

# Critical growth double phase problems\*

**Francesca Colasuonno**

Dipartimento di Matematica

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna

Piazza di Porta San Donato 5, 40126 Bologna, Italy

*francesca.colasuonno@unibo.it*

**Kanishka Perera**

Department of Mathematical Sciences

Florida Institute of Technology

150 W University Blvd, Melbourne, FL 32901, USA

*kperera@fit.edu*

## Abstract

We study Brezis-Nirenberg type Dirichlet problems governed by the double phase operator  $-\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u + a(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u)$  and involving a critical nonlinear term of the form  $|u|^{p^*-2}u + b(x)|u|^{q^*-2}u$ . We prove new compactness and existence results in Musielak-Orlicz Sobolev spaces via variational techniques. The paper is complemented with nonexistence results of Pohožaev type.

---

\*F.C. was partially supported by the INdAM-GNAMPA Projects 2022 “Studi asintotici in problemi parabolici ed ellittici” CUP-E55F22000270001 and 2023 “Interplay between parabolic and elliptic PDEs” CUP\_E53C22001930001, and by the MSCA funded GHAIA (Geometric and Harmonic Analysis with Interdisciplinary Applications, Grant no. 777822) project. F.C. acknowledges also the support of the Department of Mathematics - Florida Institute of Technology for her visits in Melbourne, where parts of this work have been achieved.

*MSC2010:* Primary 35J92, Secondary 35B33

*Key Words and Phrases:* Double phase operator; Brezis-Nirenberg type critical problem; Musielak-Orlicz Sobolev spaces; Variational methods; Existence results.

# 1 Introduction

Problems involving the double phase operator

$$\mathcal{D}_a u := -\operatorname{div} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u + a(x) |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u)$$

have been extensively studied starting with the work of Zhikov on strongly anisotropic materials (see [24, 25, 26] and the monograph [20]). The associated energy integral

$$\int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{1}{p} |\nabla u|^p + \frac{a(x)}{q} |\nabla u|^q \right] dx$$

belongs to a class of functionals with non-standard growth conditions introduced by Marcellini in [21, 22, 10]. In [20], this energy also appears in the context of homogenization and elasticity, where the weight  $a(x)$  drives the geometry of a composite of two different materials with hardening powers  $p$  and  $q$ . A regularity theory for minimizers of such energy functionals was recently developed by the school of Mingione (see [4, 3, 5, 9, 8]).

In the present paper we consider the double phase problem

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u + a(x) |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) = f(x, u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $N \geq 2$  is a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary  $\partial\Omega$ ,  $1 < p < q < N$ ,  $q/p < 1 + 1/N$ ,  $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  is a nonnegative and locally Lipschitz continuous function, and  $f$  is a Carathéodory function on  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ . Our goal here is to obtain nontrivial weak solutions of problem (1.1) when the nonlinearity  $f$  has critical growth as in (1.2) below. Unlike in the classical Brezis-Nirenberg problem, a threshold for compactness for the energy functional associated with problem (1.1) cannot be found in a closed form (see Proposition 1.6 below). Moreover, there is no closed form formula for the maximum energy on a ray starting from the origin, which makes it rather delicate to show that the mountain pass level is below the compactness threshold. These new difficulties that problem (1.1) presents are due to the inhomogeneity of the double phase operator.

We set problem (1.1) in the Musielak-Orlicz Sobolev space  $W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ , where  $\mathcal{A}(x, t) := t^p + a(x) t^q$  for  $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, \infty)$  is the generalized  $\Phi$ -function (cf. Definition 2.1 below). The critical growth for these spaces is not yet completely understood; we refer to the end of Section 2 for some comments on the topic. The choice of the nonlinearity  $f$  in the present paper relies on the results of Fan [15], which extend to Musielak-Orlicz Sobolev spaces the embedding results proved by Donaldson and Trudinger in [13] for Orlicz Sobolev spaces, i.e., spaces related to  $\Phi$ -functions that are independent of  $x$ . According to those results, the Sobolev conjugate function  $\mathcal{A}_*(x, t)$  of  $\mathcal{A}(x, t)$  (cf. Definition 2.8 below) behaves at infinity as  $t^{p^*}$  if  $a(x) = 0$  and as  $t^{q^*}$  if  $a(x) \neq 0$  (see the proof of Proposition 2.10). This leads us to consider in problem (1.1) critical nonlinearities of the form

$$f(x, u) = |u|^{p^*-2} u + b(x) |u|^{q^*-2} u + c(x) |u|^{s-2} u, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $1 < s < q^*$ ,  $b \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  is a nonnegative function satisfying

$$a_0 := \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in \operatorname{supp}(b)} a(x) > 0, \quad (1.3)$$

and  $c \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  is a nonnegative function that satisfies the following additional assumption when  $s \geq p^*$ :

$$c(x) \leq Ca(x)^{s/q} \text{ for some constant } C > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad c(x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow a(x) = 0. \quad (1.4)$$

Condition (1.3) is needed to prove the estimate (2.11) in the next section, which in turn is crucial to show that the weak solution of the problem to which a  $(\text{PS})_\beta$  sequence weakly converges up to a subsequence is non-zero (cf. the proof of Proposition 1.6). The term of growth  $(s-1)$  is meant to be a subcritical perturbation of the critical part of the nonlinearity, and the condition (1.4) is needed to prove its subcriticality when  $s \geq p^*$  (cf. Proposition 2.10 below).

First we consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_a u = \lambda |u|^{r-2} u + \mu |u|^{p^*-2} u + b(x) |u|^{q^*-2} u & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

where  $p \leq r < p^*$  and  $\lambda, \mu > 0$  are parameters. A weak solution of this problem is a function  $u \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  satisfying

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} + a(x) |\nabla u|^{q-2}) \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx = \int_{\Omega} (\lambda |u|^{r-2} + \mu |u|^{p^*-2} + b(x) |u|^{q^*-2}) uv \, dx$$

for all  $v \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ . Let

$$\lambda_1(p) = \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p \, dx}{\int_{\Omega} |u|^p \, dx} \quad (1.6)$$

be the first Dirichlet eigenvalue of the  $p$ -Laplacian in  $\Omega$ . We have the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Assume that (1.3) holds and there is a ball  $B_\rho(x_0) \subset \Omega$  such that*

$$a(x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in B_\rho(x_0). \quad (1.7)$$

*Then there exists  $b^* > 0$  such that problem (1.5) has a nontrivial weak solution in  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  when  $\mu > 0$  and  $b_\infty < b^*$ , where  $b_\infty := \|b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ , in each of the following cases:*

- (i)  $N \geq p^2$ ,  $r = p$ , and  $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(p)$ ,
- (ii)  $N \geq p^2$ ,  $p < r < p^*$ , and  $\lambda > 0$ ,
- (iii)  $N < p^2$ ,  $(Np - 2N + p)p/(N - p)(p - 1) < r < p^*$ , and  $\lambda > 0$ .

We remark that  $(Np - 2N + p)p/(N - p)(p - 1) > p$  if and only if  $N < p^2$ , so the assumption required on  $r$  in (iii) is more restrictive than  $r > p$ .

In particular, the previous theorem applies when  $b(x) \equiv 0$  and  $\mu = 1$ , so we have the following Brezis-Nirenberg type result for the double phase operator.

**Corollary 1.2.** *Assume (1.3) and (1.7). Then the problem*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_a u = \lambda |u|^{r-2} u + |u|^{p^*-2} u & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

*has a nontrivial weak solution in  $W_0^{1,A}(\Omega)$  in each of the following cases:*

- (i)  $N \geq p^2$ ,  $r = p$ , and  $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(p)$ ,
- (ii)  $N \geq p^2$ ,  $p < r < p^*$ , and  $\lambda > 0$ ,
- (iii)  $N < p^2$ ,  $(Np - 2N + p)p/(N - p)(p - 1) < r < p^*$ , and  $\lambda > 0$ .

*Remark 1.3.* The case  $1 < r < p$  was considered in [16], where it was shown that there exist infinitely many negative energy solutions for all sufficiently small  $\lambda > 0$ .

Next we consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_a u = c(x) |u|^{s-2} u + \mu |u|^{p^*-2} u + b(x) |u|^{q^*-2} u & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

where  $p^* \leq s < q^*$ ,  $c \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  is a nonnegative function satisfying (1.4), and  $\mu \geq 0$  is a parameter. We have the following theorem for this problem.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Assume that (1.3) holds and there is a ball  $B_\rho(x_0) \subset \Omega$  such that*

$$a(x) = a_0, \quad b(x) = b_\infty, \quad c(x) \geq c_0 \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in B_\rho(x_0) \quad (1.9)$$

*for some constant  $c_0 > 0$ . Then there exists  $\mu^* > 0$  such that problem (1.8) has a nontrivial weak solution in  $W_0^{1,A}(\Omega)$  when  $0 \leq \mu < \mu^*$  and  $b_\infty > 0$  in each of the following cases:*

- (i)  $1 < p < N(q - 1)/(N - 1)$  and  $N^2(q - 1)/(N - 1)(N - q) < s < q^*$ ,
- (ii)  $N(q - 1)/(N - 1) \leq p < q$  and  $Np/(N - q) < s < q^*$ .

In particular, the previous theorem applies when  $\mu = 0$ , so we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.5.** *Assume (1.3) and (1.9). Then the problem*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_a u = c(x) |u|^{s-2} u + b(x) |u|^{q^*-2} u & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

*has a nontrivial weak solution in  $W_0^{1,A}(\Omega)$  in each of the following cases:*

- (i)  $1 < p < N(q - 1)/(N - 1)$  and  $N^2(q - 1)/(N - 1)(N - q) < s < q^*$ ,
- (ii)  $N(q - 1)/(N - 1) \leq p < q$  and  $Np/(N - q) < s < q^*$ .

Proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.4 will be based on a new compactness result that we will prove for the general critical growth double phase problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_a u = \mu |u|^{p^*-2} u + b(x) |u|^{q^*-2} u + g(x, u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

where  $g$  is a Carathéodory function on  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$  satisfying the subcritical growth condition

$$|g(x, t)| \leq c_1 + c_2 |t|^{r-1} + c(x) |t|^{s-1} \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and all } t \in \mathbb{R} \quad (1.11)$$

for some constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$ ,  $1 < r < p^* \leq s < q^*$ , and a nonnegative function  $c \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  with  $\text{supp}(c) \subset \text{supp}(a)$ . The variational functional associated with this problem is

$$E(u) = \int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{1}{p} |\nabla u|^p + \frac{a(x)}{q} |\nabla u|^q - \frac{\mu}{p^*} |u|^{p^*} - \frac{b(x)}{q^*} |u|^{q^*} - G(x, u) \right] dx, \quad u \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega),$$

where  $G(x, t) = \int_0^t g(x, s) ds$ . We recall that  $(u_j) \subset W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  is a  $(\text{PS})_\beta$  sequence for  $E$  if  $E(u_j) \rightarrow \beta$  and  $E'(u_j) \rightarrow 0$ . To ensure that  $(\text{PS})_\beta$  sequences are bounded, we assume that

$$G(x, t) - \frac{t}{\sigma} g(x, t) \leq \mu \left( \frac{1}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{p^*} \right) |t|^{p^*} + c_3 \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and all } t \in \mathbb{R} \quad (1.12)$$

for some constants  $c_3 > 0$  and  $q < \sigma < p^*$ . This technical assumption may be replaced with the condition

$$\frac{c^{q^*/(q^*-s)}}{b^{s/(q^*-s)}} \in L^1(\Omega).$$

However, we prefer not to impose this condition since the nonlinearities in problems (1.5) and (1.8) satisfy (1.12) without further assumptions on  $c$ .

We will show that there exists a threshold level for  $\beta$  below which every  $(\text{PS})_\beta$  sequence has a subsequence that converges weakly to a nontrivial weak solution of problem (1.10). Although we do not have a closed form formula for this threshold, we can characterize it variationally as follows. Let

$$I(X, Y, Z, W) = \frac{1}{p} X + \frac{1}{q} Y - \frac{1}{p^*} Z - \frac{1}{q^*} W, \quad X, Y, Z, W \geq 0. \quad (1.13)$$

Denote by  $S(\mu, b_\infty)$  the set of points  $(X, Y, Z, W) \in \mathbb{R}^4$  with  $X, Y, Z, W \geq 0$  satisfying

$$I(X, Y, Z, W) > 0, \quad (1.14)$$

$$X + Y = Z + W, \quad (1.15)$$

$$Z \leq \frac{\mu}{S_p^{p^*/p}} X^{p^*/p}, \quad W \leq \frac{b_\infty}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} Y^{q^*/q}, \quad (1.16)$$

and set

$$\beta^*(\mu, b_\infty) := \inf_{(X,Y,Z,W) \in S(\mu, b_\infty)} I(X, Y, Z, W).$$

**Proposition 1.6.** *Assume (1.3), (1.11), and (1.12). If*

$$0 < \beta < \beta^*(\mu, b_\infty),$$

*then every  $(\text{PS})_\beta$  sequence for  $E$  has a subsequence that converges weakly to a nontrivial weak solution of problem (1.10).*

We will prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.4 by combining this compactness result with the following asymptotic estimates for  $\beta^*(\mu, b_\infty)$ .

**Proposition 1.7.** *For  $\mu > 0$ ,*

$$\beta^*(\mu, b_\infty) \geq \frac{1}{N} \frac{S_p^{N/p}}{\mu^{(N-p)/p}} + o(1) \quad \text{as } b_\infty \rightarrow 0. \quad (1.17)$$

*For  $b_\infty > 0$ ,*

$$\beta^*(\mu, b_\infty) \geq \frac{1}{N} \frac{(a_0 S_q)^{N/q}}{b_\infty^{(N-q)/q}} + o(1) \quad \text{as } \mu \rightarrow 0. \quad (1.18)$$

*Remark 1.8.* In Theorem 1.1,  $b_\infty$  is small and  $\mu > 0$  is arbitrary, while in Theorem 1.4,  $\mu$  is small and  $b_\infty$  is arbitrary. Results when both  $\mu$  and  $b_\infty$  are small can be found in [17, Theorems 2.5 and 2.6]. We note that such results are easier to obtain as Proposition 1.7 implies that  $\beta^*(\mu, b_\infty) \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $\mu, b_\infty \rightarrow 0$ .

We finally prove a Pohožaev type identity for problem (1.1).

**Theorem 1.9.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a bounded  $C^1$ -domain,  $1 < p < q < N$ ,  $q/p < 1 + 1/N$ , and  $0 \leq a \in C^1(\Omega)$ . If  $u \in W_0^{1,A}(\Omega) \cap W^{2,A}(\Omega)$  is a weak solution of (1.1), then we have the identity*

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx + \frac{1}{Nq} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^q (\nabla a \cdot x) dx \\ + \frac{1}{N} \int_{\partial\Omega} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) |\partial_\nu u|^p + \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) a(x) |\partial_\nu u|^q \right] (x \cdot \nu) d\sigma \\ = \int_{\Omega} \left[ F(x, u) - \frac{1}{q^*} f(x, u) u \right] dx, \end{aligned} \quad (1.19)$$

where  $F(x, t) := \int_0^t f(x, \tau) d\tau$  for a.e.  $x \in \Omega$  and for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\nu$  is the outward unit normal to  $\partial\Omega$ .

This allows us to prove the following nonexistence result.

**Theorem 1.10.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a bounded and starshaped  $C^1$ -domain,  $1 < p < q < N$ ,  $q/p < 1 + 1/N$ , and  $0 \leq a \in C^1(\Omega)$  be radial and radially nondecreasing. Let  $f(x, u) = c(x)|u|^{r-2}u + \mu|u|^{p^*-2}u + b(x)|u|^{q^*-2}u$ , with  $p \leq r < q^*$ ,  $\mu \leq 0$ , and  $b, c \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ . Problem (1.1) does not admit a non-zero weak solution  $u \in W_0^{1,A}(\Omega) \cap W^{2,A}(\Omega)$  in each of the following cases:*

(i)  $c(x) \leq 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ ;

(ii)  $r = p$  and  $0 < \|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \lambda_1(p) \frac{N(q-p)}{N(q-p)+pq}$ ;

(iii)  $\Omega$  is strictly starshaped,  $r = p$ , and  $\|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = \lambda_1(p) \frac{N(q-p)}{N(q-p)+pq}$ .

Another consequence of the Pohožaev type identity is the following nonexistence result for solutions with small norm.

**Theorem 1.11.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a bounded and starshaped  $C^1$ -domain,  $1 < p < q < N$ ,  $q/p < 1 + 1/N$ ,  $0 \leq a \in C^1(\Omega)$  be radial and radially nondecreasing, and let  $f(x, u) = c(x)|u|^{r-2}u + \mu|u|^{p^*-2}u + b(x)|u|^{q^*-2}u$  with  $\mu \geq 0$ ,  $0 \leq b \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  satisfying (1.3), and  $0 \leq c \in L^\infty(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ . Then there exists a positive constant  $\kappa = \kappa(\Omega, p, q, r, a, c, \mu, b_\infty)$  such that problem (1.1) does not admit a weak solution  $u \in W_0^{1,A}(\Omega) \cap W^{2,A}(\Omega)$  belonging to the ball  $\{u \in W^{1,A}(\Omega) : \|u\| \leq \kappa\}$  in each of the following cases:*

(i)  $p < r \leq p^*$ ;

(ii)  $p^* < r < q^*$  and  $c(x)$  satisfies (1.4);

(iii)  $p^* < r < q^*$  and  $c(x)$  satisfies  $a'_0 := \text{ess inf}_{\text{supp}(c)} a(x) > 0$ .

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some notation, definitions and preliminary results for Musielak-Orlicz spaces, and introduce the functional setting for double phase problems. At the end of the same section, we prove some useful embedding results. In Section 3, we prove the compactness result stated in Proposition 1.6 and the asymptotic estimates of Proposition 1.7. Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to the proofs of the existence Theorems 1.1 and 1.4, respectively. Finally, in Section 6, we prove the Pohožaev type identity in Theorem 1.9 and the nonexistence results stated in Theorems 1.10 and 1.11.

## 2 Preliminaries

We recall here some notions on Musielak-Orlicz spaces that will be useful in the rest of the paper, see for reference [23], Section 2 of [12], and also Section 2 of [7].

Here and throughout the paper,  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  is a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary.

### 2.1 Generalities on Musielak-Orlicz spaces

**Definition 2.1.** A continuous, convex function  $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is called  $\Phi$ -function if  $\varphi(0) = 0$  and  $\varphi(t) > 0$  for all  $t > 0$ .

A function  $\varphi : \Omega \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is said to be a *generalized  $\Phi$ -function*, denoted by  $\varphi \in \Phi(\Omega)$ , if  $\varphi(\cdot, t)$  is measurable for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $\varphi(x, \cdot)$  is a  $\Phi$ -function for a.a.  $x \in \Omega$ .  $\varphi \in \Phi(\Omega)$  is *locally integrable* if  $\varphi(\cdot, t) \in L^1(\Omega)$  for all  $t > 0$ .

$\varphi \in \Phi(\Omega)$  satisfies the  $(\Delta_2)$ -condition if there exist a positive constant  $C$  and a nonnegative function  $h \in L^1(\Omega)$  such that

$$\varphi(x, 2t) \leq C\varphi(x, t) + h(x) \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and all } t \in [0, \infty).$$

Given  $\varphi \in \Phi(\Omega)$  that satisfies the  $(\Delta_2)$ -condition, the Musielak-Orlicz space  $L^\varphi(\Omega)$  is defined as follows

$$L^\varphi(\Omega) := \{u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable} : \rho_\varphi(u) < \infty\},$$

where  $\rho_\varphi(u) := \int_\Omega \varphi(x, |u|) dx$  is the  $\varphi$ -modular. Endowed with the Luxemburg norm

$$\|u\|_\varphi := \inf \{\gamma > 0 : \rho_\varphi(u/\gamma) \leq 1\},$$

$L^\varphi$  is a Banach space, cf. [23, Theorem 7.7]).

The following proposition gives a relation between the modular and the norm in  $L^\varphi(\Omega)$ , the so called *unit ball property*, cf. for instance [12, Lemma 2.1.14].

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $\varphi \in \Phi(\Omega)$ . If  $u \in L^\varphi(\Omega)$ , then*

$$\rho_\varphi(u) < 1 \quad (\text{resp. } = 1; > 1) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \|u\|_\varphi < 1 \quad (\text{resp. } = 1; > 1). \quad (2.1)$$

**Definition 2.3.** For  $\varphi \in \Phi(\Omega)$ , the related Sobolev space  $W^{1,\varphi}(\Omega)$  is the set of all  $L^\varphi(\Omega)$ -functions  $u$  having  $|\nabla u| \in L^\varphi(\Omega)$ , and is equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{1,\varphi} = \|u\|_\varphi + \|\nabla u\|_\varphi,$$

where  $\|\nabla u\|_\varphi$  stands for  $\||\nabla u|\|_\varphi$ .

Similarly, the  $m$ -th order Musielak-Orlicz Sobolev space  $W^{m,\varphi}(\Omega)$  is the set of all measurable functions  $u$  on  $\Omega$  having  $|\nabla^k u| \in L^\varphi(\Omega)$  for  $k = 0, 1, 2$ .

$\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is called  $\mathcal{N}$ -function ( $\mathcal{N}$  stands for *nice*) if it is a  $\Phi$ -function satisfying

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\varphi(t)}{t} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(t)}{t} = \infty.$$

A function  $\varphi : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is said to be a *generalized  $\mathcal{N}$ -function*, and is denoted by  $\varphi \in N(\Omega)$ , if  $\varphi(\cdot, t)$  is measurable for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varphi(x, \cdot)$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -function for a.a.  $x \in \Omega$ .

If  $\varphi \in N(\Omega)$  is locally integrable, we denote by  $W_0^{1,\varphi}(\Omega)$  the completion of  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  in  $W^{1,\varphi}(\Omega)$ .

We introduce below only preliminary notation, definitions, and results for the embeddings in general Musielak-Orlicz spaces. In the next subsection, we will give the Sobolev embeddings results that we need for the specific Musielak-Orlicz Sobolev spaces involved in the study of our double phase problems.

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $\varphi, \psi \in \Phi(\Omega)$ . The function  $\varphi$  is *weaker than*  $\psi$ , denoted by  $\varphi \preceq \psi$ , if there exist two positive constants  $C_1, C_2$  and a nonnegative function  $h \in L^1(\Omega)$  such that

$$\varphi(x, t) \leq C_1 \psi(x, C_2 t) + h(x) \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and all } t \in [0, \infty).$$

In what follows, the notation  $X \hookrightarrow Y$  means that the space  $X$  is *continuously* embedded into the space  $Y$ , while  $X \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow Y$  means that  $X$  is *compactly* embedded into  $Y$ .

**Proposition 2.5.** (cf. [23, Theorem 8.5]) *Let  $\varphi, \psi \in \Phi(\Omega)$ , with  $\varphi \preceq \psi$ . Then  $L^\psi(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^\varphi(\Omega)$ .*

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $\phi, \psi \in N(\Omega)$ . We say that  $\phi$  *increases essentially more slowly than*  $\psi$  *near infinity*, and we write  $\phi \ll \psi$ , if for any  $k > 0$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi(x, kt)}{\psi(x, t)} = 0 \quad \text{uniformly for a.a. } x \in \Omega.$$



## 2.2 Functional setting and embeddings for double phase problems

The function  $\mathcal{A} : \Omega \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  defined as

$$\mathcal{A}(x, t) := t^p + a(x)t^q \quad \text{for all } (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, \infty),$$

with  $1 < p < q < N$ ,  $q/p < 1 + 1/N$ ,  $0 \leq a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  locally Lipschitz, is a locally integrable generalized  $\mathcal{N}$ -function satisfying the  $(\Delta_2)$ -condition. Therefore, the Musielak-Orlicz Lebesgue space  $L^{\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  consists of all measurable functions  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with finite  $\mathcal{A}$ -modular

$$\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(u) := \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}(x, |u|) dx < \infty,$$

endowed with the Luxemburg norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}} := \inf \{ \gamma > 0 : \rho_{\mathcal{A}}(u/\gamma) \leq 1 \}.$$

Since by (2.1),  $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(u/\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}}) = 1$  whenever  $u \neq 0$ , we have

$$\min \{ \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}}^p, \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}}^q \} \leq \int_{\Omega} (|u|^p + a(x)|u|^q) dx \leq \max \{ \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}}^p, \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}}^q \} \quad \forall u \in L^{\mathcal{A}}(\Omega). \quad (2.2)$$

The corresponding Musielak-Orlicz Sobolev space  $W^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  consists of all functions  $u$  in  $L^{\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  with  $|\nabla u| \in L^{\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ , endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{1, \mathcal{A}} := \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}} + \|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}},$$

where  $\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}} = \|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}$ . We work in the completion  $W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  of  $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  in  $W^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ .

We recall that the spaces  $L^{\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ ,  $W^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ , and  $W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  are reflexive Banach spaces (see [7, Propositions 2.14]), and moreover, the following Poincaré-type inequality holds

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}} \quad \forall u \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega), \quad (2.3)$$

for some constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $u$ , cf. [7, Proposition 2.18-(iv)] and [15, Theorem 1.2].

Hence, we can equivalently renorm  $W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  by setting  $\|u\| := \|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

We observe that, by (2.2), we have

$$\min \{ \|u\|^p, \|u\|^q \} \leq \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^p + a(x)|\nabla u|^q) dx \leq \max \{ \|u\|^p, \|u\|^q \} \quad \forall u \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega). \quad (2.4)$$

In the rest of the subsection, we collect some embedding results that will be useful for our analysis. Hereafter,  $p^* := Np/(N-p)$  and  $q^* := Nq/(N-q)$  denote the critical Sobolev exponents.

**Proposition 2.7** (Proposition 2.15 of [7]). *Let  $1 < p < q < N$ ,  $0 \leq a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ , and let  $L_a^q(\Omega)$  be the weighted Lebesgue space  $L_a^q(\Omega) := \{u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable} : \int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^q dx < \infty\}$ , endowed with the seminorm  $\|u\|_{q, a} := (\int_{\Omega} a(x)|u|^q dx)^{1/q}$ . Then the following embeddings hold:*

(i)  $L^A(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$  and  $W_0^{1,A}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$  for all  $r \in [1, p]$ ;

(ii)  $W_0^{1,A}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$  for all  $r \in [1, p^*]$  and  $W_0^{1,A}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$  for all  $r \in [1, p^*)$ ;

(iv)  $L^q(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^A(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L_a^q(\Omega)$ .

**Definition 2.8.** For all  $x \in \Omega$  denote by  $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \cdot) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  the inverse function of  $\mathcal{A}(x, \cdot)$  and define  $\mathcal{A}_*^{-1} : \Omega \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by

$$\mathcal{A}_*^{-1}(x, \tau) := \int_0^\tau \frac{\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \sigma)}{\sigma^{(N+1)/N}} d\sigma \quad \text{for all } (x, \tau) \in \Omega \times [0, \infty).$$

The function  $\mathcal{A}_* : (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, \infty) \mapsto \tau \in [0, \infty)$  where  $\tau$  is such that  $\mathcal{A}_*^{-1}(x, \tau) = t$ , is called *Sobolev conjugate function of  $\mathcal{A}$* .

**Proposition 2.9** (Theorems 1.1 - 1.2 and Proposition 3.1 of [15] and Proposition 2.18 of [7]). *The following embeddings hold:*

(i)  $W^{1,A}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\mathcal{A}_*}(\Omega)$ ;

(ii) if  $\mathcal{K} : \Omega \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is a continuous generalized  $\mathcal{N}$ -function such that  $\mathcal{K} \ll \mathcal{A}_*$ , then

$$W^{1,A}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow L^{\mathcal{K}}(\Omega);$$

(iii)  $\mathcal{A} \ll \mathcal{A}_*$ , and consequently  $W^{1,A}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow L^A(\Omega)$ .

**Proposition 2.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be of the form*

$$\mathcal{C}(x, t) = t^r + c(x)t^s, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, \infty),$$

where  $1 < r < p^* \leq s < q^*$  and  $c \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  is a nonnegative function satisfying (1.4). Then the following compact embedding holds:  $W_0^{1,A}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow L^{\mathcal{C}}(\Omega)$ .

*Proof.* In view of Proposition 2.9-(ii), it is enough to prove that  $\mathcal{C} \ll \mathcal{A}_*$ . It is standard to verify (see for instance [1, §8.5]) that this is equivalent to proving that

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{A}_*^{-1}(x, \tau)}{\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau)} = 0 \quad \text{uniformly for } x \in \Omega. \quad (2.5)$$

If  $a(x) = 0$ , then also  $c(x) = 0$ . Thus  $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \tau) = \tau^{1/p}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_*^{-1}(x, \tau) = \tau^{1/r}$ , and so

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{A}_*^{-1}(x, \tau)}{\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau)} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tau^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{N}}}{\tau^{\frac{1}{r}}} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \tau^{\frac{1}{p^*} - \frac{1}{r}} = 0 \quad \text{uniformly for } x \in \{x \in \Omega : a(x) = 0\},$$

being  $r < p^*$ . That is

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{\mathcal{A}_*^{-1}(x, \tau)}{\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau)} \right\|_{L^\infty(\{x \in \Omega : a(x) = 0\})} = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

If  $a(x) \neq 0$ , also  $c(x) \neq 0$ . Then, by the Definition 2.8, integrating by parts and using that  $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \tau) \sim \tau^{1/p}$  as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$  uniformly in  $x$ , and De l'Hôpital's rule, we get

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{A}_*^{-1}(x, \tau)}{\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau)} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{-N\tau^{-\frac{1}{N}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \tau)}{\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau)} + \frac{N\tau^{-\frac{1}{N}}\partial_\tau\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \tau)}{\partial_\tau\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau)} \right). \quad (2.7)$$

Now, using (1.4), it is straightforward to verify that

$$\left| \frac{-N\tau^{-\frac{1}{N}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \tau)}{\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau)} \right| \leq NC \frac{a(x)^{\frac{s}{sq}}}{a(x)^{\frac{1}{q}}} \tau^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{s}} = NC\tau^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{s}} \quad \text{as } \tau \rightarrow \infty,$$

thus,

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-N\tau^{-\frac{1}{N}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \tau)}{\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau)} = 0 \quad \text{uniformly for } x \in \{x \in \Omega : a(x) \neq 0\}. \quad (2.8)$$

Moreover, since  $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \tau) \sim a(x)^{-1/q}\tau^{1/q}$  as  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain as  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$

$$\left| \frac{\partial_\tau\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \tau)}{\partial_\tau\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau)} \right| = \left| \frac{r(\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau))^{r-1} + sc(x)(\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau))^{s-1}}{p(\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \tau))^{p-1} + qa(x)(\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \tau))^{q-1}} \right| \sim \frac{sc(x)^{\frac{1}{s}}\tau^{1-\frac{1}{s}}}{qa(x)^{\frac{1}{q}}\tau^{1-\frac{1}{q}}} \leq sC\tau^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{s}}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N\tau^{-\frac{1}{N}}\partial_\tau\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x, \tau)}{\partial_\tau\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau)} = 0 \quad \text{uniformly for } x \in \{x \in \Omega : a(x) \neq 0\}, \quad (2.9)$$

since  $s < q^*$ . Altogether, inserting (2.8) and (2.9) in (2.7), we get

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{\mathcal{A}_*^{-1}(x, \tau)}{\mathcal{C}^{-1}(x, \tau)} \right\|_{L^\infty(\{x \in \Omega : a(x) \neq 0\})} = 0.$$

Together with (2.6), this gives (2.5) and concludes the proof.  $\square$

We refer to [19, Proposition 3.7] for a compactness result, similar to the one proved in the previous proposition, under slightly different assumptions on the weight  $c(x)$ .

**Proposition 2.11.** *Let  $b \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  be a nonnegative function such that (1.3) holds, namely*

$$a_0 = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in \operatorname{supp}(b)} a(x) > 0$$

and let  $L^{\mathcal{B}}(\Omega)$  be the Musielak-Orlicz space associated with

$$\mathcal{B}(x, t) = t^{p^*} + b(x)t^{q^*}, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, \infty).$$

Then,  $W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\mathcal{B}}(\Omega)$ .

Furthermore, for every  $u \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  the following estimates hold:

$$\int_{\Omega} |u|^{p^*} dx \leq \frac{1}{S_p^{p^*/p}} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx \right)^{p^*/p} \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} b(x) |u|^{q^*} dx \leq \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} \left( \int_{\Omega} a(x) |\nabla u|^q dx \right)^{q^*/q}, \quad (2.11)$$

where  $b_{\infty} := \|b\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}$  and

$$S_p := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^p dx}{\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{p^*} dx \right)^{p/p^*}}, \quad S_q := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^N) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^q dx}{\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{q^*} dx \right)^{q/q^*}} \quad (2.12)$$

are the best Sobolev constants for  $W^{1,m}(\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow L^{m^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ , and  $\mathcal{D}^{1,m}(\mathbb{R}^N) = \{u \in L^{m^*}(\mathbb{R}^N) : |\nabla u| \in L^m(\mathbb{R}^N)\}$ , with  $m = p, q$ .

*Proof.* Let  $u \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ . Since  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  by Proposition 2.7, (2.10) follows immediately by the Sobolev embedding  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{p^*}(\Omega)$ . As for (2.11),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} b(x) |u|^{q^*} dx &\leq b_{\infty} \int_{\text{supp}(b)} |u|^{q^*} dx \leq \frac{b_{\infty}}{S_q^{q^*/q}} \left( \int_{\text{supp}(b)} |\nabla u|^q dx \right)^{q^*/q} \\ &\leq \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} \left( \int_{\text{supp}(b)} a(x) |\nabla u|^q dx \right)^{q^*/q} \leq \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} \left( \int_{\Omega} a(x) |\nabla u|^q dx \right)^{q^*/q}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies in particular that  $\rho_{\mathcal{B}}(u) < \infty$  and proves that  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \subset L^{\mathcal{B}}(\Omega)$ .

We now prove the continuous embedding. We apply (2.10) and (2.11) to the function  $u/\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\mathcal{B}} \left( \frac{u}{\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}} \right) &\leq \frac{1}{S_p^{p^*/p}} \left( \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{\nabla u}{\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}} \right|^p dx \right)^{p^*/p} + \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} \left( \int_{\Omega} a(x) \left| \frac{\nabla u}{\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}} \right|^q dx \right)^{q^*/q} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{S_p^{p^*/p}} \rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{p^*/p} \left( \frac{\nabla u}{\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}} \right) + \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} \rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{q^*/q} \left( \frac{\nabla u}{\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{S_p^{p^*/p}} + \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} =: C_{p,q}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used the unit ball property. Now, if  $C_{p,q} \leq 1$ , recalling that  $\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}} = \|u\|$ , and using again the unit ball property, we get  $\rho_{\mathcal{B}}(u/\|u\|) \leq 1$ , and so

$$\left\| \frac{u}{\|u\|} \right\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq 1, \quad \text{that is } \|u\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \|u\|.$$

If  $C_{p,q} > 1$ , we can estimate analogously

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{\mathcal{B}} \left( \frac{u}{2C_{p,q} \|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}} \right) &\leq \frac{1}{S_p^{p^*/p} (2C_{p,q})^{p^*}} \left( \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{\nabla u}{\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}} \right|^p dx \right)^{p^*/p} \\
&\quad + \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q} (2C_{p,q})^{q^*}} \left( \int_{\Omega} a(x) \left| \frac{\nabla u}{\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}} \right|^q dx \right)^{q^*/q} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{S_p^{p^*/p}} \frac{1}{C_{p,q}} \rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{p^*/p} \left( \frac{\nabla u}{\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} \frac{1}{C_{p,q}} \rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{q^*/q} \left( \frac{\nabla u}{\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{S_p^{p^*/p}} \frac{1}{C_{p,q}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} \frac{1}{C_{p,q}} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 1,
\end{aligned}$$

and so, arguing via unit ball property as in the previous case,

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq 2C_{p,q} \|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{A}} = 2C_{p,q} \|u\|.$$

This implies that  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  is continuously embedded in  $L^{\mathcal{B}}(\Omega)$  and concludes the proof.  $\square$

Even though we are not yet able to prove that the continuous embedding  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\mathcal{B}}(\Omega)$  in Proposition 2.11 is not compact, we observe that, replacing  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $\mathcal{B}$  in the proof of Proposition 2.10, it becomes apparent that  $\mathcal{B} \not\ll \mathcal{A}_*$ , and so Proposition 2.9-(ii) for compact embeddings does not apply.

For Orlicz Sobolev spaces, i.e., when the  $\Phi$ -function  $\varphi$  that defines  $W^{1,\varphi}$  is independent of  $x$ , in a setting that corresponds to the limiting case of the Sobolev embeddings, it is known that the embedding result by Donaldson and Trudinger in [13] is not optimal. Indeed, Cianchi proved in [6] that the target Orlicz space for the embedding in [13] is not the smallest Orlicz space into which the Orlicz Sobolev space is continuously embedded. So, also the embeddings proved by Fan in [15] that extend to Musielak-Orlicz Sobolev spaces the embeddings of Donaldson and Trudinger are not sharp. In the same paper [6], Cianchi provides also the proof of a sharp embedding theorem for Orlicz Sobolev spaces  $W^{1,\varphi}$  and introduces the optimal Sobolev critical  $\Phi$ -function  $\varphi_N(t)$  for  $\varphi(t)$ . Such a result has not been extended to Musielak-Orlicz Sobolev spaces yet. On the other hand, to our knowledge, there is no evidence that in our setting, for  $\mathcal{A}(x,t) = t^p + a(x)t^q$  with  $N > q > p$ , that somehow corresponds to the case  $N > p$  for classical Sobolev embeddings, the Sobolev conjugate function  $\mathcal{A}_*$  (given in [15]) is not sharp for the embedding  $W^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\mathcal{A}_*}(\Omega)$ . We refer also to [19] for the embedding of  $W^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  in the Musielak-Orlicz space related to the generalized  $\Phi$ -function  $t^{p^*} + a(x)t^{q^*/q}t^{q^*}$ , and for the proof of its optimality in the class of generalized  $\Phi$ -functions of the form  $t^r + a(x)\alpha t^s$ , with  $1 < r \leq p^* < s \leq q^*$  and  $\alpha > 1$ .

### 3 Proofs of Proposition 1.6 and Proposition 1.7

We begin with the following lemmas.

**Lemma 3.1.** *If  $(u_j) \subset W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  converges weakly to  $u$  and  $E'(u_j) \rightarrow 0$ , then, up to a subsequence,  $\nabla u_j \rightarrow \nabla u$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ .*

*Proof.* Let

$$T(\tau) := \begin{cases} \tau & \text{if } |\tau| \leq 1, \\ \frac{\tau}{|\tau|} & \text{if } |\tau| > 1 \end{cases}$$

We recall that, if we prove that the following limit holds true

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_j|^{p-2} \nabla u_j - |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) \cdot \nabla T(u_j - u) dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.1)$$

we can conclude the proof by [11, Theorem 1.1].

Let

$$\Omega_j := \{x \in \Omega : |u_j(x) - u(x)| \leq 1\} \quad \text{for every } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We recall that, by Simon's inequality, if  $r \geq 2$ , there exists a constant  $\kappa_r > 0$  such that

$$(|\xi|^{r-2} \xi - |\eta|^{r-2} \eta) \cdot (\xi - \eta) \geq \kappa_r |\xi - \eta|^r$$

for all  $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . Hence, for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} I_{p,j} &:= \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_j|^{p-2} \nabla u_j - |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) \cdot \nabla T(u_j - u) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega_j} (|\nabla u_j|^{p-2} \nabla u_j - |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) \cdot \nabla (u_j - u) dx \\ &\geq \kappa_p \int_{\Omega_j} |\nabla u_j - \nabla u|^p dx \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

and similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{q,j} &:= \int_{\Omega} a(x) (|\nabla u_j|^{q-2} \nabla u_j - |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) \cdot \nabla T(u_j - u) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega_j} a(x) (|\nabla u_j|^{q-2} \nabla u_j - |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) \cdot \nabla (u_j - u) dx \\ &\geq \kappa_q \int_{\Omega_j} a(x) |\nabla u_j - \nabla u|^q dx \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover, by  $u_j \rightharpoonup u$  in  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ ,  $u_j \rightarrow u$  a.e. in  $\Omega$  up to a subsequence still denoted by  $u_j$ . Therefore, definitely in  $j$ , along such a subsequence,  $T(u_j - u) = u_j - u$  and also  $\nabla T(u_j - u) = \nabla(u_j - u)$ . Now, since  $u_j \rightharpoonup u$  in  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ ,  $\nabla(u_j - u) \rightharpoonup 0$  in  $(L^{\mathcal{A}}(\Omega))^N$  and so also  $\nabla T(u_j - u) \rightharpoonup 0$  in  $(L^{\mathcal{A}}(\Omega))^N$ . Hence,

$$\int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u - a(x) |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) \cdot \nabla T(u_j - u) dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty \quad (3.4)$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} (I_{p,j} + I_{q,j}) &= \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_j|^{p-2} \nabla u_j - a(x) |\nabla u_j|^{q-2} \nabla u_j) \cdot \nabla T(u_j - u) \right\} \\ &= \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ E'(u_j)[T(u_j - u)] + \int_{\Omega} (\mu |u_j|^{p^*-2} u_j + b(x) |u_j|^{q^*-2} u_j + g(x, u_j)) T(u_j - u) dx \right\} \\ &= \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} (\mu |u_j|^{p^*-2} u_j + b(x) |u_j|^{q^*-2} u_j + g(x, u_j)) T(u_j - u) dx, \end{aligned}$$

(3.5)

where in the last equality we used the assumption  $E'(u_j) \rightarrow 0$ .

Set

$$I_j := \int_{\Omega} (\mu|u_j|^{p^*-2}u_j + b(x)|u_j|^{q^*-2}u_j + g(x, u_j)) T(u_j - u) dx,$$

if we prove that  $I_j \rightarrow 0$ , we can conclude by (3.5), (3.2), and (3.3), that both  $I_{p,j}$  and  $I_{q,j}$  go to zero as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . In particular  $I_{p,j} \rightarrow 0$  implies (3.1) by (3.4). To this aim, using Hölder's inequality and (1.11), we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \mu|u_j|^{p^*-2}u_j T(u_j - u) dx &\leq \mu \left( \int_{\Omega} |u_j|^{p^*} \right)^{\frac{p^*-1}{p^*}} \left( \int_{\Omega} |T(u_j - u)|^{p^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^*}}, \\ \int_{\Omega} b(x)^{\frac{q^*-1}{q^*} + \frac{1}{q^*}} |u_j|^{q^*-2}u_j T(u_j - u) dx &\leq \left( \int_{\Omega} b(x)|u_j|^{q^*} \right)^{\frac{q^*-1}{q^*}} \left( \int_{\Omega} b(x)|T(u_j - u)|^{q^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{q^*}}, \\ \int_{\Omega} g(x, u_j) T(u_j - u) dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} (c_1 + c_2|u_j|^{r-1} + c(x)|u_j|^{s-1}) T(u_j - u) dx \\ &\leq c_1 \int_{\Omega} |T(u_j - u)| dx \\ &\quad + c_2 \left( \int_{\Omega} |u_j|^r dx \right)^{\frac{r-1}{r}} \left( \int_{\Omega} |T(u_j - u)|^r dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \\ &\quad + \left( \int_{\Omega} c(x)|u_j|^s dx \right)^{\frac{s-1}{s}} \left( \int_{\Omega} c(x)|T(u_j - u)|^s dx \right)^{\frac{1}{s}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Clearly, since  $u_j \rightharpoonup u \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^1(\Omega)$ , up to a subsequence  $u_j \rightarrow u$  a.e. and so  $\Omega_j = \Omega$  for  $j$  large. Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega} |T(u_j - u)| dx = \int_{\Omega_j} |u_j - u| dx \leq \|u_j - u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Furthermore, by Propositions 2.10 and 2.11 and since  $(u_j)$  is bounded in  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ , all the integrals

$$\int_{\Omega} |u_j|^{p^*}, \quad \int_{\Omega} b(x)|u_j|^{q^*}, \quad \int_{\Omega} |u_j|^r dx, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} c(x)|u_j|^s dx$$

are bounded. Finally, since  $u_j \rightarrow u$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ , also  $T(u_j - u) \rightarrow 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ , and  $|T(u_j - u)| \leq 1 \in L^1(\Omega)$ . Thus, by the Dominated Convergence Theorem, all the integrals in the right-hand sides of (3.6) involving  $T(u_j - u)$  go to zero as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . This proves that  $I_j \rightarrow 0$  as well, and concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *If  $(u_j) \subset W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  converges weakly to  $u$  and  $E'(u_j) \rightarrow 0$ , then  $u$  is a weak solution of problem (1.10).*

*Proof.* By assumption we have for every  $v \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$

$$\int_{\Omega} \left[ |\nabla u_j|^{p-2} \nabla u_j \cdot \nabla v + a(x) |\nabla u_j|^{q-2} \nabla u_j \cdot \nabla v - \mu |u_j|^{p^*-2} u_j v - b(x) |u_j|^{q^*-2} v - g(x, u_j) v \right] dx = o(1) \quad (3.7)$$

as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . Our goal is to pass in the limit under the integral sign. In what follows the symbols  $C, C'$  denote different positive constants whose exact values are not important for the argument of the proof.

Let  $(u_{j_k})$  be any subsequence of  $(u_j)$ . By the continuous embedding  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  and the hypothesis that  $(u_j)$  is weakly convergent in  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ ,  $\|\nabla u_{j_k}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \|\nabla u_{j_k}\|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq C'$  for every  $k$ . Since, by Lemma 3.1,  $\nabla u_{j_k} \rightarrow \nabla u$  a.e. in  $\Omega$  up to a subsequence still indexed by  $j_k$ , by [2, Proposition A.8-(i), with  $w = \chi_{\Omega}$ ],  $|\nabla u_{j_k}|^{p-2} \nabla u_{j_k} \rightharpoonup |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u$  in  $(L^{p'}(\Omega))^N$ . By the arbitrariness of the subsequence, the entire sequence  $(|\nabla u_j|^{p-2} \nabla u_j)$  converges weakly to  $|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u$  in  $(L^{p'}(\Omega))^N$ . In particular, for every  $v \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ ,

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_j|^{p-2} \nabla u_j \cdot \nabla v dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v dx \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.8)$$

since  $\nabla v \in (L^{\mathcal{A}}(\Omega))^N \subset (L^p(\Omega))^N$ .

Similarly, since  $\int_{\Omega} a(x) |\nabla u_{j_k}|^q dx \leq \rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_{j_k}) \leq C$  by (2.2), and using the a.e. convergence of the gradients, by [2, Proposition A.8-(i), with  $w = a(x)\chi_{\Omega}$ ], it holds  $|\nabla u_{j_k}|^{q-2} \nabla u_{j_k} \rightharpoonup |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u$  in the weighted Lebesgue space

$$(L^{q'}(\Omega; a(x)))^N := \left\{ \varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N \text{ measurable} : \int_{\Omega} a(x) |\varphi|^{q'} dx < \infty \right\}.$$

Hence, the whole sequence  $(|\nabla u_j|^{q-2} \nabla u_j)$  converges weakly to  $|\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u$  in  $(L^{q'}(\Omega; a(x)))^N$ . In particular, for every  $v \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ ,

$$\int_{\Omega} a(x) |\nabla u_j|^{q-2} \nabla u_j \cdot \nabla v dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} a(x) |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v dx \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.9)$$

since  $\nabla v \in (L^{\mathcal{A}}(\Omega))^N \subset (L^q(\Omega; a(x)))^N$ .

Analogously, by the continuous embedding  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{p^*}(\Omega)$  and the hypothesis that  $(u_j)$  is weakly convergent -and so bounded- in  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ , the sequence  $(u_{j_k})$  is bounded in  $L^{p^*}(\Omega)$ . Moreover, up to a further subsequence,  $u_{j_k} \rightarrow u$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ , and so applying again [2, Proposition A.8-(i), with  $w = \chi_{\Omega}$ ], we can conclude by the arbitrariness of the subsequence that  $|u_{j_k}|^{p^*-2} u_{j_k} \rightharpoonup |u|^{p^*-2} u$  in  $L^{p^*}(\Omega)$ . In particular, for every  $v \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ ,

$$\int_{\Omega} |u_j|^{p^*-2} u_j v dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} |u|^{p^*-2} u v dx \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.10)$$

We can argue in a similar way to obtain for every  $v \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ ,

$$\int_{\Omega} b(x) |u_j|^{q^*-2} u_j v dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} b(x) |u|^{q^*-2} u v dx \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.11)$$



Finally, taking into account that  $g(x, \cdot)$  is continuous and assumption (1.11), also the term with  $g(x, u_j)$  can be passed to the limit in the same way to get for every  $v \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ ,

$$\int_{\Omega} g(x, u_j) v \, dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} g(x, u) v \, dx \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.12)$$

Combining together (3.8)-(3.12), we can pass to the limit in (3.7) to have the desired result.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Proposition 1.6.

*Proof of Proposition 1.6.* Let  $(u_j)$  be a  $(\text{PS})_{\beta}$  sequence, i.e.,

$$E(u_j) = \int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{1}{p} |\nabla u_j|^p + \frac{a(x)}{q} |\nabla u_j|^q - \frac{\mu}{p^*} |u_j|^{p^*} - \frac{b(x)}{q^*} |u_j|^{q^*} - G(x, u_j) \right] dx = \beta + o(1) \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$E'(u_j) u_j = \int_{\Omega} \left[ |\nabla u_j|^p + a(x) |\nabla u_j|^q - \mu |u_j|^{p^*} - b(x) |u_j|^{q^*} - u_j g(x, u_j) \right] dx = o(\|u_j\|). \quad (3.14)$$

Dividing (3.14) by  $\sigma$ , subtracting from (3.13), and using (1.12) gives

$$\left( \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{\sigma} \right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_j|^p \, dx + \left( \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\sigma} \right) \int_{\Omega} a(x) |\nabla u_j|^q \, dx \leq o(\|u_j\|) + \beta + c_3 |\Omega| + o(1),$$

which together with (2.4) implies that  $(u_j)$  is bounded. Since  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  is reflexive, a renamed subsequence of  $(u_j)$  then converges weakly to some  $u \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $u$  is a weak solution of problem (1.10).

It remains to show that  $u$  is nontrivial. Suppose  $u = 0$ . Then the growth condition (1.11) implies by Proposition 2.10 that

$$\int_{\Omega} G(x, u_j) \, dx \rightarrow 0, \quad \int_{\Omega} u_j g(x, u_j) \, dx \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.15)$$

so (3.13) and (3.14) reduce to

$$\int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{1}{p} |\nabla u_j|^p + \frac{a(x)}{q} |\nabla u_j|^q - \frac{\mu}{p^*} |u_j|^{p^*} - \frac{b(x)}{q^*} |u_j|^{q^*} \right] dx = \beta + o(1) \quad (3.16)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} \left[ |\nabla u_j|^p + a(x) |\nabla u_j|^q - \mu |u_j|^{p^*} - b(x) |u_j|^{q^*} \right] dx = o(1), \quad (3.17)$$

respectively. Since  $(u_j)$  is bounded, (2.4), (2.10), and (2.11) imply that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_j|^p \, dx \rightarrow X, \quad \int_{\Omega} a(x) |\nabla u_j|^q \, dx \rightarrow Y, \quad \mu \int_{\Omega} |u_j|^{p^*} \, dx \rightarrow Z, \quad \int_{\Omega} b(x) |u_j|^{q^*} \, dx \rightarrow W$$

for a renamed subsequence and some  $X, Y, Z, W \geq 0$ . Then (3.16) gives

$$\beta = I(X, Y, Z, W), \quad (3.18)$$

in particular, (1.14) holds, and (3.17) reduces to (1.15). Since

$$\mu \int_{\Omega} |u_j|^{p^*} dx \leq \frac{\mu}{S_p^{p^*/p}} \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_j|^p dx \right)^{p^*/p}$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} b(x) |u_j|^{q^*} dx \leq \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} \left( \int_{\Omega} a(x) |\nabla u_j|^q dx \right)^{q^*/q}$$

by (2.10) and (2.11), respectively, (1.16) also holds. So  $(X, Y, Z, W) \in S(\mu, b_{\infty})$  and hence (3.18) gives  $\beta \geq \beta^*(\mu, b_{\infty})$ , contrary to assumption.  $\square$

We stress the importance of the compactness of the embedding  $W^{1,4}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\mathcal{C}}(\Omega)$  for the proof of  $u \neq 0$  in the last part of the previous proof, cf. (3.15).

*Proof of Proposition 1.7.* Let  $((X_j, Y_j, Z_j, W_j)) \subset S(\mu, b_{\infty})$  be a minimizing sequence for  $\beta^*(\mu, b_{\infty})$ . By (1.16) and (1.15),

$$\begin{aligned} (X_j + Y_j) \left[ 1 - \frac{\mu}{S_p^{p^*/p}} X_j^{\frac{p^*}{p}-1} - \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} Y_j^{\frac{q^*}{q}-1} \right] &\leq X_j + Y_j \\ - \frac{\mu}{S_p^{p^*/p}} X_j^{p^*/p} - \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} Y_j^{q^*/q} &\leq X_j + Y_j - Z_j - W_j = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

If  $X_j + Y_j = 0$ , then  $Z_j + W_j = 0$  also by (1.15), so  $X_j = Y_j = Z_j = W_j = 0$  and hence  $I(X_j, Y_j, Z_j, W_j) = 0$ , contradicting (1.14). So  $X_j + Y_j > 0$  and hence (3.19) implies that

$$\frac{\mu}{S_p^{N/(N-p)}} X_j^{p/(N-p)} + \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{N/(N-q)}} Y_j^{q/(N-q)} \geq 1. \quad (3.20)$$

Dividing (1.15) by  $p^*$ , subtracting from (1.13), and combining with (3.20) gives

$$\begin{aligned} I(X_j, Y_j, Z_j, W_j) &= \frac{1}{N} X_j + \left( \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p^*} \right) Y_j + \left( \frac{1}{p^*} - \frac{1}{q^*} \right) W_j \\ &\geq \frac{1}{N} \frac{S_p^{N/p}}{\mu^{(N-p)/p}} \left[ 1 - \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{N/(N-q)}} Y_j^{q/(N-q)} \right]^{(N-p)/p}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

where we used that  $p < q < p^* < q^*$ . Since  $S(\mu, 0) \subset S(\mu, b_{\infty})$ ,  $\beta^*(\mu, b_{\infty}) \leq \beta^*(\mu, 0)$  and hence  $I(X_j, Y_j, Z_j, W_j)$  is bounded uniformly in  $b_{\infty} \geq 0$  for fixed  $\mu > 0$ , so the first equality in (3.21) implies for  $j$  large

$$Y_j \leq I(X_j, Y_j, Z_j, W_j) \leq \beta^*(\mu, b_{\infty}) + 1 \leq \beta^*(\mu, 0) + 1,$$

that is,  $Y_j$  is bounded uniformly in  $b_\infty$ . So (1.17) follows from the last inequality in (3.21).

Dividing (1.15) by  $q^*$ , subtracting from (1.13), and combining with (3.20) and (1.16) gives

$$\begin{aligned} I(X_j, Y_j, Z_j, W_j) &= \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q^*}\right) X_j + \frac{1}{N} Y_j - \left(\frac{1}{p^*} - \frac{1}{q^*}\right) Z_j \\ &\geq \frac{1}{N} \frac{(a_0 S_q)^{N/q}}{b_\infty^{(N-q)/q}} \left[1 - \frac{\mu}{S_p^{N/(N-p)}} X_j^{p/(N-p)}\right]^{(N-q)/q} - \left(\frac{1}{p^*} - \frac{1}{q^*}\right) \frac{\mu}{S_p^{p^*/p}} X_j^{p^*/p}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Since  $S(0, b_\infty) \subset S(\mu, b_\infty)$ ,  $\beta^*(\mu, b_\infty) \leq \beta^*(0, b_\infty)$  and hence  $I(X_j, Y_j, Z_j, W_j)$  is bounded uniformly in  $\mu \geq 0$  for fixed  $b_\infty > 0$ , so the first equality in (3.21) implies that  $X_j$  is bounded uniformly in  $\mu$ . So (1.18) follows from (3.22).  $\square$

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

The variational functional associated with problem (1.5) is

$$E(u) = \int_\Omega \left[ \frac{1}{p} |\nabla u|^p + \frac{a(x)}{q} |\nabla u|^q - \frac{\lambda}{r} |u|^r - \frac{\mu}{p^*} |u|^{p^*} - \frac{b(x)}{q^*} |u|^{q^*} \right] dx, \quad u \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega).$$

When  $r = p$ , (1.6), (2.10), and (2.11) give

$$\begin{aligned} E(u) &\geq \frac{1}{p} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(p)}\right) \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p dx + \frac{1}{q} \int_\Omega a(x) |\nabla u|^q dx - \frac{\mu}{p^* S_p^{p^*/p}} \left( \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p dx \right)^{p^*/p} \\ &\quad - \frac{b_\infty}{q^* (a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} \left( \int_\Omega a(x) |\nabla u|^q dx \right)^{q^*/q}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

For  $\|u\| \leq 1$ ,

$$\|u\|^q \leq \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^p + a(x) |\nabla u|^q) dx \leq \|u\|^p$$

by (2.4) and hence, using that  $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(p)$ , (4.1) gives

$$E(u) \geq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{p} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(p)}\right), \frac{1}{q} \right\} \|u\|^q - \frac{\mu}{p^* S_p^{p^*/p}} \|u\|^{p^*} - \frac{b_\infty}{q^* (a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} \|u\|^{p q^*/q}.$$

Since  $q < p^* < p q^*/q$ , it follows from this that the origin is a strict local minimizer of  $E$  when  $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(p)$ . A similar argument using  $W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$  (cf. Proposition 2.7-(ii)) shows that when  $r > p$ , the origin is a strict local minimizer of  $E$  for all  $\lambda > 0$ . On the other hand,  $E(tu) \rightarrow -\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  for any  $u \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ . So  $E$  has the mountain pass geometry.

Let

$$\beta := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \max_{u \in \gamma((0,1))} E(u) > 0$$

be the mountain pass level, where

$$\Gamma = \{\gamma \in C([0, 1], W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega)) : \gamma(0) = 0, E(\gamma(1)) < 0\}$$

is the class of paths in  $W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  joining the origin to the set  $\{u \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega) : E(u) < 0\}$ . A standard deformation argument shows that  $E$  has a  $(PS)_\beta$  sequence  $(u_j)$ . We will show that for all  $\mu > 0$  and sufficiently small  $b_\infty \geq 0$ , in each of the cases in Theorem 1.1,

$$\beta < \beta^*(\mu, b_\infty) \tag{4.2}$$

and hence  $(u_j)$  has a subsequence that converges weakly to a nontrivial weak solution of problem (1.5) by Proposition 1.6.

For any  $u \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\exists t_u > 0$  such that  $E(t_u u) < 0$  since  $E(tu) \rightarrow -\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ . Then the line segment  $\{t \cdot t_u u : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$  belongs to  $\Gamma$  and hence

$$\beta \leq \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} E(t \cdot t_u u) \leq \max_{t \geq 0} E(tu).$$

So, to show that (4.2) holds, it suffices to show that

$$\max_{t \geq 0} E(tu_0) < \beta^*(\mu, b_\infty) \tag{4.3}$$

for some  $u_0 \in W_0^{1, \mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ . To construct such a function  $u_0$ , take  $x_0 = 0$  for the sake of simplicity, let  $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B_\rho(0))$  be a cut-off function such that  $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$  and  $\psi = 1$  on  $B_{\rho/2}(0)$ , and set

$$u_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{\psi(x)}{(\varepsilon^{p/(p-1)} + |x|^{p/(p-1)})^{(N-p)/p}}, \quad v_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{u_\varepsilon(x)}{\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p^*}(\Omega)}}$$

for  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We will show that (4.3) holds for  $u_0 = v_\varepsilon$  with  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small.

Using the big- $O$  notation, we have the estimates

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^p dx = S_p + O(\varepsilon^{(N-p)/(p-1)}) \tag{4.4}$$

and

$$\int_\Omega v_\varepsilon^r dx = \begin{cases} O(\varepsilon^{[Np - (N-p)r]/p}), & r > \frac{N(p-1)}{N-p} \\ O(\varepsilon^{N/p} |\log \varepsilon|), & r = \frac{N(p-1)}{N-p} \\ O(\varepsilon^{(N-p)r/p(p-1)}), & r < \frac{N(p-1)}{N-p} \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  (see Drábek and Huang [14]).

**Lemma 4.1.** *If the following limit holds*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon^{(N-p)/(p-1)}}{\int_\Omega v_\varepsilon^r dx} = 0, \tag{4.6}$$

then there exist  $\varepsilon_0, b^* > 0$  such that

$$\max_{t \geq 0} E(tv_{\varepsilon_0}) < \beta^*(\mu, b_\infty)$$

when  $\mu > 0$  and  $0 \leq b_\infty < b^*$ .

*Proof.* Since (1.3) implies that  $\text{supp}(b) \subset \text{supp}(a)$ ,  $a = 0 = b$  a.e. in  $B_\rho(0)$  by (1.7). Since  $\text{supp}(v_\varepsilon) \subset B_\rho(0)$  and  $\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p^*}(\Omega)} = 1$ , this gives

$$E(tv_\varepsilon) = \frac{t^p}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^p dx - \frac{\lambda t^r}{r} \int_{\Omega} v_\varepsilon^r dx - \frac{\mu t^{p^*}}{p^*} =: \varphi_\varepsilon(t).$$

So, in view of (1.17), it suffices to show that

$$\max_{t \geq 0} \varphi_\varepsilon(t) < \frac{1}{N} \frac{S_p^{N/p}}{\mu^{(N-p)/p}}$$

for all sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Suppose this is false. Then there are sequences  $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$  and  $t_j > 0$  such that

$$\varphi_{\varepsilon_j}(t_j) = \frac{t_j^p}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_j|^p dx - \frac{\lambda t_j^r}{r} \int_{\Omega} v_j^r dx - \frac{\mu t_j^{p^*}}{p^*} \geq \frac{1}{N} \frac{S_p^{N/p}}{\mu^{(N-p)/p}} \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$t_j \varphi'_{\varepsilon_j}(t_j) = t_j^p \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_j|^p dx - \lambda t_j^r \int_{\Omega} v_j^r dx - \mu t_j^{p^*} = 0, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $v_j = v_{\varepsilon_j}$ . By (4.4) and (4.5),

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_j|^p dx \rightarrow S_p, \quad \int_{\Omega} v_j^r dx \rightarrow 0.$$

So (4.7) implies that the sequence  $(t_j)$  is bounded and hence converges to some  $t_0 > 0$  for a renamed subsequence. Passing to the limit in (4.8) gives

$$S_p t_0^p - \mu t_0^{p^*} = 0, \quad (4.9)$$

so

$$t_0 = \left( \frac{S_p}{\mu} \right)^{(N-p)/p^2}.$$

Subtracting (4.9) from (4.8) and using (4.4) gives

$$S_p (t_j^p - t_0^p) - \lambda t_j^r \int_{\Omega} v_j^r dx - \mu (t_j^{p^*} - t_0^{p^*}) = O(\varepsilon_j^{(N-p)/(p-1)}).$$

Then

$$\left( p S_p \sigma_j^{p-1} - p^* \mu \tau_j^{p^*-1} \right) (t_j - t_0) = \lambda t_j^r \int_{\Omega} v_j^r dx + O(\varepsilon_j^{(N-p)/(p-1)}) \quad (4.10)$$

for some  $\sigma_j, \tau_j$  between  $t_0$  and  $t_j$  by the mean value theorem. Since  $t_j \rightarrow t_0$ ,  $\sigma_j, \tau_j \rightarrow t_0$  and hence

$$p S_p \sigma_j^{p-1} - p^* \mu \tau_j^{p^*-1} \rightarrow p S_p t_0^{p-1} - p^* \mu t_0^{p^*-1} = -(p^* - p) \mu t_0^{p^*-1} < 0$$

by (4.9). So (4.10) and (4.6) imply that  $t_j \leq t_0$  for all sufficiently large  $j$ . Dividing (4.8) by  $p^*$ , subtracting from (4.7), and using (4.4) and (4.9) gives

$$\frac{1}{N} S_p t_j^p - \lambda \left( \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{p^*} \right) t_j^r \int_{\Omega} v_j^r dx \geq \frac{1}{N} S_p t_0^p + O(\varepsilon_j^{(N-p)/(p-1)}).$$

This together with  $t_j \leq t_0$  and (4.6) gives

$$\lambda \left( \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{p^*} \right) t_0^r \leq 0,$$

a contradiction since  $\lambda, t_0 > 0$  and  $r < p^*$ .  $\square$

In view of Lemma 4.1, it suffices to show that (4.6) holds in each of the cases in Theorem 1.1 to complete its proof. Equation (4.5) gives us the estimate

$$\frac{\varepsilon^{(N-p)/(p-1)}}{\int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon}^r dx} = \begin{cases} O(\varepsilon^{[(N-p)(p-1)r - (Np-2N+p)p]/p(p-1)}), & r > \frac{N(p-1)}{N-p} \\ O(\varepsilon^{(N-p^2)/p(p-1)}/|\log \varepsilon|), & r = \frac{N(p-1)}{N-p} \\ O(\varepsilon^{(N-p)(p-r)/p(p-1)}), & r < \frac{N(p-1)}{N-p} \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

(i) Let  $N \geq p^2$  and  $r = p$ . Then (4.11) gives

$$\frac{\varepsilon^{(N-p)/(p-1)}}{\int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon}^r dx} = \begin{cases} O(\varepsilon^{(N-p^2)/(p-1)}), & N > p^2 \\ O(1/|\log \varepsilon|), & N = p^2 \end{cases} \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

so (4.6) follows.

(ii) Let  $N \geq p^2$  and  $p < r < p^*$ . Then  $p \geq N(p-1)/(N-p)$  and hence  $r > N(p-1)/(N-p)$ , so (4.11) gives

$$\frac{\varepsilon^{(N-p)/(p-1)}}{\int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon}^r dx} = O(\varepsilon^{[(N-p)(p-1)r - (Np-2N+p)p]/p(p-1)}) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Since  $(N-p)(p-1)r - (Np-2N+p)p > (N-p^2)p \geq 0$ , (4.6) follows.

(iii) Let  $N < p^2$  and  $(Np-2N+p)p/(N-p)(p-1) < r < p^*$ . Then  $(Np-2N+p)p/(N-p)(p-1) > N(p-1)/(N-p)$  and hence  $r > N(p-1)/(N-p)$ , so (4.11) gives

$$\frac{\varepsilon^{(N-p)/(p-1)}}{\int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon}^r dx} = O(\varepsilon^{[(N-p)(p-1)r - (Np-2N+p)p]/p(p-1)}) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Since  $(N-p)(p-1)r - (Np-2N+p)p > 0$  by the hypothesis on  $r$ , (4.6) follows.  $\square$

## 5 Proof of Theorem 1.4

The variational functional associated with problem (1.8) is

$$E(u) = \int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{1}{p} |\nabla u|^p + \frac{a(x)}{q} |\nabla u|^q - \frac{c(x)}{s} |u|^s - \frac{\mu}{p^*} |u|^{p^*} - \frac{b(x)}{q^*} |u|^{q^*} \right] dx, \quad u \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega).$$

Fix  $p < r < p^*$  and let

$$C(x, t) = t^r + c(x) t^s, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, \infty).$$

Then

$$\int_{\Omega} c(x) |u|^s dx \leq \int_{\Omega} (|u|^r + c(x) |u|^s) dx \leq \max \{ \|u\|_{\mathcal{C}}^r, \|u\|_{\mathcal{C}}^s \} \leq \|u\|_{\mathcal{C}}^r$$

for all  $u \in L^{\mathcal{C}}(\Omega)$  with  $\|u\|_{\mathcal{C}} \leq 1$ , and  $W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  is continuously embedded in  $L^{\mathcal{C}}(\Omega)$  by Proposition 2.10, so an argument similar to that in the proof of Theorem 1.1 shows that  $E$  has the mountain pass geometry. As in that proof, it now suffices to show that for all  $b_{\infty} > 0$  and sufficiently small  $\mu \geq 0$ ,

$$\max_{t \geq 0} E(tu_0) < \beta^*(\mu, b_{\infty}) \tag{5.1}$$

for some  $u_0 \in W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ . Take  $x_0 = 0$ , let  $\psi \in C_0^{\infty}(B_{\rho}(0))$  be a cut-off function such that  $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$  and  $\psi = 1$  on  $B_{\rho/2}(0)$ , and set

$$u_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x) = \frac{\psi(x/\delta)}{(\varepsilon^{q/(q-1)} + |x|^{q/(q-1)})^{(N-q)/q}}, \quad v_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x) = \frac{u_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x)}{\|u_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{L^{q^*}(\Omega)}}$$

for  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $0 < \delta \leq 1$ . We will show that (5.1) holds for  $u_0 = v_{\varepsilon, \delta}$  with suitably chosen  $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ .

We have the estimates

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_{\varepsilon, \delta}|^q dx = S_q + O((\varepsilon/\delta)^{(N-q)/(q-1)}), \tag{5.2}$$

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_{\varepsilon, \delta}|^p dx = \begin{cases} O(\varepsilon^{N(q-p)/q}), & p > \frac{N(q-1)}{N-1} \\ O(\varepsilon^{N(N-q)/(N-1)q} |\log(\varepsilon/\delta)|), & p = \frac{N(q-1)}{N-1} \\ O(\varepsilon^{(N-q)p/q(q-1)} \delta^{[N(q-1)-(N-1)p]/(q-1)}), & p < \frac{N(q-1)}{N-1}, \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon, \delta}^s dx = \begin{cases} O(\varepsilon^{[Nq-(N-q)s]/q}), & s > \frac{N(q-1)}{N-q} \\ O(\varepsilon^{N/q} |\log(\varepsilon/\delta)|), & s = \frac{N(q-1)}{N-q} \\ O(\varepsilon^{(N-q)s/q(q-1)} \delta^{[N(q-1)-(N-q)s]/(q-1)}), & s < \frac{N(q-1)}{N-q} \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  and  $\varepsilon/\delta \rightarrow 0$  (see Ho et al. [18, Lemma 3.2]).

**Lemma 5.1.** *If  $\varepsilon/\delta \rightarrow 0$  and the following limits hold*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_{\varepsilon, \delta}|^p dx}{\int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon, \delta}^s dx} = 0, \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{(\varepsilon/\delta)^{(N-q)/(q-1)}}{\int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon, \delta}^s dx} = 0, \quad (5.5)$$

then there exist  $\varepsilon_0, \delta_0, \mu^* > 0$  such that

$$\max_{t \geq 0} E(tv_{\varepsilon_0, \delta_0}) < \beta^*(\mu, b_{\infty})$$

when  $0 \leq \mu < \mu^*$  and  $b_{\infty} > 0$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\text{supp}(v_{\varepsilon, \delta}) \subset B_{\rho}(0)$  and  $\|v_{\varepsilon, \delta}\|_{L^{q^*}(\Omega)} = 1$ , (1.9) gives

$$E(tv_{\varepsilon, \delta}) \leq \frac{t^p}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_{\varepsilon, \delta}|^p dx + \frac{a_0 t^q}{q} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_{\varepsilon, \delta}|^q dx - \frac{c_0 t^s}{s} \int_{\Omega} v_{\varepsilon, \delta}^s dx - \frac{b_{\infty} t^{q^*}}{q^*} =: \varphi_{\varepsilon}(t)$$

for all  $\mu \geq 0$ . So, in view of (1.18), it suffices to show that

$$\max_{t \geq 0} \varphi_{\varepsilon}(t) < \frac{1}{N} \frac{(a_0 S_q)^{N/q}}{b_{\infty}^{(N-q)/q}}$$

for all sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Suppose this is false. Then there are sequences  $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$  and  $t_j > 0$  such that

$$\varphi_{\varepsilon_j}(t_j) = \frac{t_j^p}{p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_j|^p dx + \frac{a_0 t_j^q}{q} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_j|^q dx - \frac{c_0 t_j^s}{s} \int_{\Omega} v_j^s dx - \frac{b_{\infty} t_j^{q^*}}{q^*} \geq \frac{1}{N} \frac{(a_0 S_q)^{N/q}}{b_{\infty}^{(N-q)/q}} \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$t_j \varphi'_{\varepsilon_j}(t_j) = t_j^p \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_j|^p dx + a_0 t_j^q \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_j|^q dx - c_0 t_j^s \int_{\Omega} v_j^s dx - b_{\infty} t_j^{q^*} = 0, \quad (5.7)$$

where  $v_j = v_{\varepsilon_j, \delta_j}$  and  $\delta_j = \delta(\varepsilon_j)$ . By (5.2)–(5.4),

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_j|^q dx \rightarrow S_q, \quad \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_j|^p dx \rightarrow 0, \quad \int_{\Omega} v_j^s dx \rightarrow 0.$$

So (5.6) implies that the sequence  $(t_j)$  is bounded and hence converges to some  $t_0 > 0$  for a renamed subsequence. Passing to the limit in (5.7) gives

$$a_0 S_q t_0^q - b_{\infty} t_0^{q^*} = 0, \quad (5.8)$$

so

$$t_0 = \left( \frac{a_0 S_q}{b_{\infty}} \right)^{(N-q)/q^2}.$$



Subtracting (5.8) from (5.7) and using (5.2) gives

$$t_j^p \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_j|^p dx + a_0 S_q (t_j^q - t_0^q) - c_0 t_j^s \int_{\Omega} v_j^s dx - b_{\infty} (t_j^{q^*} - t_0^{q^*}) = O((\varepsilon_j/\delta_j)^{(N-q)/(q-1)}).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} (qa_0 S_q \sigma_j^{q-1} - q^* b_{\infty} \tau_j^{q^*-1}) (t_j - t_0) &= c_0 t_j^s \int_{\Omega} v_j^s dx - t_j^p \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_j|^p dx \\ &\quad + O((\varepsilon_j/\delta_j)^{(N-q)/(q-1)}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

for some  $\sigma_j, \tau_j$  between  $t_0$  and  $t_j$  by the mean value theorem. Since  $t_j \rightarrow t_0$ ,  $\sigma_j, \tau_j \rightarrow t_0$  and hence

$$qa_0 S_q \sigma_j^{q-1} - q^* b_{\infty} \tau_j^{q^*-1} \rightarrow qa_0 S_q t_0^{q-1} - q^* b_{\infty} t_0^{q^*-1} = -(q^* - q) b_{\infty} t_0^{q^*-1} < 0$$

by (5.8). So (5.9) and (5.5) imply that  $t_j \leq t_0$  for all sufficiently large  $j$ . Dividing (5.7) by  $q^*$ , subtracting from (5.6), and using (5.2) and (5.8) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q^*}\right) t_j^p \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_j|^p dx + \frac{1}{N} a_0 S_q t_j^q - c_0 \left(\frac{1}{s} - \frac{1}{q^*}\right) t_j^s \int_{\Omega} v_j^s dx &\geq \frac{1}{N} a_0 S_q t_0^q \\ &\quad + O((\varepsilon_j/\delta_j)^{(N-q)/(q-1)}). \end{aligned}$$

This together with  $t_j \leq t_0$  and (5.5) gives

$$c_0 \left(\frac{1}{s} - \frac{1}{q^*}\right) t_0^s \leq 0,$$

a contradiction since  $c_0, t_0 > 0$  and  $s < q^*$ . □

In view of Lemma 5.1, it only remains to find a  $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) \in (0, 1]$  such that  $\varepsilon/\delta \rightarrow 0$  and (5.5) holds as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  in each of the two cases in Theorem 1.4.

(i) Let  $1 < p < N(q-1)/(N-1)$  and  $N^2(q-1)/(N-1)(N-q) < s < q^*$ . We take  $\delta = \varepsilon^{\kappa}$ , where  $\kappa \in [0, 1)$  is to be determined. Since

$$s > \frac{N^2(q-1)}{(N-1)(N-q)} > \frac{N(q-1)}{N-q},$$

(5.3) and (5.4) give

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v_{\varepsilon, \delta}|^p dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v_{\varepsilon, \delta}^s dx} &= O(\varepsilon_j^{[(N-q)(s+p/(q-1)) - Nq]/q + \kappa[N(q-1) - (N-1)p]/(q-1)}) \\ &= O(\varepsilon^{[N(q-1) - (N-1)p](\kappa - \underline{\kappa})/(q-1)}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\underline{\kappa} = \frac{Nq(q-1) - (N-q)(q-1)s - (N-q)p}{[N(q-1) - (N-1)p]q},$$

and (5.4) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\varepsilon/\delta)^{(N-q)/(q-1)}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v_{\varepsilon,\delta}^s dx} &= O\left(\varepsilon^{[(N-q)(q-1)s - (Nq-2N+q)q]/q(q-1) - \kappa(N-q)/(q-1)}\right) \\ &= O\left(\varepsilon^{(N-q)(\bar{\kappa}-\kappa)/(q-1)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\bar{\kappa} = \frac{(N-q)(q-1)s - (Nq-2N+q)q}{(N-q)q}.$$

We want to choose  $\kappa \in [0, 1)$  so that  $\kappa > \underline{\kappa}$  and  $\kappa < \bar{\kappa}$ . This is possible if and only if  $\underline{\kappa} < \bar{\kappa}$ ,  $\underline{\kappa} < 1$ , and  $\bar{\kappa} > 0$ . Tedious calculations show that these inequalities are equivalent to

$$s > \frac{N^2(q-1)}{(N-1)(N-q)},$$

$$s > \frac{Np}{N-q},$$

and

$$s > \frac{N^2(q-1)}{(N-1)(N-q)} - \frac{N-q}{(N-1)(q-1)},$$

respectively, all of which hold under our assumptions on  $p$  and  $s$ .

(ii) Let  $N(q-1)/(N-1) \leq p < q$  and  $Np/(N-q) < s < q^*$ . We take  $\delta = 1$ . Since

$$s > \frac{Np}{N-q} \geq \frac{N^2(q-1)}{(N-1)(N-q)} > \frac{N(q-1)}{N-q},$$

(5.3) and (5.4) give

$$\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^p dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v_{\varepsilon,\delta}^s dx} = \begin{cases} O\left(\varepsilon^{[(N-q)s - Np]/q}\right), & p > \frac{N(q-1)}{N-1} \\ O\left(\varepsilon^{[(N-q)s - Np]/q} |\log \varepsilon|\right), & p = \frac{N(q-1)}{N-1} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\frac{(\varepsilon/\delta)^{(N-q)/(q-1)}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v_{\varepsilon,\delta}^s dx} = O\left(\varepsilon^{[(N-q)(q-1)s - (Nq-2N+q)q]/q(q-1)}\right).$$

Since  $s > Np/(N-q)$ , the first limit in (5.5) holds. The second limit also holds since

$$\frac{Np}{N-q} \geq \frac{N^2(q-1)}{(N-1)(N-q)} > \frac{(Nq-2N+q)q}{(N-q)(q-1)}.$$

□

## 6 Proofs of Theorems 1.9, 1.10, and 1.11

In this section we prove the Pohožaev type identity (1.19) and derive subsequent nonexistence results for the double phase problem (1.1), which we report here for the reader's convenience

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u + a(x) |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) = f(x, u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  is a  $C^1$  bounded domain,  $1 < p < q < N$ ,  $q/p < 1 + 1/N$ , and  $0 \leq a \in C^1(\Omega)$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.9.* Multiplying the left-hand side of the equation in (6.1) by  $(x \cdot \nabla u)$ , and integrating by parts over  $\Omega$ , we get by straightforward calculations

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div} (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u + a(x) |\nabla u|^{q-2} \nabla u) (x \cdot \nabla u) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{N}{p}\right) |\nabla u|^p + \left(1 - \frac{N}{q}\right) a(x) |\nabla u|^q \right] dx - \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u|^q}{q} (\nabla a \cdot x) dx \\ & \quad - \int_{\partial\Omega} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) |\nabla u|^p + \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) a(x) |\nabla u|^q \right] (x \cdot \nu) d\sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

Then, performing the same operations on the right-hand side, we have by straightforward calculations

$$- \int_{\Omega} f(x, u) (x \cdot \nabla u) dx = -N \int_{\Omega} F(x, u) dx. \quad (6.3)$$

Hence, using that  $u$  solves the equation in (6.1), by (6.2) and (6.3), we obtain the following identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{p^*} |\nabla u|^p + \frac{1}{q^*} a(x) |\nabla u|^q \right) dx + \frac{1}{Nq} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^q (\nabla a \cdot x) dx \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{N} \int_{\partial\Omega} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) |\nabla u|^p + \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) a(x) |\nabla u|^q \right] (x \cdot \nu) d\sigma \\ & \quad = \int_{\Omega} F(x, u) dx \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

Now, multiplying the equation in (6.1) by  $u/q^*$  and integrating by parts over  $\Omega$ , we also have

$$\frac{1}{q^*} \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u|^p + a(x) |\nabla u|^q) dx = \frac{1}{q^*} \int_{\Omega} f(x, u) u dx \quad (6.5)$$

Finally, subtracting (6.5) from (6.4) and observing that  $1/p^* - 1/q^* = 1/p - 1/q$  and  $|\nabla u| = |\partial_{\nu} u|$  over  $\partial\Omega$ , in view of the homogeneous boundary conditions, we obtain the desired identity (1.19) and conclude the proof.  $\square$

In the rest of the section we assume that  $\Omega$  is starshaped. Without loss of generality we suppose that  $0 \in \Omega$  and  $\Omega$  is starshaped with respect to the origin, and so  $(x \cdot \nu) \geq 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ .

Being  $a(x)$  nonnegative, the boundary term in (1.19) is nonnegative, and the Pohožaev type identity (1.19) gives the inequality

$$\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx + \frac{1}{Nq} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^q (\nabla a \cdot x) dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \left( F(x, u) - \frac{1}{q^*} f(x, u) u \right) dx. \quad (6.6)$$

We are now ready to prove the nonexistence theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 1.10.* Being  $a(x)$  radial and radially nondecreasing,  $(\nabla a \cdot x) \geq 0$ . Thus, by (6.6), we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \left[ c(x) \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{q^*}\right) |u|^r + \mu \left(\frac{1}{p^*} - \frac{1}{q^*}\right) |u|^{p^*} \right] dx. \quad (6.7)$$

In case (i) this immediately gives  $\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx \leq 0$ , that is  $u \equiv 0$ . In case (ii), by inequality (6.7) we can infer that

$$\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx \leq \|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q^*}\right) \int_{\Omega} |u|^p dx.$$

Hence, using the variational characterization of the first eigenvalue  $\lambda_1(p)$  of the  $p$ -Laplacian, we have

$$\left[ \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) - \frac{\|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\lambda_1(p)} \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q^*}\right) \right] \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx \leq 0,$$

which again implies  $u \equiv 0$ , by the assumption on  $\|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ . Finally, for (iii), we go back to the Pohožaev type identity (1.19) and observe that in this case, using again the variational characterization of  $\lambda_1(p)$  and the assumptions on  $\mu$  and  $\|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ , it implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx + \frac{1}{N} \int_{\partial\Omega} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) |\partial_\nu u|^p + \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) a(x) |\partial_\nu u|^q \right] (x \cdot \nu) d\sigma \\ \leq \|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q^*}\right) \int_{\Omega} |u|^p dx \leq \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) |\partial_\nu u|^p + \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) a(x) |\partial_\nu u|^q \right] (x \cdot \nu) d\sigma \leq 0,$$

which in view of the strict starshapedness of  $\Omega$  (i.e.,  $(x \cdot \nu) > 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ ) forces

$$\partial_\nu u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \quad (6.8)$$

Since, by the explicit expression for  $\|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$  given in the hypothesis, it holds

$$\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^p dx \leq \|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q^*}\right) \int_{\Omega} |u|^p dx = \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) \lambda_1(p) \int_{\Omega} |u|^p dx.$$

By the variational characterization of  $\lambda_1(p)$ , if  $u$  is non-zero, it must be the first eigenvalue of the  $p$ -Laplacian, and so it satisfies the equation  $-\Delta_p u = \lambda_1(p) u^{p-1}$ . Hence, by the Hopf Lemma,  $\partial_\nu u \neq 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ . Thus, in view of (6.8),  $u \equiv 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.11.* Suppose by contradiction that there exists a sequence  $(u_j) \subset W_0^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \cap W^{2,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega)$  of solutions of (6.1) such that  $\|u_j\| \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $\gamma > q^*$ . Multiplying the equation in (6.1) by  $u/\gamma$  and using the expression of the specific nonlinearity  $f$  in the hypothesis, we get

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_j|^p + a(x)|\nabla u_j|^q) dx = \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_{\Omega} (c(x)|u_j|^r + \mu|u_j|^{p^*} + b(x)|u_j|^{q^*}) dx.$$

Subtracting this last identity from (6.4), and using that  $\Omega$  is starshaped and  $a$  is radial and radially nondecreasing, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{p^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_j|^p dx + \left(\frac{1}{q^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \int_{\Omega} a(x)|\nabla u_j|^q dx \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \int_{\Omega} c(x)|u_j|^r dx + \mu \left(\frac{1}{p^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \int_{\Omega} |u_j|^{p^*} dx + \left(\frac{1}{q^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \int_{\Omega} b(x)|u_j|^{q^*} dx \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \int_{\Omega} c(x)|u_j|^r dx + \mu \left(\frac{1}{p^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \frac{1}{S_p^{p^*/p}} (\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j))^{p^*/p} \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{1}{q^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} (\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j))^{q^*/q}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last steps we used (2.10) and (2.11). Thus, the last chain of inequalities gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{q^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j) & \leq \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \int_{\Omega} c(x)|u_j|^r dx + \mu \left(\frac{1}{p^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \frac{1}{S_p^{p^*/p}} (\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j))^{p^*/p} \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{1}{q^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} (\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j))^{q^*/q}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

Now, if  $r \in (p, p^*]$ , then by the Sobolev embedding  $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{q^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j) & \leq \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) c_{\infty} C_S \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_j|^p dx\right)^{r/p} \\ & \quad + \mu \left(\frac{1}{p^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \frac{1}{S_p^{p^*/p}} (\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j))^{p^*/p} + \left(\frac{1}{q^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} (\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j))^{q^*/q} \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) c_{\infty} C_S (\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j))^{r/p} + \mu \left(\frac{1}{p^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \frac{1}{S_p^{p^*/p}} (\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j))^{p^*/p} \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{1}{q^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \frac{b_{\infty}}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} (\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j))^{q^*/q}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_{\infty} = \|c\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}$  and  $C_S > 0$  is a constant arising from the Sobolev embedding. Since by (2.4),  $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j) \rightarrow 0$  as well, this gives a contradiction, because all the exponents of  $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j)$  on the right-hand side are larger than 1. Thus, (i) is proved. As for (ii), setting  $\mathcal{C}(x, t) := t^{\sigma} + c(x)t^r$ , with  $\sigma \in (q, p^*)$ , by Proposition 2.10, we know that  $W^{1,\mathcal{A}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\mathcal{C}}(\Omega)$ . Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega} c(x)|u_j|^r dx \leq \rho_{\mathcal{C}}(u_j) \leq \max\{\|u_j\|_{\mathcal{C}}^{\sigma}, \|u_j\|_{\mathcal{C}}^r\} \leq C'_S \max\{\|u_j\|^{\sigma}, \|u_j\|^r\} = C'_S \|u_j\|^{\sigma},$$

where  $C'_S > 0$  is a constant arising from the embedding, and we used that  $\|u_j\| < 1$  for  $j$  large. Therefore, combining with (6.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{q^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \|u_j\|^q &\leq \left(\frac{1}{q^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u_j) \leq \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) C'_S \|u_j\|^\sigma \\ &\quad + \mu \left(\frac{1}{p^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \frac{1}{S_p^{p^*/p}} \|u_j\|^{p^*} + \left(\frac{1}{q^*} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \frac{b_\infty}{(a_0 S_q)^{q^*/q}} \|u_j\|^{pq^*/q}, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts  $\|u_j\| \rightarrow 0$ , because all the exponents of  $\|u_j\|$  on the right-hand side are larger than  $q$ , in particular  $pq^*/q > q$  is a consequence of  $q/p < 1 + 1/N$ . This concludes the proof of (ii). Finally, to prove (iii), we first estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} c(x) |u|^r dx &\leq c_\infty \int_{\text{supp}(c)} |u|^r dx \leq c_\infty C''_S \left( \int_{\text{supp}(c)} |\nabla u|^q dx \right)^{r/q} \\ &\leq \frac{c_\infty C''_S}{(a'_0)^{r/q}} \left( \int_{\text{supp}(c)} a(x) |\nabla u|^q dx \right)^{r/q} \leq \frac{c_\infty C''_S}{(a'_0)^{r/q}} (\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\nabla u))^{r/q}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C''_S > 0$  is a constant arising from the embedding  $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$ . The proof can now be concluded as in case (i).  $\square$

## References

- [1] Robert A. Adams and John J. F. Fournier. *Sobolev spaces*, volume 140 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics (Amsterdam)*. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, second edition, 2003.
- [2] Giuseppina Autuori and Patrizia Pucci. Existence of entire solutions for a class of quasi-linear elliptic equations. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 20(3):977–1009, 2013.
- [3] P. Baroni, M. Colombo, and G. Mingione. Nonautonomous functionals, borderline cases and related function classes. *Algebra i Analiz*, 27(3):6–50, 2015.
- [4] Paolo Baroni, Maria Colombo, and Giuseppe Mingione. Harnack inequalities for double phase functionals. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 121:206–222, 2015.
- [5] Paolo Baroni, Tuomo Kuusi, and Giuseppe Mingione. Borderline gradient continuity of minima. *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.*, 15(2):537–575, 2014.
- [6] Andrea Cianchi. A sharp embedding theorem for Orlicz-Sobolev spaces. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 45(1):39–65, 1996.
- [7] Francesca Colasuonno and Marco Squassina. Eigenvalues for double phase variational integrals. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 195(6):1917–1959, 2016.

- [8] Maria Colombo and Giuseppe Mingione. Bounded minimisers of double phase variational integrals. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 218(1):219–273, 2015.
- [9] Maria Colombo and Giuseppe Mingione. Regularity for double phase variational problems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 215(2):443–496, 2015.
- [10] Giovanni Cupini, Paolo Marcellini, and Elvira Mascolo. Local boundedness of minimizers with limit growth conditions. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 166(1):1–22, 2015.
- [11] Sébastien de Valeriola and Michel Willem. On some quasilinear critical problems. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 9(4):825–836, 2009.
- [12] Lars Diening, Petteri Harjulehto, Peter Hästö, and Michael Růžička. *Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces with variable exponents*, volume 2017 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [13] Thomas K. Donaldson and Neil S. Trudinger. Orlicz-Sobolev spaces and imbedding theorems. *J. Functional Analysis*, 8:52–75, 1971.
- [14] Pavel Drábek and Yin Xi 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.
- [15] Xianling Fan. An imbedding theorem for Musielak-Sobolev spaces. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 75(4):1959–1971, 2012.
- [16] Csaba Farkas, Alessio Fiscella, and Patrick Winkert. On a class of critical double phase problems. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 515(2):Paper No. 126420, 16, 2022.
- [17] Hoang Hai Ha and Ky Ho. Multiplicity results for double phase problems involving a new type of critical growth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17859*, 2023.
- [18] Ky Ho, Kanishka Perera, and Inbo Sim. On the Brezis-Nirenberg problem for the  $(p, q)$ -Laplacian. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, (4), 2023.
- [19] Ky Ho and Patrick Winkert. New embedding results for double phase problems with variable exponents and a priori bounds for corresponding generalized double phase problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.00504*, 2022.
- [20] V. V. Jikov, S. M. Kozlov, and O. A. Oleĭnik. *Homogenization of differential operators and integral functionals*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994. Translated from the Russian by G. A. Yosifian [G. A. Iosif'yan].
- [21] Paolo Marcellini. Regularity of minimizers of integrals of the calculus of variations with nonstandard growth conditions. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 105(3):267–284, 1989.
- [22] Paolo Marcellini. Regularity and existence of solutions of elliptic equations with  $p, q$ -growth conditions. *J. Differential Equations*, 90(1):1–30, 1991.

- [23] Julian Musielak. *Orlicz spaces and modular spaces*, volume 1034 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [24] V. V. Zhikov. Averaging of functionals of the calculus of variations and elasticity theory. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 50(4):675–710, 877, 1986.
- [25] Vasiliĭ V. Zhikov. On Lavrentiev’s phenomenon. *Russian J. Math. Phys.*, 3(2):249–269, 1995.
- [26] Vasiliĭ V. Zhikov. On some variational problems. *Russian J. Math. Phys.*, 5(1):105–116 (1998), 1997.