

Pavel Drábek

Nonlinear elliptic problems with jumping nonlinearities near the first eigenvalue

Aplikace matematiky, Vol. 26 (1981), No. 4, 304--311

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/103919>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1981

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

NONLINEAR ELLIPTIC PROBLEMS WITH JUMPING
NONLINEARITIES NEAR THE FIRST EIGENVALUE

PAVEL DRÁBEK

(Received October 11, 1979)

1. INTRODUCTION

Let Ω be a bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^N with a boundary $\partial\Omega$. Let $g : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous function satisfying Carathéodory's conditions and a certain type of the growth condition, let $a_{\alpha\beta} = a_{\beta\alpha} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and let μ, ν be two numbers, $\mu\nu > 0$. We are concerned with the weak solvability of the Dirichlet problem

$$(1) \quad \sum_{|\alpha|=|\beta|=m} -(-1)^{|\alpha|} D^\alpha(a_{\alpha\beta}(x) D^\beta u(x)) + \lambda_1 u(x) + \mu u^+(x) + \nu u^-(x) + g(x, u(x)) = f(x) \quad \text{on } \Omega,$$

$$Bu = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

(where $u^+(x) = \max\{u(x), 0\}$, $u^-(x) = \max\{-u(x), 0\}$ and B denotes the Dirichlet boundary conditions) for a given real-valued right hand side $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ under the assumption that λ_1 is the first eigenvalue of the linear boundary value problem

$$(2) \quad \sum_{|\alpha|=|\beta|=m} (-1)^{|\alpha|} D^\alpha(a_{\alpha\beta}(x) D^\beta u(x)) - \lambda u(x) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega,$$

$$Bu = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

and there is one and only one normed nonnegative eigenfunction $v_1 \neq 0$ corresponding to λ_1 .

In the present paper we prove a result about the weak solvability of (1) analogous to that in [2] but under less restrictive conditions upon μ, ν and g than in Fučík's paper [2]. The proof is based on the variational characterization of the eigenvalues of (2). A similar method is used in [1].

2. PRELIMINARIES

We will denote by $\|u\|_m$ the norm in $\mathbf{E} = W_0^{m,2}(\Omega)$, $m \geq 1$ is an integer and the usual Sobolev space notation is employed; $\|u\|_0$ is the norm in $L^2(\Omega)$. The inner product in \mathbf{E} will be denoted by $(u, v)_m$ while $(u, v)_0$ stands for the inner product in $L^2(\Omega)$.

Let us consider a formal differential operator

$$\mathcal{L} = - \sum_{|\alpha|=|\beta|=m} (-1)^{|\alpha|} D^\alpha (a_{\alpha\beta}(x) D^\beta).$$

In what follows we shall assume

$$(3) \quad a_{\alpha\beta}(x) = a_{\beta\alpha}(x) \in L^\infty(\Omega);$$

there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$(4) \quad \sum_{|\alpha|=|\beta|=m} a_{\alpha\beta} \xi^\alpha \bar{\xi}^\beta > c |\xi|^{2m}$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

For $u, v \in \mathbf{E}$, set

$$((u, v)) = \int_{\Omega} \sum_{|\alpha|=|\beta|=m} a_{\alpha\beta} D^\alpha u D^\beta \bar{v}.$$

Remark 1. \mathcal{L} , together with the Dirichlet boundary condition $Bu = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, defines by putting $(Lu, v)_m = -((u, v))$ a linear bounded self-adjoint operator L from \mathbf{E} into \mathbf{E} , with a countable set of eigenvalues $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots$ and a corresponding complete orthogonal set of eigenfunctions v_1, v_2, \dots (see e.g. [5]). We recall that λ_k can be determined as follows:

$$\lambda_k = \min \left\{ \frac{((v, v))}{\|v\|_0^2}; v \in \mathbf{E}, (v, v_i)_0 = 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1 \right\}.$$

Let us denote by $L_k : \mathbf{E} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}$ the linear operator defined by

$$(L_k u, v)_m = (Lu, v)_m + \lambda_k (u, v)_0.$$

Let $g(x, s) : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function such that

$$(5) \quad g \text{ is measurable in } x \in \Omega \text{ for all } s \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ and } g \text{ is continuous in } s \text{ for almost all } x \in \Omega; g(x, 0) \in L^2(\Omega).$$

Moreover, let us suppose that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$(6) \quad |g(x, s_1) - g(x, s_2)| \leq c_1 |s_1 - s_2|$$

for all $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and almost all $x \in \Omega$. Let us remark that (6) implies

$$|g(x, s)| \leq |g(x, 0)| + c_1 |s|$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and almost all $x \in \Omega$.

Define the mappings

$$N : \mathbf{E} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}, \quad G : \mathbf{E} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}, \quad F : \mathbf{E} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}$$

by the relations

$$(7) \quad (N(u), v)_m = \mu \int_{\Omega} u^+(x) v(x) dx + \nu \int_{\Omega} u^-(x) v(x) dx,$$

$$(8) \quad (G(u), v)_m = \int_{\Omega} g(x, u(x)) v(x) dx,$$

$$(9) \quad (F(f), v)_m = \int_{\Omega} f(x) v(x) dx$$

for all $u, v \in \mathbf{E}, f \in L^2(\Omega)$.

Definition. A function $u \in \mathbf{E}$ is said to be a weak solution of the boundary value problem (1) if

$$(10) \quad L_1(u) + N(u) + G(u) = F(f).$$

Remark 2. It is easy to see that the mapping N defined by (7) is lipschitzian with the constant $\max\{|\mu|, |v|\}$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \|N(u_1) - N(u_2)\|_m &= \sup_{\|v\|_m=1} (N(u_1) - N(u_2), v)_m \leq \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{\mu - v}{2} (u_1 - u_2) + \frac{\mu + v}{2} (u_1 - u_2) \right\|_0 \leq \\ &\leq \left| \frac{\mu - v}{2} \right| \|u_1 - u_2\|_0 + \left| \frac{\mu + v}{2} \right| \|u_1 - u_0\|_0 \leq \\ &\leq \max\{|\mu|, |v|\} \|u_1 - u_2\|_0 \leq \max\{|\mu|, |v|\} \|u_1 - u_2\|_m. \end{aligned}$$

If $\|F\|$ means the norm of the linear mapping F defined by (9) then $\|F\| \leq 1$ (see [2], Remark 4).

3. MAIN RESULT

Denote by P the orthogonal projection from \mathbf{E} onto $\text{Ker } L_1$ and put $P^c(x) = x - P(x)$, $x \in \mathbf{E}$. Suppose that

(11) $\text{Ker } L_1$ is the linear hull of v_1 , $v_1 \in \mathbf{E}$, $v_1 \geq 0$ almost everywhere, $v_1 \neq 0$.

The restriction L_1 of the operator L_1 onto $\text{Im } L_1$ is a one-to-one mapping and there exists a continuous mapping $K : \text{Im } L_1 \rightarrow \text{Im } L_1$ which is called the right inverse of L_1 . Thus for each $x \in \text{Im } L_1$ we have $x = KLx$.

Lemma 1. Suppose (3)–(6), (11). Let

$$(12) \quad \mu v > 0, \quad \max\{|\mu|, |v|\} + c_1 < \lambda_2 - \lambda_1.$$

Then for an arbitrary $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ there exists exactly one $v_{t,f} \in \text{Im } L_1$ satisfying

$$(13) \quad L_1(v_{t,f}) + P^c N(tv_1 + v_{t,f}) + P^c G(tv_1 + v_{t,f}) = P^c F(f).$$

Proof. Let $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ be fixed and for every $w \in \text{Im } L_1$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ let us denote

$$\Phi_t(w) = L_1(w) + P^c N(tv_1 + w) + P^c G(tv_1 + w).$$

We shall prove the lemma by showing that Φ_t is a strictly monotone mapping in $\text{Im } L_1$. For $w_1, w_2 \in \text{Im } L_1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\Phi_t(w_1) - \Phi_t(w_2), w_1 - w_2)_m = -((w_1 - w_2, w_1 - w_2)) + \\ & + \lambda_1 \|w_1 - w_2\|_0^2 + \mu \int_{\Omega} ((t v_1(x) + w_1(x))^+ - (t v_1(x) + w_2(x))^+) \cdot \\ & \cdot (w_1(x) - w_2(x)) \, dx + \nu \int_{\Omega} ((t v_1(x) + w_1(x))^- - (t v_1(x) + w_2(x))^-) \cdot \\ & \cdot (w_1(x) - w_2(x)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} (g(x, t v_1(x) + w_1(x)) - g(x, t v_1(x) + w_2(x))) \cdot \\ & \cdot (w_1(x) - w_2(x)) \, dx . \end{aligned}$$

The inequalities (12) imply the existence of such an $\varepsilon > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\Phi_t(w_1) - \Phi_t(w_2), w_1 - w_2)_m \leq -((w_1 - w_2, w_1 - w_2)) + \\ & + \lambda_1 \|w_1 - w_2\|_0^2 + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 - \varepsilon) \|w_1 - w_2\|_0^2 . \end{aligned}$$

The variational characterization of λ_2 implies

$$\|w_1 - w_2\|_0^2 \leq \frac{((w_1 - w_2, w_1 - w_2))}{\lambda_2} .$$

Using this fact we obtain

$$(\Phi_t(w_1) - \Phi_t(w_2), w_1 - w_2)_m \leq -\frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda_2} ((w_1 - w_2, w_1 - w_2)) .$$

Since $((z, z))^{1/2}$ is a norm in \mathbf{E} equivalent to $\|z\|_m$, the result follows from a well known lemma of Minty (see [4]).

Remark 3. Let us denote

$$(14) \quad \Psi_f : t \mapsto PN(tv_1 + v_{t,f}) + PG(tv_1 + v_{t,f}) .$$

It is proved in [2], Lemma 2 that the equation (10) has a solution $u_0 \in \mathbf{E}$ if and only if there exists $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(15) \quad \Psi_f(t_0) = P F(f)$$

and, moreover, $u_0 = t_0 v_1 + v_{t_0,f}$.

Remark 4. As in [2], instead of (15) we can consider an equivalent equation

$$(16) \quad \psi_f(t) = (F(f), v_1)_m ,$$

where $\psi_f(t)$ is a real-valued function defined by

$$(17) \quad \psi_f(t) = (\Psi_f(t), v_1)_m .$$

Using the notation from Section 2 we have

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_f(t) = & \mu \int_{\Omega} (t v_1(x) + v_{t,f}(x))^+ v_1(x) \, dx + \\ & + v \int_{\Omega} (t v_1(x) + v_{t,f}(x))^- v_1(x) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} g(x, t v_1(x) + v_{t,f}(x)) v_1(x) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5. We shall assume in the sequel that the function g or $-g$ is bounded from below by a sublinear function in the case $\mu > 0$ and $v > 0$ or $\mu < 0$ and $v < 0$, respectively; this means that there exist a function g_1 defined on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ and $c_2 > 0$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $r(x) \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$|g_1(x, s)| \leq r(x) + c_2 |s|^\delta$$

and

$$g(x, s) \geq g_1(x, s) \quad \text{or} \quad -g(x, s) \geq g_1(x, s)$$

for almost all $x \in \Omega$ and all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 2. For a fixed $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ the function ψ_f is continuous on \mathbb{R} and

$$\lim_{|t| \rightarrow +\infty} \psi_f(t) = +\infty$$

if $\mu > 0$, $v > 0$ and

$$\lim_{|t| \rightarrow \infty} \psi_f(t) = -\infty$$

in the opposite case.

Proof. Fix $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and suppose

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |t_n - t_0| = 0.$$

According to the proof of Lemma 1 we have

$$\Phi_{t_n}(v_{t_n,f}) = \Phi_{t_0}(v_{t_0,f}) = P^c F(f).$$

This fact implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\Phi_{t_n}(v_{t_n,f}) - \Phi_{t_0}(v_{t_0,f})\|_m = \|\Phi_{t_n}(v_{t_0,f}) - \Phi_{t_0}(v_{t_0,f})\|_m = \\ & = \|P^c N(t_n v_1 + v_{t_0,f}) - P^c N(t_0 v_1 + v_{t_0,f}) + P^c G(t_n v_1 + v_{t_0,f}) - \\ & \quad - P^c G(t_0 v_1 + v_{t_0,f})\|_m \leq (\max\{|\mu|, |v|\} + c_1) |t_n - t_0|. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously as in the proof of Lemma 1 we obtain

$$|t_n - t_0| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda_2(\max\{|\mu|, |v|\} + c_1)} \cdot \frac{((v_{t_n,f} - v_{t_0,f}, v_{t_n,f} - v_{t_0,f}))}{\|v_{t_n,f} - v_{t_0,f}\|_m},$$

which implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|v_{t_n,f} - v_{t_0,f}\|_m = 0$.

The continuity of the function $\psi_f(t)$ defined by (18) now follows from the necessary and sufficient condition for the continuity of Nĕmickij's operator in the space $L^2(\Omega)$ (see e.g. [3]).

Let us suppose $\mu > 0$, $\nu > 0$ (the proof of the opposite case is analogous). Suppose on the contrary that there exists $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^+$, $|t_n| \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$(19) \quad \lim_{|t_n| \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \left(v_1(x) + \frac{v_{t_n, f}(x)}{t_n} \right)^+ v_1(x) \, dx = 0,$$

$$(20) \quad \lim_{|t_n| \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \left(v_1(x) + \frac{v_{t_n, f}(x)}{t_n} \right)^- v_1(x) \, dx = 0$$

hold simultaneously. Then

$$0 \leftarrow \int_{\Omega} \left(v_1(x) + \frac{v_{t_n, f}(x)}{t_n} \right) v_1(x) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} v_1^2(x) \, dx$$

because $v_{t_n, f}/t_n \in \text{Im } L_1$. This is a contradiction with the assumption made at the beginning of this section. The assertion follows from (18) because the function g is bounded from below by a sublinear function.

Theorem. *Let all the assumptions of Lemma 1 and Remark 5 be fulfilled, $\mu > 0$ and $\nu > 0$. Then there exists a lower semicontinuous function $\Gamma : \text{Im } L_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\inf_{F(f) \in \text{Im } L_1} \Gamma(f) > -\infty$ for $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and*

(i) *the boundary value problem (1) has a weak solution for the right hand side $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ if and only if $f \in \mathbf{A}$, where*

$$\mathbf{A} = \left\{ f \in L^2(\Omega); \int_{\Omega} f(x) v_1(x) \, dx \geq \Gamma(Q^c(f)) \right\};$$

(ii) *the boundary value problem (1) has at least two weak solutions for the right hand side $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ if and only if $f \in \mathbf{B}$,*

$$\mathbf{B} = \left\{ f \in L^2(\Omega); \int_{\Omega} f(x) v_1(x) \, dx > \Gamma(Q^c(f)) \right\},$$

where Q is the orthogonal projection from $L^2(\Omega)$ onto $\mathbf{X} = \{f \in L^2(\Omega); F(f) \in \text{Ker } L_1\}$.

Proof. If we put

$$\Gamma(f) = \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \psi_f(t)$$

for $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, $F(f) \in \text{Im } L_1$ then the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1 - f_2\|_m \|v_{t, f_1} - v_{t, f_2}\|_m &\geq \|P^c F(f_1) - P^c F(f_2)\|_m \|v_{t, f_1} - v_{t, f_2}\|_m \geq \\ &\geq -(\Phi_t(v_{t, f_1}) - \Phi_t(v_{t, f_2}), v_{t, f_1} - v_{t, f_2})_m \geq \\ &\geq \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda_2} ((v_{t, f_1} - v_{t, f_2}, v_{t, f_1} - v_{t, f_2})), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad F(f_i) \in \text{Im } L_1, \quad i = 1, 2, \end{aligned}$$

imply the lower semicontinuity of Γ . The other assertions of Theorem follow from the previous lemmas and remarks.

Remark 6. Theorem is presented for the case $\mu > 0$ and $\nu > 0$. In the opposite case $\Gamma = \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \psi_f(t)$ will be an upper semicontinuous function and the inequalities in (i) and (ii) will be converse.

Remark 7. Let us consider the following simple boundary value problem:

$$\begin{aligned} u''(x) + \lambda u(x) &= 0, \quad x \in (0, \pi), \\ u(0) &= u(\pi) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let us denote by

$$\begin{aligned} (u, v)_1 &= \int_0^\pi u'(x) v'(x) dx + \int_0^\pi u(x) v(x) dx, \\ (u, v)_0 &= \int_0^\pi u(x) v(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

the inner products in $W_0^{1,2}(0, \pi)$ and $L^2(0, \pi)$, respectively. In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\|K\|} &= \inf_{\|w\|_1=1} \sup_{\|u\|_1=1} \left[- \int_0^\pi w'(x) u'(x) dx + \int_0^\pi w(x) u(x) dx \right] \leq \\ &\leq \inf_{\|w\|_1=1} \sup_{\|u\|_1=1} \left[- \int_0^\pi w'(x) u'(x) dx + 4 \int_0^\pi w(x) u(x) dx - 3 \int_0^\pi w(x) u(x) dx \right] \leq \\ &\leq 3 \sqrt{\frac{2}{5\pi}} \left[\int_0^\pi (\sin 2x)^2 dx \right]^{1/2} = \frac{3}{\sqrt{5}}, \quad \text{where } w \in \text{Im } L_1 \quad \text{and} \quad u \in W_0^{1,2}(0, \pi). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 = 3$. This fact shows that the condition (12) is more general than the condition $\|K\| \max\{\mu, \nu\} < 1$ from the paper [2].

Remark 8. We put $\mathbf{E} = W^{m,2}(\Omega)$ if B denotes the Neumann boundary conditions.

References

- [1] *A. Ambrosetti, G. Mancini*: Existence and multiplicity results for nonlinear elliptic problems with linear part at resonance. The case of the simple eigenvalue, *Journal of Diff. Eq.*, vol. 28, (1978), 220–245.
- [2] *S. Fučík*: Remarks on a result by A. Ambrosetti and G. Prodi, *U.M.I.*, (4), 11 (1975), 259–267.
- [3] *M. A. Krasnoselskij*: Topological methods in the theory of nonlinear integral equations, Pergamon Press, London, 1964.
- [4] *J. Minty*: Monotone operators in Hilbert space, *Duke Math. Journal* 29 (1962), 341–346.
- [5] *A. N. Kolmogorov, S. V. Fomin*: Элементы теории функций и функционального анализа, Nauka, Moskva, 1972.

Souhrn

NELINEÁRNÍ ELIPTICKÉ PROBLÉMY SE SKÁKAJÍCÍ NELINEARITOU V OKOLÍ PRVNÍHO VLASTNÍHO ČÍSLA

PAVEL DRÁBEK

V článku je proveden rozbor existence a násobnosti řešení nelineárního eliptického problému

$$\mathcal{L}u + \lambda_1 u + \mu u^+ + \nu u^- + g(x, u) = f \text{ v } \Omega$$

$$Bu = 0 \text{ na } \partial\Omega,$$

kde parametry μ a ν se pohybují v okolí prvního vlastního čísla λ_1 . Uvedené postačující podmínky jsou obecnější než v práci [2].

Author's address: RNDr. Pavel Drábek, KMA VŠSE, Nejedlého sady 14, 306 14 Plzeň.