

# SINGULAR SEMILINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS IN HALF-SPACES

PHUONG LE

ABSTRACT. We prove the monotonicity of positive solutions to the problem  $-\Delta u = f(u)$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N := \{(x', x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid x_N > 0\}$  under zero Dirichlet boundary condition with a possible singular nonlinearity  $f$ . In some situations, we can derive a precise estimate on the blow-up rate of  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta}$  as  $x_N \rightarrow 0^+$ , where  $(\eta, e_N) > 0$ , and obtain a classification result. The main tools we use are the method of moving planes and the sliding method.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The monotonicity and symmetry of solutions to the semilinear elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f(u) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where

$$\mathbb{R}_+^N := \{x := (x', x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid x_N > 0\},$$

are well studied in the literature. Berestycki, Caffarelli, and Nirenberg [4, 6] demonstrated that if  $f : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a Lipschitz function with  $f(0) \geq 0$ , then any classical solution of (1) is monotone in the  $x_N$ -direction. When  $f$  is only locally Lipschitz continuous on  $[0, +\infty)$ , a similar monotonicity result can be obtained for solutions that are bounded on all strips  $\Sigma_\lambda := \{(x', x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid 0 < x_N < \lambda\}$  ( $\lambda > 0$ ), as shown in [17, 27]. The case where  $f(0) < 0$  is more complex, and a complete proof of monotonicity for solutions in this scenario is currently only available for dimension  $N = 2$ , as detailed in [18, 19]. For results on symmetry of solutions, which is usually called rigidity in the literature, we refer to [2, 4, 5, 7, 13] and the references therein.

In this paper, we are mainly interested in problem (1) with singular nonlinearity at zero in the sense that  $f : (0, +\infty)$  is locally Lipschitz continuous and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} f(t) = +\infty$ . A model problem is given by

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\gamma} + g(u) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where  $\gamma > 0$  and  $g : [0, +\infty)$  is a locally Lipschitz continuous function. It's well established that solutions to problem (2) are generally not smooth up to the boundary.

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J61, 35J75, 35B06, 35B09.

*Key words and phrases.* semilinear elliptic equation, singular nonlinearity, half-space, monotonicity, rigidity.

In fact, it was shown in [23] and also in Theorem 2 below that the gradient of solutions becomes unbounded at the boundary. Given the natural regularity behavior of these solutions (as discussed in [14]), we focus on solutions  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  to (1). Consequently, the equation is well-defined in the classical sense within the domain's interior.

Since the seminal paper [14], singular semilinear elliptic problems

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\gamma} + g(u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  is a bounded domain, have been extensively studied from various perspectives. We specifically reference the works [3, 9, 10, 12, 15, 21–23], which are closely related to our research. A key focus in the study of these equations is understanding the behavior of solutions near the boundary, where they often lose regularity. A generalized version of the Höpf boundary lemma was obtained in [11]. The symmetry of solutions was studied in [15] (see also [16, 24] and the references therein).

As demonstrated in [11], to obtain the Höpf boundary lemma for (3), one may exploit a scaling argument near the boundary which leads to the study of a limiting problem in the half-space

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \frac{1}{u^\gamma} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

which is exactly problem (1) with  $f \equiv 0$ . Solutions to problem (4) have been classified recently in elegant papers [25, 26]. These results reveal that all weak solutions to (4) with  $\gamma > 1$  must be either of the form

$$u(x) \equiv \frac{(\gamma + 1)^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}}}{(2\gamma - 2)^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}} x_N^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}}$$

or of the form

$$u(x) \equiv \lambda^{-\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} v(\lambda x_N)$$

where  $\lambda > 0$  and  $v \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+})$  is the unique solution to

$$\begin{cases} -v'' = \frac{1}{v^\gamma}, & t > 0, \\ v(t) > 0, & t > 0, \\ v(0) = 0, \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} v'(t) = 1. \end{cases}$$

One notable feature of problem (4) is that its nonlinearity is decreasing on  $(0, +\infty)$ . Hence the weak comparison principle holds in large subdomains of  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$  and the monotonicity of solutions follows directly from this principle. In this paper, we consider a more general situation by studying the monotonicity and rigidity results for solutions  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  to (1) with a possible singular nonlinearity  $f$ . In particular, we address the issue that  $f$  is not decreasing in the whole  $(0, +\infty)$ . The main assumption on  $f$  we require is the following:

(F) for any  $M > 0$ , there exists  $C(M) > 0$  such that

$$f(s) - f(t) \leq C(M)(s - t) \quad \text{for all } 0 < t \leq s \leq M.$$

Our first result is the following monotonicity result, which holds in a very general setting. Indeed, we require only the behavior of  $f$  near its possible singular point.

**Theorem 1.** *Assume that  $f : (0, +\infty)$  is a locally Lipschitz continuous function satisfying (F) and there exist  $c_0, t_0 > 0$  such that*

$$f(t) > c_0 t \quad \text{for all } 0 < t < t_0.$$

Let  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  be a solution to (1) with  $u \in L^\infty(\Sigma_\lambda)$  for all  $\lambda > 0$ . Then

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_N} > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N.$$

Theorem 1 applies not only to singular nonlinearities but also the superlinear ones. Since  $f$  is not decreasing, we need to derive a weak comparison principle for the problem in narrow strips and exploit the moving plane method to prove Theorem 1. Similar results for singular problems in bounded domains were obtained in [11, 15]. Theorem 1 can be applied to problem (2) to yield the monotonicity of solutions. Furthermore, the inward derivatives of all such solutions must blow up near the boundary. Indeed, we can provide a precise estimate of the blow-up rate of derivatives as  $x_N \rightarrow 0^+$  in our next result.

**Theorem 2.** *Assume that  $\gamma > 1$  and  $g : [0, +\infty)$  is a locally Lipschitz continuous function. Let  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  be a solution to (2) with  $u \in L^\infty(\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}})$  for some  $\bar{\lambda} > 0$ . Then*

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_N} > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N.$$

Moreover, for each  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , there exist  $c_1, c_2, \lambda_0 > 0$  such that

$$c_1 x_N^{\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma+1}} < \frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial \eta} < c_2 x_N^{\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma+1}} \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_0} \quad (5)$$

for all  $\eta \in \mathbb{S}_+^{N-1}$  with  $(\eta, e_N) \geq \beta$ , where  $\mathbb{S}_+^{N-1} := \mathbb{R}_+^N \cap \partial B_1(0)$  and  $e_N := (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ .

In this paper, we also exploit the techniques and ideas from [25] to establish one-dimensional symmetry of solutions to singular problems whose a model is problem (2), where  $\gamma > 1$  and  $g : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a nonnegative locally Lipschitz continuous function such that  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} t^\gamma g(t) < +\infty$ . Notice that  $g$  may have a singularity at zero such as  $g(t) = \frac{1}{t^\beta}$  with  $\beta \geq \gamma$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Assume that  $\gamma > 1$  and  $f : (0, +\infty)$  is a positive locally Lipschitz continuous function satisfying (F) and*

(i) *there exists  $c_0 > 0$  such that*

$$f(t) > \frac{c_0}{t^\gamma} \quad \text{for all } t > 0,$$

(ii) *there exist  $c_1, t_1 > 0$  such that  $f$  is nonincreasing on  $(t_1, +\infty)$  and*

$$f(t) < \frac{c_1}{t^\gamma} \quad \text{for all } t > t_1.$$

Let  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  be a solution to (1) with  $u \in L^\infty(\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}})$  for some  $\bar{\lambda} > 0$ . Then  $u(x) \equiv v(x_N)$ , where  $v$  is given by the formula

$$\int_0^{v(t)} \frac{ds}{\sqrt{M + F(s)}} = \sqrt{2}t \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0$$

for some  $M \geq 0$ , where  $F(s) = \int_s^{+\infty} f(t)dt$ .

We will employ the sliding method, which was introduced by Berestycki and Nirenberg [8], to prove Theorem 3. We stress that in Theorem 3 we do not assume that  $f$  is nonincreasing in the whole domain  $(0, +\infty)$ . If this condition is granted, then we can show that solutions depend only on  $x_N$  without the assumption of their boundedness on strips. This in turn yields a classification result. The proof for the following result is similar to the one in [26].

**Theorem 4.** *Assume that  $f : (0, +\infty)$  is a nonincreasing positive locally Lipschitz continuous function. Let  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  be a solution to (1). Then  $u$  depends only on  $x_N$ . Consequently, such a solution exists if and only if  $\int_1^{+\infty} f(t)dt < +\infty$ . Moreover, when such a solution exists, it is given by  $u(x) \equiv v(x_N)$ , where  $v$  is determined by the formula*

$$\int_0^{v(t)} \frac{ds}{\sqrt{M + F(s)}} = \sqrt{2}t \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0$$

for some  $M \geq 0$ , where  $F(s) = \int_s^{+\infty} f(t)dt$ .

The rest of this paper is devoted to the proofs of our main results. In Section 2 we prove a comparison principle for narrow strips and derive some a priori estimates for solutions. In Section 3, we prove the monotonicity and rigidity of solutions by means of the moving plane and sliding methods.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Weak comparison principle for narrow strips.** We prove a weak comparison principle which can be applied to problems with singular nonlinearities.

**Proposition 5.** *Assume that  $f : (0, +\infty)$  is a locally Lipschitz continuous function such that (F) holds and  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u \leq f(u), & u > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u = 0 & & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u \in L^\infty(\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}}) & & \text{for some } \bar{\lambda} > 0. \end{cases}$$

Then there exists a small positive number  $\lambda^* = \lambda^*(f, \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}})}) < \bar{\lambda}$  such that: if  $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda^*$  and  $v \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v \geq f(v), & v > 0 & \text{in } \Sigma_\lambda, \\ v > 0 & & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u \leq v & & \text{on } \{x_N = \lambda\}, \end{cases}$$

then  $u \leq v$  in  $\Sigma_\lambda$ .

*Proof.* In what follows, we consider  $\lambda < \bar{\lambda}$ . For  $R > 0$ , let  $\varphi_R \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N-1})$  be such that

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq \varphi_R \leq 1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{N-1}, \\ \varphi_R = 1 & \text{in } B'_R, \\ \varphi_R = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \setminus B'_{2R}, \\ |\nabla \varphi_R| \leq \frac{2}{R} & \text{in } B'_{2R} \setminus B'_R, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $B'_r$  denotes the ball in  $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$  of center  $0' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$  with radius  $r$ . We set

$$\varphi(x) = w^+(x) \varphi_R^2(x') \chi_{\Sigma_\lambda}(x),$$

where  $w^+ := \max\{u - v, 0\}$ . Since the support of  $\varphi$  is compactly contained in  $\Sigma_\lambda \cup \{x_N = \lambda\}$ , we can use it as a test function in  $-\Delta u \leq f(u)$  and  $-\Delta v \geq f(v)$ . Then subtracting, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla w^+|^2 \varphi_R^2 &\leq -2 \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (\nabla w^+, \nabla \varphi_R) w^+ \varphi_R + \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (f(u) - f(v)) w^+ \varphi_R^2 \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla w^+| |\nabla \varphi_R| w^+ \varphi_R + \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (f(u) - f(v)) w^+ \varphi_R^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the set  $\Sigma_\lambda \cap \{w^+ > 0\}$  we have

$$0 < v < u \leq \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}})}.$$

Hence by exploiting Young's inequality and using (F), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla w^+|^2 \varphi_R^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla w^+|^2 \varphi_R^2 + 2 \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla \varphi_R|^2 (w^+)^2 \\ &\quad + C(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}})}) \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (w^+)^2 \varphi_R^2. \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to

$$\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla w^+|^2 \varphi_R^2 \leq 4 \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla \varphi_R|^2 (w^+)^2 + 2C(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}})}) \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (w^+)^2 \varphi_R^2. \quad (7)$$

By the classical Poincaré inequality in the interval  $(0, \lambda)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla w^+|^2 \varphi_R^2 &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}} \left( \int_0^\lambda \left( \frac{\partial w^+}{\partial x_N} \right)^2 dx_N \right) \varphi_R^2(x') dx' \\ &\geq \frac{\pi^2}{\lambda^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}} \left( \int_0^\lambda (w^+)^2 dx_N \right) \varphi_R^2(x') dx' \\ &= \frac{\pi^2}{\lambda^2} \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (w^+)^2 \varphi_R^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (7) leads to

$$\left( \frac{\pi^2}{\lambda^2} - 2C(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}})}) \right) \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (w^+)^2 \varphi_R^2 \leq 4 \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla \varphi_R|^2 (w^+)^2.$$

Choosing  $\lambda_0 = \pi[4 + 2C(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}})})]^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , then for all  $\lambda < \min\{\lambda_0, \bar{\lambda}\}$  we have

$$\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (w^+)^2 \varphi_R^2 \leq \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} |\nabla \varphi_R|^2 (w^+)^2.$$

Using (6), we deduce

$$\int_{\Sigma_\lambda^R} (w^+)^2 \leq \frac{4}{R^2} \int_{\Sigma_{2R}^{2R}} (w^+)^2,$$

where  $\Sigma_\lambda^R := B'_R \times (0, \lambda)$ . Setting  $h(R) := \int_{\Sigma_\lambda^R} (w^+)^2$ , we have

$$h(R) \leq \frac{4}{R^2} h(2R) \quad \text{and} \quad h(R) \leq C_\lambda R^{N-1} \quad \text{for all } R > 0.$$

Hence  $h(R) \leq \frac{1}{2^{Nk}} h(2^k R)$  for all  $R > 2^{\frac{N+2}{2}}$ . By iteration of this inequality, we obtain

$$h(R) \leq \frac{1}{2^{Nk}} h(2^k R) \leq \frac{C_\lambda}{2^{Nk}} (2^k R)^{N-1} = \frac{C_\lambda}{2^k} R^{N-1}$$

for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $R > 2^{\frac{N+2}{2}}$ . Letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we deduce  $h(R) \equiv 0$ . This implies  $\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (w^+)^2 = 0$ , which means  $u \leq v$  in  $\Sigma_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda < \lambda^* := \min\{\lambda_0, \bar{\lambda}\}$ .  $\square$

**2.2. A priori estimates.** We need the following property on solutions so that we can carry out the moving plane method to prove Theorem 1.

**Lemma 6.** *Assume that  $f : (0, +\infty)$  is a locally Lipschitz continuous function such that (F) holds. Let  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  be a solution to (1) with  $u \in L^\infty(\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}})$  for some  $\bar{\lambda} > 0$ . Then*

$$\lim_{x_N \rightarrow 0^+} u(x', x_N) = 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } x' \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N-1}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda^* < \bar{\lambda}$  be defined as in Proposition 5 and choose some  $\rho > \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{\lambda^*})}$ . Let  $h : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $C^1$  function such that

$$\begin{aligned} h(t) &> \max\{f(t), 0\} \quad \text{in } (0, \rho), \\ h(t) &= \frac{c}{t^2} \quad \text{in } [\rho, +\infty) \end{aligned}$$

for some  $c > 0$ . We set  $H(t) = \int_\rho^t h(s) ds$  for  $t > 0$ , then  $H$  is strictly increasing in  $(0, +\infty)$  and  $H(t) < \int_\rho^{+\infty} h(s) ds = \frac{c}{\rho}$ . For each  $\mu \geq \frac{c}{\rho}$ , one can check that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{ds}{\sqrt{\mu - H(s)}} > \int_\rho^{+\infty} \frac{ds}{\sqrt{\mu}} = +\infty$$

and

$$\int_0^t \frac{ds}{\sqrt{\mu - H(s)}} < \frac{t}{\sqrt{\mu - H(t)}} < +\infty \quad \text{for } 0 < t < +\infty.$$

Hence the formula

$$\int_0^{v_\mu(t)} \frac{ds}{\sqrt{\mu - H(s)}} = \sqrt{2}t \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0$$

uniquely determine a function  $v_\mu \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+})$ , which is a solution to the ODE problem

$$\begin{cases} -v'' = h(v) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+, \\ v'(t) > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+, \\ v(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover,  $\lim_{\mu \rightarrow +\infty} v_\mu(t) = +\infty$  for all  $t > 0$ .

We fix some  $\mu > 0$  such that  $v_\mu(\lambda^*) > \rho$ . Then we choose  $\lambda_0 < \lambda^*$  satisfying  $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{\lambda^*})} < v_\mu(\lambda_0) < \rho$ . By abuse of notation, we will write  $v_\mu(x', x_N) := v_\mu(x_N)$ . Then  $0 < v_\mu < \rho$  in  $\Sigma_{\lambda_0}$  and  $u < v_\mu$  on  $\{x_N = \lambda_0\}$ .

For small  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $v_\mu(\lambda_0 + \varepsilon) < \rho$ , we define

$$v_{\mu,\varepsilon}(x) := v_\mu(x + \varepsilon e_N),$$

Then

$$\begin{cases} v_\mu(\varepsilon) < v_{\mu,\varepsilon} < v_\mu(\lambda_0 + \varepsilon) < \rho & \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_0}, \\ -\Delta v_{\mu,\varepsilon} = h(v_{\mu,\varepsilon}) > f(v_{\mu,\varepsilon}) & \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_0}, \\ u \leq v_{\mu,\varepsilon} & \text{on } \partial\Sigma_{\lambda_0}. \end{cases}$$

Now Proposition 5 implies  $u \leq v_{\mu,\varepsilon}$  in  $\Sigma_{\lambda_0}$ . Letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we have  $u \leq v_\mu$  in  $\Sigma_{\lambda_0}$  and the conclusion follows from that fact that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} v_\mu(t) = 0$ .  $\square$

We prove some a priori estimates for solutions to (1) in what follows. The next lemma improves the upper bound on  $u$  near the boundary in Lemma 6 when an explicit upper bound on  $f$  is given.

**Lemma 7.** *Assume that  $f : (0, +\infty)$  is a locally Lipschitz continuous function such that (F) holds and  $f(t) < \frac{c_0}{t^\gamma}$  for all  $0 < t < t_0$ , where  $c_0, t_0 > 0$  and  $\gamma > 1$ . Let  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  be a solution to (1) with  $u \in L^\infty(\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}})$  for some  $\bar{\lambda} > 0$ . Then*

$$u(x) \leq Cx_N^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_0}$$

for some constants  $C, \lambda_0 > 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda^* < \bar{\lambda}$  be defined as in Proposition 5 and choose some  $\rho > \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{\lambda^*})}$ . By compactness, there exists  $c \geq c_0$  such that  $f(t) < \frac{c}{t^\gamma}$  for all  $0 < t < \rho$ . Let

$$v(t) \equiv \frac{(\gamma+1)^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}}}{(2\gamma-2)^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}} t^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}},$$

then  $v_\mu(x) = \mu v(x_N)$  solves  $-\Delta v_\mu = \frac{\mu^{\gamma+1}}{v_\mu^\gamma}$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ . By abuse of notation, we will write  $v_\mu(x_N) := v_\mu(x', x_N)$ . We choose  $\mu$  large such that  $\mu^{\gamma+1} > c_1$  and  $v_\mu(\lambda^*) > \rho$ . Then we choose  $\lambda_0 < \lambda^*$  satisfying  $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_{\lambda^*})} < v_\mu(\lambda_0) < \rho$ . Now we have  $0 < v_\mu < \rho$  in  $\Sigma_{\lambda_0}$  and  $-\Delta v_\mu \geq f(v_\mu)$  in  $\Sigma_{\lambda_0}$ .

For small  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $v_\mu(\lambda_0 + \varepsilon) < \rho$ , we define

$$v_{\mu,\varepsilon}(x) = v_\mu(x + \varepsilon e_N).$$

Then

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v_{\mu,\varepsilon} \geq f(v_{\mu,\varepsilon}) & \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_0}, \\ v_{\mu,\varepsilon} = v_\mu(\varepsilon) > 0 & \text{on } \{x_N = 0\}, \\ u < v_{\mu,\varepsilon} & \text{on } \{x_N = \lambda_0\}. \end{cases}$$

Now Proposition 5 implies  $u \leq v_{\mu,\varepsilon}$  in  $\Sigma_{\lambda_0}$ . Letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  we conclude the proof.  $\square$

The next lemma concerns a lower bound on solutions.

**Lemma 8.** *Assume that  $f : (0, +\infty)$  is a locally Lipschitz continuous function and  $f(t) > \frac{c_0}{t^\gamma}$  for all  $0 < t < t_0$ , where  $c_0, t_0 > 0$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ . Let  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  be a solution to (1). Then*

$$u(x) \geq \min\{Cx_N^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}}, t_0\} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N$$

for some constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $t_0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda_1 > 0$  and  $\phi_1 \in C^2(\overline{B_1(0)})$  be the first eigenvalue and a corresponding positive eigenfunction of the Laplacian in  $B_1(0)$ , namely,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\phi_1 = \lambda_1\phi_1 & \text{in } B_1(0), \\ \phi_1 > 0 & \text{in } B_1(0), \\ \phi_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_1(0). \end{cases}$$

Setting

$$w = \beta\phi_1^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}},$$

where  $\beta > 0$  will be chosen later. Direct calculation yields that

$$-\Delta w = \frac{\alpha(x)}{w^\gamma} \quad \text{in } B_1(0),$$

where

$$\alpha(x) := \frac{2\beta^{\gamma+1}}{\gamma+1} \left( \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1} |\nabla\phi_1(x)|^2 + \lambda_1\phi_1^2(x) \right).$$

Now we fix  $\beta > 0$  such that  $\sup_{x \in B_1(0)} \alpha(x) = c_0$  and hence

$$-\Delta w \leq \frac{c_0}{w^\gamma} \quad \text{in } B_1(0).$$

Let  $R_0 > 0$  be such that  $R_0^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} w(0) = t_0$ . For any  $0 < R \leq R_0$  and  $x_0 = (x'_0, x_{0,N}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  with  $x_{0,N} \geq R + \varepsilon$ , where  $\varepsilon$  is sufficiently small, we set

$$w_{x_0,R}(x) := R^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} w\left(\frac{x-x_0}{R}\right) \quad \text{in } B_R(x_0).$$

Then

$$w_{x_0,R} \leq t_0 \quad \text{and} \quad -\Delta w_{x_0,R} \leq \frac{c_0}{w_{x_0,R}^\gamma} \quad \text{in } B_R(x_0).$$

On the other hand, since  $w_{x_0,R} = 0 < u$  on  $\partial B_R(x_0)$ , we can use  $(w_{x_0,R} - u)^+ \chi_{B_R(x_0)}$  as a test function in

$$-\Delta u = f(u) \quad \text{and} \quad -\Delta w_{x_0,R} \leq \frac{c_0}{w_{x_0,R}^\gamma}$$

to obtain

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla(w_{x_0,R} - u)^+|^2 \leq \int_{B_R(x_0)} \left( \frac{c_0}{w_{x_0,R}^\gamma} - f(u) \right) (w_{x_0,R} - u)^+.$$

In  $B_R(x_0) \cap \{w_{x_0,R} > u\}$  we have  $f(u) \geq \frac{c_0}{u^\gamma}$ . Hence

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla(w_{x_0,R} - u)^+|^2 \leq \int_{B_R(x_0)} \left( \frac{c_0}{w_{x_0,R}^\gamma} - \frac{c_0}{u^\gamma} \right) (w_{x_0,R} - u)^+ \leq 0.$$

This implies  $u \geq w_{x_0,R}$  in  $B_R(x_0)$  with  $x_{0,N} \geq R + \varepsilon$ . Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, we deduce

$$u \geq w_{x_0,R} \quad \text{in } B_R(x_0) \quad \text{for all } 0 < R \leq R_0 \quad \text{and all } x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N \quad \text{with } x_{0,N} \geq R.$$

In particular, if  $x_{0,N} = R < R_0$ , then

$$u(x_0) \geq w_{x_0,R}(x_0) = w(0)R^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} = w(0)x_{0,N}^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}}.$$



If  $x_{0,N} \geq R = R_0$ , then

$$u(x_0) \geq w_{x_0,R}(x_0) = w(0)R_0^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} = t_0.$$

The conclusion follows from the fact that  $x_0$  is chosen arbitrarily in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .  $\square$

Under a weaker assumption on  $f$ , we can still obtain a lower bound of  $u$ , which is useful in many situations.

**Lemma 9.** *Assume that  $f : (0, +\infty)$  is a locally Lipschitz continuous function and  $f(t) > c_0 t$  for all  $0 < t < t_0$ , where  $c_0, t_0 > 0$ . Let  $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  be a solution to (1). Then*

$$u(x) \geq \min\{Cx_N, t_0\} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N.$$

for some constant  $C > 0$ .

An similar result was obtained by Berestycki et al. [7] for  $C^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  solutions and  $f$  being locally Lipschitz continuous on  $[0, +\infty)$ . We provide a proof that works in our more general situation.

*Proof of Lemma 9.* Let  $\lambda_1 > 0$  and  $\phi_1 \in C^2(\overline{B_1(0)})$  be the first eigenvalue and the corresponding positive eigenfunction of the Laplacian in  $B_1(0)$  such that  $\phi_1(0) = t_0$ . We take  $R = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_1}{c_0}}$  and set  $\phi_R(x) = \phi_1(\frac{x}{R})$ , then

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\phi_R = c_0\phi_R \leq f(\phi_R) & \text{in } B_R(0), \\ \phi_R > 0 & \text{in } B_R(0), \\ \phi_R = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_R(0). \end{cases}$$

Since  $\phi_R$  is radially symmetric and by abuse of notion, we may write  $\phi_R(x) = \phi_R(|x|)$ . For each  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_R$  we set

$$\phi_R^{x_0}(x) = \phi_R(x - x_0) \quad \text{for } x \in B_R(x_0).$$

We will show that

$$u \geq \phi_R^{x_0} \text{ in } B_R(x_0) \quad \text{for every } x_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_R. \quad (8)$$

To this end, we let any  $x_0 := (x'_0, x_{0,N}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_R$ .

We only consider the case  $x_{0,N} > R$  since the case  $x_{0,N} = R$  can be derived by continuity. We define the set

$$\Lambda := \{s \in (0, 1] \mid u > t\phi_R^{x_0} \text{ in } B_R(x_0) \text{ for all } t \in (0, s)\}.$$

Since  $u$  is positive on compact set  $\overline{B_R(x_0)}$ , we have  $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$ . We denote  $s_0 = \sup \Lambda$ . To derive (8), we have to show that  $s_0 = 1$ . Assume by contradiction that  $s_0 < 1$ . We set  $\tilde{\phi} := s_0\phi_R^{x_0}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} u &\geq \tilde{\phi} \quad \text{in } B_R(x_0) \\ u(\hat{x}) &= \tilde{\phi}(\hat{x}) \quad \text{for some } \hat{x} \in B_R(x_0). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

From the boundary data of  $\tilde{\phi}$ , we can choose  $\varepsilon > 0$  small such that

$$\hat{x} \in B_{R-\varepsilon}(x_0) \quad \text{and} \quad u > \tilde{\phi} \quad \text{on } \partial B_{R-\varepsilon}(x_0). \quad (10)$$

Since  $u$  and  $\tilde{\phi}$  are positive in the set  $\overline{B_{R-\varepsilon}(x_0)}$  and  $f$  is locally Lipschitz continuous in  $(0, +\infty)$ , the strong comparison principle can be applied in  $B_{R-\varepsilon}(x_0)$  to yield

either  $\tilde{\phi} < u$  in  $B_{R-\varepsilon}(x_0)$  or  $\tilde{\phi} = u$  in  $B_{R-\varepsilon}(x_0)$ . However, the former contradicts (9), while the latter contradicts (10). Hence (8) holds. This implies

$$u(x) \geq \begin{cases} \phi_R(R - x_N) & \text{if } x_N < R, \\ \phi_R(0) & \text{if } x_N \geq R. \end{cases}$$

The conclusion follows immediately from the fact that  $\phi'_R(R) < 0$  and  $\phi_R(0) = t_0$ .  $\square$

### 3. QUALITATIVE PROPERTIES OF SOLUTIONS

**3.1. Monotonicity of solutions.** As in the previous works, the main tool we use in proving the monotonicity of solutions is the method of moving planes, which was introduced by Alexandrov [1] in the context of differential geometry and by Serrin [29] in the PDE framework, for an overdetermined problem. We recall some familiar notions related to this method. For each  $\lambda > 0$ , we denote

$$x_\lambda = (x_1, x_2, \dots, 2\lambda - x_n),$$

which is the reflection of  $x$  through the hyperplane  $\partial\Sigma_\lambda$ . Let  $u$  be a solution to (1). We set

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

then  $u_\lambda$  satisfies  $-\Delta u_\lambda = f(u_\lambda)$  in  $\Sigma_{2\lambda}$ .

We are ready to prove the main results in this section.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Applying Proposition 5 with  $v \equiv u_\lambda$ , we find  $\lambda^* > 0$  such that  $u \leq u_\lambda$  in  $\Sigma_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda \leq \lambda^*$ . Hence the set

$$\Lambda = \{\lambda \in (0, +\infty) \mid u \leq u_\mu \text{ in } \Sigma_\mu \text{ for all } \mu \in (0, \lambda]\}$$

is not empty. Therefore, we can define

$$\lambda_0 = \sup \Lambda.$$

We show that  $\lambda_0 = +\infty$ .

By contradiction, we assume that  $\lambda_0 < +\infty$ . By continuity, we know that

$$u \leq u_{\lambda_0} \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_0}. \quad (11)$$

By Lemmas 6 and 9, there exist  $\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\delta} > 0$  sufficiently small such that

$$u + \tilde{\delta} < u_\lambda \text{ in } \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}} \quad \text{for all } \lambda \geq \lambda_0. \quad (12)$$

We will reach a contradiction by showing that for some small  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ ,

$$u \leq u_\lambda \text{ in } \Sigma_\lambda \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon_0].$$

If this is not true, then there exist  $\lambda_n \searrow \lambda_0$  and  $x_n := (x'_n, x_{n,N}) \in \Sigma_{\lambda_n} \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}$  such that

$$u(x_n) > u_{\lambda_n}(x_n). \quad (13)$$

Up to a subsequence, we may assume that  $x_{n,N} \rightarrow y_0 \in [\tilde{\lambda}, \lambda_0]$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Now we set

$$u_n(x', x_N) := u(x' + x'_n, x_N).$$

By Lemma 9, we know that

$$\min\{C\tilde{\lambda}, t_0\} \leq u_n \leq \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_\lambda)} \quad \text{in } \Sigma_\lambda \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}} \text{ for } \lambda > 0.$$

Hence  $f(u_n)$  are also bounded on each strip  $\Sigma_\lambda \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}$ . By standard regularity, Ascoli-Arzelà's theorem and a diagonal process, we deduce that

$$u_n \rightarrow v \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}})$$

up to a subsequence, where  $v$  weakly solves  $-\Delta u = f(u)$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}}$ . Moreover, (11), (13) imply  $v \leq v_{\lambda_0}$  in  $\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}$  and  $v(0', y_0) \geq v_{\lambda_0}(0', y_0)$ . Hence

$$v(0', y_0) = v_{\lambda_0}(0', y_0).$$

Therefore,

$$-\Delta(v_{\lambda_0} - v) + C(v_{\lambda_0} - v) = f(v_{\lambda_0}) - f(v) + C(v_{\lambda_0} - v) \geq 0 \quad (14)$$

in any compact set of  $\{\tilde{\lambda} < x_N \leq \lambda_0\}$  with sufficiently large  $C$ . By the strong maximum principle, we deduce  $v < v_{\lambda_0}$  in  $\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}}$ . (The case  $v \equiv v_{\lambda_0}$  in  $\Sigma_{\lambda_0}$  cannot happen due to  $v < v_{\lambda_0}$  on  $\{x_N = \tilde{\lambda}\}$  deduced from (12).) This implies  $y_0 = \lambda_0$ . By the mean value theorem, there exists  $\xi_n \in (x_{n,N}, 2\lambda_n - x_{n,N})$  such that

$$\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_N}(0', \xi_n) = \frac{u_n(0', 2\lambda_n - x_{n,N}) - u_n(0', x_{n,N})}{2\lambda_n - 2x_{n,N}} = \frac{u_{\lambda_n}(x_n) - u(x_n)}{2\lambda_n - 2x_{n,N}} < 0.$$

Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_N}(0', \lambda_0) \leq 0.$$

Hence

$$\frac{\partial(v_{\lambda_0} - v)}{\partial x_N}(0', \lambda_0) = -2 \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_N}(0', \lambda_0) \geq 0.$$

However, this contradicts the Höpf lemma [20] for (14) in  $\Sigma_{\lambda_0} \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}$ .

Therefore,  $\lambda_0 = +\infty$ . Hence  $u \leq u_\lambda$  in  $\Sigma_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda > 0$ . Exploiting the strong maximum principle and the Höpf lemma for  $u_\lambda - u$  as above we deduce

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_N} > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

which is what we have to prove.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Since  $g : [0, +\infty)$  is a locally Lipschitz continuous, there exist  $t_0, c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that the function  $f(t) = \frac{1}{t^\gamma} + g(u)$  is decreasing on  $(0, t_0)$  and

$$\frac{c_1}{t^\gamma} < f(t) < \frac{c_2}{t^\gamma} \quad \text{in } (0, t_0).$$

Hence Lemmas 7 and 8 imply the existence of  $\lambda_0 > 0$  such that

$$cx_N^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} \leq u(x) \leq Cx_N^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_0}. \quad (15)$$

The monotonicity of  $u$  follows from Theorem 1. So we only prove (5). Our proof is motivated by an idea from [28].

Let any  $A > a > 0$  and a positive sequence  $(\varepsilon_n)$  such that  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We define

$$w_n(x) := \varepsilon_n^{-\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} u(\varepsilon_n x) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N.$$

For  $n$  sufficiently large, we deduce from (15)

$$ca^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} \leq w_n(x) \leq CA^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} \quad \text{in } \Sigma_A \setminus \Sigma_a \quad (16)$$

and

$$w_n(x) \leq Ca^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} \quad \text{on } \{x_N = a\}. \quad (17)$$

Moreover,  $w_n$  solves

$$-\Delta w_n = \frac{1}{w_n^\gamma} + \varepsilon_n^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma+1}} g(\varepsilon_n^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} w_n) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N. \quad (18)$$

Since the right hand side of (18) is uniformly bounded in  $\Sigma_A \setminus \Sigma_a$  and by the standard regularity [20],  $(w_n)$  is uniformly bounded in  $C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Sigma_A \setminus \Sigma_a})$ , for some  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . Since

$$|\nabla w_n(x)| = \varepsilon_n^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1}} |\nabla u(\varepsilon_n x)| \geq \varepsilon_n^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1}} \frac{\partial u(\varepsilon_n x)}{\partial \eta},$$

for  $\varepsilon_n$  sufficiently small we get the estimate from above in (5).

Now we prove the estimate from below. Suppose by contradiction that there exist  $\beta > 0$ , a sequence of normal vectors  $\eta_n \in \mathbb{S}_+^{N-1}$  with  $(\eta_n, e_N) \geq \beta$  and a sequence of points  $x_n = (x'_n, x_{n,N}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$  such that

$$x_{n,N}^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1}} \frac{\partial u(x_n)}{\partial \eta_n} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad x_{n,N} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (19)$$

Passing to a subsequence, we may assume  $\eta_n \rightarrow \eta \in \mathbb{S}_+^{N-1}$  with  $(\eta, e_N) \geq \beta$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We define  $w_n$  as above with  $\varepsilon_n = x_{n,N}$  and  $\tilde{w}_n(x', x_N) = w_n(x' + \varepsilon_n^{-1} x'_n, x_N)$ , namely,

$$\tilde{w}_n(x) := x_{n,N}^{-\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} u(x_{n,N} x' + x'_n, x_{n,N} x_N) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N.$$

Then (16), (17) and (18) still hold for  $\tilde{w}_n$ . Since  $(\tilde{w}_n)$  is uniformly bounded in  $C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Sigma_A \setminus \Sigma_a})$ , up to a subsequence, we have

$$\tilde{w}_n \rightarrow w_{a,A} \quad \text{in } C_{\text{loc}}^2(\overline{\Sigma_A \setminus \Sigma_a}).$$

Moreover, passing (18) to the limit, we get

$$-\Delta w_{a,A} = \frac{1}{w_{a,A}^\gamma} \quad \text{in } \Sigma_A \setminus \Sigma_a.$$

Now we take  $a = \frac{1}{j}$  and  $A = j$ , for large  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and we construct  $w_{\frac{1}{j},j}$  as above. For  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , using a standard diagonal process, we can construct a limiting profile  $w_\infty \in C_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$  so that

$$-\Delta w_\infty = \frac{1}{w_\infty^\gamma} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N$$

and  $w_{\frac{1}{j},j} = w_\infty$  in  $\Sigma_j \setminus \Sigma_{\frac{1}{j}}$ . Moreover, from (17) we know that

$$\lim_{x_N \rightarrow 0^+} w_\infty(x) = 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}.$$

Hence  $w_\infty$  is a solution to (4). By [25, Theorem 1],  $w_\infty$  depends only on  $x_N$  and  $w'_\infty > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+$ .

On the other hand, (19) gives  $\frac{\partial \tilde{w}_n(e_N)}{\partial \eta_n} = x_{n,N}^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1}} \frac{\partial u(x_n)}{\partial \eta_n} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This is a contradiction since  $\frac{\partial \tilde{w}_n(e_N)}{\partial \eta_n} \rightarrow \frac{\partial w_\infty(e_N)}{\partial \eta} = w'_\infty(1)\eta_N > 0$ .  $\square$

*Remark 1.* The proof indicates the following estimate which is stronger than the upper bound in (5)

$$|\nabla u(x)| < c_2 x_N^{\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma+1}} \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda_1}$$

for some  $\lambda_1, c_2 > 0$  independent of  $\beta$ .

**3.2. Rigidity of solutions.** In this subsection, we prove Theorem 3. We will make use of the following version of the maximum principle in unbounded domains which is due to Berestycki, Caffarelli and Nirenberg.

**Lemma 10** (Lemma 2.1 in [7]). *Let  $D$  be a domain (open connected set) in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , possibly unbounded. Assume that  $\overline{D}$  is disjoint from the closure of an infinite open connected cone  $\Sigma$ . Suppose there is a function  $w \in C^2(D) \cap C(\overline{D})$  that is bounded above and satisfies for some continuous function  $c(x)$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w - c(x)w &\leq 0 \text{ in } D \text{ with } c(x) \leq 0, \\ w &\leq 0 \text{ on } \partial D. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $w \leq 0$  in  $D$ .

Lemma 10 allows us to derive a weak comparison principle. Notice that in the following result, we do not assume that  $v$  is bounded from above.

**Proposition 11.** *Let  $f : (0, +\infty)$  be a locally Lipschitz continuous function which is non-increasing on  $(t_1, +\infty)$  for some  $t_1 > 0$ . Let  $u, v \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$  be solutions to*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w = f(w) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  is an open connected set such that  $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{\Omega}$  contains an infinite open connected cone. Assume that

$$u \leq v \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad v(x) \geq t_1 \text{ in } \Omega$$

and

$$\sup_{\Omega} (u - v) < +\infty.$$

Then  $u \leq v$  in  $\Omega$ .

*Proof.* Assume by contradiction that  $u > v$  somewhere in  $\Omega$ . Let  $D$  be a connected component of the set where  $u > v$ . Setting

$$w = u - v,$$

then

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w - c(x)w = 0 & \text{in } D, \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases}$$

where

$$c(x) = \frac{f(u(x)) - f(v(x))}{u(x) - v(x)}.$$

Moreover, since  $t_1 \leq v < u$  in  $D$  and  $f$  is non-increasing on  $(t_1, +\infty)$ , we deduce  $c(x) \leq 0$  in  $D$ . Hence Lemma 10 applies to yield  $w \leq 0$  in  $D$ , a contradiction. Therefore,  $u \leq v$  in  $\Omega$ .  $\square$

We employ the technique from [25, Proposition 5] to show that solutions to problem (1) grow at most at a linear rate as  $x_N \rightarrow +\infty$ .

**Lemma 12.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3, there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that*

$$u(x) \leq Cx_N \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_{\overline{\Sigma}}.$$

*Proof.* If  $u$  is a solution to (1), then

$$v(x) := \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}\right)^{-\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} u\left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}x\right)$$

is bounded in  $\Sigma_2$  and  $v$  satisfies

$$-\Delta v = \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}\right)^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma+1}} f\left(\left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}\right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} v\right).$$

Moreover, the function  $g(t) := \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}\right)^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma+1}} f\left(\left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}\right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} t\right)$  still satisfies (i) and (ii) in Theorem 3 with possible different parameters  $c_0, c_1, t_1$ . Therefore, without loss of generality, we may assume that our solution  $u$  is bounded in the strip  $\Sigma_2$ .

From (i) and Lemma 8, we have

$$u(x) \geq \tilde{C}x_N^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N. \quad (20)$$

From (ii) and the compactness, there exists  $c_2 > 0$  such that

$$f(t) < \frac{c_2}{t^\gamma} \quad \text{for all } t \geq \tilde{C}. \quad (21)$$

Let any  $x_0 = (x'_0, x_{0,N}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$  with  $x_{0,N} := 4R > 2$ . We set

$$u_R(x) := R^{-\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} u(x_0 + R(x - x_0)),$$

then  $u_R > 0$  in  $B_4(x_0)$  and

$$-\Delta u_R(x) = R^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma+1}} f(u(x_0 + R(x - x_0))) = \frac{R^2 f(u(x_0 + R(x - x_0)))}{u(x_0 + R(x - x_0))} u_R(x).$$

Remark that  $x_0 + R(x - x_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_{2R} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_1$  for  $x \in B_2(x_0)$ . Hence (20) and (21) give

$$\frac{R^2 f(u(x_0 + R(x - x_0)))}{u(x_0 + R(x - x_0))} \leq \frac{c_2 R^2}{u(x_0 + R(x - x_0))^{\gamma+1}} \leq \frac{c_2}{4\tilde{C}^{\gamma+1}} \quad \text{in } B_2(x_0).$$

By Harnack's inequality, we have

$$\sup_{B_1(x_0)} u_R \leq C_H \inf_{B_1(x_0)} u_R,$$

which implies

$$\sup_{B_R(x_0)} u \leq C_H \inf_{B_R(x_0)} u,$$

where  $C_H > 0$  is independent of  $x_0$ . From this point, we can proceed as in the proof of [25, Proposition 5] to get the thesis.  $\square$

Given the previous asymptotic bound on  $u$ , we can apply the scaling technique as in [25, Proposition 7] to establish a bound on the gradient.

**Lemma 13.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3, there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that*

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leq C \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}}.$$

*Proof.* As in Lemma 12, we may assume  $\bar{\lambda} = 2$ . Let  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_2$  and set  $R = x_{0,N} \geq 2$ . We define

$$u_R(x) := \frac{u(Rx)}{R} \quad \text{in } B_{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{x_0}{R}\right).$$

By Lemma 12 we have  $u_R \leq C$ . Moreover, from (20) and (21), we deduce

$$-\Delta u_R = Rf(u(Rx)) \leq \frac{c_2 R}{u(Rx)^\gamma} \leq \frac{4^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1}} c_2}{\tilde{C}^\gamma} R^{-\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1}} \leq \frac{2c_2}{\tilde{C}^\gamma} \quad \text{in } B_{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{x_0}{R}\right).$$

By the standard gradient estimate, we have  $|\nabla u_R| \leq C'$  in  $B_{\frac{1}{4}}\left(\frac{x_0}{R}\right)$ . This indicates  $|\nabla u| \leq C'$  in  $B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_0)$ . The thesis follows from the arbitrariness of  $x_0$ .  $\square$

We are ready to prove Theorem 3 by employing the sliding method.

*Proof of Theorem 3.* For each  $\lambda > 0$  and  $\nu \in \mathbb{S}_+^{N-1}$ , we define

$$u'_\lambda(x) := u(x + \lambda\nu).$$

We aim to show that

$$u \leq u'_\lambda \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \quad \text{for all } \lambda > 0. \quad (22)$$

By Lemma 8, there exists  $\lambda^* > 0$  such that

$$u(x) > t_1 \quad \text{for } x_N > \lambda^*.$$

Let  $\lambda > \lambda_\nu^*$ , where  $\lambda_\nu^* := \frac{\lambda^*}{\langle \nu, e_N \rangle}$ , then  $u'_\lambda > t_1$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ . Moreover, from Lemmas 12, 13 and the mean value theorem, we deduce

$$\sup_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} (u - u'_\lambda) < +\infty.$$

Since

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f(u) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ -\Delta u'_\lambda = f(u'_\lambda) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u'_\lambda > t_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ u \leq u'_\lambda & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N, \end{cases}$$

we can apply Proposition 11 to derive

$$u \leq u'_\lambda \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \quad \text{for all } \lambda > \lambda_\nu^*.$$

Now that the set

$$\Lambda = \{\lambda > 0 \mid u \leq u'_\mu \text{ in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \text{ for all } \mu > \lambda\}$$

is nonempty, we can define  $\lambda_0 = \inf \Lambda$ . We will show that

$$\lambda_0 = 0.$$

Assume on contrary that  $\lambda_0 > 0$ . By continuity of  $u$ , we have  $u \leq u'_{\lambda_0}$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ . In order to reach a contradiction, we will search for some  $\varepsilon_0$  small such that

$$u \leq u'_\lambda \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \quad (23)$$

for all  $\lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \varepsilon_0, \lambda_0]$ .

◦ Due to Lemmas 6 and 8, there exist  $\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\delta} > 0$  sufficiently small such that

$$u + \tilde{\delta} \leq u'_\lambda \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}} \quad (24)$$

for all  $\lambda > \lambda_0/2$ .

◦ We claim that

$$u \leq u'_\lambda \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\lambda^*} \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}} \quad (25)$$

for all  $\lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \varepsilon_0, \lambda_0)$ , where  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  is sufficiently small.

Assume that (25) does not hold. Then there exist two sequences  $\lambda_n \nearrow \lambda_0$  and  $x_n := (x'_n, x_{n,N}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \times [\tilde{\lambda}, \lambda^*)$  such that

$$u(x_n) > u'_{\lambda_n}(x_n). \quad (26)$$

Moreover, we may assume  $x_{n,N} \rightarrow y_0 \in [\tilde{\lambda}, \lambda^*]$ . Now we set

$$u_n(x', x_N) = u(x' + x'_n, x_N).$$

Since  $C\tilde{\lambda}^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}} \leq u_n \leq \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_\lambda)}$  in  $\Sigma_\lambda \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}$ , we have that  $f(u_n)$  is bounded in  $\Sigma_\lambda \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}$  for each  $\lambda > \tilde{\lambda}$ . The standard regularity gives  $\|u_n\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Sigma_\lambda \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}})} < C_\lambda$  for some  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . By the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem, via a standard diagonal process, we have

$$u_n \rightarrow v \quad \text{in } C^2_{\text{loc}}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}})$$

up to a subsequence. Moreover,  $v$  weakly solves  $-\Delta v = f(v)$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \overline{\Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}}$ . Using the definition of  $\lambda_0$  and passing (26) to the limit, we have

$$\begin{aligned} v &\leq v'_{\lambda_0} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}, \\ v(x_0) &= v'_{\lambda_0}(x_0), \end{aligned}$$

where  $x_0 = (0', y_0)$ . On the other hand, by (24) we have  $v + \tilde{\delta} \leq v'_{\lambda_0}$  on  $\{x_N = \tilde{\lambda}\}$ . Hence the strong comparison principle implies  $v < v'_{\lambda_0}$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_{\tilde{\lambda}}$ . This contradicts the fact that  $v(x_0) = v'_{\lambda_0}(x_0)$ . Therefore, (25) must hold.

◦ Next, we show that

$$u \leq u'_\lambda \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_{\lambda^*} \quad (27)$$

for all  $\lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \varepsilon_0, \lambda_0)$ .

From (25) and the continuity, we already have  $u \leq u'_\lambda$  on  $\{x_N = \lambda^*\}$ . Moreover,  $u'_\lambda(x) \geq t_1$  for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_{\lambda^*}$ . Hence (27) follows by applying Proposition 11 with  $u$  and  $v := u'_\lambda$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \Sigma_{\lambda^*}$ .

Combining (24), (25) and (27), we obtain (23). This contradicts the definition of  $\lambda_0$  and hence (22) is proved.

Therefore,  $u$  is monotone increasing in direction  $\nu$  for all  $\nu \in \mathbb{S}_+^{N-1}$ . That is,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} := (\nabla u, \nu) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N.$$

To deduce the one-dimensional symmetry of  $u$ , we take  $\zeta$  be any direction in  $\{x \in \partial B_1(0) \mid x_N = 0\}$ . Let  $\nu_n \in \mathbb{S}_+^{N-1}$  be a sequence converging to  $\zeta$ , we have  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_n} \geq 0$ . By sending  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we deduce  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \zeta} \geq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ . Similarly, let another sequence  $\tau_n \in \mathbb{S}_+^{N-1}$  converging to  $-\zeta$ , we obtain  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau_n} \leq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ . Therefore,  $u$  is constant in direction  $\zeta$ . Since  $\zeta$  is arbitrary, we deduce that  $u$  does not depend on  $x'$ . Hence  $u$  depends only on  $x_N$  and monotone increasing in  $x_N$ .

By the Höpf lemma [20], we have actually  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_N} > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ . By writing  $v(x_N) = u(x)$ , problem (1) reduces to

$$\begin{cases} -v'' = f(v) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+, \\ v'(t) > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+, \\ v(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$



Hence for every  $t > 0$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{2}(v')^2 - F(v) = M, \quad (28)$$

which is a constant. Letting  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  and noticing that  $v(t) \rightarrow +\infty$  by Lemma 8, we deduce  $M \geq 0$ . By integrating (28) and using  $v(0) = 0$ , this gives

$$\int_0^{v(t)} \frac{ds}{\sqrt{M + F(s)}} = \sqrt{2}t \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (29)$$

Conversely, for every  $M \geq 0$  we have

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{ds}{\sqrt{M + F(s)}} = +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^t \frac{ds}{\sqrt{M + F(s)}} < +\infty \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

Therefore, for each  $M \geq 0$ , formula (29) uniquely determines a function  $v := v_M$  which is a solution to (1). It is also clear from (28) that each solution  $v_M$  is characterized by the property  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} v'_M(t) = \sqrt{2M}$ .  $\square$

Finally, we discuss the case that  $f$  is nonincreasing in the whole domain  $(0, +\infty)$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4.* The proof is almost the same as that of [26, Theorem 6], so we only comment on the difference. By employing the Kelvin transform

$$\hat{u}(x) := \frac{1}{|x|^{N-2}} u\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right),$$

we deduce that  $\hat{u} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^N) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N} \setminus \{0\})$  and  $\hat{u}$  is a solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \hat{u} = \frac{1}{|x|^{N+2}} f(|x|^{N-2} \hat{u}) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ \hat{u} > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N, \\ \hat{u} = 0 & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

As in [26] we denote  $\Sigma_\lambda = \{(x_1, x') \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \mid x_1 < \lambda\}$ ,  $x_\lambda = (2\lambda - x_1, x')$  and  $\hat{u}_\lambda(x) = \hat{u}(x_\lambda)$ . Then for test functions of type  $w = (\hat{u} - \hat{u}_\lambda - \tau)^+ \psi \chi_{\Sigma_\lambda}$  with compact support in  $\Sigma_\lambda$  and  $\tau > 0$  we have

$$\int_{\Sigma_\lambda} (\nabla(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_\lambda), \nabla w) = \int_{\Sigma_\lambda} \left( \frac{1}{|x|^{N+2}} f(|x|^{N-2} \hat{u}) - \frac{1}{|x_\lambda|^{N+2}} f(|x_\lambda|^{N-2} \hat{u}_\lambda) \right) w \leq 0$$

since  $\hat{u} \geq \hat{u}_\lambda$  on the support of  $w$  and  $|x| \geq |x_\lambda|$  in  $\Sigma_\lambda$ . From this inequality, we can argue as in the proof of [26, Theorem 6] and repeat the arguments there to get  $u(x) = v(x_N)$ , where  $v$  is a solution to

$$\begin{cases} -v'' = f(v) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+, \\ v(t) > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+, \\ v(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

By Theorem 1 we have  $v'(t) > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . Moreover, since  $-v'' \geq 0$  we have that  $v'$  is nondecreasing and hence  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} v(t) = +\infty$ . From  $-v'' = f(v)$  we deduce

$$\frac{1}{2}(v')^2 + F_1(v) = M_1,$$

where  $F_1(s) = \int_1^s f(t)dt$  and  $M_1$  is a constant. Sending  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ , we obtain  $M_1 \geq \int_1^{+\infty} f(t)dt$ . In particular,  $\int_1^{+\infty} f(t)dt$  is finite. Hence also  $F(s) = \int_s^{+\infty} f(t)dt$  is finite for all  $s > 0$ . Similar to the proof of Theorem 3 we deduce

$$\int_0^{v(t)} \frac{ds}{\sqrt{M + F(s)}} = \sqrt{2}t \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and some } M \geq 0 \quad (30)$$

and (30) indeed provides a solution to our problem.  $\square$

**Conflict of interest** The author declares no conflict of interest.

**Data Availability** Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] A. D. Alexandrov. A characteristic property of spheres. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 58:303–315, 1962. doi:10.1007/BF02413056. 10
- [2] S. B. Angenent. Uniqueness of the solution of a semilinear boundary value problem. *Math. Ann.*, 272(1):129–138, 1985. doi:10.1007/BF01455933. 1
- [3] D. Arcoya, L. Boccardo, T. Leonori, and A. Porretta. Some elliptic problems with singular natural growth lower order terms. *J. Differential Equations*, 249(11):2771–2795, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.jde.2010.05.009. 2
- [4] H. Berestycki, L. Caffarelli, and L. Nirenberg. Further qualitative properties for elliptic equations in unbounded domains. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 25(1-2):69–94 (1998), 1997. Dedicated to Ennio De Giorgi. URL: [http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASNSP\\_1997\\_4\\_25\\_1-2\\_69\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASNSP_1997_4_25_1-2_69_0). 1
- [5] H. Berestycki, L. A. Caffarelli, and L. Nirenberg. Symmetry for elliptic equations in a half space. In *Boundary value problems for partial differential equations and applications*, volume 29 of *RMA Res. Notes Appl. Math.*, pages 27–42. Masson, Paris, 1993. 1
- [6] H. Berestycki, L. A. Caffarelli, and L. Nirenberg. Inequalities for second-order elliptic equations with applications to unbounded domains. I. *Duke Math. J.*, 81(2):467–494, 1996. A celebration of John F. Nash, Jr. doi:10.1215/S0012-7094-96-08117-X. 1
- [7] H. Berestycki, L. A. Caffarelli, and L. Nirenberg. Monotonicity for elliptic equations in unbounded Lipschitz domains. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 50(11):1089–1111, 1997. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0312(199711)50:11<1089::AID-CPA2>3.0.CO;2-6. 1, 9, 13
- [8] H. Berestycki and L. Nirenberg. On the method of moving planes and the sliding method. *Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. (N.S.)*, 22(1):1–37, 1991. doi:10.1007/BF01244896. 4
- [9] L. Boccardo. A Dirichlet problem with singular and supercritical nonlinearities. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 75(12):4436–4440, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.na.2011.09.026. 2
- [10] L. Boccardo and L. Orsina. Semilinear elliptic equations with singular nonlinearities. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 37(3-4):363–380, 2010. doi:10.1007/s00526-009-0266-x. 2
- [11] A. Canino, F. Esposito, and B. Sciunzi. On the Höpf boundary lemma for singular semilinear elliptic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 266(9):5488–5499, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.jde.2018.10.039. 2, 3
- [12] A. Canino, M. Grandinetti, and B. Sciunzi. Symmetry of solutions of some semilinear elliptic equations with singular nonlinearities. *J. Differential Equations*, 255(12):4437–4447, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.jde.2013.08.014. 2
- [13] P. Clément and G. Sweers. Existence and multiplicity results for a semilinear elliptic eigenvalue problem. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 14(1):97–121, 1987. URL: [http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASNSP\\_1987\\_4\\_14\\_1\\_97\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASNSP_1987_4_14_1_97_0). 1
- [14] M. G. Crandall, P. H. Rabinowitz, and L. Tartar. On a Dirichlet problem with a singular nonlinearity. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 2(2):193–222, 1977. doi:10.1080/03605307708820029. 2
- [15] F. Esposito, A. Farina, and B. Sciunzi. Qualitative properties of singular solutions to semilinear elliptic problems. *J. Differential Equations*, 265(5):1962–1983, 2018. doi:10.1016/j.jde.2018.04.030. 2, 3

- [16] F. Esposito and B. Sciunzi. The moving plane method for doubly singular elliptic equations involving a first-order term. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 21(4):905–916, 2021. doi:10.1515/ans-2021-2151. 2
- [17] A. Farina. Some results about semilinear elliptic problems on half-spaces. *Math. Eng.*, 2(4):709–721, 2020. doi:10.3934/mine.2020033. 1
- [18] A. Farina and B. Sciunzi. Qualitative properties and classification of nonnegative solutions to  $-\Delta u = f(u)$  in unbounded domains when  $f(0) < 0$ . *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 32(4):1311–1330, 2016. doi:10.4171/RMI/918. 1
- [19] A. Farina and B. Sciunzi. Monotonicity and symmetry of nonnegative solutions to  $-\Delta u = f(u)$  in half-planes and strips. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 17(2):297–310, 2017. doi:10.1515/ans-2017-0010. 1
- [20] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition. 11, 12, 16
- [21] N. Hirano, C. Saccon, and N. Shioji. Existence of multiple positive solutions for singular elliptic problems with concave and convex nonlinearities. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 9(1-2):197–220, 2004. 2
- [22] B. Kawohl. On a class of singular elliptic equations. In *Progress in partial differential equations: elliptic and parabolic problems (Pont-à-Mousson, 1991)*, volume 266 of *Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser.*, pages 156–163. Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow, 1992. 2
- [23] A. C. Lazer and P. J. McKenna. On a singular nonlinear elliptic boundary-value problem. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 111(3):721–730, 1991. doi:10.2307/2048410. 2
- [24] P. Le. Doubly singular elliptic equations involving a gradient term: symmetry and monotonicity. *Results Math.*, 79(1):Paper No. 3, 13, 2024. doi:10.1007/s00025-023-02025-y. 2
- [25] L. Montoro, L. Muglia, and B. Sciunzi. Classification of solutions to  $-\Delta u = u^{-\gamma}$  in the half-space. *Math. Ann.*, 389(3):3163–3179, 2024. doi:10.1007/s00208-023-02717-4. 2, 3, 12, 13, 14
- [26] L. Montoro, L. Muglia, and B. Sciunzi. The Classification of all weak solutions to  $-\Delta u = u^{-\gamma}$  in the half-space. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2404.03343, Apr. 2024. arXiv:2404.03343, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2404.03343. 2, 4, 17
- [27] A. Quaas and B. Sirakov. Existence results for nonproper elliptic equations involving the Pucci operator. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 31(7-9):987–1003, 2006. doi:10.1080/03605300500394421. 1
- [28] B. Sciunzi. Classification of positive  $\mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ -solutions to the critical  $p$ -Laplace equation in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . *Adv. Math.*, 291:12–23, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2015.12.028. 11
- [29] J. Serrin. A symmetry problem in potential theory. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 43:304–318, 1971. doi:10.1007/BF00250468. 10

PHUONG LE<sup>1,2</sup> (ORCID: 0000-0003-4724-7118)

<sup>1</sup>FACULTY OF ECONOMIC MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS AND LAW, HO CHI MINH CITY, VIETNAM;

<sup>2</sup>VIETNAM NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, HO CHI MINH CITY, VIETNAM

Email address: phuongl@uel.edu.vn