

Logistic elliptic and parabolic problem for the fractional p -Laplacian

Loïc Constantin*, Carlos Alberto Santos†, Guillaume Warnault‡

Abstract. In this paper we prove existence, uniqueness of weak solutions of the following nonlocal nonlinear logistic equation

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s u_\lambda = \lambda u_\lambda^q - b(x)u_\lambda^r & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_\lambda = 0 & \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega), \\ u_\lambda > 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

We also prove behavior of u_λ with respect to λ , underlining the effect of the nonlocal operator. We then study the associated parabolic problem, proving local and global existence, uniqueness and global behavior such as stabilization, finite time extinction and blow up.

1 Introduction

We study the following nonlocal logistic problem in Ω a bounded regular domain of \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 2$,

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s u = \lambda u^q - b(x)u^r & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega), \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (\mathcal{E}_\lambda)$$

where:

- the operator $(-\Delta)_p^s$ is the p -fractional Laplacian defined, up to a constant, for some $p \in (1, +\infty)$ and $s \in (0, 1)$ by:

$$(-\Delta)_p^s u(x) = 2 \, P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} (u(x) - u(y))}{|x - y|^{d+sp}} dy$$

where $P.V.$ stands for Cauchy principal value;

*loic.constantin@univ-pau.fr, LMAP Bâtiment IPRA, Avenue de l'Université, Pau, France

†csantos@unb.br, Department of Mathematics, University of Brasilia, Brasília, Brazil

‡guillaume.warnault@univ-pau.fr, LMAP Bâtiment IPRA, Avenue de l'Université, Pau, France

- the parameters always satisfy $q > 0$, $r > p - 1$ and $\lambda > 0$;
- the function $b \not\equiv 0$ is bounded and nonnegative such that $b^{-1}(\{0\}) =: \overline{\Omega}_0$ where Ω_0 is $C^{1,1}$ -open set and $|\Omega_0| > 0$.

In this paper, we show existence, uniqueness of a weak solution of (\mathcal{E}_λ) . We also show qualitative behavior of the solution depending on the parameter $\lambda > 0$. We then study the associated parabolic problem where we show existence, uniqueness and qualitative behavior.

The study of nonlocal operators has recently attracted increasing attention due to their occurrence in a wide range of physical phenomena characterized by long-range interactions. Elliptic and parabolic equations involving these operators, arise in diverse fields such as finance, physics, fluid dynamics, image processing, stochastic processes of Lévy type, phase transitions, population dynamics, optimal control and game theory (see e.g. [13, 27, 30]). Logistic equations have been vastly studied for their applications in mathematical biology. Indeed logistic equations can describe population dynamics, where the solution represent population density. In this optic, taking the term $b = 0$ on Ω_0 can be seen as representing a negative effect on the population only on a subset of where the population lives.

The elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s u = f(x, u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega), \end{cases}$$

have been studied for different source term in the literature see e.g. [8, 11, 17, 21]. As for the logistic problem the local case $s = 1, p = 2$ has been studied in [23, 25] where the authors study the case $q = 1$ to find existence, uniqueness and behavior depending on λ . The logistic problem for the fractional p -Laplacian has been in [19] for $b = 1$ getting existence, nonexistence and uniqueness results. In this article we treat the questions of existence, uniqueness and qualitative behavior of the solution depending on the parameter λ . More precisely we use the mountain pass Theorem to show existence of a weak solution and then using a Picone type inequality we prove uniqueness as well as a comparison principle in the subhomogeneous case. We finish the study of the elliptic problem by using different methods to obtain qualitative behavior depending on the parameter λ . The main difference between [23, 25] and our work in the case $q = p - 1$ is the behavior of u_λ depending on λ , in fact in [23, 25] the authors find blow up on Ω_0 and convergence to a degenerate solution on $\Omega \setminus \Omega_0$, where in our case the nonlocal operator gives blow up on Ω . We then study the parabolic problem associated to (\mathcal{E}_λ) :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + (-\Delta)_p^s u = \lambda u^q - b(x)u^r & \text{in } Q_T, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega^c, \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } Q_T, \\ u(0) = u_0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (\mathcal{P}_\lambda)$$

where $Q_T = (0, T) \times \Omega$, $u_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ is nonnegative and $\lambda > 0$. Parabolic problems involving the fractional p -Laplacian have been vastly studied in the literature, see e.g. [1, 9, 26, 29]. The parabolic logistic equation has also been studied in the local case $s = 1, p = 2$, e.g. [4] the authors study global behavior of the parabolic logistic equation for Ω_0 non-smooth. Up to our knowledge the parabolic logistic equation has never been studied for the fractional p -Laplacian case. We show in this paper existence of a bounded weak solution using a discretization method similarly as in [9] and uniqueness utilizing Gronwall's Lemma. Next, in the subhomogeneous case, using comparison principle and a sub-supersolution technique we show convergence of the solution of the parabolic problem to the solution of (\mathcal{E}_λ) . Finally using energy method as well as Sattinger stable and unstable sets we show extinction and blow up of our solution.

1.1 Preliminaries and main results

We first present the functional settings, for additional references we refer for instance [6, 12]. The fractional Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined as:

$$W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \left\{ u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{d+sp}} dx dy < \infty \right\},$$

associated with the natural norm:

$$\|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^p dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{d+sp}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The reflexive Banach space $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ is defined by $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) = \{u \in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid u = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega\}$, with the Banach norm

$$\|u\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{d+sp}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

equivalent to $\|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$. For $sp < d$ and $m \in [1, \frac{dp}{d-sp}]$, we have the continuous embedding $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^m(\Omega)$ and if $m < \frac{dp}{d-sp}$ the embedding is compact (see e.g. [12, Coro. 7.2]). For $sp \geq d$, we have the compact embedding $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$ for all $r \in [1, +\infty)$.

By the definition of the fractional p -Laplacian, we have for any $u, v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$:

$$\langle (-\Delta)_p^s u, v \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} (u(x) - u(y)) (v(x) - v(y))}{|x - y|^{d+sp}} dx dy.$$

Let $\lambda_1(\omega)$ be the first eigenvalue for a general bounded regular domain ω

$$\lambda_1(\omega) = \inf_{v \in W_0^{s,p}(\omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\omega)}^p}{\|v\|_{L^p(\omega)}^p},$$

then we have that $\omega \mapsto \lambda_1(\omega)$ is decreasing in the sense that for $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$ such that $|\Omega_2 \setminus \Omega_1| > 0$ we have $\lambda_1(\Omega_1) > \lambda_1(\Omega_2)$.

In this work, We consider the notion of weak solution of problem (\mathcal{E}_λ) defined as follows:

Definition 1.1 (Weak solution). *We call a weak solution of (\mathcal{E}_λ) a positive function $u \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ such that for any $\phi \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$*

$$\langle (-\Delta)_p^s u, \phi \rangle = \int_{\Omega} (\lambda u^q - b(x)u^r) \phi \, dx. \quad (1.1)$$

For $q \leq p - 1$, we define the set

$$\Lambda_q = \begin{cases} (0, +\infty) & \text{if } q < p - 1 \\ (\lambda_1(\Omega), \lambda_1(\Omega_0)) & \text{if } q = p - 1. \end{cases}$$

We recall the existence theorem involving the set Λ_q :

Theorem 1.2. *Problem (\mathcal{E}_λ) admits a unique weak solution u_λ iff $\lambda \in \Lambda_q$. Furthermore, for any $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda_q$, u_λ belongs to $C^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $u_\lambda \geq cd(\cdot, \Omega^c)^s$ in Ω and for $\lambda < \mu$, we have $u_\lambda \leq u_\mu$ in Ω .*

The existence and the regularity come from Theorem 1 and Lemma 2.3 in [21] and from the Hopf Lemma [11, Th. 1.5]. The comparison principle is established by Proposition 2.2.

We extend the previous existence result considering the superlinear case.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $q \in (p - 1, p^* - 1)$ and $r < q$. For any $\lambda > 0$, (\mathcal{E}_λ) admits at least a weak solution belonging to $C^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Remark 1.4. *The case $r < q$ is not studied in the article [19] but the proof of Theorem 1.3 still holds for positive functions $b \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.*

The next result provides the uniform behaviour of the sequence $(u_\lambda)_\lambda$ as λ goes to the boundaries of Λ_q :

Theorem 1.5. *Let the sequence $(u_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda_q}$ defined by Theorem 1.2. Then:*

- (i) *$(u_\lambda)_\lambda$ blows up uniformly on compact subsets of Ω (i.e. for any K compact subset of Ω , $\min_K u_\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$) as $\lambda \rightarrow \sup \Lambda_q$ under the additional condition $p \geq 2$ if $q < p - 1$.
More precisely, the sequence $(u_\lambda)_\lambda$ blows up uniformly on compact subsets of Ω_0 in any case without additional hypothesis.*
- (ii) *$(u_\lambda)_\lambda$ converges uniformly to 0 as $\lambda \rightarrow \inf \Lambda_q$.*

For $q = p - 1$, this results differs from the local case. In [23], the authors study the problem (\mathcal{E}_λ) involving the Laplacian operator, they obtain the blow-up only in Ω_0 and the convergence to the minimal large positive solution of a singular problem on $\Omega \setminus \Omega_0$. Similar results are also obtained in the case of the p -Laplacian operator see [14].

In our case, the nonlocality of the operator which considers the far effects implies that the blow-up in $\Omega \setminus \Omega_0$.

We now state the result on the associated parabolic problem (\mathcal{P}_λ) where we consider the class of weak solutions in the following framework

$$X_T = \{v \in L^\infty(Q_T) \mid \partial_t v \in L^2(Q_T)\} \cap L^\infty(0, T; W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))$$

and

Definition 1.6 (Weak solution). *A nonnegative function $u \in X_T$ is a weak solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) if $u(0, \cdot) = u_0$ a.e. in Ω such that for any $t \in [0, T]$:*

$$\int_0^t \int_\Omega \partial_t u \phi \, dx d\tau + \int_0^t \langle (-\Delta)_p^s u, \phi \rangle \, d\tau = \int_0^t \int_\Omega (\lambda u^q - b(x)u^r) \phi \, dx d\tau, \quad (1.2)$$

for any $\phi \in L^1(0, T; W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)) \cap L^2(Q_T)$.

We define the operator $\mathcal{A} : v \mapsto \mathcal{A}v = (-\Delta)_p^s v + b(x)|v|^{r-1}v$ and its domain

$$D(\mathcal{A}) = \{v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega) \mid \mathcal{A}v \in L^\infty(\Omega)\}.$$

Remark 1.7. *By Proposition 2.1 of [9], the operator \mathcal{A} satisfies the comparison principle i.e. for any $u, v \in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $u \leq v$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega$ and*

$$\langle \mathcal{A}u, \varphi \rangle \leq \langle \mathcal{A}v, \varphi \rangle$$

for any $\varphi \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$, $\varphi \geq 0$. Then $u \leq v$ a.e. in Ω .

We have the following theorem of existence, uniqueness and regularity.

Theorem 1.8. *Let $u_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then, there exists $T > 0$ and $u \in C([0, T], W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))$ such that for any $T' < T$, u is a weak solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) on $Q_{T'}$. Additionally we have*

- if $q \leq 1$ or $(q \in (0, p-1] \text{ and } \lambda < \sup \Lambda_q)$ then the solution u is global i.e. $T = +\infty$,
- if $q \geq 1$, then the weak solution is unique,
- if $q \geq 1$ and $u_0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$ then $u \in C([0, T], C^0(\overline{\Omega}))$.

Remark 1.9. *When $q \geq 1$, the uniqueness of the weak solution gives as for [9, Th. 1.5] the existence of maximum life time of the solution:*

$$T_{max} = \sup\{T > 0 \mid u \text{ is the weak solution } u \text{ of } (\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \text{ on } Q_T\}.$$

And if $T_{max} < \infty$ then $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow T_{max}$.

Theorem 1.10. *Let $q \leq p - 1$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda_q$. Let $u_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $u_0 \geq cd(\cdot, \tilde{\Omega}^c)^s$ for some $\tilde{\Omega} \subset \Omega$ a enough regular open subset. In addition if $q = p - 1$ we assume $\Omega_0 \subset \tilde{\Omega}$. Let u be the global solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) obtained by Theorem 1.8. Then, $u(t) \rightarrow u_\lambda$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ in $L^m(\Omega)$ for any $m < \infty$. Additionally if $q > 1$ and $u_0 \leq Cd(\cdot, \Omega^c)^s$ then $u(t) \rightarrow u_\lambda$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$.*

Theorem 1.11. *Let $q = p - 1$, $\tilde{\Omega} \subset \Omega_0$ a regular open subset and u_0 such that $u \geq cd(\cdot, \tilde{\Omega}^c)^s$. If $\lambda \geq \lambda_1(\tilde{\Omega})$ then $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_{max}} \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = +\infty$.*

Lemma 1.12. *Let $q = p - 1$, $\lambda > \lambda_1(\Omega_0)$ and $u_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ nonnegative such that $u_0 \geq Cd(\cdot, \Omega_0^c)^s$. If $p \leq 2$ then $\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ where u is the solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) and if $p > 2$ then $T_{max} < +\infty$.*

We define on $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)$ the energy functional

$$E_0(v) = \frac{1}{p} \|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)}^p - \frac{\lambda}{q+1} \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1},$$

and set the following condition on u_0 :

$$\exists v_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_0) \text{ such that } u_0 \geq v_0 \text{ and } E_0(v_0) < 0. \quad (\text{H})$$

Theorem 1.13. *Let $\lambda > 0$, $q > p - 1$, $u_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and u the solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) then*

- (i) *If $q > 1$ and (H) holds then $T_{max} < +\infty$,*
- (ii) *if $q = 1$ and (H) holds then $\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$,*
- (iii) *if $q < 1$ and (H) holds then $\sup_{(0, +\infty)} \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)} = +\infty$,*
- (iv) *if $q \leq 1$ and $\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ small enough then there exists $t_0 < \infty$ such that $u(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq t_0$.*

In order to generalize the last theorem in the case $q \leq p^* - 1$ we define the unstable set

$$V = \{v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0) \mid E_0(v) < m, I(v) < 0\},$$

where $m = \inf_{v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0) \setminus \{0\}} \sup_{\theta > 0} E_0(v\theta)$ and $I(v) = \|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)}^p - \lambda \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1}$.

We also define the following functionals and set:

$$\tilde{E}(v) = \frac{1}{p} (\|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p - \lambda \|v\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p), \quad \tilde{I}(v) = \|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)}^p - \lambda \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1},$$

$$\widetilde{W} = \{v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \mid \tilde{E}(v) < m, \tilde{I}(v) > 0\} \cap \{0\}.$$

Then we can define the following conditions on u_0 :

$$\exists v_0 \in V \cap L^\infty(\Omega_0) \text{ such that } u_0 \geq v_0, \quad (\text{H1})$$

$$\exists v_0 \in \widetilde{W} \cap L^\infty(\Omega) \text{ such that } v_0 \geq u_0. \quad (\text{H2})$$

Theorem 1.14. *Let $\lambda > 0$, $q > p-1$, $u_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and u the solution of problem (\mathcal{P}_λ) then*

- *If $q > 1$ and (H1) holds then $T_{max} < +\infty$,*
- *if $q = 1$ and (H1) holds then $\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$,*
- *if $q < 1$ and (H1) holds then $\sup_{(0,+\infty)} \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)} = +\infty$,*
- *let (H2) holds then $T_{max} = +\infty$ and $u \rightarrow 0$ in $L^r(\Omega)$ for all $r < \infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.*

Let us summarize the results and main contributions to the literature.

- Theorem 1.3 generalizes the existing existence Theorems of the elliptic logistic equation for other powers.
- Theorem 1.5 proves the qualitative behavior of the solution of (\mathcal{E}_λ) depending on λ highlighting the differences between the local and nonlocal cases. In fact, for $q = p-1$, in the nonlocal case we obtain the uniform blow up on the entire space Ω . In the local case the authors obtain uniform blow up only on Ω_0 and convergence on Ω_0^c to the bounded solution of a degenerate solution.
- for the parabolic problem, Theorems 1.8 to 1.14 generalize the parabolic p -fractional equation that has been studied for different source types (see e.g. [1, 9, 26, 29]). They also generalize the parabolic logistic equation that has been mainly in the local linear case in [3, 4].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove the results on the elliptic problem. In particular we prove the qualitative behavior of the solution depending on λ in Section 2.1. Section 3 is dedicated to the parabolic problem. More precisely we prove Theorem 1.8 in Section 3.1 and Theorems 1.10 to 1.14 in Sections 3.2 and 3.3.

2 The elliptic problem

We start with a comparison principle for problem (\mathcal{E}_λ) .

Definition 2.1 (Sub- and supersolution). *We say that u is a subsolution (resp. supersolution) of (\mathcal{E}_λ) if u is a nonnegative function belonging to $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ such that $u \leq 0$ (resp. $u \geq 0$) in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega$ and satisfies for any $\phi \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$, $\phi \geq 0$:*

$$\langle (-\Delta)_p^s u, \phi \rangle \leq \int_{\Omega} (\lambda u^q - bu^r) \phi \, dx, \quad (\text{resp. } \geq).$$

Proposition 2.2. *Assume $q \leq p-1$. Let $u, v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ such that $u, v \in [cd(\cdot, \Omega^c)^s, Cd(\cdot, \Omega^c)^s]$ and are respectively super and subsolution of (\mathcal{E}_λ) . Then $u \geq v$ a.e. in Ω .*

Remark 2.3. Proposition 2.2 still works for $b = 0$, thus we have a comparison principle for the subhomogeneous equation: $(-\Delta)_p^s u = \lambda u^q$ where $q \leq p - 1$.

Proof. Defining $u_\epsilon = u + \epsilon$, $v_\epsilon = v + \epsilon$ and $\Psi_\epsilon = (u_\epsilon - \frac{v_\epsilon^p}{u_\epsilon^{p-1}})_-$, $\Phi_\epsilon = (v_\epsilon - \frac{u_\epsilon^p}{v_\epsilon^{p-1}})_+$ in Ω and $\Psi = \Phi = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$ where f_+, f_- are respectively the positive and negative part of f such that $f = f_- + f_+$. Under the conditions on u and v , we have that $\Psi_\epsilon, \Phi_\epsilon \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$. Using $\Psi_\epsilon \leq 0$ and u is supersolution, as well as $\Psi_\epsilon \geq 0$ and v is subsolution, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle (-\Delta)_p^s u, \Psi_\epsilon \rangle + \langle (-\Delta)_p^s v, \Phi_\epsilon \rangle \\ & \leq I_\epsilon := \int_{\{u < v\}} (\lambda u^q - b u^r) \Psi_\epsilon + (\lambda v^q - b v^r) \Phi_\epsilon dx \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

We have

$$\langle (-\Delta)_p^s u, \Psi_\epsilon \rangle + \langle (-\Delta)_p^s v, \Phi_\epsilon \rangle = \int_{\{u < v\}^2} W(x, y) dx dy + 2 \int_{\{u < v\} \times \{u > v\}} \tilde{W}(x, y) dx dy$$

where using the notation $(t)^{p-1} = |t|^{p-2}t$:

$$\begin{aligned} W(x, y) &= (v_\epsilon(x) - v_\epsilon(y))^{p-1} \left((v_\epsilon - \frac{u_\epsilon^p}{v_\epsilon^{p-1}})(x) - (v_\epsilon - \frac{u_\epsilon^p}{v_\epsilon^{p-1}})(y) \right) \\ &+ (u_\epsilon(x) - u_\epsilon(y))^{p-1} \left((u_\epsilon - \frac{v_\epsilon^p}{u_\epsilon^{p-1}})(x) - (u_\epsilon - \frac{v_\epsilon^p}{u_\epsilon^{p-1}})(y) \right) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

by [7, Proposition 4.2] and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{W}(x, y) &= (u_\epsilon(x) - u_\epsilon(y))^{p-1} (u_\epsilon - \frac{v_\epsilon^p}{u_\epsilon^{p-1}})(x) + (v_\epsilon(x) - v_\epsilon(y))^{p-1} (v_\epsilon - \frac{u_\epsilon^p}{v_\epsilon^{p-1}})(x) \\ &= \left(\left(1 - \frac{u_\epsilon(y)}{u_\epsilon(x)} \right)^{p-1} - \left(1 - \frac{v_\epsilon(y)}{v_\epsilon(x)} \right)^{p-1} \right) (u_\epsilon^p(x) - v_\epsilon^p(x)) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

since the mapping $s \rightarrow (1 - s)^{p-1}$ is decreasing on \mathbb{R}^+ and $\frac{u_\epsilon(y)}{u_\epsilon(x)} \leq \frac{u_\epsilon(y)}{u_\epsilon(x)}$ on $\{u < v\} \times \{u > v\}$, hence $I_\epsilon \geq 0$. Under the conditions on u, v the dominated convergence Theorem yields as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$:

$$I_\epsilon \rightarrow \int_{\{u < v\}} \lambda(u^p - v^p)(u^{q-p+1} - v^{q-p+1}) - b(u^p - v^p)(u^{r-p+1} - v^{r-p+1}) dx,$$

Assume that $|\{u < v\}| > 0$, the integral I_ϵ is negative for ϵ small enough since $q \leq p - 1 < r$, which is absurd, thus we have that $u \geq v$ a.e. in Ω . \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We use the mountain pass Theorem see for instance [2, Th 2.4]. We define, for any $v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$:

$$J(v) := \frac{1}{p} \|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p - \frac{\lambda}{q+1} \|v\|_{q+1}^{q+1} + \int_{\Omega} b \frac{|v|^{r+1}}{r+1} dx.$$

Then $J \in C^1(W_0^{s,p}(\Omega), \mathbb{R})$ and

$$J'(u).v = \langle (-\Delta)_p^s u, v \rangle - \lambda \int_{\Omega} |u|^{q-1} uv \, dx + \int_{\Omega} b|u|^{r-1} uv \, dx.$$

Since $q+1 < p^*$ and $b \geq 0$, we have for some $C > 0$:

$$J(v) \geq \|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} - C \frac{\lambda}{q+1} \|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^{q+1-p} \right),$$

and from $q+1 > p$, we deduce that $J(0) = 0$ is a local minimum.

Let $\phi \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)$, then

$$J(t\phi) = t^p \frac{1}{p} \|\phi\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p - t^{q+1} \frac{\lambda}{q+1} \|\phi\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^{q+1} < 0$$

for t big enough, with continuity there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $J(\phi t_0) = 0$.

Let now show that J satisfies the Palais-Smale condition. Let $(u_n)_n \subset W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ with $|J(u_n)| \leq C$ and $|J'(u_n)| \rightarrow 0$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$. We have in particular, for n big enough:

$$|J'(u_n).u_n| \leq \|u_n\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)},$$

giving

$$-\|u_n\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p + \lambda \|u_n\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^{q+1} - \int_{\Omega} b|u_n|^{r+1} \leq \|u_n\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}. \quad (2.2)$$

and with $J(u_n)$ bounded:

$$\frac{1}{p} \|u_n\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p + \int_{\Omega} b \frac{|u_n|^{r+1}}{r+1} \leq C + \frac{\lambda}{q+1} \|u_n\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^{q+1}. \quad (2.3)$$

Combining (2.2) and (2.3):

$$\left(\frac{q+1}{p} - 1 \right) \|u_n\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p + \left(\frac{q+1}{r+1} - 1 \right) \int_{\Omega} b|u_n|^{r+1} \leq \|u_n\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)} - C,$$

with $q+1 > p$ and $q > r$ we have u_n bounded in $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ and $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ up to a subsequence. Using the compact embeddings and $q, r < p^* - 1$ we have:

$$-\lambda \int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{q-1} u_n (u_n - u) + \int_{\Omega} b|u_n|^{r-1} u_n (u_n - u) \rightarrow 0,$$

with $J'(u_n).(u_n - u) \rightarrow 0$ we have $\langle (-\Delta)_p^s u_n, u_n - u \rangle \rightarrow 0$ and combined with $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ we have:

$$\langle (-\Delta)_p^s u_n - (-\Delta)_p^s u, u_n - u \rangle \rightarrow 0,$$

which gives $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$. Thus J verifies the Palay-Smale condition and there exists a weak solution $u \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$.

Using [17, Th 3.1] we have that u is bounded and with [18, Th 2.7] $u \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We now show that $u > 0$ in Ω . With $J(u) < 0$ we have that $u \neq 0$. And with $||u(x)| - |u(y)|| \leq |u(x) - u(y)|$ we have $J(|u|) \leq J(u)$ thus the critical value of J given by the mountain pass is attained for a nonnegative u . We also have $(-\Delta)_p^s u \geq -||b||_\infty ||u||_\infty^{r-p+1} u^{p-1}$ then using [11, Th. 1.4] we have $u > 0$ in Ω . \square

2.1 Asymptotic behavior

In this section, we establish Theorem 1.5. Subsection 2.1.1 gives the proof of (i). The second point is obtained by Theorem 2.7. We also study the behaviour of the sequence of solutions in the superlinear case in subsection 2.1.3.

2.1.1 As $\lambda \rightarrow \sup \Lambda_q$

We first show uniform blow up on compact subset of Ω_0 when $\lambda \rightarrow \sup \Lambda_q$ using a method similar as in [23]. For this, for the case $q = p - 1$, we introduce an auxiliary eigenvalue problem: let $\mu > 0$,

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s \psi_\mu = \lambda_\mu \psi_\mu^{p-1} - \mu b(x) \psi_\mu^{p-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \psi_\mu = 0 & \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega), \\ \psi_\mu > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (\mathcal{Q}_\mu)$$

We first have:

Theorem 2.4. *For any $\mu > 0$, there exist $\lambda_\mu \in (0, \lambda_1(\Omega_0))$ and a positive function $\psi_\mu \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, and $\|\psi_\mu\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = 1$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_\mu &= \inf_{w \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega), \|w\|_{L^p(\Omega)}=1} \|w\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p + \mu \int_\Omega b|w|^p dx \\ &= \|\psi_\mu\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p + \mu \int_\Omega b|\psi_\mu|^p dx. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the sequence $(\psi_\mu, \lambda_\mu)_\mu$ converges to $(\psi_{1,\Omega_0}, \lambda_1(\Omega_0))$ in $C(\overline{\Omega}) \times \mathbb{R}$ as $\mu \rightarrow +\infty$ where ψ_{1,Ω_0} is the normalized eigenfunction associated to $\lambda_1(\Omega_0)$.

Proof. The existence of $(\psi_\mu, \lambda_\mu)_\mu$ is given by Theorem 3.4 in [10]. Moreover Remark 3.5 and Lemma 3.2 of [10] imply $\Psi_\mu > 0$ on Ω and from [15, Theorem 3.2], we get that $\psi_\mu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

By definition of λ_μ , the sequence $(\lambda_\mu)_\mu$ is nonincreasing and for any $w \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0) \subset W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$, $\|w\|_{L^p(\Omega_0)} = 1$, we have

$$\|\psi_\mu\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p + \mu \int_\Omega b|\psi_\mu|^p dx = \lambda_\mu \leq \|w\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p = \|w\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)}^p.$$

By taking w the first eigenfunction associated to $\lambda_1(\Omega_0)$, we have $\lambda_\mu \leq \lambda_1(\Omega_0)$. We also deduce that the sequence $(\psi_\mu)_\mu$ is bounded in $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ and

$$\int_\Omega b\psi_\mu^p dx \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \mu \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

Then, up to a subsequence, there exist $\psi \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ and $\lambda_\infty \in (0, \lambda_1(\Omega_0)]$ such that $\psi_\mu \rightharpoonup \psi$ in $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ and by compact embedding $\psi_\mu \rightarrow \psi$ in $L^p(\Omega)$, *a.e.* in Ω and $\lambda_\mu \rightarrow \lambda_\infty$ as $\mu \rightarrow +\infty$.

Furthermore (2.4) implies that $\int_\Omega b\phi^p = 0$ thus $\phi = 0$ on Ω_0^c and $\psi \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)$. For any $\mu > 0$, $(-\Delta)_p^s \psi_\mu \leq \lambda_1(\Omega_0) \psi_\mu^{p-1}$ in Ω and noting that Theorem 3.2 in [15] is still valid for positive subsolutions as ψ_μ , this yields that $(\psi_\mu)_\mu$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$.

From [18, Th 2.7], we deduce that $(\psi_\mu)_\mu$ is uniformly bounded in $C^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and hence $(\psi_\mu)_\mu$ is equicontinuous in $C(K)$ for any K compact set of \mathbb{R}^d and thus Ascoli-Arzelà Theorem gives, up to a subsequence, $\psi_\mu \rightarrow \psi$ on $C(\overline{\Omega})$.

Also, since ψ_μ is bounded in $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ we have

$$\Psi_\mu(x, y) = \frac{|\psi_\mu(x) - \psi_\mu(y)|^{p-2}}{|x - y|^{(d+sp)/p'}} (\psi_\mu(x) - \psi_\mu(y))$$

bounded in $L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Using compact embedding we get pointwise convergence and thus we can identify:

$$\Psi_\mu \rightharpoonup \frac{|\psi(x) - \psi(y)|^{p-2}}{|x - y|^{(d+sp)/p'}} (\psi(x) - \psi(y)),$$

in $L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Which gives $\langle (-\Delta)_p^s \psi_\mu, \phi \rangle \rightarrow \langle (-\Delta)_p^s \psi, \phi \rangle$ for any $\phi \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$. Finally, taking $\phi \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)$ we have:

$$\langle (-\Delta)_p^s \psi_\mu, \phi \rangle = \lambda_\mu \int_{\Omega_0} \psi_\mu^{p-1} \phi,$$

and using passing to the limit $\mu \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\lambda_\mu \rightarrow \lambda_\infty$, and get:

$$\langle (-\Delta)_p^s \psi, \phi \rangle = \lambda_\infty \int_{\Omega_0} \psi^{p-1} \phi,$$

by Theorem 3.7 in [10] since $\|\psi_\mu\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = 1$ we deduce that $\lambda_\infty = \lambda_1(\Omega_0)$ and $\psi = \psi_{1,\Omega_0}$.

We now show that $\lambda_\mu < \lambda_1(\Omega_0)$, first assume $\lambda_\mu = \lambda_1(\Omega_0)$ for some μ . Then, ψ_{1,Ω_0} satisfies:

$$\|\psi_{1,\Omega_0}\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p + \mu \int_\Omega b|\psi_{1,\Omega_0}|^p dx = \lambda_1(\Omega_0) = \lambda_\mu.$$

Hence ψ_{1,Ω_0} is a nonnegative solution of (\mathcal{Q}_μ) and $\psi_{1,\Omega_0} > 0$ *a.e.* in Ω by [10, Th. 2.9] which contradicts $\psi_{1,\Omega_0} \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)$. \square

We have the following result of uniform blow up on Ω_0 .

Theorem 2.5. *The sequence $(u_\lambda)_\lambda$ blows up uniformly on compact subsets of Ω_0 as $\lambda \rightarrow \sup \Lambda_q$.*

Proof. Consider first the case $q = p - 1$, then $\sup \Lambda_q = \lambda_1(\Omega_0)$.

Let $\mu > 0$, taking ψ_μ and λ_μ defined by Theorem 2.4 and renormalizing ψ_μ such that $\|\psi_\mu\|_\infty = 1$, we define $\underline{u}_\lambda = \mu^{\frac{1}{r-p+1}} \psi_\mu$ which satisfies

$$(-\Delta)_p^s \underline{u}_\lambda = \lambda_\mu \underline{u}_\lambda^{p-1} - b \underline{u}_\lambda^r \psi_\mu^{p-1-r}.$$

Since $r > p - 1$ and $\|\psi_\mu\|_\infty = 1$, we get for any λ close enough to $\lambda_1(\Omega_0)$ i.e. $\lambda_\mu \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(\Omega_0)$

$$(-\Delta)_p^s \underline{u}_\lambda \leq \lambda \underline{u}_\lambda^{p-1} - b \underline{u}_\lambda^r \quad (2.5)$$

hence \underline{u}_λ is a subsolution.

Thus, Proposition 2.2 implies that $u_\lambda \geq \mu^{\frac{1}{r-p+1}} \psi_\mu$ a.e. in Ω for $\lambda \in [\lambda_\mu, \lambda_1(\Omega_0))$. Hence taking μ goes to $+\infty$, Theorem 2.4 insures the conclusion of the proof in the case $q = p - 1$.

Consider now the case $q < p - 1$, then $\sup \Lambda_q = +\infty$. Let V be the unique solution of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s V = V^q & \text{in } \Omega_0, \\ V = 0 & \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega_0), \\ V > 0 & \text{in } \Omega_0. \end{cases}$$

The solution V is obtained by minimization and satisfies $V \geq C d(\cdot, \Omega_0^c)^s$ for some constant $C > 0$ (see for instance Theorem 4.3 in [9]).

Define, for any $\lambda \geq 1$, $v_\lambda = \lambda^{\frac{1}{p-1-q}} V$.

Since the solution u_λ of (\mathcal{E}_λ) is a supersolution of $(-\Delta)_p^s w = \lambda w^q$ in Ω_0 , Remark 2.3 implies that $u_\lambda \geq v_\lambda$ a.e. in Ω_0 . Hence $u_\lambda \geq v_\lambda \geq C \lambda^{\frac{1}{p-1-q}} d(\cdot, \Omega_0^c)^s$ and we conclude the blow-up of u_λ on the compact subsets of Ω_0 . \square

Theorem 2.6. *The sequence $(u_\lambda)_\lambda$ blows up uniformly on compact subsets of Ω as $\lambda \rightarrow \sup \Lambda_q$ under an additional condition $p \geq 2$ if $q < p - 1$.*

Proof. Let K be a compact subset of Ω , there exists $\omega \subset \Omega_0$ verifying $\bar{\omega} \subset \Omega_0$ and $\kappa = d(\omega, K) > 0$.

Let $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2} \min(d(K, \partial\Omega), \kappa)$, we consider the finite family $(x_k) \subset K$ such that $K \subset \bigcup B(x_k, r)$ where $r < \frac{\eta}{2}$.

For any k , we consider $\mathcal{O} = B(x_k, 2r) \subset \Omega$ and we have that $d(\omega, \mathcal{O}) > 0$.

We define $v_\lambda = u_\lambda - u_\lambda \mathbb{1}_\omega$ then by [20, Lemma 2.8], v_λ satisfies in the weak sense on $W_0^{s,p}(\mathcal{O})$

$$(-\Delta)_p^s v_\lambda + b v_\lambda^r = \lambda u_\lambda^q + h_\lambda \quad (2.6)$$

where, for any $x \in \mathcal{O}$, we have, using the notation $(t)^{p-1} = |t|^{p-2}t$

$$h_\lambda(x) = 2 \int_\omega \frac{(u_\lambda(x))^{p-1} - (u_\lambda(x) - u_\lambda(y))^{p-1}}{|x - y|^{d+sp}} dy.$$

First, for $q = p - 1$, we choose $\alpha > 0$ a suitable parameter independent of λ small enough such that for any $x \in \mathcal{O}$, we have

$$\lambda u_\lambda^{p-1}(x) + h_\lambda(x) \geq 2 \int_\omega \frac{(1 + \alpha)(u_\lambda(x))^{p-1} - (u_\lambda(x) - u_\lambda(y))^{p-1}}{|x - y|^{d+sp}} dy, \quad (2.7)$$

Noting that, for any $t_0 > 0$, $t \geq 0$, $(1 + \alpha)t^{p-1} - (t - t_0)^{p-1} \geq c_p t_0^{p-1}$ where the constant c_p depends on α and p . Hence, we obtain , for any $x \in \mathcal{O}$

$$h_\lambda(x) + \lambda u_\lambda^{p-1}(x) \geq 2c_p \int_\omega \frac{(u_\lambda(y))^{p-1}}{|x-y|^{d+sp}} dy \geq C(\inf_\omega u_\lambda)^{p-1} \quad (2.8)$$

where C depends on ω , s , p , d , \mathcal{O} .

Now consider the case $q < p - 1$ where $p \geq 2$. The inequality (A.1.2) implies directly that for any $x \in \mathcal{O}$

$$h_\lambda(x) \geq C(\inf_\omega u_\lambda)^{p-1}.$$

Hence, the inequality (2.8) holds for $q < p - 1$ and $p \geq 2$.

Thus by Theorem 2.5, we deduce in any case that the right hand side in (2.6) can be chosen large enough in \mathcal{O} as $\lambda \rightarrow \sup \Lambda_q$.

Consider now $w \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ the positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s w = 1 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ w = 0 & \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathcal{O}), \end{cases}$$

satisfying $w \geq Cd(\cdot, \mathcal{O}^c)^s$ for some constant C (see [11, Theorem 1.5]).

Then, setting $w_R = R w$, we have that for any $R > 0$ and for λ close enough to $\sup \Lambda_q$, for any $\varphi \in W_0^{s,p}(\mathcal{O})$, $\varphi \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (-\Delta)_p^s w_R, \varphi \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{O}} b w_R^r \varphi dx &\leq \int_{\mathcal{O}} \left(R^q + C \|b\|_{L^\infty} R^r \right) \varphi dx \\ &\leq \langle (-\Delta)_p^s v_\lambda, \varphi \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{O}} b v_\lambda^r \varphi dx \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Taking $\varphi = (w_R - v_\lambda)_+$, we deduce that

$$u_\lambda = v_\lambda \geq w_R \geq C R d(\cdot, \mathcal{O}^c)^s \text{ in } \mathcal{O}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of R .

Finally, we deduce from the previous inequality, for any k , for any $R > 0$ then for λ close enough to $\sup \Lambda_q$,

$$\inf_{B(x_k, r)} u_\lambda \geq \tilde{C}_k R$$

and hence, by construction, we have that u_λ blows up uniformly on the compact set K . \square

2.1.2 As $\lambda \rightarrow \inf \Lambda_q$

Theorem 2.7. *The sequence $(u_\lambda)_\lambda$ converges uniformly to 0 as $\lambda \rightarrow \inf \Lambda_q$.*

Proof. From Proposition 2.2, for λ close to $\inf \Lambda_q$, we have that the sequence $(u_\lambda)_\lambda$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$.

We deduce taking the test function u_λ in (1.1), that the sequence $(u_\lambda)_\lambda$ is also bounded in $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$. Then, up to a subsequence and for some $u \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$, $u_\lambda \rightharpoonup u$ in $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ and by Sobolev embedding and interpolation we have the convergence in $L^m(\Omega)$ for any $m \geq 1$. Moreover Theorem 1.1 in [20] and Ascoli-Arzelà theorem gives $u_\lambda \rightarrow u$ in $C(\Omega)$.

Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 2.4, we get that u is a weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s u + bu^r = (\inf \Lambda_q)u^q & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

In the case $q < p-1$, i.e. $\inf \Lambda_q = 0$, $w = 0$ is the unique solution by Proposition 2.1 in [9] and for $q = p-1$, i.e. $\inf \Lambda_q = \lambda_1(\Omega)$, Theorem 1.2 implies $u = 0$. \square

2.1.3 For $q > p-1$

In this subsection, we get the asymptotic behavior for the superlinear case.

We set $\Sigma_q \subseteq \mathbb{R}_*^+$ the set of λ such that (\mathcal{E}_λ) admits a weak solution. We denote that for $q \leq p-1$, $\Sigma_q = \Lambda_q$ by Theorem 1.2 and for r and q as in Theorem 1.3 we have $\Sigma_q = (0, +\infty)$.

Theorem 2.8. *Let $q > p-1$. Assume that $\inf \Sigma_q = 0$, then the sequence $(\|u_\lambda\|_\infty)_{\lambda \in \Sigma_q}$ goes to ∞ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. Let (λ_n) be a minimizing sequence of Σ_q . It suffices to show that any subsequences of $(u_n) := (u_{\lambda_n})$ are unbounded. For that, we argue by contradiction assuming that there exists $(\lambda_{n'})$ such that $\|u_{n'}\|_\infty \leq M$ for any n' . Taking $u_{n'}$ as test function in (1.1), this yields

$$\|u_{n'}\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p \leq \lambda_{n'} \int_\Omega u_{n'}^q dx \leq \lambda_{n'} M^{q+1-p} \|u_{n'}\|_p^p.$$

Hence, for n' large enough we obtain a contradiction with the Poincaré inequality since $u_{n'} \not\equiv 0$. \square

3 The parabolic problem

3.1 Existence and properties of solutions

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.8. We start by proving the local existence.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $u_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and let $q > 0$. Then, there exists $T_* \in (0, +\infty]$ such that, for any $T < T_*$, (\mathcal{P}_λ) admits a weak solution on Q_T belonging to $C([0, T], L^m(\Omega))$ for any $m \in [1, +\infty)$.*

Proof. The proof follows the ones of Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2 in [9] adapting some points. For the convenience of the readers, we only give the

idea of the proof and the important points which are necessary for the other proofs. First, we replace the operator $(-\Delta)_p^s$ by the operator \mathcal{A} which satisfies maximum principle by Remark 1.7 and defining, for some $R > 0$, the truncated problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + \mathcal{A}u = \lambda \min(R, u)^q & \text{in } Q_T, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega^c, \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } Q_T, \\ u(0) = u_0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (\mathcal{P}_{\lambda, R})$$

We also consider the associated discretization scheme of $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda, R})$:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{u_n - u_{n-1}}{\Delta t} + \mathcal{A}u_n = \lambda \min(R, u_{n-1})^q & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_n = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega, \\ u_n \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where $\Delta t = \frac{T}{N}$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$. The sequence (u_n) is well defined and bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, more precisely, we have for $1 \leq n \leq N$

$$\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \lambda T R^q. \quad (3.2)$$

Then we define the functions $u_{\Delta t} = u_n$ and $\tilde{u}_{\Delta t} = \frac{-t_{n-1}}{\Delta t}(u_n - u_{n-1}) + u_{n-1}$ defined on $[(n-1)\Delta t, n\Delta t)$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$ which satisfy

$$\partial_t \tilde{u}_{\Delta t} + \mathcal{A}u_{\Delta t} = \lambda u_{\Delta t}^q(\cdot - \Delta t) \text{ in } Q_T.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [9], we obtain estimates of the sequences $(u_{\Delta t})_{\Delta t}$ and $(\tilde{u}_{\Delta t})_{\Delta t}$ which imply the convergence in suitable spaces.

Hence, for any $T > 0$ and for any R , we get a weak solution of the problem $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda, R})$ (in the sense of Definition 1.6) $u_R \in C([0, T], L^m(\Omega))$, for any $m \in [1, +\infty)$ limits of $(u_{\Delta t})_{\Delta t}$ and $(\tilde{u}_{\Delta t})_{\Delta t}$ and satisfying

$$\|u_R\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \lambda T R^q. \quad (3.3)$$

The previous inequality comes from (3.2).

Finally, as in the proof of Corollary 3.2 of [9], we deduce the existence of $T_* = T_*(q, u_0, \lambda)$ such that for suitable $R > 0$, $\|u_R\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} < R$ for any $T < T_*$ and hence u_R is a weak solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) on Q_T . \square

Remark 3.2. Note that, by construction, u_R is a mild solution of $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda, R})$.

Remark 3.3. As in Corollary 3.2 of [9], we have that $T_* = +\infty$ when $q < 1$ and $T_* = \frac{1}{\lambda}$ when $q = 1$.

Theorem 3.4. Let $u_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. Assume $q \in (0, p-1]$ and $\lambda < \sup \Lambda_q$. Then, for any $T > 0$, (\mathcal{P}_λ) admits a weak solution on Q_T belonging to $C([0, T], L^m(\Omega))$ for any $m \in [1, +\infty)$.

Proof. The proof is close to the one of Theorem 1.4 in [9]. For this reason, we skip it but we only precise the main changes.

First, we establish the existence of a weak solution u_R of $(\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,R})$. As in the proof of Theorem 1.4 in [9], it is sufficient to prove that u_R is uniformly bounded independently in Q_T of T and R . For that, it suffices to obtain a uniform bound of the sequence (u_n) defined by (3.1).

Let $\tilde{\lambda} \in \Lambda_q$ such that $\tilde{\lambda} > \lambda$ and let \tilde{u} be the solution of $(\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\lambda}})$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \supset \bar{\Omega}$ where the function b is extended by a positive function \tilde{b} on $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \Omega$ such that $\tilde{b}^{-1}(\{0\}) = \bar{\Omega}_0$. The function $\tilde{u} \in W_0^{s,p}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}})$ is well defined by Theorem 1.2 since $\sup \Lambda_q$ only depends on Ω_0 .

Then, the function $\bar{u} = \alpha \tilde{u}$ with $\alpha \geq 1$ is a supersolution of (\mathcal{E}_{λ}) in Ω by Proposition 2.2 and since $q \leq p-1 < r$, .

Moreover, by Theorem 1.2, $\tilde{u} \geq C$ in $\bar{\Omega}$ hence for α large enough we have $\bar{u} \geq u_0$ a.e. in Ω and we choose $R = \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$.

Hence by induction argument, we have for any $\varphi \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$, $\varphi \geq 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u_n - \bar{u}}{\Delta t} \varphi \, dx dt + \langle \mathcal{A}u_n - \mathcal{A}\bar{u}, \varphi \rangle &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{u_{n-1} - \bar{u}}{\Delta t} \varphi \, dx dt \\ &\quad + \lambda \int_{\Omega} (u_{n-1}^q - \bar{u}^q) \varphi \, dx dt \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

and we deduce that for any n

$$0 \leq u_n \leq \bar{u} \text{ and then } \|u_R\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \leq \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \quad (3.4)$$

Then, with the choice of R , u_R is a weak solution of \mathcal{P}_{λ} in Q_T for any $T > 0$. \square

Remark 3.5. For any $q > 0$, we have a comparison principle about the solutions obtained by Theorem 3.1 and 3.4. Indeed it arises from the discretization scheme, Remark 1.7 and an induction argument.

Proposition 3.6. Let $u_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. Assume either $q \in (0, p-1]$ and $\lambda < \sup \Lambda_q$ or $q \leq 1$. Then, there exists $u_{glob} \in L_{loc}^\infty((0, +\infty), L^\infty(\Omega))$ such that u_{glob} is a weak solution of (\mathcal{P}_{λ}) on Q_T for any $T > 0$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{T} \in (0, \frac{1}{\lambda})$ fixed and independent of u_0 . By Theorem (3.1), 3.4 and Remark 3.3, for any $q \leq 1$ or $q \leq p-1$ and $\lambda < \sup \Lambda_q$, there exists a weak solution u_1 of (\mathcal{P}_{λ}) on $Q_{\tilde{T}}$. By Definition 1.6, $u_1(\tilde{T}, \cdot)$ belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega) \cap W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ hence we apply either Theorem (3.1) or Theorem 3.4 with the initial condition $u_1(T, \cdot)$ and we get a weak solution u_2 of (\mathcal{P}_{λ}) on $Q_{\tilde{T}}$.

Then we proceed by induction argument to construct a sequence $(u_n) \subset X_{\tilde{T}}$ such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, u_n is a weak solution of (\mathcal{P}_{λ}) on $Q_{\tilde{T}}$ with the initial data $u_n(0) = u_{n-1}(T)$.

We conclude defining u_{glob} as follows $u_{glob} = u_{n+1}(\cdot - n\tilde{T}, \cdot)$ on $[n\tilde{T}, (n+1)\tilde{T}] \times \Omega$. \square

Remark 3.7. For $q \in (0, p-1]$ and $\lambda < \sup \Lambda_q$, u_{glob} belongs to $L^\infty([0, \infty) \times \Omega)$.

Now we deal with the question of the uniqueness. We get the following result:

Proposition 3.8. *Let $u_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and let $T > 0$. Assume $q \geq 1$. Then, (\mathcal{P}_λ) admits at most a weak solution in sense of Definition 1.6.*

Proof. Let u, v be two solutions of (\mathcal{P}_λ) on Q_T . We take $\phi = u - v$ in (1.2) we have for any $t \leq T$:

$$\frac{1}{2} \|(u - v)(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \int_0^t \int_\Omega \lambda(u^q - v^q)(u - v) dx d\tau.$$

and since $u, v \in L^\infty(Q_T)$ and the mapping $y \mapsto y^q$ is locally Lipschitz in \mathbb{R} we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \|(u - v)(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C \int_0^t \int_\Omega \|(u - v)(\tau)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 d\tau,$$

finally we conclude applying the Gronwall Lemma. \square

We introduce the energy functional given by for any $v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$:

$$E(v) = \frac{1}{p} \|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p - \frac{\lambda}{q+1} \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1} + \int_\Omega \frac{bv^{r+1}}{r+1} dx.$$

Then, we obtain

Proposition 3.9. *Let $u_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and let $T > 0$. Let u the weak solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) in Q_T given by Theorem 3.1 or 3.4. Then, $u \in C([0, T], W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))$ and*

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \int_\Omega |\partial_t u|^2 dx dt + E(u(t_1)) = E(u(t_0)), \quad (3.5)$$

for any $t_0, t_1 \in [0, T]$ such that $t_1 \geq t_0$. Additionally if $q \geq 1$, and $u_0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$ we have $u \in C([0, T], C^0(\bar{\Omega}))$.

Proof. Let $t_0 \in [0, T]$. Proposition 3.4 of [9] implies that for any $t \in (t_0, T)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_0}^t \int_\Omega |\partial_t u|^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{p} \|u(t)\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p \\ \leq \frac{1}{p} \|u(t_0)\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p + \int_{t_0}^t \int_\Omega (\lambda u^q - bu^r) \partial_t u dx dt, \end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\int_{t_0}^t \int_\Omega |\partial_t u|^2 dx dt + E(u(t)) \leq E(u(t_0)), \quad (3.6)$$

We have $u \in L^\infty(0, T; W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)) \cap C([0, T], L^m(\Omega))$ for any $m \in [1, +\infty)$ thus the mapping $t \mapsto u(t)$ is weakly continuous from $[0, T]$ to $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$.

Hence from (3.6) and taking $t_n \rightarrow t_0$ where $t_n > t_0$ for any n , we deduce that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t_n)\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)} \leq \|u(t_0)\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}$ and from the weak continuity, we finally get that the right continuity of u in t_0 and thus for any $t \in [0, T]$.

Let $h > 0$ small enough, choosing as test function $\tau_h u(\cdot, \cdot) = \frac{u(\cdot+h, \cdot) - u(\cdot, \cdot)}{h}$ in (1.2) first on $[0, t_0]$ and then on $[0, t]$, this yields subtracting the both equations and by convexity of $\frac{1}{p} \|\cdot\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_0}^t \int_{\Omega} \partial_t u \tau_h u \, dx dt + \frac{1}{hp} \int_t^{t+h} \|u\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p dt \\ \geq \frac{1}{hp} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+h} \|u\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p dt + \int_{t_0}^t \int_{\Omega} (\lambda u^q - bu^r) \tau_h u \, dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\partial_t u \in L^2(Q_T)$, $u \in L^\infty(Q_T) \cap L^\infty(0, T; W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))$ and by dominated convergence, we pass to the limit in the previous inequality as $h \rightarrow 0$. Hence we have for any $t \in (t_0, T)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_0}^t \int_{\Omega} |\partial_t u|^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{p} \|u(t)\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p \\ \geq \frac{1}{p} \|u(t_0)\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p + \int_{t_0}^t \int_{\Omega} (\lambda u^q - bu^r) \partial_t u \, dx dt, \end{aligned}$$

which give the equality in (3.1) and also in (3.6).

Finally, in (3.5), for $t_n \rightarrow t$ with $t_n \leq t$ we deduce that $\limsup \|u(t_n)\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)} = \|u(t)\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}$ and plugging with the weak continuity we establish the right continuity of u . Thus $u \in C([0, T], W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))$.

We now take $q \geq 1$ and $u_0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$ and show that $u \in C([0, T], C^0(\overline{\Omega}))$. We consider the discretization scheme given by (3.1) at the range $n-1$ and n then Proposition A.2 implies

$$\|u_n - u_{n-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq (1 + C\Delta t \lambda) \|u_{n-1} - u_{n-2}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},$$

where the constant C is independent of n . Using discrete Gronwall's Lemma, we get for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$

$$\|u_n - u_{n-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|u_1 - u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} e^{C\lambda T}.$$

Since $u_0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$, applying again Proposition A.2 we have

$$\|u_n - u_{n-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \Delta t \|\lambda u_0^q - \mathcal{A}u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} e^{C\lambda T} = C(u_0, T) \Delta t. \quad (3.7)$$

Hence, plugging (3.2), (3.4) and (3.7), we deduce that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$

$$\|(-\Delta)_p^s u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \lambda \|u_{n-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^q + \|bu_n^r\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \left\| \frac{u_n - u_{n-1}}{\Delta t} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C,$$

and $(u_n)_n$ is bounded in $C^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by Theorem 2.7 in [18].

The Ascoli Theorem implies up to a subsequence, for any $t \in [0, T]$, $\tilde{u}_{\Delta t}(t)$ converges to $u(t)$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\tilde{u}_{\Delta t}(t)$ converges $u(t)$ in $C^0(\overline{\Omega})$.

Since (3.7) holds for any n , $(\partial_t \tilde{u}_{\Delta t})_{\Delta t}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(Q_T)$ hence there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of Δt such that for any $t, t_0 \in [0, T]$

$$\|\tilde{u}_{\Delta t}(t) - \tilde{u}_{\Delta t}(s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C|t - s|,$$

thus passing to the limit as $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that $u \in C([0, T], C^0(\overline{\Omega}))$. \square

Remark 3.10. If $p \geq 2$, $q \in [1, p-1]$, $\lambda < \sup \Lambda_q$ and $u_0 \in \overline{D(\mathcal{A})}^{L^\infty} \cap W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$, then using a compactness argument we can get $u \in C([0, T], C^0(\overline{\Omega}))$.

Finally we summarize to establish Theorem 1.8

Proof of Theorem 1.8. The existence of a solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) is given by Theorem 3.1, the regularity by Proposition 3.9. The first point comes from Proposition 3.6 and the uniqueness from Proposition 3.8. \square

3.2 Qualitative behavior

Lemma 3.11. Let $q \leq p-1$ and $\lambda \in (0, \sup \Lambda_q)$ and let $(u_{0,n})$ be a bounded sequence of $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $u_{0,n} \rightarrow u_0$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. Then, for any $T > 0$, up to a subsequence, the sequence of solutions (U_n) of (\mathcal{P}_λ) in Q_T (with $U_n(0) = u_{0,n}$) converges to U solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) in Q_T (with $U(0) = u_0$) in $C([0, T], L^1(\Omega))$.

Proof. Using the supersolution of the proof of Theorem 3.4, the sequence (U_n) is bounded in $L^\infty(Q_T)$. As in the proof of Theorem 3.4 and using the uniform L^∞ bound we have from (3.6):

$$\|d_t U_n\|_{L^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|U_n\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W_0^{s,p}(\Omega))}^p \leq C(1 + \|u_{0,n}\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p),$$

using a compactness argument, we get convergence of U_n and with a method similar as [9, Step 4 and 5, Th. 3.1] we get that, up to a subsequence, $U_n \rightarrow U$ in $C([0, T], L^1(\Omega))$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.10. Let $\mathcal{O}_n \supset \Omega$ a sequence of open subsets such that $|\mathcal{O}_n \setminus \Omega| \rightarrow 0$. Let $\bar{v}_{0,n} \in W_0^{s,p}(\mathcal{O}_n)$ a supersolution of (\mathcal{E}_λ) constructed as in the proof of Theorem 3.4 such that $\bar{v}_{0,n} \geq u_0$ in Ω and let \bar{v}_n the global solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) over $\mathcal{O}_n \times (0, \infty)$ obtained by Theorem 1.8 with $\bar{v}_n(0) = \bar{v}_{0,n}$, then by construction with the discretized scheme the function $t \mapsto \bar{v}_n(t)$ is nondecreasing.

Let $w_\lambda \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap C^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the solution of (\mathcal{E}_λ) in $\tilde{\Omega} \supset \Omega$ satisfying for some constant $c > 0$ $w_\lambda \leq cd(x, \tilde{\Omega})^s$.

We define $\underline{u}_0 = \epsilon w_\lambda$ hence for ϵ small enough $\underline{u}_0 \leq u_0$ a.e. in Ω .

Let \underline{u} be the global solution of the global solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) obtained by Theorem 1.8 with $\underline{u}(0) = \underline{u}_0$.

We show that \underline{u} is nondecreasing using the discretization scheme (3.1) with $R = \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. Using $r > p-1 \geq q$ we have for any $\varphi \in W_0^{s,p}(\tilde{\Omega})$, $\varphi \geq 0$:

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{\underline{u}_1 - \underline{u}_0}{\Delta t} \varphi \, dx + \langle \mathcal{A} \underline{u}_1, \varphi \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \lambda \underline{u}_0^q \varphi \, dx \geq \langle \mathcal{A} \underline{u}_0, \varphi \rangle,$$

and using $\underline{u}_1 \geq 0$ on $\Omega \setminus \tilde{\Omega}$ we have by a comparison principle that $\underline{u}_1 \geq \underline{u}_0$. By induction we have $\underline{u}_n \geq \underline{u}_{n-1}$ and taking $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ we have \underline{u} nondecreasing. Using Proposition 3.8 we have $u \in [\underline{u}, \bar{v}_n]$ for all n . Thus $\underline{u}, \bar{v}_n \rightarrow \underline{u}_\infty, \bar{w}_n$ a.e.

when $t \rightarrow \infty$ and in $L^s(\Omega)$ for any s by dominated convergence theorem. We now use semigroup theory arguments to show $\underline{u}_\infty = u_\lambda$. We introduce $S(t, v_0) := v(t)$ where v is the solution of Theorem 3.4. We have that $S(t, \underline{u}_0) \rightarrow \underline{u}_\infty$ and with (3.5):

$$E(0) \geq E(t) \geq \frac{1}{p} \|\underline{u}\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)}^p - \frac{\lambda}{q+1} \|\underline{u}\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1},$$

which gives $(S(t, \underline{u}_0))_t$ bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega) \cap W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$. Using Lemma 3.11 we have:

$$S(t, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(Tn, \underline{u}_0)) = S(t, \underline{u}_\infty).$$

We have for $n \in \mathbb{N}$: $S(t+nT, v_0) = S(t, S(nT, v_0))$. And since $\underline{u} \in C([0, \infty], L^1(\Omega))$:

$$\underline{u}_\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(t + Tn, \underline{u}_0) = S(t, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(Tn, \underline{u}_0)) = S(t, \underline{u}_\infty)$$

which means that \underline{u}_∞ is a nonnegative stationary solution of (\mathcal{E}_λ) and by uniqueness, $\underline{u}_\infty = u_\lambda$. Similarly, we obtain \bar{w}_n is the solution of (\mathcal{E}_λ) on \mathcal{O}_n . We now show that $w_n \rightarrow u_\lambda$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$. We have that w_n is bounded in $L^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ and in $W_0^{s,p}(\mathcal{O})$ where \mathcal{O} a bounded domain such that $\mathcal{O}_n \subset \mathcal{O}$. Thus for all $\phi \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \subset W_0^{s,p}(\mathcal{O}_n)$ we have:

$$\langle (-\Delta)_p^s w_n, \phi \rangle = \int_{\Omega} (\lambda w_n^q - b w_n^r) \phi,$$

and passing to the limit we have $w_n \rightarrow u_\lambda$ in $L^s(\Omega)$ for all $s < \infty$. Since $u \in [\underline{u}, \bar{w}_n]$, we have for all n : $w_n \geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u \geq u_\lambda$ almost everywhere, which gives pointwise convergence. Finally with the $L^\infty(\Omega)$ bound we get u tends to u_λ in $L^s(\Omega)$ for all s as t goes to ∞ .

We now take $q > 1$ and $u_0 \leq Cd(\cdot, \Omega^c)^s$. Using $Cd(\cdot, \Omega^c)^s$ we can take $\tilde{\Omega} = \Omega$ in the supersolution build in the proof of Theorem 3.4 then using Theorem 1.2 we have $\bar{u}_0, \underline{u}_0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$. Using Proposition 3.9 we have $\underline{u}(t), \bar{u}(t) \in C^0(\tilde{\Omega})$ and using Dini's Theorem we have $\underline{u}(t), \bar{u}(t) \rightarrow u_\lambda$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. \square

Remark 3.12. For the case $q = p - 1$, $\lambda \leq \lambda_1(\Omega)$ we obtain the same result as in Theorem 1.10, but for $u_\lambda = 0$. As we can take 0 as a subsolution, the condition $u_0 \geq cd(\cdot, \tilde{\Omega}^c)^s$ is not necessary.

Proof of Theorem 1.11. When $q \leq 1$ we have a global solution and when $q > 1$, using Corollary 1.9 we can assume $T_{max} = +\infty$.

We set $\underline{u}_0 = \epsilon w$ where w is the positive eigenvalue solution of:

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s w = \lambda_1(\tilde{\Omega}) w^{p-1} & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}, \\ w = 0 & \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \tilde{\Omega}). \end{cases}$$

As in the proof of Theorem 1.10 we have $\underline{u}_1 \geq \underline{u}_0$ and using:

$$\frac{\underline{u}_1}{\Delta t} + b \underline{u}_1^r = (-\Delta)_p^s \underline{u}_1 > 0 \text{ on } \Omega \setminus \tilde{\Omega}$$

we have $\underline{u}_1 \neq 0$ on $\Omega \setminus \tilde{\Omega}$. We have, as for Theorem 1.10, \underline{u} a nondecreasing subsolution such that $\underline{u} \leq u$.

Assuming $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\underline{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = +\infty$ false and with \underline{u} nondecreasing we have $\|\underline{u}\|_{L^\infty(Q_\infty)} \leq C$. Thus, as for Theorem 1.10, we have $\underline{u} \rightarrow u_\lambda$ which contradicts Theorem 1.2. \square

To obtain a more accurate estimate of blow up for the case $\lambda > \lambda_1(\Omega_0)$ we first study the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + (-\Delta)_p^s v = \lambda v^q & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega_0, \\ v = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega_0^c, \\ v(0) = v_0 & \text{in } \Omega_0, \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

where $v_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_0)$ nonnegative. As for Theorem 3.1 and Proposition (3.8) we have:

Theorem 3.13. *There exists a weak solution of (3.8) for a certain $T > 0$. And for $p \leq 2$ we have a global solution. Also for $p \geq 2$ we have uniqueness of the weak solution and for all $p > 1$ a comparison principle on the solutions given by the discretization holds.*

Remark 3.14. *As we have a comparison principle on the solutions given by an elliptic comparison principle and the discretization of problems (\mathcal{P}_λ) and (3.8) then for simplicity we will only consider this type of solution in the following.*

We define on $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)$

$$E_0(v) = \frac{1}{p} \|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)}^p - \frac{\lambda}{q+1} = \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1}.$$

Lemma 3.15. *Let $q = p - 1$, $\lambda > \lambda_1(\Omega_0)$ and $v_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)$ nontrivial such that $E_0(v_0) < 0$. Then if $p \leq 2$ we have $\|v(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} \rightarrow \infty$ when $t \rightarrow \infty$. In addition if $p > 2$ then $T_{\max} < +\infty$.*

Proof. For the case $p \leq 2$, using the energy inequality we have:

$$\|\partial_t v\|_{L^2(Q_t)}^2 + E_0(v(t)) \leq E_0(v_0),$$

and so, taking the test function v and integrating in space we have:

$$\partial_t \|v(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)}^2 = -pE_0(v(t)) \geq -pE_0(v_0),$$

thus by integrating we have $\|v(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)}^2 \rightarrow \infty$.

For the case $p > 2$ one can see [24, Th. 3.5] or [16, Th. B] and adapt the method for $s < 1$. \square

Proof of Lemma 1.12. Using $u_0 \geq Cd(\cdot, \Omega_0^c)^s$ we can find $v_0 \leq u_0$ such that $E_0(v_0) < 0$, for example, taking v_0 be a solution of the eigenvalue problem

$$(-\Delta)_p^s v_0 = \lambda_1(\Omega_0) v_0^{p-1} \text{ on } \Omega_0,$$

we then have that if $p \leq 2$ then $\|v(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)}^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and if $p > 2$ then $T_{max} < +\infty$ where v is the solution of (3.8). Finally using a parabolic comparison principle for the problem (3.8) we have the result. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.13. Let $v_0 \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_0)$ as in (H) and v the solution of (3.8). We have as for [9, Th 1.8]

- If $q > 1$ and $E_0(v_0) < 0$ then $T_{max} < +\infty$,
- if $q = 1$ and $E_0(v_0) < 0$ then $\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$,
- if $q < 1$ and $E_0(v_0) < 0$ then $\sup_{(0,+\infty)} \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)} = +\infty$.

Thus proof of (i) – (iii) follows directly from (H) and Remark 3.14 principle for the equation (3.8). To prove (iv) we set v solution of :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + (-\Delta)_p^s v = \lambda v^q & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ v = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega^c, \\ v(0) = u_0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

then using [9, Th 1.8] we have $t_0 < \infty$ such that $v(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Using again a parabolic comparison principle we have $v \geq u$, thus concluding the result. \square

3.3 Case $q \in (p-1, p^*-1]$

In order to prove Theorem 1.14 and generalize Theorem 1.13 in the case $\lambda(t) := \lambda$ and $q \in (p-1, p^*-1)$ for $sp \geq N$ or $q \in (p-1, p^*-1]$ for $sp < N$. We use in this section a Sattinger type method utilizing stable and unstable set to show quantitative behavior in the case $q \in (p-1, p^*-1)$. We define stable set

$$W = \{v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0) \mid E_0(v) < m, I(v) > 0\} \cap \{0\},$$

and the unstable set:

$$V = \{v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0) \mid E_0(v) < m, I(v) < 0\},$$

where $m = \inf_{v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0) \setminus \{0\}} \sup_{\theta > 0} E_0(v\theta)$ and $I(v) = \|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)}^p - \lambda \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1}$. By straightforward computations we have:

$$m = \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q+1} \right) \lambda^{\frac{-p}{q+1-p}} S_p^{\frac{q+1}{q+1-p}},$$

where $S_p = \inf_{v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)}^p}{\|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1}}$. Also $\sup_{\theta > 0} E_0(v\theta) = E(v\theta^*)$ where

$$\theta^* = \left(\frac{\|v\|_{W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)}^p}{\lambda \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q+1-p}} \text{ and } I(\theta^* v) = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Theorem 3.16. *If $v_0 \in V \cap L^\infty(\Omega_0)$ then $v(t) \in V$ for all $t < T_{max}$ and*

- *if $q > 1$ then $T_{max} < +\infty$,*
- *if $q = 1$ then $\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$,*
- *if $q < 1$ then $\sup_{(0,+\infty)} \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)} = +\infty$,*

Proof. We first show that if $v_0 \in V$ then $v(t) \in V$ for all $t < T_{max}$. Using (3.5) we have that $E_0(v(t)) \leq E_0(v_0) < m$, also if there exists t such that $I(v(t)) \geq 0$ then using Proposition 3.9 we have $v \in C([0, T]; W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0))$ and there exists t_0 such that $I(v(t_0)) = 0$ thus using the definition of m we have $E_0(v(t_0)) \geq m$ which is absurd thus $v(t) \in V$.

We have using $E_0(v(t))$ nonincreasing:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \partial_t \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)}^2 &= -pE_0(v) + \lambda(1 - \frac{p}{q+1}) \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1}, \\ &\geq -pE_0(v_0) + \lambda(1 - \frac{p}{q+1}) \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1}, \\ &\geq -pm(1 - \tau) + \lambda(1 - \frac{p}{q+1}) \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where $\tau = 1 - E_0(v_0)/m \in (0, 1)$. Also using (3.9) we have:

$$-pm = -p \inf_{\tilde{v} \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)} E_0(\tilde{v}\theta^*) = -\lambda(1 - \frac{p}{q+1}) \inf_{\tilde{v} \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)} \|\tilde{v}\theta^*\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1},$$

and using $\theta^* < 1$, we have for all $\tilde{v} \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)$:

$$-\lambda(1 - \frac{p}{q+1}) \inf_{\tilde{v} \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)} \|\tilde{v}\theta^*\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1} \geq -\lambda(1 - \frac{p}{q+1}) \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1}. \quad (3.11)$$

Finally combining (3.10) and (3.11) we have:

$$\partial_t \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)}^2 \geq c \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1},$$

by setting the continuous function $Y(t) = \|v(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)}^2$ we have for $q \geq 1$:

$$Y'(t) \geq cY(t)^\gamma, \quad (3.12)$$

when $q = 1$ we have $\gamma = 1$ and we obtain $Y(t) \rightarrow +\infty$ by integrating (3.12). For $q > 1$ we have $\gamma > 1$ and assume $T_{max} = +\infty$. By integration we have

$$Y^{1-\gamma}(t) \leq -C(\gamma - 1)t + Y^{1-\gamma}(0),$$

giving $Y(t) < 0$ for t big enough, which is absurd. We finish with the case $q < 1$, we assume $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)} \leq C$. Then $Y(t) \leq C^{1-q} \|v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega_0)}^{q+1}$ giving:

$$Y'(t) \geq cY(t),$$

which gives a contradiction by integrating. \square

Theorem 3.17. *And if $v_0 \in W$, $sp > d$ then $T_{max} = +\infty$ and $v \rightarrow 0$ in $L^r(\Omega)$ for all $r < \infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.*

Proof. Similarly as for Theorem 3.16 we have that if $v_0 \in W$ then $v(t) \in W$ for all $t < T_{max}$. We already have $T_{max} = +\infty$ for $q \leq 1$, we now show that $T_{max} = +\infty$ for $q > 1$. Using $E_0(v) < m$ and $I(v) > 0$ we have that v is bounded in $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0)$ and using $sp > d$ we have that v is also bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega_0)$ uniformly in t . Finally using Corollary 1.9 we have $T_{max} = +\infty$. We now show that $v(t) \rightarrow 0$. First using the $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega_0) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_0)$ bound we have $v(t) \rightarrow w$ in $L^r(\Omega_0)$ for all $r < \infty$. We have using $v \in W$

$$E_0(v) = \frac{1}{p}I(v) + \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q+1}\right)\|v\|_{q+1}^{q+1} > 0,$$

also $E_0(v)$ nonincreasing in time thus $E_0(v) \rightarrow c \geq 0$ when $t \rightarrow \infty$. And using (3.5) we deduce $\int_t^{t+1} \|d_tv\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0$ which gives w is a solution of:

$$(-\Delta)_p^s w = \lambda w^q,$$

then $I(w) = 0$ and if $w \neq 0$

$$m \leq E_0(w) \leq \liminf E_0(v) < m,$$

which is absurd. \square

Similarly as in the proof Theorem 1.13 we can use the conditions on u_0 and Theorems 3.16 and 3.17 to prove Theorem 1.14.

A Appendix

Property A.1. [22, 28] *There exist c_1, c_2 positive constants such that for any $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$:*

$$\left| |\xi|^{p-2}\xi - |\eta|^{p-2}\eta \right| \leq c_1 \begin{cases} |\xi - \eta|(|\xi| + |\eta|)^{p-2} & \text{if } p \geq 2, \\ |\xi - \eta|^{p-1} & \text{if } p \leq 2, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1.1})$$

$$(|\xi|^{p-2}\xi - |\eta|^{p-2}\eta) \cdot (\xi - \eta) \geq c_2 \begin{cases} |\xi - \eta|^p & \text{if } p \geq 2, \\ \frac{|\xi - \eta|^2}{(|\xi| + |\eta|)^{2-p}} & \text{if } p \leq 2. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1.2})$$

Proposition A.2. *The operator \mathcal{A} is accretive in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ in the sense of [5, Definition 3.1].*

Proof. We take $\lambda > 0$ and $u, v \in D(\mathcal{A})$ such that $u + \lambda \mathcal{A}u = f$ and $v + \lambda \mathcal{A}v = g$. Using $u, v \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ we have, using (A.1.1), $\phi = |u - v|^{q-1}(u - v) \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ for all $q > 1$. We have by direct computation:

$$\langle \mathcal{A}u - \mathcal{A}v, \phi \rangle \geq 0,$$

and so taking the test function ϕ in:

$$u - v + \mathcal{A}u - \mathcal{A}v = f - g,$$

gives

$$\|u - v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1} = \int_{\Omega} (f - g)\phi \leq \|f - g\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \|u - v\|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^q,$$

which gives, when $q \rightarrow \infty$, $\|u - v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|f - g\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ giving accretivity in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. \square

References

- [1] B. Abdellaoui, A. Attar, R. Bentifour, and I. Peral. On fractional p -Laplacian parabolic problem with general data. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 197(2):329–356, 2018.
- [2] Antonio Ambrosetti and Paul H Rabinowitz. Dual variational methods in critical point theory and applications. *Journal of functional Analysis*, 14(4):349–381, 1973.
- [3] José M. Arrieta, Rosa Pardo, and Aníbal Rodríguez-Bernal. A degenerate parabolic logistic equation. In *Advances in differential equations and applications*, volume 4 of *SEMA SIMAI Springer Ser.*, pages 3–11. Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [4] José M. Arrieta, Rosa Pardo, and Aníbal Rodríguez-Bernal. Asymptotic behavior of degenerate logistic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 259(11):6368–6398, 2015.
- [5] Viorel Barbu. *Nonlinear differential equations of monotone types in Banach spaces*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [6] Giovanni Molica Bisci, Vicențiu D Rădulescu, and Raffaella Servadei. *Variational methods for nonlocal fractional problems*, volume 162. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [7] Lorenzo Brasco and Giovanni Franzina. Convexity properties of dirichlet integrals and picone-type inequalities. *Kodai Mathematical Journal*, 37(3):769–799, 2014.
- [8] Wenjing Chen, Sunra Mosconi, and Marco Squassina. Nonlocal problems with critical Hardy nonlinearity. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 275(11):3065–3114, 2018.
- [9] Loïc Constantin, Jacques Giacomoni, and Guillaume Warnault. Existence and global behaviour of solutions of a parabolic problem involving the fractional p -Laplacian in porous medium. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 87:Paper No. 104416, 18, 2026.

- [10] Leandro Del Pezzo, Julián Fernández Bonder, and Luis López Ríos. An optimization problem for the first eigenvalue of the-fractional laplacian. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 291(4):632–651, 2018.
- [11] Leandro M Del Pezzo and Alexander Quaas. A hopf’s lemma and a strong minimum principle for the fractional p-laplacian. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 263(1):765–778, 2017.
- [12] Eleonora Di Nezza, Giampiero Palatucci, and Enrico Valdinoci. Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional sobolev spaces. *Bulletin des sciences mathématiques*, 136(5):521–573, 2012.
- [13] C.S. Drapaca and S. Sivalogonathan. A fractional model of continuum mechanics. *Journal of Elasticity*, 107:105–123, 2012.
- [14] Yihong Du and Zongming Guo. Boundary blow-up solutions and their applications in quasilinear elliptic equations. *J. Anal. Math.*, 89:277–302, 2003.
- [15] Giovanni Franzina and Giampiero Palatucci. Fractional p-eigenvalues. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.1789*, 2013.
- [16] Ataru Fujii and Masahito Ohta. Asymptotic behavior of blowup solutions of a parabolic equation with the p -Laplacian. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 32(3):503–515, 1996.
- [17] Antonio Iannizzotto, Shibo Liu, Kanishka Perera, and Marco Squassina. Existence results for fractional p-laplacian problems via morse theory. *Advances in Calculus of Variations*, 9(2):101–125, 2016.
- [18] Antonio Iannizzotto and Sunra Mosconi. Fine boundary regularity for the singular fractional p -laplacian. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02448*, 2024.
- [19] Antonio Iannizzotto, Sunra Mosconi, and Nikolaos S Papageorgiou. On the logistic equation for the fractional p-laplacian. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 296(4):1451–1468, 2023.
- [20] Antonio Iannizzotto, Sunra JN Mosconi, and Marco Squassina. Global hölder regularity for the fractional p -laplacian. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana*, 32(4):1353–1392, 2016.
- [21] Antonio Iannizzotto and Dimitri Mugnai. Optimal solvability for the fractional p-laplacian with dirichlet conditions. *Fractional Calculus and Applied Analysis*, pages 1–27, 2024.
- [22] Nobuyuki Kato, Masashi Misawa, Kenta Nakamura, and Yoshihiko Yamaura. Existence for doubly nonlinear fractional p-laplacian equations. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata (1923-)*, pages 1–47, 2024.

- [23] Wan-Tong Li, Julián López-Gómez, and Jian-Wen Sun. Sharp patterns of positive solutions for some weighted semilinear elliptic problems. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 60:1–36, 2021.
- [24] Yuxiang Li and Chunhong Xie. Blow-up for p -Laplacian parabolic equations. *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, pages No. 20, 12, 2003.
- [25] J. López-Gómez, V. K. Ramos, C. A. Santos, and A. Suárez. Point-wise behavior of the explosive positive solutions to a degenerate elliptic BVP with an indefinite weight function. *J. Differential Equations*, 403:67–86, 2024.
- [26] José M. Mazón, Julio D. Rossi, and Julián Toledo. Fractional p -Laplacian evolution equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 105(6):810–844, 2016.
- [27] J.S. Silling. Reformulation of elasticity theory for discontinuities and long-range forces,. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 48:175–209, 2000.
- [28] Jacques Simon. Régularité de la solution d’une équation non linéaire dans \mathbb{R}^n . In *Journées d’Analyse Non Linéaire: Proceedings, Besançon, France, June 1977*, pages 205–227. Springer, 2006.
- [29] Juan Luis Vázquez. The Dirichlet problem for the fractional p -Laplacian evolution equation. *J. Differential Equations*, 260(7):6038–6056, 2016.
- [30] M. Zimmermann. *A Continuum Theory with Long-Range Forces for Solids*. PhD thesis, MIT, 2005.