# INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATIONS (USA) 

# Communications on Applied Nonlinear Analysis <br> Volume 17(2010), Number 4, 81-88 

# Pohozaev's Identity and Non-existence of Solutions for Elliptic Systems 

Philip Korman<br>University of Cincinnati<br>Department of Mathematical Sciences<br>Cincinnati Ohio 45221-0025<br>Communicated by the Editors<br>(Received August 28, 2010; Accepted September 25, 2010)


#### Abstract

We extend the classical Pohozaev's identity to semilinear elliptic systems of Hamiltonian type, providing an alternative and simpler approach to the results of E. Mitidieri [8], R.C.A.M. Van der Vorst [15], and Y. Bozhkov and E. Mitidieri [2].
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## 1 Introduction

Any solution $u(x)$ of semilinear Dirichlet problem on a bounded domain $\Omega \subset R^{n}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta u+f(u)=0 \text { in } \Omega, \quad u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

satisfies the well known Pohozaev's identity

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega}[2 n F(u)+(2-n) u f(u)] d x=\int_{\partial \Omega}(x \cdot \nu)|\nabla u|^{2} d S \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $F(u)=\int_{0}^{u} f(t) d t$, and $\nu$ is the unit normal vector on $\partial \Omega$, pointing outside. (From the equation (1.1), $\int_{\Omega} u f(u) d x=\int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{2} d x$, which gives an alternative form of the Pohozaev's identity.) A standard use of this identity is to conclude that if $\Omega$ is a star-shaped domain with respect to the origin, i.e. $x \cdot \nu \geq 0$ for all $x \in \partial \Omega$, and $f(u)=u|u|^{p-1}$, for some constant $p$, then
the problem (1.1) has no non-trivial solution in the super-critical case, when $p>\frac{n+2}{n-2}$. In this note we present a proof of Pohozaev's identity, which appears a little more straightforward than the usual one, see e.g. L. Evans [3], and then use a similar idea for systems, generalizing the well-known results of E. Mitidieri [8]. After completing this work, we found out that this result appeared previously in Y. Bozhkov and E. Mitidieri [2]. However, our proof is different, and it appears to be much simpler. Similarly, we derive Pohozhaev's identity for a version of $p$-Laplace equation.

Let $z=x \cdot \nabla u=\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i} u_{x_{i}}$. It is easy to verify that $z$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta z+f^{\prime}(u) z=-2 f(u) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We multiply the equation (1.1) by $z$, and subtract from that the equation (1.3) multiplied by $u$, obtaining

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Sigma_{i=1}^{n}\left[\left(z u_{x_{i}}-u z_{x_{i}}\right)_{x_{i}}+x_{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}(2 F(u)-u f(u))\right]=2 f(u) u \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Clearly,

$$
\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} x_{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}(2 F-u f)=\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\left[x_{i}(2 F-u f)\right]-n(2 F-u f)
$$

We then rewrite (1.4)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\left(z u_{x_{i}}-u z_{x_{i}}\right)+x_{i}(2 F(u)-u f(u))\right]_{x_{i}}=2 n F(u)+(2-n) u f(u) . \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Integrating over $\Omega$, we conclude the Pohozaev's identity (1.2). (The only non-zero boundary term is $\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \int_{\partial \Omega} z u_{x_{i}} \nu_{i} d S$. Since $\partial \Omega$ is a level set of $u, \nu= \pm \frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}$, i.e. $u_{x_{i}}= \pm|\nabla u| \nu_{i}$. Then $z= \pm(x \cdot \nu)|\nabla u|$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_{x_{i}} \nu_{i}= \pm|\nabla u|$.)

It appears natural to refer to (1.5) as a differential form of Pohozaev's identity. For radial solutions on a ball, the corresponding version of (1.5) played a crucial role in the study of exact multiplicity of solutions, see T. Ouyang and J. Shi [9], and also P. Korman [6].

## 2 Non-existence of solutions for a class of systems

The following class of systems has attracted considerable attention recently

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta u+H_{v}(u, v)=0 \text { in } \Omega, \quad u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \\
& \Delta v+H_{u}(u, v)=0 \text { in } \Omega, \quad v=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{2.1}
\end{align*}
$$

where $H(u, v)$ is a given differentiable function, see e.g. the following surveys: D.G. de Figueiredo [4], P. Quittner and P. Souplet [13], B. Ruf [14], see also P. Korman [5]. This system is of Hamiltonian type, which implies that it has some of the properties of scalar equations.

More generally, we assume that $H\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, \ldots, u_{m}, v_{1}, v_{2}, \ldots, v_{m}\right)$, with integer $m \geq 1$, and consider the Hamiltonian system of $2 m$ equations

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta u_{k}+H_{v_{k}}=0 \text { in } \Omega, \quad u_{k}=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega, \quad k=1,2, \ldots, m \\
& \Delta v_{k}+H_{u_{k}}=0 \text { in } \Omega, \quad v_{k}=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega, \quad k=1,2, \ldots, m . \tag{2.2}
\end{align*}
$$

We call solution of (2.2) to be positive, if $u_{k}(x)>0$ and $v_{k}(x)>0$ for all $x \in \Omega$, and all $k$. We consider only the classical solutions, with $u_{k}$ and $v_{k}$ of class $C^{2}(\Omega) \cap C^{1}(\bar{\Omega})$. We have the following generalization of Pohozaev's identity, see also [2].

Theorem 2.1 Assume that $H\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, \ldots, u_{m}, v_{1}, v_{2}, \ldots, v_{m}\right) \in C^{2}\left(R_{+}^{m} \times R_{+}^{m}\right) \cap C\left(\bar{R}_{+}^{m} \times \bar{R}_{+}^{m}\right)$. For any positive solution of (2.2), and any real numbers $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{m}$, one has

$$
\begin{gather*}
\int_{\Omega}\left[2 n H(u, v)+(2-n) \Sigma_{k=1}^{m}\left(a_{k} u_{k} H_{u_{k}}+\left(2-a_{k}\right) v_{k} H_{v_{k}}\right)\right] d x  \tag{2.3}\\
=2 \Sigma_{k=1}^{m} \int_{\partial \Omega}(x \cdot \nu)\left|\nabla u_{k}\right|\left|\nabla v_{k}\right| d S
\end{gather*}
$$

Proof. Define $p_{k}=x \cdot \nabla u_{k}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i} u_{k x_{i}}$, and $q_{k}=x \cdot \nabla v=\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i} v_{k x_{i}}, k=1,2, \ldots, m$. These functions satisfy the system

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta p_{k}+\Sigma_{j=1}^{m} H_{v_{k} u_{j}} p_{j}+\Sigma_{j=1}^{m} H_{v_{k} v_{j}} q_{j}=-2 H_{v_{k}}, \quad k=1,2, \ldots, m \\
& \Delta q_{k}+\Sigma_{j=1}^{m} H_{u_{k} u_{j}} p_{j}+\Sigma_{j=1}^{m} H_{u_{k} v_{j}} q_{j}=-2 H_{u_{k}}, \quad k=1,2, \ldots, m \tag{2.4}
\end{align*}
$$

We multiply the first equation in (2.2) by $q_{k}$, and subtract from that the first equation in (2.4) multiplied by $v_{k}$. The result can be written as

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\left(u_{k x_{i}} q_{k}-p_{k x_{i}} v_{k}\right)_{x_{i}}+\left(-u_{k x_{i}} q_{k x_{i}}+v_{k x_{i}} p_{k x_{i}}\right)\right] \\
+H_{v_{k}} q_{k}-\sum_{j=1}^{m} H_{v_{k} u_{j}} p_{j} v_{k}-\sum_{j=1}^{m} H_{v_{k} v_{j}} q_{j} v_{k}=2 v_{k} H_{v_{k}} . \tag{2.5}
\end{align*}
$$

Similarly, we multiply the second equation in (2.2) by $p_{k}$, and subtract from that the second equation in (2.4) multiplied by $u_{k}$, and write the result as

$$
\begin{gather*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\left(v_{k x_{i}} p_{k}-q_{k x_{i}} u_{k}\right)_{x_{i}}+\left(-v_{k x_{i}} p_{k x_{i}}+u_{k x_{i}} q_{k x_{i}}\right)\right] \\
+H_{u_{k}} p_{k}-\Sigma_{j=1}^{m} H_{u_{k} u_{j}} p_{j} u_{k}-\Sigma_{j=1}^{m} H_{u_{k} v_{j}} q_{j} u_{k}=2 u_{k} H_{u_{k}} . \tag{2.6}
\end{gather*}
$$

Adding the equations (2.5) and (2.6), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Sigma_{i=1}^{n}\left[u_{k x_{i}} q_{k}-p_{k x_{i}} v_{k}+v_{k x_{i}} p_{k}-q_{k x_{i}} u_{k}\right]_{x_{i}}+H_{u_{k}} p_{k}+H_{v_{k}} q_{k}-\Sigma_{j=1}^{m} H_{u_{k} u_{j}} p_{j} u_{k} \\
& \quad-\sum_{j=1}^{m} H_{u_{k} v_{j}} q_{j} u_{k}-\sum_{j=1}^{m} H_{v_{k} u_{j}} p_{j} v_{k}-\sum_{j=1}^{m} H_{v_{k} v_{j}} q_{j} v_{k}=2 u_{k} H_{u_{k}}+2 v_{k} H_{v_{k}}
\end{aligned}
$$

We now sum in $k$, then switch the orders of summation in $i$ and $k$ in the second group of terms on the left (the ones involving $H$ ), putting the result into the form

$$
\begin{gathered}
\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[u_{k x_{i}} q_{k}-p_{k x_{i}} v_{k}+v_{k x_{i}} p_{k}-q_{k x_{i}} u_{k}\right]_{x_{i}} \\
+\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}\left(2 H-\sum_{k=1}^{m} u_{k} H_{u_{k}}-\sum_{k=1}^{m} v_{k} H_{v_{k}}\right)_{x_{i}}=2 \sum_{k=1}^{m} u_{k} H_{u_{k}}+2 \sum_{k=1}^{m} v_{k} H_{v_{k}} .
\end{gathered}
$$

Writing,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\left(2 H-\Sigma_{k=1}^{m} u_{k} H_{u_{k}}-\Sigma_{k=1}^{m} v_{k} H_{v_{k}}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\left[x_{i}\left(2 H-\Sigma_{k=1}^{m} u_{k} H_{u_{k}}-\Sigma_{k=1}^{m} v_{k} H_{v_{k}}\right)\right] \\
-n\left(2 H-\sum_{k=1}^{m} u_{k} H_{u_{k}}-\Sigma_{k=1}^{m} v_{k} H_{v_{k}}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

we obtain the differential form of Pohozaev's identity

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Sigma_{k=1}^{m} \Sigma_{i=1}^{n}\left[u_{k x_{i}} q_{k}-p_{k x_{i}} v_{k}+v_{k x_{i}} p_{k}-q_{k x_{i}} u_{k}+x_{i}\left(2 H-\Sigma_{k=1}^{m} u_{k} H_{u_{k}}-\Sigma_{k=1}^{m} v_{k} H_{v_{k}}\right)\right]_{x_{i}} \\
=2 n H+(2-n)\left(\Sigma_{k=1}^{m} u_{k} H_{u_{k}}+\Sigma_{k=1}^{m} v_{k} H_{v_{k}}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

Integrating, we obtain as before

$$
\begin{gather*}
\int_{\Omega}\left[2 n H(u, v)+(2-n)\left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} u_{k} H_{u_{k}}+\sum_{k=1}^{m} v_{k} H_{v_{k}}\right)\right] d x  \tag{2.7}\\
\quad=2 \sum_{k=1}^{m} \int_{\partial \Omega}(x \cdot \nu)\left|\nabla u_{k}\right|\left|\nabla v_{k}\right| d S
\end{gather*}
$$

(Since we consider positive solutions, and $\partial \Omega$ is a level set for both $u_{k}$ and $v_{k}$, we have $\nu=-\frac{\nabla u_{k}}{\left|\nabla u_{k}\right|}=-\frac{\nabla v_{k}}{\left|\nabla v_{k}\right|}$, i.e., $u_{k i}=-\left|\nabla u_{k}\right| \nu_{i}$ and $v_{k i}=\left|\nabla v_{k}\right| \nu_{i}$ on the boundary $\partial \Omega$.) From the first equation in (2.1), $\int_{\Omega} v_{k} H_{v_{k}} d x=\int_{\Omega} \nabla u_{k} \cdot \nabla v_{k} d x$, while from the second equation $\int_{\Omega} u_{k} H_{u_{k}} d x=\int_{\Omega} \nabla u_{k} \cdot \nabla v_{k} d x$, i.e., for each $k$

$$
\int_{\Omega} v_{k} H_{v_{k}} d x=\int_{\Omega} u_{k} H_{u_{k}} d x
$$

Using this in (2.7), we conclude the proof.
Remark Here and later on, we consider only the classical solutions. Observe that by our conditions and elliptic regularity, classical solutions are in fact of class $C^{3}(\Omega)$, so that all quantities in the above proof are well defined. Also, it suffices to assume that $\Omega$ is starshaped with respect to any one of its points (which we then take to be the origin).

As a consequence, we have the following non-existence result.
Proposition 1 Assume that $\Omega$ is a star-shaped domain with respect to the origin, and for some real constants $\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{m}$, and all $u_{k}>0, v_{k}>0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
n H+(2-n) \sum_{k=1}^{m}\left(\alpha_{k} u_{k} H_{u_{k}}+\left(1-\alpha_{k}\right) v_{k} H_{v_{k}}\right)<0 \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then the problem (2.2) has no positive solutions.
Proof. We use the identity (2.3), with $a_{k} / 2=\alpha_{k}$. Then, assuming existence of positive solution, the left hand side of (2.3) is negative, while the right hand side is non-negative, a contradiction.

Example Assume that $m=2$, and consider $H\left(u_{1}, v_{1}, u_{2}, v_{2}\right)=\frac{1}{p}\left(v_{1}^{p}+v_{2}^{p}\right)+u_{1}^{r} u_{2}^{s}$, with $p>\frac{2 n}{n-2}$, and $r+s>\frac{2 n}{n-2}$. Then the inequality (2.8) holds, with $\alpha_{1}=\alpha_{2}=\frac{1}{2}$. It follows that the system

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Delta u_{1}+v_{1}^{p-1}=0 \quad \text { in } \Omega, \quad u_{1}=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \\
& \Delta v_{1}+r u_{1}^{r-1} u_{2}^{s}=0 \quad \text { in } \Omega, \quad v_{1}=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega, \\
& \Delta u_{2}+v_{2}^{p-1}=0 \quad \text { in } \Omega, \quad u_{2}=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \\
& \Delta v_{2}+s u_{1}^{r} u_{2}^{s-1}=0 \quad \text { in } \Omega, \quad v_{2}=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega
\end{aligned}
$$

has no positive solutions.
In case $m=1$, we recover the following result of E. Mitidieri [8]. We provide some details, in order to point out that some restrictions in [8] can be relaxed.

Proposition 2 Assume that $\Omega$ is a star-shaped domain with respect to the origin, and for some real constant $\alpha$, and all $u>0, v>0$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha u H_{u}(u, v)+(1-\alpha) v H_{v}(u, v)>\frac{n}{n-2} H(u, v) . \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then the problem (2.1) has no positive solution.
Comparing this result to E. Mitidieri[8], observe that we do not require that $H_{u}(0,0)=$ $H_{v}(0,0)=0$.

An important subclass of (2.1) is

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta u+f(v)=0 \text { in } \Omega, \quad u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \\
& \Delta v+g(u)=0 \text { in } \Omega, \quad v=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{2.10}
\end{align*}
$$

which corresponds to $H(u, v)=F(v)+G(u)$, where as before, $F(v)=\int_{0}^{v} f(t) d t, G(u)=$ $\int_{0}^{u} g(t) d t$. Unlike [8], we do not require that $f(0)=g(0)=0$. The Theorem 2.1 now reads as follows.

Theorem 2.2 Let $f, g \in C\left(\bar{R}_{+}\right)$. For any positive solution of (2.10), and any real number a, one has

$$
\begin{gather*}
\int_{\Omega}[2 n(F(v)+G(u))+(2-n)(a v f(v)+(2-a) u g(u))] d x  \tag{2.11}\\
=2 \int_{\partial \Omega}(x \cdot \nu)|\nabla u \| \nabla v| d S
\end{gather*}
$$

We now consider a particular system

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta u+v^{p}=0 \text { in } \Omega, \quad u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega  \tag{2.12}\\
& \Delta v+g(u)=0 \text { in } \Omega, v=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega
\end{align*}
$$

with $g(u) \in C\left(\bar{R}_{+}\right)$, and a constant $p>0$.
Theorem 2.3 Assume that $\Omega$ is a star-shaped domain with respect to the origin, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
n G(u)+(2-n)\left(1-\frac{n}{(n-2)(p+1)}\right) u g(u)<0, \quad \text { for all } u>0 \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then the problem (2.12) has no positive solution.
Proof. We use Pohozaev's identity (2.11), with $f(v)=v^{p}$. We select the constant $a$, so that

$$
2 n F(v)+(2-n) a v f(v)=0
$$

i.e., $a=\frac{2 n}{(n-2)(p+1)}$. Then, assuming existence of a positive solution, the left hand side of (2.11) is negative, while the right hand side is non-negative, a contradiction.

Observe that in case $p=1$, the Theorem 2.3 provides a non-existence result for a biharmonic problem with Navier boundary conditions (in E. Mitidieri [8], a separate identity was used to cover the biharmonic case)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta^{2} u=g(u) \text { in } \Omega, \quad u=\Delta u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proposition 3 Assume that $\Omega$ is a star-shaped domain with respect to the origin, and the condition (2.13) holds. Then the problem (2.14) has no positive solution.

Finally, we consider the system

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta u+v^{p}=0 \text { in } \Omega, \quad u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \\
& \Delta v+u^{q}=0 \text { in } \Omega, \quad v=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega . \tag{2.15}
\end{align*}
$$

The curve $\frac{1}{p+1}+\frac{1}{q+1}=\frac{n-2}{n}$ is called a critical hyperbola. We recover the following well known result of E. Mitidieri [8], see also R.C.A.M. Van der Vorst [15]. (Observe that we relax the restriction $p, q>1$ from [8].)

Proposition 4 Assume that $p, q>0$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{p+1}+\frac{1}{q+1}<\frac{n-2}{n} \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then the problem (2.15) has no positive solution.
Proof. Condition (2.16) is equivalent to (2.13), and the Theorem 2.3 applies.
In case $p=1$, we have the following known result, see E. Mitidieri [8].
Proposition 5 Assume that $\Omega$ is a star-shaped domain with respect to the origin, and $q>$ $\frac{n+4}{n-4}$. Then the problem

$$
\Delta^{2} u=u^{q} \text { in } \Omega, u=\Delta u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega
$$

has no positive solutions.

## 3 Pohozhaev's identity for a version of $p$-Laplace equation

We consider the following version of $p$-Laplace equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \varphi\left(u_{x_{i}}\right)+f(u)=0 \text { in } \Omega, u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $\varphi(t)=t|t|^{p-2}$, with a constant $p>1$. This is a variational equation for the functional $\int_{\Omega}\left[\frac{1}{p}\left(\left|u_{x_{1}}\right|^{p}+\ldots+\left|u_{x_{n}}\right|^{p}\right)-F(u)\right] d x$. This equation is known to the experts, see P . Lindqvist [7], but it has not been studied much.

Observe that $\varphi(a t)=a^{p-1} \varphi(t)$, for any constant $a>0$. Also, $\varphi^{\prime}(t)=(p-1)|t|^{p-2}$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
t \varphi^{\prime}(t)=(p-1) \varphi(t) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Letting, as before, $z=x \cdot \nabla u=\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i} u_{x_{i}}$, we see that $z$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\left[\varphi^{\prime}\left(u_{x_{i}}\right) z_{x_{i}}\right]+f^{\prime}(u) z=-p f(u) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

To derive (3.3), we consider $u^{s}(x) \equiv u(s x)$, which satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \varphi\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} u^{s}\right)=-s^{p} f\left(u^{s}\right) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

(To see that, it is convenient to write (3.1) as $\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \varphi^{\prime}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} u\right) \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial x_{i}^{2}} u+f(u)=0$.) Then differentiating (3.4) with respect to $s$, and setting $s=1$, we obtain (3.3). (Alternatively, to derive (3.3), one could differentiate (3.1) in $x_{j}$, then multiply by $x_{j}$, and sum in $j$.)

Proposition 6 Any solution of (3.1) satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega}[p n F(u)+(p-n) u f(u)] d x=(p-1) \int_{\partial \Omega}(x \cdot \nu)|\nabla u| \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \varphi\left(|\nabla u| \nu_{i}\right) \nu_{i} d S \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\nu_{i}$ is the $i$-th component of $\nu$, the unit normal vector on $\partial \Omega$, pointing outside.

Proof. Multiply the equation (3.1) by $z$, and write the result as

$$
\begin{equation*}
(p-1) \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\left[z \varphi\left(u_{x_{i}}\right)\right]-(p-1) \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \varphi\left(u_{x_{i}}\right) z_{x_{i}}+(p-1) f(u) z=0 \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiply the equation (3.3) by $u$, and write the result as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\left[u \varphi^{\prime}\left(u_{x_{i}}\right) z_{x_{i}}\right]-\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} u_{x_{i}} \varphi^{\prime}\left(u_{x_{i}}\right) z_{x_{i}}+f^{\prime}(u) u z=-p u f(u) \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

We now subtract (3.7) from (3.6). In view of (3.2), we have a cancellation, and so we obtain

$$
\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\left[(p-1) z \varphi\left(u_{x_{i}}\right)-u \varphi^{\prime}\left(u_{x_{i}}\right) z_{x_{i}}\right]+\left[(p-1) f(u)-u f^{\prime}(u)\right] z=p u f(u)
$$

As before,

$$
\begin{align*}
& {\left[(p-1) f(u)-u f^{\prime}(u)\right] z=\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}(p F(u)-u f(u))}  \tag{3.8}\\
& \quad=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\left[x_{i}(p F(u)-u f(u))\right]-n(p F(u)-u f(u))
\end{align*}
$$

This gives us a differential form of Pohozaev's identity

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} & {\left[(p-1) z \varphi\left(u_{x_{i}}\right)-u \varphi^{\prime}\left(u_{x_{i}}\right) z_{x_{i}}+x_{i}(p F(u)-u f(u))\right] }  \tag{3.9}\\
& =p n F(u)+(p-n) u f(u)
\end{align*}
$$

Integrating, and using the divergence theorem, we conclude the proof.
For star-shaped domains, the right hand side of (3.5) is non-negative, so if

$$
p n F(u)+(p-n) u f(u)<0 \text { for all } u
$$

then the problem (3.1) has no non-trivial solutions.
Example For star-shaped domains, the problem

$$
\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \varphi\left(u_{x_{i}}\right)+u|u|^{r-1}=0 \text { in } \Omega, u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega
$$

has no non-trivial solutions, provided the constant $r$ satisfies $r>\frac{n p-n+p}{n-p}$.
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