^{-\delta} + \mu u^q, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, & u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ \delta > 0, & q > p - 1, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

with singular terms combined with $(p - 1)$ -superlinear ones, we can quote the pioneer work of Coclite and Palmeri [12], in which the authors considered (1.2) with $p = 2$, $\delta > 0$, $q \geq 1$, $\lambda = 1$ and proved existence of $\mu_* > 0$ such that the problem (1.2) has classical solution for $0 < \mu < \mu_*$ and has no solution for $\mu > \mu_*$. Mainly highlighting the studies in which strongly singular problems ($\delta > 1$) were considered, we can also mention Hirano et. al in [27] and Arcoya and Mérida [3]. In [27], the authors explored (1.2) with $\lambda = 1$, $p = 2$, $1 < q \leq 2^* - 1$ and using non-smooth analysis tools proved the existence of $\mu_* > 0$ such that (1.2) has at least two weak solutions for $0 < \mu < \mu_*$, at least one solution for $\mu = \mu_*$ and no solution for $\mu > \mu_*$. Whereas in [3] the problem (1.2) was studied with $p = 2$, $\mu = 1$, $1 < q < 2^* - 1$ and a local multiplicity of $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}$ -solutions was established through penalization arguments, a priori estimates and continuation theorem of Leray-Schauder.

In the case $p \neq 2$, few are known about (1.2), especially when $\delta > 1$. In [24], the problem (1.2) was considered with $\mu = 1$, $0 < \delta < 1$, $p - 1 < q \leq p^* - 1$ and global multiplicity with respect to the parameter λ was established by combining Brezis-Nirenberg type result with sub-supersolution ones. Recently, Bal and Garain in [6] generalized the results of Arcoya and Mérida [3] by considering $(2N + 2)/(N + 2) < p < N$.

The main goal of this paper is to study (P) by combining bifurcation theory, comparison principle for sub-supersolutions in $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with approximations arguments to prove the existence of a global unbounded connected of solutions for the problem (P). The main advantage of this approach is that, in addition to establish multiplicity of solutions, we obtain a global connected branch of solutions of (P). In the environment of singular problems, this kind of approach was considered in [1] and [8], where an analytic globally path connected branch of solutions was obtained for the cases $p = 2$ and fractional Laplace operator, respectively. In these works, analytic bifurcation theory is used and requires to deal with analytic operators. In the case of nonlinear diffusion operators as $-\Delta_p$, it is not clear if it is true.

Before presenting our main results, let us set some terminologies and notations. Denoting by $S = \{(\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times C_0(\overline{\Omega}) : (\lambda, u) \text{ solves (P) in the sense of Definition 1.1}\}$ and $\Sigma \subset S$ an unbounded connected set of S , we say that $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is a bifurcation value of Σ from infinity if there exists a sequence $\{(\lambda_n, u_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \Sigma$ such that $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda$ and $\|u_n\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The normalized positive eigenfunction associated to the first eigenvalue of $(-\Delta_p, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ is denoted by $\phi_1 \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$, that is,

$$-\Delta_p \phi_1 = \lambda_1 \phi_1^{p-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \phi_1|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

Now we can state our main results.

Theorem 1.1 Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain, $\delta > 0$ and $q > p - 1$. Then, there exists an unbounded connected set $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R} \times (W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p} \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega}))$ of positive solutions of (P) satisfying the following:

- a) $(0, 0) \in \overline{\Sigma}$,
- b) Σ contains the branch of minimal solutions of (P) and bifurcates from infinity at $\lambda = 0$.

Moreover, by letting $\overline{\text{Proj}}_{\mathbb{R}^+} \Sigma = [0, \Lambda^*]$, then:

i) $0 < \Lambda^* \leq \lambda_1(\zeta + 1)^\delta \zeta^{p-1}$, where $\zeta = \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}}$,

ii) for $\lambda > \Lambda^*$ there is no solution for (P) ,

iii) there exists $0 < \Lambda_* \leq \Lambda^*$ such that for $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda_*)$ there are at least two solutions of (P) on Σ . In addition, $\Lambda_* = \Lambda^*$ if $\delta \in (0, 1)$, that is, global multiplicity holds in this case.

In the proof of Theorem 1.1, we performed two approximation arguments, one in the $(p-1)$ -superlinear term u^q truncating it by $\min\{n, u\}^{q-p+1}u^{p-1}$, and the other one in the singular nonlinearity $u^{-\delta}$ by considering $(u + \epsilon)^{-\delta}$ for $\epsilon > 0$. The existence of an unbounded connected set of solutions for (P) will be obtained through a limit process of the continua Σ_ϵ^n as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, in that order, where Σ_ϵ^n are continua of positive solutions the (ϵ, n) -problems

$$(P_\epsilon^n) \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda [(u + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + \min\{n, u\}^{q-p+1}u^{p-1}] & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The advantage of this approach is that several qualitative informations may be extracted from continua Σ_ϵ^n due to the linear and non-singular nature of the nonlinearity in (P_ϵ^n) . Moreover, no additional conditions on the $(p-1)$ -superlinear power q are required.

The knowledge in literature (see [5] and [24]) and the behavior of the Σ_ϵ^n suggest that (P) should admit a solution on the extremal parameter Λ^* , but we were not able to prove such existence in Theorem 1.1, mainly by the fact that, under the assumptions considered there, any $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda^*)$ may be a bifurcation parameter of Σ from infinity. This type of behavior may be ruled out when it is possible to assure the existence of a priori estimates for the solutions of (P) for each fixed $\lambda > 0$.

Inspired by Azizieh and Clément [4], we proved a priori estimates by using the blow-up technique combined with Liouville type theorem for strictly convex and smooth domain. A crucial point in the proof presented by them is that the global maxima of the solutions are uniformly distanced from the boundary $\partial\Omega$. In our case, this fact will be established through the results of monotonicity of Damascelli and Sciunzi [15], but in this direction restrictions in the domain are essential.

Theorem 1.2 *Let Ω be a bounded strictly-convex and smooth domain in \mathbb{R}^N , $N \geq 2$. In addition, assume $p-1 < q < p^* - 1$. Then $\lambda = 0$ is the only bifurcation parameter of Σ from infinity, that is, for $\{(\lambda_n, u_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \Sigma$ with*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda \\ \|u_n\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty \end{cases}$$

one has $\lambda = 0$. As a consequence, (P) admits a solution for $\lambda = \Lambda^$, that is, global existence and local multiplicity hold.*

About other bifurcation diagrams and existence of extremal solutions with respect to the behaviour of the involved nonlinearity in the non-singular case, we quote [9], [16], [17], [21] and [32] for instance.

The main novelties of this paper are the following:

- (i) we propose here a different way to approach strongly-singular and $(p-1)$ -superlinear problems, compared to variational approaches used in most of papers in the current literature,
- (ii) the existence of a branch of positive solutions for (P) is established without any restriction on the singular and $(p-1)$ -superlinear powers,
- (iii) global multiplicity is proved for weak singularities, that is, $\delta \in (0, 1)$. This complements the principal result in [27] for $q > p^* - 1$,
- (iv) local multiplicity is proved in the case of strong singularity ($\delta \in [1, \infty)$), which is completely new and complements the main results in [3] and [6],

- (v) the establishment of $\lambda = 0$ as the only bifurcation point of the continua from infinity in convex domains, according to our knowledge, is new.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In section 2 we present several properties of the continuum Σ_ϵ^n . Such properties are essential in section 3, where we will prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

2 Approximated regular problem

Throughout this paper, we will denote by $e_p \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$ the solution of the p -Laplacian torsion problem

$$-\Delta_p u = 1 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \quad (1.3)$$

and by $\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} \in C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ the only positive solution of

$$-\Delta_p u = \lambda(u + \epsilon)^{-\delta} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad (1.4)$$

for each $\lambda > 0$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$, where $\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$ for $\epsilon > 0$ and $\omega_{\lambda,0} \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$.

For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$, let us consider the auxiliary problem

$$(P_\epsilon^n) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda [(u + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + f_n(u)] & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $f_n(u) = \min\{u, n\}^{q-p+1} u^{p-1}$.

Lemma 2.1 *Suppose $\delta > 0$. Then, for each $\epsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, there exists an unbounded continuum (connected and closed) $\Sigma_\epsilon^n \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ of positive solutions of (P_ϵ^n) emanating from $(0, 0)$.*

Proof It follows from the regularity results due to Lieberman ([29], Theorem 1) and Minty-Browder theorem ([18], Theorem 12.1) that for each $(\lambda, v) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times C(\overline{\Omega})$, the problem

$$-\Delta_p u = \lambda [(|v| + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + f_n(|v|)] \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \quad (1.5)$$

admits a unique solution $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$, for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Thus, the operator $T : \mathbb{R}^+ \times C(\overline{\Omega}) \rightarrow C(\overline{\Omega})$, which associates each pair $(\lambda, v) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times C(\overline{\Omega})$ to the only weak solution of (1.5), is well-defined.

It is classical to show that T is a compact operator by using Arzelà-Ascoli theorem. Hence, we are able to apply the bifurcation theorem by Rabinowitz (see Theorem 3.2 in [35]) to get an unbounded ϵ -continuum $\Sigma_\epsilon^n \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ of solutions of

$$T(\lambda, u) = u. \quad (1.6)$$

By the definition, $T(0, v) = 0$. Moreover, if $T(\lambda, 0) = 0$, then $\lambda = 0$. So we conclude that $\Sigma_\epsilon^n \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ is formed by nontrivial solutions of (1.6).

Finally, using that $0 < (|v| + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + f_n(|v|) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ for each given $v \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ and classical strong maximum principle from Vazquez [39], we obtain that $T((\mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\}) \times C(\overline{\Omega})) \subset \{u \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) : u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega\}$. Therefore, Σ_ϵ^n is a *continuum* of positive solutions of (P_ϵ^n) , for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ given. ■

Lemma 2.2 *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then:*

- a) *there exists $\Lambda_{\epsilon,n} = \Lambda_{\epsilon,n}(\epsilon, n, \Omega, \lambda_1, p, q)$ such that (P_ϵ^n) has no solution for $\lambda > \Lambda_{\epsilon,n}$.*
- b) *the value $\lambda = \lambda_1/n^{q-p+1}$ is the unique bifurcation point of Σ_ϵ^n from infinity.*

Proof

a) Since $[(t + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + f_n(t)] t^{1-p} \rightarrow n^{q-p+1}$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, we can find $C_* > 0$ such that

$$(t + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + f_n(t) \geq C_* t^{p-1}, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (1.7)$$

We claim that there is no solution of $(P_{\lambda, \epsilon}^n)$ for $\lambda > \lambda_1 C_*^{-1}$. Indeed, if $u_* > 0$ solves $(P_{\lambda, \epsilon}^n)$ for some $\lambda > \lambda_1 C_*^{-1}$, then u_* is a supersolution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = (\lambda_1 + \kappa) u^{p-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0, \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

for all $\kappa \in (0, \lambda C_* - \lambda_1)$. On the other hand, $s\phi$ is a subsolution of (1.8) satisfying $s\phi_1 < u_*$ in Ω for $s \in (0, 1)$ small enough. So, the monotonic iteration method provides a solution of (1.8) for any $\kappa \in (0, \lambda C_* - \lambda_1)$, which contradicts the fact that λ_1 is an isolate point in the spectrum of $(-\Delta_p, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ (see [2]).

b) Since Σ_ϵ^n is bounded in the λ -direction, it has to become unbounded in the direction of the Banach space $C_0(\overline{\Omega})$. Hence, there exists $\lambda_* > 0$ and a sequence $\{(\lambda_k, u_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \Sigma_\epsilon^n$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \|u_k\|_\infty \rightarrow +\infty \\ \lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda_* \end{cases}$$

Then $v_k := u_k / \|u_k\|_\infty$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p v_k = \lambda_k \left[n^{q-p+1} v_k^{p-1} + \frac{g(u_k)}{\|u_k\|_\infty^{p-1}} \right], & \text{in } \Omega \\ v_k > 0, \quad \|v_k\|_\infty = 1, \quad v_k|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

where

$$g(t) = (t + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + f_n(t) - n^{q-p+1} t^{p-1} = \begin{cases} (t + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + t^q - n^{q-p+1} t^{p-1}, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq n \\ (t + \epsilon)^{-\delta}, & \text{if } n < t \end{cases}$$

Notice that $|g(t)| \leq \epsilon^{-\delta} + 2n^q$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, so that the right hand side of the equation in (1.9) is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Hence, we can employ the regularity result due to Lieberman ([29], Theorem 1) to conclude that $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is uniformly bounded in $C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$, for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Therefore, it follows from Arzelà-Ascoli theorem that exists $v \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ and a subsequence $\{v_{k_j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ such that $v_{k_j} \rightarrow v$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ as $k_j \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, $v \geq 0$ in Ω , $\|v\|_\infty = 1$ and v solves

$$-\Delta_p v = \lambda_* n^{q-p+1} v^{p-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

Since v does not change signs, it follows from (Theorem 7, [30]) that $\lambda_* = \lambda_1 / n^{q-p+1}$. This concludes the proof of Lemma 2.2. ■

The next two lemmas claim that the continuum Σ_ϵ^n cross the line $\lambda = \lambda_1 / n^{q-p+1}$.

Lemma 2.3 *Let*

$$\varepsilon_0 = 2^{\frac{-q}{(q+\delta)(p-1)}}^{-1}, \quad N_0 = \lambda_1^{\frac{1}{q-p+1}} \left(\|\omega_{1,0}\|_\infty \varepsilon_0^{-1} \right)^{\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1}} + 1,$$

where $\omega_{1,0}$ is the only solution of (1.4), with $\lambda = 1$ and $\epsilon = 0$. Then for each $0 < \epsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and $n > N_0$, there exists $\varrho > 0$, independent of $\epsilon > 0$ and n , such that (P_ϵ^n) admits a solution for all $\lambda \in \left[\frac{\lambda_1}{n^{q-p+1}}, \frac{\lambda_1}{n^{q-p+1}} + \varrho \right)$.

Proof Clearly the only solution $\omega_{\lambda, \epsilon} \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ of the problem (1.4) is a subsolution of (P_ϵ^n) . To construct a supersolution of (P_ϵ^n) , let us consider $\overline{\omega}_{\lambda, \epsilon} = M\omega_{\lambda, \epsilon}$, where $M > 1$ will be chosen later. In order to $\overline{\omega}_{\lambda, \epsilon}$ be a supersolution of (P_ϵ^n) , we must have

$$-\Delta_p \overline{\omega}_{\lambda, \epsilon} = M^{p-1} \lambda (\omega_{\lambda, \epsilon} + \epsilon)^{-\delta} \geq \lambda \left[(M\omega_{\lambda, \epsilon} + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + f_n(M\omega_{\lambda, \epsilon}) \right] \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (1.10)$$

For the validity of the inequality (1.10), it is sufficient that

$$\begin{cases} \frac{M^{p-1}}{2(\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} + \epsilon)^\delta} \geq \frac{1}{(\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} + \epsilon)^\delta} \\ \frac{M^{p-1}}{2(\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} + \epsilon)^\delta} \geq M^q(\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} + \epsilon)^q \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

hold.

Since $\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon}$ is a subsolution of (1.4) and $\omega_{\lambda,0} = \lambda^{\frac{1}{p-1+\delta}}\omega_{1,0}$ is the only solution of (1.4) with $\epsilon = 0$, we can apply the comparison principle of [10, 36] to conclude that

$$\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} \leq \lambda^{\frac{1}{p-1+\delta}}\omega_{1,0} \text{ in } \Omega. \quad (1.12)$$

On the other hand, by the choice of N_0 and ε_0 , we have

$$\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{n^{q-p+1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1+\delta}} \|\omega_{1,0}\|_\infty + \epsilon < 2^{\frac{-q}{(q+\delta)(p-1)}}$$

for all $0 < \epsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and $n > N_0$. Hence, for any $0 < \varrho < \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{\|\omega_{1,0}\|_\infty}\right)^{p-1+\delta} - \frac{\lambda_1}{N_0^{q-p+1}}$ and for all $\lambda \in [\lambda_1/n^{q-p+1}, \lambda_1/n^{q-p+1} + \varrho]$ we obtain

$$\lambda^{\frac{1}{p-1+\delta}} \|\omega_{1,0}\|_\infty + \epsilon < 2^{\frac{-q}{(q+\delta)(p-1)}}, \quad (1.13)$$

for all $0 < \epsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and $n > N_0$. Thus, combining (1.12) and (1.13) one gets

$$\|\omega_{\epsilon,\lambda}\|_\infty + \epsilon < 2^{\frac{-q}{(q+\delta)(p-1)}}, \quad (1.14)$$

for all $\lambda \in [\lambda_1/n^{q-p+1}, \lambda_1/n^{q-p+1} + \varrho]$, $\epsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $n > N_0$. So, by setting $M = 2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$, it follows from (1.14) that

$$M < \left(\frac{1}{2(\|\omega_{\epsilon,\lambda}\|_\infty + \epsilon)^{\delta+q}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q-p+1}}. \quad (1.15)$$

As a consequence of (1.15), both inequalities in (1.11) are fulfilled for such M , whence $\bar{\omega}_{\epsilon,\lambda} = M\omega_{\epsilon,\lambda}$ is a supersolution of (P_ϵ^n) .

Now, let us prove that for $\lambda \in [\lambda_1/n^{q-p+1}, \lambda_1/n^{q-p+1} + \varrho]$, $0 < \epsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and $n > N_0$, the problem (P_ϵ^n) admits a solution in $[\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon}, \bar{\omega}_{\lambda,\epsilon}]$. For this, consider

$$g(x, t) = \begin{cases} (\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + f_n(\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon}) & \text{if } t < \omega_{\lambda,\epsilon}, \\ (t + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + f_n(t) & \text{if } \omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} \leq t \leq \bar{\omega}_{\lambda,\epsilon}, \\ (\bar{\omega}_{\lambda,\epsilon} + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + f_n(\bar{\omega}_{\lambda,\epsilon}) & \text{if } \bar{\omega}_{\lambda,\epsilon} < t \end{cases}$$

and the functional $I : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$I(u) = \frac{1}{p} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p dx - \lambda \int_\Omega G(x, u) dx,$$

where $G(x, t) = \int_0^t g(x, s) ds$. As usual, we can prove that $I \in C^1(W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \mathbb{R})$ is coercive and weakly lower semi-continuous. Hence, I achieves its global minimum at some $u_0 \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, which satisfies $-\Delta_p u_0 = \lambda g(x, u_0)$ in Ω .

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_\Omega (|\nabla \omega_{\lambda,\epsilon}|^{p-2} \nabla \omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} - |\nabla u_0|^{p-2} \nabla u_0) \nabla(\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} - u_0)^+ dx \\ &\leq \lambda \int_{[\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} > u_0]} ((\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + f_n(\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon}) - g(x, u_0)) (\omega_{\lambda,\epsilon} - u_0)^+ dx = 0, \end{aligned}$$

whence $u_0 \geq \omega_{\lambda,\epsilon}$ in Ω . In a similar way, we obtain $u_0 \leq \bar{\omega}_{\lambda,\epsilon}$ in Ω . Therefore, u_0 is the solution claimed. \blacksquare

Lemma 2.4 For all $0 \leq \epsilon < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}} < n$ and for each $\lambda \in \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}} \Sigma_{\epsilon}^n$, the problem (P_{ϵ}^n) admits at most a solution satisfying $\|u\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}}$.

Proof Define

$$g_{\epsilon}(t) = \frac{(t+\epsilon)^{-\delta} + f_n(t)}{t^{p-1}}, \quad \text{for } t > 0.$$

If $0 < t \leq n$, then g_{ϵ} becomes $g_{\epsilon}(t) = t^{1-p}(t+\epsilon)^{-\delta} + t^{q-p+1}$, whose derivative is

$$\begin{aligned} g'_{\epsilon}(t) &= (1-p)t^{-p}(t+\epsilon)^{-\delta} - \delta t^{1-p}(t+\epsilon)^{-\delta-1} + (q-p+1)t^{q-p} \\ &= t^{-p}(t+\epsilon)^{-\delta-1} [(1-p)(t+\epsilon) - \delta t + (q-p+1)t^q(t+\epsilon)^{1+\delta}] \\ &= t^{-p}(t+\epsilon)^{-\delta-1} [t(1-p-\delta) + \epsilon(1-p) + (q-p+1)t^q(t+\epsilon)^{1+\delta}] \\ &< t^{-p}(t+\epsilon)^{-\delta-1} [t(1-p-\delta) + (q-p+1)t^q(t+\epsilon)^{1+\delta}]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $0 < t \leq n$ satisfying

$$t + \epsilon \leq \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}}, \quad (1.16)$$

we have

$$(q-p+1)t^{q-1}(t+\epsilon)^{1+\delta} < (q-p+1)(t+\epsilon)^{q+\delta} < (p-1+\delta),$$

which implies in $g'_{\epsilon}(t) < 0$. In particular, if

$$0 \leq \epsilon < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < t < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}},$$

then (1.16) holds and as a result g_{ϵ} is decreasing. Hence, we can employ the uniqueness result of Díaz-Saa (see Theorem 1 in [20]) to conclude that for each $\lambda \in \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}} \Sigma_{\epsilon}^n$, the problem (P_{ϵ}^n) has a unique solution satisfying $\|u\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}}$. ■

Combining the previous lemmas, we have the following.

Lemma 2.5 There exist $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ (independent of $n > 0$) and $N_1 > 0$ (independent of $\epsilon > 0$) such that $(\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}} \Sigma_{\epsilon}^n \cap (\lambda_1/n^{q-p+1}, +\infty)) \times C_0(\bar{\Omega})_+ \neq \emptyset$, for all $0 < \epsilon < \varepsilon_1$ and $n > N_1$.

Proof Let ε_0, N_0, K and ϱ be the constantes introduced in Lemma 2.3. In Lemma 2.3 we proved that (P_{ϵ}^n) admits a positive solution for all $\lambda \in [\frac{\lambda_1}{n^{q-p+1}}, \frac{\lambda_1}{n^{q-p+1}} + \varrho)$, whenever $0 < \epsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and $n > N_0$. Moreover, for $\lambda \in [\frac{\lambda_1}{n^{q-p+1}}, \frac{\lambda_1}{n^{q-p+1}} + \varrho)$ the solution obtained there, say u , satisfies

$$\|u\|_{\infty} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{p-1+\delta}} \|\omega_{1,0}\|_{\infty}. \quad (1.17)$$

Thus, by taking $\varepsilon_1 = \min \left\{ \varepsilon_0, \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}} \right\}$,

$$N_1 = \max \left\{ N_0, \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q-p}}, \left(2^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \left(\frac{q-p+1}{p-1+\delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}} \lambda_1^{\frac{1}{p-1+\delta}} \|\omega_{1,0}\|_{\infty} \right)^{\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1}} \right\},$$

and reducing ϱ , if it is necessary, we conclude from (1.17) that $\|u\|_{\infty} < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}}$, whenever $0 < \epsilon < \varepsilon_1$, $n > N_1$ and $\lambda \in [\frac{\lambda_1}{n^{q-p+1}}, \frac{\lambda_1}{n^{q-p+1}} + \varrho)$. Indeed, for $n > N_1$, $\epsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$ and for all $\lambda \in [\frac{\lambda_1}{n^{q-p+1}}, \frac{\lambda_1}{n^{q-p+1}} + \varrho)$ one has

$$\lambda^{\frac{1}{p-1+\delta}} \|\omega_{1,0}\|_{\infty} + \epsilon < 2^{\frac{-q}{(q+\delta)(p-1)}}$$

and

$$\|u\|_\infty + \epsilon \leq \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}}.$$

After all these, the result follows by combining Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4. ■

The previous lemmas suggest that Σ_ϵ^n may have one of the shapes given in the figure below.




Fig.1. Possible bifurcation diagrams of Σ_ϵ^n

3 Asymptotic singular problem

The unbounded connected set of solutions of (P) will be obtained through limit process of Σ_ϵ^n as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$.

Definition 3.1 Let X be a Banach space and let $\{\Sigma_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a family of subsets of X . The set of all points $x \in X$ such that every neighborhood of x contains points of infinitely many sets $\{\Sigma_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is called the limit superior of $\{\Sigma_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and is written $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_n$. The set of all points y such that every neighborhood of y contains points of all but a finite number of the sets of $\{\Sigma_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is called the limit inferior of $\{\Sigma_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and is written $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_n$.

Lemma 3.1 ([40]) Let X be a normal space and let $\{\Sigma_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of unbounded connected subsets of X . Assume that:

- i) there exists $z^* \in \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_n$ with $\|z^*\| < +\infty$,
- ii) for every $R > 0$, $\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{+\infty} \Sigma_n \right) \cap \overline{B_R(0)}$ is a relatively compact set of X , where $\overline{B_R(0)} = \{x \in X : \|x\| \leq R\}$.

Then $C = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_n$ is unbounded, closed and connected set.

Lemma 3.2 ([40]) Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed vector space and $\{\Sigma_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ a sequence of unbounded sets whose limit superior is C and satisfies the following conditions:

i) there exists $z^* \in C$ with $\|z^*\| < +\infty$,

ii) $\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_n\right) \cap \overline{B_R(z^*)}$ is a relatively compact, for every $R > 0$.

Then, for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Sigma_n \subset V_\epsilon(C)$ for all $n > m$, where $V_\epsilon(C) = \{y \in X : \text{dist}(y, C) < \epsilon\}$.

Proposition 3.1 For each $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_1$, the problem

$$(P_\epsilon) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda [(u + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + u^q] & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

admits a continuum $\Sigma_\epsilon \subset W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ of positive solutions, which is bounded in the λ -direction, emanates from $(0, 0)$ and bifurcates from infinity at $\lambda = 0$.

Proof We will apply Lemma 3.1 to get such continuum. More precisely, consider $X = \mathbb{R} \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})$, $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_1$ and $n > N_1$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the continuum Σ_ϵ^n contains $(0, 0)$, whence $(0, 0) \in \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_\epsilon^n$. Moreover, by taking

$$\{(\lambda_j, u_j)\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \left(\bigcup_{n=N_1+1}^{+\infty} \Sigma_\epsilon^n\right) \cap \overline{B_R(0, 0)},$$

it follows from the mapping properties of the inverse p-Laplacian (see [29]) that $\|u_j\|_{C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})}$ is uniformly bounded, for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Thus, Arzelà-Ascoli theorem assures us that

$$\lambda_j \rightarrow \lambda \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u_j \rightarrow u \quad \text{in } C^1(\overline{\Omega}),$$

up to a subsequence. Hence, we are able to apply Lemma 3.1 to conclude that $\Sigma_\epsilon := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_\epsilon^n$ is unbounded, closed and connected set in $\mathbb{R} \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})$.

We claim that Σ_ϵ is formed by solutions of (P_ϵ) . In fact, if $(\lambda, u) \in \Sigma_\epsilon$, then

$$(\lambda_{n_j}, u_{n_j}) \rightarrow (\lambda, u) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times C_0(\overline{\Omega}),$$

for some subsequence $\{(\lambda_{n_j}, u_{n_j})\}$, where $(\lambda_{n_j}, u_{n_j}) \in \Sigma_\epsilon^{n_j}$. In particular, $\{\|u_{n_j}\|_\infty\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is uniformly bounded, thus once again invoking Lieberman regularity result [29] and applying Arzelà-Ascoli theorem we obtain that $(\lambda_{n_j}, u_{n_j}) \rightarrow (\lambda, u)$ in $\mathbb{R} \times C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$ and (λ, u) solves (P_ϵ) .

To prove that Σ_ϵ is bounded in the λ -direction, notice that the function

$$g_\epsilon(t) = \frac{(t + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + t^q}{t^{p-1}}, \quad \text{for } t > 0$$

admits a global minimum at $t_{\min} = h^{-1}(0)$, where $h : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an invertible function given by

$$h(t) = -\delta(t + \epsilon)^{-\delta-1}t^{1-p} + (1-p)(t + \epsilon)^{-\delta}t^{-p} + (q-p+1)t^{q-p}.$$

Moreover,

$$\left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}} - \epsilon < t_{\min} < \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}}. \quad (1.18)$$

So, denoting by $\zeta = \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}}$, we conclude from (1.18) that

$$g_\epsilon(t) \geq g_\epsilon(t_{\min}) \geq (\zeta + 1)^{-\delta} \zeta^{1-p}$$

for all $t > 0$ and $0 < \epsilon < \varepsilon_1 < 1$.

Suppose there exists $(\lambda_*, u_*) \in \Sigma_\epsilon$ with $\lambda_* > \lambda_1(\zeta + 1)^\delta \zeta^{p-1}$. Then, $\lambda_* g_\epsilon(t) \geq \lambda_1 + \kappa$ for every $\kappa > 0$ small enough, that is,

$$\lambda_* ((t + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + t^q) \geq (\lambda_1 + \kappa)t^{p-1}, \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

In particular, u_* is a supersolution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = (\lambda_1 + \kappa)u^{p-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0, \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.19)$$

for all $\kappa > 0$ small enough. Moreover, for $s > 0$ small $s\phi_1$ is a subsolution of (1.19) and satisfies $u_* \geq s\phi_1$ in Ω . Hence, by monotone interaction we obtain a solution of (1.19) for any $\kappa > 0$ small, contradicting the fact that λ_1 is an isolated point in the spectrum of $(-\Delta_p, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ (see [2]). Therefore, $\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}^+} \Sigma_\epsilon \subset [0, \lambda_1(\zeta + 1)^\delta \zeta^{p-1}]$, for any $0 < \epsilon < \varepsilon_1$.

Finally, let us prove that Σ_ϵ joins $(0, 0)$ to $(0, +\infty)$. In this direction, we first observe that there exists a sequence $\{(\lambda_k, u_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \Sigma_\epsilon$ such that $\lambda_k \rightarrow 0^+$ and $u_k \neq \underline{u}_{\lambda_k}$, where $\underline{u}_{\lambda_k}$ denotes the minimal solution of (P_ϵ) for $\lambda = \lambda_k$. Indeed, otherwise we could find some $\lambda_* > 0$ small enough such that $\Sigma_\epsilon \cap [0, \lambda_*] \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ contains only elements in the branch of minimal solution of (P_ϵ) (see Proposition 3.2-i) below), which is not possible by invoking Lemma 3.2. Therefore, consider a sequence $\{(\lambda_k, u_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \Sigma_\epsilon$ satisfying $\lambda_k \rightarrow 0^+$ and $u_k \neq \underline{u}_{\lambda_k}$. In this case, we must have $\|u_k\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty$, up to a subsequence. On the contrary, $\|u_k\|_\infty$ would be uniformly bounded, which combined with the $\lambda_k \rightarrow 0^+$ and Arzelà-Ascoli theorem would lead us to $(\lambda_k, u_k) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ in $\mathbb{R} \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})$, but this is not possible by uniqueness of solution for small λ and small norm (note that $t \mapsto [(t + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + t^q]/t^{p-1}$ is decreasing for $0 < t < \eta$, η small). Hence the continuum Σ_ϵ joins $(0, 0)$ to $(0, +\infty)$. ■

Proposition 3.2 *For each $0 < \epsilon < \varepsilon_1$, let $\overline{\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}^+} \Sigma_\epsilon} = [0, \Lambda_\epsilon]$ be the closure of the projection of Σ_ϵ onto the λ -axis. Then:*

- i) Σ_ϵ contains the branch of minimal solutions of (P_ϵ) ,
- ii) for $\lambda > \Lambda_\epsilon$ there is no solution of (P_ϵ) ,
- iii) for $0 < \lambda < \Lambda_\epsilon$ there are at least two solutions of (P_ϵ) on Σ_ϵ ,
- iv) the map $\epsilon \mapsto \Lambda_\epsilon$ is non decreasing.

Besides this, $0 < \Lambda_\epsilon \leq \lambda_1(\zeta + 1)^\delta \zeta^{p-1}$ for all $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, where $\zeta = \left(\frac{p-1+\delta}{q-p+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{q+\delta}}$.

Proof Part i): Since $\Sigma_\epsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})_+$, it follows from the theory of regularity for elliptic equations (see [29], Theorem 1) that $\Sigma_\epsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \times C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$. Let us denote by $(\Sigma_\epsilon, \mathbb{R} \times C)$ the set Σ_ϵ with the topology induced by $\mathbb{R} \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ and represent by $(\Sigma_\epsilon, \mathbb{R} \times C^1)$ the set Σ_ϵ with the topology induced by $\mathbb{R} \times C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$. As we have proved, $(\Sigma_\epsilon, \mathbb{R} \times C)$ is connected.

Claim: $(\Sigma_\epsilon, \mathbb{R} \times C^1)$ is connected. Indeed, let \mathbb{Z} be the set of integers with the topology induced by the usual topology on \mathbb{R} and $h : (\Sigma_\epsilon, \mathbb{R} \times C^1) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a continuous function. Then $h : (\Sigma_\epsilon, \mathbb{R} \times C) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is also continuous. Since $(\Sigma_\epsilon, \mathbb{R} \times C)$ is connected, it follows that $h : (\Sigma_\epsilon, \mathbb{R} \times C) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is constant, hence $h : (\Sigma_\epsilon, \mathbb{R} \times C^1) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is constant as well, which proves that $(\Sigma_\epsilon, \mathbb{R} \times C^1)$ is connected.

Now we are able to prove that Σ_ϵ contains the branch of minimal solutions of (P_ϵ) , that is, if $\lambda' \in (0, \Lambda_\epsilon)$ and $\underline{u}_{\lambda'}$ is a minimal solution of (P_ϵ) with $\lambda = \lambda'$, then $(\lambda', \underline{u}_{\lambda'}) \in \Sigma_\epsilon$. On the contrary, consider

$$A = (0, \lambda') \times \left\{ u \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ : 0 < u < \underline{u}_{\lambda'} \text{ in } \Omega, 0 > \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} > \frac{\partial \underline{u}_{\lambda'}}{\partial \nu} \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\}$$

an open and bounded set in $C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$, where v is the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega$. Notice that $A \cap \Sigma_\epsilon \neq \emptyset$ and, by our contradiction hypothesis, $\Sigma_\epsilon \cap (\{\lambda'\} \times [0, \underline{u}_{\lambda'}]) = \emptyset$. Moreover, for $(\lambda, u) \in \Sigma_\epsilon \cap \overline{A}$ with $\lambda \in [0, \lambda')$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u - \lambda(u + \epsilon)^{-\delta} &= \lambda u^q, \\ -\Delta_p \underline{u}_{\lambda'} - \lambda(\underline{u}_{\lambda'} + \epsilon)^{-\delta} &= \lambda' \underline{u}_{\lambda'}^q + (\lambda' - \lambda)(\underline{u}_{\lambda'} + \epsilon)^{-\delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.20)$$

where $\lambda u^q < \lambda' \underline{u}_{\lambda'}^q + (\lambda' - \lambda)(\underline{u}_{\lambda'} + \epsilon)^{-\delta}$ in Ω because $0 \leq u \leq \underline{u}_{\lambda'}$ in Ω . Thus, by taking advantage of the proof of the Theorem 2.3 in [24], we conclude from (1.20) that $u < \underline{u}_{\lambda'}$ in Ω . Therefore, $\Sigma_\epsilon \cap \partial A = \{(0, 0)\}$, which contradicts the unboundedness and C^1 -connectedness of Σ_ϵ . Hence, Σ_ϵ contains the branch of minimal solutions of (P_ϵ) .

Part ii): We argue by contradiction. Suppose there exists a pair (λ_*, u_*) of solution of the problem (P_ϵ) with $\lambda_* > \Lambda_\epsilon$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that u_* is a minimal solution of (P_ϵ) with $\lambda = \lambda_*$.

Consider the open and bounded set in $C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+$ defined by

$$A = (0, \lambda_*) \times \left\{ u \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ : 0 < u < u_* \text{ in } \Omega \text{ and } 0 > \frac{\partial u}{\partial v} > \frac{\partial u_*}{\partial v} \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\}$$

and notice that $A \cap \Sigma_\epsilon \neq \emptyset$. Proceeding exactly as in *Part-i)* one gets $\Sigma_\epsilon \cap \partial A = \{(0, 0)\}$, again contradicting the unboundedness and connectedness of Σ_ϵ .

Part iii): Let $\lambda' \in (0, \Lambda_\epsilon)$. In the following discussion, $\underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}$ denotes the minimal solution of (P_ϵ) with $\lambda = \Lambda_\epsilon$. If (P_ϵ) does not admit a solution for $\lambda = \Lambda_\epsilon$, then just replace $\underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}$ with $\underline{u}_{\lambda''}$, where $\lambda'' \in (\lambda', \Lambda_\epsilon)$. Now, we argue by contradiction. Suppose that $u \leq \underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}$, whenever $(\lambda', u) \in \Sigma_\epsilon$. In this case, it follows from the strong comparison principle [24] that $u < \underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}$ in Ω and $\partial u / \partial v > \partial \underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon} / \partial v$ on $\partial\Omega$. Consider the open and bounded set

$$V = \left\{ u \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ : u(x) < \underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}(x) \text{ in } \Omega \text{ and } \frac{\partial u}{\partial v}(x) > \frac{\partial \underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}}{\partial v}(x) \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\}$$

and $B = [0, \lambda'] \times V^c$. Clearly $\Sigma_\epsilon \cap B^c \neq \emptyset$ and $\Sigma_\epsilon \cap B \neq \emptyset$, because Σ_ϵ bifurcates from infinity at $\lambda = 0$ and emanates from $(0, 0)$. On the other hand, we have

$$\partial B = \left(\{0, \lambda'\} \times \overline{V^c} \right) \cup ([0, \lambda'] \times \partial V^c),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \partial V^c &= \overline{V} \cap \overline{V^c} \subseteq \left\{ u \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ : u(x) \leq \underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}(x) \text{ in } \Omega \text{ and } \frac{\partial u}{\partial v}(x) \geq \frac{\partial \underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}}{\partial v}(x) \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\} \\ &\quad \cap \left\{ u \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ : u(x) \geq \underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}(x) \text{ for some } x \in \Omega \text{ or } \frac{\partial u}{\partial v}(x) \leq \frac{\partial \underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}}{\partial v}(x) \text{ for some } x \in \partial\Omega \right\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ u \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ : u(x) \leq \underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}(x) \text{ in } \Omega \text{ and } u(x) = \underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}(x) \text{ for some } x \in \Omega \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{or } \frac{\partial u}{\partial v}(x) = \frac{\partial \underline{u}_{\Lambda_\epsilon}}{\partial v}(x) \text{ for some } x \in \partial\Omega \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies again by Theorem 2.3 in [24] that $\Sigma_\epsilon \cap [0, \lambda'] \times \partial V^c = \emptyset$. Since $\Sigma_\epsilon \cap (\{0, \lambda'\} \times \overline{V^c}) = \emptyset$, we have $\Sigma_\epsilon \cap \partial B = \emptyset$, contradicting the C^1 -connectedness of Σ_ϵ . From this, the proof of item-*iii)* is established.

Part iv): Let $\kappa > 0$ small, $0 < \epsilon_1 < \epsilon_2$ and denote by \underline{u}_i the minimal solution of the problem (P_{ϵ_i}) with $\lambda = \Lambda_{\epsilon_i} - \kappa$, $i = 1, 2$. In this case, \underline{u}_1 is a supersolution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = (\Lambda_{\epsilon_1} - \kappa) ((u + \epsilon_2)^{-\delta} + u^q) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.21)$$

and $v = 0$ is subsolution. So, (1.21) admits a positive solution in $[0, \underline{u}_1]$ and by arbitrariness of κ we conclude that $\Lambda_{\epsilon_1} \leq \Lambda_{\epsilon_2}$. \blacksquare

Below, we present some of the possible bifurcation diagrams of Σ_ϵ .




Figure 1: Possible bifurcation diagram for Σ_ϵ and non-existence regions

Lemma 3.3 Let $g \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R})$ be a non-negative function and $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset (0, 1)$ a sequence satisfying $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$. If $u_k \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda_k [(u + \epsilon_k)^{-\delta} + g(x, u)] & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.22)$$

such that $0 < \inf_k \lambda_k \leq \lambda_k \leq \lambda$ and $0 < u_k(x) \leq h(x)$, for some $\lambda > 0$ and $h \in C_0(\overline{\Omega})_+$, then there exists $(\lambda_*, u_*) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times (W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega}))$ such that

$$\lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda_* \quad \text{and} \quad u_k \rightarrow u_* \quad \text{in } C(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{and} \quad W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega),$$

up to a subsequence. Moreover, u_* solves

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda_* [u^{-\delta} + g(x, u)] & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.23)$$

Proof By our hypothesis on the sequence $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, there exists $\lambda_* > 0$ such that $\lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda_*$, up to a subsequence. Hence, for $\tau > 0$ small we have $0 < \lambda_* - \tau < \lambda_k < \lambda_* + \tau$, for every k enough large. From this inequality and classical weak comparison principles one obtains $\omega_{\lambda_* - \tau, 1} \leq u_k$ in Ω , where $\omega_{\lambda_* - \tau, 1} \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$ is the only solution of (1.4) with $\lambda = \lambda_* - \tau$ and $\epsilon = 1$.

Consider a sequence (Ω_i) of open sets in Ω such that $\Omega_i \subset \subset \Omega_{i+1}$, $\bigcup_i \Omega_i = \Omega$ and define $\gamma_i = \min_{\overline{\Omega_i}} \omega_{\lambda_* - \tau, 1}$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Using that $g(x, u_k) \leq \max_{\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \|h\|_\infty]} g(x, t)$ in Ω and testing the problem (1.22) against $\varphi = (u_k - \gamma_1)^+$, we obtain

$$\int_{[u_k \geq \gamma_1]} |\nabla u_k|^p dx = \lambda_k \int_{[u_k \geq \gamma_1]} [(u_k + \epsilon_k)^{-\delta} + g(x, u_k)] (u_k - \gamma_1)^+ dx \leq C_1,$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is a real constant independent of k . Hence, the sequence $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded in $W^{1,p}(\Omega_1)$ and there exists $u_{\Omega_1} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_1)$ and a subsequence $\{u_{k_j^1}\}$ of $\{u_k\}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} u_{k_j^1} \rightharpoonup u_{\Omega_1} \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(\Omega_1) \text{ and strongly in } L^s(\Omega_1) \text{ for } 1 \leq s < p^* \\ u_{k_j^1} \rightarrow u_{\Omega_1} \text{ a.e. in } \Omega_1. \end{cases}$$

Proceeding as above through a diagonal argument we can obtain subsequences $\{u_{k_j^i}\}$ of $\{u_k\}$, with $\{u_{k_j^{i+1}}\} \subset \{u_{k_j^i}\}$, and functions $u_{\Omega_i} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_i)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} u_{k_j^i} \rightharpoonup u_{\Omega_i} \text{ weakly in } W^{1,p}(\Omega_i) \text{ and strongly in } L^s(\Omega_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq s < p^* \\ u_{k_j^i} \rightarrow u_{\Omega_i} \text{ a.e. in } \Omega_i. \end{cases}$$

By construction, we have $u_{\Omega_{i+1}|_{\Omega_i}} = u_{\Omega_i}$. Hence,

$$u_* := \begin{cases} u_{\Omega_1} & \text{in } \Omega_1, \\ u_{\Omega_{i+1}} & \text{in } \Omega_{i+1} \setminus \Omega_i \end{cases}$$

belongs to $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and satisfies $\omega_{\lambda_* - \tau, 1} \leq u_* \leq h$ in Ω .

We claim that u_* is a solution of (1.23). Indeed, by taking $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ and using Theorem 2.1 of Boccardo and Murat [7], we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^{p-2} \nabla u_k \nabla \varphi dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi dx, \quad (1.24)$$

up to a subsequence. On the other hand, it follows from the convergence $u_k \rightarrow u_*$ a.e in Ω , continuity of g , uniform boundedness of $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem that

$$\lambda_k \int_{\Omega} [(u_k + \epsilon_k)^{-\delta} + g(x, u_k)] \varphi dx \rightarrow \lambda_* \int_{\Omega} [u_*^{-\delta} + g(x, u_*)] \varphi dx. \quad (1.25)$$

Therefore, combining (1.24) and (1.25) one has

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_*|^{p-2} \nabla u_* \nabla \varphi dx = \lambda_* \int_{\Omega} [u_*^{-\delta} + g(x, u_*)] \varphi dx,$$

for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, which proves that u_* solves (1.2).

To conclude that $(\lambda_k, u_k) \rightarrow (\lambda_*, u_*)$ in $\mathbb{R} \times C(\overline{\Omega})$ as well, we just need to combine L^∞ -uniform bound of $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and Arzelà-Ascoli theorem with Theorem 1.8 of [25]. \blacksquare

Lemma 3.4 Let $B_R(0,0) \subset \mathbb{R} \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ be the ball centered at $(0,0)$ with radius R , $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and $(\lambda_\epsilon, u_\epsilon) \in \left((0, \infty) \times (W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \right) \cap \overline{B}_R(0,0)$ be a pair of solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda [(u + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + u^q] & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.26)$$

satisfying $\|(\lambda_\epsilon, u_\epsilon)\|_\infty > \varrho$, for some $\varrho \in (0, R)$. Then, there exist positive constants $\mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{K}_1(R, \varrho)$ and $\mathcal{K}_2 = \mathcal{K}_2(r, R)$ such that

$$\lambda_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \mathcal{K}_1(R, \varrho) \phi_1 \leq u_\epsilon \leq r + \lambda_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \mathcal{K}_2(r, R)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} e_p \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (1.27)$$

for each $r \in (0, R]$ fixed, where e_p is defined in (1.3).

Proof To prove the first inequality in (1.27), we set

$$\mathcal{K}_2(r, R) = \max \{ t^{-\delta} + t^q : r \leq t \leq R+1, x \in \overline{\Omega} \},$$

where r is a fixed number on $(0, R]$, and $\mathcal{O}_r = \{x \in \Omega : u_\epsilon > r\}$. Then, it follows from the definition of \mathcal{K}_2 that

$$-\Delta_p \left(r + \lambda_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \mathcal{K}_2(r, R)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} e_p \right) = \lambda_\epsilon \mathcal{K}_2(r, R) \geq \lambda_\epsilon (u_\epsilon + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + u_\epsilon^q \geq -\Delta_p u_\epsilon \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}_r.$$

Since $r + \lambda_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \mathcal{K}_2(r, R)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} e_p - u_\epsilon = \lambda_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \mathcal{K}_2(r, R)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} e_p \geq 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{O}_r$, the claim is valid in \mathcal{O}_r by classical comparison principles. In the complementary of \mathcal{O}_r , the inequality is obvious.

To show the first inequality in (1.27), we start by proving that

$$\lambda_\epsilon > C_* := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}_2(\varrho/4, R)} \left(\frac{\varrho}{4 \|e_p\|_\infty} \right)^{p-1}, \frac{\varrho}{4} \right\}.$$

In fact, otherwise by taking $r = \varrho/4$ in the second inequality in (1.29) we would have $(\lambda_\epsilon, u_\epsilon) \in B_{3\varrho/4}(0,0) \subset \mathbb{R} \times C(\overline{\Omega})$, which contradicts the fact that $\|(\lambda_\epsilon, u_\epsilon)\|_\infty > \varrho$.

Now, let us define $\underline{u}_\epsilon = \lambda_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \mathcal{K}_1(R, \varrho) \phi_1$, where $\mathcal{K}_1(R, \varrho)$ will be chosen later. It follows from Picone's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_\Omega \left[|\nabla \underline{u}_\epsilon|^{p-2} \nabla \underline{u}_\epsilon \nabla \left(\frac{u_\epsilon^p - u_\epsilon^q}{\underline{u}_\epsilon^{p-1}} \right)^+ - |\nabla u_\epsilon|^{p-2} \nabla u_\epsilon \nabla \left(\frac{u_\epsilon^p - u_\epsilon^q}{u_\epsilon^{p-1}} \right)^+ \right] dx \\ &\leq \lambda_\epsilon \int_\Omega \left[\frac{\lambda_1 \mathcal{K}_1^{p-1} \phi_1^{p-1}}{(\lambda_\epsilon^{1/(p-1)} \mathcal{K}_1 \phi_1)^{p-1}} - \frac{(u_\epsilon + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + u_\epsilon^q}{u_\epsilon^{p-1}} \right] (\underline{u}_\epsilon^p - u_\epsilon^p)^+ dx \\ &= \lambda_\epsilon \int_\Omega \left[\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_\epsilon} - \frac{(u_\epsilon + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + u_\epsilon^q}{u_\epsilon^{p-1}} \right] (\underline{u}_\epsilon^p - u_\epsilon^p)^+ dx. \end{aligned} \quad (1.28)$$

Since $((t+1)^{-\delta} + t^q)/t^{p-1} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$, for $\tilde{K} > \max\{R, \lambda_1/C_*\}$ given we can find $a > 0$ such that $(t+1)^{-\delta} + t^q \geq \tilde{K} t^{p-1}$, for all $0 < t < a$. Hence, for $\mathcal{K}_1(R, \varrho) = a / \left(2\tilde{K}^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \|\phi_1\|_\infty \right)$ the first inequality in (1.27) holds. Indeed, if $|\underline{u}_\epsilon > u_\epsilon| > 0$ then

$$u_\epsilon \leq \underline{u}_\epsilon \leq \frac{a}{2} \text{ on } [\underline{u}_\epsilon > u_\epsilon].$$

Therefore, going back to (1.28) and using that $\lambda_1/\lambda_\epsilon \leq \lambda_1/C_*$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \lambda_\epsilon \int_\Omega \left[\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_\epsilon} - \frac{(u_\epsilon + \epsilon)^{-\delta} + u_\epsilon^q}{u_\epsilon^{p-1}} \right] (\underline{u}_\epsilon^p - u_\epsilon^p)^+ dx \\ &\leq \lambda_\epsilon \int_\Omega \left[\frac{\lambda_1}{C_*} - \frac{\tilde{K} u_\epsilon^{p-1}}{u_\epsilon^{p-1}} \right] (\underline{u}_\epsilon^p - u_\epsilon^p)^+ dx < 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is an absurd. Hence, $\lambda_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \mathcal{K}_1(R, \varrho) \phi_1 \leq u_\epsilon$ in Ω and the inequality (1.27) is proved.

Proof Theorem 1.1 Our proof will be based again on the Lemma 3.1. Initially, notice that $(0, 0) \in \Sigma_\epsilon$, for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_1$, whence the pair $(0, 0)$ fulfills the first condition of the mentioned lemma. To prove that the second condition in Lemma 3.1 is also satisfied, let $B_R(0, 0) \subset \mathbb{R} \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ be the ball centered at $(0, 0)$ with radius $R > 0$, $\{\epsilon_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, \epsilon_1)$ a sequence such that $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0^+$, and $\{(\lambda_k, u_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ a sequence in $\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{+\infty} \Sigma_{\epsilon_n}\right) \cap B_R(0, 0)$. We have three cases to consider:

- a) an infinite amount terms of the sequence $\{(\lambda_k, u_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ belongs to some Σ_{ϵ_n} .
- b) $(0, 0)$ is a limit point of $\{(\lambda_k, u_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$.
- c) $\{(\lambda_k, u_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ has terms on infinite amount of Σ_{ϵ_n} and $(0, 0)$ is not a limit point of this sequence.

If *a*) occurs, by using Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, we get a convergent subsequence in the $\mathbb{R} \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ -topology. If condition *b*) holds, naturally we have a convergent subsequence as well. In the case of *c*) be true, we can assume without loss of generality that $(\lambda_k, u_k) \in \Sigma_{\epsilon_k}$ and $\varrho \leq |(\lambda_k, u_k)|_\infty \leq R$, for some $\varrho > 0$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus we are able to use Lemma 3.4 to obtain positive constants $\mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{K}_1(R, \varrho)$ and $\mathcal{K}_2 = \mathcal{K}_2(r, R)$ such that

$$\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \mathcal{K}_1(R, \varrho) \phi_1 \leq u_k \leq r + \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \mathcal{K}_2(r, R)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} e \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (1.29)$$

for each $r \in (0, R]$ fixed.

Suppose that $\lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda \geq 0$. If $\lambda = 0$, then by (1.29) we have $(\lambda_k, u_k) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ in $\mathbb{R} \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})$, which contradicts the fact that $(0, 0)$ is not a limit point of the sequence $\{(\lambda_k, u_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$. Therefore, $0 < \inf_k \lambda_k \leq \lambda_k \leq R$ for all k sufficiently large. From this and (1.29), the existence of the subsequence convergent of $\{(\lambda_k, u_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a consequence of Lemma 3.3.

Therefore, from Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 3.2 we obtain that

$$\Sigma' := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_{\epsilon_n}$$

is unbounded, closed, connected and joins $(0, 0)$ to $(0, +\infty)$. Moreover, by Proposition 3.2 we also have $\overline{\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}^+} \Sigma'} := [0, \Lambda^*] \subset [0, \lambda_1(\zeta + 1)^\delta \zeta^{p-1}]$ and $\Lambda^* \leq \Lambda_\epsilon$ (see item-*iv* in Proposition 3.2).

Let us prove that $\Sigma := \Sigma' \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ has the properties stated in the theorem. It is a direct consequence of the Lemma 3.3 and the construction of Σ that Σ is formed by solutions of (P) .

Next, let us show that Σ contains the branch of minimal solutions of (P) . In fact, assume $\lambda_* \in \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}} \Sigma$, let $(\lambda_*, u_*) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ be a pair of solution of (P) and consider the iterative process

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u_n - \lambda_* u_n^{-\delta} = \lambda_* u_{n-1}^q & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_0 = 0, \quad u_n \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \end{cases} \quad (1.30)$$

It is clear that $u_0 \leq u_1$ in Ω . By induction, we assume $u_{n-1} \leq u_n$ in Ω and let us prove that $u_n \leq u_{n+1}$ in Ω . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u_n &= \lambda_* u_n^{-\delta} + \lambda_* u_{n-1}^q \\ -\Delta_p u_{n+1} &= \lambda_* u_{n+1}^{-\delta} + \lambda_* u_n^q \geq \lambda_* u_{n+1}^{-\delta} + \lambda_* u_{n-1}^q, \end{aligned}$$

that is, u_n is a solution and u_{n+1} is a supersolution of

$$-\Delta_p u = \lambda_* u^{-\delta} + \lambda_* u_{n-1}^q \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0,$$

respectively. So, we can apply the comparison principle of [36] to conclude that $u_n \leq u_{n+1}$ in Ω , as claimed.

Analogously, we can show that $0 < u_n \leq u_*$ in Ω , for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $0 < u_1 \leq u_n \leq u_*$ for all $n \geq 1$, we are able to employ the same steps of proof of Lemma 3.3 to ensure the existence of a solution

$\underline{u}_* \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ of (P) such that $u_n \rightarrow \underline{u}_*$ in $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and in $C_0(\overline{\Omega})$, up to a subsequence. Furthermore, the construction of \underline{u}_* assures us that this must be the minimal solution of (P) with $\lambda = \lambda_*$.

Finally, we will show that $(\lambda_*, \underline{u}_*) \in \Sigma$. To this end, let us consider $\epsilon_k \searrow 0^+$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ and denote by $\underline{u}_{\epsilon_k}$ the minimal solution of (P_{ϵ_k}) with $\lambda = \lambda_*$. Once again by monotonic iteration and the comparison principle in [36], we have

$$\underline{u}_1 \leq \underline{u}_{\epsilon_k} \leq \underline{u}_* \quad (1.31)$$

for all $\epsilon_k \in (0, 1]$. It follows from Lemma 3.3 and inequalities (1.31) that $\underline{u}_{\epsilon_k} \rightarrow \underline{u}_*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since $(\lambda_*, \underline{u}_{\epsilon_k}) \in \Sigma_{\epsilon_k}$, the construction of Σ provides $(\lambda_*, \underline{u}_*) \in \Sigma$.

Now let us verify that item-*ii*) holds. On the contrary, we could find a pair $(\lambda_*, u_*) \in \mathbb{R} \times (W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega}))$ of solution of the problem (P) with $\lambda_* > \Lambda^*$.

Let $\epsilon_k \searrow 0^+$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Given $\tau = (\lambda_* - \Lambda^*)/2$, we can apply Lemma 3.2 to find some $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Sigma_{\epsilon_k} \subset V_\tau(\Sigma')$, for all $k > k_0$. In particular, $\Lambda_{\epsilon_k} \leq \Lambda^* + \tau < \lambda_*$ for all $k > k_0$, where Λ_{ϵ_k} is the threshold parameter for the existence of solutions of (P_{ϵ_k}) . Let us fix $k > k_0$, $\hat{\lambda} \in (0, \Lambda_{\epsilon_k}]$ and consider $\hat{u}_{\epsilon_k} \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ the minimal solution of (P_{ϵ_k}) with $\lambda = \hat{\lambda}$. Since u_* is a supersolution of the problem (P_{ϵ_k}) with $\lambda = \hat{\lambda}$, once again by monotonic iteration we can conclude that $\hat{u}_{\epsilon_k} \leq u_*$ in Ω . So, about the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda_*(u + \epsilon_k)^{-\delta} + u^q & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.32)$$

we can summarize the following facts:

- \hat{u}_{ϵ_k} is a subsolution of (1.32);
- u_* is a supersolution of (1.32);
- $0 < \hat{u}_{\epsilon_k} \leq u_*$ in Ω .

Hence, we are able to apply Theorem 2.4 of [31] to get a $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ -solution of (1.32) in $[\hat{u}_{\epsilon_k}, u_*]$, which contradicts the fact that (1.32) does not admits any solution since $\lambda_* \notin \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}} \Sigma_{\epsilon_k}$. This proves item-*ii*).

Regarding item-*iii*), the multiplicity for $\lambda > 0$ small follows from the facts that Σ is connected and $\lambda = 0$ is a bifurcation value of Σ from the infinity and from the trivial solution. Indeed, let $C_* > 0$ be a positive constant such that (P) admits at most a positive solution satisfying $\|u\|_\infty \leq C_*$ (such constant exists by Lemma 2.4). If for some $\tilde{\lambda} > 0$ small enough (P) does not admit two distinct solutions in Σ , then we can define the open set $U = (0, \tilde{\lambda}) \times V$, where $V := \{u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) : \|u\|_\infty > C_*\}$, and conclude that $U^c \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset$ (since $(0, 0) \in \overline{\Sigma}$) and $U \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset$ (because $\lambda = 0$ is a bifurcation value of Σ from the infinity). However $\partial U \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$ because $\{0, \tilde{\lambda}\} \times \overline{V} = \emptyset$, due to our contradiction assumption, and $[0, \tilde{\lambda}] \times \partial V = \emptyset$, because $\|\underline{u}_\lambda\|_\infty < C_*$ for any $\lambda \leq \tilde{\lambda}$ since we are supposing $\tilde{\lambda}$ enough small. This contradiction leads us to conclude that there exists $\Lambda_* > 0$ such that (P) admits at least two solutions for $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda_*)$.

In the particular case, when $\delta \in (0, 1)$, the proof of the existence of at least two solutions for $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda^*)$ is obtained by redoing the proof of item-*iii*) in Proposition 3.2 and noting that in this case any continuous solution of (P) belongs to $C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$ (see Theorem B.1 in [24]). \blacksquare

Our goal from now on is to establish the proof of Theorem 1.2, which is essentially inspired by [4], see also [11] and [22]. For this, we need to introduce some definitions and preliminary results.

Lemma 3.5 ([4], Lemma 4.1) *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a convex and bounded domain with C^2 boundary. Then*

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x = y + t\nu(y), 0 < t < 2\rho\} \subset \Omega,$$

for some $\rho > 0$, where $\nu(y)$ denotes the inward unit normal to $\partial\Omega$ at y .

Let ν be a direction in \mathbb{R}^N with $|\nu| = 1$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ we set

- $T_\lambda^\nu = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \cdot \nu = \lambda\}$
- $a(\nu) = \inf_{x \in \Omega} x \cdot \nu$
- $\Omega_\lambda^\nu = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \cdot \nu < \lambda\}$, which is nonempty for $\lambda > a(\nu)$
- $x_\lambda^\nu = R_\lambda^\nu(x) = x + 2(\lambda - x \cdot \nu)\nu$, the reflection of $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ through the hyperplane T_λ^ν
- $(\Omega_\lambda^\nu)' = R_\lambda^\nu(\Omega_\lambda^\nu)$, the reflection of Ω_λ^ν through T_λ^ν
- $\Lambda_1(\nu) = \{\lambda > a(\nu) : \forall \mu \in (a(\nu), \lambda) \text{ none of conditions (a) and (b) holds}\}$, where the conditions (a) and (b) are the following:
 - $(\Omega_\lambda^\nu)'$ becomes internally tangent to $\partial\Omega$
 - T_λ^ν is orthogonal to $\partial\Omega$
- $\lambda_1(\nu) = \sup \Lambda_1(\nu)$

Lemma 3.6 [[4], Lemma 4.2] *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a convex and bounded domain with C^2 boundary and ρ given in Lemma 3.5. Then*

$$\inf_{x \in \partial\Omega} \text{dist}(x, T_{\lambda_1(\nu(x))}^{\nu(x)}) \geq \rho > 0.$$

Lemma 3.7 [[15], Theorem 1.5] *Let Ω be a bounded smooth domain in \mathbb{R}^N , $N \geq 2$, $1 < p < \infty$, $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a continuous function which is strictly positive and locally Lipschitz continuous in $(0, \infty)$ and $u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ a weak solution of*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = f(u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

For any direction ν and for λ in the interval $(a(\nu), \lambda_1(\nu)]$, we have

$$u(x) \leq u(x_\lambda^\nu), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_\lambda^\nu.$$

Now we are able to prove Theorem 1.2, which follows similar strategy considered in [4], with minor changes. However, for the reader convenience, we include the details here.

Proof of Theorem 1.2: We argue by contradiction, that is, let us assume that there exists $\check{\lambda} \in (0, \Lambda^*]$ being a bifurcation parameter of Σ from infinity. Then, by the construction of Σ , there would exist a subsequence of index $\mathbb{N}' \subset \mathbb{N}$, a numerical sequence $\{\epsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}'}$ such that $\epsilon_n \searrow 0$, and pairs $(\lambda_n, u_n) \in \Sigma_{\epsilon_n}$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_n \rightarrow \check{\lambda}, \\ \|u_n\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty. \end{cases}$$

Claim 1: For each $n \in \mathbb{N}'$, there exists a global maximum point $\tau_n \in \Omega$ of u_n (that is, $u_n(\tau_n) = \|u_n\|_\infty$) such that $\text{dist}(\tau_n, \partial\Omega) \geq \rho$.

Proof of claim 1: Assume by contradiction that every global maximum point τ of u_n satisfies $\text{dist}(\tau, \partial\Omega) < \rho - \epsilon$, for some $\epsilon \in (0, \rho)$. By fixing $\check{\tau}$ a such maximum and considering $\check{x} \in \partial\Omega$ the nearest point of $\partial\Omega$ from $\check{\tau}$, we have that $\text{dist}(\check{\tau}, \check{x}) = \text{dist}(\check{\tau}, \partial\Omega) < \rho - \epsilon$. Moreover, $\check{\tau}$ belongs to the normal line to $\partial\Omega$ at \check{x} , which will be denoted by L . From Lemma 3.6, we are able to find $y \in L \cap \Omega_{\lambda_1(\check{x})}^{\nu(\check{x})}$ with $\text{dist}(y, \check{x}) = \text{dist}(y, \partial\Omega) = \rho - \epsilon$. Since we are supposing that there are no global maximum points of u_n at a distance of $\partial\Omega$ greater than or equal to $\rho - \epsilon$, we conclude that $u(y) < u(\check{\tau})$, but this fact contradicts the monotonicity established in Lemma 3.7. So the claim is proved.

In what follows, we employ a blow-up method to derive a contradiction with the existence of the positive bifurcation parameter $\check{\lambda} \in (0, \Lambda^*]$. For this proposal, denote by

$$M_n = \|u_n\|_\infty = u_n(\tau_n),$$

where τ_n is a maximum point of u_n given by Claim 1, and define

$$w_n(y) = \frac{u_n(M_n^{-k}y + \tau_n)}{M_n}, \quad y \in \Omega_n := M_n^k(\Omega - \tau_n),$$

where $k = (q - p + 1)/p > 0$. Then, from the fact that $(\lambda_n, u_n) \in \Sigma_{\epsilon_n}$ and using change of variable in the integral one obtains

$$\int_{\Omega_n} |\nabla w_n|^{p-2} \nabla w_n \nabla \varphi dy = \lambda_n \int_{\Omega_n} [w_n^q + M_n^{-kp-p+1} (M_n w_n + \epsilon_n)^{-\delta}] \varphi dy, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega_n).$$

Given any $R > 0$, we obtain from $M_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $k > 0$ that $\overline{B_R(0,0)} \subset \Omega_n$ for n large enough, where $B_R(0,0)$ is the ball in \mathbb{R}^n centered at the origin with radius R . Fixing a such ball, notice that

$$(w_n(y)M_n + \epsilon_n)^{-\delta} \leq [u_n(M_n^{-k}y + x_n)]^{-\delta} \leq [\omega_{\lambda_n,1}(M_n^{-k}y + x_n)]^{-\delta}, \quad y \in \overline{B_R(0,0)}, \quad (1.33)$$

where $\omega_{\lambda_n,1}$ is the solution of (1.4) with $\lambda = \lambda_n$ and $\epsilon = 1$. Noting that $\lambda_n \rightarrow \check{\lambda} > 0$, we get from (1.33) that $(w_n(y)M_n + \epsilon_n)^{-\delta} \leq C_R$ in $\overline{B_R(0,0)}$, for some C_R depending on R but not of n . In this way, we can apply once again the regularity results of Lieberman [29] to conclude that w_n is $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{B_R(0,0)})$ uniformly bounded. Hence, using Arzelà-Ascoli theorem and a diagonalization argument one obtains a subsequence which converges locally uniformly in $C^{1,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to a $w \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla w|^{p-2} \nabla w \nabla \varphi dx = \check{\lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w^q \varphi dx, & \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \\ \|w\|_\infty = 1, & w > 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

that contradicts the result of Serrin and Zou (see Theorem II in [37]). Therefore, $\lambda = 0$ is the only bifurcation value of Σ from infinity. As a consequence, if $\lambda_n \nearrow \Lambda^*$ and $\underline{u}_{\lambda_n}$ is the minimal solution of (P) with $\lambda = \lambda_n$, then $\|\underline{u}_{\lambda_n}\|_\infty$ is uniformly bounded. So, from Lemma 3.3 we obtain the existence of $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ solution of (P) with $\lambda = \Lambda_*$ such that $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$. ■

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we present a new approach to deal with elliptic quasilinear problems perturbed by strongly-singular terms combined with $(p - 1)$ -superlinear nonlinearities on smooth bounded domains. With this approach, we were able to establish not only λ -ranging for existence and multiplicity but also qualitative information of the solutions depending on the parameter $\lambda > 0$. However, mainly due to the lack of a priori estimates and strong comparison principle for strongly-singular problems (that in general requires $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ -regularity of the solutions), we only provided a local multiplicity in the strong singular case ($\delta \geq 1$). An important challenge in this class of problems is to establish conditions to obtain global multiplicity.

References

- [1] Adimurthi, J. Giacomoni and S. Santra, *Positive solutions to a fractional equation with singular nonlinearity*, J. Differential Equations 265 (2018), 1191-1226.
- [2] A. Anane, *Simplicité et isolation de la première valeur propre du p -laplacien avec poids*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér. I-Math 305 (1987), 725-728.

- [3] D. Arcoya and L. Moreno-Mérida, *Multiplicity of solutions for a Dirichlet problem with a strongly singular nonlinearity*, Nonlinear Anal. 95 (2014), 281-291.
- [4] C. Azizieh and Ph. Clément, *A priori estimates for positive solutions of p -Laplace equations*, J. Differential Equations 179 (2002), 213-245.
- [5] J. P. Azorero, I. P. Alonso and J. J. Manfredi, *Sobolev versus Hölder local minimizers and global multiplicity for some quasilinear elliptic equations*, Commun. Contemp. Math. 2 (2000), 385-404.
- [6] K. Bal and P. Garain, *Multiplicity of solutions for a quasilinear equation with singular nonlinearity*, Mediterr. J. Math. 17 (2020), 1-20.
- [7] L. Boccardo and F. Murat, *Almost everywhere convergence of the gradients of solutions to elliptic and parabolic equations*, Nonlinear Anal. 19 (1992), 581-597.
- [8] B. Bougherara, J. Giacomoni and S. Prashanth, *Analytic global bifurcation and infinite turning points for very singular problems*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 52 (2015), no. 3-4, 829-856.
- [9] X. Cabré, Y. Martel, *Weak eigenfunctions for the linearization of extremal elliptic problems*, J. Funct. Anal. 156 (1998), 30-56.
- [10] A. Canino, B. Sciunzi and A. Trombetta, *Existence and uniqueness for p -Laplace equations involving singular nonlinearities*, Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. 23 (2016), 1-18.
- [11] W. Chen and C. Li, *A priori estimates for prescribing scalar curvature equations*, Ann. of Math., 145 (1997), 547-564
- [12] M. M. Coclite and G. Palmeri, *On singular nonlinear Dirichlet problem*, Commun. Partial Differential Equations 14 (1989), 1315-1327.
- [13] M. G. Crandall, P. H. Rabinowitz and L. Tartar, *On a Dirichlet problem with a singular nonlinearity*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 2 (1977), 193-222.
- [14] G. Dai, *Two Whyburn type topological theorems and its applications to Monge-Ampère equations*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 55 (2016) 97.
- [15] L. Damascelli and B. Sciunzi, *Regularity, monotonicity and symmetry of positive solutions of m -Laplace equations*, J. Differential Equations 206 (2) (2004), 483-515.
- [16] E. Dancer, *Infinitely many turning points for some supercritical problems*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) 178 (2000), 225-233.
- [17] E. Dancer, *Some bifurcation results for rapidly growing nonlinearities*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 33 (2013), 153-161.
- [18] K. Deimling, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, New York, 1985.
- [19] E. DiBenedetto, *$C^{1,\alpha}$ local regularity of weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations*, Nonlinear Anal. 7 (1983), 827-850.
- [20] J. I. Díaz and J. E. Saa, *Existence et unicité de solutions positives pour certaines équations elliptiques quasilinéaires*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I- Math. 305 (1987), 521-524.
- [21] J. Dolbeault, I. Flores, *Geometry of phase space and solutions of semilinear elliptic equations in a ball*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 359 (2007), 4073-4087.
- [22] D. de Figueiredo, P.L. Lions and R.D. Nussbaum, *A priori estimates and existence of positive solutions of semilinear elliptic equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 61 (1982), pp. 41-63

- [23] M. Ghergu and V. Rădulescu, *Singular elliptic problems: bifurcation and asymptotic analysis*, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [24] J. Giacomoni, I. Schindler and P. Takáč, *Sobolev versus Hölder local minimizers and existence of multiple solutions for a singular quasilinear equation*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) VI (2007), 117-158.
- [25] J. Giacomoni, D. Kumar, K. Sreenadh, *Sobolev and Hölder regularity results for some singular nonhomogeneous quasilinear problems*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/2004.06699>.
- [26] J. Hernández and F. J. Mancebo, *Singular elliptic and parabolic equations*, Handbook of Differential Equations, **3** (2006), 317-400.
- [27] 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 (2008), 1997-2037.
- [28] A. C. Lazer and P. J. McKenna, *On a singular nonlinear elliptic boundary value problem*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 111 (1991), 721-730.
- [29] G. Lieberman, *Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations*, Nonlinear Anal. 12 (1998), 1203-1219.
- [30] P. Lindqvist, *On a nonlinear eigenvalue problem*, Berichte Univ. Jyväskylä Math. Inst. 68 (1995), 33-54.
- [31] N. H. Loc and K. Schmitt, *Boundary value problems for singular elliptic equations*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. 41 (2011), 555-572.
- [32] Y. Miyamoto, Y. Naito, *Singular extremal solutions for supercritical elliptic equations in a ball*, Differential Equations 265 (2018), 2842-2885.
- [33] A. Mohammed, *Positive solutions of the p -Laplace equation with singular nonlinearity*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 352 (2009), 234-245.
- [34] K. Perera and E. Silva, *On singular p -Laplacian problems*, Differential Integral Equations 20 (1) (2007), 105-120.
- [35] P. H. Rabinowitz, *Some global results for nonlinear eigenvalue problems*, J. Functional Analysis 7 (1971), 487-513.
- [36] C. A. Santos and L. M. Santos, *How to break the uniqueness of $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ -solutions for very singular elliptic problems by non-local terms*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys 69 (6) (2018), 22 pp.
- [37] J. Serrin, H. Zou, *Cauchy-Liouville and universal boundedness theorems for quasilinear elliptic equations and inequalities*, Acta Math. 189 (2002) 79-142.
- [38] M. Väth, *Global solution branches and a topological implicit function theorem*, Annali di Matematica 186 (2) (2007), 199-227.
- [39] J. L. Vazquez, *A strong maximum principle for some quasilinear elliptic equations*, Appl. Math. Optim. 12 (1984), 191-202.
- [40] G. T. Whyburn, *Topological analysis*, Princeton Mathematical Series. No. 23. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1958.