



HAL
open science

Asymptotics for the blow-up boundary solution of the logistic equation with absorption

Florica Cirstea, Vicentiu Radulescu

► **To cite this version:**

Florica Cirstea, Vicentiu Radulescu. Asymptotics for the blow-up boundary solution of the logistic equation with absorption. 2003. hal-00000189

HAL Id: hal-00000189

<https://hal.science/hal-00000189>

Preprint submitted on 13 Feb 2003

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Asymptotics for the blow-up boundary solution of the logistic equation with absorption*

Florica-Corina CÎRSTEA¹ and Vicențiu RĂDULESCU²

¹ School of Communications and Informatics, Victoria University of Technology, PO Box 14428,

Melbourne City MC, Victoria 8001, Australia

² Department of Mathematics, University of Craiova, 1100 Craiova, Romania

Scientific field: Équations aux dérivées partielles/ *Partial differential equations*

Abstract. Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain in \mathbf{R}^N . Assume that $f \geq 0$ is a C^1 -function on $[0, \infty)$ such that $f(u)/u$ is increasing on $(0, +\infty)$. Let a be a real number and let $b \geq 0$, $b \not\equiv 0$ be a continuous function such that $b \equiv 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. The purpose of this Note is to establish the asymptotic behaviour of the unique positive solution of the logistic problem $\Delta u + au = b(x)f(u)$ in Ω , subject to the singular boundary condition $u(x) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \rightarrow 0$. Our analysis is based on the Karamata regular variation theory.

Comportement asymptotique de la solution explosant au bord de l'équation logistique avec absorption

Résumé. Soit Ω un domaine borné et régulier de \mathbf{R}^N . On suppose que $0 \leq f \in C^1[0, \infty)$ est telle que $f(u)/u$ soit strictement croissante sur $(0, +\infty)$. Soit a un réel et $b \geq 0$, $b \not\equiv 0$, une fonction continue sur $\bar{\Omega}$ telle que $b \equiv 0$ sur $\partial\Omega$. Dans cette Note on établit le comportement asymptotique de l'unique solution positive du problème logistique $\Delta u + au = b(x)f(u)$ sur Ω avec la donnée au bord singulière $u(x) \rightarrow +\infty$ si $\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \rightarrow 0$. Notre analyse porte sur la théorie de la variation régulière de Karamata.

Version française abrégée. Soit $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^N$ ($N \geq 3$) un domaine borné et régulier, a un paramètre réel et $0 \not\equiv b \in C^{0,\mu}(\bar{\Omega})$, $b \geq 0$ dans Ω . On considère le problème logistique avec explosion au bord

$$\Delta u + au = b(x)f(u) \quad \text{dans } \Omega, \quad u(x) \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{si } d(x) := \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \rightarrow 0, \quad (1)$$

où $0 \leq f \in C^1[0, \infty)$ satisfait la condition de Keller–Osserman (voir [6, 7]) et telle que $f(u)/u$ soit strictement croissante sur $(0, +\infty)$. Soit $\Omega_0 := \text{int}\{x \in \Omega : b(x) = 0\}$. On suppose que $\partial\Omega_0$ est régulier (éventuellement vide), $\bar{\Omega}_0 \subset \Omega$ et $b > 0$ sur $\Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_0$. On désigne par $\lambda_{\infty,1}$ la première valeur propre de l'opérateur $(-\Delta)$ dans $H_0^1(\Omega_0)$, avec la convention $\lambda_{\infty,1} = +\infty$ si $\Omega_0 = \emptyset$. Dans [2] on

*The research of F. Cîrstea was done under the IPRS Programme funded by the Australian Government through DETYA. V. Rădulescu was supported by CNRS with a research visiting position at the Université de Savoie. E-mail addresses: florica@matilda.vu.edu.au (F. Cîrstea), vicrad@yahoo.com (V. Rădulescu).

montre que le problème (1) admet une solution positive u_a si et seulement si $a < \lambda_{\infty,1}$. L'unicité de la solution u_a est établie dans [1]. Soit \mathcal{K} l'ensemble des fonctions $k : (0, \nu) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ (pour un certain ν), de classe C^1 , croissantes, telles que $\lim_{t \searrow \lambda_0} (\int_0^t k(s) ds / k(t))^{(i)} := \ell_i$, pour $i = \overline{0,1}$.

Soit RV_q ($q \in \mathbf{R}$) l'ensemble des fonctions positives et mesurables $Z : [A, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ (avec $A > 0$) telles que $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} Z(\xi u) / Z(u) = \xi^q, \forall \xi > 0$. On désigne par NRV_q la classe des fonctions f définies par $f(u) = Cu^q \exp \left\{ \int_B^u \phi(t) / t dt \right\}, \forall u \geq B > 0$, où $C > 0$ et $\phi \in C[B, \infty)$ satisfait $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi(t) = 0$. Supposons que $0 \leq f \in C^1[0, \infty) \cap NRV_{\rho+1}$ ($\rho > 0$) est telle que $f(u)/u$ soit strictement croissante sur $(0, \infty)$ et que $b \equiv 0$ sur $\partial\Omega$ vérifie $b(x) = k^2(d)(1 + o(1))$ si $d(x) \rightarrow 0$, avec $k \in \mathcal{K}$. Alors, pour chaque $a < \lambda_{\infty,1}$, le problème (1) admet une unique solution positive u_a (voir [1]). Le but de cette Note est d'établir la vitesse d'explosion au bord de la solution u_a .

Pour chaque $\zeta > 0$, soit

$$\mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} k : k(u^{-1}) = d_0 u [\Lambda(u)]^{-1} \exp \left[- \int_{d_1}^u (s\Lambda(s))^{-1} ds \right] \quad (u \geq d_1), \quad 0 < \Lambda \in C^1[d_1, \infty), \\ \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(u) = \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} u\Lambda'(u) = 0, \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} u^{\zeta+1}\Lambda'(u) = \ell_* \in \mathbf{R}, \quad d_0, d_1 > 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

On a $\mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta} \subset \mathcal{K}$. De plus, si $k \in \mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta}$ alors $\ell_1 = 0$ et $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} k(t) = 0$.

On définit les classes $\mathcal{F}_{\rho\eta} = \{f \in NRV_{\rho+1} (\rho > 0) : \phi \in RV_\eta \text{ ou } -\phi \in RV_\eta\}$, si $\eta \in (-\rho - 2, 0]$ et $\mathcal{F}_{\rho 0, \tau} = \{f \in \mathcal{F}_{\rho 0} : \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} (\ln u)^\tau \phi(u) = \ell^* \in \mathbf{R}\}$, pour $\tau \in (0, \infty)$.

On démontre le résultat suivant.

THÉORÈME 1. - *On suppose que $b(x) = k^2(d)(1 + \tilde{c}d^\theta + o(d^\theta))$ si $d(x) \rightarrow 0$ (avec $\theta > 0, \tilde{c} \in \mathbf{R}$), où $k \in \mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta}$. Soit $0 \leq f \in C^1[0, \infty)$ telle que $f(u)/u$ soit strictement croissante sur $(0, \infty)$. De plus, on suppose que f satisfait l'un des cas suivants de croissance à l'infini:*

- (i) $f(u) = Cu^{\rho+1}$ dans un voisinage de l'infini;
- (ii) $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\rho\eta}$ avec $\eta \neq 0$;
- (iii) $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\rho 0, \tau_1}$ avec $\tau_1 = \varpi / \zeta$, où $\varpi = \min\{\theta, \zeta\}$.

Alors, pour chaque $a \in (-\infty, \lambda_{\infty,1})$, l'unique solution positive u_a du problème (1) satisfait

$$u_a(x) = \xi_0 h(d)(1 + \chi d^\varpi + o(d^\varpi)) \quad \text{si } d(x) \rightarrow 0,$$

où $\xi_0 = [2(2 + \rho)^{-1}]^{1/\rho}$ et h est définie par $\int_{h(t)}^\infty [2F(s)]^{-1/2} ds = \int_0^t k(s) ds$, pour $t > 0$ suffisamment petit. L'expression de χ est donnée par

$$\chi = \begin{cases} -(1 + \zeta)\ell_*(2\zeta)^{-1} \text{Heaviside}(\theta - \zeta) - \tilde{c}\rho^{-1} \text{Heaviside}(\zeta - \theta) = \chi_1 & \text{dans les cas (i) et (ii)} \\ \chi_1 - \ell^* \rho^{-1} (-\rho\ell_*/2)^{\tau_1} (1/(\rho + 2) + \ln \xi_0) & \text{pour le cas (iii)}. \end{cases}$$

Notons que le seul cas lié à ce résultat et correspondant à la situation particulière $\Omega_0 = \emptyset$, $f(u) = u^{\rho+1}$, $k(t) = ct^\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$ (avec $c, \alpha > 0$), $\theta = 1$, a été étudié dans [4]. Dans ce travail, les deux premiers termes du développement asymptotique de u_a autour de $\partial\Omega$ tiennent compte de $d(x)$ ainsi que de la courbure moyenne H de $\partial\Omega$. Dans notre résultat on enlève la restriction $b > 0$ dans Ω et on garde la condition $b \equiv 0$ sur $\partial\Omega$, comme restriction naturelle héritée du problème logistique (voir [4]). De plus, on raffine la vitesse d'explosion de u_a pour une large classe de potentiels b , avec $\theta > 0$ quelconque et k appartenant à un ensemble très riche de fonctions.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^N$ ($N \geq 3$) be a smooth bounded domain. Consider the blow-up logistic problem

$$\Delta u + au = b(x)f(u) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u(x) \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } d(x) := \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \rightarrow 0, \quad (1)$$

where $f \in C^1[0, \infty)$, a is a real parameter and $0 \neq b \in C^{0,\mu}(\overline{\Omega})$ (for some $\mu \in (0, 1)$) satisfies $b \geq 0$ in Ω . Suppose that the absorption term f fulfills both

(A) $f \geq 0$ and $f(u)/u$ is increasing on $(0, \infty)$

and the Keller–Osserman condition (see [6, 7]) $\int_1^\infty [F(t)]^{-1/2} dt < \infty$, where $F(t) = \int_0^t f(s) ds$.

Assume throughout that $\Omega_0 \subset\subset \Omega$ satisfies the exterior cone condition (possibly, $\Omega_0 = \emptyset$) and $b > 0$ on $\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega}_0$, where $\Omega_0 := \text{int}\{x \in \Omega : b(x) = 0\}$. Let $\lambda_{\infty,1}$ be the first Dirichlet eigenvalue of $(-\Delta)$ in $H_0^1(\Omega_0)$. Set $\lambda_{\infty,1} = +\infty$ if $\Omega_0 = \emptyset$. Under the above assumptions, we have proved in [2] that (1) has a positive solution u_a if and only if $a < \lambda_{\infty,1}$. Moreover, the uniqueness of u_a is studied in [1]. Denote by \mathcal{K} the set of all positive increasing C^1 -functions k defined on $(0, \nu)$, for some $\nu > 0$, which satisfy $\lim_{t \searrow 0} (\int_0^t k(s) ds / k(t))^{(i)} := \ell_i$, $i \in \overline{0,1}$. We have $\ell_0 = 0$ and $\ell_1 \in [0, 1]$.

Let us now recall some basic definitions related to the Karamata regular variation theory (see [5, 8]). Let RV_q ($q \in \mathbf{R}$) be the set of all positive measurable functions $Z : [A, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ (for some $A > 0$) satisfying $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} Z(\xi u)/Z(u) = \xi^q$, $\forall \xi > 0$. Define by NRV_q the class of functions f in the form $f(u) = Cu^q \exp\{\int_B^u \phi(t)/t dt\}$, $\forall u \geq B > 0$, where $C > 0$ is a constant and $\phi \in C[B, \infty)$ satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi(t) = 0$. The Karamata Representation Theorem shows that $NRV_q \subset RV_q$.

If $f \in NRV_{\rho+1}$ ($\rho > 0$) satisfies (A) and $b \equiv 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ such that $b(x) = k^2(d)(1 + o(1))$ as $d(x) \rightarrow 0$, for some $k \in \mathcal{K}$, then for any $a \in (-\infty, \lambda_{\infty,1})$, there is a unique positive solution u_a of Eq. (1). Note that the Keller–Osserman condition is automatically fulfilled. Moreover, we have $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \Xi(u) = \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} [F(u)]^{1/2} [f(u) \int_u^\infty (F(s))^{-1/2} ds]^{-1} = \rho[2(\rho+2)]^{-1}$ (see [1]).

We have seen in [1] that the uniqueness of u_a is essentially based on the same boundary behaviour shown by any positive solution of (1). The purpose of this Note is to refine the blow-up rate of u_a near $\partial\Omega$ by giving the second term in the expansion of u_a near $\partial\Omega$. This is a more subtle question which represents the goal of more recent literature (see [4] and the references therein). The approach we give is very general and, as a novelty, it relies on the theory of regular variation instituted in the 30's by Karamata and subsequently developed by himself and many others (see [5, 8]). For any $\zeta > 0$, set $\mathcal{K}_{0,\zeta}$ the subset of \mathcal{K} with $\ell_1 = 0$ and $\lim_{t \searrow 0} t^{-\zeta} (\int_0^t k(s) ds / k(t))' := L_\star \in \mathbf{R}$. It can be proven that $\mathcal{K}_{0,\zeta} \equiv \mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta}$, where

$$\mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} k : k(u^{-1}) = d_0 u [\Lambda(u)]^{-1} \exp\left[-\int_{d_1}^u (s\Lambda(s))^{-1} ds\right] \quad (u \geq d_1), \quad 0 < \Lambda \in C^1[d_1, \infty), \\ \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(u) = \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} u\Lambda'(u) = 0, \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} u^{\zeta+1}\Lambda'(u) = \ell_\star \in \mathbf{R}, \quad d_0, d_1 > 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

Moreover, ℓ_\star and L_\star are connected by $L_\star = -(1 + \zeta)\ell_\star/\zeta$ (see [3] for details). Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\rho\eta} &= \{f \in NRV_{\rho+1} (\rho > 0) : \phi \in RV_\eta \text{ or } -\phi \in RV_\eta\}, \quad \eta \in (-\rho - 2, 0]; \\ \mathcal{F}_{\rho 0, \tau} &= \{f \in \mathcal{F}_{\rho 0} : \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} (\ln u)^\tau \phi(u) = \ell^\star \in \mathbf{R}\}, \quad \tau \in (0, \infty). \end{aligned}$$

Our main result establishes the following asymptotic estimate.

THEOREM 1. - *Assume that*

$$b(x) = k^2(d)(1 + \tilde{c}d^\theta + o(d^\theta)) \text{ if } d(x) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{where } k \in \mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta}, \quad \theta > 0, \quad \tilde{c} \in \mathbf{R}. \quad (2)$$

Suppose that f fulfills (A) and one of the following growth conditions at infinity:

(i) $f(u) = Cu^{\rho+1}$ in a neighbourhood of infinity;

(ii) $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\rho\eta}$ with $\eta \neq 0$;

(iii) $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\rho_0, \tau_1}$ with $\tau_1 = \varpi/\zeta$, where $\varpi = \min\{\theta, \zeta\}$.

Then, for any $a \in (-\infty, \lambda_{\infty,1})$, the unique positive solution u_a of (1) satisfies

$$u_a(x) = \xi_0 h(d)(1 + \chi d^\varpi + o(d^\varpi)) \quad \text{if } d(x) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{where } \xi_0 = [2(2 + \rho)^{-1}]^{1/\rho} \quad (3)$$

and h is defined by $\int_{h(t)}^\infty [2F(s)]^{-1/2} ds = \int_0^t k(s) ds$, for $t > 0$ small enough. The expression of χ is

$$\chi = \begin{cases} -(1 + \zeta)\ell_*(2\zeta)^{-1} \text{Heaviside}(\theta - \zeta) - \tilde{c}\rho^{-1} \text{Heaviside}(\zeta - \theta) := \chi_1 & \text{if (i) or (ii) holds} \\ \chi_1 - \ell^*\rho^{-1}(-\rho\ell_*/2)^{\tau_1} [1/(\rho + 2) + \ln \xi_0] & \text{if } f \text{ obeys (iii).} \end{cases}$$

Note that the only case related, in same way, to our Theorem 1 corresponds to $\Omega_0 = \emptyset$, $f(u) = u^{\rho+1}$ on $[0, \infty)$, $k(t) = ct^\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$ (where $c, \alpha > 0$), $\theta = 1$ in (2), being studied in [4]. There, the two-term asymptotic expansion of u_a near $\partial\Omega$ ($a \in \mathbf{R}$ since $\lambda_{\infty,1} = \infty$) involves both the distance function $d(x)$ and the mean curvature H of $\partial\Omega$. However, the blow-up rate of u_a we present in Theorem 1 is of a different nature since the class $\mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta}$ does not include $k(t) = ct^\alpha$.

Our main result contributes to the knowledge in some new directions. More precisely, the blow-up rate of the unique positive solution u_a of (1) (found in [1]) is here refined

(a) on the maximal interval $(-\infty, \lambda_{\infty,1})$ for the parameter a , which is in connection with an appropriate semilinear eigenvalue problem; thus, the condition $b > 0$ in Ω (which appears in [4]) is removed by defining the set Ω_0 , but we maintain $b \equiv 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ since this is a *natural* restriction inherited from the logistic problem (see [4] for details).

(b) when b satisfies (2), where θ is *any* positive number and k belongs to a very rich class of functions, namely $\mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta}$. The equivalence $\mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta} \equiv \mathcal{K}_{0,\zeta}$ shows the connection to the larger class \mathcal{K} (introduced in [1]) for which the uniqueness of u_a holds. In addition, the explicit form of $k \in \mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta}$ shows us how to build $k \in \mathcal{K}_{0,\zeta}$.

(c) for a wide class of functions $f \in NRV_{\rho+1}$ where either $\phi \equiv 0$ (case (i)) or ϕ (resp., $-\phi$) belongs to RV_η with $\eta \in (-\rho - 2, 0]$ (cases (ii) and (iii)). Therefore, the theory of regular variation plays a key role in understanding the general framework and the approach as well.

Proof of Theorem 1. - We first state two auxiliary results (see [3] for their proofs).

LEMMA 1. - Assume (2) and $f \in NRV_{\rho+1}$ satisfies (A). Then h has the following properties:

- (i) $h \in C^2(0, \nu)$, $\lim_{t \searrow 0} h(t) = \infty$ and $\lim_{t \searrow 0} h'(t) = -\infty$;
- (ii) $\lim_{t \searrow 0} h''(t)/[k^2(t)f(h(t)\xi)] = (2 + \rho\ell_1)/[\xi^{\rho+1}(2 + \rho)]$, $\forall \xi > 0$;
- (iii) $\lim_{t \searrow 0} h(t)/h''(t) = \lim_{t \searrow 0} h'(t)/h''(t) = \lim_{t \searrow 0} h(t)/h'(t) = 0$;
- (iv) $\lim_{t \searrow 0} h'(t)/[th''(t)] = -\rho\ell_1/(2 + \rho\ell_1)$ and $\lim_{t \searrow 0} h(t)/[t^2 h''(t)] = \rho^2 \ell_1^2/[2(2 + \rho\ell_1)]$;
- (v) $\lim_{t \searrow 0} h(t)/[th'(t)] = \lim_{t \searrow 0} [\ln t]/[\ln h(t)] = -\rho\ell_1/2$;
- (vi) If $\ell_1 = 0$, then $\lim_{t \searrow 0} t^j h(t) = \infty$, for all $j > 0$;
- (vii) $\lim_{t \searrow 0} 1/[t^\zeta \ln h(t)] = -\rho\ell_*/2$ and $\lim_{t \searrow 0} h'(t)/[t^{\zeta+1} h''(t)] = \rho\ell_*/(2\zeta)$, $\forall k \in \mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta}$.

Let $\tau > 0$ be arbitrary. For any $u > 0$, define $T_{1,\tau}(u) = \{\rho/[2(\rho + 2)] - \Xi(u)\}(\ln u)^\tau$ and $T_{2,\tau}(u) = \{f(\xi_0 u)/[\xi_0 f(u)] - \xi_0^\rho\}(\ln u)^\tau$. Note that if $f(u) = Cu^{\rho+1}$, for u in a neighbourhood V_∞ of infinity, then $T_{1,\tau}(u) = T_{2,\tau}(u) = 0$ for each $u \in V_\infty$.

LEMMA 2. - Assume (A) and $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\rho\eta}$. The following hold:

- (i) If $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\rho_0, \tau}$, then $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} T_{1,\tau}(u) = -\ell^*/(\rho + 2)^2$ and $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} T_{2,\tau}(u) = \xi_0^\rho \ell^* \ln \xi_0$.
- (ii) If $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\rho\eta}$ with $\eta \neq 0$, then $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} T_{1,\tau}(u) = \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} T_{2,\tau}(u) = 0$.

Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$. We can find $\delta > 0$ such that $d(x)$ is of class C^2 on $\{x \in \mathbf{R}^N : d(x) < \delta\}$, k is nondecreasing on $(0, \delta)$, and $h'(t) < 0 < h''(t)$ for all $t \in (0, \delta)$ (see [1] for details). A straightforward computation shows that $\lim_{t \searrow 0} t^{1-\theta} k'(t)/k(t) = \infty$, for every $\theta > 0$. Using now (2), it follows that we can diminish $\delta > 0$ such that $k^2(t) [1 + (\tilde{c} - \varepsilon)t^\theta]$ is increasing on $(0, \delta)$ and

$$1 + (\tilde{c} - \varepsilon)d^\theta < b(x)/k^2(d) < 1 + (\tilde{c} + \varepsilon)d^\theta, \quad \forall x \in \Omega \text{ with } d \in (0, \delta). \quad (4)$$

We define $u^\pm(x) = \xi_0 h(d)(1 + \chi_\varepsilon^\pm d^\varpi)$, with $d \in (0, \delta)$, where $\chi_\varepsilon^\pm = \chi \pm \varepsilon [1 + \text{Heaviside}(\zeta - \theta)]/\rho$. Take $\delta > 0$ small enough such that $u^\pm(x) > 0$, for each $x \in \Omega$ with $d \in (0, \delta)$. By the Lagrange mean value theorem, we obtain $f(u^\pm(x)) = f(\xi_0 h(d)) + \xi_0 \chi_\varepsilon^\pm d^\varpi h(d) f'(\Upsilon^\pm(d))$, where $\Upsilon^\pm(d) = \xi_0 h(d)(1 + \lambda^\pm(d) \chi_\varepsilon^\pm d^\varpi)$, for some $\lambda^\pm(d) \in [0, 1]$. We claim that

$$\lim_{d \searrow 0} f(\Upsilon^\pm(d))/f(\xi_0 h(d)) = 1. \quad (5)$$

Fix $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and $M > 0$ such that $|\chi_\varepsilon^\pm| < M$. Choose $\mu^* > 0$ so that $|(1 \pm Mt)^{\rho+1} - 1| < \sigma/2$, for all $t \in (0, 2\mu^*)$. Let $\mu_* \in (0, (\mu^*)^{1/\varpi})$ be such that, for every $x \in \Omega$ with $d \in (0, \mu_*)$

$$|f(\xi_0 h(d)(1 \pm M\mu_*))/f(\xi_0 h(d)) - (1 \pm M\mu_*)^{\rho+1}| < \sigma/2.$$

Hence, $1 - \sigma < (1 - M\mu^*)^{\rho+1} - \sigma/2 < f(\Upsilon^\pm(d))/f(\xi_0 h(d)) < (1 + M\mu^*)^{\rho+1} + \sigma/2 < 1 + \sigma$, for every $x \in \Omega$ with $d \in (0, \mu_*)$. This proves (5).

Step 1. There exists $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta)$ so that $\Delta u^+ + au^+ - k^2(d)[1 + (\tilde{c} - \varepsilon)d^\theta]f(u^+) \leq 0$, $\forall x \in \Omega$ with $d \in (0, \delta_1)$ and $\Delta u^- + au^- - k^2(d)[1 + (\tilde{c} + \varepsilon)d^\theta]f(u^-) \geq 0$, $\forall x \in \Omega$ with $d \in (0, \delta_1)$.

Indeed, for every $x \in \Omega$ with $d \in (0, \delta)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta u^\pm + au^\pm - k^2(d) [1 + (\tilde{c} \mp \varepsilon)d^\theta] f(u^\pm) \\ &= \xi_0 d^\varpi h''(d) \left[a\chi_\varepsilon^\pm \frac{h(d)}{h''(d)} + \chi_\varepsilon^\pm \Delta d \frac{h'(d)}{h''(d)} + 2\varpi\chi_\varepsilon^\pm \frac{h'(d)}{dh''(d)} + \varpi\chi_\varepsilon^\pm \Delta d \frac{h(d)}{dh''(d)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \varpi(\varpi - 1)\chi_\varepsilon^\pm \frac{h(d)}{d^\varpi h''(d)} + \Delta d \frac{h'(d)}{d^\varpi h''(d)} + \frac{a h(d)}{d^\varpi h''(d)} + \sum_{j=1}^4 \mathcal{S}_j^\pm(d) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where, for any $t \in (0, \delta)$, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_1^\pm(t) &= (-\tilde{c} \pm \varepsilon)t^{\theta-\varpi} k^2(t) f(\xi_0 h(t))/[\xi_0 h''(t)], \quad \mathcal{S}_2^\pm(t) = \chi_\varepsilon^\pm (1 - k^2(t)h(t)f'(\Upsilon^\pm(t))/h''(t)), \\ \mathcal{S}_3^\pm(t) &= (-\tilde{c} \pm \varepsilon)\chi_\varepsilon^\pm t^\theta k^2(t)h(t)f'(\Upsilon^\pm(t))/h''(t), \quad \mathcal{S}_4^\pm(t) = t^{-\varpi} (1 - k^2(t)f(\xi_0 h(t))/[\xi_0 h''(t)]). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1 (ii), we find $\lim_{t \searrow 0} k^2(t)f(\xi_0 h(t))/[\xi_0 h''(t)]^{-1} = 1$, which yields $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \mathcal{S}_1^\pm(t) = (-\tilde{c} \pm \varepsilon)\text{Heaviside}(\zeta - \theta)$. Using [1, Lemma 1] and (5), we obtain $\lim_{t \searrow 0} k^2(t)h(t)f'(\Upsilon^\pm(t))/h''(t) = \rho + 1$. Hence, $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \mathcal{S}_2^\pm(t) = -\rho\chi_\varepsilon^\pm$ and $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \mathcal{S}_3^\pm(t) = 0$.

Using the expression of h'' , we derive $\mathcal{S}_4^\pm(t) = \frac{k^2(t)f(h(t))}{h''(t)} \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{S}_{4,i}(t)$, $\forall t \in (0, \delta)$, where we denote $\mathcal{S}_{4,1}(t) = 2 \frac{\Xi(h(t))}{t^\varpi} (\int_0^t k(s) ds/k(t))'$, $\mathcal{S}_{4,2}(t) = 2 \frac{T_{1,\tau_1}(h(t))}{[t^\zeta \ln h(t)]^{\tau_1}}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{4,3}(t) = -\frac{T_{2,\tau_1}(h(t))}{[t^\zeta \ln h(t)]^{\tau_1}}$.

Since $\mathcal{R}_{0,\zeta} \equiv \mathcal{K}_{0,\zeta}$, we find $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \mathcal{S}_{4,1}(t) = -(1 + \zeta)\rho\ell_*\zeta^{-1}(\rho + 2)^{-1} \text{Heaviside}(\theta - \zeta)$.

Cases (i), (ii). By Lemma 1 (vii) and Lemma 2 (ii), we find $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \mathcal{S}_{4,2}(t) = \lim_{t \searrow 0} \mathcal{S}_{4,3}(t) = 0$. In view of Lemma 1 (ii), we derive that $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \mathcal{S}_4^\pm(t) = -(1 + \zeta)\rho\ell_*(2\zeta)^{-1} \text{Heaviside}(\theta - \zeta)$.

Case (iii). By Lemma 1 (vii) and Lemma 2 (i), $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \mathcal{S}_{4,2}(t) = -2\ell^*(\rho + 2)^{-2}(-\rho\ell_*/2)^{\tau_1}$ and $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \mathcal{S}_{4,3}(t) = -2\ell^*(\rho + 2)^{-1}(-\rho\ell_*/2)^{\tau_1} \ln \xi_0$. Using Lemma 1 (ii) once more, we arrive at $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \mathcal{S}_4^\pm(t) = -(1 + \zeta)\rho\ell_*(2\zeta)^{-1} \text{Heaviside}(\theta - \zeta) - \ell^*(-\rho\ell_*/2)^{\tau_1} [1/(\rho + 2) + \ln \xi_0]$.

Note that in each of the cases (i)–(iii), the definition of χ_ε^\pm yields $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \sum_{j=1}^4 \mathcal{S}_j^\pm(t) = -\varepsilon < 0$ and $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \sum_{j=1}^4 \mathcal{S}_j^-(t) = \varepsilon > 0$. By Lemma 1 (vii), $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{h'(t)}{t^\varpi h''(t)} = 0$. But $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{h(t)}{h'(t)} = 0$, so $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{h(t)}{t^\varpi h''(t)} = 0$. Thus, using Lemma 1 [(iii), (iv)], relation (6) concludes our Step 1.

Step 2. There exists $M^+, \delta^+ > 0$ such that $u_a(x) \leq u^+(x) + M^+$, for all $x \in \Omega$ with $0 < d < \delta^+$.

Define $(0, \infty) \ni u \mapsto \Psi_x(u) = au - b(x)f(u)$, $\forall x$ with $d \in (0, \delta_1)$. Clearly, $\Psi_x(u)$ is decreasing when $a \leq 0$. Suppose $a \in (0, \lambda_{\infty,1})$. Obviously, $f(t)/t : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (f'(0), \infty)$ is bijective. Let $\delta_2 \in (0, \delta_1)$ be such that $b(x) < 1$, $\forall x$ with $d \in (0, \delta_2)$. Let u_x define the unique positive solution of $b(x)f(u)/u = a + f'(0)$, $\forall x$ with $d \in (0, \delta_2)$. Hence, for any x with $d \in (0, \delta_2)$, $u \rightarrow \Psi_x(u)$ is decreasing on (u_x, ∞) . But $\lim_{d(x) \searrow 0} \frac{b(x)f(u^+(x))}{u^+(x)} = +\infty$ (use $\lim_{d(x) \searrow 0} u^+(x)/h(d) = \xi_0$, (A) and Lemma 1 [(ii) and (iii)]). So, for δ_2 small enough, $u^+(x) > u_x$, $\forall x$ with $d \in (0, \delta_2)$.

Fix $\sigma \in (0, \delta_2/4)$ and set $\mathcal{N}_\sigma := \{x \in \Omega : \sigma < d(x) < \delta_2/2\}$. We define $u_\sigma^*(x) = u^+(d - \sigma, s) + M^+$, where (d, s) are the local coordinates of $x \in \mathcal{N}_\sigma$. We choose $M^+ > 0$ large enough to have $u_\sigma^*(\delta_2/2, s) \geq u_a(\delta_2/2, s)$, $\forall \sigma \in (0, \delta_2/4)$ and $\forall s \in \partial\Omega$. Using (4) and Step 1, we find

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u_\sigma^*(x) &\geq au^+(d - \sigma, s) - [1 + (\tilde{c} - \varepsilon)(d - \sigma)^\theta]k^2(d - \sigma)f(u^+(d - \sigma, s)) \\ &\geq au^+(d - \sigma, s) - [1 + (\tilde{c} - \varepsilon)d^\theta]k^2(d)f(u^+(d - \sigma, s)) \geq \Psi_x(u^+(d - \sigma, s)) \\ &\geq \Psi_x(u_\sigma^*) = au_\sigma^*(x) - b(x)f(u_\sigma^*(x)) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{N}_\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by [2, Lemma 1], $u_a \leq u_\sigma^*$ in \mathcal{N}_σ , $\forall \sigma \in (0, \delta_2/4)$. Letting $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, we have proved Step 2.

Step 3. There exists $M^-, \delta^- > 0$ such that $u_a(x) \geq u^-(x) - M^-$, for all $x \in \Omega$ with $0 < d < \delta^-$.

For every $r \in (0, \delta)$, define $\Omega_r = \{x \in \Omega : 0 < d(x) < r\}$. We will prove that for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small, $\lambda u^-(x) \leq u_a(x)$, $\forall x \in \Omega_{\delta_2/4}$. Indeed, fix arbitrarily $\sigma \in (0, \delta_2/4)$. Define $v_\sigma^*(x) = \lambda u^-(d + \sigma, s)$, for $x = (d, s) \in \Omega_{\delta_2/2}$. We choose $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ small enough such that $v_\sigma^*(\delta_2/4, s) \leq u_a(\delta_2/4, s)$, $\forall \sigma \in (0, \delta_2/4)$, $\forall s \in \partial\Omega$. Using (4), Step 1 and (A), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta v_\sigma^*(x) + av_\sigma^*(x) &\geq \lambda k^2(d + \sigma)[1 + (\tilde{c} + \varepsilon)(d + \sigma)^\theta]f(u^-(d + \sigma, s)) \\ &\geq k^2(d)[1 + (\tilde{c} + \varepsilon)d^\theta]f(\lambda u^-(d + \sigma, s)) \geq bf(v_\sigma^*), \end{aligned}$$

for all $x = (d, s) \in \Omega_{\delta_2/4}$, that is v_σ^* is a subsolution of $\Delta u + au = b(x)f(u)$ in $\Omega_{\delta_2/4}$. By [2, Lemma 1], we conclude that $v_\sigma^* \leq u_a$ in $\Omega_{\delta_2/4}$. Letting $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, we find $\lambda u^-(x) \leq u_a(x)$, $\forall x \in \Omega_{\delta_2/4}$.

Since $\lim_{d \searrow 0} u^-(x)/h(d) = \xi_0$, by using (A) and Lemma 1 [(ii), (iii)], we can easily obtain $\lim_{d \searrow 0} k^2(d)f(\lambda^2 u^-(x))/u^-(x) = \infty$. So, there exists $\tilde{\delta} \in (0, \delta_2/4)$ such that

$$k^2(d)[1 + (\tilde{c} + \varepsilon)d^\theta]f(\lambda^2 u^-)/u^- \geq \lambda^2 |a|, \quad \forall x \in \Omega \text{ with } 0 < d \leq \tilde{\delta}. \quad (7)$$

By Lemma 1 [(i) and (v)], we deduce that $u^-(x)$ decreases with d when $d \in (0, \tilde{\delta})$ (if necessary, $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ is diminished). Choose $\delta_* \in (0, \tilde{\delta})$, close enough to $\tilde{\delta}$, such that

$$h(\delta_*)(1 + \chi_\varepsilon^- \delta_*^\varpi)/[h(\tilde{\delta})(1 + \chi_\varepsilon^- \tilde{\delta}^\varpi)] < 1 + \lambda. \quad (8)$$

For each $\sigma \in (0, \tilde{\delta} - \delta_*)$, we define $z_\sigma(x) = u^-(d + \sigma, s) - (1 - \lambda)u^-(\delta_*, s)$. We prove that z_σ is a subsolution of $\Delta u + au = b(x)f(u)$ in Ω_{δ_*} . Using (8), $z_\sigma(x) \geq u^-(\tilde{\delta}, s) - (1 - \lambda)u^-(\delta_*, s) > 0$ $\forall x = (d, s) \in \Omega_{\delta_*}$. By (4) and Step 1, z_σ is a subsolution of $\Delta u + au = b(x)f(u)$ in Ω_{δ_*} if

$$k^2(d + \sigma)[1 + (\tilde{c} + \varepsilon)(d + \sigma)^\theta] [f(u^-(d + \sigma, s)) - f(z_\sigma(d, s))] \geq a(1 - \lambda)u^-(\delta_*, s), \quad (9)$$

for all $(d, s) \in \Omega_{\delta_*}$. Applying the Lagrange mean value theorem and (A), we infer that (9) is a consequence of $k^2(d + \sigma)[1 + (\tilde{c} + \varepsilon)(d + \sigma)^\theta] f(z_\sigma(d, s))/z_\sigma(d, s) \geq |a|$, $\forall (d, s) \in \Omega_{\delta_*}$. This inequality holds by virtue of (7), (8) and the decreasing character of u^- with d .

On the other hand, $z_\sigma(\delta_*, s) \leq \lambda u^-(\delta_*, s) \leq u_a(x)$, $\forall x = (\delta_*, s) \in \Omega$. Clearly, $\limsup_{d \rightarrow 0} (z_\sigma - u_a)(x) = -\infty$ and $b > 0$ in Ω_{δ_*} . Thus, by [2, Lemma 1], $z_\sigma \leq u_a$ in Ω_{δ_*} , $\forall \sigma \in (0, \tilde{\delta} - \delta_*)$. Letting $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, we conclude the assertion of Step 3.

By Steps 2 and 3, $\chi_\varepsilon^+ \geq \{-1 + u_a(x)/[\xi_0 h(d)]\}d^{-\varpi} - M^+ / [\xi_0 d^\varpi h(d)] \forall x \in \Omega$ with $d \in (0, \delta^+)$ and $\chi_\varepsilon^- \leq \{-1 + u_a(x)/[\xi_0 h(d)]\}d^{-\varpi} + M^- / [\xi_0 d^\varpi h(d)] \forall x \in \Omega$ with $d \in (0, \delta^-)$. Passing to the limit as $d \rightarrow 0$ and using Lemma 1 (vi), we obtain $\chi_\varepsilon^- \leq \liminf_{d \rightarrow 0} \{-1 + u_a(x)/[\xi_0 h(d)]\}d^{-\varpi}$ and $\limsup_{d \rightarrow 0} \{-1 + u_a(x)/[\xi_0 h(d)]\}d^{-\varpi} \leq \chi_\varepsilon^+$. Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we conclude our proof. ■

References

- [1] **F. Cirstea and V. Rădulescu**, Uniqueness of the blow-up boundary solution of logistic equations with absorption, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I*, **335** (2002), 447–452.
- [2] **F. Cirstea and V. Rădulescu**, Solutions with boundary blow-up for a class of nonlinear elliptic problems, *Houston J. Math.*, in press.
- [3] **F. Cirstea and V. Rădulescu**, Blow-up solutions of logistic equations with absorption: uniqueness and asymptotics, in preparation.
- [4] **J. García-Melián, R. Letelier-Albornoz and J. Sabina de Lis**, Uniqueness and asymptotic behavior for solutions of semilinear problems with boundary blow-up, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **129** (2001), 3593–3602.
- [5] **J. Karamata**, Sur un mode de croissance régulière de fonctions. Théorèmes fondamentaux, *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, **61** (1933), 55–62.
- [6] **J.B. Keller**, On solution of $\Delta u = f(u)$, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **10** (1957), 503–510.
- [7] **R. Osserman**, On the inequality $\Delta u \geq f(u)$, *Pacific J. Math.*, **7** (1957), 1641–1647.
- [8] **E. Seneta**, *Regularly Varying Functions*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 508, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1976.