

EXISTENCE AND NON-EXISTENCE PHENOMENA FOR NONLINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS WITH L^1 DATA AND SINGULAR REACTIONS

FRANCESCANTONIO OLIVA, FRANCESCO PETITTA, AND MATHEUS F. STAPENHORST

ABSTRACT. We study existence and non-existence of solutions for singular elliptic boundary value problems as

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u + \frac{a(x)}{u^\gamma} = \mu f(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where Ω is a smooth bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^N ($N \geq 2$), $\Delta_p u$ is the p -Laplacian with $p > 1$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, and $a \geq 0$ is bounded and non-trivial. For any positive $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ we show that problem (1) is solvable for any $\mu > \mu_0 > 0$, for some μ_0 large enough. As a reciprocal outcome we also show that no finite energy solution exists if $0 < \mu < \mu_{0*}$, for some small μ_{0*} . This paper extends the celebrated one of J. I. Diaz, J. M. Morel and L. Oswald ([16]) to the case $p \neq 2$. Our result is also new for $p = 2$ provided the singular term has a critical growth near zero (i.e. $\gamma = 1$).

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Notation and preliminaries	3
2. Main assumptions and results for $0 < \gamma < 1$	4
3. Proof of existence and non-existence results	6
3.1. A priori estimates and convergence results	9
3.2. Existence for $\mu \geq \mu_0$	10
3.3. Non-existence for $0 < \mu < \mu_{0*}$	11
4. Some compatibility conditions in the case $\gamma = 1$.	11
4.1. Non-existence result for $\gamma = 1$	13
Declarations:	14
References	14

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider the elliptic boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u + \frac{a(x)}{u^\gamma} = \mu f(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

with $p > 1$, $\gamma > 0$, $a \geq 0$ bounded and non-trivial, $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, and $\mu > 0$. Here Ω is a smooth bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^N ($N \geq 2$) and $\Delta_p u = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u)$ is the usual p -Laplace operator. Singular problems as (1.1) for $p = 2$, i.e.

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \frac{a(x)}{u^\gamma} = \mu f(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J25, 35K57, 35J60, 35J75.

Key words and phrases. Existence and non-existence, p -Laplacian, reaction-diffusion equations, L^1 data, singular problems.

were largely studied in literature both for its applications to non-Newtonian fluids ([26, 18]) and for their pure mathematical interest in the context of singular Lane-Emden-Fowler semilinear problems. Problem (1.2) in case of a nonpositive $a(x)$ is nowadays completely understood since the pioneering papers by [12, 33, 22] (see also [10, 11, 34, 21, 6, 27, 28], and [29] for a gentle introduction on the subject).

From a mathematical point of view and when $a(x)$ is nonpositive, the strategy on proving existence in the above literature mostly relies in constructing a suitable barrier from below for a certain approximating sequence. This procedure applies immediately after an application of the strong maximum principle as the suitable approximating sequence is chosen to be nondecreasing. On the other hand, dealing with a nonnegative function $a(x)$ in (1.2) is more challenging and less studied as the above construction of the barrier does not, in general, simply extend to this case. Here it is necessary a more sophisticated control from below of the approximating sequence near the boundary of the domain in order to deal with the singular term $a(x)u^{-\gamma}$. As we will see this barrier from below is essentially constructed as a power of the first Dirichlet eigenfunction φ_1 on Ω .

The case $a \equiv 1$, $\mu = 1$, and $0 < \gamma < 1$ was studied in the celebrated paper [16] where existence and non-existence results were shown provided suitable, respectively, smallness or largeness assumptions are assumed on f . Among other results, by a delicate study of the inverse of $-\Delta$ and the introduction of a convenient weak notion of sub and super-solutions the authors of [16] prove in fact that a solution exists if

$$\int_{\Omega} f \varphi_1 dx \geq \bar{C},$$

for a suitable constant $\bar{C} > 0$.

For $\mu > 0$ in (1.2), this latter condition translates into the fact that there exists μ_0 such that a solution of (1.2) does exist provided $\mu > \mu_0$. Conversely, for μ small enough a non-existence result also holds; we remark that a solution u of (1.2) is asked in particular to satisfy that $u^{-\gamma}$ belongs to $L^1(\Omega)$.

Also, in [9], the authors showed non-existence of classical solutions of (1.2) when $\gamma \geq 1$. A problem with sublinear nonlinearity of the form μu^q was also studied ([35]). More recently, in [30], the case of a generic Caratheodory function $f(x, u)$ as source was considered.

Let us also mention that there are contexts in which non-strictly positive solutions are obtained, thus leading to the existence of a free-boundary. In [13] (see also [1]) for instance, the authors considered problems of the type

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \left(-\frac{1}{u^\gamma} + \lambda f(x, u) \right) \chi_{\{u>0\}} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

With suitable assumptions on f , for λ large, the authors proved existence of a strictly positive solution u_λ . When λ is small it was shown that the set $\{u_\lambda = 0\}$ has positive measure which gives rise to a non-trivial free-boundary. In the context of reaction-diffusion problems, this phenomenon is associated with the existence of a region in which no reaction takes place. See [3] and [15] for further details.

Problem (1.3) with $f(x, s) = s^\theta$, $0 < \theta < 1$, was considered in [25]. Using a smooth positive subsolution, the authors obtained a positive solution for large λ 's. See also [14] and [19]. Problems as (1.2) in the presence of gradient terms were also considered in the literature (see for instance [5, 2, 20] and references therein for further details).

Turning back to the case $p \neq 2$, problems of the form

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u + \frac{a(x)}{u^\gamma} = f(x, u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

have been extensively studied in the literature as we mentioned in case $a(x) \leq 0$ (see also [8, 31, 32, 29]).

In this paper our aim is to prove existence and non-existence results for problem (1.1), extending, as a consequence, the result of [16] for $p = 2$, $0 < \gamma < 1$, and $a \equiv 1$. The existence result will follow after a suitable sub- and supersolution argument.

Let us stress that we are also able to extend our result to the critical case $\gamma = 1$ under suitable compatibility assumptions on the data.

As we already mentioned, singular problems naturally appear in the study of pseudoplastic non-Newtonian fluids. The particular case of a reaction term in (1.2) (i.e. $a(x) \geq 0$) is of particular interest in reaction-diffusion problems for permeable catalysts (see [3]). There are also applications in Micro-Electromechanical Systems (MEMS), where the parameter μ denotes the applied voltage and the function f plays the role of the varying dielectric permittivity of the elastic membrane Ω . See [17] for more details.

The plan of the paper is as follows: in Section 1.1 we set the notations and some preliminaries which will be useful in the sequel. In Section 2 we state the main assumptions and existence result in case $0 < \gamma < 1$. We also give a non-existence result provided μ is small enough. In Section 3 we prove the results presented in Section 2. Finally, in Section 4 we discuss the critical case $\gamma = 1$.

1.1. Notation and preliminaries. In the entire paper $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 2$) denotes an open bounded set with smooth boundary. By $|\Omega|$ we denote the size of Ω with respect to the N -dimensional Lebesgue measure.

The distance of a point $x \in \Omega$ from the boundary of Ω is denoted by

$$\delta(x) := \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega),$$

and it is frequently used that, as $\partial\Omega$ is smooth, it holds

$$\int_{\Omega} \delta^r(x) dx < \infty \text{ if and only if } r > -1. \quad (1.4)$$

Let us stress that in order to avoid technicalities, without losing generality and with a little abuse of notation, we will refer to $\delta(x)$ as a suitable positive smooth (say C^1) modification of the distance function which agrees with $\delta(x)$ in a fixed neighbourhood of $\partial\Omega$.

In particular, for $\varepsilon > 0$, we denote by

$$\Omega_{\varepsilon} := \{x \in \Omega : \delta(x) < \varepsilon\} \quad (1.5)$$

an ε -neighbourhood of $\partial\Omega$.




FIGURE 1. The ε -neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$

In the sequel we make use of the standard truncation function defined, for any fixed $k > 0$, as

$$T_k(s) = \max(-k, \min(s, k)),$$

for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

As we will deal with measurable functions not necessarily belonging to $W^{1,1}(\Omega)$, we will use the following result which clarifies the concept of weak derivative for functions having the truncation at any level belonging to a Sobolev space.

Lemma 1.1. [4, Lemma 2.1] *Let $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function such that $T_k(u) \in W_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ for every $k > 0$. Then, there exists a measurable vectorial function $v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ such that*

$$\nabla T_k(u) = v \chi_{\{|u| \leq k\}} \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ and for every } k > 0.$$

Furthermore, $u \in W_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ if and only if $v \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ and then $v = \nabla u$ in the usual distributional sense.

From now on, for a measurable function u such that $T_k(u) \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ for every $k > 0$, with ∇u we mean the function v defined in Lemma 1.1.

Let us also recall that a function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ belongs to the Marcinkiewicz space (also called *weak Lebesgue space*) $M^s(\Omega)$, with $s > 0$, if there exists a positive constant c such that

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |u(x)| > \lambda\}| \leq \frac{c}{\lambda^s} \quad \forall \lambda > 0.$$

It is known that $L^1(\Omega) \subset M^1(\Omega)$ and $L^s(\Omega) \subset M^s(\Omega) \subset L^{s-\varepsilon}(\Omega)$ for every $s > 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq s - 1$.

We will use the following classical comparison principle:

Lemma 1.2. [24, Theorem 2.15] *Let $u_1, u_2 \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be such that*

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_1|^{p-2} \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla v \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_2|^{p-2} \nabla u_2 \cdot \nabla v \quad \text{for all } v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), v \geq 0.$$

Then $u_1 \leq u_2$ a.e. in Ω .

Let us consider the Rayleigh quotient

$$\lambda_p = \min_{u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), u \neq 0} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p}{\int_{\Omega} |u|^p}, \quad (1.6)$$

which is the Dirichlet eigenvalue problem associated with the p -Laplacian. It is known that the $\text{argmin}(\lambda_p)$ of (1.6) is the first eigenfunction $0 < \varphi_1 \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ which solves

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p \varphi_1 = \lambda_p \varphi_1^{p-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \varphi_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

Also observe that, as an easy consequence of the Hopf Lemma, there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$c_1 \delta(x) \leq \varphi_1(x) \leq c_2 \delta(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega. \quad (1.8)$$

Finally, for the sake of simplicity, we use the simplified notation

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

when referring to integrals when no ambiguity is possible.

2. MAIN ASSUMPTIONS AND RESULTS FOR $0 < \gamma < 1$

Here we address the existence and non-existence of nonnegative solutions to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u + \frac{a(x)}{u^\gamma} = \mu f(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $p > 1$, $0 < \gamma < 1$, $\mu > 0$, $0 \leq a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\forall \omega \subset\subset \Omega \quad \exists c_\omega > 0 : f(x) \geq c_\omega \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \omega. \quad (2.2)$$

This condition ensures that f is a.e. bounded away from zero on any set that is compactly embedded in Ω . Yet, it allows for f to be equal to zero on $\partial\Omega$. We now precise what we mean by a solution to (2.1).

Definition 2.1. A nonnegative measurable function u is a distributional solution of (2.1) if $T_k(u) \in W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$ for every $k > 0$, if both $|\nabla u|^{p-1}$ and $au^{-\gamma}$ belong to $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$, and

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\Omega} \frac{a\varphi}{u^\gamma} = \mu \int_{\Omega} f\varphi \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega). \quad (2.3)$$

We underline that in the sequel u is meant to be a *finite energy solution* to (2.1) if u is a solution in the sense of Definition 2.1 and it belongs to $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$; otherwise we may refer to it as an *infinite energy solution* or simply as a solution in the sense of Definition 2.1.

Let us state our main existence theorem.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $1 < p < N$, $0 < \gamma < 1$, $0 \leq a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and let $f \in L^q(\Omega)$ be a function satisfying (2.2). Then there exists a positive μ_0 such that for any $\mu \geq \mu_0$ the following holds:*

- i) if $q = \frac{Np}{Np-N+p}$ then there exists a positive finite energy solution u to (2.1);
ii) if $q = 1$ then there exists a positive infinite energy solution u to (2.1) such that $u \in M^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}}(\Omega)$ and $|\nabla u| \in M^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-1}}(\Omega)$.

Furthermore $au^{-\gamma}$ belongs to $L^1(\Omega)$, and there exists $t_0 > 0$, depending only on Ω, a, γ and p , such that

$$u \geq t_0 \varphi_1^{\frac{p}{p-1+\gamma}} \text{ a.e. in } \Omega,$$

where φ_1 is given by (1.7).

As one might expect, the case $p \geq N$ is simpler. In this situation, the result can be stated as follows:

Theorem 2.3. *Let $p \geq N$, $0 < \gamma < 1$, $0 \leq a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and let $f \in L^q(\Omega)$ be a function satisfying (2.2). Then there exists a positive μ_0 such that for any $\mu \geq \mu_0$ the following holds:*

- i) if $p = N$ and $q > 1$, then there exists a positive finite energy solution u to (2.1);
ii) if $p > N$ and $q = 1$, then there exists a positive finite energy solution u to (2.1).

Furthermore $au^{-\gamma}$ belongs to $L^1(\Omega)$, and there exists $t_0 > 0$, depending only on Ω, a, γ and p , such that

$$u \geq t_0 \varphi_1^{\frac{p}{p-1+\gamma}} \text{ a.e. in } \Omega,$$

where φ_1 is given by (1.7).

As a counterpart result of the previous theorem we show that no finite energy solution exists for a small enough μ . In order to state our result we need a slightly stronger assumption on a , i.e. when μ is small enough, we request that a is bounded away from zero; on the other hand the result holds true for a generic $a \in L^1(\Omega)$.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $0 < c_0 \leq a \in L^1(\Omega)$ for some positive constant c_0 , and let $0 \leq f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then there exists $\mu_{0*} > 0$ such that problem (2.1) does not admit a finite energy solution for any $0 < \mu < \mu_{0*}$.*

The following regularity result, which is interesting by itself, will be useful in the sequel. Firstly, it shows that if a solution has finite energy and the datum is regular enough then the set of test functions in (2.3) can be suitably enlarged. Furthermore, if the datum f is summable enough, then any solution to (2.1) is actually essentially bounded.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $1 < p < N, \gamma > 0$, let $0 \leq a \in L^1(\Omega)$, $\mu > 0$, and $0 \leq f \in L^{\frac{Np}{Np-N+p}}(\Omega)$. Moreover let $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be a solution to (2.1) in sense of Definition 2.1. Then*

$$\frac{a}{u^\gamma} v \in L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{for every } v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

Moreover it holds

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + \int_{\Omega} \frac{a}{u^\gamma} v = \mu \int_{\Omega} f v \quad \text{for every } v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega). \quad (2.4)$$

Finally, if $f \in L^r(\Omega)$ for some $r > \frac{N}{p}$, then $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

Proof. Let us prove the result for a nonnegative $v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$; the case of v with general sign will easily follow.

Consider at first a sequence $\varphi_n \in C_c^1(\Omega)$ such that $\varphi_n \rightarrow v$ strongly in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now let ρ_η be a standard mollifier. It holds that $\psi_{n,\eta} = \rho_\eta * \min\{v, \varphi_n\} \in C_c^1(\Omega)$ for $\eta > 0$ small enough. Then we test (2.3) with $\varphi = \psi_{n,\eta}$, i.e.

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \psi_{n,\eta} + \int_{\Omega} \frac{a \psi_{n,\eta}}{u^\gamma} = \mu \int_{\Omega} f \psi_{n,\eta}. \quad (2.5)$$

Now observe that $\psi_{n,\eta} \rightarrow \psi_n = \min\{\varphi_n, v\}$ as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ strongly in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, *-weak in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ and it has compact support in Ω . Then, since $|\nabla u|^{p-1} \in L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega)$, $au^{-\gamma} \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$, and $f \in L^{\frac{Np}{Np-N+p}}(\Omega)$, we may let $\eta \rightarrow 0$ in (2.5) in order to deduce that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \psi_n + \int_{\Omega} \frac{a \psi_n}{u^\gamma} = \mu \int_{\Omega} f \psi_n. \quad (2.6)$$

Therefore, since $\psi_n \rightarrow v$ strongly in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we can take $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the first and in the third term of (2.6) (observe that $\psi_n \rightarrow v$ also weakly in $L^{\frac{Np}{N-p}}(\Omega)$). Hence, as up to subsequences $\psi_n \rightarrow v$ a.e. in Ω , an application of the Fatou Lemma gives that

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{av}{u^\gamma} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{a\psi_n}{u^\gamma} = - \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + \mu \int_{\Omega} fv,$$

which implies $avu^{-\gamma} \in L^1(\Omega)$. Hence, as $0 \leq \psi_n \leq v$, after an application of the Lebesgue Theorem in the second term of (2.6) one can deduce that (2.4) holds.

We finally show that u is essentially bounded if $f \in L^r(\Omega)$ with $r > \frac{N}{p}$. Indeed, let $w \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be the solution to $-\Delta_p w = \mu f$. The classical Stampacchia argument gives that w is essentially bounded. Furthermore, from (2.4) one gets

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \leq \mu \int_{\Omega} fv = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w|^{p-2} \nabla w \cdot \nabla v \quad \text{for all } v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), v \geq 0,$$

which allows to apply Lemma 1.2 in order to deduce that $u \leq w$ a.e. in Ω . This concludes the proof. \square

3. PROOF OF EXISTENCE AND NON-EXISTENCE RESULTS

In order to prove Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 we perform an iteration procedure. Before introducing the scheme, it is useful to make some preliminary comments on the strategy. As we will see, the approximating solutions are shown to be bounded from below by a suitable power of the first eigenfunction of the p -Laplacian in Ω (defined in (1.7)), namely $t_0 \varphi_1^r$ with $r = \frac{p}{p+\gamma-1} > 1$ for some positive constant t_0 which will be fixed later; roughly speaking, we will consider $t_0 \|\varphi_1^r\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ as the first step of the iteration and from it we will construct a suitable sequence of functions u_n that, at the end, will converge to a solution of problem (2.1).

Let us recall that for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough we denote by $\Omega_\varepsilon := \{x \in \Omega : \delta(x) < \varepsilon\}$. We will frequently consider Ω_ε with $\varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$ for some fixed $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$.

We now introduce the iterative scheme; let $u_0 = t_0 \|\varphi_1^r\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ in Ω , where $t_0 > 0$ will be fixed in Lemma 3.1 below, and, for $n > 0$, consider u_n as the (weak) solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u_n + \frac{a(x)}{(|u_{n-1}| + \frac{1}{n})^\gamma} = \mu f_n(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where $f_n = T_{n+c_{\Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_\varepsilon}}(f)$, $r = \frac{p}{p+\gamma-1}$. Here $c_{\Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_\varepsilon}$ is defined by (2.2) (with $\omega = \Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_\varepsilon$); in particular, as far as f_n is defined one deduces that

$$f_n(x) \geq c_{\Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_\varepsilon} \geq c_{\Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_\varepsilon} \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_\varepsilon, \quad \forall \varepsilon < \bar{\varepsilon}, \quad (3.2)$$

since $c_{\Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_\varepsilon}$, defined again in (2.2) (with $\omega = \Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_\varepsilon$), is non-increasing as ε decreases.

The existence of a function $u_n \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ solution to (3.1) follows by standard Leray-Lions Theorem ([23]).

We start proving a comparison lemma, which provides a barrier from below for u_n . We explicitly stress that the constant t_0 appearing in the next result does not depend on n and this will be crucial in the proof of Theorem 2.2 in order to pass to the limit in the singular term.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $p > 1$, $0 < \gamma < 1$, $0 \lesssim a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, and let $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ satisfy (2.2). Let u_n be a solution to (3.1). Then there exist positive numbers μ_0 and t_0 such that*

$$u_n \geq t_0 \varphi_1^{\frac{p}{p+\gamma-1}} \quad \text{for all } \mu \geq \mu_0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (3.3)$$

where μ_0 and t_0 depend only on Ω, a, f, γ and p .

Proof. First we show that $v = t\varphi_1^r$, where $r = \frac{p}{p+\gamma-1} > 1$ and $t > 0$ is large enough, satisfies

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a}{\left(v + \frac{1}{n}\right)^\gamma} \leq \mu f_n \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (3.4)$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and for any $\mu \geq \mu_0$ for some suitably large μ_0 . To this aim, a simple computation takes to

$$-\Delta_p v = -(tr)^{p-1}(r-1)(p-1)\varphi_1^{(r-1)(p-1)-1}|\nabla\varphi_1|^p - (tr)^{p-1}\varphi_1^{(r-1)(p-1)}\Delta_p\varphi_1,$$

which implies that

$$-\Delta_p v = -\frac{t^{p+\gamma-1}}{v^\gamma} \left(r^{p-1}(r-1)(p-1)\varphi_1^{(r-1)(p-1)-1+\gamma r}|\nabla\varphi_1|^p + r^{p-1}\varphi_1^{(r-1)(p-1)+\gamma r}\Delta_p\varphi_1 \right).$$

Using (1.7) and the fact that $r = \frac{p}{p+\gamma-1}$, one gets

$$-\Delta_p v = \frac{t^{p+\gamma-1}}{v^\gamma} \left(r^{p-1}(1-r)(p-1)|\nabla\varphi_1|^p + r^{p-1}\lambda_p\varphi_1^p \right).$$

Hence we have shown that

$$-\Delta_p v = \frac{t^{p+\gamma-1}}{v^\gamma} \left(-C_{p,\gamma}|\nabla\varphi_1|^p + D_{p,\gamma,\Omega}\varphi_1^p \right) = -t^{p-1}C_{p,\gamma}|\nabla\varphi_1|^p\varphi_1^{-r\gamma} + t^{p-1}D_{p,\gamma,\Omega}\varphi_1^{p-r\gamma}, \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$C_{p,\gamma} = r^{p-1}(r-1)(p-1) \quad \text{and} \quad D_{p,\gamma,\Omega} = r^{p-1}\lambda_p.$$

Then, it follows from (3.5) that

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v^\gamma} = -t^{p-1}C_{p,\gamma}|\nabla\varphi_1|^p\varphi_1^{-r\gamma} + t^{p-1}D_{p,\gamma,\Omega}\varphi_1^{p-r\gamma} + a(x)t^{-\gamma}\varphi_1^{-r\gamma}. \quad (3.6)$$

As we aim to prove the validity of (3.4), we need to show that the right-hand of (3.6) does not exceed μf_n for μ large enough. Indeed this will be sufficient by simply observing that

$$a(x) \left(v + \frac{1}{n} \right)^{-\gamma} \leq a(x)v^{-\gamma} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

We proceed by estimating the right-hand of (3.6) splitting the calculation both near the boundary of Ω (i.e. in Ω_ε) and in the interior Ω (i.e. in $\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}$).

We first estimate (3.6) into $\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}$ (ε to be fixed later). We get rid of the first negative term on the right-hand of (3.6) and we ask for

$$a(x)t^{-\gamma}\varphi_1^{-r\gamma} \leq t^{p-1}D_{p,\gamma,\Omega}\varphi_1^{p-r\gamma},$$

for any $x \in \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}$ which means requiring

$$t \geq t_0 := \left(\frac{\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{D_{p,\gamma,\Omega} \min_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}}(\varphi_1^p)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p+\gamma-1}}. \quad (3.7)$$

Therefore we have shown that

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v^\gamma} \leq 2t^{p-1}D_{p,\gamma,\Omega}\varphi_1^{p-r\gamma} \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon} \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0. \quad (3.8)$$

Now let $t = t_0$ in (3.8). We claim that there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ (depending on ε) such that

$$2t_0^{p-1}D_{p,\gamma,\Omega}\varphi_1^{p-r\gamma} \leq c_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}} \mu \stackrel{(3.2)}{\leq} \mu f_n(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon} \quad \text{for all } \mu \geq \mu_0, n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.9)$$

Indeed, inequality (3.9) amounts to require that

$$\mu \geq \mu_0 := \frac{2t_0^{p-1}D_{p,\gamma,\Omega}\|\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{p-r\gamma}}{c_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}}}.$$

We have thus shown that

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v^\gamma} \leq \mu f_n(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon} \quad \text{for } \mu \geq \mu_0 \quad \text{and } t = t_0. \quad (3.10)$$

We then fix $t = t_0$ (i.e. from now on $v = t_0\varphi_1^r$) and we estimate (3.6) in Ω_ε for $0 < \varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$. Observe that, by (3.7) and (1.8), t_0 depends on ε and

$$t_0(\varepsilon) \geq \frac{c_3}{\varepsilon^r} \quad \text{for all } 0 < \varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}, \quad (3.11)$$

for some constant c_3 which do not depend on ε . Now, recall that the Hopf Lemma (see (1.8)) guarantees the existence of a constant $\bar{c} > 0$ such that $|\nabla\varphi_1|^p \geq \bar{c}$ in Ω_ε for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$.

Hence, from (3.6), one has

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v^\gamma} \leq -t_0^{p-1} \bar{c} C_{p,\gamma} \varphi_1^{-r\gamma} + t_0^{p-1} D_{p,\gamma,\Omega} \varphi_1^{p-r\gamma} + a(x) t_0^{-\gamma} \varphi_1^{-r\gamma} \text{ in } \Omega_\varepsilon,$$

which is

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v^\gamma} \leq \left(a(x) t_0^{-\gamma} - t_0^{p-1} \bar{c} C_{p,\gamma} \right) \varphi_1^{-r\gamma} + t_0^{p-1} D_{p,\gamma,\Omega} \varphi_1^{p-r\gamma} \text{ in } \Omega_\varepsilon. \quad (3.12)$$

Now, assuming ε small enough, one can deduce

$$t_0^{p-1} D_{p,\gamma,\Omega} \varphi_1^{p-r\gamma} \leq \frac{t_0^{p-1} \bar{c} C_{p,\gamma} \varphi_1^{-r\gamma}}{2} \text{ in } \Omega_\varepsilon. \quad (3.13)$$

Indeed, (3.13) is equivalent to require

$$\varphi_1^p \leq \frac{\bar{c} C_{p,\gamma}}{2 D_{p,\gamma,\Omega}} \text{ in } \Omega_\varepsilon,$$

which clearly holds if ε is fixed small enough.

Then, gathering (3.13) into (3.12), one gets

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v^\gamma} \leq \left(a(x) t_0^{-\gamma} - \frac{t_0^{p-1} \bar{c} C_{p,\gamma}}{2} \right) \varphi_1^{-r\gamma} \text{ in } \Omega_\varepsilon.$$

Now, using (3.11), we get

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v^\gamma} \leq \left(c_3^{-\gamma} a(x) \varepsilon^{r\gamma} - \frac{c_3^{p-1} \bar{c} C_{p,\gamma}}{2 \varepsilon^{r(p-1)}} \right) \varphi_1^{-r\gamma} \text{ in } \Omega_\varepsilon.$$

Therefore, the right-hand of the previous inequality is nonpositive for small enough $\bar{\varepsilon}$ that we fix here, and thus

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v^\gamma} \leq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\bar{\varepsilon}}.$$

Recalling that (3.10) holds in $\Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$, we have then proven that

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v^\gamma} \leq \mu f_n(x) \text{ in } \Omega \text{ for all } \mu \geq \mu_0, \quad (3.14)$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This gives (3.4).

Now we are in position to conclude the proof showing that (3.3) holds, i.e. that

$$u_n \geq v = t_0 \varphi_1^r \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We proceed by induction. For $n = 1$, as (3.14) is in force, one has

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{(v+1)^\gamma} \leq -\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v^\gamma} \leq \mu f_1(x) = -\Delta_p u_1 + \frac{a(x)}{(t_0 \|\varphi_1^r\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + 1)^\gamma} \text{ in } \Omega, \quad (3.15)$$

as, we recall, $u_0 = t_0 \|\varphi_1^r\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. Then, since by definition $u_0 \geq v$ a.e. in Ω , (3.15) implies that

$$-\Delta_p v \leq -\Delta_p u_1 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

which, thanks to Lemma 1.2, gives that $u_1 \geq v$ a.e. in Ω . Now let us assume that $u_n \geq v$ a.e. in Ω and let us prove that $u_{n+1} \geq v$ a.e. in Ω . Once again let us note that, reasoning as in (3.15), it holds

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{\left(v + \frac{1}{n+1}\right)^\gamma} \leq \mu f_{n+1}(x) = -\Delta_p u_{n+1} + \frac{a(x)}{\left(u_n + \frac{1}{n+1}\right)^\gamma} \stackrel{u_n \geq v}{\leq} -\Delta_p u_{n+1} + \frac{a(x)}{\left(v + \frac{1}{n+1}\right)^\gamma} \text{ in } \Omega,$$

which implies, using again Lemma 1.2, that $u_{n+1} \geq v$ a.e. in Ω . This shows that $u_n \geq v$ a.e. in Ω for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

3.1. A priori estimates and convergence results. Let us collect in the next result some a priori estimates for the solutions u_n of (3.1).

Lemma 3.2. *Let $1 < p < N$, $0 < \gamma < 1$, $0 \leq a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $\mu > 0$, and let $0 \leq f \in L^q(\Omega)$, $q \geq 1$. Let u_n be a nonnegative solution to (3.1). Then it holds*

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla T_k(u_n)|^p \leq \mu k \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \quad \forall k > 0. \quad (3.16)$$

Moreover, it holds:

- i) if $q = \frac{Np}{Np-N+p}$ then u_n is uniformly bounded in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with respect to n ;
- ii) if $q = 1$ then u_n is uniformly bounded in $M^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}}(\Omega)$ and $|\nabla u_n|$ is uniformly bounded in $M^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-1}}(\Omega)$ with respect to n .

Proof. The proof is standard once one observes that u_n is a subsolution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p w_n = \mu f_n(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega; \end{cases}$$

we will briefly sketch it for the sake of completeness.

Let us take $T_k(u_n)$ as a test function in the weak formulation of (3.1) in order to deduce that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla T_k(u_n)|^p \leq \mu k \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \quad (3.17)$$

where we have got rid of the nonnegative second term on the left-hand of (3.1). This shows (3.16).

Proof of i). Let us take u_n as a test function in the weak formulation of (3.1), yielding to

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^p &\leq \mu \int_{\Omega} f_n u_n \leq \mu \left(\int_{\Omega} f_n^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_n^{\frac{Np}{N-p}} \right)^{\frac{N-p}{Np}} \\ &\leq \mu \mathcal{S}_p^{-1} \left(\int_{\Omega} f_n^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where we have got rid of the nonnegative second term on the left-hand of (3.1). We also have applied Hölder's and Sobolev's inequalities and \mathcal{S}_p , from here on, is the best constant in the Sobolev inequality for functions in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Hence, (3.18) gives that u_n is bounded in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ in n as f_n is bounded in $L^q(\Omega)$ (recall that u_n has zero Sobolev trace).

Proof of ii). Then the result standardly follows from (3.17) by applying Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 of [4]. This concludes the proof. \square

Next lemma concerns the identification of the limit of u_n as n tends to ∞ in the case $q = 1$. In fact, if $q = \frac{Np}{Np-N+p}$, by Lemma 3.2 one easily gets the existence of $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that, up to subsequences $u_n \rightarrow u$ a.e. in Ω and weakly in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $1 < p < N$, $0 < \gamma < 1$, $0 \leq a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $\mu > 0$, and let $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ satisfy (2.2). Let u_n be a positive solution to (3.1). Then u_n converges, up to subsequences, a.e. in Ω to a positive function $u \in M^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}}(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. As this proof is quite classical nowadays (after [4]), we only present a brief sketch. An application of the Sobolev inequality in the left-hand of (3.17) allows us to deduce that

$$\mathcal{S}_p^{-p} \left(\int_{\Omega} |T_k(u_n)|^{p^*} \right)^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \leq \mu k \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } k > 0. \quad (3.19)$$

By denoting $A_{n,k} = \{u_n \geq k\}$, the previous inequality implies that

$$|A_{n,k}| \leq \left(\frac{\mathcal{S}_p^p \mu \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)}}{k^{p-1}} \right)^{\frac{N}{N-p}}. \quad (3.20)$$

Now let us show that u_n is a Cauchy sequence in measure. Indeed observe that for all $\eta, k > 0$ and $l, n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\{|u_n - u_l| \geq \eta\} \subset A_{n,k} \cup A_{l,k} \cup \{|T_k(u_n) - T_k(u_l)| > \eta\}.$$

From (3.20), we know that the sizes of $A_{n,k}$ and $A_{l,k}$ tend to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$. To estimate the size of the third set, we use the fact that, up to subsequences, and as an application of (3.17) and Rellich–Kondrachov Theorem, one has that $T_k(u_n)$ is Cauchy in measure for all $k > 0$. Then fixing k large enough, one has that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $n_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$|\{|u_n - u_l| \geq \eta\}| < \varepsilon \text{ for all } l, n > n_\varepsilon,$$

which implies that u_n is a Cauchy sequence in measure. Thus, recalling Lemma 3.1, there exists a positive measurable function u to which u_n converges (up to a subsequence) a.e. in Ω as $n \rightarrow \infty$. From an application of the Fatou Lemma in (3.19) and reasoning as above, we get that

$$|\{u > k\}| \leq \left(\frac{\mathcal{S}_p^p \mu \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)}}{k^{p-1}} \right)^{\frac{N}{N-p}} \text{ for all } k > 0.$$

This proves the result. \square

3.2. Existence for $\mu \geq \mu_0$. We are now in position to prove Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. We fix $\mu \geq \mu_0$ where μ_0 is determined in Lemma 3.1. We aim to let $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the weak formulation of (3.1). By Corollary 3.3 we have that, up to a subsequence, $u_n \rightarrow u$ a.e. in Ω as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore both u_n and u are positive thanks to Lemma 3.1.

First we claim that $\mu f_n - (au_{n-1} + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma}$ converges in $L^1(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to $\mu f - au^{-\gamma}$ by applications of the Lebesgue Theorem; indeed it follows from Lemma 3.1, that for some positive constant C , one has

$$\frac{a(x)}{(u_{n-1} + \frac{1}{n})^\gamma} \stackrel{(3.3)}{\leq} \frac{\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{C\varphi_1^{\frac{p\gamma}{p+\gamma-1}}} \in L^1(\Omega),$$

thanks to (1.8) and (1.4) since $\gamma < 1$.

Furthermore, the a.e. convergence of ∇u_n , up to subsequences, towards ∇u in Ω as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is in force. Indeed, as $\mu f_n - (au_{n-1} + \frac{1}{n})^{-\gamma}$ converges in $L^1(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, one can apply classical stability results for nonlinear elliptic equations with L^1 data ([7, 4]) in order to get this convergence.

Thus, we can pass to the limit the principal part of the weak formulation of (3.1). Indeed Lemma 3.2 gives that $|\nabla u_n|^{p-1}$ is bounded in $M^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)$ with respect to n and then $|\nabla u_n|^{p-2} \nabla u_n$ converges to $|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u$ in $L^r(\Omega)^N$ with $r < \frac{N}{N-1}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$; this is sufficient to let $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the term of the weak formulation of (3.1) involving the principal operator. This allows us to deduce that u is a solution to (2.1).

The regularity properties of the solution follow by the lower semicontinuity of the norm with respect to n in the estimates of Lemma 3.2. This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.3. We now turn our attention to the proof of Theorem 2.3. Let $p \geq N$ and recall that the following embeddings hold for any $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } p > N & \text{ then } \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c_\infty \|u\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}, \\ \text{if } p = N & \text{ then } \|u\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \leq c_r \|u\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}, \text{ for all } r > 1. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 2.2. We fix $\mu \geq \mu_0$ where μ_0 is determined in the Lemma 3.1. We aim to let $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the weak formulation of (3.1). Choosing u_n as a test function, and using the injection for $p > N$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^p &\leq \mu \int_\Omega f_n u_n \leq \mu \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_\Omega f_n \\ &\leq \mu c_\infty \left(\int_\Omega f_n \right) \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

A similar estimate can be obtained under the hypothesis $p = N$ and $f \in L^q(\Omega)$ with $q > 1$. Consequently, there exists $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that $u_n \rightarrow u$ a.e. in Ω and weakly in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. The result then follows by arguing as in the proof of Theorem 2.2. \square

3.3. Non-existence for $0 < \mu < \mu_{0*}$. In this section we prove Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. By contradiction let us assume that there exists a finite energy solution u to problem (2.1) for any $\mu > 0$. Notice in particular that, by (2.3), one should have $u > 0$ on Ω . Then, applying Lemma 2.5, one can take $v = u$ into (2.4). This yields to

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p + \int_{\Omega} au^{1-\gamma} \leq \mu \int_{\Omega} fu.$$

Moreover, as $a \geq c_0$, $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and, observing that $s \leq s^{1-\gamma} + s^p$ for all $s \geq 0$, one deduces

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p + c_0 \int_{\Omega} u^{1-\gamma} \leq C\mu \int_{\Omega} (u^{1-\gamma} + u^p),$$

where $C = \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. If $\mu < \frac{c_0}{C}$, then

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \leq C\mu \int_{\Omega} u^p.$$

From (1.6), we obtain

$$(1 - C\mu\lambda_p^{-1}) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \leq 0,$$

which means that if

$$\mu < \min \left\{ \frac{c_0}{C}, \frac{1}{C\lambda_p^{-1}} \right\},$$

then $u \equiv 0$. This provides a contradiction and the proof is concluded. \square

4. SOME COMPATIBILITY CONDITIONS IN THE CASE $\gamma = 1$.

In this section we briefly comment problem (2.1) in the extremal case $\gamma = 1$. By requiring some extra conditions on both a and f one can show the existence of a positive solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u + \frac{a(x)}{u} = \mu f(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where $p > 1$ and $\mu > 0$ is large enough. Let $\bar{\varepsilon}$ a small parameter that will be fixed later; with respect to the previous sections we further assume that $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ is a nonnegative function, not identically null, such that

$$a(x) \leq \bar{a}\delta(x)^\alpha \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, \quad (4.2)$$

for some constants $\bar{a} > 0$, $0 < \alpha < 1$ ($\Omega_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ is defined in (1.5)). Moreover $0 < f \in L^1(\Omega)$ satisfies (2.2) and the following growth assumption

$$f(x) \geq \bar{f}\delta(x)^{-s} \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, \quad (4.3)$$

for some $0 < \bar{f} \leq 1$, $0 < s < 1$.

Let us state the main existence theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $1 < p < N$, let $0 \leq a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfy (4.2), let $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ satisfy both (2.2) and (4.3) such that $\alpha + s \geq 1$. Then there exists a positive μ_0 such that for any $\mu \geq \mu_0$ there exists a positive solution u to problem (4.1). Furthermore, $u \in M^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}}(\Omega)$ and $|\nabla u| \in M^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-1}}(\Omega)$.*

Proof of Theorem 4.1. As in several parts the proof strictly follows the ideas presented in Section 3, here we present a brief sketch focusing on the main differences with respect to the one of Theorem 2.2.

The scheme of approximation is given again by (3.1), namely $u_0 = t_0\|\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ in Ω , and for $n > 0$

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u_n + \frac{a(x)}{|u_{n-1}| + \frac{1}{n}} = \mu f_n(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

where $f_n = T_{n+c_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_{\bar{\varepsilon}}}}(f)$. Let us observe that f_n satisfies both (3.2) and

$$f_n(x) \geq \bar{f} \left(\delta(x) + \frac{1}{n} \right)^{-s} \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.5)$$

The existence of such $u_n \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ solution to (3.1) follows again from [23] for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As in Lemma 3.1, we aim to show that, for some positive constant C , we have

$$u_n \geq C\varphi_1 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.6)$$

Indeed, the main differences rely on showing that in Ω it holds

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v + \frac{1}{n}} \leq \mu f_n(x), \quad (4.7)$$

where $v = t\varphi_1$ for some $t > 0$. We show it separately on both $\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}$ and Ω_ε . We start by $\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}$ where we can assume that

$$\frac{a(x)}{t\varphi_1} \leq t^{p-1} \lambda_p \varphi_1^{p-1},$$

by requiring

$$t \geq t_0 := \left(\frac{\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\lambda_p \min_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}}(\varphi_1^p)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v + \frac{1}{n}} \leq 2t_0^{p-1} \lambda_p \varphi_1^{p-1} \leq c_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}} \mu \stackrel{(2.2)}{\leq} \mu f_n(x) \text{ in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}, \quad (4.8)$$

where we required that

$$\mu \geq \mu_0 := \frac{2t_0^{p-1} \lambda_p \|\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{p-1}}{c_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon}}}. \quad (4.9)$$

Now we focus on proving (4.7) in Ω_ε , for $\varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$; thanks to (4.2), one has

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v + \frac{1}{n}} \leq \frac{\bar{a}\delta(x)^\alpha}{t_0\varphi_1 + \frac{1}{n}} + t_0^{p-1} \lambda_p \varphi_1^{p-1}. \quad (4.10)$$

For the right-hand of (4.10), observe that, as for (3.11), by (1.8) one has

$$\frac{c_3}{\varepsilon} \leq t_0 \leq \frac{c_4}{\varepsilon} \quad (4.11)$$

for $c_3, c_4 > 0$ independent of ε ; in particular, without losing generality, we assume ε small enough so that

$$t_0 c_1 \geq 1 \quad (4.12)$$

where c_1 is the constant given into (1.8).

Using both (1.8) and (4.5), and the fact that $\alpha + s \geq 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{a}\delta(x)^\alpha}{t_0\varphi_1 + \frac{1}{n}} + t_0^{p-1} \lambda_p \varphi_1^{p-1} &\stackrel{(4.5)}{\leq} \left(\frac{\bar{a}\delta(x)^\alpha}{t_0\varphi_1 + \frac{1}{n}} \right) \frac{f_n(x)}{\bar{f}(\delta(x) + \frac{1}{n})^{-s}} + t_0^{p-1} \lambda_p \varphi_1^{p-1} \frac{f_n(x)}{\bar{f}(\delta(x) + \frac{1}{n})^{-s}} \\ &\stackrel{(1.8)-(4.12)}{\leq} \bar{a}\delta(x)^\alpha \left(\frac{1}{t_0 c_1 \delta(x) + \frac{1}{n}} \right)^{1-s} \frac{f_n(x)}{\bar{f}} + t_0^{p-1} \lambda_p \varphi_1^{p-1} \frac{f_n(x)}{\bar{f}(\delta(x) + \frac{1}{n})^{-s}} \\ &\stackrel{(1.8)-(4.11)}{\leq} \left(\frac{\bar{a}}{\bar{f} t_0^{1-s} c_1^{1-s}} \delta(x)^{\alpha+s-1} + \frac{c_4^{p-1} c_2^{p-1} \lambda_p}{\bar{f}} \left(\delta(x) + \frac{1}{n} \right)^s \right) f_n(x) \\ &\stackrel{(4.11)}{\leq} \tilde{C} \left(\varepsilon^\alpha + \left(\varepsilon + \frac{1}{n} \right)^s \right) f_n(x) \text{ in } \Omega_\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{C} = \frac{\bar{a}}{\bar{f} c_1 c_3^{1-s}} + \frac{\lambda_p c_2^{p-1} c_4^{p-1}}{\bar{f}}.$$

Thanks to the assumptions on α and s , one can fix $\bar{\varepsilon}$ small enough so that

$$\tilde{C} \left(\bar{\varepsilon}^\alpha + \left(\bar{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{n} \right)^s \right) \leq \mu_0.$$

Then, gathering the previous inequalities one has

$$-\Delta_p v + \frac{a(x)}{v + \frac{1}{n}} \leq \mu f_n(x) \text{ in } \Omega_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, \quad (4.13)$$

under the request (4.9) (recall from now on $\Omega_\varepsilon = \Omega_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ is fixed). Hence (4.8) and (4.13) give that (4.7) holds. Once that (4.7) is in force, the proof of (4.6) is identical to the one in Lemma 3.1.

Now observe that an application of Lemma 3.2 (case *ii*) gives that u_n is uniformly bounded in $M^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}}(\Omega)$ and $|\nabla u_n|$ is uniformly bounded in $M^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-1}}(\Omega)$.

From here on the proof is almost identical to the one of the proof of Theorem 2.2. Indeed in order to pass to the limit in the singular term of (4.4) as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we may observe that, for some positive constant C , one has

$$\frac{a(x)}{u_{n-1} + \frac{1}{n}} \stackrel{(4.6)}{\leq} \frac{a(x)}{C\varphi_1} \in L^1(\Omega), \quad (4.14)$$

thanks to (4.2). Then (4.14) allows to apply the Lebesgue Theorem on the singular term as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This concludes the proof. \square

The case of a generic bounded function a in the lower order term of (4.1) (i.e. $\alpha = 0$ in (4.2)) is quite exceptional. In this case, it is not generally true that $a\varphi_1^{-1}$ belongs to $L^1(\Omega)$ and the previous proof does not apply. Surprisingly in this case the existence of a solution of (4.1) is hampered by the fact that f is too ‘‘regular’’ (say summable) near the boundary.

4.1. Non-existence result for $\gamma = 1$. A non-existence result analogous to the one in Theorem 2.4 can be proven for $\gamma = 1$ even for an unbounded f . We have the following:

Theorem 4.2. *Let $p > 1$, $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$, assume that $0 \leq a \in L^1(\Omega)$ is a non-trivial function and that $f \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$. Then there exists $\mu_{0^*} > 0$ such that problem (4.1) does not admit any non-trivial finite energy solution $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for all $0 < \mu \leq \mu_{0^*}$.*

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Assume by contradiction that $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a solution of problem (4.1). Let

$$A := \int_{\Omega} a > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad F := \frac{1}{p'} \int_{\Omega} f^{p'} > 0$$

Since $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $f \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$, we may apply Lemma 2.5 to conclude that (2.4) holds with $\gamma = 1$. Thus, choosing $v = u$ in (2.4), we get

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p + A = \mu \int_{\Omega} f u.$$

We estimate the right-hand side using Young’s inequality with exponents p and p' . By a further use of Poincaré’s inequality (recall (1.6)), we get

$$\left(1 - \frac{\mu}{p\lambda_p}\right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p + A \leq \mu F.$$

Consequently, if

$$\mu \leq \mu_{0^*} := \min\left\{p\lambda_p, \frac{A}{F}\right\},$$

one has

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \leq 0,$$

and thus $u \equiv 0$. This concludes the proof \square

DECLARATIONS:

Funding: F. Oliva and F. Petitta are partially supported by the Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM). M.F. Stapenhorst is partially supported by FAPESP 2022/15727-2 and 2021/12773-0.

Conflict of interest declaration: The authors declare no competing interests.

Data availability statement: We do not analyse or generate any datasets, because our work proceeds within a theoretical and mathematical approach. One can obtain the relevant materials from the references below.

Ethical Approval: not applicable

Acknowledgements: The authors thank the anonymous referee for the suggestions, which helped to improve the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. W. Alt and D. Phillips, A free boundary problem for semilinear elliptic equations, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 368 (1986) 63-107.
- [2] D. Arcoya, J. Carmona, T. Leonori, P. J. Martínez-Aparicio, L. Orsina and F. Petitta, Existence and nonexistence of solutions for singular quadratic quasilinear equations, *J. Differential Equations* 246 (2009) 4006-4042.
- [3] R. Aris, *The mathematical theory of diffusion and reaction in permeable catalysts*, Volumes I and II, Clarendon Press, Oxford (1975).
- [4] P. Bénilan, L. Boccardo, T. Gallouët, R. Gariépy, M. Pierre and J. L. Vazquez, An L^1 -theory of existence and uniqueness of solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* 22 (1995) 241-273.
- [5] L. Boccardo, Dirichlet problems with singular and gradient quadratic lower order terms, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 14 (2008) 411-426.
- [6] L. Boccardo and L. Orsina, Semilinear elliptic equations with singular nonlinearities, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 37 (2010) 363-380.
- [7] L. Boccardo and F. Murat, Almost everywhere convergence of the gradients of solutions to elliptic and parabolic equations, *Nonlinear Anal. TMA* 19 (1992) 581-597.
- [8] A. Canino, B. Sciunzi and A. Trombetta, Existence and uniqueness for p -Laplace equations involving singular nonlinearities, *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.* 23 (2016).
- [9] Y. S. Choi, A. C. Lazer and P. J. McKenna, Some remarks on a singular elliptic boundary value problem, *Nonlinear Anal.* 32 (1998) 305-314.
- [10] M. M. Coclite and G. Palmieri, On a singular nonlinear Dirichlet problem, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 14 (1989) 1315-1327.
- [11] G. M. Coclite and M. M. Coclite, On a Dirichlet problem in bounded domains with singular nonlinearity, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 33 (2013) 4923-4944.
- [12] M.G. Crandall, P.H. Rabinowitz and L. Tartar, On a dirichlet problem with a singular nonlinearity, *Comm. Partial Diff. Equations* 2 (1977) 193-222.
- [13] J. Dávila and M. Montenegro, Positive versus free boundary solutions to a singular elliptic equation, *J. Anal. Math.* 90 (2003) 303-335.
- [14] J. Dávila and M. Montenegro, Concentration for an elliptic equation with singular nonlinearity, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 97 (2012) 545-578.
- [15] J. I. Diaz, *Nonlinear partial differential equations and free boundaries Volume I Elliptic equations*, Research Notes in Mathematics, 106, Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, MA, (1985).
- [16] J. I. Diaz, J. -M. Morel and L. Oswald, An elliptic equation with singular nonlinearity, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 12 (1987) 1333-1344.
- [17] P. Esposito, N. Ghoussoub and Y. Guo, *Mathematical analysis of partial differential equations modeling electrostatic MEMS*, American Mathematical Soc. (2010)
- [18] W. Fulks and J.S. Maybee, A singular nonlinear equation, *Osaka J. Math. Soc.* 12 (1960) 1-19.
- [19] M. Ghergu and V. Rădulescu, Sublinear singular elliptic problems with two parameters, *J. Differential Equations* 195 (2003) 520-536.
- [20] M. Ghergu and V. Rădulescu, Multi-parameter bifurcation and asymptotics for the singular Lane-Emden-Fowler equation with a convection term, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* 135 (2005) 61-83.
- [21] N. Hirano, C. Saccon and N. Shioji, Existence of multiple positive solutions for singular elliptic problems with concave and convex nonlinearities, *Adv. Differential Equations* 9 (2004) 197-220.
- [22] A. C. Lazer and P. J. McKenna, On a singular nonlinear elliptic boundary-value problem, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 111 (1991) 721-730.
- [23] J. Leray and J.L. Lions, Quelques résultats de Visk sur les problèmes elliptiques semi-linéaires par les méthodes de Minty et Browder, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* 93 (1965) 97-107.
- [24] P. Lindqvist, *Notes on the Stationary p -Laplace Equation*, SpringerBriefs in Mathematics, Cham, (2019)
- [25] M. Montenegro and E. A. B. Silva, Two solutions for a singular elliptic equation by variational methods, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* (5) 11 (2012) 143-165.

- [26] A. Nachman and A. Callegari, A nonlinear singular boundary value problem in the theory of pseudoplastic fluids, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 38 (1980) 275-281.
- [27] F. Oliva and F. Petitta, On singular elliptic equations with measure sources, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 22 (2016) 289-308.
- [28] F. Oliva and F. Petitta, Finite and infinite energy solutions of singular elliptic problems: existence and uniqueness, *J. Differential Equations* 264 (2018) 311-340.
- [29] F. Oliva and F. Petitta, Singular Elliptic PDEs: an extensive overview, *Partial Differ. Equ. Appl.* 6 (2025) 82 pp.
- [30] N. S. Papageorgiou, V. D. Rădulescu and D. D. Repovš, Positive solutions for a class of singular Dirichlet problems, *J. Differential Equations* 267 (2019) 6539-6554.
- [31] N. S. Papageorgiou, V. D. Rădulescu and D. D. Repovš, Positive solutions for nonlinear parametric singular Dirichlet problems, *Bull. Math. Sci.* 9 (2019) 1950011.
- [32] N. S. Papageorgiou and P. Winkert, Singular p -Laplacian equations with superlinear perturbation, *J. Differential Equations* 266 (2019) 1462-1487.
- [33] C.A. Stuart, Existence and approximation of solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations, *Math. Z.* 147 (1976) 53-63.
- [34] Y. Sun, S. Wu and Y. Long, Combined effects of singular and superlinear nonlinearities in some singular boundary value problems, *J. Differential Equations* 176 (2001) 511-531.
- [35] Z. Zhang, On a Dirichlet problem with a singular nonlinearity, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 194 (1995) 103-113.

FRANCESCANTONIO OLIVA

DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE DI BASE E APPLICATE PER L' INGEGNERIA, SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA
VIA SCARPA 16, 00161 ROMA, ITALY

Email address: francescantonio.oliva@uniroma1.it

FRANCESCO PETITTA

DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE DI BASE E APPLICATE PER L' INGEGNERIA, SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA
VIA SCARPA 16, 00161 ROMA, ITALY

Email address: francesco.petitta@uniroma1.it

MATHEUS STAPENHORST

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA E COMPUTAÇÃO, UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL PAULISTA-UNESP
R. ROBERTO SÍMONSEN 305, 19060-900 PRESIDENTE PRUDENTE-SP, BRAZIL

Email address: m.stapenhorst@unesp.br