

# MONOTONICITY OF SOLUTIONS TO QUASILINEAR PROBLEMS WITH A FIRST-ORDER TERM IN HALF-SPACES

ALBERTO FARINA<sup>+</sup>, LUIGI MONTORO<sup>\*</sup>, GIUSEPPE RIEY<sup>\*</sup>, AND BERARDINO SCIUNZI<sup>\*</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** We consider a quasilinear elliptic equation involving a first order term, under zero Dirichlet boundary condition in half spaces. We prove that any positive solution is monotone increasing w.r.t. the direction orthogonal to the boundary. The main ingredient in the proof is a new comparison principle in unbounded domains. As a consequence of our analysis, we also obtain some new Liouville type theorems.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction and statement of the main results.	1
2. The weak comparison principle: Proof of Theorem 1.6	6
3. Properties of the local symmetry regions	16
4. Recovering Compactness	23
5. Proof of Theorem 1.1	25
6. Proof of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4	26
References	27

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE MAIN RESULTS.

We consider  $C^{1,\alpha}$  weak solutions to the problem

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(a(u)|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) + b(u)|\nabla u|^q = f(u), & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \\ u(x', y) > 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \\ u(x', 0) = 0, & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N \end{cases}$$

where we assume  $N \geq 2$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and

---

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification:* 35B05, 35B65, 35J70.

<sup>+</sup> *Université de Picardie J. Verne, LAMFA, CNRS UMR 7352, Amiens, France, E-mail:* alberto.farina@u-picardie.fr.

<sup>+</sup> *A.F. is supported by the ERC grant EPSILON (Elliptic Pde's and Symmetry of Interfaces and Layers for Odd Nonlinearities).*

<sup>\*</sup> *Dipartimento di Matematica, Università della Calabria, Ponte Pietro Bucci 31B, I-87036 Arcavacata di Rende, Cosenza, Italy, E-mail:* montoro@mat.unical.it, rief@mat.unical.it, sciunzi@mat.unical.it.

<sup>\*</sup> *The authors were partially supported by the Italian PRIN Research Project 2007: Metodi Variazionali e Topologici nello Studio di Fenomeni non Lineari.*

- (H<sub>1</sub>)  $1 < p < 2$ ,  $1 < q \leq p$ ;
- (H<sub>2</sub>)  $a, b$  and  $f$  are locally Lipschitz continuous functions on  $\mathbb{R}$ ;
- (H<sub>3</sub>) there exists  $\gamma > 0$  such that  $a(s) \geq \gamma$  for every  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ .

We denote a generic point in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$  by  $x = (x', y)$  with  $x' = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{N-1})$  and  $y = x_N$ .

Note that the  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity of the solutions follows by the well known results in [18, 30, 31, 39].

We study monotonicity properties of the solutions, w.r.t. the  $y$ -direction, via the Alexandrov-Serrin moving plane method [1, 6, 27, 37]. For the semilinear case, the founding papers on this topic go back to the works [2, 3, 4, 5, 15, 28]. We also refer the readers to [7, 9, 16, 19, 20, 25, 36] for other results concerning the monotonicity of the solutions in half-spaces also in more general settings (always in the uniformly elliptic case).

In the present work, we consider the quasilinear problem (1.1) and we continue the study that we have started in [21, 22].

The first main contribution of this paper is the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $u$  be a solution to (1.1) and let us assume that  $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  and  $\nabla u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ . Let (H<sub>1</sub>), (H<sub>2</sub>) and (H<sub>3</sub>) be satisfied and assume that  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$ . Then  $u$  is monotone increasing w.r.t. the  $y$ -direction, that is*

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N.$$

For  $a(\cdot) = 1$  and  $b(\cdot) = 0$  problem (1.1) reduces to

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = f(u), & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \\ u(x', y) > 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \\ u(x', 0) = 0, & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N. \end{cases}$$

The monotonicity of solutions to (1.2) was first studied in [14] in the two dimensional case and considering positive nonlinearities. Later, in dimension  $N$  (always for positive nonlinearities) a first result was obtained in [21]. Both the results hold under the restriction  $\frac{2N+2}{N+2} < p < 2$ .

As a consequence of Theorem 1.1, we can remove this restriction and get the following:

**Corollary 1.2.** *Let  $1 < p < 2$  and  $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  be a solution of problem (1.2) with  $|\nabla u| \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ . Assume that  $f$  is locally Lipschitz continuous with  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$ . Then  $u$  is monotone increasing w.r.t. the  $y$ -direction.*

Let us point out that in [21] the restriction  $\frac{2N+2}{N+2} < p < 2$  is needed because it is used there the strong maximum and comparison principles of [13], which, in turn, are based on the estimates in [12]. A novelty in this paper, even in the special case of the pure  $p$ -Laplacian operator, is the fact that we avoid the restriction  $\frac{2N+2}{N+2} < p < 2$ .

Let us also mention that the case  $p = 2$  is well known, as remarked here above, while recently in [22] the monotonicity of solutions to (1.2) is proved in the case  $2 < p < 3$ , for positive power-like nonlinearities or in the case  $p > 2$ , for strictly positive nonlinearities.

The technique exploited in the proof of Theorem 1.1 also allows us to improve Theorem 1.8 in [21] allowing the presence of a first order term in the equation and avoiding also in this case the restriction  $p > \frac{2N+2}{N+2}$ . Namely we have the following:

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $(H_1)$  and  $(H_2)$  be satisfied. Assume that  $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$ , with  $u \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ , is a solution to (1.1) with  $a \equiv 1$  and  $b(u) \geq 0$ . Suppose that*

$$\exists z > 0 \quad : \quad 0 < s < z \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(s) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad s > z \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(s) < 0.$$

*Then  $u$  is monotone increasing w.r.t. the  $y$ -direction.*

Let us emphasize some new Liouville type results that complement and improve those we proved in [21, Theorem 1.6]. They follow from our monotonicity results and some techniques used in [21]:

**Theorem 1.4.** *Assume  $1 < p < 2$  and let  $f$  be locally Lipschitz continuous. Let  $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$  be a non-negative solution of*

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = f(u), & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \\ u(x', 0) = 0, & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N. \end{cases}$$

*Assume that one of the following holds:*

- a)  $N = 2$  and  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$ , with  $f(0) = 0$ ,
- b)  $N \geq 3$ ,  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$ ,  $f(0) = 0$  and  $f$  is subcritical w.r.t. the Sobolev critical exponent in  $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ ,
- c)  $N \geq 3$ ,  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$ ,  $f(0) = 0$  and  $f(s) \geq \lambda s^{\frac{(N-1)(p-1)}{N-1-p}}$  in  $[0, \delta]$ , for some  $\lambda, \delta > 0$ .

*Then  $u \equiv 0$ .*

*On the other hand, if  $N \geq 2$ ,  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s \geq 0$ , then there are no non-negative solutions of (1.3).*

We refer the readers to [14, 21, 22, 41] for other Liouville type theorems for quasilinear elliptic equations in half-spaces.

The proofs of the monotonicity results in half spaces are generally based on weak comparison principles in narrow unbounded domains. We refer the readers to [3, 4, 5, 9, 15, 16, 20, 25, 36].

In our case, the presence of the term  $|\nabla u|^{p-2}$  gives rise to a phenomenon that was first pointed out in [8, 11], in the case of bounded domains. Namely, we will prove our monotonicity result via a weak comparison principle in domains that can be decomposed into two parts. A narrow part (w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure of the section) and a part where the gradient of the solution is small.

We will state our comparison principle, which is the second main contribution of the present work, under more general structural assumptions and for more general quasilinear problems (cfr.(1.5) below). We also remark that no restriction on the sign of  $u$  and  $v$  is required. More precisely, we consider continuous functions  $a = a(x, u)$ ,  $b = b(x, u)$  and  $f = f(x, u)$  defined on  $\mathbb{R}_+^N \times \mathbb{R}$  and satisfying the following conditions:

(H<sub>4</sub>)  $a, b$  and  $f$  are locally Lipschitz continuous functions, uniformly w.r.t.  $x$ . Namely, for every  $M > 0$ , there are positive constants  $L_a = L_a(M)$ ,  $L_b = L_b(M)$  and  $L_f = L_f(M)$  such that for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$  and every  $u, v \in [-M, M]$  we have :

$$|a(x, u) - a(x, v)| \leq L_a |u - v|, \quad |b(x, u) - b(x, v)| \leq L_b |u - v|,$$

$$|f(x, u) - f(x, v)| \leq L_f |u - v|.$$

For every  $M > 0$  there is a constant  $K = K(M) > 0$  such that for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$  and every  $s \in [-M, M]$  we have :

$$|a(x, s)| \leq K, \quad |b(x, s)| \leq K.$$

(H<sub>5</sub>) There is a constant  $\gamma > 0$  such that  $a(x, s) \geq \gamma$  for every  $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \times \mathbb{R}$ .

**Remark 1.5.** (i) When the functions  $a, b$  and  $f$  depend only on the variable  $u$  and are locally Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathbb{R}$ , the assumption (H<sub>4</sub>) is automatically satisfied.

(ii) Typical examples of functions  $a = a(x, u)$  satisfying both (H<sub>4</sub>) and (H<sub>5</sub>) are provided by  $a(x, u) = (\sin^2(x_1) + 10)(|u| + 1)$  or  $a(x, u) = |u| + 2 + \cos^2(|x|)$ .

We have the following:

**Theorem 1.6.** Let  $1 < p < 2$ ,  $N \geq 2$  and let  $(H_1), (H_4), (H_5)$  be satisfied. Fix  $\lambda_0 > 0$  and  $M_0 > 0$ . Consider  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$ ,  $\tau, \varepsilon > 0$  and set

$$(1.4) \quad \Sigma_{(\lambda, y_0)} := \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \times \left(y_0 - \frac{\lambda}{2}, y_0 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\right), \quad y_0 \geq \frac{\lambda}{2}.$$

Let  $u, v \in C_{loc}^{1, \alpha}(\overline{\Sigma_{(\lambda, y_0)}})$  such that  $\|u\|_\infty + \|\nabla u\|_\infty \leq M_0$ ,  $\|v\|_\infty + \|\nabla v\|_\infty \leq M_0$  and

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(a(x, u)|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) + b(x, u)|\nabla u|^q \leq f(x, u), & \text{in } \Sigma_{(\lambda, y_0)}, \\ -\operatorname{div}(a(x, v)|\nabla v|^{p-2}\nabla v) + b(x, v)|\nabla v|^q \geq f(x, v), & \text{in } \Sigma_{(\lambda, y_0)}, \\ u \leq v, & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{S}_{(\tau, \varepsilon)}, \end{cases}$$

where the open set  $\mathcal{S}_{(\tau,\varepsilon)} \subseteq \Sigma_{(\lambda,y_0)}$  is such that

$$\mathcal{S}_{(\tau,\varepsilon)} = \bigcup_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}} I_{x'}^{\tau,\varepsilon},$$

and the open set  $I_{x'}^{\tau,\varepsilon} \subseteq \{x'\} \times (y_0 - \frac{\lambda}{2}, y_0 + \frac{\lambda}{2})$  has the form

$$(1.6) \quad I_{x'}^{\tau,\varepsilon} = A_{x'}^{\tau} \cup B_{x'}^{\varepsilon} \quad \text{with} \quad |A_{x'}^{\tau} \cap B_{x'}^{\varepsilon}| = 0$$

and, for  $x'$  fixed,  $A_{x'}^{\tau}, B_{x'}^{\varepsilon} \subset (y_0 - \frac{\lambda}{2}, y_0 + \frac{\lambda}{2})$  are measurable sets such that

$$|A_{x'}^{\tau}| \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad B_{x'}^{\varepsilon} \subseteq \{y \in \mathbb{R} : |\nabla u(x', y)| < \varepsilon, |\nabla v(x', y)| < \varepsilon\}.$$

Then there exist

$$\tau_0 = \tau_0(N, p, q, \lambda_0, M_0, \gamma) > 0$$

and

$$\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(N, p, q, \lambda_0, M_0, \gamma) > 0^1$$

such that, if  $0 < \tau < \tau_0$  and  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ , it follows that

$$u \leq v \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{S}_{(\tau,\varepsilon)}.$$

If the functions  $f$ ,  $a$  and  $b$  are assumed to be globally Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathbb{R}_+^N \times \mathbb{R}$  and the functions  $a$  and  $b$  are supposed to be bounded on  $\mathbb{R}_+^N \times \mathbb{R}$ , the same conclusion holds true without any assumption on the boundedness of  $u$  and  $v$ .

For later purposes, we also state the following special case of the previous theorem. It corresponds to the case in which  $B_{x'}^{\varepsilon} \equiv \emptyset$  and the set  $\mathcal{S}_{(\tau,\varepsilon)}$  is contained in a narrow strip. This result also provides an extension of Theorem 1.1 in [21] to the case of problems involving a first-order term as in (1.1) or in (1.5).

**Theorem 1.7.** *Let  $1 < p < 2$ ,  $N \geq 2$  and let  $(H_1), (H_4), (H_5)$  be satisfied. Fix  $M_0 > 0$ . Consider  $\lambda > 0$  and set*

$$\Sigma_{(\lambda,y_0)} := \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \times (y_0 - \frac{\lambda}{2}, y_0 + \frac{\lambda}{2}), \quad y_0 \geq \frac{\lambda}{2}.$$

Let  $u, v \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Sigma_{(\lambda,y_0)}})$  such that  $\|u\|_{\infty} + \|\nabla u\|_{\infty} \leq M_0$ ,  $\|v\|_{\infty} + \|\nabla v\|_{\infty} \leq M_0$  and

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(a(x, u)|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) + b(x, u)|\nabla u|^q \leq f(x, u), & \text{in } \Sigma_{(\lambda,y_0)}, \\ -\operatorname{div}(a(x, v)|\nabla v|^{p-2}\nabla v) + b(x, v)|\nabla v|^q \geq f(x, v), & \text{in } \Sigma_{(\lambda,y_0)}, \\ u \leq v, & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{S}, \end{cases}$$

where  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \Sigma_{(\lambda,y_0)}$  is an open subset.

Then there exists

$$\bar{\lambda} = \bar{\lambda}(N, p, q, M_0, \gamma) > 0^2$$

such that, if  $0 < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}$ , it follows that

$$u \leq v \quad \text{in } \mathcal{S}.$$

<sup>1</sup>Both  $\varepsilon_0$  and  $\tau_0$  can be explicitly calculated, cfr. Remark 2.3.

<sup>2</sup>  $\bar{\lambda}$  can be explicitly calculated, cfr. Remark 2.3.

If the functions  $f$ ,  $a$  and  $b$  are assumed to be globally Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathbb{R}_+^N \times \mathbb{R}$  and the functions  $a$  and  $b$  are supposed to be bounded on  $\mathbb{R}_+^N \times \mathbb{R}$ , the same conclusion holds true without any assumption on the boundedness of  $u$  and  $v$ .

**Remark 1.8.** *Theorem 1.6 and Theorem 1.7 are the main ingredients in the proof of our monotonicity result Theorem 1.1. The new geometry of the domain that we consider is crucial to prove our monotonicity result in the case  $1 < p < 2$ , without the restriction  $p > \frac{2N+2}{N+2}$  that appears in [21]. At each  $x'$  fixed, the section of the domain is decomposed into two parts: a narrow (w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure) part and a part where the gradients are small.*

The qualitative properties of positive solutions to  $-\Delta_p u = f(u)$ , in various unbounded domains, are also studied in [10, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 33, 38, 41].

Here below we describe the scheme of the paper:

- i) In Section 2 we prove the general weak comparison principle stated in Theorem 1.6 (and also Theorem 1.7). The proof is carried out exploiting the iteration scheme introduced in [21] (see also [22]), and taking advantage from the geometry of the considered domain.
- ii) In Section 3 we prove a crucial property of local symmetry regions of the solutions. Namely we show that such regions must touch the boundary. This follows by a fine analysis of the limiting profiles of the solution.
- iii) In Section 4 we prove Proposition 4.1, that allows to carry out the moving plane procedure via Theorem 1.6.
- iv) In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.1.
- v) In Section 6 we prove Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4.

## 2. THE WEAK COMPARISON PRINCIPLE: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

In the sequel we will use the following inequalities:  $\forall \eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{R}^N$  with  $|\eta| + |\eta'| > 0$  there exist positive constants  $C_1, C_2$  depending only on  $p$  such that

$$(2.1) \quad [|\eta|^{p-2}\eta - |\eta'|^{p-2}\eta'][\eta - \eta'] \geq C_1(|\eta| + |\eta'|)^{p-2}|\eta - \eta'|^2 \quad \text{if } p > 1$$

$$||\eta|^{p-2}\eta - |\eta'|^{p-2}\eta'| \leq C_2|\eta - \eta'|^{p-1} \quad \text{if } 1 < p \leq 2.$$

NOTATION. Generic fixed numerical constants will be denoted by  $C$  (with subscript in some case) and they will be allowed to vary within a single line or formula.  $|S|$  denotes the Lebesgue measure of a set  $S$ .  $f^+$  and  $f^-$  are the positive part and the negative part of a function  $f$ , i.e.  $f^+ = \max\{f, 0\}$  and  $f^- = -\min\{f, 0\}$ .

We start recalling a lemma, whose proof can be found in [21, Lemma 2.1].

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\theta > 0$  and  $\beta > 0$  such that  $\theta < 2^{-\beta}$ . Moreover let  $R_0 > 0$ ,  $c > 0$  and*

$$\mathcal{L} : (R_0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

*a non-negative and non-decreasing function such that*

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(R) \leq \theta \mathcal{L}(2R) + g(R) & \forall R > R_0, \\ \mathcal{L}(R) \leq CR^\beta & \forall R > R_0, \end{cases}$$

*where  $g : (R_0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is such that  $\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} g(R) = 0$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{L}(R) = 0.$$

We provide now the proof of a generalized version of the Poincaré inequality in one dimension.

**Lemma 2.2** (Poincaré type inequality). *Let  $I$  be an open bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  and assume that  $I = A \cup B$  with  $|A \cap B| = 0$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  measurable subsets of  $I$ . Let  $\rho : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  be measurable and such that*

$$\inf_{t \in I} \rho(t) > 0.$$

*Then for any  $w \in H_0^1(I)$  such that  $\int_I \rho(t) |\partial_t w|^2(t) dt$  is finite, the following inequality holds:*

$$(2.3) \quad \int_I w^2(t) dt \leq 2|I| \max \left\{ |A| \sup_{t \in A} \frac{1}{\rho(t)}, |B| \sup_{t \in B} \frac{1}{\rho(t)} \right\} \int_I \rho(t) |\partial_t w|^2(t) dt.$$

*Proof.* Since  $w$  belongs to  $H_0^1(I)$ , there exists  $a \in \bar{I}$  such that  $w(x) = \int_a^x \partial_t w(t) dt$ . Thus we have:

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} |w(x)| &\leq \int_a^x |\partial_t w(t)| dt \leq \int_I |\partial_t w(t)| dt = \int_A |\partial_t w(t)| dt + \int_B |\partial_t w(t)| dt \\ &\leq |A|^{1/2} \left( \int_A |\partial_t w|^2(t) dt \right)^{1/2} + |B|^{1/2} \left( \int_B |\partial_t w|^2(t) dt \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left( |A| \sup_{t \in A} \frac{1}{\rho(t)} \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_A \rho(t) |\partial_t w|^2(t) dt \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \left( |B| \sup_{t \in B} \frac{1}{\rho(t)} \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_B \rho(t) |\partial_t w|^2(t) dt \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by using (2.4) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I w^2(t) dt &\leq |I| \sup_{t \in I} w^2(t) \\ &\leq 2|I| \left( |A| \sup_{t \in A} \frac{1}{\rho(t)} \int_A \rho |\partial_t w|^2(t) dt + |B| \sup_{t \in B} \frac{1}{\rho(t)} \int_B \rho |\partial_t w|^2(t) dt \right), \end{aligned}$$

from which the thesis immediately follows.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.6:** In the proof, the quantities  $L_a(M_0)$ ,  $L_b(M_0)$ ,  $L_f(M_0)$  and  $K(M_0)$  will denote the structural constants appearing in assumption  $(H_4)$ . Also we denote by  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ , the  $L^\infty$  norm in  $\Sigma_{(\lambda, y_0)}$ .

We remark that  $(u - v)^+$  belongs to  $L^\infty(\Sigma_{(\lambda, y_0)})$  since  $u$  and  $v$  are bounded in  $\Sigma_{(\lambda, y_0)}$ . For  $\alpha > 1$  we define

$$(2.5) \quad \psi = [(u - v)^+]^\alpha \varphi^2,$$

where  $\varphi(x', y) = \varphi(x')$  and  $\varphi(x') \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N-1})$  is such that

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{cases} \varphi \geq 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \\ \varphi \equiv 1, & \text{in } B'(0, R) \subset \mathbb{R}^{N-1}, \\ \varphi \equiv 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \setminus B'(0, 2R), \\ |\nabla \varphi| \leq \frac{C}{R}, & \text{in } B'(0, 2R) \setminus B'(0, R) \subset \mathbb{R}^{N-1}, \end{cases}$$

where  $B'(0, R) = \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1} : |x'| < R\}$ ,  $R > 1$  and  $C$  is a positive constant.

Let  $\mathcal{C}(R)$  be defined as

$$\mathcal{C}(R) := \left\{ \mathcal{S}_{(\tau, \varepsilon)} \cap \{B'(0, R) \times \mathbb{R}\} \right\}.$$

The assumptions in (2.6) and the inequality  $u \leq v$  on  $\partial \mathcal{S}_{(\tau, \varepsilon)}$  imply that  $\psi \in W_0^{1,p}(\mathcal{C}(2R))$ . This allows us to use  $\psi$  as test function in both equations of problem (1.5) and to get (by subtracting):

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (a(x, u)|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u - a(x, v)|\nabla v|^{p-2}\nabla v, \nabla \psi) \\ & + \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (b(x, u)|\nabla u|^q - b(x, v)|\nabla v|^q)\psi \\ & \leq \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (f(x, u) - f(x, v))\psi, \end{aligned}$$

from which we infer:

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} a(x, u)(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u - |\nabla v|^{p-2}\nabla v, \nabla \psi) \\ & + \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (a(x, u) - a(x, v))(|\nabla v|^{p-2}\nabla v, \nabla \psi) \\ & + \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} b(x, u)(|\nabla u|^q - |\nabla v|^q)\psi + \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (b(x, u) - b(x, v))|\nabla v|^q\psi \\ & \leq \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (f(x, u) - f(x, v))\psi \end{aligned}$$



and hence:

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.9) \quad & \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} a(x, u) (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u - |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v, \nabla \psi) \\
& \leq \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |a(x, u) - a(x, v)| |\nabla v|^{p-1} |\nabla \psi| + K(M_0) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} ||\nabla u|^q - |\nabla v|^q| \psi \\
& + \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |b(x, u) - b(x, v)| |\nabla v|^q \psi + \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |f(x, u) - f(x, v)| \psi \leq \\
& \leq L_a(M_0) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla v|^{p-1} |\nabla \psi| |u - v| + K(M_0) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} ||\nabla u|^q - |\nabla v|^q| \psi \\
& + L_b(M_0) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla v|^q \psi |u - v| + L_f(M_0) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} \psi |u - v|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\nabla u$  and  $\nabla v$  belongs to  $L^\infty(\Sigma_{(\lambda, y_0)})$ , using (2.5) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.10) \quad & \alpha \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} a(x, u) (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u - |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v, \nabla (u - v)^+) [(u - v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \varphi^2 \\
& + \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} a(x, u) (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u - |\nabla v|^{p-2} \nabla v, \nabla \varphi^2) [(u - v)^+]^\alpha \\
& \leq \alpha L_a(M_0) \|\nabla v\|_\infty^{p-1} \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} [(u - v)^+]^\alpha |\nabla (u - v)^+| \varphi^2 \\
& + L_a(M_0) \|\nabla v\|_\infty^{p-1} \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} [(u - v)^+]^{\alpha+1} |\nabla \varphi^2| + \\
& + (L_b(M_0) \|\nabla v\|_\infty^q + L_f(M_0)) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} [(u - v)^+]^{\alpha+1} \varphi^2 + \\
& + qK(M_0) M_0^{q-1} \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla (u - v)^+| [(u - v)^+]^\alpha \varphi^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where, in the last term we used the mean value theorem and the boundedness of  $\nabla u$  and  $\nabla v$  to deduce that:  $||\nabla u|^q - |\nabla v|^q| \leq qM_0^{q-1} |\nabla (u - v)|$ .

Recalling (2.1), from (2.10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \alpha C_1 \gamma \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \varphi^2 \\
& \leq C_2 K(M_0) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^{p-1} |\nabla \varphi^2| [(u-v)^+]^\alpha \\
& + \alpha L_a(M_0) \|\nabla v\|_\infty^{p-1} \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla(u-v)^+| [(u-v)^+]^{\frac{\alpha-1+\alpha+1}{2}} \varphi^2 \\
& + L_a(M_0) \|\nabla v\|_\infty^{p-1} \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha+1} |\nabla \varphi^2| \\
& + (L_b(M_0) \|\nabla v\|_\infty^q + L_f(M_0)) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha+1} \varphi^2 \\
& + qK(M_0) M_0^{q-1} \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla(u-v)^+| [(u-v)^+]^{\frac{\alpha-1+\alpha+1}{2}} \varphi^2.
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to resume as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.11) \quad & \alpha C_1 \gamma \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \varphi^2 \\
& \leq (C_2 K(M_0) (2M_0)^{p-1} + 2M_0^p L_a(M_0)) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla \varphi^2| [(u-v)^+]^\alpha \\
& + \alpha \cdot (L_a(M_0) M_0^{p-1} + qK(M_0) M_0^{q-1}) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla(u-v)^+| [(u-v)^+]^{\frac{\alpha-1+\alpha+1}{2}} \varphi^2 \\
& + (L_b(M_0) M_0^q + L_f(M_0)) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha+1} \varphi^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that  $p < 2$  and using the weighted Young inequality  $zy \leq \varepsilon z^2 + \frac{y^2}{4\varepsilon}$ , from

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla(u-v)^+| [(u-v)^+]^{\frac{\alpha-1+\alpha+1}{2}} \varphi^2 \\
& = \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R) \cap \{|\nabla u| + |\nabla v| > 0\}} |\nabla(u-v)^+| [(u-v)^+]^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}} \varphi \cdot [(u-v)^+]^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}} \varphi
\end{aligned}$$

we deduce that, for every  $\delta > 0$  it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.12) \quad & \alpha C_1 \gamma \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \varphi^2 \\
& \leq (C_2 K(M_0)(2M_0)^{p-1} + 2M_0^p L_a(M_0)) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla \varphi^2| [(u-v)^+]^\alpha \\
& + \delta \cdot \alpha \cdot (L_a(M_0)M_0^{p-1} + qK(M_0)M_0^{q-1}) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \varphi^2 \\
& + \left( \alpha \frac{(L_a(M_0)M_0^{p-1} + qK(M_0)M_0^{q-1})}{4\delta} + (L_b(M_0)M_0^q + L_f(M_0)) \right) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha+1} \varphi^2. \\
& \leq (C_2 K(M_0)(2M_0)^{p-1} + 2M_0^p L_a(M_0)) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla \varphi^2| [(u-v)^+]^\alpha \\
& + \delta \alpha 2^{2-p} (L_a(M_0)M_0 + qK(M_0)M_0^{q-(p-1)}) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \varphi^2 \\
& + \left( \alpha \frac{2^{2-p} \cdot (L_a(M_0)M_0 + qK(M_0)M_0^{q-(p-1)})}{4\delta} + (L_b(M_0)M_0^q + L_f(M_0)) \right) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha+1} \varphi^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we are using the fact that  $q > 1 > p - 1$ , since  $(H_1)$  holds.

Take now

$$\delta := \frac{C_1 \gamma}{2 \cdot (2^{2-p} L_a(M_0)M_0 + 2^{2-p} q K(M_0)M_0^{q-(p-1)})}.$$

Consequently we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.13) \quad & \alpha \frac{C_1 \gamma}{2} \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \varphi^2 \\
& \leq (C_2 K(M_0)(2M_0)^{p-1} + 2M_0^p L_a(M_0)) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla \varphi^2| [(u-v)^+]^\alpha \\
& + \alpha \frac{(2^{2-p} L_a(M_0)M_0 + 2^{2-p} q K(M_0)M_0^{q-(p-1)})^2}{2C_1 \gamma} \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha+1} \varphi^2 \\
& + (L_b(M_0)M_0^q + L_f(M_0)) \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha+1} \varphi^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\alpha > 1$  we immediately get that

(2.14)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{C(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \varphi^2 \\
& \leq \frac{2(C_2 K(M_0)(2M_0)^{p-1} + 2M_0^p L_a(M_0))}{C_1 \gamma} \int_{C(2R)} |\nabla \varphi^2| [(u-v)^+]^\alpha \\
& + \frac{(2^{2-p} L_a(M_0) M_0 + 2^{2-p} q K(M_0) M_0^{q-(p-1)})^2}{(C_1 \gamma)^2} \int_{C(2R)} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha+1} \varphi^2 \\
& + \frac{2(L_b(M_0) M_0^q + L_f(M_0))}{C_1 \gamma} \int_{C(2R)} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha+1} \varphi^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us define

$$(2.15) \quad c_1 = \frac{2(C_2 K(M_0)(2M_0)^{p-1} + 2M_0^p L_a(M_0))}{C_1 \gamma},$$

$$(2.16) \quad c_2 = \frac{(2^{2-p} L_a(M_0) M_0 + 2^{2-p} q K(M_0) M_0^{q-(p-1)})^2}{(C_1 \gamma)^2} + \frac{2(L_b(M_0) M_0^q + L_f(M_0))}{C_1 \gamma},$$

$$I_1 = \int_{C(2R)} |\nabla \varphi^2| [(u-v)^+]^\alpha, \quad I_2 = \int_{C(2R)} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha+1} \varphi^2$$

and note that both  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  depend only on  $p, q, \gamma$  and  $M_0$ , in particular they are independent of  $\alpha > 1$ . Thus, with the definitions above, we now rewrite (2.14) as follows: for every  $\alpha > 1$ ,

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{C(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \varphi^2 \\ & \leq c_1 I_1 + c_2 I_2. \end{aligned}$$

We also observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}} \left( \int_{I_{x'}^{\tau, \varepsilon}} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \right) dy \varphi^2(x') dx' = \\
& = \int_{C(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \varphi^2 < +\infty
\end{aligned}$$

since  $\varphi$  depends only on  $x'$  and the right-hand-side of (2.17) is finite. Hence, for almost every  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$  we have that

$$(2.18) \quad \int_{I_{x'}^{\tau, \varepsilon}} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} dy < +\infty,$$

which also entails: for almost every  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$

$$(2.19) \quad \int_{I_{x'}^{\tau,\varepsilon}} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\partial_y(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} dy < +\infty.$$

$\hookrightarrow$  **Evaluation of the term  $I_1$ .** Recalling the decomposition stated in (1.6) which gives

$$\mathcal{S}_{(\tau,\varepsilon)} = \bigcup_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} I_{x'}^{\tau,\varepsilon} \quad \text{with} \quad I_{x'}^{\tau,\varepsilon} = A_{x'}^\tau \cup B_{x'}^\varepsilon$$

we set

$$\rho_{x'}(t) = (|\nabla u(x', t)| + |\nabla v(x', t)|)^{p-2}$$

in order to apply Lemma 2.2 in each  $I_{x'}^{\tau,\varepsilon}$ , for which (2.19) holds true, with  $\rho(t) := \rho_{x'}(t)$ ,  $A := A_{x'}^\tau$ ,  $B := B_{x'}^\varepsilon$  and  $w(t) = [(u-v)^+(x', t)]^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}$ . Note that the constant in (2.3) in this case is given by:

$$C_{\tau,\varepsilon}(x') = 2\lambda \max \left\{ |A_{x'}^\tau| \sup_{t \in A_{x'}^\tau} \frac{1}{\rho_{x'}(t)}, |B_{x'}^\varepsilon| \sup_{t \in B_{x'}^\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\rho_{x'}(t)} \right\}.$$

Therefore, for almost every  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ , we have

$$(2.20) \quad C_{\tau,\varepsilon}(x') \leq C_{\tau,\varepsilon} := 2\lambda_0 \max \{ \tau(2M_0)^{2-p}, \lambda_0(2\varepsilon)^{2-p} \},$$

so that, since  $1 < p < 2$ ,  $C_{\tau,\varepsilon}$  can be chosen arbitrary small, for  $\tau$  and  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small. Now, recalling that  $\varphi$  depends only on  $x'$  and using Young inequality with conjugate exponents  $\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}$  and  $\alpha+1$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} [(u-v)^+]^\alpha \varphi |\nabla \varphi| = 2 \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} [(u-v)^+]^\alpha \varphi |\nabla \varphi|^{\frac{1}{2}} |\nabla \varphi|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} \frac{[(u-v)^+]^{\alpha+1} \varphi^{\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}} |\nabla \varphi|^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2\alpha}}}{\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}} + 2 \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} \frac{|\nabla \varphi|^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}}{\alpha+1} \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}} \left( \int_{I_{x'}^{\tau,\varepsilon}} \left( [(u-v)^+]^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}} \right)^2 dy \right) \varphi^{\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}} |\nabla \varphi|^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2\alpha}} dx' + 2 \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla \varphi|^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

and the application of Lemma 2.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} (2.21) \quad I_1 &\leq C_{\tau,\varepsilon} \frac{(\alpha+1)^2}{2} \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} |\partial_y(u-v)^+|^2 \varphi^{\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}} |\nabla \varphi|^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2\alpha}} \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla \varphi|^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_{\tau,\varepsilon} \frac{(\alpha+1)^2}{2} \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 \varphi^{\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}} |\nabla \varphi|^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2\alpha}} \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} |\nabla \varphi|^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_{\tau,\varepsilon}$  has been defined in (2.20).

$\hookrightarrow$  **Evaluation of the term  $I_2$ .** We use the same notations as in the evaluation of  $I_1$  and we get:

(2.22)

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \int_{C(2R)} \left( [(u-v)^+]^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}} \right)^2 \varphi^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}} \left( \int_{I_{x'}^{\tau,\varepsilon}} \left( [(u-v)^+]^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}} \right)^2 dy \right) (\varphi(x'))^2 dx' \\ &\leq C_{\tau,\varepsilon} \left( \frac{\alpha+1}{2} \right)^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}} \left( \int_{I_{x'}^{\tau,\varepsilon}} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} |\partial_y(u-v)^+|^2 dy \right) (\varphi(x'))^2 dx' \\ &\leq C_{\tau,\varepsilon} \left( \frac{\alpha+1}{2} \right)^2 \int_{C(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 \varphi^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let us fix

$$(2.23) \quad \alpha = 2N + 1 > 1.$$

Recalling that  $C_{\tau,\varepsilon}$  tends to 0, as both  $\tau$  and  $\varepsilon$  go to zero, we can take  $\tau > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough, such that

$$(2.24) \quad c_2 C_{\tau,\varepsilon} \left( \frac{\alpha+1}{2} \right)^2 < \frac{1}{2}, \quad c_1 C_{\tau,\varepsilon} (\alpha+1)^2 < 2^{-N}$$

so that from (2.17) we have

$$(2.25) \quad \int_{C(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \varphi^2 \leq 2c_1 I_1.$$

From (2.6) we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} (2.26) \quad & \int_{C(R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 (u-v)^{\alpha-1} \\ & \leq \int_{C(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 (u-v)^{\alpha-1} \varphi^2 \leq 2c_1 I_1 \end{aligned}$$

and, using (2.21), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (2.27) \quad & \int_{C(R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} \leq \\ & \leq c_1 C_{\tau,\varepsilon} (\alpha+1)^2 \int_{C(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 \varphi^{\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}} |\nabla \varphi|^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2\alpha}} + \\ & + 4c_1 \int_{C(2R)} |\nabla \varphi|^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling (2.23) one has:

$$(2.28) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{C}(R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 (u-v)^{\alpha-1} \\ & \leq \theta \int_{\mathcal{C}(2R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1} + \hat{C} R^{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\theta = c_1 C_{\tau,\varepsilon} (\alpha + 1)^2,$$

$$\hat{C} = 4c_1 \lambda C^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}} > 0$$

exploiting also (2.6). Notice that, in view of (2.24), we also have that  $\theta < 2^{-N}$ . In order to apply Lemma 2.1 we set

$$\mathcal{L}(R) = \int_{\mathcal{C}(R)} (|\nabla u| + |\nabla v|)^{p-2} |\nabla(u-v)^+|^2 [(u-v)^+]^{\alpha-1},$$

and

$$g(R) = \hat{C} R^{-2}.$$

Then from (2.28) we have:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(R) \leq \theta \mathcal{L}(2R) + g(R) & \forall R > 0, \\ \mathcal{L}(R) \leq C R^N & \forall R > 0. \end{cases}$$

Applying Lemma 2.1 with  $\beta = N$ , we get  $\mathcal{L}(R) = 0$  and consequently the thesis.  $\square$

### Proof of Theorem 1.7.

The desired result is obtained with the same proof of that of Theorem 1.6 with the following slight (but necessary) modifications. Replace  $\mathcal{S}_{(\tau,\varepsilon)}$  by  $\mathcal{S}$ , set  $\varepsilon = \tau = \lambda$ ,  $B_{x'}^\varepsilon = \emptyset$ ,  $I_{x'}^{\tau,\varepsilon} = A_{x'}^\tau = \mathcal{S} \cap \{x'\} \times (y_0 - \frac{\lambda}{2}, y_0 + \frac{\lambda}{2})$  and observe that (2.20) becomes

$$(2.29) \quad C_\lambda(x') \leq C_\lambda := 2\lambda^2 (2M_0)^{2-p},$$

and that (2.24) becomes

$$(2.30) \quad c_2 C_\lambda \left( \frac{\alpha + 1}{2} \right)^2 < \frac{1}{2}, \quad c_1 C_\lambda (\alpha + 1)^2 < 2^{-N}.$$

The conclusion the follows by taking  $\lambda$  small enough in the latter one.  $\square$

**Remark 2.3.** In view of (2.15), (2.16), (2.20), (2.23) and of (2.24), it is possible to calculate explicitly the value of  $\varepsilon_0$  and  $\tau_0$ . The same can be done for  $\bar{\lambda}$ .

## 3. PROPERTIES OF THE LOCAL SYMMETRY REGIONS

Let us start this section recalling a useful change of variable. Under our assumptions on the function  $a = a(s)$  set

$$A(s) := \int_0^s a(t)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} dt.$$

It follows that  $A$  belongs to  $C_{loc}^{1,1}([0, +\infty), [0, +\infty))$ , is strictly increasing and satisfies  $A(0) = 0$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} A(t) = +\infty$ . Set

$$(3.1) \quad w := A(u)$$

then,  $w \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  and

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p w + \tilde{b}(w)|\nabla w|^q = \tilde{f}(w), & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \\ w(x', y) > 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \\ w(x', 0) = 0, & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}_+^N \end{cases}$$

with  $\tilde{b}(w) := \frac{b(A^{-1}(w))}{(a(A^{-1}(w)))^{\frac{q}{p-1}}}$  and  $\tilde{f}(w) := f(A^{-1}(w))$ . It follows that  $\tilde{b}$  and  $\tilde{f}$  still are locally Lipschitz continuous (here we used the fact that  $q > 1 > p - 1$ , since  $(H_1)$  is in force). We notice that :  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$  if and only if  $\tilde{f}(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$  and that,  $f(0) = \tilde{f}(0)$ . This shows that, as we will recall later, it is not restrictive to our purposes to assume from now on that

$$a(s) = 1.$$

We also observe that using the mean value theorem in the  $y$ -direction, the Dirichlet condition on  $u$  and the fact that  $\nabla u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ , we get that  $u$  is bounded on every set of the form  $\{0 \leq y \leq \eta\}$ , for any  $\eta > 0$ . This implies that also  $w$  and  $\nabla w$  are bounded on every set of the form  $\{0 \leq y \leq \eta\}$ , for any  $\eta > 0$  (the bound might depend on  $\eta$ ).

With this in mind, now we are going to prove an important properties concerning the local symmetry regions of the solutions. Let us start with some notations.

We define the strip  $\Sigma_\lambda$  by

$$\Sigma_\lambda := \{0 < y < \lambda\}$$

and the reflected function  $u_\lambda(x)$  by

$$u_\lambda(x) = u_\lambda(x', y) := u(x', 2\lambda - y) \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{2\lambda}.$$

As customary we also define the critical set  $Z_u$  by

$$Z_u = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N : \nabla u(x) = 0\}.$$

We have the following

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $1 < p < 2$  and let  $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  be a solution to (1.1) with  $a(s) = 1$ . Let  $(H_1)$ ,  $(H_2)$  be satisfied and assume that  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$ . Let us assume that both  $u$  and*



$\nabla u$  are bounded on every strip  $\Sigma_\eta$ ,  $\eta > 0$ . Suppose furthermore that  $u$  is monotone non-decreasing in  $\Sigma_\lambda$ , for some  $\lambda > 0$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{U}$  is a (not empty) connected component of  $\Sigma_\lambda \setminus Z_u$  such that  $u(x) \equiv u_\lambda(x)$  in  $\mathcal{U}$ , (i.e. a local symmetry region for  $u$ ). Then necessarily  $\mathcal{U}$  touches the boundary of  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ , namely

$$\partial\mathcal{U} \cap \{y = 0\} \neq \emptyset.$$

*Proof.* Let us start showing the following

*Claim 1:* There exists  $\tau = \tau(\mathcal{U}, \lambda) > 0$  such that  $\text{dist}(\mathcal{U}, \{y = 0\}) > \tau$ .

By contradiction let us assume that there exists a sequence of points

$$x_n = (x'_n, y_n) \in \mathcal{U},$$

such that

$$(3.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(x_n, \{y = 0\}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = 0.$$

We consider the sequence

$$\hat{x}_n = (x'_n, \frac{\lambda}{2})$$

and the two different cases

- a)  $u(\hat{x}_n)$  is strictly bounded away from zero uniformly on  $n$ ;
- b) up to subsequences  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u(\hat{x}_n) = 0$ .

**Case a).** Define the sequence

$$(3.4) \quad u_n(x) = u(x' + x'_n, y).$$

Let  $\mathcal{K} \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}$  be a compact set. Since both  $u$  and  $\nabla u$  are bounded on every strip  $\Sigma_\eta$ ,  $\eta > 0$ , we get :

$$0 \leq u_n(x) \leq C(\mathcal{K}), \quad |\nabla u_n(x)| \leq C(\mathcal{K}), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{K},$$

for some positive constant  $C(\mathcal{K})$ .

Therefore  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimates (see the classical results [18, 31, 39]), Ascoli's Theorem and a standard diagonal process imply that

$$(3.5) \quad u_n \xrightarrow{C_{loc}^{1,\alpha'}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})} u_\infty.$$

up to subsequences, for  $\alpha' < \alpha$ . Recalling that  $u_n(0, \frac{\lambda}{2}) \geq \gamma_0 > 0$ , uniform convergence implies that  $u_\infty$  is a non-trivial non-negative solution to the equation in (1.1) (with  $a(s) = 1$ ). Actually, by the strong maximum principle [40], we have that

$$(3.6) \quad u_\infty(x) > 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N.$$

By the definition of  $\mathcal{U}$  (i.e.  $u(x) \equiv u_\lambda(x)$  in  $\mathcal{U}$ ), since by (3.3) (together with the Dirichlet condition and the mean value theorem) we have

$$u(x'_n, y_n) \leq \|\nabla u(x)\|_\infty \cdot y_n \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty,$$

then it follows:

$$(3.7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} u(x'_n, 2\lambda - y_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} u(x'_n, y_n) = 0.$$

Then from (3.7), using (3.4) and (3.5), we obtain:

$$u_\infty(0, 2\lambda) = 0.$$

This is a contradiction with (3.6) and *Claim 1* is proved in case *a*).

**Case *b*).** Arguing exactly as in the proof of the case *a*) here above, it follows that necessarily  $u_\infty \equiv 0$ . This implies that case *b*) occurs only if  $f(0) = 0$  because if not, 0 can not be a solution of our equation.

Recalling (3.4) we define

$$(3.8) \quad \bar{u}_n(x', y) \equiv \frac{u_n(x', y)}{u_n(0, \frac{\lambda}{2})} = \frac{u(x' + x'_n, y)}{u(x'_n, \frac{\lambda}{2})},$$

so that

$$\bar{u}_n(0, \frac{\lambda}{2}) = 1,$$

and  $u_n$  uniformly converges to 0 on compact sets of  $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}$  by construction. Recalling that we are assuming that  $a(s) = 1$ , it is easily seen that

$$-\operatorname{div}(|\nabla \bar{u}_n|^{p-2} \nabla \bar{u}_n) + (u_n(0, \frac{\lambda}{2}))^{q-(p-1)} \cdot b(u_n) \cdot |\nabla \bar{u}_n|^q = \frac{f(u_n)}{u_n^{p-1}} \cdot \bar{u}_n^{p-1},$$

that is

$$(3.9) \quad -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla \bar{u}_n|^{p-2} \nabla \bar{u}_n) + \hat{c}_n(x) \cdot |\nabla \bar{u}_n|^{p-1} = \tilde{c}_n(x) \cdot \bar{u}_n^{p-1},$$

where

$$\hat{c}_n(x) = b(u_n) |\nabla u_n|^{q-(p-1)}, \quad \tilde{c}_n(x) = \frac{f(u_n)}{u_n^{p-1}}.$$

The assumptions on  $b(\cdot)$  and  $f(\cdot)$  and the fact that  $q > 1 > p - 1$  imply that  $\hat{c}_n$  and  $\tilde{c}_n$  are bounded on every strip  $\Sigma_\eta$ ,  $\eta > 0$ . Indeed, since  $b$  and  $f$  are locally Lipschitz continuous functions we have

$$(3.10) \quad |\hat{c}_n(x)| \leq \|b(u)\|_{\infty, \Sigma_\eta} \|\nabla u\|_{\infty, \Sigma_\eta}^{q-(p-1)}$$

$$(3.11) \quad 0 \leq \tilde{c}_n(x) = \frac{f(u_n)}{u_n^{p-1}} \leq L_f(\|u\|_{\infty, \Sigma_\eta}) |u_n(x)|^{2-p} \leq L_f(\|u\|_{\infty, \Sigma_\eta}) \|u\|_{\infty, \Sigma_\eta}^{2-p},$$

where we used that  $f(0) = 0$ .

On the other hand we have that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(t)}{t^{p-1}} = 0$ , since  $f(0) = 0$  as remarked above,  $p-1 < 1$  and  $f$  is locally Lipschitz continuous. The latter, together with the fact that both  $u_n$  and  $\nabla u_n$  converge to zero uniformly on compact sets of  $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}$  and  $q > 1 > p - 1$ , immediately yields that also  $\tilde{c}_n$  and  $\hat{c}_n$  converge to zero uniformly on compact sets of  $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}$ .

Fix  $0 < \delta < \frac{\lambda}{2}$  and consider an arbitrary compact set  $\mathcal{K}$  of  $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}$  containing the point  $(0, \frac{\lambda}{2})$ . By Harnack inequality (see [35, Theorem 7.2.2]), applied to the equation (3.9) on the compact set  $\mathcal{K} \cap \{y \geq \delta\} \subset \subset \mathbb{R}_+^N$ , we get that:

$$(3.12) \quad \sup_{\mathcal{K} \cap \{y \geq \delta\}} \bar{u}_n \leq C_H \inf_{\mathcal{K} \cap \{y \geq \delta\}} \bar{u}_n \leq C_H.$$

Moreover, by the monotonicity of  $u$  in  $\Sigma_\lambda$  we have:

$$(3.13) \quad \sup_{\mathcal{K} \cap \{y \geq 0\}} \bar{u}_n \leq \sup_{\mathcal{K} \cap \{y \geq \delta\}} \bar{u}_n \leq C_H.$$

Hence we can use (once again)  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimates, Ascoli's Theorem and a diagonal argument to get, up to subsequences, that:

$$\bar{u}_n \xrightarrow{C_{loc}^{1,\alpha'}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})} \bar{u}$$

for  $\alpha' < \alpha$ . Arguing as above, we see that  $\bar{u} \geq 0$  in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}$  and  $\bar{u}(0, \frac{\lambda}{2}) = 1$ .

Taking into account the properties of  $\hat{c}_n$  and of  $\tilde{c}_n$ , we can pass to the limit in (3.9) obtaining:

$$-\Delta_p \bar{u} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N.$$

By the Strong Maximum Principle [40], we therefore get that  $\bar{u} > 0$  since  $\bar{u}$  cannot be equal to zero because of the condition :  $\bar{u}(0, \frac{\lambda}{2}) = 1$ . Actually, by construction, we have

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p \bar{u} = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \\ \bar{u} > 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N \\ \bar{u}(x', 0) = 0, & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}_+^N. \end{cases}$$

By results in [29] it follows that  $\bar{u}$  is affine linear, that means:

$$\bar{u}(x', y) = ky,$$

for some  $k > 0$  by the Dirichlet assumption. This is a contradiction since by assumption  $u$  and consequently  $\bar{u}$  have a local symmetry region and this concludes the proof of the *Claim 1*.

We show the following

*Claim 2:* There exists  $\gamma = \gamma(\mathcal{U}, \lambda) > 0$  such that  $u \geq \gamma$  in  $\mathcal{U}$ .

To show this, assume by contradiction that there exists a sequence of points

$$x_n = (x'_n, y_n) \in \mathcal{U},$$

such that

$$(3.15) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u(x_n) = 0$$

and with  $y_n$  converging (up to subsequences) to  $y_0 > 0$ .

Using definition (3.4) we set

$$\bar{u}_n(x', y) \equiv \frac{u(x' + x'_n, y)}{u(x'_n, y_n)},$$

so that  $\bar{u}(0, y_n) = 1$  and  $u_n$  uniformly converges to 0 on compact sets of  $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}$  by construction (see (3.15)). As above (see (3.9)), it is easy to see that

$$(3.16) \quad -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla \bar{u}_n|^{p-2} \nabla \bar{u}_n) + \hat{c}_n(x) \cdot |\nabla \bar{u}_n|^{p-1} = \tilde{c}_n(x) \cdot \bar{u}_n^{p-1},$$

with  $\hat{c}_n$  and  $\tilde{c}_n$  satisfy (3.10) and (3.11) and, both of them converges to zero uniformly on compact sets of  $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}$ . Furthermore, we have that

$$\bar{u}_n \xrightarrow{C_{loc}^{1,\alpha'}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})} \bar{u}$$

up to subsequences, for  $\alpha' < \alpha$ . Then, arguing as above, we get that  $\bar{u} \geq 0$  in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N}$  and  $\bar{u}(0, y_0) = 1$ , with  $y_0 > 0$ . Moreover

$$-\Delta_p \bar{u} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^N.$$

By the Strong Maximum Principle (see [40]) we get that  $\bar{u} > 0$ , since  $\bar{u}$  cannot be equal to 0 because of the condition:  $\bar{u}(0, y_0) = 1$ . In fact, as in (3.14), by construction and using results in [29], it follows that  $\bar{u}$  is of the form :

$$(3.17) \quad \bar{u}(x', y) = ky,$$

for some  $k > 0$ .

Since by construction

$$\bar{u}(0, y_0) = \bar{u}_\lambda(0, y_0),$$

if  $y_0 < \lambda$ , we get a contradiction by (3.17) concluding the proof of *Claim 2*. If else  $y_0 = \lambda$ , it follows by construction that  $\frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial y}(0, y_0) = 0$ . This is deduced by observing that  $\frac{\partial \bar{u}_n}{\partial y}$  vanishes somewhere on the segment from  $(0, y_n)$  to  $(0, 2\lambda - y_n)$  (since  $(x'_n, y_n) \in \mathcal{U}$ ) and exploiting the uniform convergence of the gradients. Therefore again we get a contradiction by (3.17) concluding the proof of *Claim 2*.

Since  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$ , *Claim 2* implies that there exists  $\gamma^+ > 0$  such that

$$(3.18) \quad f(u) \geq \gamma^+ \quad \text{in } \mathcal{U}.$$

Now we proceed in order to conclude the proof. Let  $\varphi_R(x', y) = \varphi_R(x')$  with  $\varphi(x') \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N-1})$  defined as in (2.6). For all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $G_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined as:

$$(3.19) \quad G_\varepsilon(t) = \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } t \geq 2\varepsilon \\ 2t - 2\varepsilon, & \text{if } \varepsilon \leq t \leq 2\varepsilon \\ 0, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

Let  $\chi$  be the characteristic function of a set . We define

$$\Psi = \Psi_{\varepsilon, R} := e^{-s(u)} \varphi_R \frac{G_\varepsilon(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|} \chi_{(\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{U}^\lambda)},$$

where  $\mathcal{U}^\lambda$  is the reflected set of  $\mathcal{U}$  w.r.t. the hyperplane  $T_\lambda = \{y = \lambda\}$  and

$$(3.20) \quad s(t) = \hat{C} \cdot \int_0^t b^+(t') dt',$$

with  $\hat{C}$  some positive constant to be chosen later. By the definition of  $\mathcal{U}$  and taking into account the fact that  $\mathcal{U}$  is a local symmetry region of  $u$ , we have that  $\nabla u = 0$  on  $\partial(\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{U}^\lambda)$ . Moreover  $\nabla u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$  implies that  $u$  is bounded in  $\Sigma_\lambda$ . Therefore  $\Psi$  is well defined and we can use it as test function in equation (1.1) (see also [32, Lemma 5]), getting:

$$(3.21) \quad \int_{\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{U}^\lambda} |\nabla u|^{p-2} (\nabla u, \nabla \Psi) dx + \int_{\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{U}^\lambda} b^+(u) |\nabla u|^q \Psi dx = \int_{\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{U}^\lambda} b^-(u) |\nabla u|^q \Psi dx \\ + \int_{\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{U}^\lambda} f(u) \Psi dx.$$

Since  $u$  and  $\Psi$  are even w.r.t. the hyperplane  $\{y = \lambda\}$ , it follows that  $(\nabla u, \nabla \Psi)$  is even too. Therefore we infer that

$$(3.22) \quad \int_{\mathcal{U}} |\nabla u|^{p-2} (\nabla u, \nabla \Psi) dx + \int_{\mathcal{U}} b^+(u) |\nabla u|^q \Psi dx = \int_{\mathcal{U}} b^-(u) |\nabla u|^q \Psi dx + \int_{\mathcal{U}} f(u) \Psi dx.$$

Let us suppose  $1 \leq q \leq p$ . For every  $\sigma > 0$  we have:

$$(3.23) \quad x^q \leq C(\sigma) \cdot x^p + \sigma, \quad x \geq 0,$$

say e.g.  $C(\sigma) = \sigma^{1-\frac{p}{q}}$ . Therefore (3.22) and (3.23) imply:

$$(3.24) \quad \int_{\mathcal{U}} |\nabla u|^{p-2} (\nabla u, \nabla \Psi) dx + C(\sigma) \int_{\mathcal{U}} b^+(u) |\nabla u|^p \Psi dx + \sigma \int_{\mathcal{U}} b^+(u) \Psi dx \\ \geq \int_{\mathcal{U}} b^-(u) |\nabla u|^q \Psi dx + \int_{\mathcal{U}} f(u) \Psi dx \geq \int_{\mathcal{U}} f(u) \Psi dx.$$

By (3.18) we can choose  $\sigma$  in (3.23), say  $\bar{\sigma}$ , small enough such that

$$\gamma^+ - \bar{\sigma} \|b^+(u)\|_\infty = \tilde{C} > 0,$$

so that

$$(3.25) \quad \int_{\mathcal{U}} |\nabla u|^{p-2} (\nabla u, \nabla \Psi) dx + C(\bar{\sigma}) \int_{\mathcal{U}} b^+(u) |\nabla u|^p \Psi dx \geq \tilde{C} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \Psi dx.$$

Choosing  $\hat{C}$  in (3.20) equal to  $C(\bar{\sigma})$  in (3.25) we obtain

(3.26)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-s(u)} \varphi_R |\nabla u|^{p-2} (\nabla u, \nabla \frac{G_\varepsilon(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|}) dx \\ & + \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-s(u)} \frac{G_\varepsilon(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|} |\nabla u|^{p-2} (\nabla u, \nabla \varphi_R) dx \\ & \geq \tilde{C} \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-s(u)} \varphi_R \frac{G_\varepsilon(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|} dx \end{aligned}$$

We set  $h_\varepsilon(t) = \frac{G_\varepsilon(t)}{t}$ , meaning that  $h(t) = 0$  for  $0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon$ . We have:

(3.27)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-s(u)} \varphi_R |\nabla u|^{p-2} (\nabla u, \nabla \frac{G_\varepsilon(|\nabla u|)}{|\nabla u|}) dx \right| \\ & \leq C \int_{\mathcal{U}} |\nabla u|^{p-1} |h'_\varepsilon(|\nabla u|)| |\nabla(|\nabla u|)| \varphi_R dx \\ & \leq C \int_{\mathcal{U}} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \left( |\nabla u| h'_\varepsilon(|\nabla u|) \right) \|D^2 u\| \varphi_R dx, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\|D^2 u\|$  denotes the Hessian norm.

Here below, we fix  $R > 0$  and let  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Later we will let  $R \rightarrow \infty$ . To this aim, let us first show that

$$(i) \quad |\nabla u|^{p-2} \|D^2 u\| \varphi_R \in L^1(\mathcal{U}) \quad \forall R > 0;$$

$$(ii) \quad |\nabla u| h'_\varepsilon(|\nabla u|) \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathcal{U} \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } |\nabla u| h'_\varepsilon(|\nabla u|) \leq C \text{ with } C \text{ not depending on } \varepsilon.$$

Let us prove (i). Defining  $\mathcal{D}(R) = \{\mathcal{U} \cap \{B'(0, R) \times \mathbb{R}\}\}$ , by Hölder's inequality it follows

$$\begin{aligned} (3.28) \quad & \int_{\mathcal{U}} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \|D^2 u\| \varphi_R dx \leq C(\mathcal{D}(2R)) \left( \int_{\mathcal{D}(2R)} |\nabla u|^{2(p-2)} \|D^2 u\|^2 \varphi_R^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C \left( \int_{\mathcal{D}(2R)} |\nabla u|^{p-2-\beta} \|D^2 u\|^2 \varphi_R^2 |\nabla u|^{p-2+\beta} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)}^{(p-2+\beta)/2} \left( \int_{\mathcal{D}(2R)} |\nabla u|^{p-2-\beta} \|D^2 u\|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

with  $0 \leq \beta < 1$  and  $\varphi_R^2 |\nabla u|^{p-2+\beta}$  consequently bounded. By *Claim 1* we have:

$$\text{dist}(\mathcal{U}, \{y = 0\}) > 0.$$

Using [34, Proposition 2.1]<sup>3</sup>, we infer that

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{D}(2R)} |\nabla u|^{p-2-\beta} \|D^2 u\|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C.$$

Then by (3.28) we obtain

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \|D^2 u\| \varphi_R dx \leq C.$$

Let us prove (ii). Recalling (3.19), we obtain

$$h'_\varepsilon(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t \geq 2\varepsilon \\ \frac{2\varepsilon}{t^2} & \text{if } \varepsilon \leq t \leq 2\varepsilon \\ 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

and then  $|\nabla u| h'_\varepsilon(|\nabla u|)$  tends to 0 almost everywhere in  $\mathcal{U}$  as  $\varepsilon$  goes to 0 and we have:  $|\nabla u| h'_\varepsilon(|\nabla u|) \leq 2$ .

Then by (3.26), (3.27) and (i), (ii) above, passing to the limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we get:

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-s(u)} |\nabla u|^{p-2} (\nabla u, \nabla \varphi_R) dx \geq C \int_{\mathcal{U}} \varphi_R dx, \quad \forall R > 0.$$

Recalling (2.6), we have that there exists  $C = C(\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)})$  (not depending on  $R$ ) such that:

$$|\mathcal{U} \cap \text{supp}(\varphi_R)| \cdot \frac{1}{R} \geq C \cdot |\mathcal{U} \cap \text{supp}(\varphi_R)|$$

and we get a contradiction for  $R$  large, concluding the proof.  $\square$

#### 4. RECOVERING COMPACTENESS

In this section we prove a crucial result, which allows us to localize the support of  $(u - u_{\bar{\lambda}})^+$ , where  $\bar{\lambda}$  is defined in (4.2) below. The localization obtained will enable us to apply the weak comparison principle Theorem 1.6.

With the notations introduced at the beginning of the previous section, we set

$$(4.1) \quad \Lambda := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+ : u \leq u_\mu \text{ in } \Sigma_\mu \quad \forall \mu < \lambda \right\}$$

and we define

$$(4.2) \quad \bar{\lambda} := \sup \Lambda.$$

We have the following:

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $1 < p < 2$  and let  $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})$  be a solution to (1.1) with  $a(s) = 1$ . Let  $(H_1)$ ,  $(H_2)$  and  $(H_3)$  be satisfied and assume that  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$ . Let us assume that both  $u$  and  $\nabla u$  are bounded on every strip  $\Sigma_\eta$ ,  $\eta > 0$ .*

---

<sup>3</sup>Actually in Proposition 2.1 of [34] it is considered the case  $q = p$ . The same result in the more general case  $1 < q \leq p$  follows exactly in the same way repeating the same calculations.

Assume  $0 < \bar{\lambda} < +\infty$  and set

$$W_\varepsilon := \left(u - u_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \chi_{\{y \leq \bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon\}}$$

where  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

Given  $0 < \delta < \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}$  and  $\rho > 0$ , there exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that, for any  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ , it follows

$$\text{Supp } W_\varepsilon^+ \subset \{0 \leq y \leq \delta\} \cup \{\bar{\lambda} - \delta \leq y \leq \bar{\lambda} + \varepsilon\} \cup \left( \bigcup_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}} B_{x'}^\rho \right).$$

where  $B_{x'}^\rho$  is such that

$$(4.3) \quad B_{x'}^\rho \subseteq \{y \in (0, \bar{\lambda} + \varepsilon) : |\nabla u(x', y)| < \rho, |\nabla u_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon}(x', y)| < \rho\}.$$

*Proof.* Assume by contradiction that there exists  $\delta > 0$ , with  $0 < \delta < \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}$ , such that, given any  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ , we find  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$  and  $x_\varepsilon = (x'_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon)$  such that:

- (i)  $u(x'_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) \geq u_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon}(x'_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon)$
- (ii)  $x_\varepsilon$  belongs to the set

$$\left\{ (x', y) \in \mathbb{R}^N : \delta \leq y \leq \bar{\lambda} - \delta \right\}$$

and it holds the alternative: either  $|\nabla u(x_\varepsilon)| \geq \rho$  or  $|\nabla u_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon}(x_\varepsilon)| \geq \rho$ .

Take now  $\varepsilon_0 = \frac{1}{n}$ , then there exists  $\varepsilon_n \leq \frac{1}{n}$  and a sequence

$$x_n = (x'_n, y_n) = (x'_{\varepsilon_n}, y_{\varepsilon_n})$$

such that

$$u(x'_n, y_n) \geq u_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon_n}(x'_n, y_n)$$

and satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) above. Up to subsequences we may assume that:

$$y_n \rightarrow y_0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty, \quad \text{with } \delta \leq y_0 \leq \bar{\lambda} - \delta.$$

Let us define

$$(4.4) \quad \tilde{u}_n(x', y) = u(x' + x'_n, y),$$

Since both  $u$  and  $\nabla u$  are bounded on every strip  $\Sigma_\eta$ ,  $\eta > 0$ , as before, by  $C^{1,\alpha}$  estimates, Ascoli's Theorem and a standard diagonal process we get that :

$$(4.5) \quad \tilde{u}_n \xrightarrow{C_{loc}^{1,\alpha'}(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^N})} \tilde{u}$$

(up to subsequences) for  $\alpha' < \alpha$ .

We claim that

- $\tilde{u} \geq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ , with  $\tilde{u}(x, 0) = 0$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ ;
- $\tilde{u} \leq \tilde{u}_{\bar{\lambda}}$  in  $\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}}$ ;
- $\tilde{u}(0, y_0) = \tilde{u}_{\bar{\lambda}}(0, y_0)$ ;
- $|\nabla \tilde{u}(0, y_0)| \geq \rho$ .



To prove this note that, since each  $\tilde{u}_n(x', y)$  is positive and satisfies the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition by construction, we have:  $\tilde{u} \geq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$  and  $\tilde{u}(x, 0) = 0$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ . It is also clear that  $\tilde{u} \leq \tilde{u}_{\bar{\lambda}}$  in  $\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}}$  and  $\tilde{u}(0, y_0) \geq \tilde{u}_{\bar{\lambda}}(0, y_0)$ . Since (as shown above)  $\tilde{u} \leq \tilde{u}_{\bar{\lambda}}$ , actually there holds:  $\tilde{u}(0, y_0) = \tilde{u}_{\bar{\lambda}}(0, y_0)$ . Finally, at  $x_0 = (0, y_0)$  (where  $\tilde{u}(0, y_0) = \tilde{u}_{\bar{\lambda}}(0, y_0)$ ) we have that  $\nabla \tilde{u}(0, y_0) = \nabla \tilde{u}_{\bar{\lambda}}(0, y_0)$ , because  $x_0$  is an interior minimum point for the function  $w(x) := \tilde{u}_{\bar{\lambda}}(x) - \tilde{u}(x) \geq 0$ . For all  $n$  we have  $|\nabla u(x_n)| \geq \rho$  or  $|\nabla u_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon_n}(x_n)| \geq \rho$ , and, using the uniform  $C^1$  convergence on compact set, we get:  $|\nabla \tilde{u}(0, y_0)| \geq \rho$ .

Recalling that we assumed here  $a(s) = 1$ , passing to the limit we obtain that  $\tilde{u}$  satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^{p-2} (\nabla \tilde{u}, \nabla \varphi) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} b(\tilde{u}) |\nabla \tilde{u}|^q dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} f(\tilde{u}) \varphi dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N).$$

Since  $\tilde{u} \geq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ , by the strong maximum principle [35, Theorem 2.5.1], it follows that  $\tilde{u} > 0$  or  $\tilde{u} = 0$ : by the fact that  $|\nabla \tilde{u}(0, y_0)| \geq \delta$ , the case  $\tilde{u} = 0$  is not possible. Hence  $\tilde{u} > 0$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ . Moreover we have  $\tilde{u} \leq \tilde{u}_{\bar{\lambda}}$  in  $\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}}$  and  $\tilde{u}(0, y_0) = \tilde{u}_{\bar{\lambda}}(0, y_0)$ . By the strong comparison principle [35, Theorem 2.5.2], we have that  $\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}_{\bar{\lambda}}$  in the connected component, say  $\mathcal{U}$ , of  $\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}} \setminus Z_u$  containing the point  $(0, y_0)$ . By Theorem 3.1 we have that  $\partial \mathcal{U} \cap \partial \mathbb{R}_+^N \neq \emptyset$ . The latter yields the existence of a point  $z = (z', 2\bar{\lambda})$  such that  $\tilde{u}(z) = 0$ , which contradicts  $\tilde{u} > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ .  $\square$

## 5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Let us start recalling that, in view of the changing of variable in (3.1), which preserves the monotonicity property, it is not restrictive to prove Theorem 1.1 in the case  $a(\cdot) = 1$ . As already remarked, the assumption  $\nabla u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$  implies that  $w$  and  $\nabla w$  (see (3.1)) are bounded on every set of the form  $\{0 \leq y \leq \lambda\}$ , for any  $\lambda > 0$ . Thus, we can use the results demonstrated in Sections 3 and Sections 4.

The proof is based on the moving planes procedure. By Theorem 1.7 the set  $\Lambda$  defined in (4.1) is not empty and  $\bar{\lambda} \in (0, +\infty]$ . To conclude the proof we need to show that  $\bar{\lambda} = \infty$ .

Assume that  $\bar{\lambda}$  is finite, set  $\lambda_0 = \bar{\lambda} + 2$ ,

$$M_0 := \|u\|_{L^\infty(\{0 \leq y \leq 2\bar{\lambda}+10\})} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\{0 \leq y \leq 2\bar{\lambda}+10\})} + 1 > 0$$

and take  $\tau_0 = \tau_0(N, p, q, \lambda_0, M_0, \gamma) > 0$  and  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(N, p, q, \lambda_0, M_0, \gamma) > 0$  as in Theorem 1.6.

By Proposition 4.1 we have that, given  $0 < \delta < \min\{\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{2}, \frac{\tau_0}{4}\}$  and  $0 < \rho < \varepsilon_0$ , we find  $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$  such that, for any  $0 < \varepsilon \leq \min\{\bar{\varepsilon}, \frac{\tau_0}{4}, 1\}$ , it follows

$$\text{Supp } W_\varepsilon^+ \subset \{0 \leq y \leq \delta\} \cup \{\bar{\lambda} - \delta \leq y \leq \bar{\lambda} + \varepsilon\} \cup \left( \bigcup_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}} B_{x'}^\rho \right),$$

where  $W_\varepsilon^+ = (u - u_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon})^+ \cdot \chi_{\{y \leq \bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon\}}$  and  $B_{x'}^\rho$  is defined in (4.3).

We claim that  $u \leq u_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon}$  in  $\Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon}$ , which contradicts the definition of  $\bar{\lambda}$  and yields that  $\bar{\lambda} = \infty$ . This, in turn, implies the desired monotonicity of  $u$ , that is  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial y}(x', y) \geq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ .

To this end, we proceed by contradiction. Suppose that the open set

$$\mathcal{S}_{(2\delta+\varepsilon, \rho)} := \{x \in \Sigma_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon} : u(x) - u_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon}(x) > 0\}$$

is not empty, then  $u$  and  $v = u_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon}$  satisfy (1.5) with  $\lambda = y_0 = \bar{\lambda} + \varepsilon (< \lambda_0)$ , as well as:  $\|u\|_\infty + \|\nabla u\|_\infty \leq M_0$ ,  $\|v\|_\infty + \|\nabla v\|_\infty \leq M_0$ . Since by construction  $2\delta + \varepsilon < \tau_0$  and  $\rho < \varepsilon_0$ , we can apply Theorem 1.6 to conclude that  $u \leq u_{\bar{\lambda}+\varepsilon}$  on  $\mathcal{S}_{(2\delta+\varepsilon, \rho)}$ . This clearly contradicts the definition of  $\mathcal{S}_{(2\delta+\varepsilon, \rho)}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{S}_{(2\delta+\varepsilon, \rho)} = \emptyset$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3 AND THEOREM 1.4

### Proof of Theorem 1.3 .

Since we assumed that  $b(u) \geq 0$  then  $-\Delta_p u \leq f(u)$  so that Theorem 1.7 in [21] applies and gives that actually

$$0 < u \leq z$$

in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ . Note that, once it is proved that  $0 < u \leq z$ , then the strong maximum principle (see [35]) applies and gives that actually  $0 < u < z$ . It follows furthermore that  $u$  is strictly bounded away from  $z$  in  $\Sigma_\lambda$  for any  $\lambda > 0$ . In fact, if this is not the case, arguing as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 (see case a)) we could easily construct a limiting profile  $u_\infty$  with  $0 < u_\infty \leq z$ , touching  $z$  at some point. This is not possible again by the strong maximum principle [35]. This is enough to repeat the proof of Theorem 1.1 and get the thesis.

### Proof of Theorem 1.4.

If  $u$  is not identically zero, then it is strictly positive by the strong maximum principle (see [35, 40]). Therefore  $u$  is monotone increasing w.r.t. the  $y$ -direction by Theorem 1.1 and the proof of b) and of c) follows by [33, 38] exactly in the same way as b) and c) in Theorem 1.6 of [21].

To prove a) let  $N = 2$  and denote by  $(x, y)$  a point in the plane. Define

$$(6.1) \quad w(x) := \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} u(x, y)$$

We see that (see e.g. the proof of Theorem 8.3 in [21] for details)  $w : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is non-negative and bounded with

$$-(|w'|^{p-2}w')' = f(w) \geq 0.$$

A simple O.D.E analysis shows that  $w$  is constant and, by the assumptions on  $f$ , it follows that necessarily  $w = 0$  that also implies  $u = 0$  and the thesis.

To prove the non-existence result when  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s \geq 0$ , we first consider the case  $N = 2$ . By the above argument (which uses only the assumption  $f(s) > 0$  for  $s > 0$ ) we

infer that  $u = 0$  which contradicts  $f(0) > 0$ . Thus, there are no non-negative solutions. The same argument can be employed to treat the case  $N \geq 3$ . Indeed, in this case the assumption  $f(0) > 0$  implies that  $f(s) \geq \lambda s^{\frac{(N-1)(p-1)}{N-1-p}}$  in  $[0, \delta]$ , for some  $\lambda, \delta > 0$ , yielding  $u = 0$ . Again contradicting  $f(0) > 0$ .

□

## REFERENCES

- [1] A.D. Alexandrov, A characteristic property of the spheres, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, 58, pp. 303 – 354, 1962.
- [2] H. Berestycki, L. A. Caffarelli and L. Nirenberg, Symmetry for elliptic equations in the halfspace, *in Boundary value problems for PDEs and applications*. Vol. dedicated to E. Magenes, J. L. Lions et al., ed. Masson, Paris (1993), 27–42.
- [3] H. Berestycki, L. Caffarelli and L. Nirenberg, Inequalities for second order elliptic equations with applications to unbounded domains. *Duke Math. J.*, 81(2), pp. 467 – 494, 1996.
- [4] H. Berestycki, L. Caffarelli and L. Nirenberg, Further qualitative properties for elliptic equations in unbounded domains. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* (4), 25(1-2), pp. 69 – 94, 1997.
- [5] H. Berestycki, L. Caffarelli and L. Nirenberg, Monotonicity for elliptic equations in an unbounded Lipschitz domain. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 50, pp. 1089 – 1111, 1997.
- [6] H. Berestycki and L. Nirenberg, On the method of moving planes and the sliding method. *Bolletín Soc. Brasil. de Mat Nova Ser*, 22(1), pp. 1 – 37, 1991.
- [7] Charro, F., Montoro, L., Sciunzi, B., Monotonicity of solutions of Fully nonlinear uniformly elliptic equations in the half-plane, *J. Diff. Equations*, 251(6), pp. 1562-1579, 2011.
- [8] L. Damascelli, Comparison theorems for some quasilinear degenerate elliptic operators and applications to symmetry and monotonicity results. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 15(4), pp. 493–516, (1998).
- [9] L. Damascelli, F. Gladiali, Some nonexistence results for positive solutions of elliptic equations in unbounded domains. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana*, 20(1), pp. 67–86, 2004.
- [10] L. Damascelli, A. Farina, B. Sciunzi and E. Valdinoci. Liouville results for  $m$ -Laplace equations of Lane-Emden-Fowler type. *Ann. Inst. Henry Poincaré, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 26 (4), pp. 1099–1119, 2009.
- [11] L. Damascelli, F. Pacella, Monotonicity and symmetry of solutions of  $p$ -Laplace equations,  $1 < p < 2$ , via the moving plane method, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* 26 (4), pp. 689-707, 1998.
- [12] L. Damascelli, B. Sciunzi. Regularity, monotonicity and symmetry of positive solutions of  $m$ -Laplace equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 206(2), pp. 483–515, 2004.
- [13] L. Damascelli, B. Sciunzi, Harnack inequalities, maximum and comparison principles, and regularity of positive solutions of  $m$ -Laplace equations. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 25(2), pp. 139–159, 2006.
- [14] L. Damascelli and B. Sciunzi. Monotonicity of the solutions of some quasilinear elliptic equations in the half-plane, and applications. *Diff. Int. Eq.*, 23(5-6), pp. 419–434, 2010.
- [15] E. N. Dancer, Some notes on the method of moving planes. *Bull. Australian Math. Soc.*, 46(3), pp. 425 – 434, 1992.
- [16] E. N. Dancer, Some remarks on half space problems. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems. Series A*, 25(1), pp. 83– 88, 2009.
- [17] E.N. Dancer, Y. Du, M. Efendiev. Quasilinear Elliptic Equations on Half- and Quarter-spaces. *Advanced Nonlinear Studies*, 13, pp. 115–136, 2013.

- [18] E. Di Benedetto,  $C^{1+\alpha}$  local regularity of weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 7(8), pp. 827–850, 1983.
- [19] Y. Du and Z. Guo, Symmetry for elliptic equations in a half-space without strong maximum principle. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 134(2), pp. 259 – 269, 2004.
- [20] A. Farina, Rigidity and one-dimensional symmetry for semilinear elliptic equations in the whole of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and in half spaces. *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.*, 13(1), pp. 65 – 82, 2003.
- [21] A. Farina, L. Montoro and B. Sciunzi, Monotonicity and one-dimensional symmetry for solutions of  $-\Delta_p u = f(u)$  in half-spaces. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 43, pp. 123-145, 2012.
- [22] A. Farina, L. Montoro and B. Sciunzi, Monotonicity of solutions of quasilinear degenerate elliptic equations in half-spaces. *Mathematische Annalen*, to appear, DOI: 10.1007/s00208-013-0919-0.
- [23] A. Farina, B. Sciunzi and E. Valdinoci, Bernstein and De Giorgi type problems: new results via a geometric approach. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* (5), 7(4), pp. 741 – 791, 2008.
- [24] A. Farina, B. Sciunzi and E. Valdinoci, On a Poincaré type formula for solutions of singular and degenerate elliptic equations. *Manuscripta Math.*, 132(3-4), pp. 335–342, 2010.
- [25] A. Farina and E. Valdinoci, Flattening results for Elliptic PDEs in unbounded domains with applications to Overdetermined Problems. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 195(3), 2010.
- [26] E. Galakhov, A comparison principle for quasilinear operators in unbounded domains. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 70(12), pp. 4190–4194, 2009.
- [27] B. Gidas, W. M. Ni, and L. Nirenberg, Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 68(3), pp. 209–243, 1979.
- [28] B. Gidas and J. Spruck, A priori bounds for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 6 (1981), pp. 883–901.
- [29] T. Kilpeläinen, H. Shahgholian, and X. Zhong, Growth estimates through scaling for quasilinear partial differential equations. *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Mathematica*, 32(2), pp. 595–599, 2007.
- [30] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, N.N. Ural'tseva, Linear and Quasilinear Elliptic Equations, Academic Press, New York, 1968.
- [31] G.M. Lieberman, Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 12(11), pp. 1203–1219, 1988.
- [32] S. Merchán, L. Montoro, I. Peral, B. Sciunzi, Existence and qualitative properties of solutions to a quasilinear elliptic equation involving the Hardy-Leray potential. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, (2013), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.anihpc.2013.01.003>.
- [33] E. Mitidieri, S.I. Pokhozhaev, The absence of positive solutions for quasilinear elliptic inequalities. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk* 359, pp. 456–460, 1998. English translation in, *Dokl. Math* 57, pp. 250–253, 1998.
- [34] L. Montoro, B. Sciunzi and M. Squassina, Asymptotic symmetry for a class of quasi-linear parabolic problems, *Advanced Nonlinear Studies*, 10(4), pp. 789–818, 2010.
- [35] P. Pucci, J. Serrin, *The maximum principle*. Birkhauser, Boston (2007).
- [36] A. Quaas, B. Sirakov, Existence results for nonproper elliptic equations involving the Pucci operator. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 31(7-9), pp. 987–1003, 2006.
- [37] J. Serrin, A symmetry problem in potential theory. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 43(4), pp. 304–318, 1971.
- [38] J. Serrin and H. Zou, Cauchy-Liouville and universal boundedness theorems for quasilinear elliptic equations and inequalities, *Acta Mathematica*, 189(1), pp. 79 – 142, 2002.
- [39] P. Tolksdorf, Regularity for a more general class of quasilinear elliptic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 51(1), pp. 126–150, 1984.
- [40] J. L. Vazquez, A strong maximum principle for some quasilinear elliptic equations, *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 12(3), pp. 191 – 202, 1984.

- [41] H.H. Zou, A priori estimates and existence for quasi-linear elliptic equations, *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 33(4), pp. 417 – 437, 2008.

UNIVERSITÉ DE PICARDIE JULES VERNE  
LAMFA, CNRS UMR 6140  
AMIENS, FRANCE  
*E-mail address:* `alberto.farina@u-picardie.fr`

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA  
UNIVERSITÀ DELLA CALABRIA  
PONTE PIETRO BUCCI 31B, I-87036 ARCAVACATA DI RENDE, COSENZA, ITALY  
*E-mail address:* `montoro@mat.unical.it`

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA  
UNIVERSITÀ DELLA CALABRIA  
PONTE PIETRO BUCCI 31B, I-87036 ARCAVACATA DI RENDE, COSENZA, ITALY  
*E-mail address:* `riey@mat.unical.it`

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA  
UNIVERSITÀ DELLA CALABRIA  
PONTE PIETRO BUCCI 31B, I-87036 ARCAVACATA DI RENDE, COSENZA, ITALY  
*E-mail address:* `sciunzi@mat.unical.it`