

## ON THE GENERALISED BRÉZIS-NIRENBERG PROBLEM

T. V. ANOOP<sup>1</sup> AND UJJAL DAS<sup>2\*</sup>

ABSTRACT. For  $p \in (1, N)$  and a domain  $\Omega$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , we study the following quasi-linear problem involving the critical growth:

$$-\Delta_p u - \mu g |u|^{p-2} u = |u|^{p^*-2} u \text{ in } \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega),$$

where  $\Delta_p$  is the  $p$ -Laplace operator defined as  $\Delta_p(u) = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u)$ ,  $p^* = \frac{Np}{N-p}$  is the critical Sobolev exponent and  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  is the Beppo-Levi space defined as the completion of  $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  with respect to the norm  $\|u\|_{\mathcal{D}_p} := \left[ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}$ . In this article, we provide various sufficient conditions on  $g$  and  $\Omega$  so that the above problem admits a positive solution for certain range of  $\mu$ . As a consequence, for  $N \geq p^2$ , if  $g$  is such that  $g^+ \neq 0$  and the map  $u \mapsto \int_{\Omega} |g||u|^p dx$  is compact on  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ , we show that the problem under consideration has a positive solution for certain range of  $\mu$ . Further, for  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ , we give a necessary condition for the existence of positive solution.

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2020):** 35B33, 35J60, 58E30

**Keywords:** Brézis-Nirenberg type problem; Critical Sobolev exponent; Concentration compactness; Principle of symmetric criticality; Pohozaev type identity.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For  $p \in (1, N)$  and a domain  $\Omega$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , the Beppo-Levi space  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  is defined as the completion of  $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  with respect to the norm  $\|u\|_{\mathcal{D}_p} := \left[ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}$ . In this article, we study the following quasi-linear partial differential equation involving the critical growth:

$$-\Delta_p u - \mu g |u|^{p-2} u = |u|^{p^*-2} u \text{ in } \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega), \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\Delta_p$  is the  $p$ -Laplace operator defined as  $\Delta_p u = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u)$ , and  $p^* = \frac{Np}{N-p}$  is the critical Sobolev exponent. Since the seminal work of Brézis-Nirenberg [11], many different classes of elliptic boundary value problems involving the critical exponent have been explored. For example, see [3, 42, 13, 17, 47, 18] for Laplacian ( $p = 2$ ) and [27, 41, 29, 26, 43, 16, 12] for  $p$ -Laplacian ( $p \in (1, N)$ ). It is well known that, if  $g \equiv 0$  in (1.1) i.e. the problem

$$-\Delta_p u = |u|^{p^*-2} u \text{ in } \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega), \quad (1.2)$$

does not admit any positive solution on a bounded, star-shaped domain [11, Remark 1.2]. However, if  $g \equiv 1$  on a bounded domain  $\Omega$ , then (1.1) admits a positive solution for certain range (depending

<sup>1</sup> DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, MADRAS, INDIA.

<sup>2</sup> CORRESPONDING AUTHOR, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TECHNION - ISRAEL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, HAIFA, ISRAEL.

*E-mail addresses:* anoop@iitm.ac.in, ujjaldas@campus.technion.ac.il, ujjal.rupam.das@gmail.com.

on  $p$  and  $N$ ) of  $\mu$ , see [11, for Laplacian] and [27, for p-Laplacian]. This suggests that certain perturbations of (1.2) of the form (1.1) may admit a positive solution. Also, in [52], authors multiplied a weight function  $g$  to the right-hand side of (1.2) and studied the existence of positive solutions. In this article, we are interested in identifying a general class of  $g$  so that (1.1) admits a positive solution. Many results have been appeared in this direction. For example, for bounded domain  $\Omega$ ,  $g$  is positive constant [11, 27],  $g$  is bounded non-negative function [29, 23], sign-changing  $g \in C(\overline{\Omega})$  [30]. For  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ , Charles Swanson and Lao Sen [48] considered nontrivial, non-negative  $g$  in  $L^{\frac{N}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . For  $p = 2$ , Chabrowski [15] considered sign-changing  $g$  which is positive on a positive measure set and  $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^N)$  with  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_l(x)} |g|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} dx = 0$  for some  $r \in (2, 2^*)$ ,  $l > 0$ , and for  $p \in (1, N)$ , Huang [31] has taken  $g \in L^{\frac{p^*}{p^*-r}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  for some  $r \in (1, p^*)$ . In [22], Drábek-Huang considered  $g$  such that  $g^+ \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^{\frac{N}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and  $g^- \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . In all the above mentioned results, the assumptions on  $g$  ensure that the map

$$G_p(u) := \int_{\Omega} |g||u|^p dx \text{ on } \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$$

is compact (i.e.  $G_p(u_n) \rightarrow G_p(u)$  whenever  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ ). In this case, the non-compactness issues in dealing with (1.1) arise only due to the presence of critical exponent or the unboundedness of the domain. Indeed, to tackle these kinds of non-compactness, one can use the celebrated concentration compactness principles of P. L. Lions [38, 39]. Moreover, in [14], authors considered multiple perturbations of (1.2), where the non-compactness of one perturbation is compensated by another perturbation. The main objective of this article is to consider a single non-compact perturbation of (1.2) by a potential  $g$  and enlarge the class of  $g$  that ensures the existence of a positive solution of (1.1). We use a concentration compactness principle that depends on  $g$  (and in the later part, depends on a closed subgroup of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ ) that can simultaneously address all the aforementioned non-compactness (critical exponent, unboundedness of the domain, non-compact perturbations).

Notice that, if  $u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  is a solution to (1.1), then

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx = \mu \int_{\Omega} g|u|^p dx + \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p^*} dx \geq \mu \int_{\Omega} g|u|^p dx.$$

We priory assume that  $g$  must satisfy the following Hardy type inequality:

$$\int_{\Omega} |g||u|^p dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega),$$

for some  $C > 0$ .

**Definition 1.1.** A function  $g \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$  satisfying the above inequality is called as a Hardy potential and the space of all Hardy potentials is denoted by  $\mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$ .

One can define a norm on  $\mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  which makes it a Banach function space (see Section 2.5). For  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$ , we define

$$\mu_1(g, \Omega) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx : \int_{\Omega} |g||u|^p dx = 1, u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega) \right\}.$$

If the underlying domain is unambiguous, then we simply write  $\mu_1(g)$  instead of  $\mu_1(g, \Omega)$ . Observe that  $\mu_1(g) > 0$ , and for each  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ ,  $\|u\|_{\mathcal{D}_p, \mu} := \left[ \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^p - \mu g|u|^p] dx \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}$  is a quasi-norm on  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  and it is equivalent to  $\|u\|_{\mathcal{D}_p}$ . We also define

$$\mu_1(g, x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \left[ \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx : \int_{\Omega} |g||u|^p dx = 1 : u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega \cap B_r(x)) \right\} \right]; x \in \overline{\Omega},$$

and

$$\Sigma_g = \{x \in \overline{\Omega} : \mu_1(g, x) < \infty\}.$$

Now, for  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  and  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ , we consider the functional

$$J_{g, \mu}(u) = \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^p - \mu g|u|^p] dx$$

and define

$$\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega) = \inf \{J_{g, \mu}(u) : u \in \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)\}, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $\mathbb{S}_p(\Omega) := \{u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega) : \|u\|_{p^*} = 1\}$ . If  $\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega)$  is attained at  $v \in \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)$ , then the standard variational arguments ensure that  $[J_{g, \mu}(v)]^{\frac{1}{p^*-p}} v$  is a non-trivial solution of (1.1). In order to investigate whether  $\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega)$  is attained or not, consider a minimizing sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega)$ , say  $(w_n)$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . It is not difficult to see that  $(w_n)$  converges weakly to some  $w \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . By zero extension,  $w_n \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  can be considered as a  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)$  function whenever convenient. Using this convention, we define the measures  $\nu_n$  as

$$\nu_n(E) = \int_E |w_n - w|^{p^*} dx, \text{ for every Borel set } E \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

and the following quantity

$$\nu_{\infty} = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R^c} |w_n - w|^{p^*} dx.$$

Since  $(w_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ , it follows that  $(\nu_n)$  is bounded in the space of all regular, finite, Borel signed-measures  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  with respect to the norm  $\|\nu_n\| := \nu_n(\mathbb{R}^N)$  (total variation of measures). By the Reisz representation theorem [1, Theorem 14.14, Chapter 14],  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is the dual of  $C_0(\mathbb{R}^N) := \overline{C_c(\mathbb{R}^N)}$  in  $L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Hence, by the Banach-Aloglu theorem it follows that  $\nu_n \xrightarrow{*} \nu$  in  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . It is important to mention that the measure  $\nu$  together with the quantity  $\nu_{\infty}$  captures the possible failure of strong convergence of  $(w_n)$  in  $L^{p^*}(\Omega)$ . Indeed, if  $\nu = 0 = \nu_{\infty}$ , then  $w_n \rightarrow w$  in  $L^{p^*}(\Omega)$  (see Corollary 3.5), and consequently,  $\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega)$  is attained at  $w$ . If  $\nu \neq 0$  (or  $\nu_{\infty} \neq 0$ ), then we say that  $(w_n)$  concentrate on  $\overline{\Omega}$  (or at  $\infty$ ). To study the concentration behaviour of  $\nu$ , we consider the following concentration function of  $g$ :

$$\mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}(x) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega \cap B_r(x)), \quad \mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}(\infty) := \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega \cap B_R^c).$$

We denote  $\mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}^*(\Omega) = \inf_{\overline{\Omega}} \mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}(x)$ . Notice that

$$\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}^*(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}(\infty). \quad (1.4)$$

Later we see that the nature of the above inequalities (strict or not) helps us to determine whether  $\nu$  is concentrated or not. For the brevity, we make the following definition.

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  and  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ . We say

- (i)  $g$  is **sub-critical in  $\Omega$**  if  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega) < \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^*(\Omega)$ , and **sub-critical at infinity** if  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega) < \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}(\infty)$ ,
- (ii)  $g$  is **critical in  $\Omega$**  if  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega) = \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^*(\Omega)$ , and **critical at infinity** if  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega) = \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}(\infty)$ .

Let

$$\mathcal{F}_p(\Omega) := \overline{\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\Omega)} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega).$$

In [6], it is proved that  $\mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$  is the optimal space for  $g$  such that  $G_p$  is compact in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . In this article, we assume that  $g$  satisfies:

$$\text{(H1)} \quad g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega), g^- \in \mathcal{F}_p(\Omega), \text{ and } |\overline{\Sigma_g}| = 0.$$

Now we state our first result.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and  $g$  satisfies (H1). If for some  $\lambda \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ ,  $g$  is sub-critical in  $\Omega$  and at infinity, then (1.1) admits a positive solution for  $\mu = \lambda$ .*

Our proof for the above theorem is based on the fact that, if  $g$  is subcritical in  $\Omega$  and at infinity, then  $\nu = 0 = \nu_\infty$  for any minimising sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega)$ . In other words, the subcriticality (in  $\Omega$  and at  $\infty$ ) of  $g$  ensures that the minimising sequence does not concentrate in  $\overline{\Omega}$  as well as at  $\infty$ .

Now, it is natural to ask whether the compact perturbations are sub-critical or not? The answer is no, for example,  $g \equiv 0$  is a compact perturbation (as  $G_p \equiv 0$  on  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ ) but not a sub-critical potential. On a bounded domain  $\Omega$ ,  $g \equiv 1$  is a compact perturbation and it is sub-critical for all  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$  if  $N \geq p^2$ , see [11, Theorem 1.2] (for  $p = 2$ ) and [19, Theorem 4.2] (for general  $p$ ). Next we show that every compact perturbation (with non-trivial positive part) behaves like  $g \equiv 1$ .

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $N \geq p^2$  and  $g \in \mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$  be such that  $g^+ \neq 0$ . Then  $g$  is sub-critical in  $\Omega$  and at the infinity for all  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ .*

**Remark 1.5.** Indeed, the condition  $N \geq p^2$  is crucial, for instance, if  $p = 2$  and  $N = 3$  then  $g \equiv 1$  is not sub-critical for  $\mu$  near 0. [11, Corollary 1.1].

Next we ask, what happens if  $g$  fails to be sub-critical either in  $\Omega$  or at infinity? Recall that, for the critical potential  $g \equiv 0$ , (1.1) does not admit any positive solution when  $\Omega$  is a bounded star-shaped domain. However, it admits a positive solution when  $\Omega$  is an annular domain [33, Section 4] or entire  $\mathbb{R}^N$  [39]. Similarly, if  $\Omega$  contains the origin, then  $g(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^p}$  is critical in  $\Omega$  (see Example 4.5), and (1.1) does not admit a positive solution for any  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$  [28, Theorem 2.1], when  $\Omega$  is bounded star-shaped. On the other hand, for the same  $g$ , (1.1) does admit a positive radial solution on entire  $\mathbb{R}^N$  for every  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$  [53, Theorem 1.41]. This indicates that, when the subcriticality fails, the symmetry of the domain plays a vital role for the existence of solutions of (1.1). Here we study the non-subcritical cases under some additional symmetry assumptions on  $\Omega$  and  $g$ .

Consider the action of a closed subgroup  $H$  of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$  (the group of all orthogonal matrices on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ) on  $\mathbb{R}^N$  given by  $x \rightarrow h \cdot x$ , for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $h \in H$ , where  $\cdot$  represents the matrix multiplication. We will be writing  $h(x)$  instead of  $h \cdot x$ . For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , the orbit of  $x$  is denoted by  $Hx$  and for  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ , the orbit of  $E$  is denoted by  $H(E)$ . Thus,  $Hx = \{h(x) : h \in H\}$  and  $H(E) = \{h(x) : x \in E, h \in H\}$ .

**Definition 1.6.** Let  $\Omega$  be a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . If  $H(\Omega) = \Omega$ , then we say  $\Omega$  is  $H$ -invariant. If  $\Omega$  is  $H$ -invariant and  $f(h(x)) = f(x), \forall h \in H$  (i.e.,  $f$  is constant on each  $H$  orbit), then we say  $f$  is  $H$ -invariant.

For a  $H$ -invariant domain  $\Omega$ , the  $H$ -action on  $\Omega$  naturally induces an action of  $H$  on  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  given by

$$\pi(h)(u) = u_h, \text{ where } u_h(x) = u(h^{-1}(x)).$$

Thus,  $u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  is  $H$ -invariant if, and only if,  $u_h = u$ . The set of all  $H$ -invariant functions in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  and  $\mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)$  are denoted by  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H$  and  $\mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)^H$  respectively, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H &= \{u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega) : u = u_h, \forall h \in H\} \\ \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)^H &= \{u \in \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega) : u = u_h, \forall h \in H\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, for  $H = \{Id_{\mathbb{R}^N}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H = \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  and  $\mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)^H = \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)$ , and if  $H = \mathcal{O}(N)$  and  $\Omega$  is a radial domain, then  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H$  and  $\mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)^H$  corresponds to the space of all radial functions in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  and  $\mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)$  respectively. Next, we consider a  $H$ -depended minimization problem analogous to (1.3)

$$\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) = \inf \{J_{g,\mu}(u) : u \in \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)^H\}.$$

It is clear that  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega)$ . It may happen that  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega)$  is attained in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H$  without  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega)$  being attained in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . Now one may ask, does a minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega)$  actually solve (1.1)? i.e., whether a critical point of  $J_{g,\mu}$  over  $\mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)^H$  can be a critical point of  $J_{g,\mu}$  over  $\mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)$ ? The principle of symmetric criticality theory answers this question affirmatively. We used the following version of the principle of symmetric criticality by Kobayashi and Ôtani. [35, Theorem 2.2].

**Theorem. (Principle of symmetric criticality).** *Let  $V$  be a reflexive and strictly convex Banach space and  $H$  be a group that acts on  $V$  isometrically i.e.,  $\|h(v)\|_V = \|v\|_V, \forall h \in H, v \in V$ . If  $F : V \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is a  $H$ -invariant,  $C^1$ , then*

$$(F|_{V^H})'(v) = 0 \text{ implies } F'(v) = 0 \text{ and } v \in V^H,$$

where  $V^H$  is the set of all  $H$ -invariant elements of  $V$ .

For the remaining part of this section, we make the following assumptions on  $\Omega$  and  $g$ :

**(H2)** The domain  $\Omega$  and the Hardy potential  $g$  are  $H$ -invariant, where  $H$  is a closed subgroup of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ .

For any closed subgroup  $H$  of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ , and  $\Omega, g$  as in **(H2)**, it is easy to verify that

$$\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u_h|^p - \mu g |u_h|^p] dx = \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^p - \mu g |u|^p] dx,$$

i.e.,  $J_{g,\mu}$  is  $H$ -invariant, and also  $J_{g,\mu}$  is  $C^1$  as  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$ . Thus, the principle of symmetric criticality holds for  $J_{g,\mu}$ , and hence a minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega)$  (if exists) solves (1.1) (up to a constant multiple).

Now, for  $H, \Omega$ , and  $g$  as given in **(H1)** and **(H2)**, we investigate whether  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega)$  is achieved or not. For this purpose, analogous to  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}$ , we introduce a  $H$ -depended concentration function of  $g$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(x) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega \cap H(B_r(x))) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(\infty) := \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega \cap B_R^c)$$

and  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\Omega) := \inf_{\overline{\Omega}} \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(x)$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H$  is constant on each  $H$ -orbits, and if  $H = \{Id_{\mathbb{R}^N}\}$ , then  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H = \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}$ . Now, in the similar fashion as in Definition 1.2, we make the following definition:

**Definition 1.7.** Let  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  be  $H$ -invariant. Then for a  $\mu$  in  $(0, \mu_1(g))$ , we say

- (i)  $g$  is  **$H$ -subcritical in  $\Omega$**  if  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) < \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\Omega)$ , and  **$H$ -subcritical at infinity** if  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) < \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(\infty)$ .
- (ii)  $g$  is  **$H$ -critical in  $\Omega$**  if  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) = \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\Omega)$ , and  **$H$ -critical at infinity** if  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(\infty) = \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega)$ .

Now analogues to Theorem 1.3, we have the following result:

**Theorem 1.8.** Let  $H$ ,  $\Omega$  and  $g$  as given in (H1) and (H2). For  $\lambda \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ , assume that  $g$  is  $H$ -subcritical in  $\Omega$  and at infinity. Then (1.1) admits a positive solution for  $\mu = \lambda$ .

**Remark 1.9.** Indeed, there are Hardy potentials that are not subcritical but  $H$ -subcritical for some  $H$ , see Example 5.2-(iii).

Next, to understand the situation when  $g$  fails to be  $H$ -subcritical either in  $\Omega$  or at infinity, we consider a minimizing sequence  $(w_n)$  of  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega)$ . In this case,  $(w_n)$  can concentrate only on a finite  $H$ -orbit in  $\overline{\Omega}$  and or at infinity (see Corollary 3.5). In particular, if all the  $H$ -orbits are infinite under the  $H$ -action, then  $(w_n)$  can not concentrate anywhere in  $\overline{\Omega}$ . These ideas leads to our next result.

**Theorem 1.10.** Let  $H$ ,  $\Omega$  and  $g$  be as given in (H1) and (H2) such that the orbits  $Hx$  are infinite for all  $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ . Assume that for some  $\lambda \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ ,  $g$  is  $H$ -subcritical at infinity. Then (1.1) admits a positive solution for  $\mu = \lambda$ .

**Remark 1.11.** For  $2 \leq k \leq N$ , let  $H = \mathcal{O}(k) \times \{I_{N-k}\}$ , where any  $h \in H$  is considered as  $\begin{pmatrix} h_k & 0_{N-k} \\ 0_{n-k} & I_{N-k} \end{pmatrix}$ ;  $h_k \in \mathcal{O}(k)$ . Let  $\Omega = \Omega_k \times \Omega_{N-k}$ , where  $\Omega_{N-k}$  is a general domain in  $\mathbb{R}^{N-k}$  and

$$\Omega_k := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^k : a \leq |x| \leq b \right\}^\circ, \quad a, b \geq 0, \quad (1.5)$$

$A^\circ$  denotes the interior of a set  $A$ . Depending on the values of  $a, b$ , the above domain  $\Omega$  in (1.5) can be a ball, an annulus, exterior of a ball, unbounded cylinders, or entire  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . In particular, if  $k = N$ , then  $\Omega$  is all radial domains in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Observe that  $\Omega$  is  $H$ -invariant, and only the origin has a finite  $H$ -orbit. If  $a > 0$  then  $0 \notin \overline{\Omega}$ , and hence Theorem 1.10 helps us to identify  $H$ -invariant critical Hardy potentials on  $\Omega$  for which (1.1) admits a positive solution. For instance, for  $k = N$  and  $0 < a < b < \infty$  (i.e., annular domains in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ),  $g \equiv 0$  is  $O(N)$ -subcritical at infinity (since the annular domains are bounded). Hence, for  $g \equiv 0$ , (1.1) admits a positive solution. See Example 5.2 for more of such potentials.

Next we address the case when  $g$  is not necessarily  $H$ -subcritical at infinity. In this case, we assume that  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $g$  satisfies the following homogeneity condition:

$$(H3) \quad g(rz) \geq \frac{g(z)}{r^p}; \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^N, r > 0.$$

**Theorem 1.12.** Let  $H$  be a closed subgroup of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$  and  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $g$  be as in (H1) and (H2).

- (i) If  $g$  is  $H$ -subcritical in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  for some  $\lambda \in (0, \mu_1(g))$  and satisfies **(H3)** for small values of  $r > 0$ , then (1.1) admits a positive solution for  $\mu = \lambda$ .
- (ii) Let the orbits  $Hx$  are infinite for all  $x(\neq 0) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . If  $g$  satisfies **(H3)** for all  $r > 0$ , then (1.1) admits a positive solution for all  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ .

**Remark 1.13.** Consider  $g(x) = 0$  or  $\frac{1}{|x|^p}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and  $H = O(N)$ . Then  $g$  satisfies **(H3)**, and the above theorem assures that (1.1) admits a positive solution on entire  $\mathbb{R}^N$  for all  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ .

Next we provide a necessary condition for the existence of a positive solution for (1.1). In this direction, a Pohozaev type identity is available for bounded star-shaped domain [23, Theorem 1.1]. Here we establish such an identity for entire  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

**Theorem 1.14.** Let  $g \in C_{loc}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)$  such that  $g(x)|u|^p \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and also  $x \cdot \nabla g(x)|u|^p \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Further, if  $u$  solves

$$-\Delta_p u - g|u|^{p-2}u = |u|^{p^*-2}u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

in weak sense, then the following holds:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [x \cdot \nabla g(x) + pg(x)]|u|^p dx = 0.$$

A similar identity has been derived when the problem does not involve critical exponent [49, Proposition 4.5](for  $p = 2$ ) and [4, Theorem 6.1.3] (for general  $p$ ).

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we briefly discuss about the spaces  $\mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$ , and recall some important results such as principle of symmetric criticality, a strong maximum principle. In Section 3, we derive a  $H$ -dependent concentration-compactness lemma. Section 4 is devoted to the discussions on subcritical potentials and it includes our proofs for Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4. In Section 5, Theorem 1.10 and Theorem 1.12 are proved. We prove Theorem 1.14 in Section 6.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we briefly discuss many essential results that are required for the development of this article.

**2.1 Principle of symmetric criticality.** Let  $(V, \|\cdot\|_V)$  be a real Banach space and  $BL(V, V)$  be the space of all bounded linear operator on  $V$ . Let  $H$  be a group. A representation  $\pi : H \mapsto BL(V, V)$  is a map that satisfies the following:

- (i)  $\pi(e)v = v; \forall v \in V$ , where  $e$  is the identity element in  $H$ .
- (ii)  $\pi(h_1 h_2)v = \pi(h_1)\pi(h_2)v, \forall h_1, h_2 \in H, v \in V$ .

The action of  $H$  on  $V$  is said to be isometric if  $\|\pi(h)v\|_V = \|v\|_V, \forall h \in H, v \in V$ . The subspace  $V^H := \{v \in V : \pi(h)v = v, \forall h \in H\}$  is called the  $H$ -invariant subspace of  $V$ . A functional  $J : V \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is called  $H$ -invariant if  $J(\pi(h)v) = J(v), \forall h \in H, \forall v \in V$ . A differentiable,  $H$ -invariant functional  $J : V \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is said to satisfy *the principle of symmetric criticality* if

$$\text{(P)} \quad (J|_{V^H})'(v) = 0 \text{ implies } J'(v) = 0 \text{ and } v \in V^H.$$



In 1979, Palais [44] has introduced the notion of principle of symmetric criticality. Since then many versions of this principle were proved e.g., [35, Theorem 2.2], [35, Theorem 2.7], [36, Theorem 2.1]. In this article, we use the following version due to Kobayashi and Ôtani [35, Theorem 2.2].

**Theorem 2.1** (Principle of symmetric criticality). [35, Theorem 2.2] *Let  $V$  be reflexive and strictly convex and the action of the  $H$  on  $V$  is isometric. If  $J$  is a  $H$ -invariant,  $C^1$  functional, then **(P)** holds.*

**Remark 2.2.** Let  $\Omega$  be a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Consider  $V = \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  and  $H$  be a closed subgroup of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$  which acts on  $V$  as  $\pi(h)v = v_h$ , where  $v_h(x) := v(h^{-1}(x))$ ,  $\forall x \in \Omega$ . One can verify the following:

- (a)  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  is reflexive and strictly convex,
- (b) the action of  $H$  on  $V$  is isometric.

Furthermore, for  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$ , the functional  $J_{g,\mu}$  is  $C^1$ . Thus, by Theorem 2.1, **(P)** holds for  $J_{g,\mu}$ .

**2.2 The space of signed measures.** We denote the collection of all Borel sets in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  by  $\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Let  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be the space of all regular, finite, Borel signed-measures on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . It is well known that  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is a Banach space with respect to the norm  $\|\nu\| = |\nu|(\mathbb{R}^N)$  (total variation of  $\nu$ ). By the Reisz Representation theorem [1, Theorem 14.14, Chapter 14],  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is the dual of  $C_0(\mathbb{R}^N) := \overline{C_c(\mathbb{R}^N)}$  in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . A sequence  $(\nu_n)$  is said to be weak\* convergent to  $\nu$  in  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , if

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \phi \, d\nu_n \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \phi \, d\nu, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \forall \phi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

In this case we write  $\nu_n \xrightarrow{*} \nu$ .

The following result is a consequence of the Banach-Alaoglu theorem [20, Chapter 5, Section 3] which states that for any normed linear space  $X$ , the closed unit ball in  $X^*$  is weak\* compact.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $(\nu_n)$  be a bounded sequence in  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , then there exists  $\nu \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  such that  $\nu_n \xrightarrow{*} \nu$  up to a subsequence.*

The next proposition follows from the uniqueness part of the Riesz representation theorem [1, Theorem 14.14, Chapter 14].

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $\nu \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be a positive measure. Then for an open  $V \subseteq \Omega$ ,*

$$\nu(V) = \sup \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \phi \, d\nu : 0 \leq \phi \leq 1, \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ with } \text{Supp}(\phi) \subseteq V \right\},$$

*and for any  $E \in \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ,  $\nu(E) := \inf \{ \nu(V) : E \subseteq V \text{ and } V \text{ is open} \}$ .*

The following result plays an important role in proving the concentration compactness principle. For a proof we refer to [39, Lemma 1.2].

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $\nu, \Gamma$  be two non-negative, bounded measures on  $\mathbb{R}^N$  such that*

$$\left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^q \, d\nu \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq C \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^p \, d\Gamma \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \forall \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N),$$



for some  $C > 0$  and  $1 \leq p < q < \infty$ . Then there exist a countable set  $\{x_j \in \mathbb{R}^N : j \in \mathbb{J}\}$  and  $\nu_j \in (0, \infty)$  such that

$$\nu = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \nu_j \delta_{x_j}.$$

**Definition 2.6.** A measure  $\Upsilon \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is said to be concentrated on a Borel set  $F$  if

$$\Upsilon(E) = \Upsilon(E \cap F), \quad \forall E \in \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

If  $\Upsilon$  is concentrated on  $F$ , then one can observe that  $\Upsilon(F) = \|\Upsilon\|$ .

For any measure  $\Upsilon \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and a  $E \in \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , we denote the restriction of  $\Upsilon$  on  $E$  as  $\Upsilon_E$ . Observe that  $\Upsilon_E$  is concentrated on  $E$ .

**2.3 Brezis-Lieb lemma.** The next lemma is due to Brezis and Lieb (see Theorem 1 of [10]).

**Lemma 2.7.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$  be a measure space and  $(f_n)$  be a sequence of complex-valued measurable functions which are uniformly bounded in  $L^p(\Omega, \mu)$  for some  $0 < p < \infty$ . Moreover, if  $(f_n)$  converges to  $f$  a.e., then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \|f_n\|_{(p, \mu)} - \|f_n - f\|_{(p, \mu)} \right| = \|f\|_{(p, \mu)}.$$

We also require the following inequality [39, Lemma I.3] that played an important role in the proof of Brezis-Lieb lemma: for  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,

$$\left| |a + b|^p - |a|^p \right| \leq \epsilon |a|^p + C(\epsilon, p) |b|^p \quad (2.1)$$

valid for each  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $0 < p < \infty$ .

**2.4 A strong maximum principle.** We use a version of strong maximum principle that holds for  $p$ -Laplacian for showing the positivity of the solution of (1.1), see [32, Proposition 3.2].

**Lemma 2.8.** Let  $u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  and  $g \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$  be two non-negative functions on  $\Omega$  such that  $gu^{p-1} \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$  and  $u$  satisfies the following differential inequality (in the sense of distributions)

$$-\Delta_p u + gu^{p-1} \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Then either  $u \equiv 0$  or  $u > 0$  in  $\Omega$ .

**2.5 The spaces  $\mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$ .** We briefly recall the spaces  $\mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$  that have been introduced in [6]. The space of Hardy potentials  $\mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  is defined as the set of all  $g \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$  such that the following Hardy type inequality holds:

$$\int_{\Omega} |g| |u|^p dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega),$$

for some  $C > 0$ . In [6], using Mazya's  $p$ -capacity, we provide a Banach function space structure on  $\mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$ . Recall that for  $F \subset \subset \Omega$ , the  $p$ -capacity of  $F$  relative to  $\Omega$  is defined as,

$$\text{Cap}_p(F, \Omega) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx : u \in \mathcal{N}_p(F) \right\},$$

where  $\mathcal{N}_p(F) = \{u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega) : u \geq 1 \text{ in a neighbourhood of } F\}$ . We define the Banach function space norm on  $\mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  as follows,

$$\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_p} = \sup \left\{ \frac{\int_F |g| dx}{\text{Cap}_p(F, \Omega)} : F \subset \subset \Omega; |F| \neq 0 \right\}.$$

Now we define  $\mathcal{F}_p(\Omega) = \overline{C_c^\infty(\Omega)}$  in  $\mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$ . The following result is proved in [6, Theorem 1].

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$ . Then  $G_p : \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is compact if and only if  $g \in \mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$ .*

### 3. A VARIANT OF CONCENTRATION COMPACTNESS PRINCIPLE

In this section, we derive a variant of the concentration compactness principle that we use extensively in this article.

**Notations.** We will be following the notations below throughout this article.

- For each  $R > 0$ , we fix a function  $\Phi_R \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$  (bounded  $C^1$  functions on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ) satisfying  $0 \leq \Phi_R \leq 1$ ,  $\Phi_R = 0$  on  $\overline{B_R}$  and  $\Phi_R = 1$  on  $B_{R+1}^c$ .
- For a sequence  $(u_n)$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$  with  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , each of the following sequences corresponds to a bounded sequence in  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and hence weak\* converges to a measure in  $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . For convenience, we denote the sequences and their limits as given below:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_n &:= |u_n - u|^{p^*} \xrightarrow{*} \nu \text{ in } \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N), \\ \Gamma_n &:= |\nabla(u_n - u)|^p \xrightarrow{*} \Gamma \text{ in } \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N), \\ \gamma_n &:= g|u_n - u|^p \xrightarrow{*} \gamma \text{ in } \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N), \\ \tilde{\Gamma}_n &:= |\nabla u_n|^p \xrightarrow{*} \tilde{\Gamma} \text{ in } \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N), \\ \tilde{\gamma}_n &:= g|u_n|^p \xrightarrow{*} \tilde{\gamma} \text{ in } \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^N). \end{aligned}$$

The following limits will be denoted by:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n - u|^{p^*} dx &= \nu_\infty \\ \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|x| \geq R} |\nabla(u_n - u)|^p dx &= \Gamma_\infty \\ \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|x| \geq R} g|u_n - u|^p dx &= \gamma_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 3.1.** *The following statements are true:*

- (i)  $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_n|^{p^*} \Phi_R dx = \nu_\infty.$
- (ii)  $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g|u_n|^p \Phi_R dx = \gamma_\infty.$
- (iii)  $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_n|^p \Phi_R dx = \Gamma_\infty.$

*Proof.* (i) Use Brezis-Lieb lemma to obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n - u|^{p^*} dx - \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n|^{p^*} dx \right| = \int_{|x| \geq R} |u|^{p^*} dx. \quad (3.1)$$

Now, by the sub-additivity property of  $\limsup$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n|^{p^*} dx - \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n - u|^{p^*} dx \right| \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n - u|^{p^*} dx - \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n|^{p^*} dx \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using (3.1), we obtain

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n|^{p^*} dx = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n - u|^{p^*} dx = \nu_\infty. \quad (3.2)$$

Notice that

$$\int_{|x| \geq R+1} |u_n|^{p^*} dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_n|^{p^*} \Phi_R dx \leq \int_{|x| \geq R} |u_n|^{p^*} dx.$$

By taking  $n, R \rightarrow \infty$  and using (3.2) we get (i).

(ii), (iii) follows by the similar set of calculations as given in (i).  $\square$

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $H$  be a closed subgroup of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be a non-negative  $H$ -invariant Hardy potential, and  $(u_n)$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$  such that  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$ . Then the followings hold:*

(i) if  $\Phi \in C_b^1(\Omega)$  is such that  $\nabla \Phi$  has compact support, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla((u_n - u)\Phi)|^p dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u_n - u)|^p |\Phi|^p dx. \quad (3.3)$$

(ii) there exists a countable set  $\mathbb{J}$  such that  $\nu = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \nu_j \delta_{x_j}$ , where  $\nu_j \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $x_j \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . In particular,  $\nu$  is supported on the countable set  $F_{\mathbb{J}} := \{x_j \in \mathbb{R}^N : j \in \mathbb{J}\}$ ,

(iii)  $\gamma$  is supported on  $\overline{\sum_g}$ .

*Proof.* (i) Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Using (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Omega} |\nabla((u_n - u)\Phi)|^p dx - \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u_n - u)|^p |\Phi|^p dx \right| \\ & \leq \epsilon \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u_n - u)|^p |\Phi|^p dx + C(\epsilon, p) \int_{\Omega} |u_n - u|^p |\nabla \Phi|^p dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\nabla \Phi$  is compactly supported, by Rellich-Kondrachov compactness theorem [34, Theorem 2.6.3], the second term in the right-hand side of the above inequality goes to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Further, as  $(u_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, we obtain the desired result.

(ii) Let  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ . From the definition of  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N) \leq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla\phi(u_n - u)|^p - \mu g|\phi(u_n - u)|^p] dx}{\left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi(u_n - u)|^{p^*} dx \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}}} \leq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla\phi(u_n - u)|^p dx}{\left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi(u_n - u)|^{p^*} dx \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}}} \quad (3.4)$$

for all  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . By the above assertion (i) we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla\phi(u_n - u)|^p dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi \nabla(u_n - u)|^p dx.$$

Thus, by taking  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (3.4),

$$\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\mathbb{R}^N) \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^{p^*} d\nu \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^p d\Gamma.$$

Now, (ii) follows from Proposition 2.5.

(iii) For  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ,  $(u_n - u)\phi \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ , and since  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^p d\gamma_n &= \int_{\Omega} g|(u_n - u)\phi|^p dx \leq \frac{1}{\mu_1(g, \Omega)} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla((u_n - u)\phi)|^p dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu_1(g, \Omega)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla((u_n - u)\phi)|^p dx. \end{aligned}$$

Take  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and use assertion (i) to obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^p d\gamma \leq \frac{1}{\mu_1(g, \Omega)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^p d\Gamma. \quad (3.5)$$

Now by the density of  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$  in  $C_0(\mathbb{R}^N)$  together with Proposition 2.4, we get

$$\gamma(E) \leq \frac{\Gamma(E)}{\mu_1(g, \Omega)}, \forall E \in \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}^N). \quad (3.6)$$

In particular,  $\gamma \ll \Gamma$  and hence by Radon-Nikodym theorem,

$$\gamma(E) = \int_E \frac{d\gamma}{d\Gamma} d\Gamma, \forall E \in \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}^N). \quad (3.7)$$

Further, by Lebesgue differentiation theorem (page 152-168 of [25]) we have

$$\frac{d\gamma}{d\Gamma}(x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\gamma(B_r(x))}{\Gamma(B_r(x))}. \quad (3.8)$$

Now replacing  $g$  by  $g\chi_{B_r(x)}$  and proceeding as before, one can get an analogue of (3.6) as follows:

$$\gamma(B_r(x)) \leq \frac{\Gamma(B_r(x))}{\mu_1(g, B_r(x))}.$$

Thus from (3.8) we get

$$\frac{d\gamma}{d\Gamma}(x) \leq \frac{1}{\mu_1(g, x)}. \quad (3.9)$$

Now from (3.7) and (3.9), we conclude that  $\gamma$  is supported on  $\overline{\Sigma_g}$ .  $\square$

As we have seen from the above proposition that  $\nu$  is supported on the countable set  $F_{\mathbb{J}} = \{x_j \in \mathbb{R}^N : j \in \mathbb{J}\}$ . Now let us define

$$\Gamma_{F_{\mathbb{J}}} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \Gamma_j \delta_{x_j}, \gamma_{F_{\mathbb{J}}} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \gamma_j \delta_{x_j}, \text{ and } \zeta_{\mu} = \Gamma_{F_{\mathbb{J}}} - \mu \gamma_{F_{\mathbb{J}}}$$

for  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ . Then we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $H$  be a closed subgroup of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be a non-negative  $H$ -invariant Hardy potential, and  $(u_n)$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$  such that  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$ . If  $u = 0$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} = \|\zeta_{\mu}\|$  for some  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ , then  $\nu$  is either zero or concentrated on a single finite  $H$ -orbit in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u = 0$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} = \|\zeta_{\mu}\|$ . First we show that  $\nu$  is supported on a single  $H$  orbit. By the definition of  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N)$

$$\left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi u_n|^{p^*} dx \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \leq [\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N)]^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla(\phi u_n)|^p - \mu g |\phi u_n|^p] dx$$

for any  $H$ -invariant function  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Since  $u = 0$ , the above inequality together with (3.3) yield

$$\left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^{p^*} d\nu \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \leq [\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N)]^{-1} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^p d\Gamma - \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^p d\gamma \right]$$

Consequently,  $\nu^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \leq [\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N)]^{-1} [\Gamma - \mu \gamma]$ . Since  $\nu$  is supported on  $F_{\mathbb{J}}$ , it follows that

$$\nu^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \leq [\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N)]^{-1} \zeta_{\mu}. \quad (3.10)$$

Further, by applying Holder's inequality we get  $[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^p d\zeta_{\mu}]^{\frac{p^*}{p}} \leq [\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^{p^*} d\zeta_{\mu}] \|\zeta_{\mu}\|^{\frac{p^*}{p}-1}$ . This gives  $\zeta_{\mu}^{\frac{p^*}{p}} \leq \|\zeta_{\mu}\|^{\frac{p^*}{p}-1} \zeta_{\mu}$ . Thus, (3.10) gives  $\nu(E) \leq [\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N)]^{-\frac{p^*}{p}} \|\zeta_{\mu}\|^{\frac{p^*}{N}} \zeta_{\mu}(E)$  for all  $H$ -invariant  $E \in \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Now, since  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} = \|\zeta_{\mu}\|$ , it follows that

$$\nu(E) = [\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N)]^{-\frac{p^*}{p}} \|\zeta_{\mu}\|^{\frac{p^*}{N}} \zeta_{\mu}(E)$$

for all  $H$ -invariant  $E \in \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . We use this equality in (3.10), and also  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} = \|\zeta_{\mu}\|$  to obtain

$$\nu(E)^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \nu(\mathbb{R}^N)^{\frac{1}{N}} \leq \nu(E)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

for any  $H$ -invariant  $E \in \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Thus,  $\nu(E)$  is either 0 or  $\|\nu\|$ , and hence  $\nu$  is concentrated on a single  $H$  orbit. Now, let  $\nu$  be concentrated on the orbit  $H\xi$  for some  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . We show that  $H\xi$  is finite. It follows from the inequality (3.10) and Lemma 2.5 that there exist a countable set  $F_{\mathbb{J}} = \{x_j \in \mathbb{R}^N : j \in \mathbb{J}\}$  and  $\nu_j \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $\nu = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \nu_j \delta_{x_j}$ . Since  $\nu$  is concentrated at  $H\xi$ , it is clear that  $F_{\mathbb{J}} = H\xi$ . Noticing  $\nu$  is invariant under any orthogonal transformations  $h \in H$  (i.e.,  $\nu(h(E)) = \nu(E)$  for all  $E \in \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  and  $h \in H$ ), we infer that  $\nu_i = \nu_j$  for all  $i, j \in \mathbb{J}$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{J}$  has to be finite (as  $\|\nu\| < \infty$ ).  $\square$

Now, we are ready to derive  $(g, H)$ -dependent concentration compactness lemma. For  $g \equiv 0$ , a similar result is obtained in [52, Lemma 4.3]. Here we obtain an analogous result for the case  $g \neq 0$  under the assumption  $|\overline{\sum g}| = 0$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $H$  be a closed subgroup of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)$  be non-negative and  $H$ -invariant. Assume that  $(u_n)$  is a sequence in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$  such that  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$ . If  $|\overline{\Sigma_g}| = 0$ , then for  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ , the following holds:*

- (a)  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mu \|\gamma\| \leq \left\| \Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}} \right\|$ ,
- (b)  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(\infty) \nu_{\infty}^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mu \gamma_{\infty} \leq \Gamma_{\infty}$ ,
- (c)  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_n|^{p^*} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{p^*} dx + \|\nu\| + \nu_{\infty}$ ,
- (d)  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g|u_n|^p dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g|u|^p dx + \|\gamma\| + \gamma_{\infty}$ ,
- (e)  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_n|^p dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^p dx + \left\| \Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}} \right\| + \Gamma_{\infty}$ ,
- (f)  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g|u_n|^p] dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla u|^p - \mu g|u|^p] dx + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(\infty) \nu_{\infty}^{\frac{p}{p^*}}$ .

*Proof.* (a) By the definition of  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(H(B_r(x)))$ , we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(H(B_r(x))) \leq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla \phi(u_n - u)|^p - \mu g|\phi(u_n - u)|^p] dx}{\left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi(u_n - u)|^{p^*} dx \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}}}$$

for all  $H$ -invariants  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(H(B_r(x)))$ . By taking  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in the above inequality and using (3.3), we get

$$\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(H(B_r(x))) \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^{p^*} d\nu \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^p d\gamma \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^p d\Gamma.$$

In particular, for  $x_j$  with  $j \in \mathbb{J}$ , by taking  $\phi = 1$  on  $H(\{x_j\})$  and then letting  $r \rightarrow 0$ , we get

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(x_j) |\nu(Hx_j)|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mu \gamma(Hx_j) \leq \Gamma(Hx_j) \forall j \in \mathbb{J}.$$

Taking the sum over  $\mathbb{J}$  and using the concavity of the map  $f(t) := t^{\frac{p}{p^*}}$ , we obtain

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mu \|\gamma_{F_{\mathbb{J}}}\| \leq \|\Gamma_{F_{\mathbb{J}}}\|. \quad (3.11)$$

Next we show that  $\mu \|\gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \setminus F_{\mathbb{J}}}\| \leq \|\Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \setminus F_{\mathbb{J}}}\|$ . Since  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  and  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ , we have

$$\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g|(u_n - u)\phi|^p dx \leq \frac{\mu}{\mu_1(g)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla(u_n - u)\phi|^p dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla(u_n - u)\phi|^p dx$$

for any  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . By taking  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and using (3.3), one can get

$$\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi|^p d\gamma \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla \phi|^p d\Gamma$$

for any  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Thus, we have  $\mu \gamma(\overline{\Sigma_g} \setminus F_{\mathbb{J}}) \leq \Gamma(\overline{\Sigma_g} \setminus F_{\mathbb{J}})$ . In particular, we get

$$\mu \|\gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \setminus F_{\mathbb{J}}}\| \leq \|\Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \setminus F_{\mathbb{J}}}\|. \quad (3.12)$$

Now, by adding (3.12) and (3.11), and using the fact that  $\nu, \Gamma$  are supported on  $F_{\mathbb{J}}, \overline{\Sigma_g}$ , we get

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mu \|\gamma\| \leq \|\Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}}\|. \quad (3.13)$$

(b) For  $R > 0$ , choose  $\Phi_R \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$  satisfying  $0 \leq \Phi_R \leq 1$ ,  $\Phi_R = 0$  on  $\overline{B_R}$  and  $\Phi_R = 1$  on  $B_{R+1}^c$ . Then  $(u_n - u)\Phi_R \in \mathcal{D}_p(B_R^c)^H$ . In order to prove (b), one can start with  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(B_R^c)$  instead of  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(H(B_r(x)))$  and follow the similar arguments as in (a) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(H(B_R^c)) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\Phi_R|^{p^*} |u_n - u|^{p^*} dx \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mu \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g |u_n - u| |\Phi_R|^p dx \\ \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\Phi_R|^p |\nabla(u_n - u)|^p dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Thus, by taking  $R \rightarrow \infty$  in (3.14) and using Proposition 3.1, we prove the assertion (b).

(c) Using Brezis-Lieb lemma together with Proposition 3.1-(i), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_n|^{p^*} dx \\ = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_n|^{p^*} (1 - \Phi_R) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_n|^{p^*} \Phi_R dx \right] \\ = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{p^*} (1 - \Phi_R) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_n - u|^{p^*} (1 - \Phi_R) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_n|^{p^*} \Phi_R dx \right] \\ = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{p^*} dx + \|\nu\| + \nu_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

(d) As in (c), using Brezis-Lieb lemma together with Proposition 3.1-(ii), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g |u_n|^p dx \\ = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g |u_n|^p (1 - \Phi_R) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g |u_n|^p \Phi_R dx \right] \\ = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g |u|^p (1 - \Phi_R) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g |u_n - u|^p (1 - \Phi_R) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g |u_n|^p \Phi_R dx \right] \\ = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g |u|^p dx + \|\gamma\| + \gamma_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

(e) We break this proof into several steps.

**Claim 1:**  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{F_{\mathbb{J}}} = \Gamma_{F_{\mathbb{J}}}$ . Let  $\phi_\varepsilon \in C_c^\infty(B_\varepsilon(\omega))$  satisfying  $0 \leq \phi_\varepsilon \leq 1$ ,  $\phi_\varepsilon(\omega) = 1$ , where  $\omega \in F_{\mathbb{J}}$ . Then, using (2.1), we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \tilde{\Gamma}(\phi_\varepsilon) - \Gamma(\phi_\varepsilon) \right| &= \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| |\nabla(u_n)|^p - |\nabla u_n - u|^p \right| \phi_\varepsilon dx \\ &\leq \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \phi_\varepsilon |\nabla u_n|^p dx + C(\varepsilon, p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \phi_\varepsilon |\nabla u|^p dx. \end{aligned}$$

By taking  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we get  $\tilde{\Gamma}(\omega) = \Gamma_{F_{\mathbb{J}}}(\omega)$ .

**Claim 2:**  $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma$ , on  $\overline{\sum_g}$ . Let  $E \subset \overline{\sum_g}$  be a Borel set. Thus, for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists an open subset  $O_m$  containing  $E$  such that  $|O_m| = |O_m \setminus E| < \frac{1}{m}$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given. Then, for any



$\phi \in C_c^\infty(O_m)$  with  $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ , using (2.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} \phi d\Gamma_n - \int_{\Omega} \phi d\tilde{\Gamma}_n \right| &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \phi |\nabla(u_n - u)|^p dx - \int_{\Omega} \phi |\nabla u_n|^p dx \right| \\ &\leq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \phi |\nabla u_n|^p dx + C(\varepsilon, p) \int_{\Omega} \phi |\nabla u|^p dx \\ &\leq \varepsilon L + C(\varepsilon, p) \int_{O_m} |\nabla u|^p dx, \end{aligned}$$

where  $L = \sup_n \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^p dx \right\}$ . Now letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain  $\left| \int_{\Omega} \phi d\Gamma - \int_{\Omega} \phi d\tilde{\Gamma} \right| \leq \varepsilon L + C(\varepsilon, p) \int_{O_m} |\nabla u|^p dx$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \Gamma(O_m) - \tilde{\Gamma}(O_m) \right| &= \sup \left\{ \left| \int_{\Omega} \phi d\Gamma - \int_{\Omega} \phi d\tilde{\Gamma} \right| : \phi \in C_c^\infty(O_m), 0 \leq \phi \leq 1 \right\} \\ &\leq \varepsilon L + C(\varepsilon, p) \int_{O_m} |\nabla u|^p dx, \end{aligned}$$

Now as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $|O_m| \rightarrow 0$  and hence  $|\Gamma(E) - \tilde{\Gamma}(E)| \leq \varepsilon L$ . Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, we conclude  $\Gamma(E) = \tilde{\Gamma}(E)$ .

**Claim 3:**  $\|\tilde{\Gamma}\| \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^p dx + \|\Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}}\|$ . Choose an arbitrary  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$  with  $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ . Hence, by the lower semicontinuity, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_n|^p \phi dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^p \phi dx.$$

This yields  $\tilde{\Gamma} \geq |\nabla u|^p dx$ . On the other hand, the measure  $|\nabla u|^p dx$  is singular to  $\Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}}$  (as  $\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}$  has Lebesgue measure zero) and hence

$$\|\tilde{\Gamma}\| \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^p dx + \|\Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}}\|. \quad (3.15)$$

Now we are ready to prove (e). Observe that

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_n|^p dx = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_n|^p (1 - \Phi_R) dx + \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_n|^p \Phi_R dx.$$

Using Proposition 3.1-(iii), (3.15), and (3.11), we infer that

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_n|^p dx = \|\tilde{\Gamma}\| + \Gamma_\infty \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^p dx + \|\Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}}\| + \Gamma_\infty.$$

(f) Since  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ , it follows that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g |u_n|^p] dx \geq 0$ . Thus, using the sub-additivity of limsup, (e), (d) we get

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g |u_n|^p] dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla u|^p - \mu g |u|^p] dx + (\|\Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}}\| - \mu \|\gamma\|) + (\Gamma_\infty - \mu \gamma_\infty).$$

Now use (a) and (b) to obtain (f). □

The next corollary state the above results for a general domain in place of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let  $H$  be a closed subgroup of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ , and  $g \geq 0, \Omega$  be as in (H2). Assume that  $(u_n)$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H$  such that  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H$ . If  $|\overline{\Sigma_g}| = 0$ , then for  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ , the following holds:*

- (a) *there exists a countable set  $\mathbb{J}$  such that  $\nu = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \nu_j \delta_{x_j}$ , where  $\nu_j \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $x_j \in \overline{\Omega}$ . In particular,  $\nu$  is supported on the countable set  $F_{\mathbb{J}} := \{x_j \in \overline{\Omega} : j \in \mathbb{J}\}$ ,*
- (b)  *$\gamma$  is supported on  $\overline{\Sigma_g}$ ,*
- (c)  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\Omega) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mu \|\gamma\| \leq \left\| \Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}} \right\|$ ,
- (d)  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(\infty) \nu_{\infty}^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mu \gamma_{\infty} \leq \Gamma_{\infty}$ ,
- (e)  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |u_n|^{p^*} dx = \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p^*} dx + \|\nu\| + \nu_{\infty}$ ,
- (f)  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} g |u_n|^p dx = \int_{\Omega} g |u|^p dx + \|\gamma\| + \gamma_{\infty}$ ,
- (g)  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^p dx \geq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx + \left\| \Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}} \right\| + \Gamma_{\infty}$ ,
- (h)  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g |u_n|^p] dx \geq \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^p - \mu g |u|^p] dx + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\Omega) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(\infty) \nu_{\infty}^{\frac{p}{p^*}}$
- (i) *if  $u = 0$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} = \|\zeta_{\mu}\|$ , where  $\zeta_{\mu} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} (\Gamma_j - \mu \gamma_j) \delta_{x_j}$ , then  $\nu$  is either zero or concentrated on a single finite  $H$ -orbit in  $\mathbb{R}^N$*

*Proof.* Recall that any function  $u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  can be considered as a  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)$  function whenever convenient. Since  $g, (u_n), u$  are supported inside  $\Omega$ , it is not difficult to see that (i)  $\nu, \Gamma = 0$  outside  $\overline{\Omega}$ , (ii)  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\Omega) = \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Hence the corollary follows as a consequence of Proposition 3.2, Proposition 3.3, and Lemma 3.4.  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** (i) It follows from Corollary 3.5-(c) that  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mu \|\gamma\| \leq \left\| \Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}} \right\|$ . Now, if  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} < \|\zeta_{\mu}\|$  ( $\zeta_{\mu}$  is as in Proposition 3.3), then the previous inequality has to be strict. Therefore, if  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mu \|\gamma\| = \left\| \Gamma_{\overline{\Sigma_g} \cup F_{\mathbb{J}}} \right\|$ , then  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} = \|\zeta_{\mu}\|$ .

(ii) Let  $H$  be an infinite closed subgroup on  $\mathcal{O}(N)$  and  $0 \notin \overline{\Omega}$ . Assume all the hypothesis of Proposition 3.3 (or Corollary 3.5-(i)). Then, it follows that  $\nu = 0$ .

(iii) Observe that, for a bounded sequence  $(u_n)$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ , the measure  $\nu$  in the above corollary helps us to determine whether  $u_n \rightarrow u$  in  $L^{p^*}(\Omega)$  or not. Precisely, if  $\nu = 0 = \nu_{\infty}$ , then  $u_n \rightarrow u$  in  $L^{p^*}(\Omega)$ .

#### 4. SUBCRITICAL POTENTIALS

This section is devoted to prove Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4. We bring up several important consequences of these theorems, and provide a few examples of subcritical and non-subcritical potentials. Let us commence with the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  be such that  $g^- \in \mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^*(\Omega) = \mathcal{C}_{g^+,\mu}^*(\Omega)$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}(\infty) = \mathcal{C}_{g^+,\mu}(\infty)$  for all  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ .*

*Proof.* Let us fix  $x \in \overline{\Omega}$  and  $u_n \in \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega \cap B_{\frac{1}{n}}(x))$  be such that

$$\mathcal{C}_{g^+, \mu}(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g^+ |u_n|^p] dx.$$

Since  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ , the quasi-norm  $\|u\|_{\mathcal{D}_p, \mu} := \left( \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^p - \mu g^+ |u|^p] dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$  is equivalent to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}_p}$  on  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . Thus,  $(u_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . Furthermore, the supports of  $(u_n)$  converges to the singleton set  $\{x\}$ . Consequently,  $u_n \rightharpoonup 0$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  (up to a subsequence). Now, since  $g^- \in \mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$ , we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} g^- |u_n|^p dx = 0$  (by Proposition 2.9). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{g^+, \mu}(x) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g^+ |u_n|^p] dx + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \mu g^- |u_n|^p dx \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g |u_n|^p] dx \\ &\geq \mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}(x). \end{aligned}$$

The other way inequality holds trivially. Hence  $\mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}(x) = \mathcal{C}_{g^+, \mu}(x)$ . Since  $x \in \overline{\Omega}$  is arbitrary, we prove that  $\mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}^*(\Omega) = \mathcal{C}_{g^+, \mu}^*(\Omega)$ . The other assertion follows from the similar set of arguments.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.3 :** We choose  $H = \{Id_{\mathbb{R}^N}\}$  in Corollary 3.5. Then  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H = \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ , and  $\mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)^H = \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)$ . Let  $u_n \in \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)$  be a minimizing sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega)$ . Since  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ , the quasi-norm  $\|u\|_{\mathcal{D}_p, \mu} := \left( \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^p - \mu g |u|^p] dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$  is equivalent to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}_p}$  on  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . Consequently,  $(u_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ , which implies  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  (up to a subsequence). Now, we use Proposition 4.1, and Corollary 3.5 to obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g |u_n|^p] dx \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^p - \mu g |u|^p] dx + \mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}^*(\Omega) \|\nu\|^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}(\infty) \nu_{\infty}^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \\ &\geq \mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega) \left[ \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p^*} dx \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}^*(\Omega) \|\nu\|^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}(\infty) \nu_{\infty}^{\frac{p}{p^*}}. \end{aligned}$$

If one of  $\|\nu\|$  or  $\nu_{\infty}$  is non-zero, then using the hypothesis that  $\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega) < \mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}^*(\Omega)$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega) < \mathcal{C}_{g, \mu}(\infty)$  (i.e.,  $g$  is subcritical in  $\Omega$  and at infinity), we infer

$$\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega) > \mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega) \left( \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p^*} dx + \|\nu\| + \nu_{\infty} \right)^{\frac{p}{p^*}}.$$

By (e) of Corollary 3.5,  $\int_{\Omega} |u|^{p^*} dx + \|\nu\| + \nu_{\infty} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n\|_{p^*}^{p^*} = 1$  (as  $u_n \in \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)$ ). Hence,  $\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega) > \mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega)$ , a contradiction. Therefore,  $\|\nu\| = 0 = \nu_{\infty}$ . As a consequence  $\|u\|_{p^*} = 1$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega)$  is attained at  $u$ . Thus,  $v = [\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega)]^{\frac{1}{p^*-p}} u$  is a non-trivial solution to (1.1). Notice that, if  $u$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}_{g, \mu}(\Omega)$ , then  $|u|$  is also so. Thus, we prove that there exists a non-negative, non-trivial solution  $v$  of (1.1). Therefore, we have

$$-\Delta_p v + \mu g^- v^{p-1} = \mu g^+ v^{p-1} \geq 0,$$

in distribution sense, and Lemma 2.8 ensures that  $v$  is positive.

**Remark 4.2.** The above proof gives not only the existence of a positive solution of (1.1) but also it assures that  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega)$  is attained at some positive  $u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ .

In the next proposition, we prove a particular case of Theorem 1.4.

**Proposition 4.3.** Let  $N \geq p^2$  and  $\Omega$  be a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Then any positive constant function  $g$  is sub-critical in  $\Omega$  as well as at infinity for all  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we consider the constant function  $\mathbf{1}(z) = 1$ ;  $z \in \Omega$  and prove that  $\mathbf{1}$  is sub-critical in  $\Omega$  and at infinity. Notice that  $\mu_1(\mathbf{1}) = \lambda_1$ , where  $\lambda_1$  is the first Dirichlet eigenvalue of  $\Delta_p$ . Fix  $\mu \in (0, \lambda_1)$ . For  $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ , there exists  $v_n \in \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega \cap B_{\frac{1}{n}}(x))$  (by definition of  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{1},\mu}(\Omega \cap B_{\frac{1}{n}}(x))$ ) such that

$$\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla v_n|^p - \mu |v_n|^p] dx < \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{1},\mu}(\Omega \cap B_{\frac{1}{n}}(x)) + \frac{1}{n} \leq \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega \cap B_{\frac{1}{n}}(x)) + 1 = \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega) + 1. \quad (4.1)$$

The last equality follows from the fact that  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\cdot)$  does not depend on the domain. From (4.1), we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega) - \mu \int_{\Omega} |v_n|^p dx < \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{1},\mu}(\Omega \cap B_{\frac{1}{n}}(x)) + \frac{1}{n}. \quad (4.2)$$

Since  $\mu \in (0, \lambda_1)$ , it follows from (4.1) that  $(v_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . Further, their supports are shrinking to a null set, namely  $\{x\}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This implies,  $v_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ , and the Rellich-Kondrachov compactness theorem assures that  $v_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^p(\Omega)$ . Now, by taking  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in the above inequality (4.2), we obtain  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{1},\mu}(x)$ , for each  $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ . This implies  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{1},\mu}^*(\Omega)$ . Further, for all  $\mu \in (0, \lambda_1)$ , we have  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{1},\mu}(\Omega) < \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega)$  when  $N \geq p^2$ , see [27, Lemma 7.1]. Hence, for all  $\mu \in (0, \lambda_1)$ ,  $\mathbf{1}$  is sub-critical in  $\Omega$  when  $N \geq p^2$ . On the other hand, since  $\Omega$  is bounded,  $\mathbf{1}$  is sub-critical at infinity too.  $\square$

**Remark 4.4.** By the above proposition and Theorem 1.3, we conclude that (1.1) with  $g \equiv 1$  on a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  admits a positive solution for all  $\mu \in (0, \lambda_1)$ , provided  $N \geq p^2$ . Thus the results of Brézis-Nirenberg [11, Theorem 1.1] (for  $p = 2$ ) and [27, Theorem 7.4] (for general  $p$ ) follows as a particular case of Theorem 1.3.

**Example 4.5.** We provide some examples of  $g$  that are not subcritical.

(i) **A potential critical in  $\Omega$ .** Let  $\Omega$  be a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Consider the zero function  $\mathbf{0}(z) \equiv 0$  on  $\Omega$ . Fix  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(0))$ . Recall that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx : \|u\|_{p^*} = 1 \right\}.$$

It is not difficult to see that  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\cdot)$  is independent of domain (as  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\cdot)$  is invariant under translations and dilations in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ), and hence  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(x) = \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega)$  for any  $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ . This implies  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}^*(\Omega) = \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega)$ . Therefore,  $\mathbf{0}$  is critical in  $\Omega$ .

(ii) **A potential critical in  $\Omega$ .** Let  $\Omega = \Omega_k \times \Omega_{N-k}$  be as in (1.5) with  $0 \in \Omega$ . Let  $g(z) = \frac{1}{|z|^p}$ ;  $z \in \Omega$ . Fix a  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ . Recall that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}(\Omega) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^p - \frac{\mu}{|z|^p}] dz : \|u\|_{p^*} = 1 \right\}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}(\Omega)$  is invariant under dilation, using the scaling arguments it can be seen that  $\mathcal{C}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}(0) = \mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}(\Omega)$ . This implies  $\mathcal{C}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}^*(\Omega) = \mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}(\Omega)$ . Therefore,  $\frac{1}{|z|^p}$  is critical in  $\Omega$ .

(iii) **A potential critical at infinity.** Let  $\Omega = \Omega_k \times \Omega_{N-k}$  be as in (1.5) with  $k = N$ ,  $a > 0$ , and  $b = \infty$  i.e., the exterior of a ball  $B_a(0)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Consider  $g(z) = \frac{1}{|z|^p}$ ;  $z \in \Omega$ . For each  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $w \in \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)$  such that

$$\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla w|^p(z) - \mu \frac{|w|^p(z)}{|z|^p}] dz < \mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}(\Omega) + \epsilon.$$

For  $w_R(z) = R^{\frac{p-N}{p}} w(\frac{z}{R})$ , one can see that  $w_R \in \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega \cap B_{aR}^c)$  for  $R > 1$ , and

$$\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla w_R|^p(z) - \mu \frac{|w_R|^p(z)}{|z|^p}] dz = \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla w|^p(z) - \mu \frac{|w|^p(z)}{|z|^p}] dz.$$

This gives  $\mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}(\Omega \cap B_{aR}^c) \leq \mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}(\Omega)$  for all  $R > 1$  and hence  $\mathcal{C}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}(\infty) \leq \mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}(\Omega)$ , and the other way inequality always holds. Thus,  $g$  is critical at infinity.

Next, we are going to prove Theorem 1.4.

**Remark 4.6.** Recall that, for any  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_{0, \mu}(\cdot)$  is invariant under dilation and translation in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{E}_{0, \mu}(\Omega) = \mathcal{C}_{0, \mu}^*(\Omega)$  i.e.,  $g \equiv 0$  is critical in  $\Omega$ . In addition, if  $\Omega$  is bounded and star shaped, using the Pohozev identity, we can show that  $\mathcal{E}_{0, \mu}(\Omega)$  is not attained in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . However, for  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_{0, \mu}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  is attained by the following radial functions in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ :

$$\Psi_{\epsilon, x_0}(x) = \epsilon^{-\frac{N}{p^*}} \left( 1 + C(N, p) \left| \frac{x - x_0}{\epsilon} \right|^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \right)^{\frac{p-N}{p}},$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$  [39, Corollary I.1].

Let  $g \in \mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$  be such that  $g^+ \neq 0$ . Then there exists a compact set  $K \subseteq \Omega$  with  $|K| > 0$  such that  $g$  is positive on  $K$ . Furthermore, due to Lusin's theorem, we can assume that  $g$  is continuous on  $K$ . Thus,

$$g_{min} := \min\{g(x) : x \in K\} > 0. \quad (4.3)$$

Let  $\Phi_K \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  such that  $\Phi_K = 1$  on  $K$ . For each  $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , we consider

$$u_{\epsilon, y} = \Phi_K U_{\epsilon, y}$$

where  $U_{\epsilon, y}(x) = \chi_{\epsilon, y}(x) \left( \epsilon + C(N, p) |x - y|^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \right)^{\frac{p-N}{p}}$  and  $\chi_{\epsilon, y}(x) = \chi_0\left(\frac{x-y}{\epsilon}\right)$  with  $\chi_0 \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  is such that  $0 \leq \chi_0 \leq 1$ ,  $\chi_0 = 1$  on  $B_1(0)$  and vanishes outside  $B_2(0)$ . Next, we list some properties of  $u_{\epsilon, y}$ .

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  be such that  $g^+ \neq 0$ . For each  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $u_{\epsilon, y}$  satisfies the following properties:*

- (i)  $\|u_{\epsilon,y}\|_{p^*}^p = \|\Psi_{1,y}\|_{p^*}^p \epsilon^{\frac{p-N}{p}} + O(1)$ ,  
(ii)  $\|\nabla u_{\epsilon,y}\|_p^p = \|\nabla \Psi_{1,y}\|_p^p \epsilon^{\frac{p-N}{p}} + O(1)$ ,  
(iii) for  $y \in K$ , we have

$$\int_{\Omega} g|u_{\epsilon,y}|^p dx \geq \begin{cases} A g_{min} \epsilon^{\frac{p^2-N}{p}} + O(1) & \text{if } p^2 < N \\ A g_{min} |\log(\epsilon)| + O(1) & \text{if } p^2 = N, \end{cases}$$

where  $A > 0$  depends only on  $N, p$ , and  $g_{min}$  is defined as (4.3).

*Proof.* For a proof of (i) and (ii), we refer to the assertion (7.7) of [27] (one can also see [11, assertion 1.11, 1.12] for  $p = 2$ ). To prove (iii), we first recall the following estimate [27, (c) of 7.7] (one can also see [11, 1.13] for  $p = 2$ ):

$$\|U_{\epsilon,0}^p\|_1 = \begin{cases} A\epsilon^{\frac{p^2-N}{p}} + O(1), & \text{if } p^2 < N, \\ A|\log(\epsilon)| + O(1), & \text{if } p^2 = N \end{cases}$$

$A$  is a positive constant independent of  $\epsilon$ . Observe that  $u_{\epsilon,y}(x) = \Phi_K(x)U_{\epsilon,y}(x) = \Phi_K(x)U_{\epsilon,0}(x-y)$ . By applying  $\frac{U_{\epsilon,0}^p}{\|U_{\epsilon,0}^p\|_1}$  as an approximate identity, we compute the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} g(x)|u_{\epsilon,y}(x)|^p dx &= \int_{\Omega} g(x)\Phi_K(x)^p U_{\epsilon,0}(x-y)^p dx \\ &= \|U_{\epsilon,0}^p\|_1 \int_{\Omega} (g\Phi_K^p)(x) \frac{U_{\epsilon,0}^p}{\|U_{\epsilon,0}^p\|_1}(x-y) dx \\ &= \|U_{\epsilon,0}^p\|_1 (g\Phi_K^p)(y) + O(1) \\ &\geq \begin{cases} A\epsilon^{\frac{p^2-N}{p}} g_{min} + O(1) & \text{if } p^2 < N \\ A|\log(\epsilon)| g_{min} + O(1) & \text{if } p^2 = N. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

□

**Proof of Theorem 1.4:** Let  $g \in \mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$ . Proposition 2.9 assures that  $G_p$  is compact on  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . Fix  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$  and choose  $\epsilon > 0$ . By definition of  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}(x)$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for each  $r \in (0, \delta)$ , there exists  $u_r \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega \cap B_r(x))$  with  $\|u_r\|_{p^*} = 1$  satisfying

$$\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u_r|^p - \mu g|u_r|^p] dx < \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}(x) + \epsilon.$$

This yields,

$$\mathcal{E}_{0,\mu}(\Omega) - \mu \int_{\Omega} g|u_r|^p dx < \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}(x) + \epsilon.$$

Since  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ , it follows that  $(u_r)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . Further, their supports are decreasing to a singleton set  $\{x\}$ . Hence,  $u_r \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  as  $r \rightarrow 0$ , and hence the compactness of  $G_p$  implies  $\int_{\Omega} g|u_r|^p dx \rightarrow 0$  as  $r \rightarrow 0$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{E}_{0,\mu}(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}(x)$ , for any  $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ . This shows that  $\mathcal{E}_{0,\mu}(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^*(\Omega)$ . By the similar reasoning we conclude  $\mathcal{E}_{0,\mu}(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}(\infty)$ . Thus, in order to show that  $g$  is subcritical in  $\Omega$  and at infinity, it is enough to show that  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega) < \mathcal{E}_{0,\mu}(\Omega)$ . To establish this strict inequality, we recall the functions  $u_{\epsilon,y} \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  (for  $\epsilon > 0$  small) in Lemma

4.7 and get the following estimate:

$$Q_g(u_{\epsilon,y}) := \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{\epsilon,y}|^p dx - \mu \int_{\Omega} g |u_{\epsilon,y}|^p dx}{[\int_{\Omega} |u_{\epsilon,y}|^{p^*} dx]^{\frac{p}{p^*}}} \leq \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega) + O(\epsilon^{\frac{N-p}{p}}) - A g_{min} \epsilon^{p-1}, & \text{if } p^2 < N \\ \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega) + O(\epsilon^{\frac{N-p}{p}}) - A g_{min} \epsilon^{\frac{N-p}{p}} |\log(\epsilon)|, & \text{if } p^2 = N, \end{cases}$$

This implies  $Q_g(u_{\epsilon,y}) < \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega)$  for sufficiently small  $\epsilon$ . By taking  $w_{\epsilon} = \frac{u_{\epsilon,y}}{\|u_{\epsilon,y}\|_{p^*}}$  we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega) \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_{\epsilon}|^p dx - \mu \int_{\Omega} g |w_{\epsilon}|^p dx = Q_g(u_{\epsilon,y}) < \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}(\Omega).$$

This completes our proof.

In the following remark, we exhibit certain classical spaces that are contained in  $\mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$ .

**Remark 4.8.** For  $p = 2$  and  $\Omega$  bounded,  $L^r(\Omega) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$  with  $r > \frac{N}{2}$  [40],  $r = \frac{N}{2}$  [2]. For  $p \in (1, \infty)$  and for general domain  $\Omega$ ,  $L^{\frac{N}{p},d}(\Omega) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$  with  $d < \infty$ , in [51]. Furthermore, a larger space  $\overline{C_c^\infty(\Omega)}$  in  $L^{\frac{N}{p},\infty}(\Omega)$  is contained in  $\mathcal{F}_p(\Omega)$  [8, for  $p = 2$ ] and [5, for  $p \in (1, N)$ ]. For  $g \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ , we consider

$$\tilde{g}(r) = \text{ess sup}\{|g(y)| : |y| = r\}, \quad r > 0,$$

where the essential supremum is taken with respect to  $(N-1)$  dimensional surface measure. Let  $I_p(\Omega) = \{g \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega) : \tilde{g} \in L^1((0, \infty), r^{p-1} dr)\}$ . In [7], authors showed that  $I_p(\overline{B_1^c}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p(\overline{B_1^c})$  for  $p \in (1, N)$ .

## 5. CRITICAL POTENTIALS

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.10 and Theorem 1.12. First we observe that, for a Hardy potential  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  which is not sub-critical in  $\Omega$  or at infinity, one of the following cases occur:

- (i)  $g$  is  $H$ -subcritical in  $\Omega$  as well at infinity,
- (ii)  $g$  is  $H$ -critical in  $\Omega$  but  $H$ -subcritical at infinity,
- (iii)  $g$  is  $H$ -critical at infinity but  $H$ -subcritical in  $\Omega$ ,
- (iv)  $g$  is  $H$ -critical in  $\Omega$  as well as at infinity,

for a closed subgroup  $H$  of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ . Theorem 1.8 deals with the case (i), while Theorem 1.10 and Theorem 1.12 address the rest of the three cases.

**Proof of Theorem 1.8 :** Let  $H$ ,  $\Omega$ , and  $g$  satisfy (H1) and (H2). If  $g$  is  $H$ -subcritical in  $\Omega$  and at infinity, then one can repeat similar arguments as in Theorem 1.3 to show that  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega)$  is attained in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H$ . Further, the principle of symmetric criticality and strong maximum principle can be applied to ensure that (1.1) admits a positive solution.

Next we prove Theorem 1.10.



**Proof of Theorem 1.10 :** Let  $H$ ,  $\Omega$ , and  $g$  satisfy **(H1)** and **(H2)**. Let  $(u_n)$  be a minimising sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega)$  i.e.,  $u_n \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H$  with  $\|u_n\|_{p^*} = 1$  and

$$\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g|u_n|^p] dx \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ , we have  $(u_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H$ . Hence,  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H$  (upto a subsequence). Now, we use Corollary 3.5 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g|u_n|^p] dx \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^p - \mu g|u|^p] dx + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\Omega) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(\infty) \nu_{\infty}^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \\ &\geq \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) \left( \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p^*} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\Omega) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(\infty) \nu_{\infty}^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \\ &\geq \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) \left( \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p^*} dx + \|\nu\| + \nu_{\infty} \right)^{\frac{p}{p^*}} = \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

Thus, equality occurs in all the above inequalities. As  $g$  is  $H$ -subcritical at infinity, by the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1.3 we infer that  $\nu_{\infty} = 0$ . In the view of Corollary 3.5, observe that the equality in (5.1) implies that  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mu \|\gamma\| = \left\| \Gamma_{\sum_g \cup \mathbb{J}} \right\|$ . Thus, by Remark 3.6-(i), we have  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} = \|\zeta_{\mu}\|$ , where  $\zeta_{\mu}$  is as in Proposition 3.3. Notice that, the equality in (5.1) and Corollary 3.5-(e) implies that

$$\left[ \left( \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p^*} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \|\nu\|_{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \nu_{\infty}^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \right] = \left[ \left( \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p^*} dx \right) + \|\nu\| + \nu_{\infty} \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}} = 1.$$

Hence, one among  $\|u\|_{p^*}$ ,  $\|\nu\|$ , and  $\nu_{\infty}$  is 1, others are 0. Since  $\nu_{\infty} = 0$ , either  $\|u\|_{p^*} = 1$  and  $\|\nu\| = 0$ , or  $\|u\|_{p^*} = 0$  and  $\|\nu\| = 1$ . Suppose  $\|\nu\| = 1$  and  $\|u\|_{p^*} = 0$ . Thus, by Corollary 3.5-(i) we infer that  $\nu$  is concentrated on a finite  $H$  orbit. But, by our hypothesis,  $Hx$  is infinite for all  $x \in \overline{\Omega}$  i.e., no points of  $\overline{\Omega}$  has finite  $H$  orbit. This leads to a contradiction. Therefore,  $\nu = 0$  and  $\|u\|_{p^*} = 1$ . Now using the arguments as given in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we conclude that  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega)$  is attained by  $u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H$ . Now by the principle of symmetric criticality theory and strong maximum principle, we establish the existence of a positive solution to the problem (1.1).

**Remark 5.1.** (i) If  $\Omega$ ,  $g$ ,  $H$  are as in Theorem 1.10, then the above proof shows that  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega)$  is attained at some  $u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^H$  irrespective of  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega)$  being attained in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . For example, take  $g(z) = \frac{1}{|z|^p}$  on  $\mathcal{A} := B_R(0) \setminus B_r(0)$  for  $0 < r < R < \infty$ . Theorem 2.1 of [46] shows that, for  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}(\Omega)$  is attained only if  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ . This infers that  $\mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{|z|^p}, \mu}(\mathcal{A})$  is not achieved. However,  $g$  is  $H$ -invariant, in fact,  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ -invariant, and also  $g$  is  $H$ -subcritical at infinity (as  $\mathcal{A}$  is bounded). Therefore, by Theorem 1.10,  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathcal{A})$  must be attained.

(ii) Notice that, the solution obtained in Theorem 1.10 is always  $H$ -invariant. Thus, in particular, if  $H = \mathcal{O}(N)$  then the solution (if exists) will be radial.

**Example 5.2.** (i) **A potential critical in  $\Omega$ :** Let  $\Omega = \Omega_k \times \Omega_{N-k}$  be as in (1.5) and  $g(z) = \frac{1}{|y|^p}$ ;  $z = (x, y) \in \Omega$ . It is known that  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\Omega)$  if  $N - k \geq 2$  and  $p < N - k$ , see [9, Theorem 2.1]. We show that  $g$  is critical in  $\Omega$ . For a fix  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $w \in C_c^{\infty}(\Omega)$  (by density

of  $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$  with  $\|w\|_{p^*} = 1$  such that

$$\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla w|^p(z) - \mu \frac{|w|^p(z)}{|y|^p}] dz < \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega) + \epsilon.$$

By taking  $(\xi, 0) \in \Omega_k \times \Omega_{N-k}$  and

$$w_r(z) = r^{\frac{p-N}{p}} w\left(\frac{x-\xi}{r}, \frac{y}{r}\right),$$

on  $\Omega_r := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \Omega_{N-k} : ar \leq |x-\xi| \leq \bar{b}r\}$ , where  $\bar{b} > a$  is such that  $w(x, y) = 0, \forall |x| > \bar{b}$ . It is clear that  $\|w_r\|_{p^*} = 1$  and  $\Omega_r \subseteq \Omega$  for small  $r > 0$ . Now, using the change of variable  $\frac{x-\xi}{r} = x'$  and  $\frac{y}{r} = y'$  we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_r} [|\nabla w_r|^p(z) - \mu \frac{|w_r|^p(z)}{|y|^p}] dz = \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla w|^p(z) - \mu \frac{|w|^p(z)}{|y|^p}] dz.$$

This gives  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}((\xi, 0)) \leq \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega)$ . Consequently,  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^*(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega)$  holds for all  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ , and the other way inequality indeed holds. Therefore,  $g$  is critical in  $\Omega$ .

(ii) **A potential  $H$ -subcritical at infinity in a unbounded domain:** Consider the same example as above where  $\Omega = \Omega_k \times \Omega_{N-k}$  as in (1.5) with  $0 < a, b = \infty$  and  $N - k \geq 2, p < N - k$ . Then it follows from the similar arguments used in Example 4.5-(iii) that  $g$  is critical at infinity. On the other hand, if  $b < \infty$ , then  $\Omega_k$  is bounded, and on top of that if  $\Omega_{N-k}$  is bounded, then  $\Omega$  becomes bounded. In that case  $g$  is  $H$ -subcritical at infinity for any subgroup  $H$  of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ . Next consider that  $b < \infty$  and  $\Omega_{N-k} = \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$ . In this case, we show that  $g$  is  $H_{N-k}$ -subcritical at infinity, where  $H_{N-k} = \{Id_k\} \times \mathcal{O}(N - k)$ . Fix  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$ . For each  $R > 0$ , by definition of  $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H_{N-k}}(\infty)$ , there exists  $v_R \in \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega \cap B_R^c)^{H_{N-k}}$  such that

$$\int_{\Omega} [|\nabla v_R|^p(x, y) - \mu \frac{|v_R|^p(x, y)}{|y|^p}] dz < \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H_{N-k}}(\infty) + \frac{1}{R}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}^{H_{N-k}}(\Omega) - \mu \int_{\Omega_R} \frac{|v_R|^p(x, y)}{|y|^p} dz < \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H_{N-k}}(\infty) + \frac{1}{R}, \quad (5.2)$$

where  $\Omega_R = \Omega \cap B_R^c$ . Notice that  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$  implies that  $(v_R)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega_R)$  and their supports are decreasing to infinity. Hence,  $v_R \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)$ . Now, since  $g \in L^{\frac{N}{p}}(\Omega_R)$ , it follows that  $g \in \mathcal{F}_p(\Omega_R)$  (Remark 4.8) and hence

$$\int_{\Omega_R} \frac{|v_R|^p(x, y)}{|y|^p} dz \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty.$$

By taking  $R \rightarrow \infty$  in (5.2), we obtain  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}^{H_{N-k}}(\Omega) \leq \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H_{N-k}}(\infty)$ . Now, in order to show that  $g$  is  $H_{N-k}$ -subcritical at infinity, we require to show that  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^{H_{N-k}}(\Omega) < \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}^{H_{N-k}}(\Omega)$ . To show this, we recall the well known compact embedding proved by Lions [37, LEMME III.2] that ensures  $\mathcal{D}_p(\Omega)^{H_{N-k}} \hookrightarrow L^{p^*}(\Omega)$  is compact. As a consequence  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}^{H_{N-k}}(\Omega)$  is achieved at some  $u \in \mathbb{S}_p(\Omega)^{H_{N-k}}$  and consequently,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0},\mu}^{H_{N-k}}(\Omega) = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dz > \int_{\Omega} [|\nabla u|^p - \mu g|u|^p] dz \geq \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^{H_{N-k}}(\Omega).$$

(iii) **A potential critical at infinity but  $H$ -subcritical at infinity:** Let  $\Omega = \Omega_k \times \Omega_{N-k}$  as in (1.5) with  $0 < a, b < \infty$  and  $\Omega_{N-k} = \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$ . Also, assume that  $N - k \geq 2, p < N - k$ . Consider  $g(z) = \frac{1}{|z|^p}$ ;  $z = (x, y) \in \Omega$ . One can repeat the arguments of Example 5.2-(ii) to show that  $g$  is  $H_{N-k}$ -subcritical at infinity. Now, we show that  $g$  is critical at infinity. On the contrary, if  $g$  is subcritical at infinity, then it follows from the proof of Theorem 1.10 that  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}(\Omega)$  is achieved. However, this is possible only if  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$  [46, Theorem 2.2]. Hence,  $g$  must be critical at infinity.

(iv) **A potential  $H$ -subcritical at infinity:** Let  $\Omega = \Omega_k \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$  be as in (1.5) with  $b < \infty$  and  $N - k \geq 2, p < N - k$ . For  $z = (x, y) \in \Omega$ , let

$$g(z) = \frac{1}{|x|^\alpha(1 + |y|^2)^{\frac{p-\alpha}{2}}}, \quad \alpha \in (0, \frac{pk}{N}).$$

Using the same arguments as in the previous example, one can show that  $g$  is  $H_{N-k}$ -subcritical at infinity, where  $H_{N-k} = \{Id_k\} \times \mathcal{O}(N - k)$ .

**Remark 5.3.** Let  $\Omega = \Omega_k \times \Omega_{N-k}$  be as in (1.5) with  $0 < a, b < \infty$  and  $g$  be as in (ii), (iii) in Example 5.2. Then  $g$  is  $H_{N-k}$  invariant and  $H_{N-k}$ -subcritical at infinity for certain range of  $k$ , where  $H_{N-k} = \{Id_k\} \times \mathcal{O}(N - k)$ . In these cases, Theorem 1.10 can be applied to show that (1.1) admits a positive solution.

Next we prove Theorem 1.12.

**Proof of Theorem 1.12:** (i) Let  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $H$  be a closed subgroup of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$  that acts on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Let  $(u_n)$  be a minimising sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N)$  on  $\mathbb{S}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$  i.e.,  $u_n \in \mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$  with  $\|u_n\|_{p^*} = 1$  and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g |u_n|^p] dx \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For each  $u_n$ , there exists  $R_n > 0$  such that

$$\int_{B_{R_n}} |u_n|^{p^*} dx \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

We define  $w_n(z) = R_n^{\frac{N-p}{p}} u_n(R_n z)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Then,  $w_n \in \mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$  and  $\|w_n\|_{p^*} = 1$ . Also, since  $g$  satisfies (H3) for small  $r > 0$ , we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla w_n|^p - \mu g |w_n|^p] dz \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g |u_n|^p] dx \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

$\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$  ensures that  $(w_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$ , and hence  $w_n \rightharpoonup w$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$ . Now, we use Corollary 3.5 to obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla w_n|^p - \mu g |w_n|^p] dz \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla w|^p - \mu g |w|^p] dz + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \|\nu\|^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(\infty) \nu_\infty^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \\ &\geq \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^{p^*} dz \right)^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \|\nu\|^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(\infty) \nu_\infty^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \\ &\geq \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^{p^*} dz + \|\nu\| + \nu_\infty \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \geq \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, equality occurs in  $\left[ \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^{p^*} dz \right)^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \|\nu\|^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \nu_\infty^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \right] = \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^{p^*} dz + \|\nu\| + \nu_\infty \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}}$ . Hence, exactly one of  $\|w\|_{p^*}$ ,  $\|\nu\|$  or  $\nu_\infty$  is 1, others are 0. Since

$$\int_{B_1(0)} |w_n(z)|^{p^*} dz = \int_{B_{R_n}(0)} |u_n(x)|^{p^*} dx \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

it follows that  $\nu_\infty = 0$ . Since  $g$  is  $H$ -subcritical in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , we have  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) < \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . Hence, one can use the arguments in the proof of Theorem 1.3 to conclude  $\|\nu\| = 0$ . Therefore,  $\|w\|_{p^*} = 1$ , and again using the arguments as in Theorem 1.3, we infer that (1.1) admits a positive solution in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

(ii) We consider  $H = \mathcal{O}(N)$  and  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ . Let  $(u_n)$  be a minimising sequence of  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N)$  on  $\mathbb{S}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$  i.e.,  $u \in \mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$  with  $\|u_n\|_{p^*} = 1$  and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g |u_n|^p] dx \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $R_n > 0$  such that

$$\int_{B_{R_n}(0)} |u_n|^{p^*} dx = \frac{1}{2}.$$

We define  $w_n(z) = R_n^{\frac{N-p}{p}} u_n(R_n z)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Then,  $w_n \in \mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$  with  $\|w_n\|_{p^*} = 1$  and

$$\int_{B_1(0)} |w_n|^{p^*} dz = \frac{1}{2} \tag{5.3}$$

Further, since  $g$  satisfies **(H3)** for all  $r > 0$ , we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla w_n|^p - \mu g |w_n|^p] dz \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla u_n|^p - \mu g |u_n|^p] dx \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now,  $\mu \in (0, \mu_1(g))$  ensures that  $(w_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$ , and hence  $w_n \rightharpoonup w$  in  $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N)^H$ . Now, we use Corollary 3.5 to obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [|\nabla w_n|^p - \mu g |w_n|^p] dz \\ &\geq \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^{p^*} dz \right)^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^{H,*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \|\nu\|^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \mathcal{C}_{g,\mu}^H(\infty) \nu_\infty^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \\ &\geq \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^{p^*} dz + \|\nu\| + \nu_\infty \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \geq \mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\mathbb{R}^N) \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Thus, equality occurs in (5.4). Therefore, as we have seen in the proof of Theorem 1.10 that  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) \|\nu\|^{\frac{p}{p^*}} = \|\zeta_\mu\|$ , where  $\zeta$  is as in Proposition 3.3, and also

$$\left[ \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^{p^*} dz \right)^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \|\nu\|^{\frac{p}{p^*}} + \nu_\infty^{\frac{p}{p^*}} \right] = \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^{p^*} dz + \|\nu\| + \nu_\infty \right]^{\frac{p}{p^*}} = 1.$$

Hence, exactly one of  $\|w\|_{2^*}$ ,  $\|\nu\|$  or  $\nu_\infty$  is 1, others are 0. By (5.3),  $\nu_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2}$  and hence  $\nu_\infty = 0$ . Now, if  $\|\nu\| = 1$ , then  $\|w\|_{p^*} = 0$ , and since  $\mathcal{E}_{g,\mu}^H(\Omega) \|\nu\|^{\frac{p}{p^*}} = \|\zeta_\mu\|$ , it follows from Corollary 3.5-(i) that, either  $\nu = 0$  or it is concentrated on a finite  $H$  orbit. Since only 0 has a finite  $H$ -orbit, it

follows that either  $\nu = 0$  or  $\nu = \delta_0$ . Let  $\nu = \delta_0$ . Choose  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$  with  $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ ,  $\phi = 1$  on  $B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)$  and  $\phi = 0$  outside  $B_1(0)^c$ . Using (5.3) we obtain,

$$\frac{1}{2} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_1(0)} |w_n|^{p^*} dz \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w_n|^{p^*} \phi dz = \delta_0(\phi) = 1,$$

which is a contradiction. Thus,  $\nu = 0$  and hence,  $\|w\|_{p^*} = 1$ . Now, following the arguments as in Theorem 1.3, we infer that (1.1) admits a positive solution in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

## 6. A NECESSARY CONDITION

In this section, we prove a necessary condition for  $g$  so that (1.1) admits a positive solution in entire  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . A similar result has been derived in [4, Theorem 6.1.3] for the existence of solution to the problem:

$$-\Delta_p u = g(x)|u|^{p-2}u \text{ in } \mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

We adapt their ideas for proving Theorem 1.14. For this we need the following regularity result of solutions.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $g \in C_{loc}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N)$  with  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and  $u$  be a solution to*

$$-\Delta_p u - g|u|^{p-2}u = |u|^{p^*-2}u \text{ in } \mathcal{D}_p(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

*Then  $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Omega$  be any bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Then, by following the arguments of Proposition A.1 of [23] (we also refer to [45, Theorem E.0.20]) we can show that  $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ . Subsequently, using Tolksdorf's regularity results [50] for general quasilinear operator, we have  $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.14:** Using the above regularity (Proposition 6.1) we first show that any solution  $u$  of (1.1) satisfies a pointwise identity outside the set where  $\nabla u$  vanishes. For each  $\eta > 0$ , we set  $\Omega_\eta = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |\nabla u| > \eta\}$ . Now since  $-\Delta_p$  is uniformly elliptic on  $\Omega_\eta$  and  $u \in C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , it follows from standard elliptic regularity theory [24, Section 8.3, page 482] that  $u \in C_{loc}^{2,\alpha}(\Omega_\eta)$ . Thus we obtain the following point-wise identity on  $\Omega_\eta$ :

$$-\Delta_p u - \mu g(x)|u|^{p-2}u = |u|^{p^*-2}u \text{ a.e in } \Omega_\eta \quad (6.1)$$

Now we choose a cut-off function  $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  with  $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$  such that  $\zeta(t) = 1$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $\zeta = 0$  for  $t \geq 2$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we consider

$$\psi_n(x) = \zeta\left(\frac{|x|^2}{n^2}\right).$$

Then there exists  $C > 0$  independent of  $n$  such that

$$|\psi_n(x)|, |x||\nabla \psi_n(x)| \leq C,$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Now multiplying (6.1) by  $\{x \cdot \nabla u\}\psi_n$ ,

$$-\Delta_p u \{x \cdot \nabla u\}\psi_n - g(x)|u|^{p-2}u \{x \cdot \nabla u\}\psi_n = |u|^{p^*-2}u \{x \cdot \nabla u\}\psi_n \text{ a.e in } \Omega_\eta \quad (6.2)$$

For convenience, we denote

$$L_n = |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \{x \cdot \nabla u\}\psi_n - (x|\nabla u|^p)\psi_n$$

$$\begin{aligned} K_n &= - \left[ g(x)|u|^{p-2}u + |u|^{p^*-2}u \right] \{x \cdot \nabla u\} \psi_n \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \frac{N}{p}\right) |\nabla u|^p \psi_n + \{x \cdot \nabla u\} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \psi_n. \end{aligned}$$

Using (6.2) and following the estimates in [4, Theorem 6.1.3] we can show that  $\operatorname{div} L_n = K_n$  a.e. in  $\Omega_\eta$ , and furthermore

$$\operatorname{div} L_n = K_n \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N$$

in distribution sense. Since we have  $C_{loc}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^N)$  regularity of  $u$  (Proposition 6.1), by using weak divergence theorem [21, Lemma A.1], we obtain

$$\int_{B_{\sqrt{2}n}} K_n(x) \, dx = 0.$$

Furthermore, following the steps of [4, Theorem 6.1.3] we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} \left\{ \left[ g(x) \frac{|u|^p}{p} + \frac{|u|^{p^*}}{p^*} \right] x \psi_n(x) \right\} &= N \left[ g(x) \frac{|u|^p}{p} + \frac{|u|^{p^*}}{p^*} \right] \psi_n(x) + \frac{|u|^p}{p} [x \cdot \nabla g(x)] \psi_n(x) \\ &\quad + [g(x)|u|^{p-2}u + |u|^{p^*-2}u] \{x \cdot \nabla u\} \psi_n \\ &\quad + \left[ g(x) \frac{|u|^p}{p} + \frac{|u|^{p^*}}{p^*} \right] x \cdot \nabla \psi_n(x) \end{aligned}$$

a.e. in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} K_n &= N \left[ g(x) \frac{|u|^p}{p} + \frac{|u|^{p^*}}{p^*} \right] \psi_n(x) + \frac{|u|^p}{p} [x \cdot \nabla g(x)] \psi_n(x) \\ &\quad + \left[ g(x) \frac{|u|^p}{p} + \frac{|u|^{p^*}}{p^*} \right] x \cdot \nabla \psi_n(x) - \operatorname{div} \left\{ \left[ g(x) \frac{|u|^p}{p} + \frac{|u|^{p^*}}{p^*} \right] x \psi_n(x) \right\} \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \frac{N}{p}\right) |\nabla u|^p \psi_n + \{x \cdot \nabla u\} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \psi_n \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\sqrt{2}n}} \left[ N \left( g(x) \frac{|u|^p}{p} + \frac{|u|^{p^*}}{p^*} \right) + \frac{|u|^p}{p} [x \cdot \nabla g(x)] \psi_n(x) + \left(1 - \frac{N}{p}\right) |\nabla u|^p \right] \psi_n \\ \int_{B_{\sqrt{2}n}} \left( \{x \cdot \nabla u\} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u + \left[ g(x) \frac{|u|^p}{p} + \frac{|u|^{p^*}}{p^*} \right] x \right) \nabla \psi_n(x) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Notice that  $\psi_n \rightarrow 1$  and  $\nabla \psi_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Since each of the above integrals are integrable in entire  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , we use dominated convergence theorem to obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[ N \left[ g(x) \frac{|u|^p}{p} + \frac{|u|^{p^*}}{p^*} \right] + \frac{|u|^p}{p} [x \cdot \nabla g(x)] + \left(1 - \frac{N}{p}\right) |\nabla u|^p \right] = 0.$$

As  $u$  is a solution,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^p = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [g|u|^p + |u|^{p^*}].$$

Substituting this in (6),

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [x \cdot \nabla g(x) + pg(x)] |u|^p = 0.$$

**Remark 6.2.** Consider the function

$$g(z) = \frac{1}{(1 + |y|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}}},$$

for  $z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . Then one can verify that  $z \cdot \nabla g(z) + pg(z) > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Therefore, (1.1) does not have a solution in entire  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . However, if we consider the domain  $\Omega = \Omega_k \times \Omega_{N-k}$  as in (1.5) with  $0 < a < b < \infty$ , then following the arguments of Example 5.2-B, it can be shown that  $g$  is sub-critical at infinity if  $N - k \geq 2, p < N - k$ . Thus, it follows from Theorem 1.10 that (1.1) admits a positive solution in  $\Omega$ .

### Acknowledgements

The second author acknowledges the support of the Israel Science Foundation (grant 637/19) founded by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

### REFERENCES

- [1] C. D. Aliprantis and K. C. Border. *Infinite dimensional analysis. A hitchhiker's guide*. Springer, Berlin, third edition, 2006. [3](#), [8](#)
- [2] W. Allegretto. Principal eigenvalues for indefinite-weight elliptic problems in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 116(3):701–706, 1992. [22](#)
- [3] A. Ambrosetti, H. Brezis, and G. Cerami. Combined effects of concave and convex nonlinearities in some elliptic problems. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 122(2):519–543, 1994. [1](#)
- [4] T. V. Anoop. On weighted eigenvalue problems and applications. *Ph.D Thesis*, 2011. [7](#), [27](#), [28](#)
- [5] T. V. Anoop. Weighted eigenvalue problems for the  $p$ -Laplacian with weights in weak Lebesgue spaces. *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, pages No. 64, 22, 2011. [22](#)
- [6] T. V. Anoop and U. Das. The compactness and the concentration compactness via  $p$ -capacity. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata (1923 -)*, 200(6):2715–2740, 2021. [4](#), [9](#), [10](#)
- [7] T. V. Anoop, P. Drábek, and S. Sasi. Weighted quasilinear eigenvalue problems in exterior domains. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 53(3-4):961–975, 2015. [22](#)
- [8] T. V. Anoop, M. Lucia, and M. Ramaswamy. Eigenvalue problems with weights in Lorentz spaces. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 36(3):355–376, 2009. [22](#)
- [9] M. Badiale and G. Tarantello. A Sobolev-Hardy inequality with applications to a nonlinear elliptic equation arising in astrophysics. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 163(4):259–293, 2002. [23](#)
- [10] H. Brézis and E. Lieb. A relation between pointwise convergence of functions and convergence of functionals. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 88(3):486–490, 1983. [9](#)
- [11] H. Brézis and L. Nirenberg. Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 36(4):437–477, 1983. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#), [19](#), [21](#)
- [12] D. Cao, S. Peng, and S. Yan. Infinitely many solutions for  $p$ -Laplacian equation involving critical Sobolev growth. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 262(6):2861–2902, 2012. [1](#)
- [13] A. Capozzi, D. Fortunato, and G. Palmieri. An existence result for nonlinear elliptic problems involving critical Sobolev exponent. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 2(6):463–470, 1985. [1](#)
- [14] M. Cencelj, D. Repovš, and v. Virk. Multiple perturbations of a singular eigenvalue problem. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 119:37–45, 2015. [2](#)
- [15] J. Chabrowski. Concentration-compactness principle at infinity and semilinear elliptic equations involving critical and subcritical Sobolev exponents. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 3(4):493–512, 1995. [2](#)
- [16] J. Chabrowski. On multiple solutions for the nonhomogeneous  $p$ -Laplacian with a critical Sobolev exponent. *Differential Integral Equations*, 8(4):705–716, 1995. [1](#)



- [17] M. Clapp. A global compactness result for elliptic problems with critical nonlinearity on symmetric domains. In *Nonlinear equations: methods, models and applications (Bergamo, 2001)*, volume 54 of *Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, pages 117–126. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2003. 1
- [18] M. Clapp and T. Weth. Multiple solutions for the Brezis-Nirenberg problem. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 10(4):463–480, 2005. 1
- [19] P. Clément, D. G. de Figueiredo, and E. Mitidieri. Quasilinear elliptic equations with critical exponents. *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.*, 7(1):133–170, 1996. 4
- [20] J. B. Conway. *A course in functional analysis*, volume 96 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1990. 8
- [21] M. Cuesta and P. Takáč. A strong comparison principle for positive solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. *Differential Integral Equations*, 13(4-6):721–746, 2000. 28
- [22] P. Drábek and Y. X. Huang. Multiplicity of positive solutions for some quasilinear elliptic equation in  $\mathbf{R}^N$  with critical Sobolev exponent. *J. Differential Equations*, 140(1):106–132, 1997. 2
- [23] H. Egnell. Existence and nonexistence results for  $m$ -Laplace equations involving critical Sobolev exponents. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 104(1):57–77, 1988. 2, 7, 27
- [24] L. C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*, volume 19. 2010. 27
- [25] H. Federer. *Geometric measure theory*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 153. Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York, 1969. 12
- [26] J. García Azorero and I. Peral Alonso. Multiplicity of solutions for elliptic problems with critical exponent or with a nonsymmetric term. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 323(2):877–895, 1991. 1
- [27] J. P. García Azorero and I. Peral Alonso. Existence and nonuniqueness for the  $p$ -Laplacian: nonlinear eigenvalues. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 12(12):1389–1430, 1987. 1, 2, 19, 21
- [28] N. Ghoussoub and C. Yuan. Multiple solutions for quasi-linear PDEs involving the critical Sobolev and Hardy exponents. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 352(12):5703–5743, 2000. 4
- [29] M. Guedda and L. Véron. Quasilinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 13(8):879–902, 1989. 1, 2
- [30] T.-S. Hsu. Multiplicity results for  $p$ -Laplacian with critical nonlinearity of concave-convex type and sign-changing weight functions. *Abstr. Appl. Anal.*, pages Art. ID 652109, 24, 2009. 2
- [31] Y. Huang. On multiple solutions of quasilinear equations involving the critical Sobolev exponent. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 231(1):142–160, 1999. 2
- [32] B. Kawohl, M. Lucia, and S. Prashanth. Simplicity of the principal eigenvalue for indefinite quasilinear problems. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 12(4):407–434, 2007. 9
- [33] J. L. Kazdan and F. W. Warner. Remarks on some quasilinear elliptic equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 28(5):567–597, 1975. 4
- [34] S. Kesavan. *Topics in functional analysis and applications*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1989. 11
- [35] J. Kobayashi and M. Ôtani. The principle of symmetric criticality for non-differentiable mappings. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 214(2):428–449, 2004. 5, 8
- [36] A. Kristály, C. Varga, and V. Varga. A nonsmooth principle of symmetric criticality and variational-hemivariational inequalities. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 325:975–986, 01 2007. 8
- [37] P.-L. Lions. Symétrie et compacité dans les espaces de Sobolev. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 49(3):315 – 334, 1982. 24
- [38] P. L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations: The locally compact cases I & II. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 1(2):109–145, 223–283, 1984. 2
- [39] P. L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations: The limit cases I & II. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 1(1):45–121, 145–201, 1985. 2, 4, 8, 9, 20

- [40] A. Manes and A. M. Micheletti. Un'estensione della teoria variazionale classica degli autovalori per operatori ellittici del secondo ordine. *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. (4)*, 7:285–301, 1973. [22](#)
- [41] C. Mercuri and F. Pacella. On the pure critical exponent problem for the  $p$ -Laplacian. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 49(3-4):1075–1090, 2014. [1](#)
- [42] O. H. Miyagaki. On a class of semilinear elliptic problems in  $\mathbf{R}^N$  with critical growth. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 29(7):773–781, 1997. [1](#)
- [43] E. S. Noussair, C. A. Swanson, and J. F. Yang. Quasilinear elliptic problems with critical exponents. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 20(3):285–301, 1993. [1](#)
- [44] R. S. Palais. The principle of symmetric criticality. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 69(1):19–30, 1979. [8](#)
- [45] I. Peral. Multiplicity of solutions for the  $p$ -laplacian, lecture notes for the second school of nonlinear functional analysis and applications to differential equations. *International Centre of Theoretical Physics - Trieste (Italy)*, 1997. [27](#)
- [46] D. Ruiz and M. Willem. Elliptic problems with critical exponents and Hardy potentials. *J. Differential Equations*, 190(2):524–538, 2003. [23](#), [25](#)
- [47] M. Schechter and W. Zou. On the Brézis-Nirenberg problem. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 197(1):337–356, 2010. [1](#)
- [48] C. A. Swanson and L. S. Yu. Critical  $p$ -Laplacian problems in  $\mathbf{R}^N$ . *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 169:233–250, 1995. [2](#)
- [49] A. Tertikas. Critical phenomena in linear elliptic problems. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 154(1):42–66, 1998. [7](#)
- [50] P. Tolksdorf. Regularity for a more general class of quasilinear elliptic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 51(1):126–150, 1984. [27](#)
- [51] N. Visciglia. A note about the generalized Hardy-Sobolev inequality with potential in  $L^{p,d}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 24(2):167–184, 2005. [22](#)
- [52] S. Waliullah. Minimizers and symmetric minimizers for problems with critical Sobolev exponent. *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.*, 34(2):291–326, 2009. [2](#), [13](#)
- [53] M. Willem. *Minimax theorems*, volume 24 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1996. [4](#)