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## 1. Introduction

Consider the semilinear elliptic boundary value problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\Delta u=f(x, u, \nabla u), \quad x \in \Omega  \tag{1.1}\\
u=0, \quad x \in \partial \Omega
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\Omega$ is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^{N}, N \geq 3$, with a smooth boundary $\partial \Omega$ and $f: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

The existence of positive solutions to (1.1) in the case where $f$ depends only on $u$ and grows subcritically has been studied extensively in recent years (see the review article by Lions [3] and the references therein). In this paper, we establish the existence of nonnegative solutions to (1.1) where $f$ has a subcritical growth in $u$ and at most linear growth in $\nabla u$. Aside from the above we do not make any other assumptions on the domain $\Omega$. Our results imply, for instance, the existence of nonnegative solutions to

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\Delta u=-\lambda u-\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{j} u^{p_{j}}-b|\nabla u|-h(x), \quad x \in \Omega \\
u=0, \quad x \in \partial \Omega
\end{array}\right.
$$
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where $\lambda, c_{j} \in \mathbb{R}, b \geq 0, p_{j}>1$, provided $b, \lambda$ and the $L^{2}$-norm of $h$ are small.

We also consider one-dimensional cases of (1.1), in particular the equations

$$
u^{\prime \prime}=f\left(x, u, u^{\prime}\right)
$$

and

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}=f\left(x, u, u^{\prime}\right), \quad k \in \mathbb{R},
$$

subject to Dirichlet, Neumann and periodic boundary conditions.
We derive our results using the $L^{p}$ theory of elliptic partial differential operators as presented in [2] plus some elementary properties of the Leray-Schauder and coincidence degrees (see [4]). Our results were motivated by the studies in $[5,7]$ and extend the results in these papers in several ways.

We shall denote the norms in $L^{p}, W^{2, p}$ and $C^{k}$ by $\|\cdot\|_{p},\|\cdot\|_{2, p}$ and $|\cdot|_{k}$ respectively, and for brevity, we denote the $L^{2}$-norm by $\|\cdot\|$.

## 2. An existence theorem for partial differential equations

In this section we shall establish a general existence theorem solutions of boundary value problems for semilinear elliptic problems subject to zero Dirichlet boundary conditions. In particular, we shall establish the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. Let $f: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and assume:
(i) There exist $h \in L^{2}(\Omega)$ and continuous functions $F, \widetilde{F}: \mathbb{R}^{+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $F$ nondecreasing, $F(0)=0$ and

$$
F(u) \leq c_{1} u^{p}+c_{2}, \quad \widetilde{F}(u) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m} d_{j} u^{p_{j}}
$$

for $u \geq 0$, where $0<p, p_{j}<p^{*}-1, p^{*}=2 N /(N-2), c_{1}, c_{2}$ and $d_{j}$ are positive constants, such that

$$
-\widetilde{F}(u)-b|v|-h(x) \leq f(x, u, v) \leq F(u)+b|v|
$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ with $u \geq 0$, where $0 \leq b<\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}, \lambda_{1}$ being the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ on $H_{0}^{1}$.
(ii) There exists $R>0$ such that
$R>\left(1-\frac{b}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}}\right)^{-1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{j}|\Omega|^{\left(p^{*}-p_{j}-1\right) / p^{*}} \delta^{p_{j}+1} R^{p_{j}}+\frac{\|h\|}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}}\right)$,
where $|\Omega|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of $\Omega$ and $\delta>0$ is such that $\|u\|_{p^{*}} \leq \delta\|\nabla u\|$ for all $u \in H_{0}^{1}$.

Under these assumptions the problem (1.1) has a nonnegative solution.

Even though only the values of $u \geq 0$ are of interest here, we shall find it convenient to have $F$ defined for $u<0$. We hence fix $F$ to be defined by $F(u)=-F(-u)$ for $u<0$.

Before proving the theorem, we establish an auxiliary result.
Lemma 2.1. Let $q=p^{*} / p$. Then for each $v \in L^{q}$, the problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\Delta u=F(u)+b|\nabla u|+v, \quad x \in \Omega,  \tag{2.1}\\
u=0, \quad x \in \partial \Omega,
\end{array}\right.
$$

has a unique solution $u=B v \in H_{0}^{1} \cap W^{2, q}$, and $B: L^{q} \rightarrow H_{0}^{1}$ is completely continuous.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume $p \geq p^{*} / 2$. So $q \leq 2$. Since $H^{1}$ is continuously embedded in $L^{p^{*}}$ the growth conditions on $F$ imply that for each $w \in H_{0}^{1}$, we have

$$
F(w)+b|\nabla w|+v \in L^{q} .
$$

We now use results about the solvability of boundary value problems for nonhomogeneous linear elliptic equations presented in [2] and let $u=K w \in W^{2, q} \cap H_{0}^{1}$ be the unique solution of

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\Delta u=F(w)+b|\nabla w|+v, \quad x \in \Omega  \tag{2.2}\\
u=0, \quad x \in \partial \Omega
\end{array}\right.
$$

Since the embedding $H_{0}^{1} \hookrightarrow L^{p^{*}}$ is continuous, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
\|u\|_{2, q} & \leq C_{1}\left[\|F(w)\|_{q}+\|\nabla w\|_{q}+\|v\|_{q}\right]  \tag{2.3}\\
& \leq C_{2}\left[\|\nabla w\|^{p}+\|\nabla w\|+\|v\|_{q}+1\right],
\end{align*}
$$

where $C_{i}$ are constants. Since $q>p^{*} /\left(p^{*}-1\right)$, the embedding $W^{2, q} \hookrightarrow H^{1}$ is compact. Hence $K$ takes bounded subsets in $H_{0}^{1}$ into relatively compact subsets in $H_{0}^{1}$. We next verify that $K$ is continuous. Let $\left\{w_{n}\right\}_{n} \subset H_{0}^{1}$ be such that $w_{n} \rightarrow w$ in $H_{0}^{1}$ and let $u_{n}=K w_{n}, u=K w$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta\left(u_{n}-u\right)=F\left(w_{n}\right)-F(w)-b\left(\left|\nabla w_{n}\right|-|\nabla w|\right) . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying (2.4) by $u_{n}-u$, integrating and using Poincaré's and Hölder's inequalities we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|\nabla\left(u_{n}-u\right)\right\|^{2} \leq & C\left\|F\left(w_{n}\right)-F(w)\right\|_{q}\left\|u_{n}-u\right\|_{p^{*}}  \tag{2.5}\\
& +\frac{b}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}}\left\|\nabla\left(u_{n}-u\right)\right\| \| \nabla\left(w_{n}-w \| .\right.
\end{align*}
$$

Next choose any subsequence of $\left\{w_{n}\right\}$, which we again denote by $\left\{w_{n}\right\}$. Then since $w_{n}$ converges to $w$ in $L^{p^{*}}$, there exists a subsequence $\left\{w_{n_{k}}\right\}$ such that $w_{n_{k}} \rightarrow w$ a.e. and $\left|w_{n_{k}}\right| \leq w^{*}$ for every $k$, and some $w^{*} \in L^{p^{*}}$ (see [1]). Hence

$$
F\left(w_{n_{k}}\right) \rightarrow F(w) \quad \text { a.e., } \quad\left|F\left(w_{n_{k}}\right)\right| \leq C\left[1+\left|w^{*}\right|^{p}\right] \in L^{q},
$$

from which it follows that $\left\|F\left(w_{n_{k}}\right)-F(w)\right\|_{q} \rightarrow 0$ and thus (we use (2.5)) $\left\|\nabla\left(u_{n}-u\right)\right\| \rightarrow 0$, proving the continuity of $K$.

We next apply the Leray-Schauder continuation theorem to prove that $K$ has a fixed point. To this end, let $u \in H_{0}^{1}$ and $\lambda \in(0,1)$ be such that $u=\lambda K u$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta u=\lambda F(u)+\lambda b|\nabla u|+\lambda v . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying (2.6) by $u$ and integrating, we obtain

$$
\|\nabla u\|^{2} \leq \frac{b}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}}\|\nabla u\|^{2}+C\|v\|_{q}\|\nabla u\|,
$$

which implies (recall that $b<\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}$ )

$$
\|\nabla u\| \leq C
$$

where $C$ is a constant independent of $u$ and $\lambda$.
Hence $K$ has a fixed point $u$, which is a solution to (2.1). To show uniqueness, let $u_{1}$ and $u_{2}$ be two solutions of (2.1) and let $u=u_{1}-u_{2}$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta u=F\left(u_{1}\right)-F\left(u_{2}\right)+b\left(\left|\nabla u_{1}\right|-\left|\nabla u_{2}\right|\right) . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying (2.7) by $u$ and integrating, we obtain

$$
\|\nabla u\|^{2} \leq \frac{b}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}}\|\nabla u\|^{2}
$$

and hence $u=0$.
We next verify that $B: L^{q} \rightarrow H_{0}^{1}$ is completely continuous. Let $\left\{v_{n}\right\}_{n} \subset L^{q}$ be such that $v_{n} \rightarrow v$ in $L^{q}$ and let $u_{n}=B v_{n}, u=B v$. Then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta\left(u_{n}-u\right)=F\left(u_{n}\right)-F(u)+b\left(\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|-|\nabla u|\right)+v_{n}-v . \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying (2.8) by $u_{n}-u$ and integrating gives

$$
\left\|\nabla\left(u_{n}-u\right)\right\|^{2} \leq \frac{b}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}}\left\|\nabla\left(u_{n}-u\right)\right\|^{2}+C\left\|v_{n}-v\right\|_{q}\left\|\nabla\left(u_{n}-u\right)\right\|
$$

and hence

$$
\left\|\nabla\left(u_{n}-u\right)\right\| \rightarrow 0
$$

proving the continuity of $B$.
Now let $\mathbb{K}$ be a bounded set in $L^{q}$ and $v \in \mathbb{K}$. Then using equation (2.1), we deduce $\|\nabla u\| \leq C$.

Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{2, q} & \leq C\left[\|F(u)\|_{q}+b\|\nabla u\|_{q}+\|v\|_{q}\right] \\
& \leq C\left[\|\nabla u\|^{p}+b\|\nabla u\|+\|v\|_{q}+1\right],
\end{aligned}
$$

it follows that $B(\mathbb{K})$ is bounded in $W^{2, q}$ and therefore is relatively compact in $H_{0}^{1}$, completing the proof of lemma 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $E=\left\{v \in H_{0}^{1}: v \geq 0\right\}$, where we use $\|\nabla u\|$ as a norm in $H_{0}^{1}$. For each $v \in E$, let

$$
N v=f(x, v, \nabla v)-F(v)-b|\nabla v| .
$$

Then $N v \in L^{q}$, and $N$ maps bounded sets in $E$ into bounded sets in $L^{q}$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that for each $v \in E$, there exists a unique solution $u=A v$ of

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\Delta u-F(u)-b|\nabla u|=N v, \quad x \in \Omega \\
u=0, \quad x \in \partial \Omega
\end{array}\right.
$$

Since $N v \leq 0$, it follows from the maximum principle (recall the convention made about the definition of $F$ for negative values of $u$ ) [2] that $u \geq 0$. So $A: E \rightarrow E$ and since $A=B N$, it follows that $A$ is completely continuous.

Now let $u \in E$ and $\lambda \in(0,1)$ be such that

$$
u=\lambda A u
$$

Then we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\Delta u & =\lambda\left(F\left(\frac{u}{\lambda}\right)-F(u)\right)+(1-\lambda) b|\nabla u|+\lambda f(x, u, \nabla u)  \tag{2.9}\\
& \geq \lambda f(x, u, \nabla u) .
\end{align*}
$$

Multiplying (2.9) by $u$ and integrating, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla u\|^{2} \leq & -\lambda \int f(x, u, \nabla u) u \leq \int \tilde{F}(u) u+b \int|\nabla u| u+\int|h| u \\
\leq & \sum_{j=1}^{m} d_{j} \int u^{p_{j}+1}+\frac{b}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}}\|\nabla u\|^{2}+\frac{\|h\|}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}}\|\nabla u\| \\
\leq & \sum_{j=1}^{m} d_{j}|\Omega|^{\left(p^{*}-p_{j}-1\right) / p^{*}} \delta^{p_{j}+1}\|\nabla u\|^{p_{j}+1} \\
& +\frac{b}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}}\|\nabla u\|^{2}+\frac{\|h\|}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}}\|\nabla u\|,
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies

$$
\left(1-\frac{b}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}}\right)\|\nabla u\|^{2} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m} d_{j}|\Omega|^{\left(p^{*}-p_{j}-1\right) / p^{*}} \delta^{p_{j}+1}\|\nabla u\|^{p_{j}+1}+\frac{\|h\|}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}}\|\nabla u\|
$$

and hence $\|\nabla u\| \neq R$, by (ii).

Thus $A$ has a fixed point $u$, which is a nonnegative solution to (1.1), completing the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Remark 2.1. Condition (ii) is satisfied if either $p_{j}>1$ or $p_{j}<1$ for all $j$, and $\|h\|$ is small.

## 3. Existence theorems for ordinary differential equations

Now we turn to the one-dimensional case of (1.1). We first have an existence result for the Dirchlet boundary value problem.

Theorem 3.1. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and assume:
(i) There exist continuous, nondecreasing functions $F, \widetilde{F}: \mathbb{R}^{+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $F(0)=0$, and there exist $h \in L^{1}(0,1)$ and $0 \leq b<4$ such that

$$
-\widetilde{F}(u)-b|v|-h(x) \leq f(x, u, v) \leq F(u)+b|v|
$$

for a.e. $x \in[0,1]$ and all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ with $u \geq 0$.
(ii) There exists $R>0$ such that

$$
R>\left(1-\frac{b}{4}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\pi} \widetilde{F}\left(\frac{R}{2}\right)+\frac{\|h\|_{1}}{2}\right) .
$$

Under these assumptions the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}=f\left(x, u, u^{\prime}\right), \quad u(0)=u(1)=0 \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

has a nonnegative solution.
Proof. Let $E=\left\{u \in H_{0}^{1}: u \geq 0\right\}$. Then using Opial's inequality [6]

$$
\int_{0}^{1}|u|\left|u^{\prime}\right| \leq \frac{1}{4} \int_{0}^{1}\left|u^{\prime}\right|^{2}, \quad \forall u \in H_{0}^{1}
$$

and the arguments in the proof of Lemma 2.1, it follows that for each $v \in E$, there exists a unique solution $u=A v$ of

$$
u^{\prime \prime}-F(u)-b\left|u^{\prime}\right|=f\left(x, v, v^{\prime}\right)-F(v)-b\left|v^{\prime}\right|, \quad u(0)=u(1)=0
$$

and $A: E \rightarrow E$ is completely continuous. Let $u \in E$ and $\lambda \in(0,1)$ be such that $u=\lambda A u$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime} \geq \lambda f\left(x, u, u^{\prime}\right) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying (3.2) by $u$ and integrating gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|^{2} & \leq \int_{0}^{1} \widetilde{F}(u) u+b \int_{0}^{1}|u|\left|u^{\prime}\right|+\int_{0}^{1}|h u| \\
& \leq \widetilde{F}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|\right) \frac{\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|}{\pi}+\frac{b}{4}\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|^{2}+\|h\|_{1} \frac{\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used that $|u|_{0} \leq \frac{1}{2}\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|$ and Opial's inequality. From this and (ii), we deduce $\left\|u^{\prime}\right\| \neq R$, completing the proof of Theorem 3.1 (recall that $\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|=\|u\|_{H_{0}^{1}}$.

## Remark 3.1.

(a) Theorem 2 is valid if continuity assumptions on $f$ are replaced by Carathéodory conditions.
(b) In [5] and [7], the existence of nonnegative solutions of (3.1) was established for $f$ independent of $u^{\prime}$ and satisfying
(*)

$$
-c_{1}-c_{2} u \leq f(x, u) \leq 0
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta u \leq f(x, u) \leq \alpha u \tag{**}
\end{equation*}
$$

respectively, where $c_{1}>0,0 \leq c_{2}<1, \beta \in L^{1}$ and $\alpha>0$. By applying Theorem 3.1 with $F=0, b=0, \widetilde{F}(u)=c_{2} u$ and $h(x) \equiv c_{1}$, we obtain the condition $0 \leq c_{2}<2 \pi$ for $(*)$, and by choosing $\widetilde{F}=0, F(u)=\alpha u$, $b=0$, we obtain the condition $\alpha>0$ for ( $* *$ ). Thus Theorem 3.1 contains the corresponding results in $[5,7]$ as special cases.

For the Neumann boundary condition, we have:
TheOrem 3.2. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and assume:
(i) There exists $M>0$ such that $f(x, u)>0$ for $u>M$.
(ii) There exist continuous, increasing functions $F, \widetilde{F}: \mathbb{R}^{+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $F(0)$ $=0, \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} F(t)=\infty$, and $h \in L^{1}$ such that

$$
-\widetilde{F}(u)-h(x) \leq f(x, u) \leq F(u)
$$

for a.e. $x \in[0,1]$ and all $u \geq 0$.
(iii) There exists $R>0$ such that

$$
R^{2}>2\left[M^{2}+\widetilde{F}(R) R+\|h\|_{1} R\right]
$$

Then the problem

$$
u^{\prime \prime}=f(x, u), \quad u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(1)=0
$$

has a nonnegative solution.
In order to prove the theorem we first establish a lemma.

Lemma 3.1. For each $v \in C^{0}[0,1]$, the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}-F(u)=v, \quad u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(1)=0, \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

has a unique solution $u=B v$, and $B: C^{0} \rightarrow C^{0}$ is a completely continuous mapping.

Proof. Let $X=C^{0}, Z=C^{0}$.
Define $L: X \supset \operatorname{dom} L \rightarrow Z$ by $L u=u^{\prime \prime}$ where $\operatorname{dom} L=\left\{u \in C^{2}: u^{\prime}(0)=\right.$ $\left.u^{\prime}(1)=0\right\}$ and set

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
\widetilde{A}: X \rightarrow Z, & & \widetilde{A} u & =F(u) \\
N: X \rightarrow Z, & & N u=F(u)+v
\end{array}
$$

Then (3.3) is equivalent to

$$
L u=N u .
$$

Note that $L$ is a linear Fredholm operator of index 0 and $\widetilde{A}$ and $N$ are $L$ completely continuous [4], with $(L u-\widetilde{A}(u))=0$ if and only if $u=0$.

Let now $u \in \operatorname{dom} L$ and $\lambda \in(0,1)$ be such that

$$
L u-(1-\lambda) \widetilde{A} u-\lambda N u=0
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}-F(u)=\lambda v \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Integrating (3.4) gives

$$
\int_{0}^{1} F(u)=-\lambda \int_{0}^{1} v
$$

which, by the mean value theorem, implies that there exists $\tau \in[0,1]$ such that $F(|u(\tau)|)=|F(u(\tau))| \leq|v|_{0}$. Since $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} F(t)=\infty$, it follows that $|u(\tau)| \leq C$, where $C$ depends only on $F$ and $v$.

## Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
|u|_{0} \leq C+\left\|u^{\prime}\right\| . \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying (3.4) by $u$ and integrating gives

$$
\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|^{2}+\int_{0}^{1} F(u) u \leq \int_{0}^{1}\left|v\left\||u| \leq C \int_{0}^{1}|v|+\right\| u^{\prime} \| \int_{0}^{1}\right| v \mid
$$

and so $\left\|u^{\prime}\right\| \leq C,|u|_{0} \leq C$ where $C$ is independent of $u$ and $\lambda$. We now use Theorem IV. 3 of [4] with $L$ and $N$ as above and $H=L-\widetilde{A}$ and conclude that the first condition of that theorem is satisfied on choosing $\Omega$ a large ball, and that the second condition holds via Proposition II. 18 of [4] as $H$ is odd. Hence there is a solution $u$ to $L u=N u$, and hence to (3.3). Uniqueness is proved in a standard way using the monotonicity of $F$.

We now verify that $B: C^{0} \rightarrow C^{0}$ is completely continuous. Let $\left\{v_{n}\right\}_{n} \subset C^{0}$ be such that $v_{n} \rightarrow v$ in $C^{0}$ and let $u_{n}=B v_{n}, u=B v$. Since $\left\{v_{n}\right\}_{n}$ is bounded in $C^{0}$, it follows from the above argument that $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n}$ is bounded in $C^{0}$. Using the equation

$$
u_{n}^{\prime \prime}-F\left(u_{n}\right)=v_{n}
$$

we deduce that $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n}$ is bounded in $C^{2}$.
Now choose any subsequence of $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n}$ which we again denote by $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n}$. It, in turn, has a subsequence $\left\{u_{n_{k}}\right\}_{k}$ such that $u_{n_{k}} \rightarrow \widetilde{u}$ in $C^{1}$. Since

$$
u_{n_{k}}^{\prime \prime}-u^{\prime \prime}=F\left(u_{n_{k}}\right)-F(u)+v_{n_{k}}-v,
$$

it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{1}\left|u_{n_{k}}^{\prime}-u^{\prime}\right|^{2}+\int_{0}^{1}\left(F\left(u_{n_{k}}\right)-F(u)\right)\left(u_{n_{k}}-u\right) \leq \int_{0}^{1}\left|v_{n_{k}}-v\right|\left|u_{n_{k}}-u\right| . \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Passing to the limit in (3.6), we obtain

$$
\int_{0}^{1}\left|\widetilde{u}^{\prime}-u^{\prime}\right|^{2}+\int_{0}^{1}(F(\widetilde{u})-F(u))(\widetilde{u}-u) \leq 0
$$

which implies that $\widetilde{u}=u$. Hence $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ in $C^{0}$ and $B$ is continuous. $B$ is completely continuous since $B$ maps bounded sets in $C^{0}$ into bounded sets in $C^{2}$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Let $E=\left\{u \in C^{0}: u \geq 0\right\}$. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that for each $v \in E$ the problem

$$
\begin{aligned}
& u^{\prime \prime}-F(u)=f(x, v)-F(v) \equiv N v, \\
& u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(1)=0,
\end{aligned}
$$

has a unique solution $u=A v$. Since $N v \leq 0, u \geq 0$ so $A: E \rightarrow E$. Since $N$ transforms bounded sets in $C^{0}$ into bounded sets in $C^{0}$ and $A=B N, A$ is completely continuous. Let $u \in E$ and $\lambda \in(0,1)$ be such that $u=\lambda A u$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}=\lambda f(x, u)+\lambda\left(F\left(\frac{u}{\lambda}\right)-F(u)\right) \geq \lambda f(x, u) . \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Integrating (3.7), we obtain

$$
\int_{0}^{1} \lambda f(x, u)+\lambda\left(F\left(\frac{u}{\lambda}\right)-F(u)\right)=0
$$

which implies by (i) that there exists $\tau \in[0,1]$ such that $u(\tau) \leq M$. By the mean value theorem we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
|u|_{0} \leq M+\left\|u^{\prime}\right\| . \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying (3.7) by $u$ and integrating, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|^{2} & \leq \lambda \int_{0}^{1} f(x, u) u \leq \int_{0}^{1} \widetilde{F}(u) u+\int_{0}^{1}|h| u \\
& \leq \widetilde{F}\left(|u|_{0}\right)|u|_{0}+\|h\|_{1}|u|_{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence by (3.8),

$$
|u|_{0}^{2} \leq 2 M^{2}+2\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leq 2\left[M^{2}+\widetilde{F}\left(|u|_{0}\right)|u|_{0}+\|h\|_{1}|u|_{0}\right],
$$

which, together with (iii), implies $|u|_{0} \neq R$. This completes the proof.
Using similar arguments one immediately obtains the following result for boundary value problems subject to periodic boundary conditions.

Theorem 3.3. Under the assumption of Theorem 3.2, the problem

$$
u^{\prime \prime}=f(x, u), \quad u(0)-u(1)=u^{\prime}(0)-u^{\prime}(1)=0
$$

has a nonnegative solution.
In Theorems 3.1-3.3, the constant $b$ has to be small or equal to zero, so we cannot apply these theorems to the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}+f\left(x, u, u^{\prime}\right)=0 \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

if $|k|$ is large. But, as we shall see in the next theorems, problem (3.9) with Dirichlet, Neumann or periodic boundary conditions always has a nonnegative solution for $f$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
-a u-b|v| \leq f(t, u, v) \leq a u+b|v|+c \quad \forall u, v \in \mathbb{R}, u \geq 0 \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a, b, c$ are positive constants, provided $|k|$ is sufficiently large.
Theorem 3.4. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and satisfy (3.10) with

$$
a+2 b<\frac{|k|}{1-e^{-|k|}} .
$$

Then the problem

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}+f\left(t, u, u^{\prime}\right)=0, \quad u(0)=u(1)=0
$$

has a nonnegative solution.
We again need a lemma.

Lemma 3.2. Let $k, a, b>0$ satisfy

$$
a+2 b<\frac{k}{1-e^{-k}} .
$$

Then for each $v \in C^{0}$, the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}-a u-b\left|u^{\prime}\right|=v, \quad u(0)=u(1)=0 \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

has a unique solution $u=B v$, and $B: C^{0} \rightarrow C^{1}$ is completely continuous.
Proof. For each $w \in C^{1}$, let $u=K w$ be the unique solution of

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}=a w+b\left|w^{\prime}\right|+v, \quad u(0)=u(1)=0
$$

Then $K: C^{1} \rightarrow C^{1}$ is completely continuous. Let $u \in C^{1}$ and $\lambda \in(0,1)$ be such that $u=\lambda K u$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}=\lambda\left(a u+b\left|u^{\prime}\right|+v\right) . \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying (3.12) by $e^{-k t} u^{\prime}$ and integrating gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime}(t)=e^{k t}\left[u^{\prime}(0)+\lambda \int_{0}^{t}\left(a u+b\left|u^{\prime}\right|+v\right) e^{k s} d s\right] \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\int_{0}^{1} u^{\prime}=0$, this implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
u^{\prime}(0) & =\frac{-\lambda \int_{0}^{1} e^{-k t}\left(\int_{0}^{t}\left(a u+b\left|u^{\prime}\right|+v\right) e^{k s} d s\right)}{\int_{0}^{1} e^{-k t}} \\
& =\frac{-\lambda}{1-e^{-k}} \int_{0}^{1}\left(1-e^{-k(1-s)}\right)\left(a u+b\left|u^{\prime}\right|+v\right) d s
\end{aligned}
$$

so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|u^{\prime}(0)\right| \leq a\|u\|_{1}+b\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{1}+\|v\|_{1} \leq\left(\frac{a}{2}+b\right)\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{1}+\|v\|_{1} . \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining (3.13) and (3.14), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{1} & \leq\left|u^{\prime}(0)\right| \frac{1-e^{-k}}{k}+\int_{0}^{1} \frac{1-e^{-k(1-s)}}{k}\left(a|u|+b\left|u^{\prime}\right|+|v|\right) d s \\
& \leq 2 \frac{1-e^{-k}}{k}\left[\left(\frac{a}{2}+b\right)\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{1}+\|v\|_{1}\right],
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies, by the assumption on $k$, that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{1} \leq C \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C$ is independent of $u$ and $\lambda$. Using this in (3.12), we deduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{1} \leq C_{1} \tag{3.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C_{1}$ is independent of $u$ and $\lambda$. It now follows that

$$
|u|_{1} \leq C+C_{1} .
$$

We now use the Leray-Schauder continuation theorem to deduce that there exists a solution $u$ to (3.11). If $u_{1}$ and $u_{2}$ are two solutions of (3.11), let $u=$ $u_{1}-u_{2}$. Then $u$ satisfies

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}=a u+b\left(\left|u_{1}^{\prime}\right|-\left|u_{2}^{\prime}\right|\right), \quad u(0)=u(1)=0
$$

Since $\left|a u+b\left(\left|u_{1}^{\prime}\right|-\mid u_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right||\leq a| u|+b| u^{\prime} \mid$, we deduce as in the existence proof that

$$
\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{1} \leq 2 \frac{1-e^{-k}}{k}\left(\frac{a}{2}+b\right)\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{1}
$$

and hence $u^{\prime}=0$. So $u=0$.
We now verify that $B: C^{0} \rightarrow C^{1}$ is completely continuous. Let $v \in C^{0}$, $|v|_{0} \leq M$ and let $u=B v$. Then we have as above

$$
\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{1} \leq M_{1}
$$

where $M_{1}$ depends only on $M, a, b$ and $k$. Hence, by using the equation in (3.11),

$$
\left\|u^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{1} \leq M_{2}
$$

where $M_{2}=k M_{1}+a M_{1}+b M_{1}+M$ and so

$$
\left|u^{\prime}\right|_{0} \leq\left\|u^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{1} \leq M_{2}, \quad\left|u^{\prime \prime}\right|_{0} \leq M_{3},
$$

where $M_{3}=k M_{2}+a M_{1}+b M_{2}+M$. Thus $B$ transforms bounded subsets in $C^{0}$ into relatively compact subsets in $C^{1}$. Now, let $\left\{v_{n}\right\}_{n} \subset C^{0}$ be such that $v_{n} \rightarrow v$ in $C^{0}$ and let $u_{n}=B v_{n}, u=B v$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(u_{n}-u\right)^{\prime \prime}+k\left(u_{n}-u\right)^{\prime}=a\left(u_{n}-u\right)+b\left(\left|u_{n}^{\prime}\right|-\left|u^{\prime}\right|\right)+v_{n}-v, \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u_{n}^{\prime}-u^{\prime}\right\|_{1} \leq c_{1}\left\|v_{n}-v\right\|_{1}, \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c_{1}$ depends only on $a, b$ and $k$. Using (3.18) in (3.17), we deduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u_{n}^{\prime \prime}-u^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{1} \leq c_{2}\left\|v_{n}-v\right\|_{1} \tag{3.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c_{2}=k c_{1}+a c_{1}+b c_{1}+1$, and so

$$
\left|u_{n}-u\right|_{1} \leq\left(c_{1}+c_{2}\right)\left\|v_{n}-v\right\|_{1}
$$

i.e., $B$ is continuous.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Note first that $u$ is a solution of

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}+f\left(x, u, u^{\prime}\right)=0
$$

if and only if $v(x)=u(1-x)$ is a solution of

$$
v^{\prime \prime}-k v^{\prime}+g\left(x, v, v^{\prime}\right)=0
$$

where $g(x, u, v)=f(1-x, u,-v)$. Therefore we may assume that $k>0$. Let $E=\left\{u \in C^{1}: u \geq 0\right\}$. For each $v \in E$, let $u=A v$ be the unique solution of

$$
\begin{aligned}
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}-a u-b\left|u^{\prime}\right| & =-f\left(x, v, v^{\prime}\right)-a v-b\left|v^{\prime}\right| \equiv N v, \\
u(0)=u(1) & =0
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $N$ transforms bounded subsets in $C^{1}$ into bounded subsets in $C^{0}$, and $A=B N$, it follows that $A: E \rightarrow E$ is completely continuous. Let $u \in E$ and $\lambda \in(0,1)$ be such that $u=\lambda A u$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}=-\lambda f\left(t, u, u^{\prime}\right)+(1-\lambda)\left(a u+b\left|u^{\prime}\right|\right) \tag{3.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|-\lambda f\left(t, u, u^{\prime}\right)+(1-\lambda)\left(a u+b\left|u^{\prime}\right|\right)\right| \leq a u+b\left|u^{\prime}\right|+c \tag{3.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

by (3.10), it follows as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 that $\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{1} \leq C$, where $C$ is independent of $u$ and $\lambda$. Hence, by (3.20) and (3.21), we deduce $\left\|u^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{1} \leq C_{1}$, where $C_{1}$ is independent of $u$ and $\lambda$, and so $|u|_{1} \leq C_{2}$, where $C_{2}$ is independent of $u$ and $\lambda$.

For the Neumann problem, we have the following result.
Theorem 3.5. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and satisfy (3.10) with

$$
a+2 b<\frac{|k|}{1-e^{|k|}}
$$

and suppose that there exists $M>0$ such that

$$
f(x, u, v)<0 \quad \text { for } u>M
$$

Then the problem

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}+f\left(x, u, u^{\prime}\right)=0, \quad u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(1)=0
$$

has a nonnegative solution.
The following lemma will be needed.
Lemma 3.3. Let $k, a, b>0$ satisfy

$$
a+2 b<\frac{k}{1-e^{-k}}
$$

Then for each $v \in C^{0}$, the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}-a u-b\left|u^{\prime}\right|=v, \quad u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(1)=0 \tag{3.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

has a unique solution $u=B v$, and $B: C^{0} \rightarrow C^{1}$ is completely continuous.

Proof. Let $X=C^{1}, Z=C^{0}$. Define $L: X \supset \operatorname{dom} L \rightarrow Z$ by $L u=u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}$, where $\operatorname{dom} L=\left\{u \in C^{2}: u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(1)=0\right\}$, and let

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{A} & =X \rightarrow Z, & & \widetilde{A} u=a u \\
N & =X \rightarrow Z, & & N u=a u+b\left|u^{\prime}\right|+v
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $L$ is a linear Fredholm mapping of index $0, \widetilde{A}$ and $N$ are $L$-completely continuous and (3.22) is equivalent to $L u=N u$. Since $\operatorname{ker}(L-\widetilde{A})=\{0\}$, we need only prove that all possible solutions of the family

$$
\begin{equation*}
L u-(1-\lambda) \widetilde{A} u-\lambda N u=0, \quad \lambda \in(0,1) \tag{3.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

are bounded independently of $u$ and $\lambda$. Let $u \in \operatorname{dom} L$ and $\lambda \in(0,1)$ satisfy (3.23). Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}=a u+\lambda\left(b\left|u^{\prime}\right|+v\right) . \tag{3.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying (3.24) by $e^{k t}$ and integrating gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime}(t)=e^{-k t} \int_{0}^{t} e^{k s}\left(a u+b\left|u^{\prime}\right|+v\right) d s \tag{3.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $u^{\prime}(1)=0$, there exists $\tau \in[0,1]$ such that

$$
|u(\tau)| \leq \frac{b}{a}\left|u^{\prime}\right|_{0}+\frac{|v|_{0}}{a}
$$

and so

$$
\begin{equation*}
|u|_{0} \leq\left(\frac{b}{a}+1\right)\left|u^{\prime}\right|_{0}+\frac{|v|_{0}}{a} . \tag{3.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (3.25) and (3.26), we deduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right| \leq \frac{1-e^{-k}}{k}\left[(a+2 b)\left|u^{\prime}\right|_{0}+2|v|_{0}\right] \tag{3.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies $\left|u^{\prime}\right|_{0} \leq C$, and thus, by using (3.26), $|u|_{1} \leq C_{1}$, where $C_{1}$ is independent of $u$ and $\lambda$. So by Theorem IV. 5 of [4], there exists a solution $u$ to (3.22).

Now, let $u_{1}$ and $u_{2}$ be two solutions to (3.22) and let $u=u_{1}-u_{2}$. Then we have

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}=a u+b\left(\left|u_{1}^{\prime}\right|-\left|u_{2}^{\prime}\right|\right),
$$

which implies

$$
\left|u^{\prime}\right|_{0} \leq \frac{1-e^{-k}}{k}(a+2 b)\left|u^{\prime}\right|_{0}
$$

and hence $u^{\prime}=0, u=0$. Finally, by using (3.27) it can be proved that $B: C^{0} \rightarrow$ $C^{1}$ is completely continuous, and the proof is complete.

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Let $E=\left\{u \in C^{1}: u \geq 0\right\}$. For each $v \in E$, let $u=A v$ be the unique solution of

$$
\begin{aligned}
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}-b\left|u^{\prime}\right|-a u & =-f\left(x, v, v^{\prime}\right)-a v-b\left|v^{\prime}\right|, \\
u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(1) & =0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $A: E \rightarrow E$ is completely continuous. As in Theorem 3.4, we assume $k>0$. Let $u \in E$ and $\lambda \in(0,1)$ be such that $u=\lambda A u$. Then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}=(1-\lambda)\left(a u+b\left|u^{\prime}\right|\right)-\lambda f\left(x, u, u^{\prime}\right) . \tag{3.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying (3.28) by $e^{k t}$ and integrating, we obtain

$$
\int_{0}^{1} e^{k t}\left[(1-\lambda)\left(a u+b\left|u^{\prime}\right|\right)-\lambda f\left(t, u, u^{\prime}\right)\right] d t=0
$$

which implies that there exists $\tau \in[0,1]$ such that $u(\tau) \leq M$, from which we deduce as in the proof of Lemma 3.3 that $|u|_{1} \leq M_{1}$, where $M_{1}$ is independent of $u$ and $\lambda$.

Using a similar argument we obtain the following result.
THEOREM 3.6. Let the assumptions of Theorem 3.5 hold, with

$$
a+2 b<|k|
$$

Then the problem

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+k u^{\prime}+f\left(t, u, u^{\prime}\right)=0, \quad u(0)-u(1)=0, \quad u^{\prime}(0)-u^{\prime}(1)=0,
$$

has a nonnegative solution.
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