

Blow-up boundary solutions for a class of nonhomogeneous logistic equations

IONICĂ ANDREI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we will be concerned with the equations $\Delta_{p(x)}u = g(x)f(u)$, where Ω is a bounded domain, g is a non-negative continuous function on Ω which is allowed to be unbounded on Ω and non-linearity f is a non-negative non-decreasing functions. We show that the equation $\Delta_{p(x)}u = g(x)f(u)$ admits a non-negative local weak solution $u \in W_{loc}^{1,p(x)}(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ such that $u(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ if $\Delta_{p(x)}w = -g(x)$ in the weak sense for some $w \in W_0^{1,p(x)}(\Omega)$ and f satisfies a generalized Keller-Osserman condition.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 35J60; Secondary 58E05.
Key words and phrases. elliptic equation, blow-up solutions, $p(x)$ -Laplacian.

1. Introduction

Differential equations and variational problems with nonstandard $p(x)$ -growth conditions have been studied intensively in the recent years. The results this paper have been obtained by Mohammed [24] in the case $p > 1$ is a real number.

In this paper, we will be concerned with local weak solutions to equations of the form

$$\Delta_{p(x)}u = H(x, u), \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (1)$$

where $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}^N$ is a bounded domain and $\Delta_{p(x)}v := \operatorname{div}(|\nabla v|^{p(x)-2}\nabla v)$ is the $p(x)$ -Laplacian, a function defined on \mathbf{R}^n with $1 < p(x) < \infty$ and $H : \Omega \times \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a continuous function with $H(x, t) = g(x)f(t)$.

By weak solution to (1) in the domain Ω we mean a function $u \in W^{1,p(x)}(\Omega)$ which satisfies

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p(x)-2}\nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi dx = - \int_{\Omega} H(x, u)\varphi dx \quad (2)$$

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

By local weak solution to (1) in the domain Ω we mean a function $u \in W_{loc}^{1,p(x)}(\Omega)$ which is a weak solution of (1) on D for every sub-domain D with $\overline{D} \subset \Omega$.

By local weak solution u of (1) we mean a (local weak) blow-up solution u which is continuous on Ω and

$$u(x) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as} \quad d(x, \partial\Omega) \rightarrow 0.$$

We study in this paper the solutions $u \in W_{loc}^{1,p(x)}(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ to the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p(x)-2}\nabla u) = g(x)f(u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u(x) \rightarrow \infty & \text{as } d(x, \partial\Omega) \rightarrow 0. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Received: 08 June 2009.

The function g is supposed that is non-negative, which satisfies the following condition:

for any $x_0 \in \Omega$ satisfying $g(x_0) = 0$, there exists a sub-domain

$$O \text{ with } \overline{O} \subset \Omega \text{ containing } x_0 \text{ such that } g(x) > 0 \text{ for all } x \in \partial O. \quad (4)$$

Suppose that the non-linearity f satisfies

(F1) $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a non-decreasing C^1 function such that $f(0) = 0$,

and

(F2) $f(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$.

The growth condition on f at infinity,

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{(F(t))^{1/p(x)}} dt < \infty, \quad \text{where } F(t) := \int_0^t f(s) ds, \quad (5)$$

first introduced by Keller [18] and Osserman [25] and is crucial in the investigation of existence of blow-up solutions.

We will refer to the condition (5) as the generalized Keller-Osserman, or simply the Keller-Osserman condition.

Keller [18] and Osserman [25] gave the condition (5) that a necessary and sufficient for the equation $\Delta u = f(u)$ to admit a blow-up solution on a bounded domain Ω (with $p > 1$ a real number).

The Keller-Osserman type condition around the origin we have, also, in [26].

The important results clung of blow-up solutions have been obtained in the papers [1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 20, 21, 23] and references therein. Cîrstea and Rădulescu [6, 10, 11] prove the uniqueness and asymptotic behavior of solutions for problem

$$\Delta u = g(x)f(u), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad u(x) \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \rightarrow \infty, \quad (6)$$

when $g \in C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)$ is a nonnegative function and f is regularly varying.

We recall some definitions and basic properties of the variable exponent Lebesgue-Sobolev spaces $L^{p(x)}(\Omega)$ and $W_0^{1,p(x)}(\Omega)$, where Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbf{R}^N .

Set $C_+(\overline{\Omega}) = \{h \in C(\overline{\Omega}) : \min_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} h(x) > 1\}$. For any $h \in C_+(\overline{\Omega})$ we define

$$h^+ = \sup_{x \in \Omega} h(x) \quad \text{and} \quad h^- = \inf_{x \in \Omega} h(x).$$

For any $p \in C_+(\overline{\Omega})$, we introduce the variable exponent Lebesgue space

$$L^{p(x)}(\Omega) = \{u : u \text{ is a measurable real-valued function such that}$$

$$\int_\Omega |u(x)|^{p(x)} dx < \infty\},$$

endowed with the so-called Luxemburg norm

$$|u|_{p(x)} = \inf \left\{ \mu > 0; \int_\Omega \left| \frac{u(x)}{\mu} \right|^{p(x)} dx \leq 1 \right\},$$

which is a separable and reflexive Banach space. For basic properties of the variable exponent Lebesgue spaces we refer to [19]. If $0 < |\Omega| < \infty$ and p_1, p_2 are variable exponents in $C_+(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $p_1 \leq p_2$ in Ω , then the embedding $L^{p_2(x)}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{p_1(x)}(\Omega)$ is continuous, [19, Theorem 2.8].

Let $L^{p'(x)}(\Omega)$ be the conjugate space of $L^{p(x)}(\Omega)$, obtained by conjugating the exponent pointwise that is, $1/p(x) + 1/p'(x) = 1$, [19, Corollary 2.7]. For any $u \in$

$L^{p(x)}(\Omega)$ and $v \in L^{p'(x)}(\Omega)$ the following Hölder type inequality

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} uv \, dx \right| \leq \left(\frac{1}{p^-} + \frac{1}{p'^-} \right) |u|_{p(x)} |v|_{p'(x)} \quad (7)$$

is valid.

An important role in manipulating the generalized Lebesgue–Sobolev spaces is played by the modular of the $L^{p(x)}(\Omega)$ space, which is the mapping $\rho_{p(x)} : L^{p(x)}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ given by

$$\rho_{p(x)}(u) = \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p(x)} \, dx.$$

If (u_n) , $u \in L^{p(x)}(\Omega)$ then the following relations hold

$$|u|_{p(x)} < 1 \quad (= 1; > 1) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \rho_{p(x)}(u) < 1 \quad (= 1; > 1) \quad (8)$$

$$|u|_{p(x)} > 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad |u|_{p(x)}^{p^-} \leq \rho_{p(x)}(u) \leq |u|_{p(x)}^{p^+} \quad (9)$$

$$|u|_{p(x)} < 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad |u|_{p(x)}^{p^+} \leq \rho_{p(x)}(u) \leq |u|_{p(x)}^{p^-} \quad (10)$$

$$|u_n - u|_{p(x)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \rho_{p(x)}(u_n - u) \rightarrow 0, \quad (11)$$

since $p^+ < \infty$. For a proof of these facts see [19].

We will need the following comparison principle for weak solutions to equations.

Theorem 1.1. (*Weak comparison principle*). *Let $G : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be continuous and further assume that it is non-increasing in the second variable. Let $u, v \in W^{1,p(x)}(\Omega)$ satisfy the inequalities*

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p(x)-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi \leq \int_{\Omega} G(x, u) \varphi$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^{p(x)-2} \nabla v \cdot \nabla \varphi \geq \int_{\Omega} G(x, v) \varphi$$

for all non-negative $\varphi \in W_0^{1,p(x)}(\Omega)$. Then the inequality $u \leq v$ on $\partial\Omega$ implies $u \leq v$ in Ω .

Proof. See Lemma 2.3 in [28].

The other result which using is the following interior regularity result for weak solutions to equations. It is due to DiBenedetto [13] and Tolksdorf [27].

Theorem 1.2. (*DiBenedetto-Tolksdorf $C^{1,\alpha}$ interior regularity*). *Suppose $h(x, t)$ is measurable in $x \in \Omega$ and continuous in $t \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $|h(x, t)| \leq \Gamma$ on $\Omega \times \mathbf{R}$. Let $u \in W^{1,p(x)} \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ be a weak solution of $\Delta_{p(x)} u = h(x, u)$. Given a sub-domain D with $\overline{D} \subset \Omega$, there is $\alpha > 0$ and a positive constant C , depending on $n, p, \Gamma, \|u\|_\infty$ and D such that*

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla u(x) - \nabla u(y)| \leq C|x - y|^\alpha, \quad x, y \in D. \quad (12)$$

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present a sufficient condition on the weight g for problem (3) to admit a local weak blow-up solution. In Section 3 we investigated asymptotic boundary behavior of blow-up solutions.

2. Existence of blow-up solutions

In this section we assume that $H(x, t)$ satisfies the assumptions in Theorem 1.2.

We start with the following lemma that extends a result of Lair (see Theorem 1 of [20], see also [24]) to the $p(x)$ -Laplacian case.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}^N$ be a bounded domain. Suppose that $g \in C(\overline{D})$ satisfied (4) on D . Let f satisfy the Keller-Osserman condition. Then the problem*

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p(x)-2}\nabla u) = g(x)f(u) & \text{in } D, \\ u(x) \rightarrow \infty & \text{as } d(x, \partial D) \rightarrow 0, \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

admits a non-negative solution $u \in W_{loc}^{1,p(x)}(D) \cap C^{1,\alpha}(D)$, $0 < \alpha < 1$.

Proof. We follow the method used by Mohammed [24]. Let $u_k \in W^{1,p(x)}(D)$ be a weak solutions of

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p(x)-2}\nabla u) = g(x)f(u) & x \in D, \\ u(x) = k & x \in \partial D, \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, (see [12, Theorem 4.2]). Using the fact that $u \equiv 0$ is a solution of the above Dirichlet problem with $k = 0$, by the comparison principle we see that

$$0 \leq u_k(x) \leq u_{k+1}(x), \quad x \in D,$$

for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$. By proceeding as in [20] we find that $\{u_k\}$ is uniformly bounded on sub-domains that are compactly contained in D . Let us consider U with $\overline{U} \subset D$ a sub-domain and take $x_0 \in U$. We have the following alternative: either $g(x_0) > 0$ or $g(x_0) = 0$. Suppose that $g(x_0) > 0$. Then there is a ball B containing x_0 such that $g > 0$ on $2B$. Let w be a blow-up solution of $\Delta_{p(x)}u = mf(u)$, $u = \infty$ on $\partial(2B)$, where $m > 0$ is the minimum of g on $2B$. The existence of such a blow-up solutions follows from [14, 22, 23]. Using again the comparison principle we deduce that $u_k \leq w$ on $2B$. But w is locally bounded. Therefore $u_k \leq C$ on B for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$, and some $C > 0$. Now, suppose that $g(x_0) = 0$. Since condition (4) it follows that there exists a sub-domain O with $\overline{O} \subset D$ such that $g(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \partial O$. Now, arguing as in [20] we deduce that $u_k \leq C$ on ∂O for some C and all $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Using again the comparison principle we see that $u_k \leq C$ on O for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Therefore in any case we have that given $x_0 \in U$ there is a ball $B \subset U$ containing x_0 and a positive constant C_B such that $0 \leq u_k \leq C_B$ on B for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$. By covering U by such balls we obtain that $\{u_k\}$ is indeed uniformly bounded on U .

From the Theorem 1.2 we see that sequences $\{u_k\}$ and $\{\nabla u_k\}$ are equicontinuous in subdomains compactly contained in Ω , and thus we can find a subsequence, which we still denote by $\{u_k\}$, such that $u_k \rightarrow u$ and $\nabla u_k \rightarrow v$ uniformly on compact subsets of D for some $u \in C(D)$ and $v \in (C(D))^n$. We immediately see that $v = \nabla u$ on D , and it follows from the interior $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimate (12) that $\nabla u \in C^\alpha(D)$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$. Therefore $u \in W_{loc}^{1,p(x)}(D) \cap C^{1,\alpha}(D)$. Let U with $\overline{U} \subset D$ and $\varphi \in W_0^{1,p(x)}(U)$. Using again (12) we easily get that $|\nabla u_k|^{p(x)-1}|\nabla \varphi| \leq C|\nabla \varphi|$ on U and since the function $\xi \rightarrow |\xi|^{p(x)-2}\xi$ is continuous on \mathbf{R}^n , we deduce that

$$|\nabla u_k(x)|^{p(x)-2}\nabla u_k(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) \rightarrow |\nabla u(x)|^{p(x)-2}\nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) \text{ for } x \in U.$$

Then by the dominated convergence theorem we obtain that

$$\int_U |\nabla u_k(x)|^{p(x)-2}\nabla u_k(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) \rightarrow \int_U |\nabla u(x)|^{p(x)-2}\nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x).$$

Taking into account that $0 \leq f(u_k) \leq f(u_{k+1})$ and $f(u_k(x)) \rightarrow f(u(x))$ for each $x \in U$, with the monotone convergence theorem we get

$$\int_U gf(u_k)\varphi \rightarrow \int_U gf(u)\varphi.$$

Thus it follows that

$$\int_U |\nabla u|^{p(x)-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi = - \int_U gf(u)\varphi, \quad \varphi \in W_0^{1,p(x)}(U),$$

and we see that u is a local weak solution of $\Delta_{p(x)}u = gf(u)$ on D . Using the fact that $u_k = k$ on ∂D we obtain that $u(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \partial D$. ■ □

Now, we assume that f satisfies the Keller Osserman condition (5). Then it follows that (see Lemma 2.1 of [17])

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(F(t))^{(p(x)-1)/p(x)}}{f(t)} = 0 \tag{15}$$

We obtain that for $t > 0$,

$$\int_t^\infty \frac{1}{f(s)^{1/(p(x)-1)}} ds < \infty.$$

Next, we define $\gamma : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \gamma(0+))$ given by

$$\gamma(t) := \int_t^\infty \frac{1}{f(s)^{1/(p(x)-1)}} ds,$$

which is a decreasing function.

Next, we assume the following condition on $g \in C(\Omega)$ (introduced in [24]), which we will tell off to as the G -condition.

There exist a sequence $\{D_k\}$ of domains such that

- (1) $\overline{D}_k \subseteq D_{k+1}; k = 1, 2, \dots$
- (2) $\Omega = \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty D_k$.
- (3) g satisfied condition (4) on each D_k .

We consider the following Dirichlet problem:

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla w|^{p(x)-2} \nabla w) = -g(x), & x \in \Omega, \\ w(x) = 0 & x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

Next, we prove the following result

Theorem 2.1. *Let f be a function satisfying the Keller-Osserman condition, and suppose that $g \in C(\Omega)$ satisfy the G -condition. Then (3) admits a non-negative blow-up solution, if the Dirichlet problem (16) has a weak solution.*

Proof. We follow the method used by Mohammed [24]. Using the G -condition it follows that there exist domains D_j with $\overline{D}_j \subseteq D_{j+1} \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\bigcup_{j=1}^\infty D_j = \Omega$, and g satisfying the condition (4) on each D_j . Since $g \in C(\overline{D}_j)$ and g verifies condition (4) on D_j , by the Lemma 2.1 obtain that for each j there exists u_j a local weak blow-up solution of (3) with D_j replacing Ω . Using the comparison principle we get that $u_{j+1} \leq u_j$ on D_j .

Now let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed, and we denote $v_j(x) := \gamma(u_j(x) + \varepsilon)$, $x \in D_j$. Then, it follows that

$$|\nabla v_j|^{p^+-2} \nabla v_j = |\gamma'(u_j + \varepsilon)|^{p^+-2} \gamma'(u_j + \varepsilon) |\nabla u_j|^{p^+-2} \nabla u_j.$$

and

$$\nabla \left(|\gamma'(u_j + \varepsilon)|^{p^+ - 2} \gamma'(u_j + \varepsilon) \right) = (p^+ - 1) |\gamma'(u_j + \varepsilon)|^{p^+ - 2} \gamma''(u_j + \varepsilon) \nabla u_j.$$

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{D_j} |\nabla v_j|^{p(x) - 2} \nabla v_j \cdot \nabla \varphi \leq \int_{D_j} |\nabla v_j|^{p^+ - 2} \nabla v_j \cdot \nabla \varphi \\ &= \int_{D_j} |\nabla u_j|^{p^+ - 2} \nabla u_j \cdot \nabla \left(|\gamma'(u_j + \varepsilon)|^{p^+ - 2} \gamma'(u_j + \varepsilon) \varphi \right) \\ & \quad - \int_{D_j} |\nabla u_j|^{p^+ - 2} \nabla u_j \cdot \nabla \left(|\gamma'(u_j + \varepsilon)|^{p^+ - 2} \gamma'(u_j + \varepsilon) \right) \varphi \\ &= - \int_{D_j} g f(u_j) |\gamma'(u_j + \varepsilon)|^{p^+ - 2} \gamma'(u_j + \varepsilon) \varphi \\ & \quad - (p^+ - 1) \int_{D_j} |\nabla u_j|^{p^+} |\gamma'(u_j + \varepsilon)|^{p^+ - 2} \gamma''(u_j + \varepsilon) \varphi. \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(D_j)$ is a non-negative test function.

If we denote that

$$|\gamma'(t)|^{p^+ - 2} \gamma'(t) = -\frac{1}{f(t)} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma''(t) = \frac{1}{p^+ - 1} \frac{f'(t)}{f(t)^{p^+ / (p^+ - 1)}},$$

then we have the equation

$$\int_{D_j} |\nabla v_j|^{p^+ - 2} \nabla v_j \cdot \nabla \varphi = \int_{D_j} g \frac{f(u_j)}{f(u_j + \varepsilon)} \varphi - \int_{D_j} |\nabla u_j|^{p^+} \frac{f'(u_j + \varepsilon)}{f^2(u_j + \varepsilon)} \varphi.$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\int_{D_j} |\nabla v_j|^{p(x) - 2} \nabla v_j \cdot \nabla \varphi \leq \int_{D_j} g \varphi, \quad 0 \leq \varphi \in C_0^\infty(D_j).$$

Using the density argument we get that the above inequality is still valid for all $0 \leq \varphi \in W_0^{1,p(x)}(D_j)$.

Using again the comparison principle, we obtain that

$$v_j(x) \leq w(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in D_j, \quad (17)$$

where w is a local weak solution to the Dirichlet problem (16). Let D a domain in Ω with $\overline{D} \subset \Omega$. We choose m such that $D \subseteq D_m$. We observe that the sequence $\{u_j(x)\}_{j=m+1}^\infty$, with $x \in D_m$, is a monotone non-increasing sequence bounded below by $\gamma^{-1}(w)$. Using the regularity theorem we also obtain that $\{\nabla u_j\}_{j=k}^\infty$ is equicontinuous on D_k . Hence by diagonal extraction we find a subsequence $\{u_j\}$ such that $u_j(x) \rightarrow u(x)$ and $\nabla u_j(x) \rightarrow \nabla u(x)$ for $x \in D$. We observe that for all $k \geq m+1$ the following inequalities holds:

$$|\nabla u_k|^{p(x) - 1} |\nabla \varphi| \leq C_m |\nabla \varphi|, \quad f(u_k) \leq f(u_{m+1}) \quad \text{on } D,$$

where $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(D)$.

Taking into account these inequalities and the pointwise convergence we obtain

$$|\nabla u_k(x)|^{p(x) - 2} \nabla u_k \cdot \nabla \varphi \rightarrow |\nabla u|^{p(x) - 2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi, \quad f(u_k) \rightarrow f(u) \quad \text{on } D.$$

By the Lebesgue convergence theorem, we see that

$$\int_D |\nabla u_k(x)|^{p(x) - 2} \nabla u_k(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) \rightarrow \int_D |\nabla u(x)|^{p(x) - 2} \nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x)$$

and

$$\int_D gf(u_k)\varphi \rightarrow \int_D gf(u)\varphi.$$

Thus, we have that

$$\int_D |\nabla u|^{p(x)-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi = - \int_D gf(u)\varphi, \quad \varphi \in C_0^\infty(D).$$

Using the usual density argument, we obtain that the above equation continues to hold for any $\varphi \in W_0^{1,p(x)}(D)$, and it follows that u is a local weak solution of $\Delta_{p(x)}u = gf(u)$ on Ω . But, by (17) we observe, since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, that $\gamma(u) \leq w$ on Ω . Taking $U \subseteq \Omega$ a neighborhood of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ such that $0 \leq w \leq \gamma(0+)$ it follows that $u(x) \geq \gamma^{-1}(w(x))$ on U and so $u(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \partial\Omega$. ■ □

Corollary 2.1. *We assume that $g \in C(\Omega)$ for which the Dirichlet problem (16) admits a weak solution w and let f be a function which satisfies the Keller-Osserman condition. Then we have*

$$u(x) \geq \gamma^{-1}(w(x))$$

for any non-negative blow-up solution u of (3) and for x near $\partial\Omega$.

Proof. Since the proof of the above theorem we observe that the function

$$v(x) = \gamma(u + \varepsilon), \quad \varepsilon > 0,$$

where u is a non-negative blow-up solution of (3), which satisfies the inequality

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^{p(x)-2} \nabla v \cdot \nabla \varphi \leq \int_\Omega g\varphi, \quad 0 \leq \varphi \in W_0^{1,p(x)}(\Omega).$$

Using again the comparison principle we get

$$\gamma(u + \varepsilon)(x) \leq w(x), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Thus, we have

$$u(x) + \varepsilon \geq \gamma^{-1}(w(x)) \quad \text{for } x \text{ near } \partial\Omega.$$

Using the fact that $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $u(x) \geq \gamma^{-1}(w(x))$. ■ □

3. Asymptotic boundary behavior of blow-up solutions

In this section we investigated asymptotic boundary behavior of blow-up solutions of (3) near the boundary $\partial\Omega$. We denote by $d(x)$ the distance of $x \in \Omega$ to the boundary $\partial\Omega$ and with $d(x, \partial D)$ the distance of $x \in D$ to ∂D for other domains D . For the next result we assume that Ω is a bounded domain with C^2 boundary $\partial\Omega$. We know that (see [16]) there exists a positive number $\mu = \mu(\Omega)$, depending only on Ω , such that the distance function $d(x)$, $x \in \Omega$ is in $C^2(\bar{\Gamma}_\mu)$, where Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbf{R}^n with boundary $\partial\Omega$ of class C^2 and

$$\Gamma_\mu : \{x \in \Omega : d(x) < \mu\}.$$

Moreover, we have that

$$|\nabla d(x)| = 1, \quad x \in \bar{\Gamma}_\mu.$$

Next, we prove the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\partial\Omega$ be of class C^2 , let f a function which satisfies the Keller-Osserman condition, let $g \in C(\Omega)$ be such that the Dirichlet problem (16) has a solution. If $\sup_{\Omega} g(x)d(x)^{(1-\beta)(p(x)-1)+1} \leq N < \infty$ for some $0 < \beta < 1$, then there is a neighborhood O of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ and a positive constant α , depending only on Ω and the weight g , such that for any non-negative blow-up solution u of (3),*

$$u(x) \geq \gamma^{-1}(\alpha d(x)^\beta), \quad x \in O.$$

Proof. We follow the method used by Mohamed [24]. Let β be a real number such that $0 < \beta < 1$, and let $v(x) = \alpha d(x)^\beta$ with $\alpha > 0$ to be determined later. Using the fact that $v \in C^2(\Gamma_\mu)$, and that $|\nabla d(x)| = 1$ on Γ_μ we get

$$\nabla v = \alpha\beta d(x)^{\beta-1} \nabla d(x)$$

and

$$|\nabla v|^{p(x)-2} \nabla v = (\alpha\beta)^{p(x)-1} d(x)^{(p(x)-1)(\beta-1)} \nabla d(x).$$

Set $M := \max\{|\Delta d(x)| : x \in \bar{\Gamma}_\mu\}$.

On $\Gamma_\eta = \{x \in \Omega : d(x) < \eta\}$, where $0 < \eta \leq \mu$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla v|^{p(x)-2} \nabla v) - g(x) \\ &= d(x)^{(p(x)-1)(\beta-1)-1} \{ -(\alpha\beta)^{p(x)-1} [\ln(\alpha\beta) \cdot \nabla(p(x)-1) \nabla d(x) \cdot d(x) \\ & \quad + d(x) \cdot (\beta-1) \cdot \nabla(p(x)-1) \cdot d(x) \ln d(x) + 1 + d(x) \cdot \Delta d(x)] \\ & \quad - g(x) d(x)^{(p(x)-1)(1-\beta)+1} \} \\ & \geq d(x)^{(p(x)-1)(\beta-1)-1} \{ -(\alpha\beta)^{p(x)-1} [\ln(\alpha\beta) \cdot \nabla(p(x)-1) \nabla d(x) \cdot d(x) \\ & \quad + d(x) \cdot (\beta-1) \cdot \nabla(p(x)-1) \cdot d(x) \ln d(x) + 1 + d(x) \cdot M] - N \} \end{aligned}$$

We now choose $\eta > 0$ small enough and $\alpha > 0$ big enough such that

$$-\operatorname{div}(|\nabla v|^{p(x)-2} \nabla v) - g(x) \geq 0.$$

Taking into account this choices of α and η it follows that the function v satisfies

$$-\operatorname{div}(|\nabla v|^{p(x)-2} \nabla v) - g(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_\eta.$$

Now, since w is the solution to the Dirichlet problem (16) it follows from Corollary 2.1 that for any blow-up solution u of (3), we have $u(x) \geq \gamma^{-1}(w(x))$ in some neighborhood U of $\partial\Omega$. We choose $\eta > 0$ such that $\Gamma_\eta \subseteq U$ and α large enough such that $\alpha\eta^\beta \geq w$ on the set $\{x \in \Omega : d(x) = \eta\}$ so that $v \geq w$ on the boundary $\partial\Gamma_\eta$. Using the weak comparison principle we get that $w \leq v$ on Γ_η . Hence we see that $u \geq \gamma^{-1}(v)$ on Γ_η . With this the proof is complete. \blacksquare \square

We assume that f satisfies the Keller-Osserman condition and we consider the function

$$\psi(t) = \int_t^\infty \frac{1}{q(s)F(s)^{1/p(s)}} ds, \quad t > 0. \quad (18)$$

where $1/(q(s)) + 1/(p(s)) = 1$

The function ψ is decreasing and let ϕ be the inverse of the function ψ . Next, we use the following condition, introduced in [3]. At this condition we will use the Bandle-Marcus condition on f . Suppose that the function ψ defined in (18) satisfy

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(\beta t)}{\psi(t)} > 1 \quad \text{for any } 0 < \beta < 1. \quad (19)$$

We recall a result from [3](see also [24])

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that $\psi \in C[t_0, \infty)$ is strictly monotone decreasing and satisfies (19) and let $\phi := \psi^{-1}$. If is given a positive number γ there exist positive numbers η_γ, ρ_γ with the following property:*

$$\text{If } \gamma > 1, \quad \text{then } \phi((1 - \eta)\rho) \leq \gamma\phi(\rho) \quad \text{for all } \eta \in [0, \eta_\gamma], \quad \rho \in [0, \rho_\gamma]; \quad (20)$$

$$\text{If } \gamma < 1, \quad \text{then } \phi((1 + \eta)\rho) \geq \gamma\phi(\rho) \quad \text{for all } \eta \in [0, \eta_\gamma], \quad \rho \in [0, \rho_\gamma]. \quad (21)$$

Given a bounded domain D with C^2 boundary ∂D and a function f with satisfies the Keller-Osserman condition, we note that if $u \in W_{loc}^{1,p(x)}(D) \cap C(D)$ is a solution of

$$\Delta_{p(x)} u = f(u), \quad u(x) \rightarrow \infty, \quad x \rightarrow \partial D,$$

then by [23] it is known that

$$\lim_{d(x, \partial D)} \frac{u(x)}{\phi(d(x, \partial D))} = 1. \quad (22)$$

A similar result for weak blow-up solutions of (3) when $g \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ we prove in the next theorem.

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbf{R}^n . We say that Ω satisfies a uniform interior(exterior) sphere condition if there is $R > 0$ such that for any $y \in \partial\Omega$ and any $0 < r < R$ there is a ball $B := B_r(x)$ contained in Ω (contained in the complement Ω^c) such that $\partial B \cap \partial\Omega = \{y\}$. (see [24])

Theorem 3.2. *We assume that Ω is a bounded domain that satisfies both the uniform interior and exterior sphere conditions. Let f be a function which satisfies both the Keller-Osserman and the Bandle-Marcus conditions. If $g \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $g > 0$ on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ then for any non-negative solution u of (3) we have*

$$\lim_{d(x) \rightarrow 0} \frac{u(x)}{\phi(g(x)^{1/p^+} d(x))} = 1. \quad (23)$$

Proof. We follow the method introduced by Bandle and Marcus in [3] (see also [23], [24]). Let $z \in \partial\Omega$. First we prove that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow z} \frac{u(x)}{\phi(g^{1/p^+}(x) d(x))} \leq 1.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Taking $\gamma = 1 + \varepsilon$ in Lemma 3.1 we find $\eta_\varepsilon < 1$ and $\rho_\varepsilon > 0$ such that (20) holds for all $\eta \in [0, \eta_\varepsilon]$, $\rho \in [0, \rho_\varepsilon]$. We choose $\eta > 0$ such that $2\eta - \eta^2 < \eta_\varepsilon$. We observe that $g^{1/p^+}(x) d(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow z$ and we see that g^{1/p^+} is continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$. Hence there is $r_1 = r_1(z, \eta)$ such that $|g^{1/p^+}(x) - g^{1/p^+}(z)| < g^{1/p^+}(z)\eta$ and $g^{1/p^+}(x) d(x, \partial B) < \rho_\varepsilon$ when $|x - z| < r_1$, $x \in \overline{\Omega}$.

We observe that $g^{1/p^+}(z) > g^{1/p^+}(x)(1 - \eta)$ for any $x \in \Omega$, $|x - z| < r_1$. Hence, for such x we see that

$$\alpha^{1/p^+} > g^{1/p^+}(z)(1 - \eta) > g^{1/p^+}(x)(1 - \eta)^2.$$

Taking into account the fact that ϕ is decreasing and the above inequality, we have that

$$\phi(\alpha^{1/p^+} d(x)) \leq \phi(g^{1/p^+}(x) d(x)) (1 - (2\eta - \eta^2)), \quad x \in \Omega, |x - z| < r_1.$$

It follows from (20) of Lemma 3.1 and the above inequality that

$$\phi(\alpha^{1/p^+} d(x)) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\phi(g^{1/p^+}(x) d(x)), \quad x \in \Omega, |x - z| < r_1. \quad (24)$$

Using the fact that Ω satisfies the interior sphere condition we choose a ball $B := B(x_0, r) \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\partial B \cap \partial\Omega = \{z\}$. We assume that the radius r is small enough such that $r < r_1/2$ and $g > 0$ on B .

Set $\alpha = \inf\{g(x) : x \in B\} > 0$ and let $w \in W_{loc}^{1,p(x)}(B) \cap C(B)$ be a blow-up solution of

$$\Delta_{p(x)} w = \alpha f(w).$$

It follows from the comparison principle that

$$u(x) \leq w(x), \quad x \in B \quad (25)$$

Letting αf instead of f in (18) and taking ϕ^α for the corresponding inverse, we observe that

$$\phi^\alpha(s) = \phi(\alpha^{1/p^+} s).$$

It follows from (22) that

$$\lim_{d(x, \partial B) \rightarrow 0} \frac{w(x)}{\phi(\alpha^{1/p^+} d(x, \partial B))} = 1.$$

Also for the each $\varepsilon > 0$ given there exists a $\rho > 0$ such that

$$w(x) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \phi\left(\alpha^{1/p^+} d(x, \partial B)\right), \quad \text{with } x \in B \text{ and } d(x, \partial B) < \rho. \quad (26)$$

Next, we choose $x \in B$ on segment $\overline{x_0 z}$ such that $d(x, \partial B) = d(x)$. We observe that for this x we have from (24) and (26) that

$$\phi\left(\alpha^{1/p^+} d(x, \partial B)\right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2 \phi\left(g^{1/p^+}(x) d(x)\right).$$

From the above inequality and (25) we obtain that

$$u(x) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2 \phi\left(g^{1/p^+}(x) d(x)\right)$$

for $x \in B$ which lies on the segment $\overline{x_0 z}$. Hence

$$\lim_{d(x) \rightarrow 0} \sup \frac{u(x)}{\phi(g^{1/p^+}(x) d(x))} \leq 1. \quad (27)$$

Taking into account the fact that Ω satisfies the exterior sphere condition and using a similar argument as in the above we can show that

$$\lim_{d(x) \rightarrow 0} \inf \frac{u(x)}{\phi(g^{1/p^+}(x) d(x))} \geq 1.$$

Let $z \in \partial\Omega$ and let $B = B(x_0, r) \subseteq \Omega^c$ such that $\partial B \cap \partial\Omega = \{z\}$. We denote $D(r) = B(x_0, 2r) \setminus B(x_0, r)$ and set $\beta := \sup\{g(x) : x \in \overline{\Omega \cap D(r)}\}$. From [23] it follows that there exists $w \in W_{loc}^{1,p(x)}(D(r))$ a solution of

$$\Delta_{p(x)} w = \beta f(w), \quad w(x) \rightarrow \infty \text{ on } \partial B(x_0, r) \text{ and } w(x) = 0 \text{ on } \partial B(x_0, 2r).$$

Using the comparison principle we obtain that

$$w(x) \leq u(x), \quad x \in \Omega \cap D(r). \quad (28)$$

By [23] we see that w satisfies

$$\lim_{D(r) \ni x \rightarrow \partial B(x_0, r)} \frac{w(x)}{\phi(\beta^{1/p^+} d(x, \partial B(x_0, r)))} \geq 1.$$

In a similar manner it follows from (21) of Lemma 3.1 that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \partial\Omega} \inf \frac{u(x)}{\phi(g(x)^{1/p^+} d(x, \partial\Omega))} \geq 1. \quad (29)$$

Using (27) and (29) it follows that the proof is complete. ■ □

Note that, in general, a solutions u of (3) does not satisfy the limit in (23). From [4] we see that the limit superior in (3.10) could be zero, while the limit inferior in (29) could be infinity.

Therefore we assume that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\Gamma_\eta} g(x) &> 0 \text{ for some } \eta > 0, \\ g(x)^{1/p^+} d(x, \partial\Omega) &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } d(x) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Theorem 3.3. *We assume that $g \in C(\Omega)$ satisfy (30) and let f be a function which satisfies both the Keller-Osserman and the Bandle-Marcus conditions. If u is a blow-up solution of (3) then we have*

$$\lim_{d(x) \rightarrow 0} \sup \frac{u(x)}{\phi(g^{1/p^+}(x)d(x))} \leq 1.$$

Proof. We follow the method used by Mohamed [24]. We prove arguing by contradiction. We assume that there is a sequence of points $x_i \in \Omega$ with $d(x_i) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\frac{u(x_i)}{\phi(g^{1/p^+}(x_i)d(x_i))} > 1 + \alpha$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and for some $\alpha > 0$. It follows from continuity that for each $i = 1, 2, \dots$, there is a ball $B_i(x_i) \subseteq \Omega$ centered at x_i such that

$$u(x) \geq (1 + \alpha)\phi\left(g^{1/p^+}(x)d(x)\right), \quad x \in B_i(x_i). \tag{31}$$

For $\gamma := 1 + \alpha/2$ we find η_α and ρ_α such that inequality (20) of Lemma 3.1 holds for all $\eta \in [0, \eta_\alpha]$ and all $\rho \in [0, \rho_\alpha]$. We denote

$$\Omega_i := \{x \in \Omega : d(x) > d(x_i)\}.$$

We choose $\nu > 0$ such that for all $x \in \Omega$ with $d(x) < \nu$ we have

$$g^{1/p^+}(x)d(x) \in [0, \rho_\alpha], \quad \frac{d(x, \partial\Omega) - d(x, \partial\Omega_i)}{d(x, \partial\Omega)} \in [0, \eta_\alpha],$$

for all i sufficiently large.

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi\left(g(x)^{1/p^+} d(x, \partial\Omega_i)\right) &= \phi\left(g(x)^{1/p^+} d(x, \partial\Omega) \left(1 - \frac{d(x, \partial\Omega) - d(x, \partial\Omega_i)}{d(x, \partial\Omega)}\right)\right) \\ &\leq (1 + \alpha/2)\phi\left(g(x)^{1/p^+} d(x, \partial\Omega)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Using the comparison principle, we obtain that

$$w_i(x) \geq u(x), \quad x \in \Omega_i,$$

where w_i is a blow-up solution of (3) on the set Ω_i .

By this and (31) it follows that

$$w_i(x) \geq (1 + \alpha/(\alpha + 2))\phi\left(g(x)^{1/p^+} d(x, \partial\Omega_i)\right), \quad x \in B_i(x_i) \cap (\Omega_i \setminus \Omega_\nu),$$

which is in contradiction with the fact that

$$\lim_{d(x, \partial\Omega_i) \rightarrow 0} \sup \frac{w_i(x)}{\phi(g^{1/p^+}(x)d(x, \partial\Omega_i))} \leq 1,$$

and thus the proof is complete. ■ □

References

- [1] C. Bandle, M. Marcus, Large solutions of semilinear elliptic equations: existence, uniqueness and asymptotic behaviour, *J. Anal. Math.* 58 (1992) 9-24.
- [2] C. Bandle, M. Marcus, On second order effects in the boundary behaviour of large solutions of semilinear elliptic problem, *Differential Integral Equations* 11 (1998) 23-34.
- [3] C. Bandle, M. Marcus, Asymptotic behaviour of solutions and their derivatives for semilinear elliptic problems with blow-up on the boundary, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré* 12 (1995) 155-171.
- [4] C. Bandle, Y. Cheng, G. Porru, Boundary blow-up in semilinear elliptic problems with singular weights at the boundary, *Institut Mittag-Leffler, Report No. 39, 1999-2000*, pp. 1-14.
- [5] F. Cîrstea and V. Rădulescu, Entire solutions blowing-up at infinity for semilinear elliptic systems, *J. Math. Pures Appliquées (Journal de Liouville)* 81 (2002), 827-846.
- [6] F. Cîrstea and V. Rădulescu, Uniqueness of the blow-up boundary solution of logistic equations with absorption, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I* 335 (2002), 447-452.
- [7] F. Cîrstea and V. Rădulescu, Asymptotics for the blow-up boundary solution of the logistic equation with absorption, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I* 336 (2003), 231-236.
- [8] F. Cîrstea and V. Rădulescu, Solutions with boundary blow-up for a class of nonlinear elliptic problems, *Houston J. Math.* 29 (2003), 821-829.
- [9] F. Cîrstea and V. Rădulescu, Extremal singular solutions for degenerate logistic-type equations in anisotropic media, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I* 339 (2004), 119-124.
- [10] F. Cîrstea and V. Rădulescu, Nonlinear problems with boundary blow-up: a Karamata regular variation theory approach, *Asymptotic Analysis* 46 (2006), 275-298.
- [11] F. Cîrstea and V. Rădulescu, Boundary blow-up in nonlinear elliptic equations of Bieberbach-Rademacher type, *Transactions Amer. Math. Soc.* 359 (2007), 3275-3286.
- [12] J. Diaz, *Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations and Free Boundaries*, vol I, *Elliptic Equations*, in: Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, vol. 106, Longman, 1985.
- [13] E. DiBenedetto, $C^{1+\alpha}$ local regularity of weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations, *Nonlinear Anal.* 7 (1983) 827-850.
- [14] Y. Du, Z. Guo, Liouville type results and eventual flatness of positive solutions for p -Laplacian equations, *Adv. Differential Equations* 7 (2002) 1479-1512.
- [15] M. Ghergu, V. Rădulescu, *Singular Elliptic Problems. Bifurcation and Asymptotic Analysis*, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and Its Applications, vol. 37, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [16] D. Gilbarg, N. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, second ed., Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [17] F. Gladiali, G. Porru, Estimates for explosive solutions to p -Laplace equations, in: *Progress in Partial Differential Equations (Pont-à-Mousson 1997)*, vol. 1, in: Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, vol 383, Longman, 1998, pp. 117-127.
- [18] J.B. Keller, On solutions of $\Delta u = f(u)$, *Comm. Pure Appl.* 10 (1957) 503-510.
- [19] O. Kováčik and J. Rákosník, On spaces $L^{p(x)}$ and $W^{1,p(x)}$, *Czechoslovak Math. J.* 41 (1991), 592-618.
- [20] A. V. Lair, A necessary and sufficient condition for existence of large solutions to semilinear elliptic equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 240 (1999), 205-218.
- [21] A. C. Lazer, P. J. McKenna, Asymptotic behaviour of solutions of boundary blow-up problems, *Differential Integral Equations* 7 (1994), 1001-1019.
- [22] O. Martio, G. Porru, Large solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations in the degenerate cases, in: *Complex analysis and Differential Equations, 1997*, 225-241.
- [23] J. Matero, Quasilinear elliptic equations with boundary blow-up, *J. Anal. Math.* 69 (1996), 229-247.
- [24] A. Mohamed, Existence and asymptotic behavior of blow-up solutions to weighted quasilinear equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 298 (2004), 621-637.
- [25] R. Osserman, On the inequality $\Delta u \geq f(u)$, *Pacific J. Math.* 7 (1957), 1641-1647.
- [26] V. Rădulescu, Bifurcation and asymptotics for elliptic problems with singular nonlinearity, in *Studies in Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations: In Honor of Haim Brezis*, Fifth European Conference on Elliptic and Parabolic Problems: A special tribute to the work of Haim Brezis, Gaeta, Italy, May 30 - June 3, 2004 (C. Bandle, H. Berestycki, B. Brighi, A. Brillard, M. Chipot,

J.-M. Coron, C. Sbordone, I. Shafrir, V. Valente, G. Vergara Caffarelli, Eds.), Birkhuser, 2005, pp. 349-362

- [27] P. Tolksdorf, Regularity for a more general class of quasilinear elliptic equations, J. Differential Equations 51 (1984), 126-150.
- [28] Q. Zhang, A strong maximum principle for differential equations with nonstandard $p(x)$ -growth conditions, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 312 (2005), 24-32.

(Ionică Andrei) UNIVERSITY OF CRAIOVA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 200585 CRAIOVA, ROMANIA

E-mail address: andreiionica2003@yahoo.com