

Interpolation inequality and some applications

Abdellaziz Harrabi¹

*Institut Supérieur des Mathématiques Appliquées et de l'Informatique, Université de Kairouan, Tunisia
Mathematics Department, Northern Border University, Arar, Saudi Arabia
Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy.*

Abstract

We introduce a new interpolation inequality which will be more relevant than the standard weighted one [13, 18, 19, 28] in providing integral estimate to solutions of PDE's. Consequently, we establish explicit universal estimate of finite Morse index solutions to polyharmonic equation. Differently to previous works [8, 11, 18, 32], we propose here a direct proof under large superlinear and subcritical growth conditions to show that the universal constant evolves as a polynomial function of the Morse index. We also improve previous nonexistence results [18, 19] concerning stable at infinity weak solutions to the p -polyharmonic equation in the subcritical range.

Keywords: Interpolation inequality, Universal estimate, p -polyharmonic equation, Morse index, Liouville-type theorem, Pohozaev identity, Boot strap argument.

PACS: Primary 35G20, 35G30, Secondary 35B05, 35B09, 35B53.

1. Introduction

1.1. Interpolation inequalities.

Let $n, r \geq 2$ be two integer numbers, $p \geq 2$ and Ω an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n . The weak j^{th} partial derivative (respectively the magnitude of the s^{th} gradient) of $u \in W_{loc}^{r,p}(\Omega)$ are defined a.e in Ω by $D^j u = \frac{\partial^j u}{\partial x_1^{j_1} \dots \partial x_n^{j_n}}$, $1 \leq |j| \leq r$ and

$$|\nabla^s u| = \left(\sum_{|j|=s} |D^j u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad 1 \leq s \leq r. \quad (1.1)$$

We designate by B_λ the ball of radius $\lambda > 0$ centered at the origin. From standard interpolation inequality [1] and obvious dilation argument, we derive

$$R^{p(q-r)} \int_{B_R} |\nabla^q v|^p \leq \varepsilon \int_{B_R} |\nabla^r v|^p + C \varepsilon^{\frac{-q}{r-q}} R^{-pr} \int_{B_R} |v|^p, \quad \forall v \in W_{loc}^{r,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1), \quad (1.2)$$

where $1 \leq q \leq r-1$ and $C = C(n, p, r) > 0$. According to (1.2), one can establish the following weighted interpolation inequality (see [13, 18, 19, 28])

$$R^{p(q-r)} \Phi_q^p(v) \leq \varepsilon \Phi_r^p(v) + C \varepsilon^{\frac{-q}{r-q}} R^{-pr} \int_{B_R} |v|^p dx, \quad (1.3)$$

Email address: abdellaziz.harrabi@yahoo.fr (Abdellaziz Harrabi)

where Φ_q is a family of weighted semi-norms defined by

$$\Phi_q(v) = \left(\sup_{0 < \alpha < 1} (1 - \alpha)^q \int_{B_{\alpha R}} |\nabla^\alpha v|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad 0 \leq q \leq r.$$

Inequality (1.3) together with the following family of cut-off functions allow to provide local L^p - $W^{2r,p}$ -regularity [13, 28] and the energy estimate of stable at infinity solutions to the higher order p -polyharmonic equations [19] (see also [18] for $p = 2$): let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, denote $\alpha' = \frac{1 + \alpha}{2}$ and consider the cut-off function ψ satisfying

$$\psi = \psi_{(R, \alpha)} \in C_c^r(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad 0 \leq \psi \leq 1, \quad \text{supp}(\psi) \subset B_{\alpha' R}, \quad \psi \equiv 1 \text{ in } B_{\alpha R},$$

where

$$\psi(x) = \exp \left(\left(\frac{\frac{|x|}{R} - \alpha}{\frac{|x|}{R} - \alpha'} \right)^{r+1} \right) \quad \text{if } \alpha R < |x| < \alpha' R.$$

Then, for $1 \leq k \leq r$, we have

$$|\nabla^k \psi| \leq C((1 - \alpha)R)^{-k}.$$

Here, we introduce a more "general" cut-off function ψ to establish a new interpolation inequality which will be more relevant than (1.3) in providing integral estimate and which allows in particular to improve the energy estimate stated in [18, 19]. It will be also helpful in investigating explicit universal estimate of finite Morse index solutions to higher order polyharmonic equation. Let ω and ω' be two bounded open subset of Ω such that $\overline{\omega} \subset \omega' \subset \overline{\omega'} \subset \Omega$. Set $d = \text{dist}(\omega, \Omega \setminus \omega')$, we have

Lemma 1.1. *There exists $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \text{supp}(\psi) \subset \omega' \text{ and } 0 \leq \psi \leq 1, \\ \psi \equiv 1 \text{ if } x \in \omega, \\ |\nabla^k \psi(x)|^p \leq C d^{-kp}, \quad \forall x \in \omega' \setminus \omega \text{ and } k \in \mathbb{N}, \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on (n, p, k) .

Following [6, 11, 30, 32, 21], we used the power function ψ^m , $m > r$ as a cut-off function. Let $(q, k) \in \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}^*$, $q + k = r$. Our interpolation inequality reads as follows

Lemma 1.2. *For every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, there exist two positive constants $C = C(n, r, p, m)$ and $C_\varepsilon = C(\varepsilon, n, p, r, m) > 0$ such that for any $u \in W_{loc}^{r,p}(\Omega)$, we have*

$$\int_{\omega'} |\nabla^q u|^p |\nabla^k (\psi^m)|^p \leq C d^{-pk} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^q u|^p \psi^{p(m-k)} \leq \varepsilon \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^r u|^p \psi^{pm} + C_\varepsilon d^{-pr} \int_{\omega'} |u|^p \psi^{p(m-r)}. \quad (1.5)$$

Consequently,

$$\int_{\omega'} |\nabla^r u|^p \psi^{pm} \leq 2 \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^r (u \psi^m)|^p + C d^{-pr} \int_{\omega'} |u|^p \psi^{p(m-r)}, \quad (1.6)$$

and

$$\int_{\omega'} |\nabla^q u|^p |\nabla^k \psi^m|^p \leq C d^{-pk} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^q u|^p \psi^{p(m-k)} \leq \varepsilon \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^r (u \psi^m)|^p + C_\varepsilon d^{-pr} \int_{\omega'} |u|^p \psi^{p(m-r)}. \quad (1.7)$$

1.2. Explicit universal estimate.

Thanks to the above interpolation inequality, we investigate explicit universal estimate for finite Morse index solutions to the following polyharmonic problem:

$$(-\Delta)^r u = f(x, u), \text{ in } \Omega. \quad (1.8)$$

Here, Ω is a proper domain of \mathbb{R}^n , $u \in C^{2r}(\Omega)$, f and $f' = \frac{\partial f}{\partial s}$ belong to $C(\Omega \times \mathbb{R})$. The main r -order differential operator is defined by $D_r u = \nabla \Delta^{j-1} u$ if $r = 2j - 1$ and $\Delta^j u$ if $r = 2j$. We denote

$$D_r u \cdot D_r v = \begin{cases} \nabla \Delta^{j-1} u \cdot \nabla \Delta^{j-1} v & \text{if } r = 2j - 1; \\ \Delta^j u \Delta^j v & \text{if } r = 2j; \\ |D_r u|^2 = D_r u \cdot D_r u. \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

The associated quadratic form of (1.8) is

$$Q_u(h) = \int_{\Omega} |D_r u h|^2 - \int_{\Omega} f'(x, u) h^2, \quad \forall h \in C_c^r(\Omega). \quad (1.10)$$

The Morse index of u , denoted by $i(u)$ is defined as the maximal dimension of all subspaces V of $C_c^r(\Omega)$ such that $Q_u(h) < 0$, $\forall h \in V \setminus \{0\}$.

In [3, 8, 11, 18, 32], universal estimate; or L^∞ -bounds were established using blow-up technique together with some Liouville-type theorems classifying finite Morse index solutions (see also the case of positive solutions in [12, 26, 28, 30, 31]). However, this procedure fails to exhibit an explicit estimate and requires the following asymptotical condition at infinity:

(h_0) : For an adequate exponent $q > 1$, $\lim_{|s| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f'(x, s)}{|s|^{q-1}} = 1$, uniformly with respect to $x \in \Omega$.

Here, we propose a direct proof to establish an explicit universal estimate under large superlinear and subcritical growth conditions. Precisely, we assume that there exist $s_0 > 0$, $c_1 > 1$ and $1 < p_1 \leq p_2 < \frac{n+2r}{n-2r}$ such that for all $(x, s) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \setminus [-s_0, s_0]$, we have

$$(h_1) \text{ (Super-linearity) } f'(x, s)s^2 \geq p_1 f(x, s)s;$$

$$(h_2) \text{ (Subcritical growth) } (p_2 + 1)F(x, s) \geq f(x, s)s, \text{ where } F(x, s) = \int_0^s f(x, t)dt;$$

$$(h_3) |\nabla_y F(x, s)| \leq c_1(F(x, s) + 1), \text{ for all } (x, s) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R};$$

$$(h_4) |f'(x, s)| \leq c_1, \text{ for all } (x, s) \in \Omega \times [-s_0, s_0], |f(x, 0)| \leq c_1 \text{ and } \pm f(x, \pm s_0) \geq \frac{1}{c_1}, \text{ for all } x \in \Omega.$$

In the autonomous case $f(x, s) = f(s)$, the above assumptions are reduced to (h_1) – (h_2) with $\pm f(\pm s_0) > 0$ and note that when $1 < q < \frac{n+2r}{n-2r}$, then assumption (h_0) implies (h_1) – (h_2) . Moreover, the nonlinearity $f(s) = s_+^{p_2} - s_-^{p_1}$ ($1 < p_1 < p_2 < \frac{n+2r}{n-2r}$ and $s_+ = \max(s, 0)$, $s_- = \max(-s, 0)$) satisfies (h_1) – (h_2) and violates (h_0) . Let $K \in C^1(\Omega)$ be a positive function such that $K, |\nabla K| \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, then $f(x, s) = K(x)(s_+^{p_2} - s_-^{p_1})$ satisfies (h_1) – (h_4) . Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $y \in \Omega$ and denote $\delta_y = \text{dist}(y, \partial\Omega)$, $d_y = \inf(\alpha, \delta_y)$. Our explicit estimate reads as follows¹:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that f satisfies (h_1) – (h_4) . Then, there exist $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma_1 > 0$, $\gamma_2 > 0$ and a positive constant $C = C(\alpha_0, n, r, p_1, p_2, s_0, c_1)$ independent of Ω such that for any finite Morse index solution u of (1.8) and for every $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$, we have*

$$\sum_{j=0}^{2r-1} d_y^j |\nabla^j u(y)| \leq C(1 + i(u))^{\gamma_2} d_y^{-\gamma_1}, \quad \forall y \in \Omega. \quad (1.11)$$

¹We use here (1.1) with $p = 2$.

Precisely, if $2r \frac{p_2 + 1}{p_2} < n$ then $\gamma_1 = \frac{4r^2(p_1 + 1)p_2}{(p_1 - 1)(2r(p_2 + 1) - n(p_2 - 1))}$ and $\gamma_2 = \gamma_1 + \frac{2r(p_2 + 1)}{2r(p_2 + 1) - n(p_2 - 1)}$.

Remark 1.1. As a consequence of (1.11), for $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$ et $\Omega_\alpha = \{y \in \Omega, \delta_y \geq \alpha\}$, we have $\|u\|_{C^{2r-1}(\Omega_\alpha)} \leq C\alpha^{-2r+1-\gamma_1}(1 + i(u))^{\gamma_2}$ and if $y \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_\alpha$, then

$$\sum_{j=0}^{2r-1} |\nabla^j u(y)| \leq C(1 + i(u))^{\gamma_2} \delta_y^{2r+1-\gamma_1}.$$

To prove Theorem 1.1 we apply Lemma 1.2 with appropriate cut-off function to provide a local integral estimate on a ring around y (see (3.12) in Section 3). Thanks to a variant of the Pohozaev identity [25], we extend this estimate to a ball as follows:

$$d_y^{-n} \int_{B(y, \frac{d_y}{2})} |f(x, u)|^{\frac{p_2+1}{p_2}} \leq C(1 + i(u)) \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{\frac{2(p_1+1)r}{p_1-1}}, \quad \forall y \in \Omega. \quad (1.12)$$

As p_2 is subcritical, we will be able to employ a delicate boot strap argument using local L^q - $W^{2r,q}$ -regularity to derive estimate (1.11). One can also derive estimate (1.12) in the supercritical case $\frac{n+2r}{n-2r} < p_1 \leq p_2$, but it is not clear which procedure would be helpful to derive explicit universal estimate. Regarding the p -polyharmonic equation, similar estimate of (1.12) could be also established. However, we do not dispose to any L^q -regularity result to employ a boot strap procedure except the subcritical p -laplacian Dirichlet boundary-value problem in a bounded domain where explicit L^∞ -bounds of finite Morse index solutions are obtained under similar assumptions of (h_1) - (h_2) [17] and which extends the result of [33] with $p = 2$, where it was shown that the L^∞ norm evolves less rapidly than a polynomial growth on $i(u)$. Particularly, when the nonlinearity f is close to the critical power as $f(s) = \frac{|s|^{\frac{4}{n-2}} s}{\ln(s^2 + 2)}$, it has been proven in [15] that the L^∞ norm has an exponential growth on $i(u)$. Also, in [20] the authors examined the influence of the type boundary conditions involving the biharmonic and triharmonic problems to provide similar polynomial growth estimate of [17, 33]. The general higher order case $r \geq 4$, is harder to achieve since we need to carefully handle some local interior estimate, especially near the boundary.

1.3. Liouville type theorem.

Consider the following problem

$$\Delta_p^r u = c_1 u_+^{q_1} - c_2 u_-^{q_2} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (1.13)$$

where $p \geq 2$, $q_1, q_2 > p - 1$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$. The p -polyharmonic operator Δ_p^r is defined by

$$\Delta_p^r u = -\operatorname{div} \left\{ \Delta^{j-1} (|\nabla \Delta^{j-1} u|^{p-2} \nabla \Delta^{j-1} u) \right\} \text{ if } r = 2j - 1 \text{ and } \Delta^j (|\Delta^j u|^{p-2} \Delta^j u) \text{ if } r = 2j.$$

Denote $\bar{q} = \max(q_1, q_2)$, $\underline{q} = \min(q_1, q_2)$, $E_\lambda := W_0^{r,p}(B_\lambda) \cap L^{\bar{q}+1}(B_\lambda)$, $\lambda > 0$ and $p^* = \frac{pn}{n-pr}$, the Sobolev critical exponent of $W^{r,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if $n > pr$. The associated energy functional of (1.13) is defined by:

$$I(v) := \frac{1}{p} \int_{B_\lambda} |D_r v|^p - \int_{B_\lambda} \left(\frac{c_1 v_+^{q_1+1}}{q_1 + 1} + \frac{c_2 v_-^{q_2+1}}{q_2 + 1} \right), \quad \forall v \in E_\lambda,$$

which belongs in $C^2(E_\lambda)$ as $p \geq 2$.²

Except the case $r = 1$, no regularity result of the p -polyharmonic operator is known, so we deal here with weak solutions. Precisely, we say that $u \in W_{loc}^{r,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L_{loc}^{\bar{q}+1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a weak solution of (1.13) if for any $h \in E_\lambda$ and for any $\lambda > 0$, we have

$$\int_{B_\lambda} |D_r u|^{p-2} D_r u \cdot D_r h = \int_{B_\lambda} (c_1 u_+^{q_1} - c_2 u_-^{q_2}) h. \quad (1.14)$$

²Observe that $E_\lambda =: W_0^{r,m}(B_\lambda)$ if $n \leq pr$ or $n > pr$ and $p - 1 < \bar{q} \leq p^* - 1$.

If $1 < p < 2$, the functional I is only C^1 functional, so it is not clear which definition of stability would be the natural one.

The linearized operator of (1.13) at u is given by

$$L_u(g, h) := \int_{B_\lambda} \left[|D_r u|^{p-2} D_r g \cdot D_r h + (p-2) |D_r u|^{p-4} (D_r u \cdot D_r g)(D_r u \cdot D_r h) - (c_1 q_1 u_+^{q_1-1} + c_2 q_2 u_-^{q_2-1}) g h \right], \quad \forall (g, h) \in E_\lambda^2. \quad (1.15)$$

Taking into account that

$$\int_{B_\lambda} |D_r u|^{p-4} (D_r u \cdot D_r h)^2 \leq \int_{B_\lambda} |D_r u|^{p-2} |D_r h|^2, \quad \forall h \in E_\lambda,$$

then the associated quadratic form $Q_u(h) := L_u(h, h)$ satisfies the following inequality which will be useful to classify stable weak solutions:

$$Q_u(h) \leq (p-1) \int_{B_\lambda} |D_r u|^{p-2} |D_r h|^2 - \int_{B_\lambda} (c_1 q_1 u_+^{q_1-1} + c_2 q_2 u_-^{q_2-1}) h^2. \quad (1.16)$$

Definition 1.1. • We say that u is stable if, for all $\lambda > 0$, we have $Q_u(h) \geq 0$, for any $h \in E_\lambda$.

- u is said to be stable at infinity solution if there exists $R_0 > 0$ such that, $\forall \lambda > R_0$, we have $Q_u(h) \geq 0$, $\forall h \in E_\lambda$ with $\text{supp}(h) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{R_0}$. u is also called stable solution outside the ball B_{R_0} .

When $c_1 = c_2$, $q_1 = q_2$ and $p = 2$, sharp nonexistence results have been obtained in lower order $r \leq 3$ up to the so called Joseph-Lundgren exponent $p_{JL}(n, 2r)$ [9, 11, 21] which improve previous partial classification results of stable at infinity solutions [3, 5, 7, 16, 32]. The cases $r = 2, 3$ need more involved analysis using powerful monotonicity formula with a delicate blow-down analysis. This approach succussed very recently to provide nonexistence result in the supercritical range to the higher order Lane-Emden equation for large dimension where a convenient explicit expression of $p_{JL}(n, 2r)$ is also exhibited [29]. The proof relies on the energy estimate stated in [18] where the subcritical case is achieved. The case $c_1 > 0$ and $c_2 = 0$ is more difficult, it was investigated for only $r = 1$ in [22, 23, 27] where the authors proved that any changing-sign finite Morse index solution is spherically symmetric about some point of \mathbb{R}^n . The situation is extremely unclear in the higher order case since the decomposition $u = u^+ - u^-$ is no longer available for $r \geq 2$.

When $p > 2$, the degenerate nonlinear p -polyharmonic operator does not yield any monotonicity formula which provokes an obstruction to examine the supercritical growth case. In contrast, from Moser's iteration argument, sharp classification results of stable solutions and **radial** stable at infinity solutions were obtained in [10] for $r = 1$. Regarding the p -biharmonic problem, only the subcritical case was examined in [24], where the energy estimate is so hard to achieve. Thanks to similar interpolation inequality of Lemma 1.2 (see Lemma 4.1 in Section 4), we success to improve the energy estimate stated in [18, 19] which derives from inequality (1.3) and are weaker than those obtained in [9, 11, 21] for $r = 1, 2, 3$. Let $r \geq 2$, $p \geq 2$, $q_1, q_2 > p - 1$ and $R_0 > 0$, we have

Proposition 1.1. Let $u \in W_{loc}^{r,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L_{loc}^{\bar{q}+1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak solution of (1.13) which is stable outside the ball B_{R_0} . Then, there exist two positive constants $C_0 = C_0(u, R_0, n, r, q_1, q_2, p)$ and $C = C(n, r, q_1, q_2, p)$ such that

$$\int_{B_R} |\nabla^r u|^p + \int_{B_R} (c_1 u_+^{q_1+1} + c_2 u_-^{q_2+1}) \leq C_0 + CR^{n-\frac{p(\bar{q}+1)}{q_1+1-p}}, \quad \forall R > \max(1, R_0). \quad (1.17)$$

Moreover, if u is a stable solution, then (1.17) holds with $C_0 = 0$ for all $R > 1$.

Next, we provide the nonexistence of nontrivial stable and stable at infinity solutions of (1.13) in the subcritical range. According to the above estimate, we remove the exponential growth condition imposed on unbounded solutions in [18, 19]:

Theorem 1.2. 1. The problem (1.13) has no nontrivial weak stable solution belonging to $W_{loc}^{r,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if $p - 1 < q_1, q_2 \leq p^* - 1$ and $n > pr$, or $p - 1 < q_1, q_2$ and $n \leq pr$.

2. Let $u \in W_{loc}^{r+1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak solution of (1.13) which is stable outside the ball B_{R_0} . Then, $u \equiv 0$ if $p-1 < q_1, q_2 < p^*-1$ and $n > pr$, or $p-1 < q_1, q_2$ and $n \leq pr$.

Moreover, if $n > pr$ and $q_1 = q_2 = p^*-1$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |D_r u|^p = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (c_1 u_+^{q_1+1} + c_2 u_-^{q_1+1}). \quad (1.18)$$

If $p-1 < \underline{q} < \bar{q} = p^*-1$, then (1.18) holds with $u \geq 0$ if $\bar{q} = q_1$ (respectively $u \leq 0$ if $\bar{q} = q_2$).

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 is devoted to the proofs of Lemmas 1.1 and 1.2. In section 3, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. The proofs of Proposition 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 will be done in section 4. In the appendix, we make use of Lemma 1.2 to revise previous L^p - $W^{2r,p}$ estimate stated in [14, 28].

2. Proofs of Lemmas 1.1 and 1.2.

Proof of Lemma 1.1. Set $\omega_d = \{x \in \Omega, \text{dist}(x, \omega) < \frac{d}{4}\}$, where $d = \text{dist}(\omega, \Omega \setminus \omega')$, we have $\omega \subset \omega_d \subset \omega'$. Let $h = \chi_{\omega_d}$ be the indicator function of ω_d and $g \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ a nonnegative function such that $\text{supp}(g) \subset B_1$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g(x) dx = 1$. Set

$$g_d(x) = \left(\frac{8}{d}\right)^n g\left(\frac{8x}{d}\right) \text{ and } \psi(x) = \int_{B_{\frac{d}{8}}} g_d(y) h(x-y) dy.$$

We have $\text{supp}(\psi) \subset \omega_d + B_{\frac{d}{8}} \subset \omega'$ and $\omega + B_{\frac{d}{8}} \subset \omega_d$, then $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$ and $\psi(x) = \int_{B_{\frac{d}{8}}} g_d(y) dy = 1$ if $x \in \omega$. Also, $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $D^j \psi(x) = \int_{B_{\frac{d}{8}}} D^j g_d(y) h(x-y) dy$. Therefore, $|D^j \psi(x)| \leq \int_{B_{\frac{d}{8}}} |D^j g_d| dy \leq \lambda^{-|j|} \int_{B_1} |D^j g(y)| dy \leq C d^{-|j|}$, where $C = C((n, |j|))$. This achieves the proof of Lemma 1.1. \square

2.1. Proof of Lemma 1.2.

Let $m > r$. Working by induction, we may verify that

$$|\nabla^k \psi^m| \leq C d^{-k} \psi^{(m-k)}, \quad \forall x \in \omega' \text{ and } 1 \leq k \leq r, \quad (2.1)$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on (n, r, m) (for the proof, see [18, Appendix]). Inequality (1.7) is an immediate consequence of (1.5) and (1.6). Also, inequalities (1.6) follows from (1.5) and the following elementary inequality³:

$$b^p \leq 2a^p + C|a-b|^p, \quad \forall a, b > 0 \text{ where } C = C(p) > 0. \quad (2.2)$$

In fact, according to (1.1), we have

$$|\nabla^r u|^p \psi^{pm} = \sum_{|j|=r} |D^j u|^p \psi^{pm}.$$

Applying inequality (2.2) with $a = |D^j(u\psi^m)|$ and $b = |D^j(u)\psi^m|$, then Leibnitz's formula [1] implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^r u|^p \psi^{pm} &\leq 2|\nabla^r(u\psi^m)|^p + C \sum_{|j|=r} |D^j(u\psi^m) - D^j(u)\psi^m|^p \\ &\leq 2|\nabla^r(u\psi^m)|^p + C \sum_{q+k=r, q \neq r} |\nabla^q u|^p |\nabla^k \psi^m|^p. \end{aligned}$$

³Inequality (2.2) is a simple consequence of $(1 - 2^{-\frac{1}{p}})b \leq |b-a|$ if $b \geq 2^{\frac{1}{p}}a$.

Integrating the above inequality over ω' and using (2.1), we get

$$\int_{\omega'} |\nabla^r u|^p \psi^{pm} \leq 2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla^r (u\psi^m)|^p + C \sum_{q+k=r, q \neq r} d^{-pk} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^q u|^p \psi^{p(m-k)}.$$

Combining this inequality with (1.5) and choose $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{rC}$, we derive (1.6).

Proof of (1.5). In the following, C denotes always generic positive constants depending only on (n, p, r, m) which could be changed from one line to another. Set $I_q = d^{-pk} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^q u|^p \psi^{p(m-k)}$. By virtue of (2.1), we have $\int_{\omega'} |\nabla^q u|^p |\nabla^k(\psi^m)|^p \leq CI_q$. Hence, to prove (1.5) we have only to establish the following inequality:

$$I_q \leq C\varepsilon^{1-p'} I_0 + \varepsilon I_r, \quad \forall 1 \leq q \leq r-1. \quad (2.3)$$

We divide the proof of (2.3) in two steps.

Step 1. We establish the following first-order interpolation inequality:

$$I_q \leq C\varepsilon^{1-p} I_{q-1} + \varepsilon I_{q+1}, \quad 1 \leq q \leq r-1. \quad (2.4)$$

Denote by $u|_{\omega'}$ the restriction of u on ω' . As $u \in W_{loc}^{r,p}(\Omega)$, we have $u|_{\omega'} \in W^{r,p}(\omega')$. Thanks to Meyers-Serrin's density theorem [1], we need to prove (2.3) for only $u|_{\omega'} \in C^r(\omega') \cap W^{r,p}(\omega')$ ⁴. Let $j = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n)$ be a multi index with $|j| = q$ and $1 \leq q \leq r-1$. As $|j| \neq 0$, there exists $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $j_{i_0} \neq 0$. Set $j_- = (j_1, \dots, j_{i_0}-1, \dots, j_n)$, $|j_-| = q-1$ and $j_+ = (j_1, \dots, j_{i_0}+1, \dots, j_n)$, $|j_+| = q+1$. Taking into account that $u|_{\omega'} \in C^r(\omega') \cap W^{r,p}(\omega')$, $1 \leq |j| = q \leq r-1$ and $p \geq 2$, we deduce

$$|D^j u|^{p-2} D^j u \in C^1(\omega') \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial(|D^j u|^{p-2} D^j u)}{\partial x_{i_0}} = (p-1)|D^j u|^{p-2} D^{j_+} u. \quad (2.5)$$

Recall that $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\omega')$ and $|\nabla \psi| \leq Cd^{-1}$, then integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} d^{-pk} \int_{\omega'} |D^j u|^p \psi^{p(m-k)} &= d^{-pk} \int_{\omega'} |D^j u|^{p-2} D^j u \frac{\partial D^j u}{\partial x_{i_0}} \psi^{p(m-k)} \\ &= -(p-1) d^{-pk} \int_{\omega'} |D^j u|^{p-2} D^{j_+} u D^{j_-} u \psi^{p(m-k)} \\ &\quad - p(m-k) d^{-pk} \int_{\omega'} |D^j u|^{p-2} D^j u D^{j_-} u \psi^{p(m-k)-1} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_{i_0}} \\ &\leq C d^{-pk} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^{q-1} u| |\nabla^q u|^{p-2} |\nabla^{q+1} u| \psi^{p(m-k)} \\ &\quad + C d^{-(pk+1)} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^{q-1} u| |\nabla^q u|^{p-1} \psi^{p(m-k)-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where $C = C(n, p, r, m) > 0$. As $I_q = \sum_{|j|=q} d^{-pk} \int_{\omega'} |D^j u|^p \psi^{p(m-k)}$ with $k+q=r$, then (2.6) implies

$$I_q \leq C(J_1 + J_2) \quad \text{where} \quad J_1 = d^{-pk} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^{q-1} u| |\nabla^q u|^{p-2} |\nabla^{q+1} u| \psi^{p(m-k)} \quad \text{and} \quad J_2 = d^{-(pk+1)} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^{q-1} u| |\nabla^q u|^{p-1} \psi^{p(m-k)-1}. \quad (2.7)$$

Now, we invoke the following Young's inequalities

$$ab^{p-2}c \leq \frac{1}{p} \varepsilon^{1-p} a^p + \frac{p-2}{p} \varepsilon b^p + \frac{1}{p} \varepsilon c^p. \quad (2.8)$$

⁴In fact if $u|_{\omega'} \in W^{r,p}(\omega')$, inequality (2.3) follows from standard approximation argument and Lebesgue's dominated convergence.

Observe that $pk = (k+1) + k(p-2) + (k-1)$, $p(m-k) = (m-(k+1)) + (p-2)(m-k) + (m-(k-1))$ (respectively $pk+1 = (k+1) + (p-2)k + k$ and $p(m-k)-1 = (m-(k+1)) + (p-2)(m-k) + (m-k)$). Thus, inequality (2.8) with $a = d^{-(k+1)}|\nabla^{q-1}u|\psi^{m-(k+1)}$, $b = d^{-k}|\nabla^q u|\psi^{(r-k)}$ and $c = d^{-(k-1)}|\nabla^{q+1}u|\psi^{m-(k-1)}$ (respectively $c = d^{-k}|\nabla^q u|\psi^{(r-k)}$), implies

$$J_1 \leq \frac{1}{p}\varepsilon^{1-p}I_{q-1} + \frac{(p-2)}{p}\varepsilon I_q + \frac{1}{p}\varepsilon I_{q+1} \text{ and } J_2 \leq \frac{1}{p}\varepsilon^{1-p}I_{q-1} + \frac{p-1}{p}\varepsilon I_q.$$

Therefore, the above inequalities and (2.7) imply

$$(1 - 2C\varepsilon)I_q \leq C\varepsilon^{1-p}I_{q-1} + C\varepsilon I_{q+1}.$$

Thus, the inequality (2.4) follows by replacing ε by $\frac{\varepsilon}{4(1+C)}$.

Step 2. End of the proof of (2.3). The case $r = 2$ is obvious. The case $r \geq 3$ needs involved iteration argument. First, we first prove that

$$I_q \leq C\varepsilon^{1-p'}I_0 + \varepsilon I_{q+1}, \quad 1 \leq q \leq r-1. \quad (2.9)$$

The case $q = 1$ follows from (2.4). For $q \geq 2$, let $2 \leq j \leq q \leq r-1$. Applying (2.4), where we replace q by $j-i$ and ε by ε^{p^j} with $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, j-1$, we derive

$$C^i \varepsilon^{-p^j} I_{j-i} \leq C^{i+1} \varepsilon^{-p^{j+1}} I_{j-i-1} + C^i I_{j-i+1}.$$

Set $S_j = \sum_{i=2}^j I_i$, we make the sum of the above inequality from $i = 0$ to $i = j-1$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{-1} I_j &\leq C^j \varepsilon^{-p^j} I_0 + I_{j+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} C^i I_{j-i+1} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{-p'} I_0 + I_{j+1} + CS_j. \end{aligned}$$

As $S_j \leq S_q$, we have

$$I_j \leq C\varepsilon^{1-p'} I_0 + \varepsilon I_{j+1} + C\varepsilon S_q \text{ if } 2 \leq j \leq q. \quad (2.10)$$

So, make the sum of (2.10) from $j = 2$ to $j = q$, we arrive at

$$S_q \leq C\varepsilon^{1-p'} I_0 + \varepsilon I_{q+1} + C\varepsilon S_q.$$

We replace ε by $\frac{\varepsilon}{2(C+1)}$, we get

$$S_q \leq C\varepsilon^{1-p'} I_0 + \varepsilon I_{q+1}, \text{ for all } 1 \leq q \leq r-1.$$

Hence, inequality (2.9) follows from (2.10) with $j = q$ and the above inequality. According to (2.9), we have⁵

$$\begin{cases} I_q \leq C\varepsilon^{1-p'} I_0 + I_{q+1}, \\ I_{q+1} \leq C\varepsilon^{1-p'} I_{0,r} + I_{q+2}, \\ \vdots \\ I_{r-1} \leq C\varepsilon^{1-p'} I_0 + \varepsilon I_r. \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

Make the sum of these inequalities, we deduce

$$I_q \leq C\varepsilon^{1-p'} I_0 + \varepsilon I_r.$$

The proof of Lemma 1.2 is completed. \square

⁵Recall that $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1.

3.1. Preliminary results.

$B(y, \lambda)$ stands for the ball of radius $\lambda > 0$ centered at $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let ω and ω' be two bounded open subset such that $\overline{\omega} \subset \omega' \subset \overline{\omega'} \subset B(y, \lambda)$ and consider ψ the corresponding cut-off function defined in Lemma 1.1. The following lemma will be used in this section for only $p = 2$ and we omit the proofs of similar results needed in next section for all $p \geq 2$ (see Lemma 4.1).

Lemma 3.1. *For every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, there exists a positive constant $C_\varepsilon = C(n, m, r, p, \varepsilon)$ such that, for all $u \in W^{r,p}(B(y, \lambda))$, we have*

$$\int_{B(y, \lambda)} |D_r u|^{p-2} \left| |D_r(u\psi^{\frac{pm}{2}})|^2 - D_r u D_r(u\psi^{pm}) \right| \leq \varepsilon \int_{B(y, \lambda)} |\nabla^r(u\psi^m)|^p + C_\varepsilon d^{-pr} \int_{B(y, \lambda)} |u|^p \psi^{p(m-r)}; \quad (3.1)$$

$$\int_{B(y, \lambda)} |D_r u|^{p-2} \left| |D_r u|^2 \psi^{pm} - D_r u D_r(u\psi^{pm}) \right| \leq \varepsilon \int_{B(y, \lambda)} |\nabla^r(u\psi^m)|^p + C_\varepsilon d^{-pr} \int_{B(y, \lambda)} |u|^p \psi^{p(m-r)}; \quad (3.2)$$

where $d = \text{dist}(\omega, B(y, \lambda) \setminus \omega')$. Moreover, we have

$$\int_{B(y, \lambda)} |\nabla^r(u\psi^m)|^p \leq 3 \int_{B(y, \lambda)} |D_r u|^p \psi^{pm} + C d^{-pr} \int_{B(y, \lambda)} |u|^p \psi^{p(m-r)}. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Let $s > 1$ and $\beta_q \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 \leq q \leq r$. Recall the following Young's inequality:

$$\left| \beta_r \sum_{q=0}^{r-1} \beta_q \right| \leq \varepsilon |\beta_r|^s + C_\varepsilon \sum_{q=0}^{r-1} |\beta_q|^{\frac{s}{s-1}}. \quad (3.4)$$

Set $A(\eta, u) := D_r(u\eta) - \eta D_r u$, where $\eta \in C_c^r(B(y, \lambda))$ ⁶. We can see easily that $|A(\eta, u)| \leq C \sum_{q+k=r, q \neq r} |\nabla^q u| |\nabla^k \eta|$ and

$$\begin{cases} \eta^2 |D_r u|^2 - D_r u \cdot D_r(u\eta^2) = -D_r u \cdot A(\eta^2, u); \\ |D_r(u\eta)|^2 - \eta^2 |D_r u|^2 = 2\eta D_r u \cdot A(\eta, u) + |A(\eta, u)|^2. \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$\left| |D_r u|^{p-2} \left(|D_r(u\eta)|^2 - D_r u D_r(u\eta^2) \right) \right| \leq C \sum_{q+k=r, q \neq r} \left(|D_r u|^{p-1} |\nabla^q u| (|\eta| |\nabla^k \eta| + |\nabla^k(\eta^2)|) + |D_r u|^{p-2} |\nabla^q u|^2 |\nabla^k \eta|^2 \right).$$

and

$$\left| |D_r u|^{p-2} \left(|D_r u|^2 \eta^2 - D_r u D_r(u\eta^2) \right) \right| \leq C |D_r u|^{p-1} \sum_{q+k=r, q \neq r} |\nabla^q u| |\nabla^k(\eta^2)|.$$

Choose now $\eta = \psi^{\frac{pm}{2}}$ and use (2.1) (where one replaces respectively m by $\frac{pm}{2}$ and pm), we obtain⁷

$$\int_{B(y, \lambda)} \left| |D_r u|^{p-2} \left(|D_r(u\psi^{\frac{pm}{2}})|^2 - D_r u D_r(u\psi^{pm}) \right) \right|; \int_{B(y, \lambda)} \left| |D_r u|^{p-2} \left(|D_r u|^2 \psi^{pm} - D_r u D_r(u\psi^{pm}) \right) \right| \leq CS(d, p, m, r), \quad (3.5)$$

⁶Both D_r and $A(\eta, u)$ are respectively scalar operators if r is even, and n -vectorial operators if r is odd.

⁷Observe that $|D_r u| \leq C |\nabla^r u|$.

$$\text{where } S(d, p, m, r) = \int_{B(y, \lambda)} \left(|\nabla^r u|^{p-1} \sum_{q+k=r, q \neq r} d^{-k} |\nabla^q u| \psi^{pm-k} \right) + \int_{B(y, \lambda)} \left(|\nabla^r u|^{p-2} \sum_{q+k=r, q \neq r} d^{-2k} |\nabla^q u|^2 \psi^{pm-2k} \right).$$

Observe that $pm - k = (p-1)m + (m-k)$ (respectively $pm - 2k = (p-2)m + 2(m-k)$), so we apply (3.4) with $s = \frac{p}{p-1}$, $\beta_r = |\nabla^r u|^{p-1} \psi^{(p-1)m}$ and $\beta_q = d^{-k} |\nabla^q u| \psi^{(m-k)}$ (respectively $s = \frac{p}{p-2}$, $\beta_r = |\nabla^r u|^{p-2} \psi^{(p-2)m}$ and $\beta_q = d^{-2k} |\nabla^q u|^2 \psi^{2(m-k)}$), we obtain

$$S(d, p, m, r) \leq +\varepsilon \int_{B(y, \lambda)} |\nabla^r u|^p \psi^{pm} + C_\varepsilon \sum_{q+k=r, q \neq r} d^{-pk} \int_{B(y, \lambda)} |\nabla^q u|^p \psi^{p(m-k)}. \quad (3.6)$$

Hence, inequalities (3.1) and (3.2) follow from (3.5), (3.6) and inequalities (1.6), (1.7) of Lemma 1.2.

Proof of Inequality (3.3). First, recall the higher order Calderon-Zygmund's inequality [14]⁸:

$$\int_{B(y, \lambda)} |\nabla^r v|^p \leq C \int_{B(y, \lambda)} |D^r v|^p, \forall v \in W_0^{r,p}((B(y, \lambda))), \quad (3.7)$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on (n, r, p) . We invoke inequality (2.2) with $a = |D_r(u\psi^m)|$ and $b = |D_r u| \psi^m$, which with (2.1) imply

$$\begin{aligned} |D_r(u\psi^m)|^p &\leq 2|D_r u|^p \psi^{pm} + C|D_r(u\psi^m) - \psi^m D_r u|^p \\ &\leq 2|D_r u|^p \psi^{pm} + C \sum_{q+k=r, q \neq r} d^{-pk} |\nabla^q u|^p \psi^{p(m-k)}. \end{aligned}$$

We integrate the above inequality over $B(y, \lambda)$, so (3.3) follows from (1.7) and (3.7). The proof of Lemma 3.1 is completed. \square

At last, according to assumptions (h_1) – (h_4) , we derive the following lemma (see the proof in Appendix A). Set $q_1 = \frac{p_2 + 1}{p_2}$. Let $q > 1$. Then, we have

Lemma 3.2. *There exists a positive constant $C = C(s_0, p_1, p_2, c_1)$ such that for all $(x, s) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$, we have*

- [1] $f'(x, s)s^2 \geq p_1 f(x, s) - C$;
- [2] $(p_2 + 1)F(x, s) \geq f(x, s)s - C$;
- [3] $|s|^{p_1+1} \leq C(|f(x, s)s| + 1)$, $|f(x, s)s| \leq f(x, s)s + C$ and $|F(x, s)| \leq C(f(x, s)s + 1)$;
- [4] $|f(x, s)|^{q_1} \leq C(|f(x, s)s| + 1)$ and $|f(x, s)|^{\frac{q}{p_2}} \leq C(|s|^q + 1)$;
- [5] For all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $0 \leq a \leq 1$ and $b > 0$ we have $as^2b \leq C + \varepsilon|f(x, s)s|a^{\frac{p_1+1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{-2}{p_1-1}} b^{\frac{p_1+1}{p_1-1}}$.

3.2. End of the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Recall that $d_y = \inf(\alpha, \delta_y)$, where $\delta_y = \text{dist}(y, \partial\Omega)$ and $y \in \Omega$. We denote $A_a^b = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; a < |x - y| < b\}$. For $j = 1, 2, \dots, i(u) + 1$, set

$$A_j := A_{a_j}^{b_j} \quad \text{with} \quad a_j = d_x \frac{2(j+i(u))}{4(i(u)+1)}; \quad b_j = d_x \frac{2(j+i(u))+1}{4(i(u)+1)}; \quad (3.8)$$

$$A'_j := A_{a'_j}^{b'_j} \quad \text{with} \quad a'_j = d_x \frac{2(j+i(u)) - \frac{1}{2}}{4(i(u)+1)}; \quad b'_j = d_x \frac{2(j+i(u)) + \frac{3}{2}}{4(i(u)+1)}. \quad (3.9)$$

⁸Inequality (3.7) can be obtained from an induction argument and the standard Calderon-Zygmund's inequality for $r = 2$ [13].

Let $\psi_j \in C_c^r(B(y, d_y))$ be the cut-off function defined in Lemma 1.1 with $\omega = A_j$ and $\omega' = A'_j$ which satisfies $\text{supp}(\psi_j) \subset A'_j$, $0 \leq \psi_j \leq 1$ for $x \in A'_j$ and $\psi_j = 1$ for $x \in A_j$. As $\text{dist}(A_j, B(y, d_y) \setminus A'_j) = \frac{d_y}{2(i(u) + 1)}$, estimate (2.1) implies

$$|\nabla^k(\psi_j^m)(x)|^2 \leq C \psi_j^{2(m-k)} \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{2k}, \quad \forall x \in B(y, d_y). \quad (3.10)$$

Clearly, $\text{supp}(u\psi_j^m) \cap \text{supp}(u\psi_l^m) = \emptyset, \forall 1 \leq l \neq j \leq 1 + i(u)$. Consequently

$$Q_u \left(\sum_1^{1+i(u)} \lambda_j u \psi_j^m \right) = \sum_1^{1+i(u)} \lambda_j^2 Q_u(u\psi_j^m),$$

where Q_u is the quadratic form defined in (3.11)). According to the definition of $i(u)$, there exists $j_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, 1 + i(u)\}$ such that $Q_u(u\psi_{j_0}^m) \geq 0$. Therefore, point 1 of lemma 3.2 implies

$$p_1 \int_{B(y, d_y)} f(x, u) u \psi_{j_0}^{2m} - C d_y^n \leq \int_{B(y, d_y)} f'(x, u) (u \psi_{j_0}^m)^2 \leq \int_{B(y, d_y)} |D_r(u \psi_{j_0}^m)|^2. \quad (3.11)$$

Step 1. First, we prove the following estimate

$$\int_{A_{j_0}} |\nabla^r u|^2 + \int_{A_{j_0}} |f(x, u) u| \leq C d_y^n \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{\frac{2(p_1+1)r}{p_1-1}}. \quad (3.12)$$

Multiplying equation (1.8) by $(-\frac{1+p_1}{2})u\psi_{j_0}^{2m}$, integrating by parts and adding it to (3.11), yields

$$\frac{p_1-1}{2} \left(\int_{B(y, d_y)} f(x, u) u \psi_{j_0}^{2m} + \int_{B(y, d_y)} |D_r(u \psi_{j_0}^m)|^2 \right) \leq C d_y^n + \frac{p_1+1}{2} \left(\int_{B(y, d_y)} (|D_r(u \psi_{j_0}^m)|^2 - D_r u D_r u (u \psi_{j_0}^{2m})) \right).$$

Hence, (3.7) and (3.1) imply

$$\int_{B(y, d_y)} |\nabla^r(u \psi_{j_0}^m)|^2 + \int_{B(y, d_y)} f(x, u) u \psi_{j_0}^{2m} \leq C d_y^n + \varepsilon \int_{B(y, d_y)} |\nabla^r(u \psi_{j_0}^m)|^2 + C_\varepsilon \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_x} \right)^{2r} \int_{B(y, d_y)} u^2 \psi_{j_0}^{2(m-r)}. \quad (3.13)$$

Now, choose $m = \frac{(p_1+1)r}{2} > r$ so that $\frac{(p_1+1)(m-r)}{p_1-1} = m$, thus from point 5 of Lemma 3.2 with $s = u$, $a = \psi_{j_0}^{2(m-r)}$ and $b = C \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_x} \right)^{-2r}$, there holds

$$C \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{-2r} \int_{B(y, d_y)} u^2 \psi_{j_0}^{2(m-r)} \leq C d_y^n + \varepsilon \int_{B(y, d_y)} |f(x, u) u| \psi_{j_0}^{2m} + C_\varepsilon d_y^n \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{\frac{2(p_1+1)r}{p_1-1}}.$$

The last inequality with (3.13) and point 3 of Lemma 3.2 imply⁹

$$\int_{B(y, d_y)} |\nabla^r(u \psi_{j_0}^m)|^2 + \int_{B(y, d_y)} |f(x, u) u| \psi_{j_0}^{2m} \leq C d_y^n \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{\frac{2(p_1+1)r}{p_1-1}}.$$

Therefore, inequality (3.12) follows as $\psi_{j_0}^k(x) = 1$ for $x \in A_{j_0}$.

⁹Observe that $d_y^n \leq d_y^n \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{\frac{2(p_1+1)r}{p_1-1}}$ as $d_y = \inf(\alpha, \delta_y) < 1$.

Step 2. First, recall the following identity (see the proof in [18], page 1866):

$$D_r u D_r (\nabla u \cdot (x - y)) = \frac{1}{2} \nabla(|D_r u|^2) \cdot (x - y) + r|D_r u|^2. \quad (3.14)$$

We shall prove the following estimate:

$$d_y^{-n} \int_{B(y, \frac{d_y}{2})} |f(x, u)|^{q_1} \leq C(1 + i(u)) \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{\frac{2(p_1+1)r}{p_1-1}}. \quad (3.15)$$

We invoke again Lemma 1.1 with $\omega = B(y, a_{j_0})$, $\omega' = B(y, b_{j_0})$, so there exists $\psi \in C_c^r(B(y, b_{j_0}))$ such that

$$\psi \equiv 1 \text{ for all } x \in B(y, a_{j_0}) \text{ and } |\nabla^k \psi^{2m}| \leq C \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^k \psi^{2m-k} \quad \forall x \in A_{j_0} \text{ and } k = 1, 2, \dots, r. \quad (3.16)$$

In one hand, multiplying (1.8) by $(\nabla u \cdot (x - y))\psi^{2m}$. So, according to (3.14), integration by parts gives

$$\frac{2r-n}{2} \int_{B(y, d_y)} |D_r u|^2 \psi^{2m} + n \int_{B(y, d_y)} F(x, u) \psi^{2m} = I - \int_{B(y, d_y)} (\nabla_x F)(x, u) \cdot (x - y) \psi^{2m}, \quad (3.17)$$

$$\text{where } I = \frac{1}{2} \int_{A_{j_0}} |D_r u|^2 (\nabla \psi^{2m} \cdot (x - y)) - \int_{A_{j_0}} F(x, u) (\nabla \psi^{2m} \cdot (x - y)).$$

As $|x - y| \leq d_y \leq \alpha$, point 3 of Lemma 3.2, assumption (h_3) , (3.12) and (3.16) imply

$$\begin{cases} |I| \leq C(1 + i(u)) \left(d_y^n + \int_{A_{j_0}} (|f(y, u)u| + |D_r u|^2) \right) \leq C d_y^n (1 + i(u)) \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{\frac{2(p_1+1)r}{p_1-1}}; \\ \int_{B(y, d_y)} |(\nabla_x F)(x, u) \cdot (x - y)| \psi^{2m} \leq C \left(d_y^n + \alpha \int_{B(y, d_y)} f(x, u) u \psi^{2m} \right). \end{cases}$$

These inequalities with (3.17) and point 2 of Lemma 3.2 imply

$$\left(\frac{2n}{(p_2 + 1)(n - 2r)} - C\alpha \right) \int_{B(y, d_y)} f(x, u) u \psi^{2m} - \int_{B(y, d_y)} |D_r u|^2 \psi^{2m} \leq C d_y^n (1 + i(u)) \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{\frac{2(p_1+1)r}{p_1-1}}. \quad (3.18)$$

On the other hand, multiplying equation (1.8) by $u\psi^{2m}$, we deduce

$$\int_{B(y, d_y)} D_r u D_r (u\psi^{2m}) = \int_{B(y, d_y)} f(x, u) u \psi^{2m}.$$

In view of inequality (3.2) of Lemma 3.1, we derive

$$\int_{B(y, d)} |D_r u|^2 \psi^{2m} - \int_{B(y, d_y)} f(x, u) u \psi^{2m} \leq \varepsilon \int_{B(y, d_y)} |\nabla^r (u\psi^m)|^2 + C_\varepsilon \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_x} \right)^{2r} \int_{B(y, d)} u^2 \psi^{2(m-r)}.$$

Recall that $\frac{2n}{(p_2 + 1)(n - 2r)} > 1$ and choose $\alpha = \alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ small enough so that $\frac{2n}{(p_2 + 1)(n - 2r)} - C\alpha_0 > 1$. So, the above inequality with (3.18) and (3.3) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(y, d_y)} |\nabla^r u|^2 \psi^{2m} + \int_{B(y, d_y)} f(x, u) u \psi^{2m} &\leq \varepsilon \int_{B(y, d_y)} |\nabla^r (u\psi^m)|^2 + C_\varepsilon \frac{(1 + i(u))^{2r}}{d_y^{2r}} \int_{B(y, d)} u^2 \psi^{2(m-r)} \\ &\quad + C d_y^n (1 + i(u)) \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{\frac{2(p_1+1)r}{p_1-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose now $m = \frac{(p_1 + 1)r}{2} > r$, then from points 3 and 5 of Lemma 3.2 we deduce

$$\int_{B(y, d_y)} |\nabla^r(u\psi^m)|^2 + \int_{B(y, d_y)} |f(x, u)u\psi^{2m}| \leq C d_y^n (1 + i(u)) \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{\frac{2(p_1+1)r}{p_1-1}}. \quad (3.19)$$

As $\psi \equiv 1$ for all $x \in B(y, \frac{d_y}{2}) \subset B(y, a_{j_0})$, estimate (3.15) follows from point 4 of Lemma 3.2.

Step 3. Boot-strap procedure. Set $\lambda = \frac{d_y}{2} < 1$, $u_\lambda(x) = u(y + \lambda x)$ and $g_\lambda(x) = f(y + \lambda x, u(y + \lambda x))$, $x \in B_1$, then u_λ satisfies

$$(-\Delta u_\lambda)^r = \lambda^{2r} g_\lambda \text{ in } B_1. \quad (3.20)$$

By virtue of (3.15), we have

$$\int_{B_1} |g_\lambda|^{q_1} = 2^n d_y^{-n} \int_{B(y, \frac{d_y}{2})} |f(x, u)|^{q_1} \leq C (1 + i(u)) \left(\frac{1 + i(u)}{d_y} \right)^{\frac{2(p_1+1)r}{p_1-1}}. \quad (3.21)$$

Let $q > 1$. We invoke now local L^p - $W^{2r,p}$ estimate (see Corollary 4.1 in the Appendix B, or corollary 6 in [28]) and Rellich-Kondrachov's theorem [14]. Therefore, as $\lambda = \frac{d_y}{2} < 1$, point 3 of Lemma 3.2 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\lambda\|_{L^{q^*}(B_{\frac{1}{2}})} &\leq C \|u_\lambda\|_{W^{2r,q}(B_{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq C (\|g_\lambda\|_{L^q(B_1)} + \|u_\lambda\|_{L^q(B_1)}) \leq C (\|g_\lambda\|_{L^q(B_1)} + 1), \\ \text{where } q^* &= \frac{qn}{n - 2rq} \text{ if } 2rq < n \text{ and for all } q^* > 1 \text{ if } q = \frac{n}{2r}; \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

and

$$\|u_\lambda\|_{C^{2r-1}(B_{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq C \|u_\lambda\|_{W^{2r,q}(B_{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq C (\|g_\lambda\|_{L^q(B_1)} + \|u_\lambda\|_{L^q(B_1)}) \leq C (\|g_\lambda\|_{L^q(B_1)} + 1), \text{ if } 2rq > n. \quad (3.23)$$

Also, inequality (3.22) and point 4 of Lemma 3.2 give

$$\|g_\lambda\|_{L^{\frac{q^*}{p_2}}(B_{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq C (\|g_\lambda\|_{L^q(B_1)} + 1)^{p_2}, \text{ if } 2rq \leq n. \quad (3.24)$$

The case $2rq_1 < n$ needs more careful analysis. In fact, as $q_1 = \frac{p_2 + 1}{p_2}$ and $1 < p_2 < \frac{n + 2r}{n - 2r}$, we have $q_1^* = \frac{q_1 n}{n - 2rq_1} = \frac{(p_2 + 1)n}{p_2(n - 2r) - 2r} > \frac{(p_2 + 1)n}{n} > p_2$ and $\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{2rp_2}{n(p_2 - 1)} < 0$. Set $q_2 = \frac{q_1^*}{p_2}$ and $q_{k+1} = \frac{q_k^*}{p_2}$. We claim that there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that

$$2rq_{k_0+1} > n \text{ and } 2rq_{k_0} < n. \quad (3.25)$$

Suppose by contradiction that $2rq_k < n$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Then, $\frac{1}{q_{k+1}} = \frac{p_2}{q_k} - \frac{2rp_2}{n}$ and

$$\frac{1}{q_{k+1}} = \frac{p_2^k}{q_1} - \frac{2rp_2}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} p_2^j = p_2^k \left(\frac{1}{q_1} - \frac{2rp_2}{n(p_2 - 1)} \right) + \frac{2rp_2}{n(p_2 - 1)}. \quad (3.26)$$

Therefore, we reach a contradiction since $\frac{1}{q_k} \rightarrow -\infty$. Set

$$\beta = \frac{2rp_2}{n(p_2 - 1)} \left(\frac{2rp_2}{n(p_2 - 1)} - \frac{1}{q_1} \right)^{-1} = \frac{2r(p_2 + 1)}{2r(p_2 + 1) - n(p_2 - 1)}.$$

From (3.26), we have $p_2^{k_0} < \beta$ and $p_2^{k_0+1} > \beta$. Now, iterating (3.24) and using (3.2), we obtain

$$\|g_\lambda\|_{L^{q_{k_0+1}}(B_{\frac{1}{2^{k_0+1}}})} \leq C(\|g_\lambda\|_{L^{q_1}(B_1)} + 1)^{p_2^{k_0}} \leq C(\|g_\lambda\|_{L^{q_1}(B_1)} + 1)^\beta.$$

Set $\gamma_1 = \frac{(p_1+1)\beta}{q_1} = \frac{2r(p_1+1)p_2}{2r(p_2+1)-n(p_2-1)}$ and $\gamma_2 = \beta + \frac{2r}{p_1-1}\gamma_1$. As $rq_{k_0+1} > n$, the last inequality with (3.23) and (3.21) imply

$$\|u_\lambda\|_{C^{2r-1}(B_{\frac{1}{2^{k_0+1}}})} \leq C(1+i(u))^{\gamma_2} d_y^{\frac{-2r}{p_1-1}\gamma_1}.$$

According to the definition of u_λ , we get $\sum_{j=0}^{2r-1} d_y^j |(\nabla^j u)(y)| \leq C(1+i(u))^{\gamma_2} d_y^{\frac{-2r}{p_1-1}\gamma_1}$. If $2rq_1 > n$ (respectively $2rq_1 = n$) the estimate (1.11) follows from (3.21) and (3.23) (with $q = q_1$) (respectively (3.21), (3.22) (with $q = q_1$) and (3.23), (3.24) (with $q = p_2 \frac{n+1}{2r}$)). This achieves the proof of Theorem 1.1. \square

4. Proofs of Proposition 1.1 and Theorem 1.2.

4.1. Preliminary lemma.

To discuss the class of solutions which are stable outside the ball B_{R_0} for some $R_0 > 0$, we employed the following cut-off function $\psi = \psi_{R,R_0} \in C_c^r(B_{2R})$, $R > 2R_0 > 0$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \psi \equiv 1 & \text{if } 2R_0 < |x| < R, \\ \psi \equiv 0 & \text{if } |x| < R_0 \text{ or } |x| > 2R, \\ 0 \leq \psi \leq 1 \text{ and } |\nabla^k \psi| \leq CR^{-k}, & \text{for all } R < |x| < 2R, \text{ and } 1 \leq k \leq r. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

Set $A_R = \{R < |x| < 2R\}$, similarly to estimate (2.1), we have

$$|\nabla^k \psi^m|^p \leq CR^{-pk} \psi^{p(m-k)}, \quad \forall R \leq |x| \leq 2R \text{ and } 1 \leq k \leq r. \quad (4.2)$$

Regarding the case of stable solutions, we used the cut-off function $\psi = \psi_R$ defined in Lemma 1.1 with $\omega = B_R$ and $\omega' = B_{2R}$. From a simple examination of the proofs of Lemmas 1.2 and 3.1, we may establish the following analogue one:

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\psi = \psi_{R,R_0}$ and $u \in W_{loc}^{r,p}(\Omega)$. Then, for every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ there exist two positive constants $C_\varepsilon = C(\varepsilon, n, p, r, m) > 0$ and $C_0 = C_0(u, R_0, n, p, r, m)$ such that for all $R > 2R_0$, we have*

$$R^{-pk} \int_{B_{2R}} |\nabla^q u|^p |\psi|^{p(m-k)} \leq C_0 + \varepsilon \int_{B_{2R}} |\nabla^r u|^p \psi^{pm} + C_\varepsilon R^{-pr} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u|^p \psi^{p(m-r)}; \quad (4.3)$$

$$\int_{B_{2R}} |\nabla^r u|^p \psi^{pm} \leq C_0 + 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla^r(u\psi^m)|^p + CR^{-pr} \int_{B_{2R}} |u|^p \psi^{p(m-r)}; \quad (4.4)$$

$$R^{-pk} \int_{B_{2R}} |\nabla^q u|^p \psi^{p(m-k)} \leq C_0 + \varepsilon \int_{B_{2R}} |\nabla^r(u\psi^m)|^p + C_\varepsilon R^{-pr} \int_{B_{2R}} |u|^p \psi^{p(m-r)}; \quad (4.5)$$

$$\int_{B_{2R}} \left| |D_r u|^{p-2} \left(|D_r(u\psi^{\frac{pm}{2}})|^2 - D_r u D_r(u\psi^{pm}) \right) \right| \leq C_0 + A(u, R, r, p, m, \varepsilon); \quad (4.6)$$

$$\int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^p \psi^{pm} - \int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^{p-2} D_r u D_r(u \psi^{pm}) \leq C_0 + A(u, R, r, p, m, \varepsilon) \quad (4.7)$$

$$\text{where } A(u, R, r, p, m, \varepsilon) = \varepsilon \int_{A_R} |\nabla^r u|^p \psi^{pm} + C_\varepsilon \sum_{q+k=r, q \neq r} R^{-pk} \int_{A_R} |\nabla^q u|^p |\psi|^{p(m-k)}; \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$\int_{B_{2R}} |\nabla^r(u \psi^m)|^p \leq C_0 + 3 \int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^p \psi^{pm} + CR^{-pr} \int_{B_{2R}} |\nabla^q u|^p |\psi|^{p(m-r)}. \quad (4.9)$$

Moreover, if $\psi = \psi_R$, the above inequalities hold with $C_0 = 0$.

We omit the proof of Lemma 4.1, we will only show briefly how the constant $C_0 = C_0(u, R_0, n, p, r, m)$ will be appeared in inequality (4.3). For $1 \leq q \leq r-1$ and $k = r-q$, set $I_q = R^{-pk} \int_{B_{2R}} |\nabla^q u|_p^p \psi^{p(r-k)}$. Recall that $|\nabla \psi| \leq CR^{-1}$ if $x \in A_R$. Following the proof of inequality (2.4), integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned} R^{-pk} \int_{B_{2R}} |D^j u|^p \psi^{p(m-k)} &= -(p-1)R^{-pk} \int_{B_{2R}} D^{j-} u |D^j u|^{p-2} D^{j+} u \psi^{p(m-k)} \\ &\quad - p(m-k)R^{-pk} \int_{A_R \cup A_{R_0}} D^{j-} u |D^j u|^{p-2} D^j u \psi^{p(m-k)-1} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_{i_0}} \\ &\leq C_0 + (p-1)R^{-pk} \int_{B_{2R}} |D^{j-} u| |D^j u|^{p-2} |D^{j+} u| \psi^{p(m-k)} \\ &\quad + p(m-k)R^{-pk-1} \int_{B_{2R}} |D^{j-} u| |D^j u|^{p-2} |D^j u| \psi^{p(m-k)-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_0 = pmR_0^{-rp} \int_{A_{R_0}} |D^{j-} u| |D^j u|^{p-1} |\nabla \psi|$. Therefore,

$$I_q \leq C_0 + C \left(R^{-pk} \int_{B_{2R}} |\nabla^{q-1} u| |\nabla^q u|^{p-2} |\nabla^{q+1} u| \psi^{p(m-k)} + R^{-pk-1} \int_{B_{2R}} |\nabla^{q-1} u| |\nabla^q u|^{p-1} \psi^{p(m-k)-1} \right),$$

where $C_0 = pmR_0^{-rp} \int_{A_{R_0}} |\nabla^{q-1} u| |\nabla^q u|^{p-1} |\nabla \psi|$. Similarly to the proof of (2.4), we may derive that

$$I_q \leq C_0 + C\varepsilon^{1-p} I_{q-1} + \varepsilon I_{q+1}, \quad \forall 1 \leq q \leq r-1. \quad (4.10)$$

Noticing that the additive constant C_0 does not provoke any extra mathematical difficulty to provide (4.3) as in step 2 of the proof of inequality (1.5).

4.2. Proof of Proposition 1.1.

Let $u \in W_{loc}^{r,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L_{loc}^{q+1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a weak solution of (1.13) and recall that $q_1, q_2 > p-1$. If u is stable outside the ball B_{R_0} , then $u \psi^{\frac{pm}{2}} \in W_0^{r,p}(B_{2R}) \cap L^{\bar{q}+1}(B_{2R})$ and $\text{supp}(u \psi^{\frac{pm}{2}}) \subset B_{2R} \setminus B_{R_0}$. Thus, (1.14) and (1.16) imply¹⁰

$$\int_{B_{2R}} (c_1 u_+^{q_1+1} + c_2 u_-^{q_2+1}) \psi^{pm} = \int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^{p-2} D_r u \cdot D_r(u \psi^{pm}) \quad (4.11)$$

and

$$\int_{B_{2R}} (c_1 q_1 u_+^{q_1+1} + c_2 q_2 u_-^{q_2+1}) \psi^{pm} \leq (p-1) \int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^{p-2} |D_r(u \psi^{\frac{pm}{2}})|^2. \quad (4.12)$$

¹⁰If u is a stable solution, then (1.14) and (1.16) hold with $\psi = \psi_R$.

We multiply (4.11) by $-\frac{q+p-1}{2}$ and we combine it with (4.12) to obtain¹¹

$$\frac{q-p+1}{2} \left(\int_{B_{2R}} (c_1 u_+^{q_1+1} + c_2 u_-^{q_2+1}) \psi^{pm} + \int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^{p-2} |D_r(u \psi^{\frac{pm}{2}})|^2 \right) \leq \frac{q+p-1}{2} \left(\int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^{p-2} (|D_r(u \psi^{\frac{pm}{2}})|^2 - D_r u D_r(u \psi^{pm})) \right). \quad (4.13)$$

From (4.13), (4.6) and (4.7), we get

$$\int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^p \psi^{pm} + \int_{B_{2R}} (u_+^{q_1+1} + u_-^{q_2+1}) \psi^{pm} \leq C_0 + A(u, R, r, p, m, \varepsilon), \quad (4.14)$$

where $C_0 = 0$ if u is a stable solution. Hence, inequalities (4.4), (4.5) and (4.7) imply

$$\int_{B_{2R}} |\nabla^r(u \psi^m)|^p + \int_{B_{2R}} (u_+^{q_1+1} + u_-^{q_2+1}) \psi^{pm} \leq C_0 + CR^{-pr} \int_{B_{2R}} |u|^p \psi^{p(m-r)}.$$

Choose now $m = \frac{(q+1)r}{p} > r$ so that $pm = \frac{(q+1)(p(m-r))}{q+1-p} \leq \frac{(\bar{q}+1)(p(m-r))}{\bar{q}+1-p}$ and apply Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} CR^{-pr} \int_{B_{2R}} (u_+^p + u_-^p) \psi^{p(m-r)} &\leq \frac{p}{q_1+1} \int_{B_{2R}} u_+^{q_1+1} \psi^{pm} + \frac{p}{q_2+1} \int_{B_{2R}} u_-^{q_2+1} \psi^{pm} + C(R^{-\frac{pr(q_1+1)}{q_1+1-p}+n} + R^{-\frac{pr(q_2+1)}{q_2+1-p}+n}) \\ &\leq \frac{p}{q_1+1} \int_{B_{2R}} u_+^{q_1+1} \psi^{pm} + \frac{p}{q_2+1} \int_{B_{2R}} u_-^{q_2+1} \psi^{pm} + CR^{-\frac{pr(\bar{q}+1)}{\bar{q}+1-p}+n}, \quad \forall R > \max(1, R_0). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two above inequalities and taking into account that $\psi_{R,R_0} \equiv 1$ on $\{2R_0 < |x| < R\}$ (respectively $\psi_R = 1$ if $|x| < R$), we then derive the energy estimate (1.17). The proof of Proposition 1.1 is thereby completed. \square

4.3. Proof of Theorem 1.2.

First, assume that $u \in W_{loc}^{r,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a weak stable solution of (1.13) (respectively stable outside the ball B_{R_0}). As $p-1 < \underline{q} \leq \bar{q} \leq p^*-1$ if $n > pr$ (respectively $p-1 < \underline{q} \leq \bar{q}$ if $n \leq pr$), then $n - \frac{pr(\underline{q}+1)}{\underline{q}+1-p} \leq n - \frac{pr(\bar{q}+1)}{\bar{q}+1-p} \leq 0$. Therefore, the energy estimate (1.17) implies

$$u_+^{q_1+1} + u_-^{q_2+1} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n), |\nabla^r u|^p \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ and } |D_r u|^p \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (4.15)$$

In view of Hölder's inequality, we have

$$R^{-pr} \int_{A_R} |u|^p \leq CR^{-pr} \int_{B_{2R}} (u_+^p + u_-^p) \leq CR^{\frac{n(q_1+1-p)}{q_1+1}-pr} \left(\int_{A_R} u_+^{q_1+1} \right)^{\frac{p}{q_1+1}} + CR^{\frac{n(q_2+1-p)}{q_2+1}-pr} \left(\int_{A_R} u_-^{q_2+1} \right)^{\frac{p}{q_2+1}}.$$

It follows from (4.15) that

$$R^{-rp} \int_{A_R} |u|^p = o(1), \quad \int_{A_R} (u_+^{q_1+1} + u_-^{q_2+1}) = o(1) \text{ and } \int_{A_R} |\nabla^r u|^p = o(1), \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.16)$$

Noticing that inequality (1.2) holds if we replace B_λ by A_R which implies

$$A(u, R, r, p, m, 1) = \int_{A_R} |\nabla^r u|^p + C \sum_{q+k=r, q \neq r} R^{-pk} \int_{A_R} |\nabla^q u|^p \leq 2 \int_{A_R} |\nabla^r u|^p + R^{-pr} \int_{A_R} |u|^p.$$

¹¹ Recall that $1 \leq p-1 < \underline{q}$.

As a consequence of (4.17), we have

$$A(u, R, r, p, m, 1) = o(1), \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.17)$$

Proof of Point 1 of Theorem 1.2. If u is a stable solution of (1.13), we go back to inequality (4.14) (which holds with $C_0 = 0$), according to estimate (4.17) we derive¹²

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u_+^{q_1+1} + u_-^{q_2+1}) = 0 \text{ and therefore } u \equiv 0.$$

Proof of Point 2. Fix now $\psi = \psi_R$ and set $\phi = \psi^{pm}$, then inequalities (4.7) of Lemma 4.1 holds with $C_0 = 0$. Thus, (4.11) and (4.17) imply

$$\int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^p \phi - \int_{B_{2R}} (c_1 u_+^{q_1+1} + c_2 u_-^{q_2+1}) \phi = o(1). \quad (4.18)$$

Recall that $u \in W_{loc}^{r+1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\bar{q} \leq p^* - 1$, then $(\nabla u \cdot x)\phi \in W_0^{r,p}(B_{2R}) \subset L^{\bar{q}+1}(B_{2R})$. From (??), we have

$$\int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^{p-2} D_r u D_r (\nabla u \cdot x \phi) = \int_{B_{2R}} (c_1 u_+^{q_1} + c_2 u_-^{q_2}) \nabla u \cdot x \phi.$$

Now, multiplying (3.14) by $|D_r u|^{p-2} D_r u$, a direct integration by parts yields¹³

$$\int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^{p-2} D_r u D_r (\nabla u \cdot x) \phi = \frac{rp-n}{p} \int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^p \phi - \frac{1}{p} \int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^p (\nabla \phi \cdot x)$$

and

$$\int_{B_{2R}} (c_1 u_+^{q_1} - c_2 u_-^{q_2}) \nabla u \cdot x \phi = -n \int_{B_{2R}} \left(\frac{c_1 u_+^{q_1+1}}{q_1+1} + \frac{c_2 u_-^{q_2+1}}{q_2+1} \right) \phi - \int_{B_{2R}} \left(\frac{c_1 u_+^{q_1+1}}{q_1+1} + \frac{c_2 u_-^{q_2+1}}{q_2+1} \right) (\nabla \phi \cdot x).$$

Collecting these equalities with (4.16), we deduce that

$$n \int_{B_{2R}} \left(\frac{c_1 u_+^{q_1+1}}{q_1+1} + \frac{c_2 u_-^{q_2+1}}{q_2+1} \right) \phi - \frac{n-rp}{p} \int_{B_{2R}} |D_r u|^p \phi = o(1) \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.19)$$

If $n \leq pr$, then from (4.19) one has $\int_{B_{2R}} \left(\frac{c_1 u_+^{q_1+1}}{q_1+1} + \frac{c_2 u_-^{q_2+1}}{q_2+1} \right) \phi = o(1)$, which implies that $u \equiv 0$. If $n > pr$ and $p-1 < \underline{q} \leq \bar{q} < p^* - 1$, we combine (4.19) with (4.18) to derive

$$c_1 \left(\frac{np}{(n-rp)(q_1+1)} - 1 \right) \int_{B_{2R}} u_+^{q_1+1} \phi + c_2 \left(\frac{np}{(n-rp)(q_2+1)} - 1 \right) \int_{B_{2R}} u_-^{q_2+1} \phi = o(1).$$

Therefore, $u \equiv 0$. If $\underline{q} = \bar{q} = p^* - 1$, then equality (1.18) follows from (4.18), (4.15) and the dominated convergence theorem.

Lastly, if $p-1 < \underline{q} < \bar{q} = p^* - 1$, as above we derive that

$$c_2 \left(\frac{np}{(n-rp)(\underline{q}+1)} - 1 \right) \int_{B_{2R}} u_-^{q+1} \phi = o(1).$$

¹²Note that if $p-1 < \underline{q} < \bar{q} < p^* - 1$ and $n > pr$, or $p-1 < \underline{q} \leq \bar{q}$ and $n \leq pr$, then point 1 is an immediate consequence of the energy estimate (1.17).

¹³We use here (3.14) with $y = 0$.

Consequently, (1.18) holds with $u \geq 0$ if $\bar{q} = q_1$ (respectively $u \leq 0$ if $\bar{q} = q_2$). This achieves the proof of Theorem 1.2. \square

Appendix A: Proof of Lemma 3.2. In the following, C denotes generic positive constant depending only on the parameters (s_0, p_1, p_2) and the constant c_1 of assumptions (h_1) – (h_4) . The following inequalities are an immediate consequence of (h_4) :

$$|F(x, s)|, |f(x, s)s| \leq C, \quad \forall (x, s) \in \Omega \times [-s_0, s_0]. \quad (4.20)$$

Hence, points 1 and 2 follow from (h_1) – (h_2) and (4.20). As the nonlinearity $-f(x, -s)$ satisfies also (h_1) – (h_4) and according to (4.20), we need only to prove points 3 and 4 for all $(x, s) \in \Omega \times [s_0, \infty)$.

Proof of point 3. From (h_1) , we have

$$f'(x, s)s \geq p_1 f(x, s), \quad \forall (x, s) \in \Omega \times [s_0, \infty). \quad (4.21)$$

It follows that $\left(\frac{f(x, s)}{s^{p_1}}\right)' \geq 0$ and $f(x, s) \geq \frac{f(x, s_0)}{s_0^{p_1}} s^{p_1}$. As $f(x, s_0) \geq \frac{1}{c_1}$ for all $x \in \Omega$ (see (h_4)), we derive

$$f(x, s)s \geq \frac{s^{p_1+1}}{c_1 s_0^{p_1}} \text{ and } f(x, s) \geq \frac{s^{p_1}}{c_1 s_0^{p_1}}, \quad \forall (x, s) \in \Omega \times [s_0, \infty). \quad (4.22)$$

The first and second inequalities follow from (4.22)). Integrating (4.21) over $[s_0, s]$ and using (h_2) , we derive $\frac{f(x, s)s}{p_2 + 1} \leq F(x, s) \leq \frac{f(x, s)s}{p_1 + 1} + C$, $\forall (x, s) \in \Omega \times [s_0, \infty)$ which implies the third inequality.

Proof of point 4. Assumption (h_2) gives $\left(\frac{F(x, s)}{s^{p_2+1}}\right)' \leq 0$

; $\forall (x, s) \in \Omega \times [s_0, \infty)$. Then, (4.20) implies $F(x, s) \leq \frac{F(x, s_0)}{s_0^{p_2+1}} s^{p_2+1} \leq C s^{p_2+1}$, $\forall (x, s) \in \Omega \times [s_0, \infty)$. According to (h_2) and (4.22), we have $|f(x, s)|^{\frac{1}{p_2}} \leq C|s|$, $\forall (x, s) \in \Omega \times [s_0, \infty)$. Recall that $q_1 = \frac{p_2 + 1}{p_2}$. Therefore, for $q > 1$, we deduce

$$|f(x, s)|^{q_1} \leq C|f(x, s)s| \text{ and } |f(x, s)|^{\frac{q}{p_2}} \leq C(|s|^q + 1), \quad (x, s) \in \Omega \times [s_0, \infty).$$

Proof of point 5. In view of Young's inequality, we obtain $as^2b \leq \varepsilon s^{p_1+1} a^{\frac{p_1+1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{-2}{p_1-1}} b^{\frac{p_1+1}{p_1-1}}$. Recall that $0 \leq a \leq 1$ and using point 3, we derive point 5. This ends the proof of Lemma 3.2. \square

Appendix B: Local L^p - $W^{2r,p}$ -regularity revisited. Consider the linear higher order elliptic problem of the form

$$Lu = g \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (4.23)$$

Here Ω is a domain of \mathbb{R}^n and

$$L = \left(- \sum_{i,k=1}^n a_{ik}(x) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_k} \right)^r + \sum_{|j| \leq 2r-1} b_j(x) D^j$$

is a uniformly elliptic operator with coefficients $b_j \in L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $a_{ik} \in C^{2r-2}(\Omega)$, that is there exists a constant $\lambda > 0$ with $\lambda^{-1}|\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,k=1}^n a_{ik}(x) \xi_i \xi_k \leq \lambda |\xi|^2$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \in \Omega$.

For $p \geq 2$, thanks to Lemma 1.2, we propose a direct proof of local analogue of the celebrated L^p - $W^{2r,p}$ estimate of Agmon-Douglis-Nirenberg [2]. Let ω and ω' be two bounded open subset of Ω such that $\bar{\omega} \subset \omega'$ and $\bar{\omega}' \subset \Omega$, we have

Corollary 4.1. *Let $g \in L_{loc}^p(\Omega)$ for some $p > 1$. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\|a_{ik}\|_{C^{2r-2}(\omega')}$, $\|b_j\|_{L^\infty(\omega')}$ and $\lambda, \omega', d, n, p, r$ such that for any $u \in W_{loc}^{2r,p}(\Omega)$ a weak solution of (4.23), we have*

$$\|u\|_{W^{2r,p}(\omega)} \leq C (\|g\|_{L^p(\omega')} + \|u\|_{L^p(\omega')}).$$

In the following C denotes a generic positive constant which depends on the parameters stated in Corollary 4.1 and $d = \text{dist}(\omega, \Omega \setminus \omega')$.

Proof of Corollary 4.1. Let $x \in \omega$, Corollary 6 of [28]) with $R = \frac{d}{2}$ and $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{W^{2r,p}(B(x, \frac{d}{4}))}^p &\leq C \left(\|g\|_{L^p(B(x, \frac{d}{2}))}^p + \|u\|_{L^p(B(x, \frac{d}{2}))}^p \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\|g\|_{L^p(\omega')}^p + \|u\|_{L^p(\omega')}^p \right). \end{aligned}$$

As $\bar{\omega}$ is a compact subset of ω' , we can find $x_i \in \omega$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k_0$ such that $\bar{\omega} \subset \cup B(x_i, \frac{d}{4}) \subset \omega'$ where $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ depending only on d and ω . Therefore, we derive

$$\|u\|_{W^{2r,p}(\omega)}^p \leq C k_0 \left(\|g\|_{L^p(\omega')}^p + \|u\|_{L^p(\omega')}^p \right).$$

This achieves the proof of Corollary 4.1. \square

Our main motivation here is to propose a direct proof of Corollary 4.1 when $p \geq 2$ by using Lemmas 1.1 and 1.2. In fact, let ψ be the cut-off function defined in Lemma 1.1 and $m \geq 2r$. Then, we have

$$L(u\psi^m) = g\psi^m + uL(\psi^m) + b_0 u\psi^m + \sum_{1 \leq |i|+|j| \leq 2r-1} c_{i,j} D^j u D^i(\psi^m), \text{ where } c_{i,j} \in L^\infty(\Omega).$$

As $u\psi^m \in W^{2r,p}(\omega') \cap W_0^{r,p}(\omega')$ with **compact support**, Agmon-Douglis-Nirenberg's global estimate [2] and (2.1) imply

$$\sum_{0 \leq s \leq 2r} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^s(u\psi^m)|^p \leq C \left(\|g\|_{L^p(\omega')}^p + \|u\|_{L^p(\omega')}^p + \sum_{1 \leq s \leq 2r-1} \sum_{1 \leq q \leq s} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^q u|^p |\nabla^{s-q} \psi^m|^p \right). \quad (4.24)$$

Using now inequality (1.7) (where one replaces r by s in (1.7)), we obtain

$$\sum_{1 \leq q \leq s-1} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^q u|^p |\nabla^{s-q} \psi^m|^p \leq \varepsilon \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^s(u\psi^m)|^p + C_{\varepsilon,d} \int_{\omega'} |u|^p \psi^{p(m-s)}.$$

Applying again (1.7) with $r = s + 1$ and replacing ε by $\frac{\varepsilon}{d}$, yields

$$\int_{\omega'} |\nabla^s u|^p |\psi^m|^{pm} \leq \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^s u|^p \psi^{p(m-1)} \leq \varepsilon \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^{s+1}(u\psi^m)|^p + C_{\varepsilon,d} \int_{\omega'} |u|^p \psi^{p(m-s-1)}.$$

Collecting the two last inequalities, we derive

$$\sum_{1 \leq s \leq 2r-1} \sum_{1 \leq q \leq s} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^q u|^p |\nabla^{s-q} \psi^m|^p \leq \varepsilon \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 2r} \int_{\omega'} |\nabla^s(u\psi^m)|^p + C_{\varepsilon,d} \int_{\omega'} |u|^p.$$

We insert the above inequality in the right-hand side of (4.24) and we choose $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2C}$, it follows that

$$\|u\psi^m\|_{W^{2r,p}(\omega')}^p \leq C \left(\|g\|_{L^p(\omega')}^p + \|u\|_{L^p(\omega')}^p \right).$$

Since $\psi(x) = 1$ if $x \in \omega$, we obtain

$$\|u\|_{W^{2r,p}(\omega)}^p \leq C \left(\|g\|_{L^p(\omega')}^p + \|u\|_{L^p(\omega')}^p \right).$$

References

- [1] R.A. Adams, J.J.F. Fournier, *Sobolev Spaces*. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Academic Press, London, 2nd edn. xiii+305 pp (2003).
- [2] S. Agmon, A. Douglis, L. Nirenberg, *Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions*. I. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **12** (1959), 623–727.
- [3] A. Bahri and P.L. Lions, *Solutions of superlinear elliptic equations and their Morse indices*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **45** (1992), 1205–1215.
- [4] S. Blatt, *Monotonicity formulas for extrinsic triharmonic maps and the triharmonic Lane–Emden equation*. Journal of Differential Equations **262** (2017), 5691–5734.
- [5] C. Cowan, *Liouville theorems for stable Lane–Emden systems and biharmonic problems*, Nonlinearity, **26** (2013), 2357–2371.
- [6] M. G. Crandall and P. H. Rabinowitz, *Some continuation and variation methods for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic eigenvalue problems*. Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **58** (1975), 207–218.
- [7] E.N. Dancer, *Finite Morse index solutions of supercritical problems*. J. Reine Angew Math. **620** (2008), 213–233.
- [8] J. Dávila, L. Dupaigne and A. Farina, *Partial regularity of finite Morse index solutions to the Lane–Emden equation*, J. Funct. Anal. **261** (2011), 218–232.
- [9] J. Dávila, L. Dupaigne, K. Wang and J. Wei, *A monotonicity formula and a Liouville-type theorem for a fourth order supercritical problem*. Adv. Math., **258** (2014), 240–285.
- [10] L. Damascelli, A. Farina, B. Sciunzi and E. Valdinoci, *Liouville results for m -Laplace equations of Lane–Emden Fowler type*. Ann. I. H. Poincaré. **26** (2009), 1099–1119.
- [11] A. Farina, *On the classification of solutions of the Lane–Emden equation on unbounded domains of \mathbb{R}^N* , J. Math. Pures Appl. **87** (2007), 537–561.
- [12] B. Gidas and J. Spruck, *A priori bounds for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations. **6** (1981), 883–901.
- [13] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, 2nd edition, Grundlehren **224**, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York-Tokyo (1983).
- [14] F. Gazzola, H. Christoph Grunau, G. Sweers, *Polyharmonic Boundary Value Problems*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol.1991, Springer, (2010).
- [15] H. Hajlaoui, A. Harrabi and F. Mtiri, *Morse indices of solutions for super-linear elliptic PDEs*, Nonlinear Analysis **116** (2015), 180–192.
- [16] H. Hajlaoui, A. Harrabi and D. Ye, *On stable solutions of the biharmonic problem with polynomial growth*, Pacific J. Math. **270** (2014), 79–93.
- [17] M. K. Hamdani, A. Harrabi, *L^∞ -norm Estimates of Weak Solutions via their Morse indices for the m -Laplacian Problems*, Results in Mathematics. **74** (2019), article number (69).
- [18] A. Harrabi, *High-order Bahri-Lions Liouville type theorems*, Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata. **198** (2019), 1675–1692.
- [19] A. Harrabi, F. Mtiri, *Liouville-type theorems and existence results for stable at infinity solutions of higher order m -polyharmonic problems*, To appear in JMAA (2021).
- [20] A. Harrabi, F. Mtiri and D. Ye, *Explicit L^∞ -norm estimates via Morse index, the bi-harmonic and tri-harmonic semilinear problems*, Manuscripta Math. **270** (2019), 57–79.
- [21] A. Harrabi and B. Rahal, *On the sixth-order Joseph-Lundgren exponent*, Ann. Henri Poincaré. **18** (2017), 1055–1094.
- [22] A. Harrabi and S. Rebhi, *L^∞ -bounds for solutions of supercritical elliptic problems with finite Morse index*, Adv.Nonlinear Stud. **10** (2010), 741–756.
- [23] A. Harrabi, S. Rebhi and A. Selmi, *Solutions of superlinear equations and their Morse indices I*, Duke. Math. J. **94** (1998), 141–157.
- [24] F. Mtiri and D. Ye, *Liouville theorems for stable at infinity solutions of Lane–Emden system*, Nonlinearity **32** (2019), 910–926.
- [25] S.I. Pohozaev, *Eigenfunctions of the equation $\Delta u + \lambda f(u) = 0$* . Sov. Math. Doklady **5** (1965), 1408–1411.
- [26] P. Poláčik, P. Quittner and P. Souplet, *Singularity and decay estimates in superlinear problems via Liouville-type theorems. I. Elliptic equations and systems*, Duke Math. Journal. **139** (3) (2007), 555–579.
- [27] S. Rebhi, *Characterization of solutions having finite Morse index for some nonlinear PDE with supercritical growth*, Nonlinear Analysis T. M. A **74** (2011), 1182–1189.
- [28] W. Reichel and T. Weth, *A priori bounds and a Liouville theorem on a half space for higher-order elliptic Dirichlet problems*, Math. Z. **261** (2009), 805–827.
- [29] S. Luo, J. Wei and W. Zou, *Monotonicity formula and classification of stable solutions to polyharmonic Lane–Emden equations*, IMRN, (2021);, rnab212, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imrn/rnab212>.
- [30] J. Serrin and H. Zou, *Cauchy-Liouville and universal boundedness theorems for quasilinear elliptic equations and inequalities*, Acta Math. **189** (2002), 79–142.
- [31] B. Sirakov, *Existence results and a priori bounds for higher order elliptic equations and systems*, J.Math.Pures.Appl **9** 89 (2008), no. 2, 114–133.
- [32] J. Wei and D. Ye, *Liouville Theorems for stable solutions of biharmonic problem*, Math. Ann. **356** (4) (2013), 1599–1612.
- [33] X.F. Yang, *Nodal Sets and Morse Indices of Solutions of Super-linear Elliptic PDE's*. J. Funct. Anal. **160** (1998), 223–253.