# ROBIN BOUNDARY-VALUE PROBLEMS FOR QUASILINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS WITH SUBCRITICAL AND CRITICAL NONLINEARITIES 

DIMITRIOS A. KANDILAKIS, MANOLIS MAGIROPOULOS


#### Abstract

By using variational methods we study the existence of positive solutions for a class of quasilinear elliptic problems with Robin boundary conditions.


## 1. Introduction

Let $\Omega$ be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ with a smooth boundary $\partial \Omega$. In this article we study the nonlinear Robin problem:

$$
\begin{gathered}
-\Delta_{p} u=\lambda|u|^{p-2} u+a(x)|u|^{q-2} u \quad \text { in } \Omega \\
|\nabla u|^{p-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta}+b(x)|u|^{p-2} u=\mu \rho(x)|u|^{r-2} u \quad \text { on } \partial \Omega
\end{gathered}
$$

where $\Delta_{p} u:=\operatorname{div}\left(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u\right), 1<p<N$, denotes the $p$-Laplace operator, $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta}(x)$ denotes the outward unit normal at $x \in \partial \Omega, \lambda, \mu$ are parameters, $\mu>0, a: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $b, \rho: \partial \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are essentially bounded functions, with $b(x) \geq 0$ and $m x \in \partial \Omega$ : $b(\cdot)>0\}>0$. Restrictions on $q, r$ are given in the subsequent sections. With respect to the parameter $\mu$, we notice that its role is crucial in the critical case examined in Section 3.

Quasilinear problems of the form $-\Delta_{p} u=f(x, u)$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions have received considerable attention; see [2, 8, 16, 20, 23. This equation with Neumann boundary conditions (i.e. $b(\cdot) \equiv 0$ and $\rho(\cdot) \equiv 0$ ) and $a(\cdot)$ being a constant has been studied in [4], where existence of solutions has been provided for $\lambda \in\left(0, \lambda^{*}\right)$, for a suitable $\lambda^{*}>0$. The same authors in [3] provide positive solutions to the aforementioned problem but with a critical term added to the right hand side of (1). In [5] the existence of solutions is proved for (1)-(1) when $\lambda$ appears on the boundary condition, $a(\cdot) \equiv 0$, and $r$ can be subcritical, critical or supercritical. Multiplicity of solutions is examined in [18] where the right hand side of (1) is a real Carathéodory function $f(x, u, \lambda)$ defined on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times(0,+\infty)$ and the boundary condition is Neumann. Multiplicity of solutions is also proved in [17] for $\lambda>\lambda_{2}$,

[^0]for $\lambda_{2}$ being the second eigenvalue of the $p$-Laplacian operator with Robin boundary conditions, while in [19] existence of positive solutions is shown for $\lambda<\lambda_{1}$. Existence of solutions depending on the Fučik spectrum of the p-Laplace operator is examined in [24]. When $\Omega$ is an exterior domain, existence and nonexistence of solutions is examined in 10. In case the potential is nonsmooth we refer to [11]. The fibering method, attributed to Pohozaev, is useful when the right hand sides of the equation and the boundary condition are power-like, see [7, 21]. For systems of equations the interested reader may see [6].

Our aim in this work is to provide existence results concerning positive solutions to (1)-(1) when $q$ is either subcritical or critical, $r$ is subcritical and $\lambda \leq \lambda_{1}$, where $\lambda_{1}$ is the first eigenvalue of the associated eigenvalue problem. When the exponents are subcritical, our proofs rely on the fibering method and the mountain pass theorem developed in Ambrosetti-Rabinowitz [1], while in the case of $q$ being critical we use the concentration-compactness principle of Lions [13, 14]. A useful survey of results concerning the mountain pass theorem is provided in 22].

As usual $X:=W^{1, p}(\Omega)$ is equipped with the norm

$$
\|u\|_{1, p}=\left(\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{p} d x+\int_{\Omega}|u|^{p} d x\right)^{1 / p}
$$

The action functional $I(\cdot)$ corresponding to problem (1)-1 is defined on $X$ by

$$
I_{\lambda}(u)=\frac{1}{p}\left[\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{p} d x-\lambda \int_{\Omega}|u|^{p} d x+\int_{\partial \Omega} b(x)|u|^{p} d \sigma\right]-\frac{1}{q} A(u)-\frac{\mu}{r} P(u),
$$

where $P(u):=\int_{\partial \Omega} \rho(x)|u|^{r} d \sigma$ and $A(u):=\int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^{q} d x$.
Consider the eigenvalue problem

$$
\begin{align*}
& -\operatorname{div}\left(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u\right)=\lambda|u|^{p-2} u \quad \text { in } \Omega  \tag{1.1}\\
& |\nabla u|^{p-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta}+b(x)|u|^{p-2} u=0 \quad \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{1.2}
\end{align*}
$$

It is known that the smallest eigenvalue $\lambda_{1}$ is isolated and positive with corresponding normalized eigenvector $u_{1} \in C^{1}(\Omega)$ (that is, $\left\|u_{1}\right\|=1$ ) which is positive in $\Omega$, [12, Lemma 5.3]. Furthermore,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{1}=\inf \left\{\frac{\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{p} d x+\int_{\partial \Omega} b(x)|u|^{p} d \sigma}{\int_{\Omega}|u|^{p} d x}: u \in W^{1, p}(\Omega) \backslash\{0\}\right\} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 2. Subcritical exponents

In what follows we assume that $1<q<p^{*}:=\frac{N p}{N-p}$ and $1<r<\widehat{p}^{*}:=\frac{p(N-1)}{N-p}$.

### 2.1. Existence of solutions when $\lambda<\lambda_{1}$.

Lemma 2.1. The expression

$$
[u]=\left[\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{p} d x-\lambda \int_{\Omega}|u|^{p} d x+\int_{\partial \Omega} b(x)|u|^{p} d \sigma\right]^{1 / p}
$$

is a norm on $X$ and is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{1, p}$.
The proof of the above lemma follows from [4, Proposition 2].
Depending on the relative ordering of the exponents $p, q, r$, we distinguish the following four cases.
Case 1. $p<\min \{q, r\}$. We assume
(H1) $a(\cdot) \geq 0$ and $m\{x \in \Omega: a(\cdot)>0\}>0$.
(H2) $\rho(\cdot) \geq 0$ on $\partial \Omega$ and $m\{x \in \partial \Omega: \rho(\cdot)>0\}>0$.
Let $Y$ be an Banach space and $\Sigma:=\{A \subseteq X \backslash\{0\}: A$ is closed and $A=-A\}$. The genus of a set $A \in \Sigma$ is defined by

$$
\gamma(A):=\min \left\{n \in \mathbb{N}: \exists \varphi \in C\left(A, \mathbb{R}^{n} \backslash\{0\}\right) \text { with } \varphi(x)=-\varphi(-x)\right\}
$$

Theorem 2.2. Suppose that $I: Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an even $C^{1}(Y, \mathbb{R})$ function such that:
(i) I satisfies the Palais-Smale condition.
(ii) $I(u)>0$ if $0<\|u\|<r$ and $I(u) \geq c>0$ if $\|u\|=r$, for some $r>0$.
(iii) There exists a subspace $Y_{m} \subseteq E$ of dimension $m$ and a compact subset $A_{m} \subseteq Y_{m}$ with $I<0$ on $A_{m}$ such that 0 lies in a bounded component (in $\left.Y_{m}\right)$ of $Y_{m} \backslash A$.
Let $\Gamma:=\left\{h \in C(Y, Y): h(0)=0, h\right.$ is an odd homeomorhism, $\left.I\left(h\left(B_{1}\right)\right) \geq 0\right\}$, $K_{m}:=\left\{K \subseteq Y: K\right.$ is compact, $K=-K, \gamma\left(K \cap h\left(\partial B_{1}\right)\right) \geq m$ for every $\left.h \in \Gamma\right\}$, where $B_{1}$ denotes the unit ball of $Y$. Then

$$
c_{m}:=\inf _{K \in K_{m}} \max _{u \in K} I(u)
$$

is a critical value of $I$ with $0<c<c_{m} \leq c_{m+1}<+\infty$. Furthermore, if $c_{m}=$ $c_{m+1}=\cdots=c_{m+n}$, then $\gamma\left(K_{c_{m}}\right) \geq n+1$, where $K_{c_{m}}:=\left\{u \in X: I^{\prime}(u)=0\right.$, $\left.I(u)=c_{m}\right\}$.

For the proof of the above Theorem we refer the reader to [1].
Theorem 2.3. Assume that (H1) and (H2) hold. Then (1)-(1) admits infinitely many solutions.
Proof. We will show first that $I$ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition. So let $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $X$ such that $\left|I\left(u_{n}\right)\right| \leq M$ and $I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0$. For $k \in(p, \min \{q, r\})$ we have

$$
-M+o_{n}(1)\left[u_{n}\right] \leq I\left(u_{n}\right)-\frac{1}{k} I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n} \leq M+o_{n}(1)\left[u_{n}\right]
$$

and so

$$
\begin{align*}
-M+o_{n}(1)\left[u_{n}\right] & \leq\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{k}\right)\left[u_{n}\right]^{p}+\left(\frac{1}{k}-\frac{1}{q}\right) A\left(u_{n}\right)+\mu\left(\frac{1}{k}-\frac{1}{r}\right) P\left(u_{n}\right)  \tag{2.1}\\
& \leq M+o_{n}(1)\left[u_{n}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

which implies $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $X$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ weakly in $X$ and strongly in $L^{p}(\Omega), L^{q}(\Omega), L^{p}(\partial \Omega)$ and $L^{r}(\partial \Omega)$. Therefore,

$$
\begin{gather*}
\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla\left(u_{n}-u\right) d x \rightarrow 0  \tag{2.2}\\
\int_{\Omega} a\left(\left|u_{n}\right|^{q-2} u_{n}-|u|^{q-2} u\right)\left(u_{n}-u\right) d x \rightarrow 0  \tag{2.3}\\
\int_{\partial \Omega} b\left(\left|u_{n}\right|^{p-2} u_{n}-|u|^{p-2} u\right)\left(u_{n}-u\right) d \sigma \rightarrow 0  \tag{2.4}\\
\int_{\partial \Omega} \rho\left(\left|u_{n}\right|^{r-2} u_{n}-|u|^{r-2} u\right)\left(u_{n}-u\right) d \sigma \rightarrow 0 \tag{2.5}
\end{gather*}
$$

as $n \rightarrow+\infty$. Since $I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0,2.3$-2.5 imply that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)-I^{\prime}(u), u_{n}-u\right\rangle \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow+\infty . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega}\left[\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{p-2} \nabla u_{n}-|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u\right]\left(\nabla u_{n}-\nabla u\right) d x \\
& -\lambda \int_{\Omega}\left(\left|u_{n}\right|^{p-2} u_{n}-|u|^{p-2} u\right)\left(u_{n}-u\right) d x \\
& +\int_{\partial \Omega} b\left(\left|u_{n}\right|^{p-2} u_{n}-|u|^{p-2} u\right)\left(u_{n}-u\right) d \sigma \\
& -\int_{\Omega} a\left(\left|u_{n}\right|^{q-2} u_{n}-|u|^{q-2} u\right)\left(u_{n}-u\right) d x \\
& -\mu \int_{\partial \Omega} \rho\left(\left|u_{n}\right|^{r-2} u_{n}-|u|^{r-2} u\right)\left(u_{n}-u\right) d \sigma \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow+\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently,

$$
\int_{\Omega}\left[\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{p-2} \nabla u_{n}-|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u\right]\left(\nabla u_{n}-\nabla u\right) d x \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow+\infty .
$$

As a consequence of Holder's inequality we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{\Omega}\left[\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{p-2} \nabla u_{n}-|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u\right]\left(\nabla u_{n}-\nabla u\right) d x \\
& \geq\left[\left(\int_{\Omega}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{p} d x\right)^{(p-1) / p}-\left(\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{p} d x\right)^{(p-1) / p}\right]  \tag{2.7}\\
& \quad \times\left[\left(\int_{\Omega}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{p} d x\right)^{1 / p}-\left(\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{p} d x\right)^{1 / p}\right] .
\end{align*}
$$

Therefore, $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{1, p} \rightarrow\|u\|_{1, p}$. The uniform convexity of $X$ implies that $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ in $X$. Note that

$$
I(u)=\frac{1}{p}[u]^{p}-\frac{1}{q} A(u)-\frac{\mu}{r} P(u) \geq \frac{1}{p}[u]^{p}-c_{1}[u]^{q}-c_{2}[u]^{r},
$$

by the Sobolev embedding, and so $I(u)>0$ for $\|u\|=\rho$ and $I(u) \geq c_{3}>0$ for $\|u\|<\rho$, provided $\rho$ is sufficiently small. Suppose that $\left\{X_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of subspaces of $X$ with dimension $\operatorname{dim}\left(X_{n}\right)=n$ such that $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} \neq 0$ if $u \in X_{n} \backslash\{0\}$. Then, for $u \in B_{1}^{n}:=\left\{v \in X_{n}:[v]=1\right\}$ and $\zeta$ sufficiently large

$$
I(\zeta u)=\frac{\zeta^{p}}{p}[u]^{p}-\frac{\zeta^{q}}{q} A(u)-\frac{\mu \zeta^{r}}{r} P(u)<\frac{\zeta^{p}}{p}-\frac{\zeta^{q}}{q} \min _{u \in B_{1}^{n}} A(u)-\frac{\mu \zeta^{r}}{r} \min _{u \in B_{1}^{n}} P(u)<0 .
$$

We can now apply Theorem 2.2 to complete the proof.
Case 2. $1<r<q<p$ We assume
$\left(\mathrm{H} 1^{\prime}\right) a(\cdot) \geq 0$ or $a(\cdot) \leq 0$ in $\Omega$ and $m\{x \in \Omega: a(\cdot) \neq 0\}>0$.
Theorem 2.4. If $1<r<q<p$ and ( $\mathrm{H} 1^{\prime}$ ), $\mathrm{H}(2)$ hold, then (11)-(1) admits a positive solution.
Proof. Assume first that $a(\cdot) \geq 0$. We consider the open set $Z:=\{u \in X: A(u)>$ 0 or $P(u)>0\}$.

For $u \in Z, t \geq 0$, one forms

$$
I(t u)=\frac{t^{p}}{p} H_{\lambda}(u)-\frac{t^{q}}{q} A(u)-\frac{\mu t^{r}}{r} P(u)
$$

where $H_{\lambda}(u):=[u]^{p}$.

For $t>0$, let

$$
I_{t}(t u)=t^{p-1} H_{\lambda}(u)-t^{q-1} A(u)-\mu t^{r-1} P(u)
$$

For critical points, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
t^{p} H_{\lambda}(u)-t^{q} A(u)-\mu t^{r} P(u)=0 \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

that has always a unique solution $t=t(u)$. Let $S_{\lambda}=Z \cap\left\{u \in X: H_{\lambda}(u)=1\right\}$. We notice that $\left\{t(u): u \in S_{\lambda}\right\}$ is bounded.

For $u \in Z$, we define $\widehat{I}(u):=I(t(u) u)$. In view of 2.8 ,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{I}(u)=\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right) t(u)^{p} H_{\lambda}(u)+\left(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{r}\right) \mu t(u)^{r} P(u)<0 . \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that $\widehat{I}(\cdot)$ is bounded below in $S_{\lambda}$. Let $M=\inf _{u \in S_{\lambda}} \widehat{I}(u)$. Let $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq S_{\lambda}$ be a minimizing sequence for $\widehat{I} / S_{\lambda}$. Since $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $X$, we may assume that $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ in $X$. At the same time, $t\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow \widehat{t}$ in $\mathbb{R}$. Thus $t\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n} \rightharpoonup \widehat{t} u$ in $X$. By weak lower semicontinuity of $I(\cdot)$, we have

$$
I(\widehat{t u}) \leq \liminf _{n \rightarrow+\infty} I\left(t\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}\right)=M
$$

Thus $\widehat{t u} \neq 0$. Because of the corresponding compact Sobolev embeddings, $A\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow$ $A(u)$ and $P\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow P(u)$. Exploiting 2.8 for each $n$, one has

$$
t\left(u_{n}\right)^{p-r}=t\left(u_{n}\right)^{q-r} A\left(u_{n}\right)+\mu P\left(u_{n}\right) .
$$

Letting $n \rightarrow+\infty$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{t}^{p-r}=\widehat{t}^{q-r} A(u)+\mu P(u) . \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\widehat{t}>0$, either $A(u)>0$ or $P(u)>0$, thus $u \in Z$, and $t(u)$ is well defined. The weak lower semicontinuity of the norm applies to give

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{t}^{p-r} H_{\lambda}(u) \leq \widehat{t}^{q-r} A(u)+\mu P(u) \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

or

$$
H_{\lambda}(u) \leq \widehat{t}^{q-p} A(u)+\widehat{t}^{r-p} \mu P(u)
$$

At the same time,

$$
H_{\lambda}(u)=t(u)^{q-p} A(u)+t(u)^{r-p} \mu P(u)
$$

Since the map $f(t)=t^{q-p} A(u)+t^{r-p} \mu P(u), t>0$ is strictly decreasing, the last two relations imply $\widehat{t} \leq t(u)$. Let us assume that $\widehat{t}<t(u)$. We set $F(y):=I(y u), y \geq$ 0. For $y \in[\widehat{t}, t(u)]$, one has $F^{\prime}(y)=y^{p-1} H_{\lambda}(u)-y^{q-1} A(u)-y^{r-1} \mu P(u)=$ $y^{r-1}\left[y^{p-r} H_{\lambda}(u)-y^{q-r} A(u)-\mu P(u)\right]$, which is negative everywhere but at $y=t(u)$, since 2.8 has a unique solution. Thus $F(y)$ is strictly decreasing in $\widehat{t}, t(u)]$, so

$$
I(t(u) u)<I(\widehat{t} u) \leq M
$$

We take $k>0$ such that $k u \in S_{\lambda}$ (actually, combining 2.10 and 2.11) one sees that $k \geq 1$ ). We have

$$
t(k u)^{p}=t(k u)^{q} A(k u)+t(k u)^{r} \mu P(k u)
$$

or

$$
(k t(k u))^{p} H_{\lambda}(u)=(k t(k u))^{q} A(u)+(k t(k u))^{r} \mu P(u),
$$

thus $k t(k u)=t(u)$. Then

$$
I(t(k u) k u)=I(t(u) u)<I(\widehat{t u} u) \leq M
$$

which is a contradiction. Thus $\widehat{t}=t(u), H_{\lambda}(u)=1$, and $t(u) u$ is a nontrivial solution of our problem. Since $|t(u) u|$ will also be a minimizer, by Harnack's inequality we may assume that $t(u) u$ is positive.

If $a(\cdot) \leq 0$ in $\Omega$, we define $\hat{Z}:=\{u \in X: P(u)>0\}$. It is clear that 2.8 has a unique positive solution and $M<0$. Furthermore, since the limit $u$ of a minimizing sequence satisfies 2.10 , we have that $P(u)>0$. Thus $u \in \hat{Z}$ and $|t(u) u|$ is a positive solution of (1), 1.
Case 3. $1<q<r<p$.
Theorem 2.5. Suppose that $1<q<r<p$ and (H1), (H2) hold. Then (11)-(1) admits a positive solution.
Proof. Note that for every $u \in Z(2.8)$ has a unique positive solution $t:=t(u)$. Furthermore, the set $\{t(u): u \in Z\}$ is bounded. Let $\widehat{I}(u):=I(t(u) u)$. Then, in view of 2.8,

$$
\begin{align*}
\widehat{I}(u) & =t^{p}\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right)+\mu t^{r}\left(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{r}\right) P(u)  \tag{2.12}\\
& \leq t^{p}\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right)+t^{p}\left(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{r}\right)=t^{p}\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{r}\right)<0
\end{align*}
$$

We can now proceed as in case 2 .
Case 4. $1<r<p<q$. We assumpe
(H3) $a(\cdot) \leq 0$ and $m\{x \in \Omega: a(\cdot)<0\}>0$.
Theorem 2.6. If $1<r<p<q$ and (H2), (H3) hold, then (1)-(1) admits a positive solution.
Proof. Once more, 2.8 has a unique positive solution $t:=t(u)$ for every $u \in \hat{Z}$. Furthermore, the set $\{t(u): u \in \hat{Z}\}$ is bounded and $\widehat{I}(u)<0$ in $\hat{Z}$. We proceed as in case 2.
2.1.1. Existence of solutions when $\lambda=\lambda_{1}$. In this section we assume that (H2) and (H3) hold.
Case 5. $1<r<q<p$.
Theorem 2.7. Assume that $1<r<q<p$ and (H2), (H3) hold. then (11)-(1) admits a positive solution.
Proof. Let $H_{\lambda}^{P}(u):=[u]^{p}-A(u)$ and $S_{\lambda}^{P}:=\left\{u \in X: P(u)>0\right.$ and $H_{\lambda}^{P}(u)=$ 1\}. If $u \in S_{\lambda}^{P}$, then 2.8 has a unique solution $t(u)$ with $\widehat{I}(u)<0$. Define $M=\inf _{u \in S_{\lambda}^{P}} \widehat{I}(u)$ and assume that $u_{n} \in S_{\lambda}^{P}$ is such that $\widehat{I}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow M$. We claim that $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{1, p}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, is bounded. Indeed, let us assume that it is not, that is, $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{1, p} \rightarrow+\infty$. Define $z_{n}:=\frac{u_{n}}{d_{n}}$, where $d_{n}=\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{1, p}$. Then

$$
d_{n}^{p}\left[z_{n}\right]^{p}-d_{n}^{q} A\left(z_{n}\right)=1
$$

Consequently,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[z_{n}\right]^{p} \leq \frac{1}{d_{n}^{p}} \rightarrow 0, \quad 0 \leq-A\left(z_{n}\right) \leq \frac{1}{d_{n}^{q}} \rightarrow 0 \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{1} \int_{\Omega}\left|z_{n}\right|^{p} d x \rightarrow 1 \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\left\|z_{n}\right\|_{1, p}=1$, we may assume that $z_{n} \rightarrow z$ weakly in $X$. Therefore, 2.14 implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{1} \int_{\Omega}|z|^{p} d x=1 \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

and so $z \neq 0$. By 2.14 and 2.15 we see that $[z]=0$, that is, $z$ is an eigenvector corresponding to $\lambda_{1}$. On the other hand, since $A\left(z_{n}\right) \rightarrow A(z), 2.14$ yields $A(z)=$ 0 , contradicting the fact $z>0$ in $\Omega$. Thus, $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{1, p}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, is indeed bounded. So we may assume that $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ weakly in $X$. Note that, for an infinite number of $n^{\prime} s$, either $\left[u_{n}\right]^{p} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, or $-A\left(u_{n}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. In either case, 2.8) implies that $r\left(u_{n}\right)$ is bounded. Since 2.8 implies that $P(u)>0$, we see that $u \in S_{\lambda}^{P}$. We can now proceed as in case 1 to get a solution.

Case 6. $1<r<p<q$.
Theorem 2.8. Assume that $1<r<p<q$ and (H2), (H3) hold. Then (1)-(1) admits a positive solution.
Proof. We use the inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widehat{I}(u) & =t^{p}\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right)+\mu t^{r}\left(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{r}\right) P(u) \\
& \leq \mu t^{r}\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right) P(u)+\mu t^{r}\left(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{r}\right) P(u) \\
& =\mu t^{r}\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{r}\right) P(u)<0,
\end{aligned}
$$

to show that $\inf _{u \in S_{\lambda}^{P}} \widehat{I}(u)<0$ and by following the same steps as in case 5 we obtain a positive solution.

## 3. The critical case $q=p^{*}$

In this section we study the critical problem $q=p^{*}:=\frac{N p}{N-p}$. with $p<r<\frac{p(N-1)}{N-p}$ and $\lambda<\lambda_{1}$. The proof follows closely the lines of [9, Theorem 1.4]. Since the embedding $X \hookrightarrow L^{p^{*}}(\Omega)$ is no longer compact we do not expect that the PalaisSmale condition holds. So we prove a local Palais-Smale condition which is true if $I(\cdot)$ lies below a certain energy value.

In what follows we assume that $a(\cdot) \equiv 1$ and (H2) holds. Consider the problem

$$
\begin{align*}
& -\operatorname{div}\left(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u\right)=\lambda|u|^{p-2} u+|u|^{q-2} u \quad \text { in } \Omega  \tag{3.1}\\
& |\nabla u|^{p-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta}+b(x)|u|^{p-2} u=\mu \rho(x) h(u) \quad \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{3.2}
\end{align*}
$$

Let

$$
S=\inf _{u \in D^{1, p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) \backslash\{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{p} d x}{\int_{\Omega}|u|^{p^{*}} d x},
$$

be the best Sobolev constant, where $u \in D^{1, p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ is the completion of $C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ under the gradient norm.

Lemma 3.1. Suppose that $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in $X$ satisfying the Palais-Smale condition with energy level $c<\frac{1}{N} S^{\frac{N}{p}}$, that is

$$
I\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow c \quad \text { and } \quad I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0
$$

Then $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a convergent subsequence in $X$.

Proof. The boundedness of $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a consequence of 2.1. Thus, $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a subsequence, still denoted by $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, which converges weakly to $u \in X$. By [15. Lemma 3.6] there exists a set of points $\left\{x_{j}\right\}_{j \in J} \subseteq \bar{\Omega}, J$ at most countable, and nonnegative numbers $\mu_{j}, \nu_{j}$ satisfying

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{p} \rightarrow \mu \geq|\nabla u|^{p}+\sum_{j \in J} \mu_{j} \delta_{x_{j}} \\
\left|u_{n}\right|^{p^{*}} \rightarrow \nu=|u|^{p^{*}}+\sum_{j \in J} \nu_{j} \delta_{x_{j}} \\
S \nu_{j}^{\frac{p}{p^{*}}} \leq \mu_{j} \quad \text { if } x_{j} \in \Omega \\
S \nu_{j}^{\frac{p}{p^{*}}} \leq 2^{\frac{p}{N}} \mu_{j} \text { if } x_{j} \in \partial \Omega
\end{gathered}
$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, \varepsilon>0$ and take $\varphi \in C^{\infty}(\Omega)$ such that

$$
\varphi \equiv 1 \text { in } B\left(x_{k}, \varepsilon\right), \quad \varphi \equiv 0 \quad \text { in } X \backslash B\left(x_{k}, 2 \varepsilon\right), \quad|\nabla \varphi| \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon}
$$

Since $I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)\left(\varphi u_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0$ an $n \rightarrow+\infty$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty}\left[\int_{\Omega}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{p-2} \nabla u_{n} \nabla \varphi u_{n} d x+\int_{\Omega}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{p} \varphi d x\right] \\
& =\lambda \int_{\Omega}|u|^{p} \varphi d x-\int_{\partial \Omega} b(x)|u|^{p} \varphi d \sigma+\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} \int_{\Omega}\left|u_{n}\right|^{p^{*}} \varphi d x+\mu \int_{\partial \Omega} \rho(x)|u|^{r} \varphi d \sigma \\
& =\lambda \int_{\Omega}|u|^{p} \varphi d x-\int_{\partial \Omega}|u|^{p} \varphi d \sigma+\int_{\Omega} \varphi d \nu+\mu \int_{\partial \Omega} \rho(x)|u|^{r} \varphi d \sigma .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that, by the Holder inequality,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty}\left|\int_{\Omega}\right| \nabla u_{n}\right|^{p-2} \nabla u_{n} \nabla \varphi u_{n} d x \mid \\
& \leq \lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty}\left(\int_{\Omega}\left|u_{n}\right|^{p} \varphi d x\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty}\left(\int_{\Omega}|\nabla \varphi|^{p}\left|u_{n}\right|^{p} d x\right)^{1 / p} \\
& \leq C\left(\int_{B\left(x_{k}, 2 \varepsilon\right) \cap \Omega}|\nabla \varphi|^{p}|u|^{p} d x\right)^{1 / p} \\
& \leq C\left(\int_{B\left(x_{k}, 2 \varepsilon\right) \cap \Omega}|\nabla \varphi|^{N} d x\right)^{1 / N}\left(\int_{B\left(x_{k}, 2 \varepsilon\right) \cap \Omega}|u|^{p^{*}} d x\right)^{1 / p^{*}} \\
& \leq C^{\prime} \int_{B\left(x_{k}, 2 \varepsilon\right) \cap \Omega}|u|^{p^{*}} d x \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

and so

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}\left[\int_{\Omega} \varphi d \mu-\lambda \int_{\Omega}|u|^{p} \varphi d x+\int_{\partial \Omega} b(x)|u|^{p} \varphi d \sigma-\int_{\Omega} \varphi d \nu-\mu \int_{\partial \Omega} \rho(x)|u|^{r} \varphi d \sigma\right] \\
& =\mu_{k}-\nu_{k}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently, $S \nu_{k}^{\frac{p}{p^{*}}} \leq \nu_{k}$ if $x_{k} \in \Omega$ or $2^{-\frac{p}{N}} S \nu_{k}^{\frac{p}{p^{*}}} \leq \nu_{k}$ if $x_{k} \in \partial \Omega$, implying that $S^{\frac{N}{p}} \leq \nu_{k}$ if $x_{k} \in \Omega$ or $\frac{1}{2} S^{\frac{N}{p}} \leq \nu_{k}$ if $x_{k} \in \partial \Omega$. On the other hand,

$$
c=\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} I\left(u_{n}\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} I\left(u_{n}\right)-\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{1}{p} I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)\left(u_{n}\right)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{p^{*}}\right) \int_{\Omega}|u|^{p^{*}}+\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{p^{*}}\right) \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j \in J} \nu_{j} \delta_{x_{j}}+\mu\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{r}\right) \int_{\partial \Omega} \rho(x)|u|^{r} d \sigma \\
& \geq\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{p^{*}}\right) \nu_{k}=\frac{1}{N} S^{N / p}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus $\nu_{k}=0$ for every $k \in J$, implying that $\int_{\Omega}\left|u_{n}\right|^{p^{*}} d x \rightarrow \int_{\Omega}|u|^{p^{*}} d x$. The result follows by exploiting the continuity of the inverse $p$-Laplace operator.

Theorem 3.2. There exists $\mu_{0}>0$ such that for $\mu \geq \mu_{0}$ problem (1)-(1) admits a solution.

Proof. We will first verify the requirements for the mountain pass theorem. By the Sobolev embedding and trace theorems we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(u) & =\frac{1}{p}[u]^{p}-\frac{1}{p^{*}} A(u)-\frac{\mu}{r} P(u) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{p}[u]^{p}-C_{1}[u]^{p^{*}}-C_{2}[u]^{r},
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $C_{1}, C_{2}>0$, and so for a sufficiently small positive number $\beta$ there exists $a>0$ such that $I(u)>a>0$ for $[u]=\beta$. We now take $v \in X \backslash\{0\}$. It is easy to see that $\lim _{s \rightarrow+\infty} I(s v)=-\infty$. Thus, $I\left(s_{0} v\right)<0$ for sufficiently large $s_{0}$.

Let $c:=\inf _{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup _{t \in[0,1]} I(\gamma(t))$, where $\Gamma:=\{\gamma \in C([0,1], X): \gamma(0)=0, \gamma(1)=$ $\left.s_{0} v\right\}$. We will show that $c<\frac{1}{N} S^{\frac{N}{p}}$ for large enough $\mu$. Take $z \in X$ such that $\|z\|_{p^{*}}=1$. The maximum value of $\eta \rightarrow I(\eta z), \eta>0$, is assumed at the point $\eta_{\mu}$ satisfying $\frac{d}{d \eta} I\left(\eta_{\mu} z\right)=0$, that is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta_{\mu}^{p}[z]^{p}=\eta_{\mu}^{p^{*}}\|z\|_{p^{*}}^{p^{*}}+\mu \eta_{\mu}^{r} P(z)=\eta_{\mu}^{p^{*}}+\mu \eta_{\mu}^{r} P(z) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\eta_{\mu} \leq[z]^{\frac{p}{p^{*}-p}}
$$

which, in view of (3.3), yields $\lim _{\mu \rightarrow+\infty} \eta_{\mu}=0$. On the other hand,

$$
I\left(\eta_{\mu} z\right)=\eta_{\mu}^{p}\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{p^{*}}\right)[z]^{p}+\mu \eta_{\mu}^{r}\left(\frac{1}{p^{*}}-\frac{1}{r}\right) P(z) \leq \eta_{\mu}^{p}\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{p^{*}}\right)[z]^{p}
$$

implying that $\lim _{\mu \rightarrow+\infty} I\left(\eta_{\mu} z\right)=0$. Thus, for large enough $\mu$, say $\mu \geq \mu_{0}, I\left(\eta_{\mu} z\right)<$ $\frac{1}{N} S^{\frac{N}{p}}$. By Lemma 3.1, $I(\cdot)$ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition and the mountain pass theorem provides a solution.
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