

Singular doubly nonlocal elliptic problems with Choquard type critical growth nonlinearities

Jacques Giacomoni^{1 *}, Divya Goel^{2†} and K. Sreenadh^{2‡}

¹ Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, LMAP (UMR E2S-UPPA CNRS 5142)

Bat. IPRA, Avenue de l'Université F-64013 Pau, France

² Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi,

Hauz Khaz, New Delhi-110016, India

Abstract

The theory of elliptic equations involving singular nonlinearities is well studied topic but the interaction of singular type nonlinearity with nonlocal nonlinearity in elliptic problems has not been investigated so far. In this article, we study the very singular and doubly nonlocal singular problem (P_λ) (See below). Firstly, we establish a very weak comparison principle and the optimal Sobolev regularity. Next using the critical point theory of non-smooth analysis and the geometry of the energy functional, we establish the global multiplicity of positive weak solutions.

Key words: Choquard equation, Fractional Laplacian, Singular Nonlinearity, Non smooth analysis, Regularity.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 49J35, 35A15, 35S15, 46E35, 49J52

*e-mail: jacques.giacomoni@univ-pau.fr

†e-mail: divyagoel2511@gmail.com

‡e-mail: sreenadh@maths.iitd.ac.in

1 Introduction

The purpose of the article is to discuss the existence and multiplicity of weak solutions to the following singular problem:

$$(P_\lambda) \begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u = u^{-q} + \lambda \left(\int_\Omega \frac{|u|^{2_\mu^*}(y)}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \right) |u|^{2_\mu^*-2} u, & u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases}$$

for all $q > 0, N \geq 2s, s \in (0, 1), 2_\mu^* = \frac{2N-\mu}{N-2s}$ and Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N with smooth boundary. Here the operator $(-\Delta)^s$ is the fractional Laplacian defined as

$$(-\Delta)^s u(x) = -\text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} dy$$

where P.V. denotes the Cauchy principal value.

The problems involving singular nonlinearity have a very long history. In the pioneering work [12], Crandall, Rabinowitz and Tartar [12] proved the existence of a solution of classical elliptic PDE with singular nonlinearity using the approximation arguments. Later many researchers studied the problems involving singular nonlinearity. Haitao [26] studied the following problem

$$-\Delta u = au^{-q} + bu^{\frac{N+2}{N-2}}, u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N (N \geq 3)$ is a smooth bounded domain. If $a = \lambda$ and $b = 1$, and $q \in (0, 1)$, authors proved a global multiplicity result. While in [3, 14], researchers improvised the results of [26] and proved the global multiplicity result for $q \in (0, 3)$. In [28], Hirano, Saccon, and Shioji studied the problem (1.1) with $a = \lambda$ and $b = 1$, and $q \in (0, 1)$. Using the well known splitting Nehari manifold method, authors proved the multiplicity of solutions for small λ . While in [29], authors studied the problem for all $q > 0, a = 1, b = \lambda$, and established a global multiplicity result using the nonsmooth analysis. For more details on singular type problems, we refer to [11, 18, 23, 24, 26, 27] and references therein.

The study of nonlinear elliptic problems with critical terms motivated by Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality started long back and attracted lot of researchers due to its wide applications. Indeed, it was originated in the framework of various physical models. One of the first applications was found in H. Fröhlich and S. Pekar model of the polaron, where free electrons in an ionic lattice interact with photons associated to the deformations of the lattice or with the polarization that it creates on the medium [15, 16]. In the modeling of one component plasma, Ph. Choquard gave the model which involves Choquard equation [30]. Later on such nonlinear problems are called Choquard equations and many researchers studied these type

of problems to understand the existence, uniqueness, radial symmetry and regularity of the solutions [33, 34, 35] and references therein. Pertaining the Choquard type critical exponent problems on bounded domains, Gao and Yang [17] studied the Brezis-Nirenberg type existence and nonexistence results with Choquard critical nonlinearities. In [9], [37] and [41] are studied a Brezis-Nirenberg type problem with uppercritical growth, concentration profiles of ground states and existence of semiclassical states respectively.

Nonlocal problems involving fractional Laplacian challenged a lot of researchers due to the large spectrum of applications. Consider the following problem

$$(-\Delta)^s u = f(x, u) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \quad (1.2)$$

where f is a Carathéodory function. The questions of existence, multiplicity and regularity of solutions to problem (1.2) have been extensively studied in [32, 1] and references therein. Concerning the existence and multiplicity of solutions to doubly nonlocal problems, a lot of works have been done. For a detailed state of art, one can refer [10, 13, 36] and references therein.

On the other hand, Barrios et al. [4] started the work on nonlocal equations with singular nonlinearity. Precisely, [4] deal with the existence of solutions to the following problem

$$(-\Delta)^s u = \lambda \left(\frac{a(x)}{u^r} + f(x, u) \right) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega \quad (1.3)$$

where Ω is a bounded domain with smooth boundary, $N > 2s$, $0 < s < 1$, $r, \lambda > 0$, $f(x, u) \sim u^p$, $1 < p < 2_s^* - 1$. In the spirit of [12], here authors first prove the existence of solutions u_n to the equation with singular term $1/u^r$ replaced by $1/(u+1/n)^r$ and use the uniform estimates on the sequence $\{u_n\}$ to finally prove the existence of a solution to (1.3). Furthermore, authors prove some Sobolev regularity, in particular for $r > 1$ that $u^{\frac{r+1}{2}} \in X_0$. In case of $s = 1$, optimal Sobolev regularity was established in [5] and [6] for semilinear and quasilinear elliptic type problems respectively. But in case of $0 < s < 1$, the question of optimal Sobolev regularity still remained an open question. The regularity issue is of independent interest. In the recent times, Adimurthi, Giacomoni and Santra [2] studied the problem (1.3) with $f = 0$ and complement the results of [4]. In particular they obtained the boundary behaviour and Hölder regularity of the classical solution. Then exploiting this asymptotic behavior, authors obtained multiplicity of classical solutions by global bifurcation method in the framework of weighted spaces for (1.3) with subcritical f .

Regarding the critical case, Giacomoni, Mukherjee and Sreenadh [21] studied the problem (1.3) with $a = 1/\lambda$, $r > 0$, and $f(x, u) \sim u^{2_s^* - 1}$. Here authors extended the techniques of [29] in fractional framework and proved the existence and multiplicity of solutions in $C_{\text{loc}}^\alpha(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Recently, authors [20] proved the global multiplicity result for (1.3)

with $a = 1/\lambda, p = 2_s^* - 1$ and $r(2s - 1) < (1 + 2s)$ for energy solutions. Concerning the doubly nonlocal problem with singular operators, in [19], we studied the regularity results for the problems of the type (P_λ) with $0 < q < 1$. But the questions of existence, multiplicity of solutions to the problem (P_λ) was a completely open problem even when $s = 1$. Also the question of (Hölder, Sobolev) regularity of solutions for $q \geq 1$ still remained as an open problem.

Motivated by the above discussion, in this article we answer the open problems stated above with an unified approach. More precisely, we consider a more general definition of weak solutions as compared to definition of (1.3) in [2]. By establishing a new comparison principle (see Lemma 3.1) we prove that any very weak solution is actually a classical solution. This is a significant extension of the regularity results obtained in [2]. The question of optimal Sobolev regularity is also answered in our article (see Lemma 2.7 and Theorem 2.14). To prove Lemma 2.7, we exploit suitably the boundary behavior of the weak solution of problem (2.1) and the Hardy's inequality. The crucial comparison principle in Lemma 3.1 is obtained with a careful use of suitable testing functions to tackle the H_{loc}^s phenomena. In case of $s = 1$, this result was established in [8] with a slightly different approach. We first prove the $L^\infty(\Omega)$ estimate for solutions of (P_λ) by establishing the relation between the solutions of (P_λ) and (\widetilde{P}_λ) (See Section 2). The techniques used here can be applied in a more general context and are of independent interest. Next, using the results of [2] and Lemma 3.1 we prove the asymptotic behavior and optimal Hölder and Sobolev regularity of weak solutions.

In this paper we have given a consolidated approach to prove the global multiplicity result for the problem (P_λ) exploiting convex properties of the singular nonlinearity and the geometry of the energy functional. To the best of our knowledge there is no previous contribution which deals the Choquard problem with singular nonlinearity. Further, the results proved in this article are new and novel even in case of $s = 1$ where the approach can be closely adapted.

For simplicity of illustration, we set some notations. We denote $\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ by $|u|_p$, $\|u\|_{X_0}$ by $\|u\|$, $[u]_{H^s(A)} = \int_A \int_A \frac{(u(x)-u(y))^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} dx dy$. The positive constants $C, c_1, c_2 \dots$ values change case by case.

Turning to the paper organization: In Section 2, we define the function spaces, give some preliminaries of nonsmooth analysis and further state the main results of the article. In Section 3, we establish a very weak comparison principle. In Section 4, we established the regularity of solutions to (P_λ) . In sections 5 and 6, we prove the existence of first and second solution to (P_λ) .

2 Preliminary results and statement of main results

We recall the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev Inequality which is foundational in study of Choquard problems of the type (P_λ)

Proposition 2.1. [31] *Let $t, r > 1$ and $0 < \mu < N$ with $1/t + \mu/N + 1/r = 2$, $f \in L^t(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $h \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^N)$. There exists a sharp constant $C(t, r, \mu, N)$ independent of f, h , such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{f(x)h(y)}{|x-y|^\mu} dydx \leq C(t, r, \mu, N)|f|_t|h|_r.$$

Consider the space

$$X_0 := \{u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N) : u = 0 \text{ a.e in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega\},$$

equipped with the inner product

$$\langle u, v \rangle = \iint_Q \frac{(u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy.$$

where $Q = \mathbb{R}^{2N} \setminus (\Omega^c \times \Omega^c)$. From the embedding results ([32]), the space X_0 is continuously embedded into $L^r(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $r \in [1, 2_s^*]$ where $2_s^* = \frac{2N}{N-2s}$. The embedding is compact if and only if $r < 2_s^*$. The best constant S of the classical Sobolev embedding is defined

$$S = \inf_{u \in X_0 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}{\left(\int_{\Omega} |u|^{2_s^*}\right)^{2/2_s^*}}.$$

Consequently, we define

$$S_{H,L} = \inf_{u \in X_0 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u|^{2_s^*}(x)|u|^{2_s^*}(y)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy\right)^{1/2_s^*}}.$$

Lemma 2.2. [36] *The constant $S_{H,L}$ is achieved if and only if*

$$u = C \left(\frac{b}{b^2 + |x - a|^2} \right)^{\frac{N-2s}{2}}$$

where $C > 0$ is a fixed constant, $a \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $b \in (0, \infty)$ are parameters. Moreover,

$$S = S_{H,L} (C(N, \mu))^{\frac{N-2s}{2N-\mu}}.$$

Definition 2.3. For $\phi \in C_0(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\phi > 0$ in Ω , the set $C_\phi(\Omega)$ is defined as

$$C_\phi(\Omega) = \{u \in C_0(\overline{\Omega}) : \text{there exists } c \geq 0 \text{ such that } |u(x)| \leq c\phi(x), \text{ for all } x \in \Omega\},$$

endowed with the natural norm $\left\| \frac{u}{\phi} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$.

Definition 2.4. The positive cone of $C_\phi(\Omega)$ is the open convex subset of $C_\phi(\Omega)$ defined as

$$C_\phi^+(\Omega) = \left\{ u \in C_\phi(\Omega) : \inf_{x \in \Omega} \frac{u(x)}{\phi(x)} > 0 \right\}.$$

The barrier function ϕ_q is defined as follows:

$$\phi_q = \begin{cases} \phi_1 & \text{if } 0 < q < 1, \\ \phi_1 \left(\log \left(\frac{A}{\phi_1} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } q = 1, \\ \phi_1^{\frac{2}{q+1}} & \text{if } q > 1, \end{cases}$$

where ϕ_1 is the normalized ($\|\phi_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 1$) eigenfunction corresponding to the smallest eigenvalue of $(-\Delta)^s$ on X_0 and $A > \text{diam}(\Omega)$. We recall that $\phi_1 \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\phi_1 \in C_{d^s}^+(\Omega)$ (See Proposition 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 of [40]).

Before giving the definition of weak solution to (P_λ) we discuss the solution of the following purely singular problem

$$(-\Delta)^s u = u^{-q}, \quad u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \quad (2.1)$$

From [2] we know the following result.

Proposition 2.5. Let $q > 0$. Then there exists $\bar{u} \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap C_{\phi_q}^+$ classical solution to (2.1). Moreover, \bar{u} has the following properties:

(i) $\bar{u} \in X_0$ if and only if $q(2s - 1) < (2s + 1)$ and in this case we have unique classical solution to (2.1).

(ii) $\bar{u} \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^N)$ where

$$\gamma = \begin{cases} s & \text{if } q < 1, \\ s - \varepsilon & \text{if } q = 1, \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ small enough,} \\ \frac{1}{q+1} & \text{if } q > 1. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

Remark 2.6. We remark that since $\bar{u} \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap C_{\phi_q}^+ \cap C^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^N)$. So we can achieve the interior C^∞ regularity. That is for any compact set $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ we have $\bar{u} \in C^\infty(\Omega')$. From this one can easily prove the fact that $\bar{u} \in H_{loc}^s(\Omega)$.

Lemma 2.7. (a) If $q(2s - 1) \geq (2s + 1)$ then $\bar{u}^\gamma \in X_0$ if and only if $\gamma > \frac{(2s-1)(q+1)}{4s}$. Moreover

the lower bound on γ is optimal in the sense that $u^\gamma \notin X_0$ if $\gamma \leq \frac{(2s-1)(q+1)}{4s}$.

(b) $(\bar{u} - \varepsilon)^+ \in X_0$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. (a) Let $\xi(x) = x^\gamma$, $\gamma > 1$. Observe that ξ is convex and differentiable function on \mathbb{R}^+ . Hence using this and the fact that $\phi_1 \in C_{d^s}^+(\Omega)$ and $\bar{u} \in C_{\phi_q}^+$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi(\bar{u})\|^2 &= \langle (-\Delta)^s \xi(\bar{u}), \xi(\bar{u}) \rangle \leq \int_{\Omega} \xi(\bar{u}) \xi'(\bar{u}) (-\Delta)^s \bar{u} \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \gamma \bar{u}^{2\gamma-q-1} \, dx \\ &\leq C \int_{\Omega} d^{\frac{2s(2\gamma-q-1)}{q+1}} \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

We know that $d^{\frac{2s(2\gamma-q-1)}{q+1}} \in L^1(\Omega)$ if and only if $\gamma > \frac{(2s-1)(q+1)}{4s}$. This settles first part of the proof. For the second part, let $\gamma \leq \frac{(2s-1)(q+1)}{4s}$ and if possible let $\bar{u}^\gamma \in X_0$. Consider

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{\bar{u}^{2\gamma}}{d^{2s}} \, dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} d^{\frac{4s\gamma}{q+1}-2s} \, dx = \infty$$

It contradicts the fact that $\bar{u}^\gamma \in X_0$ and then satisfies the Hardy inequality.

(b) Let $A = \{x : \bar{u}(x) > \varepsilon\}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\bar{u} - \varepsilon)^+\|^2 &\leq \int_A \int_A \frac{|\bar{u}(x) - \bar{u}(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus A} \int_A \frac{|\bar{u}(x) - \bar{u}(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy \\ &\leq \kappa_1 \int_A \int_A \frac{|\bar{u}^\gamma(x) - \bar{u}^\gamma(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy + 2\kappa_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus A} \int_A \frac{|\bar{u}^\gamma(x) - \bar{u}^\gamma(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy \\ &\leq (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2) \int_Q \frac{|\bar{u}^\gamma(x) - \bar{u}^\gamma(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By the mean value theorem and convexity arguments, one can easily prove the existence of κ_1, κ_2 such that $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \geq \varepsilon^{\gamma-1}$. Hence the proof is complete. \square

The energy functional associated to the problem (P_λ) is

$$I(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy - \frac{1}{1-q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^{1-q} \, dx - \frac{\lambda}{22_\mu^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{|u|^{2_\mu^*} |u|^{2_\mu^*}}{|x-y|^\mu} \, dx dy.$$

Though the functional I is continuous on X_0 when $0 < q < 1$ but if $q \geq 1$, the functional I is not even finite at all points of X_0 . Also I it can be shown that I is not Gâteaux differentiable at all points of X_0 . The doubly nonlocal nature of the problem (P_λ) and the lack of regularity of I force to use to introduce a quite general definition of weak solution. The Lemma 2.7 motivates the following definition of weak solution to the problem (P_λ) .

Definition 2.8. A function $u \in H_{loc}^s(\Omega) \cap L^{2_\mu^*}(\Omega)$ is said to be a weak solution of (P_λ) if the

following hold:

(i) there exists $m_K > 0$ such that $u > m_K$ for any compact set $K \subset \Omega$.

(ii) For any $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$,

$$\langle u, \phi \rangle = \int_{\Omega} u^{-q} \phi \, dx + \lambda \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{u^{2^*}(x) u^{2^*-1}(y) \phi(y)}{|x-y|^\mu} \, dx dy.$$

(iii) $(u - \varepsilon)^+ \in X_0$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Lemma 2.9. Let u be a weak solution to (P_λ) as it is defined in Definition 2.8. Then for all compactly supported $0 \leq v \in X_0 \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, we have

$$\langle u, v \rangle - \int_{\Omega} u^{-q} v \, dx - \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{u^{2^*} u^{2^*-1} v}{|x-y|^\mu} \, dx dy = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. Let $0 \leq v \in X_0 \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ be compactly supported function. Then there exists a sequence $v_n \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $v_n \geq 0$, $K := \cup_n \text{supp } v_n$ is contained in compact set of Ω , $\{|v_n|_\infty\}$ is bounded sequence and $v_n \rightarrow v$ strongly in X_0 . Since u is a weak solution to (P_λ) , we have

$$\langle u, v_n \rangle - \int_{\Omega} u^{-q} v_n \, dx - \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{u^{2^*} u^{2^*-1} v_n}{|x-y|^\mu} \, dx dy = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Q \frac{(u(x) - u(y))(v_n(x) - v_n(y))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy &= \int_K \int_K \frac{(u(x) - u(y))(v_n(x) - v_n(y))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy \\ &+ 2 \int_{\Omega \setminus K} \int_K \frac{(u(x) - u(y))v_n(x)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy \\ &+ 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u(x)v_n(x)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy \\ &:= I + II + III. \end{aligned}$$

Now using the fact that $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^s(\Omega)$ and the strong convergence of v_n , as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$I \rightarrow \int_K \int_K \frac{(u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy.$$

Next taking into account $u \in L^{2^*}(\Omega)$ and the fact that v_n is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, by dominated convergence theorem, we deduce that

$$II \rightarrow 2 \int_{\Omega \setminus K} \int_K \frac{(u(x) - u(y))v(x)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy.$$

Similarly, $III \rightarrow 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u(x)v(x)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} dx dy$. Hence $\langle u, v_n \rangle \rightarrow \langle u, v \rangle$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Trivially $\int_{\Omega} u^{-q} v_n dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} u^{-q} v dx$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Also using the strong convergence of sequence v_n and the fact that $u \in L^{2^*}(\Omega)$, we infer that

$$\iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{u^{2^*} u^{2^*-1} v_n}{|x-y|^{\mu}} dx dy \rightarrow \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{u^{2^*} u^{2^*-1} v}{|x-y|^{\mu}} dx dy.$$

It implies that passing the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (2.4), we have (2.3) for all compactly supported $0 \leq v \in X_0 \cap L^{\infty}(\Omega)$. \square

In the direction of existence of solution to (P_{λ}) , we translate the problem (P_{λ}) by the solution \bar{u} of problem (2.1). Consider the translated problem

$$(\widetilde{P}_{\lambda}) \begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u + \bar{u}^{-q} - (u + \bar{u})^{-q} = \lambda \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{(u + \bar{u})^{2^*}(y)}{|x-y|^{\mu}} dy \right) (u + \bar{u})^{2^*-1}, & u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Observe that $u + \bar{u}$ is a solution to (P_{λ}) if and only if $u \in X_0$ is a solution to $(\widetilde{P}_{\lambda})$. Define the function $g : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cap \{\infty\}$ as

$$g(x, s) = \begin{cases} \bar{u}^{-q} - (s + \bar{u})^{-q} & \text{if } s + \bar{u} > 0, \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $G(x, y) = \int_0^y g(x, \tau) d\tau$ for $(x, y) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 2.10. A function $u \in X$ is a subsolution (resp. supersolution) to $(\widetilde{P}_{\lambda})$ if the following holds

- (i) $u^+ \in X_0$ (resp. $u^- \in X_0$);
- (ii) $g(\cdot, u) \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$;
- (iii) For all $\phi \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$, $\phi \geq 0$, we have

$$\langle u, \phi \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, u) \phi dx - \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u + \bar{u})^{2^*} (u + \bar{u})^{2^*-1} \phi}{|x-y|^{\mu}} dx dy \leq 0 \text{ (resp. } \geq 0).$$

Definition 2.11. A function $u \in X_0$ is a weak solution to $(\widetilde{P}_{\lambda})$ if it is both sub and supersolution and $u \geq 0$ in Ω .

Lemma 2.12. Let $u \in X_0$ be a weak solution to $(\widetilde{P}_{\lambda})$. Then for any $v \in X_0$, we have

$$\langle u, v \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, u) v dx - \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u + \bar{u})^{2^*} (u + \bar{u})^{2^*-1} v}{|x-y|^{\mu}} dx dy = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

Proof. Let $0 \leq v \in X_0$ then by [21, Lemma 3.1], there exists an increasing sequence

$\{v_n\} \in X_0$ such that v_n has a compact support and $v_n \rightarrow v$ strongly in X_0 . For each n , there exists a sequence $\phi_n^k \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\phi_n^k \geq 0$, $\cup_k \text{supp} \phi_n^k$ is contained in compact set of Ω , $\{|\phi_n^k|_\infty\}$ is bounded sequence and $\phi_n^k \rightarrow v_n$ strongly in X_0 . Since u is a weak solution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) , we have

$$\langle u, \phi_n^k \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, u) \phi_n^k dx - \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (u + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu - 1} \phi_n^k}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy = 0.$$

Using the fact that $\phi_n^k \rightarrow v_n$ strongly in X_0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we deduce that

$$\langle u, v_n \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, u) v_n dx - \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (u + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu - 1} v_n}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy = 0.$$

Now by using the dominated convergence theorem and the strong convergence of the sequence v_n in X_0 , we get $g(x, u)v \in L^1(\Omega)$ and we have (2.5) for any $0 \leq v \in X_0$. For any $v \in X_0$, $v = v^+ - v^-$. Employing the above procedure for v^+ and v^- separately, we obtain the desired result. Hence the proof. \square

With this functional framework we record now the statement of our main Theorems.

Theorem 2.13. *Let $\mu \leq \min\{4s, N\}$. There exists a $\Lambda > 0$ such that*

1. *For every $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda)$ the problem (P_λ) admits two solutions in $C_{\phi_q}^+(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$.*
2. *For $\lambda = \Lambda$ there exists a solution in $C_{\phi_q}^+(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$.*
3. *For $\lambda > \Lambda$, there exists no solution.*

Moreover, solution belongs to X_0 if and only if $q(2s - 1) < (2s + 1)$.

Concerning the Hölder and Sobolev regularity of solutions we have the following Theorem.

Theorem 2.14. *Let $\mu \leq \min\{4s, N\}$. Let $q > 0$, $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda)$. Then any weak solution in the sense of Definition 2.8 is classical and belongs to $C^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^N)$ where γ is defined (2.2). Furthermore any weak solution satisfies the statements of Lemma 2.7.*

Remark 2.15. *We point out that regularity results contained in Theorem 2.14 are much stronger as compared to those obtained in [2, 20] where regularity of continuous solutions are only investigated.*

2.1 Notions of nonsmooth Analysis

In this subsection we record some basic definitions, observations and linking theorem to nonsmooth functionals. We remark that in case of $q(2s - 1) < (2s + 1)$, one can adapt the variational techniques of the [26, 20] to prove the global multiplicity result as in Theorem 2.13 but to incorporate the case of q large we adopt the following notions of non-smooth analysis.

Definition 2.16. Let H be a Hilbert space and $J : H \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ be a proper (i.e. $J \not\equiv \infty$) lower semicontinuous functional.

(i) Let $D(J) = \{u \in H : J(u) < \infty\}$ be the domain of J . For every $u \in D(J)$, we define the Fréchet sub-differential of J at u as the set

$$\partial^- J(u) = \left\{ z \in H : \liminf_{v \rightarrow u} \frac{J(v) - J(u) - \langle z, v - u \rangle}{\|v - u\|_H} \geq 0 \right\}.$$

(ii) For each $u \in H$, we define

$$\|\partial^- J(u)\| = \begin{cases} \min\{\|z\|_H : z \in \partial^- J(u)\} & \text{if } \partial^- J(u) \neq \emptyset, \\ \infty & \text{if } \partial^- J(u) = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

We know that $\partial^- J(u)$ is a closed convex set which may be empty. If $u \in D(J)$ is a local minimizer for J , then it can be seen that $0 \in \partial^- J(u)$.

Remark 2.17. We remark that if $J_0 : H \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ be a proper, lower semicontinuous, convex functional, $J_1 : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a C^1 functional and $J = J_1 + J_0$, then $\partial^- J(u) = \nabla J_1(u) + \partial J_0(u)$ for every $u \in D(J) = D(J_0)$, where ∂J_0 denotes the usual subdifferential of the convex functional J_0 . Thus, u is said to be a critical point of J if $u \in D(J_0)$ and for every $v \in H$, we have $\langle \nabla J_1(u), v - u \rangle + J_0(v) - J_0(u) \geq 0$.

Definition 2.18. For a proper, lower semicontinuous functional $J : H \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$, we say that J satisfies Cerami's variant of the Palais-Smale condition at level c (in short, J satisfies (CPS) c), if any sequence $\{z_n\} \subset D(J)$ such that $J(z_n) \rightarrow c$ and $(1 + z_n)\|\partial^- J(z_n)\| \rightarrow 0$ has a strongly convergent subsequence in H .

Analogous to the mountain pass theorem, we have the following linking theorem for non-smooth functionals.

Theorem 2.19. [39] Let H be a Hilbert space. Assume $J = J_0 + J_1$, where $J_0 : H \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is a proper, lower semicontinuous, convex functional and $J_1 : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a C^1 -functional. Let B^N, S^{N-1} denote the closed unit ball and its boundary in \mathbb{R}^N respectively. Let $\varphi : S^{N-1} \rightarrow D(J)$ be a continuous function such that

$$\Sigma = \{\psi \in C(B^N, D(J)) : \psi|_{S^{N-1}} = \varphi\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Let A be a relatively closed subset of $D(J)$ such that

$$A \cap \varphi(S^{N-1}) = \emptyset, \quad A \cap \varphi(B^N) \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } \psi \in \Sigma \text{ and } \inf J(A) \geq \sup J(\varphi(S^{N-1})).$$

Define $c = \inf_{\psi \in \Sigma} \sup_{x \in B^N} J(\psi(x))$. Assume that c is finite and that J satisfies (CPS) c . Then there exists $u \in D(J)$ such that $J(u) = c$ and $0 \in \partial^- J(u)$. Furthermore, if $\inf J(A) = c$, then there exists $u \in A \cap D(J)$ such that $J(u) = c$ and $0 \in \partial^- J(u)$.

3 Very weak comparison principle

Here we establish a new weak comparison principle that can be applied in the setting of $H_{loc}^s(\Omega)$ sub and supersolutions to (P_λ) and cover all $q > 0$ (whereas [20, Lemma 2.2] $q(2s - 1) < 2s + 1$ is required).

Lemma 3.1. *Let $F \in X_0^*$ and let $z, w \in H_{loc}^s(\Omega)$ be such that $z, w > 0$ a.e in Ω , $z, w \geq 0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $z^{-q}, w^{-q} \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$, $(z - \varepsilon)^+ \in X_0$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $z \in L^1(\Omega)$ and*

$$\langle z, \phi \rangle \leq \int_{\Omega} z^{-q} \phi \, dx + (F, \phi), \quad \langle w, \phi \rangle \geq \int_{\Omega} w^{-q} \phi \, dx + (F, \phi) \quad (3.1)$$

for all compactly supported $\phi \in X_0 \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\phi \geq 0$. Then $z \leq w$ a.e in Ω .

Proof. Let us denote that $\Psi_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the primitive of the function

$$s \mapsto \begin{cases} \max\{-s^{-q}, -n\} & \text{if } s > 0, \\ -n & \text{if } s \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

such that $\Psi_n(1) = 0$. Let us define a proper lower semicontinuous, strictly convex functional $\check{H}_{0,n} : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\check{H}_{0,n}(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \|u\|^2 + \int_{\Omega} \Psi_n(u) \, dx & \text{if } u \in X_0, \\ \infty & \text{if } u \in L^2(\Omega) \setminus X_0. \end{cases}$$

We define $H_{0,n} : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$H_{0,n}(u) = \check{H}_{0,n}(u) - \min \check{H}_{0,n} = \check{H}_{0,n}(u) - \check{H}_{0,n}(u_{0,n})$$

where $u_{0,n} \in X_0$ is the minimum of $\check{H}_{0,n}$. More generally, for $F \in X_0^*$ we set:

$$\check{H}_{F,n}(u) = \begin{cases} \check{H}_{0,n}(u) - (F, u - u_{0,n}) & \text{if } u \in X_0, \\ \infty & \text{if } u \in L^2(\Omega) \setminus X_0. \end{cases}$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n > \varepsilon^{-q}$ and let v be the minimum of the functional $\check{H}_{F,n}$ on the convex set $K = \{\varphi \in X_0 : 0 \leq \varphi \leq w \text{ a.e in } \Omega\}$. Then for all $\varphi \in K$ we get

$$\langle v, \varphi - v \rangle \geq - \int_{\Omega} \Psi_n'(v)(\varphi - v) \, dx + (F, \varphi - v). \quad (3.2)$$

Let $0 \leq \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, $t > 0$. Define $\varphi_t := \min\{v + t\varphi, w\}$. Now using the fact that $w \in H_{loc}^s(\Omega)$, $v \in X_0$, $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, we have $\varphi_t \in X_0$. Furthermore, φ_t is uniformly bounded in X_0 for all $t < 1$. For the proof let $A = \text{supp}(\varphi)$. Since on $\Omega \setminus A$, $\varphi_t = v$ and otherwise $v \leq \varphi_t \leq w$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_Q \frac{(\varphi_t(x) - \varphi_t(y))^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy &\leq [\varphi_t]_{H^s(A)} + \int_{\Omega \setminus A} \int_{\Omega \setminus A} \frac{(v(x) - v(y))^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy \\
&+ 2 \int_{\Omega \setminus A} \int_A \frac{(v(x) - v(y))^2 + 2tv(y)\varphi(y) + t^2\varphi^2(y)}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy \quad (3.3) \\
&+ 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(v + t\varphi(y))^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Employing the fact that for any $g : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $|g^+(x) - g^+(y)|^2 \leq |g(x) - g(y)|^2$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ coupled with $\varphi_t = v + t\varphi - (v + t\varphi - w)^+$, for all $t < 1$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
[\varphi_t]_{H^s(A)} &\leq 2 \int_A \int_A \frac{((v + t\varphi)(x) - (v + t\varphi)(y))^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy \\
&+ 2 \int_A \int_A \frac{((v + t\varphi - w)(x) - (v + t\varphi - w)(y))^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy \quad (3.4) \\
&\leq C ([v]_{H^s(A)} + [\varphi]_{H^s(A)} + [w]_{H^s(A)}).
\end{aligned}$$

From (3.3) and (3.4) we obtain that φ_t is uniformly bounded in X_0 . Take the subsequence (still denoted by φ_t) such that $\varphi_t \rightharpoonup v$ weakly in X_0 as $t \rightarrow 0^+$. Now test (3.2) with φ_t , we get

$$\langle v, \varphi_t - v \rangle \geq - \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(v)(\varphi_t - v) dx + (F, \varphi_t - v). \quad (3.5)$$

Using (3.1) and the fact that $w^{-q} \geq -\Psi'_n(w)$, we infer that w satisfies

$$\langle w, \phi \rangle \geq - \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(w)\phi dx + (F, \phi) \quad (3.6)$$

Deploying the fact that $\varphi_t \leq w$ coupled with $\varphi_t - v - t\varphi \leq 0$ and if $\varphi_t = w$ then $\varphi_t - v - t\varphi \neq 0$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_Q \frac{(\varphi_t(x) - \varphi_t(y))((\varphi_t - v - t\varphi)(x) - (\varphi_t - v - t\varphi)(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy \\
&\leq \int_Q \frac{w(x)(\varphi_t - v - t\varphi)(x)}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy + \int_Q \frac{w(y)(\varphi_t - v - t\varphi)(y)}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy \\
&\quad - \int_Q \frac{w(x)(\varphi_t - v - t\varphi)(y)}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy - \int_Q \frac{w(y)(\varphi_t - v - t\varphi)(x)}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy = \langle w, \varphi_t - v - t\varphi \rangle. \quad (3.7)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\int_{\Omega} (\Psi'_n(\varphi_t) - \Psi'_n(w))(\varphi_t - v - t\varphi) dx \leq 0$ and moreover $\Psi'_n(w) \leq -w^{-q}$. Taking into

account (3.1), (3.5), (3.6), (3.7) and above observations, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\varphi_t - v\|^2 - \int_{\Omega} (-\Psi'_n(\varphi_t) + \Psi'_n(v))(\varphi_t - v) dx \\
&= \langle \varphi_t, \varphi_t - v \rangle + \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(\varphi_t)(\varphi_t - v) dx - \langle v, \varphi_t - v \rangle - \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(v)(\varphi_t - v) dx \\
&\leq \langle \varphi_t, \varphi_t - v \rangle + \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(\varphi_t)(\varphi_t - v) dx - (F, \varphi_t - v) \\
&= \langle \varphi_t, \varphi_t - v - t\varphi \rangle + \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(\varphi_t)(\varphi_t - v - t\varphi) dx - (F, \varphi_t - v - t\varphi) \\
&\quad + t \left(\langle \varphi_t, \varphi \rangle + \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(\varphi_t)\varphi dx - (F, \varphi) \right) \\
&\leq \langle w, \varphi_t - v - t\varphi \rangle + \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(w)(\varphi_t - v - t\varphi) dx - (F, \varphi_t - v - t\varphi) \\
&\quad + t \left(\langle \varphi_t, \varphi \rangle + \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(\varphi_t)\varphi dx - (F, \varphi) \right) \\
&\leq t \left(\langle \varphi_t, \varphi \rangle + \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(\varphi_t)\varphi dx - (F, \varphi) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \varphi_t, \varphi \rangle + \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(\varphi_t)\varphi dx - (F, \varphi) &\geq \frac{1}{t} \left(\|\varphi_t - v\|^2 - \int_{\Omega} |\Psi'_n(\varphi_t) - \Psi'_n(v)|(\varphi_t - v) dx \right) \\
&\geq - \int_{\Omega} |\Psi'_n(\varphi_t) - \Psi'_n(v)|\varphi dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Now using the weak convergence of φ_t and monotone convergence theorem, and dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\langle v, \varphi \rangle \geq - \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(v)\varphi dx + (F, \varphi). \quad (3.8)$$

Using the density argument, one can easily show that (3.8) is true for all $\varphi \in X_0$ with $\varphi \geq 0$ a.e in Ω . Note that $v \geq 0$ implies $\text{supp}(z - \epsilon - v)^+ \subset \text{supp}(z - \epsilon)^+$ that is, $(z - v - \epsilon)^+ \in X_0$. So from (3.8), it implies that

$$\langle v, (z - v - \epsilon)^+ \rangle \geq - \int_{\Omega} \Psi'_n(v)(z - v - \epsilon)^+ dx + (F, (z - v - \epsilon)^+). \quad (3.9)$$

Let $(z - v - \epsilon)^+ := \mathbf{g} \in X_0$ such that $0 \leq \mathbf{g} \leq z$ a.e in Ω . Let $\{\hat{\mathbf{g}}_m\}$ be a monotonically increasing sequence in $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\{\hat{\mathbf{g}}_m\}$ converging to \mathbf{g} in X_0 and set $\mathbf{g}_m = \min\{\hat{\mathbf{g}}_m^+, \mathbf{g}\}$. Testing (3.1) with \mathbf{g}_m , we get

$$\langle z, \mathbf{g}_m \rangle \leq \int_{\Omega} z^{-q} \mathbf{g}_m dx + (F, \mathbf{g}_m) \quad (3.10)$$

Observe that if $\mathfrak{g} > 0$ then $z > \varepsilon$. Now consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \int_{\{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \frac{(z(x) - z(y))((\mathfrak{g}_m - \mathfrak{g})(x) - (\mathfrak{g}_m - \mathfrak{g})(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy \\ &= \int_{\{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \int_{\{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \frac{((z - \varepsilon)^+(x) - (z - \varepsilon)^+(y))((\mathfrak{g}_m - \mathfrak{g})(x) - (\mathfrak{g}_m - \mathfrak{g})(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy \quad (3.11) \\ &\leq \|(z - \varepsilon)^+\| \|(\mathfrak{g}_m - \mathfrak{g})\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \int_{\{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \frac{(z(x) - z(y))(\mathfrak{g}_m(x) - \mathfrak{g}_m(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \int_{\{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \frac{(z(x))(\mathfrak{g}_m(x))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \int_{\{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \frac{(z(y))(\mathfrak{g}_m(x))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \int_{\{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \frac{(z(x))(\mathfrak{g}_m(x))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \int_{\{\mathfrak{g}>0\}} \frac{(z(y))(\mathfrak{g}(x))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy. \quad (3.12) \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account the fact that $z^{-q}\mathfrak{g}_m \leq z^{-q}\mathfrak{g}$, (3.10), (3.11), (3.12) and monotone convergence theorem, if $z^{-q}\mathfrak{g} \in L^1(\Omega)$ or $z^{-q}\mathfrak{g} \notin L^1(\Omega)$, we conclude that

$$\langle z, \mathfrak{g} \rangle \leq \int_{\Omega} z^{-q}\mathfrak{g} dx + (F, \mathfrak{g}).$$

That is,

$$\langle z, (z - v - \varepsilon)^+ \rangle \leq \int_{\Omega} z^{-q}(z - v - \varepsilon)^+ dx + (F, (z - v - \varepsilon)^+) \quad (3.13)$$

Exploiting $n \geq \varepsilon^{-q}$, (3.9), (3.13), and the fact that for any measurable function \mathfrak{h} , $\langle \mathfrak{h}^+, \mathfrak{h}^+ \rangle \leq \langle \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}^+ \rangle$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (z - v - \varepsilon)^+, (z - v - \varepsilon)^+ \rangle &\leq \langle z - v, (z - v - \varepsilon)^+ \rangle \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} (z^{-q} + \Psi'_n(v))(z - v - \varepsilon)^+ dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (-\Psi'_n(z) + \Psi'_n(v))(z - v - \varepsilon)^+ dx \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $z \leq v + \varepsilon \leq w + \varepsilon$. Since ε was arbitrary chosen, hence proof follows. \square

4 Regularity and Proof of Theorem 2.14

In this section, we start by extending some regularity results contained in [19] and conclude the proof of Theorem 2.14.

Lemma 4.1. *Any nonnegative solution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Let $u \in X_0$ be any non negative weak solution to (4.6). Let $u_\tau = \min\{u, \tau\}$ for $\tau > 0$. Let $\phi = u(u_\tau)^{r-2} \in X_0$ ($r \geq 2$) be a test function to problem (\widetilde{P}_λ) . Now from [19, Lemma 3.5], we have the following inequality

$$\frac{4(r-1)}{r^2} \left(a|a_k|^{\frac{r}{2}-1} - b|b_k|^{\frac{r}{2}-1} \right)^2 \leq (a-b)(a_k|a_k|^{r-2} - b_k|b_k|^{r-2}). \quad (4.1)$$

where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r \geq 2$. Using (4.1), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |u(u_\tau)^{\frac{r}{2}-1}|_{2_s^*}^2 &\leq C \|u(u_\tau)^{\frac{r}{2}-1}\|^2 \leq \frac{Cr^2}{r-1} \int_Q \frac{(u(x) - u(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} dx dy \\ &= Cr \left(-g(x, u)u(u_\tau)^{r-2} dx + \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{(u + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (u + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu-1} u(u_\tau)^{r-2}}{|x-y|^\mu} dx dy \right) \\ &\leq Cr \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{(u + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (u + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu-1} u(u_\tau)^{r-2}}{|x-y|^\mu} dx dy \\ &\leq Cr \left(\int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{u^{2^*_\mu} u^{2^*_\mu} (u_\tau)^{r-2}}{|x-y|^\mu} dx dy + \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{u^{2^*_\mu} \bar{u}^{2^*_\mu-1} u(u_\tau)^{r-2}}{|x-y|^\mu} dx dy \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{\bar{u}^{2^*_\mu} u^{2^*_\mu} (u_\tau)^{r-2}}{|x-y|^\mu} dx dy + \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{\bar{u}^{2^*_\mu} \bar{u}^{2^*_\mu-1} u(u_\tau)^{r-2}}{|x-y|^\mu} dx dy \right) \\ &\leq Cr \left(|u|_{2_s^*}^{2^*_\mu} \left(\int_\Omega (u^{2^*_\mu} u_\tau^{r-2})^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \right)^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} + |u|_{2_s^*}^{2^*_\mu} |\bar{u}|_\infty^{2^*_\mu-1} \left(\int_\Omega (u u_\tau^{r-2})^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \right)^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2^*_\mu} \left(\int_\Omega (u^{2^*_\mu} u_\tau^{r-2})^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \right)^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} + |\bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2^*_\mu} |\bar{u}|_\infty^{2^*_\mu-1} \left(\int_\Omega (u u_\tau^{r-2})^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \right)^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Claim: Let $r_1 = 2_s^* + 1$. Then $u \in L^{\frac{2_s^* r_1}{2}}(\Omega)$.

In view of Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_\Omega (u^{2^*_\mu} u_\tau^{r-2})^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \right)^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} &= \left(\int_{u \leq R} (u^{2^*_\mu} u_\tau^{r_1-2})^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \right)^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} + \left(\int_{u > R} (|u|^{2^*_\mu} u_\tau^{r_1-2})^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \right)^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \\ &\leq R^{2^*_\mu} \left(\int_{u \leq R} (u_\tau^{r_1-2})^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \right)^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} + \left(\int_{u > R} (u u_\tau^{r_1-2})^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \right)^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_\mu}} \\ &\quad \left(\int_{u > R} u^{2^*_\mu} \right)^{\frac{2^*_\mu-2}{2^*_\mu}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Choose $R > 0$ large enough such that

$$\left(\int_{|u|>R} |u|^{2^*} dx \right)^{\frac{2^*-2}{2^*}} < \frac{1}{4Cr_1} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{|u|_{2^*}^{2^*}}, \frac{1}{|\bar{u}|_{2^*}^{2^*}} \right\}. \quad (4.4)$$

Taking into account (4.2), (4.3) jointly with (4.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |u(u_\tau)^{\frac{r_1}{2}-1}|_{2^*}^2 &\leq Cr \left(R^{2^*} |u|_{2^*}^{2^*} \left(\int_{u \leq R} (u^{2^*-1})^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} \right)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} + |u|_{2^*}^{2^*} |\bar{u}|_\infty^{2^*-1} \left(\int_\Omega u^{2^*} \right)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\bar{u}|_{2^*}^{2^*} R^{2^*} \left(\int_{u \leq R} (u^{2^*-1})^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} \right)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} + |\bar{u}|_{2^*}^{2^*} |\bar{u}|_\infty^{2^*-1} \left(\int_\Omega u^{2^*} \right)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Appealing Fatou's Lemma as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\|u\|^{\frac{r_1}{2}}_{2^*} \leq Cr_1 \left(|u|_{2^*}^{2^*} + |\bar{u}|_{2^*}^{2^*} \right) \left(R^{2^*} \left(\int_{u \leq R} (u^{2^*-1})^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} \right)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} + |\bar{u}|_\infty^{2^*-1} \left(\int_\Omega u^{2^*} \right)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} \right) < \infty.$$

This establishes the Claim. Now let $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.2) and using the inequality $x^p < 1 + x$ for $p < 1$ and $x \geq 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|^{\frac{r}{2}}_{2^*} &\leq Cr \left(|u|_{2^*}^{2^*} + |\bar{u}|_{2^*}^{2^*} \right) \left(\left(\int_\Omega (u^{2^*+r-2})^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} \right)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} + |\bar{u}|_\infty^{2^*-1} \left(\int_\Omega (u^{r-1})^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} \right)^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} \right) \\ &\leq Cr \left(|u|_{2^*}^{2^*} + |\bar{u}|_{2^*}^{2^*} \right) \left(\left(1 + \int_\Omega (u^{2^*+r-2})^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} \right) + |\bar{u}|_\infty^{2^*-1} \left(1 + \int_\Omega (u^{r-1})^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} \right) \right) \\ &\leq 2Cr(1 + |\bar{u}|_\infty^{2^*-1} + |\Omega|) \left(|u|_{2^*}^{2^*} + |\bar{u}|_{2^*}^{2^*} \right) \left(1 + \int_\Omega (|u|^{r+2^*-2})^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

It implies

$$\left(1 + \int_\Omega |u|^{\frac{2^*r}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(r-2)}} \leq C_r^{\frac{1}{(r-2)}} \left(1 + \int_\Omega (u^{2^*-2+r})^{\frac{2^*}{2^*}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{(r-2)}} \quad (4.5)$$

where $C_r = 4Cr(1 + |u|_{2^*}^{2^*} + |\Omega|) \left(|u|_{2^*}^{2^*} + |\bar{u}|_{2^*}^{2^*} \right)$. For $j \geq 1$ we define r_{j+1} inductively as

$$(r_{j+1} + 2^* - 2) \frac{2^*}{2^*} = \frac{2^* r_j}{2}.$$

That is, $(r_{j+1} - 2) = \left(\frac{2^*}{2} \right)^j (r_1 - 2)$. From (4.5) with $C_{r_{j+1}} = 4Cr_{j+1}(1 + |u|_{2^*}^{2^*} + |\Omega|)$, it

follows that

$$\left(1 + \int_{\Omega} |u|^{\frac{2_s^* r_{j+1}}{2}} dx\right)^{\frac{2}{2_s^*(r_{j+1}-1)}} \leq C_{r_{j+1}}^{\frac{1}{(r_{j+1}-2)}} \left(1 + \int_{\Omega} (u^{2_\mu^* - 2 + r_j})^{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}} dx\right)^{\frac{2}{2_s^*(r_j-2)}}.$$

Defining $A_j := \left(1 + \int_{\Omega} (u^{2_\mu^* - 2 + r_j})^{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}} dx\right)^{\frac{2}{2_s^*(r_j-2)}}$. Then by Claim and limiting argument, there exists $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$A_{j+1} \leq \prod_{k=2}^{j+1} C_k^{(1/2)(r_k-1)} A_1 \leq C_0 A_1.$$

Hence $|u|_\infty \leq C_0 A_1$. That is $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. \square

Remark 4.2. We remark that if $u \in X_0$ be any weak solution of the following problem

$$(-\Delta)^s u = f(x, u) + \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|u|^{2_\mu^*}(y)}{|x-y|^\mu} dy\right) |u|^{2_\mu^*-1} \text{ in } \Omega, u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \quad (4.6)$$

where $|f(x, u)| \leq C(1 + |u|^{2_\mu^*-1})$ and $\mu \leq \min\{4s, N\}$. Then by using the same assertions as in Lemma 4.1, we obtain that $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. This complements in the singular case previous results proved in [19].

Lemma 4.3. Let $z \in L^{2_s^*}(\Omega)$ be a positive function, let $h(x, z) = \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{z^{2_\mu^*}(y)}{|x-y|^\mu} dy\right) z^{2_\mu^*-1}$. Assume $u \in X_0$ be a positive weak solution to

$$(-\Delta)^s u + g(x, u) = h(x, z) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \quad (4.7)$$

Then $(u + \bar{u} - \varepsilon)^+ \in X_0$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. Using the assertions and arguments used in [21, Lemma 3.4], one can easily proof the result, we leave it for the readers. \square

Lemma 4.4. Let $\lambda > 0$ and let $z \in H_{loc}^s(\Omega) \cap L^{2_s^*}(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to (P_λ) as it is defined in definition 2.8. Then $z - \bar{u}$ is a positive weak solution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) belonging to $L^\infty(\Omega)$.

Proof. Consider problem (4.7) with z given. Then 0 is a strict subsolution to (4.7). Define the functional $I : X_0 \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ by

$$I(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \|u\|^2 + \int_{\Omega} G(x, u) dx - \frac{\lambda}{22_\mu^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{z^{2_\mu^*} z^{2_\mu^*-1} u}{|x-y|^\mu} dx dy & \text{if } G(\cdot, u) \in L^1(\Omega), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover for the closed convex set $K_0 = \{u \in X_0 : u \geq 0\}$ we define $I_{K_0} : X_0 \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$

by

$$I_{K_0}(u) = \begin{cases} I(u) & \text{if } u \in K_0 \text{ and } G(\cdot, u) \in L^1(\Omega), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

we can easily prove that there exists $u \in K_0$ such that $I_{K_0}(u) = \inf I_{K_0}(K_0)$. It implies that $0 \in \partial^- I_{K_0}(u)$. Now from Proposition 5.2, we obtain that u is a non negative solution to (4.7). Using the Lemma 4.3, Lemma 2.9 and assertions as in Lemma 2.12, we obtain that $(u + \bar{u} - \varepsilon)^+ \in X_0$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u + \bar{u}, v \rangle - \int_{\Omega} (u + \bar{u})^{-q} v \, dx - \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{z^{2^*} z^{2^* - 1} v}{|x - y|^\mu} \, dx dy &= 0 \\ \langle z, v \rangle - \int_{\Omega} z^{-q} v \, dx - \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{z^{2^*} z^{2^* - 1} v}{|x - y|^\mu} \, dx dy &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all compactly supported $0 \leq v \in X_0 \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. To prove the above equations for all compactly supported $0 \leq v \in X_0 \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ one can use the fact that $u \in X_0$, $\bar{u} \in H_{\text{loc}}^s(\Omega)$ (See Remark 2.6) and the assertions as in Lemma 2.9 and Lemma 2.12. Now using the Lemma 3.1, we get $z = u + \bar{u}$. That $u = z - \bar{u}$ is a solution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) . And from Lemma 4.1, we have $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\mu \leq \min\{4s, N\}$. Let u be any weak solution of problem (P_λ) . Then $u \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap C_{\phi_q}^+(\Omega) \cap C^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^N)$ where γ is defined (2.2).*

Proof. Let u be any weak solution of problem (P_λ) . Employing Lemma 4.4, $u - \bar{u} \in X_0$ is the solution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) and which on taking account Lemma 6.3, we have $u - \bar{u} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Therefore, $u = (u - \bar{u}) + \bar{u} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Let \hat{u} be a unique solution (See [2, Theorem 1.2, Remark 1.5]) to the following problem

$$(-\Delta)^s \hat{u} = \hat{u}^{-q} + \lambda c, u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \hat{u} = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$$

where $c = C^* |u|_\infty^{22^* - 1}$ with $C^* = \left| \int_{\Omega} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^\mu} \right|_\infty$. Practising Lemma 3.1, one can easily show that $\bar{u} \leq u \leq \hat{u}$ a.e in Ω . Now using the fact that $\bar{u} \leq u \leq \hat{u}$ a.e in Ω and regularity of \bar{u} and \hat{u} we obtain $u \in C_{\phi_q}^+(\Omega)$. Observe that u is a classical solution in sense of [2, Definition 1] so by [2, Theorem 1.2], Hölder's regularity follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.14: It follows from the proof of Lemma 4.5 and of Lemma 2.7. \square

5 Existence of first solution

In this section, we have prove the existence of first solution and further establish that the first solution is actually a local minimizer of an appropriate functional. We start the section by defining the functional associated with (\widetilde{P}_λ) . Consider the functional $\mathcal{J} : X_0 \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ associated with

$$\mathcal{J}(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 + \int_{\Omega} G(x, u) \, dx - \frac{\lambda}{22_\mu^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{|u|^{2_\mu^*} |u|^{2_\mu^*}}{|x-y|^\mu} \, dx dy & \text{if } G(\cdot, u) \in L^1(\Omega), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For any convex subset $K \subset X_0$ we define the functional $\mathcal{J}_K : X_0 \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ by

$$\mathcal{J}_K(u) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{J}(u) & \text{if } u \in K \text{ and } G(\cdot, u) \in L^1(\Omega), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Define $\Lambda := \sup\{\lambda > 0 : (P_\lambda) \text{ has a weak solution}\}$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let K be a convex subset of X_0 and let $w \in X_0$. Let $u \in K$ with $G(\cdot, u) \in L^1(\Omega)$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) $\alpha \in \partial^- \mathcal{J}_K(u)$.

(ii) For every $w \in K$ with $G(\cdot, w) \in L^1(\Omega)$, we have $g(\cdot, u)(w - u) \in L^1(\Omega)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \alpha, w - u \rangle &\leq \langle u, (w - u) \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, u)(w - u) \, dx \\ &\quad - \lambda \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} (u + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} (w - u)}{|x - y|^\mu} \, dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (i) implies (ii). Let $w \in K$ and $G(\cdot, w) \in L^1(\Omega)$. Define $z = w - u$. Then clearly since $g(x, u)$ is increasing in u , we have $g(x, u)z \leq G(x, w) - G(x, u)$. Moreover, $(g(\cdot, u)z) \vee 0 \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $t \mapsto (G(x, u + tz) - G(x, u))/t, (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, is increasing and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{J}_K(u + tz) - \mathcal{J}_K(u)}{t} &= \langle u, w \rangle + \frac{t\|z\|^2}{2} + \int_{\Omega} \frac{(G(x, u + tz) - G(x, u))}{t} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{22_\mu^* t} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u + \bar{u} + tz)^{2_\mu^*} (u + \bar{u} + tz)^{2_\mu^*}}{|x - y|^\mu} \, dx dy \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{22_\mu^* t} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} (u + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*}}{|x - y|^\mu} \, dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit as $t \rightarrow 0$ and using the fact that $\alpha \in \partial^- \mathcal{J}_K(u)$, we deduce the required result. (ii) implies (i). Let $z \in K$ and $G(\cdot, w) \in L^1(\Omega)$. Employing the fact that $G(x, s)$ is

convex is s and using (ii) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_K(w) - \mathcal{J}_K(u) &= \frac{1}{2}\|z\|^2 + \int_{\Omega} (G(x, w) - G(x, u) - g(x, u)z) \, dx + \langle \alpha, z \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda}{22_{\mu}^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{((w + \bar{u})^{2\mu^*} (w + \bar{u})^{2\mu^*} - (u + \bar{u})^{2\mu^*} (u + \bar{u})^{2\mu^*})}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy \\ &\quad + \lambda \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u + \bar{u})^{2\mu^*} (u + \bar{u})^{2\mu^* - 1} z}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

It implies that $\alpha \in \partial^- \mathcal{J}_K(u)$. \square

For any functions $\varphi, \psi : \Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$, we define the following subspaces

$$K_{\varphi} = \{u \in X_0 : \varphi \leq u \text{ a.e}\}, K^{\psi} = \{u \in X_0 : u \leq \psi \text{ a.e}\}, K_{\varphi}^{\psi} = \{u \in X_0 : \varphi \leq u \leq \psi \text{ a.e}\}.$$

Proposition 5.2. *Assume one the following condition holds:*

- (i) ϕ_1 is a subsolution to $(\widetilde{P}_{\lambda})$, $G(x, w(x)) \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ for all $w \in K_{\phi_1}, u \in D(\mathcal{J}_{K_{\phi_1}})$ and $0 \in \partial^- \mathcal{J}_{K_{\phi_1}}(u)$.
- (ii) ϕ_2 is a supersolution to $(\widetilde{P}_{\lambda})$, $G(x, w(x)) \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ for all $w \in K^{\phi_2}, u \in D(\mathcal{J}_{K^{\phi_2}})$ and $0 \in \partial^- \mathcal{J}_{K^{\phi_2}}(u)$.
- (iii) ϕ_1, ϕ_2 are subsolution and supersolution to $(\widetilde{P}_{\lambda})$, $\phi_1 \leq \phi_2$, $G(x, \phi_1), G(x, \phi_2) \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$, $u \in D(\mathcal{J}_{K_{\phi_1}^{\phi_2}})$ and $0 \in \partial^- \mathcal{J}_{K_{\phi_1}^{\phi_2}}(u)$.

Then u is weak solution to $(\widetilde{P}_{\lambda})$.

Proof. Follow the [21, Proposition 4.2], we have the required result. \square

Let $\vartheta \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap X_0$ be the unique solution which satisfies $(-\Delta)^s \vartheta = 1/2$ in Ω in the sense of distributions. By the definition of g and G , we obtain the following properties

Lemma 5.3. (i) *Let $u \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ such that $\text{ess inf}_K u > 0$ for any compact set $K \subset \Omega$.*

Then $g(x, u(x)), G(x, u(x)) \in L_{loc}^1(\Omega)$.

(ii) *For all $x \in \Omega$, the following holds*

(a) $G(x, st) \leq s^2 G(x, t)$ for each $s \geq 1$ and $t \geq 0$.

(b) $G(x, s) - G(x, t) - (g(x, s) + g(x, t))(s - t)/2 \geq 0$ for each s, t with $s \geq t > -\vartheta(x)$.

(c) $G(x, s) - g(x, s)s/2 \geq 0$ for each $s \geq 0$.

Lemma 5.4. *The following hold:*

(i) 0 is the strict subsolution to $(\widetilde{P}_{\lambda})$ for all $\lambda > 0$.

(ii) ϑ is a strict supersolution to $(\widetilde{P}_{\lambda})$ for all sufficiently small $\lambda > 0$.

(iii) Any positive weak solution w to $(\widetilde{P_{\lambda_2}})$ is a strict supersolution to $(\widetilde{P_{\lambda_1}})$ for $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$.

Proof. (i) Trivial.

(ii) Choose λ small enough such that $\lambda \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{(\vartheta + \bar{u})^{2^*}}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \right) (\vartheta + \bar{u})^{2^*-1} < 1$ in Ω . From Lemma 5.3, $g(x, \vartheta), G(x, \vartheta) \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$, for all $\psi \in X_0 \setminus \{0\}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \vartheta, \psi \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, \vartheta) \psi \, dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\vartheta + \bar{u})^{2^*} (\vartheta + \bar{u})^{2^*-1} \psi}{|x-y|^\mu} \, dx dy \\ & \geq \int \left(1 - \lambda \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{(\vartheta + \bar{u})^{2^*}}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \right) (\vartheta + \bar{u})^{2^*-1} \right) \psi \, dx > 0. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) Let $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ and w be a positive weak solution to $(\widetilde{P_{\lambda_2}})$. Then for all $\psi \in X_0 \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle w, \psi \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, w) \psi \, dx - \lambda_1 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(w + \bar{u})^{2^*} (w + \bar{u})^{2^*-1} \psi}{|x-y|^\mu} \, dx dy \\ & = (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(w + \bar{u})^{2^*} (w + \bar{u})^{2^*-1} \psi}{|x-y|^\mu} \, dx dy > 0. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is now complete. \square

Theorem 5.5. Let $w_1, w_2 : \Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ with $w_1 \leq w_2$ such that w_1 is a strict subsolution to $(\widetilde{P_{\lambda}})$ and $u \in D(\mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}^{w_2}})$ be a minimizer for $\mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}^{w_2}}$. Then u is a local minimizer for $\mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}}$.

Proof. For each $v \in K_{w_1}$ and $0 \leq \phi \in X_0$, we define $\sigma(v) = \min\{v, w_2\} = v - (v - w_2)^+$ and

$$\Xi(\phi) = \langle w_2, \phi \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, w_2) \phi \, dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(w_2 + \bar{u})^{2^*} (w_2 + \bar{u})^{2^*-1} \phi}{|x-y|^\mu} \, dx dy.$$

Claim: $\langle \sigma(v), v - \sigma(v) \rangle \geq \langle w_2, v - \sigma(v) \rangle$ and

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{((\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2^*} (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2^*-1} - (w_2 + \bar{u})^{2^*} (w_2 + \bar{u})^{2^*-1}) (v - \sigma(v))}{|x-y|^\mu} \, dx dy \leq 0.$$

Notice that $v - \sigma(v) = (v - w_2)^+$. Let $\Omega_1 = \text{supp}((v - w_2)^+)$. Then on $\Omega_1, \sigma(v) = w_2$ and using the fact that $\sigma(v) \leq w_2$ on Ω , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma(v), v - \sigma(v) \rangle & = \left(\int_{\Omega_1} \int_{\Omega_1} + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega_1} \int_{\Omega_1} + \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_1} \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_1} + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_1} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{(\sigma(v)(x) - \sigma(v)(y))((v - \sigma(v))(x) - (v - \sigma(v))(y))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}} \, dx dy \right) \\ & \geq \langle w_2, v - \sigma(v) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Second holds by using the fact that $\sigma(v) \leq w_2$ on Ω . It implies that the Claim holds. Taking into account the fact that u is a minimizer of for $\mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}^{w_2}}$, $\sigma(v) \in D(\mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}^{w_2}})$, Lemma 2 of [29] and the fact that $G(x, \cdot)$ is convex, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}}(v) - \mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}}(u) \geq \mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}}(v) - \mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}}(\sigma(v)) \\
&= \frac{\|v - \sigma(v)\|^2}{2} + \langle \sigma(v), v - \sigma(v) \rangle + \int_{\Omega} (G(x, v) - G(x, \sigma(v))) \, dx \\
&\quad - \frac{\lambda}{22_{\mu}^*} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{((v + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (v + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} - (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*})}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy \\
&\geq \frac{\|v - \sigma(v)\|^2}{2} + \langle \sigma(v), v - \sigma(v) \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, \sigma(v))(v - \sigma(v)) \, dx \\
&\quad - \frac{\lambda}{22_{\mu}^*} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{((v + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (v + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} - (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*})}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy \tag{5.1} \\
&\geq \frac{\|v - \sigma(v)\|^2}{2} + \langle w_2, v - \sigma(v) \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, w_2)(v - \sigma(v)) \, dx \\
&\quad - \frac{\lambda}{22_{\mu}^*} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{((v + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (v + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} - (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*})}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy \\
&\geq \frac{\|v - \sigma(v)\|^2}{2} + \Xi(v - \sigma(v)) - \frac{\lambda}{22_{\mu}^*} I
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(v + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (v + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy - \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy \\
&\quad - 22_{\mu}^* \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^* - 1} (v - \sigma(v))}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate I from above. First observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= 2_{\mu}^* \int_{\Omega} \int_{\sigma(v)}^v \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{(v + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} + (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dy \right) \left((t + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^* - 1} - (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^* - 1} \right) \, dt dx \\
&\quad + 2_{\mu}^* \int_{\Omega} \int_{\sigma(v)}^v \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{(v + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} - (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dy \right) (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^* - 1} \, dt dx. \tag{5.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Using the mean value theorem, there exists $\theta \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{(u + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} - (v + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1}}{(u - v)} &= (2_\mu^* - 1)(u + \bar{u} + \theta(v - u))^{2_\mu^* - 2}(u - v) \\
&= (2_\mu^* - 1)(\bar{u} + (1 - \theta)u + \theta v)^{2_\mu^* - 2}(u - v) \\
&\leq (2_\mu^* - 1)2^{2_\mu^* - 3}(\bar{u}^{2_\mu^* - 2} + ((1 - \theta)u + \theta v)^{2_\mu^* - 2})(u - v) \\
&\leq (2_\mu^* - 1)2^{2_\mu^* - 3}(\bar{u}^{2_\mu^* - 2} + \max\{u, v\}^{2_\mu^* - 2})(u - v).
\end{aligned}$$

For each $x \in \Omega$ and $v \in D(\mathcal{J}_{K_{w_2}})$ define the functions

$$\begin{aligned}
k_v^1(x) &= (2_\mu^* - 1)2^{2_\mu^* - 3}(\bar{u}^{2_\mu^* - 2} + \max\{|w_2|, |v|\}^{2_\mu^* - 2})\chi_{\{v > w_2\}}, \\
k_v^2(x) &= 2_\mu^* 2^{2_\mu^* - 2}(\bar{u}^{2_\mu^* - 1} + \max\{|w_2|, |v|\}^{2_\mu^* - 1})\chi_{\{v > w_2\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \int_{\sigma(v)}^v \left(\int_\Omega \frac{(v + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} + (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*}}{|x - y|^\mu} dy \right) \left((t + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} - (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} \right) dt dx \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{((v + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} + (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*}) k_v^1(x) (v - \sigma(v))^2}{|x - y|^\mu} dy dx \\
&\leq c_1 \left(|v + \bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2_\mu^*} + |\sigma(v) + \bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2_\mu^*} \right) |k_v^1(x) (v - \sigma(v))^2|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

for some appropriate positive constant c_1 . Similarly with the help of Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, Hölder's inequality and the definition of S we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \int_{\sigma(v)}^v \left(\int_\Omega \frac{(v + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} - (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*}}{|x - y|^\mu} dy \right) (\sigma(v) + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} dt dx \\
&\leq c_2 S^{-1/2} |k_v^2(x) (v - \sigma(v))|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}} |\sigma(v) + \bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2_\mu^* - 1} \|v - \sigma(v)\|
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

for some appropriate positive constant c_1 . Using (5.2) jointly with (5.3) and (5.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I &\leq c_1 \left(|v + \bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2_\mu^*} + |\sigma(v) + \bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2_\mu^*} \right) |k_v^1(x) (v - \sigma(v))^2|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}} \\
&\quad + c_2 S^{-1/2} |k_v^2(x) (v - \sigma(v))|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}} |\sigma(v) + \bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2_\mu^* - 1} \|v - \sigma(v)\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Let us suppose that the result is not true. This means that there exists a sequence $\{v_n\} \subset X_0$ such that for any $v_n \in K_{w_1}$ and

$$\|v_n - u\| < \frac{1}{2^n}, \quad \mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}}(v_n) < \mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}}(u) \text{ for all } n.$$

Define $l := u + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |v_n - u|$. By definition, $|v_n| \leq l$ a.e for all n . Now for each $v \in D(\mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}})$, set

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{k}_v^1(x) &= (2_\mu^* - 1)2^{2_\mu^* - 3}(\bar{u}^{2_\mu^* - 2} + \max\{|w_2|, |l|\}^{2_\mu^* - 2})\chi_{\{v > w_2\}} \\ \underline{k}_v^2(x) &= 2_\mu^* 2^{2_\mu^* - 2}(\bar{u}^{2_\mu^* - 1} + \max\{|w_2|, |l|\}^{2_\mu^* - 1})\chi_{\{v > w_2\}}.\end{aligned}$$

Employing (5.1) and (5.5), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}0 &> \mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}}(u) \\ &\geq \mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_{K_{w_1}}(\sigma(v_n)) \\ &\geq \frac{\|v_n - \sigma(v_n)\|^2}{2} - \lambda \left(c_1 \left(|v_n + \bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2_\mu^*} + |\sigma(v_n) + \bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2_\mu^*} \right) |\underline{k}_{v_n}^1(x)(v_n - \sigma(v_n))^2|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + c_2 S^{-1/2} |\underline{k}_{v_n}^2(x)(v_n - \sigma(v_n))|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}} |\sigma(v_n) + \bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2_\mu^* - 1} \|v_n - \sigma(v_n)\| \right) + \Xi(v_n - \sigma(v_n)) \\ &\geq \frac{\|v_n - \sigma(v_n)\|^2}{2} + \Xi(v_n - \sigma(v_n)) - \left(\frac{C_1}{4} |\underline{k}_{v_n}^1(x)(v_n - \sigma(v_n))^2|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{C_2}{4} |\underline{k}_{v_n}^2(x)(v_n - \sigma(v_n))|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}} \|v_n - \sigma(v_n)\| \right)\end{aligned}\tag{5.6}$$

where $C_1 = \sup_n 4\lambda c_1 \left(|v_n + \bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2_\mu^*} + |\sigma(v_n) + \bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2_\mu^*} \right)$ and $C_2 = \sup_n 4\lambda c_2 S^{-1/2} |\sigma(v_n) + \bar{u}|_{2_s^*}^{2_\mu^* - 1}$.

Consider

$$\begin{aligned}|\underline{k}_{v_n}^1(x)(v_n - \sigma(v_n))^2|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}} &\leq |\underline{k}_{v_n}^1(x)|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^* - 2}} |(v_n - \sigma(v_n))^2|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}} \\ &= \left(\left(\int_{\{\underline{k}_{v_n}^1 \leq R_1\}} |\underline{k}_{v_n}^1(x)|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^* - 2}}^{\frac{2_\mu^* - 2}{2_s^*}} \right)^{\frac{2_\mu^* - 2}{2_s^*}} + \left(\int_{\{\underline{k}_{v_n}^1 > R_1\}} |\underline{k}_{v_n}^1(x)|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^* - 2}}^{\frac{2_\mu^* - 2}{2_s^*}} \right)^{\frac{2_\mu^* - 2}{2_s^*}} \right) \\ &\quad |(v_n - \sigma(v_n))^2|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^*}}.\end{aligned}$$

Choose $R_1, R_2 > 0$ such that, for all n ,

$$C_1 S^{-1} \left(\int_{\{\underline{k}_{v_n}^1 > R_1\}} |\underline{k}_{v_n}^1(x)|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^* - 2}}^{\frac{2_\mu^* - 2}{2_s^*}} \right)^{\frac{2_\mu^* - 2}{2_s^*}} < \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } C_2 S^{-1/2} \left(\int_{\{\underline{k}_{v_n}^2 > R_2\}} |\underline{k}_{v_n}^2(x)|_{\frac{2_s^*}{2_\mu^* - 1}}^{\frac{2_\mu^* - 1}{2_s^*}} \right)^{\frac{2_\mu^* - 1}{2_s^*}} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore, using the Hölder's inequality in (5.6) with above estimates, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &> \frac{\|v_n - \sigma(v_n)\|^2}{4} + \Xi(v_n - \sigma(v_n)) - \left(\frac{C_1 R_1}{4} \left(\int_{\Omega} (v_n - \sigma(v_n))^{\frac{22^*_s}{2^*_\mu}} dx \right)^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_s}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{C_2 R_2}{4} \left(\int_{\Omega} (v_n - \sigma(v_n))^{\frac{2^*_s}{2^*_\mu}} dx \right)^{\frac{2^*_\mu}{2^*_s}} \|v_n - \sigma(v_n)\| \right) \\
&\geq \frac{\|(v_n - w_2)^+\|^2}{4} + \Xi((v_n - w_2)^+) \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{C_1 R_1}{4} |(v_n - w_2)^+|^{\frac{22^*_s}{2^*_\mu}} + \frac{C_2 R_2}{4} |(v_n - w_2)^+|^{\frac{22^*_s}{2^*_\mu}} \|v_n - \sigma(v_n)\| \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $C^* = \max\{\frac{C_1 R_1}{2}, \frac{C_2 R_2}{2}\}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &> \frac{\|(v_n - w_2)^+\|^2}{4} + \Xi((v_n - w_2)^+) \\
&\quad - \frac{C^*}{2} \left(|(v_n - w_2)^+|^{\frac{22^*_s}{2^*_\mu}} + |(v_n - w_2)^+|^{\frac{22^*_s}{2^*_\mu}} \|(v_n - w_2)^+\| \right). \tag{5.7}
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\nu = \inf\{\Xi(\phi) : \phi \in \mathcal{A}\}$ where $\mathcal{A} = \{\phi \in X_0 : \phi \geq 0, |\phi|^{\frac{22^*_s}{2^*_\mu}} = 1, \|\phi\| \leq 2C^*\}$. Clearly, \mathcal{A} is a weakly sequentially closed subset of X_0 . Using Fatou's lemma and the fact that Riesz potential is a bounded linear functional, one can easily prove that Ξ is a weakly lower semicontinuous on \mathcal{A} . Hence $\nu > 0$. Indeed, let z_n is a minimizing sequence of ν such that $z_n \rightharpoonup z$ weakly in X_0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ then $\Xi(z) \leq \liminf \Xi(z_n)$. Now by the application of the fact that w_2 is a strict supersolution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) we get that $\Xi(z) > 0$. Now notice that using the definition of ν , (5.7) can be rewritten as the following

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &> \nu + \frac{1}{4} \left(\left(\|(v_n - w_2)^+\| - C^* |(v_n - w_2)^+|^{\frac{22^*_s}{2^*_\mu}} \right)^2 - ((C^*)^2 + 2C^*) |(v_n - w_2)^+|^{\frac{22^*_s}{2^*_\mu}} \right) \\
&> \nu - \frac{1}{4} ((C^*)^2 + 2C^*) |(v_n - w_2)^+|^{\frac{22^*_s}{2^*_\mu}} \tag{5.8}
\end{aligned}$$

As v_n is a sequence such that $v_n \rightarrow u$ in X_0 . It implies that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $|(v_n - w_2)^+|^{\frac{22^*_s}{2^*_\mu}} \rightarrow 0$. So from (5.8), we get a contradiction to the fact that $\nu > 0$. Hence the proof is complete. \square

Lemma 5.6. $\Lambda > 0$.

Proof. We will use the lower and upper solution method to prove the required result. From Lemma 5.4, 0 and ϑ are the sub and supersolution respectively to (\widetilde{P}_λ) . We define the closed

convex set of X_0 as

$$W = \{u \in X_0 : 0 \leq u \leq \vartheta\}.$$

Employing the definition of W , one can easily prove that

$$\mathcal{J}_W \geq \frac{\|u\|^2}{2} - c_1 - c_2$$

for appropriate positive constants c_1 and c_2 . It implies \mathcal{J}_W is coercive on W . \mathcal{J}_W is weakly lower semi continuous on W . Indeed, let $\{u_n\} \subset W$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in X_0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For each n ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} G(x, u_n) dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} G(x, u) dx < +\infty, \\ \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_n + \bar{u})^{2^*} (u_n + \bar{u})^{2^*}}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy &\leq \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(\vartheta + \bar{u})^{2^*} (\vartheta + \bar{u})^{2^*}}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now we may use the dominated convergence theorem and the weak lower semicontinuity of the norm to prove that \mathcal{J}_W is weakly lower semi continuous on W . Thus, there exists $u \in X_0$ such that

$$\inf_{v \in W} \mathcal{J}_W(v) = \mathcal{J}_W(u).$$

Since $0 \in \partial^- \mathcal{J}_W(u)$, u is a weak solution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) . It implies $\Lambda > 0$. \square

Theorem 5.7. *Let $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda)$. Then there exists a positive weak solution u_λ to (\widetilde{P}_λ) belonging to X_0 such that $\mathcal{J}(u_\lambda) < 0$ and u_λ is a local minimizer for \mathcal{J}_{K_0} .*

Proof. Let $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda)$ and $\lambda' \in (\lambda, \Lambda)$. Then by Lemma 5.4, 0 and $u_{\lambda'}$ are strict sub and supersolution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) . The existence of $u_{\lambda'}$ is clear by the definition of Λ . Consider the convex set $W = \{u \in X_0 : 0 \leq u \leq u_{\lambda'}\}$. Using the same analysis as in Lemma 5.6, there exists a $u_\lambda \in X_0$ such that $\inf_{v \in W} \mathcal{J}_W(v) = \mathcal{J}_W(u_\lambda)$. Notice that $0 \in W$ and $\mathcal{J}_W(0) < 0$, it implies that $\mathcal{J}_W(u_\lambda) < 0$. Let $\phi_1 = 0$ and $\phi_2 = u_{\lambda'}$ in Theorem 5.5 we have u_λ is a local minimizer of \mathcal{J}_{K_0} . \square

Lemma 5.8. $\Lambda < \infty$.

Proof. Assume by contradiction that $\Lambda = +\infty$. Then there exists a sequence $\lambda_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let u_{λ_n} be the corresponding solution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) . Then by Theorem 5.7, $\mathcal{J}(u_{\lambda_n}) < 0$

and u_{λ_n} is a local minimizer for \mathcal{J}_{K_0} . That is,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|u_{\lambda_n}\|^2 + \int_{\Omega} G(x, u_{\lambda_n}) \, dx - \frac{\lambda_n}{22_{\mu}^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy < 0 \\ \text{and } & \|u_{\lambda_n}\|^2 + \int_{\Omega} g(x, u_{\lambda_n}) u_{\lambda_n} \, dx - \lambda_n \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^* - 1} u_{\lambda_n}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

With the application of Lemma 5.3(ii) and statements, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^* - 1} u_{\lambda_n}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy < \frac{1}{22_{\mu}^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy. \quad (5.10)$$

Using the fact that $\bar{u} \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$, for each $x \in \Omega$, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|t + \bar{u}|^{2_{\mu}^*}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dy \right) |t + \bar{u}|^{2_{\mu}^*}}{\left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|t + \bar{u}|^{2_{\mu}^*}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dy \right) |t + \bar{u}|^{2_{\mu}^* - 1} t} = 1.$$

Therefore, it follows that for any small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $M_{\varepsilon} > 0$ such that, for all n

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{22_{\mu}^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy \\ & < \frac{1}{2 + \varepsilon} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^* - 1} u_{\lambda_n}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy + M_{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

From (5.10) and (5.11), we obtain

$$\iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^* - 1} u_{\lambda_n}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy < \infty \text{ for all } n.$$

From (5.9), we have

$$\|u_{\lambda_n}\|^2 < \lambda_n \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^*} (u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2_{\mu}^* - 1} u_{\lambda_n}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy.$$

Hence $\{\lambda_n^{-1/2} u_{\lambda_n}\}$ is uniformly bounded in X_0 . Then there exists $z_0 \in X_0$ such that $z_n := \lambda_n^{-1/2} u_{\lambda_n} \rightharpoonup z_0$ weakly in X_0 . Let $0 \leq \psi \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$ be a non trivial function. Let $k > 0$ such

that $\bar{u} > k$ on $\text{supp}(\psi)$. Once again using (5.9), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\lambda_n} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{k^{22^*_\mu - 1} \psi}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy &\leq \sqrt{\lambda_n} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (u_{\lambda_n} + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu - 1} \psi}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ &= \langle z_n, \psi \rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \int_{\Omega} g(x, u_{\lambda_n}) \psi dx \\ &\leq \langle z_n, \psi \rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \int_{\Omega} k^{-q} \psi dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now passing the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\langle z_0, \psi \rangle = \infty$, which is not true. Hence $\Lambda < \infty$. \square

6 Second solution

In this section we will prove the existence of second solution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) . Let u_λ denotes the first solution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) obtained in Theorem 5.7.

Proposition 6.1. *The functional $\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}$ satisfies the $(CPS)_c$ for each c satisfying*

$$c < \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{N - \mu + 2s}{2N - \mu} \right) \left(\frac{S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N - \mu}{N - \mu + 2s}}}{\lambda^{\frac{N - 2s}{N - \mu + 2s}}} \right).$$

Proof. Let $c < \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{N - \mu + 2s}{2N - \mu} \right) \left(\frac{S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N - \mu}{N - \mu + 2s}}}{\lambda^{\frac{N - 2s}{N - \mu + 2s}}} \right)$. Let z_n be a sequence such that

$$\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(z_n) \rightarrow c \text{ and } (1 + \|z_n\|) \|\partial^- \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(z_n)\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

It implies there exists $\xi_n \in \partial^- \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(z_n)$ such that $\|\xi_n\| = \|\partial^- \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(z_n)\|$ for every n . From Lemma 5.1, for each $v \in D(\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}})$ and for each n , $g(\cdot, z_n)(v - z_n) \in L^1(\Omega)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \xi_n, v - z_n \rangle &\leq \langle z_n, v - z_n \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, z_n)(v - z_n) dx \\ &\quad - \lambda \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu - 1} (v - z_n)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy. \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Using the fact that $G(\cdot, z_n) \in L^1(\Omega)$ and Lemma 5.3, we obtain that $G(\cdot, 2z_n) \in L^1(\Omega)$. So $2z_n \in D(\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}})$, now employing (6.1), we get

$$\langle \xi_n, z_n \rangle \leq \|z_n\|^2 + \int_{\Omega} g(x, z_n) z_n dx - \lambda \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu - 1} z_n}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy.$$

With the help of Lemma 5.3 and (5.11), for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$\begin{aligned}
c + 1 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|z_n\|^2 + \int_{\Omega} G(x, z_n) \, dx - \frac{\lambda}{22^*_{\mu}} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_{\mu}} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_{\mu}}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \|z_n\|^2 + \int_{\Omega} G(x, z_n) \, dx - \frac{1}{2 + \varepsilon} \left(\langle \xi_n, z_n \rangle - \|z_n\|^2 - \int_{\Omega} g(x, z_n) z_n \, dx \right) - \lambda M_{\varepsilon} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \|z_n\|^2 - \frac{1}{2 + \varepsilon} (\langle \xi_n, z_n \rangle - \|z_n\|^2) - \lambda M_{\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

It shows that $\{z_n\}$ is a bounded sequence in X_0 . Hence, up to a subsequence, there exist $z_0 \in X_0$ such that $z_n \rightharpoonup z_0$ weakly in X_0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\|z_n - z_0\| \rightarrow a^2$ and $\iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_n - z_0)^{2^*_{\mu}} (z_n - z_0)^{2^*_{\mu}}}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy \rightarrow b^{22^*_{\mu}}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By the mean value theorem, Brezis-Lieb Lemma (see [7, 17]) and (6.1), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} G(x, z_0) \, dx &\geq \int_{\Omega} G(x, z_n) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} g(x, z_n)(z_0 - z_n) \, dx \\
&\geq \int_{\Omega} G(x, z_n) \, dx - \lambda \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_{\mu}} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_{\mu} - 1} (z_n - z_0)}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy \\
&\quad - \langle \xi_n, z_n - z_0 \rangle + \langle z_n, z_n - z_0 \rangle \\
&= \int_{\Omega} G(x, z_n) \, dx - \langle \xi_n, z_n - z_0 \rangle + \langle z_n, z_n - z_0 \rangle \\
&\quad - \lambda \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{((z_n - z_0)^{2^*_{\mu}} (z_n - z_0)^{2^*_{\mu}} + (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2^*_{\mu}} (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2^*_{\mu}})}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy \\
&\quad + \lambda \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_{\mu}} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_{\mu} - 1} (z_0 + \bar{u})}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Now using the fact that z_n converges to z_0 weakly in X_0 , hence as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\int_{\Omega} G(x, z_0) \, dx \geq \int_{\Omega} G(x, z_0) \, dx + a^2 - \lambda b^{22^*_{\mu}}.$$

Thus

$$\lambda b^{22^*_{\mu}} \geq a^2. \tag{6.2}$$

On account of the fact that u_{λ} is a weak positive solution to $(\widetilde{P}_{\lambda})$, for each n ,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \langle u_{\lambda}, z_n - u_{\lambda} \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, u_{\lambda})(z_n - u_{\lambda}) \, dx \\
&\quad + \lambda \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_{\lambda} + \bar{u})^{2^*_{\mu}} (u_{\lambda} + \bar{u})^{2^*_{\mu} - 1} (z_n - u_{\lambda})}{|x - y|^{\mu}} \, dx dy.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

In consideration of $G(\cdot, z_n), G(\cdot, 2z_n) \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $u_{\lambda} \leq 2z_n - u_{\lambda} \leq 2z_n$, we infer that

$2z_n - u_\lambda \in D(\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}})$. Testing (6.1) with $2z_n - u_\lambda$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \xi_n, z_n - u_\lambda \rangle &\leq \langle z_n, z_n - u_\lambda \rangle + \int_{\Omega} g(x, z_n)(z_n - u_\lambda) dx \\ &\quad - \lambda \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu - 1} (z_n - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy. \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

From Lemma 5.3, (6.3) and (6.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(z_n) - \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|z_n\|^2 + \int_{\Omega} G(x, z_n) dx - \frac{\lambda}{22^*_\mu} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu}}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \|u_\lambda\|^2 - \int_{\Omega} G(x, u_\lambda) dx + \frac{\lambda}{22^*_\mu} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu}}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} \left(G(x, z_n) - G(x, u_\lambda) - \frac{1}{2} (g(x, u_\lambda) + g(x, z_n)) (z_n - u_\lambda) \right) dx \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{22^*_\mu} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} - (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu}}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy + \frac{1}{2} \langle \xi_n, z_n - u_\lambda \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{((u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu - 1} - (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu - 1}) (z_n - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda}{22^*_\mu} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} - (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu}}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{((u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu - 1} (z_n - u_\lambda) - (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu - 1} (u_\lambda + \bar{u}))}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu}}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy + \frac{1}{2} \langle \xi_n, z_n - u_\lambda \rangle \\ &=: \mathcal{I} + \frac{1}{2} \langle \xi_n, z_n - u_\lambda \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

Using Brezis-Lieb Lemma (See [17]), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} &= \lambda \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{22^*_\mu} \right) \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{((z_n - z_0)^{2^*_\mu} (z_n - z_0)^{2^*_\mu}) + ((z_0 + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu})}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{((u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu - 1} (z_n - u_\lambda)) - ((z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu - 1} (u_\lambda + \bar{u}))}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{22^*_\mu} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu} (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2^*_\mu}}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy + o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

Observe that by weak convergence of the sequence $\{z_n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} (z_n - z_0)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \rightarrow 0 \\ \text{and } & \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{((z_n + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} (z_n + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} - (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1}) (u_\lambda + \bar{u})}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

Taking into account (6.5), (6.6), (6.7) and passing the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} c - \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) & \geq \frac{\lambda}{22_\mu^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*}}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy + \lambda \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{22_\mu^*} \right) b^{22_\mu^*} \\ & \quad + \frac{\lambda}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} (z_0 - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ & \quad + \frac{\lambda}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} (z_0 - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ & \quad - \frac{\lambda}{22_\mu^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*}}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ & := \mathcal{I}_1(\text{say}) + \lambda \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{22_\mu^*} \right) b^{22_\mu^*}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

Clearly, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 & = \frac{\lambda}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} ((u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} + (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1}) (z_0 - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ & \quad - \frac{\lambda}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} (z_0 - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ & \quad + \frac{\lambda}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} ((z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} + (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1}) (z_0 - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ & \quad - \frac{\lambda}{2} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} (z_0 - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ & \quad + \frac{\lambda}{22_\mu^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} ((u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} - (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*})}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ & \quad + \frac{\lambda}{22_\mu^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} ((u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} - (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*})}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy. \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} - (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} & = -2_\mu^* \int_{u_\lambda}^{z_0} (t + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} dt \\ & \geq -2_\mu^* \left(\frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} + (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1}}{2} \right) (z_0 - u_\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

It implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda}{22_\mu^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} ((u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} - (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*})}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ & \geq -\frac{\lambda}{4} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} ((u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} + (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1}) (z_0 - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy. \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Similarly, } & \frac{\lambda}{22_\mu^*} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} ((u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} - (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*})}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ & \geq -\frac{\lambda}{4} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} ((u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} + (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1}) (z_0 - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy. \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

From (6.9), (6.10) and (6.11), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 &= \frac{\lambda}{4} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} ((u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} - (z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1}) (z_0 - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ & \quad + \frac{\lambda}{4} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{(z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} ((z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} - (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1}) (z_0 - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{4} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} \frac{((z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*} - (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^*}) ((z_0 + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1} - (u_\lambda + \bar{u})^{2_\mu^* - 1}) (z_0 - u_\lambda)}{|x - y|^\mu} dx dy \\ & \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

Hence from (6.8) and (6.12), we obtain

$$c - \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) \geq \lambda \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{22_\mu^*} \right) b^{22_\mu^*}. \quad (6.13)$$

Using definition of $S_{H,L}$ and (6.2), we have $\lambda b^{22_\mu^*} \geq a^2$ and $a^2 \geq S_{H,L} b^2$, that is

$$b \geq \left(\frac{S_{H,L}}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{N-2s}{2(N-\mu+2s)}}. \quad (6.14)$$

Using (6.13) and (6.14), we get

$$c - \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) \geq \lambda \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{22_\mu^*} \right) \left(\frac{S_{H,L}}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{N-\mu+2s}{2N-\mu} \right) \left(\frac{S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}}}{\lambda^{\frac{N-2s}{N-\mu+2s}}} \right).$$

It contradicts the fact that $c < \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{N-\mu+2s}{2N-\mu} \right) \left(\frac{S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}}}{\lambda^{\frac{N-2s}{N-\mu+2s}}} \right)$. Hence $a = 0$. \square

Now consider the family of minimizers $\{U_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ of S defined as

$$U_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-\frac{(N-2s)}{2}} S^{\frac{(N-\mu)(2s-N)}{4(N-\mu+2s)}} (C(N, \mu))^{\frac{2s-N}{2(N-\mu+2s)}} u^*(x/\varepsilon)$$

where $u^*(x) = \bar{u}(x/S^{1/2s})$, $\bar{u}(x) = \frac{\tilde{u}(x)}{|\tilde{u}|_{2_s^*}}$ and $\tilde{u}(x) = a(b^2 + |x|^2)^{\frac{-(N-2s)}{2}}$ with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\beta > 0$ are fixed constants. Then from Lemma 2.2, for $\varepsilon > 0$, U_ε satisfies

$$(-\Delta)^s u = (|x|^{-\mu} * |u|^{2_\mu^*}) |u|^{2_\mu^* - 2} u \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Let $\rho > 0$ such that $B_{4\rho} \subset \Omega$. Now define $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ in \mathbb{R}^N , $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B_\rho(0)$ and $\eta \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{2\rho}(0)$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we define $\Psi_\varepsilon = \eta(x)U_\varepsilon(x)$.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $N > 2s$, $0 < \mu < N$ then the following holds:*

- (i) $\|\Psi_\varepsilon\|^2 \leq S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}} + O(\varepsilon^{N-2s})$.
- (ii) $\|\Psi_\varepsilon\|_{NL}^{2.2_\mu^*} \leq S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}} + O(\varepsilon^N)$.
- (iii) $\|\Psi_\varepsilon\|_{NL}^{2.2_\mu^*} \geq S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}} - O(\varepsilon^N)$.

Proof. Using the definition of Ψ_ε and [38, Proposition 1] part (i) follows. For (ii) and (iii) see [22, Proposition 2.8]. \square

Lemma 6.3. [25] *The following holds:*

- (i) *If $\mu < \min\{4s, N\}$ then for all $\Theta < 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\lambda + t\Psi_\varepsilon\|_{NL}^{2.2_\mu^*} &\geq \|u_\lambda\|_{NL}^{2.2_\mu^*} + \|\Psi_\varepsilon\|_{NL}^{2.2_\mu^*} + \widehat{C}t^{2.2_\mu^*-1} \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{(\Psi_\varepsilon(x))^{2_\mu^*} (\Psi_\varepsilon(y))^{2_\mu^*-1} u_\lambda(y)}{|x-y|^\mu} dx dy \\ &\quad + 2.2_\mu^* t \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{(u_\lambda(x))^{2_\mu^*} (u_\lambda(y))^{2_\mu^*-1} \Psi_\varepsilon(y)}{|x-y|^\mu} dx dy - O(\varepsilon^{\frac{2N-\mu}{4}\Theta}). \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) *There exists a $R_0 > 0$ such that $\int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{(\Psi_\varepsilon(x))^{2_\mu^*} (\Psi_\varepsilon(y))^{2_\mu^*-1} u_\lambda(y)}{|x-y|^\mu} dx dy \geq \widehat{C}R_0\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{2}}$.*

Lemma 6.4. $\sup\{\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda + t\Psi_\varepsilon) : t \geq 0\} < \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{N-\mu+2s}{2N-\mu} \right) \frac{S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}}}{\lambda^{\frac{N-2s}{N-\mu+2s}}}$ for any sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. Employing the fact that u_λ is a weak solution to (P_λ) and using Lemma 6.3, for all

$\Theta < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda + t\Psi_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) &\leq \frac{1}{2}\|t\Psi_\varepsilon\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{22_\mu^*}\|t\Psi_\varepsilon\|_{NL}^{2.2_\mu^*} + O(\varepsilon^{(\frac{2N-\mu}{4})\Theta}) \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} (G(u_\lambda + t\Psi_\varepsilon) - G(x, u_\lambda) - g(x, u_\lambda)t\Psi_\varepsilon) dx \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda\widehat{C}t^{2.2_\mu^*-1}}{22_\mu^*} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\Psi_\varepsilon(x))^{2_\mu^*}(\Psi_\varepsilon(y))^{2_\mu^*-1}u_\lambda(y)}{|x-y|^\mu} dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 6.2 and Lemma 6.3, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda + t\Psi_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) &\leq \frac{t^2}{2}(S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}} + O(\varepsilon^{N-2s})) - \frac{\lambda t^{2.2_\mu^*}}{22_\mu^*}(S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}} - O(\varepsilon^N)) \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} (G(u_\lambda + t\Psi_\varepsilon) - G(x, u_\lambda) - g(x, u_\lambda)t\Psi_\varepsilon) dx \quad (6.15) \\ &\quad - \frac{\widehat{C}t^{2.2_\mu^*-1}}{22_\mu^*}\widehat{C}R_0\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{2}} + O(\varepsilon^{(\frac{2N-\mu}{4})\Theta}). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that for any fix $1 < \rho < \min\{2, \frac{2}{n-2s}\}$, there exists $R_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\Psi_\varepsilon|^\rho dx \leq R_1\varepsilon^{(n-2s)\rho/2}.$$

Moreover, there exists $R_2 > 0$ such that, for all $x \in \Omega, r > m$ and $s \geq 0$,

$$G(x, r+s) - G(x, s) - g(x, r)s = \int_r^{r+s} (\tau^{-q} - r^{-q}) d\tau \leq R_2s^\rho.$$

Using last inequality and (6.15) with $\Theta = \frac{2}{2_\mu^*}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda + t\Psi_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) &\leq \frac{t^2}{2}(S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}} + O(\varepsilon^{N-2s})) - \frac{t^{2.2_\mu^*}}{22_\mu^*}(S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}} - O(\varepsilon^N)) \\ &\quad - \frac{\widehat{C}t^{2.2_\mu^*-1}}{22_\mu^*}\widehat{C}R_0\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{2}} + R_1R_2t^\rho\varepsilon^{(n-2s)\rho/2} + o(\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{2}}) \\ &:= K(t). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, one can check that $K(t) \rightarrow -\infty, K(t) > 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ and there exists $t_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $K'(t_\varepsilon) = 0$. Furthermore, there exist positive constants T_1 and T_2 such that $T_1 \leq t_\varepsilon \leq T_2$ (for

details see [25]). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} K(t) &\leq \frac{t_\varepsilon^2}{2} (S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}} + O(\varepsilon^{N-2s})) - \frac{t_\varepsilon^{22^*}}{22^*_\mu} (S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}} - O(\varepsilon^N)) - \frac{\widehat{C}T_1^{2.2^*_\mu-1}}{22^*_\mu} \widehat{C}R_0 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{2}} \\ &\quad + R_1 R_2 T_2^\rho \varepsilon^{(n-2s)\rho/2} + o(\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{2}}) \\ &\leq \sup_{t \geq 0} K_1(t) - \frac{\widehat{C}T_1^{2.2^*_\mu-1}}{22^*_\mu} \widehat{C}R_0 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{2}} + R_1 R_2 T_2^\rho \varepsilon^{(n-2s)\rho/2} + o(\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{2}}) \end{aligned}$$

where $K_1(t) = \frac{t^2}{2} (S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}} + O(\varepsilon^{N-2s})) - \frac{t^{22^*}}{22^*_\mu} (S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}} - O(\varepsilon^N))$. By trivial computations, we get

$$\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda + t\Psi_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{N-\mu+2s}{2N-\mu} \right) \frac{S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}}}{\lambda^{\frac{N-2s}{N-\mu+2s}}} + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{2}}) - C\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{2}} + o(\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{2}})$$

for an appropriate constant $C > 0$. Thus, for ε sufficiently small,

$$\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda + t\Psi_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{N-\mu+2s}{2N-\mu} \right) \frac{S_{H,L}^{\frac{2N-\mu}{N-\mu+2s}}}{\lambda^{\frac{N-2s}{N-\mu+2s}}}.$$

Hence the proof follows. \square

Proposition 6.5. *For each $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda)$ there exist a second positive solution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) .*

Proof. From Theorem 5.7, u_λ is a local minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}$. It implies there exist $\varsigma > 0$ such that $\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(z) \geq \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda)$ for every $z \in K_{u_\lambda}$ with $\|z - u_\lambda\| \leq \varsigma$. Let $\Psi = \Psi_\varepsilon$ for ε obtained in Lemma 6.4. Since $\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda + t\Psi) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, so choose $t \geq \varsigma/\|\Psi\|$ such that $\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda + t\Psi) \leq \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda)$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma &= \{\phi \in C([0, 1], D(\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}})) : \phi(0) = u_\lambda, \phi(1) = u_\lambda + t\Psi\}, \\ A &= \{z \in D(\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}) : \|z - u_\lambda\| = \alpha\} \text{ and } c = \inf_{\phi \in \Sigma} \sup_{r \in [0, 1]} \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(\phi(r)). \end{aligned}$$

With the help of Proposition 6.1 and Lemma 6.4, $\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}$ satisfies $(CPS)_c$ condition. If $c = \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) = \inf \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(A)$ then $u_\lambda \notin A$, $u_\lambda + t\Psi \notin A$, $\inf \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(A) \geq \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda) \geq \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(u_\lambda + t\Psi)$, and for every $\phi \in \Sigma$, there exist $r \in [0, 1]$ such that $\|\phi(r) - u_\lambda\| = \varsigma$. Thus by Theorem 2.19, we get there exists $z_\lambda \in D(\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}})$ such that $z_\lambda \neq u_\lambda$, $\mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(z_\lambda) = c$ and $0 \in \partial^- \mathcal{J}_{K_{u_\lambda}}(z_\lambda)$. Using Proposition 5.2, we obtain that z_λ is positive weak solution to (\widetilde{P}_λ) . \square

Proof of Theorem 2.13: It follows from Theorem 5.7, Proposition 6.5 and Lemma 4.5. \square

References

- [1] N. Abatangelo and E. Valdinoci, *Getting acquainted with the fractional Laplacian*, in Contemporary Research in Elliptic PDEs and Related Topics, Springer, Cham (2019), 1-105.
- [2] Adimurthi, J. Giacomoni and S. Santra, *Positive solutions to a fractional equation with singular nonlinearity*, J. Differential Equations, **265** (2018), no. 4, 1191-1226.
- [3] Adimurthi and J. Giacomoni, *Multiplicity of positive solutions for a singular and critical elliptic problem in \mathbb{R}^2* , Commun. Contemp. Math. **8** (2006), no. 5, 621-656.
- [4] B. Barrios, I. De Bonis, M. Medina, and I. Peral, *Semilinear problems for the fractional laplacian with a singular nonlinearity*, Open Math. J., **13** (2015), 390-407.
- [5] L. Boccardo and L. Orsina, *Semilinear elliptic equations with singular nonlinearities*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, **37** (2010), 363-380.
- [6] B. Bougherara, J. Giacomoni and J. Hernandez, *Some regularity results for singular elliptic problems*, Dyn. Syst. Differ. Equ. Appl. Proc. AIMS 2015, (2015), 142-150.
- [7] H. Brezis and E. Lieb, *A relation between pointwise convergence of functions and convergence of functionals*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **88** (1983), 486-90.
- [8] A. Canino and M. Degiovanni, *A variational approach to a class of singular semilinear elliptic equations*, J. Convex Anal., **11** (2004), 147-162.
- [9] D. Cassani and J. Zhang, *Choquard-type equations with Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev upper-critical growth*, Adv. Nonlinear Anal., **8** (2019), no. 1, 1184-1212.
- [10] H. Chen and C. Liu, *Ground state solutions for non-autonomous fractional Choquard equations*, Nonlinearity, **29** (2016), 1827-1842.
- [11] M. M. Coclite and G. Palmieri, *On a singular nonlinear Dirichlet problem*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **14** (1989), no. 10, 1315-1327.
- [12] M. G. Crandall, P. H. Rabinowitz and L. Tartar, *On a Dirichlet problem with a singular nonlinearity*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **2** (1977), 193-222.
- [13] P. d'Avenia, G. Siciliano and M. Squassina, *On fractional Choquard equations*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., **25** (2015), no. 8, 1447-1476.
- [14] R. Dhanya, S. Prashanth, K. Sreenadh and Sweta Tiwari, *Critical growth elliptic problem in \mathbb{R}^2 with singular discontinuous nonlinearities*, Adv. Differential Equations, **19** (2014), no. 5/6, 409-440.

- [15] H. Fröhlich, *Theory of electrical breakdown in ionic crystal*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Ser. A, **160** (1937), no. 901, 230241.
- [16] H. Fröhlich, *Electrons in lattice fields*, Adv. in Phys., **3** (1954), no. 11, 325-361.
- [17] F. Gao and M. Yang, *On the Brezis-Nirenberg type critical problem for nonlinear Choquard equation*, Sci. China Math., **61** (2018), 1219-1242.
- [18] M. Ghergu and V. Rădulescu, *Singular Elliptic Problems: Bifurcation and Asymptotic Analysis*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008.
- [19] J. Giacomoni, D. Goel and K. Sreenadh, *Regularity results on a class of doubly nonlocal problems involving Choquard nonlinearity*, J. Differential equations, DOI: 10.1016/j.jde.2019.11.009.
- [20] J. Giacomoni, T. Mukherjee and K. Sreenadh, *A Global multiplicity result for a very singular critical nonlocal equation*, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal., **54** (2019), no. 1, 345370.
- [21] J. Giacomoni, T. Mukherjee and K. Sreenadh, *Positive solutions of fractional elliptic equation with critical and singular nonlinearity*, Adv. Nonlinear Anal., **6** (2017), no. 3, 327-354.
- [22] J. Giacomoni, T. Mukherjee and K. Sreenadh, *Doubly nonlocal system with Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev critical nonlinearity*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **467** (2018), no.1, 638-672.
- [23] J. Giacomoni, I. Schindler and P. Takáč, *Singular quasilinear elliptic equations and Hölder regularity*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, **350** (2012), no. 7/8, 383-388.
- [24] J. Giacomoni, I. Schindler and P. Takáč, *Sobolev versus Hölder local minimizers and existence of multiple solutions for a singular quasilinear equation*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.(5) , (2007) 117-158.
- [25] D. Goel and K. Sreenadh, *Kirchhoff equations with Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev critical nonlinearity*, Nonlinear Anal., **186** (2019), 162-186.
- [26] Y. Haitao, *Multiplicity and asymptotic behavior of positive solutions for a singular semi-linear elliptic problem*, J. Differential Equations, **189** (2003), 487-512.
- [27] J. Hernández and F. Mancebo, *Singular elliptic and parabolic equations*, in: Handbook of Differential Equations: Stationary Partial Differential Equations. Vol. III, Elsevier, Amsterdam (2006), 317-400.
- [28] N. Hirano, C. Saccon and N. Shioji, *Existence of multiple positive solutions for singular elliptic problems with concave and convex nonlinearities*, Adv. Differential Equations, **9** (2004), no. 1-2, 197-220.

- [29] N. Hirano, C. Saccon and N. Shioji, *Brezis-Nirenberg type theorems and multiplicity of positive solutions for a singular elliptic problem*, J. Differential Equations, **245** (2008), 1997-2037.
- [30] E. H. Lieb, *Existence and uniqueness of the minimizing solution of Choquard's nonlinear equation*, Stud. Appl. Math., **57** (1976/77), 93-105.
- [31] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss, *Analysis*, volume 14 of graduate studies in mathematics, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, Rhode Island, 2001.
- [32] G. Molica Bisci, V. D. Rădulescu and R. Servadei, *Variational methods for nonlocal fractional problems*, **162**, Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [33] V. Moroz and J. Van Schaftingen, *Semi-classical states for the Choquard equation*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, **52** (2015), no. 12, 199-235.
- [34] V. Moroz and J. Van Schaftingen, *Existence of groundstates for a class of nonlinear Choquard equations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **367** (2015), 6557-6579.
- [35] V. Moroz and J. Van Schaftingen, *A guide to the Choquard equation*, J. Fixed Point Theory Appl., **19** (2017), no. 1, 773-813.
- [36] T. Mukherjee and K. Sreenadh, *Critical growth elliptic problems with Choquard type nonlinearity: A survey*, in Mathematical Modelling, Optimization, Analytic and Numerical Solutions, 197-229, Springer Singapore 2020.
- [37] J. Seok, *Limit profiles and uniqueness of ground states to the nonlinear Choquard equations*, Adv. Nonlinear Anal., **8** (2019), no. 1, 1083-1098.
- [38] R. Servadei and E. Valdinoci, *The Brezis-Nirenberg result for the fractional Laplacian*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **367** (2015), no. 1, 67-102.
- [39] A. Szulkin, *Minimax principles for lower semicontinuous functions and applications to nonlinear boundary value problems*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, **3** (1986), 77-109.
- [40] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra, *The Dirichlet problem for the fractional Laplacian: regularity up to the boundary*, J. Math. Pures Appl., **101** (2014), 275-302.
- [41] X. Tang and S. Chen, *Singularly perturbed Choquard equations with nonlinearity satisfying Berestycki-Lions assumptions*, Adv. Nonlinear Anal., **9** (2020), no. 1, 413-437.