

MODIFIED QUASILINEAR EQUATIONS WITH STRONGLY SINGULAR AND CRITICAL EXPONENTIAL NONLINEARITIES

Reshmi Biswas*, Sarika Goyal† and K. Sreenadh‡

Abstract

In this paper, we study global multiplicity result for a class of modified quasilinear singular equations involving the critical exponential growth:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \Delta(u^2)u &= \lambda\alpha(x)u^{-q} + f(x, u), \quad u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a smooth bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^2 , $0 < q < 3$ and $\alpha : \Omega \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ such that $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. The function $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and enjoys critical exponential growth of Trudinger–Moser type. Using a sub-super solution method, we show that there exists some $\Lambda^* > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda^*)$ the problem has at least two positive solutions, for $\lambda = \Lambda^*$, the problem achieves at least one positive solution and for $\lambda > \Lambda^*$, the problem has no solution.

Key words: Modified quasilinear operator, very singular nonlinearity, sub-super solution, critical exponential nonlinearity, Trudinger-Moser inequality.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35J62, 35J75, 35B33

1 Introduction and statement of main results

In this article, we study the existence and multiplicity of the positive solutions for the following modified quasilinear equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \Delta(u^2)u &= \lambda\alpha(x)u^{-q} + f(x, u) \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u &> 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (P_*)$$

where Ω is a smooth bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^2 , $0 < q < 3$ and the function $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as $f(x, s) = g(x, s) \exp(|s|^4)$, where $g \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R})$ satisfies some appropriate assumptions described later. We also have the following assumption on function $\alpha : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

($\alpha 1$) $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\alpha(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$.

*Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, Hauz Khaz, New Delhi-110016, India. e-mail: reshmi15.biswas@gmail.com

†Department of Mathematics, Bennett University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh 201310, India e-mail: sarika.goyal@bennett.edu.in

‡Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, Hauz Khaz, New Delhi-110016, India. e-mail: sreenadh@gmail.com

The study on the equations driven by the modified quasilinear operator $-\Delta u - \Delta(u^2)u$ is quite popular for long because of their wide range of applications in the modeling of the physical phenomenon such as, in plasma physics and fluid mechanics [6], in dissipative quantum mechanics [17], etc. Solutions of such equations (called soliton solutions) are related to the existence of standing wave solutions for quasilinear Schrödinger equations of the form

$$iu_t = -\Delta u + V(x)u - h_1(|u|^2)u - C\Delta h_2(|u|^2)h_2'(|u|^2)u, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (1.1)$$

where V is a potential function, C is a real constant, h_1 and h_2 are real valued functions. Equations of the form (1.1) appear in the study of mathematical physics. Each different type of the function h_2 represents different physical phenomenon. For example, if $h_2(s) = s$, then (1.1) is used in the modeling of the super fluid film equation in plasma physics (see [22]). When $h_2(s) = \sqrt{1+s^2}$, (1.1) attributes to the study of self-channeling of a high-power ultra short laser in matter (see [31]). Because of the quasilinear term $\Delta(u^2)u$, present in the problems of type (P_*) , the natural energy functional associated to such problems are not well defined. Hence, we have a restriction in applying variational method directly for studying such problems. To overcome this shortcoming, researchers developed several methods and arguments, such as the perturbation method (see for e.g., [24, 27]) a constrained minimization technique (see for e.g., [25, 26, 30, 32]), and a change of variables (see for e.g., [8, 11, 13, 12, 20, 21]).

Without the quasilinear term $\Delta(u^2)u$, the problem (P_*) goes back to the original semilinear equation

$$-\Delta u = \lambda\alpha(x)u^{-q} + f(x, u) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \quad (1.2)$$

Such kind of equations have significant applications in the physical modelling related to the boundary layer phenomenon for viscous fluids, non-Newtonian fluids, etc. If $f \equiv 0$, (1.2) becomes purely singular problem, for which existence, uniqueness, non-existence and regularity results are extensively studied in [9, 19] with suitable $\alpha(x)$ and for different ranges of q .

One of the main features of problem (P_*) is that the nonlinear term $f(x, s)$ enjoys the critical exponential growth with respect to the following Trudinger–Moser inequality (see [28]):

Theorem 1.1. (*Trudinger–Moser inequality*) *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^2 . Then for $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $p > 0$ we have*

$$\exp(p|u|^2) \in L^1(\Omega).$$

Moreover,

$$\sup_{\|u\| \leq 1} \int_{\Omega} \exp(p|u|^2) \, dx < +\infty$$

if and only if $p \leq 4\pi$.

Here the Sobolev space $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and the corresponding norm $\|\cdot\|$ are defined in Section 2. The study on the critical growth exponential problems associated to this inequality were initiated with the work of Adimurthi [1] and de Figueiredo et al. [10]. Furthermore, the problem of type (P_*) without the singular term, that is the equation

$$-\Delta u - \Delta(u^2)u + V(x)u = f(x, u) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (1.3)$$

where $V : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous potential and $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function with some suitable assumption and is having critical exponential growth ($\exp(ps^4)$), was studied by do Ó et al. in [11] for the first time. Note that, unlike as in the case of semilinear critical exponential problem involving Laplacian, where the critical exponential growth is given as $\exp(|s|^2)$, in problem (P_*) and in (1.3), the form of critical exponential nonlinearity f is considered as $\exp(|s|^4)$ because of the quasilinear term $\Delta(u^2)u$.

Motivated by the seminal work of Ambrosetti et al. [3], many researchers studied the global multiplicity results for singular-convex problems. In [18], the author proved the global multiplicity result for (1.2), considering critical polynomial growth as $f(x, s) = |s|^{\frac{N+2}{N-2}}$, and $0 < q < 1$ in a general smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N > 2$. Then, in the critical dimension $N = 2$, Adimurthi and Giacomoni [2] discussed the global multiplicity of H_0^1 solutions for (1.2) by taking the optimal range of q as $1 < q < 3$ and considered f to be having critical exponential growth as $f(x, s) = g(x, s) \exp(4\pi s^2)$, where g is some appropriate continuous function. Later, in [16], the authors showed the similar results as in [18] for (1.2) while considering $f(x, s) = |s|^{\frac{N+2}{N-2}}$, $0 < q < 3$ and adding a smooth perturbation with sub-critical asymptotic behavior at $+\infty$. In [14, 15], Dhanya et al. studied the global multiplicity result for the problem of type (1.2) with critical growth nonlinearities combined with a discontinuous function multiplied with the singular term u^{-q} , $0 < q < 3$.

On the other hand, for modified quasilinear Schrödinger equations involving singular nonlinearity, there are a few results in the existing literature. Authors in [5, 29, 33] discussed existence of multiple solutions of such equations with singular nonlinearity u^{-q} , $0 < q < 1$ in combination with some polynomial type perturbation. Very recently, in [34], the authors studied the global multiplicity results for the equations of type (P_*) in a smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N > 2$, for the first time, by assuming critical polynomial growth $f(x, s) = b(x)|s|^{\frac{3N+2}{N-2}}$, where b is a sign changing continuous function.

Inspired from all these aforementioned works, in this article, we investigate the existence, multiplicity and non-existence results (that is, the global multiplicity result) for problem (P_*) driven by modified quasilinear operator involving singular and critical exponential nonlinearity, which was an open question. The main mathematical difficulties we face in studying problem (P_*) occur in three folds as following:

1. The modified quasilinear term $\Delta(u^2)u$ prohibits the natural energy functional corresponding to problem (P_*) to be well defined for all $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ (defined in Section 2).
2. The critical exponential nature of f induces non-compactness of the Palais-Smale sequences.
3. The growth on the singular nonlinearity falls into the optimal range (that is, $0 < q < 3$), which again prevents the associated energy functional to problem (P_*) to be well defined for all $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

First, we transform the problem (P_*) by using a change of variable as in [8, 34]. Then, applying variational and sub-super solution methods on the transformed problem, we show that there exists some $\Lambda^* > 0$ such that for the range of the parameter $0 < \lambda < \Lambda^*$, the transformed problem has at least two positive solutions, for $\lambda = \Lambda^*$ it achieves at least one positive solution and for $\lambda > \Lambda^*$, it has no solutions.

In Section 3, we prove the existence of a non trivial weak solution for the range $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda^*$ and non existence of solutions for $\lambda > \Lambda^*$ by constructing a suitable sub-super solution argument. We also prove the asymptotic boundary behavior of such solutions. Then in Section 4, we investigate the existence of second solution in a cone around the first solution for $0 < \lambda < \Lambda^*$ by using the Ekeland variational principle and a mountain pass argument with a min-max level. There we find the first critical level, below which we prove the compactness condition of the Palaise-Smale sequences. This gives rise to the existence of a second positive solution. In this whole process, we prove many technically involved delicate estimates due to the several complexities present in problem (P_*) . We would like to mention that to the best of our knowledge, there is no work in the literature addressing the question of global multiplicity of positive solutions involving modified quasilinear operator and singular and exponential nonlinearity. In this article, we study the global multiplicity results for problem (P_*) up to the optimal range for the singularity ($0 < q < 3$).

We now state all the hypotheses imposed on the continuous function $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, given by $f(x, s) = g(x, s) \exp(|s|^4)$:

(f1) $g \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R})$ such that for each $x \in \overline{\Omega}$, $g(x, s) = 0$ for all $s \leq 0$; $g(x, s) > 0$ for all $s > 0$ and $\frac{f(x, s)}{s^3}$ is non decreasing in $s > 0$, for all $x \in \overline{\Omega}$.

(f2) $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x, s)}{s} = 0$, uniformly in $x \in \Omega$.

(f3) *Critical growth assumption:* For any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} g(x, s) \exp(-\epsilon|s|^4) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} g(x, s) \exp(\epsilon|s|^4) = +\infty.$$

(f4) There exist constants $M_0 > \sqrt{2}$, $L > 0$ such that

$$f'(x, s) \geq M_0 f(x, s) - L \text{ for all } s > 0.$$

(f5) There exists a constant $\tau > 4$ such that $0 < \tau F(x, s) \leq f(x, s)s$, for all $(x, s) \in \Omega \times (0, +\infty)$.

(f6) There exists a constant $M_1 > 0$ such that $F(x, s) \leq M_1(1 + f(x, s))$ for all $s > 0$.

(f7) We assume that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{sf(x, s)}{\exp(s^4)} = +\infty, \text{ uniformly in } x \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

Example 1.2. Consider $f(x, s) = g(x, s)e^{s^4}$, where $g(x, s) = \begin{cases} t^{a_0+1} \exp(d_0 s^r), & \text{if } s > 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } s \leq 0 \end{cases}$ for some $a_0 > 0$, $0 < d_0 \leq 4\pi$ and $1 \leq r < 4$. Then f satisfies all the conditions from (f1)-(f7).

Now for any $\phi \in C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\phi > 0$ in Ω , we define the set

$$C_\phi := \{u \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) \mid \text{there exists } c \geq 0 \text{ such that } |u(x)| \leq c\phi \text{ for all } x \in \Omega\}$$

equipped with the norm $\|u\|_{C_\phi(\overline{\Omega})} := \|u/\phi\|_\infty$. Next, we define the following open convex set of $C_\phi(\Omega)$ as

$$C_\phi^+(\Omega) = \left\{ u \in C_\phi(\Omega) \mid \inf_{x \in \Omega} \frac{u(x)}{\phi(x)} > 0 \right\}.$$

That is, the set $C_\phi^+(\Omega)$ is consisting of all those functions $u \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $C_1\phi \leq u \leq C_2\phi$ in Ω for some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$. Let us also define the distance function

$$\delta(x) := \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) = \inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} |x - y|$$

for any $x \in \overline{\Omega}$. Now for any continuous, non-negative bounded function $\varrho : \Omega \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, we consider the following weighted eigenvalue problem :

$$-\Delta u = \lambda\varrho(x)u \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \quad (1.4)$$

Let $\varphi_{1,\Omega} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be a positive solution (first eigen function) of the above equation corresponding to the first eigenvalue $\tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega}(\varrho)$ with $\|\varphi_{1,\Omega}\|_\infty < 1$. We recall that $\varphi_{1,\Omega} \in C^{1,\theta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $\varphi_{1,\Omega} \in C_\delta^+(\Omega)$. Then, we define the function φ_q as follows:

$$\varphi_q = \begin{cases} \varphi_{1,\Omega} & \text{if } 0 < q < 1, \\ \varphi_{1,\Omega} \left(\log \left(\frac{1}{\varphi_{1,\Omega}} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{q+1}} & \text{if } q = 1, \\ \varphi_{1,\Omega}^{\frac{2}{q+1}} & \text{if } q > 1. \end{cases}$$

One can easily see that $\varphi_{1,\Omega} \in C_{\varphi_q}^+$.

Now we state the main results of this article:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a smooth bounded domain. Suppose the hypotheses (f1) – (f7) and $(\alpha 1)$ hold. Then there exists $\Lambda^* > 0$ such that for every $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda^*]$, problem (P_*) admits at least one solution in $H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$ and for $\lambda > \Lambda^*$, problem (P_*) admits no solution.*

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a smooth bounded domain. Assume that the hypotheses (f1) – (f7) and $(\alpha 1)$ hold. Then for every $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda^*)$, problem (P_*) admit at least two solutions in $H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$.*

2 Variational frame work

For $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, measurable function, and for $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$, we define the Lebesgue space $L^p(\Omega)$ as

$$L^p(\Omega) = \left\{ u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable} : \int_\Omega |u|^p dx < +\infty \right\}$$

equipped with the usual norm denoted by $\|u\|_p$. Now the Sobolev space $H_0^1(\Omega)$ is defined as

$$H_0^1(\Omega) = \left\{ u \in L^2(\Omega) : \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx < +\infty \right\}$$

endowed with the norm

$$\|u\| := \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{1/2}.$$

Since $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a smooth bounded domain, we have the continuous embedding $H_0^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega)$ for $p \in (0, +\infty)$. Moreover, the embedding $H_0^1(\Omega) \ni u \mapsto \exp(|u|^\beta) \in L^1(\Omega)$ is compact for all $\beta \in [1, 2)$ and is continuous for $\beta = 2$. Consequently, the map $\mathcal{M} : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega)$ for $p \in [1, +\infty)$, defined by $\mathcal{M}(u) := \exp(|u|^2)$ is continuous with respect to the H_0^1 -norm topology.

The natural energy functional associated to problem (P_*) is the following:

$$I_\lambda(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega (1 + 2|u|^2)|\nabla u|^2 dx - \lambda \frac{1}{1-q} \int_\Omega \alpha(x) u^{1-q} dx - \int_\Omega F(x, u(x)) dx & \text{if } q \neq 1; \\ \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega (1 + 2|u|^2)|\nabla u|^2 dx - \lambda \int_\Omega \alpha(x) \log |u| dx - \int_\Omega F(x, u(x)) dx & \text{if } q = 1. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Observe that, the functional I_λ is not well defined in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ because of the nature of the singularity ($0 < q < 3$) as well as, due to the fact that $\int_\Omega u^2 |\nabla u|^2 dx$ is not finite for all $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. So, it is difficult to apply variational methods directly in our problem (P_*) . In order to get rid of this inconvenience, first we apply the following change of variables introduced in [8], namely, $w := h^{-1}(u)$, where h is defined by

$$\begin{cases} h'(s) = \frac{1}{(1 + 2|h(s)|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \text{ in } [0, +\infty), \\ h(s) = -h(-s) \text{ in } (-\infty, 0]. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

Now we gather some properties of h , which we follow throughout in this article. For the detailed proofs of such results, one can see [8, 11].

Lemma 2.1. *The function h satisfies the following properties:*

- (h₁) h is uniquely defined, C^∞ and invertible;
- (h₂) $h(0) = 0$;
- (h₃) $0 < h'(s) \leq 1$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (h₄) $\frac{1}{2}h(s) \leq sh'(s) \leq h(s)$ for all $s > 0$;
- (h₅) $|h(s)| \leq |s|$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (h₆) $|h(s)| \leq 2^{1/4}|s|^{1/2}$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (h₇) $\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} h(s)/s^{\frac{1}{2}} = 2^{\frac{1}{4}}$;
- (h₈) $|h(s)| \geq h(1)|s|$ for $|s| \leq 1$ and $|h(s)| \geq h(1)|s|^{1/2}$ for $|s| \geq 1$;
- (h₉) $h''(s) = -2h(s)(h'(s))^4$, for all $s \geq 0$ and $h''(s) < 0$ when $s > 0$, $h''(s) > 0$ when $s < 0$.
- (h₁₀) the function $\frac{(h(s))^\gamma h'(s)}{s}$ is strictly increasing for $\gamma \geq 3$;
- (h₁₁) $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} h(s)/s = 1$;
- (h₁₂) $|h(s)h'(s)| < 1/\sqrt{2}$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (h₁₃) the function $h(s)^{-\gamma}h'(s)$ is decreasing for all $s > 0$, where $\gamma > 0$.

After employing the change of variable $w = h^{-1}(u)$ in (2.1), we define the new functional $J_\lambda : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$J_\lambda(w) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |\nabla w|^2 dx - \lambda \frac{1}{1-q} \int_\Omega \alpha(x) |h(w)|^{1-q} dx - \int_\Omega F(x, h(w)) dx & \text{if } q \neq 1; \\ \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |\nabla w|^2 dx - \lambda \int_\Omega \alpha(x) \log |h(w)| dx - \int_\Omega F(x, h(w)) dx & \text{if } q = 1. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

Remark 2.2. The functional $J_\lambda(w)$ is well defined for $w \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$. Indeed, let us define the set $\mathcal{D}(J_\lambda) := \{w \in H_0^1(\Omega) : J_\lambda(w) < +\infty\}$. Now we intend to show that this set is non empty. Let $1 < q < 3$. Then using the fact that $h(s)$ is increasing in $s > 0$ and Lemma 2.1-(h₈), we have

$$h(w) > h(C_1 \varphi_{1,\Omega}^{\frac{2q}{q+1}}) > h(C_2 \delta^{\frac{2q}{q+1}}) > \begin{cases} C_2 h(1) \delta^{\frac{2q}{q+1}} & \text{if } C_2 \delta^{\frac{2q}{q+1}} < 1, \\ h(1) & \text{if } C_2 \delta^{\frac{2q}{q+1}} \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

where C_1, C_2 are positive constants. Then for any $\psi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $w \in C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$, using Lemma 2.1-(h₃), Hölder's inequality Hardy's inequality, and the Sobolev embedding, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega h(w)^{-q} h'(w) \psi dx &= \int_{\Omega \cap \{x : C_2 \delta(x)^{\frac{2q}{q+1}} < 1\}} h(w)^{-q} h'(w) \psi dx + \int_{\Omega \cap \{x : C_2 \delta(x)^{\frac{2q}{q+1}} \geq 1\}} h(w)^{-q} h'(w) \psi dx \\ &\leq C_3 \left(\int_\Omega \frac{dx}{\delta^{\frac{2(q-1)}{q+1}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_\Omega \frac{\psi^2}{\delta^2} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_4 h(1)^{-q} \int_\Omega \psi dx \\ &< C_5 \|\psi\| < +\infty, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

since $\frac{2(q-1)}{q+1} < 1$ for $1 < q < 3$, where C_3, C_4, C_5 are positive constants. For case $0 < q \leq 1$, arguing in a similar manner as above and following [18, 34], we get (2.4). In view of this, we obtain that the set $\mathcal{D}(J_\lambda) \neq \emptyset$ for $0 < q < 3$. This also justifies the reason behind considering the optimal range of q as $0 < q < 3$.

Next, we check for the Gateaux differentiability of the functional J_λ . For $0 < q < 1$ and $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $w \geq c\delta$, using the idea of [18] combining with the properties of h described in Lemma 2.1, we can show that the functional J_λ is Gateaux differentiable at w . For the range $1 < q < 3$, we have the following lemma regarding the similar property of J_λ .

Lemma 2.3. Let $\mathcal{S} := \{w \in H_0^1(\Omega) : w_1 \leq w \leq w_2\}$, where $w_1 \in C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$ and $w_2 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Then J_λ is Gateaux differentiable at w in the direction $v - w$ for $v, w \in \mathcal{S}$.

Proof. We have to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{J_\lambda(w + t(v - w)) - J_\lambda(w)}{t} &= \int_\Omega \nabla w \nabla(v - w) dx - \lambda \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w)^{-q} h'(w)(v - w) dx \\ &\quad - \int_\Omega f(x, h(w)) h'(w)(v - w) dx. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term and third term in the right hand side of the above expression, the proof follows in a standard way. So, we are left to show for the second term, that is, for the singular term. Since \mathcal{S} is a convex set, for any $t \in (0, 1)$, $w + t(v - w) \in \mathcal{S}$. Let us define the function $H : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$H(w) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-q} \int_\Omega h(w)^{1-q} dx & \text{if } q \neq 1 \\ \int_\Omega \log(h(w)) dx & \text{if } q = 1. \end{cases}$$

Now using mean value theorem, for any $0 < q < 3$, it follows that

$$\frac{H(w + t(v - w)) - H(w)}{t} = \int_{\Omega} h(w + t\theta(v - w))^{-q} h'(w + t\theta(v - w))(v - w) dx \quad (2.5)$$

for some $\theta \in (0, 1)$. Since $w + t\theta(v - w) \in \mathcal{S}$, using Lemma 2.1-(h₁₃) together with (2.4), we get

$$\int_{\Omega} h(w + t\theta(v - w))^{-q} h'(w + t\theta(v - w))(v - w) dx \leq \int_{\Omega} h(w_1)^{-q} h'(w_1)(v - w) dx < +\infty.$$

Thus, applying Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem and passing to the limit $t \rightarrow 0^+$ in (2.5), we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{H(w + t(v - w)) - H(w)}{t} = \int_{\Omega} h(w)^{-q} h'(w)(v - w) dx. \quad (2.6)$$

This completes the proof. \square

Thus, using the properties of the functions f, h and the above results, it can be derived that (2.3) is the associated energy functional to the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w &= \lambda \alpha(x) h(w)^{-q} h'(w) + f(x, h(w)) h'(w) \text{ in } \Omega, \\ w &> 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ w &= 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

Moreover, applying Lemma 2.1 and following the idea as in [8], one can show that the problem (2.7) is equivalent to our original problem (P_*) and w is a solution to (2.7) if and only if $u = h(w)$ is a solution to the problem (P_*). Thus, our main objective is now reduced to proving the existence of solutions to the new transformed equation (2.7).

Definition 2.4. A function $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is said to be a weak solution to (2.7) if for every compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \Omega$, there exists a constant $m_{\mathcal{K}} > 0$ such that $w > m_{\mathcal{K}}$ holds in \mathcal{K} and for every $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla w \nabla \phi dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w)^{-q} h'(w) \phi dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w)) h'(w) \phi dx = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

In the next lemma, we discuss some comparison type result related to our problem (2.7).

Lemma 2.5. Let $w_1, w_2 \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w_1 &\leq h(w_1)^{-q} h'(w_1), & x \in \Omega; \\ -\Delta w_2 &\geq h(w_2)^{-q} h'(w_2), & x \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Then $w_1 \leq w_2$ a.e. in Ω .

Proof. The proof of this lemma follows in a similar fashion as in [34, Lemma 2.2]. \square

Notations. In the next subsequent sections, we make use of the following notations:

- If u is a measurable function, we denote the positive and negative parts by $u^+ = \max\{u, 0\}$ and $u^- = \max\{-u, 0\}$, respectively.

- For any function f , $\text{supp } f = \{x : f(x) \neq 0\}$.
- If A is a measurable set in \mathbb{R}^2 , we denote the Lebesgue measure of A by $|A|$.
- The arrows \rightharpoonup , \rightarrow denote weak convergence, strong convergence, respectively.
- The arrow \hookrightarrow denotes continuous embedding.
- B_r denotes the ball of radius $r > 0$ centered at $0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.
- $\overline{B_r}$ denotes the closure of the ball B_r with respect to $H_0^1(\Omega)$ -norm topology.
- ∂B_r denotes the boundary of the ball B_r .
- $B_r(x)$ denotes the ball of radius $r > 0$ centered at $x \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.
- For any $p > 1$, $p' := \frac{p}{p-1}$ denotes the conjugate of p .
- $c, C_0, C_1, C_2, \dots, \tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2, \dots, C$ and \tilde{C} denote positive constants which may vary from line to line.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.3: Existence and non-existence results

From the assumptions (f2)-(f3), we obtain that for any $\epsilon > 0$, $r \geq 1$, there exist $\tilde{C}(\epsilon)$ and $C(\epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$|f(x, s)| \leq \epsilon |s| + \tilde{C}(\epsilon) |s|^{r-1} \exp((1 + \epsilon)|s|^4) \quad \text{for all } (x, s) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.1)$$

$$|F(x, s)| \leq \epsilon |s|^2 + C(\epsilon) |s|^r \exp((1 + \epsilon)|s|^4) \quad \text{for all } (x, s) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.2)$$

Thus, for any $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, in light of the Sobolev embedding, we have $w \in L^q(\Omega)$ for all $q \in [1, +\infty)$.

Let us define the set \mathcal{Q} as

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{\lambda > 0 : \text{the problem (2.7) has a weak solution in } H_0^1(\Omega)\}$$

and let $\Lambda^* := \sup \mathcal{Q}$. Then we have the following result:

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that the conditions in Theorem 1.3 hold and let h be defined as in (2.2). Then the set \mathcal{Q} is non empty.*

Proof. First, we consider the case $0 < q < 1$.

Using (3.2), Lemma 2.1-(h₅), (h₆) with the Sobolev embedding and Hölder's inequality, from (2.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} J_\lambda(w) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{q-1} \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w)^{1-q} dx - \epsilon \int_\Omega h(w)^2 dx - C(\epsilon) \int_\Omega |w|^r \exp((1 + \epsilon)h(w)^4) dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 - \frac{\lambda \|\alpha\|_\infty}{q-1} \int_\Omega |w|^{1-q} dx - \epsilon \int_\Omega w^2 dx - C(\epsilon) \int_\Omega |w|^r \exp(2(1 + \epsilon)w^2) dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 - \frac{\lambda \|\alpha\|_\infty}{q-1} C_1 \|w\|^{1-q} - \epsilon C_2 \|w\|^2 - C_3(\epsilon) \|w\|_{r p'}^r \left(\int_\Omega \exp(2p(1 + \epsilon)w^2) dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon C_2 \right) \|w\|^2 - \frac{\lambda \|\alpha\|_\infty}{q-1} C_1 \|w\|^{1-q} - C_4(\epsilon) \|w\|^r \left(\int_\Omega \exp \left(2p(1 + \epsilon) \|w\|^2 \cdot \frac{w^2}{\|w\|^2} \right) dx \right)^{1/p}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$, $p > 1$ and $r > 2$. Choose $\|w\| = r_0$ with $0 < r_0 < 1$ sufficiently small, $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2C_2}$ sufficiently small and $p > 1$ very near to 1 such that $2(1 + \epsilon)pr_0 < 4\pi$. Then by using Theorem 1.1, from (3.3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\|w\|^2 - \int_{\Omega} F(x, h(w)) \, dx &\geq 2\delta_0 \quad \text{for all } w \in \partial B_{r_0}; \\ \frac{1}{2}\|w\|^2 - \int_{\Omega} F(x, h(w)) \, dx &\geq 0 \quad \text{for all } w \in B_{r_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can choose $\lambda = \lambda_0 > 0$ sufficiently small so that the last two relations yield that

$$J_{\lambda_0}|_{\partial B_{r_0}} \geq \delta_0 > 0.$$

Set $m_0 := \inf_{w \in B_{r_0}} J_{\lambda_0}(w)$. Since for $t > 0$ very small and $w \neq 0$, from (2.3), we have

$$J_{\lambda_0}(tw) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|tw\|^2 - C\lambda_0\|tw\|^{1-q},$$

it follows that $m_0 < 0$. Let $\{w_k\} \subset B_{r_0}$ be a minimizing sequence such that as $k \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\lambda_0}(w_k) &\rightarrow m_0; \\ w_k &\rightharpoonup w_0 \quad \text{weakly in } H_0^1(\Omega); \\ w_k &\rightarrow w_0 \quad \text{strongly in } L^{1-q}(\Omega) \text{ and} \\ w_k(x) &\rightarrow w_0(x) \quad \text{point-wise a.e. in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, let us assume that $w_k \geq 0$ due to the fact that $J_{\lambda}(w) = J_{\lambda}(|w|)$. Now by mean value theorem there exists \tilde{w}_k in between w_0 and w_k such that as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)h(w_k)^{1-q} \, dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)h(w_0)^{1-q} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)|h(w_k) - h(w_0)|^{1-q} \, dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)h(w_0)^{1-q} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)|w_k - w_0|^{1-q}|h'(\tilde{w}_k)|^{1-q} \, dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)h(w_0)^{1-q} \, dx + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we get $\int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)h(w_0)^{1-q} \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)h(w_k)^{1-q} \, dx + o(1)$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore, from the last two relations, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)h(w_k)^{1-q} \, dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)h(w_0)^{1-q} \, dx \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (3.4)$$

Next, using (3.2) and arguing in a similar fashion as in (3.3) for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, we deduce

$$\int_{\Omega} F(x, h(w_k)) \, dx \leq \epsilon C_2 \|w_k\|^2 + C_4(\epsilon) \|w_k\|^r \left(\int_{\Omega} \exp \left(2p(1 + \epsilon) \|w_k\|^2 \cdot \frac{w_k^2}{\|w_k\|^2} \right) \, dx \right)^{1/p} < +\infty.$$

In the last line of the above relation, we used Theorem 1.1, with sufficiently small $\|w_k\| < r_0 \ll 1$ and $p > 1$ very close to 1 so that $2(1 + \epsilon)pr_0 < 4\pi$. Thus, recalling Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} F(x, h(w_k)) \, dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} F(x, h(w_0)) \, dx \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (3.5)$$

Now from the weak lower semi-continuity of norm, we have

$$r_0 \geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \|w_k\| \geq \|w_0\|,$$

which yields that $w_0 \in B_{r_0}$. Therefore,

$$J_{\lambda_0}(w_0) \geq m_0.$$

Furthermore, recalling (3.4) and (3.5), we deduce

$$m_0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} J_{\lambda_0}(w_k) \geq J_{\lambda_0}(w_0) \geq m_0.$$

Thus,

$$J_{\lambda_0}(w_0) = m_0 < 0.$$

Hence, $w_0 (\neq 0)$ is a local minimizer of J_{λ_0} in $H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Now we claim that w_0 is a weak solution to the problem (2.7). Note that,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{J_{\lambda_0}(w_0 + t\phi) - J_{\lambda_0}(w_0)}{t} \geq 0. \quad (3.6)$$

It can be derived from the last expression that $-\Delta w_0 \geq 0$ in Ω in the weak sense and hence, by strong maximum principle, $w_0 > 0$ in Ω . Furthermore, employing Fatou's lemma in (3.6), we infer that

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla w_0 \nabla \psi \, dx \geq \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_0)^{-q} h'(w_0) \psi \, dx + \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_0)) h'(w_0) \psi \, dx \quad \text{for all } \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega), \psi \geq 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Now for any $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, taking $\psi = (w_0 + \epsilon\phi)^+$ as a test function in (3.7) and dividing it by $\epsilon > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \nabla w_0 \nabla \phi \, dx + \epsilon \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dx &\geq \frac{\lambda}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) (h(w_0 + \epsilon\phi)^{1-q} - h(w_0)^{1-q}) \, dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} (F(x, h(w_0 + \epsilon\phi)) - F(x, h(w_0))) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Letting the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ in the last expression, we deduce

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla w_0 \nabla \phi \, dx \geq \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_0)^{-q} h'(w_0) \phi \, dx + \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_0)) h'(w_0) \phi \, dx.$$

Again, by taking $-\phi$ in place of ϕ , we get the reverse inequality in the last relation. Therefore, w_0 is a weak solution to the problem (2.7).

Next, we consider the case $1 \leq q < 3$. For that, we consider the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w &= \lambda \alpha(x) (h(w) + \epsilon)^{-q} h'(w) + f(x, h(w)) h'(w) \text{ in } \Omega, \\ w &> 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ w &= 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

such that $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small and $0 < \lambda < \min\{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega}, \lambda_0\}$. Here $\tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega} := \tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega}(\alpha)$ is the first eigenvalue of the problem (1.4) with $\varrho = \alpha$ and $\varphi_{1,\Omega}$ is the first eigen function corresponding to $\tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega}$. We show the

existence of solution to (3.8) by constructing a sub-solution and a super-solution to (3.8). Let W be a solution to

$$-\Delta W = 1 \text{ in } \Omega; \quad W = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Then by maximum principle, $W > 0$ in Ω and by standard elliptic regularity theory, $W \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ and hence, bounded on $\bar{\Omega}$. Set

$$\bar{w} := C \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_{1,\Omega}} \varphi_{1,\Omega} + MW,$$

where $C = C(\lambda)$ and $M > 0$ are two sufficiently large real constants. Therefore,

$$-\Delta \bar{w} = C\lambda\alpha(x)\varphi_{1,\Omega} + M. \quad (3.9)$$

Now using Lemma 2.1-(h_{13}), (h_3), (h_5) and the fact $h(s) > 1$ for sufficiently large $s > 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h' \left(C \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_{1,\Omega}} \varphi_{1,\Omega} + MW \right)}{\left(h \left(C \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_{1,\Omega}} \varphi_{1,\Omega} + MW \right) + \epsilon \right)^q} &\leq \frac{h'(C\varphi_{1,\Omega})}{h(C\varphi_{1,\Omega})^q} \\ &= \frac{h'(C\varphi_{1,\Omega})}{h(C\varphi_{1,\Omega})^{1+q}} h(C\varphi_{1,\Omega}) \leq C\varphi_{1,\Omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Again, using Lemma 2.1-(h_3), (h_6) combining with (f3), for any $c > 0, \epsilon > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &f \left(x, h \left(C \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_{1,\Omega}} \varphi_{1,\Omega} + MW \right) \right) h' \left(C \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_{1,\Omega}} \varphi_{1,\Omega} + MW \right) \\ &< c \exp \left((1 + \epsilon) h \left(C \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_{1,\Omega}} \varphi_{1,\Omega} + MW \right)^4 \right) \\ &< c \exp \left(2(1 + \epsilon) \left(C \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_{1,\Omega}} \varphi_{1,\Omega} + MW \right)^2 \right) \\ &< c \exp \left(2(1 + \epsilon) \left(C \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_{1,\Omega}} \|\varphi_{1,\Omega}\|_\infty + M\|W\|_\infty \right)^2 \right) \\ &< M \quad \text{for sufficiently small } c = c(\lambda) > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Plugging (3.10) and (3.11) in (3.9), we infer that \bar{w} is a super-solution to (3.8). Now let us set

$$\underline{w} := \lambda\alpha(x)mW$$

for sufficiently small $m > 0$. Therefore,

$$-\Delta \underline{w} = \lambda\alpha(x)m.$$

We claim that \underline{w} is a sub-solution to (3.8). To prove the claim, it is enough to show

$$m < \frac{h'(mW)}{(h(mW) + \epsilon)^q}. \quad (3.12)$$

For sufficiently small $0 < m(\lambda) < 1$, using Lemma 2.1-(h₄), (h₅), (h₈), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m(h(mW) + \epsilon)^q} h'(mW) &\geq \frac{1}{m(h(mW) + \epsilon)^q} \frac{h(mW)}{2mW} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{m(mW + \epsilon)^q} \frac{h(1)}{2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{m^{q+1}(\|W\|_\infty + 1/m)^q} \frac{h(1)}{2} > 1. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes the claim. Now by choosing M sufficiently large and m sufficiently small so that $M \gg m$, from (3.11) and (3.12), we have $\underline{w} \leq \bar{w}$. Hence, there is a solution $\underline{w} \leq w_\epsilon \leq \bar{w}$ to (3.8) in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Since \underline{w}, \bar{w} do not depend on ϵ , we have

$$w_\epsilon(x) \rightarrow w_\lambda(x) \quad \text{point-wise in } \Omega \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+.$$

Next, we show that w_λ is a weak solution to (2.7). Testing (3.8) against the test function w_ϵ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega |\nabla w_\epsilon|^2 dx &= \lambda \int_\Omega \alpha(x)(h(w_\epsilon) + \epsilon)^{-q} h'(w_\epsilon) w_\epsilon dx + \int_\Omega f(x, h(w_\epsilon)) h'(w_\epsilon) w_\epsilon dx \\ &\leq \lambda \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(\underline{w})^{-q} h'(\underline{w}) \underline{w} dx + \int_\Omega f(x, h(\underline{w})) h'(\underline{w}) \underline{w} dx < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\{w_\epsilon\}$ is bounded in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Up to some sub-sequence, $w_\epsilon \rightharpoonup w_\lambda$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Again, testing (3.8) against any $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, we deduce

$$\int_\Omega \nabla w_\epsilon \nabla \phi dx = \lambda \int_\Omega \alpha(x)(h(w_\epsilon) + \epsilon)^{-q} h'(w_\epsilon) \phi dx + \int_\Omega f(x, h(w_\epsilon)) h'(w_\epsilon) \phi dx. \quad (3.13)$$

For $\phi \geq 0$, using Lemma 2.1-(h₁₃), we have

$$\alpha(x)(h(w_\epsilon) + \epsilon)^{-q} h'(w_\epsilon) \phi \leq \alpha(x) h(\underline{w})^{-q} h'(\underline{w}) \phi \in L^1(\Omega). \quad (3.14)$$

Observe that, $f(x, h(s))h'(s)$ is increasing in $s > 0$. Indeed, using (f1) and Lemma 2.1-(h₁₀), it follows that $f(x, h(s))h'(s) = \frac{f(x, h(s))}{h(s)^3} \cdot \frac{h(s)^3 h'(s)}{s} \cdot s$ is increasing in $s > 0$. Using this, again for $\phi \geq 0$, by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$f(x, h(w_\epsilon))h'(w_\epsilon) \phi \leq f(x, h(\bar{w}))h'(\bar{w}) \phi \in L^1(\Omega). \quad (3.15)$$

Then (3.13), (3.14) and (3.15) together with Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem yield that as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$\int_\Omega \nabla w_\lambda \nabla \phi dx = \lambda \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda) \phi dx + \int_\Omega f(x, h(w_\lambda)) h'(w_\lambda) \phi dx. \quad (3.16)$$

Since for any $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\phi = \phi^+ - \phi^-$, the relation in (3.16) holds for all $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Thus w_λ is a solution to (2.7). This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

In the next lemma, we aim to discuss the regularity result for the solutions of (2.7).

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that (f1) – (f7) and (α 1) hold. Let h be defined as in (2.2). If $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is any weak solution to (2.7) for $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda^*]$, then $w \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Let $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to (2.7). First, in spirit of [16, Lemma A.4], we show that w is in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. For that, let us define a C^1 cut-off function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as

$$\psi(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s \leq 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } s \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Now for any $\epsilon > 0$, define

$$\psi_\epsilon(s) = \psi\left(\frac{s-1}{\epsilon}\right) \quad \text{for } s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Note that $\nabla(\psi_\epsilon \circ w) = (\psi'_\epsilon \circ w)\nabla w$. Hence, $\psi_\epsilon \circ w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Let $v \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ with $v \geq 0$. Now using $\phi := (\psi_\epsilon \circ w)v$ as a test function in (2.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \nabla(\psi_\epsilon \circ w)v \, dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)h(w)^{-q}h'(w)(\psi_\epsilon \circ w)v \, dx \\ - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w)(x))h'(w)(\psi_\epsilon \circ w)v \, dx = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Since

$$\nabla w \nabla(\psi_\epsilon \circ w)v = |\nabla w|^2 \nabla(\psi'_\epsilon \circ w)v + (\nabla w \nabla v)(\psi_\epsilon \circ w),$$

from (3.17), we deduce

$$\int_{\Omega} (\nabla w \nabla v)(\psi_\epsilon \circ w) \, dx \leq \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)h(w)^{-q}h'(w)(\psi_\epsilon \circ w)v \, dx + \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w)(x))h'(w)(\psi_\epsilon \circ w)v \, dx.$$

In the last relation, letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ and using Lemma 2.1-(h_{13}), (h_3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \nabla(w-1)^+ \nabla v \, dx &\leq \int_{\Omega \cap \{x:w(x)>1\}} \lambda \alpha(x)h(1)^{-q}h'(1)v \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap \{x:w(x)>1\}} f(x, h(w))h'(w)v \, dx \\ &\leq C + \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w))v \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now following the arguments as in [19, Lemma 10, Theorem C] combining with Theorem 1.1, from the last relation, we infer that $(w-1)^+ \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Hence $w \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

Finally, adapting the ideas as in the proof of [2, Corollary 1.1] and [9, Theorem 4], we can conclude that $w \in C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$. \square

Remark 3.3. By Lemma 3.2, it follows that if $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is any weak solution to (2.7), then $w \in C(\overline{\Omega})$. Moreover, when $0 < q < 1$, we have $w \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$.

The following lemma basically ensures the non-existence of solution to (2.7) for $\lambda > \Lambda^*$.

Lemma 3.4. Let the conditions in Theorem 1.3 hold and let h be defined as in (2.2). Then, $0 < \Lambda^* < +\infty$.

Proof. From Lemma 3.1, we can infer that $\Lambda^* > 0$. Thus, we are left to show that $\Lambda^* < +\infty$. Suppose this is not true. Then there exists a sequence $\{\lambda_k\} \subset \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\lambda_k \rightarrow +\infty$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. For $s > 0$, let us define the function

$$\mathcal{N}_\lambda(s) := [\lambda h(s)^{-q} + f(x, h(s))] \frac{h'(s)}{s}.$$

We claim that there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large and $\beta = \beta(\lambda_{k_0}) > 0$ such that for all $s > 0$,

$$\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_{k_0}}(s) = [\lambda_{k_0} h(s)^{-q} + f(x, h(s))] \frac{h'(s)}{s} > \beta > \tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega}(\varrho), \quad (3.18)$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega}(\varrho)$ is the first eigenvalue of the problem (1.4) with $\varrho(x) = \min\{1, \alpha(x)\}$. Indeed, for any arbitrary $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for $s \in [1/n, n]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let us consider $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_k}(s)$. Since \mathcal{N}_{λ_k} is a continuous function, there exists $s_n := s_{n,k} \in [1/n, n]$ such that

$$\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_k}(s_n) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_k}(s) \text{ for all } s \in [1/n, n].$$

Now we show that, up to some sub-sequence, $s_n \rightarrow s_{0,k} \in (0, +\infty)$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Supposing the contrary to this, we have either $s_n \rightarrow 0$ or $s_n \rightarrow +\infty$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. For both the cases, applying Lemma 2.1-(h_6), (h_8), we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_k}(s) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_k}(s_n) = +\infty.$$

That is, $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_k} \geq +\infty$ for all $s \in (0, +\infty)$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which is absurd. Hence, $s_n \rightarrow s_{0,k} \in (0, +\infty)$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and

$$\mathcal{N}_{\lambda_k}(s) \geq [\lambda_k h(s_{0,k})^{-q} + f(x, h(s_{0,k}))] \frac{h'(s_{0,k})}{s_{0,k}} \text{ for all } s > 0. \quad (3.19)$$

Arguing in a similar manner as in (3.19), it can be deduced that $s_k := s_{0,k} \rightarrow s_0 \in (0, +\infty)$, up to some sub-sequence, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Using this fact, from (3.19), we achieve (3.18). Thus, the claim follows. Since $\lambda_{k_0} \in \mathcal{Q}$, for $\lambda = \lambda_{k_0}$, let $w_{\lambda_{k_0}}$ be a solution to (2.7). So, from Lemma 2.1-(h_8), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w_{\lambda_{k_0}} - \beta \varrho(x) w_{\lambda_{k_0}} &\geq -\Delta w_{\lambda_{k_0}} - \mathcal{N}_{\lambda_{k_0}} \varrho(x) w_{\lambda_{k_0}} \\ &= -\Delta w_{\lambda_{k_0}} - \varrho(x) w_{\lambda_{k_0}} [\lambda_{k_0} h(w_{\lambda_{k_0}})^{-q} + f(x, h(w_{\lambda_{k_0}}))] \frac{h'(w_{\lambda_{k_0}})}{w_{\lambda_{k_0}}} \\ &\geq -\Delta w_{\lambda_{k_0}} - \lambda_{k_0} \alpha(x) h(w_{\lambda_{k_0}})^{-q} - f(x, h(w_{\lambda_{k_0}})) h'(w_{\lambda_{k_0}}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $-\Delta w_{\lambda_{k_0}} \geq \beta \varrho(x) w_{\lambda_{k_0}} > 0$ in Ω , which in view of strong maximum principle yields that $w_{\lambda_{k_0}} > 0$ in Ω . Now by applying Picone's identity for $\varphi_{1,\Omega}$ and $w_{\lambda_{k_0}}$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_{1,\Omega}|^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} \nabla \left(\frac{\varphi_{1,\Omega}^2}{w_{\lambda_{k_0}}} \right) \nabla w_{\lambda_{k_0}} dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi_{1,\Omega}|^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} \beta \varrho(x) \varphi_{1,\Omega}^2 dx \\ &= (\tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega}(\varrho) - \beta) \int_{\Omega} \varrho(x) \varphi_{1,\Omega}^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega}(\varrho) \geq \beta$, which contradicts (3.18). Thus, the proof of the lemma follows. \square

In the next result, using a sub-super solution technique, we show the existence of at least one solution to (2.7).

Proposition 3.5. *Let the conditions in Theorem 1.3 be satisfied and let h be defined as in (2.2). Then for each $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda^*)$, (2.7) admits a nontrivial solution in $H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda^*)$ and $\lambda' \in (\lambda, \Lambda^*)$. Then, one can see that $w_{\lambda'} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ forms a weak solution to (2.7) for $\lambda = \lambda'$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.2, $w_{\lambda'} \in C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$. Existence of such λ' is guaranteed from the definition of Λ^* and Lemma 3.1. Therefore,

$$-\Delta w_{\lambda'} \geq \lambda \alpha(x) h(w_{\lambda'})^{-q} h'(w_{\lambda'}) + f(x, h(\underline{w}_\lambda)) h'(w_{\lambda'}), \quad x \in \Omega; \quad w_{\lambda'} > 0, \quad x \in \Omega; \quad w_{\lambda'} = 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega.$$

Hence, $w_{\lambda'}$ is a super-solution to (2.7). Now we aim to find a sub-solution to (2.7) which is smaller than $w_{\lambda'}$. For this, we use the first eigen function $\varphi_{1,\Omega}$ corresponding to the first eigenvalue $\tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega} > 0$ as defined for the equation (1.4) with $\varrho = \alpha$. Choose $c := c(\lambda) \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small and define $\underline{w}_\lambda := c\varphi_{1,\Omega}$. By the construction and the properties of $\varphi_{1,\Omega}$, we have $\underline{w}_\lambda \in C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$. That is, there exist two positive constants $c_1 := c_1(\lambda, q)$, $c_2 := c_2(\lambda, q)$ such that

$$c_1(q, \lambda)\delta(x) \leq \underline{w}_\lambda \leq c_2(q, \lambda)\delta(x) \quad \text{if } 0 < q < 1, \quad (3.20)$$

$$c_1(q, \lambda)\delta(x)^{\frac{2}{q+1}} \leq \underline{w}_\lambda \leq c_2(q, \lambda)\delta(x)^{\frac{2}{q+1}} \quad \text{if } 1 < q < 3. \quad (3.21)$$

Then by using Lemma 2.1-(h₁₃), (h₈), we can derive the relation

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \alpha(x) h(\underline{w}_\lambda)^{-q} h'(\underline{w}_\lambda) &= \lambda \alpha(x) h(\underline{w}_\lambda)^{-1-q} h'(\underline{w}_\lambda) h(\underline{w}_\lambda) \\ &\geq \tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega} \alpha(x) \frac{h(\underline{w}_\lambda)}{h(1)} \\ &\geq \tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega} \alpha(x) \underline{w}_\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

This is evident from the last relation that $c(\lambda)$ is increasing in $\lambda > 0$. Therefore,

$$\lambda \mapsto \underline{w}_\lambda \text{ is increasing and continuous in } \lambda \text{ from } \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow C^1(\overline{\Omega}). \quad (3.23)$$

From (3.22), it follows that

$$-\Delta \underline{w}_\lambda = \tilde{\lambda}_{1,\Omega} \alpha(x) \underline{w}_\lambda \leq \lambda \alpha(x) h(\underline{w}_\lambda)^{-q} h'(\underline{w}_\lambda) + f(x, h(\underline{w}_\lambda)) h'(\underline{w}_\lambda), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Thus, \underline{w}_λ is a weak sub-solution to (2.7). Therefore, we see that $w_{\lambda'}$ and \underline{w}_λ satisfy the following:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w_{\lambda'} \geq \lambda \alpha(x) h(w_{\lambda'})^{-q} h'(w_{\lambda'}) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta \underline{w}_\lambda \leq \lambda \alpha(x) h(\underline{w}_\lambda)^{-q} h'(\underline{w}_\lambda) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Hence, Lemma 2.5 yields that $\underline{w}_\lambda \leq w_{\lambda'}$. Now we consider the closed convex subset Y_λ of $H_0^1(\Omega)$ as

$$Y_\lambda := \{w \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \underline{w}_\lambda \leq w \leq w_{\lambda'}\}.$$

Let $\{w_k\} \subset Y_\lambda$ be such that $w_k \rightharpoonup w_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Then, up to a sub-sequence, $w_k(x) \rightarrow w_0(x)$ point-wise a.e. in Ω . Using Lemma 2.1-(h₅) and Remark 3.3 for $w_{\lambda'}$, we get

$$h(w_k)^{1-q} dx \leq w_k^{1-q} dx \leq w_{\lambda'}^{1-q} dx \in L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{if } 0 < q < 1$$

and

$$\log(h(w_k)) \leq \log(w_k) \leq \log(w_{\lambda'}) \in L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{if } q = 1.$$

Again, from Lemma 2.1-(h₈) and (3.21), it follows that

$$h(w_k)^{1-q} \leq h(\underline{w}_k)^{1-q} \leq h(1)^{1-q} \underline{w}_\lambda^{1-q} < C\delta^{\frac{2(1-q)}{1+q}} \in L^1(\Omega) \text{ if } 1 < q < 3$$

since $\frac{2(1-q)}{1+q} > -1$ for $1 < q < 3$. Furthermore, using (f3) in combination with Lemma 2.1-(h₆) and Theorem 1.1, we deduce

$$F(x, h(w_k)) < C \exp((1 + \epsilon)h(w_k)^4) \leq C \exp(2(1 + \epsilon)w_\lambda^2) \in L^1(\Omega).$$

So, by Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} h(w_k)^{1-q} dx &\rightarrow \int_{\Omega} h(w_0)^{1-q} dx, \text{ if } q \neq 1; \\ \int_{\Omega} \log(h(w_k)) dx &\rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \log(h(w_0)) dx, \text{ if } q = 1; \\ \int_{\Omega} F(x, h(w_k)) dx &\rightarrow \int_{\Omega} F(x, h(w_0)) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using last three limits and weak lower semicontinuity property of the norm, we deduce that J_λ is weakly lower semicontinuous on Y_λ . Since Y_λ is weakly sequentially closed subset of $H_0^1(\Omega)$, there exists some $w_\lambda \in Y_\lambda$ such that

$$\inf_{w \in Y_\lambda} J_\lambda(w) = J_\lambda(w_\lambda). \quad (3.24)$$

Now we show that w_λ is a weak solution to (2.7).

For $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, we define

$$v_\epsilon := \min\{w_{\lambda'}, \max\{\underline{w}_\lambda, w_\lambda + \epsilon\varphi\}\} = w_\lambda + \epsilon\varphi - \varphi^\epsilon + \varphi_\epsilon \in Y_\lambda,$$

where $\varphi^\epsilon := \max\{0, w_\lambda + \epsilon\varphi - w_{\lambda'}\}$ and $\varphi_\epsilon := \max\{0, \underline{w}_\lambda - w_\lambda - \epsilon\varphi\}$. By construction, $v_\epsilon \in Y_\lambda$ and $\varphi^\epsilon, \varphi_\epsilon \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. Since $w_\lambda + t(v_\epsilon - w) \in Y_\lambda$, for each $0 < t < 1$, using (3.24), Lemma 2.3 and mean value theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{J_\lambda(w_\lambda + t(v_\epsilon - w_\lambda)) - J_\lambda(w_\lambda)}{t} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \nabla w_\lambda \nabla (v_\epsilon - w_\lambda) dx - \lambda \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda + \theta t(v_\epsilon - w_\lambda))^{-q} h'(w_\lambda + \theta t(v_\epsilon - w_\lambda))(v_\epsilon - w_\lambda) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_\lambda)) h'(w_\lambda)(v_\epsilon - w_\lambda) dx \end{aligned}$$

for some $0 < \theta < 1$. From the definition of $\varphi^\epsilon, \varphi_\epsilon$, we get that $|v_\epsilon - w_\lambda| \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, which yields that

$$|(h(\underline{w}_\lambda))^{-q} h'(\underline{w}_\lambda))(v_\epsilon - w_\lambda)| \in L^1(\Omega).$$

Moreover, using Lemma 2.1-(h₁₃), we obtain

$$|h(w_\lambda + \theta t(v_\epsilon - w_\lambda))^{-q} h'(w_\lambda + \theta t(v_\epsilon - w_\lambda))(v_\epsilon - w_\lambda)| \leq |(h(\underline{w}_\lambda))^{-q} h'(\underline{w}_\lambda))(v_\epsilon - w_\lambda)|$$

for all $t \in (0, 1)$. From the last relation, it follows that

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla w_\lambda \nabla \varphi dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda) \varphi dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_\lambda)) h'(w_\lambda) \varphi dx \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon} (E^\epsilon - E_\epsilon), \quad (3.25)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E^\epsilon &:= \int_{\Omega} \nabla w_\lambda \nabla \varphi^\epsilon dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda) \varphi^\epsilon dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_\lambda)) h'(w_\lambda) \varphi^\epsilon dx; \\ E_\epsilon &:= \int_{\Omega} \nabla w_\lambda \nabla \varphi_\epsilon dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda) \varphi_\epsilon dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_\lambda)) h'(w_\lambda) \varphi_\epsilon dx. \end{aligned}$$

We define the set $\Omega^\epsilon := \{x \in \Omega : (w_\lambda + \epsilon \varphi)(x) \geq w_{\lambda'} > w_\lambda(x)\}$ so that $|\Omega^\epsilon| \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. Next, using the fact that $w_{\lambda'}$ is a super-solution to (2.7) together with Lemma 2.1-(h₁₃), we estimate the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\epsilon} E^\epsilon &= \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left[\int_{\Omega} \nabla(w_\lambda - w_{\lambda'}) \nabla \varphi^\epsilon dx + \int_{\Omega} \nabla w_{\lambda'} \nabla \varphi^\epsilon dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} (\alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{-q} + f(x, h(w_\lambda))) h'(w_\lambda) \varphi^\epsilon dx \right] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} |\nabla(w_\lambda - w_{\lambda'})|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} \nabla(w_\lambda - w_{\lambda'}) \nabla \varphi dx + \frac{\lambda}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} \alpha(x) (h(w_{\lambda'})^{-q} h'(w_{\lambda'}) \\ &\quad - h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda)) \varphi^\epsilon dx + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} (f(x, h(w_{\lambda'})) h'(w_{\lambda'}) - f(x, h(w_\lambda)) h'(w_\lambda)) \varphi^\epsilon dx \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} \nabla(w_\lambda - w_{\lambda'}) \nabla \varphi dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} \alpha(x) (h(w_{\lambda'})^{-q} h'(w_{\lambda'}) - h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda)) |\varphi| dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega^\epsilon} |f(x, h(w_{\lambda'})) h'(w_{\lambda'}) - f(x, h(w_\lambda)) h'(w_\lambda)| |\varphi| dx \\ &= o(1) \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+. \end{aligned}$$

Arguing similarly, we have

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon} E_\epsilon \leq o(1) \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+.$$

Thus, from (3.25), we get

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla w_\lambda \nabla \varphi dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda) \varphi dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_\lambda)) h'(w_\lambda) \varphi dx \geq o(1) \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$$

for all $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Considering $-\varphi$ in place of φ and following the similar arguments as above, we infer that w_λ is a weak solution to (2.7). Moreover, from the construction of w_λ and Lemma 3.2, it follows that $w_\lambda \in C_{\varphi_q}^+$. This concludes the proof of the proposition. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Assume that the conditions in Theorem 1.3 hold and let h be defined as in (2.2). Let $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda^*)$. Then any weak solution to (2.7) obtained in Lemma 3.5 forms a local minimizer for the functional J_λ .*

Proof. We prove this lemma for the case $q \neq 1$. For $q = 1$, the proof follows in a similar fashion.

Now suppose the statement of the lemma does not hold, that is, let us assume that w_λ is not a local minimum of J_λ . Then there exists a sequence $\{w_k\} \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\|w_k - w_\lambda\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow +\infty \text{ and } J_\lambda(w_k) < J_\lambda(w_\lambda). \quad (3.26)$$

Next, we define $\underline{w} := \underline{w_\lambda}$ and $\bar{w} := w_{\lambda'}$ as a sub-solution and a super-solution to (2.7), respectively, as defined in the proof of Proposition 3.5. Furthermore, we define

$$v_k := \max\{\underline{w}, \min\{w_k, \underline{w}\}\} = \begin{cases} \underline{w}, & \text{if } w_k < \underline{w}, \\ w_k, & \text{if } \underline{w} \leq w_k \leq \bar{w}, \\ \bar{w}, & \text{if } w_k > \bar{w}, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{u}_k &:= (w_k - \underline{w})^-, \quad \overline{u}_k := (w_k - \overline{w})^+, \\ \underline{\mathcal{S}}_k &:= \text{supp}(\underline{u}_k), \quad \overline{\mathcal{S}}_k := \text{supp}(\overline{u}_k).\end{aligned}$$

Then $w_k = v_k - \underline{u}_k + \overline{u}_k$ and $v_k \in Y_\lambda$, where Y_λ is defined in Proposition 3.5. Then we can express $J_\lambda(w_k)$ as

$$J_\lambda(w_k) = J_\lambda(v_k) + A_k + B_k, \quad (3.27)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}A_k &:= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} (|\nabla w_k|^2 - |\nabla \overline{w}|^2) dx - \frac{\lambda}{1-q} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} \alpha(x) (h(w_k)^{1-q} - h(\overline{w})^{1-q}) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} (F(x, h(w_k)) - F(x, h(\overline{w}))) dx, \quad (3.28)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}B_k &:= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\underline{\mathcal{S}}_k} (|\nabla w_k|^2 - |\nabla \underline{w}|^2) dx - \frac{\lambda}{1-q} \int_{\underline{\mathcal{S}}_k} \alpha(x) (h(w_k)^{1-q} - h(\underline{w})^{1-q}) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\underline{\mathcal{S}}_k} (F(x, h(w_k)) - F(x, h(\underline{w}))) dx. \quad (3.29)\end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 3.5, we get $J_\lambda(w_k) \geq J_\lambda(w_\lambda) + A_k + B_k$. We intend to show that $A_k, B_k \geq 0$ for large k . For that, we need to show

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} |\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k| = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} |\underline{\mathcal{S}}_k| = 0. \quad (3.30)$$

Now recalling the properties of $\varphi_{1,\Omega}$ and the proof of Proposition 3.5, we have

$$\overline{w} \geq w_\lambda > \underline{w} := c(\lambda)\varphi_{1,\Omega} > c(\lambda)\delta(x) > 0$$

for sufficiently small $c(\lambda) > 0$. On the other hand, by (f1) and Lemma 2.1, we have $f(x, h(s))h'(s)$ is increasing in $s > 0$. For any $b > 0$, let us define the set

$$\Omega_b := \{x \in \Omega : \delta(x) > b\}.$$

Gathering all the above facts together with Lemma 2.1-(h₃), (h₁₂) and using mean value theorem, for $x \in \Omega_{\frac{b}{2}}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}-\Delta(\overline{w} - w_\lambda) &\geq \lambda \alpha(x) [h(\overline{w})^{-q} h'(\overline{w}) - h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda)] \\ &= \lambda \alpha(x) [-q(h'(w_*))^2 h(w_*)^{-q-1} + h(w_*)^{-q} h''(w_*)] (\overline{w} - w_*), \quad \text{for some } w_* \in (w_\lambda, \overline{w}) \\ &\geq \lambda \alpha(x) [-q h(w_*)^{-q-1} - \sqrt{2} h(w_*)^{-q}] (\overline{w} - w_*) \\ &\geq -\lambda \alpha(x) \left[q h \left(c(\lambda) \frac{b}{2} \right)^{-q-1} + \sqrt{2} h \left(c(\lambda) \frac{b}{2} \right)^{-q} \right] (\overline{w} - w_\lambda).\end{aligned}$$

Applying [7, Theorem 3], from the last relation, we infer that for any $b > 0$, there exists a constant $C_* > 0$ such that

$$\overline{w} - w_\lambda \geq C_* \frac{b}{2} > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_b.$$

Given $\epsilon > 0$, choose $b > 0$ such that $|\Omega \setminus \Omega_b| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Since we assumed that $w_k \rightarrow w_\lambda$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, for sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k| &\leq |\Omega \setminus \Omega_b| + |\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k \cap \Omega_b| \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k \cap \Omega_b} \frac{w_k - w_\lambda}{\overline{w} - w_\lambda} dx \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{4}{C_*^2 b^2} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k \cap \Omega_b} (w_k - w_\lambda)^2 dx \\ &< \epsilon + C \|w_k - w_\lambda\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This yields that $|\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. In a similar fashion as above, considering $\underline{w} - w_\lambda$, we get $|\underline{\mathcal{S}}_k| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\overline{v}_k\|^2 &= \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} |\nabla(w_k - \overline{w})|^2 dx \\ &\leq 2 \left(\|w_k - w_\lambda\|^2 + \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} |\nabla(w_\lambda - \overline{w})|^2 dx \right) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

Similarly, $\|\underline{v}_k\|^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Since \overline{w} is a super-solution to (2.7), using Lemma 2.1-(h_g) and mean value theorem, from (3.28), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_k &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} (|\nabla(\overline{w} + \overline{v}_k)|^2 - |\nabla \overline{w}|^2) dx - \frac{\lambda}{1-q} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} \alpha(x) (h(\overline{w} + \overline{v}_k)^{1-q} - h(\overline{w})^{1-q}) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} (F(x, h(\overline{w} + \overline{v}_k)) - F(x, h(\overline{w}))) dx, \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|\overline{v}_k\|^2 + \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} \nabla \overline{w} \nabla \overline{v}_k dx - \frac{\lambda}{1-q} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} \alpha(x) h(\overline{w} + \theta \overline{v}_k)^{-q} h'(\overline{w} + \theta \overline{v}_k) \overline{v}_k dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} f(x, h(\overline{w} + \theta \overline{v}_k)) h'(\overline{w} + \theta \overline{v}_k) \overline{v}_k dx, \quad \theta \in (0, 1) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\overline{v}_k\|^2 + \lambda \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} \alpha(x) h(\overline{w})^{-q} h'(\overline{w}) \overline{v}_k dx + \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} f(x, h(\overline{w})) h'(\overline{w}) \overline{v}_k dx \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda}{1-q} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} \alpha(x) h(\overline{w} + \theta \overline{v}_k)^{-q} h'(\overline{w} + \theta \overline{v}_k) \overline{v}_k dx - \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} f(x, h(\overline{w} + \theta \overline{v}_k)) h'(\overline{w} + \theta \overline{v}_k) \overline{v}_k dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\overline{v}_k\|^2 + \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} f(x, h(\overline{w})) h'(\overline{w}) \overline{v}_k dx - \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} f(x, h(\overline{w} + \theta \overline{v}_k)) h'(\overline{w} + \theta \overline{v}_k) \overline{v}_k dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|\overline{v}_k\|^2 + \theta \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} \left(f'(x, h(\overline{w} + \tilde{\theta} \overline{v}_k)) (h'(\overline{w} + \tilde{\theta} \overline{v}_k))^2 + f(x, h(\overline{w} + \tilde{\theta} \overline{v}_k)) h''(\overline{w} + \tilde{\theta} \overline{v}_k) \right) \overline{v}_k^2 dx, \quad \tilde{\theta} \in (0, 1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|\overline{v}_k\|^2 + \theta \int_{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_k} \left(f'(x, h(\overline{w} + \tilde{\theta} \overline{v}_k)) (h'(\overline{w} + \tilde{\theta} \overline{v}_k))^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2f(x, h(\overline{w} + \tilde{\theta} \overline{v}_k)) h(\overline{w} + \tilde{\theta} \overline{v}_k) (h'(\overline{w} + \tilde{\theta} \overline{v}_k))^4 \right) \overline{v}_k^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

Now by the definition of the function f , we have

$$f'(x, h(s)) = (g'(x, h(s)) + 4h(s)^3 g(x, h(s))) \exp(h(s)^4) \geq 4h(s)^3 f(x, h(s)).$$

Using this combining with Lemma 2.1-(h_{13}), (h_{12}), (h_3), (h_6) and Hölder's inequality, from (3.32), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_k &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{v}_k\|^2 + \theta \int_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}_k} \left(4f(x, h(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k)) h(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k)^3 (h'(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k))^2 \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - 2f(x, h(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k)) h(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k) (h'(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k))^4 \right) \bar{v}_k^{-2} dx \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{v}_k\|^2 - \theta \int_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}_k} \left(4f(x, h(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k)) h(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k)^3 (h'(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k))^3 \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - 2f(x, h(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k)) h(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k) h'(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k) \right) \bar{v}_k^{-2} dx \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{v}_k\|^2 - \sqrt{2}\theta \int_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}_k} f(x, h(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k)) \bar{v}_k^{-2} dx \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{v}_k\|^2 - C \int_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}_k} \exp((1 + \epsilon)h(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k)^4) \bar{v}_k^{-2} dx, \quad \text{by (f3) for } \epsilon > 0 \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{v}_k\|^2 - C \int_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}_k} \exp(2(1 + \epsilon)(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k)^2) \bar{v}_k^{-2} dx \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{v}_k\|^2 - C \left(\int_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}_k} \exp(4(1 + \epsilon)(\bar{w} + \tilde{\theta}\bar{v}_k)^2) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}_k} \bar{v}_k^{-4} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{v}_k\|^2 - C |\bar{\mathcal{S}}_k| \|\bar{v}_k\|^2 \geq 0, \quad \text{for large } k \in \mathbb{N},
 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line of the above estimation, we used Theorem 1.1, (3.31) and (3.30). Similarly, from (3.29), we can show that $B_k \geq 0$ for sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus from (3.27), for large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it yields that

$$J_\lambda(w_k) \geq J_\lambda(w_\lambda),$$

which is a contradiction to (3.26). Hence, w_λ is a local minimum of J_λ over $H_0^1(\Omega)$. \square

The next result is a consequence of Lemma 3.6, which yields that at the threshold level of λ , that is $\lambda = \Lambda^*$, we have a weak solution to (2.7).

Proposition 3.7. *Let the conditions in Theorem 1.3 be satisfied and let h be defined as in (2.2). Then for $\lambda = \Lambda^*$, (2.7) admits a weak solution in $H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$.*

Proof. From the definition of Λ^* , there exists a increasing sequence $\{\lambda_k\} \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\lambda_k \uparrow \Lambda^*$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Hence, by Lemma 3.5, $\{w_{\lambda_k}\} \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega) \cap Y_{\lambda_k}$ is a sequence of positive weak solutions to (2.7) with $\lambda = \lambda_k$. Therefore,

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{\lambda_k}|^2 dx - \lambda_k \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_{\lambda_k})^{-q} h'(w_{\lambda_k}) w_{\lambda_k} dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_{\lambda_k})) h'(w_{\lambda_k}) w_{\lambda_k} dx = 0. \quad (3.33)$$

Let $\underline{w}_{\lambda_k} := c(\lambda_k) \varphi_{1,\Omega}$ denote the sub-solution to (2.7) for $\lambda = \lambda_k$ as described in previous lemmas. So, using (3.22) and Lemma 2.1-(h_4), from (1.4) with $\rho = \alpha$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \underline{w}_{\lambda_k}|^2 dx &= \lambda_{1,\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) \underline{w}_{\lambda_k}^2 dx \\
 &\leq \lambda_k \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(\underline{w}_{\lambda_k})^{-q} h'(\underline{w}_{\lambda_k}) \underline{w}_{\lambda_k} dx \leq \lambda_k \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(\underline{w}_{\lambda_k})^{1-q} dx. \quad (3.34)
 \end{aligned}$$

Now Lemma 3.6 yields that w_{λ_k} forms the local minimizer of J_{λ_k} for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ as shown in Lemma 3.6. So,

$$J_{\lambda_k}(w_{\lambda_k}) = \min_{w \in Y_{\lambda_k}} J_{\lambda_k}(w) \leq J_{\lambda_k}(\underline{w_{\lambda_k}}) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \underline{w_{\lambda_k}}|^2 dx - \lambda \frac{1}{1-q} \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) |h(\underline{w_{\lambda_k}})|^{1-q} dx & \text{if } q \neq 1; \\ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \underline{w_{\lambda_k}}|^2 dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) \log |h(\underline{w_{\lambda_k}})| dx & \text{if } q = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.35)$$

Plugging (3.34) in (3.35), we get

$$J_{\lambda_k}(w_{\lambda_k}) \leq \beta_k := \begin{cases} \lambda_k \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{1-q} \right) \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) |h(\underline{w_{\lambda_k}})|^{1-q} dx & \text{if } q \neq 1; \\ \frac{\lambda_k}{2} \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) dx - \lambda_k \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) \log |h(\underline{w_{\lambda_k}})| dx & \text{if } q = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.36)$$

Now for all $0 < q < 3$, since $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_k \leq \dots \leq \Lambda^*$, from (3.20) and (3.21) and (3.23), we infer that

$$\sup_k \beta_k < +\infty. \quad (3.37)$$

Case-I: $0 < q < 1$.

Now (3.33) and (3.36) combining with Lemma 2.1-(h₄) and (f5) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_k + \lambda_k \left(\frac{1}{1-q} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) |h(w_{\lambda_k})|^{1-q} dx &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_{\lambda_k})) h'(w_{\lambda_k}) w_{\lambda_k} dx - \int_{\Omega} F(x, h(w_{\lambda_k})) dx \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{\tau} \right) \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_{\lambda_k})) h(w_{\lambda_k}) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

Plugging (3.38) and (3.37) in (3.33) and using Lemma 2.1-(h₄), (h₅) together with the fact that $\tau > 4$ and Sobolev embedding ($H_0^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{1-q}(\Omega)$), we obtain

$$\|w_{\lambda_k}\|^2 = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{\lambda_k}|^2 dx \leq C_1 + C_2 \Lambda^* \int_{\Omega} h(w_{\lambda_k})^{1-q} dx \leq C_1 + C_2 \Lambda^* \int_{\Omega} w_{\lambda_k}^{1-q} dx \leq C_1 + C_3 \|w_{\lambda_k}\|^{1-q}. \quad (3.39)$$

Case-II: $q = 1$.

Again using (3.33), (3.36), Lemma 2.1-(h₄) and (f5) combining with the inequality $\log h(s) \leq \log s < s$, for $s > 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_k + \lambda_k \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) w_{\lambda_k} &\geq \beta_k + \lambda_k \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) \log w_{\lambda_k} \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda_k}{2} \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_{\lambda_k})^{-1} h'(w_{\lambda_k}) w_{\lambda_k} + \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{\tau} \right) \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_{\lambda_k})) h(w_{\lambda_k}) dx \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda_k}{4} \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) dx + \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{\tau} \right) \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_{\lambda_k})) h(w_{\lambda_k}) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

This gives that

$$\beta_k + \frac{3}{4} \lambda_k \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) \geq \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{\tau} \right) \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_{\lambda_k})) h(w_{\lambda_k}) dx. \quad (3.41)$$

Using (3.41) and (3.37), from (3.33), we deduce

$$\|w_{\lambda_k}\|^2 \leq C_6(\beta_k + \Lambda^* \|\alpha\|_\infty \|w_{\lambda_k}\| + \|\alpha\|_\infty |\Omega|). \quad (3.42)$$

Case-III: $1 < q < 3$.

Form (3.38), it follows that

$$\left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{\tau}\right) \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_{\lambda_k})) h(w_{\lambda_k}) \, dx \leq \beta_k + \lambda_k \left(\frac{1}{q-1} + \frac{1}{2}\right) \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) |h(w_{\lambda_k})|^{1-q} \, dx.$$

Employing this in (3.33), recalling Lemma 2.1-(h₈) and using (3.21), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{\lambda_k}\|^2 &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{\lambda_k}|^2 \leq C_1 + C_4 \Lambda^* \int_{\Omega} h(w_{\lambda_k})^{1-q} \, dx \\ &\leq C_1 + C_4 h(1)^{1-q} \Lambda^* \int_{\Omega} w_{\lambda_k}^{1-q} \, dx \\ &\leq C_1 + C_5 \int_{\Omega} \frac{w_{\lambda_k}^{1-q}}{\underline{w}_{\lambda_k}} \, dx \\ &\leq C_1 + C_5 c_2(q, \lambda_2) \int_{\Omega} \delta^{\frac{2(1-q)}{1+q}} \, dx < +\infty, \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

since $\frac{2(1-q)}{1+q} > -1$.

Thus, each of the expressions in (3.39), (3.43), (3.42) from Case-I, II, III, respectively, yields that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \|w_{\lambda_k}\| < +\infty.$$

Therefore, up to a sub-sequence, there exists $w_{\Lambda^*} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $w_{\lambda_k} \rightharpoonup w_{\Lambda^*}$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $w_{\lambda_k}(x) \rightarrow w_{\Lambda^*}(x)$ a.e. in Ω as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Also, by construction, it follows that $w_{\lambda_k} \geq \underline{w}_{\lambda_k} \geq \underline{w}_{\lambda_1}$. So,

$$w_{\Lambda^*}(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} w_{\lambda_k}(x) > \underline{w}_{\lambda_1}(x) > 0 \text{ a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Thus, by Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, for any $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} h(w_{\lambda_k})^{-q} h'(w_{\lambda_k}) \phi \, dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} h(w_{\Lambda^*})^{-q} h'(w_{\Lambda^*}) \phi \, dx \text{ as } k \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (3.44)$$

Since w_{λ_k} is a weak solution to (2.7) for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla w_{\lambda_k} \nabla \phi \, dx - \lambda_k \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_{\lambda_k})^{-q} h'(w_{\lambda_k}) \phi \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_{\lambda_k})) h'(w_{\lambda_k}) \phi \, dx = 0 \text{ for any } \phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega). \quad (3.45)$$

Letting $k \rightarrow +\infty$, from (3.44) and (3.45), we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_{\lambda_k})) h'(w_{\lambda_k}) \phi \, dx < +\infty.$$

This implies

$$\int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_{\lambda_k})) h'(w_{\lambda_k}) \phi \, dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_{\Lambda^*})) h'(w_{\Lambda^*}) \phi \, dx \text{ as } k \rightarrow +\infty,$$

thanks to Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem. Gathering all these facts, finally we infer that $w_{\Lambda^*} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is a positive weak solution to (2.7). Moreover, in light of Lemma 3.2, we have $w_{\Lambda^*} \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$. Hence, the proof of the proposition is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3: Combining Lemma 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.6 along with Proposition 3.5, 3.7, we infer that $w_\lambda \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to (2.7). Now by Lemma 2.1-(h_1), we have h is a C^∞ function and Lemma 2.1-(h_8), (h_{11}) ensure that $h(s)$ behaves like s when s is close to 0. Therefore, we can conclude that $h(w_\lambda) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$ forms a weak solution to the problem (P_*).

4 Proof of Theorem 1.4 : Multiplicity result

This section is dedicated toward establishing the existence of second solution of (2.7) using the mountain pass lemma in combination with Ekeland variational principle. Let us define the set

$$T := \{w \in H_0^1(\Omega) : w \geq w_\lambda \text{ a.e. in } \Omega\}.$$

Since w_λ forms a local minimizer for J_λ , we get that $J_\lambda(w) \geq J_\lambda(w_\lambda)$ whenever $\|w_\lambda - w\| \leq \sigma_0$, for some small constant $\sigma_0 > 0$. Then, one of the following cases holds:

(ZA) (**Zero Altitude**): $\inf\{J_\lambda(w) \mid w \in T, \|w - w_\lambda\| = \sigma\} = J_\lambda(w_\lambda)$ for all $\sigma \in (0, \sigma_0)$.

(MP) (**Mountain Pass**): There exists a $\sigma_1 \in (0, \sigma_0)$ such that $\inf\{J_\lambda(w) \mid w \in T, \|w - w_\lambda\| = \sigma_1\} > J_\lambda(w_\lambda)$.

Now for the case (ZA), inspired by [18] and [2], we prove the existence of second weak solution to (2.7) in the following result.

Proposition 4.1. *Let the conditions in Theorem 1.4 hold and let $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda^*)$. Suppose that (ZA) holds. Then (2.7) admits a second solution $v_\lambda \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$ such that $v_\lambda \geq w_\lambda$ and $\|v_\lambda - w_\lambda\| = \sigma$ for all $\sigma \in (0, \sigma_0)$.*

Proof. Let us fix $\sigma \in (0, \sigma_0)$ and $r > 0$ such that $\sigma - r > 0$ and $\sigma + r < \sigma_0$. Define the set

$$\mathcal{A} := \{w \in T : 0 < \sigma - r \leq \|w - w_\lambda\| \leq \sigma + r\}.$$

Clearly \mathcal{A} is closed in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and by (ZA), $\inf_{w \in \mathcal{A}} J_\lambda(w) = J_\lambda(w_\lambda)$. So, for any minimizing sequence $\{w_k\} \subset \mathcal{A}$ satisfying $\|w_k - w_\lambda\| = \sigma$, by Ekeland variational principle, we get another sequence $\{v_k\} \subset \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} J_\lambda(v_k) & \leq J_\lambda(w_k) \leq J_\lambda(w_\lambda) + \frac{1}{k} \\ \|w_k - v_k\| & \leq \frac{1}{k} \\ J_\lambda(v_k) & \leq J_\lambda(v) + \frac{1}{k}\|v - v_k\| \text{ for all } v \in \mathcal{A}. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

For $z \in T$, we can choose $\epsilon > 0$ small enough so that $v_k + \epsilon(z - v_k) \in \mathcal{A}$. So, from (4.1), we obtain

$$\frac{J_\lambda(v_k + \epsilon(z - v_k)) - J_\lambda(v_k)}{\epsilon} \geq -\frac{1}{k}\|z - v_k\|.$$

Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, using the fact that $v_k \geq w_\lambda$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and following the similar arguments as in (2.5) and (2.6) for the singular term in the last relation, we obtain

$$-\frac{1}{k}\|z - v_k\| \leq \int_\Omega \nabla v_k \nabla(z - v_k) \, dx - \lambda \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(v_k)^{-q} h'(v_k)(z - v_k) \, dx - \int_\Omega f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k)(z - v_k) \, dx \quad (4.2)$$

for all $z \in T$. Since $\{v_k\}$ is a bounded sequence in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, there exists $v_\lambda \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that, up to a sub-sequence, $v_k \rightharpoonup v_\lambda$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and point-wise a.e. in Ω as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. As $v_k \geq w_\lambda$ for each k , we have that $v_\lambda \geq w_\lambda$ a.e. in Ω .

Claim: v_λ is a weak solution to (2.7).

For $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we set

$$\psi_{k,\epsilon} := (v_k + \epsilon\phi - w_\lambda)^-, \quad \psi_\epsilon := (v_\lambda + \epsilon\phi - w_\lambda)^-.$$

Clearly, $\psi_{k,\epsilon} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. This gives that $(v_k + \epsilon\phi + \psi_{k,\epsilon}) \in T$. Taking $z = v_k + \epsilon\phi + \psi_{k,\epsilon}$ in (4.2), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{k} \|(\epsilon\phi + \psi_{k,\epsilon})\| &\leq \int_{\Omega} \nabla v_k \nabla (\epsilon\phi + \psi_{k,\epsilon}) - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_k)^{-q} h'(v_k) (\epsilon\phi + \psi_{k,\epsilon}) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) (\epsilon\phi + \psi_{k,\epsilon}) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Note that $|\psi_{k,\epsilon}| \leq w_\lambda + \epsilon|\phi|$. Hence, using the Sobolev embedding and Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, $\psi_{k,\epsilon} \rightarrow \psi_\epsilon$ in $L^p(\Omega)$, $p \in [1, +\infty)$; $\psi_{k,\epsilon} \rightharpoonup \psi_\epsilon$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\psi_{k,\epsilon}(x) \rightarrow \psi_\epsilon(x)$ point-wise a.e. in Ω . Now using Lemma 2.1-(h₁₃), we obtain

$$\alpha(x) h(v_k)^{-q} h'(v_k) (\epsilon\phi + \psi_{k,\epsilon}) \leq \|\alpha\|_{\infty} h(v_\lambda)^{-q} h'(v_\lambda) (v_\lambda + 2\epsilon|\phi|).$$

Furthermore, using the fact that both h and $f(x, \cdot)$ are non decreasing functions, we get

$$f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) (\epsilon\phi + \psi_{k,\epsilon}) \leq f(x, h(w_\lambda + \epsilon|\phi|)) (w_\lambda + \epsilon|\phi|).$$

Hence, employing Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, we infer

$$\int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_k)^{-q} h'(v_k) (\epsilon\phi + \psi_{k,\epsilon}) dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_\lambda)^{-q} h'(v_\lambda) (\epsilon\phi + \psi_\epsilon) dx, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) (\epsilon\phi + \psi_{k,\epsilon}) dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_\lambda)) h'(v_\lambda) (\epsilon\phi + \psi_\epsilon) dx. \quad (4.5)$$

We define the sets

$$\Omega_{k,\epsilon} := \text{supp } \psi_{k,\epsilon}, \quad \Omega_\epsilon := \text{supp } \psi_\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_0 := \{x \in \Omega : v_\lambda(x) := w_\lambda(x)\}.$$

Then,

$$|\Omega_\epsilon \setminus \Omega_0| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0; \quad (4.6)$$

$$|\Omega_{k,\epsilon} \setminus \Omega_\epsilon| + |\Omega_\epsilon \setminus \Omega_{k,\epsilon}| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (4.7)$$

Therefore, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \nabla v_k \nabla \psi_{k,\epsilon} dx &= \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \nabla v_k \nabla \psi_\epsilon dx - \int_{\Omega_{k,\epsilon}} |\nabla(v_k - v_\lambda)|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_{k,\epsilon}} \nabla v_\lambda \nabla (v_\lambda - v_k) dx + o(1) \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \nabla v_k \nabla \psi_\epsilon dx + \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \nabla v_\lambda \nabla (v_\lambda - v_k) dx + o(1) = \int_{\Omega} \nabla v_k \nabla \psi_\epsilon dx + o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Combining (4.3), (4.4), (4.5), (4.6), (4.7) and (4.8), letting $k \rightarrow +\infty$ and using Lemma 2.1-(h₁₃), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega} \nabla v_{\lambda} \nabla \phi \, dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_{\lambda})^{-q} h'(v_{\lambda}) \phi \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_{\lambda})) h'(v_{\lambda}) \phi \, dx \\
 & \geq -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left[\int_{\Omega} \nabla v_{\lambda} \nabla \psi_{\epsilon} \, dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_{\lambda})^{-q} h'(v_{\lambda}) \psi_{\epsilon} \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_{\lambda})) h'(v_{\lambda}) \psi_{\epsilon} \, dx \right] \\
 & = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left[\int_{\Omega} -\nabla(v_{\lambda} - w_{\lambda}) \nabla \psi_{\epsilon} \, dx + \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) [h(v_{\lambda})^{-q} h'(v_{\lambda}) - h(w_{\lambda})^{-q} h'(w_{\lambda})] \psi_{\epsilon} \, dx \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \int_{\Omega} [f(x, h(v_{\lambda})) h'(v_{\lambda}) - f(x, h(w_{\lambda})) h'(w_{\lambda})] \psi_{\epsilon} \, dx \right] \\
 & = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left[\int_{\Omega_{\epsilon}} -\nabla(v_{\lambda} - w_{\lambda}) \nabla(w_{\lambda} - v_{\lambda} - \epsilon \phi) \, dx \right. \\
 & \quad + \lambda \int_{\Omega_{\epsilon}} \alpha(x) [h(v_{\lambda})^{-q} h'(v_{\lambda}) - h(w_{\lambda})^{-q} h'(w_{\lambda})] (w_{\lambda} - v_{\lambda} - \epsilon \phi) \, dx \\
 & \quad \left. + \int_{\Omega_{\epsilon}} [f(x, h(v_{\lambda})) h'(v_{\lambda}) - f(x, h(w_{\lambda})) h'(w_{\lambda})] (w_{\lambda} - v_{\lambda} - \epsilon \phi) \, dx \right] \\
 & = \int_{\Omega_{\epsilon}} \nabla(v_{\lambda} - w_{\lambda}) \nabla \phi \, dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega_{\epsilon}} \alpha(x) [h(v_{\lambda})^{-q} h'(v_{\lambda}) - h(w_{\lambda})^{-q} h'(w_{\lambda})] \phi \, dx \\
 & \quad - \int_{\Omega_{\epsilon}} [f(x, h(v_{\lambda})) h'(v_{\lambda}) - f(x, h(w_{\lambda})) h'(w_{\lambda})] \phi \, dx \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega_{\epsilon}} [f(x, h(v_{\lambda})) h'(v_{\lambda}) - f(x, h(w_{\lambda})) h'(w_{\lambda})] (w_{\lambda} - v_{\lambda}) \, dx. \tag{4.9}
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $v_{\lambda} \geq w_{\lambda}$, using Lemma 2.1-(h₉) and mean value theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & [f(x, h(v_{\lambda})) h'(v_{\lambda}) - f(x, h(w_{\lambda})) h'(w_{\lambda})] (w_{\lambda} - v_{\lambda}) \, dx \\
 & \geq -(v_{\lambda} - w_{\lambda})^2 [f'(x, h(\xi_{\lambda})) (h'(\xi_{\lambda}))^2 + f(x, h(\xi_{\lambda})) h''(\xi_{\lambda})], \quad \xi_{\lambda} \in (w_{\lambda}, v_{\lambda}) \\
 & \geq -\epsilon^2 f'(x, h(\xi_{\lambda})) \phi^2. \tag{4.10}
 \end{aligned}$$

Plugging (4.10) into (4.9), letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ and using (4.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega} \nabla v_{\lambda} \nabla \phi \, dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_{\lambda})^{-q} h'(v_{\lambda}) \phi \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_{\lambda})) h'(v_{\lambda}) \phi \, dx \\
 & \geq o(1) - \epsilon \int_{\Omega_{\epsilon}} f'(x, h(\xi_{\lambda})) \phi^2 \, dx = o(1).
 \end{aligned}$$

Considering $-\phi$ in place of ϕ and arguing similarly as above, we get the reverse inequality in the last relation. Therefore,

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla v_{\lambda} \nabla \phi \, dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_{\lambda})^{-q} h'(v_{\lambda}) \phi \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_{\lambda})) h'(v_{\lambda}) \phi \, dx = 0$$

for all $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. So, $v_{\lambda} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to (2.7) and thus, the claim is proved. Moreover, by Lemma 3.2, $v_{\lambda} \in C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$.

Now we show that $v_{\lambda} \neq w_{\lambda}$. For that, it is enough to prove that

$$v_k \rightarrow v_{\lambda} \quad \text{in } H_0^1(\Omega) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty. \tag{4.11}$$

Applying Brézis-Lieb lemma, we get

$$\|v_k\|^2 - \|v_k - v_\lambda\|^2 = \|v_\lambda\|^2 + o(1).$$

Putting $z = v_\lambda$ in (4.2) and using the fact that $v_k \rightharpoonup v_\lambda$ in T as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla(v_k - v_\lambda)|^2 dx \leq o(1) - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_k)^{-q} h'(v_k) (v_\lambda - v_k) dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) (v_\lambda - v_k) dx. \quad (4.12)$$

Let us denote $u_k := \frac{v_k - w_\lambda}{\|v_k - w_\lambda\|}$. Now recalling (f3) and (3.1) for any $\epsilon > 0$, Lemma 2.1-(h₃), (h₄), (h₅) and using Hölder's inequality, for some large $N \gg 1$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega \cap \{x : v_k(x) > N\}} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega \cap \{x : v_k(x) > N\}} \exp((1 + \epsilon) h(v_k)^4) h'(v_k) v_k dx \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega \cap \{x : v_k(x) > N\}} \exp(2(1 + \epsilon) v_k^2) v_k dx \\ & \leq C \int_{\Omega \cap \{x : v_k(x) > N\}} \exp(3(1 + \epsilon) v_k^2) dx \\ & = C \int_{\Omega \cap \{x : v_k(x) > N\}} \exp(-(1 + \epsilon) v_k^2) \exp(4(1 + \epsilon)(v_k - w_\lambda + w_\lambda)^2) dx \\ & \leq C \exp(-(1 + \epsilon) N^2) \int_{\Omega \cap \{x : v_k(x) > N\}} \exp(8(1 + \epsilon)[(v_k - w_\lambda)^2 + w_\lambda^2]) dx \\ & \leq C \exp(-(1 + \epsilon) N^2) \int_{\Omega \cap \{x : v_k(x) > N\}} \exp(8(1 + \epsilon) u_k^2 \|v_k - w_\lambda\|^2) \exp(8(1 + \epsilon) w_\lambda^2) dx \\ & \leq C \exp(-(1 + \epsilon) N^2) \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{x : v_k(x) > N\}} \exp(8p(1 + \epsilon) u_k^2 \|v_k - w_\lambda\|^2) dx \right)^{1/p} \\ & \quad \left(\int_{\Omega} \exp(8p'(1 + \epsilon) w_\lambda^2) dx \right)^{1/p'} \\ & \leq C \exp(-(1 + \epsilon) N^2) \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{x : v_k(x) > N\}} \exp(8p(1 + \epsilon) u_k^2 (\sigma + r)^2) dx \right)^{1/p} \\ & \quad \left(\int_{\Omega} \exp(8p'(1 + \epsilon) w_\lambda^2) dx \right)^{1/p'}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Now choosing $p > 1$ and $\sigma_0 > 0$ appropriately small so that $8(1 + \epsilon)p(\sigma + r) < 8(1 + \epsilon)p\sigma_0 < 4\pi$ and then, applying Theorem 1.1, from (4.13), we infer that

$$\int_{\Omega \cap \{x : v_k(x) > N\}} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx = O(\exp(-(1 + \epsilon) N^2)). \quad (4.14)$$

Since $f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k \rightarrow f(x, h(v_\lambda)) h'(v_\lambda) v_\lambda$ point-wise a.e. in Ω as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, using (4.14) and

applying Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k))h'(v_k)v_k \, dx &= \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: v_k \leq N\}} f(x, h(v_k))h'(v_k)v_k \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: v_k > N\}} f(x, h(v_k))h'(v_k)v_k \, dx \\
 &= \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: v_k \leq N\}} f(x, h(v_k))h'(v_k)v_k \, dx + O(\exp(-(1+\epsilon)N^2)) \\
 &\rightarrow \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_{\lambda}))h'(v_{\lambda})v_{\lambda} \, dx \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty \text{ and } N \rightarrow +\infty.
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

In a similar way, we also have $\int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k))h'(v_k)v_k \, dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k))h'(v_k)v_{\lambda} \, dx$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. This combining with (4.15) implies that

$$\int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k))h'(v_k)(v_k - v_{\lambda}) \, dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty. \tag{4.16}$$

Next, we show that

$$\int_{\Omega} \alpha(x)h(v_k)^{-q}h'(v_k)(v_{\lambda} - v_k) \, dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty. \tag{4.17}$$

By the construction, we have $v_k, v_{\lambda} \geq w_{\lambda} \geq \underline{w}_{\lambda}$. We consider three cases separately.

Case I: $0 < q < 1$. By (3.20) and the fact that $v_{\lambda} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$, using Lemma 2.1-(h₁₃), (h₃), (h₈), we get

$$h(v_k)^{-q}h'(v_k)v_{\lambda} \leq h(\underline{w}_{\lambda})^{-q}h'(\underline{w}_{\lambda})v_{\lambda} \leq h(1)^{-q}\underline{w}_{\lambda}^{-q}v_{\lambda} \leq C(\lambda)\delta^{-q}v_{\lambda} \in L^1(\Omega). \tag{4.18}$$

Moreover, by Lemma 2.1-(h₃), (h₄), it follows that

$$h(v_k)^{-q}h'(v_k)v_k \leq h(v_k)^{1-q} \leq v_k^{1-q} \in L^1(\Omega) \tag{4.19}$$

due to the continuous embedding $H_0^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{1-q}(\Omega)$. Therefore, by Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, combining (4.18) and (4.19), we get (4.17).

Case II: $q = 1$. Again using the fact that $v_{\lambda} \in C_{\varphi_q}^+$ and $1 > \underline{w}_{\lambda} > C_1\delta > 0$, together with Lemma 2.1-(h₁₃), (h₃), (h₈), there exists some $c > 0$ such that

$$h(v_k)^{-1}h'(v_k)v_{\lambda} \leq h(\underline{w}_{\lambda})^{-1}h'(\underline{w}_{\lambda})c\varphi_{1,\Omega} \left(\log \left(\frac{1}{c\varphi_{1,\Omega}} \right) \right)^{1/2} \leq h(1)^{-1}\underline{w}_{\lambda}^{-1}(c\varphi_{1,\Omega})^{1/2} \leq C\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \in L^1(\Omega) \tag{4.20}$$

and hence, (4.17) follows, thanks to Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem.

Case III: $1 < q < 3$. Recalling (3.21) and the fact that $v_{\lambda} \in C_{\varphi_q}^+$, by Lemma 2.1-(h₁₃), (h₃), (h₈), it yields that

$$h(v_k)^{-q}h'(v_k)v_{\lambda} \leq h(\underline{w}_{\lambda})^{-q}h'(\underline{w}_{\lambda})v_{\lambda} \leq h(1)^{-q}\underline{w}_{\lambda}^{-q}v_{\lambda} \leq C(\lambda)\delta^{\frac{2(1-q)}{1+q}} \in L^1(\Omega) \tag{4.21}$$

since $\frac{2(1-q)}{1+q} > -1$. Again, by Lemma 2.1-(h₄), (h₈) and using the facts that $h(s)$ is non decreasing in $s > 0$ and $h^{1-q}(s)$ is non increasing in $s > 0$ for $q > 1$, it follows that

$$h(v_k)^{-q}h'(v_k)v_k \leq h(v_k)^{1-q} \leq h(\underline{w}_{\lambda})^{1-q} \leq h(1)^{1-q}\underline{w}_{\lambda}^{1-q} \leq C(\lambda)\delta^{\frac{2(1-q)}{1+q}} \in L^1(\Omega). \tag{4.22}$$

Thus, (4.21) and (4.22) combining with Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem give (4.17).

Therefore, taking into account (4.16) and (4.17), from (4.12), we finally get (4.11). This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

Now we prove the existence of second solution in the case where (MP) occurs.

Now for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the Moser function $\mathcal{M}_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\mathcal{M}_k(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \begin{cases} (\log k)^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } 0 \leq |x| \leq \frac{1}{k}, \\ \frac{\log\left(\frac{1}{|x|}\right)}{(\log k)^{\frac{1}{2}}} & \text{if } \frac{1}{k} \leq |x| \leq 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } |x| \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Then, $\mathcal{M}_k \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\text{supp } \mathcal{M}_k \subseteq B_1$. Moreover, we define the function

$$\mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x) := \mathcal{M}_k\left(\frac{x - x_0}{\ell}\right).$$

We choose x_0 and ℓ is such a way so that $\text{supp } \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \subset \Omega$. Note that $\|\mathcal{M}_k^\ell\| = 1$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let the conditions in Theorem 1.4 and (MP) hold. Then*

(i) $J_\lambda(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ uniformly for k large.

(ii) $\sup_{t \geq 0} J_\lambda(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell) < J_\lambda(w_\lambda) + \pi$ for large k .

Proof. We prove this lemma for the case $q \neq 1$. When $q = 1$, the proof follows similarly.

(i). By (f3), there exist two positive constants C_1, C_2 such that

$$F(x, s) \geq C_1 \exp(h(s)^4) - C_2$$

for all $x \in \Omega$, $s \geq 0$. Using this combining with Lemma 2.1-(h8) for large $t \gg 1$ and Hölder's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & J_\lambda(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |\nabla(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell)|^2 dx - \frac{\lambda}{1-q} \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{1-q} dx - \int_\Omega F(x, h(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|w_\lambda\|^2 + t \|w_\lambda\| \|\mathcal{M}_k^\ell\| + \frac{1}{2} t^2 \|\mathcal{M}_k^\ell\|^2 + C_2 |\Omega| - C_1 \int_\Omega \exp\left(h(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^4\right) dx \\ &\leq t^2 + C_3 t - \int_{B_{\frac{\ell}{k}}(x_0)} \exp\left(h(1)^4 (w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^2\right) dx \\ &\leq t^2 + C_3 t - C_4 \int_{B_{\frac{\ell}{k}}(x_0)} \exp\left(t^2 \frac{h(1)^4}{2\pi} \log k\right) dx \\ &= t^2 + C_3 t - C_4 k^{\frac{h(1)^4}{2\pi}} t^{2-2} \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{uniformly in } k \text{ as } t \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

(ii). Suppose (ii) does not hold. So, there exists a sub-sequence of $\{\mathcal{M}_k^\ell\}$, still denoted by $\{\mathcal{M}_k^\ell\}$, such that

$$\max_{t \geq 0} J_\lambda(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell) \geq J_\lambda(w_\lambda) + \pi. \tag{4.23}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 J_\lambda(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell) &= \frac{1}{2}\|w_\lambda\|^2 + t \int_\Omega \nabla w_\lambda \nabla \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \, dx + \frac{t^2}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{1-q} \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{1-q} \, dx \\
 &\quad - \int_\Omega F(x, h(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) \, dx \\
 &= J_\lambda(w_\lambda) + \frac{\lambda}{1-q} \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{1-q} \, dx + \int_\Omega F(x, h(w_\lambda)) \, dx \\
 &\quad + t\lambda \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda) \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \, dx + t \int_\Omega f(x, h(w_\lambda)) h'(w_\lambda) \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \, dx \\
 &\quad + \frac{t^2}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{1-q} \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{1-q} \, dx - \int_\Omega F(x, h(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) \, dx. \tag{4.24}
 \end{aligned}$$

From (i) and (4.23), it follows that there exists $t_k \in (0, +\infty)$ and $L_0 > 0$ satisfying $t_k \leq L_0$, such that

$$\max_{t \geq 0} J_\lambda(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell) = J_\lambda(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) \geq J_\lambda(w_\lambda) + \pi. \tag{4.25}$$

Now (4.24) and (4.25) yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\frac{\lambda}{1-q} \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{1-q} \, dx + \int_\Omega F(x, h(w_\lambda)) \, dx \\
 &\quad + t_k \lambda \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda) \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \, dx + t_k \int_\Omega f(x, h(w_\lambda)) h'(w_\lambda) \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \, dx \\
 &\quad + \frac{t_k^2}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{1-q} \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{1-q} \, dx - \int_\Omega F(x, h(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) \, dx \geq \pi.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using mean value theorem and Lemma 2.1-(h₉), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\frac{\lambda}{1-q} \left[\int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{1-q} \, dx - \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{1-q} \, dx \right] + t_k \lambda \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda) \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \, dx \\
 &= -\lambda t_k \left[\int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda + t_k \theta_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda + t_k \theta_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \, dx - \int_\Omega \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda) \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \, dx \right] \\
 &= -\lambda t_k^2 \theta_k \int_\Omega \alpha(x) |\mathcal{M}_k^\ell|^2 \left[-qh(w_\lambda + t_k \xi_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{-q-1} h'(w_\lambda + t_k \xi_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + h(w_\lambda + t_k \xi_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{-q} h''(w_\lambda + t_k \xi_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) \right] \\
 &= \lambda t_k^2 \theta_k \int_\Omega \alpha(x) |\mathcal{M}_k^\ell|^2 \left[qh(w_\lambda + t_k \xi_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{-q-1} h'(w_\lambda + t_k \xi_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + 2h(w_\lambda + t_k \xi_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{1-q} (h'(w_\lambda + t_k \xi_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell))^4 \right], \tag{4.26}
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta_k, \xi_k \in (0, 1)$. Now by Lemma 2.1-(h₃), (h₁₂),

$$2h(s)^{1-q} (h'(s))^4 = 2h(s)^{-1-q} (h(s)h'(s))^2 (h'(s))^2 \leq h(s)^{-1-q} h'(s).$$

Plugging this in (4.26) and again using Lemma 2.1-(h₁₃), (h₃), (h₈) together with the fact that

$w_\lambda + t_k \xi_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \geq \underline{w}_\lambda > 0$ in $B_{\frac{\ell}{k}}(x_0)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\lambda}{1-q} \left[\int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{1-q} dx - \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{1-q} dx \right] + t_k \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda) \mathcal{M}_k^\ell dx \\
& \leq \lambda t_k^2 \theta_k (q+1) \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) |\mathcal{M}_k^\ell|^2 h(w_\lambda + t_k \xi_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{-q-1} h'(w_\lambda + t_k \xi_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) dx \\
& \leq \lambda t_k^2 \theta_k (q+1) \|\alpha\|_\infty \int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{M}_k^\ell|^2 h(\underline{w}_\lambda)^{-q-1} h'(\underline{w}_\lambda) dx \\
& \leq \lambda t_k^2 \theta_k (q+1) \|\alpha\|_\infty (h(1))^{-1-q} \int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{M}_k^\ell|^2 \underline{w}_\lambda^{-q-1} dx = t_k^2 O\left(\frac{1}{\log k}\right). \tag{4.27}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, again using mean value theorem and Lemma 2.1-(h₉), (h₁₂), (h₃), we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
& t_k \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_\lambda)) h'(w_\lambda) \mathcal{M}_k^\ell dx + \int_{\Omega} F(x, h(w_\lambda)) dx - \int_{\Omega} F(x, h(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) dx \\
& = t_k \left[\int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_\lambda)) h'(w_\lambda) \mathcal{M}_k^\ell dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\theta}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) h'(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\theta}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) \mathcal{M}_k^\ell dx \right] \\
& = t_k^2 \int_{\Omega} -\tilde{\theta}_k |\mathcal{M}_k^\ell|^2 \left[f'(x, h(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) (h'(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell))^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + f(x, h(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) h''(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) \right] dx \\
& = t_k^2 \tilde{\theta}_k \int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{M}_k^\ell|^2 \left[-f'(x, h(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) (h'(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell))^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + 2f(x, h(w_\lambda + 2t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) h(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) (h'(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell))^4 \right] dx \\
& \leq t_k^2 \tilde{\theta}_k \int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{M}_k^\ell|^2 \left[-f'(x, h(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) (h'(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell))^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sqrt{2} f(x, h(w_\lambda + 2t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) h(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) h'(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) \right] dx \\
& \leq t_k^2 \tilde{\theta}_k \int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{M}_k^\ell|^2 \left[(\sqrt{2} - M_0) f'(x, h(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) + L \right] h'(w_\lambda + t_k \tilde{\xi}_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) dx \quad [\text{by (f4)}] \\
& \leq L t_k^2 \tilde{\theta}_k \int_{\Omega} |\mathcal{M}_k^\ell|^2 dx = t_k^2 O\left(\frac{1}{\log k}\right), \tag{4.28}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\theta}_k, \tilde{\xi}_k \in (0, 1)$. Now gathering (4.23), (4.27) and (4.28), it follows that $\frac{t_k^2}{2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\log k}\right) t_k^2 \geq \pi$. That is,

$$t_k^2 \geq 2\pi - O\left(\frac{1}{\log k}\right). \tag{4.29}$$

In virtue of the relation $\frac{d}{dt} J_\lambda(w_\lambda + t \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)|_{t=t_k} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& t_k^2 + t_k \int_{\Omega} \nabla w_\lambda \nabla \mathcal{M}_k^\ell dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^{-q} h'(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell dx \\
& = \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) h'(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell dx. \tag{4.30}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate the right hand side in (4.30) as following:

In light of the fact that $w_\lambda \geq C > 0$ on $B_{\frac{\ell}{k}}(x_0)$ combining with (f1) and Lemma 2.1-(h₁₀), (h₄), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) h'(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \, dx \\
 & \geq \int_{B_{\frac{\ell}{k}}(x_0)} f(x, h(C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) h'(C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \, dx \\
 & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{\frac{\ell}{k}}(x_0)} f(x, h(C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) h(C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) \frac{t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell}{C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell} \, dx.
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

By (f7), for any $b > 0$ there exists some constant $M_b > 0$ such that

$$f(x, h(C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) h(C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) > b \exp\left(h(C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^4\right) \quad \text{for all } t_k > M_b. \tag{4.32}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.1-(h₇), for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $m_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$h(C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^4 > (C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^2 (2 - \epsilon) \quad \text{for all } t_k \geq m_\epsilon. \tag{4.33}$$

Plugging (4.32) and (4.33) in (4.31) and using (4.29), for $t_k > \max\{M_b, m_\epsilon\}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{B_{\frac{\ell}{k}}(x_0)} f(x, h(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)) h'(w_\lambda + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell) t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell \, dx \\
 & \geq \frac{b}{2} \int_{B_{\frac{\ell}{k}}(x_0)} \exp(h(C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^4) \frac{t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell}{C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell} \, dx \\
 & \geq \frac{b}{2} \int_{B_{\frac{\ell}{k}}(x_0)} \exp((C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^2 (2 - \epsilon)) \frac{t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell}{C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell} \, dx \\
 & \geq \frac{b}{2} \frac{t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0)}{C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0)} \int_{B_{\frac{\ell}{k}}(x_0)} \exp((C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell)^2 (2 - \epsilon)) \, dx \\
 & = \frac{b}{2} \frac{t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0)}{C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0)} \exp\left(\left[C^2 + 2Ct_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0) + t_k^2 |M_k^\ell(x_0)|^2\right] (2 - \epsilon)\right) |B_{\frac{\ell}{k}}(x_0)| \\
 & = \frac{b}{2} \frac{t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0)}{C + t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0)} C_0 \exp\left(2Ct_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0) + t_k^2 |M_k^\ell(x_0)|^2\right) |B_{\frac{\ell}{k}}(x_0)| \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+ \\
 & = \frac{b}{2} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{C}{t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0)}} C_0 \pi \ell^2 \exp\left(2Ct_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0) + 2 \log k \left(\frac{t_k^2}{2\pi} - 1\right)\right) \\
 & \geq \frac{b}{2} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{C\sqrt{2\pi}}{t_k \sqrt{\log k}}} C_1 \pi \ell^2 \exp\left(2Ct_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0)\right).
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

Now incorporating (4.34) in (4.30) and using Hölder's inequality, we get

$$+\infty > C_2 := L_0^2 + \|w_\lambda\|_{L_0} \geq t_k^2 + \|w_\lambda\|_{t_k} \geq \frac{b}{2} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{C\sqrt{2\pi}}{t_k \sqrt{\log k}}} C_1 \pi \ell^2 \exp\left(2Ct_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0)\right).$$

Since t_k is bounded away from 0, $t_k \mathcal{M}_k^\ell(x_0) := C_3(\log k)^{1/2} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Hence, letting $k \rightarrow +\infty$ in the last relation, it yields that

$$C_2 \geq \frac{b}{2} C_1 \pi \ell^2.$$

This is absurd since, $b > 0$ is arbitrary. Hence, (ii) follows. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Next, we recall the following result due to P. L. Lions ([23]).

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\{u_k : \|u_k\| = 1\}$ be a sequence in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ converging weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ to a non zero function u . Then, for every $0 < p < (1 - \|u\|)^{-1}$*

$$\sup_k \int_{\Omega} \exp(4\pi p u_k^2) dx < +\infty.$$

Proposition 4.4. *Let the conditions in Theorem 1.4 hold and let $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda^*)$. Suppose that (MP) holds. Then (2.7) admits a second solution $v_{\lambda} \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$ satisfying $v_{\lambda} \geq w_{\lambda}$ and $\|v_{\lambda} - w_{\lambda}\| = \sigma_1$.*

Proof. First, we define the complete metric space

$$\Gamma := \{\eta \in C([0, 1], T) : \eta(0) = w_{\lambda}, \|\eta(1) - w_{\lambda}\| > \sigma_1, J_{\lambda}(\eta(1)) < J_{\lambda}(w_{\lambda})\}$$

with the metric

$$d(\eta, \tilde{\eta}) = \max_{t \in [0, 1]} \{\|\eta(t) - \tilde{\eta}(t)\|\} \quad \text{for all } \eta, \tilde{\eta} \in \Gamma.$$

Using Lemma 4.2-(i), we have $\Gamma \neq \emptyset$. Let us set

$$\gamma_0 = \inf_{\eta \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0, 1]} J_{\lambda}(\eta(t)).$$

Then, in light of Lemma 4.2-(ii) and the condition (MP), we obtain

$$J_{\lambda}(w_{\lambda}) < \gamma_0 \leq J_{\lambda}(w_{\lambda}) + \pi.$$

Set $\Phi(\eta) := \max_{t \in [0, 1]} J_{\lambda}(\eta(t))$ for $\eta \in \Gamma$. Then employing Ekeland's variational principle to the functional Φ on Γ , we get a sequence $\{\eta_k\} \subset \Gamma$ such that

$$\Phi(\eta_k) < \gamma_0 + \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(\eta_k) < \Phi(\eta) + \frac{1}{k} \|\Phi(\eta) - \Phi(\eta_k)\|_{\Gamma} \quad \text{for all } \eta \in \Gamma.$$

Again, applying Ekeland's variational principle to J_{λ} on Γ and arguing exactly similar to [4, Lemma 3.5], one can show that there exists a sequence $\{v_k\} \subset T$ such that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} J_{\lambda}(v_k) \rightarrow \gamma_0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty \\ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_k \nabla(w - v_k)|^2 dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_k)^{-q} h'(v_k)(w - v_k) dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k)(w - v_k) dx \\ \geq -\frac{C}{k}(1 + \|w\|) \quad \text{for all } w \in T. \end{array} \right. \quad (4.35)$$

Now choosing $w = 2v_k$ in (4.35), we get

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_k|^2 dx - \lambda_k \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_k)^{-q} h'(v_k) v_k dx - \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx \geq -\frac{C}{k}(1 + \|2v_k\|). \quad (4.36)$$

In virtue of Lemma 2.1-(h₄), from (4.36), we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_k|^2 dx - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_k)^{1-q} dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k)) h(v_k) dx \geq -\frac{C}{k}(1 + \|2v_k\|). \quad (4.37)$$

We claim that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \|v_k\| < +\infty. \quad (4.38)$$

For $0 < q < 1$, using (4.35), (4.37), (f5), Lemma 2.1-(h₅) and the Sobolev embedding, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0 + \frac{4C}{\tau} \|v_k\| + o(1) &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{\tau}\right) \|v_k\|^2 - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{1-q} - \frac{1}{\tau}\right) \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_k)^{1-q} dx \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} [\tau F(x, h(v_k)) - f(x, h(v_k)) h(v_k)] dx \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{\tau}\right) \|v_k\|^2 - \lambda C(q, \Omega) \left(\frac{1}{1-q} - \frac{1}{\tau}\right) \|\alpha\|_{\infty} \|v_k\|^{1-q} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.39)$$

Since $\tau > 4$ and $2 > 1 - q > 0$, the last relation yields that $\{v_k\}$ is bounded in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and hence, (4.38) holds.

Next, for $q = 1$, using (4.39) and following the arguments in similar way as in (3.40) and (3.41), we obtain (4.38).

Lastly, for the case $1 < q < 3$, again using (4.39) and the exact arguments in (3.43) used for estimating the singular term, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, we get

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{\tau}\right) \|v_k\|^2 \leq (1 + C) \|v_k\| + \gamma_0 + o(1),$$

which gives (4.38). Therefore, there exists a $v_{\lambda} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $v_k \rightharpoonup v_{\lambda}$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and point-wise a.e. in Ω as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Arguing similarly as in the proof of Proposition 4.1, we infer that v_{λ} is a weak solution to (2.7) and $v_{\lambda} \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$.

Claim: $v_{\lambda} \neq w_{\lambda}$.

In order to establish this claim, it is sufficient to prove that $v_k \rightarrow v_{\lambda}$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. For that, we need to establish

$$\int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_{\lambda})) h'(v_{\lambda}) v_{\lambda} dx \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (4.40)$$

Now borrowing the similar arguments used for showing (4.17), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_k)^{1-q} dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_{\lambda})^{1-q} dx \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (4.41)$$

Next, we show that

$$\int_{\Omega} F(x, h(v_k)) dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} F(x, h(v_{\lambda})) dx \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (4.42)$$

Since $\{v_k\}$ is bounded in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, from (4.37), it follows that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx < +\infty. \quad (4.43)$$

Now using (4.43) and Lemma 2.1-(h₈), for some large $N \gg 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: h(v_k)(x) > N\}} f(x, h(v_k)) \, dx &\leq \frac{1}{N} \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: h(v_k)(x) > N\}} f(x, h(v_k)) h(v_k) \, dx \\ &\leq \frac{2}{N} \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: h(v_k)(x) > N\}} 2f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This together with Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k)) \, dx &= \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: h(v_k)(x) \leq N\}} f(x, h(v_k)) \, dx + \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: h(v_k)(x) > N\}} f(x, h(v_k)) \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: h(v_k)(x) \leq N\}} f(x, h(v_k)) \, dx + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \\ &\rightarrow \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_\lambda)) \, dx, \end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ and $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Since by (f6), $F(x, v_k) \leq M_1(1 + f(x, v_k))$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, using (4.44) and Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, (4.42) follows. Therefore, combining (4.42) and (4.41) with the weak lower semicontinuity property of the norm, we achieve

$$J_\lambda(v_\lambda) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} J_\lambda(v_k). \tag{4.45}$$

Supposing the contrary, let us assume that $\{v_k\}$ does not converge in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ strongly. Then (4.42), (4.41) and (4.45) give that $J_\lambda(v_\lambda) < \gamma_0$. By the hypothesis, $J_\lambda(w_\lambda) \leq J_\lambda(v_\lambda)$. So, for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, by Lemma 4.2, we have

$$(\gamma_0 - J_\lambda(v_\lambda))(1 + \epsilon) < (\gamma_0 - J_\lambda(v_\lambda))(1 + \epsilon) \leq \left(\max_{t \in [0,1]} J(w_\lambda + t\mathcal{M}_k^\ell) - J_\lambda(w_\lambda) \right) (1 + \epsilon) < \pi. \tag{4.46}$$

Set

$$\zeta_0 := \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_k)^{1-q} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} F(x, h(v_k)) \, dx.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \|v_k\|^2 &= 2 \lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \left[J_\lambda(v_k) + \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) h(v_k)^{1-q} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} F(x, h(v_k)) \, dx \right] \\ &= 2(\gamma_0 + \zeta_0). \end{aligned} \tag{4.47}$$

Taking into account (4.46) and (4.47), we deduce

$$(1 + \epsilon) \|v_k\|^2 < \frac{2\pi(\gamma_0 + \zeta_0)}{\gamma_0 - J_\lambda(v_\lambda)} = \frac{2\pi(\gamma_0 + \zeta_0)}{\gamma_0 + \zeta_0 - \frac{1}{2}\|v_\lambda\|^2} = 2\pi \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\|v_\lambda\|^2}{\gamma_0 + \zeta_0} \right) \right)^{-1}.$$

Hence, we choose $r > 0$ such that $\frac{(1+\epsilon)}{2\pi} \|v_k\|^2 \leq p := \frac{r}{2\pi} < (1 - \|u_\lambda\|^2)^{-1}$, where $u_\lambda := \frac{v_\lambda}{(2(\gamma_0 + \zeta_0))^{1/2}}$. Also, note that $u_k := \frac{v_k}{\|v_k\|} \rightharpoonup \frac{v_\lambda}{(2(\gamma_0 + \zeta_0))^{1/2}} = u_\lambda$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore, using Theorem 4.3, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we deduce

$$\sup_k \int_{\Omega} \exp(4\pi p u_k^2) \, dx < +\infty.$$

This together with the fact that $p > \frac{(1+\epsilon)}{2\pi} \|v_k\|^2$ implies that

$$\sup_k \int_{\Omega} \exp(2(1+\epsilon)v_k^2) dx < +\infty. \quad (4.48)$$

Now using (f3), Lemma 2.1-(h₆) and (4.48), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: v_k(x) > N > 1\}} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx + \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: v_k(x) \leq N\}} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx \\ &= O \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{x: v_k(x) > N\}} \exp \left(\left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) h(v_k)^4 \right) dx \right) + \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: v_k(x) \leq N\}} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx \\ &= O \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{x: v_k(x) > N\}} \exp \left(2 \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) v_k^2 \right) dx \right) + \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: v_k(x) \leq N\}} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx \\ &= O \left(\exp(-\epsilon N^2) \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: v_k(x) > N\}} \exp(2(1+\epsilon)v_k^2) dx \right) + \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: v_k(x) \leq N\}} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx \\ &= O(\exp(-\epsilon N^2)) + \int_{\Omega \cap \{x: v_k(x) \leq N\}} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx \\ &\rightarrow \int_{\Omega} f(x, h(v_k)) h'(v_k) v_k dx, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty \text{ and } N \rightarrow +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem. Thus, we achieve (4.40). Hence, taking into account (4.41) and (4.40) and arguing as in the proof of Proposition 4.1, we can infer that $v_k \rightarrow v_k$ strongly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ and $v_{\lambda} \neq w_{\lambda}$. Hence, the claim is verified. Thus, the proof of the proposition follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4: From Proposition 4.4, 4.4, it follows that $v_{\lambda} \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to (2.7). Moreover, $v_{\lambda} \neq w_{\lambda}$, where w_{λ} is another weak solution to (2.7). Now by Lemma 2.1-(h₁), we have h is a C^∞ function and Lemma 2.1-(h₈), (h₁₁) ensure that $h(s)$ behaves like s when s is close to 0. Therefore, $h(v_{\lambda}) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$ forms a weak solution to the problem (P_*) and $h(v_{\lambda}) \neq h(w_{\lambda})$, where $h(w_{\lambda})$ is another solution to the problem (P_*) obtained in Theorem 1.3. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Remark 4.5. Consider the purely singular problem

$$-\Delta u - \Delta(u^2)u = \lambda\alpha(x)u^{-q} \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad (4.49)$$

where Ω is a smooth bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^2 , $0 < q < 3$ and $\alpha: \Omega \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ is a positive valued function such that $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then using the transformation $u = h(w)$, where h is defined in (2.2), we get the associated transformed problem

$$-\Delta w = \lambda\alpha(x)h(w)^{-q}h'(w) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad w > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad w = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \quad (4.50)$$

It can be checked that w is a solution to (4.50) if and only if $h(w)$ is a solution to (4.49). Now $\lambda\alpha(x)h(w)^{-q}h'(w)$ verifies the hypotheses of Proposition 4.1 in [2]. Hence, using [2, Proposition 4.1] (also

by [9]), we can infer that there exists a unique solution to (4.50), say \hat{w}_λ , such that $\hat{w}_\lambda \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C_{\varphi_q}^+(\Omega)$. Therefore, instead of using $\underline{w}_\lambda := c(\lambda)\varphi_{1,\Omega}$ as a sub-solution to (2.7), similar to [2], we can make use of \hat{w}_λ as a sub-solution to (4.50) and argue in a similar fashion as discussed above to prove Theorem 1.3, 1.4.

References

- [1] Adimurthi, *Existence of positive solutions of the semilinear Dirichlet problem with critical growth for the n -Laplacian*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci., 17 (1990), 393-413.
- [2] Adimurthi and J. Giacomoni, *Multiplicity of positive solutions for singular and critical elliptic problem in \mathbb{R}^2* , Commun. Contemp. Math., 8 (2006), 621-656.
- [3] A. Ambrosetti, H. Brézis and G. Cerami, *Combined effect of concave and convex nonlinearities in some elliptic problems*, J. Func. Anal., 122 (1994), 519-543.
- [4] M. Badiale and G. Tarantello, *Existence and multiplicity for elliptic problems with critical growths and discontinuous nonlinearities*, Nonlinear Anal., 29 (1997), 639-677.
- [5] K. Bal, P. Garain, I. Mandal and K. Sreenadh, *Multiplicity result to a singular quasilinear Schrödinger equation*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 497 (2021), 124904.
- [6] F. Bass and N. N. Nasanov, *Nonlinear electromagnetic-spin waves*, Phys. Rep. 189 (1990), 165-223.
- [7] H. Brézis and L. Nirenberg, *H^1 versus C^1 local minimizers*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., 317 (5) (1983), 465-472.
- [8] M. Colin and L. Jeanjean, *Solutions for a quasilinear Schrödinger equation: a dual approach*, Nonlinear Anal. 56 (2004), 213-226.
- [9] M. G. Crandall, P. H. Rabinowitz and L. Tartar, *On a Dirichlet problem with a singular nonlinearity*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 2 (1977), 193-222.
- [10] D. G. de Figueiredo, O. H. Miyagaki, and B. Ruf, *Elliptic equations in \mathbb{R}^2 with nonlinearities in the critical growth range*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 3 (1995), no. 2, 139-153.
- [11] J. M. do Ó, O. H. Miyagaki and S. H. M. Soares, *Soliton solutions for quasilinear Schrödinger equations: The critical exponential case*, Nonlinear Anal., 67 (2007), 3357-3372.
- [12] J. M. do Ó and U. Severo, *Solitary waves for a class of quasilinear Schrödinger equations in dimension two*, Calc. Var., 38 (2010), 275-315.
- [13] J. M. do Ó, O. H. Miyagaki and S. H. M. Soares, *Soliton solutions for quasilinear Schrödinger equations with critical growth*, J. Differential Equations, 248 (2010), 722-744.
- [14] R. Dhanya, S Prashanth, K. Sreenadh and S. Tiwari, *Critical growth elliptic problem in \mathbb{R}^2 with singular discontinuous nonlinearities*, Adv. Differ. Equ., 19 (2014), 409-440.

- [15] R. Dhanya, S. Prashanth, S. Tiwari and K. Sreenadh, Elliptic problems in \mathbb{R}^N with critical and singular discontinuous nonlinearities. *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.* 61 (2016), 1668–1688.
- [16] J. Giacomoni and K. Saoudi, *Multiplicity of positive solutions for a singular and critical problem*, *Nonlinear Anal.*, 71 (2009), 4060-4077.
- [17] R. W. Hasse, *A general method for the solution of nonlinear soliton and kink Schrödinger equation*, *Z. Phys., B* 37 (1980), 83-87.
- [18] Y. Haitao, *Multiplicity and asymptotic behavior of positive solutions for a singular semilinear elliptic problem*, *J. Differential Equations* 189 (2003), 487-512.
- [19] N. Hirano, C. Saccon and N. Shioji, *Existence of multiple positive solutions for singular elliptic problems with concave and convex nonlinearities*, *Adv. Differential Equations*, 9 (2004), 197-220.
- [20] Y. He and G. B. Li, *Concentrating soliton solutions for quasilinear Schrödinger equations involving critical Sobolev exponents*, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 36 (2016), 73-762.
- [21] L. Jeanjean, T. J. Luo and Z. Q. Wang, *Multiple normalized solutions for quasi-linear Schrödinger equations*, *J. Differential Equations*, 259 (2015), 3894-3928.
- [22] S. Kurihara, *Large-amplitude quasi-solitons in superfluids films*, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* 50 (1981) 3262-3267.
- [23] P. L. Lions, *The concentration compactness principle in the calculus of variations part-I*, *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 1 (1985), 185-201.
- [24] Q. Liu, X. Q. Liu and Z. Q. Wang, *Multiple sign-changing solutions for quasilinear elliptic equations via perturbation method*, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 39 (2014), 2216- 2239.
- [25] J. Q. Liu, Y. Q. Wang and Z. Q. Wang, *Solutions for quasilinear Schrödinger equations via the Nehari method*, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 29 (2004), 879-901.
- [26] J. Q. Liu and Z. Q. Wang, *Soliton solutions for quasilinear Schrödinger equations, I*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 131 (2003), 441-448.
- [27] X. Q. Liu, J. Q. Liu and Z. Q. Wang, *Quasilinear elliptic equations with critical growth via perturbation method*, *J. Differential Equations*, 254 (2013), 102-124.
- [28] J. Moser, *A sharp form of an inequality by N. Trudinger*, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 20 (1971), 1077-1092.
- [29] J. M. do Ó, A. Moameni, *Solutions for singular quasilinear Schrödinger equations with one parameter*, *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.* 9 (2010), no. 4, 1011-1023.
- [30] M. Poppenberg, K. Schmitt and Z. Q. Wang, *On the existence of soliton solutions to quasilinear Schrödinger equations*, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 14 (2002), 329-344.

- [31] B. Ritchie, *Relativistic self-focusing and channel formation in laser-plasma interactions*, Phys. Rev. E, 50 (1994), 687-689.
- [32] D. Ruiz and G. Siciliano, *Existence of ground states for a modified nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Nonlinearity, 23 (2010), 1221-1233.
- [33] G. Santos, G. M. Figueiredo and U. B. Severo, *Multiple solution for a class of singular quasilinear problems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 480 (2019), 123405.
- [34] C. A. Santos, M. Yang and J. Zhou, *Global multiplicity of solutions for a modified elliptic problem with singular terms*, Nonlinearity, 34 (2021), 7842-7871.