PROCEEDINGS OF THE
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
Volume 145, Number 11, November 2017, Pages 4783–4794
http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/proc/13609
Article electronically published on May 30, 2017

GENERALIZED NEHARI MANIFOLD AND SEMILINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION WITH WEAK MONOTONICITY CONDITION ON THE NONLINEAR TERM

FRANCISCO ODAIR DE PAIVA, WOJCIECH KRYSZEWSKI, AND ANDRZEJ SZULKIN

(Communicated by Joachim Krieger)

ABSTRACT. We study the Schrödinger equations $-\Delta u + V(x)u = f(x,u)$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $-\Delta u - \lambda u = f(x,u)$ in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. We assume that f is superlinear but of subcritical growth and $u \mapsto f(x,u)/|u|$ is nondecreasing. In $\mathbb{R}^N$ we also assume that V and f are periodic in $x_1, \dots, x_N$. We show that these equations have a ground state and that there exist infinitely many solutions if f is odd in u. Our results generalize those by Szulkin and Weth [J. Funct. Anal. 257 (2009), 3802–3822], where $u \mapsto f(x,u)/|u|$ was assumed to be strictly increasing. This seemingly small change forces us to go beyond methods of smooth analysis.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the semilinear Schrödinger equations

$$-\Delta u + V(x)u = f(x,u), \quad u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \tag{1.1}$$

and

$$-\Delta u - \lambda u = f(x,u), \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega), \tag{1.2}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded domain and $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $H_0^1(\Omega)$ are the usual Sobolev spaces. In both problems we make the following assumptions on f:

- (F_1) f is continuous and $|f(x,u)| \le C(1+|u|^{p-1})$ for some $C > 0$ and $p \in (2, 2^*)$, where $2^* := 2N/(N-2)$ if $N \ge 3$ and $2^* := +\infty$ if $N = 1$ or 2,
- (F_2) $f(x,u) = o(u)$ uniformly in x as $u \to 0$,
- (F_3) $F(x,u)/u^2 \to \infty$ uniformly in x as $|u| \to \infty$, where $F(x,u) := \int_0^u f(x,s)\,ds$,
- (F_4) $u \mapsto f(x,u)/|u|$ is nondecreasing on $(-\infty, 0)$ and on $(0, \infty)$.

The assumptions (F_1)–(F_3) appear in [11] while a condition corresponding to (F_4) is a little stronger there:

- (F_4') $u \mapsto f(x,u)/|u|$ is strictly increasing on $(-\infty, 0)$ and on $(0, \infty)$.

Received by the editors September 15, 2016 and, in revised form, December 5, 2016.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35J20, 35J60, 58E30.
Key words and phrases. Generalized Nehari manifold, Schrödinger equation, strongly indefinite functional, Clarke's subdifferential.
The first author was supported by FAPESP under the grant 2015/10545-0. This work was done while he was visiting the mathematics department of Stockholm University. He would like to thank the members of the department for their hospitality and a stimulating scientific atmosphere.
The second author was partially supported by the Polish National Science Center under grant 2013/09/B/ST1/01963.

©2017 American Mathematical Society

As we shall see, this slightly weaker hypothesis will force us to go beyond methods of smooth analysis, and introducing a nonsmooth approach in this context is in fact our main purpose. In what follows we shall frequently refer to different results and arguments in [11, 12]. When such reference is made, it should be understood that no stronger conditions than (F_1)–(F_4) were needed there.

The main results of this paper are the following two theorems:

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose V is continuous, f satisfies (F_1)–(F_4), V and f are 1-periodic in $x_1, \dots, x_N$ and $0 \notin \sigma(-\Delta + V)$, where $\sigma(\cdot)$ denotes the spectrum in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Then equation* (1.1) *has a ground state solution. If moreover f is odd in u, then equation* (1.1) *has infinitely many pairs of geometrically distinct solutions.*

Theorem 1.2.

(i) Suppose V is continuous, f satisfies (F_1)–(F_4) and $\lambda \neq \lambda_k$ for any k, where λ_k is the k-th eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Then equation (1.2) *has a ground state solution. If moreover f is odd in u, then equation* (1.1) *has infinitely many pairs of geometrically distinct solutions $\pm u_k$ such that the $L^\infty(\Omega)$-norm of u_k tends to infinity with k.*

(ii) If $\lambda = \lambda_k$ for some k, then the above results remain valid under the additional assumption that $f(x, u) \neq 0$ unless $u = 0$.

Similar results, but under the stronger condition (F_4'), have been proved in [11].

As usual, a *ground state* is a solution which minimizes the functional corresponding to the problem over the set of all nontrivial ($u \neq 0$) solutions. Later in this section we shall define what we mean by geometrically distinct solutions.

Existence of a ground state solution under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 has been shown by S. Liu in [7]; since this result is an easy consequence of our approach, we include it here anyway. See also [16], where a number of results on ground states for problems similar to (1.1) and (1.2) have been proved, and [13], where (F_4) has been further weakened. Existence of ground states for *systems* of equations has been discussed in [8]. Concerning existence of infinitely many solutions we know of a result by Tang [14], where a condition different from (F_4) has been introduced for (1.2), and by Zhong and Zou [16], where (1.1) and (1.2) have been considered under the same hypotheses as in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. However, they needed an additional assumption which is not easy to verify unless $u \mapsto f(x, u)/|u|$ is "most time" strictly increasing.

Consider equation (1.1) under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1. Let $E := H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. The functional corresponding to (1.1) is

$$\Phi(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + V(x)u^2)\, dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} F(x, u)\, dx.$$

It is well known (see e.g. [15]) that $\Phi \in C^1(E, \mathbb{R})$ and critical points of Φ are solutions for (1.1). Let $E = E^+ \oplus E^-$ be the decomposition corresponding to the positive and the negative parts of the spectrum of $-\Delta + V$. Since $0 \notin \sigma(-\Delta + V)$, there exists an equivalent inner product $\langle ., . \rangle$ in E such that

$$\Phi(u) = \frac{1}{2}\|u^+\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|u^-\|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} F(x, u)\, dx, \tag{1.3}$$

where $u^\pm \in E^\pm$.

For equation (1.2) under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2 we put $E = H_0^1(\Omega)$ and we have the spectral decomposition $E = E^+ \oplus E^0 \oplus E^-$, where E^0 is the nullspace

of $-\Delta-\lambda$ in E and $0 \le \dim(E^0 \oplus E^-) < \infty$. Also here we can choose an equivalent inner product such that the corresponding functional Φ is of the form (1.3), with $\mathbb{R}^N$ replaced by Ω.

The following set introduced by Pankov [9] is called the *generalized Nehari manifold* or the *Nehari-Pankov manifold*:

(1.4)
$$\mathcal{M} := \big\{u \in E \setminus (E^0 \oplus E^-) : \Phi'(u)u = 0 \text{ and } \Phi'(u)v = 0 \text{ for all } v \in E^0 \oplus E^-\big\}$$

(E^0 is necessarily trivial in Theorem 1.1). (F_4) implies $f(x,u)u \ge 0$, and the assumptions of Theorem 1.2 imply that if $\dim E^0 > 0$, then $f(x,u)u > 0$ for $u \ne 0$. Hence $\mathcal{M}$ contains all nontrivial critical points of Φ. Note that if $E^0 \oplus E^- = \{0\}$, then $\mathcal{M}$ is the usual Nehari manifold [12]. Since this case is considerably easier to handle, we assume in what follows that $\sigma(-\Delta + V) \cap (-\infty, 0) \ne \emptyset$ in Theorem 1.1 and $\lambda \ge \lambda_1$ in Theorem 1.2. As in [11], for $u \notin E^0 \oplus E^-$ we define

$$E(u) := E^0 \oplus E^- \oplus \mathbb{R}u = E^0 \oplus E^- \oplus \mathbb{R}u^+ \tag{1.5}$$
$$\text{and} \quad \widehat{E}(u) := E^0 \oplus E^- \oplus \mathbb{R}^+u = E^0 \oplus E^- \oplus \mathbb{R}^+u^+,$$

where $\mathbb{R}^+ = [0,\infty)$. It has been shown there that if (F_4) is replaced by (F_4'), then $\widehat{E}(u)$ intersects $\mathcal{M}$ at a unique point which is the unique global maximum of $\Phi|_{\widehat{E}(u)}$. It has been shown in [16] by an explicit example that if (F_4) but not (F_4') holds, then (in the framework of Theorem 1.2) $\widehat{E}(u)$ and $\mathcal{M}$ may intersect on a finite line segment. In the next section we shall show that $\widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M} \ne \emptyset$ and if $w \in \widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}$, then there exist $\sigma_w > 0$, $\tau_w \ge \sigma_w$ such that $\widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M} = [\sigma_w, \tau_w]w$. In other words, $\widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}$ is either a point or a finite line segment. We also show that a point $\widetilde{w} \in [\sigma_w, \tau_w]w$ is critical for Φ if and only if the whole segment $[\sigma_w, \tau_w]w$ consists of critical points.

In Theorem 1.1 the functional Φ is invariant with respect to the action of $\mathbb{Z}^N$ given by the translations $k \mapsto u(\cdot - k)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^N$. Hence if u is a solution of (1.1), then so is $u(\cdot - k)$. This and the preceding paragraph justify the following definition: Two solutions u_1 and u_2 are called *geometrically distinct* if $u_2 \ne u_1(\cdot - k)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ and $u_2 \notin [\sigma_{u_1}, \tau_{u_1}]u_1$. In Theorem 1.2 there is no $\mathbb{Z}^N$-invariance, but we still want to identify solutions in $\widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}$. So u_1, u_2 are *geometrically distinct* if $u_2 \notin [\sigma_{u_1}, \tau_{u_1}]u_1$.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we assume that the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1 or 1.2 are satisfied. In particular, (F_1)–(F_4) hold. To simplify notation, Ω will stand for $\mathbb{R}^N$ or for a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

Lemma 2.1. *If $f(x,u) \ne 0$, then $F(x,u) < \frac{1}{2}f(x,u)u$.*

Proof. Suppose $u > 0$. Since $f(x,t)/t \to 0$ as $t \to 0$ and $f(x,u)/u > 0$,

$$F(x,u) = \int_0^u \frac{f(x,t)}{t}\, t\, dt < \frac{f(x,u)}{u} \int_0^u t\, dt = \frac{1}{2} f(x,u)u.$$

For $u < 0$ the proof is similar. □

The following result will be crucial for studying the structure of the set $\widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $x \in \Omega$ be fixed and let $u, s, v \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $s \geq 0$ and $f(x,u) \neq 0$. Then:*
(i)

$$g(s,v) := f(x,u)\left[\tfrac{1}{2}\left(s^2-1\right)u + sv\right] + F(x,u) - F(x,su+v) \leq 0. \tag{2.1}$$

(ii) There exist $s_u \in (0,1]$, $t_u \geq 1$ such that $g(s,v) = 0$ if and only if $s \in [s_u, t_u]$ and $v = 0$ ($s_u = t_u$ not excluded). Moreover, for such s we have $f(x,su) = sf(x,u)$.

Part (i) of this proposition has been shown in [7], and it extends a similar result in [11] where (F_4') has been assumed (however, our s corresponds to $s+1$ in [7,11]). Here we provide a different argument which will be needed in order to show part (ii).

Proof. Obviously, $g(1,0) = 0$. We shall show that $g(s,v) \to -\infty$ as $s + |v| \to \infty$. Put $z = z(s) := su + v$. Using Lemma 2.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g(s,v) &= f(x,u)\left[\tfrac{1}{2}\left(s^2-1\right)u + sv\right] + F(x,u) - F(x,z) \\ &< f(x,u)\left[\tfrac{1}{2}\left(s^2-1\right)u + s(z-su)\right] + \frac{1}{2}f(x,u)u - F(x,z) \\ &= -\tfrac{1}{2}s^2 f(x,u)u + sf(x,u)z - Az^2 + (Az^2 - F(x,z)). \end{aligned}$$

Since the quadratic form (in s and z) above is negative definite if $A > 0$ is a constant large enough and since $Az^2 - F(x,z)$ is bounded above according to (F_3), $g(s,v) \to -\infty$ as $s + |v| \to \infty$ as claimed.

It follows that g has a maximum ≥ 0 on the set $\{(s,v) : s \geq 0\}$. As

$$g(0,v) = -\tfrac{1}{2}f(x,u)u + F(x,u) - F(x,v) < -F(x,v) \leq 0$$

(by Lemma 2.1), the maximum is attained at some (s,v) with $s > 0$. Then

$$g_v'(s,v) = sf(x,u) - f(x,su+v) = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$g_s'(s,v) = (su+v)f(x,u) - uf(x,su+v) = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Using (2.2) in (2.3) we obtain $vf(x,u) = 0$. Hence $v = 0$ and

$$g_s'(s,0) = su^2\left(\frac{f(x,u)}{u} - \frac{f(x,su)}{su}\right) = 0.$$

By (F_4), there must exist s_u, t_u such that $s_u \in (0,1]$, $t_u \geq 1$ and $g_s'(s,0) = 0$ if and only if $s \in [s_u, t_u]$. For such s we have $g(s,0) = g(1,0) = 0$ and $f(x,su) = sf(x,u)$. □

Corollary 2.3. *Suppose $u \in \mathcal{M}$ and let $s \geq 0$, $v \in E^0 \oplus E^-$. Then*

$$\int_\Omega \left(f(x,u)\left[\tfrac{1}{2}\left(s^2-1\right)u + sv\right] + F(x,u) - F(x,su+v)\right)dx \leq 0$$

and there exist $0 < s_u \leq 1 \leq t_u$ such that equality holds if and only if $s \in [s_u, t_u]$, $v = 0$. Moreover, for such s and almost all $x \in \Omega$, $f(x,su) = sf(x,u)$.

Proof. If $u \in \mathcal{M}$, then $f(x,u(x)) \neq 0$ for x on a set of positive measure. According to Proposition 2.2, inequality (2.1) holds for such x and there exist $s_{u(x)} \in (0,1]$, $t_{u(x)} \geq 1$ such that the left-hand side of (2.1) is zero if and only if $s \in [s_{u(x)}, t_{u(x)}]$ and $v(x) = 0$. Moreover, for such s, $f(x,su(x)) = sf(x,u(x))$. Now one takes $s_u := \operatorname{ess\,sup}\{s_{u(x)} : f(x,u(x)) \neq 0\}$ and $t_u := \operatorname{ess\,inf}\{t_{u(x)} : f(x,u(x)) \neq 0\}$.

Note that if $f(x,u(x)) = 0$, then $F(x,u(x)) = \int_0^{u(x)} f(x,t)\,dt = 0$ because $f(x,t) = 0$ for t between 0 and $u(x)$ according to (F_4). Hence the integrand above is ≤ 0 also in this case. □

Proposition 2.4.

(i) If $u \in E \setminus (E^0 \oplus E^-)$, then $\widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$.

(ii) If $w \in \widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}$, then there exist $0 < s_w \le 1 \le t_w$ such that $\widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M} = [s_w, t_w]w$. Moreover, $\Phi(sw) = \Phi(w)$, $\Phi'(sw) = s\Phi'(w)$ for all $s \in [s_w, t_w]$ and $\Phi(z) < \Phi(w)$ for all other $z \in \widehat{E}(u)$.

(iii) $\mathcal{M}$ is bounded away from $E^0 \oplus E^-$, closed and $c := \inf_{w\in\mathcal{M}} \Phi(w) > 0$. Moreover, $\Phi|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is coercive, i.e., $\Phi(u) \to \infty$ as $u \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\|u\| \to \infty$.

Note that an immediate consequence is that if w is a critical point of Φ, then the whole line segment $[s_w, t_w]w$ consists of critical points.

Proof. (i) The conclusion can be found in [11, Lemma 2.6 and Theorem 3.1]; see also [12, Proposition 39]. The proof is by showing that $\Phi(z) \le 0$ for $z \in \widehat{E}(u)$ and $\|z\|$ large enough, and then weak upper semicontinuity of $\Phi|_{\widehat{E}(u)}$ implies that there exists a positive maximum.

(ii) For each $z \in \widehat{E}(u)$ we have $z = sw + v$, where $s \ge 0$ and $v = v^0 + v^- \in E^0 \oplus E^-$. It has been shown in the course of the proof of [11, Proposition 2.3] and [12, Proposition 39] that

$$\Phi(z) - \Phi(w) = \Phi(sw+v) - \Phi(w) = -\frac{1}{2}\|v^-\|^2 + \int_\Omega \left(f(x,w)\left[\tfrac{1}{2}\left(s^2-1\right)w + sv\right] + F(x,w) - F(x,sw+v)\right)dx$$

(again, keep in mind that our s corresponds to $s+1$ in [11,12]). Hence according to Corollary 2.3, $\Phi(z) \le \Phi(w)$ for all $z \in \widehat{E}(u)$ and $\Phi(z) = \Phi(w)$ if and only if $z \in [s_w, t_w]w$. That $\Phi(sw) = \Phi(w)$ for $s \in [s_w, t_w]$ is clear, and since $\Phi(sw) = \max_{\widehat{E}(u)} \Phi(z)$, it is also clear that $\widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M} = [s_w, t_w]w$ and $\Phi(z) < \Phi(w)$ for other z. The equality $\Phi'(sw) = s\Phi'(w)$ follows immediately from the fact that $f(x,sw) = sf(x,w)$.

(iii) That $c > 0$ has been shown in [11, Lemma 2.4] and is an immediate consequence of the fact that $\Phi(u) = \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 + o(\|u\|^2)$ as $u \to 0$, $u \in E^+$. Since $\Phi|_{E^0\oplus E^-} \le 0$, $\mathcal{M}$ is bounded away from $E^0 \oplus E^-$ and hence closed. Finally, according to Proposition 2.7 and the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [11], $\Phi|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is coercive. □

Remark 2.5. If f satisfies (F_1)–(F_4) and is of the form $f(x,u) = a(x)h(u)$, where $h(u) \neq 0$ for $u \neq 0$, then $s_w = t_w = 1$ in Proposition 2.4; i.e., $\widehat{E}(u)$ intersects $\mathcal{M}$ at a unique point. Assuming the contrary, suppose $t_w > 1$ and $w > 0$ on a set of positive measure (other cases are treated similarly). So $\operatorname{meas}\{x : w(x) > d\}$ is positive for some $d > 0$. We claim that $h(t)/t$ is constant for $0 < t < d$. Otherwise there exist $s \in (1, t_w]$, t_0 and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon < t_0 < d - \varepsilon$ and

$$\frac{h(t)}{t} < \frac{h(st)}{st} \quad \text{for all } t \in (t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon).$$

Since the sets $\{x : w(x) > t_0 + \varepsilon\}$ and $\{x : w(x) < t_0 - \varepsilon\}$ have positive measure, so does the set $\{x : w(x) \in (t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon)\}$; see [1]. But this contradicts the last

statement of Corollary 2.3. Hence $h(t)/t$ is constant for $0 < t < d$ and $h(t)/t \to 0$ as $t \to 0$. So $h(t) = 0$ on $(0, d)$, which is impossible.

According to Proposition 2.4, for each $u \in E^+ \setminus \{0\}$ there exist w and $0 < \sigma_w \leq \tau_w$ such that

$$m(u) := [\sigma_w, \tau_w]w = \widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M} \subset E.$$

This is a multivalued map from $E^+ \setminus \{0\}$ to E. However, the map $\widehat{\Psi} : E^+ \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\widehat{\Psi}(u) := \Phi(m(u)) = \max_{z \in \widehat{E}(u)} \Phi(z)$$

is single-valued because Φ is constant on $\widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}$. In fact more is true:

Proposition 2.6. *The map $\widehat{\Psi}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous.*

Proof. If $u_0 \in E^+ \setminus \{0\}$, then there exist a neighbourhood $U \subset E^+ \setminus \{0\}$ of u_0 and $R > 0$ such that $\Phi(w) \leq 0$ for all $u \in U$ and $w \in \widehat{E}(u)$, $\|w\| \geq R$, for otherwise we can find sequences (u_n), (w_n) such that $u_n \to u_0$, $w_n \in \widehat{E}(u_n)$, $\Phi(w_n) > 0$ and $\|w_n\| \to \infty$. But $u_0, u_1, u_2, \ldots$ is a compact set; hence according to [11, Lemma 2.5], $\Phi(w) \leq 0$ for some R and all $w \in \widehat{E}(u_j)$, $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, $\|w\| \geq R$, which is a contradiction. We may assume without loss of generality that U is bounded and bounded away from 0.

Let U, R be as above and $s_1u_1 + v_1 \in m(u_1)$, $s_2u_2 + v_2 \in m(u_2)$, where $u_1, u_2 \in U$ and $v_1, v_2 \in E^0 \oplus E^-$. Then $\|w_1\|, \|w_2\| \leq R$ for all $w_1 \in m(u_1)$, $w_2 \in m(u_2)$. By the maximality property of $m(u)$ and the mean value theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Psi}(u_1) - \widehat{\Psi}(u_2) &= \Phi(s_1u_1 + v_1) - \Phi(s_2u_2 + v_2) \leq \Phi(s_1u_1 + v_1) - \Phi(s_1u_2 + v_1) \\ &\leq s_1 \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|\Phi'(s_1(tu_1 + (1-t)u_2) + v_1)\| \, \|u_1 - u_2\| \leq C\|u_1 - u_2\|,\end{aligned}$$

where the constant C depends on R but not on the particular choice of points in $m(u_1)$, $m(u_2)$ (because $\|s_1(tu_1 + (1-t)u_2) + v_1\| \leq C_0R$ for some $C_0 > 0$; recall that U is bounded and bounded away from 0). Similarly, $\widehat{\Psi}(u_2) - \widehat{\Psi}(u_1) \leq C\|u_1 - u_2\|$, and the conclusion follows. □

Remark 2.7. It has been shown in [11] that if (F_4') holds instead of (F_4), then $\widehat{\Psi} \in C^1(E^+ \setminus \{0\}, \mathbb{R})$. An easy inspection of the arguments in [11] or [12] shows that if for each $u \in E^+ \setminus \{0\}$ there exists a unique positive maximum of $\Phi|_{\widehat{E}(u)}$, then $\widehat{\Psi}$ is still of class C^1. Hence in particular, if f is as in Remark 2.5, then the conclusions of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 hold with the same proofs as in [11].

However, under our assumptions we can in general only assert that $\widehat{\Psi}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous (because $u \mapsto m(u)$ may not be single-valued). Therefore, instead of the derivative of $\widehat{\Psi}$ we shall use Clarke's subdifferential [4]. The study of minimax methods for differential equations whose associated functional is merely locally Lipschitz continuous has been initiated by Chang in [3]. We recall some notions and facts taken from [3, 4]. They may also be found conveniently collected in Section 7.1 of [2]. The *generalized directional derivative* of $\widehat{\Psi}$ at u in the direction v is defined by

$$\widehat{\Psi}^\circ(u; v) := \limsup_{\substack{h \to 0 \\ t \downarrow 0}} \frac{\widehat{\Psi}(u + h + tv) - \widehat{\Psi}(u + h)}{t}, \qquad u \in E^+ \setminus \{0\}, \ v, h \in E^+.$$

The function $v \mapsto \widehat{\Psi}^\circ(u;v)$ is convex, and its subdifferential $\partial\widehat{\Psi}(u)$ at $v=0$ is called the *generalized gradient* (or *Clarke's subdifferential*) of $\widehat{\Psi}$ at u, that is,

$$\partial\widehat{\Psi}(u) := \{w \in E^+ : \widehat{\Psi}^\circ(u;v) \geq \langle w, v\rangle \text{ for all } v \in E^+\}. \tag{2.4}$$

In [2] E is a Banach space and the generalized gradient is in the dual space E^*. Since here we work in a Hilbert space, we may assume via duality that $\partial\widehat{\Psi}(u)$ is a subset of E (or more precisely, of E^+). A point u is called a *critical point* of $\widehat{\Psi}$ if $0 \in \partial\widehat{\Psi}(u)$, i.e., $\widehat{\Psi}^0(u;v) \geq 0$ for all $v \in E^+$, and a sequence (u_n) is called a *Palais-Smale sequence* for $\widehat{\Psi}$ (PS-sequence for short) if $\widehat{\Psi}(u_n)$ is bounded and there exist $w_n \in \partial\widehat{\Psi}(u_n)$ such that $w_n \to 0$. The functional $\widehat{\Psi}$ satisfies the *PS-condition* if each PS-sequence has a convergent subsequence. Below we collect some notation which we shall need:

$$S^+ := \{u \in E^+ : \|u\| = 1\}, \quad T_uS^+ := \{v \in E^+ : \langle u, v\rangle = 0\}, \quad \Psi := \widehat{\Psi}|_{S^+},$$
$$\Psi^d := \{u \in S^+ : \Psi(u) \leq d\}, \quad \Psi_c := \{u \in S^+ : \Psi(u) \geq c\}, \quad \Psi_c^d := \Psi_c \cap \Psi^d,$$
$$K := \{u \in S^+ : 0 \in \partial\widehat{\Psi}(u)\} \quad K_c := \Psi_c^c \cap K, \quad \partial\Psi(u) := \partial\widehat{\Psi}(u), \text{ where } u \in S^+.$$

Note that the symbol $\partial\Psi(u)$ stands for $\partial\widehat{\Psi}(u)$ when u is restricted to S^+. This is inconsistent with the notation $\Psi = \widehat{\Psi}|_{S^+}$. As we shall see in the proof of the next proposition, $\widehat{\Psi}^\circ(u;su) = 0$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence $\partial\Psi(u) \subset T_uS^+$.

Proposition 2.8.

(i) $u \in S^+$ is a critical point of $\widehat{\Psi}$ if and only if $m(u)$ consists of critical points of Φ. The corresponding critical values coincide.

(ii) $(u_n) \subset S^+$ is a PS-sequence for $\widehat{\Psi}$ if and only if there exist $w_n \in m(u_n)$ such that (w_n) is a PS-sequence for Φ.

Proof. (i) Let $u \in S^+$. We shall show that $\widehat{\Psi}^\circ(u;v) \geq 0$ for all $v \in E^+$ if and only if $m(u)$ consists of critical points. Note first that there exists an orthogonal decomposition $E = E(u) \oplus T_uS^+$, and by the maximizing property of $m(u)$, $\Phi'(w)v = 0$ for all $w \in m(u)$ and $v \in E(u)$. Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ be fixed. Since $\widehat{\Psi}(u) = \widehat{\Psi}(\sigma u)$ for all $\sigma > 0$ and $\widehat{\Psi}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous,

$$|\widehat{\Psi}(u+h+t(su)) - \widehat{\Psi}(u+h)| = |\widehat{\Psi}((1+ts)u+h) - \widehat{\Psi}((1+ts)(u+h))| \leq Ct|s|\|h\|$$

for $h \in E^+$, $\|h\|$ and $t > 0$ small. Hence $\widehat{\Psi}^\circ(u;su) = 0$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$. So we only need to consider $v \in T_uS^+$.

Let $s_uu + z_u$, where $s_u > 0$ and $z_u \in E^0 \oplus E^-$, denote an (arbitrarily chosen) element of $m(u)$. Then, using the maximizing property of $m(u)$ and the mean value theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Psi}(u+h+tv) - \widehat{\Psi}(u+h) &= \Phi(s_{u+h+tv}(u+h+tv) + z_{u+h+tv}) \\ &\quad - \Phi(s_{u+h}(u+h) + z_{u+h}) \\ &\leq \Phi(s_{u+h+tv}(u+h+tv) + z_{u+h+tv}) - \Phi(s_{u+h+tv}(u+h) + z_{u+h+tv}) \\ &= ts_{u+h+tv}\Phi'(s_{u+h+tv}(u+h+\theta tv) + z_{u+h+tv})v\end{aligned}$$

for some $\theta \in (0,1)$ (here and below $h \in E^+$). Dividing by t and letting $h \to 0$ and $t \downarrow 0$ via subsequences we obtain

$$\widehat{\Psi}^\circ(u;v) \leq s^*\Phi'(s^*u + z^*)v, \tag{2.5}$$

where $s_n := s_{u+h_n+t_nv} \to s^* > 0$ and $z_n := z_{u+h_n+t_nv} \rightharpoonup z^*$. This follows because $\mathcal{M}$ is bounded away from $E^0 \oplus E^-$ and $\Phi|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is coercive; hence s_n, z_n must be bounded and $s_n \geq \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$. We claim that $s^*u + z^* \in \mathcal{M}$. Indeed, taking subsequences once more, writing $z_n = z_n^0 + z_n^- \in E^0 \oplus E^-$ and using Fatou's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Psi}(u) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \widehat{\Psi}(u + h_n + t_nv) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(s_n(u + h_n + t_nv) + z_n)\\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2}\|s_n(u + h_n + t_nv)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|z_n^-\|^2 \right.\\ &\qquad\qquad \left. - \int_\Omega F(x, s_n(u + h_n + t_nv) + z_n)\,dx\right)\\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\|s^*u\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|(z^*)^-\|^2 - \int_\Omega F(x, s^*u + z^*)\,dx \leq \widehat{\Psi}(u).\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\|z_n\| \to \|z^*\|$ (recall $\dim E^0 < \infty$), hence $z_n \to z^*$ and $s_n(u + h_n + t_nv) + z_n \to s^*u + z^*$. As $\mathcal{M}$ is closed, the claim follows. Since $\widehat{E}(u) \cap \mathcal{M}$ may be a line segment, it is not certain that s^* and z^* are the same for different v. However, if s_1^*, s_2^* and z_1^*, z_2^* correspond to v_1 and v_2, then by Proposition 2.4, $s_1^*u + z_1^* = \tau(s_2^*u + z_2^*)$ and $\Phi'(s_1^*u + z_1^*)v_2 = \tau\Phi'(s_2^*u + z_2^*)v_2$ for some $\tau > 0$. Taking this into account, we see from (2.5) that if $y \in \partial\Psi(u)$, then

$$\langle y, v\rangle \leq \widehat{\Psi}^\circ(u; v) \leq \tau(v)\Phi'(s^*u + z^*)v, \tag{2.6}$$

where τ is bounded and bounded away from 0 (by constants independent of v). It follows immediately that u is a critical point of Ψ if and only if $m(u)$ consists of critical points of Φ.

(ii) The proof is very similar here. We take $y_n \in \partial\Psi(u_n)$ and $w_n \in m(u_n)$. Since $\Phi|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is coercive, boundedness of $\Phi(m(u_n))$ implies that $(m(u_n))$ is bounded. As in (2.6), we see that

$$\langle y_n, v\rangle \leq \widehat{\Psi}^\circ(u_n; v) \leq \tau_n(v)\Phi'(w_n)v, \tag{2.7}$$

where τ_n is bounded and bounded away from 0 because so is $m(u_n)$. So the conclusion follows. □

Note that if $(w_n) \subset (m(u_n))$ is a PS-sequence for Φ, then so is any sequence $(w_n') \subset (m(u_n))$.

Finally for this section we construct a pseudo-gradient vector field $H : S^+ \setminus K \to TS^+$ for Ψ. For $u \in S^+$, let

$$\partial^-\Psi(u) := \left\{p \in \partial\Psi(u) : \|p\| = \min_{a\in\partial\Psi(u)} \|a\|\right\}$$
$$\text{and} \quad \mu(u) := \inf_{a\in S^+}\{\|\partial^-\Psi(a)\| + \|u - a\|\}.$$

Since $\partial\Psi(u)$ is closed and convex, p as above exists and is unique; cf. [2, 3]. Hence

$$K = \{u \in S^+ : \partial^-\Psi(u) = 0\}.$$

The map $u \mapsto \|\partial^-\Psi(u)\|$ is lower semicontinuous [2, Proposition 7.1.1(vi)] but not continuous in general. The reason for introducing the function μ is that it regularizes $\|\partial^-\Psi(u)\|$. The idea comes from [5], where a similar function has been defined.

Lemma 2.9. *The function μ is continuous, and $u \in K$ if and only if $\mu(u) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $u, v, a \in S^+$. Then

$$\mu(u) \le \|\partial^- \Psi(a)\| + \|u - a\| \le \|\partial^- \Psi(a)\| + \|v - a\| + \|u - v\|,$$

and taking the infimum over a on the right-hand side we obtain $\mu(u) \le \mu(v) + \|u - v\|$. Reversing the roles of u and v we see that $|\mu(u) - \mu(v)| \le \|u - v\|$. Hence μ is (Lipschitz) continuous.

Since $0 \le \mu(u) \le \|\partial^- \Psi(u)\|$, it is clear that $\mu(u) = 0$ if $u \in K$. Suppose $\mu(u) = 0$. Then there exist a_n such that $\partial^- \Psi(a_n) \to 0$ and $a_n \to u$, so $u \in K$ by the lower semicontinuity of $u \mapsto \|\partial^- \Psi(u)\|$. □

Proposition 2.10. *There exists a locally Lipschitz continuous vector field $H : S^+ \setminus K \to TS^+$ such that $\|H(u)\| \le 1$ and $\inf\{\langle p, H(u)\rangle : p \in \partial\Psi(u)\} > \frac{1}{2}\mu(u)$ for all $u \in S^+ \setminus K$. If Φ is even, then H may be chosen to be odd.*

Proof. Let $u \in S^+ \setminus K$ and put $v_u := \partial^- \Psi(u)/\|\partial^- \Psi(u)\|$. Consider the map

$$\chi : w \mapsto \inf_{p \in \partial\Psi(w)} \langle p,\, v_u - \langle v_u, w\rangle w\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\mu(w), \quad w \in S^+ \setminus K$$

(note that $v_u - \langle v_u, w\rangle w \in T_w(S^+)$). Since $\partial\Psi(u)$ is convex, $\inf_{p \in \partial\Psi(u)} \langle p, v_u\rangle \ge \|\partial^- \Psi(u)\| \ge \mu(u)$ and therefore $\chi(u) \ge \frac{1}{2}\mu(u) > 0$. Moreover, since

$$\inf_{p \in \partial\Psi(w)} \langle p,\, v_u - \langle v_u, w\rangle w\rangle = -\sup_{p \in \partial\Psi(w)} \langle p,\, \langle v_u, w\rangle w - v_u\rangle = -\widehat{\Psi}^0(w;\, \langle v_u, w\rangle w - v_u)$$

(see Proposition 7.1.1(vii) in [2]) and $\widehat{\Psi}^0$ is upper semicontinuous in both arguments [2, property(c) on p. 168], χ is lower semicontinuous. Hence there exists a neighbourhood U_u of u such that $\chi(w) > 0$ for all $w \in U$.

The remaining part of the proof is standard. Take a locally finite open refinement $(U_{u_i})_{i \in I}$ (with corresponding points v_{u_i}) of the open cover $(U_u)_{u \in S^+ \setminus K}$ and a subordinated locally Lipschitz continuous partition of unity $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \in I}$. Define

$$H(u) := \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i(u)\,(v_{u_i} - \langle v_{u_i}, u\rangle u), \quad u \in S^+ \setminus K.$$

It is easy to see that H satisfies the required conclusions.

If Φ is even, then so is Ψ and we may replace $H(u)$ with $\frac{1}{2}(H(u) - H(-u))$. □

3. Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

Since the arguments are very similar to those appearing in [11, 12], we shall describe them rather briefly and concentrate on pointing out the main differences.

We start with Theorem 1.1. First we want to show that there exists a minimizer for Ψ on S^+. It follows from the results of Section 2 that

$$c := \inf_{w \in \mathcal{M}} \Phi(w) = \inf_{u \in S^+} \Psi(u) > 0.$$

According to Ekeland's variational principle [6], there exists a sequence $(u_n) \subset S^+$ such that $\Psi(u_n) \to c$ and

$$\Psi(w) \ge \Psi(u_n) - \frac{1}{n}\|w - u_n\| \quad \text{for all } w \in S^+. \tag{3.1}$$

For a given $v \in T_{u_n} S^+$, let $z_n(t) := (u_n + tv)/\|u_n + tv\|$. Since $\|u_n + tv\| - 1 = O(t^2)$ as $t \to 0$ and $\widehat{\Psi}(u_n + tv) = \Psi(z_n(t))$, it follows from (3.1) that

$$\widehat{\Psi}^\circ(u_n; v) \geq \limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\widehat{\Psi}(u_n + tv) - \widehat{\Psi}(u_n)}{t} = \limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\Psi(z_n(t)) - \Psi(u_n)}{t} \geq -\frac{1}{n}\|v\|.$$

Since $m(u_n)$ is bounded by coercivity of $\Phi|_{\mathcal{M}}$, the second inequality in (2.7) implies that

$$-\frac{1}{n}\|v\| \leq \widehat{\Psi}^\circ(u_n; v) \leq \tau_n(v)\Phi'(w_n)v,$$

where $w_n \in m(u_n) \subset \mathcal{M}$ and τ_n is bounded and bounded away from 0. So recalling $\Phi'(w_n)v = 0$ for all $v \in E(w_n)$, it follows that (w_n) is a bounded PS-sequence for Φ. Now we may proceed exactly as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [11, pp. 3811–3812] (or in the proof of Theorem 40 in [12]). More precisely, one shows, invoking Lions' lemma [15, Lemma 1.21] in a rather standard way, that there exists a sequence $(y_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ such that

$$\int_{|x - y_n| < 1} w_n^2 \, dx \geq \varepsilon \quad \text{for } n \text{ large enough and some } \varepsilon > 0,$$

and since Φ and $\mathcal{M}$ are invariant by translations $u(\cdot) \mapsto u(\cdot - k)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^N$, we may assume (y_n) is bounded. So passing to a subsequence, $w_n \rightharpoonup w \neq 0$. This w is a solution, and an additional argument shows it is a ground state; see [11] or [12] for more details.

Suppose now that f is odd in u and note that Ψ is even and invariant by translations by elements of $\mathbb{Z}^N$. To prove that there exist infinitely many geometrically distinct solutions we assume the contrary. Since to each $[\sigma_w, \tau_w]w \subset \mathcal{M}$ there corresponds a unique point $u \in S^+$, K consists of finitely many orbits $\mathcal{O}(u) := \{u(\cdot - k) : u \in K,\ k \in \mathbb{Z}^N\}$. We choose a subset $\mathcal{F} \subset K$ such that $\mathcal{F} = -\mathcal{F}$ and each orbit has a unique representative in $\mathcal{F}$. Now an easy inspection shows that Lemmas 2.11 and 2.13 in [11] hold; i.e., the mapping $\check{m} : u \mapsto u^+/\|u^+\|$ from $\mathcal{M}$ to S^+ is Lipschitz continuous and $\kappa := \inf\{v - w\| : v, w \in K,\ v \neq w\} > 0$.

Proposition 3.1 (Lemma 2.14 in [11]). *Let $d \geq c$. If $(v_n^1), (v_n^2) \subset \Psi^d$ are two PS-sequences for Ψ, then either $\|v_n^1 - v_n^2\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ or $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|v_n^1 - v_n^2\| \geq \rho(d) > 0$, where ρ depends on d but not on the particular choice of PS-sequences in Ψ^d.*

The argument is exactly the same as in [11], taking into account that by Proposition 2.8, to $(v_n^j) \subset \Psi^d$ there correspond PS-sequences (u_n^j) with $u_n^j \in m(v_n^j)$, $j = 1, 2$. Once u_n^j have been chosen, one follows the lines of [11].

Let H be the vector field constructed in Proposition 2.10 and consider the flow given by

$$\frac{d}{dt}\eta(t, w) = -H(\eta(t, w)), \quad \eta(0, w) = w,$$

defined on the set

$$\mathcal{G} := \{(t, w) : w \in S^+ \setminus K,\ T^-(w) < t < T^+(w)\},$$

where $(T^-(w), T^+(w))$ is the maximal existence time for the trajectory passing through w at $t = 0$.

Proposition 3.2 (Cf. Lemma 2.15 in [11]). *For each $w \in S^+ \setminus K$ the limit $\lim_{t \to T^+(w)} \eta(t, w)$ exists and is a critical point of Ψ.*

Proof. We adapt the argument in [11].

If $T^+(w) < \infty$, then for $0 \le s < t < T^+(w)$ we have

$$\|\eta(t,w) - \eta(s,w)\| \le \int_s^t \|H(\eta(\tau,w))\|\, d\tau \le t - s;$$

hence $\lim_{t\to T^+(w)} \eta(t,w)$ exists and must be a critical point (or the flow can be continued for $t > T^+(w)$).

Let $T^+(w) = \infty$. It suffices to show that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $t_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\|\eta(t_\varepsilon, u) - \eta(t,u)\| < \varepsilon$ for all $t \ge t_\varepsilon$. Assuming the contrary, we find $\varepsilon \in (0, \rho(d)/2)$ and $t_n \to \infty$ such that $\|\eta(t_n,w) - \eta(t_{n+1},w)\| = \varepsilon$ for all n. Choose the smallest $t_n^1 \in (t_n, t_{n+1})$ such that $\|\eta(t_n,w) - \eta(t_n^1,w)\| = \varepsilon/3$. Recall from Lemma 2.9 that μ is continuous and set $\kappa_n := \min_{s\in[t_n,t_n^1]} \mu(\eta(s,w))$. Then, using Proposition 2.10 and [2, Proposition 7.1.1(viii)],

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\varepsilon}{3} &= \|\eta(t_n^1,w) - \eta(t_n,w)\| \le \int_{t_n}^{t_n^1} \|H(\eta(s,w))\|\, ds \le t_n^1 - t_n \\
&\le \frac{2}{\kappa_n} \int_{t_n}^{t_n^1} \inf_{p\in\partial\Psi(\eta(s,u))} \langle p, H(\eta(s,w))\rangle\, ds \\
&= -\frac{2}{\kappa_n} \int_{t_n}^{t_n^1} \sup_{p\in\partial\Psi(\eta(s,u))} \langle p, -H(\eta(s,w))\rangle\, ds \\
&\le -\frac{2}{\kappa_n} \int_{t_n}^{t_n^1} \frac{d}{ds}\Psi(\eta(s,w))\, ds = \frac{2}{\kappa_n}(\Psi(\eta(t_n,w)) - \Psi(\eta(t_n^1,w))).
\end{aligned}$$

Since Ψ is bounded below, $\Psi(\eta(t_n,w)) - \Psi(\eta(t_n^1,w)) \to 0$; hence $\kappa_n \to 0$, and we may find $s_n^1 \in [t_n, t_n^1]$ such that if $z_n^1 := \eta(s_n^1, w)$, then $\mu(z_n^1) \to 0$. By the definition of μ there exist w_n^1 such that $w_n^1 - z_n^1 \to 0$ and $\partial^-\Psi(w_n^1) \to 0$. So $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|w_n^1 - \eta(t_n,w)\| \le \varepsilon/3$. Similarly, there exists a largest $t_n^2 \in (t_n^1, t_{n+1})$ with $\|\eta(t_{n+1},w) - \eta(t_n^2,w)\| = \varepsilon/3$, and we find w_n^2 with $\partial^-\Psi(w_n^2) \to 0$ and $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|w_n^2 - \eta(t_{n+1},w)\| \le \varepsilon/3$. It follows that

$$\varepsilon/3 \le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \|w_n^1 - w_n^2\| \le 2\varepsilon < \rho(d),$$

a contradiction to Proposition 3.1. □

Proposition 3.3 (Cf. Lemma 2.16 in [11])**.** *Let $d \ge c$. Then for each $\delta > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\Psi_{d-\varepsilon}^{d+\varepsilon} \cap K = K_d$ and $\lim_{t\to T^+(w)} \Psi(\eta(t,w)) < d - \varepsilon$ for all $w \in \Psi^{d+\varepsilon} \setminus U_\delta(K_d)$, where $U_\delta(K_d)$ is the open δ-neighbourhood of K_d.*

The proof requires changes which, in view of the arguments of Proposition 3.2, are rather obvious (in particular, $\nabla\Psi$ in the definition of τ in [11] should be replaced by μ).

With all these prerequisites, existence of infinitely many solutions is obtained by repeating the arguments on pp. 3817–3818 in [11]. Let

$$c_k := \inf\{d \in \mathbb{R} : \gamma(\Psi^d) \ge k\}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where γ denotes Krasnoselskii's genus [10]. Using the flow η and Proposition 3.3 one shows that $K_{c_k} \ne \emptyset$ and $c_k < c_{k+1}$ for all k. This contradicts our assumption that there are finitely many geometrically distinct solutions.

Now we turn our attention to Theorem 1.2. Here there is no $\mathbb{Z}^N$-symmetry, but instead there is a compact embedding $H_0^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^q(\Omega)$ for $q \in [1, 2^*)$. Using this,

one sees as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [11] or Theorem 37 in [12] that the ground state exists. The minimizing PS-sequence is extracted by using Ekeland's variational principle in the same way as at the beginning of this section. To obtain infinitely many solutions for odd f one first shows as in [11, Theorem 3.2] (or in [12, Section 4.2]) that Ψ satisfies the PS-condition. Now a standard minimax argument as in [11, Theorem 3.2] can be employed. Note that with the aid of the vector field H and suitable cutoff functions one can construct a deformation in the usual way as e.g. in [10] (see also [3]). We leave the details to the reader.

References

[1] A. Chabi and A. Haraux, *Un théorème de valeurs intermédiaires dans les espaces de Sobolev et applications* (French, with English summary), Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (5) **7** (1985), no. 2, 87–100. MR842764

[2] J. Chabrowski, *Variational methods for potential operator equations*, With applications to nonlinear elliptic equations, De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, vol. 24, Walter de Gruyter and Co., Berlin, 1997. MR1467724

[3] K. C. Chang, *Variational methods for nondifferentiable functionals and their applications to partial differential equations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **80** (1981), no. 1, 102–129. MR614246

[4] F. H. Clarke, *Optimization and nonsmooth analysis*, Université de Montréal, Centre de Recherches Mathématiques, Montreal, QC, 1989. Reprint of the 1983 original. MR1019086

[5] A. Ćwiszewski and W. Kryszewski, *Equilibria of set-valued maps: a variational approach*, Nonlinear Anal. **48** (2002), no. 5, Ser. A: Theory Methods, 707–746. MR1868111

[6] I. Ekeland, *On the variational principle*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **47** (1974), 324–353. MR0346619

[7] S. Liu, *On superlinear Schrödinger equations with periodic potential*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **45** (2012), no. 1-2, 1–9. MR2957647

[8] J. Mederski, *Ground states of a system of nonlinear Schrödinger equations with periodic potentials*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **41** (2016), no. 9, 1426–1440. MR3551463

[9] A. Pankov, *Periodic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with application to photonic crystals*, Milan J. Math. **73** (2005), 259–287. MR2175045

[10] M. Struwe, *Variational methods*, Applications to nonlinear partial differential equations and Hamiltonian systems, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990. MR1078018

[11] A. Szulkin and T. Weth, *Ground state solutions for some indefinite variational problems*, J. Funct. Anal. **257** (2009), no. 12, 3802–3822. MR2557725

[12] A. Szulkin and T. Weth, *The method of Nehari manifold*, Handbook of nonconvex analysis and applications, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2010, pp. 597–632. MR2768820

[13] X. H. Tang, *New super-quadratic conditions on ground state solutions for superlinear Schrödinger equation*, Adv. Nonlinear Stud. **14** (2014), no. 2, 361–373. MR3194360

[14] X. H. Tang, *Non-Nehari manifold method for superlinear Schrödinger equation*, Taiwanese J. Math. **18** (2014), no. 6, 1957–1979. MR3284041

[15] M. Willem, *Minimax theorems*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, vol. 24, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1996. MR1400007

[16] X. Zhong and W. Zou, *Ground state and multiple solutions via generalized Nehari manifold*, Nonlinear Anal. **102** (2014), 251–263. MR3182813

Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal de São Carlos, 13565-905 São Carlos, Brazil

E-mail address: odair@dm.ufscar.br

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Sciences, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Chopina 12/18, 87-100 Toruń, Poland

E-mail address: wkrysz@mat.umk.pl

Department of Mathematics, Stockholm University, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

E-mail address: andrzejs@math.su.se