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#### Abstract

In this paper we prove the existence and multiplicity of solutions for $p$-laplacian problem with decaying cylindrical potential and critical exponent by using Palais-Smale condition and by splitting the Nehari manifold N in two disjoint subsets $N^{+}$and $N$, thus considering the minimization problems on $N^{+}$and $N^{-}$respectively.
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## Introduction

In this paper we consider the following problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
L_{a, t} u^{u}  \tag{1.1}\\
u \in \mathcal{D}_{p}^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right),
\end{array}=h|y|^{-p, b}|u|^{p_{0}-2} u+\lambda \operatorname{gin} \mathbb{R}^{N}, y \neq 0\right.
$$

Where $L_{a, \mu} w=-\operatorname{div}\left(|y|^{p a}|\nabla w|^{p-2} \nabla w\right)-\mu|y|^{-p(a+1)}|w|^{p-2} w, 1<\mathrm{p}<\mathrm{k}$ with k and N are integers such that $N \geq p+1$ and k belongs to $\{3, ., N-1\}$ and where each point x in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ is written as a pair

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{k} \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k}-\infty<a<(k-p) / p, a \leq b<a+1, p^{*}= \\
& p N /(N-p+p(b-a))-\infty<\mu<\bar{\mu} \%_{a, k, p}=((k-p(a+1)) / p)
\end{aligned}
$$

h is a bounded positive function on $\mathbb{R}^{k}$ and $\lambda$ is real parameter. $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{\prime}$ is the dual of $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$, where $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{1}^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ will be defined later.

Some results are already available for (1.1) in the case $\mathrm{k}=\mathrm{N}$ and $\mathrm{p}=2$, Example [1,2] and the references therein. Wang and Zhou [1,2] proved that there exist at least two solutions for (1.1) with $\mathrm{a}=0,0<\mu \leq \bar{\mu}_{0, N}=((N-2) / 2)^{2}$ and $h \equiv 1$, under certain conditions on g. Bouchekif and Matallah [3] showed the existence of two solutions of (1.1) under certain conditions on functions $g$ and $h$; when $0<\mu \leq \bar{\mu}_{0, N} \$, \$ \lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{*}\right),-\infty<a<(N-2) / 2$ and $a \leq b<a+1$ with $\Lambda_{*}$ a positive constant. Concerning existence results in the case $\mathrm{k}<\mathrm{N}$ and $\mathrm{p}=2$, [4,5]. Musina [5] considered (1.1) with $-\mathrm{a} / 2$ instead of a and $\lambda=0$, also (1.1) with a=0, $\mathrm{b}=0, \lambda=0$, with $h \equiv 1$ and $a \neq 2-k$. She established the existence of a ground state solution when $2<k \leq N$ and $0<\mu<\bar{\mu}_{a, k}=((k-2+a) / 2)^{2}$ for (1.1) with $-\mathrm{a} / 2$ instead of a and $\lambda=0$. She also showed that (1.1) with $\mathrm{a}=0, \mathrm{~b}=0, \lambda=0$ does not admit ground state solutions. Badiale et al. [6] studied (1.1) with $\mathrm{a}=0, \mathrm{~b}=0, \lambda=0 c$ and $h \equiv 1$. They proved the existence of at least a nonzero nonnegative weak solution u , satisfying $u(y, z)=u(|y|, z)$ when $2 \leq k<N$ and $\mu<0$. Bouchekif and El Mokhtar [7] proved that (1.1) admits two distinct solutions when $2<k \leq N \$, \$ b=N-p(N-2) / 2$ with $p \in\left(2,2^{*}\right], \mu<\bar{\mu}_{0, k}$, and $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{*}\right)$ where $\Lambda_{*}$ is a positive constant. Terracini [8] proved that there is no positive solutions of (1.1) with $\mathrm{b}=0, \lambda=0$ when $a \neq 0$, $h \equiv 1$ and $\mu<0$. The regular problem corresponding to $a=b=\mu=0$ and $h \equiv 1$ has been considered on a regular bounded domain by Tarantello [9]. She proved that, for $g \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, the dual of $H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$, not identically zero and satisfying a suitable condition, the problem considered admits two distinct solutions. For instance, Xuan studied the multiple weak solutions for p -Laplace equation with singularity and cylindrical symmetry in bounded domains [10]. However, they only considered the equation with sole critical Hardy-Sobolev term.

Before formulating our results, we give some definitions and notation. We denote by $\mathcal{D}_{1}^{p}=\mathcal{D}_{1}^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{k} \backslash\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k}\right)$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}=\mathcal{H}_{\mu}\left(\mathbb{R}^{k} \backslash\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k}\right)$, the closure of $C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{k} \backslash\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k}\right)$ with respect to the norms.

$$
\|u\|_{a, p, 0}=\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}|y|^{-p a}|\nabla u|^{p} d x\right)^{1 / p}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { and } \\
& \|u\|_{a, p, \mu}=\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}\left(|y|^{-p a}|\nabla u|^{p}-\mu|y|^{-p(a+1)}|u|^{p}\right) d x\right)^{1 / p},
\end{aligned}
$$

respectively, with $\mu<\bar{\mu}_{a, k, p}=((k-p(a+1)) / p)^{p}$ for $k \neq p(a+1)$.
From the Hardy-Sobolev-Mazfiya inequality, it is easy to see that the norm $\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}$ is equivalent to $\|u\|_{a, p, 0}$.

Since our approach is variational, we define the functional $I_{a, b, \lambda, \mu}$
 say that $u \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu}$ is a weak solution of the problem $(\mathcal{P})$ if it satisfies $\left.\left\langle r^{\prime}(u), v\right\rangle=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{v}}\left(|y|^{-p a} \nabla u \nabla v-\mu|y|^{-p(a+1)} u v-h|y|^{-p_{0} b}|u|^{p+2} u v-\lambda g v\right\rangle\right) d x=0$, for $v \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu}$

Here $\langle\ldots$,$\rangle denotes the product in the duality \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{\prime}, \mathcal{H}_{\mu}$.
Throughout this work, we consider the following assumptions:
(G) There exist $v_{0}>0$ and $\delta_{0}>0$ such that $g(x) \geq v_{0}$, for all x in $B\left(0,2 \delta_{0}\right)$.
(H) $\lim _{\mid y \rightarrow 0} h(y)=\lim _{|y| \rightarrow \infty} h(y)=h_{0}>0, h(y) \geq h_{0}, y \in \mathbb{R}^{k}$.

Here, $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{r})$ denotes the ball centered at a with radius r .
Under some sufficient conditions on coefficients of equation of (1.1), we split $\mathcal{N}$ in two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{N}^{+}$and $\mathcal{N}^{-}$, thus we consider the minimization problems on $\mathcal{N}^{+}$and $\mathcal{N}^{-}$respectively.

Remark 1: Note that all solutions of our problem (1.1) are nontrivial.

[^0]We shall state our main results:
Theorem 1: Assume that $3 \leq k \leq N-1,-1<a<(k-p) / p, \% 0 \leq \mu<\bar{\mu}_{a, k, p}$ and (G) holds, then there exists $\Lambda_{1}>0$ such that the problem (1.1), has at least one nontrivial solution on $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$ for all $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{1}\right)$.

Theorem 2: In addition to the assumptions of the Theorem 1, if (H) holds, then there exists $\Lambda_{2}>0$ such that the problem (1.1), has at least two nontrivial solutions on $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$ for all $0<\lambda<\Lambda_{3}=\min \left(\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}\right)$.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some preliminaries. Section 3 and 4 are devoted to the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2.

## Preliminaries

We list here a few integral inequalities. The first one that we need is the Hardy inequality with cylindrical weights [5]. It states that

$$
\bar{\mu}_{a, k, p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}|y|^{-p(a+1)} v^{p} d x \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}|y|^{-p a}|\nabla v|^{p} d x, \text { for all } v \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu}
$$

The starting point for studying (1:1), is the Hardy-Sobolev-Mazfiya inequality that is particular to the cylindrical case $\mathrm{k}<\mathrm{N}$ and that was proved by Mazfiya in [4]. It states that there exists positive constant $C_{a, p_{*}}$ such that

$$
C_{a, p_{*}}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}|y|^{-p_{*} b}|v|^{2_{*}} d x\right)^{p / p_{*}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}\left(|y|^{-p a}|\nabla v|^{p}-\mu|y|^{-p(a+1)} v^{p}\right) d x,
$$

$$
\text { for any } v \in C_{c}^{\infty}\left(\left(\mathbb{R}^{k} \backslash\{0\}\right) \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k}\right) \text {. }
$$

Proposition 1: The value [4]

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\mu, p_{*}}=S_{\mu, p_{*}}\left(k, p_{*}\right)=\inf _{v \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu} \backslash\{0\}} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}\left(|y|^{-p a}|\nabla v|^{p}-\mu|y|^{-p(a+1)} v^{p}\right) d x}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}|y|^{-p_{*} b}|v|^{p_{*}} d x\right)^{p / p_{*}}} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

is achieved on $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$, for $p \leq k<N$ and $\mu \leq \bar{\mu} \%_{a, k, p}$
Definition 1: Let $c \in \mathbb{R}, E$ a Banach space and $I \in C^{1}(E, \mathbb{R})$.
(i) $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n}$ is a Palais-Smale sequence at level $\mathrm{c}\left(\right.$ in short $\left.(\mathrm{PS})_{c}\right)$ in E for I if

$$
I\left(u_{n}\right)=c+o_{n}(1) \text { and } I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)=o_{n}(1)
$$

where $o_{n}(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
(ii) We say that I satisfies the (PS)c condition if any (PS)c sequence in $E$ for $I$ has a convergent subsequence.

## Nehari manifold

It is well known that I is of class $\mathrm{C}^{1}$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$ and the solutions of (1.1) are the critical points of I which is not bounded below on $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$. Consider the following Nehari manifold

$$
\mathcal{N}=\left\{u \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu} \backslash\{0\}:\left\langle I^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle=0\right\}
$$

Thus, $u \in \mathcal{N}$ if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} h|y|^{-p_{*} b}|u|^{p_{*}} d x-\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} g u d x=0 \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that N contains every nontrivial solution of the problem (1.1) Moreover, we have the following results.

Lemma 1: The functional I is coercive and bounded from below on $\mathcal{N}$.

Proof: If $u \in \mathcal{N}$, then by (2.2) and the Holder inequality, we
deduce that

$$
\begin{align*}
& I(u)=\left(\left(p_{*}-p\right) / p_{*} p\right)\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}-\lambda\left(1-\left(1 / p_{*}\right)\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} g u d x \\
& \geq\left(\left(p_{*}-p\right) / p_{*} p\right)\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}-\lambda\left(1-\left(1 / p_{*}\right)\right)\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}\|g\| \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{\prime}  \tag{2.3}\\
& \geq-\lambda^{p} C_{0}
\end{align*}
$$

where
$C_{0}:=C_{0}\left(\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{\prime}}\right)=\left[\left(p_{*}-1\right)^{p} / p_{*} p\left(p_{*}-p\right)\right]\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{\prime}}^{p}>0$.
Thus, I is coercive and bounded from below on N
Define
$\Psi_{\lambda}(u)=\left\langle I^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle$.
Then, for $u \in \mathcal{N}$
$\left\langle\Psi_{\lambda}^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle=p\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}-p_{*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} h|y|^{-p_{*} b}|u|^{p_{*}} d x-\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} g u d x$
$=\|u\|_{\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{p}, \mu}^{\mathrm{p}}-\left(\mathrm{p}_{*}-1\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} h|y|^{-p_{*} b}|u|^{p_{*}} d x$
$=\lambda\left(p_{*}-1\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \operatorname{gudx}-\left(p_{*}-p\right)\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}$.

Now, we split $\mathcal{N}$ in three parts:
$\mathcal{N}^{+}=\left\{u \in \mathcal{N}:\left\langle\Psi_{\lambda}^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle>0\right\}, \mathcal{N}^{0}=\left\{u \in \mathcal{N}:\left\langle\Psi_{\lambda}^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle=0\right\}$
and $\mathcal{N}^{-}=\left\{u \in \mathcal{N}:\left\langle\Psi_{\lambda}^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle<0\right\}$.
We have the following results.
Lemma 2: Suppose that there exists a local minimizer $\mathrm{u}_{0}$ for $I$ on $\mathcal{N}$ and $u_{0} \notin \mathcal{N}^{0}$. Then, $I^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right)=0$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{\prime}$.

Proof: If u 0 is a local minimizer for I on N , then there exists $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\left\langle I^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right), \varphi\right\rangle=\theta\left\langle\Psi_{\lambda}^{v}\left(u_{0}\right), \varphi\right\rangle$ for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu}$.

If $\theta=0$, then the lemma is proved. If not, taking $\varphi \equiv u_{0}$ and using the assumption $u_{0} \in \mathcal{N}$, we deduce $0=\left\langle I^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right), u_{0}\right\rangle=\theta\left\langle\Psi_{\lambda}^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right), u_{0}\right\rangle$.

Thus,
$\left\langle\Psi_{\lambda}^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right), u_{0}\right\rangle=0$,
which contradicts the fact that $u_{0} \notin \mathcal{N}^{0}$.
Let be
$\Lambda_{1}=\left(p_{*}-p\right)\left(p_{*}-1\right)^{-\left(p_{*}-1\right)\left(p_{*}-p\right)}\left[\left(h_{0}\right)^{-1} S_{\mu, p_{*}}\right]^{p_{*} / p\left(p_{*}-p\right)}\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}}^{-1}$.
Lemma 3: We have $\mathcal{N}^{0}=\varnothing$ for all $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{1}\right)$.
Proof: Let us reason by contradiction.
Suppose $\mathcal{N}^{0} \neq \varnothing$ for some $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{1}\right)$. Then, by (2.4) and for $u \in \mathcal{N}^{0}$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p} & =\left(p_{*}-1\right) \int \mathbb{R}^{N} h|y|^{-p_{*} b}|u|^{p_{*}} d x  \tag{2.6}\\
& =\lambda\left(\left(\mathrm{p}_{*}-1\right) /\left(\mathrm{p}_{*}-\mathrm{p}\right)\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} g u d x .
\end{align*}
$$

Moreover, by (G), the Holder inequality and the Sobolev embedding theorem, we obtain
$\left[\left(\left(h_{0}\right)^{-1} S_{\mu, p_{*}}\right)^{p_{*} / p} /\left(p_{*}-1\right)\right]^{1 /\left(p_{*}-p\right)} \leq\|u\|_{a, p, \mu} \leq\left[\lambda\left(\left(p_{*}-1\right)\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}} /\left(p_{*}-p\right)\right)\right]$. (2.7)

This implies that $\lambda \geq \Lambda_{1}$, which is a contradiction with the fact that $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{1}\right)$.

Thus $\mathcal{N}=\mathcal{N}^{+} \cup \mathcal{N}^{-}$for $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{1}\right)$.
Define
$c=\inf _{u \in \mathcal{N}} I(u), c^{+}=\inf _{u \in \mathcal{N}^{+}} I(u)$ and $c^{-}=\inf _{u \in \mathcal{N}^{-}} I(u)$.
For the sequel, we need the following Lemma.
Lemma 4: (i) If $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{1}\right)$, then one has $c \leq c^{+}<0$.
(ii) If $0<\lambda<\Lambda_{3}=\min \left(\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}\right)$ then $c^{-}>C_{1}$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_{1}=C_{1}\left(\lambda, S_{\mu, p_{*}}\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}}\right)= & \left(\left(p_{*}-p\right) / p_{*} p\right)\left(p_{*}-1\right)^{p\left(p_{*}-p\right)}\left(S_{\mu, p_{*}}\right)^{p_{p}\left(p_{*}-p\right)}+ \\
& -\lambda\left(1-\left(1 / p_{*}\right)\right)\left(\mathrm{p}_{*}-1\right)^{\mathrm{p}\left(p_{*}-p\right)}\|\mathrm{g}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof: (i) Let $u \in \mathcal{N}^{+}$. By (2.4), we have

$$
\left[1 /\left(p_{*}-1\right)\right]\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}>\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N} h|y|^{-p_{p} b}|u|^{p_{*}} d x}
$$

and so

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(u) & =(-1 / p)\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}+\left(1-\left(1 / p_{*}\right)\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N} h|y|-\left(p^{-p, b}\right.}|u|^{p,} d x \\
& <\left[(-1 / p)+\left(1-\left(1 / p_{*}\right)\right)\left(1 /\left(p_{*}-1\right)\right)\right]\|u\|_{a, p, \mu, u}^{p}= \\
& -\left(\left(p_{*}-p\right) / p_{*} p\right)\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p},
\end{aligned}
$$

we conclude that $c \leq c^{+}<0$.
(ii) Let $u \in \mathcal{N}^{-}$. By (2.4), we get
$\left[1 /\left(p_{*}-1\right)\right]\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}<\int_{\mathbb{R}^{v}} h|y|^{-p_{t} b}|u|^{p_{*}} d x$.
Moreover, by Sobolev embedding theorem, we have
$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} h|y|^{-p_{s} b}|u|^{p_{*}} d x \leq\left(S_{\mu, p_{*}}\right)^{-p_{v} / p}\|u\|_{a, \mu}^{p_{*}}$.
This implies
$\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}>\left[\left(p_{*}-1\right)\right]^{-1 /\left(p_{*}-p\right)}\left(S_{\mu, p_{*}}\right)^{p^{\prime / p}\left(p\left(p_{-}-p\right)\right.}$, for all $u \in \mathcal{N}^{-}$.
By (2.3), we get
$I(u) \geq\left(\left(p_{*}-p\right) / p_{*} p\right)\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}-\lambda\left(1-\left(1 / p_{*}\right)\right)\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}}$.
Thus, for all

$$
\begin{equation*}
0<\lambda<\Lambda_{3}=\min \left(\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}\right), \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\Lambda_{2}=\left(\left(p_{*}-p\right) / p_{*} p\right)\left[\frac{p-1}{\left(p_{*}-1\right) h_{0}}\right]^{p /\left(p_{p}-p\right)}\left[\frac{p_{*}}{\left(p_{*}-1\right)\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}}}\right]\left(S_{\mu, p_{*}}\right)^{1 / p_{*}},
$$

we have $I(u) \geq C_{1}$.
For each $u \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu}$, we write
$t_{m}=t_{\text {max }}(u)=\left[\frac{\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}}{\left(p_{*}-1\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}} h|y|^{-p_{b} b}|u|^{p_{*}} d x}\right]^{1 /\left(p_{*}-p\right)}>0$.
Lemma 5: Let $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{1}\right)$. For each $u \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu}$, one has the following:
(i) If $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} g(x) u d x \leq 0$, then there exists a unique $t^{-}>t_{m}$ such that $t^{-} u \in \mathcal{N}^{-}$and $I\left(t^{-} u\right)=\sup _{\geq \geq 0} I(t u)$.
(ii) If $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} g(x) u d x>0$, then there exist unique $t^{+}$and $t^{-}$such that $0<t^{+}<t_{m}<t^{-}, t^{+} u \in \mathcal{N}^{+}, t^{-} u \in \mathcal{N}^{-}$,
$I\left(t^{+} u\right)=\inf _{0 \leq \Lambda_{t}} I(t u)$ and $I\left(t^{-} u\right)=\sup _{t \geq 0} I(t u)$.
Proof: With minor modifications, we refer to [11].

## Proof of theorem 1

For the proof we get, firstly, the following results:

## Proposition 2:

(i) If $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{1}\right)$, [11] then there exists a minimizing sequence $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n}$ in $\mathcal{N}$ such that
$I\left(u_{n}\right)=c+o_{n}(1)$ and $I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)=o_{n}(1)$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{\prime}$,
where $o_{n}(1)$ tends to 0 as n tends to $\infty$.
(ii) If $0<\lambda<\Lambda_{3}=\min \left(\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}\right)$, then there exists a minimizing sequence $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n}$ in $\mathcal{N}^{-}$such that
$I\left(u_{n}\right)=c^{-}+o_{n}(1)$ and $I\left(u_{n}\right)=c^{-}+o_{n}(1)$ and $I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)=o_{n}(1)$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{\prime}$.
Now, taking as a starting point the work of Tarantello [9], we establish the existence of a local minimum for I on $\mathcal{N}^{+}$.

Proposition 3: If $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{1}\right)$, then I has a minimizer $u_{1} \in \mathcal{N}^{+}$and it satisfies
(i) $I\left(u_{1}\right)=c=c^{+}<0$,
(ii) $u_{1}$ is a nonnegative solution of (1.1)

Proof: (i) By Lemma 1, I is coercive and bounded below on $\mathcal{N}$. We can assume that there exists $u_{1} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu}$ such that
$u_{n} \rightharpoonup u_{1}$ weakly in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$,
$u_{n} \rightharpoonup u_{1}$ weakly in $L^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N},|y|^{-p, b}\right)$,
$u_{n} \rightarrow u_{1}$ a.e in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$.
Thus, by (3.1) and (3.2), $u_{1}$ is a weak solution of (1.1) since $c<0$ and $I(0)=0$. Now, we show that $u_{n}$ converges to $u_{1}$ strongly in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$. Suppose otherwise. Then $\left\|u_{1}\right\|_{a, p, \mu}<\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{a, p, \mu}$ and we obtain $c \leq I\left(u_{1}\right)=\left(\left(p_{*}-p\right) / p_{*} p\right)\left\|u_{1}\right\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}-\lambda\left(1-\left(1 / p_{*}\right)\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N} g u_{1} d x} \quad<\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} I\left(u_{n}\right)=c$.

We get a contradiction. Therefore, $u_{n}$ converges to $u_{1}$ strongly in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$. Moreover, we have $u_{1} \in \mathcal{N}^{+}$. If not, then by Lemma 5, there are two numbers $t_{0}^{+}$and $t_{0}^{-}$, uniquely defined so that $t_{0}^{+} u_{1} \in \mathcal{N}^{+}$and $t_{0}^{-} u_{1} \in \mathcal{N}^{-}$. In particular, we have $t_{0}^{+}<t_{0}^{-}=1$. Since $\frac{d}{d t} I\left(t u_{1}\right)_{k=t}=0$ and $\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2}}{\mathrm{dt}^{2}} \mathrm{I}\left(\mathrm{tu} u_{1}\right)_{l=t_{0}}>0$, there exists $t_{0}^{+}<t^{-} \leq t_{0}^{-}$such that $I\left(t_{0}^{+} u_{1}\right)<I\left(t^{-} u_{1}\right)$. By Lemma 5, $I\left(t_{0}^{+} u_{1}\right)<I\left(t^{-} u_{1}\right)<I\left(t_{0}^{-} u_{1}\right)=I\left(u_{1}\right)$, which is a contradiction.

## Proof of theorem 2

In this section, we establish the existence of a second nonnegative solution of (1.1). For this, we require the following Lemmas with $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ is given in (2.3).

Lemma 6: Assume that (G) holds and let $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\mu}$ be a $(P S)_{c}$ sequence for I for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$ with $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$. Then, $I^{\prime}(u)=0$ and $I(u) \geq-C_{0} \lambda^{p}$.

Proof: It is easy to prove that $I^{\prime}(u)=0$, which implies that $\left\langle I^{\prime}(u), u\right\rangle=0$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} h|y|^{-p, b}|u|^{2} d x=\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}-\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} g u d x$.

Therefore, we get

$$
I(u)=\left(\left(p_{*}-p\right) / p_{*} p\right)\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}-\lambda\left(1-\left(1 / p_{*}\right)\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}} g u d x .
$$

Using (2.3), we obtain that $I(u) \geq-C_{0} \lambda^{p}$.
Lemma 7: Assume that (G) holds and for any (PS)c sequence with c is a real number such that $c<c_{\lambda}^{*}$. Then, there exists a subsequence which converges strongly.

Here $c_{\lambda}^{*}=\left(\left(p_{*}-p\right) / p_{*} p\right)\left(h_{0}\right)^{-p /\left(p_{*}-p\right)}\left(S_{\mu, p_{0}}\right)^{p_{0} /\left(p_{-}-p\right)}-C_{0} \lambda^{p}$.
Proof: Using standard arguments, we get that $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$. Thus, there exist a subsequence of $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n}$ which we still denote by $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n}$ and $u \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu}$ such that
$u_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$,
$u_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $L^{p_{x}}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N},|y|^{-p, b}\right)$.
$u_{n} \rightarrow u$ a.e in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$.
Then, u is a weak solution of (1.1). Let $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{n}}=\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{n}}-\mathrm{u}$, then by Brezis-
Lieb [12], we obtain $\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}=\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}-\|u\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}+o_{n}(1)$
and

On the other hand, by using the assumption (H), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} h(x)|y|^{-p, b}\left|v_{n} p^{p .} d x=h_{0} \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\sqrt{x}}}\right| y\right|^{-p, b}\left|v_{n}\right|^{p \cdot} d x . \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $I\left(u_{n}\right)=c+o_{n}(1), I^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)=o_{n}(1)$ and by (4.1), (4.2), and (4.3) we can deduce that $\left.(1 / p)\left|\left\|_{n}\right\|_{a, p, u}^{p}-\left(1 / p_{*}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\prime}} h\right| y\right|^{-p, b}\left|v_{n}\right|^{p} d x=c-I(u)+o_{n}(1), \quad$ (4.4)

$$
\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} h|y|^{-p, b}\left|v_{n}\right|^{p,} d x=o_{n}(1) .
$$

Hence, we may assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p} \rightarrow l, \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} h|y|^{-p_{p}, b}\left|v_{n}\right|^{p_{v}} d x \rightarrow l . \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Sobolev inequality gives $\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{a, p, \mu}^{p} \geq\left(S_{\mu, p_{p}}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} h|y|^{-p_{0} b}\left|v_{n}\right|^{p_{0}} d x$. Combining this inequality with (4.5), we get $l \geq S_{\mu, p_{0}}\left(l^{-1} h_{0}\right)^{-p^{-p} p_{0}}$.

Either $1=0$ or $l \geq\left(h_{0}\right)^{-p\left(p_{0}-p\right)}\left(S_{\mu_{\mu}, p_{0}}\right)^{p_{0}\left(p_{0}-p\right)}$. Suppose that $l \geq\left(h_{0}\right)^{-p^{\prime}\left(p_{-}-p\right)}\left(S_{\mu, p_{0}}\right)^{p_{0}\left(p_{0}-p\right)}$.

Then, from (4.4), (4.5) and Lemma 6, we get

$$
c \geq\left(\left(p_{*}-p\right) / p_{*} p\right) l+I(u) \geq c_{\lambda}^{*},
$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, $\mathrm{l}=0$ and we conclude that $\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{n}}$ converges to $u$ strongly in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$.

Lemma 8: Assume that ( G ) and (H) hold. Then, there exist $v \in \mathcal{H}_{\mu}$
and $\Lambda_{*}>0$ such that for $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{*}\right)$, one has

$$
\sup _{t \geq 0} I(t v)<c_{\lambda}^{*},
$$

where C 0 is the positive constant given in (2.3). In particular,

$$
c^{-}<c_{\lambda}^{*} \text {, for all } \lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{*}\right) \text {. }
$$

Proof: Let $\varphi_{\varepsilon}$ be such that

$$
\varphi_{\varepsilon}(x)= \begin{cases}\omega_{\varepsilon}(x) & \text { if } g(x) \geq 0 \text { for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \\ \omega_{\varepsilon}\left(x-x_{0}\right) & \text { if } g\left(x_{0}\right)>0 \text { for } x_{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \\ -\omega_{\varepsilon}(x) & \text { if } g(x) \leq 0 \text { for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}\end{cases}
$$

where $\omega_{\varepsilon}$ verifies (2.1). Then, we claim that there exists $\varepsilon_{0}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} g(x) \varphi_{\varepsilon}(x) d x>0 \text { for any } \varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right) . \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact, if $g(x) \geq 0$ or $g(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$, (4.6) obviously holds. If there exists $x_{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ such that $g\left(x_{0}\right)>0$, then by the continuity of $g(x)$, there exists $\eta>0$ such that $g(x)>0$ for all $x \in B\left(x_{0}, \eta\right)$. Then by the definition of $\omega_{\varepsilon}\left(x-x_{0}\right)$, it is easy to see that there exists an $\varepsilon_{0}$ small enough such that $\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^{x}} g(x) \omega_{\varepsilon}\left(x-x_{0}\right) d x>0$, for any $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right)$.

Now, we consider the following functions

$$
f(t)=I\left(t \varphi_{\varepsilon}\right) \text { and } \tilde{f}(t)=\left(t^{p} / p\right)\left\|\varphi_{s}\right\|_{\alpha, p, \mu}^{p}-\left(t^{p_{*} /} / p_{*}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{*}} h|y|^{-p, b}\left|\varphi_{s}\right|^{p_{*}} d x .
$$

Then, we get for all $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{1}\right)$
$f(0)=0<c_{\lambda}^{*}$.
By the continuity of f , there exists $\mathrm{t}_{0}>0$ small enough such that $f(t)<c_{\lambda}^{*}$, for all $t \in\left(0, t_{0}\right)$.

On the other hand, we have

$$
\max _{t \geq 0} \tilde{f}(t)=\left(\left(p_{*}-p\right) / p_{*} p\right)\left(h_{0}\right)^{-p /\left(p_{*}-p\right)}\left(S_{\mu, p_{*}}\right)^{p_{0}\left(\left(p_{*}-p\right)\right.} .
$$

Then, we obtain
$\sup _{t \geq 0} I\left(t \varphi_{\varepsilon}\right)<\left(\left(p_{*}-p\right) / p_{*} p\right)\left(h_{0}\right)^{-p\left(p p_{*}-p\right)}\left(S_{\mu, z_{*}}\right)^{p_{p} /\left(p_{*}-p\right)}-\lambda t_{0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{v}} g \varphi_{\varepsilon} d x$.
Now, taking $\lambda>0$ such that
$-\lambda t_{0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{v}} g \varphi_{\varepsilon} d x<-C_{0} \lambda^{p}$,
and by (4.6), we get
$0<\lambda<\left[\left(t_{0} / C_{0}\right)\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} g \varphi\right)\right]^{1 /(1)}$, for $\varepsilon \ll \varepsilon_{0}$.
Set
$\Lambda_{\stackrel{ }{*}}=\min \left\{\Lambda_{\mathrm{l}},\left[\left(t_{0} / C_{0}\right)\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} g \varphi_{\varepsilon}\right)\right]^{\eta(p-1)}\right\}$.
We deduce that
$\sup _{t \geq 0} I\left(t \varphi_{\varepsilon}\right)<c_{\lambda}$, for all $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{*}\right)$.
Now, we prove that
$c^{-}<c_{\lambda}^{*}$, for all $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{*}\right)$.
By (G) and the existence of $\psi_{n}$ satisfying (2.1), we have
$\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} g \psi_{n} d x>0$.

Combining this with Lemma 5 and from the definition of $c^{-}$and (4.7), we obtain that there exists $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{n}}>0$ such that $t_{n} \psi_{n} \in \mathcal{N}^{-}$and for all $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{*}\right), \quad c^{-} \leq I\left(t_{n} \psi_{n}\right) \leq \sup _{l \geq 0} I\left(t \psi_{n}\right)<c_{\lambda}^{*}$.

Now we establish the existence of a local minimum of I on $\mathcal{N}^{-}$.
Proposition 4: There exists $\Lambda_{4}>0$ such that for $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{4}\right)$, the functional I has
a minimizer $\mathrm{u}_{2}$ in $\mathcal{N}^{-}$and satisfies.
(i) $I\left(u_{2}\right)=c^{-}$,
(ii) $\mathrm{u}_{2}$ is a solution of $(1.1)$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$, where $\Lambda_{4}=\min \left\{\Lambda_{3}, \Lambda_{*}\right\}$ with $\Lambda_{3}$ defined as in (2.8) and $\Lambda_{*}$ defined as in the proof of Lemma 8.

Proof: By Proposition 2 (ii), there exists a $(P S)_{c^{-}}$sequence for I, $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n}$ in $\mathcal{N}^{-}$for all $0<\lambda<\Lambda_{3}=\min \left(\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}\right)$. From Lemmas $7 ; 8$ and 4 (ii), for $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{*}\right)$, I satisfies $(P S)_{c^{-}}$condition and $c^{-}>0$. Then, we get that $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$. Therefore, there exist a subsequence of $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n}$ still denoted by $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n}$ and $u_{2} \in \mathcal{N}^{-}$such that $\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{n}}$ converges to $u_{2}$ strongly in $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$ and $I\left(u_{2}\right)=c^{-}$for all $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{4}\right)$. Finally, by using the same arguments as in the proof of the Proposition 3, for all $\lambda \in\left(0, \Lambda_{1}\right)$, we have that u 2 is a solution of (1.1).

Now, we complete the proof of Theorem 2. By Propositions 3 and 4, we obtain that $(\mathcal{P})$ has two solutions $u_{1}$ and $u_{2}$ such that $u_{1} \in \mathcal{N}^{+}$ and $u_{2} \in \mathcal{N}^{-}$. Since $\mathcal{N}^{+} \cap \mathcal{N}^{-}=\varnothing$, this implies that $\mathrm{u}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{u}_{2}$ are distinct.

## Conclusion

In our work, we have searched the critical points as the minimizers of the energy functional associated to the problem on the constraint defined by the Nehari manifold $\mathcal{N}$, which are solutions of our
problem. Under some sufficient conditions on coefficients of equation of (1.1), we split $\mathcal{N}$ in two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{N}^{+}$and $\mathcal{N}^{-}$, thus we consider the minimization problems on $\mathcal{N}^{+}$and $\mathcal{N}^{-}$respectively. In the sections 3 and 4 we have proved the existence of at least two nontrivial solutions on $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}$ for all $0<\lambda<\Lambda_{3}=\min \left(\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}\right)$.

## References

1. Wang Z, Zhou H (2006) Solutions for a nonhomogeneous elliptic problem involving critical Sobolev-Hardy exponent in RN. Acta Math Sci 26: 525-536.
2. Xuan B, Su S, Yan Y (2007) Existence results for Brezis-Nirenberg problems with Hardy potential and singular coefficients. Nonlinear Anal 67: 2091-2106.
3. Bouchekif M, Matallah A (2009) On singular nonhomogeneous elliptic equations involving critical Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg exponent. Ric Mat 58: 207-218.
4. Gazzini M, Musina R (2009) On the Hardy-Sobolev-Mazja inequalities: Symmetry and breaking symmetry of extremal functions. Commun Contemp Math 11: 993-1007.
5. Musina R (2008) Ground state solutions of a critical problem involving cylindrical weights. Non-linear Anal 68: 3972-3986.
6. Badiale M, Guida M, Rolando S (2007) Elliptic equations with decaying cylindrical potentials and power-type nonlinearities. Adv Differential Equations 12: 1321-1362.
7. Bouchekif M, El Mokhtar MEO (2010) On nonhomogeneous singular elliptic equations with cylindrical weight. Preprint Université de Tlemcen.
8. Terracini $S$ (1996) On positive entire solutions to a class of equations with singular coefficient and critical exponent. Adv Differential Equations 1: 241-264.
9. Tarantello G (1992) On nonhomogeneous elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponent. Ann Inst H Poincaré Anal Non Lineaire 9: 281-304.
10. Xuan BJ (2003) Multiple solutions to p-Laplacian equation with singularity and cylindrical symmetry. Nonlinear Analysis 55: 217-232.
11. Brown KJ, Zang Y (2003) The Nehari manifold for a semilinear elliptic equation with a sign-changing weight function. J Differential aquations 193: 481-499.
12. Brezis H, Lieb E (1983) A relation between point convergence of functions and convergence of Functional. Proc Amer Math Soc 88: 486-490.

[^0]:    *Corresponding author: El Mokhtar MEO, Department of Mathemtics, Qassim University, BO 6644, Buraidah 51452, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Tel: 043202336; E-mail: med.mokhtar66@yahoo.fr
    Received July 16, 2015; Accepted August 14, 2015; Published August 21, 2015
    Citation: El Mokhtar MEO (2015) On P-Laplacian Problem with Decaying Cylindrical Potential and Critical Exponent. J Appl Computat Math 4: 248. doi:10.4172/2168-9679.1000248
    Copyright: © 2015 El Mokhtar MEO. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

