

Weighted Robin eigenvalue problems and nonlinear elliptic equations with general growth in the gradient

Francesco Della Pietra

Giuseppina di Blasio

Giuseppe Riey

December 24, 2025

Abstract

Abstract. We prove an existence result for Robin boundary value problems modeled on

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + |\nabla u|^2 + \lambda f(x) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + \beta u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a bounded, sufficiently smooth open set in \mathbb{R}^N , $f(x)$ belongs to the Marcinkiewicz space $M^{N/2}$ and $\beta > 0$, under a smallness assumption on the datum λ . In order to study such problem, we will show several properties of the weighted, singular Robin eigenvalue problem

$$\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) = \inf_{\psi \in H^1, \int_{\Omega} f \psi^2 = 1} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \psi|^2 dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} \psi^2 \right\}.$$

MSC 2020: 35J66, 35J20, 35P15.

Key words and phrases: Elliptic equations with natural growth in the gradient; Robin boundary conditions; a priori estimates; existence results.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Preliminaries	3
2.1	Functional setting	3
2.2	A concentration-compactness Lemma	6
3	Some properties of the first weighted Robin eigenvalue	8
4	Existence results for Robin problems with natural growth in the gradient	16

1 Introduction

In this paper we are concerned with the existence of solutions to a class of nonlinear elliptic boundary value problems with Robin boundary conditions. To introduce the subject, let us consider the

F. Della Pietra: Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni “R. Caccioppoli”, Università degli studi di Napoli Federico II, Via Cintia, Complesso Universitario Monte S. Angelo, 80126 Napoli, Italy. f.dellapietra@unina.it

G. di Blasio: Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Università degli Studi della Campania “Luigi Vanvitelli”, viale Lincoln 5, 81100 Caserta, Italy. Email: giuseppina.diblasio@unicampania.it

G. Riey: Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università della Calabria, Ponte Pietro Bucci 31B, Cosenza, Rende 87036, Italy. Email: giuseppe.riey@unical.it

prototype problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \sigma_0 |\nabla u|^2 + \lambda f(x) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + \beta u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain in \mathbb{R}^N ($N \geq 3$), ν is the outer unit normal to $\partial\Omega$, $\lambda, \sigma_0, \beta > 0$ are constants, and $f(x)$ is a nonnegative function belonging to the Marcinkiewicz space $M^{N/2}(\Omega)$.

Problems with quadratic growth in the gradient, often referred to as having natural (or critical) growth, have been extensively studied, particularly in the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions, as well as its generalization to p -Laplace operator, or with subcritical growth. The bibliography is vast; we recall, for example, [1, 5, 7, 11–20, 23, 26]. The critical nature of the space $L^{N/2}$ (or $M^{N/2}$) for the source term f is well-known in this context. Moreover, it is also well known that, in the Dirichlet case ($\beta = +\infty$), in order to get a H^1 solution to (1.1) a smallness hypothesis on λ is needed. In particular, when $f \not\equiv 0$, this happens if λ is smaller than the first weighted eigenvalue $\lambda_{1,f}(\Omega)$ of $-\Delta$, namely

$$\lambda_{1,f}(\Omega) = \inf_{\psi \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \psi|^2 dx}{\int_{\Omega} f(x) \psi^2 dx}. \quad (1.2)$$

This variational problem includes as special cases the standard first Dirichlet eigenvalue (when $f \equiv 1$) and the Hardy constant (when $f(x) = |x|^{-2}$, $\lambda_{1,f} = \frac{(N-2)^2}{4}$).

The main novelty of this work lies in the treatment of the Robin boundary condition, combined with a source term in the Lorentz space $M^{N/2}$, as for example the Hardy weight. While Dirichlet problems are naturally associated with the functional space $H_0^1(\Omega)$, the Robin condition requires working in the full space $H^1(\Omega)$, which introduces specific difficulties related to the trace terms. As a matter of fact, if we formally perform the classical change of variable $v = e^u$, problem (1.1) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v + \lambda f v = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} + \beta v \ln v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

The transformation linearizes the PDE but introduces a nonlinearity of logarithmic type into the Robin boundary condition.

In the Robin case, the existence of a solution to (1.1) is deeply connected to the properties of a related weighted eigenvalue problem. Specifically, we investigate the first eigenvalue of the Laplacian with Robin boundary conditions and a singular weight f . We consider

$$\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) = \inf_{\psi \in H^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} R_{\gamma,f}[\psi] \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$R_{\gamma,f}[\psi] = \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \psi|^2 dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} \psi^2 d\sigma}{\int_{\Omega} f(x) \psi^2 dx}.$$

and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. This variational problem generalizes the classical weighted Dirichlet eigenvalue (1.2) (obtained for $\gamma \rightarrow +\infty$) and includes as special cases the standard Robin eigenvalue (when $f \equiv 1$) and variants of the Hardy constant (when $f(x) = |x|^{-2}$). The case of the Hardy potential has been studied by Chabrowski et al. in [9, 10] and by Adimurthi et al. in [2, 3], who established Hardy-Sobolev type

inequalities. Our hypotheses will cover a wide family of weights f . We will only impose a condition on f to avoid singularities close to the boundary (see Section 3).

Then, the main existence result for problems like (1.1) (Theorem 4.2) states that if the parameter λ is sufficiently small, specifically

$$\lambda < \frac{\lambda_{1,f}(\Omega)}{\sigma_0},$$

then there exists at least one weak solution $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ to the problem. Furthermore, this solution possesses a regularity property typical of problems with quadratic growth: $e^{a|u|} \in H^1(\Omega)$ for some $a > 0$. Moreover, it is interesting to observe that the smallness hypothesis for the existence does not depend on β , but only on the Dirichlet eigenvalue ($\beta = +\infty$).

To achieve this, we first perform a detailed analysis of the eigenvalue problem (1.3). We prove the existence of minimizers using a Concentration-Compactness argument to handle the possible lack of compactness due to the singular weight $f \in M^{N/2}$, adapting the techniques of P.L. Lions [22] and Smets [24]. We also study the qualitative properties of $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega)$ as a function of γ , showing its continuity, monotonicity, and asymptotic behavior towards the Dirichlet eigenvalue $\lambda_{1,f}(\Omega)$. The bibliography on this topic is quite large, too; we refer, for example, to [24, 25], for the study of some properties of weighted eigenvalue properties in the Dirichlet case.

The proof of the existence theorem relies on a priori estimates obtained by using exponential test functions (a technique going back to [7]), adapted to handle the boundary terms and the arbitrary sign of the solution. The convergence of the approximate solutions is then established using truncation methods and pointwise convergence of gradients, as developed in [6, 16, 17].

In summary, the aim paper of the paper is twofold: the study of a Robin eigenvalue problem with a very general weight, and the existence of solutions of equations modeled on (1.1). It is organized as follows: in Section 2 we introduce the functional setting and some preliminary results, including a concentration-compactness lemma. Section 3 is devoted to the study of the weighted Robin eigenvalue problem (1.3). Finally, in Section 4 we state and prove the existence result for the general nonlinear problem (4.4), and we discuss the necessity of the condition $\beta > 0$ for the validity of our estimates.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Functional setting

We recall that for $p > 0$, the Marcinkiewicz space $M^p(\Omega)$, also known as the weak L^p space, is the set of all measurable functions f on Ω such that there exists a constant $C > 0$ for which the distribution function of f , $\mu_f(t) := |\{x : |f(x)| > t\}|$, satisfies

$$\mu_f(t) \leq \frac{C}{t^p}, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

It is well-known that, when $|\Omega| < +\infty$, then $L^q(\Omega) \subset M^q(\Omega) \subset L^{q-\varepsilon}(\Omega)$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

The space M^q is a particular case of the so called Lorentz spaces. A measurable function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ belongs to the Lorentz space $L^{p,q}(\Omega)$, $1 < p < +\infty$, if

$$\|f\|_{p,q,\Omega} = \begin{cases} \left\{ \int_0^{|\Omega|} [t^{1/p} f^*(t)]^q \frac{dt}{t} \right\}^{1/q}, & 1 \leq q < +\infty, \\ \sup_{0 < t < |\Omega|} t^{1/p} f^*(t), & q = +\infty, \end{cases}$$

is finite, where $f^*(s)$, $s \in [0, |\Omega|]$, is the decreasing rearrangement of f , that is the distribution function of μ_f . In general $\|f\|_{p,q,\Omega}$ is not a norm. As matter of fact, it is possible to introduce a metric in $L^{p,q}$ defining

$$\|f\|_{(p,q)} = \|f^{**}\|_{p,q,\Omega},$$

with $f^{**}(t) = t^{-1} \int_0^t f^*(\sigma) d\sigma$. we have that for $1 < p < +\infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq +\infty$,

$$\|f\|_{p,q,\Omega} \leq \|f\|_{(p,q)} \leq \frac{p}{p-1} \|f\|_{p,q,\Omega}.$$

For $1 \leq p, q \leq +\infty$, it holds that

$$\|fg\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \|f\|_{p,q,\Omega} \|g\|_{p',q',\Omega}, \quad (2.1)$$

where p', q' are the Hölder conjugates of p, q respectively. More generally, the $L^{p,q}$ spaces are related in the following way:

$$L^r \subset L^{p,1} \subset L^{p,q} \subset L^{p,p} = L^p \subset L^{p,r} \subset L^{p,\infty} = M^p \subset L^q,$$

for $1 < q < p < r < +\infty$. The Lorentz spaces allow to get a refinement of the Sobolev inequality. Indeed, it holds that

$$\|f\|_{p^*,p,\mathbb{R}^N} \leq S_{N,p} \|f\|_{W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)}$$

when for $1 \leq p < N$ (see [4]). Then, if Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain, using classical extension theorems we can conclude that there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\|f\|_{p^*,p,\Omega} \leq C \|f\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \quad (2.2)$$

for any $f \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

In the following, the Proposition below will be useful.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded, connected, Lipschitz domain, and let $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ a positive function in Ω . Then there exists a positive constant C such that for every $u \in H^1(\Omega)$,*

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega,f)} \right),$$

where $\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega,f)} = \left(\int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx \right)^{1/2}$.

Proof. We prove the inequality by contradiction. Therefore, for any $n \geq 1$, there exists $u_n \in H^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\|u_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} > n \left(\|\nabla u_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \left(\int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \right).$$

Let us define $v_n = \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)}}$. By construction, the sequence $\{v_n\}$ satisfies

$$(i) \quad \|v_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} = 1 \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

$$(ii) \quad \|\nabla v_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \left(\int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx \right)^{1/2} < \frac{1}{n}.$$

From (ii), it follows immediately that as $n \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\|\nabla v_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} f(x) v_n^2 dx \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.3)$$

From (i), the sequence $\{v_n\}$ is bounded in $H^1(\Omega)$. Therefore, up to a subsequence, $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$ weakly in $H^1(\Omega)$, and $v_n \rightarrow v_0$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ and almost everywhere in Ω . From (2.3), we must have $\nabla v_0 = 0$ and, since Ω is a connected domain, this implies that $v_0 \equiv K$. Furthermore, combining $\|v_n\|_{H^1}^2 = \|\nabla v_n\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v_n\|_{L^2}^2 = 1$ and that $\|\nabla v_n\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0$, it holds $\|v_n\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 1$. As $v_n \rightarrow v_0$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$, it follows that $\|v_0\|_{L^2} = 1$, and $v_0 = K = \pm 1/\sqrt{|\Omega|}$. Finally, by Fatou's Lemma and (2.3), it holds

$$\int_{\Omega} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (f(x) v_n(x)^2) dx \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f(x) v_n^2 dx = 0.$$

This yields:

$$\int_{\Omega} f(x) v_0^2 dx = 0.$$

this is a contradiction, being $f(x) > 0$ a.e. and $v_0^2 = K^2 > 0$. The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded, Lipschitz domain, and let $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ a positive function in Ω such that $f > 0$ almost everywhere in Ω . Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all $u \in H^1(\Omega)$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} u^2 d\sigma \leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx + C(\varepsilon) \int_{\Omega} u^2 f dx \quad (2.4)$$

Proof. We proceed by contradiction. Then there exists an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we can find a function $u_m \in H^1(\Omega)$ (with $u_m \not\equiv 0$) satisfying

$$\varepsilon_0 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_m|^2 dx + m \int_{\Omega} u_m^2 f dx < \int_{\partial\Omega} u_m^2 d\sigma = 1, \quad \text{for all } m$$

Hence, by (2.1), u_m is bounded in the $H^1(\Omega)$, and then

$$u_m \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{weakly in } H^1(\Omega), \quad u_m \rightarrow u \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega) \text{ and in } L^2(\partial\Omega).$$

Hence

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} u^2 d\sigma = 1. \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover, by Fatou we get

$$\int_{\Omega} u^2 f dx \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} u_m^2 f dx = 0.$$

and thus $u = 0$ a.e. in Ω , and so its trace, contradicting (2.5). \square

2.2 A concentration-compactness Lemma

The analysis of minimizing sequences for (1.3) is challenging because the functional $u \mapsto \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx$ is not weakly continuous on $H^1(\Omega)$ for a general weight $f \in M^{N/2}(\Omega)$. To overcome this lack of compactness, we use the concentration-compactness Principle, in the spirit of the well-known results of P.L. Lions ([22]), and of the result proved by Smets ([24]) in the Dirichlet case.

To this aim, we need to assume a stronger assumption on f . For any $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $r > 0$, we define

$$S_{r,f}^x := \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega \cap B_r(x)) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(x)} |\nabla \phi|^2 dx : \phi \in H_0^1(\Omega \cap B_r(x)), \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(x)} f(x) \phi^2 dx = 1 \right\},$$

and we set for $x \in \overline{\Omega}$

$$S_f^x := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} S_{r,f}^x.$$

The singularity set Σ_f is

$$\Sigma_f := \{x \in \overline{\Omega} \mid S_f^x < +\infty\}.$$

For an interior point $x \in \Omega$ and r sufficiently small, $S_{r,f}^x$ is the first eigenvalue of the Dirichlet problem on $B_r(x)$ with weight f , $\lambda_{1,f}(B_r(x))$. We will make the following two assumptions:

($H_{f,1}$) $\overline{\Sigma}_f$ is at most countable;

($H_{f,2}$) the singularity set Σ_f is compactly contained in Ω :

$$\overline{\Sigma}_f \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset.$$

The first condition avoid strong spikes on a dense subset of Ω ; the second, avoid that singularities on the boundary of Ω appear.

Remark 2.3. We emphasize that when $f \in L^{N/2}(\Omega)$, it holds that $\Sigma_f = \emptyset$.

Indeed in such a case, for $x \in \overline{\Omega}$

$$S_{r,f}^x \geq \lambda_{1,f}(B_r(x)), \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \lambda_{1,f}(B_r) = +\infty.$$

If $x \in \partial\Omega$, we may think $f \equiv 1$ outside Ω . Through a change of variables,

$$\lambda_{1,f}(B_r) = \frac{1}{r^2} \lambda_{1,f_r}(B_1),$$

where $f_r(z) = f(rz)$, $z = \frac{y-x}{r}$ is the scaled weight function defined on B_1 . We look for a lower bound for $\lambda_{1,f_r}(B_1)$. For any test function $v \in H_0^1(B_1)$, using Hölder and Sobolev inequalities we get

$$\int_{B_1} f_r v^2 dz \leq S \|f_r\|_{L^{N/2}(B_1)} \int_{B_1} |\nabla v|^2 dz$$

where S is the Sobolev constant. Hence

$$\frac{\int_{B_1} |\nabla v|^2 dz}{\int_{B_1} f_r v^2 dz} \geq \frac{1}{S \|f_r\|_{L^{N/2}(B_1)}}.$$

Passing to the infimum, we may conclude that

$$\lambda_{1,f}(B_r) \geq \frac{1}{r^2} \cdot \frac{1}{S \|f_r\|_{L^{N/2}(B_1)}} = \frac{1}{S \left(\int_{B_r} |f|^{\frac{N}{2}} dy \right)^{\frac{2}{N}}}.$$

Being $f \in L^{N/2}(\Omega)$, we conclude that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \lambda_{1,f}(B_r) = +\infty.$$

Example 1. If $f = \frac{1}{|x|^2}$ and $0 \in \Omega$, then $S_f^0 = \frac{(N-2)^2}{4}$ is the Hardy constant, and $\Sigma_f = \{0\}$.

We are ready to state and prove the concentration-compactness lemma.

Lemma 2.4. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded, open, and connected set, and let $f \in M^{N/2}(\Omega)$ be a non-negative weight function, and $(H_{f,1}) - (H_{f,2})$ hold. Consider a bounded sequence $\{u_n\}$ in $H^1(\Omega)$ with $u_n \rightharpoonup u_0$ weakly in $H^1(\Omega)$. We may assume that there exist non-negative, finite Radon measures $\mu, \nu, \tilde{\mu}$ on Ω such that:

- a. $|\nabla(u_n - u_0)|^2 \rightharpoonup \mu$ weakly in $\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$;
- b. $f|u_n - u_0|^2 \rightharpoonup \nu$ weakly in $\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$;
- c. $|\nabla u_n|^2 \rightharpoonup \tilde{\mu}$ weakly in $\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$,

where $\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$ is the cone of positive finite Radon measures over Ω . Then, the following properties hold:

1. The measure ν is purely atomic and supported on Σ_f . That is,

$$\nu = \sum_{i \in I} \nu_i \delta_{x_i}, \quad \text{with } x_i \in \Sigma_f \text{ and } \nu_i > 0,$$

where I is an at most countable set.

2. The measure μ is bounded from below by ν , in the sense that

$$\mu \geq \sum_{i \in I} \nu_i S_f^{x_i} \delta_{x_i}, \tag{2.6}$$

and the total energy measure $\tilde{\mu}$ satisfies:

$$\tilde{\mu} \geq |\nabla u_0|^2 + \sum_{i \in I} \nu_i S_f^{x_i} \delta_{x_i}. \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. The proof adapts the argument by P.L. Lions ([22]) and Smets ([24]), adding the additional hypothesis $\bar{\Sigma}_f \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset$ in order to manage a sequence in $H^1(\Omega)$. In what follows, we set $v_n = u_n - u_0$. We first claim that ν is supported on $\bar{\Sigma}_f$. This is equivalent to proving that for any test function $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\text{supp}(\phi) \cap \bar{\Sigma}_f = \emptyset$, we have $\nu(\phi) = \int_\Omega \phi d\nu = 0$. Let ϕ be such a test function. We may assume that $\phi \geq 0$ and $\sqrt{\phi}$ is smooth. For any $x \in \text{supp}(\phi)$, since $x \notin \bar{\Sigma}_f$, by definition $S_f^x = +\infty$. This means that for any large number M , we can choose the radius r of each ball B_r small enough such that $S_{r,f}^x > M$. We can then extract a finite open sub-covering $\{B_{r_i}(x_i)\}_{i=1,\dots,m}$. Because we assumed $\bar{\Sigma}_f \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset$, we can also ensure that the support of ϕ is strictly inside Ω . This means we can choose the balls $\{B_i\}$ to be strictly contained in Ω . Now, let $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^m$ be a smooth partition of unity subordinate to this cover. Consider the test functions $w_{n,i} = v_n \cdot (\phi \xi_i)^{1/2}$. Since $\phi \xi_i$ has compact support inside

the ball $B_i \subset \subset \Omega$, the function $w_{n,i}$ belongs to $H_0^1(B_i)$. It is therefore an admissible test function for the infimum defining $S_{r_i,f}^{x_i}$. Applying the definition, we have:

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{n,i}|^2 dx \geq S_{r_i,f}^{x_i} \int_{\Omega} f w_{n,i}^2 dx > M \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 \phi \xi_i dx.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} v(\phi) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 \phi = \sum_{i=1}^m \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 \phi \xi_i \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^m \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{n,i}|^2 dx = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^m \mu(\phi \xi_i) = \frac{1}{M} \mu(\phi) \leq \frac{\|\mu\| \|\phi\|_{\infty}}{M}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

The first equality in the second line of (2.8) follows by using the elementary inequality $\|a + b\|^2 - \|a\|^2 \leq \epsilon \|a\|^2 + C_{\epsilon} \|b\|^2$:

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{n,i}|^2 - \int_{\Omega} \phi \xi_i |\nabla v_n|^2 \right| \leq \epsilon \int_{\Omega} \phi \xi_i |\nabla v_n|^2 + C_{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} |v_n|^2 |\nabla((\phi \xi_i)^{1/2})|^2. \quad (2.9)$$

Then the first term on the right can be made small by choosing ϵ small (since $\int \phi \xi_i |\nabla v_n|^2$ converges). The second term tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ because $v_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ (since $v_n \rightarrow 0$ in H^1). As M can be arbitrarily large, we conclude by (2.8) that $v(\phi) = 0$. This proves that the support of v is contained in $\bar{\Sigma}_f$, proving the claim.

Now, let $x \in \Sigma_f$; for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $r_j > 0$ such that $S_{r_j,f}^x > S_f^x - \frac{1}{j}$. We can choose a sequence of smooth cutoff functions $\{\psi_j\}$ that are supported in balls $B_{r_j}(x)$ with $r_j \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, and $\psi_j \equiv 1$ near x . We have, arguing in particular as in (2.9),

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{x\}) &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\psi_j^2) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(v_n \psi_j)|^2 \\ &\geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \left(S_f^x - \frac{1}{j} \right) \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 \psi_j^2 \right\} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(S_f^x - \frac{1}{j} \right) v(\psi_j^2) = S_f^x v(\{x\}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $x \in \bar{\Sigma}_f \setminus \Sigma_f$, it holds that $\mu(\{x\}) > j v(\{x\})$ for each j so that $v(\{x\}) = 0$. This proves that there are no Dirac masses on $\bar{\Sigma}_f \setminus \Sigma_f$. Moreover, $\mu(\{x\}) = \bar{\mu}(\{x\})$. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 \psi_j^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^2 \psi_j^2 dx \right| \\ \leq \epsilon \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 \psi_j^2 + c(\epsilon) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 \psi_j^2 \leq \epsilon K + c(\epsilon) o(1), \quad j \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now, if $\psi \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is positive, the weakly sequentially lower semi-continuity of $v \in L^2(\Omega) \mapsto \int_{\Omega} \psi |v|^2$, we get $\bar{\mu} \geq |\nabla u_0|^2$. One can conclude by the orthogonality of $|\nabla u_0|^2$ with Dirac masses. This completes the proof. \square

3 Some properties of the first weighted Robin eigenvalue

In this section we list and prove several properties of $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega)$. For the sake of completeness, we consider both the cases $\gamma > 0$ and $\gamma < 0$.

Proposition 3.1 (Simplicity of the first eigenvalue). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded, connected open set with Lipschitz boundary. Let $f \in M^{N/2}(\Omega)$ be a weight function such that $f > 0$ a.e. in Ω . If $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$ is attained by a minimizer, then this is unique up to a multiplicative constant.*

Proof. Let $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ be a minimizer for $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$. Then $|u|$ is still a minimizer, so we may assume $u \geq 0$. By the maximum principle (see [8, Cor. 3]), it holds that $u > 0$ a.e. in Ω . We now show that any two positive minimizers, u_1 and u_2 , must be proportional. This argument is a classic technique in the spirit of Picone's identity (see also, for example, [10]).

Let $u_1 > 0$ and $u_2 > 0$ be two normalized minimizers of $\lambda = \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$, $\int_{\Omega} f u_1^2 dx = \int_{\Omega} f u_2^2 dx = 1$. For any test function $\phi \in H^1(\Omega)$:

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla \phi dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} u_1 \phi d\sigma = \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_1 \phi dx \quad (3.1)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla u_2 \cdot \nabla \phi dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} u_2 \phi d\sigma = \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_2 \phi dx \quad (3.2)$$

Since $u_1 > 0$ a.e., the function $\phi_1 = \frac{u_2^2}{u_1 + \frac{1}{n}}$ is a valid test function in $H^1(\Omega)$. We also choose $\phi_2 = u_2$. Substitute ϕ_1 into (3.1) and ϕ_2 into (3.2):

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{u_2^2}{u_1 + \frac{1}{n}} \right) dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{u_1}{u_1 + \frac{1}{n}} u_2^2 d\sigma = \lambda \int_{\Omega} f \frac{u_1}{u_1 + \frac{1}{n}} u_2^2 dx.$$

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_2|^2 dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} u_2^2 d\sigma = \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_2^2 dx.$$

Passing to the limit in the first equation and comparing, we get

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_2|^2 dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla \left(\frac{u_2^2}{u_1 + \frac{1}{n}} \right) dx = 0$$

Computing the gradient, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_2|^2 dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{2u_2}{u_1 + \frac{1}{n}} \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla u_2 - \frac{u_2^2}{(u_1 + \frac{1}{n})^2} |\nabla u_1|^2 \right) dx.$$

Rearranging all terms to one side, we get:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla u_2 - \frac{u_2}{u_1 + \frac{1}{n}} \nabla u_1 \right|^2 dx = 0.$$

Then

$$\nabla u_2 - \frac{u_2}{u_1} \nabla u_1 = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Since Ω is a connected domain, $u_2 = c \cdot u_1$. Since both functions are normalized and a.e. positive, we must have $c = 1$, and the proof is completed. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded, connected open set with a Lipschitz boundary. Let $f \in M^{N/2}(\Omega)$ be a weight function such that $f > 0$ a.e. in Ω . Assume that the structural hypotheses $(H_{f,1}) - (H_{f,2})$ hold. Then the first Robin eigenvalue $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega)$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ has the following properties:*

(i) (1) *For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$ has the sign of γ ; moreover,*

$$-\infty < \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) \leq \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega) < +\infty. \quad (3.3)$$

(2) the following limits hold:

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) = \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega), \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow -\infty} \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) = -\infty. \quad (3.5)$$

(ii) The infimum $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega)$ is attained, provided

$$\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) < \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega). \quad (3.6)$$

Moreover, if $f \in L^{N/2}(\Omega)$, this condition is always satisfied for $\gamma > 0$, and thus a minimizer always exists.

(iii) The function $\lambda(\gamma) := \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega)$, defined on \mathbb{R} , is:

(a) non-decreasing and continuous;

(b) differentiable for any γ where a minimizer exists (i.e., where (3.6) holds). Its derivative is given by

$$\lambda'(\gamma) = \int_{\partial\Omega} u_\gamma^2 d\sigma,$$

where u_γ is the unique nonnegative minimizer normalized by $\int_{\Omega} f u_\gamma^2 dx = 1$.

(c) If $f \in L^{N/2}(\Omega)$, then $\bar{\gamma} = +\infty$, and the map is strictly increasing for all $\gamma > 0$.

Proof. We split the proof in several steps.

Step 1: For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega)$ is finite. If $\gamma \geq 0$, this is obvious by the definition. If $\gamma < 0$, using the trace inequality (2.4), we have, for any $\psi \in H^1$,

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \psi|^2 dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} \psi^2 d\sigma \geq (1 - \varepsilon|\gamma|) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \psi|^2 dx - |\gamma|C(\varepsilon) \int_{\Omega} \psi^2 f dx.$$

Hence, if $\varepsilon \leq 1/|\gamma|$, we get that $R_\gamma[\psi]$ is bounded from below in H^1 , which implies that $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega)$ is finite.

In all the following steps of the proof, we will always denote by $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset H^1(\Omega)$ a normalized minimizing sequence for $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega)$, in the sense that

$$\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} u_n^2 d\sigma \right), \quad \int_{\Omega} f(x) u_n^2 dx = 1. \quad (3.7)$$

As $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$ is finite, u_n will be bounded in $H^1(\Omega)$, and then weakly convergent in H^1 and strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ and $L^2(\partial\Omega)$, respectively, to a function $u_0 \in H^1(\Omega)$.

Step 2: proof of i)(1). If $\gamma = 0$, then $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} = 0$, and if $\gamma < 0$, it holds $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} \leq \gamma \frac{P(\Omega)}{|\Omega|} < 0$ by taking constant test functions. So let us suppose $\gamma > 0$. In order to prove that $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) > 0$, we argue by contradiction. Assume that $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) = 0$. Since $\gamma > 0$ we have by (3.7):

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} = 0. \quad (3.8)$$

This implies that $\nabla u_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)^N$, then $\nabla u_0 = 0$, which implies that u_0 is a constant, say K , since Ω is connected. By the compactness of the trace operator, the weak convergence $u_n \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $H^1(\Omega)$ implies strong convergence of the traces $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ in $L^2(\partial\Omega)$. From (3.8), we get $u_0 \equiv 0$. On the other hand, by the Hölder inequality (2.1) and the Sobolev inequality (2.2) it holds that

$$1 = \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx \leq \|f\|_{N/2, \infty, \Omega} \|u_n\|_{\frac{2N}{N-2}, 2, \Omega}^2 \leq C \|f\|_{N/2, \infty, \Omega} \|u_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2$$

and this is a contradiction with $\|u_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$. This means that $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega)$ must be positive.

Step 3: proof of (ii). Let us prove the existence of the minimum under the assumptions $(H_{f,1}) - (H_{f,2})$ and the condition $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} < \lambda_{1,f}$. Let u_n a minimizing normalized sequence converging weakly in $H^1(\Omega)$ to u_0 and strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ and $L^2(\partial\Omega)$, as the previous step. We aim to apply the concentration-compactness Lemma 2.4. To this end, using the notation of Section 2.4, by definition it holds

$$\lambda_{1,f}(B_r(x)) = S_{r,f}^x,$$

for $x \in \Omega$ and r sufficiently small. Then, by inclusion,

$$\lambda_{1,f}(\Omega) \leq \lambda_{1,f}(B_r(x)) \leq S_f^x.$$

Hence from (2.6) we get

$$\mu \geq \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega) v. \quad (3.9)$$

Case $\gamma > 0$. First, we show that $u_0 \neq 0$. If by contradiction $u_0 \equiv 0$ (and then $\tilde{\mu} = \mu$), using also (3.9) and (2.7)

$$\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left[\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} u_n^2 dx \right] = \mu(\Omega) \geq \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega) v(\Omega) = \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega),$$

being $f|u_n|^2 = f|u_n - u_0|^2 \rightharpoonup v$, and $\int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx = 1$ and $u_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly also in $L^2(\partial\Omega)$. Due to $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} < \lambda_{1,f}$, we have a contradiction.

Hence, the limit u_0 is non null. Let $v_n = u_n - u_0$; then $v_n \rightharpoonup 0$. By the Brézis-Lieb Lemma, we can decompose the norms:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_0|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 dx + o(1), \\ 1 = \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx &= \int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by (3.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{1,f,\gamma} &\geq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_0|^2 dx + \mu + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0^2 d\sigma \geq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_0|^2 dx + \lambda_{1,f} v + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0^2 d\sigma \\ &\geq \lambda_{1,f,\gamma} (1 - v) + \lambda_{1,f} v = v(\lambda_{1,f} - \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}) + \lambda_{1,f,\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

where $v = 1 - \int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx < 1$. Last inequality can hold only if $v = 0$, that is $\int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx = 1$. This means that u_0 is a minimizer for $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$, having weighted L^2 norm equal to 1 and

$$\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} = \lim \left[\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} u_n^2 d\sigma \right] \geq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_0|^2 dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0^2 d\sigma \geq \lambda_{1,f,\gamma},$$

That is u_0 is a minimizer for $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$.

If in addition $f \in L^{N/2}(\Omega)$, as showed in Remark 2.3 then $\Sigma_f = \emptyset$. Hence (without assuming the smallness of $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$) it is not difficult to show that the convergence of the approximating sequence is strong for $\int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx$ and this allow to pass to the limit and get that $u_0 \neq 0$ is a minimizer. Moreover, $u_0 \neq 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, and then $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} < \lambda_{1,f}$.

Case $\gamma < 0$. For a normalized minimizing sequence u_n , by arguing similarly as in the case $\gamma > 0$, the concentration compactness gives $u_0 \neq 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u_n - u_0)|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_0|^2 dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0^2 d\sigma \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u_n - u_0)|^2 dx + \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) \int_{\Omega} u_0^2 f dx \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$0 \geq \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) \left(1 - \int_{\Omega} u_0^2 f dx \right) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u_n - u_0)|^2 dx,$$

and all the above inequalities are equalities. This implies that $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ strongly in H^1 , and u_0 is a minimum for $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega)$.

Step 4: proof of (i)(2). The limit (3.5) is given by the inequality $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}(\Omega) \leq \frac{P(\Omega)}{\|f\|_{L^1}} \gamma$. Moreover, it is obvious, by definition, that $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$ is nondecreasing in γ . As regards (3.4), by (3.3) we have only to show that

$$L = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{1,\gamma,f}(\Omega) \geq \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega).$$

We proceed by contradiction. Assume that $L < \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega)$. This assumption implies that for γ large enough, $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} < \lambda_{1,f}$, which guarantees that a minimizer for $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$ exists.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can find a γ_n (with $\gamma_n \rightarrow \infty$) such that $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma_n} < L + 1/n$. By the definition of the infimum, for each γ_n , we can find a function $w_n \in H^1(\Omega)$ such that $\int_{\Omega} f(x) w_n^2 dx = 1$ and

$$\frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx + \gamma_n \int_{\partial\Omega} w_n^2 d\sigma}{\int_{\Omega} f(x) w_n^2 dx} < L + \frac{1}{n}.$$

Thus, the sequence $\{w_n\}$ is bounded in $H^1(\Omega)$, and, up to a subsequence, $w_n \rightharpoonup w_0$ weakly in $H^1(\Omega)$, $w_n \rightarrow w_0$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ and in $L^2(\partial\Omega)$, respectively. Furthermore, being $\gamma_n \rightarrow +\infty$, the weak limit w_0 belongs to $H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Now, let $v_n = w_n - w_0$; then $v_n \rightharpoonup 0$. By the Brézis-Lieb Lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_0|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 dx + o(1), \\ 1 &= \int_{\Omega} f w_n^2 dx = \int_{\Omega} f w_0^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

The bound on the gradient of w_n gives that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_0|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 dx \leq L + o(1).$$

Since $w_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$:

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_0|^2 dx \geq \lambda_{1,f} \int_{\Omega} f w_0^2 dx;$$

moreover, using (2.6) of the concentration-compactness Lemma,

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 dx \geq (\lambda_{1,f} - o(1)) \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx.$$

Substituting,

$$\lambda_{1,f} \left(\int_{\Omega} f w_0^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx \right) \leq L + o(1)$$

and by the decomposition of the denominator

$$\lambda_{1,f}(1 - o(1)) \leq L + o(1).$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $\lambda_{1,f} \leq L$. This contradicts the initial assumption that $L < \lambda_{1,f}$, and the proof of this step is concluded.

Step 5: proof of (iii)(a). Let $\lambda(\gamma) := \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$. We prove that the map is continuous for γ in any interval where the condition $\lambda(\gamma) < \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega)$ holds, which guarantees the existence of a minimizer.

The right-hand continuity easily follows. For any γ_0 , let u_0 be the corresponding normalized minimizer. For any $\gamma > \gamma_0$, using u_0 as a test function for $\lambda(\gamma)$ gives

$$\lambda(\gamma) \leq R_{\gamma}(u_0) = \lambda(\gamma_0) + (\gamma - \gamma_0) \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0^2 d\sigma.$$

As $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma_0^+$, the right-hand side tends to $\lambda(\gamma_0)$. Since we already know the map is non-decreasing, we have $\lambda(\gamma_0) \leq \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \gamma_0^+} \lambda(\gamma) \leq \lambda(\gamma_0)$, which proves right-hand continuity.

As regards the left-hand continuity, let $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be any sequence such that $\gamma_n \rightarrow \gamma_0^-$. Let w_n be the corresponding normalized minimizer, which exists by hypothesis. The sequence $\{\lambda_n\}$ is non-decreasing and bounded above by $\lambda(\gamma_0)$. Thus, it converges to a limit $L \leq \lambda(\gamma_0)$. We aim to show that $L = \lambda(\gamma_0)$. The sequence $\{w_n\}$ is bounded in $H^1(\Omega)$. Let $w_0 \in H^1(\Omega)$ its weak limit. The proof runs similarly as before.

First, let us show that $w_0 \not\equiv 0$. We argue by contradiction, assuming $w_0 \equiv 0$. In this case, the mass decomposition $1 = \int_{\Omega} f w_n^2 dx = \int_{\Omega} f w_0^2 dx + \nu(\Omega) + o(1)$ implies that $\nu(\Omega) = 1$. The energy limit is

$$L = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(\gamma_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx + \gamma_n \int_{\partial\Omega} w_n^2 d\sigma \right).$$

Since $w_n \rightharpoonup 0$, the trace converges strongly in L^2 to 0, and the boundary term vanishes in the limit. The energy decomposition becomes $L = \mu(\Omega)$. Hence, using (2.6) we get

$$L = \mu(\Omega) \geq \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega) \nu(\Omega) = \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega).$$

We have the chain of inequalities $L \leq \lambda(\gamma_0)$ and $L \geq \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega)$, which implies $\lambda(\gamma_0) \geq \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega)$. This contradicts the hypothesis that a minimizer exists at γ_0 . Thus, the assumption $w_0 \equiv 0$ is false.

Second, we prove that the convergence is strong. Indeed, we first observe that

$$L = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(\gamma_n) = \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_0|^2 dx + \gamma_0 \int_{\partial\Omega} w_0^2 d\sigma \right) + \mu(\Omega).$$

By definition of $\lambda(\gamma_0)$ and the concentration-comparison Lemma:

$$L \geq \left(\lambda(\gamma_0) \int_{\Omega} f w_0^2 dx \right) + \lambda_{1,f} \nu(\Omega).$$

Using the mass decomposition $\int_{\Omega} f w_0^2 dx = 1 - \nu(\Omega)$, and the fact that $L \leq \lambda(\gamma_0)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(\gamma_0) &\geq \lambda(\gamma_0)(1 - \nu(\Omega)) + \lambda_{1,f}\nu(\Omega) \\ 0 &\geq (\lambda_{1,f} - \lambda(\gamma_0))\nu(\Omega).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda(\gamma_0) < \lambda_{1,f}$ by hypothesis, the term $(\lambda_{1,f} - \lambda(\gamma_0))$ is strictly positive. Since $\nu(\Omega) \geq 0$, this inequality can only hold if $\nu(\Omega) = 0$. This implies that the convergence is strong: $w_n \rightarrow w_0$ in $H^1(\Omega)$.

Finally, we can pass to the limit in all terms, showing that $\int_{\Omega} f w_0^2 dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f w_n^2 dx = 1$, and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(\gamma_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx + \gamma_n \int_{\partial\Omega} w_n^2 d\sigma \right) = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_0|^2 dx + \gamma_0 \int_{\partial\Omega} w_0^2 d\sigma.$$

Hence

$$\frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_0|^2 dx + \gamma_0 \int_{\partial\Omega} w_0^2 d\sigma}{\int_{\Omega} f w_0^2 dx} = L.$$

This gives $\lambda(\gamma_0) \leq L$. Since we already knew $L \leq \lambda(\gamma_0)$, we must conclude that $L = \lambda(\gamma_0)$. This proves left-hand continuity, and the map is finally continuous.

Step 6: proof of (iii)(b). Let us still denote $\lambda(\gamma) := \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$. The previous proof, in particular, gives also that the map $\gamma \mapsto u_{\gamma}$ is continuous from \mathbb{R} to $H^1(\Omega)$.

Let $u_{\gamma} \geq 0$ normalized first eigenfunction for $\lambda(\gamma)$. Using u_{γ} as a test function for $\lambda(\gamma + h)$, we get

$$\lambda(\gamma + h) \leq \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{\gamma}|^2 dx + (\gamma + h) \int_{\partial\Omega} u_{\gamma}^2 d\sigma}{\int_{\Omega} f u_{\gamma}^2 dx} = \lambda(\gamma) + h \int_{\partial\Omega} u_{\gamma}^2 d\sigma,$$

and then

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\lambda(\gamma + h) - \lambda(\gamma)}{h} \leq \int_{\partial\Omega} u_{\gamma}^2 d\sigma.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\lambda(\gamma) \leq \lambda(\gamma + h) - h \int_{\partial\Omega} u_{\gamma+h}^2 d\sigma;$$

rearranging and dividing by $h > 0$ we have

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} u_{\gamma+h}^2 d\sigma \leq \frac{\lambda(\gamma + h) - \lambda(\gamma)}{h}.$$

Using the continuity of the map $\gamma \mapsto u_{\gamma}$, we have that $u_{\gamma+h} \rightarrow u_{\gamma}$ strongly in $H^1(\Omega)$. This implies strong convergence of the traces in $L^2(\partial\Omega)$, and therefore:

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} u_{\gamma}^2 d\sigma = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\partial\Omega} u_{\gamma+h}^2 d\sigma \leq \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\lambda(\gamma + h) - \lambda(\gamma)}{h}.$$

An identical argument holds for the left-hand derivative. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.3. We emphasize that the statement (iii), (b) of the previous proposition implies the existence of a threshold $\bar{\gamma} \in (0, +\infty]$ such that the map is strictly increasing for $\gamma \leq \bar{\gamma}$ and constant for $\gamma \geq \bar{\gamma}$ (where $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} = \lambda_{1,f}$). Moreover, as shown in the next example, if $f \notin L^{N/2}$, $\bar{\gamma}$ may be finite.

Example 2. Let $\Omega = B_1(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 3$, and let the weight function be the Hardy potential, $f(x) = |x|^{-2}$. For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, the first eigenvalue of the problem

$$\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} = \inf_{\psi \in H^1(B_1) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{B_1} |\nabla \psi|^2 dx + \gamma \int_{\partial B_1} \psi^2 d\sigma}{\int_{B_1} \frac{\psi^2}{|x|^2} dx}$$

is given as follows:

(i) If $\gamma < \bar{\gamma} := \frac{N-2}{2}$, the infimum is attained, and the eigenvalue is

$$\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} = \gamma(N-2-\gamma).$$

The corresponding eigenfunction (unique up to a multiplicative constant) is

$$u_\gamma(x) = |x|^{-\gamma}.$$

(ii) If $\gamma \geq \bar{\gamma}$, the eigenvalue is equal to the Hardy constant,

$$\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} = \left(\frac{N-2}{2}\right)^2,$$

and the infimum is not attained by any function in $H^1(B_1)$.

Proof. By symmetry of the domain, the eigenfunction u_γ must be radial, $u_\gamma(x) = u(r)$ where $r = |x|$. The corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation is

$$u''(r) + \frac{N-1}{r} u'(r) + \frac{\lambda}{r^2} u(r) = 0,$$

subject to the Robin boundary condition $u'(1) + \gamma u(1) = 0$. We look for solutions of the form $u(r) = r^\alpha$. Substituting this into the ODE, we obtain

$$\alpha^2 + (N-2)\alpha + \lambda = 0.$$

The two roots are $\alpha_{1,2} = \frac{-(N-2) \pm \sqrt{(N-2)^2 - 4\lambda}}{2}$, and the general solution is $u(r) = c_1 r^{\alpha_1} + c_2 r^{\alpha_2}$.

In order to get $u \in H^1$, we require the exponents to be greater than $\frac{2-N}{2}$. Since $\alpha_2 < \frac{2-N}{2}$, we must set $c_2 = 0$, and $u(r) = A r^{\alpha_1}$.

Using the Robin condition $u'(1) + \gamma u(1) = 0$, we obtain $\alpha_1 = -\gamma$, and then $\gamma < \frac{N-2}{2}$.

This analysis confirms that for any $\gamma < \frac{N-2}{2}$ (including all $\gamma \leq 0$), a minimizer exists. We can now find the eigenvalue λ by substituting $\alpha = \alpha_1 = -\gamma$, obtaining

$$\lambda = \gamma(N-2-\gamma).$$

This proves (i).

If $\gamma \geq (N-2)/2$, no solution of the form r^α can satisfy both the $H^1(B_1)$ requirement and the boundary condition. Since the map $\gamma \mapsto \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$ is non-decreasing and continuous, and $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} \leq \lambda_{1,f} = (\frac{N-2}{2})^2$, we must have:

$$\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} = \left(\frac{N-2}{2}\right)^2, \text{ for all } \gamma \geq \frac{N-2}{2}.$$

In this case, the infimum is not attained. Indeed, by contradiction, let assume there exists $u_{\gamma_1} \in H^1(B_1)$ such that $R_{\gamma_1}[u_{\gamma_1}] = (\frac{N-2}{2})^2$. Since $\lambda(\gamma)$ is strictly increasing for $\gamma < (N-2)/2$, γ_1 cannot be an interior point of the interval where $\lambda(\gamma)$ is constant. If $\gamma_1 > (N-2)/2$, we could choose γ_2 such that $(N-2)/2 \leq \gamma_2 < \gamma_1$. Then

$$R_{\gamma_2}[u_{\gamma_1}] = R_{\gamma_1}[u_{\gamma_1}] - (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) \int_{\partial\Omega} u_{\gamma_1}^2 d\sigma = \left(\frac{N-2}{2}\right)^2 - (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) \int_{\partial\Omega} u_{\gamma_1}^2 d\sigma.$$

If the trace is not zero, then $R_{\gamma_2}[u_{\gamma_1}] < (\frac{N-2}{2})^2 = \lambda(\gamma_2)$, which is impossible. If the trace is zero, $u_{\gamma_1} \in H_0^1(B_1)$, which is known to not contain a minimizer for the Hardy quotient. This proves (ii). \square

4 Existence results for Robin problems with natural growth in the gradient

We start observing that a smallness assumption on λf is needed in order to get existence.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded domain with a C^2 boundary. Let $f \in M^{N/2}(\Omega)$ be a weight function such that $f > 0$ a.e. in Ω . Suppose there exists a solution $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ to*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + |\nabla u|^2 + \lambda f = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + \beta u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

for some constant $\lambda > 0$ and $\beta > 0$. Then

$$\lambda \leq \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega).$$

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. Assume that a solution $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ of (4.1) exists for some $\lambda > \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega)$. Then, for every test function $\psi \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$:

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \psi dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} u \psi d\sigma = \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda f) \psi dx. \quad (4.2)$$

The assumption $\lambda > \lambda_{1,f}(\Omega)$ implies that there exists a function $\varphi_0 \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_0|^2 dx < \lambda \int_{\Omega} f \varphi_0^2 dx. \quad (4.3)$$

We now choose $\psi = \varphi_0^2$ as a test function in (4.2). It follows that, also by Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\lambda \int_{\Omega} f \varphi_0^2 dx = \int_{\Omega} (2\varphi_0(\nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi_0) - |\nabla u|^2 \varphi_0^2) dx \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_0|^2 dx.$$

This contradicts (4.3). \square

Now we finally consider the following class of Robin boundary value problems

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(a(x, u, \nabla u)) = H(x, u, \nabla u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ a(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nu + \beta u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

where Ω is a bounded Lipschitz, connected open subset of \mathbb{R}^N , $N \geq 3$, ν is the outer normal to Ω on $\partial\Omega$ and $\beta > 0$. Moreover, the Carathéodory functions $a : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ and $H : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy

$$a(x, u, \xi) \cdot \xi \geq |\xi|^2, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (4.5)$$

the monotonicity condition

$$(a(x, u, z) - a(x, u, z')) \cdot (z - z') > 0, \quad z \neq z' \quad (4.6)$$

and the growth conditions

$$|a(x, u, z)| \leq a_0|z| + a_1, \quad a_0, a_1 > 0, \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$|H(x, u, z)| \leq \sigma_0|z|^2 + \lambda f(x), \quad \sigma_0 > 0, \quad (4.8)$$

for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, for every $u \in \mathbb{R}$, and $z, z' \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Here $\lambda \geq 0$ is a constant and f is a non-negative function in $M^{N/2}(\Omega)$, $f \not\equiv 0$.

We say that $u \in H^1$ is a weak solution to (4.4) if for any $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ it holds

$$\int_{\Omega} a(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} u \varphi \, d\sigma = \int_{\Omega} H(x, u, \nabla u) \varphi \, dx.$$

Theorem 4.2. Suppose that $f \in M^{N/2}(\Omega)$, and $(H_{f,1}) - (H_{f,2})$ hold. Let us assume

$$\lambda < \frac{\lambda_{1,f}(\Omega)}{\sigma_0},$$

where $\lambda_{1,f}(\Omega)$ is defined in (1.2), and $\sigma_0 > 0$ in (4.8). Then there exists at least a solution $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ of problem (4.4), under the conditions (4.5), (4.6), (4.7), (4.8) and u is such that $e^{\sigma_0|u|} \in H^1(\Omega)$.

Proof. Step 1: a priori estimates.

Let us consider the following approximation problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n)) = H_n(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nu + \beta u_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

where H_n is a bounded approximation of H :

$$H_n = \frac{H}{1 + 1/n|H|},$$

and it is such that $|H_n(x, u, \xi)| \leq \min\{n, \sigma_0|\xi|^2 + \lambda f(x)\}$. Classical results can be applied in order to get the existence of a solution $u_n \in H^1(\Omega)$ of (4.9) (see [21]). Moreover, from a classical argument by Stampacchia, $u_n \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

Since u_n does not have a constant sign, we split the estimates. We define $u_n^+ = \max\{u_n, 0\}$ and $u_n^- = \max\{-u_n, 0\}$.

Positive part estimate. We choose the test function $\varphi_n = e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^+} - 1$. Note that $\varphi_n \geq 0$ and φ_n vanishes on $\{u_n \leq 0\}$, so the integrals are restricted to $\{u_n > 0\}$. We get:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla (e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^+} - 1) \, dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} u_n (e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^+} - 1) \, d\sigma = \\ = \int_{\Omega} H_n(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) (e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^+} - 1) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using the ellipticity (4.5) and the growth condition on H_n on the set $\{u_n > 0\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\sigma_0 \int_{\{u_n > 0\}} |\nabla u_n|^2 e^{2\sigma_0 u_n} dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} u_n^+ (e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^+} - 1) d\sigma &\leq \\ &\leq \sigma_0 \int_{\{u_n > 0\}} |\nabla u_n|^2 (e^{2\sigma_0 u_n} - 1) dx + \lambda \int_{\Omega} f(e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^+} - 1) dx. \end{aligned}$$

We perform the change of variables $v_n = e^{\sigma_0 u_n^+}$, obtaining

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_0} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 dx + \sigma_0 \int_{\{u_n > 0\}} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \frac{\beta}{\sigma_0} \int_{\partial\Omega} (v_n^2 - 1) \log v_n d\sigma \leq \lambda \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx. \quad (4.10)$$

We choose $\gamma > 0$ such that $\sigma_0 \lambda < \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$. Hence by (4.10) and the definition of $\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} (v_n^2 - 1) \log v_n d\sigma &\leq \\ &\leq \sigma_0 \lambda \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx \leq \frac{\sigma_0 \lambda}{\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}} \left[\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 dx + \gamma \int_{\partial\Omega} v_n^2 d\sigma \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

From (4.11) we get

$$\left(1 - \frac{\sigma_0 \lambda}{\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}}\right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 dx \leq \int_{\partial\Omega} [(C_1 - \beta \log v_n) v_n^2 + \beta \log v_n] d\sigma$$

where $C_1 = \frac{\sigma_0 \lambda \gamma}{\lambda_{1,f,\gamma}}$. Since $\beta > 0$, the integrand on the right-hand side, $g(t) = t^2(C_1 - \beta \log t) + \beta \log t$, is bounded from above for $t \geq 1$ and the maximum is given by some value $C_2 = C_2(\lambda, \sigma_0, \gamma, \beta, f)$. Hence

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 dx \leq \frac{C_2 P(\Omega)}{1 - \sigma_0 \lambda / \lambda_{1,f,\gamma}}. \quad (4.12)$$

Similarly, from (4.11), substituting $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_n|^2 dx \leq \sigma_0 \lambda \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx - \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} (v_n^2 - 1) \log v_n d\sigma$ into the eigenvalue inequality relation, we can derive a bound for the weighted L^2 norm:

$$\int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} - \sigma_0 \lambda} \int_{\partial\Omega} [(\gamma - \beta \log v_n) v_n^2 + \beta \log v_n] d\sigma \leq \frac{C_3 P(\Omega)}{\lambda_{1,f,\gamma} - \sigma_0 \lambda}, \quad (4.13)$$

where C_3 is the maximum of the function $h(t) = t^2(\gamma - \beta \log t) + \beta \log t$ for $t \geq 1$.

Negative part estimate. We proceed similarly for u_n^- . We choose the test function $\psi_n = 1 - e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-}$. Note that $\psi_n \leq 0$ and it vanishes on $\{u_n \geq 0\}$, so the support is $\{u_n < 0\}$. The gradient is $\nabla \psi_n = -2\sigma_0 e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-} \nabla u_n^- = 2\sigma_0 e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-} \nabla u_n$ on the set $\{u_n < 0\}$. Substituting into (4.9):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{u_n < 0\}} a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) \cdot (2\sigma_0 e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-} \nabla u_n) dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} u_n (1 - e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-}) d\sigma &= \\ &= \int_{\{u_n < 0\}} H_n(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) (1 - e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-}) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using the ellipticity (4.5) on the left hand side:

$$2\sigma_0 \int_{\{u_n < 0\}} |\nabla u_n|^2 e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-} dx.$$

For the boundary term, note that on $\{u_n < 0\}$, $u_n = -u_n^-$, so:

$$\beta \int_{\partial\Omega} (-u_n^-)(1 - e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-}) d\sigma = \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} u_n^-(e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-} - 1) d\sigma.$$

For the right hand side, since $1 - e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-} \leq 0$, we use the absolute value of the bound on H_n :

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{u_n < 0\}} H_n(1 - e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-}) dx &\leq \int_{\{u_n < 0\}} |H_n|(e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-} - 1) dx \\ &\leq \int_{\{u_n < 0\}} (\sigma_0 |\nabla u_n|^2 + \lambda f)(e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-} - 1) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\sigma_0 \int_{\{u_n < 0\}} |\nabla u_n|^2 e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-} dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} u_n^-(e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-} - 1) d\sigma \leq \\ \sigma_0 \int_{\{u_n < 0\}} |\nabla u_n|^2 (e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-} - 1) dx + \lambda \int_{\Omega} f(e^{2\sigma_0 u_n^-} - 1) dx. \end{aligned}$$

We perform the change of variables $w_n = e^{\sigma_0 u_n^-}$. This leads to an inequality formally identical to (4.10) but for w_n :

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_0} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx + \sigma_0 \int_{\{u_n < 0\}} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \frac{\beta}{\sigma_0} \int_{\partial\Omega} (w_n^2 - 1) \log w_n d\sigma \leq \lambda \int_{\Omega} f w_n^2 dx.$$

By the same spectral argument used for v_n (choosing γ large enough), we obtain analogous bounds for the gradient and the weighted mass:

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx \leq C, \quad \int_{\Omega} f w_n^2 dx \leq C. \quad (4.14)$$

Conclusion. Being $f \in M^{N/2}(\Omega)$, by Proposition 2.1, using the estimates (4.12), (4.13) and (4.14), we obtain

$$\|v_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad \|w_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C. \quad (4.15)$$

Finally, the boundedness of the $H^1(\Omega)$ norm implies the boundedness of the trace norm, by using the trace inequality

$$\|v_n\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \leq C_{tr} \|v_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

By the above estimates, up to a subsequence, u_n converges weakly in $H^1(\Omega)$, strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ and a.e. in Ω to some $u \in H^1(\Omega)$.

Step 2: Convergence of u_n In order to prove that u is a weak solution of (4.4), we need the strong convergence of the gradients of u_n in $L^2(\Omega)$. For this purpose we follow the strategy in [15–17], which goes back to the technique developed in [6] and consisting in proving the almost everywhere convergence of the gradient of truncation at height k of u_n after having proved an estimate on the L^p norms of the gradients of u_n on the sets where u_n is greater than k .

Let $T_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as:

$$T_n(s) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } s \geq n \\ s & \text{if } -n < s < n \\ -n & \text{if } s \leq -n \end{cases}$$

and $G_n(s) = s - T_n(s)$.

Let $Z_n = e^{\sigma_0|u_n|} \in H^1(\Omega)$. Note that Z_n is controlled by $v_n w_n$, so it is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\Omega)$. Recalling that $|\nabla u_n| = \frac{1}{\sigma_0} e^{-\sigma_0|u_n|} |\nabla Z_n|$, we get:

$$\int_{\{|u_n|>k\}} |\nabla u_n|^2 = \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} \int_{\{|u_n|>k\}} e^{-2\sigma_0|u_n|} |\nabla Z_n|^2 \leq \frac{e^{-2\sigma_0 k}}{\sigma_0^2} \int_{\{|u_n|>k\}} |\nabla Z_n|^2 \leq \frac{e^{-2\sigma_0 k}}{\sigma_0^2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla Z_n|^2$$

and by the uniform bounds on Z_n it follows:

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla G_k(u_n)|^2 \leq C e^{-2\sigma_0 k},$$

so that $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla G_k(u_n)|^2$ goes to 0 as k tends to $+\infty$ uniformly on n .

Let us show now that $\nabla T_k(u_n)$ converges a.e. to $\nabla T_k(u)$ and for this purpose it is enough to show the strong convergence of $\nabla T_k(u_n)$ in $(L^2(\Omega))^N$.

By [7, Lemma 5], in order to get that $\|\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ goes to 0, it is enough to show that

$$\int_{\Omega} [a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u_n)) - a(x, T_k(u), \nabla T_k(u))] \cdot (\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)) \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.16)$$

Let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the increasing, C^1 -function defined as $\psi(s) = 2s e^{\Gamma s^2}$, where $\Gamma = \frac{\sigma_0^2(1+a_0)^2}{4}$. Remark that ψ satisfies:

$$\psi(0) = 0 \quad \psi' - \sigma_0(1+a_0)|\psi| \geq 1. \quad (4.17)$$

Using $w_n = e^{\sigma_0|u_n|} \psi(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u))$ as test function in (4.9), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) \cdot [\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)] e^{\sigma_0|u_n|} \psi'(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} [H_n(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) - \operatorname{sgn}(u_n) \sigma_0 a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla u_n] e^{\sigma_0|u_n|} \psi \\ & \quad - \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} u_n e^{\sigma_0|u_n|} \psi \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

where for sake of brevity we write $\psi(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u))$ as ψ . Taking into account that $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^2(\partial\Omega)$ (by Trace inequality), the boundary term goes to 0. Hence, after setting $\Omega_- = \{x \in \Omega : |u_n| \leq k\}$ and $\Omega_+ = \{x \in \Omega : |u_n| > k\}$, equation (4.18) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_-} [a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u_n)) - a(x, T_k(u), \nabla T_k(u))] \\ & \quad \cdot [\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)] e^{\sigma_0|u_n|} \psi'(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) \\ & + \int_{\Omega_-} a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u)) \cdot [\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)] e^{\sigma_0|u_n|} \psi'(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) \\ & + \int_{\Omega_+} a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) (-\nabla T_k(u)) \psi'(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) e^{\sigma_0|u_n|} \\ &= \int_{\Omega_-} [H_n(x, u_n, \nabla T_k(u_n)) - \operatorname{sgn}(u_n) \sigma_0 a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u_n)) \cdot \nabla T_k(u_n)] e^{\sigma_0|u_n|} \psi \\ & + \int_{\Omega_+} [H_n(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) - \operatorname{sgn}(u_n) \sigma_0 a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla u_n] e^{\sigma_0|u_n|} \psi \\ & + o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

Let us analyze the several integrals in (4.19). First, we observe that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega_-} a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u)) \cdot [\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)] e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} \psi'(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) = 0,$$

being $\nabla T_k(u_n) \rightharpoonup \nabla T_k(u)$ weakly in $L^2(\Omega)$ and

$$\chi_{\{|u_n| \leq k\}} e^{\sigma_0 T_k(|u_n|)} \psi'(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u))$$

strongly convergent in $L^2(\Omega)$. Second, it holds that

$$\lim_n \int_{\Omega_+} a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) (-\nabla T_k(u)) \psi'(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} = 0.$$

Indeed, $\psi'(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u))$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$; moreover the inequalities (4.7) and (4.15) gives that $a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|}$ is bounded in $[L^2(\Omega)]^N$, while u_n strongly converges in $L^2(\Omega)$.

On the other hand, also the last term in the right-hand side of (4.19) goes to 0 as n tends to $+\infty$. Indeed, recalling that $\psi(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) \operatorname{sgn}(u_n) \geq 0$ in Ω_+ , and using (4.8) and (4.5), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_+} [H_n(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) - \operatorname{sgn}(u_n) \sigma_0 a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla u_n] e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} \psi(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) \\ &= \int_{\Omega_+} [H_n(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) \operatorname{sgn}(u_n) - \sigma_0 a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla u_n] e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} \psi(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) \operatorname{sgn}(u_n) \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega_+} [\sigma_0 |\nabla u_n|^2 - \sigma_0 a(x, u_n, \nabla u_n) \cdot \nabla u_n] e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} \psi(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) \operatorname{sgn}(u_n) \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega_+} \lambda f e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} \psi(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) \operatorname{sgn}(u_n) \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega_+} \lambda f e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} \psi(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) \operatorname{sgn}(u_n) \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude combining the fact that $|\psi(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u))| \rightarrow 0$ a.e. and the estimates (4.15).

Hence, by (4.19), using assumptions (4.7) and (4.8), on Ω_- we infer:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_-} [a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u_n)) - a(x, T_k(u), \nabla T_k(u))] \\ &\quad \cdot [\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)] e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} \psi'(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega_-} [\sigma_0 |\nabla T_k(u_n)|^2 + \lambda f + \sigma_0 (a_0 |\nabla T_k(u_n)| + a_1) |\nabla T_k(u_n)|] e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} |\psi| + o(1) \quad (4.20) \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega_-} \sigma_0 (1 + a_0) |\nabla T_k(u_n)|^2 e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} |\psi| + \int_{\Omega_-} (\lambda f + \sigma_0 a_1 |\nabla T_k(u_n)|) e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} |\psi| \\ &\quad + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Reasoning as before, since $|\psi(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u))| \rightarrow 0$ a.e., the last integral of the last inequality goes to

0 as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. By assumption (4.5) and (4.20) we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega_-} [a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u_n)) - a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u))] \\
& \quad \cdot [\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)] e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} \psi'(T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega_-} a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u_n)) \cdot \nabla T_k(u_n) e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} \sigma_0 (1 + a_0) |\psi| + o(1) \\
& = \int_{\Omega_-} [a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u_n)) - a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u))] \\
& \quad \cdot [\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)] e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} \sigma_0 (1 + a_0) |\psi| \\
& \quad + \int_{\Omega_-} a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u)) \cdot \nabla (T_k(u_n) - T_k(u)) e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} \sigma_0 (1 + a_0) |\psi| \\
& \quad + \int_{\Omega_-} a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u_n)) \cdot \nabla T_k(u_n) \sigma_0 (1 + a_0) |\psi| \\
& \quad + o(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

The second and third terms in the right-hand side in (4.21) go to 0 as n tends to $+\infty$ and hence, using (4.17) and (4.6), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & < \int_{\Omega} [a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u_n)) - a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u))] \cdot (\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)) \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega_-} [a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u_n)) - a(x, T_k(u_n), \nabla T_k(u))] \\
& \quad \cdot [\nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u)] e^{\sigma_0 |u_n|} [\psi' - \sigma_0 (1 + a_0) |\psi|] \\
& < o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.16).

In order to conclude the proof, it is enough to note that

$$\nabla u_n - \nabla u = \nabla T_k(u_n) - \nabla T_k(u) + \nabla G_k(u_n) - \nabla G_k(u)$$

and to use the strong convergence in $L^2(\Omega)$ of $\nabla T_k(u_n)$ and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla G_k(u_n)|^2 dx = 0.$$

Hence, we get the strong convergence in L^2 of ∇u_n , that finally allows to pass to the limit in the approximating problems (4.9), obtaining that u is a solution to (4.4). \square

We conclude the paper by listing some radial example.

Example 3. We consider the problem with $\lambda, \beta > 0$, in the unit ball $B_1(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + |\nabla u|^2 + \lambda = 0 & \text{in } B_1, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + \beta u = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases}$$

and consider solutions $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ such that $e^u \in H^1(\Omega)$.

Using the transformation $v = e^u$, the problem is equivalent to the following system for the positive function v :

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v + \lambda v = 0 & \text{in } B_1, \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} + \beta v \log v = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_1. \end{cases} \tag{4.22}$$

We look for radial solutions $v(r)$ with $r = |x|$. The equation in (4.22) becomes:

$$v'' + \frac{N-1}{r} v' + \lambda v = 0, \quad r \in (0, 1),$$

and the boundary condition at $r = 1$ reads:

$$v'(1) + \beta v(1) \log(v(1)) = 0. \quad (4.23)$$

Let $\mu = \sqrt{\lambda}$. We impose $\lambda < (j_{\frac{N-2}{2},1})^2$, where $j_{\frac{N-2}{2},1}$ is the first positive zero of $J_{\frac{N-2}{2}}(x)$. The solution is given by:

$$v(r) = A r^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} J_{\frac{N-2}{2}}(\mu r), \quad r \in (0, 1)$$

where J_ν denotes the Bessel function of the first kind of order ν , and $A > 0$ is a constant to be determined. Let $\alpha = \frac{N-2}{2}$. We define $\Phi(r) = r^{-\alpha} J_\alpha(\mu r)$. The boundary condition (4.23) implies:

$$A\Phi'(1) + \beta A\Phi(1) \log(A\Phi(1)) = 0.$$

Being $\beta > 0$ and $\Phi(1) \neq 0$, we solve for A :

$$\log A = -\frac{\Phi'(1)}{\beta\Phi(1)} - \log \Phi(1).$$

Using the recurrence relation $\frac{d}{dz}(z^{-\alpha} J_\alpha(z)) = -z^{-\alpha} J_{\alpha+1}(z)$, we have:

$$\Phi'(1) = -\mu J_{\alpha+1}(\mu), \quad \Phi(1) = J_\alpha(\mu).$$

Substituting back into $u(r) = \log v(r) = \log A + \log \Phi(r)$, we obtain the explicit solution:

$$u(r) = \frac{\mu}{\beta} \frac{J_{\frac{N}{2}}(\mu)}{J_{\frac{N-2}{2}}(\mu)} + \log \left(\frac{r^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} J_{\frac{N-2}{2}}(\mu r)}{J_{\frac{N-2}{2}}(\mu)} \right), \quad r \in (0, 1).$$

Example 4. We analyze the problem with a singular potential term, given by the PDE:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{|x|^2} = 0 & \text{in } B_1 \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + \beta u = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_1 \end{cases}$$

with $\beta, \lambda > 0$. By changing the variable and looking for radially symmetric solutions $v(x) = R(r)$, we obtain the ODE

$$R''(r) + \frac{N-1}{r} R'(r) + \frac{\lambda}{r^2} R(r) = 0$$

We look for a solution of the form $R(r) = Ar^\alpha$. This leads to

$$\alpha^2 + (N-2)\alpha + \lambda = 0$$

Let

$$R(r) = Ar^{\alpha_1}$$

Here, α_1 is given by

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{-(N-2) + \sqrt{(N-2)^2 - 4\lambda}}{2}$$

This form is considered for the range of λ where α_1 is real, i.e., $\lambda \leq \frac{(N-2)^2}{4}$.

The single unknown constant A is determined by the boundary condition at $r = 1$:

$$\frac{R'(1)}{R(1)} + \beta \log(R(1)) = 0$$

which gives $\alpha_1 + \beta \log(A) = 0$. Being $\beta > 0$, the (positive) solution u is

$$u(x) = \alpha_1 \left(\log(|x|) - \frac{1}{\beta} \right)$$

Acknowledgement

This work has been partially supported by PRIN PNRR 2022 “Linear and Nonlinear PDEs: New directions and Applications”, by GNAMPA of INdAM, and by the “Geometric-Analytic Methods for PDEs and Applications” project - funded by European Union - Next Generation EU within the PRIN 2022 program (D.D. 104 - 02/02/2022 Ministero dell’Università e della Ricerca). This manuscript reflects only the authors’ views and opinions and the Ministry cannot be considered responsible for them.

References

- [1] B. Abdellaoui, A. Dall’Aglio, I. Peral, Some remarks on elliptic problems with critical growth on the gradient. *J. Differential Equations*, 222(1), 2006, 21–62. [2](#)
- [2] Adimurthi, Hardy Sobolev inequality in $H^1(\Omega)$ and its applications, *Commun. Contemp. Maths*, 4, 2002, 409–439. [2](#)
- [3] Adimurthi, M.J. Esteban, An improved Hardy-Sobolev inequality in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and its applications to Schrödinger operators, *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 12, 2005, 243–263. [2](#)
- [4] A. Alvino, Sulla disuguaglianza di Sobolev in spazi di Lorentz, *Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. A*, 14, 1977, 148–156. [4](#)
- [5] A. Alvino, V. Ferone, A. Mercaldo, Sharp a priori estimates for a class of nonlinear elliptic equations with lower order terms, *Annali di Matematica Pura Appl.* 194, 2015, 1169–1201. [2](#)
- [6] A. Bensoussan, L. Boccardo, F. Murat, On a non linear partial differential equation having natural growth terms and unbounded solutions, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non linéaire*, 5, 1988, 347–364. [3](#), [19](#)
- [7] L. Boccardo, F. Murat, J.P. Puel, L^∞ estimate for some nonlinear elliptic partial differential equations and application to an existence result. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 23(2), 1992, 326–333. [2](#), [3](#), [20](#)
- [8] H. Brezis, A. Ponce, Remarks On The Strong Maximum Principle, *Differential and Integral Equations* Volume 16, Number 1, January 2003, Pages 1–12 [9](#)
- [9] J. Chabrowski, On the nonlinear Neumann problem involving the critical Sobolev exponent and Hardy potential, *Rev. Mat. Complut.* 17(1) (2004) 195–227. [2](#)

- [10] J. Chabrowski, I. Peral, B. Ruf, On an eigenvalue problem involving the Hardy potential, *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, 12(6), 2010, 953–975. [2](#), [9](#)
- [11] F. Della Pietra, Existence results for non-uniformly elliptic equations with general growth in the gradient. *Differ. Integral Equ.*, 21(9-10), 2008, 821–836. [2](#)
- [12] Della Pietra F., di Blasio G., *Blow-up solutions for some nonlinear elliptic equations involving a Finsler-Laplacian*, Publicacions Matemàtiques 61, 2017, 213-238. [2](#)
- [13] F. Della Pietra, N. Gavitone, Anisotropic elliptic equations with general growth in the gradient and Hardy-type potentials. *J. Differential Equations*, 255(11), 2013, 3788–3810. [2](#)
- [14] F. Della Pietra, I. Peral, Breaking of resonance for elliptic problems with strong degeneration at infinity. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 10(2), 2011, 593–612. [2](#)
- [15] V. Ferone, F. Murat, Quasilinear problems having quadratic growth in the gradient: an existence result when the source term is small. In *Équations aux dérivées partielles et applications*, 497–515. Gauthier-Villars, Éd. Sci. Méd. Elsevier, Paris, 1998. [2](#), [19](#)
- [16] V. Ferone, F. Murat, Nonlinear problems having natural growth in the gradient: an existence result when the source terms are small. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 42(7, Ser. A), 2000, 1309–1326. [2](#), [3](#), [19](#)
- [17] V. Ferone, F. Murat, Nonlinear elliptic equations with natural growth in the gradient and source terms in Lorentz spaces. *J. Differential Equations*, 256(3), 2014, 577–608. [2](#), [3](#), [19](#)
- [18] N. Grenon, F. Murat, A. Porretta, A priori estimates and existence for elliptic equations with gradient dependent terms. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 14(1), 2015, 137–205. [2](#)
- [19] K. Hansson, V.G. Maz'ya, and I.E. Verbitsky, Criteria of solvability for multidimensional Riccati equations. *Ark. Mat.*, 37(1), 1999, 87–120. [2](#)
- [20] J.L. Kazdan, R.J. Kramer, Invariant criteria for existence of solutions to second-order quasilinear elliptic equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 14(12), 1989, 1817–1845. [2](#)
- [21] J. Leray, J.L. Lions, Quelques résultats de Višik sur les problèmes elliptiques non linéaires par les méthodes de Minty-Browder. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 93, 1965, 97–107. [17](#)
- [22] P.-L. Lions, The concentration compactness principle in the calculus of variations: The locally compact case, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Sect. A* 1 1984, 109145, 223283. [3](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [23] F. Oliva, Existence and uniqueness of solutions to some singular equations with natural growth. *Ann. Matematica Pura Appl.* (2021) 200:287–314. [2](#)
- [24] D. Smets, A Concentration-Compactness Lemma with Applications to Singular Eigenvalue Problems, *J. Functional Anal.*, 167, 1999, 463-480. [3](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [25] A. Szulkin, M. Willem, Eigenvalue problems with indefinite weight. *Stud. Math.* 135, 191–201 (1999). [3](#)
- [26] C. Trombetti, Non-uniformly elliptic equations with natural growth in the gradient, *Potential Analysis*, 18(4), 2003, 391–404. [2](#)