

Normalized solutions to Schrödinger equations with potential and inhomogeneous nonlinearities on large convex domains

Thomas Bartsch & Shijie Qi & Wenming Zou*

Abstract

The paper addresses an open problem raised in [4] on the existence of normalized solutions to Schrödinger equations with potentials and inhomogeneous nonlinearities. We consider the problem

$$-\Delta u + V(x)u + \lambda u = |u|^{q-2}u + \beta|u|^{p-2}u, \quad \|u\|_2^2 = \int |u|^2 dx = \alpha,$$

both on \mathbb{R}^N as well as on domains $r\Omega$ where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is an open bounded convex domain and $r > 0$ is large. The exponents satisfy $2 < p < 2 + \frac{4}{N} < q < 2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$, so that the nonlinearity is a combination of a mass subcritical and a mass supercritical term. Due to the presence of the potential a by now standard approach based on the Pohozaev identity cannot be used. We develop a robust method to study the existence of normalized solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations with potential and find conditions on V so that normalized solutions exist. Our results are new even in the case $\beta = 0$.

Keywords: nonlinear Schrödinger equation; normalized solutions; combined nonlinearities; potential.

Mathematics Subject Classification. 35J60 (35B09, 35A01).

1 Introduction and main results

The nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$-i\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial t} = \Delta\Phi - V(x)\Phi + f(|\Phi|)\Phi \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \quad (1.1)$$

for a wave function $\Phi(t, x) \in \mathbb{C}$ is a fundamental equation in quantum mechanics, used to model, for instance, nonlinear optical problems or Bose-Einstein condensates; see e.g. [14, 16, 20]. Since the remarkable experiments on Bose-Einstein condensates in dilute gases of alkali atoms in 1995 [1] several types of potentials have been used, see e.g., [14, 21, 39]. Consequently, nonlinear Schrödinger equations have been a central topic in mathematics and theoretical physics during the last decades.

*Supported by NSFC (No.12171265, 11025106, 12201482).

In particular, many papers focus on standing wave solutions of (1.1), that is, solutions of the form

$$\Phi(t, x) = e^{-i\lambda t} u(x). \quad (1.2)$$

This ansatz leads to the equation

$$-\Delta u + V(x)u + \lambda u = f(|u|)u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \quad (1.3)$$

for the unknowns $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. There are two different points of view concerning the ansatz (1.2): one can either prescribe the frequency λ or the L^2 norm $\|u\|_2$. Recall that the L^2 norm of $\Phi(t, \cdot)$ is conserved in time for a solution Φ of (1.1). In spite of the clear physical relevance of solutions with prescribed L^2 norm their existence and properties are much less understood compared with solutions of (1.3) for prescribed λ .

Normalized solutions correspond to critical points of the functional $E_V : H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$E_V(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V u^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} F(u) dx \quad (1.4)$$

on the mass constraint manifold

$$S_\alpha = \{u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) : \|u\|_2^2 = \alpha\}, \quad (1.5)$$

where $F(s) = \int_0^s f(|t|)t dt$. In fact, a critical point $u \in S_\alpha$ of $E_V|_{S_\alpha}$ is a solution (1.3) with λ the corresponding Lagrange multiplier. The difficulty of this approach is the lack of the Palais-Smale condition, even if the nonlinearity is Sobolev subcritical. This is different from the variational approach corresponding to the fixed frequency problem.

In the autonomous case, i.e. the potential V is constant, an approach based on the Pohozaev identity and going back to Jeanjean's paper [24], has been used successfully in recent years. The main ingredient of this approach is the use of the transformation $s * u(x) = e^{sN/2} u(e^s x)$ in order to find bounded Palais-Smale sequences. Recall that the identity $P(u) := \frac{d}{ds} E_V(s * u) = 0$ is the Pohozaev identity. In [5] it is proved, in the case $V = 0$, that the Pohozaev manifold $\{u \in S_\alpha : P(u) = 0\}$ can be used as natural constraint for the problem even though it may only be a topological manifold, depending on f . Jeanjean and Lu [27] and Bieganowski and Mederski [10] improved these results by weakening the conditions in [24, 5]. These papers are concerned with mass supercritical nonlinearities; a typical example is $f(|u|)u = |u|^{p-2}u$, $2 + \frac{4}{N} < p < 2^*$, or sums of such nonlinearities. Recently, Soave [42, 43] studied normalized solution of (1.3) with combined nonlinearity $f(|u|)u = |u|^{q-2}u + \beta|u|^{p-2}u$, $2 < p < 2 + \frac{4}{N} < q \leq 2^*$, by decomposing the Nehari-Pohozaev manifold in a subtle way using the more complicated geometric structure of the energy functional. We would also like to mention the papers [25, 44] for the multiplicity of normalized solutions in the Sobolev critical case, [3, 5, 6, 31] and references therein for systems of nonlinear Schrödinger equations, and [9, 11, 38] and the references therein for the study of normalized solutions to other autonomous equations.

The methods of the papers mentioned above depend heavily on V being constant and do not work for non-constant V , even in the case of a radial potential $V(x) = V(|x|)$. They also do not work on bounded domains. In the presence of a potential V the existence of

a normalized solution of (1.3) has been obtained recently by Ikoma and Miyamoto [22] provided $V \leq 0$, $V(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ and V satisfies additional technical conditions, and f is mass subcritical, i.e. $f(|u|)u = o(|u|^{1+4/N})$ as $|u| \rightarrow \infty$. The conditions on V have been considerably relaxed by Yang et al. [45]. In the mass subcritical case one can try to minimize E_V on S_α as in the seminal paper [29] of P.L. Lions. For mass supercritical f so far only the case of a homogeneous nonlinearity $f(|u|)u = |u|^{p-2}u$ has been considered. Noris et al. [35] considered confining potentials where $V(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, Bellazzini et al. [8] treated partially confining potentials, and Bartsch et al. [4] decaying potentials, i.e. $V(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. The existence of normalized solutions on bounded domains has been obtained in [33, 34, 36, 37]. In all these papers the homogeneity of the nonlinearity was essential. As mentioned in [4] the existence of normalized solutions of (1.3) is an open problem when V is not constant and f is mass supercritical and not homogeneous. But even in the autonomous case, the existence of normalized solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations with combined nonlinearities in bounded domains still remains open.

In the present paper, we address these open problems and study the existence and multiplicity of solutions of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + V(x)u + \lambda u = |u|^{q-2}u + \beta|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \in H_0^1(\Omega), \quad \int_\Omega |u|^2 dx = \alpha \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

when $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is either a bounded smooth convex domain or all of \mathbb{R}^N , $N \geq 3$, $2 < p < 2 + \frac{4}{N} < q < 2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$, the mass $\alpha > 0$ and the parameter $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ are prescribed. The frequency λ is unknown and to be determined. We first investigate the problem on large bounded convex domains and then consider the compactness of normalized solutions u_r in B_r as the radius r tends to infinity, finally obtaining a normalized solution in \mathbb{R}^N . It would be interesting to investigate whether the bifurcation theory approach developed in [7] can also be employed for (1.6).

Before stating our main results, we introduce a few more notations. Let $s_+ = \max\{s, 0\}$, $s_- = \min\{s, 0\}$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$. The Aubin-Talenti constant [2] is denoted by S , that is, S is the best constant in the Sobolev embedding $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow L^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Let $C_{N,s}$ be the best constant in the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality

$$\|u\|_s^s \leq C_{N,s} \|u\|_2^{\frac{2s-N(s-2)}{2}} \|\nabla u\|_2^{\frac{N(s-2)}{2}} \quad \text{for } 2 < s < 2^*.$$

The functional E_V defined in (1.4) will be considered on $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as well as on the subspaces $H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ open. Our basic assumption on V is:

$$(V_0) \quad V \in C(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^{\frac{N}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ is bounded and } \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} < S.$$

For some results we require that V is C^1 and consider the function

$$\tilde{V} : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \tilde{V}(x) = \nabla V(x) \cdot x.$$

For $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and $r > 0$ we set

$$\Omega_r = \{rx \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \in \Omega\}$$

and

$$S_{r,\alpha} := S_\alpha \cap H_0^1(\Omega_r) = \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega_r) : \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega_r)}^2 = \alpha\}.$$

From now on we assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded smooth convex domain with $0 \in \Omega$. In our first result we consider the case $\beta \leq 0$.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume $\beta \leq 0$, V satisfies (V_0) , is of class C^1 and \tilde{V} is bounded. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *For every $\alpha > 0$ there exists $r_\alpha > 0$ such that (1.6) on Ω_r with $r > r_\alpha$ has a mountain pass type solution $(\lambda_{r,\alpha}, u_{r,\alpha})$ with $u_{r,\alpha} > 0$ in Ω_r and positive energy $E_V(u_{r,\alpha}) > 0$. Moreover, there exists $C_\alpha > 0$ such that*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \max_{x \in \Omega_r} u_{r,\alpha}(x) < C_\alpha.$$

- (ii) *If in addition $\|\tilde{V}_+\|_{\frac{N}{2}} < 2S$ then there exists $\tilde{\alpha} > 0$ such that*

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{r,\alpha} > 0 \quad \text{for any } 0 < \alpha < \tilde{\alpha}.$$

Remark 1.2. a) In the proof of Lemma 2.1 we will define r_α explicitly. From the definition it follows that $r_\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ as $\beta \rightarrow 0$ or as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, and that $r_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ if $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ and α is bounded, or $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and β is bounded.

b) The solution $(\lambda_{r,\alpha}, u_{r,\alpha})$ being of mountain pass type means that $u_{r,\alpha}$ is a critical point of the constrained functional $E_V|_{S_{r,\alpha}}$ of mountain pass type with $\lambda_{r,\alpha}$ the corresponding Lagrange multiplier. This applies also to other types of critical points obtained in the theorems below.

c) If one is only interested in the existence of solutions for a fixed $r > r_\alpha > 0$, then the assumptions on V in Theorem 1.1 can be weakened to $V \in C^1(\Omega_r)$, V and \tilde{V} are bounded in Ω_r , and $\|V_-\|_{L^{\frac{N}{2}}(\Omega_r)} < S$. This also applies to Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 below.

Next we consider problem (1.6) with $\beta > 0$, and obtain the existence of solutions of local minimum type and of mountain pass type.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume $\beta > 0$, V satisfies (V_0) , and set*

$$\alpha_V = \left(\frac{1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1}}{2N(q-p)} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \left(\frac{q(4 - N(p-2))}{C_{N,q}} \right)^{\frac{4-N(p-2)}{2(q-p)}} \left(\frac{p(N(q-2) - 4)}{\beta C_{N,p}} \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)-4}{2(q-p)}}.$$

Then the following hold for $0 < \alpha < \alpha_V$:

- (i) *There exists $r_\alpha > 0$ such that (1.6) on Ω_r with $r > r_\alpha$ has a local minimum type solution $(\lambda_{r,\alpha}, u_{r,\alpha})$ with $u_{r,\alpha} > 0$ in Ω_r and negative energy $E_V(u_{r,\alpha}) < 0$.*
- (ii) *There exists $C_\alpha > 0$ such that*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \max_{x \in \Omega_r} u_{r,\alpha}(x) < C_\alpha, \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{r,\alpha} > 0.$$

Theorem 1.4. Assume $\beta > 0$, V satisfies (V_0) , is of class C^1 and \tilde{V} is bounded. Set

$$\tilde{\alpha}_V = \left(\frac{2(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \left(\frac{C_{N,q}}{q} A_{p,q} + \frac{C_{N,q}}{q} \right)^{-\frac{N}{2}} \left(\frac{pC_{N,q}}{\beta q C_{N,p}} A_{p,q} \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)-4}{2(q-p)}},$$

where

$$A_{p,q} = \frac{(q-2)(N(q-2)-4)}{(p-2)(4-N(p-2))}.$$

Then the following hold for $0 < \alpha < \tilde{\alpha}_V$:

- (i) There exists $\tilde{r}_\alpha > 0$ such that (1.6) in Ω_r admits for $r > r_\alpha$ a mountain pass type solution $(\lambda_{r,\alpha}, u_{r,\alpha})$ with $u_{r,\alpha} > 0$ in Ω_r and positive energy $E_V(u_{r,\alpha}) > 0$. Moreover, there exists $C_\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \max_{x \in \Omega_r} u_{r,\alpha}(x) < C_\alpha.$$

- (ii) There exists $0 < \bar{\alpha} \leq \tilde{\alpha}_V$ such that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{r,\alpha} > 0 \quad \text{for any } 0 < \alpha \leq \bar{\alpha}.$$

Remark 1.5. a) r_α and \tilde{r}_α in Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 are defined explicitly; see the proof of Theorem 2.10, in particular (2.44), and the proof of Lemma 2.11, in particular (2.63).

b) The methods developed in Theorems 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4 can also be used to find normalized solutions for other elliptic partial differential equations in large bounded smooth convex domains. We conjecture that the convexity of Ω is not essential for our results.

Now we obtain the existence and multiplicity of normalized solutions in \mathbb{R}^N by taking $\Omega = B_1$, the unit ball centered at the origin in \mathbb{R}^N , and analyzing the compactness of the solutions $u_{r,\alpha}$ established in Theorems 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4 as r tends to infinity. For the passage $r \rightarrow \infty$ we require the following condition on V .

(V_1) V is of class C^1 , $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V(x) = 0$, and there exists $\rho \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{y \in B(x, \rho|x|)} (x \cdot \nabla V(y)) e^{\tau|x|} > 0 \quad \text{for any } \tau > 0. \quad (1.7)$$

Theorem 1.6. Assume $\beta > 0$ and V satisfies (V_0) - (V_1) . Then problem (1.6) with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ admits for any $0 < \alpha < \alpha_V$, where α_V is as in Theorem 1.3, a solution $(\lambda_\alpha, u_\alpha)$ with $u_\alpha > 0$, $\lambda_\alpha > 0$, and $E_V(u_\alpha) < 0$.

Remark 1.7. a) The assumptions on V in Theorem 1.6 and Theorems 1.8, 1.6 below hold, for instance, for $V(x) = -\frac{c}{1+|x|^\tau}$ with $\tau > 2$ and c small so that $\|V\|_{\frac{N}{2}} < S$. Observe that (V_1) implies $V(x) \leq 0$ for $|x|$ large. Thus we cover similar potentials as in [22] but not those in [4] where it was assumed that $V \geq 0$.

b) Clearly (1.7) is only concerned with the behavior of ∇V as $|x|$ tends to infinity. It holds, for instance, if $V(x) \sim -|x|^{-\tau}$ for $|x|$ large with $\tau > 2$. The condition $\tau > 2$ is needed so that $\|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} < S$ can be satisfied as required in (V_0) . More generally, if $V(x)$ is radial and radially increasing for $|x|$ large, if there are $c_0 > 0$, $r_1 > 0$ and $\tau_0 > 0$ such that

$$y \cdot \nabla V(y) \geq c_0 |y|^{-\tau_0} \quad \text{for all } |y| \geq r_1, \quad (1.8)$$

and there exist $c_2, r_2 > 0$ such that for any y with $|y| \geq r_2$,

$$|\xi \cdot \nabla V(y)| \leq c_2 \left(\frac{y \cdot \nabla V(y)}{|y|} \right) \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ with } \xi \cdot y = 0 \text{ and } |\xi| = 1, \quad (1.9)$$

then (1.7) holds. Indeed, for any $y \in B(x, \rho|x|)$ with $\rho \in (0, 1)$ to be determined, let $\xi = x - \frac{y \cdot x}{|y|^2} y$. Then

$$x = \frac{y \cdot x}{|y|^2} y + \xi \in (\text{span}\{y\}) \oplus (\text{span}\{y\})^\perp.$$

From $y \in B(x, \rho|x|)$ we deduce

$$\frac{1-\rho}{(1+\rho)^2} |y|^2 \leq y \cdot x \leq \frac{1+\rho}{(1-\rho)^2} |y|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\xi| \leq \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} |y|.$$

In view of (1.9) we get for $y \in B(x, \rho|x|)$ with $|y| \geq r_2$:

$$\begin{aligned} x \cdot \nabla V(y) &= \frac{y \cdot x}{|y|^2} (y \cdot \nabla V(y)) + |\xi| \left(\frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \cdot \nabla V(y) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{y \cdot x}{|y|^2} (y \cdot \nabla V(y)) - c_2 |\xi| \left(\frac{y}{|y|} \cdot \nabla V(y) \right) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1-\rho}{(1+\rho)^2} - c_2 \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \right) (y \cdot \nabla V(y)). \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

Note that

$$\frac{1-\rho}{(1+\rho)^2} - c_2 \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } \rho \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence, we can take ρ small such that

$$\frac{1-\rho}{(1+\rho)^2} - c_2 \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} > \frac{1}{2}. \quad (1.11)$$

Now (1.8), (1.10) and (1.11) imply for $y \in B(x, \rho|x|)$ with $|y| \geq \max\{r_1, r_2\}$:

$$x \cdot \nabla V(y) \geq \frac{1}{2} (y \cdot \nabla V(y)) \geq \frac{c_0}{2} |y|^{-\tau_0} \geq \frac{c_0(1+\rho)^{-\tau_0}}{2} |x|^{-\tau_0}.$$

Therefore (1.8) and (1.9) imply (1.7). Moreover, (1.9) holds if there exists $r_2 > 0$ such that V is radial and increasing with respect to $|x|$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{r_2}$.

Theorem 1.8. *Assume $\beta > 0$ and V satisfies (V_0) - (V_1) . Then (1.6) with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ admits for $0 < \alpha < \bar{\alpha}$, $\bar{\alpha} > 0$ as in Theorem 1.4(ii), a solution $(\lambda_\alpha, u_\alpha)$ with $u_\alpha > 0$, $\lambda_\alpha > 0$, and $E_V(u_\alpha) > 0$. Moreover, $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} E_V(u_\alpha) = \infty$.*

Our last theorem deals with the existence of a solution to (1.6) in \mathbb{R}^N in the case $\beta \leq 0$.

Theorem 1.9. *Assume $\beta \leq 0$, V satisfies (V_0) - (V_1) , and $\|\tilde{V}_+\|_{\frac{N}{2}} < 2S$. Then problem (1.6) with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ admits for $0 < \alpha < \tilde{\alpha}$, $\tilde{\alpha} > 0$ as in Theorem 1.1(ii), a solution $(\lambda_\alpha, u_\alpha)$ with $u_\alpha > 0$, $\lambda_\alpha > 0$, and $E_V(u_\alpha) > 0$. Moreover, $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} E_V(u_\alpha) = \infty$.*

In the proofs of Theorems 1.6, 1.8 and 1.9, we develop a rather robust method to investigate the existence of normalized solutions in \mathbb{R}^N , that can also be used to study the existence of normalized solutions of other elliptic partial differential equations with potentials.

Remark 1.10. a) Theorem 1.9 is new even in the case $\beta = 0$. In [4] and [32] the case $\beta = 0$ with $V \geq 0$ is treated.

b) It is shown in [28] that even for the case $V \equiv 0$ and $\beta > 0$, there is no nonnegative normalized solution for large α . Moreover, a stronger condition than (1.7) is used to consider the fixed frequency problem in [40].

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we investigate the existence and multiplicity of normalized solutions in large bounded smooth convex domains Ω_r for the cases $\beta > 0$ and $\beta \leq 0$, respectively, and obtain the sign of the Lagrange multiplier. In section 3 we specialize Ω to the unit ball $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, establish the profile decomposition of the normalized solution $u_{r,\alpha}$ in B_r , and then show the compactness of $u_{r,\alpha}$ as r tends to infinity.

2 Normalized solutions in large bounded domains

In this section, we use different approaches to consider the existence and multiplicity of normalized solutions in large bounded smooth convex domains since the energy functionals possess different geometric structures according to the sign of β . Consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + V(x)u + \lambda u = |u|^{q-2}u + \beta|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega_r, \\ u \in H_0^1(\Omega_r), \quad \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^2 dx = \alpha, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $N \geq 3$, $2 < p < 2 + \frac{4}{N} < q < 2^*$, the mass $\alpha > 0$ and the parameter $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ are prescribed, and the frequency λ is unknown and to be determined by the solution. The energy functional $E_r : H_0^1(\Omega_r) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$E_r(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} V(x)u^2 dx - \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^q dx - \frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^p dx, \quad (2.2)$$

and the mass constraint manifold is defined by

$$S_{r,\alpha} = \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega_r) : \|u\|_2^2 = \alpha\}. \quad (2.3)$$

2.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this subsection we always assume that the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold. In order to obtain a bounded Palais-Smale sequence, we will use the monotonicity trick inspired by [23, 12, 13]. For $\frac{1}{2} \leq s \leq 1$ we define the functional $E_{r,s} : S_{r,\alpha} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$E_{r,s}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} V u^2 dx - \frac{s}{q} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^q dx - \frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^p dx. \quad (2.4)$$

Note that if $u \in S_{r,\alpha}$ is a critical point of $E_{r,s}$, then there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (λ, u) is a solution of the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + V u + \lambda u = s|u|^{q-2}u + \beta|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega_r, \\ u \in H_0^1(\Omega_r), \quad \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^2 dx = \alpha. \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

Lemma 2.1. For any $\alpha > 0$, there exist $r_\alpha > 0$ and $u^0, u^1 \in S_{r_\alpha, \alpha}$ such that

(i) $E_{r,s}(u^1) \leq 0$ for any $r > r_\alpha$ and $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$,

$$\|\nabla u^0\|_2^2 < \left(\frac{2q}{N(q-2)C_{N,q}} \left(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1}\right) \alpha^{\frac{q(N-2)-2N}{4}} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} < \|\nabla u^1\|_2^2$$

and

$$E_{r,s}(u^0) < \frac{(N(q-2)-4)(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{2N(q-2)} \left(\frac{2q(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)C_{N,q} \alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}}} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}}$$

(ii) If $u \in S_{r,\alpha}$ satisfies

$$\|\nabla u\|_2^2 = \left(\frac{2q}{N(q-2)C_{N,q}} \left(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1}\right) \alpha^{\frac{q(N-2)-2N}{4}} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}}$$

then there holds

$$E_{r,s}(u) \geq \frac{(N(q-2)-4)(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{2N(q-2)} \left(\frac{2q(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)C_{N,q} \alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}}} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}}$$

(iii) Set

$$m_{r,s}(\alpha) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{r,\alpha}} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} E_{r,s}(\gamma(t)),$$

with

$$\Gamma_{r,\alpha} = \{\gamma \in C([0,1], S_{r,\alpha}) : \gamma(0) = u^0, \gamma(1) = u^1\}.$$

Then

$$\frac{(N(q-2)-4)(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{2N(q-2)} \left(\frac{2q(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)C_{N,q} \alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}}} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} \leq m_{r,s}(\alpha) \leq T_\alpha,$$

where $T_\alpha = \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} h(t)$, the function $h : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ being defined by

$$h(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \|V\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1}\right) t^2 \theta \alpha - \frac{\beta C_{N,p}}{p} \alpha^{\frac{p}{2}} \theta^{\frac{N(p-2)}{4}} t^{\frac{N(p-2)}{2}} - \frac{1}{2q} \alpha^{\frac{q}{2}} |\Omega|^{\frac{2-q}{2}} t^{\frac{N(q-2)}{2}}.$$

Here θ is the principal eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions in Ω , and $|\Omega|$ is the volume of Ω .

Proof. (i) Clearly the set $S_{r,\alpha}$ is path connected. Let $v_1 \in S_{1,\alpha}$ be the positive eigenfunction associated to θ . Then we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_1|^2 dx = \theta \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} |v_1|^q dx \geq \alpha^{\frac{q}{2}} |\Omega|^{\frac{2-q}{2}}. \quad (2.6)$$

by the Hölder inequality. Setting $v_t(x) = t^{\frac{N}{2}} v_1(tx)$ for $x \in \Omega_{\frac{1}{t}}$ and $t > 0$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\frac{1}{t},s}(v_t) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \|V\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1}\right) t^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_1|^2 dx - \frac{\beta C_{N,p}}{p} \alpha^{\frac{2p-N(p-2)}{4}} \left(t^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_1|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{N(p-2)}{4}} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2q} t^{\frac{N(q-2)}{2}} \int_{\Omega} |v_1|^q dx \\ &\leq h(t). \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Note that since $2 < p < 2 + \frac{4}{N} < q < 2^*$ and $\beta < 0$ there exist $0 < \alpha < t_0$ such that $h(t_0) = 0$, $h(t) < 0$ for any $t > t_0$, $h(t) > 0$ for any $0 < t < t_0$ and $h(T_\alpha) = \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} h(t)$. As a consequence, there holds

$$E_{r,s}(v_{t_0}) = E_{\frac{1}{t_0},s}(v_{t_0}) \leq h(t_0) = 0 \quad (2.8)$$

for any $r \geq \frac{1}{t_0}$ and $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Moreover, there exists $0 < t_1 < T_\alpha$ such that

$$h(t) < \frac{(N(q-2)-4)(1-\|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}}S^{-1})}{2N(q-2)} \left(\frac{2q(1-\|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}}S^{-1})}{N(q-2)C_{N,q}\alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}}} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} \quad \text{for } t \in [0, t_1]. \quad (2.9)$$

On the other hand, it follows from the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and the Hölder inequality that

$$E_{r,s}(u) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}}S^{-1} \right) \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{C_{N,q}\alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}}}{q} \left(\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)}{4}}. \quad (2.10)$$

Let

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}}S^{-1} \right) t - \frac{C_{N,q}\alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}}}{q} t^{\frac{N(q-2)}{4}},$$

and

$$\tilde{t} = \left(\frac{2q}{N(q-2)C_{N,q}} \left(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}}S^{-1} \right) \alpha^{\frac{q(N-2)-2N}{4}} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}}.$$

Then f is increasing in $(0, \tilde{t})$ and decreasing in (\tilde{t}, ∞) , and

$$f(\tilde{t}) = \frac{(N(q-2)-4)(1-\|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}}S^{-1})}{2N(q-2)} \left(\frac{2q(1-\|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}}S^{-1})}{N(q-2)C_{N,q}\alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}}} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}}.$$

For $r \geq \tilde{r}_\alpha := \max \left\{ \frac{1}{t_1}, \sqrt{\frac{2\theta\alpha}{\tilde{t}}} \right\}$ we have $v_{\frac{1}{r_\alpha}} \in S_{r,\alpha}$ and

$$\|\nabla v_{\frac{1}{r_\alpha}}\|_2^2 = \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{r}_\alpha} \right)^2 \|\nabla v_1\|_2^2 < \left(\frac{2q}{N(q-2)C_{N,q}} \left(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}}S^{-1} \right) \alpha^{\frac{q(N-2)-2N}{4}} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}}. \quad (2.11)$$

Moreover, there holds

$$E_{\tilde{r}_\alpha,s}(v_{\frac{1}{r_\alpha}}) \leq h\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{r}_\alpha}\right) \leq h(t_1). \quad (2.12)$$

Setting $u^0 = v_{\frac{1}{r_\alpha}}$, $u^1 = v_{t_0}$ and

$$r_\alpha = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{t_0}, \tilde{r}_\alpha \right\} \quad (2.13)$$

the statement (i) holds due to (2.11), (2.12), (2.9) and (2.8).

(ii) Statement (ii) holds by (2.10) and a direct calculation.

(iii) Since $E_{r,s}(u^1) \leq 0$ for any $\gamma \in \Gamma_{r,\alpha}$, we have

$$\|\nabla \gamma(0)\|_2^2 < \tilde{t} < \|\nabla \gamma(1)\|_2^2.$$

It then follows from (2.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{t \in [0,1]} E_{r,s}(\gamma(t)) &\geq f(\tilde{t}) \\ &= \frac{(N(q-2)-4)(1-\|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{2N(q-2)} \left(\frac{2q(1-\|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)C_{N,q}\alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}}} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} \end{aligned}$$

for any $\gamma \in \Gamma_{r,\alpha}$, hence the first inequality in (iii) holds. Now we define a path $\gamma \in \Gamma_{r,\alpha}$ by

$$\gamma(\tau)(x) = \left(\tau t_0 + (1-\tau) \frac{1}{\tilde{r}_\alpha} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} v_1 \left(\left(\tau t_0 + (1-\tau) \frac{1}{\tilde{r}_\alpha} \right) x \right)$$

for $\tau \in [0,1]$ and $x \in \Omega_r$. Then by (2.7) we have $m_{r,s}(\alpha) \leq T_\alpha$, where $T_\alpha = \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} h(t)$. Note that T_α is independent of r and s . This finishes the proof of (iii). \square

In view of Lemma 2.1, the energy functional $E_{r,s}$ possesses the mountain pass geometry. Next we recall a theorem from [12, 13].

Theorem 2.2 (Theorem 1, [12]). *Let $(E, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ and $(H, (\cdot, \cdot))$ be two infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces and assume there are continuous injections*

$$E \hookrightarrow H \hookrightarrow E'$$

Let

$$\|u\|^2 = \langle u, u \rangle, \quad |u|^2 = (u, u) \quad \text{for } u \in E,$$

and

$$S_\mu = \{u \in E : |u|^2 = \mu\}, \quad T_u S_\mu = \{v \in E : (u, v) = 0\} \quad \text{for } \mu \in (0, +\infty).$$

Let $I \subset (0, +\infty)$ be an interval and consider a family of C^2 functionals $\Phi_\rho : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$\Phi_\rho(u) = A(u) - \rho B(u), \quad \text{for } \rho \in I,$$

with $B(u) \geq 0$ for every $u \in E$, and

$$A(u) \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{or} \quad B(u) \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as } u \in E \text{ and } \|u\| \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (2.14)$$

Suppose moreover that Φ'_ρ and Φ''_ρ are τ -Hölder continuous, $\tau \in (0, 1]$, on bounded sets in the following sense: for every $R > 0$ there exists $M = M(R) > 0$ such that

$$\|\Phi'_\rho(u) - \Phi'_\rho(v)\| \leq M\|u - v\|^\tau \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Phi''_\rho(u) - \Phi''_\rho(v)\| \leq M\|u - v\|^\tau \quad (2.15)$$

for every $u, v \in B(0, R)$. Finally, suppose that there exist $w_1, w_2 \in S_\mu$ independent of ρ such that

$$c_\rho := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} \Phi_\rho(\gamma(t)) > \max\{\Phi_\rho(w_1), \Phi_\rho(w_2)\} \quad \text{for all } \rho \in I$$

where

$$\Gamma = \{\gamma \in C([0, 1], S_\mu) : \gamma(0) = w_1, \gamma(1) = w_2\}.$$

Then for almost every $\rho \in I$ there exists a sequence $\{u_n\} \subset S_\mu$ such that

- (i) $\Phi_\rho(u_n) \rightarrow c_\rho$,
- (ii) $\Phi'_\rho|_{S_\mu}(u_n) \rightarrow 0$,
- (iii) $\{u_n\}$ is bounded in E .

Remark 2.3. One can see [12, 13] for more details on assumption (2.15).

Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 yield the following result.

Theorem 2.4. For any $\alpha > 0$, let $r > r_\alpha$, where r_α is defined in Lemma 2.1. Then problem (2.5) admits a solution $(\lambda_{r,s}, u_{r,s})$ for almost every $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Moreover, $u_{r,s} \geq 0$ and $E_{r,s}(u_{r,s}) = m_{r,s}(\alpha)$.

Proof. We apply Theorem 2.2 to $E_{r,s}$, with $\Gamma_{r,\alpha}$ defined in Lemma 2.1,

$$A(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} V(x)u^2 dx - \frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^p dx \quad \text{and} \quad B(u) = \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^q dx.$$

Note that the assumptions in Theorem 2.2 hold due to $\beta \leq 0$ and Lemma 2.1. Hence, for almost every $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, there exists a bounded Palais-Smale sequence $\{u_n\}$:

$$E_{r,s}(u_n) \rightarrow m_{r,s}(\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad E'_{r,s}(u_n)|_{T_{u_n}S_{r,\alpha}} \rightarrow 0$$

where $T_{u_n}S_{r,\alpha}$ denotes the tangent space of $S_{r,\alpha}$ at u_n . Then

$$\lambda_n = -\frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_r} V u_n^2 dx - \beta \int_{\Omega_r} |u_n|^p dx - s \int_{\Omega_r} |u_n|^q dx \right),$$

is bounded and

$$E'_{r,s}(u_n) + \lambda_n u_n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } H^{-1}(\Omega_r). \quad (2.16)$$

Moreover, there exist $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega_r)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that up to a subsequence,

$$\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda, \quad u_n \rightharpoonup u_0 \quad \text{in } H_0^1(\Omega_r) \quad \text{and} \quad u_n \rightarrow u_0 \quad \text{in } L^t(\Omega_r) \quad \text{for all } 2 \leq t < 2^*,$$

and u_0 satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_0 + V u_0 + \lambda u_0 = s|u_0|^{q-2}u_0 + \beta|u_0|^{p-2}u_0 & \text{in } \Omega_r, \\ u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega_r), \quad \int_{\Omega_r} |u_0|^2 dx = \alpha. \end{cases}$$

In view of (2.16), we have or $n \rightarrow \infty$:

$$E'_{r,s}(u_n)u_0 + \lambda_n \int_{\Omega_r} u_n u_0 dx \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad E'_{r,s}(u_n)u_n + \lambda_n \alpha \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_r} V(x)u_n^2 dx = \int_{\Omega_r} V(x)u_0^2 dx.$$

As a result we get $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega_r)$, hence $E_{r,s}(u_0) = m_{r,s}(\alpha)$. In order to obtain a nonnegative normalized solution we only need to modify the proof of Theorem 2.2 established in [12, 13]. In fact, for almost every $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, the derivative $m'_{r,s}$ with respect to s is well defined since the function $s \mapsto m_{r,s}$ is nonincreasing, where $m_{r,s}$ denotes $m_{r,s}(\alpha)$ for fixed α . Let s be such that $m'_{r,s}$ exists and $\{s_n\} \subset [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ be a monotone increasing sequence converging to s . Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.2 established in [12, 13], there exist $\{\gamma_n\} \subset \Gamma_{r,\alpha}$ and $K = K(m'_{r,s})$ such that:

- (i) if $E_{r,s}(\gamma_n(t)) \geq m_{r,s} - (2 - m'_{r,s})(s - s_n)$, then $\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla \gamma_n(t)|^2 dx \leq K$.
- (ii) $\max_{t \in [0,1]} E_{r,s}(\gamma_n(t)) \leq m_{r,s} - (2 - m'_{r,s})(s - s_n)$.

Setting $\tilde{\gamma}_n(t) = |\gamma_n(t)|$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$ we have $\{\tilde{\gamma}_n\} \subset \Gamma_{r,\alpha}$. Observe that $\|\nabla|u|\|_2^2 \leq \|\nabla u\|_2^2$ for any $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Now we have:

- (I) if $E_{r,s}(\tilde{\gamma}_n(t)) \geq m_{r,s} - (2 - m'_{r,s})(s - s_n)$, then $E_{r,s}(\gamma_n(t)) \geq m_{r,s} - (2 - m'_{r,s})(s - s_n)$. By (i), there holds $\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla \gamma_n(t)|^2 dx \leq K$, and hence $\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla \tilde{\gamma}_n(t)|^2 dx \leq K$. Thus (i) also holds for $\tilde{\gamma}_n$.
- (II) $\max_{t \in [0,1]} E_{r,s}(\tilde{\gamma}_n(t)) \leq \max_{t \in [0,1]} E_{r,s}(\gamma_n(t)) \leq m_{r,s} - (2 - m'_{r,s})(s - s_n)$.

By replacing γ_n with $\tilde{\gamma}_n$ in the proof of Theorem 2.2 established in [12, 13], we obtain a nonnegative bounded Palais-Smale sequence $\{u_n\}$. Consequently, there exists a nonnegative normalized solution to (2.5) for almost every $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ as above. The proof is complete. \square

In order to obtain a solution of (2.1) we first prove a uniform estimate for the solutions of (2.5) established in Theorem 2.4.

Lemma 2.5. *If $(\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times S_{r,\alpha}$ is a solution of (2.5) established in Theorem 2.4 for some r and s , then*

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx \leq \frac{4N}{N(q-2) - 4} \left(\frac{q-2}{2} T_\alpha + \alpha \left(\frac{1}{2N} \|\tilde{V}\|_\infty + \frac{q-2}{4} \|V\|_\infty \right) \right),$$

where the constant T_α is defined in (iii) of Lemma 2.1 and is independent of r and s .

Proof. Since u is a solution of (2.5), there holds

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_r} V u^2 dx = s \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^q dx + \beta \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^p dx - \lambda \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^2 dx. \quad (2.17)$$

The Pohozaev identity implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{N-2}{2N} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\partial\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 (x \cdot \mathbf{n}) d\sigma + \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\Omega_r} (\tilde{V}) u^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} V u^2 dx \\ & = -\frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^2 dx + \frac{s}{q} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^q dx + \frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^p dx, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{n} denotes the outward unit normal vector on $\partial\Omega_r$. It then follows from $\beta \leq 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\partial\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 (x \cdot \mathbf{n}) d\sigma - \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\Omega_r} (\nabla V \cdot x) u^2 dx \\ & = \frac{(q-2)s}{2q} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^q dx + \frac{\beta(p-2)}{2p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^p dx \\ & \geq \frac{q-2}{2} \left(\frac{s}{q} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^q dx + \frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^p dx \right) \\ & = \frac{q-2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} V u^2 dx - m_{r,s}(\alpha) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{q-2}{2}m_{r,s}(\alpha) &\geq \frac{q-2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} V u^2 dx \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1}{N} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\partial\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 (x \cdot \mathbf{n}) d\sigma - \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\Omega_r} (\nabla V \cdot x) u^2 dx \right) \\ &\geq \frac{N(q-2)-4}{4N} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \alpha \left(\frac{1}{2N} \|\nabla V \cdot x\|_\infty + \frac{q-2}{4} \|V\|_\infty \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since $x \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) \geq 0$ for any $x \in \partial\Omega_r$ due to the convexity of Ω_r . By a direct calculation and Lemma 2.1 we get the inequality. \square

Now, we obtain a solution of (2.1) by letting $s \rightarrow 1$.

Theorem 2.6. *For every $\alpha > 0$ problem (2.1) has a solution (λ_r, u_r) provided $r > r_\alpha$ where r_α is as in Lemma 2.1. Moreover, $u_r \geq 0$ in Ω_r .*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 2.4 that there is a nonnegative solution $(\lambda_{r,s}, u_{r,s})$ to (2.5) for almost every $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. In view of Lemma 2.5, $\{u_{r,s}\}$ is bounded. By an argument similar to that in Theorem 2.4, there exist $u_r \in S_{r,\alpha}$ and λ_r such that up to a subsequence,

$$\lambda_{r,s} \rightarrow \lambda_r \quad \text{and} \quad u_{r,s} \rightarrow u_r \quad \text{in } H_0^1(\Omega_r) \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow 1.$$

Hence u_r is a nonnegative solution of problem (2.1). \square

Before analyzing the Lagrange multiplier, we first establish an a priori estimate for the solutions of (2.1).

Lemma 2.7. *If $\{(\lambda_r, u_r)\}$ is a family of nonnegative solutions of (2.1) such that $\|u_r\|_{H^1} \leq C$ with $C > 0$ independent of r , then $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|u_r\|_\infty < \infty$ is bounded.*

Proof. It follows from the regularity theory of elliptic partial differential equations that $u_r \in C(\Omega_r)$. Assume to the contrary that there exist a sequence, for simplicity denoted by $\{u_r\}$, and $x_r \in \Omega_r$ such that

$$M_r := \max_{x \in \Omega_r} u_r(x) = u_r(x_r) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty.$$

Suppose without loss of generality that, up to a subsequence, $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x_r}{|x_r|} = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Set

$$v_r(x) = \frac{u_r(x_r + \tau_r x)}{M_r} \quad \text{for } x \in \Sigma^r := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_r + \tau_r x \in \Omega_r\},$$

where $\tau_r = M_r^{\frac{2-q}{2}}$. Then $\tau_r \rightarrow 0$, $\|v_r\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma^r)} \leq 1$, and v_r satisfies

$$-\Delta v_r + \tau_r^2 V(x_r + \tau_r x) v_r + \tau_r^2 \lambda_r v_r = |v_r|^{q-2} v_r + \beta \tau_r^{\frac{2(q-p)}{q-2}} |v_r|^{p-2} v_r \quad \text{in } \Sigma^r. \quad (2.18)$$

In view of (2.1), the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and $\|u_r\|_{H^1} \leq C$ with C independent of r , we infer that the sequence $\{\lambda_r\}$ is bounded. It then follows from the regularity theory of elliptic partial differential equations and the Arzela-Ascoli theorem that there exists v such that up to a subsequence

$$v_r \rightharpoonup v \quad \text{in } H_0^1(\Sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad v_r \rightarrow v \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^\beta(\Sigma) \quad \text{for some } \beta \in (0, 1),$$

where $\Sigma := \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma^r$.

We claim that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{dist}(x_r, \partial\Omega_r)}{\tau_r} = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|y_r - x_r|}{\tau_r} \geq d > 0, \quad (2.19)$$

where $y_r \in \partial\Omega_r$ is such that $\text{dist}(x_r, \partial\Omega_r) = |y_r - x_r|$ for any large r . If this is not true, let

$$p_r = \frac{y_r - x_r}{\tau_r} \in \partial\Sigma^r,$$

so that $p_r \rightarrow 0$, $v_r(p_r) = 0$ and $v_r(0) = 1$. If v_r is uniformly (in r) locally Lipschitz continuous at p_r we obtain a contradiction because

$$|v_r(p_r) - v_r(0)| \leq L|p_r - 0| \rightarrow 0$$

contradicts $v_r(p_r) = 0$ and $v_r(0) = 1$. In order to obtain the uniformly locally Lipschitz continuity of v_r at p_r we first translate p_r to the point $(-1, 0, \dots, 0)$ such that the unit ball B_1 is exterior tangent to $\partial\Sigma^r$ at $(-1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Let $\phi_1(x) = \frac{1}{2N}(1 - |x|^2)$ for any $x \in B_1$, then

$$-\Delta\phi_1 = 1 \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Let ϕ_2 be the Kelvin transformation of ϕ_1 , that is,

$$\phi_2(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^{N-2}} \phi_1\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right) \quad \text{for } x \in B_1^c,$$

so that

$$-\Delta\phi_2 = \frac{1}{|x|^{N+2}} \quad \text{in } B_1^c.$$

Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ satisfy $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ in \mathbb{R}^N , $\phi = 0$ in $\overline{B_1}$, $\phi(x) > 0$ in $B_3 \setminus \overline{B_1}$, and $\phi(x) = 1$ for $x \in \partial B_3$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$-\Delta\phi \geq -C \quad \text{in } B_3 \setminus \overline{B_1}.$$

Define $h(x) = t\phi_2(x) + \phi(x)$, where $t > 0$ is to be determined. Note that h satisfies

$$-\Delta h = \frac{t}{|x|^{N+2}} - C \geq \frac{t}{3^{N+2}} - C \quad \text{in } B_3 \setminus \overline{B_1},$$

$$h(x) = \frac{t}{2N|x|^{N-2}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{|x|^2}\right) + \phi(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \partial\Sigma^r,$$

and

$$h(x) = \frac{4t}{N3^N} + 1 \quad \text{for } x \in \partial B_3.$$

Hence we can choose t large such that for any r large enough:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta(h - v_r) \geq 0 & \text{in } \Sigma^r \cap B_3, \\ h - v_r \geq 0 & \text{on } \partial(\Sigma^r \cap B_3). \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

The maximum principle then implies that

$$h \geq v_r \quad \text{in } \Sigma^r \cap B_3.$$

This yields

$$0 \leq v_r(x) - v_r(p_r) = v_r(x) \leq h(x) = h(x) - h(p_r) \quad \text{in } \Sigma^r \cap B_3.$$

Consequently, we only need to prove the locally Lipschitz continuity of ϕ_2 at p_r . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_2(x) - \phi_2(p_r) &= \frac{1}{2N|x|^{N-2}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{|x|^2} \right) = \frac{1}{2N|x|^N} (|x| + 1)(|x| - 1) \\ &\leq L|x - p_r| \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

for $x \in B(p_r, \frac{1}{4}) \cap B_1^c$. Here the last inequality holds since we have translated p_r to $(-1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Therefore the claim (2.19) holds. As a result, by letting $r \rightarrow \infty$ in (2.18), we obtain that $v \in H_0^1(\Sigma)$ is a nonnegative solution of

$$-\Delta v = |v|^{q-2}v \quad \text{in } \Sigma \quad (2.22)$$

where

$$\Sigma = \begin{cases} \mathbb{R}^N & \text{if } \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{dist}(x_r, \partial\Omega_r)}{r} = \infty \\ \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_1 > -d\} & \text{if } \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{dist}(x_r, \partial\Omega_r)}{r} > 0. \end{cases}$$

It then follows from the Liouville theorems (see e.g. [17]) that $v = 0$ in H , which contradicts $v(0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} v_r(0) = 1$. \square

Remark 2.8. Note that the proof of Lemma 2.7 does not depend on β .

Lemma 2.9. *Let $(\lambda_{r,\alpha}, u_{r,\alpha})$ be the solution of (2.1) from Theorem 2.6. If $\|\tilde{V}_+\|_{\frac{N}{2}} \leq 2S$ then there exists $\bar{\alpha} > 0$ such that*

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{r,\alpha} > 0 \quad \text{for } 0 < \alpha < \bar{\alpha}.$$

Proof. Let $(\lambda_{r,\alpha}, u_{r,\alpha})$ be the solution of (2.1) established in Theorem 2.6. The regularity theory of elliptic partial differential equations yields $u_{r,\alpha} \in C(\Omega_r)$. In view of Lemma 2.7, there holds

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\Omega_r} u_{r,\alpha} < \infty.$$

Setting

$$g(\alpha) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\Omega_r} u_{r,\alpha}$$

we claim that there is $\alpha_1 > 0$ such that $g(\alpha) > 0$ for any $0 < \alpha < \alpha_1$. Assume to the contrary that there exists a sequence $\{\alpha_k\}$ tending to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $g(\alpha_k) = 0$ for any k , that is,

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\Omega_r} u_{r,\alpha_k} = 0 \quad \text{for any } k. \quad (2.23)$$

As a consequence of (iii) in Lemma 2.1,

$$E_r(u_{r,\alpha_k}) = m_{r,1}(\alpha_k) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{for any } r > r_{\alpha_k}. \quad (2.24)$$

For any given k , it follows from (2.23) and $u_{r,\alpha_k} \in S_{r,\alpha_k}$ that up to a subsequence,

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |u_{r,\alpha_k}|^s dx \leq \max_{\Omega_r} |u_{r,\alpha_k}|^{s-2} \alpha_k \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty \quad (2.25)$$

for any $s > 2$. Hence, for any given large k , there exists $\bar{r}_k > r_{\alpha_k}$ such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_r} |u_{r,\alpha_k}|^q dx + \frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u_{r,\alpha_k}|^p dx \right| < \frac{m_{r,1}(\alpha_k)}{2} \quad \text{for any } r \geq \bar{r}_k.$$

In view of (2.24) and $E_r(u_{r,\alpha_k}) = m_{r,1}(\alpha_k)$, we further have

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u_{r,\alpha_k}|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_r} V u_{r,\alpha_k}^2 dx \geq \frac{m_{r,1}(\alpha_k)}{2} \quad \text{for any large } k \text{ and } r \geq \bar{r}_k. \quad (2.26)$$

It follows from (2.23), (2.25) and (2.26) that there exists $r_k \geq \bar{r}_k$ with $r_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\Omega_{r_k}} u_{r_k, \alpha_k} = 0, \quad (2.27)$$

$$\int_{\Omega_{r_k}} |u_{r_k, \alpha_k}|^s dx \leq \left| \max_{\Omega_{r_k}} u_{r_k, \alpha_k} \right|^{s-2} \alpha_k \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty \text{ for any } s > 2, \quad (2.28)$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega_{r_k}} |\nabla u_{r_k, \alpha_k}|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_{r_k}} V u_{r_k, \alpha_k}^2 dx \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.29)$$

By (2.1), (2.28) and (2.29), we have

$$\lambda_{r_k, \alpha_k} \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.30)$$

Now (2.1) implies

$$-\Delta u_{r_k, \alpha_k} + \left(\|V\|_\infty + \frac{\lambda_{r_k, \alpha_k}}{2} \right) u_{r_k, \alpha_k} \geq \left(-\frac{\lambda_{r_k, \alpha_k}}{2} + |u_{r_k, \alpha_k}|^{q-2} + \beta |u_{r_k, \alpha_k}|^{p-2} \right) u_{r_k, \alpha_k}.$$

In view of (2.30) and (2.27), we further have

$$-\Delta u_{r_k, \alpha_k} + \left(\|V\|_\infty + \frac{\lambda_{r_k, \alpha_k}}{2} \right) u_{r_k, \alpha_k} \geq 0$$

for large k . Let θ_{r_k} be the principal eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ with Dirichlet boundary condition in Ω_{r_k} , and $v_{r_k} > 0$ be the corresponding normalized eigenfunction. Then $\theta_{r_k} = \frac{\theta_1}{r_k^2}$, and

$$\left(\frac{\theta_1}{r_k^2} + \|V\|_\infty + \frac{\lambda_{r_k, \alpha_k}}{2} \right) \int_{\Omega_{r_k}} u_{r_k, \alpha_k} v_{r_k} dx \geq 0.$$

Since $\int_{\Omega_{r_k}} u_{r_k, \alpha_k} v_{r_k} dx > 0$, we have

$$\frac{\theta_1}{r_k^2} + \|V\|_\infty + \frac{\lambda_{r_k, \alpha_k}}{2} \geq 0,$$

which contradicts (2.30) for large k . Hence the claim holds, that is, there exists $\alpha_1 > 0$ such that

$$g(\alpha) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\Omega_r} u_{r, \alpha} > 0 \quad (2.31)$$

for any $0 < \alpha < \alpha_1$.

We consider $H^1(\Omega_r)$ as a subspace of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for any $r > 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.5 that the set of solutions $\{u_{r, \alpha} : r > r_\alpha\}$ established in Theorem 2.6 is bounded in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, so there exist $u_\alpha \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\lambda_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that up to a subsequence:

$$\lambda_{r, \alpha} \rightarrow \lambda_\alpha,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
u_{r,\alpha} &\rightharpoonup u_\alpha \quad \text{in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^N), \\
u_{r,\alpha} &\rightarrow u_\alpha \quad \text{in } L^k_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ for all } 2 \leq k < 2^*, \\
u_{r,\alpha} &\rightarrow u_\alpha \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^N,
\end{aligned}$$

and u_α is a solution of the equation

$$-\Delta u + Vu + \lambda_\alpha u = |u|^{q-2}u + \beta|u|^{p-2}u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (2.32)$$

Therefore

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V u_\alpha^2 dx + \lambda_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_\alpha^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_\alpha|^q dx + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_\alpha|^p dx \quad (2.33)$$

and the Pohozaev identity gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{N-2}{2N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \tilde{V} u_\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V u_\alpha^2 dx + \frac{\lambda_\alpha}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_\alpha^2 dx \\
&= \frac{1}{q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_\alpha|^q dx + \frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_\alpha|^p dx.
\end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

It follows from (2.33), (2.34), the Hölder inequality, the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and $\beta < 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1}{N} - \frac{\|\tilde{V}_+\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1}}{2N} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \\
&\leq \frac{C_{N,q}(q-2)}{2q} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_\alpha^2 dx \right)^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)}{4}}.
\end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

As a consequence there holds for $u_\alpha \neq 0$:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \geq \left(\frac{q(2 - \|\tilde{V}_+\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{NC_{N,q}(q-2)} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} \alpha^{\frac{q(N-2)-2N}{N(q-2)-4}}. \quad (2.36)$$

Next it follows from (2.33), (2.34), (2.36) and $2 < p < 2 + \frac{4}{N} < 2^*$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{(2-q)\lambda_\alpha}{2q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_\alpha^2 dx &= \frac{(N-2)q-2N}{2Nq} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \tilde{V} u_\alpha^2 dx \\
&\quad + \frac{q-2}{2q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V u_\alpha^2 dx - \frac{(q-p)\beta}{pq} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_\alpha|^p dx \\
&\leq \frac{(N-2)q-2N}{2Nq} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx + \frac{\|\tilde{V}\|_\infty}{2N} \alpha + \frac{(q-2)\|V\|_\infty}{2q} \alpha \\
&\quad - \frac{(q-p)\beta C_{N,p}}{pq} \alpha^{\frac{2p-N(p-2)}{4}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\alpha|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{N(p-2)}{4}} \\
&\rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } \alpha \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $u_\alpha \neq 0$ for $\alpha > 0$ small there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that $\lambda_\alpha > 0$ for $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$.

In order to complete the proof we consider the case that there is a sequence $\alpha_k \rightarrow 0$ such that $u_{\alpha_k} = 0$ for any k . Assume without loss of generality that $u_\alpha = 0$ for any $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_1)$. Let $x_{r,\alpha} \in \Omega_r$ be such that $u_{r,\alpha}(x_{r,\alpha}) = \max_{\Omega_r} u_{r,\alpha}$. In view of (2.31), there holds $|x_{r,\alpha}| \rightarrow \infty$

as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Otherwise, there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, up to a subsequence $x_{r,\alpha} \rightarrow x_0$, and hence $u_\alpha(x_0) \geq d_\alpha > 0$. This contradicts $u_\alpha = 0$. We claim that $\text{dist}(x_{r,\alpha}, \partial\Omega_r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Arguing by contradiction we assume that $\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(x_{r,\alpha}, \partial\Omega_r) = l < \infty$. It follows from (2.31) that $l > 0$. Let $w_r(x) = u_{r,\alpha}(x + x_{r,\alpha})$ for any $x \in \Sigma^r := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x + x_{r,\alpha} \in \Omega_r\}$. Then w_r is bounded in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, and there is $w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $w_r \rightharpoonup w$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. By the regularity theory of elliptic partial equations and $\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} u_{r,\alpha}(x_{r,\alpha}) > d_\alpha > 0$, we infer that $w(0) \geq d_\alpha > 0$. Assume without loss of the generality that, up to a subsequence,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x_{r,\alpha}}{|x_{r,\alpha}|} = e_1.$$

Setting

$$\Sigma = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \cdot e_1 < l\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_1 < l\},$$

we have $\phi(\cdot - x_{r,\alpha}) \in C_c^\infty(\Omega_r)$ for any $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Sigma)$ and r large enough. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_r} \nabla u_{r,\alpha} \nabla \phi(\cdot - x_{r,\alpha}) dx + \int_{\Omega_r} V u_{r,\alpha} \phi(\cdot - x_{r,\alpha}) dx + \lambda_{r,\alpha} \int_{\Omega_r} u_{r,\alpha} \phi(\cdot - x_{r,\alpha}) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega_r} |u_{r,\alpha}|^{q-2} u_{r,\alpha} \phi(\cdot - x_{r,\alpha}) dx + \beta \int_{\Omega_r} |u_{r,\alpha}|^{p-2} u_{r,\alpha} \phi(\cdot - x_{r,\alpha}) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.37)$$

Since $|x_{r,\alpha}| \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega_r} V u_{r,\alpha} \phi(\cdot - x_{r,\alpha}) dx \right| &\leq \int_{\text{Supp}\phi} |V(\cdot + x_{r,\alpha}) w_r \phi| dx \\ &\leq \|w_r\|_{2^*} \|\phi\|_{2^*} \left(\int_{\text{Supp}\phi} |V(\cdot + x_{r,\alpha})|^{\frac{N}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{N}} \\ &\leq \|w_r\|_{2^*} \|\phi\|_{2^*} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\frac{|x_{r,\alpha}|}{2}}} |V|^{\frac{N}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{N}} \\ &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

Letting $r \rightarrow \infty$ in (2.37) we obtain for $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Sigma)$:

$$\int_{\Sigma} \nabla w \cdot \nabla \phi dx + \lambda_\alpha \int_{\Sigma} w \phi dx = \int_{\Sigma} |w|^{q-2} w \phi dx + \beta \int_{\Sigma} |w|^{p-2} w \phi dx.$$

Thus $w \in H_0^1(\Sigma)$ is a weak solution of the equation

$$-\Delta w + \lambda_\alpha w = |w|^{q-2} w + \beta |w|^{p-2} w \quad \text{in } \Sigma. \quad (2.39)$$

Hence we obtain a nontrivial nonnegative solution of (2.39) on a half space which is impossible by the Liouville theorem (see e.g. [17]). This proves that $\text{dist}(x_{r,\alpha}, \partial\Omega_r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. A similar argument as above shows that (2.39) holds for $\Sigma = \mathbb{R}^N$. Now we argue as in the case $u_\alpha \neq 0$ above that there exists α_2 such that $\lambda_\alpha > 0$ for any $0 < \alpha < \alpha_2$.

Setting $\bar{\alpha} = \min\{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ the proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The proof is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.6 and Lemmas 2.7 and 2.9. \square

2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.3

In this section we assume that the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 hold. Let $0 < \alpha < \alpha_V$ be fixed and consider the functions

$$h(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1} \right) t^2 - \frac{\beta C_{N,p}}{p} \alpha^{\frac{2p-N(p-2)}{4}} t^{\frac{N(p-2)}{2}} - \frac{C_{N,q}}{q} \alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}} t^{\frac{N(q-2)}{2}}$$

and

$$\phi(t) := \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1} \right) t^{\frac{4-N(p-2)}{2}} - \frac{C_{N,q}}{q} \alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}} t^{\frac{N(q-p)}{2}}.$$

Note that ϕ admits a unique maximum at

$$\bar{t} = \left(\frac{q(4-N(p-2))(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{2N(q-p)C_{N,q}} \right)^{\frac{2}{N(q-2)-4}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{2(N(q-2)-4)}}.$$

By a direct calculation and the definition of α_V , we obtain

$$\phi(\bar{t}) > \frac{\beta C_{N,p}}{p} \alpha^{\frac{2p-N(p-2)}{4}} \quad (2.40)$$

and $h(\bar{t}) > 0$. In view of $2 < p < 2 + \frac{4}{N} < q < 2^*$ and (2.40), there exist $0 < R_1 < T_\alpha < R_2$ such that $h(t) < 0$ for $0 < t < R_1$ and for $t > R_2$, $h(t) > 0$ for $R_1 < t < R_2$, and $h(T_\alpha) = \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} h(t) > 0$.

Define

$$\mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha} = \{u \in S_{r,\alpha} : \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \leq T_\alpha^2\}. \quad (2.41)$$

Let θ be the principal eigenvalue of operator $-\Delta$ with Dirichlet boundary condition in Ω , and let $|\Omega|$ be the volume of Ω .

Theorem 2.10. (i) If $r < \frac{\sqrt{\theta\alpha}}{T_\alpha}$, then $\mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha} = \emptyset$.

(ii) If

$$r > \max \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{\theta\alpha}}{T_\alpha}, \left(\frac{2\beta}{p} \alpha^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \left(\theta \left(1 + \|V\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1} \right) \right)^{-1} |\Omega|^{\frac{2-p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{2}{N(p-2)-4}} \right\} \quad (2.42)$$

then $\mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha} \neq \emptyset$ and

$$e_{r,\alpha} := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha}} E_r(u) < 0$$

is attained at some interior point $u_r > 0$ of $\mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha}$. As a consequence, there exists a Lagrange multiplier $\lambda_r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (λ_r, u_r) is a solution of (2.1). Moreover $\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_r > 0$ holds true.

Proof. Let $v_1 \in S_{1,\alpha}$ be the positive normalized eigenfunction corresponding to θ . The Poincaré inequality implies

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx \geq \frac{\theta\alpha}{r^2} \quad (2.43)$$

for any $u \in S_{r,\alpha}$. Since T_α is independent of r , there holds $B_{r,\alpha} = \emptyset$ if and only if $r < \frac{\sqrt{\theta\alpha}}{T_\alpha}$. Setting

$$r_\alpha = \max \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{\theta\alpha}}{T_\alpha}, \left(\frac{p\theta \left(1 + \|V\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1}\right)}{2\beta} \alpha^{\frac{2-p}{2}} |\Omega|^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \right)^{\frac{2}{N(p-2)-4}} \right\} \quad (2.44)$$

we construct for $r > r_\alpha$ a function $u_r \in S_{r,\alpha}$ such that $u_r \in \mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha}$ and $E_r(u_r) < 0$. Observe that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_1|^2 dx = \theta\alpha \quad (2.45)$$

and

$$\alpha = \int_{\Omega} |v_1|^2 dx \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} |v_1|^p dx \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} |\Omega|^{\frac{p-2}{p}}. \quad (2.46)$$

We define $u_r \in S_{r,\alpha}$ by $u_r(x) = r^{-\frac{N}{2}} v_1(r^{-1}x)$ for $x \in \Omega_r$. Then

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u_r|^2 dx = r^{-2} \theta\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega_r} |u_r|^p dx \geq r^{\frac{N(2-p)}{2}} \alpha^{\frac{p}{2}} |\Omega|^{\frac{2-p}{2}}.$$

By (2.44), $2 < p < 2 + \frac{4}{N}$ and a direct calculation we have $u_r \in \mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} E_r(u_r) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u_r|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} V u_r^2 dx - \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_r} |u_r|^q dx - \frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u_r|^p dx \\ &< \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \|V\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1}\right) r^{-2} \theta\alpha - \frac{\beta}{p} r^{\frac{N(2-p)}{2}} \alpha^{\frac{p}{2}} |\Omega|^{\frac{2-p}{2}} \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.47)$$

It then follows from the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} E_r(u) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|V\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1}\right) \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{C_{N,p}\beta}{p} \alpha^{\frac{2p-N(p-2)}{4}} \left(\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{N(p-2)}{4}} \\ &\quad - \frac{C_{N,q}}{q} \alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}} \left(\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)}{4}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.48)$$

As a consequence E_r is bounded from below in $\mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha}$. By the Ekeland principle there exists a sequence $\{u_{n,r}\} \subset \mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha}$ such that

$$E_r(u_{n,r}) \rightarrow \inf_{u \in \mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha}} E_r(u) E_r'(u_{n,r})|_{T_{u_{n,r}} S_{r,\alpha}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Consequently there exists $u_r \in H_0^1(\Omega_r)$ such that

$$u_{n,r} \rightharpoonup u_r \text{ in } H_0^1(\Omega_r) \quad \text{and} \quad u_{n,r} \rightarrow u_r \text{ in } L^k(\Omega_r) \text{ for all } 2 \leq k < 2^*.$$

Moreover,

$$\|\nabla u_r\|_2^2 \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla u_{n,r}\|_2^2 \leq T_\alpha^2,$$

that is, $u_r \in \mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha}$. Note that

$$\int_{\Omega_r} V u_{n,r}^2 dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_r} V u_r^2 dx \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

hence

$$e_{r,\alpha} \leq E_r(u_r) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_r(u_{n,r}) = e_{r,\alpha}. \quad (2.49)$$

It follows that $u_{n,r} \rightarrow u_r$ in $H_0^1(\Omega_r)$, so $E_r(u_r) < 0$. Therefore u_r is an interior point of $\mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha}$ because $E_r(u) \geq h(T_\alpha) > 0$ for any $u \in \partial\mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha}$ by (2.48). The Lagrange multiplier theorem implies that there exists $\lambda_r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (λ_r, u_r) is a solution of (2.1). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_r \alpha &= \int_{\Omega_r} |u_r|^q dx + \beta \int_{\Omega_r} |u_r|^p dx - \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u_r|^2 dx - \int_{\Omega_r} V u_r^2 dx \\ &= \frac{(p-2)\beta}{p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u_r|^p dx + \frac{q-2}{q} \int_{\Omega_r} |u_r|^q dx - 2E_r(u_r) \\ &> -2E_r(u_r) = -2e_{r,\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.50)$$

It follows from the definition of $e_{r,\alpha}$ that $e_{r,\alpha}$ is nonincreasing with respect to r . Hence, $e_{r,\alpha} \leq e_{r_\alpha,\alpha} < 0$ for any $r > r_\alpha$ and $0 < \alpha < \alpha_V$. In view of (2.50), we have

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_r > 0.$$

Finally, the strong maximum principle implies $u_r > 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The proof is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.10, Lemma 2.7 and Remark 2.8. \square

2.3 Proof of Theorem 1.4

In this subsection we assume that the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 hold. For $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ we define the functional $\mathcal{E}_{r,s} : S_{r,\alpha} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathcal{E}_{r,s}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} V u^2 dx - s \left(\frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^p dx + \frac{1}{q} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^q dx \right). \quad (2.51)$$

Note that if $u \in S_{r,\alpha}$ is a critical point of $\mathcal{E}_{r,s}$ then there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (λ, u) is a solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + V u + \lambda u = s|u|^{q-2}u + s\beta|u|^{p-2}u & \text{in } \Omega_r, \\ u \in H_0^1(\Omega_r), \quad \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^2 dx = \alpha. \end{cases} \quad (2.52)$$

Lemma 2.11. *For $0 < \alpha < \tilde{\alpha}_V$ where $\tilde{\alpha}_V$ is defined in Theorem 1.4, there exist $\tilde{r}_\alpha > 0$ and $u^0, u^1 \in S_{r_\alpha,\alpha}$ such that*

(i) *For $r > \tilde{r}_\alpha$ and $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ we have $\mathcal{E}_{r,s}(u^1) \leq 0$ and*

$$\mathcal{E}_{r,s}(u^0) < \frac{N(q-2)-4}{4} \left(\frac{2(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S)}{N(q-2)} \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)}{N(q-2)-4}} A^{\frac{4}{4-N(q-2)}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{N(q-2)-4}}$$

where

$$A = \left(\frac{C_{N,q}(q-2)(N(q-2)-4)}{q(p-2)(4-N(p-2))} + \frac{C_{N,q}}{q} \right).$$

Moreover,

$$\|\nabla u^0\|_2^2 < \left(\frac{2(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)A} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{N(q-2)-4}}$$

and

$$\|\nabla u^1\|_2^2 > \left(\frac{2(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)A} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{N(q-2)-4}}$$

(ii) If $u \in S_{r,\alpha}$ satisfies

$$\|\nabla u\|_2^2 = \left(\frac{2(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)A} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{N(q-2)-4}},$$

then there holds

$$\mathcal{E}_{r,s}(u) \geq \frac{N(q-2)-4}{4} \left(\frac{2(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S)}{N(q-2)} \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)}{N(q-2)-4}} A^{\frac{4}{4-N(q-2)}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{N(q-2)-4}}.$$

(iii) Let

$$m_{r,s}(\alpha) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{r,\alpha}} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \mathcal{E}_{r,s}(\gamma(t)),$$

where

$$\Gamma_{r,\alpha} = \{\gamma \in C([0,1], S_{r,\alpha}) : \gamma(0) = u^0, \gamma(1) = u^1\}.$$

Then

$$m_{r,s}(\alpha) \geq \frac{N(q-2)-4}{4} \left(\frac{2(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S)}{N(q-2)} \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)}{N(q-2)-4}} A^{\frac{4}{4-N(q-2)}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{N(q-2)-4}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} m_{r,s}(\alpha) &\leq \frac{N(q-2)-4}{2} \left(\frac{\theta(1 + \|V\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)} \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)}{N(q-2)-4}} \\ &\quad \times (4q)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} |\Omega|^{\frac{2(q-2)}{N(q-2)-4}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{N(q-2)-4}}, \end{aligned}$$

where θ is the principal eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ with Dirichlet boundary condition in Ω .

Proof. Let $v_1 \in S_{1,\alpha}$ be the positive normalized eigenfunction of $-\Delta$ with Dirichlet boundary condition in Ω associated to θ . Then we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_1|^2 dx = \theta \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} |v_1|^p dx \geq \alpha^{\frac{p}{2}} |\Omega|^{\frac{2-p}{2}}. \quad (2.53)$$

Setting $v_t(x) = t^{\frac{N}{2}} v_1(tx)$ for $x \in B_{\frac{1}{t}}$ and $t > 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{t},s}(v_t) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \|V\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1} \right) t^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_1|^2 dx - \frac{\beta}{2p} t^{\frac{N(p-2)}{2}} \int_{\Omega} |v_1|^p dx \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2q} t^{\frac{N(q-2)}{2}} \int_{\Omega} |v_1|^q dx \\ &\leq h(t), \end{aligned} \quad (2.54)$$

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

$$h(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \|V\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1} \right) t^2 \theta \alpha - \frac{1}{2q} \alpha^{\frac{q}{2}} |\Omega|^{\frac{2-q}{2}} t^{\frac{N(q-2)}{2}}.$$

A simple computation shows that $h(t_0) = 0$ for

$$t_0 := \left((1 + \|V\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1}) q \theta \alpha^{\frac{2-q}{2}} |\Omega|^{\frac{q-2}{2}} \right)^{\frac{2}{N(q-2)-4}}$$

and $h(t) < 0$ for any $t > t_0$, $h(t) > 0$ for any $0 < t < t_0$. Moreover h achieves its maximum at

$$t_\alpha = \left(\frac{4q(1 + \|V\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1}) \theta}{N(q-2)} \alpha^{\frac{2-q}{2}} |\Omega|^{\frac{q-2}{2}} \right)^{\frac{2}{N(q-2)-4}}.$$

This implies

$$\mathcal{E}_{r,s}(v_{t_0}) = \mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{t_0},s}(v_{t_0}) \leq h(t_0) = 0 \quad (2.55)$$

for any $r \geq \frac{1}{t_0}$ and $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. There exists $0 < t_1 < t_\alpha$ such that for any $t \in [0, t_1]$,

$$h(t) < \frac{N(q-2)-4}{4} \left(\frac{2(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S)}{N(q-2)} \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)}{N(q-2)-4}} A^{\frac{4}{4-N(q-2)}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{N(q-2)-4}}. \quad (2.56)$$

On the other hand, it follows from the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and the Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{r,s}(u) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1} \right) \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{C_{N,q} \alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}}}{q} \left(\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)}{4}} \\ &\quad - \frac{C_{N,p} \beta \alpha^{\frac{2p-N(p-2)}{4}}}{p} \left(\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{N(p-2)}{4}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.57)$$

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1} \right) t - \frac{\beta C_{N,p} \alpha^{\frac{2p-N(p-2)}{4}} t^{\frac{N(p-2)}{4}}}{p} - \frac{C_{N,q} \alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}} t^{\frac{N(q-2)}{4}}}{q}. \quad (2.58)$$

In view of $2 < p < 2 + \frac{2}{N} < q < 2^*$ and the definition of $\tilde{\alpha}_V$, there exist $0 < l_1 < l_M < l_2$ such that $h(t) < 0$ for any $0 < t < l_1$ and $t > l_2$, $f(t) > 0$ for $l_1 < t < l_2$ and $f(l_M) = \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} f(t) > 0$. Let

$$t_2 = \left(\frac{\beta q C_{N,p} (p-2)(4-N(p-2))}{p C_{N,q} (q-2)(N(q-2)-4)} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-p)}} \alpha^{\frac{N-2}{N}}.$$

Then by a direct calculation, we have $f''(t) \leq 0$ if and only if $t \geq t_2$. Hence

$$\max_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} f(t) = \max_{t \in [t_2, \infty)} f(t).$$

Note that for any $t \geq t_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(t) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1} \right) t - \frac{\beta C_{N,p} \alpha^{\frac{(q-p)(N-2)}{4}} \alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}} t^{\frac{N(p-2)}{4}}}{p} - \frac{C_{N,q} \alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}} t^{\frac{N(q-2)}{4}}}{q} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1} \right) t - \left(\frac{C_{N,q} (q-2)(N(q-2)-4)}{q(p-2)(4-N(p-2))} + \frac{C_{N,q}}{q} \right) \alpha^{\frac{2q-N(q-2)}{4}} t^{\frac{N(q-2)}{4}} \\ &=: g(t). \end{aligned} \quad (2.59)$$

Let

$$A = \left(\frac{C_{N,q}(q-2)(N(q-2)-4)}{q(p-2)(4-N(p-2))} + \frac{C_{N,q}}{q} \right).$$

and

$$t_g = \left(\frac{2(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)A} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{N(q-2)-4}}$$

so that $t_g > t_2$ by the definition of $\tilde{\alpha}_V$, $\max_{t \in [t_2, \infty)} g(t) = g(t_g)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} f(t) &\geq \max_{t \in [t_2, \infty)} g(t) \\ &= \frac{(N(q-2)-4)}{4} \left(\frac{2(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} A^{\frac{4}{4-N(q-2)}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{N(q-2)-4}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.60)$$

Set $\bar{r}_\alpha = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{t_1}, \sqrt{\frac{2\theta\alpha}{t_g}} \right\}$, then $v_{\frac{1}{\bar{r}_\alpha}} \in S_{r,\alpha}$ for any $r > \bar{r}_\alpha$, and

$$\|\nabla v_{\frac{1}{\bar{r}_\alpha}}\|_2^2 = \left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}_\alpha} \right)^2 \|\nabla v_1\|_2^2 < \left(\frac{2(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)A} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{N(q-2)-4}}, \quad (2.61)$$

moreover,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\bar{r}_\alpha, s}(v_{\frac{1}{\bar{r}_\alpha}}) \leq h\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}_\alpha}\right) \leq h(t_1). \quad (2.62)$$

Let $u^0 = v_{\frac{1}{\bar{r}_\alpha}}$, $u^1 = v_{t_0}$ and

$$\tilde{r}_\alpha = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{t_0}, \bar{r}_\alpha \right\}. \quad (2.63)$$

Then the statement (i) holds by (2.61), (2.62), (2.56) and (2.55).

(ii) holds by (2.59) and a direct calculation.

(iii) In view of $\mathcal{E}_{r,s}(u^1) \leq 0$ for any $\gamma \in \Gamma_{r,\alpha}$ and the definition of t_0 , we have

$$\|\nabla \gamma(0)\|_2^2 < t_g < \|\nabla \gamma(1)\|_2^2.$$

It then follows from (2.59) that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{t \in [0,1]} \mathcal{E}_{r,s}(\gamma(t)) &\geq g(t_g) \\ &= \frac{N(q-2)-4}{4} \left(\frac{2(1 - \|V_-\|_{\frac{N}{2}} S^{-1})}{N(q-2)} \right)^{\frac{4}{N(q-2)-4}} A^{\frac{4}{4-N(q-2)}} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{N(q-2)-4}} \end{aligned}$$

for any $\gamma \in \Gamma_{r,\alpha}$, hence the first inequality in (iii) holds. We define a path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow S_{r,\alpha}$ by

$$\gamma(t) : \Omega_r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad x \mapsto \left(\tau t_0 + (1-\tau) \frac{1}{\tilde{r}_\alpha} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} v_1 \left(\left(\tau t_0 + (1-\tau) \frac{1}{\tilde{r}_\alpha} \right) x \right). \quad (2.64)$$

Then $\gamma \in \Gamma_{r,\alpha}$, and the second inequality in (iii) follows from (2.54). \square

Theorem 2.12. *Assume $0 < \alpha < \tilde{\alpha}_V$ where $\tilde{\alpha}_V$ is given in Theorem 1.4. Let $r > \tilde{r}_\alpha$, where \tilde{r}_α is defined in Lemma 2.11. Then problem (2.52) admits a solution $(\lambda_{r,s}, u_{r,s})$ for almost every $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Moreover, there hold $u_{r,s} > 0$ and $\mathcal{E}_{r,s}(u_{r,s}) = m_{r,s}(\alpha)$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.4 by Lemma 2.11 and Theorem 2.2. We omit it here. \square

Lemma 2.13. *For fixed $\alpha > 0$ the set of solutions $u \in S_{r,\alpha}$ of (2.52) is bounded uniformly in s and r .*

Proof. By an argument similar to that in Lemma 2.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\partial\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 (x \cdot \mathbf{n}) d\sigma - \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\Omega_r} \tilde{V} u^2 dx \\ &= \frac{(q-2)s}{2q} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^q dx + \frac{\beta(p-2)s}{2p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^p dx \\ &= \frac{q-2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} V u^2 dx - m_{r,s}(\alpha) \right) + \frac{\beta s(p-q)}{2p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^p dx. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{q-2}{2} m_{r,s}(\alpha) + \frac{\beta(q-p)C_{N,p}}{2p} \alpha^{\frac{2p-N(p-2)}{4}} \left(\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{N(p-2)}{4}} \\ & \geq \frac{q-2}{2} m_{r,s}(\alpha) + \frac{\beta s(q-p)}{2p} \int_{\Omega_r} |u|^p dx. \\ & \geq \frac{q-2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_r} V u^2 dx \right) \\ & \quad - \left(\frac{1}{N} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\partial\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 (x \cdot \mathbf{n}) d\sigma - \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\Omega_r} (\nabla V \cdot x) u^2 dx \right) \\ & \geq \frac{N(q-2)-4}{4N} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \alpha \left(\frac{1}{2N} \|\nabla V \cdot x\|_\infty + \frac{q-2}{4} \|V\|_\infty \right). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of $2 < p < 2 + \frac{4}{N}$ and (iii) in Lemma 2.11 we can bound $\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2 dx$ uniformly in s and r . \square

Theorem 2.14. *Assume $0 < \alpha < \tilde{\alpha}_V$, where $\tilde{\alpha}_V$ is given in Theorem 1.4, and let $r > \tilde{r}_\alpha$, where \tilde{r}_α is defined in Lemma 2.11. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *Equation (2.1) admits a solution $(\lambda_{r,\alpha}, u_{r,\alpha})$ for every $r > \tilde{r}_\alpha$ such that $u_{r,\alpha} > 0$ in Ω_r .*
- (ii) *There is $0 < \bar{\alpha} \leq \tilde{\alpha}_V$ such that*

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{r,\alpha} > 0 \quad \text{for any } 0 < \alpha < \bar{\alpha}.$$

Proof. The proof of (i) is similar to that of Theorem 2.6, so we omit it. As we consider $H_0^1(\Omega_r)$ as a subspace of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for every $r > 0$. In view of Lemma 2.13, there are λ_α and $u_\alpha \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that up to a subsequence,

$$u_{r,\alpha} \rightharpoonup u_\alpha \quad \text{in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{r,\alpha} \rightarrow \lambda_\alpha.$$

Arguing by contradiction we assume that $\lambda_{\alpha_n} \leq 0$ for some sequence $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$. Let θ_r be the principal eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ with Dirichlet boundary condition in Ω_r and let $v_{>0r}$ be the corresponding normalized eigenfunction. Testing (2.1) with v_r we obtain

$$(\theta_r + \lambda_{r,\alpha_n}) \int_{\Omega_r} u_{r,\alpha_n} v_r dx + \int_{\Omega_r} V u_{r,\alpha_n} v_r dx \geq 0.$$

In view of $\int_{\Omega_r} u_{r,\alpha_n} v_r dx > 0$ and $\theta_r = r^{-2}\theta_1$, there holds

$$\max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} V + \lambda_{r,\alpha_n} + r^{-2}\theta_1 \geq 0.$$

Hence there exists $C > 0$ independent of n such that $|\lambda_{\alpha_n}| \leq C$ for any n .

Case 1. There is subsequence denoted still by $\{\alpha_n\}$ such that $u_{\alpha_n} = 0$. We first claim that there exists $d_n > 0$ for any n such that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^N} \int_{B(z,1)} u_{r,\alpha_n}^2 dx \geq d_n. \quad (2.65)$$

Otherwise, the concentration compactness principle implies for every n that

$$u_{r,\alpha_n} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^t(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{for all } 2 < t < 2^*.$$

By the diagonal principle, (2.1) and $|\lambda_{r,\alpha_n}| \leq 2C$ for large r , there exists $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u_{r_n,\alpha_n}|^2 dx \leq C$$

for some C independent of n , contradicting (iii) in Lemma 2.11 for large n . As a consequence (2.65) holds, and there is $z_{r,\alpha_n} \in \Omega_r$ with $|z_{r,\alpha_n}| \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\int_{B(z_{r,\alpha_n},1)} u_{r,\alpha_n}^2 dx \geq \frac{d_n}{2}.$$

Moreover, $\text{dist}(z_{r,\alpha_n}, \partial\Omega_r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ by an argument similar to that in Lemma 2.9. Now, for n fixed let $v_r(x) = u_{r,\alpha_n}(x + z_{r,\alpha_n})$ for $x \in \Sigma^r := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x + z_{r,\alpha_n} \in \Omega_r\}$. It follows from Lemma 2.13 that there is $v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $v \neq 0$ such that $v_r \rightharpoonup v$. Observe that for every $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ there is r large such that $\phi(\cdot - z_{r,\alpha_n}) \in C_c^\infty(\Omega_r)$ due to $\text{dist}(z_{r,\alpha_n}, \partial\Omega_r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_r} \nabla u_{r,\alpha_n} \nabla \phi(\cdot - z_{r,\alpha_n}) dx + \int_{\Omega_r} V u_{r,\alpha_n} \phi(\cdot - z_{r,\alpha_n}) dx + \lambda_{r,\alpha_n} \int_{\Omega_r} u_{r,\alpha_n} \phi(\cdot - z_{r,\alpha_n}) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega_r} |u_{r,\alpha_n}|^{q-2} u_{r,\alpha_n} \phi(\cdot - z_{r,\alpha_n}) dx + \beta \int_{\Omega_r} |u_{r,\alpha_n}|^{p-2} u_{r,\alpha_n} \phi(\cdot - z_{r,\alpha_n}) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.66)$$

From $|z_{r,\alpha_n}| \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega_r} V u_{r,\alpha_n} \phi(\cdot - z_{r,\alpha_n}) dx \right| &\leq \int_{\text{Supp}\phi} |V(\cdot + z_{r,\alpha_n}) v_r \phi| dx \\ &\leq \|v_r\|_{2^*} \|\phi\|_{2^*} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\frac{|z_{r,\alpha_n}|}{2}}} |V|^{\frac{N}{2}} dx \right)^{\frac{2}{N}} \\ &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $r \rightarrow \infty$ in (2.66) we get for every $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nabla v \cdot \nabla \phi dx + \lambda_{\alpha_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v \phi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v|^{q-2} v \phi dx + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v|^{p-2} v \phi dx$$

Therefore $v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is a weak solution of the equation

$$-\Delta v + \lambda_{\alpha_n} v = \beta |v|^{p-2} v + |v|^{q-2} v \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v|^2 dx + \lambda_{\alpha_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v|^2 dx = \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v|^p dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v|^q dx.$$

The Pohozaev identity implies

$$\frac{N-2}{2N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v|^2 dx + \frac{\lambda_{\alpha_n}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v|^2 dx = \frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v|^p dx + \frac{1}{q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v|^q dx$$

hence

$$\frac{\lambda_{\alpha_n}}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v|^2 dx = \frac{\beta(2N - p(N-2))}{2Np} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v|^p dx + \frac{2N - q(N-2)}{2Nq} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v|^q dx. \quad (2.67)$$

As a result we have $\lambda_{\alpha_n} > 0$, which is a contradiction.

Case 2. $u_{\alpha_n} \neq 0$ for n large. Note that u_{α_n} satisfies

$$-\Delta u_{\alpha_n} + V u_{\alpha_n} + \lambda_{\alpha_n} u_{\alpha_n} = \beta |u_{\alpha_n}|^{p-2} u_{\alpha_n} + |u_{\alpha_n}|^{q-2} u_{\alpha_n}. \quad (2.68)$$

If $v_{r,\alpha_n} := u_{r,\alpha_n} - u_{\alpha_n}$ satisfies

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^N} \int_{B(z,1)} v_{r,\alpha_n}^2 dx = 0, \quad (2.69)$$

then the concentration compactness principle implies $u_{r,\alpha_n} \rightarrow u_{\alpha_n}$ in $L^t(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for any $2 < t < 2^*$. It then follows from (2.1) and (2.68) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u_{r,\alpha_n}|^2 dx + \alpha_n \lambda_{r,\alpha_n} &= \beta \int_{\Omega_r} |u_{r,\alpha_n}|^p dx + \int_{\Omega_r} |u_{r,\alpha_n}|^q dx - \int_{\Omega_r} V u_{r,\alpha_n}^2 dx \\ &= \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_{r,\alpha_n}|^p dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_{r,\alpha_n}|^q dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V u_{r,\alpha_n}^2 dx \\ &\rightarrow \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_{\alpha_n}|^p dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_{\alpha_n}|^q dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V u_{\alpha_n}^2 dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_{\alpha_n}|^2 dx + \lambda_{\alpha_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_{\alpha_n}^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using $\lambda_{r,\alpha_n} \rightarrow \lambda_{\alpha_n}$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ we further have

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u_{r,\alpha_n}|^2 dx + \alpha_n \lambda_{\alpha_n} \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_{\alpha_n}|^2 dx + \lambda_{\alpha_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_{\alpha_n}^2 dx \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.70)$$

In view of (2.70), (iii) in Lemma 2.11 and $|\lambda_{\alpha_n}| \leq C$ for large n , there holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_{\alpha_n}|^2 dx \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.71)$$

By (2.68) and the Pohozaev identity, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{(2-q)\lambda_{\alpha_n}}{2q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_{\alpha_n}^2 dx \\ &= \frac{(N-2)q-2N}{2Nq} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_{\alpha_n}|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \tilde{V} u_{\alpha_n}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{q-2}{2q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V u_{\alpha_n}^2 dx - \frac{(q-p)\beta}{pq} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_{\alpha_n}|^p dx \\ &\leq \frac{(N-2)q-2N}{2Nq} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_{\alpha_n}|^2 dx + \frac{\|\tilde{V}\|_{\infty}}{2N} \alpha_n + \frac{(q-2)\|V\|_{\infty}}{2q} \alpha_n \\ &\rightarrow -\infty, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (2.72)$$

Therefore (2.69) cannot occur. Consequently there exist $d_n > 0$ and $z_{r,\alpha_n} \in \Omega_r$ with $|z_{r,\alpha_n}| \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\int_{B(z_{r,\alpha_n},1)} v_{r,\alpha_n}^2 dx > d_n.$$

Then $\tilde{v}_{r,\alpha_n} := v_{r,\alpha_n}(\cdot + z_{r,\alpha_n}) \rightarrow \tilde{v}_{\alpha_n} \neq 0$, and \tilde{v}_{α_n} is a nonnegative solution of

$$-\Delta v + \lambda_{\alpha_n} v = \beta |v|^{p-2} v + |v|^{q-2} v \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

In fact, we have $\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(z_{r,\alpha_n}, \partial\Omega_r) = \infty$ by the Liouville theorem on the half space. It follows from an argument similar to that of (2.67) that $\lambda_{\alpha_n} > 0$ for large n , which is a contradiction. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. The proof is a direct result of Theorem 2.14, Lemma 2.7 and Remark 2.8. \square

3 Normalized solutions in \mathbb{R}^N

In this section we specialize Ω to the unit ball $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ in Theorems 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4, and then study the existence of the solutions of (1.6) in \mathbb{R}^N by analyzing the compactness of normalized solutions u_r in the ball B_r as the radius r tends to infinity.

As in Section 2 we consider $H_0^1(B_r)$ as a subspace of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for any $r > 0$.

Lemma 3.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 (resp. Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4), let (λ_r, u_r) , $r > 0$, be a family of solutions of (2.1) with $\Omega_r = B_r$ as established in Theorem 1.1 (resp. Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4). Then u_r is bounded uniformly in r and $\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_r > 0$.*

Proof. If (λ_r, u_r) is a solution of (2.1) as established in Theorem 1.1, then the lemma is a direct consequence of the Lemmas 2.5 and 2.9.

If (λ_r, u_r) is a solution of (2.1) as established in Theorem 1.3, then the lemma follows from $u_r \in \mathcal{B}_{r,\alpha}$, (2.41) and Theorem 2.10.

Finally, if (λ_r, u_r) is a solution of (2.1) as established in Theorems 1.4, then the lemma is a consequence of Lemma 2.13 and (ii) of Theorem 2.14. \square

The next lemma is concerned with the profile decomposition of normalized solutions.

Lemma 3.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 (resp. Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4), let $\{(\lambda_r, u_r)\}$ be a sequence of solutions of (2.1) with $\Omega_r = B_r$ as established in Theorem 1.1 (resp. Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4). Then there exists a subsequence, still denoted by $\{(\lambda_r, u_r)\}$, and there exist $\lambda > 0$, $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $w^1, \dots, w^l \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \setminus \{0\}$, $\{z_r^k\} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ with $z_r^k \in B_r$, such that*

$$|z_r^k| \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{dist}(z_r^k, \partial B_r) \rightarrow \infty, \quad |z_r^k - z_r^{k'}| \rightarrow \infty$$

for any $k, k' = 1, \dots, l$ and $k \neq k'$. These satisfy:

(i) $\lambda_r \rightarrow \lambda$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

(ii) $\left\| u_r - u_0 - \sum_{k=1}^l w^k(\cdot - z_r^k) \right\|_{H^1} \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

(iii) u_0 is a solution of

$$-\Delta u + Vu + \lambda u = |u|^{q-2}u + \beta|u|^{p-2}u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

(iv) w^k , $k = 1, \dots, l$ is a solution of

$$-\Delta u + \lambda u = |u|^{q-2}u + \beta|u|^{p-2}u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. The argument is quite standard. In view of Lemma 3.1, there exist $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\lambda > 0$ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$\lambda_r \rightarrow \lambda, \quad u_r \rightharpoonup u_0 \quad \text{in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Moreover, u_0 is a solution of

$$-\Delta u + Vu + \lambda u = |u|^{q-2}u + \beta|u|^{p-2}u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Set $v_r^1 = u_r - u_0$, then $v_r^1 \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. We consider two cases.

Case 1. If

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^N} \int_{B(z,1)} |v_r^1|^2 dx \rightarrow 0,$$

then we claim that $v_r^1 \rightarrow 0$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. In fact, it follows from the concentration compactness principle that $v_r^1 \rightarrow 0$ in $L^t(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for any $2 < t < 2^*$. By the Brezis-Lieb lemma and the Vitali convergence theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} o_r(1) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v_r^1|^q dx + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v_r^1|^p dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_r|^q dx + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_r|^p dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_0|^q dx - \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_0|^p dx + o_r(1) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_r|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V u_r^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_r|^2 dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_0|^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V u_0^2 dx - \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_0|^2 dx + o_r(1) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla(u_r - u_0)|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_r - u_0|^2 dx + o_r(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $v_r^1 = u_r - u_0 \rightarrow 0$ as claimed.

Case 2. If there exists $z_r^1 \in B_r$ such that

$$\int_{B(z_r^1,1)} |v_r^1|^2 dx > d > 0,$$

then $|z_r^1| \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Otherwise, there is $R > 0$ such that $|z_r^1| < R$. Hence

$$\int_{B(0,R+1)} |v_r^1|^2 dx \geq \int_{B(z_r^1,1)} |v_r^1|^2 dx > d. \quad (3.2)$$

This contradicts $v_r^1 \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. It follows from arguments similar to those in the proof of Theorem 2.9 that $\text{dist}(z_r^1, \partial B_r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Then $w_r^1 = v_r^1(\cdot + z_r^1) \rightarrow w^1$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, and a calculation similar to (2.38) shows that w^1 satisfies

$$-\Delta w^1 + \lambda w^1 = |w^1|^{q-2} w^1 + \beta |w^1|^{p-2} w^1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Setting $v_r^2(x) = v_r^1(x) - w^1(x - z_r^1)$ we repeat the above process. If the process has been repeated m times then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|u_r - u_0 - \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} w^k(\cdot - z_r^k)\|_{H^1} \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|u_r\|_{H^1} - \|u_0\|_{H^1} - \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \|w^k\|_{H^1} \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

and thus

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|u_r\|_{H^1} \geq \|u_0\|_{H^1} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \|w^k\|_{H^1}. \quad (3.4)$$

We claim that there is $d > 0$ such that $\|w\|_{H^1} \geq d$ for any solution w with $\|w\|_2^2 \leq \alpha$ of (3.1). Once this has been proved the theorem follows immediately.

Consider first the case $\beta \leq 0$. If w satisfies $\|w\|_2^2 \leq \alpha$ and

$$-\Delta w + \lambda w = |w|^{q-2} w + \beta |w|^{p-2} w \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N$$

then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla w|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^q dx + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^p dx.$$

The Pohozaev identity implies

$$\frac{N-2}{2N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla w|^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^2 dx = \frac{1}{q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^q dx + \frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^p dx.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla w|^2 dx = \frac{q-2}{2q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^q dx + \frac{\beta(p-2)}{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^p dx.$$

Since $\beta \leq 0$ the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality now yields the required bound of w from below:

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla w|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)-4}{4}} \geq \frac{2q}{N(q-2)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{4}} \geq \frac{2q}{N(q-2)} \alpha^{\frac{N(q-2)-2q}{4}}.$$

It remains to consider the case $\beta > 0$. Recall that the ground state energy of the fixed frequency equation (3.1) is positive as is the mountain pass value. This implies

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla w|^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^2 dx - \frac{1}{q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^q dx - \frac{\beta}{p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w|^p dx > 0.$$

It follows from the Pohozaev identity that

$$\frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla w|^2 dx > 0.$$

Therefore w is also bounded from below in the case $\beta > 0$. \square

Now we consider the existence of a normalized solution in \mathbb{R}^N .

Proofs of Theorems 1.6, 1.8 and 1.9. Let $\{(\lambda_r, u_r)\}$ be a family of solutions of (2.1) with $\Omega_r = B_r$ as established in Theorems 1.1 (resp. in Theorem 1.3 or Theorem 1.4). In view of Lemma 3.2, if $l = 0$ then $u_r \rightarrow u_0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, and we are done. If $l > 0$ then, up to a subsequence, there exists $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}$ such that $|z_r^i| \leq \min\{|z_r^j| : j = 1, \dots, l\}$. Assume without loss of the generality that $i = 1$. Let

$$\frac{|z_r^k - z_r^1|}{|z_r^1|} \rightarrow d_k \in [0, \infty],$$

and set $\nu^* = \frac{1}{4} \min\{1, \rho, d^*\}$, where $d^* = \min\{d_k : d_k \neq 0\}$. Fixing $0 < \delta < \nu^*$ and consider the annulus

$$A_r = B\left(z_r^1, \frac{3}{2}\delta|z_r^1|\right) \setminus B\left(z_r^1, \frac{1}{2}\delta|z_r^1|\right).$$

We claim that $\text{dist}(z_r^i, A_r) \geq \frac{1}{4}\delta|z_r^1|$ for any $i = 2, \dots, l$ and large r . In fact, if $d_i = 0$ for some $i = 2, \dots, l$, then $z_r^i \in B\left(z_r^1, \frac{1}{4}\delta|z_r^1|\right)$ and the claim holds. If $d_i \geq d^* > 0$ for some $i = 2, \dots, l$, then $|z_r^i - z_r^1| > \frac{d_i}{2}|z_r^1| > 2\delta|z_r^1|$. Then $\text{dist}(z_r^i, A_r) > \frac{1}{2}\delta|z_r^1|$ and the claim holds. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that $\|u_r\|_{L^p(A_r)} \rightarrow 0$. Note that u_r satisfies

$$-\Delta u_r + V u_r + \lambda u_r \leq |u_r|^{q-2} u_r + \beta |u_r|^{p-2} u_r \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \quad (3.5)$$

for large r , where $\lambda := \frac{1}{2} \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_r > 0$ due to Lemma 3.1. Setting

$$R_m = B\left(z_r^1, \frac{3}{2}\delta|z_r^1| - m\right) \setminus B\left(z_r^1, \frac{1}{2}\delta|z_r^1| + m\right) \quad \text{for } m \in \mathbb{N}^+$$

the interior estimates of elliptic partial differential equations (see e.g. [19]) imply

$$\|u_r\|_{L^\infty(R_1)}^{q-2} < \frac{\lambda}{8} \quad \text{and} \quad |\beta| \cdot \|u_r\|_{L^\infty(R_1)}^{p-2} < \frac{\lambda}{8}. \quad (3.6)$$

Let $\xi_m \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be a cut-off function with $0 \leq \xi_m(t) \leq 1$, $|\xi_m'(t)| < 4$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and

$$\xi_m(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \frac{1}{2}\delta|z_r^1| + m < t < \frac{3}{2}\delta|z_r^1| - m, \\ 0 & \text{if } t < \frac{1}{2}\delta|z_r^1| + m - 1 \text{ or } t > \frac{3}{2}\delta|z_r^1| - m + 1. \end{cases}$$

Now we set $\phi_m(x) = \xi(|x - z_r^1|)$ and test (3.5) with $\phi_m^2 u_r$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{R_{m-1}} |\nabla u_r|^2 \phi_m^2 dx + \int_{R_{m-1}} V u_r^2 \phi_m^2 dx + \lambda \int_{R_{m-1}} u_r^2 \phi_m^2 dx - \int_{R_{m-1}} |u_r|^q \phi_m^2 dx \\ & \quad - \beta \int_{R_{m-1}} |u_r|^p \phi_m^2 dx \\ & \leq -2 \int_{R_{m-1}} u_r \phi_m \nabla u_r \cdot \nabla \phi_m dx \\ & \leq 8 \int_{R_{m-1} \setminus R_m} |u_r| |\nabla u_r| dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Since $|z_r^1| \rightarrow \infty$ and $\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V(x) \geq 0$ there exists \bar{r} such that $V(x) \geq -\frac{\lambda}{4}$ for any $x \in A_r$ with $r > \bar{r}$. It follows from (3.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{R_{m-1}} |\nabla u_r|^2 \phi_m^2 dx + \int_{R_{m-1}} V u_r^2 \phi_m^2 dx + \lambda \int_{R_{m-1}} u_r^2 \phi_m^2 dx - \int_{R_{m-1}} |u_r|^q \phi_m^2 dx \\ & \quad - \beta \int_{R_{m-1}} |u_r|^p \phi_m^2 dx \\ & \geq \int_{R_{m-1}} |\nabla u_r|^2 \phi_m^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{R_{m-1}} u_r^2 \phi_m^2 dx \\ & \geq \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\lambda}{2} \right\} \left(\int_{R_{m-1}} |\nabla u_r|^2 \phi_m^2 dx + \int_{R_{m-1}} u_r^2 \phi_m^2 dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now (3.7) implies

$$\int_{R_m} |\nabla u_r|^2 dx + \int_{R_m} u_r^2 dx \leq \kappa \left(\int_{R_{m-1} \setminus R_m} |\nabla u_r|^2 dx + \int_{R_{m-1} \setminus R_m} u_r^2 dx \right) \quad (3.8)$$

where $\kappa = 4 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{2}{\lambda} \right\}$. Setting

$$a_m = \int_{R_m} |\nabla u_r|^2 dx + \int_{R_m} u_r^2 dx \quad \text{and} \quad \theta = \frac{\kappa}{1 + \kappa}$$

we obtain from (3.8)

$$a_m \leq \theta a_{m-1} \leq \theta^m \max_r \|u_r\|_{H^1} = \left(\max_r \|u_r\|_{H^1} \right) e^{m \ln \theta} =: A e^{m \ln \theta}.$$

Observe that

$$D_r = B(z_r^1, \delta |z_r^1| + 1) \setminus B(z_r^1, \delta |z_r^1| - 1) \subset R_M$$

with

$$M = \left\lceil \frac{\delta |z_r^1|}{2} \right\rceil - 1.$$

Therefore we have

$$\int_{D_r} |\nabla u_r|^2 dx + \int_{D_r} u_r^2 dx \leq A e^{M \ln \theta} \leq A e^{\frac{\delta |z_r^1|}{4} \ln \theta}.$$

It follows from the interior estimate that

$$|\nabla u_r| + |u_r| \leq A e^{-c|z_r^1|} \quad (3.9)$$

for any x with $\delta |z_r^1| - \frac{1}{2} < |x - z_r^1| < \delta |z_r^1| + \frac{1}{2}$ and large r , where the constants $A > 0$ and $c > 0$ are independent of r .

Let $\Gamma_1 = \partial B(z_r^1, \delta |z_r^1|) \cap B_r$ and $\Gamma_2 = B(z_r^1, \delta |z_r^1|) \cap \partial B_r$. Multiplying both sides of (2.1) with $z_r^1 \cdot \nabla u_r$ and integrating, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_{B(z_r^1, \delta |z_r^1|) \cap B_r} (z_r^1 \cdot \nabla V) u_r^2 dx \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2} (z_r^1 \cdot \mathbf{n}) |\nabla u_r|^2 d\sigma - \int_{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2} (\nabla u_r \cdot \mathbf{n}) (z_r^1 \cdot \nabla u_r) d\sigma \\ & \quad - \int_{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2} (z_r^1 \cdot \mathbf{n}) \left(\frac{V u_r^2}{2} - \frac{\beta |u_r|^p}{p} - \frac{|u_r|^q}{q} + \frac{\lambda}{2} |u_r|^2 \right) d\sigma \\ & =: \mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where \mathbf{n} denotes the outward unit normal vector on $\partial(B(z_r^1, \delta|z_r^1|) \cap B_r)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_i := & \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Gamma_i} (z_r^1 \cdot \mathbf{n}) |\nabla u_r^1|^2 d\sigma - \int_{\Gamma_i} (\nabla u_r \cdot \mathbf{n}) (z_r^1 \cdot \nabla u_r) d\sigma \\ & - \int_{\Gamma_i} (z_r^1 \cdot \mathbf{n}) \left(\frac{V u_r^2}{2} - \frac{\beta |u_r|^p}{p} - \frac{|u_r|^q}{q} + \frac{\lambda}{2} |u_r|^2 \right) d\sigma \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

for $i = 1, 2$. If $\Gamma_2 \neq \emptyset$, then $z_r^1 \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) > 0$ for any $x \in \Gamma_2$ by the choice of δ . Note that $\mathbf{n}(x) = \frac{x}{|x|} = \frac{\nabla u_r}{|\nabla u_r|}$ for any $x \in \Gamma_2$, hence

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Gamma_2} (z_r^1 \cdot \mathbf{n}) |\nabla u_r|^2 d\sigma \leq 0. \quad (3.12)$$

It follows from (3.9) that there is $\tau_0 > 0$ independent of r such that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} e^{\tau_0 |z_r^1|} \mathcal{A}_1 = 0. \quad (3.13)$$

In view of Lemma 3.2 we have

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B(z_r^1, \delta|z_r^1|) \cap B_r} u_r^2 dx \geq \|w^1\|_2^2 > 0.$$

Moreover, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} e^{\tau_0 |z_r^1|} \int_{B(z_r^1, \delta|z_r^1|) \cap B_r} (z_r^1 \cdot \nabla V) u_r^2 dx \\ & \geq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} e^{\tau_0 |z_r^1|} \left(\inf_{x \in B(z_r^1, \delta|z_r^1|)} (z_r^1 \cdot \nabla V(x)) \right) \int_{B(z_r^1, \delta|z_r^1|) \cap B_r} u_r^2 dx \\ & > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Now we obtain a contradiction using (3.10), (3.12), (3.13) and (3.14). It follows that $l = 0$ and we conclude that $u_r \rightarrow u_0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Consequently, u_0 is a normalized solution of (1.6). \square

References

- [1] M. Anderson, J. Ensher, M. Matthews, C. Wieman, E. Cornell, Observation of Bose-Einstein condensation in a dilute atomic vapor. *Science* 269 (1995), 198-201.
- [2] T. Aubin, Problèmes isopérimétriques et espaces de Sobolev. (French) *J. Differential Geometry* 11 (1976), no. 4, 573-598.
- [3] T. Bartsch, L. Jeanjean, N. Soave, Normalized solutions for a system of coupled cubic Schrödinger equations on \mathbb{R}^3 . *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 106 (2016), no. 4, 583-614.
- [4] T. Bartsch, R. Molle, M. Rizzi, G. Verzini, Normalized solutions of mass supercritical Schrödinger equations with potential. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 46 (2021), no. 9, 1729-1756.
- [5] T. Bartsch, N. Soave, A natural constraint approach to normalized solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations and systems. *J. Funct. Anal.* 272 (2017), no. 12, 4998-5037.

- [6] T. Bartsch, N. Soave, Multiple normalized solutions for a competing system of Schrödinger equations. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 58 (2019), no. 1, Paper No. 22, 24 pp.
- [7] T. Bartsch, X. Zhong, W. Zou, Normalized solutions for a coupled Schrödinger system. *Math. Ann.* 380 (2021), no. 3-4, 1713-1740.
- [8] J. Bellazzini, N. Boussaid, L. Jeanjean, N. Visciglia, Existence and stability of standing waves for supercritical NLS with a partial confinement. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 353 (2017), no. 1, 229-251.
- [9] J. Bellazzini, L. Jeanjean, T. Luo, Existence and instability of standing waves with prescribed norm for a class of Schrödinger-Poisson equations. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* 107 (2013), no. 2, 303-339.
- [10] B. Bieganowski, J. Mederski, Normalized ground states of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with at least mass critical growth. *J. Funct. Anal.* 280 (2021), no. 11, Paper No. 108989, 26 pp.
- [11] D. Bonheure, J. Casteras, T. Gou, L. Jeanjean, Normalized solutions to the mixed dispersion nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the mass critical and supercritical regime. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 372 (2019), no. 3, 2167-2212.
- [12] J. Borthwick, X. Chang, L. Jeanjean, N. Soave, Bounded Palais-Smale sequences with Morse type information for some constrained functionals. arXiv:2210.12626.
- [13] X. Chang, L. Jeanjean, N. Soave, Normalized solutions of L^2 -supercritical NLS equations on compact metric graphs. (2022), arXiv:2204.01043.
- [14] D. Choi, Q. Niu, Bose Einstein condensation in an optical lattice. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82 (1999), 2022-2025.
- [15] Y. Ding, X. Zhong, Normalized solution to the Schrödinger equation with potential and general nonlinear term: mass super-critical case. *J. Diff. Equ.* 334 (2022), 194-215.
- [16] L. Erdős, B. Schlein, H. Yau, Derivation of the Gross-Pitaevskii equation for the dynamics of Bose-Einstein condensate. *Ann. Math.* 172 (2010), 291-370.
- [17] M. Esteban, P. L. Lions, Existence and nonexistence results for semilinear elliptic problems in unbounded domains. *Proc. R. Soc. Edinb. Sect. A* 93, (1982/83), 1-14.
- [18] G. Fang, N. Ghoussoub, Morse-type information on Palais-Smale sequences obtained by min-max principles. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 47 (1994), no. 12, 1595-1653.
- [19] D. Gilbarg, N. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*. Springer, Berlin (1983).
- [20] E. Gross, Structure of a quantized vortex in boson systems. *Nuovo Cimento* 20 (1961), 454-466.

- [21] S. Gupta, K. Murch, K. Moore, T. Purdy, D. Stamper-Kurn, Bose-Einstein condensation in a circular waveguide. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 95 (2005), 143201.
- [22] N. Ikoma, Y. Miyamoto, Stable standing waves of nonlinear Schrödinger equations with potentials and general nonlinearities. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 59 (2020), no. 2, Paper No. 48, 20 pp.
- [23] L. Jeanjean, On the existence of bounded Palais-Smale sequences and application to a Landesman-Lazer-type problem set on \mathbb{R}^N . *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* 129 (1999), 787-809.
- [24] L. Jeanjean, Existence of solutions with prescribed norm for semilinear elliptic equations. *Nonlinear Anal.* 28 (1997), no. 10, 1633-1659.
- [25] L. Jeanjean, T. Le, Multiple normalized solutions for a Sobolev critical Schrödinger equation. *Math. Ann.* 384 (2022), no. 1-2, 101-134.
- [26] L. Jeanjean, S. Lu, Nonradial normalized solutions for nonlinear scalar field equations. *Nonlinearity* 32 (2019), no. 12, 4942–4966.
- [27] L. Jeanjean, S. Lu, A mass supercritical problem revisited. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 59 (2020), no. 5, Paper No. 174, 43 pp.
- [28] L. Jeanjean, J. Zhang, X. Zhong, A global branch approach to normalized solutions for the Schrödinger equation. (2021), arXiv:2112.05869v2.
- [29] The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case II. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Lin.* 1 (1984), 223-283.
- [30] A. Masiello, Variational methods in Lorentzian geometry. Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, 309. Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow; copublished in the United States with John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1994.
- [31] J. Mederski, J. Schino, Least energy solutions to a cooperative system of Schrödinger equations with prescribed bounds: at least critical growth. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 61 (2022), no. 1, 31 pp.
- [32] R. Molle, G. Riey, G. Verzini, Normalized solutions to mass supercritical Schrödinger equations with negative potential. *J. Diff. Equ.* 333 (2022), 302–331.
- [33] B. Noris, H. Tavares, S. Terracini, G. Verzini, Convergence of minimax structures and continuation of critical points for singularly perturbed systems. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 14 (2012), no. 4, 1245-1273.
- [34] B. Noris, H. Tavares, G. Verzini, Existence and orbital stability of the ground states with prescribed mass for the critical and supercritical NLS on bounded domains. *Anal. PDE* 7 (2014), no. 8, 1807-1838.
- [35] B. Noris, H. Tavares, G. Verzini, Stable solitary waves with prescribed L^2 -mass for the cubic Schrödinger system with trapping potentials. *Disc. Cont. Dyn. Syst.* 35 (2015), no. 12, 6085-6112.

- [36] B. Noris, H. Tavares, G. Verzini, Normalized solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger systems on bounded domains. *Nonlinearity* 32 (2019), no. 3, 1044-1072.
- [37] D. Pierotti, G. Verzini, Normalized bound states for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation in bounded domains. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 56 (2017), no. 5, Paper No. 133, 27 pp.
- [38] S. Qi, W. Zou, Exact number of positive solutions for the Kirchhoff equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 54 (2022), no. 5, 5424-5446.
- [39] C. Ryu, M. Andersen, P. Cladé, Vasant Natarajan, K. Helmerson, W. Phillips, Observation of persistent flow of a Bose-Einstein condensate in a toroidal trap. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 99 (2007), 260401.
- [40] Y. Sato, M. Shibata, Infinitely many solutions for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation with general nonlinearity. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 57 (2018), no. 5, Paper No. 137, 31 pp.
- [41] M. Shibata, Stable standing waves of nonlinear Schrödinger equations with a general nonlinear term. *Manuscripta Math.* 143 (2014), no. 1-2, 221-237.
- [42] N. Soave, Normalized ground states for the NLS equation with combined nonlinearities. *J. Differential Equations* 269 (2020), no. 9, 6941-6987.
- [43] N. Soave, Normalized ground states for the NLS equation with combined nonlinearities: the Sobolev critical case. *J. Funct. Anal.* 279 (2020), no. 6, 108610, 43 pp.
- [44] J. Wei, Y. Wu, Normalized solutions for Schrödinger equations with critical Sobolev exponent and mixed nonlinearities. *J. Funct. Anal.* 283 (2022), no. 6, Paper No. 109574.
- [45] Z. Yang, S. Qi, W. Zou, Normalized solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations with potentials and non-autonomous nonlinearities. *J. Geom. Anal.* 32 (2022), no. 5, Paper No. 159, 27 pp.

ADDRESS OF THE AUTHORS:

Thomas Bartsch

Mathematisches Institut

University of Giessen

Arndtstr. 2

35392 Giessen

Germany

Thomas.Bartsch@math.uni-giessen.de

Shijie Qi

School of Mathematics and Statistics,

Xidian University, Xi'an, 710071, Shaanxi, China

shijie28502@126.com

Wenming Zou

Department of Mathematical Sciences

Tsinghua University

Beijing 100084, China

zou-wm@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn