

REITERATED HOMOGENIZATION OF NONLINEAR DEGENERATE ELLIPTIC OPERATORS WITH NONSTANDARD GROWTH

JOEL FOTSO TACHAGO[‡], HUBERT NNANG[†], AND ELVIRA ZAPPALE[†]

ABSTRACT. It is shown by means of reiterated two-scale convergence in the Sobolev-Orlicz setting, that the sequence of solutions of a class of highly oscillatory problems involving nonlinear elliptic operators with nonstandard growth, converges to a solution of a suitable homogeneous nonlinear elliptic equation associated to an operator with nonstandard growth.

1. INTRODUCTION

We are interested in the limiting behaviour (as $0 < \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) of the sequence of solutions of the problems

$$(1.1) \quad -\operatorname{div} \left[a \left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2}, u_\varepsilon, Du_\varepsilon \right) \right] = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, u_\varepsilon \in W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega),$$

with Ω a regular bounded open set in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 2$, D and div denoting gradient and divergence operators, respectively, $f \in L^d(\Omega) \cap L^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)$, $a := (a_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying the following conditions:

(H_1) For all $(\zeta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the function $(y, z) \rightarrow a(y, z, \zeta, \lambda)$ from $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ into \mathbb{R}^d is of Caratheodory type, that is:

(i) For each $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the function $y \rightarrow a(y, z, \zeta, \lambda)$ is measurable from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R}^d

(ii) For almost all $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the function $z \rightarrow a(y, z, \zeta, \lambda)$ is continuous from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R}^d with $a(\cdot, \cdot, 0, \omega) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$, ω being the origin in \mathbb{R}^d .

(H_2) There are N -functions $\Phi, \Psi : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow [0, +\infty[$, Φ, Ψ being twice continuously differentiable with

$$(1.2) \quad 1 < \rho_0 \leq \frac{t\psi(t)}{\Psi(t)} \leq \rho_1 \leq \frac{t\phi(t)}{\Phi(t)} \leq \rho_2 \quad \text{for all } t > 0,$$

where ρ_0, ρ_1, ρ_2 are constants and Φ, Ψ are odd, increasing homeomorphisms from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} such that $\Phi(t) = \int_0^t \phi(s) ds$ and $\Psi(t) = \int_0^t \psi(s) ds$ ($t \geq 0$). Moreover, there exist $c_1, c_3 > \frac{1}{2}$ and $c_2, c_4 > 0$, Φ dominates Ψ globally (in symbols $\Phi \prec \Psi$) and

$$(1.3) \quad |a(y, z, \zeta, \lambda) - a(y, z, \zeta', \lambda')| \leq c_1 \tilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\Phi(c_2 |\zeta - \zeta'|)) + c_3 \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(\Phi(c_4 |\lambda - \lambda'|))$$

for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for all $(z, \zeta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\tilde{\Phi}(t) = \int_0^t \phi^{-1}(s) ds$ and $\tilde{\Psi}(t) = \int_0^t \psi^{-1}(s) ds$ ($t \geq 0$) are the complementary N -functions of Φ and Ψ , respectively, (see Section 2 for Orlicz-Sobolev spaces and [5] for the adopted assumptions in the context of PDEs, among a wide literature on the subject).

(H_3) There exists a continuous monotone decreasing mapping $h : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow [0, 1[$, with $\min_{t \geq 0} h(t) > 0$ and unbounded anti-derivative such that for any $(\zeta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(1.4) \quad a(y, z, \zeta, \lambda) \cdot \lambda \geq \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(\Phi(h(|\zeta|))) \cdot \Phi(|\lambda|) \quad \text{a.e. } (y, z) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

(H_4) For all $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ and for all $\lambda, \lambda' \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(a(y, z, \zeta, \lambda) - a(y, z, \zeta, \lambda')) \cdot (\lambda - \lambda') > 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } (y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

(H_5) The function a is periodic in the first two variables, and satisfies a local continuity assumption in the first variable, i.e.

(i) $a(y + k, z + k', \zeta, \lambda) = a(y, z, \zeta, \lambda)$ for any $(k, k') \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d$, $(z, \zeta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$;

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B27, 35B40, 35J25, 35J60, 35J70.

Key words and phrases. Elliptic Operators, reiterated two-scale convergence, Orlicz Sobolev Spaces.

[†]Recall that, as observed in [17] and [5], (1.2) guarantee that Φ, Ψ and their conjugates verify Δ_2 condition

(ii) For each bounded set Λ in \mathbb{R}^d and $\eta > 0$, there exists $\rho > 0$ such that,

$$(1.5) \quad \text{if } |\xi| \leq \rho \text{ then } |a(y - \xi, z, \zeta, \lambda) - a(y, z, \zeta, \lambda)| \leq \eta,$$

for all $(z, \zeta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and almost all $y \in \Lambda$.

Indeed, we aim at extending [3, Theorem 1.3] and [14, Theorem 29], to the framework of Sobolev-Orlicz spaces, relying on the ad hoc notion of reiterated two-scale convergence in such spaces, obtained in [9] (cf. also [8] and [10]). We also refer to [20, 21, 22] for homogenization problems for PDEs in the Orlicz setting, to [26, 27, 28, 29] for homogenization of non-monotone operators in the Sobolev setting, to [4, 18, 16] for homogenization problems in the variable exponent setting, among a wider literature and to [15] for reiterated homogenization in general deterministic setting.

Indeed, under the above assumptions (which, in turn, rephrase into the multiscale periodic setting, the degenerate equation considered in [30]) and with the notation in section 2 and subsection 4.1, our main results read as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *Let (1.1) be the problem defined in Section 1, with a and f satisfying $(H_1) - (H_5)$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, let u_ε be a solution of (1.1). Then there exists a not relabeled subsequence and $u := (u_0, u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{F}_0^{1, \Phi} := W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega) \times L_{per}^\Phi(\Omega; W_\#^1 L^\Phi(Y)) \times L^\Phi(\Omega; L_{per}^\Phi(Y; W_\#^1 L^\Phi(Z)))$ such that*

$$(1.6) \quad u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u_0 \text{ in } W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega) - \text{weakly},$$

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & D_{x_i} u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup D_{x_i} u_0 + D_{y_i} u_1 + D_{z_i} u_2 \\ & \text{weakly reiteratedly two-scale in } L^\Phi(\Omega), 1 \leq i \leq N, \end{aligned}$$

and u solves the problem

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{cases} \int_\Omega \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, u_0, Du_0 + D_y u_1 + D_z u_2) \cdot (Dv_0 + D_y v_1 + D_z v_2) dx dy dz \\ = \int_\Omega f v_0 dx, \text{ for all } v = (v_0, v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{F}_0^{1, \Phi}. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, in order to get uniqueness of the solutions in (1.1) and (1.8), in the same spirit of [23, (2.3.40)] (see also [24]) one can assume that there exists $c_5 > 0$ such that (H_6) for all $\zeta, \zeta' \in \mathbb{R}$ and for all $\lambda, \lambda' \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(a(y, z, \zeta, \lambda) - a(y, z, \zeta', \lambda')) \cdot (\lambda - \lambda') > c_5 \Phi(|\lambda - \lambda'|)$$

a.e in (y, z) in $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, see Remark 4.4 below.

Theorem 1.2. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$, let (1.1) be such that a and f satisfy $(H_1) - (H_6)$. Let $u_0 \in W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega)$ be the solution defined by means of (1.8). Then, it is the unique solution of the macroscopic homogenized problem*

$$(1.9) \quad -\operatorname{div} q(u_0, Du_0) = f \text{ in } \Omega, u_0 \in W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega),$$

where q is defined as follows. For $(r, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$

$$(1.10) \quad q(r, \xi) = \int_Y h(y, r, \xi + D_y \pi_1(r, \xi)) dy.$$

where, for a.e. $y \in Y$, and for any $(r, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(1.11) \quad h(y, r, \xi) := \int_Z a_i(y, z, r, \xi + D_z \pi_2(y, r, \xi)) dz,$$

where for a.e. $y \in Y$, and every $(r, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $\pi_2(y, r, \xi)$, is the solution of the following variational cell problem:

$$(1.12) \quad \begin{cases} \text{find } \pi_2(y, r, \xi) \in W_\#^1 L^\Phi(Z) \text{ such that} \\ \int_Z a(y, z, r, \xi + D_z \pi_2(y, r, \xi)) \cdot D_z \theta dz = 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in W_\#^1 L^\Phi(Z) \end{cases}$$

and $\pi_1(r, \xi) \in W_\#^1 L^\Phi(Y)$ is the unique solution of the variational problem

$$(1.13) \quad \begin{cases} \text{find } \pi_1(r, \xi) \in W_\#^1 L^\Phi(Y) \text{ such that} \\ \int_Y h(r, \xi + D_y \pi_1(r, \xi)) \cdot D_y \theta dy = 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in W_\#^1 L^\Phi(Y). \end{cases}$$

The paper is organized as follows: section 2 deals with some preliminaries on Orlicz-Sobolev spaces, reiterated two-scale convergence, compactness results in the considered functions spaces, and other preliminaries while section 3 focuses on the detection of the asymptotic behaviour of solutions of problems with highly oscillating coefficients, in particular (1.1) while section 4 contains the proof of our main result. Finally in the Appendix, for the reader's convenience, we justify the well-posedness of (1.1) under our set of assumptions.

2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARY RESULTS

In what follows X and V denote a locally compact space and a Banach space, respectively, and $\mathcal{C}(X; V)$ stands for the space of continuous functions from X into V , and $\mathcal{C}_b(X; V)$ stands for those functions in $\mathcal{C}(X; V)$ that are bounded. The space $\mathcal{C}_b(X; V)$ is endowed with the supremum norm $\|u\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in X} \|u(x)\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the norm in V , (in particular, given an open set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ by $\mathcal{C}_b(A)$ we denote the space of real valued continuous and bounded functions defined in A). Likewise the spaces $L^p(X; V)$ and $L^p_{\text{loc}}(X; V)$ (X provided with a positive Radon measure) are denoted by $L^p(X)$ and $L^p_{\text{loc}}(X)$, respectively, when $V = \mathbb{R}$ (we refer to [6] for integration theory).

In the sequel we denote by Y and Z two identical copies of the cube $] -1/2, 1/2[^d$.

In order to enlighten the space variable under consideration we will adopt the notation $\mathbb{R}_x^d, \mathbb{R}_y^d$, or \mathbb{R}_z^d to indicate where x, y or z belong to.

The family of open subsets in \mathbb{R}_x^d will be denoted by $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{R}_x^d)$.

For any subset E of \mathbb{R}^m , $m \in \mathbb{N}$, by \overline{E} , we denote its closure in the relative topology.

For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote by $[x]$ its integer part, namely the vector in \mathbb{Z}^d , which has as components the integer parts of the components of x .

By \mathcal{L}^d we denote the Lebesgue measure in \mathbb{R}^d .

2.1. Orlicz-Sobolev spaces. Let $B : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ be an N-function (see [1]), i.e., B is continuous, convex, with $B(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$, $\frac{B(t)}{t} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, and $\frac{B(t)}{t} \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Equivalently, B is of the form $B(t) = \int_0^t b(\tau) d\tau$, where $b : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ is non decreasing, right continuous, with $b(0) = 0, b(t) > 0$ if $t > 0$ and $b(t) \rightarrow +\infty$ if $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

We denote by \tilde{B} , the complementary N-function of B defined by

$$\tilde{B}(t) = \sup_{s \geq 0} \{st - B(s)\}, t \geq 0.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{tb(t)}{B(t)} \geq 1 \quad (\text{or } > \text{ if } b \text{ is strictly increasing}),$$

$$\tilde{B}(b(t)) \leq tb(t) \leq B(2t) \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

An N-function B is of class Δ_2 near ∞ (denoted $B \in \Delta_2$) if there are $\alpha > 0$ and $t_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad B(2t) \leq \alpha B(t)$$

for all $t \geq t_0$.

An N-function B is of class Δ' if there exists $C > 0$ such that $B(ts) \leq CB(t)B(s)$, for every $s, t \geq 0$. In what follows every N-function B and its conjugate \tilde{B} satisfy the Δ_2 condition and c refers to a constant.

It is also worth recalling that given two N-functions B and C , B dominates C (denoted as $C \prec B$) if there is $k > 0$ such that $C(t) \leq B(kt)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Hence, it follows that $C \prec B$ if and only if $\tilde{B} \prec \tilde{C}$.

Let Ω be a bounded open set in \mathbb{R}^d . The Orlicz space

$$L^B(\Omega) = \left\{ u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable, } \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Omega} B(\delta |u(x)|) dx = 0 \right\}$$

is a Banach space with respect to the Luxemburg norm:

$$\|u\|_{B,\Omega} := \inf \left\{ k > 0 : \int_{\Omega} B\left(\frac{|u(x)|}{k}\right) dx \leq 1 \right\} < +\infty.$$

It follows that: $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ is dense in $L^B(\Omega)$, $L^B(\Omega)$ is separable and reflexive, the dual of $L^B(\Omega)$ is identified with $L^{\tilde{B}}(\Omega)$, and the norm on $L^{\tilde{B}}(\Omega)$ is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{B},\Omega}$. We will denote the norm of elements in $L^B(\Omega)$, both by $\|\cdot\|_{L^B(\Omega)}$ and with $\|\cdot\|_{B,\Omega}$, the latter symbol being useful when we want to emphasize the domain Ω .

Furthermore, it is also convenient to recall that:

- (i) $|\int_{\Omega} u(x) v(x) dx| \leq 2 \|u\|_{B,\Omega} \|v\|_{\tilde{B},\Omega}$ for $u \in L^B(\Omega)$ and $v \in L^{\tilde{B}}(\Omega)$,
- (ii) given $v \in L^{\tilde{B}}(\Omega)$, the linear functional L_v on $L^B(\Omega)$ defined by $L_v(u) := \int_{\Omega} u(x) v(x) dx$, ($u \in L^B(\Omega)$) belongs to the dual $[L^B(\Omega)]' = L^{\tilde{B}}(\Omega)$ with $\|v\|_{\tilde{B},\Omega} \leq \|L_v\|_{[L^B(\Omega)]'} \leq 2 \|v\|_{\tilde{B},\Omega}$,
- (iii) the property $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{B(t)}{t} = +\infty$ implies $L^B(\Omega) \subset L^1(\Omega) \subset L^1_{loc}(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$, each embedding being continuous.

Given any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, when $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, such that each component u^i , of u , lies in $L^B(\Omega)$, we will denote the norm of u with the symbol $\|u\|_{L^B(\Omega)^d} := \sum_{i=1}^d \|u^i\|_{B,\Omega}$.

Analogously one can define the Orlicz-Sobolev function space as follows:

$W^1 L^B(\Omega) = \left\{ u \in L^B(\Omega) : \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \in L^B(\Omega), 1 \leq i \leq d \right\}$, where derivatives are taken in the distributional sense on Ω . Endowed with the norm $\|u\|_{W^1 L^B(\Omega)} = \|u\|_{B,\Omega} + \sum_{i=1}^d \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{B,\Omega}$, $u \in W^1 L^B(\Omega)$, $W^1 L^B(\Omega)$ is a reflexive Banach space. We denote by $W_0^1 L^B(\Omega)$, the closure of $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ in $W^1 L^B(\Omega)$ and the seminorm $u \rightarrow \|u\|_{W_0^1 L^B(\Omega)} = \|Du\|_{B,\Omega} = \sum_{i=1}^d \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{B,\Omega}$ is a norm on $W_0^1 L^B(\Omega)$ equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{W^1 L^B(\Omega)}$.

By $W_{\#}^1 L^B(Y)$, we denote the space of functions $u \in W^1 L^B(Y)$ such that $\int_Y u(y) dy = 0$. It is endowed with the gradient norm.

Given a function space S defined in Y , Z or $Y \times Z$, the subscript $_{per}$ stands for periodic, i.e. S_{per} means that its elements are periodic in Y , Z or $Y \times Z$, as it will be clear from the context. In particular $\mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$ denotes the space of periodic functions in $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$, i.e. that verify $w(y+k, z+h) = w(y, z)$ for $(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and $(k, h) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d$. $\mathcal{C}_{per}^\infty(Y \times Z) = \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z) \cap \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$, and $L_{per}^B(Y \times Z)$ is the space of $Y \times Z$ -periodic functions in $L_{loc}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$. In our subsequent analysis we denote by $L^B(\Omega; L_{per}^B(Y))$ and $L^B(\Omega; L_{per}^B(Y \times Z))$ the spaces of functions in $L_{loc}^B(\Omega \times Y)$ and $L_{loc}^B(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$, respectively which are Y and $Y \times Z$ periodic for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, respectively and whose Luxemburg norm is finite in $\Omega \times K$, with K being any compact set in Y and $Y \times Z$, respectively.

In formulas

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} L^B(\Omega; L_{per}^B(Y)) &:= \left\{ u \in L_{loc}^B(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_y^d) : u(x, \cdot) \in L_{per}^B(Y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \text{ and } \iint_{\Omega \times Y} B(|u(x, y)|) dx dy < \infty \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} L^B(\Omega; L_{per}^B(Y \times Z)) &:= \left\{ u \in L_{loc}^B(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d) : u(x, \cdot, \cdot) \in L_{per}^B(Y \times Z) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \text{ and } \iiint_{\Omega \times Y \times Z} B(|u(x, y, z)|) dx dy dz < \infty \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. We observe that, in view of [8, Lemma 2.4], if \tilde{B} satisfies Δ' condition, then the above spaces coincide with the standard Orlicz-Bochner spaces. These spaces play an important role in the definition of reiterated two-scale convergence in the Orlicz setting.

2.2. Traces results. This subsection is devoted to recall some results which are crucial for reiterated multiple scales convergence in the Orlicz setting.

While the definitions are natural for regular functions, several function spaces and related norms can be introduced to extend the concept of compositions to the multiscale, periodic setting. The notation is very similar to [15, Sections 2 and 4]) and [9, Section 2 and Appendix], where also proofs dealing with the standard Sobolev setting can be found.

Traces of the form $u^\varepsilon(x) := u(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2})$, $x \in \Omega$, $\varepsilon > 0$, when $u \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$ are well known and, clearly the operator of order $\varepsilon > 0$, (t^ε) , defined by

$$(2.4) \quad t^\varepsilon : u \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d) \longrightarrow u^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega),$$

is linear and continuous.

Making use of the subscript $_b$ to denote bounded functions, the same definitions and properties hold true (since $\overline{\Omega}$ is compact), when $u \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)) \subset \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)) \cong \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$. Then, considering $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d))$ as a subspace of $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$, $u^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}_b(\Omega)$ and, with an abuse of notation the operator t^ε can be interpreted from $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d))$ to $\mathcal{C}_b(\Omega)$ as linear and continuous.

Moreover, it is easily seen that

$$(2.5) \quad |u^\varepsilon(x)| = \left| u\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \right| \leq \|u(x)\|_\infty$$

for every $x \in \Omega$. By $u \in L^B(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d))$ we mean that the function $x \rightarrow \|u(x)\|_\infty$, from Ω into \mathbb{R} , belongs to $L^B(\Omega)$ and

$$\|u\|_{L^B(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d))} = \inf \left\{ k > 0 : \int_\Omega B\left(\frac{\|u(x)\|_\infty}{k}\right) dx \leq 1 \right\} < +\infty.$$

Recalling that N-functions are non decreasing, from (2.5), we deduce that:

$$\begin{aligned} B\left(\frac{|u^\varepsilon(x)|}{k}\right) &\leq B\left(\frac{\|u(x)\|_\infty}{k}\right), \text{ for all } k > 0, \text{ for all } x \in \overline{\Omega}, \\ \int_\Omega B\left(\frac{|u^\varepsilon(x)|}{k}\right) dx &\leq \int_\Omega B\left(\frac{\|u(x)\|_\infty}{k}\right) dx, \\ \text{thus } \int_\Omega B\left(\frac{\|u(x)\|_\infty}{k}\right) dx &\leq 1 \implies \int_\Omega B\left(\frac{|u^\varepsilon(x)|}{k}\right) dx \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$(2.6) \quad \|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^B(\Omega)} \leq \|u\|_{L^B(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d))}.$$

Thus the trace operator $t^\varepsilon : u \rightarrow u^\varepsilon$ from $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d))$ into $L^B(\Omega)$, extends by density and continuity to a unique operator from $L^B(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d))$, still denoted in the same way, which verifies (2.6) for all $u \in L^B(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d))$. Referring to [15, Section 2] and to [9, Section 2], it can be ensured measurability for the trace of elements $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$ and $u \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)))$, which is of crucial importance to deal with reiterated to-scale convergence.

By $M : \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we denote the mean value operator (or equivalently ‘averaging operator’) defined by

$$(2.7) \quad u \rightarrow M(u) := \iint_{Y \times Z} u(x, y) dx dy.$$

It is easily seen that it is:

- (i) nonnegative, i.e. $M(u) \geq 0$ for all $u \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z), u \geq 0$;
- (ii) continuous on $\mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$ (for the sup norm);
- (iii) such that $M(1) = 1$;
- (iv) translation invariant.

Following [15], for the given N-function B , by $\Xi^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$ we denote the space

$$(2.8) \quad \Xi^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)) := \left\{ u \in L_{loc}^B(\mathbb{R}_x^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)) : \text{for every } U \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{R}_x^d) : \right. \\ \left. \sup_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1} \inf \left\{ k > 0, \int_U B\left(\frac{\|u(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}}{k}\right) dx \leq 1 \right\} < \infty \right\},$$

which, endowed with the norm

$$(2.9) \quad \|u\|_{\Xi^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))} := \sup_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1} \inf \left\{ k > 0, \int_{B_d(\omega, 1)} B\left(\frac{\|u(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}}{k}\right) dx \leq 1 \right\},$$

turns out to be a Banach space ($B_d(\omega, 1)$, above being the unit ball of \mathbb{R}_x^d centered at the origin).

We denote by $\mathfrak{X}_{per}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$ the closure of $\mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$ in $\Xi^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$. and with the above notation, by $L_{per}^B(Y \times Z)$ the space of functions in $L_{loc}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$ which are $Y \times Z$ -periodic, with norm $\|\cdot\|_{B, Y \times Z}$, (i.e. one considers the L^B norm just on the unit period). Furthermore it is immediately seen that

$$\left| \int_{B_d(\omega, 1)} u\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) dx \right| \leq \int_{B_d(\omega, 1)} \left\| u\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \cdot\right) \right\|_\infty dx \leq 2 \|1\|_{\tilde{B}, B_d(\omega, 1)} \|u\|_{\Xi^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))},$$

for every $u \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$ and for every $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$.

The following results, useful to prove estimates which involve test functions on oscillating arguments (see for instance Proposition 2.7), can be found in [9, Section 2].

Lemma 2.1. *There exists $C \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\|u^\varepsilon\|_{B, B_d(\omega, 1)} \leq C \|u\|_{B, Y \times Z}$, for every $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, and $u \in \mathfrak{X}_{per}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$.*

Lemma 2.2. *The operator M defined on $\mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$ by (2.7) can be extended (with the same notation) by continuity to a unique linear and continuous operator from $\mathfrak{X}_{per}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$ to \mathbb{R} in such a way that it results non negative and translation invariant.*

Finally we recall that $\mathfrak{X}_{per}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$ can be endowed with another norm, considering the set $\mathfrak{X}_{per}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$ as the closure of $\mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$ in $L_{loc}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$ with the norm

$$\|u\|_{\Xi^B} := \sup_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1} \left\| u \left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{y}{\varepsilon} \right) \right\|_{B, (B_d(\omega, 1))^2}.$$

Via Riemann-Lebesgue lemma it can be proven that the above norm is equivalent to $\|u\|_{L^B(Y \times Z)}$, thus in the sequel we will consider this one. For completeness, we state the following result, whose proof is in the Appendix of [9]. It states that the latter norm is controlled by the one defined in (2.9), thus together with Lemma 2.1, it provides the equivalence among the introduced norms in $\mathfrak{X}_{per}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$.

Proposition 2.3. *It results that $\mathfrak{X}_{per}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)) \subset L_{per}^B(Y \times Z) = \mathfrak{X}_{per}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$ and $\|u\|_{B, Y \times Z} \leq c \|u\|_{\Xi^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))}$ for all $u \in \mathfrak{X}_{per}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$.*

2.3. Reiterated two-scale convergence in Orlicz spaces. In this subsection we recall the results proven in [9], which, in turn, generalize on the one hand to the Orlicz setting the notions introduced in [19] and, on the other, to the multiscale setting the results introduced in [8, 15, 21] (cf. [2, 3, 7, 25] among a wide literature in the Sobolev setting). For the sake of exposition and having in mind the applications to remainder on the paper, we assume, within the section, that B and \tilde{B} satisfy (2.1).

Recalling the spaces introduced in subsection 2.1, we start by defining reiterated two-scale convergence:

Definition 2.4. *A sequence of functions $(u_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon \subseteq L^B(\Omega)$ is said to be:*

- *weakly reiteratively two-scale convergent in $L^B(\Omega)$ to $u_0 \in L^B(\Omega; L_{per}^B(Y \times Z))$ if*

$$(2.10) \quad \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon f^\varepsilon dx \rightarrow \iiint_{\Omega \times Y \times Z} u_0 f dx dy dz, \text{ for all } f \in L^{\tilde{B}}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)),$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,

- *strongly reiteratively two-scale convergent in $L^B(\Omega)$ to $u_0 \in L^B(\Omega; L_{per}^B(Y \times Z))$ if for $\eta > 0$ and $f \in L^B(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))$ verifying $\|u_0 - f\|_{B, \Omega \times Y \times Z} \leq \frac{\eta}{2}$ there exists $\rho > 0$ such that $\|u_\varepsilon - f^\varepsilon\|_{B, \Omega} \leq \eta$ for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \rho$.*

When (2.10) happens we denote it by " $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $L^B(\Omega)$ – weakly reiteratively two-scale" and we say that u_0 is the weak reiterated two-scale limit in $L^B(\Omega)$ of the sequence $(u_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon$.

Remark 2.5. *The above definition is given in the scalar setting, but it extends to vector valued functions, arguing in components.*

The following results have been proven in [9, Subsection 2.3]. We report them since they will be used in the sequel.

Proposition 2.6. *If $u \in L^B(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))$ then (with the notation in subsection 2.2) $u^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u$ in $L^B(\Omega)$ weakly reiteratively two-scale, and we have $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|u^\varepsilon\|_{B, \Omega} = \|u\|_{B, \Omega \times Y \times Z}$.*

Next we recall a sequential compactness result in the Orlicz setting.

Proposition 2.7. *Given a bounded sequence $(u_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon \subset L^B(\Omega)$, one can extract a not relabeled subsequence such that $(u_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon$ is weakly reiteratively two-scale convergent in $L^B(\Omega)$.*

The results in the sequel follow (similarly to the (non reiterated) case in [8]) as a consequence of density results in the 'standard' setting.

Proposition 2.8. *If a sequence $(u_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon$ is weakly reiteratively two-scale convergent in $L^B(\Omega)$ to $u_0 \in L^B(\Omega; L_{per}^B(Y \times Z))$ then*

- (i) $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \int_Z u_0(\cdot, \cdot, z) dz$ in $L^B(\Omega)$ weakly two-scale, and
- (ii) $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \widetilde{u_0}$ in $L^B(\Omega)$ -weakly as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ where $\widetilde{u_0}(x) = \iint_{Y \times Z} u_0(x, \cdot, \cdot) dy dz$.

In the sequel we will consider the space

$$(2.11) \quad \mathfrak{X}_{per}^{B,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_y^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)) := \mathfrak{X}_{per}^B(\mathbb{R}_y^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)),$$

endowed with the L^∞ norm.

Proposition 2.9. *If $(u_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon$ is weakly reiteratively two-scale convergent in $L^B(\Omega)$ to $u_0 \in L^B(\Omega; L_{per}^B(Y \times Z))$ then $\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon f^\varepsilon dx \rightarrow \iint_{\Omega \times Y \times Z} u_0 f dx dy dz$, for all $f \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}) \otimes \mathfrak{X}_{per}^{B,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$.*

Moreover, if $v \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathfrak{X}_{per}^{B,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)))$, then $v^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup v$ in $L^B(\Omega)$ - weakly reiteratively two-scale as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 2.10. (1) *If $v \in L^B(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))$, then $v^\varepsilon \rightarrow v$ in $L^B(\Omega)$ -strongly reiteratively two-scale as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.*

(2) *If $(u_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon \subset L^B(\Omega)$ is strongly reiteratively two-scale convergent in $L^B(\Omega)$ to $u_0 \in L^B(\Omega; L_{per}^B(Y \times Z))$ then*

- (i) $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $L^B(\Omega)$ weakly reiteratively two-scale as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$;
- (ii) $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{B,\Omega} \rightarrow \|u_0\|_{B,\Omega \times Y \times Z}$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The following result is key to define weak reiterated two-scale convergence in Orlicz-Sobolev spaces, also providing a sequential compactness result in $W^1 L^B(\Omega)$. The proof, which extends with alternative arguments [8, Theorem 4.1], can be found in [9, Proposition 2.12], see also [10, Remark 2] for the more regularity stated below.

Indeed, recalling that $L_{per}^B(\Omega; W_\#^1 L^B(Y))$ denotes the space of functions $u \in L^B(\Omega; L_{per}^B(Y))$, such that $u(x, \cdot) \in W_\#^1 L^B(Y)$, for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and $L_{per}^B(Y; W_\#^1 L^B(Z))$ denotes the space of functions $u \in L_{per}^B(Y \times Z)$, such that $u(y, \cdot) \in W_\#^1 L^B(Z)$, for a.e. $y \in Y$, we have

Proposition 2.11. *Let Ω be a bounded open set in \mathbb{R}_x^d , and $(u_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon$ bounded in $W^1 L^B(\Omega)$. There exist a not relabeled subsequence, $u_0 \in W^1 L^B(\Omega)$, $(u_1, u_2) \in L_{per}^B(\Omega; W_\#^1 L^B(Y)) \times L^B(\Omega; L_{per}^B(Y; W_\#^1 L^B(Z)))$ such that:*

- (i) $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u_0$ weakly reiteratively two-scale in $L^B(\Omega)$,
- (ii) $D_{x_i} u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup D_{x_i} u_0 + D_{y_i} u_1 + D_{z_i} u_2$ weakly reiteratively two-scale in $L^B(\Omega)$, $1 \leq i \leq d$,

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Corollary 2.12. *If $(u_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon$ is such that $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup v_0$ weakly reiteratively two-scale in $W^1 L^B(\Omega)$, we have:*

- (i) $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \int_Z v_0(\cdot, \cdot, z) dz$ weakly two-scale in $W^1 L^B(\Omega)$,
- (ii) $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \tilde{v}_0$ in $W^1 L^B(\Omega)$ -weakly, where $\tilde{v}_0(x) = \iint_{Y \times Z} v_0(x, \cdot, \cdot) dy dz$.

In view of the next applications, we underline that, under the assumptions of the above proposition, the canonical injection $W^1 L^B(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^B(\Omega)$ is compact.

Remark 2.13. *If $(v_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon \subset L^B(\Omega)$ and $v_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup v_0$ weakly reiteratively two-scale in $L^B(\Omega)$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0 : v_\varepsilon \geq 0$ a.e in $\Omega \times Y \times Z$ then $v_0 \geq 0$ a.e in $\Omega \times Y \times Z$.*

3. WEAK SOLUTION OF (1.1)

The aim of this section consists of showing the existence of a weak solution to (1.1), neglecting the periodicity assumptions on a .

Given $(v, \mathbf{V}) = (v, (v_i)) \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}) \times \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})^d$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$, one can check, using assumptions $(H_1) - (H_4)$, that the function $(x, y, z) \rightarrow a_i(y, z, v(x), \mathbf{V}(x))$ of $\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ into \mathbb{R} belongs to $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Z)))$. Hence for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, the function $x \rightarrow a_i(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2}, v(x), \mathbf{V}(x))$ of Ω into \mathbb{R} denoted by $a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, v, \mathbf{V})$ is well defined by a function in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ see [15, Remark 2.1]. In particular we have the following:

Proposition 3.1. *Let $(a_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ be the functions in (1.1) and assume that they satisfy the assumptions $(H_1) - (H_4)$. Let $a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, v, \mathbf{V}) = (a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, v, \mathbf{V}))_{1 \leq i \leq d}$, then the transformation $(v, \mathbf{V}) \rightarrow a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, v, \mathbf{V})$ of $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}) \times \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})^d$ into $L^\infty(\Omega)^d$ extends by continuity to a mapping, still denoted by $(v, \mathbf{V}) \rightarrow a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, v, \mathbf{V})$, from $L^\Phi(\Omega) \times L^\Phi(\Omega)^d$ into $L^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)^d$ such that*

$$(3.1) \quad \|a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, v, \mathbf{V}) - a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, w, \mathbf{W})\|_{\tilde{\Phi}, \Omega} \leq c \|v - w\|_{\Phi, \Omega}^\alpha + c' \|\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{W}\|_{\Phi, \Omega}^\beta,$$

for all $(v, \mathbf{V}), (w, \mathbf{W}) \in L^\Phi(\Omega) \times L^\Phi(\Omega)^d$ where $c, c' > 0$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \left\{ \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_0}(\rho_0 - 1), \frac{\rho_2}{\rho_0}(\rho_0 - 1), \rho_1 - 1, \frac{\rho_2}{\rho_1}(\rho_1 - 1) \right\}$, with the constants ρ_0, ρ_1 and ρ_2 as in (1.2).

Proof. The proof is entirely similar to the one of [22, Proposition 2.3], relying in turn on [5, 13], which we refer to. Indeed, also the constants' values α and β are deduced according to the value of the Luxemburg norm on the right hand side of (3.1). \square

By (i) and (ii) in (H_1) , the assumptions on f , (1.3) in (H_2) , (H_3) and (H_4) it follows that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the assumptions of [30, Theorem 3.2] are satisfied, hence there exists $u_\varepsilon \in W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ weak solution of (1.1), i.e.

$$(3.2) \quad \exists u_\varepsilon \in W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega) \text{ such that} \\ \int_{\Omega} a\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2}, u_\varepsilon, Du_\varepsilon\right) Dv dx = \int_{\Omega} f v dx, \text{ for every } v \in W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega).$$

Thus, by (1.4) in (H_4) and (H_5) , it follows that

$$\int_{\Omega} \theta \Phi(|Du_\varepsilon|) dx \leq \int_{\Omega} a\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2}, u_\varepsilon, Du_\varepsilon\right) Du_\varepsilon dx = \int_{\Omega} f u_\varepsilon dx \leq 2 \|f\|_{\tilde{\Phi}, \Omega} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{\Phi, \Omega},$$

where

$$(3.3) \quad \theta := \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(\Phi(\min_{t \geq 0} h(t))) > 0.$$

If $\|Du_\varepsilon\|_{\Phi, \Omega} \geq 1$, we have

$$\theta \|Du_\varepsilon\|_{\Phi, \Omega}^\sigma \leq \int_{\Omega} \theta \Phi(|Du_\varepsilon|) dx \leq 2 \|f\|_{\tilde{\Phi}, \Omega} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{\Phi, \Omega} \leq c \|Du_\varepsilon\|_{\Phi, \Omega}, \sigma > 1.$$

We deduce therefore that:

$$\sup_{0 < \varepsilon} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega)} < +\infty.$$

It is easily observed that if (H_6) is satisfied the solution in (3.2) is unique. Indeed, suitable differences between the weak formulations of (1.1) with two possible solutions allow us to get uniqueness. We refer to Remark 4.4 for more details regarding uniqueness of the limiting problem.

4. HOMOGENIZATION PROBLEM

We intend to investigate the limiting behaviour, as $0 < \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, of a sequence of solutions u_ε of (1.1), i.e. u_ε as in (3.2), taking into account all the assumptions in section 1, in particular requiring that the coefficients a satisfy $(H_1) - (H_4)$ together with the periodicity assumption (H_5) . Hence, we start by showing in suitable spaces of regular functions, where the compositions of functions in the weak formulation of (1.1) are meaningful, which convergence is appropriate to consider limits as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

For the readers' convenience we put in the Appendix some intermediate results, dealing with the well posedness of the compositions appearing in (1.1).

Indeed, taking into account the just mentioned traces results, making use of the notation in Section 2 (cf. (2.11)), under the extra assumption of periodicity on the first two variables of a and for (w, \mathbf{W}) periodic, we conclude that, for every $1 \leq i \leq d$, the map $x \rightarrow a_i(\cdot, \cdot, w(x, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{W}(x, \cdot, \cdot))$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathfrak{X}_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}_y^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)))$, where $a_i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot))$ is the function $(y, z) \rightarrow a_i(y, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z))$, with $(f, \mathbf{f}) \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)^{d+1}$.

Hence, we are in position to state our first convergence result, prior to the proof of our main existence theorem.

Proposition 4.1. *For $(f, \mathbf{f}) \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)^{d+1})$, let $a = (a_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfy $(H_1) - (H_5)$, we have that*

(i) *for each $1 \leq i \leq d$,*

$$a_i(y, z, f(x, y, z), \mathbf{f}(x, y, z)) \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathfrak{X}_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}_y^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))) \quad \text{and} \\ a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, f^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) \rightharpoonup a_i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) \text{ weakly reiteratively two-scale,} \\ \text{in } L^\Phi(\Omega), \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

- (ii) The function $(f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) \rightarrow a(\cdot, \cdot, f, \mathbf{f})$ from $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)^{d+1})$ to $L^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}}(Y \times Z))^d$ extends by continuity to a (not relabeled) function from $L^{\Phi}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\Phi}(Y \times Z))^{d+1}$ to $L^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}}(Y \times Z))^d$, and there exist positive constants c, c' such that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|a(\cdot, \cdot, u(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{U}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) - a(\cdot, \cdot, v(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{V}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot))\|_{L^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}}(Y \times Z))^d} \leq \\ & c \|u(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) - v(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^{\Phi}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\Phi}(Y \times Z))}^{\alpha} + c' \|\mathbf{U}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) - \mathbf{V}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^{\Phi}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\Phi}(Y \times Z))^d}^{\beta}, \\ & a(\cdot, \cdot, u(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{U}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) \cdot \mathbf{U} \geq \theta \Phi(|\mathbf{U}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)|) \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & (a(\cdot, \cdot, u(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{U}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) - a(\cdot, \cdot, u(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{V}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot))) \cdot (\mathbf{U}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) - \mathbf{V}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) \geq 0 \\ & \text{a.e. in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, \end{aligned}$$

for all $u, v \in L^{\Phi}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\Phi}(Y \times Z))$, $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \in L^{\Phi}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\Phi}(Y \times Z)^d)$, where α, β and θ are defined as in Proposition 3.1 and (3.3), respectively, and L_{per}^{Φ} is as in subsection 2.1, with the N -function B replaced by Φ .

Proof. It is easily seen that, for every $1 \leq i \leq d$, when $(f, \mathbf{f}) \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)^{d+1})$, $a_i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot))$ lies in $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathfrak{X}_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}_z^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)))$.

Thus, by Proposition 2.9, it follows that the sequence $a_i^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, f^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) \rightarrow a_i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot))$ weakly reiteratively two-scale in $L^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega)$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Moreover, by $(H_1) - (H_4)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & |a^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, f^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) - a^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, f'^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}'^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot))| \leq \\ & c_1 \tilde{\Psi}^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(c_2 \left| f^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) - f'^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \right| \right) \right) + c_3 \tilde{\Phi}^{-1} \left(\Phi(c_4 |\mathbf{f}^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) - \mathbf{f}'^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)|) \right); \\ & a^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, f^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) \cdot \mathbf{f}^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \geq \theta \Phi(|\mathbf{f}^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)|) \quad (\text{with } \theta \text{ as in (3.3)}); \\ & (a^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, f^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) - a^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, f'^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}'^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot))) \cdot (\mathbf{f}^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) - \mathbf{f}'^{\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) \geq 0, \\ & \text{a.e. in } \Omega, \text{ for any } \varepsilon > 0. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, arguing as in [22, Proposition 3.4] (cf. also Remark 2.13) it follows that for a.e x in Ω and every $(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |a(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) - a(\cdot, \cdot, f'(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}'(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot))| \leq \\ & c_1 \tilde{\Psi}^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(c_2 \left| f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) - f'(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \right| \right) \right) + c_3 \tilde{\Phi}^{-1} \left(\Phi(c_4 |\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) - \mathbf{f}'(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)|) \right); \\ & a(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \geq \theta \Phi(|\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)|); \\ & (a(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) - a(\cdot, \cdot, f'(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}'(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot))) \cdot (\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) - \mathbf{f}'(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $a(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) = (a_i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)))_{1 \leq i \leq d}$. From the first of the above inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z \tilde{\Phi} \left(\frac{|a(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) - a(\cdot, \cdot, f'(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}'(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot))|}{\delta} \right) dx dy dz \leq \\ & \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z \tilde{\Phi} \left(\frac{c_1 \tilde{\Psi}^{-1} \left(\Phi(c_2 |(f - f')(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)|) \right) + c_3 \tilde{\Phi}^{-1} \left(\Phi(c_4 |(\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}')(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)|) \right)}{\delta} \right) dx dy dz, \end{aligned}$$

for $\delta > 0$. Therefore, arguing analogously to [22] and to Proposition 3.1, we are lead to

$$\begin{aligned} & \|a(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)) - a(\cdot, \cdot, f'(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}'(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot))\|_{L^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}}(Y \times Z))^d} \leq \\ & c \|f - f'\|_{L^{\Phi}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\Phi}(Y \times Z))}^{\alpha} + c' \|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}'\|_{L^{\Phi}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\Phi}(Y \times Z))^d}^{\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $(f, \mathbf{f}), (f', \mathbf{f}') \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)^{d+1})$.

Since $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)^{d+1})$ is dense in $L^{\Phi}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\Phi}(Y \times Z)^{d+1})$, the function a extends by continuity to a mapping not relabeled from $L^{\Phi}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\Phi}(Y \times Z)^{d+1})$ into $L^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}}(Y \times Z)^{d+1})$ such that all the

inequalities in (ii) hold for every $u, v \in L^\Phi(\Omega; L_{per}^\Phi(Y \times Z))$ and every $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \in L^\Phi(\Omega; L_{per}^\Phi(Y \times Z)^d)$. \square

Thus, in the same spirit of [22, Corollary 3.5], we have the following result in the multiscale setting:

Corollary 4.2. *Under the same assumptions of Proposition 4.1, take $(u_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon \subset L^\Phi(\Omega)$ such that $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u_0$ in $L^\Phi(\Omega)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Then, for each $1 \leq i \leq d$ and for every $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)^d)$ we have*

$$a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, \mathbf{f}^\varepsilon) \rightharpoonup a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_0, \mathbf{f}) \text{ weakly reiteratively two-scale, in } L^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega), \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Let $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})$ be a sequence that converges to u_0 in $L^\Phi(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Let $\varphi \in L^\Phi(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))$ be arbitrarily fixed, let $1 \leq i \leq d$, fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and let

$$(4.1) \quad I(\varepsilon) := \int_{\Omega} a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, \mathbf{f}^\varepsilon) \varphi^\varepsilon dx - \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_0, \mathbf{f}) \varphi dx dy dz,$$

the thesis will be achieved as $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} I(\varepsilon) = 0$. We can rewrite $I(\varepsilon) = \sum_{k=1}^4 I_k(\varepsilon, n)$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(\varepsilon, n) &:= \int_{\Omega} (a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, \mathbf{f}^\varepsilon) - a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_0, \mathbf{f}^\varepsilon)) \varphi^\varepsilon dx, \\ I_2(\varepsilon, n) &:= \int_{\Omega} (a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_0, \mathbf{f}^\varepsilon) - a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_n, \mathbf{f}^\varepsilon)) \varphi^\varepsilon dx, \\ I_3(\varepsilon, n) &:= \int_{\Omega} a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_n, \mathbf{f}^\varepsilon) \varphi^\varepsilon dx - \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_n, \mathbf{f}) \varphi dx dy dz, \\ I_4(\varepsilon, n) &:= \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z (a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_n, \mathbf{f}) - a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_0, \mathbf{f})) \varphi dx dy dz. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 4.1, it follows that

$$(4.2) \quad |I_1(\varepsilon, n)| \leq 2c \|\varphi\|_{L^\Phi(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))} \|u_\varepsilon - u_0\|_{\Phi, \Omega}^\alpha \text{ for every } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

$$(4.3) \quad |I_2(\varepsilon, n)| \leq 2c \|\varphi\|_{L^\Phi(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))} \|u_n - u_0\|_{\Phi, \Omega}^\alpha \text{ for every } \varepsilon > 0.$$

Hence $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} I_1(\varepsilon, n) \equiv \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} I_1(\varepsilon) = 0$ while $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} I_2(\varepsilon, n) = 0$, uniformly with respect to ε . Since $u_n \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}) \subset \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))$ it follows again from Proposition 4.1 that

$$(4.4) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_n, \mathbf{f}^\varepsilon) \varphi^\varepsilon dx = \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_n, \mathbf{f}) \varphi dx dy dz,$$

and consequently that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} I_3(\varepsilon, n) = 0$. Finally

$$(4.5) \quad |I_4(\varepsilon, n)| \leq 2 \|\varphi\|_{L_{per}^\Phi(\Omega \times Y \times Z)} \|u_n - u_0\|_{\Phi, \Omega}^\alpha,$$

which again entails $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} I_4(\varepsilon, n) = 0$. Hence, given $\delta > 0$, we can find from (4.2), $\varepsilon_\delta > 0$ such that $|I_1(\varepsilon)| < \frac{\delta}{4}$ for every $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_\delta$. Moreover from (4.3) we have that $|I_2(\varepsilon)| < \frac{\delta}{4}$ for every $n \geq n(\delta)$ uniformly for every $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_\delta$. Then, from (4.4) we can take any $n > n(\delta)$ and a $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_{2, \delta}$ (with $n > n_\delta$ and $\varepsilon_{2, \delta} \leq \varepsilon_\delta$, such that $|I_3| < \frac{\delta}{4}$). Finally (4.5) guarantees that for an $n > n_\delta$ and uniformly with respect to ε , $|I_4| < \frac{\delta}{4}$, which concludes the proof. \square

Corollary 4.3. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.1, consider $(u_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon \subset L^\Phi(\Omega)$ such that $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u_0$ in $L^\Phi(\Omega)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Let $\phi_\varepsilon(x) := \varphi_0(x) + \varepsilon \varphi_1(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}) + \varepsilon^2 \varphi_2(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2})$, $x \in \Omega$, $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$, $\varphi_1 \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y)$, $\varphi_2 \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{per}(Z)$ ($\phi_\varepsilon = \varphi_0 + \varepsilon \varphi_1^\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 \varphi_2^\varepsilon$, shortly). Then,*

$$a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, D\phi_\varepsilon) \rightharpoonup a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_0, D\varphi_0 + D_y \varphi_1 + D_z \varphi_2) \text{ in } L^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega) \\ \text{weakly reiteratively two-scale}$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, for any $1 \leq i \leq d$. Furthermore, given a sequence $(v_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon \subset L^\Phi(\Omega)$, such that $v_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup v_0$ in $L^\Phi(\Omega)$ weakly reiteratively two-scale as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, D\phi_\varepsilon) v_\varepsilon dx = \\ \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_0, D\varphi_0 + D_y \varphi_1 + D_z \varphi_2) v_0 dx dy dz \end{aligned}$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq d$.

Proof. Given $\varphi \in L^\Phi(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$, let

$$I'(\varepsilon) := \int_{\Omega} a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, D\phi_\varepsilon) \varphi^\varepsilon dx - \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_0, D\varphi_0 + D_y\varphi_1 + D_z\varphi_2) \varphi dx dy dz.$$

We can rewrite $I'(\varepsilon) := I(\varepsilon) + J(\varepsilon)$, with

$$J(\varepsilon) := \int_{\Omega} (a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, D\phi_\varepsilon) - a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, D\varphi_0 + (D_y\varphi_1)^\varepsilon + (D_z\varphi_2)^\varepsilon)) \varphi^\varepsilon dx,$$

and $I(\varepsilon)$ as in (4.1) with \mathbf{f}^ε replaced by $D\varphi_0 + (D_y\varphi_1)^\varepsilon + (D_z\varphi_2)^\varepsilon$.

Thus, applying Corollary 4.2, $I(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Since $D\phi_\varepsilon(x) = D\varphi_0(x) + D_y\varphi_1(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}) + D_z\varphi_2(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2}) + \varepsilon D_x\varphi_1(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}) + \varepsilon D_y\varphi_2(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2}) + \varepsilon^2 D_x\varphi_2(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2})$, by condition *i*) in Section 2.1 and Proposition 3.1, we deduce that

$$|J(\varepsilon)| \leq 2c \|\varphi\|_{L^\Phi(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))} \|\varepsilon D_x\varphi_1^\varepsilon + \varepsilon D_y\varphi_2^\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 D_x\varphi_2^\varepsilon\|_{\Phi, \Omega}^\beta$$

and $|J(\varepsilon)| \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and this proves the first statement. The second one is obtained via similar arguments to those in Corollary 4.2, exploiting the fact that there exists a strong convergent sequence $(u_n) \subset C(\overline{\Omega}; C_{per}(Y \times Z))$ to $u_0 \in L^\Phi(\Omega)$.

Indeed one can define

$$I''(\varepsilon) := \int_{\Omega} a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, D\phi_\varepsilon) v_\varepsilon dx - \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_0, D\varphi_0 + D_y\varphi_1 + D_z\varphi_2) v_0 dx dy dz,$$

thus the proof will be concluded if we show that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} I''(\varepsilon) = 0$. To this end we can rewrite $I''(\varepsilon) = \sum_{k=1}^5 I_k(\varepsilon, n)$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(\varepsilon, n) (\equiv I_1(\varepsilon)) &:= \int_{\Omega} a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, D\phi_\varepsilon) v_\varepsilon dx - \int_{\Omega} a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, D\varphi_0 + (D_y\varphi_1)^\varepsilon + (D_z\varphi_2)^\varepsilon) v_\varepsilon dx \\ I_2(\varepsilon, n) (\equiv I_2(\varepsilon)) &:= \int_{\Omega} (a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, D\varphi_0 + (D_y\varphi_1)^\varepsilon + (D_z\varphi_2)^\varepsilon) - a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_0, D\varphi_0 + (D_y\varphi_1)^\varepsilon + (D_z\varphi_2)^\varepsilon)) v_\varepsilon dx \\ I_3(\varepsilon, n) &:= \int_{\Omega} a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_0, D\varphi_0 + (D_y\varphi_1)^\varepsilon + (D_z\varphi_2)^\varepsilon) v_\varepsilon dx - \int_{\Omega} a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_n, D\varphi_0 + (D_y\varphi_1)^\varepsilon + (D_z\varphi_2)^\varepsilon) v_\varepsilon dx \\ I_4(\varepsilon, n) &:= \int_{\Omega} a_i^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_n, D\varphi_0 + (D_y\varphi_1)^\varepsilon + (D_z\varphi_2)^\varepsilon) v_\varepsilon dx - \int_{\Omega} a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_n, D\varphi_0 + (D_y\varphi_1)^\varepsilon + (D_z\varphi_2)^\varepsilon) v_0 dx \\ I_5(\varepsilon, n) &:= \int_{\Omega} a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_n, D\varphi_0 + D_y\varphi_1 + D_z\varphi_2) v_0 dx - \int_{\Omega} a_i(\cdot, \cdot, u_0, D\varphi_0 + D_y\varphi_1 + D_z\varphi_2) v_0 dx. \end{aligned}$$

These integrals can be estimated as in Proposition 4.1, i.e. as in [15]

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |I_1(\varepsilon)| &= 0, \text{ uniformly with respect to } n \\ \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |I_2(\varepsilon, n)| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |I_2(\varepsilon)| = 0 \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} |I_3(\varepsilon, n)| &= 0 \text{ uniformly with respect to } \varepsilon, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |I_4(\varepsilon, n)| &= 0 \text{ (as in the proof of (4.4) above)} \\ |I_5(\varepsilon, n)| &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty, \text{ uniformly with respect to } \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

These estimates conclude the proof. \square

4.1. Homogenization Result. Following the notation in section 2.1, we set

$$\mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi} := W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega) \times L_{per}^\Phi(\Omega; W_\#^1 L^\Phi(Y)) \times L^\Phi(\Omega; L_{per}^\Phi(Y; W_\#^1 L^\Phi(Z)))$$

and

$$F^\infty := \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \times [\mathcal{D}(\Omega) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{per}^\infty(Y)] \times [\mathcal{D}(\Omega) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{per}^\infty(Y) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{per}^\infty(Z)].$$

We endow $\mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi}$ by the norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi}} := \|D_x u_0\|_{\Phi, \Omega} + \|D_y u_1\|_{\Phi, \Omega \times Y} + \|D_z u_2\|_{\Phi, \Omega \times Y \times Z},$$

with $u = (u_0, u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi}$. With this norm, $\mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi}$ is a Banach space. Moreover F^∞ is dense in $\mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi}$, where, in terms of notation, if

$$(4.6) \quad (\psi_0, \psi_1, \psi_2) \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \times [\mathcal{D}(\Omega) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{per}^\infty(Y)] \times [\mathcal{D}(\Omega) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{per}^\infty(Y) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{per}^\infty(Z)],$$

then $F^\infty = \{\phi, \phi := (\psi_0, \psi_1, \psi_2) \text{ in (4.6)}\}$.

We are in position of proving the existence Theorem 1.1, which we restate for the reader's convenience.

Theorem 1.1 *Let (1.1) be the problem defined in Section 1, with a and f satisfying $(H_1) - (H_5)$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, let u_ε be a solution of (1.1). Then there exists a not relabeled subsequence and Then there exists a not relabeled subsequence and $u := (u_0, u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi} := W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega) \times L_{per}^\Phi(\Omega; W_\#^1 L^\Phi(Y)) \times L^\Phi(\Omega; L_{per}^\Phi(Y; W_\#^1 L^\Phi(Z)))$ such that (1.6), (1.7) and (1.8) hold, namely*

$$\begin{aligned} u_\varepsilon &\rightharpoonup u_0 \text{ in } W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega) - \text{weakly, and} \\ D_{x_i} u_\varepsilon &\rightharpoonup D_{x_i} u_0 + D_{y_i} u_1 + D_{z_i} u_2 \\ &\text{weakly reiteratively two-scale in } L^\Phi(\Omega), 1 \leq i \leq N. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover the function $u := (u_0, u_1, u_2)$ is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} \int_\Omega \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, u_0, Du_0 + D_y u_1 + D_z u_2) \cdot (Dv_0 + D_y v_1 + D_z v_2) dx dy dz \\ = \int_\Omega f v_0 dx, \text{ for all } v = (v_0, v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Observing that $\sup_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega)} < \infty$, one can extract a not relabeled subsequence such that

(1.6) and (1.7) hold. We show that $u := (u_0, u_1, u_2)$ defined by (1.6) and (1.7) is a solution of (1.8).

To this end, for $\phi := (\psi_0, \psi_1, \psi_2) \in F_0^\infty$, consider $\phi_\varepsilon(x) = \psi_0(x) + \varepsilon \psi_1(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}) + \varepsilon^2 \psi_2(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, Du_\varepsilon) \cdot Du_\varepsilon dx &= \int_\Omega f u_\varepsilon dx; \\ \int_\Omega a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, Du_\varepsilon) \cdot D\phi_\varepsilon dx &= \int_\Omega f \phi_\varepsilon dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (H_4) ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_\Omega (a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, Du_\varepsilon) - a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, D\phi_\varepsilon)) \cdot (Du_\varepsilon - D\phi_\varepsilon) dx = \int_\Omega f (u_\varepsilon - \phi_\varepsilon) dx \\ &\quad - \int_\Omega a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, D\phi_\varepsilon) \cdot (Du_\varepsilon - D\phi_\varepsilon) dx, \end{aligned}$$

with $f \in L^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega) \subset L^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))$ and $\phi_\varepsilon \rightarrow \psi_0$ in $L^\Phi(\Omega)$ (and so the convergence to ψ_0 is also in the strong reiterated two-scale convergence setting). Moreover, since $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega)$, and the embedding $W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^\Phi(\Omega)$ is compact, then $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u_0$ in $L^\Phi(\Omega)$ strongly and in the reiterated two-scale convergence setting.

Therefore,

$$\int_{\Omega} f(u_\varepsilon - \phi_\varepsilon) dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z f(u_0 - \psi_0) dx dy dz = \int_{\Omega} f(u_0 - \psi_0) dx.$$

By Corollary 4.3, it results that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, u_\varepsilon, D\phi_\varepsilon) \cdot (Du_\varepsilon - D\phi_\varepsilon) dx \rightarrow \\ & \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, u_0, D\psi_0 + D_y\psi_1 + D_z\psi_2) \cdot \\ & (D(u_0 - \psi_0) + D_y(u_1 - \psi_1) + D_z(u_2 - \psi_2)) dx dy dz, \end{aligned}$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq & \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z f(u_0 - \psi_0) dx dy dz - \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, u_0, D\psi_0 + D_y\psi_1 + D_z\psi_2) \cdot \\ & (D(u_0 - \psi_0) + D_y(u_1 - \psi_1) + D_z(u_2 - \psi_2)) dx dy dz. \end{aligned}$$

Using density of F_0^∞ in $\mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi}$ the result remains valid for all $\phi \in \mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi}$. In particular, choosing $\phi := u - tv$, $v = (v_0, v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi}$, and dividing by $t > 0$ we get:

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega} f v_0 dx - \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, u_0, \mathbb{D}u - t\mathbb{D}v) \cdot \mathbb{D}v dx dy dz,$$

where $\mathbb{D}v = Dv_0 + D_y v_1 + D_z v_2$.

Using the continuity of a in its last argument and passing to the limit as $t \rightarrow 0$, we are led to

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega} f v_0 dx - \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, u_0, \mathbb{D}u) \cdot \mathbb{D}v dx dy dz,$$

that is for all $v \in \mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi}$. Thus, if we replace $v = (v_0, v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{F}_0^{1,\Phi}$ by $v^1 = (-v_0, -v_1, -v_2)$ we deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\Omega} f v_0 dx & \geq \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, u_0, \mathbb{D}u) \cdot \mathbb{D}v^1 dx dy dz, i.e.; \\ - \int_{\Omega} f v_0 dx & \geq - \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, u_0, \mathbb{D}u) \cdot \mathbb{D}v dx dy dz \end{aligned}$$

thus the equality follows, i.e. $u = (u_0, u_1, u_2)$ verifies (1.8). \square

Remark 4.4. Assuming (H_6) (which is a strict monotonicity assumption on a and not very restrictive, for instance, in the case of a not dependent on the third variable) one can prove that (1.8) has a unique solution. Take $w = (w_0, w_1, w_2)$ another solution of (1.8), then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} f w_0 dx &= \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, u_0, \mathbb{D}u) \cdot \mathbb{D}w dx dy dz, \\ \int_{\Omega} f u_0 dx &= \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, w_0, \mathbb{D}w) \cdot \mathbb{D}u dx dy dz, \\ - \int_{\Omega} f u_0 dx &= - \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, u_0, \mathbb{D}u) \cdot \mathbb{D}u dx dy dz, \\ - \int_{\Omega} f w_0 dx &= - \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, w_0, \mathbb{D}w) \cdot \mathbb{D}w dx dy dz, \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by (H_6)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z (a(y, z, w_0, \mathbb{D}w) - a(y, z, u_0, \mathbb{D}u)) \cdot (\mathbb{D}w - \mathbb{D}u) dx dy dz \geq \\ & \gamma \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z \Phi(|\mathbb{D}w - \mathbb{D}u|) dx dy dz. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (1.2), we can apply [12, Lemma 2], in turn relying on [17, Proposition 2.1], which entail that the norm in $L^\Phi(\Omega \times Y \times Z)$ of $\mathbb{D}w - \mathbb{D}u$ is null. Hence, standard derivation and integration on Z and Y ,

together with the fact that $u, w \in \mathbb{F}_0^{1,\phi}$ guarantee that $w = u$. We omit the details referring to [15] where the same result is obtained in standard Sobolev setting.

It is worth to point out that equation (1.8) is referred as global homogenization problem for (1.1) and is equivalent to the following three systems (cf. also [3, Theorem 2.11] and [14] for the classical Sobolev setting and [20]):

$$(4.7) \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, u_0, Du_0 + D_y u_1 + D_z u_2) \cdot D_z v_2 dx dy dz = 0$$

for all $v_2 \in L^{\Phi}(\Omega; L_{per}^{\Phi}(Y; W_{\#}^1 L^{\Phi}(Z)))$,

$$(4.8) \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \left(\int_Z a(y, z, u_0, Du_0 + D_y u_1 + D_z u_2) dz \right) \cdot D_y v_1 dx dy = 0$$

for all $v_1 \in L_{per}^{\Phi}(\Omega; W_{\#}^1 L^{\Phi}(Y))$,

$$(4.9) \quad \int_{\Omega} \left(\int_Y \int_Z a(y, z, u_0, Du_0 + D_y u_1 + D_z u_2) dy dz \right) \cdot Dv_0 dx$$

$= \int_{\Omega} f v_0 dx$ for all $v_0 \in W_0^1 L^{\Phi}(\Omega)$.

Now we are in position to derive a macroscopic homogenized problem, as in [3, Corollary 2.12]. Hence, let $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be arbitrarily fixed. For a.e. $y \in Y$, consider the variational cell problem in (1.12), whose solution is denoted by $\pi_2(y, r, \xi)$, i.e.

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{cases} \text{find } \pi_2(y, r, \xi) \in W_{\#}^1 L^{\Phi}(Z) \text{ such that} \\ \int_Z a(y, z, r, \xi + D_z \pi_2(y, r, \xi)) \cdot D_z \theta dz = 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in W_{\#}^1 L^{\Phi}(Z). \end{cases}$$

This problem has a solution (arguing as in [30, Theorem 3.2]), unique under assumption (H_6) , as in the classical case (see [20, page 18] which in turn relies on [11]).

Comparing (4.9) with (4.10) for $r = u_0(x)$ and $\xi = Du_0(x) + D_y u_1(x, y)$ we can consider

$$\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_y^d \ni (x, y) \rightarrow \pi_2(y, u_0(x), Du_0(x) + D_y u_1(x, y)) \in W_{\#}^1 L^{\Phi}(Z),$$

Hence, defining for a.e. $y \in Y$, and for any $(r, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, h as in (1.11), namely

$$h(y, r, \xi) := \int_Z a_i(y, z, r, \xi + D_z \pi_2(y, r, \xi)) dz,$$

(4.8) becomes

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_Y h(y, u_0(x), Du_0(x) + D_y u_1(x, y)) \cdot D_y v_1 dx dy = 0,$$

for all $v_1 \in L_{per}^{\Phi}(\Omega; W_{\#}^1 L^{\Phi}(Y))$.

Consequently, in analogy with the previous steps, one can consider, for any $(r, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the function $\pi_1(r, \xi) \in W_{\#}^1 L^{\Phi}(Y)$ solution of the variational problem in (1.13), (unique if (H_6) exists) i.e.

$$\begin{cases} \text{find } \pi_1(r, \xi) \in W_{\#}^1 L^{\Phi}(Y) \text{ such that} \\ \int_Y h(y, r, \xi + D_y \pi_1(r, \xi)) \cdot D_y \theta dy = 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in W_{\#}^1 L^{\Phi}(Y). \end{cases}$$

Note also that (4.8) lead us to $u_1 = \pi_1(u_0, Du_0)$. Set, again, for $(r, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$

$$q(r, \xi) = \int_Y h(y, r, \xi + D_y \pi_1(r, \xi)) dy,$$

the function q in (1.10) is well defined. Moreover, it results from (4.9) and the above cell problems that

$$(4.11) \quad \int_{\Omega} q(u_0, Du_0) \cdot Dv_0 dx = \int_{\Omega} f \cdot v_0 dx \text{ for all } v_0 \in W_0^1 L^{\Phi}(\Omega).$$

Finally, analogously to the already mentioned standard H^1 setting in [3], we have the following result, linking the macroscopic problem to the single iterated ones.

Theorem 1.2 *For every $\varepsilon > 0$, let (1.1) be such that a and f satisfy $(H_1) - (H_6)$.*

Let $u_0 \in W_0^1 L^{\Phi}(\Omega)$ be the solution defined by means of (1.8). Then, it is the unique solution of the macroscopic homogenized problem

$$(4.12) \quad -\operatorname{div} q(u_0, Du_0) = f \text{ in } \Omega, u_0 \in W_0^1 L^{\Phi}(\Omega),$$

where q is defined by (1.10), taking into account (1.11), (1.12) and (1.13).

Proof. From (4.11), the function u_0 is a solution of (4.12). Let $w_0 \in W_0^1 L^\Phi(\Omega)$ be another solution of (4.12), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\Omega} q(u_0, Du_0) \cdot Dw_0 dx &= - \int_{\Omega} f \cdot w_0 dx; \\ \int_{\Omega} q(u_0, Du_0) \cdot Du_0 dx &= \int_{\Omega} f \cdot u_0 dx; \\ \int_{\Omega} q(w_0, Dw_0) \cdot Dw_0 dx &= \int_{\Omega} f \cdot w_0 dx; \\ - \int_{\Omega} q(w_0, Dw_0) \cdot Du_0 dx &= - \int_{\Omega} f \cdot u_0 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\int_{\Omega} (q(u_0, Du_0) - q(w_0, Dw_0)) \cdot (Du_0 - Dw_0) dx = 0.$$

Replacing q by (1.10) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \int_Y (h(y, u_0, Du_0 + D_y \pi_1(u_0, Du_0)) - h(y, w_0, Dw_0 + D_y \pi_1(w_0, Dw_0))) \cdot (Du_0 - Dw_0) dx dy &= 0, \text{ i.e.} \\ \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z \left[a \left(y, z, u_0(x), \underbrace{Du_0(x) + D_y \pi_1(u_0, Du_0) + D_z \pi_2(y, u_0, Du_0 + D_y \pi_1(u_0, Du_0))}_{=P} \right) - \right. \\ \left. a \left(y, z, w_0(x), \underbrace{Dw_0(x) + D_y \pi_1(w_0, Dw_0) + D_z \pi_2(y, w_0, Dw_0 + D_y \pi_1(w_0, Dw_0))}_{=F} \right) \right] \cdot \\ \left. [(Du_0 - Dw_0)] dx dy dz = 0. \right. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z (a(y, z, u_0(x), P) - a(y, z, w_0(x), F)) \cdot (P - F) dx dy dz = 0.$$

Since we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z (a(y, z, u_0(x), P)) \cdot (P - Du_0) dx dy dz = \\ &\quad \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z (a(y, z, w_0(x), F)) \cdot (F - Dw_0) dx dy dz \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z (a(y, z, u_0(x), P)) \cdot (F - Dw_0) dx dy dz = \\ &\quad \int_{\Omega} \int_Y \int_Z (a(y, z, w_0(x), F)) \cdot (P - Du_0) dx dy dz, \end{aligned}$$

similar arguments as in Remark 4.4, relying on (H_6) give uniqueness. \square

5. APPENDIX

In the following, requiring that the coefficients a in problem (1.1) satisfy $(H_1) - (H_4)$ together with the periodicity assumption (H_5) , we prove which are the spaces of regular functions, where the compositions of functions as in the weak formulation of (1.1) are meaningful. Consequently, the existence of solutions of (1.1) in the general case, presented in Section 3, will follow by density arguments. Regarding uniqueness we recall that a strict monotonicity assumption, such as (H_6) , would guarantee it, cf. Remark 4.4 for the uniqueness of solutions for the limiting problem.

By (1.3) of (H_2) applied to $\zeta' = 0, \lambda' = \omega, \zeta, \lambda$ and by (H_5) , for every $1 \leq i \leq d$, it follows

$$|a_i(y, z, \zeta, \lambda)| \leq |a_i(y, z, 0, \omega)| + c_1 \tilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\Phi(c_2 |\zeta|)) + c_3 \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(\Phi(c_4 |\lambda|)) \leq c,$$

for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and every $(z, \zeta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Using (H_1) , for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, every $(\zeta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, for $1 \leq i \leq d$,

$$a_i(y, \cdot, \zeta, \lambda) \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d),$$

and for each $(z, \zeta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $1 \leq i \leq d$,

$$a_i(\cdot, z, \zeta, \lambda) \text{ is measurable and bounded.}$$

Consequently, with the notation of Section 2, for $(\zeta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$,

$$a_i(\cdot, z, \zeta, \lambda) \in L_{per}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)) \subset \mathfrak{X}_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)).$$

Recalling Section 2, traces (in the sense of (2.4)) are well defined on $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$, thus also on $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^N; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^N)))$, in particular for $(u, Du) \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ (cf. [15]).

Next, assume that, for every $1 \leq i \leq d$, $(\zeta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $a_i(\cdot, \cdot, \zeta, \lambda) \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$. Thus, for every $(f, \mathbf{f}) \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)^{d+1}$, it results that $a_i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) \in \mathfrak{X}_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$, hence $a_i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$.

Let Λ_1 and Λ_2 be compact sets of \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^d , respectively such that $(f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z)) \in \Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2$, for every $(y, z) \in Y \times Z$. For every $1 \leq i \leq d$, and denoting by a_i , also its restriction (with respect to the two last arguments) on $\Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2$, we have that $a_i \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))$.

Then, suppose that, for every $1 \leq i \leq d$, $a_i(\cdot, \cdot, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) := \mathcal{X}\varphi$, with $\mathcal{X} \equiv \mathcal{X}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2)$, and $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$. Hence, there exists $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, sequence of polynomials in the arguments (λ_1, λ_2) such that $f_n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Therefore $f_n(f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot))$ in $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e.

$$\sup_{(y, z)} \|f_n(f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z)) - \mathcal{X}(f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z))\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$$

and the function $\mathcal{X}(f, \mathbf{f}) \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$. Consequently, for every $1 \leq i \leq d$,

$$a_i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) = \mathcal{X}(f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) \varphi(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z).$$

Analogously for every $1 \leq i \leq d$, if $a_i(\cdot, \cdot, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) := \sum_{j=1}^s \mathcal{X}_j(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \varphi_j(\cdot, \cdot)$, $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\mathcal{X}_i \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2)$, and $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$, then

$$a_i \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)).$$

Taking a_i arbitrarily in $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))$ satisfying the hypotheses $(H_1) - (H_5)$, by the density of $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$ in $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))$ it results that there exists $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{C}(\Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|g_n - a_i\|_{\mathcal{C}(\Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2; \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z))} \equiv \\ & \sup_{\substack{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2 \\ (y, z) \in \mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d}} |g_n(y, z, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) - a_i(y, z, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)| \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Then $g_n(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) \rightarrow a_i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot))$ in $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Thus, since $g_n(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot))$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$, which is closed in $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)$, it results that

$$a_i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z) \subset \mathfrak{X}_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)).$$

For the general case, i.e. assuming that for every $1 \leq i \leq d$, $a_i(\cdot, \cdot, \zeta, \lambda) \in L_{per}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$ for each $(\zeta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we exploit condition (1.5).

Let $\theta \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\theta \geq 0$, $\text{supp } \theta \subset \overline{B}_d(0, 1)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \theta(y) dy = 1$. For any integer $n \geq 1$, set $\theta_n(y) := n^d \theta(ny)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Define, for every $(z, \zeta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$,

$$g_n^i(y, z, \zeta, \lambda) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \theta_n(\xi) a_i(y - \xi, z, \zeta, \lambda) d\xi,$$

and, let $g_n := (g_n^i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$. Clearly $g_n^i \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$ with $g_n(\cdot, \cdot, 0, \omega) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d; \mathbb{R})$. Moreover

$$(g_n(y, z, \zeta, \lambda) - g_n(y, z, \zeta', \lambda')) \cdot (\lambda - \lambda') \geq c_5 \Phi(|\lambda - \lambda'|), \text{ and}$$

$$|g_n(y, z, \zeta, \lambda) - g_n(y, z, \zeta', \lambda')| \leq c_1 \tilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\Phi(c_2 |\zeta - \zeta'|)) + c_3 \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(\Phi(c_4 |\lambda - \lambda'|)),$$

for all $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \lambda, \lambda' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \zeta, \zeta' \in \mathbb{R}$. From the above considerations, $g_n(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)^d$. Introducing the space

$$\left(L^{\tilde{\Phi}}, l^\infty\right)(\mathbb{R}_y^N; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_z^N)) := \left\{u \in L_{loc}^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\mathbb{R}_y^N; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_z^N)) : \|u\|_{(L^{\tilde{\Phi}}, l^\infty)(\mathbb{R}_y^N; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_z^N))} < \infty\right\},$$

endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{(L^{\tilde{\Phi}}, l^\infty)(\mathbb{R}_y^N; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_z^N))} = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^N} \|u(y, \cdot)\|_\infty \|\tilde{\Phi}, k + Y\|,$$

it results that, for every $1 \leq i \leq d$,

$$a_i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) \in L_{per}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^N; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^N)) \subset \left(L^{\tilde{\Phi}}, l^\infty\right)(\mathbb{R}_y^N; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_z^N)).$$

Hence, for $\eta > 0$, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that if $n \geq N_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |g_n^i(y, z, \zeta, \lambda) - a_i(y, z, \zeta, \lambda)| \leq \\ & \int_{\frac{1}{n}B_d(0,1)} |\theta_n(\xi) a_i(y - \xi, z, \zeta, \lambda) - a_i(y, z, \zeta, \lambda)| d\xi \leq \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \|g_n^i(y, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z)) - a_i(y, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z))\|_{L^\infty(Z)} \right\|_{\tilde{\Phi}, Y} = \\ & \sup_{\|u\|_{\tilde{\Phi}, Y} \leq 1} \left| \int_Y \|g_n^i(y, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z)) - a_i(y, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z))\|_{L^\infty(Z)} u(y) dy \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_Y \|g_n^i(y, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z)) - a_i(y, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z))\|_{L^\infty(Z)} u(y) dy \right| = \\ & \left| \int_Y \sup_z \left| \int_{\frac{1}{n}B_d(\omega, 1)} \theta_n(\xi) a_i(y - \xi, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z)) d\xi - a_i(y, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z)) \right| u(y) dy \right| = \\ & \left| \int_Y \sup_z \left| \int_{\frac{1}{n}B_d(\omega, 1)} \theta_n(\xi) (a_i(y - \xi, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z)) - a_i(y, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z))) d\xi u(y) dy \right| \leq \\ & \int_Y \sup_z \left| \int_{\frac{1}{n}B_d(\omega, 1)} \theta_n(\xi) (a_i(y - \xi, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z)) - a_i(y, z, f(y, z), \mathbf{f}(y, z))) \right| |u(y)| d\xi dy \leq \\ & \int_Y \left| \int_{\frac{1}{n}B_d(\omega, 1)} \theta_n(\xi) \eta \right| |u(y)| d\xi dy \leq \int_{\frac{1}{n}B_d(\omega, 1)} \theta_n(\xi) \int_Y |\eta| |u(y)| dy d\xi \leq C\eta \int_Y |u(y)| dy. \end{aligned}$$

Then, considering the space $\Xi^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\mathbb{R}_y^N; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^N))$ in (2.8), endowed with the norm (2.9) (with the N -function B therein replaced by $\tilde{\Phi}$), taking into account Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 2.3, (i.e. $\|u\|_{\Xi^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))}$ equivalent to $\|u\|_{\tilde{\Phi}, Y \times Z}$), the above estimates provide (with $u \in \mathfrak{X}_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$)

$$\|g_n^i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) - a^i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot))\|_{\Xi^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))} \leq 2c \|\eta\|_{\tilde{\Phi}, Y}$$

for every $n \geq N_0$. The arbitrariness of η proves that, for every $1 \leq i \leq d$,

$$g_n^i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) \rightarrow a^i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) \text{ in } \Xi^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)),$$

and, since $g_n^i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) \in \mathcal{C}_{per}(Y \times Z)$, it results that

$$a^i(\cdot, \cdot, f(\cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)) \in \mathfrak{X}_{per}^{\tilde{\Phi}}(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)).$$

5.1. Definition of $a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, w^\varepsilon, \mathbf{W}^\varepsilon)$ for $(w, \mathbf{W}) \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d))$.

Let U be a bounded open set of \mathbb{R}_y^d and let $u \in \mathcal{C}_b(\overline{U}) \otimes L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, F)$, where F is a Banach space. It is well known that there exists a negligible set $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{R}_t^d$ such that $\|u(y, t)\|_F \leq \sup_{y \in \overline{U}} \|u(y, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, F)}$,

for every $y \in \overline{U}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_t^d \setminus \mathcal{N}$. Moreover, given $s \in \mathbb{N}$, and assuming that $u = \sum_{i=1}^s \varphi_i \otimes \psi_i$, with $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{U})$, $\psi_i \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, F)$, one can define $\tilde{u}^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(U, F)$ by

$$\tilde{u}^\varepsilon(y) := \sum_{i=1}^s \varphi_i(y) \otimes \psi_i\left(\frac{y}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad y \in U.$$

Consequently, it is defined a linear trace operator $u \rightarrow \tilde{u}^\varepsilon$ from $\mathcal{C}_b(\overline{U}) \otimes L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, F)$ to $L^\infty(U, F)$. Since $\mathcal{C}_b(\overline{U}) \otimes L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, F)$ is dense in $\mathcal{C}_b(\overline{U}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, F))$, it is also known that the trace operator $u \rightarrow \tilde{u}^\varepsilon$ extends by continuity to a unique linear operator from $\mathcal{C}_b(\overline{U}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, F))$ to $L^\infty(U, F)$ still denoted by $u \rightarrow \tilde{u}^\varepsilon$ such that

$$\|\tilde{u}^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(U, F)} \leq \sup_{y \in \overline{U}} \|u(y, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, F)}, \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathcal{C}_b(\overline{U}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, F)).$$

Observe that, with the above strategy, we have defined the application $u \rightarrow \tilde{u}^\varepsilon$ which is the trace operator on $\{(y, t) : t = \frac{y}{\varepsilon}, y \in U\}$.

Let V be an open bounded subset of \mathbb{R}_z^d and consider ψ of the form $\psi = \varphi \otimes v \otimes \phi$ with $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{U})$, $v \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{V})$ and $\phi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_\zeta^d))$. For fixed y and t in \overline{U} and \mathbb{R}_t^d , respectively, the function $(z, \zeta) \rightarrow \varphi(y) v(z) \phi(t, \zeta)$ is an element of $\mathcal{C}_b(\overline{V} \times \mathbb{R}_\zeta^d)$ such that its trace of order ε on $\{(z, \zeta) : \zeta = \frac{z}{\varepsilon}, z \in V\}$ is well defined. In particular the function $z \rightarrow \varphi(y) v(z) \phi(t, z)$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}(\overline{V})$. Therefore, the function $(y, t) \rightarrow \varphi(y) \phi(t, \cdot)$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}(\overline{U}) \otimes L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d; \mathcal{C}(\overline{V}))$. Thus, its trace of order $\varepsilon > 0$ on $\{(y, t) : t = \frac{y}{\varepsilon}, y \in U\}$ is defined as above. It follows that the function $(y, z) \rightarrow \varphi(y) v(z) \phi(y, z)$ is well defined and belongs to $L^\infty(U; \mathcal{C}(\overline{V}))$ with

$$(5.1) \quad |\psi(y, z, y, z)| \leq \sup_{a \in \overline{U}} \sup_{b \in \overline{V}} \|\psi(a, \cdot, b, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d))}.$$

Then for every positive integer s , let $\psi := \sum_{i=1}^s \varphi_i \otimes v_i \otimes \phi_i$, where $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{U})$, $v_i \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{V})$ and $\phi_i \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, \mathbb{R}_z^d)$. From the above formulas, it follows that each function $(y, z) \rightarrow \varphi_i(y) v_i(z) \phi_i(y, z)$ belongs to $L^\infty(U; \mathcal{C}(\overline{V}))$. Consequently $(y, z) \rightarrow \psi(y, z, y, z)$ is an element of $L^\infty(U; \mathcal{C}(\overline{V}))$ verifying (5.1). Thus the restriction on $\mathcal{C}(\overline{U}) \otimes \mathcal{C}(\overline{V}) \otimes L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_\zeta^d))$ of the transformation $\psi \rightarrow \tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon=1}$ from $\mathcal{C}_b(\overline{U} \times \overline{V}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_\zeta^d)))$ to $L^\infty(U \times V)$ is a continuous linear operator from $\mathcal{C}(\overline{U}) \otimes \mathcal{C}(\overline{V}) \otimes L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_\zeta^d))$ to $L^\infty(U; \mathcal{C}(\overline{V}))$. This operator, in turn, extends uniquely by continuity and density to a linear and continuous operator from $\mathcal{C}(\overline{U} \times \overline{V}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_\zeta^d)))$ to $L^\infty(U; \mathcal{C}(\overline{V}))$ still denoted by $\psi \rightarrow \tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon=1}$ with

$$\left\| \tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon=1} \right\|_{L^\infty(U; \mathcal{C}(\overline{V}))} \leq \sup_{a \in \overline{U}} \sup_{b \in \overline{V}} \|\psi(a, \cdot, b, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d))}$$

for all $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_b(\overline{U} \times \overline{V}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_\zeta^d)))$.

Moreover, given $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_b(\overline{U} \times \overline{V}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_\zeta^d)))$, if for any fixed $(y, z) \in \overline{U} \times \overline{V}$ it results $\psi(y, z, t, \zeta) \geq 0$ for every $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then there exists a negligible set $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{R}_y^d$ such that $\tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon=1} \geq 0$ for all $(y, z) \in (U \setminus \mathcal{N}) \times V$.

All the above considerations can be generalized on $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_\zeta^d)))$, indeed, we have

Proposition 5.1. *For $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_\zeta^d)))$, the trace of order $\varepsilon = 1$ on*

$\{(y, z, t, \zeta) : t = y \text{ and } \zeta = z, (y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d)\}$ of ψ belongs to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$. Moreover, for every $(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, if $\psi(y, z, t, \zeta) \geq 0$, for every $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $\tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon=1}(y, z) \geq 0$, for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. Let n be a positive integer. Let U_n and V_n be the open balls of \mathbb{R}_y^d and \mathbb{R}_z^d , respectively, centered at ω , with radius n . Set $\psi_n := \psi|_{\overline{U}_n \times \overline{V}_n}$, (i.e. the restriction with respect to the first two variables) then ψ_n is an element of $\mathcal{C}_b(\overline{U}_n \times \overline{V}_n; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_\zeta^d)))$. Thus, following the above arguments, one can define $\tilde{\psi}_n^{\varepsilon=1} \in L^\infty(U_n; \mathcal{C}(\overline{V}_n))$. Hence it results that the sequence $(\tilde{\psi}_n^{\varepsilon=1})_n$ verifies $\tilde{\psi}_n^{\varepsilon=1} = \tilde{\psi}_{n+1}^{\varepsilon=1}|_{\overline{U}_n \times \overline{V}_n}$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular this guarantees that there is a unique $\tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon=1} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$ such that $\tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon=1}|_{U_n \times V_n} = \tilde{\psi}_n^{\varepsilon=1}$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover the continuity is a consequence of (5.1).

To prove the second part, we start assuming that for every $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ it results $\psi(y, z, t, \zeta) \geq 0$ for every $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n > 0$, it results that $\psi_n(y, z, t, \zeta) \geq 0$ for every $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

By the above considerations about traces (prior to Proposition 5.1), for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a negligible set $\mathcal{N}_n \subset \mathbb{R}_y^d$ such that $\tilde{\psi}_n^{\varepsilon=1}(y, z) \geq 0$ for all $(y, z) \in (U_n \setminus \mathcal{N}_n) \times V_n$. Then $\tilde{\psi}_n^{\varepsilon=1}(y, z) \geq 0$ for every $(y, z) \in (U_n \setminus \mathcal{N}_n) \times V_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\mathcal{N} = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{N}_n$, from which it follows that $\tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon=1}(y, z) \geq 0$ for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. \square

Corollary 5.2. Let $a := (a_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfy $(H_1) - (H_4)$ and let $(w, \mathbf{W}) \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)^{d+1}$. For $1 \leq i \leq d$, the function $(y, z) \rightarrow a_i(y, z, w(y, z), \mathbf{W}(y, z))$ from $\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d$ into \mathbb{R} is an element of $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$, denoted as $a_i(\cdot, \cdot, w, \mathbf{W})$.

For every $(w, \mathbf{W}), (v, \mathbf{V}) \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)^{d+1}$, it results that

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & |a(y, z, w(y, z), \mathbf{W}(y, z)) - a(y, z, v(y, z), \mathbf{V}(y, z))| \\ & \leq c_1 \tilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\Phi(c_2 |w(y, z) - v(y, z)|)) + c_3 \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(\Phi(c_4 |\mathbf{W}(y, z) - \mathbf{V}(y, z)|)); \end{aligned}$$

$$(a(y, z, w(y, z), \mathbf{W}(y, z)) - a(y, z, w(y, z), \mathbf{V}(y, z))) \cdot (\mathbf{W}(y, z) - \mathbf{V}(y, z)) \geq 0;$$

$$(a(y, z, w(y, z), \mathbf{W}(y, z))) \cdot \mathbf{W}(y, z) \geq \theta \Phi(|\mathbf{W}(y, z)|),$$

$$\text{with } \theta := \tilde{\Phi}^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(\min_{t>0} h(t) \right) \right),$$

for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $a(\cdot, \cdot, w, \mathbf{W}) := (a_i(\cdot, \cdot, w, \mathbf{W}))_{1 \leq i \leq d}$.

Proof. Let $(w, \mathbf{W}) \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)^{d+1}$. From $(H_1) - (H_4)$, the function $\psi : \mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d \times \mathbb{R}_t^d \times \mathbb{R}_\zeta^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\psi(y, z, t, \zeta) := a_i(t, \zeta, w(y, z), \mathbf{W}(y, z))$, $(1 \leq i \leq d)$, is an element of $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_\zeta^d)))$ and we define its trace $\tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon=1}$ as above and we get $\tilde{\psi}^{\varepsilon=1} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$. Then, the inequalities are immediate consequences of $(H_1) - (H_4)$ and of Proposition 5.1. \square

In order to give a meaning to $a^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot, w^\varepsilon, \mathbf{W}^\varepsilon)$ for $(w, \mathbf{W}) \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)^{d+1})$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the following result can be proven:

Proposition 5.3. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $a := (a_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfy $(H_1) - (H_4)$. Let $(w, \mathbf{W}) \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d)^{d+1})$. The function $x \in \Omega \rightarrow a_i(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2}, w(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2}), \mathbf{W}(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon^2})) \in \mathbb{R}$, denoted by $a_i(\cdot, \cdot, w^\varepsilon, \mathbf{W}^\varepsilon)$, is well defined and belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega)$.

Proof. Let $x \in \Omega$ fixed. Let $a_i(\cdot, \cdot, w(x, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{W}(x, \cdot, \cdot)) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d, \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d))$, then, by Corollary 5.2, the function $(y, z) \rightarrow a_i(y, z, w(x, y, z), \mathbf{W}(x, y, z))$ is well defined. Using (5.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|a_i(\cdot, \cdot, w(x, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{W}(x, \cdot, \cdot)) - a_i(\cdot, \cdot, w(x', \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{W}(x', \cdot, \cdot))\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_z^d)} \leq \\ & c_1 \tilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\Phi(c_2 \|w(x, \cdot, \cdot) - w(x', \cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty)) + \\ & c_3 \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(\Phi(c_4 \|\mathbf{W}(x, \cdot, \cdot) - \mathbf{W}(x', \cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty)), \quad x, x' \in \overline{\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the function $x \in \Omega \rightarrow a_i(\cdot, \cdot, w(x, \cdot, \cdot), \mathbf{W}(x, \cdot, \cdot)) \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d; \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_z^d)))$, hence, by Proposition 5.1 the statement follows. \square

Acknowledgments

The first author acknowledges the support of ICTP-INdAM (2018) and of the University of Salerno which the last author was affiliated with, when this work started. The last author is a member of INdAM-GNAMPA, whose support is gratefully acknowledged. The authors are indebted with the anonymous referee for his/her comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Adams, *Sobolev Spaces*, Academic Press, New York, 1975.
- [2] G. Allaire: *Homogenization and two scale convergence*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 23 (1992) 1482-1518.
- [3] G. Allaire, M. Briane: *Multiscale convergence and reiterated homogenization*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edin. 126 (1996) 297-342.
- [4] B. Amaziane, S. Antonsev, L. Pankratov, *Homogenization of a class of nonlinear elliptic equations with nonstandard growth*, C. R. Mecanique **335**, (2007), 138-143.
- [5] P. Clément, B. de Pagter, G. Sweers, F. de Thélin, *Existence of solutions to a semilinear elliptic system through Orlicz-Sobolev spaces*, Mediterr. J. Math., **1**, (2004), n. 3, 241-267.
- [6] I. Fonseca, G. Leoni, *Modern methods in the calculus of variations: L^p spaces*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, New York, (2007), xiv+599.
- [7] I. Fonseca, E. Zappale: *Multiscale Relaxation of Convex Functionals* Journal of Convex Analysis, **10**, n.2, (2003), 325-350.
- [8] J. Fotso Tachago, H. Nnang: *Two-scale convergence of Integral functionals with convex, periodic and Nonstandard Growth Integrands*, Acta Appl. Math., **121**, (2012), 175-196.
- [9] J. Fotso Tachago, H. Nnang, E. Zappale: *Reiterated periodic homogenization of integral functionals with convex and nonstandard growth integrands*, Opuscula Mathematica, **41**, n.1, (2021), 113-143.
- [10] J. Fotso Tachago, G. Gargiulo, H. Nnang, E. Zappale: *Multiscale homogenization of integral convex functionals in Orlicz Sobolev setting*, Evolution Equations & Control Theory, **10**, n. 2, (2021), 297-320.
- [11] P. Hartman, G. Stampacchia: *On some non-linear elliptic differential-functional equations*, Acta Math., **115**, (1966), 271-310.
- [12] R. Kenne Bogning, H. Nnang, *Periodic homogenisation of parabolic nonstandard monotone operators*, Acta Appl. Math. **25**, (2013), 209-229.
- [13] E. Y. Khruslov, L. S. Pankratov, *Homogenization of the Dirichlet variational problems in Orlicz-Sobolev spaces*, Operator theory and its applications (Winnipeg, MB, 1998), Fields Inst. Commun., Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, **25**, (2000), 345-366.
- [14] D. Lukkassen, G. Nguetseng, P. Wall, *Two-scale convergence*, International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, **2** N. 1, (2002), 33-81.
- [15] D. Lukkassen, G. Nguetseng, H. Nnang, P. Wall, *Reiterated homogenization of nonlinear monotone operators in a general deterministic setting*, Journal of Function Spaces and Applications, **7**, N. 2 (2009), 121-152.
- [16] D. Marcon, J. F. Rodrigues, R. Teymurazy, *Homogenization of obstacle problems in Orlicz-Sobolev spaces*, Port. Math. **75**, N. 3/4, (2018), 267-283.
- [17] M. Mihăilescu, V. Rădulescu, *Neumann problems associated to nonhomogeneous differential operators in Orlicz-Sobolev spaces*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), **58**, (2008), n. 6, 2087-2111.
- [18] M. Mihăilescu, G. Moroşanu, V. Rădulescu, *Eigenvalue problems in anisotropic Orlicz-Sobolev spaces*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I **347**, (2009) 521-526.
- [19] G. Nguetseng, *A general convergent result for functional related to the theory of homogenization*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **20**, (1989), 608-623.
- [20] G. Nguetseng, H. Nnang: *Homogenization of nonlinear monotone operators beyond the periodic setting*, Electron. J. Diff. Equ., (2003), 1-24.
- [21] H. Nnang, *Homogénéisation déterministe d'opérateurs monotones*, Fac. Sc. University of Yaoundé 1, Yaoundé, 2004.
- [22] H. Nnang, *Deterministic Homogenization of Nonlinear Degenerated Elliptic Operators with Nonstandard Growth*, Act. Math. Sinica, **30**, (2014), 1621-1654.
- [23] A. Pankov, *G-convergence and homogenization of nonlinear partial differential operators*, Mathematics and its Applications, **422**, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, (1997), xiv+249.
- [24] A. Pankov, *Periodic approximations of homogenization problems*, Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences, **36**, (2013), 2018-2022.
- [25] A. Visintin, *Towards a two-scale calculus*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var., **12**, (2006), n. 3, 371-397.

- [26] J. L. Woukeng, *Deterministic homogenization of non-linear non-monotone degenerate elliptic operators*, Adv. Math., **219**, (2008), n. 5, 1608–1631.
- [27] J.L. Woukeng, *Reiterated homogenization of nonlinear pseudo monotone degenerate parabolic operators*, Commun. Math. Anal., **9**, (2010), n. 2, 98–129.
- [28] J. L. Woukeng, *Homogenization of nonlinear degenerate non-monotone elliptic operators in domains perforated with tiny holes*, Acta Appl. Math., **112**, (2010), n. 1, 35–68.
- [29] J. L. Woukeng, *Periodic homogenization of nonlinear non-monotone parabolic operators with three time scales*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4), Series IV, **189**, (2010), n. 3, 357–379.
- [30] A. Youssfi, *Existence of bounded solutions for nonlinear degenerate elliptic equations in Orlicz spaces*, Electron. J. Differential Equations, (2007), n. 54, 1–13.

Current address: [‡]University of Bamenda, Higher Teachers Training College, Department of Mathematics, P.O. Box 39, Bambili, Cameroon

Email address: fotsotachago@yahoo.fr

Current address: [†]University of Yaounde I, École Normale Supérieure de Yaoundé, P.O. Box 47 Yaounde, Cameroon.

Email address: hnnang@uy1.uninet.cm

Current address: Dipartimento di Scienze di Base e Applicate per l'Ingegneria, Sapienza - Università di Roma, Via Antonio Scarpa, 16, Roma 10161, Italy

Email address: elvira.zappale@uniroma1.it