

CONTINUITY OF WEAK SOLUTIONS TO AN ELLIPTIC PROBLEM ON p -FRACTIONAL LAPLACIANWEI CHEN¹, QI HAN², GUOPING ZHAN^{3*}

Abstract. In this paper we study an elliptic variational problem regarding the p -fractional Laplacian in \mathbb{R}^N on the basis of recent result [7], which generalizes the nice work [2, 3, 19], and then give some sufficient conditions under which some weak solutions to the above elliptic variational problem are continuous in \mathbb{R}^N . In the final appendix we correct the proofs of both [15, Lemma 10] and [16, Lemma A.6] for $1 < p < 2$.

Keywords. Elliptic partial differential equation; Variational method; p -fractional Laplacian

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) Primary: 35A01; 35A23; 35D30; Secondly: 35A15; 35B09

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider in this paper the following problem

$$(-\Delta)_p^s u + V(x)|u|^{p-2}u = \lambda a(x)|u|^{r-2}u - b(x)|u|^{q-2}u \quad (1.1)$$

in \mathbb{R}^N , where up to a normalization constant one defines

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

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $\mathbf{B}_\epsilon(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x - y| < \epsilon\}$, under the assumptions as below.

- (1) $N \geq 2$, $\lambda > 0$, $0 < s < 1$, and $1 < p < r < \min\{q, p_s^*\}$, with $N > ps$ and $p_s^* := \frac{Np}{N - ps}$.
- (2) $V : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ with a positive constant V_0 such that $V(x) \geq V_0 > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$.
- (3) $a, b : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying

$$0 < \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} a(x)^{\frac{p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p) + \gamma(p_s^* - q)}{p_s^* - r}} b(x)^{-\gamma} dx < \infty$$

for some $\beta \in [0, \infty)$ and $\gamma \in \left(0, \frac{(r-p)(p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p))}{(q-r)(p_s^* - p)}\right)$ when $a, b \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, or some

$\beta \in [0, \infty)$ and $\gamma = \frac{(r-p)(p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p))}{(q-r)(p_s^* - p)}$ when $a \in L^k(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $k > 1$ and $b \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

It is closely related to the following Dirichlet problem with indefinite weights:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \lambda u = \omega(x)u^{q-1} - h(x)u^{r-1} & \text{in } \Omega \\ u(x) > 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u(x) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 3$) is a bounded domain with smooth boundary, the coefficients $\omega, h \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ are nonnegative and $2 < q < r$. Alama and Tarantello [2] proved the existence, nonexistence and multiplicity of solutions to (1.2) depending on λ and according to the integrability of the ratio w^{r-2}/h^{q-2} .

In [14], Pucci and Rădulescu considered the following related problem in the whole space:

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) + |u|^{p-2}u = \lambda|u|^{q-2}u - h(x)|u|^{r-2}u & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \\ u(x) \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

* Corresponding author: Guoping Zhan (E-mail address: zhangp@zjut.edu.cn).

where $h > 0$ satisfies $0 < \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} h(x)^{q/(q-r)} dx < \infty$ and λ is a positive parameter and $2 \leq p < q < r < p^*$, with $p^* = Np/(N-p)$ if $N > p$ and $p^* = \infty$ if $N \leq p$. They showed the nonexistence and existence of nontrivial solutions for the smallness and the largeness of λ , respectively.

Later, Autuori and Pucci [4] extended above (1.3) to the following quasilinear elliptic equation:

$$-\operatorname{div} A(x, \nabla u) + a(x)|u|^{p-2}u = \lambda\omega(x)|u|^{q-2}u - h(x)|u|^{r-2}u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (1.4)$$

where $A(x, \nabla u)$ acts like the p -Laplacian, $\max\{2, p\} < q < \min\{r, p^*\}$ with $p^* = Np/(N-p)$ and $1 < p < N$, the coefficients ω and h are related by the integrability condition

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[\frac{\omega^r(x)}{h^q(x)} \right]^{1/(r-q)} dx \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

After that, Autuori and Pucci in [3] turned to the following elliptic equation involving the fractional Laplacian:

$$(-\Delta)^s u + a(x)u = \lambda\omega(x)|u|^{q-2}u - h(x)|u|^{r-2}u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (1.5)$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 < s < 1$, $2s < N$ and $2 < q < \min\{r, 2_s^*\}$ with $2_s^* = 2N/(N-2s)$, $(-\Delta)^s$ is the fractional Laplacian operator. They studied the existence and multiplicity of entire solutions to (1.5) by using variational methods and the mountain pass theorem.

In [17], Pucci and Zhang considered the following quasilinear elliptic equations in the setting of variable exponents:

$$-\operatorname{div} A(x, \nabla u) + a(x)|u|^{p(x)-2}u = \lambda\omega(x)|u|^{q(x)-2}u - h(x)|u|^{r(x)-2}u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (1.6)$$

In fact, they obtained the existence of entire solutions of (1.6), which generalized (1.4) from the case of constant exponents p, q and r to the case of variable exponents. They also extended the previous work of Alama and Tarantello [2] from Dirichlet Laplacian problems in bounded domains of \mathbb{R}^N to the case of general variable exponent differential equation in the \mathbb{R}^N . Furthermore, they solved the two open problems proposed in [3]. Recently, Pucci et al. [16] also gave a positive answer to these open problems in the context of Kirchhoff problems involving the fractional p -Laplacian.

More recently, Xiang et al. [19] investigated the existence, nonexistence and multiplicity of nontrivial weak solutions to (1.1) depending on λ and according to the integrability of the ratio a^{q-p}/b^{r-p} by using variational methods. In fact, they extended the results of Autuori and Pucci to the fractional p -Laplacian and weakened the conditions in their paper.

Motivated by [19], in this paper we will extend the well known results on existence and multiplicity of weak solutions of (1.1). Furthermore, we would like to give some sufficient conditions under which the weak solutions of (1.1) are continuous. Finally, we correct the proofs of both [15, Lemma 10] and [16, Lemma A.6] for $1 < p < 2$.

Now we give the definition of weak solutions of problem (1.1).

Definition 1.1. We say that $u \in W$ (or $u \in W_M \subset W$) is a weak solution of problem (1.1) if

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle (-\Delta)_p^s u, \varphi \rangle + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x)|u(x)|^{p-2}u(x)\varphi(x)dx \\ &= \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} a(x)|u(x)|^{r-2}u(x)\varphi(x)dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b(x)|u(x)|^{q-2}u(x)\varphi(x)dx \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

for any $\varphi \in W$, where

$$\langle (-\Delta)_p^s u, \varphi \rangle = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^{p-2}(u(x) - u(y))(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy$$

and the solution spaces W and W_M will be introduced in Section 2.

Firstly, we shall generalize the condition and result of [19, Theorem 1.1] on problem (1.1) and prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. Suppose that the three conditions (1)-(3) are satisfied. Then there exist a universal constant $\lambda_* > 0$ and two constants λ_M and λ_M^* depending on M with $\lambda_M^* \geq \lambda_M > 0$ for each fixed $M > 0$ such that problem (1.1) has

- (i) only the trivial weak solution in W if $\lambda < \lambda_*$ when $a \in L^k(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $k > 1$ and $b \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, and only the trivial weak solution in W_M if $\lambda < \lambda_M$ when $a, b \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$;
- (ii) at least two nontrivial nonnegative weak solutions in W_M in which one has negative energy and

another has positive energy if $\lambda > \lambda_M^*$.

Remark 1.3. Since $W_M \subset W$ our result generalizes the Theorem 1.1 in [19]. And our condition (3) is new even in the regular Laplacian setting. More precisely, $L^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^* - r}}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ implies the condition (H3) in [19] is essentially $a \in L^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^* - r}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, which corresponds to the case when $a \in L^k(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $k = \frac{p_s^*}{p_s^* - r} > 1$ and $b \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ in our condition (3); in this case if $\beta = 0$ and $\gamma = \frac{(r-p)(p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p))}{(q-r)(p_s^* - p)}$, then $\frac{p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p) + \gamma(p_s^* - q)}{p_s^* - r} = \frac{q-p}{q-r} \cdot \frac{N}{ps}$ and $\gamma = \frac{r-p}{q-r} \cdot \frac{N}{ps}$, which implies the condition (H4) in [19] is a special case of our condition (3), so our condition (3) generalizes the conditions (H3) and (H4) in [19]. Moreover, our result also generalizes the nice work [2, 3] as well as the closely related ones [7, 8, 16, 17, 20], and can be extended to improve the work [9, 10, 13] etc. among many others.

Secondly, applying Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.13 in [5] we give some sufficient conditions under which some weak solutions to the problem (1.1) are continuous in \mathbb{R}^N .

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose that the three conditions (1)-(3) are satisfied and that $a(x), b(x), V(x) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ for any bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. If $q \leq p_s^*$, then any weak solution in W to problem (1.1) is continuous in \mathbb{R}^N . If $q > p_s^*$, then any weak solution in $W \cap L_{loc}^{\frac{p_s^*(q-p)}{p_s^* - p}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ to problem (1.1) is continuous in \mathbb{R}^N .*

Remark 1.5. When $q \leq p_s^*$ and $u \in W$ is a weak solution with bounded support denoted by $\text{supp}u$, this theorem follows from applying the argument of [6, Theorem 3.3] with corresponding $\Omega = \text{supp}u$, $\alpha = 0$ and $f(x, u) = \lambda a(x)|u|^{r-2}u - b(x)|u|^{q-2}u - V(x)|u|^{p-2}u$ since the condition (3.8) of [6, Theorem 3.3] holds a.e. in Ω . However, the condition (3.8) of [6, Theorem 3.3] is not applicable for our case when $q > p_s^*$ since our condition is not included in (3.8) of [6, Theorem 3.3] in this case.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we first give some basic results of fractional Sobolev spaces that will be used in the next section. Let $0 < s < 1 < p < \infty$ be real numbers and the fractional Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be defined as follows:

$$W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) = \{u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N) : [u]_{s,p}^p < \infty\}$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \left(\|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)}^p + [u]_{s,p}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where

$$[u]_{s,p} = \left(\int \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

By [12, Theorem 6.7] we know that the embedding $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow L^\nu(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is continuous for any $\nu \in [p, p_s^*]$ with a positive constant $C = C(N, p, s)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^\nu(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C \|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \quad \text{for all } u \in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N). \quad (2.1)$$

Let E denote the completion of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_E = \left([u]_{s,p}^p + \|u\|_{p,V}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \text{where } \|u\|_{p,V} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x)|u(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Now we introduce the main space W which is the completion of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with respect to the norm

$$\|u\|_W = \|u\|_E + \|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^N, b)}, \quad \text{where } \|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^N, b)} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b(x)|u|^q dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

It is proved in [19, Lemma 2.2] that W is a reflexive Banach space by using the fact that $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$ is a uniformly convex Banach space, which is proved in [15, Lemma 10] and [16, Lemma A.6]. However, there are mistakes in the proof of both lemmas when $1 < p < 2$. For instance, since

$p'/p = 1/(p-1) > 1$ when $1 < p < 2$, applying $(a+b)^p \leq 2^{p-1}(a^p + b^p)$ for all $a, b > 0$ and $p \geq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{u+v}{2} \right\|_E^{p'} + \left\| \frac{u-v}{2} \right\|_E^{p'} \\
&= \left(\left[\frac{u+v}{2} \right]_{s,p}^p + \left\| \frac{u+v}{2} \right\|_{p,V}^p \right)^{p'/p} + \left(\left[\frac{u-v}{2} \right]_{s,p}^p + \left\| \frac{u-v}{2} \right\|_{p,V}^p \right)^{p'/p} \\
&\leq 2^{\frac{1}{p-1}-1} \left(\left[\frac{u+v}{2} \right]_{s,p}^{p'} + \left\| \frac{u+v}{2} \right\|_{p,V}^{p'} + \left[\frac{u-v}{2} \right]_{s,p}^{p'} + \left\| \frac{u-v}{2} \right\|_{p,V}^{p'} \right) \\
&= 2^{\frac{1}{p-1}-1} \left\{ \left\| \left(\left| \frac{u(x)+v(x)}{2} - \frac{u(y)+v(y)}{2} \right| |x-y|^{\frac{-N-ps}{p}} \right) \right\|_{L^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2N})}^{p'} \right. \\
&\quad + \left\| \left(V(x)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left| \frac{u(x)+v(x)}{2} \right| \right) \right\|_{L^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{p'} \\
&\quad + \left\| \left(\left| \frac{u(x)-v(x)}{2} - \frac{u(y)-v(y)}{2} \right| |x-y|^{\frac{-N-ps}{p}} \right) \right\|_{L^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2N})}^{p'} \\
&\quad \left. + \left\| \left(V(x)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left| \frac{u(x)-v(x)}{2} \right| \right) \right\|_{L^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{p'} \right\}, \tag{2.2}
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the last inequality in (5.3) of [15, Lemma 10] lacks a factor $2^{\frac{1}{p-1}-1}$. Besides, in (A.4) of [16, Lemma A.6] the equality that $2^{1/(1-p)}(\|u\|_E^p + \|v\|_E^p)^{1/(p-1)} = 2^{1/(1-p)}$ should be $2^{1/(1-p)}(\|u\|_E^p + \|v\|_E^p)^{1/(p-1)} = 1$, so neither (5.3) of [15, Lemma 10] nor (A.4) of [16, Lemma A.6] can imply the uniform convexity of E . We shall give another proof by contradiction in the appendix.

From now on, B_R denotes the ball of radius R in \mathbb{R}^N that is centered at the origin, $D^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is the completion of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with respect to the norm $[u]_{s,p}$ and

$$W_M = \{u \in W : \|u\|_E \leq M\}$$

for each fixed $M > 0$.

Lemma 2.1. (See [15, Lemma 1]) *The embeddings $E \hookrightarrow W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow L^v(\mathbb{R}^N)$ are continuous with*

$$\min\{1, V_0\} \|u\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^p \leq \|u\|_E^p$$

for all $u \in W$ and $v \in [p, p_s^*]$. Moreover, for any $R > 0$ and $v \in [1, p_s^*]$, the embeddings $E \hookrightarrow L^v(B_R)$ is compact for all $m \in [1, p_s^*]$.

The following lemma is [16, Lemma 2.1], which is an application of [12, Theorem 6.5] and [12, Corollary 7.2].

Lemma 2.2. *The embeddings $W \hookrightarrow E \hookrightarrow D^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow L^{p_s^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ are continuous with $[u]_{s,p} \leq \|u\|_E$ for all $u \in E$, $\|u\|_E \leq \|u\|_W$ for all $u \in W$, and*

$$\|u\|_{L^{p_s^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq C_{p_s^*} [u]_{s,p},$$

for all $u \in D^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Moreover, for any $R > 0$, the embeddings $E \hookrightarrow L^m(B_R)$ and $W \hookrightarrow L^m(B_R)$ are compact for all $m \in [1, p_s^*]$.

Lemma 2.3. *If the three conditions (1)-(3) are satisfied, then $W \hookrightarrow L^r(\mathbb{R}^N, a)$ is compact.*

Proof. Denote

$$s_1 = \frac{\beta(p_s^* - r)}{p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p) + \gamma(p_s^* - q)}, \quad s_2 = \frac{\gamma(p_s^* - r)}{p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p) + \gamma(p_s^* - q)}$$

and

$$s_3 = \frac{r + \beta(r - p) + \gamma(r - q)}{p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p) + \gamma(p_s^* - q)}, \quad s_4 = \frac{p_s^* - r}{p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p) + \gamma(p_s^* - q)}.$$

One can check that $\sum_{i=1}^4 s_i = 1$.

If $p_s^* \geq q$, then by $\beta \geq 0$, $0 < \gamma \leq \frac{(r-p)(p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p))}{(q-r)(p_s^* - p)} < \frac{\beta(r-p) + r}{q-r}$ and condition (1) we have $s_1 \geq 0$ and $s_i > 0$ for each $i = 2, 3, 4$. So $\sum_{i=1}^4 s_i = 1$ implies $s_1 \in [0, 1)$ and $s_i \in (0, 1)$ for each $i = 2, 3, 4$.

If $p_s^* < q$, then $0 < \gamma \leq \frac{(r-p)(p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p))}{(q-r)(p_s^* - p)} < \frac{\beta(r-p) + r}{q-r} < \frac{\beta(p_s^* - p) + p_s^*}{q - p_s^*}$ and so $p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p) + \gamma(p_s^* - q) > 0$. Combining this with $\beta \geq 0$, $0 < \gamma < \frac{\beta(r-p) + r}{q-r}$ and condition (1) yields $s_1 \geq 0$ and $s_i > 0$ for each $i = 2, 3, 4$, thus $\sum_{i=1}^4 s_i = 1$ implies $s_1 \in [0, 1)$ and $s_i \in (0, 1)$ for each $i = 2, 3, 4$.

Since $ps_1 + qs_2 + p_s^*s_3 = r$, $\beta = s_1/s_4$ and $\gamma = s_2/s_4$, applying Hölder's inequality with Lemma 2.2 and condition (2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^N, a)}^r &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} a(x) |u|^r dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{r-ps_1-qs_2} \{V(x) |u|^p\}^{s_1} \{b(x) |u|^q\}^{s_2} \left\{ \frac{a(x)}{V(x)^{s_1} b(x)^{s_2}} \right\} dx \\
&\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{p_s^*} dx \right)^{s_3} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x) |u|^p dx \right)^{s_1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b(x) |u|^q dx \right)^{s_2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{V(x)^\beta b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{s_4} \\
&\leq (C_{p_s^*} [u]_{s,p})^{p_s^* s_3} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x) |u|^p dx \right)^{s_1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b(x) |u|^q dx \right)^{s_2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{V(x)^\beta b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{s_4} \\
&\leq C_1 ([u]_{s,p})^{p_s^* s_3} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x) |u|^p dx \right)^{s_1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b(x) |u|^q dx \right)^{s_2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{s_4} \quad (2.3)
\end{aligned}$$

with constant $C_1 = C_{p_s^*}^{p_s^* s_3} V_0^{-s_1} > 0$.

By $ps_1 + qs_2 + p_s^*s_3 = r$ and (2.3) we have $\|u\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^N, a)} \leq C_1^{\frac{1}{r}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{\frac{s_4}{r}} \|u\|_W$, then the embedding $W \hookrightarrow L^r(\mathbb{R}^N, a)$ is continuous. Next we will show that $W \hookrightarrow L^r(\mathbb{R}^N, a)$ is compact.

Indeed, by condition (3) for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an $R_1 > 0$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{R_1}} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx < \varepsilon^{1/s_4}$ for all $R \geq R_1$. Fix $R_1 > 0$ and let $\{u_n\}_n$ be a bounded sequence in W , then by Lemma 2.1, [12, Theorem 6.5] and [12, Corollary 7.2] as in [19, Theorem 2.1] we obtain a subsequence of $\{u_n\}_n$, which is also denoted by $\{u_n\}_n$ for convenience, satisfying $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $W \cap L^{p_s^*}$ and $a(x)|u_n - u|^r \rightarrow 0$ a.e. in B_{R_1} as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $W \cap L^{p_s^*}$, applying condition (3) and the argument of (2.3) yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{R_1}} a(x) |u_n(x) - u(x)|^r dx \leq C_1 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{R_1}} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{s_4} \|u_n - u\|_W^r \leq C_2 \varepsilon \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$\int_U a(x) |u_n(x) - u(x)|^r dx \leq C_1 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{s_4} \|u_n - u\|_W^r \leq C_3 < \infty \quad (2.5)$$

for each measurable subset $U \subset B_{R_1}$ with constants $C_2, C_3 > 0$. Then (2.5) and the Vitali convergence theorem imply

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{R_1}} a(x) |u_n(x) - u(x)|^r dx = 0.$$

Thus, for the above $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an integer $N_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{B_{R_1}} a(x) |u_n(x) - u(x)|^r dx < \varepsilon \quad (2.6)$$

for all $n \geq N_1$. Hence, using (2.4) and (2.6) obtains

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} a(x)|u_n - u|^r dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{R_1}} a(x)|u_n(x) - u(x)|^r dx + \int_{B_{R_1}} a(x)|u_n(x) - u(x)|^r dx < (C_2 + 1)\varepsilon$$

for all $n \geq N_1$, which proves $W \hookrightarrow L^r(\mathbb{R}^N, a)$ is compact. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

As in [19] for each $u \in W$ we define $I(u) = J(u) - H(u)$, whose critical points are weak solutions of problem (1.1), where

$$\begin{aligned} J(u) &= \frac{1}{p} \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{N+ps}} dx dy + \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x)|u(x)|^p dx + \frac{1}{q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b(x)|u(x)|^q dx, \\ H(u) &= \frac{\lambda}{r} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} a(x)|u(x)|^r dx. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.1. *Under the conditions (1)-(3), the function I is coercive and weakly lower semi-continuous in W_M for each constant $M > 0$.*

Proof. Let $M > 0$ be a constant. By (2.3) for each $u \in W_M$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} H(u) &= \frac{\lambda}{r} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} a(x)|u|^r dx \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda C_1}{r} \left([u]_{s,p}^p \right)^{\frac{p^* s_3}{p}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x)|u|^p dx \right)^{s_1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b(x)|u|^q dx \right)^{s_2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{s_4} \\ &\leq C_4 \|u\|_E^{p^* s_3 + ps_1} \|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^N, b)}^{qs_2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

with constant $C_4 = \frac{\lambda C_1}{r} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{s_4} > 0$. Then by $\|u\|_E \leq M$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(u) &\geq \frac{1}{p} \|u\|_E^p + \frac{1}{q} \|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^N, b)}^q - C_4 \|u\|_E^{p^* s_3 + ps_1} \|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^N, b)}^{qs_2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{q} \|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^N, b)}^q - C_4 M^{p^* s_3 + ps_1} \|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^N, b)}^{qs_2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{q} (\|u\|_W - M)^q - C_4 M^{p^* s_3 + ps_1} \|u\|_W^{qs_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

This, together with $q > qs_2$, implies I is coercive in W_M for each constant $M > 0$.

Note that $W_M \subset W$, then [19, Lemma 3.2] implies the functional J is weakly lower semi-continuous in W_M with $J \in C^1(W_M, \mathbb{R})$. Also, Lemma 2.3 implies $W_M \hookrightarrow L^r(\mathbb{R}^N, a)$ is compact, then by applying the similar argument as in [19, Lemma 3.3] one can get the functional H is weakly continuous in W_M with $H \in C^1(W_M, \mathbb{R})$. Hence, the functional I is weakly lower semi-continuous in W_M with $I \in C^1(W_M, \mathbb{R})$. \square

For each fixed $M > 0$ we define

$$\widetilde{W}_M := \{u \in W_M : \|u\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^N, a)} = 1\} \text{ and } \lambda_M^* := \inf_{u \in \widetilde{W}_M} rJ(u).$$

Applying Lemma 2.3 with a similar argument as in [19, Lemma 3.4] we have

Lemma 3.2. *Let $M > 0$ be fixed. Then $\inf_{u \in \widetilde{W}_M} J(u)$ can be achieved at some $u_M \in \widetilde{W}_M$ and $\lambda_M^* = r \cdot \inf_{u \in \widetilde{W}_M} J(u) = rJ(u_M) > 0$. Moreover, $|u_M|$ is also a minimizer of $\inf_{u \in \widetilde{W}_M} J(u)$, which means that $J(|u_M|) = J(u_M)$.*

The following theorem is the modification of the mountain pass theorem of Ambrosetti-Rabinowitz (see [4, Theorem A.3]), which will be used to prove Theorem 1.2 (ii).

Theorem 3.3. *Let $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ and $(Y, \|\cdot\|_Y)$ be two Banach spaces. Suppose X can be continuously embedded into Y . Let $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^1 functional with $\Phi(0) = 0$. Assume that there exist $\rho, \alpha > 0$*

and $e \in X$ such that $\|e\|_Y > \rho$, $\Phi(e) < \alpha$ and $\Phi(u) \geq \alpha$ for all $u \in X$ with $\|u\|_Y = \rho$. Then there exists a sequence $\{u_n\} \subset X$ such that for all n

$$c \leq \Phi(u_n) \leq c + \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Phi'(u_n)\|_{X'} \leq \frac{2}{n},$$

where

$$c = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} \Phi(\gamma(t)) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma = \{\gamma \in C([0,1]; X) : \gamma(0) = 0, \gamma(1) = e\}.$$

Now for each $e \in W \setminus \{0\}$ we find a lower bound of the functional I on the boundary of W_M with $0 < M < \|e\|_E$ to establish the next lemma, which is similar to [19, Lemma 3.5], but its proof is different.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose the conditions (1)-(3) are satisfied. Then for each $e \in W \setminus \{0\}$, there exist $\rho \in (0, \|e\|_E)$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that*

$$I(u) \geq \alpha > 0,$$

for all $u \in W$ with $\|u\|_E = \rho$.

Proof. We divide the proof of this lemma into two cases as follows.

Case 1 If $\beta \in [0, \infty)$ and $\gamma \in \left(0, \frac{(r-p)(p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p))}{(q-r)(p_s^* - p)}\right)$ when $a, b \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, by (2.3) and (3.1) for each $u \in W$ we have

$$I(u) \geq \frac{1}{p} \|u\|_E^p + \frac{1}{q} \|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^N, b)}^q - C_4 \left([u]_{s,p}^p\right)^{\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p}} \left(\|u\|_{p,V}^p\right)^{s_1} \|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^N, b)}^{qs_2}. \quad (3.3)$$

Denote $\rho = \|u\|_E$ and $x = [u]_{s,p}^p$, then $\|u\|_{p,V}^p = \rho^p - x$ and direct computation yields

$$\left([u]_{s,p}^p\right)^{\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p}} \left(\|u\|_{p,V}^p\right)^{s_1} = x^{\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p}} (\rho^p - x)^{s_1} \leq x_0^{\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p}} (\rho^p - x_0)^{s_1} = C_5 (\rho^p)^{\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p} + s_1} \quad (3.4)$$

with $x_0 = \frac{p_s^* s_3 \rho^p}{p_s^* s_3 + p s_1}$ and $C_5 = \left(\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p_s^* s_3 + p s_1}\right)^{\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p}} \left(\frac{p s_1}{p_s^* s_3 + p s_1}\right)^{s_1}$.

Applying (3.3) and (3.4) with $y = \|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^N, b)}^q$ and $C_6 = C_4 C_5$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(u) &\geq \frac{1}{p} \rho^p + \frac{1}{q} y - C_6 (\rho^p)^{\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p} + s_1} y^{s_2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{p} \rho^p + \frac{1}{q} y_0 - C_6 (\rho^p)^{\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p} + s_1} y_0^{s_2} \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \rho^p - C_7 (\rho^p)^{\frac{1}{1-s_2} \left(\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p} + s_1\right)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where $y_0 = \left(C_6 q s_2 (\rho^p)^{\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p} + s_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-s_2}}$ and $C_7 = (1-s_2) C_6^{\frac{1}{1-s_2}} (q s_2)^{\frac{s_2}{1-s_2}}$.

Note that $\gamma \in \left(0, \frac{(r-p)(p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p))}{(q-r)(p_s^* - p)}\right)$ implies $\frac{1}{1-s_2} \left(\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p} + s_1\right) > 1$, then by (3.5) for each $e \in W \setminus \{0\}$ there exists $0 < \rho < \min \left\{ \|e\|_E, \left(p C_7\right)^{-1 / \left[\frac{p}{1-s_2} \left(\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p} + s_1\right) - p\right]} \right\}$ such that

$$I(u) \geq \rho^p \left(\frac{1}{p} - C_7 \rho^{\frac{p}{1-s_2} \left(\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p} + s_1\right) - p}\right) =: \alpha > 0.$$

Case 2 If $\beta \in [0, \infty)$ and $\gamma = \frac{(r-p)(p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p))}{(q-r)(p_s^* - p)}$ when $a \in L^k(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $k > 1$ and $b \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we can take sufficiently small $t_5 \in (0, 1/k)$, $t_4 = s_4(1 - k t_5)$, $t_3 = \frac{1}{p_s^* - p} [(p + p\gamma - q\gamma)t_4 + p t_5 + (r-p)]$, $t_2 = \gamma t_4$ and $t_1 = 1 - t_3 - (1 + \gamma)t_4 - t_5$ satisfying $p t_1 + q t_2 + p_s^* t_3 = r$ and $\sum_{i=1}^5 t_i = 1$ with $t_i > 0$, and use the same argument as in (2.3) to obtain

$$\|u\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^N, a)}^r \leq C_8 ([u]_{s,p})^{p_s^* t_3} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x) |u|^p dx\right)^{t_1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b(x) |u|^q dx\right)^{t_2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx\right)^{t_4}$$

with constant $C_8 = C_{p_s^*}^{p_s^* t_3} V_0^{-t_1} \|a\|_{L^k(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{t_5} > 0$. In this case it can be checked that

$$\frac{1}{1-t_2} \left(\frac{p_s^* t_3}{p} + t_1 \right) > \frac{1}{1-s_2} \left(\frac{p_s^* s_3}{p} + s_1 \right) = 1,$$

then applying the argument of Case 1 yields that

$$I(u) \geq \rho^p \left(\frac{1}{p} - C_9 \rho^{\frac{p}{1-t_2} \left(\frac{p_s^* t_3}{p} + t_1 \right) - p} \right) =: \alpha > 0$$

for all $u \in W$ with $\|u\|_E = \rho \in \left(0, \min \left\{ \|e\|_E, \left(p C_9 \right)^{-1 / \left[\frac{p}{1-t_2} \left(\frac{p_s^* t_3}{p} + t_1 \right) - p \right]} \right\} \right)$, where $C_9 > 0$ is a constant. \square

Now we first give the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. (i) Suppose $u \neq 0$ is a nontrivial weak solution of problem (1.1). Since condition (1) implies $\frac{\gamma(r-qs_2)}{\gamma(1-s_2)-s_2} \in [p, p_s^*]$ and condition (3) implies $\frac{r-qs_2}{1-s_2} \in (0, p]$, taking $\varphi = u$ in Definition 1.1 and applying Hölder's inequality with inequality (2.1), Lemma 2.1 and [19, inequality(3.1)] we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_E^p &= \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} a(x)|u(x)|^r dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b(x)|u(x)|^q dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\lambda a(x)|u|^{\frac{(q-r)s_2}{1-s_2}} - b(x)|u|^{\frac{q-r}{1-s_2}} \right) |u|^{\frac{r-qs_2}{1-s_2}} dx \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \lambda^{\frac{1}{1-s_2}} \left(\frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{1-s_2}}}{b(x)^{\frac{s_2}{1-s_2}}} \right) |u|^{\frac{r-qs_2}{1-s_2}} dx \\ &\leq \lambda^{\frac{1}{1-s_2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{\frac{s_2}{\gamma(1-s_2)}} \|u\|_{L^{\frac{\gamma(r-qs_2)}{\gamma(1-s_2)-s_2}}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\frac{r-qs_2}{1-s_2}} \\ &\leq \lambda^{\frac{1}{1-s_2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{\frac{s_2}{\gamma(1-s_2)}} \left((\min\{1, V_0\})^{-\frac{1}{p}} C \|u\|_E \right)^{\frac{r-qs_2}{1-s_2}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

with the same constants s_2 and s_4 as in (2.3).

Case 1 If u is a nontrivial weak solution in W when $a \in L^k(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $k > 1$ and $b \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then $\gamma = \frac{(r-p)(p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p))}{(q-r)(p_s^* - p)}$ implies $\frac{r-qs_2}{1-s_2} = p$. By (3.6) we have

$$\lambda \geq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{-\frac{s_2}{\gamma}} \left((\min\{1, V_0\})^{-\frac{1}{p}} C \right)^{-p(1-s_2)} =: \lambda_*.$$

So problem (1.1) has only the trivial weak solution in W if $\lambda < \lambda_*$ when $a \in L^k(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $k > 1$ and $b \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Case 2 Let $M > 0$ be fixed. If u is a nontrivial weak solution in W_M when $a, b \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then $\gamma \in \left(0, \frac{(r-p)(p_s^* + \beta(p_s^* - p))}{(q-r)(p_s^* - p)} \right)$ implies $\frac{r-qs_2}{1-s_2} > p$. By (3.6) and $\|u\|_E \leq M$ we have

$$\lambda \geq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{-\frac{s_2}{\gamma}} \left((\min\{1, V_0\})^{-\frac{1}{p}} C \right)^{qs_2-r} M^{(p-q)s_2+p-r} =: \lambda_M.$$

So problem (1.1) has only the trivial weak solution in W_M if $\lambda < \lambda_M$ when $a, b \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

(ii) Let $M > 0$ be an arbitrary constant and λ_M^* be the same as in Lemma 3.2. Recall that W is a reflexive Banach space, it can be checked that W_M is a closed and convex subset of W , then W_M is a weakly closed subset of W and also a reflexive Banach subspace of W . Since Lemma 3.1 and 3.4 imply the functional I is weakly lower semi-continuous, bounded below and coercive in W_M for all $\lambda > 0$, by [18, Theorem 1.2] there exists a $u_M^* \in W_M$ such that $I(u_M^*) = \inf_{u \in W_M} I(u)$. When $\lambda > \lambda_M^*$, applying Lemma 3.2 and similar argument of [19, Theorem 3.1] yields $I(u_M^*) < 0$.

Taking $e = u_M^*$ in Lemma 3.4 we can check that the functional I satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.3. Then for all $\lambda > \lambda_M^*$ by Theorem 3.3 there is a sequence $\{u_{n,M}\}_{n \geq 1} \subset W_M$ such that

$$I(u_{n,M}) \rightarrow c_M \quad \text{and} \quad \|I'(u_{n,M})\|_{W_M'} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where

$$c_M = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} I(\gamma(t)) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma = \{\gamma \in C([0,1]; W_M) : \gamma(0) = 0, \gamma(1) = u_M^*\}.$$

So coerciveness of the functional I in W_M and reflexivity of W_M imply $\{u_{n,M}\}_{n \geq 1}$ has a subsequence, which is also denoted by $\{u_{n,M}\}$ for convenience, such that $u_{n,M} \rightharpoonup u_M$ weakly in W_M and thus $u_{n,M} \rightarrow u_M$ strongly in $L^r(\mathbb{R}^N, a)$ by Lemma 2.3. By the similar proof of [19, Theorem 3.3] we obtain $I(u_M) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(u_{n,M}) = c_M > 0$.

Moreover, using the similar argument of [19, Corollary 3.4] with Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 we can show that problem (1.1) has at least two nontrivial nonnegative weak solutions in W_M in which one has negative energy and another has positive energy if $\lambda > \lambda_M^*$. So Theorem 1.2 is proved.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

Proof. Suppose that the three conditions (1)-(3) are satisfied and that $a(x), b(x), V(x) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ for any bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. Let $u \in W$ be a weak solution of problem (1.1) and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded domain. Define $\tilde{u}(x) := u(x)$ for each $x \in \Omega$ and $\tilde{u}(x) := 0$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$. Then $(-\Delta)_p^s \tilde{u} = f(x, \tilde{u})$ for each $x \in \Omega$ with $f(x, \tilde{u}) = \lambda a(x) |\tilde{u}|^{r-2} \tilde{u} - b(x) |\tilde{u}|^{q-2} \tilde{u} - V(x) |\tilde{u}|^{p-2} \tilde{u}$ and $\|\tilde{u}\|_W \leq \|u\|_W < \infty$.

Given $k > 0$, $\mu \geq 1$ and $\nu > 0$, define $g_{\mu,\nu}(t) := t^\mu (t_k)^\nu$ with $t_k = \min\{t, k\}$ for all $t \geq 0$. We claim that

$$G_{\mu,\nu}(t) := \int_0^t (g'_{\mu,\nu}(\tau))^{\frac{1}{p}} d\tau \geq \frac{p(\mu+\nu)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\mu+\nu+p-1} g_{\frac{\mu+p-1}{p}, \frac{\nu}{p}}(t). \quad (4.1)$$

Indeed, if $t \leq k$, then $g_{\mu,\nu}(t) = t^{\mu+\nu}$ and so

$$G_{\mu,\nu}(t) = \int_0^t ((\mu+\nu)\tau^{\mu+\nu-1})^{\frac{1}{p}} d\tau = \frac{p(\mu+\nu)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\mu+\nu+p-1} t^{\frac{\mu+\nu+p-1}{p}} = \frac{p(\mu+\nu)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\mu+\nu+p-1} g_{\frac{\mu+p-1}{p}, \frac{\nu}{p}}(t).$$

If $t > k$, then

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\mu,\nu}(t) &= \int_0^k ((\mu+\nu)\tau^{\mu+\nu-1})^{\frac{1}{p}} d\tau + \int_k^t k^{\frac{\nu}{p}} (\mu t^{\mu-1})^{\frac{1}{p}} d\tau \\ &= \frac{p(\mu+\nu)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\mu+\nu+p-1} k^{\frac{\mu+\nu+p-1}{p}} + k^{\frac{\nu}{p}} \frac{p\mu^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\mu+p-1} (t^{\frac{\mu+p-1}{p}} - k^{\frac{\mu+p-1}{p}}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu \geq 1, \nu > 0$ and $p \geq 1$ one can check that $(\mu+\nu)(\mu+p-1)^p \leq \mu(\mu+\nu+p-1)^p$, which implies $\frac{\mu+p-1}{\mu+\nu+p-1} \leq \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\nu}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$. Therefore,

$$G_{\mu,\nu}(t) \geq \frac{p(\mu+\nu)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\mu+\nu+p-1} k^{\frac{\nu}{p}} t^{\frac{\mu+p-1}{p}} = \frac{p(\mu+\nu)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\mu+\nu+p-1} g_{\frac{\mu+p-1}{p}, \frac{\nu}{p}}(t)$$

if $t > k$. So the claim (4.1) follows.

Now by [5, Lemma A.2] we have

$$\begin{aligned} & [G_{\mu,\nu}(\tilde{u})]_{s,p}^p \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|G_{\mu,\nu}(\tilde{u})(x) - G_{\mu,\nu}(\tilde{u})(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|\tilde{u}(x) - \tilde{u}(y)|^{p-2} |(\tilde{u}(x) - \tilde{u}(y))(g_{\mu,\nu}(\tilde{u})(x) - g_{\mu,\nu}(\tilde{u})(y))|}{|x-y|^{N+ps}} dx dy \\ &= \langle (-\Delta)_p^s(\tilde{u}), g_{\mu,\nu}(\tilde{u}) \rangle \\ &= \langle f(x, \tilde{u}), g_{\mu,\nu}(\tilde{u}) \rangle \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \lambda a(x) |\tilde{u}|^{r+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^\nu dx + \int_{\Omega} V(x) |\tilde{u}|^{p+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^\nu dx + \int_{\Omega} b(x) |\tilde{u}|^{q+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^\nu dx. \quad (4.2) \end{aligned}$$

Applying [11, Theorem 1] or [12, Theorem 6.5] with (4.1) and (4.2) obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{p(\mu + \nu)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\mu + \nu + p - 1} \right)^{p_s^*} |g_{\frac{\mu+p-1}{p}, \frac{\nu}{p}}(\tilde{u})|^{p_s^*} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \\
& \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} |G_{\mu, \nu}(\tilde{u})|^{p_s^*} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \\
& \leq \tilde{C} [G_{\mu, \nu}(\tilde{u})]_{s, p}^p \\
& \leq \tilde{C} \left(\int_{\Omega} \lambda a(x) |\tilde{u}|^{r+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx + \int_{\Omega} V(x) |\tilde{u}|^{p+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx + \int_{\Omega} b(x) |\tilde{u}|^{q+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx \right), \quad (4.3)
\end{aligned}$$

where \tilde{C} depends only on N, p and s , which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\int_{\Omega} |\tilde{u}|^{\frac{(\mu+p-1)p_s^*}{p}} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\frac{\nu p_s^*}{p}} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \\
& \leq C_0 \left(\int_{\Omega} \lambda a(x) |\tilde{u}|^{r+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx + \int_{\Omega} V(x) |\tilde{u}|^{p+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx + \int_{\Omega} b(x) |\tilde{u}|^{q+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx \right) \quad (4.4)
\end{aligned}$$

with $C_0 = \frac{(\mu + \nu + p - 1)^p}{p^p(\mu + \nu)} \tilde{C} > 0$.

Since $[\tilde{u}]_{s, p} \leq \|\tilde{u}\|_W < \infty$, again by [11, Theorem 1] or [12, Theorem 6.5] we get $\tilde{u} \in L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)$, and then by $1 < p < r < \min\{q, p_s^*\}$ we have $\tilde{u} \in L^{q+\mu-1}(\Omega) \subset L^{r+\mu-1}(\Omega) \subset L^{p+\mu-1}(\Omega)$ if $1 \leq \mu \leq 1 + p_s^* - \min\{q, p_s^*\}$. Thus, for each $1 \leq \mu \leq 1 + p_s^* - \min\{q, p_s^*\}$ there must exist a positive number $K_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} |\tilde{u}|^{p+\mu-1} dx & \leq \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} |\tilde{u}|^{r+\mu-1} dx \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} |\tilde{u}|^{q+\mu-1} dx \\
& \leq \left(4C_0 (\lambda \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|V\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) \right)^{\frac{p_s^*}{p-p_s^*}}, \quad (4.5)
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with Hölder's inequality and (2.3), implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \lambda a(x) |\tilde{u}|^{r+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx \\
& = \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} \lambda a(x) |\tilde{u}|^{r+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx + \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| < K_0\}} \lambda a(x) |\tilde{u}|^{r+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx \\
& \leq \lambda \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} |\tilde{u}|^{r+\mu-1} dx \right)^{1-\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} |\tilde{u}|^{r+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\frac{\nu p_s^*}{p}} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \\
& \quad + K_0^{\mu+\nu-1} \lambda \int_{\Omega} a(x) |\tilde{u}|^r dx \\
& \leq \frac{1}{4C_0} \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} |\tilde{u}|^{r+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\frac{\nu p_s^*}{p}} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} + K_0^{\mu+\nu-1} \lambda C_1 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^\gamma} dx \right)^{s_4} \|u\|_W^r \quad (4.6)
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} V(x) |\tilde{u}|^{p+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx \\
& = \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} V(x) |\tilde{u}|^{p+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx + \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| < K_0\}} V(x) |\tilde{u}|^{p+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx \\
& \leq \|V\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} |\tilde{u}|^{p+\mu-1} dx \right)^{1-\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} |\tilde{u}|^{p+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\frac{\nu p_s^*}{p}} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \\
& \quad + K_0^{\mu+\nu-1} \int_{\Omega} V(x) |\tilde{u}|^p dx \\
& \leq \frac{1}{4C_0} \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} |\tilde{u}|^{p+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\frac{\nu p_s^*}{p}} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} + K_0^{\mu+\nu-1} \|u\|_W^p \quad (4.7)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} b(x) |\tilde{u}|^{q+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} b(x) |\tilde{u}|^{q+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx + \int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| < K_0\}} b(x) |\tilde{u}|^{q+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\nu} dx \\
&\leq \|b\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} |\tilde{u}|^{q+\mu-1} dx \right)^{1-\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} |\tilde{u}|^{q+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\frac{\nu p_s^*}{p}} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \\
&\quad + K_0^{\mu+\nu-1} \int_{\Omega} b(x) |\tilde{u}|^q dx \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4C_0} \left(\int_{\Omega \cap \{|\tilde{u}| \geq K_0\}} |\tilde{u}|^{q+\mu-1} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\frac{\nu p_s^*}{p}} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} + K_0^{\mu+\nu-1} \|u\|_W^q. \tag{4.8}
\end{aligned}$$

Next we consider the following two cases to check that $f(x, \tilde{u}) \in L^{\tilde{q}}(\Omega)$ for $\tilde{q} > \frac{N}{ps}$.

Case 1 If $q \leq p_s^*$, we take $\mu = 1 + p_s^* - q$ such that $p + \mu - 1 < r + \mu - 1 < q + \mu - 1 \leq \frac{(\mu + p - 1)p_s^*}{p}$.

Combining (4.4) and (4.6)-(4.8) yields

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} |\tilde{u}|^{\frac{(\mu+p-1)p_s^*}{p}} |\tilde{u}_k|^{\frac{\nu p_s^*}{p}} dx \right)^{\frac{p}{p_s^*}} \leq 4C_0 K_0^{p_s^*-q+\nu} \left(\lambda C_1 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{a(x)^{\frac{1}{s_4}}}{b(x)^{\gamma}} dx \right)^{s_4} \|u\|_W^r + \|u\|_W^p + \|u\|_W^q \right)$$

and then letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ obtains

$$\int_{\Omega} |\tilde{u}|^{\frac{(\mu+\nu+p-1)p_s^*}{p}} dx < \infty \tag{4.9}$$

for all $\nu > 0$. Recall that $1 < p < r < q \leq p_s^*$ and $f(x, \tilde{u}) = \lambda a(x) |\tilde{u}|^{r-2} \tilde{u} - b(x) |\tilde{u}|^{q-2} \tilde{u} - V(x) |\tilde{u}|^{p-2} \tilde{u}$. Since $\mu + \nu + p - 1 = p_s^* - q + \nu + p > p$, it can be easily verified that $f(x, \tilde{u}) \in L^{\tilde{q}}(\Omega)$ for $\tilde{q} > \frac{N}{ps}$ by substituting some proper values of ν into (4.9).

Case 2 If $q > p_s^*$, we take $\mu = 1 + \frac{p(q - p_s^*)}{p_s^* - p}$ such that

$$p + \mu - 1 < r + \mu - 1 < q + \mu - 1 = \frac{p_s^*(q - p)}{p_s^* - p} = \frac{(\mu + p - 1)p_s^*}{p}.$$

Using the assumption that $u \in W \cap L_{loc}^{\frac{p_s^*(q-p)}{p_s^*-p}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and repeating the argument of (4.5)-(4.8) we can also get the same result (4.9) and thus $f(x, \tilde{u}) \in L^{\tilde{q}}(\Omega)$ for $\tilde{q} > \frac{N}{ps}$.

Therefore, by the arbitrariness of Ω we can deduce from [5, Theorem 3.1] and [5, Theorem 3.13] that any weak solution in W to problem (1.1) is continuous in \mathbb{R}^N if $q \leq p_s^*$, and that any weak solution in $W \cap L_{loc}^{\frac{p_s^*(q-p)}{p_s^*-p}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ to problem (1.1) is continuous in \mathbb{R}^N if $q > p_s^*$, which proves Theorem 1.4. \square

5. APPENDIX

Now we correct the proofs of both [15, Lemma 10] and [16, Lemma A.6] for $1 < p < 2$.

Lemma 5.1. *The set $E = (E, \|\cdot\|_E)$ is a uniformly convex Banach space.*

Proof. Since it has been proved in [15, Lemma 10] and [16, Lemma A.6] that E is a Banach space for $p > 1$ and E is uniformly convex when $p \geq 2$, we only need to show that E is uniformly convex when $1 < p < 2$. Recall that $\|u\|_E = \left([u]_{s,p}^p + \|u\|_{p,V}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ and denote

$$W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) = \{u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N) : [u]_{s,p} < \infty\},$$

$$L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, V) = \{u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N) : \|u\|_{p,V} < \infty\}.$$

We first show that both $(W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N), [\cdot]_{s,p})$ and $(L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, V), \|\cdot\|_{p,V})$ are uniformly convex.

Since $1 < p < 2$, by [1, Lemma 2.13] and [1, Lemma 2.37] for any $u, v \in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\frac{u+v}{2} \right]_{s,p}^{p'} + \left[\frac{u-v}{2} \right]_{s,p}^{p'} \\
&= \left\| \left(\left| \frac{u(x)+v(x)}{2} - \frac{u(y)+v(y)}{2} \right| |x-y|^{\frac{-N-ps}{p}} \right)^{p'} \right\|_{L^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2N})} \\
&\quad + \left\| \left(\left| \frac{u(x)-v(x)}{2} - \frac{u(y)-v(y)}{2} \right| |x-y|^{\frac{-N-ps}{p}} \right)^{p'} \right\|_{L^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2N})} \\
&\leq \left\| |x-y|^{\frac{-N-ps}{p-1}} \left(\left| \frac{u(x)+v(x)}{2} - \frac{u(y)+v(y)}{2} \right|^{p'} + \left| \frac{u(x)-v(x)}{2} - \frac{u(y)-v(y)}{2} \right|^{p'} \right) \right\|_{L^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2N})} \\
&\leq \left\| |x-y|^{\frac{-N-ps}{p-1}} \left(\frac{1}{2} |u(x)-u(y)|^p + \frac{1}{2} |v(x)-v(y)|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \right\|_{L^{p-1}(\mathbb{R}^{2N})} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{2} [u]_{s,p}^p + \frac{1}{2} [v]_{s,p}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}. \tag{5.1}
\end{aligned}$$

So for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 2]$, by (5.1) there exists $\delta_1 = 1 - (1 - (\varepsilon/2)^{p'})^{1/p'} > 0$ such that if $[u]_{s,p} = [v]_{s,p} = 1$ and $[u-v]_{s,p} \geq \varepsilon$, then $\left[\frac{u+v}{2} \right]_{s,p} \leq 1 - \delta_1$, which implies $(W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N), [\cdot]_{s,p})$ is uniformly convex. Similarly, it can be proved that $(L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, V), \|\cdot\|_{p,V})$ is also uniformly convex by repeating the above argument.

Now for any given $\varepsilon \in (0, 2]$ we take $u, v \in E$ with $\|u\|_E = \|v\|_E = 1$ and $\|u-v\|_E \geq \varepsilon$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& [u]_{s,p}^p + \|u\|_{p,V}^p = \|u\|_E^p = 1, \\
& [v]_{s,p}^p + \|v\|_{p,V}^p = \|v\|_E^p = 1, \\
& [u-v]_{s,p}^p + \|u-v\|_{p,V}^p = \|u-v\|_E^p \geq \varepsilon^p.
\end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that $[u-v]_{s,p}^p \geq \varepsilon^p/2$, that is, $[u-v]_{s,p} \geq \varepsilon/2^{1/p}$. Next we show by contradiction that there exists $\delta_2 > 0$ depending on ε such that

$$\left[\frac{u+v}{2} \right]_{s,p}^p \leq \frac{1-\delta_2}{2} ([u]_{s,p}^p + [v]_{s,p}^p). \tag{5.2}$$

Note that $[u]_{s,p} \leq 1$ and $[v]_{s,p} \leq 1$ we have two cases for the proof of (5.2) as follows.

Case 1 When $[u]_{s,p} = 1$ and $[v]_{s,p} \leq 1$, suppose that (5.2) is false, then there must exist an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and two sequences $\{u_k\}$ and $\{v_k\}$ in E with $[u_k]_{s,p} = 1$, $[v_k]_{s,p} \leq 1$ and $[u_k - v_k]_{s,p} \geq \varepsilon_0/2^{1/p}$ such that

$$\left[\frac{u_k + v_k}{2} \right]_{s,p}^p \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k} \right) ([u_k]_{s,p}^p + [v_k]_{s,p}^p). \tag{5.3}$$

We claim that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [v_k]_{s,p} = 1$. Otherwise, one can take a subsequence $\{v_{k_i}\} \subset \{v_k\}$ such that $[v_{k_i}]_{s,p} \leq A < 1$, and apply triangle inequality to obtain

$$\left[\frac{u_{k_i} + v_{k_i}}{2} \right]_{s,p}^p \leq \frac{1}{2^p} (1 + [v_{k_i}]_{s,p})^p \leq \frac{[u_{k_i}]_{s,p}^p + [v_{k_i}]_{s,p}^p}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{1+A}{2} \right)^p / \left(\frac{1+A^p}{2} \right), \tag{5.4}$$

which contradicts (5.3) since $\left(\frac{1+A}{2} \right)^p / \left(\frac{1+A^p}{2} \right) < 1$, so the claim holds.

Denote $w_k = \frac{v_k}{[v_k]_{s,p}}$, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [v_k - w_k]_{s,p} = 0$. This, together with (5.3) and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [v_k]_{s,p} = 1$, yields

$$1 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{u_k + v_k}{2} \right]_{s,p} \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{u_k + w_k}{2} \right]_{s,p} \leq 1,$$

and thus $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{u_k + w_k}{2} \right]_{s,p} = 1$. However, by $[u_k - v_k]_{s,p} \geq \varepsilon_0/2^{1/p}$ for all $k \geq 1$ we can get an integer k_0 such that $[u_k - w_k]_{s,p} \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2^{1+1/p}}$ for each $k \geq k_0$, and thus $\left[\frac{u_k + w_k}{2} \right]_{s,p} \leq 1 - \delta_3$ by definition of uniform convexity, where $\delta_3 > 0$ depends on ε_0 , which is a contradiction to $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{u_k + w_k}{2} \right]_{s,p} = 1$. Hence, (5.2) follows.

Case 2 When $[u]_{s,p} \leq 1$ and $[v]_{s,p} \leq 1$, without loss of generality we may assume $[u]_{s,p} \geq [v]_{s,p} > 0$. Denote $\tilde{u} = \frac{u}{[u]_{s,p}}$, $\tilde{v} = \frac{v}{[v]_{s,p}}$, then $[\tilde{u}]_{s,p} = 1$, $[\tilde{v}]_{s,p} \leq 1$ and $[\tilde{u} - \tilde{v}]_{s,p} \geq \varepsilon/2^{1/p}$ in

that $[u - v]_{s,p} \geq \varepsilon/2^{1/p}$ for the above ε . By the result of Case 1 the inequality (5.2) holds for \tilde{u} and \tilde{v} , and so (5.2) follows for u and v .

Therefore, noting $\frac{[u]_{s,p}^p + [v]_{s,p}^p}{2} \geq \left[\frac{u-v}{2}\right]_{s,p}^p \geq \frac{\varepsilon^p}{2^{p+1}}$ and applying (5.2) with $(a+b)^p \leq 2^{p-1}(a^p + b^p)$ for all $a, b > 0$ and $p \geq 1$ obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{u+v}{2} \right\|_E &= \left(\left[\frac{u+v}{2} \right]_{s,p}^p + \left\| \frac{u+v}{2} \right\|_{p,V}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left((1-\delta_2) \frac{[u]_{s,p}^p + [v]_{s,p}^p}{2} + \frac{\|u\|_{p,V}^p + \|v\|_{p,V}^p}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(1 - \delta_2 \frac{\varepsilon^p}{2^{p+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &=: 1 - \delta \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

with $\delta = 1 - \left(1 - \delta_2 \frac{\varepsilon^p}{2^{p+1}} \right)^{1/p} > 0$, which proves E is uniformly convex when $1 < p < 2$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] R.A. Adams and J.J. Fournier. Sobolev Spaces, 2nd edn. Academic Press, New York, 2003
- [2] S. Alama and G. Tarantello. Elliptic problems with nonlinearities indefinite in sign. *J. Funct. Anal.* 141 (1996), 159-215.
- [3] G. Autuori and P. Pucci. Elliptic problems involving the fractional Laplacian in \mathbb{R}^N . *J. Differential Equations* 255 (2013), 2340-2362.
- [4] G. Autuori and P. Pucci, Existence of entire solutions for a class of quasilinear elliptic equations. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential equations Appl.* 20 (2013), 977-1009.
- [5] L. Brasco and E. Parini. The second eigenvalue of the fractional p -Laplacian. *Adv. Calc. Var.* 9 (2016), 323-355.
- [6] W. Chen, S. Mosconi and M. Squassina. Nonlocal problems with critical Hardy nonlinearity. *J. Funct. Anal.* 275 (2018), 3065-3114.
- [7] Q. Han. Compact Sobolev embeddings and positive solutions to a quasilinear equation with mixed nonlinearities. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 481 (2020), Article 123150.
- [8] Q. Han. Elliptic variational problems with mixed nonlinearities. Appearing in *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* DOI:10.1002/mma.5993
- [9] H. Jin and W. Liu. Fractional Kirchhoff equation with a general critical nonlinearity. *Appl. Math. Lett.* 74 (2017), 140-146.
- [10] Q. Li and X. Wu. Soliton solutions for fractional Schrödinger equations. *Appl. Math. Lett.* 53 (2016), 119-124.
- [11] V. Maz'ya and T. Shaposhnikova. On the Bourgain, Brezis, and Mironescu theorem concerning limiting embeddings of fractional Sobolev spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.* 195 (2002), 230-238.
- [12] E. Di Nezza, G. Palatucci, and E. Valdinoci. Hitchhiker's guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces. *Bull. Sci. Math.* 136 (2012), 521-573.
- [13] L. Qiao. Weak solutions for the stationary Schrödinger equation and its application. *Appl. Math. Lett.* 63 (2017), 34-39.
- [14] P. Pucci and V. Rădulescu, Combined effects in quasilinear elliptic problems with lack of compactness, *Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.* 22 (2011), 189-205.
- [15] P. Pucci, M. Xiang, and B. Zhang. Multiple solutions for nonhomogeneous Schrödinger-Kirchhoff type equations involving the fractional p -Laplacian in \mathbb{R}^N . *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 54 (2015), 2785-2806.
- [16] P. Pucci, M. Xiang, and B. Zhang. Existence and multiplicity of entire solutions for fractional p -Kirchhoff equations. *Adv. Nonlinear Anal.* 5 (2016), 27-55.
- [17] P. Pucci and Q. Zhang. Existence of entire solutions for a class of variable exponent elliptic equations. *J. Differential Equations* 257 (2014), 1529-1566.
- [18] M. Struwe. Variational Methods: Applications to Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations and Hamilton Systems (Fourth Edition). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.
- [19] M. Xiang, B. Zhang, and V.D. Rădulescu. Existence of solutions for perturbed fractional p -Laplacian equations. *J. Differential Equations* 260 (2016), 1392-1413.
- [20] M. Xiang, B. Zhang, and V.D. Rădulescu. Superlinear Schrödinger-Kirchhoff type problems involving the fractional p -Laplacian and critical exponent. *Adv. Nonlinear Anal.* 9 (2020), 690-709.

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, CHONGQING UNIVERSITY OF POSTS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS,
CHONGQING 400065, P.R. CHINA *Email:* weichensdu@126.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY,
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78224, USA *Email:* qhan@tamusa.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY,
HANGZHOU 310023, ZHEJIANG, P.R. CHINA *Email:* zhangp@zjut.edu.cn