

MARCO SQUASSINA

Weak solutions to general Euler's equations via nonsmooth critical point theory

Annales de la faculté des sciences de Toulouse 6^e série, tome 9, n^o 1 (2000), p. 113-131

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AFST_2000_6_9_1_113_0

© Université Paul Sabatier, 2000, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales de la faculté des sciences de Toulouse » (<http://picard.ups-tlse.fr/~annaes/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
<http://www.numdam.org/>

Weak Solutions to General Euler’s Equations via Nonsmooth Critical Point Theory (*)

MARCO SQUASSINA ⁽¹⁾

RÉSUMÉ. — Au moyen de la théorie des points critiques non réguliers, nous démontrons l’existence de solutions faibles qui ne sont pas nulles pour une classe générale de problèmes elliptiques non linéaires.

ABSTRACT. — By means of nonsmooth critical point theory we prove existence of a nontrivial weak solution for a general class of nonlinear elliptic boundary value problems on a bounded domain Ω of \mathbb{R}^n .

1. Introduction

Since 1972, existence of weak solutions for the semilinear elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} - \sum_{i,j=1}^n D_j(a_{ij}(x)D_i u) = g(x, u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

has been deeply investigated (see e.g. [1, 2, 3, 13, 21] and references therein) by means of classical critical point theory.

Later on, since 1994, also quasilinear elliptic problems of the type

$$\begin{cases} - \sum_{i,j=1}^n D_j(a_{ij}(x, u)D_i u) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n D_s a_{ij}(x, u)D_i u D_j u = g(x, u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

(*) Reçu le 30 novembre 1999, accepté le 21 mars 2000

(1) Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli studi di Milano,
Via C. Saldini 50, I 20133 Milano, Italy.
squassin@mat.unimi.it

have been studied in [5, 9, 10, 12, 14, 22] via techniques of nonsmooth critical point theory. On the other hand, more recently, some results for the more general problem

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\nabla_{\xi}L(x, u, \nabla u)) + D_sL(x, u, \nabla u) = g(x, u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

have been considered in [4] and [20].

The goal of this paper is to extend some of the results of [4, 20]. In order to solve (1.1), we shall look for critical points of functionals $f : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f(u) = \int_{\Omega} L(x, u, \nabla u) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} G(x, u) \, dx. \quad (1.2)$$

In general, f is continuous but not even locally Lipschitzian unless L does not depend on u or L is subjected to some very restrictive growth conditions.

Then, we shall refer to the nonsmooth critical point theory developed in [15, 16, 17, 19] and in particular to [12] for what we shall recall in section 2.

We assume that $L : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable in x for all $(s, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, of class C^1 in (s, ξ) for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, the function $L(x, s, \cdot)$ is strictly convex and $L(x, s, 0) = 0$. Furthermore, we shall assume that:

(i) there exist $a \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $b_0, \nu > 0$ such that

$$\nu|\xi|^p \leq L(x, s, \xi) \leq a(x) + b_0|s|^p + b_0|\xi|^p, \quad (1.3)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $(s, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$;

(ii) for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $a_{\varepsilon} \in L^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$|D_sL(x, s, \xi)| \leq a_{\varepsilon}(x) + \varepsilon|s|^{p^*} + b_1|\xi|^p, \quad (1.4)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $(s, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, with $b_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ independent of ε .

Furthermore, there exists $a_1 \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$ such that

$$|\nabla_{\xi}L(x, s, \xi)| \leq a_1(x) + b_1|s|^{\frac{p^*}{p'}} + b_1|\xi|^{p-1}, \quad (1.5)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $(s, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$;

(iii) there exists $R > 0$ such that

$$|s| \geq R \implies D_sL(x, s, \xi)s \geq 0, \quad (1.6)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $(s, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$;

(iv) $G : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Carathéodory function such that

$$G(x, s) \leq d(x)|s|^p + b|s|^{p^*} \quad (1.7)$$

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{G(x, s)}{|s|^p} = 0 \quad (1.8)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, where $d \in L^{\frac{n}{p}}(\Omega)$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover,

$$G(x, s) = \int_0^s g(x, \tau) d\tau$$

and there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$|g(x, s)| \leq c_1 + c_2|s|^\sigma$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and each $s \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\sigma < p^* - 1$.

(v) there exist $q > p$ and $R' > 0$ such that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $a_\varepsilon \in L^1(\Omega)$ with

$$|s| \geq R' \implies 0 < qG(x, s) \leq g(x, s)s, \quad (1.9)$$

$$|s| \geq R' \implies qL(x, s, \xi) - \nabla_\xi L(x, s, \xi) \cdot \xi - D_s L(x, s, \xi)s \geq \nu|\xi|^p - a_\varepsilon(x) - \varepsilon|s|^p \quad (1.10)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $(s, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Under the previous assumptions, the following is our main result.

(1.11) THEOREM. — *The boundary value problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\nabla_\xi L(x, u, \nabla u)) + D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) = g(x, u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

has at least one nontrivial weak solution $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

This result is an extension of [4, Theorem 3.3], since instead of assuming that

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{R} : qL(x, s, \xi) - \nabla_\xi L(x, s, \xi) \cdot \xi - D_s L(x, s, \xi)s \geq \nu|\xi|^p,$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we only request condition (1.10). In this way the proof of Lemma (3.15) becomes more difficult. The keypoint, to deal with the more general assumption, is constituted by Lemma (3.11).

Similarly, in [20, Theorem 1], a multiplicity result for (1.1) is proved, assuming that

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{R} : D_s L(x, s, \xi)s \geq 0,$$

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{R} : qL(x, s, \xi) - \nabla_\xi L(x, s, \xi) \cdot \xi - D_s L(x, s, \xi)s \geq \nu|\xi|^p,$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, which are both stronger than (1.6) and (1.10). In particular, the first inequality above and the more general condition (1.6) are involved in Theorem (3.4).

Finally, let us point out that the growth conditions (1.3) – (1.5) are a relaxation of those of [4, 20], where it is assumed that

$$\nu|\xi|^p \leq L(x, s, \xi) \leq \beta|\xi|^p, \quad |D_s L(x, s, \xi)| \leq \gamma|\xi|^p, \quad (1.12)$$

$$|\nabla_\xi L(x, s, \xi)| \leq a_1(x) + b_1|s|^{p-1} + b_1|\xi|^{p-1}, \quad (1.13)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $(s, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

2. Weak slope and weak solutions

In this section we want to recall the relationship between weak solutions to (1.1) and critical points of f in the sense of weak slope [12, Definition 1.1.1].

For the sake of generality, we shall here consider the more general setting of functionals on $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$, with $N \geq 1$, subjected to growth conditions weaker than (1.3) – (1.5).

Let $a_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$, $b_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $a_1 \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ and $b_1 \in L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$ be such that

$$|L(x, s, \xi)| \leq a_0(x) + b_0|s|^{p^*} + b_0|\xi|^p, \quad (2.1)$$

$$|\nabla_s L(x, s, \xi)| \leq a_1(x) + b_1(x)|s|^{p^*} + b_1(x)|\xi|^p, \quad (2.2)$$

$$|\nabla_\xi L(x, s, \xi)| \leq a_1(x) + b_1(x)|s|^{p^*} + b_1(x)|\xi|^p. \quad (2.3)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $(s, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{nN}$.

Conditions (2.2) and (2.3) imply that for every $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$

$$\nabla_\xi L(x, u, \nabla u) \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{nN}), \quad \nabla_s L(x, u, \nabla u) \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N).$$

Therefore for each $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ we have

$$-\operatorname{div}(\nabla_\xi L(x, u, \nabla u)) + \nabla_s L(x, u, \nabla u) \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N).$$

(2.4) DEFINITION. — We say that u is a weak solution to (1.1), if $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ and

$$-\operatorname{div}(\nabla_\xi L(x, u, \nabla u)) + \nabla_s L(x, u, \nabla u) = g(x, u)$$

in $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$.

Under more restrictive conditions, it would turn out f to be of class C^1 and

$$-\operatorname{div}(\nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u)) + \nabla_s L(x, u, \nabla u) \in W^{-1, p'}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N),$$

for every $u \in W_0^{1, p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$. In this regular setting, the classical $(PS)_c$ condition may be considered. On the other hand, in our nonsmooth context, it is convenient to introduce the following variant of the $(PS)_c$ condition :

(2.5) DEFINITION. — *Let $c \in \mathbb{R}$. A sequence $(u_h) \subseteq W_0^{1, p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ is said to be a concrete Palais-Smale sequence at level c ($(CPS)_c$ -sequence, in short) for f , if $f(u_h) \rightarrow c$,*

$$-\operatorname{div}(\nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h)) + \nabla_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \in W^{-1, p'}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N),$$

eventually as $h \rightarrow +\infty$ and

$$-\operatorname{div}(\nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h)) + \nabla_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) - g(x, u_h) \rightarrow 0,$$

strongly in $W^{-1, p'}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$.

We say that f satisfies the concrete Palais-Smale condition at level c ($(CPS)_c$ in short), if every $(CPS)_c$ -sequence for f admits a strongly convergent subsequence.

The next result connects the previous notions with abstract critical point theory.

(2.6) THEOREM. — *$f : W_0^{1, p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & |df|(u) \geq \\ & \geq \sup_{\substack{v \in C_0^{\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N) \\ \|v\|_{1, p} \leq 1}} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} [\nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla v + \nabla_s L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot v - g(x, u) \cdot v] dx \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

for every $u \in W_0^{1, p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$. In particular, $|df|(u) < +\infty$ implies that

$$\|-\operatorname{div}(\nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u)) + \nabla_s L(x, u, \nabla u) - g(x, u)\|_{-1, p'} \leq |df|(u).$$

Proof. — See, [12, Theorem 2.1.3] \square

As a consequence, each critical point u of f is a weak solution to (1.1).

Let us finally recall from [12] a concrete versions of the Mountain Pass Theorem.

(2.7) THEOREM. — Let (D, S) be a compact pair, $\psi : S \rightarrow W_0^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ a continuous map and let

$$\Phi = \left\{ \varphi \in C(D, W_0^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)) : \varphi|_S = \psi \right\}.$$

Assume that there exists a closed subset A of $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\inf_A f \geq \max_{\psi(S)} f,$$

$$A \cap \psi(S) = \emptyset \text{ and } A \cap \varphi(D) \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } \varphi \in \Phi.$$

If f satisfies the concrete Palais-Smale condition at level

$$c = \inf_{\varphi \in \Phi} \max_{\varphi(D)} f,$$

then there exists a weak solution $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ of (1.1) with $f(u) = c$.

3. The concrete Palais-Smale condition

We first recall a very useful consequence of Brezis-Browder's Theorem [8].

(3.1) PROPOSITION. — Let $u, v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $\eta \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $w \in W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$ with

$$D_s L(x, u, \nabla u)v \geq \eta,$$

and for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$

$$\langle w, \varphi \rangle = \int_\Omega \nabla_\xi L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx + \int_\Omega D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) \varphi \, dx.$$

Then $D_s L(x, u, \nabla u)v \in L^1(\Omega)$ and

$$\langle w, v \rangle = \int_\Omega \nabla_\xi L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla v \, dx + \int_\Omega D_s L(x, u, \nabla u)v \, dx.$$

Proof. — See e.g. [20, Proposition 1]. \square

Let us point out that as a consequence of assumptions (i) – (ii) and convexity of $L(x, s, \cdot)$, we can find $M > 0$ such that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $a_\varepsilon \in L^1(\Omega)$ with

$$\nabla_\xi L(x, s, \xi) \cdot \xi \geq \nu |\xi|^p - a(x) - b_0 |s|^p, \quad (3.2)$$

$$|D_s L(x, s, \xi)| \leq M \nabla_\xi L(x, s, \xi) \cdot \xi + a_\varepsilon(x) + \varepsilon |s|^{p^*}, \quad (3.3)$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $(s, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

We now come to a local compactness property, which is crucial for the $(CPS)_c$ condition to hold. This result improves [20, Lemma 2], since (iii) relaxes condition (8) in [20].

(3.4) THEOREM. — Assume (i) – (iii), let (u_h) be a bounded sequence in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and set

$$\langle w_h, v \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla v \, dx + \int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) v \, dx, \quad (3.5)$$

for all $v \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$. If (w_h) is strongly convergent to some w in $W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$, then (u_h) admits a strongly convergent subsequence in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

Proof. — Since (u_h) is bounded in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, we find a u in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$\nabla u_h \rightharpoonup \nabla u \text{ in } L^p(\Omega), \quad u_h \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^p(\Omega), \quad u_h(x) \rightarrow u(x) \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

By [7, Theorem 2.1], up to a subsequence, we have

$$\nabla u_h(x) \rightarrow \nabla u(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega. \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore, by (1.5) we deduce that

$$\nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \rightharpoonup \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \text{ in } L^{p'}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n).$$

We now want to prove that u solves the equation

$$\forall v \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega) : \langle w, v \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla v \, dx + \int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) v \, dx. \quad (3.7)$$

To this aim, let us test equation (3.5) with the functions

$$v_h = \varphi \exp\{-M(u_h + R)^+\}, \quad \varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega), \quad \varphi \geq 0.$$

It results for each $h \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla \varphi \exp\{-M(u_h + R)^+\} \, dx - \langle w_h, \varphi \exp\{-M(u_h + R)^+\} \rangle + \\ & + \int_{\Omega} [D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) - M \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla (u_h + R)^+] \\ & \quad \varphi \exp\{-M(u_h + R)^+\} \, dx = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Of course, for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, we obtain

$$\varphi \exp\{-M(u_h + R)^+\} \rightarrow \varphi \exp\{-M(u + R)^+\}.$$

Since by inequality (3.3) and (1.6) for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $h \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & [D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) - M \nabla_\xi L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla(u_h + R)^+] \varphi \\ & \exp\{-M(u_h + R)^+\} - \varepsilon |u_h|^{p^*} \varphi \leq a_\varepsilon(x) \varphi, \end{aligned}$$

Fatou's Lemma implies that for each $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_h \int_\Omega [D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) - M \nabla_\xi L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla(u_h + R)^+] \varphi \\ & \exp\{-M(u_h + R)^+\} - \varepsilon |u_h|^{p^*} \varphi \, dx \leq \int_\Omega [D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) \\ & - M \nabla_\xi L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla(u + R)^+] \varphi \exp\{-M(u + R)^+\} - \varepsilon |u|^{p^*} \varphi \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since (u_h) is bounded in $L^{p^*}(\Omega)$, we find $c > 0$ such that for each $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_h \int_\Omega [D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) - M \nabla_\xi L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla(u_h + R)^+] \varphi \\ & \exp\{-M(u_h + R)^+\} \, dx \leq \int_\Omega [D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) - M \nabla_\xi L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla(u + R)^+] \varphi \\ & \exp\{-M(u + R)^+\} \, dx - c\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the previous inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_h \int_\Omega [D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) - M \nabla_\xi L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla(u_h + R)^+] \varphi \\ & \exp\{-M(u_h + R)^+\} \, dx \leq \int_\Omega [D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) - M \nabla_\xi L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla(u + R)^+] \varphi \\ & \exp\{-M(u + R)^+\} \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we also have

$$\varphi \exp\{-M(u_h + R)^+\} \rightarrow \varphi \exp\{-M(u + R)^+\} \quad \text{in } W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

Moreover

$$\nabla \varphi \exp\{-M(u_h + R)^+\} \rightarrow \nabla \varphi \exp\{-M(u + R)^+\} \quad \text{in } L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\Omega \nabla_\xi L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla \varphi \exp\{-M(u_h + R)^+\} \, dx \rightarrow \\ & \rightarrow \int_\Omega \nabla_\xi L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi \exp\{-M(u + R)^+\} \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we may conclude that

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi \exp\{-M(u+R)^+\} dx - \langle w, \varphi \exp\{-M(u+R)^+\} \rangle + \\ + \int_{\Omega} [D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) - M \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla(u+R)^+] \varphi \exp\{-M(u+R)^+\} dx \geq 0$$

Consider now the test functions

$$\varphi_k = \varphi H\left(\frac{u}{k}\right) \exp\{M(u+R)^+\}, \quad \varphi \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega), \quad \varphi \geq 0,$$

where $H \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$, $H = 1$ in $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $H = 0$ in $]-\infty, -1] \cup [1, +\infty[$. It follows that

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi_k \exp\{-M(u+R)^+\} dx - \langle w, \varphi H\left(\frac{u}{k}\right) \rangle + \\ + \int_{\Omega} [D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) - M \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla(u+R)^+] \varphi H\left(\frac{u}{k}\right) dx \geq 0.$$

Furthermore, standard computations yield

$$\nabla \varphi_k = \exp\{M(u+R)^+\} \left[\nabla \varphi H\left(\frac{u}{k}\right) + H'\left(\frac{u}{k}\right) \frac{\varphi}{k} \nabla u + M \nabla(u+R)^+ \varphi H\left(\frac{u}{k}\right) \right].$$

Since $\varphi H\left(\frac{u}{k}\right)$ goes to φ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ we have

$$\langle w, \varphi H\left(\frac{u}{k}\right) \rangle \rightarrow \langle w, \varphi \rangle.$$

By the properties of H and the growth conditions on $\nabla_{\xi} L$, letting $k \rightarrow +\infty$ yields

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi H\left(\frac{u}{k}\right) dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi dx, \\ \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u H'\left(\frac{u}{k}\right) \frac{\varphi}{k} dx \rightarrow 0, \\ \int_{\Omega} M \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla(u+R)^+ \varphi H\left(\frac{u}{k}\right) dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} M \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla(u+R)^+ \varphi dx$$

Whence, we conclude that for all $\varphi \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$

$$\varphi \geq 0 \implies \langle w, \varphi \rangle \leq \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla \varphi dx + \int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) \varphi dx.$$

Choosing now as test functions

$$v_h = \varphi \exp\{-M(u_h - R)^-\},$$

where as before $\varphi \geq 0$, we obtain the opposite inequality so that (3.7) is proven.

In particular, taking into account Proposition (3.1), we immediately obtain

$$\langle w, u \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u \, dx + \int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) u \, dx. \quad (3.8)$$

The final step is to show that (u_h) goes to u in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Consider the function $\zeta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\zeta(s) = \begin{cases} Ms & \text{if } 0 < s < R \\ MR & \text{if } s \geq R \\ -Ms & \text{if } -R < s < 0 \\ MR & \text{if } s \leq -R, \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

and let us prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_h \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} \, dx &\leq \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u \exp\{\zeta(u)\} \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Since by Proposition (3.1), $u_h \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\}$ are admissible test functions for (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} \, dx - \langle w_h, u_h \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} \rangle + \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} [D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) + \zeta'(u_h) \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h] u_h \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} \, dx = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let us observe that (3.6) implies that

$$\nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \rightarrow \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Since by inequality (3.3) for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $h \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &[-D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) - \zeta'(u_h) \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h] u_h \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} + \\ &-R \exp\{MR\} \varepsilon |u_h|^{p^*} \leq R \exp\{MR\} a_{\varepsilon}(x), \end{aligned}$$

Fatou's Lemma yields

$$\limsup_h \int_{\Omega} [-D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) - \zeta'(u_h) \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h] u_h \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} \, dx$$

$$-R \exp\{MR\} \varepsilon |u_h|^{p^*} dx \leq \int_{\Omega} [-D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) - \zeta'(u) \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u] u \exp\{\zeta(u)\} - R \exp\{MR\} \varepsilon |u|^{p^*} dx.$$

Therefore, since (u_h) is bounded in $L^{p^*}(\Omega)$, we find $c > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_h \int_{\Omega} [-D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) - \zeta'(u_h) \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h] u_h \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} \\ \leq \int_{\Omega} [-D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) - \zeta'(u) \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u] u \exp\{\zeta(u)\} - c\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that ε is arbitrary, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_h \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} dx = \\ & = \limsup_h \left\{ \int_{\Omega} [-D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) - \zeta'(u_h) \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h] u_h \right. \\ & \quad \left. \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} dx + \langle w_h, u_h \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} \rangle \right\} \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega} [-D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) - \zeta'(u) \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u] u \exp\{\zeta(u)\} dx \\ & \quad + \langle w, u \exp\{\zeta(u)\} \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u \exp\{\zeta(u)\} dx. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u \exp\{\zeta(u)\} dx & \leq \liminf_h \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \\ \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} dx & \leq \limsup_h \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} dx \leq \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u \exp\{\zeta(u)\} dx, \end{aligned}$$

namely

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_h \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \exp\{\zeta(u_h)\} dx & = \\ = \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u \exp\{\zeta(u)\} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (3.2), generalized Fatou's Lemma yields

$$\limsup_h \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_h|^p dx \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx,$$

that implies the strong convergence of (u_h) to u in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. \square

(3.11) LEMMA. — Let $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and let (u_h) be a $(CPS)_c$ -sequence in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Then for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varrho > 0$ there exists $K_{\varrho,\varepsilon} > 0$ such that for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\{|u_h| \leq \varrho\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h dx \leq \\ & \leq \varepsilon \int_{\{\varrho < |u_h| < K_{\varrho,\varepsilon}\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h dx + K_{\varrho,\varepsilon} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{\{|u_h| \leq \varrho\}} |\nabla u_h|^p dx \leq \varepsilon \int_{\{\varrho < |u_h| < K_{\varrho,\varepsilon}\}} |\nabla u_h|^p dx + K_{\varrho,\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. — Let $\sigma, \varepsilon > 0$ and $\varrho > 0$. For all $v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w_h, v \rangle &= \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla v dx + \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) v dx - \int_{\Omega} g(x, u_h) v dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Let us now consider $\vartheta_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\vartheta_1(s) = \begin{cases} s & \text{if } |s| < \sigma \\ -s + 2\sigma & \text{if } \sigma \leq s < 2\sigma \\ -s - 2\sigma & \text{if } -2\sigma < s \leq -\sigma \\ 0 & \text{if } |s| \geq 2\sigma. \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

Then, testing (3.12) with $\vartheta_1(u_h) \in L^{\infty}([-2\sigma, 2\sigma])$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla \vartheta_1(u_h) dx + \int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \vartheta_1(u_h) dx \leq \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega} g(x, u_h) \vartheta_1(u_h) dx + \|w_h\|_{-1,p'} \|\vartheta_1(u_h)\|_{1,p}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, it follows that

$$\int_{\{|u_h| \leq \sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h dx - \int_{\{\sigma < |u_h| \leq 2\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h dx +$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \int_{\{|u_h| \leq \sigma\}} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) u_h \, dx + \int_{\{\sigma < |u_h| \leq 2\sigma\}} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \vartheta_1(u_h) \, dx \leq \\
 & \leq \int_{\Omega} \left(c_1 + c_2 |2\sigma|^{\frac{n(p-1)+p}{n-p}} \right) \sigma \, dx + \frac{4 \frac{p'}{p}}{p' p^{\frac{p'}{p}} \nu^{\frac{p'}{p}}} \|w_h\|_{-1, p'}^{p'} + \frac{\nu}{4} \|\vartheta_1(u_h)\|_{1, p}^p.
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $K_0 > 0$ be such that $\|w_h\|_{-1, p'} \leq K_0$. Then, since by (3.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \nu \|\vartheta_1(u_h)\|_{1, p}^p \leq \int_{\{|u_h| \leq \sigma\}} \nu |\nabla u_h|^p \, dx + \int_{\{\sigma < |u_h| \leq 2\sigma\}} \nu |\nabla u_h|^p \, dx \leq \\
 & \leq \int_{\{|u_h| \leq \sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + \int_{\{\sigma < |u_h| \leq 2\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx \\
 & + \int_{\{|u_h| \leq \sigma\}} a(x) \, dx + b_0 \int_{\{|u_h| \leq \sigma\}} |u_h|^p \, dx + \int_{\{\sigma < |u_h| \leq 2\sigma\}} a(x) \, dx + \\
 & + b_0 \int_{\{\sigma < |u_h| \leq 2\sigma\}} |u_h|^p \, dx,
 \end{aligned}$$

taking into account (3.3), we get for a sufficiently small value of $\sigma > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(1 - \sigma M - \frac{1}{4} \right) \int_{\{|u_h| \leq \sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx \leq \\
 & \leq \left(1 + \sigma M + \frac{1}{4} \right) \int_{\{\sigma < |u_h| \leq 2\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + \\
 & + \int_{\Omega} \left(c_1 + c_2 |2\sigma|^{\frac{n(p-1)+p}{n-p}} \right) \sigma \, dx + \frac{4 \frac{p'}{p}}{p' p^{\frac{p'}{p}} \nu^{\frac{p'}{p}}} K_0^{p'} + \\
 & + \int_{\Omega} a_{\varepsilon}(x) \, dx + \left[b_0(2^p + 1)\sigma^p + \varepsilon\sigma^{p^*+1} \right] \mathcal{L}^n(\Omega).
 \end{aligned}$$

Whence, we have shown an inequality of the type

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\{|u_h| \leq \sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx \leq \\
 & \leq K_1 \int_{\{\sigma < |u_h| \leq 2\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + K_2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Let us now define for each $k \geq 1$ the functions $\vartheta_{2k}, \vartheta_{2k-1} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by setting

$$\vartheta_{2k}(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |s| \leq k\sigma \\ s - k\sigma & \text{if } k\sigma < s < (k+1)\sigma \\ s + k\sigma & \text{if } -(k+1)\sigma < s < -k\sigma \\ -s + (k+2)\sigma & \text{if } (k+1)\sigma \leq s < (k+2)\sigma \\ -s - (k+2)\sigma & \text{if } -(k+2)\sigma < s \leq -(k+1)\sigma \\ 0 & \text{if } |s| \geq (k+1)\sigma, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\vartheta_{2k-1}(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{s}{k} & \text{if } |s| \leq k\sigma \\ -s + (k+1)\sigma & \text{if } k\sigma < s < (k+1)\sigma \\ s - (k+1)\sigma & \text{if } (k+1)\sigma < s < (k+2)\sigma \\ -s - (k+1)\sigma & \text{if } -(k+1)\sigma \leq s < -k\sigma \\ s + (k+1)\sigma & \text{if } -(k+2)\sigma < s \leq -(k+1)\sigma \\ 0 & \text{if } |s| \geq (k+1)\sigma. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, by iterating on k , we obtain the k -th inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\{|u_h| \leq k\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx \leq \tag{3.14} \\ & \leq K_1(k) \int_{\{k\sigma < |u_h| \leq (k+1)\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + K_2(k). \end{aligned}$$

Let now choose $k \geq 1$ such that $k\sigma \geq \varrho$ and $k\sigma \geq R$. Take $0 < \delta < 1$ and let $\vartheta_{\delta} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function defined by setting

$$\vartheta_{\delta}(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |s| \leq k\sigma \\ s - k\sigma & \text{if } k\sigma < s < (k+1)\sigma \\ s + k\sigma & \text{if } -(k+1)\sigma < s < -k\sigma \\ -\delta s + \sigma + \delta(k+1)\sigma & \text{if } (k+1)\sigma \leq s < (k+1)\sigma + \frac{\sigma}{\delta} \\ -\delta s - \sigma - \delta(k+1)\sigma & \text{if } -(k+1)\sigma - \frac{\sigma}{\delta} < s \leq -(k+1)\sigma \\ 0 & \text{if } |s| \geq (k+1)\sigma + \frac{\sigma}{\delta}. \end{cases}$$

As before, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla \vartheta_{\delta}(u_h) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \vartheta_{\delta}(u_h) \, dx \leq \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega} g(x, u_h) \vartheta_{\delta}(u_h) \, dx + \frac{1}{p' p^{\frac{p'}{p}} \delta^{\frac{p'}{p}}} \|w_h\|_{-1, p'}^{p'} + \delta \|\vartheta_{\delta}(u_h)\|_{1, p}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account (1.6), by computations, we deduce that

$$\int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \vartheta_{\delta}(u_h) \, dx \geq 0.$$

Moreover we have as before

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vartheta_{\delta}(u_h)\|_{1, p}^p & \leq \int_{\{k\sigma < |u_h| \leq (k+1)\sigma\}} |\nabla u_h|^p \, dx + \int_{\{|u_h| \geq (k+1)\sigma\}} |\nabla u_h|^p \, dx \leq \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\nu} \int_{\{k\sigma < |u_h| \leq (k+1)\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \frac{1}{\nu} \int_{\{|u_h| \geq (k+1)\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + \\
 & + \frac{1}{\nu} \int_{\{k\sigma < |u_h| \leq (k+1)\sigma\}} a(x) \, dx + \frac{b_0}{\nu} \int_{\{k\sigma < |u_h| \leq (k+1)\sigma\}} |u_h|^p \, dx + \\
 & + \frac{1}{\nu} \int_{\{|u_h| \geq (k+1)\sigma\}} a(x) \, dx + \frac{b_0}{\nu} \int_{\{(k+1)\sigma + \frac{\sigma}{\nu} \geq |u_h| \geq (k+1)\sigma\}} |u_h|^p \, dx,
 \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{\nu}\right) \int_{\{k\sigma < |u_h| \leq (k+1)\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx \leq \\
 & \leq \left(\delta + \frac{\delta}{\nu}\right) \int_{\{|u_h| > (k+1)\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + \\
 & + \int_{\Omega} \left(c_1 + c_2 \left| (k+1)\sigma + \frac{\sigma}{\delta} \left| \frac{n(p-1)+p}{n-p} \right| \right) \sigma \, dx + \frac{1}{p'p \frac{p'}{\delta} \frac{p'}{\delta}} K_0^{p'} + \frac{2}{\nu} \int_{\Omega} a(x) \, dx + \\
 & + \frac{b_0}{\nu} \left[(k+1)^p + \left((k+1) + \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^p \right] \sigma^p \mathcal{L}^n(\Omega).
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\{k\sigma < |u_h| \leq (k+1)\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx \leq \\
 & \leq \frac{\nu\delta + \delta}{\nu - \delta} \int_{\{|u_h| \geq (k+1)\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + K_3(k, \delta).
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining this inequality with (3.14) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\{|u_h| \leq \varrho\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx \leq \int_{\{|u_h| \leq k\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx \leq \\
 & \leq K_1(k) \int_{\{k\sigma < |u_h| \leq (k+1)\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + K_2(k) \leq \\
 & \leq K_1(k) \frac{\nu\delta + \delta}{\nu - \delta} \int_{\{|u_h| > (k+1)\sigma\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + K_1(k) K_3(k, \delta) + \\
 & \leq \varepsilon \int_{\{|u_h| > \varrho\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + K_{\varrho, \varepsilon},
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have fixed $\delta > 0$ in such a way that $K_1(k) \frac{\nu\delta + \delta}{\nu - \delta} \leq \varepsilon$. \square

The next result is an extension of [20, Lemma 1], since (1.10) relaxes (9) of [20].

(3.15) LEMMA. — *Let $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then each $(CPS)_c$ -sequence for f is bounded in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.*

Proof. — First of all, we can find $a_0 \in L^1(\Omega)$ such that for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and all $s \in \mathbb{R}$

$$qG(x, s) \leq sg(x, s) + a_0(x).$$

Now, let (u_h) be a $(CPS)_c$ -sequence for f and let for all $v \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w, v \rangle &= \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u, \nabla u) \cdot \nabla v \, dx + \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u, \nabla u) v \, dx - \int_{\Omega} g(x, u_h) v \, dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

According to Proposition (3.1) and Lemma (3.11), for each $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\|w_h\|_{-1,p'} \|u_h\|_{1,p} &\leq \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) u_h \, dx - \int_{\Omega} g(x, u_h) u_h \, dx \leq \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + \int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) u_h \, dx + \\ &\quad -q \int_{\Omega} G(x, u_h) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} a_0 \, dx \leq \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \int_{\{|u_h| > R'\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + \int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) u_h \, dx + \\ &\quad -q \int_{\Omega} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \, dx + qf(u_h) + \int_{\Omega} a_0 \, dx + K_{R',\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from Lemma (3.11) and (3.3), for each $\varepsilon > 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) u_h \, dx = \\ &= \int_{\{|u_h| \leq R'\}} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) u_h \, dx + \int_{\{|u_h| > R'\}} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) u_h \, dx \leq \\ &\leq \varepsilon MR' \int_{\{KR',\varepsilon > |u_h| > R'\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & - \int_{\{|u_h|>R'\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + q \int_{\Omega} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} a_{\varepsilon}(x) \, dx + \\
 & + \varepsilon \int_{\{|u_h|>R'\}} |u_h|^p \, dx - \nu \int_{\{|u_h|>R'\}} |\nabla u_h|^p \, dx + K_{R',\varepsilon}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account Poincare and Young's inequalities, by (1.5) we find $c > 0$ and $C_{R',\varepsilon} > 0$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega} D_s L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) u_h \, dx \leq \\
 & \leq \varepsilon c \int_{\{|u_h|>R'\}} |\nabla u_h|^p \, dx - \int_{\{|u_h|>R'\}} \nabla_{\xi} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \cdot \nabla u_h \, dx + \\
 & + q \int_{\Omega} L(x, u_h, \nabla u_h) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} a_{\varepsilon}(x) \, dx - \nu \int_{\{|u_h|>R'\}} |\nabla u_h|^p \, dx + C_{R',\varepsilon}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\vartheta_{\varepsilon} > 0$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
 \vartheta_{\varepsilon} \int_{\{|u_h|>R'\}} |\nabla u_h|^p \, dx & \leq \|w_h\|_{-1,p'} \|u_h\|_{1,p} + qf(u_h) + \\
 & + \int_{\Omega} a_0 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} a_{\varepsilon} \, dx + K_{R',\varepsilon} + C_{R',\varepsilon}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it is

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_h|^p \, dx \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \int_{\{|u_h|>R'\}} |\nabla u_h|^p \, dx + K_{R',\varepsilon}.$$

Since $w_h \rightarrow 0$ in $W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$, the assertion follows. \square

(3.17) LEMMA. — *Under assumptions (iv) we have*

$$\frac{\int_{\Omega} G(x, u_h) \, dx}{\|u_h\|_{1,p}^p} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow +\infty,$$

for each (u_h) that goes to 0 in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

Proof. — Let $(u_h) \subseteq W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with $u_h \rightarrow 0$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. We can find $(\varrho_h) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and a sequence $(w_h) \subseteq W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that $u_h = \varrho_h w_h$, $\varrho_h \rightarrow 0$ and $\|w_h\|_{1,p} = 1$. Taking into account (1.8), it follows

$$\lim_h \frac{G(x, u_h(x))}{\|u_h\|_{1,p}^p} = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Moreover, for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ we have

$$\frac{G(x, u_h(x))}{\|u_h\|_{1,p}^p} \leq d|w_h|^p + b\varrho_h^{\frac{p^2}{n-p}} |w_h|^{p^*}.$$

If w is the weak limit of (w_h) , since $d|w_h|^p \rightarrow d|w|^p$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $b\varrho_h^{\frac{p^2}{n-p}} |w_h|^{p^*} \rightarrow 0$ in $L^1(\Omega)$, (a variant of) Lebesgue's Theorem concludes the proof. \square

We finally conclude with the proof of the main result of this paper.

Proof of Theorem (1.11). From Lemma (3.15) and Theorem (3.4) it follows that f satisfies the $(CPS)_c$ condition for each $c \in \mathbb{R}$. By (1.3) and (1.9) it easily follows that

$$\forall u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\} : \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f(tu) = -\infty.$$

Finally from Lemma (3.17) and (1.3) we deduce that 0 is a strict local minimum for f . From Theorem (2.7) the assertion follows.

(3.18) REMARK. — *In this paper we only consider existence of weak solutions to (1.1). However, as proved in [4, Lemma 1.4], each weak solution of (1.1) belongs to $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ provided that L and g satisfy suitable conditions. Then, some nice regularity results hold for various classes of integrands L . (see [18]).*

(3.19) ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. — The author wishes to thank Marco Degiovanni for providing helpful discussions.

Bibliography

- [1] AMANN (H.). — Existence and multiplicity theorems for semi-linear elliptic boundary value problems, *Math. Z.* **151** (1976), 281-295.
- [2] AMBROSETTI (A.). — On the existence of multiple solutions for al class of nonlinear boundary value problems, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova* **49** (1973), 195-204.
- [3] AMBROSETTI (A.) and RABINOWITZ (P.H.). — Dual variational methods in critical point theory and applications, *J. Funct. Anal.* **14** (1973), 349-381.
- [4] ARCOYA (D.), BOCCARDO (L.). — Critical points for multiple integrals of the calculus of variations, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **134** (1996), 249-274.
- [5] ARIOLI (G.), GAZZOLA (F.). — Weak solutions of quasilinear elliptic PDE's at resonance, *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse* **6** (1997), 573-589.
- [6] BARTSCH (T.). — Topological methods for variational problems with symmetries, *Springer Verlag* (1993).
- [7] BOCCARDO (L.), MURAT (F.). — Almost everywhere convergence of the gradients of solutions to elliptic and parabolic equations, *Nonlin. Anal.* **19** (1992), 581-597.

- [8] BREZIS (H.), BROWDER (F.E.). — Sur une propriété des espaces de Sobolev, *C. R. Acad. Sc. Paris* **287** (1978), 113-115.
- [9] CANINO (A.). — Multiplicity of solutions for quasilinear elliptic equations, *Top. Meth. Nonlin. Anal.* **6** (1995), 357-370.
- [10] CANINO (A.). — On a variational approach to some quasilinear problems, *Serdica Math. J.* **22** (1996), 399-426.
- [11] CANINO (A.). — On a jumping problem for quasilinear elliptic equations, *Math. Z.* **226** (1997), 193-210.
- [12] CANINO (A.), DEGIOVANNI (M.). — Nonsmooth critical point theory and quasilinear elliptic equations, *Topological Methods in Differential Equations and Inclusions*, 1-50 - A. Granas, M. Frigon, G. Sabidussi Eds. - Montreal (1994), NATO ASI Series - Kluwer A.P. (1995).
- [13] COFFMAN (C.V.). — A minimum-maximum principle for a class of nonlinear integral equations, *J. Anal. Math.* **22** (1969), 391-410.
- [14] CORVELLEC (J.N.), DEGIOVANNI (M.). — Nontrivial solutions of quasilinear equations via nonsmooth Morse theory, *J. Diff. Eq.* **136** (1997), 268-293.
- [15] CORVELLEC (J.N.), DEGIOVANNI (M.), MARZOCCHI (M.). — Deformation properties for continuous functionals and critical point theory, *Top. Meth. Nonlin. Anal.* **1** (1993), 151-171.
- [16] DEGIOVANNI (M.), MARZOCCHI (M.). — A critical point theory for nonsmooth functionals, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* (4) **167** (1994), 73-100.
- [17] IOFFE (A.), SCHWARTZMAN (E.). — Metric critical point theory 1. Morse regularity and homotopic stability of a minimum, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **75** (1996), 125-153.
- [18] LADYZHENSKAYA (O.A.), URAL'TSEVA (N.N.). — Equations aux dérivées partielles de type elliptique, Dunod, Paris, (1968).
- [19] KATRIEL (G.). — Mountain pass theorems and global homeomorphism theorems, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **11** (1994), 189-209.
- [20] PELLACCI (B.). — Critical points for non differentiable functionals, *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. B* (7) **11** (1997), 733-749.
- [21] RABINOWITZ (P.H.). — Minimax methods in critical point theory with applications to differential equations, *CBMS Reg. Conf. Series Math.* **65** Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, R.I. (1986).
- [22] STRUWE (M.). — Quasilinear elliptic eigenvalue problems, *Comment. Math. Helvetici* **58** (1983), 509-527.