Hindawi Publishing Corporation
Abstract and Applied Analysis
Volume 2007, Article ID 43018, 19 pages
doi:10.1155/2007/43018

Research Article

Multiple Positive Solutions of Nonhomogeneous Elliptic Equations in Unbounded Domains

Tsing-San Hsu

Received 7 July 2006; Revised 25 December 2006; Accepted 25 December 2006

Recommended by Martin J. Bohner

We will show that under suitable conditions on f and h, there exists a positive number λ^* such that the nonhomogeneous elliptic equation $-\Delta u + u = \lambda(f(x,u) + h(x))$ in Ω, $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $N \geq 2$, has at least two positive solutions if $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$, a unique positive solution if $\lambda = \lambda^*$, and no positive solution if $\lambda > \lambda^*$, where Ω is the entire space or an exterior domain or an unbounded cylinder domain or the complement in a strip domain of a bounded domain. We also obtain some properties of the set of solutions.

1. Introduction

Let $2^* = 2N/(N-2)$ for $N \geq 3$, $2^* = \infty$ for $N = 2$. In this paper, we study the existence, nonexistence, and multiplicity of solutions of the equation

$$-\Delta u + u = \lambda\big(f(x,u) + h(x)\big) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u \text{ in } H_0^1(\Omega),\ u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega,\ N \geq 2, \tag{1.1$_\lambda$}$$

where $\lambda > 0$, $N = m + n \geq 2$, $n \geq 1$, $0 \in \omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is a smooth bounded domain, $\mathbb{S} = \omega \times \mathbb{R}^n$, D is a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ such that $D \subset\subset \mathbb{S}$, $\Omega = \mathbb{S}\backslash\overline{D}$ is the exterior of this domain in the strip.

Associated to $(1.1)_\lambda$, we consider the functional I, for $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$,

$$I(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \big(|\nabla u|^2 + u^2\big)dx - \lambda\int_\Omega F(x,u^+)\,dx - \lambda\int_\Omega h(x)u\,dx, \tag{1.1}$$

where $F(x,t) = \int_0^t f(x,s)ds$.

It is assumed that $h(x) \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^{q_0}(\Omega)$ for some $q_0 > N/2$ if $N \geq 4$, $q_0 = 2$ if $N = 2,3$, $h(x) \geq 0$, $h(x) \not\equiv 0$, and $f(x,t)$ satisfies the following conditions:

$(f1)$ $f(x,\cdot) \in C^1([0,+\infty),\mathbb{R}^+)$, $f(x,t) \equiv 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{S}$, $t \leq 0$, and $\lim_{t\to 0}(f(x,t)/t) = 0$ uniformly for $x \in \mathbb{S}$;

$(f2)$ there exists a positive constant C such that for all $x \in \mathbb{S}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$0 < \frac{\partial}{\partial t} f(x,t) \leq C\left(1 + |t|^{p-2}\right), \tag{1.2}$$

where $2 < p < 2^*$;

$(f3)$ there exists a number $\theta \in [1/p, 1)$ such that

$$\theta t \frac{\partial}{\partial t} f(x,t) \geq f(x,t) > 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{S},\ t > 0; \tag{1.3}$$

$(f4)$ there exists $\overline{f} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{|x|\to\infty} f(x,t) = \overline{f}(t)$ uniformly for bounded $t > 0$, $f(x,t) \geq \overline{f}(t)$, for all $x \in \mathbb{S}$, $t \geq 0$, and $\lim_{t\to\infty}(f(x,t)/t) = \infty$ uniformly for $x \in \mathbb{S}$;

$(f5)$ $f(x,\cdot) \in C^2(0,+\infty)$ and $(\partial^2/\partial t^2) f(x,t) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{S}$, $t \geq 0$.

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, by $(f1)$ and $(f2)$, there exists a $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq f(x,u) \leq \varepsilon u + C_\varepsilon |u|^{p-1}, \tag{1.4}$$

$$0 \leq F(x,u) \leq \varepsilon u^2 + C_\varepsilon |u|^p. \tag{1.5}$$

If $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ or $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N \backslash \overline{D}$ ($m = 0$ in our case), then the homogeneous case of problem $(1.1)_\lambda$ (i.e., the case $h(x) \equiv 0$) has been studied by many authors; see Cao [1] and the references therein. For the nonhomogeneous case ($h(x) \not\equiv 0$), Zhu-Zhou [2] have studied the multiplicity of positive solutions of equations similar to $(1.1)_\lambda$. Recently, Chen [3] showed that there exists a $\lambda^* > 0$ such that $(1.1)_\lambda$ has exactly two positive solutions if $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$, and $(1.1)_\lambda$ has no positive solution when $\lambda \in (\lambda^*,\infty)$. However, her method cannot determine whether λ^* is bounded or infinite (at least for general nonlinearity $f(x,u)$). In this paper, one of our results answers the question (see Theorem 1.1). Now, we state our main results.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega = \mathbb{S} \backslash \overline{D}$ or $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N \backslash \overline{D}$ or $\Omega = \mathbb{S}$ or $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$. Suppose $h(x) \geq 0$, $h(x) \not\equiv 0$, $h(x) \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^{q_0}(\Omega)$ for some $q_0 > N/2$ if $N \geq 4$, $q_0 = 2$ if $N = 2,3$, and $f(x,t)$ satisfies $(f1)$–$(f5)$. Then there exists $\lambda^* > 0$, $0 < \lambda^* < \infty$, such that*

(i) *equation $(1.1)_\lambda$ has at least two positive solutions u_λ, U_λ and $u_\lambda < U_\lambda$ if $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$;*

(ii) *equation $(1.1)_{\lambda^*}$ has a unique positive solution u_{λ^*};*

(iii) *equation $(1.1)_\lambda$ has no positive solutions if $\lambda > \lambda^*$,*

where u_λ is the minimal solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ and U_λ is the second solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ constructed in Section 4.

Theorem 1.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, then*

(i) *u_λ is strictly increasing with respect to λ, u_λ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ for all $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*]$ and*

$$u_\lambda \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \text{ as } \lambda \longrightarrow 0^+; \tag{1.6}$$

(ii) U_λ *is unbounded in* $L^\infty(\Omega)\cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ *for* $\lambda\in(0,\lambda^*)$, *that is,*

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0^+}||U_\lambda|| = \lim_{\lambda\to 0^+}||U_\lambda||_\infty = \infty, \tag{1.7}$$

where $\|U_\lambda\| = (\int_\Omega(|\nabla U|^2+U^2)dx)^{1/2}$ *and* $\|U_\lambda\|_\infty = \sup_{x\in\Omega}|U(x)|$.

First of all, we list some properties of $f(x,t)$. The proof can be found in Zhu-Zhou [2, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 1.3. *Assume* $(f1)$, $(f3)$, *and* $(f5)$ *hold, then*

(i) $tf(x,t)\ge \nu F(x,t)$ *for all* $x\in\mathbb{S}$, $t>0$ *and* $\nu = 1+\theta^{-1}\in(2,p+1]$;

(ii) $t^{-1/\theta}f(x,t)$ *is monotone nondecreasing and* $t^{-1}f(x,t)$ *is strictly monotone increasing for all* $x\in\mathbb{S}$, $t>0$;

(iii) $f(x,t_1+t_2)\ge f(x,t_1)+f(x,t_2)$ *and* $f(x,t_1+t_2)\not\equiv f(x,t_1)+f(x,t_2)$ *for all* $x\in\mathbb{S}$, $t_1,t_2>0$.

2. Asymptotic behavior of solutions

Throughout this paper, let $x=(y,z)$ be the generic point of $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $y\in\mathbb{R}^m$, $z\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $N=m+n\ge 2$, $n\ge 1$. We denote by C and C_i $(i=1,2,\dots)$ universal constants, maybe the constants here should be allowed to depend on n and p, unless some statement is given, and denote $(\partial/\partial t)f(x,t)$ and $(\partial^2/\partial t^2)f(x,t)$ by $f'(x,t)$ and $f''(x,t)$, respectively, in what follows.

We define

$$\begin{gathered}\|u\| = \left(\int_\Omega(|\nabla u|^2+u^2)dx\right)^{1/2},\\ \|u\|_p = \left(\int_\Omega |u|^p dx\right)^{1/p},\quad 2\le p<\infty,\\ \|u\|_\infty = \sup_{x\in\Omega}|u(x)|.\end{gathered} \tag{2.1}$$

Now, we introduce the equation at infinity associated with $(1.1)_\lambda$ on an unbounded cylinder domain $\mathbb{S}$,

$$\begin{gathered}-\Delta u+u=\lambda\overline{f}(u)\quad \text{in } \mathbb{S},\\ u\in H_0^1(\mathbb{S}),\quad N\ge 2.\end{gathered} \tag{2.1$_\lambda$}$$

P. L. Lions has studied the following minimization problem closely related to $(2.1)_\lambda$:

$$S^\infty = \inf\{I^\infty(u): u\in H_0^1(\mathbb{S}),\ u\not\equiv 0,\ I^{\infty'}(u)=0\}>0, \tag{2.2}$$

where $I^\infty(u) = (1/2)\int_{\mathbb{S}}(|\nabla u|^2+u^2)dx - \lambda\int_{\mathbb{S}}\overline{F}(u^+)dx$, $\overline{F}(t)=\int_0^t\overline{f}(s)ds$. For this problem, also a minimum exists and is realized by a ground state solution $w>0$ in $\mathbb{S}$ such that

$$S^\infty = I^\infty(w) = \sup_{t\ge 0} I^\infty(tw). \tag{2.3}$$

In order to get the asymptotic behavior of solutions of $(1.1)_\lambda$ and $(2.1)_\lambda$, we need the following Lemmas 2.3 and 2.5. First, we quote two regularity lemmas (see Hsu [4] for the proof). Now, let $\mathbb{X}$ be a $C^{1,1}$ domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ (typically the domains considered in the introduction).

Lemma 2.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Carathéodory function such that for almost every $x \in \mathbb{X}$, there holds*

$$|f(x,u)| \leq C(|u| + |u|^{p-1}) \quad \text{uniformly in } x \in \mathbb{X}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $2 < p < 2^*$. If $u \in H_0^1(\mathbb{X})$ is a weak solution of equation $-\Delta u = f(x,u) + h(x)$ in $\mathbb{X}$, where $h \in L^{N/2}(\mathbb{X}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{X})$, then $u \in L^q(\mathbb{X})$ for $q \in [2,\infty)$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $g \in L^2(\mathbb{X}) \cap L^q(\mathbb{X})$ for some $q \in [2,\infty)$ and let $u \in H_0^1(\mathbb{X})$ be a weak solution of the equation $-\Delta u + u = g$ in $\mathbb{X}$. Then $u \in W^{2,q}(\mathbb{X})$ satisfies*

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,q}(\mathbb{X})} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{X})} + \|g\|_{L^q(\mathbb{X})}), \tag{2.5}$$

where $C = C(N,q,\partial\mathbb{X})$.

By Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, we obtain the first asymptotic behavior of solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$.

Lemma 2.3 (asymptotic lemma 1). *Let $(f1)$, $(f2)$ hold and let u be a weak solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$, then $u(y,z) \to 0$ as $|z| \to \infty$ uniformly for $y \in \omega$. Moreover, there exist positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that*

$$\|u\|_\infty \leq C_1\|u\|_{q_0} + \lambda C_2\left(\|u\|_{(p-1)q_0}^{p-1} + \|h\|_{q_0}\right). \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. Suppose that u is a solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$, then $-\Delta u + u = \lambda(f(x,u) + h(x))$ in Ω. Since $h \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^{q_0}(\Omega)$ for some $q_0 > N/2$ if $N \geq 4$, $q_0 = 2$ if $N = 2,3$, this implies $h \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^{N/2}(\Omega)$ for $N \geq 2$. By (1.4) and Lemma 2.1, we conclude that

$$u \in L^q(\Omega) \quad \text{for } q \in [2,\infty). \tag{2.7}$$

Hence $\lambda(f(x,u) + h(x)) \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^{q_0}(\Omega)$ and by Lemma 2.2, we have

$$u \in W^{2,2}(\Omega) \cap W^{2,q_0}(\Omega), \qquad q_0 > N/2 \quad \text{if } N \geq 4, \quad q_0 = 2 \quad \text{if } N = 2,3. \tag{2.8}$$

Now, by the Sobolev embedding theorem, we obtain that $u \in C_b(\overline{\Omega})$. It is well known that the Sobolev embedding constants are independent of domains (see Adams [5]). Thus there exists a constant C such that for $R > 0$,

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega\backslash B_R)} \leq C\|u\|_{W^{2,q_0}(\Omega\backslash B_R)} \quad \text{for } N \geq 2, \tag{2.9}$$

where $B_R = \{x = (y,z) \in \Omega \mid |z| \le R\}$. From this, we conclude that $u(y,z) \to 0$ as $|z| \to \infty$ uniformly for $y \in \omega$. By Lemma 2.2 and (1.4), we also have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_\infty &\le C\|u\|_{W^{2,q_0}(\Omega)} \\ &\le C\Big(\|u\|_{q_0} + \big\|\lambda f(x,u) + \lambda h(x)\big\|_{q_0}\Big) \\ &\le C_1\|u\|_{q_0} + \lambda C_2\Big(\|u\|^{p-1}_{(p-1)q_0} + \|h\|_{q_0}\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where C_1, C_2 are constants independent of λ. □

Remark 2.4. Let w be a positive solution of $(2.1)_\lambda$. If $h(x) \equiv 0$ and $f(x,t) \equiv \overline{f}(t)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{S}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, by Lemma 2.3, then we have that $w(y,z) \to 0$ as $|z| \to \infty$ uniformly for $y \in \omega$.

We use Lemma 2.3, and modify the proof in Hsu [6], we obtain a precise asymptotic behavior of solutions of $(2.1)_\lambda$ at infinity and the second asymptotic behavior of solutions of $(1.1)_\lambda$.

Lemma 2.5 (asymptotic lemma 2). *Let w be a positive solution of $(2.1)_\lambda$, let u be a positive solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ and let φ be the first positive eigenfunction of the Dirichlet problem $-\Delta\varphi = \mu_1\varphi$ in ω, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ with $0 < \varepsilon < 1 + \mu_1$, there exist constants $C, C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} w(y,z) &\le C_\varepsilon\varphi(y)\exp\Big(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1-\varepsilon}|z|\Big), \\ w(y,z) &\ge C\varphi(y)\exp\Big(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1}|z|\Big)|z|^{-(n-1)/2} \qquad \text{as } |z| \longrightarrow \infty,\ y \in \overline{\omega}, \\ u(y,z) &\ge C\varphi(y)\exp\Big(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1}|z|\Big)|z|^{-(n-1)/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. (i) First, we claim that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ with $0 < \varepsilon < 1 + \mu_1$, there exists $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$w(y,z) \le C_\varepsilon\varphi(y)\exp\Big(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1-\varepsilon}|z|\Big) \quad \text{as } |z| \longrightarrow \infty,\ y \in \overline{\omega}. \tag{2.12}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\varepsilon < 1$. Now given $\varepsilon > 0$, by $(f1)$, $(f4)$, and Remark 2.4, we may choose R_0 large enough such that

$$\lambda\overline{f}(w(y,z)) \le \lambda f(x, w(y,z)) \le \varepsilon w(y,z) \quad \text{for } |z| \ge R_0. \tag{2.13}$$

Let $q = (q_y, q_z)$, $q_y \in \partial\omega$, $|q_z| = R_0$, and B a small ball in Ω such that $q \in \partial B$. Since $\varphi(y) > 0$ for $x = (y,z) \in B$, $\varphi(q_y) = 0$, $w(x) > 0$ for $x \in B$, $w(q) = 0$, by the strong maximum principle $(\partial\varphi/\partial y)(q_y) < 0$, $(\partial w/\partial x)(q) < 0$. Thus

$$\lim_{\substack{x\to q \\ |z|=R_0}} \frac{w(x)}{\varphi(y)} = \frac{(\partial w/\partial x)(q)}{(\partial\varphi/\partial y)(q_y)} > 0. \tag{2.14}$$

Note that $w(x)\varphi^{-1}(y) > 0$ for $x = (y,z)$, $y \in \omega$, $|z| = R_0$. Thus $w(x)\varphi^{-1}(y) > 0$ for $x = (y,z)$, $y \in \overline{\omega}$, $|z| = R_0$. Since $\varphi(y)\exp(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1-\varepsilon}|z|)$ and $w(x)$ belong to $C^1(\overline{\omega \times \partial B_{R_0}(0)})$, if set

$$C_\varepsilon = \sup_{y\in\overline{\omega},\, |z|=R_0} \Big(w(x)\varphi^{-1}(y)\exp\Big(\sqrt{1+\mu_1-\varepsilon}R_0\Big)\Big), \tag{2.15}$$

then $C_\varepsilon > 0$ and

$$C_\varepsilon \varphi(y)\exp\left(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1-\varepsilon}R_0\right) \ge w(x) \quad \text{for } y\in\overline{\omega},\ |z| = R_0. \tag{2.16}$$

Let $\Phi_1(x) = C_\varepsilon\varphi(y)\exp(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1-\varepsilon}|z|)$ for $x\in\overline{\Omega}$. Then for $|z|\ge R_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(w-\Phi_1)(x)-(w-\Phi_1)(x) &= -\lambda\overline{f}(w(x))+\left(\varepsilon+\frac{\sqrt{1+\mu_1-\varepsilon}(n-1)}{|z|}\right)\Phi_1(x)\\ &\ge -\varepsilon w(x)+\varepsilon\Phi_1(x)\\ &= \varepsilon(\Phi_1-w)(x).\end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

Hence $\Delta(w-\Phi_1)(x)-(1-\varepsilon)(w-\Phi_1)(x)\ge 0$ for $|z|\ge R_0$.

The strong maximum principle implies that $w(x)-\Phi_1(x)\le 0$ for $x=(y,z)$, $y\in\overline{\omega}$, $|z|\ge R_0$, and therefore we get this claim.

(ii) Let

$$\Psi(y,z) = \left(1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{|z|}}\right)\varphi(y)\exp\left(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1}|z|\right)|z|^{-(n-1)/2} \quad \text{for } (y,z)\in\Omega. \tag{2.18}$$

It is very easy to show that

$$-\Delta\Psi+\Psi\le 0 \quad \text{for } y\in\overline{\omega},\ |z| \text{ large}. \tag{2.19}$$

Therefore, by means of the maximum principle, there exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$\left.\begin{aligned} w(y,z)&\ge C\varphi(y)\exp\left(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1}|z|\right)|z|^{-(n-1)/2}\\ u(y,z)&\ge C\varphi(y)\exp\left(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1}|z|\right)|z|^{-(n-1)/2}\end{aligned}\right. \quad \text{as } |z|\longrightarrow\infty,\ y\in\overline{\omega}. \tag{2.20}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.5. □

3. Existence of the minimal solution

We now prove the existence of minimal positive solutions of $(1.1)_\lambda$.

LEMMA 3.1. *If $(f1)$ and $(f2)$ hold, then for any given $\rho>0$, there exists $\lambda_0>0$ such that for $\lambda\in(0,\lambda_0)$, one has $I(u)>0$ for all $u\in S_\rho=\{u\in H_0^1(\Omega)\mid \|u\|=\rho\}$. Moreover, for any $\varepsilon\ge 0$, there exists $\delta>0$ $(\delta\le\rho)$ such that $I(u)\ge-\varepsilon$ for all $u\in\{u\in H_0^1(\Omega)\mid \rho-\delta\le\|u\|=\rho\}$.*

Proof. By (1.5), the Sobolev embedding theorem, and the Hölder inequality, we have that, for all $u\in S_\rho$,

$$\begin{aligned} I(u) &= \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2-\lambda\int_\Omega F(x,u^+)\,dx-\lambda\int_\Omega hu\,dx\\ &\ge \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2-\lambda\int_\Omega(\varepsilon|u|^2+C_\varepsilon|u|^p)\,dx-\lambda\|h\|_2\|u\|\\ &\ge \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2-\lambda C(\|u\|^2+\|u\|^p)\,dx-\lambda\|h\|_2\|u\|\\ &\ge \rho\left(\frac{1}{2}\rho-\lambda C(\rho+\rho^{p-1})-\lambda\|h\|_2\right),\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant which is independent of λ, ρ. Hence by (3.1), there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$, we have $I(u) > 0$ for all $u \in S_\rho$.

Moreover, we can choose $\lambda_0 > 0$ small enough such that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}\left(\frac{1}{2}\rho - \lambda C(\rho + \rho^{p-1})\right) = \frac{1}{2} - \lambda(1 + (p-1)\rho^{p-2}) > 0 \quad \text{for } \lambda \in (0, \lambda_0). \tag{3.2}$$

Then for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ $(\delta \leq \rho)$ such that $I(u) \geq -\varepsilon$ for all $u \in \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \mid \rho - \delta \leq \|u\| \leq \rho\}$. □

Lemma 3.2. *Assume $(f1)$ and $(f2)$ hold. If λ_0 is chosen as in Lemma 3.1 and $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$, then there exists a $u_0 \in B_\rho$ such that u_0 is a positive solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$.*

Proof. Since $h \not\equiv 0$ and $h \geq 0$, we can choose a function $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $\int_\Omega h\varphi > 0$. For $t \in (0, +\infty)$, then by (1.5),

$$\begin{aligned} I(t\varphi) &= \frac{t^2}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla\varphi|^2 + \varphi^2) - \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^N} F(x, t\varphi^+) - \lambda t \int_\Omega h\varphi \\ &\leq \frac{t^2}{2}\|\varphi\|^2 + \lambda C t^2 \int_\Omega (|\varphi|^2 + t^{p-2}|\varphi|^p) - \lambda t \int_\Omega h\varphi. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Then for t small enough, $I(t\varphi) < 0$. So $\alpha = \inf\{I(u) \mid u \in \overline{B_\rho}\}$. Clearly $\alpha > -\infty$. By Lemma 3.1, there exists ρ' such that $0 < \rho' < \rho$ and $\alpha = \inf\{I(u) \mid u \in \overline{B_{\rho'}}\}$. By Ekeland's variational principle [7], there exists a $(PS)_\alpha$-sequence $\{u_k\} \subset \overline{B_{\rho'}}$, that is, $I(u_k) = \alpha + o(1)$ and $I'(u_k) = o(1)$ strongly in $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ as $k \to \infty$. Then there exists a subsequence $\{u_k\}$ and $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_k \rightharpoonup u_0$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, $u_k \to u_0$ strongly in $L_{\mathrm{loc}}^q(\Omega)$ for $2 \leq q < 2^*$ and $u_k \to u_0$ a.e. in Ω. Since $I'(u_k) = o(1)$ strongly in $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ as $k \to \infty$, and by $(f1)$ and $(f2)$, we have $I'(u_0) = 0$ in $H^{-1}(\Omega)$, that is, u_0 is a weak nonnegative solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$; and since $h \not\equiv 0$, by the maximum principle for weak solutions, we have $u_0 > 0$ in Ω. □

By the standard barrier method, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *If $(f1)$ and $(f2)$ hold, then there exists $\lambda^* \in (0, +\infty]$ such that*

(i) *for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, $(1.1)_\lambda$ has a minimal positive solution u_λ and u_λ is strictly increasing in λ;*

(ii) *if $\lambda > \lambda^*$, $(1.1)_\lambda$ has no positive solution.*

Proof. Setting $Q_\lambda = \{0 < \lambda < +\infty \mid (1.1)_\lambda \text{ is solvable}\}$, by Lemma 3.2, we have Q_λ is nonempty. Denoting $\lambda^* = \sup Q_\lambda > 0$, we claim that $(1.1)_\lambda$ has at least one solution for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$. In fact, for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, by the definition of λ^*, we know that there exists $\lambda' > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < \lambda' < \lambda^*$ such that $(1.1)_{\lambda'}$ has a solution $u_{\lambda'} > 0$, that is,

$$-\Delta u_{\lambda'} + u_{\lambda'} = \lambda'(f(x, u_{\lambda'}) + h(x)) \geq \lambda(f(x, u_{\lambda'}) + h(x)). \tag{3.4}$$

Then $u_{\lambda'}$ is a supersolution of $(1.1)_\lambda$. From $h(x) \geq 0$ and $h(x) \not\equiv 0$, it is easy to see that 0 is a subsolution of $(1.1)_\lambda$. By the standard barrier method, there exists a solution $u_\lambda > 0$ of $(1.1)_\lambda$ such that $0 \leq u_\lambda \leq u_{\lambda'}$. Since 0 is not a solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ and $\lambda' > \lambda$, the maximum principle implies that $0 < u_\lambda < u_{\lambda'}$. Again using a result of Amann [8, Theorem 9.4], we can choose a minimal positive solution u_λ of $(1.1)_\lambda$. □

Let u_λ be the minimal positive solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$, we study the following eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{gathered} -\Delta v + v = \sigma_\lambda f'(x,u_\lambda)v \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ v \in H_0^1(\Omega), \quad v > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \end{gathered} \tag{3.5}$$

then we have the following.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume $(f1)$–$(f5)$ hold, and let the first eigenvalue σ_λ of (3.5) be defined by*

$$\sigma_\lambda = \inf\left\{ \int_\Omega (|\nabla v|^2 + v^2)\,dx \mid v \in H_0^1(\Omega),\ \int_\Omega f'(x,u_\lambda)v^2\,dx = 1 \right\}. \tag{3.6}$$

Then

(i) *σ_λ is achieved;*

(ii) *$\sigma_\lambda > \lambda$ and is strictly decreasing in λ, $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$;*

(iii) *$\lambda^* < +\infty$ and $(1.1)_{\lambda^*}$ has a minimal positive solution u_{λ^*}.*

Proof. (i) Indeed, recall assumption $(f3)$, by the definition of σ_λ, we know that $0 < \sigma_\lambda < +\infty$. Let $\{v_k\} \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ be a minimizing sequence of σ_λ, that is,

$$\int_\Omega f'(x,u_\lambda)v_k^2\,dx = 1, \qquad \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla v_k|^2 + v_k^2\right)dx \longrightarrow \sigma_\lambda \quad \text{as } k \longrightarrow \infty. \tag{3.7}$$

This implies that $\{v_k\}$ is bounded in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, then there exists a subsequence, still denoted by $\{v_k\}$ and some $v_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & v_k \rightharpoonup v_0 \quad \text{weakly in } H_0^1(\Omega), \\ & v_k \longrightarrow v_0 \quad \text{almost everywhere in } \Omega, \\ & v_k \longrightarrow v_0 \quad \text{strongly in } L^s_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega) \quad \text{for } 2 \le s < 2^*. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Thus

$$\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla v_0|^2 + v_0^2\right)dx \le \liminf \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla v_k|^2 + v_k^2\right)dx = \sigma_\lambda. \tag{3.9}$$

By Lemma 2.3 and $(f1)$, we have $f'(x,u_\lambda) \to 0$ as $|x| \to \infty$, it is standard to show that v_0 achieves σ_λ. Clearly $|v_0|$ also achieves σ_λ. By (3.5) and the maximum principle, we may assume $v_0 > 0$ in Ω.

(ii) We now prove $\sigma_\lambda > \lambda$. Setting $\lambda' > \lambda > 0$ and $\lambda' \in (0,\lambda^*)$, by Lemma 3.3, $(1.1)_{\lambda'}$ has a positive solution $u_{\lambda'}$. Since u_λ is the minimal positive solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$, then $u_{\lambda'} > u_\lambda$ as $\lambda' > \lambda$. By virtue of $(1.1)_{\lambda'}$ and $(1.1)_\lambda$, we see that

$$-\Delta(u_{\lambda'} - u_\lambda) + (u_{\lambda'} - u_\lambda) = \lambda' f(x,u_{\lambda'}) - \lambda f(x,u_\lambda) + (\lambda' - \lambda)h. \tag{3.10}$$

Applying the Taylor expansion and noting that $\lambda' > \lambda$, $h(x) \geq 0$, and $f''(x,t) \geq 0$, $f(x,t) > 0$ for all $t > 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta(u_{\lambda'} - u_\lambda) + (u_{\lambda'} - u_\lambda) &\geq (\lambda' - \lambda) f(x,u_\lambda) + \lambda' f'(x,u_\lambda)(u_{\lambda'} - u_\lambda) \\ &> \lambda f'(x,u_\lambda)(u_{\lambda'} - u_\lambda). \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Let $v_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $v_0 > 0$ solves (3.5). Multiplying (3.11) by v_0 and noting (3.5), then we get

$$\sigma_\lambda \int_\Omega f'(x,u_\lambda)(u_{\lambda'} - u_\lambda) v_0 dx > \lambda \int_\Omega f'(x,u_\lambda)(u_{\lambda'} - u_\lambda) v_0 dx, \tag{3.12}$$

hence $\sigma_\lambda > \lambda$. Now, let v_λ be a minimizer of σ_λ, then

$$\int_\Omega f'(x,u_{\lambda'}) v_\lambda^2 dx > \int_\Omega f'(x,u_\lambda) v_\lambda^2 dx = 1, \tag{3.13}$$

and there exists t, with $0 < t < 1$ such that

$$\int_\Omega f'(x,u_{\lambda'})(t v_\lambda)^2 dx = 1. \tag{3.14}$$

Therefore

$$\sigma_{\lambda'} \leq t^2 ||v_\lambda||^2 < ||v_\lambda||^2 = \sigma_\lambda \tag{3.15}$$

showing that σ_λ is strictly decreasing in λ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$.

(iii) We show next that $\lambda^* < +\infty$. Let $\lambda_0 \in (0, \lambda^*)$ be fixed. For any $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, we have $\sigma_\lambda > \lambda$ and by (3.15), then

$$\sigma_{\lambda_0} \geq \sigma_\lambda > \lambda \tag{3.16}$$

for all $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda^*)$. Thus $\lambda^* < +\infty$.

By (3.5) and $\sigma_\lambda > \lambda$, we have

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_\lambda|^2 + |u_\lambda|^2) dx > \int_\Omega \lambda f'(x,u_\lambda) u_\lambda^2 dx, \tag{3.17}$$

and also we have

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_\lambda|^2 + |u_\lambda|^2) dx - \int_\Omega \lambda f(x,u_\lambda) u_\lambda dx - \int_\Omega \lambda h(x) u_\lambda dx = 0. \tag{3.18}$$

By $(f3)$ and (3.17), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega (|\nabla u_\lambda|^2 + |u_\lambda|^2) dx &= \int_\Omega \lambda f(x,u_\lambda) u_\lambda dx + \int_\Omega \lambda h(x) u_\lambda dx \\ &\leq \theta \int_\Omega \lambda f'(x,u_\lambda) u_\lambda^2 dx + \lambda \|h\|_2 ||u_\lambda|| \\ &\leq \theta ||u_\lambda||^2 + \lambda \|h\|_2 ||u_\lambda||. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

This implies that

$$||u_\lambda|| \leq \frac{\lambda}{1-\theta}\|h\|_2 \tag{3.20}$$

for all $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$. By Lemma 3.3(i), the solution u_λ is strictly increasing with respect to λ; we may suppose that

$$u_\lambda \rightharpoonup u_{\lambda^*} \quad \text{weakly in } H_0^1(\Omega) \text{ as } \lambda \longrightarrow \lambda^*, \tag{3.21}$$

and by (1.4), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega (\nabla u_\lambda \cdot \nabla\varphi + u_\lambda\varphi)\,dx &\longrightarrow \int_\Omega (\nabla u_{\lambda^*} \cdot \nabla\varphi + u_{\lambda^*}\varphi)\,dx, \\ \lambda\int_\Omega (f(x,u_\lambda)+h)\varphi\,dx &\longrightarrow \lambda^*\int_\Omega (f(x,u_{\lambda^*})+h)\varphi\,dx \end{aligned} \quad \text{as } \lambda \longrightarrow \lambda^* \tag{3.22}$$

for all $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Hence u_{λ^*} is a minimal positive solution of $(1.1)_{\lambda^*}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.4. □

4. Existence of second solution

When $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$, we know that $(1.1)_\lambda$ has a minimal positive solution u_λ by Lemma 3.3, then we need only to prove that $(1.1)_\lambda$ has another positive solution in the form of $U_\lambda = u_\lambda + \overline{v}$, where $\overline{v}$ is a solution of the following equation:

$$\begin{gathered} -\Delta v + v = \lambda(f(x,u_\lambda+v) - f(x,u_\lambda)) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ v > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad v \in H_0^1(\Omega). \end{gathered} \tag{4.1}$$

We define the energy functional $J : H_0^1(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$J(v) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla v|^2 + v^2)\,dx - \lambda\int_\Omega (F(x,u_\lambda+v^+) - F(x,u_\lambda) - f(x,u_\lambda)v^+)\,dx. \tag{4.2}$$

Using the monotonicity of f and the maximum principle, we know that the nontrivial critical points of energy functional J are the positive solutions of (4.1).

First, we give an inequality about concerning f and u_λ.

Lemma 4.1. *If $(f1)$ and $(f2)$ hold, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$f(x,u_\lambda+s) - f(x,u_\lambda) - f'(x,u_\lambda)s \leq \varepsilon s + C_\varepsilon s^{p-1}, \quad s \geq 0, \text{ uniformly } \forall x \in \mathbb{S}, \tag{4.3}$$

where $1 < p < 2^* - 1$ and u_λ is the minimal solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$.

Proof. By $(f1)$, $(f2)$, (1.4), and Lemma 2.3, we obtain $u_\lambda \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and

$$\lim_{s\to 0} \frac{f(x,u_\lambda+s)-f(x,u_\lambda)-f'(x,u_\lambda)s}{s} = 0,$$
$$0 \le \limsup_{s\to\infty} \frac{f(x,u_\lambda+s)-f(x,u_\lambda)-f'(x,u_\lambda)s}{s^{p-1}} \le C_\varepsilon \tag{4.4}$$

uniformly for all $x \in \mathbb{S}$. Thus, it is clear that Lemma 4.1 holds. □

Lemma 4.2. *If $(f1)$–$(f5)$ hold, then there exist $\rho > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that*

$$J(v) \ge \alpha > 0 \tag{4.5}$$

for all $v \in S_\rho = \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \mid \|u\| = \rho\}$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.4, it is easy to see that, for all $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$,

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla v|^2 + v^2)\,dx \ge \sigma_\lambda \int_\Omega f'(x,u_\lambda)v^2\,dx. \tag{4.6}$$

Again by Lemma 4.1 and the Sobolev embedding theorem, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
J(v) &= \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla v|^2 + v^2)\,dx - \lambda \int_\Omega (F(x,u_\lambda+v^+) - F(x,u_\lambda) - f(x,u_\lambda)v^+)\,dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\|v\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_\Omega f'(x,u_\lambda)\left|v^+\right|^2 dx \\
&\quad - \lambda \int_\Omega \int_0^{v^+} (f(x,u_\lambda+s) - f(x,u_\lambda) - f'(x,u_\lambda)s)\,ds\,dx \\
&\ge \frac{1}{2}\|v\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_\Omega f'(x,u_\lambda)\left|v^+\right|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2}\lambda\varepsilon\int_\Omega \left|v^+\right|^2 dx - \frac{1}{p}\lambda C_\varepsilon \int_\Omega \left|v^+\right|^p dx \\
&\ge \frac{1}{2}\|v\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2}\sigma^{-1}\|v\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda\varepsilon\|v\|^2 - \lambda C_\varepsilon \|v\|^p \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\sigma_\lambda^{-1}(\sigma_\lambda - \lambda - \lambda\sigma_\lambda\varepsilon)\|v\|^2 - \lambda C_\varepsilon\|v\|^p.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Since $\sigma_\lambda > \lambda$, we may choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that $\sigma_\lambda - \lambda - \lambda\sigma_\lambda\varepsilon > 0$. If we take $\varepsilon = (\sigma_\lambda - \lambda)/2\lambda\sigma_\lambda$, then

$$J(v) \ge \frac{1}{4}\sigma_\lambda^{-1}(\sigma_\lambda - \lambda)\|v\|^2 - C\|v\|^p. \tag{4.8}$$

Hence, there exist $\rho > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that $J(v) \ge \alpha > 0$ for all $v \in S_\rho = \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \mid \|u\| = \rho\}$. □

Proposition 4.3. *Assume $(f1)$–$(f4)$ hold. Let $\{v_k\}$ be a $(PS)_c$-sequence of J. Then there exists a subsequence (still denoted by $\{v_k\}$) for which the following holds: there exist an integer $l \ge 0$, sequences $\{x_k^i\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$, $1 \le i \le l$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, of the form $(0,z_k^i) \in \mathbb{S}$, a solution $\overline{v}$ of (4.1), and solutions u^i of $(2.1)_\lambda$, $1 \le i \le l$, such that, for some subsequence $\{v_k\}$, as $k \to \infty$,* *one has*

$$
\begin{gathered}
v_k \rightharpoonup \overline{v} \quad \text{weakly in } H_0^1(\Omega), \\
J(v_k) \longrightarrow J(\overline{v}) + \sum_{i=1}^{l} I^\infty(u^i), \\
v_k - \left(\overline{v} + \sum_{i=1}^{l} u^i(x - x_k^i)\right) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{strong in } H_0^1(\mathbb{S}), \\
|x_k^i| \longrightarrow \infty, \quad |x_k^i - x_k^j| \longrightarrow \infty, \quad 1 \le i \ne j \le l,
\end{gathered} \tag{4.9}
$$

where one agrees that in the case $l = 0$ the above holds without u^i, x_k^i.

Proof. This result can be derived from the arguments in [9] (see also [10–12]). Here we omit it. □

Now, let δ be small enough, D^δ a δ-tubular neighborhood of D such that $D^\delta \subset\subset \mathbb{S}$. Let $\eta(x) : \mathbb{S} \to [0,1]$ be a C^∞ cutoff function such that $0 \le \eta \le 1$ and

$$
\eta(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \in D; \\ 1, & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{S} \backslash \overline{D}^\delta. \end{cases} \tag{4.10}
$$

Let $e_N = (0,0,\dots,0,1) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, denote

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tau_0 &= 2 \sup_{x \in D^\delta} |x| + 1, \\
w_\tau(x) &= w(x - \tau e_N),
\end{aligned} \qquad \tau \in [0,\infty), \tag{4.11}
$$

where w is a ground state solution of $(2.1)_\lambda$.

Lemma 4.4. *If $(f1)$–$(f5)$ hold, then*

(i) *there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $J(t\eta w_\tau) < 0$ for $t \ge t_0$, $\tau \ge \tau_0$,*

(ii) *there exists $\tau_* > 0$ such that the following inequality holds for $\tau \ge \tau_*$:*

$$
0 < \sup_{t \ge 0} J(t\eta w_\tau) < I^\infty(w) = S^\infty. \tag{4.12}
$$

Proof. (i) By the definition of η and Lemma 1.3(iii), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
J(t\eta w_\tau) &= \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla(t\eta w_\tau)|^2 + (t\eta w_\tau)^2\right)dx - \lambda \int_\Omega \int_0^{t\eta w_\tau} \left(f(x,u_\lambda + s) - f(x,u_\lambda)\right)ds\,dx \\
&\le \frac{t^2}{2}\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla(\eta w_\tau)|^2 + (\eta w_\tau)^2\right)dx - \lambda \int_{\mathbb{S}\backslash\overline{D}^\delta} F(x,tw_\tau)\,dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}
$$

From Lemma 1.3(ii), we have that $F(x,u)/(\nu^{-1}u^\nu)$ is monotone nondecreasing for $u > 0$, where $\nu = 1 + \theta^{-1} > 2$. Thus for any given constant $C > 0$, there exists $u_0 \ge 0$ such that

$$
F(x,u) \ge Cu^\nu \quad \forall u \ge u_0. \tag{4.14}
$$

Let r_0 be a positive constant such that $B^m(0;r_0) = \{y \mid |y| \le r_0\} \subset\subset \omega$, $B^n(0;1) = \{z \mid |z| \le 1\}$, $\Omega_1 = B^m(0;r_0) \times B^n(0;1)$, and $\Omega_{1\tau} = B^m(0;r_0) \times \{z + \tau e_N \mid |z| \le 1\}$. By the definition of τ_0, we have that $\Omega_{1\tau} \subset\subset \Omega \backslash \overline{D}^{\delta}$ for all $\tau \ge \tau_0$. This also implies that there exists $t_0 \ge 0$, as $t \ge t_0$, we have

$$F(x, tw_\tau) \ge Ct^\nu w^\nu \quad \forall \tau \ge \tau_0,\ \forall x \in \Omega_{1\tau}. \tag{4.15}$$

Therefore as $t > t_0$ and $\tau \ge \tau_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} J(t\eta w_\tau) &\le \frac{t^2}{2}\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla(\eta w_\tau)|^2 + (\eta w_\tau)^2\right)dx - \lambda C t^\nu \int_{\Omega_{1\tau}} w_\tau^\nu dx \\ &\le \frac{t^2}{2}\|\eta w_\tau\|^2 - \lambda C t^\nu \int_{\Omega_1} w^\nu dx. \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Since $\nu > 2$, we can choose $t_0 > 0$ large enough such that (i) holds.

(ii) By (i), J is continuous on $H_0^1(\Omega)$, $J(0) = 0$, and Lemma 4.2, we know that there exists t_1 with $0 < t_1 < t_0$ such that

$$\sup_{t \ge 0} J(t\eta w_\tau) = \sup_{t_1 \le t \le t_0} J(t\eta w_\tau) \quad \forall \tau \ge \tau_0. \tag{4.17}$$

Now, we define $\eta_\tau(x) = \eta(x + \tau e_N)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{S}$. For $\tau \ge \tau_0$, $t_1 \le t \le t_0$, by $(f4)$, (1.4), (2.3), Lemmas 1.3 and 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J(t\eta w_\tau) &= \frac{t^2}{2}\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla(\eta w_\tau)|^2 + (\eta w_\tau)^2\right)dx - \lambda\int_\Omega F(x, t\eta w_\tau)dx \\ &\quad - \lambda\int_\Omega\int_0^{t\eta w_\tau} \left(f(x, u_\lambda + s) - f(x, u_\lambda) - f(x, s)\right)ds\,dx \\ &\le \frac{t^2}{2}\int_{\mathbb{S}} (-\Delta w + w)(\eta_\tau^2 w)dx + \frac{t^2}{2}\int_{\mathbb{S}} |\nabla \eta_\tau|^2 |w|^2 dx - \lambda\int_{\mathbb{S}} F(x, tw_\tau)dx \\ &\quad + \lambda\int_{\mathbb{S}}\int_{t\eta w_\tau}^{tw_\tau} f(x,s)ds\,dx - \lambda\int_\Omega\int_0^{t\eta w_\tau} \left(f(x, u_\lambda + s) - f(x, u_\lambda) - f(x, s)\right)ds\,dx \\ &\le \frac{t^2}{2}\int_{\mathbb{S}} \left(|\nabla w|^2 + w^2\right)dx - \lambda\int_{\mathbb{S}} \overline{F}(tw_\tau)dx + \frac{t_0^2}{2}\int_{D^\delta \backslash D} |\nabla \eta|^2 |w_\tau|^2 dx \\ &\quad + \lambda\int_{D^\delta}\int_0^{tw_\tau} f(x,s)ds\,dx - \lambda\int_\Omega\int_0^{t\eta w_\tau} \left(f(x, u_\lambda + s) - f(x, u_\lambda) - f(x, s)\right)ds\,dx \\ &\le S^\infty + C_\varepsilon \exp\left(-2\sqrt{1 + \mu_1 - \varepsilon}\,\tau\right) + \lambda C\int_{D^\delta}\left[\frac{(tw_\tau)^2}{2} + \frac{(tw_\tau)^p}{p}\right]dx \\ &\quad - \lambda\int_\Omega\int_0^{t\eta w_\tau} \left(f(x, u_\lambda + s) - f(x, u_\lambda) - f(x, s)\right)ds\,dx \\ &\le S^\infty + C_\varepsilon \exp\left(-2\sqrt{1 + \mu_1 - \varepsilon}\,\tau\right) \\ &\quad - \lambda\int_\Omega\int_0^{t\eta w_\tau} \left(f(x, u_\lambda + s) - f(x, u_\lambda) - f(x, s)\right)ds\,dx, \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

where $0 < \varepsilon < 1 + \mu_1$ and C_ε is independent of τ.

It follows from Taylor's expansion that

$$f(x,u_\lambda+s)=f(x,s)+f'(x,s)u_\lambda+\frac{1}{2}f''(x,\xi)u_\lambda^2,\quad \xi\in(s,u_\lambda+s). \tag{4.19}$$

From $(f5)$ and the above formula, for $t_1\le t\le t_0$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{t\eta w_\tau}\left(f(x,u_\lambda+s)-f(x,u_\lambda)-f(x,s)\right)ds\\
&\quad\ge\int_0^{t_1\eta w_\tau}\left(f'(x,s)u_\lambda-f(x,u_\lambda)\right)ds\\
&\quad=\left[(t_1w_\tau)^{-1}f(x,t_1\eta w_\tau)-\eta u_\lambda^{-1}f(x,u_\lambda)\right]t_1w_\tau u_\lambda.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Since $w_\tau>0$ in $\mathbb{S}$, there exists $\gamma_1>0$ such that

$$w_\tau\ge\gamma_1\quad\text{in }\Omega_{1\tau}. \tag{4.21}$$

By the definition of w_τ and $u_\lambda(x)\to0$ as $|x|\to\infty$, we see that for τ large enough,

$$t_1w_\tau\ge u_\lambda\quad\text{in }\Omega_{1\tau}, \tag{4.22}$$

then Lemma 1.3(ii) implies that there exist $\gamma_2>0$ and $\tau_1>0$ such that, for $\tau\ge\tau_1$,

$$(t_1w_\tau)^{-1}f(x,t_1w_\tau)-u_\lambda^{-1}f(x,u_\lambda)>\gamma_2\quad\text{in }\Omega_{1\tau}. \tag{4.23}$$

Now by Lemma 2.5, for $\tau\ge\max(\tau_0,\tau_1)$ and $t_1\le t\le t_0$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega_{1\tau}}\int_0^{t\eta w_\tau}\left(f(x,u_\lambda+s)-f(x,u_\lambda)-f(x,s)\right)ds\,dx\\
&\quad\ge\int_{\Omega_{1\tau}}\left[(t_1w_\tau)^{-1}f(x,t_1w_\tau)-u_\lambda^{-1}f(x,u_\lambda)\right]t_1w_\tau u_\lambda\,dx\\
&\quad\ge\gamma_1\gamma_2\int_{\Omega_{1\tau}}t_1u_\lambda\,dx\\
&\quad\ge C_2\exp\left(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1}\,\tau\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

where C_2 is independent of τ.

Therefore we obtain that

$$J(t\eta w_\tau)\le S^\infty+C_\varepsilon\exp\left(-2\sqrt{1+\mu_1-\varepsilon}\,\tau\right)-\lambda C_2\exp\left(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1}\,\tau\right), \tag{4.25}$$

for $t\in[t_1,t_0]$ and $\tau\ge\max(\tau_0,\tau_1)$.

Now, let $\varepsilon=(1+\mu_1)/2$, then we can find some τ_* large enough such that

$$C_\varepsilon\exp\left(-\sqrt{2(1+\mu_1)}\,\tau\right)-\lambda C_2\exp\left(-\sqrt{1+\mu_1}\,\tau\right)<0, \tag{4.26}$$

for all $\tau\ge\tau_*$ and we complete the proof. □

THEOREM 4.5. *If $(f1)$–$(f5)$ hold, then (4.1) has a positive solution $\overline{v}$ if $\lambda\in(0,\lambda^*)$.*

Proof. Now, set

$$\Gamma = \{p \in C([0,1], H_0^1(\Omega)) \mid p(0) = 0,\ p(1) = t_0 \eta w_{\tau_*}\},$$
$$c = \inf_{p\in\Gamma} \max_{s\in[0,1]} J(p(s)). \tag{4.27}$$

By Lemmas 4.2 and 4.4, we have

$$0 < \alpha \le c < S^\infty. \tag{4.28}$$

Applying the mountain pass theorem of Ambrosetti-Rabinowitz [13], there exists a $(PS)_c$-sequence $\{v_k\}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$J(v_k) \longrightarrow c,$$
$$J'(v_k) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{strong in } H^{-1}(\Omega). \tag{4.29}$$

By Proposition 4.3, there exist a sequence (still denoted by $\{v_k\}$), an integer $l \ge 0$, sequence $\{x_k^i\}$ in $\mathbb{S}$, $1 \le i \le l$, a solution $\overline{v}$ of (4.1), and solutions u^i of $(2.1)_\lambda$ such that

$$c = J(\overline{v}) + \sum_{i=0}^{l} I^\infty(u^i). \tag{4.30}$$

By the strong maximum principle, to complete the proof, we only need to prove $\overline{v} \not\equiv 0$ in Ω. In fact, we have

$$c = J(\overline{v}) \ge \alpha > 0 \quad \text{if } l = 0, \qquad S^\infty > c \ge J(\overline{v}) + S^\infty \quad \text{if } l \ge 1. \tag{4.31}$$

This implies $\overline{v} \not\equiv 0$ in Ω. □

5. Properties of solutions

Denote by $A = \{(\lambda, u) \mid u \text{ solves problem } (1.1)_\lambda\}$, the set of solutions of $(1.1)_\lambda$, $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*]$. For each $(\lambda, u) \in A$, let $\sigma_\lambda(u)$ denote the number defined by

$$\sigma_\lambda(u) = \inf\left\{ \int_\Omega (|\nabla v|^2 + v^2)dx \mid v \in H_0^1(\Omega),\ \int_\Omega f'(x,u)v^2 dx = 1 \right\}, \tag{5.1}$$

which is the smallest eigenvalue of the following problem:

$$-\Delta v + v^2 = \sigma_\lambda(u) f'(x,u) v \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$
$$v > 0, \quad v \in H_0^1(\Omega). \tag{5.2}$$

In this section, we always assume that $(f1)$–$(f5)$ hold. By Lemma 2.3, we have $A \subset \mathbb{R} \times L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let u be a solution and u_λ be the minimal solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$. Then*

(i) $\sigma_\lambda(u) > \lambda$ *if and only if* $u = u_\lambda$;

(ii) $\sigma_\lambda(U_\lambda) < \lambda$, *where U_λ is the second solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ constructed in Section 4.*

Proof. Now, let $\psi \geq 0$ and $\psi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Since u and u_λ slove $(1.1)_\lambda$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \nabla\psi \cdot \nabla(u_\lambda - u)\,dx + \int_\Omega \psi(u_\lambda - u)\,dx \\
&\quad = \lambda\int_\Omega \left(f(x,u_\lambda) - f(x,u)\right)\psi\,dx = \lambda\int_\Omega\left(\int_u^{u_\lambda} f'(x,t)\,dt\right)\psi\,dx \\
&\quad \geq \lambda\int_\Omega f'(x,u)(u_\lambda - u)\psi\,dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Let $\psi = (u - u_\lambda)^+ \geq 0$ and $\psi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. If $\psi \not\equiv 0$, then (5.3) implies

$$-\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla\psi|^2 + \psi^2\right)dx \geq -\lambda\int_\Omega f'(x,u)\psi^2\,dx \tag{5.4}$$

and, therefore, the definition of $\sigma_\lambda(u)$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla\psi|^2 + \psi^2\right)dx &\leq \lambda\int_\Omega f'(x,u)\psi^2\,dx \\
&< \sigma_\lambda(u)\int_\Omega f'(x,u)\psi^2\,dx \\
&\leq \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla\psi|^2 + \psi^2\right)dx,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

which is impossible. Hence $\psi \equiv 0$, and $u = u_\lambda$ in Ω. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.4, we also have that $\sigma_\lambda(u_\lambda) > \lambda$. This completes the proof of (i).

By (i), we get that $\sigma_\lambda(U_\lambda) \leq \lambda$ for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$. We claim that $\sigma_\lambda(U_\lambda) = \lambda$ cannot occur. We proceed by contradiction. Set $w = U_\lambda - u_\lambda$; we have

$$-\Delta w + w = \lambda\left[f(x,U_\lambda) - f(x,U_\lambda - w)\right], \quad w > 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \tag{5.6}$$

By $\sigma_\lambda(U_\lambda) = \lambda$, we have that the problem

$$-\Delta\phi + \phi = \lambda f'(x,U_\lambda)\phi, \quad \phi \in H_0^1(\Omega) \tag{5.7}$$

possesses a positive solution ϕ_1.

Multiplying (5.6) by ϕ_1 and (5.7) by w, integrating and subtracting we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \int_\Omega \lambda\left[f(x,U_\lambda) - f(x,U_\lambda - w) - f'(x,U_\lambda)w\right]\phi_1\,dx \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \lambda f''(\xi_\lambda)w^2\phi_1\,dx,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where $\xi_\lambda \in (u_\lambda, U_\lambda)$. Thus $w \equiv 0$, that is $U_\lambda = u_\lambda$ for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$. This is a contradiction. Hence we have that $\sigma_\lambda(U_\lambda) < \lambda$ for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$. □

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose u_{λ^*} is a solution of (1.1)$_{\lambda^*}$, then $\sigma_{\lambda^*}(u_{\lambda^*}) = \lambda^*$ and the solution u_{λ^*} is unique.*

Proof. Define $\mathcal{F} : \mathbb{R} \times H_0^1(\Omega) \to H^{-1}(\Omega)$ by

$$\mathcal{F}(\lambda, u) = \Delta u - u + \lambda(f(x,u) + h(x)). \tag{5.9}$$

Since $\sigma_\lambda(u_\lambda) > \lambda$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, we have $\sigma_{\lambda^*}(u_{\lambda^*}) \geq \lambda^*$. If $\sigma_{\lambda^*}(u_{\lambda^*}) > \lambda^*$, the equation $\mathcal{F}_u(\lambda^*, u_{\lambda^*})\phi = 0$ has no nontrivial solution. By the standard argument, we can prove that $\mathcal{F}_u$ maps $\mathbb{R} \times H_0^1(\Omega)$ onto $H^{-1}(\Omega)$. Applying the implicit function theorem to $\mathcal{F}$, we can find a neighborhood $(\lambda^* - \delta, \lambda^* + \delta)$ of λ^* such that $(1.1)_\lambda$ possesses a solution u_λ if $\lambda \in (\lambda^* - \delta, \lambda^* + \delta)$. This is contradictory to the definition of λ^*. Hence we obtain that $\sigma_{\lambda^*}(u_{\lambda^*}) = \lambda^*$.

Next, we are going to prove that u_{λ^*} is unique. In fact, suppose $(1.1)_{\lambda^*}$ has another solution $U_{\lambda^*} \geq u_{\lambda^*}$. Set $w = U_{\lambda^*} - u_{\lambda^*}$; we have

$$-\Delta w + w = \lambda^*[f(w + u_{\lambda^*}) - f(x, u_{\lambda^*})], \quad w > 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \tag{5.10}$$

By $\sigma_{\lambda^*}(u_{\lambda^*}) = \lambda^*$, we have that the problem

$$-\Delta\phi + \phi = \lambda^* f'(x, u_{\lambda^*})\phi, \quad \phi \in H_0^1(\Omega) \tag{5.11}$$

possesses a positive solution ϕ_1.

Multiplying (5.10) by ϕ_1 and (5.11) by w, integrating and subtracting we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_\Omega \lambda^*[f(w + u_{\lambda^*}) - f(x, u_{\lambda^*}) - f'(x, u_{\lambda^*})w]\phi_1 dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \lambda^* f''(\xi_{\lambda^*})w^2\phi_1 dx, \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

where $\xi_{\lambda^*} \in (u_{\lambda^*}, u_{\lambda^*} + w)$. Thus $w \equiv 0$. □

Proposition 5.3. *Let u_λ be the minimal solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$. Then u_λ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*]$, and*

$$u_\lambda \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \text{ as } \lambda \longrightarrow 0^+. \tag{5.13}$$

Proof. By (3.20), we have that

$$\|u_\lambda\| \leq \frac{\lambda}{1-\theta}\|h\|_2 \tag{5.14}$$

for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, and u_λ is strictly increasing with respect to λ, we can easily deduce that u_λ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*]$ and $u_\lambda \to 0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ as $\lambda \to 0^+$.

By (2.6) and the fact that u_λ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\lambda\|_\infty &\leq C_1\|u_\lambda\|_{q_0} + \lambda C_2(\|u_\lambda\|_{(p-1)q_0}^{p-1} + \|h\|_{q_0}) \\ &\leq C_1\|u_\lambda\|_\infty^{(q_0-2)/q_0}\|u_\lambda\|_2^{2/q_0} + C_3\lambda \\ &\leq C(\lambda^{2/q_0} + \lambda), \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

where C is independent of λ, and $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*]$. Hence we obtain that $u_\lambda \to 0$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ as $\lambda \to 0^+$. □

Proposition 5.4. *If $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$, then U_λ is unbounded in $L^\infty(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, and*

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0^+} ||U_\lambda|| = \lim_{\lambda\to 0^+} ||U_\lambda||_\infty = \infty. \tag{5.16}$$

Proof. Let φ_λ be a minimizer of $\sigma_\lambda(U_\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$, that is

$$\int_\Omega f'(x,U_\lambda)\varphi_\lambda^2 = 1, \qquad ||\varphi_\lambda||^2 = \sigma_\lambda(U_\lambda). \tag{5.17}$$

(i) First, we show that $\{U_\lambda : \lambda \in (0,\lambda_0)\}$ is unbounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ for any $\lambda_0 \in (0,\lambda^*)$. We proceed by contradiction. Assume to the contrary that there exists $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$||U_\lambda||_\infty \le C_0 < \infty \quad \forall \lambda \in (0,\lambda_0). \tag{5.18}$$

By $(f1)$ and (5.18), there exists a constant M independent of λ, such that $f'(x,U_\lambda(x)) \le M$ for all $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_0)$ and $x \in \Omega$. Hence, by (5.17) and $\sigma_\lambda(U_\lambda) < \lambda$ for all $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_0)$, we obtain that

$$1 = \int_\Omega f'(x,U_\lambda)\varphi_\lambda^2 \le M||\varphi_\lambda||^2 = M\sigma_\lambda(U_\lambda) < M\lambda. \tag{5.19}$$

This is a contradiction for all $\lambda < 1/M$. Hence, for any $\lambda_0 \in (0,\lambda^*)$, we have that $\{U_\lambda : \lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)\}$ is unbounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. From this result, it is easy to see that $\lim_{\lambda\to 0^+} \|U_\lambda\|_\infty = \infty$.

(ii) Now, we show that $\{U_\lambda : \lambda \in (0,\lambda_0)\}$ is unbounded in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ for any $\lambda_0 \in (0,\lambda^*)$. If not, then there exists a constant M independent of λ, such that

$$||U_\lambda|| \le M \quad \forall \lambda \in (0,\lambda_0). \tag{5.20}$$

By (5.17), (5.20), $(f2)$, the Hölder inequality, the Sobolev embedding theorem, and $\sigma_\lambda(U_\lambda) < \lambda$ for all $\lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \int_\Omega f'(x,U_\lambda)\varphi_\lambda^2 \le C_1\int_\Omega \left(1+U_\lambda^{p-2}\right)\varphi_\lambda^2 \le C_1||\varphi_\lambda||^2 + C_1||U_\lambda||_p^{p-2}||\varphi_\lambda||_p^2 \\ &\le C_1||\varphi_\lambda||^2 + C_2||U_\lambda||^{p-2}||\varphi_\lambda||^2 \le C_3||\varphi_\lambda||^2 = C_3\sigma_\lambda(U_\lambda) < C_3\lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

where C_1, C_2, and C_3 are constants independent of λ. Now, let $\lambda \to 0^+$, then we obtain a contradiction. Hence $\{U_\lambda : \lambda \in (0,\lambda^*)\}$ is unbounded in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\lim_{\lambda\to 0^+} \|U_\lambda\| = +\infty$. □

Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. First, we consider the case $\Omega = \mathbb{S}\backslash\overline{D}$. Theorem 1.1 now follows from Lemmas 3.3, 3.4, and Theorems 4.5, 5.2. Theorem 1.2 follows immediately from Lemma 3.4, and Propositions 5.3, 5.4. □

With the same argument, we also have that Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 hold for $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N\backslash\overline{D}$ or $\Omega = \mathbb{S}$ or $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$.

References

[1] D. M. Cao, "Eigenvalue problems and bifurcation of semilinear elliptic equation in $\mathbb{R}^N$," *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 529–554, 1995.

[2] X. P. Zhu and H. S. Zhou, "Existence of multiple positive solutions of inhomogeneous semilinear elliptic problems in unbounded domains," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. Section A*, vol. 115, no. 3-4, pp. 301–318, 1990.

[3] K.-J. Chen, "Exactly two entire positive solutions for a class of nonhomogeneous elliptic equations," *Differential Integral Equations*, vol. 17, no. 1-2, pp. 1–16, 2004.

[4] T.-S. Hsu, "Existence of multiple positive solutions of subcritical semilinear elliptic problems in exterior strip domains," *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 1203–1228, 2006.

[5] R. A. Adams, *Sobolev Spaces*, vol. 65 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*, Academic Press, New York, NY, USA, 1975.

[6] T.-S. Hsu, "Multiple solutions for semilinear elliptic equations in unbounded cylinder domains," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. Section A*, vol. 134, no. 4, pp. 719–731, 2004.

[7] I. Ekeland, "Nonconvex minimization problems," *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society. New Series*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 443–474, 1979.

[8] H. Amann, "Fixed point equations and nonlinear eigenvalue problems in ordered Banach spaces," *SIAM Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 620–709, 1976.

[9] A. Bahri and P.-L. Lions, "On the existence of a positive solution of semilinear elliptic equations in unbounded domains," *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré. Analyse Non Linéaire*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 365–413, 1997.

[10] P.-L. Lions, "The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case. I," *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré. Analyse Non Linéaire*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 109–145, 1984.

[11] P.-L. Lions, "The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case. II," *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré. Analyse Non Linéaire*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 223–283, 1984.

[12] P.-L. Lions, "On positive solutions of semilinear elliptic equations in unbounded domains," in *Nonlinear Diffusion Equations and Their Equilibrium States, II (Berkeley, CA, 1986)*, W. M. Ni, L. A. Peletier, and J. Serrin, Eds., vol. 13 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pp. 85–122, Springer, New York, NY, USA, 1988.

[13] A. Ambrosetti and P. H. Rabinowitz, "Dual variational methods in critical point theory and applications," *Journal of Functional Analysis*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 349–381, 1973.

Tsing-San Hsu: Center for General Education, Chang Gung University, Kwei-Shan,
Tao-Yuan 333, Taiwan
Email address: tshsu@mail.cgu.edu.tw

Special Issue on Space Dynamics

Call for Papers

Space dynamics is a very general title that can accommodate a long list of activities. This kind of research started with the study of the motion of the stars and the planets back to the origin of astronomy, and nowadays it has a large list of topics. It is possible to make a division in two main categories: astronomy and astrodynamics. By astronomy, we can relate topics that deal with the motion of the planets, natural satellites, comets, and so forth. Many important topics of research nowadays are related to those subjects. By astrodynamics, we mean topics related to spaceflight dynamics.

It means topics where a satellite, a rocket, or any kind of man-made object is travelling in space governed by the gravitational forces of celestial bodies and/or forces generated by propulsion systems that are available in those objects. Many topics are related to orbit determination, propagation, and orbital maneuvers related to those spacecrafts. Several other topics that are related to this subject are numerical methods, nonlinear dynamics, chaos, and control.

The main objective of this Special Issue is to publish topics that are under study in one of those lines. The idea is to get the most recent researches and published them in a very short time, so we can give a step in order to help scientists and engineers that work in this field to be aware of actual research. All the published papers have to be peer reviewed, but in a fast and accurate way so that the topics are not outdated by the large speed that the information flows nowadays.

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at http://www.hindawi.com/journals/mpe/guidelines.html. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/ according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	July 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	October 1, 2009
Publication Date	January 1, 2010

Lead Guest Editor

Antonio F. Bertachini A. Prado, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE), São José dos Campos, 12227-010 São Paulo, Brazil; prado@dem.inpe.br

Guest Editors

Maria Cecilia Zanardi, São Paulo State University (UNESP), Guaratinguetá, 12516-410 São Paulo, Brazil; cecilia@feg.unesp.br

Tadashi Yokoyama, Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP), Rio Claro, 13506-900 São Paulo, Brazil; tadashi@rc.unesp.br

Silvia Maria Giuliatti Winter, São Paulo State University (UNESP), Guaratinguetá, 12516-410 São Paulo, Brazil; silvia@feg.unesp.br