

A generalization of a lemma of Boccardo and Orsina and application

HONGYA GAO¹ MENG GAO¹ SIYU GAO^{2*}

1. College of Mathematics and Information Science, Hebei University, Baoding, 071002, China

2. Department of Mathematics, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas 76203, USA

Abstract. We present a generalization of a technical lemma due to Boccardo and Orsina, and then give an application to regularity of minima for integral functionals noncoercive in the energy space.

AMS Subject Classification: 49N60, 35J70

Keywords: A generalization of a lemma of Boccardo and Orsina, regularity, minima, integral functional.

1 Introduction.

In dealing with regularity properties of minima of some integral functionals noncoercive in the energy space, Boccardo and Orsina proved in [2] a useful lemma to consider how the regularity of u depends on the summability of the source f in some Marcinkiewicz space. More precisely, Boccardo and Orsina considered integral functionals of the type

$$\mathcal{J}(v) = \int_{\Omega} a(x, v) j(\nabla v) dx - \int_{\Omega} f v dx, \quad v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \quad (1.1)$$

where Ω is a bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$,

$$f \in L^r(\Omega), \quad r \geq (p^*)', \quad (1.2)$$

$a(x, s) : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Carathéodory function (that is, $a(\cdot, s)$ is measurable on Ω for every s in \mathbb{R} , and $a(x, \cdot)$ is continuous on \mathbb{R} for almost every x in Ω) such that for almost every $x \in \Omega$ and every $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$a(x, s) = \frac{\beta_1}{(b(x) + |s|)^{\alpha p}}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\beta_1 > 0$, $1 < p < n$,

$$0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{p'}, \quad (1.4)$$

and $b(x)$ is a measurable function on Ω such that

$$0 < \beta_2 \leq \beta(x) \leq \beta_3 < +\infty, \quad \text{for almost every } x \in \Omega; \quad (1.5)$$

moreover, $j : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function such that $j(0) = 0$ and for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\beta_4 |\xi|^p \leq j(\xi) \leq \beta_5 (1 + |\xi|^p) \quad (1.6)$$

with $\beta_4, \beta_5 > 0$.

Note that, although the functional (1.1) is well-defined for f satisfying (1.2), it is not coercive on the energy space $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$: there exists a function f , and a sequence $\{u_n\}$ whose norm diverges in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, such that $\mathcal{J}(u_n)$ tends to $-\infty$, see Example 3.3 in [2].

*Corresponding author, email: siyugao@my.unt.edu.

Thus \mathcal{J} may not attain its minimum on $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. A good idea to consider a minimum of \mathcal{J} is to extend $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ to a larger space $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ with

$$q = \frac{np(1-\alpha)}{n-\alpha p} < p, \quad (1.7)$$

in the following way:

$$\mathcal{I}(v) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{J}(v), & \text{if } \mathcal{J}(v) \text{ is finite,} \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

A function $u \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ is called a minima of the functional $\mathcal{I}(v)$ in (1.8) if

$$\mathcal{I}(u) \leq \mathcal{I}(v), \quad \text{for all } v \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega). \quad (1.9)$$

The following result comes from Theorem 2.1 in [2]: Suppose that f belongs to $L^r(\Omega)$, with $r \geq [p^*(1-\alpha)]'$. Then \mathcal{I} is coercive and weakly lower semicontinuous on $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$. By standard results, \mathcal{I} has a minimum on $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$. See Theorem 1.1 in [2].

Let us recall the Marcinkiewicz space $M^r(\Omega)$, $r > 0$, which is the set of all measurable functions $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$|\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > t\}| \leq \frac{c}{t^r}, \quad (1.10)$$

for every $t > 0$ and for some constant $c > 0$. The norm of $f \in M^r(\Omega)$ is defined by

$$\|f\|_{M^r(\Omega)}^r = \inf \{c > 0 : (1.10) \text{ holds}\}.$$

If Ω has finite measure, then

$$L^r(\Omega) \subset M^r(\Omega) \subset L^{r-\varepsilon}(\Omega), \quad (1.11)$$

for every $r > 1$ and every $0 < \varepsilon \leq r - 1$. We recall also that, see Proposition 3.13 in [1], if $f \in M^r(\Omega)$, $r > 1$, then there exists a positive constant $B = B(\|f\|_{M^r(\Omega)}, r)$ such that, for every measurable set $E \subset \Omega$,

$$\int_E |f| dx \leq B|E|^{1-\frac{1}{r}}. \quad (1.12)$$

In [2], Boccardo and Orsina obtained some regularity results for u and ∇u in terms of

$$f \in M^r(\Omega), \quad [p^*(1-\alpha)]' < r < \frac{n}{p}, \quad (1.13)$$

see Theorem 6.3 in [2].

Proposition 1.1. *Let f be in $M^r(\Omega)$, with $[p^*(1-\alpha)]' < r < \frac{n}{p}$. Then any minima u of \mathcal{I} belongs to $M^s(\Omega)$ with*

$$s = \frac{nr(p(1-\alpha)-1)}{n-rp}.$$

Moreover:

a) if

$$\left(\frac{p^*}{1+\alpha p} \right)' < r < \frac{n}{p},$$

then u belongs to $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$;

b) if

$$[p^*(1-\alpha)]' < r \leq \left(\frac{p^*}{1+\alpha p} \right)',$$

then $|\nabla u|$ belongs to $M^\rho(\Omega)$ with

$$\rho = \frac{nr[p(1-\alpha)-1]}{n-r(1+\alpha p)}.$$

The main tool in proving Proposition 1.1 is a technical lemma as follows, see Lemma 6.1 in [2].

Lemma 1.1. *Let $\psi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a non increasing function, and suppose that*

$$\psi(h) \leq c \frac{k^A \psi(k)^B + \psi(k)^C}{(h-k)^D}, \quad \forall h > k \geq 0, \quad (1.14)$$

where c is a positive constant, and A, B, C and D are such that

$$A < D, \quad C < B < 1, \quad \frac{D-A}{1-B} = \frac{D}{1-C}. \quad (1.15)$$

Then there exists $\bar{k} \geq 0$, and a positive constant \bar{c} such that

$$\psi(k) \leq \bar{c} k^{-\frac{D-A}{1-B}} = \bar{c} k^{-\frac{D}{1-C}}, \quad \forall k \geq \bar{k}. \quad (1.16)$$

We remark that this lemma is very similar to the classical Stampacchia Lemma (see [3], Lemma 4.1) used till now repeatedly by many mathematicians in dealing with regularity issues of solutions of elliptic PDEs as well as minima of variational integrals.

Let us come back to Proposition 1.1. For $v \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ and $f \in M^r(\Omega)$, $r > [p^*(1-\alpha)]' = (q^*)'$, the second integral $\int_\Omega f v dx$ is well-defined thanks to Sobolev embedding. Two natural questions now arise as: do we have any regularity properties for minima of \mathcal{I} when $r = \frac{n}{p}$ and $r > \frac{n}{p}$? In order to answer these two questions, we need to generalize Lemma 1.1.

2 A generalization of Lemma 1.1.

We now prove the following

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose c_1, A, B, C, D are positive constants, $A < D$, $k_0 \geq 0$. Let $\psi : [k_0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a non increasing function, and suppose that*

$$\psi(h) \leq c_1 \frac{h^A \psi(k)^B + \psi(k)^C}{(h-k)^D}, \quad (2.1)$$

for every h, k with $h > k > k_0$. It results that:

i) if $C < B < 1$ and $\frac{D-A}{1-B} = \frac{D}{1-C}$, then there exists a positive constant \bar{c}_1 such that for any $k \geq k_0$,

$$\psi(k) \leq \bar{c}_1 k^{-\frac{D-A}{1-B}} = \bar{c}_1 k^{-\frac{D}{1-C}}; \quad (2.2)$$

ii) if $B = C = 1$, then for any $k \geq k_0$ we have

$$\psi(k) \leq \psi(k_0) e^{1 - \left(\frac{k-k_0}{\tau}\right)^{\frac{D-A}{D}}}, \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\tau = \max \left\{ k_0 + 1, \left(\frac{2c_1 e 2^{\frac{(2D-A)A}{D-A}} (D-A)^D}{D^D} \right)^{\frac{1}{D-A}} \right\}; \quad (2.4)$$

iii) if $B > C > 1$, then

$$\psi(2L) = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$L = \max \left\{ 1, 2k_0, (c_1 2^{1+D} (1 + \psi(k_0))^B)^{\frac{1}{D-A}}, \left(c_1^{\frac{C}{C-1}} (1 + \psi(k_0))^B 2^{D+1 + \frac{A+D+1}{C-1} + \frac{D}{(C-1)^2}} \right)^{\frac{C-1}{(D-A)C}} \right\}. \quad (2.6)$$

We mention that the difference between Lemma 2.1 i) and Lemma 1.1 is that a real number k_0 replaced 0 and h^A replaced k^A . We mention also that, this section borrows some ideas from the papers [2, 4–8, 10].

In the proof of Lemma 2.1 iii) we shall use the following lemma, which comes from Lemma 7.1 in [9].

Lemma 2.2. Let β, M, \bar{C}, x_i be such that $\beta > 1$, $\bar{C} > 0$, $M > 1$, $x_i \geq 0$ and

$$x_{i+1} \leq \bar{C} M^i x_i^\beta, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots. \quad (2.7)$$

If

$$x_0 \leq \bar{C}^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}} M^{-\frac{1}{(\beta-1)^2}},$$

then, we have

$$x_i \leq M^{-\frac{i}{\alpha}} x_0, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

so that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} x_i = 0.$$

Proof of Lemma 2.1.

i) Define

$$\lambda = \frac{D-A}{1-B} = \frac{D}{1-C} \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\rho(h) = h^\lambda \psi(h).$$

Then (2.1) implies

$$\rho(h) \leq c_1 \frac{h^\lambda (h^A \psi(k)^B + \psi(k)^C)}{(h-k)^D}, \quad \forall h > k \geq k_0.$$

Choosing $h = 2k$ in the above inequality and we have, for all positive $k \geq k_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(2k) &\leq c_1 \frac{(2k)^\lambda ((2k)^A \psi(k)^B + \psi(k)^C)}{k^D} \\ &\leq c_1 \frac{2^{\lambda+A} ((k^{\lambda+A} \psi(k)^B + k^\lambda \psi(k)^C)}{k^D} \\ &= c_1 \frac{2^{\lambda+A} ((k^{\lambda+A-\lambda B} \rho(k)^B + k^{\lambda-\lambda C} \rho(k)^C)}{k^D}.\end{aligned}$$

From the definition of λ in (2.8), one has $\lambda + A - \lambda B = D$ and $\lambda - \lambda C = D$, then the above inequality becomes

$$\rho(2k) \leq c_1 2^{\lambda+A} (\rho(k)^B + \rho(k)^C), \quad \text{for all positive } k \geq k_0. \quad (2.9)$$

We claim that, for every integer $n \geq 0$,

$$\rho(2^n k_0) \leq c_1^{\frac{1}{1-B}} 2^{\frac{\lambda+A+1}{1-B}} (1 + \rho(k_0))^{B^n}. \quad (2.10)$$

For $n = 0$, (2.10) is obvious (it is no loss of generality to assume $c_1 \geq 1$ so that $c_1^{\frac{1}{1-B}} 2^{\frac{\lambda+A+1}{1-B}} \geq 1$, which ensures (2.10) in case of $n = 0$). We now suppose, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (2.10) holds true, and we proceed by induction on n . Since $C < B < 1$, then we have, using (2.9) with $k = k_0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(2k_0) &\leq c_1 2^{\lambda+A} (\rho(k_0)^B + \rho(k_0)^C) \\ &\leq c_1 2^{\lambda+A+1} (1 + \rho(k_0))^B \\ &\leq c_1^{\frac{1}{1-B}} 2^{\frac{\lambda+A+1}{1-B}} (1 + \rho(k_0))^B.\end{aligned}$$

By (2.9) again, (2.10) and the above inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(2^{n+1} k_0) &\leq c_1 2^{\lambda+A} (\rho(2^n k_0)^B + \rho(2^n k_0)^C) \\ &\leq c_1 2^{\lambda+A} \left[\left(c_1^{\frac{1}{1-B}} 2^{\frac{\lambda+A+1}{1-B}} (1 + \rho(k_0))^{B^n} \right)^B + \left(c_1^{\frac{1}{1-B}} 2^{\frac{\lambda+A+1}{1-B}} (1 + \rho(k_0))^{B^n} \right)^C \right] \\ &\leq c_1^{1+\frac{B}{1-B}} 2^{\lambda+A} \left[2^{\frac{(\lambda+A+1)B}{1-B}} (1 + \rho(k_0))^{B^{n+1}} + 2^{\frac{(\lambda+A+1)B}{1-B}} (1 + \rho(k_0))^{B^{n+1}} \right] \\ &\leq c_1^{\frac{1}{1-B}} 2^{(\lambda+A+1)(1+\frac{B}{1-B})} (1 + \rho(k_0))^{B^{n+1}} \\ &= c_1^{\frac{1}{1-B}} 2^{\frac{\lambda+A+1}{1-B}} (1 + \rho(k_0))^{B^{n+1}},\end{aligned}$$

which is (2.10) for $n + 1$. Thus, (2.10) holds for every $n \geq 0$.

Since $B < 1$, then for $n \geq 0$, $(1 + \rho(k_0))^{B^n} \leq (1 + \rho(k_0))^B$, from (2.10) it follows that

$$\rho(2^n k_0) \leq c_1^{\frac{1}{1-B}} 2^{\frac{\lambda+A+1}{1-B}} (1 + \rho(k_0))^B := M, \quad n \geq 0, \quad (2.11)$$

and so, recalling the definition of ρ ,

$$\psi(2^n k_0) \leq \frac{M}{(2^n k_0)^\lambda}. \quad (2.12)$$

For any positive $k \geq k_0$, there exist $k' \in [k_0, 2k_0]$ and $n \geq 0$ such that $k = 2^n k'$, and so

$2^n k_0 \leq k < 2^{n+1} k_0$. Since ψ is non increasing, we thus have, by (2.12),

$$\psi(k) \leq \psi(2^n k_0) \leq \frac{M}{(2^n k_0)^\lambda} = \frac{2^\lambda M}{(2^{n+1} k_0)^\lambda} \leq \frac{2^\lambda M}{k^\lambda},$$

so that Claim i) is proved with $\bar{c}_1 = 2^\lambda M$ with λ and M be as in (2.8) and (2.11) respectively.

ii) Let $B = C = 1$ and τ be as in (2.4). For $s = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, we let

$$k_s = k_0 + \tau s^{\frac{D}{D-A}},$$

then $\{k_s\}$ is an increasing sequence and

$$k_{s+1} - k_s = \tau \left[(s+1)^{\frac{D}{D-A}} - s^{\frac{D}{D-A}} \right].$$

We use Taylor's formula to get

$$k_{s+1} - k_s = \tau \left[\frac{D}{D-A} s^{\frac{A}{D-A}} + \frac{AD}{(D-A)^2} \xi^{\frac{2A-D}{D-A}} \right] \geq \frac{\tau D}{D-A} s^{\frac{A}{D-A}}, \quad (2.13)$$

where ξ lies in the open interval $(s, s+1)$. In (2.1) we take $B = C = 1$, $k = k_s$ and $h = k_{s+1}$, we use (2.13) and we get, for $s \in \mathbb{N}^+ = \{1, 2, \dots\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(k_{s+1}) &\leq c_1 \frac{\left[k_0 + \tau(s+1)^{\frac{D}{D-A}} \right]^A \psi(k_s) + \psi(k_s)}{\left(\frac{\tau D}{D-A} \right)^D s^{\frac{AD}{D-A}}} \\ &\leq 2c_1 \frac{\left[k_0 + 1 + \tau(2s)^{\frac{D}{D-A}} \right]^A \psi(k_s)}{\left(\frac{\tau D}{D-A} \right)^D s^{\frac{AD}{D-A}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

(2.4) ensures, for $s \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$k_0 + 1 \leq \tau < \tau(2s)^{\frac{D}{D-A}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{2c_1 \left(2^{1+\frac{D}{D-A}} \tau \right)^A}{\left(\frac{\tau D}{D-A} \right)^D} \leq \frac{1}{e}.$$

From (2.14) and the above inequalities, one has

$$\psi(k_{s+1}) \leq \frac{2c_1 \left(2\tau(2s)^{\frac{D}{D-A}} \right)^A}{\left(\frac{\tau D}{D-A} \right)^D s^{\frac{AD}{D-A}}} \psi(k_s) = \frac{2c_1 \left(2^{1+\frac{D}{D-A}} \tau \right)^A}{\left(\frac{\tau D}{D-A} \right)^D} \psi(k_s) \leq \frac{1}{e} \psi(k_s).$$

By recursion,

$$\psi(k_s) \leq \frac{1}{e^s} \psi(k_0), \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{N}^+.$$

The above inequality holds true for $n = 0$ as well. For any $k \geq k_0$, there exists $s \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that

$$k_0 + \tau s^{\frac{D}{D-A}} \leq k < k_0 + \tau(s+1)^{\frac{D}{D-A}}.$$

Thus, considering $\psi(k)$ is nonincreasing, one has

$$\psi(k) \leq \psi\left(k_0 + \tau s^{\frac{D}{D-A}}\right) = \psi(k_s) \leq e^{-s} \psi(k_0) \leq \psi(k_0) e^{1 - \left(\frac{k-k_0}{\tau}\right)^{\frac{D-A}{D}}},$$

as desired.

iii) For $B > C > 1$ we fix $L \geq \max\{1, 2k_0\}$ (which implies $L - k_0 \geq \frac{L}{2}$) such that $\psi(L) \leq 1$. This can always be done since one can choose in (2.1) $h = L$, $k = k_0$, using the fact $A < D$, one has

$$\psi(L) \leq c_1 \frac{L^A \psi(k_0)^B + \psi(k_0)^C}{(L - k_0)^D} \leq c_1 \frac{2L^A (1 + \psi(k_0))^B}{(L - k_0)^D} \leq c_1 \frac{2^{1+D} (1 + \psi(k_0))^B}{L^{D-A}},$$

thus $\psi(L) \leq 1$ would be satisfied if

$$L^{D-A} \geq c_1 2^{1+D} (1 + \psi(k_0))^B. \quad (2.15)$$

We choose levels

$$k_i = 2L(1 - 2^{-i-1}), \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

It is obvious that

$$k_0 = L \leq k_i < 2L,$$

$\{k_i\}$ be an increasing sequence, and

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} k_i = 2L.$$

We choose in (2.1)

$$k = k_i, \quad h = k_{i+1},$$

let

$$x_i = \psi(k_i), \quad x_{i+1} = \psi(k_{i+1}),$$

and notice that

$$h - k = k_{i+1} - k_i = L2^{-i-1}, \quad x_i = \psi(k_i) \leq \psi(L) \leq 1,$$

we have, for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} x_{i+1} &\leq c_1 \frac{[2L(1 - 2^{-i-2})]^A x_i^B + x_i^C}{(L2^{-i-1})^D} \\ &\leq 2c_1 \frac{[2L(1 - 2^{-i-2})]^A}{(L2^{-i-1})^D} x_i^C \\ &\leq c_1 \frac{2^{A+D+1} (2^D)^i}{L^{D-A}} x_i^C. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (2.7) holds true with

$$\bar{C} = \frac{c_1 2^{A+D+1}}{L^{D-A}}, \quad M = 2^D \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = C > 1.$$

We use Lemma 2.2 and we have

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} x_i = \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \psi(k_i) = 0 \quad (2.16)$$

provided that

$$x_0 = \psi(k_0) = \psi(L) \leq \left(\frac{c_1 2^{A+D+1}}{L^{D-A}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{C-1}} (2^D)^{-\frac{1}{(C-1)^2}}. \quad (2.17)$$

Note that (2.16) implies

$$\psi(2L) = 0.$$

Let us check condition (2.17) and determine the value of L . (2.17) is equivalent to

$$\psi(L) \leq c_1^{-\frac{1}{C-1}} 2^{-\frac{A+D+1}{C-1} - \frac{D}{(C-1)^2}} L^{\frac{D-A}{C-1}}. \quad (2.18)$$

In (2.1) we take $k = k_0$ and $h = L \geq \max\{1, 2k_0\}$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(L) &\leq c_1 \frac{L^A \psi(k_0)^B + \psi(k_0)^C}{(L - k_0)^D} \leq \frac{2c_1 L^A (1 + \psi(k_0))^B}{(L - k_0)^D} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{D+1} c_1 L^A (1 + \psi(k_0))^B}{L^D} = \frac{2^{D+1} c_1 (1 + \psi(k_0))^B}{L^{D-A}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then (2.18) would be satisfied if $\psi(L) \leq 1$,

$$L \geq \max\{1, 2k_0\}, \quad (2.19)$$

and

$$\frac{2^{D+1} c_1 (1 + \psi(k_0))^B}{L^{D-A}} \leq c_1^{-\frac{1}{C-1}} 2^{-\frac{A+D+1}{C-1} - \frac{D}{(C-1)^2}} L^{\frac{D-A}{C-1}}.$$

The above inequality is equivalent to

$$c_1^{\frac{C}{C-1}} (1 + \psi(k_0))^B 2^{D+1 + \frac{A+D+1}{C-1} + \frac{D}{(C-1)^2}} \leq L^{\frac{(D-A)C}{C-1}}. \quad (2.20)$$

(2.6) is a sufficient condition for (2.15), (2.19) and (2.20).

This ends the proof of Lemma 2.1. \square

We notice that, in the proof of Claim i) of Lemma 2.1 we have chosen $h = 2k$. Let us take $h = 2k$ in (2.1) and replace c_1 by c_2 , that is,

$$\psi(2k) \leq c_2 \frac{(2k)^A \psi(k)^B + \psi(k)^C}{k^D}, \quad \forall k \geq k_0. \quad (2.21)$$

Remark 2.1. Assume (2.1). We take $h = 2k$ and we get (2.21) with $c_2 = c_1$. That is, (2.1) implies (2.21).

Remark 2.2. If we replace (2.1) by (2.21), then the Claim i) of Lemma 2.1 also holds.

In the remaining part of this section, we shall consider the relationship between (2.21) and (2.1). We ask the following question: is (2.21) weaker than (2.1)? The answer is: it depends. For different cases, we have different answers. We give the following three remarks.

Remark 2.3. For the case $C < B < 1$, one has

$$(2.1) \Leftrightarrow (2.21).$$

Proof. “ \Rightarrow ”. See Remark 2.1.

“ \Leftarrow ”. Assume (2.21). Let us consider $h > k \geq k_0$. We split the proof into two cases: $2^{n+1}k \geq h > 2^n k$ for some integer $n \geq 1$ and $2k \geq h > k$.

Case $2^{n+1}k \geq h > 2^n k$ **for some integer** $n \geq 1$. Since ψ decreases, we have $\psi(h) \leq \psi(2^n k) = \psi(2(2^{n-1}k))$; we keep in mind that $n \geq 1$ so $2^{n-1}k \geq k \geq k_0$ and we can use (2.21) with $2^{n-1}k$ in place of k : we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(2(2^{n-1}k)) &\leq c_2 \frac{(2^n k)^A [\psi(2^{n-1}k)]^B + [\psi(2^{n-1}k)]^C}{(2^{n-1}k)^D} \\ &\leq c_2 \frac{h^A [\psi(2^{n-1}k)]^B + [\psi(2^{n-1}k)]^C}{(2^{n-1}k)^D}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $2^{n-1}k \geq k$, we use the monotonicity of ψ to have $\psi(2^{n-1}k) \leq \psi(k)$; then $[\psi(2^{n-1}k)]^B \leq [\psi(k)]^B$ and $[\psi(2^{n-1}k)]^C \leq [\psi(k)]^C$. Since $2^{n+1}k \geq h$, we have $(2^{n+1} - 1)k \geq h - k$, then

$$2^{n-1}k = \frac{2^{n+1}k}{4} \geq \frac{(2^{n+1} - 1)k}{4} \geq \frac{h - k}{4},$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(h) &\leq \psi(2^n k) = \psi(2(2^{n-1}k)) \\ &\leq c_2 \frac{h^A [\psi(2^{n-1}k)]^B + [\psi(2^{n-1}k)]^C}{(2^{n-1}k)^D} \\ &\leq 4^D c_2 \frac{h^A [\psi(k)]^B + [\psi(k)]^C}{(h - k)^D}. \end{aligned}$$

Case $2k \geq h > k$. We use Remark 2.2 and Claim i) of Lemma 2.1 and we get (2.2). We use (2.2) and the fact that ψ decreases in order to get

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(h) &\leq \psi(k) = [\psi(k)]^B [\psi(k)]^{1-B} \\ &\leq [\psi(k)]^B \left[\bar{c}_1 \left(\frac{1}{k} \right)^{\frac{D-A}{1-B}} \right]^{1-B} = \bar{c}_1^{1-B} k^A [\psi(k)]^B \left(\frac{1}{k} \right)^D. \end{aligned}$$

Since $2k \geq h$ we get $k \geq h - k$ and $\left(\frac{1}{k} \right)^D \leq \left(\frac{1}{h-k} \right)^D$, then

$$\psi(h) \leq \frac{\bar{c}_1^{1-B} h^A [\psi(k)]^B}{(h - k)^D} \leq \bar{c}_1^{1-B} \frac{h^A [\psi(k)]^B + [\psi(k)]^C}{(h - k)^D}.$$

In both cases we have obtained (2.1) with $c_1 = \max \left\{ 4^D c_2; \bar{c}_1^{1-B} \right\}$. □

Remark 2.4. For the case $B = C = 1$, one has

$$(2.1) \Leftarrow (2.21).$$

More precisely, the function

$$\psi(k) = e^{-(\ln k)^2}, \quad k \in [1, +\infty) \quad (2.22)$$

verifies (2.21) with $k_0 = 1$, $B = C = 1$, $c_2 = \frac{1}{2 \ln 2}$, $D = 2 \ln 2$, and any $0 < A < 2 \ln 2$, but it does not satisfy (2.1) with $B = C = 1$, for any choice of the three constants $D > A > 0$ and $c_1 > 0$.

Proof. Let us take ψ as in (2.22), then for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(2k) &= e^{-[\ln(2k)]^2} = e^{-(\ln 2 + \ln k)^2} = e^{-(\ln k)^2 - 2 \ln k \ln 2 - (\ln 2)^2} \\ &= e^{-(\ln k)^2} e^{-2 \ln k \ln 2 - (\ln 2)^2} = \psi(k) e^{-(\ln 2)(2 \ln k + \ln 2)} \\ &= \psi(k) e^{-(\ln 2)[\ln(2k^2)]} = \psi(k) e^{\ln(2k^2) - \ln 2} = \psi(k) (2k^2)^{-\ln 2} \\ &= \psi(k) \left(\frac{1}{2k^2}\right)^{\ln 2} \leq \frac{1}{2^{\ln 2}} \frac{(2k)^A \psi(k) + \psi(k)}{k^{2 \ln 2}}.\end{aligned}$$

This shows that (2.21) holds true with $k_0 = 1$, $B = C = 1$, $c_2 = \frac{1}{2^{\ln 2}}$, $D = 2 \ln 2$, and any $0 < A < 2 \ln 2$.

Now we are going to show that (2.1) does not hold true with $B = C = 1$, for any choice of the three constants $D > A > 0$ and $c_1 > 0$: by contradiction, if (2.1) would hold true, then Lemma 2.1 ii) would guarantees (2.3), then (note that $\psi(k_0) = \psi(1) = 1$)

$$\psi(k) \leq e^{1 - \left(\frac{k-1}{\tau}\right)^{\frac{D-A}{D}}}, \quad \forall k \in [1, +\infty)$$

for a suitable constant τ depending only on the constants c_1, A and D . That is

$$e^{-(\ln k)^2} \leq e^{1 - \left(\frac{k-1}{\tau}\right)^{\frac{D-A}{D}}},$$

this means that

$$1 \leq e^{1 - \left(\frac{k-1}{\tau}\right)^{\frac{D-A}{D}} + (\ln k)^2},$$

but this is false since

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} 1 - \left(\frac{k-1}{\tau}\right)^{\frac{D-A}{D}} + (\ln k)^2 = -\infty.$$

□

Remark 2.5. For the case $B > C > 1$, one has

$$(2.1) \not\Leftarrow (2.21).$$

More precisely, the function

$$\psi(k) = e^{-k^p}, \quad p = \log_2(2C), \quad k \in [1, +\infty) \quad (2.23)$$

verifies (2.21) with $B > C > 1$, $c_2 = 1$, any $D > 0$ and a suitable $k_0 = k_0(D, C) \geq 1$, but it does not satisfy (2.1) for any choice of the four constants $B > C > 1$, $D > 0$ and $c_1 > 0$.

Proof. Let us take ψ as in (2.23), we keep in mind that $2^p = 2C$ and we have

$$\psi(2k) = e^{-(2k)^p} = e^{-2^p k^p} = e^{-2Ck^p} = (e^{-k^p})^{2C} = (\psi(k))^{2C} = (e^{-k^p})^C (\psi(k))^C.$$

Note that there exists $k_0 = k_0(D, C) \geq 1$ such that

$$(e^{-k^p})^C \leq \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^D, \quad \forall k \in [k_0, +\infty).$$

Then

$$\psi(2k) = (e^{-k^p})^C (\psi(k))^C \leq \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^D (\psi(k))^C, \quad \forall k \in [k_0, +\infty),$$

so that ψ verifies (2.21) with $c_2 = 1$, with any $D > 0$ and with a suitable $k_0 = k_0(D, C) \geq 1$. We claim that such a ψ does not satisfy (2.1) for any choice of the constants $B > C > 1$, $D > 0$, $c_1 > 0$, $k_0 \geq 1$. Indeed, if such a ψ would satisfy (2.1), then part iii) of Lemma 2.1 would imply (2.5):

$$\psi(2L) = 0$$

for a suitable $L \geq 0$: this gives a contradiction since $\psi(k) > 0$ for every $k \in [1, +\infty)$. \square

3 An Application.

In this section, we shall answer the two questions proposed at the end of the first section.

Theorem 3.1. *Let f be in $M^r(\Omega)$, with $r \geq \frac{n}{p}$, and u is a minima of \mathcal{I} on $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$. Then*

- (i) $r = \frac{n}{p} \Rightarrow \exists \lambda > 0$ such that $e^{\lambda|u|^{1-p'\alpha}} \in L^1(\Omega)$;
- (ii) $r > \frac{n}{p} \Rightarrow \exists L > 0$ such that $|u| \leq 2L$, a.e. Ω .

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 6.3 in [2], for $u \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ a minima of \mathcal{I} , we take

$$v = T_k(u) = \min\{-k, \max\{k, u\}\}$$

in (1.9) and we get for any $k > 0$,

$$\int_{A_k} a(x, u) j(\nabla u) dx \leq \int_{A_k} f G_k(u) dx,$$

where

$$A_k = \{x \in \Omega : |u(x)| \geq k\}, \quad G_k(u) = u - T_k(u).$$

We follow the lines of the proof of Theorem 6.3 in [2] until we arrive at the following inequality: for any $h > k > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |A_h| &\leq \frac{c}{(h-k)^{q^*}} \left[|A_k|^{(p-1-\frac{q}{r}+\frac{q}{n})\frac{q^*}{q(p-1)}} k^{\frac{\alpha p q^*}{p-1}} + |A_k|^{(q-1-\frac{q}{r}+\frac{q}{n})\frac{q^*}{q[p(1-\alpha)-1]}} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{c}{(h-k)^{q^*}} \left[|A_k|^{(p-1-\frac{q}{r}+\frac{q}{n})\frac{q^*}{q(p-1)}} h^{\frac{\alpha p q^*}{p-1}} + |A_k|^{(q-1-\frac{q}{r}+\frac{q}{n})\frac{q^*}{q[p(1-\alpha)-1]}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where q is as in (1.7). We now apply Lemma 2.1 with

$$\psi(k) = |A_k|, \quad c_1 = c, \quad A = \frac{\alpha p q^*}{p-1}, \quad B = \left(p-1-\frac{q}{r}+\frac{q}{n}\right) \frac{q^*}{q(p-1)},$$

$$C = \left(q-1-\frac{q}{r}+\frac{q}{n}\right) \frac{q^*}{q[p(1-\alpha)-1]}, \quad D = q^* \quad \text{and} \quad k_0 = 0.$$

We note that $A < D$ since (1.4).

(i) If $r = \frac{n}{p}$, then $B = C = 1$. We use Lemma 2.1 ii) and we derive that there exists a constant τ such that for any $k \geq 0$,

$$|\{ |u| \geq k \}| \leq |\{ |u| \geq 0 \}| e^{1-(\frac{k}{\tau})^{\frac{D-A}{D}}} \leq |\Omega| e^{1-(\frac{k}{\tau})^{1-\alpha p'}} = |\Omega| e e^{-2\lambda k^{1-\alpha p'}},$$

where $2\lambda = (\frac{1}{\tau})^{1-\alpha p'}$ and we have used $\frac{D-A}{D} = 1 - \alpha p'$.

The above inequality implies

$$|\{e^{\lambda|u|^{1-\alpha p'}} \geq e^{\lambda k^{1-\alpha p'}}\}| = |\{|u| \geq k\}| \leq |\Omega| e e^{-2\lambda k^{1-\alpha p'}}.$$

Let $\tilde{k} = e^{\lambda k^{1-\alpha p'}}$, then

$$|\{e^{\lambda|u|^{1-\alpha p'}} \geq \tilde{k}\}| \leq \frac{|\Omega|e}{\tilde{k}^2}, \quad \forall \tilde{k} \geq 1.$$

We now use Lemma 3.11 in [1] which states that the sufficient and necessary condition for $g \in L^r(\Omega)$, $r \geq 1$, is

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{r-1} |\{|g| \geq k\}| < +\infty.$$

We use the above lemma for $g = e^{\lambda|u|^{1-\alpha p'}}$ and $r = 1$. Since

$$\sum_{\tilde{k}=1}^{\infty} |\{e^{\lambda|u|^{1-\alpha p'}} \geq \tilde{k}\}| \leq |\Omega|e \sum_{\tilde{k}=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\tilde{k}^2} < +\infty,$$

then $e^{\lambda|u|^{1-\alpha p'}} \in L^1(\Omega)$, as desired.

(ii) If $r > \frac{N}{p}$, then $B > C > 1$. We use Lemma 2.1 iii) and we have $|A_{2L}| = 0$ for some constant $L > 0$, from which we derive $|u| \leq 2L$ a.e. Ω . That is, u is bounded. \square

Acknowledgments: The first author thanks NSFC(12071021), NSF of Hebei Province (A2019201120) and the Key Science and Technology Project of Higher School of Hebei Province (ZD2021307) for the support; the second author thanks the Postgraduate Innovation Project of Hebei Province (CXZZSS2020005).

References

- [1] L.Boccard, G.Croce, Elliptic partial differential equations, De Gruyter, 2014.
- [2] L.Boccardo, L.Orsina, Existence and regularity of minima for integral functionals noncoercive in the energy space, Annali Della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa Classe di Scienze, 1997, 25, 95-130.
- [3] G.Stampacchia, Le problème de Dirichlet pour les équations elliptiques du second ordre à coefficients discontinus, Ann Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), 1965, 15, 189-258.
- [4] G.Stampacchia, Équations elliptiques du second ordre á coefficients discontinus, in: Séminaire de mathématiques supérieures, No.16, Été, 1965, Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1966.
- [5] A.A.Kovalevskii, M.V.Voitovich, On the improvement of summability of generalized solutions of the Dirichlet problem for nonlinear equations of the fourth order with strengthend ellipticity, Ukranian Mathematical Journal, 2006, 58, 1717-1733.
- [6] H.Gao, F.Leonetti, L.Wang, Remarks on Stampacchia Lemma, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 2018, 458, 112-122.
- [7] H.Gao, H.Deng, M.Huang, W.Ren, Generalizations of Stampacchia lemma and applications to quasi-linear elliptic systems, Nonlinear Analysis, 2021, 208, 112297.
- [8] H.Gao, M.Huang, W.Ren, Regularity for entropy solutions to degenerate elliptic equations, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 2020, 491, 124251.
- [9] E.Giusti, Direct methods in the calculus of variations, World Scientific, 2003.
- [10] H.Gao, J.Zhang, H.Ma, A generalization of Stampacchia lemma and applications, submitted.