# On positive solutions of quasi-linear elliptic equations

## J. CHABROWSKI (Received May 6, 1987)

**ABSTRACT.** In this note we prove the existence of positive solutions of the Dirichlet problem for a quasi-linear elliptic equation. Our boundary data belongs to  $L^2$  and a corresponding solution is in a weighted Sobolev space.

## 1. Introduction.

Let  $Q \subset R_n$  be a bounded domain with the boundary  $\partial Q$  of class  $C^2$ . In Q we consider the Dirichlet problem

(1)  $Lu = -\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} D_i(a_{ij}(x, u)D_ju) + a_0(x)u = f(x, u)$  in Q,

(2) 
$$u(x) = \phi(x)$$
 on  $\partial Q$ ,

where  $\phi$  is a non-negative function in  $L^2(\partial Q)$ .

Throughout this paper we make the following assumptions

(A) There is a positive constant  $\gamma$  such that

$$\gamma^{-1}|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(x, u) \ \boldsymbol{\xi}_i \boldsymbol{\xi}_j \leq \gamma |\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2$$

for all  $\xi \in R_n$  and  $(x, u) \in Q \times R$ ;  $a_{ij}(x, u) = a_{ji}(x, u)$  (i, j=1, ..., n) for all  $(x, u) \in Q \times R$ . Moreover, we assume that  $a_{ij}(\bullet, \bullet) \in C(\bar{Q} \times R)$  (i, j=1, ..., n) and for each  $u \in R$ ,  $a_{ij}(\bullet, u) \in C^1(\bar{Q})$  (i, j=1, ..., n) and that there exist functions  $A_{ij} \in C^1(\bar{Q})$  such that

$$\lim_{|u| \to \infty} a_{ij}(x, u) = A_{ij}(x) \text{ and } \lim_{|u| \to \infty} D_x a_{ij}(x, u) = D_x A_{ij}(x) \quad (i, j = 1, ..., n)$$

n)

uniformly on  $\overline{Q}$ . Finally, the coefficient  $a_0(x)$  is non-negative and belongs to  $L^{\infty}(Q)$ .

(B) The nonlinearity  $f: Q \times R \rightarrow R$  satisfies the Carathéodory conditions, i. e.

(i) for each  $u \in R$ , the function  $x \rightarrow f(x, u)$  is measurable in Q,

(ii) for each  $x \in Q(a. e.)$ , the function  $u \rightarrow f(x, u)$  is continuous on R. Further assumptions on f will be formulated later on.

In this note we use the notion of a generalized (weak) solution of (1) involving the Sobolev spaces  $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(Q)$ ,  $W^{1,2}(Q)$  and  $\mathring{W}^{1,2}(Q)$  (for the

definitions of these spaces see [10]).

A function u is said to be a generalized (weak) solution of (1) if  $u \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(Q)$  and satisfies

(3)  $\int_{Q} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} [a_{ij}(x, u) D_{i}u \ D_{j}v + a_{0}(x)u \ v] \ dx = \int_{Q} f(x, u)v \ dx$ 

for each  $v \in W^{1,2}(Q)$  with compact support, provided  $f(\bullet, u(\bullet)) \in L^2_{loc}(Q)$ .

There is an extensive literature on positive solutions for semi-linear elliptic equations (see survey articles [1] and [8]). Most of these results are concerned with solutions with zero or smooth boundary data for semi-linear elliptic equations. Terefore solutions belong to the usual Sobolev space  $W^{1,2}(Q)$  or to the Hölder space  $C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{Q})$ , depending on the regularity of coefficients. The results of this paper are related to those of [7], where some existence theorems of positive solutions in  $C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{Q})$  for quasi-linear elliptic equations were obtained.

In this paper we assume that  $\phi \in L^2(\partial Q)$  and consequently we cannot expect to find a solution in the Sobolev space  $W^{1,2}(Q)$ . On the other hand, the boundary condition (2) requires a proper formulation due to the fact that not every function in  $L^2(\partial Q)$  is a trace of an element from  $W^{1,2}(Q)$ .

To describe our approach to the problem (1), (2) we need some terminology. It follows from the regularity of the boundary  $\partial Q$  that there exists a number  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that, for  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ , the domain  $Q_{\delta} = Q \cap \{x; \min_{\nu \in \partial Q} | x - y| > \delta\}$  with the boundary  $\partial Q_{\delta}$  possesses the property that to each  $x_0 \in \partial Q$ there exists a unique point  $x_{\delta}(x_0) \in \partial Q_{\delta}$  such that  $x_{\delta}(x_0) = x_0 - \delta \nu(x_0)$ , where  $\nu$  $(x_0)$  is the outward normal to  $\partial Q$  at  $x_0$ . The above relation gives a one-toone mapping, of class  $C^1$ ,  $\partial Q$  onto  $\partial Q_{\delta}$ .

According to Lemma 14. 16 in [10] (p. 355), the distance function  $r(x) = \text{dist}(x, \partial Q)$  belongs to  $C^2(\bar{Q} - Q_{\delta_0})$  if  $\delta_0$  is sufficiently small. We denote by  $\rho(x)$  the extension of the function r(x) into  $\bar{Q}$  satisfying the following properties:  $\rho(x) = r(x)$  for  $x \in \bar{Q} - Q_{\delta_0}$ ,  $\rho \in C_2(\bar{Q})$ ,  $\rho(x) \ge \frac{3\delta_0}{4}$  in  $Q_{\delta_0}$ ,  $\gamma_1^{-1} r(x) \le \rho(x) \le \gamma_1 r(x)$  in Q for some positive constant  $\gamma_1$ .

Guided by the results of [3], [4] and [5], we adopt the following approach to the Dirichlet problem (1), (2).

Let  $\phi \in L^2(\partial Q)$ . A weak solution  $u \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(Q)$  of (1) is a solution of the Dirichlet problem with the boundary conditin (2) if

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\int_{\partial Q} [u(x_{\delta}(x))-\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)]^2 dS_x=0.$$

It follows from [4], that if the problem (1), (2) admits a solution u such that  $f(\cdot, u(\cdot)) \in L^2(Q)$ , then  $u \in \tilde{W}^{1,2}$  where  $\tilde{W}^{1,2}(Q)$  is a weighted Sobolev space defined by

$$\tilde{W}^{1,2}(Q) = \{ u \; ; \; u \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(Q) \; \text{ and } \int_{Q} |Du(x)|^2 r(x) dx + \int_{Q} u(x)^2 dx < \infty \}$$

and equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{\tilde{W}^{1,2}}^2 = \int_Q |Du(x)|^2 r(x) \, dx + \int_Q u(x)^2 \, dx$$

To proceed further we set for every  $v \in L^2(Q)$ 

$$L_{u}^{v} = -\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} D_{i}(a_{ij}(x, v(x))D_{j}u) + a_{0}(x)u$$

and consider the eigenvalue problem in  $W^{1,2}(Q)$ 

(EVP)  $L_u^v = \lambda m(x) u$  in Q, u(x) = 0 on  $\partial Q$ ,

where  $m \in L^{\infty}(Q)$  and m(x) > 0 on some subset of Q of positive measure. By virtue of Theorem 1.13 in [8] the first positive eigenvalue  $\lambda_1(m, v)$  is simple and the corresponding eigenfunction can be taken positive on Q. Set

$$\mathscr{H}_{i}(m) = \inf \lambda_{1}_{v \in L^{2}(Q)}(m, v)$$

Combining the argument of the proof of Proposition 1. 11 in [8] with the variational characterization of eigenvalues (Proposition 1. 10 in [8]), it is easy to check that  $\mathscr{H}_1(m) > 0$ . Let  $\bar{\mu}(m)$  be the first eigenvalue associated with the eigenvalue problem in  $\mathring{W}^{1,2}(Q)$ 

$$(\text{EVP})_1 \quad \begin{cases} -\sum_{i,j=1}^n D_i (A_{ij}(x) D_j u) + a_0(x) u = \lambda m(x) u \text{ in } Q, \\ u(x) = 0 \text{ on } \partial Q. \end{cases}$$

It is obvious that  $\mathscr{H}_1(m) \leq \overline{\mu}(m)$ . One can give examples of quasilinear elliptic operators for which cases  $\overline{\mu}(m) = \mathscr{H}_1(m)$  and  $\mathscr{H}_1(m) < \overline{\mu}(m)$  occur (for more details see [6]).

2. Main result.

To establish our main theorem we need some modification of results contained in papers [5] and [6] for the Dirichlet problem

(4)  $Lu = \mu m(x)u + h(x)$  in Q.

(5)  $u(x) = \phi(x)$  on  $\partial Q$ ,

where  $h \in L^2(Q)$  and  $\mu \ge 0$  is a parameter.

LEMMA, 1. Let  $0 < \mu \leq \mathscr{H}_1(m)$  and  $\mathscr{H}_1(m) < \overline{\mu}(m)$ . Then for each  $\phi \in C^1(\partial Q)$  there exists at least one solution  $u \in W^{1,2}(Q)$  of the problem (4), (5), which is non-negative if  $\phi \geq 0$  on  $\partial Q$  and  $h \geq 0$  on Q.

### J. Chabrowski

PROOF. If  $\mu < \mathscr{H}_1(m)$  the result is an immediate consequence of the Schauder fixed point theorem. To show that this continues to hold for  $\mu = \mathscr{H}_1(m)$ , we consider for each integer k > 1 the Dirichlet problem for the equation

(4k) 
$$Lu = (1 - \frac{1}{k}) \mathscr{H}_1(m) m(x)u + h(x)$$
 in Q

with the boundary condition (5). Since  $\phi$  can be extended to an element  $\Phi \in C^1(\bar{Q})$  by means of the transformation  $u-\Phi$ , the problem (4k), (5) can be reduced to the Dirichlet problem in  $\mathring{W}^{1,2}(Q)$ . By the previous case, for each k there exists a solution  $u_k \in \mathring{W}^{1,2}(Q)$ . It is sufficient to show that  $\{u_k\}$ is bounded in  $W^{1,2}(Q)$ . Then a suitable subsequence is convergent weakly in  $W^{1,2}(Q)$  and strongly in  $L^2(Q)$  to a solution of (4), (5) with  $\mu = \mathscr{H}_1(m)$ . If we assume, contrary to the assertion, that  $\{u_k\}$  is unbounded in  $W^{1,2}(Q)$ , then we may assume that  $\|u_k\|_{W^{1,2}} \to \infty$  as  $k \to \infty$  and consequently  $v_k =$  $u_k \|u_k\|_{W^{1,2}}^{-1}$  contains a subsequence convergent to a function v, weakly in  $W^{1,2}(Q)$  and strongly in  $L^2(Q)$ . Using the fact that  $a_{ij}(x, t) \to A_{ij}(x)$  and  $D_x a_{ij}(x, t) \to D_x A_{ij}(x)$  as  $|t| \to \infty$  uniformly on  $\bar{Q}$ , we show that v satisfies the equation

$$-\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} D_{i}(A_{ij}(x)D_{j}v) = \mathscr{H}_{1}(m)m(x)v$$

and moreover that  $v_k \rightarrow v$  strongly in  $\mathring{W}^{1,2}(Q)$ . Therefore  $||v||_{W^{1,2}} = 1$  and this contradicts the fact that  $\mathscr{H}_1(m) < \overline{\mu}(m)$ . Details of the proof are similar to the argument used un [5]. If  $\phi \ge 0$  on  $\partial Q$  and  $h \ge 0$  on Q, then the maximum principle implies that  $u \ge 0$  on Q in the case when  $\mu < \mathscr{H}_1(m)$ . If  $\mu = \mathscr{H}_1(m)$ , then the solutions  $u_k$  of  $(4_k)$ , (5) are non-negative and hence  $u \ge 0$  on Q.

LEMMA, 2. Suppose that  $\mathscr{H}_1(m) < \overline{\mu}(m)$ ,  $0 < \mu < \leq \mathscr{H}_1(m)$  and  $\phi \in L^2$ ( $\partial Q$ ). Let  $\{u_k\}$  be a sequence of solutions of (4), (5) in  $W^{1,2}(Q)$  with  $\phi = \phi_k$  and  $\phi_k \in C^1(\partial Q)$ . If  $\lim_{k \to \infty} \phi_k = \phi$  in  $L^2(\partial Q)$ , then a subsequence of  $\{u_k\}$  converges in  $\tilde{W}^{1,2}(Q)$  to a function u satisfying (4), (5).

To prove our assertion it is sufficient to show that  $\{u_k\}$  is bounded in  $\tilde{W}^{1,2}(Q)$ . The proof is similar to the argument used in the proof of Lemma 1. Again the assumption that  $\lim_{|t|\to\infty} a_{ij}(x, t) = A_{ij}(x)$  and  $\lim_{|t|\to\infty} D_x a_{ij}(x, t) = D_x A_{ij}(x)$  (i, j=1, ..., n) uniformly on  $\bar{Q}$  is essential in the proof, as well as the compactness of the imbedding of  $\tilde{W}^{1,2}(Q)$  in  $L^2(Q)$  (Theorem 4.11 in [11]). All details can be found in [5] or [6] (Theorem 6).

We are now in a position to establish our main existence result.

**THEOREM 1.** suppose that the nonlinearity f(x, u) satisfies the follow-

ing two conditions

- $(a) f(x, 0) \ge 0 \text{ on } Q,$
- (b) there exist functions  $g \in L^{\infty}(Q)$  and  $c \in L^2(Q)$  such that

 $f(x, s) \leq g(x)s + c(x)$ 

for all  $s \ge 0$  and  $x \in Q$ ; moreover  $c(x) \ge 0$  in Q and  $\mathscr{H}_1(g) \ge 1$ .

If  $\mathscr{H}_1(g) < \overline{\mu}(g)$ ,  $\phi \in L^2(\partial Q)$  and  $\phi \neq 0$  on  $\partial Q$ , then the Dirichlet problem (1), (2) admits at least one positive solution  $u \in \tilde{W}^{1,2}(Q)$ .

PROOF. Let  $\{\phi_k\}$  be a sequence of non-nnegative  $C^1$ -functions on  $\partial Q$  such that  $\lim \phi_k = \phi$  in  $L^2(\partial Q)$ .

By Lemma 1, for each k > 1 the Dirichlet problem

(6) 
$$Lu = g(x)u + c(x)$$
 in Q

(2<sub>k</sub>) 
$$u(x) = \phi_k(x)$$
 on  $\partial Q$ 

admits a non-negative solution  $\bar{u}_k \in W^{1,2}(Q)$ . It follows from the assumption (b) that  $\bar{u}_k$  is a supersolution of the problem (1), (2<sub>k</sub>). Since, by the assumption (a),  $\bar{u}_k \equiv 0$  on Q is a subsolution of (1), (2<sub>k</sub>), the results of [9] (p. 51) yield the existence of a solution  $u_k \in W^{1,2}(Q)$  of (1), (2<sub>k</sub>) such that  $0 \le u_k(x) \le \bar{u}_k(x)$  on Q for each k. It follows from LEMMA 2 that a subsequence of  $\{\bar{u}_k\}$  converges strongly in  $\tilde{W}^{1,2}(Q)$  to a function  $\bar{u}$  satisfying (6), (2). We now show that there exists a constant C > 0 such that

(7) 
$$\int_{Q} |Du_{k}(x)|^{2} r(x) dx \leq C \left[ \int_{\partial Q} \phi_{k}(x)^{2} dSx + \int_{Q} u_{k}(x)^{2} dx \right]$$

 $k=1, 2, \ldots$ , To establish this estimate we take as test functions in (3)

$$v_k(x) = \begin{bmatrix} u_k(x)(\rho(x) - \delta) & \text{for } x \in Q_\delta, \\ 0 & \text{for } x \in Q - Q_\delta, \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ . Letting  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  we obtain

(8) 
$$\int_{Q} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ij}(x, u_{k}) D_{i}u_{k}D_{j}u_{k}\rho dx + \int_{Q} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ij}(x, u_{k}) D_{i}u_{k}u_{k}D_{j}\rho dx + \int_{Q} a_{0}(x) u_{k}^{2}\rho dx = \int_{Q} f(x, u_{k}) u_{k}\rho dx.$$

Integrating by parts we obtain

$$(9) \quad \int_{Q} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ij}(x, u_{k}) D_{i}u_{k}u_{k}D_{j}\rho dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} D_{i}(\int_{0}^{u_{k}^{*}} a_{ij}(x, s) ds) D_{j}\rho dx$$
$$-\frac{1}{2} \int_{Q} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{u_{k}^{*}} D_{i}a_{ij}(x, s) ds D_{j}\rho dx = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial Q} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{\phi_{k}^{*}} a_{ij}(x, s) ds D_{i}\rho D_{i}\rho dS_{x}$$
$$-\frac{1}{2} \int_{Q} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{u_{k}^{*}} a_{ij}(x, s) ds D_{ij}\rho dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{u_{k}^{*}} D_{i}a_{ij}(x, s) ds D_{j}\rho dx.$$

The estimate (7) readily follows from (8), (9) and (b) and the ellipticity condition in(A). Since  $0 \le u_k \le \bar{u}_k$ , the estimate (7) implies that

the sequence  $\{u_k\}$  is bounded in  $\tilde{W}^{1,2}(Q)$ . By Theorem 4.11 in [9],  $\tilde{W}^{1,2}(Q)$  is compactly imbedded in  $L^2(Q)$ . Therefore we may assume that  $u_k$  converges weakly in  $\tilde{W}^{1,2}(Q)$  and strongly in  $L^2(Q)$  to a function u. It is easy to check that u is a solution of (1). By Theorem 1 in [4] there exists a function  $\xi \in L^2(\partial Q)$  such that  $u(x_{\delta}) \rightarrow \xi$  in  $L^2(\partial Q)$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Repeating the argument from Theorem 3 in [4], we show that  $\xi = \phi$  a. e. on  $\partial Q$ . Finally we notice that  $u(x) \leq \bar{u}(x)$  on Q.

We mention here that for semi-linear elliptic equations in the case of  $C^{2,\alpha}$ -solutions, the result of this type is essentially due to Amann [1].

We also observe that if  $g(x) \le 0$  on Q, then the assumption  $\mathscr{H}_1(g) \ge 1$  should be dropped.

To obtain the existence result when  $\mathscr{H}_1(g) = \overline{\mu}(g)$  we replace the inequality  $\mathscr{H}_1(g) \ge 1$  in (b) by  $\mathscr{H}_1(g) > 1$ .

THEOREM 2. Suppose that the nonlinearity f(x, u) satisifies (a) and (b) with  $\mathscr{H}_1(g) > 1$ . If  $\mathscr{H}_1(g) = \overline{\mu}(g)$ ,  $\phi \in L^2(\partial Q)$  and  $\phi \equiv 0$ , then the problem (1), (2) admits at least one positive solution.

The proof is based on modifications of LEMMAS 1 and 2 which continue to hold in the case  $\mathscr{H}_1(m) = \overline{\mu}(m)$  provided  $\mu < \mathscr{H}_1(m)$ .

It is worthwhile to notice that in the case  $\phi \equiv 0$  on  $\partial Q$ , the assumption (a) must be replaced by the stronger condition

 $g(x, s) \ge g_0(x)s$  for  $0 < s < s_0$ ,

for some  $s_0 > 0$ , with  $\mathscr{H}_2(g_0) \le 1$ , where  $\mathscr{H}_2(g_0) = \sup_{v \in L_2(Q)} \lambda_1(v_1, g_0)$ . Here  $\lambda_1(v_1, g_0)$  denotes the first eigenvalue of (EVP) with  $m = g_0$  (see [7]). Then according to [2] and [7], for each r > 0 there exists a positive eigenfunction w, with  $\|w\|_{L^2} = r$ , of the problem  $Lu = \lambda g_0(x)u$  in Q, u(x) = 0 on  $\partial Q$  for some  $\mathscr{H}_1(g_0) \le \lambda \le \mathscr{H}_2(g_0)$ . It turns out that w, with r sufficiently small, is a suitable subsolution of the problem (1), (2). This also requires some stronger assumptions on  $a_{ij}$ , c and  $g_0$  to ensure that the outward normal derivative  $\frac{dw}{dv}$  is negative on  $\partial Q$ . Since w > 0 on Q, the corresponding non-nogative solution of (1), (2) is non-trivial (for details see [7]).

Examples of functions  $f: Q \times R \rightarrow R$  satisfying the conditions (a) and (b) can be found in [7] and [8].

### References

- H. AMANN, Fixed point equations and nonlinear eigenvalue problems in ordered Banach spaces, SIAM Review, 18(2) (1976), 620-709.
- [2] L. BOCCARDO, Positive eigenfunctions for a class of quasi-linear operators, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. (5) 18-B (1981), 951-959.

- [3] J. CHABROWSKI and B. THOMPSON, On the boundary values of the solutions of linear elliptic equations, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. 27(1) (1983), 1-30.
- [4] J. CHABROWSKI, On boundary values of solutions of quasi-linear partial differential equation of elliptic type, Rocky Mountain J. Math. 16(2), (1986), 223-236.
- [5] J. CHABROWSKI, On the Dirichlet problem for a quasi-linear elliptic equation, Rend. Circ. Mat, Palermo 35 (1986), 159-168.
- [6] J. CHABROWSKI, On the solvability of the Dirichlet problem for non-linear elliptic equation, to appear in J. d' Analyse Mathématique.
- [7] P. DRÁBEK, Positive solutions of some quasi-linear elliptic problem, Coment. Math. Univ. Carolinae, 24(2) (1983), 267-279.
- [8] D. G. de FIGUEIREDO, Positive solutions of semilinear elliptic problems, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 957 Springer Verlag (1981), 34-87.
- [9] J. DEUEL and P. HESS, A criterion for the existence of solutions of non-linear elliptic boundary value problems, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A. 74(3), 1974/75, 49-54.
- [10] D. GILBARG, N. S. TRUDINGER, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, Grundlehren der matematischen Wissenschaften 224, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York Tokyo (1983), Second edition.
- [11] R. D. MEYER, Some embedding theorems for generalized Sobolev spaces and applications to degenerate elliptic differential operator, J. Math. Mech. 16 (1967), 739-760.

Department of Mathematics The University of Queensland