

Blow-up estimates and a priori bounds for the positive solutions of a class of superlinear indefinite elliptic problems*

Julián López-Gómez ^{†1} and Juan Carlos Sampedro ^{‡2}

¹Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Instituto de Matemática Interdisciplinar, Department of Mathematical Analysis and Applied Mathematics, Plaza de las Ciencias 3, 28040 Madrid, Spain

²Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Instituto de Matemática Interdisciplinar, Departamento de Matemática Aplicada a la Ingeniería Industrial, Ronda de Valencia 3, 28012 Madrid, Spain

February 5, 2024

Abstract

In this paper we find out some new blow-up estimates for the positive explosive solutions of a paradigmatic class of elliptic boundary value problems of superlinear indefinite type. These estimates are obtained by combining the scaling technique of Guidas–Spruck together with a generalized De Giorgi–Moser weak Harnack inequality found, very recently, by Sirakov [14, 15]. In a further step, based on a comparison result of Amann and López-Gómez [1], we will show how these bounds provide us with some sharp a priori estimates for the classical positive solutions of a wide variety of superlinear indefinite problems. It turns out that this is the first general result where the decay rates of the potential in front of the nonlinearity ($a(x)$ in (1.1)) do not play any role for getting a priori bounds for the positive solutions when $N \geq 3$.

Keywords: Superlinear indefinite problems, Weak Harnack inequality, Rescaling arguments, Blow-up estimates, A priori bounds, Mixed boundary conditions.

2020 MSC: 65P30, 65N06, 35J25, 35J60

1 Introduction

In this paper we deliver some new blow-up estimates and universal a priori bounds for the positive solutions of the semilinear elliptic boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u = \lambda u + a(x)u^r & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{B}u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where Ω is a bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^N , $N \geq 1$, of class \mathcal{C}^2 , $\lambda \geq 0$, and

$$\mathcal{L}u = -\operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla u),$$

*This work has been supported by the Ministry of Science and Innovation of Spain under the Research Grant PID2021-123343NB-I00 and by the Institute of Interdisciplinary Mathematics of the Complutense University of Madrid

[†]jlopezgo@ucm.es

[‡]juancarlos.sampedro@upm.es

A being a matrix of order N with entries in $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ such that, for some $\mu > 0$ and every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $x \in \Omega$,

$$\langle A(x)\xi, \xi \rangle \geq \mu |\xi|^2 \equiv \mu \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j^2.$$

Thus, \mathcal{L} is uniformly elliptic in Ω . Moreover, in (1.1), the boundary of Ω , $\partial\Omega$, is divided into two disjoint open and closed subsets $\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1 \subset \partial\Omega$ where the boundary operator $\mathcal{B} : \mathcal{C}(\Gamma_0) \otimes \mathcal{C}^1(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\partial\Omega)$ is defined through

$$\mathcal{B}u := \begin{cases} u & \text{on } \Gamma_0, \\ \partial_\nu u + \beta(x)u & \text{on } \Gamma_1, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where $\nu \in \mathcal{C}(\Gamma_1, \mathbb{R}^N)$ is an outward pointing nowhere tangent vector field, and $\beta \in \mathcal{C}(\Gamma_1)$, $\beta \geq 0$. Hence, \mathcal{B} is the Dirichlet boundary operator on Γ_0 and the Neumann or a first order regular oblique derivative boundary operator on Γ_1 . In (1.1), we also suppose that $a \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega})$ and $r > 1$. Throughout this paper, setting

$$\Omega_+ := \{x \in \Omega : a(x) > 0\}, \quad \Omega_- := \{x \in \Omega : a(x) < 0\}, \quad \Omega_0 := a^{-1}(0),$$

we will assume that Ω_+ and Ω_- are of class \mathcal{C}^2 , and that

$$\Omega_+ \neq \emptyset.$$

As $a \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\Omega})$, Ω_+ and Ω_- are open subsets of Ω , while Ω_0 is a compact subset of $\bar{\Omega}$. Moreover, a is bounded away from zero on compact subsets of Ω_\pm . Since Ω_+ and Ω_- are of class \mathcal{C}^2 , their boundaries can have, at most, finitely many components. Finally, we require that, for every component Γ of Γ_1 ,

$$\Gamma \subset \partial\Omega_\pm \quad \text{if } \Gamma \cap \partial\Omega_\pm \neq \emptyset. \quad (1.3)$$

Fixed $p > N$, by a solution of (1.1), we mean a pair $(\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ such that u satisfies (1.1) almost everywhere. A positive solution of (1.1) is a solution $(\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ such that $u \geq 0$ in Ω but $u \neq 0$ (i.e., $u \gtrsim 0$). Since $r > 1$, by the maximum principle, the positive solutions satisfy $u \gg 0$, in the sense that $u(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(x) < 0$ for all $x \in u^{-1}(0) \cap \partial\Omega$. This concept of solution makes sense because, by the Sobolev embeddings, $W^{2,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{2-N/p}(\bar{\Omega})$ if $p > N$. So, the boundary operator \mathcal{B} acts on the classical sense.

As $\Omega_+ \neq \emptyset$, this setting is wide enough as to include purely superlinear problems ($\Omega = \Omega_+$), general superlinear problems ($\Omega_- = \emptyset$) as well as superlinear indefinite problems ($\Omega_- \neq \emptyset$). In this paper we will focus attention on superlinear indefinite problems and on general superlinear problems without specific boundary conditions.

The problem of the existence of a priori bounds for purely superlinear problems ($\Omega = \Omega_+$) has attracted a huge amount of attention since the paper of Brézis and Turner [4] established the existence of a priori bounds, through some Hardy–Sobolev type inequalities, for the positive weak solutions of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda u + a(x)u^r & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

provided

$$r < p_{BT} \equiv \frac{N+1}{N-1}.$$

Later, Gidas and Spruck [9] got the existence of a priori bounds for the classical positive solutions of (1.4) for all $r > 1$ if $N = 2$, and for

$$r < p_{GS} \equiv \frac{N+2}{N-2} \quad \text{if } N \geq 3.$$

On this occasion the proof consisted of a blowing-up technique reducing the original equation to a Liouville type problem. Almost simultaneously, the same result was found by De Figueiredo, Lions and Nussbaum [8] by exploiting the symmetry properties of the Laplace operator.

Although the critical exponent p_{BT} might be thought to be of a technical nature, Souplet [16] has recently shown that it is actually optimal for weak solutions. Indeed, according to [16], whenever $p > p_{BT}$, there is a suitable nonlinearity $f(x, u) = a(x)u^p$, with $a(x) \geq 0$ and $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, for which (1.4) admits a positive unbounded weak solution.

More recently, Sirakov [14] has generalized these classical results obtaining the following theorem with no need to impose boundary conditions on the whole domain. Our statement is an adaptation of [14, Th. 2] to our setting. It should be noted that this result applies to general superlinear problems in the sense that, in contrast to the classical results, $a(x)$ is allowed to vanish somewhere in Ω . Subsequently, we will denote by \mathcal{P}_λ the λ -projection operator, $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\lambda, u) = \lambda$.

Theorem 1.1 (Sirakov, 2020). *Suppose $\Omega_- = \emptyset$ and $\Gamma \subset \partial\Omega$ is a relatively open subset of $\partial\Omega$ of class $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}$ regularity. Let \mathcal{D} be a subdomain of \mathbb{R}^N such that $\bar{\mathcal{D}} \subset \Omega \cup \Gamma$ and either*

$$r < \frac{N+1}{N-1}, \quad \text{or } r < \frac{N}{N-2} \text{ if } \bar{\mathcal{D}} \subset \Omega.$$

Then, for every subset of positive solutions, $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times W^{2,p}(\Omega)$, of

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u = \lambda u + a(x)u^r & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

with λ -projection $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S}} \equiv \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathcal{S})$ bounded, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{(\lambda, u) \in \mathcal{S}} \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D})} \leq C.$$

These bounds are derived from the generalized weak Harnack inequality of De Giorgi and Moser type given by Sirakov in [15, Cor. 1.1]. Next, by their relevance in this paper, we are going to deliver a short summary of these results at the light of the perspective adopted in [11]. The classical De Giorgi–Moser weak Harnack inequality establishes that, for every $q \in [1, \frac{N}{N-2})$, $y \in \Omega$ and $R > 0$ with $\bar{B}_R(y) \subset \Omega$, any weak non-negative superharmonic function $u \in H^1(\Omega) \equiv W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\|u\|_{L^q(B_R(y))} \leq C \inf_{B_{R/2}(y)} u, \quad (1.6)$$

where $C = C(N, q, R)$. On the other hand, by the uniform decay property of Hopf and Walter (see, e.g., [11, Th. 1.5]), there exists $M = M(R) > 0$ such that, for every positive superharmonic $u \in W^{2,p}(\Omega)$,

$$u(x) \geq M \left(\inf_{B_{R/2}(y)} u \right) \text{dist}(x, \partial B_R(y)). \quad (1.7)$$

Combining (1.6) and (1.7), it follows the estimate

$$u(x) \geq C \|u\|_{L^q(B_R(y))} \text{dist}(x, \partial B_R(y)), \quad (1.8)$$

where $C = C(N, q, R)$. Actually, (1.8) holds by replacing $B_R(y)$ by any subdomain \mathcal{D} with $\bar{\mathcal{D}} \subset \Omega$. The Sirakov result extends (1.8) up to the boundary $\partial\Omega$ by establishing that, for every weak non-negative superharmonic function $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ and any $q \in [1, \frac{N}{N-1})$,

$$\|u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C \inf_{\Omega} \frac{u}{d}, \quad d(x) = \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega), \quad (1.9)$$

where $C = C(N, q)$. The exponent $\frac{N}{N-1}$ is optimal in the sense that this estimate fails if $q \geq \frac{N}{N-1}$. From (1.9), Sirakov [15] infers the following result.

Theorem 1.2 (Sirakov, 2022). *Let $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ be a weak non-negative superharmonic function. Then, there exists a positive constant $C > 0$, independent of u , such that, for every $q \in [1, \frac{N}{N-1})$,*

$$u(x) \geq C \|u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega.$$

By combining Theorem 1.2 with some sharp refinements of the blowing-up arguments of Gidas and Spruck [9], we will infer the first main result of this paper, which can be stated as follows. It establishes the blow-up rates of the explosive positive solutions of (1.1).

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that $\Omega_+ \neq \emptyset$, $\bar{\Omega}_+ \subset \Omega$, $\Omega_- \neq \emptyset$, $1 \leq q < \frac{N}{N-1}$, and $\{(\lambda_n, u_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ is a sequence of positive solutions of (1.1), with $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ bounded, such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_+)} = +\infty.$$

Then, there exist $C = C(N, q) > 0$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that, for every $n \geq n_0$,

$$u_n(x) \geq C \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_+)}^{1 + \frac{(1-r)N}{2q}} \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_+) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega_+. \quad (1.10)$$

The estimate (1.10) is of great interest on its own. It might be useful even to get some parabolic counterparts in the vein outlined by Quittner and Simondon in [12].

In the context of superlinear indefinite problems, where $\Omega_+ \neq \emptyset$ and $\Omega_- \neq \emptyset$, no effective method for obtaining a priori bounds had been known, at least, until Berestycki, Capuzzo-Docetta and Nirenberg [2, 3] provided a sufficient condition in terms of the behaviour of $a(x)$ near Ω_0 . Precisely, imposing that

$$a \in C^2(\bar{\Omega}), \quad \nabla a(x) \neq 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \bar{\Omega}_+ \cap \bar{\Omega}_- \subset \Omega, \quad (1.11)$$

the main result of [2] guarantees the existence of a priori bounds for the classical positive solutions of (1.1) in the special case when $\mathcal{L} = -\Delta$, i.e., for $A(x) \equiv I_{\mathbb{R}^N}$, under Dirichlet boundary conditions, provided that

$$1 < r < \frac{N+2}{N-1}.$$

Later, Chen and Li [5, 6] proved, by a novel moving plane argument, that actually (1.11) entails the existence of a priori bounds for the positive solutions of (1.1) in a neighborhood of Ω_0 for every $r > 1$.

Under the general assumptions of this paper, adapting the Liouville theorem of [2] and using some comparison arguments, Amann and López-Gómez [1] improved the results of [2] in a different direction. Their main result reads as follows in our present setting.

Theorem 1.4 (Amann and López-Gómez, 1998). *Suppose $\Omega_+ \neq \emptyset$, $\bar{\Omega}_+ \subset \Omega$, $\Omega_- \neq \emptyset$, and there exist a continuous function $\alpha : \bar{\Omega}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, with $\alpha(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega_+$, and a constant $\gamma > 0$ such that*

$$a(x) = \alpha(x) [\operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_+)]^\gamma \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega_+. \quad (1.12)$$

Suppose, in addition, that

$$r < \frac{N+1+\gamma}{N-1} \quad \text{and} \quad r < \frac{N+2}{N-2} \quad \text{if } N \geq 3. \quad (1.13)$$

Then, if $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ is a set of positive solutions of (1.1) such that $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S}}$ is bounded, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{(\lambda,u) \in \mathcal{S}} \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C.$$

Note that (1.13) reduces to the Gidas–Spruck condition $r < \frac{N+2}{N-2}$ if $N \geq 3$ provided that $\gamma \geq \frac{2N}{N-2}$. Some time later, Du and Li [7] were also able to get the a priori bounds up to $r < \frac{N+2}{N-2}$ if $N \geq 3$ by imposing the additional conditions that $\mathcal{L} = -\Delta$ and that

$$a(x) = \alpha_1(x)[\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_+)]^{\gamma_1} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega_-, \quad (1.14)$$

for a continuous function $\alpha_1 : \bar{\Omega}_- \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\alpha_1(x) > 0$ if $x \in \partial\Omega_-$, and a constant $\gamma_1 > 0$.

A question that arises rather naturally is to ascertain whether or not these decaying conditions on $a(x)$ —(1.12) and (1.14)— are really necessary to guarantee the existence of a priori bounds. The main result of this paper shows that the decaying conditions (1.12) and (1.14) are unnecessary to have a priori bounds as soon as $r < p_{BT} = \frac{N+1}{N-1}$ if $N \geq 3$. It reads as follows.

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose that $\Omega_+ \neq \emptyset$, $\bar{\Omega}_+ \subset \Omega$, $\Omega_- \neq \emptyset$, and*

$$r < p_{BT} := \frac{N+1}{N-1} \quad \text{if } N \geq 3.$$

Then, for every set of positive solutions of (1.1), $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times W^{2,p}(\Omega)$, with $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S}}$ bounded, there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{(\lambda,u) \in \mathcal{S}} \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C.$$

Therefore, by simply imposing $r < p_{BT}$ if $N \geq 3$, one can get universal a priori bounds regardless the decay rates of $a(x)$ on $\partial\Omega_+ \cup \partial\Omega_-$ and the nature of the boundary conditions. We stress again that, according to Souplet [16], whenever $p > p_{BT}$, there exists $a \geq 0$ and $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that (1.4) admits a positive unbounded weak solution. Thus, the weak counterpart of Theorem 1.5, is optimal if valid. Anyway, it remains an open problem to ascertain whether or not one might improve the range $r < p_{BT}$ up to reach $p_{GS} := \frac{N+2}{N-2}$ if $N \geq 3$ under the minimal requirements of Theorem 1.5. Our proof of Theorem 1.5 proceeds by contradiction from the blowing-up rates of Theorem 1.3.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 collects some preliminary results that will be used in the proofs of the main results of this paper. Section 3 proves Theorem 1.3. Finally, based on these bounds, Section 4 delivers the proof of Theorem 1.5.

2 Preliminaries

We begin by delivering a technical lemma necessary to apply the scaling arguments of Gidas–Spruck type.

Lemma 2.1. *Let Ω be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^N and $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, +\infty)$ be two sequences satisfying*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} z_n = z_0 \in -\Omega, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mu_n = +\infty. \quad (2.1)$$

Then, for every $R > 0$, there exists $n_0 = n_0(R) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$B_R(0) \subset \mu_n (z_n + \Omega) \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0. \quad (2.2)$$

Therefore,

$$\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n(z_n + \Omega) = \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Proof. Since $z_0 \in -\Omega$ and $-\Omega$ is open, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B_\varepsilon(z_0) \subset -\Omega$. Pick $R > 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfying $|y| < R$, and observe that

$$y \in \mu_n(z_n + \Omega) \iff z_n - \mu_n^{-1}y \in -\Omega. \quad (2.3)$$

Choose $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$R\mu_n^{-1} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad |z_n - z_0| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0. \quad (2.4)$$

Then, for every $n \geq n_0$,

$$|z_n - \mu_n^{-1}y - z_0| \leq \mu_n^{-1}|y| + |z_n - z_0| < R\mu_n^{-1} + |z_n - z_0| < \varepsilon,$$

which implies that

$$z_n - \mu_n^{-1}y \in B_\varepsilon(z_0) \subset -\Omega \quad (2.5)$$

for all $n \geq n_0$. Thus, by (2.3), $y \in \mu_n(z_n + \Omega)$ for all $n \geq n_0$. As n_0 depends on R but not on y , we can infer (2.2). This concludes the proof. \square

In the proof of Theorem 1.5 we will invoke the next result, which is [1, Th. 4.1] and it is based on the strong maximum principle.

Proposition 2.2. *If $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ is a set of positive solutions of (1.1), then*

$$\sup_{(\lambda,u) \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{x \in \Omega_+} u(x) < +\infty \implies \sup_{(\lambda,u) \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{x \in \Omega} u(x) < +\infty. \quad (2.6)$$

In other words, uniform a priori bounds on Ω_+ imply uniform bounds on Ω .

The next result, which is [1, Lem. 4.2], will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.3. It establishes that the blow up of the positive solutions of (1.1) must occur on $\partial\Omega_+$.

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that $r < \frac{N+2}{N-2}$ if $N \geq 3$. Let $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ be a sequence of positive solutions of (1.1) such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_+)} = +\infty,$$

and let $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \bar{\Omega}_+$ be such that $u_n(x_n) = \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_+)}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{dist}(x_n, \partial\Omega_+) = 0.$$

The final preliminary result, which is [10, Th. 5], will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.3. It establishes the measure density condition for regular domains.

Theorem 2.4. *Let Ω be a C^1 -subdomain of \mathbb{R}^N . Then, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that, for every $x \in \Omega$ and $r \in (0, 1]$,*

$$\mathbf{m}(B_r(x) \cap \Omega) \geq cr^N,$$

where \mathbf{m} stands for the Lebesgue measure of \mathbb{R}^N .

3 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Suppose $1 \leq q < \frac{N}{N-1}$, and choose $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \bar{\Omega}_+$ with

$$u_n(x_n) = \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_+)} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By hypothesis,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_+)} = +\infty. \quad (3.1)$$

Since $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \bar{\Omega}_+$ and $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, by compactness, there exist two subsequences, again denoted by $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} x_n = x_0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_n = \lambda_0,$$

for some $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}_+$ and $\lambda_0 \geq 0$. By Theorem 2.3, necessarily, $x_0 \in \partial\Omega_+$ and consequently $a(x_0) = 0$. Subsequently, we set $M_n := \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_+)}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and consider the scaling function

$$v_n(\nu_n^{-1}(x - x_n)) = \nu_n^{\frac{2}{r-1}} u_n(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad \nu_n := M_n^{\frac{1-r}{2}}. \quad (3.2)$$

Observe that $\nu_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$v_n(0) = M_n^{-1} u_n(x_n) = 1.$$

According to (3.2), for every $n \geq 1$, the function v_n is well defined in the region

$$\mathcal{D}_n := \nu_n^{-1}(-x_n + \Omega),$$

and v_n can be equivalently defined by

$$v_n(y) := \nu_n^{\frac{2}{r-1}} u_n(x_n + \nu_n y), \quad y \in \mathcal{D}_n. \quad (3.3)$$

After some straightforward manipulations, it is easily seen that $v_n \in W^{2,p}(\mathcal{D}_n)$ and that it satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}v_n = \lambda_n \nu_n^2 v_n + a(x_n + \nu_n y) v_n^r, \quad y \in \mathcal{D}_n. \quad (3.4)$$

In order to understand the behavior of the sets \mathcal{D}_n as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we apply Lemma 2.1 with

$$z_n := -x_n, \quad \mu_n := \nu_n^{-1}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

to deduce that, for every $R > 0$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$B_R(0) \subset \nu_n^{-1}(-x_n + \Omega) = \mathcal{D}_n, \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0. \quad (3.5)$$

Fix $R > 0$ and choose $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying (3.5). Then, v_n is defined on $B_R \equiv B_R(0)$ for each $n \geq n_0$ and it satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}v_n = \lambda_n \nu_n^2 v_n + a(x_n + \nu_n y) v_n^r, & y \in B_R(0), \\ 0 \leq v_n \leq v_n(0) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

By the elliptic regularity L^p -theory, we can infer from (3.6) that $\{v_n\}_{n \geq n_0}$ is bounded in $W^{2,p}(B_R)$ for all $p > N$. Passing to a suitable subsequence, again denoted by $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and using the compactness of the embedding of $W^{2,p}(B_R)$ in each of the spaces $\mathcal{C}^1(B_R)$, $W^{1,p}(B_R)$

and $L^p(B_R)$, we can assume that there exists $v \in W^{2,p}(B_R)$ such that $v \geq 0$, $v_n \rightharpoonup v$ in $W^{2,p}(B_R)$ and $v_n \rightarrow v$ in $W^{1,p}(B_R)$ as well as in $C^1(B_R)$. This implies that

$$\mathcal{L}v_n \rightharpoonup -\operatorname{div}(A(x_0)\nabla v) \quad \text{in } L^p(B_R),$$

and that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} [\lambda_n \nu_n^2 v_n + a(x_n + \nu_n y) v_n^r] = a(x_0) v^r \quad (3.7)$$

strongly in $L^p(B_R)$. Since $a(x_0) = 0$ and $a : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, necessarily

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} a(x_n + \nu_n y) = a(x_0) = 0.$$

Hence, $v \in W^{2,p}(B_R)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(A(x_0)\nabla v) = 0, & y \in B_R, \\ 0 \leq v \leq v(0) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

As this argument can be repeated for each $R > 0$, by a standard diagonal sequence argument in $R > 0$ it is not difficult to see that v can be extended to a function $v \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(A(x_0)\nabla v) = 0, & y \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ 0 \leq v \leq v(0) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

Also by elliptic regularity, we may infer that $v \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Moreover, there exists an invertible matrix $M \in GL(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that the transformed function

$$w(z) := v(y), \quad z := My,$$

satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w = 0, & y \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ 0 \leq w \leq w(0) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

Thanks to the classical Liouville theorem, w is constant and necessarily $w \equiv 1$, because $w(0) = 1$. Therefore, $v \equiv 1$, which implies that, for every $R > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} v_n = 1 \quad \text{in } C^1(B_R). \quad (3.11)$$

In particular, for every (fixed) $R > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $n_0 \equiv n_0(R, \varepsilon) \geq 1$ such that

$$\|v_n - 1\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} < \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0. \quad (3.12)$$

By the definition of the rescaling function (3.2), equation (3.12) is equivalent to

$$\|M_n^{-1} u_n(x_n + M_n^{\frac{1-r}{2}} \cdot) - 1\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} < \varepsilon, \quad n \geq n_0. \quad (3.13)$$

Setting $r_n := M_n^{\frac{1-r}{2}} R$, equation (3.13) can be rewritten as

$$\|M_n^{-1} u_n - 1\|_{L^\infty(B_{r_n}(x_n))} < \varepsilon, \quad n \geq n_0.$$

In particular, the next lower bound holds

$$M_n(1 - \varepsilon) < u_n(x), \quad x \in B_{r_n}(x_n), \quad n \geq n_0. \quad (3.14)$$

On the other hand, since

$$\mathcal{L}u_n = \lambda_n u_n + a(x)u_n^r \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega_+,$$

it follows from Theorem 1.2, applied in Ω_+ , that

$$u_n(x) \geq C \|u_n\|_{L^q(\Omega_+)} \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_+) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega_+, \quad (3.15)$$

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

To estimate the norm $\|u_n\|_{L^q(\Omega_+)}$ we will exploit the local lower inequality (3.14) by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_n\|_{L^q(\Omega_+)}^q &= \int_{\Omega_+} |u_n|^q dx \geq \int_{B_{r_n}(x_n) \cap \Omega_+} |u_n|^q dx \\ &> M_n^q (1 - \varepsilon)^q \mathbf{m}(B_{r_n}(x_n) \cap \Omega_+). \end{aligned}$$

By hypothesis, Ω_+ is a \mathcal{C}^1 -subdomain of \mathbb{R}^N . Thus owing to Theorem 2.4, there exists a constant $c > 0$, independent of n , such that

$$\mathbf{m}(B_{r_n}(x_n) \cap \Omega_+) \geq cr_n^N \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Consequently, we obtain that

$$\|u_n\|_{L^q(\Omega_+)}^q > cr_n^N M_n^q (1 - \varepsilon)^q, \quad n \geq n_0,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\|u_n\|_{L^q(\Omega_+)} > c^{1/q} (1 - \varepsilon) R^{N/q} M_n^{1 + \frac{(1-r)N}{2q}}, \quad n \geq n_0. \quad (3.16)$$

Combining the estimates (3.15) and (3.16), we get (1.10). So, concluding the proof.

4 Proof of Theorem 1.5

We will argue by contradiction. Suppose that there exist sequences $\{(\lambda_n, u_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{S}$ and $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \bar{\Omega}$ such that

$$\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = u_n(x_n) \equiv M_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

for some $x_n \in \bar{\Omega}$, $n \geq 1$, and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = +\infty.$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\{M_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is increasing and, owing to Proposition 2.2, that $x_n \in \bar{\Omega}_+$ for all $n \geq 1$. By compactness, since $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \bar{\Omega}_+$ and $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has been taken to be bounded, we can assume also that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} x_n = x_0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_n = \lambda_0,$$

for some $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}_+$ and $\lambda_0 \geq 0$. By Theorem 2.3, necessarily, $x_0 \in \partial\Omega_+$, and so $a(x_0) = 0$.

Subsequently, for every $L > 0$, we set

$$[u_n > L] := \{x \in \Omega_+ : u_n(x) > L\}, \quad [u_n \leq L] := \{x \in \Omega_+ : u_n(x) \leq L\}.$$

Under these assumptions, and keeping the same notations, the next result establishes that the blow-up must occur in the whole of Ω_+ .

Lemma 4.1. For every $L > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{m}([u_n \leq L]) = 0.$$

Proof. By Theorem 1.3, for every $1 \leq q < \frac{N}{N-1}$, there are a positive constant $C = C(N, q) > 0$, independent of n , and an integer $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for each $x \in [u_n \leq L]$,

$$C M_n^{1 + \frac{N(1-r)}{2q}} \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_+) \leq u_n(x) \leq L, \quad n \geq n_0.$$

Thus,

$$\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_+) \leq LC^{-1} M_n^{\frac{N(r-1)}{2q}-1}, \quad n \geq n_0.$$

Consequently, for every $n \geq n_0$,

$$[u_n \leq L] \subset \mathcal{F}_n := \left\{ x \in \Omega_+ : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_+) \leq LC^{-1} M_n^{\frac{N(r-1)}{2q}-1} \right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

As we are assuming that $r < \frac{N+1}{N-1}$, it is apparent that

$$\frac{1}{2}(r-1)(N-1) < 1.$$

Pick any $\frac{1}{2}(r-1)(N-1) < \alpha < 1$, and set

$$q = \frac{\alpha N}{N-1}.$$

Then,

$$\frac{(r-1)N}{2q} - 1 < 0,$$

and hence,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} LC^{-1} M_n^{\frac{(r-1)N}{2q}-1} = 0.$$

Therefore, by the monotonicity of the sequence $\{M_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the definition of the sets $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \geq n_0}$, we find that

$$\mathcal{F}_{n_0} \supset \mathcal{F}_{n_0+1} \supset \cdots \supset \mathcal{F}_{n_0+n} \supset \cdots, \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcap_{n \geq n_0} \mathcal{F}_n = \emptyset.$$

Consequently, by the continuity from above of the Lebesgue measure, we can infer that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{F}_n) = \mathbf{m}\left(\bigcap_{n \geq n_0} \mathcal{F}_n\right) = 0.$$

Finally, by (4.1) and the monotonicity of the measure,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{m}([u_n \leq L]) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{F}_n) = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

This ends the proof. \square

Subsequently, we are denoting by

$$\sigma_1(a) \equiv \sigma_1[\mathcal{L}, \Omega_+; a] > 0$$

the (positive) principal eigenvalue of the weighted eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u = \sigma a(x)u & \text{in } \Omega_+, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_+. \end{cases}$$

The existence and uniqueness of $\sigma_1(a)$ follows from the abstract theory of [11, Ch. 9] taking into account that $\sigma_1[\mathcal{L}, \Omega_+] > 0$, where $\sigma_1[\mathcal{L}, \Omega_+]$ stands for the principal eigenvalue of

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u = \sigma u & \text{in } \Omega_+, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_+. \end{cases}$$

Now, let $L > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be two (arbitrary) positive constants such that

$$\sigma_1(a) = L^{r-1} - \varepsilon, \quad (4.3)$$

and let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\bar{\Omega}_+)$ be the unique positive eigenfunction associated to $\sigma_1(a)$ satisfying

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_+)} = 1.$$

Since $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_+$, integrating by parts in Ω_+ shows that, for every $n \geq n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_+} (\varphi \mathcal{L}u_n - u_n \mathcal{L}\varphi) &= \int_{\partial\Omega_+} \langle A(x)\mathbf{n}, \nabla\varphi \rangle u_n \, d\sigma - \int_{\partial\Omega_+} \langle A(x)\mathbf{n}, \nabla u_n \rangle \varphi \, d\sigma \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega_+} \langle A(x)\mathbf{n}, \nabla\varphi \rangle u_n \, d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, as $a(x) \gtrsim 0$ and $\sigma_1(a) > 0$, φ is a strict supersolution of $(\mathcal{L}, \Omega_+, \mathfrak{D})$, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}\varphi = \sigma_1(a)a(x)\varphi \gtrsim 0 & \text{in } \Omega_+, \\ \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_+. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, $h \equiv 1$ is a positive strict supersolution of \mathcal{L} in Ω_+ , under Dirichlet boundary conditions, such that $h(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \bar{\Omega}_+$. Consequently, by [11, Cor. 2.1], $\partial_\nu\varphi < 0$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega_+$, where ν is any outward pointing vector at x for all $x \in \partial\Omega_+$. By the ellipticity of $A(x)$, we have that

$$\langle A(x)\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n} \rangle > \mu|\mathbf{n}|^2 = \mu > 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega_+.$$

Hence, the co-normal vector field $\nu(x) := A(x)\mathbf{n}$ is an outward pointing vector at x for all $x \in \partial\Omega_+$. So,

$$\langle A(x)\mathbf{n}, \nabla\varphi \rangle = \partial_{\nu(x)}\varphi(x) < 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial\Omega_+.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{\Omega_+} (\varphi \mathcal{L}u_n - u_n \mathcal{L}\varphi) = \int_{\partial\Omega_+} \langle A(x)\mathbf{n}, \nabla\varphi \rangle u_n \, d\sigma < 0 \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0.$$

Equivalently, for every $n \geq n_0$,

$$\int_{\Omega_+} (\lambda_n u_n + a(x)u_n^r)\varphi - \sigma_1(a) \int_{\Omega_+} a(x)u_n\varphi = I_1 + I_2 < 0, \quad (4.4)$$

where

$$I_1 := \int_{[u_n > L]} (\lambda_n u_n + a(x)u_n^r)\varphi - \sigma_1(a) \int_{[u_n > L]} a(x)u_n\varphi,$$

$$I_2 := \int_{[u_n \leq L]} (\lambda_n u_n + a(x)u_n^r)\varphi - \sigma_1(a) \int_{[u_n \leq L]} a(x)u_n\varphi.$$

Thanks to (4.3), for every $n \geq n_0$, we have that

$$I_1 = \int_{[u_n > L]} \lambda_n u_n \varphi_n + \int_{[u_n > L]} (u_n^{r-1} - L^{r-1})a u_n \varphi + \varepsilon \int_{[u_n > L]} a u_n \varphi$$

$$\geq \varepsilon \int_{[u_n > L]} a u_n \varphi \geq L\varepsilon \int_{[u_n > L]} a \varphi.$$

On the other hand,

$$I_2 \geq -\sigma_1(a)L \int_{[u_n \leq L]} a \varphi.$$

Thanks to (4.4), we already know that $I_1 + I_2 < 0$. Thus,

$$L\varepsilon \int_{[u_n > L]} a \varphi - \sigma_1(a)L \int_{[u_n \leq L]} a \varphi < 0 \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0. \quad (4.5)$$

According to Lemma 4.1,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}_{[u_n > L]} = \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_+} \quad \text{pointwise almost everywhere in } \Omega_+.$$

Moreover, $a\varphi \in L^1(\Omega_+)$. Thus, owing to the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{[u_n > L]} a(x)\varphi = \int_{\Omega_+} a(x)\varphi. \quad (4.6)$$

On the other hand, since $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$, it is apparent that, for every $n \geq n_0$,

$$\left| \int_{[u_n \leq L]} a \varphi \right| \leq \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_+)} \mathbf{m}([u_n \leq L]).$$

Thus, thanks again to Lemma 4.1,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left| \int_{[u_n \leq L]} a \varphi \right| = 0. \quad (4.7)$$

Therefore, letting $n \uparrow \infty$ in (4.5), we find from (4.6) and (4.7) that

$$0 < L\varepsilon \int_{\Omega_+} a \varphi \leq 0,$$

which is impossible. This contradiction ends the proof of Theorem 1.5.

References

- [1] H. Amann and J. López-Gómez, A priori bounds and multiple solutions for superlinear indefinite elliptic problems, *J. Diff. Equ.* **146**, (1998), 336–374.
- [2] H. Berestycki, I. Capuzzo Dolcetta and L. Nirenberg, Superlinear indefinite elliptic problems and nonlinear Liouville theorems, *Top. Meth. Nonl. Anal.* **4**, (1994), 59–78.
- [3] H. Berestycki, I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta, and L. Nirenberg, Variational methods for indefinite superlinear homogeneous elliptic problems, *Nonl. Diff. Equ. Appl.* **2** (1995), 553–572.
- [4] H. Brezis and R. E. L. Turner, On a class of superlinear elliptic problems, *Comm. Part. Diff. Equ.* **2** (1977), 601–614.
- [5] W. Chen and C. Li, A priori estimates for prescribing scalar curvature equations, *Ann. of Math.* **145**, (1997), 547–564.
- [6] W. Chen and C. Li, Moving planes, moving spheres, and apriori estimates, *J. Diff. Equ.* **195** (2003), 1–13.
- [7] Y. Du and S. Li, Nonlinear Liouville theorems and a priori estimates for indefinite superlinear elliptic equations, *Adv. Diff. Equ.* **10** (2005), 841–860.
- [8] D. G. de Figueiredo, P. L. Lions and R. D. Nussbaum, A priori estimates and existence of positive solutions of semilinear elliptic equations, *J. Math. Pures et Appl.* **61** (1982), 41–63.
- [9] B. Gidas and J. Spruck, A priori bounds for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations, *Comm. in Part. Diff. Equ.* **6** (1981), 883–901.
- [10] P. Hajlasz, P. Koskela and H. Tuominen, Sobolev embeddings, extensions and measure density condition, *J. Funct. Anal.* **254** (2008), 1217–1234.
- [11] J. López-Gómez, *Linear Second Order Elliptic Operators*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2013.
- [12] P. Quittner and F. Simondon, A priori bounds and complete blow-up of positive solutions of indefinite superlinear parabolic problems, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **304** (2005), 614–631.
- [13] M. Ramos, S. Terracini, and C. Troestler, Superlinear indefinite elliptic problems and Pohozaev type identities, *J. Funct. Anal.* **159** (1998), 596–628.
- [14] B. Sirakov, A new method of proving a priori bounds for superlinear elliptic PDE, *J. Math. Pures et Appl.* **141** (2020), 184–194.
- [15] B. Sirakov, Global integrability and weak Harnack estimates for elliptic PDEs in divergence form, *Analysis & PDE* **15** (2022), 197–216.
- [16] P. Souplet, Optimal regularity conditions for elliptic problems via L^p_δ -spaces, *Duke Math. J.* **127** (2005), 175–192.