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#### Abstract

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{N}, N \geq 2$, be a bounded domain which is divided into two sub-domains $\Omega_{1}$ and $\Omega_{2}$. Consider in $\Omega$ an eigenvalue-transmission problem associated with the $p$-Laplacian acting in $\Omega_{1}$ and the $q$-Laplacian acting in $\Omega_{2}, 1<p<q$, with Dirichlet-Neumann conditions on the interface separating the two sub-domains $\Omega_{1}$ and $\Omega_{2}$ [see (1.1)]. The main result Theorem 2.1 states the existence of a sequence of eigenvalues for this eigenvalue problem. The proof is based on the Lusternik-Schnirelmann principle. Using the method of Lagrange multipliers for constrained minimization problems, we show (see Theorem 2.2) that if $2 \leq p<q$ then there exists an eigenfunction in any set of the form $$
\left\{u \in W^{1, p}(\Omega) ;\left.u\right|_{\Omega_{2}} \in W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right), \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p}+\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{q}=\alpha\right\}, \quad \alpha>0 .
$$


The case of Robin conditions on $\partial \Omega$ and the Riemannian setting are also addressed.
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Mathematics Subject Classification 35J47 • 35J50 • 35J57

[^0]
## 1 Introduction

Consider a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{N}, N \geq 2$, with Lipschitz boundary $\partial \Omega$, which is divided into two Lipschitz sub-domains $\Omega_{1}$ and $\Omega_{2}$ by a Lipschitz closed hypersurface $H$. We further assume that $H \cap \partial \Omega$ is an ( $N-2$ )-dimensional manifold. In the differentiable category this is the case whenever $H$ and $\partial \Omega$ intersect transversally. In other words, $\Omega=\Omega_{1} \cup \Omega_{2} \cup \Gamma$, where $\Gamma=H \cap \Omega$. The standard example we have in mind is the disc $D^{N}$ divided by some coordinate hyperplane in two open components, i.e. the two open semidiscs. Deformations of this divided disc are a good enough source of further examples. The boundary of $\Omega$ is assumed smooth enough and is divided into two pieces $\partial \Omega_{1}$ and $\partial \Omega_{2}$ in such a way that $\partial \Omega_{1}$ is the union $\Gamma_{1} \cup \Gamma$ and $\partial \Omega_{2}$ is the union $\Gamma_{2} \cup \Gamma$. To this picture we consider the eigenvalue problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\Delta_{p} u_{1}=\lambda\left|u_{1}\right|^{p-2} u_{1} \text { in } \Omega_{1},  \tag{1.1}\\
-\Delta_{q} u_{2}=\lambda\left|u_{2}\right|^{q-2} u_{2} \text { in } \Omega_{2} \\
\frac{\partial u_{1}}{\partial v_{p}}=0 \text { on } \Gamma_{1}, \frac{\partial u_{2}}{\partial v_{q}}=0 \text { on } \Gamma_{2}, ~(3) ~ \\
u_{1}=u_{2}, \frac{\partial u_{1}}{\partial v_{p}}=\frac{\partial u_{2}}{\partial v_{q}} \text { on } \Gamma
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\Delta_{r}$ stands for the $r$-Laplace operator, namely $\Delta_{r} w:=\operatorname{div}\left(|\nabla w|^{r-2} \nabla w\right)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial v_{r}}$ denotes the boundary operator defined by

$$
\frac{\partial w}{\partial v_{r}}:=|\nabla w|^{r-2} \frac{\partial w}{\partial v} \quad \text { for } r=p, q, 1<p<q .
$$

The solution $u=\left(u_{1}, u_{2}\right)$ of the problem (1.1) is understood in a weak sense, i.e. $u$ is an element of the space

$$
\begin{equation*}
W:=\left\{u \in W^{1, p}(\Omega):\left.u\right|_{\Omega_{2}} \in W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)\right\}, \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $u_{i}=\left.u\right|_{\Omega_{i}}$ satisfies the nonlinear problem (1.1) $)_{i}$ on $\Omega_{i}$ in the sense of distributions, $i=1,2$, and $u_{1}, u_{2}$ satisfy the boundary and transmission conditions (1.1 $)_{3,4}$ in the sense of traces. Recall that, for any domain $\hat{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^{N}$ with Lipschitz boundary $\partial \hat{\Omega}$, the trace operator

$$
\operatorname{Tr}^{\hat{\Omega}}: W^{1, p}(\hat{\Omega}) \rightarrow W^{1-1 / p, p}(\partial \hat{\Omega})
$$

is a linear and bounded operator, for $1 \leq p<\infty$ (see Gagliardo [8]). For linear transmission problems, involving the Laplace operator or some perturbed Stokes operators, treated by using the layer potential technique, we refer the reader to [5,9], respectively.

Definition 1.1 A scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is said to be an eigenvalue of the problem (1.1) whenever (1.1) admits a nontrivial solution $u=\left(u_{1}, u_{2}\right) \in W$. In that case $u=\left(u_{1}, u_{2}\right)$ is called an eigenfunction/eigencouple of the problem (1.1) (which corresponds to the eigenvalue $\lambda$ ) and the pair $(u, \lambda)$ an eigenpair of the problem (1.1). Note that $W^{1, q}(\Omega)$ is a subspace of $W$, as $W^{1, q}(\Omega)$ is a subspace of $W^{1, p}(\Omega)$.

We endow $W$ with the norm

$$
\|u\|_{W}:=\left\|\left.u\right|_{\Omega_{1}}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}+\left\|\left.u\right|_{\Omega_{2}}\right\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}, \quad \forall u \in W,
$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}$ are the usual norms of the Sobolev spaces $W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ and $W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$, respectively.

Remark 1.1 The space $W$ defined before can be identified with the space

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{W}:=\left\{\left(u_{1}, u_{2}\right) \in W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right) \times W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right) ; \operatorname{Tr}^{\Omega_{1}} u_{1}=\operatorname{Tr}^{\Omega_{2}} u_{2} \text { on } \Gamma\right\}, \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

which shows that $W$ is a reflexive Banach space, as $\tilde{W}$ is a closed subspace of the reflexive product $W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right) \times W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$ with reflexive factors.

While the inclusion $W \subseteq \widetilde{W}$ is obvious, for the opposite one we consider $\left(u_{1}, u_{2}\right) \in \widetilde{W}$ and define

$$
u(x)= \begin{cases}u_{1}(x), & x \in \Omega_{1}, \\ u_{2}(x), & x \in \Omega_{2} .\end{cases}
$$

Let us show that $u \in W$. Obviously, $u$ belongs to $L^{p}(\Omega)$, and its (distributional) derivatives verify the equalities:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}, \varphi\right\rangle & =-\left\langle u, \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_{i}}\right\rangle=-\int_{\Omega_{1} \cup \Omega_{2}} u \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_{i}} \mathrm{~d} x \\
& =\int_{\Omega_{1}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \varphi \mathrm{~d} x-\int_{\partial \Omega_{1}} u \nu_{1 i} \varphi \mathrm{~d} \sigma+\int_{\Omega_{2}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \varphi \mathrm{~d} x-\int_{\partial \Omega_{2}} u v_{2 i} \varphi \mathrm{~d} \sigma,
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $\varphi \in C_{0}^{\infty}(\Omega)$, where $\nu_{1}=\left(\nu_{11}, \ldots, \nu_{1 n}\right)$ and $\nu_{2}=\left(\nu_{21}, \ldots, \nu_{2 n}\right)$ are the outward pointing unit normal fields to boundaries $\partial \Omega_{1}$ and $\partial \Omega_{2}$, respectively. Clearly, the integral terms on the two boundaries cancel each other as $u_{1}=u_{2}$ and $\nu_{1 i}+\nu_{2 i}=0, \forall i=\overline{1, n}$, on $Г$. Thus,

$$
\left\langle\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}, \varphi\right\rangle=\int_{\Omega_{1}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \varphi \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \varphi \mathrm{~d} x, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_{0}^{\infty}(\Omega),
$$

which shows that

$$
\left.\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right|_{\Omega_{1}}=\frac{\partial u_{1}}{\partial x_{i}} \text { and }\left.\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right|_{\Omega_{2}}=\frac{\partial u_{2}}{\partial x_{i}},
$$

for all $i=\overline{1, n}$, and the desired claim follows now easily.
Proposition 1.1 The scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is an eigenvalue of the problem (1.1) if and only if there exists $u=u_{\lambda} \in W \backslash\{0\}$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w d x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w d x \\
& \quad=\lambda\left(\int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p-2} u w d x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{q-2} u w d x\right), \quad \forall w \in W . \tag{1.4}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof Indeed, if $u \in W$ is a solution of the problem (1.1), then we have for all $w \in W$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega_{1}} \operatorname{div}\left(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u\right) w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}} \operatorname{div}\left(|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u\right) w \mathrm{~d} x \\
& \quad=-\lambda \int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x-\lambda \int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{q-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x
\end{aligned}
$$

or, equivalently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -\int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Gamma} w|\nabla u|^{p-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial v} \mathrm{~d} \sigma-\int_{\Omega_{2}}|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x \\
& -\int_{\Gamma} w|\nabla u|^{q-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial v} \mathrm{~d} \sigma=-\lambda \int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x-\lambda \int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{q-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x
\end{aligned}
$$

which is equivalent to (1.4).
Conversely, assume that $u \in W$ satisfies (1.4) and consider $w \in W$ such that $\left.w\right|_{\Omega_{1}}=\varphi$ for some arbitrary $\varphi \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ and $\left.w\right|_{\Omega_{2}}=0$. We obtain

$$
\int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi \mathrm{~d} x=\lambda \int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p-2} u \varphi \mathrm{~d} x, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\Omega_{1}\right) .
$$

By using the formula of integration by parts, we obtain

$$
-\int_{\Omega_{1}} \operatorname{div}\left(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u\right) \varphi \mathrm{d} x=\lambda \int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p-2} u \varphi \mathrm{~d} x, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\Omega_{1}\right),
$$

which shows that $-\Delta_{p} u=\lambda|u|^{p-2} u$ in $\Omega_{1}$. Similarly, $-\Delta_{q} u=\lambda|u|^{q-2} u$ in $\Omega_{2}$.
We next assume that $w \in C^{1}(\bar{\Omega})$ and $\left.w\right|_{\Omega_{2}}=0$. With such a choice of $w$, using the integration by parts formula, the fact that $\left.w\right|_{\Gamma}=0$ and the equation $-\Delta_{p} u=\lambda|u|^{p-2} u$ in $\Omega_{1}$ obtained above, the relation (1.4) implies

$$
0=\int_{\partial \Omega_{1}} w|\nabla u|^{p-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial v} \mathrm{~d} \sigma=\int_{\Gamma_{1}} w|\nabla u|^{p-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial v} \mathrm{~d} \sigma
$$

for all $w \in C^{1}\left(\bar{\Omega}_{1}\right),\left.w\right|_{\Gamma}=0$, therefore $\frac{\partial u}{\partial v_{p}}=|\nabla u|^{p-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial v}=0$ on $\Gamma_{1}$. One can similarly show that $\frac{\partial u}{\partial v_{q}}=|\nabla u|^{q-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial v}=0$ on $\Gamma_{2}$.

It remains to obtain the transmission conditions on $\Gamma$. First of all, it is obvious that $\operatorname{Tr}^{\Omega_{1}}\left(\left.u\right|_{\Omega_{1}}\right)=\operatorname{Tr}^{\Omega_{2}}\left(\left.u\right|_{\Omega_{2}}\right)$ on $\Gamma$. Finally, we take in (1.4) $w=\varphi$, where $\varphi$ is an arbitrary function in $C_{0}^{\infty}(\Omega)$. Using again the integration by parts formula (in particular, on $\Gamma$ we have $\nu_{1}+\nu_{2}=0$, the normal vector $v_{k}$ being chosen to point towards the exterior of $\Omega_{k}, k=1,2$ ) and the equations and equalities proved before, we derive

$$
\int_{\Gamma} \varphi \frac{\partial u}{\partial v_{p}} \mathrm{~d} \sigma+\int_{\Gamma} \varphi \frac{\partial u}{\partial v_{q}} \mathrm{~d} \sigma=0, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_{0}^{\infty}(\Omega) .
$$

Thus, the transmission relation

$$
\frac{\partial u}{\partial v_{p}}=\frac{\partial u}{\partial v_{q}} \text { on } \Gamma
$$

is satisfied. This completes the proof.
If we choose $w=u$ in (1.4), we see that there exist no negative eigenvalues of problem (1.1). It is also obvious that $\lambda_{0}=0$ is an eigenvalue of this problem and the corresponding eigenfunctions are the nonzero constant functions. So any other eigenvalue belongs to $(0, \infty)$.

Obviously, $u$ corresponding to any eigenvalue $\lambda>0$ cannot be a constant function (see (1.4) with $w=u$ ).

If we assume that $\lambda>0$ is an eigenvalue of problem (1.1) and choose $w \equiv 1$ in (1.4), we deduce that every eigenfunction $u$ corresponding to $\lambda$ satisfies the equation

$$
\int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p-2} u \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{q-2} u \mathrm{~d} x=0 .
$$

So all eigenfunctions corresponding to positive eigenvalues necessarily belong to the set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{C}:=\left\{u \in W ; \int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p-2} u \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{q-2} u \mathrm{~d} x=0\right\} . \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the Sobolev's embedding theorem and [11, Lemma $\left.A_{1}\right]$ ), we can see that $\mathscr{C}$ is a weakly closed subset of $W$. This set has nonzero elements. To show this, we choose $x_{1}, x_{2} \in$ $\Omega_{1}, x_{1} \neq x_{2}, r>0$, such that $B_{r}\left(x_{1}\right) \cap B_{r}\left(x_{2}\right)=\emptyset, B_{r}\left(x_{k}\right) \subset \Omega_{1}$, and consider the test functions $u_{k}: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, k=1,2$,

$$
u_{k}(x)= \begin{cases}e^{-\frac{1}{r^{2}-\left|x-x_{k}\right|^{2}},} & \text { if } x \in B_{r}\left(x_{k}\right) \\ 0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Clearly, $u_{k} \in W, k=1,2$. Denote

$$
\theta_{k}=\int_{\Omega} u_{k}^{p-1} \mathrm{~d} x
$$

Obviously, $\theta_{k}>0, k=1,2$. Define $\sigma_{k}=\theta_{k}^{\frac{-1}{p-1}}, \quad k=1$, 2. It is then easily seen that the function $w=\sigma_{1} u_{1}-\sigma_{2} u_{2}$ belongs to $\mathscr{C} \backslash\{0\}$.

Our next goal is to prove, via the Lusternik-Schnirelmann principle, that there exists a sequence of positive eigenvalues of problem (1.1). Note, however, that this sequence might not cover the whole eigenvalue set.

## 2 Results

In what follows we make use of a version of Lusternik-Schnirelmann principle (see [2], [19, Section 44.5, Remark 44.23] and [11]) in order to establish the existence of a sequence of eigenvalues for problem (1.1).

Define the functionals $F, G: W \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
\begin{align*}
F(u):= & \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{q} \mathrm{~d} x,  \tag{2.1}\\
G(u) & :=\frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega_{1}}\left(|\nabla u|^{p}+|u|^{p}\right) \mathrm{d} x+\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_{2}}\left(|\nabla u|^{q}+|u|^{q}\right) \mathrm{d} x \\
& =F(u)+\frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla u|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_{2}}|\nabla u|^{q} \mathrm{~d} x . \tag{2.2}
\end{align*}
$$

It is easily seen that functionals $F$ and $G$ are of class $C^{1}$ on $W$ (see Remark 2.1) and obviously $F, G$ are even with $F(0)=G(0)=0$. We also have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\langle F^{\prime}(u), w\right\rangle=\int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{q-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x,  \tag{2.3}\\
& \left\langle G^{\prime}(u), w\right\rangle=\left\langle F^{\prime}(u), w\right\rangle+\int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x, \tag{2.4}
\end{align*}
$$

for all $w \in W$. We denote by $S_{G}(1)$ the level set of $G, S_{G}(1):=\{u \in W ; G(u)=1\}$.
We have the following auxiliary result:

## Lemma 2.1 The functionals $F$ and $G$ satisfy the following properties:

$\left(h_{1}\right) F^{\prime}$ is strongly continuous, i.e. $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ (meaning $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ weakly) in $W \Rightarrow F^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow$ $F^{\prime}(u)$ and

$$
\left\langle F^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle=0 \Rightarrow u=0
$$

$\left(h_{2}\right) G^{\prime}$ is bounded and satisfies condition $\left(S_{0}\right)$, i.e.,

$$
u_{n} \rightharpoonup u, G^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightharpoonup w,\left\langle G^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle \rightarrow\langle w, u\rangle \Rightarrow u_{n} \rightarrow u
$$

$\left(h_{3}\right) S_{G}(1)$ is bounded and if $u \neq 0$ then

$$
\left\langle G^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle>0, \quad \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} G(t u)=\infty, \quad \inf _{u \in S_{G}(1)}\left\langle G^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle>0 .
$$

Proof $\left(h_{1}\right)$ Assume that $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ in $W$. Hölder's inequality yields

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\left\langle F^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)-F^{\prime}(u), w\right\rangle\right| \leq & \left\|\left|u_{n}\right|^{p-2} u_{n}-|u|^{p-2} u\right\|_{L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}\|w\|_{L^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} \\
& +\left\|\left|u_{n}\right|^{q-2} u_{n}-|u|^{q-2} u\right\|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-1}}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}\|w\|_{L^{q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)} \\
\leq & \left(\left\|\left|u_{n}\right|^{p-2} u_{n}-|u|^{p-2} u\right\|_{L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}\right. \\
& \left.+\left\|\left|u_{n}\right|^{q-2} u_{n}-|u|^{q-2} u\right\|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-1}}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}\right)\|w\|_{W} \tag{2.5}
\end{align*}
$$

for all $w \in W$. This shows that the linear functionals $F^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)-F^{\prime}(u)$ are all bounded and

$$
\begin{align*}
&\left\|F^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)-F^{\prime}(u)\right\| \leq\left\|\left|u_{n}\right|^{p-2} u_{n}-|u|^{p-2} u\right\|_{L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} \\
&+\left\|\left|u_{n}\right|^{q-2} u_{n}-|u|^{q-2} u\right\|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-1}}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)} \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Since $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ in $W$, it follows that $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ as well as the sequences of restrictions $\left\{\left.u_{n}\right|_{\Omega_{1}}\right\}$ and $\left\{\left.u_{n}\right|_{\Omega_{2}}\right\}$ are bounded (see [1, Proposition 3.5, p. 58]). Consequently, $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ in $L^{p}(\Omega),\left.\left.u_{n}\right|_{\Omega_{1}} \rightarrow u\right|_{\Omega_{1}}$ in $L^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ and $\left.\left.u_{n}\right|_{\Omega_{2}} \rightarrow u\right|_{\Omega_{2}}$ in $L^{q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$, as the canonical injections $W^{1, p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{p}(\Omega), W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right) \hookrightarrow L^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ and $W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right) \hookrightarrow L^{q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$ are all compact (see [20, Proposition 21.29, p. 262]). The convergence $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{L^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} \longrightarrow\|u\|_{L^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}$ is equivalent with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.\left.\left.\int_{\Omega_{1}}| | u_{n}\right|^{p-2} u_{n}\right|^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \mathrm{~d} x \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_{1}}| | u\right|^{p-2} u\right|^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \mathrm{~d} x . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

As the set of weak cluster points of the sequence $\left\{\left|u_{n}\right|^{p-2} u_{n}\right\}$ in $L^{p /(p-1)}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ is the singleton $\left\{|u|^{p-2} u\right\}$, it follows that in fact this sequence is strongly convergent in $L^{p /(p-1)}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ to $|u|^{p-2} u$ (see, for example, [1, Prop. 3.32, p. 78]).

One can similarly show that $\left|u_{n}\right|^{q-2} u_{n} \rightarrow|u|^{q-2} u$ in $L^{q /(q-1)}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$. Thus, the convergence $F^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow F^{\prime}(u)$ in $W^{*}$ follows by using (2.6).

If $\left\langle F^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle=0$ then obviously $u=0$.
Note that the strong continuity of $G$ can be similarly derived.
$\left(h_{2}\right)$ Let us first prove that for all $u, w \in W$ the following relations hold:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\langle G^{\prime}(u)-G^{\prime}(w), u-w\right\rangle \\
& \quad \geq\left(\left\|u_{1}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}^{p-1}-\left\|w_{1}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}^{p-1}\right)\left(\left\|u_{1}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}-\left\|w_{1}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}\right) \\
& \quad+\left(\left\|u_{2}\right\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}^{q-1}-\left\|w_{2}\right\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}^{q-1}\right)\left(\left\|u_{2}\right\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}-\left\|w_{2}\right\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}\right) \geq 0, \tag{2.8}
\end{align*}
$$

where $u_{1}, w_{1}, u_{2}, w_{2}$ stand for $\left.u\right|_{\Omega_{1}},\left.w\right|_{\Omega_{1}},\left.u\right|_{\Omega_{2}},\left.w\right|_{\Omega_{2}}$, respectively. Moreover,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle G^{\prime}(u)-G^{\prime}(w), u-w\right\rangle=0 \Leftrightarrow u=w \text { a. e. in } \Omega . \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is obvious that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\langle G^{\prime}(u)-G^{\prime}(w), u-w\right\rangle= & \left\|u_{1}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}^{p}+\left\|w_{1}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}^{p} \\
& +\left\|u_{2}\right\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}^{q}+\left\|w_{2}\right\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}^{q} \\
& -\left(T_{1}+T_{2}\right)-\left(T_{3}+T_{4}\right), \tag{2.10}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have denoted

$$
\begin{aligned}
& T_{1}:=\int_{\Omega_{1}}\left(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w+|u|^{p-2} u w\right) \mathrm{d} x \\
& T_{2}:=\int_{\Omega_{1}}\left(|\nabla w|^{p-2} \nabla w \cdot \nabla u+|w|^{p-2} w u\right) \mathrm{d} x
\end{aligned}
$$

and $T_{3}, T_{4}$ are similarly defined, by replacing $p$ and $\Omega_{1}$ with $q$ and $\Omega_{2}$. Using the Hölder inequality, we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
T_{1} & \leq\left(\int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla u|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\left(\int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla w|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}+\left(\int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\left(\int_{\Omega_{1}}|w|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
& \leq\left(\int_{\Omega_{1}}\left(|\nabla u|^{p}+|u|^{p}\right) \mathrm{d} x\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\left(\int_{\Omega_{1}}\left(|\nabla w|^{p}+|w|^{p}\right) \mathrm{d} x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
& =\left\|u_{1}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}^{p-1}\left\|w_{1}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}, \tag{2.11}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have also used the inequality

$$
\alpha^{s} \gamma^{1-s}+\beta^{s} \delta^{1-s} \leq(\alpha+\beta)^{s}(\gamma+\delta)^{1-s}, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta>0, s \in(0,1) .
$$

Similar inequalities can be obtained for the other terms, $T_{2}, T_{3}, T_{4}$, and using (2.10) we derive (2.8).

Now by (2.8) we see that $\left\langle G^{\prime}(u)-G^{\prime}(w), u-w\right\rangle=0$ implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u_{1}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}=\left\|w_{1}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)},\left\|u_{2}\right\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}=\left\|w_{2}\right\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}, \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

and also we have equalities in Hölder inequalities; therefore, there exist positive constants, $k_{1}, k_{2}$ such that $\left|u_{i}\right|=k_{i}\left|w_{i}\right|, i=1,2$. On the other hand, we have equality in (2.11); thus,

$$
T_{1}=k_{1}^{p-1}\left\|w_{1}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}^{p} \Rightarrow u_{1}=k_{1} w_{1} \text { a. e. in } \Omega_{1} .
$$

Similarly, we can derive that $u_{2}=k_{2} w_{2}$ a. e. in $\Omega_{2}$ and taking into account (2.12) we derive (2.9).

In order to prove that $G^{\prime}$ is bounded, we can use again the Hölder inequality and straightforward computations lead us to

$$
\left|\left\langle G^{\prime}(u), w\right\rangle\right| \leq\left(\left\|u_{1}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}^{p-1}+\left\|u_{2}\right\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}^{q-1}\right)\|w\|_{W}, \quad \forall u, w \in W .
$$

Moreover, a similar argument to the one we used to prove $\left(h_{1}\right)$ would imply the continuity of $G^{\prime}$.

Finally, let us prove that $G^{\prime}$ verifies condition ( $S_{0}$ ), i.e.,

$$
u_{n} \rightharpoonup u, G^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightharpoonup w,\left\langle G^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle \rightarrow\langle w, u\rangle \text { implies } u_{n} \rightarrow u,
$$

for some $u \in W, w \in W^{*}$. Indeed, as $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ in $W$, we have $\left.\left.u_{n}\right|_{\Omega_{1}} \rightarrow u\right|_{\Omega_{1}}$ in $L^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ and $\left.\left.u_{n}\right|_{\Omega_{2}} \rightarrow u\right|_{\Omega_{2}}$ in $L^{q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$. Since $W$ is a reflexive Banach space, using the Lindenstrauss-Asplund-Troyanski theorem (see [18]), it is enough to prove that $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{W} \rightarrow\|u\|_{W}$ in order
to obtain the strong convergence $u_{n} \rightarrow u$. This convergence is a simple consequence of the equality
$\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left\langle G^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)-G^{\prime}(u), u_{n}-u\right\rangle=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(\left\langle G^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle-\left\langle G^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u\right\rangle-\left\langle G^{\prime}(u), u_{n}-u\right\rangle\right)=0$ and the inequality (2.8).

The properties $\left(h_{3}\right)$ follow immediately from the definition of the functional $G$. Thus, the proof is complete.

Remark 2.1 For the convenience of the reader, we recall that:

1. the $C^{1}$-smooth regularity of the functionals $F$ and $G$ follows by computing the Gâteaux derivatives

$$
\left\langle F^{\prime}(u), w\right\rangle=\left.\frac{d}{d t}\right|_{t=0} F(u+t w) \text { and }\left\langle G^{\prime}(u), w\right\rangle=\left.\frac{d}{d t}\right|_{t=0} G(u+t w)
$$

of $F$ and $G$ at $u \in W$ in the direction $w \in W$ and showing that they have the forms (2.3) and (2.4), respectively. The existence of the Gâteaux derivatives of $F$ and $G$ at every point of $W$ and all directions of $W$ combined with the strong continuity of $F^{\prime}$ and $G^{\prime}$ shows the Fréchet differentiability of $F$ and $G$ and therefore the $C^{1}$-smooth regularity of $F$ and $G$.
2. The weak closedness of the set $\mathscr{C}$ defined by (1.5) follows also from the strong continuity of $F^{\prime}$ and the representation of $\mathscr{C}$ as $\left\{u \in W \mid\left\langle F^{\prime}(u), 1\right\rangle=0\right\}$.

Due to the properties $\left(h_{1}\right)-\left(h_{3}\right)$, verified by the functionals $F$ and $G$, combined with their properties to be even and to vanish at zero, it follows, according to the LusternikSchnirelmann principle, that the eigenvalue problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
F^{\prime}(u)=\mu G^{\prime}(u), \quad u \in S_{G}(1) \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

admits a sequence of eigenpairs $\left\{\left(u_{n}, \mu_{n}\right)\right\}$ such that $u_{n} \rightarrow 0$ and $\mu_{n} \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\mu_{n} \neq 0$, for all $n$. In fact, $\left\{\mu_{n}\right\}$ is a decreasing sequence of non-negative reals (which converges to zero) and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu_{n}=\sup _{H \in \mathbb{A}_{n}} \inf _{u \in H} F(u), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbb{A}_{n}$ is the class of all compact, symmetric subsets $K$ of $S_{G}(1)$ such that $F(u)>0$ on $K$ and $\gamma(K) \geq n$, where $\gamma(K)$ denotes the genus of $K$, i.e.,

$$
\gamma(K):=\inf \left\{k \in \mathbb{N} ; \exists h: K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k} \backslash\{0\} \text { such that } \mathrm{h} \text { is continuous and odd }\right\} .
$$

The problem (2.13) consists in finding $u \in S_{G}(1)$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{q-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x \\
& \quad=\mu\left(\left\langle F^{\prime}(u), w\right\rangle+\int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $w \in W$, or equivalently, in finding $u \in S_{G}(1)$, such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x \\
& \quad=(1 / u-1)\left(\int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{q-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x\right), \quad \forall w \in W . \tag{2.15}
\end{align*}
$$

Observe that (2.15) is the variational formulation of problem (1.1). We therefore get the following consequence of the Lusternik-Schnirelmann principle associated with the transmission problem (1.1):

Theorem 2.1 The sequence $\left\{\mu_{n}\right\}$ of eigenvalues of the problem (2.13) produces a nondecreasing sequence $\lambda_{n}=\frac{1}{\mu_{n}}-1$ of eigenvalues of the problem (1.1) and obviously $\lambda_{n} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In what follows we shall use the Lagrange multipliers rule to show that every positive level set of the functional $F$ defined by (2.1) contains an eigenfunction of the problem (1.1) and we shall find its corresponding eigenvalue in terms of the pointed out eigenfunction. Such an eigenfunction will appear as a solution of the minimum problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{u \in \mathscr{C} \cap S_{F}(\alpha)} H(u), \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $H$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
H: W \rightarrow[0, \infty), H(u):=\frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla u|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_{2}}|\nabla u|^{q} \mathrm{~d} x, \quad \forall u \in W \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\mathscr{C}$ is defined by (1.5) and $S_{F}(\alpha)$ is the set at the level $\alpha>0$ of $F$, i.e.

$$
S_{F}(\alpha):=\{u \in W ; \quad F(u)=\alpha\}, \quad \forall \alpha>0 .
$$

In this respect we first recall the Lagrange multipliers principle (see, for example, [14, Thm. 2.2.18, p. 78]):

Lemma 2.2 Let $X, Y$ be real Banach spaces and let $f: D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be Fréchet differentiable, $g \in C^{1}(D, Y)$, where $D \subseteq X$ is a nonempty open set. If $v_{0}$ is a local minimizer of the constraint problem

$$
\min f(w), \quad g(w)=0
$$

and $\mathscr{R}\left(g^{\prime}\left(v_{0}\right)\right)$ (the range of $\left.g^{\prime}\left(v_{0}\right)\right)$ is closed, then there exist $\lambda^{*} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y^{*} \in Y^{*}$, at least one of which is non zero, such that

$$
\lambda^{*} f^{\prime}\left(v_{0}\right)+y^{*} \circ g^{\prime}\left(v_{0}\right)=0,
$$

where $Y^{*}$ stands for the dual of $Y$.
Note that $\lambda^{*} \neq 0$ whenever $g^{\prime}\left(v_{0}\right)$ is onto and can be therefore chosen to be 1 in this particular case.

The eigenvalue problem corresponding to the minimum problem (2.16), via the Lagrange multipliers, is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
H^{\prime}\left(u_{\alpha}\right)=\lambda_{\alpha} F^{\prime}\left(u_{\alpha}\right), \lambda_{\alpha}>0, u_{\alpha} \neq 0 . \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Its variational version is (1.4).
Theorem 2.2 Let F and $H$ be the functionals defined by (2.1) and (2.17). For every $2 \leq p<$ $q, \alpha>0$, the minimization problem (2.16) has a solution $u_{\alpha}$ which is an eigenfunction of the eigenvalue problem (2.18) and therefore a solution of the variational version (1.4) of the initial eigenvalue problem (1.1).

Proof Let us first show that the set $\mathscr{C} \cap S_{F}(\alpha)$ is nonempty for every $\alpha>0$. Indeed, if we choose $w \in \mathscr{C} \cap C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$, nonzero, then $\alpha w / F(w) \in \mathscr{C} \cap S_{F}(\alpha)$.

Now, the functional $H$ is coercive on the weakly closed subset $\mathscr{C} \cap S_{F}(\alpha)$ of the reflexive Banach space $W$, i.e.,

$$
\lim _{\substack{\|u\|_{W} \rightarrow \infty \\ u \in \mathscr{C} \cap S_{F}(\alpha)}} H(u)=\infty
$$

This fact is a simple consequence of the equality

$$
\lim _{\substack{\|u\|_{W \rightarrow \infty} \rightarrow \infty \\ u \in S_{F}(\alpha)}}\left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}+\|\nabla u\|_{L^{q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}\right)=\infty
$$

On the other hand, the weakly lower semicontinuity of the norms in $L^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ and $L^{q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$ implies the weakly lower semicontinuity of the functional $H$ on $\mathscr{C} \cap S_{F}(\alpha)$. Then, we can apply [16, Theorem 1.2] in order to obtain the existence of a global minimum point of $H$ over $\mathscr{C} \cap S_{F}(\alpha)$, say $u_{\alpha}$, i.e., $H\left(u_{\alpha}\right)=\min _{u \in \mathscr{C} \cap S_{F}(\alpha)} H(u)$. Obviously, $u_{\alpha} \in \mathscr{C} \cap S_{F}(\alpha)$ implies that $u_{\alpha}$ is a nonconstant function. In fact, $u_{\alpha}$ is a solution of the minimization problem

$$
\min _{w \in W} H(w)
$$

under the restrictions

$$
\begin{aligned}
& g(w):=\frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega_{1}}|w|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_{2}}|w|^{q} \mathrm{~d} x-\alpha=0 \\
& h(w):=\int_{\Omega_{1}}|w|^{p-2} w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|w|^{q-2} w \mathrm{~d} x=0, \quad \forall w \in W
\end{aligned}
$$

We can apply Lemma 2.2 with $X=W, D=W \backslash\{0\}, Y=\mathbb{R}, f=H, g, h: W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ being the functions just defined above, and $v_{0}=u_{\alpha}$, on the condition that $\mathscr{R}\left(g^{\prime}\left(u_{\alpha}\right)\right), \mathscr{R}\left(h^{\prime}\left(u_{\alpha}\right)\right)$ be closed sets. In fact, we can show that $g^{\prime}\left(u_{\alpha}\right), h^{\prime}\left(u_{\alpha}\right)$ are surjective, i.e. $\forall c_{1}, c_{2} \in \mathbb{R}$ there exist $w_{1}, w_{2} \in W$ such that

$$
\left\langle g^{\prime}\left(u_{\alpha}\right), w_{1}\right\rangle=c_{1},\left\langle h^{\prime}\left(u_{\alpha}\right), w_{2}\right\rangle=c_{2}
$$

We seek $w_{1}, w_{2}$ of the form $w_{1}=\beta u_{\alpha}, w_{2}=\gamma$, with $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, we obtain from the above equations

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta\left(\int_{\Omega_{1}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{q} \mathrm{~d} x\right) & =c_{1} \\
\gamma\left((p-1) \int_{\Omega_{1}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{p-2} \mathrm{~d} x+(q-1) \int_{\Omega_{2}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{q-2} \mathrm{~d} x\right) & =c_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

which have unique solutions $\beta, \gamma$ since $u_{\alpha} \in S_{F}(\alpha)$ implies that

$$
r_{1} \int_{\Omega_{1}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{p_{1}} \mathrm{~d} x+r_{2} \int_{\Omega_{2}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{q_{1}} \mathrm{~d} x>0, \quad \forall p_{1}, q_{1}, r_{i}>0, i=1,2
$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.2, there exist $\lambda$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, $\lambda^{2}+\mu^{2}>0$ and for all $w \in W$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{\Omega_{1}}\left|\nabla u_{\alpha}\right|^{p-2} \nabla u_{\alpha} \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}\left|\nabla u_{\alpha}\right|^{q-2} \nabla u_{\alpha} \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x \\
& \quad-\lambda\left(\int_{\Omega_{1}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{p-2} u_{\alpha} w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{q-2} u_{\alpha} w \mathrm{~d} x\right) \\
& \quad-\mu\left((p-1) \int_{\Omega_{1}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{p-2} w \mathrm{~d} x+(q-1) \int_{\Omega_{2}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{q-2} w \mathrm{~d} x\right)=0 . \tag{2.19}
\end{align*}
$$

Testing with $w=1$ in (2.19) and observing that $u_{\alpha}$ belongs to $\mathscr{C}$, we deduce that $\mu=0$ and therefore $\lambda \neq 0$. By choosing $w=u_{\alpha}$ in (2.19), we find $K_{1 \alpha}-\lambda K_{2 \alpha}=0$, where $K_{1 \alpha}$ and $K_{2 \alpha}$ denote the constants

$$
\int_{\Omega_{1}}\left|\nabla u_{\alpha}\right|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}\left|\nabla u_{\alpha}\right|^{q} \mathrm{~d} x \text { and } \int_{\Omega_{1}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{q} \mathrm{~d} x
$$

respectively, which are positive as $u_{\alpha} \in \mathscr{C} \cap S_{F}(\alpha)$. In other words (2.19) becomes

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{\Omega_{1}}\left|\nabla u_{\alpha}\right|^{p-2} \nabla u_{\alpha} \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}\left|\nabla u_{\alpha}\right|^{q-2} \nabla u_{\alpha} \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x \\
& =\lambda_{\alpha}\left(\int_{\Omega_{1}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{p-2} u_{\alpha} w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{q-2} u_{\alpha} w \mathrm{~d} x\right), \tag{2.20}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\lambda_{\alpha}=\frac{K_{1 \alpha}}{K_{2 \alpha}}=\frac{\int_{\Omega_{1}}\left|\nabla u_{\alpha}\right|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}\left|\nabla u_{\alpha}\right|^{q} \mathrm{~d} x}{\int_{\Omega_{1}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}\left|u_{\alpha}\right|^{q} \mathrm{~d} x} .
$$

Thus, $\left(\lambda_{\alpha}, u_{\alpha}\right)$ is an eigenpair of problem (1.4).
Remark 2.2 The results we have proved so far are also valid for the eigenvalue problem obtained out of (1.1) by replacing Eq. (1.1) $)_{2}$ with the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\Delta_{q} u_{2}=\lambda\left|u_{2}\right|^{p-2} u_{2} \quad \text { in } \Omega_{2}, \tag{2.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $1<p<q$. In this case we shall consider the same space $W$ but endowed with the norm

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\|u \mid\|:=\|u\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}+\|\nabla u\|_{L^{q}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}+\|u\|_{L^{p}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}, \quad \forall u \in W .\right. \tag{2.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $p \leq q$, then $\left|\|\cdot \mid\|\right.$ is a norm in $W$ equivalent with the usual norm $\|\cdot\|_{W}$ of this space. This fact follows from [4, Proposition 3.9.55].

In this case, the variational version of the new eigenvalue problem is:
Find $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ for which there exists $u \in W \backslash\{0\}$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x \\
& \quad=\lambda \int_{\Omega}|u|^{p-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x, \quad \forall w \in W . \tag{2.23}
\end{align*}
$$

In order to obtain the counterpart of Theorem 2.1 for this new eigenvalue transmission problem, we need to verify the conditions $\left(h_{1}\right)-\left(h_{3}\right)$ of Lemma 2.1 . We shall define for this new context the corresponding functionals $F_{p}, G_{p}: W \rightarrow[0, \infty)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{p}(u):=\frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega}|u|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x, G_{p}(u):=F_{p}(u)+\frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla u|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_{2}}|\nabla u|^{q} \mathrm{~d} x . \tag{2.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

All calculations are similar to those we did to prove $\left(h_{1}\right)-\left(h_{3}\right)$ in the case of the eigenvalue transmission problem (1.1), except the one which verifies the property $\left(S_{0}\right)$ on $G_{p}^{\prime}$ of $\left(h_{2}\right)$. In order to prove $\left(S_{0}\right)$, we define the functional $J: W \rightarrow W^{*}$

$$
\langle J(u), w\rangle:=\int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{p-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x-\int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{q-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x, \quad \forall u, w \in W .
$$

One can show, by using the same type of arguments as we did to prove $\left(h_{1}\right)$ and Lemma 2.1, that $J(u)$ is strongly continuous. Let us consider

$$
u_{n} \rightharpoonup u, G_{p}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightharpoonup w_{p},\left\langle G_{p}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle \rightarrow\left\langle w_{p}, u\right\rangle \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty
$$

for some $u \in W, w_{p} \in W^{*}$ and we shall show that $u_{n} \rightarrow u$. In this respect (see also the argument within the proof of the statement $\left.\left(h_{2}\right)\right)$ it is sufficient to show that $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{W} \rightarrow\|u\|_{W}$, as $\|\cdot\|_{W}$ and $|\|\cdot \mid\|$ are equivalent norms on $W$. In this regard we observe that

$$
G^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)=G_{p}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)-J\left(u_{n}\right)-w_{p}-J(u),\left\langle G^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle \rightarrow\left\langle w_{p}-J(u), u\right\rangle,
$$

which combined with the $\left(S_{0}\right)$ property of $G^{\prime}$ implies the desired statement.
The counterpart of Theorem 2.2 can be obtained with no difficulty, by using arguments similar to those we have used in the case of the eigenvalue transmission problem (1.1).

## 3 Extensions

In this section we discuss some extensions of the previous results.

## An eigenvalue-transmission problem with Robin boundary conditions

Following the same type of arguments, one can actually prove the counterparts of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 for the following more general eigenvalue-transmission problem, involving Robin conditions on $\Gamma_{1}$ and $\Gamma_{2}$, namely

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\Delta_{p} u_{1}=\lambda\left|u_{1}\right|^{p-2} u_{1} \text { in } \Omega_{1},  \tag{3.1}\\
-\Delta_{q} u_{2}=\lambda\left|u_{2}\right|^{q-2} u_{2} \text { in } \Omega_{2}, \\
\frac{\partial u_{1}}{\partial v_{p}}+\beta_{1}\left|u_{1}\right|^{p-2}=0 \text { on } \Gamma_{1}, \\
\frac{\partial u_{2}}{\partial v_{q}}+\beta_{2}\left|u_{2}\right|^{q-2}=0 \text { on } \Gamma_{2}, \\
u_{1}=u_{2}, \quad \frac{\partial u_{1}}{\partial v_{p}}=\frac{\partial u_{2}}{\partial v_{q}} \text { on } \Gamma,
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\beta_{1}, \beta_{2} \geq 0$. The variational version of problem (3.1) is:
Proposition 3.1 The scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is an eigenvalue of the problem (3.1) if and only if there exists $u \in W \backslash\{0\}$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{\Omega_{1}}|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w d x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w d x \\
& \quad+\beta_{1} \int_{\partial \Omega_{1}}|u|^{p-2} u w d \sigma+\beta_{2} \int_{\partial \Omega_{2}}|u|^{q-2} u w d \sigma \\
& =\lambda\left(\int_{\Omega_{1}}|u|^{p-2} u w d x+\int_{\Omega_{2}}|u|^{q-2} u w d x\right), \quad \forall w \in W . \tag{3.2}
\end{align*}
$$

While the functional playing the role of $F$ in this setting remains unchanged, the functional playing the role of $G: W \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
G(u):= & \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega_{1}}\left(|\nabla u|^{p}+|u|^{p}\right) \mathrm{d} x+\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_{2}}\left(|\nabla u|^{q}+|u|^{q}\right) \mathrm{d} x \\
& +\frac{1}{p} \int_{\partial \Omega_{1}} \beta_{1}|u|^{p} \mathrm{~d} \sigma+\frac{1}{q} \int_{\partial \Omega_{2}} \beta_{2}|u|^{q} \mathrm{~d} \sigma . \tag{3.3}
\end{align*}
$$

## The counterpart of problem (1.1) in the Riemannian setting

Let $(M, g)$ be a compact boundaryless Riemannian manifold and $\Omega \subseteq M$ be a connected open set such that $\Omega_{-}:=M \backslash \bar{\Omega}$ is also connected. We denote $\Omega$ by $\Omega_{+}$and the common boundary of $\Omega_{+}$and $\Omega_{-}$by $\partial \Omega$, which is assumed to be a hypersurface of $M$. We consider the following coupled problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\Delta_{p} u_{+}=\lambda\left|u_{+}\right|^{p-2} u_{+} \text {in } \Omega_{+},  \tag{3.4}\\
-\Delta_{q} u_{-}=\lambda\left|u_{-}\right|^{q-2} u_{-} \text {in } \Omega_{-}, \\
u_{+}=u_{-}, \quad \frac{\partial u_{+}}{\partial v_{p}}=\frac{\partial u_{-}}{\partial v_{q}} \text { on } \partial \Omega^{2}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\Delta_{r} w$ stands for the $r$-Laplace operator $\operatorname{div}\left(|\nabla w|^{r-2} \nabla w\right)$.
Proposition 3.2 The scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is an eigenvalue of the problem (3.4) if and only if there exists $u \in W_{\Omega} \backslash\{0\}$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{\Omega_{+}}|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w d x+\int_{\Omega_{-}}|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w d x \\
& \quad=\lambda\left(\int_{\Omega_{+}}|u|^{p-2} u w d x+\int_{\Omega_{-}}|u|^{q-2} u w d x\right), \quad \forall w \in W_{\Omega^{\prime}}, \tag{3.5}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
W_{\Omega}:=\left\{u \in W^{1, p}(M):\left.u\right|_{\Omega_{-}} \in W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{-}\right)\right\} . \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The proof of Proposition 3.2 works along the same lines with the proof of Proposition 1.1 and partly relies on the integration by parts formula [12, p. 383]

$$
\int_{X}(f \operatorname{div} X) d V_{g}=-\int_{X} g(X, \operatorname{grad} f) \mathrm{d} V_{g}+\int_{\partial X} g(X, v) \mathrm{d} V_{\tilde{g}}
$$

where $(X, g)$ is a compact oriented Riemannian manifold, $v$ is the outward unit normal vector field on $\partial X$, and $\tilde{g}$ is the Riemannian metric on $\partial X$ induced by $g$.

We endow $W_{\Omega}$ with the norm

$$
\|u\|_{W_{\Omega}}:=\left\|\left.u\right|_{\Omega_{+}}\right\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{+}\right)}+\left\|\left.u\right|_{\Omega_{-}}\right\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{-}\right)}, \quad \forall u \in W_{\Omega}
$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{+}\right)}$and $\|\cdot\|_{W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{-}\right)}$are the usual norms of the Sobolev spaces $W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{+}\right)$ and $W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{-}\right)$, respectively.

Remark 3.1 The space $W_{\Omega}$ defined before can be identified with the space

$$
\widetilde{W}_{\Omega}:=\left\{\left(u_{+}, u_{-}\right) \in W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{+}\right) \times W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{-}\right) ; \operatorname{Tr}^{\Omega_{+}} u_{+}=\operatorname{Tr}^{\Omega_{-}} u_{-} \text {on } \partial \Omega\right\} .
$$

Note that $W_{\Omega}$ is a reflexive Banach space, as it is a closed subspace of the reflexive product $W^{1, p}\left(\Omega_{+}\right) \times W^{1, q}\left(\Omega_{-}\right)$with reflexive factors (see [1, p. 70], [6, p. 11] or [7, p. 20]). Define the functionals $F$ and $G$ on $W_{\Omega}$ :

$$
\begin{gather*}
F(u):=\frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega_{+}}|u|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_{-}}|u|^{q} \mathrm{~d} x,  \tag{3.7}\\
G(u):=\frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega_{+}}\left(|\nabla u|^{p}+|u|^{p}\right) \mathrm{d} x+\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_{-}}\left(|\nabla u|^{q}+|u|^{q}\right) \mathrm{d} x, \tag{3.8}
\end{gather*}
$$

for all $u \in W_{\Omega}$. It is easily seen that functionals $F$ and $G$ are of class $C^{1}$ on $W_{\Omega}$ and obviously $F, G$ are even with $F(0)=G(0)=0$. We also have

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left\langle F^{\prime}(u), w\right\rangle=\int_{\Omega_{+}}|u|^{p-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{-}}|u|^{q-2} u w \mathrm{~d} x \\
\left\langle G^{\prime}(u), w\right\rangle=\left\langle F^{\prime}(u), w\right\rangle+\int_{\Omega_{+}}|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{-}}|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla w \mathrm{~d} x,
\end{gathered}
$$

for all $w \in W_{\Omega}$. We denote by $S_{G}(1)$ the level set $\left\{u \in W_{\Omega} ; G(u)=1\right\}$ of $G$.
The following auxiliary result can be proved in a similar way with Lemma 2.1.
Lemma 3.1 The functionals $F$ and $G$ satisfy the following properties:
$\left(\mathfrak{h}_{1}\right) F^{\prime}$ is strongly continuous, i.e. $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ in $W_{\Omega} \Rightarrow F^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow F^{\prime}(u)$ and

$$
\left\langle F^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle=0 \Rightarrow u=0
$$

$\left(\mathfrak{h}_{2}\right) G^{\prime}$ is bounded and satisfies condition $\left(S_{0}\right)$, i.e.,

$$
u_{n} \rightharpoonup u, G^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightharpoonup w,\left\langle G^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle \rightarrow\langle w, u\rangle \Rightarrow u_{n} \rightarrow u
$$

$\left(\mathfrak{h}_{3}\right) S_{G}(1)$ is bounded and if $u \neq 0$ then

$$
\left\langle G^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle>0, \quad \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} G(t u)=\infty, \quad \inf _{u \in S_{G}(1)}\left\langle G^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle>0 .
$$

According to the properties $\left(\mathfrak{h}_{1}\right)-\left(\mathfrak{h}_{3}\right)$, verified by the functionals $F$ and $G$, combined with their properties to be even and to vanish at zero, it follows, via the Lusternik-Schnirelmann principle, that the eigenvalue problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
F^{\prime}(u)=\mu G^{\prime}(u), u \in S_{G}(1) \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

admits a sequence of eigenpairs $\left\{\left(u_{n}, \mu_{n}\right)\right\}$ such that $u_{n} \rightarrow 0, \mu_{n} \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\mu_{n} \neq 0$, for all $n$.

Theorem 3.1 The sequence $\left\{\mu_{n}\right\}$ of eigenvalues of the problem (3.9) produces a nondecreasing sequence $\lambda_{n}=\frac{1}{\mu_{n}}-1$ of eigenvalues of the problem (3.4) and obviously $\lambda_{n} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Consider the minimization problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{u \in \mathscr{C}_{\Omega} \cap S_{F}(\alpha)} H(u), \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
H: W_{\Omega} \rightarrow[0, \infty), H(u) & :=\frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega_{+}}|\nabla u|^{p} \mathrm{~d} x+\frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_{-}}|\nabla u|^{q} \mathrm{~d} x, \quad \forall u \in W_{\Omega}  \tag{3.11}\\
\mathscr{C}_{\Omega} & :=\left\{u \in W_{\Omega} ; \int_{\Omega_{+}}|u|^{p-2} u \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega_{-}}|u|^{q-2} u \mathrm{~d} x=0\right\} . \tag{3.12}
\end{align*}
$$

and $S_{F}(\alpha)$ is the set at the level $\alpha>0$ of $F$ (i.e. $S_{F}(\alpha):=\{u \in W ; F(u)=\alpha\}$ ).
The eigenvalue problem corresponding to the minimization problem (3.10), via the Lagrange multipliers, is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
H^{\prime}\left(u_{\alpha}\right)=\lambda_{\alpha} F^{\prime}\left(u_{\alpha}\right), \lambda_{\alpha}>0, u_{\alpha} \neq 0, \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Its variational version is (3.5).
Theorem 3.2 Let F and $H$ be the functionals defined by (3.7) and (3.11). For every $2 \leq p<$ $q, \alpha>0$, the problem (3.10) has a solution $u_{\alpha}$ which is an eigenfunction of the eigenvalue problem (3.13) and therefore a solution of the variational version (3.5) of the eigenvalue problem (3.4).

Remark 3.2 Note that in (3.4) there is no boundary condition, because the ambient manifold $M$ is boundary-free. One can think of the eigenvalue-transmission counterpart of the problem (1.1) in a more general Riemannian setting, where the ambient manifold $M$ has nonempty boundary and the interface hypersurface is suitably chosen. Indeed, for a compact Riemannian manifold ( $M, g$ ) with nonempty boundary, we consider a connected open set $\Omega_{1} \subseteq M$ such that $\Omega_{2}:=M \backslash \bar{\Omega}_{1}$ is also connected and $\bar{\Omega}_{1}, \bar{\Omega}_{2}$ are manifolds with boundaries $\partial \Omega_{1}, \partial \Omega_{2}$. We further assume that their common boundary part $\Gamma:=\partial \Omega_{1} \cap \partial \Omega_{2}$ is a hypersurface of $M$ (which is closed), such that $\Gamma_{1}:=\partial \Omega_{1} \backslash \Gamma$ and $\Gamma_{2}:=\partial \Omega_{2} \backslash \Gamma$ are also connected. With such choices the eigenvalue-transmission counterpart of the problem (1.1) in this more general Riemannian setting looks like (1.1).
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