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Abstract. We study the concentration and multiplicity of weak solutions to the Kirchhoff type equation with critical Sobolev growth

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\left(\varepsilon^{2} a+\varepsilon b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right) \Delta u+V(z) u=f(u)+u^{5} \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3} \\
u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right), u>0 \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\varepsilon$ is a small positive parameter and $a, b>0$ are constants, $f \in C^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{+}, \mathbb{R}\right)$ is subcritical, $V: \mathbb{R}^{3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a locally Hölder continuous function. We first prove that for $\varepsilon_{0}>0$ sufficiently small, the above problem has a weak solution $u_{\varepsilon}$ with exponential decay at infinity. Moreover, $u_{\varepsilon}$ concentrates around a local minimum point of $V$ in $\Lambda$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. With minimax theorems and Ljusternik-Schnirelmann theory, we also obtain multiple solutions by employing the topology construct of the set where the potential $V(z)$ attains its minimum.
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## 1. Introduction and Main Result

In this paper, we study the Kirchhoff type equation

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\left(\left(\varepsilon^{2} a+\varepsilon b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right) \Delta u+V(z) u=f(u)+u^{5} \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3},\right. \\
u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right), u>0 \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3},
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\varepsilon$ is a small positive parameter, $a, b>0$ are constants and $f$ is a continuous subcritical and superlinear nonlinearity. Such problems are often referred to as being nonlocal because of the presence of the term $\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right) \Delta u$ which implies that problem $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$ is no longer a pointwise identity. Problem $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$ is a variant type of the following Dirichlet problem of Kirchhoff type

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\left(a+b \int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{2}\right) \Delta u=f(z, u) \text { in } \Omega  \tag{1.1}\\
u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega
\end{array}\right.
$$

which is related to the stationary analogue of the equation

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
u_{t t}-\left(a+b \int_{\Omega}|\nabla u|^{2}\right) \Delta u=f(z, u) \text { in } \Omega  \tag{1.2}\\
u=0 \text { on } \partial \Omega
\end{array}\right.
$$

proposed by Kirchhoff in [14] as an existence of the classical D'Alembert's wave equations for free vibration of elastic strings. Kirchhoff's model takes into account the changes in length of the string produced by transverse vibrations. In $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right), u$ denotes the displacement, $f(z, u)$ the external force and $b$ the initial tension while $a$ is related to the intrinsic properties of the string (such as Young's modulus). We have to point out that nonlocal problems also appear in other fields as biological systems, where $u$ describes a process which depends on the average of itself (for example, population density). After the pioneer work of Lions [18], where a functional analysis approach was proposed, Problem $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$ began to call attention of several researchers. In [2], Arosio and Panizzi studied the Cauchy-Dirichlet type problem related to (1.2) in the Hadamard sense as a special case of an abstract second-order Cauchy problem in a Hilbert space. Ma and Rivera In [19] obtained positive solutions of such problems by using variational methods. A nontrivial solution of (1.1) was obtained via Yang index and critical group by Perera and Zhang in [25]. In [12], He and Zou obtained infinitely many solutions of (1.1) by using local minimum method and the fountain theorem. In [8], (1.1) was studied with concave and convex nonlinearities by using Nehari manifold and fibering map methods, and multiple positive solutions were obtained. For more result, we can refer to [2, 1, 19] and the references therein.

We note that problem $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$ with $b=0$ is motivated by the search for standing wave solutions for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, which is one of the main subjects in nonlinear analysis. Different approaches have been taken to deal with this problem under various hypotheses on the potentials and the nonlinearity (see [11, 20, 21, 22, 26, 9, 29, 23] and so on).

For $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$ without the critical growth, it seems that the first existence result of concentration solutions and multiple solutions for small $\varepsilon$ was obtained by He and Zou in [13]. While for the critical growth, in [30], Wang, Tian, Xu and Zhang considered ( $E_{\varepsilon}$ ) with $f(u)$ replaced by $\lambda f(u)$ and obtained some interesting results, where $\lambda>0$ is a large parameter. It was proved in [30] that ground state solutions and multiple solutions exist for large $\lambda>0$ under the condition $\inf _{x \in \mathbb{R}^{3}} V(x)<\liminf _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V(x)$. Moreover, if $\inf _{x \in \mathbb{R}^{3}} V(x)=\liminf _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V(x)=V^{\infty}$ and $V(v) \not \equiv V^{\infty},\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$ does not has ground state solutions. We point out here that to overcome the obstacle due to the appearance of the critical nonlinearity $u^{5}$, the parameter $\lambda>0$ should be large enough in 30].

In this paper, we will consider $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$ (without the parameter $\lambda$ before $f(u)$ ) and study the existence of concentration solutions in the case that $V(x)$ has local minimum points. Our assumptions are as follows.
$V$ is a locally Hölder continuous function satisfying for some positive constant $\alpha$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
V(z) \geq \alpha>0 \text { for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^{3} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\inf _{\Lambda} V<\min _{\partial \Lambda} V \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some open bounded set $\Lambda$.
$f \in C^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{+}, \mathbb{R}\right)$ satisfies:
$\left(f_{1}\right) f(s)=o\left(s^{3}\right)$ as $s \rightarrow 0^{+}$;
$\left(f_{2}\right)$ The function $\frac{f(s)}{s^{3}}$ is strictly increasing for $s>0$;
$\left(f_{3}\right) \exists \lambda>0$ such that $f(s) \geq \lambda s^{q_{1}}$ for some $3 \leq q_{1}<5$ (If $q_{1}=3$, we require a sufficiently large $\lambda$, otherwise $\lambda$ can be fixed);
$\left(f_{4}\right) f(s) \leq C\left(1+|s|^{q-1}\right)$ for some $C>0$ where $4<q<6$.
It follows from $\left(f_{1}\right),\left(f_{2}\right)$ that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0<4 F(s) \leq f(s) s \text { for all } s>0 \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $F(s)=\int_{0}^{s} f(\tau) d \tau$.
As we are interested in positive solutions, we define $f(s)=0$ for $s \leq 0$.
We define

$$
H:=\left\{u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z) u^{2}<\infty .\right\}
$$

with the norm

$$
\|u\|_{H}=\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} a|\nabla u|^{2}+V(z) u^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

We call $u \in H$ a weak solution to $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$ if for any $\varphi \in H$ it holds that

$$
\left(\varepsilon^{2} a+\varepsilon b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \nabla u \nabla \varphi+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z) u \varphi=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(f(u)+\left(u^{+}\right)^{5}\right) \varphi .
$$

For $I \in C^{1}(H, \mathbb{R})$, we say that $I$ satisfies Palais-Smale condition ((P.S.) condition in short) if any sequence $\left\{u_{n}\right\} \subset H$ with $I\left(u_{n}\right)$ bounded, $I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0$, has a convergent subsequence in $H$.

Our main results are as follows:
Theorem 1.1. Suppose that the potential $V$ satisfies $\left(V_{1}\right),\left(V_{2}\right)$ and $f \in C^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{+}, \mathbb{R}\right)$ satisfies $\left(f_{1}\right)-\left(f_{4}\right)$. Then there is an $\varepsilon_{0}>0$ such that problem $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$ possesses a positive weak solution $u_{\varepsilon} \in H$ for all $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right]$. Moreover, $u_{\varepsilon}$ possesses a maximum $z_{\varepsilon} \in \Lambda$ such that $V\left(z_{\varepsilon}\right) \rightarrow$ $\inf _{\Lambda} V$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{\varepsilon} \leq \alpha \exp \left(-\frac{\beta}{\varepsilon}\left|z-z_{\varepsilon}\right|\right), z \in \mathbb{R}^{3} \text { and } \varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right] \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some positive constants $\alpha, \beta$.
In order to get the multiple solutions for $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$, we need one more assumption:

$$
\begin{equation*}
M:=\left\{z \in \Lambda \mid V(z)=\inf _{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\xi)\right\} \neq \emptyset \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We recall that, if $Y$ is a closed set of a topological space of $X$, $\operatorname{cat}_{X}(Y)$ is the LjusternikSchnirelmann category of $Y$ in $X$, namely the least number of closed and contractible sets in $X$ which cover $Y$. We denote by

$$
M_{\delta}:=\left\{z \in \mathbb{R}^{3} \mid \operatorname{dist}(z, M) \leq \delta\right\}
$$

the closed $\delta$-neighborhood of $M$, and we shall prove the following multiplicity result

Theorem 1.2. Suppose that the potential $V$ satisfies $\left(V_{1}\right),\left(V_{2}\right),\left(V_{3}\right)$, and $f \in C^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{+}, \mathbb{R}\right)$ satisfies $\left(f_{1}\right)-\left(f_{4}\right)$. Then, for any $\delta>0$ given, there exists $\varepsilon_{\delta}>0$ such that, for any $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{\delta}\right)$, the Equation $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$ has at least cat $M_{M_{\delta}}(M)$ solutions. Furthermore, if $u_{\varepsilon}$ denotes one of these solutions and $u_{\varepsilon}$ possesses a maximum $z_{\varepsilon} \in \Lambda$, then
(i) $\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} V\left(z_{\varepsilon}\right)=\inf _{\Lambda} V$;
(ii) $u_{\varepsilon} \leq \alpha \exp \left(-\frac{\beta}{\varepsilon}\left|z-z_{\varepsilon}\right|\right)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$ and $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{\delta}\right)$ for some positive constants $\alpha$, $\beta$.

Remark 1.3. If we replace $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ by $\Omega$, where $\Omega$ is a smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ (possibly unbounded), then Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 remain true.

The proof is based on variational method. The main difficulties lie in the appearance of the non-local term and the lack of compactness due to the unboundedness of the domain $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ and the nonlinearity with the critical Sobolev growth. As we will see later, the competing effect of the nonlocal term with the nonlinearity $f(u)$ and the lack of compactness of the embedding prevent us from using the variational methods in a standard way.

To complete this section, we outline the sketch of our proof.
Define $f(s)=0$ for $s \leq 0$. We will work with the following equation equivalent to ( $E_{\varepsilon}$ )

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right) \Delta u+V(\varepsilon z) u=f(u)+u^{5} \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3},  \tag{E}\\
u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right), u>0 \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3}
\end{array}\right.
$$

The energy functional corresponding to $\left(\hat{E}_{\varepsilon}\right)$ is

$$
I_{\varepsilon}(u)=\frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u^{2}+\frac{b}{4}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right)^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(F(u)+\frac{1}{6}\left(u^{+}\right)^{6}\right), u \in H_{\varepsilon},
$$

where $H_{\varepsilon}:=\left\{u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u^{2}<\infty\right.$. $\}$ endowed with the norm

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{\varepsilon}=\left(a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} . \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Unlike [13] and [30], where the minimum of $V(x)$ is global and the mountain-pass lemma can be used globally, here in the present paper, the condition $\left(V_{2}\right)$ is local, hence we need to use a local mountain-pass argument introduced in [23], which also helps us to overcome the obstacle caused by the non-compactness due to the unboundedness of the domain. To this end, we should modify the nonlinear terms.

For the bounded domain $\Lambda$ given in $\left(V_{2}\right), k>2, a^{\prime}>0$ such that $f\left(a^{\prime}\right)+\left(a^{\prime}\right)^{5}=\frac{\alpha}{k} a^{\prime}$ where $\alpha$ is mentioned in $\left(V_{1}\right)$, we consider a new problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right) \Delta u+V(\varepsilon z) u=g(\varepsilon z, u) \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3} \tag{E}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
g(z, s)=\chi(z)\left(f(s)+\left(s^{+}\right)^{5}\right)+(1-\chi(z)) \tilde{f}(s)
$$

with

$$
\tilde{f}(s)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
f(s)+\left(s^{+}\right)^{5} \text { if } s \leq a^{\prime} \\
\frac{\alpha}{k} s \text { if } s>a^{\prime}
\end{array}\right.
$$

and $\chi(z)$ is a smooth function such that $\chi(z)=1$ on $\Lambda, 0 \leq \chi(z) \leq 1$ on $\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda, \chi(z)=0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Lambda^{\prime}$, where $\Lambda^{\prime}$ is a suitable open set satisfying $\bar{\Lambda} \subset \Lambda^{\prime}$ and $V(z)>\inf _{\xi \in \Lambda} V(\xi)$ for all $z \in \overline{\Lambda^{\prime}} \backslash \Lambda$. It is easy to see that under the assumptions $\left(f_{1}\right)-\left(f_{4}\right), g(z, s)$ is a Caratheodory function and satisfies the following assumptions:
$\left(g_{1}\right) g(z, s)=o\left(s^{3}\right)$ near $s=0$ uniformly on $z \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$;
$\left(g_{2}\right) g(z, s) \leq f(s)+\left(s^{+}\right)^{5}$;
$\left(g_{3}\right) 0<4 G(z, s) \leq g(z, s) s$ for all $z \in \Lambda, s>0$ or $z \in \mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Lambda, s \leq a^{\prime}$;
$\left(g_{4}\right) 0<2 \tilde{F}(s) \leq \tilde{f}(s) s \leq \frac{1}{k} \alpha s^{2} \leq \frac{1}{k} V(z) s^{2}$ for all $s>0$ with the number $k$ satisfying $k>2$, where $\tilde{F}(s)=\int_{0}^{s} \tilde{f}(\tau) d \tau$.
In particular, $0<2 G(z, s) \leq g(z, s) s \leq \frac{1}{k} V(z) s^{2}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Lambda^{\prime}, s>0$, where $G(z, s)=\int_{0}^{s} g(z, \tau) d \tau$.

The energy functional corresponding to $\left(\hat{E}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{\varepsilon}(u)=\frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u^{2}+\frac{b}{4}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right)^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} G(\varepsilon z, u), u \in H_{\varepsilon} \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using a standard method, we can prove that $J_{\varepsilon}$ possesses a mountain-pass energy $c_{\varepsilon}$. To deal with the difficulty caused by the non-compactness due to the the critical growth, we should estimate precisely the value of $c_{\varepsilon}$ and give a threshold value (see Lemma 2.1 below) under which the $(P . S .)_{c_{\varepsilon}}$ condition for $J_{\varepsilon}$ is satisfied. Moreover, to verify the critical point $v_{\varepsilon}$ of $J_{\varepsilon}$ at the level $c_{\varepsilon}$ is indeed a solution of the original problem $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$, we need to establish a uniform estimate on $L^{\infty}$-norm of $v_{\varepsilon}$ (with respect to $\varepsilon$ ) by using the idea introduced by Li in [15]. We should point out that the non-local term makes it much more complicated to estimate the threshold value.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is mainly based on Ljusternik-Schnirelmann theory (see [13, [24, for example). Firstly, we apply the penalization method to modify the nonlinearity $f(u)+\left(u^{+}\right)^{5}$ such that the energy functional of the modified problem satisfies the (P.S.) condition on an appropriate manifold. Secondly, using the technique due to Benci and Cerami [4, we establish a relationship between the category of the set $M$ and the number of solutions for the modified problem. Finally, we prove that, for $\varepsilon>0$ small, the solutions for the modified problem are in fact solutions for the original problem.

Summarily, the novelty of our results lies in two aspects. Firstly, differently from [13] and [30], where only the ground states concentrating at the global minimum point of $V(z)$ were obtained, we can construct a bound state which concentrates exactly at one point of any prescribed set consisting of local minimum points of $V(z)$. Hence the solutions obtained in Theorem 1.1 may not be the ground state solution. Secondly, we obtain the precise threshold value under which the (P.S.) condition for $J_{\varepsilon}$ is satisfied. So we can get rid of the large factor $\lambda$ of $f(u)$ in [30].

This paper is organized as follows, in Section 2, we give some preliminary results and obtain a (P.S.) sequence. In Section 3, we will prove that the (P.S.) sequence will converge in $H_{\varepsilon}$ to a solution of $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$, which can complete the proof of Theorem 1.1, In Section 4, we will use the Ljusternik-Schnirelmann theory to prove Theorem 1.2

## 2. Preliminaries

Taking $\varepsilon=1$ for simplicity, we consider the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right) \Delta u+V(z) u=g(z, u) \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The energy functional associated to (2.1) is given by

$$
J(u)=\frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z) u^{2}+\frac{b}{4}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right)^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} G(z, u), u \in H
$$

and $J \in C^{1}(H, \mathbb{R})$.
Clearly $J$ possesses the mountain-pass geometry construct i.e. $\exists e \in H, r>0$, such that $\|e\|_{H}>r$ and

$$
\inf _{\|u\|_{H}=r} J(u)>J(0) \geq J(e)
$$

Hence, by the mountain pass theorem without (P.S.) condition (see [3]), we obtain a sequence $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
J\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow c>0, J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0, \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c$ is the minimax level of functional $J$ given by

$$
c=\inf _{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup _{t \in[0,1]} J(\gamma(t)) .
$$

Here $\Gamma=\{\gamma \in C([0,1], H) \mid \gamma(0)=0$ and $J(\gamma(1))<0\}$.
Moreover, as in [9, 23, 26], we can prove

$$
c=\inf _{u \in H, u \neq 0} \sup _{\tau \geq 0} J(\tau u)=\inf _{u \in H \backslash\{0\},\left\langle J^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle=0} J(u)>0 .
$$

For the constant $c$, we have the following estimate

## Lemma 2.1.

$$
c<\frac{1}{4} a b S^{3}+\frac{1}{24} b^{3} S^{6}+\frac{1}{24}\left(b^{2} S^{4}+4 a S\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}
$$

where $S$ is the best Sobolev constant for the embedding $D^{1,2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \hookrightarrow L^{6}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$.
Proof. Without loss of generalities, we assume that $0 \in \Lambda$. Choose $R>0$ such that $B_{2 R}(0) \subset \Lambda$ and $\varphi \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(B_{2 R}(0)\right)$ satisfying $\varphi \equiv 1$ on $B_{R}(0)$ and $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$ on $B_{2 R}(0)$.

Given $\delta>0$, we set $\psi_{\delta}(z):=\varphi(z) w_{\delta}(z)$, where

$$
w_{\delta}(z)=(3 \delta)^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{1}{\left(\delta+|z|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}
$$

satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla w_{\delta}\right|^{2}=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|w_{\delta}\right|^{6}=S^{\frac{3}{2}} . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We see

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R}(0)}\left|\nabla \psi_{\delta}\right|^{2}=O\left(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\right), \text { as } \delta \rightarrow 0 \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $X_{\delta}:=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{\delta}\right|^{2}$, where $v_{\delta}:=\psi_{\delta} /\left(\int_{B_{2 R}(0)}\left|\psi_{\delta}\right|^{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{6}}$. We find

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{\delta} \leq S+O\left(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \text { as } \delta \rightarrow 0 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

There exists $t_{\delta}>0$ such that $\sup _{t \geq 0} J\left(t v_{\delta}\right)=J\left(t_{\delta} v_{\delta}\right)$. Hence $\left.\frac{d J\left(t v_{\delta}\right)}{d t}\right|_{t=t_{\delta}}=0$, that is

$$
a t_{\delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{\delta}\right|^{2}+t_{\delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z)\left|v_{\delta}\right|^{2}+b t_{\delta}^{3}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{\delta}\right|^{2}\right)^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(f\left(t_{\delta} v_{\delta}\right)+\left(t_{\delta} v_{\delta}\right)^{5}\right) v_{\delta}=0
$$

which implies

$$
t_{\delta}^{4}-b X_{\delta}^{2} t_{\delta}^{2}-\left(a X_{\delta}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z)\left|v_{\delta}\right|^{2}\right) \leq 0
$$

Hence

$$
0 \leq t_{\delta}^{2} \leq \frac{b X_{\delta}^{2}+\left(b^{2} X_{\delta}^{4}+4\left(a X_{\delta}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z)\left|v_{\delta}\right|^{2}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2}:=T_{0}
$$

Denote $c_{1}=b X_{\delta}^{2}, c_{2}=a X_{\delta}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z)\left|v_{\delta}\right|^{2}$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& J\left(t_{\delta} v_{\delta}\right) \\
\leq & \frac{1}{2} t_{\delta}^{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(a\left|\nabla v_{\delta}\right|^{2}+V(z)\left|v_{\delta}\right|^{2}\right)+\frac{b}{4} t_{\delta}^{4}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{\delta}\right|^{2}\right)^{2}-\frac{1}{6} t_{\delta}^{6}-C \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(t_{\delta} v_{\delta}\right)^{q_{1}+1} \\
\leq & \frac{1}{2} T_{0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(a\left|\nabla v_{\delta}\right|^{2}+V(z)\left|v_{\delta}\right|^{2}\right)+\frac{b}{4} T_{0}^{2}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{\delta}\right|^{2}\right)^{2}-\frac{1}{6} T_{0}^{3}-C \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(t_{\delta} v_{\delta}\right)^{q_{1}+1} \\
= & \frac{1}{2} T_{0}\left(a X_{\delta}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z)\left|v_{\delta}\right|^{2}\right)+\frac{1}{4} T_{0}^{2} b X_{\delta}^{2}-\frac{1}{6} T_{0}^{3}-C \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(t_{\delta} v_{\delta}\right)^{q_{1}+1} \\
= & \frac{1}{24}\left(c_{1}^{2}+4 c_{2}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}+\frac{1}{24} c_{1}^{3}+\frac{1}{4} c_{1} c_{2}-C \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(t_{\delta} v_{\delta}\right)^{q_{1}+1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Noting (2.5) and inequality

$$
(a+b)^{\alpha} \leq a^{\alpha}+\alpha(a+b)^{\alpha-1} b, \quad \alpha \geq 1, \quad a b>0
$$

we conclude that

$$
\begin{align*}
& J\left(t_{\delta} v_{\delta}\right) \\
\leq & \frac{1}{24}\left(b^{2} X_{\delta}^{4}+4 a X_{\delta}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}+C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z) v_{\delta}^{2}+\frac{1}{24} b^{3} X_{\delta}^{6}+\frac{1}{4} a b X_{\delta}^{3}+C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z) v_{\delta}^{2} \\
& -C \lambda t_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1} \\
\leq & \frac{1}{24}\left(b^{2}\left(S+O\left(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right)^{4}+4 a\left(S+O\left(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right)\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}+\frac{1}{24} b^{3}\left(S+O\left(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right)^{6}  \tag{2.6}\\
& +\frac{1}{4} a b\left(S+O\left(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right)^{3}+C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z) v_{\delta}^{2}-C \lambda t_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1} \\
\leq & \frac{1}{24}\left(b^{2} S^{4}+4 a S\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}+\frac{1}{24} b^{3} S^{6}+\frac{1}{4} a b S^{3}+O\left(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\
& +\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(C V(z) v_{\delta}^{2}-C \lambda t_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1} v_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

We can assume that there is a positive constant $t_{0}$ such that $t_{\delta} \geq t_{0}>0, \forall \delta>0$. Otherwise, we could find a sequence $\delta_{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $t_{\delta_{n}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now up to a subsequence, we have $t_{\delta_{n}} v_{\delta_{n}} \rightarrow 0$ in $H$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore

$$
0<c \leq \sup _{t \geq 0} J\left(t v_{\delta_{n}}\right)=J\left(t_{\delta_{n}} v_{\delta_{n}}\right) \rightarrow J(0)=0
$$

which is a contradiction.
From (2.6), to complete the proof, it suffices to show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\delta \rightarrow 0^{+}} \frac{1}{\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{B_{R}(0)}\left(C V(z) v_{\delta}^{2}-C \lambda t_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1} v_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1}\right)=-\infty \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\delta \rightarrow 0^{+}} \frac{1}{\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R}(0)}\left(C V(z) v_{\delta}^{2}-C \lambda t_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1} v_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1}\right) \leq C \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact,

$$
\frac{1}{\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{B_{R}(0)} C V(z) v_{\delta}^{2} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{B_{R}(0)} \frac{\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta+|z|^{2}} \leq C(R)
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}} \lambda \int_{B_{R}(0)} t_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1} v_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1} & \geq \frac{C \lambda}{\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{B_{R}(0)} w_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1}=\frac{C \lambda}{\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{B_{R}(0)} \frac{\delta^{\frac{q_{1}+1}{4}}}{\left(\delta+|z|^{2}\right)^{\frac{q_{1}+1}{2}}} \\
& \geq C \lambda \delta^{\frac{-q_{1}+3}{4}}
\end{aligned}
$$

If $3<q_{1}<5$, (2.7) holds, while if $q_{1}=3$, we choose $\lambda=1 / \delta$, (2.7) also holds.
Since

$$
\frac{1}{\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R}(0)}\left(C V(z) v_{\delta}^{2}-C \lambda t_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1} v_{\delta}^{q_{1}+1}\right) \leq \frac{1}{\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{B_{2 R}(0) \backslash B_{R}(0)} C V(z) v_{\delta}^{2} \leq C(R),
$$

then (2.8) holds.
Lemma 2.2. Every sequence $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ satisfying (2.2) is bounded in $H$.
Proof. Observing $\left(g_{3}\right)$ and $\left(g_{4}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& J\left(u_{n}\right)-\frac{1}{4}\left\langle J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle \\
= & \frac{1}{4}\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{H}^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(g\left(z, u_{n}\right) u_{n}-4 G\left(z, u_{n}\right)\right) \\
\geq & \frac{1}{4}\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{H}^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda}(1-\chi)\left(\tilde{f}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}-4 \tilde{F}\left(u_{n}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Lambda^{\prime}}\left(g\left(z, u_{n}\right) u_{n}-4 G\left(z, u_{n}\right)\right) \\
\geq & \frac{1}{4}\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{H}^{2}-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda}(1-\chi) \tilde{F}\left(u_{n}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Lambda^{\prime}} G\left(z, u_{n}\right) \\
\geq & \frac{1}{4}\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{H}^{2}-\frac{1}{4 k} \int_{\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda}(1-\chi) V(z) u_{n}^{2}-\frac{1}{4 k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Lambda^{\prime}} V(z) u_{n}^{2} \\
\geq & \frac{1}{4}\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right)\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{H}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

By the choice of $k$, we get the upper bound of $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{H}$.
Lemma 2.3. There is a sequence $\left\{z_{n}\right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ and $R>0, \beta>0$ such that

$$
\int_{B_{R}\left(z_{n}\right)} u_{n}^{2} \geq \beta
$$

where $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is the sequence given by Lemma 2.2.
Proof. Suppose by contradiction that the lemma does not hold. Then by the Vanishing Theorem (Lemma 1.1 of [16]) it follows that

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|u_{n}\right|^{s} \rightarrow 0, \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty \text { for all } 2<s<6
$$

and then

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} F\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n} \rightarrow 0 \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty
$$

This implies that

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} G\left(z, u_{n}\right) \leq & \frac{1}{6} \int_{\Lambda \cup\left\{z \mid u_{n} \leq a^{\prime}\right\}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}+\frac{1}{6} \int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}} \chi\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}  \tag{2.9}\\
& +\frac{\alpha}{2 k} \int_{\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Lambda^{\prime}\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}} u_{n}^{2}+\frac{\alpha}{2 k} \int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}}(1-\chi) u_{n}^{2}+o(1)
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} g\left(z, u_{n}\right) u_{n}= & \int_{\Lambda \cup\left\{z \mid u_{n} \leq a^{\prime}\right\}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}+\int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}} \chi\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}  \tag{2.10}\\
& +\frac{\alpha}{k} \int_{\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Lambda^{\prime}\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}} u_{n}^{2}+\frac{\alpha}{k} \int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}}(1-\chi) u_{n}^{2}+o(1) .
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, using $\left\langle J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle=o(1)$, we conclude that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|u_{n}\right\|_{H}^{2}-\frac{\alpha}{k} \int_{\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Lambda^{\prime}\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}} u_{n}^{2}-\frac{\alpha}{k} \int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}}(1-\chi) u_{n}^{2}+b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{2} \\
= & \int_{\Lambda \cup\left\{z \mid u_{n} \leq a^{\prime}\right\}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}+\int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}} \chi\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}+o(1) . \tag{2.11}
\end{align*}
$$

Let $l_{1} \geq 0, l_{2} \geq 0$ be such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{H}^{2}-\frac{\alpha}{k} \int_{\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Lambda^{\prime}\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a\right\}} u_{n}^{2}-\frac{\alpha}{k} \int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a\right\}}(1-\chi) u_{n}^{2} \rightarrow l_{1} \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{2} \rightarrow l_{2} \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to check that $l_{1}>0$, otherwise $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{H} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ which contradicts $c>0$. From (2.11), (2.12), (2.13), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Lambda \cup\left\{z \mid u_{n} \leq a\right\}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}+\int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a\right\}} \chi\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6} \rightarrow l_{1}+l_{2} . \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (2.9), (2.12), (2.14) and $J\left(u_{n}\right)=c+o(1)$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
c \geq \frac{1}{3} l_{1}+\frac{1}{12} l_{2} . \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, using the definition of the constant $S$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|u_{n}\right\|_{H}^{2}-\frac{\alpha}{k} \int_{\left(\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash \Lambda^{\prime}\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}} u_{n}^{2}-\frac{\alpha}{k} \int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}}(1-\chi) u_{n}^{2} \\
\geq & a S\left(\int_{\Lambda \cup\left\{z \mid u_{n} \leq a^{\prime}\right\}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}+\int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}} \chi\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{2} \geq b S^{2}\left(\int_{\Lambda \cup\left\{z \mid u_{n} \leq a^{\prime}\right\}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}+\int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} \backslash \Lambda\right) \cap\left\{z \mid u_{n}>a^{\prime}\right\}} \chi\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} .
$$

Taking the limit in the above two inequalities, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we achieve that

$$
l_{1} \geq a S\left(l_{1}+l_{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}
$$

and

$$
l_{2} \geq b S^{2}\left(l_{1}+l_{2}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}
$$

Hence

$$
\left(l_{1}+l_{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \geq \frac{b S^{2}+\left(b^{2} S^{4}+4 a S\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& c \geq \frac{1}{3} l_{1}+\frac{1}{12} l_{2} \geq \frac{1}{3} a S\left(l_{1}+l_{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}+\frac{1}{12} b S^{2}\left(l_{1}+l_{2}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
& \geq \frac{1}{4} a b S^{3}+\frac{1}{24} b^{3} S^{6}+\frac{1}{24}\left(b^{2} S^{4}+4 a S\right)^{\frac{3}{2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

which contradicts Lemma 2.1.
Lemma 2.4. The sequence $\left\{z_{n}\right\}$ given in Lemma 2.3 is bounded in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$.
Proof. For each $\rho>0$ consider a smooth cut-off function $0 \leq \psi_{\rho} \leq 1$ such that

$$
\psi_{\rho}(z)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
0 \text { if }|z| \leq \rho, \\
1 \text { if }|z| \geq 2 \rho,
\end{array} \quad\left|\nabla \psi_{\rho}\right| \leq \frac{C}{\rho}\right.
$$

Using $\left\langle J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), \psi_{\rho} u_{n}\right\rangle=o(1)$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2} \psi_{\rho}+a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla u_{n} \cdot \nabla \psi_{\rho}\right) u_{n}+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2} \psi_{\rho}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla u_{n} \cdot \nabla \psi_{\rho}\right) u_{n}\right) \\
& \quad+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z) u_{n}^{2} \psi_{\rho} \\
& =\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} g\left(z, u_{n}\right) u_{n} \psi_{\rho}+o(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Choose $\rho$ large enough such that $\Lambda^{\prime} \subset B_{\rho}(0)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z) u_{n}^{2} \psi_{\rho} \\
\leq & -a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla u_{n} \cdot \nabla \psi_{\rho}\right) u_{n}-b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla u_{n} \cdot \nabla \psi_{\rho}\right) u_{n}+o(1) \\
\leq & \frac{C}{\rho} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|\left|u_{n}\right|+\frac{C}{\rho} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|\left|u_{n}\right|+o(1) \\
\leq & \frac{C}{\rho}+o(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we get

$$
\int_{|z| \geq 2 \rho} u_{n}^{2} \leq \frac{C}{\rho}+o(1)
$$

If $\left\{z_{n}\right\}$ is unbounded, Lemma 2.3 and the above estimate give that

$$
0<\beta \leq \frac{C}{\rho}
$$

which leads to a contradiction for large $\rho$.

Using standard argument, up to a subsequence, we may assume that there is $u \in H$ such that

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
u_{n} \rightharpoonup u \text { in } H  \tag{2.16}\\
u_{n} \rightarrow u \text { in } L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{s}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \text { for all } 1 \leq s<6 \\
u_{n} \rightarrow u \text { a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^{3}
\end{array}\right.
$$

By Lemma 2.3 and Lemma [2.4, $u$ is nontrivial. Moreover, for any $\varphi \in H$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z) u \varphi+b A \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} g(z, u) \varphi=0, \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A:=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2} \leq A$. Taking $\varphi=u$, we get

$$
\left\langle J^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle \leq 0
$$

Now, we prove that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle J^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle=0 . \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assuming the contrary, if $\left\langle J^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle<0$, there is a unique $0<t<1$ such that

$$
\left\langle J^{\prime}(t u), t u\right\rangle=0 .
$$

So,

$$
\begin{align*}
c & \leq J(t u)-\frac{1}{4}\left\langle J^{\prime}(t u), t u\right\rangle \\
& =\frac{t^{2}}{4}\left(a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z) u^{2}\right)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\frac{1}{4} g(z, t u) t u-G(z, t u)\right) \\
& <\frac{1}{4}\left(a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z) u^{2}\right)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\frac{1}{4} g(z, u) u-G(z, u)\right)  \tag{2.19}\\
& \leq \varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{4}\left(a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(z) u_{n}^{2}\right)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\frac{1}{4} g\left(z, u_{n}\right) u_{n}-G\left(z, u_{n}\right)\right) \\
& =\varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty}\left\{J\left(u_{n}\right)-\frac{1}{4}\left\langle J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle\right\}=c,
\end{align*}
$$

which causes a contradiction. Hence, (2.18) follows and $A=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}$. Using (2.19) again with $t=1$, we conclude $J(u)=c$.

Hence, we indeed prove
Proposition 2.5. The functional $J_{\varepsilon}$ possesses a nontrivial critical point $v_{\varepsilon} \in H_{\varepsilon}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{\varepsilon}\left(v_{\varepsilon}\right)=\inf _{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup _{t \in[0,1]} J_{\varepsilon}(\gamma(t))=\inf _{u \in H_{\varepsilon} \backslash\{0\}} \sup _{\tau \geq 0} J_{\varepsilon}(\tau u)=\inf _{u \in H_{\varepsilon} \backslash\{0\},\left\langle J^{\prime} \varepsilon(u), u\right\rangle=0} J_{\varepsilon}(u), \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Gamma=\left\{\gamma \in C\left([0,1], H_{\varepsilon}\right) \mid \gamma(0)=0\right.$ and $\left.J_{\varepsilon}(\gamma(1))<0\right\}$.

Now, we consider the following equation

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right) \Delta u+\bar{V} u=f(u)+u^{5} \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3}  \tag{2.21}\\
u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right), u>0 \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\bar{V}$ is a positive constant. The functional corresponding to (2.21) is

$$
I_{\bar{V}}(u)=\frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \bar{V} u^{2}+\frac{b}{4}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right)^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(F(u)+\frac{1}{6}\left(u^{+}\right)^{6}\right) .
$$

Proposition 2.6. Suppose that $f(u)$ satisfies $\left(f_{1}\right)-\left(f_{4}\right)$, then (2.21) has a positive groundstate solution $w \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \cap C_{\text {loc }}^{2, \alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$, such that $I_{\bar{V}}(w)=c_{\bar{V}}>0$, where

$$
c_{\bar{V}}=\inf _{\mathcal{N}_{\bar{V}}} I_{\bar{V}}(u)
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{N}_{\bar{V}}=\left\{u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \mid u \neq 0,\left\langle I_{\bar{V}}^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle=0\right\}
$$

is the Nehari manifold of $I_{\bar{V}}$. Moreover, $I_{\bar{V}}(w)=\inf _{u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \backslash\{0\}} \sup _{\tau \geq 0} I_{\bar{V}}(\tau u)$.
Proof. Similar to the proof of Proposition [2.5, we can get the existence of a $w \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ such that $I_{\bar{V}}^{\prime}(w)=0$ and $I_{\bar{V}}(w)=c_{\bar{V}}>0$. By elliptic regularity theory, $w \in C_{\text {loc }}^{2, \alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$. Since $f(s)=0$ for $s \leq 0, w \geq 0$. By the strong maximum principle, $w>0$. Similar to Proposition 2.5, $c_{\bar{V}}=\inf _{u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \backslash\{0\}} \sup _{\tau \geq 0} I_{\bar{V}}(\tau u)$.

For $V_{0}:=\min _{\Lambda} V$, let $w$ be a ground-state solution to the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}\right) \Delta w+V_{0} w=f(w)+\left(w^{+}\right)^{5} \tag{2.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{V_{0}}(w)=\inf _{v \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \backslash\{0\}} \sup _{\tau \geq 0} I_{V_{0}}(\tau v):=c_{V_{0}} \tag{2.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 2.7.

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{\varepsilon}\left(v_{\varepsilon}\right) \leq c_{V_{0}}+o(1) \tag{2.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. The proof is similar to what was done in [23]. Let $z_{0} \in \Lambda$ be such that $V\left(z_{0}\right)=V_{0}$ and $u_{\varepsilon}(z)=\eta\left(\frac{\varepsilon z-z_{0}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right) w\left(\frac{\varepsilon z-z_{0}}{\varepsilon}\right)$ where $\eta$ is a smooth cut-off function with $0 \leq \eta \leq 1, \eta=1$ on $B_{1}(0), \eta=0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{2}(0),|\nabla \eta| \leq C$. Since $w>0$, by the arguments as in the proof of Lemma [2.1, there is a unique $t_{\varepsilon}>0$ such that $\sup _{t>0} J_{\varepsilon}\left(t u_{\varepsilon}\right)=J_{\varepsilon}\left(t_{\varepsilon} u_{\varepsilon}\right)$ and $\left.\frac{d J_{\varepsilon}\left(t u_{\varepsilon}\right)}{d t}\right|_{t=t_{\varepsilon}}=0$, i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
a t_{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}+t_{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u_{\varepsilon}^{2}+b t_{\varepsilon}^{3}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\right)^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(f\left(t_{\varepsilon} u_{\varepsilon}\right) u_{\varepsilon}+t_{\varepsilon}^{5} u_{\varepsilon}^{6}\right)=0 . \tag{2.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

We claim that there exist $t_{0}, T_{0}>0$ such that $0<t_{0} \leq t_{\varepsilon} \leq T_{0}$ which will be proved later. Let $z^{\prime}=\frac{\varepsilon z-z_{0}}{\varepsilon}$, we see

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a t_{\varepsilon} \int_{B_{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}}(0)}\left|\nabla w\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right|^{2}+t_{\varepsilon} \int_{B_{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}}(0)} V\left(\varepsilon z^{\prime}+z_{0}\right)\left(w\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right)^{2}+b t_{\varepsilon}^{3}\left(\int_{B_{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}}(0)}\left|\nabla w\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right|^{2}\right)^{2} \\
& \quad-\int_{B_{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}}(0)} f\left(t_{\varepsilon} w\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right) w\left(z^{\prime}\right)-t_{\varepsilon}^{5} \int_{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(0)}\left(w\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right)^{6}=o(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $0<t_{0} \leq t_{\varepsilon} \leq T_{0}$, going if necessary to a subsequence, $t_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow T>0$, then

$$
\begin{align*}
& a T \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla w\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right|^{2}+T \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V_{0}\left(w\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right)^{2}+b T^{3}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} t\left|\nabla w\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right|^{2}\right)^{2}  \tag{2.26}\\
& \quad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(T w\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right) w\left(z^{\prime}\right)-T^{5} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(w\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right)^{6}=0 .
\end{align*}
$$

Since $w$ is a weak solution to (2.22), we get

$$
\left(\frac{1}{T^{2}}-1\right)\left(a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V_{0} w^{2}\right)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} w^{4}\left(\frac{f(T w)}{(T w)^{3}}-\frac{f(w)}{w^{3}}\right)+\left(T^{2}-1\right) w^{6}
$$

By $\left(f_{2}\right), t_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow T=1$. Direct calculations show that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sup _{t>0} J_{\varepsilon}\left(t u_{\varepsilon}\right) \\
= & J_{\varepsilon}\left(t_{\varepsilon} u_{\varepsilon}\right) \\
= & \frac{a t_{\varepsilon}^{2}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}+\frac{t_{\varepsilon}^{2}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V_{0} w^{2}+\frac{b t_{\varepsilon}^{4}}{4}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}\right)^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} F\left(t_{\varepsilon} w\right)-\frac{t_{\varepsilon}^{6}}{6} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} w^{6}+o(1) \\
= & \frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V_{0} w^{2}+\frac{b}{4}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}\right)^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} F(w)-\frac{1}{6} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} w^{6}+o(1) \\
= & c_{V_{0}}+o(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus (2.24) follows.
At last, we prove the claim that $0<t_{0} \leq t_{\varepsilon} \leq T_{0}$. Assuming the contrary that $t_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$, then by $\left(f_{1}\right),\left(f_{4}\right)$, we get that

$$
\begin{align*}
& a t_{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}+t_{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u_{\varepsilon}^{2}+b t_{\varepsilon}^{3}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\right)^{2}  \tag{2.27}\\
= & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(t_{\varepsilon} u_{\varepsilon}\right) u_{\varepsilon}+t_{\varepsilon}^{5} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} u_{\varepsilon}^{6} \leq C t_{\varepsilon}^{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} u_{\varepsilon}^{4}+C t_{\varepsilon}^{5} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} u_{\varepsilon}^{6} .
\end{align*}
$$

Direct computations yield

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t_{\varepsilon}\left(a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V_{0} w^{2}+o(1)\right)+t_{\varepsilon}^{3}\left(b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}\right)^{2}+o(1)\right) \\
\leq & C t_{\varepsilon}^{3}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} w^{4}+o(1)\right)+C t_{\varepsilon}^{5}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} w^{6}+o(1)\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

which leads to a contradiction.
If $t_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$
\begin{align*}
& a t_{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}+t_{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u_{\varepsilon}^{2}+b t_{\varepsilon}^{3}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\right)^{2} \\
= & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(t_{\varepsilon} u_{\varepsilon}\right) u_{\varepsilon}+t_{\varepsilon}^{5} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} u_{\varepsilon}^{6} \geq t_{\varepsilon}^{5} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} u_{\varepsilon}^{6} . \tag{2.28}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence,

$$
a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V_{0} w^{2}+t_{\varepsilon}^{2} b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}\right)^{2} \geq t_{\varepsilon}^{4}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} w^{6}+o(1)\right)
$$

which is a contradiction.
Since $\left\langle J_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(v_{\varepsilon}\right), v_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle=0$, we have, from (2.24) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) v_{\varepsilon}^{2}+\frac{b}{4}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\right)^{2} \\
\leq & c_{V_{0}}+o(1)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} G\left(\varepsilon z, v_{\varepsilon}\right) \\
\leq & C+\int_{\Lambda / \varepsilon} G\left(\varepsilon z, v_{\varepsilon}\right)+\int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} / \varepsilon\right) \backslash(\Lambda / \varepsilon)} G\left(\varepsilon z, v_{\varepsilon}\right)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash\left(\Lambda^{\prime} / \varepsilon\right)} G\left(\varepsilon z, v_{\varepsilon}\right) \\
\leq & C+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\Lambda / \varepsilon} g\left(\varepsilon z, v_{\varepsilon}\right) v_{\varepsilon}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} / \varepsilon\right) \backslash(\Lambda / \varepsilon)} \chi(\varepsilon z)\left(f\left(v_{\varepsilon}\right)+v_{\varepsilon}^{5}\right) v_{\varepsilon} \\
& +\int_{\left(\Lambda^{\prime} / \varepsilon\right) \backslash((\Lambda / \varepsilon)}(1-\chi(\varepsilon z)) \frac{1}{2 k} V(\varepsilon z) v_{\varepsilon}^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash\left(\Lambda^{\prime} / \varepsilon\right)} \frac{1}{2 k} V(\varepsilon z) v_{\varepsilon}^{2} \\
\leq & C+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} g\left(\varepsilon z, v_{\varepsilon}\right) v_{\varepsilon}+\frac{1}{2 k}\left(a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) v_{\varepsilon}^{2}\right) \\
\leq & C+\frac{1}{4}\left(a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) v_{\varepsilon}^{2}+b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\right)^{2}\right) \\
& +\frac{1}{2 k}\left(a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) v_{\varepsilon}^{2}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

which gives that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{1}{4}-\frac{1}{2 k}\right)\left(a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) v_{\varepsilon}^{2}\right) \leq C \tag{2.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consider the following equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}\right) \Delta u+V_{n}(z) u=f_{n}(z, u) \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3} \tag{2.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left\{V_{n}\right\}(n=1, \cdots)$ satisfies

$$
V_{n}(z) \geq \alpha>0 \text { for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^{3}
$$

and $f_{n}(z, t)$ is a Carathedory function such that for any $\varepsilon>0$, there exists $C_{\varepsilon}>0$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|f_{n}(z, t)\right| \leq \varepsilon|t|+C_{\varepsilon}|t|^{5}, \forall(z, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{3} \times \mathbb{R} . \tag{2.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 2.8. Assume that $v_{n}$ are weak solutions to (2.30) satisfying $\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)} \leq C$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\left\{\left|v_{n}\right|^{6}\right\}$ is uniformly integrable near $\infty$, i.e. $\forall \delta>0, \exists R>0$, for any $r>R$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{r}(0)}\left|v_{n}\right|^{6}<\delta$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{|z| \rightarrow \infty} v_{n}(z)=0 \text { uniformly for } n \tag{2.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Following [15], for any $R>0,0<r \leq \frac{R}{2}$, let $\eta \in C^{\infty}\left(R^{N}\right), 0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ with

$$
\eta=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
1 \text { if }|z| \geq R \\
0 \text { if }|z| \leq R-r
\end{array}\right.
$$

$|\nabla \eta| \leq \frac{C}{r}$. Set $\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}=\min \left(v_{n}, L\right)$ where $L>0$. Taking $\bar{v}=\eta^{2} v_{n}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}$ for $\beta \geq 1$ as a test function in (2.30). Considering (2.31), we see that for $\forall \varepsilon>0, \exists C_{\varepsilon}>0$, such that

$$
\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \nabla v_{n} \nabla \bar{v}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V_{n}(z) v_{n} \bar{v} \leq \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{n} \bar{v}+C_{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{n}^{5} \bar{v} .
$$

Taking $\varepsilon=\alpha$, we get

$$
\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \nabla v_{n} \nabla \bar{v} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{n}^{5} \bar{v} .
$$

For simplicity, we denote by $A_{n}:=\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{n}\right|^{2}\right)$. We rewrite the above inequality as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A_{n}\left(2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla v_{n} \cdot \nabla \eta\right) \eta v_{n}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{n}\right|^{2} \eta^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}\right. \\
& \left.\quad+2(\beta-1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}\right|^{2} \eta^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}\right) \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{n}^{6} \eta^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

By Young's inequality , we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A_{n}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{n}\right|^{2} \eta^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}+C(\beta-1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}\right|^{2} \eta^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}\right) \\
\leq & C A_{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla \eta|^{2} v_{n}^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}+C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{n}^{6} \eta^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

It is clear that $a \leq A_{n} \leq a^{*}$ for some $a^{*}>0$. Therefore We can rewrite the above inequality as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{n}\right|^{2} \eta^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}+C(\beta-1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}\right|^{2} \eta^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)} \\
\leq & C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla \eta|^{2} v_{n}^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}+C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{n}^{6} \eta^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)} \tag{2.33}
\end{align*}
$$

Let $W_{L}=\eta v_{n}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{(\beta-1)}$, by Sobolev's inequality and (2.33), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|W_{L}\right\|_{L^{6}}^{2} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla W_{L}\right|^{2} \\
\leq & C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla \eta|^{2} v_{n}^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}+C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \eta^{2}\left|\nabla v_{n}\right|^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}  \tag{2.34}\\
& +C(\beta-1)^{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \eta^{2}\left|\nabla\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}\right|^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)} \\
\leq & C \beta^{2}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{n}^{6} \eta^{p}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{n}^{2}|\nabla \eta|^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2(\beta-1)}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

We claim that there exists $R>1$, independent of $n$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
v_{n} \text { is bounded in } L^{18}\{|z| \geq R\} . \tag{2.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact, let $\beta=3$ and use (2.34), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\eta v_{n}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2}\right)^{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \\
& \leq C\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\eta v_{n}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2}\right)^{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\left(\int_{|z| \geq R-r} v_{n}^{6}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}+C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla \eta|^{2} v_{n}^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{4} \\
& \leq C\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\eta v_{n}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2}\right)^{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{6}\{|z| \geq R / 2\}}^{4}+C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla \eta|^{2} v_{n}^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{4} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $v_{n}^{6}$ is uniformly integrable near infinity, $\exists \bar{R}>1$, such that for any $R>\bar{R}$,

$$
\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{6}\{|z| \geq R / 2\}}^{4} \leq \frac{1}{2 C}
$$

Hence we get

$$
\left(\int_{|z| \geq R}\left(v_{n}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2}\right)^{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\eta v_{n}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2}\right)^{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla \eta|^{2} v_{n}^{2}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{4} \leq \frac{C}{r^{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{n}^{6}
$$

Taking $r=\frac{R}{2}$, we have

$$
\left(\int_{|z| \geq R}\left(v_{n}\left(v_{n}\right)_{L}^{2}\right)^{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{n}^{6}
$$

Letting $L \rightarrow \infty$, we get that

$$
\int_{|z| \geq R} v_{n}^{18} \leq C
$$

which gives (2.35).
Let $t=\frac{9}{2}$, suppose $v_{n} \in L^{2 \beta t /(t-1)}\{|z| \geq R-r\}$ for some $\beta \geq 1$, (2.34), (2.35) give that

$$
\left\|W_{L}\right\|_{L^{6}}^{2} \leq C \beta^{2}\left(\int_{|z| \geq R-r}\left(\eta^{2} v_{n}^{2 \beta}\right)^{t /(t-1)}\right)^{1-1 / t}\left(\int_{|z| \geq R-r}\left(v_{n}^{18}\right)\right)^{1-1 / t}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +C \beta^{2} \frac{\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}-(R-r)^{3}\right)^{1 / t}}{r^{2}}\left(\int_{|z| \geq R-r}\left(v_{n}^{2 \beta t /(t-1)}\right)\right)^{1-1 / t} \\
\leq & C \beta^{2}\left(1+\frac{R^{3 / t}}{r^{2}}\right)\left(\int_{|z| \geq R-r}\left(v_{n}^{2 \beta t /(t-1)}\right)\right)^{1-1 / t}
\end{aligned}
$$

Letting $L \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$
\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{6 \beta}\{|z| \geq R\}}^{2 \beta} \leq C \beta^{2}\left(1+\frac{R^{3 / t}}{r^{2}}\right)\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{2 \beta t /(t-1)}\{|z| \geq R\}}^{2 \beta}
$$

If we set $\chi=3(t-1) / t, s=2 t /(t-1)$, then

$$
\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{\beta \gamma s}\{|z| \geq R\}} \leq C^{1 / \beta} \beta^{1 / \beta}\left(1+\frac{R^{3 / t}}{r^{2}}\right)^{1 / 2 \beta}\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{\beta s}\{|z| \geq R-r\}}
$$

Let $\beta=\chi^{m}, m=1,2, \ldots$, then we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{m+1_{s}}\{|z| \geq R\}} \leq C^{\chi^{-m}} \chi^{m \chi^{-m}}\left(1+\frac{R^{3 / t}}{r^{2}}\right)^{1 /\left(2 \chi^{m}\right)}\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{m} \chi_{s}\{|z| \geq R-r\}} \tag{2.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $r_{m}=2^{-(m+1)} R$, then (2.36) implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{x^{m+1_{s}}\{|z| \geq R\}}} & \leq\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{m+1_{s}}\left\{|z| \geq R-r_{m+1}\right\}} \\
& \leq C^{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \chi^{-i}} \chi^{\sum_{i=1}^{m} i \chi^{-i}} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \ln \left(2^{2(i+1)}\right) /\left(2 \chi^{i}\right)\right)\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{\chi s}\left\{|z| \geq R-r_{1}\right\}} \\
& \leq C\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{6}\{|z| \geq R / 2\} .} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$
\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{\infty}\{|z| \geq R\}} \leq C\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{L^{6}\{|z| \geq R / 2\}}
$$

Since $\left\{v_{n}^{6}\right\}$ is uniformly integrable near infinity, (2.32) follows.

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

For $\varepsilon>0$, let $v_{\varepsilon}$ be the mountain-pass solution to $\left(\hat{E}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)$ given by Proposition 2.5. For any sequence $\left\{\varepsilon_{n}\right\}$ satisfying $\varepsilon_{n} \rightarrow 0^{+}$, denote by $v_{n}:=v_{\varepsilon_{n}}, J_{n}:=J_{\varepsilon_{n}}$ and $H_{n}:=H_{\varepsilon_{n}}$. Then $v_{n}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \Delta v_{n}+V\left(\varepsilon_{n} z\right) v_{n}=g\left(\varepsilon_{n} z, v_{n}\right) \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence $v_{n}$ is a critical point of the following functional $J_{n}$, and by (2.29), $v_{n}$ is bounded in $H_{n}$.

Similar to Lemma 2.3, we have
Lemma 3.1. There is a sequence $\left\{y_{n}\right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ and $R>0, \beta>0$ such that

$$
\int_{B_{R}\left(y_{n}\right)} v_{n}^{2} \geq \beta
$$

Lemma 3.2. $\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}$ is bounded in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. Moreover, $\operatorname{dist}\left(\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}, \Lambda^{\prime}\right) \leq \varepsilon_{n} R$.

Proof. For $\delta>0$, define $K_{\delta}=\left\{z \in \mathbb{R}^{3} \mid \operatorname{dist}\left(z, \Lambda^{\prime}\right) \leq \delta\right\}$. We set $\phi_{\varepsilon_{n}}(z)=\phi\left(\varepsilon_{n} z\right)$ where $\phi \in C^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3},[0,1]\right)$ is such that

$$
\phi(z)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
1, z \notin K_{\delta}, \\
0, z \in \Lambda^{\prime},
\end{array} \quad|\nabla \phi| \leq \frac{C}{\delta}\right.
$$

Taking $v_{n} \phi_{\varepsilon_{n}}$ as a test function in (3.1), using $\left(g_{4}\right)$ and the fact that $\operatorname{supp} \phi_{\varepsilon_{n}} \cap\left(\Lambda^{\prime} / \varepsilon_{n}\right)=\emptyset$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \alpha\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{n}^{2} \phi_{\varepsilon_{n}} \leq\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V\left(\varepsilon_{n} z\right) v_{n}^{2} \phi_{\varepsilon_{n}} \\
\leq & -\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla v_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v_{n}\left(\nabla \phi_{\varepsilon_{n}} \cdot \nabla v_{n}\right) \\
\leq & C \frac{\varepsilon_{n}}{\delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|v_{n}\right|\left|\nabla v_{n}\right| \leq C \frac{\varepsilon_{n}}{\delta} .
\end{aligned}
$$

If there is a subsequence $\varepsilon_{n_{j}} \rightarrow 0^{+}$such that

$$
B_{R}\left(y_{n_{j}}\right) \cap\left\{z \in \mathbb{R}^{3}, \varepsilon_{n_{j}} z \in K_{\delta}\right\}=\emptyset,
$$

then

$$
\alpha\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right) \int_{B_{R}\left(y_{n_{j}}\right)} v_{n_{j}}^{2} \leq C \frac{\varepsilon_{n_{j}}}{\delta}
$$

which contradicts Lemma 3.1. Thus, for all small $\varepsilon_{n}$ there is a $y^{\prime}{ }_{n}$ such that $\varepsilon_{n} y^{\prime}{ }_{n} \in K_{\delta}$ and $\left|y^{\prime}{ }_{n}-y_{n}\right| \leq R$. It is easy to verify that $\operatorname{dist}\left(\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}, \Lambda^{\prime}\right) \leq \varepsilon_{n} R+\delta$ and by the arbitrariness of $\delta$, we complete the proof.

From Lemma 3.2, we can assume that $\varepsilon_{n} y_{n} \in \overline{\Lambda^{\prime}}$ for all $\varepsilon_{n}$ small enough. Otherwise, we can replace $y_{n}$ by $\varepsilon_{n}^{-1} x_{n}$ where $x_{n} \in \overline{\Lambda^{\prime}}$ and $\left|y_{n}-\varepsilon_{n}^{-1} x_{n}\right| \leq R$. Thus

$$
0<\beta \leq \int_{B_{R}\left(y_{n}\right)} v_{n}^{2} \leq \int_{B_{2 R}\left(\varepsilon_{n}^{-1} x_{n}\right)} v_{n}^{2}
$$

and if we replace $R$ by $2 R$ in Lemma 3.1, we have our claim.

## Lemma 3.3.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} V\left(\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}\right)=V_{0} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Since $\varepsilon_{n} y_{n} \in \overline{\Lambda^{\prime}}$, up to a subsequence, $\varepsilon_{n} y_{n} \rightarrow x_{0} \in \overline{\Lambda^{\prime}}$, we shall prove that $V\left(x_{0}\right)=$ $V_{0}$. We have already known that $V\left(x_{0}\right) \geq V_{0}$. Let we set $w_{n}(z)=v_{n}\left(z+y_{n}\right)$, from (3.1) and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
\int_{B_{R}(0)} w_{n}^{2} \geq \beta>0 \text { for all } n, \\
-\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla w_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \Delta w_{n}+V\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}\right) w_{n}=g\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}, w_{n}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

and $\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{H^{1}}=\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{H^{1}}$ is bounded. Up to a subsequence, $\exists w \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \backslash\{0\}$, such that

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
w_{n} \rightharpoonup w \text { in } H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)  \tag{3.3}\\
w_{n} \rightarrow w \text { in } L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \text { for all } 1 \leq p<6, \\
w_{n} \rightarrow w \text { a.e. }
\end{array}\right.
$$

and denote by $A:=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla w_{n}\right|^{2}$, it is clear that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2} \leq A$.
Taking $\varphi \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ as a test function in (3.1), by (3.3), we have

$$
(a+b A) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \nabla w \nabla \varphi+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V\left(x_{0}\right) w \varphi=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \bar{g}(w) \varphi \forall \varphi \in C_{c}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)
$$

where $\bar{g}(w)=\chi\left(x_{0}\right)\left(f(w)+w^{5}\right)+\left(1-\chi\left(x_{0}\right)\right) \tilde{f}(w)$. By density, we get

$$
(a+b A) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \nabla w \nabla \varphi+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V\left(x_{0}\right) w \varphi=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \bar{g}(w) \varphi \forall \varphi \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)
$$

Choose $\varphi=w$, then

$$
\left\langle\bar{J}_{x_{0}}^{\prime}(w), w\right\rangle \leq 0
$$

where, $\bar{G}(s)=\int_{0}^{s} \bar{g}(\tau) d \tau$ and

$$
\bar{J}_{x_{0}}(w)=\frac{1}{2} a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V\left(x_{0}\right) w^{2}+\frac{1}{4} b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}\right)^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \bar{G}(w), u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) .
$$

Moreover, with the same argument to prove (2.19), we conclude

$$
\left\langle\bar{J}_{x_{0}}^{\prime}(w), w\right\rangle=0
$$

and

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}=A:=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla w_{n}\right|^{2},
$$

which implies that $w>0$ is a critical point of $\bar{J}_{x_{0}}$.
Now we prove $V\left(x_{0}\right)=V_{0}$. Assuming to the contrary that $V\left(x_{0}\right)>V_{0}$. Denote by

$$
c_{V\left(x_{0}\right)}:=\inf _{u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \backslash\{0\}} \sup _{\tau \geq 0} I_{V\left(x_{0}\right)}(\tau u) .
$$

Let $c_{x_{0}}$ be the mountain-pass energy of $\bar{J}_{x_{0}}$. Then $c_{x_{0}} \geq c_{V\left(x_{0}\right)}$ since $\bar{J}_{x_{0}}(u) \geq I_{V\left(x_{0}\right)}(u)$. Hence

$$
\begin{align*}
& c_{V\left(x_{0}\right)} \leq c_{x_{0}} \leq \bar{J}_{x_{0}}(w)-\frac{1}{4}\left\langle\bar{J}_{x_{0}}^{\prime}(w), w\right\rangle \\
= & \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} a|\nabla w|^{2}+V\left(x_{0}\right) w^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\frac{1}{4} \bar{g}(w) w-\bar{G}(w)\right) \\
\leq & \underline{\lim } \\
n \rightarrow \infty & \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} a\left|\nabla w_{n}\right|^{2}+V\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}\right) w_{n}^{2}  \tag{3.4}\\
& +\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\frac{1}{4} g\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}, w_{n}\right) w_{n}-G\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}, w_{n}\right)\right) \\
= & \varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} a\left|\nabla v_{n}\right|^{2}+V\left(\varepsilon_{n} z\right) v_{n}^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\frac{1}{4} g\left(\varepsilon_{n} z, v_{n}\right) v_{n}-G\left(\varepsilon_{n} z, v_{n}\right)\right) \\
= & \underset{n \rightarrow \infty}{\lim } J_{n}\left(v_{n}\right)-\frac{1}{4}\left\langle J^{\prime}{ }_{n}\left(v_{n}\right), v_{n}\right\rangle \leq c_{V_{0}} .
\end{align*}
$$

Denote $w^{\prime}$ be a critical point of $I_{V\left(x_{0}\right)}$ with minimal energy, there exists a $t^{\prime}>0$ such that

$$
I_{V_{0}}\left(t^{\prime} w^{\prime}\right)=\sup _{t>0} I_{V_{0}}\left(t w^{\prime}\right) .
$$

Since $V\left(x_{0}\right)>V_{0}$, we have

$$
\sup _{t>0} I_{V_{0}}\left(t w^{\prime}\right)=I_{V_{0}}\left(t^{\prime} w^{\prime}\right)<I_{V\left(x_{0}\right)}\left(t^{\prime} w^{\prime}\right) \leq \sup _{t>0} I_{V\left(x_{0}\right)}\left(t w^{\prime}\right)=I_{V\left(x_{0}\right)}\left(w^{\prime}\right)=c_{V\left(x_{0}\right)}
$$

then $c_{V_{0}}<c_{V\left(x_{0}\right)}$, which contradicts (3.4), thus (3.2) follows.
Proof of Theorem 1.1. Since $V\left(x_{0}\right)=V_{0}$, then $c_{V_{0}}=c_{V\left(x_{0}\right)}$. Combining with (3.4), we get

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla w_{n}\right|^{2}=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2}
$$

From Sobolev's inequality, $\left\{\left|w_{n}\right|^{6}\right\}$ is uniformly integrable near infinity. Lemma 2.8 yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{|z| \rightarrow \infty} w_{n}(z)=0 \text { uniformly for } n \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies that there is a $\rho$ such that $w_{n}(z)<a^{\prime}$ for all $|z| \geq \rho$ and large $n$, that is

$$
-\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla w_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \Delta w_{n}+V\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}\right) w_{n}=f\left(w_{n}\right)+w_{n}^{5} \text { in }|z| \geq \rho
$$

On the other hand, if $|z| \leq \rho$, by Lemma 3.3, we get $B_{\varepsilon_{n} \rho}\left(\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}\right) \subset \Lambda$ for all $\varepsilon_{n}$ small enough. So $g\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}, w_{n}\right)=f\left(w_{n}\right)+w_{n}^{5}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\left(a+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla w_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \Delta w_{n}+V\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}\right) w_{n}=f\left(w_{n}\right)+w_{n}^{5} \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining with the arbitrariness of $\left\{\varepsilon_{n}\right\}$, we have obtained the existence of solutions $v_{\varepsilon}$ for $\left(\hat{E}_{\varepsilon}\right)$, which is equivalent to the existence of solutions $u_{\varepsilon}$ for problem $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$.

Now we claim that if $P_{n}$ is a maximum of $w_{n}$, then

$$
w_{n}\left(P_{n}\right) \geq a^{\prime}
$$

for all $n$.
Indeed, if $w_{n}\left(P_{n}\right)<a^{\prime}$, taking $w_{n}$ as a test function for (3.6), we get

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}\right) w_{n}^{2} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(w_{n}\right) w_{n}+w_{n}^{6}
$$

which gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} w_{n}^{2} & \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(w_{n}\right) w_{n}+w_{n}^{6}=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} w_{n}^{2}\left(\frac{f\left(w_{n}\right)}{w_{n}}+w_{n}^{4}\right) \\
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} w_{n}^{2}\left(\frac{f\left(a^{\prime}\right)}{a^{\prime}}+\left(a^{\prime}\right)^{4}\right)=\frac{\alpha}{k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} w_{n}^{2},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $k>2$. Hence we got a contradiction.
By (3.5), $P_{n}$ must be bounded. Denote $z_{n}=\varepsilon_{n} P_{n}+\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}$, it is clear that $z_{n}$ is a maximum of $u_{\varepsilon_{n}}$. Combining with Lemma 3.3 and the arbitrariness of $\left\{\varepsilon_{n}\right\}$, we have obtained the concentration result in Theorem 1.1.

To complete the proof, we only need to prove the exponential decay of $u_{\varepsilon}$. Since the proof is standard (see [23, 30], for example), we omit it here.

## 4. Multiplicity of solutions to $\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$

Suppose that $V$ be a Banach space, $\mathcal{V}$ be a $C^{1}$-manifold of $V$ and $I: V \rightarrow R$ a $C^{1}$ functional. We say that $\left.I\right|_{\mathcal{V}}$ satisfies the (P.S.) condition at level $c\left((P . S .)_{c}\right.$ in short) if any sequence $\left\{u_{n}\right\} \subset \mathcal{V}$ such that $I\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow c$ and $\left\|I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)\right\|_{*} \rightarrow 0$ contains a convergent subsequence. Here $\left\|I^{\prime}(u)\right\|_{*}$ denotes the norm of the derivative of $I$ restricted to $\mathcal{V}$ at the point $u \in \mathcal{V}$.

Proposition 4.1. The functional restricted to $\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon}$ satisfies (P.S. $)_{c}$ condition for each $c \in$ $\left(0, \frac{1}{4} a b S^{3}+\frac{1}{24} b^{3} S^{6}+\frac{1}{24}\left(b^{2} S^{4}+4 a S\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)$, where

$$
\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon}:=\left\{u \in H_{\varepsilon} \backslash\{0\} \mid\left\langle J_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle=0\right\} .
$$

Proof. Let $\left\{u_{n}\right\} \subset \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon}$ be such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{\varepsilon}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow c \text { and }\left\|J_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)\right\|_{*} \rightarrow 0 \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty . \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

There exists $\left\{\lambda_{n}\right\} \subset R$ such that

$$
J_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)=\lambda_{n} \phi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)+o(1)
$$

where

$$
\phi_{\varepsilon}(u)=\left\langle J_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle .
$$

Since $\left\{u_{n}\right\} \subset \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon}$, we have that

$$
0=\left\langle J_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle=\lambda_{n}\left\langle\phi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle+o(1)\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{\varepsilon}
$$

Direct calculations show that $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is bounded in $H_{\varepsilon}$, we have that

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
u_{n} \rightharpoonup u \text { in } H_{\varepsilon}  \tag{4.2}\\
u_{n} \rightarrow u \text { in } L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{s} 1 \leq s<6, \\
u_{n} \rightarrow u \text { a.e. }
\end{array}\right.
$$

(4.2) and the fact $\left(\frac{f(s)}{s^{3}}\right)^{\prime}>0,\left(\frac{\tilde{f}(s)}{s}\right)^{\prime} \geq 0$ for all $s \geq 0$ imply that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle\phi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle \\
= & 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(a\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}+V(\varepsilon z) u_{n}^{2}\right)+4 b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(g^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon z, u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{2}+g\left(\varepsilon z, u_{n}\right) u_{n}\right) \\
= & -2 a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}-2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u_{n}^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(3 g\left(\varepsilon z, u_{n}\right) u_{n}-g^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon z, u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{2}\right) \\
= & -2 a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}-2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u_{n}^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \chi(\varepsilon z)\left(3 f\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}-f^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{2}-2\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}\right) \\
& +\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}(1-\chi(\varepsilon z))\left(3 \tilde{f}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}-\tilde{f}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{2}\right) \\
\leq & -2 a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}-2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u_{n}^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} 2(1-\chi(\varepsilon z)) \tilde{f}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n} \\
\leq & -2 a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}-2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u_{n}^{2}+\frac{2}{k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u_{n}^{2} \\
\leq & -2\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right)\left[a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u_{n}^{2}\right] \\
= & -2\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right)\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{\varepsilon}^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We may suppose that $\left\langle\phi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle \rightarrow l<0$. Hence the above expression shows that $\lambda_{n} \rightarrow 0$ and therefore we conclude that $J_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the dual space of $H_{\varepsilon}$. Now, we claim that, for each $\delta>0$, there exists $R>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varlimsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R}(0)}\left(a\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}+V(\varepsilon z) u_{n}^{2}\right)<\delta \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact, first, we may assume that $R$ is chosen so that $\left(\Lambda^{\prime} / \varepsilon\right) \subset B_{R / 2}(0)$. Let $\eta_{R}$ be a smooth cut-off function such that $\eta_{R}=0$ on $B_{R / 2}(0), \eta_{R}=1$ on $\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R}(0), 0 \leq \eta_{R} \leq 1$ and $\left|\nabla \eta_{R}\right| \leq \frac{C}{R}$. Since $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is a bounded (P.S.) sequence, we have

$$
\left\langle J_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), \eta_{R} u_{n}\right\rangle \rightarrow 0 \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla u_{n}\right) \cdot\left(\nabla\left(\eta_{R} u_{n}\right)\right)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u_{n}^{2} \eta_{R}+b \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla u_{n}\right) \cdot\left(\nabla\left(\eta_{R} u_{n}\right)\right) \\
= & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} g\left(\varepsilon z, u_{n}\right) u_{n} \eta_{R}+o(1) \leq \frac{1}{k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z) u_{n}^{2} \eta_{R}+o(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We conclude that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R}(0)}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}+\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R}(0)} V(\varepsilon z) u_{n}^{2} \\
\leq & \frac{C}{R}\left\|\nabla u_{n}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)}\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)}+\frac{C}{R}\left\|\nabla u_{n}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)}^{3}\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)}+o(1),
\end{aligned}
$$

and (4.3) follows.
We claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} g\left(\varepsilon z, u_{n}\right) u_{n} \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} g(\varepsilon z, u) u . \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact, we can use (4.2) and Dominated Convergence Theorem to show that

$$
\int_{B_{R}(0)} \chi(\varepsilon z) f\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n} \rightarrow \int_{B_{R}(0)} \chi(\varepsilon z) f(u) u
$$

and

$$
\int_{B_{R}(0)}(1-\chi(\varepsilon z)) \tilde{f}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n} \rightarrow \int_{B_{R}(0)}(1-\chi(\varepsilon z)) \tilde{f}(u) u .
$$

In order to get (4.4), we just need to prove that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{B_{R}(0)} \chi(\varepsilon z)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6} \rightarrow \int_{B_{R}(0)} \chi(\varepsilon z)\left(u^{+}\right)^{6} \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is bounded in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$, we may suppose that

$$
\left|\nabla u_{n}^{+}\right|^{2} \rightharpoonup\left|\nabla u^{+}\right|^{2}+\mu \text { and }\left|u_{n}^{+}\right|^{6} \rightharpoonup\left|u^{+}\right|^{6}+\nu,
$$

where $\mu$ and $\nu$ are bounded nonnegative measure in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. By the Concentration Compactness Principle II (Lemma 1.1 of [17]), we obtain an at most countable index set $\Gamma$, sequence $\left\{x_{i}\right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ and $\left\{\mu_{i}\right\},\left\{\nu_{i}\right\} \subset(0, \infty)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu \geq \sum_{i \in \Gamma} \mu_{i} \delta_{x_{i}}, \nu=\sum_{i \in \Gamma} \nu_{i} \delta_{x_{i}} \text { and } S\left(\nu_{i}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq \mu_{i} . \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

It suffices to show that $\left\{x_{i}\right\}_{i \in \Gamma} \cap\{z \mid \chi(\varepsilon z)>0\}=\emptyset$. Suppose, by contradiction, that $\chi\left(\varepsilon x_{i}\right)>0$ for some $i \in \Gamma$. Define, for $\rho>0$, the function $\psi_{\rho}(z):=\psi\left(\frac{z-x_{i}}{\rho}\right)$ where $\psi$ is a smooth cut-off function such that $\psi=1$ on $B_{1}(0), \psi=0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{2}(0), 0 \leq \psi \leq 1$ and $|\nabla \psi| \leq C$. we suppose that $\rho$ is chosen in such a way that the support of $\psi_{\rho}$ is contained in $\{z \mid \chi(\varepsilon z)>0\}$. We see

$$
\left\langle J_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), \psi_{\rho} u_{n}^{+}\right\rangle \rightarrow 0 \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty
$$

i.e.

$$
\begin{align*}
& a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}^{+}\right|^{2} \psi_{\rho}+a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla u_{n}^{+} \cdot \nabla \psi_{\rho}\right) u_{n}^{+}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} \psi_{\rho} \\
& +b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}\right)\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}^{+}\right|^{2} \psi_{\rho}\right)+b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}\right)\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla u_{n}^{+} \cdot \nabla \psi_{\rho}\right) u_{n}^{+}\right)  \tag{4.7}\\
& -\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} g\left(\varepsilon z, u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{+} \psi_{\rho}=o(1) .
\end{align*}
$$

Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \varlimsup_{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla u_{n}^{+} \cdot \nabla \psi_{\rho}\right) u_{n}^{+}\right| \leq \varlimsup_{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} u_{n}^{2}\left|\nabla \psi_{\rho}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq & C\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} u^{2}\left|\nabla \psi_{\rho}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\left(\int_{B_{2 \rho}\left(x_{i}\right)} u^{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{6}}\left(\int_{B_{2 \rho}\left(x_{i}\right)}\left|\nabla \psi_{\rho}\right|^{3}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \\
\leq & C\left(\int_{B_{2 \rho}\left(x_{i}\right)} u^{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{6}} \rightarrow 0 \text { as } \rho \rightarrow 0, \\
& \varlimsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}^{+}\right|^{2} \psi_{\rho} \geq a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u^{+}\right|^{2} \psi_{\rho}+a \mu_{i} \rightarrow a \mu_{i} \text { as } \rho \rightarrow 0, \\
& {\overline{\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}} b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}\right)\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}^{+}\right|^{2} \psi_{\rho}\right) \geq \overline{\lim }_{n \rightarrow \infty} b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}^{+}\right|^{2} \psi_{\rho}\right)^{2}}_{\geq} b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u^{+}\right|^{2} \psi_{\rho}+\mu_{i}\right)^{2} \rightarrow b \mu_{i}^{2} \text { as } \rho \rightarrow 0, \\
& \varlimsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} \psi_{\rho}=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z)\left(u^{+}\right)^{2} \psi_{\rho} \rightarrow 0 \text { as } \rho \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

and similarly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \varlimsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \\
= & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} g\left(\varepsilon z, u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{+} \psi_{\rho} \\
= & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \chi(\varepsilon z) f(u) u \psi_{\rho}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}(1-\chi(\varepsilon z)) \tilde{f}(u) u \psi_{\rho}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \chi(\varepsilon z)\left(u^{+}\right)^{6} \psi_{\rho}+\chi\left(\varepsilon x_{i}\right) \nu_{i} \\
\rightarrow & \chi\left(\varepsilon x_{i}\right) \nu_{i} \text { as } \rho \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

we obtain from (4.7) that

$$
a \mu_{i}+b \mu_{i}^{2} \leq \chi\left(\varepsilon x_{i}\right) \nu_{i}
$$

Combining with (4.6), we have

$$
\left(\nu_{i}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \geq \frac{b S^{2}+\sqrt{b^{2} S^{4}+4 a S}}{2 \chi\left(\varepsilon x_{i}\right)}
$$

On the other hand,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& c+o(1) \\
&= J_{\varepsilon}\left(u_{n}\right)-\frac{1}{4}\left\langle J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle \\
& \geq \frac{1}{4} a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}^{+}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\frac{1}{4} g\left(\varepsilon z, u_{n}\right) u_{n}-G\left(\varepsilon z, u_{n}\right)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}^{+}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \chi(\varepsilon z)\left(\frac{1}{4} f\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}-F\left(u_{n}\right)\right) \\
&+\frac{1}{12} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \chi(\varepsilon z)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}(1-\chi(\varepsilon z))\left(\frac{1}{4} \tilde{f}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}-\tilde{F}\left(u_{n}\right)\right) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{4} a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}^{+}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{12} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \chi(\varepsilon z)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}(1-\chi(\varepsilon z)) \tilde{F}\left(u_{n}\right) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{4} a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}^{+}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(\varepsilon z)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{12} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \chi(\varepsilon z)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6} \\
&-\frac{1}{4 k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}(1-\chi(\varepsilon z)) V(\varepsilon z)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} \\
& \geq \frac{1}{4} a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}^{+}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{12} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \chi(\varepsilon z)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{6} \\
& \geq \frac{1}{4} a \mu_{i}+\frac{1}{12} \chi\left(\varepsilon x_{i}\right) \nu_{i}+o(1),
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
c & \geq \frac{1}{4} a S\left(\nu_{i}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}+\frac{1}{12} \chi\left(\varepsilon x_{i}\right) \nu_{i} \\
& \geq \frac{1}{4} a S \frac{b S^{2}+\sqrt{b^{2} S^{4}+4 a S}}{2 \chi\left(\varepsilon x_{i}\right)}+\frac{1}{12} \chi\left(\varepsilon x_{i}\right)\left(\frac{b S^{2}+\sqrt{b^{2} S^{4}+4 a S}}{2 \chi\left(\varepsilon x_{i}\right)}\right)^{3} \\
& \geq \frac{1}{4} a S \frac{b S^{2}+\sqrt{b^{2} S^{4}+4 a S}}{2}+\frac{1}{12}\left(\frac{b S^{2}+\sqrt{b^{2} S^{4}+4 a S}}{2}\right)^{3} \\
& =\frac{1}{4} a b S^{3}+\frac{1}{24} b^{3} S^{6}+\frac{1}{24}\left(b^{2} S^{4}+4 a S\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This leads to a contradiction, hence (4.5) holds, then (4.4) follows.
Since $\left\langle J_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right), u_{n}\right\rangle \rightarrow 0$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{\varepsilon}^{2}+b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} g\left(\varepsilon z, u_{n}\right) u_{n} \rightarrow 0 \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty . \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (4.2), $u$ satisfies

$$
-(a+b A) \Delta u+V(\varepsilon z) u=g(\varepsilon z, u)
$$

where $A:=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2} \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla u|^{2}$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{\varepsilon}^{2}+b A \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla u_{n}\right|^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} g(\varepsilon z, u) u=0 . \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining (4.4), (4.8) with (4.9), we get

$$
u_{n} \rightarrow u \text { in } H_{\varepsilon} \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty
$$

Proposition 4.2. For any $\delta>0$, there exists $\varepsilon_{\delta}>0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{\delta}\right)$, the Equation ( $\hat{E}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$ ) has at least cat $M_{M_{\delta}}(M)$ solutions.

Before proving this proposition, we need some lemmas.

Lemma 4.3. (See Chapter II, 3.2. of [7]) Let I be a $C^{1}$-functional defined on a $C^{1}$-Finsler manifold $\mathcal{V}$. If I is bounded from below and satisfies the (PS) condition, then I has at least $\operatorname{cat}_{\nu}(\mathcal{V})$ distinct critical points.

Lemma 4.4. (See Lemma 4.3 of [4]) Let $\Gamma, \Omega^{+}, \Omega^{-}$be closed sets with $\Omega^{-} \subset \Omega^{+}$. Let $\Phi: \Omega^{-} \rightarrow \Gamma, \beta: \Gamma \rightarrow \Omega^{+}$be two continuous maps such that $\beta \circ \Phi$ is homotopically equivalent to the embedding Id : $\Omega^{-} \rightarrow \Omega^{+}$. Then $\operatorname{cat}_{\Gamma}(\Gamma) \geq \operatorname{cat}_{\Omega^{+}}\left(\Omega^{-}\right)$.

From Proposition 2.6, denote by $w \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ such that $I^{\prime}{ }_{V_{0}}(w)=0$ and $I_{V_{0}}(w)=c_{V_{0}}$, where $I_{V_{0}}, c_{V_{0}}$ have been mentioned in (2.23).

Let us consider $\delta>0$ such that $M_{\delta} \subset \Lambda$ and a smooth cut-off function $\eta$ with $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\eta=1$ on $B_{1}(0), \eta=0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{2}(0),|\nabla \eta| \leq C$. For any $y \in M$, we define the function

$$
\psi_{\varepsilon, y}(z)=\eta\left(\frac{\varepsilon z-y}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right) w\left(\frac{\varepsilon z-y}{\varepsilon}\right)
$$

and $t_{\varepsilon}>0$ satisfying $\max _{t \geq 0} J_{\varepsilon}\left(t \psi_{\varepsilon, y}\right)=J_{\varepsilon}\left(t_{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon, y}\right)$ and $\left.\frac{d J_{\varepsilon}\left(t \psi_{\varepsilon, y}\right)}{d t}\right|_{t=t_{\varepsilon}>0}=0$.
Define $\Phi_{\varepsilon}: M \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon}$ by

$$
\Phi_{\varepsilon}(y):=t_{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon, y} .
$$

As we prove Lemma 2.7, we have
Lemma 4.5. Uniformly for $y \in M$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^{+}} J_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon}(y)\right)=c_{V_{0}} \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consider $\delta>0$ such that $M_{\delta} \subset \Lambda$ and choose $\rho=\rho(\delta)>0$ satisfying $M_{\delta} \subset B_{\rho}(0)$. Let $\Upsilon: \mathbb{R}^{3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3}$ be defined as $\Upsilon(z):=z$ for $|z| \leq \rho$ and $\Upsilon(z):=\rho z /|z|$ for $|z| \geq \rho$, and consider the map $\beta_{\varepsilon}: \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3}$ given by

$$
\beta_{\varepsilon}(u):=\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \Upsilon(\varepsilon z) u^{2}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} u^{2}}
$$

Moreover, we conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^{+}} \beta_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon}(y)\right)=y \text { uniformly for } y \in M \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact, Let $z^{\prime}=\frac{\varepsilon z-y}{\varepsilon}$, we see

$$
\beta_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon}(y)\right)=y+\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\Upsilon\left(\varepsilon z^{\prime}+y\right)-y\right) \eta^{2}\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon} z^{\prime}\right) w^{2}\left(z^{\prime}\right)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \eta^{2}\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon} z^{\prime}\right) w^{2}\left(z^{\prime}\right)}
$$

Direct calculations show that,

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \eta^{2}\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon} z^{\prime}\right) w^{2}\left(z^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} w^{2}>0 \text { as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0
$$

Since $y \in M$ and $M$ is compact,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\Upsilon\left(\varepsilon z^{\prime}+y\right)-y\right) \eta^{2}\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon} z^{\prime}\right) w^{2}\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right| \\
& \leq \int_{B \frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(0)}\left|\Upsilon\left(\varepsilon z^{\prime}+y\right)-\Upsilon(y)\right| w^{2}\left(z^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq o(1) \int_{B_{\frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}}(0)} w^{2}\left(z^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow 0 \text { as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \text { uniformly for } y \in M
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence (4.11) holds.
Lemma 4.6. Let $\varepsilon_{n} \rightarrow 0^{+}$and $u_{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_{n}}$ such that $J_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow c_{V_{0}}$. Then there exists $\left\{y_{n}\right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ such that the sequence $u_{n}\left(z+y_{n}\right)$ has a convergent subsequence in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$. Moreover, up to a subsequence, $\varepsilon_{n} y_{n} \rightarrow y \in M$.

Proof. Direct calculations show that $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is bounded in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$, the same arguments employed in Lemma 2.3 provides a sequence $\left\{y_{n}\right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ and positive constants $R, \beta$ such that

$$
\int_{B_{R}\left(y_{n}\right)}\left|u_{n}\right|^{2} \geq \beta>0
$$

Denote by $\tilde{u}_{n}(z)=u_{n}\left(z+y_{n}\right)$, going if necessary to a subsequence, we can assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{u}_{n} \rightharpoonup \tilde{u} \neq 0 \text { in } H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) . \tag{4.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $t_{n}>0$ be such that $t_{n} \tilde{u}_{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{V_{0}}$, where $\mathcal{N}_{V_{0}}:=\left\{u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \backslash\{0\} \mid\left\langle I^{\prime}{ }_{0}(u), u\right\rangle=0\right\}$. By the definition of $I_{V_{0}}, c_{V_{0}}$, we obtain

$$
c_{V_{0}} \leq I_{V_{0}}\left(t_{n} \tilde{u}_{n}\right)=I_{V_{0}}\left(t_{n} u_{n}\right) \leq J_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(t_{n} u_{n}\right) \leq J_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right)=c_{V_{0}}+o(1),
$$

from which it follows that $I_{V_{0}}\left(t_{n} \tilde{u}_{n}\right) \rightarrow c_{V_{0}}$.
We claim, up to a subsequence, that $t_{n} \rightarrow t_{0}>0$. Direct computations show that $\left\{t_{n} \tilde{u}_{n}\right\}$ is bounded in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$. Since $\tilde{u}_{n}$ does not converge to 0 in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$, there exists a $\delta^{\prime}>0$ such that $\left\|\tilde{u}_{n}\right\|_{H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)} \geq \delta^{\prime}>0$. Therefore, $0<t_{n} \delta^{\prime} \leq\left\|t_{n} \tilde{u}_{n}\right\|_{H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)} \leq C$. Thus $\left\{t_{n}\right\}$ is bounded and we can suppose that $t_{n} \rightarrow t_{0} \geq 0$. If $t_{0}=0$, in view of the boundedness
of $\left\{\tilde{u}_{n}\right\}$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$, we have $t_{n} \tilde{u}_{n} \rightarrow 0$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$. Hence $I_{0}\left(t_{n} \tilde{u}_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0$, which contradicts $c_{V_{0}}>0$.

Denote by $\hat{u}_{n}:=t_{n} \tilde{u}_{n}, \hat{u}:=t_{0} \tilde{u}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{V_{0}}\left(\hat{u}_{n}\right) \rightarrow c_{V_{0}}, \hat{u}_{n} \rightharpoonup \hat{u} \text { in } H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \tag{4.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact, by the Ekeland's Variational Principle in [10], there exists a sequence $\left\{\hat{w}_{n}\right\} \subset \mathcal{N}_{V_{0}}$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{w}_{n}-\hat{u}_{n} \rightarrow 0 \text { in } H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right), I_{V_{0}}\left(\hat{w}_{n}\right) \rightarrow c_{V_{0}},\left\|I_{V_{0}}^{\prime}\left(\hat{w}_{n}\right)\right\|_{*} \rightarrow 0 \tag{4.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 4.1, we get that

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{V_{0}}^{\prime}\left(\hat{w}_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0 \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty \tag{4.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (4.13), (4.14),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{w}_{n} \rightharpoonup \hat{u} \text { in } H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \tag{4.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the same arguments as in the proof of (2.18), we conclude that $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{N}_{V_{0}}$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_{V_{0}} & \leq I_{V_{0}}(\hat{u})=I_{V_{0}}(\hat{u})-\frac{1}{4}\left\langle I_{V_{0}}^{\prime}(\hat{u}), \hat{u}\right\rangle \\
& =\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(a|\nabla \hat{u}|^{2}+V_{0}(\hat{u})^{2}\right)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\frac{1}{4} f(\hat{u}) \hat{u}-F(\hat{u})\right)+\frac{1}{12} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\hat{u}^{+}\right)^{6} \\
& \leq \underline{\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}} \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(a\left|\nabla \hat{w}_{n}\right|^{2}+V_{0}\left(\hat{w}_{n}\right)^{2}\right)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\frac{1}{4} f\left(\hat{w}_{n}\right) \hat{w}_{n}-F\left(\hat{w}_{n}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{12} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\hat{w}_{n}^{+}\right)^{6} \\
& =\varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{V_{0}}\left(\hat{w}_{n}\right)-\frac{1}{4}\left\langle I_{V_{0}}^{\prime}\left(\hat{w}_{n}\right), \hat{w}_{n}\right\rangle=c_{V_{0}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(a\left|\nabla \hat{w}_{n}\right|^{2}+V_{0}\left(\hat{w}_{n}\right)^{2}\right) \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(a|\nabla \hat{u}|^{2}+V_{0}(\hat{u})^{2}\right) \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty
$$

which combined with (4.14) and (4.16) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{u}_{n} \rightarrow \tilde{u} \text { in } H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \tag{4.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, we are going to prove that $\varepsilon_{n} y_{n} \rightarrow y \in M$. First, as we prove Lemma 3.2, we can prove that $\left\{\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}\right\}$ is bounded and $\varepsilon_{n} y_{n} \rightarrow y \in \overline{\Lambda^{\prime}}$. Hence it suffices to show that $V(y)=V_{0}:=\inf _{\Lambda} V$. Arguing by contradiction again, we assume that $V(y)>V_{0}$. Recalling (4.17), we get that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& c_{V_{0}}= I_{V_{0}}(\hat{u}) \\
&< \frac{1}{2} a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla \hat{u}|^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(y)(\hat{u})^{2}+\frac{1}{4} b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla \hat{u}|^{2}\right)^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(F(\hat{u})+\frac{1}{6}\left(\hat{u}^{+}\right)^{6}\right) \\
& \leq \underline{\lim } \\
& n \rightarrow \infty \frac{1}{2} a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla \hat{u}_{n}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\varepsilon_{n} y_{n}\right)\left(\hat{u}_{n}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{4} b\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla \hat{u}_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{2} \\
&-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(F\left(\hat{u}_{n}\right)+\frac{1}{6}\left(\hat{u}_{n}^{+}\right)^{6}\right) \\
& \leq \underline{\lim } \\
& n \rightarrow \infty \\
& \varepsilon_{n}\left(t_{n} u_{n}\right) \leq \underline{\lim } \\
& n \rightarrow \infty \\
& \delta_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right)=c_{V_{0}},
\end{aligned}
$$

which does not make sense, thus $V(y)=V_{0}$ and the proof is completed.
Define

$$
\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon}:=\left\{u \in \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon} \mid J_{\varepsilon}(u) \leq c_{V_{0}}+h(\varepsilon)\right\},
$$

where $h(\varepsilon):=\sup _{y \in M}\left|J_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon}(y)\right)-c_{V_{0}}\right|$. we can deduce from Lemma 4.5 that, $h(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow \tilde{0}^{+}$. By the definition of $h(\varepsilon)$, we know that, for any $y \in M$ and $\varepsilon>0, \Phi_{\varepsilon}(y) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon} \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 4.7. For any $\delta>0$, we have

$$
\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^{+}} \sup _{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon}} \operatorname{dist}\left(\beta_{\varepsilon}(u), M_{\delta}\right)=0
$$

Proof. Let $\left\{\varepsilon_{n}\right\} \subset R$ be such that $\varepsilon_{n} \rightarrow 0^{+}$. By definition, there exists $u_{n} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon_{n}}$ such that

$$
\operatorname{dist}\left(\beta_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right), M_{\delta}\right)=\sup _{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon_{n}}} \operatorname{dist}\left(\beta_{\varepsilon_{n}}(u), M_{\delta}\right)+o(1)
$$

Thus it suffices to find a sequence $\left\{\tilde{y}_{n}\right\} \subset M_{\delta}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\beta_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right)-\tilde{y}_{n}\right|=o(1) . \tag{4.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $u_{n} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon_{n}} \subset \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_{n}}$, we can use the definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon_{n}}$ to obtain

$$
c_{V_{0}} \leq \inf _{u \in \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_{n}}} J_{\varepsilon_{n}}(u) \leq J_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right) \leq c_{V_{0}}+h\left(\varepsilon_{n}\right)
$$

therefore, $J_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow c_{V_{0}}$. By Lemma 4.6, we can get a sequence $\left\{y_{n}\right\}$ and $\tilde{u} \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \backslash\{0\}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{n}\left(z+y_{n}\right) \rightarrow \tilde{u} \text { in } H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) . \tag{4.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, up to a subsequence,

$$
\tilde{y}_{n}:=\varepsilon_{n} y_{n} \rightarrow y \in M \subset M_{\delta}
$$

By direct computations,

$$
\beta_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right)=\tilde{y}_{n}+\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\Upsilon\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\tilde{y}_{n}\right)-\tilde{y}_{n}\right) \tilde{u}_{n}^{2}\left(z+y_{n}\right)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} u_{n}^{2}\left(z+y_{n}\right)} .
$$

By (4.19), we have

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} u_{n}^{2}\left(z+y_{n}\right) \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \tilde{u}^{2}>0
$$

and $\left\{u_{n}^{2}\left(z+y_{n}\right)\right\}$ is uniformly integrable near $\infty$, i.e. $\forall \delta^{\prime}>0, \exists R>0$ such that

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R}(0)} u_{n}^{2}\left(z+y_{n}\right)<\delta^{\prime} / 4 \rho .
$$

Thus

$$
\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R}(0)}\left(\Upsilon\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\tilde{y}_{n}\right)-\tilde{y}_{n}\right) \tilde{u}_{n}^{2}\left(z+y_{n}\right)\right| \leq 2 \rho \cdot\left(\delta^{\prime} / 4 \rho\right)=\delta^{\prime} / 2 .
$$

Since $\left\{\tilde{y}_{n}\right\} \subset M_{\delta}$ and $M_{\delta}$ is compact, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\int_{B_{R}(0)}\left(\Upsilon\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\tilde{y}_{n}\right)-\tilde{y}_{n}\right) \tilde{u}_{n}^{2}\left(z+y_{n}\right)\right| \\
& =\left|\int_{B_{R}(0)}\left(\Upsilon\left(\varepsilon_{n} z+\tilde{y}_{n}\right)-\Upsilon\left(\tilde{y}_{n}\right)\right) \tilde{u}_{n}^{2}\left(z+y_{n}\right)\right| \\
& \leq o(1) \int_{B_{R}(0)} \tilde{u}_{n}^{2}\left(z+y_{n}\right) \leq o(1)<\delta^{\prime} / 2
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $n$ large enough. Hence (4.18) follows, the lemma is proved.
Proof of Proposition 4.2. Given $\delta>0$ such that $M_{\delta} \subset \Lambda$, we can use Lemma 4.5, Lemma 4.7 and (4.11) to obtain $\varepsilon_{\delta}>0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{\delta}\right)$, the diagram

$$
M \xrightarrow{\Phi_{q}} \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon} \xrightarrow{\beta_{\varepsilon}} M_{\delta}
$$

is well defined. In view of (4.11), for $\varepsilon$ small enough, we can denote by $\beta_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon}(y)\right)=y+\theta(y)$ for $y \in M$, where $|\theta(y)|<\delta^{\prime} / 2$ uniformly for $y \in M$. Define $S(t, y)=y+(1-t) \theta(y)$. Thus $S:[0,1] \times M \rightarrow M_{\delta}$ is continuous. Obviously, $S(0, y)=\beta_{\varepsilon}\left(\Phi_{\varepsilon}(y)\right)$ and $S(1, y)=y$ for all $y \in M$. That is, $\beta_{\varepsilon} \circ \Phi_{\varepsilon}$ is homotopically equivalent to $I d: M \rightarrow M_{\delta}$. By Lemma 4.4, we obtain that

$$
\operatorname{cat}_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon}}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon}\right) \geq \operatorname{cat}_{M_{\delta}}(M)
$$

Since $c_{V_{0}}<\frac{1}{4} a b S^{3}+\frac{1}{24} b^{3} S^{6}+\frac{1}{24}\left(b^{2} S^{4}+4 a S\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}$, we can use the definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon}$ and Proposition 4.1 to conclude that $J_{\varepsilon}$ satisfies the (P.S.) condition in $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon}$ for all small $\varepsilon>0$. Therefore, Lemma 4.3 proves at least cat $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon}\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon}\right)$ critical points of $J_{\varepsilon}$ restricted to $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon}$. Using the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 4.1, we can conclude that a critical point of the functional $J_{\varepsilon}$ on $\mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon}$, is in fact, a critical point of the functional $J_{\varepsilon}$ in $H_{\varepsilon}$ and therefore a weak solution for the problem $\left(\hat{E}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right)$, the theorem is proved.
Proof of Theorem 1.2. For any sequence $\left\{\varepsilon_{n}\right\} \subset R$ satisfying $\varepsilon_{n} \rightarrow 0^{+}$, denote $v_{\varepsilon_{n}} \in$ $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon_{n}} \subset \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon_{n}}$ by a weak solution of $\left(\hat{E}_{\varepsilon_{n}}^{\prime}\right)$, we can use the definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\varepsilon}$ to obtain

$$
c_{V_{0}} \leq \inf _{u \in \mathcal{E}_{\varepsilon_{n}}} J_{\varepsilon_{n}}(u) \leq J_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(v_{\varepsilon_{n}}\right) \leq c_{V_{0}}+h\left(\varepsilon_{n}\right)
$$

therefore, $J_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(v_{\varepsilon_{n}}\right) \rightarrow c_{V_{0}}$. By Lemma 4.6, we can get a sequence $\left\{y_{n}\right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ and $\tilde{v} \in$ $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \backslash\{0\}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
v_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(z+y_{n}\right) \rightarrow \tilde{v} \text { in } H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \tag{4.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, up to a subsequence,

$$
\varepsilon_{n} y_{n} \rightarrow y \in M
$$

(4.20) and the Sobolev's Theorem show that

$$
v_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(z+y_{n}\right) \rightarrow \tilde{v} \text { in } L^{6}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) .
$$

Thus, $\left\{\left|v_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(z+y_{n}\right)\right|^{6}\right\}$ is uniformly integrable near $\infty$. By Lemma 2.7, we get that $\lim _{|z| \rightarrow \infty} v_{\varepsilon_{n}}\left(z+y_{n}\right)=0$ uniformly for $n$.

Proceeding as we prove Theorem 1.1, we can complete the proof.
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