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ABSTRACT. In this paper we investigate the existence, decay and concentration behavior of solutions for the following class of fractional relativistic Schrödinger equations:

\[
\begin{cases}
(-\Delta + m^2)^s u + V(\varepsilon x) u = f(u) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\
u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N), & u > 0 \\
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \varepsilon > 0 \) is a small parameter, \( s \in (0,1) \), \( m > 0 \), \( N > 2s \), \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\) is the fractional relativistic Schrödinger operator, \( V : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R} \) is a continuous potential satisfying a local condition, and \( f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) is a continuous subcritical nonlinearity. The approach is based on a variant of the extension method and applying appropriate variational techniques.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider the following class of nonlinear fractional elliptic problems:

\[
\begin{cases}
(-\Delta + m^2)^s u + V(\varepsilon x) u = f(u) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\
u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N), & u > 0 \\
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \varepsilon > 0 \) is a small parameter, \( s \in (0,1) \), \( N > 2s \), \( m > 0 \), \( V : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R} \) is a continuous potential and \( f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) is a continuous nonlinearity. The nonlocal operator \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\) appearing in (1.1) is defined via Fourier transform by

\[
(-\Delta + m^2)^s u := (2\pi)^{-\frac{N}{2}} \mathcal{F}^{-1}((|k|^2 + m^2)^s \mathcal{F} u)
\]

for any \( u : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R} \) belonging to the Schwartz space \( \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N) \) of rapidly decaying functions, or equivalently (see [28,40])

\[
(-\Delta + m^2)^s u(x) := m^{2s} u(x) + C(N,s) m^{\frac{s+2}{2s}} P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x-y|^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}} K_{\frac{N+2s}{2}}(m|x-y|) \, dy,
\]

where \( P.V. \) stands for the Cauchy principal value, \( K_{\nu} \) is the modified Bessel function of the third kind (or Macdonald function) of index \( \nu \) (see [9,20]) which satisfies the following well-known asymptotic formulas for \( \nu \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( r > 0 \):

\[
K_{\nu}(r) \sim \Gamma(\nu) \left( \frac{r}{2} \right)^{-\nu} \text{ as } r \to 0, \quad \text{for } \nu > 0,
\]

\[
K_{\nu}(r) \sim \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} r^{-\frac{\nu}{2}} e^{-r} \text{ as } r \to \infty, \quad \text{for } \nu \in \mathbb{R},
\]

and \( C(N,s) \) is a positive constant whose exact value is given by

\[
C(N,s) := 2^{-\frac{N+2s}{2} + 1} \pi^{\frac{s}{2}} 2^{2s} s(1-s) \Gamma(2-s).
\]

Equations involving \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\) arise in the study of standing waves \( \psi(x,t) \) for Schrödinger-Klein-Gordon equations of the form

\[
i \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = (-\Delta + m^2)^s \psi - f(x,\psi), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R},
\]

which describe the behavior of bosons. In particular, when \( s = 1/2 \), the operator \( \sqrt{-\Delta + m^2} - m \) plays an important role in relativistic quantum mechanics because it corresponds to the kinetic energy of a relativistic
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particle with mass \( m > 0 \). If \( p \) is the momentum of the particle then its relativistic kinetic energy is given by \( E = \sqrt{p^2 + m^2} \). In the process of quantization the momentum \( p \) is replaced by the differential operator \( -i \nabla \) and the quantum analog of the relativistic kinetic energy is the free relativistic Hamiltonian \( \sqrt{-\Delta + m^2 - m} \).

Physical models related to this operator have been widely studied over the past 30 years and there exists a huge literature on the spectral properties of relativistic Hamiltonians, most of it has been strongly influenced by the works of Lieb on the stability of relativistic matter; see \([25, 35, 41, 42]\) for more physical background. On the other hand, there is also a deep connection between \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\) and the theory of Lévy processes. Indeed, \( m^{2s} - (-\Delta + m^2)^s \) is the infinitesimal generator of a Lévy process \( X_t^{2s,m} \) called \( 2s \)-stable relativistic process having the following characteristic function

\[
E^0 e^{ik \cdot X_t^{2s,m}} = e^{-\|k|^2\tau - \|m\|^{2s}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{R}^N;
\]

we refer to \([13, 16, 45]\) for a more detailed discussion on relativistic stable processes. When \( m = 0 \), the previous operator boils down to the fractional Laplacian operator \((-\Delta)^s\) which has been extensively studied in these last years due to its great applications in several fields of the research; see \([11, 23, 43]\) for an introduction on this topic. In particular, a great interest has been devoted to the existence and multiplicity of solutions for fractional Schrödinger equations \([39]\) like

\[
\varepsilon^{2s}(-\Delta)^s u + V(x)u = f(u) \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N,
\]

and the asymptotic behavior as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \); see for instance \([2, 5, 6, 21, 29, 32]\) and the references therein.

When \( m > 0 \) and \( \varepsilon = 1 \) in \((1.1)\), some interesting existence, multiplicity, and qualitative results of solutions for \((1.1)\) can be found in \([4, 12, 17, 19, 20, 31, 36, 46]\), while only one result \([18]\) treats with the semiclassical analysis \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) of a fractional Hartree equation involving \( -\varepsilon^2 \Delta + m^2 \).

Motivated by the above papers, in this work we focus our attention on the concentration phenomenon of solutions to \((1.1)\) as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \). Along this paper, we suppose that \( V : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R} \) is a continuous function which satisfies the following conditions due to del Pino and Felmer \([22]\):

- \((V_1)\) there exists \( V_1 \in (0, m^{2s}) \) such that \(-V_1 := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} V(x)\),
- \((V_2)\) there exists a bounded open set \( \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^N \) such that \(-V_0 := \inf_{x \in \Lambda} V(x) < \min_{x \in \partial \Lambda} V(x)\),

with \( V_0 > 0 \). We also set \( \mathcal{M} := \{x \in \Lambda : V(x) = -V_0\}\). Without loss of generality, we may assume that \( 0 \in \mathcal{M}\).

Concerning the nonlinearity \( f \), we assume that \( f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) is continuous, \( f(t) = 0 \) for \( t \leq 0 \), and \( f \) fulfills the following hypotheses:

- \((f_1)\) \( \lim_{t \to 0^-} \frac{f(t)}{t} = 0 \),
- \((f_2)\) \( \sup_{t \to +\infty} \frac{f(t)}{t^p} < \infty \) for some \( p \in (1, 2^*_s - 1) \), where \( 2^*_s := \frac{2N}{N - 2s} \) is the fractional critical exponent,
- \((f_3)\) there exists \( \theta \in (2, 2^*_s) \) such that \( 0 < \theta F(t) \leq tf(t) \) for all \( t > 0 \),
- \((f_4)\) \( \frac{f(t)}{t} \) is increasing for \( t > 0 \).

The main result of this work can be stated as follows:

**Theorem 1.1.** Assume that \((V_1)\)-(V_2) and \((f_1)-(f_4)\) are satisfied. Then, for every small \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists a solution \( u_\varepsilon \) to \((1.1)\) such that \( u_\varepsilon \) has a maximum point satisfying

\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \text{dist}(\varepsilon x_\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}) = 0,
\]

and for which

\[
0 < u_\varepsilon(x) \leq Ce^{-c|x - x_\varepsilon|} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N,
\]

for suitable constants \( C, c > 0 \). Moreover, for any sequence \((\varepsilon_n)\) with \( \varepsilon_n \to 0 \), there exists a subsequence, still denoted by itself, such that there exist a point \( x_0 \in \mathcal{M} \) with \( \varepsilon_n y_{\varepsilon_n} \to x_0 \), and a positive least energy solution \( u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N) \) of the limiting problem

\[
(-\Delta + m^2)^s u - V_0 u = f(u) \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N,
\]

for which we have

\[
u_{\varepsilon_n}(x) = u(x - y_{\varepsilon_n}) + \mathcal{R}_n(x)
\]

where \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \|\mathcal{R}_n\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 0 \).
The proof of Theorem 1.1 is obtained through suitable variational techniques. Firstly, we start by observing that \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\) is a nonlocal operator and that does not scale like the fractional Laplacian operator \((-\Delta)^s\). More precisely, the first operator is not compatible with the semigroup \(\mathbb{R}_+\) acting on functions as 
\(t \mapsto u(t^{-1}x)\) for \(t > 0\). This fact does not permit to adapt in a simple way the same arguments performed to deal with \((-\Delta)^s\). Nevertheless, we overcome these difficulties by using a variant of the extension method [14] for \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\) (see [19, 28, 49]) which permits to study via local variational methods a degenerate elliptic equation in a half-space with a nonlinear Neumann boundary condition. Clearly, some additional difficulties arise in the investigation of this problem because we have to handle the trace terms of the involved functions and thus a more careful analysis will be needed.

Due to the lack of informations on the behavior of \(V\) at infinity, we carry out a penalization argument [22] which consists in modifying appropriately the nonlinearity \(f\) outside \(\Lambda\), and thus consider a modified problem whose corresponding energy functional fulfills all the assumptions of the mountain pass theorem [22] with some elliptic regularity estimates established in [28]. To our knowledge this is the first time that the penalization trick is used to study the concentration phenomena for the fractional relativistic Schrödinger operator \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\) for all \(s \in (0, 1)\) and \(m > 0\). When \(m = 0\), namely when (1.1) reduces to (1.5) after rescaling, we refer the interested reader to [2, 5, 6] for similar approaches. Finally, we show that the solutions of (1.1) have an exponential decay, contrary to the case \(m = 0\) for which the solutions of (1.5) satisfy the power-type decay \(|x|^{-(N+2s)}\) as \(|x| \to \infty\); see [6, 29, 30]. To investigate the decay of solutions to (1.1), we construct a suitable comparison function and we carry out some refined estimates which take care of an adequate estimate concerning \(2s\)-stable relativistic density with parameter \(m\) found in [34], and that the modified Bessel function \(K_\nu\) has an exponential decay at infinity. We stress that exponential type estimates for equations like (1.1), appear in [18, 19] where \(s = \frac{1}{2}\), \(V\) is bounded, \(f\) is a Hartree type nonlinearity, and in [31] where \(s \in (0, 1)\), \(m = 1\), \(V \equiv 0\) and \(|f(u)| \leq C u^p\) for some \(p \in (1, 2^*_s - 1)\). Anyway, our approach to obtain the decay estimate is completely different from the above mentioned papers, it is more general and we believe that can be applied in other situations to deal with fractional problems driven by \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\).

We conclude this introduction by pointing out that in view of the techniques developed here and the recent result in [7], we are preparing a work [8] in which we obtain a multiplicity result for (1.1) when \(f\) is a Berestycki-Lions type nonlinearity [10].

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we collect some notations and preliminary results which will be used along the paper. In section 3 we introduce a penalty functional in order to apply suitable variational arguments. The section 4 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. Finally, we give some interesting results for \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\) in the appendix.

2. preliminaries

2.1. Notations and functional setting. We denote the upper half-space in \(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\) by 
\[
\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+ := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} : y > 0\},
\]
and for \((x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+\) we consider the Euclidean norm \(|(x, y)| := \sqrt{|x|^2 + y^2}|\).

Let \(p \in [1, \infty]\) and \(A \subset \mathbb{R}^N\) be a measurable set. We indicate by \(L^p(A)\) the set of measurable functions \(u : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}\) such that 
\[
|u|_{L^p(A)} := \begin{cases}
(f_A |u|^p \, dx)^{1/p} < \infty & \text{if } p < \infty, \\
\text{esssup}_{x \in A} |u(x)| & \text{if } p = \infty.
\end{cases}
\]
When \(A = \mathbb{R}^N\), we simply write \(|u|_p\) instead of \(|u|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)}\). With \(\|w\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)}\) we will always denote the norm of \(w \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)\).
Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ be a bounded domain, that is a bounded connected open set, with boundary $\partial D$, we denote by $\partial' D$ the interior of $\overline{D} \cap \partial \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$, and we set $\partial'' D := \partial D \setminus \partial' D$. For $R > 0$, we put
\[ B^+_R := \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} : |(x,y)| < R\}, \]
\[ \Gamma^0_R := \partial' B^+_R = \{(x,0) \in \partial \mathbb{R}^{N+1} : |x| < R\}, \]
\[ \Gamma^+_R := \partial'' B^+_R = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} : y \geq 0, |(x,y)| = R\}. \]

Now, we introduce the Lebesgue spaces with weight (see [27, 37] for more details). Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ be an open set and $r \in (1, \infty)$. Denote by $L^r(D, y^{1-2s})$ the weighted Lebesgue space of all measurable functions $v : D \to \mathbb{R}$ such that
\[ \|v\|_{L^r(D, y^{1-2s})} := \left( \int_D |v|^{r} \, dx \right)^{1/r} < \infty. \]

We say that $v \in H^1(D, y^{1-2s})$ if $v \in L^2(D, y^{1-2s})$ and its weak derivatives, collectively denoted by $\nabla v$, exist and belong to $L^2(D, y^{1-2s})$. The norm of $v$ in $H^1(D, y^{1-2s})$ is given by
\[ \|v\|_{H^1(D, y^{1-2s})}^2 := \int_D |\nabla v|^2 + v^2 \, dx < \infty. \]

It is clear that $H^1(D, y^{1-2s})$ is a Hilbert space with the inner product
\[ \int_D y^{1-2s} \nabla v \nabla u + vu \, dx. \]

Let $H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be the fractional Sobolev space defined as the completion of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with respect to the norm
\[ \|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)} := \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |k|^2 + m^2 |\mathcal{F}u(k)|^2 \, dk \right)^{1/2}. \]

Then, $H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is continuously embedded in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $p \in [2, 2_s^*)$ and compactly in $L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $p \in [1, 2_s^*)$; see [1, 9, 23, 40]. Next we define $X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) := H^1(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, y^{1-2s})$ as the completion of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)$ with respect to the norm
\[ \|u\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} := \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} |\nabla u|^2 + m^2 |u|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}. \]

By Lemma 3.1 in [28], we deduce that $X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)$ is continuously embedded in $L^{2\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, y^{1-2s})$, that is
\[ \|u\|_{L^{2\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, y^{1-2s})} \leq C_s \|u\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} \quad \forall u \in X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+), \tag{2.1} \]
where $\gamma := 1 + 2 \frac{2}{N-2s}$, and $L^r(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, y^{1-2s})$ is the weighted Lebesgue space, with $r \in (1, \infty)$, endowed with the norm
\[ \|u\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, y^{1-2s})} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s} |u|^r \, dx. \]

Moreover, by Lemma 3.1.2 in [24], we also have that $X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)$ is compactly embedded in $L^2(B^+_R, y^{1-2s})$ for all $R > 0$. From Proposition 5 in [28], we know that there exists a linear trace operator $\text{Tr} : X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) \to H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that
\[ \sqrt{\sigma_s} |\text{Tr}(u)|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \|u\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} \quad \forall u \in X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+), \tag{2.2} \]
where $\sigma_s := 2^{1-s} \Gamma(1-s)/\Gamma(s)$. We also note the (2.2) and the definition of $H^s$-norm imply that
\[ \sigma_s m^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\text{Tr}(u)|^2 \, dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s} (|\nabla u|^2 + m^2 |u|^2) \, dx. \tag{2.3} \]

In what follows, in order to simplify the notation, we denote $\text{Tr}(u)$ by $u(\cdot, 0)$.

Since $\text{Tr}(X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)) \subset H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $H^s(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset L^q(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $q \in [2, 2_s^*)$ and the embedding is locally compact for all $q \in [1, 2_s^*)$ (see [1, 9, 23]), we obtain the following result:

**Theorem 2.1.** $\text{Tr}(X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+))$ is continuously embedded in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $q \in [2, 2_s^*)$ and compactly embedded in $L^q_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $q \in [1, 2_s^*)$. 

In order to circumvent the nonlocal character of the pseudo-differential operator \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\), we make use of a variant of the extension method [14] given in [28, 49]. More precisely, for any \(u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)\) there exists a unique function \(U \in X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)\) solving the following problem:

\[
\begin{cases}
-\text{div}(y^{1-2s}\nabla U) + m^2y^{1-2s}U = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, \\
U(\cdot,0) = u & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+ \cong \mathbb{R}^N.
\end{cases}
\]

The function \(U\) is called the \(s\)-extension of \(u\) and possesses the following properties:

(i) \(\frac{\partial U}{\partial y^{1-2s}} := -\lim_{y \to 0} y^{1-2s} \frac{\partial U}{\partial y}(x,y) = \sigma_s(-\Delta + m^2)^s u(x)\) in distribution sense,

(ii) \(\sqrt{\sigma_s} u_{|H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \|U\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} \leq \|V\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)}\) for all \(V \in X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)\) such that \(V(\cdot,0) = u\).

(iii) \(U \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)\) and can be expressed as

\[
U(x,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} P_{s,m}(x-z,y)u(z)\,dz
\]

with

\[
P_{s,m}(x,y) := c_{N,s}^2 y^{2s} m^{\frac{N+2s}{2}} \left| (x,y) \right|^{-\frac{N+2s}{2}} K_{N+2s}(m(|x,y|)),
\]

and

\[
c_{N,s} := p_{N,s} \frac{2^{N+2s} - 1}{\Gamma(\frac{N+2s}{2})},
\]

where \(p_{N,s}\) is the constant for the (normalized) Poisson kernel with \(m = 0\); see [49].

We note that \(P_{s,m}\) is the Fourier transform of \(k \mapsto \vartheta(\sqrt{|k|^2 + m^2})\) and that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} P_{s,m}(x,y)\,dx = \vartheta(my),
\]

where \(\vartheta \in H^1(\mathbb{R}_+, y^{1-2s})\) solves the following ordinary differential equation

\[
\begin{cases}
\vartheta'' + \frac{1-2s}{y} \vartheta' - \vartheta = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+, \\
\vartheta(0) = 1.
\end{cases}
\]

We also recall that \(\vartheta\) can be expressed via modified Bessel functions, more precisely \(\vartheta(r) = \frac{2}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2})} (\frac{r}{2})^s K_s(r)\); see [28] for more details.

Taking into account the previous facts, problem (1.1) can be realized in a local manner through the following nonlinear boundary value problem:

\[
\begin{cases}
-\text{div}(y^{1-2s}\nabla u) + m^2y^{1-2s}u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, \\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial y^{1-2s}} = \sigma_s[-V_\varepsilon(x)w(\cdot,0) + f(w(\cdot,0))] & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.
\end{cases}
\]

where \(V_\varepsilon(x) := V(\varepsilon x)\). For simplicity of notation, we will omit the constant \(\sigma_s\) from the second equation in (2.5). For all \(\varepsilon > 0\), we define

\[
X_\varepsilon := \left\{ u \in X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V_\varepsilon(x)u^2(x,0)\,dx < \infty \right\}
\]

endowed with the norm

\[
\|u\|_{\varepsilon} := \left( \|u\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)}^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V_\varepsilon(x)u^2(x,0)\,dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

We note that \(\| \cdot \|_{\varepsilon}\) is actually a norm. Indeed,

\[
\|u\|_{\varepsilon}^2 = \|u\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)}^2 - V_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^2(x,0)\,dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1)u^2(x,0)\,dx,
\]

and using (2.3) and (V1) we can see that

\[
\left(1 - \frac{V_1}{m^{2s}}\right) \|u\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)}^2 \leq \left[ \|u\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)}^2 - V_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^2(x,0)\,dx \right] \leq \|u\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)}^2
\]
We say that

\[ \parallel u \parallel^2_{X^s(R^N_+)} = V_1 \int_{R^N} u^2(x, 0) \, dx \]

is a norm equivalent to \( \parallel \cdot \parallel^2_{X^s(R^N_+)} \). This observation yields the required claim. Clearly, \( X_\varepsilon \subset X^s(R^N_+) \), and using (V1) we have

\[ \parallel u \parallel^2_{X^s(R^N_+)} \leq \left( \frac{m^{2s}}{m^{2s} - V_1} \right) \parallel u \parallel^2_\varepsilon \quad \forall u \in X_\varepsilon. \]  

### 2.2. Elliptic estimates.

For reader’s convenience, we list some results about local Schauder estimates for degenerate elliptic equations involving the operator

\[ -\text{div}(y^{1-2s}\nabla v) + m^2 y^{1-2s} v. \]

Firstly we give the following definition:

**Definition 2.1.** Let \( D \subset R^{N+1}_+ \) be a bounded domain with \( \partial'D \neq \emptyset \). Let \( f \in L^{\frac{2N}{N+2}}_{locc}(\partial'D) \) and \( g \in L^1_{locc}(\partial'D) \). Consider

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
-\text{div}(y^{1-2s}\nabla v) + m^2 y^{1-2s} v = 0 & \text{in } D, \\
\frac{\partial v}{\partial N} = f(x)v + g(x) & \text{on } \partial'D.
\end{array} \right.
\]  

We say that \( v \in H^1(D, y^{1-2s}) \) is a weak supersolution (resp. subsolution) to (2.7) in \( D \) if for any nonnegative \( \varphi \in C_c^1(D \cup \partial'D) \),

\[ \iint_D y^{1-2s}(\nabla v \nabla \varphi + m^2 v \varphi) \, dx \, dy \geq (\leq) \int_{\partial'D} [f(x)v(\cdot, 0) + g(x)]\varphi(\cdot, 0) \, dx. \]

We say that \( v \in H^1(D, y^{1-2s}) \) is a weak solution to (2.7) in \( D \) if it is both a weak supersolution and a weak subsolution.

We denote by \( Q_R = B_R \times (0, R) \) where \( B_R \subset R^N \) is the ball in \( R^N \) centered at 0 and with radius \( R > 0 \). Then we recall the following version of De Giorgi-Giusti-Nash-Moser type theorems established in [28] (see also [27, 37] for the case \( m = 0 \)).

**Proposition 2.1.** [28] Let \( f, g \in L^q(B_1) \) for some \( q > \frac{N}{2s} \).

(i) Let \( v \in H^1(Q_1, y^{1-2s}) \) be a weak supersolution to (2.7) in \( Q_1 \). Then

\[ \sup_{Q_{1/2}} v^+ \leq C(\parallel v^+ \parallel_{L_2(Q_1, y^{1-2s})} + \parallel g^+ \parallel_{L_s(B_1)}), \]

where \( v^+ := \max\{v, 0\} \), and \( C > 0 \) depends only on \( N, s, q, \parallel f^+ \parallel_{L_s(B_1)}. \)

(ii) (weak Harnack inequality) Let \( v \in H^1(Q_1, y^{1-2s}) \) be a nonnegative weak supersolution to (2.7) in \( Q_1 \). Then for some \( p_0 > 0 \) and any \( 0 < \mu < \tau < 1 \) we have\n
\[ \inf_{Q_\mu} v + |g|_{L_s(B_1)} \geq C\parallel v \parallel_{L^{p_0}(Q_1, y^{1-2s})}, \]

where \( v_- := \max\{-v, 0\} \), and \( C > 0 \) depends only on \( N, s, q, \mu, \theta, |f|_{L_s(B_1)}. \)

(iii) Let \( v \in H^1(Q_1, y^{1-2s}) \) be a nonnegative weak solution to (2.7) in \( Q_1 \). Then \( v \in C^{0, \alpha}(Q_{1/2}) \) and in addition

\[ \parallel v \parallel_{C^{0, \alpha}(Q_{1/2})} \leq C(\parallel v \parallel_{L_2(Q_1)} + \parallel g \parallel_{L_s(B_1)}), \]

with \( C > 0, \alpha \in (0, 1) \) depending only on \( N, s, p, \parallel f \parallel_{L_s(B_1)}. \)

### 3. The penalization argument

In order to find solutions to (2.5), we follow the penalization approach in [22] which permits to study our problem via variational arguments. Fix \( \kappa > \frac{V_1}{m^{2s} - V_1} \) and \( a > 0 \) such that \( \frac{2a}{\kappa} = \frac{V_1}{m^{2s}} \). Define\n
\[ \tilde{f}(t) := \begin{cases} 
    f(t) & \text{for } t < a,
    \\
    \frac{V_1}{m^{2s}} & \text{for } t \geq a.
\end{cases} \]

Let us consider the following Carathéodory function

\[ g(x,t) := \chi_{[a, \infty)}(t) \tilde{f}(t) + (1 - \chi_{[a, \infty)}(t)) \tilde{f}(t) \quad \text{for } (x,t) \in R^N \times R, \]
where $\chi_\Lambda$ denotes the characteristic function of $\Lambda$. Set $G(x,t) := \int_0^t g(x,\tau) \, d\tau$. By (f1)-(f4) it follows that

$(g_1)$ $\lim_{t \to 0} \frac{g(x,t)}{t} = 0$ uniformly in $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$,
$(g_2)$ $g(x,t) \leq f(t)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $t > 0$,
$(g_3)$ (i) $0 < \theta G(x,t) \leq tg(x,t)$ for all $x \in \Lambda$ and $t > 0$,
(ii) $0 \leq 2G(x,t) \leq tg(x,t) \leq \frac{4}{x_t^2}$ for all $x \in \Lambda^c = \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Lambda$ and $t > 0$,
$(g_4)$ for each $x \in \Lambda$ the function $t \mapsto \frac{g(x,t)}{t}$ is increasing in $(0, \infty)$, and for each $x \in \Lambda^c$ the function $t \mapsto \frac{g(x,t)}{t}$ is increasing in $(0, a)$.

Consider the following modified problem:

$$
\begin{cases}
- \text{div}(y^{1-2s} \nabla u) + m^2y^{1-2s}u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+,
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = -V_\varepsilon(x)u(\cdot,0) + g_\varepsilon(\cdot, u(\cdot,0)) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,
\end{cases}
$$

(3.1)

where we set $g_\varepsilon(x,t) := g(\varepsilon, x,t)$. Obviously, if $u_\varepsilon$ is a positive solution of (3.1) satisfying $u_\varepsilon(x,0) < a$ for all $x \in \Lambda^c_\varepsilon$, then $u_\varepsilon$ is indeed a solution of (2.5). The corresponding energy functional is defined as

$$
J_\varepsilon(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_2^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G_\varepsilon(x,u(x,0)) \, dx.
$$

Clearly, $J_\varepsilon \in C^1(X_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R})$ and its differential is given by:

$$
\langle J'_\varepsilon(u), v \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} y^{1-2s}(\nabla u \nabla v + m^2uv) \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V_\varepsilon(x)u(x,0)v(x,0) \, dx
$$

$$
-\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g_\varepsilon(x,u(x,0))v(x,0) \, dx
$$

for all $u,v \in X_\varepsilon$.

We start by proving that $J_\varepsilon$ satisfies all the assumptions of the mountain pass theorem [3].

**Lemma 3.1.** $J_\varepsilon$ has a mountain pass geometry, that is:

- there exist $\alpha, \rho > 0$ such that $J_\varepsilon(u) \geq \alpha$ for all $u \in X$ such that $\|u\| = \rho$,
- there exists $v \in X$ such that $\|v\| > \rho$ and $J_\varepsilon(v) < 0$.

**Proof.** By (f1), (f2), (g1), (g2), we deduce that for all $\eta > 0$ there exists $C_\eta > 0$ such that

$$
|g_\varepsilon(x,t)| \leq \eta|t| + C_\eta |t| \leq 2s \eta \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N, t > 0,
$$

(3.2)

and

$$
|G_\varepsilon(x,t)| \leq \frac{\eta}{2} |t|^2 + \frac{C_\eta}{2} |t| \leq 2s \eta \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N, t > 0.
$$

(3.3)

Fix $\eta \in (0, m^2s - V_1)$. Using (3.3), (2.3), (2.6) and Theorem 2.1 we have

$$
J_\varepsilon(u) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_2^2 - \frac{\eta}{2} \|u(\cdot,0)\|_2^2 - \frac{C_\eta}{2} \|u(\cdot,0)\|_2^2
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_2^2 - \frac{\eta}{2m^2s^2} \|u(\cdot,0)\|_2^2 - \frac{C_\eta}{2} \|u(\cdot,0)\|_2^2
$$

$$
\geq \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_2^2 - \frac{\eta}{2m^2s^2} \|u\|_{X(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)}^2 - C_\eta \|u\|_{X(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)}^2
$$

$$
\geq \left( 1 - \frac{\eta}{2(m^2s - V_1)} \right) \|u\|_2^2 - C_\eta \|u\|_2^2,
$$

from which we deduce the thesis. Now, let $v \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)$ such that $\text{supp}(v(\cdot,0)) \subset \Lambda_\varepsilon$. Then, by (f3), we have

$$
J_\varepsilon(tv) = \frac{t^2}{2} \|v\|_2^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} F(tv(x,0)) \, dx
$$

$$
\leq \frac{t^2}{2} \|v\|_2^2 - t^\theta \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} |v(x,0)|^\theta \, dx + C|\Lambda_\varepsilon| \to -\infty \text{ as } t \to \infty.
$$

□
By Lemma 3.1 and using a variant of mountain pass lemma without Palais-Smale condition [50], we can
find a Palais-Smale sequence \((u_n) \subset X_\varepsilon\) such that
\[
J_\varepsilon(u_n) \to c_\varepsilon \quad J'_\varepsilon(u_n) \to 0, \tag{3.4}
\]
where
\[
c_\varepsilon := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma_\varepsilon} \max_{t \in [0,1]} J_\varepsilon(\gamma(t))
\]
and
\[
\Gamma_\varepsilon := \{ \gamma \in C([0,1], X_\varepsilon) : \gamma(0) = 0, J_\varepsilon(\gamma(1)) \leq 0 \}.
\]
In view of \((f_4)\), it is standard to check (see [50]) that
\[
c_\varepsilon = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} J_\varepsilon(u) = \inf_{u \in X_\varepsilon \setminus \{0\}, t \geq 0} J_\varepsilon(tu),
\]
where
\[
\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon := \{ u \in X_\varepsilon : \langle J'_\varepsilon(u), u \rangle = 0 \}
\]
is the Nehari manifold associated with \(J_\varepsilon\). Now we prove the following fundamental compactness result:

**Lemma 3.2.** \(J_\varepsilon\) satisfies the Palais-Smale condition at any level \(c \in \mathbb{R}\).

**Proof.** Let \(c \in \mathbb{R}\) and \((u_n) \subset X_\varepsilon\) be such that
\[
J_\varepsilon(u_n) \to c \quad J'_\varepsilon(u_n) \to 0. \tag{3.5}
\]
Then, using \((g_3), (2.3)\) and \((2.6)\), we have
\[
J_\varepsilon(u_n) - \frac{1}{\theta} \langle J'_\varepsilon(u_n), u_n \rangle
\]
\[
= \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \| u_n \|_\varepsilon^2 + \frac{1}{\theta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g_\varepsilon(x, u_n(x,0)) u_n(x,0) - \theta G_\varepsilon(x, u_n(x,0)) \, dx
\]
\[
\geq \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \| u_n \|_\varepsilon^2 - \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \frac{V_1}{\kappa} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_n^2(x,0) \, dx
\]
\[
= \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \| u_n \|_\varepsilon^2 - \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \frac{V_1}{\kappa m^{2s}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_n^2(x,0) \, dx
\]
\[
\geq \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \| u_n \|_\varepsilon^2 - \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \frac{V_1}{\kappa m^{2s}} \| u_n \|^2_{X_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})}
\]
\[
\geq \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{V_1}{\kappa (m^{2s} - V_1)} \right) \| u_n \|_\varepsilon^2.
\]
Since \(\theta > 2\) and \(\kappa > \frac{V_1}{m^{2s} - V_1}\), we deduce that \((u_n)\) is bounded in \(X_\varepsilon\). Hence, up to a subsequence, we may assume that \(u_n \to u\) in \(X_\varepsilon\). Now we prove that this convergence is indeed strong. Using the fact that \(g\) has subcritical growth and applying Theorem 2.1, it is easy to check that \(\langle J'_\varepsilon(u), \varphi \rangle = 0\) for all \(\varphi \in X_\varepsilon\). In particular,
\[
\| u \|^2_{X_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})} - V_1 |u(\cdot,0)|_2^2 + \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u^2(x,0) \, dx + \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} [(V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u^2(x,0) - g_\varepsilon(x, u(x,0)) u(x,0)] \, dx
\]
\[
= \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} f(u(x,0)) u(x,0) \, dx. \tag{3.6}
\]
On the other hand, by \(\langle J'_\varepsilon(u_n), u_n \rangle = o_n(1)\), we get
\[
\| u_n \|^2_{X_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})} - V_1 |u_n(\cdot,0)|_2^2 + \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u_n^2(x,0) \, dx + \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} [(V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u_n^2(x,0) - g_\varepsilon(x, u_n(x,0)) u_n(x,0)] \, dx
\]
\[
= \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} f(u_n(x,0)) u_n(x,0) \, dx + o_n(1). \tag{3.7}
\]
Since \(\Lambda_\varepsilon\) is bounded, by the compactness of Sobolev embeddings in Theorem 2.1 we have
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} f(u_n(x,0)) u_n(x,0) \, dx = \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} f(u(x,0)) u(x,0) \, dx, \tag{3.8}
\]
\[
\int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} f(u_n(x,0)) u_n(x,0) \, dx,
\begin{align}
\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\Lambda_n} (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u_n^2(x,0) \, dx = \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u^2(x,0) \, dx. \tag{3.9}
\end{align}

In view of (3.6), (3.7), (3.8), (3.9), we obtain
\begin{align}
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \left( \left\| u_n \right\|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_+)} - V_1 |u_n(\cdot,0)|^2_2 + \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} \left[ (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u_n^2(x,0) - g_\varepsilon(x,u_n(x,0)) u_n(x,0) \right] dx \right) \\
= \left\| u \right\|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_+)} - V_1 |u(\cdot,0)|^2_2 + \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} \left[ (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u^2(x,0) - g_\varepsilon(x,u(x,0)) u(x,0) \right] dx.
\end{align}

On the other hand, by (g2) and Fatou’s Lemma, we get
\begin{align}
\liminf_{n \to \infty} \left( \left\| u_n \right\|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_+)} - V_1 |u_n(\cdot,0)|^2_2 + \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} \left[ (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u_n^2(x,0) - g_\varepsilon(x,u_n(x,0)) u_n(x,0) \right] dx \right) \\
\geq \left\| u \right\|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_+)} - V_1 |u(\cdot,0)|^2_2 + \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} \left[ (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u^2(x,0) - g_\varepsilon(x,u(x,0)) u(x,0) \right] dx.
\end{align}

Hence,
\begin{align}
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left\| u_n \right\|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_+)} - V_1 |u_n(\cdot,0)|^2_2 = \left\| u \right\|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_+)} - V_1 |u(\cdot,0)|^2_2 \tag{3.10}
\end{align}
and
\begin{align}
\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} \left[ (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u_n^2(x,0) - g_\varepsilon(x,u_n(x,0)) u_n(x,0) \right] dx = \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} \left[ (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u^2(x,0) - g_\varepsilon(x,u(x,0)) u(x,0) \right] dx.
\end{align}

The last limit combined with definition of $g_\varepsilon$ yields
\begin{align}
\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u_n^2(x,0) \, dx = \int_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u^2(x,0) \, dx
\end{align}
which together with (3.9) implies that
\begin{align}
\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u_n^2(x,0) \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (V_\varepsilon(x) + V_1) u^2(x,0) \, dx. \tag{3.11}
\end{align}

From (3.10) and (3.11) we have
\begin{align}
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left\| u_n \right\|^2_{X^s} = \left\| u \right\|^2_{X^s}
\end{align}
and since $X_\varepsilon$ turns out to be a Hilbert space we deduce that $u_n \to u$ in $X_\varepsilon$.

In light of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, it follows from the mountain pass theorem [3] that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $u_\varepsilon \in X_\varepsilon \setminus \{0\}$ such that
\begin{align}
J_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) = c_\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad J_\varepsilon'(u_\varepsilon) = 0. \tag{3.12}
\end{align}

Since $f(t) = 0$ for $t \leq 0$, it follows from \( \langle J'_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon), u_\varepsilon^- \rangle = 0 \), where $u_\varepsilon^- := \min\{u_\varepsilon, 0\}$, that $u_\varepsilon \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$.

Next, for all $\mu > -m^{2s}$, we consider the following family of autonomous problems related to (2.5), namely
\begin{align}
\left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
-\div (g^{1-2s} \nabla w) + m^2 g^{1-2s} w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, \\
\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = -\mu w(\cdot,0) + f(w(\cdot,0)) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.
\end{array} \right.
\end{align}

Define the energy functionals $L_\mu : X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by
\begin{align}
L_\mu(u) := \frac{1}{2} \left\| u \right\|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} + \frac{\mu}{2} |u(\cdot,0)|^2_{2} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} F(u(x,0)) \, dx,
\end{align}
and denote by $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ the Nehari manifold associated with $L_\mu$, that is $\mathcal{M}_\mu := \{ u \in X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) : \langle L'_\mu(u), u \rangle = 0 \}$. Arguing as in the case $\varepsilon > 0$, one can check that $L_\mu$ has a mountain pass geometry [3], so we can find a Palais-Smale sequence $(u_n) \subset X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)$ at the mountain pass level $d_\mu$ of $L_\mu$. As before, $(u_n)$ is bounded in $X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)$. We also note that, by (f3), it holds
\begin{align}
d_\mu = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{M}_\mu} L_\mu(u) = \inf_{u \in X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) \setminus \{0\}} \sup_{t \geq 0} L_\mu(tu).\]
Next we show the existence of a ground state solution to (3.13). We first prove some useful technical lemmas. The first one is a vanishing Lions type result.

**Lemma 3.3.** Let \( t \in [2, 2_*] \) and \( R > 0 \). If \((u_n) \subset X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)\) is a bounded sequence such that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^N} \int_{B_R(z)} |u_n(x,0)|^t \, dx = 0,
\]
then \( u_n(\cdot, 0) \to 0 \) in \( L^q(\mathbb{R}^N) \) for all \( q \in (t, 2_*) \).

**Proof.** Take \( q \in (t, 2_*) \). Given \( R > 0 \) and \( z \in \mathbb{R}^N \), by using Hölder inequality, we get
\[
|u_n(\cdot, 0)|_{L^q(B_R(z))} \leq |u_n(\cdot, 0)|_{L^{1-\lambda q}(B_R(z))} |u_n(\cdot, 0)|_{L^\lambda_{2_*}^*(B_R(z))}^{\lambda q} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},
\]
where
\[
\frac{1 - \lambda q}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{2_*} = \frac{1}{q}.
\]
Now, covering \( \mathbb{R}^N \) by balls of radius \( R \), in such a way that each point of \( \mathbb{R}^N \) is contained in at most \( N + 1 \) balls, we find
\[
|u_n(\cdot, 0)|_q^q \leq (N + 1)|u_n(\cdot, 0)|_{L^{1-\lambda q}(B_R(z))} |u_n(\cdot, 0)|_{L^\lambda_{2_*}^*(B_R(z))}^{\lambda q},
\]
which combined with Theorem 2.1 and the assumptions yields
\[
|u_n(\cdot, 0)|_q^q \leq C(N + 1)|u_n(\cdot, 0)|_{L^{1-\lambda q}(B_R(z))} |u_n|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})} \leq C(N + 1) \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^N} |u_n(\cdot, 0)|_{L^{1-\lambda q}(B_R(z))} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.
\]
This ends the proof of lemma.

**Lemma 3.4.** Let \((u_n) \subset X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)\) be a Palais-Smale sequence at level \( c \in \mathbb{R} \) and such that \( u_n \rightharpoonup 0 \) in \( X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) \). Then we have either
(a) \( u_n \to 0 \) in \( X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) \), or
(b) there exists a sequence \((z_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^N \) and constants \( R, \beta > 0 \) such that
\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} \int_{B_R(z_n)} |u_n(x,0)|^2 \, dx \geq \beta.
\]

**Proof.** Assume that (b) does not occur. Then, for all \( R > 0 \), we have
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^N} \int_{B_R(z)} |u_n(x,0)|^2 \, dx = 0.
\]
Using Lemma 3.3 (with \( t = 2 \)), we can see that \( u_n(\cdot, 0) \to 0 \) in \( L^q(\mathbb{R}^N) \) for all \( q \in (2, 2_*) \). This fact and \((f_1)-(f_2)\) imply that
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(u_n(x,0)) u_n(x,0) \, dx \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.
\]
Hence, using \( \langle L'_\mu(u_n), u_n \rangle = o_n(1), \mu > -m^{2s} \) and (2.3), we get
\[
\left(1 + \frac{\mu}{m^{2s}}\right) \|u_n\|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} \leq \|u_n\|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} + \mu |u_n(\cdot, 0)|_2^2 \leq o_n(1)
\]
that is \( u_n \to 0 \) in \( X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) \) as \( n \to \infty \).

Now we prove the following existence result for (3.13).

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \( \mu > -m^{2s} \). Then (3.13) has a positive ground state solution.

**Proof.** Since \( L_\mu \) has a mountain pass geometry \([3]\), we can find a Palais-Smale sequence \((u_n) \subset X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)\) at the level \( d_\mu \). Thus \((u_n)\) is bounded in \( X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) \) and there exists \( u \in X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) \) such that \( u_n \rightharpoonup u \) in \( X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) \). Clearly, \( L'_\mu(u) = 0 \). If \( u = 0 \), then we can use Lemma 3.4 to deduce that for some sequence \((z_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^N, v_n(x, y) := u_n(x + z_n, y)\) is a bounded Palais-Smale sequence at the level \( d_\mu \) and having a nontrivial weak limit \( v \). Hence, \( v \in \mathcal{M}_\mu \), where \( \mathcal{M}_\mu \) denotes the Nehari manifold associated with \( L_\mu \).
Moreover, using the weak lower semicontinuity of \( \| \cdot \|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_+)} + \mu \| \cdot \|_2 \), (f4) and Fatou’s lemma, it is easy to see that \( L_\mu(v) = d_\mu \). When \( u \neq 0 \), as before, we can deduce that \( u \) is a ground state solution to (3.13). In conclusion, for any \( \mu > -m^{2s} \), there exists a ground state solution \( w = w_\mu \in X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_+ \setminus \{0\}) \) such that
\[
L_\mu(w) = d_\mu \quad \text{and} \quad L'_\mu(w) = 0.
\]
Since \( f(t) = 0 \) for \( t \leq 0 \), we deduce that \( w \geq 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^N_+ \) and \( w \neq 0 \). A Moser iteration argument (see Lemma 4.1 below) shows that \( w(\cdot,0) \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N) \) for all \( p \in [2, \infty) \) and \( w \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_+) \). Using Proposition 2.1-(iii) we obtain that \( w \in C^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^N_+) \) for some \( \alpha \in (0,1) \). By Proposition 2.1-(ii) we conclude that \( w \) is positive. \( \Box \)

In the next lemma we establish an important connection between \( c_\varepsilon \) and \( d_{V(0)} = d_{-V_0} \) (we remark that \( V(0) = -V_0 > -m^{2s} \)):

**Lemma 3.5.** The numbers \( c_\varepsilon \) and \( d_{V(0)} \) verify the following inequality:
\[
\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} c_\varepsilon \leq d_{V(0)}.
\]

**Proof.** By Theorem 3.1, we know that there exists a positive ground state solution \( w \) to (3.13) with \( \mu = V(0) \). Let \( \eta \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}) \) be such that \( 0 \leq \eta \leq 1 \), \( \eta = 1 \) in \([-1,1]\) and \( \eta = 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R} \setminus (-2,2) \). Suppose that \( B_2(0) \subset \Lambda \). Define \( w_\varepsilon(x,y) = \eta(\varepsilon(\|x,y\|))w(x,y) \) and note that supp\( (w_\varepsilon(\cdot,0)) \subset \Lambda_\varepsilon \). It is easy to prove that \( w_\varepsilon \to w \) in \( X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_+) \) and \( L_{V(0)}(w_\varepsilon) \to L_{V(0)}(w) \) as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \). On the other hand, by definition of \( c_\varepsilon \), we have
\[
c_\varepsilon \leq \max_{t \geq 0} J_{\varepsilon}(tw_\varepsilon) = J_{\varepsilon}(t_\varepsilon w_\varepsilon) = \frac{t^2}{2} \|w_\varepsilon\|_\varepsilon^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} F(tw_\varepsilon(x,0)) \, dx
\]
for some \( t_\varepsilon > 0 \). Recalling that \( w \in \mathcal{M}_{V(0)} \) and using (f4), it is easy to check that \( t_\varepsilon \to 1 \) as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \). Note that
\[
J_{\varepsilon}(t_\varepsilon w_\varepsilon) = L_{V(0)}(t_\varepsilon w_\varepsilon) + \frac{t_\varepsilon^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (V_{\varepsilon}(x) - V(0))w_{\varepsilon}^2(x,0) \, dx.
\]
Since \( V_{\varepsilon}(x) \) is bounded on the support of \( w_{\varepsilon}(\cdot,0) \), and \( V_{\varepsilon}(x) \to V(0) \) as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \), we can apply the dominated convergence theorem and use (3.14) and (3.15) to conclude the proof. \( \Box \)

Now we come back to study (3.1) and consider the mountain pass solutions \( u_\varepsilon \) satisfying (3.12).

**Lemma 3.6.** There exist \( R, \beta, \varepsilon^* > 0 \) and \( (y_\varepsilon) \subset \mathbb{R}^N \) such that
\[
\int_{B_r(y_\varepsilon)} u^2_{\varepsilon}(x,0) \, dx \geq \beta, \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*).
\]

**Proof.** Since \( u_\varepsilon \) verifies (3.12), it follows from the growth assumptions on \( f \) that there exist \( \alpha > 0 \) independent of \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that
\[
\|u_\varepsilon\|^2_\varepsilon \geq \alpha, \forall \varepsilon > 0.
\]
Let \( (\varepsilon_n) \subset (0, \infty) \) be such that \( \varepsilon_n \to 0 \). If by contradiction there exists \( r > 0 \) such that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^N} \int_{B_r(y)} u^2_{\varepsilon_n}(x,0) \, dx = 0,
\]
we can use Lemma 3.3 to deduce that \( u_{\varepsilon_n}(\cdot,0) \to 0 \) in \( L^q(\mathbb{R}^N) \) for all \( q \in (2, 2^*) \). Then, (3.12) and the growth assumptions on \( f \) imply that \( \|u_{\varepsilon_n}\|_{\varepsilon_n} \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \) which contradicts (3.16). \( \Box \)

**Lemma 3.7.** For any \( \varepsilon_n \to 0 \), consider the sequence \( (y_{\varepsilon_n}) \subset \mathbb{R}^N \) given in Lemma 3.6 and \( w_n(x,y) = u_{\varepsilon_n}(x + y_{\varepsilon_n}, y) \). Then there exists a subsequence of \( w_n \), still denoted by itself, and \( w \in X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_+) \) such that
\[
w_n \to w \quad \text{in} \quad X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_+).
\]
Moreover, there exists \( x_0 \in \Lambda \) such that
\[
\varepsilon_n y_{\varepsilon_n} \to x_0 \quad \text{and} \quad V(x_0) = -V_0.
\]
Proof. In what follows, we denote by \((y_n)\) and \((u_n)\), the sequences \((y_{\varepsilon_n})\) and \((u_{\varepsilon_n})\) respectively. Since each \(u_n\) satisfies (3.12), we can argue as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 to deduce that \((u_n)\) is bounded in \(X^s(\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1})\). Thus \((w_n)\) is bounded in \(X^s(\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1})\) and there exists \(w \in X^s(\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1}) \setminus \{0\}\) such that
\[
    w_n \rightharpoonup w \text{ in } X^s(\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1}) \text{ as } n \to \infty.
\] (3.17)
Moreover, by Lemma 3.6, we know that
\[
    \int_{B_r(0)} w^2(x,0) \, dx \geq \beta > 0.
\] (3.18)
Next we show that \((\varepsilon_n y_n)\) is bounded in \(\mathbb{R}\). First of all, we prove that
\[
    \text{dist}(\varepsilon_n y_n, \Lambda) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.
\] (3.19)
If (3.19) does not hold, there exists \(\delta > 0\) and a subsequence of \((\varepsilon_n y_n)\), still denoted by itself, such that
\[
    \text{dist}(\varepsilon_n y_n, \Lambda) \geq \delta \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]
Then there is \(R > 0\) such that \(B_R(\varepsilon_n y_n) \subseteq \Lambda^c\) for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\). By the definition of \(X^s(\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1})\) and using the fact that \(w \geq 0\), we know that there exists \((\psi_j) \subseteq X^s(\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1})\) such that \(\psi_j\) has compact support in \(\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1}\) and \(\psi_j \rightharpoonup w \text{ in } X^s(\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1})\) as \(j \to \infty\). Fix \(j \in \mathbb{N}\). Taking \(\psi_j\) as test function in \(\langle J'_1(u_n), \phi \rangle = 0\) for all \(\phi \in X_{\varepsilon}\), we get
\[
    \int \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1}} g^{1-2s}(\nabla w_n \nabla \psi_j + m^2 w_n \psi_j) \, dxdy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n)w_n(x,0)\psi_j(x,0) \, dx
    = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n, w_n(x,0))\psi_j(x,0) \, dx.
\] (3.20)
By the definition of \(g_\varepsilon\) there holds
\[
    \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n, w_n(x,0))\psi_j(x,0) \, dx \leq \int_{B^R_{\varepsilon_n} \setminus \{0\}} g(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n, w_n(x,0))\psi_j(x,0) \, dx
    + \int_{B^*_{\varepsilon_n} \setminus \{0\}} g(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n, w_n(x,0))\psi_j(x,0) \, dx
    \leq \frac{V_1}{\kappa} \int_{B_{\varepsilon_n} \setminus \{0\}} w_n(x,0)\psi_j(x,0) \, dx + \int_{B^*_{\varepsilon_n} \setminus \{0\}} f(w_n(x,0))\psi_j(x,0) \, dx.
\]
Using \((V_1)\) and (3.20) we can see that
\[
    \int \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1}} g^{1-2s}(\nabla w_n \nabla \psi_j + m^2 w_n \psi_j) \, dxdy - V_1 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\kappa}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} w_n(x,0)\psi_j(x,0) \, dx
    \leq \int_{B_{\varepsilon_n} \setminus \{0\}} f(w_n(x,0))\psi_j(x,0) \, dx.
\]
Taking into account that \(\psi_j\) has compact support, \(\varepsilon_n \to 0\), the growth assumptions on \(f\), and (3.17), we deduce that as \(n \to \infty\)
\[
    \int_{B^*_{\varepsilon_n}} f(w_n(x,0))\psi_j(x,0) \, dx \to 0,
\]
and
\[
    \int \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1}} g^{1-2s}(\nabla w_n \nabla \psi_j + m^2 w_n \psi_j) \, dxdy - V_1 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\kappa}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} w_n(x,0)\psi_j(x,0) \, dx
    \to \int \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{N+1}} g^{1-2s}(\nabla w_n \nabla \psi_j + m^2 w_n \psi_j) \, dxdy - V_1 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\kappa}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} w(x,0)\psi_j(x,0) \, dx.
\]
The previous relations of limits combined with (3.20) give

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}(\nabla w \nabla \psi_j + m^2 w \psi_j) \, dx dy - V_1 \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\kappa} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} w(x,0) \psi_j(x,0) \, dx \leq 0
\]

and passing to the limit as \( j \to \infty \) we find

\[
\|w\|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} - V_1 \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\kappa} \right) |w(\cdot,0)|^2 dx \leq 0.
\]

Thus (2.3) and \( \kappa > \frac{V_1}{m^{2s} - V_1} \) yield

\[
0 \leq \left( 1 - \frac{V_1}{m^{2s}} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\kappa} \right) \right) \|w\|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} \leq 0
\]

that is \( w \equiv 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^N \) and this is in contrast with (3.18). Consequently, there exist a subsequence of \( (\varepsilon_n y_n) \), still denoted by itself, and \( x_0 \in \overline{A} \) such that \( \varepsilon_n y_n \to x_0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). Next we prove that \( x_0 \in A \).

Using \((g_2)\) and \((3.20)\), we know that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}(\nabla w_n \nabla \psi_j + m^2 w_n \psi_j) \, dx dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n) w_n(x,0) \psi_j(x,0) \, dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(w_n(x,0)) \psi_j(x,0) \, dx.
\]

Letting \( n \to \infty \) and using (3.17) and the continuity of \( V \) we find

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}(\nabla w \nabla \psi_j + m^2 w \psi_j) \, dx dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x_0) w(x,0) \psi_j(x,0) \, dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(w(x,0)) \psi_j(x,0) \, dx.
\]

By passing to the limit as \( j \to \infty \) we obtain

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}(|\nabla w|^2 + m^2 w^2) \, dx dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x_0) w^2(x,0) \, dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(w(x,0)) w(x,0) \, dx.
\]

Hence there exists \( t_1 \in (0,1) \) such that \( t_1 w \in \mathcal{M}_{V(x_0)} \). In view of Lemma 3.5 we have

\[
d_{V(x_0)} \leq L_{V(x_0)}(t_1 w) \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} J_{\varepsilon_n}(u_n) = \liminf_{n \to \infty} c_{\varepsilon_n} \leq d_{V(0)}
\]

from which \( d_{V(x_0)} \leq d_{V(0)} \) and thus \( V(x_0) \leq V(0) = -V_0 \). Since \( -V_0 = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} V(x) \), we achieve that \( V(x_0) = -V_0 \). Using \((V_2)\), we conclude that \( x_0 \in A \).

Finally, we show that \( w_n \to w \) in \( X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) \). Set

\[
\tilde{A}_n := \frac{\Lambda - \varepsilon_n \tilde{y}_n}{\varepsilon_n}
\]

and define

\[
\tilde{\chi}^1_n(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in \tilde{A}_n, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \tilde{A}_n, \end{cases}
\]

\[
\tilde{\chi}^2_n(x) := 1 - \tilde{\chi}^1_n(x).
\]
Let us also consider the following functions for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^N \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N} 
\)
\[
h_n^1(x) := \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) (V(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n) + V_1) w_n^2(x, 0) \chi_n^1(x)
\]
\[
h_1(x) := \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) (V(x_0) + V_1) w^2(x, 0)
\]
\[
h_n^2(x) := \left[ \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) (V(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n) + V_1) w_n^2(x, 0) + \frac{1}{\theta} g(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n, w_n(x, 0)) w_n(x, 0) - G(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n, w_n(x, 0)) \right] \chi_n^2(x)
\]
\[
\geq \left( \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) - \frac{1}{\kappa} \right) (V(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n) + V_1) w_n^2(x, 0) \chi_n^2(x)
\]
\[
h_n^3(x) := \left( \frac{1}{\theta} g(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n, w_n(x, 0)) w_n(x, 0) - G(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n, w_n(x, 0)) \right) \chi_n^3(x)
\]
\[
\geq \left( \frac{1}{\theta} (f(w_n(x, 0)) w_n(x, 0) - F(w_n(x, 0))) \right) \chi_n^3(x)
\]
\[
h_3(x) := \frac{1}{\theta} (f(w(x, 0)) w(x, 0) - F(w(x, 0))).
\]

From \((f_3)\) and \((g_3)\), we see that the above functions are nonnegative in \( \mathbb{R}^N \). Since
\[
w_n(x, 0) \to w(x, 0) \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N,
\]
\[
\varepsilon_n y_n \to x_0 \in \Lambda,
\]
we get
\[
\hat{\chi}_n^1(x) \to 1, \ h_n^1(x) \to h^1(x), \ h_n^2(x) \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad h_n^3(x) \to h^3(x) \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N.
\]

Hence, observing that \( \| \cdot \|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})} - \mu \| \cdot \|_2 \) is weakly lower semicontinuous for all \( \mu \in (0, m^{2s}) \), and using Fatou’s Lemma and the invariance of the \( \mathbb{R}^N \) by translation, we have
\[
d_{V(0)} \geq \limsup_{n \to \infty} c_{\varepsilon_n} = \limsup_{n \to \infty} \left( J_{\varepsilon_n}(u_n) - \frac{1}{\theta} (J'_{\varepsilon_n}(u_n), u_n) \right)
\]
\[
\geq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \left[ \| w_n \|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})} - V_1 |w_n|, 0)\right]_2 \right] + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (h_n^1 + h_n^2 + h_n^3) \ dx \right\}
\]
\[
\geq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \left[ \| w_n \|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})} - V_1 |w_n|, 0)\right]_2 \right] + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (h_n^1 + h_n^2 + h_n^3) \ dx \right\}
\]
\[
\geq \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \left[ \| w \|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})} - V_1 |w|, 0)\right]_2 \right] + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (h^1 + h^3) \ dx = d_{V(0)}.
\]

Accordingly,
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \| w_n \|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})} - V_1 |w_n|, 0)\right]_2 = \| w \|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})} - V_1 |w|, 0)\right]_2,
\]
and
\[
h_n^1 \to h^1, \ h_n^2 \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad h_n^3 \to h^3 \quad \text{in } L^1(\mathbb{R}^3).
\]

Then
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (V(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n) + V_1) w^2(x, 0) \ dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (V(x_0) + V_1) w^2(x, 0) \ dx,
\]
which implies that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} |w_n|, 0)\right]_2 = |w|, 0)\right]_2^2.
\]

Putting together (3.21) and (3.22), and using the fact that \( X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}) \) is a Hilbert space, we attain
\[
\| w_n - w \|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1})} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.
\]

This ends the proof of lemma.
\( \square \)
4. The proof of Theorem 1.1

In this last section we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. We start by proving the following lemma which will be crucial to study the behavior of maximum points of the solutions. The proof is based on a variant of the Moser iteration argument [44] (see also [4, 6, 19]).

**Lemma 4.1.** Let \((w_n)\) be the sequence of Lemma 3.7. Then, \(w_n(\cdot, 0) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)\) and there exists \(M > 0\) such that

\[
|w_n(\cdot, 0)|_\infty \leq M \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

Moreover, \(w_n \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)\) and there exists \(R > 0\) such that

\[
\|w_n\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} \leq R \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

**Proof.** We note that \(w_n\) is a weak solution to

\[
\begin{aligned}
-\text{div}(y^{1-2s}\nabla w_n) + m^2 y^{1-2s} w_n &= 0 \\
\partial_t w_n &= -V(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n)w_n(\cdot, 0) + g(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n, w_n(\cdot, 0))
\end{aligned}
\]

in \(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+\), \(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n \in \mathbb{R}^N\), \((4.1)\)

Let \(z_{n,L} := w_n^{2\beta}_{n,L}\) where \(w_{n,L} := \min\{w_n, L\}, L > 0\) and \(\beta > 0\) will be chosen later. Taking \(z_{L,n}\) as a test-function in \((4.1)\) we deduce that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s} w_{n,L}^{2\beta} |(\nabla w_n|^2 + m^2 w_n^2) \, dx \, dy + \int_{D_{n,L}} 2\beta y^{1-2s} w_{n,L}^{2\beta} |\nabla w_n|^2 \, dx \, dy = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n)w_n^2(x, 0)w_{n,L}^{2\beta}(x, 0) \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n, w_n(\cdot, 0))w_n(x, 0)w_{n,L}^{2\beta}(x, 0) \, dx
\]

where \(D_{n,L} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+: |w_n(x, y)| \leq L\}\). It is easy to check that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s} |(\nabla w_n)|^2 \, dx \, dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s} w_{n,L}^{2\beta} |\nabla w_n|^2 \, dx \, dy + \int_{D_{n,L}} (2\beta + \beta^2) y^{1-2s} w_{n,L}^{2\beta} |\nabla w_n|^2 \, dx \, dy.
\]

Then, putting together \((4.2), (4.3), (V_1), (f_1)-(f_2), (g_1)-(g_2)\), we get

\[
\|wu_n^{\beta}_{n,L}\|_{X^\ast(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}((|\nabla (w_n w_n^{\beta})|^2 + m^2 w_n^2 w_{n,L}^{2\beta}) \, dx \, dy
\]

\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}(\nabla w_n)^2 + m^2 w_n^2 \, dx \, dy + \int_{D_{n,L}} 2\beta \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2}\right) y^{1-2s} w_{n,L}^{2\beta} |\nabla w_n|^2 \, dx \, dy
\]

\[
\leq c_\beta \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s}(\nabla w_n)^2 + m^2 w_n^2 \, dx \, dy + \int_{D_{n,L}} 2\beta y^{1-2s} w_{n,L}^{2\beta} |\nabla w_n|^2 \, dx \, dy \right]
\]

\[
\leq c_\beta \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n)w_n^2(x, 0)w_{n,L}^{2\beta}(x, 0) \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n, w_n(\cdot, 0))w_n(x, 0)w_{n,L}^{2\beta}(x, 0) \, dx \right]
\]

\[
\leq c_\beta \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (V_1 + 1)w_n^2(x, 0)w_{n,L}^{2\beta}(x, 0) + C_1 w_n^{\beta+1}(x, 0)w_{n,L}^{2\beta}(x, 0) \, dx \right]
\]

where

\[
c_\beta := 1 + \frac{\beta}{2}.
\]

Now, we prove that there exist a constant \(c > 0\) independent of \(n, L, \beta, \) and \(h_n \in L^{N/2s}(\mathbb{R}^N), h_n \geq 0\) and independent of \(L \) and \(\beta\), such that

\[
(V_1 + 1)w_n^2(x, 0)w_{n,L}^{2\beta}(x, 0) + C_1 w_n^{\beta+1}(x, 0)w_{n,L}^{2\beta}(x, 0) \leq (c + h_n)w_n^2(\cdot, 0)w_{n,L}^{2\beta}(\cdot, 0) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^N.
\]

(4.5)
Firstly, we notice that
\[(V_1 + 1)w_n^2(x, 0)u_{n,L}^{2\beta}(x, 0) + C_1 w_n^{p-1}(x, 0)w_{n,L}^{2\beta}(x, 0) \leq (V_1 + 1)w_n^2(x, 0)u_{n,L}^{2\beta}(x, 0) + C_1 w_n^{p-1}(\cdot, 0)w_{n,L}^{2\beta}(\cdot, 0) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^N.\]
Moreover,
\[w_n^{p-1}(\cdot, 0) \leq 1 + h_n \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^N,\]
where \(h_n := \chi_{\{|w_n(\cdot, 0)| > 1\}}w_n^{p-1}(\cdot, 0) \in L^{N/2s}(\mathbb{R}^N).\) In fact, we can observe that
\[w_n^{p-1}(\cdot, 0) = \chi_{\{|w_n(\cdot, 0)| \leq 1\}}w_n^{p-1}(\cdot, 0) + \chi_{\{|w_n(\cdot, 0)| > 1\}}w_n^{p-1}(\cdot, 0) \leq 1 + \chi_{\{|w_n(\cdot, 0)| > 1\}}w_n^{p-1}(\cdot, 0) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^N,
\]
and that if \((p - 1) \frac{N}{2s} < 2\) then, recalling that \((w_n(\cdot, 0))\) is bounded in \(H^s(\mathbb{R}^N),\)
\[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \chi_{\{|w_n(\cdot, 0)| > 1\}}|w_n(x, 0)|^{\frac{N}{p-1}} dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \chi_{\{|w_n(\cdot, 0)| > 1\}}|w_n(x, 0)|^2 dx \leq C, \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N},\]
while if \(2 \leq (p - 1) \frac{N}{2s}\) we deduce that \((p - 1) \frac{N}{2s} \in [2, 2^*_s),\) and by Theorem 2.1 and the boundedness of \((w_n)\) in \(X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)\) we find
\[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \chi_{\{|w_n(\cdot, 0)| > 1\}}|w_n(x, 0)|^{\frac{N}{p-1}} dx \leq C \|w_n\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)}^{(p-1)} \leq C,\]
for some \(C > 0\) depending only on \(N, s\) and \(p.\) Taking into account (4.4) and (4.5) we obtain that
\[\|w_n u_{n,L}^{\beta\cdot}\|^2_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} \leq c_\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (c + h_n(x))w_n^2(x, 0)u_{n,L}^{2\beta}(x, 0) dx,
\]
and by the monotone convergence theorem \((w_n, L)\) is nondecreasing with respect to \(L\) we have as \(L \to \infty\)
\[\|w_n\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)}^{(p-1)} \leq c_\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w_n(x, 0)|^{2(\beta+1)} dx + c_\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} h_n(x)|w_n(x, 0)|^{2(\beta+1)} dx.
\]
Fix \(M > 1\) and let \(A_{1,n} := \{h_n \leq M\} \) and \(A_{2,n} := \{h_n > M\} \). Then, by Hölder inequality,
\[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} h_n(x)|w_n(x, 0)|^{2(\beta+1)} dx = \int_{A_{1,n}} h_n(x)|w_n(x, 0)|^{2(\beta+1)} dx + \int_{A_{2,n}} h_n(x)|w_n(x, 0)|^{2(\beta+1)} dx \leq M\|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{(\beta+1)}_2 + \varepsilon(M)\|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{(\beta+1)}_2.\]
where \(\varepsilon(M) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left( \int_{A_{2,n}} h_n^{N/2s} dx \right)^{\frac{N}{N}} \to 0\) as \(M \to \infty\) due to the fact that \(w_n(\cdot, 0) \to w(\cdot, 0)\) in \(H^s(\mathbb{R}^N).\)
In view of (4.6) and (4.7) we get
\[\|w_n|^{(\beta+1)}_2 \|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} \leq c_\beta (c + M)\|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{(\beta+1)}_2 + c_\beta \varepsilon(M)\|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{(\beta+1)}_2.\]
We note that Theorem 2.1 yields
\[\|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{(\beta+1)}_2 \|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} \leq C_\beta (c + M)\|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{(\beta+1)}_2 + c_\beta \varepsilon(M)\|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{(\beta+1)}_2.
\]
Then, choosing \(M\) large so that
\[\varepsilon(M)c_\beta C_\beta^2 < \frac{1}{2},\]
and using (4.8) and (4.9) we obtain that
\[\|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{(\beta+1)}_2 \|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+)} \leq 2C_\beta^2c_\beta\varepsilon(M)\|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{(\beta+1)}_2.\]
Then we can start a bootstrap argument: since \(w_n(\cdot, 0) \in L^{2^*_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)\) and \(|w_n(\cdot, 0)|_{2^*_s} \leq C\) for all \(n \in \mathbb{N},\) we can apply (4.10) with \(\beta_1 + 1 = \frac{N}{N-2s}\) to deduce that \(w_n(\cdot, 0) \in L^{(\beta_1+1)2^*_s}(\mathbb{R}^N) = \left(L^{2^*_s}(\mathbb{R}^N) \right)^{2^*_s}(\mathbb{R}^N)\). Applying again (4.10), after \(k\) iterations, we find \(w_n(\cdot, 0) \in L^{2^k}(\mathbb{R}^N)\), and so \(w_n(\cdot, 0) \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^N)\) for all \(q \in [2, \infty)\) and \(|w_n(\cdot, 0)|_q \leq C\) for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}.\)
Now we prove that actually \( w_n(\cdot, 0) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \). Since \( w_n(\cdot, 0) \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^N) \) for all \( q \in [2, \infty) \) we have that \( h_n \in L^{\frac{2}{\beta+1}}(\mathbb{R}^N) \) and \( |h_n|_{\frac{2}{\beta+1}} \leq D \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Then, by the generalized Hölder inequality and Young’s inequality with \( \lambda > 0 \), we can see that for all \( \lambda > 0 \)

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} h_n(x)|w_n(x, 0)|^{2(\beta+1)} \leq |h_n|_{\frac{2}{\beta+1}}|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{\beta+1}|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{\beta+1} \lesssim D \left( \frac{\lambda}{|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{\beta+1}} \right)^{\frac{2}{\beta+1} + \frac{1}{\lambda}}|w_n(\cdot, 0)|^{\beta+1} \frac{2}{\beta+1}.
\]

Consequently, using (4.6) and (4.9), we deduce that

\[
||w_n(\cdot, 0)||^{\beta+1} < C_0^2 \frac{2}{\beta+1}||w_n||^{\beta+1} ||w_n||^{2(\beta+1)} \leq c_\beta C_0^2 (c + D\beta)||w_n(\cdot, 0)||^{\beta+1} \frac{2}{\beta+1} + C_0^2 \frac{2}{\beta+1} \frac{D\lambda}{\lambda} ||w_n(\cdot, 0)||^{\beta+1} \frac{2}{\beta+1}.
\]

Taking \( \lambda > 0 \) such that

\[
c_\beta D C_0^2 \frac{2}{\beta+1} = 1
\]

we obtain that

\[
||w_n(\cdot, 0)||^{\beta+1} < 2c_\beta (c + D\beta) C_0^2 \frac{2}{\beta+1} ||w_n(\cdot, 0)||^{\beta+1} \frac{2}{\beta+1} = M_\beta ||w_n(\cdot, 0)||^{\beta+1} \frac{2}{\beta+1},
\]

where

\[
M_\beta := 2c_\beta (c + D\beta) C_0^2 \frac{2}{\beta+1}.
\]

Now we can control the dependence on \( \beta \) of \( M_\beta \) as follows:

\[
M_\beta \leq C C_\beta^2 \leq C(1 + \beta)^2 \leq M_0^2 e^{2\sqrt{\beta+1}},
\]

for some \( M_0 > 0 \) independent of \( \beta \), and we get

\[
||w_n(\cdot, 0)||^{\beta+1} \leq M_0 \frac{2}{\beta+1} e^{2\sqrt{\beta+1}} ||w_n(\cdot, 0)||^{2(\beta+1)}.
\]

As before, iterating this last relation and choosing \( \beta_0 = 0 \) and \( 2(\beta_0 + 1) = 2(\beta_j + 1) \) we have that

\[
||w_n(\cdot, 0)||^{\beta+1} \leq M_0 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{2}{\beta_0 + 1} e^{2\sqrt{\beta_0+1}} ||w_n(\cdot, 0)||^{2(\beta_0+1)}.
\]

We note that

\[
\beta_j = \left( \frac{N}{N-2s} \right)^j - 1,
\]

so the series

\[
\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\beta_j + 1} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta_j + 1}}
\]

are convergent. Recalling that \( ||w_n(\cdot, 0)||_q \leq C \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( q \in [2, \infty) \), we get

\[
||w_n(\cdot, 0)||_{\infty} = \lim_{j \to \infty} ||w_n(\cdot, 0)||_{2(\beta_j + 1)} \leq M \quad \text{for all} \ n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

This proves the \( L^\infty \)-desired estimate for the trace. At this point, we prove that there exists \( R > 0 \) such that

\[
||w_n||_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N_{+})} \leq R \quad \text{for all} \ n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

Using (4.11) with \( \lambda = 1 \) and that \( ||w_n(\cdot, 0)||_q \leq C \) for all \( q \in [2, \infty) \), we deduce that

\[
|||w_n||^{\beta+1} ||^2 \leq C \beta C^2 |||w_n||^{\beta+1} || ^2 \quad \text{for all} \ n \in \mathbb{N},
\]

for some \( \bar{c}, C > 0 \) independent on \( \beta \) and \( n \). On the other hand, from (2.1), we obtain that

\[
\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^N_{+}} y^a |w_n(x, y)|^{2(\beta+1)} \right) \frac{\beta+1}{2(\beta+1)} = |||w_n||^{\beta+1} ||^2 \leq C |||w_n||^{\beta+1} ||^2 \leq C \frac{|||w_n||^{\beta+1} ||^2}{C \frac{2}{\beta+1} ||w||^{\beta+1} ||^2}.
\]
which combined with the previous inequality yields
\[ \|w_n\|_{L^{2\gamma(\beta+1)}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, y^{1-2s})} \leq C'(C_s \epsilon) \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \]

Since
\[ \frac{1}{\beta+1} \log \left( 1 + \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \leq \frac{\beta}{2(\beta+1)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ for all } \beta > 0, \]
we can see that there exists \( \bar{C} > 0 \) such that \( C'(C_s \epsilon)^\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1} \leq \bar{C} \) for all \( \beta > 0 \), and so
\[ \|w_n\|_{L^{2\gamma(\beta+1)}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, y^{1-2s})} \leq \bar{C} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \beta > 0. \]

Now, fix \( R > \bar{C} \) and define \( A_n := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+ : w_n(x, y) > R\} \). Hence, for all \( n, j \in \mathbb{N} \), we have
\[ \bar{C} \geq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+} y^{1-2s} |w_n(x, y)|^{2\gamma(\beta+1)} \, dxdy \right)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma(\beta+1)}} \geq R^{\gamma(\beta+1)-1} \left( \int_{A_n} y^{1-2s} |w_n(x, y)|^2 \, dxdy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \]
which yields
\[ \left( \frac{\bar{C}}{R} \right)^{\beta_j+1+\frac{1}{2}} \geq \frac{1}{C^+} \left( \int_{A_n} y^{1-2s} |w_n(x, y)|^2 \, dxdy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \]
where \( \beta_j \) is given in (4.12). Letting \( j \to \infty \), we have that \( \beta_j \to \infty \) and then
\[ \int_{A_n} y^{1-2s} |w_n(x, y)|^2 \, dxdy = 0 \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \]
which implies that \( |A_n| = 0 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Consequently, (4.13) holds true. \( \square \)

**Lemma 4.2.** The sequence \( (w_n) \) satisfies \( w_n(\cdot, 0) \to 0 \) as \( |x| \to \infty \) uniformly in \( n \in \mathbb{N} \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 4.1 and Proposition 2.1-(iii), we obtain that \( w_n \) is continuous in \( \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+ \). On the other hand, from (2.1) and \( w_n \to w \) in \( X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) \), we have that \( w_n \to w \) in \( L^{2\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, y^{1-2s}) \). Fix \( \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \). Using (V1) and (3.2) we see that \( w_n \) is a weak subsolution to
\[ \begin{cases} -\text{div}(y^{1-2s} \nabla w_n) + m^2 y^{1-2s} w_n = 0 & \text{in } Q_1(\bar{x}, 0) := B_1(\bar{x}) \times (0, 1), \\ \frac{\partial w_n}{\partial y^{1-2s}} = (V_1 + \eta)w_n + C\eta w_n^{2s-1} & \text{on } B_1(\bar{x}), \end{cases} \]
where \( \eta \in (0, m^{2s} - V_1) \) is fixed. Applying Proposition 2.1-(i) and observing that \( L^{2\gamma}(A, y^{1-2s}) \subset L^2(A, y^{1-2s}) \) for any bounded set \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^N, \) we get
\[ 0 \leq \sup_{Q_1(\bar{x}, 0)} w_n \leq C(\|w_n\|_{L^{2\gamma}(Q_1(\bar{x}, 0), y^{1-2s})} + |w_n^{2s-1}(\cdot, 0)|_{L^s(B_1(\bar{x}))}) \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \]
where \( q > \frac{N}{2s} \) is fixed and \( C > 0 \) is a constant depending only on \( N, m, s, q, \gamma \) and independent of \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \bar{x} \). Note that \( q(2s - 1) \in (2, \infty) \) because \( N > 2s \) and \( q > \frac{N}{2s} \). Taking the limit as \( |\bar{x}| \to \infty \) we infer that \( w_n(\bar{x}, 0) \to 0 \) as \( |\bar{x}| \to \infty \) uniformly in \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). \( \square \)

Now we have all tools to give the proof of the main result of this work.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** We begin by proving that there exists \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) such that for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0) \) and any mountain pass solution \( u_\varepsilon \in X_\varepsilon \) of (3.1), it holds
\[ |u_\varepsilon(\cdot, 0)|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus A_\varepsilon)} < a. \quad (4.14) \]

Assume by contradiction that for some subsequence \( (\varepsilon_n) \) such that \( \varepsilon_n \to 0 \), we can find \( u_n := u_{\varepsilon_n} \in X_{\varepsilon_n} \) such that \( J_{\varepsilon_n}(u_n) = c_{\varepsilon_n}, J'_{\varepsilon_n}(u_n) = 0 \) and
\[ |u_n(\cdot, 0)|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus A_{\varepsilon_n})} \geq a. \quad (4.15) \]

In view of Lemma 3.7, we can find \( (y_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^N \) such that \( w_n(x, y) := u_n(x + y_n, y) \to w \) in \( X^s(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+) \) and \( \varepsilon_n y_n \to x_0 \) for some \( x_0 \in \Lambda \) such that \( V(x_0) = -V_0 \).
Now, if we choose $r > 0$ such that $B_r(x_0) \subset B_{2r}(x_0) \subset \Lambda$, we can see that $B_{\frac{2r}{\varepsilon_n}}(x_0) \subset \Lambda_{\varepsilon_n}$. Then, for any $x \in B_{\frac{2r}{\varepsilon_n}}(y_n)$ it holds

$$
\left| x - \frac{x_0}{\varepsilon_n} \right| \leq |x - y_n| + \left| y_n - \frac{x_0}{\varepsilon_n} \right| < \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n} (r + o_n(1)) < \frac{2r}{\varepsilon_n}
$$

for $n$ sufficiently large.

Therefore,

$$
\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Lambda_{\varepsilon_n} \subset \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\frac{2r}{\varepsilon_n}}(y_n)
$$

(4.16)

for any $n$ big enough. Using Lemma 4.2 we see that

$$
w_n(x, 0) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |x| \to \infty
$$

(4.17)

uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore there exists $R > 0$ such that

$$
w_n(x, 0) < a \quad \text{for any} \quad |x| \geq R, n \in \mathbb{N}.
$$

Hence, $u_n(x, 0) = w_n(x - y_n, 0) < a$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(y_n)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, by (4.16), there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \geq n_0$ we have

$$
\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Lambda_{\varepsilon_n} \subset \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\frac{2r}{\varepsilon_n}}(y_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(y_n),
$$

which implies that $u_n(x, 0) < a$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Lambda_{\varepsilon_n}$ and $n \geq n_0$. This is impossible according to (4.15). Since $u_c \in X_c$ satisfies (4.14), by the definition of $g$ it follows that $u_c$ is a solution of (2.5) for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. From the Harnack inequality we conclude that $u_c(x, 0) > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

In what follows, we study the behavior of the maximum points of solutions to Problem (1.1). Take $\varepsilon_n \to 0$ and let $(u_n) \subset X_{\varepsilon_n}$ be a sequence of solutions to (3.1) as above. Consider the translated sequence $w_n(x, y) = u_n(x + y, y)$ where $(y_n)$ is given by Lemma 3.7. Let us prove that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$
|w_n(\cdot, 0)|_{\infty} \geq \delta \quad \text{for all} \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.
$$

(4.18)

Assume by contradiction that $|w_n(\cdot, 0)|_{\infty} \to 0$. Using $(f_1)$ we can see that there exists $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\frac{f(|w_n(\cdot, 0)|_{\infty})}{|w_n(\cdot, 0)|_{\infty}} < \frac{V_1}{\kappa} \quad \text{for all} \quad n \geq \nu.
$$

(4.19)

From $(\langle J_{\varepsilon_n}(u_n), u_n \rangle = 0$, $(g_2)$ and $(f_4)$), we can see that for all $n \geq \nu$

$$
\|w_n\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_{+1})} - V_1|w_n(\cdot, 0)|_{\infty}^2 = \|u_n\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_{+1})}^2 - V_1|u_n(\cdot, 0)|_{\infty}^2
$$

$$
\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(u_n(x, 0))u_n(x, 0) \, dx
$$

$$
\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{f(|w_n(\cdot, 0)|_{\infty})}{|w_n(\cdot, 0)|_{\infty}} \, w_n^2(x, 0) \, dx
$$

$$
\leq \frac{V_1}{\kappa} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} w_n^2(x, 0) \, dx
$$

which combined with (2.3) yields

$$
\left(1 - \frac{V_1}{m^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\kappa}\right)\right) \|w_n\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_{+1})}^2 \leq 0.
$$

Since $\kappa > \frac{V_1}{m^2 - V_1}$ we get $\|w_n\|_{X^s(\mathbb{R}^N_{+1})} = 0$ for all $n \geq \nu$ which is a contradiction. Therefore, if $q_n$ is a global maximum point of $w_n(\cdot, 0)$, we deduce from Lemma 4.1 and (4.18) that there exists $R > 0$ such that $|q_n| < R$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $x_n := q_n + y_n$ is a global maximum point of $u_n(\cdot, 0)$, and $\varepsilon_n x_n \to x_0 \in \mathbb{M}$. Using the continuity of $V$ we deduce that

$$
\lim_{n \to \infty} V(\varepsilon_n x_n) = V(x_0) = -V_0.
$$

Finally, we prove a decay estimate for $u_n(\cdot, 0)$. Using $(f_1)$, the definition of $g$ and (4.17), we can find $R_1 > 1$ sufficiently large such that

$$
g(\varepsilon_n x + \varepsilon_n y_n, w_n(x, 0))w_n(x, 0) \leq \delta w_n^2(x, 0) \quad \text{for} \quad |x| \geq R_1,
$$

(4.19)
where \( \delta \in (0, m^{2s} - V_1) \) is fixed. Pick a smooth cut-off function \( \phi \) such that \( 0 \leq \phi \leq 1 \), \( \phi(x) = 0 \) for \( |x| \geq 1 \), and \( \phi \neq 0 \). By Riesz representation theorem, there exists a unique function \( \tilde{w} \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N) \) such that
\[
( -\Delta + m^2 )^s \tilde{w} - (V_1 + \delta) \tilde{w} = \phi \in \mathbb{R}^N.
\] (4.20)

Since \( \tilde{w} = B_{2x,m} \ast \phi \), for some positive kernel \( B_{2x,m} \), whose expression is given below, we can see that \( \tilde{w} \geq 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^N \). Denote by \( \bar{W} \) the s-extension of \( \tilde{w} \), namely \( \bar{W}(x,y) = (P_{s,m}(\cdot,y) \ast \tilde{w})(x) \). Fix \( x \in \mathbb{R}^N \). Then, from Young’s inequality and (4.21), we can see that
\[
\frac{|\bar{W}|}{L^2(B_1(x) \times [0,1];y^{1-2s})} \leq \frac{|\bar{W}|}{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{N+1};y^{1-2s})} = \left\| P_{s,m}(\cdot,y) \ast \tilde{w} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{N+1};y^{1-2s})}
\leq \left( \int_0^1 |P_{s,m}(\cdot,y) \ast \tilde{w}|^2 y^{1-2s} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\leq \left( \int_0^1 |P_{s,m}(\cdot,y) \tilde{w}|^2 y^{1-2s} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\leq |\tilde{w}|^2 \left( \int_0^1 \theta^2(m y)^{1-2s} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\leq c_{s,m} |\tilde{w}|^2,
\]

for some constant \( c_{s,m} > 0 \). Therefore, by Proposition 2.1-(i) and translation invariance of (4.20) with respect to \( x \in \mathbb{R}^N \), we deduce that \( \tilde{w} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \), and thus, by interpolation, \( \tilde{w} \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^N) \) for any \( q \in [2, \infty] \). Hence, \( ( -\Delta + m^2 )^s \tilde{w} = (V_1 + \delta) \tilde{w} + \phi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \) and applying Theorem 5.4 (see also Theorem 5.1-(v) and Proposition 2.1-(iii)) we obtain that \( \tilde{w} \) is Hölder continuous in \( \mathbb{R}^N \). Using Harnack’s inequality (see Proposition 2.1-(ii)) we conclude that \( \tilde{w} > 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^N \). Moreover, we can prove that there exist \( c, C > 0 \) such that
\[
0 < \tilde{w}(x) \leq C e^{-c|x|} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N.
\] (4.21)

Assume for the moment that (4.21) holds and we postpone the proof of it after proving the decay estimate for \( \hat{u}_n(\cdot,0) \). We know that
\[
( -\Delta + m^2 )^s \tilde{w} - (V_1 + \delta) \tilde{w} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{R_1}.
\] (4.22)

On the other hand, by (V1) and (4.19), we can see that
\[
( -\Delta + m^2 )^s w_n(\cdot,0) - (V_1 + \delta) w_n(\cdot,0) \leq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{R_1}.
\] (4.23)

Set \( b := \inf_{B_{R_1}} \tilde{w} > 0 \) and \( z_n := (\ell + 1) \tilde{w} - bw_n(\cdot,0) \), where \( \ell := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |w_n(\cdot,0)|_\infty \). We aim to show that \( z_n \geq 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^N \). Assume by contradiction that there exists a sequence \((x_j,n)\) such that
\[
\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} z_n(x) = \lim_{j \to \infty} z_n(x_j,n) < 0.
\] (4.24)

In view of (4.17) and (4.21), we notice that
\[
\lim_{|x| \to \infty} \tilde{w}(x) = \lim_{|x| \to \infty} w_n(x,0) = 0
\]
where the second limit is uniform in \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), and so
\[
\lim_{|x| \to \infty} z_n(x) = 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

Consequently, \((x_j,n)\) is bounded and, up to a subsequence, we may assume that \( x_j,n \to x_n^* \) for some \( x_n \in \mathbb{R}^N \). Hence, (4.24) becomes
\[
\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} z_n(x) = z_n(x_n^*) < 0.
\] (4.25)

Then, from the minimality of \( x_n^* \) and using Theorem 5.4, we deduce that
\[
( -\Delta + m^2 )^s z_n(x_n^*) = m^{2s} z_n(x_n^*) + \frac{C(N,s)}{2} m^{\frac{N+2s}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{2z_n(x_n^*) - z_n(x_n^* + y) - z_n(x_n^* - y)}{|y|^{N+2s}} K_{\frac{m}{2\inf}}(m|y|) dy
\leq m^{2s} z_n(x_n^*).
\] (4.26)
Then exponential decay of $\bar{B}$ of $u$, where
\[ (\Delta + m^2)^s z_n - (V_1 + \delta) z_n \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{R_1}, \]
and this is a contradiction because (4.25), (4.26), (4.27) and $V_1 + \delta < m^{2s}$ imply that
\[ (\Delta + m^2)^s z_n(x_n^{*}) - (V_1 + \delta) z_n(x_n^{*}) \leq (m^{2s} - (V_1 + \delta)) z_n(x_n^{*}) < 0. \]
Hence, $z_n \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. In the light of (4.21) we obtain that there exist $c, C > 0$ such that
\[ 0 \leq w_n(x) \leq C e^{-c|x|} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N, n \in \mathbb{N}, \]
which combined with $u_n(x,0) = w_n(x-y_n,0)$ yields
\[ u_n(x,0) = w_n(x-y_n,0) \leq C e^{-c|x-y_n|} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N, n \in \mathbb{N}. \]
In what follows, we focus our attention on the estimate (4.21). Note that $\bar{w} = B_{2s,m} \ast \phi$, where
\[ B_{2s,m}(x) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}([[|k|^2 + m^2]^s - (V_1 + \delta)]^{-1}). \]
Since $\phi$ has compact support, the exponential decay of $\bar{w}$ at infinity follows if we show the exponential decay of $B_{2s,m}(x)$ for big values of $|x|$. After that, due to the fact that $\bar{w}$ is continuous in $\mathbb{R}^N$, we can deduce the exponential decay of $\bar{w}$ in the whole of $\mathbb{R}^N$. Next we prove the exponential decay of $B_{2s,m}(x)$ for $|x|$ large. Then
\[ B_{2s,m}(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{N}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{ik \cdot x} \frac{1}{[(|k|^2 + m^2)^s - (V_1 + \delta)]} dk \]
\[ = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{N}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{ik \cdot x} \left( \int_0^\infty e^{-t[(|k|^2 + m^2)^s - (V_1 + \delta)]} dt \right) dk \]
\[ = \int_0^\infty e^{-\gamma t} \left( \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{N}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{ik \cdot x} e^{-t[(|k|^2 + m^2)^s - m^{2s}]} dk \right) dt \]
\[ = \int_0^\infty e^{-\gamma t} p_{s,m}(x,t) dt \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.28)
where
\[ \gamma := m^{2s} - (V_1 + \delta) > 0, \]
and
\[ p_{s,m}(x,t) := e^{m^{2s}t} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{\frac{N}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4t}} e^{-m^{2s}z} \vartheta_{s}(t,z) dz \]
is the $s$-stable relativistic density with parameter $m$ (see pag. 4 formula (7) in [45], and pag. 4875 formula (2.12) and Lemma 2.2 in [13]), and $\vartheta_{s}(t,z)$ is the density function of the $s$-stable process whose Laplace transform is $e^{-t\Lambda^s}$. Using the scaling property $p_{s,m}(x,t) = m^N p_{s,1}(mx, m^{2s}t)$ (see pag. 4876 formula (2.15) in [13] and Lemma 2.2 in [34], we can see that
\[ p_{s,m}(x,t) \leq C \left( g_m^{2s} \left( \frac{mx}{\sqrt{2}} \right) + m^{2s} \nu^m \left( \frac{mx}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \right) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N, t > 0, \]
where
\[ g_{t}(x) := \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{\frac{N}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4t}} \]
and $\nu^m$ is the Lévy measure of relativistic process with parameter $m > 0$ given by
\[ \nu^m(x) := \frac{2\pi^{\frac{N}{2}}}{\Gamma(1-s)} \left( \frac{m}{|x|} \right)^{N+2s} K_{N+2s} \left( \frac{m|x|}{2} \right). \]
We start with the estimate of \( B_{2s,m}(x) \). Here

\[
B_{2s,m}(x) \leq C \int_0^\infty e^{-\gamma t} g_{m,s,t} \left( \frac{mx}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \, dt + C \int_0^\infty e^{-\gamma t} \nu^m \left( \frac{mx}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \, dt
\]

\[
=: I_1(x) + I_2(x).
\]

(4.30)

We start with the estimate of \( I_1(x) \) for \( |x| \geq 2 \). Observing that

\[
\gamma t + \frac{m^{2-2s}}{8t} |x|^2 \geq \gamma t + \frac{m^{2-2s}}{2t} \quad \text{for all} \quad |x| \geq 2, t > 0,
\]

and that \( ab \leq \varepsilon a^2 + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon} b^2 \) for all \( a, b \geq 0 \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \) gives

\[
\gamma t + \frac{m^{2-2s}}{8t} |x|^2 \geq \gamma t + \frac{m^{2-2s}}{4t} + \frac{m^{1-s}}{2\sqrt{2}|x|^{\sqrt{7}}}
\]

we deduce that for all \( |x| \geq 2 \) and \( t > 0 \)

\[
\gamma t + \frac{m^{2-2s}}{8t} |x|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \gamma t + \frac{m^{2-2s}}{4t} + \frac{m^{1-s}}{2\sqrt{2}|x|^{\sqrt{7}}}
\]

Thus, using the definition of \( g_t \), we can see that for all \( |x| \geq 2 \)

\[
I_1(x) \leq C \int_0^\infty e^{-\gamma t} \frac{x^{2-2s}}{t^{\frac{2s}{2}}} e^{-\frac{m^{1-s}}{2\sqrt{2}|x|^{\sqrt{7}}}} \, dt
\]

\[
\leq C e^{-c|x|} \int_0^\infty e^{-\gamma t} \frac{x^{2-2s}}{t^{\frac{2s}{2}}} \, dt \leq C e^{-c|x|}
\]

(4.31)

where we used the fact that

\[
\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} t^{-p} e^{-\frac{\beta t}{p}} \, dt < \infty \quad \forall \alpha, \beta, p > 0.
\]

Here \( C, c > 0 \) depend only on \( N, s, m \). Now we estimate \( I_2(x) \) for large values of \( |x| \). Recalling formula (1.4) concerning the asymptotic behavior of \( K_r \) at infinity, we deduce that there exists \( r_0 > 0 \) such that

\[
K_{\nu^{mr}} \leq C e^{-mr} \quad \text{for all} \quad r \geq r_0,
\]

and then

\[
\frac{K_{\nu^{mr}}}{\nu^{mr + \frac{1}{2}}} \leq C e^{-m|x|} \quad \text{for all} \quad |x| \geq r_0.
\]

Consequently, using the definition of \( \nu^m \), for all \( |x| \geq r_0 \) we get

\[
I_2(x) \leq C \frac{e^{-m|x|}}{|x|^{N+2s}} \int_0^\infty t e^{-\gamma t} \, dt \leq C \frac{e^{-m|x|}}{|x|^{N+2s}}.
\]

(4.32)

Gathering (4.28), (4.30), (4.31), (4.32) we find that for any \( |x| \geq \max\{r_0, 2\} \)

\[
B_{2s,m}(x) \leq C_1 e^{-C_2|x|} + C_3 \frac{e^{-C_4|x|}}{|x|^{N+2s}} \leq C_5 e^{-C_6|x|}.
\]

Thus (4.21) holds true and this ends the proof of Theorem 1.1. \( \square \)

**Remark 4.1.** When \( s = \frac{1}{2} \), \( p_{\frac{1}{2},m}(x,t) \) can be calculated explicitly (see [13, 40]) and is given by

\[
p_{\frac{1}{2},m}(x,t) = 2 \left( \frac{m}{2\pi} \right)^{\frac{N+1}{2}} t e^{m|x|^2 + t^2} - \frac{K_{\frac{N+1}{2}}}{m \sqrt{|x|^2 + t^2}}.
\]

**Remark 4.2.** By the definitions of \( B_{2s,m} \) and \( p_{s,m} \), it follows that \( B_{2s,m} \) is radial, positive, strictly decreasing in \( |x| \), and smooth on \( \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\} \).
5. Appendix: Bessel potentials

In this appendix we collect some useful results concerning Bessel potentials (with $m = 1$). For more details we refer to [9, 15, 33, 48].

**Definition 5.1.** Let $\alpha > 0$. The Bessel potential of order $\alpha$ of $u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{J}_\alpha u(x) := (1 - \Delta)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) = (\mathcal{G}_\alpha * u)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathcal{G}_\alpha(x - y) u(y) \, dy,$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_\alpha(x) := (2\pi)^{-\frac{N}{2}} \mathcal{F}^{-1}((1 + |k|^2)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})(x)$$

is called Bessel kernel.

**Remark 5.1.** If $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ (or $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$), then we may define the Bessel potential of a temperate distribution $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^N)$ (see [15]) by setting

$$\mathcal{F} \mathcal{J}_\alpha u(k) := (2\pi)^{-\frac{N}{2}} (1 + |k|^2)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \mathcal{F} u(k).$$

From definition it is evident that $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha + \beta} = \mathcal{G}_\alpha * \mathcal{G}_\beta$. It is possible to prove (see [9]) that

$$\mathcal{G}_\alpha(x) = \frac{|x|^{-N + \alpha}}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{2})} K_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(|x|) x^\frac{2N - \alpha}{2}. $$

Thus $\mathcal{G}_\alpha(x)$ is a positive, decreasing function of $|x|$, analytic except at $x = 0$, and for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathcal{G}_\alpha(x)$ is an entire function of $\alpha$. Moreover, from (1.3) and (1.4), we have

$$\mathcal{G}_\alpha(x) = \frac{|x|^{-N + \alpha}}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{2})} + o(|x|^{-N + \alpha}) \text{ as } |x| \to 0, \text{ if } 0 < \alpha < N,$$

$$\mathcal{G}_\alpha(x) = O(e^{-c|x|}) \text{ as } |x| \to \infty, \text{ for some } c > 0,$$

$\mathcal{G}_\alpha \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $\alpha > 0$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathcal{G}_\alpha(x) \, dx = 1$. We also have the following integral formula (see [48]):

$$\mathcal{G}_\alpha(x) = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{\frac{N}{2}}} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{2})} \int_0^\infty e^{\frac{-\pi\delta^2}{4}} e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{4\pi\delta^N}} d\delta.$$

One the most interesting facts concerning Bessel potentials is they can be employed to define the Bessel potential spaces; see [1, 9, 15, 33, 48]. For $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ we define the Banach space

$$\mathcal{L}^p_\alpha := \mathcal{G}_\alpha(L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)) = \{u : u = \mathcal{G}_\alpha * f, f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)\}$$

endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^p_\alpha} := |f|_p \text{ if } u = \mathcal{G}_\alpha * f.$$

Thus $\mathcal{L}^p_\alpha$ is a subspace of $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$. We also have the following useful result:

**Theorem 5.1.** [1, 15, 48]

(i) If $\alpha \geq 0$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$, then $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is dense in $\mathcal{L}^p_\alpha$.

(ii) If $1 < p < \infty$ and $p'$ its conjugate exponent, then the dual of $\mathcal{L}^p_\alpha$ is isometrically isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}^{p'}_{-\alpha}$.

(iii) If $\beta < 0$, then $\mathcal{L}^p_\alpha$ is continuously embedded in $\mathcal{L}^q_{\beta}$.

(iv) If $\beta \leq \alpha$ and if either $1 < p \leq q \leq \frac{N}{N-(\alpha-\beta)p} < \infty$ or $p = 1$ and $1 \leq q < \frac{N}{N-(\alpha+\beta)}$, then $\mathcal{L}^p_\alpha$ is continuously embedded in $\mathcal{L}^q_\beta$.

(v) If $0 \leq \mu \leq -\frac{\alpha}{p} < 1$, then $\mathcal{L}^p_\alpha$ is continuously embedded in $C^0(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

(vi) $\mathcal{L}^p_k = W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 < p < \infty$, $\mathcal{L}^p_\alpha = W^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for any $\alpha$.

(vii) If $1 < p < \infty$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, then for every $\alpha$ we have the following continuous embeddings:

$$\mathcal{L}^p_{\alpha + \varepsilon} \subset W^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset \mathcal{L}^p_{\alpha - \varepsilon}.$$
In order to accomplish some useful regularity results for equations driven by \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\), with \(m > 0\), we introduce the Hölder-Zygmund (or Lipschitz) spaces \(\Lambda_{\alpha}\); see [15, 38, 48]. If \(\alpha > 0\) and \(\alpha \notin \mathbb{N}\) then we set \(\Lambda_{\alpha} := C^{[\alpha],\alpha-\lfloor\alpha\rfloor} (\mathbb{R}^N)\). If \(\alpha = k \in \mathbb{N}\) then we set \(\Lambda_{\alpha} := \Lambda_k^*\) where

\[
\Lambda_k^* := \left\{ u \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^N) : \sup_{x,h \in \mathbb{R}^N, |h| > 0} \frac{|u(x+h) + u(x-h) - 2u(x)|}{|h|} < \infty \right\} \text{ if } k = 1,
\]

and

\[
\Lambda_k := \left\{ u \in C^{k-1}(\mathbb{R}^N) : D^\gamma u \in \Lambda_k^* \text{ for all } |\gamma| \leq k-1 \right\} \text{ if } k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 2.
\]

Then we have the following useful result:

**Theorem 5.2.** [15, 48] If \(\alpha, \beta \geq 0\), \((1 - \Delta)^{-\alpha}\) is an isomorphism of \(\mathbb{L}^p_{\beta} \to \mathbb{L}^p_{\beta+2\alpha}\). If \(\alpha \geq 0\) and \(\beta > 0\), \((1 - \Delta)^{-\alpha}\) is an isomorphism of \(\Lambda_{\beta} \to \Lambda_{\beta+2\alpha}\).

As a consequence of Theorem 5.2 and the definition of Hölder-Zygmund spaces, we easily deduce the following result:

**Corollary 5.1.** Let \(s \in (0,1)\) and \(0 < \alpha \leq 1\). Assume that \(f \in C^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^N)\) and that \(u \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)\) is a solution to \((-\Delta + 1)^s u = f\) in \(\mathbb{R}^N\).

- If \(\alpha + 2s < 1\) then \(u \in C^{0,\alpha+2s}(\mathbb{R}^N)\).
- If \(1 < \alpha + 2s < 2\) then \(u \in C^{1,\alpha+2s-1}(\mathbb{R}^N)\).
- If \(2 < \alpha + 2s < 3\) then \(u \in C^{2,\alpha+2s-2}(\mathbb{R}^N)\).
- If \(\alpha + 2s = k \in \{1, 2\}\) then \(u \in \Lambda_k^*\).

Bearing in mind the asymptotic estimates (1.3) and (1.4) for \(K_{\nu}\), we are able to gain an integral representation formula for \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\), with \(s \in (0,1)\), in the spirit of [23].

**Theorem 5.3.** Let \(s \in (0,1)\). Then, for all \(u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N)\),

\[
(-\Delta + m^2)^s u(x) = m^{2s} u(x) + \frac{C(N, s)}{2} m^{\frac{N+2s}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{2u(x) - u(x+y) - u(x-y)}{|y|^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}} K_{\frac{N+2s}{2}}(m|y|) dy.
\]

**Proof.** Choosing the substitution \(z = y - x\) in (1.2), we obtain

\[
(-\Delta + m^2)^s u(x) = m^{2s} u(x) + C(N, s) m^{\frac{N+2s}{2}} P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x-y|^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}} K_{\frac{N+2s}{2}}(m|x-y|) dy
\]

\[
= m^{2s} u(x) + C(N, s) m^{\frac{N+2s}{2}} P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x) - u(x+z)}{|z|^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}} K_{\frac{N+2s}{2}}(m|z|) dz. \tag{5.1}
\]

By substituting \(\tilde{z} = -z\) in the last term in (5.1), we get

\[
P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x+z) - u(x)}{|z|^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}} K_{\frac{N+2s}{2}}(m|z|) dz = P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x - \tilde{z}) - u(x)}{|	ilde{z}|^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}} K_{\frac{N+2s}{2}}(m|\tilde{z}|) d\tilde{z}, \tag{5.2}
\]

and so, after relabeling \(\tilde{z}\) as \(z\),

\[
2P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x+z) - u(x)}{|z|^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}} K_{\frac{N+2s}{2}}(m|z|) dz
\]

\[
= P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x+z) - u(x)}{|z|^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}} K_{\frac{N+2s}{2}}(m|z|) dz
\]

\[
+ P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x-z) - u(x)}{|z|^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}} K_{\frac{N+2s}{2}}(m|z|) dz
\]

\[
= P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x+z) + u(x-z) - 2u(x)}{|z|^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}} K_{\frac{N+2s}{2}}(m|z|) dz. \tag{5.3}
\]

Hence, if we rename \(z\) as \(y\) in (5.1) and (5.3), we can write \((-\Delta + m^2)^s\) as

\[
(-\Delta + m^2)^s u(x) = m^{2s} u(x) + \frac{C(N, s)}{2} m^{\frac{N+2s}{2}} P.V. \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{2u(x) - u(x+y) - u(x-y)}{|y|^{\frac{N+2s}{2}}} K_{\frac{N+2s}{2}}(m|y|) dy. \tag{5.4}
\]
Now, by using a second order Taylor expansion, we see that
\[
\frac{2u(x) - u(x+y) - u(x-y)}{|y|^\frac{2s+2}{2}} K^{\frac{s+2}{2}}(m|y|) \leq \frac{|D^2u|_\infty}{|y|^\frac{2s+2}{2}} K^{\frac{s+2}{2}}(m|y|).
\]
From (1.3) we deduce that
\[
\frac{|D^2u|_\infty}{|y|^\frac{2s+2}{2}} K^{\frac{s+2}{2}}(m|y|) \sim \frac{C}{|y|^N} \text{ as } |y| \to 0
\]
which is integrable near 0. On the other hand, using (1.4), we get
\[
\frac{2u(x) - u(x+y) - u(x-y)}{|y|^\frac{2s+2}{2}} K^{\frac{s+2}{2}}(m|y|) \leq \frac{3|u|_\infty}{|y|^\frac{2s+2}{2}} K^{\frac{s+2}{2}}(m|y|) \sim \frac{C}{|y|^\frac{N+2s}{2}} e^{-m|y|} \text{ as } |y| \to \infty
\]
which is integrable near \(\infty\). Therefore, we can remove the P.V. in (5.4).

By Theorem 5.3 and using the fact that \(|z|^{-\nu} K_\nu(m|z|) \leq C_\nu |z|^{-2\nu}\) (see pag. 5865 in [28]), we can argue as in [47] and use the \(C^{k,\alpha}\) estimates, with \(k \in \{1,2\}\), for the elliptic equation \(-\Delta + m^2 u = g\) in \(\mathbb{R}^N\), to obtain Schauder-Hölder estimates for \((-\Delta + m^2)^s u\). In the light of this observation, we can give an alternative proof of Corollary 5.1 and deduce the next helpful result. Since the proofs are similar to the ones performed in [47] for the case \(m = 0\), we skip the details.

**Theorem 5.4.** Let \(s \in (0,1)\) and \(m > 0\). Assume that \(f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)\) and that \(u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)\) is a solution to \((-\Delta + m^2)^s u = f\) in \(\mathbb{R}^N\).

- If \(2s \leq 1\) then \(u \in C^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^N)\) for any \(\alpha < 2s\).
- If \(2s > 1\) then \(u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^N)\) for any \(\alpha < 2s - 1\).
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