

**CRITICAL CONCAVE CONVEX AMBROSETTI-PRODI TYPE
PROBLEM FOR FRACTIONAL p -LAPLACIAN**

H. P. BUENO, E. HUERTO CAQUI, O. H. MIYAGAKI, AND F. R. PEREIRA

ABSTRACT. In this paper we consider a class of critical concave convex Ambrosetti-Prodi type problems for the fractional p -Laplacian operator. By applying the Linking Theorem and the Mountain Pass Theorem as well, the interaction of the nonlinearities with the first eigenvalue of fractional p -Laplacian will be used to prove existence and multiplicity of solutions.

1. INTRODUCTION

We study, in this paper, existence and multiplicity of solutions to the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s u &= -\lambda|u|^{q-2}u + a|u|^{p-2}u + b(u^+)^{p_s^*-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $(-\Delta)_p^s$ is fractional p -Laplacian operator, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded, smooth domain, $\lambda > 0$, $1 < q < p$, $a > 0$, $b > 0$, $u^+ = \max\{0, u\}$, $u^- = \min\{0, u\}$ and $p_s^* = pN/(N - sp)$ is the critical Sobolev exponent for $(-\Delta)_p^s$.

Here

$$(-\Delta)_p^s u(x) = 2 \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B(x, \epsilon)} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2}(u(x) - u(y))}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy,$$

where u is a measurable function and $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Our problem is related to two classical local problems, namely, the Ambrosetti-Prodi problem and the Brezis-Nirenberg problem. On these subjects see the excellent books [23] and [39], respectively. In 1972, Ambrosetti and Prodi [4] considered the Dirichlet boundary value problem

$$(AP) \quad -\Delta u = g(u) + f(x) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35A15, 35R11, 35J60, 35J62, 35B33.

Key words and phrases. Variational methods; fractional equations; nonlinear elliptic equations; quasilinear equations; critical exponents.

First author takes part in the project 422806/2018-8 by CNPq/Brazil.

Second author was supported by CAPES/Brazil.

Third author was supported by Grant 2019/24901-3 by São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) and Grant 307061/2018-3 by CNPq/Brazil.

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ a bounded smooth domain, Δ denotes the Laplacian operator, $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $f \in C^1$, $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, convex, C^2 , satisfying

$$g_- = \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{g(t)}{t} < \lambda_1 < g_+ = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{g(t)}{t} < \lambda_2,$$

with $0 < \lambda_1$ and λ_2 being the first and second eigenvalues of $(-\Delta, H_0^1(\Omega))$. They proved the existence of at least two solutions.

Many authors have extended this result in different ways and we would like to apologize if we might omit some important work, but we cite e.g. the papers [2, 6, 8, 9, 15, 19, 20, 28, 36], and references therein. In all the above result shows the role of the limits g_{\pm} interacting with eigenvalues of $(-\Delta, H_0^1(\Omega))$.

On the other hand, in 1983, Brézis and Nirenberg [11] studied the Dirichlet boundary problem

$$(BN) \quad -\Delta u = au + |u|^{2^*-2}u \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

where $a > 0$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ a bounded smooth domain, $2^* = 2N/(N-2)$ ($N \geq 3$) is the Sobolev critical exponent. As before, denoting by λ_j the eigenvalues of $-\Delta$, they actually proved that there exists $a_0 > 0$ such that

- (i) if $a < \lambda_1$ and $N \geq 4$, problem (BN) has one solution,
- (ii) if $a_0 < a < \lambda_1$ and $N = 3$, problem (BN) has one solution.

Among many works extending or complementing the above result for both local or nonlocal operators, we mention e.g. [3, 5, 7, 10, 14, 17, 29, 31, 33]. But we would like to highlight [16], where the authors prove that problem (BN) possesses at least one solution for all $a > 0$ if $N \geq 5$, and, if $a \neq \lambda_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$, if $N = 4$.

In a interesting work, de Paiva and Presoto in [21] (see also [22] for the subcritical case and [25, 32] for related problems) established a multiplicity result for the Dirichlet boundary problem

$$(PP) \quad -\Delta u = -\lambda|u|^{q-2}u + au + (u^+)^{p-1} \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

where $a, \lambda > 0$, $1 < q < 2 < p \leq 2^*$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded smooth domain. This result was extended for nonlocal problem with $p = 2$ in [30] and [13], for polynomial and exponential growth, respectively. Our main goal in the present paper is to prove the result obtained in [21] for the fractional p -Laplacian.

Since solutions should be equal to zero outside of Ω , it is natural to consider the space $X_p^s \subset W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ given by

$$X_p^s = \{u \in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) : u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega\}.$$

In order to obtain the geometric conditions of the Linking Theorem, which will be used to obtain a third solution to the problem (1.1), we define

$$\lambda^* = \inf \left\{ \|u\|_{X_p^s}^p : u \in W, \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p = 1 \right\},$$

where

$$W = \{u \in X_p^s : \langle A(\varphi_1), u \rangle = 0\},$$

with φ_1 the first autofunction of $(-\Delta)_p^s$, positive and L^p -normalized, and with $A : X_p^s \rightarrow (X_p^s)^*$ defined, for all $u, v \in X_p^s$, by

$$\langle A(u), v \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} (u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y))}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy.$$

The proof of the next result is simple.

Proposition 1.1. $X_p^s = W \oplus \text{span}\{\varphi_1\}$.

We denote by P_-^s and P_+^s the projections of X_p^s in $\text{span}\{\varphi_1\}$ and W , respectively.

Following ideas of Alves, Carrião and Miyagaki [1] and Capozzi, Fortunato and Palmieri [16], it is not difficult to obtain the next result, see [13] for details.

Proposition 1.2. $\lambda_1 < \lambda^*$.

The main result of this paper is the following.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that $\lambda_1 < a < \lambda^*$, $1 < q < p$, $\lambda > 0$ and $b > 0$.*

- (i) *If $N > sp^2$ and $1 < p \leq \frac{2N}{N+s}$, then problem (1.1) has at least three nontrivial solutions, if $\lambda > 0$ is small enough.*
- (ii) *The same conclusion is valid if $N > sp((p-1)^2 + p)$ and $p > \frac{2N}{N+s}$.*

Remark 1.3. *It seems that we have only considered two of six possibilities, namely:*

- (a) $1 < p \leq \frac{2N}{N+s}$ and $\begin{cases} (1) & N > sp^2, \\ (2) & N = sp^2, \\ (3) & sp < N < sp^2. \end{cases}$
- (b) $\left[p > \frac{2N}{N+s}, N > sp((p-1)^2 + p) \right]$ and $\begin{cases} (1) & N > sp^2, \\ (2) & N = sp^2, \\ (3) & sp < N < sp^2. \end{cases}$

However, it is not difficult to verify that possibilities (a) – (2) and (3) and (b) – (2) and (3) are void.

In the proof of Theorem 1 we apply, for the positive and negative parts of the functional associated with this problem, the Mountain Pass Theorem. This part is quite standard, but depends heavily on the next minimization result, the proof of which was inspired by the works [12] and [35] for semilinear and quasilinear problems, respectively.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that $g \in C(\Omega)$ satisfies*

$$|g(t)| \leq C(1 + |t|^{q-1}), \text{ for some } 1 \leq q \leq p_s^* \text{ and } C > 0 \quad (1.2)$$

and consider the functional $\Phi : X_p^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\Phi(u) = \frac{1}{p} \|u\|_{X_p^s}^p - \int_{\Omega} G(u) dx,$$

where $G(t) = \int_0^t g(s) ds$.

If 0 is a local minimum of Φ in $C_{\delta}^0(\overline{\Omega})$, that is, there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that

$$\Phi(0) \leq \Phi(z), \forall z \in X_p^s \cap C_{\delta}^0(\overline{\Omega}), \|z\|_{0,\delta} \leq r_1,$$

then 0 is a local minimum of Φ in X_p^s , that is, there exists $r_2 > 0$ such that

$$\Phi(0) \leq \Phi(z), \quad \forall z \in X_p^s, \quad \|z\|_{X_p^s} \leq r_2.$$

(The space $C_\delta^0(\overline{\Omega})$ will be defined in Section 3).

A third solution is obtained as consequence of the Linking Theorem, see [34]. It adapts arguments found in Miyagaki, Motreanu and Pereira [30], de Paiva and Presoto [21], but mainly in de Figueiredo and Yang [20]. The presence of the fractional p -Laplacian makes impossible the application of approximate autofunctions, which were used in [21]. Furthermore, since an explicit formula for minimizers of the best constant of the Sobolev immersion $X_p^s \hookrightarrow L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)$, another difficulties arise. A partial solution is obtained by Chen, Mosconi and Squassina [18], Mosconi, Perera, Squassina and Yang [31] and also Brasco, Mosconi and Squassina [10].

2. PRELIMINARIES

Definition 2.1. We say that $u \in X_p^s$ is a weak solution to (1.1) if

$$\langle A(u), v \rangle = -\lambda \int_{\Omega} |u|^{q-2} u v dx + a \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p-2} u v dx + b \int_{\Omega} (u^+)^{p_s^*-1} v dx,$$

for all $v \in X_p^s$.

We define the “energy” functional $I_{\lambda,s} : X_p^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$I_{\lambda,s}(u) = \frac{1}{p} \|u\|_{X_p^s}^p + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx - \frac{a}{p} \int_{\Omega} |u|^p dx - \frac{b}{p_s^*} \int_{\Omega} (u^+)^{p_s^*} dx.$$

Of course, we have

$$\langle I'_{\lambda,s}(u), v \rangle = \langle A(u), v \rangle + \lambda \int_{\Omega} |u|^{q-2} u v dx - a \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p-2} u v dx - b \int_{\Omega} (u^+)^{p_s^*-1} v dx,$$

thus implying that critical points of $I_{\lambda,s}$ are weak solutions of (1.1).

The proof of the next result is straightforward

Lemma 2.2. For all $u : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $p > 1$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ it holds

- (i) $|u^+(x) - u^+(y)|^p \leq |u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} (u(x) - u(y)) (u^+(x) - u^+(y))$,
- (ii) $|u^-(x) - u^-(y)|^p \leq |u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} (u(x) - u(y)) (u^-(x) - u^-(y))$.

We also recall (see [38, p.122])

Lemma 2.3. For all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p > 1$, there exists a constant K_p , depending on p , such that

$$\left| |b|^p - |a|^p - |b - a|^p \right| \leq K_p (|b - a|^{p-1} |a| + |a|^{p-1} |b - a|).$$

The next elementary result can be found in Mosconi, Perera, Squassina and Yang [31, p.17].

Lemma 2.4. Given $k > 1$ and $p-1 < q < p$, there exists a constant $C = C(k, q) > 0$ such that

$$|a + b|^p \leq k|a|^p + |b|^p + C|a|^{p-\tau}|b|^\tau, \quad \forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}.$$

As an immediately consequence of Lemma 2.4, we have.

Lemma 2.5. *There exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$|a + b|^p \leq C_1|a|^p + C_2|b|^p, \quad \forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The proof of the next result follows immediately by considering $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $f(t) = (Bt^p/p) - Ct^{p_s^*}/p_s^*$.

Lemma 2.6. *For constants $B > 0$ and $C > 0$ we have*

$$\max_{t \geq 0} \left(\frac{Bt^p}{p} - \frac{Ct^{p_s^*}}{p_s^*} \right) = \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{B}{C^{p/p_s^*}} \right)^{\frac{N}{p}}.$$

The proof of the next result was given in [20, Lema 2.5]) in the case $s = 1$ and $p = 2$. It is easily adapted for the case where $s \in (0, 1)$ and $p > 1$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $u, v \in L^r(\Omega)$ with $p \leq r \leq p_s^*$. If $\omega \subset \Omega$ and $u + v > 0$ on ω , then*

$$\left| \int_{\omega} (u + v)^r dx - \int_{\omega} |u|^r dx - \int_{\omega} |v|^r dx \right| \leq C \int_{\omega} (|u|^{r-1}|v| + |u||v|^{r-1}) dx,$$

where C depends only on r .

Let us consider the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s u = f(u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N > 1$) is a bounded, smooth domain, $s \in (0, 1)$, $p > 1$ and $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

The next two results can be found in Iannizzotto, Mosconi and Squassina [27], Theorems 1.1 and 4.4, respectively.

Proposition 2.8. *There exist $\alpha \in (0, s]$ and $C_\Omega > 0$ depending only on N, p, s , with C_Ω also depending on Ω , such that, for all weak solution $u \in X_p^s$ of (2.1), $u \in C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$ and*

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C_\Omega \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{p-1}}.$$

Proposition 2.9. *Let $u \in X_p^s$ satisfies $|(-\Delta)_p^s u| \leq K$ weakly in Ω for some $K > 0$. Then*

$$|u| \leq (C_\Omega K)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \delta^s \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega,$$

for some $C_\Omega = C(N, p, s, \Omega)$.

We denote

$$S_{p,s} = \inf_{u \in X_p^s} \left\{ \frac{\|u\|_{X_p^s}^p}{\left(\int_{\Omega} |u|^{p_s^*} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}}}; u \in X_p^s, u \neq 0 \right\} \quad (2.2)$$

the best constant of the immersion $X_p^s \hookrightarrow L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)$, see [31].

We now state the following result, which can be found in [31, Proposition 2.1]. See also [10].

Proposition 2.10. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $s \in (0, 1)$, $N > sp$. Then*

- (i) *There exists a minimizer for $S_{p,s}$;*
- (ii) *For every minimizer U , there exist $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and a constant sign monotone function $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $U(x) = u(|x - x_0|)$;*
- (iii) *For every minimizer $U \in X_p^s$, there exists $\lambda_U > 0$ such that $v \in X_p^s$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{(U(x) - U(y))^{p-1} (v(x) - v(y))}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy = \lambda_U \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} U^{p^*-1} v dx.$$

Citing [31], we fix a radially symmetric nonnegative decreasing minimizer $U = U(r)$ para $S_{p,s}$. Multiplying U by a positive constant, we may assume that

$$(-\Delta)_p^s U = U^{p^*-1}. \quad (2.3)$$

It follows from (2.2) that

$$\|U\|_{X_p^s}^p = \|U\|_{L^{p^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{p^*} = (S_{p,s})^{N/sp}. \quad (2.4)$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, the function

$$U_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{(N-sp)/p}} U\left(\frac{|x|}{\varepsilon}\right) \quad (2.5)$$

is also a minimizer of $S_{p,s}$ satisfying (2.3) and (2.4), so after a rescaling we may assume that $U(0) = 1$. Henceforth, U will denote such a function and $\{U_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ the associated family of minimizers given by (2.5).

Since an explicit formula for a minimizer of $S_{p,s}$ is unknown, we make use of some asymptotic estimates obtained by Brasco, Mosconi and Squassina [10], see also [31, Lemma 2.2].

Lemma 2.11. *There exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and $\theta > 1$ such that for all $r \geq 1$,*

$$\frac{c_1}{r^{(N-sp)/(p-1)}} \leq U(r) \leq \frac{c_2}{r^{(N-sp)/(p-1)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{U(\theta r)}{U(r)} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

In order to apply the Linking Theorem with respect to the decomposition given by Proposition 1.1, we consider the family of functions $\{U_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$. Without loss of generality, we suppose that $0 \in \Omega$. From now on, let us consider θ as given in Lemma 2.11. For $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ we define, as in Chen, Mosconi and Squassina [18],

$$m_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \frac{U_\varepsilon(\delta)}{U_\varepsilon(\delta) - U_\varepsilon(\theta\delta)},$$

and also

$$g_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq U_\varepsilon(\theta\delta), \\ m_{\varepsilon,\delta}^p (t - U_\varepsilon(\theta\delta)), & \text{if } U_\varepsilon(\theta\delta) \leq t \leq U_\varepsilon(\delta), \\ t - U_\varepsilon(\delta) (m_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{p-1} - 1), & \text{if } t \geq U_\varepsilon(\delta), \end{cases}$$

Since

$$G_{\varepsilon,\delta}(t) := \int_0^t (g'_{\varepsilon,\delta}(\tau))^{\frac{1}{p}} d\tau = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq U_\varepsilon(\theta\delta), \\ m_{\varepsilon,\delta} (t - U_\varepsilon(\theta\delta)), & \text{if } U_\varepsilon(\theta\delta) \leq t \leq U_\varepsilon(\delta), \\ t, & \text{if } t \geq U_\varepsilon(\delta), \end{cases}$$

it is not difficult to verify that the functions $g_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and $G_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ are non-decreasing and absolutely continuous.

We now define the non-increasing, absolutely continuous and radially symmetric function

$$u_{\varepsilon,\delta}(r) = G_{\varepsilon,\delta}(U_\varepsilon(r))$$

which satisfies

$$u_{\varepsilon,\delta}(r) = \begin{cases} U_\varepsilon(r), & \text{if } r \leq \delta, \\ 0, & \text{if } r \geq \theta\delta. \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

According to Ambrosio and Isernia [5, p. 17], for any $\delta \leq r \leq \theta\delta$ it holds

$$0 \leq m_{\varepsilon,\delta}(U_\varepsilon(r) - U_\varepsilon(\theta\delta)) = U_\varepsilon(\delta) \left[\frac{U_\varepsilon(r) - U_\varepsilon(\theta\delta)}{U_\varepsilon(\delta) - U_\varepsilon(\theta\delta)} \right] \leq U_\varepsilon(\delta).$$

Therefore, the definition of $G_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and (2.6) show that

$$u_{\varepsilon,\delta}(r) \leq \begin{cases} U_\varepsilon(r), & \text{if } r < \theta\delta, \\ 0, & \text{if } r \geq \theta\delta. \end{cases}$$

We define

$$e_{\varepsilon,\delta} = P_+^s u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in W, \quad (2.7)$$

and note that $e_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ is a continuous function. As shown in [10], we know that $U \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C^0(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Since $e_{\varepsilon,\delta} = u_{\varepsilon,\delta} - P_-^s u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$, our claim is proved.

The next result is a special case of the one proved by Chen, Mosconi and Squassina [18, Lemma 2.11].

Lemma 2.12. *For any $\beta > 0$ and $0 < 2\varepsilon \leq \delta < \theta^{-1} \text{dist}(0, \partial\Omega)$ we have*

$$\|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \leq \begin{cases} C_\beta \varepsilon^{N - \frac{N-ps}{p}\beta} |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|, & \text{if } \beta = \frac{p_s^*}{p'}, \\ C_\beta \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}\beta} \delta^{N - \frac{N-sp}{p-1}\beta}, & \text{if } \beta < \frac{p_s^*}{p'}, \\ C_\beta \delta^{N - \frac{N-sp}{p}\beta}, & \text{if } \beta > \frac{p_s^*}{p'}. \end{cases}$$

Of course, $p' = p/(p-1)$. Observe that, taking $\beta = 1$, we obtain

$$\|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \begin{cases} C_1 \varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p}} |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ C_1 \varepsilon^{N - \frac{N-sp}{p}}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ C_1 \delta^{N - \frac{N-sp}{p-1}} \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}}, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s}. \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

Since $(p_s^* - 1)p/(p-1) > p_s^*$, it also follows from Lemma 2.12 by taking $\beta = p_s^* - 1$ that

$$\|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^{p_s^*-1}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*-1} \leq C_{p_s^*-1} \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p}}. \quad (2.9)$$

In order to obtain the estimate (2.12) below we apply [5, Lemma 2.4] and to obtain the other estimates we use arguments similar to those used in [17]. Therefore, we get the following result

Lemma 2.13.

$$\|P_-^s u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \begin{cases} \|\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^p C_1 \varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p}} |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ \|\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^p C_1 \varepsilon^{N - \frac{N-sp}{p}}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ \|\varphi_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^p C_1 \delta^{N - \frac{N-sp}{p-1}} \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}}, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s}. \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

$$\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \begin{cases} C_0 \varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p}} |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s} \\ C_0 \varepsilon^{N - \frac{N-sp}{p}}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ C_0 \delta^{N - \frac{N-sp}{p-1}} \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}}, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s}, \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

$$\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \leq \begin{cases} K_1 \varepsilon^{sp} |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|^p, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2 \\ K_1 \varepsilon^{sp}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2 \\ K_1 \varepsilon^{sp}, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2, \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

$$\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^{p_s^*-1}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*-1} \leq \begin{cases} K_2 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p}} |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|^{p_s^*-1}, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ K_2 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p}}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ K_2 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p}}, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s}, \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} |e_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^{p_s^*} dx - \int_{\Omega} |u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^{p_s^*} dx \right| \leq \begin{cases} K_3 \varepsilon^N |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|^{p_s^*}, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ K_3 \varepsilon^N + K_3 \varepsilon^{N(p_s^*-1)}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ K_3 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s}, \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

Let us now fix $K > 0$.

Lemma 2.14. *There exist $\varepsilon(K) > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$ such that*

$$B_{\sigma}(0) \cap \{x \in \Omega : e_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x) > K\} := \Omega_{\varepsilon,K}$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon(K)$.

As a consequence,

$$\left| \int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon,K}} |e_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^{p_s^*} dx - \int_{\Omega} |u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^{p_s^*} dx \right| \leq \begin{cases} K_4 \varepsilon^N |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|^{p_s^*}, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ K_4 \varepsilon^N + K_4 \varepsilon^{N(p_s^*-1)}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ K_4 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s}, \end{cases}$$

Proof. It follows from the definition of $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$, Lemma 2.11 and (2.10) that

$$e_{\varepsilon,\delta}(0) \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{(N-sp)/p}} - \|P_-^s u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \rightarrow +\infty, \quad (2.15)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the proof of the first claim is complete, because $e_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ is continuous. The proof of the estimates are obtained by applying Lemma 2.4 in de Figueiredo and Yang [20]. \square

The next result can be found in [31, Lema 2.7].

Lemma 2.15. *There exists a constant $C = C(N, p, s) > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \leq \delta/2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad & \|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{W_0^{s,p}}^p \leq S_{p,s}^{N/sp} + C \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}\right)^{(N-sp)/(p-1)}. \\ (ii) \quad & \|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \geq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{C} \varepsilon^{sp} \log\left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right), & N = sp^2 \\ \frac{1}{C} \varepsilon^{sp}, & N > sp^2. \end{cases} \\ (iii) \quad & \|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} \geq S_{p,s}^{N/sp} - C \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}\right)^{N/(p-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the next result is obtained by applying Lemma 2.4 with $a = \|re_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ and $b = \|u_1 + re_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ and considering the cases $0 < \tau < 1$ and $\tau > 1$. In the latter case we then apply Lemma 2.5 and once again Lemma 2.4 with $a = \|re_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|$ and $b = \|u_1\|_{X_p^s}$.

Lemma 2.16. *Suppose that $u_1 \in \text{span}\{\varphi_1\}$. Then there exists a constant $C_* > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p}\|u_1 + re_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p - \frac{a}{p}\|u_1 + re_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p &\leq \frac{1}{p}\|u_1\|_{X_p^s}^p - \frac{a}{p}\|u_1\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p + C_* r^p \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \\ &\quad + C_* r^{p-\tau} \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{p-\tau} \|u_1\|_{X_p^s}^\tau. \end{aligned}$$

3. C_δ^0 VERSUS $W^{s,p}$ MINIMIZATION FOR POLYNOMIAL GROWTH

The next result is a local minimization result for functionals defined in the fractional Sobolev space $X_p^s = W_0^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with polynomial growth nonlinearity, following ideas developed by Barrios, Colorado, de Pablo and Sánchez [7], Giacomoni, Prashanth and Sreenadh [24] and Iannizzotto, Mosconi and Squassina [26].

The result we prove is general than the ones found in [7] and [26], since we allow $p > 1$.

We start showing a regularization result that will be useful in the proof of our main result. Its proof is similar to that of [13, Lemma 3.1].

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose $|g(t)| \leq C(1 + |t|^{q-1})$, for some $1 \leq q \leq p_s^*$ and $C > 0$. Let $(v_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \subseteq X_p^s$ be a bounded family of solutions in X_p^s of*

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s u = \left(\frac{1}{1-\xi_\varepsilon}\right) g(u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

with $\xi_\varepsilon \leq 0$. Then $\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \infty$.

Proof. For $0 < k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$T_k(s) = \begin{cases} s + k, & \text{if } s \leq -k, \\ 0, & \text{if } -k < s < k, \\ s - k, & \text{if } s \geq k \end{cases}$$

and

$$\Omega_k = \{x \in \Omega : |v_\varepsilon(x)| \geq k\}.$$

Observe that $T_k(v_\varepsilon) \in X_p^s$ and $\|T_k(v_\varepsilon)\|_{X_p^s}^p \leq C^p \|v_\varepsilon\|_{X_p^s}^p < \infty$ for a constant $C > 0$.

Taking $T_k(v_\varepsilon)$ as a test-function, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A(v_\varepsilon), T_k(v_\varepsilon) \rangle &= \left(\frac{1}{1-\xi_\varepsilon}\right) \int_\Omega g(v_\varepsilon) T_k(v_\varepsilon) dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega_k} C |T_k(v_\varepsilon)| dx + C \int_{\Omega_k} |v_\varepsilon|^{p_s^*-1} |T_k(v_\varepsilon)| dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now consider $1 < \theta_3 < \theta_2 < p$, $p < \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_3} + 1$ and $(p_s^* - 1)\theta_1 < p_s^*$ such that $\theta_1^{-1} + \theta_2^{-1} + \theta_3^{-1} = 1$. Therefore, by applying Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\langle A(v_\epsilon), T_k(v_\epsilon) \rangle_{X_p^s} \leq C \left(\int_{\Omega} |T_k(v_\epsilon)|^{\theta_2} dx \right)^{1/\theta_2} |\Omega_k|^{1/\theta_3}. \quad (3.2)$$

Denoting $T(x, y) = \frac{|v_\epsilon(x) - v_\epsilon(y)|^{p-2} (v_\epsilon(x) - v_\epsilon(y)) (T_k(v_\epsilon)(x) - T_k(v_\epsilon)(y))}{|x - y|^{N+sp}}$ and $E = \langle A(v_\epsilon), T_k(v_\epsilon) \rangle_{X_p^s}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E &\equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} T(x, y) dx dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[\left(\int_{v_\epsilon(x) \leq -k} + \int_{|v_\epsilon(x)| < k} + \int_{v_\epsilon(x) \geq k} \right) T(x, y) dx \right] dy \\ &\equiv E_1 + E_2 + E_3, \end{aligned}$$

with the integrals E_i defined in the order they appear in the right-hand side.

Let us consider E_1 . It follows from the definition of T_k that

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &\geq \int_{v_\epsilon(y) \leq -k} \left[\int_{v_\epsilon(x) \leq -k} \frac{|T_k(v_\epsilon)(x) - T_k(v_\epsilon)(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx \right] dy \\ &\quad + \int_{|v_\epsilon(y)| < k} \left[\int_{v_\epsilon(x) \leq -k} \frac{|T_k(v_\epsilon)(x) - T_k(v_\epsilon)(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx \right] dy \\ &\quad + \int_{v_\epsilon(y) \geq k} \left[\int_{v_\epsilon(x) \leq -k} \frac{|T_k(v_\epsilon)(x) - T_k(v_\epsilon)(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx \right] dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[\int_{v_\epsilon(x) \leq -k} \frac{|T_k(v_\epsilon)(x) - T_k(v_\epsilon)(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx \right] dy. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously,

$$E_2 \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[\int_{|v_\epsilon(x)| < k} \frac{|T_k(v_\epsilon)(x) - T_k(v_\epsilon)(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx \right] dy$$

and

$$E_3 \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[\int_{v_\epsilon(x) \geq k} \frac{|T_k(v_\epsilon)(x) - T_k(v_\epsilon)(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx \right] dy.$$

Therefore, we have the following estimate

$$\langle A(v_\epsilon), T_k(v_\epsilon) \rangle \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|T_k(v_\epsilon)(x) - T_k(v_\epsilon)(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \geq \|T_k(v_\epsilon)\|_{X_p^s}^p.$$

It follows from the continuous immersion $X_p^s \hookrightarrow L^{\theta_2}(\Omega)$ that (for a constant $C_1 > 0$)

$$C_1 \left(\int_{\Omega} |T_k(v_\epsilon)|^{\theta_2} dx \right)^{p/\theta_2} \leq \langle A(v_\epsilon), T_k(v_\epsilon) \rangle. \quad (3.3)$$

So, (3.2) and (3.3) guarantees the existence of $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} |T_k(v_\epsilon)|^{\theta_2} dx \leq C |\Omega_k|^{\theta_2/\theta_3(p-1)} = C |\Omega_k|^{\beta/\beta-1}, \quad (3.4)$$

where $\beta = \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_2 - \theta_3(p-1)} > 1$, since $p < \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_3} + 1$ then $\theta_2/[\theta_3(p-1)] = \beta/(\beta-1)$.

Since, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $|T_k(s)| = (|s| - k)(1 - \chi_{[-k,k]}(s))$, we conclude that, if $0 < k < h \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\Omega_h \subset \Omega_k$.

Therefore

$$\int_{\Omega} |T_k(v_\epsilon)|^{\theta_2} dx = \int_{\Omega_k} (|v_\epsilon| - k)^{\theta_2} dx \geq \int_{\Omega_h} (|v_\epsilon| - k)^{\theta_2} dx \geq (h - k)^{\theta_2} |\Omega_h|.$$

Defining, for $0 < k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\phi(k) = |\Omega_k|,$$

it follows

$$\phi(h) \leq C(h - k)^{-\theta_2} \phi(k)^{\beta/(\beta-1)}, \quad 0 < k < h \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For $d = 2^\beta C^{1/\theta_2} |\Omega|^{1/(p-1)\theta_2}$, considering the sequece (k_n) defined by $k_0 = 0$ and $k_n = k_{n-1} + d/2^n$, we have $0 \leq \phi(k_n) \leq \phi(0)/(2^{nr(\beta-1)})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi(k_n) = 0$.

Since $\phi(k_n) \geq \phi(d)$ implies $\phi(d) = 0$, we have $|v_\epsilon(x)| \leq d$ a.e. in Ω , for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. We are done. \square

We recall the definitions of the spaces $C_\delta^0(\overline{\Omega})$ and $C_\delta^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$. For this, let $\delta : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be given by $\delta(x) = \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega)$. Then, if $0 < \alpha < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_\delta^0(\overline{\Omega}) &= \left\{ u \in C^0(\overline{\Omega}) : \frac{u}{\delta^s} \text{ has a continuous extension to } \overline{\Omega} \right\} \\ C_\delta^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}) &= \left\{ u \in C^0(\overline{\Omega}) : \frac{u}{\delta^s} \text{ has a } \alpha\text{-H\"older extension to } \overline{\Omega} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

with the respective norms

$$\|u\|_{0,\delta} = \left\| \frac{u}{\delta^s} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{\alpha,\delta} = \|u\|_{0,\delta} + \sup_{x,y \in \overline{\Omega}, x \neq y} \frac{|u(x)/\delta(x)^s - u(y)/\delta(y)^s|}{|x - y|^\alpha}.$$

We emphasize that, only in this section, δ stands for the function defined by $\delta(x) = \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$.

The proof of the next result is similar to that of [13, Theorem 1].

Proof of Theorem 2. Let us consider first the *subcritical case* $q < p_s^*$.

Denoting $B_\epsilon = \{z \in X_p^s : \|z\|_{X_p^s} \leq \epsilon\}$, by contradiction let us suppose that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $u_\epsilon \in B_\epsilon$ such that

$$\Phi(u_\epsilon) < \Phi(0). \quad (3.5)$$

Since $\Phi : B_\epsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is weakly lower semicontinuous, there exists $v_\epsilon \in B_\epsilon$ such that $\inf_{u \in B_\epsilon} \Phi(u) = \Phi(v_\epsilon)$. It follows from (3.5) that

$$\Phi(v_\epsilon) = \inf_{u \in B_\epsilon[0]} \Phi(u) \leq \Phi(u_\epsilon) < \Phi(0).$$

We will show that

$$v_\epsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } C_\delta^0(\overline{\Omega}) \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

since this implies that, for $r_1 > 0$, the existence of $z \in C_\delta^0(\overline{\Omega})$, such that $\|z\|_{0,\delta} < r_1$ and $\Phi(z) < \Phi(0)$, contradicting our hypothesis.

Since v_ϵ is a critical point of Φ in X_p^s , by Lagrange multipliers we obtain the existence of $\xi_\epsilon \leq 0$ such that

$$\langle \Phi'(v_\epsilon), \phi \rangle = \xi_\epsilon \langle v_\epsilon, \phi \rangle, \quad \forall \phi \in X_p^s.$$

Thus, v_ϵ satisfies

$$(Pv) \quad \begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s v_\epsilon = \left(\frac{1}{1 - \xi_\epsilon} \right) g(v_\epsilon) =: g^\epsilon(v_\epsilon) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v_\epsilon = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases}$$

If $\|v_\epsilon\|_{X_p^s} \leq \epsilon < 1$, Proposition 3.1 shows the existence of a constant $C_1 > 0$, not depending on ϵ , such that

$$\|v_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_1. \quad (3.6)$$

Since $\xi_\epsilon \leq 0$, (1.2) and (3.6) show that

$$\|g^\epsilon(v_\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty(0,1)} \leq C_2$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$.

Proposition 2.8 then yields $\|v_\epsilon\|_{C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C_3$, for $0 < \beta \leq s$ and a constant C_3 not depending on ϵ .

It follows from Arzelà-Ascoli theorem the existence of a *sequence* (v_ϵ) such that $v_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ uniformly as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Passing to a subsequence, we can suppose that $v_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ a. e. in Ω and, therefore, $v_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$. But now follows from Proposition 2.9 that

$$\|v_\epsilon\|_{0,\delta} = \left\| \frac{v_\epsilon}{\delta^s} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C \sup_{x \in (0,1)} |g^\epsilon(v_\epsilon(x))|$$

for a constant $C > 0$. The proof of the subcritical case is complete.

We now consider the critical case $q = p_s^*$. As before, we argument by contradiction. For this, we define $g_k, G_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$g_k(s) = g(t_k(s)) \quad \text{and} \quad G_k(t) = \int_0^t g_k(s) ds,$$

with t_k given by

$$t_k(s) = \begin{cases} -k, & \text{if } s \leq -k \\ s, & \text{if } -k < s < k \\ k, & \text{if } s \geq k. \end{cases}$$

Considering $\Phi_k \in C^1(X_p^s, \mathbb{R})$ given by

$$\Phi_k(u) = \frac{\|u\|_{X_p^s}^p}{p} - \int_{\Omega} G_k(t) dt,$$

it follows $\Phi_k(u) \rightarrow \Phi(u)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $k_\epsilon \geq 1$ such that $\Phi_{k_\epsilon}(w_\epsilon) < \Phi(0)$ and the subcritical growth of g_k guarantees the existence of $u_\epsilon \in B_\epsilon$ such that

$$\Phi_{k_\epsilon}(u_\epsilon) = \inf_{u \in B_\epsilon[0]} \Phi_{k_\epsilon}(u) \leq \Phi_{k_\epsilon}(w_\epsilon) < \Phi(0).$$

As in the subcritical case, we find $\xi_\epsilon \leq 0$ such that u_ϵ is a weak solution to the problem (Pv) with u_ϵ instead of v_ϵ .

The definition of g_k , and since $\|u_\epsilon\|_{X_p^s} \leq \epsilon < 1$, by applying Proposition 3.1 we obtain

$$\|g_{k_\epsilon}^\epsilon(u_\epsilon)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_2$$

for a constant $C_2 > 0$. It follows from Proposition 2.8 that $\|u_\epsilon\|_{C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C_3$, with $0 < \beta \leq s$ and a constant C_3 that does not depend on ϵ . It follows from Arzelà-Ascoli theorem the existence of a *sequence* (u_ϵ) such that $u_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ uniformly as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Passing to a subsequence, we can suppose that $u_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ a. e. in Ω and, therefore, $u_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$. But now it follows from Proposition 2.9 that

$$\|u_\epsilon\|_{0,\delta} = \left\| \frac{u_\epsilon}{\delta^s} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C \sup_{x \in (0,1)} |g^\epsilon(u_\epsilon(x))|$$

for a constant $C > 0$. We are done. \square

Remark 3.2. *Observe that, if 0 a strict local minimum in $C_\delta^0(\overline{\Omega})$, then 0 is also a strict local minimum in X_p^s .*

4. POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE SOLUTIONS

Taking care of the operator A , the next two results are obtained by adapting arguments presented in [21].

Lemma 4.1. *If $\lambda_1 < a$, $1 < q < p$ and $\lambda > 0$, then any (PS) -sequence of $I_{\lambda,s}$ is bounded.*

Lemma 4.2. *If $\lambda_1 < a$, $1 < q < p$ and $\lambda > 0$, then $I_{\lambda,s}$ satisfies the (PS) -condition at any level*

$$C < \frac{s}{N} b^{\frac{sp-N}{sp}} S_{p,s}^{\frac{N}{sp}}.$$

We now consider the positive part of the functional $I_{\lambda,s}$. That is, $I_{\lambda,s}^+ : X_p^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$I_{\lambda,s}^+(u) = \frac{1}{p} \|u\|_{X_p^s}^p + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u^+|^q dx - \frac{a}{p} \int_{\Omega} |u^+|^p dx - \frac{b}{p_s^*} \int_{\Omega} (u^+)^{p_s^*} dx.$$

Of course, $I_{\lambda,s}^+ \in C^1(X_p^s, \mathbb{R})$ and it holds, for all $u, h \in X_p^s$,

$$\langle (I_{\lambda,s}^+)'(u), h \rangle = \langle A(u), h \rangle + \lambda \int_{\Omega} |u^+|^{q-1} h dx - a \int_{\Omega} |u^+|^{p-1} h dx - \frac{b}{p_s^*} \int_{\Omega} (u^+)^{p_s^*-1} h dx.$$

Furthermore, critical points of $I_{\lambda,s}^+$ are weak solutions of

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s u &= -\lambda|u^+|^{q-1} + a|u^+|^{p-1} + (u^+)^{p_s^*-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $1 < q < p$ and $u^+ = \max\{u, 0\}$.

If u is a critical point of $I_{\lambda,s}^+$, then $\langle (I_{\lambda,s}^+)'(u), h \rangle = 0$ for all $h \in X_p^s$. Taking $h = u^-$, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that

$$0 = \langle (I_{\lambda,s}^+)'(u), u^- \rangle = \langle A(u), u^- \rangle \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u^-(x) - u^-(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dx dy = \|u^-\|_{X_p^s}^p$$

and therefore $u^- = 0$. Thus, a critical point u of $I_{\lambda,s}^+$ satisfies $u = u^+ \geq 0$.

As in the proof of Lemma 4.2, we have that $I_{\lambda,s}^+$ satisfy the (PS) -condition at any level

$$C < \frac{s}{N} b^{\frac{sp-N}{sp}} S_{p,s}^{\frac{N}{sp}}, \quad (4.1)$$

for any $\lambda > 0$.

In order to show that $I_{\lambda,s}^+$ satisfies the geometric conditions of the Mountain Pass Theorem, we define for any $u \in X_p^s$,

$$J_{\lambda,s}(u) := I_{\lambda,s}(u) - \frac{1}{p} \|u\|_{X_p^s}^p = \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx - \frac{a}{p} \int_{\Omega} |u|^p dx - \frac{b}{p_s^*} \int_{\Omega} |u^+|^{p_s^*} dx.$$

Lemma 4.3. *If $a > 0$ and $1 < q < p$, then the trivial solution $u = 0$ is a strict local minimizer of $J_{\lambda,s}^+$ for any $\lambda > 0$.*

Proof. According to Remark 3.2, it is enough to show that $u = 0$ is a strict local minimum of $I_{\lambda,s}^+$ in $C_{\delta}^0(\overline{\Omega})$. Take $u \in C_{\delta}^0(\overline{\Omega})$ and consider

$$J_{\lambda,s}^+(u) := I_{\lambda,s}^+(u) - \frac{1}{p} \|u\|_{X_p^s}^p = \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u^+|^q dx - \frac{a}{p} \int_{\Omega} |u^+|^p dx - \frac{b}{p_s^*} \int_{\Omega} |u^+|^{p_s^*} dx.$$

So for positive constants C_1 and C_2 , we have that

$$J_{\lambda,s}^+(u) \geq \left(\frac{\lambda}{q} - \frac{aC_1}{p} \|u\|_{0,\delta}^{p-q} - \frac{bC_2}{p_s^*} \|u\|_{0,\delta}^{p_s^*-q} \right) \int_{\Omega} |u^+|^q dx \quad (4.2)$$

This implies for all $\|u\|_{0,\delta}$, sufficiently small,

$$J_{\lambda,s}^+(u) > 0 = J_{\lambda,s}^+(0). \quad \square$$

Lemma 4.4. *If $\lambda_1 < a$, $1 < q < p$ and $b > 0$, then, for any fixed $\Lambda > 0$, there exists $t_0 = t_0(\Lambda) > 0$ such that*

$$I_{\lambda,s}^+(t\varphi_1) < 0,$$

for all $t \geq t_0$ and $\lambda < \Lambda$.

Proof. For a fixed $\Lambda > 0$, our hypotheses guarantee that we can choose $t_0 = t_0(\Lambda) > 0$ such that, if $t \geq t_0$ and $\lambda < \Lambda$, it follows $I_{\lambda,s}^+(t\varphi_1) < 0$. \square

Now we prove that (1.1) has at least one positive solution.

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose that $\lambda > 0$, $1 < q < p$, $\lambda_1 < a$ and $b > 0$. Then, there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that, if*

$$0 < \lambda < \lambda_0,$$

then problem (1.1) has at least one positive solution.

Proof. We observe that a non non-negative weak solution of (1.1) is a critical point of the functional $I_{\lambda,s}^+$.

We now apply the Mountain Pass Theorem. The geometric conditions of this theorem are consequences of Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4. We now prove the existence of $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that, if $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$, then $I_{\lambda,s}^+$ satisfies the (PS) -condition at level

$$C_\lambda^+ = \inf_{g \in \Gamma^+} \max_{u \in g([0,1])} I_{\lambda,s}^+(u),$$

where $\Gamma^+ = \{g \in C([0,1], X_p^s) : g(0) = 0, g(1) = t_0 \varphi_1\}$, with t_0 obtained in Lemma 4.4.

In order to do that, we observe that, for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$, we have as consequences of our hypotheses that

$$\inf_{g \in \Gamma^+} \max_{u \in g([0,1])} I_{\lambda,s}^+(u) \leq \max_{u \in g_0([0,1])} I_{\lambda,s}^+(u) = \max_{t \in [0,1]} I_{\lambda,s}^+(g_0(t)) \leq \frac{\lambda t_0^q}{q} |\varphi_1|_{L^q(\Omega)}^q,$$

it follows there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq C_\lambda^+ < \frac{s}{N} b^{\frac{sp-N}{sp}} S_{p,s}^{\frac{N}{sp}}, \quad \text{for all } 0 < \lambda < \lambda_0 < \Lambda,$$

with Λ as in Lemma 4.4. The proof is complete as a consequence of (4.1). \square

In order to show the existence of a negative solution for $I_{\lambda,s}$, we consider $I_{\lambda,s}^- : X_p^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by where $u^- = \min\{u, 0\}$.

Of course $I_{\lambda,s}^- \in C^1(X_p^s, \mathbb{R})$ and critical points of $I_{\lambda,s}^-$ are weak solutions to the problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s u = -\lambda |u^-|^{q-1} + a |u^-|^{p-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

As before, a critical point u of $I_{\lambda,s}^-$ satisfies $u = u^- \leq 0$.

Observe that $I_{\lambda,s}^-$ satisfies the (PS) -condition at all levels, for any $\lambda > 0$, since the nonlinearity in (4.3) does not have fractional critical power.

To show that the geometric conditions of the Mountain Pass Theorem are satisfied, we define, for $u \in X_p^s$,

$$J_{\lambda,s}^-(u) := I_{\lambda,s}^-(u) - \frac{1}{p} \|u\|_{X_p^s}^p = \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u^-|^q dx - \frac{a}{p} \int_{\Omega} |u^-|^p dx.$$

Lemma 4.6. *If $0 < a$ and $1 < q < p$, then $u = 0$ is a strict local minimizer of $J_{\lambda,s}^-$ for all $\lambda > 0$.*

Proof. According to Remark 3.2, it is enough to show that $u = 0$ is a strict local minimum of $J_{\lambda,s}^-$ in $C_\delta^0(\overline{\Omega})$. It is not difficult to verify that, for all $u \in C_\delta^0(\overline{\Omega}) \setminus \{0\}$,

we have

$$J_{\lambda,s}^-(u) > \left(\frac{\lambda}{q} - \frac{a}{p} \|u\|_{0,\delta}^{p-q} \right) \int_{\Omega} |u^-|^q dx$$

and for a fixed $\lambda > 0$, taking $R = \lambda p / (qa)$, it follows $a \|u\|_{0,\delta}^{p-q} / p < \lambda / q$ and

$$J_{\lambda,s}^-(u) > 0 = J_{\lambda,s}^-(0), \text{ if } \|u\|_{0,\delta} < R.$$

□

The proof of the next result is analogous to that of Lemma 4.5.

Lemma 4.7. *If $\lambda_1 < a$, $1 < q < p$ and $b > 0$, then, for any fixed $\Lambda > 0$, there exists $t'_0 = t'_0(\Lambda) > 0$ such that*

$$I_{\lambda,s}^-(-t\varphi_1) < 0,$$

for all $t \geq t'_0$ and $\lambda < \Lambda$.

The proof of the next result is similar to that of Proposition 4.5. In the proof, the inequality

$$0 \leq C_{\lambda}^- \leq \frac{\lambda(t'_0)^q}{q} |\varphi_1|_q^q, \text{ for all } \lambda > 0.$$

play an essential role, with C_{λ}^- defined analogously to C_{λ}^+ .

Proposition 4.8. *Suppose that $\lambda > 0$, $1 < q < p$, $\lambda_1 < a$ and $b > 0$. Then, there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that, if*

$$0 < \lambda < \lambda_0,$$

then problem (1.1) has at least one negative solution.

5. A THIRD SOLUTION VIA LINKING THEOREM

In this section we obtain a third solution by applying the Linking Theorem. We suppose $0 < s < 1$, $N > sp$, $\lambda > 0$, $\lambda_1 < a < \lambda^*$ and $b > 0$.

In order to obtain the geometric conditions of the Linking Theorem, we consider the decomposition given by Proposition 1.1, namely

$$X_p^s = \text{span}\{\varphi_1\} \oplus W,$$

where $\text{span}\{\varphi_1\}$ is the space generated by the first (positive, L^p -normalized) autofunction of $(-\Delta)_p^s$.

The next result will be used to prove that the geometric conditions of the Linking Theorem are satisfied.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that $a < \lambda^*$. Then, there exist α and $\rho > 0$ such that $I_{\lambda,s}(u) \geq \alpha$ for any $u \in W$ with $\|u\| = \rho$.*

Proof. Since $a > 0$, from the definition of λ^* combined with the immersion $X_p^s \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$, for $r \in [p, p_s^*]$, we obtain

$$I_{\lambda,s}(u) \geq \frac{1}{p} \left(1 - \frac{a}{\lambda^*} \right) \|u\|_{X_p^s}^p - \frac{bC^{p_s^*}}{p_s^*} \|u\|_{X_p^s}^{p_s^*},$$

and we conclude that $I_{\lambda,s}(u) \geq \alpha$ for all $u \in W$ satisfying $\|u\|_{X_p^s} = \rho$. \square

We now observe that it follows from Lemma 2.14 that there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$e_{\varepsilon,\delta} \neq 0, \quad 0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0, \quad \text{where } e_{\varepsilon,\delta} \text{ was defined in (2.7).}$$

Thus, in the Linking Theorem, we can take $e = e_{\varepsilon,\delta}$.

If $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, take $R_1, R_2 > 0$ and define

$$Q_{\varepsilon,R_1,R_2} := \{u \in X_p^s : u = u_1 + r e_{\varepsilon,\delta}, u_1 \in \text{span}\{\varphi_1\} \cap \overline{B}_{R_1}(0), 0 \leq r \leq R_2\}. \quad (5.1)$$

Denote by $\partial Q_{\varepsilon,R_1,R_2}$ the boundary of Q_{ε,R_1,R_2} in the finite dimensional space $\text{span}\{\varphi_1\} \oplus \text{span}\{e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\}$.

We denote $O(\varepsilon^\omega)$ for $\omega \geq 0$ if $|O(\varepsilon^\omega)| \leq C\varepsilon^\omega$ for some $C > 0$, not depending on $\varepsilon > 0$. We remark that $O(\varepsilon^\omega)$ is not always positive.

Adapting ideas from Miyagaki, Motreanu and Pereira [30] and de Figueiredo and Yang [20], we obtain the next result.

Proposition 5.2. *Consider Q_{ε,R_1,R_2} defined in (5.1). There exist $R_1 > 0$ and $R_2 > 0$ large enough so that*

$$I_{\lambda,s}(u) \leq \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx, \quad \forall u \in \partial Q_{\varepsilon,R_1,R_2},$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough and all $\lambda > 0$.

Proof. We write $\partial Q_{\varepsilon,R_1,R_2} = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3$, with

$$\Gamma_1 = B_{R_1} \cap \text{span}\{\varphi_1\},$$

$$\Gamma_2 = \{u \in X_p^s : u = u_1 + r e_{\varepsilon,\delta}, u_1 \in \text{span}\{\varphi_1\}, \|u_1\|_{X_p^s} = R_1, 0 \leq r \leq R_2\},$$

$$\Gamma_3 = \{u \in X_p^s : u = u_1 + R_2 e_{\varepsilon,\delta}, u_1 \in \text{span}\{\varphi_1\}, \|u_1\|_{X_p^s} \leq R_1\}.$$

We consider $I_{\lambda,s}$ in the three parts of the boundary Q_{ε,R_1,R_2} . If $u \in \Gamma_1$, then $u = t\varphi_1$ and we obtain

$$I_{\lambda,s}(u) \leq \frac{|t|^p}{p} (\lambda_1 - a) \int_{\Omega} |\varphi_1|^p dx + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |\varphi_1|^q dx \leq \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx, \quad \forall u \in \Gamma_1,$$

as desired.

If $u \in \Gamma_2$, then $u = u_1 + r e_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in \text{span}\{\varphi_1\} \oplus \text{span}\{e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\}$, with $\|u_1\|_{X_p^s} = R_1$. Since P_+^s is bounded in X_p^s , there exist $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s} = \|P_+^s u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s} \leq C_1 \|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}.$$

It follows then from Lemma 2.15 the existence of $C > 0$ such that, for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \widehat{\varepsilon}_0 = \min\{\delta/2, \varepsilon_0\}$, we have

$$\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p \leq C_1^p \|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p \leq C_1^p S_{p,s}^{N/sp} + C_1^p C \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}\right)^{(N-sp)/(p-1)}.$$

We conclude that $\eta := \sup_{0 < \varepsilon \leq \widehat{\varepsilon}_0} \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}$ is finite.

In order to satisfy the condition $R_2 \|e_{\varepsilon, \delta}\| > \rho$ in the Linking Theorem for $0 < \varepsilon \leq \widehat{\varepsilon}_0$ small enough, with $\delta < \theta^{-1} \text{dist}(0, \partial\Omega)/2$ as in Lemma 2.12 and $\rho > 0$ as in Proposition 5.1, we must have

$$R_2 \eta \geq R_2 \|e_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{X_p^s} > \rho,$$

showing that ρ/η is a lower bound for R_2 .

Thus, we define $r_0 = \max\{\rho/\eta, 1\}$ and consider two cases:

a) $0 \leq r \leq r_0$. Since all norms are equivalent in finite dimensional spaces

$$I_{\lambda, s}(u) \leq \frac{1}{p} \left(1 - \frac{a}{\lambda_1}\right) R_1^p + C_* r_0^p \eta^p + C_* r_0^{p-\tau} \eta^{p-\tau} R_1^\tau + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx.$$

Taking $R_1 > 0$ large enough, the result is obtained in this case.

b) $r > r_0$. We suppose $R_1 \geq 1$ and denote

$$K(R_1) := \frac{1}{r_0} \sup \left\{ \|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} : u_1 \in \text{span}\{\varphi_1\}, \|u_1\|_{X_p^s} = R_1 \right\} \in [c_0 R_1, c_1 R_1],$$

with constants $c_0 > 0$ and $c_1 > 0$. We introduce the open set

$$\Omega_{\varepsilon, \delta} = \{x \in \Omega : e_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x) > K(R_1)\}.$$

It follows from (2.15) that $0 \in \Omega_{\varepsilon, \delta}$ if $\varepsilon \in (0, \widehat{\varepsilon}_0]$.

If $x \in \Omega_{\varepsilon, \delta}$ and $r > r_0$, we have $e_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x) > |u_1(x)/r| \geq -\frac{u_1(x)}{r}$ a.e. in Ω . That is,

$$e_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x) + \frac{u_1(x)}{r} > 0 \tag{5.2}$$

for all $x \in \Omega_{\varepsilon, \delta}$, $r > r_0$ and $u_1 \in \text{span}\{\varphi_1\}$ with $\|u_1\|_{X_p^s} = R_1$.

We now take $R_2 = 2R_1$. As consequence of (2.16) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\lambda, s}(u) &\leq \frac{1}{p} \left(1 - \frac{a}{\lambda_1}\right) R_1^p + C_* r^p (C_1^p S_{p, s}^{N/sp} + C_0) + 2^{p-\tau} C_* R_1^p \|e_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{p-\tau} \\ &\quad - \frac{b}{p_s^*} r^{p_s^*} \int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon, \delta}} \left(\frac{u_1}{r} + e_{\varepsilon, \delta}\right)^{p_s^*} + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx \end{aligned}$$

and applying Lemma 2.7 for $u = u_1/r$, $v = e_{\varepsilon, \delta}$ and $\omega = \Omega_{\varepsilon, \delta}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\lambda, s}(u) &\leq \frac{1}{p} \left(1 - \frac{a}{\lambda_1}\right) R_1^p + C_* r^p (C_1^p S_{p, s}^{N/sp} + C_0) + 2^{p-\tau} C_* R_1^p \|e_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{p-\tau} \\ &\quad - \frac{b}{p_s^*} r^{p_s^*} \left[\|e_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega_{\varepsilon, \delta})}^{p_s^*} - C_2 \left(\|e_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} R_1^{p_s^*-1} + \|e_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{L^{p_s^*-1}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*-1} R_1 \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx \end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant $C_2 > 0$.

We consider the case $p > \frac{2N}{N+s}$ and $N > sp^2$, since the cases $1 < p < 2N/(N+s)$ and $N > sp^2$ or $p = 2N/(N+s)$ and $N > sp^2$ are analogous.

The estimates (2.11), (2.12), (2.13) and (2.14) combined with Lemma 2.15, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\lambda,s}(u) &\leq \frac{1}{p} \left[\left(1 - \frac{a}{\lambda_1} \right) + 2^{p-\tau} C_* \varepsilon^s (p-\tau) \right] R_1^p + C_* r^p (C_1^p S_{p,s}^{N/sp} + C_0) \\ &\quad - \frac{b}{p_s^*} r^{p_s^*} \left[S_{p,s}^{N/sp} + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}) - C_2 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)} - \gamma(p_s^* - 1)} - C_2 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p} - \gamma} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx, \end{aligned}$$

where γ is chosen such that $0 < \gamma < \min \left\{ \frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)(p_s^* - 1)}, \frac{N-sp}{p} \right\}$.

Taking

$$A = \left(1 - \frac{a}{\lambda_1} \right) + 2^{p-\tau} C_* \varepsilon^s (p-\tau), \quad B = C_* p (C_1^p S_{p,s}^{N/sp} + C_0)$$

and

$$C = b S_{p,s}^{N/sp} + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}) - b C_2 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)} - \gamma(p_s^* - 1)} - b C_2 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p} - \gamma},$$

and choosing $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1 < \widehat{\varepsilon}_0$ so that $A < 0$ and $C > 0$, we have

$$I_{\lambda,s}(u) \leq \frac{A}{p} R_1^p + \frac{B}{p} r^p - \frac{C}{p_s^*} r^{p_s^*} + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx.$$

By applying Lemma 2.6 to the function $h(r) = (Br^p/p) - (Cr^{p_s^*}/p_s^*)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\lambda,s}(u) &\leq \frac{A}{p} R_1^p + \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{C_* p (C_1^p S_{p,s}^{N/sp} + C_0)}{b S_{p,s}^{N/sp} + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}) - b C_2 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)} - \gamma(p_s^* - 1)} - b C_2 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p} - \gamma}} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $A < 0$, $R_1 > 0$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \widehat{\varepsilon}_1 < \varepsilon_0$ can be chosen small enough, we have the result for $u \in \Gamma_2$.

Finally, if $u \in \Gamma_3$, then $u = u_1 + R_2 e_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in \text{span}\{\varphi_1\} \oplus \text{span}\{e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\}$, with $\|u_1\|_{X_p^s} \leq R_1$. We recall that $R_2 = 2R_1$.

By (2.16), since $\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}$ is bounded, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\lambda,s}(u) &\leq \left[C_* (C_1^p S_{p,s}^{N/sp} + C_0) + \frac{C_* C_2}{2^\tau} \right] R_2^p - \frac{b}{p_s^*} R_2^{p_s^*} \int_{\Omega} \left(\left(\frac{u_1}{R_2} + e_{\varepsilon,\delta} \right)^+ \right)^{p_s^*} \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

But there exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ such that, if $\|u_1\|_{X_p^s} \leq R_1$, then

$$\|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_3 \|u_1\|_{X_p^s} \leq C_3 R_1.$$

Furthermore,

$$\Omega'_\varepsilon := \left\{ x \in \Omega : e_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x) > \frac{C_3}{2} + 1 \right\} \supset \{x \in \Omega : e_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x) > C_3 + 1\} := D_\varepsilon \quad (5.4)$$

with $|D_\varepsilon| > 0$.

So, for all $x \in \Omega'$, it follows from (5.2), (5.4) and $R_2 = 2R_1$ that

$$\frac{u_1(x)}{R_2} + e_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x) > \frac{u_1(x)}{R_2} + \frac{C_3 R_1}{R_2} + 1 \geq \frac{u_1(x)}{R_2} + \frac{\|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{R_2} + 1 \geq 1. \quad (5.5)$$

Substituting (5.4) and (5.5) into (5.3) we obtain

$$I_{\lambda,s}(u) \leq \left[C_* (C_1^p S_{p,s}^{N/sp} + C_0) + \frac{C_* C_2}{2^\tau} \right] R_2^p - \frac{b}{p_s^*} R_2^{p_s^*} |D_\varepsilon| + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_\Omega |u|^q dx,$$

for all $u \in \Gamma_3$. Our proof is complete. \square

Remark 5.3. *It is noteworthy to remark that R_1 , R_2 and ε in Proposition 5.2 do not depend on λ .*

By adapting the proof of Lemma 6.1 in Miyagaki, Motreanu and Pereira [30], we obtain the following result. Some details are to be found there.

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that $N > sp$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, the following estimate is true.*

$$I_{\lambda,s}(u) \leq \frac{s}{N} \left(\frac{1}{b} \right)^{\frac{N-sp}{sp}} \left(\frac{\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p - a \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p}{\|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^p} \right)^{\frac{N}{sp}} + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_\Omega |u|^q dx$$

$$+ \begin{cases} K_0 \varepsilon^{s(p-1)} |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|^{p_s^*}, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2 \\ K_0 \varepsilon^{s(p-1)}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ e } N > sp^2 \\ K_0 \varepsilon^{s(p-1)} + K_0 \varepsilon^s, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ e } N > sp^2, \end{cases}$$

for all $u \in Q_{\varepsilon,R_1,R_2}$, where the constant $K_0 > 0$ does not depend on ε .

Proof. By applying Lemma 2.3 for $a = u_1(x)$ and $b = u_1(x) + r e_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x)$, the equivalences of norms in finite dimensional spaces guarantees that

$$\frac{1}{p} \|u_1 + r e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p - \frac{a}{p} \|u_1 + r e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \leq \frac{1}{p} \left(\|u_1\|_{X_p^s}^p - a \|u_1\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \right)$$

$$+ \frac{r^p}{p} \left(\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p - a \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \right) + C R_2^{p-1} \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{p-1} \|u_1\|_{X_p^s}$$

$$+ C R_2 \|u_1\|_{X_p^s}^{p-1} \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

Thus, by applying Lemma 2.16 and estimates (2.12), we obtain

$$I_{\lambda,s}(u) \leq \frac{r^p}{p} \left(\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p - a \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \right) - \frac{b}{p_s^*} \int_\Omega (u^+)^{p_s^*} dx + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_\Omega |u|^q dx$$

$$+ \begin{cases} 2C' \varepsilon^{s(p-1)} |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2 \\ 2C' \varepsilon^{s(p-1)}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2 \\ C' \varepsilon^{s(p-1)} + C' \varepsilon^s, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2. \end{cases}$$

Estimating the term $-b/p_s^* \|u^+\|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*}$ by applying estimates (2.8) and (2.9), we obtain the existence of a constant $C_6 > 0$ such that

$$-\frac{b}{p_s^*} \int_{\Omega} (u^+)^{p_s^*} dx \leq -\frac{br^{p_s^*}}{p_s^*} \int_{\Omega} (u_{\varepsilon,\delta})^{p_s^*} dx + \begin{cases} C_6 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p}} |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|^{p_s^*}, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ C_6 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p}} + C_6 \varepsilon^{N(p_s^*-1)}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ C_6 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p}}, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we conclude the existence of a constant $K_0 > 0$ such that

$$I_{\lambda,s}(u) \leq \frac{r^p}{p} \left(\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_X^p - a \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \right) - \frac{br^{p_s^*}}{p_s^*} \int_{\Omega} |u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^{p_s^*} dx + \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_{\Omega} |u|^q dx + \begin{cases} K_0 \varepsilon^{s(p-1)} |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|^{p_s^*}, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2 \\ K_0 \varepsilon^{s(p-1)}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2 \\ K_0 \varepsilon^{s(p-1)} + K_0 \varepsilon^s, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2. \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

By applying Lemma 2.6 we have that the function $f : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f(t) = \frac{t^p}{p} \left(\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_X^p - a \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \right) - \frac{bt^{p_s^*}}{p_s^*} \|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*},$$

admits its maximum at a point t_M so that

$$f(t_M) = \frac{s}{N} \left(\frac{1}{b} \right)^{\frac{N-sp}{sp}} \left(\frac{\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_X^p - a \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p}{b \|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^p} \right)^{\frac{N}{sp}}.$$

Our result follows from (5.6). \square

Also the next result adapts the similar result (Lemma 6.2) in [30].

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose that $N > sp^2$ and $1 < p \leq \frac{2N}{N+s}$. Then we have*

$$c_s := \inf_{h \in \Gamma} \sup_{u \in Q_{\varepsilon,R_1,R_2}} I_{\lambda,s}(h(u)) < \frac{s}{N} b^{\frac{sp-N}{sp}} S_{p,s}^{\frac{N}{sp}}$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ small enough, where

$$\Gamma = \{h \in C(Q_{\varepsilon,R_1,R_2}, X) : h = id \text{ in } \partial Q_{\varepsilon,R_1,R_2}\}.$$

The same result is also valid if $N > sp((p-1)^2 + p)$ and $p > 2N/(N+s)$.

Proof. Since $h = id_{Q_{\varepsilon,R_1,R_2}} \in \Gamma$, the compactness of Q_{ε,R_1,R_2} assures that is enough to prove

$$I_{\lambda,s}(u) < \frac{s}{N} b^{\frac{sp-N}{sp}} S_{p,s}^{\frac{N}{sp}}, \quad \forall u \in Q_{\varepsilon,R_1,R_2}. \quad (5.7)$$

By applying Lemma 2.5 for $a = u_{\varepsilon,\delta} - P_- u_{\varepsilon,\delta} = e_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and $b = P_+^s u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$, for some constant $c_0 > 0$ we have,

$$\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \geq \frac{1}{c_0} \|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p - \|P_-^s u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p.$$

Since $N > sp^2$, it follows from Lemma 2.15 that $\|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \geq c_2 \varepsilon^{sp}$ for a constant $c_2 > 0$. Taking into account (2.10), we obtain

$$\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \geq \frac{c_2}{c_0} \varepsilon^{sp} - \begin{cases} c_1 \varepsilon^N |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|^p, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2, \\ c_1 \varepsilon^{N(p-1)+sp}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2, \\ c_1 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s} \text{ and } N > sp^2. \end{cases}$$

But Lemma 2.15 yields

$$\|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} \geq S_{p,s}^{\frac{N}{sp}} + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p-1}}).$$

Now, mimicking [17, p.286], we obtain

$$\left| \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p - \|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p \right| \leq c_3 \|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^{p-1} \|P_-^s u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + c_3 \|P_-^s u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^p.$$

A new application of Lemma 2.15 and the estimate (2.10) give

$$\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p \leq \|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p + \begin{cases} c_4 \varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p}} |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})|, & \text{if } p = \frac{2N}{N+s} \\ c_4 \varepsilon^{N - \frac{N-sp}{p}}, & \text{if } 1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s}, \\ c_4 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}}, & \text{if } p > \frac{2N}{N+s}. \end{cases}$$

Case 1: Suppose $N > sp^2$ and $p = 2N/(N+s)$.

By applying the mean value theorem to the function $f(t) = (1+t)^{\frac{N-sp}{N}}$, we conclude that

$$\left| 1 - \left(1 + S_{p,s}^{-\frac{N}{sp}} O(\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p-1}}) \right)^{\frac{N-sp}{N}} \right| = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p-1}}).$$

Then adding and subtracting $\left(1 + S_{p,s}^{-\frac{N}{sp}} O(\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p-1}}) \right)^{\frac{N-sp}{N}} S_{p,s}^{\frac{N}{sp}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p - a \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p}{\|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^p} \\ & \leq S_{p,s} + \frac{\varepsilon^{sp} \left[O(\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p-1}-sp}) + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}-sp}) + (c_4 + ac_2) \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p}} |\log(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta})| - a \frac{c_2}{c_0} \right]}{\left(S_{p,s}^{\frac{N}{sp}} + O(\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p-1}}) \right)^{\frac{N-sp}{N}}}, \end{aligned}$$

from what follows

$$\frac{\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p - a \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p}{\|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^p} < S_{p,s}, \quad (5.8)$$

if $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough. Therefore,

$$\frac{s}{N} \left(\frac{1}{b} \right)^{\frac{N-sp}{sp}} \left(\frac{\|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{X_p^s}^p - a \|e_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p}{\|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^p} \right)^{\frac{N}{sp}} < \frac{s}{N} \left(\frac{1}{b} \right)^{\frac{N-sp}{sp}} S_{p,s}^{\frac{N}{sp}},$$

The boundness of Q_{ε,R_1,R_2} and Lemma 5.4 guarantee that (5.7) is true for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ small enough.

Case 2: $N > sp^2$ and $1 < p < \frac{2N}{N+s}$ or $N > sp((p-1)^2 + p)$ and $p > \frac{2N}{N+s}$.

The proof is analogous. The conclusion follows once obtained inequality (5.8). \square

End of the proof of Theorem 1

The geometric conditions of the Linking Theorem follow from Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2. According to Lemmas 4.2 and 5.5, $I_{\lambda,s}$ satisfies the $(P.S)_{c_s}$ -condition, with

$$c_s = \inf_{h \in \Gamma} \sup_{u \in Q_{\varepsilon, R_1, R_2}} I_{\lambda}(h(u)) < \frac{s}{N} b^{\frac{sp-N}{sp}} S_{p,s}^{\frac{N}{sp}}$$

and $\Gamma = \{h \in C(Q_{\varepsilon, R_1, R_2}, X_p^s) ; h = id \text{ em } \partial Q_{\varepsilon, R_1, R_2}\}$, if $\varepsilon > 0, \lambda > 0$ are small enough and $R_1 > 0, R_2 > 0$ are large enough.

Let us denote u_1 the positive solution, u_2 the negative solution and $u_3 \neq 0$ the solution obtained by applying the Linking Theorem. Of course, $u_1 \neq u_2$. Since

$$I_{\lambda,s}(u_1) = I_{\lambda,s}^+(u_1) = C_{\lambda}^+ \leq \frac{\lambda t_0^q}{q} \int_{\Omega} \varphi_1^q dx < \alpha \leq c_s = I_{\lambda,s}(u_3), \quad (5.9)$$

we conclude that $u_1 \neq u_3$. By the same reasoning, we conclude that $u_2 \neq u_3$. We are done. \square

Observe that it follows from (5.9) and the analogous equation for $I_{\lambda,s}^-$ that, if $0 < \lambda < q\alpha / \int_{\Omega} \varphi^q dx$, then solution u_1, u_2 and u_3 are distinct, where $\alpha > 0$ was given in Proposition 5.1.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. O. Alves, P. C. Carrião and O. H. Miyagaki: *Nontrivial solutions of a class of quasilinear elliptic problems involving critical exponents*, Nonlinear equations: methods, models and applications (Bergamo, 2001), 225-238, Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. **54**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2003.
- [2] H. Amann and P. Hess: *A multiplicity result for a class of elliptic boundary value problems*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **84** (1979), 145-151.
- [3] A. Ambrosetti, H. Brezis and G. Cerami: *Combined effects of concave and convex nonlinear in some elliptic problems*, J. Funct. Anal. **122** (1994), 519-543.
- [4] A. Ambrosetti and G. Prodi: *On the inversion of some differentiable mappings with singularities between Banach spaces*. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **93** (1972), no. 4, 231-246, 1972.
- [5] V. Ambrosio and T. Isernia: *On the multiplicity and concentration for p -fractional Schrödinger equations*, Appl. Math. Lett. **95** (2019), 13-22.
- [6] T. Aubin and W.Z. Wang: *Positive solutions of Ambrosetti-Prodi problems involving the critical Sobolev exponent*, Bull. Sci. Math. **125** (2001), no. 4, 311-340.
- [7] B. Barrios, E. Colorado, A. de Pablo and U. Sánchez: *On some critical problems for the fractional Laplacian operator*, J. Differential Equations **252** (2012), no. 11, 6133-6162.
- [8] H. Berestycki: *Le nombre de solutions de certains problèmes semi-linéaire elliptiques*, J. Funct. Anal. **40** (1981), 1-29.
- [9] M. S. Berger and E. Podolak: *On the solutions of a nonlinear Dirichlet problem*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **24** (1974/75), 837-846.
- [10] L. Brasco, S. Mosconi and M. Squassina: *Optimal decay of extremal functions for the fractional Sobolev inequality*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **55** (2016), no. 2, Art. 23, 32 pp.
- [11] H. Brézis and L. Nirenberg: *Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **36** (1983), no. 4, 437-477.

- [12] H. Brézis and L. Nirenberg: *H^1 versus C^1 local minimizers*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **317** (1993), no. 5, 465-472.
- [13] H. Bueno, E. Huerto Caqui and O. H. Miyagaki: *Critical fractional elliptic equations with exponential growth without Ambrosetti-Rabinowitz type condition*, preprint.
- [14] M. Calanchi and B. Ruf: *Elliptic equations with one-sided critical growth*, Electron. J. Differential Equations **2002**, No. 89, 21 pp.
- [15] M. Calanchi, C. Tomei and A. Zaccur: *Cusps and a converse to the Ambrosetti-Prodi theorem*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **18** (2018), no. 2, 483-507.
- [16] A. Capozzi, D. Fortunato and G. Palmieri: *An existence result for nonlinear elliptic problems involving critical Sobolev exponent*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **2** (1985), no. 6, 463-470.
- [17] J. Chabrowski and J. Yang: *Existence theorems for the Schrödinger equation involving a critical Sobolev exponent*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. **49** (1998), no. 2, 276-293.
- [18] W. Chen, S. Mosconi and M. Squassina: *Problems with critical Hardy nonlinearity*, J. Funct. Anal. **275** (2018), no. 11, 3065-3114.
- [19] E. N. Dancer: *On the ranges of certain weakly nonlinear elliptic partial differential equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl., (9) **57** (1978), no. 4, 351-366.
- [20] D. G. de Figueiredo and J. Yang: *Critical superlinear Ambrosetti-Prodi problems*, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. **14** (1999), no. 1, 59-80.
- [21] F. O. de Paiva and A. E. Presoto: *Semilinear elliptic problems with asymmetric nonlinearities*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **409** (2014), no. 1, 254-262.
- [22] F. O. de Paiva and E. Massa: *Multiple solutions for some elliptic equations with a nonlinearity concave at the origin*, Nonlinear Anal. **66** (2007) 2940-2946.
- [23] S. Fučík: *Solvability of nonlinear equations and boundary value problems*, D. Reidel Publ. Co., Dordrecht, 1980.
- [24] J. Giacomoni, S. Prashanth and K. Sreenadh: *$W^{1,N}$ versus C^1 local minimizers for elliptic functionals with critical growth in \mathbb{R}^N* , C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **347** (2009), no. 5-6, 255-260.
- [25] L. Huang and Y. Yang: *Asymmetric critical fractional p -Laplacian problems*, Electron. J. Differential Equations **2017**, Paper No. 103, 12 pp.
- [26] A. Iannizzotto, S. Mosconi and M. Squassina: *H^s versus C^0 -weighted minimizers*, NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. **22** (2015), no. 3, 477-497.
- [27] A. Iannizzotto, S. Mosconi and M. Squassina: *Global Hölder regularity for the fractional p -Laplacian*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **32** (2016), no. 4, 1353-1392.
- [28] J. L. Kazdan and F. W. Warner: *Remarks on some quasilinear elliptic equations* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **28** (1975), no. 5, 567-597.
- [29] M. Khiddi: *Multiple of solutions for nonlocal elliptic equations with critical exponent driven by the fractional p -Laplacian of order s* , Abstr. Appl. Anal. **2019**, Art. ID 6091236, 6 pp.
- [30] O. H. Miyagaki, D. Motreanu and F. R. Pereira: *Multiple solutions for a fractional elliptic problem with critical growth*, to appear in J.D.E.
- [31] S. Mosconi, K. Perera, M. Squassina and Y. Yang: *The Brezis-Nirenberg problem for the fractional p -Laplacian*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **55** (2016), no. 4, Art. 105, 25 pp.
- [32] D. Motreanu, V. V. Motreanu and N. S. Papageorgiou: *p -Laplacian equations with concave terms and asymmetric perturbations*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **141** (2011) 171-192.
- [33] K. Perera: *Multiplicity results for some elliptical problems with concave nonlinearities*, J. Differential Equations **140** (1997) 133-141.
- [34] P. H. Rabinowitz: *Minimax methods in critical point theory with applications to differential equations*, CBMS Reg. Conf. Ser. Math. vol. 65, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1986.
- [35] K. Saoudi: *On $W^{s,p}$ vs. C^1 local minimizers for a critical functional related to fractional p -Laplacian*, Appl. Anal. **96** (2017), no. 9, 1586-1595.
- [36] B. Sirakov, C. Tomei and A. Zaccur: *Results of Ambrosetti-Prodi type for non-selfadjoint elliptic operators*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **35** (2018), no. 7, 1757-1772.

- [37] S. Solimini: Some remarks on the number of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic problems, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **2** (1985), no. 2, 143-156.
- [38] D. W. Stroock: *A concise introduction to the theory of integration*, Second edition, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1994.
- [39] M. Willem: *Minimax Theorems: Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*, vol. 24, Birkhauser Boston, Boston, MA, 1996.

(H. P. Bueno) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE MINAS GERAIS,
31270-901 - BELO HORIZONTE-MG, BRAZIL
E-mail address: `hamilton@mat.ufmg.br`

(E. Huerto Caqui) DEPARTMENT OF MATEMATICS, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE MINAS GERAIS,
31270-901 - BELO HORIZONTE-MG, BRAZIL
E-mail address: `analisis_11@hotmail.com`

(O. H. Miyagaki) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SÃO CARLOS,
13565-905 - SÃO CARLOS-SP, BRAZIL
E-mail address: `olimpio@ufscar.br, ohmiyagaki@gmail.com`

(F. R. Pereira) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE JUIZ DE FORA,
36036-330 - JUIZ DE FORA-MG, BRAZIL
E-mail address: `fabio.pereira@ufjf.edu.br`