

Research Article

Existence and Uniqueness of Renormalized Solution to Nonlinear Anisotropic Elliptic Problems with Variable Exponent and L^1 **-Data**

Ibrahime Konaté ^b¹ and Arouna Ouédraogo²

¹Université Thomas Sankara, BP 417 Ouagadougou 12, Saaba, Burkina Faso ²Université Norbert Zongo, BP 376, Koudougou, Laboratoire de Mathématiques, Informatique et Applications (LAMIA), Burkina Faso

Correspondence should be addressed to Ibrahime Konaté; ibrakonat@yahoo.fr

Received 26 September 2022; Revised 18 February 2023; Accepted 25 March 2023; Published 10 April 2023

Academic Editor: Davood D. Ganji

Copyright © 2023 Ibrahime Konaté and Arouna Ouédraogo. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Nonlinear partial differential equations are considered as an essential tool for describing the behavior of many natural phenomena. The modeling of some phenomena requires to work in Sobolev spaces with constant exponent. But for others, such as electrorheological fluids, the properties of classical spaces are not sufficient to have precision. To overcome this difficulty, we work in the appropriate spaces called Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces with variable exponent. In recent works, researchers are attracted by the study of mathematical problems in the context of variable exponent. This great interest is motivated by their applications in many fields such as elastic mechanics, fluid dynamics, and image restoration. In this paper, we combine the technic of monotone operators in Banach spaces and approximation methods to prove the existence of renormalized solutions of a class of nonlinear anisotropic problem involving \vec{p} (.)–Leray–Lions operator, a graph, and L^1 data. In particular, we establish the uniqueness of the solution when the graph data are considered a strictly increasing function.

1. Introduction

Partial differential equations (PDEs for short) are considered a fundamental tool for modeling and thus understanding many real-world phenomena. These partial differential equations make it possible to take into account many parameters related to the course of phenomena and the role of these parameters. They also make it possible to predict, sometimes extremely accurately, how the phenomenon evolves over time. This prediction may exist in the very special case of linear PDEs, but when the phenomenon is modeled by a nonlinear PDE, prediction becomes almost impossible.

Nonlinear PDEs appear in many fields including chemistry, physics, and engineering science (see [1-5]). For example, in [6], Gandji et al. used nonlinear equations to study the three-dimensional Bödewadt hybrid nanofluid flow where fluids are composed of water and hexanol. Note that some nonhomogeneous materials such as aluminum

oxide or alumina (Al_2O_3) have the ability to change state very quickly (in a few milliseconds) physically when an electric field of very small intensity is applied to them. To model the behavior of these materials, classical Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces with constant exponent are not efficient enough to have accuracy. To this end, we commonly work in the Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces with variable exponent. The properties of these nonhomogeneous materials are widely exploited in many technological applications such as shock absorbers and equipment rehabilitation.

The study of PDEs with variable exponent has increased intensively in recent years. The importance of studying such problems is due to the discovery of their applications in the modeling of behavior of certain nonhomogeneous devices in physics, mechanical process, electrorheological fluids, and stationary thermo-rheological viscous flows of non-Newtonian fluids (see [7–11] for more details). They are also used in modeling the propagation of epidemic diseases (see [12]) and image processing ([13]). In this paper, we are interested in the existence and uniqueness of renormalized solution of the following anisotropic problem:

$$(E, f) \begin{cases} \beta(u) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} a_{i} \left(x, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right) + \operatorname{div} F(u) \ni f \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$
(1)

where Ω is an open bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N (N \ge 3)$ with Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$, $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, $F: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, and $\beta: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ is a set-valued maximal monotone mapping such that $0 \in \beta(0)$. We allow the term $\beta(u)$ to be multivalued, not necessarily defined in the whole of \mathbb{R} .

Under our assumptions, problem (E, f) is generally not well posed in the framework of weak solution because F(u)may not belong to $(L_{loc}^1(\Omega))^N$ (*F* is just continuous on \mathbb{R}). To overcome this difficulty, we use the framework of renormalized solutions which requires low regularity than the weak one. This concept of solution first appeared in the work of Lions and Diperna [14] and used later by Lions and Murat to tackle elliptic equation with low summability data (i.e. when the data are L^1 or a measure).

Analysis of problems involving graph data, Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with constant exponent, and generalized Orlicz spaces is already a classical topic investigated since [15–17]. Then, differential inclusion problems have been extended to variable exponent setting in [18–21] and the references therein. In [22], Akdim and Allalou ensured the existence of renormalized solution of a problem close to (E, f) but in the framework of weighted space.

In the literature, special cases of problem (E, f) have been explored in the framework of anisotropic Sobolev space (see [23–25]) and have concerned the problem below:

$$(P) \begin{cases} \beta(u) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} a_{i} \left(x, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \right) \ni f \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega, \end{cases}$$
(2)

where f is a bounded Radon measure or L^1 -function.

Let us recall that the first elliptic problems studied in anisotropic Sobolev space with variable exponent were the works of Mihailescu et al. [26, 27].

For the case where $\beta(.) \equiv 0$, Koné et al. [28, 29] used the minimization technics to prove the existence of weak solutions of problem (*P*) (see also [30, 31]). The case in which $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ and β are continuous nondecreasing functions from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} is studied in [23]. In [24], Konaté and Ouaro have proved the existence and uniqueness of an entropy solution of problem (*P*) when *f* is a Radon measure and β is a maximal monotone graph.

When the components of the vector $\vec{p} = (p_1, \ldots, p_N)$ are constants, the authors in [32] studied the problem (E, f)and established the existence and uniqueness of renormalized solution in the anisotropic Sobolev space $W^{1, \vec{p}}(\Omega)$ with constant components of the vector \vec{p} . Since the components of the vector $\vec{p}(.)$ are able to vary, the $\vec{p}(.)$ -Leray-Lions operator $Au = -\sum_{i=1}^N \partial_i \partial x_i a_i(x, \partial u_i \partial x_i)$ which appears in the left-hand side of problem (E, f) is more general than the one which appears in [32].

To our knowledge, all the previous studies dealing with similar problem (E, f) in the framework of variable exponent spaces are focused on particular cases.

In this paper, we extend the recent works [21, 24, 25, 32] by using the ideas developed in [21, 32]. More precisely, we used the technic of monotone operators in Banach spaces and approximation methods to prove the existence and uniqueness of a renormalized solution of problem (E, f) in the context of anisotropic space involving variable exponents $W^{1, \vec{p}(.)}(\Omega)$. As the novelty of this study, the components of the vector $\vec{p}(.) = (p_1(.), \ldots, p_N(.))$ are able to vary and the diffusion convection term div F(u) is not null. The main difficulty we encounter is how to establish the a priori estimates and convergence results.

Our main results rely on the following assumptions.

Throughout this paper, $\overrightarrow{p}(.) = (p_1(.), \dots, p_N(.))$ is a vector such that the components $p_i(.): \overline{\Omega} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous functions (for any $i = 1, \dots, N$) satisfying

$$1 < p_i^- \coloneqq \inf_{x \in \Omega} p_i(x) \le p_i^+ \coloneqq \sup_{x \in \Omega} p_i(x) < \infty,$$
(3)

and we set

$$p_M(x) \coloneqq \max(p_1(x), \dots, p_N(x)) \text{ and } p_m(x) \coloneqq \min(p_1(x), \dots, p_N(x)).$$
 (4)

For any i = 1, ..., N, let $a_i: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Carathéodory function verifying the following assumptions.

There exists positive constants C_1 , C_2 , C_3 such that

(i) For a.e.
$$x \in \Omega$$
 and for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$,

where j_i is a nonnegative function in $L^{p'_i(.)}(\Omega)$, with $1/p_i(x) + 1/p'_i(x) = 1$.

(5)

 $|a_i(x,\xi)| \leq C_1(j_i(x) + |\xi|^{p_i(x)-1}),$

(ii) For $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\xi \neq \eta$ and for every $x \in \Omega$,

$$(a_i(x,\xi) - a_i(x,\eta))(\xi - \eta) \ge \begin{cases} C_2 |\xi - \eta|^{p_i(x)}, & \text{if } |\xi - \eta| \ge 1, \\ C_2 |\xi - \eta|^{p_i^-}, & \text{if } |\xi - \eta| < 1. \end{cases}$$

$$(6)$$

(iii) For $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ and a.e. $x \in \Omega$,

$$a_i(x,\xi).\xi \ge C_3 |\xi|^{p_i(x)}.$$
(7)

We assume that

$$\frac{\overline{p}(N-1)}{N(\overline{p}-1)} < p_i^- < \frac{\overline{p}(N-1)}{N-\overline{p}}, \frac{p_i^+ - p_i^- - 1}{p_i^-} < \frac{\overline{p}-N}{\overline{p}(N-1)}, \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{p_i} > 1,$$
(9)

where $N/\overline{p} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} 1/p_i^-$.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we recall some fundamental preliminaries which are useful in this work and we give our main results. In Section 3 we study the case where $f \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$. In Section 4, we study the existence and uniqueness of a renormalized solution when $f \in L^1(\Omega)$. Finally, in Section 5, we give an example for illustrating our abstract result.

2. Preliminary and Main Results

This section is devoted to some definitions and basic properties of anisotropic Lebesgue with Sobolev spaces and variable exponents. Set

$$C_{+}(\overline{\Omega}) = \left\{ p \in C(\overline{\Omega}): \min_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} p(x) > 1 \right\}.$$
 (10)

For any $p \in C_+(\overline{\Omega})$, the variable exponent Lebesgue space is defined by

$$L^{p(.)}(\Omega) \coloneqq \left\{ u: \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ a measurable function such that } \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p(x)} \mathrm{d}x < \infty \right\}, \tag{11}$$

endowed with the so-called Luxemburg norm

$$|u|_{p(.)} \coloneqq \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0: \ \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{u(x)}{\lambda} \right|^{p(x)} dx \le 1 \right\}.$$
(12)

The p(.)-modular of the space $L^{p(.)}(\Omega)$ is the mapping $\rho_{p(.)}: L^{p(.)}(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\rho_{p(.)}(u) \coloneqq \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p(x)} \mathrm{d}x. \tag{13}$$

For any $u \in L^{p(.)}(\Omega)$, we have (see [33, 34])

$$\min\left\{|u|_{p(.)}^{p^{-}};|u|_{p(.)}^{p^{+}}\right\} \le \rho_{p(.)}(u) \le \max\left\{|u|_{p(.)}^{p^{-}};|u|_{p(.)}^{p^{+}}\right\}.$$
(14)

For any $u \in L^{p(.)}(\Omega)$ and $v \in L^{q(.)}(\Omega)$, with 1/p(x) + 1/q(x) = 1 for any $x \in \Omega$, we have the Hölder type inequality

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} uv dx \right| \le \left(\frac{1}{p^{-}} + \frac{1}{q^{-}} \right) |u|_{p(.)} |v|_{q(.)}.$$
(15)

If Ω is bounded and $p, q \in C_+(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $p(x) \leq q(x)$ for any $x \in \Omega$, then the embedding $L^{p(.)}(\Omega) \longrightarrow L^{q(.)}(\Omega)$ is continuous (see [35], Theorem 2.8).

We defined the anisotropic Sobolev space with variable exponent as follows:

$$W^{1,\overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega) \coloneqq \left\{ u \in L^{p_{M}(.)}(\Omega) \colon \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \in L^{p_{i}(.)}(\Omega), i = 1, \dots, N \right\},$$
(16)

which is a separable and reflexive Banach space (see [26]) under the norm

$$\|u\|_{\overrightarrow{p}(.)} = |u|_{p_{M}(.)} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right|_{p_{i}(.)}.$$
 (17)

We have the following embedding results.

Theorem 1 (see [33], Corollary 2.1). Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N (N \ge 3)$ be a bounded open set and for all $i = 1, ..., N, p_i \in L^{\infty}(\Omega), p_i(x) \ge 1$ a.e. $x \in \Omega$. Then, for any $q \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ with $q(x) \ge 1$ a.e. $x \in \Omega$ such that

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x\in\Omega}(p_M(x) - q(x)) > 0, \tag{18}$$

we have the compact embedding

$$W^{1,\overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega) \longrightarrow L^{q(.)}(\Omega).$$
(19)

We defined the numbers

$$q = \frac{N(\overline{p} - 1)}{N - 1},$$

$$q^* = \frac{N(\overline{p} - 1)}{N - \overline{p}} = \frac{Nq}{N - q}.$$
(20)

Theorem 2 (see [36]). Let $p_1, \ldots, p_N \in [1, \infty)$; $g \in W^{1, (p_1, \ldots, p_N)}(\Omega)$ and

$$\begin{cases} q = (\overline{p})^*, & \text{if } (\overline{p})^* < N, \\ q \in [1, \infty), & \text{if } (\overline{p})^* \ge N. \end{cases}$$
(21)

Then, there exists a constant $C_4 > 0$ depending on N, p_1, \ldots, p_N if $\overline{p} < N$ and also on q and meas (Ω) if $\overline{p} \ge N$ such that

$$\|g\|_{L^{q}(\Omega)} \leq C_{4} \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left[\|g\|_{L^{p_{M}}(\Omega)} + \left\| \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_{i}} \right\|_{L^{p_{i}}(\Omega)} \right]^{1/N}, \qquad (22)$$

where $1/\overline{p} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i$ and $(\overline{p})^* = N\overline{p}/N - \overline{p}$.

The Marcinkiewicz space $\mathcal{M}^q(\Omega)(1 < q < +\infty)$ is introduced as the set of measurable function $g: \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for which the distribution

$$\lambda_g(k) \coloneqq \max\{x \in \Omega: |g(x)| > k\}, k \ge 0,$$
(23)

satisfies the following:

$$\lambda_q(k) \le Ck^{-q}$$
, for some finite constant $C > 0.$ (24)

We will use the following pseudonorm in $\mathcal{M}^q(\Omega)$.

$$\|g\|_{\mathcal{M}^{q}(\Omega)} \coloneqq \inf \left\{ C > 0: \lambda_{g}(k) \le Ck^{-q}, \forall k > 0 \right\}.$$
(25)

We defined the truncation function T_k , (k > 0) by

$$T_k(s) = \max\{-k, \min\{k; s\}\}.$$
 (26)

We observe that $\lim_{k \to +\infty} T_k(s) = s$ and $|T_k(s)| = \min\{|s|; k\}.$

For any $v \in W^{1, \overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega)$, we use v instead of $v|_{\partial\Omega}$ for the trace of v on $\partial\Omega$.

Set $\mathcal{T}^{1,\overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega)$ as the set of the measurable functions $u: \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $k > 0, T_k(u) \in W^{1,\overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega)$.

Lemma 1 (see [30]). Let g be a nonnegative function in $W^{1, \overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega)$. Assume $\overline{p} < N$ and there exists a constant C > 0 such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| T_k(g) \right|^{p_M^-} \mathrm{d}x + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\{|g| \le k\}} \left| \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i^-} \mathrm{d}x \le C(k+1), \quad (27)$$

for every k > 0.

Then, there exists a constant D, depending on C such that

$$\|g\|_{\mathcal{M}^{q^*}(\Omega)} \le D,\tag{28}$$

where $q^* = N(\overline{p} - 1)/N - \overline{p}$.

We introduce some useful functions as follows.

For $r \in \mathbb{R}$, let $r^+ := \max(r, 0)$ and sign_0^+ be the function defined by

$$\operatorname{sign}_{0}^{+}(r) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } r > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } r \le 0. \end{cases}$$
(29)

Let $h_l: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $h_l(r) \coloneqq \min((l+1-|r|)^+, 1)$ for each $r, l \in \mathbb{R}$.

For $\sigma > 0$, we define H_{σ}^+ : $\mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$H_{\sigma}^{+}(r) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } r < 0, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma}r, & \text{if } 0 \le r \le \sigma, \\ 1, & \text{if } r > \sigma, \end{cases}$$
(30)

and $H_{\sigma} \colon \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$H_{\sigma}(r) = \begin{cases} l-1, & \text{if } r < -\sigma, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma}r, & \text{if } -\sigma \le r \le \sigma, \\ 1, & \text{if } r > \sigma. \end{cases}$$
(31)

Now, we give our main results.

Theorem 3. Under assumptions (3)–(9) and $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, there exists at least one renormalized solution (u,b) to problem (E, f) in the sense that

$$(i) \ u \in \mathcal{T}^{1, \overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega), b \in L^{1}(\Omega), \qquad u(x) \in \operatorname{dom}(\beta(x)), b(x) \in \beta(u(x)) \ for \ a.e. \ in \ \Omega.$$

$$(ii) \ For \ all \ h \in C_{c}^{1}(\mathbb{R}) \ and \ \varphi \in W_{0}^{1, \overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega), \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} a_{i}\left(x, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right) \ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} [h(u)\varphi] dx + \int_{\Omega} bh(u)\varphi dx - \int_{\Omega} F(u) \cdot \nabla[h(u)\varphi] dx = \int_{\Omega} fh(u)\varphi dx.$$

$$(32)$$

(iii)
$$\int_{\substack{\{k < |u| < k+1\}\\k \longrightarrow +\infty}} a_i(x, \partial u/\partial x_i) \partial u/\partial x_i dx \longrightarrow 0 \qquad as$$

Theorem 4. Let (u, b) and (\tilde{u}, \tilde{b}) be two renormalized solutions of problem (E, f). Then,

$$\begin{cases} u = \tilde{u} \text{ a.e.in } \Omega, \\ b = \tilde{b} \text{ a.e.in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$
(33)

3. Existence Result for L^{∞} **-Data**

Theorem 5. Assuming that (3)–(9) hold, $f \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$, then the problem (E, f) admits at least one renormalized solution.

Proof. We demonstrate Theorem 5 in five steps.

Step 1. Approximate problem.

Let β_{ϵ} : $\mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the Yosida regularization of β (see [37]), defined by $\beta_{\epsilon} = 1/\epsilon (I - (I + \epsilon \beta)^{-1})$ such that $0 < \epsilon \le 1$. We consider the approximate problem

$$(E_{\epsilon}, f) \begin{cases} \beta_{\epsilon} (T_{1/\epsilon}(u_{\epsilon})) + \epsilon \arctan(u_{\epsilon}) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} a_{i} \left(x, \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon}}{\partial x_{i}}\right) - \operatorname{div} F(T_{1/\epsilon}(u_{\epsilon})) = f \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u_{\epsilon} = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega. \end{cases}$$
(34)

Lemma 2. The problem (E_{ϵ}, f) has at least one weak solution $u_{\epsilon}W_{0}^{1,\overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega)$ in the sense that

$$\int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i \left(x, \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon}}{\partial x_i} \right) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} dx + \int_{\Omega} \left(\beta_{\epsilon} \left(T_{1/\epsilon} \left(u_{\epsilon} \right) + \epsilon \arctan\left(u_{\epsilon} \right) \right) \varphi dx + \int_{\Omega} F\left(T_{1/\epsilon} \left(u_{\epsilon} \right) \right) \cdot \nabla \varphi dx = \langle f, \varphi \rangle,$$
(35)

where $\varphi \in W_0^{1, \overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ and $\langle .,. \rangle$ denotes the duality pairing between $W_0^{1, \overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega)$ and $(W_0^{1, \overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega))^*$.

Proof. We define the operators $A_{1,\epsilon}$, $A_{2,\epsilon}$, and A_{ϵ} : = $A_{1,\epsilon} + A_{2,\epsilon}$, acting from $W_0^{1,\overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega)$ into its dual $(W_0^{1,\overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega))^*$ as follows:

$$\langle A_{1,\epsilon}u,\varphi\rangle = \langle Au,\varphi\rangle + \int_{\Omega} \left(\beta_{\epsilon} \left(T_{1/\epsilon}\left(u\right) + \epsilon \arctan\left(u_{\epsilon}\right)\right)\varphi dx, \forall u,\varphi \in W_{0}^{1,\overrightarrow{p}}\left(\Omega\right),\right)$$
(36)

where

$$\langle Au, \varphi \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i \left(x, \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon}}{\partial x_i} \right) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} dx,$$

$$\langle A_{2,\epsilon} u, \varphi \rangle = -\int_{\Omega} F(T_{1/\epsilon}(u)) \cdot \nabla \varphi dx, \forall u, \varphi \in W_0^{1, \overrightarrow{P}}(\Omega).$$

$$(37)$$

Reasoning as in [25] (see also [21, 32]), we can prove that the operator A_{ϵ} is pseudomonotone, coercive, and bounded. Then, we deduce from [38] (Theorem 2.7) that A_{ϵ} is surjective. Since $f \in (W_0^{1,\overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega))^*$, it follows that the problem (E_{ϵ}, f) admits at least one solution $u_{\epsilon} \in W_0^{1,\overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega)$.

Taking into account the monotonicity of a_i and β_e and following the same lines as in [21, 32], we establish the following comparison principle which will be essential in the proof of uniqueness of the solution.

Proposition 1. Let $f, \tilde{f} \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ and $u_{\epsilon}, \tilde{u_{\epsilon}} \in W_0^{1, \vec{p}(.)}(\Omega)$ such that u_{ϵ} is a solution of (E_{ϵ}, f) and $\tilde{u_{\epsilon}}$ is a solution of $(E_{\epsilon}, \tilde{f})$. Then, the following comparison principle holds:

$$\epsilon \int_{\Omega} (\arctan(u_{\epsilon}) - \arctan(\tilde{u_{\epsilon}})^{+} \leq \int_{\Omega} (f - \tilde{f}) \operatorname{sign}_{0}^{+} (u_{\epsilon} - \tilde{u_{\epsilon}}).$$
(38)

Remark 1 (see [21, 32]). By assuming that $f \leq \tilde{f}$ a.e. in Ω , an immediate consequence of the proposition above is the inequality $u_{\epsilon} \leq \tilde{u_{\epsilon}}$. In addition, we have $\beta_{\epsilon} (T_{1/\epsilon} (u_{\epsilon})) \leq \beta_{\epsilon} (T_{1/\epsilon} (\tilde{u_{\epsilon}}))$ a.e. in Ω .

Step 2. A apriori estimates.

Lemma 3 (see [25]). If u_{ϵ} is a solution of problem (E_{ϵ}, f) , then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\{|u_{\epsilon}| \le k\}} \left| \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon}}{\partial x_{i}} \right|^{p_{i}(x)} dx \le \frac{k \| f \|_{\infty}}{C_{5}},$$

$$\| \beta_{\epsilon} \left(T_{1/\epsilon} \left(u_{\epsilon} \right) \right) \|_{\infty} \le \| f \|_{\infty},$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\{l < |u_{\epsilon}| < l+k\}} a_{i} \left(x, \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon}}{\partial x_{i}} \right) \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon}}{\partial x_{i}} dx \le k \int_{\{|u_{\epsilon}| > l\}} |f| dx$$

$$\int_{\{|u_{\epsilon}| \le k\}} |\nabla T_{k} \left(u_{\epsilon} \right) |^{p_{m}^{-}} dx \le C_{6},$$
(39)

where $k, C_5, C_6 > 0$.

Lemma 4 (see [23, 30]). There exist some constants $C_7, C_8 > 0$ such that

(i)
$$\|u_{\epsilon}\|_{\mathscr{M}^{q^*}(\Omega)} \leq C_7.$$

(ii) $\|(\partial u_{\epsilon}/\partial x_i)\|_{\mathscr{M}^{p_1^-q/p}(\Omega)} \leq C_8, \forall i = 1, \dots, N.$

Remark 2 (see [25]). There exist C_9 , $C_{10} > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \right|^{p_{i}(x)} \mathrm{d}x \geq C_{9} \nabla u \| \|_{L^{p_{m}}(\Omega)}^{p_{m}^{-}} - N \operatorname{meas}(\Omega),$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\{l \leq |u_{\varepsilon}| < l+k\}} a_{i} \left(x, \frac{\partial u_{\varepsilon}}{\partial x_{i}} \right) \frac{\partial u_{\varepsilon}}{\partial x_{i}} \mathrm{d}x \leq k \| f \|_{\infty} \left| \left\{ \left| u_{\varepsilon} \right| \geq l \right\} \right| \leq C_{10}(k) l^{-p_{m}^{-}}.$$
(40)

Step 3. Convergence results.

Lemma 5 (see [23, 25]). Assume that $0 < \epsilon \leq A$ and u_{ϵ} is a solution of (E_{ϵ}, f) . Then, there exist $u \in W_0^{1, p(.)}(\Omega)$ and $b \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ such that for a non-relabelled subsequence of $(u_{\epsilon})_{0 < \epsilon \leq 1}$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$,

$$u_{\epsilon} \longrightarrow u \text{ in } L^{p'(.)}(\Omega) \text{ and } a.e. \text{ in } \Omega;$$

$$\frac{\partial u_{\epsilon}}{\partial x_{i}} \text{ converges in measure to the weak partial gradient of } u;$$

$$a_{i}\left(x, \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon}}{\partial x_{i}}\right) \longrightarrow a_{i}\left(x, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right) \text{ in } L^{1}(\Omega) \text{ a.e.} x \in \Omega;$$

$$a_{i}\left(x, \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon}}{\partial x_{i}}\right) \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon}}{\partial x_{i}} \longrightarrow a_{i}\left(x, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \text{ in } L^{1}(\Omega) \text{ and } a.e.x \in \Omega$$
and $\beta_{\epsilon}(T_{1/\epsilon}(u_{\epsilon})) \longrightarrow b \text{ weakly} - * \text{ in } L^{\infty}(\Omega).$

$$(41)$$

Moreover, for any k > 0*,*

$$\frac{\partial T_k(u_{\epsilon})}{\partial x_i} \longrightarrow \frac{\partial T_k(u)}{\partial x_i} \text{ in } L^{p_i(.)}(\Omega),$$

$$a_i\left(x, \frac{\partial T_k(u_{\epsilon})}{\partial x_i}\right) \longrightarrow a_i\left(x, \frac{\partial T_k(u)}{\partial x_i}\right) \text{ in } L^1(\Omega).$$
(42)

Step 4. Passing to limit. $\overrightarrow{p}_{(.)}$ Let $h \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $\in W_0^{\overrightarrow{p}}(.)$ $(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)$. We apply the test function $h_l(u_{\epsilon})h(u)\varphi$ in (35) to get

$$J_{\epsilon,l}^{1} + J_{\epsilon,l}^{2} + J_{\epsilon,l}^{3} + J_{\epsilon,l}^{4} = J_{\epsilon,l}^{5},$$
(43)

where

$$J_{\epsilon,l}^{1} = \int_{\Omega} \beta_{\epsilon} (T_{1/\epsilon}(u_{\epsilon})) h_{l}(u_{\epsilon}) h(u) \varphi dx,$$

$$J_{\epsilon,l}^{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} a_{i} \left(x, \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon}}{\partial x_{i}} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} [h_{l}(u_{\epsilon}) h(u) \varphi] dx,$$

$$J_{\epsilon,l}^{3} = \int_{\Omega} F(T_{1/\epsilon}(u_{\epsilon})) \cdot \nabla [h_{l}(u_{\epsilon}) h(u) \varphi] dx,$$

$$J_{\epsilon,l}^{4} = \epsilon \int_{\Omega} \arctan(u_{\epsilon}) h_{l}(u_{\epsilon}) h(u) \varphi dx,$$

$$J_{\epsilon,l}^{5} = \int_{\Omega} fh_{l}(u_{\epsilon}) h(u) \varphi dx.$$
(44)

We first observe that $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} J_{\epsilon,l}^4 = 0$. Then, letting $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ and $l\uparrow\infty$ in (43), we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i \left(x, \frac{\partial u_{\epsilon}}{\partial x_i} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} [h(u)\varphi] dx + \int_{\Omega} bh(u)\varphi dx$$

$$+ \int_{\Omega} F(u) \cdot \nabla [h(u)\varphi] dx = \int_{\Omega} fh(u)\varphi dx,$$

$$(45)$$

$$= \int_{\Omega} fh(u) \cdot \nabla [h(u)\varphi] dx = \int_{\Omega} fh(u)\varphi dx,$$

where $h \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $\varphi \in W_0^{1, P(0)}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ (for the convergence result, see [25]).

Step 5. Subdifferential argument.

To end the proof, we have (see [25, 39])

(i) $u(x) \in \text{dom}(\beta(x)), b(x) \in \beta(u(x))$ a.e. in Ω . (ii) $\int_{\{k < |u| < k+1\}} a_i(x, \partial u_{\epsilon}/\partial x_i) \partial/\partial x_i dx \longrightarrow 0$ as $k \longrightarrow +\infty$.

Remark 3 (see [21]). If (u, b) is a renormalized solution of $(E, f) \xrightarrow{} \text{for second member } f \in L^{\infty}(\Omega), \text{ then } u \in W_0^{1, p(.)}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega).$ Moreover, u is a weak solution of (E, f).

4. The Case of L^1 -Data

4.1. Proof of Theorem 1. This proof is made in several steps.

4.1.1. Step 1: Approximate Problem. The first step consists in approximating the second member by bounded function. For $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $f_{m,n}: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f_{m,n}(x) = \max \{\min(f(x), m), -n\}a.e.x\Omega.$$
 (46)

Note that $f_{m,n} \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$, $|f_{m,n}(x)| \le |f(x)|$ a.e. in Ω and $f_{m,n} \to f$ in $L^{1}(\Omega)$ as $n, m \to \infty$. We have also

$$\|f_{m,n}\|_{1} \le f \|f\|_{1}. \tag{47}$$

According to Theorem 5, the problem $(E, f_{m,n})$ admits a renormalized solution $(u_{m,n}, b_{m,n}) \in W_0^{1, \overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega) \times L^{\infty}(\Omega).$ That is,

$$\int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i \left(x, \frac{\partial u_{m,n}}{\partial x_i} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[h(u_{m,n}) \varphi \right] dx + \int_{\Omega} b_{m,n} h(u_{m,n}) \varphi dx$$
$$+ \int_{\Omega} F(u_{m,n}) \cdot \nabla \left[h(u_{m,n}) \varphi \right] dx = \int_{\Omega} f_{m,n} h(u_{m,n}) \varphi dx,$$
(48)

where $h \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $\varphi \in W_0^{1,\overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)$. Our goal is to show that these approximated solutions

 $(u_{m,n}, b_{m,n})$ tend, as n, m go to ∞ , to a couple of functions (u, b) which are renormalized solutions of problem (E, f). We begin by giving some useful a priori estimates.

4.1.2. Step 2: A Priori Estimates

Lemma 6. If $(u_{m,n}, b_{m,n})$ is a renormalized solution of problem $(E, f_{m,n})$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{\partial u_{m,n}}{\partial x_i} \right|^{p_i(x)} \mathrm{d}x \le \frac{k \|f\|_1}{C_5}, \tag{49}$$

$$\|b_{m,n1} \le \|f_1,$$
 (50)

for k > 0 and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. For any k, l > 0, by applying $h_l(u_{m,n})T_k(u_{m,n})$ as test function in (48), we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i \left(x, \frac{\partial u_{m,n}}{\partial x_i} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[h(u_{m,n}) T_k(u_{m,n}) \right] dx + \int_{\Omega} b_{m,n} h(u_{m,n}) T_k(u_{m,n}) dx + \int_{\Omega} F(u_{m,n}) \cdot \nabla \left[h(u_{m,n}) T_k(u_{m,n}) \right] dx = \int_{\Omega} f_{m,n} h(u_{m,n}) T_k(u_{m,n}) dx.$$
(51)

Proof. Using Remark 2, we get

Using the same arguments as used in the proof of Lemma 2, we get (49).

For the proof of (50), see [21, 32, 39].

Remark 4 (see [21, 32, 39]). Letting m, n go to ∞ , we get the following convergences.

$$b_{m,n} \longrightarrow b \text{ in } L^{1}(\Omega) \text{ and } a.e.\text{in } \Omega,$$

 $u_{m,n} \longrightarrow u \text{ a.e.in } \Omega,$
(52)

where $u: \Omega \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is a measurable function.

The next lemma will be used to show that u is finite a.e. in Ω .

Lemma 7. If $(u_{m,n}, b_{m,n})$ is a renormalized solution of $(E, f_{m,n})$, then there exists a constant $C_{13} > 0$, not depending on $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\left| \left\{ \left| u_{m,n} \right| \ge l \right\} \right| \le C_{13} l^{-\left(p_{m}^{-} \right)}, \tag{53}$$

for all $l \ge 1$.

$$\left|\left\{\left|u_{m,n}\right| \ge l\right\}\right| \le C\left(p_{m}^{-}, N\right) l^{p_{m}^{-}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} \left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right|^{p_{i}(x)} \mathrm{d}x + N.\mathrm{meas}\left(\Omega\right)\right),$$
(54)

where $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $C(p_m^-, N)$ is a constant coming from Sobolev embedding in (19). From (49) and (54), we deduce (53).

Remark 5. u is finite a.e. in Ω and $b \in \beta(u)$ a.e. in Ω . Indeed, the proof relies on Lemma 4.6 and subdifferential argument (see [21, 32, 39] for details).

Remark 6. If $(u_{m,n}, b_{m,n})$ is a renormalized solution of $(E, f_{m,n})$, choosing $h_{\nu}(u_{m,n})T_k(u_{m,n} - T_l(u_{m,n}))$ as a test function in (48), discarding positive terms, and letting ν go to ∞ , we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{l \leq |u_{m,n}| < l+k} a_i \left(x, \frac{\partial u_{m,n}}{\partial x_i} \right) \frac{\partial u_{m,n}}{\partial x_i} \mathrm{d}x \leq k \left(\int_{\{|u_{m,n}| > l\} \cap \{|f| < \delta\}} |f| \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\{|f| > \delta\}} |f| \mathrm{d}x \right), \tag{55}$$

for any $k, l, \delta > 0$. Now using (53) in (55), we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{l \neq |u_{m,n}| < l+k} a_i \left(x, \frac{\partial u_{m,n}}{\partial x_i} \right) \frac{\partial u_{m,n}}{\partial x_i} dx \le \delta k C_{13} l^{-\left(p_m^--1\right)} + k \int_{\{|f| > \delta\}} |f| dx,$$
(56)

where $k, \delta > 0, l \ge 1$, and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$.

4.1.3. Step 3: Basic Convergence

Lemma 8 (see [25], Lemma 3). For i = 1, ..., N and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $(u_{m,n}, b_{m,n})$ is a renormalized solution of $(E, f_{m,n})$, then there exists a subsequence $(m(n))_n$ such that

posing f_n : = $f_{m(n),n}$, b_n : = $b_{m(n),n}$, u_n : = $u_{m(n),n}$, there exists $u \in W_0^{1, \overrightarrow{P}^{(.)}}(\Omega)$ such that $u \in \operatorname{dom}(\beta)$ a.e. in Ω and the convergences below hold:

 a_i

 $u_n \longrightarrow u$ in measure and *a.e.* in Ω ,

$$\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_i} \text{ converges in measure to the weak partial gradient of } u,$$

$$\left(x, \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_i}\right) \longrightarrow a_i\left(x, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\right) \text{ in } L^1(\Omega) \text{ a.e.} x \in \Omega.$$
(57)

More over, for any k > 0,

$$a_i\left(x,\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}T_k(u_n)\right) \longrightarrow a_i\left(x,\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}T_k(u)\right) \text{ in } L^1(\Omega) \text{ strongly and in } L^{p_i^{(.)}}(\Omega) \text{ weakly.}$$

$$(58)$$

4.1.4. Step 4: Strong Convergence

Remark 7. Arguing as in [25] (Lemma 1), we obtain equality (iii), namely,

$$\lim_{l \to +\infty} \int_{\{l \neq u | < l+1\}} a_i \left(x, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} dx = 0.$$
 (59)

To complete the proof of Theorem 3, it remains to verify (ii). To this end, we choose $h_l(u_n)h(u)\varphi$ as test function in (48) to obtain

$$I_{n,l}^{1} + I_{n,l}^{2} + I_{n,l}^{3} = I_{n,l}^{4},$$
 (60)

where

$$I_{n,l}^{1} = \int_{\Omega} b_{n} h_{l}(u_{n}) h(u) \varphi dx,$$

$$I_{n,l}^{2} = \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{i} \left(x, \frac{\partial u_{n}}{\partial x_{i}} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left[h_{l}(u_{n}) h(u) \varphi \right] dx,$$

$$I_{n,l}^{3} = \int_{\Omega} F(u_{n}) \cdot \nabla \left[h_{l}(u_{n}) h(u) \varphi \right] dx,$$

$$I_{n,l}^{4} = \int_{\Omega} f_{n} h_{l}(u_{n}) h(u) \varphi dx.$$
(61)

Letting *n* go to ∞ and using Lemma 7, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \longrightarrow +\infty} I_{n,l}^{1} = \int_{\Omega} bh_{l}(u)h(u)\varphi dx,$$

$$\lim_{n \longrightarrow +\infty} I_{n,l}^{4} = \int_{\Omega} fh_{l}(u)h(u)\varphi dx.$$
(62)

By rewriting as follows:

$$I_{n,l}^2 = I_{n,l}^{2,1} + I_{n,l}^{2,2},$$
 (63)

where

$$I_{n,l}^{2,1} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} h_l(u_n) a_i\left(x, \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_i}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} [h(u)\varphi] dx,$$

$$I_{n,l}^{2,2} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} h_l'(u_n) h(u) \varphi a_i\left(x, \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_i}\right) \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_i} dx,$$
(64)

and reasoning as in [25], we obtain

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} I_{n,l}^{2,1} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} h_l(u) a_i\left(x, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} [h(u)\varphi] dx.$$
(65)

From (56), we deduce that

$$\left|\lim_{n \longrightarrow \infty} I_{n,l}^{2,2}\right| \le \left\|h_{\infty}\right\|\varphi_{\infty}\left(\delta C_{13}l^{-\left(p_{m}^{-1}\right)} + \int_{\left\{|f| > \delta\right\}} |f|dx\right),\tag{66}$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $l \ge 1, \delta > 0$. Split $I_{n,l}^3 = I_{n,l}^{3,1} + I_{n,l}^{3,2}$, where

$$I_{n,l}^{3,1} = \int_{\Omega} h_l'(u_n) h(u_n) \varphi F(u_n)). \nabla u_n \mathrm{d}x,$$

$$I_{n,l}^{3,2} = \int_{\Omega} h_l(u_n) F(u_n) . \nabla [h(u_n) \varphi] \mathrm{d}x.$$
(67)

Passing to limit as n goes to ∞ , we get

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} I_{n,l}^{3,1} = \int_{\Omega} h_l(u) F(u) \cdot \nabla [h(u)\varphi] dx,$$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} I_{n,l}^{3,2} = \int_{\Omega} h_l'(u) h(u)\varphi F(u) \cdot \nabla u dx.$$
(68)

For all $\delta > 0$ and $l \ge 1$, letting $n \longrightarrow \infty$ in (60), we obtain

$$I_l^1 + I_l^2 + I_l^3 + I_l^4 + I_l^5 = I_l^6,$$
(69)

where

$$I_{l}^{1} = \int_{\Omega} bh_{l}(u)h(u)\varphi dx,$$

$$I_{l}^{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} h_{l}(u)a_{i}\left(x, \frac{\partial T_{k+1}(u)}{\partial x_{i}}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} [h(u)\varphi] dx,$$

$$|I_{l}^{3}| \leq \|h_{\infty}\|\varphi_{\infty}\left(\delta C_{4}l^{-(p_{m}^{-1})} + \int_{\{|f| > \delta\}} |f| dx\right), \forall \delta > 0,$$

$$I_{l}^{4} = \int_{\Omega} h_{l}'(u)h(u)\varphi F(u).\nabla u dx,$$

$$I_{l}^{5} = \int_{\Omega} h_{l}(u)F(u).\nabla [h(u)\varphi] dx,$$

$$I_{l}^{6} = \int_{\Omega} fh_{l}(u)h(u)\varphi dx.$$
(70)

Let k > 0 such that sup $ph \in [-k, k]$. Replacing u by $T_k(u)$ and passing to limit, as l goes to ∞ , in each term of (69), we get

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} I_l^1 = \int_{\Omega} bh(u)\varphi dx,$$
(71)

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} I_l^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\Omega} a_i \left(x, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} [h(u)\varphi] dx, \qquad (72)$$

$$\left|\lim_{l \to \infty} I_l^3\right| \le \|h\|_{\infty} \|\varphi\|_{\infty} \left(\int_{\{|f| > \delta\}} |f| \mathrm{d}x \right), \forall \delta > 0, \qquad (73)$$

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} I_l^4 = 0, \tag{74}$$

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} I_l^5 = \int_{\Omega} F(u) \cdot \nabla[h(u)\varphi] \mathrm{d}x,\tag{75}$$

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} I_l^6 = \int_{\Omega} fh(u)\varphi dx.$$
(76)

Thanks to (72)–(76), we pass to the limit in (69) as $\delta \longrightarrow \infty$, to get (32).

4.2. Proof of Theorem 2. We highlight that the uniqueness is more delicate and it is necessary to have additional hypothesis.

Here we assume that β is strictly increasing, and we prove a uniqueness result for renormalized solution of the problem (E, f) where $f \in L^1(\Omega)$.

Proposition 2. Let $f, \tilde{f} \in L^1(\Omega)$ and (u, b) and (\tilde{u}, \tilde{b}) be renormalized solutions of (E, f) and (E, \tilde{f}) , respectively. Then, the following comparison principle holds:

$$\int_{\Omega} (b - \tilde{b}) \operatorname{sign}_{0}^{+} (u - \tilde{u}) \mathrm{d}x \leq \int_{\Omega} (f - \tilde{f}) \operatorname{sign}_{0}^{+} (u - \tilde{u}) \mathrm{d}x.$$
(77)

Proof. Let δ , l > 0, H_{δ}^+ be the Lipschitz approximation of the sign₀⁺ function.

The fact that (u, b), (\tilde{u}, \tilde{b}) are renormalized solutions implies that $T_{l+1}(u), T_{l+1}(\tilde{u}) \in W_0^{1, \overrightarrow{p}(.)}(\Omega) \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ for l > 0. Hence, $H_{\delta}^+(T_{l+1}(u) - T_{l+1}(\tilde{u}))$ is an admissible test function.

Taking $h = h_l$ and writing the renormalized equalities corresponding to solutions (u, b) and (\tilde{u}, \tilde{b}) , respectively, with test function $H^+_{\delta}(T_{l+1}(u) - T_{l+1}(\tilde{u}))$ and adding up both results, we get

$$I_{l,\delta}^{1} + I_{l,\delta}^{2} + I_{l,\delta}^{3} + I_{l,\delta}^{4} + I_{l,\delta}^{5} = I_{l,\delta}^{6},$$
(78)

where

$$I_{l,\delta}^{1} = \int_{\Omega} \left(bh_{l}(u) - \tilde{b}h_{l}(\tilde{u})H_{\delta}^{+} \right) \left(T_{l+1}(u) - T_{l+1}(\tilde{u}) \right) dx,$$

$$I_{l,\delta}^{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\Omega} \left(h_{l}'(u)a_{i}\left(x,\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} - h_{l}'(\tilde{u})a_{i}\left(x,\frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial x_{i}}\right) \right) H_{\delta}^{+} \left(T_{l+1}(u) - T_{l+1}(\tilde{u}) \right) dx,$$

$$I_{l,\delta}^{3} = \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{K} \left(h_{l}(u)a_{i}\left(x,\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right) - h_{l}(\tilde{u})a_{i}\left(x,\frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial x_{i}}\right) \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(T_{l+1}(u) - T_{l+1}(\tilde{u}) \right) dx,$$

$$I_{l,\delta}^{4} = \int_{\Omega} \left(h_{l}'(u)F(u) \cdot \nabla u - h_{l}'(\tilde{u})F(\tilde{u}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{u} \right) H_{\delta}^{+} \left(T_{l+1}(u) - T_{l+1}(\tilde{u}) \right) dx,$$

$$I_{l,\delta}^{5} = \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{K} \left(h_{l}(u)F(u) - h_{l}(\tilde{u})F(\tilde{u}) \right) \cdot \nabla \left(T_{l+1}(u) - T_{l+1}(\tilde{u}) \right) dx,$$

$$I_{l,\delta}^{6} = \int_{\Omega} \left(fh_{l}(u) - \tilde{f}h_{l}(\tilde{u}) \right) H_{\delta}^{+} \left(T_{l+1}(u) - T_{l+1}(\tilde{u}) \right) dx,$$

with $K = \{0 < T_{l+1}(u) - T_{l+1}(\tilde{u}) < \delta\}$. Reasoning as in [21], i.e., neglecting the positive part of $I_{l,\delta}^3$ and using the fact that

F is locally Lipschitz continuous, we can pass to the limit as $\delta \longrightarrow 0.$

Using the condition (iii) of Theorem 3, we pass to limit as $l \longrightarrow \infty$ to obtain (77).

To end the proof, we assume $f = \tilde{f}$. Then, following the same lines as in [40], we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} (b - \tilde{b}) \operatorname{sign}_{0}^{+} (u - \tilde{u}) dx \le 0,$$
(80)

$$u = u, b = b a.e.$$
 in Ω .

5. Example

An example that is covered by our assumption is the following anisotropic \overrightarrow{p} (.)-harmonic problem: set

$$a_{i}\left(x,\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right) = \left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}\right|^{p_{i}(x)-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}}, \text{ where } p_{i}(.) = p \text{ for any } i = 1, \dots, N,$$
$$\beta(u) = (u-1)^{+} - (u-1)^{-}, F = (F_{i})_{i=1,\dots,N} \colon \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N}.$$
(81)

Then, we have the problem

$$ll(u-1)^{+} - (u-1)^{-} - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \right|^{p_{i}(x)-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_{i}} \right) + \operatorname{div} F(u) = f \text{ in } \Omega,$$

$$u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$
(82)

 $a_i(x,\xi)$ are Carathéodory functions satisfying the growth condition (4), the coercivity (6), and the monotonicity condition (5).

Since all the hypothesis of Theorem 2 are fulfilled, problem (82) has at least one solution for all $\in L^1(\Omega)$.

6. Conclusion

In the present study, we investigated the existence and uniqueness of solution of a class of anisotropic nonlinear elliptic problems defined with inclusion equation and Dirichlet boundary condition. Governing equations are solved by using the technic of monotone operators in Banach spaces and approximation methods. The novelty of this work relies on transposing nonlinear PDEs from classical (Lebesgue and Sobolev) spaces into generalized Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces with variable exponents. The main conclusions of this work are given as follows:

- (1) When the components of the vector *p*(.) = (p₁(.),..., p_N(.)) are able to vary, the problem (E, f) admits an unique renormalized so-lution in the anisotropic Sobolev space W₀^{1, *p*(.)}(Ω). Moreover if the graph is a nondecreasing function, the solution is unique.
- (2) The main result of this study extends the previous works in [25, 32] in the context of anisotropic space with variable exponent.

Data Availability

No data were used to support this study.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

References

- M. M. Gulzar, A. Aslam, M. Waqasl, and M. A. J. K. Hosseinzadeh, "A Nonlinear Mathematical Analysis for Magneto-Hyperbolic-tangent Liquid Featuring Simultaneous Aspects of Magnetic Feld, Heat Source and thermal Stratification," *Applied Nanoscience*, vol. 10, 2020.
- [2] B. Jalili, S. Sadighi, P. Jalili, and D. D. Ganji, "Characteristics of ferrofluid flow over a stretching sheet with suction and injection," *Case Studies in Thermal Engineering*, vol. 14, Article ID 100470, 2019.
- [3] B. Jalili, A. Mousavi, P. Jalili, A. Shateri, and D. Domiri Ganji, "Thermal analysis of fluid flow with heat generation for different logarithmic surfaces," *International Journal of Engineering*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 2291–2296, 2022.
- [4] M. Fallah Najafabadi, H. Talebi Rostami, K. Hosseinzadeh, and D. Domiri Ganji, "Thermal analysis of a moving fin using the radial basis function approximation," *Heat Transfer*, vol. 50, no. 8, pp. 7553–7567, 2021.
- [5] H. Yahyazadeh, D. Ganji, A. Yahyazadeh, T. Khalili, P. Jalili, and M. Jouya, "Evaluation of natural convection flow of a nanofluid over a linearly stretching sheet in the presence of magnetic field by the differential transformation method," *Thermal Science*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 1281–1287, 2012.
- [6] K. Hosseinzadeh, M. R. Mardani, S. Salehi, M. Paikar, M. Waqas, and D. D. Ganji, "Entropy generation of threedimensional Bödewadt flow of water and hexanol base fluid suspended by Fe3O4," *Pramana - Journal of Physics*, vol. 95, no. 2, 2021.
- [7] S. N. Antontsev and J. F. Rodrigues, "On stationary thermorheological viscous flows," *Annali dell'Universita di Ferrara*, vol. 52, pp. 19–36, 2006.
- [8] L. Diening, Theoretical and Numerical Results for Electrorheological Fluids, PhD. Thesis, University of Frieburg, Berlin, Germany, 2002.
- [9] P. Gwiazda, A. Świerczewska-Gwiazda, and A. Wròblewska, "Monotonicity methods in generalized Orlicz spaces for a class of non-Newtonian fluids," *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 125–137, 2010.

- [10] K. Rajagopal and M. Ruzicka, "Mathematical modeling of electrorheological materials," *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 59–78, 2001.
- [11] M. Ruzicka, Electrorheological Fluids: Modelling and Mathematical Theory, Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2000.
- [12] M. Bendahmane, M. Langlais, and M. Saad, "On some anisotropic reaction-diffusion systems with L1-data modeling the propagation of an epidemic diseaseL1-data modeling the propagation of an epidemic disease," *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 617–636, 2003.
- [13] Y. Chen, S. Levine, and M. Rao, "Variable exponent, linear growth functionals in image restoration," *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 1383–1406, 2006.
- [14] R. J. DiPerna and P.-L. Lions, "On the Cauchy problem for Boltzmann equations: global existence and weak stability," *Annals of Mathematics*, vol. 130, no. 2, pp. 321–366, 1989.
- [15] F. Andreu, N. Igbida, J. M. Mazon, and J. Toledo, "L1 existence and uniqueness results for quasi-linear elliptic equations with nonlinear boundary conditionsRésultats d'existence et d'unicité dans L1 pour des équations elliptiques quasilinéaires avec des conditions au bord non linéaires," *Annales De l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse Non Linéaire*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 61–89, 2007.
- [16] F. Andreu, N. Igbida, J. M. Mazon, and J. Toledo, "Obstacle problems for degenerate elliptic equations with nonlinear boundary conditions," *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, vol. 18, no. 11, pp. 1869–1893, 2008.
- [17] P. Gwiazda, P. Wittbold, A. Wròblewska, and A. Zimmermann, "Renormalized solutions of nonlinear elliptic problems in generalized Orlicz spaces," *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 253, no. 2, pp. 635–666, 2012.
- [18] N. Igbida, S. Ouaro, and S. Soma, "Elliptic problem involving diffuse measure data," *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 253, no. 12, pp. 3159–3183, 2012.
- [19] I. Nyanquini, S. Ouaro, and S. Soma, "Entropy solution to nonlinear multivalued elliptic problem with variable exponents and measure data," *Annals of the University of Craiova serive Mathematics Inform*.vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 174–198, 2013.
- [20] S. Ouaro, A. Ouédraogo, and S. Soma, "Multivalued homogeneous Neumann problem involving diffuse measure data and variable exponent," *Nonlinear Dynamics and Systems Theory*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 109–123, 2016.
- [21] P. Wittbold and A. Zimmermann, "Existence and uniqueness of renormalized solutions to nonlinear elliptic equations with variable exponents and -dataL1-data," *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 72, no. 6, pp. 2990–3008, 2010.
- [22] Y. Akdim and C. Allalou, "Existence of renormalized solutions of nonlinear elliptic problems in weighted variableexponent space," *Journal of Mathematical Study*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 375–397, 2015.
- [23] I. Ibrango and S. Ouaro, "Entropy solutions for anisotropic nonlinear Dirichlet problems," Annals of the University of Craiova, Mathematics Inform. vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 347–364, 2015.
- [24] I. Konaté and S. Ouaro, "Nonlinear multivalued problems with variable exponent diffuse measure data in anisotropic space," *Gulf Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 13–30, 2018.
- [25] I. Konaté and A. Ouédraogo, "Existence of renormalized solutions to nonlinear elliptic equations with variable exponents and Loo-data," *Journal of Pure and Applied Functional Analysis*, vol. 8, pp. 261–277, 2023.

- [26] M. Mihailescu, P. Pucci, and V. Radulescu, "Eigenvalue problems for anisotropic quasi-linear elliptic equations with variable exponent," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 340, no. 1, pp. 687–698, 2008.
- [27] M. Mihailescu, P. Pucci, and V. Radulescu, "Nonhomogeneous boundary value problems in anisotropic Sobolev spaces," *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, vol. 345, no. 10, pp. 561–566, 2007.
- [28] B. Koné, S. Ouaro, and S. Traoré, "Weak solutions for anisotropic nonlinear elliptic equations with variable exponents," *The Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 144, pp. 1–11, 2009.
- [29] B. Koné, S. Ouaro, and S. Soma, "Weak solutions for anisotropic nonlinear elliptic problem with variable exponent and measure data," *International Journal of Evolution Equations*, vol. 5, pp. 1–23, 2011.
- [30] B. K. Bonzi, S. Ouaro, and F. D. Y. Zongo, "Entropy solution for nonlinear elliptic anisotropic homogeneous Neumann Problem," *International Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 2013, Article ID 476781, 14 pages, 2013.
- [31] S. Ouaro, "Well-posedness results for anisotropic nonlinear elliptic equations with variable exponent and L¹-DataL1data," *Cubo (Temuco)*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 133–148, 2010.
- [32] Y. Akdim, M. Elansari, and S. L Rhali, "Existence of a renormalized solution for some nonlinear anisotropic elliptic problems," *Gulf Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 6, 2018.
- [33] X. Fan, "Anisotropic variable exponent Sobolev spaces and -Laplacian equationsp.-Laplacien equations. Complex variable and Elliptic equations," *Complex Variables and Elliptic Equations*, vol. 56, no. 7-9, pp. 623–642, 2011.
- [34] X. Fan and D. Zhao, "On the Spaces Lp(x)(Ω) and Wm,p(x)(Ω)LpxΩ and W1,pxΩ," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 263, no. 2, pp. 424–446, 2001.
- [35] O. Kovacik and J. Rakosnik, "On spaces L p(x) and W k,p(x)," *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 592– 618, 1991.
- [36] M. Troisi, "Teoremi di inclusione per spazi di Sobolev non isotropi," *Ricerche di Matematica*, vol. 18, pp. 3–24, 1969.
- [37] H. Brezis, Opérateurs maximaux monotones et semigroupes de contraction dans les espaces de Hilbert, North Holland, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 1973.
- [38] J. L. Lions, *Quelques Méthodes de Résolution des Problèmes aux Limites NonLinéaires*, Dunod, France, Paris, 1969.
- [39] T. Valea and A. Ouédraogo, "Existence and uniqueness of renormalized solution to multivalued homogeneous Neumann problem with L1data," *Gulf Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 46–66, 2022.
- [40] Y. Akdim, M. E. Ansari, and S. L. Rhali, "Solvability of Some Stefan Type Problems," 2022, https://arxiv.org/abs/2205. 06357.