

Normalized ground state solutions for the fractional Sobolev critical NLSE with an extra mass supercritical nonlinearity

Jiabin Zuo^a, Yuyou Zhong^a, Dušan D. Repovš^{b,c,d*}

^aSchool of Mathematics and Information Science, Guangzhou University, Guangzhou, 510006, P. R. China.

^bFaculty of Education, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, 1000, Slovenia.

^cFaculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, 1000, Slovenia.

^dInstitute of Mathematics, Physics and Mechanics, Ljubljana, 1000, Slovenia.

Abstract

This paper is concerned with existence of normalized ground state solutions for the mass supercritical fractional nonlinear Schrödinger equation involving a critical growth in the fractional Sobolev sense. The compactness of Palais-Smale sequences will be obtained by a special technique, which borrows from the ideas of Soave (J. Funct. Anal. 279(6) (2020) 1086102020). This paper represents an extension of previous results - in the local and the non-local cases.

Keywords: Normalized solutions; fractional Schrödinger equation; mass supercritical; Sobolev critical.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): 26A33, 35A15, 35B33, 35J20.

1 Introduction and the main result

This paper is devoted to the following fractional Sobolev critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLSE) in \mathbb{R}^N ($N \geq 2$)

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u = \mu u + |u|^{2_s^*-2} u + \eta |u|^{p-2} u, \\ \|u\|_{L^2}^2 = m^2, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $s \in (0, 1)$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ is an unknown real number, which will appear as a Lagrange multiplier, 2_s^* is the fractional Sobolev critical exponent, $\eta > 0$, $p \in (2 + \frac{4s}{N}, 2_s^*)$, $m > 0$ is a finite parameter, and $(-\Delta)^s$ is the fractional Laplace operator defined by

$$(-\Delta)^s u(x) = C(N, s) \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_\varepsilon(x)} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy,$$

where $C(N, s)$ is a dimensional constant which depends on N and s (for more details we refer the interested reader to [6]).

* *E-mail address:* zuojiabin88@163.com (J. Zuo), zhongyy@e.gzhu.edu.cn (Y. Zhong), dusan.repovs@guest.arnes.si (D.D. Repovš).

† Corresponding author

The fractional Schrödinger equation originated from Laskin's work [9], and since then, the interest in its study has grown in the last few decades. It is worthwhile and very interesting to look for normalized solutions to such equations which have a prescribed L^2 -norm, since it represents the physical view of the conservation of mass.

Existence and properties of normalized solutions for problem (1.1) depend strongly on the behavior of combined nonlinearity $g(u) = u^{q-2} + \eta u^{p-2}$ with $2 < p < q < 2_s^*$. Zhang et al. [10] investigated a class of Sobolev subcritical fractional NLSEs when the parameters p and q are in different order, and obtained several nice results concerning existence of normalized solutions. In particular, when the degree of nonlinearity $g(u)$ exceeds the mass critical index $2 + 4s/N$, the functional is unbounded from below, which makes it impossible to adopt the direct variational method.

Secchi and Appolloni [2] studied existence and multiplicity of ground state normalized solutions for the fractional mass supercritical NLSEs by using the min-max theory under more general assumptions, but in the Sobolev subcritical sense. Under certain conditions on the potential, Peng et al. [11] showed that NLSE has least one normalized solutions, with the help of a new min-max argument and the splitting lemma for nonlocal version also in the case when the mass is supercritical and Sobolev subcritical.

However, to the best of our knowledge, there are few works on normalized solutions of fractional NLSEs. Moreover, they only consider the Sobolev subcritical case. Therefore it is natural to inquire what difficulties will appear if a fractional Sobolev critical nonlinearity is considered. In particular, Zhen and Zhang [16] investigated a critical fractional NLSE with the L^2 -supercritical perturbation, but their coefficient of perturbation was not allowed to be large enough, while in the present paper, η can be large enough since $\eta \in [\eta^*, +\infty)$.

Of course, for the case when $s \rightarrow 1$, the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^s$ reduces to a classical Laplace operator $-\Delta$, the literature on (1.1) is huge. Here we shall only mention some of key papers which are relevant to our study. Brézis and Nirenberg [4] presented a great piece of pioneering work. Later, many mathematicians made important progress in this filed. For L^2 -supercritical perturbation $\eta|u|^{p-2}u$, Soave [14] made the first contribution concerning the existence of normalized solutions for NLSEs in the Sobolev critical case. Next, Alves et al. [1] obtained a similar result for this kind of NLSE in the case of dimension $N \geq 5$, when η can be large enough. In particular, under weaker and more general conditions, Jeanjean and Lu [8] proved the existence of ground states and asymptotic behavior of ground state energy with mass change. They also obtained infinitely many radial solutions when $N \geq 2$, and established the existence and multiplicity of nonradial sign-changing solutions for any $N \geq 4$.

Inspired by the above literature, we will consider the existence of ground state normalized solutions of fractional Sobolev critical NLSEs with a mass supercritical nonlinearity. The main result of our paper is the existence of nonlocal operator and critical Sobolev term, as naturally expected, which complicates the proof of convergence of Palais-Smale sequences. Studies have shown that compactness can be restored combining some of the main ideas of [4] and [7].

In order to introduce the main result of this paper, we first define fractional Sobolev spaces

$$H^s(\mathbb{R}^N) = \left\{ u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \mid [u]_{H^s}^2 = \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy < \infty \right\},$$

whose norm is defined by

$$\|u\| = (\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + [u]_{H^s}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For convenience, we shall simply write the norm of Lebesgue space $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as $\|u\|_p$ for $p \in [1, \infty)$.

A standard method for investigating problem (1.1) is to find critical points of the following energy functional

$$I_\eta(u) = \frac{1}{2}[u]_{H^s}^2 - \frac{1}{2_s^*}\|u\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} - \frac{\eta}{p}\|u\|_p^p,$$

constrained to the set

$$S(m) = \{u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N) \mid \|u\|_2^2 = m^2\}.$$

Obviously, I_η is of class C^1 in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R})$.

Our main result is as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $N \geq 2$ and $p \in (2 + \frac{4s}{N}, 2_s^*)$. Then there exists $\eta^* = \eta^*(m) > 0$ such that for any $\eta \geq \eta^*$, problem (1.1) admits a radial normalized solution \tilde{u} for any $m > 0$. Moreover, \tilde{u} is a positive ground state whose associated Lagrange multiplier μ is negative.*

Remark 1.1. *In our setting, if $\mu = 0$, then problem (1.1) has no solutions for any η . However, the solution can be obtained if μ is used as a Lagrange multiplier. Our conclusion can be regarded as an extension of [1, Theorem 1.1].*

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives some important lemmas, which play a key role in the proof of compactness condition. In Section 3, we prove the strong convergence of the Palais-Smale sequence at some level set, using special technique. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.1.

2 Main lemmas

Although the study of normalized solutions is convenient for applications, it also presents some difficulties. For example, the Nehari manifold method cannot be used because the constant μ is unknown. This also makes it difficult to verify the boundedness of Palais-Smale sequences when employing some common methods.

To this end, let

$$\zeta_p = (Np - 2N)/2ps, \text{ for any } p \in (2, 2_s^*]$$

and define the Pohozaev manifold

$$\mathcal{P}_{\eta,m} = \{u \in S(m) \mid P_\eta(u) = 0\}, \text{ where } P_\eta(u) = [u]_{H^s}^2 - \|u\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} - \eta\zeta_p\|u\|_p^p.$$

It is well-known that any critical point of $I_\eta|_{S(m)}$ stays in $\mathcal{P}_{\eta,m}$, as a consequence of the Pohozaev identity (see [5, Proposition 4.1]).

In order to get the mountain pass geometry, we are going to make the scaling transformation. For $u \in S(m)$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, we let

$$(\xi \star u)(x) = e^{\frac{N\xi}{2}} u(e^\xi x) = v(x), \text{ for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

which is based on a very interesting idea from Jeanjean [7]. Careful analysis shows that the transformed functional $\tilde{I}_\eta = I_\eta(\xi \star u)$ has the same mountain pass geometry and mountain pass level as the original functional $I_\eta(u)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that $u \in S(m)$ is arbitrary but fixed. Then we have:*

- (1) $[\xi \star u]_{H^s}^2 \rightarrow 0$ and $I_\eta(\xi \star u) \rightarrow 0$ as $\xi \rightarrow -\infty$;
- (2) $[\xi \star u]_{H^s}^2 \rightarrow +\infty$ and $I_\eta(\xi \star u) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $\xi \rightarrow +\infty$.

Proof. By direct calculations, we get

$$\begin{aligned} [\xi \star u]_{H^s}^2 &= e^{2\xi s} \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy = e^{2\xi s} [u]_{H^s}^2, \\ \|\xi \star u\|_\beta^\beta &= e^{\frac{(\beta-2)N\xi}{2}} \|u\|_\beta^\beta, \text{ for all } \beta \geq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

On the basis of (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\xi \star u]_{H^s}^2 &\rightarrow 0, \text{ as } \xi \rightarrow -\infty, \\ I_\eta(\xi \star u) &= \frac{1}{2} [\xi \star u]_{H^s}^2 - \frac{1}{2_s^*} \|\xi \star u\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} - \frac{\eta}{p} \|\xi \star u\|_p^p \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } \xi \rightarrow -\infty, \end{aligned}$$

showing (1).

On the other hand, it follows from (2.1) that $[\xi \star u]_{H^s}^2 \rightarrow +\infty$, as $\xi \rightarrow +\infty$. Besides,

$$I_\eta(\xi \star u) = \frac{1}{2} e^{2\xi s} [u]_{H^s}^2 - \frac{1}{2_s^*} e^{\frac{(2_s^*-2)N\xi}{2}} \|u\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} - \frac{\eta}{p} e^{\frac{(p-2)N\xi}{2}} \|u\|_p^p \rightarrow -\infty, \text{ as } \xi \rightarrow +\infty,$$

since $p \in (2 + \frac{4s}{N}, 2_s^*)$, which shows (2). \square

Let

$$S_r(m) = S(m) \cap H_{rad}^s(\mathbb{R}^N) = \{u \in S(m) : u(x) = u(|x|)\}.$$

Then thanks to [12], there exists a best fractional critical Sobolev constant $\mathcal{S} > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{S} \|u\|_{2_s^*}^2 \leq [u]_{H^s}^2, \text{ for all } u \in S_r(m) \setminus \{0\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Also, according to [10, Lemma 1.1], there exists an optimal constant $C(N, p, s)$ such that for $p \in (2, 2_s^*)$,

$$\|u\|_p^p \leq C^p(N, p, s) [u]_{H^s}^{p\zeta_p} \|u\|_2^{p(1-\zeta_p)}, \text{ for all } u \in S_r(m), \quad (2.3)$$

where ζ_p is given by P_η . The above two inequalities (fractional Sobolev inequality (2.2) and fractional Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (2.3)) play an important role in the subsequent proof of the main result.

Lemma 2.2. *There exists a small enough $\rho(m, \eta)$ such that*

$$0 < \inf_{u \in X} I_\eta(u) \leq \sup_{u \in X} I_\eta(u) < \inf_{u \in Y} I_\eta(u),$$

with

$$X = \{u \in S_r(m), [u]_{H^s}^2 \leq \rho(m, \eta)\}, \quad Y = \{u \in S_r(m), [u]_{H^s}^2 = 2\rho(m, \eta)\}.$$

Moreover, $\rho(m, \eta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\eta \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. First, observing that since $\|\xi \star u\|_2 = \|u\|_2 = m$,

$$(\xi \star u)(x) = e^{\frac{N\xi}{2}} u(e^\xi x) = v(x) \in S_r(m),$$

we obtain in view of (2.2) and (2.3), that

$$\frac{1}{2_s^*} \|v\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} + \frac{\eta}{p} \|v\|_p^p \leq \frac{1}{2_s^* \mathcal{S}^{\frac{2_s^*}{2}}} ([v]_{H^s}^2)^{\frac{2_s^*}{2}} + \frac{\eta C^p(N, p, s)}{p} ([v]_{H^s}^2)^{\frac{Np-2N}{4s}} m^{\frac{2sp-Np+2N}{2s}}. \quad (2.4)$$

Then for any $u \in S_r(m)$, fixing $[u]_{H^s}^2 \leq \rho(m, \eta)$ and $[v]_{H^s}^2 = 2\rho(m, \eta)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} I_\eta(v) - I_\eta(u) &\geq \frac{1}{2}[v]_{H^s}^2 - \frac{1}{2}[u]_{H^s}^2 - \frac{1}{2_s^*} \|v\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} - \frac{\eta}{p} \|v\|_p^p \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\rho(m, \eta) - \frac{2^{\frac{2_s^*}{2}}}{2_s^* \mathcal{S}^{\frac{2_s^*}{2}}} (\rho(m, \eta))^{\frac{2_s^*}{2}} - \frac{\eta C^p(N, p, s)}{p} 2^{\frac{Np-2N}{4s}} (\rho(m, \eta))^{\frac{Np-2N}{4s}} m^{\frac{2sp-Np+2N}{2s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, choosing

$$\rho(m, \eta) = \min \left\{ \left(\frac{p}{8\eta C^p(N, p, s) 2^{\frac{Np-2N}{4s}} m^{\frac{2sp-Np+2N}{2s}}} \right)^{\frac{4s}{Np-2N-4s}}, \left(\frac{2_s^*}{8} \right)^{\frac{N-2s}{2s}} \left(\frac{\mathcal{S}}{2} \right)^{\frac{N}{2s}} \right\}, \quad (2.5)$$

we can infer

$$\frac{1}{2}\rho(m, \eta) - \frac{2^{\frac{2_s^*}{2}}}{2_s^* \mathcal{S}^{\frac{2_s^*}{2}}} (\rho(m, \eta))^{\frac{2_s^*}{2}} - \frac{\eta C^p(N, p, s)}{p} 2^{\frac{Np-2N}{4s}} (\rho(m, \eta))^{\frac{Np-2N}{4s}} m^{\frac{2sp-Np+2N}{2s}} > 0.$$

Again, by the definition of $\rho(m, \eta)$ in (2.5), we get

$$I_\eta(u) \geq \frac{1}{2}[u]_{H^s}^2 - \frac{2^{\frac{2_s^*}{2}}}{2_s^* \mathcal{S}^{\frac{2_s^*}{2}}} [u]_{H^s}^{2_s^*} - \frac{\eta C^p(N, p, s)}{p} 2^{\frac{Np-2N}{4s}} m^{\frac{2sp-Np+2N}{2s}} [u]_{H^s}^{\frac{Np-2N}{2s}} > 0,$$

which means that the inequality in Lemma 2.2 holds. Finally, $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} \rho(m, \eta) = 0$ also follows from (2.5). \square

Next, fix $u_0 \in S_r(m)$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 that there exist numbers $\xi_1 = \xi_1(m, \eta, u_0) < 0$ and $\xi_2 = \xi_2(m, \eta, u_0) > 0$ such that the functions $u_{1,\eta} = \xi_1 \star u_0, u_{2,\eta} = \xi_2 \star u_0$ satisfy

$$[u_{1,\eta}]_{H^s}^2 < \frac{\rho(m, \eta)}{2}, [u_{2,\eta}]_{H^s}^2 > 2\rho(m, \eta), \quad I_\eta(u_{1,\eta}) > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad I_\eta(u_{2,\eta}) < 0.$$

Now, similarly to the discussion in Jeanjean [7] or Zhang [10, Proposition 5.3], we fix the minimax

$$E_\eta(m) = \inf_{\psi \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in (0,1]} I_\eta(\psi(t)), \quad \text{where } \Gamma = \{\psi \in C([0,1], S_r(m)) : [\psi(0)]_{H^s}^2 < \rho(m, \eta)/2, I_\eta(\psi(1)) < 0\}.$$

By virtue of Lemma 2.2, we know that

$$[\psi(1)]_{H^s}^2 > \rho(m, \eta), \quad \text{for any } \psi \in \Gamma.$$

Therefore there exists $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$[\psi(t_0)]_{H^s}^2 = \rho(m, \eta)/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{t \in [0,1]} I_\eta(\psi(t)) \geq I_\eta(\psi(t_0)) \geq \inf_{u \in X} I_\eta(u) > 0.$$

Thus, $E_\eta(m) > 0$.

Lemma 2.3. $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} E_\eta(m) = 0$.

Proof. Fix $u_0 \in S_r(m)$, and we consider the path $\psi_0(t) = [(1-t)\xi_1 + t\xi_2] \star u_0 \in \Gamma$. We have

$$E_\eta(m) \leq \max_{t \in [0,1]} I_\eta(\psi_0(t)) \leq \max_{r \geq 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} r^2 [u_0]_{H^s}^2 - \frac{\eta}{p} r^{\frac{Np-2N}{2s}} \|u_0\|_p^p \right\}.$$

Thus, setting $C_1 = [u_0]_{H^s}^2$ and $C_2 = \|u_0\|_p^p$, we consider the maximum value of the following function

$$f(r) = \frac{1}{2} C_1 r^2 - \frac{\eta}{p} C_2 r^{\frac{Np-2N}{2s}}, \text{ for any } r \geq 0.$$

Letting,

$$f'(r) = C_1 r - \left(\frac{Np-2N}{2s} \right) \frac{\eta}{p} C_2 r^{\frac{Np-2N-2s}{2s}} = 0,$$

we can get the maximum point of $f(r)$

$$r_{max} = \left(\frac{2spC_1}{(Np-2N)\eta C_2} \right)^{\frac{2s}{Np-2N-4s}}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{r \geq 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} r^2 [u_0]_{H^s}^2 - \frac{\eta}{p} r^{\frac{Np-2N}{2s}} \|u_0\|_p^p \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2spC_1}{(Np-2N)\eta C_2} \right)^{\frac{4s}{Np-2N-4s}} C_1 - \frac{\eta}{p} \left(\frac{2spC_1}{(Np-2N)\eta C_2} \right)^{\frac{Np-2N}{Np-2N-4s}} C_2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2spC_1}{(Np-2N)\eta C_2} \right)^{\frac{4s}{Np-2N-4s}} C_1. \end{aligned}$$

So there exists $C > 0$, which is not depended on $\eta > 0$, such that

$$E_\eta(m) \leq C \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \right)^{\frac{4s}{Np-2N-4s}} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } \eta \rightarrow \infty$$

since $p > 2 + 4s/N$. The proof of Lemma 2.3 is thus complete. \square

In the sequel, recall that $\{u_n\} \subset S_r(m)$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for I_η at level $E_\eta(m)$, because of the scaling transformation $u_n = (-\xi_n) \star v_n$, where $\{(-\xi_n) \star v_n\} \subset S_r(m)$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for \tilde{I}_η associated with the level $E_\eta(m)$ thanks to [7, Proposition 2.2]. More precisely,

$$I_\eta(u_n) \rightarrow E_\eta(m) > 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } I'_\eta(u_n) \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\{u_n\} \subset S_r(m)$ be a Palais-Smale sequence for I_η . Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_\eta(u_n) = 0$.*

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned} I_\eta((-\xi_n) \star v_n) &= \frac{1}{2} [(-\xi_n) \star v_n]_{H^s}^2 - \frac{1}{2_s^*} \|(-\xi_n) \star v_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} - \frac{\eta}{p} \|(-\xi_n) \star v_n\|_p^p \\ &= \frac{1}{2} e^{2(-\xi_n)s} [v_n]_{H^s}^2 - \frac{1}{2_s^*} e^{\frac{(2_s^*-2)N(-\xi_n)}{2}} \|v_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} - \frac{\eta}{p} e^{\frac{(p-2)N(-\xi_n)}{2}} \|v_n\|_p^p, \end{aligned}$$

clearly $I_\eta((-\xi_n) \star v_n)$ is C^1 with respect to ξ_n . Now, by taking the derivative

$$\frac{d}{d\xi_n} I_\eta((-\xi_n) \star v_n) = -2se^{2(-\xi_n)s} [v_n]_{H^s}^2 + se^{\frac{(2_s^*-2)N(-\xi_n)}{2}} \|v_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} + s\eta\zeta_p e^{\frac{(p-2)N(-\xi_n)}{2}} \|v_n\|_p^p,$$

and noticing that

$$P_\eta((-\xi_n) \star v_n) = 2e^{2(-\xi_n)s} [v_n]_{H^s}^2 - e^{\frac{(2_s^*-2)N(-\xi_n)}{2}} \|v_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} - \eta\zeta_p e^{\frac{(p-2)N(-\xi_n)}{2}} \|v_n\|_p^p,$$

we can infer that

$$\frac{d}{d\xi_n} I_\eta((-\xi_n) \star v_n) = -sP_\eta((-\xi_n) \star v_n) = -sP_\eta(u_n).$$

Since $I_\eta'(u_n) \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, it follows from [10, Proposition 5.4(2)] that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_\eta(u_n) = 0$. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\{u_n\} \subset S_r(m)$ be a Palais-Smale sequence for I_η . Then $\{u_n\}$ is bounded in $S_r(m)$.*

Proof. We note that $\zeta_p p > 2$, since $p > 2 + 4s/N$. By Lemma 2.4, we obtain

$$I_\eta(u_n) = \frac{\eta}{2p} (\zeta_p p - 2) \|u_n\|_p^p + \frac{s}{N} \|u_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} + o(1).$$

It follows from the boundedness of $I_\eta(u_n)$ that $\{\|u_n\|_p^p\}$ and $\{\|u_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*}\}$ are both bounded, which further means that $\{[u_n]_{H^s}^2\}$ is bounded by virtue of Lemma 2.4. \square

3 Compactness condition

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\{u_n\} \subset S_r(m)$ be a Palais-Smale sequence for I_η with the level*

$$0 < E_\eta(m) < \frac{s\mathcal{S}^{\frac{N}{2s}}}{N},$$

where \mathcal{S} is a best fractional Sobolev constant defined by in (2.2). Then one of the following conditions is satisfied:

(1) *either up to subsequence, $u_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{u}$ weakly in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ but not strongly, where $\tilde{u} \not\equiv 0$ solves the first identity of (1.1) for some $\mu < 0$, moreover*

$$I_\eta(\tilde{u}) < E_\eta(m) - \frac{s\mathcal{S}^{\frac{N}{2s}}}{N};$$

(2) *or up to subsequence, $u_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ strongly in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $I_\eta(\tilde{u}) = E_\eta(m)$, and \tilde{u} is a solution of (1.1) for some $\mu < 0$.*

Proof. According to Lemma 2.5, we know that sequence $\{u_n\}$ is bounded and radial, and thus, thanks to the embedding $H_{rad}^s(\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ being compact, there exists $\tilde{u} \in H_{rad}^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that up to a subsequence, $u_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{u}$ weakly in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $u_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ strongly in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$, and a.e. in \mathbb{R}^N . Since $\{u_n\}$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for I_η and by the Lagrange multipliers rule, there exists $\{\mu_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $\phi \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$,

$$\int \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{(u(x) - u(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dx dy - \mu_n u_n \phi - |u_n|^{2_s^*-2} u_n \phi + \eta |u_n|^{p-2} u_n \phi = o(1) \|\phi\|, \quad (3.1)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Setting $\phi = u_n$, we infer that $\{\mu_n\}$ is also bounded, and therefore up to a subsequence, $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu \in \mathbb{R}^N$. By Lemma 2.4, compactness of the embedding $H_{rad}^s(\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$, and $\zeta_p < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu m^2 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n \|u_n\|_2^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left([u_n]_{H^s}^2 - \|u_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} - \eta \|u_n\|_p^p \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta (\zeta_p - 1) \|u_n\|_p^p = \eta (\zeta_p - 1) \|\tilde{u}\|_p^p \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

with $\mu = 0$ if and only if $\tilde{u} \equiv 0$. We shall now show that

$$\tilde{u} \not\equiv 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Suppose to the contrary, $\tilde{u} \equiv 0$. Since $\{u_n\}$ is bounded in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$, up to a subsequence, we know that $[u_n]_{H^s}^2 \rightarrow \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Again, by $P_\eta(u_n) \rightarrow 0$ and $u_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we have that

$$\|u_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} = [u_n]_{H^s}^2 - \eta \zeta_p \|u_n\|_p^p \rightarrow \gamma.$$

Thus, it follows from (2.2) that $\gamma \geq \mathcal{S} \gamma^{\frac{2}{2_s^*}}$. Furthermore, we infer that

$$\text{either } \gamma = 0 \text{ or } \gamma > \mathcal{S}^{\frac{N}{2_s^*}}.$$

If $\gamma > \mathcal{S}^{\frac{N}{2_s^*}}$, then according to $I_\eta(u_n) \rightarrow E_\eta(m)$ and Lemma 2.4, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} E_\eta(m) + o(1) &= I_\eta(u_n) = \frac{s}{N} [u_n]_{H^s}^2 - \frac{\eta}{p} \left(1 - \frac{\zeta_p p}{2_s^*} \right) \|u_n\|_p^p + o(1) \\ &= \frac{s}{N} [u_n]_{H^s}^2 + o(1) = \frac{\gamma s}{N} + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

so $E_\eta(m) = \frac{\gamma s}{N}$, thereby $E_\eta(m) \geq \frac{s \mathcal{S}^{\frac{N}{2_s^*}}}{N}$, which contradicts our conditions.

If instead $\gamma = 0$, we note that $[u_n]_{H^s}^2 \rightarrow 0$, $\|u_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} \rightarrow 0$ and $\|u_n\|_p^p \rightarrow 0$. Therefore $I_\eta(u_n) \rightarrow 0$, which is a contradiction as well. So (3.3) is proved. Furthermore, it follows from (3.2) and (3.3) that $\mu < 0$. Invoking the limit weak convergence in (3.1), we get

$$(-\Delta)^s \tilde{u} = \mu \tilde{u} + |\tilde{u}|^{2_s^* - 2} \tilde{u} + \eta |\tilde{u}|^{p-2} \tilde{u} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (3.4)$$

and thus by the Pohozaev identity (see [5, Proposition 4.1]), we have $P_\eta(\tilde{u}) = 0$. We know that $w_n = u_n - \tilde{u} \rightarrow 0$ in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$, and according to [15, Lemma 2.4] and the Brézis-Lieb lemma [3], we have

$$\begin{aligned} [u_n]_{H^s}^2 &= [\tilde{u}]_{H^s}^2 + [w_n]_{H^s}^2 + o(1), \\ \|u_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} &= \|\tilde{u}\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} + \|w_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} + o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.4 and since $u_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ strongly in L^p , we obtain

$$[\tilde{u}]_{H^s}^2 + [w_n]_{H^s}^2 = \eta \zeta_p \|\tilde{u}\|_p^p + \|\tilde{u}\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} + \|w_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} + o(1).$$

In view of $P_\eta(\tilde{u}) = 0$, we also have that

$$[w_n]_{H^s}^2 = \|w_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} + o(1).$$

We claim that up to a subsequence, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [w_n]_{H^s}^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|w_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} = \gamma \geq 0$. Then by (2.2), we also have $\gamma \geq \mathcal{S}\gamma^{\frac{2}{2_s^*}}$. Hence, either $\gamma = 0$ or $\gamma > \mathcal{S}^{\frac{N}{2_s}}$.

If $\gamma > \mathcal{S}^{\frac{N}{2_s}}$, then from (3.5), we obtain that

$$E_\eta(m) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_\eta(u_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(I_\eta(\tilde{u}) + \frac{1}{2} [w_n]_{H^s}^2 - \frac{1}{2_s^*} \|w_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} \right) = I_\eta(\tilde{u}) + \frac{s\gamma}{N} \geq I_\eta(\tilde{u}) + \frac{s\mathcal{S}^{\frac{N}{2_s}}}{N},$$

so (1) in Proposition 3.1 is obtained.

If instead $\gamma = 0$, then we claim that $u_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Indeed, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [w_n]_{H^s}^2 = 0$, so it follows from $w_n = u_n - \tilde{u}$ that $[u_n - \tilde{u}]_{H^s}^2 \rightarrow 0$.

Next, it suffices to verify that $u_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ in L^2 . Choosing $\phi = u_n - \tilde{u}$ in (3.1), invoking (3.4) with $u_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ and subtracting, we get

$$\begin{aligned} [u_n - \tilde{u}]_{H^s}^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\mu_n u_n - \mu \tilde{u})(u_n - \tilde{u}) &= \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|u_n|^{2_s^*-2} u_n - |\tilde{u}|^{2_s^*-2} \tilde{u})(u_n - \tilde{u}) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|u_n|^{p-2} u_n - |\tilde{u}|^{p-2} \tilde{u})(u_n - \tilde{u}) &+ o(1). \end{aligned}$$

We note that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|w_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} = 0$. It follows from (3.5) that $\|u_n\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*} \rightarrow \|\tilde{u}\|_{2_s^*}^{2_s^*}$, therefore, in the formula above, the first term, the third term, and the fourth term converge to 0. As a result,

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\mu_n u_n - \mu \tilde{u})(u_n - \tilde{u}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_n - \tilde{u})^2.$$

Therefore also (2) in Proposition 3.1 is obtained. Hence the proof of Proposition 3.1 is now complete. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Now, in order to prove our main result, it remains to verify the condition $E_\eta(m) < \frac{s\mathcal{S}^{\frac{N}{2_s}}}{N}$ of Proposition 3.1, which is a consequence of Lemma 2.3.

Therefore, we know that one of the two conclusions of Proposition 3.1 must hold. We show that conclusion (1) does not hold. Indeed, if it did, then \tilde{u} would be a nontrivial solution of (1.1), thus we would have $I_\eta(\tilde{u}) > 0$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.3, there would then exist $\eta^* > 0$ such that

$$E_\eta(m) - \frac{s\mathcal{S}^{\frac{N}{2_s}}}{N} < 0, \quad \text{for any } \eta \geq \eta^*,$$

which is impossible.

Therefore, conclusion (2) must hold and \tilde{u} is a radial normalized solution of (1.1) for some $\mu < 0$. Furthermore, \tilde{u} is a ground state follows as in the proof of [14, Theorem 1.1]. Since I_η is even, the proof of the nonnegativity of solution \tilde{u} is almost the same as in [1] and we can also obtain $\tilde{u} > 0$ with the help of the strong maximum principle for fractional Laplace operators [13, Proposition 2.17]. \square

Acknowledgements

Repovš was supported by the Slovenian Research Agency grants P1-0292, N1-0114, and N1-0083.

References

- [1] C.O. ALVES, J. CHAO, O. H. MIYAGAKI, *Normalized solutions for a Schrödinger equation with critical growth in \mathbb{R}^N* , Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ. **61(18)** (2022).
- [2] L. APPOLLONI, S. SECCHI, *Normalized solutions for the fractional NLS with mass supercritical nonlinearity*, J. Differential Equations **286** (2021) 248–283.
- [3] H. BRÉZIS, E. LIEB, *A relation between pointwise convergence of functions and convergence of functionals*, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. **88 (3)** (1983) 486–490.
- [4] H. BRÉZIS, L. NIRENBERG, *Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **36 (4)** (1983) 437–477.
- [5] X. CHANG, Z.-Q. WANG, *Ground state of scalar field equations involving a fractional Laplacian with general nonlinearity*, Nonlinearity **26 (2)** (2013) 479–494.
- [6] E. DI NEZZA, G. PALATUCCI, E. VALDINOCI, *Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces*, Bull. Sci. Math. **136 (5)** (2012), 521–573.
- [7] L. JEANJEAN, *Existence of solutions with prescribed norm for semilinear elliptic equations*, Nonlinear Anal. **28 (10)** (1997) 1633–1659.
- [8] L. JEANJEAN, S.-S. LU, *A mass supercritical problem revisited*, Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ. **59(5)** (2020) 174.
- [9] N. LASKIN, *Fractional Schrödinger equation*, Phys. Rev. E **66 (5)** (2002) 056108.
- [10] H. LUO, Z. ZHANG, *Normalized solutions to the fractional Schrödinger equations with combined nonlinearities*, Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ. **59 (4)** (2020) 143.
- [11] S. PENG, A. XIA, *Normalized solutions of supercritical nonlinear fractional Schrödinger equation with potential*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. **20(11)** (2021) 3723–3744.
- [12] R. SERVADEI, E. VALDINOCI, *The Brezis-Nirenberg result for the fractional Laplacian*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015) 67–102.
- [13] L. SILVESTRE, *Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **60** (2007) 67–112.
- [14] N. SOAVE, *Normalized ground states for the NLS equation with combined nonlinearities: the Sobolev critical case*, J. Funct. Anal. **279(6)** (2020) 108610.
- [15] J. ZUO, T. AN, A. FISCELLA, *A critical Kirchhoff-type problem driven by a $p(\cdot)$ -fractional Laplace operator with variable $s(\cdot)$ -order*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **44** (2021) 1071–1085.
- [16] M. ZHEN, B. ZHANG, *Normalized ground states for the critical fractional NLS equation with a perturbation*, Rev. Mat. Complut. **35** (2022) 89–132.