A priori estimates for elliptic equations with reaction terms involving the function and its gradient
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Abstract We study local and global properties of positive solutions of $-\Delta u = u^p + M |\nabla u|^q$ in a domain $\Omega$ of $\mathbb{R}^N$, in the range $\min\{p, q\} > 1$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}$. We prove a priori estimates and existence or non-existence of ground states for the same equation.
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1 Introduction

This article is concerned with local and global properties of positive solutions of the following

\[ -\Delta u = M'|u|^{p-1}u + M |\nabla u|^q, \]

in $\Omega \setminus \{0\}$ where $\Omega$ is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ containing 0, $p$ and $q$ are exponents larger than

1 and $M, M'$ are real parameters. If $M' \leq 0$ the equation satisfies a comparison principle and

a big part of the study can be carried via radial local supersolutions. This no longer the case

when $M' > 0$ which will be assumed in all the article, and by homothety (1.1) becomes

\[ -\Delta u = |u|^{p-1}u + M |\nabla u|^q. \]

If $M = 0$ (1.2) is called Lane-Emden equation

\[ -\Delta u = |u|^{p-1}u. \]

It turns out that it plays an important role in modelling meteorological or astrophysical pheno-

mena [15], [13], this is the reason for which the first study, in the radial case, goes back to the

end of nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. A fairly complete presentation

can be found in [18]. If $N \geq 3$, This equations exhibits two main critical exponents $p = \frac{N}{N-2}$

and $p = \frac{N+2}{N-2}$ which play a key role in the description of the set of positive solutions which can

be summarized by the following overview:

1- If $1 < p \leq \frac{N}{N-2}$, there exists no positive solution if $\Omega$ is the complement of a compact set.

Even in that case solution can be replaced by supersolution. This is easy to prove by studying

the inequality satisfied by the spherical average of a solution of the equation.

2- If $1 < p < \frac{N+2}{N-2}$, there exists no *ground state*, i.e. positive solution in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Furthermore any

positive solution $u$ in a ball $B_R = B_R(a)$ satisfies

\[ u(x) \leq c(R - |x - a|)^{-\frac{2}{N-2}}, \]

(1.4)
where \( c = c(N, p) > 0 \), see [19].

3- If \( p = \frac{N+2}{N-2} \) all the positive solutions in \( \mathbb{R}^N \) are radial with respect to some point \( a \) and endow the following form

\[
u(x) := u_\lambda(x) = \frac{(N(N - 2)\lambda)^{N-2}}{\left(\lambda + |x - a|^2\right)^{N-2}}.
\]

All the positive solutions in \( \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\} \) are radial, see [12].

4- If \( p > \frac{N+2}{N-2} \) there exist infinitely many positive ground states radial with respect to some points. They are obtained from one say \( v \), radial for example with respect to 0 by the scaling transformation \( T_k \) where \( k > 0 \) with

\[
T_k[v](x) = k^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}v(kx).
\]

Indeed, the first significant non-radial results deals with the case \( 1 < p \leq \frac{N}{N-2} \). They are based upon the Brezis-Lions lemma [11] which yields an estimate of solutions in the Lorentz space \( L^{\frac{N}{N-2}, \infty} \), implying in turn the local integrability of \( u^q \). Then a bootstrapping method as in [21] leads easily to some a priori estimate. Note that this subcritical case can be interpreted using the famous Serrin’s results on quasilinear equations [24]. The first breakthrough in the study of Lane-Emden equation came in the treatment of the case \( 1 < p < \frac{N+2}{N-2} \); it is due to Gidas and Spruck [19]. Their analysis is based upon differentiating the equation and then obtaining sharp enough local integral estimates on the term \( u^{q-1} \) making possible the utilization of Harnack inequality as in [24]. The treatment of the critical case \( p = \frac{N+2}{N-2} \), due to Caffarelli, Gidas and Spruck [12], was made possible thanks to a completely new approach based upon a combination of moving plane analysis and geometric measure theory. As for the supercritical case, not much is known and the existence of radial ground states is a consequence of Pohozaev’s identity [22], using a shooting method.

The study of (1.2) when \( M \neq 0 \) presents some similarities with the one of Lane-Emden equation in the cases 1 and 2, except that the proof are much more involved. Actually the approach we develop in this article is much indebted to our recent paper [6] where we study local and global aspects of positive solutions of

\[
- \Delta u = u^p |\nabla u|^q,
\]

where \( p \geq 0, 0 \leq q < 2 \), mostly in the superlinear case \( p + q - 1 > 0 \). Therein we prove the existence of a critical line of exponents

\[
(\mathfrak{L}) := \{(p, q) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, 2) : (N - 2)p + (N - 1)q = N\}.
\]

The subcritical range corresponds to the fact that \((p, q)\) is below \((\mathfrak{L})\). In this region Serrin’s celebrated results [24] can be applied and we prove [6] Theorem A] that positive solutions of (1.7) in the punctured ball \( B_2 \setminus \{0\} \) satisfy, for some constant \( c > 0 \) depending on the solution,

\[
u(x) + |x| |\nabla u(x)| \leq c |x|^{2-N} \quad \text{for all } x \in B_1 \setminus \{0\}.
\]

When \((p, q)\) is above \((\mathfrak{L})\), i.e. in the supercritical range, we introduced two methods for obtaining a priori estimate of solutions: The pointwise Bernstein method and the integral Bernstein method. The first one is based upon the change of unknown \( u = v^{-\beta} \), and then to show
that $|\nabla v|$ satisfies an inequality of Keller-Osserman type. When $(p,q)$ lies above $(2)$ and verifies

(i) either $1 \leq p < \frac{N+3}{N-1}$ and $p + q - 1 < \frac{4}{N-1}$,
(ii) or $0 \leq p < 1$ and $p + q - 1 < \frac{(p+1)^2}{p(N-1)}$,

we prove that any positive solution of (1.7) in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfies

$$|\nabla u^a(x)| \leq c^* (\text{dist}(x, \partial \Omega))^{-\frac{2-q}{p+q-1}}$$

for all $x \in \Omega$, (1.10)

for some positive $c^*$ and $a$ depending on $N$, $p$ and $q$ [6, Theorem B]. As a consequence we prove that any positive solution of (1.7) in $\mathbb{R}^N$ is constant. With the second method we combine the change of unknown $u = v^{-\beta}$ with integration and cut-off functions. We show the existence of a quadratic polynomial $G$ in two variables such that for any $(p,q) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0,2)$ satisfying $G(p,q) < 0$ any positive solution of (1.7) in $\mathbb{R}^N$ is constant [6, Theorem C]. The polynomial $G$ is not simple but it is worth noting that if $0 \leq p < \frac{N+2}{N-2}$, there holds $G(p,0) < 0$, which recovers Gidas and Spruck result [10].

For equation (1.2) we first observe that the equation is invariant under the scaling transformation (1.6) for any $k > 0$ if and only if $q$ is critical with respect to $p$, i.e.

$$q = \frac{2p}{p+1}.$$ 

In general the transformation $T_k$ exchanges (1.2) with

$$-\Delta v = v^p + Mk^{\frac{2p-q(p+1)}{p+q-1}}|\nabla v|^q,$$

hence if $q < \frac{2p}{p+1}$, the limit equation when $k \to 0$ is (1.3). We say that the exponent $p$ is dominant. We can also consider the transformation

$$S_k[v](x) = k^{\frac{2-q}{q-1}} v(kx),$$

when $q \neq 2$, which is the same as $T_k$ if $q = \frac{2p}{p+1}$, and more generally transforms (1.2) into

$$-\Delta v = k^{\frac{q-p(2-q)}{q-1}} v^p + M|\nabla v|^q.$$

(1.13)

Hence if $q > \frac{2p}{p+1}$, the limit equation when $k \to 0$ is the Riccati equation

$$-\Delta v = M|\nabla v|^q.$$ 

(1.14)

It is also important to notice that the value of the coefficient $M$ (and not only its sign) plays a fundamental role, only if $q = \frac{2p}{p+1}$. If $q \neq \frac{2p}{p+1}$ the transformation

$$u(x) = av(y) \quad \text{with} \quad a = |M|^\frac{2}{(p+1)(q-2p)} \quad \text{and} \quad y = a^{\frac{p}{2}} x$$

allows to transform (1.2) into

$$-\Delta v = |v|^{p-1} v \pm |\nabla v|^q.$$ 

(1.15)
The equation (1.2) has been essentially studied in the radial case when \( M < 0 \) in connection with the parabolic equation
\[
\partial_t u - \Delta u + M|\nabla u|^q = |u|^{p-1}u,
\]
see [14], [16], [17], [25], [27], [30], [31]. The studies mainly deal with the case \( q \neq \frac{2p}{p+1} \), although not complete when \( q > \frac{2p}{p+1} \). When \( q = \frac{2p}{p+1} \) the existence of a ground state is proved in dimension 1. Some partial results that we will improve, already exist in higher dimension. The case \( M > 0 \) attracted less attention.

In the nonradial case, any nonnegative nontrivial solution is positive since \( p, q > 1 \). We first observe, using a standard averaging method applied to positive supersolutions of (1.3), that if \( M \geq 0, 1 < p \leq \frac{N}{N-2} \) when \( N \geq 3 \), any \( p > 1 \) if \( N = 1, 2 \), then for any \( q > 0 \) there exists no positive solution in an exterior domain. When \( 0 < q < \frac{2p}{p+1} \) the equation endows some character of the pure Emden-Fowler equation (1.3) by the transformation \( T_k \). In [23] it is proved that if \( 0 < q < \frac{2p}{p+1}, 1 < p < \frac{N+2}{N-2} \) and \( M \in \mathbb{R} \), any positive solution of (1.3) in an open domain satisfies
\[
|\nabla u(x)| \leq c_{N,p,q,M} \left( 1 + (\text{dist} \,(x,\partial \Omega))^{-\frac{N}{p+1}} \right) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega.
\]
(1.18)

Note that this does not imply the non-existence of ground state. In [1] Alarcón, García-Melián and Quass study the equation
\[
-\Delta u = |\nabla u|^q + f(u),
\]
in an exterior domain of \( \mathbb{R}^N \) emphasizing the fact that positive solutions are super harmonic functions. They prove that if \( 1 < q \leq \frac{N}{N-2} \) and if \( f \) is positive on \((0, \infty)\) and satisfies
\[
\limsup_{s \to 0} s^{-p}f(s) > 0,
\]
for some \( p > \frac{N}{N-2} \), then (1.19) admits no positive supersolution. The same authors also study in [2] existence and non-existence of positive solutions of (1.19) in a bounded domain with Dirichlet condition.

The techniques we developed in this paper are based upon a delicate extension of the ones already introduced in [6]. Our first nonradial result dealing with the case \( q > \frac{2p}{p+1} \) is the following:

**Theorem A** Let \( N \geq 1, p > 1 \) and \( q > \frac{2p}{p+1} \). Then for any \( M > 0 \), any solution of (1.2) in a domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N \) satisfies
\[
|\nabla u(x)| \leq c_{N,p,q} \left( M^{-\frac{p+1}{(p+1)q-2p}} + (M \text{dist} \,(x,\partial \Omega))^{-\frac{1}{q-1}} \right) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega.
\]
(1.21)

As a consequence, any ground state has at most a linear growth at infinity:
\[
|\nabla u(x)| \leq c_{N,p,q}M^{-\frac{p+1}{(p+1)q-2p}} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N.
\]
(1.22)
Our proof relies on a direct Bernstein method combined with Keller-Osserman’s estimate applied to $|\nabla u|^2$. It is important to notice that the result holds for any $p > 1$, showing that, in some sense, the presence of the gradient term has a regularizing effect. In the case $q < \frac{2p}{p+1}$ we prove a non-existence result.

**Theorem A’** Let $N \geq 1$, $p > 1$, $1 < q < \frac{2p}{p+1}$ and $M > 0$. Then there exists a constant $c_{N,p,q} > 0$ such that there is no positive solution of (1.2) in $\mathbb{R}^N$ satisfying

$$u(x) \leq c_{N,p,q} M^{\frac{2}{2p-(p+1)/q}} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (1.23)$$

When $q$ is critical with respect to $p$ the situation is more delicate since the value of $M$ plays a fundamental role. Our first statement is a particular case of a more general result in [1], but with a simpler proof which allows us to introduce techniques that we use later on.

**Theorem B** Let $N \geq 2$, $p > 1$ if $N = 2$ or $1 < p \leq \frac{N}{N-2}$ if $N = 3$, $q = \frac{2p}{p+1}$ and $M > -\mu^*$ where

$$\mu^* := \mu^*(N) = (p+1) \left( \frac{N-(N-2)p}{2p} \right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}}. \quad (1.24)$$

Then there exists no nontrivial nonnegative supersolution of (1.2) in an exterior domain.

In this range of values of $p$ this result is optimal since for $M \leq -\mu^*$ there exists positive singular solutions. The constant $\mu^*$ will play an important role in the description developed in [7] of radial solutions of (1.2). Using a variant of the method used in the proof of Theorem B we obtain results of existence and nonexistence of large solutions.

**Theorem B’** Let $N \geq 1$, $p > 1$ and $q = \frac{2p}{p+1}$.

1. If $\Omega$ is a domain with a compact boundary satisfying the Wiener criterion and $M \geq -\mu^*(2)$ there exists no positive supersolution of (1.2) in $\Omega$ satisfying

$$\lim_{\text{dist } (x,\partial \Omega) \to 0} u(x) = \infty. \quad (1.25)$$

2. If $G$ is a bounded convex domain, $\Omega = G^c$ and $M < -\mu^*(1)$ there exists a positive solution of (1.2) in $\Omega$ satisfying (1.25).

We show in [7] that the inequality $M < -\mu^*(1)$ is the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a radial large solution in the exterior of a ball.

Concerning ground states, we prove their nonexistence for any $p > 1$ provided $M > 0$ is large enough: indeed

**Theorem C** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 1$, be a domain, $p > 1$, $q = \frac{2p}{p+1}$. For any

$$M > M_\dagger := \left( \frac{p-1}{p+1} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p+1}} \left( \frac{N(p+1)^2}{4p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p+1}}, \quad (1.26)$$

we show that the inequality $M < -\mu^*(1)$ is the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a radial large solution in the exterior of a ball.
and any $\nu > 0$ such that $(1 - \nu)M > M_1$, there exists a positive constant $c_{N,p,\nu}$ such that any solution $u$ in $\Omega$ satisfies
\[
|\nabla u(x)| \leq c_{N,p,\nu} ((1 - \nu)M - M_1)^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}} (\text{dist} (x, \partial\Omega))^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega.
\] (1.27)

Consequently there exists no nontrivial solution of (1.2) in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

The next result, based upon an elaborate Bernstein method, complements Theorem C under a less restrictive assumption on $M$ but a more restrictive assumption on $p$.

**Theorem D** Let $1 < p < \frac{N+3}{N-1}$, $N \geq 2$, $1 < q < \frac{N+2}{N}$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a domain. Then there exist $a > 0$ and $c_{N,p,q} > 0$ such that for any $M > 0$, any positive solution $u$ in $\Omega$ satisfies
\[
|\nabla u^a(x)| \leq c_{N,p,q} (\text{dist} (x, \partial\Omega))^{-\frac{2a}{p-1}} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega.
\] (1.28)

Hence there exists no nontrivial nonnegative solution of (1.2) in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

It is remarkable that the constants $a$ and $c_{N,p,q}$ do not depend on $M > 0$, a fact which is clear when $q \neq \frac{2p}{p+1}$ by using the transformation $T_k$, but much more delicate to highlight when $q = \frac{2p}{p+1}$ since (1.2) is invariant. When $|M|$ is small, we use an integral method to obtain the following result which contains, as a particular case, the estimates in [19] and [7]. The key point of this method is to prove that the solutions in a punctured domain satisfy a local Harnack inequality.

**Theorem E** Let $N \geq 3$, $1 < p < \frac{N+2}{N-2}$, $q = \frac{2p}{p+1}$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ depending on $N$ and $p$ such that for any $M$ satisfying $|M| \leq \epsilon_0$, any positive solution $u$ in $B_R \setminus \{0\}$ satisfies
\[
u u(x) \leq c_{N,p} |x|^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} \quad \text{for all } x \in B_{\frac{R}{2}} \setminus \{0\}.
\] (1.29)

As a consequence there exists no positive solution of (1.2) in $\mathbb{R}^N$, and any positive solution $u$ in a domain $\Omega$ satisfies
\[
u u(x) + |\nabla u(x)|^{\frac{2}{p-1}} \leq c'_{N,p} (\text{dist} (x, \partial\Omega))^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega.
\] (1.30)

Note that under the assumptions of Theorem E, there exist ground states for $|M|$ large enough when $1 < p < \frac{N}{N-2}$, or any $p > 1$ if $N = 1, 2$.

If $u$ is a radial solutions of (1.2) in $\mathbb{R}^N$ it satisfies
\[
u u'' - \frac{N-1}{r} u' = |u|^{p-1} u + M |u'|^q,
\] (1.31)
on $(0, \infty)$. Using several type of Lyapounov type functions introduced by Leighton [20] and Anderson and Leighton [3], we prove some results dealing with the case $M > 0$ which complement the ones of [25] relative to the case $M < 0$.

**Theorem F 1-** Let $p > 1$ and $q > \frac{2p}{p+1}$. Then there exists no radial ground state $u$ satisfying $u(0) = 1$ when $M > 0$ is too large.
2- Let $1 < p < \frac{N+2}{N-2}$. If $1 < q \leq p$ there exists no radial ground state for any $M > 0$. If $q > p$ there exists no radial ground state for $M > 0$ small enough.

3- Let $N \geq 3$, $p > \frac{N+2}{N-2}$ and $q \geq \frac{2p}{p+1}$. Then there exist radial ground states for $M > 0$ small enough.

We end the article in proving the existence of non-radial positive singular solutions of \((1.2)\) in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$ in the case $q = \frac{2p}{p+1}$ obtained by bifurcation from radial explicit positive singular solutions. Our result shows that the situation is very contrasted according $M > 0$ where a bifurcation from $(M, X_M)$ occurs only if $p \geq \frac{N+1}{N-3}$ and $M \geq 0$ and $M < 0$ where there exists a countable set of bifurcations from $(M_k, X_{M_k})$, $k \geq 1$, when $1 < p < \frac{N+1}{N-3}$.

In a subsequent article \([7]\) we present a fairly complete description of the positive radial solutions of \((1.2)\) in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$ in the scaling invariant case $q = \frac{2p}{p+1}$.
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2 The direct Bernstein method

We begin with a simple property in the case $M \geq 0$ which is a consequence of the fact that the positive solutions of \((1.2)\) are superharmonic.

**Proposition 2.1** 1- There exists no positive solution of \((1.2)\) in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B}_R$, $R \geq 0$ if one of the two conditions is satisfied:

(i) $M \geq 0$, $q \geq 0$ and either $N = 1, 2$ and $p > 1$ or $N \geq 3$ and $1 < p \leq \frac{N}{N-2}$.

(ii) $M > 0$, $N \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$ and $1 < q \leq \frac{N}{N-1}$.

2- If $N \geq 3$, $q \geq 1$, $p > \frac{N}{N-2}$ and $u(r) = u(r, \sigma)$ is a positive solution of \((1.2)\) in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B}_R$, $R \geq 0$. Then there exists $\rho \geq R$ such that

\[
\frac{1}{N\omega_N} \int_{S^{N-1}} u(r, \sigma) dS := \overline{u}(r) \leq c_0 r^{-\frac{q}{p-1}} \text{ for all } r > \rho,
\]

with $c_0 := \left(\frac{2N}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$ and

\[
\left| \frac{1}{N\omega_N} \int_{S^{N-1}} u_r(r, \sigma) dS \right| := |\overline{u}_r(r)| \leq (N-2)c_0 r^{-\frac{q+1}{p-1}} \text{ for all } r > \rho.
\]

3- If $M > 0$, $p \geq 0$, and $q > \frac{N}{N-1}$ there holds for

\[
|\overline{u}_r(r)| \leq \left(\frac{q-1}{q-1} - 1\right)^{\frac{1}{q-1}} r^{-\frac{1}{q-1}} r^{\frac{q}{q-1}} \text{ for all } r > \rho,
\]

and

\[
|\overline{u}(r)| \leq \left(\frac{q-1}{2-q} \right) \left(\frac{(q-1)(N-1) - 1}{(q-1)M}\right)^{\frac{1}{q-1}} r^{\frac{q-2}{q-1}} \text{ for all } r > \rho.
\]

Furthermore, if $R = 0$, inequalities \((2.1), (2.2)\) and \((2.3)\) hold with $\rho = 0$. 

Quasilinear elliptic equations with mixed reaction terms
Proof. Assertion 1-(i) is not difficult to obtain by integrating the inequality satisfied by the spherical average of the solution and using Jensen’s inequality. For the sake of completeness, we give a simple proof although the result is actually valid for much more general equations (see e.g. [8] and references therein). In this statement we denote by \((r,\sigma) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times S^{N-1}\) the spherical coordinates in \(\mathbb{R}^N\), by \(\omega_N\) the volume of the unit N-ball and thus \(N\omega_N\) is the (N-1)-volume of the unit sphere \(S^{N-1}\). Writing (2.2) in spherical coordinates and using Jensen formula, we get

\[
-r^{1-N}(r^{N-1}\overline{u}_r)_r \geq \overline{w}^p + M |\overline{u}_r|^q,
\]

which implies \(r \mapsto w(r) := -r^{N-1}\overline{u}_r\) is increasing on \((R,\infty)\), thus it admits a limit \(\ell \in (-\infty,\infty]\). If \(\ell \leq 0\), then \(\overline{u}_r(r) > 0\) on \((R,\infty)\). Hence \(\overline{w}(r) \geq \overline{w}(\rho) := c > 0\) for \(r \geq \rho > R\). then

\[
(r^{N-1}\overline{u}_r)_r \leq -c^p r^{N-1} \implies \overline{u}_r(r) \leq \frac{c^p}{r^{N-1}} - \frac{p}{N} (\rho - \frac{\rho^N}{r^{N-1}})
\]

which yields (2.1). If we are in the second case with \(r_\ell > R\), we apply the same inequality with \(r > 2r_\ell\) and again (2.1) for \(r > 2r_\ell\). Since \(\overline{u}\) is superharmonic, the function \(v(s) = \overline{u}(r)\) with \(s = r^{2-N}\) is concave on \((0, R^{2-N})\) and it tends to 0 when \(s \to 0\). Thus

\[
v_\ell(s) = \frac{v}{s} \implies |\overline{u}_r(r)| \leq (N-2) \frac{\overline{u}(r)}{r} \leq (N-2)c_0 r^{-\frac{N-1}{p-1}}.
\]

This yields (2.1) and (2.2). Note that the case \(r_\ell > R\) cannot happen if \(R = 0\), so in any case, if \(R = 0\) then \(\rho = 0\).

If \(M > 0\), we have with \(w(r) = -r^{N-1}\overline{u}_r\)

\[
w_\ell \geq Mr^{(1-q)(N-1)} |w|^q.
\]

We have seen that \(w(r) > 0\) at infinity with limit \(\ell \in (0,\infty]\), hence, on the maximal interval containing \(\infty\) where \(w > 0\), we have \((w^{1-q})_r \leq (1-q)Mr^{(N-1)(1-q)}\). We have for \(r > s > R\)

\[
w^{1-q}(r) - w^{1-q}(s) \leq M \ln \left( \frac{r}{s} \right),
\]

if \(q = \frac{N}{N-1}\) and

\[
w^{1-q}(r) - w^{1-q}(s) \leq \frac{M(q-1)}{(q-1)(N-1)-1} \left( r^{1-(q-1)(N-1)} - s^{1-(q-1)(N-1)} \right)
\]

if \(q < \frac{N}{N-1}\), and both expressions which tend to \(-\infty\) when \(r \to \infty\), a contradiction. This proves 1-(ii). If \(q > \frac{N}{N-1}\), the above expression yields, when \(r \to \infty\),

\[
\ell^{1-q} - w^{1-q}(s) \leq -\frac{(q-1)M}{(q-1)(N-1)-1} s^{1-(q-1)(N-1)}.
\]
This implies
\[ w(s) \leq \left( \frac{(q-1)(N-1)-1}{(q-1)M} \right)^{\frac{1}{q-1}} s^{N-1-\frac{1}{q-1}}, \]
and (2.3). \( \square \)

Remark. The previous is a particular case of a much more general one dealing with quasilinear operators proved in [8, Theorem 3.1].

2.1 Proof of Theorems A, A' and C

The function \( u \) is at least \( C^{3+\alpha} \) for some \( \alpha \in (0,1) \) since \( p,q > 1 \). Hence \( z = |\nabla u|^2 \) is \( C^{2+\alpha} \).

Since there holds by Bochner’s identity and Schwarz’s inequality
\[ -\frac{1}{2} \Delta z + \frac{1}{N} (\Delta u)^2 + \langle \nabla \Delta u, \nabla u \rangle \leq 0, \]
we obtain from (1.2),
\[ -\frac{1}{2} \Delta z + \frac{|u|^{2p}}{N} + \frac{2M}{N} |u|^{p-1} uz^{\frac{q}{2}} + \frac{M^2}{N} z^q - p|u|^{p-1} z - \frac{Mq}{2} z^{\frac{q}{2}-1} \langle \nabla z, \nabla u \rangle \leq 0. \]

Since for \( \delta > 0 \),
\[ z^{\frac{q}{2}-1} |\langle \nabla z, \nabla u \rangle| \leq \left| z^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla z \right| z^{\frac{q}{2}} |\nabla u| = \left| z^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla z \right| z^{\frac{q}{2}} \leq \delta z^q + \frac{1}{4\delta} \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z}, \]
we obtain for any \( \nu \in (0,1) \), provided \( \delta \) is small enough,
\[ -\frac{1}{2} \Delta z + \frac{|u|^{2p}}{N} + \frac{2M}{N} |u|^{p-1} uz^{\frac{q}{2}} + \frac{M^2}{N} z^q - p|u|^{p-1} z \leq c_1 \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z}, \]
where \( c_1 = c_1(M,N,\nu) > 0 \).

2.1.1 Proof of Theorem A

We recall the following technical result proved in [6, Lemma 2.2] which will be used several times in the course of this article.

Lemma 2.2 Let \( S > 1, R > 0 \) and \( v \) be continuous and nonnegative in \( B_R \) and \( C^1 \) on the set \( \mathcal{U}_+ = \{ x \in B_R : v(x) > 0 \} \). If \( v \) satisfies, for some real number \( a \),
\[ -\Delta v + v^S \leq a \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v} \]
on each connected component of \( \mathcal{U}_+ \), then
\[ v(0) \leq c_{N,S,a} R^{\frac{2}{2-S}}. \]
Quasilinear elliptic equations with mixed reaction terms

Abridged proof. Assuming $a > 0$, we set $W = v^\alpha$ for $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{a+1}$, this transforms (2.8) into

$$-\Delta W + \frac{1}{\alpha} W^{\alpha(S-1)+1} \leq 0,$$

and then we apply Keller-Osserman inequality. □

Proof of Theorem A. Suppose $\frac{2p}{p+1} < q$. We set $r = \frac{2p}{p+1}$, $r' = \frac{r}{r-1}$, then, for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$p|u|^{p-1} z \leq \frac{\epsilon^r|u|^{(p-1)r}}{r} + z^{r'} = (p-1)\frac{\epsilon^r|u|^{2p}}{2} + (p+1)\frac{z^{2p}}{2e^r}.$$

We fix $\eta \in (0,1)$ and $\epsilon$ so that $\epsilon^r = \frac{2(1-\eta)}{N(p-1)}$ and get

$$p|u|^{p-1} z \leq (1-\eta)\frac{|u|^{2p}}{N} + c_2 z^{p+1},$$

where $c_2 = \frac{p+1}{2} \left( \frac{N(p-1)}{2(1-\eta)} \right)^{\frac{p+1}{p-1}}$. We perform the change of scale (1.6) in order to reduce (1.2) to the case $M = 1$ by setting $u(x) = \alpha x v(\alpha x)$ with $\alpha = M^{-\frac{p-1}{(p+1)(p-2p)}}$. Then the equation for $z = |\nabla v|^2$ is considered in $\Omega_\alpha = \alpha \Omega$. Choosing now $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ we obtain

$$c_2 z^{2p+1} \leq \frac{1}{4N} z^q + c_3,$$

where $c_3 = c_3(N,p,q) > 0$, hence

$$-\frac{1}{2} \Delta z + \frac{v^{2p}}{2N} + \frac{1}{4N} z^q \leq c_3 + c_1 \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z}.$$ 

Put $\tilde{z} = \left( z - (4Nc_3)^{\frac{1}{q}} \right)_+$, then

$$-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{z} + \frac{1}{4N} \tilde{z} \leq c_1 \frac{|\nabla \tilde{z}|^2}{\tilde{z}},$$

hence, from Lemma 2.2 we derive

$$\tilde{z}(y) \leq c_4 \left( \text{dist} (y, \partial \Omega_\alpha) \right)^{\frac{q}{q-1}}$$

where $c_4 = c_4(N,q,c_1) > 0$ which implies

$$|\nabla v(y)| \leq c'_4 \left( 1 + \text{dist} (y, \partial \Omega_\alpha) \right)^{-\frac{1}{q-1}} \quad \forall y \in \Omega_\alpha. \quad (2.11)$$

Then (1.21) and (1.22) follow.

Assume now that there exists a ground state $u$. Fix $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and consider $\{y_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $|y_n| = 2n > |y|$. We apply (2.11) with $\Omega_\alpha = B_n(y_n)$. Then

$$|\nabla v(y)| \leq c'_4 \left( 1 + |2n - |y|| \right)^{-\frac{1}{q-1}},$$
and letting \( n \to \infty \) we infer
\[
|\nabla v(y)| \leq c'_4 \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^N.
\] (2.12)

Hence, by the definition of \( v \) and \( y \) we see that
\[
|\nabla u(x)| \leq c'_4 M^{-\frac{p+1}{(p+1)q-2p}} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N
\]
which is exactly Proposition 2.2.

2.1.2 Proof of Theorem A’

Suppose \( 1 < q < \frac{2p}{p+1} \). By scaling we reduce to the case \( M = 1 \) and we replace \( u \) by \( v \) defined by (1.6) as in the proof of Theorem A with \( \alpha = M^{\frac{p+1}{2q-2p}} \). From (2.7) with \( \nu = \frac{1}{4} \) the function \( z = |\nabla v|^2 \) satisfies
\[
-\frac{1}{2} \Delta z + \frac{v^{2p}}{N} + \frac{1}{2N} z^q - pu^{p-1}z \leq c_1 |\nabla z|^2.
\] (2.13)

By Hölder’s inequality,
\[
pu^{p-1}z \leq \frac{1}{4N} z^q + p(4Np)^{q'-1}v^{(p-1)q'}. \]

Since \( (p-1)q' = 2p + \frac{2p-(p+1)q}{q-1} \) we derive
\[
-\frac{1}{2} \Delta z + \frac{v^{2p}}{N} \left( 1 - 4^{q'-1}p^{q'}N^{q'} v^{\frac{2p-(p+1)q}{q-1}} \right) + \frac{1}{4N} z^q \leq c_1 |\nabla z|^2.
\]

If \( \max v \leq c_{N,p,q} := (4^{q'-1}p^{q'}N^{q'})^{-\frac{q-1}{2p-(p+1)q}} \), we obtain
\[
-\frac{1}{2} \Delta z + \frac{1}{4N} z^q \leq c_1 |\nabla z|^2,
\]
which implies that \( z = 0 \) by Lemma 2.2 hence \( v \) is constant and thus \( v = 0 \) from the equation.

\( \square \)

Remark. If \( u \) is a positive ground state of (1.2) radial with respect to 0, it satisfies \( u_r(0) = 0 \) and it is a decreasing function of \( r \). The previous theorem asserts that it must satisfy
\[
u(0) > c_{N,p,q} M^{\frac{2}{2p-(p+1)q}}.
\] (2.14)

2.1.3 Proof of Theorem C

Suppose \( \frac{2p}{p+1} = q \). For \( A > 0 \) we consider the expression
\[
(u^p + A |\nabla u|^q)^2 - Npu^{p-1} |\nabla u|^2
\]
\[
= \left( u^p + A |\nabla u|^q - \sqrt{Np} u^{\frac{p-1}{2}} |\nabla u| \right) \left( u^p + A |\nabla u|^q + \sqrt{Np} u^{\frac{p-1}{2}} |\nabla u| \right).
\]
Now the function \( Z \mapsto \Phi_A(Z) = u^p + A Z^q - \sqrt{Np} \ u^{\frac{p+1}{2}} Z \) achieves its minimum at \( Z_0 = \left( \frac{\sqrt{N} \ Z}{q A} \right)^{\frac{p+1}{p+2}} u^\frac{p}{p+1} \) and

\[
\Phi_A(Z_0) = \left[ 1 - \frac{p-1}{p+1} \left( \frac{N(p+1)^2}{4p} \right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}} A^{-\frac{p+1}{p+1}} \right] u^p.
\]

Thus setting

\[
M^\dagger = \frac{p-1}{p+1} \left( \frac{N(p+1)^2}{4p} \right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}},
\]

we obtain that if \( A \geq M^\dagger \), then \( \Phi_A(Z) \geq 0 \) for all \( Z \). Put \( M_\nu = (1 - \nu) M \) for \( \nu \in (0,1) \) such that \( M^\dagger < M_\nu \), we derive from (2.17)

\[
\frac{1}{2} \Delta z + \frac{(u^p + M^\dagger z^q)^2}{N} - pu^{p-1}z + \frac{M^2_\nu - M^2}{N} z^q \leq c_1 \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z},
\]

which yields

\[
\frac{1}{2} \Delta z + \frac{M^2_\nu - M^2}{N} z^q \leq c_1 \frac{|\nabla z|^2}{z}.
\]

Using again Lemma (2.2) we obtain

\[
|\nabla u(x)| \leq c_1' \ ((1 - \nu) M - M^\dagger)^{-\frac{1}{q-1}} \ (\text{dist} \ (x, \partial \Omega))^{-\frac{1}{q-1}},
\]

which is equivalent to (1.27). \( \square \)

### 2.2 Proof of Theorems B and B’

#### 2.2.1 Proof of Theorem B

Since the result is known when \( M \geq 0 \) from Proposition 2.1, we can assume that \( M = -m \leq 0 \) and \( N = 1,2 \) or \( N \geq 3 \) with \( p < \frac{N}{N-2} \), \( u \) is a nonnegative supersolution of (1.2) in \( B_R^c \) and we set \( u = v^b \) with \( b > 1 \). Then

\[
- \Delta v \geq (b-1) \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v} + \frac{1}{b} v^{1+b(p-1)} - m b^{q-1} v^{(b-1)(q-1)} |\nabla v|^q.
\]

Here again \( q = \frac{2p}{p+1} \), setting \( z = |\nabla v|^2 \) we obtain

\[
- \Delta v \geq \frac{\Phi(z)}{b v}
\]

where

\[
\Phi(z) = b(b-1)z - m b^{q-1} v^{2+b(p-1)} z^{\frac{p}{p+1}} + v^{2+b(p-1)}.
\]

Thus \( \Phi \) achieves its minimum for

\[
z_0 = \left( \frac{m b^{q-1}}{(b-1)(p+1)} \right)^{\frac{p+1}{b p-1}} v^{2+b(p-1)}
\]
and
\[ \Phi(z_0) = v^{2+b(p-1)} \left( 1 - \frac{p^p}{(p+1)^{p+1}} \left( \frac{b}{b-1} \right)^{p} \right)^{m^{p+1}}. \]  
(2.19)

In order to ensure the optimal choice, when \( N \geq 3 \), we take
\[ \frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{N-2} \] which is larger than 1 because \( p < \frac{N}{N-2} \). Finally
\[ \Phi(z_0) = v^{\frac{N}{N-2}+1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{(p+1)^{p+1}} \left( \frac{2p}{N-p(N-2)} \right)^{p} \right)^{m^{p+1}}. \]

Hence, if
\[ m < (p+1) \left( \frac{N-p(N-2)}{2p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p+1}} = \mu^*(N), \]  
(2.20)

we have for some \( \delta > 0 \),
\[ - \Delta v \geq \delta v^{\frac{N}{N-2}}, \]  
(2.21)

and by Proposition 2.1 that is no positive solution in an exterior domain of \( \mathbb{R}^N \).

If \( N = 2 \), for a given \( b > 1 \) we have from (2.19) that if
\[ m < (p+1) \left( \frac{b-1}{bp} \right)^{\frac{1}{p+1}}, \]  
then, for some \( \delta > 0 \),
\[ - \Delta v \geq \delta v^{1+b(p-1)}. \]  
(2.22)

The result follows from Proposition 2.1 by choosing \( b \) large enough.

\[ \square \]

2.2.2 Proof of Theorem B’

1- We assume that such a supersolution \( u \) exists and we denote \( u = e^v \), then
\[ - \Delta v \geq F(|\nabla v|^2), \]  
(2.23)

where
\[ F(X) = X + e^{(p-1)v} + M e^{\frac{p-1}{p+1}v} X^{\frac{p}{p+1}}. \]

Clearly, if \( M \geq 0 \), then \( F(X) \geq 0 \) for any \( X \geq 0 \). Next we assume \( M < 0 \), then
\[ F(X) \geq F(X_0) = e^{(p-1)v} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{|M|}{p+1} \right)^{p+1} \right) = e^{(p-1)v} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{|M|}{\mu^*(2)} \right)^{p+1} \right). \]

Hence, if \( |M| \leq \mu^*(2) \), \( v \) is a positive superharmonic function in \( \Omega \) which tends to infinity on the boundary. Such a function is larger than the harmonic function with boundary value \( k > 0 \) for any \( k \) (and taking the value \( \min_{|x|=R} v(x) \) for \( R \) large enough if \( \Omega \) is an exterior domain). Letting \( k \to \infty \) we derive a contradiction.
2- Let $R > 0$ such that $\Omega^c \subset B_R$ and let $w$ be the solution of

$$\begin{align*}
-\Delta w - ae^{(p-1)w} &= 0 \quad \text{in } B_R \cap \Omega \\
\lim_{\text{dist}(x,\partial B_R) \to 0} w(x) &= -\infty \\
\lim_{\text{dist}(x,\partial \Omega) \to 0} w(x) &= \infty,
\end{align*}$$

(2.24)

with $a = 1 - \left(\frac{|M|}{\mu(2)}\right)^{p+1} < 0$, obtained by approximations. By the argument used in 1,

$$ae^{(p-1)w} \leq |\nabla w|^2 + e^{(p-1)w} - |M|e^{\frac{p+1}{p+1}}|\nabla w|^{\frac{2p}{p+1}},$$

hence

$$-\Delta w \leq |\nabla w|^2 + e^{(p-1)w} - |M|e^{\frac{p+1}{p+1}}|\nabla w|^{\frac{2p}{p+1}}.$$ 

Therefore $v = e^w$ is nonnegative and satisfies

$$-\Delta v - v^p + |M||\nabla v|^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} \leq 0 \quad \text{in } B_R \cap \Omega$$

$$v = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_R$$

(2.25)

Next we extend $v$ by zero in $B^c_R$ and denote by $\tilde{v}$ the new function. It is a nonnegative subsolution of (1.2) which tends to $\infty$ on $\partial \Omega$. For constructing a supersolution we recall that if $M \leq -\mu^*(1)$ there exist two types of explicit solutions of

$$-u'' = u^p + M|u'|^{\frac{2p}{p+1}}$$

(2.26)

defined on $\mathbb{R}$ by $U_{j,M}(t) = \infty$ for $t \leq 0$ and $U_{j,M}(t) = X_{j,M}t^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}$, $j=1,2$, for $t > 0$ where $X_{1,M}$ and $X_{2,M}$ are respectively the smaller and the larger positive root of

$$X^{p-1} - |M|\left(\frac{2}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{2}{p+1}}X^{\frac{p+1}{p+1}} + \frac{2(p+1)}{(p-1)^2} = 0.$$ 

(2.27)

Since $\Omega^c$ is convex it is the intersection of all the closed half-spaces which contain it and we denote by $\mathcal{H}_\Omega$ the family of such hyperplanes which are touching $\partial \Omega$. If $H \in \mathcal{H}_\Omega$ let $n_H$ be the normal direction to $H$, inward with respect to $\Omega$, $\mathcal{H}_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \langle n_H, x - n_H \rangle > 0\}$ and we define $U_H$ in the direction $n_H$ by putting

$$U_H(x) = U_{2,M}(\langle n_H, x - n_H \rangle) = X_{2,M}(\langle n_H, x - n_H \rangle)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{H}_+.$$ 

Hence and set, for $x \in \Omega := \cap_{H \in \mathcal{H}_\Omega} \mathcal{H}_+$,

$$u_\Omega(x) = \inf_{H \in \mathcal{H}_\Omega} U_H(x).$$ 

(2.28)

Then $u_\Omega$ is a nonnegative supersolution of (1.2) in $\Omega$ and

$$u_\Omega(x) \geq X_{2,M}(\text{dist } x, \Omega)^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$
Next \( v_\Omega = \ln u_\Omega \) blows up on \( \partial \Omega \), is finite on \( \partial B_R \) and satisfies

\[- \Delta v_\Omega - a e^{(p-1)\nu_\Omega} \geq 0 \quad \text{in } B_R \cap \Omega. \hspace{1cm} (2.29)\]

By comparison with \( w \) since \( a < 0, v_\Omega \geq w \). Hence \( u_\Omega \geq v \) in \( B_R \setminus \Omega^c \). Extending \( v \) by zero as \( \tilde{v} \) we obtain \( u_\Omega \geq \tilde{v} \) in \( \Omega^c \). Hence \( u_\Omega \) is a supersolution in \( \Omega^c \) where it dominates the subsolution \( \tilde{v} \). It follows by [29, Theorem 1-4-6] that there exists a solution \( u \) of (1.2) satisfying \( \tilde{v} \leq u \leq u_\Omega \), which ends the proof. \( \square \)

### 3 The refined Bernstein method

The method is a combination of the one used in the previous proofs. It is based upon the replacement of the unknown by setting first \( u = v^{-\beta} \) as in [19] and [10] and the study of the equation satisfied by \( |\nabla v| \). However we do not use integral techniques. Since \( u \) is a positive solution of (1.2) in \( B_R \), the function \( v \) is well defined and satisfies

\[- \Delta v + (1 + \beta) \frac{|\nabla v|^2}{v} + \frac{1}{\beta} v^{1-\beta(p-1)} + M |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{(\beta+1)(1-q)} |\nabla v|^q = 0 \hspace{1cm} (3.1)\]

in \( B_R \). We set

\[ z = |\nabla v|^2, \quad s = 1 - q - \beta(q - 1) = (1 - q)(\beta + 1), \quad \sigma = 1 - \beta(p - 1), \]

and derive

\[ \Delta v = (1 + \beta) \frac{z}{v} + \frac{1}{\beta} v^{\sigma} + M |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^s z^\frac{q}{2}. \hspace{1cm} (3.2)\]

Combining Bochner’s formula and Schwarz identity we have classically

\[ \frac{1}{2} \Delta z \geq \frac{1}{N} (\Delta v)^2 + \langle \nabla \Delta v, \nabla v \rangle. \]

We explicit the different terms

\[ (\Delta v)^2 = (1 + \beta)^2 \frac{z^2}{v^2} + M^2 \beta^2 (q-1) v^{2s} z^q + \frac{v^{2\sigma}}{\beta^2} + 2M (1 + \beta) |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{s-1} z^{1+\frac{q}{2}} + \frac{2(1 + \beta)}{\beta} v^{\sigma-1} z + 2M |\beta|^{q-2} v^{s+\sigma} z^\frac{q}{2}, \]

\[ \nabla \Delta v = (1 + \beta) \frac{\nabla z}{v} - \frac{(1 + \beta) z}{v^2} \nabla v + \frac{\sigma}{\beta} v^{\sigma-1} \nabla v + M s |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{s-1} z^\frac{q}{2} \nabla v + \frac{M q}{2} |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{s} z^\frac{q}{2-1} \nabla z, \]

\[ \langle \nabla \Delta v, \nabla v \rangle = \left( \frac{1 + \beta}{v} + \frac{M q}{2} |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{s} z^\frac{q}{2-1} \right) \langle \nabla z, \nabla v \rangle - \frac{(1 + \beta) z^2}{v^2} + \frac{\sigma}{\beta} v^{\sigma-1} z + M s |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{s-1} z^{\frac{q}{2}+1}. \]

Hence

\[ -\frac{1}{2} \Delta z + \frac{1}{N} (\Delta v)^2 + \left( \frac{1 + \beta}{v} + \frac{M q}{2} |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{s} z^\frac{q}{2-1} \right) \langle \nabla z, \nabla v \rangle - \frac{(1 + \beta) z^2}{v^2} + \frac{\sigma}{\beta} v^{\sigma-1} z + M s |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{s-1} z^{\frac{q}{2}+1} \leq 0. \hspace{1cm} (3.3)\]
3.1 Proof of Theorem D

We develop the term \((\Delta v)^2\) in (3.3) and get

\[
-\frac{1}{2} \Delta z + \left( \frac{(1 + \beta)^2}{N} - (1 + \beta) \right) \frac{z^2}{v^2} + \frac{M^2 \beta^{2(q-1)}}{N} v^{2s} z^q + M \left( s + \frac{2(1 + \beta)}{N} \right) |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{s-1} z^{1+\frac{q}{N}} \\
+ \frac{v^{2\sigma}}{N\beta^2} + \left( \frac{1 + \beta}{v} + \frac{Mq}{2} |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{\sigma} z^{\frac{q}{N}-1} \right) \langle \nabla z, \nabla v \rangle + \frac{N\sigma + 2(1 + \beta)}{N\beta} v^{\sigma-1} z + \frac{2M |\beta|^{q-2}}{N} v^{s+\sigma} z^\frac{q}{N} \\
\leq 0.
\]

(3.4)

Next we set \(z = v^{-k}Y\) where \(k\) is a real parameter. Then \(\nabla z = -kv^{-k-1}Y \nabla v + v^{-k} \nabla Y\),

\[
\langle \nabla z, \nabla v \rangle = -kv^{-k-1}Yz + v^{-k} \langle \nabla Y, \nabla v \rangle = -kv^{-2k-1}Y^2 + v^{-k} \langle \nabla Y, \nabla v \rangle,
\]

\[
\frac{\langle \nabla z, \nabla v \rangle}{v} = -kv^{-2k-2}Y^2 + v^{-k} \langle \nabla Y, \nabla v \rangle,
\]

\[
Mv^{s}z^{\frac{q}{N}-1} \langle \nabla z, \nabla v \rangle = -kMv^{s-k} - kY z^{\frac{q}{N}+1} + Mv^{s-k}Yz^{\frac{q}{N}-1} \langle \nabla Y, \nabla v \rangle,
\]

\[
-\Delta z = \text{div} (kv^{-k-1}Y \nabla v - v^{-k} \nabla Y) \]

\[
= kv^{-k-1}Y \Delta v - k(k+1)v^{-k-2}Yz + 2kv^{-k-1} \langle \nabla Y, \nabla v \rangle - v^{-k} \Delta Y \]

\[
= kv^{-k-1}Y \Delta v - k(k+1)v^{-2k-2}Y^2 + 2kv^{-k-1} \langle \nabla Y, \nabla v \rangle - v^{-k} \Delta Y.
\]

From (3.2)

\[
\Delta v = (1 + \beta)v^{-k-1}Y + \frac{1}{\beta} v^\sigma + M |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{s-k}Y^\frac{q}{N},
\]

therefore

\[
-\Delta z = k(\beta - k)v^{-2k-2}Y^2 + \frac{k}{\beta} v^{\sigma-k-1}Y + kM |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{s-k} - kY^{\frac{q}{N}+1} + 2kv^{-k-1} \langle \nabla Y, \nabla v \rangle - v^{-k} \Delta Y.
\]

Replacing \(\langle \nabla z, \nabla v \rangle\) and \(\Delta z\) given by the above expressions in (3.4) and \(z\) by \(v^{-k}Y\), leads to

\[
-\Delta Y + \left( \frac{k(\beta - k)}{2} + \frac{(1 + \beta)^2}{N} - (k+1)(\beta + 1) \right) v^{-k-2}Y^2 + \frac{v^{2\sigma+k}}{N\beta^2} + \frac{M^2 \beta^{2(q-1)}}{N} v^{2s+k-kq} Y^q \\
+ \left( \frac{k + \beta + 1}{v} + \frac{Mq |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{s-k} Y^{\frac{q}{N}-1}}{2} \right) \langle \nabla Y, \nabla v \rangle + \frac{2M |\beta|^{q-2}}{N} v^{s+\sigma+k-kq} Y^{\frac{q}{N}} \\
+ \left( s + \frac{2(1 + \beta)}{N} - k\left( q - 1 \right) \right) M |\beta|^{q-2} \beta v^{s-k} - kY^{\frac{q}{N}+1} + \frac{1}{\beta} \left( \frac{k}{2} + \sigma + \frac{2(1 + \beta)}{N} \right) v^{\sigma-1} Y \leq 0.
\]

For \(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0\),

\[
\frac{1}{v} |\langle \nabla Y, \nabla v \rangle| \leq \epsilon_1 v^{-k-2}Y^2 + \frac{1}{4\epsilon_1} \frac{|\nabla Y|^2}{Y},
\]

\[
v^{s+\sigma-k-kq} Y^{\frac{q}{N}-1} |\langle \nabla Y, \nabla v \rangle| \leq \epsilon_2 v^{-k}v^{2s-kq+k} Y^q + \frac{1}{4\epsilon_2} \frac{|\nabla Y|^2}{Y}.
\]
Hence
\[ -\Delta Y + \frac{v^{2\sigma+k}}{N\beta^2} + \frac{2M|\beta|^{q-2}}{N}v^{\sigma+k-k\frac{q}{2}}Y^q + \left( \frac{M^2\beta^2(q-1)}{N} - \frac{Mq\epsilon_2|\beta|^{q-1}}{2} \right) v^{2s+k-kq}Y^q \]
\[ + \left( \frac{k(\beta - k)}{2} + \frac{(1 + \beta)^2}{N} - (k + 1)(\beta + 1) - |k + \beta + 1| \epsilon_1 \right) v^{-k-2}Y^2 \]
\[ + \frac{1}{\beta} \left( \frac{k}{2} + \sigma + \frac{2(1 + \beta)}{N} \right) v^{\sigma-1}Y + \left( s + \frac{2(1 + \beta)}{N} - \frac{k(q - 1)}{2} \right) M|\beta|^{q-2}v^{s+k-k\frac{q}{2}+1}Y^{1+\frac{q}{2}} \]
\[ \leq \left( \frac{|k + \beta + 1|}{\epsilon_1} + \frac{Mq|\beta|^{q-1}}{2\epsilon_2} \right) |\nabla Y|^2. \quad (3.5) \]

We first choose \( \epsilon_2 = \frac{M|\beta|^{q-1}}{qN} \), then
\[ -\Delta Y + \frac{v^{2\sigma+k}}{N\beta^2} + \left( \frac{k(\beta - k)}{2} + \frac{(1 + \beta)^2}{N} - (k + 1)(\beta + 1) - |k + \beta + 1| \epsilon_1 \right) v^{-k-2}Y^2 \]
\[ + \frac{1}{\beta} \left( \frac{k}{2} + \sigma + \frac{2(1 + \beta)}{N} \right) v^{\sigma-1}Y + \left( s + \frac{2(1 + \beta)}{N} - \frac{k(q - 1)}{2} \right) M|\beta|^{q-2}v^{s+k-k\frac{q}{2}+1}Y^{1+\frac{q}{2}} \]
\[ \leq \left( \frac{|k + \beta + 1|}{\epsilon_1} + \frac{Nq^2}{2} \right) |\nabla Y|^2. \quad (3.6) \]

In order to show the sign of the terms on the left in (3.5), we separate the terms containing the coefficient \( M \) from the ones which do not contain it. Indeed these last terms are associated to the mere Lane-Emden equation (1.3) which is treated, as a particular case, in [6, Theorem B] where the exponents therein are \( q = 0 \), and \( p \in \left( 1, \frac{N+3}{N-1} \right) \). We set
\[ H_{\epsilon_1,1} = \frac{v^{2\sigma+k}}{N\beta^2} + \left( \frac{k(\beta - k)}{2} + \frac{(1 + \beta)^2}{N} - (k + 1)(\beta + 1) - |k + \beta + 1| \epsilon_1 \right) v^{-k-2}Y^2 \]
\[ + \frac{1}{\beta} \left( \frac{k}{2} + \sigma + \frac{2(1 + \beta)}{N} \right) v^{\sigma-1}Y \quad (3.7) \]
where
\[ \tilde{H}_{\epsilon_1,1}(t) = \left( \frac{k(\beta - k)}{2} + \frac{(1 + \beta)^2}{N} - (k + 1)(\beta + 1) - |k + \beta + 1| \epsilon_1 \right) t^2 \]
\[ + \frac{1}{\beta} \left( \frac{k}{2} + \sigma + \frac{2(1 + \beta)}{N} \right) t + \frac{1}{N\beta^2}, \quad (3.8) \]
and
\[ H_{M,2} = \frac{M^2\beta^2(q-1)}{2N}v^{2s+k-kq}Y^q + \frac{2M|\beta|^{q-2}}{N}v^{s+k-k\frac{q}{2}+1}Y^{1+\frac{q}{2}} \]
\[ + \left( s + \frac{2(1 + \beta)}{N} - \frac{k(q - 1)}{2} \right) M|\beta|^{q-2}v^{s+k-k\frac{q}{2}+1}Y^{1+\frac{q}{2}}. \quad (3.9) \]
Then
\[-\Delta Y + v^{2\sigma + k} \tilde{H}_{\epsilon_1,1}(v^{-1-k-\sigma}Y) + H_{M,2} \leq \left( \frac{|k + \beta + 1|}{\epsilon_1} + \frac{Nq^2}{2} \right) \frac{|\nabla Y|^2}{4Y}.\]

The sign of \(\tilde{H}_{\epsilon_1,1}\) depends on its discriminant \(D_1\), which is a polynomial in its coefficients. Then if for \(\epsilon_1 = 0\) this discriminant is negative \(D_0\) is negative, the discriminant \(D_1\) of \(\tilde{H}_{\epsilon_1,1}\) shares this property for \(\epsilon_1 > 0\) small enough and therefore \(H_{\epsilon_1,1}\) is positive. The proof is similar as the one of [2] Theorem B in case (i) but for the sake of completeness we recall the main steps. Firstly
\[D_0' := N^2 \beta^2 D_0 = \left( \frac{Nk}{2} + \sigma N + 2(1 + \beta) \right)^2 - 4 \left( \frac{Nk(\beta - k)}{2} + (1 + \beta)^2 - N(k + 1)(\beta + 1) \right).\]

Then
\[D_0' = \left( \frac{N(p - 1)}{4} - 1 \right) (2\sigma + k)^2 + 2(p - 1)(2\sigma + k) + \bar{L}\]
where \(\bar{L} = (p - 1)k^2 + p(\lambda + 2)^2 > 0\). Put
\[S = \frac{2\sigma + k}{k + 2} = 1 - \frac{2\beta(p - 1)}{k + 2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}(S) = \left( \frac{(N - 1)(p - 1)}{4} - 1 \right) S^2 + (p - 1)S + p.\]

After some computations we get, if \(k \neq -2\),
\[D_1' := \frac{(p - 1)D_0'}{(k + 2)^2} = (p - 1) \left( \frac{k}{k + 2} - \frac{S}{2} \right)^2 + \mathcal{T}(S). \quad (3.10)\]

We choose \(S > 2\) such that \(\frac{k}{k + 2} - \frac{S}{2} = 0\), hence \(\beta = \frac{2 - k}{2(p - 1)}\). If \(p < \frac{N + 3}{N - 1}\) the coefficient of \(S^2\) in \(\mathcal{T}(S)\) is negative. Hence \(\mathcal{T}(S) < 0\) provided \(S\) is large enough which is satisfied if \(k < -2\) with \(|k + 2|\) small enough. We infer from this that \(\beta > 0\), \(D_0' < 0\) and \(\tilde{H}_{\epsilon_1,1} > 0\) if \(\epsilon_1\) is small enough. In particular \(\tilde{H}_{\epsilon_1,1}(t) \geq c_6(t^2 + 1)\) for some \(c_6 = c_6(N, p, q) > 0\), which means
\[v^{2\sigma + k} \tilde{H}_{\epsilon_1,1}(v^{-1-k-\sigma}Y) \geq c_6 \left( v^{k - 2}Y^2 + v^{2\sigma + k} \right). \quad (3.11)\]

Secondly the positivity of \(H_{M,2}\) is ensured, as \(\beta\) and \(M\) are positive, by the positivity of
\[A := s + \frac{2(1 + \beta)}{N} - \frac{k(q - 1)}{2}.\]
Replacing \(s\) by its value, we obtain, since \(1 < q < \frac{N + 2}{N}\) and \(\beta + \frac{2 + k}{2} > 0\), which can be assume by taking \(|k + 2|\) small enough,
\[A = 2 \frac{1 + \beta}{N} - (q - 1) \left( \beta + 1 + \frac{k}{2} \right) > -\frac{k}{N}.\]

Then we deduce that
\[-\Delta Y + c_6 \left( v^{k - 2}Y^2 + v^{2\sigma + k} \right) \leq c_7 \frac{|\nabla Y|^2}{Y}. \quad (3.12)\]
and \( c_7 = c_7(N, p, q) > 0 \) is independent of \( M \). Since \( S = 1 - \frac{2\beta(p-1)}{k+2} = 1 - \frac{2-k}{k+2} = \frac{2k}{k+2} > 0 \), we have

\[
2Y^{\frac{2S}{S+1}} = 2 \left( \frac{Y^2}{v^k+2} \right)^{\frac{S}{S+1}} v^{\frac{(k+2)S}{S+1}} \leq \frac{Y^2}{v^k+2} + v^{(k+2)S} = \frac{Y^2}{v^k+2} + v^{2\sigma+k}. \tag{3.13}
\]

From this we infer the inequality

\[
-\Delta Y + 2c_0Y^{\frac{2S}{S+1}} \leq c_7 \frac{\|\nabla Y\|^2}{Y}. \tag{3.14}
\]

Then we derive from Lemma 2.2 that in the ball \( B_R \) there holds

\[
Y(0) \leq c_8 R^{-\frac{2(S+1)}{S}} = c_8 R^{-2+\frac{2(k+2)}{p-1}}. \tag{3.15}
\]

From this it follows

\[
|\nabla u^{\frac{k+2}{2}}(0)| \leq \frac{|k+2|}{2} \sqrt{c_8} R^{-1+\frac{k+2}{p-1}}. \tag{3.16}
\]

Setting \( a = -\frac{k+2}{2} > 0 \) we get that for any domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N \) any positive solution in \( \Omega \) satisfies

\[
|\nabla u^a(x)| \leq \frac{|k+2|}{2} \sqrt{c_8} (\text{dist}(x, \partial \Omega))^{-1} - \frac{2a}{p} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega. \tag{3.17}
\]

The non existence of any positive of \( u \) solution in \( \mathbb{R}^N \) follows classically. \( \square \)

**Corollary 3.1** Let \( \Omega \) be a smooth domain in \( \mathbb{R}^N \), \( N \geq 2 \) with a bounded boundary, \( 1 < p < \frac{N+2}{N-1} \), \( 1 < q < \frac{N+2}{N} \) and \( M > 0 \). If \( u \) is a positive solution of \( (1.2) \) in \( \Omega \) there exists \( d_0 \) depending on \( \Omega \) and \( c_9 = c_9(N, p, q) > 0 \) such that

\[
u(x) \leq c_9 \left( (\text{dist}(x, \partial \Omega))^{-\frac{p-1}{p-2}} + \max_{(z, \partial \Omega) = d_0} u(z) \right) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega. \tag{3.18}
\]

**Proof.** It is similar to the one of [6 Corollary B-2]. \( \square \)

## 4 The integral method

### 4.1 Preliminary inequalities

We recall the next inequality [9 Lemma 3.1].

**Lemma 4.1** Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N \) be a domain. Then for any positive \( u \in C^2(\Omega) \), any nonnegative \( \eta \in C_0^{\infty}(\Omega) \) and any real numbers \( m \) and \( d \) such that \( d \neq m + 2 \), the following inequality holds

\[
A \int_{\Omega} \eta u^{m-2} |\nabla u|^4 \, dx - \frac{N-1}{N} \int_{\Omega} \eta u^m (\Delta u)^2 \, dx - B \int_{\Omega} \eta u^{m-1} |\nabla u|^2 \Delta u \, dx \leq R, \tag{4.1}
\]

where

\[
A = \frac{1}{4N} (2(N-m)d - (N-1)(m^2 + d^2)) , \quad B = \frac{1}{2N} (2(N-1)m + (N+2)d),
\]

and

\[
R = \frac{m+d}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{m-1} |\nabla u|^2 \langle \nabla u, \nabla \eta \rangle \, dx + \int_{\Omega} u^m (\Delta u)(\nabla u, \nabla \eta) \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^m |\nabla u|^2 \Delta \eta \, dx.
\]
It is noticeable that $d$ is a free parameter which plays a role only in the coefficients of the integral terms. The following technical result is useful to deal with the multi-parameter constraints problems which occur in our construction. It was first used in [10] under a simpler form and extended in [9, Lemma 3.4].

**Lemma 4.2**  For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $N \geq 3$ and $1 < p < \frac{N+2}{N-2}$ there exist real numbers $m$ and $d$ verifying

(i) $d \neq m + 2$,

(ii) $\frac{2(N - 1)p}{N + 2} < d$, \hfill (4.2)

(iii) $\max \left\{ -2, 1 - p, \frac{(N - 4)p - N}{2} \right\} < m \leq 0$,

(iv) $2(N - m)d - (N - 1)(m^2 + d^2) > 0$.

### 4.2 Proof of Theorem E

**Step 1:** The integral estimates. Let $\eta \in C^\infty_0(\Omega)$, $\eta \geq 0$. We apply Lemma 4.1 to a positive solution $u \in C^2(\Omega)$ of (1.2), firstly with $q > 1$ and then with $q = \frac{2p}{p+1}$.

\[
A \int_\Omega \eta u^{m-2} |\nabla u|^4 \, dx - \frac{N - 1}{N} \int_\Omega \eta \left( u^{m+2p} + 2Mu^{m+p} |\nabla u|^q + M^2u^m |\nabla u|^{2q} \right) \, dx \\
- B \int_\Omega \eta u^{m-1} |\nabla u|^2 \Delta u \, dx \leq R. \tag{4.3}
\]

We multiply (1.2) by $\eta u^{m+p}$ and integrate over $\Omega$. Then

\[
\int_\Omega \eta \left( u^{m+2p} + Mu^{m+p} |\nabla u|^q \right) \, dx = - \int_\Omega \eta u^{m+p} \Delta u \, dx \\
= \int_\Omega u^{m+p} \langle \nabla u, \nabla \eta \rangle \, dx + (m + p) \int_\Omega \eta u^{m+p-1} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx.
\]

We set

\[
F = \int_\Omega \eta u^{m-2} |\nabla u|^4 \, dx, \quad P = \int_\Omega \eta u^{m-1} |\nabla u|^{q+2} \, dx, \quad V = \int_\Omega \eta u^{m+2p} \, dx, \\
T = \int_\Omega \eta u^{m+p-1} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx, \quad W = \int_\Omega \eta u^{m+p} |\nabla u|^q \, dx, \quad U = \int_\Omega \eta u^{m} |\nabla u|^{2q} \, dx, \\
S = \int_\Omega u^{m+p} \langle \nabla u, \nabla \eta \rangle \, dx,
\]

so that there holds

\[
AF - \frac{N - 1}{N} \left( V + 2MW + M^2U \right) + BT + BMP \leq R, \tag{4.4}
\]
and

\[ V + MW = (m + p)T + S. \]  

(4.5)

Eliminating \(V\) between (4.4) and (4.5), we get

\[ AF + B_0T + M \left( BP - \frac{N - 1}{N} W - \frac{N - 1}{N} MU \right) \leq R - \frac{N - 1}{N} S, \]

(4.6)

where

\[ B_0 = B - \frac{N - 1}{N}(m + p) = \frac{N + 2}{2N}d - \frac{N - 1}{N}p. \]

Also

\[ 2P = 2 \int_{\Omega} \eta u^m |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \eta u^m \left( \frac{|\nabla u|^4}{u^2} + |\nabla u|^{2q} \right) \, dx = F + U. \]

We fix now \(q = \frac{2m}{p+1}\), then

\[
U = \int_{\Omega} \eta u^m |\nabla u|^{2q} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \eta u^m \left( \frac{|\nabla u|}{\sqrt{u}} \right)^{4(q-1)} u^{2(q-1)} |\nabla u|^{4-2q} \, dx
\leq \frac{p-1}{p+1} \int_{\Omega} \eta u^{m-2} |\nabla u|^4 \, dx + \frac{2}{p+1} \int_{\Omega} \eta u^{m+p-1} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx
\leq \frac{p-1}{p+1} F + \frac{2}{p+1} T,
\]

(4.7)

hence

\[ P \leq \frac{1}{2} F + \frac{1}{2} U \leq \frac{p}{p+1} F + \frac{1}{p+1} T, \]

(4.8)

and

\[ 2W = 2 \int_{\Omega} \eta u^{m+p} |\nabla u|^q \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \eta u^{m+2p} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \eta u^{m} |\nabla u|^{2q} \, dx = V + U \]

\[ \leq U + (m + p)T + S - MW. \]

(4.9)

Next we assume that \(|M| \leq 1\). From (4.7), (4.9), it follows that

\[ W \leq U + (m + p)T + S \leq F + (m + p + 1)T + S. \]

(4.10)

From now we fix \(m\) and \(d\) according Lemma 4.2 Therefore \(A > 0\) by (4.2)-(iv) and \(B > 0\) by combining (4.2)-(ii) and (4.2)-(iii). Furthermore \(B_0 > 0\) by (4.2)-(ii). Hence, from (4.7), (4.8) and (4.10) we derive, since \(\frac{N-1}{N} < 1\) and \(m \leq 0\) from (4.2)-(ii)

\[ \left| BP - \frac{N - 1}{N} W - \frac{N - 1}{N} MU \right| \leq B(F + T) + F + (p + 1)T + S + F + T, \]

\[ \leq (B + 2)F + (B + p + 2)T + S. \]

Plugging these estimates into (4.10) we infer

\[ AF + B_0T - |M| \left( (B + 2)F + (B + p + 2)T + S \right) \leq R - \frac{N - 1}{N} S. \]

(4.11)
Since $A$ and $B_0$ are positive, there exists $\mu_1 \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $|M| < \mu_1$, 

$$A_1 := A - |M|(B + 2) > \frac{A}{2} \text{ and } B_1 := B_0 - |M|(B + p + 2) > \frac{B_0}{2}.$$ 

Set $A_2 = \min\{A_1, B_1\}$, then, and whatever is the sign of $S$, 

$$A_2(F + T) \leq |R| + |S|.$$ 

Using $(4.7)$ and $(4.8)$ we have 

$$A_2(U + P) \leq 2A_2(F + T) \leq 2(|R| + |S|). \quad (4.12)$$ 

In the sequel we denote by $c_j$ some positive constants depending on $N$ and $p$. Then 

$$U + P + F + T + W \leq c_1(|R| + |S|). \quad (4.13)$$ 

On the other hand, we have 

$$|R| \leq c_2 \int_{\Omega} \left( u^{m-1} |\nabla u|^3 |\nabla \eta| + u^{m+p} |\nabla u| |\nabla \eta| + u^m |\nabla u|^{q+1} |\nabla \eta| + u^m |\nabla u|^{2 |\Delta \eta|} \right) \, dx.$$ 

Since 

$$|\nabla u|^q = \left( \frac{|\nabla u|}{\sqrt{u}} \right)^q u^{\frac{q}{2}} \leq \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u} + u^{\frac{q}{2}} = \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{u} + u^p,$$ 

we deduce 

$$\int_{\Omega} u^m |\nabla u|^{q+1} |\nabla \eta| \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} u^{m-1} |\nabla u|^3 |\nabla \eta| \, dx + \int_{\Omega} u^{m+p} |\nabla u| |\nabla \eta| \, dx + \int_{\Omega} u^{m+p} |\nabla u| |\nabla \eta| \, dx.$$ 

Thus we derive from $(4.13)$ 

$$U + P + F + T + W \leq 2c_3 \left( \int_{\Omega} u^{m-1} |\nabla u|^3 |\nabla \eta| \, dx + \int_{\Omega} u^{m+p} |\nabla u| |\nabla \eta| \, dx + \right. \quad (4.14)$$ 

$$\left. + \int_{\Omega} u^m |\nabla u|^2 |\Delta \eta| \, dx \right).$$ 

From this point we can use the method developed in [10 p 599] for proving the Harnack inequality satisfied by positive solutions of $(1.3)$ in $\Omega$. We set $\eta = \xi^\lambda$ with $\xi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ with value in $[0, 1]$ and $\lambda > 4$. For $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ we have by the Hölder-Young inequality 

$$\int_{\Omega} u^{m-1} |\nabla u|^3 |\nabla \xi^\lambda| \, dx \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4c_3} \int_{\Omega} u^{m-2} |\nabla u|^4 \xi^\lambda \, dx + C(\epsilon, c_3) \int_{\Omega} u^{m+2} |\nabla \xi|^4 \xi^{\lambda-4} \, dx, \quad (4.15)$$ 

$$\int_{\Omega} u^{m+p} |\nabla u| |\nabla \xi^p| \, dx \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4c_3} \int_{\Omega} u^{m+p-1} |\nabla u|^2 \xi^p \, dx + C(\epsilon, c_3) \int_{\Omega} u^{m+p+1} |\nabla \xi|^2 \xi^{\lambda-2} \, dx, \quad (4.16)$$ 

and 

$$\int_{\Omega} u^m |\nabla u|^2 |\Delta \xi^p| \, dx \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4c_3} \int_{\Omega} u^{m-2} |\nabla u|^4 \xi^p \, dx + C(\epsilon, c_3) \int_{\Omega} u^{m+2} (|\nabla \xi|^4 + |\Delta \xi|^2) \xi^{\lambda-4} \, dx. \quad (4.17)$$
Let us denote by $c_4 X$ the right-hand side of (4.18). Combining (4.5), (4.16) and (4.18) we also get

$$S := \int_{\Omega} u^{m+p} |\nabla u| |\nabla \xi|^p dx \leq c_5 X \implies V := \int_{\Omega} u^{m+2p} \xi^p dx \leq c_6 X,$$

and we finally obtain

$$U + V + P + F + S + T + W \leq c_7 X.$$  

Finally we estimate the different terms in $X$, using that $m + p > 0$ from (4.2)- (iii). For $\epsilon > 0$

$$\int_{\Omega} u^{m+2} \left( |\nabla \xi|^4 + |\Delta \xi|^2 \right) \xi_{-4} dx \leq \epsilon \int_{\Omega} u^{m+2} \xi^\lambda dx$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} u^{m+2} |\nabla \xi|^2 \xi_{-2} dx \leq \epsilon \int_{\Omega} u^{m+2p} \xi^\lambda dx + C(\epsilon, c_7) \int_{\Omega} \xi_{-2}\frac{m+2p}{p-1} |\nabla \xi|^2 \frac{m+2p}{p-1} dx,$$

At end we obtain

$$U + V + P + F + S + T + W \leq c_8 \int_{\Omega} \xi_{-2} \frac{m+2p}{p-1} \left( |\nabla \xi|^4 + |\Delta \xi|^2 \right) \frac{m+2p}{2(p-1)} dx.$$  

Step 2: The Harnack inequality. We suppose that $\Omega = B_{R} \setminus \{0\} := B^*_R$, fix $y \in B^*_R$, set $r = |y|$, then $B_r(y) \subset B^*_R$. Let $\xi \in C_0^\infty(B_r(y))$ such that $0 \leq \xi \leq 1$, $\xi = 1$ in $B^*_2(y)$, $|\nabla \xi| \leq c r^{-1}$ and $|\Delta \xi| \leq c r^{-2}$. We choose $\lambda > \max \left\{ 4, \frac{m+2p}{p+1} \right\}$, then

$$\int_{B_r(y)} \xi_{-2} \frac{m+2p}{p-1} \left( |\nabla \xi|^4 + |\Delta \xi|^2 \right) \frac{m+2p}{2(p-1)} dx \leq c_9 r^{-2} \frac{m+2p}{p-1},$$

and hence

$$\int_{B^*_2(y)} u^{m+2p} dx \leq V \leq c_{10} r^{-2} \frac{m+2p}{p-1}.$$  

We write (4.2) under the form

$$\Delta u + D(x) u + M \langle G(x), \nabla u \rangle = 0,$$

with

$$D(x) = u^{p-1} \quad \text{and} \quad G(x) = |\nabla u|^{-\frac{2}{p+1}} \nabla u.$$
Set $\sigma = \frac{m+2p}{p-1}$, then $\sigma > \frac{N}{2}$ by (4.22)-(iii) and
\[ \int_{B_y}^{N-2(m+2p)} dx \leq c_{10} r^{N-2(m+2p)} = c_{10} r^{N-2\sigma}. \] (4.26)

Next we estimate $G$. For $\tau, \omega, \gamma > 0$ and $\theta > 1$, we have with $\theta' = \frac{\theta}{\theta - 1}$.
\[ |\nabla u|^{(q-1)\tau} = u^\omega |\nabla u|^{\gamma} u^{-\omega} |\nabla u|^{(q-1)\gamma} \leq u^{\omega \theta'} |\nabla u|^{\gamma \theta} + u^{-\omega \theta} |\nabla u|^{((q-1)\gamma)\theta'}. \]

We fix $\tau = \frac{2p + m}{p - 1} = 2\sigma, \omega = \frac{(2 - m)(p + m - 1)}{p + 1}$ and $\theta = \frac{p + 1}{2 - m}$.

Then $\omega > 0$ and $\theta > 1$ from (4.22)-(iii), $\omega > 0$. Then $u^{\omega \theta'} |\nabla u|^{\gamma \theta} = u^{p + m - 1} |\nabla u|^2$ and $u^{-\omega \theta} |\nabla u|^{((q-1)\gamma)\theta'} = u^{n-2} |\nabla u|^4$, thus
\[ \int_{B_y}^{N-2} dx \leq F + T \leq c_{11} \int_{\Omega}^{N} \left( |\nabla \xi|^4 + |\Delta \xi|^2 \xi^2 \right)^{\frac{m+2p}{2p+1}} dx. \]

This implies
\[ \int_{B_y}^{N-\tau} dx \leq c_{12} r^{N-\tau}, \] (4.27)

with $\tau > N$. Using the results of [29, Section 5], we infer that a Harnack inequality, uniform with respect to $r$, is satisfied. Hence there exists $c_{13} > 0$ depending on $N, p$ such that for any $r \in (0, \frac{R}{4}]$ and $y$ such that $|y| = r$ there holds
\[ \max_{z \in B_y} u(z) \leq c_{13} \min_{z \in B_y} u(z) \quad \forall 0 < r \leq \frac{R}{4} \quad \forall y \text{ s.t. } |y| = r, \] (4.28)

which implies
\[ u(x) \leq c_{14} u(x') \quad \forall x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^N \quad \text{s.t. } |x| = |x'| \leq \frac{R}{2}, \] (4.29)

and actually $c_{14} = c_{13}^7$ by a simple geometric construction. By (4.24)
\[ r^N \omega_N r^N \left( \min_{z \in B_y} u(z) \right)^{\frac{m+2p}{2p+1}} \leq 4N c_{10} r^{N-2(m+2p)} \frac{p-1}{p-1}, \]

where $\omega_N$ is the volume of the unit N-ball. This implies
\[ u(x) \leq c_{14} |x|^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} \quad \forall x \in B_y^* \frac{R}{4}. \] (4.30)

The proof follows. \qed

**Remark.** Using standard rescaling techniques (see e.g. [29, Lemma 3.3.2]) the gradient estimate holds
\[ |\nabla u(x)| \leq c_{15} |x|^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}} \quad \forall x \in B_y^* \frac{R}{4}. \] (4.31)

And the next estimate for a solution $u$ in a domain $\Omega$ satisfying the interior sphere condition with radius $R$ is valid
\[ u(x) \leq c_{14} (\text{dist}(x, \partial \Omega))^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} \quad \forall x \in \Omega \quad \text{s.t. dist}(x, \partial \Omega) \leq \frac{R}{2}. \] (4.32)
5 Radial ground states

We recall that if \( q \neq \frac{2p}{p+1} \) and \( M \neq 0 \), (1.2) can be reduced to the case \( M = \pm 1 \) by using the transformation (1.15). Since any ground state \( u \) of (1.2) radial with respect to 0 is decreasing (this is classical and straightforward), it achieves its maximum at 0 and the following equivalence holds if \( v \) is defined by (1.15)

\[
-u'' - \frac{N-1}{r} u' = |u|^{p-1} u + M |u_r|^q \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \max u = u(0) = 1
\]

\[\iff\]
\[
-v'' - \frac{N-1}{r} v' = |v|^{p-1} v \pm |v_r|^q \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \max v = v(0) = |M|^{\frac{2}{(p+1)q-2p}}.
\]

Hence large or small values of \( M \) for \( u \) are exchanged into large or small values of \( v(0) \) for \( v \) and in the sequel we will essentially express our results using the function \( u \).

5.1 Energy functions

We consider first the energy function

\[
r \mapsto H(r) = \frac{u^{p+1}}{p+1} + \frac{u'^2}{2}.
\]

Then

\[
H'(r) = M |u'|^{q+1} - \frac{N-1}{r} u'^2.
\]

Hence, if \( M \leq 0 \), \( H \) is decreasing, a property often used in [25]. This implies in particular that a radial ground state satisfies

\[
|u'(r)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{p+1} (u(0))^{\frac{p+1}{2}}}.
\]

A similar estimate holds in all the cases.

**Proposition 5.1** Let \( M > 0 \), \( p, q > 1 \). If \( u \) is a radial ground state solution of (1.2), then the function \( H \) defined in (5.2) is decreasing and in particular (5.3) holds.

**Proof.** Let \( u \) be such a radial ground state. By Proposition 2.1 we must have \( q > \frac{N}{N-1} \) and

\[
\frac{r}{u'^2} H' = Mr |u'|^{q-1} + 1 - N \leq \frac{(N-1)q - N}{q-1} + 1 - N = -\frac{1}{q-1},
\]

this implies the claim. \( \square \)

5.1.1 Exponential perturbations

As we have seen it in the introduction, if \( q < \frac{2p}{p+1} \) equation (1.2) can be seen as a perturbation of the Lane-Emden equation (1.3) while if \( q > \frac{2p}{p+1} \) it can be seen as a perturbation of the Ricatti
Quasilinear elliptic equations with mixed reaction terms

1) For \( p > 1 \) set
\[
\begin{align*}
    u(r) &= r^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} x(t), \quad u'(r) = -r^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}} y(t), \quad t = \ln r,
\end{align*}
\]
then
\[
\begin{align*}
    x_t &= \frac{2}{p-1} x - y \\
    y_t &= -K y + x^p + M e^{-\omega t} y^q
\end{align*}
\]
with
\[
K = \frac{(N - 2)p - N}{p - 1},
\]
and
\[
\omega = \frac{(p + 1)q - 2p}{p + 1}.
\]
If \( q > \frac{2p}{p+1} \) (resp. \( q < \frac{2p}{p+1} \)), then \( \omega > 0 \) (resp. \( \omega < 0 \)) system (5.7) is a perturbation of the Lane-Emden system
\[
\begin{align*}
    x_t &= \frac{2}{p-1} x - y \\
    y_t &= -K y + x^p,
\end{align*}
\]
at \( \infty \) (resp. \( -\infty \)). The following energy type function introduced in [20] is natural with (5.8)
\[
N(t) = L(x(t), y(t)) = \frac{K}{p-1} x^2 - \frac{x^{p+1}}{p+1} - \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right)^q M e^{-\omega t} x^{q+1} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{2x}{p-1} - y \right)^2,
\]
and it satisfies
\[
N'(t) = \left( \frac{2x}{p-1} - y \right) \left[ L \left( \frac{2x}{p-1} - y \right) - M e^{-\omega t} \left( \frac{2x}{p-1} - y \right)^q \right] + \omega \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right)^q M e^{-\omega t} x^{q+1} \left( \frac{q+1}{q+1} \right),
\]
where \( L = N - 2 - \frac{4}{p-1} = K - \frac{2}{p-1} \). Relation (5.10) will be used later on.

2) For \( p, q > 1 \) set
\[
\begin{align*}
    u(r) &= r^{-\frac{2-q}{q-1}} \xi(t), \quad u'(r) = -r^{-\frac{1}{q-1}} \eta(t), \quad t = \ln r,
\end{align*}
\]
then
\[
\begin{align*}
    \xi_t &= \frac{2-q}{q-1} \xi - \eta \\
    \eta_t &= -\frac{(N-1)q - N}{q-1} \eta + e^{\omega t} \xi^p + M \eta^q
\end{align*}
\]
where
\[
\omega = \frac{p-1}{q-1} \omega.
\]
Note that if \( q < \frac{2p}{p+1} \) this system at \( \infty \) endows the form

\[
\xi_t = \frac{2-q}{q-1} \xi - \eta \\
\eta_t = -\frac{(N-1)q - N}{q-1} \eta + M \eta^q.
\]

(5.14)

It is therefore autonomous and much easier to study.

### 5.1.2 Pohozaev-Pucci-Serrin type functions

Let \( \alpha, \gamma, \theta, \kappa \) be real parameters with \( \alpha, \kappa > 0 \). Set

\[
Z(r) = r^\kappa \left( \frac{u'^2}{2} + \frac{u^{p+1}}{p+1} + \alpha \frac{uu'}{r} - \gamma |u'|^q \right).
\]

(5.15)

This type of function has been introduced in [25] in their study of equation (1.2) with \( M = 1 \) with specific parameters. We use it here to embrace all the values of \( M \). We define \( U \) by the identity

\[
Z' + \theta |u'|^{q-1} Z = r^{\kappa-1} U.
\]

(5.16)

Then

\[
U = \left( \frac{\kappa}{2} + \alpha + 1 - N \right) u'^2 + \left( \frac{\kappa}{p+1} - \alpha \right) u^{p+1} + \alpha(\kappa - N) \frac{uu'}{r} + \left( \frac{\theta}{p+1} - \gamma \right) ru^{p+1} |u'|^{q-1}
\]

\[
+ \left( M + \gamma \right) r |u'|^{q-1} + \left( ((N-1)q - \kappa) \gamma - \alpha(\theta + M) \right) u |u'|^q - \gamma(\theta + qM)ru |u'|^{2q-1}.
\]

(5.17)

### 5.2 Some known results in the case \( M < 0 \)

We recall the results of [14], [25] and [23] relative to the case \( M < 0 \).

**Theorem 5.2**

1. Let \( N \geq 3 \) and \( 1 < p \leq \frac{N}{N-2} \).
   1-(i) If \( q > \frac{2p}{p+1} \), there is no ground state for any \( M < 0 \) ([25, Theorem C]).
   1-(ii) If \( 1 < q < \frac{2p}{p+1} \) there exists a ground state when \( |M| \) is large ([14, Proposition 5.7]) and there exists no ground state when \( |M| \) is small ([23]).

2. Assume \( \frac{N}{N-2} < p < \frac{N+2}{N-2} \) and let \( \overline{q} \) be the unique root in \( (\frac{2p}{p+1}, p) \) of the quadratic equation

\[
(N-1)(X-p)^2 - (N+2-(N-2)p)((p+1)X - 2p)X = 0.
\]

2-(i) If \( \overline{q} \leq q < p \) there exists no ground state for any \( M < 0 \) ([25, Theorem C]).

2-(ii) If \( \frac{2p}{p+1} < q < \overline{q} \), there exists no ground state for \( |M| \). It is an open question whether there could exist a finite number of \( M \) for which there exists a ground state ([23, Theorem 4]).

2-(iii) If \( 1 < q < \frac{2p}{p+1} \), there exists a ground state for large \( |M| \) ([14, Proposition 5.7]) and no ground state when \( |M| \) is small ([23]).
3- Assume $p > \frac{N+2}{N-2}$ and $q > 1$ and let $Q_{N,p} = \frac{2(N-1)p}{2N+p+1} \in \left(\frac{2p}{p+1}, p\right)$. 

3-(i) If $Q_{N,p} < q < p$ there exists a ground state for $|M|$ small.

3-(ii) If $1 < q \leq Q_{N,p}$ there exists a ground state for any $M < 0$ (25, Theorem A).

4- Assume $p = \frac{N+2}{N-2}$. There exists at least one $M < 0$ such that there exists a ground state if and only if $1 < q < p$. More precisely:

4-(i) If $\frac{2p}{p+1} < q < p$ there exists ground state if $|M|$ is small (25, Theorem B).

4-(ii) If $q \geq \frac{2p}{p+1}$ there exists a ground state for any $M < 0$ (25, Theorem A).

Remark. It is interesting to quote that when $M < 0$ and $q \geq \frac{2p}{p+1}$, there holds [25, Theorem 3],

$$u(r) = O(r^{-\frac{2}{p+1}}) \quad \text{and} \quad u'(r) = O(r^{-\frac{p+1}{p+1}}) \quad \text{when} \quad r \to \infty.$$ 

5.3 The case $M > 0$

This next result is a consequence of Theorem A.

Theorem 5.3 Let $M > 0$, $p > 1$ and $q > \frac{2p}{p+1}$ then there exists no radial ground state satisfying $u(0) = 1$ when $M$ is large.

Proof. Suppose that such a solution $u$ exists. From Theorem A and Proposition 2.1 there holds

$$\sup_{r > 0} \left| u'(r) \right| \leq c_{N,p,q} |M|^{-\frac{p+1}{(p+1)q-2p}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{r > 0} r^{\frac{p+1}{p+1}} \left| u'(r) \right| \leq c_{N,p}. \tag{5.18}$$

As a consequence, if $r > R > 0$,

$$1 - u(r) = u(0) - u(r) = u(0) - u(R) + u(R) - u(r) \leq c_{N,p,q} |M|^{-\frac{p+1}{(p+1)q-2p}} R + \int_{R}^{\infty} |u'(s)| \, ds \leq c_{N,p,q} |M|^{-\frac{p+1}{(p+1)q-2p}} R + c'_{N,p} R^{-\frac{2}{p-1}},$$

with $c'_{N,p} = \frac{p-1}{2} c_{N,p}$. Since $u(r) \to 0$ when $r \to \infty$, we take $R = |M|^{\frac{p+1}{(p+1)q-2p}}$ and derive

$$1 \leq (c_{N,p,q} + c'_{N,p}) |M|^{-\frac{2}{(p+1)q-2p}}, \tag{5.19}$$

and the conclusion follows. \[\square\]

Remark. If we use Proposition 5.1 we can make estimate (5.19) more precise.

5.3.1 The case $M > 0$, $1 < p \leq \frac{N+2}{N-2}$

It is a consequence of our general results that there is no radial ground state for large $M$ or for small $M$ when $1 < q \leq \frac{2p}{p+1}$ and $1 < p < \frac{N+2}{N-2}$. Indeed, if $1 < q < \frac{2p}{p+1}$ is a consequence of the equivalence statement between a priori estimate and non-existence of ground state proved in [23], and if $q = \frac{2p}{p+1}$ it follows from Theorems C and E. Actually in the radial case, the result is more general.
Theorem 5.4 Let $M > 0$ and $1 < p < \frac{N+2}{N-2}$. If $1 < q \leq p$, there exists no radial ground state for any $M$. If $q > p$ there exists no radial ground state for $M$ small enough.

Proof. By Proposition 2.1 we may assume $N \geq 3$ and
\[
\frac{N}{N-2} < p \leq \frac{N+2}{N-2} \quad \text{and} \quad q > \frac{N}{N-1}.
\] (5.20)

(i) Assume first $q < \frac{2p}{p+1}$. We use the system (5.5). Then $\omega$, defined by (5.7), is negative. Hence the Leighton function $\mathcal{N}$ defined by (5.9) is nonincreasing since $L \leq 0$ when $p \leq \frac{N+2}{N-2}$. Furthermore since $(x(t), y(t)) \to (0, 0)$ when $t \to -\infty$ and $e^{-\omega t} \to 0$, we get $\mathcal{N}(-\infty) = 0$ it follows that $\mathcal{N}(t) < 0$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, by Proposition 2.1,
\[
u(r) = O(r^{-\frac{2}{p+1}}) \quad \text{as} \quad r \to \infty \iff x(t) = O(e^{\frac{q(p+1)}{2(p+1)}}) = o(1) \quad \text{as} \quad t \to \infty
\]
This implies $e^{-\omega t} x' q(t) = O(e^{\frac{q(p+1)}{2(p+1)}}) = o(1)$ as $t \to \infty$ and $\mathcal{N}(\infty) = 0$, contradiction.

(ii) Assume next $\frac{2p}{p+1} \leq q \leq p$. We consider the function (5.15) with the parameters
\[
\kappa = \frac{2(p+1)(N-1)}{p+3} = (p+1)\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma = -\frac{2M}{q(p+1) + 2} = \frac{\theta}{q(p+1)},
\]
already used by [25] when $M = -1$, and we get with $\mathcal{U}$ defined by (5.16).
\[
\mathcal{U} = \frac{2}{(p+3)^2} \frac{|u'|}{r} (A + BM\chi + CM\chi^2) \quad \text{with} \quad \chi = \frac{p+3}{2 + q(p+1)} r |u'|^{q-1},
\]
where
\[
A = (N-1)(N+2-(N-2)p), \quad B = 2(N-1)(p-q), \quad C = q(p(p+1)-2p).
\] (5.21)

By our assumptions $A \geq 0$, $B \geq 0$ and $C > 0$. Hence $\mathcal{U} > 0$. This implies
\[
\mathcal{Z}(r) = e^{-\int_0^r \theta |u'|^{q-1} ds} \mathcal{Z}(0) + \int_0^r e^{-\theta \int_s^r |u'|^{q-1} ds} \mathcal{U}(s) ds = \int_0^r e^{-\theta \int_s^r |u'|^{q-1} ds} \mathcal{U}(s) ds,
\]
since $\mathcal{Z}(0) = 0$. If $u$ is a ground state, then $u'(r) \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$, thus $u |u'|^q \leq u |u'|^{\frac{2p}{p+1}}$. Hence, from Proposition 2.1, $u'^2(r) = O(r^{-\frac{2p}{p+1}})$ as $r \to \infty$. The other terms $u^{p+1}(r)$, $r^{-1} u'(r)$ and $u |u'|^{\frac{2p}{p+1}}$ satisfy the same bound, hence
\[
\mathcal{Z}(r) = O(r^{\kappa - \frac{2(p+1)}{p+1}}) = O(r^{\frac{2(p+3)(N-1)}{p+1} - \frac{2(p+1)}{p+1}}) = O(r^{\frac{2(p+1)((N-2)p-(N+2))}{(p+3)(p-1)}}).
\]
Then $\mathcal{Z}(r) \to 0$ when $r \to \infty$, contradiction.

(iii) Suppose $q > p$ and $u$ is a ground state. By Proposition 5.1 and (5.16), there holds
\[
r |u'|^{q-1} = r |u'|^{p+1} |u'|^{q-\frac{2p}{p+1}} \leq c_{N,p}.
\]
Then $\chi = \frac{p+3}{2 + q(p+1)} r |u'|^{q-1} \leq c_{N,p}$. Hence, if $M \leq M_{N,p}$ for some $M_{N,p} > 0$, $\mathcal{U}$ is positive as $A$ is. We conclude as above. □
5.3.2 The case $M > 0$, $p > \frac{N+2}{N-2}$

We recall that in Theorem C if $q = \frac{2p}{p+1}$ and $p > 1$ there is no ground state whenever $M > M_{N,p}$, see (1.20). In Theorem A' if $1 < q < \frac{2p}{p+1}$ and $p > 1$ there is no ground state $u$ such that $u(0) = 1$ if $M$ is too large. In the next result we complement Theorem 5.3 for small value of $M$ in assuming $q > \frac{2p}{p+1}$.

**Theorem 5.5** If $p > \frac{N+2}{N-2}$ and $q \geq \frac{2p}{p+1}$ then there exist radial ground states for $M > 0$ small enough.

**Proof.** First we consider the function $Z$ with $k = N$ and obtain

$$Z(r) = r^N \left( \frac{u^2}{2} + \frac{u^{p+1}}{p+1} + \alpha \frac{uu'}{r} - \gamma u |u'|^q \right).$$

The function vanishes at the origin. We compute $U$ from the identity $Z' + \theta |u'|^{q-1} Z = r^{N-1} U$ and get

$$U = \left( \alpha - \frac{N - 2}{2} \right) u^2 + \left( \frac{N}{p+1} - \alpha \right) u^{p+1} + \left( \frac{\theta}{p+1} - \gamma q \right) ru^{p+1} |u'|^{q-1} + \left( M + \frac{\theta + \gamma}{2} \right) ru |u'|^{q-1} + \left( (N-1)q - N \right) \gamma - \alpha (\theta + M) \right) u |u'|^q - \gamma (\theta + qM) ru |u'|^{2q-1}.$$

If $\gamma = 0$ and $\theta = -2M$, then

$$U = \left( \alpha - \frac{N - 2}{2} \right) u^2 + \left( \frac{N}{p+1} - \alpha \right) u^{p+1} - \frac{2M}{p+1} ru^{p+1} |u'|^{q-1} + \alpha Mu |u'|^q.$$

If $u$ is a regular solution which vanishes at some $r_0 > 0$, then $Z(r_0) = 2^{-1}r_0^2 u^N(r_0) > 0$. As $p > \frac{N+2}{N-2}$, by choosing $\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{N}{p+1} + \frac{N-2}{2} \right)$ we have $\frac{N}{p+1} < \alpha < \frac{N-2}{2}$. We define $\ell > 0$ by $(N-2)p - (N+2) = 4(p+1)\ell$, then $\frac{N-2}{2} - \alpha = \alpha - \frac{N}{p+1} = \ell$ and then

$$U \leq -\ell (u^2 + u^{p+1}) + M \alpha u |u'|^q.$$

Assume first $q < 2$, we have from Hölder’s inequality and $0 < r \leq r_0$ where $u$ is positive

$$u |u'|^q \leq q \frac{u^2}{2} + \frac{2-q}{2} |u|^\frac{2}{2-q} \leq u^2 + |u|^\frac{2}{2-q},$$

and

$$U + (\ell - M)u^2 \leq M \alpha u \frac{2}{2-q} - \ell u^{p+1} = \ell u^{p+1} \left( \frac{M\alpha}{\ell} \frac{u^{\frac{q(p+1)-2p}{2-q}} - 1}{u^{\frac{q(p+1)-2p}{2-q}}} \right) \leq \ell u^{p+1} \left( \frac{M\alpha}{\ell} - 1 \right)$$

since $q \geq \frac{2p}{p+1}$ and $u \leq u(0) = 1$. Taking $M \leq \frac{\ell}{\alpha} = \frac{(N-2)p-N-2}{(N-2)p+3N-2}$, $U$ is negative implying that $r \mapsto e^{-2M} \int_0^r |u'|^{q-1} ds Z(r)$ is nonincreasing. Since $Z(0) = 0$, $Z(r) \leq 0$, a contradiction.
If \( q = 2 \), then \( U \leq -\ell(u'^2 + u^{p+1}) + M\alpha u'^2 \) since \( u \leq 1 \) on \([0, r_0]\). We still infer that \( U \leq 0 \) if we choose \( M \leq \frac{\ell}{\alpha} \).

Finally, if \( q > 2 \), we have from Theorem A, \( u' \leq C_{N, p, q}M^{-\frac{(p+1)(q-2)}{(p+1)(q-2)p+1}}u'^2 = \alpha C_{N, p, q}M^{-\frac{p}{p+1}}u'^2 \). Therefore, using again the decay of \( u \) from \( u(0) = 1 \),

\[
M\alpha u' |u'|^q \leq M\alpha u' |u'|^{q-2} u'^2 \leq M\alpha C_{N, p, q}M^{-\frac{(p+1)(q-2)}{(p+1)(q-2)p+1}}u'^2 = \alpha C_{N, p, q}M^{-\frac{p}{p+1}}u'^2.
\]

Hence \( U \leq -\left(\ell - \alpha C_{N, p, q}M^{-\frac{p}{p+1}}\right)u'^2 \). Taking \( M \leq \frac{2}{p+1} \), \( \psi(r) = r^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} \), and \( \omega \) is a solution of

\[
-\Delta\omega + \frac{2K}{p-1}\omega = \omega^p + M\left(\left(\frac{2}{p-1}\right)^2 \omega^2 + |\nabla\omega|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}},
\]

where \( K \) is defined in (5.6). Throughout this section we assume

\[
p > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad q = \frac{2p}{p+1}.
\]

### 6 Separable solutions

We denote by \((r, \sigma) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times S^{N-1}\) the spherical coordinates in \(\mathbb{R}^N\). Then equation (1.2) takes the form

\[
-u_{rr} - \frac{N-1}{r} u_r - \frac{1}{r^2} \Delta' u = |u|^{p-1} + M\left(u_r^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |\nabla' u|^2\right)^{\frac{2}{p}},
\]

where \(\Delta' \) is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on \(S^{N-1}\) and \(\nabla'\) the tangential gradient. If we look for separable nonnegative solutions of (1.2), i.e. solutions under the form \(u(r, \sigma) = \psi(r)\omega(\sigma)\), then \(q = \frac{2p}{p+1}, \psi(r) = r^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}\), and \(\omega\) is a solution of

\[
-\Delta\omega + \frac{2K}{p-1}\omega = \omega^p + M\left(\left(\frac{2}{p-1}\right)^2 \omega^2 + |\nabla\omega|^2\right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}},
\]

where \(K\) is defined in (5.6). Throughout this section we assume

\[
p > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad q = \frac{2p}{p+1}.
\]

#### 6.1 Constant solutions

The constant function \(\omega = X\) is a solution of (6.2) if

\[
X^{p-1} + M\left(\frac{2}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{2p}{p+1}}X^{\frac{p-1}{p+1}} - \frac{2K}{p-1} = 0.
\]

For \(N = 1, 2\) and \(p > 1\) or \(N \geq 3\) and \(1 < p < \frac{N}{N-2}\), we recall that \(\mu^* = \mu^*(N)\) has been defined in (1.21). The following result is easy to prove
Proposition 6.1 1- Let $M \geq 0$ then there exists a unique positive root $X_M$ to (6.4) if and only if $p > \frac{N}{N-2}$. Moreover the mapping $M \mapsto X_M$ is continuous and decreasing from $[0, \infty)$ onto $(0, \left(\frac{2K}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}]$.

2- Let $M < 0$, $N \geq 3$ and $p \geq \frac{N}{N-2}$ then there exists a unique positive root $X_M$ to (6.4) and the mapping $M \mapsto X_M$ is continuous and decreasing from $(-\infty, 0]$ onto $\left(\frac{2K}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}, \infty)$. 

3- Let $M < 0$, $N = 1, 2$ and $p > 1$ or $N \geq 3$ and $1 < p < \frac{N}{N-2}$ then there exists no positive root to (6.4) if $-\mu^* < M \leq 0$. If $M = M^* := -\mu^*$ there exists a unique positive root $X_{M^*} = \left(\frac{2|K|}{p(p-1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$. If $M < -\mu^*$ there exist two positive roots $X_{1,M} < X_{2,M}$. The mapping $M \mapsto X_{1,M}$ is continuous and increasing from $(-\infty, \mu^*]$ onto $(0, X_{M^*}]$. The mapping $M \mapsto X_{2,M}$ is continuous and decreasing from $(-\infty, \mu^*)$ onto $[X_{M^*}, \infty)$. 

Abridged proof. Set

$$f_M(X) = X^{p-1} + M \left(\frac{2}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} X^{\frac{1}{p+1}} - \frac{2K}{p-1},$$

then $f'_M(X) = (p-1)X^{p-2} + M^{\frac{p-1}{p+1}} \left(\frac{2}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} X^{-\frac{2}{p+1}}$.

1- If $M$ is nonnegative, $f_M$ is increasing from $-\frac{2K}{p-1} = -\frac{2(N-2)p-N}{(p-1)^2}$ to $\infty$; hence, if $p > \frac{N}{N-2}$ there exists a unique $X_M > 0$ such that $f_M(X_M) = 0$, while if $1 < p < \frac{N}{N-2}$, $f_M$ admits no zero on $[0, \infty)$. Since $f_M > f_{M'}$ for $M > M' > 0$, there holds $X_M > X_{M'}$, By the implicit function theorem the mapping $M \mapsto X_M$ is $C^1$ and decreasing from $[0, \infty)$ onto $(0, \left(\frac{2K}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}]$. Actually it can be proved that (see [7], Proposition 2.2)

$$X_M = \frac{p-1}{2} \left(\frac{K}{M}\right)^{\frac{p+1}{2p}} (1 + o(1)) \quad \text{as } M \to \infty.$$

2- If $M$ is negative, $f_M$ achieves its minimum on $[0, \infty)$ at $X_0 = \left(\frac{-M}{p+1}\right)^{\frac{p+1}{p}} \left(\frac{2}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}}$, and

$$f_M(X_0) = -\frac{p}{(p+1)^{\frac{p+1}{p}}} \left(\frac{2}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{2}{p-1}} (M)^{\frac{p+1}{p}} + \frac{2K}{p-1}$$

$$= -\left(\frac{2}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \left(\frac{p}{(p+1)^{\frac{p+1}{p}}} (M)^{\frac{p+1}{p}} + \frac{(N-2)p-N}{2}\right).$$

Since $K > 0$, there exists a unique $X_M > 0$ such that $f_M(X_M) = 0$ and $X_M > X_0$. The mapping
\[ M \mapsto X_M \text{ is } C^1 \text{ and decreasing from } (-\infty, 0] \text{ onto } \left( \left( \frac{2K}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}, \infty \right). \] The following estimate holds

\[
\max \left\{ \left( \frac{2K}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}, \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-1}} |M|^{\frac{p+1}{p(p-1)}} \right\} \leq X_M
\leq 2 \left( \frac{2K}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-1}} |M|^{\frac{p+1}{p(p-1)}}. \tag{6.7}
\]

3. If \( N = 1, 2 \) and \( p > 1 \) or \( N \geq 3 \) and \( 1 < p < \frac{N}{N-2} \), then \( f_M(0) > 0 \). Hence, if \( f_M(X_0) > 0 \) there exists no positive root to \( f_M(X) = 0 \). Equivalently, if \(-\mu^* < M < 0 \). If \( f_M(X_0) = 0 \), \( X_0 \) is a double root and this is possible only if \( M = -\mu^* \), hence \( X_{-\mu^*} = \left( \frac{2K}{p(p-1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \). If \( f_M(X) < 0 \), or equivalently, if \( M < -\mu^* \), the equation \( f_M(X) = 0 \) admits two positive roots \( X_{1, M} < X_0 < X_{2, M} \). The monotonicity of the \( X_{j, M}, j=1,2 \), and their range follows easily from the monotonicity of \( M \mapsto f_M(X) \) for \( M < 0 \). Actually the following asymptotics hold when \( M \to -\infty \),

\[
X_{1, M} = \frac{p-1}{2} \left( \frac{K}{M} \right)^{\frac{p+1}{p-1}} (1 + o(1)) \quad \text{and} \quad X_{2, M} = \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-1}} (-M)^{\frac{p+1}{p(p-1)}} (1 + o(1)). \tag{6.8}
\]

\[ \square \]

6.2 Bifurcations

We set

\[
A(\omega) = -\Delta' \omega + \frac{2K}{p-1} \omega - \omega^p - M \left( \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right)^2 \omega^2 + |\nabla' \omega|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}}, \tag{6.9}
\]

If \( \eta \in C^\infty(S^{N-1}) \) and if there exists a constant positive solution \( X \) to \( A(X) = 0 \) we have

\[
\left. \frac{d}{d\tau} A(X + \tau \eta) \right|_{\tau=0} = -\Delta' \eta + \frac{2K}{p-1} \left( pX^{p-1} - \frac{2p}{p+1} \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} X^{\frac{p-1}{p+1}} \right) \eta.
\]

Hence the problem is singular if

\[
-\frac{2K}{p-1} + pX^{p-1} + M \frac{2p}{p+1} \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} X^{\frac{p-1}{p+1}} = \lambda_k, \tag{6.10}
\]

where \( \lambda_k = k(k + N - 2) \) is the \( k \)-th nonzero eigenvalue of \(-\Delta'\) in \( H^1(S^{N-1}) \). The following result follows classically from the standard bifurcation theorem from a simple eigenvalue (which can always be assumed if we consider functions depending only on the azimuthal angle on \( S^{N-1} \) reducing the eigenvalue problem to a simple Legendre type ordinary differential equation) see e.g. \[26\ Chapter 13] and identity (6.21).
Theorem 6.2 Let $M_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $X_{M_0}$ be a constant solution of (6.2). If $X_{M_0}$ satisfies for some $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$,
\[ M_0 \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} X_{M_0}^{\frac{p+1}{p+1}} = \frac{p+1}{p(p-1)} (2K - \lambda_k), \]
there exists a continuous branch of nonconstant positive solutions $(M, \omega_M)$ of (6.2) bifurcating from the $(M_0, X_{M_0})$.

Since $M \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} X_M^{\frac{p+1}{p+1}} = \frac{2K}{p-1} - X_M^{p-1}$ by (6.4) the following statements follow immediately from Proposition 6.1.

Lemma 6.3 Set $\Phi(M) = M \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} X_M^{\frac{p+1}{p+1}}$ when $X_M$ is uniquely determined, and $\Phi_j(M) = M \left( \frac{2}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} X_j(M)^{\frac{p+1}{p+1}}$, $j=1,2$, if there exist two equilibria. Then

1- If $N \geq 3$ and $p > \frac{N}{N-2}$, the mapping $M \mapsto \Phi(M)$ is continuous and increasing from $[0, \infty)$ onto $[0, \frac{2K}{p-1})$.

2- If $N \geq 3$ and $p \geq \frac{N}{N-2}$, the mapping $M \mapsto \Phi(M)$ is continuous and increasing from $(-\infty,0]$ onto $(-\infty,0]$.

3- If $N = 1,2$ and $p > 1$ or $N \geq 3$ and $1 < p < \frac{N}{N-2}$, the mapping $M \mapsto \Phi_1(M)$ (resp. $M \mapsto \Phi_2(M)$) is continuous and decreasing (resp. increasing) from $(-\infty,-\mu^*)$ onto $[\frac{2K}{p-1},0)$ (resp. $(-\infty, \frac{2K}{p-1}]$).

If we analyse the range $R[\Phi]$ of $\Phi$ or $R[\Phi_j]$ of $\Phi_j$, we prove the following result.

Theorem 6.4 1- Let $N \geq 3$ and $p \geq \frac{N}{N-2}$.

1-(i) There exists a continuous curve of bifurcation $(M, \omega_M)$ issued from $(M_0, X_{M_0})$ for some $M_0 = M_0(p) \geq 0$ if and only if $p > \frac{N+1}{N-3}$ and $k = 1$. Furthermore $M_0(\frac{N+1}{N-3}) = 0$.

1-(ii) The bifurcation curve $s \mapsto (M(s), \omega_M(s))$, is defined on $(-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0)$ for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and verifies $(M(0), \omega_{M(0)}) = (M_0, X_{M_0})$.

2- Let $N \geq 3$ and $p \geq \frac{N}{N-2}$.

2-(i) For any $k \geq 1$ there exist $M_k < 0$ and a continuous branch of bifurcation $(M, \omega_M)$ issued from $(M_k, X_{M_k})$, with the restriction that $p < \frac{N+1}{N-3}$ if $k = 1$.

2-(ii) The bifurcation curve $s \mapsto (M(s), \omega_M(s))$, is defined on $(-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0)$ for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and verifies $(M(0), \omega_{M(0)}) = (M_0, X_{M_0})$. Finally $M_k \rightarrow -\infty$ when $k \rightarrow \infty$.

3- Let $N = 1,2$ and $p > 1$, or $N \geq 3$ and $1 < p < \frac{N}{N-2}$.

3-(i) There exists no $M < 0$ such that $\frac{2K}{p-1} < \Phi_1(M) < 0$, and a countable set of $M_k < 0$, $k \geq 1$, such that $\Phi_2(M_k) = \frac{p+1}{p(p-1)} (2K - \lambda_k)$.

3-(ii) There exist a countable branches of bifurcation of solutions $(M_k(s), \omega_{M_k(s)})$ issued from $(M_k, X_{2,M_k})$. 
Proof. Assertion 1. Since from Lemma (6.3) \( R[\Phi] = [0, \frac{2K}{p-1}] \) for \( M \geq 0 \), we have to see under what condition on \( p \geq \frac{N}{N-2} \) one can find \( k \geq 1 \) such that

\[
0 \leq \frac{p+1}{p(p-1)} (2K - \lambda_k) < \frac{2K}{p-1} \iff \frac{2K}{p+1} < \lambda_k \leq 2K.
\]

Since \( K < N \) and \( \lambda_k \geq 2N \) for \( k \geq 2 \), the only possibility for this last inequality to hold is \( k = 1 \). The inequality \( \frac{2K}{p+1} < N - 1 \) always holds since \( p > 1 \), while the inequality \( N - 1 = \lambda_1 \leq 2K \) is equivalent to \( p \geq \frac{N+1}{N-3} \). Therefore \( M_0 = 0 \) and \( X_{M_0} = \left( \frac{2K}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \). If we consider only functions on the sphere \( S^{N-1} \) which depend uniquely on the azimuthal angle \( \theta = \tan^{-1}(x_N|_{S^{N-1}}) \), the function \( \psi_1(\sigma) = x_N|_{S^{N-1}} \) is an eigenfunction of \( -\Delta \) in \( H^1(S^{N-1}) \) with multiplicity one. Hence the bifurcation branch is locally a regular curve \( s \mapsto (M(s), \omega_M(s)) \) with \( 0 \leq s < \epsilon_0 \) and we construct the bifurcating solution on \( S^{N-1} \) using the classical tangency condition [28, Theorem 13.5],

\[
\omega_M(s) = X_M(s) + s(\psi_1 + \zeta_1)
\]

where \( \zeta_1 \in H^1(S^{N-1}) \), is orthogonal to \( \psi_1 \) in \( H^1(S^{N-1}) \) and satisfies \( \|\zeta_1\|_{C^1} = o(1) \) when \( s \to 0 \). This implies the claim.

Assertion 2. Since \( R[\Phi] = (-\infty, 0) \) for \( M < 0 \), we have to find \( k \geq 1 \) such that

\[
\frac{p+1}{p(p-1)} (2K - \lambda_k) < 0 \iff 2K < \lambda_k.
\]

As in Case 1, \( K < 2N \), then inequality \( 2K \leq \lambda_k \) holds for all \( k \geq 2 \), and if \( k = 1 \) this is possible only if \( p < \frac{N+1}{N-2} \). The construction of the bifurcating curve is the same as in Case 1.

Assertion 3. We have \( R[\Phi_1] = [\frac{2K}{p-1}, 0] \) for \( M \leq -\mu^* \). If we look for the existence of some \( k \geq 1 \) such that

\[
\frac{2K}{p-1} \leq \frac{p+1}{p(p-1)} (2K - \lambda_k) < 0 \iff 2K \leq \lambda_k < \frac{2K}{p+1};
\]

we get an impossibility since \( K < 0 \). Hence there exists no \( M_0 < 0 \) such that \( (M_0, X_{1,M_0}) \) is a bifurcation point. We have also \( R[\Phi_2] = (-\infty, \frac{2K}{p-1}] \) for \( M \leq -\mu^* \). Now the condition for the existence of a bifurcation branch issued from \( (M_0, X_{2,M_0}) \) for some \( M_0 \leq -\mu^* \) is

\[
\frac{p+1}{p(p-1)} (2K - \lambda_k) \leq \frac{2K}{p-1} \iff \lambda_k \geq \frac{2K}{p+1},
\]

which is always true for any \( k \geq 1 \) and \( 1 < p < \frac{N}{N-2} \). \( \square \)

Remark. The exponent \( p = \frac{N+1}{N-3} \) is the Sobolev critical exponent on \( S^{N-1} \). If one consider the Lane-Emden equation with a Leray potential

\[
-\Delta u + \lambda |x|^{-2} u = u^{\frac{N+1}{N-3}},
\]

with \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \), then the separable solutions \( u(r, \sigma) = r^{-\frac{N-3}{2}} \omega(\sigma) \) verify

\[
-\Delta' \omega + \left( \frac{(N-1)(N-3)}{4} - \lambda \right) \omega - \omega^{\frac{N+1}{N-3}} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad S^{N-1}.
\]
It was observed in [10] that there exists a branch of bifurcation \((\lambda, \omega_\lambda)\) with \(\lambda > 0\) issued from \((0, \omega_0)\), where \(\omega_0\) is the constant explicit solution of (6.14).

Remark. In Theorem 6.4 and the above remark, we conjectured that on the bifurcating curve there holds locally \(M(s) < M_0\), and that for any \(p \geq \frac{N+1}{N-3}\) there exists \(M_0 := M_0(p)\) such that for \(M > M_0\) all the positive solutions to (6.2) are constant, furthermore \(M_0\) is defined by (6.11). When \(p = \frac{N+1}{N-3}\), then \(M = 0\) and there exists infinitely many positive solutions to (6.2) [10, Proposition 5.1]. When \(N - 2 < p < \frac{N+1}{N-3}\), it is unclear if the branches of bifurcation \((M(s), \omega_{M(s)})\) issued from \((M_0, \omega_{M_0})\) with \(M_0 < 0\) are such that \(M(s)\) keeps a constant sign. If it is the case one could expect that if \(M \geq 0\) and \(N - 2 < p < \frac{N+1}{N-3}\), all the positive solutions to (6.2) are constant.

The following statement is an immediate consequence of Theorem 6.4.

Corollary 6.5 1- If \(p > 1\) and \(q = \frac{2p}{p+1}\) there always exist nonradial positive singular solutions of (1.2) in \(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}\) under the form \(u(r, \sigma) = r^{-\frac{2}{p+1}}\omega(\sigma)\).
2- If \(N \geq 4\) and \(p > \frac{N+1}{N-3}\), the functions are obtained by bifurcation from \(X_M\) with \(M > 0\).
3- If \(N \geq 3\) and \(\frac{N-2}{N} \leq p < \frac{N+1}{N-3}\), the functions are obtained by bifurcation from \(X_M\) with \(M < 0\).
4- If \(N = 1, 2\) and \(p > 1\) or \(N \geq 3\) and \(1 < p < \frac{N}{N-2}\), the functions are obtained by bifurcation from \((M_k, X_{2,M_k})\) with \(M_k < -\mu^*\) and \(k \geq 1\).
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