

Existence of infinitely many solutions to a fractional p -Kirchhoff problem involving singularity and critical exponent

Sekhar Ghosh¹, Debajyoti Choudhuri¹

Abstract

We prove the existence of infinitely many nonnegative solutions to the following nonlocal elliptic partial differential equation involving singularity.

$$\mathfrak{M} \left(\int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \right) (-\Delta)_p^s u = \frac{\lambda}{|u|^{\gamma-1}u} + |u|^{p_s^*-2}u \text{ in } \Omega,$$

$$u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega,$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 2$ is a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary, $\lambda > 0$, $N > sp$, $0 < s, \gamma < 1$, $(-\Delta)_p^s$ is the fractional p -Laplacian operator for $1 < p < \infty$ and $p_s^* = \frac{Np}{N-sp}$ is the critical Sobolev exponent. We will employ a *cut-off* argument to obtain the existence of infinitely many solutions. Further, by using the Moser iteration technique, we will prove an uniform $L^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ bound for the solutions.

Keywords: Fractional p -Laplacian, Critical Exponent, Concentration Compactness, Genus, Symmetric Mountain Pass Theorem, Singularity.

2020 MSC: 35R11, 35J60, 35J75.

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to study the following nonlocal Kirchhoff type elliptic partial differential equation involving singularity and critical exponent.

$$\mathfrak{M} \left(\int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \right) (-\Delta)_p^s u = \frac{\lambda}{|u|^{\gamma-1}u} + |u|^{p_s^*-2}u \text{ in } \Omega,$$

$$u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \tag{P}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary, $\lambda > 0$, $sp < N$, $0 < s, \gamma < 1$ and $p_s^* = \frac{Np}{N-sp}$ is the critical Sobolev exponent. The Kirchhoff function \mathfrak{M} is supposed to satisfy the following conditions.

- (\mathbf{m}_1) The function $\mathfrak{M} : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is continuous and there exists $\theta > 1$ such that $p < p\theta < p_s^*$ and $t\mathfrak{M}(t) \leq \theta\mathfrak{M}(t) >$ for all $t \geq 0$, where $\mathfrak{M}(t) = \int_0^t \mathfrak{M}(s) ds$.

Email addresses: sekharghosh1234@gmail.com (Sekhar Ghosh), dc.iit12@gmail.com (Debajyoti Choudhuri)

¹Department of Mathematics, National Institute of Technology Rourkela, India

$$(m_2) \inf_{t \geq 0} \{\mathfrak{M}(t)\} = m_0 > 0.$$

Here, \mathfrak{M} is degenerate Kirchhoff function if $\mathfrak{M}(0) = 0$, otherwise the \mathfrak{M} is said to be a non-degenerate Kirchhoff function. We define the fractional p -Laplacian as follows.

$$(-\Delta_p)^s u(x) = C_{N,s} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_\epsilon(x)} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} (u(x) - u(y))}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy, \text{ in } x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Off late a lot of attention has been paid to the elliptic problems involving local/nonlocal operators with singularities. These works are not only important from the mathematical point of view but also has lots of applications, *viz.* in thin obstacle problems[1], problems on minimal surfaces[2], fractional quantum mechanics[3] etc.(refer [4, 5, 6] and the references therein). “*The problem draws its motivation from the models presented by Kirchhoff in 1883 as a generalization of the D’Alembert wave equation.*”

$$\rho \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \left(a + b \int_0^l \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right|^2 dx \right) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} = g(x, u)$$

where a, b, ρ are positive constants and l is the changes in the length of the strings due to the vibrations.” An elaborate detailing on these for the fractional counterpart can be found in [7], [8, Appendix A] and the references therein. For further details on practical applications, one may refer [9, 10, 11] and the references therein. Elliptic problems with a singularity has not only been important but also a tough challenge to the mathematical community. The roots of the problem can be traced back to a celebrated work due to Lazer and McKenna [12], where the authors considered the following problem.

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u &= p(x)u^{-\gamma}, \text{ in } \Omega \\ u &= 0, \text{ on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a sufficiently regular domain. Also p is a sufficiently regular function which is positive in $\overline{\Omega}$. The solution u is in $W_0^{1,2}$ if and only if $\gamma < 3$. The authors in [12] proved that if $\gamma > 1$, then u is not in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ whereas for $0 < \gamma < 1$ the solution obtained is a classical solution. Thereafter a lot of work on elliptic problems involving a singularity has also been considered whose existence and multiplicity results have been investigated. As a passing list of references on some pioneering study of problems involving a purely singular term one may refer to [13, 14, 15] and the references therein. With the development of newer tools in functional analysis, the problems with a singularity also became richer. One such instance is a problem investigated by Giacomoni [16]. The problem is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u &= \lambda u^{-\gamma} + u^q, \text{ in } \Omega \\ u &= 0, \text{ on } \partial\Omega \\ u &> 0, \text{ in } \Omega \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $1 < p - 1 < q \leq p^* - 1$, $\lambda > 0$, $0 < \gamma < 1$. Here the authors have proved the existence of two positive solutions. Similar type of results to obtain existence and multiplicity (finitely many) of solutions can be found in [17, 18, 19, 20, 21] and the references therein. Recently, Saoudi et al. [20] considered a fractional p -Laplacian version of (1.1) and proved the existence of two solutions

to it by using a variational methods. Besides this the authors in [20] used Moser's iteration method to prove that the solutions are in L^∞ . A $W_0^{s,p}$ versus C^1 analysis has also been discussed in it. We now focus on some of the work which bears the Kirchhoff term, with or without singularities. Moving on from here, we now turn our attention to problems involving a critical exponent. If one considers \mathfrak{M} , $\lambda = 0$ in (P), then the problem reduces to the following.

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta_p)^s u &= |u|^{p_s^*-2}u, \text{ in } \Omega \\ u &= 0, \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \partial\Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

The main hurdle with problems with critical exponent is the lack of compact embedding $W_0^{s,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{p^*}(\Omega)$. Such problems are tackled by the concentration-compactness principle due to Lions [22, 23]. The literature pertaining to these type of problems are so vast that it can't be discussed here in this section completely. However, the readers may refer to [24, 25, 26, 27, 28] and the references therein. As for the existence of infinitely many solutions to problems with critical exponent, one may refer to Azorero and Alosonso [29], who have studied the following problem.

$$-\Delta_p u = |u|^{p^*-2}u + \lambda|u|^{q-2}u, \text{ in } \Omega \tag{1.3}$$

$$u = 0, \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \tag{1.4}$$

for $1 < q < p$, $\lambda > 0$. Here the authors have used the Lusternik-Schnirelman's theory to guarantee the existence of infinitely many solutions. The problem in [29] was further generalized by Li and Zhang [30] with the driving operator being $-\Delta_p - \Delta_q$. The reader may also refer to the work due to Figueiredo [31]. We now throw some light on the p -Kirchhoff problems of the following type discussed in Khiddi and Sbai [32].

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M} \left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \right) (-\Delta_p)^s u &= \lambda H(x)|u|^{q-2}u + |u|^{p_s^*-2}u, \text{ in } \Omega \\ u &= 0, \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda > 0$, $1 < q < p < p_s^* < \infty$. The authors in [32] have guaranteed infinitely many solutions. Such type of problems have led to the generalization of a few classical results for the case of $\mathfrak{M} = 1$. In [33], the authors employed the Fountain and the dual Fountain theorem to guarantee the existence of infinitely many solutions for a symmetric subcritical Kirchhoff problem for a non-degenerate \mathfrak{M} and $p \geq 2$. In [34], the authors dealt with the case when $p = 2$ and used the notion of Krasnoselskii's genus (refer [35]) to obtain the existence of infinitely many solutions. Further in [36] the authors had a similar conclusion but for a system of PDEs with subcritical degenerate Kirchhoff function. This is in no way a complete picture of the literature developed so far as it is vast. What we can do at this point is to direct the attention of the reader to the problem which prompted us to take up this problem. The motivation of this problem was drawn from the results due to Azorero et al. [29], Khiddi-Sbai [32]. The literature consisting the study of infinitely many solution mainly deals with the concave-convex data, which may be both sublinear as well as superlinear. Recently, in its first kind the study due to [37] guarantees the existence of infinitely solutions involving a singularity. Motivated from the above studies, in this article by employing a cut-off technique, we will prove that the problem (P) possesses a sequence of solutions whose space norms converges to zero. It is noteworthy to mention here that the symmetric mountain pass theorem plays an key role to study the existence of infinitely many to a PDE. The symmetric mountain pass theorem has two type of

conclusions consisting a sequence of solutions. One is for sublinear data in which the space norm of the solutions converges to zero another one is for the superlinear data which says the space norm of solutions goes to infinity. The major hurdles to us were to figure out a way to tackle the singular term as well as the critical exponent term, which is superlinear in the problem (P) and then to show that the sequence of solutions converges to zero in space norm. To add to the lacunae, the functional also fails to be coercive. The main result proved in this article is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let \mathbf{m}_1 - \mathbf{m}_2 holds and $0 < \gamma < 1$. Then there exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that whenever $0 < \lambda < \Lambda$, the problem (P) has a sequence of non-negative weak solutions $\{u_n\}$ such that $I_\lambda(u_n) < 0$, $I'_\lambda(u_n) = 0$ and $u_n \rightarrow 0$ in X_0 . (The space X_0 and I_λ will be defined in Section 2). Further, each solution to (P) belongs to $L^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.*

Remark 1.2. *We will now make following two remarks.*

1. *The conclusion of the Theorem 1.1 holds true even if we consider subcritical but superlinear exponent instead of p_s^* .*
2. *It will be interesting to study whether the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 holds true if we take a degenerate Kirchhoff function, i.e. if $\mathbf{m}_0 = 0$.*

2. Preliminaries and Weak Formulations.

In this section we will first recall some properties of the fractional Sobolev spaces. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N , $N \geq 2$ with Lipschitz boundary and define $Q = \mathbb{R}^{2N} \setminus ((\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega) \times (\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega))$. Consider the Banach space $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ such that

$$X = \left\{ u : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ is measurable, } u|_\Omega \in L^p(\Omega) \text{ and } \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^{\frac{N+ps}{p}}} \in L^p(Q) \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

with respect to the well known Gagliardo norm

$$\|u\|_X = \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \left(\int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Let X_0 be the subspace of X defined as

$$X_0 = \{u \in X : u = 0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega\}.$$

Then the space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is a Banach space [38, 39] with respect to the norm

$$\|u\| = \left(\int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The best Sobolev constant is defined as

$$S = \inf_{u \in X_0 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy}{\left(\int_\Omega |u|^{p_s^*} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}}}. \quad (2.2)$$

The next Lemma is due to [38, 39] which states the embeddings of the space X_0 into Lebesgue spaces.

Lemma 2.1. *If Ω has a Lipschitz boundary and $N > ps$, then the embedding $X_0 \hookrightarrow L^q(\Omega)$ for $q \in [1, p_s^*]$ is continuous and is compact for $q \in [1, p_s^*)$, where $p_s^* = \frac{Np}{N-ps}$ is the critical Sobolev exponent.*

A function $u \in X_0$ is a weak solution to the problem (P), if $\varphi u^{-\gamma} \in L^1(\Omega)$ and

$$\mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) \int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2}(u(x) - u(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy - \int_{\Omega} \frac{\lambda}{|u|^{\gamma-1}u} \varphi - \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p_s^*-2} u \varphi = 0 \quad (2.3)$$

for each $\varphi \in X_0$. The energy functional $J_{\lambda}: X_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ associated to the problem (P) is defined as

$$J_{\lambda}(u) = \frac{1}{p} \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) - \frac{\lambda}{1-\gamma} \int_{\Omega} |u|^{1-\gamma} dx - \frac{1}{p_s^*} \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p_s^*} dx. \quad (2.4)$$

Observe that the existence of solution through the usual variational techniques to the presence of the singular term and the critical Sobolev exponent where the former restricts the differentiability of J_{λ} and the later causes the lack of compact embedding (refer Lemma 2.1). Hence we will use a cut-off technique to accomplish our goal. Precisely, we will first construct a C^1 functional I_{λ} such that the critical points of both the functionals J_{λ} and I_{λ} coincides. Then on applying the concentration compactness principle, we will obtain a certain range of *energy* for the functional to satisfy the Palais Smale condition. Finally, by using the Kajikiya's symmetric mountain pass theorem [40] the existence of infinitely many solutions will be achieved. One can prove the Gâteaux differentiability of J_{λ} with a slight modification of cf.[20, Lemma 6.2].

Let us now consider the singular PDE

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{m}_0(-\Delta_p)^s w &= \frac{\lambda}{|w|^{\gamma-1}w} \text{ in } \Omega, \\ w &= 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

The existence of a weak solution to this PDE can be obtained as a SOLA solution by considering a sequence of perturbed PDEs. One can easily show that the solution to the problem (2.5) is unique and nonnegative. For instance one can choose, $w^- \in X_0$ as the test function in the weak formulation of (2.5). Then by using the identity $(a - b)(a^- - b^-) \leq -(a^- - b^-)^2$ one can obtain

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega^-} \lambda |w^-|^{1-\gamma} dx \leq -\mathfrak{m}_0 \|w^-\|^p < 0,$$

which guarantees that $|\Omega^-| = 0$. Here, $|\Omega^-| = 0$ refers to the Lebesgue measure of Ω^- . Hence the solution to the problem (2.5) is nonnegative. We now have the following Lemma due to [14].

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary. Then for $0 < \gamma < 1$ and $\lambda > 0$ the problem (2.5) possesses a unique solution, $\underline{u}_{\lambda} \in W_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$, such that for every $K \subset\subset \Omega$, $\text{ess.inf}_K \underline{u}_{\lambda} > 0$.*

We now consider the following cut-off problem

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M} \left(\int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \right) (-\Delta_p)^s u &= \lambda g(u) + f(u) \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (P')$$

where, the functions g and f are defined as below. Let \underline{u}_λ be the solution to (2.5), then define

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|t|^{\gamma-1}t}, & \text{if } |t| > \underline{u}_\lambda \\ \frac{1}{|\underline{u}_\lambda|^{\gamma-1}\underline{u}_\lambda}, & \text{if } |t| \leq \underline{u}_\lambda \end{cases}$$

and

$$f(t) = \begin{cases} |t|^{p_s^*-2}t, & \text{if } |t| > \underline{u}_\lambda \\ \underline{u}_\lambda^{p_s^*-2}\underline{u}_\lambda, & \text{if } |t| \leq \underline{u}_\lambda. \end{cases}$$

Let $G(s) = \int_0^s g(t)dt$ and $F(s) = \int_0^s f(t)dt$. Therefore, the associated cut-off functional $I_\lambda: X_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ corresponding to (P') is defined as

$$I_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{p}\mathcal{M}(\|u\|^p) - \lambda \int_\Omega G(u)dx - \int_\Omega F(u)dx. \quad (2.6)$$

Note that the functional I_λ is even. Moreover, one can proceed on similar lines as in cf. [20, Lemma 6.4] to conclude that I_λ is C^1 . Since the functional J_λ is Gâteaux differentiable, then the set of critical points of I_λ coincides with the same for J_λ . We aim to guarantee that the problem (P') possesses infinitely many solutions.

A function $u \in X_0$ is said to be a weak solution to the problem (P') , if $\varphi u^{-\gamma} \in L^1(\Omega)$ and

$$\mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) \int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2}(u(x) - u(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy - \lambda \int_\Omega g(u)\varphi - \int_\Omega f(u)\varphi = 0 \quad (2.7)$$

for each $\varphi \in X_0$. Now for any $u \in X_0$, we have

$$\langle I'_\lambda(u), \varphi \rangle = \int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2}(u(x) - u(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy - \lambda \int_\Omega g(u)\varphi dx - \int_\Omega f(u)\varphi dx,$$

for every $\varphi \in X_0$. Thus, the weak solutions of problem (P') are precisely the critical points of the energy functional I_λ .

3. Sufficient energy range for the Palais-Smale Condition.

The aim of this section is to see whether the functional I_λ satisfies the Palais-Smale $(PS)_c$ condition upto some finite energy level c or not. We also target to apply the symmetric mountain pass theorem to the functional I_λ . Observe that due to the presence of the critical exponent, the functional I_λ is not bounded from below. Moreover, due to the lack of a compact embedding of X_0 in $L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)$, one can not verify the (PS) condition instantly. However, we will look for an energy range $(-\infty, c]$ such that the $(PS)_c$ condition holds true. Before we venture out to hunt for the energy range $(-\infty, c]$, we first state the $(PS)_c$ condition for I_λ .

Definition 3.1 ($(PS)_c$ condition for I_λ). Let $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\{u_n\} \subset X_0$ is a sequence such that $I_\lambda(u_n) \rightarrow c$ and $I'_\lambda(u_n) \rightarrow 0$ in X_0^* , where X_0^* refers to the dual of X_0 . Then $\{u_n\}$ is said to be a $(PS)_c$ sequence for I_λ if $\{u_n\}$ possesses a convergent subsequence. Moreover, I_λ satisfies the $(PS)_c$ condition if every $(PS)_c$ sequence for I_λ possesses a convergent subsequence.

Lemma 3.2. *Let the assumptions \mathbf{m}_1 - \mathbf{m}_2 hold true. Then there exists $\alpha > 0, K > 0$ such that the functional I_λ satisfies $(PS)_c$ condition for every $\lambda > 0$ and*

$$c < c_* = \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{p_s^*} \right) (\mathbf{m}_0 S)^{\frac{N}{p_s^*}} - K \lambda^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^* - 1 + \gamma}}.$$

for some $K > 0$. Here, S refers to the best Sobolev constant defined is (2.2).

Proof. Consider a sequence $\{u_n\} \subset X_0$ such that

$$I_\lambda(u_n) \rightarrow c \text{ and } \langle I'_\lambda(u_n), v \rangle \rightarrow 0 \quad (3.1)$$

and for every $v \in X_0$. Now choose α such that $1 - \gamma < p\theta < \alpha < p_s^*$. Then by the Sobolev inequality together with \mathbf{m}_1 - \mathbf{m}_2 we get

$$\begin{aligned} c + o(\|u_n\|) &= I_\lambda(u_n) - \frac{1}{\alpha} \langle I'_\lambda(u_n), u_n \rangle \\ &\geq \frac{1}{p} \mathfrak{M}(\|u_n\|^p) - \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathfrak{M}(\|u_n\|^p) \|u_n\|^p - \lambda \int_\Omega (G(u_n) - g(u_n)u_n) - \int_\Omega (F(u_n) - f(u_n)u_n) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{\theta p} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \mathfrak{M}(\|u_n\|^p) \|u_n\|^p - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \int_\Omega |u_n|^{1-\gamma} - \left(\frac{1}{p_s^*} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \int_\Omega |u_n|^{p_s^*} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{\theta p} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \mathfrak{M}(\|u_n\|^p) \|u_n\|^p - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) S^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{p_s^*}} \|u_n\|^{1-\gamma} + \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{p_s^*} \right) \|u_n\|^{p_s^*} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{p_s^*} \right) \|u_n\|^{p_s^*} - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) S^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{p_s^*}} \|u_n\|^{1-\gamma} \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

It is clear from the last inequality (3.2) that the sequence $\{u_n\}$ is bounded in X_0 . Since the space X_0 is reflexive then there exists a subsequence of $\{u_n\}$ (still denoted by $\{u_n\}$) and $u \in X_0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_n &\rightharpoonup u \text{ weakly in } X_0, \\ u_n &\rightarrow u \text{ strongly in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ for } 1 \leq r < p_s^*, \\ u_n(x) &\rightarrow u(x) \text{ a. e. in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the weak convergence we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Q \frac{|u_n(x) - u_n(y)|^{p-2} (u_n(x) - u_n(y)) (v(x) - v(y))}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \\ &= \int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} (u(x) - u(y)) (v(x) - v(y))}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \end{aligned}$$

Again, on applying the Lemma 2.1, one can obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_\Omega f(u_n) v dx = \int_\Omega f(u) v dx$$

We now claim that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_\Omega g(u_n) v dx = \int_\Omega g(u) v dx \quad (3.3)$$

Proof of the claim: To prove the claim we first show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} v u_n^{-\gamma} dx = \int_{\Omega} v u^{-\gamma} dx.$$

Let us denote the set $A_n = \{x \in \Omega : u_n(x) = 0\}$. Since $\phi u_n^{-\gamma} \in L^1(\Omega)$, we have that the Lebesgue measure of A_n is zero, i.e. $|A_n| = 0$. Thus by the sub-additivity of the Lebesgue measure we have, $|\bigcup A_n| = 0$. Let $x \in \Omega \setminus D$ such that $u(x) = 0$. Here $|D| < \delta$ - obtained from the Egorov's theorem - where u is a uniform limit of (a subsequence of $\{u_n\}$, still denoted as $\{u_n\}$) u_n in Ω . Further, define

$$A_{m,n} = \left\{x \in \Omega \setminus D : |u_n(x)| < \frac{1}{m}\right\}.$$

Note that due to the uniform convergence, for a fixed n we have $|A_{m,n}| \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Now consider

$$\bigcup_{m,n \in \mathbb{N}} A_{m,n} = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \bigcap_{m \geq n} A_{m,n}.$$

Observe that, for a fixed n ,

$$\left| \bigcap_{m \geq n} A_{m,n} \right| = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} |A_{m,n}| = 0.$$

The above argument is true for each fixed n and thus

$$\left| \bigcup_{m,n \in \mathbb{N}} A_{m,n} \right| = 0.$$

Therefore, $|\{x \in \Omega \setminus D : u_n(x) \rightarrow u(x) = 0\}| = 0$. Hence the claim.

Therefore, we obtain $\langle I'_\lambda(u_n), \varphi \rangle \rightarrow 0$ for every $\varphi \in X_0$. Hence on passing the limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we get

$$\langle I'_\lambda(u), \varphi \rangle = 0.$$

for every $\varphi \in X_0$. Thus u is a weak solution to the problem (P') . Now from the concentration-compactness principle [22, 23] there exists a pair of Radon measures μ, ν such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u_n(x) - u_n(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy \rightharpoonup \mu \text{ and } |u_n|^{p_s^*} \rightharpoonup \nu$$

Moreover, there exists Υ , an at most countable set, $\{x_i\}_{i \in \Upsilon} \subset \Omega$, $\mu_{x_i}, \nu_{x_i} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dy + \sum_{i \in \Upsilon} \mu_{x_i} \delta_{x_i}, \\ \nu &= |u|^{p_s^*} + \sum_{i \in \Upsilon} \nu_{x_i} \delta_{x_i} \\ \mu_{x_i} &\geq S \nu_{x_i}^{p/p_s^*}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where δ_{x_i} is the Dirac mass at $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Fix an $i \in \Upsilon$ and let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Now consider the following smooth family of cut-off functions $\varphi_{i,\epsilon}$ such that $0 \leq \varphi_{i,\epsilon} \leq 1$, $\varphi_{i,\epsilon} = 1$ for $|x - x_i| \leq$

$\epsilon, \varphi_{i,\epsilon} = 0$ for $|x - x_i| \geq 2\epsilon$ and $|\nabla\varphi_{i,\epsilon}| \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon}$. Clearly, the sequence $\{u_n\varphi_{i,\epsilon}\}$ is bounded in X_0 . Therefore, by taking $\varphi = u_n\varphi_{i,\epsilon}$ as the test function in $\langle I'_\lambda(u_n), \varphi \rangle \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}(\|u_n\|^p) & \int_Q \frac{|u_n(x) - u_n(y)|^{p-2}(u_n(x) - u_n(y))(u_n(x)\varphi_{i,\epsilon}(x) - u_n(y)\varphi_{i,\epsilon}(y))}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \\ & = \lambda \int_\Omega g(u_n)u_n\varphi_{i,\epsilon} dx + \int_\Omega f(u_n)u_n\varphi_{i,\epsilon} dx + o_n(1) \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

We will now estimate every term in (3.5). Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q \frac{|u_n(x) - u_n(y)|^{p-2}(u_n(x) - u_n(y))(u_n(x)\varphi_{i,\epsilon}(x) - u_n(y)\varphi_{i,\epsilon}(y))}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \\ & = \int_Q \frac{|u_n(x) - u_n(y)|^p \varphi_{i,\epsilon}(x)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy + \int_Q \frac{|u_n(x) - u_n(y)|^{p-2}(u_n(x) - u_n(y))(\varphi_{i,\epsilon}(x) - \varphi_{i,\epsilon}(y))u_n(y)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

On applying (3.4), the first term in (3.6) gives that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Q \frac{|u_n(x) - u_n(y)|^p \varphi_{i,\epsilon}(x)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy = \int_\Omega \varphi_{i,\epsilon} d\mu \geq \int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p \varphi_{i,\epsilon}(x)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy + \mu_{x_i}$$

Now on taking limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Q \frac{|u_n(x) - u_n(y)|^p \varphi_{i,\epsilon}(x)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \right] \geq \mu_{x_i} \quad (3.7)$$

Again, from the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_Q \frac{|u_n(x) - u_n(y)|^{p-2}(u_n(x) - u_n(y))(\varphi_{i,\epsilon}(x) - \varphi_{i,\epsilon}(y))u_n(y)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \right| \\ & \leq \left(\int_Q \frac{|u_n(x) - u_n(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left(\int_Q \frac{|\varphi_{i,\epsilon}(x) - \varphi_{i,\epsilon}(y)|^p |u_n(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq C \left(\int_Q \frac{|\varphi_{i,\epsilon}(x) - \varphi_{i,\epsilon}(y)|^p |u_n(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Now from Lemma 2.3 [41], we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Q \frac{|\varphi_{i,\epsilon}(x) - \varphi_{i,\epsilon}(y)|^p |u_n(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy = 0$$

Hence, we can conclude that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Q \frac{|u_n(x) - u_n(y)|^{p-2}(u_n(x) - u_n(y))(\varphi_{i,\epsilon}(x) - \varphi_{i,\epsilon}(y))u_n(y)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy = 0 \quad (3.9)$$

Further from (3.4), we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{p_s^*} \varphi_{i,\epsilon} dx = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\int_{\Omega} |u|^{p_s^*} \varphi_{i,\epsilon} dx + \nu_{x_i} \right] = \nu_{x_i}.$$

This implies

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} f(u_n) u_n \varphi_{i,\epsilon} dx = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\int_{\Omega} f(u_n) u_n \varphi_{i,\epsilon} + \nu_{x_i} \right] = \nu_{x_i}. \quad (3.10)$$

Now on using \mathbf{m}_1 - \mathbf{m}_2 and $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^r(\Omega)$ for $1 \leq r < p_s^*$ we obtain

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{1-\gamma} \varphi_{i,\epsilon} dx = 0.$$

From this one can obtain

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} g(u_n) \varphi_{i,\epsilon} dx = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

Again on using the boundedness of $\{u_n\}$, one can say that upto a subsequence, $\|u_n\| \rightarrow t_0$ for some t_0 . Therefore, by using the continuity of the function \mathfrak{M} , we conclude that $\mathfrak{M}(\|u_n\|^p) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(t_0^p)$. Hence, from the equations (3.5)-(3.11), we obtain

$$0 \geq \mathfrak{M}(t_0^p) \mu_{x_i} - \nu_{x_i}. \quad (3.12)$$

Moreover, we have, $\mu_{x_i} \geq S \nu_{x_i}^{p/p_s^*}$ from (3.4) and $\mathfrak{M}(t_0^p) \geq \mathbf{m}_0$. Thus we deduce that either one of the following must hold.

$$\nu_{x_i} = 0 \text{ or } \nu_{x_i}^{ps/N} \geq \mathbf{m}_0 S. \quad (3.13)$$

If $\nu_{x_i} = 0$ then we are done. Let us assume

$$\nu_{x_i}^{ps/N} \geq \mathbf{m}_0 S. \quad (3.14)$$

for some i . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} c + o(1) &= I_{\lambda}(u_n) - \frac{1}{\alpha} I'_{\lambda}(u_n) u_n \\ &\geq \mathbf{m}_0 \left(\frac{1}{\theta p} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \|u_n\|^p - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{1-\gamma} + \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{p_s^*} \right) \int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{p_s^*} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{p_s^*} \right) \left[\int_{\Omega} |u|^{p_s^*} dx + \sum_{i \in \Upsilon} \nu_{x_i} \delta_i \right] - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{1-\gamma} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{p_s^*} \right) |u|_{p_s^*}^{p_s^*} - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) |u_n|_{p_s^*}^{1-\gamma} + \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{p_s^*} \right) \sum_{i \in \Upsilon} \nu_{x_i} \delta_i \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Now consider the function $f : x \mapsto ax^{p_s^*} - \lambda bx^{1-\gamma}$, where $a = \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{p_s^*}\right)$ and $b = \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma} - \frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$. The function f attains its absolute minimum for all $x > 0$ at $x_0 = \left(\frac{b\lambda(1-\gamma)}{ap_s^*}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_s^*-1+\gamma}} > 0$ and $f(x) \geq -K\lambda^{p_s^*/(p_s^*-1+\gamma)}$ where

$$K = b^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^*-1+\gamma}} a^{\frac{\gamma-1}{p_s^*-1+\gamma}} \left(\left(\frac{1-\gamma}{p_s^*}\right)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{p_s^*-1+\gamma}} - \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{p_s^*}\right)^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^*-1+\gamma}} \right) > 0.$$

Hence, on passing the limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ in (3.15), we have

$$c \geq \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{p_s^*}\right) \sum_{i \in \Upsilon} \nu_{x_i} \delta_{x_i} - K\lambda^{p_s^*/(p_s^*-1+\gamma)}$$

Now from (3.14) we get

$$c \geq \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{p_s^*}\right) (\mathfrak{m}_0 S)^{N/p_s} - K\lambda^{p_s^*/(p_s^*-1+\gamma)}$$

This is a contradiction to our assumption.

$$c < c_* = \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{p_s^*}\right) (\mathfrak{m}_0 S)^{N/p_s} - K\lambda^{p_s^*/(p_s^*-1+\gamma)}.$$

Hence, the set Υ is empty, i.e. there does not exist any x_i in the decomposition of $\{u_n\}$ and we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{p_s^*} dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p_s^*} dx.$$

From (3.1) with $\varphi = u_n$, we deduce that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathfrak{M}(\|u_n\|^p) \|u_n\|^p = \lambda \int_{\Omega} g(u) u dx + \int_{\Omega} f(u) u dx \quad (3.16)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{M}(t_0^p) \|u\|^p = \lambda \int_{\Omega} g(u) u dx + \int_{\Omega} f(u) u dx \quad (3.17)$$

Thus from (3.16) and (3.17), we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathfrak{M}(\|u_n\|^p) \|u_n\|^p = \mathfrak{M}(t_0^p) \|u\|^p.$$

Hence, we can conclude that $\|u_n\|^p \rightarrow \|u\|^p$ and that $u_n \rightarrow u$ strongly in X_0 . This completes the proof. \square

4. Auxiliary Results and Proof of Main Theorem.

In this section, we will establish the existence of infinitely many solutions to the problem (P'). Prior to that let us define some useful tools to be used to guarantee the existence of solutions.

Definition 4.1 (Genus[35]). Let X be a Banach space and $A \subset X$. A set A is said to be symmetric if $u \in A$ implies $(-u) \in A$. Let A be a close, symmetric subset of X such that $0 \notin A$. We define a genus $\gamma(A)$ of A by the smallest integer k such that there exists an odd continuous mapping from A to $\mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\}$. We define $\gamma(A) = \infty$, if no such k exists.

The next Proposition is due to [35] pertaining to some properties of genus. Let Γ denotes the family of all closed subsets of $X \setminus \{0\}$ which are symmetric with respect to the origin.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $A, B \in \Gamma$. Then*

1. $A \subset B \Rightarrow \gamma(A) \leq \gamma(B)$.
2. *Suppose A and B are homeomorphic via an odd map, then $\gamma(A) = \gamma(B)$.*
3. $\gamma(S^{N-1}) = N$, where S^{N-1} is the sphere in \mathbb{R}^N .
4. $\gamma(A \cup B) \leq \gamma(A) + \gamma(B)$.
5. $\gamma(A) < \infty \Rightarrow \gamma(A \setminus B) \geq \gamma(A) - \gamma(B)$.
6. *For every compact subset A of X , $\gamma(A) < \infty$ and there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\gamma(A) = \gamma(N_\delta(A))$ where $N_\delta(A) = \{x \in X : d(x, A) \leq \delta\}$.*
7. *Suppose $Y \subset X$ is a subspace of X such that $\text{codim}(Y) = k$ and $\gamma(A) > k$, then $A \cap Y \neq \emptyset$.*

We will use the following version of the symmetric Mountain Pass Theorem due to Kajikiya [40].

Theorem 4.3. *Let X be an infinite dimensional Banach space and $I \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies the following*

(i) *I is even, bounded below, $I(0) = 0$ and I satisfies the $(PS)_c$ condition.*

(ii) *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an $A_n \in \Gamma_n$ such that $\sup_{u \in A_n} I(u) < 0$.*

Then either (1) or (2) below holds.

(1) *There exists a sequence $\{u_n\}$ such that $I'(u_n) = 0$, $I(u_n) < 0$ and $u_n \rightarrow 0$ in X .*

(2) *There exist two sequences $\{u_n\}$ and $\{v_n\}$ such that $I'(u_n) = 0$, $I(u_n) = 0$, $u_n \neq 0$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n = 0$; $I'(v_n) = 0$, $I(v_n) < 0$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n = 0$ and $\{v_n\}$ converges to a non-zero limit.*

Remark 4.4. *It is important here to mention that in either of the cases from Theorem 4.3, we obtain a sequence $\{u_n\}$ of critical points such that $I'(u_n) = 0$, $I(u_n) = 0$, $u_n \neq 0$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n = 0$.*

Observe that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I_\lambda(tu) = -\infty$. Therefore the functional I_λ is not bounded from below. Hence, we will use a technique from [29] to overcome this difficulty. Let $u \in X_0$. Since $1-\gamma < 1 < p < p\theta < p_s^*$, therefore on using the Sobolev inequality and Hölder inequality we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} I_\lambda(u) &= \frac{1}{p}\mathcal{M}(\|u\|^p) - \lambda \int_{\Omega} G(u)dx - \int_{\Omega} F(u)dx \\ &\geq \frac{\mathbf{m}_0}{p\theta}\|u\|^p - \lambda \frac{S^{(\gamma-1)/p}}{1-\gamma}\|u\|^{1-\gamma} - \frac{S^{-p_s^*/p}}{p_s^*}\|u\|^{p_s^*} \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Let us look at the following polynomial

$$h(x) = \frac{\mathbf{m}_0}{p\theta}x^p - \lambda \frac{S^{(\gamma-1)/p}}{1-\gamma}x^{1-\gamma} - \frac{S^{-p_s^*/p}}{p_s^*}x^{p_s^*} \quad (4.2)$$

Now, we may choose $\Lambda > 0$, very small such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda)$ the function h has exactly two real roots r_0, r_1 , say. More precisely, $h(t) > 0$ for $r_0 < t < r_1$, $h(t) < 0$ for $t < r_0$ and $t > r_1$ with $h(r_0) = 0$ and $h(r_1) = 0$. Moreover, h attains its non-negative maximum at some point $r \in (r_0, r_1)$. Let us now truncate the functional I_λ as follows.

$$\bar{I}_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{p}\mathcal{M}(\|u\|^p) - \lambda \int_{\Omega} G(u)dx - \int_{\Omega} F(u)\tau(\|u\|)dx \quad (4.3)$$

where $\tau : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a non-decreasing, $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ function such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(x) &= 1 \text{ if } x \leq r_0 \\ \tau(x) &= 0 \text{ if } x \geq r_1 \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Now define

$$\bar{h}(x) = \frac{\mathbf{m}_0}{p\theta}x^p - \lambda \frac{S^{(\gamma-1)/p}}{1-\gamma}x^{1-\gamma} - \frac{S^{-p_s^*/p}}{p_s^*}x^{p_s^*}\tau(x) \quad (4.5)$$

From (4.1), it is clear that

$$\bar{I}_\lambda(u) \geq \bar{h}(\|u\|) \quad (4.6)$$

One can easily conclude that $\bar{h}(x) \geq h(x)$ whenever $x \geq 0$, $\bar{h}(x) = h(x)$ for $0 \leq x \leq r_0$, $\bar{h}(x) \geq 0$, for $r_0 < x \leq r_1$ and if $x > r_1$, then $\bar{h}(x) > 0$ since the function $\bar{h}(x) = x^{1-\gamma}((\mathbf{m}_0/p\theta)x^{p-1+\gamma} - \lambda(S^{(\gamma-1)/p}/(1-\gamma)))$ is strictly increasing. Therefore, $\bar{h}(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \geq r_0$.

We now prove the following auxiliary Lemma for the truncated functional \bar{I}_λ to apply the symmetric mountain pass theorem.

Lemma 4.5. *There exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$, we have*

- (i) $\bar{I}_\lambda \in C^1(X_0, \mathbb{R})$ is even, $\bar{I}_\lambda(0) = 0$.
- (ii) \bar{I}_λ is coercive and bounded from below.
- (iii) $\|u\| < r_0$ whenever $\bar{I}_\lambda(u) < 0$. In addition, $\bar{I}_\lambda(v) = I_\lambda(v)$ for all $v \in N_\delta(u)$.

(iv) For every $c < 0$, the functional \bar{I}_λ satisfies a local $(PS)_c$ -condition.

Proof. (i) Clearly, $\bar{I}_\lambda(0) = 0$. By definition of τ , there exists a small neighbourhood of $0 \in X_0$ such that \bar{I}_λ is even and $\bar{I}_\lambda \in C^1(X_0, \mathbb{R})$.

(ii) Again from the definition of τ , we get $\bar{I}_\lambda(u) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\|u\| \rightarrow +\infty$. This implies that \bar{I}_λ is coercive and bounded from below.

(iii) Suppose that $\bar{I}_\lambda(u) < 0$ and the conclusion fails to hold, i.e. $\|u\| \geq r_0$. Then from (4.6) and the succeeding calculations, we can conclude that $\bar{I}_\lambda(u) \geq \bar{h}(u) \geq 0$. This gives a contradiction to our assumption. Therefore, $\|u\| < r_0$. In addition, by using the fact that $\bar{h}(x) = h(x)$ for $0 \leq x \leq r_0$, one may guarantee that there exists a $\delta > 0$, small enough such that $\bar{I}_\lambda(v) = I_\lambda(v)$ for all $v \in N_\delta(u)$.

(iv) Let $c < 0$ and $\{u_n\} \subset X_0$ be a $(PS)_c$ sequence for the functional \bar{I}_λ . Then we have $\bar{I}_\lambda(u_n) < 0$, $\bar{I}'_\lambda(u_n) \rightarrow 0$. From the conclusion in (ii), using the coerciveness of \bar{I}_λ we get the sequence $\{u_n\}$ bounded in X_0 . Thus from (iii) we get $\|u_n\| < r_0$ and hence $\bar{I}_\lambda(u_n) = I_\lambda(u_n)$ and $\bar{I}'_\lambda(u_n) = I'_\lambda(u_n)$. Finally from Lemma 3.2, we can obtain that there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$, the functional \bar{I}_λ satisfies $(PS)_c$ -condition. \square

We now prove the following technical property of \bar{I}_λ which guarantees the existence of a subset of X_0 of genus at least n for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 4.6. *For every $\lambda > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(\lambda, k) < 0$ such that*

$$\gamma(\{u \in X_0 : \bar{I}_\lambda(u) \leq \epsilon\}) \geq k.$$

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda > 0$ be given. Let Y^k be a k -dimensional subspace of X_0 . Now for each $u \in Y^k$ such that $0 < \|u\| \leq r_0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{I}_\lambda(u) &\leq \frac{1}{p} \mathcal{M}(\|u\|^p) - \frac{1}{p_s^*} \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p_s^*} dx - \frac{\lambda}{1-\gamma} \int_{\Omega} |u|^{1-\gamma} dx \\ &\leq \frac{M}{p} \|u\|^p - \frac{\lambda}{1-\gamma} \int_{\Omega} |u|^{1-\gamma} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

where $M = \max_{0 \leq t \leq r_0} \mathfrak{M}(t) < \infty$. Since $0 < 1 - \gamma < 1$, we lose the advantages of having concave-convex nonlinearity. More precisely, we can not use an immediate equivalence of norms over finite dimensional space to conclude $\bar{I}_\lambda(u) < 0$. We instead use the following bypass route to overcome this difficulty. Note that, using the fact that $\dim(Y^k) = k$, we can say there exist $c > 0$ such that

$$c^{-1} \|u\|_{\infty} \leq \|u\| \leq c \|u\|_{\infty}.$$

Therefore, whenever $\|u\| \leq r_0$, we get $\|u\|_{\infty} \leq cr_0$. We now choose $r_0 \leq 1$ small enough such that $\|u\| \leq r_0 < 1$ and $\|u\|_{\infty} \leq cr_0 < 1$. Obviously, $|u| \leq \|u\|_{\infty}$. Thus we can easily obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} |u|^{1-\gamma} dx \geq \int_{\Omega} |u| dx \geq C \|u\| \quad (4.8)$$

where we have used the fact that any two norms over a finite dimensional normed linear space are topologically equivalent. Therefore, on using (4.7) and (4.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{I}_\lambda(u) &\leq \frac{1}{p}\mathcal{M}(\|u\|^p) - \frac{\lambda}{1-\gamma} \int_\Omega |u|^{1-\gamma} dx \\ &\leq \frac{M}{p}\|u\|^p - \frac{C\lambda}{1-\gamma}\|u\|.\end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

Now choose, $\rho > 0$ and $R > 0$ such that

$$0 < \rho < R < \min \left\{ r_0, \left[\frac{Cp\lambda}{M(1-\gamma)} \right]^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \right\}$$

and consider the subset of Y^k , defined as $A_k = \{u \in Y^k : \|u\| = \rho\}$. Thus for any $u \in A_k$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{I}_\lambda(u) &\leq \rho \left(\frac{M}{p}\rho^{p-1} - \frac{C\lambda}{1-\gamma} \right) \\ &\leq R \left(\frac{M}{p}R^{p-1} - \frac{C\lambda}{1-\gamma} \right) \\ &< 0.\end{aligned}\tag{4.10}$$

This implies that for every $u \in A_k$ there exists $\epsilon < 0$ such that

$$\bar{I}_\lambda(u) \leq \epsilon < 0.$$

Therefore, $A_k \subset \{u \in X_0 : \bar{I}_\lambda(u) \leq \epsilon\}$. Finally by Lemma 4.2, one can conclude that

$$\gamma(\{u \in X_0 : \bar{I}_\lambda(u) \leq \epsilon\}) \geq \gamma(A_k \cap Y^k) \geq k.$$

This completes the proof. □

We now define the following notations. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let us define the following

$$\Gamma_n = \{A_n \subset X : A_n \text{ is closed, symmetric and } 0 \notin A_n \text{ such that the genus } \gamma(A_n) \geq n\},$$

$$K_c = \{u \in X_0 : \bar{I}'_\lambda(u) = 0, \bar{I}_\lambda(u) = c\} \text{ and } c_n = \inf_{A \in \Gamma_n} \sup_{u \in A} \bar{I}_\lambda(u).$$

Lemma 4.7. *For $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ and each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the energy c_n is a critical value of \bar{I}_λ . Moreover, $c_n < 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = 0$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ as in Lemma 4.5. By using Lemma 4.5(ii) and Lemma 4.6, we conclude that

$$-\infty < c_n < 0.\tag{4.11}$$

Again, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_n \leq c_{n+1}$, since $\Gamma_{n+1} \subset \Gamma_n$. Therefore from (4.11), we get $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} c_n = c \leq 0$. Proceeding similar to [35, Proposition 9.33], we will show that $c = 0$. We will prove it by contradiction. Observe that for $c < 0$, the functional \bar{I}_λ satisfies $(PS)_c$ -condition. Therefore the

set K_c is compact. Then from the Lemma 4.2, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\gamma(N_\delta(K_c)) = \gamma(K_c) = m < \infty$. Again, since $c < 0$, then by using the Deformation Lemma [42], there exists $\epsilon > 0$ with $\epsilon + c < 0$ and an odd homeomorphism $\eta : X_0 \rightarrow X_0$ such that

$$\eta(A^{c+\epsilon} \setminus N_\delta(K_c)) \subset A^{c-\epsilon}, \quad (4.12)$$

where $A^c = \{u \in X_0 : \bar{I}_\lambda(u) \leq c\}$. Now, the sequence $\{c_n\}$ is monotonically increasing and $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} c_n = c$. Thus there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c_n > c - \epsilon$ and $c_{n+m} < c$. We now choose, $A \subset \Gamma_{n+m}$ such that $\sup_{u \in A} \bar{I}_\lambda(u) < c + \epsilon$. In other words, $A \subset A^{c+\epsilon}$. Then from Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\gamma(\overline{A \setminus N_\delta(K_c)}) \geq \gamma(A) - \gamma(N_\delta(K_c)) \geq n \text{ and } \gamma(\eta(\overline{A \setminus N_\delta(K_c)})) \geq n.$$

This implies that $\eta(\overline{A \setminus N_\delta(K_c)}) \in \Gamma_n$. Hence, we obtain

$$\sup_{u \in \eta(\overline{A \setminus N_\delta(K_c)})} \bar{I}_\lambda(u) \geq c_n > c - \epsilon.$$

This gives a contradiction and hence we conclude $c_n \rightarrow 0$. Finally from [35], it is easy to prove that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the energy c_n is a critical value of \bar{I}_λ . This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Observe that from Lemma 4.5, we have $\bar{I}_\lambda(u) = I_\lambda(u)$ whenever $\bar{I}_\lambda(u) < 0$. We now have all the ingredients required for the symmetric mountain pass theorem. Therefore, from Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.5, Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.7 one can easily verify that all the hypotheses of Theorem 4.3 are satisfied. Therefore, we conclude that there exists infinitely many critical points of the functional I_λ and hence infinitely many solutions to the problem (P).

We will conclude our main Theorem by showing the non-negativity of weak solutions as follows. Let us consider the decomposition of Ω as $\Omega = \Omega^+ \cup \Omega^-$, where $\Omega^+ = \{x \in X_0 : u(x) \geq 0\}$ and $\Omega^- = \{x \in X_0 : u(x) < 0\}$ and define $u = u^+ - u^-$, where $u^+(x) = \max\{u(x), 0\}$ and $u^-(x) = \max\{-u(x), 0\}$. Let us suppose, $u_n < 0$ a.e. in Ω . Now put, $\phi = u^-$ in (2.3) as the test function and then by using the standard inequality $(a - b)(a^- - b^-) \leq -(a^- - b^-)^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \left(\lambda \frac{u^-}{|u|^{\gamma-1}u} + |u|^{p_s^*-2}uu^- \right) dx &= \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) \int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2}(u(x) - u(y))(u^-(x) - u^-(y))}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \\ \Rightarrow \lambda \int_\Omega \frac{\text{sign}(u)u^-}{|u|^\gamma} dx &\leq -\mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) \int_Q \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2}(u^-(x) - u^-(y))^2}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \\ \Rightarrow \lambda \int_{\Omega^-} |u^-|^{1-\gamma} dx &\leq -\mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p)\|u^-\|^p < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can conclude that $|\Omega^-| = 0$. This contradicts the assumption $u_n < 0$ a.e. in Ω and hence we guarantee the the solutions to the problem (P) are non-negative. Hence the proof. \square

5. Regularity of solutions

This section is fully devoted to obtain some regularity of solutions to (P). We begin with the following comparison principle. We borrowed the idea from [43].

Lemma 5.1 (Weak Comparison Principle). *Let $u, v \in X_0$. Suppose, $\mathfrak{M}(\|v\|^p)(\Delta_p)^s v - \frac{\lambda}{|v|^{\gamma-1}v} \geq \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p)(\Delta_p)^s u - \frac{\lambda}{|u|^{\gamma-1}u}$ weakly with $v = u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$. Then $v \geq u$ in \mathbb{R}^N .*

Proof. Since, $\mathfrak{M}(\|v\|^p)(\Delta_p)^s v - \frac{\lambda}{|v|^{\gamma-1}v} \geq \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p)(\Delta_p)^s u - \frac{\lambda}{|u|^{\gamma-1}u}$ weakly with $v = u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$, we have

$$\langle \mathfrak{M}(\|v\|^p)(\Delta_p)^s v, \phi \rangle - \int_{\Omega} \frac{\lambda}{|v|^{\gamma-1}v} dx \geq \langle \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p)(\Delta_p)^s u, \phi \rangle - \int_{\Omega} \frac{\lambda}{|u|^{\gamma-1}u} dx \quad \forall \phi \geq 0 \in X_0. \quad (5.1)$$

In particular choose $\phi = (u - v)^+$. To this choice, the inequality in (5.1) looks as follows.

$$\langle \mathfrak{M}(\|v\|^p)(\Delta_p)^s v - \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p)(\Delta_p)^s u, (u - v)^+ \rangle - \int_{\Omega} \lambda(u - v)^+ \left(\frac{1}{|v|^{\gamma-1}v} - \frac{1}{|u|^{\gamma-1}u} \right) dx \geq 0. \quad (5.2)$$

Since $\mathcal{M}(t) = \int_0^t \mathfrak{M}(t) dt$ and therefore $\mathcal{M}'(t) = \mathfrak{M}(t)$. By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y))| &\leq |u(x) - u(y)| |v(x) - v(y)| \\ &\leq \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2 + |v(x) - v(y)|^2}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

Consider $I_1 = \langle \mathcal{M}'(u), u \rangle - \langle \mathcal{M}'(u), v \rangle - \langle \mathcal{M}'(v), u \rangle + \langle \mathcal{M}'(v), v \rangle$ and let $|u(x) - u(y)| \geq |v(x) - v(y)|$. Therefore using (5.3) we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= p\mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) \left(\int_Q |u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} \{ |u(x) - u(y)|^2 - (u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y)) \} dx dy \right) \\ &\quad + p\mathfrak{M}(\|v\|^p) \left(\int_Q |v(x) - v(y)|^{p-2} \{ |v(x) - v(y)|^2 - (u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y)) \} dx dy \right) \\ &\geq \frac{p}{2}\mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) \left(\int_Q |u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} \{ |u(x) - u(y)|^2 - |v(x) - v(y)|^2 \} dx dy \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{p}{2}\mathfrak{M}(\|v\|^p) \left(\int_Q |v(x) - v(y)|^{p-2} \{ |v(x) - v(y)|^2 - |u(x) - u(y)|^2 \} dx dy \right) \\ &\geq p\mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) \left(\int_Q (|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} - |v(x) - v(y)|^{p-2}) (|u(x) - u(y)|^2 - |v(x) - v(y)|^2) dx dy \right) \\ &\geq p\mathfrak{m}_0 \left(\int_Q (|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} - |v(x) - v(y)|^{p-2}) (|u(x) - u(y)|^2 - |v(x) - v(y)|^2) dx dy \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

On the other hand, when $|u(x) - u(y)| \leq |v(x) - v(y)|$, we interchange the roles of u, v to get

$$I_1 \geq p\mathfrak{m}_0 \left(\int_Q (|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2} - |v(x) - v(y)|^{p-2}) (|u(x) - u(y)|^2 - |v(x) - v(y)|^2) dx dy \right) \quad (5.5)$$

Thus, we deduce that

$$\langle \mathcal{M}'(u) - \mathcal{M}'(v), u - v \rangle = I_1 \geq 0. \quad (5.6)$$

Thus \mathcal{M}' is a monotone operator. This monotonicity is sufficient for our work. Finally, coming back to inequality (5.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq -\langle \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p)(\Delta_p)^s u - \mathfrak{M}(\|v\|^p)(\Delta_p)^s v, (u - v)^+ \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathfrak{M}(\|v\|^p)(\Delta_p)^s v - \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p)(\Delta_p)^s u, (u - v)^+ \rangle \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Therefore, $|\{x : u(x) > v(x)\}| = 0$. Hence $v \geq u$ a.e. in Ω and hence $v \geq u$ a.e. in \mathbb{R}^N . \square

We now recall three essential results due to [44] to obtain an $L^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ bound. Consider the monotone increasing function $J_p(t) := |t|^{p-2}t$ for every $1 < p < \infty$.

Lemma 5.2. *For every $\beta > 0$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$ we have*

$$\left(\frac{1}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\frac{p+\beta-1}{p}\right) \geq 1.$$

Lemma 5.3. *Assume $1 < p < \infty$ and $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be a C^1 convex function. Then for any $\tau \geq 0$*

$$J_p(a-b) [AJ_{p,\tau}(f'(a)) - BJ_{p,\tau}(f'(b))] \geq (\tau(a-b)^2 + (f(a) - f(b))^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} (f(a) - f(b))(A-B), \quad (5.8)$$

for every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and every $A, B \geq 0$, where $J_{p,\tau}(t) = (\tau + |t|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}t$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, for $\tau = 0$, we get

$$J_p(a-b) [AJ_p(f'(a)) - BJ_p(f'(b))] \geq (f(a) - f(b))^{p-2} (f(a) - f(b))(A-B), \quad (5.9)$$

for every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and every $A, B \geq 0$

Lemma 5.4. *Assume $1 < p < \infty$ and $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be an increasing function. Define*

$$G(t) = \int_0^t h'(\tau)^{\frac{1}{p}} d\tau, t \in \mathbb{R},$$

then we have

$$J_p(a-b)(h(a) - h(b)) \geq |h(a) - h(b)|^p. \quad (5.10)$$

We now prove the uniform boundedness of solutions to the problem (P). The proof is based on the Moser iteration technique.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $u \in X_0$ be a positive weak solution to the problem in (P), then $u \in L^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.*

Proof. We will prove this Lemma by obtaining a more general result for any $r \in (p-1, p_s^*]$ in place of the critical exponent, p_s^* . The arguments of the proof is taken from the celebrated article of [44] with appropriate modifications. We will proceed with the smooth, convex and Lipschitz function $g_\epsilon(t) = (\epsilon^2 + t^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for every $\epsilon > 0$. Moreover, $g_\epsilon(t) \rightarrow |t|$ as $t \rightarrow 0$ and $|g'_\epsilon(t)| \leq 1$. Let $0 < \psi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$. Choose $\varphi = \psi |g'_\epsilon(u)|^{p-2} g'_\epsilon(u)$ as the test function in (2.3) with exponent $r \in (p-1, p_s^*]$ in place of p_s^* . Now the following estimate follows immediately by putting $a = u(x)$, $b = u(y)$, $A = \psi(x)$ and $B = \psi(y)$ in Lemma 5.3. For all $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{R}^+$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) & \int_Q \frac{|g_\epsilon(u(x)) - g_\epsilon(u(y))|^{p-2} (g_\epsilon(u(x)) - g_\epsilon(u(y))) (\psi(x) - \psi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \\ & \leq \int_\Omega \left(\left| \frac{\lambda}{|u|^{\gamma-1}u} + |u|^{r-2}u \right| |g_\epsilon(u)|^{p-1} \psi dx \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Now on passing to the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ together with Fatou's Lemma, we obtain

$$\mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) \int_Q \frac{||u(x)| - |u(y)||^{p-2} (|u(x)| - |u(y)|) (\psi(x) - \psi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \leq \int_\Omega \left(\left| \frac{\lambda}{|u|^{\gamma-1}u} + |u|^{r-2}u \right| \right) \psi dx \quad (5.12)$$

Note that (5.12) is true for every $\psi \in X_0$. Define $u_k = \min\{(u-1)^+, k\} \in X_0$ for each $k > 0$. Let $\beta > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ be given. Putting $\psi = (u_k + \delta)^\beta - \delta^\beta$ (5.12) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) & \int_Q \frac{\|u(x) - u(y)\|^{p-2} (|u(x) - u(y)|) ((u_k(x) + \delta)^\beta - (u_k(y) + \delta)^\beta)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \\ & \leq \int_\Omega \left| \frac{\lambda}{|u|^{\gamma-1}u} + |u|^{r-2}u \right| ((u_k + \delta)^\beta - \delta^\beta) dx \end{aligned}$$

On setting $h(u) = (u_k + \delta)^\beta$ in Lemma 5.4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) & \int_Q \frac{|((u_k(x) + \delta)^{\frac{\beta+p-1}{p}} - (u_k(y) + \delta)^{\frac{\beta+p-1}{p}})|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \\ & \leq \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) \int_Q \left(\frac{(\beta + p - 1)^p}{\beta p^p} \right) \frac{\|u(x) - u(y)\|^{p-2} (|u(x) - u(y)|) ((u_k(x) + \delta)^\beta - (u_k(y) + \delta)^\beta)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \\ & \leq \left(\frac{(\beta + p - 1)^p}{\beta p^p} \right) \mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) \int_Q \frac{\|u(x) - u(y)\|^{p-2} (|u(x) - u(y)|) ((u_k(x) + \delta)^\beta - (u_k(y) + \delta)^\beta)}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \\ & \leq \left(\frac{(\beta + p - 1)^p}{\beta p^p} \right) \int_\Omega \left(\left| \frac{\lambda}{|u|^{\gamma-1}u} \right| + \|u|^{r-2}u \right) ((u_k + \delta)^\beta - \delta^\beta) dx \\ & = \left(\frac{(\beta + p - 1)^p}{\beta p^p} \right) \left[\int_{\{u \geq 1\}} \lambda |u|^{-\gamma} ((u_k + \delta)^\beta - \delta^\beta) + \int_{\{u \geq 1\}} |u|^{r-1} ((u_k + \delta)^\beta - \delta^\beta) dx \right] \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{(\beta + p - 1)^p}{\beta p^p} \right) \left[\int_{\{u \geq 1\}} (1 + |u|^{r-1}) ((u_k + \delta)^\beta - \delta^\beta) dx \right] \\ & \leq 2C \left(\frac{(\beta + p - 1)^p}{\beta p^p} \right) \left[\int_\Omega |u|^{r-1} ((u_k + \delta)^\beta - \delta^\beta) dx \right] \\ & \leq C' \left(\frac{(\beta + p - 1)^p}{\beta p^p} \right) \|u\|_{p_s^*}^{r-1} \|(u_k + \delta)^\beta\|_q, \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

where $q = \frac{p_s^*}{p_s^* - r + 1}$ and $C = \max\{1, |\lambda|\}$. From the Sobolev inequality [6] we get

$$\mathfrak{M}(\|u\|^p) \int_Q \frac{|((u_k(x) + \delta)^{\frac{\beta+p-1}{p}} - (u_k(y) + \delta)^{\frac{\beta+p-1}{p}})|^p}{|x - y|^{N+sp}} dx dy \geq C \mathfrak{m}_0 \left\| (u_k + \delta)^{\frac{\beta+p-1}{p}} - \delta^{\frac{\beta+p-1}{p}} \right\|_{p_s^*}^p \tag{5.14}$$

where $C > 0$. Again from triangle inequality and $(u_k + \delta)^{\beta+p-1} \geq \delta^{p-1}(u_k + \delta)^\beta$ we have

$$\left[\int_\Omega \left((u_k + \delta)^{\frac{\beta+p-1}{p}} - \delta^{\frac{\beta+p-1}{p}} \right)^{p_s^*} dx \right]^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \geq \left(\frac{\delta}{2} \right)^{p-1} \left[\int_\Omega (u_k + \delta)^{\frac{p_s^* \beta}{p}} \right]^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} - \delta^{\beta+p-1} |\Omega| \frac{p}{p_s^*}. \tag{5.15}$$

Therefore, by using (5.15) in (5.14) and then from (5.13), we obtain

$$\left\| (u_k + \delta)^{\frac{\beta}{p}} \right\|_{p_s^*}^p \leq \frac{C'}{\mathbf{m}_0} \left[C \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right)^{p-1} \left(\frac{(\beta + p - 1)^p}{\beta p^p} \right) \|u\|_{p_s^*}^{r-1} \|(u_k + \delta)^\beta\|_q + \delta^\beta |\Omega|^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \right]. \quad (5.16)$$

Therefore, on using (5.16), Lemma 5.2 and (5.13), we can deduce that

$$\left\| (u_k + \delta)^{\frac{\beta}{p}} \right\|_{p_s^*}^p \leq \frac{C'}{\mathbf{m}_0} \left[\frac{1}{\beta} \left(\frac{\beta + p - 1}{p} \right)^p \|(u_k + \delta)^\beta\|_q \left(\frac{C \|u\|_{p_s^*}^{r-1}}{\delta^{p-1}} + |\Omega|^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \frac{1}{q} \right) \right]. \quad (5.17)$$

Now choose, $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta^{p-1} = C \|u\|_{p_s^*}^{r-1} \left(|\Omega|^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \frac{1}{q} \right)^{-1}$ and $\beta \geq 1$ with $\left(\frac{\beta + p - 1}{p} \right)^p \leq \beta^p$. Further, by setting $\eta = \frac{p_s^*}{pq} > 1$ and $\tau = q\beta$ we can rewrite the inequality (5.17) as

$$\|(u_k + \delta)\|_{\eta\tau} \leq \left(C |\Omega|^{\frac{p}{p_s^*} - \frac{1}{q}} \right)^{\frac{q}{\tau}} \left(\frac{\tau}{q} \right)^{\frac{q}{\tau}} \|(u_k + \delta)\|_\tau. \quad (5.18)$$

Set $\tau_0 = q$ and $\tau_{m+1} = \eta\tau_m = \eta^{m+1}q$. Then after performing m iterations, the inequality (5.18) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u_k + \delta)\|_{\tau_{m+1}} &\leq \left(C |\Omega|^{\frac{p}{p_s^*} - \frac{1}{q}} \right)^{\left(\sum_{i=0}^m \frac{q}{\tau_i} \right)} \left(\prod_{i=0}^m \left(\frac{\tau_i}{q} \right)^{\frac{q}{\tau_i}} \right)^{p-1} \|(u_k + \delta)\|_q \\ &= \left(C |\Omega|^{\frac{p}{p_s^*} - \frac{1}{q}} \right)^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}} \left(\eta^{\frac{\eta}{(\eta-1)^2}} \right)^{p-1} \|(u_k + \delta)\|_q \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

Therefore, on passing the limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\|u_k\|_\infty \leq \left(C |\Omega|^{\frac{p}{p_s^*} - \frac{1}{q}} \right)^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}} \left(C' \eta^{\frac{\eta}{(\eta-1)^2}} \right)^{p-1} \|(u_k + \delta)\|_q. \quad (5.20)$$

Furthermore, by applying the triangle inequality together with the fact $u_k \leq (u - 1)^+$ in (5.20) and then letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\|(u - 1)^+\|_\infty \leq \|u_k\|_\infty \leq C \left(\eta^{\frac{\eta}{(\eta-1)^2}} \right)^{p-1} \left(|\Omega|^{\frac{p}{p_s^*} - \frac{1}{q}} \right)^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}} \left(\|(u - 1)^+\|_q + \delta |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{q}} \right) \quad (5.21)$$

Hence, we have $u \in L^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$. In particular, by choosing $r = p_s^*$, we conclude that if $u \in X_0$ is a solution to (P), then $u \in L^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$. \square

Acknowledgement

The author S. Ghosh thanks the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), India, for the financial assistantship received to carry out this research work (CSIR no. 09/983(0013)/2017-EMR-I). D. Choudhuri thanks the Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB), India for the research grant (MTR/2018/000525) to carry out the research.

References

References

- [1] L. Silvestre, Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 60 (2007) 67–112. doi:10.1002/cpa.20153.
- [2] L. Caffarelli, J.-M. Roquejoffre, O. Savin, Nonlocal minimal surfaces, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 63 (2010) 1111–1144. doi:10.1002/cpa.20331.
- [3] N. Laskin, Fractional quantum mechanics and Lévy path integrals, *Physics Letters. A* 268 (2000) 298–305. doi:10.1016/S0375-9601(00)00201-2.
- [4] N. S. Papageorgiou, V. D. Rădulescu, D. D. Repovš, *Nonlinear Analysis-Theory and Methods*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, Cham, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-03430-6.
- [5] G. Molica Bisci, V. D. Radulescu, R. Servadei, Variational methods for nonlocal fractional problems, volume 162 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016. doi:10.1017/CB09781316282397, with a foreword by Jean Mawhin.
- [6] E. D. Nezza, G. Palatucci, E. Valdinoci, Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional sobolev spaces, *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques* 136 (2012) 521–573. doi:10.1016/j.bulsci.2011.12.004.
- [7] P. Pucci, M. Xiang, B. Zhang, Existence and multiplicity of entire solutions for fractional p -Kirchhoff equations, *Advances in Nonlinear Analysis* 5 (2016) 27–55. doi:10.1515/anona-2015-0102.
- [8] A. Fiscella, E. Valdinoci, A critical Kirchhoff type problem involving a nonlocal operator, *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications. An International Multidisciplinary Journal* 94 (2014) 156–170. doi:10.1016/j.na.2013.08.011.
- [9] C. O. Alves, F. J. S. A. Corrêa, T. F. Ma, Positive solutions for a quasilinear elliptic equation of Kirchhoff type, *Computers & Mathematics with Applications. An International Journal* 49 (2005) 85–93. doi:10.1016/j.camwa.2005.01.008.
- [10] L. Caffarelli, Non-local diffusions, drifts and games, in: *Nonlinear partial differential equations*, volume 7 of *Abel Symp.*, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012, pp. 37–52. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-25361-4_3.
- [11] G. Molica Bisci, Sequences of weak solutions for fractional equations, *Mathematical Research Letters* 21 (2014) 241–253. doi:10.4310/MRL.2014.v21.n2.a3.
- [12] A. C. Lazer, P. J. McKenna, On a singular nonlinear elliptic boundary value problem, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 111 (1991) 721–730. doi:10.1090/s0002-9939-1991-1037213-9.

- [13] M. G. Crandall, P. H. Rabinowitz, L. Tartar, On a Dirichlet problem with a singular nonlinearity, *Communications in Partial Differential Equations* 2 (1977) 193–222. doi:10.1080/03605307708820029.
- [14] A. Canino, L. Montoro, B. Sciunzi, M. Squassina, Nonlocal problems with singular nonlinearity, *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques* 141 (2017) 223–250. doi:10.1016/j.bulsci.2017.01.002.
- [15] L. Boccardo, L. Orsina, Semilinear elliptic equations with singular nonlinearities, *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 37 (2009) 363–380. doi:10.1007/s00526-009-0266-x.
- [16] J. Giacomoni, I. Schindler, P. Takáč, Sobolev versus Hölder local minimizers and existence of multiple solutions for a singular quasilinear equation, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze. Serie 5*, 6 (2007) 117–158. URL: http://www.numdam.org/item/ASNSP_2007_5_6_1_117_0/.
- [17] K. Saoudi, A critical fractional elliptic equation with singular nonlinearities, *Fractional Calculus and Applied Analysis* 20 (2017) 1507–1530. doi:10.1515/fca-2017-0079.
- [18] Y. Haitao, Multiplicity and asymptotic behavior of positive solutions for a singular semilinear elliptic problem, *Journal of Differential Equations* 189 (2003) 487–512. doi:10.1016/s0022-0396(02)00098-0.
- [19] J. Giacomoni, K. Saoudi, Multiplicity of positive solutions for a singular and critical problem, *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications* 71 (2009) 4060–4077. doi:10.1016/j.na.2009.02.087.
- [20] K. Saoudi, S. Ghosh, D. Choudhuri, Multiplicity and Hölder regularity of solutions for a nonlocal elliptic PDE involving singularity, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 60 (2019) 101509. doi:10.1063/1.5107517.
- [21] T. Mukherjee, K. Sreenadh, On dirichlet problem for fractional p-laplacian with singular nonlinearity, *Advances in Nonlinear Analysis* 8 (2016) 52–72. doi:10.1515/anona-2016-0100.
- [22] P.-L. Lions, The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The limit case. I, *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana* 1 (1985) 145–201. doi:10.4171/RMI/6.
- [23] P.-L. Lions, The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The limit case. II, *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana* 1 (1985) 45–121. doi:10.4171/RMI/12.
- [24] S. Mosconi, K. Perera, M. Squassina, Y. Yang, The Brezis-Nirenberg problem for the fractional p -Laplacian, *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 55 (2016) Art. 105, 25. doi:10.1007/s00526-016-1035-2.
- [25] C.-M. Chu, Z.-P. Cai, H.-M. Suo, Multiplicity of positive solutions for critical fractional Kirchhoff type problem with concave-convex nonlinearity, *Univerzitet u Nišu. Prirodno-Matematički Fakultet. Filomat* 32 (2018) 3791–3798. doi:10.2298/fil1811791c.

- [26] Y. Song, S. Shi, Multiplicity results for stationary Kirchhoff problems involving fractional elliptic operator and critical nonlinearity in \mathbb{R}^N , *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 59 (2018) 071512, 12. doi:10.1063/1.5047664.
- [27] O. H. Miyagaki, D. Motreanu, F. R. Pereira, Multiple solutions for a fractional elliptic problem with critical growth, *Journal of Differential Equations* 269 (2020) 5542–5572. doi:10.1016/j.jde.2020.04.010.
- [28] J. Zhang, Z. Lou, Y. Ji, W. Shao, Ground state of Kirchhoff type fractional Schrödinger equations with critical growth, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 462 (2018) 57–83. doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2018.01.060.
- [29] J. García Azorero, I. Peral Alonso, Multiplicity of solutions for elliptic problems with critical exponent or with a nonsymmetric term, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 323 (1991) 877–895. doi:10.2307/2001562.
- [30] G. Li, G. Zhang, Multiple solutions for the $p&q$ -Laplacian problem with critical exponent, *Acta Mathematica Scientia. Series B. English Edition* 29 (2009) 903–918. doi:10.1016/S0252-9602(09)60089-8.
- [31] G. M. Figueiredo, Existence and multiplicity of solutions for a class of $p&q$ elliptic problems with critical exponent, *Mathematische Nachrichten* 286 (2013) 1129–1141. doi:10.1002/mana.201100237.
- [32] M. Khiddi, S. M. Sbai, Infinitely many solutions for non-local elliptic non-degenerate p -Kirchhoff equations with critical exponent, *Complex Variables and Elliptic Equations. An International Journal* 65 (2020) 368–380. doi:10.1080/17476933.2019.1627527.
- [33] M. Xiang, B. Zhang, X. Guo, Infinitely many solutions for a fractional Kirchhoff type problem via fountain theorem, *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications. An International Multidisciplinary Journal* 120 (2015) 299–313. doi:10.1016/j.na.2015.03.015.
- [34] A. Fiscella, Infinitely many solutions for a critical Kirchhoff type problem involving a fractional operator, *Differential and Integral Equations. An International Journal for Theory & Applications* 29 (2016) 513–530.
- [35] P. H. Rabinowitz, *Minimax methods in critical point theory with applications to differential equations*, volume 65 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*, Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1986. doi:10.1090/cbms/065.
- [36] M. Xiang, B. Zhang, V. D. Rădulescu, Multiplicity of solutions for a class of quasilinear Kirchhoff system involving the fractional p -Laplacian, *Nonlinearity* 29 (2016) 3186–3205. doi:10.1088/0951-7715/29/10/3186.
- [37] S. Ghosh, D. Choudhuri, Existence of infinitely many solutions for a nonlocal elliptic PDE involving singularity, *Positivity* 17 (2020) 97–115. doi:10.1007/s11117-019-00690-4.

- [38] R. Servadei, E. Valdinoci, Mountain pass solutions for non-local elliptic operators, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 389 (2012) 887–898. doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2011.12.032.
- [39] R. Servadei, E. Valdinoci, Variational methods for non-local operators of elliptic type, *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems - A* 33 (2013) 2105–2137. doi:10.3934/dcds.2013.33.2105.
- [40] R. Kajikiya, A critical point theorem related to the symmetric mountain pass lemma and its applications to elliptic equations, *Journal of Functional Analysis* 225 (2005) 352–370. doi:10.1016/j.jfa.2005.04.005.
- [41] M. Xiang, B. Zhang, X. Zhang, A nonhomogeneous fractional p -Kirchhoff type problem involving critical exponent in \mathbb{R}^N , *Advanced Nonlinear Studies* 17 (2017) 611–640. doi:10.1515/ans-2016-6002.
- [42] M. Willem, *Minimax Theorems*, volume 24 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications*, first ed., Birkhuser, Boston, 1997. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-4146-1.
- [43] D. Choudhuri, Existence and Hölder regularity of infinitely many solutions to a p -Kirchhoff type problem involving a singular and a superlinear nonlinearity without the Ambrosetti-Rabinowitz (AR) condition (2020). arXiv:2006.00953v2.
- [44] L. Brasco, E. Parini, The second eigenvalue of the fractional p -laplacian, *Advances in Calculus of Variations* 9 (2016). doi:10.1515/acv-2015-0007.