Uniqueness and sign properties of minimizers in a quasilinear indefinite problem \textsuperscript{*†}

Uriel Kaufmann‡, Humberto Ramos Quoirin §, Kenichiro Umezu¶

January 31, 2020

Abstract
Let $1 < q < p$ and $a \in C(\Omega)$ be sign-changing, where $\Omega$ is a bounded and smooth domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$. We show that the functional

$$I_q(u) := \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{p}|\nabla u|^p - \frac{1}{q}a(x)|u|^q \right),$$

has exactly one nonnegative minimizer $U_q$ (in $W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ or $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$). In addition, we prove that $U_q$ is the only possible positive solution of the associated Euler-Lagrange equation, which shows that this equation has at most one positive solution. Furthermore, we show that if $q$ is close enough to $p$ then $U_q$ is positive, which also guarantees that minimizers of $I_q$ do not change sign. Several of these results are new even for $p = 2$.

1 Introduction
Let $\Omega$ be a bounded and smooth domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 1$. This note is concerned with the problem

$$(P_q) \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = a(x)u^{q-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ Bu = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\Delta_p$ is the $p$-Laplacian operator. Here $a \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ changes sign and $q \in (1, p)$ (which is known as the $p$-sublinear or $p$-subhomogeneous case).

We consider either Dirichlet ($Bu = u$) or Neumann ($Bu = \partial_\nu u$, where $\nu$ is the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega$) homogeneous boundary conditions. In the Neumann case, we assume throughout this note that $\int_{\Omega} a < 0$, which is a necessary condition for the existence of a positive solution of $(P_q)$.
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By a solution of \((P_q)\) we mean a nonnegative weak solution, i.e. \(u \in X\) such that \(u \geq 0\) in \(\Omega\) and
\[
\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \phi = \int_\Omega a(x)u^{q-1}\phi,
\]
for all \(\phi \in X\), where \(X = W_{0}^{1,p}(\Omega)\) in the Dirichlet case, and \(X = W^{1,p}(\Omega)\) in the Neumann case. Since \(a\) is bounded, by standard regularity for quasilinear elliptic equations \([10, 17]\), we know that \(u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)\) for some \(\alpha \in (0, 1)\). If, in addition, \(u > 0\) in \(\Omega\), then we call it a positive solution of \((P_q)\).

One of the main features of \((P_q)\) under the current conditions on \(a\) and \(q\) is the possible existence of nontrivial dead core solutions, i.e. solutions vanishing in open subsets of \(\Omega\) (see \([3, 14]\) for examples when \(p = 2\)). On the other hand, this phenomenon does not occur when \(a \geq 0\) or \(q \geq p\), as in this case the strong maximum principle \([18]\) yields that any nontrivial solution of \((P_q)\) is positive and, by the Hopf lemma, it satisfies \(\partial_{\nu}u(x) < 0\) for every \(x \in \partial\Omega\) such that \(u(x) = 0\).

The existence of a nontrivial solution of \((P_q)\) is not difficult to establish, either by variational arguments or by the sub-supersolutions method, while the existence of positive solutions is far more involved, even for \(p = 2\). We shall focus here on a variational approach. Thanks to the homogeneity in both sides of the equation, \((P_q)\) can be tackled by several minimization techniques (not only for \(1 < q < p\), but also for \(p < q < p^*\), where \(p^*\) is the critical Sobolev exponent). For \(1 < q < p\) we shall exploit two of them, namely, global and constrained minimization, which we describe in the sequel. Let \(I_q\) be the functional given by
\[
I_q(u) := \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{p}|\nabla u|^p - \frac{1}{q}a(x)|u|^q\right),
\]
for \(u \in X\). One may easily check that \(I_q\) has a minimizer \(u \geq 0\), which solves then \((P_q)\), and satisfies \(u > 0\) in \(\Omega^+_a\), where
\[
\Omega^+_a := \{x \in \Omega : a(x) > 0\}.
\]
We call such \(u\) a ground state (or least energy) solution of \((P_q)\). Alternatively, one can find a nonnegative minimizer of \(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p\) over the \(C^1\) manifold
\[
S_a := \left\{u \in X : \int_\Omega a(x)|u|^q = 1\right\}.
\]
By the Lagrange multipliers rule, this minimizer solves \((P_q)\), up to some rescaling constant. We shall see in Lemma \([2,1]\) that these minimization procedures are equivalent, i.e. they provide the same solutions. Furthermore, these solutions turn out to be only one, cf. \([16\) Theorem 1.1]. On the other hand, an application of a generalized Picone’s inequality \([6, Proposition 2.9]\) shows that this solution is the only possible positive solution of \((P_q)\). More precisely:

**Theorem 1.1.** For any \(1 < q < p\) there exists exactly one ground state solution \(U_q\), which is the only solution of \((P_q)\) such that \(U_q > 0\) in \(\Omega^+_a\). In particular, \((P_q)\) has at most one positive solution.

Uniqueness results for positive solutions of sublinear type problems have a long history, since the well-known paper by Brezis and Oswald \([7]\), which applies
in the Dirichlet case to \( (P_2) \) if \( p = 2 \) and \( a > 0 \) in \( \Omega \). This result was extended to \( p \neq 2 \) by Díaz and Saa [9] (see also [4, 11] and its references). The indefinite case, i.e. with \( a \) sign-changing, has received less attention. To the best of our knowledge, this case has been considered only for \( p = 2 \). Assuming that \( \Omega^+_a \) is smooth and has a finite number of connected components, Bandle et al proved Theorem 1.1 for the Dirichlet problem [2, Theorem 2.3], and the uniqueness of a solution positive on \( \Omega^+_a \) for the Neumann problem [3, Lemma 3.1]. Still for \( p = 2 \), Delgado and Suarez [9, Theorem 2.1] extended the uniqueness results for the Dirichlet case without any assumptions on \( \Omega^+_a \). Let us note that [2, 3, 9] deal with more general nonlinearities (not necessarily powerlike), and their uniqueness results are based on a change of variables and the strong maximum principle.

The uniqueness of positive solution for \( (P_q) \) derived from Theorem 1.1 confirms a striking difference (known when \( p = 2 \)) with the case \( p < q < p^* \), where a high number of positive solutions may be obtained in accordance with the number of connected components of \( \Omega^+_a \), cf. [5]. We are not aware of an extension of this multiplicity result to \( p \neq 2 \). Note also that the condition ‘\( u > 0 \) in \( \Omega^+_a \)’ is sharp in the uniqueness statement, for \( (P_q) \) may have multiple solutions that are positive in some connected component of \( \Omega^+_a \), as shown in [2] for \( p = 2 \). We also extend this uniqueness feature to solutions that are positive in a prescribed number of connected components of \( \Omega^+_a \) and vanish in the remaining ones (see Proposition 2.8).

Let us consider now minimizers of \( I_q \) in general (not only nonnegative ones). When \( \Omega^+_a \) is connected, every such minimizer has constant sign, cf. [16, Theorem 1.2], so that \( \pm U_q \) are the only minimizers of \( I_q \). However, when \( \Omega^+_a \) is disconnected this is no longer true. An example of a sign-changing minimizer of \( I_q \) is given in [16, Example 6.3] for \( q = 1 \) and \( p = 2 \) (see also Remark 2.5 below for an example with \( 1 < q < p = 2 \)). On the other hand, minimizers of \( I_q \) have constant sign whenever \( U_q > 0 \) in \( \Omega \). Indeed, since \( |U| \) minimizes \( I_q \) whenever \( U \) does, by Theorem 1.1 we have \( |U| \equiv U_q \). Thus \( U \) does not change sign if \( U_q > 0 \). This occurs when \( q = p \) (in which case \( U_q \) has to be understood as a positive eigenfunction of \( (P_q) \)), thanks to the strong maximum principle. By some sort of continuity, this property holds also for \( q \) close to \( p \):

**Theorem 1.2.** Given \( a \in C(\Omega) \) there exists \( q_0 = q_0(a) \in (1, p) \) such that any minimizer of \( I_q \) has constant sign and \( U_q \) is the only positive solution of \( (P_q) \) for \( q \in (q_0, p) \).

We point out that the first assertion in Theorem 1.2 seems to be new even for \( p = 2 \). It can be considered as an extension of the fact that the first positive eigenvalue of

\[
\begin{aligned}
-\Delta_p u &= \lambda a(x)|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega, \\
B u &= 0 & \text{on } \partial \Omega,
\end{aligned}
\]

is principal, i.e., its eigenfunctions have constant sign. As for the second assertion, it extends (together with Theorem 1.1) to \( p \neq 2 \) two of the results in [13, Theorem 1.2]. To the best of our knowledge, apart from [13] where the one-dimensional Dirichlet problem is considered, this is the first result (in the sublinear and indefinite case) on the existence of a positive solution of \( (P_q) \) with \( p \neq 2 \), for both Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions. For the case \( p = 2 \) we refer to [14, 15] and references therein.
Remark 1.3.

1. For the sake of simplicity, we have assumed that \( a \in C(\Omega) \). However, our results hold also if \( a \in L^\infty(\Omega) \). In this case we set \( \Omega^+_a \) as the largest open set where \( a > 0 \) a.e.

2. Since the proof of Theorem 1.1 does not rely on the strong maximum principle, it holds more generally if \( \Omega \) is a bounded domain (not necessarily smooth). In this way, we also improve (in the powerlike case) the uniqueness results in [9], where \( \Omega \) is assumed to be smooth, and [2, 3], where \( \Omega^+_a \) is required to be smooth and to have finitely many connected components.

3. We believe that for \( q \) close to \( p \) the ground state solution \( U_q \) is the unique nontrivial solution of \((P_q)\). This result is known for \( p = 2 \), assuming that \( \Omega^+_a \) has finitely many connected components, cf. [14].

The proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are divided into several Propositions and Lemmata, stated in the next section.

Notation

Throughout this paper, we use the following notation:

- \( \Omega_f := \{ x \in \Omega : f(x) > 0 \} \) for \( f \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \).
- Given \( u \) such that \( \int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^q > 0 \) we denote by \( \tilde{u} \) the projection of \( u \) over \( S_a \), i.e. \( \tilde{u} := (\int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^q)^{-\frac{1}{q}} u \).
- Given \( r > 1 \), we denote by \( \| \cdot \| \) the usual norm in \( L^r(\Omega) \) and by \( \| \cdot \| \) the usual norm in \( X \), i.e. \( \|u\| = \|\nabla u\|_p \) if \( X = W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \) and \( \|u\| = \|\nabla u\|_p + \|u\|_p \) if \( X = W^{1,p}(\Omega) \).
- If \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^N \) then we denote by \( 1_A \) the characteristic function of \( A \).

2 Proofs

We set

\[
M := \inf_{u \in X} I_q(u) \quad \text{and} \quad m := \inf_{v \in S_a} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^p.
\]

Let us show that these infima provide the same solutions of \((P_q)\), and these ones are positive in \( \Omega^+_a \):

Lemma 2.1.

1. There exists \( U \in X \) such that \( U \geq 0 \) and \( I_q(U) = M < 0 \).
2. There exists \( V \in S_a \) such that \( V \geq 0 \) and \( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla V|^p = m > 0 \).
3. If \( I_q(U) = M \) then \( \int_{\Omega} a(x)|U|^q > 0 \) and \( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{U}|^p = m \).
4. If \( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla V|^p = m \) and \( V \in S_a \) then \( I_q(CV) = M \) for some \( C > 0 \).
5. If $I_q(U) = M$ and $U \geq 0$ then $U > 0$ in $\Omega_a^+$. 
6. If $\int_\Omega |\nabla V|^p = m$, $V \in \mathcal{S}_a$, and $V \geq 0$ then $V > 0$ in $\Omega_a^+$. 

Proof. 

1. The proof follows by standard compactness arguments. Let us first show that $M < 0$. Indeed, let $u \in X$ be such that $\int_\Omega a(x)|u|^q > 0$. Then, for $t > 0$ small enough, we have 

$$I_q(tu) = \frac{t^p}{p} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p - \frac{t^q}{q} \int_\Omega a(x)|u|^q < 0,$$

since $q < p$. If $X = W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ then, by Sobolev and Holder inequalities, we find some constant $C > 0$ such that 

$$I_q(u) \geq \frac{1}{p} \|u\|^{p} - C \|u\|^q \quad \forall u \in X,$$

i.e. $I$ is coercive. Now, if $X = W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ then we claim that there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that $\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p \geq C_1 \|u\|^p$ for every $u \in X$ such that $\int_\Omega a(x)|u|^q \geq 0$. Indeed, otherwise there exists a sequence $(u_n) \subset X$ such that 

$$\int_\Omega a(x)|u_n|^q \geq 0, \quad \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^p \to 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_n\| = 1$$

for every $n$. Then, up to a subsequence, we have $u_n \to k$ in $X$, for some constant $k \neq 0$. Since $\int_\Omega a(x)|u_n|^q \geq 0$ it follows that $\int_\Omega a \geq 0$, a contradiction. Thus the claim is proved and it implies that 

$$I_q(u) \geq \begin{cases} C_1 \|u\|^p - C \|u\|^q & \text{if } \int_\Omega a(x)|u|^q \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \int_\Omega a(x)|u|^q < 0, \end{cases}$$

so that $I$ is bounded from below in $X$ in both cases. Therefore, since $I_q$ is weakly lower semi-continuous we deduce that $I_q(U) = M < 0$ for some $U \in X$, which can be chosen nonnegative, since $I_q(u) = I_q(|u|)$. 

2. Since $v \mapsto \int_\Omega |\nabla v|^p$ is weakly lower semi-continuous and $\mathcal{S}_a$ is weakly closed in $X$, we see that there exists $V \in \mathcal{S}_a$ such that $\int_\Omega |\nabla V|^p = m$. Moreover since $\int_\Omega |\nabla V|^p = \int_\Omega |\nabla v|^p$, we can take $V \geq 0$. Finally, if $X = W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ then $V$ is not a constant, in view of the condition $f_\Omega a < 0$. 

3. Let $U$ be such that $I_q(U) = M$. Since $M < 0$ we have that $\int_\Omega a(x)|U|^q > 0$. Let $V \in \mathcal{S}_a$ be such that $\int_\Omega |\nabla V|^p = m$. Then 

$$I_q(U) \leq I_q(tV) = \frac{t^p}{p} \int_\Omega |\nabla V|^p - \frac{t^q}{q} \int_\Omega a(x)|V|^q = \frac{t^p}{p}m - \frac{t^q}{q},$$

for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We choose $t = (\int_\Omega a(x)|U|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}$, so that 

$$\frac{1}{p} \int_\Omega |\nabla U|^p - \frac{1}{q} \int_\Omega a(x)|U|^q = I_q(U) \leq \frac{1}{p} \left( \int_\Omega a(x)|U|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} m - \frac{1}{q} \int_\Omega a(x)|U|^q,$$ 
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i.e.
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla U|^p \leq \left( \int_{\Omega} a(x)|U|^q \right)^\frac{p}{q} m.
\]
Thus \( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{U}|^p \leq m \), which yields the desired conclusion.

4. We use a similar trick. Let \( U \) be as in the first item. Then, by the previous item,
\[
I_q(tV) = \frac{tp}{q} m - \frac{t^q}{q} = \frac{tp}{q} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{U}|^p - \frac{t^q}{q} = \frac{tp}{q} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla U|^p - \frac{t^q}{q},
\]
so that, taking \( t = \left( \int_{\Omega} a(x)|U|^q \right)^\frac{1}{q} \), we find that
\[
I_q(tV) = \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla U|^p - \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega} a(x)|U|^q = M,
\]
which concludes the proof.

5. Let \( U \geq 0 \) be such that \( I_q(U) = M \). If \( U(x_0) = 0 \) for some \( x_0 \in \Omega_+^a \) then, by the strong maximum principle, \( U \equiv 0 \) in a ball \( B \subset \Omega_+^a \). We choose then \( \phi \in C_0^\infty(B) \) with \( \phi \geq 0, \phi \neq 0 \). Then, for \( t > 0 \) small enough, we have \( I_q(t\phi) < 0 \), so that
\[
I_q(U + t\phi) = I_q(U) + I_q(t\phi) < I_q(U) = M,
\]
and we obtain a contradiction. Thus \( U > 0 \) in \( \Omega_+^a \).

6. It follows from (4) and (5).

Let us prove now that \( m \) is achieved by exactly one nonnegative minimizer, which we denote by \( V_q \) from now on. This result was proved in [16] in a more general setting, but we include the proof here for completeness. It relies on the following inequality, which is a particular case of [16, Proposition 6.1]:

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \( q \in [1,p] \) and \( \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in [0,1] \) with \( \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1 \). Then, for any \( \eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^N \), we have
\[
\left| \alpha_1^{q-1} \eta_1 + \alpha_2^{q-1} \eta_2 \right|^p \leq 2^{q-1} \left( |\eta_1|^p + |\eta_2|^p \right),
\]
with strict inequality if \( \alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2 \) and \( |\eta_1| + |\eta_2| \neq 0 \).

**Proposition 2.3.** There exists exactly one \( V_q \in S_a \) such that \( V_q \geq 0 \) and
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla V_q|^p = m.
\]

**Proof.** Assume that \( V_1, V_2 \geq 0 \) satisfy
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla V_1|^p = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla V_2|^p = m \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} a(x)V_1^q = \int_{\Omega} a(x)V_2^q = 1.
\]
We set \( W := \left( \frac{V_{1}^{q} + V_{2}^{q}}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \), so that \( \int_{\Omega} a(x) W^{q} = 1 \), and
\[
\nabla W = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{V_{1}^{q} + V_{2}^{q}}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{q} - 1} \left( V_{1}^{q-1} \nabla V_{1} + V_{2}^{q-1} \nabla V_{2} \right) 1_{\Omega_{1}^{+} \cup \Omega_{2}^{+}} \\
= 2^{-\frac{1}{q}} \left[ \left( \frac{V_{1}^{q}}{V_{1}^{q} + V_{2}^{q}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q} - 1} \nabla V_{1} + \left( \frac{V_{2}^{q}}{V_{1}^{q} + V_{2}^{q}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q} - 1} \nabla V_{2} \right] 1_{\Omega_{1}^{+} \cup \Omega_{2}^{+}}.
\]

We apply Lemma 2.2 with \( \alpha_{1} = \left( \frac{V_{1}^{q}}{V_{1}^{q} + V_{2}^{q}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \), \( \alpha_{2} = \left( \frac{V_{2}^{q}}{V_{1}^{q} + V_{2}^{q}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \), \( \eta_{1} = \nabla V_{1} \), and \( \eta_{2} = \nabla V_{2} \). Thus
\[
\left| \left( \frac{V_{1}^{q}}{V_{1}^{q} + V_{2}^{q}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q} - 1} \nabla V_{1} + \left( \frac{V_{2}^{q}}{V_{1}^{q} + V_{2}^{q}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q} - 1} \nabla V_{2} \right|^{p} \leq 2^{\frac{q}{p} - 1} (|\nabla V_{1}|^{p} + |\nabla V_{2}|^{p})
\]
in \( \Omega_{1}^{+} \cup \Omega_{2}^{+} \), with strict inequality in the set
\[
E := \{ x \in \Omega_{1}^{+} \cup \Omega_{2}^{+} : V_{1}(x) \neq V_{2}(x), |\nabla V_{1}(x)| + |\nabla V_{2}(x)| \neq 0 \}.
\]
It follows that
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla W|^{p} \leq 2^{-\frac{q}{p}} \int_{\Omega_{1}^{+} \cup \Omega_{2}^{+}} 2^{\frac{q}{p} - 1} (|\nabla V_{1}|^{p} + |\nabla V_{2}|^{p}) \leq m.
\]
Thus \( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla W|^{p} = m \) and \( |E| = 0 \), so that for almost every \( x \in \Omega \) we have
\[
V_{1}(x) = V_{2}(x) \quad \text{or} \quad \nabla V_{1}(x) = \nabla V_{2}(x) = 0
\]
In particular, \( \nabla V_{1} = \nabla V_{2} \) a.e. in \( \Omega \), so \( V_{1} \equiv V_{2} + C \), for some constant \( C \). If \( C \neq 0 \) then, from the alternative above, we have \( \nabla V_{1} = \nabla V_{2} = 0 \) a.e. in \( \Omega \), which is impossible. Therefore \( V_{1} \equiv V_{2} \), and the proof is complete.

From Lemma 2.11(3) we deduce that \( I_{q} \) has a unique nonnegative minimizer, and we denote it by \( U_{q} \) from now on.

**Corollary 2.4.** There exists exactly one \( U_{q} \in X \) such that \( U_{q} \geq 0 \) and \( I_{q}(U_{q}) = M \).

**Proof.** If \( U_{1}, U_{2} \in X \) satisfy \( U_{1}, U_{2} \geq 0 \) and \( I_{q}(U_{1}) = I_{q}(U_{2}) = M \) then, by Lemma 2.11(3) and Proposition 2.3, we have \( \hat{U}_{1} \equiv \hat{U}_{2} \equiv V_{q} \). Thus \( U_{1} = CU_{2} \), for some \( C > 0 \). But since \( U_{1} \) and \( U_{2} \) solve \( (P_{q}) \), we infer that \( C = 1 \).

**Remark 2.5.** When \( \Omega_{a}^{+} \) is connected, every minimizer of \( I_{q} \) has a sign, cf. [16] Theorem 1.2. However, when \( \Omega_{a}^{+} \) is disconnected \( I_{q} \) may have a sign-changing minimizer, cf. [16] Example 6.3] for \( q = 1 \) and \( p = 2 \). More generally, for \( 1 < q < p = 2 \), this situation occurs, for instance, if \( \Omega = (b,c) \) and \( \Omega_{a}^{+} = (b, b+d) \cup (c, c-d) \), for some \( d > 0 \). If \( a \) is sufficiently negative in \((b + \delta, c - \delta)\) then any solution of \((P_{q})\) vanishes in a subinterval of \((b + \delta, c - \delta)\), cf. [12] Theorem 3.2. Thus \( U_{q} \) has two positive bumps, so that changing the sign of one of these bumps one gets a sign-changing minimizer of \( I_{q} \).
The next step is to show that \( U_q \) is the only solution of \((P_q)\) satisfying \( U_q > 0 \) in \( \Omega^+_a \). This result, which has been proved in [3, Theorem 5.1] for \( a \equiv 1 \), is based on the following generalized Picone’s identity (or inequality). We also include a (simpler) proof here, since [6, Proposition 2.9] deals with a more general differential operator. Note that when \( q = p \) we obtain the usual Picone’s identity, which has been used to prove the simplicity of the first \( p \)-Laplacian eigenvalue (among other results), cf. [1].

**Lemma 2.6** (Generalized Picone’s identity). Let \( q \in [1, p] \) and \( u, v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) \) with \( u > 0 \) and \( v \geq 0 \). Then

\[
|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left( \frac{v^q}{u^{q-1}} \right) \leq |\nabla u|^{p-q} |\nabla v|^q.
\]

**Proof.** Note that

\[
|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left( \frac{v^q}{u^{q-1}} \right) = q \left( \frac{v}{u} \right)^{q-1} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla v - (q-1) \left( \frac{v}{u} \right)^q |\nabla u|^p
\]

We apply Young’s inequality \( ab \leq \frac{a^r}{q} + \frac{b^{r'}}{r} \) with \( a = \left( \frac{v}{u} \right)^{q-1} |\nabla u|^\frac{p(q-1)}{q} \), \( b = |\nabla u|^{-\frac{p(q-1)}{q}} |\nabla v| \), and \( r = \frac{q}{q-1} \), so that \( r' = q \). Thus

\[
\left( \frac{v}{u} \right)^{q-1} |\nabla u|^{p-2} |\nabla v| = ab \leq \frac{q-1}{q} \left( \frac{v}{u} \right)^q |\nabla u|^p + \frac{1}{q} |\nabla u|^{p-q} |\nabla v|^q,
\]

which yields the desired conclusion. \( \square \)

**Proposition 2.7.** If \( u \) is a solution of \((P_q)\) such that \( u > 0 \) in \( \Omega^+_a \) then \( u \equiv U_q \).

**Proof.** Let \( \epsilon > 0 \). We take \( \frac{V_q^q}{(u+\epsilon)^q} \) as test function in \((P_q)\) and apply Lemma 2.6 (with \( u + \epsilon \) instead of \( u \)) to obtain

\[
\int_{\Omega} a(x)u^{q-1} \frac{V_q^q}{(u+\epsilon)^q} = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \left( \frac{V_q^q}{(u+\epsilon)^q} \right) \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-q} |\nabla V_q|^q.
\]

Now, by Holder’s inequality we find that

\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-q} |\nabla V_q|^q \leq \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{p-q}{p}} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla V_q|^p \right)^{\frac{q}{p}} = m^{\frac{p}{2}} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{p-q}{p}}.
\]

Note that \( \frac{u}{u+\epsilon} \to 1_{\Omega^+_a} \) as \( \epsilon \to 0 \). Thus, by Lebesgue’s dominated convergence theorem and the above inequalities, we have

\[
\int_{\Omega} a(x)|V_q|^q = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \int_{\Omega} a(x)|V_q|^q \left( \frac{u}{u+\epsilon} \right)^{q-1} \leq m^{\frac{p}{2}} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{p-q}{p}}.
\]

In addition, since \( u > 0 \) in \( \Omega^+_a \), we have \( a \leq 0 \) in \( \Omega \setminus \Omega^+_a \), which implies that

\[
\int_{\Omega} a(x)|V_q|^q = 1 - \int_{\Omega,\Omega^+_a} a(x)|V_q|^q \leq 1,
\]

and therefore

\[
\left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{p-q}{p}} \leq m.
\]
Now, since \( u \) solves \((P_q)\), we have \( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p = \int_{\Omega} a(x) u^q \), so the latter inequality yields
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^p = \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p}{(\int_{\Omega} a(x) u^q)^{\frac{p}{q}}} \leq m,
\]
i.e. \( \tilde{u} \equiv V_q \). By Lemma 2.1 (4) and Corollary 2.4, we conclude that \( u \equiv U_q \). □

Next we prove a generalization of the uniqueness assertion in Proposition 2.7. This result extends [2, Theorem 2.1] to \( p \neq 2 \), without requiring any smoothness condition on \( \Omega^+_a \), nor the finiteness of \( \mathcal{J} \).

**Proposition 2.8.** Let \( \{ \Omega_i : i \in \mathcal{I} \} \) be the connected components of \( \Omega^+_a \), and \( \mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{I} \). Then \((P_q)\) has at most one solution such that \( u > 0 \) in \( \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{J}} \Omega_i \) and \( u \equiv 0 \) in \( \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{J}} \Omega_i \).

**Proof.** Set \( m_j := \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^p : v \in \mathcal{S}_u \text{ and } v \equiv 0 \text{ in } \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{J}} \Omega_i \right\} \). Arguing as in Proposition 2.3, we can show that \( m_j \) is achieved by a unique \( V_j \geq 0 \). Repeating the proof of Proposition 2.7 with \( V_j \) instead of \( V \), we obtain
\[
\int_{\Omega^+_j} a(x)|V_j|^q = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \int_{\Omega} a(x)|V_j|^q \left( \frac{u}{u + \epsilon} \right)^{q-1} \leq m_j \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \right)^{\frac{p}{q}}.
\]
Now, since \( V_j = 0 \) in \( \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{J}} \Omega_i \), we have \( a(x)V_j^q \leq 0 \) in \( \Omega \setminus \Omega^+_j \), so that
\[
1 = \int_{\Omega} a(x)|V_j|^q = \int_{\Omega^+_j} a(x)|V_j|^q + \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega^+_j} a(x)|V_j|^q \leq \int_{\Omega^+_j} a(x)|V_j|^q.
\]
The rest of the argument yields that \( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{u}|^p \leq m_j \), i.e. \( \tilde{u} \equiv V_j \). □

The existence of solutions as the ones in the aforementioned proposition is a more delicate issue that requires some conditions on \( a \) and \( q \) allowing dead cores formation in \((P_q)\). When \( p = 2 \), we know that these solutions do not exist for \( q \) close enough to \( p \), cf. [14].

We prove now that minimizers of \( I_q \) do not change sign when \( q \) is close to \( p \). Recall that
\[
\lambda_1(a) = \min \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^p : v \in X, \int_{\Omega} a(x)|v|^p = 1 \right\}
\]
is the first positive eigenvalue of
\[
\begin{cases}
-\Delta_p u = \lambda a(x)|u|^{p-2} u & \text{in } \Omega, \\
B u = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Omega.
\end{cases}
\]
We denote by \( \phi_1(a) \) a positive eigenfunction associated to \( \lambda_1(a) \). By the strong maximum principle, we have \( \phi_1(a) \in \mathcal{P}^0 \), where
\[
\mathcal{P}^0 := \left\{ u \in C^0(\overline{\Omega}) : u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \partial_{\nu} u < 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega \right\} \quad \text{if } B u = u,
\] \[
\{ u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) : u > 0 \text{ on } \Omega \} \quad \text{if } B u = \partial_{\nu} u.
\]
Proposition 2.9. There exists \( q_0 = q_0(a) \in (1,p) \) such that \( U_q \in \mathcal{P}^c \) for \( q \in (q_0,p) \). In particular, any minimizer of \( I_q \) has constant sign for \( q \in (q_0,p) \).

Proof. Since \( \lambda_1(c\alpha) = c^{-1} \lambda_1(a) \) for any \( c > 0 \), and \( u \) solves \((P_q)\) if, and only if, \( c^{-1}u \) solves \((P_q)\) with \( a \) replaced by \( ca \), we can assume without loss of generality that \( \lambda_1(a) < 1 \). Assume by contradiction that there exists a sequence \( q_n \to p^- \) with \( u_n \notin \mathcal{P}^c \), where \( u_n := U_{q_n} \). First we assume that \((u_n)\) is bounded in \( X \), so that, up to a subsequence, \( u_n \to u_0 \) in \( X \), \( u_n \to u_0 \) in \( L^t(\Omega) \) with \( t \in (1,p^*) \), and \( u_n \to u_0 \) a.e. in \( \Omega \), for some \( u_0 \in X \). It follows that \( u_0 \geq 0 \) and

\[
\frac{1}{p} \int_\Omega (|\nabla u_n|^p - a(x)|u_n|^p) \leq \liminf I_{q_n}(u_n) \leq \liminf I_{q_n}(\phi_1)
\]

which shows that \( u_0 \neq 0 \). Moreover, one easily see that \( u_n \to u_0 \) in \( X \) and \( v_0 \) solves \( -\Delta_p u_0 = a(x)u_0^{p-1} \) in \( \Omega \). Since \( \int_\Omega a u_0^{p-1} > 0 \), we have \( \int_\Omega a u_0^p > 0 \), and consequently \( \lambda_1(a) = 1 \), a contradiction. Thus \((u_n)\) is unbounded in \( X \). We can assume that

\[
|u_n| \to \infty, \quad v_n := \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|} \to v_0 \text{ in } X, \quad v_n \to v_0 \text{ in } L^t(\Omega) \text{ with } t \in (1,p^*),
\]

for some \( v_0 \in X \). Note that \( v_n \) satisfies

\[
-\Delta_p v_n = a(x)\frac{v_n^{p-1}}{\|u_n\|^{p-q_0}}, \quad v_n \geq 0, \quad v_n \in X. \tag{2.1}
\]

Since \( \|u_n\| \geq 1 \) for \( n \) large enough, we have either \( \|u_n\|^{p-q_0} \to \infty \) or \( \|u_n\|^{p-q_0} \) is bounded. In the first case, from (2.1) we have

\[
\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^p = \int_\Omega a(x)\frac{v_n^{p-1}}{\|u_n\|^{p-q_0}} \to 0,
\]

which is a contradiction. Now, if \( \|u_n\|^{p-q_0} \) is bounded then we can assume that \( \|u_n\|^{p-q_0} \to d > 1 \). From (2.1), we obtain

\[
\int_\Omega |\nabla v_0|^{p-2}\nabla v_0 \nabla \phi = \frac{1}{d} \int_\Omega a(x)v_0^{p-1} \phi, \quad \forall \phi \in X,
\]

i.e.

\[
-\Delta_p v_0 = \frac{1}{d} a(x)v_0^{p-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad v_0 \in X.
\]

In addition, \( v_n \to v_0 \) in \( X \), so that \( v_0 \neq 0 \) and \( v_0 \geq 0 \) (which implies that \( \lambda_1(a) = d^{-1} \)). By the strong maximum principle, we deduce that \( v_0 \in \mathcal{P}^c \).

Finally, by elliptic regularity, we find that \( v_n \to v_0 \) in \( C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \). Consequently \( v_n \in \mathcal{P}^c \) for \( n \) large enough, which contradicts \( u_n \notin \mathcal{P}^c \). Therefore there exists \( q_0(a) = q_0 \in (1,p) \) such that \( U_q \in \mathcal{P}^c \) for \( q \in (q_0,p) \), which shows in particular that any minimizer of \( I_q \) has constant sign for such \( q \).

\( \square \)

Remark 2.10.
1. In the Dirichlet case, Proposition 2.9 can be extended as follows: given $q \in (1, p)$ and $a^+$ fixed, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $U_a \in P^\circ$ if $\|a^-\|_\infty < \delta$, where $U_a$ is the unique nonnegative minimizer of

$$I_a(u) = \int_\Omega \left( \frac{1}{p} |\nabla u|^p - \frac{1}{q} a(x)|u|^q \right),$$

defined on $W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$. In particular, minimizers of $I_a$ have constant sign if $\|a^-\|_\infty < \delta$. Indeed, assume that $a_n = a^+ - a_n^-$, with $a_n^- \to 0$ in $C(\overline{\Omega})$, and let $u_n := U_{a_n}$. Then $(u_n)$ is bounded in $W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$, since

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^p \leq \int_\Omega a^+(x)|u_n|^q.$$

One can show then that $u_n \to u_0$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, and $u_0 \geq 0$ solves $-\Delta_p u = a^+(x)u^{p-1}$. Moreover $u_0 \not\equiv 0$ since

$$I_{a^+}(u_0) = \lim_{n \to \infty} I_{a_n}(u_n) \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} I_{a_n}(u_+) = I_{a^+}(u_+) < 0,$$

where $u_+$ is the nonnegative minimizer of $I_{a^+}$. Thus $u_0 \in P^\circ$, which yields a contradiction.

2. The proof of Proposition 2.9 also shows that $U_q$ has the following asymptotic behavior as $q \to p^-$:

- $\|U_q\|_\infty \to \infty$ if $\lambda_1(a) < 1$.
- $U_q \to 0$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ if $\lambda_1(a) > 1$.

This fact has been observed for $p = 2$ in [15].
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