



## A variational inequality on the half line

Alexandru Kristály<sup>a,\*</sup>, Ioana Lazăr<sup>b</sup>, Nikolaos S. Papageorgiou<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Babeş-Bolyai University, Department of Economics, 400591 Cluj-Napoca, Romania

<sup>b</sup> Babeş-Bolyai University, Department of Mathematics and Computer Sciences, 400084 Cluj-Napoca, Romania

<sup>c</sup> National Technical University, Department of Mathematics, Zografou Campus, Athens, 15780, Greece

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 10 February 2009

Accepted 25 March 2009

#### Keywords:

Variational inequality

Critical points

Non-smooth functionals

### ABSTRACT

Multiple solutions are obtained for a variational inequality defined on the half line  $(0, \infty)$ . Our approach is based on a key embedding result as well as on the non-smooth critical point theory for Szulkin-type functionals.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

### 1. Introduction

Variational inequalities either on bounded or unbounded domains describe real life phenomena from Mechanics and Mathematical Physics. A comprehensive monograph dealing with various forms of variational inequalities is due to Duvaut–Lions [1]. Motivated also by some mechanical problems where certain non-differentiable term perturbs the classical function, Panagiotopoulos [2] developed the so-called theory of hemivariational inequalities; see also Motreanu–Rădulescu [3].

The aim of the present paper is to study a variational inequality which is defined on the half line  $(0, \infty)$  by exploiting variational arguments described below. The natural functional space we are dealing with is the well-known Sobolev space  $W^{1,p}(0, \infty)$ ,  $p > 1$ . Since the domain is not bounded, the continuous embedding  $W^{1,p}(0, \infty) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(0, \infty)$  is not compact. Moreover, since the domain is one-dimensional, the compactness cannot be regained from a symmetrization argument as in Esteban [4], Esteban–Lions [5], Kobayashi–Ôtani [6], Kristály [7]. However, bearing in mind a specific construction from [5], it is convenient to introduce the closed, convex cone

$$K = \{u \in W^{1,p}(0, \infty) : u \geq 0, u \text{ is nonincreasing on } (0, \infty)\}.$$

The main result of Section 2 is to prove that the embedding  $W^{1,p}(0, \infty) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(0, \infty)$  transforms the closed bounded sets from  $K$  into compact sets,  $p \in (1, \infty)$ . This fact will be exploited (particularly, for  $p = 2$ ) to obtain nontrivial solutions for a variational inequality defined on  $(0, \infty)$ , involving concave–convex nonlinearities. To be more precise, we consider the problem, denoted by  $(P_\lambda)$ : Find  $(u, \lambda) \in K \times (0, \infty)$  such that

$$Au(v - u) - \lambda \int_0^\infty a(x)|u(x)|^{q-2}u(x)(v(x) - u(x))dx - \int_0^\infty b(x)f(u(x))(v(x) - u(x))dx \geq 0, \quad \forall v \in K,$$

where

$$Au(v - u) = \int_0^\infty u'(x)(v'(x) - u'(x))dx + \int_0^\infty u(x)(v(x) - u(x))dx,$$

and  $q \in (1, 2)$ ,  $a, b \in L^1(0, \infty)$  and  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has a suitable growth.

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [alexandrukristaly@yahoo.com](mailto:alexandrukristaly@yahoo.com) (A. Kristály).

By using the Ekeland variational principle and a non-smooth version of the Mountain Pass theorem for Szulkin-type functionals, we are able to guarantee the existence of  $\lambda_0 > 0$  such that  $(P_\lambda)$  has two nontrivial solutions whenever  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ .

The structure of the paper is as follows. In the next section we prove a compactness result; in Section 3 we recall some elements from the non-smooth critical point theory for Szulkin-type functionals; in Section 4 we state our main theorem and we prove some auxiliary results; and, in Section 5 we prove our main theorem.

## 2. A compactness result on $(0, \infty)$

We endow the space  $W^{1,p}(0, \infty)$  by its natural norm

$$\|u\| = \left[ \int_0^\infty |u|^p + \int_0^\infty |u'|^p \right]^{1/p},$$

and the space  $L^\infty(0, \infty)$  by the standard sup-norm. The main result of this section is as follows.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$ . The embedding  $W^{1,p}(0, \infty) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(0, \infty)$  transforms the closed bounded sets from  $K$  into compact sets.*

**Proof.** We notice that every function  $u \in W^{1,p}(0, \infty)$  ( $p > 1$ ) admits a continuous representation, see Brézis [8]; in what follows, we will replace  $u$  by this element. It is enough to consider a bounded sequence  $\{u_n\}$  in  $K$  and prove that there is a subsequence of it which converges strongly in  $L^\infty(0, \infty)$ . Taking a subsequence if necessary we may assume that  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  weakly in  $W^{1,p}(0, \infty)$  for some  $u \in W^{1,p}(0, \infty)$ . Moreover, since  $K$  is strongly closed and convex, then it is weakly closed; in particular  $u \in K$ .

Let us fix  $y > 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} |u_n(y) - u(y)|^p y &\leq 2^p [u_n^p(y) + u^p(y)] y \\ &\leq 2^p \int_0^y [u_n^p(x) + u^p(x)] dx \\ &< 2^p [\|u_n\|_{W^{1,p}}^p + \|u\|_{W^{1,p}}^p]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded in  $W^{1,p}(0, \infty)$ , dividing by  $y > 0$  the above inequality, then for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $R_\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$|u_n(y) - u(y)| < 2[\|u_n\|_{W^{1,p}}^p + \|u\|_{W^{1,p}}^p]^{1/p} y^{-1/p} < \varepsilon/2$$

for every  $y > R_\varepsilon$  and for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus

$$\|u_n - u\|_{L^\infty(R_\varepsilon, \infty)} < \varepsilon, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.1)$$

On the other hand, by Rellich theorem,  $W^{1,p}(0, R_\varepsilon) \hookrightarrow C^0[0, R_\varepsilon]$  ( $p > 1$ ) is compact. Since  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $W^{1,p}(0, \infty)$ , in particular,  $u_n \rightarrow u$  (strongly) in  $C^0[0, R_\varepsilon]$ , up to a subsequence, i.e., there exists  $n_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\|u_n - u\|_{C^0[0, R_\varepsilon]} < \varepsilon, \quad \forall n \geq n_\varepsilon.$$

Combining this fact with (2.1), we obtain

$$\|u_n - u\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty)} < \varepsilon, \quad \forall n \geq n_\varepsilon,$$

and thus the claim is proven.  $\square$

## 3. Szulkin-type functionals

Let  $X$  be a real Banach space and  $X^*$  its dual. Let  $E : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a functional of class  $C^1$  and let  $\psi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be a proper (i.e.  $\neq +\infty$ ), convex, lower semicontinuous function. Then,  $I = E + \psi$  is a *Szulkin-type functional*, see [9]. An element  $u \in X$  is called a *critical point of  $I = E + \psi$*  if

$$E'(u)(v - u) + \psi(v) - \psi(u) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in X, \quad (3.1)$$

or equivalently,

$$0 \in E'(u) + \partial\psi(u) \quad \text{in } X^*,$$

where  $\partial\psi(u)$  stands for the subdifferential of the convex functional  $\psi$  at  $u \in X$ .

**Proposition 3.1** ([9, p. 80]). *Every local minimum point of  $I = E + \psi$  is a critical point of  $I$  in the sense of (3.1).*

**Definition 3.1.** The functional  $I = E + \psi$  satisfies the *Palais–Smale condition at level  $c \in \mathbb{R}$* , (shortly,  $(PSZ)_c$ -condition) if every sequence  $\{u_n\} \subset X$  such that  $\lim_n I(u_n) = c$  and

$$\langle E'(u_n), v - u_n \rangle_X + \psi(v) - \psi(u_n) \geq -\varepsilon_n \|v - u_n\| \quad \text{for all } v \in X,$$

where  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ , possesses a convergent subsequence.

The following version of the Mountain Pass theorem will be used in Section 5.1.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $X$  be a Banach space,  $I = E + \psi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  a Szulkin-type functional and we assume that

- (i)  $I(x) \geq \alpha$  for all  $\|x\| = \rho$  with  $\alpha, \rho > 0$ , and  $I(0) = 0$ ;
- (ii) there is  $e \in X$  with  $\|e\| > \rho$  and  $I(e) \leq 0$ .

If  $I$  satisfies the  $(PSZ)_c$ -condition for

$$c = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} I(\gamma(t)),$$

$$\Gamma = \{\gamma \in C([0, 1], X) : \gamma(0) = 0, \gamma(1) = e\},$$

then  $c$  is a critical value of  $I$  and  $c \geq \alpha$ .

#### 4. Main theorem and related results

Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function. We denote by  $F(s) = \int_0^s f(t)dt$ . We assume that

- (f1): There exists  $p > 2$  such that  $f(s) = O(|s|^{p-1})$  as  $s \rightarrow 0$ .
- (f2): There exists  $v > p$  such that

$$vF(s) - f(s)s \leq 0, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

- (f3): There exists  $R > 0$  such that

$$\max_{s \in [0,R]} F(s) > 0.$$

We shall prove the following theorem which represents the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function which satisfies (f1)–(f3),  $q \in (1, 2)$ , and  $a, b \in L^1(0, \infty)$  with  $a, b > 0$ . Then there exists  $\lambda_0 > 0$  such that  $(P_\lambda)$  has at least two nontrivial, distinct solutions  $u_\lambda^1, u_\lambda^2 \in K$  whenever  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ .

For every  $\lambda > 0$ , we define the functional  $E_\lambda : W^{1,2}(0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$E_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_0^\infty a(x)|u|^q dx - \mathcal{F}(u),$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}(u) = \int_0^\infty b(x)F(u(x))dx.$$

Due to the continuous embedding  $W^{1,2}(0, \infty) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(0, \infty)$ , and  $a, b \in L^1(0, \infty)$ , the functional  $E_\lambda$  is well defined and of class  $C^1$  on  $W^{1,2}(0, \infty)$ .

We define the indicator function of the set  $K$ , i.e.

$$\psi_K(u) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } u \in K, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } u \notin K. \end{cases}$$

The function  $\psi_K$  is convex, proper, and lower semicontinuous. In conclusion,  $I_\lambda = E_\lambda + \psi_K$  is a Szulkin-type functional. Moreover, one easily obtains the following

**Proposition 4.1.** Fix  $\lambda > 0$  arbitrarily. Every critical point  $u \in W^{1,2}(0, \infty)$  of  $I_\lambda = E_\lambda + \psi_K$  is a solution of  $(P_\lambda)$ .

**Proof.** Since  $u \in W^{1,2}(0, \infty)$  is a critical point of  $I_\lambda = E_\lambda + \psi_K$ , one has

$$E'_\lambda(u)(v - u) + \psi_K(v) - \psi_K(u) \geq 0, \quad \forall v \in W^{1,2}(0, \infty).$$

In particular,  $u$  necessarily belongs to  $K$ . In case  $u$  does not belong to  $K$  we get  $\psi_K(u) = +\infty$ . Taking then, for instance  $v = 0 \in K$  in the above inequality, we reach a contradiction. Now, we fix  $v \in K$  arbitrarily. Since

$$E'_\lambda(u)(v - u) = Au(v - u) - \lambda \int_0^\infty a(x)|u(x)|^{q-2}u(x)(v(x) - u(x))dx - \int_0^\infty b(x)f(u(x))(v(x) - u(x))dx,$$

the desired inequality follows.  $\square$

We shall show next that  $I_\lambda = E_\lambda + \psi_K$  fulfills the  $(PSZ)_c$ -condition for every  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** If the continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  verifies (f2) then  $I_\lambda = E_\lambda + \psi_K$  satisfies  $(PSZ)_c$  for every  $\lambda > 0$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\lambda > 0$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  be some fixed numbers. Let  $\{u_n\}$  be a sequence in  $W^{1,2}(0, \infty)$  such that

$$I_\lambda(u_n) = E_\lambda(u_n) + \psi_K(u_n) \rightarrow c; \tag{4.1}$$

$$E'_\lambda(u_n)(v - u_n) + \psi_K(v) - \psi_K(u_n) \geq -\varepsilon_n\|v - u_n\|, \quad \forall v \in W^{1,2}(0, \infty), \tag{4.2}$$

$\{\varepsilon_n\}$  being a sequence in  $[0, \infty)$  with  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ . By (4.1) one concludes that the sequence  $\{u_n\}$  belongs entirely to  $K$ . Setting  $v = 2u_n$  in (4.2), we obtain

$$E'_\lambda(u_n)(u_n) \geq -\varepsilon_n \|u_n\|.$$

Therefore, we derive

$$\|u_n\|^2 - \lambda \int_0^\infty a(x)|u_n|^q dx - \int_0^\infty b(x)f(u_n(x))u_n(x) dx \geq -\varepsilon_n \|u_n\|. \quad (4.3)$$

By (4.1) for large  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we get

$$c + 1 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|u_n\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_0^\infty a(x)|u_n|^q dx - \int_0^\infty b(x)F(u_n(x)) dx. \quad (4.4)$$

Multiplying (4.3) by  $v^{-1}$ , adding this one to (4.4) and applying the Hölder inequality, for large  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c + 1 + \frac{1}{v} \|u_n\| &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{v}\right) \|u_n\|^2 - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{v}\right) \int_0^\infty a(x)|u_n|^q dx \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{v} \int_0^\infty b(x)[-f(u_n(x))u_n(x) + vF(u_n(x))] dx \\ &\stackrel{(R2)}{\geq} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{v}\right) \|u_n\|^2 - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{v}\right) \|a\|_{L^1} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty}^q \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{v}\right) \|u_n\|^2 - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{v}\right) \|a\|_{L^1} k_\infty^q \|u_n\|^q, \end{aligned}$$

where  $k_\infty > 0$  is the best Sobolev constant of the embedding  $W^{1,2}(0, \infty) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(0, \infty)$ . Since  $q < 2 < v$ , from the above estimation we derive that the sequence  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded in  $K$ . Therefore, due to Proposition 2.1, up to a subsequence, we can suppose that

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{weakly in } W^{1,2}(0, \infty); \quad (4.5)$$

$$u_n \rightarrow u \quad \text{strongly in } L^\infty(0, \infty). \quad (4.6)$$

As  $K$  is (weakly) closed,  $u \in K$ . Setting  $v = u$  in (4.2), we obtain

$$Au_n(u - u_n) + \int_0^\infty b(x)f(u_n(x))(u_n(x) - u(x)) dx - \lambda \int_0^\infty a(x)|u_n|^{q-2}u_n(u - u_n) dx \geq -\varepsilon_n \|u - u_n\|.$$

Therefore, for large  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_n\|^2 &\leq Au(u - u_n) + \int_0^\infty b(x)f(u_n(x))(u_n(x) - u(x)) dx - \lambda \int_0^\infty a(x)|u_n|^{q-2}u_n(u - u_n) dx + \varepsilon_n \|u - u_n\| \\ &\leq Au(u - u_n) + \|b\|_{L^1} \max_{s \in [-M, M]} |f(s)| \cdot \|u - u_n\|_{L^\infty} + \lambda \|a\|_{L^1} M^{q-1} \|u - u_n\|_{L^\infty} + \varepsilon_n \|u - u_n\|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $M = \|u\|_{L^\infty} + 1$ . Due to (4.5), we have

$$\lim_n Au(u - u_n) = 0.$$

Taking into account (4.6), the second and the third term in the last expression also tend to 0. Finally, since  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\{u_n\}$  converges strongly to  $u$  in  $W^{1,2}(0, \infty)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. Proof of Theorem 4.1

We assume throughout this section that all the hypotheses of Theorem 4.1 are fulfilled. The present section is divided into two parts; in the first subsection we guarantee the existence of a solution for problem  $(P_\lambda)$  by using the Mountain Pass theorem (see Theorem 3.1); the second subsection proves the existence of a second solution for the problem  $(P_\lambda)$  by applying a local minimization argument based on the Ekeland variational principle.

### 5.1. MP geometry of $I_\lambda = E_\lambda + \psi_K$ ; the first solution of $(P_\lambda)$

**Lemma 5.1.** *There exist  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that*

$$F(s) \geq c_1 s^v - c_2 s^p, \quad \forall s \geq 0.$$

**Proof.** Due to (f3), there exists  $\rho_0 \in [0, R]$  such that  $F(\rho_0) > 0$ . Clearly,  $\rho_0 \neq 0$ , since  $F(0) = 0$ . We consider the function  $g : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $g(t) = t^{-\nu}F(t\rho_0)$ . Let  $t > 1$ . By using a mean value theorem, there exists  $\tau \in (1, t)$  such that  $g(t) - g(1) = [-\nu\tau^{-\nu-1}F(\tau\rho_0) + \tau^{-\nu}\rho_0 f(\tau\rho_0)](t - 1)$ . By (f2), one has  $g(t) \geq g(1)$ , i.e.,  $F(t\rho_0) \geq t^\nu F(\rho_0)$  for every  $t \geq 1$ . Therefore, we have

$$F(s) \geq \frac{F(\rho_0)}{\rho_0^\nu} s^\nu, \quad \forall s \geq \rho_0.$$

On the other hand, by (f1), there exist  $\delta, L > 0$  such that  $|F(s)| \leq L|s|^p$  for  $|s| \leq \delta$ . In particular, we have that

$$F(s) \geq -Ls^p, \quad \forall s \in [0, \delta].$$

It remains to combine these two relations in order to obtain our claim.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.1.** *There exists  $\lambda_0 > 0$  such that for every  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$  the following assertions are true:*

- (i) *there exist constants  $\alpha_\lambda > 0$  and  $\rho_\lambda > 0$  such that  $I_\lambda(u) \geq \alpha_\lambda$  for all  $\|u\| = \rho_\lambda$ ;*
- (ii) *there exists  $e_\lambda \in W^{1,2}(0, \infty)$  with  $\|e_\lambda\| > \rho_\lambda$  and  $I_\lambda(e_\lambda) \leq 0$ .*

**Proof.** (i) Let  $\delta, L > 0$  from the proof of the previous lemma. For  $u \in W^{1,2}(0, \infty)$  complying with  $\|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq \delta$ , we have

$$\mathcal{F}(u) \leq L\|b\|_{L^1}\|u\|_{L^\infty}^p \leq L\|b\|_{L^1}k_\infty^p\|u\|^p.$$

It suffices to restrict our attention to elements  $u$  which belong to  $K$ ; otherwise  $I_\lambda(u)$  would be  $+\infty$ , i.e. (i) holds trivially. Due to the above inequality, for every  $\lambda > 0$  and  $u \in K$  with  $\|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq \delta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_\lambda(u) &\geq \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 - \lambda\|a\|_{L^1}k_\infty^q\|u\|^q - L\|b\|_{L^1}k_\infty^p\|u\|^p \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda A\|u\|^{q-2} - B\|u\|^{p-2}\right)\|u\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $A = \|a\|_{L^1}k_\infty^q > 0$ , and  $B = L\|b\|_{L^1}k_\infty^p > 0$ .

For every  $0 < \lambda < \frac{\delta^{p-q}B(p-2)}{A(2-q)}$ , we define the function  $g_\lambda : (0, \delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$g_\lambda(t) = \frac{1}{2} - \lambda At^{q-2} - Bt^{p-2}.$$

Clearly,  $g'_\lambda(t_\lambda) = 0$  if and only if  $t_\lambda = (\lambda \frac{2-q}{p-2} \frac{A}{B})^{\frac{1}{p-q}}$ . Moreover,  $g_\lambda(t_\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} - D\lambda^{\frac{p-2}{p-q}}$ , where  $D = D(p, q, A, B) > 0$ . Choosing  $0 < \lambda_0 < \frac{\delta^{p-q}B(p-2)}{A(2-q)}$  so small that  $g_{\lambda_0}(t_{\lambda_0}) > 0$ , one clearly has for every  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$  that  $g_\lambda(t_\lambda) > 0$ . Therefore, for every  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ , setting  $\rho_\lambda = t_\lambda/k_\infty$  and  $\alpha_\lambda = g_\lambda(t_\lambda)t_\lambda^2/k_\infty^2$ , the assertion from (i) holds true.

(ii) By Lemma 5.1 we have  $\mathcal{F}(u) \geq \int_0^\infty b(x)[c_1u^v - c_2u^p]dx$  for every  $u \in K$ . Then, for every  $u \in K$  we have

$$I_\lambda(u) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{q} \int_0^\infty a(x)u^q dx - \int_0^\infty b(x)[c_1u^v - c_2u^p]dx. \tag{5.1}$$

Fix  $u_0(x) = \max(1 - x, 0)$ ,  $x > 0$ ; it is clear that  $u_0 \in K$ . Letting  $u = su_0$  ( $s > 0$ ) in (5.1), we have that  $I_\lambda(su_0) \rightarrow -\infty$  as  $s \rightarrow +\infty$ , since  $v > p > 2 > q$  and  $b > 0$ . Thus, for every  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ , it is possible to set  $s = s_\lambda$  so large that for  $e_\lambda = s_\lambda u_0$ , we have  $\|e_\lambda\| > \rho_\lambda$  and  $I_\lambda(e_\lambda) \leq 0$ . This concludes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

By Proposition 4.2, the functional  $I_\lambda$  satisfies the  $(PSZ)_c$ -condition ( $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ), and  $I_\lambda(0) = 0$  for every  $\lambda > 0$ . Let us fix  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ . By Proposition 5.1 it follows that there exist constants  $\alpha_\lambda, \rho_\lambda > 0$  and  $e_\lambda \in W^{1,2}(0, \infty)$  such that  $I_\lambda$  fulfills the properties (i) and (ii) from Theorem 3.1. Therefore, the number

$$c_\lambda^1 = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} I_\lambda(\gamma(t))$$

is a critical value of  $I_\lambda$  with  $c_\lambda^1 \geq \alpha_\lambda > 0$ , where

$$\Gamma = \{\gamma \in C([0, 1], W^{1,2}(0, \infty)) : \gamma(0) = 0, \gamma(1) = e_\lambda\}.$$

It is clear that the critical point  $u_\lambda^1 \in W^{1,2}(0, \infty)$  which corresponds to  $c_\lambda^1$  cannot be trivial since  $I_\lambda(u_\lambda^1) = c_\lambda^1 > 0 = I_\lambda(0)$ . It remains to apply Proposition 4.1 which concludes that  $u_\lambda^1$  is actually an element of  $K$  and a solution of  $(P_\lambda)$ .

### 5.2. Local minimization; the second solution of $(P_\lambda)$

Let us fix  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$  arbitrarily;  $\lambda_0$  was defined in the previous subsection. By Proposition 5.1, there exists  $\rho_\lambda > 0$  such that

$$\inf_{\|u\|=\rho_\lambda} I_\lambda(u) > 0. \tag{5.2}$$

Since  $a > 0$ , for  $u_0(x) = \max(1 - x, 0)$ ,  $x > 0$ , we have  $\int_0^\infty a(x)u_0^q dx > 0$ . Taking into account that  $v > p > 2 > q$ , for  $t > 0$  small enough one has

$$I_\lambda(tu_0) \leq \frac{t^2}{2} \|u_0\|^2 - \frac{\lambda t^q}{q} \int_0^\infty a(x)u_0^q dx - \int_0^\infty b(x)[c_1 t^v u_0^v - c_2 t^p u_0^p] dx < 0.$$

For  $r > 0$ , we denote by  $B_r = \{u \in W^{1,2}(0, \infty) : \|u\| \leq r\}$  and by  $S_r = \{u \in W^{1,2}(0, \infty) : \|u\| = r\}$ . Using these notations, relation (5.2) and the above inequality can be summarized as

$$c_\lambda^2 = \inf_{u \in B_{\rho_\lambda}} I_\lambda(u) < 0 < \inf_{u \in S_{\rho_\lambda}} I_\lambda(u). \tag{5.3}$$

A simple argument shows that  $c_\lambda^2$  is finite. Moreover, we will show that  $c_\lambda^2$  is another critical value of  $I_\lambda$ . To this end, let  $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$\frac{1}{n} < \inf_{u \in S_{\rho_\lambda}} I_\lambda(u) - \inf_{u \in B_{\rho_\lambda}} I_\lambda(u). \tag{5.4}$$

By the Ekeland variational principle, applied to the lower semicontinuous functional  $I_{\lambda|_{B_{\rho_\lambda}}}$ , which is bounded below (see (5.3)), there exists  $u_{\lambda,n} \in B_{\rho_\lambda}$  such that

$$I_\lambda(u_{\lambda,n}) \leq \inf_{u \in B_{\rho_\lambda}} I_\lambda(u) + \frac{1}{n}; \tag{5.5}$$

$$I_\lambda(w) \geq I_\lambda(u_{\lambda,n}) - \frac{1}{n} \|w - u_{\lambda,n}\|, \quad \forall w \in B_{\rho_\lambda}. \tag{5.6}$$

By (5.4) and (5.5) we have that  $I_\lambda(u_{\lambda,n}) < \inf_{u \in S_{\rho_\lambda}} I_\lambda(u)$ ; therefore  $\|u_{\lambda,n}\| < \rho_\lambda$ .

Fix an element  $v \in W^{1,2}(0, \infty)$ . It is possible to choose  $t > 0$  small enough such that  $w = u_{\lambda,n} + t(v - u_{\lambda,n}) \in B_{\rho_\lambda}$ . Applying (5.6) to this element, using the convexity of  $\psi_K$  and dividing by  $t > 0$ , one concludes

$$\frac{E_\lambda(u_{\lambda,n} + t(v - u_{\lambda,n})) - E_\lambda(u_{\lambda,n})}{t} + \psi_K(v) - \psi_K(u_{\lambda,n}) \geq -\frac{1}{n} \|v - u_{\lambda,n}\|.$$

Letting  $t \rightarrow 0^+$ , we obtain

$$E'_\lambda(u_{\lambda,n})(v - u_{\lambda,n}) + \psi_K(v) - \psi_K(u_{\lambda,n}) \geq -\frac{1}{n} \|v - u_{\lambda,n}\|. \tag{5.7}$$

On the other hand, by (5.3) and (5.5) it follows

$$I_\lambda(u_{\lambda,n}) = E_\lambda(u_{\lambda,n}) + \psi_K(u_{\lambda,n}) \rightarrow c_\lambda^2 \tag{5.8}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $v$  is arbitrarily fixed in (5.7), the sequence  $\{u_{\lambda,n}\}$  fulfills (4.1) and (4.2), respectively. Therefore, in a similar manner as in Proposition 4.2, we may prove that  $\{u_{\lambda,n}\}$  contains a convergent subsequence; we denote it again by  $\{u_{\lambda,n}\}$ , its limit point being  $u_\lambda^2$ . It is clear that  $u_\lambda^2$  belongs to  $B_{\rho_\lambda}$ . By the lower semicontinuity of  $\psi_K$  we have

$$\psi_K(u_\lambda^2) \leq \liminf_n \psi_K(u_{\lambda,n}),$$

and due to the fact that  $E_\lambda$  is of class  $C^1$  on  $W^{1,2}(0, \infty)$ , we have

$$\lim_n E'_\lambda(u_{\lambda,n})(v - u_{\lambda,n}) = E'_\lambda(u_\lambda^2)(v - u_\lambda^2).$$

Combining these relations with (5.7) we obtain

$$E'_\lambda(u_\lambda^2)(v - u_\lambda^2) + \psi_K(v) - \psi_K(u_\lambda^2) \geq 0, \quad \forall v \in W^{1,2}(0, \infty),$$

i.e.  $u_\lambda^2$  is a critical point of  $I_\lambda$ . Moreover,

$$c_\lambda^2 \stackrel{(5.3)}{=} \inf_{u \in B_{\rho_\lambda}} I_\lambda(u) \leq I_\lambda(u_\lambda^2) \leq \liminf_n I_\lambda(u_{\lambda,n}) \stackrel{(5.8)}{=} c_\lambda^2,$$

i.e.  $I_\lambda(u_\lambda^2) = c_\lambda^2$ . Since  $c_\lambda^2 < 0$  (see (5.3)), it follows that  $u_\lambda^2$  is not trivial. We apply again Proposition 4.1, concluding that  $u_\lambda^2$  is another solution of  $(P_\lambda)$  different from  $u_\lambda^1$ . This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.1.  $\square$

**Acknowledgments**

The first and second author's research was supported by the Grant PN II IDEL\_2162 from CNCSIS.

## References

- [1] G. Duvaut, J.-L. Lions, *Inequalities in Mechanics and Physics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976.
- [2] P.D. Panagiotopoulos, *Hemivariational Inequalities: Applications to Mechanics and Engineering*, Springer-Verlag, New-York, 1993.
- [3] D. Motreanu, V. Rădulescu, *Variational and Non-variational Methods in Nonlinear Analysis and Boundary Value Problems*, Kluwer Academic Publisher, Boston, Dordrecht, London, 2003.
- [4] M.J. Esteban, Nonlinear elliptic problems in strip-like domains: Symmetry of positive vortex rings, *Nonlinear Anal. TMA* 7 (1983) 365–379.
- [5] M.J. Esteban, P.L. Lions, A compactness lemma, *Nonlinear Anal. TMA* 7 (1983) 381–385.
- [6] J. Kobayashi, M. Ôtani, The principle of symmetric criticality for non-differentiable mappings, *J. Funct. Anal.* 214 (2) (2004) 428–449.
- [7] A. Kristály, Multiplicity results for an eigenvalue problem for hemivariational inequalities in strip-like domains, *Set-Valued Anal.* 13 (2005) 85–103.
- [8] H. Brézis, *Analyse Fonctionnelle*, Masson, 1992.
- [9] A. Szulkin, Minimax principles for lower semicontinuous functions and applications to nonlinear boundary value problems, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 3 (2) (1986) 77–109.