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#### Abstract

This paper deals with the superlinear elliptic problem without Ambrosetti and Rabinowitz type growth condition of the form: $$
\left\{\begin{array}{l} -\operatorname{div}\left(|\nabla u|^{p(x)-2} \nabla u\right)=\lambda f(x, u) \quad \text { in } \Omega, \\ u=0 \quad \text { on } \partial \Omega, \end{array}\right.
$$ where $\Omega \subset R^{N}(N \geq 2)$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial \Omega$, $\lambda>0$ is a parameter. Existence of nontrivial solution is established for arbitrary $\lambda>0$. Firstly, by using the mountain pass theorem a nontrivial solution is constructed for almost every parameter $\lambda>0$. Then, it is considered the continuation of the solutions. Our results are a generalization of Miyagaki and Souto.
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## 1 Introduction

In this paper we consider the following nonlinear eigenvalue problem involving the $p(x)$-Laplacian:

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\operatorname{div}\left(|\nabla u|^{p(x)-2} \nabla u\right)=\lambda f(x, u) \quad \text { in } \Omega,  \tag{1.1}\\
u=0 \quad \text { on } \partial \Omega,
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\Omega \subset R^{N}(N \geq 2)$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial \Omega, 1<p(x) \in$ $C(\bar{\Omega}), f \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times R)$ is superlinear and don't satisfy Ambrosetti and Rabinowitz type growth condition, $\lambda>0$ is a parameter.

Fan and Zhang in [1] established an existence of nontrivial solution for problem (1.1), by assuming the following conditions: $\left(f_{0}\right) f: \Omega \times R \rightarrow R$ satisfies Caratheodory condition and

$$
|f(x, t)| \leq C_{1}+C_{2}|t|^{\alpha(x)-1}, \quad \forall(x, t) \in \Omega \times R,
$$

[^0]where $\alpha(x) \in C_{+}(\bar{\Omega})=\{h \mid h \in C(\bar{\Omega}), h(x)>1$ for any $x \in \bar{\Omega}\}$ and $\alpha(x)<p^{*}(x)$, $p^{*}(x)$ is the Sobolev critical exponent and
\[

p^{*}(x)= $$
\begin{cases}\frac{N p(x)}{N-p(x)}, & p(x)<N \\ \infty, & p(x) \geq N\end{cases}
$$
\]

$\left(f_{1}\right) \exists M>0, \theta>p^{+}:=\max _{\bar{\Omega}} p(x)$ such that

$$
0<\theta F(x, t) \leq t f(x, t), \quad|t| \geq M, x \in \Omega,
$$

where $F(x, t)=\int_{0}^{t} f(x, s) d s$.
$\left(f_{2}\right) f(x, t)=o\left(|t|^{p^{+}-1}\right), t \rightarrow 0$, for $x \in \Omega$ uniformly and $\alpha^{-}:=\min _{\bar{\Omega}} \alpha(x)>p^{+}$.
When $p(x) \equiv 2$, several researchers that studied problem (1.1) tried to drop above condition $\left(f_{1}\right)$ (see $\left.[2,3,4,5]\right)$, that is
$\left(f_{1}^{\prime}\right) \exists M>0, \theta>2$ such that

$$
0<\theta F(x, t) \leq t f(x, t), \quad|t| \geq M, x \in \Omega,
$$

where $F(x, t)=\int_{0}^{t} f(x, s) d s$.
$\left(f_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ is the famous Ambrosetti and Rabinowitz growth condition and $\left(f_{1}\right)$ is a generalization of $\left(f_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ to problem involving the $p(x)$-Laplacian, here we call it Ambrosetti and Rabinowitz type grow condition. For the case $p(x) \equiv p$, we may refer [6]. It's well known (see [1]) that $\left(f_{1}\right)$ is quite important not only to ensure that the Eulerlagrange functional associated to problem (1.1) has a mountain pass geometry, but also to guarantee that Palais-Smale sequence of the Euler-Lagrange functional is bounded. But this condition is very restrictive eliminating many nonlinearities. We recall that $\left(f_{1}\right)$ implies a weaker condition

$$
F(x, t) \geq c_{1}|t|^{\theta}-c_{2}, \quad c_{1}, c_{2}>0, x \in \Omega, t \in R \text { and } \theta>p^{+} .
$$

The above condition implies another much weaker condition, which is a consequence of the superlinearity of $f$ at infinity:
( $f_{3}$ )

$$
\lim _{|t| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(x, t)}{|t|^{p^{+}}}=+\infty, \quad \text { uniformly a.e. } x \in \Omega .
$$

When $p(x) \equiv 2$, under conditions $\left(f_{0}\right),\left(f_{2}\right),\left(f_{3}\right)$ and the following condition: $\left(f_{4}^{\prime}\right)$ There is $t_{0}>0$ such that

$$
\frac{f(x, t)}{t} \text { is increasing in } t \geq t_{0} \text { and decreasing in } t \leq-t_{0}, \forall x \in \Omega
$$

if $f \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times R)$, Miyagaki and Souto in [3] got a nontrivial solution of problem (1.1), for all $\lambda>0$. Here we will generalize results in [3] to the variable exponent case. Because the $p(x)$-Laplacian possesses more complicated nonlinearities than Laplacian and $p$-laplacian, for example, it is inhomogeneous, thus our problem is the more difficult.

The following is our main result, namely,
Theorem 1.1. Under hypotheses $\left(f_{0}\right),\left(f_{2}\right),\left(f_{3}\right)$ and
$\left(f_{4}\right)$ There is $t_{0}>0$ such that

$$
\frac{f(x, t)}{t^{p^{+}-1}} \text { is increasing in } t \geq t_{0} \text { and decreasing in } t \leq-t_{0}, \forall x \in \Omega .
$$

Moreover, $f \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times R)$, then problem (1.1) has a nontrivial weak solution, for all $\lambda>0$.

Example 1.1. Function $f(x, t)=t^{\alpha(x)-1}(\alpha(x) \ln t+1)\left(F(x, t)=t^{\alpha(x)} \ln t\right)$ where $\alpha(x) \in C_{+}(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies condition $\left(f_{4}\right)$, but it does not satisfy $\left(f_{1}\right)$ if $2 \alpha^{-}>p^{+}>\alpha^{+}$.

Remark 1.1. Actually our result still holds if we consider a weaker condition than $\left(f_{4}\right)$, namely
( $f_{4}^{\prime}$ ) There is $C_{*}>0$ such that

$$
t f(x, t)-p^{+} F(x, t) \leq s f(x, s)-p^{+} F(x, s)+C_{*}
$$

for all $0<t<s$ or $s<t<0$.
The variational problems and differential equations with nonstandard growth conditions have been a very attractive topic in recent years. We refer to $[7,8]$ for applied background, to $[9,10]$ for the variable exponent Lebesgue-Sobolev spaces and to $[1,11,12,13,14]$ for the $p(x)$-Laplacian equations and the corresponding variational problems.

The paper is divided into three sections. In Section 2 we present some preliminary knowledge on the variable exponent spaces. In Section 3, we give some preliminary lemmas and the proof of Theorem 1.1.

## 2 Preliminary

Throughout this paper, we always assume $p(x) \in C_{+}(\bar{\Omega})$ and $f \in C(\bar{\Omega} \times R)$. Set

$$
L^{p(x)}(\Omega)=\left\{u \mid u \text { is a measurable real-valued function : } \int_{\Omega}|u|^{p(x)} d x<\infty\right\}
$$

with the norm

$$
|u|_{L^{p(x)}(\Omega)}=|u|_{p(x)}=\inf \left\{\lambda>0: \int_{\Omega}\left|\frac{u}{\lambda}\right|^{p(x)} d x \leq 1\right\}
$$

and $\left(L^{p(x)}(\Omega),|\cdot|_{p(x)}\right)$ becomes a Banach space, that is generalized Lebesgue space.
Proposition 2.1([1]).
(1) The space $\left(L^{p(x)}(\Omega),|\cdot|_{p(x)}\right)$ is separable, uniform convex Banach space, and its conjugate space is $L^{q(x)}(\Omega)$ where $\frac{1}{q(x)}+\frac{1}{p(x)}=1$. For any $u \in L^{p(x)}(\Omega)$ and $v \in L^{q(x)}(\Omega)$, we have

$$
\left|\int_{\Omega} u v d x\right| \leq\left(\frac{1}{p^{-}}+\frac{1}{q^{-}}\right)|u|_{p(x)}|v|_{q(x)} .
$$

(2) If $p_{1}, p_{2} \in C_{+}(\bar{\Omega}), p_{1}(x) \leq p_{2}(x)$ for any $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, then $L^{p_{2}(x)}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{p_{1}(x)}(\Omega)$ and the imbedding is continuous.

Proposition 2.2([1], [9], [10]). Set $\rho(u)=\int_{\Omega}|u(x)|^{p(x)} d x$. If $u, u_{k} \in L^{p(x)}(\Omega)$, we have
(1) For $u \neq 0, \quad|u|_{p(x)}=\lambda \Leftrightarrow \rho\left(\frac{u}{\lambda}\right)=1$.
(2) $|u|_{p(x)}<1(=1$; >1) $\Leftrightarrow \rho(u)<1(=1 ;>1)$.
(3) If $|u|_{p(x)}>1$, then $|u|_{p(x)}^{p^{-}} \leq \rho(u) \leq|u|_{p(x)}^{p^{+}}$.
(4) If $|u|_{p(x)}<1$, then $|u|_{p(x)}^{p^{+}} \leq \rho(u) \leq|u|_{p(x)}^{p^{-}}$.
(5) $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left|u_{k}\right|_{p(x)}=0 \Leftrightarrow \lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho\left(u_{k}\right)=0$.
(6) $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left|u_{k}\right|_{p(x)}=\infty \Leftrightarrow \lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho\left(u_{k}\right)=\infty$.

The space $W^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$ is defined by

$$
W^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)=\left\{u \in L^{p(x)}(\Omega)| | \nabla u \mid \in L^{p(x)}(\Omega)\right\}
$$

and it can be equipped with the norm

$$
\|u\|=|u|_{p(x)}+|\nabla u|_{p(x)}, \quad \forall u \in W^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)
$$

We denote by $W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$ the closure of $C_{0}^{\infty}(\Omega)$ in $W^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$. Moreover, we have Proposition 2.3([1]).
(1) $W^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$ and $W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$ are separable, reflexive Banach spaces;
(2) If $q \in C_{+}(\bar{\Omega})$ and $q(x)<p^{*}(x)$ for all $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, then the imbedding from $W^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$ to $L^{q(x)}(\Omega)$ is compact and continuous;
(3) There is constant $C>0$, such that

$$
|u|_{p(x)} \leq C|\nabla u|_{p(x)}, \quad \forall u \in W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)
$$

By (3) of Proposition 2.3, we know that $|\nabla u|_{p(x)}$ and $\|u\|$ are equivalent norms on $W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$. We will use $|\nabla u|_{p(x)}$ to replace $\|u\|$ in the following discussions.

## 3 Main Results

Now we introduce the energy functional $I_{\lambda}: W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega) \rightarrow R$ associated with problem (1.1), defined by

$$
I_{\lambda}(u)=\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{p(x)}|\nabla u(x)|^{p(x)} d x-\lambda \int_{\Omega} F(x, u) d x
$$

From the hypotheses on $f$, it is standard to check that $I_{\lambda} \in C^{1}\left(W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega), R\right)$ and its Gateaux derivative is

$$
I_{\lambda}^{\prime}(u) \cdot v=\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{p(x)-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v-\lambda \int_{\Omega} f(x, u) v d x, u, v \in W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)
$$

Thus the critical points of $I_{\lambda}$ are precisely the weak solutions of problem (1.1).
First of all, notice that $I_{\lambda}$ verifies the mountain pass geometry, in a uniform way on compact sets:

## Lemma 3.1.

(1) Under the condition $\left(f_{3}\right)$, the functional $I_{\lambda}$ is unbounded from below;
(2) Under the conditions $\left(f_{0}\right)$ and $\left(f_{2}\right), u=0$ is a strict local minimum for the functional $I_{\lambda}$.

Proof of (1). From $\left(f_{3}\right)$ follows that, for all $M>0$ there exists $C_{M}>0$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(x, t) \geq M|t|^{p^{+}}-C_{M}, \quad \forall x \in \Omega, \forall t>0 \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Take $\phi \in W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$ with $\phi>0$, from (3.1) we obtain

$$
I_{\lambda}(t \phi) \leq t^{p^{+}}\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla \phi|^{p(x)}}{p(x)}-\lambda M \int_{\Omega}|\phi|^{p^{+}}\right)+C_{M}|\Omega|,
$$

where $t \geq 1$ and $|\Omega|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of $\Omega$. If $M$ is large, then

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} I_{\lambda}(t \phi)=-\infty
$$

This proves (1).
Proof of (2). From $\left(f_{0}\right)$ and $\left(f_{2}\right)$, we have

$$
F(x, t) \leq \epsilon|t|^{p^{+}}+C(\epsilon)|t|^{\alpha(x)}, \forall(x, t) \in \Omega \times R
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{\lambda}(u) & \geq \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{p^{+}}|\nabla u|^{p^{+}} d x-\epsilon \lambda \int_{\Omega}|u|^{p^{+}} d x-C(\epsilon) \lambda \int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha(x)} d x \\
& \geq \frac{1}{p^{+}}\|u\|^{p^{+}}-\epsilon \lambda C_{0}^{p^{+}}\|u\|^{p^{+}}-C(\epsilon) \lambda\|u\|^{\alpha^{-}} \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2 p^{+}}\|u\|^{p^{+}}-\lambda C(\epsilon)\|u\|^{\alpha^{-}}, \quad \text { when }\|u\| \leq 1,
\end{aligned}
$$

there exist $r>0$ and $\delta>0$ such that $I_{\lambda}(u) \geq \delta>0$ for every $u \in W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$ and $\|u\|=r$. The proof is complete.

Fix $0<\lambda_{0}<\mu_{0}$. Now, we can see that the geometry on $I_{\lambda}$ works uniformly on [ $\lambda_{0}, \mu_{0}$ ]. From the proof of Lemma 3.1 (2), we obtain

$$
I_{\lambda}(u) \geq \frac{1}{2 p^{+}}\|u\|^{p^{+}}-\mu_{0} C(\epsilon)\|u\|^{\alpha^{-}}, \text {when }\|u\| \leq 1,0<\lambda \leq \mu_{0}
$$

That is, there exist $r>0$ and $\delta>0$ such that $I_{\lambda}(u) \geq \delta>0$ for every $u \in W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$, $\|u\|=r$ and $\forall \lambda \leq \mu_{0}$.

By choosing $e \in W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$ such that $I_{\lambda_{0}}(e)<0$, we infer that

$$
\frac{I_{\lambda}(e)}{\lambda} \leq \frac{I_{\lambda_{0}}(e)}{\lambda_{0}}<0, \quad \lambda_{0} \leq \lambda \leq \mu_{0}
$$

We also have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{I_{\lambda}(u)}{\lambda} \leq \frac{I_{\mu}(u)}{\mu}, \quad \forall u \in W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega), \mu<\lambda \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define

$$
P=\left\{\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega): \gamma \text { is continuous and } \gamma(0)=0 \text { and } \gamma(1)=e\right\},
$$

and for $\lambda_{0} \leq \lambda \leq \mu_{0}$, let

$$
c_{\lambda}=\inf _{\gamma \in P} \max _{t \in[0,1]} I_{\lambda}(\gamma(t)) .
$$

We recall that the map $c:\left[\lambda_{0}, \mu_{0}\right] \rightarrow R_{+}$, given by $c(\lambda)=c_{\lambda}$, is such that $\frac{c_{\lambda}}{\lambda}$ is decreasing, left semi-continuous and bounded from below by $c_{\mu_{0}}>0$.

In fact, from (3.2) follows the monotonicity. While the estimate in Lemma 3.1 (2) implies that $c_{\lambda} \geq \delta>0$.

Now, we check the left semi-continuous of $\frac{c_{\lambda}}{\lambda}$. Fix $\mu \in\left[\lambda_{0}, \mu_{0}\right]$ and $\epsilon>0$. Then fix $\gamma \in P$ such that

$$
c(\mu) \leq \max _{t \in[0,1]} I_{\mu}(\gamma(t)) \leq c(\mu)+\frac{\epsilon \mu}{4} .
$$

Let $R_{0}=\max _{t \in[0,1]} \int_{\Omega} F(x, \gamma(t)) d x$. Then, for $\lambda>\frac{\mu}{2}$ and such that $\frac{1}{\lambda}<\frac{1}{\mu}+\frac{\epsilon}{2 \mu}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{\lambda}(\gamma(t)) & =\left(I_{\lambda}(\gamma(t))-I_{\mu}(\gamma(t))\right)+I_{\mu}(\gamma(t)) \\
& =I_{\mu}(\gamma(t))+(\mu-\lambda) \int_{\Omega} F(x, \gamma(t)) d x \\
& \leq R_{0}|\lambda-\mu|+c_{\mu}+\frac{\epsilon \mu}{4}, \forall t \in[0,1],
\end{aligned}
$$

that is,

$$
c(\lambda) \leq c(\mu)+\frac{\epsilon \mu}{2}, \text { if }|\lambda-\mu|<\frac{\epsilon \mu}{4 R_{0}} .
$$

Hence, if $\mu>\lambda$, it follows that

$$
\frac{c_{\mu}}{\mu}-\epsilon<\frac{c_{\mu}}{\mu} \leq \frac{c_{\lambda}}{\lambda} \leq \frac{c_{\mu}}{\lambda}+\frac{2 \epsilon}{3} \leq \frac{c_{\mu}}{\mu}+\epsilon
$$

This proves the left semi-continuity of $\frac{c_{\lambda}}{\lambda}$ and $c_{\lambda}$.
Lemma 3.2. There exists $d>0$, such that

$$
\left\|I_{\mu}^{\prime}(u)-I_{\lambda}^{\prime}(u)\right\|_{*} \leq d\left(1+\|u\|^{\alpha^{+}-1}\right)|\mu-\lambda|, \forall \lambda, \mu>0 .
$$

Proof. For $\alpha(x) \in C_{+}(\bar{\Omega})$, define $\alpha^{\prime}(x)$ such that $\frac{1}{\alpha(x)}+\frac{1}{\alpha^{\prime}(x)}=1$ for $\forall x \in \bar{\Omega}$. From condition $\left(f_{0}\right)$, one has

$$
|f(x, t)|^{\alpha^{\prime}(x)}=|f(x, t)|^{\frac{\alpha(x)}{\alpha(x)-1}} \leq d_{1}+d_{2}|t|^{\alpha(x)}, \forall x \in \Omega, \forall t \in R,
$$

for some constants $d_{1}, d_{2}>0$ and then

$$
\int_{\Omega}|f(x, u)|^{\alpha^{\prime}(x)} \leq d_{1}|\Omega|+d_{2} \int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha(x)} d x .
$$

Therefore, there exist positive constants $d_{3}$ and $d_{4}>0$, such that

$$
\int_{\Omega}|f(x, u)|^{\alpha^{\prime}(x)} \leq d_{3}+d_{4}\|u\|^{\alpha^{+}}, \forall u \in W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)
$$

Now, for all $v \in W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$ with $\|v\| \leq 1$, we have

$$
I_{\mu}^{\prime}(u) v-I_{\lambda}^{\prime}(u) v=(\lambda-\mu) \int_{\Omega} f(x, u) v d x
$$

Moreover, one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|I_{\mu}^{\prime}(u) v-I_{\lambda}^{\prime}(u) v\right| & \leq|\lambda-\mu| \int_{\Omega}|f(x, u) v| d x \\
& \leq 2|\lambda-\mu||f(x, u)|_{\alpha^{\prime}(x)}|v|_{\alpha(x)} \\
& \leq 2 C_{0}|\lambda-\mu|\left(d_{3}+d_{4}\|u\|^{\alpha^{+}}\right)^{\frac{\alpha^{+}-1}{\alpha+}}\|v\| .
\end{aligned}
$$

So there exists constant $d>0$ such that

$$
\left\|I_{\mu}^{\prime}(u)-I_{\lambda}^{\prime}(u)\right\|_{*} \leq d\left(1+\|u\|^{\alpha^{+}-1}\right)|\mu-\lambda|, \forall \lambda, \mu>0 .
$$

Remark 3.1. We recall that the map $b:\left[\lambda_{0}, \mu_{0}\right] \rightarrow R_{+}$, given by $b(\lambda)=\frac{c_{\lambda}}{\lambda}$, is monotone decreasing. Thus $b_{\lambda}$ and $c_{\lambda}$ are differentiable at almost all values $\lambda \in\left(\lambda_{0}, \mu_{0}\right)$.

Lemma 3.3. Suppose the map $c:\left[\lambda_{0}, \mu_{0}\right] \rightarrow R_{+}$, given by $c(\lambda)=c_{\lambda}$, is differentiable in $\mu$, then there exists a sequence $\left\{u_{n}\right\} \subset W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$ such that

$$
I_{\mu}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow c_{\mu}, \quad I_{\mu}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text { and } \quad\left\|u_{n}\right\|^{p^{-}} \leq C^{\prime}
$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and actually $C^{\prime}=p^{+} c_{\mu}+p^{+} \mu\left(2-c^{\prime}(\mu)\right)+1$.
The proof of the Lemma is similar to the proof of Lemma 2.3 in [3], so omit it.

The next lemma follows directly Lemma 3.3.
Lemma 3.4. For almost all $\lambda>0, c_{\lambda}$ is a critical value for $I_{\lambda}$.
Combining above Lemmas and arguments, now we give the proof of Theorem 1.1.
Proof. As $c_{\lambda}$ is left semi-continuous, from Lemma 3.4, for each $\mu>0$ we can fix sequence $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ in $W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$ and $\left\{\lambda_{n}\right\} \subset R$ such that $\lambda_{n} \rightarrow \mu, c_{\lambda_{n}} \rightarrow c_{\mu}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$
I_{\lambda_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right)=c_{\lambda_{n}} \quad \text { and } \quad I_{\lambda_{n}}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)=0 .
$$

For the proof of Theorem, it is enough that one can prove that the sequence $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is bounded. If it is unbounded we define $\omega_{n}=\frac{u_{n}}{\left\|u_{n}\right\|}$. Without loss of generality, suppose that there is $\omega \in W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega)$ such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\omega_{n}(x) \rightharpoonup \omega(x) \quad \text { in } W_{0}^{1, p(x)}(\Omega), n \rightarrow \infty \\
\omega_{n}(x) \rightarrow \omega(x) \quad \text { in } L^{\alpha(x)}(\Omega), n \rightarrow \infty \\
\omega_{n}(x) \rightarrow \omega(x) \quad \text { for } \text { a.e. } x \in \Omega, n \rightarrow \infty .
\end{gathered}
$$

Let $\Omega_{\neq}=\{x \in \Omega: \omega(x) \neq 0\}$. If $x \in \Omega_{\neq}$, then

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F\left(x, u_{n}(x)\right)}{\left|u_{n}(x)\right|^{p^{+}}}\left|\omega_{n}(x)\right|^{p^{+}}=\infty .
$$

Applying the Fatou Lemma and the limit

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{F\left(x, u_{n}(x)\right)}{\left|u_{n}(x)\right|^{p^{+}}}\left|\omega_{n}(x)\right|^{p^{+}} \leq \frac{1}{\mu p^{-}}
$$

These two last limits are incompatible if $\left|\Omega_{\neq}\right|>0$, so $\Omega_{\neq}$has zero measure, that is $\omega=0$ a.e. in $\Omega$.
Let $t_{n} \in[0,1]$ such that

$$
I_{\lambda_{n}}\left(t_{n} u_{n}\right)=\max _{t \in[0,1]} I_{\lambda_{n}}\left(t u_{n}\right) .
$$

If $t_{n}=1, I_{\lambda_{n}}\left(t u_{n}\right)$ is bounded for all $t \in[0,1]$. If $t_{n}<1, I_{\lambda_{n}}^{\prime}\left(t_{n} u_{n}\right) u_{n}=0$. Since $I_{\lambda_{n}}^{\prime}\left(t_{n} u_{n}\right)\left(t_{n} u_{n}\right)=0$, from $\left(f_{4}^{\prime}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{\lambda_{n}}\left(t u_{n}\right) & \leq I_{\lambda_{n}}\left(t_{n} u_{n}\right)-\frac{1}{p^{+}} I_{\lambda_{n}}^{\prime}\left(t_{n} u_{n}\right)\left(t_{n} u_{n}\right) \\
& =\int_{\Omega}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}-\frac{1}{p^{+}}\right)\left|\nabla t_{n} u_{n}\right|^{p(x)} d x \\
& +\lambda_{n} \int_{\Omega}\left(\frac{1}{p^{+}} t_{n} u_{n} f\left(x, t_{n} u_{n}\right)-F\left(x, t_{n} u_{n}\right)\right) d x \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega}\left(\frac{1}{p(x)}-\frac{1}{p^{+}}\right)\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{p(x)} d x \\
& +\lambda_{n} \int_{\Omega}\left(\frac{1}{p^{+}} u_{n} f\left(x, u_{n}\right)-F\left(x, u_{n}\right)+\frac{C_{*}}{p^{+}}\right) d x \\
& =c_{\lambda_{n}}+\frac{C_{*} \lambda_{n}}{p^{+}}|\Omega|
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $t \in[0,1]$.
On the other hand, for all $R>1$, set $R^{\prime}=\left(2 p^{+} R\right)^{\frac{1}{p^{-}}}$

$$
I_{\lambda_{n}}\left(R^{\prime} \omega_{n}\right) \geq 2 R-\lambda_{n} \int_{\Omega} F\left(x, R^{\prime} \omega_{n}\right) d x \geq R
$$

which contradicts $I_{\lambda_{n}}\left(R^{\prime} \omega_{n}\right) \leq c_{\lambda_{n}}+\frac{C_{* \lambda_{n}}}{p^{+}}|\Omega|$, for $n$ large.
Now we have a bounded sequence $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ such that

$$
I_{\mu}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow c_{\mu} \quad \text { and } \quad I_{\mu}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty .
$$

The proof is complete.
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