

# EXISTENCE OF SOLUTIONS FOR 1-LAPLACIAN PROBLEMS WITH SINGULAR FIRST ORDER TERMS

FRANCESCO BALDUCCI

ABSTRACT. We prove existence of solutions to the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_1 u + g(u)|Du| = h(u)f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ , with  $N \geq 2$ , is an open and bounded set with Lipschitz boundary,  $g$  is a continuous and positive function which possibly blows up at the origin and bounded at infinity and  $h$  is a continuous and nonnegative function bounded at infinity (possibly blowing up at the origin) and finally  $0 \leq f \in L^N(\Omega)$ . As a by-product, this paper extends the results found where  $g$  is a continuous and bounded function. We investigate the interplay between  $g$  and  $h$  in order to have existence of solutions.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Notation and preparatory tools	2
2.1. Essential properties of $BV$ functions	3
2.2. The Anzellotti-Chen-Frid theory	4
3. Main assumptions and results for $f > 0$	6
3.1. Approximation scheme and existence of a limit function	7
3.2. Identification of the vector field $z$	9
3.3. Proof of the main existence result	11
4. The case of a nonnegative $f \in L^N(\Omega)$	12
Data availability	14
Acknowledgment	14
References	14

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study the following nonlinear elliptic Dirichlet problem which is

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_1 u + g(u)|Du| = h(u)f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  with  $N \geq 2$  is an open bounded set with Lipschitz boundary,  $\Delta_1 u := \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{|Du|}\right)$  is the 1-laplacian operator and  $g$  is a positive and continuous function on  $[0, \infty)$  which possibly blows up at the origin and is bounded at infinity. Finally,  $0 \leq f \in L^N(\Omega)$  and  $h$  is a continuous and nonnegative function on  $[0, \infty)$  that is allowed to blow up at the origin and bounded at infinity. We highlight that the case of continuous, bounded and nonmonotone functions  $g, h$  is covered by the above assumptions and by [5].

This type of problems has also been studied as a model for the level set formulation as explain in [16] for the inverse mean curvature flow, as done initially in [18], in order to prove the well-known Penrose inequality for a single black hole.

Our aim is proving the existence of finite energy solutions of (1.1); i.e. a function  $u \in BV(\Omega)$ , which is the space where such problems are naturally built-in in case of smooth nonlinear terms and data.

Problems involving natural growth gradient terms are widely studied in the literature in the case of  $p$ -growth, namely

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u + g(u)|\nabla u|^p = h(u)f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J25, 35J60, 35J75.

*Key words and phrases.* 1-laplacian, natural growth gradient terms, regularizing effects,  $L^N$  data, singular problems.

In this case, despite the irregularity of the datum  $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ , the existence of a finite-energy solution in  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  is ensured by the presence of the regularizing gradient term, as shown in [6, 7].

We want to explore the interplay between the first order and possibly singular absorption term involving  $g$  and the zero order and possibly singular nonlinearity  $h$  in presence of a datum  $f \in L^N(\Omega)$  and the game between the explosion range of  $g$  and  $h$  at the origin. The problem (1.2) was already studied in the case of the laplacian operator (i.e.  $p = 2$ ) in [4] with  $g(s) \sim s^{-\theta}$  with  $\theta > 0$  near the origin and  $h \equiv 1$  where the condition for the existence result of finite energy solutions is  $\theta < 2$ ; later the result was extended to  $p$ -laplacian case provided  $\theta < p$  in [22].

Let us briefly discuss the literature concerning the existence of solution for the 1-laplacian operator, one usually solves the corresponding problem with the operator  $p$ -laplacian, finds uniform estimates in  $p$ , and then lets  $p$  tend to 1.

In order to give sense to the 1-laplacian operator in [2] the authors used the Anzellotti theory of pairings  $(z, Du)$  of  $L^\infty$ -divergence-measure vector fields  $z$  and the gradient of a  $BV$  function  $u$ ; the vector field  $z \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$  (see Section 2 for more details) is such that  $\|z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \leq 1$  and  $(z, Du) = |Du|$ , in this way  $z$  plays the role of the singular quotient  $\frac{Du}{|Du|}$ . Furthermore, the datum on the boundary is not attained in the classical sense, as it involves the trace of the vector field  $z$  on the boundary  $\partial\Omega$  (for more details, see Remark 3.2).

If  $g \equiv 0$  and  $h \equiv 1$ , it is well known that  $u \equiv 0$  if  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} < \mathcal{S}_1^{-1}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}_1$  is the constant defined in Theorem 2.1 (for more details see [10]); instead in [19] the authors proved that  $u \equiv \infty$  in a subset of the domain with positive Lebesgue measure if  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} > \mathcal{S}_1^{-1}$ .

The case with  $g \equiv 0$  and  $h(s) \sim s^{-\gamma}$  with  $\gamma > 0$  near the origin is discussed in [12]. The solution of this problem exists when  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} < (\mathcal{S}_1 h(\infty))^{-1}$  and in particular it is shown that  $u > 0$  a.e. if  $h(0) = \infty$ .

The case with  $h \equiv 1$  and  $g$  is a nonnegative and continuous function is analyzed in [17]. The presence of a gradient term introduced some regularizing effects such as there is no jump part in  $Du$  and no smallness condition for the norm of  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)}$  is needed in order to obtain existence of solutions. Finally, the data is pointwise assumed  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$  on the boundary.

In conclusion, in [5] we can see all the regularizing effects described previously due to the presence of the functions  $g$  and  $h$ , we highlight that there exists a solution in  $BV(\Omega)$  because  $\gamma \leq 1$  and the datum is pointwise assumed on the boundary because  $g$  is a continuous, positive and bounded function.

Our aim is generalizing the condition on  $\theta$  when  $g(s) \sim s^{-\theta}$  near the origin with the presence of a singular zero-order term on the right-side in the context of 1-laplacian operator; the conditions found on  $\theta$  and  $\gamma$  generalize the ones found in [4, 22], in fact we assume that  $0 \leq \theta < 1$  to gain the integrability of the function  $g$  near the origin and  $\theta + \gamma \leq 1$ , moreover there is no smallness assumption on  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)}$  for the existence of a finite energy solution  $u \in BV(\Omega)$  (for further details on the significance of these hypotheses, refer Remark 3.4).

Let us summarize the contents present of this paper. In Section 2 we introduce the notation and we give preparatory tools. In Section 3 we present the main assumptions and results. Finally, in Section 4, we discuss the case of a nonnegative  $f \in L^N(\Omega)$ .

## 2. NOTATION AND PREPARATORY TOOLS

In this paper, we denote by  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ , with  $N \geq 2$ , an open bounded set with Lipschitz boundary. We indicate with  $|E|$  the  $N$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure of a set  $E$ , whereas  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial E)$  means the  $(N-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure.

$\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$  is the space of Radon measures with finite total variation over  $\Omega$ .  $\mathcal{M}_{loc}(\Omega)$  is its local counterpart, i.e. the space of Radon measures with locally finite total variation on  $\Omega$ .

Let us introduce the truncation functions, fixed  $k > 0$ :

$$T_k(s) := \begin{cases} -k & \text{if } s < -k, \\ s & \text{if } |s| \leq k, \\ k & \text{if } s > k, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

and  $G_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is

$$G_k(s) := s - T_k(s). \quad (2.2)$$

Furthermore, for a fixed  $\delta > 0$ , we define another type of truncation function  $V_\delta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$

$$V_\delta(s) := \begin{cases} 1 & 0 \leq s \leq \delta, \\ \frac{2\delta-s}{\delta} & \delta < s < 2\delta, \\ 0 & s \geq 2\delta. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

In the entire paper, we use the following notation

$$\int_{\Omega} f := \int_{\Omega} f(x) \, dx.$$

Moreover, we denote by  $C_b^0(\Omega)$  the space of continuous and bounded real functions.

Finally, by  $C$  we mean several positive constants whose value change from line to line or on the same line whose value does not depend on the indexes of introduced sequence, but it only depends on the data. In particular, we will not relabel an extracted subsequence.

**2.1. Essential properties of BV functions.** The set of bounded variation functions is

$$BV(\Omega) := \{u \in L^1(\Omega) : Du \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)^N\},$$

where  $Du$  is the distributional gradient.  $BV(\Omega)$  is a Banach space endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{BV(\Omega)} := \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \int_{\Omega} |Du|,$$

where  $|Du|$  is the total variation of the vector measure  $Du$ . However in the paper we use the following equivalent norm

$$\|u\|_{BV(\Omega)} := \int_{\partial\Omega} |u| \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} + \int_{\Omega} |Du|.$$

Furthermore we recall the following embedding Theorem.

**Theorem 2.1.** *The embeddings  $BV(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega)$  are compact for every  $1 \leq p < \frac{N}{N-1}$ . The embedding  $BV(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)$  is continuous and  $\mathcal{S}_1$  is the best constant of this embedding, i.e. for every  $u \in BV(\Omega)$ , it holds*

$$\|u\|_{L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)} \leq \mathcal{S}_1 \|u\|_{BV(\Omega)}. \quad (2.4)$$

Let us state the compactness result for  $BV$ -functions ([1, Theorem 3.23]).

**Theorem 2.2.** *Consider a sequence of functions  $u_n$  uniformly bounded with respect to  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{BV(\Omega)}$ . Then there exists  $u \in BV(\Omega)$  such that  $u_n \rightarrow u$  strongly in  $L^1(\Omega)$  and  $Du_n \rightarrow Du$  \*-weakly in  $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ .*

Now we state another important result for  $BV$ -functions (see for instance [1, Proposition 3.6]).

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let consider a sequence  $u_n \in BV(\Omega)$  such that  $u_n \rightarrow u$  strongly in  $L^1(\Omega)$  with  $u \in BV(\Omega)$ . Then*

$$\int_{\Omega} |Du|\varphi \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |Du_n|\varphi \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega).$$

For a function  $u \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ , we denote with  $L_u$  the set of its Lebesgue points, with  $S_u = \Omega \setminus L_u$  and with  $J_u$  the jump set. In particular if  $u \in BV(\Omega)$  the set  $S_u \setminus J_u$  is  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ -negligible, hence  $u$  is well defined  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ -a.e. In this case  $u$  can be identified with the precise representative  $u^*$  which is

$$u^*(x) := \begin{cases} \tilde{u}(x) & \text{if } x \in L_u, \\ \frac{u^+(x) + u^-(x)}{2} & \text{if } x \in J_u, \end{cases}$$

where  $\tilde{u}$  is the Lebesgue's representative of  $u$ ,  $u^+$  and  $u^-$  are the approximate limits of  $u$ .

When  $D^j u = 0$ , it means that  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(J_u) = 0$  or, equivalently, that  $Du = \tilde{D}u$  where  $\tilde{D}u$  is the absolutely continuous part of  $Du$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure. As a consequence, we will denote the precise representative with  $u$  instead of  $u^*$ , without ambiguity, when we integrate against a measure absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ .

Finally, let us remember an important property for  $BV$ -functions (for more details see [23, Theorem 5.14.4]) which ensures that they are finite  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ -a.e.  $x \in \Omega$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $u \in BV(\Omega)$ , then it holds*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|B_r(x_0)|} \int_{B_r(x_0)} u(x) = u(x_0), \quad (2.5)$$

for  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ -a.e.  $x_0 \in \Omega$ , where  $B_r(x_0) := \{x \in \Omega : |x - x_0| < r\}$ .

For more details on  $BV$ -functions see [1, Chapter 3].

**2.2. The Anzellotti-Chen-Frid theory.** Let us present the  $L^\infty$ -divergence-measure vector fields theory discussed, for the first time, in [3] and [9]. We introduce the space

$$\mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega) := \{z \in L^\infty(\Omega)^N : \operatorname{div} z \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)\},$$

and its local version  $\mathcal{DM}_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$  which is the set of bounded vector fields with divergence in  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ . First we remember that for  $z \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$  the distributional divergence  $\operatorname{div} z$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ .

In [3] Anzellotti introduced the distribution  $(z, Dv) : C_c^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\langle (z, Dv), \varphi \rangle := - \int_{\Omega} v^* \varphi \operatorname{div} z - \int_{\Omega} vz \cdot \nabla \varphi, \quad (2.6)$$

where  $z \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $v \in BV(\Omega) \cap C_b^0(\Omega)$ . Subsequently, different authors extended the previous definition of pairing to vector fields in  $z \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$  and functions in  $v \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ , since  $v^* \in L^\infty(\Omega, \operatorname{div} z)$  (see for instance [8, 20]). Furthermore formula (2.6) is well posed if  $z \in \mathcal{DM}_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $v \in BV_{\text{loc}}(\Omega) \cap L_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega, \operatorname{div} z)$ , as proven in [13]; the authors showed that

$$|\langle (z, Dv), \varphi \rangle| \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(A)} \|z\|_{L^\infty(A)^N} \int_A |Dv|,$$

for all open sets  $A \subset \subset \Omega$  and for all  $\varphi \in C_c^1(A)$ . Moreover, it holds

$$\left| \int_B (z, Dv) \right| \leq \int_B |(z, Dv)| \leq \|z\|_{L^\infty(A)^N} \int_B |Dv|, \quad (2.7)$$

for all Borel sets  $B$  and for all open sets  $A$  such that  $B \subset A \subset \Omega$ , which means that the measure  $(z, Dv)$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $|Dv|$ .

Further, under the same assumptions for  $z$  and  $v$  we indicate by  $\lambda(z, Dv, x)$  the Radon-Nikodým derivative of  $(z, Dv)$  with respect to  $|Dv|$ , hence we can affirm that

$$(z, Dv) = \lambda(z, Dv, x) |Dv| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega.$$

Let us highlight that, if  $z \in \mathcal{DM}_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $v \in BV_{\text{loc}}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$

$$\operatorname{div}(vz) = (z, Dv) + v^* \operatorname{div} z \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega, \quad (2.8)$$

where we underline that, as a consequence,  $vz \in \mathcal{DM}_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$ .

In [3] it is shown that every  $z \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$  has a weak trace on  $\partial\Omega$  of its normal component denoted as  $[z, \nu]$ , where  $\nu(x)$  is the outward normal unit vector defined for  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ -a.e.  $x \in \partial\Omega$ . Also we recall that

$$\|[z, \nu]\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} \leq \|z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N},$$

and if we take  $v \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ , it holds

$$v[z, \nu] = [vz, \nu] \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}\text{-a.e. on } \partial\Omega, \quad (2.9)$$

as proved in [8].

Now we are able to state the generalized Gauss-Green formula for  $L^\infty$ -divergence-measure vector fields which in the form we present is proved in [13].

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $z \in \mathcal{DM}_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $v \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  such that  $v^* \in L^1(\Omega, \operatorname{div} z)$ . Then  $vz \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$  and the following formula holds:*

$$\int_{\Omega} v^* \operatorname{div} z + \int_{\Omega} (z, Dv) = \int_{\partial\Omega} [vz, \nu] d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}. \quad (2.10)$$

For our scope, we also need the following definition of pairing measures, as defined in [18]. Let us consider  $\beta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a locally Lipschitz function and let  $v \in BV_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ . Let us define

$$\beta(v)^\# := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{v^+ - v^-} \int_{v^-}^{v^+} \beta(s) ds & \text{if } x \in J_v, \\ \beta(v) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We emphasize that  $\beta(v)^\#$  coincides with  $\beta(v)^*$  on the jump set of the function  $v$  if and only if  $\beta(s) = s$ . Let  $z \in \mathcal{DM}_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $v \in BV_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  satisfy  $\beta(v) \in BV_{\text{loc}}(\Omega) \cap L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$ . We introduce the distribution  $(z, D\beta(v)^\#) : C_c^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\langle (z, D\beta(v)^\#), \varphi \rangle := - \int_{\Omega} \beta(v)^\# \varphi \operatorname{div} z - \int_{\Omega} \beta(v) z \cdot \nabla \varphi. \quad (2.11)$$

Such pairing constitutes a well-defined measure (refer to, for instance, [18, Lemma 2.5]), which is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$  and

$$\left| \int_B (z, D\beta(v)^\#) \right| \leq \int_B |(z, D\beta(v)^\#)| \leq \|z\|_{L^\infty(A)^N} \int_B |D\beta(v)|, \quad (2.12)$$

for all Borel sets  $B$  and for all open sets  $A$  such that  $B \subset A \subset \Omega$ .

Let us finally state the chain rule formula as given in [1, Theorem 3.99].

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $v \in BV(\Omega)$  and let  $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a Lipschitz function. Then  $w = \Phi(v) \in BV(\Omega)$  and*

$$Dw = \Phi'(v)^\# Dv. \quad (2.13)$$

*In particular, if  $D^j v = 0$ , then*

$$\tilde{D}w = \Phi'(v) \tilde{D}v. \quad (2.14)$$

Now let us assert two properties of the pairing defined in (2.6) for bounded variation functions without jump part (see for instance [15, Lemma 2.6]).

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $z \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $u, v \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  such that  $D^j u = D^j v = 0$ . Then*

$$(z, D(uv)) = u(z, Dv) + v(z, Du) = (uz, Dv) + (vz, Du). \quad (2.15)$$

We conclude this section with a lemma which is an improvement of the one in [21]; it is a regularity result for a vector field in  $z \in \mathcal{DM}_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$ .

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $0 \leq \tilde{f} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ , let  $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$  a measure absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$  and let  $z \in \mathcal{DM}_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$  such that*

$$-\operatorname{div} z + \sigma = \tilde{f} \text{ in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega), \quad (2.16)$$

*then*

$$\operatorname{div} z \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega). \quad (2.17)$$

*Proof.* We choose  $0 \leq v \in W_0^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^0(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  and we let  $\varphi_n \in C_c^1(\Omega)$  be a sequence of nonnegative functions converging to  $v$  strongly in  $W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$ . Picking out  $\varphi_n$  as a test function in (2.16), we obtain

$$\int_\Omega z \cdot \nabla \varphi_n + \int_\Omega \varphi_n \sigma = \int_\Omega \tilde{f} \varphi_n.$$

Our aim is taking the limit as  $n$  tends to infinity in the previous equality.

For the first term on the left-hand side, it is sufficient observing that  $z \in L^\infty(\Omega)^N$  and  $\varphi_n \rightarrow v$  strongly in  $W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$ .

In the second one, we pass to the limit through the Lebesgue Theorem because  $\varphi_n \rightarrow v \sigma$ -a. e., since  $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$  and  $\varphi_n \rightarrow v$  strongly in  $W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$ .

For the right-hand side using the Fatou Lemma, we gain

$$\int_\Omega \tilde{f} v \leq \int_\Omega z \cdot \nabla v + \int_\Omega v \sigma. \quad (2.18)$$

Now we take  $\tilde{v} \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^0(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  and by virtue of a Gagliardo Lemma (see [3, Lemma 5.5]), there exists  $w_n \in W^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^0(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  such that

- $w_n|_{\partial\Omega} = \tilde{v}|_{\partial\Omega}$ ,
- $\|w_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}$ ,
- $\int_\Omega |\nabla w_n| \leq \int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{v} d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} + \frac{1}{n}$ ,
- $w_n \rightarrow 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ .

Taking  $|\tilde{v} - w_n| \in W_0^{1,1}(\Omega) \cap C^0(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  as a test function in (2.18), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \tilde{f} |\tilde{v} - w_n| &\leq \int_\Omega z \cdot \nabla |\tilde{v} - w_n| + \int_\Omega |\tilde{v} - w_n| \sigma \\ &\leq \|z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \left( \int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{v}| + \int_\Omega |\nabla w_n| \right) + 2|\sigma|(\Omega) \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \left( \int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{v}| + \int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{v} d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} + \frac{1}{n} \right) + 2|\sigma|(\Omega) \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking limit as  $n$  tends to infinity, from the Fatou Lemma, we have

$$\int_\Omega \tilde{f} \tilde{v} \leq \|z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \left( \int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{v}| + \int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{v} d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} \right) + 2|\sigma|(\Omega) \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \quad (2.19)$$

Then, fixing  $\tilde{v} \equiv 1$  in (2.19), one gets that  $\tilde{f} \in L^1(\Omega)$ . Therefore this implies (2.17).  $\square$

**Remark 2.9.** As a direct consequence of Lemma 2.8, we can extend the space of test function to  $BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  for the equation (2.16), it can show through a density argument, it holds

$$\int_{\Omega} (z, Dv) - \int_{\partial\Omega} v[z, \nu] d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} + \int_{\Omega} v^* \sigma = \int_{\Omega} \tilde{f} v \quad \text{for all } v \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega).$$

### 3. MAIN ASSUMPTIONS AND RESULTS FOR $f > 0$

In this section we deal with existence of solutions to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_1 u + g(u)|Du| = h(u)f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ , with  $N \geq 2$ , is an open and bounded set with Lipschitz boundary,  $\Delta_1 u := \operatorname{div} \left( \frac{Du}{|Du|} \right)$  is the 1-laplacian operator. Firstly, we study the case with  $0 < f \in L^N(\Omega)$ .

The function  $g : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty]$  is continuous and such that

$$\exists 0 \leq \theta < 1, c_1, s_1 > 0 : g(s) \leq \frac{c_1}{s^\theta} \quad \text{for all } s \leq s_1, \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$\liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} g(s) > 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover  $h : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is a continuous function such that  $h(0) > 0$  and

$$\exists 0 \leq \gamma \leq 1, c_2, s_2 > 0 : h(s) \leq \frac{c_2}{s^\gamma} \quad \text{for all } s \leq s_2, \quad (3.4)$$

and we require

$$h, g \in C_b^0([\delta, \infty)), \forall \delta > 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Furthermore we introduce the function  $\Gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\Gamma(s) := \int_0^s g(\sigma) d\sigma. \quad (3.6)$$

We set the following quantities which are also useful in the next proofs

$$\begin{aligned} g_k(\infty) &:= \sup_{s \in [k, \infty)} g(s) \quad \text{and} \quad g(\infty) := \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} g(s) < \infty, \\ h_k(\infty) &:= \sup_{s \in [k, \infty)} h(s) \quad \text{and} \quad h(\infty) := \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} h(s) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Let us highlight that the classical case  $g, h \equiv 1$  is covered by the above assumptions as  $\gamma, \theta$  could be zero.

Now we precise how the concept of distributional solution for problem (3.1) is intended.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $0 < f \in L^N(\Omega)$ . A nonnegative  $u \in BV(\Omega)$  is a distributional solution to (3.1) if  $D^j u = 0$ ,  $g(u) \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, |Du|)$  and  $h(u)f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  and if there exists a vector field  $z \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ , with  $\|z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \leq 1$  such that

$$-\operatorname{div} z + g(u)|Du| = h(u)f \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega, \quad (3.7)$$

$$(z, DT_k(u)) = |DT_k(u)| \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega) \quad \text{for any } k > 0, \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$u(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^{N-1}\text{-a.e. } x \in \partial\Omega. \quad (3.9)$$

**Remark 3.2.** Let us briefly discuss Definition 3.1. Firstly, formulas (3.7) and (3.8) represent the weak manner in which  $z$  plays the role of as the singular quotient  $\frac{Du}{|Du|}$ .

Furthermore, (3.9) underscores that the boundary condition is assumed to hold pointwise. This is intrinsically linked to the presence of the gradient term, as will be examined later. It is now widely recognized that solutions to 1-Laplace Dirichlet problems typically do not satisfy the pointwise enforcement of boundary conditions when  $g \equiv 0$  (see, for instance, [12, 17, 21]). In such cases, the weaker condition

$$u([z, \nu] + \operatorname{sgn}(u)) = 0 \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}\text{-a.e. on } \partial\Omega$$

is usually imposed. This condition essentially asserts that either  $u$  has a zero trace, or the weak trace of the normal component of  $z$  attains the minimal possible slope at the boundary.

Finally, we highlight that if  $h(0) = \infty$ , since  $h(u)f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ , it follows that  $\{u = 0\} \subseteq \{f = 0\}$ . Therefore, given  $f > 0$ , we deduce that  $u > 0$ .

At this point we state the main result of this section.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $g$  be positive and satisfy (3.2), (3.3) and (3.5), let  $h$  satisfy (3.4) and (3.5) such that  $0 \leq \theta < 1$ ,  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ , and  $\theta + \gamma \leq 1$  and let  $0 < f \in L^N(\Omega)$ . Then there exists a solution to problem (3.1) in the sense of Definition 3.1.*

*Moreover if  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} < (\mathcal{S}_1 h(\infty))^{-1}$ , then  $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ .*

**Remark 3.4.** Let us spend few words on the statements of Theorem 3.3.

Initially, the condition (3.3) is necessary for the existence of the function  $u$  (for more details see Lemma 3.5).

We emphasize that the assumption regarding the exponent  $\theta$  is necessary for the integrability of the function  $g$ . In contrast, the statement concerning  $\gamma$  is natural for solution to be globally in  $BV(\Omega)$ , in fact when  $g \equiv 0$  and  $\gamma > 1$  the solutions are only locally in  $BV(\Omega)$  (for more details see [12]). Additionally, the condition  $\theta + \gamma \leq 1$  and  $f \in L^N(\Omega)$  are crucial to have  $\Gamma(u) \in BV(\Omega)$  (see Lemma 3.5), where  $\Gamma$  is the function defined in (3.6).

We underline that the positivity of the function  $g$  is necessary for  $\Gamma$  to be increasing, which is essential to prove that  $D^j u = 0$ .

Finally, if  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} < (\mathcal{S}_1 h(\infty))^{-1}$ , we can show that  $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  through a Stampacchia's method, as a consequence fixing  $k > \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ , (3.8) becomes

$$(z, Du) = |Du| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega.$$

**3.1. Approximation scheme and existence of a limit function.** We find a solution of the problem (3.1) by approximation, let us consider

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_1 u_n + g_n(u_n)|Du_n| = h(u_n)f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

where  $g_n(s) := T_n(g(s))$  for any  $s \in [0, \infty)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $T_n$  is the truncation function defined in (2.1).

It follows from [5, Theorem 4.4] that there exists a solution to (3.10), i.e. there exists  $z_n \in \mathcal{DM}_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\Omega)$  with  $\|z_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \leq 1$  and a nonnegative function  $u_n \in BV(\Omega)$  such that  $D^j u_n = 0$ ,  $g_n(u_n) \in L^1(\Omega, |Du_n|)$  and  $h(u_n)f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  such that

$$-\text{div } z_n + g_n(u_n)|Du_n| = h(u_n)f \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega, \quad (3.11)$$

$$(z_n, DT_k(u_n)) = |DT_k(u_n)| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega, \text{ for any } k > 0, \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$u_n(x) = 0 \text{ for } \mathcal{H}^{N-1}\text{-a.e. } x \in \partial\Omega. \quad (3.13)$$

Now we estimate  $u_n$  and  $\Gamma_n(u_n)$  in  $BV(\Omega)$ , where, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\Gamma_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is such that

$$\Gamma_n(s) := \int_0^s g_n(\sigma) d\sigma.$$

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $g$  be positive and satisfying (3.2), (3.3) and (3.5). Let  $h$  satisfy (3.4) and (3.5) such that  $0 \leq \theta < 1$ ,  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$  and  $\theta + \gamma \leq 1$ , and let  $0 < f \in L^N(\Omega)$ . Finally let  $u_n$  be a solution to (3.10).*

*Then  $u_n, \Gamma_n(u_n)$  are uniformly bounded with respect to  $n$  in  $BV(\Omega)$ , there exists  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  independent of  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$\|u_n\|_{BV(\Omega)} \leq C_1, \quad (3.14)$$

and

$$\|\Gamma_n(u_n)\|_{BV(\Omega)} \leq C_2, \quad (3.15)$$

and  $h(u_n)f$  is uniformly bounded with respect to  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  in  $L^1(\omega)$ , for every  $\omega \subset\subset \Omega$ .

Moreover if  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} < (\mathcal{S}_1 h(\infty))^{-1}$ , then  $u_n$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ .

*Proof.* We first show that  $u_n$  is bounded in  $BV(\Omega)$  with respect to  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Without losing generality, we can assume that  $s_1 = s_2 = \bar{s}$  and  $c_1 = c_2 = \bar{c}$ , where  $s_1, s_2, c_1, c_2$  are the constants introduced in (3.2) and (3.4).

We choose  $T_1(u_n) \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  as a test function in (3.11) which is an admissible choice thanks to Remark 2.9.

Initially we note that

$$-\int_{\Omega} \text{div } z_n T_1(u_n) \stackrel{(2.10),(3.13)}{=} \int_{\Omega} (z_n, DT_1(u_n)) \stackrel{(3.12)}{=} \int_{\Omega} |DT_1(u_n)| \stackrel{(2.14)}{=} \int_{\{u_n \leq 1\}} |Du_n|, \quad (3.16)$$

which is possible because  $u_n$  is nonnegative. For the integral on the right-hand side, we deduce

$$\int_{\Omega} h(u_n)f T_1(u_n) \stackrel{(3.4)}{\leq} \int_{\{u_n \leq \bar{s}\}} \frac{\bar{c}}{u_n} f u_n + \int_{\{u_n > \bar{s}\}} h(u_n)f \stackrel{(3.5)}{\leq} (\bar{c}\bar{s}^{1-\gamma} + h_{\bar{s}}(\infty)) \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \quad (3.17)$$

where we highlight that the right-hand side is a constant independent of  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Putting together (3.16) and (3.17) in (3.11) with  $T_1(u_n)$  as a test function, we gain

$$\int_{\{u_n \leq 1\}} |Du_n| + \int_{\{u_n \leq 1\}} g_n(u_n) |Du_n| u_n + \int_{\{u_n > 1\}} g_n(u_n) |Du_n| \leq C. \quad (3.18)$$

At this point we stress that as a consequence of (3.3), we can assure that there exists  $\eta > 0$  such that

$$\inf_{s \in (1, \infty)} g(s) > \eta > 0,$$

so applying (3.5) in (3.18), we can affirm that

$$\min \left\{ 1, \inf_{s \in (1, \infty)} g(s) \right\} \left( \int_{\{u_n \leq 1\}} |Du_n| + \int_{\{u_n > 1\}} |Du_n| \right) \leq C,$$

hence, we have proven (3.14).

Now we focus on proving that  $\Gamma_n(u_n)$  is uniformly bounded with respect to  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  in  $BV(\Omega)$ . First of all, we want to show

$$(z_n, D\Gamma_n(T_k(u_n))) = |D\Gamma_n(T_k(u_n))| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega. \quad (3.19)$$

From the definition of  $\lambda(z_n, \Gamma_n(T_k(u_n)), x)$  we know that

$$(z_n, D\Gamma_n(T_k(u_n))) = \lambda(z_n, \Gamma_n(T_k(u_n)), x) |D\Gamma_n(T_k(u_n))| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega,$$

by [11, Proposition 4.5 (iii)] for every  $k > 0$ , we gain

$$\lambda(z_n, D\Gamma_n(T_k(u_n)), x) = \lambda(z_n, DT_k(u_n), x) = 1 \quad |D\Gamma_n(T_k(u_n))| \text{-a.e.},$$

where we recall that  $\lambda(z_n, DT_k(u_n), x) = 1 \quad |DT_k(u_n)| \text{-a.e.}$  from (3.12), hence we get (3.19).

Subsequently, we take  $\Gamma_n(T_k(u_n)) \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  with  $k > \bar{s}$  as a test function in the equation (3.11), which is an admissible choice by Remark 2.9, first we show that

$$- \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div} z_n \Gamma_n(T_k(u_n)) \stackrel{(2.10), (3.13)}{=} \int_{\Omega} (z_n, D\Gamma_n(T_k(u_n))) \stackrel{(3.19)}{=} \int_{\Omega} |D\Gamma_n(T_k(u_n))|. \quad (3.20)$$

Hence putting (3.20) in (3.11) with  $\Gamma_n(T_k(u_n))$  as a test function, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |D\Gamma_n(T_k(u_n))| &\leq \int_{\Omega} h(u_n) f \Gamma_n(T_k(u_n)) \leq \frac{\bar{c}^2}{1-\theta} \int_{\{u_n \leq \bar{s}\}} u_n^{1-\theta-\gamma} f \\ &+ h_{\bar{s}}(\infty) g_{\bar{s}}(\infty) \|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \|u_n\|_{L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)} \stackrel{(2.4)}{\leq} \frac{\bar{c}^2 \bar{s}^{1-\theta-\gamma}}{1-\theta} \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \\ &+ \mathcal{S}_1 h_{\bar{s}}(\infty) g_{\bar{s}}(\infty) \|u_n\|_{BV(\Omega)} \|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \stackrel{(3.14)}{\leq} C \|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.2), (3.4), (3.5) and Hölder's inequality.

We point out that the previous integral is uniformly bounded with respect to  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $k > \bar{s}$ , since  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq \theta < 1$  and  $\theta + \gamma \leq 1$ , hence through Lemma 2.3, one can take  $k \rightarrow \infty$  yielding to

$$\int_{\Omega} |D\Gamma_n(u_n)| \leq C \|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)},$$

therefore we get (3.15) (recall that  $u_n = 0 \mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ -a.e. on  $\partial\Omega$  which is guaranteed in (3.13)).

Now we show that  $h(u_n)f$  is uniformly bounded with respect to  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  in  $L^1(\omega)$  for every  $\omega \subset\subset \Omega$ . We choose  $0 \leq \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$  such that  $\varphi \equiv 1$  in  $\omega$  as a test function in (3.11); then it follows from (3.15) that

$$\int_{\omega} h(u_n) f \varphi \leq \int_{\Omega} z_n \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega} |D\Gamma_n(u_n)| \varphi \leq \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^1(\Omega)^N} + C \|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \quad (3.21)$$

where we also used that  $\|z_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \leq 1$ .

Finally let us demonstrate that  $u_n$  is uniformly bounded with respect to  $n$  in  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ ; we stress that the condition on the smallness of norm  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)}$  is crucial for this estimate.

Let us take  $G_k(T_r(u_n)) \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  where  $G_k$  is the function defined (2.2) with  $r > k > \bar{s}$  as a test function in (3.11); it is an admissible choice due to Remark 2.9, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} (z_n, DG_k(T_r(u_n))) \leq \int_{\Omega} h(u_n) f G_k(u_n) \leq h_k(\infty) \|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \|G_k(u_n)\|_{L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)}, \quad (3.22)$$

where we also used (2.10) and (3.13). Through [11, Proposition 4.5 (iii)], we deduce that

$$\lambda(z_n, DG_k(T_r(u_n)), x) = \lambda(z_n, DT_r(u_n), x) = 1 \quad |DG_k(T_r(u_n))| \text{-a.e.}$$

since  $G_k$  is a non-decreasing function, hence we can affirm that

$$(z_n, DG_k(T_r(u_n))) = |DG_k(T_r(u_n))| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega, \quad (3.23)$$



because  $|DG_k(T_r(u_n))|$  is an absolutely continuous measure with respect to  $|DT_r(u_n)|$ . Gathering (3.23) into (3.22), it yields

$$\int_{\{k \leq u_n \leq r\}} |Du_n| = \int_{\Omega} |DG_k(T_r(u_n))| \leq h_k(\infty) \|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \|G_k(u_n)\|_{L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)},$$

where we have applied Lemma 2.6, since  $G_k, T_r$  are Lipschitz functions and  $D^j u_n = 0$ . Due to the Lebesgue Theorem and Theorem 2.1, taking  $r$  at infinity, we have

$$\mathcal{S}_1^{-1} \|G_k(u_n)\|_{L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)} \leq h_k(\infty) \|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \|G_k(u_n)\|_{L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)}.$$

Under the assumption that  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \mathcal{S}_1 h(\infty) < 1$ , we can pick  $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large such that  $\mathcal{S}_1^{-1} - \|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} h_{\bar{k}}(\infty) > C > 0$  for a constant  $C$  which is independent of  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore, we get

$$\|G_{\bar{k}}(u_n)\|_{L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)} \leq 0,$$

which means that

$$\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \bar{k},$$

where  $\bar{k} > 0$  is a constant independent of  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.6.** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.5, there exists a nonnegative  $u \in BV(\Omega)$  such that  $u_n$  converges to  $u$  (up to subsequence) in  $L^q(\Omega)$  for every  $q < \frac{N}{N-1}$  and  $Du_n$  converges to  $Du$   $*$ -weakly as measures.*

*Moreover  $\Gamma(u) \in BV(\Omega)$  and  $\Gamma_n(u_n)$  converges to  $\Gamma(u)$  (up to subsequence) in  $L^q(\Omega)$  for every  $q < \frac{N}{N-1}$  and  $D\Gamma_n(u_n)$  converges to  $D\Gamma(u)$   $*$ -weakly as measures.*

*Finally if  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} < (\mathcal{S}_1 h(\infty))^{-1}$ , then  $u$  is also bounded.*

**3.2. Identification of the vector field  $z$ .** Now we show the existence of the vector field  $z$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.5, it holds  $h(u)f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  and there exists  $z \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  such that*

$$-\operatorname{div} \left( z e^{-\Gamma(u)} \right) = h(u) f e^{-\Gamma(u)} \text{ as measures in } \Omega, \quad (3.24)$$

and

$$-\operatorname{div} z + |D\Gamma(u)| \leq h(u) f \text{ as measures in } \Omega, \quad (3.25)$$

Moreover  $u > 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$  and  $D^j u = 0$ .

*Proof.* Let us observe that  $h(u)f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  simply follows from (3.21) after an application of the Fatou Lemma. Firstly we consider  $z_n \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ , the vector field which plays the role of  $\frac{Du_n}{|Du_n|}$ . We remember that  $z_n$  is uniformly bounded with respect to  $n$  in  $L^\infty(\Omega)^N$ , since  $\|z_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \leq 1$ .

Therefore this is sufficient to deduce the existence of  $z \in L^\infty(\Omega)^N$  such that, up to subsequences,  $z_n$  converges  $*$ -weakly in  $L^\infty(\Omega)^N$  to  $z$ , as  $n$  tends to infinity; in particular by weak lower semi-continuity, it holds  $\|z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \leq 1$ .

Let us focus on (3.24). It follows from [5, Proposition 4.3] that

$$-\operatorname{div} \left( z_n e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \right) = h(u_n) f e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \text{ as measures in } \Omega, \quad (3.26)$$

as a consequence, (3.24) is shown once we have taken  $n$  to infinity in (3.26).

We pick  $0 \leq \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$  as a test function in (3.26), for the left-hand side we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} z_n \cdot \nabla \varphi e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} = \int_{\Omega} z \cdot \nabla \varphi e^{-\Gamma(u)}, \quad (3.27)$$

which simply follows since  $z_n \rightharpoonup z$   $*$ -weakly in  $L^\infty(\Omega)^N$  and  $e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \rightarrow e^{-\Gamma(u)}$  strongly in  $L^1(\Omega)$  through the Lebesgue Theorem. Now it remains to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} h(u_n) f e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi = \int_{\Omega} h(u) f e^{-\Gamma(u)} \varphi. \quad (3.28)$$

We distinguish two cases: if  $h$  is finite at the origin then the passage to limit is a simple consequence of the Lebesgue Theorem. Hence, without losing generality, we assume  $h(0) = \infty$ .

We split the integral as follows

$$\int_{\Omega} h(u_n) f e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi = \int_{\{u_n \leq \delta\}} h(u_n) f e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi + \int_{\{u_n > \delta\}} h(u_n) f e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi, \quad (3.29)$$

where  $\delta \notin \{\eta : |\{u = \eta\}| > 0\}$  which is at most a countable set.

We highlight that  $u > 0$  almost everywhere in  $\Omega$  since  $h(0) = \infty$  and  $h(u)f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ , hence  $\{u = 0\} \subseteq \{f = 0\}$

which is Lebesgue negligible because  $f > 0$  a.e.

Applying twice the Lebesgue Theorem on the second term of right-hand side of (3.29), we gain

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{u_n > \delta\}} h(u_n) f e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\{u > \delta\}} h(u) f e^{-\Gamma(u)} \varphi \stackrel{u \geq 0}{=} \int_{\Omega} h(u) f e^{-\Gamma(u)} \varphi, \quad (3.30)$$

since

$$\chi_{\{u_n > \delta\}} h(u_n) f e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi \leq h_\delta(\infty) f \varphi \in L^1(\Omega),$$

and

$$\chi_{\{u > \delta\}} h(u) f e^{-\Gamma(u)} \varphi \leq h(u) f \varphi \in L^1(\Omega).$$

Now we prove

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{u_n \leq \delta\}} h(u_n) f e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi = 0, \quad (3.31)$$

which yields (3.28) in virtue of (3.30).

We fix  $V_\delta(u_n) e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  with  $0 \leq \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$  and  $V_\delta$  is the truncation function defined in (2.3) as a test function in (3.11). It is an admissible choice since  $e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)}, V_\delta(u_n) \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  is an algebra (see for instance [1, Remark 3.10]). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (z_n, DV_\delta(u_n)) e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi + \int_{\Omega} (z_n, De^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)}) V_\delta(u_n) \varphi + \int_{\Omega} z_n \cdot \nabla \varphi e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} V_\delta(u_n) \\ & + \int_{\Omega} g_n(u_n) |Du_n| e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} V_\delta(u_n) \varphi = \int_{\Omega} h(u_n) f e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} V_\delta(u_n) \varphi, \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

where we also use (2.10), (2.15) and (3.13).

We underline that for a solution  $u_n$  of the problem (3.10) found in [5, Theorem 4.4] by virtue of [5, Lemma 4.7], it holds

$$(z_n, D(-e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)})) = |De^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)}| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega.$$

As direct consequence of the previous equality and the fact that  $D^j u_n = 0$ , it yields

$$\int_{\Omega} (z_n, De^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)}) V_\delta(u_n) \varphi = - \int_{\Omega} |D\Gamma_n(u_n)| e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} V_\delta(u_n) \varphi. \quad (3.33)$$

Moreover by (3.12) and  $D^j u_n = 0$ , we get

$$\int_{\Omega} (z_n, DV_\delta(u_n)) e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi = \int_{\Omega} V'_\delta(u_n) (z_n, DT_{2\delta}(u_n)) e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi = \int_{\Omega} V'_\delta(u_n) |DT_{2\delta}(u_n)| e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi \leq 0, \quad (3.34)$$

where we also use Lemma 2.6 and (2.10).

Putting (3.33) and (3.34) in (3.32), we have

$$\int_{\{u_n \leq \delta\}} h(u_n) f e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi \leq \int_{\Omega} z_n \cdot \nabla \varphi e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} V_\delta(u_n).$$

Through the  $*$ -weak convergence of  $z_n \rightarrow z$  in  $L^\infty(\Omega)^N$  and the Lebesgue Theorem, it follows that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{u_n \leq \delta\}} h(u_n) f e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi \leq \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} z_n \cdot \nabla \varphi e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} V_\delta(u_n) \leq \int_{\{u=0\}} z \cdot \nabla \varphi e^{-\Gamma(u)} \stackrel{u \geq 0}{=} 0,$$

which demonstrates (3.31). Moreover putting together (3.27) and (3.28), it yields (3.24).

Now we show (3.25), it is enough to take limit as  $n$  tends to infinity in (3.11). Firstly we analyze the left-hand side, the first integral take limit due to the  $*$ -weak convergence of the vector field  $z_n$ . For the second one, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |D\Gamma(u)| \varphi \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |D\Gamma_n(u_n)| \varphi, \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega),$$

due to Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 2.3.

For the right-hand side we reason analogously as in the proof of (3.28), indeed we have that ( $\delta < 1$ )

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{u_n \leq \delta\}} h(u_n) f \varphi \leq \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{e^{-\Gamma(1)}} \int_{\{u_n \leq \delta\}} h(u_n) f e^{-\Gamma_n(u_n)} \varphi = 0, \quad (3.35)$$

this concludes the proof of (3.25).

As consequence of (3.25), it gives that  $z \in \mathcal{DM}_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$ .

Finally, we prove  $D^j u = 0$ . We highlight that  $J_{\Gamma(u)} = J_u$  because  $\Gamma$  is an increasing function since  $g$  is positive, in particular we use the pairing introduced in (2.11) with  $\beta(s) = -e^{-s}$  and  $v = \Gamma(u)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(e^{-\Gamma(u)}\right)^{\#} |D\Gamma(u)| &\stackrel{(3.25)}{\leq} e^{-\Gamma(u)} h(u) f + \left(e^{-\Gamma(u)}\right)^{\#} \operatorname{div} z \stackrel{(3.24)}{=} -\operatorname{div} \left(ze^{-\Gamma(u)}\right) + \left(e^{-\Gamma(u)}\right)^{\#} \operatorname{div} z \\ &\stackrel{(2.6)}{=} \left(z, D\left(-e^{-\Gamma(u)}\right)^{\#}\right) \stackrel{(2.7)}{\leq} \left|D\left(-e^{-\Gamma(u)}\right)\right| = \left(e^{-\Gamma(u)}\right)^{\#} |D\Gamma(u)| \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega), \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

where the last equality is a consequence of Lemma 2.6. Therefore, the previous implies

$$\left(z, D\left(-e^{-\Gamma(u)}\right)^{\#}\right) = \left|D\left(-e^{-\Gamma(u)}\right)\right| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega.$$

As a direct consequence of the previous equality we can deduce that  $D^j \Gamma(u) = 0$  through [5, Lemma 2.3] with  $\alpha(s) = s$ ,  $\beta(s) = -e^{-s}$ ,  $w = \Gamma(u)$  and (3.25).

Especially, we can affirm also that  $D^j u = 0$ , because  $\Gamma$  is increasing since  $g$  is positive.  $\square$

**3.3. Proof of the main existence result.** Let us prove Theorem 3.3 as a consequence of the previous Lemmas.

*Proof of Theorem 3.3.* Let us consider  $u_n$  a solution of the problem (3.10) given in [5, Theorem 4.4].

From Corollary 3.6, one has that there exists  $u \in BV(\Omega)$  such that, up to subsequence,  $u_n$  converges almost everywhere in  $\Omega$  at  $u$  as  $n$  tends to infinity. Moreover in Lemma 3.7 we found that  $h(u)f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  and  $D^j u = 0$ . In addition, in the same lemma, we proved the existence of a vector field  $z \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  such that  $\|z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \leq 1$ .

To complete the proof, we verify that  $u$  and  $z$  satisfy (3.7), (3.8), (3.9) and  $g(u) \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, |Du|)$ .

Let us focus on proving (3.7), in (3.36) all the inequalities become equalities, consequently we conclude that

$$e^{-\Gamma(u)} (-\operatorname{div} z + |D\Gamma(u)|) = e^{-\Gamma(u)} h(u) f \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega),$$

recalling that  $e^{-\Gamma(u)} > 0$   $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ -a.e.  $x \in \Omega$  thanks to (2.5) because  $\Gamma(u) \in BV(\Omega)$ , as proven in Corollary 3.6, we can deduce

$$-\operatorname{div} z + |D\Gamma(u)| = h(u) f \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega). \quad (3.37)$$

Now using [14, Lemma 2.4], we can affirm that

$$\chi_{\{u>0\}} |D\Gamma(u)| = g(u) \chi_{\{u>0\}} |Du| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega,$$

by Lemma 3.7 and [14, Remark 2.5], we deduce

$$|D\Gamma(u)| = g(u) |Du| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega, \quad (3.38)$$

which implies that  $g(u) \in L^1(\Omega, |Du|)$ .

Putting together (3.37) and (3.38), we can conclude that holds (3.7). We highlight that  $z \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$  since it holds Lemma 2.8.

Our next goal is proving (3.8). We take  $T_k(u_n)\varphi \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  as a test function in (3.11) with  $0 \leq \varphi \in C^1_c(\Omega)$ , which is an admissible choice as stated in Remark 2.9, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |DT_k(u_n)|\varphi + \int_{\Omega} z_n \cdot \nabla \varphi T_k(u_n) + \int_{\Omega} g_n(u_n) |Du_n| T_k(u_n)\varphi = \int_{\Omega} h(u_n) f T_k(u_n)\varphi, \quad (3.39)$$

where we use (2.8) and (3.12).

To reach our objective, we take limit as  $n$  tends to infinity in (3.39). We name

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_n(s) := \int_0^s T_k(\sigma) g_n(\sigma) d\sigma,$$

hence the first and the third integral on left hand side of (3.39), pass to limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by Lemma 2.3 (we underline that  $T_k(u_n) \rightarrow T_k(u)$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}_n(u_n) \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}(u)$  strongly in  $L^1(\Omega)$  as a consequence of Corollary 3.6), instead the second integral take limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  because  $z_n \rightarrow z$   $*$ -weakly in  $L^\infty(\Omega)^N$  as stated in Lemma 3.7 and  $T_k(u_n) \rightarrow T_k(u)$  strongly in  $L^1(\Omega)$  as proven in Corollary 3.6.

Finally, for the right hand side we reason analogously as in the proof of (3.28), indeed we have that ( $\delta < 1$ )

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{u_n \leq \delta\}} h(u_n) f T_k(u_n)\varphi \leq k \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{u_n \leq \delta\}} h(u_n) f \varphi \stackrel{(3.35)}{=} 0.$$

Hence, (3.39) becomes

$$\int_{\Omega} |DT_k(u)|\varphi + \int_{\Omega} z \cdot \nabla \varphi T_k(u) + \int_{\Omega} g(u) |Du| T_k(u)\varphi \leq \int_{\Omega} h(u) f T_k(u)\varphi, \quad (3.40)$$

where we use

$$|D\tilde{\Gamma}(u)| = g(u) |Du| T_k(u) \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega,$$

as a consequence of [14, Remark 2.5],  $|\{u = 0\}| = 0$  and  $D^j u = 0$ .

Recall Remark 2.9, we can expand the space of test function of (3.7) to  $BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ , hence from (3.40), we can deduce that

$$\int_{\Omega} |DT_k(u)| \varphi \leq - \int_{\Omega} z \cdot \nabla \varphi T_k(u) - \int_{\Omega} T_k(u) \varphi \operatorname{div} z \stackrel{(2.6)}{=} \int_{\Omega} (z, DT_k(u)) \varphi,$$

which means

$$|DT_k(u)| \leq (z, DT_k(u)) \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega, \text{ for any } k > 0,$$

and, being the reverse inequality trivial, this proves (3.8).

Now it remains to show (3.9). In [5, Lemma 4.9] it is proven, for every  $k > 0$ , that

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} ([T_k(u_n)z_n, \nu] + T_k(u_n)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} + \int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{\Gamma}_n(u_n) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} = 0. \quad (3.41)$$

In particular, it follows from (2.9) and  $\|z_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \leq 1$  that

$$|[T_k(u_n)z_n, \nu]| \leq T_k(u_n) \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \quad (3.42)$$

Therefore gathering (3.42) into (3.41), one yields

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{\Gamma}_n(u_n) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} = 0,$$

using the Fatou Lemma we gain

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{\Gamma}(u) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} \leq 0,$$

so  $\tilde{\Gamma}(u) = 0$   $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ -a.e. on  $\partial\Omega$ , as consequence it gives (3.9).

Finally if  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} < (\mathcal{S}_1 h(\infty))^{-1}$ , from Corollary 3.6, we can deduce that  $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4. THE CASE OF A NONNEGATIVE $f \in L^N(\Omega)$

In this section we extend to the case of a nonnegative datum  $f \in L^N(\Omega)$ . Let consider

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_1 u + g(u)|Du| = h(u)f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

with  $g, h$  satisfying (3.2) - (3.5); in particular we assume that  $h(0) = \infty$ .

In this case, as the solution is not expected to be positive, the notion of solution needs to be suitably adapted.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $0 \leq f \in L^N(\Omega)$ . A nonnegative  $u \in BV(\Omega)$  is a solution to the problem (4.1) if  $\chi_{\{u>0\}} \in BV_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ ,  $D^j u = 0$ ,  $\chi_{\{u>0\}} g(u) \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, |Du|)$ ,  $h(u)f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ , and there exists  $z \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  with  $\|z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \leq 1$  such that

$$-\chi_{\{u>0\}}^* \operatorname{div} z + \chi_{\{u>0\}} g(u)|Du| = h(u)f \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega, \quad (4.2)$$

$$(z, DT_k(u)) = |DT_k(u)| \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega) \text{ for any } k > 0, \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$u(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^{N-1}\text{-a.e. in } \partial\Omega. \quad (4.4)$$

**Remark 4.2.** Let us highlight the main difference with respect to Definition 3.1, i.e. the presence of the characteristic function  $\chi_{\{u>0\}}$  in (4.2), because we cannot deduce that  $u > 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$  from  $h(u)f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  because the set  $\{f = 0\}$  is not Lebesgue negligible.

**Theorem 4.3.** Let  $g$  be positive and satisfying (3.2), (3.3) and (3.5). Let  $h$  satisfy (3.4) and (3.5) such that  $0 \leq \theta < 1$ ,  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$  and  $\theta + \gamma \leq 1$  and let  $0 \leq f \in L^N(\Omega)$ . Then there exists a solution to the problem (4.1) in the sense of Definition 4.1.

Moreover if  $\|f\|_{L^N(\Omega)} < (\mathcal{S}_1 h(\infty))^{-1}$ , then  $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ .

*Proof.* We only emphasize the few differences with the proof of Theorem 3.3.

Let us introduce the following approximation scheme

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_1 u_n + g(u_n)|Du_n| = h(u_n)f_n & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

where  $f_n(x) := \max\{\frac{1}{n}, f(x)\}$  for all  $x \in \Omega$ . Thanks to Theorem 3.3 there exists  $z_n \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  and a positive  $u_n \in BV(\Omega)$  such that  $D^j u_n = 0$ ,  $g(u_n) \in L^1(\Omega, |Du_n|)$ ,  $h(u_n)f_n \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$  such that

$$-\operatorname{div} z_n + g(u_n)|Du_n| = h(u_n)f_n \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega,$$

$$(z_n, DT_k(u_n)) = |DT_k(u_n)| \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega) \text{ and for any } k > 0,$$

and

$$u_n = 0 \quad \mathcal{H}^{N-1}\text{-a.e. on } \partial\Omega.$$

Initially, we want to prove (4.2), we repeat the same arguments of Lemma 3.5 and Corollary 3.6, it is possible because we can extend the space of test functions to  $BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  thanks to Remark 2.9.

After, we take limit as  $n$  tends to infinity in the equation (3.24), which is

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(z_n e^{-\Gamma(u_n)}\right) = h(u_n) f_n e^{-\Gamma(u_n)} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega).$$

The first term passes to the limit by the Lebesgue Theorem. For the second term we split the integral into two parts

$$\int_{\Omega} h(u_n) f_n e^{-\Gamma(u_n)} \varphi = \int_{\{u_n > \delta\}} h(u_n) f_n e^{-\Gamma(u_n)} \varphi + \int_{\{u_n \leq \delta\}} h(u_n) f_n e^{-\Gamma(u_n)} \varphi,$$

with  $\delta \notin \{\eta : |\{u = \eta\}| > 0\}$  which is at most a countable set and  $0 \leq \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$ .

The first quantity passes to the limit as  $n$  tends to infinity and after as  $\delta$  tends to 0 applying twice the Lebesgue Theorem, thus we gain

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{u_n > \delta\}} h(u_n) f_n e^{-\Gamma(u_n)} \varphi = \int_{\{u > 0\}} h(u) f e^{-\Gamma(u)} \varphi = \int_{\Omega} h(u) f e^{-\Gamma(u)} \varphi, \quad (4.6)$$

where the last equality is guaranteed by the fact that  $h(u)f \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ , hence  $\{u = 0\} \subseteq \{f = 0\}$ . Instead for the second integral, it holds

$$0 \leq \int_{\{u_n \leq \delta\}} h(u_n) f_n e^{-\Gamma(u)} \varphi \quad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}, \delta > 0. \quad (4.7)$$

Hence putting together (4.6) and (4.7), we obtain

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(z e^{-\Gamma(u)}\right) \geq h(u) f e^{-\Gamma(u)} \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega. \quad (4.8)$$

Now we take  $(1 - V_\delta(u_n)) \varphi \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$  with  $0 \leq \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$  as a test function in (4.5), it yields

$$\int_{\Omega} z_n \cdot \nabla \varphi (1 - V_\delta(u_n)) + \int_{\Omega} (z_n, D(1 - V_\delta(u_n))) \varphi + \int_{\Omega} |D\Gamma(u_n)| (1 - V_\delta(u_n)) \varphi = \int_{\Omega} h(u_n) f_n (1 - V_\delta(u_n)) \varphi,$$

where we want to pass to limit as  $n$  tends to infinity and  $\delta$  tends to 0.

The first integral on the left-hand side passes to limit because  $z_n \rightarrow z$  \*-weakly in  $L^\infty(\Omega)^N$  and  $1 - V_\delta(u_n) \rightarrow \chi_{\{u > 0\}}$  strongly in  $L^1(\Omega)$  by the Lebesgue Theorem, hence we gain

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} z_n \cdot \nabla \varphi (1 - V_\delta(u_n)) = \int_{\Omega} z \cdot \nabla \varphi \chi_{\{u > 0\}}. \quad (4.9)$$

For the second integral on the left-hand side, we recall that

$$(z_n, D(1 - V_\delta(u_n))) = (z_n, D(1 - V_\delta(T_{2\delta}(u_n)))) \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega,$$

using [15, Lemma 2.3] we get

$$(z_n, D(1 - V_\delta(T_{2\delta}(u_n)))) = |D(1 - V_\delta(T_{2\delta}(u_n)))| = |D(1 - V_\delta(u_n))|,$$

therefore applying twice Lemma 2.3, we can affirm

$$\int_{\Omega} |D\chi_{\{u > 0\}}| \varphi \leq \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |D(1 - V_\delta(u_n))| \varphi, \quad (4.10)$$

which implies that  $\chi_{\{u > 0\}} \in BV_{loc}(\Omega)$  because  $u_n$  are uniformly bounded in  $BV(\Omega)$  with respect to  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Now we analyze the third integral on the left-hand side. Firstly we introduce the function  $\hat{\Gamma}_\delta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that

$$\hat{\Gamma}_\delta(s) := \int_0^s g(t)(1 - V_\delta(t)) dt,$$

hence using twice Lemma 2.3, it yields

$$\int_{\Omega} |D\Gamma(u)| \varphi \leq \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |D\hat{\Gamma}_\delta(u_n)| \varphi, \quad (4.11)$$

because we highlight that

$$\int_0^s g(t) \chi_{(0, \infty)}(t) dt = \int_0^s g(t) dt.$$

Finally, the integral on the right-hand side passes to the limit through the Lebesgue Theorem, it holds

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} h(u_n) f_n (1 - V_\delta(u_n)) \varphi = \int_{\Omega} h(u) f \varphi, \quad (4.12)$$

where we remember that  $h(u)f \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$  and  $\{u = 0\} \subseteq \{f = 0\}$ .

Putting together (4.9), (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12), we can conclude that

$$-\operatorname{div}(\chi_{\{u>0\}}z) + |D\chi_{\{u>0\}}| + |D\Gamma(u)| \leq h(u)f \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega. \quad (4.13)$$

Since  $\|z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)^N} \leq 1$ , we observe that

$$-\chi_{\{u>0\}}^* \operatorname{div} z \stackrel{(2.8)}{=} -\operatorname{div}(\chi_{\{u>0\}}z) + (z, D\chi_{\{u>0\}}) \leq -\operatorname{div}(\chi_{\{u>0\}}z) + |D\chi_{\{u>0\}}| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega, \quad (4.14)$$

as a consequence putting (4.14) into (4.13), we can affirm that

$$-\chi_{\{u>0\}}^* \operatorname{div} z + |D\Gamma(u)| \leq h(u)f \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega. \quad (4.15)$$

Now we show that  $D^j u = 0$ . We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (e^{-\Gamma(u)})^\# \chi_{\{u>0\}}^* |D\Gamma(u)| &\stackrel{(4.15)}{\leq} e^{-\Gamma(u)} h(u) f \chi_{\{u>0\}} + (e^{-\Gamma(u)})^\# \chi_{\{u>0\}}^* \operatorname{div} z \\ &\stackrel{(4.8)}{\leq} -\operatorname{div}(ze^{-\Gamma(u)}) \chi_{\{u>0\}}^* + (e^{-\Gamma(u)})^\# \chi_{\{u>0\}}^* \operatorname{div} z \\ &\stackrel{(2.11)}{=} \chi_{\{u>0\}}^* \left( z, D(-e^{-\Gamma(u)})^\# \right) \\ &\stackrel{(2.12)}{\leq} \chi_{\{u>0\}}^* |De^{-\Gamma(u)}| \stackrel{(2.13)}{=} (e^{-\Gamma(u)})^\# \chi_{\{u>0\}}^* |D\Gamma(u)|, \end{aligned}$$

which means that

$$\chi_{\{u>0\}}^* \left( z, D(-e^{-\Gamma(u)})^\# \right) = \chi_{\{u>0\}}^* |De^{-\Gamma(u)}| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega. \quad (4.16)$$

Now we use a variation of [5, Lemma 2.3]: we observe that  $\chi_{\{u>0\}}^* > 0$   $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ -a.e. on  $J_{\Gamma(u)}$ , hence from (4.16) and (4.15) we can deduce that  $D^j u = 0$ , where we highlight that  $\{u = 0\} \subseteq \{f = 0\}$  because  $h(u)f \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$  and  $\Gamma(u) = 0$  where  $u = 0$ . From now on, we repeat step-by-step the same arguments of Theorem 3.3, formulas (??) involving  $\chi_{\{u>0\}}^*$ , hence it holds

$$-\chi_{\{u>0\}}^* \operatorname{div} z + |D\Gamma(u)| = h(u)f \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega,$$

thus applying [14, Lemma 2.4] we deduce (4.2).

Finally, we observe that (4.3) and (4.4) follow as in Theorem 3.3 and this concludes the proof.  $\square$

#### DATA AVAILABILITY

No data was used for the research described in the article.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

F. Balducci is partially supported by the Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM).

Finally, we wish to thank the anonymous referee for carefully reading this article and providing some useful comments.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco and D. Pallara, Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems, Courier Corporation (2000)
- [2] F. Andreu, C. Ballester, V. Caselles and J. M. Mazón, The Dirichlet problem for the total variation flow, *J. Funct. Anal.* 180 (2), 347-403 (2001)
- [3] G. Anzellotti, Pairings between measures and bounded functions and compensated compactness, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* 135 (4), 293-318 (1983)
- [4] D. Arcoya, J. Carmona, T. Leonori, P.J. Martínez-Aparicio, L. Orsina, and F. Petitta, Existence and nonexistence of solutions for singular quadratic quasilinear equations, *J. Diff. Eqns.* 246 (10), 4006-4042 (2009)
- [5] F. Balducci, F. Oliva and F. Petitta, Finite energy solutions for nonlinear elliptic equations with competing gradient, singular and  $L^1$  terms, *J. Diff Eqns.* 391, 334-369 (2024)
- [6] L. Boccardo and T. Gallouët, Non-linear elliptic and parabolic equations involving measure data, *J. Funct. Anal.* 87 (1) 149-169, (1989)
- [7] L. Boccardo, F. Murat and J.P. Puel, Existence of bounded solutions for non linear elliptic unilateral problems, *Annali di matematica pura ed applicata* 152 (1), 183-196 (1988)
- [8] V. Caselles, On the entropy conditions for some flux limited diffusion equations, *J. Diff. Eqns.* 250, 3311-3348 (2011)
- [9] G.Q. Chen and H. Frid, Divergence-measure fields and hyperbolic conservation laws, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 147 (2), 89-118 (1999)
- [10] M. Cicalese and C. Trombetti, Asymptotic behaviour of solutions to  $p$ -Laplacian equation, *Asympt. Anal.* 35 (1), 27-40 (2003)
- [11] G. Crasta and V. De Cicco, Anzellotti's pairing theory and the Gauss-Green theorem, *Adv. Math.* 343, 935-970 (2019)
- [12] V. De Cicco, D. Giachetti, F. Oliva and F. Petitta, The Dirichlet problem for singular elliptic equations with general nonlinearities, *Calc. Var. Par. Diff. Eqns.* 58 (4), (2019)
- [13] V. De Cicco, D. Giachetti and S. Segura de León, Elliptic problems involving the 1-Laplacian and a singular lower order term, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* (2) 99 (2), 349-376 (2019)
- [14] D. Giachetti, F. Oliva and F. Petitta, 1-Laplacian type problems with strongly singular nonlinearities and gradient terms, *Commun. Contemp. Math.* 24 (10), Paper No. 2150081, 40 pp (2022)

- [15] L. Giacomelli, S. Moll, and F. Petitta, Nonlinear diffusion in transparent media: the resolvent equation, *Adv. Calc. Var.*, no. 11, 405-432 (2018)
- [16] G. Huisken and T. Ilmanen, The Inverse Mean Curvature Flow and the Riemannian Penrose Inequality, *J. Diff. Geom.* 59, 353-438 (2001)
- [17] M. Latorre and S. Segura de León, Elliptic equations involving the 1-Laplacian and a total variation term with  $L^{N,\infty}$ -data, *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.* 28 (4), 817-859 (2017)
- [18] J. M. Mazon, and S. Segura de León, The Dirichlet problem for a singular elliptic equation arising in the level set formulation of the inverse mean curvature flow, *Adv. Calc. Var.* 6 (2), 123-164 (2013)
- [19] A. Mercaldo, S. Segura de León and C. Trombetti, On the behaviour of the solutions to p-Laplacian equations as  $p$  goes to 1, *Public. Mate.*, 377-411 (2008)
- [20] A. Mercaldo, S. Segura de León and C. Trombetti, On the solutions to 1-Laplacian equation with  $L^1$  data, *J. Funct. Anal.* 256 (8), 2387-2416 (2009)
- [21] F. Oliva, Regularizing effect of absorption terms in singular problems, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 472 (1), 1136-1166 (2019)
- [22] M. Wang and Y. Wang, Solutions to nonlinear elliptic equations with a gradient, *Acta Math. Sci.* 35 (5), 1023-1036 (2015)
- [23] W. P. Ziemer, *Weakly differentiable functions: Sobolev spaces and functions of bounded variation.* Vol. 120. Springer Science and Business Media, (2012)

FRANCESCO BALDUCCI  
DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE DI BASE E APPLICATE PER L' INGEGNERIA, SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA  
VIA SCARPA 16, 00161 ROMA, ITALY  
*Email address:* francesco.balducci@uniroma1.it