

Non-existence of dead cores in fully nonlinear elliptic models

by

João Vitor da Silva^{*†}, Disson dos Prazeres[‡] & Humberto Ramos Quoirin[§]

Abstract

We investigate non-existence of nonnegative dead-core solutions for the problem

$$|Du|^{\gamma}F(x, D^2u) + a(x)u^q = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

Here $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded smooth domain, F is a fully nonlinear elliptic operator, $a : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a sign-changing weight, $\gamma \geq 0$, and $0 < q < \gamma + 1$. We show that this problem has no non-trivial dead core solutions if either q is close enough to $\gamma + 1$ or the negative part of a is sufficiently small. In addition, we obtain the existence and uniqueness of a positive solution under these conditions on q and a . Our results extend previous ones established in the semilinear case, and are new even for the simple model $|Du(x)|^{\gamma}\text{Tr}(A(x)D^2u(x)) + a(x)u^q(x) = 0$, where $A \in C^0(\Omega; \text{Sym}(N))$ is a uniformly elliptic and non-negative matrix.

Keywords: Fully nonlinear operators of degenerate type, dead core problems, existence/non-existence of positive solutions.

AMS Subject Classifications: 35A01, 35D40, 35J15, 35J66, 35J70

1 Introduction

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded and smooth domain with $N \geq 1$. This work is devoted to the problem

$$(P_{a,q}) \quad \begin{cases} |Du|^{\gamma}F(x, D^2u) + a(x)u^q = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\gamma \geq 0$, $q \in (0, \gamma + 1)$, $a \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ changes sign, and $F : \Omega \times \text{Sym}(N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a second order fully nonlinear elliptic operator satisfying the following assumptions:

^{*}Departamento de Matemática - Instituto de Ciências Exatas - Universidade de Brasília. Campus Universitário Darcy Ribeiro, 70910-900, Brasília - Distrito Federal - Brazil. E-mail address: J.V.Silva@mat.unb.br

[†]Instituto de Investigaciones Matemáticas Luis A. Santaló (IMAS) - CONICET (Argentine), Ciudad Universitaria, Pabellón I (1428) Av. Cantilo s/n - Buenos Aires E-mail address: jdasilva@dm.uba.ar

[‡]Universidade Federal de Sergipe, Departamento de Matemática - Aracaju, Brazil. E-mail address: disson@mat.ufs.br

[§]CIEM-Famaf, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, (5000) Córdoba, Argentina E-mail address: humbertorq@gmail.com

(F1) [\$(\lambda, \Lambda)\$-Ellipticity condition] There exist constants \$\Lambda \ge \lambda > 0\$ (known as *ellipticity parameters*) such that for any \$x \in \Omega\$ and \$X, Y \in \text{Sym}(N)\$, with \$Y \ge 0\$ there holds

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(Y) \leq F(x, X+Y) - F(x, X) \leq \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(Y),$$

where \$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^\pm\$ denote the *Pucci's extremal operators*:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(X) := \lambda \cdot \sum_{e_i < 0} e_i(X) + \Lambda \cdot \sum_{e_i > 0} e_i(X) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^-(X) := \lambda \cdot \sum_{e_i > 0} e_i(X) + \Lambda \cdot \sum_{e_i < 0} e_i(X)$$

and \$\{e_i(X) : 1 \le i \le N\}\$ are the eigenvalues of \$X\$.

(F2) [1-Homogeneity condition] For all \$s \in \mathbb{R}^*\$, \$x \in \Omega\$ and \$X \in \text{Sym}(N)\$ there holds

$$F(x, sX) = |s|F(x, X).$$

(F3) [Continuity condition] There exists a modulus of continuity \$\omega : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)\$ with \$\omega(0) = 0\$ such that for all \$(x, y, X) \in \Omega \times \Omega \times \text{Sym}(N)\$

$$|F(x, X) - F(y, X)| \leq \omega(|x - y|)\|X\|.$$

Some examples of operators satisfying our assumptions are given next:

1. Second order operators in non-divergence form:

$$F(x, D^2u) := \mathcal{L}u(x) = \sum_{i, j=1}^N a_{ij}(x) \partial_{ij}u(x),$$

where \$(a_{ij})_{i, j=1}^N\$ is a uniformly elliptic and symmetric matrix with (uniformly) continuous coefficients.

2. Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman and Isaac's type operators:

The following Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB in short) and Isaac's type operators, which appear in control problems for stochastic systems and in the theory of (zero-sum two-player) stochastic differential games, see e.g [9, 22, 23, 24]:

$$F(x, D^2u) := \inf_{\hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\alpha}}u(x)) \quad \left(\text{respect.} \quad \sup_{\hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\alpha}}u(x)) \right),$$

and

$$F(x, D^2u) := \sup_{\hat{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}} \inf_{\hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}u(x)) \quad \left(\text{respect.} \quad \inf_{\hat{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{\hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}u(x)) \right).$$

Here \$\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}u(x) = \sum_{i, j=1}^N a_{ij}^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}(x) \partial_{ij}u(x)\$ is a family of uniformly elliptic operators with coefficients enjoying a universal modulus of continuity and ellipticity constants \$\Lambda \ge \lambda > 0\$.

3. Pucci's extremal operators:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^+(X) = \max \{ \text{Tr}(AX) : \lambda I \leq A \leq \Lambda I \text{ for } A \in \text{Sym}(N) \}$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\Lambda}^-(X) = \min \{ \text{Tr}(AX) : \lambda I \leq A \leq \Lambda I \text{ for } A \in \text{Sym}(N) \}$$

4. p -Laplacian type operators:

Other interesting examples are given by the p -Laplacian operator (in non-divergence form) with $\gamma = p - 2$ (for $p > 1$)

$$G_p(\xi, X) = |\xi|^\gamma F_p(\xi, X)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_p(\xi, X) &:= (\text{Tr}(X) + (p-2)|\xi|^{-2} \langle X\xi, \xi \rangle) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left[\left(I + (p-2) \frac{\xi \otimes \xi}{|\xi|^2} \right) X \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we can also quote non-variational generalizations of the p -Laplacian operator, with continuous coefficients, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{c_0}(x, \xi, X) &:= \text{Tr}(\mathcal{A}_1(x)X) - c_0 |\xi|^{-2} \langle X \mathcal{A}_2(x) \xi, \mathcal{A}_2(x) \xi \rangle \\ &= \text{Tr} \left[\left(\mathcal{A}_1(x) + c_0 \frac{\mathcal{A}_2(x) \xi \otimes \mathcal{A}_2(x) \xi}{|\xi|^2} \right) X \right]. \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2 : \Omega \rightarrow \text{Sym}(N)$ are θ -Hölderian functions with $\theta > \frac{1}{2}$, $\lambda I \leq \mathcal{A}_1 \leq \Lambda I$, $-\sqrt{\lambda} I \leq \mathcal{A}_2 \leq \sqrt{\lambda} I$ and $c_0 > -1$.

We refer the reader to [1], [5], [6], [7], [10, Chapter 2], [26] and references therein for a number of examples of fully nonlinear operators with such structural properties.

Note that when $\gamma > 0$ the operator $|Du|^\gamma F(x, D^2u)$ is degenerate in the gradient. Thanks to (F1) this operator is $(\gamma + 1)$ -homogeneous and since $q < \gamma + 1$, the reaction term in the equation is 'sub-homogeneous' in comparison with the operator. This fact, combined with the change of sign of a , prevents the use of the strong maximum principle and enables the existence of *dead core* solutions, i.e. nontrivial solutions vanishing in some part of the domain. It is worth pointing out that the condition $a^+ \not\equiv 0$ is necessary for the existence of nontrivial solutions of $(P_{a,q})$. We refer to [3] for an essay on the validity of the strong maximum principle and [2, 13, 14, 15, 16] for several features on dead core type problems.

Specifically, our main aim in this manuscript is to extend the positivity results established in [21], where a simplified semilinear version of $(P_{a,q})$ has been considered for Δ , the Laplace operator. Based on a continuity argument, it was proved in [21, Theorems 1.1 and 1.3] that the positivity property obtained via the strong maximum principle still holds for nonnegative solutions of the equation

$$\Delta u + a(x)u^q = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

as long as a and q nearly satisfy the conditions to apply this principle (i.e. $a \geq 0$ or $q = 1$). Such continuity argument combines some ingredients that turn out to be available for $(P_{a,q})$ as well, namely: $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity estimates up to the boundary, the sub-supersolution method, the strong maximum principle (with $q = \gamma + 1$ or $a \geq 0$), and the homogeneity of the reaction term and the operator.

In view of the non-divergence nature of our equations, we are not allowed to employ the classical theory of weak solutions in Sobolev spaces. Solutions of $(P_{a,q})$ will then be considered in the viscosity sense, as follows:

Definition 1.1 (Viscosity solutions). Let $G : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \text{Sym}(N)$ be continuous. Then $u \in C(\Omega)$ is a viscosity super-solution (respect. sub-solution) of

$$(1.1) \quad G(x, u, Du, D^2u) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

if for every $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $\phi \in C^2(\Omega)$ such that $u - \phi$ has a local minimum at x_0 (resp. local maximum at x_0), one has

$$G(x_0, u(x_0), D\phi(x_0), D^2\phi(x_0)) \leq 0 \quad (\text{respect. } \geq 0).$$

Finally, u is said to be a viscosity solution of the above equation if it is simultaneously a viscosity super-solution and a viscosity sub-solution.

A solution u of $(P_{a,q})$ is said to be:

- non-trivial if $u \not\equiv 0$;
- positive if $u > 0$ in Ω .
- a *dead core* solution if it vanishes in an open subset of Ω .

We state now our main results. Our first result, proved by the method of sub-solution and super-solution, guarantees that $(P_{a,q})$ has a nontrivial solution.

Theorem 1.2 (Existence of nontrivial solutions). *Assume (F1) and (F2). Then $(P_{a,q})$ has a non-trivial viscosity solution.*

By adapting some ideas from [11] and [19], we are able to ensure that $(P_{a,q})$ has at most one positive solution.

Theorem 1.3 (Uniqueness of positive solution). *Assume (F1) and (F2). Then $(P_{a,q})$ has at most one positive solution.*

Let us set $\Omega^+ := \{x \in \Omega : a(x) > 0\}$ and

$$\mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega) := \left\{ u \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega}) : u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \text{ and } \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} < 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\},$$

which is the interior of the *positivity cone* of $C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$, where $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}$ denotes the exterior normal derivative.

The next theorem states that $(P_{a,q})$ has no non-trivial dead-core solution if either $\|a^-\|_\infty$ is sufficiently small or q is close enough to $\gamma + 1$.

Theorem 1.4 (Non-existence of dead-core solutions). *Assume (F1), (F2), (F3), and that Ω_+ has finitely many connected components. Then:*

1. There exists $\delta = \delta(N, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma, q, a^+, \Omega) > 0$ such that every nontrivial solution of $(P_{a,q})$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$ if $\|a^-\|_\infty < \delta$.
2. There exists $q_0 = q_0(N, a, \gamma, \lambda, \Lambda, \Omega) \in [0, \gamma + 1)$ such that every nontrivial solution of $(P_{a,q})$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$ if $q \in (q_0, \gamma + 1]$.

Thanks to the previous results, we deduce the existence and uniqueness of a positive solution under the aforementioned conditions on a and q .

Corollary 1.5 (Existence and uniqueness of nontrivial solution). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 the problem $(P_{a,q})$ has a unique nontrivial solution (which belongs to $\mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$) if either $\|a^-\|_\infty < \delta$ or $q \in (q_0, \gamma + 1)$.*

To the best of our knowledge and as far as degenerate elliptic models in non-divergence form are concerned, Theorems 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 are a novelty even for the model

$$\begin{cases} |Du|^\gamma \text{Tr}(A(x)D^2u) + a(x)u(x)^q = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

with $A \in C^0(\Omega; \text{Sym}(N))$ a uniformly elliptic and non-negative matrix.

Our paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we recall some well-known results concerning the operators considered here. Such results help us in the proofs of our main results. In section 3 we prove the existence theorem and in section 4 we prove the uniqueness of positive solutions. Finally, in section 5 we prove of our main result and give an example of a problem with a dead-core solution.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout this section we recall the results we shall rely on. Let us start with a stability result, which claims that the limit of a sequence of viscosity solutions turns out to be a viscosity solution of the limiting equation, whose proof can be found in [8, Corollary 4.3] and [20, Proposition 2.1].

Lemma 2.1 (Stability). *Let $G_k \in C(\Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \text{Sym}(N))$ and $u_k \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ be viscosity subsolutions (resp. supersolutions) of $G_k(x, u, Du, D^2u) = 0$ in Ω for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume also that $G_k(x, r, p, X) \rightarrow G(x, r, p, X)$ uniformly on compact subsets of $\Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \text{Sym}(N)$ and $u_k \rightarrow u$ uniformly on $\overline{\Omega}$ for some functions G and u , as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then u is a viscosity subsolution (resp. supersolution) of (1.1).*

The following result states the existence of viscosity solutions via the sub-supersolutions method, cf. [20, Proposition 2.3].

Lemma 2.2 (Existence of solutions via sub-supersolutions). *Let $G \in C(\Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \text{Sym}(N))$ and suppose that there is a viscosity subsolution \underline{u} and a viscosity supersolution \overline{u} of (1.1) satisfying $\underline{u} \leq \overline{u}$ and $\underline{u}, \overline{u} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$. Then (1.1) has a viscosity solution satisfying $\underline{u} \leq u \leq \overline{u}$.*

In [5] Birindelli and Demengel proved the following maximum principle result:

Lemma 2.3 (Maximum Principle). *Assume (F1) and (F2). Let u be a positive viscosity solution of $|Du|^\gamma F(x, D^2u) - ku^{1+\gamma} \leq 0$ in Ω , for some constant k . Suppose that $u(x_0) = 0$ for some $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ such that Ω satisfies the interior sphere condition at x_0 . Then there exists $M > 0$ (depending only on the structural data) such that $u(x) > Md_{\partial\Omega}(x)$, where $d_{\partial\Omega}$ is the distance to the boundary.*

As a direct consequence, we are able to prove the following Hopf type lemma:

Lemma 2.4 (Hopf Lemma). *Assume (F1) and (F2). Let u be a positive viscosity solution of $|Du|^\gamma F(x, D^2u) + a(x)u^{1+\gamma} \leq 0$ in Ω . If $u(x_0) = 0$ for some $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ such that Ω satisfies the interior sphere condition at x_0 , then there exists $M > 0$ (depending only on the structural data) such that $u(x) > Md_{\partial\Omega}(x)$, where $d_{\partial\Omega}$ is the distance function to the boundary.*

Proof. It is enough to see that

$$|Du|^\gamma F(D^2u) - \|a\|_\infty u^{1+\gamma} \leq |Du|^\gamma F(D^2u) + a(x)u^{1+\gamma} \leq 0.$$

in the viscosity sense. So the previous Lemma yields the conclusion. \square

As a byproduct of Lemma 2.4 and the $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity estimates up to the boundary [7] for solutions of the limiting problem of $(P_{a,q})$ with $q = 1 + \gamma$, namely,

$$(P_{a,1+\gamma}) \quad \begin{cases} |Du|^\gamma F(x, D^2u) + a(x)u^{1+\gamma}(x) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

we are able to deduce a *Hopf Maximum Principle* (or Hopf-Oleinik type result).

Theorem 2.5 (Hopf Maximum Principle). *Assume (F1) and (F2). Let u be a non-trivial viscosity solution of $(P_{a,1+\gamma})$. Then $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$.*

The next theorem, which plays a fundamental role in proving Theorem 1.4, can be found in [1, Theorem 3.1], [7, Theorem 1.1], [8, Theorem 1.1], [10, Section 8.2] and [19, Theorem 1].

Theorem 2.6 (Gradient estimates). *Assume (F1), (F2), and (F3). Let u be a bounded viscosity solution of*

$$|Du|^\gamma F(x, D^2u) = f \in L^\infty(B_1).$$

Then, for some universal $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$|Du|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)} \leq C(N, \gamma, \lambda, \Lambda) \left(\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} + \|f\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}} \right).$$

Finally, let us consider an eigenvalue problem related to our class of operators. Given a smooth bounded domain $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, we denote by $(\lambda^+(\mathcal{D}), \phi^+(\mathcal{D}))$ the first eigenpair of the eigenvalue problem

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} |D\phi|^\gamma F(x, D^2\phi) = -\lambda\phi^{\gamma+1} & \text{in } \mathcal{D} \\ \phi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{D}, \end{cases}$$

with $\phi^+(\mathcal{D}) > 0$ and $\|\phi^+(\mathcal{D})\|_\infty = 1$. For the existence of this eigenpair, see for instance [4], [6], [12],[17], [18], [25] and references therein.

3 Existence of non-trivial solutions: Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let us establish the existence of non-trivial solutions to $(P_{a,q})$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. First we construct a sub-solution of $(P_{a,q})$. Consider $\bar{\mathcal{B}} \subset \{a > 0\}$ a ball and $(\lambda^+(\mathcal{B}), \phi^+(\mathcal{B}))$ the first eigenpair of the problem (2.1). We claim that for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small $\varepsilon\phi^+$ is a sub-solution of

$$|Du|^\gamma F(x, D^2u) + a(x)u^q(x) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B}.$$

Indeed, since $a > 0$ on $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ we have

$$\lambda^+ \varepsilon^{1+\gamma} \phi^+ = \lambda^+ \varepsilon^{1+\gamma-q} (\phi^+)^{1-q} (\varepsilon\phi^+)^q \leq a(x) (\varepsilon\phi^+)^q \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B},$$

when $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough. In addition,

$$|D(\varepsilon\phi^+)|^\gamma F(x, D^2(\varepsilon\phi^+)) = -\varepsilon^{1+\gamma} \lambda^+ \phi^+.$$

So we can conclude that

$$|D(\varepsilon\phi^+)|^\gamma F(x, D^2(\varepsilon\phi^+)) \geq -a(x) (\varepsilon\phi^+)^q,$$

which proves the claim.

Now we are going to prove that the function

$$\underline{u}_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} \varepsilon\phi^+ & \text{in } \mathcal{B}, \\ 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \mathcal{B} \end{cases}$$

is a viscosity sub-solution of $(P_{a,q})$. Let $\varphi \in C^2(\Omega)$ touch $\underline{u}_\varepsilon$ from above at x_0 . If $\varphi(x_0) = \underline{u}_\varepsilon(x_0) = 0$ then, since 0 is a viscosity solution of $(P_{a,q})$, we have

$$|D\varphi(x_0)|^\gamma F(x_0, D^2\varphi(x_0)) \geq 0 = -a(x_0) (\varphi(x_0))^q.$$

Now if $\varphi(x_0) = \underline{u}_\varepsilon(x_0) > 0$ then $x_0 \in \mathcal{B}$, therefore φ touches $\varepsilon\phi^+$ from above at x_0 . Therefore, we have

$$|D\varphi(x_0)|^\gamma F(x_0, D^2\varphi(x_0)) = -a(x_0) \varphi^q(x_0),$$

which proves the claim.

We look now for a viscosity super-solution of $(P_{a,q})$. To this end, consider $\psi > 0$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} |D\psi|^\gamma F(x, D^2\psi) = -\|a\|_\infty & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \psi = 0 & \text{in } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

and $k \gg 1$ such that

$$k^{1+\gamma-q} > \psi^q,$$

so that

$$|D(k\psi)|^\gamma F(x, D^2(k\psi)) = -k^{1+\gamma} \|a\|_\infty \leq -\|a\|_\infty (k\psi)^q.$$

Since $\|a\|_\infty \geq a(x)$ we have

$$|D(k\psi)|^\gamma F(x, D^2(k\psi)) \leq -a(x)(k\psi)^q.$$

Thus $\bar{u}_k = k\psi$ is a super-solution of $(P_{a,q})$. As $\underline{u}_\varepsilon = 0$ in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$, we see that taking ε smaller and k larger if necessary, we have $\underline{u}_\varepsilon \leq \bar{u}_k$.

By Lemma 2.2 we conclude that there exist a viscosity solution u of $(P_{a,q})$ such that

$$\underline{u}_\varepsilon \leq u \leq \bar{u}_k,$$

and therefore $u \geq 0$ is non-trivial, which proves the theorem. \square

4 Uniqueness of positive solutions: Proof of Theorem 1.3

We adapt ideas from [11] and [19] to show that $(P_{a,q})$ admits at most one positive solution. Nevertheless, the advantage of the method applied here is that we allow a to change sign.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $0 < q < \gamma + 1$ and u be a positive viscosity solution of*

$$(4.1) \quad |Du|^\gamma F(x, D^2u) + a(x)u^q(x) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Then

$$w(x) = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{q}{1+\gamma}} u(x)^{1 - \frac{q}{1+\gamma}}$$

is a positive viscosity solution of

$$(4.2) \quad |Dw|^\gamma F\left(x, D^2w + \left(\frac{q}{1+\gamma-q}\right) \frac{Dw \otimes Dw}{w}\right) + a(x) = 0.$$

Proof. We set $\bar{q} = \frac{q}{1+\gamma}$. Consider $\Phi \in C^2(\Omega)$ a test function for (4.2) that touches w from below at $x = x_0 \in \Omega$, so that

$$\phi(x) = [(1 - \bar{q})\Phi(x)]^{\frac{1}{1-\bar{q}}}$$

touches u from below at $x = x_0$. Since $u > 0$ and $\Phi \in C^2(\Omega)$ we see that $\phi \in C^2$ in a neighborhood of x_0 , so it is a test function for (4.1). Besides, we remark that

$$D\phi(x) = [(1 - \bar{q})\Phi(x)]^{\frac{\bar{q}}{1-\bar{q}}} D\Phi(x)$$

and

$$D^2\phi(x) = [(1 - \bar{q})\Phi(x)]^{\frac{\bar{q}}{1-\bar{q}}} \left(D^2\Phi(x) + \left(\frac{\bar{q}}{1-\bar{q}}\right) \frac{D\Phi(x) \otimes D\Phi(x)}{\Phi(x)} \right).$$

Hence,

$$-a(x_0)u^q(x_0) \geq |D\phi(x_0)|^\gamma F(x_0, D^2\phi(x_0)),$$

and by the 1-homogeneity of the operator F we have

$$-a(x_0)u^q(x_0) \geq [(1-\bar{q})\Phi(x_0)]^{(1+\gamma)\frac{\bar{q}}{1-\bar{q}}} |D\Phi(x_0)|^\gamma F \left(x_0, D^2\Phi(x_0) + \left(\frac{\bar{q}}{1-\bar{q}} \right) \frac{D\Phi(x_0) \otimes D\Phi(x_0)}{\Phi(x_0)} \right).$$

Thus, using the definition of ϕ we obtain

$$-a(x_0)[(1-\bar{q})\Phi(x_0)]^{\frac{q}{1-\bar{q}}} \geq [(1-\bar{q})\Phi(x_0)]^{\frac{(1+\gamma)\bar{q}}{1-\bar{q}}} |D\Phi(x_0)|^\gamma F \left(x_0, D^2\Phi(x_0) + \left(\frac{\bar{q}}{1-\bar{q}} \right) \frac{D\Phi(x_0) \otimes \Phi(x_0)}{\Phi(x_0)} \right).$$

Finally, as $(1+\gamma)\bar{q} = q$, we conclude that

$$-a(x_0) \geq |D\Phi(x_0)|^\gamma F \left(x_0, D^2\Phi(x_0) + \left(\frac{\bar{q}}{1-\bar{q}} \right) \frac{D\Phi(x_0) \otimes \Phi(x_0)}{\Phi(x_0)} \right),$$

which proves that w is a viscosity super-solution of (4.2). In a similar way, one proves that w is a viscosity sub-solution of (4.2). \square

With a little help from Lemma 4.1 we are able to prove our uniqueness result.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Suppose that (4.1) has two positive solutions u_1, u_2 . By Lemma 4.1, it follows that (4.2) has two positive solutions w_1, w_2 . Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ be such that

$$(4.3) \quad \max_{\Omega} (w_1 - w_2) = (w_1 - w_2)(x_0) > 0$$

and Ω_1 be an open connected neighborhood of x_0 where $w_1 - w_2 > 0$. We claim that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2(w_1 - w_2)) \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega_1.$$

To this end we consider

$$\phi(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T A x + bx + c, \quad (A, b, c) \in (\text{Sym}(N), \mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R})$$

a second order polynomial that touches $w_1 - w_2$ from above at $x_1 \in \Omega_1$, i.e. $\phi(x_1) = (w_1 - w_2)(x_1)$ and $\phi > w_1 - w_2$ in $B_r \setminus \{x_1\} \subset \Omega_1$ for some $r \ll 1$. We are going to show that

$$(4.4) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(A) \geq 0.$$

We consider two cases:

First, if $b \neq 0$ then $w_1 - w_2(x_1) - \phi$ has a maximum point at x_1 , so

$$|b|^\gamma F \left(x_1, A + \left(\frac{q}{1+\gamma-q} \right) \frac{b \otimes b}{w_1(x_1)} \right) \geq -a(x_1).$$

In a similar way, $w_2 - w_1(x) + \phi$ has a minimum point at x_1 , so that

$$|b|^\gamma F \left(x_1, -A + \left(\frac{q}{1+\gamma-q} \right) \frac{b \otimes b}{w_2(x_1)} \right) \leq -a(x_1),$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$|b|^{\gamma} F \left(x_1, A + \left(\frac{q}{1+\gamma-q} \right) \frac{b \otimes b}{w_1(x_1)} \right) - |b|^{\gamma} F \left(x_1, -A + \left(\frac{q}{1+\gamma-q} \right) \frac{b \otimes b}{w_2(x_1)} \right) \geq 0.$$

Now, using the condition **(F1)** we have

$$|b|^{\gamma} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+ \left(2A + \left(\frac{q}{1+\gamma-q} \right) \left(\frac{1}{w_1(x_1)} - \frac{1}{w_2(x_1)} \right) b \otimes b \right) \geq 0,$$

and therefore, since $b \neq 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+ \left(2A + \left(\frac{q}{1+\gamma-q} \right) \left(\frac{1}{w_1(x_1)} - \frac{1}{w_2(x_1)} \right) b \otimes b \right) \geq 0.$$

To simplify the notation, we set

$$B = \left(\frac{q}{1+\gamma-q} \right) \left(\frac{1}{w_1(x_1)} - \frac{1}{w_2(x_1)} \right) b \otimes b.$$

We know that $b \otimes b$ is a non-negative symmetric matrix, and by (4.3),

$$\frac{1}{w_1(x_1)} - \frac{1}{w_2(x_1)} < 0,$$

so B is a non-positive, symmetric matrix.

On the other hand we know that $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+$ is a (λ, Λ) -elliptic operator, so

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(2A) + \Lambda \|B^+\| - \lambda \|B^-\| \geq \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(2A + B) \geq 0.$$

As B is a non-positive, we have $\|B^+\| = 0$, and consequently

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(2A) \geq \lambda \|B^-\| = \lambda \| -B \|.$$

Thus $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(A) \geq 0$, as claimed.

Assume now that $b = 0$ and suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(A) < 0,$$

so that A has at least one non-positive eigenvalue. Let S be the direct sum of the subspaces associated with the non-positive eigenvalues of A and P_S be the orthogonal projection over S . Setting

$$\psi(x) = \phi(x) - \varepsilon |P_S x|$$

and recalling that $\phi > w_1 - w_2$ in $B_r \setminus \{x_1\}$, we have that, for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ small enough, ψ touches $w_1 - w_2$ from above at some $x_2 \in B_r(x_1)$ such that $(w_1 - w_2)(x_2) > 0$. This fact suggests us to use ψ as a test function at x_2 . To this end, let us prove that $|P_S x| \neq 0$. In effect, by supposing the opposite, we use that

$$(4.6) \quad |P_S x| = \max_{|e|=1} P_S x \cdot e$$

to deduce that for all $e \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, the test function

$$\phi(x) - \varepsilon P_S x \cdot e$$

touches $w_1 - w_2$ from above at x_2 . In fact, we use (4.6) to assure that

$$\phi - \varepsilon P_S x \cdot e \geq \phi - \varepsilon |P_S x|.$$

We also observe that

$$-|P_S x| \leq P_S x \cdot e \leq |P_S x|,$$

so, by the contradiction assumption,

$$P_S x_2 \cdot e = |P_S x_2| = 0.$$

Therefore, as

$$(w_1 - w_2) - (\phi - \varepsilon |P_S x|)$$

has a local minimum at x_2 , we conclude that

$$(w_1 - w_2) - (\phi - \varepsilon P_S x \cdot e)$$

has also a local minimum at x_2 , which shows that $\phi - \varepsilon P_S x \cdot e$ touches $w_1 - w_2$ from above at x_2 for all $e \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$.

Arguing as above, we conclude that, for all $e \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, we have

$$|Ax_2 - \varepsilon P_S e|^\gamma F \left(x_2, A + \left(\frac{q}{1 + \gamma - q} \right) \frac{Ax_2 - \varepsilon P_S e \otimes Ax_2 - \varepsilon P_S e}{w_1(x_2)} \right) \geq -a(x_2).$$

and

$$|Ax_2 - \varepsilon P_S e|^\gamma F \left(x_2, -A + \left(\frac{q}{1 + \gamma - q} \right) \frac{Ax_2 - \varepsilon P_S e \otimes Ax_2 - \varepsilon P_S e}{w_2(x_2)} \right) \leq -a(x_2).$$

So

$$|Ax_2 - \varepsilon P_S e|^\gamma \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+ \left(2A + \left(\frac{q}{1 + \gamma - q} \right) \left(\frac{1}{w_1(x_2)} - \frac{1}{w_2(x_2)} \right) (Ax_2 - \varepsilon P_S e) \otimes (Ax_2 - \varepsilon P_S e) \right) \geq 0.$$

Since we can choose $\hat{e} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ such that $Ax_2 - \varepsilon P_S \hat{e} \neq 0$, and we know that

$$\frac{1}{w_1(x_2)} - \frac{1}{w_2(x_2)} < 0,$$

arguing once more as above, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(A) \geq 0,$$

which contradicts (4.5). Therefore, $|P_S x_2| \neq 0$.

Now, we use ψ as a test function to obtain

$$|Ax_2 - \varepsilon e_1|^\gamma \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+ \left(2(A - \varepsilon B) + \left(\frac{q}{1 + \gamma - q} \right) \left(\frac{1}{w_1(x_2)} - \frac{1}{w_2(x_2)} \right) (Ax_2 - \varepsilon e_1) \otimes (Ax_2 - \varepsilon e_1) \right) \geq 0,$$

where $e_1 = \frac{P_S x_2}{|P_S x_2|}$ and $B = D^2(|P_S x_2|) \geq 0$, since $|P_S x|$ is a convex function. Furthermore,

$$(Ax_2 - \varepsilon e_1) \cdot P_S x_2 = P_S A x_2 \cdot x_2 - \varepsilon |P_S x_2| \leq -\varepsilon |P_S x_2| < 0,$$

so $(Ax_2 - \varepsilon e_1) \neq 0$. Using once again

$$\frac{1}{w_1(x_2)} - \frac{1}{w_2(x_2)} < 0$$

and arguing as above we conclude that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(A - \varepsilon B) > 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(A) \geq \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(A - \varepsilon B)$ we have that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(A) \geq 0$$

which contradicts (4.5). Thus we conclude that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2(w_1 - w_2)) \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega_1.$$

Now, we observe that $w_1 - w_2 = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_1$, so that by the maximum principle

$$w_1 - w_2 \leq 0 \text{ in } \Omega_1,$$

which is a contradiction with (4.3). Therefore we have $w_1 \leq w_2$. The converse inequality is obtained similarly. \square

5 Positivity results: Proof of Theorem 1.4

We start proving that nontrivial solutions of $(P_{a,q})$ are positive in some component of Ω^+ .

Lemma 5.1. *Let u be a nontrivial viscosity solution of $(P_{a,q})$. Then, there exists a sub-domain $\Omega' \subset \Omega^+$ such that $u > 0$ in Ω' .*

Proof. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that $u = 0$ in Ω^+ . Then $\mathcal{A} = \{a < 0\} \cap \{u > 0\} \neq \emptyset$, since otherwise we would have

$$\begin{cases} |Du|^\gamma F(x, D^2 u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

which would imply $u \equiv 0$. Now, let $x_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ be such that $u(x_0) = \max_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}} u$ and take $\varphi(x) \equiv u(x_0)$ as a test function. Then the maximum of $u - \varphi$ is achieved at x_0 , so that

$$|D\varphi(x_0)|^\gamma F(x_0, D^2 \varphi(x_0)) \geq -a(x_0)u(x_0)^q > 0.$$

On the other hand, $|D\varphi|^\gamma F(x_0, D^2 \varphi) \equiv 0$, and we obtain a contradiction. \square

The next lemma plays a fundamental role in proving our main results. It provides the existence of a “barrier from below”, which ensures that the set of nontrivial solutions of $(P_{a,q})$ with $q \in (0, \gamma + 1)$ stays away from zero as long as a is sufficiently positive in some ball of Ω .

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} \subset \Omega^+$ and $(\lambda^+(\mathcal{B}), \phi^+(\mathcal{B}))$ the first eigenpair of the problem (2.1).

Lemma 5.2. *Let $q \in (0, \gamma + 1)$. If $a_0 := \min_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} a > \lambda^+(\mathcal{B}) > 0$ then there exists $\Phi \in C(\overline{\mathcal{B}})$ such that $u \geq \Phi > 0$ in \mathcal{B} , for every u satisfying $u > 0$ in \mathcal{B} and $|Du|^\gamma F(x, D^2u) + a(x)u(x)^q = 0$ in \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. Let $\theta > 0$ be such that $a_0(\lambda^+)^{-1} - \theta > 1$, where $\lambda^+ = \lambda^+(\mathcal{B})$. We consider $\varepsilon\phi$, with $\phi = \phi^+(\mathcal{B})$ and

$$(5.1) \quad \varepsilon < \varepsilon_\theta := \{a_0(\lambda^+)^{-1} - \theta\}^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1-q}}.$$

Note that by our choice of θ we have $\varepsilon_\theta > 1$ for every $q \in (0, \gamma + 1)$. Moreover,

$$(5.2) \quad |D(\varepsilon\phi)|^\gamma F(D^2\varepsilon\phi) = -\lambda^+(\varepsilon\phi)^{\gamma+1} > -a(x)(\varepsilon\phi)^q + \theta\lambda^+(\varepsilon\phi)^q \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B}$$

whenever $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_\theta$. Let u be a positive solution of $|Du|^\gamma F(x, D^2u) = -a(x)u(x)^q$ in \mathcal{B} . We claim that $u \geq \varepsilon_\theta\phi$ in \mathcal{B} . Indeed, otherwise we choose $x_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\varepsilon_\theta\phi(x_0) > u(x_0)$. Now, since $u > 0$ on $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\phi = 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{B}$ we can find some $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $s_0\varepsilon_\theta\phi(x_0) = u(x_0)$ and $s_0\varepsilon_\theta\phi \leq u$ in \mathcal{B} . Thus, the function

$$\Theta(x) := s_0\varepsilon_\theta\phi(x)$$

touches u from below at x_0 . Consequently, we have, in the viscosity sense,

$$|D\Theta(x_0)|^\gamma F(D^2\Theta(x_0)) \leq -a(x_0)\Theta(x_0)^q.$$

On the other hand, by (5.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |D\Theta(x_0)|^\gamma F(D^2\Theta(x_0)) &= |D\Theta(x_0)|^\gamma \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, \Lambda}^+(D^2s_0\varepsilon_\theta\phi(x_0)) \\ &> -a(x_0)(s_0\varepsilon_\theta\phi(x_0))^q + \theta\lambda^+s_0\varepsilon_\theta\phi(x_0) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $\Theta(x_0) = s_0\varepsilon_\theta\phi(x_0)$, we obtain

$$-a(x_0)(s_0\varepsilon_\theta\phi(x_0))^q > -a(x_0)(s_0\varepsilon_\theta\phi(x_0))^q + \theta\lambda^+s_0\varepsilon_\theta\phi(x_0),$$

which provides a contradiction. Therefore $u \geq \Phi := \varepsilon_\theta\phi$ in \mathcal{B} . \square

Remark 5.3. The previous lemma holds under the condition

$$(5.3) \quad a_0 := \min_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} a > \lambda^+(\mathcal{B}) > 0.$$

Let us show that, in the proof of Theorem 1.4, we can always assume such hypothesis. In fact, since F is an 1-homogeneous operator, we see that given $c > 0$, u solves $(P_{a,q})$ if and only if

$$\tilde{u}(x) := c^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma-q}} u(x)$$

solves $(P_{ca,q})$. Hence, for c sufficiently large, we have

$$a_0 := \min_{\mathcal{B}} ca > \lambda^+(\mathcal{B}).$$

Therefore (5.3) holds for $(P_{ca,q})$, i.e. for ca with c large enough. Since u is positive if and only if \tilde{u} is positive, we see that the above condition can be assumed without loss of generality.

Proof of Theorem 1.4.

1. Suppose, by contradiction, that there exists a sequence $a_k \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ with

$$a_k^+ = a^+ \quad \text{and} \quad a_k^- \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } C(\overline{\Omega}),$$

and $(P_{a_k,q})$ has viscosity solutions u_k such that $u_k \notin \mathcal{P}^\circ$ for every k . Since Ω_+ has finitely many connected components, we can assume that $u_k > 0$ in some sub-domain $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ for every k . We split the analysis in two cases;

- (a) First suppose that $\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < C$, for all k . In this case, from $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity estimates (see [1, Theorem 3.1] [7],[19, Theorem 1]), we obtain that

$$\|u_k\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)} \leq C(N, \lambda, \Lambda, \gamma, \Omega) \left[\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|a_k u_k^q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}} \right]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} u_k &\rightarrow u_0 \quad \text{locally uniformly in } C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega), \\ F_k &\rightarrow F_0 \quad \text{locally uniformly in } \text{Sym}(N), \\ a_k^- &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{locally uniformly in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have in the viscosity sense

$$|Du_0(x)|^\gamma F_0(x, D^2 u_0) + a^+(x) u_0^q(x) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

Furthermore, by the Strong Maximum Principle we infer that either $u_0 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$ or $u_0 \equiv 0$. However, by Lemma 5.2, we know that there exists Φ such that, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$u_k \geq \Phi > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B} \subset \text{supp}(a^+).$$

Hence, we conclude that $u_0 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$. Thus, since $u_k \rightarrow u_0$ locally uniformly in $C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ we see that $u_k \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$ for k sufficiently large, which provides a contradiction and completes the proof in this case.

- (b) Suppose now that $\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We set $v_k(x) = \frac{u_k(x)}{\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}$, so that

$$Dv_k = \frac{Du_k}{\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}.$$

By the 1-Homogeneity condition (see 1), we have

$$|Dv_k|^\gamma F(x, D^2 v_k) = \frac{1}{\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{1+\gamma}} |Du_k|^\gamma F(x, D^2 u_k) = -\frac{a(x)u_k^q}{\|u_k\|_\infty^{1+\gamma}} = -\frac{a(x)v_k^q}{\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{1+\gamma-q}}.$$

in the viscosity sense. By arguing as above, we conclude that

$$v_k \rightarrow v_0 \quad \text{locally uniformly in } C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$$

Moreover, $\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{1+\gamma-q} \rightarrow \infty$ and $a(x)v_k^q$ remains bounded. Therefore,

$$|Dv_0|^\gamma F(x, D^2 v_0) = 0.$$

From the Strong Maximum Principle, we infer either $v_0 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$ or $v_0 \equiv 0$. Since $\|v_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 1$ we rule out the second possibility, and therefore $v_0 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$. As $v_k \rightarrow v_0$ locally uniformly in $C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$, for k sufficiently large, we infer again that $v_k \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$ and thus $u_k \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$, which yields another contradiction.

2. Let us assume, for the sake of contradiction, that there are sequences $\{q_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $q_k \rightarrow (\gamma+1)^-$ and $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are nontrivial viscosity solutions of (P_{a,q_k}) with $u_k \notin \mathcal{P}^\circ$ for every k . Since Ω_+ has finitely many connected components, we can assume that $u_k > 0$ in some sub-domain $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ for every k .

As in the previous item, we consider two cases:

- (a) First we assume that $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then, as in the previous argument, $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. By the Arzelà-Ascoli compactness criteria, up to a subsequence, we obtain that

$$u_k \rightarrow u_0 \quad \text{in } C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}).$$

By Lemma 5.2, we know that

$$u_k > C \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B} \subset \text{supp}(a^+).$$

so that

$$u_0 > C \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B} \subset \text{supp}(a^+).$$

for some constant $C > 0$, i.e. $u_0 \not\equiv 0$. Moreover, by stability, u_0 solves $(P_{a,1+\gamma})$. The Hopf Maximum Principle, yields that $u_0 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$, and since $u_k \rightarrow u_0$ in $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$, it follows that $u_k \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$ for k large enough, which yields a contradiction.

- (b) Now, suppose that $\|u_k\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty$ and set

$$v_k = \frac{u_k}{\|u_k\|_\infty},$$

which solves

$$|Dv_k|^\gamma F(x, D^2v_k) = -\frac{a(x)v_k^{qk}}{\|u_k\|_\infty^{(\gamma+1)-qk}} \text{ in } \Omega, \quad v_k = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

By the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, we have, up to a subsequence, $v_k \rightarrow v_0$ in $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$.

Once again, we must analyse two possibilities:

- If $\|u_k\|_\infty^{(\gamma+1)-qk} \rightarrow +\infty$ then v_0 solves

$$|Dv_0|^\gamma F(x, D^2v_0) = 0, \text{ in } \Omega, \quad v_0 = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Since $v_0 \not\equiv 0$, we deduce, again by the Hopf Maximum Principle, that $v_0 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$, so that $v_k \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$ for k large enough, which yields a contradiction.

- If $\|u_k\|_\infty^{(\gamma+1)-qk}$ is bounded then

$$\|u_k\|_\infty^{(\gamma+1)-qk} \rightarrow C_0.$$

Note that $C_0 \geq 1$ since $\|u_k\|_\infty \gg 1$, so v_0 solves

$$|Dv_0|^\gamma F(x, D^2v_0) = -\frac{a(x)v_0^{\gamma+1}}{C_0}, \text{ in } \Omega, \quad v_0 = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

As $v_0 \not\equiv 0$, by the Hopf Maximum Principle, $v_0 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$, so that $v_k \in \mathcal{P}^\circ(\Omega)$ for k large enough, which yields another contradiction. The proof is now complete. \square

To conclude this paper we provide a simple example of a problem having a dead-core solution:

Example 5.4. Let $0 \leq q < \gamma + 1$ and $0 \leq \gamma < 2q$. Consider $v : [0, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$v(x) = \frac{\sin^r(x)}{r}$$

where $r := \frac{\gamma+2}{\gamma+1-q}$. Then, it is easy to check that

$$v'(x) = \sin^{r-1}x \cdot \cos x \text{ and } v''(x) = (r \cos^2 x - 1) \sin^{r-2}x.$$

As $r > 2$ we have that $v \in C^2([0, \pi])$, so we can extend v smoothly like 0 in $(-\pi/2, 0]$. Therefore

$$-|v'(x)|^\gamma v''(x) = a(x)v^q(x) \quad \text{in } (-\pi/2, \pi)$$

in the viscosity sense, where

$$a(x) = r^q |\cos(x)|^\gamma [-r \cos^2(x) + 1]$$

is a sign-changing weight. Clearly v is a solution of $(P_{a,q})$ with dead core. Thus

$$\delta_0 < |a(0)| = r^q(r-1).$$

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET-Argentina) and Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (PNPD-CAPES-UnB-Brazil). J.V. da Silva would like to thank the Universidad de Buenos Aires for providing an excellent working environment during his stay there, and, Universidade Federal de Sergipe by the best scientific atmosphere during his visit where part of this manuscript was written.

References

- [1] Araújo, D., Ricarte, G.C. and Teixeira, E. *Geometric gradient estimates for solutions to degenerate elliptic equations*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations. 53 (2015), no. 3-4, 605-625.
- [2] Bandle, C. and Vernier-Piro, S. *Estimates for solutions of quasilinear problems with dead cores*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys., 54 (2003), 815-821.
- [3] Bardi, M. and Da Lio, F. *On the strong maximum principle for fully nonlinear degenerate elliptic equations*. Arch. Math. (Basel) 73 (1999), no. 4, 276-285.
- [4] Berestycki, H., Capuzzo Dolcetta, I., Porretta, A. and Rossi, L. *Maximum principle and generalized principal eigenvalue for degenerate elliptic operators*. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 103 (2015), no. 5, 1276-1293.
- [5] Birindelli, I. and Demengel, F. *Eigenvalue, maximum principle and regularity for fully nonlinear homogeneous operators*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 6 (2007) 335-366.
- [6] Birindelli, I. and Demengel, F. *Eigenvalue and Dirichlet problem for fully-nonlinear operators in non-smooth domains*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 352 (2009), no. 2, 822-835.
- [7] Birindelli, I. and Demengel, F. *$C^{1,\beta}$ regularity for Dirichlet problems associated to fully nonlinear degenerate elliptic equations*. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var., 2014, pp.1009-1024.
- [8] Birindelli, I. and Demengel, F. *Hölder regularity of the gradient for solutions of fully nonlinear equations with sublinear first order terms*. Geometric Methods in PDE's. Springer International Publishing, vol. 13, pp. 257-268, 2015.
- [9] Buckdahn, R. and Li, J. *Stochastic differential games and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs equations*. SIAM J. Control Optim. 47 (2008), no. 1, 444-475.
- [10] Caffarelli, L.A. and Cabré, X. *Fully nonlinear elliptic equations*. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 43. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995. vi+104 pp. ISBN: 0-8218-0437-5.
- [11] F. Charro and I. Peral, *Zero order perturbations to fully nonlinear equations: comparison, existence and uniqueness*, Commun. Contemp. Math. 11 (2009), no. 1, 131–164.

- [12] Demengel, F. *Generalized eigenvalues for fully nonlinear singular or degenerate operators in the radial case*. Adv. Differential Equations 14 (2009), no. 11-12, 1127-1154.
- [13] Díaz, J.I. *Nonlinear partial differential equations and free boundaries. Vol. I. Elliptic equations*. Research Notes in Mathematics, 106. Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, MA, 1985. vii+323 pp. ISBN: 0-273-08572-7.
- [14] Díaz, J.I. and Hernández, J. *On the existence of a free boundary for a class of reaction-diffusion systems*. SIAM J.Math. Anal. Vol 15, N. 4, 670-685, 1984.
- [15] Díaz, J.I. and Herrero, M.A. *Estimates on the support of the solutions of some non linear elliptic and parabolic problems*. Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edimburg. Vol. 98 A, 249-258, 1981.
- [16] Díaz, J.I. and Véron, L. *Local vanishing properties of solutions of elliptic and parabolic quasi-linear equations*. Trans. of Am. Math. Soc., Vol 290, N. 2, 787-814, 1985.
- [17] Felmer, P. and Valdebenito, D. *Eigenvalues for radially symmetric fully nonlinear singular or degenerate operators*. Nonlinear Anal. 75 (2012), no. 18, 6524-6540.
- [18] Ikoma, N. and Ishii, H. *Eigenvalue problem for fully nonlinear second-order elliptic PDE on balls*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 29 (2012), no. 5, 783-812.
- [19] Imbert, C. and Silvestre, L. *$C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity of solutions of degenerate fully non-linear elliptic equations*. Adv. Math. 233, (2013), 196-206.
- [20] Ishii, H. *On uniqueness and existence of viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second-order elliptic PDEs*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 42 (1989), no. 1, 15-45.
- [21] Kaufmann, U., Ramos Quoirin, H. and Umezū, K. *Positivity results for indefinite sublinear elliptic problems via a continuity argument*, J. Differential Equations **263** (2017), 4481–4502.
- [22] Lions, P. L., *Optimal control of diffusion processes and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. I. The dynamic programming principle and applications*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 8 (1983), no. 10, 1101-1174.
- [23] Lions, P. L., *Optimal control of diffusion processes and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. II. Viscosity solutions and uniqueness*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 8 (1983), no. 11, 1229-1276.
- [24] Lions, P. L., *Optimal control of diffusion processes and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. III. Regularity of the optimal cost function*. Nonlinear partial differential equations and their applications. Collège de France seminar, Vol. V (Paris, 1981/1982), 95-205, Res. Notes in Math., 93, Pitman, Boston, MA, 1983.
- [25] Quaas, A. and Sirakov, B. *Principal eigenvalues and the Dirichlet problem for fully nonlinear elliptic operators*. Adv. Math. 218 (2008), no. 1, 105-135.

- [26] Trudinger, Neil S. *Elliptic equations in nondivergence form*. Miniconference on partial differential equations (Canberra, 1981), 1-16, Proc. Centre Math. Anal. Austral. Nat. Univ., 1, Austral. Nat. Univ., Canberra, 1982.