Singular Dirichlet (p, q) -Equations

Nikolaos S. Papageorgiou and Patrick Winkert

Abstract. We consider a nonlinear Dirichlet problem driven by the (p, q) -Laplacian and with a reaction having the combined effects of a singular term and of a parametric $(p - 1)$ -superlinear perturbation. We prove a bifurcation-type result describing the changes in the set of positive solutions as the parameter $\lambda > 0$ varies. Moreover, we prove the existence of a minimal positive solution u_λ^* and study the monotonicity and continuity properties of the map $\lambda \rightarrow u_\lambda^*$.

Mathematics Subject Classification. 35J20, 35J75, 35J92.

Keywords. Positive cone, nonlinear regularity, truncations and comparisons, minimal positive solutions, nonlinear maximum principle.

1. Introduction

In a recent paper, the authors [15] studied the following singular parametric p -Laplacian Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u &= u^{-\eta} + \lambda f(x, u) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ u &> 0, \quad \lambda > 0, \quad 0 < \eta < 1, \quad 1 < p. \end{aligned}$$

They proved a result describing the dependence of the set of positive solutions as the parameter $\lambda > 0$ varies, assuming that $f(x, \cdot)$ is $(p - 1)$ -superlinear.

In the present paper, we consider a singular parametric Dirichlet problem driven by the (p, q) -Laplacian, that is, the sum of a p -Laplacian and of a q -Laplacian with $1 < q < p$. To be more precise, the problem under consideration is the following

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u - \Delta_q u &= u^{-\eta} + \lambda f(x, u) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ u &> 0, \quad \lambda > 0, \quad 0 < \eta < 1, \quad 1 < q < p, \end{aligned} \tag{P_\lambda}$$

where $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded domain with a C^2 -boundary $\partial\Omega$. In this problem, the differential operator is not homogeneous and so many of the techniques

used in Papageorgiou–Winkert [15] are not applicable here. More precisely, in the proof of Proposition 3.1 in [15], the homogeneity of the p -Laplacian is crucial in the argument. It provides naturally an upper solution $\bar{u}$ which is an appropriate multiple of the unique solution $e \in \text{int}(C_0^1(\Omega)_+)$ of problem (3.2) in [15] (see also the argument in (3.7)). In our setting, this is no longer possible since the differential operator, the (p, q) -Laplacian, is not homogeneous. This makes our proof here of the fact that $\mathcal{L} \neq \emptyset$ (existence of admissible parameters, see Proposition 3.1) more involved and requires some preparation which involves Propositions 2.3 and 2.4. Moreover, the proof that the critical parameter $\lambda^* > 0$ is finite differs for the same reason and here is more involved and requires the use of a different strong comparison principle. In [15] (see Proposition 3.6) this is done easily since we can use the spectrum of $(-\Delta_p, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ and in particular the principal eigenvalue $\hat{\lambda}_1 > 0$ thanks to the homogeneity of the differential operator (see (3.25) in [15]). This reasoning fails in our setting and leads to a different geometry near zero (compare hypothesis H(iv) in [15] with hypothesis H(iv) in this paper). Furthermore, we now need to employ a different comparison argument based on a recent strong comparison principle due to Papageorgiou–Rădulescu–Repovš [12]. In addition, the proof of Proposition 3.7 in [15] cannot be extended to our problem (see the part from (3.42) and below). The presence of the q -Laplacian leads to difficulties. For this reason, our superlinearity condition (see hypothesis H(iii)) differs from the one used in [15]. However, we stress that both go beyond the classical Ambrosetti–Rabinowitz condition.

For the parametric perturbation of the singular term, $\lambda f(\cdot, \cdot)$ with $f: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we assume that f is a Carathéodory function, that is, $x \mapsto f(x, s)$ is measurable for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \mapsto f(x, s)$ is continuous for almost all (a. a.) $x \in \Omega$. Moreover we assume that $f(x, \cdot)$ exhibits $(p-1)$ -superlinear growth as $s \rightarrow +\infty$ but it need not satisfy the usual Ambrosetti–Rabinowitz condition (the AR-condition for short) in such cases. Applying variational tools from critical point theory along with suitable truncation and comparison techniques, we prove a bifurcation-type result as in [15], which describes in a precise way the dependence of the set of positive solutions as the parameter $\lambda > 0$ changes.

In this direction we mention the recent works of Papageorgiou–Rădulescu–Repovš [12] and Papageorgiou–Vetro–Vetro [14] which also deal with nonlinear singular parametric Dirichlet problems. In these works the parameter multiplies the singular term. Indeed, in Papageorgiou–Rădulescu–Repovš [12] the equation is driven by a nonhomogeneous differential operator and in the reaction we have the competing effects of a parametric singular term and of a $(p-1)$ -superlinear perturbation. In Papageorgiou–Vetro–Vetro [14] the equation is driven by the $(p, 2)$ -Laplacian and in the reaction we have the competing effects of a parametric singular term and of a $(p-1)$ -linear, resonant perturbation. The work of Papageorgiou–Vetro–Vetro [14] was continued by Bai–Motreanu–Zeng [2] where the authors examine the continuity properties with respect to the parameter of the solution multifunction.

Boundary value problems monitored by a combination of differential operators of different nature (such as (p, q) -equations), arise in many mathematical processes. We refer, for example, to the works of Bahrouni–Rădulescu–Repovš [1] (transonic flows), Benci–D’Avenia–Fortunato–Pisani [3] (quantum physics), Cherfil–Il’yasov [4] (reaction diffusion systems) and Zhikov [19] (elasticity theory). We also mention the survey paper of Rădulescu [18] on anisotropic (p, q) -equations.

2. Preliminaries and Hypotheses

The main spaces which we will be using in the study of problem (P_λ) are the Sobolev space $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and the Banach space $C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$. By $\|\cdot\|$ we denote the norm of the Sobolev space $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and because of the Poincaré inequality, we have

$$\|u\| = \|\nabla u\|_p \quad \text{for all } u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega),$$

where $\|\cdot\|_p$ denotes norm in $L^p(\Omega)$ and also in $L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$. From the context it will be clear which one is used.

The Banach space

$$C_0^1(\overline{\Omega}) = \{u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) : u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$$

is an ordered Banach space with positive cone

$$C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ = \{u \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega}) : u(x) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \overline{\Omega}\}.$$

This cone has a nonempty interior given by

$$\text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+) = \left\{ u \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ : u(x) > 0 \text{ for all } x \in \Omega, \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x) < 0 \text{ for all } x \in \partial\Omega \right\},$$

where $n(\cdot)$ stands for the outward unit normal on $\partial\Omega$.

For every $r \in (1, \infty)$, let $A_r : W_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{-1,r'}(\Omega) = W_0^{1,r}(\Omega)^*$ with $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r'} = 1$ be the nonlinear map defined by

$$\langle A_r(u), h \rangle = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{r-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla h \, dx \quad \text{for all } u, h \in W_0^{1,r}(\Omega). \quad (2.1)$$

From Gasiński–Papageorgiou [5, Problem 2.192, p. 279] we have the following properties of A_r .

Proposition 2.1. *The map $A_r : W_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{-1,r'}(\Omega)$ defined in (2.1) is bounded, that is, it maps bounded sets to bounded sets, continuous, strictly monotone, hence maximal monotone and it is of type $(S)_+$, that is,*

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } W_0^{1,r}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A_r(u_n), u_n - u \rangle \leq 0,$$

imply $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $W_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$.

For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we set $s^\pm = \max\{\pm s, 0\}$ and for $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ we define $u^\pm(\cdot) = u(\cdot)^\pm$. It is well known that

$$u^\pm \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \quad |u| = u^+ + u^-, \quad u = u^+ - u^-.$$

For $u, v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with $u(x) \leq v(x)$ for a. a. $x \in \Omega$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} [u, v] &= \{h \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) : u(x) \leq h(x) \leq v(x) \text{ for a. a. } x \in \Omega\}, \\ [u] &= \{h \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) : u(x) \leq h(x) \text{ for a. a. } x \in \Omega\}. \end{aligned}$$

Given a set $S \subseteq W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ we say that it is “downward directed”, if for any given $u_1, u_2 \in S$ we can find $u \in S$ such that $u \leq u_1$ and $u \leq u_2$.

If $h_1, h_2: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are two measurable functions, then we write $h_1 \prec h_2$ if and only if for every compact $K \subseteq \Omega$ we have $0 < c_K \leq h_2(x) - h_1(x)$ for a. a. $x \in K$.

If X is a Banach space and $\varphi \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$, then we define

$$K_\varphi = \{u \in X : \varphi'(u) = 0\}$$

being the critical set of φ . Furthermore, we say that φ satisfies the Cerami condition (C-condition for short), if every sequence $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq X$ such that $\{\varphi(u_n)\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is bounded and such that $(1 + \|u_n\|_X) \varphi'(u_n) \rightarrow 0$ in X^* as $n \rightarrow \infty$, admits a strongly convergent subsequence.

Our Hypotheses on the perturbation $f: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are the following:

H: $f: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Carathéodory function such that $f(x, 0) = 0$ for a. a. $x \in \Omega$ and

(i)

$$f(x, s) \leq a(x) (1 + s^{r-1})$$

for a. a. $x \in \Omega$, for all $s \geq 0$, with $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $p < r < p^*$, where p^* denotes the critical Sobolev exponent with respect to p given by

$$p^* = \begin{cases} \frac{Np}{N-p} & \text{if } p < N, \\ +\infty & \text{if } N \leq p; \end{cases}$$

(ii) if $F(x, s) = \int_0^s f(x, t) dt$, then

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F(x, s)}{s^p} = +\infty \quad \text{uniformly for a. a. } x \in \Omega;$$

(iii) there exists $\tau \in \left((r-p) \max\left\{\frac{N}{p}, 1\right\}, p^*\right)$ with $\tau > q$ such that

$$0 < c_0 \leq \liminf_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(x, s)s - pF(x, s)}{s^\tau} \quad \text{uniformly for a. a. } x \in \Omega;$$

(iv)

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x, s)}{s^{q-1}} = 0 \quad \text{uniformly for a. a. } x \in \Omega$$

and there exists $\tau \in (q, p)$ such that

$$\liminf_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x, s)}{s^{\tau-1}} \geq \hat{\eta} > 0 \quad \text{uniformly for a. a. } x \in \Omega;$$

(v) for every $\hat{s} > 0$ we have

$$f(x, s) \geq m_{\hat{s}} > 0$$

for a.a. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $s \geq \hat{s}$ and for every $\rho > 0$ there exists $\hat{\xi}_\rho > 0$ such that the function

$$s \rightarrow f(x, s) + \hat{\xi}_\rho s^{p-1}$$

is nondecreasing on $[0, \rho]$ for a.a. $x \in \Omega$.

Remark 2.2. Since we are looking for positive solutions and the hypotheses above concern the positive semiaxis $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, +\infty)$, without any loss generality, we may assume that

$$f(x, s) = 0 \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and for all } s \leq 0. \quad (2.2)$$

Hypotheses H(ii), H(iii) imply that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(x, s)}{s^{p-1}} = +\infty \quad \text{uniformly for a.a. } x \in \Omega.$$

Hence, the perturbation $f(x, \cdot)$ is $(p-1)$ -superlinear. In the literature, superlinear equations are usually treated using the AR-condition. In our case, taking (2.2) into account, we refer to a unilateral version of this condition which says that there exist $M > 0$ and $\mu > p$ such that

$$0 < \mu F(x, s) \leq f(x, s)s \quad \text{for a. a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and for all } s \geq M, \quad (2.3)$$

$$0 < \text{ess inf}_\Omega F(\cdot, M). \quad (2.4)$$

If we integrate (2.3) and use (2.4), we obtain the weaker condition

$$c_1 s^\mu \leq F(x, s) \quad \text{for a. a. } x \in \Omega, \text{ for all } s \geq M \text{ and for some } c_1 > 0.$$

This implies, due to (2.3), that

$$c_1 s^{\mu-1} \leq f(x, s) \quad \text{for a. a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and for all } s \geq M.$$

We see that the AR-condition is dictating that $f(x, \cdot)$ eventually has $(\mu-1)$ -polynomial growth. Here, instead of the AR-condition, see (2.3), (2.4), we employ a less restrictive behavior near $+\infty$, see hypothesis H(iii). This way we are able to incorporate in our framework superlinear nonlinearities with “slower” growth near $+\infty$. For example, consider the function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (for the sake of simplicity we drop the x -dependence) defined by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} s^{\mu-1} & \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq 1, \\ s^{p-1} \ln(x) + s^{\tilde{s}-1} & \text{if } 1 < s \end{cases}$$

with $q < \mu < p$ and $\tilde{s} < p$, see (2.2). This function satisfies hypotheses H, but fails to satisfy the AR-condition.

By a solution of (P_λ) we mean a function $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $u \geq 0$, $u \neq 0$, such that $uh \in L^1(\Omega)$ for all $h \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and

$$\langle A_p(u), h \rangle + \langle A_q(u), h \rangle = \int_\Omega u^{-\eta} h \, dx + \lambda \int_\Omega f(x, u) h \, dx \quad \text{for all } h \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

The energy functional $\varphi_\lambda: W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the problem (P_λ) is given by

$$\varphi_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{p} \|\nabla u\|_p^p + \frac{1}{q} \|\nabla u\|_q^q - \frac{1}{1-\eta} \int_\Omega (u^+)^{1-\eta} \, dx - \lambda \int_\Omega F(x, u^+) \, dx$$

for all $h \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

We can find solutions of (P_λ) among the critical points of φ_λ . The problem that we face is that because of the third term, so the singular one, the energy functional φ_λ is not C^1 . So, we cannot apply directly the minimax theorems of the critical point theory on φ_λ . Solving related auxiliary Dirichlet problems and then using suitable truncation and comparison techniques, we are able to overcome this difficulty, isolate the singularity and deal with C^1 -functionals on which the classical critical point theory can be used.

To this end, first we consider the following purely singular Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u - \Delta_q u &= u^{-\eta} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ u &> 0, \quad 0 < \eta < 1, 1 < q < p. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

From Proposition 10 of Papageorgiou–Rădulescu–Repovš [12] we have the following result concerning problem (2.5).

Proposition 2.3. *Problem (2.5) admits a unique solution $\underline{u} \in \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+)$.*

From the Lemma in Lazer-McKenna [9] we know that

$$\underline{u}^{-\eta} \in L^1(\Omega).$$

Moreover, from Hardy's inequality we have

$$\underline{u}^{-\eta} h \in L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_\Omega |\underline{u}^{-\eta} h| \, dx \leq \hat{c} \|h\|$$

for all $h \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. It follows that $\underline{u}^{-\eta} + 1 \in W^{-1,p'}(\Omega) = W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^*$.

So, we can consider a second auxiliary Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u - \Delta_q u &= \underline{u}^{-\eta} + 1 && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ 0 &< \eta < 1, \quad 1 < q < p. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

We show that (2.6) has a unique solution.

Proposition 2.4. *Problem (2.6) admits a unique solution $\overline{u} \in \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+)$.*

Proof. Consider the operator $L: W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$ defined by

$$L(u) = A_p(u) + A_q(u) \quad \text{for all } u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

This operator is continuous, strictly monotone, hence maximal monotone and coercive. Since $\underline{u}^{-\eta} + 1 \in W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$ (see the comments after Proposition 2.3), we can find $\overline{u} \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $\overline{u} \neq 0$ such that

$$L(\overline{u}) = \underline{u}^{-\eta} + 1.$$

The strict monotonicity of L implies the uniqueness of $\bar{u}$ while Theorem B.1 of Giacomoni-Schindler-Takáč [7] implies that $\bar{u} \in C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+ \setminus \{0\}$. Furthermore, we have

$$\Delta_p \bar{u}(x) + \Delta_q \bar{u}(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{for a. a. } x \in \Omega.$$

Hence, from the nonlinear maximum principle, see Pucci-Serrin [17, pp. 111 and 120], we conclude that $\bar{u} \in \text{int}(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+)$. $\square$

3. Positive Solutions

We introduce the following two sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \{\lambda > 0 : \text{problem } (P_\lambda) \text{ has a positive solution}\}, \\ \mathcal{S}_\lambda &= \{u : u \text{ is a positive solution of problem } (P_\lambda)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.1. *If hypotheses H hold, then $\mathcal{L} \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let $\bar{u} \in \text{int}(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+)$ be as in Proposition 2.4. Hypothesis H(i) implies that $f(\cdot, \bar{u}(\cdot)) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. So, we can find $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq \lambda_0 f(x, \bar{u}(x)) \leq 1 \quad \text{for a. a. } x \in \Omega. \quad (3.1)$$

From the weak comparison principle (see Pucci-Serrin [17, Theorem 3.4.1, p. 61]), we have $\underline{u} \leq \bar{u}$. So, for given $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$, we can define the following truncation of the reaction of problem (P_λ)

$$g_\lambda(x, s) = \begin{cases} \underline{u}(x)^{-\eta} + \lambda f(x, \underline{u}(x)) & \text{if } s < \underline{u}(x), \\ s^{-\eta} + \lambda f(x, s) & \text{if } \underline{u}(x) \leq s \leq \bar{u}(x), \\ \bar{u}(x)^{-\eta} + \lambda f(x, \bar{u}(x)) & \text{if } \bar{u}(x) < s. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

This is a Carathéodory function. We set $G_\lambda(x, s) = \int_0^s g_\lambda(x, t) dt$ and consider the C^1 -functional $\psi_\lambda : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\psi_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{p} \|\nabla u\|_p^p + \frac{1}{q} \|\nabla u\|_q^q - \int_\Omega G_\lambda(x, u) dx \quad \text{for all } u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega),$$

see also Papageorgiou-Smyrlis [13, Proposition 3]. From (3.2) we see that ψ_λ is coercive. Also, using the Sobolev embedding theorem, we see that ψ_λ is sequentially weakly lower semicontinuous. So, by the Weierstraß-Tonelli theorem, we can find $u_\lambda \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\psi_\lambda(u_\lambda) = \min \left[\psi_\lambda(u) : u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \right].$$

This means, in particular, that $\psi'_\lambda(u_\lambda) = 0$, which gives

$$\langle A_p(u_\lambda), h \rangle + \langle A_q(u_\lambda), h \rangle = \int_\Omega g_\lambda(x, u_\lambda) h dx \quad \text{for all } h \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega). \quad (3.3)$$

First, we choose $h = (\underline{u} - u_\lambda)^+ \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ in (3.3). This yields, because of (3.2), $f \geq 0$ and Proposition 2.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle A_p(u_\lambda), (\underline{u} - u_\lambda)^+ \right\rangle + \left\langle A_q(u_\lambda), (\underline{u} - u_\lambda)^+ \right\rangle \\ &= \int_{\Omega} [\underline{u}^{-\eta} + \lambda f(x, \underline{u})] (\underline{u} - u_\lambda)^+ \, dx \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} \underline{u}^{-\eta} (\underline{u} - u_\lambda)^+ \, dx \\ &= \left\langle A_p(\underline{u}), (\underline{u} - u_\lambda)^+ \right\rangle + \left\langle A_q(\underline{u}), (\underline{u} - u_\lambda)^+ \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\{\underline{u} > u_\lambda\}} (|\nabla \underline{u}|^{p-2} \nabla \underline{u} - |\nabla u_\lambda|^{p-2} \nabla u_\lambda) \cdot (\nabla \underline{u} - \nabla u_\lambda) \, dx \\ &+ \int_{\{\underline{u} > u_\lambda\}} (|\nabla \underline{u}|^{q-2} \nabla \underline{u} - |\nabla u_\lambda|^{q-2} \nabla u_\lambda) \cdot (\nabla \underline{u} - \nabla u_\lambda) \, dx \\ &\leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which means $|\{\underline{u} > u_\lambda\}|_N = 0$ with $|\cdot|_N$ being the Lebesgue measure of $\mathbb{R}^N$. Hence,

$$\underline{u} \leq u_\lambda. \quad (3.4)$$

Next, we choose $h = (u_\lambda - \bar{u})^+ \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ in (3.3). Applying (3.2), (3.4), (3.1) and recall that $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle A_p(u_\lambda), (u_\lambda - \bar{u})^+ \right\rangle + \left\langle A_q(u_\lambda), (u_\lambda - \bar{u})^+ \right\rangle \\ &= \int_{\Omega} [\bar{u}^{-\eta} + \lambda f(x, \bar{u})] (u_\lambda - \bar{u})^+ \, dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} [\underline{u}^{-\eta} + 1] (u_\lambda - \bar{u})^+ \, dx \\ &= \left\langle A_p(\bar{u}), (u_\lambda - \bar{u})^+ \right\rangle + \left\langle A_q(\bar{u}), (u_\lambda - \bar{u})^+ \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

From this we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\{u_\lambda > \bar{u}\}} (|\nabla u_\lambda|^{p-2} \nabla u_\lambda - |\nabla \bar{u}|^{p-2} \nabla \bar{u}) \cdot (\nabla u_\lambda - \nabla \bar{u}) \, dx \\ &+ \int_{\{u_\lambda > \bar{u}\}} (|\nabla u_\lambda|^{q-2} \nabla u_\lambda - |\nabla \bar{u}|^{q-2} \nabla \bar{u}) \cdot (\nabla u_\lambda - \nabla \bar{u}) \, dx \\ &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

and so $|\{u_\lambda > \bar{u}\}|_N = 0$. Thus, $u_\lambda \leq \bar{u}$. So, we have proved that

$$u_\lambda \in [\underline{u}, \bar{u}]. \quad (3.5)$$

Then, (3.5), (3.2) and (3.3) imply that $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda$ and so $(0, \lambda_0] \subseteq \mathcal{L} \neq \emptyset$. $\square$

Proposition 3.2. *If hypotheses H hold and $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$, then $\underline{u} \leq u$ for all $u \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda$.*

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda$. On $\Omega \times (0, +\infty)$ we introduce the Carathéodory function $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ defined by

$$k(x, s) = \begin{cases} s^{-\eta} & \text{if } 0 < s \leq u(x), \\ u(x)^{-\eta} & \text{if } u(x) < s \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

for all $(x, s) \in \Omega \times (0, +\infty)$. Then we consider the following Dirichlet (p, q) -problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u - \Delta_q u &= k(x, u) && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ u &> 0, \quad 1 < q < p. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 10 of Papageorgiou–Rădulescu–Repovš [12] implies that this problem admits a solution

$$\tilde{u} \in \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \right). \quad (3.7)$$

This means

$$\langle A_p(\tilde{u}), h \rangle + \langle A_q(\tilde{u}), h \rangle = \int_{\Omega} k(x, \tilde{u}) h \, dx \quad \text{for all } h \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega). \quad (3.8)$$

Choosing $h = (\tilde{u} - u)^+ \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ in (3.8) and applying (3.6), $f \geq 0$ and $u \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle A_p(\tilde{u}), (\tilde{u} - u)^+ \right\rangle + \left\langle A_q(\tilde{u}), (\tilde{u} - u)^+ \right\rangle \\ &= \int_{\Omega} u^{-\eta} (\tilde{u} - u)^+ \, dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} [u^{-\eta} + \lambda f(x, u)] (\tilde{u} - u)^+ \, dx \\ &= \left\langle A_p(u), (\tilde{u} - u)^+ \right\rangle + \left\langle A_q(u), (\tilde{u} - u)^+ \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\{\tilde{u} > u\}} (|\nabla \tilde{u}|^{p-2} \nabla \tilde{u} - |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) \cdot (\nabla \tilde{u} - \nabla u) \, dx \\ &+ \int_{\{\tilde{u} > u\}} (|\nabla \tilde{u}|^{q-2} \nabla \tilde{u} - |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) \cdot (\nabla \tilde{u} - \nabla u) \, dx \\ &\leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which means $|\{\tilde{u} > u\}|_N = 0$. Thus,

$$\tilde{u} \leq u. \quad (3.9)$$

From (3.9), (3.7), (3.6), (3.8) and Proposition 2.3 it follows that $\tilde{u} = u$. Therefore, $\underline{u} \leq u$ for all $u \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda$. $\square$

As before, using Theorem B.1 of Giacomoni-Schindler-Takáč [7], we have the following result about the solution set S_λ .

Proposition 3.3. *If hypotheses H hold and $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$, then $S_\lambda \subseteq \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \right)$.*

Let $\lambda^* = \sup \mathcal{L}$.

Proposition 3.4. *If hypotheses H hold, then $\lambda^* < \infty$.*

Proof. Hypotheses H(ii), (iii) imply that we can find $M > 0$ such that

$$f(x, s) \geq s^{p-1} \quad \text{for a. a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and for all } s \geq M.$$

Moreover, hypothesis H(iv) implies that there exist $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\hat{\eta}_1 \in (0, \hat{\eta})$ such that

$$f(x, s) \geq \hat{\eta}_1 s^{\tau-1} \geq \hat{\eta}_1 s^{p-1}$$

for a. a. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $0 \leq s \leq \delta$ since $\tau < p$ and $\delta < 1$. This yields

$$\frac{1}{\hat{\eta}_1} f(x, s) \geq s^{p-1} \quad \text{for a. a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and for all } 0 \leq s \leq \delta.$$

In addition, on account of hypothesis H(v) we can find $\tilde{\lambda} > 0$ large enough such that

$$\tilde{\lambda} f(x, s) \geq M^{p-1} \quad \text{for a. a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and for all } \delta \leq s \leq M.$$

Therefore, taking into account the calculations above, there exists $\hat{\lambda} > 0$ large enough such that

$$s^{p-1} \leq \hat{\lambda} f(x, s) \quad \text{for a. a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and for all } s \geq 0. \quad (3.10)$$

Let $\lambda > \hat{\lambda}$ and suppose that $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$. Then we can find $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda \subseteq \text{int}(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+)$, see Proposition 3.3. Let $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$ with C^2 -boundary $\partial\Omega'$. Then $m_0 = \min_{\bar{\Omega}'} u_\lambda > 0$ since $u_\lambda \in \text{int}(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+)$. Let $\rho = \|u_\lambda\|_\infty$ and let $\hat{\xi}_\rho > 0$ be as postulated by hypothesis H(v). For $\delta > 0$, we set $m_0^\delta = m_0 + \delta$. Applying (3.10), hypothesis H(v) and $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda$, we have for a. a. $x \in \Omega'$

$$\begin{aligned} & -\Delta_p m_0^\delta - \Delta_q m_0^\delta + \lambda \hat{\xi}_\rho (m_0^\delta)^{p-1} - \lambda (m_0^\delta)^{-\eta} \\ & \leq \lambda \hat{\xi}_\rho m_0^{p-1} + \chi(\delta) \quad \text{with } \chi(\delta) \rightarrow 0^+ \text{ as } \delta \rightarrow 0^+ \\ & \leq [\lambda \hat{\xi}_\rho + 1] m_0^{p-1} + \chi(\delta) \\ & \leq \hat{\lambda} f(x, m_0) + \lambda \hat{\xi}_\rho m_0^{p-1} + \chi(\delta) \\ & = \lambda [f(x, m_0) + \hat{\xi}_\rho m_0^{p-1}] - (\lambda - \hat{\lambda}) f(x, m_0) + \chi(\delta) \\ & \leq \lambda [f(x, u_\lambda(x)) + \hat{\xi}_\rho u_\lambda(x)^{p-1}] \quad \text{for } \delta > 0 \text{ small enough} \\ & = -\Delta_p u_\lambda(x) - \Delta_q u_\lambda(x) + \lambda \hat{\xi}_\rho u_\lambda(x)^{p-1} - \lambda u_\lambda(x)^{-\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for $\delta > 0$ small enough, we will have

$$0 < \hat{\eta} \leq [\lambda - \hat{\lambda}] f(x, m_0) - \chi(\delta) \quad \text{for a. a. } x \in \Omega',$$

see hypothesis H(v). Then, invoking Proposition 6 of Papageorgiou–Rădulescu–Repovš [12], it follows that

$$m_0^\delta < u_\lambda(x) \quad \text{for a. a. } x \in \Omega' \text{ and for } \delta > 0 \text{ small enough,}$$

which contradicts the definition of m_0 . Therefore, $\lambda \notin \mathcal{L}$ and so we conclude that $\lambda^* \leq \hat{\lambda} < \infty$. $\square$

Next, we are going to show that $\mathcal{L}$ is an interval. So, we have

$$(0, \lambda^*) \subseteq \mathcal{L} \subseteq (0, \lambda^*].$$

Proposition 3.5. *If hypotheses H hold, $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$ and $0 < \mu < \lambda$, then $\mu \in \mathcal{L}$.*

Proof. Since $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$, we can find $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda \subseteq \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+)$. We know that $\underline{u} \leq u_\lambda$, see Proposition 3.2. So, we can define the following truncation $e_\mu: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the reaction for problem (P_λ)

$$e_\mu(x, s) = \begin{cases} \underline{u}(x)^{-\eta} + \mu f(x, \underline{u}(x)) & \text{if } s < \underline{u}(x), \\ s^{-\eta} + \mu f(x, s) & \text{if } \underline{u}(x) \leq s \leq u_\lambda(x), \\ u_\lambda(x)^{-\eta} + \mu f(x, u_\lambda(x)) & \text{if } u_\lambda(x) < s, \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

which is a Carathéodory function. We set $E_\mu(x, s) = \int_0^s e_\mu(x, t) dt$ and consider the C^1 -functional $\hat{\varphi}_\mu: W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\hat{\varphi}_\mu(u) = \frac{1}{p} \|\nabla u\|_p^p + \frac{1}{q} \|\nabla u\|_q^q - \int_\Omega E_\mu(x, u) dx \quad \text{for all } u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega),$$

see Papageorgiou-Vetro-Vetro [14]. From (3.11) it is clear that $\hat{\varphi}_\mu$ is coercive. Moreover, it is sequentially weakly lower semicontinuous. Therefore, we can find $u_\mu \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\hat{\varphi}_\mu(u_\mu) = \min \left[\hat{\varphi}_\mu(u) : u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \right].$$

In particular, we have $\hat{\varphi}'_\mu(u_\mu) = 0$ which means

$$\langle A_p(u_\mu), h \rangle + \langle A_q(u_\mu), h \rangle = \int_\Omega e_\mu(x, u) h dx \quad \text{for all } h \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega). \quad (3.12)$$

Choosing $h = (\underline{u} - u_\mu)^+ \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ in (3.12) and applying (3.11), $f \geq 0$ and Proposition 2.3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle A_p(u_\mu), (\underline{u} - u_\mu)^+ \right\rangle + \left\langle A_q(u_\mu), (\underline{u} - u_\mu)^+ \right\rangle \\ &= \int_\Omega [\underline{u}^{-\eta} + \mu f(x, \underline{u})] (\underline{u} - u_\mu)^+ dx \\ &\geq \int_\Omega \underline{u}^{-\eta} (\underline{u} - u_\mu)^+ dx \\ &= \left\langle A_p(\underline{u}), (\underline{u} - u_\mu)^+ \right\rangle + \left\langle A_q(\underline{u}), (\underline{u} - u_\mu)^+ \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain $\underline{u} \leq u_\mu$. Furthermore, choosing $h = (u_\mu - u_\lambda)^+ \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ in (3.12) and applying (3.11), $\mu < \lambda$ and $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle A_p(u_\mu), (u_\mu - u_\lambda)^+ \right\rangle + \left\langle A_q(u_\mu), (u_\mu - u_\lambda)^+ \right\rangle \\ &= \int_\Omega [u_\lambda^{-\eta} + \mu f(x, u_\lambda)] (u_\mu - u_\lambda)^+ dx \\ &\leq \int_\Omega [u^{-\eta} + \lambda f(x, u_\lambda)] (u_\mu - u_\lambda)^+ dx \\ &= \left\langle A_p(u_\lambda), (u_\mu - u_\lambda)^+ \right\rangle + \left\langle A_q(u_\lambda), (u_\mu - u_\lambda)^+ \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $u_\mu \leq u_\lambda$ and so we have proved that

$$u_\mu \in [\underline{u}, u_\lambda]. \quad (3.13)$$

From (3.13), (3.11) and (3.12) we infer that

$$u_\mu \in \mathcal{S}_\mu \subseteq \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \right).$$

Thus, $\mu \in \mathcal{L}$. □

A byproduct of the proof above is the following corollary.

Corollary 3.6. *If hypotheses H hold, $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$, $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda \subseteq \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \right)$ and $\mu \in (0, \lambda)$, then $\mu \in \mathcal{L}$ and there exists $u_\mu \in \mathcal{S}_\mu \subseteq \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \right)$ such that $u_\mu \leq u_\lambda$.*

Using the strong comparison principle of Papageorgiou–Rădulescu–Repovš [12] we can improve the conclusion of this corollary as follows.

Proposition 3.7. *If hypotheses H hold, $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$, $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda \subseteq \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \right)$ and $\mu \in (0, \lambda)$, then $\mu \in \mathcal{L}$ and there exists $u_\mu \in \mathcal{S}_\mu \subseteq \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \right)$ such that*

$$u_\lambda - u_\mu \in \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \right).$$

Proof. From Corollary 3.6 we already have that $\mu \in \mathcal{L}$ and we also know that there exists $u_\mu \in \mathcal{S}_\mu \subseteq \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \right)$ such that

$$u_\mu \leq u_\lambda. \quad (3.14)$$

Let $\rho = \|u_\lambda\|_\infty$ and let $\hat{\xi}_\rho > 0$ be as postulated by hypothesis H(v). Applying $u_\mu \in \mathcal{S}_\mu$, (3.14), hypothesis H(v) and $\mu < \lambda$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & -\Delta_p u_\mu(x) - \Delta_q u_\mu(x) + \lambda \hat{\xi}_\rho u_\mu(x)^{p-1} - u_\mu(x)^{-\eta} \\ & = \mu f(x, u_\mu(x)) + \lambda \hat{\xi}_\rho u_\mu(x)^{p-1} \\ & = \lambda \left[f(x, u_\mu(x)) + \hat{\xi}_\rho u_\mu(x)^{p-1} \right] - (\lambda - \mu) f(x, u_\mu(x)) \\ & \leq \lambda \left[f(x, u_\lambda(x)) + \hat{\xi}_\rho u_\lambda(x)^{p-1} \right] \\ & = -\Delta_p u_\lambda(x) - \Delta_q u_\lambda(x) + \lambda \hat{\xi}_\rho u_\lambda(x)^{p-1} - u_\lambda(x)^{-\eta} \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

for a. a. $x \in \Omega$. Since $u_\mu \in \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \right)$, because of hypothesis H(v), we have

$$0 \prec (\lambda - \mu) f(\cdot, u_\mu(\cdot)).$$

Then, from (3.15) and Proposition 7 of Papageorgiou–Rădulescu–Repovš [12] we conclude that $u_\lambda - u_\mu \in \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \right)$. □

Proposition 3.8. *If hypotheses H hold and $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, then problem (P_λ) has at least two positive solutions*

$$u_0, \hat{u} \in \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+ \right), \quad u_0 \leq \hat{u}, \quad u_0 \neq \hat{u}.$$

Proof. Let $\lambda < \vartheta < \lambda^*$. Due to Proposition 3.7, we can find $u_\vartheta \in \mathcal{S}_\vartheta \subseteq \text{int}(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+)$ and $u_0 \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda$ such that

$$u_\vartheta - u_0 \in \text{int}(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+). \quad (3.16)$$

From Proposition 3.2 we know that $\underline{u} \leq u_0$. Therefore, $u_0^{-\eta} \in L^1(\Omega)$. So, we can define the following truncation $w_\lambda: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the reaction in problem (P_λ)

$$w_\lambda(x, s) = \begin{cases} u_0(x)^{-\eta} + \lambda f(x, u_0(x)) & \text{if } s \leq u_0(x), \\ s^{-\eta} + \lambda f(x, s) & \text{if } u_0(x) < s. \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

Also, using (3.16), we can consider the truncation $\hat{w}_\lambda: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of $w_\lambda(x, \cdot)$ defined by

$$\hat{w}_\lambda(x, s) = \begin{cases} w_\lambda(x, s) & \text{if } s \leq u_\vartheta(x), \\ w_\lambda(x, u_\vartheta(x)) & \text{if } u_\vartheta(x) < s. \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

It is clear that both are Carathéodory function. We set

$$W_\lambda(x, s) = \int_0^s w_\lambda(x, t) dt \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{W}_\lambda(x, s) = \int_0^s \hat{w}_\lambda(x, t) dt$$

and consider the C^1 -functionals $\sigma_\lambda, \hat{\sigma}_\lambda: W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_\lambda(u) &= \frac{1}{p} \|\nabla u\|_p^p + \frac{1}{q} \|\nabla u\|_q^q - \int_\Omega W_\lambda(x, u) dx \quad \text{for all } u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \\ \hat{\sigma}_\lambda(u) &= \frac{1}{p} \|\nabla u\|_p^p + \frac{1}{q} \|\nabla u\|_q^q - \int_\Omega \hat{W}_\lambda(x, u) dx \quad \text{for all } u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

From (3.17) and (3.18) it is clear that

$$\sigma_\lambda|_{[0, u_\vartheta]} = \hat{\sigma}_\lambda|_{[0, u_\vartheta]} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma'_\lambda|_{[0, u_\vartheta]} = \hat{\sigma}'_\lambda|_{[0, u_\vartheta]}. \quad (3.19)$$

Using (3.17), (3.18) and the nonlinear regularity theory of Lieberman [10] we obtain that

$$K_{\sigma_\lambda} \subseteq [u_0] \cap \text{int}(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+) \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\hat{\sigma}_\lambda} \subseteq [u_0, u_\vartheta] \cap \text{int}(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+). \quad (3.20)$$

From (3.20) we see that we may assume that

$$K_{\sigma_\lambda} \text{ is finite and } K_{\sigma_\lambda} \cap [u_0, u_\vartheta] = \{u_0\}. \quad (3.21)$$

Otherwise we already have a second positive smooth solution larger than u_0 and so we are done.

From (3.18) and since $u_0^{-\eta} \in L^1(\Omega)$, it is clear that $\hat{\sigma}_\lambda$ is coercive and it is also sequentially weakly lower semicontinuous. Hence, we find its global minimizer $\tilde{u}_0 \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\hat{\sigma}_\lambda(\tilde{u}_0) = \min \left[\hat{\sigma}_\lambda(u) : u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \right].$$

By (3.20) we see that $\tilde{u}_0 \in K_{\hat{\sigma}_\lambda} \subseteq [u_0, u_\vartheta] \cap \text{int}(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+)$. Then, (3.19) and (3.21) imply $\tilde{u}_0 = u_0 \in \text{int}(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+)$. Finally, from (3.16) we obtain that u_0 is a local $C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})$ -minimizer of σ_λ and then by Gasiński-Papageorgiou [6] we have that

$$u_0 \text{ is also a local } W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)\text{-minimizer of } \sigma_\lambda. \quad (3.22)$$

From (3.22), (3.21) and Theorem 5.7.6 of Papageorgiou–Rădulescu–Repovš [11, p. 449] we know that we can find $\rho \in (0, 1)$ small enough such that

$$\sigma_\lambda(u_0) < \inf [\sigma_\lambda(u) : \|u - u_0\| = \rho] = m_\lambda. \quad (3.23)$$

Hypothesis H(ii) implies that if $u \in \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+)$, then

$$\sigma_\lambda(tu) \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (3.24)$$

Claim: The functional σ_λ satisfies the C-condition.

Consider a sequence $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$|\sigma_\lambda(u_n)| \leq c_6 \quad \text{for some } c_6 > 0 \text{ and for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (3.25)$$

$$(1 + \|u_n\|)\sigma'_\lambda(u_n) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } W^{-1,p'}(\Omega) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.26)$$

From (3.26) we have

$$\left| \langle A_p(u_n), h \rangle + \langle A_q(u_n), h \rangle - \int_\Omega w_\lambda(x, u_n) h \, dx \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_n \|h\|}{1 + \|u_n\|} \quad (3.27)$$

for all $h \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0^+$. We choose $h = -u_n^- \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ in (3.27) and obtain, by applying (3.17), that

$$\|u_n^-\|^p \leq c_7 \quad \text{for some } c_7 > 0 \text{ and for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This shows that

$$\{u_n^-\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \text{ is bounded.} \quad (3.28)$$

From (3.25) and (3.28) it follows that

$$\|\nabla u_n^+\|_p^p + \frac{p}{q} \|\nabla u_n^+\|_q^q - \int_\Omega pF(x, u_n^+) \, dx \leq c_8 [1 + \|u_n^+\|_\tau] \quad (3.29)$$

for some $c_8 > 0$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, see (3.17). Moreover, choosing $h = u_n^+ \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ in (3.27), we obtain using (3.17)

$$-\|\nabla u_n^+\|_p^p - \|\nabla u_n^+\|_q^q + \int_\Omega f(x, u_n^+) u_n^+ \, dx \leq c_9 \quad (3.30)$$

for some $c_9 > 0$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Adding (3.29) and (3.30) and recall that $q < p$, gives

$$\int_\Omega [f(x, u_n^+) u_n^+ - pF(x, u_n^+)] \, dx \leq c_{10} [1 + \|u_n^+\|_\tau] \quad (3.31)$$

for some $c_{10} > 0$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Taking hypotheses H(i), (iii) into account, we see that we can find constants $c_{11}, c_{12} > 0$ such that

$$c_{11} s^\tau - c_{12} \leq f(x, s)s - pF(x, s) \quad \text{for a. a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and for all } s \geq 0. \quad (3.32)$$

Applying (3.32) in (3.31), we infer that

$$\|u_n^+\|_\tau^{\tau-1} \leq c_{13}$$

for some $c_{13} > 0$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore,

$$\{u_n^+\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq L^\tau(\Omega) \text{ is bounded.} \quad (3.33)$$

First assume that $p \neq N$. From hypothesis H(iii), we see that we can always assume that $\tau < r < p^*$. So, we can find $t \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1-t}{\tau} + \frac{t}{p^*}. \quad (3.34)$$

Invoking the interpolation inequality, see Papageorgiou-Winkert [16, Proposition 2.3.17, p. 116], we have

$$\|u_n^+\|_r \leq \|u_n^+\|_\tau^{1-r} \|u_n^+\|_{p^*}^t.$$

Hence, by (3.33),

$$\|u_n^+\|_r^r \leq c_{14} \|u_n^+\|^{tr} \quad (3.35)$$

for some $c_{14} > 0$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We choose $h = u_n^+ \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ in (3.27) to get

$$\|u_n^+\|^p \leq \int_\Omega w_\lambda(x, u_n^+) u_n^+ dx.$$

Then, from (3.17) and hypothesis H(i), it follows that

$$\|u_n^+\|^p \leq \int_\Omega c_{15} [1 + (u_n^+)^r] dx$$

for some $c_{15} > 0$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies

$$\|u_n^+\|^p \leq c_{16} [1 + \|u_n^+\|_r^r]$$

for some $c_{16} > 0$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Finally, from (3.35), we then obtain

$$\|u_n^+\|^p \leq c_{17} [1 + \|u_n^+\|^{tr}] \quad (3.36)$$

for some $c_{17} > 0$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

If $N < p$, then $p^* = \infty$ and so from (3.34) we have $tr = r - \tau$, which by hypothesis H(iii) leads to $tr < p$.

If $N > p$, then $p^* = \frac{Np}{N-p}$. From (3.34) it follows

$$tr = \frac{(r - \tau)p^*}{p^* - \tau},$$

which implies

$$tr = \frac{(r - \tau)Np}{N(p - \tau) + \tau p} < p.$$

Therefore, from (3.36) we infer that

$$\{u_n^+\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \text{ is bounded.} \quad (3.37)$$

If $N = p$, then by the Sobolev embedding theorem, we know that $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^s(\Omega)$ continuously for all $1 \leq s < \infty$. So, for the argument above to work, we need to replace p^* by $s > r > \tau$ in (3.34) which yields

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1-t}{\tau} + \frac{t}{s}.$$

Then, by hypothesis H(iii), we obtain

$$tr = \frac{(r - \tau)s}{s - \tau} \rightarrow r - \tau < p \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow +\infty.$$

We choose $s > r$ large enough so that $tr < p$. Then, we reach again (3.37).

From (3.37) and (3.28) it follows that

$$\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \text{ is bounded.}$$

So, we may assume that

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad u_n \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^r(\Omega). \quad (3.38)$$

In (3.27) we choose $h = u_n - u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, pass to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and use (3.38). This gives

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\langle A_p(u_n), u_n - u \rangle + \langle A_q(u_n), u_n - u \rangle] = 0.$$

The monotonicity of A_q implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\langle A_p(u_n), u_n - u \rangle + \langle A_q(u), u_n - u \rangle] \leq 0$$

and from (3.38) one has

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A_p(u_n), u_n - u \rangle \leq 0.$$

Hence, by Proposition 2.1, it follows

$$u_n \rightarrow u \quad \text{in } W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

Therefore, σ_λ satisfies the C-condition and this proves the Claim.

Then, (3.23), (3.24) and the Claim permit the use of the mountain pass theorem. So, we can find $\hat{u} \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\hat{u} \in K_{\sigma_\lambda} \subseteq [u_0] \cap \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_\lambda(u_0) < m_\lambda \leq \sigma_\lambda(\hat{u}), \quad (3.39)$$

see (3.20) and (3.23), respectively.

From (3.39), (3.17) and (3.27), we conclude that

$$\hat{u} \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda \subseteq \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+), \quad u_0 \leq \hat{u}, \quad u_0 \neq \hat{u}.$$

□

Proposition 3.9. *If hypotheses H hold, then $\lambda^* \in \mathcal{L}$.*

Proof. Let $0 < \lambda_n < \lambda^*$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that $\lambda_n \nearrow \lambda^*$. By Proposition 3.2 we can find $u_n \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_n} \subseteq \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+)$ such that

$$\underline{u} \leq u_n \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and

$$\langle A_p(u_n), h \rangle + \langle A_q(u_n), h \rangle = \int_{\Omega} [u_n^{-\eta} + \lambda_n f(x, u_n)] h \, dx \quad (3.40)$$

for all $h \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From hypothesis H(iii), we have

$$\varphi_\lambda(u_n) \leq c_{18} \quad (3.41)$$

for some $c_{18} > 0$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where φ_λ is the energy functional of problem (P_λ) .

From (3.40), (3.41) and reasoning as in the Claim in the proof of Proposition 3.8, we obtain that

$$u_n \rightarrow u_* \quad \text{in } W_0^{1,p}(\Omega). \quad (3.42)$$

So, if in (3.40) we pass to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and use (3.42), then

$$\langle A_p(u_*), h \rangle + \langle A_q(u_*), h \rangle = \int_{\Omega} [u_*^{-\eta} + \lambda^* f(x, u_*)] h \, dx$$

for all $h \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $\underline{u} \leq u_*$. It follows that $u_* \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda^*} \subseteq \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+)$ and so $\lambda^* \in \mathcal{L}$. $\square$

Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{L} = (0, \lambda^*].$$

We can state the following bifurcation-type theorem describing the variations in the set of positive solutions as the parameter λ moves in $(0, +\infty)$.

Theorem 3.10. *If hypotheses H hold, then there exist $\lambda^* > 0$ such that*

(a) *for every $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*$, problem (P_{λ}) has at least two positive solutions*

$$u_0, \hat{u} \in \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+), \quad u_0 \leq \hat{u}, \quad u_0 \neq \hat{u};$$

(b) *for $\lambda = \lambda^*$, problem (P_{λ}) has at least one positive solution*

$$u_* \in \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+);$$

(c) *for every $\lambda > \lambda^*$, problem (P_{λ}) has no positive solutions.*

4. Minimal Positive Solutions

In this section we show that for every $\lambda \in \mathcal{L} = (0, \lambda^*]$, problem (P_{λ}) has a smallest positive solutions $u^* \in \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+)$ and we investigate the monotonicity and continuity properties of the map $\lambda \rightarrow u_{\lambda}^*$.

Proposition 4.1. *If hypotheses H hold and $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$, then problem (P_{λ}) has a smallest positive solution $u_{\lambda}^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda} \subseteq \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+)$, that is, $u_{\lambda}^* \leq u$ for all $u \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda}$.*

Proof. From Proposition 18 of Papageorgiou–Rădulescu–Repovš [12] we know that the set $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda} \subseteq W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is downward directed. So, invoking Lemma 3.10 of Hu–Papageorgiou [8, p. 178], we can find a decreasing sequence $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\lambda}$ such that

$$\underline{u} \leq u_n \leq u_1 \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \inf_{n \geq 1} u_n = \inf \mathcal{S}_{\lambda}, \quad (4.1)$$

see Proposition 3.2. From (4.1) we see that $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is bounded. From this, as in the proof of Proposition 3.8, using Proposition 2.1, we obtain

$$u_n \rightarrow u_{\lambda}^* \text{ in } W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \quad \underline{u} \leq u_{\lambda}^*.$$

From (4.1) it follows

$$u_{\lambda}^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda} \subseteq \text{int}(C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})_+) \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\lambda}^* = \inf \mathcal{S}_{\lambda}.$$

$\square$

In the next proposition we examine the monotonicity and continuity properties of the map $\lambda \rightarrow u_{\lambda}^*$ from $\mathcal{L} = (0, \lambda^*]$ into $C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$.

Proposition 4.2. *If hypotheses H hold, then the minimal solution map $\lambda \rightarrow u_\lambda^*$ from $\mathcal{L} = (0, \lambda^*]$ into $C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})$ is*

(a) *strictly increasing in the sense that*

$$0 < \mu < \lambda \leq \lambda^* \quad \text{implies} \quad u_\lambda^* - u_\mu^* \in \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+ \right);$$

(b) *left continuous.*

Proof. (a) Let $0 < \mu < \lambda \leq \lambda^*$. According to Proposition 3.2 we can find $u_\mu \in \mathcal{S}_\mu \subseteq \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+ \right)$ such that $u_\lambda^* - u_\mu \in \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+ \right)$. Since $u_\lambda^* \leq u_\mu$ we obtain the desired conclusion.

(b) Suppose that $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda^- \leq \lambda^*$. Then $\{u_n^*\}_{n \geq 1} := \{u_{\lambda_n}^*\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+ \right)$ is increasing and

$$\underline{u} \leq u_n^* \leq u_{\lambda^*}^* \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.2)$$

From (4.2) and the nonlinear regularity theory of Lieberman [10] we have that $\{u_n^*\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})$ is relatively compact and so

$$u_n^* \rightarrow \tilde{u}_\lambda^* \quad \text{in } C_0^1(\bar{\Omega}). \quad (4.3)$$

If $\tilde{u}_\lambda^* \neq u_\lambda^*$, then we can find $z_0 \in \Omega$ such that

$$u_\lambda^*(z_0) < \tilde{u}_\lambda^*(z_0).$$

From (4.3) we then derive

$$u_\lambda^*(z_0) < u_n^*(z_0) \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0,$$

which contradicts (a). So, $\tilde{u}_\lambda^* = u_\lambda^*$ and we conclude the left continuity of $\lambda \rightarrow u_\lambda^*$. $\square$

Summarizing our findings in this section, we can state the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *If hypotheses H hold and $\lambda \in \mathcal{L} = (0, \lambda^*]$, then problem (P_λ) admits a smallest positive solution $u_\lambda^* \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda \subseteq \text{int} \left(C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})_+ \right)$ and the map $\lambda \rightarrow u_\lambda^*$ from $\mathcal{L} = (0, \lambda^*]$ into $C_0^1(\bar{\Omega})$ is*

(a) *strictly increasing;*

(b) *left continuous.*

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank a knowledgeable referee for her/his corrections and remarks.

Funding Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

Open Access. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in

the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

References

- [1] Bahrouni, A., Rădulescu, V.D., Repovš, D.: Double phase transonic flow problems with variable growth: nonlinear patterns and stationary waves. *Nonlinearity* **32**(7), 2481–2495 (2019)
- [2] Bai, Y., Motreanu, D., Zeng, S.: Continuity results for parametric nonlinear singular Dirichlet problems. *Adv. Nonlinear Anal.* **9**(1), 372–387 (2020)
- [3] Benci, V., D'Avenia, P., Fortunato, D., Pisani, L.: Solitons in several space dimensions: Derrick's problem and infinitely many solutions. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **154**(4), 297–324 (2000)
- [4] Cherfil, L., Ilyasov, Y.: On the stationary solutions of generalized reaction diffusion equations with p - and q -Laplacian. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.* **4**(1), 9–22 (2005)
- [5] Gasiński, L., Papageorgiou, N.S.: Exercises in Analysis. Part 2: Nonlinear Analysis. Springer, Heidelberg (2016)
- [6] Gasiński, L., Papageorgiou, N.S.: Multiple solutions for nonlinear coercive problems with a nonhomogeneous differential operator and a nonsmooth potential. *Set Valued Var. Anal.* **20**(3), 417–443 (2012)
- [7] Giacomoni, J., Schindler, I., Takáč, P.: Sobolev versus Hölder local minimizers and existence of multiple solutions for a singular quasilinear equation. *Ann. Sci. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **6**(1), 117–158 (2007)
- [8] Hu, S., Papageorgiou, N.S.: Handbook of Multivalued Analysis, vol. I. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht (1997)
- [9] Lazer, A.C., McKenna, P.J.: On a singular nonlinear elliptic boundary-value problem. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* **111**(3), 721–730 (1991)
- [10] Lieberman, G.M.: The natural generalization of the natural conditions of Ladyzhenskaya and Ural'tseva for elliptic equations. *Commun. Partial Differ. Equations* **16**(2–3), 311–361 (1991)
- [11] Papageorgiou, N.S., Rădulescu, V.D., Repovš, D.D.: Nonlinear Analysis - Theory and Methods. Springer, Cham (2019)
- [12] Papageorgiou, N.S., Rădulescu, V.D., Repovš, D.D.: Nonlinear nonhomogeneous singular problems. *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equations* **59**(1) (2020) (**Paper No. 9**)
- [13] Papageorgiou, N.S., Smyrlis, G.: A bifurcation-type theorem for singular nonlinear elliptic equations. *Methods Appl. Anal.* **22**(2), 147–170 (2015)
- [14] Papageorgiou, N.S., Vetro, C., Vetro, F.: Positive solutions for singular $(p, 2)$ -equations. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.* **70**(3), 10 (2019) (**Art. 72**)
- [15] Papageorgiou, N.S., Winkert, P.: Singular p -Laplacian equations with superlinear perturbation. *J. Differ. Equations* **266**(2–3), 1462–1487 (2019)

- [16] Papageorgiou, N.S., Winkert, P.: Applied Nonlinear Functional Analysis. An Introduction. De Gruyter, Berlin (2018)
- [17] Pucci, P., Serrin, J.: The Maximum Principle. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel (2007)
- [18] Rădulescu, V.D.: Isotropic and anisotropic double-phase problems: old and new. *Opuscula Math.* **39**(2), 259–279 (2019)
- [19] Zhikov, V.V.: Averaging of functionals of the calculus of variations and elasticity theory. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* **50**(4), 675–710 (1986)

Nikolaos S. Papageorgiou
Department of Mathematics
National Technical University
Zografou Campus
15780 Athens
Greece
e-mail: npapg@math.ntua.gr

Patrick Winkert
Institut für Mathematik
Technische Universität Berlin
Straße des 17. Juni 136
10623 Berlin
Germany
e-mail: winkert@math.tu-berlin.de

Received: March 17, 2020.

Revised: July 17, 2020.

Accepted: May 17, 2021.