Euler-Lagragian equations in an Orlicz-Sobolev space setting

Sonia Acinas *
Dpto. de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales
Universidad Nacional de La Pampa
(6300) Santa Rosa, La Pampa, Argentina
sonia.acinas@gmail.com

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

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

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

Erica L. Schwindt¶
Université d'Orléans, Laboratoire MAPMO, CNRS, UMR 7349,
Fédération Denis Poisson, FR 2964,
Bâtiment de Mathématiques, BP 6759, 45067 Orléans Cedex 2, France,
leris98@gmail.com

Abstract

...

1 Introduction

2 Preliminaries

For reader convenience, we give a short introduction to Orlicz and Orlicz Sobolev spaces of vector valued functions and a list of results that we will use throughout the article. We refer to [1, 10, 17] for additional details and proofs. In the first two references scalar valued function are considered, however the generalization of the results enumerated below to vector valued functions is direct. Last one reference consider vector valued functions.

Hereafter we denote by $\mathbb{R}^+$ to the set of all non negative real numbers. A function $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is called an *N-function* if it has the form

$$\Phi(t) = \int_0^t \varphi(\tau)\, d\tau, \quad \text{for } u \geq 0,$$

where $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to: \mathbb{R}^+$ is a right continuous nondecreasing function satisfying $\varphi(0) = 0$, $\varphi(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} \varphi(t) = +\infty$.

Given a function φ as above, we also consider the so-called right inverse function ψ of φ which is defined $\psi(s) = \sup_{\varphi(t)\leqslant s} t$. The function ψ satisfies the same properties that function φ, therefore we have an N-function Ψ such that $\Psi' = \psi$. The function Ψ is called the *complementary function* of Φ.

We say that Φ is a *function of the Δ_2 class* when there exists a constant $k > 0$ and a $t_0 \geq 0$ such that $\Phi(2t) \leqslant K\Phi(t)$, for every $t \geq t_0$.

In this paper we adopt the convention of to use bold symbols for denote points in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and plain symbols for scalar ones.

For n positive integer we denote by $M_n := M_n([0,T])$ the set of all measurable functions defined in $[0,T]$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Given a N-function Φ we define the *modular function* $\rho_\Phi : M_n \to: \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ by

$$\rho_\Phi(\boldsymbol{u}) := \int_{[0,T]} \Phi(|\boldsymbol{u}|)\, dt.$$

Here $|\cdot|$ is the euclidean norm of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The *Orlicz class* $C_n^\Phi = C_n^\Phi([0,T])$ is defined by

$$C_n^\Phi := \{\boldsymbol{u} \in M_n | \rho_\Phi(\boldsymbol{u}) < \infty\}. \tag{1}$$

*SECyT-UNRC
†SECyT-UNRC
‡SECyT-UNRC and CONICET
§SECyT-UNRC and CONICET
¶ANR. AVENTURES - ANR-12-BLAN-BS01-0001-01
2010 AMS Subject Classification. Primary: . Secondary: .
Keywords and phrases. .

The *Orlicz space* $L_n^\Phi = L_n^\Phi([0,T])$ is the linear hull of C_n^Φ. Equivalently

$$L_n^\Phi := \{\boldsymbol{u} \in M_n | \exists \lambda > 0 : \rho_\Phi(\lambda \boldsymbol{u}) < \infty\}. \tag{2}$$

The Orlicz space L_n^Φ equipped with the *Orlicz norm*

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\Phi} := \sup\left\{ \int_0^T \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{v}dt \middle| \rho_\Psi(\boldsymbol{v}) \leqslant 1 \right\},$$

is a Banach space. By $\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{v}$ we denote the usual dot product in $\mathbb{R}^n$ between $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$.

The subspace $E_n^\Phi = E_n^\Phi([0,T])$ is defined as the closure in L_n^Φ of the subspace L_n^∞ of all the $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued essentially bounded functions. It is showed that E_n^Φ is the only one maximal subspace contained in the Orlicz class C^Φ, that is $\boldsymbol{u} \in E_n^\Phi$ if and only if for any $\lambda > 0$ we have $\rho_\Phi(\lambda \boldsymbol{u}) < \infty$.

A generalizated version of *Hölder inequality* holds in the setting of Orlicz spaces (ver [10, Th 9.3]). Namely, if $\boldsymbol{u} \in L_n^\Phi$ and $\boldsymbol{v} \in L_n^\Psi$ then $\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{v} \in L_1^1$ and

$$\int_0^T \boldsymbol{v}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}dt \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\Phi}\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^\Psi}. \tag{3}$$

If X and Y are Banach spaces, with $Y \subset X^*$ we denote by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle : Y \times X \to \mathbb{R}$ to the bilinear pairing map given by $\langle x^*, x\rangle = x^*(x)$. Hölder inequality shows that $L_n^\Psi \subset \left[L_n^\Phi\right]^*$, where the pairing $\langle \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}\rangle$, $\boldsymbol{u} \in L_n^\Phi$ and $\boldsymbol{v} \in L_n^\Psi$, is defined by

$$\langle \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}\rangle = \int_0^T \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{v}dt. \tag{4}$$

Unless Φ be a Δ_2 function, the relation $L_n^\Psi = \left[L_n^\Phi\right]^*$ does not holds. It is true in general that $\left[E_n^\Phi\right]^* = L_n^\Psi$.

Likes in [10], we will consider the subset $\Pi(E_n^\Phi, r)$ of L_n^Φ defined by

$$\Pi(E_n^\Phi, r) := \{\boldsymbol{u} \in L_n^\Phi | d(\boldsymbol{u}, E_n^\Phi) < r\}.$$

This set is related to the Orlicz class C_n^Φ by means of inclusions

$$\Pi(E_n^\Phi, 1) \subset C_n^\Phi \subset \overline{\Pi(E_n^\Phi, 1)}. \tag{5}$$

The proof of this fact, and similar ones, is given by real valued function in [10], the extension to $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued functions does not involve any difficulty. When the function Φ is of the Δ_2 class then the four sets L_n^Φ, E_n^Φ $\Pi(E_n^\Phi, 1)$ and C_n^Φ are equal.

We will use the following elementary fact frequently

$$\boldsymbol{u} \in \Pi(E_n^\Phi, \lambda) \implies \frac{\boldsymbol{u}}{\lambda} \in \Pi(E_n^\Phi, 1) \subset C_n^\Phi. \tag{6}$$

We define the *Sobolev-Orlicz space* $W^1L_n^\Phi$ (see [1]) by

$$W^1L_n^\Phi := \{\boldsymbol{u} | \boldsymbol{u} \text{ is absolutely continuous and } \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}} \in L_n^\Phi\}.$$

This space is a Banach space equipped with the norm

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{W^1L^\Phi} = \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\Phi} + \|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi}.$$

For a function $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^1_n([0,T])$, we write $\boldsymbol{u} = \overline{\boldsymbol{u}} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}$, where $\overline{\boldsymbol{u}} = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \boldsymbol{u}(t)\,dt$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} = \boldsymbol{u} - \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}$.

An important aspect of the theory of Sobolev spaces is related to embedding theorems. There is an extensive literature on this question in the setting of Orlicz-Sobolev spaces, see for example [3, 4, 5, 6, 9]. For this reason the following simple Lemma, which we will use systematically, it is well known. We include a brief proof for sake of completeness.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in W^1L^\Phi_n$. Then $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^\infty_n([0,T])$ and*

$$\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\infty} \leqslant T\Psi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{T}\right)\|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi} \qquad \textit{(Wirtinger's inequality)} \qquad (7)$$

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty} \leqslant \Psi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{T}\right)\max\{1,T\}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{W^1L^\Phi} \qquad \textit{(Sobolev's inequality)} \qquad (8)$$

Proof. Since $\boldsymbol{u}$ is contiuous, from the mean value theorem there exists τ such that $\boldsymbol{u}(\tau) = \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}$, thus

$$|\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}| \leqslant \int_\tau^t |\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(s)|ds \leqslant \|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi}\|1\|_{L^\Psi} \leqslant T\Psi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{T}\right)\|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi}. \qquad (9)$$

Here we have used Hölder inequality and the formula for the norm of a characteristic function (ver [10, Eq. 9.11]). Inequality (9) proves Wirtinger's inequality (7).

On the other hand, again by Hölder inequality and [10, Eq. 9.11], we obtain

$$|\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}| \leqslant \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T |\boldsymbol{u}(s)|ds \leqslant \Psi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{T}\right)\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\Phi}. \qquad (10)$$

From (9),(10) and since $\boldsymbol{u} = \overline{\boldsymbol{u}} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}$ we obtain (8). □

If $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ is a Banach space and $(Y, \|\cdot\|_Y)$ is a subespace of X, as is usual we write $Y \hookrightarrow X$ and we say that Y is *embeeded* in X when the restricted identity map $i_Y : Y \to X$ is bounded. That means that there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $y \in Y$ we have $\|y\|_X \leqslant C\|y\|_Y$. With this notation, the Lemma 2.1 states $W^1L^\Phi_n \hookrightarrow L^\infty_n$ and Hölder inequality states that $L^\Psi_n \hookrightarrow \left[L^\Phi_n\right]^*$.

Given a contiuous function $a \in C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^+)$, we define the composition operator $\boldsymbol{a} : M_n \to M_n$ by $\boldsymbol{a}(\boldsymbol{u})(t) = a(|\boldsymbol{u}(t)|)$. We will use repeatedly the following elementary consequence of the previous lemma.

Corollary 2.2. *If $a \in C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^+)$ then $\boldsymbol{a} : W^1L^\Phi_n \to L^\infty_1([0,T])$ is bounded. More concretely there exists a non decreasing function $c : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{a}(\boldsymbol{u})\|_{L^\infty([0,T])} \leqslant c(\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{W^1L^\Phi})$.*

Proof. Let α be a non-decreasing mayorant of a, for example $\alpha(s) := \sup_{0\leqslant t\leqslant s} a(t)$. If $\boldsymbol{u} \in W^1L^\Phi_n$ then by Lemma 2.1

$$a(|\boldsymbol{u}(t)|) \leqslant \alpha(\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty}) \leqslant a\left(\Psi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{T}\right)\max\{1,T\}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{W^1L^\Phi}\right) =: c(\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{W^1L^\Phi}).$$

□

The following lemma is an inmediate consequence of principles related to operators of Nemitskii type, see [10, §17].

Lemma 2.3. *The composition operator $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ acts from $\Pi(E^\Phi_n, 1)$ into C^Ψ_1.*

Proof. As consequence of [10, Lemma 9.1] we have that $\boldsymbol{\varphi}\left(B_{L^\Phi}(0,1)\right) \subset C^\Psi_1$, where $B_X(\boldsymbol{u}_0, r)$ is the open ball with center $\boldsymbol{u}_0$ and radius $r > 0$ in the space X. Therefore, applying [10, Lemma 17.1] we deduce that $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ acts from $\Pi(E^\Phi_n, 1)$ into C^Ψ_1. □

We need also the following technical lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\lambda > 0$ and $\{\boldsymbol{u}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of functions in $\Pi(E^\Phi_n, \lambda)$ converging to $\boldsymbol{u} \in \Pi(E^\Phi_n, \lambda)$ in the L^Φ-norm. Then there exist a subsequence $\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}$ and a real valued function $h \in \Pi\left(E^\Phi_1\left([0,T]\right), \lambda\right)$ such that $\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k} \to \boldsymbol{u}$ a.e. and $|\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}| \leqslant h$ a.e..*

Proof. Let $r := d(\boldsymbol{u}, E^\Phi_n)$, $r < \lambda$. Because $\boldsymbol{u}_n$ converges to $\boldsymbol{u}$, there exists a subsequence (n_k) such that

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\Phi} < \frac{\lambda - r}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{u}_{n_{k+1}}\|_{L^\Phi} < 2^{-(k+1)}(\lambda - r)$$

Let $h : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$h(x) = |\boldsymbol{u}_{n_1}(x)| + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}(x) - \boldsymbol{u}_{n_{k-1}}(x)|. \tag{11}$$

As a consequence of [10, Lemma 10.1] we have that, for any $\boldsymbol{v} \in L^\Phi_n$, $d(\boldsymbol{v}, E^\Phi_n) = d(|\boldsymbol{v}|, E^\Phi_1)$. Therefore

$$d(|\boldsymbol{u}_{n_1}|, E^\Phi_1) = d(\boldsymbol{u}_{n_1}, E^\Phi_n) \leqslant d(\boldsymbol{u}_{n_1}, \boldsymbol{u}) + d(\boldsymbol{u}, E^\Phi_n) < \frac{\lambda + r}{2}.$$

Then

$$d(h, E^\Phi_1) \leqslant d(h, |\boldsymbol{u}_{n_1}|) + d(|\boldsymbol{u}_{n_1}|, E^\Phi_1) < \lambda.$$

Therefore, $h \in \Pi(E^\Phi_1, \lambda)$. In particular, $|h| < \infty$ a.e. We conclude that the series $\boldsymbol{u}_{n_1}(x) + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}(\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}(x) - \boldsymbol{u}_{n_{k-1}}(x))$ is absolutely convergent a.e. This imply that $\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k} \to \boldsymbol{u}$ a.e.. The inequality $|\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}| \leqslant h$ is clear from the definition of h. □

A common obstacle with Orlicz spaces, that distinguishes it from L^p spaces, is that a sequence $\boldsymbol{u}_n \in L^\Phi_n$ which is uniformly bounded by $h \in L^\Phi_1$ and a.e. convergent to $\boldsymbol{u}$ is not necessarily norm convergent. Fortunately the subspace E^Φ_n has that property.

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that $\boldsymbol{u_n} \in L^\Phi_n$ is a sequence such that $\boldsymbol{u_n} \to \boldsymbol{u}$ a.e. and suppose that there exist $h \in E^\Phi_1$ with $|\boldsymbol{u_n}| \leqslant h$ a.e. then $\|\boldsymbol{u_n} - \boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\Phi} \to 0$.*

Proof. [13, p.84] and [10, Th. 10.3]) □

We recall the definition of Gateâux derivative, see [2] for details. Given a function $I : U \to \mathbb{R}$ where U is an open set of a Banach space X, we say that I has a Gâteaux derivative en $\boldsymbol{u} \in U$ if there exists $\boldsymbol{u}^* \in X^*$ such that for every $\boldsymbol{v} \in X$

$$\lim_{s\to 0} \frac{I(\boldsymbol{u} + s\boldsymbol{v}) - I(\boldsymbol{u})}{s} = \langle \boldsymbol{u}^*, \boldsymbol{u}\rangle.$$

We recall the following definition.

Definition 2.6 (see [8])**.** *Let X a Banach space and $D \subset X$. A non linear operator $T : D \to X^*$ is called* demicontinuous *if it is continuous when X is equipped with the strong topology and X^* with tha weak* topology.*

3 Differetiability of action integrals on Orlicz spaces

Definition 3.1. *We said that a function $\mathcal{L} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Caratheodory function if for fixed $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$ the map $t \mapsto \mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$ is measurable and for fixed t the map $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \mapsto \mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$ is continuously differentiable for almost everywhere $t \in [0, T]$.*

In this paper we will consider Lagrangian functions satisfying the following structure conditions. We assume that there exists $\lambda > 0$ and non negative functions $a \in C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^+)$, $b \in L^1_1([0, T])$, $c \in L^\Psi_1([0, T])$ and $d \in E^\Phi_1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})| &\leqslant a(|\boldsymbol{x}|) \left(b(t) + \Phi\left(\tfrac{|\boldsymbol{y}|}{\lambda} + d(t)\right)\right), &(12)\\
|D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})| &\leqslant a(|\boldsymbol{x}|) \left(b(t) + \Phi\left(\tfrac{|\boldsymbol{y}|}{\lambda} + d(t)\right)\right), &(13)\\
|D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})| &\leqslant a(|\boldsymbol{x}|) \left(c(t) + \varphi\left(\tfrac{|\boldsymbol{y}|}{\lambda} + d(t)\right)\right). &(14)
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 1. These conditions are a generalization of the frequently considered condition (A) (see [15, 18, 16, 19]). In fact, conditions (12),(13), (14) are equivalent to condition (A) when $\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = |\boldsymbol{y}|^p/p + F(t, \boldsymbol{x})$, $\Phi_p(s) = s^p/p$, and $d = 0$.

Remark 2. Let us note that if $\Phi \in \Delta_2$ then we can asssume $d = 0$. This is consequence of that a non decreasing Δ_2 function $G : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is quasi-subadditive. In fact, we suppose $y \leqslant x$, then

$$G(x + y) \leqslant G(2x) \leqslant KG(x) \leqslant K (G(x) + G(y)).$$

Moreover, if Φ is Δ_2 then φ is also Δ_2, as the following simple argument shows

$$2x\varphi(2x) \leqslant \alpha\Phi(2x) \leqslant K\Phi(x) \leqslant Kx\varphi(x)$$

Here we have used [10, Th. 4.1], the Δ_2 condition for Φ and the inequality $\Phi(x) \leqslant x\varphi(x)$ valid for any N-function. Therefore if Φ is Δ_2 we have that

$$b(t) + \Phi\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{y}|}{\lambda} + d(t)\right) \leqslant b(t) + K\Phi\left(d(t)\right) + \Phi\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{y}|}{\lambda}\right) = b_1(t) + K\Phi\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{y}|}{\lambda}\right),$$

where $b_1(t) = b(t) + K\Phi\left(d(t)\right) \in L^1_1([0,T])$. A similar fact holds with φ instead Φ namely

$$c(t) + \varphi\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{y}|}{\lambda} + d(t)\right) \leqslant c_1(t) + \varphi\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{y}|}{\lambda}\right),$$

where, as consequence of Lemma 2.3 and the Δ_2 condition for Φ, we have $c_1(t) := c(t) + K\varphi\left(d(t)\right) \in L^\Psi_1$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a Caratheodory function satisfying* (12),(13), (14)*. Then the following statements hold*

1. *The* action integral
$$I(\boldsymbol{u}) := \int_0^T \mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))\, dt \tag{15}$$
is finitely defined in $\mathcal{E}^\Phi_n(\lambda) := W^1L^\Phi \cap \{\boldsymbol{u}|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}} \in \Pi(E^\Phi_n, \lambda)\}$.
2. *The function I is Gâteaux differentiable on $\mathcal{E}^\Phi_n(\lambda)$ and its derivative I' is demi-continuous from $\mathcal{E}^\Phi_n(\lambda)$ into $\left[W^1L^\Phi\right]^*$. Moreover I' is given by the following expression*
$$\langle I'(\boldsymbol{u}), \boldsymbol{v}\rangle = \int_0^T \left\{D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}\big(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\big)\cdot \boldsymbol{v} + D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}\big(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\big)\cdot \dot{\boldsymbol{v}}\right\}\, dt. \tag{16}$$
3. *If Ψ is Δ_2 then I' is continuous from $\mathcal{E}^\Phi_n(\lambda)$ into $\left[W^1L^\Phi\right]^*$ when both spaces are equipped with the strong topology.*

Proof. From (6) we have $\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}/\lambda \in \Pi(E^\Phi_n, 1)$. Thus, as $d \in E^\Phi_1$ and attending to (5), we get

$$|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}|/\lambda + d \in \Pi(E^\Phi_1, 1) \subset C^\Phi_1. \tag{17}$$

From Corollary 2.2 we get a constant $c = c(\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{W^1L^\Phi})$ such that $a(|\boldsymbol{u}(t)|) \leqslant c$, $t \in [0,T]$. Thus,

$$|\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}})| \leqslant c\left(b(t) + \Phi\left(\frac{|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t)|}{\lambda} + d(t)\right)\right) \in L^1_1.$$

This fact proves item 1.

We split the proof of 2 in three steps.

Step 1. The non linear operator $\boldsymbol{u} \mapsto D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}})$ is continuous from $\mathcal{E}^\Phi_n(\lambda)$ into $L^1_n([0,T])$ whith the strong topology on both sets.

We take $\{\boldsymbol{u}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ a sequence of functions in $\mathcal{E}_n^\Phi(\lambda)$, and $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{E}_n^\Phi(\lambda)$ such that $\boldsymbol{u}_n \to \boldsymbol{u}$ in $W^1L_n^\Phi$. Then $\boldsymbol{u}_n \to \boldsymbol{u}$ in L_n^Φ and $\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_n \to \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}$ in L_n^Φ. By Lemma 2.4 there exist a subsequence $\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}$ and $h \in \Pi(E_1^\Phi,\lambda))$ such that $\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k} \to \boldsymbol{u}$ a.e., $\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k} \to \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}$ a.e. and $|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k}| \leqslant h$ a.e.. Since $\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ is a strong convergent sequence in $W^1L_n^\Phi$, it is a bounded sequence in $W^1L_n^\Phi$. According to Lemmas 2.1 and Corollary 2.2 there exists $M > 0$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{a}(\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k})\|_{L^\infty} \leqslant M$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. From the previous facts, (13) and (17) we get

$$|D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k}(t))| \leqslant M\left(b(t) + \Phi\left(\frac{|h|}{\lambda} + d(t)\right)\right) \in L_1^1. \tag{18}$$

By the Caratheodory condition

$$D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k}(t)) \to D_x\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t)) \quad \text{for a.e } t \in [0, T].$$

Applying the Dominated Convergence Theorem we conclude the proof of step 1.
Step 2. The non linear operator $\boldsymbol{u} \mapsto D_y\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}})$ is continuous from $\mathcal{E}_n^\Phi(\lambda)$ with the strong topology into $\left[L^\Phi\right]^*$ with the weak* topology.

Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{E}_n^\Phi(\lambda)$. It follows from (17), Lemma 2.3 and Corollary 2.2 that

$$\varphi\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{u}|}{\lambda} + d\right) \in C_1^\Psi \tag{19}$$

and $\boldsymbol{a}(|\boldsymbol{u}|) \in L_1^\infty$. Therefore, in virtue of (14) we get

$$|D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))| \leqslant c(\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{W^1L^\Phi})\left(c + \boldsymbol{\varphi}\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{u}|}{\lambda} + d\right)\right) \in L_1^\Psi. \tag{20}$$

We note that (18), (20) , the imbedding $W^1L_n^\Phi \hookrightarrow L_n^\infty$ and $L_n^\Psi \hookrightarrow \left[L_n^\Phi\right]^*$ imply that the second member (16) defines an element in $\left[W^1L_n^\Phi\right]^*$.

Now, let us to prove the continuity of the map $\boldsymbol{u} \mapsto D_y\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}})$. We take $\boldsymbol{u}_n, \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{E}_n^\Phi(\lambda)$ with $\boldsymbol{u}_n \to \boldsymbol{u}$ in the norm of $W^1L_n^\Phi$. We must prove that $D_y\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{u}_n, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}_n}) \xrightarrow{w^*} D_y\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}})$. Suppose, on the contrary, that there exists $\boldsymbol{v} \in L_n^\Phi$, $\epsilon > 0$ and a subsequence of $\{\boldsymbol{u}_n\}$ (again denoted for simplicity $\{\boldsymbol{u}_n\}$) such that

$$|\langle D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{u}_n, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}), \boldsymbol{v}\rangle - \langle D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}), \boldsymbol{v}\rangle| \geq \epsilon. \tag{21}$$

We have $\boldsymbol{u}_n \to \boldsymbol{u}$ in L_n^Φ and $\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_n \to \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}$ in L_n^Φ. By Lemma 2.4, there exist a subsequence $\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}$ and $h \in \Pi(E^\Phi, \lambda)$ such that $\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k} \to \boldsymbol{u}$ a.e., $\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k} \to \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}$ a.e. and $|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k}| \leqslant h$ a.e.. As in the previous step, since $\boldsymbol{u}_n$ is a convergent sequence, the Corrollary 2.2 implies that $a(|\boldsymbol{u}_n(t)|)$ is uniformly bounded by certain constant C. Therefore, from (14), (19), the fact that $c \in L_1^\Phi$, Hölder inequality we obtain

$$|D_y\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{u}_n, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_n) \cdot \boldsymbol{v}| \leqslant C\left(c|\boldsymbol{v}| + \varphi\left(\frac{h}{\lambda} + d\right)\right)|\boldsymbol{v}| \in L_1^1.$$

From the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem we deduce

$$\int_0^T D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k}) \cdot \boldsymbol{v}dt \to \int_0^T D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}) \cdot \boldsymbol{v}dt \tag{22}$$

which contradict the inequality (21). This completes the proof of step 2.

Step 3. Finally we prove 2. The proof follows similar lines that [12, Theorem 1.4]. For $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{E}_n^{\Phi}(\lambda)$ and $\boldsymbol{v} \in W^1 L_n^{\Phi}$ we define the function

$$f(s,t) := \mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}(t) + s\boldsymbol{v}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t) + s\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t)).$$

From [10, Th. 10.1] we obtain that if $|\boldsymbol{u}| \leqslant |\boldsymbol{v}|$ then $d(\boldsymbol{u}, E_n^{\Phi}) \leqslant d(\boldsymbol{v}, E_n^{\Phi})$. Therefore, for $|s| \leqslant s_0 := \left(\lambda - d(\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}, E_n^{\Phi})\right) / \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{W^1 L^{\Phi}}$ we have

$$d\left(\dot{\boldsymbol{u}} + s_0 \dot{\boldsymbol{v}}, E_n^{\Phi}\right) \leqslant d\left(|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}| + s_0 |\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}|, E_1^{\Phi}\right) \leqslant d\left(|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}|, E_1^{\Phi}\right) + s_0 \|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_{L^{\Phi}} < \lambda.$$

As a consequence $\dot{\boldsymbol{u}} + s_0\dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \in \Pi(E_n^{\Phi}, \lambda)$ and $|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}| + s_0|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}| \in \Pi(E_1^{\Phi}, \lambda)$. These facts imply, in virtue of Theorem 3.2(1) that $I(\boldsymbol{u} + s\boldsymbol{v})$ is well defined and it is finite for $|s| \leqslant s_0$. Using Corollary 2.2 we see that

$$\|a(|\boldsymbol{u} + s\boldsymbol{v}|)\|_{L^\infty} \leqslant c(\|\boldsymbol{u} + s\boldsymbol{v}\|_{W^1 L^{\Phi}}) \leqslant c(\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{W^1 L^{\Phi}} + s_0 \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{W^1 L^{\Phi}}).$$

Consequently, applying chain rule, inequalities (13)-(14), the previous inequality and using that φ and Φ are non decreasing, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |D_s f(s,t)| &= |D_{\boldsymbol{x}} \mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u} + s\boldsymbol{v}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}} + s\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}) \cdot \boldsymbol{v} + D_{\boldsymbol{y}} \mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u} + s\boldsymbol{v}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}} + s\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}) \cdot \dot{\boldsymbol{v}}| \\ &\leqslant c\left[\left(b(t) + \Phi\left(\frac{|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}| + s_0|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}|}{\lambda}\right)\right)|\boldsymbol{v}|\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(c(t) + \varphi\left(\frac{|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}| + s_0|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}|}{\lambda}\right)\right)|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}|\right] \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Invoking (18), (20) with $|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}| + s_0|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}|$ instead $\boldsymbol{u}$ and taking account of $\dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \in L^\infty$ and $\boldsymbol{v} \in L^{\Phi}$ we show that there exists a function $g \in L_1^1([0,T], \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $|D_s f(s,t)| \leqslant g(t)$. Consequently, I has a directional derivative and

$$\langle v, I'(\boldsymbol{u})\rangle = \frac{d}{ds} I(\boldsymbol{u} + sv)\big|_{s=0} = \int_0^T D_{\boldsymbol{x}} \mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}) \cdot \boldsymbol{v} + D_{\boldsymbol{y}} \mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}) \cdot \dot{\boldsymbol{v}} dt.$$

Moreover, from (18), (20), Lemma 2.1 and previous formula

$$|\langle I'(\boldsymbol{u}), \boldsymbol{v}\rangle| \leqslant c\|v\|_{L^\infty} + c\|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_{L^{\Phi}} \leqslant c\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{W^1 L^{\Phi}}.$$

This complete the proof of the Gâteaux differentiability of I. Finally, the demicontinuity of $I' : \mathcal{E}_n^{\Phi}(\lambda) \to \left[W^1 L^{\Phi}\right]^*$ is a consequence of the continuity of the mappings $\boldsymbol{u} \mapsto D_{\boldsymbol{x}} \mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}})$ and $\boldsymbol{u} \mapsto D_{\boldsymbol{y}} \mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}})$. Indeed, we set $\boldsymbol{u}_n, \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{E}_n^{\Phi}(\lambda)$ with $\boldsymbol{u}_n \to \boldsymbol{u}$ in the norm of $W^1 L^{\Phi}$ and $\boldsymbol{v} \in W^1 L^{\Phi}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle I'(\boldsymbol{u}_n), \boldsymbol{v}\rangle &= \int_0^T \left\{D_{\boldsymbol{x}} \mathcal{L}\left(t, \boldsymbol{u}_n, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_n\right) \cdot \boldsymbol{v} + D_{\boldsymbol{y}} \mathcal{L}\left(t, \boldsymbol{u}_n, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_n\right) \cdot \dot{\boldsymbol{v}}\right\} \, dt \\ &\to \int_0^T \left\{D_{\boldsymbol{x}} \mathcal{L}\left(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\right) \cdot \boldsymbol{v} + D_{\boldsymbol{y}} \mathcal{L}\left(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\right) \cdot \dot{\boldsymbol{v}}\right\} \, dt \\ &= \langle I'(\boldsymbol{u}), \boldsymbol{v}\rangle . \end{aligned}$$

In order to prove 3, let us see that the maps $\boldsymbol{u} \mapsto D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{u}(\cdot), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(\cdot))$ and $\boldsymbol{u} \mapsto D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{u}(\cdot), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(\cdot))$ are norm continuous from $\mathcal{E}_n^{\Phi}(\lambda)$ into L^1 and L^{Ψ} respectively. The continuity of the first map has already been proved in step 1. We will prove the continuity of the second map. We repeat an argument similar to the one given in step 2. We consider $\boldsymbol{u}_n$ and $\boldsymbol{u}$ in $\mathcal{E}_n^{\Phi}(\lambda)$ with $\|\boldsymbol{u}_n - \boldsymbol{u}\|_{W^1L^{\Phi}} \to 0$. By Lemma 2.4, there exist a subsequence $\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}$ and $h \in \mathcal{E}_n^{\Phi}(\lambda)$ such that $\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k} \to \boldsymbol{u}$ a.e., $\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k} \to \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}$ a.e. and $|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k}| \leqslant h$ a.e.. Then since $\mathcal{L}$ is a Caratheodory function we have $D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k}(t)) \to D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))$ a.e. $t \in [0,T]$. Using (14) and that Ψ is of the Δ_2 class, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k}(t))| &\leqslant a(|\boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}(t)|)\left(c(t) + \varphi\left(\frac{|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k}(t)|}{\lambda} + d(t)\right)\right)\\ &\leqslant C\left(c(t) + \varphi\left(\frac{|h(t)|}{\lambda} + d(t)\right)\right) \in L^{\Psi} = E^{\Psi}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, invoking Lemma 2.5, we have proved that from any sequence $\boldsymbol{u}_n$ which converge to $\boldsymbol{u}$ in W^1L^{Φ} we can extract a subsequence with $D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}_{n_k}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{n_k}) \to D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}})$ in the strong topology. The desired result follows from a standard argument.

The continuity of I' follows of the previously established continuity for $D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}$ and $D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}$ by using the representation (16). □

4 Critical points and Euler-Lagrange equations

In this section we derive the Euler-Lagrange equations associated to critical points of action integrals. We denote by $W^1L^{\Phi}_T$ the subspace of W^1L^{Φ} of all T-periodic functions. Similarly we consider the subspaces E^{Φ}_T, L^{Φ}_T. As is usual, when Y is a subspace of the Banach space X, we denote by $Y^{\perp}$ the *annihilator subspace* of X^*, tghat means the subspace consistent of all the bounded linear functions which are identically zero on Y.

We recall that a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is called *strictly convex* if $f\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{y}}{2}\right) < \frac{1}{2}\left(f(\boldsymbol{x}) + f(\boldsymbol{y})\right)$ for $\boldsymbol{x} \neq \boldsymbol{y}$. It is a well known that if f is a strictly convex and differentiable functions then $D_{\boldsymbol{x}}f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a one-to-one map (see, for instance [14, Theorem 12.17]).

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{E}_n^{\Phi}(\lambda)$. The following statements are equivalent*

1. $I'(\boldsymbol{u}) \in \left(W^1L^{\Phi}_T\right)^{\perp}$
2. $D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))$ *is an absolutely continuous function and* $\mathbf{u}$ *solve the following boundary value problem*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}D_y\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t)) = D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t)) \quad \text{a.e. } t \in (0,T) \\ \boldsymbol{u}(0) - \boldsymbol{u}(T) = D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(0, \boldsymbol{u}(0), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(0)) - D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(T, \boldsymbol{u}(T), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(T)) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

Moreover if $D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t,x,y)$ is T-periodic with respect to the variable t and strictly convex with respect to $\boldsymbol{y}$, then $D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(0, \boldsymbol{u}(0), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(0)) - D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(T, \boldsymbol{u}(T), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(T)) = 0$ is equivalent to $\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(0) = \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(T)$.

Proof. The condition $I'(\boldsymbol{u}) \in \left(W^1 L_T^\Phi\right)^\perp$ and (16) imply

$$\int_0^T D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))\cdot\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t)dt = -\int_0^T D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))\cdot\boldsymbol{v}(t)dt$$

Using [12, pag. 6] we obtain that $D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))$ is absolutely continuous and T-periodic, therefore it is differentiable a.e.on $[0,T]$ and the first equality of (24) holds true. This complete the proof 1. implies 2. The proof of 2.implies 1. is still easier and so we will omit it.

The last part of the Corollary is a consequence of that $D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(T,\boldsymbol{u}(T),\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(T)) = D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(0,\boldsymbol{u}(0),\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(0)) = D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(T,u(T),\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(0))$ and the injectivity of $D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(T,u(T),\cdot)$. □

5 Coercivity discussion

We recall the following usual definition in the context of calculus of variations.

Definition 5.1. *Let X be a Banach space and let D be an unbounded subset of X. Suppose $J : D \subset X \to \mathbb{R}$. We said that J is* coercive *if $J(u) \to +\infty$ when $\|\boldsymbol{u}\| \to +\infty$.*

It is well known that coercivity is an ingredient useful in order to establish existence of minima. Therefore we are interestent in finding conditions which insure the coercivityof the action integral I acting on $\mathcal{E}_n^\Phi(\lambda)$. For this purpose we need to introduce the following extra condition on Lagrange function $\mathcal{L}$

$$\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \geq \alpha_0\Phi\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{y}|}{\Lambda}\right) - b_0(t)a_0(|\boldsymbol{x}|), \tag{25}$$

where $\alpha_0, \Lambda > 0$, $b_0 \in L_1^1([0,T])$ and $a_0 \in C(\mathbb{R}^+,\mathbb{R}^+)$.

As we shall see in Theorem 5.2, when $\mathcal{L}$ satisfies (12), (13), (14) and (25), the coercitivity of the action integral I is related to the coercitivity of the functional

$$J(\boldsymbol{u}) := \int_0^T \Phi\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{u}|}{\Lambda}\right)dt - C\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\Phi}, \tag{26}$$

for any $C > 0$. If $\Phi(x) = |x|^p/p$ then J is clearly coercitive. For more general Φ the situation is more interesting as shown by the following lemma.

Theorem 5.2. $\Psi \in \Delta_2^0$ *if and only if* $\lim\limits_{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}\to\infty} \frac{\int_0^T \Phi(|u|)\,dx}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} = \infty$

Proof. $\Rightarrow$) $\Psi \in \Delta_2^0$ if and only if $\Phi \in \nabla_2$ see [13, Th.3 , pp. 22-23]. Then, there exists $k > 2$ such that $\Phi(2^n x) \geq k^n\Phi(x)$ for every $x > 0$.
If $\lambda > 1$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^n \leqslant \lambda < 2^{n+1}$ and consequently $\Phi(\lambda x) \geq k^{-1}\lambda^\nu\Phi(x)$ where $k = 2^\nu$ with $\nu > 1$. In that way, we have

$$\Phi(\lambda x) \geq C_2\lambda^\nu\Phi(x) \text{ with } \lambda > 1. \tag{27}$$

We also know, by [10, Th. 10.5, pp. 92], that

$$\|u\|_{L^\Phi} \leqslant \frac{1}{\lambda}\left(1+\int_0^T \Phi(\lambda|u|)\,dx\right) \quad \text{for every} \quad \lambda > 0. \tag{28}$$

Let $\lambda < 1$. Then, from (33) and (34), we get

$$\frac{\int_0^T \Phi(|u|)\,dx}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} \geq \frac{C_2}{\lambda^\nu}\frac{\int_0^T \Phi(\lambda|u|)\,dx}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} \geq \frac{C_2}{\lambda^{\nu-1}}\left(1-\frac{1}{\lambda\|u\|_{L^\Phi}}\right).$$

As $\|u\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty$, we choose $\lambda = \frac{2}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} > 1$ and thus

$$\frac{\int_0^T \Phi(|u|)\,dx}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} \geq C(\|u\|_{L^\Phi})^{\nu-1} \to \infty$$

because $\nu > 1$.

$\Leftarrow$) Assume that $\Psi \notin \Delta_2$.

Now, by [10, Th. 4.2, pp. 24], there exists a sequence of real numbers r_n such that $r_n \to \infty$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{r_n\psi(r_n)}{\Psi(r_n)} = +\infty.$$

Now, we choose $u_n = \psi(r_n)\chi_{[0,\frac{1}{\Psi(r_n)}]}$, then by [10, pp. 72], we get

$$\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi} = \frac{\psi(r_n)}{\Psi(r_n)}\Psi^{-1}(\Psi(r_n)) = \frac{r_n\psi(r_n)}{\Psi(r_n)} \to \infty \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

Next, using Young's equality, we have

$$\frac{\int_0^T \Phi(u_n)}{\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi}} = \frac{\Phi(\psi(r_n))[\Psi(r_n)]^{-1}}{\frac{r_n\psi(r_n)}{\Psi(r_n)}} = \frac{r_n\psi(r_n)-\Psi(r_n)}{r_n\psi(r_n)} = 1-\frac{\Psi(r_n)}{r_n\psi(r_n)}.$$

As $\frac{\Psi(r_n)}{r_n\psi(r_n)} \to 0$ when $r_n \to \infty$, then $\frac{\int_0^T \Phi(u_n)}{\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi}}$ is bounded and therefore $\lim\limits_{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}\to\infty} \frac{\int_0^T \Phi(|u|)\,dx}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} \neq \infty$. $\square$

Theorem 5.3. *Sea $\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = \Phi(|\boldsymbol{y}|) + F(t,\boldsymbol{x})$. We suppose that Φ,Ψ are Δ_2 functions and that there exists $f \in L^1$ such that*

$$|\nabla F(t,\boldsymbol{x})| \leqslant f(t)$$

for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$ and all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with f satisfying

$$\|f\|_{L^1([0,T])} \leqslant \frac{1}{2\|1\|_{L^\Psi([0,T])}}. \tag{29}$$

If

$$\int_0^T F(t,\boldsymbol{x})\,dt \to \infty \quad \textit{as} \quad |\boldsymbol{x}| \to \infty, \tag{30}$$

then problem (32) *has at least one solution which minimizes the functional I given by* (15) *on W^1L^Φ.*

Proof. For $\boldsymbol{w} \in W^1L^\Phi$, we write $\boldsymbol{w} = \overline{\boldsymbol{w}} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}$ where $\overline{\boldsymbol{w}} = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \boldsymbol{w}(t)\, dt$.

$$\begin{aligned}
I(\boldsymbol{u}) &= \int_0^T \mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))\, dt \\
&= \int_0^T (\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{u}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t)) - \mathcal{L}(t, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t)))\, dt + \int_0^T \mathcal{L}(t, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))\, dt \\
&= \int_0^T \int_0^1 \langle D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}(t, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}} + s\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}(t), \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t)), \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}(t)\rangle\, ds\, dt + + \int_0^T \mathcal{L}(t, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))\, dt \\
&\geq - \|f\|_{L^1}\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\infty} + \int_0^T \mathcal{L}(t, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))\, dt \\
&\geq - C_1\|f\|_{L^1}\|\dot{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{L^\Phi} + \int_0^T \mathcal{L}(t, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))\, dt \\
&\geq - C_1\|f\|_{L^1}\|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi} + \int_0^T \mathcal{L}(t, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}, \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t))\, dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Cuando tomamos $\mathcal{L}$

$$\mathcal{L}(t, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = \Phi(|\boldsymbol{y}|) + F(t, \boldsymbol{x}).$$

Tenemos

$$I(\boldsymbol{u}) \geq -C_1\|f\|_{L^1}\|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi} + \int_0^T \Phi(|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}|) + F(t, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}). \tag{31}$$

Para $\boldsymbol{w}$ denotemos por $|||\boldsymbol{w}|||_{L^\Phi}$ la norma de Luxembourg de $\boldsymbol{w}$.

Es sabido que que si $|||\boldsymbol{w}|||_{L^\Phi} \geq 1$ entonces $\int_0^T \Phi(|\boldsymbol{w}|) \geq |||\boldsymbol{w}|||_{L^\Phi}$ y que $|||\boldsymbol{w}|||_{L^\Phi} \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{L^\Phi} \leqslant 2|||\boldsymbol{w}|||_{L^\Phi}$. Entonces se tiene para $|||\boldsymbol{u}||| \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
I(\boldsymbol{u}) &\geq -C_1\|f\|_{L^1}\|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi} + \int_0^T \Phi(|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}|) + F(t, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}) \\
&\geq -C_1\|f\|_{L^1}\|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi} + |||\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}|||_{L^\Phi} + \int_0^T F(t, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}) \\
&\geq -C_1\|f\|_{L^1}\|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi} + \frac{1}{2}\|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi} + \int_0^T F(t, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}) \\
&= \left(-C_1\|f\|_{L^1} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi} + \int_0^T F(t, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{W^1L^\Phi} \to \infty$ then $(|\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}|^2 + \|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi}) \to \infty$. If $|\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}|^2 \to \infty$ by (28) we have $I(\boldsymbol{u}) \to \infty$. If $\|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty$ usamos (27). En efecto,

Si $-C_1\|f\|_{L^1} + \frac{1}{2} \geq 0$, entonces $I(\boldsymbol{u}) \to \infty$ cuando $\|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty$. Pero $-C_1\|f\|_{L^1} + \frac{1}{2} \geq 0$ si y solamente si $\|f\|_{L^1([0,T])} \leqslant \frac{1}{2C_1} = \frac{1}{2\|1\|_{L^\Psi([0,T])}}$, lo cual es justamente (27). ($C_1 = \|1\|_{L^\Psi([0,T])}$ por (**??**)). $\square$

6 Weak lower semicontinuity of actions integrals

Lemma 6.1. *If the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{u}_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ converges weakly to $\boldsymbol{u}$ in W^1L^Φ, then $\{\boldsymbol{u}_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ converges uniformly to $\boldsymbol{u}$ on $[0,T]$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, the injection of W^1L^Φ in L^∞ is continuous. Since $\boldsymbol{u}_k \rightharpoonup \boldsymbol{u}$ in W^1L^Φ it follows that $\boldsymbol{u}_k \rightharpoonup \boldsymbol{u}$ in $C(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)$. Since $\boldsymbol{u}_k \rightharpoonup \boldsymbol{u}$ in W^1L^Φ, we know that $\{\boldsymbol{u}_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ is bounded in W^1L^Φ and, hence by (**??**) in $C(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{u}_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ is equi-uniformly continuous since, for $0\leqslant s\leqslant t\leqslant T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\boldsymbol{u}_k(t)-\boldsymbol{u}_k(s)| &\leqslant \int_s^t |\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_k(\tau)| \quad d\tau \leqslant \|t-s\|_{L^\Psi}\|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_k\|_{L^\Phi}\\ &\leqslant \|t-s\|_{L^\Psi}\|\boldsymbol{u}_k\|_{W^1L^\Phi}\leqslant C\|t-s\|_{L^\Psi}.\end{aligned}$$

By Arzela-Ascoli theorem, $\{\boldsymbol{u}_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ is relatively compact in $C(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)$. By the uniqueness of the weak limit in $C(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)$, every uniformly convergent subsequence of $\{\boldsymbol{u}_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ converges to $\boldsymbol{u}$. Thus, $\{\boldsymbol{u}_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ converges uniformly on $[0,T]$.

□

Theorem 6.2. *We suppose that $\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})$ is a Charateodory functions satisfying* (12)-(14). *Moreover we assume $\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{x},\cdot)$ is convex for each $t,\boldsymbol{x}$. We suppose that Φ,Ψ are Δ_2 functions. Then the functional* (15) *is weakly lower semicontinuous (w.l.s.c.).*

Proof. We fix any $\boldsymbol{u}\in W^1L^\Phi$. What we must prove that for any sequence $\{\boldsymbol{u}_n\}$ with $\boldsymbol{u}_n\rightharpoonup\boldsymbol{u}$ in W^1L^Φ we have that $I(\boldsymbol{u})\leqslant\liminf_n I(\boldsymbol{u}_n)$. We write

$$\begin{aligned}I(\boldsymbol{v}) &= \int_0^T \mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{v}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t))dt\\ &= \int_0^T \mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{v}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t))-\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t))dt+\int_0^T \mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t))dt\\ &=: J(\boldsymbol{v})+H(\boldsymbol{v}).\end{aligned}$$

As $\{\boldsymbol{u}_n\}$ is a weakly convergent sequence, by the Lemma 6.1 we have that $\boldsymbol{u}_n\to\boldsymbol{u}$ in L^∞. By the mean value theorem for derivatives, we obtain a function $\boldsymbol{\xi_n}(t)$, with $\boldsymbol{\xi_n}(t)$ belonging to line segment joining $\boldsymbol{u}_n(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{u}(t)$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}_n(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_n(t))-\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_n(t))|\\ &\leqslant |D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{\xi_n}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_n(t))||\boldsymbol{u_n}(t)-\boldsymbol{u}(t)|.\end{aligned}\tag{32}$$

The functions $\boldsymbol{u_n}$, and therefore the functions $\boldsymbol{\xi_n}$, are uniformly bounded in L^∞. Thus, there exists $C>0$ such that $a(|\boldsymbol{\xi_n}(t)|)\leqslant C$. Then, using (13) we get

$$|D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{\xi_n}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_n(t))|\leqslant C\,(b(t)+\Phi(|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_n(t))|))\tag{33}$$

Since Φ is a function of the Δ_2 class, we have that the operator $\boldsymbol{v}\mapsto\Phi(|\boldsymbol{v}|)$ acts from L^Φ in L^1. Therefore, by [10, Lemma 17.4] we have that $\{\Phi(|\boldsymbol{v}|):\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^\Phi}\leqslant r\}$ is bounded in L^1 for any $r>0$. Hence there exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$\|\Phi(|\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_n(t)|)\|_{L^1} \leqslant C$. Then, from (30), (31), Hölder inequality and since $\|\boldsymbol{u}_n - \boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty} \to 0$ and $b \in L^1$ we get $J(\boldsymbol{u}_n) \to 0$.

Now we will prove that $H(\boldsymbol{v})$ is w.l.s.c. Since $H(\boldsymbol{v})$ is convex it is sufficient to prove that H is l.s.c (see [7, Proposition 4.26]). We suppose that $\|\boldsymbol{v_n} - \boldsymbol{v}\|_{W^1L^\Phi} \to 0$.

There exists $s = s_{n,t} \in [0,1]$ such that

$$|\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n(t)) - \mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t))| \leqslant |D_{\boldsymbol{y}}\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),(1-s)\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n(t)+s\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t))||\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n - \dot{\boldsymbol{v}}|.$$

Let $\mathfrak{G}_n$ be the set $\{|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n(t)| \geq |\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t)|\}$. Then

$$|(1-s)\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n(t) + s\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t)| \leqslant \max\{|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n(t)|, |\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t)|\} = \chi_{\mathfrak{G}_n}(t)|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n(t)| + \chi_{\mathfrak{G}_n^c}(t)|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t)|$$

Therefore, using (14) and taking account that $a(|\boldsymbol{u}(t)|) \in L^\infty$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n(t)) - \mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t))| &\leqslant C\,(c(t) + \varphi(\chi_{\mathfrak{G}}|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n(t)| + \chi_{\mathfrak{G}^c}|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t)|))\,|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n - \dot{\boldsymbol{v}}| \\
&= C\,(c(t) + \varphi(\chi_{\mathfrak{G}}|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n(t)|) + \varphi(\chi_{\mathfrak{G}^c}|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t)|))\,|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n - \dot{\boldsymbol{v}}| \\
&\leqslant C\,(c(t) + \varphi(|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n(t)|) + \varphi(|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}(t)|))\,|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n - \dot{\boldsymbol{v}}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, in virtue of [10, Lemma 9.1], [10, Lemma 17.1], [10, Theorem 17.4] and the uniform boundedness of $\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_n$ in L^Φ we have

$$|H(\boldsymbol{v}_n) - H(\boldsymbol{v})| \leqslant C\|\dot{\boldsymbol{v}}_n - \dot{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_{L^\Phi} \to 0.$$

Which completes the proof. □

We consider the problem (introduced in (24)):

$$\frac{d}{dt}D_y\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t)) = D_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mathcal{L}(t,\boldsymbol{u}(t),\dot{\boldsymbol{u}}(t)) \quad \text{a.e. } t \in (0,T). \tag{34}$$

In the sequel, we will discuss the conditions that guarantee the coercivity of the functional $u \to \int_0^T \Phi(|u|)\,dx$ in L^Φ.

6.1 Condition that guarantees coercivity (a la antigua...sin λ!!!)

Habría que poner sólo el resultado que sigue, en lugar de TODOS los INTENTOS de la versión de junio?????

En la última sección dejé los intentos previos en caso de que alguno deba ser rescatado del ostracismo.

7 Algo para rescatar????

Comentario Leo-Graciela-Fernando 1. Tenemos la conjetura que todo sale si pedimos Φ que satisface ∇_2. Problema: probarla o refutarla Un problema más amplio sería tratar de sacar hipótesis ya sea la condición Δ_2 de alguna de las funciones (Φ o Ψ) o usar estas condiciones para el infinito o aún para cero(????).

We know that $\Phi \in \Delta_2$ if and only if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$C_\epsilon^{-1} \min\{\lambda^{\alpha-\epsilon}, \lambda^{\beta+\epsilon}\}\Phi(x) \leqslant \Phi(\lambda x) \leqslant C_\epsilon \max\{\lambda^{\alpha-\epsilon}, \lambda^{\beta+\epsilon}\}\Phi(x) \qquad (35)$$

for every $x, \lambda > 0$.

Recall that by Theorem 11.11 in [11] we have $p \leqslant \alpha \leqslant \beta \leqslant q$ where α, β are lower and upper Orlicz indices, and p, q are lower and upper Simonenko indices. We also have that $\Phi, \Psi \in \Delta_2$ implies that $\Phi(x) \sim x\varphi(x) \sim \Psi(\varphi(x))$.

By Theorem 4.3 in [10] or Corollary 4.4 in [13] we know that $p > 1$ if and only if $\Phi \in \nabla_2$ and by Theorem 11.7 in [11] we have that $\beta < \infty$ if and only if $\Phi \in \Delta_2$.

Theorem 10.4 in [10] says that if there exists k^* such that $\int \Psi[\varphi(k^*|u|)]\, dx = 1$, then $\|u\|_{L^\Phi} = \int \varphi(k^*|u|)|u|\, dx$.

Remark 3. If φ is a continuous function, then there exists k^* in Theorem 4.3 of [10]. See [10, pages 89, 90].

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\Phi \in \nabla_2 \cap \Delta_2$ and $\{k_n\}$ such that $\int \Psi[\varphi(k_n|u_n|)]\, dx = 1$. If $\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, then $k_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof. Since $\Phi \in \nabla_2 \cap \Delta_2$, then $\Psi \circ \varphi \in \Delta_2$ and (35) holds.

Now, for such a sequence k_n we have

$$1 = \int \Psi[\varphi(k_n|u_n|)]\, dx \geq C_\epsilon^{-1} \min\{k_n^{\alpha-\epsilon}, k_n^{\beta+\epsilon}\} \int \Psi(\varphi(|u_n|))\, dx \qquad (36)$$

for every $\epsilon > 0$. Due to $\Phi \in \Delta_2$, there exists $C_\Lambda > 0$ such that

$$C_\epsilon^{-1} \min\{k_n^{\alpha-\epsilon}, k_n^{\beta+\epsilon}\} \int \Psi(\varphi(|u_n|))\, dx \geq C_\Lambda C_\epsilon^{-1} \min\{k_n^{\alpha-\epsilon}, k_n^{\beta+\epsilon}\} \int \Phi(|u_n|)\, dx \qquad (37)$$

for every $\epsilon > 0$.

As $\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi} \geq 1$ for every $n > N$ and consequently $\int \Phi(|u_n|)\, dx \geq \||u_n\||_{L^\Phi}$ for every $n > N$.

In that way, we have

$$1 \geq C_\Lambda C_\epsilon^{-1} \min\{k_n^{\alpha-\epsilon}, k_n^{\beta+\epsilon}\}\||u_n\||_{L^\Phi} \qquad (38)$$

for every $\epsilon > 0$ and for every $n > N$.

In addition, $\alpha > 1$ because $\Phi \in \nabla_2$, then $\alpha - \epsilon > 0$ for every $0 < \epsilon < 1$.

Now, we have

$$\frac{1}{C_\Lambda C_\epsilon^{-1}\||u_n\||_{L^\Phi}} \geq \min\{k_n^{\alpha-\epsilon}, k_n^{\beta+\epsilon}\} \qquad (39)$$

for every $n > N$ and provided that $\alpha - \epsilon > 0$.

Because of the equivalence between Orlicz and Luxemburg norms, we have $\||u_n\||_{L^\Phi} \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, then

$$\min\{k_n^{\alpha-\epsilon}, k_n^{\beta+\epsilon}\} \to 0 \;\text{ as }\; n \to \infty \qquad (40)$$

where $\alpha - \epsilon > 0$ and $\beta + \epsilon > 0$; therefore, $k_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. □

El resultado que sigue es válido para cualquier función u?????

Comentario Leo-Graciela-Fernando 2. Si me parece que habría que decir que entendemos por coercitivo en el teorema de abajo. Yo creo que la demostración **Problema: verificarlo y escribarlo** implica el sentido más fuerte de coercitividad

$$\lim_{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}\to\infty} \frac{\int_0^T \Phi(|u_n|)dx}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} = \infty$$

Theorem 7.2. *If $\Phi \in \Delta_2 \cap \nabla_2$, then the functional $u \to \int_0^t \Phi(|u|)\,dx$ is coercive in L^Φ.*

Proof. Assume $\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty$ when $n \to \infty$ and suppose that there exists $\{k_n\}$ such that $\int \Psi[\varphi(k_n|u_n|)]\,dx = 1$.
In that way, by Theorem 10.4 in [10], we have

$$\int \Phi(|u_n|)\,dx - C\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi} = \int \Phi(|u_n|)\,dx - C\int \varphi(k_n|u_n|)|u_n|\,dx \tag{41}$$

As $\Phi \in \Delta_2$, there exists $\Lambda_\Phi > 0$ such that

$$\int \Phi(|u_n|)\,dx - \frac{C}{k_n}\int \varphi(k_n|u_n|)|u_n|k_n\,dx \geq \int \Phi(|u_n|)\,dx - \frac{C\Lambda_\Phi}{k_n}\int \Phi(k_n|u_n|)\,dx \tag{42}$$

Since $\Phi \in \nabla_2$, then $\alpha > 1$ [10, 13]; now, we choose $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\alpha - \epsilon > 1$.
In addition, by Lemma 7.1, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k_n < 1$ for every $n > N$ and therefore

$$\Phi(k_n|u_n|) \leqslant C_\epsilon k_n^{\alpha-\epsilon}\Phi(|u_n|) \tag{43}$$

for every $n > N$ and where $\alpha - \epsilon > 1$.
Now,

$$\int \Phi(|u_n|)\,dx - \frac{C\Lambda_\Phi}{k_n}\int \Phi(k_n|u_n|)\,dx \geq \left(1 - C\Lambda_\Phi C_\epsilon k_n^{\alpha-\epsilon-1}\right)\int \Phi(|u_n|)\,dx \tag{44}$$

with $\alpha - \epsilon - 1 > 0$.
As $\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty$, there exists $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such $\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi} > 1$ for every $n > N_2$, then

$$\left(1 - C\Lambda_\Phi C_\epsilon k_n^{\alpha-\epsilon-1}\right)\int \Phi(|u_n|)\,dx \geq \left(1 - C\Lambda_\Phi C_\epsilon k_n^{\alpha-\epsilon-1}\right)|||u_n|||_{L^\Phi} \tag{45}$$

with $\alpha - \epsilon - 1 > 0$.
Finally, due to $\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty$, we have $k_n^{\alpha-\epsilon-1} \to 0$, $|||u_n|||_{L^\Phi} \to \infty$ and consequently $\int \Phi(|u_n|)\,dx - C\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty$ for every $C > 0$; that is, the functional $u \to \int_0^t \Phi(|u|)\,dx$ is coercive in L^Φ. □

Comentario Leo-Graciela-Fernando 3. Lamentablemente el libro de Rao pag. 43 dice que ∇' implica ∇_2. Luego la primera parte de este terorema es consecuencia de la proposición anterior. El otro inciso si me parece que tiene sentido pues para ver que no es coercitiva basta mostrar contraejemplos. Este comentario no aporta problemas abiertos, solo es una observación de la redacción

Sonia: Totalmente de acuerdo, por eso escribí la observación al final de la prueba. Si el resultado usando ∇_2 es correcto, el primer inciso sobra.

Proposition 7.3. *Let u be a characteristic function.*
If $\Phi \in \Delta_2 \cap \nabla'$, then the functional $u \to \int_0^t \Phi(|u|)\,dx$ is coercive in L^Φ.
If $\Phi \in \nabla_3$, then the functional (la suelen llamar modular) $u \to \int_0^t \Phi(|u|)\,dx$ is not coercive in L^Φ.

Proof. Let $u = \alpha\chi_A$ with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and where A is a subset of $[0, T]$.
Assume that $\|u\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty$ then $\|u\|_{L^\Phi} = \alpha\|\chi_A\|_{L^\Phi} = \alpha m(A)\Psi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{m(A)}\right) \to \infty$ and consequently $m(A)\Psi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{m(A)}\right) \to \infty$ as $m(A) \to 0$.

On the other hand, we have

$$\frac{\int \Phi(|u|)\,dx}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} = \frac{\Phi(\alpha)m(A)}{\alpha m(A)\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{m(A)})} = \frac{\Phi(\alpha)}{\alpha\Psi^{-1}(\frac{1}{m(A)})}. \tag{46}$$

Let $r = \frac{1}{m(A)} \geq \frac{1}{T}$, then $\alpha\frac{\Psi^{-1}(r)}{r} \to \infty$ as $\alpha, r \to \infty$ and

$$\frac{\int \Phi(|u|)\,dx}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} = \frac{\Phi(\alpha)}{\alpha\Psi^{-1}(r)} \tag{47}$$

As $\Phi \in \nabla'$, there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that $\Phi(xy) \geq C_1\Phi(x)\Phi(y)$ for every $x, y > 0$. Taking $y = \frac{\alpha}{x}$, we have $\Phi(\alpha) \geq C_1\Phi(x)\Phi(\frac{\alpha}{x})$ and choosing $x = \Phi^{-1}(r)$ we get

$$\frac{\Phi(\alpha)}{r} \geq C_1\Phi\left(\frac{\alpha}{\Phi^{-1}(r)}\right). \tag{48}$$

As $\Phi \in \Delta_2$, there exists $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\Phi\left(\frac{\alpha}{\Phi^{-1}(r)}\right) \geq C_2\frac{\alpha}{\Phi^{-1}(r)}\varphi\left(\frac{\alpha}{\Phi^{-1}(r)}\right). \tag{49}$$

We also have that $r \leqslant \Phi^{-1}(r)\Psi^{-1}(r) \leqslant 2r$ for every $r > 0$, then

$$C_2\frac{\alpha}{\Phi^{-1}(r)}\varphi\left(\frac{\alpha}{\Phi^{-1}(r)}\right) \geq C_2\frac{\alpha\Psi^{-1}(r)}{2r}\varphi\left(\frac{\alpha\Psi^{-1}(r)}{2r}\right). \tag{50}$$

Thus, from (48)-(50),

$$\frac{\Phi(\alpha)}{r} \geq C_1C_2\frac{\alpha\Psi^{-1}(r)}{2r}\varphi\left(\frac{\alpha\Psi^{-1}(r)}{2r}\right); \tag{51}$$

and then (**Acá tenía que despejar y no irme por la ramas!!!**)

$$\frac{\Phi(\alpha)}{\alpha\Psi^{-1}(r)} \geq \frac{C_1C_2}{2}\varphi\left(\frac{\alpha\Psi^{-1}(r)}{2r}\right). \tag{52}$$

Due to $\alpha\frac{\Psi^{-1}(r)}{r} \to \infty$ as $\alpha, r \to \infty$ and the fact that $\varphi(x) \to \infty$ as $x \to \infty$, we obtain

$$\frac{C_1 C_2}{2}\varphi\left(\frac{\alpha\Psi^{-1}(r)}{2r}\right) \to \infty \tag{53}$$

and consequently

$$\frac{\Phi(\alpha)}{\alpha\Psi^{-1}(r)} \to \infty \;\text{ as }\; \alpha, r \to \infty; \tag{54}$$

that is,

$$\frac{\int \Phi(|u|)\,dx}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} \to \infty \;\text{ as }\; \|u\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty. \tag{55}$$

Now, we will see that ∇_3 functions do not imply the wished coercivity in case of u being a characteristic function.

Comentario Leo-Graciela-Fernando 4. Me parece que es posible ver que no es coercitiva en el sentido más debil que

$$\int \Phi(|u_n|)\,dx - C\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi}$$

no tiende a infinito.**Demostrarlo** Por otra parte, notar que al final de la demostración se toma $\alpha = r$, como lo que estamos mostrando es un contraejemplo, no es necesario mantener la distinción entre α y r. Podríamos haber tomado de movida

$$u = u_r = r\chi_{[0,1/r]},$$

To do so, suppose there exists a function $\Phi \in \nabla_3$ such that

$$\frac{\int \Phi(|u|)\,dx}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} = \frac{\Phi(\alpha)}{\alpha\Psi^{-1}(r)} \to \infty \;\text{ as }\; \|u\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty, \tag{56}$$

then

$$\frac{\int \Phi(|u|)\,dx}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} = \frac{\Phi(\alpha)}{\alpha\Psi^{-1}(r)} \leqslant \frac{\Phi(\alpha)\Phi^{-1}(r)}{\alpha r} \to \infty \text{ as } \;\|u\|_{L^\Phi} \to \infty \tag{57}$$

for any $\alpha > 0$.
However, $\Phi \in \nabla_3$ if and only if there exists $C_3 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\Phi(r)\Phi^{-1}(r)}{r^2} \leqslant C_3 \;\text{ for every }\; r > 0 \tag{58}$$

which contradicts (57) choosing $\alpha = r$.
Therefore, if $\Phi \in \nabla_3$ then the functional $u \to \int_0^t \Phi(|u|)\,dx$ is not coercive in L^Φ. $\square$

Remark 7.4. *∇' functions are a subset of ∇_2 functions and ∇_3 functions belong to the set of Δ_2 functions [13, Chapter 2].*

We have just proved that coercivity in L^Φ for characteristic functions holds when Φ belongs to a subclass of Δ_2 functions.
Nevertheless, Δ_2 condition is not sufficient to get the wished coercivity in L^Φ; in fact, ∇_3 functions, which belong to the set of Δ_2 functions, do not imply coercivity in L^Φ.

We can also see that Δ_2 condition is not sufficient to have coercivity in L^Φ providing a counterexample.

Comentario Leo-Graciela-Fernando 5. Deje de entender. Al fin y al cabo, el de abajo sería un contraejemplo para mostrar la misma cosa que ya vimos en otro contraejemplo?
Pero se nos plantea este problema, la Φ del contraejemlo de abajo no será ∇_3? Si fuese así lo que decimos abajo ya lo sabemos **Problema abierto: probar o refutar que la Φ es ∇_3**

Sonia: En efecto, quise decir que como ∇_3 implica Δ_2, el ejemplo que viene a continuación es redundante para probar que Δ_2 no implica coercividad.
Por otra parte, en la página 39 del Rao dice que la función Ψ que usamos es Δ_3, luego $\Phi \in \nabla_3$ (ver Teorema 3 página 38 de Rao). Conclusión: O ponemos el enunciado general para ∇_3 o el contraejemplo que viene a continuaci´on, porque dicen lo mismo.

Hay una diferencia entre el enunciado general y el ejemplo de abajo. El ejemplo de abajo es un contraejemplo a la afirmación

$$\lim_{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}\to\infty} \int \Phi(|u_n|)\, dx - C\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi} = \infty \tag{59}$$

Mientras que el resultado general lo es de

$$\lim_{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}\to\infty} \frac{\int_0^T \Phi(|u_n|)dx}{\|u\|_{L^\Phi}} = \infty \tag{60}$$

Como (60) implica (59), el contraejemplo de abajo no es consecuencia del resultado general. Además nosotros lo que necesitamos es (60). Todo esto nos lleva a:

Problema abierto (jaja): ver si el enunciado general sigue sirviendo con (59)

In fact, suppose that $\Phi(r) = (r+1)\log(r+1) - r$ then $\Phi \in \Delta_2$; and, we also have $\Psi(r) = e^r - r - 1$ which is not a Δ_2 function [13, Chapter 1, pp 22].
Let $u_n = \frac{1}{m(A_n)}\chi_{A_n}$ where $A_n \subset [0,T]$ such that $m(A_n) \to 0$.
If $r_n = \frac{1}{m(A_n)}$, we have

$$\int \Phi(|u_n|)\, dx - C\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi} = \frac{\Phi(r_n)}{r_n} - C\Psi^{-1}(r_n) \tag{61}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Phi(r_n)}{r_n} - C\Psi^{-1}(r_n) \leqslant \left(1 + \frac{1}{r_n}\right)\log(r_n+1) - C\log(r_n+1) = \\ \left(1 + \frac{1}{r_n} - C\right)\log(r_n+1)\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Now, as r_n goes to ∞, we get

$$\lim_{r_n \to \infty} \left(\frac{\Phi(r_n)}{r_n} - C\Psi^{-1}(r_n) \right) \leqslant (1 - C)\, \infty. \tag{63}$$

In that way, $\int \Phi(|u_n|)\, dx - C\|u_n\|_{L^\Phi}$ is an upper bounded function provided that $C > 1$, which means that the functional $u \to \int_0^t \Phi(|u|)\, dx$ is not coercive in L^Φ for such a particular Δ_2 function Φ.

Porque para tener coercividad, la expresión no debería estar acotada para C grande, es así????

References

[1] R.A. Adams and J.J.F. Fournier. *Sobolev Spaces*. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Elsevier Science, 2003.

[2] A. Ambrosetti and G. Prodi. *A Primer of Nonlinear Analysis*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[3] Andrea Cianchi. Some results in the theory of Orlicz spaces and applications to variational problems. *Nonlinear analysis, function spaces and applications*, 6:50–92, 1999.

[4] Andrea Cianchi. A fully anisotropic Sobolev inequality. *Pacific J. Math*, 196(2):283–295, 2000.

[5] Nadia Clavero. Optimal Sobolev embeddings and Function Spaces, 2011.

[6] DE Edmunds, R Kerman, and L Pick. Optimal Sobolev imbeddings involving rearrangement-invariant quasinorms. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 170(2):307–355, 2000.

[7] I. Fonseca and G. Leoni. *Modern Methods in the Calculus of Variations: Lˆp Spaces*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, 2007.

[8] Tosio Kato. Demicontinuity, hemicontinuity and monotonicity. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 70(4):548–550, 1964.

[9] Ron Kerman and Luboš Pick. Optimal sobolev imbeddings. In *Forum Mathematicum*, volume 18, pages 535–570, 2006.

[10] M. A. Krasnosel′skiĭ and Ja. B. Rutickiĭ. *Convex functions and Orlicz spaces*. Translated from the first Russian edition by Leo F. Boron. P. Noordhoff Ltd., Groningen, 1961.

[11] Lech Maligranda. *Orlicz spaces and interpolation*, volume 5 of *Seminários de Matemática [Seminars in Mathematics]*. Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Departamento de Matemática, Campinas, 1989.

[12] J. Mawhin and M. Willem. *Critical Point Theory and Hamiltonian Systems*. Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer, 2010.

[13] Malempati Madhusudana Rao and Zhong Dao Ren. *Theory of Orlicz spaces*. M. Dekker, 1991.

[14] R.T. Rockafellar and R.J.B. Wets. *Variational Analysis*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften in Einzeldarstellungen. Springer, 2009.

[15] Chun-Lei Tang. Periodic solutions of non-autonomous second-order systems with γ-quasisubadditive potential. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 189(3):671–675, 1995.

[16] Xianhua Tang and Xingyong Zhang. Periodic solutions for second-order hamiltonian systems with a p-laplacian. *Annales UMCS, Mathematica*, 64(1):93–113, 2010.

[17] Aneta Wróblewska-Kamińska. An application of Orlicz spaces in partial differential equations, 2012. PhD dissertation.

[18] Bo Xu and Chun-Lei Tang. Some existence results on periodic solutions of ordinary p-laplacian systems. *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, 333(2):1228–1236, 2007.

[19] Fukun Zhao and Xian Wu. Periodic solutions for a class of non-autonomous second order systems. *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, 296(2):422–434, 2004.