

Equations involving a variable exponent Grushin-type operator

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

2011 Nonlinearity 24 2663

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0951-7715/24/10/001>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 128.6.218.72

The article was downloaded on 22/10/2012 at 15:08

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

Equations involving a variable exponent Grushin-type operator

Mihai Mihăilescu¹, Gheorghe Moroşanu² and Denisa Stancu-Dumitru¹

¹ Department of Mathematics, University of Craiova, 200585 Craiova, Romania

² Department of Mathematics, Central European University, 1051 Budapest, Hungary

E-mail: mmihales@yahoo.com, Morosanug@ceu.hu and denisa.stancu@yahoo.com

Received 28 February 2011, in final form 18 July 2011

Published 12 August 2011

Online at stacks.iop.org/Non/24/2663

Recommended by K Ohkitani

Abstract

In this paper we define a Grushin-type operator with a variable exponent growth and establish existence results for an equation involving such an operator. A suitable function space setting is introduced. Regarding the tools used in proving the existence of solutions for the equation analysed here, they rely on the critical point theory combined with adequate variational techniques.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 35H99, 46E30, 35B38

1. Introduction

The study of PDEs involving variable exponents becomes more and more attractive in the last decades since differential operators involving variable exponent growth conditions can serve in describing non-homogeneous phenomena which can occur in different branches of science. In this context we remember that the first model where such kind of operators was considered comes from fluid mechanics, more exactly from the study of electrorheological fluids (Ružička 1999, 2000, Rajagopal and Ružička 2001). After this pioneering model many other applications of differential operators with variable exponents appeared in a large range of fields, such as image restoration (Chen *et al* 2006), mathematical biology (Fagnelli 2010), the study of dielectric breakdown, electrical resistivity and polycrystal plasticity (Bocea and Mihăilescu 2010, Bocea *et al* 2010) or in the study of some models for growth of heterogeneous sandpiles (Bocea *et al* submitted). On the other hand, important results in the context of potential theory have been obtained by the *Research group on variable exponent Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces* from Finland (see <http://www.helsinki.fi/~pharjule/varsob/index.shtml>). In particular, we note that a survey paper regarding the most important results in the field of partial differential equations involving variable exponent growth conditions can be found in the section *Publications* on the website quoted above, more exactly (Harjulehto *et al* 2010).

In the applications pointed out above most models involve the $p(x)$ -Laplace operator, that is

$$\Delta_{p(x)}u := \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p(x)-2}\nabla u),$$

where $p(x)$ is a continuous function satisfying $p(x) > 1$ for each x . Unfortunately, this operator cannot cover the case of models describing phenomena in which a certain degeneracy is present. To the best of our knowledge there aren't too many papers in the literature devoted to the study of degenerate equations with variable exponents (actually, the only example that we know of is Mihăilescu *et al* (at press)). In this paper we are concerned with the analysis of a class of elliptic problems involving variable exponent growth conditions and the presence of a degeneracy in the differential operator considered in the equation (of a different type than the one investigated in Mihăilescu *et al* (at press)). To be more specific, in this paper our aim is to study an equation in which a variable exponent Grushin-type operator is present (which will be introduced in the next section). The basic idea in investigating such type of operators goes back to the definition of the *classical* Grushin operator, that is a differential operator defined in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ by

$$\Delta_G u := \Delta_x u + |x|^\gamma \Delta_y u,$$

where Δ_x and Δ_y stand for the standard Laplace operators on \mathbb{R}^n , respectively, \mathbb{R}^m , $\gamma > 0$ is a constant and $u = u(x, y)$, $(x, y) \in \Omega$. The Grushin operator is not an *elliptic* operator on domains (in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}) intersecting the plane $x = 0$, but is a standard example of a *hypoelliptic* operator. The lack of ellipticity is due to the presence of the degeneracy $|x|^\gamma$. It was introduced by the Russian mathematician Grushin (1971). Problems involving the Grushin operator have been extensively studied over the years. We just remember the papers (Tri 1998, D'Ambrosio 2004, 2005, Monti and Morbidelli 2006). In an appropriate context, results on Grushin's operator were obtained in the framework of Heisenberg groups. Specifically, in Monti and Morbidelli (2006) it is noted that the Heisenberg sub-Laplacian is, actually, a Grushin operator (with $\gamma = 2$ and $m = 1$). Operator Δ_G represents the basic source of inspiration in defining a Grushin-type operator with a variable exponent in the next section of this paper.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 2 we define a Grushin-type operator involving a variable exponent; in section 3 we collect some preliminary results and we introduce some notation which will be used in the following; in section 4 we establish some auxiliary results that will be used later in the analysis of a PDE involving a Grushin-type operator with a variable exponent; in section 5 we establish existence results for an elliptic PDE involving a Grushin-type operator with a variable exponent; the equivalence of some norms is established in the appendix.

2. A Grushin-type operator involving a variable exponent

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded and smooth domain, $N = n + m$ with $n, m \geq 2$ and assume that Ω intersects the plane $x = 0$, i.e. the set $\{(0_n, y) : y \in \mathbb{R}^m\}$, where 0_n is the null vector of \mathbb{R}^n . We denote by $\partial\Omega$ the boundary of Ω .

If $(x, y) \in \Omega$ then we denote $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$.

Consider $\gamma > 0$ is a given real number and define the matrix

$$A(x) = \begin{bmatrix} I_n & O_{n,m} \\ O_{m,n} & |x|^\gamma I_m \end{bmatrix} \in M_{N \times N}(\mathbb{R}),$$

where $O_{n,m}$, respectively, $O_{m,n}$ are the null matrices in $M_{n \times m}(\mathbb{R})$, respectively, $M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ while I_n , respectively, I_m stand for the unit matrices in $M_{n \times n}(\mathbb{R})$, respectively, $M_{m \times m}(\mathbb{R})$.

Let $G(x, y) : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow (1, \infty)$ be a continuous function. We define the degenerate operator

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{G(x,y)} \cdot &= \operatorname{div}(\nabla_{G(x,y)} \cdot) \\ &= \operatorname{div}_x(|\nabla_x \cdot|^{G(x,y)-2} \nabla_x \cdot) + \operatorname{div}_y(|x|^\gamma |\nabla_y \cdot|^{G(x,y)-2} \nabla_y \cdot) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(|\nabla_x \cdot|^{G(x,y)-2} \frac{\partial \cdot}{\partial x_i} \right) + |x|^\gamma \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left(|\nabla_y \cdot|^{G(x,y)-2} \frac{\partial \cdot}{\partial y_j} \right),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\nabla_{G(x,y)} \cdot = A(x) \begin{bmatrix} |\nabla_x \cdot|^{G(x,y)-2} \nabla_x \cdot \\ |\nabla_y \cdot|^{G(x,y)-2} \nabla_y \cdot \end{bmatrix}.$$

This is a Grushin-type operator since in the particular case when $G(x, y) = 2$ for each $(x, y) \in \Omega$ we recover the classical Grushin operator. Obviously, this operator is also anisotropic but of a different type than the operators analysed in Mihăilescu and Moroşanu (2010).

In this paper we will study operators of type $\Delta_{G(x,y)}$ in the particular case when the function $G(x, y)$ is of class C^1 on Ω and has the particular form

$$G(x, y) = p(x) + q(y).$$

In fact, $p \in C^1(\Omega_1)$ and $q \in C^1(\Omega_2)$, where Ω_1 and Ω_2 are the projections of Ω on \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^m , respectively.

Assume that $1 < \inf_{\Omega_1} p(x)$, $1 < \inf_{\Omega_2} q(y)$, $\sup_{\Omega_1} p(x) < N$, $\sup_{\Omega_2} q(y) < N$.

Assume also that there exist two vector functions

$$\vec{f}(x) = (f_1(x), \dots, f_n(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{g}(y) = (g_1(y), \dots, g_m(y)),$$

of class C^1 on Ω_1 and Ω_2 , respectively, such that

$$\operatorname{div}_x \vec{f}(x) \geq f_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{div}_y \vec{g}(y) \geq g_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_2, \quad (1)$$

for some constants $f_0 > 0$ and $g_0 > 0$, and

$$\vec{f}(x) \cdot \nabla_x p(x) = \vec{g}(y) \cdot \nabla_y q(y) = 0, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_1, \quad \forall y \in \Omega_2. \quad (2)$$

Remark. If \vec{f} is the gradient of a scalar function $h = h(x)$, then the first part of (2) becomes $\nabla h \cdot \nabla p = 0$ in Ω_1 . From a geometrical point of view, this means that the equations $p(x) = C_1$, $h(x) = C_2$ represent *orthogonal surfaces* in \mathbb{R}^n .

The goal of this paper is to prove the existence of solutions for some equations of type

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{G(x,y)} u(x, y) = h((x, y), u(x, y)), & \text{for } (x, y) \in \Omega, \\ u(x, y) = 0, & \text{for } (x, y) \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

3. Preliminaries

In this section we point out certain results regarding the Lebesgue and Sobolev variable exponent spaces. We refer to Kováčik and Rákosník (1991) and Diening *et al* (2011) for more details. We will also introduce some notations which will be used throughout, and we present some preliminary results. Finally, we will introduce the suitable functional framework where we can study equations of type (3).

Given $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ (with $N = n + m$) a bounded and smooth domain an element of Ω will be denoted by $(x, y) \in \Omega$ where

$$x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad \text{and} \quad y = (y_1, \dots, y_m).$$

Given $s : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow (1, \infty)$ a continuous function the variable exponent Lebesgue space $L^{s(x,y)}(\Omega)$ is defined as follows:

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

and it is endowed with the *Luxemburg* norm

$$|u|_{s(x,y)} := \inf \left\{ \tau > 0 : \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{u(x,y)}{\tau} \right|^{s(x,y)} dx dy \leq 1 \right\}.$$

The variable exponent Sobolev space $W^{1,s(x,y)}(\Omega)$ is given by

$$W^{1,s(x,y)}(\Omega) := \{u \in L^{s(x,y)}(\Omega) : |\nabla u| \in L^{s(x,y)}(\Omega)\},$$

and

$$|u|_{1,s(x,y)} := |u|_{s(x,y)} + \|\nabla u\|_{s(x,y)}$$

is a norm on this space, where $\nabla u = (\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u)$. We denote by $W_0^{1,s(x,y)}(\Omega)$ the closure of $C_0^1(\Omega)$ in $W^{1,s(x,y)}(\Omega)$. On this space we can consider the equivalent norm

$$\|u\|_1 := \|(\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u)\|_{s(x,y)}.$$

For each function s defined as above, we define

$$s^- := \min_{(x,y) \in \bar{\Omega}} s(x,y) \quad \text{and} \quad s^+ := \max_{(x,y) \in \bar{\Omega}} s(x,y).$$

As we have already pointed out, in this paper we will only consider the case of functions s which satisfy

$$1 < s^- \leq s^+ < \infty.$$

Under this assumption it is well known the spaces $(L^{s(x,y)}(\Omega), |\cdot|_{s(x,y)})$, $(W^{1,s(x,y)}(\Omega), |\cdot|_{1,s(x,y)})$ and $(W_0^{1,s(x,y)}(\Omega), \|\cdot\|_1)$ are separable and reflexive Banach spaces. Moreover, the Hölder type inequality holds true

$$\int_{\Omega} |uv| dx \leq \left(\frac{1}{s^-} + \frac{1}{(s^-)'} \right) |u|_{s(x,y)} |v|_{s'(x,y)}, \quad \forall u \in L^{s(x,y)}(\Omega), \quad \forall v \in L^{s'(x,y)}(\Omega),$$

where $s'(x,y) := s(x,y)/(s(x,y) - 1)$. Furthermore, if $u \in L^{s(x,y)}(\Omega)$ then the following implications hold true:

$$|u|_{s(x,y)} > 1 \Rightarrow |u|_{s(x,y)}^{s^-} \leq \int_{\Omega} |u|^{s(x,y)} dx dy \leq |u|_{s(x,y)}^{s^+}; \quad (4)$$

$$|u|_{s(x,y)} < 1 \Rightarrow |u|_{s(x,y)}^{s^+} \leq \int_{\Omega} |u|^{s(x,y)} dx dy \leq |u|_{s(x,y)}^{s^-}; \quad (5)$$

$$|u|_{s(x,y)} = 1 \Leftrightarrow \int_{\Omega} |u|^{s(x,y)} dx dy = 1. \quad (6)$$

Obviously, if Ω intersects the plane $x = 0$ the space $(W_0^{1,s(x,y)}(\Omega), \|\cdot\|_1)$ is no longer adequate for seeking solutions of problem (3). In this new context the natural space where we can investigate the existence of solutions of equation (3) is defined as the closure of $C_0^1(\Omega)$ under the norm

$$\|u\| := \|\nabla_x u\| + |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{G(x,y)}} \|\nabla_y u\|_{G(x,y)},$$

where G is given in the above section. Let us denote this Sobolev type space by $W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$. Standard arguments can be used in order to show that $(W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega), \|\cdot\|)$ is a reflexive Banach space. We point out that the above norm is equivalent with the norm

$$\|u\|_1 = \|(\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u)\|_{G(x,y)},$$

provided that there exists a positive constant $m > 0$ such that for each $(x, y) \in \Omega$ we have $|x| \geq m$ (see the appendix).

4. Auxiliary results

The following theorem is essential in our analysis.

Theorem 1. *Assume (1) and (2) are fulfilled. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\Omega} (1 + |x|^{\gamma}) |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy \leq C \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla_x u|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^{\gamma} |\nabla_y u|^{G(x,y)}] dx dy,$$

for all $u \in C_c^1(\Omega)$.

Proof. Let $\vec{0}_n$ and $\vec{0}_m$ denote the null vectors in \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^m , respectively. Then the flux-divergence theorem implies that for each $u \in C_c^1(\Omega)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}[|u|^{G(x,y)}(\vec{f}(x), \vec{0}_m)] dx dy + \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}[|x|^{\gamma} |u|^{G(x,y)}(\vec{0}_n, \vec{g}(y))] dx dy \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega} |u|^{G(x,y)} [(\vec{f}(x), \vec{0}_m) + |x|^{\gamma}(\vec{0}_n, \vec{g}(y))] \cdot \vec{n}(x, y) d\sigma(x, y) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\vec{n}(x, y)$ stands for the unit outward normal at $\partial\Omega$.

Simple computations show that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}[|u|^{G(x,y)}(\vec{f}(x), \vec{0}_m)] dx dy \\ &= \int_{\Omega} |u|^{G(x,y)} \operatorname{div}_x \vec{f}(x) dx dy + \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^n |u|^{G(x,y)} f_i(x) \left[\log(|u|) \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} + G \frac{1}{|u|} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right] dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

In view of relation (2) we find

$$I_1 = \int_{\Omega} |u|^{G(x,y)} \operatorname{div}_x \vec{f}(x) dx dy + \int_{\Omega} G(x, y) |u|^{G(x,y)-2} u \vec{f}(x) \cdot \nabla_x u dx dy.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &:= \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}[|x|^{\gamma} |u|^{G(x,y)}(\vec{0}_n, \vec{g}(y))] dx dy \\ &= \int_{\Omega} |x|^{\gamma} |u|^{G(x,y)} \operatorname{div}_y \vec{g}(y) dx dy + \int_{\Omega} |x|^{\gamma} G(x, y) |u|^{G(x,y)-2} u \vec{g}(y) \cdot \nabla_y u dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Combining all the above pieces of information and taking into account relation (1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 \int_{\Omega} |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy + g_0 \int_{\Omega} |x|^{\gamma} |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy &\leq G^+ \int_{\Omega} |u|^{G(x,y)-1} |\vec{f}(x)| |\nabla_x u| dx dy \\ &+ G^+ \int_{\Omega} |x|^{\gamma} |u|^{G(x,y)-1} |\vec{g}(y)| |\nabla_y u| dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we point out that a Young-type inequality implies that for all $\epsilon > 0$, $(x, y) \in \Omega$, $A, B > 0$, we have

$$AB \leq \epsilon A^{\frac{G(x,y)}{G(x,y)-1}} + \frac{1}{\epsilon^{G(x,y)-1}} B^{G(x,y)}.$$

We fix $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$G^+ \epsilon < \frac{f_0}{2}.$$

We find

$$\begin{aligned} & f_0 \int_{\Omega} |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy + g_0 \int_{\Omega} |x|^\gamma |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy \\ & \leq G^+ \left[\epsilon \int_{\Omega} |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy + \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{G(x,y)-1} |\vec{f}(x)|^{G(x,y)} |\nabla_x u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy \right] \\ & \quad + G^+ \left[\epsilon \int_{\Omega} |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy + \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{G(x,y)-1} |x|^{\gamma G(x,y)} |\vec{g}(y)|^{G(x,y)} |\nabla_y u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy \right], \end{aligned}$$

and thus, there exists a $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & (f_0 - 2G^+ \epsilon) \int_{\Omega} |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy + g_0 \int_{\Omega} |x|^\gamma |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy \\ & \leq C_\epsilon \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla_x u|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^{\gamma G(x,y)} |\nabla_y u|^{G(x,y)}) dx dy \\ & \leq C_\epsilon (1 + \text{diam}(\Omega))^{\gamma G^+} \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla_x u|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u|^{G(x,y)}) dx dy, \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{diam}(\Omega)$ is the diameter of Ω . The proof of theorem 1 is complete. \square

Remark. We point out the fact that the conclusion of theorem 1 does not hold true in the general case. More exactly, there are examples of functions $G(x, y)$ when

$$\inf_{u \in C_c^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla_x u|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u|^{G(x,y)}] dx dy}{\int_{\Omega} (1 + |x|^\gamma) |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy} = 0. \quad (7)$$

Indeed, assuming that there exists an open set $U \subset \Omega$ and a point $(x_0, y_0) \in U$ such that $G(x_0, y_0) < G(x, y)$ (or $G(x_0, y_0) > G(x, y)$) for all $(x, y) \in \partial U$ then by theorem 3.1 in Fan *et al* (2005) we obtain

$$\inf_{u \in C_c^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy}{\int_{\Omega} |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy} = 0,$$

where $\nabla u = (\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u)$. Combining the above result with the inequality

$$2 \max \left\{ 1, \sup_{(x,y) \in \Omega} |x|^\gamma \right\} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy}{\int_{\Omega} |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy} \geq \frac{\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla_x u|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u|^{G(x,y)}] dx dy}{\int_{\Omega} (1 + |x|^\gamma) |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy},$$

for all $u \in C_c^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$, we deduce that relation (7) holds true provided that the conditions in Fan *et al* (2005, theorem 3.1) are fulfilled. On the other hand, relation (7) shows how important

conditions (1) and (2) are in establishing the conclusion of theorem 1. Unfortunately, it is hard to establish if (1) and (2) are also necessary conditions in theorem 1.

Let us try to give some more explanations in order to clarify why conditions (1) and (2) prevent G to be as in the situation of theorem 3.1 in Fan *et al* (2005). With that end in view let $\vec{h} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N = n + m$) be defined by

$$\vec{h}(x, y) = (\vec{f}(x), \vec{g}(y)).$$

Recall that $G(x, y) = p(x) + q(y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \Omega$ and consequently

$$\nabla G(x, y) = \nabla_x p(x) + \nabla_y q(y), \quad \forall (x, y) \in \Omega.$$

Relations (1) and (2) yield that there exists a positive constant h_0 such that

$$\operatorname{div} \vec{h}(x, y) = \operatorname{div}_x \vec{f}(x) + \operatorname{div}_y \vec{g}(y) \geq f_0 + g_0 = h_0 > 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad (8)$$

and

$$\vec{h}(x, y) \cdot \nabla G(x, y) = \vec{f}(x) \cdot \nabla_x p(x) + \vec{g}(y) \cdot \nabla_y q(y) = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (9)$$

A first observation is that in the particular case when G depends on only $N - 1$ variables, say $G(x, y) = G(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_{m-1})$ (that means G does not depend on y_m), then taking the particular formulations for $\vec{f}(x) = \vec{0}_n$ and $\vec{g}(y) = (0, \dots, 0, \exp(y_m))$ relations (8) and (9) are fulfilled. On the other hand, since G does not depend on y_m it follows that for each $(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \cap \Omega$ (actually, $(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_{m-1})$ belongs to the projection of Ω on \mathbb{R}^{N-1}) fixed G is constant when y_m varies (actually, G is constant on $\{y_m \in \mathbb{R} : (x, y) \in \Omega\}$). Thus, the values taken by G in each interior point of Ω are also taken in some points on $\partial\Omega$. Consequently, in this case the hypothesis of theorem 3.1 in Fan *et al* (2005) is not satisfied.

Next, we try to go further with the explanations. Assume that (8) and (9) are satisfied and suppose that there exists an open set $U \subset \Omega$ and a point $(x_0, y_0) \in U$ such that $G(x_0, y_0) < G(x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \partial U$ (the case $G(x_0, y_0) > G(x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \partial U$ can be treated similarly). Particularly, we suppose that $(x_0, y_0) \in U$ is the minimum point of G in \bar{U} . Let $\epsilon > 0$ be small enough such that the ball centred in (x_0, y_0) of radius ϵ , i.e. $B_\epsilon(x_0, y_0)$, satisfies $B_\epsilon(x_0, y_0) \subset U$ and there exists a real number $c > G(x_0, y_0)$ for which there are points in $B_\epsilon(x_0, y_0)$ where G attains the value c . Define

$$\Omega_c := \{(x, y) \in B_\epsilon(x_0, y_0) : G(x_0, y_0) < G(x, y) < c\}.$$

Then

$$\partial\Omega_c = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2,$$

where

$$\Gamma_1 := \{(x, y) \in \bar{\Omega}_c : G(x, y) = G(x_0, y_0)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_2 := \{(x, y) \in \bar{\Omega}_c : G(x, y) = c\}.$$

Assume that Ω_c and Γ_1 and Γ_2 are smooth enough such that we can apply the flux-divergence theorem to find that

$$\int_{\Omega_c} \operatorname{div}(G \vec{h}) \, dx \, dy = \int_{\partial\Omega_c} G \vec{h} \cdot \vec{n} \, d\sigma(x, y),$$

or taking into account relation (9)

$$\int_{\Omega_c} G \operatorname{div}(\vec{h}) \, dx \, dy = \int_{\partial\Omega_c} G \vec{h} \cdot \vec{n} \, d\sigma(x, y). \quad (10)$$

But on $\partial\Omega_c = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ we have $G = G(x_0, y_0)$ on Γ_1 , $G = c$ on Γ_2 and $\vec{n} = \nabla G/|\nabla G|$ on $\partial\Omega_c$. Consequently, in view of relation (9) we deduce

$$\int_{\partial\Omega_c} G \vec{h} \cdot \vec{n} \, d\sigma(x, y) = G(x_0, y_0) \int_{\Gamma_1} \vec{h} \cdot \frac{\nabla G}{|\nabla G|} \, d\sigma(x, y) + c \int_{\Gamma_2} \vec{h} \cdot \frac{\nabla G}{|\nabla G|} \, d\sigma(x, y) = 0.$$

On the other hand, relation (8) implies

$$\int_{\Omega_c} G \operatorname{div}(\vec{h}) \, dx \, dy > 0.$$

The last two relations and relation (10) lead to a contradiction. Unfortunately, the above arguments hold true only in the case when Ω_c and Γ_1 and Γ_2 are smooth enough such that we can apply the flux-divergence theorem but they can be regarded as an attempt to explain that relations (8) and (9) (and consequently relations (1) and (2)) prevent the application of the result in Fan et al (2005).

Finally, we note the interesting fact that as a consequence of theorem 1 and theorem 3.1 in Fan et al (2005) we can deduce the following *maximum principle*:

Proposition 1. Assuming (8) and (9) hold true then for each open set $U \subset \Omega$ the maximum and the minimum of G on \bar{U} are achieved on ∂U .

We point out some examples of functions $\vec{f}(x)$ and $p(x)$ (or $\vec{g}(y)$ and $q(y)$) satisfying conditions (1) and (2). The examples are inspired from Mihăilescu et al (at press) and Mihăilescu and Moroşanu (2010).

Example 1. Let $n \geq 3$ and $\Omega = B_R(0)$, the ball centred in the origin of radius $R > 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n . We define $\vec{f}(x) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\vec{f}(x) = (-x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n).$$

Clearly, $\vec{f}(x)$ is of class C^1 and we have

$$\operatorname{div} \vec{f}(x) = n - 2 \geq 1, \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Thus, condition (1) is satisfied.

Next, we define $p : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow (1, \infty)$ by

$$p(x) = x_1(x_2 + x_3 + \dots + x_{n-1} + x_n) + 2, \quad \forall x \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

Obviously, p is of class C^1 and some elementary computations show that

$$\nabla p(x) \cdot \vec{f}(x) = (x_2 + \dots + x_n)(-x_1) + x_1 x_2 + \dots + x_1 x_n = 0, \quad \forall x \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

It means that condition (2) is satisfied, too.

Example 2. Another example can be obtained in the case when $m \geq 2$ and $q : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow (1, \infty)$ does not depend on at least one of the variables y_1, \dots, y_m , say y_1 for example. In that case it is enough to choose $\vec{g}(y) = (y_1, 0, \dots, 0)$ in order to have relations (1) and (2) fulfilled.

Example 3. Finally, for $n \geq 2$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ an open and bounded set, define $\vec{f}(x) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\vec{f}(x) = (\exp(a_1 x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_{n-1}, x_n), \exp(x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \dots + x_{n-1} + x_n), \dots, \exp(x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_{n-1} + a_n x_n)),$$

where $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \in (0, \infty)$ are such that $a_1 + \dots + a_n = n$. It is obvious that \vec{f} is of class C^1 and

$$\operatorname{div} \vec{f}(x) = a_1 \exp(a_1 x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_{n-1} + x_n) + a_2 \exp(x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \dots + x_{n-1} + x_n) + \dots + a_n \exp(x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_{n-1} + a_n x_n) > 0,$$

that means condition (1) is fulfilled.

Next, define $p : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (1, \infty)$ by

$$p(x) = \exp((1 - a_1)x_1) + \exp((1 - a_2)x_2) + \cdots + \exp((1 - a_n)x_n) + 1,$$

for each $x \in \Omega$. We note that p is of class C^1 with,

$$\nabla p = ((1 - a_1) \exp((1 - a_1)x_1), (1 - a_2) \exp((1 - a_2)x_2), \dots, (1 - a_n) \exp((1 - a_n)x_n))$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{f} \cdot \nabla p &= [(1 - a_1) + (1 - a_2) + \cdots + (1 - a_n)] \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right) \\ &= [n - (a_1 + \cdots + a_n)] \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that condition (2) is satisfied, too.

Remark. Actually, we can obtain examples of $\vec{f}(x)$ and $p(x)$, $\vec{g}(y)$ and $q(y)$ satisfying conditions (1) and (2) by combining the examples pointed out above and considering that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ (with $N = n + m$) is, for instance, a ball centred in the origin.

The next result establishes some compact embeddings of $W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ into suitable Lebesgue spaces.

Theorem 2. *Assume that the hypotheses of theorem 1 are fulfilled and the domain Ω intersects the plane $x = 0$. Furthermore, assume that $s \in (1, G^-)$ and $0 < \gamma < n(G^- - s)$. Then $W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ is compactly embedded in $L^s(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Let $\{u_k\}$ be a bounded sequence in $W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$. Since Ω intersects the plane $x = 0$ it follows that there exists $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $R > 0$ such that $B_R((0_n, y_0)) \subset \Omega$, where 0_n designs the origin in \mathbb{R}^n and $B_R((0_n, y_0)) := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^N; |(x, y) - (0_n, y_0)| < R\}$. Then it is clear that there exists $\epsilon_0 \in (0, \min\{1, R\})$ such that

$$\overline{C_{\epsilon_0}} \subset \overline{B_R((0_n, y_0))} \subset \overline{\Omega},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\epsilon_0} &:= \{(x, y) \in B_R((0_n, y_0)); |x| < \epsilon_0\} \\ &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}; |x| < \epsilon_0, |(x, y) - (0_n, y_0)| < R\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ be arbitrary but fixed and define

$$C_\epsilon := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}; |x| < \epsilon, |(x, y) - (0_n, y_0)| < R\}.$$

By theorem 1 it follows that $\{u_k\}$ is bounded in $L^{G(x,y)}(\Omega)$. Consequently, $\{u_k\} \subset W^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega \setminus \overline{C_\epsilon})$ is a bounded sequence. Since $W^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega \setminus \overline{C_\epsilon}) \subset W^{1,G^-}(\Omega \setminus \overline{C_\epsilon})$ we deduce that $\{u_k\}$ is bounded in $W^{1,G^-}(\Omega \setminus \overline{C_\epsilon})$. The classical compact embedding theorem shows that there exists a convergent subsequence of $\{u_k\}$, still denoted by $\{u_k\}$, in $L^s(\Omega \setminus \overline{C_\epsilon})$. Thus, for any k, l large enough we have

$$\int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{C_\epsilon}} |u_k - u_l|^s \, dx \, dy < \epsilon.$$

On the other hand, Hölder's inequality for variable exponent spaces implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{C_\epsilon} |u_k - u_l|^s \, dx \, dy &= \int_{C_\epsilon} \frac{1}{|x|^\gamma} |x|^\gamma |u_k - u_l|^s \, dx \, dy \\ &\leq D_1 \left| \frac{1}{|x|^{\gamma/G(x,y)}} \chi_{C_\epsilon} \right|_{\left(\frac{G(x,y)}{s}\right)'} \left| |x|^{\gamma/G(x,y)} |u_k - u_l|^s \right|_{\frac{G(x,y)}{s}}, \end{aligned}$$

where D_1 is a positive constant.

Taking into account that for each $(x, y) \in C_\epsilon$ we have $|x| < \epsilon_0 \leq 1$, the relations between the Luxemburg norm and modular and the conclusion of Theorem 1 we deduce the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} | |x|^{\gamma/G(x,y)} |u_k - u_l|^s |_{\frac{G(x,y)}{s}} &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{s}} |u_k - u_l|^{G(x,y)} dx dy \right)^{1/G^-} \\ &\quad + \left(\int_{\Omega} |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{s}} |u_k - u_l|^{G(x,y)} dx dy \right)^{1/G^+} \\ &\leq \sup_{(x,y) \in \Omega} |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{sG^-}} \left(\int_{\Omega} |x|^{\gamma} |u_k - u_l|^{G(x,y)} dx dy \right)^{1/G^-} \\ &\quad + \sup_{(x,y) \in \Omega} |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{sG^+}} \left(\int_{\Omega} |x|^{\gamma} |u_k - u_l|^{G(x,y)} dx dy \right)^{1/G^+} \\ &\leq M < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where M is a positive constant.

Finally, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{|x|^{\gamma/G(x,y)}} \chi_{C_\epsilon} \right|_{\left(\frac{G(x,y)}{s}\right)'} &\leq \left[\rho_{\left(\frac{G(x,y)}{s}\right)'} \left(\frac{1}{|x|^{\gamma/G(x,y)}} \chi_{C_\epsilon} \right) \right]^{\left(\left(\frac{G(x,y)}{s}\right)'\right)^+} \\ &\quad + \left[\rho_{\left(\frac{G(x,y)}{s}\right)'} \left(\frac{1}{|x|^{\gamma/G(x,y)}} \chi_{C_\epsilon} \right) \right]^{\left(\left(\frac{G(x,y)}{s}\right)'\right)^-}, \end{aligned}$$

where $(G(x, y)/s)' = G(x, y)/(G(x, y) - s)$.

Now, we compute

$$I_\epsilon := \int_{C_\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{|x|^{\gamma/G(x,y)}} \right)^{\frac{G(x,y)}{G(x,y)-s}} dx dy.$$

Clearly,

$$I_\epsilon \leq \int_{C_\epsilon} |x|^{\frac{-\gamma}{G-s}} dx dy.$$

Define

$$\Omega_1 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; |x| < \epsilon\}$$

and

$$\Omega_2 := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m; |y - y_0| < R\}.$$

It is easy to check that

$$\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}; |x| < \epsilon, |y - y_0| < R\} \supset C_\epsilon.$$

Then it is clear that

$$I_\epsilon \leq \int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} |x|^{\frac{-\gamma}{G-s}} dx dy.$$

Define $F : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, by $F(x, y) = |x|^{\frac{-\gamma}{G-s}}$. For each $x \in \Omega_1 \setminus \{0\}$ we have

$$\int_{\Omega_2} |F(x, y)| dy = |x|^{\frac{-\gamma}{G-s}} |\Omega_2| < \infty.$$

On the other hand, the co-area formula yields

$$\int_{\Omega_1} |x|^{\frac{-\gamma}{G^- - s}} dx = \int_0^\epsilon \omega_n t^{n-1 - \frac{\gamma}{G^- - s}} dt = \text{const.} \epsilon^{n - \frac{\gamma}{G^- - s}},$$

where ω_n is the area of the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n .

Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega_1} dx \int_{\Omega_2} |x|^{\frac{-\gamma}{G^- - s}} dy = |\Omega_2| \int_{\Omega_1} |x|^{\frac{-\gamma}{G^- - s}} dx < \infty,$$

and we can apply Tonelli's theorem (see, Brezis (1992, théorème IV.4)) in order to find $F \in L^1(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$. Next, we apply Fubini's Theorem (see Brezis (1992, théorème IV.5)) and we deduce that

$$\int_{\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2} |x|^{\frac{-\gamma}{G^- - s}} dx dy \leq \text{const.} \epsilon^{n - \frac{\gamma}{G^- - s}}.$$

We infer that

$$I_\epsilon \leq M_1(\epsilon^{\alpha_1} + \epsilon^{\alpha_2}),$$

where α_1, α_2 and M_1 are positive constants.

Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega} |u_k - u_l|^s dx dy \leq M_2(\epsilon + \epsilon^{\alpha_1} + \epsilon^{\alpha_2}),$$

where $M_2 > 0$ is a constant.

We conclude that $\{u_k\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^s(\Omega)$ and the conclusion is now obvious. \square

Corollary 1. *Assume that the hypotheses of theorem 1 are fulfilled and the domain Ω intersects the plane $x = 0$. Furthermore, $s : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (1, \infty)$ is a continuous function and $0 < \gamma < n(G^- - s^+)$, $s^+ \in (1, G^-)$. Then $W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ is compactly embedded in $L^{s(x,y)}(\Omega)$.*

5. A PDE involving a Grushin-type operator with a variable exponent

In this section we are working under conditions introduced in the previous sections and furthermore, we assume that the hypotheses of corollary 1 are fulfilled. We analyse the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{G(x,y)} u = \lambda(1 + |x|^\gamma)|u|^{G(x,y)-2}u + \mu|u|^{s(x,y)-2}u, & \text{for } (x, y) \in \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{for } (x, y) \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ intersects the plane $x = 0$ and $s : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow (1, \infty)$ is a continuous function satisfying the conditions from corollary 1.

Define

$$\lambda_1 := \inf_{u \in C_c^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{G(x,y)} [|\nabla_x u|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u|^{G(x,y)}] dx dy}{\int_{\Omega} \frac{1 + |x|^\gamma}{G(x,y)} |u|^{G(x,y)} dx dy}.$$

By theorem 1 we infer that $\lambda_1 > 0$.

We say that $u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ is a *weak solution* of problem (11) if

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla_x u|^{G(x,y)-2} \nabla_x u \nabla_x v + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u|^{G(x,y)-2} \nabla_y u \nabla_y v) \, dx \, dy \\ - \lambda \int_{\Omega} (1 + |x|^\gamma) |u|^{G(x,y)-2} uv \, dx \, dy - \mu \int_{\Omega} |u|^{s(x,y)-2} uv \, dx \, dy = 0$$

for all $v \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$.

The main result of this section is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *For any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu > 0$ problem (11) has a nontrivial weak solution.*

In order to prove theorem 3 we define the functional $I : W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$I(u) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{G(x,y)} [|\nabla_x u|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u|^{G(x,y)}] \, dx \, dy \\ - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \frac{1 + |x|^\gamma}{G(x,y)} |u|^{G(x,y)} \, dx \, dy - \mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{s(x,y)} |u|^{s(x,y)} \, dx \, dy.$$

Standard arguments show that $I \in C^1(W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega), \mathbb{R})$ and

$$\langle I'(u), v \rangle = \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla_x u|^{G(x,y)-2} \nabla_x u \nabla_x v + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u|^{G(x,y)-2} \nabla_y u \nabla_y v) \, dx \, dy \\ - \lambda \int_{\Omega} (1 + |x|^\gamma) |u|^{G(x,y)-2} uv \, dx \, dy - \mu \int_{\Omega} |u|^{s(x,y)-2} uv \, dx \, dy,$$

for all $u, v \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$. Thus, in order to find weak solutions of equation (11) it is enough to find *critical points* for functional I .

Lemma 1. *For any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu > 0$ there exist $\xi > 0$ and $r > 0$ such that*

$$I(u) \geq r, \quad \forall u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega) \quad \text{with } \|u\| = \xi.$$

Proof. Let $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $\mu > 0$ be arbitrary but fixed. Since $s^+ < G^-$ by corollary 1 it follows that $W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ is continuously embedded in $L^{s^\pm}(\Omega)$. That fact combined with the simple remark that

$$|u(x,y)|^{s(x,y)} \leq |u(x,y)|^{s^+} + |u(x,y)|^{s^-}, \quad \forall u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega), \quad (x,y) \in \Omega,$$

and theorem 1 yield that there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that for any $u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ the following inequality holds true:

$$I(u) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}\right) \frac{1}{G^+} \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla_x u|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u|^{G(x,y)}] \, dx \, dy - \mu c_1 [\|u\|^{s^-} + \|u\|^{s^+}].$$

On the other hand, recalling relation (4) it is clear that for each $u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ with $\|u\| > 1$ we have

$$\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla_x u| + |x|^{\gamma/G(x,y)} |\nabla_y u|]^{G(x,y)} \, dx \, dy \geq \|u\|^{G^-}.$$

Since $G(x,y) \geq 2$ for each $(x,y) \in \Omega$ we deduce that for any $(x,y) \in \Omega$ we have

$$(|\nabla_x u| + |x|^{\gamma/G(x,y)} |\nabla_y u|)^{G(x,y)} \leq 2^{G^+-1} (|\nabla_x u|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u|^{G(x,y)}).$$

Combining the last three relations we infer that

$$I(u) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}\right) \frac{1}{2^{G^+-1} G^+} \|u\|^{G^-} - \mu c_1 [\|u\|^{s^-} + \|u\|^{s^+}], \quad (12)$$

for each $u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ with $\|u\| > 1$. (Actually, it is easy to check that a inequality of type (12) holds true for each $u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ but replacing $\|u\|^{G^-}$ by $\|u\|^{G^+}$ when $\|u\| \leq 1$.)

Inequality (12) and the fact that $G^- > s^+ \geq s^-$ imply that there exists $\xi > 1$ large enough for which we can choose $r > 0$ such that

$$I(u) \geq r, \quad \forall u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega) \quad \text{with } \|u\| = \xi.$$

The proof of lemma 1 is complete. \square

Lemma 2. *There exists $\varphi \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $I(t\varphi) < 0$, for each $t > 0$ small enough.*

Proof. Fix $\varphi \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ For any $t \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(t\varphi) &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{G(x,y)} [|\nabla_x(t\varphi)|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y(t\varphi)|^{G(x,y)}] dx dy \\ &\quad - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \frac{1+|x|^\gamma}{G(x,y)} |t\varphi|^{G(x,y)} dx dy - \mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{s(x,y)} |t\varphi|^{s(x,y)} dx dy \\ &\leq t^{G^-} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{G(x,y)} [|\nabla_x\varphi|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y\varphi|^{G(x,y)}] dx dy \\ &\quad - t^{s^+} \mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{s(x,y)} |\varphi|^{s(x,y)} dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Since $G^- > s^+$ it is clear that

$$I(t\varphi) < 0,$$

provided that

$$0 < t < \min \left\{ 1, \left(\frac{\mu \cdot \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{s(x,y)} |\varphi|^{s(x,y)} dx dy}{\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{G(x,y)} [|\nabla_x\varphi|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y\varphi|^{G(x,y)}] dx dy} \right)^{1/(G^- - s^+)} \right\}.$$

The proof of lemma 2 is complete. \square

Proof of theorem 3. By inequality (12) we obtain that I is bounded from below on $\overline{B_\xi(0)}$ (In this proof $B_\xi(0) := \{v \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega); \|v\| < \xi\}$ stands for the ball centred in the origin and of radius ξ in $W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$). Thus, using Ekeland's variational principle (see Ekeland (1974) or Willem (1996)) to the functional $I : \overline{B_\xi(0)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, it follows that there exists $u_\epsilon \in \overline{B_\xi(0)}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} I(u_\epsilon) &< \inf_{\overline{B_\xi(0)}} I + \epsilon, \\ I(u_\epsilon) &< I(u) + \epsilon \cdot \|u - u_\epsilon\|, \quad u \neq u_\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Using lemmas 1 and 2 we find

$$\inf_{\partial B_\xi(0)} I \geq r > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\overline{B_\xi(0)}} I < 0.$$

We choose $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$0 < \epsilon \leq \inf_{\partial B_\xi(0)} I - \inf_{\overline{B_\xi(0)}} I.$$

Therefore, $I(u_\epsilon) < \inf_{\partial B_\xi(0)} I$ and thus, $u_\epsilon \in B_\xi(0)$.

We define $T : B_\xi(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $T(u) = I(u) + \epsilon \cdot \|u - u_\epsilon\|$. It is clear that u_ϵ is a minimum point of T and thus

$$\frac{T(u_\epsilon + \delta \cdot v) - T(u_\epsilon)}{\delta} \geq 0$$

for a small $\delta > 0$ and any $v \in B_1(0)$. The above relation yields

$$\frac{I(u_\epsilon + \delta \cdot v) - I(u_\epsilon)}{\delta} + \epsilon \|v\| \geq 0.$$

Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ it follows that $\langle I'(u_\epsilon), v \rangle + \epsilon \cdot \|v\| > 0$ and we infer that $\|I'(u_\epsilon)\| \leq \epsilon$.

We deduce that there exists a sequence $\{u_n\} \subset B_\xi(0)$ such that

$$I(u_n) \rightarrow c = \inf_{B_\xi(0)} I < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad I'(u_n) \rightarrow 0. \quad (13)$$

It is clear that $\{u_n\}$ is bounded in $W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$. Thus, there exists $u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ such that, up to a subsequence, $\{u_n\}$ converges weakly to u in $W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$. Then theorems 2 and 1 imply that $\{u_n\}$ converges strongly to u in $L^{s(x,y)}(\Omega)$ and weakly to u in $L^{G(x,y)}(\Omega)$. Thus,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{s(x,y)-2} u_n v \, dx \, dy = \int_{\Omega} |u|^{s(x,y)-2} u v \, dx \, dy,$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{G(x,y)-2} u_n v \, dx \, dy = \int_{\Omega} |u|^{G(x,y)-2} u v \, dx \, dy,$$

for any $v \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$.

On the other hand, relation (13) implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle I'(u_n), v \rangle = 0,$$

for all $v \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$.

The above information implies

$$I'(u) = 0,$$

and thus, u is a weak solution of equation (11).

We prove now that $u \neq 0$. Assume by contradiction that $u \equiv 0$ and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla_x u_n|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u_n|^{G(x,y)}) \, dx \, dy = l \geq 0.$$

Since by relation (13) we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle I'(u_n), u_n \rangle = 0$ and $\{u_n\}$ converges strongly to 0 in $L^{s(x,y)}(\Omega)$ and the above relation holds true we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 > c + o(1) &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{G(x,y)} [|\nabla_x u_n|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u_n|^{G(x,y)}] \, dx \, dy \\ &\quad - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \frac{1 + |x|^\gamma}{G(x,y)} |u_n|^{G(x,y)} \, dx \, dy - \mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{s(x,y)} |u_n|^{s(x,y)} \, dx \, dy \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}\right) \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{G(x,y)} [|\nabla_x u_n|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u_n|^{G(x,y)}] \, dx \, dy \\ &\quad - \mu \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{s(x,y)} |u_n|^{s(x,y)} \, dx \, dy \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}\right) \frac{1}{G^+} \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla_x u_n|^{G(x,y)} + |x|^\gamma |\nabla_y u_n|^{G(x,y)}] \, dx \, dy \\ &\quad - \frac{\mu}{s^-} \int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{s(x,y)} \, dx \, dy \rightarrow \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}\right) \frac{1}{G^+} l \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

and that is a contradiction. We conclude that $u \neq 0$.

Thus, theorem 3 is completely proved. \square

Acknowledgments

M Mihăilescu has been partially supported by the Grant CNCSIS PD-117/2010 ‘Probleme neliniare modelate de operatori diferențiali neomogeni’. D Stancu-Dumitru was partially supported by the strategic grant POSDRU/88/1.5/S/49516, Project ID 49516 (2009), co-financed by the european Social Fund- Investing in People, within the Sectorial Operational Programme Human Resources Development 2007-2013. The authors wish to thank their colleague Liviu Ignat for some helpful comments.

Appendix

In this section we show that the norms

$$\|u\| := \left| |\nabla_x u| + |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{G(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u| \right|_{G(x,y)}$$

and

$$\|u\|_1 := \left| |(\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u)| \right|_{G(x,y)}$$

are equivalent on the Sobolev type space $W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$, provided that there exists a constant $m > 0$ such that for each $(x, y) \in \Omega$ we have $|x| \geq m$. Particularly, that fact shows that the function space $W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ represents a natural generalization of the *classical* variable exponent Sobolev space $W_0^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$.

More exactly, we will prove

Proposition 2. *Assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N = n + m$) is a bounded and smooth domain for which there exists a constant $m > 0$ such that for each $(x, y) \in \Omega$ we have $|x| \geq m$. Then the norms*

$$\|u\| := \left| |\nabla_x u| + |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{G(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u| \right|_{G(x,y)},$$

$$\|u\|_1 := \left| |(\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u)| \right|_{G(x,y)},$$

$$\|u\|_2 := \left| |(\nabla_x u, |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{G(x,y)}} \nabla_y u) \right|_{G(x,y)},$$

are equivalent.

Proof.

- First, we prove that the norms $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$ are equivalent. Let $u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ be arbitrary but fixed. By the definition of the Luxemburg norm we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\sqrt{|\nabla_x u|^2 + |x|^{\frac{2\gamma}{G(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u|^2}}{\|u\|_2} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy \leq 1.$$

On the other hand, it is obvious that for each $(x, y) \in \Omega$ we have

$$|\nabla_x u| + |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{G(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u| \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \sqrt{|\nabla_x u|^2 + |x|^{\frac{2\gamma}{G(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u|^2}.$$

Combining the above two relations we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla_x u| + |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{G(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u|}{\sqrt{2} \cdot \|u\|_2} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy \leq 1.$$

Therefore,

$$\|u\| \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \|u\|_2, \quad \forall u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega).$$

Next, we turn back once more to the definition of the Luxemburg norm and deduce

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla_x u| + |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{\sigma(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u|}{\|u\|} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy \leq 1.$$

On the other hand, simple computations show that for each $(x, y) \in \Omega$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(\nabla_x u, |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{\sigma(x,y)}} \nabla_y u)|^{G(x,y)} &= \sqrt{|\nabla_x u|^2 + |x|^{\frac{2\gamma}{\sigma(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u|^2}^{G(x,y)} \\ &\leq (|\nabla_x u| + |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{\sigma(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u|)^{G(x,y)} \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|(\nabla_x u, |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{\sigma(x,y)}} \nabla_y u)|}{\|u\|} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy \leq 1,$$

or

$$\|u\|_2 \leq \|u\|, \quad \forall u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega).$$

Thus, the norms $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$ are equivalent.

- Second, we prove that the norms $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\|\cdot\|_1$ are equivalent, provided that there exists a constant $m > 0$ such that for each $(x, y) \in \Omega$ we have $|x| \geq m$. We start by pointing out that taking $a = \sqrt{\min_{(x,y) \in \Omega} \{1, |x|^{2\gamma}\}}$ and $b = \sqrt{\max_{(x,y) \in \Omega} \{1, |x|^{2\gamma}\}}$ we have for all $u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$, $(x, y) \in \Omega$ and $\mu > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} a \left(\frac{|(\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u)|}{\mu} \right)^{G(x,y)} &\leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{|\nabla_x u|^2 + |x|^{\frac{2\gamma}{\sigma(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u|^2}}{\mu} \right)^{G(x,y)} \\ &\leq b \left(\frac{|(\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u)|}{\mu} \right)^{G(x,y)}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating over Ω yields

$$\begin{aligned} a \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|(\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u)|}{\mu} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\sqrt{|\nabla_x u|^2 + |x|^{\frac{2\gamma}{\sigma(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u|^2}}{\mu} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy \\ &\leq b \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|(\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u)|}{\mu} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

for all $u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ and $\mu > 0$.

Next, let $u \in W_{0,\gamma}^{1,G(x,y)}(\Omega)$ be arbitrary but fixed.

Let $\mu = \|u\|_1$ in (14). Then, since $\int_{\Omega} (|(\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u)|/\|u\|_1)^{G(x,y)} dx dy = 1$ we have

$$a \leq \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\sqrt{|\nabla_x u|^2 + |x|^{\frac{2\gamma}{\sigma(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u|^2}}{\|u\|_1} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy \leq b.$$

If $b \leq 1$ then it is clear that $\|u\|_2 \leq \|u\|_1$.

If $b > 1$ then we have

$$\frac{1}{b} \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\sqrt{|\nabla_x u|^2 + |x|^{\frac{2\gamma}{\sigma(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u|^2}}{\|u\|_1} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy \leq 1.$$

Combining that fact with the inequality $\frac{1}{b^{G(x,y)}} \leq \frac{1}{b}$ for each $(x, y) \in \Omega$ we deduce

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\sqrt{|\nabla_x u|^2 + |x|^{\frac{2\gamma}{G(x,y)}} |\nabla_y u|^2}}{b \|u\|_1} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy \leq 1,$$

i.e.

$$\|u\|_2 \leq b \|u\|_1.$$

Let $\mu = \|u\|_2$ in (14). Then, since $\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla_x u, |x|^{\frac{\gamma}{G(x,y)}} \nabla_y u| / \|u\|_2)^{G(x,y)} dx dy = 1$ we have

$$a \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u|}{\|u\|_2} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy \leq 1.$$

If $a \geq 1$ then

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u|}{\|u\|_2} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy \leq \frac{1}{a} \leq 1,$$

i.e.

$$\|u\|_1 \leq \|u\|_2.$$

If $a < 1$ then $a^{G(x,y)} \leq a$ for each $(x, y) \in \Omega$ and consequently

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla_x u, \nabla_y u|}{\frac{\|u\|_2}{a}} \right)^{G(x,y)} dx dy \leq 1,$$

i.e.

$$\|u\|_1 \leq \frac{\|u\|_2}{a}.$$

In brief, we found

- if $a > 1$ then $\frac{\|u\|_2}{b} \leq \|u\|_1 \leq \|u\|_2$;
- if $b < 1$ then $\|u\|_2 \leq \|u\|_1 \leq \frac{\|u\|_2}{a}$;
- if $a < 1 < b$ then $\frac{\|u\|_2}{b} \leq \|u\|_1 \leq \frac{\|u\|_2}{a}$.

Consequently, the norms $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\|\cdot\|_1$ are equivalent, provided that there exists a constant $m > 0$ such that for each $(x, y) \in \Omega$ we have $|x| \geq m$.

The proof of proposition 2 is complete. \square

References

- Bocea M and Mihăilescu M 2010 Γ -convergence of power-law functionals with variable exponents *Nonlinear Anal.* **73** 110–21
- Bocea M, Mihăilescu M, Pérez-Llanos M and Rossi J D 2011 Models for growth of heterogeneous sandpiles via Mosco convergence, in preparation
- Bocea M, Mihăilescu M and Popovici C 2010 On the asymptotic behavior of variable exponent power-law functionals and applications *Ricerche Mat.* **59** 207–38
- Brezis H 1992 *Analyse Fonctionnelle. Théorie, Méthodes et Applications* (Paris: Masson)
- Chen Y, Levine S and Rao M 2006 Variable exponent, linear growth functionals in image processing *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **66** 1383–406
- D'Ambrosio L 2004 Hardy inequalities related to Grushin type operators *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* **132** 725–34
- D'Ambrosio L 2005 Hardy-type inequalities related to degenerate elliptic differential operators *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **4** 451–86

- Diening L, Harjulehto P, Hästö P and Ružička M 2011 *Lebesgue and Sobolev Spaces with Variable Exponents (Lecture Notes in Mathematics vol 2017)* (Berlin: Springer)
- Ekeland I 1974 On the variational principle *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **47** 324–53
- Fan X, Zhang Q and Zhao D 2005 Eigenvalues of $p(x)$ -Laplacian Dirichlet problem, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **302** 306–17
- Fagnelli G 2010 Positive periodic solutions for a system of anisotropic parabolic equations *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **367** 204–28
- Grushin V V 1971 A certain class of elliptic pseudo differential operators that are degenerated on a submanifold *Mat. Sb.* **84** 163–95
- Grushin V V 1971 *Math. USSR Sb.* **13** 155–83 (Engl. transl.)
- Harjulehto P, Hästö P, Le U V and Nuortio M 2010 Overview of differential equations with non-standard growth *Nonlinear Anal.* **72** 4551–74
- Kováčik O and Rákosník J 1991 On spaces $L^{p(x)}$ and $W^{k,p(x)}$ *Czech. Math. J.* **41** 592–618
- Mihăilescu M and Moroşanu G 2010 On an eigenvalue problem for an anisotropic elliptic equation involving variable exponents *Glasgow Math. J.* **52** 517–27
- Mihăilescu M, Rădulescu V and Stancu-Dumitru D 2011 On a Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg type inequality in bounded domains involving variable exponent growth conditions and applications to PDE's *Complex Variables-Elliptic Eqns* at press
- Monti R and Morbidelli D 2006 Kelvin transform for Grushin operator and critical semilinear equations *Duke Math. J.* **131** 167–202
- Rajagopal K R and Ružička M 2001 Mathematical modeling of electrorheological materials *Contin. Mech. Thermodyn.* **13** 59–78
- Ružička M 1999 Flow of shear dependent electrorheological fluids: unsteady space periodic case *Applied Nonlinear Analysis* (New York: Kluwer/Plenum) pp 485–504
- Ružička M 2000 *Electrorheological Fluids: Modeling and Mathematical Theory (Lecture Notes in Mathematics vol 1748)* (Berlin: Springer)
- Tri N M 1998 On Grushin's equation *Math. Notes* **63** 84–93
- Tri N M 1998 *Mmat. Zametki* **63** 95–105 (Engl. transl.)
- Willem M 1996 *Minimax Theorems* (Boston, MA: Birkhäuser)