

On non-local nonlinear elliptic equations involving an eigenvalue problem

Kuan-Hsiang Wang*, Ching-yu Chen[†], Yueh-cheng Kuo[‡], Tsung-fang Wu[§]

Department of Applied Mathematics
National University of Kaohsiung, Kaohsiung 811, Taiwan

Abstract

The existence and multiplicity of solutions for a class of non-local elliptic boundary value problems with superlinear source functions are investigated in this paper. Using variational methods, we examine the changes arise in the solution behaviours as a result of the non-local effect. Comparisons are made of the results here with those of the elliptic boundary value problem in the absence of the non-local term under the same prescribed conditions to highlight this effect of non-locality on the solution behaviours. Our results here demonstrate that the complexity of the solution structures is significantly increased in the presence of the non-local effect with the possibility ranging from no permissible positive solution to three positive solutions and, contrary to those obtained in the absence of the non-local term, the solution profiles also vary depending on the superlinearity of the source functions.

Keywords: Kirchhoff-type equations; Mountain pass theorem; positive solutions; eigenvalue problem.

AMS Subject Classification 2020. 35B09, 35B40, 35J20, 35J61.

1 Introduction

In the present paper, we investigate the solution behaviour of a non-local elliptic boundary value problems of Kirchhoff-type with a superlinear source term, namely,

$$\begin{cases} -\left(a \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx + b\right) \Delta u = \lambda f(x)u + g(x)|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (K_{a,\lambda})$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 1$, is a bounded domain with smooth boundary, $2 < p < 2^*$ ($2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$ if $N \geq 3$; $2^* = \infty$ if $N = 1, 2$) and $a, b, \lambda > 0$ are real parameters. We are interested in the cases where the weight functions f and g are sign-changing in $\overline{\Omega}$ and thus we impose the following conditions:

(D1) $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $|\{x \in \Omega : f(x) > 0\}| > 0$,

(D2) $g \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ which changes sign;

*E-mail address: khwang0511@gmail.com (K.-H. Wang)

[†]E-mail address: aprilchen@nuk.edu.tw (C.-Y. Chen)

[‡]E-mail address: yckuo@nuk.edu.tw (Y.-C. Kuo)

[§]E-mail address: tfwu@nuk.edu.tw (T.-F. Wu)

and set $b = 1$ in Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ for simplicity.

Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ is a stationary variation of the generalist Kirchhoff equation,

$$u_{tt} - M \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right) \Delta u = f, \quad (1.1)$$

which is an extension of the classical wave equation proposed by Kirchhoff [21] to describe the transversal oscillations of a stretched string, taking into account of the effect of changes in string length during the vibrations. The well-posedness and solvability of Equation (1.1) has been well investigated in general dimension and domain (see, for examples, [4, 11, 23, 25]), and much effort has been put into studying the solution behaviours of its stationary variants focusing on various aspects of the problem with specific formulations of M and f , in bounded [5, 10, 20, 22, 26] and unbounded domain [2, 13, 14, 17, 19, 24, 27, 28] and some have, in particular, drawn attention to the presence of the non-local effect on the solution behaviours (see, for examples, [8, 9, 12, 16, 18]). We do not intend to provide a survey on the subject and would therefore refer the interested readers to the afore mentioned references and the references therein for relevant studies.

While our focus here is also on the solution behaviour of the Kirchhoff type equation, we are particularly interested in the difference that arises with the consideration of the non-local effect. To better explain the purpose of and the motivation behind our current study, it is necessary to reiterate some previous results on the solution structures of the semilinear boundary value problem, namely

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda f(x)u + g(x)|u|^{p-2}u, & \text{for } x \in \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

by setting $a = 0$ and $b = 1$ in Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$. For the detailed analysis of this problem, we refer the readers to [1, 6, 7]; the existence and multiplicity of solutions are summarised as follow

- (R1) a positive solution exists for (1.2) whenever $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$;
- (R2) if $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx < 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that (1.2) has at least two positive solutions whenever $\lambda_1(f) < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta$;
- (R3) if λ is sufficiently large, then no positive solution of (1.2) is permitted;
- (R4) if $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx > 0$, then no positive solution of (1.2) is permitted for $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$,

with $\lambda_1(f)$ being the positive principal eigenvalue and ϕ_1 the corresponding positive principal eigenfunction of the problem

$$-\Delta u = \lambda f(x)u, \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \quad u = 0, \quad \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega. \quad (1.3)$$

Remark 1.1. Under condition (D1), there exists a sequence of eigenvalues $\{\lambda_n(f)\}$ of Equation (1.3) with $0 < \lambda_1(f) < \lambda_2(f) \leq \dots$ and each eigenvalue being of finite multiplicity. Denoting the principal positive eigenfunctions by ϕ_1 , we have

$$\lambda_1(f) = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi_1|^2 dx = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx : u \in H_0^1(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx = 1 \right\} \quad (1.4)$$

and

$$\lambda_2(f) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx : u \in H_0^1(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx = 1, \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \nabla \phi_1 dx = 0 \right\}. \quad (1.5)$$




Figure 1: Examples of solution structures for Equation (1.2) where (a) $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx > 0$ with $g(x) = -\sin(3\pi x)$ and (b) $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx < 0$ with $g(x) = -\sin(1.8\pi x)$; $p = 4$ in both cases. Details of the numerical schemes are given in Section 2.

Results (R1) – (R4) are better visualized using the two examples that we simulated numerically and presented in Figure 1. Expressed in terms of global bifurcation theory, the results (R1) – (R4) indicate that the solutions bifurcate from the branch of zero solutions in two directions depending on the sign of $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx$: bifurcating to the left if $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx > 0$ and to the right if $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx < 0$, turning again to the left to give the two branches of positive solutions for $\lambda_1(f) < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta$.

The solution structures vary considerably when the non-local effect that is typical of the Kirchhoff-type equations is included into Equation (1.2). The summarised results of (R1) – (R4) observed in the positive solutions of Equation (1.2) are valid for all values of p , whereas for the Kirchhoff-type equation we studied here, different solution behaviours are found within different regimes of p . Our results, which will be presented in Theorems 2.1-2.6 below, indicate that in the cases when $p \leq 4$ Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ exhibits a much more complex solution structure than that of Equation (1.2) with the possibility ranging from admitting no positive solution to three positive solutions when $p < 4$, depending on the sign of $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx$ and varying with the values of a ; whereas for $p = 4$, provided a is sufficient large, the solution behaviours become independent on the condition imposed on the integral $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx$. When $p > 4$ and in this case for all $a > 0$, the non-local effect alone ensures the existence of two positive solutions without imposing any additional conditions on the integral $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx$.

The sections of this paper are organised as follow. In Section 2, we present the main results in Theorems 2.1-2.6, each with examples computed numerically to give graphical interpretations of these results. The proofs of these theorems are then presented in the sections that follow and we begin by showing that the energy functional is to have the mountain pass geometry while satisfying the Palais-Smale condition in Section 3. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 2.1 and present the proofs of Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 in Section 5 and finally those of Theorems 2.4-2.6 in Section 6. Furthermore, we explore the asymptotic behaviour of these positive solutions at parameter λ .

2 Main results

We carry out the analysis using the variational methods and the positive solutions of Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ are found by considering the energy functional $J_{a,\lambda} : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) = \frac{a}{4} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} g |u|^p dx.$$

Furthermore, $J_{a,\lambda}$ is a C^1 functional with the derivative given by

$$\langle J'_{a,\lambda}(u), \varphi \rangle = \left(a \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx + 1 \right) \left(\int_{\Omega} \nabla u \nabla \varphi dx \right) - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u \varphi dx - \int_{\Omega} g |u|^{p-2} u \varphi dx$$

for all $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, where $J'_{a,\lambda}$ denotes the Fréchet derivative of $J_{a,\lambda}$. We conclude that u is a critical point of $J_{a,\lambda}$ if and only if it satisfies Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that $N = 1, 2, 3$, $4 < p < 2^*$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. Then we have the following results.*

- (i) *For each $a > 0$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has a positive solution u^+ with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) > 0$ whenever $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$.*
- (ii) *For each $a > 0$, there exists $\delta_a > 0$ such that Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has two positive solutions u^+ and u^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) < 0 < J_{a,\lambda}(u^+)$ whenever $\lambda_1(f) < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_a$. More precisely, if $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx \geq 0$, then*

$$\delta_a = \lambda_1(f)(p-4) \left(\frac{p S_p^p}{\|g\|_{\infty}} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-4}} \left(\frac{a}{2p-4} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p-4}};$$

while $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx < 0$, $\delta_a^- \nearrow \infty$ as $a \nearrow \infty$ and there exists a positive constant C_0 such that $\delta_a^- > C_0$ for all $a > 0$.




Figure 2: Simulations for Theorem 2.1 with $p = 5$ showing the results of various a . Multiple solutions exist for both (a) $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx > 0$ with $g(x) = -\sin(3\pi x)$ and (b) $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx < 0$ with $g(x) = \sin(3\pi x)$. The bifurcation point $\lambda_1(f)$ is located at π^2 in all the simulations.

In this regime of p , the presence of the non-local effect is sufficient to guarantee the existence of two positive solutions. We illustrate this result using the two examples in Figure 2 taking $p = 5$ with (a) $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx > 0$ on the left and (b) $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx < 0$ on the right. In both examples and for each value of a , the existence of two branches of solutions described by Theorem 2.1 (ii) can be observed as the solution branch bifurcates to the right from the branch of zero solutions at $\lambda_1(f)$, then turning at a point $\lambda > \lambda_1(f) + \delta_a$; this turning point being pushed further to the right with increasing value of a (and hence δ_a) is evident from these curves. The upper branch extending pass the initial bifurcation point $\lambda_1(f)$ towards $\lambda = 0$ thus depicts the branch of positive solutions u^+ whenever $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$ stated in Theorem 2.1 (i).

The difference between our results and those of Equation (1.2) can be observed by comparing Figure 2 and Figure 1. For demonstration purpose, we have set $p = 4$ in Figure 1, the solution behaviour in general (i.e. the direction of bifurcation and the number of positive solutions) does not

vary with the value of p for Equation (1.2). In the case when $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx > 0$, two positive solutions are observed in Figure 2 (a), whereas in Figure 1 (a) only a single solution branch is present. In Figure 2 (b) and Figure 1 (b) when $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx < 0$, both exhibit regions with two positive solutions. While this region is finite for Equation (1.2) as indicated by (R3), in the presence of the non-local effect, this region of multiple positive solution continues to expand to the right as the non-local effect grows, leading eventually to the conclusion that at least a positive solution exists for $0 < \lambda < \infty$.

Note that we have set $f \equiv 1$ and $\bar{\Omega} = [0, 1]$ in all the simulations including those of Equation (1.2) in Figure 1. Consequently, the positive principal eigenvalue and the corresponding eigenfunction satisfying the boundary condition are given by $\lambda_1(f) = \pi^2$ and $\phi_1(x) = \sin(\pi x)$ respectively. These solution branches are numerically generated using a continuation scheme and computed using matlab codes. An initial non-trivial solution is required for the scheme which is derived using a fixed point iteration method and subsequently rescaled to give a suitable starting point for the continuation method. The details of the continuation method and the fixed point scheme can be found in [29, 30].

Next, we present the cases when $p = 4$ in Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 where it is necessary to consider the following:

$$\Gamma_0 := \sup_{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} gu^4 dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx\right)^2}.$$

By Hölder and Sobolev inequalities, we conclude that $0 < \Gamma_0 < \infty$. It is then possible to choose $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $\int_{\Omega} gv^4 dx > \int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx$ and $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi_1|^2 dx$ since g changes sign, giving subsequently $\Gamma_0 > \lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx$.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that $N = 1, 2, 3$, $p = 4$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. If $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx > 0$, then we have the following results.*

- (i) *For each $0 < a \leq \lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has a positive solution u^+ with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) > 0$ whenever $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$.*
- (ii) *For each $\lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx < a < \Gamma_0$,*
 - (ii-1) *Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has a positive solution u^+ with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) > 0$ whenever $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$;*
 - (ii-2) *there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has two positive solutions u^+ and u^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) < 0 < J_{a,\lambda}(u^+)$ whenever $\lambda_1(f) < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_0$.*
- (iii) *For each $a \geq \Gamma_0$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ does not admit nontrivial solution whenever $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$.*
- (iv) *For each $a > \Gamma_0$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has a positive solution u^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) < 0$ whenever $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$.*




Figure 3: Simulations for Theorem 2.2 with $p = 4$ and increasing values of a from (a)-(c) satisfying $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx > 0$; $g(x) = -\sin(3\pi x)$ is used for all three cases.

Examples of Theorem 2.2 satisfying the conditions $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx > 0$ are shown in Figure 3 (a)-(c). In (a), with $a = 10^{-4}$ a single branch of positive solution describing Theorem 2.2 (i) is observed bifurcating to the left; whereas increasing the value of a to $a = 0.008$ in (b), the solution branch initially bifurcates to the right before turning at a point $\lambda > \lambda_1(f) + \delta_0$ giving two solution branches for $\lambda_1(f) < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_0$ described by Theorem 2.2 (ii-2) and a single solution branch whenever $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$ by Theorem 2.2 (ii-1). Figure 3 (c) demonstrates the results of Theorem 2.2 (iii)-(iv) when the values of a exceed a certain threshold value (namely, Γ_0). A single branch of positive solutions is seen branching off to the right without turning giving the result of case (iv) that at least one positive solution exists when $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$, and for case (iii) when $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$, no positive solution is admissible. Note that the solution behaviours of (b) and (c) are similar near the bifurcation point $\lambda_1(f)$ and thus to ensure that no turning occurs in (c), we perform the simulations until $\lambda = 700$ with $\|u\|_2$ reaching the same scale as that in (b), but turning is only observed in (b).

For small values of a , the results here are similar to (R1) and (R4) of Equation (1.2), as demonstrated in Figure 3 (a) and Figure 1 (a), both imposing the condition $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx > 0$. However, with a slightly larger value of a in Figure 3 (b), the increased non-local effect pushes the bifurcated solution branch to the right before turning again to the left, as a result, multiple solutions appear for $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$ immediately to the right of $\lambda_1(f)$. Increasing the value of a further in Figure 3 (c), the bifurcated solution branch is prevented from turning to the left again and thus contrary to the result of (R1) and (R4), a positive solution exists for $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$ while no solution is permitted for $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$.

Theorem 2.3. Suppose that $N = 1, 2, 3$, $p = 4$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. If $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx \leq 0$, then we have the following results.

- (i) For each $0 < a < \Gamma_0$,
 - (i-1) Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has a positive solution u^+ with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) > 0$ whenever $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$;
 - (i-2) there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has two positive solutions u^+ and u^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) < 0 < J_{a,\lambda}(u^+)$ whenever $\lambda_1(f) < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_0$.
- (ii) For each $a \geq \Gamma_0$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ does not admit nontrivial solution whenever $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$.
- (iii) For each $a > \Gamma_0$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has a positive solution u^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) < 0$ whenever $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$.




Figure 4: Simulations for Theorem 2.3 with $p = 4$ and $g(x) = -\sin(1.8\pi x)$ satisfying $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx \leq 0$.

Figure 4 depicts the results of Theorem 2.3 for the cases when $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx \leq 0$. In Figure 4 (a), we assume the same value of a ($a = 10^{-4}$) as in Figure 3 (a) to highlight the change in the solution structure as the integral $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx$ changes sign. When a is sufficiently small, two branches

of solutions are present here with the lower branch turning left into the upper branch at a point $\lambda > \lambda_1(f) + \delta_0$ depicting the results of Theorem 2.3 (i-1) and (i-2). Figure 4 (b) demonstrates the results of Theorem 2.3 (ii) and (iii) when the values of a exceed a certain threshold value (Γ_0) exhibiting similar behaviour to that in Figure 3 (c) when $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx > 0$.

The solution structure in Figure 4 (a) is similar to that in Figure 1 (b) of Equation (1.2) when $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx \leq 0$ provided $a < \Gamma_0$. Increasing the value of a in Figure 4 (b) results in a profile that is also observed in Figure 3 (c) indicating that when the values of a exceed a certain threshold value, namely, $a \geq \Gamma_0$, the solution behaviour becomes independent on the condition imposed on the integral $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx$ for the case when $p = 4$.

We next present the results for $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$ when $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx > 0$ in Theorem 2.4 and for brevity, we assume the notations below that for $a > 0$,

$$\lambda_a^+ = \lambda_1(f) \left(1 - (4-p) \left(\frac{\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx}{p\lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p}{2}}} \right)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{2p-4}{a} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right) \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$\Lambda_a^+ = \lambda_1(f) \left(1 - (4-p) \left(\frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{2S_p^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{p-2}{a} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right)$$

with S_p being the best Sobolev constant for the embedding of $H_0^1(\Omega)$ into $L^p(\Omega)$. Note that $\Lambda_a^+ < \lambda_a^+ < \lambda_1(f)$ for all $a > 0$, and $\Lambda_a^+ > 0$ for all $a > (p-2)(4-p)^{\frac{4-p}{p-2}} \left(\frac{1}{2}\|g\|_{\infty} S_p^{-p} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}$.

Theorem 2.4. Suppose that $N \geq 1$, $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. If $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx > 0$, then the following results hold.

- (i) For each $a > 0$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has two positive solutions u^+ and u^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) < 0 < J_{a,\lambda}(u^+)$ whenever $\max\{0, \lambda_a^+\} < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$.
- (ii) For each $a > 0$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has a positive solution u^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) < 0$ whenever $\lambda \geq \lambda_1(f)$.
- (iii) For each $a > (p-2)(4-p)^{\frac{4-p}{p-2}} \left(\frac{1}{2}\|g\|_{\infty} S_p^{-p} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ does not admit nontrivial solution whenever $0 < \lambda < \Lambda_a^+$.




Figure 5: Simulations for Theorem 2.4 satisfying $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx > 0$ with $p = 3$ and $g(x) = -\sin(3\pi x)$.

Examples of Theorem 2.4 satisfying $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx > 0$ in this regime of p are presented in Figure 5 for three distinct values of a . We set $p = 3$ and all three examples exhibit similar solution structure with two branches of positive solutions. The lower branch bifurcates to the left from the zero solutions at $\lambda_1(f)$ turning into the upper branch at a point $\lambda \leq \max\{0, \lambda_a^+\}$ giving the results described by

Theorem 2.4 (i) and (ii) that two positive solutions whenever $\max\{0, \lambda_a^+\} < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$ and one positive solution whenever $\lambda \geq \lambda_1(f)$. Note that $\lambda_a^+ \leq 0$ when $0 < a \ll 1$ but approaches $\lambda_1(f)$ from the left with increasing values of a . Consequently, the turning point can be seen to edge closer to the bifurcation point $\lambda_1(f)$ in Figure 5 from (a) to (c) as a result of increasing a .

Note that the multiplicity of solutions here appears on the left hand side of the bifurcation point $\lambda_1(f)$ with the turning point approaching $\lambda = 0$ for very small value of a and on the right at least one positive solution is permitted for $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$. Thus, the existence of positive solutions is always guaranteed for $\lambda > 0$ provided a is sufficiently small. As a increases, a region with no permissible positive solution begins to appear in a right neighbourhood of $\lambda = 0$ and this neighbourhood becomes larger as the non-local effect becomes more pronounced. Nevertheless, multiple positive solutions are always present near $\lambda_1(f)$ for $\lambda < \lambda_1(f)$ unaffected by the values of a , however large it might be.

In the next two Theorems, we present the results for $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$ when $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx < 0$ and consider the following:

$$\Gamma_p := \sup \left\{ \frac{\int_{\Omega} g|u|^p dx}{\left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}} : u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}, \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx \geq 0 \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Under conditions (D1) – (D2), we can choose a function $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $\int_{\Omega} f \varphi^2 dx > 0$ and $\int_{\Omega} g|\varphi|^p dx > 0$ (see Proposition 6.2 in [7] for more details). Hence $\Gamma_p > 0$, and it is easy to deduce that $\Gamma_p \leq \|g\|_{\infty} S_p^{-p}$ by Sobolev inequality. We also denote here by $a_0(p)$ a threshold value of a which is dependent on the value of p and is given by

$$a_0(p) = (2p - 4) (4 - p)^{\frac{4-p}{p-2}} \left(\frac{\Gamma_p}{p} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}. \quad (2.3)$$

In addition, for brevity, we assume the notation below that for $a > 0$,

$$\Lambda_a^- = \lambda_2(f) \left(1 - (4 - p) \left(\frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{S_p^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{2^{p-1}(p-1)\|g\|_{\infty}\|\phi_1\|_p^p}{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1 dx|} \right)^{\frac{2p-2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{4p-8}{a} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right).$$

Note that $\Lambda_a^- > 0$ for all

$$a > a^*(p) := (4p - 8) (4 - p)^{\frac{4-p}{p-2}} \left(\frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{S_p^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \left(\frac{2^{p-1}(p-1)\|g\|_{\infty}\|\phi_1\|_p^p}{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1 dx|} \right)^{\frac{2p-2}{p-2}}$$

and $a_0(p) < a^*(p)$.

Theorem 2.5. Suppose that $N \geq 1$, $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. If $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx < 0$, then we have the following results.

- (i) For each $0 < a < a_0(p)$,
 - (i-1) Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has two positive solutions u^+ and u^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) < 0 < J_{a,\lambda}(u^+)$ whenever $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$;
 - (i-2) there exists $\bar{\delta}_a > 0$ such that Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has three positive solutions u^+ , u_1^- and u_2^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u_1^-), J_{a,\lambda}(u_2^-) < 0 < J_{a,\lambda}(u^+)$ whenever $\lambda_1(f) < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \bar{\delta}_a$.
- (ii) For each $a > 0$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has a positive solution u^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) < 0$ whenever $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$.

(iii) For each $a > a^*(p)$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ does not admit nontrivial solution whenever $0 < \lambda \leq \min\{\lambda_1(f), \Lambda_a^-\}$.

In the case when $a \geq a_0(p)$, it is necessary to consider the following:

$$\lambda_a^- := \inf_{u \in S} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx} \left(1 - (4-p) \left(\frac{\int_{\Omega} g |u|^p dx}{p \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{p}{2}}} \right)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{2p-4}{a} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right) \quad \text{for } a \geq a_0(p), \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$S = \left\{ u \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx > 0, \int_{\Omega} g |u|^p dx > 0 \right\}. \quad (2.5)$$

The function λ_a^- is nonnegative, continuous and increasing, and we conclude that

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_a^- > \lambda_1(f)$$

when $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx < 0$ (see Proposition 3.6 in Section 3). In particular, if f is nonnegative, we can deduce that

$$\lambda_{a_0(p)}^- = 0$$

(see Proposition 3.7 in Section 3). Thus, when $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx < 0$ and f is nonnegative, there is a number $\mathbf{A} > a_0(p)$ such that $0 \leq \lambda_a^- < \lambda_1(f)$ for $a_0(p) \leq a < \mathbf{A}$.

Theorem 2.6. Suppose that $N \geq 1$, $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$, conditions (D1)–(D2) hold and $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx < 0$. In addition, the following condition is assumed:

(D3) $|\{x \in \Omega : f(x) < 0\}| = 0$.

Then for each $a_0(p) \leq a < \mathbf{A}$,

- (i) Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has two positive solutions u^+ and u^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) < 0 < J_{a,\lambda}(u^+)$ whenever $\lambda_a^- < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$;
- (ii) there exists $\hat{\delta}_a > 0$ such that Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has three positive solutions u^+ , u_1^- and u_2^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u_1^-), J_{a,\lambda}(u_2^-) < 0 < J_{a,\lambda}(u^+)$ whenever $\lambda_1(f) < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \hat{\delta}_a$.




Figure 6: Simulations for Theorems 2.5 and 2.6 satisfying $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx < 0$; $p = 3$ and $g(x) = \sin(3\pi x)$.

The results of Theorems 2.5 and 2.6 when $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx < 0$ are illustrated in Figure 6 where we have set $p = 3$ as an example with the value of a increases from (a) to (c). Similar solution profiles are observed in (a) and (b) with regions of λ permitting either one, two or three positive solutions. For

the small value of a assumed in (a), the turning from the middle to the upper solution branch occurs in the region $\lambda < 0$, thus depicting the case of Theorem 2.5 (i-1) for which two positive solutions are present for $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$. With a slightly increased value of a in (b), this turning point is shifted towards the right and now occurs in the region $0 < \lambda < \lambda_a^-$ demonstrating the result of Theorem 2.6 (i) permitting two positive solutions whenever $\lambda_a^- < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$. As the values of a increases further, this turning point continues moving to the right until it vanishes in (c) leaving a single branch of solutions. All three solutions continue their extension to the right and thus as stated in Theorem 2.5 (ii) at least one positive solution is guaranteed whenever $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$. Subsequently, the region that admits no positive solutions, described by Theorem 2.5 (iii), lies to the left of these curves; however, when a is very small, as in (a), such region does not exist for $\lambda > 0$.

The presence of the non-local effect again is evident if we compare the results here with that of Figure 1 (b) in which the solution branch bifurcates from $\lambda_1(f)$ to the right, turning left once towards $\lambda = 0$ without turning again for the second time. Thus, contrary to the results of (R1) and (R3), a positive solution is always present for $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$ when $a > 0$ and a region with no permissible positive solution lies within $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$ when a becomes sufficiently large.

3 Palais-Smale sequence

We first clarify the notations that are to be used in the analysis. Denote by $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_q$ the $H_0^1(\Omega)$ -norm and $L^q(\Omega)$ -norm for $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, respectively, and the best Sobolev constant by S_r for the embedding of $H_0^1(\Omega)$ into $L^r(\Omega)$ with $1 \leq r < 2^*$ and define it by

$$S_r = \inf_{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|u\|}{\|u\|_r}. \quad (3.1)$$

A strong convergence is indicated using “ $\rightarrow$ ” whereas the weak convergence “ $\rightharpoonup$ ”. The notation $o(1)$ denotes a quantity that goes to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The notation $\{u_n\}$ is used to denote both the sequence itself and its subsequence; consequently, during the analysis below the notation $\{u_n\}$ will indicate that a subsequence may be used instead if necessary without further deliberation. The proof that is given in this section shows that the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ possesses the mountain pass geometry and satisfies the Palais-Smale condition and we begin by recalling the well known Mountain Pass Theorem [3].

Mountain Pass Theorem. *Let E be a Banach space, $J \in C^1(E, \mathbb{R})$, $e \in E$ and $\rho > 0$ be such that $\|e\|_E > \rho$ and*

$$b := \inf_{\|u\|_E = \rho} J(u) > J(0) \geq J(e).$$

If J satisfies Palais-Smale condition at level α with

$$\alpha := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} J(\gamma(t)) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma := \{\gamma \in C([0,1], E) : \gamma(0) = 0, \gamma(1) = e\},$$

then α is a critical value of J and $\alpha \geq b$.

Thus, we say that the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ has the mountain pass geometry if there exist $\rho > 0$ and $e \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\|e\| > \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\|u\| = \rho} J_{a,\lambda}(u) > J_{a,\lambda}(0) \geq J_{a,\lambda}(e),$$

and that the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ satisfies Palais-Smale condition at level $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ ($(PS)_\alpha$ -condition for short) if any sequence $\{u_n\} \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ satisfying $J_{a,\lambda}(u_n) \rightarrow \alpha$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u_n) \rightarrow 0$ has a convergent subsequence. Such sequence is called a Palais-Smale sequence at level α ($(PS)_\alpha$ -sequence).

To prove the mountain pass geometry of the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ for λ in a right neighbourhood of $\lambda_1(f)$, we decompose each $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ as $u = t\phi_1 + w$, where $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\int_{\Omega} \nabla w \nabla \phi_1 dx = 0$. Then

$$\|u\|^2 = \lambda_1(f)t^2 + \|w\|^2. \quad (3.2)$$

Moreover, by Remark 1.1, we have

$$\lambda_2(f) \int_{\Omega} fw^2 dx \leq \|w\|^2 \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f\phi_1 w dx = \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi_1 \nabla w dx = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Thus, by (3.2) – (3.4), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} fu^2 dx &= \lambda_1(f)t^2 + \|w\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} (t^2 f\phi_1^2 + 2tf\phi_1 w + fw^2) dx \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \lambda_1(f)t^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_2(f)}\right) \|w\|^2 \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \|u\|^2 + \lambda \left(\frac{\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f)}{\lambda_1(f)\lambda_2(f)}\right) \|w\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

$$\geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \|u\|^2. \quad (3.6)$$

For simplicity, we use the following notations:

$$\theta_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right), \quad \theta_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_2(f)}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta = \theta_2 - \theta_1 = \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\frac{\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f)}{\lambda_1(f)\lambda_2(f)}\right). \quad (3.7)$$

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that $N = 1, 2, 3, 4 < p < 2^*$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. Then we have the following results.*

(i) *If $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx \geq 0$, then for each $a > 0$ there exists*

$$\delta_a^+ = \lambda_1(f)(p-4) \left(\frac{pS_p^p}{\|g\|_{\infty}}\right)^{\frac{2}{p-4}} \left(\frac{a}{2p-4}\right)^{\frac{p-2}{p-4}}$$

such that for every $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_a^+$, there exist $\rho_a > 0$ and $e_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\|e_0\| > \rho_a \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\|u\|=\rho_a} J_{a,\lambda}(u) > 0 > J_{a,\lambda}(e_0). \quad (3.8)$$

(ii) *If $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx < 0$, then for each $a > 0$ there exist δ_a^- and a positive number C_0 with $\delta_a^- \nearrow \infty$ as $a \nearrow \infty$ and $\delta_a^- > C_0$ for all $a > 0$ such that for every $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_a^-$, there exist $\rho_a > 0$ and $e_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that (3.8) holds.*

Proof. (i) By (3.1), (3.6) and condition (D2), we deduce that

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq \frac{a}{4} \|u\|^4 + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \|u\|^2 - \frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{pS_p^p} \|u\|^p.$$

Consider the function $h^+ : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is defined by

$$h^+(\rho) = \frac{a}{4}\rho^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} \right) - \frac{\|g\|_\infty}{pS_p^p} \rho^{p-2}, \quad \rho > 0.$$

It is easy to obtain the absolute maximum value $h^+(\rho_a)$ at

$$\rho_a = \left(\frac{apS_p^p}{(2p-4)\|g\|_\infty} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-4}}.$$

Then a direct calculation shows that $h^+(\rho_a) > 0$ for every $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_a^+$. Thus, for every $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_a^+$ and $\|u\| = \rho_a$, we obtain

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq \rho_a^2 h^+(\rho_a) > 0.$$

By condition (D2), we take $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $\int_\Omega g|\varphi|^p dx > 0$ and $\|\varphi\| = 1$. Then for any $t > 0$,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(t\varphi) = \frac{a}{4}t^4 + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_\Omega f\varphi^2 dx \right) t^2 - \frac{\int_\Omega g|\varphi|^p dx}{p} t^p.$$

This implies that there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\|t_0\varphi\| > \rho_a$ and $J_{a,\lambda}(t_0\varphi) < 0$.

(ii) Using (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & J_{a,\lambda}(u) \\ & \geq \frac{a}{4}\|u\|^4 + \theta_1\|u\|^2 + (\theta_2 - \theta_1)\|w\|^2 - \frac{1}{p} \int_\Omega g|t\phi_1|^p dx - \frac{1}{p} \left(\int_\Omega g|t\phi_1 + w|^p dx - \int_\Omega g|t\phi_1|^p dx \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

where θ_1 and θ_2 are as in (3.7), and $u = t\phi_1 + w$ with $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\int_\Omega \nabla w \nabla \phi_1 dx = 0$. By the mean value theorem, there exists θ with $0 < \theta < 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{p} \left(\int_\Omega g|t\phi_1 + w|^p dx - \int_\Omega g|t\phi_1|^p dx \right) = \int_\Omega g|t\phi_1 + \theta w|^{p-2} (t\phi_1 + \theta w) w dx. \quad (3.10)$$

Young's inequality then gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_\Omega g|t\phi_1 + \theta w|^{p-2} (t\phi_1 + \theta w) w dx \right| \\ & \leq \|g\|_\infty 2^{p-2} \int_\Omega (|t\phi_1|^{p-1} + |\theta w|^{p-1}) |w| dx \\ & \leq \|g\|_\infty 2^{p-2} \int_\Omega \frac{p-1}{p} B^{\frac{p}{p-1}} |t\phi_1|^p + \frac{1}{pB^p} |w|^p + |w|^p dx \\ & = \frac{|\int_\Omega g\phi_1^p dx|}{2p} |t|^p + \frac{2^{p-2}\|g\|_\infty(1+pB^p)}{pB^p S_p^p} \|w\|^p, \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where

$$B = \left(\frac{|\int_\Omega g\phi_1^p dx|}{2^{p-1}(p-1)\|g\|_\infty\|\phi_1\|_p^p} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}. \quad (3.12)$$

Subsequently, combining (3.9) – (3.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& J_{a,\lambda}(u) \\
& \geq \frac{a}{4}\|u\|^4 + \theta_1\|u\|^2 + (\theta_2 - \theta_1)\|w\|^2 + \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx|}{2p}|t|^p - \frac{2^{p-2}\|g\|_{\infty}(1 + pB^p)}{pB^p S_p^p}\|w\|^p \\
& \geq \frac{a}{4}\|u\|^4 + \theta_1\|u\|^2 + (\theta_2 - \theta_1)\|w\|^2 + \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx|}{2p\lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p}{2}}}\left(\frac{\|u\|^p}{2^{\frac{p}{2}-1}} - \|w\|^p\right) - \frac{2^{p-2}\|g\|_{\infty}(1 + pB^p)}{pB^p S_p^p}\|w\|^p \\
& = \frac{a}{4}\|u\|^4 + \theta_1\|u\|^2 + (\theta_2 - \theta_1)\|w\|^2 + B_1\|u\|^p - B_2\|w\|^p, \tag{3.13}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$B_1 = \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx|}{2^{\frac{p}{2}}p\lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p}{2}}} \quad \text{and} \quad B_2 = \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx|}{2p\lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p}{2}}} + \frac{2^{p-2}\|g\|_{\infty}(1 + pB^p)}{pB^p S_p^p}.$$

Let $\rho > 0$ and define the function $h : [0, \rho] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$h(x) = \theta_1\rho^2 + \frac{a}{4}\rho^4 + B_1\rho^p + (\theta_2 - \theta_1)x^2 - B_2x^p, \quad x \in [0, \rho].$$

We conclude that there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $h(x) \geq \eta$ for all $x \in [0, \rho]$ if and only if $h(0) > 0$ and $h(\rho) > 0$, which gives the condition $\lambda < \min\{h_1(\rho), h_2(\rho)\}$, where

$$h_1(\rho) = \lambda_1(f) + \frac{a}{2}\lambda_1(f)\rho^2 + 2B_1\lambda_1(f)\rho^{p-2}$$

and

$$h_2(\rho) = \lambda_2(f) + \frac{a}{2}\lambda_2(f)\rho^2 - 2(B_2 - B_1)\lambda_2(f)\rho^{p-2}.$$

Thus, by the above argument and (3.13), for any $\rho_a > 0$, we conclude that for every $0 < \lambda < \min\{h_1(\rho_a), h_2(\rho_a)\}$ and $\|u\| = \rho_a$,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq \min\left\{\frac{a}{4}\rho_a^4 + \theta_1\rho_a^2 + B_1\rho_a^p, \frac{a}{4}\rho_a^4 + \theta_2\rho_a^2 + (B_1 - B_2)\rho_a^p\right\} > 0. \tag{3.14}$$

By condition (D2), we take $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $\int_{\Omega} g|\varphi|^p dx > 0$ and $\|\varphi\| = 1$. Then for any $t > 0$,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(t\varphi) = \frac{a}{4}t^4 + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Omega} f\varphi^2 dx\right)t^2 - \frac{\int_{\Omega} g|\varphi|^p dx}{p}t^p.$$

This implies that there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\|t_0\varphi\| > \rho_a$ and $J_{a,\lambda}(t_0\varphi) < 0$.

Next, we choose ρ_a to give a clear range for λ . Evidently, h_2 has a absolute maximum value at $\rho_0 = \left(\frac{a}{(2p-4)(B_2-B_1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-4}}$. If $h_1(\rho_0) \geq h_2(\rho_0)$, we take $\rho_a = \rho_0$ and thus $\min\{h_1(\rho_a), h_2(\rho_a)\} = h_2(\rho_a) = \lambda_1(f) + \delta_a^-$, where

$$\delta_a^- = \lambda_2(f)(p-4)(B_2 - B_1)^{\frac{-2}{p-4}} \left(\frac{a}{2p-4}\right)^{\frac{p-2}{p-4}} + \lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f).$$

It is evident that δ_a^- is increasing, $\delta_a^- \rightarrow \infty$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$, and $\delta_a^- > \lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f)$ for all $a > 0$. If $h_1(\rho_0) < h_2(\rho_0)$, then we take ρ_a satisfying $h_1(\rho_a) = h_2(\rho_a)$, that is,

$$4(B_1\lambda_1(f) + (B_2 - B_1)\lambda_2(f))\rho_a^{p-2} = a(\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f))\rho_a^2 + 2(\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f)). \tag{3.15}$$

Thus, $\min\{h_1(\rho_a), h_2(\rho_a)\} = h_1(\rho_a) = \lambda_1(f) + \delta_a^-$, where

$$\delta_a^- = \frac{a}{2}\lambda_1(f)\rho_a^2 + 2B_1\lambda_1(f)\rho_a^{p-2}. \quad (3.16)$$

By (3.15), we consider the following function:

$$h^-(x) = 4(B_1\lambda_1(f) + (B_2 - B_1)\lambda_2(f))x^{\frac{p-2}{2}} - a(\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f))x - 2(\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f)), \quad x > 0.$$

Let

$$x_1 = \left(\frac{a(\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f))}{4(B_1\lambda_1(f) + (B_2 - B_1)\lambda_2(f))} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-4}} \quad \text{and} \quad x_2 = x_1 + \left(\frac{\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f)}{2(B_1\lambda_1(f) + (B_2 - B_1)\lambda_2(f))} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}.$$

It is easy to obtain that $h^-(x_1) < h^-(\rho_a^2) = 0 < h^-(x_2)$, which implies that there exists a constant D_0 with

$$0 < D_0 < \left(\frac{\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f)}{2(B_1\lambda_1(f) + (B_2 - B_1)\lambda_2(f))} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}$$

such that

$$\rho_a^2 = \left(\frac{a(\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f))}{4(B_1\lambda_1(f) + (B_2 - B_1)\lambda_2(f))} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-4}} + D_0. \quad (3.17)$$

Combining (3.15) – (3.17), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_a^- &= \frac{aB_2\lambda_1(f)\lambda_2(f)}{2(B_1\lambda_1(f) + (B_2 - B_1)\lambda_2(f))}\rho_a^2 + \frac{B_1\lambda_1(f)(\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f))}{B_1\lambda_1(f) + (B_2 - B_1)\lambda_2(f)} \\ &= B_2\lambda_1(f)\lambda_2(f) \left(\frac{\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f)}{2} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-4}} \left(\frac{a}{2(B_1\lambda_1(f) + (B_2 - B_1)\lambda_2(f))} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p-4}} \\ &\quad + \frac{aB_2\lambda_1(f)\lambda_2(f)D_0}{2(B_1\lambda_1(f) + (B_2 - B_1)\lambda_2(f))} + \frac{B_1\lambda_1(f)(\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f))}{B_1\lambda_1(f) + (B_2 - B_1)\lambda_2(f)}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

According to Lemma 3.1, when $p > 4$, the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ has the mountain pass geometry for λ in a right neighbourhood of $\lambda_1(f)$ whether the sign of $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx$ is negative or not. Furthermore, the neighbourhood continues to expand to the right as the non-local effect grows. The mountain pass type solution is presented in Figure 2 which is the upper branch of each curve.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $N = 1, 2, 3$, $p = 4$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. Then we have the following results.*

(i) *For each $0 < a < \Gamma_0$ and $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$, there exist $\rho_\lambda > 0$ and $e_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\|e_0\| > \rho_\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\|u\|=\rho_\lambda} J_{a,\lambda}(u) > 0 > J_{a,\lambda}(e_0). \quad (3.18)$$

(ii) *If $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx > 0$, then for each $\lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx < a < \Gamma_0$, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that for every $\lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_1$, there exist $\rho_0 > 0$ and $e_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that (3.18) holds.*

(iii) *If $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx \leq 0$, then for each $0 < a < \Gamma_0$, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that for every $\lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_1$, there exist $\rho_0 > 0$ and $e_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that (3.18) holds.*

Proof. (i) By (3.1), (3.6) and condition (D2), we have

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq \frac{a}{4}\|u\|^4 + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \|u\|^2 - \frac{\|g\|_\infty}{4S_4^4} \|u\|^4.$$

Let

$$\rho_\lambda = \left(\frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \frac{4S_4^4}{\|g\|_\infty} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then for all $\|u\| = \rho_\lambda$, we have

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq \frac{a}{4}\rho_\lambda^4 + \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \rho_\lambda^2 > 0.$$

Since $a < \Gamma_0$, there exists $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $a\|\varphi\|^4 < \int_\Omega g\varphi^4 dx$. Then for any $t > 0$,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(t\varphi) = \left(\frac{\|\varphi\|^2}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_\Omega f\varphi^2 dx \right) t^2 - \frac{\int_\Omega g\varphi^4 dx - a\|\varphi\|^4}{4} t^4,$$

which implies that there exists $t_\lambda > 0$ such that $\|t_\lambda\varphi\| > \rho_\lambda$ and $J_{a,\lambda}(t_\lambda\varphi) < 0$.

(ii) Using (3.2) and (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & J_{a,\lambda}(u) \\ & \geq \frac{a}{4}(\lambda_1(f)t^2 + \|w\|^2)^2 + \theta_1\|u\|^2 + \Theta\|w\|^2 - \frac{\int_\Omega g\phi_1^4 dx}{4}t^4 - \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_\Omega g(|t\phi_1 + w|^4 - |t\phi_1|^4) dx \right) \\ & \geq \frac{a}{4}\|w\|^4 - |\theta_1|\|u\|^2 + \Theta\|w\|^2 + \frac{a\lambda_1(f)^2 - \int_\Omega g\phi_1^4 dx}{4}t^4 - \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_\Omega g(|t\phi_1 + w|^4 - |t\phi_1|^4) dx \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

where θ_1 and Θ are as in (3.7), and $u = t\phi_1 + w$ with $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\int_\Omega \nabla w \nabla \phi_1 dx = 0$. Denote

$$\Phi_4(\phi_1) = a\lambda_1(f)^2 - \int_\Omega g\phi_1^4 dx.$$

We have $\Phi_4(\phi_1) > 0$ since $a > \lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_\Omega g\phi_1^4 dx$. Repeating the same process in (3.10) and (3.11) then gives

$$\frac{1}{4} \left(\int_\Omega g(|t\phi_1 + w|^4 - |t\phi_1|^4) dx \right) \leq \left(\frac{\Phi_4(\phi_1)}{8} t^4 + \frac{\|g\|_\infty(1 + 4B_4^4)}{B_4^4 S_4^4} \|w\|^4 \right), \quad (3.20)$$

where $B_4 = \left(\frac{\Phi_4(\phi_1)}{24\|g\|_\infty\|\phi_1\|_4^4} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}}$. Subsequently, combining (3.19) and (3.20), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & J_{a,\lambda}(u) \\ & \geq \frac{a}{4}\|w\|^4 - |\theta_1|\|u\|^2 + \Theta\|w\|^2 + \frac{\Phi_4(\phi_1)}{8}t^4 - \frac{\|g\|_\infty(1 + 4B_4^4)}{B_4^4 S_4^4} \|w\|^4 \\ & = \frac{a}{4}\|w\|^4 - |\theta_1|\|u\|^2 + \Theta\|w\|^2 + \frac{\Phi_4(\phi_1)}{8\lambda_1(f)^2} (\|u\|^2 - \|w\|^2)^2 - \frac{\|g\|_\infty(1 + 4B_4^4)}{B_4^4 S_4^4} \|w\|^4 \\ & \geq \frac{a}{4}\|w\|^4 - |\theta_1|\|u\|^2 + \Theta\|w\|^2 + \frac{\Phi_4(\phi_1)}{8\lambda_1(f)^2} \left(\frac{\|u\|^4}{2} - \|w\|^4 \right) - \frac{\|g\|_\infty(1 + 4B_4^4)}{B_4^4 S_4^4} \|w\|^4 \\ & = -|\theta_1|\|u\|^2 + \frac{\Phi_4(\phi_1)}{16\lambda_1(f)^2} \|u\|^4 + \|w\|^2 \left(\Theta - \left(\frac{\Phi_4(\phi_1)}{8\lambda_1(f)^2} + \frac{\|g\|_\infty(1 + 4B_4^4)}{B_4^4 S_4^4} \right) \|w\|^2 \right) + \frac{a}{4}\|w\|^4. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Since $\lambda \geq \lambda_1(f)$, we have

$$\Theta \geq \frac{\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f)}{2\lambda_2(f)} > 0.$$

Let

$$\rho_0 = \left(\frac{\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f)}{2\lambda_2(f)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\Phi_4(\phi_1)}{8\lambda_1(f)^2} + \frac{\|g\|_\infty(1 + 4B_4^4)}{B_4^4 S_4^4} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.22)$$

Then

$$\Theta - \left(\frac{\Phi_4(\phi_1)}{8\lambda_1(f)^2} + \frac{\|g\|_\infty(1 + 4B_4^4)}{B_4^4 S_4^4} \right) \|w\|^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } 0 \leq \|w\| \leq \rho_0. \quad (3.23)$$

Moreover, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that

$$|\theta_1| = \left| \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} \right) \right| \leq \frac{\Phi_4(\phi_1)}{32\lambda_1(f)^2} \rho_0^2 \quad \text{for every } \lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_1. \quad (3.24)$$

It follows from (3.21) – (3.24) that for every $\lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_1$ and $\|u\| = \rho_0$,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq \frac{\Phi_4(\phi_1)}{32\lambda_1(f)^2} \rho_0^4 > 0.$$

Since $a < \Gamma_0$, there exists $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $a\|\varphi\|^4 < \int_\Omega g\varphi^4 dx$. Then for any $t > 0$,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(t\varphi) = \left(\frac{\|\varphi\|^2}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_\Omega f\varphi^2 dx \right) t^2 - \frac{\int_\Omega g\varphi^4 dx - a\|\varphi\|^4}{4} t^4.$$

This implies that there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\|t_0\varphi\| > \rho_0$ and $J_{a,\lambda}(t_0\varphi) < 0$.

(iii) The proof is identical to that in part (ii) and is omitted here. $\square$

Lemma 3.3. Suppose that $N \geq 1$, $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. If $\int_\Omega g\phi_1^p dx > 0$, then for each $a > 0$, and $\max\{0, \lambda_a^+\} < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$, there exist $\rho_{a,\lambda}^+ > 0$ and $e_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\|e_0\| > \rho_{a,\lambda}^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\|u\|=\rho_{a,\lambda}^+} J_{a,\lambda}(u) > 0 > J_{a,\lambda}(e_0), \quad (3.25)$$

where λ_a^+ is as in (2.1).

Proof. By (3.1), (3.6) and condition (D2), we deduce that for $\max\{0, \lambda_a^+\} < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$ and $\|u\| = \rho_{a,\lambda}^+$

$$\begin{aligned} J_{a,\lambda}(u) &\geq \frac{a}{4} \|u\|^4 + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} \right) \|u\|^2 - \frac{\|g\|_\infty}{pS_p^p} \|u\|^p \\ &\geq \frac{a}{4} \rho_{a,\lambda}^4 + \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} \right) \rho_{a,\lambda}^2 > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\rho_{a,\lambda}^+ := \min \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} \right) \frac{pS_p^p}{\|g\|_\infty} \right]^{\frac{1}{p-2}}, \left(\frac{(p-2) \int_\Omega g\phi_1^p dx}{2a\lambda_1(f)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{4-p}} \|\phi_1\| \right\}.$$

Moreover, we take

$$t_0 := \left(\frac{(2p-4) \int_\Omega g\phi_1^p dx}{ap\lambda_1(f)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{4-p}}. \quad (3.26)$$

Then $\|t_0\phi_1\| > \rho_{a,\lambda}^+$ and we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} J_{a,\lambda}(t_0\phi_1) &= \frac{t_0^2}{2} (\lambda_1(f) - \lambda) + t_0^p \left(\frac{a}{4} \lambda_1(f)^2 t_0^{4-p} - \frac{\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx}{p} \right) \\ &= \frac{t_0^2}{2} \left(\lambda_1(f) - \lambda - \frac{(4-p) \int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx}{p} \left(\frac{(2p-4) \int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx}{ap \lambda_1(f)^2} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right) \\ &= \frac{t_0^2}{2} (\lambda_a^+ - \lambda) < 0 \text{ for all } \lambda > \max\{0, \lambda_a^+\}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

According to Lemma 3.3, the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ always has the mountain pass geometry in a left neighbourhood of $\lambda_1(f)$ for all $a > 0$ when $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx > 0$. The mountain pass type solution is presented in Figure 5 which is the lower branch of each curve.

Next, we study the mountain pass geometry of $J_{a,\lambda}$ for $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$ when $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx < 0$. We recall the following which is defined in (2.2):

$$\Gamma_p := \sup \left\{ \frac{\int_{\Omega} g |u|^p dx}{\|u\|^p} : u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}, \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Then we have the following results.

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose that $N \geq 1$, $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. Then $0 < \Gamma_p \leq \|g\|_{\infty} S_p^{-p}$, and Γ_p is attained.*

Proof. Under conditions (D1) – (D2), we can choose a function $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $\int_{\Omega} f \varphi^2 dx > 0$ and $\int_{\Omega} g |\varphi|^p dx > 0$ (see Proposition 6.2 in [7] for more details). Hence $\Gamma_p > 0$. Then by Sobolev inequality, we deduce that $\Gamma_p \leq \|g\|_{\infty} S_p^{-p}$.

It is clear that

$$\Gamma_p = \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} g |u|^p dx : u \in H_0^1(\Omega), \|u\| = 1, \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Thus, let $\{u_n\}$ be a maximizing sequence for Γ_p with $\|u_n\| = 1$ for all n . Then there exist a subsequence $\{u_n\}$ and $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and

$$u_n \rightarrow u_0 \text{ in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ for all } 1 \leq r < 2^*. \quad (3.27)$$

By conditions (D1) – (D2) and (3.27), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx \geq 0,$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} g |u_0|^p dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} g |u_n|^p dx = \Gamma_p. \quad (3.28)$$

By (3.28) and $\Gamma_p > 0$, we conclude that $u_0 \neq 0$. We next show that $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. If not, we have $\|u_0\| < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n\| = 1$. Let $v_0 = \frac{u_0}{\|u_0\|}$. Then $\|v_0\| = 1$ and $\int_{\Omega} f v_0^2 dx \geq 0$. However,

$$\int_{\Omega} g |v_0|^p dx = \frac{\int_{\Omega} g |u_0|^p dx}{\|u_0\|^p} > \int_{\Omega} g |u_0|^p dx = \Gamma_p$$

gives a contradiction. Hence $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, and Γ_p is attained. $\square$

For $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$, let $B > 0$ be as in (3.12). For $a, \lambda > 0$, let

$$\bar{\delta}_a = \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx|}{2^{\frac{p}{2}} p \lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}} \min\{\rho_0^{p-2}, \rho_{1,a}^{p-2}\} \quad (3.29)$$

and

$$\bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda} = \begin{cases} \min\{\rho_{\lambda}, \rho_{1,a}\}, & \text{for } 0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f), \\ \min\{\rho_0, \rho_{1,a}\}, & \text{for } \lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \bar{\delta}_a, \end{cases} \quad (3.30)$$

where

$$\rho_0 = \left(\frac{\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f)}{2\lambda_2(f)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-2}} \left(\frac{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx|}{2p\lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p}{2}}} + \frac{2^{p-2}\|g\|_{\infty}(1+pB^p)}{pB^p S_p^p} \right)^{\frac{-1}{p-2}}, \quad (3.31)$$

$$\rho_{\lambda} = \left(\frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} \right) \frac{pS_p^p}{\|g\|_{\infty}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-2}} \text{ for } 0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f), \quad (3.32)$$

$$\rho_{1,a} = \left(\frac{(p-2)\Gamma_p}{ap} \right)^{\frac{1}{4-p}}. \quad (3.33)$$

Then we have the following result.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that $N \geq 1$, $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. If $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx < 0$, then for each $0 < a < a_0(p)$ and $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \bar{\delta}_a$, there exists $e_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\|e_0\| > \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\|u\|=\bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}} J_{a,\lambda}(u) > 0 > J_{a,\lambda}(e_0),$$

where $a_0(p) > 0$ is as in (2.3).

Proof. We firstly show that for each $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \bar{\delta}_a$, we have $\inf_{\|u\|=\bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}} J_{a,\lambda}(u) > 0$. Now, we separate this part into two cases:

Case (I) : $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$. By (3.1), (3.6) and condition (D2), we deduce that for $\|u\| = \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{a,\lambda}(u) &\geq \frac{a}{4}\|u\|^4 + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} \right) \|u\|^2 - \frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{pS_p^p} \|u\|^p \\ &\geq \frac{a}{4}\bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}^4 + \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} \right) \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Case (II) : $\lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \bar{\delta}_a$. Repeating the same process in (3.9) – (3.13), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &J_{a,\lambda}(u) \\ &\geq \frac{a}{4}\|u\|^4 - |\theta_1|\|u\|^2 + \Theta\|w\|^2 - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} g|t\phi_1|^p dx - \frac{1}{p} \left(\int_{\Omega} g(|t\phi_1 + w|^p - |t\phi_1|^p) dx \right) \\ &\geq \frac{a}{4}\|u\|^4 - |\theta_1|\|u\|^2 + \Theta\|w\|^2 + \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx|}{2p} |t|^p - \frac{2^{p-2}\|g\|_{\infty}(1+pB^p)}{pB^p S_p^p} \|w\|^p \\ &\geq \frac{a}{4}\|u\|^4 - |\theta_1|\|u\|^2 + \Theta\|w\|^2 + \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx|}{2p\lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p}{2}}} \left(\frac{\|u\|^p}{2^{\frac{p}{2}-1}} - \|w\|^p \right) - \frac{2^{p-2}\|g\|_{\infty}(1+pB^p)}{pB^p S_p^p} \|w\|^p \\ &= -|\theta_1|\|u\|^2 + \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx|}{2^{\frac{p}{2}} p \lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p}{2}}} \|u\|^p + \frac{a}{4}\|u\|^4 \\ &\quad + \|w\|^2 \left(\Theta - \left(\frac{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx|}{2p\lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p}{2}}} + \frac{2^{p-2}\|g\|_{\infty}(1+pB^p)}{pB^p S_p^p} \right) \|w\|^{p-2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

where θ_1 and Θ are as in (3.7), B is as in (3.12), and $u = t\phi_1 + w$ with $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\int_{\Omega} \nabla w \nabla \phi_1 dx = 0$. Since $\lambda \geq \lambda_1(f)$, we have

$$\Theta \geq \frac{\lambda_2(f) - \lambda_1(f)}{2\lambda_2(f)} > 0.$$

Then by (3.30), we have

$$\Theta - \left(\frac{|\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx|}{2p\lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p}{2}}} + \frac{2^{p-2}\|g\|_{\infty}(1+pB^p)}{pB^p S_p^p} \right) \|w\|^{p-2} \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \|w\| \leq \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}. \quad (3.35)$$

Moreover,

$$|\theta_1| = \left| \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} \right) \right| \leq \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx|}{2^{\frac{p}{2}+1} p \lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p}{2}}} \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}^p \quad \text{for every } \lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \bar{\delta}_a. \quad (3.36)$$

It follows from (3.34) – (3.36),

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx|}{2^{\frac{p}{2}+1} p \lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p}{2}}} \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}^p + \frac{a}{4} \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}^4 > 0$$

for every $\lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \bar{\delta}_a$ and $\|u\| = \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}$. Consequently, for each $a > 0$, we have $\inf_{\|u\|=\bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}} J_{a,\lambda}(u) > 0$ for every $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \bar{\delta}_a$.

Next, we show that there exists $e_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $\|e_0\| > \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}$ and $J_{a,\lambda}(e_0) < 0$. By Proposition 3.4, there exists $\phi_g \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $\Gamma_p \|\phi_g\|^p = \int_{\Omega} g |\phi_g|^p dx$, $\int_{\Omega} f \phi_g^2 dx \geq 0$ and

$$0 < a < a_0(p) := (2p-4)(4-p)^{\frac{4-p}{p-2}} \left(\frac{\int_{\Omega} g |\phi_g|^p dx}{p \|\phi_g\|^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}. \quad (3.37)$$

Let

$$t_a = \left(\frac{(2p-4)\Gamma_p}{ap} \right)^{\frac{1}{4-p}} \|\phi_g\|^{-1}.$$

Then by (3.30) and (3.37), we can deduce that $\|t_a \phi_g\| > \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} J_{a,\lambda}(t_a \phi_g) &= \frac{t_a^2}{2} \left(\|\phi_g\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f \phi_g^2 dx \right) + t_a^p \left(\frac{a}{4} \|\phi_g\|^4 t_a^{4-p} - \frac{\int_{\Omega} g |\phi_g|^p dx}{p} \right) \\ &= \frac{t_a^2}{2} \left(\|\phi_g\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f \phi_g^2 dx - (4-p) \left(\frac{\int_{\Omega} g |\phi_g|^p dx}{p} \right) \left(\frac{(2p-4) \int_{\Omega} g |\phi_g|^p dx}{ap \|\phi_g\|^4} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right) \\ &= \frac{t_a^2}{2} \left(\|\phi_g\|^2 - \|\phi_g\|^2 (4-p) \left(\frac{\int_{\Omega} g |\phi_g|^p dx}{p \|\phi_g\|^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{2p-4}{a} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f \phi_g^2 dx \right) \\ &< 0 \quad \text{for all } 0 < a < a_0(p). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

In what follows, we study the case when $a \geq a_0(p)$. It is necessary to consider the following which is defined in (2.4):

$$\lambda_a^- := \inf_{u \in S} \frac{\|u\|^2}{\int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx} \left(1 - (4-p) \left(\frac{\int_{\Omega} g |u|^p dx}{p \|u\|^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{2p-4}{a} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right) \quad \text{for } a \geq a_0(p).$$

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose that $N \geq 1$, $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. Then λ_a^- is nonnegative, continuous and increasing. Furthermore, if $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx < 0$, then*

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_a^- > \lambda_1(f).$$

Proof. It is easy to show that λ_a^- is nonnegative, continuous and increasing, and thus we omit this part. It is clear that

$$\lambda_a^- = \inf_{u \in S'} \|u\|^2 \left(1 - (4-p) \left(\frac{\int_{\Omega} g|u|^p dx}{p\|u\|^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{2p-4}{a} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right),$$

where

$$S' = \left\{ u \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx = 1, \int_{\Omega} g|u|^p dx > 0 \right\}.$$

Thus, by (1.4), we have

$$\tilde{\Lambda} := \inf_{u \in S'} \|u\|^2 \geq \lambda_1(f).$$

We now claim that

$$\tilde{\Lambda} > \lambda_1(f). \quad (3.38)$$

Suppose that this claim is false. Then there exists a sequence $\{u_n\}$ with $\int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx = 1$ and $\int_{\Omega} g|u_n|^p dx > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n\|^2 = \lambda_1(f).$$

Clearly, $\{u_n\}$ is bounded, and thus there exist a subsequence $\{u_n\}$ and $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and

$$u_n \rightarrow u_0 \quad \text{in } L^r(\Omega) \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq r < 2^*. \quad (3.39)$$

By conditions (D1) – (D2) and (3.39), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx = 1 \quad (3.40)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} g|u_0|^p dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} g|u_n|^p dx \geq 0. \quad (3.41)$$

Next, we show that $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. If not, then $\|u_0\|^2 < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n\|^2 = \lambda_1(f)$, which is impossible due to (1.4) and (3.40). Thus, we have $\|u_0\|^2 = \lambda_1(f)$, which indicates that $u_0 = \pm \phi_1$. Then by (3.41), we obtain $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p \geq 0$, which is a contradiction. Hence this claim is true. Moreover, by (3.38), we can deduce that

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_a^- \geq \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\Lambda} \left(1 - (4-p) \left(\frac{\Gamma_p}{p} \right)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{2p-4}{a} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right) = \tilde{\Lambda} > \lambda_1(f).$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 3.7. *Suppose that $N \geq 1$, $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$ and conditions (D1) – (D3) hold. Then $\lambda_{a_0(p)}^- = 0$. Furthermore, if $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p < 0$, then there is a number $\mathbf{A} > a_0(p)$ such that $0 \leq \lambda_a^- < \lambda_1(f)$ for all $a_0(p) \leq a < \mathbf{A}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.4, there exists $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $\int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx \geq 0$ such that $\Gamma_p \|u_0\|^p = \int_{\Omega} g |u_0|^p dx$. Then by condition (D3), we conclude that $\int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx > 0$. Hence

$$0 \leq \lambda_{a_0(p)}^- \leq \frac{\|u_0\|^2}{\int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx} \left(1 - (4-p) \left(\frac{\int_{\Omega} g |u_0|^p dx}{p \|u_0\|^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{2p-4}{a_0(p)} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right) = 0.$$

Then by Proposition 3.6, if $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx < 0$, we can deduce that there exists one number $\mathbf{A} > a_0(p)$ such that $0 \leq \lambda_a^- < \lambda_1(f)$ for every $a_0(p) \leq a < \mathbf{A}$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 3.8. By Proposition 3.7 and the definition of λ_a^- , for every $a_0(p) \leq a < \mathbf{A}$ and $\lambda_a^- < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$, there exists $\varphi_{a,\lambda} \in S$ such that

$$\lambda_a^- \leq \frac{\|\varphi_{a,\lambda}\|^2}{\int_{\Omega} f \varphi_{a,\lambda}^2 dx} \left(1 - (4-p) \left(\frac{\int_{\Omega} g |\varphi_{a,\lambda}|^p dx}{p \|\varphi_{a,\lambda}\|^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{2p-4}{a} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right) < \lambda. \quad (3.42)$$

Moreover, for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_1(f)$, there exists $\varphi_a \in S$ which is independent of λ such that

$$\lambda_a^- \leq \frac{\|\varphi_a\|^2}{\int_{\Omega} f \varphi_a^2 dx} \left(1 - (4-p) \left(\frac{\int_{\Omega} g |\varphi_a|^p dx}{p \|\varphi_a\|^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{2p-4}{a} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right) < \lambda_1(f). \quad (3.43)$$

For $a \geq a_0(p)$ and $\lambda > \lambda_a^-$, let

$$\widehat{\delta}_a = \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx|}{2^{\frac{p}{2}} p \lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}} \min \{ \rho_0^{p-2}, \rho_{2,a}^{p-2} \} \quad (3.44)$$

and

$$\widehat{\rho}_{a,\lambda} = \begin{cases} \min \{ \rho_{\lambda}, \rho_{a,\lambda} \}, & \text{for } \lambda_a^- < \lambda < \lambda_1(f), \\ \min \{ \rho_0, \rho_{2,a} \}, & \text{for } \lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \widehat{\delta}_a, \end{cases} \quad (3.45)$$

where ρ_0 and ρ_{λ} are as in (3.31) and (3.32), respectively, and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{a,\lambda} &= \left(\frac{(p-2) \int_{\Omega} g |\varphi_{a,\lambda}|^p dx}{ap \|\varphi_{a,\lambda}\|^p} \right)^{\frac{1}{4-p}} \quad \text{with } \varphi_{a,\lambda} \text{ as in (3.42),} \\ \rho_{2,a} &= \left(\frac{(p-2) \int_{\Omega} g |\varphi_a|^p dx}{ap \|\varphi_a\|^p} \right)^{\frac{1}{4-p}} \quad \text{with } \varphi_a \text{ as in (3.43).} \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the following result.

Lemma 3.9. Suppose that $N \geq 1$, $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$ and conditions (D1) – (D3) hold. Let $\mathbf{A} > 0$ be as in Proposition 3.7 and $\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx < 0$. Then for each $a_0(p) \leq a < \mathbf{A}$ and $\lambda_a^- < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \widehat{\delta}_a$, there exists $e_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\|e_0\| > \widehat{\rho}_{a,\lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\|u\|=\widehat{\rho}_{a,\lambda}} J_{a,\lambda}(u) > 0 > J_{a,\lambda}(e_0).$$

Proof. We separate the proof into two cases.

Case (I) : $\lambda_a^- < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$. By (3.1), (3.6) and condition (D2), we deduce that for $\|u\| = \widehat{\rho}_{a,\lambda}$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{a,\lambda}(u) &\geq \frac{a}{4} \|u\|^4 + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} \right) \|u\|^2 - \frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{p S_p^p} \|u\|^p \\ &\geq \frac{a}{4} \widehat{\rho}_{a,\lambda}^4 + \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} \right) \widehat{\rho}_{a,\lambda}^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$t_{a,\lambda} := \left(\frac{(2p-4) \int_{\Omega} g |\varphi_{a,\lambda}|^p dx}{ap \|\varphi_{a,\lambda}\|^4} \right)^{\frac{1}{4-p}}.$$

Then by (3.42) and (3.45), we deduce that $\|t_{a,\lambda} \varphi_{a,\lambda}\| > \widehat{\rho}_{a,\lambda}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} J_{a,\lambda}(t_{a,\lambda} \varphi_{a,\lambda}) &= \frac{t_{a,\lambda}^2}{2} \left(\|\varphi_{a,\lambda}\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f \varphi_{a,\lambda}^2 dx \right) + t_{a,\lambda}^p \left(\frac{a}{4} \|\varphi_{a,\lambda}\|^4 t_{a,\lambda}^{4-p} - \frac{\int_{\Omega} g |\varphi_{a,\lambda}|^p dx}{p} \right) \\ &= \frac{t_{a,\lambda}^2}{2} \left(\|\varphi_{a,\lambda}\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f \varphi_{a,\lambda}^2 dx - \frac{(4-p) \int_{\Omega} g |\varphi_{a,\lambda}|^p dx}{p} \left(\frac{(2p-4) \int_{\Omega} g |\varphi_{a,\lambda}|^p dx}{ap \|\varphi_{a,\lambda}\|^4} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right) \\ &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

Case (II) : $\lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \widehat{\delta}_a$. Repeating the same process in (3.34) – (3.36), we can deduce that for each $\lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \widehat{\delta}_a$ and $\|u\| = \widehat{\rho}_{a,\lambda}$, we have

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^p dx|}{2^{\frac{p}{2}+1} p \lambda_1(f)^{\frac{p}{2}}} \widehat{\rho}_{a,\lambda}^p + \frac{a}{4} \widehat{\rho}_{a,\lambda}^4.$$

Let

$$t_a =: \left(\frac{(2p-4) \int_{\Omega} g |\varphi_a|^p dx}{ap \|\varphi_a\|^4} \right)^{\frac{1}{4-p}}.$$

Then by (3.43) and (3.45), we deduce that $\|t_a \varphi_a\| > \widehat{\rho}_{a,\lambda}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} J_{a,\lambda}(t_a \varphi_a) &= \frac{t_a^2}{2} \left(\|\varphi_a\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f \varphi_a^2 dx \right) + t_a^p \left(\frac{a}{4} \|\varphi_a\|^4 t_a^{4-p} - \frac{\int_{\Omega} g |\varphi_a|^p dx}{p} \right) \\ &= \frac{t_a^2}{2} \left(\|\varphi_a\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f \varphi_a^2 dx - \frac{(4-p) \int_{\Omega} g |\varphi_a|^p dx}{p} \left(\frac{(2p-4) \int_{\Omega} g |\varphi_a|^p dx}{ap \|\varphi_a\|^4} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}} \right) \\ &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

This complete the proof. $\square$

By Lemmas 3.5 and 3.9, the mountain pass geometry of $J_{a,\lambda}$ appears for λ in a neighbourhood that contains $\lambda_1(f)$ whenever $0 < a < \mathbf{A}$. The corresponding mountain pass type solution is presented in Figure 6 (a)-(b) which is the middle branch of each curve.

Next, we prove that the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ satisfies the $(PS)_{\alpha}$ -condition.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose that $N \geq 1$, $2 < p < 2^*$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. If the $(PS)_{\alpha}$ -sequence for $J_{a,\lambda}$ is bounded, then it has a convergent subsequence.*

Proof. Let $\{u_n\} \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ be a bounded $(PS)_{\alpha}$ -sequence for $J_{a,\lambda}$. Then there exist a subsequence $\{u_n\}$ and $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and

$$u_n \rightarrow u_0 \quad \text{in } L^r(\Omega) \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq r < 2^*. \quad (3.46)$$

Since $\langle J'_{a,\lambda}(u_n), \varphi \rangle = o(1)$ for all $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} o(1) &= \langle J'_{a,\lambda}(u_n), u_n - u_0 \rangle \\ &= (a \|u_n\|^2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_n \nabla (u_n - u_0) dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_n (u_n - u_0) dx - \int_{\Omega} g |u_n|^{p-2} u_n (u_n - u_0) dx. \end{aligned}$$

By conditions (D1) – (D2) and (3.46), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} f u_n (u_n - u_0) dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} g |u_n|^{p-2} u_n (u_n - u_0) dx \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus,

$$(a \|u_n\|^2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_n \nabla (u_n - u_0) dx = o(1),$$

which implies that $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. This completes the proof. $\square$

4 The Proof of Theorem 2.1

In this section, we present the proof of Theorem 2.1 and a discussion on the asymptotic behaviour of the lower branch solutions of case (ii) in the limit $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1^+(f)$ will also be given after the proof of the main result.

The proof of Theorem 2.1: From Lemma 3.1, for each $a > 0$ there exists $\delta_a > 0$, with $\delta_a \rightarrow \infty$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$, such that the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ has the mountain pass geometry for every $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_a$. Then by Lemma 3.10, if the $(PS)_\alpha$ -sequence for $J_{a,\lambda}$ is bounded, then there exists $u^+ \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) > 0$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u^+) = 0$. Since $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) = J_{a,\lambda}(|u^+|)$, we assume without loss of generality that $u^+ > 0$ in Ω . Thus, we need to show the boundedness of the $(PS)_\alpha$ -sequence for $J_{a,\lambda}$.

Suppose that the $(PS)_\alpha$ -sequence $\{u_n\}$ is unbounded. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\|u_n\| \rightarrow \infty$,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u_n) = \frac{a}{4} \|u_n\|^4 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_n\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega} g |u_n|^p dx \rightarrow \alpha, \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\langle J'_{a,\lambda}(u_n), u_n \rangle = a \|u_n\|^4 + \|u_n\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} g |u_n|^p dx \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.2)$$

Let $v_n = \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|}$, then $\|v_n\| = 1$ and thus there exist a subsequence $\{v_n\}$ and $v_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and

$$v_n \rightarrow v_0 \text{ in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ for all } 1 \leq r < 2^*. \quad (4.3)$$

By (4.3) and condition (D1), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx = \int_{\Omega} f v_0^2 dx. \quad (4.4)$$

Dividing (4.1) and (4.2) by $\|u_n\|^4$, because of (4.4), we obtain that

$$\frac{a}{4} - \frac{\|u_n\|^{p-4}}{p} \int_{\Omega} g |v_n|^p dx \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$a - \|u_n\|^{p-4} \int_{\Omega} g |v_n|^p dx \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.6)$$

This gives a contradiction. Hence $\{u_n\}$ is bounded and we have obtained a positive solution whenever $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_a$. Here we have completed the proofs of (i) and the relevant part of (ii).

To complete the proof of case (ii), we consider the infimum of $J_{a,\lambda}$ on the closed ball $B_{\rho_a} := \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \|u\| \leq \rho_a\}$ with ρ_a as in Lemma 3.1 (i) and (ii). Set

$$\beta_0 := \inf_{\|u\| \leq \rho_a} J_{a,\lambda}(u).$$

For any $t > 0$,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(t\phi_1) = -\frac{\lambda - \lambda_1(f)}{2}t^2 + \frac{a\lambda_1(f)^2}{4}t^4 - \frac{\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx}{p}t^p.$$

Thus, for each $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$, there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\|t_0\phi_1\| \leq \rho_a$ and $J_{a,\lambda}(t_0\phi_1) < 0$. Moreover,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq -\frac{\lambda}{2\lambda_1(f)}\|u\|^2 - \frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{pS_p^p}\|u\|^p \geq -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\rho_a^2 - \frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{pS_p^p}\rho_a^p,$$

giving $-\infty < \beta_0 < 0$. By the Ekeland variational principle [15], there exists a $(PS)_{\beta_0}$ -sequence $\{u_n\} \subset B_{\rho_0}$. Then by Lemma 3.10, there exists $u^- \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = \beta_0$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = 0$. Since $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = J_{a,\lambda}(|u^-|)$, we assume without loss of generality that $u^- > 0$ in Ω . This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

We now investigate the asymptotic behaviour of solutions u^- obtained in Theorem 2.1 (ii) as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1^+(f)$.

Theorem 4.1. *For each $a > 0$, let $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda_1^+(f)$ and u_n^- be the solution obtained in Theorem 2.1 (ii) with $J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^-) < 0$. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$(i) \ u_n^- \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (ii) \ \frac{u_n^-}{\|u_n^-\|} \rightarrow k\phi_1 \text{ in } H_0^1(\Omega) \text{ for some } k > 0.$$

Proof. (i) According to the proof of Lemma 3.1, ρ_a is independent of λ . Thus, $\{u_n^-\}$ is bounded and so there exist a subsequence $\{u_n^-\}$ and $u_0^- \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_n^- \rightharpoonup u_0^-$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and

$$u_n^- \rightarrow u_0^- \text{ in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ for all } 1 \leq r < 2^*. \quad (4.7)$$

Then by (4.7) and condition (D1), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f(u_n^-)^2 dx = \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f(u_0^-)^2 dx.$$

It follows from $J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^-) < 0$ and $\langle J'_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^-), u_n^- \rangle = 0$ that

$$J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^-) = \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{p}\right) a \|u_n^-\|^4 + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(\|u_n^-\|^2 - \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f(u_n^-)^2 dx \right) < 0, \quad (4.8)$$

which indicates that

$$\|u_n^-\|^2 - \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f(u_n^-)^2 dx < 0. \quad (4.9)$$

Suppose that $u_n^- \rightarrow u_0^-$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ does not hold. Then by (4.9),

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_0^-|^2 dx - \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f(u_0^-)^2 dx < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|u_n^-\|^2 - \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f(u_n^-)^2 dx \right) \leq 0,$$

which is impossible. Hence $u_n^- \rightarrow u_0^-$ and $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_0^-|^2 dx - \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f(u_0^-)^2 dx = 0$. Then by (4.8), we conclude $u_0^- = 0$. Hence $u_n^- \rightarrow 0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$.

(ii) Let $v_n = \frac{u_n^-}{\|u_n^-\|}$, then there exist a subsequence $\{v_n\}$ and $v_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and

$$v_n \rightarrow v_0 \text{ in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ for all } 1 \leq r < 2^*. \quad (4.10)$$

By conditions (D1) – (D2) and (4.10), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx = \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f v_0^2 dx \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} g |v_n|^p dx = \int_{\Omega} g |v_0|^p dx. \quad (4.11)$$

It follows from $\langle J'_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^-), u_n^- \rangle = 0$, $\|u_n^-\| \rightarrow 0$ and (4.11) that

$$\|v_n\|^2 - \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx = \|u_n^-\|^{p-2} \int_{\Omega} g v_n^p dx - a \|u_n^-\|^2 \rightarrow 0.$$

Suppose that $v_n \rightarrow v_0$ does not hold. Then

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_0|^2 dx - \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f v_0^2 dx < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|v_n\|^2 - \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx \right) = 0,$$

which is impossible. Hence $v_n \rightarrow v_0$, and then $\|v_0\| = 1$ and $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_0|^2 dx - \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f v_0^2 dx = 0$. Thus, $v_0 = k\phi_1$ for some $k > 0$. This completes the proof. $\square$

5 The Proofs of Theorems 2.2 and 2.3

In this section, we give the proofs of Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 and we begin by proving the boundedness of Palais-Smale sequence for the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ when $p = 4$. The asymptotic behaviours of solutions will also be discussed at the end of the section.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that $N = 1, 2, 3$, $p = 4$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. Then we have the following results.*

- (i) *For each $a > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$, the $(PS)_{\alpha}$ -sequence $\{u_n\}$ for $J_{a,\lambda}$ is bounded.*
- (ii) *If $a > \lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^4 dx$, then there exists $\delta_2 > 0$ such that the $(PS)_{\alpha}$ -sequence $\{u_n\}$ for $J_{a,\lambda}$ is bounded whenever $\lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_2$.*

Proof. (i) Since

$$\frac{a}{4} \|u_n\|^4 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_n\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx - \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega} g u_n^4 dx \rightarrow \alpha, \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$(a \|u_n\|^2 + 1) \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_n \nabla \varphi dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_n \varphi dx - \int_{\Omega} g u_n^3 \varphi dx \rightarrow 0 \quad (5.2)$$

for all $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. By (5.2), we also have

$$a \|u_n\|^4 + \|u_n\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} g u_n^4 dx = o(1). \quad (5.3)$$

Combining (5.1) and (5.3), we deduce that

$$\left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \|u_n\|^2 + o(1) \leq \|u_n\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx + o(1) \rightarrow 4\alpha,$$

which implies that $\{u_n\}$ is bounded.

(ii) Suppose that the result is false. Then $\|u_n\| \rightarrow \infty$ for every $\lambda \geq \lambda_1(f)$. Let $v_n = \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|}$, then $\|v_n\| = 1$ and thus there exist a subsequence $\{v_n\}$ and $v_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and

$$v_n \rightarrow v_0 \text{ in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ for all } 1 \leq r < 2^*. \quad (5.4)$$

By conditions (D1) – (D2) and (5.4), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f v_n^2 dx = \int_{\Omega} f v_0^2 dx \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} g v_n^4 dx = \int_{\Omega} g v_0^4 dx.$$

Combining (5.1) and (5.3), we have

$$\|u_n\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx + o(1) \rightarrow 4\alpha \quad (5.5)$$

and

$$a\|u_n\|^4 - \int_{\Omega} g u_n^4 dx + o(1) \rightarrow -4\alpha. \quad (5.6)$$

Dividing (5.5) by $\|u_n\|^2$ and (5.6) by $\|u_n\|^4$ then gives

$$1 = \lambda \int_{\Omega} f v_0^2 dx \quad \text{and} \quad a = \int_{\Omega} g v_0^4 dx.$$

Dividing (5.2) by $\|u_n\|^3$ and choosing $\varphi = v_0$, we have

$$a\|v_0\|^2 = \int_{\Omega} g v_0^4 dx.$$

Thus, $\|v_0\| = 1$. Now, we define

$$\Lambda^0 := \left\{ u \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \|u\| = 1, \|u\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx = 0 \right\},$$

and

$$\Theta^0 := \left\{ u \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \|u\| = 1, \int_{\Omega} g u^4 dx - a\|u\|^4 = 0 \right\}.$$

Clearly, $v_0 \in \Lambda^0 \cap \Theta^0$. Next, we claim that there exists $\delta_2 > 0$ such that for every $\lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_2$, it holds that $\Lambda^0 \cap \Theta^0 = \emptyset$ which is a contradiction, thus implying the conclusion of (ii).

Suppose that this above claim is false. Then there exist two sequences $\{\lambda_n\}$ and $\{u_n\} \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda_1^+(f)$, $\|u_n\| = 1$,

$$\|u_n\|^2 - \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx = 0, \quad (5.7)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} g u_n^4 dx - a\|u_n\|^4 = 0. \quad (5.8)$$

Since $\{u_n\}$ is bounded, there exist a subsequence $\{u_n\}$ and $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ in $L^r(\Omega)$ for all $1 \leq r < 2^*$. By conditions (D1) – (D2), (5.7) and (5.8), we then have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx = \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx = 1 \quad (5.9)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} g u_n^4 dx = \int_{\Omega} g u_0^4 dx = a.$$

Now, we show that $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. If not, it follows from (5.7) and (5.9) that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_0|^2 dx - \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|u_n\|^2 - \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f u_n^2 dx \right) = 0,$$

which is impossible. Hence $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. It follows from (5.7) and (5.8) that

$$(I) \|u_0\|^2 = \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx = 1 \quad ; \quad (II) \int_{\Omega} g u_0^4 dx = a.$$

Here (I) gives that $u_0 = \pm \lambda_1(f)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \phi_1$ and then $\int_{\Omega} g u_0^4 dx = \lambda_1(f)^2 \int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^4 dx = a$ by (II), which is a contradiction since $a > \lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^4 dx$. Thus, the claim above is true and this completes the proof. $\square$

The following two theorems prove the results of Theorems 2.2 and 2.3.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose that $N = 1, 2, 3$, $p = 4$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. Then we have the following results.*

- (i) *For each $0 < a < \Gamma_0$ and $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has a positive solution u^+ with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) > 0$.*
- (ii) *For each $\max\{0, \lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^4 dx\} < a < \Gamma_0$ and $\lambda = \lambda_1(f)$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has a positive solution u^+ with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) > 0$.*
- (iii) *For each $\max\{0, \lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^4 dx\} < a < \Gamma_0$, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has two positive solutions u^+ and u^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) < 0 < J_{a,\lambda}(u^+)$ whenever $\lambda_1(f) < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_0$.*

Proof. (i) By Lemmas 3.2, 3.10 and 5.1 (i), for each $0 < a < \Gamma_0$ and $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$, there exists $u^+ \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) > 0$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u^+) = 0$. Since $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) = J_{a,\lambda}(|u^+|)$, which, without loss of generality, allows for the solution $u^+ > 0$ in Ω .

(ii)-(iii) The following argument proves (ii) and the relevant part of (iii). By Lemmas 3.2 (ii)-(iii), 3.10 and 5.1 (ii), for each $\max\{0, \lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^4 dx\} < a < \Gamma_0$, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for every $\lambda_1(f) \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \delta_0$, there exists $u^+ \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) > 0$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u^+) = 0$. Since $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) = J_{a,\lambda}(|u^+|)$, we may take $u^+ > 0$ in Ω . This concludes the proof here.

To prove the remaining part of (iii), we consider the infimum of $J_{a,\lambda}$ on the closed ball $B_{\rho_0} := \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \|u\| \leq \rho_0\}$ with ρ_0 as in (3.22). Set

$$\beta_0 := \inf_{\|u\| \leq \rho_0} J_{a,\lambda}(u).$$

For any $t > 0$,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(t\phi_1) = -\frac{\lambda - \lambda_1(f)}{2} t^2 + \frac{a\lambda_1(f)^2 - \int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^4 dx}{4} t^4.$$

Clearly, there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\|t_0\phi_1\| \leq \rho_0$ and $J_{a,\lambda}(t_0\phi_1) < 0$. Moreover,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} \|u\|^2 - \frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{4S_4^4} \|u\|^4 \geq -\frac{\lambda}{2\lambda_1(f)} \rho_0^2 - \frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{4S_4^4} \rho_0^4.$$

Consequently, $-\infty < \beta_0 < 0$. By the Ekeland variational principle [15], there exists a $(PS)_{\beta_0}$ -sequence $\{u_n\} \subset B_{\rho_0}$. Then by Lemma 3.10, there exists $u^- \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = \beta_0$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = 0$. Since $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = J_{a,\lambda}(|u^-|)$, this can be satisfied by taking $u^- > 0$ in Ω . This completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 5.3. Suppose that $N = 1, 2, 3$, $p = 4$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. Then we have the following results.

- (i) For each $a \geq \Gamma_0$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ does not admit nontrivial solution whenever $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$.
- (ii) For each $a > \Gamma_0$, Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ has a positive solution u^- with $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) < 0$ whenever $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$.

Proof. (i) Suppose that the result is false. Then there exists a solution $u_0 \neq 0$ such that

$$I_4(u_0) := \langle J'_{a,\lambda}(u_0), u_0 \rangle = a\|u_0\|^4 + \|u_0\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} g u_0^4 dx = 0.$$

Since $a \geq \Gamma_0$ and $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$ or $a > \Gamma_0$ and $\lambda = \lambda_1(f)$, we have

$$I_4(u_0) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \|u_0\|^2 + a\|u_0\|^4 - \int_{\Omega} g u_0^4 dx > 0,$$

which is a contradiction. For the rest case $a = \Gamma_0$ and $\lambda = \lambda_1(f)$, we can deduce that

$$(I) \ \|u_0\|^2 = \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx \quad \text{and} \quad (II) \ \Gamma_0 \|u_0\|^4 = \int_{\Omega} g u_0^4 dx.$$

Here the result of (I) implies that $u_0 = k\phi_1$ for some $k \in \mathbb{R}$ whereas that of (II) implies $k = 0$; the results contradict each other. Hence Equation $(K_{a,\lambda})$ does not admit nontrivial solution for all $a \geq \Gamma_0$ and $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$.

(ii) By Young's inequality, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} J_{a,\lambda}(u) &= \frac{1}{2} \|u\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx + \frac{a - \Gamma_0}{4} \|u\|^4 + \frac{1}{4} \left(\Gamma_0 \|u\|^4 - \int_{\Omega} g u^4 dx \right) \\ &\geq \frac{a - \Gamma_0}{4} \|u\|^4 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} - 1 \right) \|u\|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{a - \Gamma_0}{8} \|u\|^4 - \frac{1}{2(a - \Gamma_0)} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} - 1 \right)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Thus, $J_{a,\lambda}$ is coercive and bounded below for all $a > \Gamma_0$ and $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$. Now, we consider the infimum of functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ on $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Set

$$\beta_0 := \inf_{u \in H_0^1(\Omega)} J_{a,\lambda}(u).$$

Since

$$J_{a,\lambda}(t\phi_1) = -\frac{\lambda - \lambda_1(f)}{2} t^2 + \frac{a\lambda_1(f)^2 - \int_{\Omega} g \phi_1^4 dx}{4} t^4 \text{ for } t > 0.$$

This implies that there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(t_0\phi_1) < 0$. Hence $-\infty < \beta_0 < 0$. Then by the Ekeland variational principle [15], there exists a $(PS)_{\beta_0}$ -sequence $\{u_n\} \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$. It follows from (5.10) that $\{u_n\}$ is bounded. Then by Lemma 3.10, there exists $u^- \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = \beta_0$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = 0$. With $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = J_{a,\lambda}(|u^-|)$, we may assume that $u^- > 0$ in Ω . This completes the proof. $\square$

Next, we investigate the asymptotic behaviour of solutions.

Theorem 5.4. Suppose that $\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx > 0$ and $0 < a < \lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx$. Let $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda_1^-(f)$ and let u_n^+ be the solution obtained in Theorem 5.2 (i) for Equation (K_{a,λ_n}) . Then we have

$$(i) \ J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^+) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (ii) \ u_n^+ \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. (i) According to the Mountain Pass Theorem,

$$J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^+) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} J_{a,\lambda_n}(\gamma(t)) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma := \{\gamma \in C([0,1], H_0^1(\Omega)) : \gamma(0) = 0, \gamma(1) = e_0\},$$

where e_0 is obtained in Lemma 3.2 (i). Since $a < \lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx$, we can choose $e_0 = k\phi_1$ for some $k > 0$. Then a direct calculation gives

$$0 < J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^+) \leq \max_{t \in [0,1]} J_{a,\lambda_n}(tk\phi_1) = \frac{(\lambda_1(f) - \lambda_n)^3}{4 \left(\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx - a\lambda_1(f)^2 \right)}. \quad (5.11)$$

Hence it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^+) = 0$.

(ii) By $\langle J'_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^+), u_n^+ \rangle = 0$ and (5.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \|u_n^+\|^2 &\leq \|u_n^+\|^2 - \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f(u_n^+)^2 dx \\ &= 4J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^+) \leq \frac{(\lambda_1(f) - \lambda_n)^3}{\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx - a\lambda_1(f)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\|u_n^+\|^2 \leq \frac{\lambda_1(f)(\lambda_1(f) - \lambda_n)^2}{\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx - a\lambda_1(f)^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 5.5. Suppose that $\max\{0, \lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx\} < a < \Gamma_0$. Let $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda_1^+(f)$ and let u_n^- be the solution obtained in Theorem 5.2 (iii) with $J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^-) < 0$. Then we have

$$(i) \ u_n^- \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (ii) \ \frac{u_n^-}{\|u_n^-\|} \rightarrow k\phi_1 \text{ in } H_0^1(\Omega) \text{ for some } k > 0.$$

Proof. (i) From the proof of Theorem 5.2 (iii), we have $\|u_n^-\| \leq \rho_0$ for all n , where ρ_0 is as (3.22). Thus, there exist a subsequence $\{u_n^-\}$ and $u_0^- \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_n^- \rightharpoonup u_0^-$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and

$$u_n^- \rightarrow u_0^- \text{ in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ for all } 1 \leq r < 2^*. \quad (5.12)$$

By condition (D1) and (5.12), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f(u_n^-)^2 dx = \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f(u_0^-)^2 dx. \quad (5.13)$$

It follows from $J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^-) < 0$ and $\langle J'_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^-), u_n^- \rangle = 0$ that

$$\int_{\Omega} g(u_n^-)^4 dx - a\|u_n^-\|^4 = \|u_n^-\|^2 - \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f(u_n^-)^2 dx < 0. \quad (5.14)$$

Suppose that $u_n^- \rightarrow u_0^-$ does not hold. Then by (5.13) and (5.14), we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_0^-|^2 dx - \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f(u_0^-)^2 dx < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|u_n^-\|^2 - \lambda_n \int_{\Omega} f(u_n^-)^2 dx \right) \leq 0,$$

which is impossible. Hence $u_n^- \rightarrow u_0^-$. It follows that

$$(I) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_0^-|^2 dx - \lambda_1(f) \int_{\Omega} f(u_0^-)^2 dx = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (II) \int_{\Omega} g(u_0^-)^4 dx - a \|u_0^-\|^4 = 0.$$

The result from (I) implies $u_0^- = k\phi_1$ for some $k \geq 0$ and from (II) $k = 0$ since $a > \lambda_1(f)^{-2} \int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx$. Hence $u_n^- \rightarrow 0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$.

(ii) This part of the proof is identical to that of Theorem 4.1(ii) and is not repeated here. $\square$

Theorem 5.6. *Suppose that $0 < a < \Gamma_0$ and $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$. Let u_a be the solution obtained in Theorem 5.2 (i). Then $\|u_a\| \rightarrow \infty$ as $a \rightarrow \Gamma_0^-$.*

Proof. It is clear that u_a satisfies the following equation

$$a\|u_a\|^4 + \|u_a\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_a^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} g u_a^4 dx = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \|u_a\|^2 \leq \|u_a\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_a^2 dx = \int_{\Omega} g u_a^4 dx - a\|u_a\|^4 \leq (\Gamma_0 - a)\|u_a\|^4.$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 5.7. *Suppose that $a > \Gamma_0$. Let $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda_1^+(f)$ and let u_n^- be the solution obtained in Theorem 5.3 (ii) for Equation (K_{a,λ_n}) . Then we have*

$$u_n^- \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^-) \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 5.3 (ii), we have

$$J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^-) = \inf_{u \in H_0^1(\Omega)} J_{a,\lambda_n}(u) \leq \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} J_{a,\lambda_n}(t\phi_1). \quad (5.15)$$

By a direct calculation, we have

$$\inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} J_{a,\lambda_n}(t\phi_1) = \frac{-(\lambda_n - \lambda_1(f))^2}{4(a\lambda_1(f)^2 - \int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^4 dx)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.16)$$

Combining (5.10), (5.15) and (5.16) gives $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n^-\| = 0$. It follows from (5.10) and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n^-\| = 0$ that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_{a,\lambda_n}(u_n^-) = 0$. $\square$

6 The Proofs of Theorems 2.4-2.6

In this final section, we present the proofs of Theorems 2.4-2.6 and we start by showing the boundedness of Palais-Smale sequence using the fact that the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ is coercive and bounded below on $H_0^1(\Omega)$ for $p < 4$. The asymptotic behaviour of solutions is briefly discussed after the proofs of the main theorems.

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose that $N \geq 1$, $2 < p < \min\{4, 2^*\}$ and conditions (D1) – (D2) hold. Then the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ is coercive and bounded below on $H_0^1(\Omega)$ for every $a, \lambda > 0$.*

Proof. For any $a, \lambda > 0$, we have

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq \frac{a}{4}\|u\|^4 + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \|u\|^2 - \frac{\|g\|_\infty}{pS_p^p} \|u\|^p,$$

and Young's inequality gives

$$\frac{\|g\|_\infty}{pS_p^p} \|u\|^p \leq \frac{a}{16}\|u\|^4 + \frac{4-p}{4p} \left(\frac{\|g\|_\infty}{S_p^p}\right)^{\frac{4}{4-p}} \left(\frac{4}{a}\right)^{\frac{p}{4-p}}.$$

Thus, for $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$, we have

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq \frac{3}{16}a\|u\|^4 + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \|u\|^2 - \frac{4-p}{4p} \left(\frac{\|g\|_\infty}{S_p^p}\right)^{\frac{4}{4-p}} \left(\frac{4}{a}\right)^{\frac{p}{4-p}}. \quad (6.1)$$

Using Young's inequality when $\lambda > \lambda_1(f)$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \left|1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right| \|u\|^2 \leq \frac{a}{16}\|u\|^4 + \frac{1}{a} \left|1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right|,$$

and thus

$$J_{a,\lambda}(u) \geq \frac{a}{8}\|u\|^4 - \frac{1}{a} \left|1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right| - \frac{4-p}{4p} \left(\frac{\|g\|_\infty}{S_p^p}\right)^{\frac{4}{4-p}} \left(\frac{4}{a}\right)^{\frac{p}{4-p}}. \quad (6.2)$$

Hence $J_{a,\lambda}$ is coercive and bounded below on $H_0^1(\Omega)$ for every $a, \lambda > 0$. $\square$

Now we proceed to the proof of Theorem 2.4: (i) By Lemma 3.3, for each $a > 0$, the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ has the mountain pass geometry for every $\max\{0, \lambda_a^+\} < \lambda < \lambda_1(f)$. Then using Lemma 6.1, we can deduce that the $(PS)_\alpha$ -sequence for $J_{a,\lambda}$ is bounded for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, by Lemma 3.10, there exists $u^+ \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) > 0$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u^+) = 0$. Since $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) = J_{a,\lambda}(|u^+|)$, we assume without loss of generality that $u^+ > 0$ in Ω .

Next, we consider the infimum of $J_{a,\lambda}$ on the set $\{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \|u\| \geq \rho_{a,\lambda}^+\}$ with $\rho_{a,\lambda}^+$ as given in Lemma 3.3. Set

$$\beta_1 := \inf_{\|u\| \geq \rho_{a,\lambda}^+} J_{a,\lambda}(u).$$

It follows from Lemmas 3.3 and 6.1 that $-\infty < \beta_1 < 0$. By the Ekeland variational principle [15], there exists a $(PS)_{\beta_1}$ -sequence $\{u_n\}$ which is bounded according to Lemma 6.1. Then by Lemma 3.10, there exists $u^- \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = \beta_1$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = 0$. Since $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = J_{a,\lambda}(|u^-|)$, we may take $u^- > 0$ in Ω .

(ii) We consider the infimum of $J_{a,\lambda}$ on $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Set

$$\beta_2 := \inf_{u \in H_0^1(\Omega)} J_{a,\lambda}(u),$$

and β_2 is finite by Lemma 6.1. For any $t > 0$,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(t\phi_1) = -\frac{\lambda - \lambda_1(f)}{2}t^2 - \frac{\int_\Omega g\phi_1^p dx}{p}t^p + \frac{a\lambda_1(f)^2}{4}t^4.$$

Thus, there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(t_0\phi_1) < 0$ and so $\beta_2 < 0$. By the Ekeland variational principle [15], there exists a $(PS)_{\beta_2}$ -sequence $\{u_n\} \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ and the sequence is bounded as a

result of Lemma 6.1. Then by Lemma 3.10, there exists $u^- \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = \beta_2$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = 0$. Since $J_{a,\lambda}(u^-) = J_{a,\lambda}(|u^-|)$, we may assume that $u^- > 0$ in Ω .

(iii) Note that if $u_0 \neq 0$ is a solution, then

$$\langle J'_{a,\lambda}(u_0), u_0 \rangle = a\|u_0\|^4 + \|u_0\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u_0^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} g |u_0|^p dx = 0.$$

Thus, we consider the following:

$$I_p(u) := a\|u\|^4 + \|u\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} g |u|^p dx \quad \text{for } u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}.$$

For $\lambda > 0$, we may deduce that

$$I_p(u) \geq a\|u\|^4 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) \|u\|^2 - \frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{S_p^p} \|u\|^p.$$

We consider the function $H : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is defined by

$$H(x) = ax^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) x - \frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{S_p^p} x^{p-2}, \quad x > 0.$$

It is easy to obtain the absolute minimum value

$$H(x_0) = 1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)} - (4-p) \left(\frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{2S_p^p}\right)^{\frac{2}{4-p}} \left(\frac{p-2}{a}\right)^{\frac{p-2}{4-p}}$$

at $x_0 = \left(\frac{(p-2)\|g\|_{\infty}}{2aS_p^p}\right)^{\frac{1}{4-p}}$. Then we have $H(x_0) > 0$ as $\lambda < \Lambda_a^+$, which implies that $H(x) > 0$ for all $x > 0$ as $\lambda < \Lambda_a^+$. Hence we conclude that

$$I_p(u) \geq \|u\|^2 \left(a\|u\|^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(f)}\right) - \frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{S_p^p} \|u\|^{p-2} \right) > 0 \quad \text{for all } u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\},$$

whenever $0 < \lambda < \Lambda_a^+$. This completes the proof.

Next, we investigate the asymptotic behaviour of solutions.

Theorem 6.2. *For each $a > 0$ and $\lambda = \lambda_1(f)$, let u_a be the solution obtained in Theorem 2.4 (ii). Then $u_a \rightarrow 0$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. This result is readily obtained using (6.1) with $J_{a,\lambda_1(f)}(u_a) < 0$. □

Here we present the proof of Theorem 2.5: (i) By Lemma 3.5, for each $0 < a < a_0(p)$, there exists $\bar{\delta}_a > 0$ such that the functional $J_{a,\lambda}$ has the mountain pass geometry for every $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \bar{\delta}_a$. Then by Lemma 6.1, we can deduce that each $(PS)_{\alpha}$ -sequence for $J_{a,\lambda}$ is bounded. Thus, by Lemma 3.10, there exists $u^+ \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) > 0$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u^+) = 0$. Since $J_{a,\lambda}(u^+) = J_{a,\lambda}(|u^+|)$, we may have $u^+ > 0$ in Ω .

Next, we consider the infimum of $J_{a,\lambda}$ on the set $\{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \|u\| \geq \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}\}$ with $\bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}$ as in Lemma 3.5. Set

$$\beta_1 := \inf_{\|u\| \geq \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}} J_{a,\lambda}(u).$$

It follows from Lemmas 6.1 and 3.5 that $-\infty < \beta_1 < 0$. By the Ekeland variational principle [15], there exists a $(PS)_{\beta_1}$ -sequence $\{u_n\}$ and the sequence is bounded by Lemma 6.1. Using Lemma 3.10,

there exists $u_1^- \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(u_1^-) = \beta_1$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u_1^-) = 0$. Since $J_{a,\lambda}(u_1^-) = J_{a,\lambda}(|u_1^-|)$, we assume without loss of generality that $u_1^- > 0$ in Ω . Here we complete the proof of (i-1) and the partial proof of (i-2).

To complete the proof for the remaining part of (i-2), for each $\lambda_1(f) < \lambda < \lambda_1(f) + \bar{\delta}_a$, we consider the infimum of $J_{a,\lambda}$ on the closed ball $\bar{B}_{\bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}} = \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \|u\| \leq \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}\}$. Set

$$\beta_2 := \inf_{\|u\| \leq \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}} J_{a,\lambda}(u).$$

For any $t > 0$,

$$J_{a,\lambda}(t\phi_1) = -\frac{\lambda - \lambda_1(f)}{2}t^2 + \frac{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx|}{p}t^p + \frac{a\lambda_1(f)^2}{4}t^4.$$

Clearly, there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\|t_0\phi_1\| < \bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}$ and $J_{a,\lambda}(t_0\phi_1) < 0$ giving $-\infty < \beta_2 < 0$. By the Ekeland variational principle [15], there exists a $(PS)_{\beta_2}$ -sequence $\{u_n\} \subset B_{\bar{\rho}_{a,\lambda}}$. Then using Lemma 3.10, there exists $u_2^- \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $J_{a,\lambda}(u_2^-) = \beta_2$ and $J'_{a,\lambda}(u_2^-) = 0$. Since $J_{a,\lambda}(u_2^-) = J_{a,\lambda}(|u_2^-|)$, we may have $u_2^- > 0$ in Ω .

(ii) This is proved using the same argument of Theorem 2.4 (ii) and is not repeated here.

(iii) Using the same argument in the proof of Theorem 2.4 (iii), we consider the following:

$$I_p(u) := a\|u\|^4 + \|u\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} g|u|^p dx \quad \text{for } u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}.$$

We decompose each u as $u = t\phi_1 + w$, where $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\int_{\Omega} \nabla w \nabla \phi_1 dx = 0$. Then for $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1(f)$, we have

$$\|u\|^2 - \lambda \int_{\Omega} f u^2 dx \geq (\lambda_1(f) - \lambda)t^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_2(f)}\right) \|w\|^2 \geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_2(f)}\right) \|w\|^2. \quad (6.3)$$

Repeating the same process in (3.10) and (3.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\Omega} g|u|^p dx &= - \int_{\Omega} g|t\phi_1|^p dx + \left(\int_{\Omega} g|t\phi_1|^p dx - \int_{\Omega} g|t\phi_1 + w|^p dx \right) \\ &\geq \left| \int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx \right| |t|^p - 2^{p-2}(p-1)\|g\|_{\infty}\|\phi_1\|_p^p B^{\frac{p-1}{p}} |t|^p - \frac{2^{p-2}\|g\|_{\infty}}{S_p^p} (B^{-p} + p) \|w\|^p \\ &> - \frac{2^{p-1}\|g\|_{\infty}}{S_p^p B^p} \|w\|^p, \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

where $B = \left(\frac{|\int_{\Omega} g\phi_1^p dx|}{2^{p-1}(p-1)\|g\|_{\infty}\|\phi_1\|_p^p} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}$. Using Young's inequality then gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{2^{p-1}\|g\|_{\infty}}{S_p^p B^p} \|w\|^p \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_2(f)}\right) \|w\|^2 + (4p-8)(4-p)^{\frac{4-p}{p-2}} \left(\frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{S_p^p B^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_2(f)}\right)^{\frac{p-4}{p-2}} \|w\|^4. \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

It follows from (6.3) – (6.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} I_p(u) &> a\|u\|^4 - (4p-8)(4-p)^{\frac{4-p}{p-2}} \left(\frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{S_p^p B^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_2(f)}\right)^{\frac{p-4}{p-2}} \|w\|^4 \\ &> \|u\|^4 \left[a - (4p-8)(4-p)^{\frac{4-p}{p-2}} \left(\frac{\|g\|_{\infty}}{S_p^p B^p} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_2(f)}\right)^{\frac{p-4}{p-2}} \right] \\ &> 0 \quad \text{for } 0 < \lambda \leq \min\{\lambda_1(f), \Lambda_a^-\}. \end{aligned}$$

We completes this proof.

The proof of Theorem 2.6: Using Lemma 3.9, this proof is essential same as that of Theorem 2.5 (i) and is not repeated here.

Acknowledgement

K.H. Wang and T.F. Wu was supported in part by the Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan(Grant No. 108-2115-M-390-007-MY2 and Grant No. 108-2811-M-390-500).

References

- [1] S. Alama, G. Tarantello, On semilinear elliptic equations with indefinite nonlinearities, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 1 (1993) 439-475.
- [2] C.O. Alves, G.M. Figueiredo, Multi-bump solutions for a Kirchhoff-type problem, Adv. Nonlinear Anal. 5 (2016) 1-26.
- [3] A. Ambrosetti, P.H. Rabinowitz, Dual variational methods in critical point theory and applications, J. Funct. Anal. 14 (1973) 349-381.
- [4] A. Arosio, S. Panizzi, On the well-posedness of the Kirchhoff string, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 348 (1996) 305-330.
- [5] A. Bensedki, M. Boucekif, On an elliptic equation of Kirchhoff-type with a potential asymptotically linear at infinity, Math. Comput. Modelling 49 (2009) 1089-1096.
- [6] K.J. Brown, Y. Zhang, The Nehari manifold for a semilinear elliptic equation with a sign-changing weight function, J. Differential Equations 193 (2003) 481-499.
- [7] J. Chabrowski, D.G. Costa, On a class of Schrödinger-type equations with indefinite weight functions, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 33 (2008) 1368-1394.
- [8] J. Chen, Multiple positive solutions to a class of Kirchhoff equation on $\mathbb{R}^3$ with indefinite nonlinearity, Nonlinear Analysis 96 (2014) 134-145.
- [9] C. Chen, Y. Kuo, T.F. Wu, The Nehari manifold for a Kirchhoff type problem involving sign-changing weight functions, J. Differential Equations 250 (2011) 1876-1908.
- [10] G. Dai, Eigenvalue, global bifurcation and positive solutions for a class of fully nonlinear problems, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. 48 (2016) 213-233.
- [11] P. D'Ancona, S. Spagnolo, Global solvability for the degenerate Kirchhoff equation with real analytic data, Invent. Math. 108 (1992) 247-262.
- [12] Y. Deng, S. Peng, W. Shuai, Existence and asymptotic behavior of nodal solutions for the Kirchhoff-type problems in $\mathbb{R}^3$, J. Funct. Anal. 269 (2015) 3500-3527.
- [13] Y. Deng, W. Shuai, Sign-changing multi-bump solutions for Kirchhoff-type equations in $\mathbb{R}^3$, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. A 38 (2018) 3139-3168.
- [14] L. Ding, Y.J. Meng, S.W. Xiao, J.L. Zhang, Existence of two positive solutions for indefinite Kirchhoff equations in $\mathbb{R}^3$, Electronic J. Differential Equations, 2016 (2016) 1-22.

- [15] I. Ekeland, Convexity methods in Hamiltonian mechanics, Springer, 1990.
- [16] G. M. Figueiredo, N. Ikoma, J.R.S. Júnior, Existence and concentration result for the Kirchhoff-type equations with general nonlinearities, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 213 (2014) 931-979.
- [17] Z. Guo, Ground states for Kirchhoff equations without compact condition, J. Differential Equations 259 (2015) 2884-2902.
- [18] X. He, W. Zou, Existence and concentration behavior of positive solutions for a Kirchhoff equation in $\mathbb{R}^3$, J. Differential Equations 252 (2012) 1813-1834.
- [19] N. Ikoma, Existence of ground state solutions to the nonlinear Kirchhoff type equations with potentials, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **A** 35 (2015) 943-966.
- [20] J.R.S. Júnior, G. Siciliano, Positive solutions for a Kirchhoff problem with vanishing nonlocal term, J. Differential Equations 265 (2018) 2034-2043.
- [21] G. Kirchhoff, Mechanik, Teubner, Leipzig, 1883.
- [22] Z. Liang, F. Li, J. Shi, Positive solutions of Kirchhoff-type non-local elliptic equation: a bifurcation approach, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh **147A** (2017) 875-894.
- [23] J.L. Lions, On some questions in boundary value problems of mathematical physics, in: Contemporary Developments in Mechanics and Partial Differential Equations, North-Holland Mathematics Studies, vol. 30, 284-346 (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1978).
- [24] G. Li, H. Ye, Existence of positive ground state solutions for the nonlinear Kirchhoff type equations in $\mathbb{R}^3$, J. Differential Equations 257 (2014) 566-600.
- [25] S.I. Pohozaev, A certain class of quasilinear hyperbolic equations, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) 96 (138) (1975) 152-166, 168 (in Russian).
- [26] J. Sun, T.F. Wu, Existence and multiplicity of solutions for an indefinite Kirchhoff type equation in bounded domains, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. **A** 146 (2016) 435-448.
- [27] J. Sun, T.F. Wu, Steep potential well may help Kirchhoff type equations to generate multiple solutions, Nonlinear Analysis 190 (2020) 111609.
- [28] X. Tang, S. Chen, Ground state solutions of Nehari-Pohozaev type for Kirchhoff-type problems with general potentials, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 56 (2017) 110.
- [29] H.B. Keller, Lectures on numerical methods in bifurcation problems, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [30] Y. Kuo, W. Lin, S. Shieh, W. Wang, A minimal energy tracking method for non-radially symmetric solutions of coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations, J. Comput. Phys. 228 (2009) 7941-7956.
- [31] M. Willem, Minimax Theorems, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1996.