## Periodic solutions of Euler-Lagrange equations in an anisotropic Orlicz-Sobolev space setting

Sonia Acinas \*

Dpto. de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales Universidad Nacional de La Pampa (L6300CLB) Santa Rosa, La Pampa, Argentina sonia.acinas@gmail.com

Fernando D. Mazzone †

Dpto. de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas, Físico-Químicas y Naturales
Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto
(5800) Río Cuarto, Córdoba, Argentina,
fmazzone@exa.unrc.edu.ar

#### **Abstract**

#### 1 Introduction

In this paper we obtain existence of solutions for systems of equations of the type:

$$\frac{d}{dt}D_{y}Lt, ut, u't = D_{x}Lt, ut, u't \quad \text{a.e. } t \in \mathcal{Z}, T,$$

$$u\mathcal{Z} - uT = u'\mathcal{Z} - u'T = \mathcal{Z},$$

$$(P)$$

where the function  $L: (\not\approx, T \ | \ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}, d \geqslant \not\subset \text{ (called the } \textit{Lagrange function or } \textit{lagrangian})$  satisfying that it is measurable in t for each  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  and continuously differentiable in x, y for almost every  $t \in (\not\approx, T \ ]$ . The unknown function  $u: (\not\approx, T \ ) \to \mathbb{R}^d$  is assumed absolutely continuous.

Our approach involves the direct method of the calculus of variations in the framework of *anisotropic Orlicz-Sobolev spaces*. We suggest the articles [?] for definitions and main results on anisotropic Orlicz spaces, see also [?]. These spaces allow us to unify and extend previous results on existences of solutions for systems like (??).

2010 AMS Subject Classification. Primary: . Secondary: .

Keywords and phrases. .

<sup>\*</sup>SECyT-UNRC and FCEyN-UNLPam

<sup>†</sup>SECyT-UNRC, FCEyN-UNLPam and CONICET

Through this article we say that a function  $\bullet : \mathbb{R}^d \to (\not\approx, +\infty \text{ is of } N_\infty \text{ class if } \bullet \text{ is convex, } \bullet \not\approx = \not\approx, \bullet y > \not\approx \text{ if } y \not\approx \text{ and } \bullet - y = \bullet y, \text{ and}$ 

where  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \bigcup_{j=1}^{n}$  denotes the euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . From [?, Cor. 2.35] a  $N_{\infty}$  function is continuous

Associated to  $\bullet$  we have the *complementary function* // which is defined in  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$  as

$$//\xi = \phi \sum_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \phi y \cdot \xi - \bullet y \tag{2}$$

then, from the continuity of  $\bullet$  and (??), we have that  $\#: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathfrak{E}, \infty$ . Moreover, it is easy to see that # is a convex function such that  $\# \neq \mathfrak{E}, \# -\xi = \# \xi$  [?, Chapter 2]. Moreover # satisfies (??) (see [?, Th. 2.2]). i.e. # is  $N_\infty$  function.

Some examples of  $N_{\infty}$  functions are the following.

Example 1.1.  $\bullet_p y := \bigcup_{p \to p} p$ , for  $\emptyset . In this case <math>\# \xi = \bigcup_{p \to p} q$ ,  $q = p \to \emptyset$ .

Example 1.2. If  $\bullet$ :  $\mathbb{R} \to (\not\approx, +\infty)$  is a  $N_{\infty}$  function on  $\mathbb{R}$  then  $\overline{\bullet}y = \bullet (y)$  is a  $N_{\infty}$ 

function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . In this example, as in the previous one, the function  $\bullet$  is *radial*, i.e. the value of  $\bullet y$  depends on the norm of y and not on its direction. These cases are not authentically anisotropic.

*Example 1.3.* An anisotropic function  $\bullet y$  depends on the direction of y. For example, if  $\not\subset p_{\not\subset}, p_{\not\supset} < \infty$ , we define  $\bullet_{p_{\not\subset},p_{\not\supset}} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathscr{E}$ ,  $+\infty$  by

$$\bullet_{p_{\mathcal{L}},p_{\mathcal{D}}}y_{\mathcal{L}},y_{\mathcal{D}}\coloneqq\frac{\bigcup^{y_{\mathcal{L}}}\bigcup^{p_{\mathcal{L}}}}{p_{\mathcal{L}}}+\frac{\bigcup^{y_{\mathcal{D}}}\bigcup^{p_{\mathcal{D}}}}{p_{\mathcal{D}}}.$$

Then  $ullet_{p_{\mathcal{L}},p_{\mathcal{D}}}$  is a  $N_{\infty}$  function. In this case the complementary function is the function  $ullet_{q_{\mathcal{L}},q_{\mathcal{D}}}$  with  $q_i=p_{i_{\mathcal{D}}}p_i-\not\subset$ .

More generally, if  $\bullet_k : \mathbb{R}^d \to (\not\approx, +\infty, k = \not\subset, \dots, n)$ , are  $N_\infty$  functions, then  $\bullet :$ 

 $\mathbb{R}^d \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^d \to (\not\approx, +\infty \text{ defined by } \bullet y_{\not\leftarrow}, \dots, y_n = \bullet_{\not\leftarrow} y_{\not\leftarrow} + \cdots + \bullet_n y_n \text{ is a } N_\infty \text{ function.}$ These functions are truly anisotropic, i.e. x = y does not imply that  $\bullet x = \bullet y$ .

These functions are truly anisotropic, i.e. y = y does not imply that  $\bullet x = \bullet y$ .  $Example \ 1.4$ . If  $\bullet : \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{A}$ ,  $+\infty$  is a  $N_{\infty}$  function and  $O \in GLd$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$ , then  $\bullet y = \bullet Oy$  is a  $N_{\infty}$  function.

*Example 1.5.* An anisotropic  $N_{\infty}$  function is not necessarily controlled by powers if it does not satisfy the  $\S$  condition (see xxxxx). For example  $\bullet : \mathbb{R}^d : \to \mathscr{F}, +\infty$  defined by

$$\bullet y = \leftrightarrow \pi \mathfrak{P}_{|\hspace{0.1cm}|\hspace{0.1cm}|} y_{|\hspace{0.1cm}|\hspace{0.1cm}|} - \not\subset \text{is } N_{\infty} \text{ function.}$$

The occurrence of Orlicz Spaces in this paper obeys to we will consider the following structure condition on the lagrangian:

$$\bigcup_{i} L_{\bigcup_{j}} + \bigcup_{i} \nabla_{x} L_{\bigcup_{j}} + /\!/ \nabla_{y} L \leq ax \ bt + \bullet \ \frac{y}{\lambda} \ , \tag{S}$$

for a.e.  $t \in (\cancel{z}, T)$ , where  $a \in C \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $(\cancel{z}, +\infty)$ ,  $b \in L^{\not\subset}$   $(\cancel{z}, T)$ ,  $(\cancel{z}, +\infty)$ .

Our condition (??) includes structure conditions that have previously been considered in the literature. For example, it is easy to see that, when  $\bullet x$  is as in Example ??, then the condition (??) is equivalent to the structure condition in [?, Th. 1.4]. If  $\bullet$  is a radial  $N_{\infty}$  function such that # satisfies that # function then (??) is essentially equivalent????? to conditions [?, Eq. (2)-(4)] (see xxxx mas abajo). If  $\bullet$  is as in Example ?? and  $L = Lt, x_{\not\subset}, x_{\not\supset}, y_{\not\subset}, y_{\not\supset}$  is a lagrangian with  $L : \not\not\subset$ ,  $T \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$  then inequality (??) is related to estructure conditions like [?, Lemma 3.1, Eq. (3.1)]. As can be seen, condition (??) is a more compact expression than [?, Lemma 3.1, Eq. (3.1)] and moreover weaker, because (??) does not imply a control of  $D_{y_{\not\subset}}L$  independent of  $y_{\not\supset}$ . We will return to this point later.

An important example of lagrangian is giving by:

$$L_{\bullet,F}t, x, y := \bullet y + Ft, x. \tag{3}$$

Here the function Ft, x, which is often referred to potential, be differentiable with respect to x for a.e.  $t \in (*, T]$ . Moreover F satisfies the following conditions:

- (C) F and its gradient  $\nabla_x F$ , with respect to  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , are Carathéodory functions, i.e. they are measurable functions with respect to  $t \in (\mathcal{E}, T]$ , for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and they are continuous functions with respect to  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for a.e.  $t \in (\mathcal{E}, T]$ .
- (A) For a.e.  $t \in (*, T]$ , it holds that

$$|Ft, x| + |\nabla_x Ft, x| \le axbt.$$
 (4)

where  $a \in C \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $(\not\approx, +\infty)$  and  $\not\approx \leqslant b \in L^{\not\subset}(\not\approx, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$ .

The lagrangian  $L_{\bullet,F}$  satisfies condition (??). In order to prove this, the only non trivial fact that we should to establish is is that  $\|\nabla_y L\| \leq ax \ bt + \bullet \ y \wedge \lambda$ . But, from inequality xxxx below,  $\|\nabla_y L\| = \|\nabla \bullet y\| \leq \bullet \not\supset y$ .

The laplacian  $L_{\bullet,F}$  leads to the system

$$\frac{d}{dt} \nabla \bullet u't = \nabla_x Ft, ut \quad \text{a.e. } t \in \mathcal{Z}, T, 
u \mathcal{Z} - uT = u' \mathcal{Z} - u'T = \mathcal{Z},$$

$$(P_{\bullet})$$

Problem (??) contains, as a particular case, many problems that are usually considered in the literature. For example, the classic book [?] deals mainly with problem (??), for the lagrangian  $L_{\bullet,F}$ , with  $\bullet x = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x dx$ , through various methods: direct,

dual action, minimax, etc. The results in [?] were extended and improved in several articles, see [?, ?, ?, ?] to cite some examples. The case  $\bullet y = \bigcup_{p} y \bigcup_{p} p$ , for arbitrary  $\not\subset p < \infty$  were considered in [?, ?], among other papers, and in this case (??) is reduced to the p-laplacian system

$$\begin{array}{ll} \frac{d}{dt} \ u't \bigcup u' \bigcup^{p-\mathfrak{D}} = \nabla Ft, ut & \text{a.e. } t \in \mathcal{Z}, T \\ u \mathcal{Z} - uT = u' \mathcal{Z} - u'T = \mathcal{Z}. \end{array} \tag{$P_p$}$$

If  $\bullet$  is as in Example ?? and  $F: (\not\approx, T_{\perp} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$  is a Carathéodory function, then the equations (??) become

$$\begin{array}{ll} \frac{d}{dt} \bigcup_{\mathcal{U}'_{\mathcal{D}}} u'_{\mathcal{T}} \bigcup_{p_{\mathcal{T}} - \mathcal{D}} u'_{\mathcal{T}} = F_{x_{\mathcal{T}}} t, u \quad \text{a.e. } t \in \mathcal{Z}, T \\ \frac{d}{dt} \bigcup_{\mathcal{U}'_{\mathcal{D}}} u'_{\mathcal{D}} \bigcup_{p_{\mathcal{T}} - \mathcal{D}} u'_{\mathcal{D}} = F_{x_{\mathcal{D}}} t, u \quad \text{a.e. } t \in \mathcal{Z}, T \quad , \\ u \not\approx - uT = u' \not\approx - u'T = \mathcal{Z}, \end{array}$$

$$(\boldsymbol{P}_{p_{\mathcal{T}}, p_{\mathcal{D}}})$$

where  $x = x_{\mathcal{L}}, x_{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $ut = u_{\mathcal{L}}t, u_{\mathcal{D}}t \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . In the literature, these equations are known as  $p_{\mathcal{L}}, p_{\mathcal{D}}$ -Laplacian system, see [?, ?, ?, ?, ?, ?, ?].

In conclusion, the problem  $(\ref{eq:problem})$  with conditions  $(\ref{eq:problem})$  contains several problems that have been considered by many authors in the past. Moreover, our results still improve some results on  $p_{\phi}$ ,  $p_{\phi}$ -lamplacian since our structure conditions are less restrictive even in that particular case.

### 2 Anisotropic Orlicz and Orlicz-Sobolev spaces

In this section, we give a short introduction to Orlicz and Orlicz-Sobolev spaces of vector valued functions associated to anisotropic  $N_{\infty}$  functions  $\bullet : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathcal{E}, +\infty$ . References for these topics are [?, ?, ?, ?, ?, ?].

If  $\bullet$  is a  $N_{\infty}$  function then from convexity and  $\bullet \not\approx = \not\approx$  we obtain that

$$\bullet \lambda x \leq \lambda \bullet x, \quad \lambda \in (\not \approx, \not \subset), x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$
 (5)

One of the greatest difficulties when dealing with anisotropic Orlicz spaces is the lack of monotony with respect to the Euclidean norm, i.e.  $y \in y$  does not imply  $\bullet x \leq \bullet y$ . This problem is avoided if we consider functions whose values on a sphere are comparable (see[?]). However, from (??), we see that  $N_{\infty}$  functions have the following form of radial monotony:  $y \in y$  and  $y = \lambda x$  imply  $\bullet x \leq \bullet y$ .

We say that  $\bullet : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathscr{E}, +\infty$  satisfies the  $\mathscr{E}$ -condition, denoted by  $\bullet \in \mathscr{E}$ , if there exist constants  $K > \mathscr{E}$  and  $M \geqslant \mathscr{E}$  such that

$$\bullet \not \supset x \leqslant K \bullet x, \tag{6}$$

for every x > M. If  $\bullet$  es a b function then  $\bullet$  is bounded by powers functions (see [?, Proof Lemma 2.4] and [?, Prop. 1]), i.e. there exists  $\emptyset , <math>C > 2$  and C > 3 such that

$$\bullet x \leq C \underset{\bigcup}{x} \underset{\bigcup}{p}, \quad x \underset{\bigcup}{x} \geq r_{*}.$$

We consider that one of the most important aspects in considering  $N_{\infty}$  functions is that it accounts for the Lagrange functions that present faster growth than powers, for example an exponential growth. Hence we consider it important to avoid imposing hypothesis that  $\bullet$  to be  $\S$ . For some results we will need that  $/\!/$  to be  $\S$ .

Let 
$$ullet_{\phi}$$
 and  $ullet_{\phi}$  be  $N_{\infty}$  functions. Following to [?] we write  $ullet_{\phi}$ ,

We denote by  $M := M_{\ell} \not\approx_{\ell}, T_{j}, \mathbb{R}^{d}$ , with  $d \ge \mathcal{L}$ , the set of all measurable functions (i.e. functions which are limits of simple functions) defined on  $(\not\approx_{\ell}, T_{j})$  with values on  $\mathbb{R}^{d}$  and we write  $u = u_{\mathcal{L}}, \dots, u_{d}$  for  $u \in M$ .

Given an  $N_{\infty}$  function  $\bullet$  we define the modular function  $\rho_{\bullet}: M \to \mathbb{R}^+ \cup +\infty$  by

$$\rho_{\bullet}u := \mathcal{R}_{\star}^T \bullet u \ dt.$$

Now, we introduce the *Orlicz class*  $C^{\bullet} = C^{\bullet}$  ( $^{\not\approx}$ ,  $^{\not=}$ ,  $^{\not=}$  by setting

$$C^{\bullet} := u \in M_{\bigcup} \rho_{\bullet} u < \infty . \tag{7}$$

The Orlicz space  $L^{\bullet} = L^{\bullet}$  ( $\stackrel{*}{\approx}$ , T),  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is the linear hull of  $C^{\bullet}$ ; equivalently,

$$L^{\bullet} := u \in M_{\bigcup} \exists \lambda > \approx : \rho_{\bullet} \lambda u < \infty . \tag{8}$$

The Orlicz space  $L^{\bullet}$  equipped with the Luxemburg norm

$$\prod^{u} L^{\bullet} \coloneqq \boxtimes \lambda \longleftrightarrow \lambda \bigcup \rho_{\bullet} \frac{v}{\lambda} \ dt \leqslant \not\subset ,$$

is a Banach space.

The subspace  $E^{\bullet} = E^{\bullet}$  ( $\not\approx$ , T),  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is defined as the closure in  $L^{\bullet}$  of the subspace  $L^{\infty}$  ( $\not\approx$ , T),  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of all  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued essentially bounded functions. It is shown that (see [?, Thm. 5.1])  $u \in E^{\bullet}$  if and only if  $\rho_{\bullet} \lambda u < \infty$  for any  $\lambda > \not\approx$ . The equality  $L^{\bullet} = E^{\bullet}$  is true if and only if  $\bullet \in \mathcal{P}_{b}$  (see [?, Thm. 5.2]).

A generalized version of *Hölder's inequality* holds in Orlicz spaces (see [?, Thm. 7.2]). Namely, if  $u \in L^{\bullet}$  and  $v \in L^{\parallel}$  then  $u \cdot v \in L^{\neq}$  and

$$\mathcal{R}_{\sharp}^{T} v \cdot u \ dt \leq D \prod_{i=1}^{N} u_{i} \prod_{i=1}^{N} v_{i} \prod_{i=1}^{N} v_{i}$$
 (9)

By  $u \cdot v$  we denote the usual dot product in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  between u and v.

We consider the subset  $\mathbb{E}^{\bullet}$ , r of  $L^{\bullet}$  given by

$$\mathbb{E}^{\bullet}, r \coloneqq u \in L^{\bullet} \bigcup du, E^{\bullet} < r.$$

This set is related to the Orlicz class  $C^{\bullet}$  by means of inclusions, namely,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\bullet}, r \subset rC^{\bullet} \subset \overline{\mathbb{E}^{\bullet}, r} \tag{10}$$

for any positive r. This relation is a trivial generalization of [?, Thm. 5.6]. If  $\bullet \in \mathcal{P}_{p}^{\infty}$ , then the sets  $L^{\bullet}$ ,  $E^{\bullet}$ ,  $E^{\bullet}$ , r and  $C^{\bullet}$  are equal.

As usual, if 
$$X$$
,  $\bigcap_{X} X$  is a normed space and  $Y$ ,  $\bigcap_{Y} Y$  is a linear subspace of  $X$ , we write  $Y \hookrightarrow X$  and we say that  $Y$  is *embedded* in  $X$  when there exists  $C > \not\approx$  such that  $\bigcap_{X} Y \bigcap_{X} X \leqslant C \bigcap_{X} Y \bigcap_{Y} Y$  for any  $Y \in Y$ . With this notation, Hölder's inequality states

that  $L^{\bullet} \hookrightarrow (L^{\#})^*$ , where a function  $v \in L^{\bullet}$  is associated to  $\xi_v \in (L^{\#})^*$  being

$$\xi_{\nu}u = \prod_{i} \xi_{\nu}, \widetilde{u} = \mathcal{R}_{\sharp}^{T} v \cdot u \, dt, \tag{11}$$

We highlight the following result that is a consequence of Theorems 7.1 and 7.3 in [?].

**Proposition 2.1.** If  $/\!/$  satisfies the  $\mathcal{L}^{\bullet}$ -condition then  $L^{\bullet}$   $(\mathcal{Z}, T_{\downarrow}, \mathbb{R}^d = \left(L^{/\!/}(\mathcal{Z}, T_{\downarrow}, \mathbb{R}^d)\right)^*$ .

We define the *Sobolev-Orlicz space*  $W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet}$  by

$$W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet}(\not\approx,T],\mathbb{R}^{d}:=u\bigcup u\in AC(\not\approx,T],\mathbb{R}^{d} \text{ and } u'\in L^{\bullet}(\not\approx,T],\mathbb{R}^{d},$$

where AC  $(\not\approx,T]$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^d$  denotes the space of all  $\mathbb{R}^d$  valued absolutely continuous functions defined on  $(\not\approx,T]$ . The space  $W^{\not\in}L^{\bullet}$   $(\not\approx,T]$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is a Banach space when equipped with the norm

$$\prod^{u} W^{\varphi_{L} \bullet} = \prod^{u} L^{\bullet} + \prod^{u'} L^{\bullet}. \tag{12}$$

We introduce the following subspaces of  $W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet}$ 

$$W^{\neq} E^{\bullet} = u \in W^{\neq} L^{\bullet} \cup u' \in E^{\bullet},$$

$$W^{\neq} E^{\bullet}_{T} = u \in W^{\neq} E^{\bullet} \cup u \approx uT.$$
(13)

In order to find a modulus of continuity for function in  $W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet}$ , and from there, to obtain compact embedding of  $W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet}$ , we define the function  $A_{\bullet}:\mathbb{R}^+\to\mathbb{R}^+$  by

$$A_{\bullet}s = \mathbb{N} \boxtimes \hat{\pi} \bullet x \bigcup_{\left[ \begin{array}{c} x \\ \end{array} \right]} = s , \qquad (14)$$

Let us establish some elementary properties of  $A_{\bullet}$ .

**Proposition 2.2.** The function  $A_{\bullet}$  has the following properties:

1.  $A_{\bullet}$  is continuous,

- 2.  $A_{\bullet}s_{\bullet}s$  is increasing,
- 3.  $A_{\bullet_{\mid \cdot \mid}} x_{\mid \cdot \mid}$  is the greatest radial minorant of  $\bullet x$ ,
- 4.  $\bullet$  is  $N_{\infty}$  if and only if  $\square \boxtimes \aleph_{s \to +\infty} A_{\bullet} s_{\uparrow} s = +\infty$ .

*Proof.* It is well known that finite and convex functions defined on finite dimensional vector spaces are locally Lipschitz functions (see [?]). This fact implies item ?? immediately.

In order to prove item ??, suppose  $\not\approx < r < s$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $A_{\bullet}s = \bullet x$ . Then, from the definition of  $A_{\bullet}$  and the convexity of  $\bullet$ ,

$$\frac{A_{\bullet}r}{r} \leqslant \frac{\bullet \frac{r}{s}x}{r} \leqslant \frac{\bullet x}{s} = \frac{A_{\bullet}s}{s}.$$

Property in items ?? and ?? are obtained easily.

*Example 2.1.* We compute  $A_{\bullet}$  for the function  $\bullet = \bullet_{p_{\sigma}, p_{\sigma}}$  given in Example (??). We apply the method of Lagrange multipliers (see [?, Ch. 11]) to solve the next minimization problem subject to constraints

The first order conditions are

$$\bigcup_{y_{\mathcal{L}}} \bigvee_{p_{\mathcal{L}} \to \mathcal{D}} y_{\mathcal{L}} + \lambda y_{\mathcal{L}} = \cancel{z}$$

$$\bigcup_{y_{\mathcal{L}}} \bigvee_{p_{\mathcal{L}} \to \mathcal{D}} y_{\mathcal{D}} + \lambda y_{\mathcal{D}} = \cancel{z}$$

$$\bigcup_{y_{\mathcal{L}}} \bigvee_{\mathcal{D}} + \bigcup_{\mathcal{D}} \bigvee_{\mathcal{D}} \bigvee_{\mathcal{D}} = r^{\mathcal{D}}$$
(15)

These equations are solved, among others, by the following two sets of citical points: a) x = r, y = t and  $t = -r^{p_{\mathcal{I}} - t}$  and b) t = t, t = t, t = t and  $t = -r^{p_{\mathcal{I}} - t}$ . These sets are infinite when t = t. Associated with these critical points we have the following critical values: a) t = t and b) t = t and b) t = t being one of them (suppose t = t) different from 2.

We deal with  $p_{\neq} \leq \mathcal{D}$  and  $p_{\neq} \leq \mathcal{D}$  being one of them (suppose  $p_{\neq}$ ) different from 2. The remaining cases can be treated with similar techniques.

If 
$$y_{\not\subset}$$
,  $y_{\not\supset}$  solve (??) with  $y_{\not\subset}$  and  $y_{\not\supset}$  then  $y_{\not\supset} = y_{\not\subset} =$ 

We use second order conditions for constrained problems. We have to consider the tangent plane at the point  $y_{\mathcal{L}}, y_{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}n}$ , i.e.  $M = \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}n} : \xi y_{\mathcal{L}}^t + \eta y_{\mathcal{D}}^T = \not\approx$ . Let L be the Lagrangian associated to the constrained problem:  $Ly_{\mathcal{L}}, y_{\mathcal{D}}, \lambda = \mathbf{\Phi} y_{\mathcal{L}}, y_{\mathcal{D}} + \lambda H y_{\mathcal{L}}, y_{\mathcal{D}}$  being  $H = \not\approx$  the constraint. We must analize the positivity of the quadratic form associated to the matrix of second partial derivatives  $H = D^{\mathcal{D}} + \lambda D^{\mathcal{D}} H$  on the subspace M. By elementary computations we have for  $\xi, \eta \in M$ 

$$\xi, \eta^t H \xi, \eta = \bigcup_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{j,j} \xi^t x^{\mathcal{D}} (\bigcup_{j=1}^{N} y_{\mathcal{L}_{j,j}} \bigcup_{j=1}^{-\mathcal{D}} p_{\mathcal{L}_{j}} - \mathcal{D} + p_{\mathcal{D}_{j}} - \mathcal{D} \bigcup_{j=1}^{N} y_{\mathcal{D}_{j,j}} \bigcup_{j=1}^{-\mathcal{D}_{j,j}} \gamma_{\mathcal{D}_{j,j}}$$

on the subspace M. We note that  $-y_{\not\supset}, y_{\not\subset} \in M$  and  $-y_{\not\supset}, y_{\not\subset} ^t H - y_{\not\supset}, y_{\not\subset} < \not\approx$ . Then, by second order necessary conditions [?, p.333], at  $y_{\not\subset}, y_{\not\supset}$  there cannot be a minimum. Therefore, the only minima occur at  $y_{\not\subset} = \not\approx$  or  $y_{\not\supset} = \not\approx$ , then

$$A_{\bullet}x, y = \mathbb{E} A r^{p_{\neq}} p_{\neq}, r^{p_{\Rightarrow}} p_{\neq}.$$

More generally, it holds that

$$K_{\mathcal{T}} \otimes \mathbb{A} r^{p_{\mathcal{T}}}, r^{p_{\mathcal{D}}} \leqslant A_{\bullet} \leqslant K_{\mathcal{D}} \otimes \mathbb{A} r^{p_{\mathcal{T}}}, r^{p_{\mathcal{D}}}$$

with  $K_{\not\subset}$ ,  $K_{\not\supset} > \not\approx$ , for every  $\not\subset < p_{\not\subset}$ ,  $p_{\not\supset} < \infty$ .

As is customary, we will use the decomposition  $u = \overline{u} + u$  for a function  $u \in L^{\not\subset}(\mathcal{Z}, T)$  where  $\overline{u} = \frac{\not\subset}{T} \mathcal{R}_{\cancel{Z}}^T ut \ dt$  and  $u = u - \overline{u}$ .

The following lemma is an elementary generalization to anisotropic Sobolev-Orlicz spaces of known results of Sobolev spaces.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let  $\bullet : \mathbb{R}^d \to (\not\approx, +\infty)$  be a Young's function and let  $u \in W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet}$   $(\not\approx, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $A_{\bullet} : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$  be the function defined by (??). Then

1. For every 
$$s, t \in (\mathcal{Z}, T)$$
,  $s \neq t$ ,
$$\bigcup_{ut - us} u \leq \prod_{u'} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \leq \int_{u'} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \leq \int_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \leq \int_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \leq \int_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \leq \int_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \leq \int_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \leq \int_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}} u' \prod_{u' \in \mathcal{Z}}$$

2. We have  $u \in L^{\infty}(^{\cancel{z}}, T], \mathbb{R}^d$  and

$$\prod^{u} L^{\infty} \leqslant T A_{\bullet}^{-\varphi} \stackrel{\not\subset}{T} \prod^{u'} L^{\bullet}$$
 (Sobolev-Wirtinger's inequality)

3. If ullet is  $N_{\infty}$  then the space  $W^{\not\subset}L^{ullet}(\not\gtrsim,T]$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is compactly embedded in the space of continuous functions  $C(\not\gtrsim,T]$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

*Proof.* By the absolutely continuity of u, Jensen's inequality and the definition of the Luxemburg norm, we have

$$\frac{ut - us}{\prod^{u'} \prod^{L^{\bullet}} \bigcup^{s - t} \bigcup} \leq \Phi \frac{\not\subset}{\bigcup^{s - t} \bigcup} \mathcal{R}_{s}^{t} \frac{u'r}{\prod^{u'} \prod^{L^{\bullet}}} dr \\
\leq \frac{\not\subset}{\bigcup^{s - t} \bigcup} \mathcal{R}_{s}^{t} \Phi \frac{u'r}{\prod^{u'} \prod^{L^{\bullet}}} dr \leq \frac{\not\subset}{\bigcup^{s - t} \bigcup}.$$

By Proposition ??(??) we have  $A_{\bullet}^{-\varphi} \bullet x \geqslant |x|$ , therefore we get

$$\frac{\bigcup^{ut-us}\bigcup}{\prod^{u'}\prod^{L^{\bullet}}\bigcup^{s-t}\bigcup} \leqslant A_{\bullet}^{-\emptyset} \frac{\not\subset}{\bigcup^{s-t}\bigcup},$$

then ?? holds.

Now, we use ?? and Proposition ?? (??) and we have

$$\bigcup ut - \overline{u} \bigcup = \bigcup \frac{\cancel{C}}{T} \mathcal{R}_{*}^{T} ut - us \, ds \bigcup$$

$$\leq \frac{\cancel{C}}{T} \mathcal{R}_{*}^{T} \bigcup ut - us \bigcup ds$$

$$\leq \bigcup u' \bigcup L^{\bullet} T A_{\bullet}^{-\cancel{C}} \frac{\cancel{C}}{T}$$

In order to prove the Sobolev's inequality, we note that, using Jensen's inequality and the definition of  $\prod_{i=1}^{n} u_{i} \int_{0}^{1} e^{-t} dt$ , we obtain

$$\bullet \frac{\overline{u}}{\prod^{u} \prod^{L^{\bullet}}} \leqslant \frac{\not\subset}{T} \mathcal{R}_{*}^{T} \bullet \frac{us}{\prod^{u} \prod^{L^{\bullet}}} ds \leqslant \frac{\not\subset}{T}$$

Then by By Proposition ??(??)

$$\bigcup_{i} \overline{u} \bigcup_{i} \leqslant A_{\bullet}^{-\not\subset} \frac{\not\subset}{T} \prod_{i} u_{i} \prod_{i} L^{\bullet}.$$

Therefore, from this and (??) we get

$$\prod^{u} \prod^{L^{\infty}} \leq \bigcup^{\overline{u}} \bigcup^{+} \prod^{\overline{u}} \prod^{L^{\infty}} \\
\leq A_{\bullet}^{-\sigma} \frac{\sigma}{T} \prod^{u} \prod^{L^{\bullet}} + T A_{\bullet}^{-\sigma} \frac{\sigma}{T} \prod^{u'} \prod^{L^{\bullet}} \\
\leq A_{\bullet}^{-\sigma} \frac{\sigma}{T} \text{ and } T, T \prod^{u} \prod^{W^{\sigma}L^{\bullet}}$$

In order to prove item 3, we take a bounded sequence  $u_n$  in  $W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet}$  ( $\not\approx$ , T<sub>|</sub>,  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Since

• is  $N_{\infty}$ , from Proposition ??(??) we obtain  $sA_{\bullet}^{-\not\subset} \curvearrowright \to \not\approx$  when  $s \to \not\approx$ . Therefore (??) implies that  $u_n$  are equicontinuous. Furthermore (??) implies that  $u_n$  is bounded in  $C_{\bullet} \not\approx T_{\bullet}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Therefore by the Arzela-Ascoli Theorem we obtain a subsequence  $n_k$  and  $u \in C_{\bullet} \not\approx T_{\bullet}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $u_{n_k} \to u$  in  $C_{\bullet} \not\approx T_{\bullet}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $u_{nn\in\mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of functions in  $\mathbb{E}^{\bullet}$ ,  $\not\subset$  converging to  $u\in\mathbb{E}^{\bullet}$ ,  $\not\subset$  in the  $L^{\bullet}$ -norm. Then, there exist a subsequence  $u_{n_k}$  and a real valued function  $h\in L^{\not\subset}(x,T]$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $u_{n_k}\to u$  a.e. and  $\bullet u_{n_k}\leqslant h$  a.e.

*Proof.* Since  $du, E^{\bullet} < \emptyset$  and  $u_n$  converges to u, there exists  $u_{*} \in E^{\bullet}$ , a subsequence of  $u_n$  (again denoted  $u_n$ ) and  $\# < r < \emptyset$  such that  $du_n, u_{\#} < r$ . Let  $\lambda_{\#} \in r, \emptyset$ . By extracting more subsequences, if necessary, we can assume that  $u_n \to u$  a.e. and

$$\lambda_n := \prod_{n+\not\subset} u_{n+\not\subset} - u_n \prod_{n\not\subset} L^{\bullet} < \frac{\not\subset -\lambda_{\not\approx}}{\not\supset^n}, \quad \text{for } n \geqslant \not\subset.$$

We can assume  $\lambda_n > \not\approx$  for every  $n = \not\approx, \dots$ 

Let  $\lambda := \not\subset -\mathcal{P}_{n=*}^{\infty} \lambda_n$  and define  $h: (\not\succsim, T) \to \mathbb{R}$  by

$$hx = \lambda \bullet \frac{u_{*}}{\lambda} + \mathop{\mathcal{P}}_{n=*}^{\infty} \lambda_{n} \bullet \frac{u_{n+\not c} - u_{n}}{\lambda_{n}} . \tag{16}$$

Note that  $\mathcal{P}_{n=*}^{\infty} \lambda_n + \lambda = \emptyset$ , therefore for any  $n = \emptyset, \dots$ 

$$\bullet u_n = \bullet \lambda \frac{u_{\sharp}}{\lambda} + \stackrel{n-\varphi}{\mathcal{P}}_{j=\sharp} \lambda_j \frac{u_{j+\varphi} - u_j}{\lambda_j} \\
\leqslant \lambda \bullet \frac{u_{\sharp}}{\lambda} + \stackrel{n-\varphi}{\mathcal{P}}_{j=\sharp} \lambda_j \bullet \frac{u_{j+\varphi} - u_j}{\lambda_j} \leqslant h$$

Since  $u_{*} \in E^{\bullet} \subset C^{\bullet}$  and  $E^{\bullet}$  is a subspace we have that  $\bullet u_{*} \wedge \lambda \in L^{\emptyset}(*, T]$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$ . On the other hand  $u_{n+\emptyset} - u_n = L^{\bullet} \leq \lambda_n$ , therefore

$$\mathcal{R}_{*}^{T} \bullet \frac{u_{j+\not\subset} - u_{j}}{\lambda_{i}} dt \leqslant \not\subset.$$

Then  $h \in L^{\neq}(\mathcal{Z}, T)$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$ .

## . 4---

# 3 Differentiability Gateâux of action integrals in anisotropic Orlicz spaces

Given a continuous function  $a \in C\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^+$ , we define the composition operator  $a : M_d \to M_d$  by aux = aux.

We will often use the following result whose proof can be performed as that of Corollary 2.3 in [?].

**Lemma 3.1.** If  $a \in \mathbb{CR}^d$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^+$  then  $\mathbf{a} : W^{\neq} L^{\bullet} \to L^{\infty} (\stackrel{*}{\sim}, T]$  is bounded. More concretely, there exists a non decreasing function  $A : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$  such that  $\prod au \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (\stackrel{*}{\sim}, T_k) \leq 1$ 

$$A \prod u \prod^{W^{\not\subset} L^{\bullet}}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $A \in C\mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^+$  be a non decreasing, continuous function defined by  $\alpha s := \Phi \setminus \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $A \in C\mathbb{R}^+$ ,

$$aut \leq \alpha \prod^u \prod^{L^\infty} \leq \alpha \ A_{\bullet}^{-\not\subset} \ \frac{\not\subset}{T} \ \text{with} \ T, T \prod^u \prod^{W^{\not\subset} L^\bullet} =: A \prod^u \prod^{W^{\not\subset} L^\bullet}.$$

HABRÍA QUE VER DÓNDE SE UBICA LA CONDICIÓN DE ESTRUCTURA...QUIZÁS EN LA INTRODUCCIÓN?....

Next, we deal with the differentiability of the action integral

$$Iu = \mathcal{R}_{+}^{T} Lt, ut, \dot{u}t dt. \tag{17}$$

**Theorem 3.2.** Let L be a differentiable Carathéodory function satisfying (??). Then the following statements hold:

- 1. The action integral given by (??) is finitely defined on  $E^{\bullet} := W^{\phi}L^{\bullet} \cap u \bigcup \dot{u} \in \mathbb{E}^{\bullet}, \phi$ .
- 2. The function I is Gâteaux differentiable on  $E^{\bullet}$  and its derivative I' is demicontinuous from  $E^{\bullet}$  into  $(W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet}]^*$ . Moreover, I' is given by the following expression

$$\prod^{I'} u, v = \mathcal{R}_{\sharp}^T D_x Lt, u, \dot{u} \cdot v + D_y Lt, u, \dot{u} \cdot \dot{v} dt.$$
 (18)

3. If  $\| \in \S$  then I' is continuous from  $E^{\bullet}$  into  $(W^{\not\subset} L^{\bullet}]^*$  when both spaces are equipped with the strong topology.

*Proof.* Let  $u \in E^{\bullet}$ . As

$$\dot{u} \in \mathbb{E}^{\bullet}, \not\subset C_{\sigma}^{\bullet} \tag{19}$$

and (??), then  $\bullet ut \in L^{\not\subset}$ . Now,

$$\bigcup^{L\cdot, u, \dot{u}} \bigcup^{+} \bigcup^{D_{x}L\cdot, u, \dot{u}} \bigcup^{+} /\!\!/ D_{y}L\cdot, u, \dot{u} \leqslant A \prod^{u} \prod^{w^{\varphi}L \bullet b} b + \bullet \dot{u} \in L^{\sharp}, \tag{20}$$

by (??) and Lemma ??. Thus item (??) is proved.

We split up the proof of item ?? into four steps.

Step 1. The non linear operator  $u \mapsto D_x Lt$ , u, u is continuous from  $E^{\bullet}$  into  $L^{\not\subset}(z, T)$  with the strong topology on both sets.

Let  $u_{nn\in\mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of functions in  $E^{\bullet}$  and let  $u \in E^{\bullet}$  such that  $u_n \to u$  in  $W^{\not\subset} L^{\bullet}$ . By (??), we have

$$\bigcup_{n} u_n t - u t \bigcup_{n} \leqslant T A_{\bullet}^{-\varphi} \frac{\varphi}{T} \prod_{n} u_n - u \prod_{n} L^{\bullet}$$

then  $u_n \to u$  uniformly. As  $\dot{u}_n \to \dot{u} \in E^{\bullet}$ , by Lemma ??, there exist a subsequence of  $\dot{u}_{n_k}$  (again denoted  $\dot{u}_{n_k}$ ) and a function  $h \in L^{\not\subset}(\not\approx, T)$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\dot{u}_{n_k} \to \dot{u}$  a.e. and  $\bullet \dot{u}_{n_k} \leqslant h$  a.e.

Since  $u_{n_k}$ ,  $k = \emptyset, \emptyset, \ldots$ , is a strong convergent sequence in  $W^{\emptyset}L^{\bullet}$ , it is a bounded sequence in  $W^{\emptyset}L^{\bullet}$ . According to item (??) of Lemma ??, there exists  $M > \mathcal{Z}$  such that  $\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} au_{n_k} \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} au_{n_k} \prod_{$ 

$$\bigcup_{n_k} D_x L \cdot, u_{n_k}, \dot{u}_{n_k} \bigcup \leq a \bigcup_{n_k} U_{n_k} \bigcup_{n_k} b + \bullet \dot{u}_{n_k} \leq Mb + h \in L^{\mathcal{L}}.$$

On the other hand, by the continuous differentiability of L, we have

$$D_x Lt, u_{n_k} t, \dot{u}_{n_k} t \to D_x Lt, ut, \dot{u}t$$
 for a.e.  $t \in (^{\not\approx}, T]$ 

Applying the Dominated Convergence Theorem we conclude the proof of step 1. Step 2. The non linear operator  $u \mapsto D_y Lt$ ,  $u, \dot{u}$  is continuous from  $E^{\bullet}$  with the strong topology into  $(L^{\bullet})^*$  with the weak\* topology.

Let  $u \in E^{\bullet}$ . From (??) it follows that

$$D_{y}L\cdot, u, \dot{u} \in C^{\#}. \tag{21}$$

Así? o conviene poner la cota de  $//D_y$  explícitamente???

Note that (??), (??) and the imbeddings  $W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet} \hookrightarrow L^{\infty}$  and  $L^{\#} \hookrightarrow (L^{\bullet}]^*$  imply that the second member of (??) defines an element of  $(W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet}]^*$ .

Let  $u_n, u \in E^{\bullet}$  such that  $u_n \to u$  in the norm of  $W^{\not\subset} L^{\bullet}$ . We must prove that  $D_y L_{\cdot}, u_n, \dot{u}_n \stackrel{w^*}{\rightharpoonup} D_y L_{\cdot}, u, \dot{u}$ . On the contrary, there exist  $v \in L^{\bullet}$ ,  $\epsilon > \not\approx$  and a subsequence of  $u_n$  (denoted  $u_n$  for simplicity) such that

$$\bigcup_{\coprod} D_{y}L\cdot, u_{n}, \dot{u}_{n}, v \widetilde{\phantom{a}} - \coprod D_{y}L\cdot, u, \dot{u}, v \widetilde{\phantom{a}} \bigcup \geqslant \epsilon.$$
 (22)

We have  $u_n \to u$  in  $L^{\bullet}$  and  $\dot{u}_n \to \dot{u}$  in  $L^{\bullet}$ . By Lemma ??, there exist a subsequence of  $u_n$  (again denoted  $u_n$  for simplicity) and a function  $h \in L^{\not\subset}(\not\approx, T)$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $u_n \to u$  uniformly,  $\dot{u}_n \to \dot{u}$  a.e. and  $\bullet \dot{u}_n \leqslant h$  a.e. As in the previous step, since  $u_n$  is a convergent sequence, Lemma ?? implies that  $a \cup u_n t \cup u_n$  is uniformly bounded by a certain constant  $M > \not\approx$ . Therefore, from inequality (??) with  $u_n$  instead of u, we have

$$/\!/ D_{\nu} L_{\cdot}, u_{n}, \dot{u}_{n} \leqslant Mb + h \in L^{\mathcal{C}}. \tag{23}$$

As  $v \in L^{\bullet}$  there exists  $\lambda > \approx$  such that  $\bullet_{\lambda}^{\underline{v}} \in L^{\neq}$ . Now, by Young inequality and (??), we have

$$\lambda D_{y}L\cdot, u_{n_{k}}, \dot{u}_{n_{k}} \cdot \frac{vt}{\lambda}$$

$$\leq \lambda \left( //D_{y}L\cdot, u_{n_{k}}, \dot{u}_{n_{k}} + \bullet \frac{v}{\lambda} \right]$$

$$\leq \lambda Mb + h + \lambda \bullet \frac{v}{\lambda} \in L^{\mathcal{L}}$$
(24)

Finally, from the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem, we deduce

$$\mathcal{R}_{\pm}^{T} D_{\nu} Lt, u_{n_{\nu}}, \dot{u}_{n_{\nu}} \cdot v dt \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{\pm}^{T} D_{\nu} Lt, u, \dot{u} \cdot v dt$$
 (25)

which contradicts the inequality (??). This completes the proof of step 2.

Step 3. We will prove (??). For  $u \in E^{\bullet}$  and  $\not\approx v \in W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet}$ , we define the function

$$Hs, t := Lt, ut + svt, \dot{u}t + s\dot{v}t.$$

For 
$$\bigcup s \subseteq s_* := \Re \mathbb{Z} \wedge \mathbb{Z} - d\dot{u}, E^{\bullet} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{W^{\varphi}L^{\bullet}}, \mathcal{L}^{\bullet}, using triangle inequal-$$

ity we get  $d\dot{u} + s\dot{v}$ ,  $E^{\bullet} < \emptyset$  and thus  $\dot{u} + s\dot{v} \in E^{\bullet}$ ,  $\emptyset$ . These facts imply, in virtue of Theorem ?? item ??, that Iu + sv is well defined and finite for  $s \in S_{\sharp}$ .

We also have 
$$\prod_{u + sv} u + sv \prod_{w \in L^{\bullet}} u \prod_{w \in L^{\bullet}} v \prod_{w \in L^{\bullet}} v \text{ then, by Lemma}$$
??, there exists  $M > z$  such that  $u + sv \prod_{u \in L^{\infty}} v M$ .

Let  $\lambda > 2$  such that  $\bullet_{\lambda}^{\dot{v}} \in L^{\not\subset}$ . On the other hand, if  $\dot{v} \in L^{\bullet}$  and  $s \in S_{\not\sim} \lambda^{-\not\subset}$ , from the convexity and the parity of  $\bullet$ , we get

$$\bullet \dot{u} + s\dot{v} = \bullet \not\subset -s_{\cancel{z}} \frac{\dot{u}}{\not\subset -s_{\cancel{z}}} + s_{\cancel{z}} \frac{s}{s_{\cancel{z}}} \dot{v} \leqslant \not\subset -s_{\cancel{z}} \bullet \frac{\dot{u}}{\not\subset -s_{\cancel{z}}} + s_{\cancel{z}} \bullet \frac{s}{s_{\cancel{z}}} \dot{v}$$

$$\leqslant \not\subset -s_{\cancel{z}} \bullet \frac{\dot{u}}{\not\subset -s_{\cancel{z}}} + s_{\cancel{z}} \bullet \frac{\dot{v}}{\lambda} \in L^{\not\subset}$$

As  $\dot{u} \in \mathbb{E}^{\bullet}$ ,  $\not\subset$  then

$$d \frac{\dot{u}}{\not\subset -s_{\sharp}}, E^{\bullet} = \frac{\not\subset}{\not\subset -s_{\sharp}} d\dot{u}, E^{\bullet} < \not\subset$$

and therefore  $\frac{\dot{u}}{\not\subset -s_{\neq}} \in C^{\bullet}$ .

Now, applying (??), (??), the fact that  $v \in L^{\infty}$  and  $\dot{v} \in L^{\bullet}$ , we get

$$\bigcup_{v} D_{s}Hs, t = \bigcup_{v} D_{x}Lt, u + sv, \dot{u} + s\dot{v} \cdot v + \lambda D_{y}Lt, u + sv, \dot{u} + s\dot{v} \cdot \frac{\dot{v}}{\lambda} \bigcup_{v} V \bigcup$$

Consequently, I has a directional derivative and

$$\coprod I'u, v = \frac{d}{ds}Iu + sv \bigcup_{s=*} = \mathcal{R}_*^T D_x Lt, u, \dot{u} \cdot v + D_y Lt, u, \dot{u} \cdot \dot{v} dt.$$

Moreover, from the previous formula, (??), (??), and Lemma ??, we obtain

$$\bigcup \coprod^{I'u, v \sim} \bigcup \leqslant \prod^{D_x L} \prod^{L^{\sharp}} \prod^{v} \prod^{L^{\infty}} + \prod^{D_y L} \prod^{L^{\#}} \prod^{\dot{v}} \prod^{L^{\bullet}} \leqslant C \prod^{v} \prod^{W^{\sharp} L^{\bullet}}$$

with a appropriate constant C.

This completes the proof of the Gâteaux differentiability of *I*.

Step 4. The operator  $I': E^{\bullet} \to \left(W^{\not\subset}L_d^{\bullet}\right]^*$  is demicontinuous. This is a consequence of the continuity of the mappings  $u \mapsto D_x Lt$ , u,  $\dot{u}$  and  $u \mapsto D_y Lt$ , u,  $\dot{u}$ . Indeed, if  $u_n$ ,  $u \in E^{\bullet}$  with  $u_n \to u$  in the norm of  $W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet}$  and  $v \in W^{\not\subset}L^{\bullet}$ , then

$$\coprod I'u_n, v \stackrel{\sim}{=} \mathcal{R}^T_{\sharp} D_x L t, u_n, \dot{u}_n \cdot v + D_y L t, u_n, \dot{u}_n \cdot \dot{v} dt 
\rightarrow \mathcal{R}^T_{\sharp} D_x L t, u, \dot{u} \cdot v + D_y L t, u, \dot{u} \cdot \dot{v} dt 
= \coprod I'u, v \stackrel{\sim}{=} .$$

In order to prove item ??, it is necessary to see that the maps  $u \mapsto D_x Lt$ ,  $u, \dot{u}$  and  $u \mapsto D_y Lt$ ,  $u, \dot{u}$  are norm continuous from  $E^{\bullet}$  into  $L^{\emptyset}$  and  $L^{//}$ , respectively.

The continuity of the first map has already been proved in step 1.

Si eliminamos la demicontinuidad del segundo item, hay que copiar la continuidad de  $D_x$  aquí!!!

Let 
$$u_n, u \in E^{\bullet}$$
 with  $\prod u_n - u \prod_{W^{\varphi} L^{\bullet}} \to \mathscr{Z}$ .

Applying Lemma ?? to  $\dot{u}_n$ , there exists a subsequence (denoted  $\dot{u}_n$  for simplicity) such that  $\dot{u}_n \in L^{\bullet}$  and a function  $h \in L^{\emptyset}$  such that  $||\dot{u}_n|| \leq h$  and  $\dot{u}_n \to \dot{u}$  a.e.

Then, by (??) we have  $/\!\!/ v_n \le mt \in L^{\not c}$  being  $v_n := D_y L \cdot, u_n, \dot{u}_n$  and mt := Mb + h. In addition, from the continuous differentiability of L, we have that  $v_n \to v$  a.e. where  $D_y L \cdot, u, \dot{u}$ .

As 
$$\# \in \mathfrak{h}$$
, there exists  $c: \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{I}$  such that  $\# \lambda x \leqslant c \mathring{\bigcup} \mathbb{A} / \mathbb{A}$ . Then,  $\# v_n - v$  for every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Therefore, 
$$\|\frac{v_n-v}{\lambda}\| \to *$$
 a.e. as  $n \to \infty$  and  $\|\frac{v_n-v}{\lambda}\| \le c \lambda \bigcup_{n=0}^{-c} K \|v_n\| + \|v\| \le c \lambda \bigcup_{n=0}^{-c} K \|mt\| + \|v\| \le L^{\frac{c}{2}}$ .

Now, by Dominated Convergence Theorem, we get  $\mathcal{R} /\!\!/ \frac{v_n - v}{\lambda} dt \to \mathcal{Z}$  for every  $\lambda > \mathcal{Z}$ . Thus,  $v_n \to v$  in  $L^{/\!\!/}$ .

The continuity of I' follows from the continuity of  $D_xL$  and  $D_yL$  using the formula (??).

### Acknowledgments

The authors are partially supported by a UNRC grant number 18/C417. The first author is partially supported by a UNSL grant number 22/F223.