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#### Abstract

We study the existence of positive solutions on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ to semilinear elliptic equation $-\Delta u+u=f(u)$ where $N \geqslant 1$ and $f$ is modeled on the power case $f(u)=|u|^{p-1} u$. Denoting with $c$ the mountain pass level of $V(u)=\frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)}^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} F(u) d x$, $u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)\left(F(s)=\int_{0}^{s} f(t) d t\right)$, we show, via a new energy constrained variational argument, that for any $b \in[0, c)$ there exists a positive bounded solution $v_{b} \in C^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ such that $E_{v_{b}}(y)=\frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} v_{b}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)}^{2}-V\left(v_{b}(\cdot, y)\right)=-b$ and $v(x, y) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow+\infty$ uniformly with respect to $y \in \mathbb{R}$. We also characterize the monotonicity, symmetry and periodicity properties of $v_{b}$. © 2013 Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.
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## 1. Introduction

In this paper we study the existence of positive solutions on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ to semilinear elliptic equations

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\Delta u+u=f(u) \tag{E}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $N \geqslant 1$ and $f$ is a nonlinearity which can be thought modeled on the power case $f(u)=|u|^{p-1} u$ with $p$ subcritical and greater than 1. Equations of this kind are used in various fields of Physics such as, for example, plasma or laser self-focusing models (see [28] and the references therein). They arise in particular in the study of standing waves (stationary states) solutions of the corresponding nonlinear Schrödinger type equations.

Starting with the work by W.A. Strauss, [29], the problem of finding and characterizing positive solutions $v \in$ $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ of (E) has been widely studied. We refer to the paper by H. Berestycki and P.L. Lions [8] (in the case $N \geqslant 2$, see [9] for $N=1$ ) where nearly optimal existence results regarding least energy positive solutions (also ground state solutions) for (E) are obtained. Their mountain pass characterization, and so information about their

[^0]Morse index, is given by L. Jeanjean and K. Tanaka in [17]. In the pure power case, uniqueness and nondegeneracy properties of positive solutions of $(\mathrm{E})$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ was derived by M.K. Kwong in [18]. Regarding the uniqueness problem for more general nonlinearity $f$, we refer to the paper by J. Serrin and M. Tang, [27], and to the references therein.

A new kind of entire solutions of (E) has been introduced by $N$. Dancer in [13]. Denoting $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \times \mathbb{R}$ a point in $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$, we note that a ground state solution $u_{0}(x)$ of $(\mathrm{E})$ in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ can be thought as a solution of $(\mathrm{E})$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$, which is constant with respect to the $y$ variable. In the pure power case (or anyhow assuming the nondegeneracy of the ground state solution) Dancer proved, by using bifurcation and continuation arguments, the existence of a continuous branch of entire positive solutions of (E) in $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ bifurcating from the cylindric type solution $u_{0}$. These solutions are periodic in the variable $y$ and decay to zero as $|x| \rightarrow+\infty$. Different periodic Dancer's solutions (suitably rotated) were then used in the pure power case as prescribed asymptotes in the constructions of multiple ends solutions of ( E ) by A. Malchiodi in [21] and by M. del Pino, M. Kowalczyk, F. Pacard and J. Wei in [14].

Related to the above papers is the one by C. Gui, A. Malchiodi and H. Xu, [16], where qualitative properties (such as radial symmetry with respect to the variable $x$ and evenness with respect to $y$ ) of positive solutions $v(x, y)$ of (E) which decay to zero as $|x| \rightarrow+\infty$ (uniformly w.r.t. $y$ ) are established. Their study is based on moving plane techniques together with the use of some Hamiltonian identities which are connected with the Lagrangian structure of that kind of problem.

To describe the Hamiltonian identities which are used in [16] and to introduce precisely the problem studied in the present paper, note that prescribing the decay properties of a solution $v$ only with respect to the variable $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$, naturally gives to the variable $y$ the role of an evolution variable. In this respect, as usual in the evolution problems, all the solutions $v$ of $(\mathrm{E})$ described above belong to the space $X=L_{l o c}^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}, H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)\right) \cap H_{l o c}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}, L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)\right)$ and verify (at least in a weak sense) the evolution equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{y}^{2} v(\cdot, y)=V^{\prime}(v(\cdot, y)), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $V^{\prime}$ is the gradient in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ of the Euler functional relative to Eq. (E) on $\mathbb{R}^{N}$,

$$
V(u)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^{2}+\frac{1}{2}|u|^{2}-F(u) d x, \quad u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right),
$$

where $F(s)=\int_{0}^{s} f(t) d t$. We will refer to this kind of solutions as layered solutions of (E).
Noting that Eq. (1.1) has Lagrangian structure, one can think to the variable $y$ as a time variable and to the functional $U=-V$ as the energy potential of the infinite dimensional dynamical system. Every layered solution $v$ defines a trajectory $y \in \mathbb{R} \rightarrow v(\cdot, y) \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$, solution to (1.1). In this connection, any $u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ which solves (E) is an equilibrium of (1.1) and the solutions found by Dancer are periodic orbits of the system. Since the system is autonomous, if $v$ is a layered solution to (E) then the Energy function

$$
y \rightarrow E_{v}(y)=\frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)}^{2}-V(v(\cdot, y))
$$

is constant (a formal proof of this Hamiltonian identity for a general class of elliptic equations can be found in [10] and [15], see also [3] for the case of Allen Cahn equations).

In the present paper, in analogy with the study already done for Allen Cahn type equation in [3-5] (see also [2] and see [1] for Allen Cahn system of equations), we study the problem of finding layered solution of (E) with prescribed energy. In particular we study the problem of looking for connecting orbit solutions with prescribed energy.

To be more detailed, we precise our assumption on the nonlinearity $f$. We assume that
(f1) $f \in C^{1}(\mathbb{R})$,
(f2) there exist $C>0$ and $p \in\left(1,1+\frac{4}{N}\right)$ such that $|f(t)| \leqslant C\left(1+|t|^{p}\right)$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$,
(f3) there exists $\mu>2$ such that $0<\mu F(t) \leqslant f(t) t$ for any $t \neq 0$, where $F(t)=\int_{0}^{t} f(s) d s$,
(f4) $f(t) t<f^{\prime}(t) t^{2}$ for any $t \neq 0$.
As it is well known, $(f 1)-(f 4)$ are more than sufficient to guarantees that $V \in C^{1}\left(H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)\right)$ and that it satisfies the geometrical assumptions of the Mountain Pass Theorem (see [26]). Setting $c=\inf _{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup _{t \in[0,1]} V(\gamma(t))$, where
$\Gamma=\left\{\gamma \in C\left([0,1], H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)\right) \mid \gamma(0)=0, V(\gamma(1))<0\right\}$, it is nowadays standard to show that $c>0$ is the lowest positive critical level of $V$. Then, the definition of the mountain pass level implies that given any $b \in[0, c)$ the sublevel $\{V \leqslant b\}$ is the union of two disjoint path connected sets $\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$, where we denote with $\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ the one which contains 0 . The main result of the present paper establishes that given any $b \in[0, c)$ there exists a layered solution $v$ of (E) with $E_{v}=-b$ and which connects (in some sense precised below) the sets $\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$. Precisely we prove that

Theorem 1.1. If $F$ satisfies $(f 1)-(f 4)$ then for any $b \in[0, c)$ Eq. (E) has a solution $v_{b} \in C^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ with energy $E_{v_{b}}=-b$ and such that
(i) $v_{b}>0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$,
(ii) $v_{b}(x, y)=v_{b}(|x|, y) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow+\infty$, uniformly w.r.t. $y \in \mathbb{R}$,
(iii) $\partial_{r} v_{b}(x, y)<0$ for $r=|x|>0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$.

Moreover, if $b>0$,
(iv) there exists $T_{b}>0$ such that $v_{b}$ is periodic of period $2 T_{b}$ in the variable $y$ and symmetric with respect to $y=0$ and $y=T_{b}$.
(v) $\partial_{y} v_{b}(x, y)>0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left(0, T_{b}\right), v_{b}(\cdot, 0) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}, v_{b}\left(\cdot, T_{b}\right) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$.

Finally, if $b=0$,
(vi) $v_{0} \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ is radially symmetric and $\partial_{r} v_{0}<0$ for $r=|(x, y)|>0$,
(vii) $v_{0}(\cdot, 0) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{0}$ and $v_{0}$ is a mountain pass point of the Euler functional relative to $(\mathrm{E})$ on $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$.

Theorem 1.1 gives the existence for any $b \in[0, c)$ of a positive layered solution $v_{b}$ to (E) with energy $-b$ which is radially symmetric and decaying to 0 as $|x| \rightarrow+\infty$ uniformly with respect to $y \in \mathbb{R}$. When $b>0$ the solution $v_{b}$ is a periodic solution of period $2 T_{b}$ which is symmetric with respect to $y=0$ and $y=T_{b}$. It can be thought as a trajectory which oscillates back and forth along a simple curve connecting the two turning points $v_{b}(\cdot, 0) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ and $v_{b}\left(\cdot, T_{b}\right) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$. These solutions, which we call brake orbit type solutions, have the same behaviour of the above described Dancer solutions. When $b=0$ the solution $v_{0}$ defines a trajectory which emanates from $0 \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ as $y \rightarrow-\infty$, reaches the point $v(\cdot, 0) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{0}$ and goes back symmetrically to 0 for $y>0$. It can been thought as a homoclinic solution to $0 \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ and it is in fact the mountain pass point of the Euler functional relative to (E) on $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$. Finally we can think at the mountain pass point of $V$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ as an equilibrium of $(1.1)$ at energy $-c$. The Energy diagram here below wants to summarize these considerations.


To prove Theorem 1.1 we make use of variational methods and we apply an Energy constrained variational argument already introduced and used in [3-5]. Given $b \in[0, c)$, we look for minima of the renormalized functional

$$
\varphi(v)=\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)}^{2}+(V(v(\cdot, y))-b) d y
$$

on the space of function $v \in X$ which are radially symmetric with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$, monotone decreasing with respect to $|x|$ and which verify

$$
\begin{equation*}
\liminf _{y \rightarrow \pm \infty} \operatorname{dist}_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{ \pm}^{b}\right)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \inf _{y \in \mathbb{R}} V(v(\cdot, y)) \geqslant b \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thanks to the constraint $\inf _{y \in \mathbb{R}} V(v(\cdot, y)) \geqslant b$, the functional $\varphi$ is well defined on this class of functions. Moreover, its minimizing sequences admits limit points $\bar{v} \in X$ (a priori not verifying (1.2)) with respect to the weak topology of $H_{l o c}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$.

Defining $\bar{\sigma}=\sup \left\{y \in \mathbb{R} / \bar{v}(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}\right\}$ and $\bar{\tau}=\inf \left\{y>\bar{\sigma} / \bar{v}(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}\right\}$, we can prove that $-\infty \leqslant \bar{\sigma}<\bar{\tau}<+\infty$ (indeed $\bar{\sigma}>-\infty$ when $b>0$ ) and $\lim _{y \rightarrow \bar{\sigma}^{+}} \operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}\right)=0, \bar{v}(\cdot, \bar{\tau}) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ and $V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))>b$ for any $y \in(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$. Then, the minimality properties of $\bar{v}$ allow us to prove that $\bar{v}$ solves in a classical sense Eq. (E) on $\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$ and $E_{\bar{v}}(y)=-b$ for any $y \in(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$. This will imply that $\bar{v}$ satisfies the boundary conditions $\lim _{y \rightarrow \bar{\sigma}}{ }^{+} \partial_{y} \bar{v}(\cdot, y)=$ $\lim _{y \rightarrow \bar{\tau}^{-}} \partial_{y} \bar{v}(\cdot, y)=0$ in $L^{2}$ and the entire solution $v_{b}$ is recovered from $\bar{v}$ by translations, reflections and, eventually, periodic continuations.

The variational approach that we used is similar to the one already applied in the study of the Allen Cahn type equation in [3-5], but the present case is more complicated due to some natural lack of compactness and weak semicontinuity of the problem. This mainly depends on the competition between the terms $\|u\|_{H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)}^{2}$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} F(u)$ which enter in the definition of the potential functional $V(u)$ with different sign.

This explains why we assume in $(f 2)$ that $p<1+4 / N$. The exponent $p=1+4 / N$ is in fact critical with respect to the existence of a solution for the minimum problem $\inf \left\{V(u) \mid u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right),\|u\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)}=1\right\}$. Indeed, when $p<1+4 / N$, bounded $L^{2}$ sequences are bounded in $H^{1}$ when $V$ is bounded from above. Another (related) criticality of $p=1+4 / N$ is the fact that the sets $\mathcal{V}_{ \pm}^{b}$ have positive $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ distance if and only if $p<1+4 / N$ (one can simply verify it by using dilations in the pure power case). We finally mention for completeness that the exponent occurs in the study of the orbital stability being that the ground state solutions of $(\mathrm{E})$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ are stable when $1<p<1+4 / N$ (see [12] and [11]) and unstable when $1+4 / N \leqslant p$ (see [7,30]).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall some properties of the functional $V$ studying in particular the structure of the sublevel sets $\mathcal{V}_{ \pm}^{b}$. The study of the functional $\varphi$ and the use of the energy constraint variational principle described above is contained in Section 3.

Remark 1.2. Since we look for positive solution of ( E ) it is not restrictive to assume, and we will do it along the paper, that $f$ is an odd function
(f5) $f(t)=-f(-t)$ for any $t>0$.
Moreover, we list also some plain consequences of $(f 1)-(f 4)$.
(i) By $(f 1)$ and $(f 3)$ it is straightforward to verify that $f(0)=f^{\prime}(0)=0$ and so $f(t)=o(t)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$.
(ii) By (i) and ( $f 2$ ) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall \varepsilon>0, \exists A_{\varepsilon}>0 \text { such that }|f(t)| \leqslant \varepsilon|t|+A_{\varepsilon}|t|^{p}, \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

from which we also derive

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall \varepsilon>0, \exists A_{\varepsilon}>0 \text { such that }|F(t)| \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{2}|t|^{2}+\frac{A_{\varepsilon}}{p+1}|t|^{p+1}, \forall t \in \mathbb{R} . \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

(iii) By (f3), if $t \neq 0$ and $s>0$, we have $\frac{d}{d s} F(s t)=\frac{1}{s} f(s t) s t>\frac{\mu}{s} F(s t)$. Hence,

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(s t)>F(t) s^{\mu} \quad \text { whenever } t \neq 0 \text { and } s>1 . \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

(iv) By ( $f 4$ ), one plainly verify that, for any $t \neq 0$,
the function $s \mapsto \frac{1}{s} f(s t) t$ is strictly increasing for $s>0$.
For the sake of brevity in the notation, along the paper we denote $\|u\| \equiv\|u\|_{H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)},\|u\|_{p}=\|u\|_{L^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)}$ and $\langle u, v\rangle=\langle u, v\rangle_{H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)},\langle u, v\rangle_{2}=\langle u, v\rangle_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}$ for $n=N$ or $n=N+1$. Moreover $\operatorname{dist}(A, B) \equiv \operatorname{dist}_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)}(A, B)=$ $\inf _{v \in A, w \in B}\|v-w\|_{2}$ and $\operatorname{dist}(u, B) \equiv \inf _{v \in B}\|u-v\|_{2}$ for $A, B \subset L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right), u \in L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. Given $y \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ we set $B_{r}(y) \equiv\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{N} /|x|<r\right\}$ and $B_{r} \equiv B_{r}(0)$.

## 2. The potential functional

In this chapter, we study some properties of the functional $V: H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
V(u)=\frac{1}{2}\|u\|^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} F(u(x)) d x . \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 2.1. The mountain pass structure

Here we list some classical properties of $V$, in particular the ones regarding its mountain pass behaviour.
First of all we recall that $V$ is regular on $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ (see e.g. [6] and [22]).
Lemma 2.1. $V \in \mathcal{C}^{2}\left(H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)\right)$ with $V^{\prime}(u) h=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \nabla u \nabla h+u h-f(u) h d x$ and $V^{\prime \prime}(u) h \cdot h=\int_{\mathbb{R}}|\nabla h|^{2}+|h|^{2}-$ $f^{\prime}(u) h^{2} d x$ for all $h \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$.

Moreover the functional $V$ satisfies the geometrical hypotheses of the Mountain Pass Theorem. Indeed, since $p+1<2_{N}^{*}$, by the Sobolev Immersion Theorem and Remark 1.2(ii) we obtain

Lemma 2.2. There exists $\rho \in(0,1)$ such that if $u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ satisfies $\|u\| \leqslant \rho$ then $V(u) \geqslant \frac{1}{4}\|u\|^{2}$ and $V^{\prime}(u) v \geqslant$ $\langle u, v\rangle-\frac{1}{2}\|u\|\|v\|$ for all $v \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$.

By Lemma 2.2 and Remark 1.2(iii), $V$ satisfies the geometric assumptions of the Mountain Pass Theorem. Hence, defining

$$
\Gamma=\left\{\gamma \in C\left([0,1], H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)\right): \gamma(0)=0, \gamma(1) \neq 0 \text { and } V(\gamma(1)) \leqslant 0\right\}
$$

we denote the mountain pass level

$$
c=\inf _{\gamma \in \Gamma} \max _{s \in[0,1]} V(\gamma(s)) .
$$

Note that, by ( $f 3$ ), the following inequality holds true

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu V(u)-V^{\prime}(u) u=\left(\frac{\mu}{2}-1\right)\|u\|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} f(u) u-\mu F(u) \geqslant \frac{\mu-2}{2}\|u\|^{2}, \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

from which the Palais Smale sequences of $V$ are bounded in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. Moreover, by (2.2), if $V^{\prime}(u)=0$ and $u \neq 0$ then $V(u) \geqslant \frac{\mu-2}{2 \mu}\|u\|^{2}$, showing that $V$ has not critical points (or Palais Smale sequences) at negative levels.

The existence of a mountain pass critical point of $V$ can then be deduced by using e.g. concentration compactness argument. We have

Proposition 2.3. There exists $w_{0} \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ such that $V\left(w_{0}\right)=c$ and $V^{\prime}\left(w_{0}\right)=0$. Moreover $w_{0} \in C^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ is a solution of ( E ) on $\mathbb{R}^{N}$, $w_{0}>0, w_{0}(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow+\infty$ and, up to translations, $w_{0}$ is radially symmetric about the origin with $\partial_{r} w_{0}<0$ for $r=|x|>0$.

We refer for a proof to [8], for $N \geqslant 3$ and [9] for $N=2$, where a more general existence results regarding least energy solutions for scalar field equations is given. Their mountain pass characterization is proved in [17]. The case $N=1$ is easier and can be solved with similar arguments.

Fixed $u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$, the assumption ( $f 4$ ) allows us to describe the behaviour of $V$ along the rays $\{t u \mid t \geqslant 0\}$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. One plainly shows that

Lemma 2.4. For every $u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) \backslash\{0\}$ there exists $t_{u}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d}{d t} V(t u)>0 \quad \text { for } t \in\left(0, t_{u}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{d}{d t} V(t u)<0 \quad \text { for } t \in\left(t_{u},+\infty\right) . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover $V\left(t_{u} u\right) \geqslant c$ and for any $b \in(0, c)$ there exist unique $\alpha_{u, b} \in\left(0, t_{u}\right)$ and $\omega_{u, b} \in\left(t_{u},+\infty\right)$ such that $V\left(\alpha_{u, b} u\right)=V\left(\omega_{u, b} u\right)=b$. Finally the function $t \mapsto V^{\prime}(t u) t u$ is decreasing in $\left(t_{u},+\infty\right)$.

Proof. We have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d}{d t} V(t u)=V^{\prime}(t u) u=t\left(\|u\|^{2}-\frac{1}{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} f(t u) u d x\right) . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

By ( $f 4$ ) the function $t \mapsto \frac{1}{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} f(t u) u d x$ is strictly increasing in $(0,+\infty)$ for any $u \neq 0$ and so, by (2.4), the function $\frac{d}{d t} V(t u)$ can change sign at most in one point $t_{u}>0$. Then (2.3) follows since $V(0)=0, V(s u) \geqslant \frac{1}{4} s^{2}\|u\|^{2}$ for $s \in(0, \rho /\|u\|)$ and $V(s u) \rightarrow-\infty$ as $s \rightarrow+\infty$. By (2.3) we deduce $V\left(t_{u} u\right)=\max _{s \geqslant 0} V(s u)$, and, by the definition of the mountain pass level, we have $V\left(t_{u} u\right) \geqslant c$. Given $b \in[0, c)$, since $V(0)=0, V(t u)<0$ for $t$ large and $V\left(t_{u} u\right) \geqslant c$, by continuity there exist (unique by (2.3)) $0 \leqslant \alpha_{u, b}<t_{u}<\omega_{u, b}$ such that $V\left(\alpha_{u, b} u\right)=V\left(\omega_{u, b} u\right)=b$. We finally note that by $(f 4)$ we have $\frac{d^{2}}{d t^{2}} V(t u)=\|u\|^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} f^{\prime}(t u) u^{2} d x \leqslant\|u\|^{2}-\frac{1}{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} f(t u) u d x<0$ for any $t>t_{u}$. We conclude that $\frac{d}{d t} V^{\prime}(t u) t u=\frac{d}{d t}\left(t \frac{d}{d t} V(t u)\right)=t \frac{d^{2}}{d t^{2}} V(t u)+\frac{d}{d t} V(t u)<0$ for any $t>t_{u}$.

Remark 2.5. Note that if $V^{\prime}(u) u=0$ and $u \neq 0$ we have $\left.\frac{d}{d t} V(t u)\right|_{t=1}=V^{\prime}(u) u=0$ and so $t_{u}=1$. Then, by Lemma 2.4, $V(u)=V\left(t_{u} u\right) \geqslant c$ whenever $u \neq 0$ and $V^{\prime}(u) u=0$.

Remark 2.6. We note that, since by $(f 2)$ we have $p<2_{N+1}^{*}-1$, all the results stated and proved in the present sections hold unchanged for all $m \in\{1, \ldots, N+1\}$ considering the functionals

$$
V_{m}(u)=\frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)}^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{m}} F(u(x)) d x, \quad u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)
$$

In particular, denoting $c_{m}$ the mountain pass level of $V_{m}$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$, Proposition 2.3 establishes that $V_{m}$ has a positive, radially symmetric, critical point $w \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ at the level $c_{m}$.

### 2.2. Further properties of $V$ on the space of radial functions. The sublevels $\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$

From now on we reduce ourself to work on the subspace of $H^{1}$ constituted by radial functions: $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)=\{u \in$ $\left.H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) / u(x)=u(|x|)\right\}$. We recall that by the Strauss Lemma (see [29,20]) $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ is compactly embedded in $L^{q}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ for all $q \in\left(2,2_{N}^{*}\right)$. Thanks to the Strauss Lemma the functional $V$ is weakly lower semicontinuous on $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. It is indeed standard to prove the following

Lemma 2.7. Let $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ and $v_{n} \rightharpoonup v$ in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. Then

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} F\left(u_{n}\right) d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} F(u) d x \quad \text { and } \quad \lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} f\left(u_{n}\right) v_{n} d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} f(u) v d x .
$$

Hence $V(u) \leqslant \liminf _{n \rightarrow+\infty} V\left(u_{n}\right), V^{\prime}(u) u \leqslant \liminf _{n \rightarrow+\infty} V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}$ and, for every $h \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right), V^{\prime}(u) h=$ $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) h$.

For our study it is important to understand the structure of the sublevel sets $\mathcal{V}^{b}=\left\{u \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) / V(u) \leqslant b\right\}$. By definition of the mountain pass level the set $\mathcal{V}^{b}$ is not path connected for any $b \in[0, c)$. Given $b \in[0, c)$, recalling Lemma 2.4, we denote

$$
\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}=\left\{t u \mid u \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) \backslash\{0\}, t \in\left[0, \alpha_{u, b}\right]\right\} \quad \text { and } \quad \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}=\left\{t u \mid u \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) \backslash\{0\}, t \in\left[\omega_{u, b},+\infty\right)\right\} .
$$

Clearly

$$
\mathcal{V}^{b}=\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b} \cup \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}
$$

Remark 2.8. The set $\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ is clearly path connected (starshaped indeed, with respect to the origin). The same holds true also for $\mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$. Indeed, given $u_{1}, u_{2} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ such that $b \geqslant b_{1}=V\left(u_{1}\right) \geqslant b_{2}=V\left(u_{2}\right)$ we can connect them considering the path $\gamma(s)=\omega_{b_{1},(1-s) u_{1}+s u_{2}}\left((1-s) u_{1}+s u_{2}\right)$ for $s \in[0,1]$ and $\gamma(s)=s \omega_{b_{1}, u_{2}}$ for $s \in\left[1,1 / \omega_{b_{1}, u_{2}}\right]$. The function $\gamma$ is continuous since the mapping $u \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) \rightarrow \omega_{u, b} \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous for any $b<c$.

Remark 2.9. By definition of mountain pass level and Remark 2.8, if $\gamma \in C\left([0,1], H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)\right)$ is such that $\gamma(0) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ and $\gamma(1) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ then $\max _{s \in[0,1]} V(\gamma(s)) \geqslant c$. Secondly note that by Lemma 2.4

$$
\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}=\left\{u \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) / \alpha_{u, b} \geqslant 1\right\} \cup\{0\} \quad \text { and } \quad \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}=\left\{u \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) / \omega_{u, b} \leqslant 1\right\} \quad \text { for all } b \in[0, c)
$$

Moreover if $b \in(0, c)$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
u \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b} \backslash\{0\} \text { if and only if } V(u) \leqslant b \text { and } V^{\prime}(u) u>0 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, if $u \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b} \backslash\{0\}$ then $1 \leqslant \alpha_{u, b}<t_{u}$ and so, by Lemma 2.4, $V^{\prime}(u) u>0$. Vice versa if $V(u) \leqslant b$ and $V^{\prime}(u) u>0$ then $u \neq 0$ and $1 \leqslant \alpha_{u, b}$, from which $V(u) \leqslant b$. Analogously if $b \in[0, c)$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
u \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b} \text { if and only if } V(u) \leqslant b \text { and } V^{\prime}(u) u<0 \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 2.10. If $b \in[0, c)$ then $\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ are weakly closed in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$.
Proof. Let $\left(u_{n}\right) \subset \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ be such that $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u_{0}$ in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. By Remark 2.9 we have $V\left(u_{n}\right) \leqslant b$ and $V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}<0$. Since $V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}<0$, by Lemma 2.2 we deduce $\left\|u_{n}\right\| \geqslant \rho$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover since $V\left(u_{n}\right) \leqslant b$, by Lemma 2.7 we obtain $V\left(u_{0}\right) \leqslant b$. By Lemma 2.7 we know also that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} f\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n} d x \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} f\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0} d x$ and, since $V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}<0$, $V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0} \leqslant 0$. By (2.6), to prove that $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ we have to show that $V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}<0$. For that, assume by contradiction that $V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}=0$ and note that, being $V\left(u_{0}\right) \leqslant b<c$, by Remark 2.5 we have $u_{0}=0$. Then $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} f\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n} d x \rightarrow 0$ and so $0>V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}>\rho^{2}+o(1)$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$, a contradiction which shows that $\mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ is weakly closed.

Let now $\left(u_{n}\right) \subset \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ be such that $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u_{0}$ in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. Again using Remark 2.9 we have $V\left(u_{n}\right) \leqslant b$ and $V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n} \geqslant 0$. Hence, by Lemma 2.7, we deduce that $V\left(u_{0}\right) \leqslant b$. To show that $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ it suffices to show that $V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0} \geqslant 0$. Assume by contradiction that $V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}<0$. Then, by (2.6), we have $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$. Consider the path $\gamma_{n}(s)=u_{0}+s\left(u_{n}-u_{0}\right), s \in[0,1]$. Since $\gamma_{n}(0)=u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ and $\gamma_{n}(1)=u_{n} \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$, by Remark 2.9, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we find $s_{n} \in(0,1)$ such that $V\left(\gamma_{n}\left(s_{n}\right)\right) \geqslant c$. We note also that $\left\|\gamma_{n}(s)\right\|_{2} \leqslant\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{2}+\left\|u_{n}-u_{0}\right\|_{2} \leqslant C_{1}<+\infty$ and $\left\|\gamma_{n}(s)\right\|_{p+1} \leqslant\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{p+1}+\left\|u_{n}-u_{0}\right\|_{p+1} \leqslant C_{2}<+\infty$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in[0,1]$. Then, choosing $\varepsilon=\frac{c-b}{2 C_{1}^{2}}$, by (1.3) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} f\left(\gamma_{n}(s)\right)\left(u_{n}-u_{0}\right) d x\right| & \leqslant \varepsilon\left\|\gamma_{n}(s)\right\|_{2}\left\|u_{n}-u_{0}\right\|_{2}+A_{\varepsilon}\left\|\gamma_{n}(s)\right\|_{p+1}^{p}\left\|u_{n}-u_{0}\right\|_{p+1} \\
& =\frac{c-b}{2}+A_{\varepsilon} C_{2}^{p}\left\|u_{n}-u_{0}\right\|_{p+1} \quad \text { for any } s \in[0,1] .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we derive that for any $s \in[0,1]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there results

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d s} V\left(\gamma_{n}(s)\right) & =V^{\prime}\left(\gamma_{n}(s)\right)\left(u_{n}-u_{0}\right) \\
& \geqslant s\left\|u_{n}-u_{0}\right\|^{2}+\left\langle u_{0}, u_{n}-u_{0}\right\rangle-\frac{c-b}{2}-A_{\varepsilon} C_{2}^{p}\left\|u_{n}-u_{0}\right\|_{p+1}
\end{aligned}
$$

Integrating on $\left[s_{n}, 1\right]$ we get

$$
b-c \geqslant V\left(u_{n}\right)-V\left(\gamma_{n}\left(s_{n}\right)\right) \geqslant \frac{b-c}{2}+\left(1-s_{n}\right)\left(\left\langle u_{0}, u_{n}-u_{0}\right\rangle-A_{\varepsilon} C_{2}^{p}\left\|u_{n}-u_{0}\right\|_{p+1}\right) .
$$

Since $\left\langle u_{0}, u_{n}-u_{0}\right\rangle-A_{\varepsilon} C_{2}^{p}\left\|u_{n}-u_{0}\right\|_{p+1} \rightarrow 0$ we obtain the contradiction $0>b-c \geqslant \frac{b-c}{2}$.

Remark 2.11. Note that, by (2.2), if $b \in[0, c)$ and $u \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$, since $V^{\prime}(u) u \geqslant 0$, then

$$
\|u\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{2 \mu}{\mu-2} V(u) \leqslant \frac{2 \mu}{\mu-2} b .
$$

In particular we obtain that $\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ is bounded in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. Then, by Lemma 2.10, $\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ is weakly compact in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ and if $\left(u_{n}\right) \subset \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ is such that $u_{n} \rightarrow u_{0}$ with respect to the $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ metric then $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$.

Lemma 2.12. If $b \in[0, c)$ we have $\nu^{+}(b):=\inf _{u \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}} \frac{-V^{\prime}(u) u}{\max \left\{1,\|u\|_{2}^{2}\right\}}>0$.
Proof. First note that, by (2.2), if $u \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ is such that $\|u\|_{2}^{2} \geqslant \frac{4 b \mu}{\mu-2}$ or $V(u) \leqslant 0$ then $\frac{-V^{\prime}(u) u}{\|u\|_{2}^{2}} \geqslant \frac{\mu-2}{2} \frac{\|u\|^{2}}{\|u\|_{2}^{2}}-$ $\mu \frac{V(u)}{\|u\|_{2}^{2}} \geqslant \frac{\mu-2}{4}$. Assume now by contradiction that there exists $\left(u_{n}\right) \subset \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ such that $0<V\left(u_{n}\right) \leqslant b,\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{2}^{2} \leqslant \frac{4 b \mu}{\mu-2}$ and $\frac{-V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}}{\max \left\{1,\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right\}} \rightarrow 0$. Then $V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n} \rightarrow 0$. Since $u_{n} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$, by Remark 2.9 we have $t_{u_{n}}<1$. By (2.2) we have $\left\|u_{n}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{2 \mu}{\mu-2} b+o(1)$ and since, by Remark $2.5,\left\|t_{u_{n}} u_{n}\right\| \geqslant \rho$, we deduce that $t_{u_{n}} \geqslant \frac{\mu-2}{4 \mu b} \rho>0$ whenever $n$ is large. By Lemma 2.4 we have $\left|V^{\prime}\left(s u_{n}\right) s u_{n}\right| \leqslant\left|V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}\right|$ for any $s \in\left(t_{u_{n}}, 1\right)$, and we conclude $c-b \leqslant \int_{1}^{t_{u_{n}}} \frac{d}{d s} V\left(s u_{n}\right) d s=$ $\int_{1}^{t_{u_{n}}} \frac{1}{s} V^{\prime}\left(s u_{n}\right) s u_{n} d s \leqslant-\log \left(t_{u_{n}}\right)\left|V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}\right| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$, a contradiction which proves the lemma.

Lemma 2.13. If $b \in(0, c)$ then $\nu^{-}(b):=\inf _{u \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{(b+c) / 2} \backslash \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}} V^{\prime}(u) u>0$.
Proof. By contradiction, let $\left(u_{n}\right) \subset \mathcal{V}_{-}^{(b+c) / 2} \backslash \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ be such that $V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n} \rightarrow 0$. Then, by Remark 2.11, there exists $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{(b+c) / 2}$ such that, up to a subsequence, $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u_{0}$ in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. By Lemma 2.7, $V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0} \leqslant \liminf V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}=0$. Since $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{(b+c) / 2}$ that implies $u_{0}=0$ and then, again by Lemma 2.7, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} f\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n} d x \rightarrow 0$. Hence $V^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}=$ $\left\|u_{n}\right\|^{2}+o(1) \rightarrow 0$ and so $u_{n} \rightarrow 0$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ that gives the contradiction $0<b \leqslant V\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0$.

Finally, we display some properties depending on the assumption $p<1+\frac{4}{N}$.
First, as a particular case of the Gagliardo Nirenberg interpolation inequality (see [25]), we have that there exists a constant $\kappa=\kappa(N, p)>0$ such that for any $u \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$, there results

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{p+1} \leqslant \kappa\|u\|_{2}^{\theta}\|\nabla u\|_{2}^{1-\theta}, \quad \text { where } 1-\theta=\frac{N}{2} \frac{p-1}{p+1} . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, note that, by (1.4), we have $F(t) \leqslant \frac{1}{4}|t|^{2}+\frac{A_{1 / 2}}{p+1}|t|^{p+1}$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, if $u \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) \backslash\{0\}$, by (2.7) there results

$$
\begin{equation*}
V(u) \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla u\|_{2}^{2}\left(1-\frac{2 \kappa_{G N} A_{1 / 2}}{p+1} \frac{\|u\|_{2}^{(p+1) \theta}}{\|\nabla u\|_{2}^{2-(p+1)(1-\theta)}}\right)+\frac{1}{4}\|u\|_{2}^{2}, \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, since $p<1+\frac{4}{N}$, by ( $f 2$ ), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
(p+1)(1-\theta)=\frac{N}{2}(p-1)<2 . \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (2.8) and (2.9) it follows directly
Lemma 2.14. If $\left(u_{n}\right) \subset H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right), \sup _{n \in \mathbb{N}}\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{2}<+\infty$ and $\left\|\nabla u_{n}\right\|_{2} \rightarrow+\infty$ then $V\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow+\infty$.
In particular $\mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ enjoys the following property.
Lemma 2.15. If $b \in[0, c)$, for any $M_{1}>0$ there exists $M_{2}>0$ such that if $u \subset \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ and $\|u\|_{2} \leqslant M_{1}$ then $\|\nabla u\|_{2} \leqslant M_{2}$.

Remark 2.16. Note that by Lemma 2.15 and Lemma 2.10 we derive that if $\left(u_{n}\right) \subset \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ is such that $u_{n} \rightarrow u_{0}$ with respect to the $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ metric then $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$.

Another consequence is the following one
Lemma 2.17. For any $b_{1}, b_{2} \in[0, c)$ there result $\delta\left(b_{1}, b_{2}\right):=\operatorname{dist}\left(\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b_{1}}, \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b_{2}}\right)>0$.
Proof. Clearly $\delta\left(b_{1}, b_{2}\right)<+\infty$. Let $\left(u_{n, 1}\right) \subset \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b_{1}}$ and $\left(u_{n, 2}\right) \subset \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b_{2}}$ be such that $\left\|u_{n, 1}-u_{n, 2}\right\|_{2} \rightarrow \delta\left(b_{1}, b_{2}\right)$. By Remark 2.11 we know that $\left\|u_{n, 1}\right\| \leqslant \frac{2 \mu}{\mu-2} b_{1}$ and hence we obtain $\left\|u_{n, 2}\right\|_{2} \leqslant \frac{2 \mu}{\mu-2} b_{1}+\delta\left(b_{1}, b_{2}\right)+o(1)$. Then $\left(u_{n, 2}\right)$ is bounded in $L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$. By Lemma 2.14, since $V\left(u_{n, 2}\right) \leqslant b_{2}$, we obtain that $\sup _{n \in \mathbb{N}}\left\|\nabla u_{n, 2}\right\|_{2}<+\infty$ and so that $\left(u_{n, 2}\right)$ is bounded also in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. Then there exist two subsequences $\left(u_{n_{j}, 1}\right) \subset\left(u_{n, 1}\right),\left(u_{n_{j}, 2}\right) \subset\left(u_{n, 2}\right)$ which weakly converge respectively to $u_{1} \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ and $u_{2} \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. By Lemma 2.10 we have $u_{1} \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b_{1}}$ and $u_{2} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b_{2}}$ and by the weak semicontinuity of the $L^{2}$ norm we deduce $\delta\left(b_{1}, b_{2}\right) \leqslant\left\|u_{1}-u_{2}\right\|_{2} \leqslant \lim _{j \rightarrow+\infty}\left\|u_{n_{j}, 1}-u_{n_{j}, 2}\right\|_{2}=\delta\left(b_{1}, b_{2}\right)$. Since $u_{1} \neq u_{2}$ we have $\delta\left(b_{1}, b_{2}\right)=\left\|u_{1}-u_{2}\right\|_{2}>0$ and the lemma follows.

As a further consequence of the assumption $p<1+4 / N$, we give a result concerning the behaviour of $V$ along sequences in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ which converge to a point $u_{0} \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ with respect to the $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ metric.

Lemma 2.18. Let $u_{n}, u_{0} \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ be such that $\left\|u_{n}-u_{0}\right\|_{2} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$ and $\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\nabla\left(u_{n}-u_{0}\right)\right\|_{2}>0$. Then there exists $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
V\left(u_{n}\right)-V\left(u_{0}+s\left(u_{n}-u_{0}\right)\right) \geqslant \frac{1}{4}(1-s)\left\|\nabla\left(u_{n}-u_{0}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}, \quad \forall s \in[0,1], n \geqslant \bar{n} .
$$

Proof. Setting $w_{n}=u_{n}-u_{0}$, by (1.3), since $w_{n} \rightarrow 0$ in $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ we recover that there exists $C>0$ such that, for any $s \in[0,1]$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\mid \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} F\left(u_{0}+w_{n}\right)-F\left(u_{0}+s w_{n}\right)\right) d x \mid \\
& \quad=\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \int_{s}^{1} f\left(u_{0}+\sigma w_{n}\right) w_{n} d \sigma d x\right| \\
& \quad \leqslant \int_{s}^{1}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{2}\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{2}+\sigma\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}+A_{1} 2^{p-1}\left(\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{p+1}^{p}\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{p+1}+\sigma^{p}\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{p+1}^{p+1}\right) d \sigma \\
& \quad \leqslant C(1-s)\left(o(1)+\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{p+1}+\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{p+1}^{p+1}\right) \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow+\infty . \tag{2.10}
\end{align*}
$$

We now note that, since $\liminf _{n \rightarrow+\infty}\left\|\nabla w_{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}>0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{\left\langle\nabla u_{0}, \nabla w_{n}\right\rangle_{2}}{\left\|\nabla w_{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}}=0 \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, (2.11) is true along subsequences $\left(w_{n_{j}}\right)$ such that $\left\|\nabla w_{n_{j}}\right\|_{2} \rightarrow+\infty$. If $\left(w_{n_{j}}\right) \subset\left\{w_{n}\right\}$ is bounded in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ then, necessarily, $w_{n_{j}} \rightharpoonup 0$ in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ and again (2.11) follows.

Secondly we note that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{p+1}+\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{p+1}^{p+1}}{\left\|\nabla w_{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}}=0 \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, we have either $\left\|\nabla w_{n}\right\|_{2}$ is bounded or $\lim _{\sup _{n \rightarrow+\infty}}\left\|\nabla w_{n}\right\|_{2}=+\infty$. If $\left\|\nabla w_{n}\right\|_{2}$ is bounded then $\left(w_{n}\right)$ weakly converges to 0 in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ and so strongly in $L^{p+1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ giving (2.12). If $\left\|\nabla w_{n}\right\|_{2} \rightarrow+\infty$ along a subsequence, then, since $\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{2} \rightarrow 0$, (2.12) follows by (2.7) and (2.9).

Finally, by (2.10), we derive that for any $s \in[0,1]$

$$
\begin{aligned}
V\left(u_{0}+w_{n}\right)-V\left(u_{0}+s w_{n}\right)= & \frac{\left\|\nabla w_{n}\right\|^{2}}{2}\left(1-s^{2}\right)+(1-s)\left\langle\nabla u_{0}, \nabla w_{n}\right\rangle_{2}+(1-s) o(1) \\
& -\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} F\left(u_{0}+w_{n}\right)-F\left(u_{0}+s w_{n}\right) d x \\
\geqslant & \left\|\nabla w_{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}(1-s)\left(\frac{1+s}{2}+\frac{\left\langle\nabla u_{0}, \nabla w_{n}\right\rangle_{2}}{\left\|\nabla w_{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}}-C \frac{\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{p+1}+\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{p+1}^{p+1}+o(1)}{\left\|\nabla w_{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}}\right) \\
\geqslant & \left\|\nabla w_{n}\right\|_{2}^{2}(1-s)\left(\frac{1}{2}+o(1)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and the lemma follows by (2.11) and (2.12).
Remark 2.19. By Lemma 2.18 we have in particular that if $u_{n}, u_{0} \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right), s_{n} \in[0,1]$ are such that $u_{n} \rightarrow u_{0}$ in $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$ and $V\left(u_{n}\right)-V\left(u_{0}+s_{n}\left(u_{n}-u_{0}\right)\right) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$, then $\left(1-s_{n}\right)\left\|u_{n}-u_{0}\right\|^{2} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$. In particular, if $V\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow V\left(u_{0}\right)$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$, then $u_{n} \rightarrow u_{0}$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$.

## 3. Solutions on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$

In the sequel we denote $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ where $x=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$, the gradient with respect to the $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ will be denoted by $\nabla_{x}$. For $\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right) \subset \mathbb{R}$ we set $S_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}:=\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)$ and, more simply, $S_{L}:=S_{[-L, L]}$ for $L>0$. We denote by $\mathcal{X}$ the set of monotone decreasing radially symmetric functions in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ :

$$
\mathcal{X}=\left\{u \in H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) \mid u\left(x_{1}\right) \geqslant u\left(x_{2}\right) \text { for any } x_{1}, x_{2} \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \text { such that }\left|x_{1}\right| \leqslant\left|x_{2}\right|\right\} .
$$

Note that $\mathcal{X}$ is a positive cone in $H_{r}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ (and so convex) and it is sequentially closed in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ with respect to the weak topology. In the following, with abuse of notation, given $b \in[0, c)$ we will indicate $\mathcal{V}_{ \pm}^{b} \equiv \mathcal{V}_{ \pm}^{b} \cap \mathcal{X}$.

We consider the set

$$
\mathcal{H}=\left\{v \in \cap_{L>0} H^{1}\left(S_{L}\right) / v(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{X} \text { for a.e. } y \in \mathbb{R}\right\} .
$$

Note that, by the Fubini Theorem, we have that if $v \in \mathcal{H}$ then $v(x, \cdot) \in H_{l o c}^{1}(\mathbb{R})$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$. Therefore, if $\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right) \subset \mathbb{R}$ then $v\left(x, y_{2}\right)-v\left(x, y_{1}\right)=\int_{y_{1}}^{y_{2}} \partial_{y} v(x, y) d y$ holds for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ and so

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}\left|v\left(x, y_{2}\right)-v\left(x, y_{1}\right)\right|^{2} d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}\left|\int_{y_{1}}^{y_{2}} \partial_{y} u(x, y) d y\right|^{2} d x \leqslant\left|y_{2}-y_{1}\right| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \int_{y_{1}}^{y_{2}}\left|\partial_{y} v(x, y)\right|^{2} d y d x
$$

According to that, if $v \in \mathcal{H}$, the function $y \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto u(\cdot, y) \in L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$, defines a continuous trajectory verifying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|v\left(\cdot, y_{2}\right)-v\left(\cdot, y_{1}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2} \leqslant\left\|\partial_{y} v\right\|_{L^{2}\left(S\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)\right)}^{2}\left|y_{2}-y_{1}\right|, \quad \forall\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right) \subset \mathbb{R} . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the sequel we will consider the functional $V$ as extended on $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ in the following way

$$
V(u)= \begin{cases}V(u) & \text { if } u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right), \\ +\infty & \text { if } u \in L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) \backslash H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right) .\end{cases}
$$

Lemma 3.1. If $v \in \mathcal{H}$ then the function $y \in \mathbb{R} \rightarrow V(v(\cdot, y)) \in \mathbb{R} \cup\{+\infty\}$ is lower semicontinuous.
Proof. Let $v \in \mathcal{H}$ and $y_{n} \rightarrow y_{0}$ and let $\left(y_{n_{j}}\right) \subset\left(y_{n}\right)$ be such that $\liminf _{n \rightarrow+\infty} V\left(v\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right)=\lim _{j \rightarrow+\infty} V\left(v\left(\cdot, y_{n_{j}}\right)\right)$. By (3.1) we have $v\left(\cdot, y_{n_{j}}\right) \rightarrow v\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)$ in $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ as $j \rightarrow+\infty$. We consider the two following alternative cases:
(a) $\sup _{j \in \mathbb{N}}\left\|v\left(\cdot, y_{n_{j}}\right)\right\|<+\infty$ or
(b) $\limsup _{j \rightarrow+\infty}\left\|v\left(\cdot, y_{n_{j}}\right)\right\|=+\infty$.

In the case (a), since $\left(v\left(\cdot, y_{n_{j}}\right)\right)$ is bounded in $\mathcal{X}$ and $v\left(\cdot, y_{n_{j}}\right) \rightarrow v\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)$ in $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$, we deduce that $v\left(\cdot, y_{n_{j}}\right) \rightarrow$ $v\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)$ in $\mathcal{X}$. Then by Lemma 2.7 we derive $\lim _{j \rightarrow+\infty} V\left(v\left(\cdot, y_{n_{j}}\right)\right) \geqslant V\left(v\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)\right)$. In the case (b) we have $\limsup _{j \rightarrow+\infty}\left\|\nabla v\left(\cdot, y_{n_{j}}\right)\right\|_{2}=+\infty$ since $\left\|v\left(\cdot, y_{n_{j}}\right)\right\|_{2}$ is bounded. Then, by Lemma 2.14, we get $\lim _{j \rightarrow+\infty} V(v(\cdot$, $\left.\left.y_{n_{j}}\right)\right)=\lim \sup _{j \rightarrow+\infty} V\left(v\left(\cdot, y_{n_{j}}\right)\right)=+\infty$, showing that also in the case (b) there results $\lim _{j \rightarrow+\infty} V\left(v\left(\cdot, y_{n_{j}}\right)\right) \geqslant$ $V\left(v\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)\right)$.

Lemma 3.2. If $v \in \mathcal{H}$ is a solution of ( E$)$ on $S_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}$ then the energy function $E_{v}(y)=\frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}-V(v(\cdot, y))$ is constant on ( $y_{1}, y_{2}$ ).

Proof. Since $v \in \mathcal{H}$ we have that $v \in H^{1}\left(S_{L}\right)$ for any $L>0$. Then, since $v$ solves (E) on $S_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}$ by regularity we have $v \in H^{2}\left(S_{\left(\zeta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right)}\right) \cap C^{2}\left(S_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}\right)$ for any $\left[\zeta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right] \subset\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)$. Hence $v(\cdot, y) \in H^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right) \cap C^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ for all $y \in\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)$ and so $\int_{|x|=R}|v(x, y)|+\left|\nabla_{x} v(x, y)\right| d \sigma \rightarrow 0$ as $R \rightarrow+\infty$ for all $y \in\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)$. Denoting $\operatorname{div}_{x} w=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \partial_{x_{i}} w$, we derive

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \operatorname{div}_{x}\left[\partial_{y} v \nabla_{x} v\right] d x=\lim _{R \rightarrow+\infty} \int_{|x| \leqslant R} \operatorname{div}_{x}\left[\partial_{y} v \nabla_{x} v\right] d x=\lim _{R \rightarrow+\infty} \int_{|x|=R} \partial_{y} v \nabla_{x} v \cdot \frac{x}{|x|} d \sigma=0 .
$$

Therefore, multiplying (E) by $\partial_{y} v$ and integrating over $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ with respect to $x$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & =\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}-\partial_{y}^{2} v \partial_{y} v-\Delta_{x} v \partial_{y} v+v \partial_{y} v-f(v) \partial_{y} v d x \\
& =\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}-\frac{1}{2} \partial_{y}\left|\partial_{y} v\right|^{2}-\operatorname{div}_{x}\left[\partial_{y} v \nabla_{x} v\right]+\frac{1}{2} \partial_{y}\left|\nabla_{x} v\right|^{2}+\partial_{y}\left(\frac{1}{2}|v|^{2}-F(v)\right) d x \\
& =\partial_{y}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}-\frac{1}{2}\left|\partial_{y} v\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left|\nabla_{x} v\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{2}|v|^{2}-F(v) d x\right] \\
& =\partial_{y}\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}+V(v(\cdot, y))\right]=-\partial_{y} E_{v}(y)
\end{aligned}
$$

and the lemma follows.

### 3.1. The variational setting

Fixed $b \in[0, c)$ we consider the space

$$
\mathcal{X}_{b}=\left\{v \in \mathcal{H} / \liminf _{y \rightarrow \pm \infty} \operatorname{dist}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{ \pm}^{b}\right)=0 \text { and } \inf _{y \in \mathbb{R}} V(v(\cdot, y)) \geqslant b\right\}
$$

on which we look for minima of the functional

$$
\varphi(v)=\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}+(V(v(\cdot, y))-b) d y .
$$

Remark 3.3. The problem of finding a minimum of $\varphi$ on $\mathcal{X}_{b}$ is well posed. In fact, if $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b}$ then $V(v(\cdot, y)) \geqslant b$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and so the functional $\varphi$ is well defined and non-negative on $\mathcal{X}_{b}$. Moreover $\mathcal{X}_{b} \neq \emptyset$ and

$$
m_{b}=\inf _{v \in \mathcal{X}_{b}} \varphi(v)<+\infty .
$$

Indeed, for any $u \in \mathcal{X}$, recalling Lemma 2.4 and considered the function

$$
v(x, y)= \begin{cases}\omega_{b, u} u(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}, y \geqslant \omega_{b, u}, \\ y u(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}, \alpha_{u, b}<y<\omega_{b, u}, \\ \alpha_{u, b} u(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}, y<\alpha_{u, b},\end{cases}
$$

we have that $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b}$ and $\varphi(v)=\int_{\alpha_{u, b}}^{\omega_{u, b}} \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{2}^{2}+V(y u)-b d y \leqslant\left(\frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{2}^{2}+V\left(t_{u} u\right)-b\right)\left(\omega_{u, b}-\alpha_{u, b}\right)<+\infty$.

Remark 3.4. More generally, given an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ we consider the functional

$$
\varphi_{I}(v)=\int_{I} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}+V(v(\cdot, y))-b d y
$$

which is well defined for any $v \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $V(v(\cdot, y)) \geqslant b$ for a.e. $y \in I$ or for every $v \in \mathcal{H}$ if $I$ is bounded.
We will make use of the following semicontinuity property
Lemma 3.5. Let $v \in \mathcal{H}$ be such that $V(v(\cdot, y)) \geqslant$ b for a.e. $y \in I \subset \mathbb{R}$. If $\left(v_{n}\right) \subset \mathcal{X}_{b}$ is such that $v_{n} \rightharpoonup v$ in $H^{1}\left(S_{L}\right)$ for any $L>0$, then $\varphi_{I}(v) \leqslant \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{I}\left(v_{n}\right)$.

Proof. Let $L_{1}<L_{2} \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\left(L_{1}, L_{2}\right) \subset I$. The sequence $\left(v_{n}\right)$ is weakly convergent to $v$ in $H^{1}\left(S_{\left(L_{1}, L_{2}\right)}\right)$ and constituted by radially symmetric functions in the $x$ variable. By Lemma III. 2 in [20] we derive that $v_{n} \rightarrow v$ strongly in $L^{p+1}\left(S_{\left(L_{1}, L_{2}\right)}\right)$. Then, by (1.3), we deduce $\int_{S_{\left(L_{1}, L_{2}\right)}} F\left(v_{n}\right) d x d y \rightarrow \int_{S_{\left(L_{1}, L_{2}\right)}} F(v) d x d y$ and the lemma follows by the weak semicontinuity of the norm and the arbitrariness of $L_{1}$ and $L_{2}$.

Remark 3.6. In the sequel we will study coerciveness properties of $\varphi$. One of the key tools is the following simple estimate. Given $v \in \mathcal{H}$, and $\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right) \subset \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}(v) & =\frac{1}{2} \int_{y_{1}}^{y_{2}}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2} d y+\int_{y_{1}}^{y_{2}} V(v(\cdot, y))-b d y \\
& \geqslant \frac{1}{2\left(y_{2}-y_{1}\right)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}}\left(\int_{y_{1}}^{y_{2}}\left|\partial_{y} v(x, y)\right| d y\right)^{2} d x+\int_{y_{1}}^{y_{2}} V(v(\cdot, y))-b d y \\
& \geqslant \frac{1}{2\left(y_{2}-y_{1}\right)}\left\|v\left(\cdot, y_{1}\right)-v\left(\cdot, y_{2}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\int_{y_{1}}^{y_{2}} V(v(\cdot, y))-b d y
\end{aligned}
$$

In particular if $V(v(\cdot, y)) \geqslant b+v$ for any $y \in\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}(v) \geqslant \frac{1}{2\left(y_{2}-y_{1}\right)}\left\|v\left(\cdot, y_{1}\right)-v\left(\cdot, y_{2}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}+v\left(y_{2}-y_{1}\right) \geqslant \sqrt{2 v}\left\|v\left(\cdot, y_{1}\right)-v\left(\cdot, y_{2}\right)\right\|_{2} . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 3.7. In the sequel we will denote

$$
\delta_{0}=\delta((b+c) / 2,(b+c) / 2):=\operatorname{dist}\left(\mathcal{V}_{-}^{(b+c) / 2}, \mathcal{V}_{+}^{(b+c) / 2}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad r_{0}=\frac{\delta_{0}}{5} .
$$

By (3.2) we can plainly prove that $m_{b}>0$. Indeed, note that if $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b}$, since by Lemma 2.17 we have $\delta_{0}>0$, by (3.1), there exist $y_{1}<y_{2} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\left\|v\left(\cdot, y_{1}\right)-v\left(\cdot, y_{2}\right)\right\| \geqslant \delta_{0}$ and $V(v(\cdot, y))>(b+c) / 2$ for any $y \in\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)$. Then, by (3.2) we obtain $\varphi_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}(u) \geqslant \sqrt{c-b} \delta_{0}>0$. In particular

$$
m_{b} \geqslant \sqrt{c-b} \delta_{0}
$$

One of the basic properties defining $\mathcal{X}_{b}$ is the fact that if $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b}$ then $V(v(\cdot, y)) \geqslant b$ for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}$. This condition is not necessarily preserved by the weak $H_{l o c}^{1}$ convergence and we overcome this point by using the following lemma, whose proof can be obtained by rephrasing in the present context the one of Lemma 3.4 in [5].

Lemma 3.8. Let $v \in \mathcal{H}$ and $-\infty \leqslant \sigma<\tau \leqslant+\infty$ be such that
(i) $V(v(\cdot, y))>b$ for any $y \in(\sigma, \tau)$;
(ii) either $\sigma=-\infty$ and $\liminf _{y \rightarrow-\infty} \operatorname{dist}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}\right)=0$ or $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v(\cdot, \sigma) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$;
(iii) either $\tau=+\infty$ and $\liminf _{y \rightarrow+\infty} \operatorname{dist}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}\right)=0$ or $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v(\cdot, \tau) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$
then $\varphi_{(\sigma, \tau)}(v) \geqslant m_{b}$. Moreover if $\liminf _{y \rightarrow \sigma^{+}} V(v(\cdot, y))>b$ or $\liminf _{y \rightarrow \tau^{-}} V(v(\cdot, y))>b$ then $\varphi_{(\sigma, \tau)}(v)>m_{b}$.

### 3.2. Estimates near the boundary of $\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$

To study coercivity property of $\varphi$ we first establish some technical local results. We define the constants (depending on $b$ )

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta=b+\frac{c-b}{4}, \quad \text { and } \quad \Lambda_{0}=\sqrt{\frac{c-b}{2}} \frac{r_{0}}{4} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\delta_{0}$ and $r_{0}$ are defined in Remark 3.7, noting that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{dist}\left(\mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}, \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}\right) \geqslant \operatorname{dist}\left(\mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}, \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta}\right) \geqslant 5 r_{0} \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Given $u_{0} \in \mathcal{X}$ we denote

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{-}=\left\{v \in \mathcal{H} / v(\cdot, 0)=u_{0}, \inf _{(-\infty, 0)} V(v(\cdot, y)) \geqslant b, \liminf _{y \rightarrow-\infty} \operatorname{dist}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}\right)=0\right\}, \\
& \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}=\left\{v \in \mathcal{H} / v(\cdot, 0)=u_{0}, \inf _{(0,+\infty)} V(v(\cdot, y)) \geqslant b, \liminf _{y \rightarrow+\infty} \operatorname{dist}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}\right)=0\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Next lemma establishes that if $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}\left(\right.$resp. $\left.\mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{-}\right)$is such that $\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(v)$ (resp. $\varphi_{(-\infty, 0)}(v)$ ) is sufficiently small, then the trajectory $y \rightarrow v(\cdot, y)$ remains close to the set $\mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta}$ (resp. $\mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}$ ) with respect to the $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ metric.

Lemma 3.9. If $u_{0} \in \mathcal{X}, V\left(u_{0}\right) \geqslant b, v \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}\left(\right.$resp. $\left.v \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{-}\right)$and $\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(v) \leqslant \Lambda_{0}\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.\varphi_{(-\infty, 0)}(v) \leqslant \Lambda_{0}\right)$ then $\operatorname{dist}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta}\right) \leqslant r_{0}$ for every $y \in[0,+\infty)\left(r e s p . \operatorname{dist}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta}\right) \leqslant r_{0}\right.$ for every $\left.y \in(-\infty, 0]\right)$.

Proof. By (3.1) the function $y \in[0,+\infty) \mapsto v(\cdot, y) \in L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ is continuous. Hence, using Remark 2.16, the map $y \in$ $[0,+\infty) \mapsto \operatorname{dist}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta}\right)$ is continuous too. If, by contradiction, $y_{0} \geqslant 0$ is such that $\operatorname{dist}\left(v\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta}\right)>r_{0}$, since $\liminf _{y \rightarrow+\infty} \operatorname{dist}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}\right)=0$, by continuity there exists an interval $\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right) \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $0<\operatorname{dist}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta}\right)<$ $r_{0}$ for any $y \in\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)$ and $\left\|v\left(\cdot, y_{1}\right)-v\left(\cdot, y_{2}\right)\right\|_{2} \geqslant r_{0} / 2$. By (3.4) we derive $v(\cdot, y) \notin \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta} \cup \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}$ and so $V(v(\cdot, y))-b \geqslant$ $\beta-b=(c-b) / 4$ for all $y \in\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)$. By (3.2) we conclude

$$
\Lambda_{0} \geqslant \varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(v) \geqslant \varphi_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}(v) \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{c-b}{2}}\left\|v\left(\cdot, y_{1}\right)-v\left(\cdot, y_{2}\right)\right\|_{2} \geqslant \sqrt{\frac{c-b}{2}} \frac{r_{0}}{2}=2 \Lambda_{0}
$$

a contradiction which proves the lemma. Analogous is the proof in the case $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{-}$.
Clearly the infimum value of $\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}$ on $\mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}$is close to 0 as $\operatorname{dist}\left(u_{0}, \mathcal{V}^{b}\right)$ is small. Next result displays a test function $w_{u_{0}}^{+} \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}$which gives us more precise information.

Lemma 3.10. Let $b \in[0, c)$, then there exists $C_{+}(b)>0$ such that for every $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta} \backslash \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ there exists $w_{u_{0}}^{+} \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}$ such that

$$
\sup _{y>0}\left\|w_{u_{0}}^{+}(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2} \leqslant \frac{1}{v^{+}(\beta)}\left(V\left(u_{0}\right)-b\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \varphi_{(0,+\infty)}\left(w_{u_{0}}^{+}\right) \leqslant C_{+}(b)\left(V\left(u_{0}\right)-b\right)^{3 / 2}
$$

Proof. Note that, since $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta}$, by Lemma 2.4, we have $V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}<0$ and there exists a unique $s_{0} \in(1,+\infty)$ such that $V\left(s u_{0}\right)>b$ for any $s \in\left[1, s_{0}\right)$ and $V\left(s_{0} u_{0}\right)=b$. Moreover $\frac{d}{d s} V\left(s u_{0}\right)=s\left(V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} f\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}-\right.$ $\left.\frac{1}{s} f\left(s u_{0}\right) u_{0} d x\right)$ and since, by $(1.6), \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} f\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}-\frac{1}{s} f\left(s u_{0}\right) u_{0} d x \leqslant 0$ for any $s \geqslant 1$, we deduce that $\frac{d}{d s} V\left(s u_{0}\right) \leqslant$
$s V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}$ for any $s \geqslant 1$. Integrating this last inequality on the interval $\left[1, s_{0}\right]$, we obtain $V\left(s_{0} u_{0}\right) \leqslant V\left(u_{0}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(s_{0}^{2}-\right.$ 1) $V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}$ and so the estimate $s_{0}-1 \leqslant \frac{V\left(u_{0}\right)-b}{\left|V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}\right|}$. We define

$$
w_{u_{0}}^{+}(x, y)= \begin{cases}u_{0}(x) & y \leqslant 0 \\ \left(1+\frac{y^{2}}{2}\right) u_{0} & y \in\left(0, \sqrt{2\left(s_{0}-1\right)}\right) \\ s_{0} u_{0} & y \geqslant \sqrt{2\left(s_{0}-1\right)}\end{cases}
$$

noting that $w_{u_{0}}^{+} \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}$and $\sup _{y \geqslant 0}\left\|w_{u_{0}}^{+}(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2}=\left(s_{0}-1\right)\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{2} \leqslant \frac{V\left(u_{0}\right)-b}{\left|V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}\right|}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{2}$. Moreover, since $s_{0}-1 \leqslant$ $\frac{V\left(u_{0}\right)-b}{\left|V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}\right|}$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{(-\infty, 0)}\left(w_{u_{0}}^{+}\right) & =\int_{0}^{\sqrt{2\left(s_{0}-1\right)}} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y}\left(1+\frac{y^{2}}{2}\right) u_{0}(\cdot)\right\|_{2}^{2} d y+\int_{0}^{\sqrt{2\left(s_{0}-1\right)}} V\left(\left(1+\frac{y^{2}}{2}\right) u_{0}(\cdot)\right)-b d y \\
& \leqslant \int_{0}^{\sqrt{2\left(s_{0}-1\right)}} \frac{1}{2} y^{2}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2} d y+\int_{0}^{\sqrt{2\left(s_{0}-1\right)}} V\left(u_{0}\right)-b d y \\
& =\sqrt{2\left(s_{0}-1\right)}\left(\frac{\left(s_{0}-1\right)}{3}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left(V\left(u_{0}\right)-b\right)\right) \\
& \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{2}{\left|V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}\right|}}\left(\frac{1}{3\left|V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}\right|}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2}+1\right)\left(V\left(u_{0}\right)-b\right)^{3 / 2}
\end{aligned}
$$

By Lemma 2.12 we know that $\left|V^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right) u_{0}\right| \geqslant \nu^{+}(\beta) \max \left\{1,\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right\}$ and the lemma follows considering $C_{+}(b)=$ $\sqrt{\frac{2}{v^{+}(\beta)}}\left(\frac{1}{3 v^{+}(\beta)}+1\right)$.

For any $b \in[0, c)$ we fix $\beta_{+} \in(b, \beta]$ such that the following inequalities hold true:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\beta_{+}-b}{v^{+}(\beta)}<\frac{1}{2}, \quad \max \left\{1, C_{+}(b)\right\}\left(\beta_{+}-b\right)^{1 / 4}<\frac{1}{4}, \quad C_{+}(b)\left(\beta_{+}-b\right)^{3 / 2} \leqslant \Lambda_{0} . \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next Gronwall type result will play an important role together with Lemma 3.10.
Lemma 3.11. Assume that $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta_{+}} \backslash \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ and $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}$are such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { if } y \in[0,1) \text { is such that } V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y)) \leqslant \beta_{+} \text {then } \varphi_{(y,+\infty)}(\bar{v}) \leqslant C_{+}(b)(V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))-b)^{3 / 2} . \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then there exists $\bar{y} \in(0,1)$ such that $V(v(\cdot, \bar{y}))=b, v(\cdot, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ and $v(\cdot, y)=v(\cdot, \bar{y})$ for every $y \in[\bar{y},+\infty)$.
Proof. We first note that, since $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta_{+}} \backslash \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ and $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}$we have $V(v(\cdot, 0))=V\left(u_{0}\right) \leqslant \beta_{+}$and hence, by (3.6) and (3.5), we have $\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(v) \leqslant C_{+}(b)\left(V\left(u_{0}\right)-b\right)^{3 / 2} \leqslant \Lambda_{0}$. By Lemma 3.9 we then deduce that $\operatorname{dist}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta}\right) \leqslant$ $r_{0}$ for any $y>0$ and, by the definition of $r_{0}$, we obtain that $v(\cdot, y) \notin \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta_{+}}$for any $y>0$. In particular, if $y>0$ and $V(v(\cdot, y)) \leqslant \beta_{+}$then $v(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta_{+}}$.

We claim that there exists a sequence $\left(\zeta_{n}\right) \subset\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta_{n-1}<\zeta_{n} \leqslant \zeta_{n-1}+\left(\frac{\beta_{+}-b}{4^{2(n-1)}}\right)^{1 / 4}<\frac{1}{2} \quad \text { and } \quad V\left(v\left(\cdot, \zeta_{n}\right)\right)-b \leqslant \frac{\beta_{+}-b}{4^{n}}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N} . \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, defining $\zeta_{0}=0$ by (3.5) and (3.6) we have that for any $\zeta>\zeta_{0}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\zeta_{0}}^{\zeta} V(v(\cdot, s))-b d s & \leqslant \varphi_{\left(\zeta_{0},+\infty\right)}(v) \leqslant C_{+}(b)\left(V\left(v\left(\cdot, \zeta_{0}\right)\right)-b\right)^{3 / 2} \\
& \leqslant C_{+}(b)\left(\beta_{+}-b\right)^{1 / 4}\left(\beta_{+}-b\right)\left(\beta_{+}-b\right)^{1 / 4} \leqslant \frac{1}{4}\left(\beta_{+}-b\right)\left(\beta_{+}-b\right)^{1 / 4}
\end{aligned}
$$

and so

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exists \zeta_{1} \in\left(\zeta_{0}, \zeta_{0}+\left(\beta_{+}-b\right)^{1 / 4}\right) \quad \text { such that } V\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, \zeta_{1}\right)\right)-b \leqslant \frac{\beta_{+}-b}{4} . \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that, by $(3.5), \zeta_{0}+\left(\beta_{+}-b\right)^{1 / 4}<\zeta_{0}+\frac{1}{4}<\frac{1}{2}$ and so $\zeta_{1} \in\left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$.
Now, if $\zeta_{n}$ verifies (3.7) by (3.6) we obtain that for any $\zeta>\zeta_{n}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\zeta_{n}}^{\zeta} V(v(\cdot, s))-b d s & \leqslant \varphi_{\left(\zeta_{n},+\infty\right)}(v) \leqslant C_{+}(b)\left(V\left(v\left(\cdot, \zeta_{n}\right)\right)-b\right)^{3 / 2} \\
& \leqslant C_{+}(b)\left(\beta_{+}-b\right)^{1 / 4}\left(\frac{\beta_{+}-b}{4^{n}}\right)\left(\frac{\beta_{+}-b}{4^{2 n}}\right)^{1 / 4}<\frac{\beta_{+}-b}{4^{n+1}}\left(\frac{\beta_{+}-b}{4^{2 n}}\right)^{1 / 4}
\end{aligned}
$$

implying that

$$
\exists \zeta_{n+1} \in\left(\zeta_{n}, \zeta_{n}+\left(\frac{\beta_{+}-b}{4^{2 n}}\right)^{1 / 4}\right) \text { such that } V\left(v\left(\cdot, \zeta_{n+1}\right)\right)-b \leqslant \frac{\beta_{+}-b}{4^{n+1}}
$$

with, by (3.5),

$$
\zeta_{n+1}<\sum_{j=0}^{n}\left(\frac{\beta_{+}-b}{4^{2 j}}\right)^{1 / 4}=\left(\beta_{+}-b\right)^{1 / 4} \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2^{j}}<\frac{1}{2} .
$$

Then, by induction, (3.7) holds true for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
Now, note that by (3.7) we have $\zeta_{n} \rightarrow \bar{y} \in\left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$. Moreover, since $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}$ there result $V\left(v\left(\cdot, \zeta_{n}\right)\right) \geqslant b$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and hence, by $(3.7), V\left(v\left(\cdot, \zeta_{n}\right)\right) \rightarrow b$. Then, by Lemma 3.1, we deduce $V(v(\cdot, \bar{y}))=b$. Moreover, by (3.1), $v\left(\cdot, \zeta_{n}\right) \rightarrow v(\cdot, \bar{y})$ in $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. Then we can conclude that $v(\cdot, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ and hence, using (3.6), that $\varphi_{(\bar{y},+\infty)}(v) \leqslant C_{+}(b)(V(v(\cdot, \bar{y}))-b)^{3 / 2}=0$, which implies $v(\cdot, y)=v(\cdot, \bar{y})$ for every $y \geqslant \bar{y}$.

Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.10 have in particular the following consequence which will be a key tool in constructing minimizing sequences for $\varphi$ with suitable compactness properties.

Lemma 3.12. Let $b \in[0, c)$ then, for every $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta_{+}} \backslash \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ and $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}$there exists $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}$such that

$$
\sup _{y \in(0,+\infty)}\left\|\tilde{v}(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2} \leqslant 1 \quad \text { and } \quad \varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(\tilde{v}) \leqslant \min \left\{\Lambda_{0}, \varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(v)\right\} .
$$

Proof. Note that, by Lemma 3.10 and (3.5), we have in that if $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta+} \backslash \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ then $\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}\left(w_{u_{0}}^{+}\right) \leqslant \Lambda_{0}$ and $\left\|w_{u_{0}}^{+}(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\| \leqslant \frac{1}{2}$ for any $y>0$. In particular if $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta_{+}} \backslash \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ and $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}$are such that $\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(v)>\Lambda_{0}$ then the statement of the lemma holds true with $\tilde{v}=w_{u_{0}}^{+}$.

To prove the lemma we argue by contradiction assuming that there exist $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta_{+}} \backslash \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ and $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}$with $\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(v) \leqslant \Lambda_{0}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(\tilde{v})>\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(v) \text { for every } \tilde{v} \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+} \text {such that } \sup _{y \in(0,+\infty)}\left\|\tilde{v}(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2} \leqslant 1 \text {. } \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (3.9) we have $\sup _{y \in(0,+\infty)}\left\|v(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2}>1$ and since $v(\cdot, 0)=u_{0}$, by (3.1) we recover that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exists y_{0}>0 \text { such that }\left\|v\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)-u_{0}\right\|_{2}=\frac{1}{2} \text { and }\left\|v(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2}<\frac{1}{2} \text { for any } y \in\left[0, y_{0}\right) . \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

As already noted in the proof of the previous lemma, by Lemma 3.9, since $\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(v) \leqslant \Lambda_{0}$, we have that if $y>0$ and $V(v(\cdot, y)) \leqslant \beta_{+}$then $v(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta_{+}}$. We deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { if } \tilde{y} \in\left[0, y_{0}\right) \text { and } V(v(\cdot, \tilde{y})) \leqslant \beta_{+} \text {then } \varphi_{(\tilde{y},+\infty)}(v) \leqslant C_{+}(b)(V(v(\cdot, \tilde{y}))-b)^{3 / 2} \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, considering the function

$$
\tilde{v}(\cdot, y)= \begin{cases}v(\cdot, y) & 0 \leqslant y<\tilde{y}, \\ w_{v(\cdot, \tilde{y})}^{+}(\cdot, y-\tilde{y}) & y \geqslant \tilde{y},\end{cases}
$$

we have $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}$. Now note that for every $y \in[0, \tilde{y}) \subset\left[0, y_{0}\right)$, by definition of $y_{0}$ we have $\left\|\tilde{v}(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2}=$ $\left\|v(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2}<\frac{1}{2}$ while if $y \geqslant \tilde{y}$, then by Lemma 3.10 and (3.5)

$$
\left\|\tilde{v}(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2}=\left\|w_{v(\cdot, \tilde{y})}^{+}(\cdot, y-\tilde{y})-u_{0}\right\|_{2} \leqslant \frac{\beta_{+}-b}{v^{+}\left(\beta_{+}\right)}<\frac{1}{2} .
$$

Hence we recover that $\sup _{y>0}\left\|\tilde{v}(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2} \leqslant 1$. Then, by (3.9) we obtain $\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(v)<\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}(\tilde{v}) \leqslant \varphi_{(\tilde{y},+\infty)}(\tilde{v})=$ $\varphi_{(0,+\infty)}\left(w_{v(\cdot, \tilde{y})}^{+}\right)$and (3.11) follows by Lemma 3.10.

We now note that, by Remark 3.6 we have $\varphi_{\left(0, y_{0}\right)}(v) \geqslant \frac{1}{2 y_{0}}\left\|v\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)-u_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2}=\frac{1}{8 y_{0}}$ and so, by (3.5) and (3.11), we deduce $y_{0} \geqslant \frac{1}{8 C_{+}(b)\left(\beta_{+}-b\right)^{3 / 2}}>1$. Then, by (3.11) and Lemma 3.11, we derive that there exists $\bar{y} \in(0,1)$ such that $v(\cdot, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ and $v(\cdot, y)=v(\cdot, \bar{y})$ for any $y \geqslant \bar{y}$. Hence, using (3.10), we obtain $1<\sup _{y \in(0,+\infty)}\left\|v(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2}=$ $\sup _{y \in(0, \bar{y}]}\left\|v(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2} \leqslant \sup _{y \in\left(0, y_{0}\right]}\left\|v(\cdot, y)-u_{0}\right\|_{2}=\frac{1}{2}$, a contradiction which proves the lemma.

The following lemma is an analogous of Lemma 3.10 for $\mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{-}$when $b>0$. We omit the proof since it is bases on an argument symmetric to the one used proving Lemma 3.10, using Lemma 2.13 instead of Lemma 2.12.

Lemma 3.13. Let $b \in(0, c)$, then there exists $C_{-}(b)>0$ such that for any $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta} \backslash \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ there exists $w_{u_{0}}^{-} \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{-}$such that

$$
\varphi_{(-\infty, 0)}\left(w_{u_{0}}^{-}\right) \leqslant C_{-}(b)\left(V\left(u_{0}\right)-b\right)^{3 / 2}
$$

For any $b \in(0, c)$ we fix $\beta_{-} \in(b, \beta]$ such that the following inequalities hold true:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \left\{1, C_{-}(b)\right\}\left(\beta_{-}-b\right)^{1 / 4}<\frac{1}{4} \quad \text { and } \quad C_{-}(b)\left(\beta_{-}-b\right)^{3 / 2} \leqslant \Lambda_{0} . \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Analogously to Lemma 3.11 we can prove
Lemma 3.14. Let $b \in(0, c)$ and assume that $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta_{-}} \backslash \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ and $v \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{-}$are such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { if } y \in(-1,0] \text { is such that } V(v(\cdot, y)) \leqslant \beta_{-} \text {then } \varphi_{(-\infty, y)}(v) \leqslant C_{-}(b)(V(v(\cdot, y))-b)^{3 / 2} \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, there exists $\bar{y} \in(-1,0)$ such that $V(v(\cdot, \bar{y}))=b, v(\cdot, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ and $v(\cdot, y)=v(\cdot, \bar{y})$ for any $y \in(-\infty, \bar{y}]$.
The situation is slightly different when $b=0$.
Lemma 3.15. If $b=0$ there exists $\beta_{0} \in\left(0, \frac{c}{4}\right)$ such that for any $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta_{0}} \backslash\{0\}$ there exists $w_{u_{0}}^{-} \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{-}$such that $\varphi_{(-\infty, 0)}\left(w_{u_{0}}^{-}\right) \leqslant 3 V\left(u_{0}\right)$.

Proof. If $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta_{0}}$ for some $\beta_{0} \in\left(0, \frac{c}{4}\right)$ we set

$$
w_{u_{0}}^{-}(x, y)= \begin{cases}u_{0}(x) & y \geqslant 0, \\ (1+y) u_{0}(x) & y \in(-1,0), \\ 0 & y \leqslant-1\end{cases}
$$

noting that $w_{u_{0}}^{-} \in \mathcal{X}_{0, u_{0}}^{-}$and $\varphi_{(-\infty, 0)}\left(w_{u_{0}}^{-}\right) \leqslant \int_{-1}^{0} \frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2}+V\left(u_{0}\right) d y \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2}+V\left(u_{0}\right)$. By Remark 2.11 and Lemma 2.2, if $\beta_{0}$ is sufficiently small, we obtain $\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{2}^{2} \leqslant 4 V\left(u_{0}\right)$ and so $\varphi_{(-\infty, 0)}\left(w_{u_{0}}^{-}\right) \leqslant 3 V\left(u_{0}\right)$.

Remark 3.16. Eventually taking $\beta_{0}$ smaller, we can assume that $\varphi_{(-\infty, 0)}\left(w_{u_{0}}^{-}\right) \leqslant \Lambda_{0}$ for $u_{0} \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta_{0}}$.

### 3.3. Minimizing sequences and their limit points

The local results that we have described in the previous section, allow us to produce a minimizing sequence of $\varphi$ on $\mathcal{X}_{b}$ with suitable compactness properties.

Lemma 3.17. For every $b \in[0, c)$ there exist $L_{0}>0, \bar{C}>0$ and $\left(v_{n}\right) \subset \mathcal{X}_{b}$ such that $\varphi\left(v_{n}\right) \rightarrow m_{b}$ and
(i) $\operatorname{dist}\left(v_{n}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}\right) \leqslant r_{0}$ for any $y \leqslant 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,
(ii) $\operatorname{dist}\left(v_{n}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{ \pm}^{\beta}\right) \leqslant r_{0}$ for any $y \geqslant L_{0}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,
(iii) $\left\|v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2} \leqslant \bar{C}$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,
(iv) for every bounded interval $\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right) \subset \mathbb{R}$ there exists $\hat{C}>0$, depending only on $y_{2}-y_{1}$, such that $\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{H^{1}\left(S_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}\right)} \leqslant$ $\hat{C}$.

Proof. Let $b \in[0, c)$ and $\left(w_{n}\right) \subset \mathcal{X}_{b}$ be such that $\varphi\left(w_{n}\right) \leqslant m_{b}+1$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varphi\left(w_{n}\right) \rightarrow m_{b}$. We denote $\beta^{*}=$ $\min \left\{\beta_{-}, \beta_{+}\right\}$. Let $s_{n}=\sup \left\{y \in \mathbb{R} \mid \varphi_{(-\infty, y)}\left(w_{n}\right) \leqslant \Lambda_{0}\right\}$ and note that by Remark 3.7, since $\Lambda_{0}<m_{b} \leqslant \varphi\left(w_{n}\right)$, we have $s_{n} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi_{\left(-\infty, s_{n}\right)}\left(w_{n}\right)=\Lambda_{0}$. Since $w_{n}\left(\cdot, \cdot+s_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{X}_{b, w_{n}\left(\cdot, s_{n}\right)}^{-}$and $\varphi_{(-\infty, 0)}\left(w_{n}\left(\cdot, \cdot+s_{n}\right)\right)=\Lambda_{0}$, by Lemma 3.9 we derive that $\operatorname{dist}\left(w_{n}\left(\cdot, y+s_{n}\right), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}\right) \leqslant r_{0}$ for any $y \leqslant 0$ and so, by $(3.4), \operatorname{dist}\left(w_{n}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b^{*}}\right) \geqslant 4 r_{0}$ for any $y \leqslant s_{n}$. We conclude that if $y \leqslant s_{n}$ and $V\left(w_{n}(\cdot, y)\right) \leqslant b^{*}$ then $w_{n}(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{V}^{b^{*}}$. A symmetric argument shows that there exists $t_{n}>s_{n}$ such that if $y \geqslant t_{n}$ and $V\left(w_{n}(\cdot, y)\right) \leqslant b^{*}$ then $w_{n}(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b^{*}}$. Define now

$$
y_{n}^{-}=\sup \left\{y \leqslant t_{n} \mid w_{n}(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b^{*}}\right\} \text { and } y_{n}^{+}=\inf \left\{y \geqslant y_{n}^{-} \mid w_{n}(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b^{*}}\right\}
$$

Since $\liminf _{y \rightarrow \pm \infty} V\left(w_{n}(\cdot, y)\right)=b>\beta^{*}$ we deduce that $y_{n}^{-}, y_{n}^{+} \in \mathbb{R}$.
Using Remarks 2.11 and 2.16 we also recognize that $w_{n}\left(\cdot, y_{n}^{-}\right) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b^{*}}$ and $w_{n}\left(\cdot, y_{n}^{+}\right) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b^{*}}$. Since the function $y \mapsto$ $w_{n}(\cdot, y)$ is continuous with respect to the $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ metric and $\operatorname{dist}\left(\mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta^{*}}, \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta^{*}}\right) \geqslant 5 r_{0}$ we deduce $y_{n}^{-}<y_{n}^{+}$. Moreover $V\left(w_{n}(\cdot, y)\right)>\beta^{*}$ for any $y \in\left(y_{n}^{-}, y_{n}^{+}\right)$and $\left\|w_{n}\left(\cdot, y_{n}^{+}\right)-w_{n}\left(\cdot, y_{n}^{-}\right)\right\|_{2} \geqslant 5 r_{0}$. By (3.2) we derive

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{n}^{+}-y_{n}^{-} \leqslant \frac{\varphi_{\left(y_{n}^{-}, y_{n}^{+}\right)}\left(w_{n}\right)}{\beta^{*}-b} \leqslant \frac{m_{b}+1}{\beta^{*}-b}:=L_{0} \quad \text { and } \quad \sup _{y \in\left(y_{n}^{-}, y_{n}^{+}\right]}\left\|w_{n}(\cdot, y)-w_{n}\left(\cdot, y_{n}^{-}\right)\right\|_{2} \leqslant \frac{m_{b}+1}{\sqrt{2\left(\beta^{*}-b\right)}} \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

We now claim that, eventually modifying the function $w_{n}$ on the set $\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left[\left(-\infty, y_{n}^{-}\right) \cup\left(y_{n}^{+},+\infty\right)\right]$, $w_{n}$ satisfies
(I) $\varphi_{\left(-\infty, y_{n}^{-}\right)}\left(w_{n}\right) \leqslant \Lambda_{0}$,
(II) $\varphi_{\left(y_{n}^{+},+\infty\right)}\left(w_{n}\right) \leqslant \Lambda_{0}$ and $\left\|w_{n}(x, y)-w_{n}\left(x, y_{n}^{+}\right)\right\|_{2} \leqslant 1$ for any $y \geqslant y_{n}^{+}$.

Indeed, if $(\mathrm{I})$ is not satisfied, since $w_{n}\left(\cdot, y_{n}^{-}\right) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta_{-}}$, we can consider the new function

$$
w_{n}^{*}(\cdot, y)= \begin{cases}w_{w_{n}\left(\cdot, y_{n}^{-}\right)}^{-}\left(\cdot, y-y_{n}^{-}\right) & \text {if } y \leqslant y_{n}^{-} \\ w_{n}(\cdot, y) & \text { if } y>y_{n}^{-}\end{cases}
$$

noting that $w_{n}^{*} \in \mathcal{X}_{b}, \varphi\left(w_{n}^{*}\right) \leqslant \varphi\left(w_{n}\right)$ and $w_{n}^{*}$ satisfies (I) by Lemma 3.13, Lemma 3.15, (3.12) and Remark 3.16.
Now, assuming that (I) is verified, if (II) is not satisfied, since $w_{n}\left(\cdot, y_{n}^{+}\right) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta_{+}}$and $w_{n}\left(\cdot, \cdot+y_{n}^{+}\right) \in \mathcal{X}_{b, w_{n}\left(\cdot, y_{n}^{+}\right)}^{+}$, by Lemma 3.12 there exists a function $\tilde{w}_{n} \in \mathcal{X}_{b, w_{n}\left(\cdot, y_{n}^{+}\right)}^{+}$such that $\varphi_{\left(y_{n}^{+},+\infty\right)}\left(\tilde{w}_{n}\left(\cdot, \cdot-y_{n}^{+}\right)\right) \leqslant \min \left\{\Lambda_{0}, \varphi_{\left(y_{n}^{+},+\infty\right)}\left(w_{n}\right)\right\}$ and $\left\|\tilde{w}_{n}\left(\cdot, y-y_{n}^{+}\right)-w_{n}\left(x, y_{n}^{+}\right)\right\|_{2} \leqslant 1$ for any $y \geqslant y_{n}^{+}$. Then considering

$$
w_{n}^{* *}(\cdot, y)= \begin{cases}\tilde{w}_{n}\left(\cdot, y-y_{n}^{+}\right) & \text {if } y \geqslant y_{n}^{+}, \\ w_{n}(\cdot, y) & \text { if } y<y_{n}^{+}\end{cases}
$$

we recognize that $w_{n}^{* *} \in \mathcal{X}_{b}, \varphi\left(w_{n}^{* *}\right) \leqslant \varphi\left(w_{n}\right)$ and $w_{n}^{* *}$ satisfies (I) and (II). Hence, eventually modifying $w_{n}$ as indicated above our claim follows.

We finally set $v_{n}=w_{n}\left(\cdot, \cdot+y_{n}^{-}\right.$) obtaining that $v_{n} \in \mathcal{X}_{b}$ and $\varphi\left(v_{n}\right)=\varphi\left(w_{n}\right) \rightarrow m_{b}$. Moreover, by (I) we have $\varphi_{(-\infty, 0)}\left(v_{n}\right)=\varphi_{\left(-\infty, y_{n}^{-}\right)}\left(w_{n}\right) \leqslant \Lambda_{0}$ and (i) follows by Lemma 3.9.

Since by (3.14) we have $y_{n}^{+}-y_{n}^{-} \leqslant L_{0}$, by (II) we have $\varphi_{\left(L_{0},+\infty\right)}\left(v_{n}\right)=\varphi_{\left(L_{0}+y_{n}^{-},+\infty\right)}\left(w_{n}\right) \leqslant \varphi_{\left(y_{n}^{+},+\infty\right)}\left(w_{n}\right) \leqslant \Lambda_{0}$ and (ii) follows by Lemma 3.9.

To prove (iii) we first note that by Remark 2.11 we have $\|u\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{2 \mu}{\mu-2} \beta$ for any $u \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}$. Then, by (i) we recover that $\left\|v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2} \leqslant \frac{2 \mu}{\mu-2} \beta+r_{0}$ for any $y \leqslant 0$. Since $v_{n}(\cdot, 0)=w_{n}\left(\cdot, y_{n}^{-}\right) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}$, by (3.14) we obtain moreover $\left\|v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2} \leqslant$ $\left\|v_{n}(\cdot, 0)\right\|_{2}+\left\|v_{n}(\cdot, y)-v_{n}(\cdot, 0)\right\|_{2} \leqslant \frac{2 \mu}{\mu-2} \beta+\frac{m_{b}+1}{\sqrt{2\left(b^{*}-b\right)}}$ for any $y \in\left(0, y_{n}^{+}-y_{n}^{-}\right]$. Finally, by (II), we have $\| v_{n}(\cdot, y)-$ $v_{n}\left(\cdot, y_{n}^{+}-y_{n}^{-}\right) \|_{2} \leqslant 1$ for any $y>y_{n}^{+}-y_{n}^{-}$and (iii) follows with $\bar{C}=\frac{2 \mu}{\mu-2} \beta+r_{0}+\frac{m_{b}+1}{\sqrt{2\left(b^{*}-b\right)}}+1$.

To prove (iv) we use (iii) and (2.8). By (2.8) we know that there exists $C>0$ such that

$$
V\left(v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right) \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\left\|\nabla v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}\left(1-C \frac{\left\|v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{(p+1) \theta}}{\left\|\nabla v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2-(p+1)(1-\theta)}}\right)+\frac{1}{4}\left\|v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2} \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R} .
$$

We set

$$
\mathcal{A}_{n}=\left\{y \in \mathbb{R} \mid\left\|\nabla v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2-(p+1)(1-\theta)} \geqslant 2 C\left\|v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{(p+1) \theta}\right\} .
$$

By (2.8), $V\left(v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right) \geqslant \frac{1}{4}\left\|v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|^{2}$ for every $y \in \mathcal{A}_{n}$ while $\left\|\nabla v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2-(p+1)(1-\theta)}<2 C\left\|v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{(p+1) \theta}$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R} \backslash \mathcal{A}_{n}$. By (iii) we know that $\left\|v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2} \leqslant \bar{C}$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and so $\left\|\nabla v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}<\tilde{C}:=2 C \bar{C}^{(p+1) \theta}$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R} \backslash \mathcal{A}_{n}$. Given $\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right) \subset \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{H^{1}\left(S_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}\right)}^{2} & =\int_{y_{1}}^{y_{2}}\left\|\partial_{y} v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left\|\nabla v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left\|v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2} d y \\
& \leqslant 2 \varphi\left(v_{n}\right)+\int_{y_{1}}^{y_{2}}\left\|\nabla v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2} d y+\bar{C}\left(y_{2}-y_{1}\right) \\
& \leqslant 2 \varphi\left(v_{n}\right)+\int_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right) \cap \mathcal{A}_{n}}\left\|\nabla v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2} d y+(\bar{C}+\tilde{C})\left(y_{2}-y_{1}\right) \\
& \leqslant 2 \varphi\left(v_{n}\right)+4 \int_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right) \cap \mathcal{A}_{n}} V\left(v_{n}(\cdot, y)\right)-b d y+(\bar{C}+\tilde{C}+4 b)\left(y_{2}-y_{1}\right) \\
& \leqslant 6 \varphi\left(v_{n}\right)+(\bar{C}+\tilde{C}+4 b)\left(y_{2}-y_{1}\right) \\
& \leqslant \hat{C}^{2}=6\left(m_{0}+1\right)+(\bar{C}+\tilde{C}+4 c)\left(y_{2}-y_{1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and (iv) follows.
By (iv) of Lemma 3.17 we have that the minimizing sequence $\left(v_{n}\right)$ weakly converges in $H^{1}\left(S_{L}\right)$ for any $L>0$ to a function $\bar{v} \in \mathcal{H}$. Even if we do not know a priori that $\bar{v} \in \mathcal{X}_{b}$, thanks to Lemma 3.5, Lemma 2.10 and the semicontinuity of the distance function, the function $\bar{v}$ enjoys the following properties

Corollary 3.18. For any $b \in[0, c)$ there exists $\bar{v} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that
(i) given any interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y)) \geqslant b$ for a.e. $y \in I$ we have $\varphi_{I}(\bar{v}) \leqslant m_{b}$,
(ii) $\operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}\right) \leqslant r_{0}$ for any $y \leqslant 0$,
(iii) $\operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}\right) \leqslant r_{0}$ for any $y \geqslant L_{0}$,
(iv) $\|\bar{v}(\cdot, y)\|_{2} \leqslant \bar{C}$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$,
(v) for every $\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right) \subset \mathbb{R},\|\bar{v}\|_{H^{1}\left(S_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}\right)} \leqslant \hat{C}$,
where $L_{0}, \bar{C}$ and $\hat{C}$ are given by Lemma 3.17.
We define $\bar{\sigma}$ and $\bar{\tau}$ as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{\sigma}=\sup \left\{y \in \mathbb{R} / \operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}\right) \leqslant r_{0} \text { and } V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y)) \leqslant b\right\}, \\
& \bar{\tau}=\inf \{y>\bar{\sigma} / V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y)) \leqslant b\},
\end{aligned}
$$

with the agreement that $\bar{\sigma}=-\infty$ whenever $V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))>b$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}\right) \leqslant r_{0}$ and that $\bar{\tau}=+\infty$ whenever $V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))>b$ for every $y>\bar{\sigma}$.

## Remark 3.19. Properties of $\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau}$ :

(i) $\bar{\sigma} \in\left[-\infty, L_{0}\right]$ and $\bar{\tau} \in[0,+\infty]$.

By Corollary 3.18(iii), if $y \geqslant L_{0}$ then $\operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta}\right) \leqslant r_{0}$. Hence $\operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}\right)>4 r_{0}$ for $y \geqslant L_{0}$ and $\bar{\sigma} \leqslant L_{0}$ follows. Moreover, by Corollary $3.18(\mathrm{ii})$, there results $\operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}\right) \leqslant r_{0}$ if $y \leqslant 0$. Then, by the definition of $\bar{\sigma}$, we have that if $\bar{\sigma}<0$ then $V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))>b$ for any $y \in(\bar{\sigma}, 0]$ and so $\bar{\tau} \geqslant 0$ follows.
(ii) If $\bar{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}$ then $\bar{v}(\cdot, \bar{\sigma}) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$.

Indeed, by definition, there exists a sequence $y_{n} \in(-\infty, \bar{\sigma}]$ such that $y_{n} \rightarrow \bar{\sigma}$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty, V\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right) \leqslant b$ and $\operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}\right) \leqslant r_{0}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and since, $\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right) \rightarrow \bar{v}(\cdot, \bar{\sigma})$ in $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$, by Remark 2.11 we conclude that $\bar{v}(\cdot, \bar{\sigma}) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$.
(iii) $\bar{\sigma}<\bar{\tau}$.

It is sufficient to prove that if $\bar{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}$ then, there exists $\delta>0$ such that $V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))>b$ for any $y \in(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}+\delta)$. Assume by contradiction that there exists a sequence $\left(y_{n}\right) \subset(\bar{\sigma},+\infty)$ such that $V\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right) \leqslant b$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y_{n} \rightarrow \bar{\sigma}$. Then, by definition of $\bar{\sigma}$ we have $\operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}\right)>r_{0}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and so $\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$. Hence, since $v\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right) \rightarrow v(\cdot, \bar{\sigma})$ in $L^{2}$, by Remark 2.16, we obtain $\bar{v}(\cdot, \bar{\sigma}) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ while, by (ii) we know that $\bar{v}(\cdot, \bar{\sigma}) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$.
(iv) If $\bar{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}$ then $\bar{v}(\cdot, \bar{\tau}) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$.

Indeed, by definition, there exists a sequence $y_{n} \in[\bar{\tau},+\infty)$ such that $y_{n} \rightarrow \bar{\tau}$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty, V\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right) \leqslant b$. By definition of $\bar{\sigma}$, since $y_{n}>\bar{\sigma}$, we have $\operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}\right)>r_{0}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and since, $\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right) \rightarrow \bar{v}(\cdot, \bar{\tau})$ in $L^{2}(\mathbb{R})$, we conclude by Remark 2.16 that $\bar{v}(\cdot, \bar{\tau}) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$.
(v) If $\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right] \subset(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$ then $\inf _{y \in\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right]} V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))>b$. Moreover $\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})}(\bar{v}) \leqslant m_{b}$.

It follows by the definition of $\bar{\sigma}$ and $\bar{\tau}$ that $V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))>b$ for any $y \in(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$. Then, by Lemma 3.1 we have $\inf _{y \in\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right]} V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))=\min _{y \in\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right]} V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))>b$ whenever $\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right] \subset(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$. By Corollary 3.18(i) we furthermore derive that $\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})}(\bar{v}) \leqslant m_{b}$.
(vi) If $\bar{\sigma}=-\infty$ then $\liminf _{y \rightarrow-\infty} V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))-b=\liminf _{y \rightarrow-\infty} \operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}\right)=0$.

By Corollary 3.18(ii) we have $\operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}\right) \leqslant r_{0}$ for every $y \leqslant 0$. Since $\bar{\sigma}=-\infty$ and $\varphi_{(-\infty, \bar{\tau})}(\bar{v}) \leqslant m_{b}$ we derive that there exists a sequence $y_{n} \rightarrow-\infty$ such that $V\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right) \rightarrow b, \bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}$ and $\operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right), \nu_{+}^{b}\right) \geqslant$ $4 r_{0}$.
If $b=0$, by Remark 2.11, we obtain $\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0$ and (vi) follows. If $b>0$, arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.10, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since $V\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right)>b$, there exists a unique $s_{n} \in(0,1]$ such that $V\left(s_{n} \bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right)=b$, $s_{n} \bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ with $1-s_{n} \leqslant\left(V\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right)-b\right) / \nu^{-}(b) \rightarrow 0$. Since by Remark $2.11\left\|\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right\|_{2}$ is bounded, $\operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right), \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}\right) \leqslant\left(1-s_{n}\right)\left\|\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right\|_{2} \rightarrow 0$ and (vi) follows.
(vii) If $\bar{\tau}=+\infty$ then $\liminf _{y \rightarrow+\infty} V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))-b=\liminf _{y \rightarrow+\infty} \operatorname{dist}\left(\bar{v}(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}\right)=0$.

The proof is analogous of the one of (vi).
Thanks to the properties (ii)-(iv), (vi)-(vii) we recognize that the function $\bar{v}$ satisfies the assumption of Lemma 3.8 on the interval $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$ which allows us to derive the following properties of $\bar{v}$.

## Lemma 3.20. There result

(i) $\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})}(\bar{v})=m_{b}$ and $\liminf _{y \rightarrow \bar{\tau}^{-}} V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))=\liminf _{y \rightarrow \bar{\sigma}^{+}} V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))=b$,
(ii) $\bar{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}$ for any $b \in[0, c)$ and $\bar{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}$ for any $b \in(0, c)$,
(iii) for every $h \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})\right)$, with $\operatorname{supp} h \subset \mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right] \subset \mathbb{R}^{N} \times(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$, there exists $\bar{t}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})}(\bar{v}+t h) \geqslant \varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})}(\bar{v}), \quad \forall t \in(0, \bar{t}) . \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $\bar{v} \in C^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})\right)$ verifies $-\Delta u+u-f(u)=0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$ and for any $\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right] \subset(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$ there results $\bar{v} \in H^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)\right)$,
(iv) $E_{y}(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))=\frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} \bar{v}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}-V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))=-b$ for every $y \in(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$,
(v) $\liminf _{y \rightarrow \bar{\tau}^{-}}\left\|\partial_{y} \bar{v}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}=\liminf _{y \rightarrow \bar{\sigma}^{+}}\left\|\partial_{y} \bar{v}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}=0$.

Proof. (i) By Lemma 3.8 we already know that $\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})}(\bar{v}) \geqslant m_{b}$ and by (v) of Remark 3.19 we conclude that $\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})}(\bar{v})=m_{b}$. Hence, using Lemma 3.8 again, we conclude that $\liminf _{y \rightarrow \bar{\tau}^{-}} V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))=\liminf _{y \rightarrow \bar{\sigma}^{+}} V(\bar{v}(\cdot$, $y)=b$.
(ii) Assume by contradiction that $\bar{\tau}=+\infty$. By (vii) of Remark 3.19 there exists $y_{0}>L_{0}$ such that $u_{0}:=\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right) \in$ $\mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta_{+}} \backslash \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$ and $\bar{v}\left(\cdot, \cdot+y_{0}\right) \in \mathcal{X}_{b, u_{0}}^{+}$. To obtain a contradiction we show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall y \geqslant y_{0} \text { such that } V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y)) \leqslant \beta_{+} \text {we have } \varphi_{(y,+\infty)}(\bar{v}) \leqslant C_{+}(b)(V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))-b)^{3 / 2} \tag{3.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (3.16), using Lemma 3.11, we derive that there exists $\bar{y} \in\left(y_{0}, y_{0}+1\right)$ such that $V(\bar{v}(\cdot, \bar{y}))=b$ which contradicts that $\bar{\tau}=+\infty$.

If (3.16) does not hold, by Lemma 3.10, there exists $\tilde{y} \geqslant y_{0}$ with $\bar{v}(\cdot, \tilde{y}) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta_{+}}$and $\varphi_{(\tilde{y},+\infty)}(\bar{v})>\varphi_{(\tilde{y},+\infty)}\left(w_{\bar{v}(\cdot, \tilde{y})}^{+}\right)$. Then, defining

$$
\tilde{v}(\cdot, y)= \begin{cases}\bar{v}(\cdot, y) & y \leqslant \tilde{y} \\ w_{\bar{v}(\cdot, \tilde{y})}^{+}(\cdot, \cdot-\tilde{y}) & y>\tilde{y}\end{cases}
$$

we obtain $\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma},+\infty)}(\tilde{v})<\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma},+\infty)}(\bar{v})=m_{b}$. On the other hand, defining $\tilde{\tau}=\sup \{y>\bar{\sigma} \mid V(\tilde{v}(\cdot, y))>b\}$, we recognize that $\tilde{\tau}$ satisfies the assumption of Lemma 3.8 on the interval $(\bar{\sigma}, \tilde{\tau})$ and we get the contradiction $m_{b} \leqslant \varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}, \tilde{\tau})}(\tilde{v}) \leqslant$ $\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma},+\infty)}(\tilde{v})<m_{b}$.

To prove that $\bar{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}$ when $b>0$ we can argue analogously using Lemmas 3.13 and 3.14.
(iii) Let us consider $h \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})\right)$ with supp $h \subset \mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right] \subset \mathbb{R}^{N} \times(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$. By (v) of Remark 3.19 we know that there exists $\mu>0$ such that $V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y)) \geqslant b+\mu$ for any $y \in\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right]$. Let us consider $(\bar{v}+t h)^{*}$ the symmetric decreasing rearrangement of the function $v+t h$ with respect to the variable $x$, i.e. the unique function with radial symmetry with respect to the variable $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ such that

$$
\left|\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \mid(\bar{v}+t h)^{*}(\cdot, y)>r\right\}\right|=\left|\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}| |(\bar{v}+t h)(\cdot, y) \mid>r\right\}\right| \quad \text { for every } r>0 \text { and a.e. } y \in \mathbb{R}
$$

and $(\bar{v}+t h)^{*}\left(x_{1}, y\right) \geqslant(\bar{v}+t h)^{*}\left(x_{2}, y\right)$ whenever $\left|x_{1}\right| \leqslant\left|x_{2}\right|$, for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}$. One recognizes (use e.g. [20, (12)-(14)], and [23, (3), p. 73]) that $\left\|\nabla(\bar{v}+t h)^{*}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)\right)} \leqslant\|\nabla(\bar{v}+t h)\|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)\right)}$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)} \frac{1}{2}\left|(\bar{v}+t h)^{*}\right|^{2}+$ $F\left((\bar{v}+t h)^{*}\right) d x d y=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)} \frac{1}{2}|v+t h|^{2}+F(|v+t h|) d x d y=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)} \frac{1}{2}|v+t h|^{2}+F(\bar{v}+t h) d x d y$. Therefore we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right]} \frac{1}{2}\left|\nabla(\bar{v}+t h)^{*}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left|(\bar{v}+t h)^{*}\right|^{2}-F\left((\bar{v}+t h)^{*}\right) d x d y \\
& \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right]} \frac{1}{2}|\nabla(\bar{v}+t h)|^{2}+\frac{1}{2}|\bar{v}+t h|^{2}-F(\bar{v}+t h) d x d y . \tag{3.17}
\end{align*}
$$

We now claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exists \bar{t}>0 \text { such that } V\left((\bar{v}+t h)^{*}(\cdot, y)\right)>b+\mu / 2 \text { for any } t \in[0, \bar{t}] \text { and } y \in\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right] . \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Arguing by contradiction, if (3.18) does not hold, there exist a sequence $t_{n} \in(0,1)$ and a sequence $y_{n} \in\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right]$ such that $t_{n} \rightarrow 0, y_{n} \rightarrow y_{0} \in\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right]$ and $V\left(\left(\bar{v}+t_{n} h\right)^{*}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right) \leqslant b+\mu / 2$.

By Corollary 3.18(iv), since $h$ has compact support, we have that there exists $C>0$ such that $\left\|\left(\bar{v}+t_{n} h\right)^{*}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right\|_{2}=$ $\left\|\left(\bar{v}+t_{n} h\right)\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right\|_{2} \leqslant\left\|\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right\|_{2}+\left\|h\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right\|_{2} \leqslant C$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $V\left(\left(\bar{v}+t_{n} h\right)^{*}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right) \leqslant b+\mu / 2$, by Lemma 2.14 there exists a constant $R>0$ such that $\left\|\nabla\left(\bar{v}+t_{n} h\right)^{*}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right\|_{2} \leqslant R$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the sequence $\left\{\left(\bar{v}+t_{n} h\right)^{*}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right\}$ is bounded in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. Since the rearrangement is contractive in $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ we have $\left\|\left(\bar{v}+t_{n} h\right)^{*}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)-\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)\right\|_{2} \leqslant\left\|\left(\bar{v}+t_{n} h\right)\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)-\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)\right\|_{2} \rightarrow 0$ and so $\left(\bar{v}+t_{n} h\right)^{*}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)-\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$. By Lemma 2.7 we then obtain the contradiction $b+\mu / 2 \geqslant \liminf _{n \rightarrow+\infty} V\left(\left(\bar{v}+t_{n} h\right)^{*}\left(\cdot, y_{n}\right)\right) \geqslant V\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)\right) \geqslant b+\mu$ which proves (3.18).

Since $\bar{v}(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{X}$ for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $\bar{v}=\bar{v}^{*}$ and $(\bar{v}+t h)^{*}=v$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R} \backslash\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right]$. By (3.18) we then recognize that $(\bar{v}+t h)^{*}$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.8 on the interval $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$ for any $t \in[0, \bar{t}]$. Then $\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})}\left((\bar{v}+t h)^{*}\right) \geqslant m_{b}=\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})}(\bar{v})$ for any $t \in[0, \bar{t}]$ and (3.15) follows by (3.17). Finally, by (3.15) we have

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})} \frac{1}{2}|\nabla(\bar{v}+t h)|^{2}+\frac{1}{2}|\bar{v}+t h|^{2}-F(\bar{v}+t h)-\frac{1}{2}|\nabla \bar{v}|^{2}-\frac{1}{2}|\bar{v}|^{2}+F(\bar{v}) d x d y \geqslant 0 \quad \forall t \in(0, \bar{t}) .
$$

Since $h$ is arbitrary we derive that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})} \nabla \bar{v} \nabla h+\bar{v} \cdot h-f(\bar{v}) h d x d y=0$ for every $h \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})\right)$, and so that $\bar{v}$ is a weak solution of ( E ) on $\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$. Then (iii) follows by (v) of Corollary 3.18 and standard regularity arguments.
(iv) Fixed $\xi \in(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$ and $s>0$ we define

$$
\bar{v}_{s}(\cdot, y)= \begin{cases}\bar{v}(\cdot, y+\xi) & y \leqslant 0, \\ \bar{v}\left(\cdot, \frac{y}{s}+\xi\right) & 0<y\end{cases}
$$

and we note that $\bar{v}_{s}$ verifies the assumption of Lemma 3.8 on the interval $(\bar{\sigma}-\xi, s(\bar{\tau}-\xi))$. Then

$$
\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}-\xi, s(\bar{\tau}-\xi))}\left(\bar{v}_{s}\right) \geqslant m_{p}=\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}-\xi, \bar{\tau}-\xi)}(\bar{v}(\cdot, \cdot+\xi))
$$

and so we have that for any $s>0$ there results

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \leqslant \varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}-\xi, s(\bar{\tau}-\xi))}\left(\bar{v}_{s}\right)-\varphi_{(\bar{\sigma}-\xi, \bar{\tau}-\xi)}(\bar{v}(\cdot, \cdot+\xi)) \\
& =\int_{0}^{s(\bar{\tau}-\xi)} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} \bar{v}_{s}(\cdot, y)\right\|^{2}+\left(V\left(\bar{v}_{s}(\cdot, y)\right)-b\right) d y-\int_{\xi}^{\bar{\tau}} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} \bar{v}(\cdot, y)\right\|^{2}+(V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))-b) d y \\
& =\int_{0}^{s(\bar{\tau}-\xi)} \frac{1}{2 s^{2}}\left\|\partial_{y} \bar{v}\left(\cdot, \frac{y}{s}+\xi\right)\right\|^{2}+\left(V\left(\bar{v}\left(\cdot, \frac{y}{s}+\xi\right)\right)-b\right) d y-\varphi_{(\xi, \bar{\tau})}(u) \\
& =\frac{1}{s} \int_{\xi}^{\bar{\tau}} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} \bar{v}(\cdot, y)\right\|^{2} d y+s \int_{\xi}^{\bar{\tau}} V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))-b d y-\varphi_{(\xi, \bar{\tau})}(\bar{v}) \\
& =\left(\frac{1}{s}-1\right) \int_{\xi}^{\bar{\tau}} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} \bar{v}(\cdot, y)\right\|^{2} d y+(s-1) \int_{\xi}^{\bar{\tau}} V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))-b d y .
\end{aligned}
$$

This means that, setting $A=\int_{\xi}^{\bar{\tau}} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} \bar{v}(\cdot, y)\right\|^{2} d y$ and $B=\int_{\xi}^{\bar{\tau}} V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))-b d y$, the real function $s \mapsto \psi(s)=A\left(\frac{1}{s}-\right.$ $1)+B(s-1)$ is non-negative on $(0,+\infty)$ and then that $0 \leqslant \min \psi(s)=\psi\left(\sqrt{\frac{A}{B}}\right)=-(\sqrt{A}-\sqrt{B})^{2}$, that implies $A=B$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\xi}^{\bar{\tau}} V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))-b d y=\int_{\xi}^{\bar{\tau}} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} \bar{v}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2} d y \quad \text { for any } \xi \in(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau}) . \tag{3.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since, by (iii), $\bar{v} \in H^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)\right)$ whenever $\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right] \subset(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$, we derive that the function $y \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} \bar{v}(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}-$ $V(\bar{v}(\cdot, y))$ is continuous and (iv) follows by (3.19).
(v) It follows by (i) and (iv).

### 3.4. The case $b>0$. The periodic solutions

Consider the case $b \in(0, c)$. By (ii) of Lemma 3.20 we have $\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}$. In this case, by reflection and periodic continuation, starting from $\bar{v}$, we can construct a solution to ( E ) on all $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ periodic in the variable $y$. Precisely let

$$
v(x, y)= \begin{cases}\bar{v}(x, y+\bar{\sigma}) & \text { if } x \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \text { and } y \in[0, \bar{\tau}-\bar{\sigma}), \\ \bar{v}(x, \bar{\tau}+(\bar{\tau}-\bar{\sigma}-y)) & \text { if } x \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \text { and } y \in[\bar{\tau}-\bar{\sigma}, 2(\bar{\tau}-\bar{\sigma})]\end{cases}
$$

and $v(x, y)=v(x, y+2 k(\bar{\tau}-\bar{\sigma}))$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}, k \in \mathbb{Z}$.
Remark 3.21. Let $T=\bar{\tau}-\bar{\sigma}$.
(i) The function $y \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto v(\cdot, y) \in L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ is continuous and periodic with period $2 T$. Moreover by (ii) and (iv) of Remark 3.19, $v(\cdot, 0) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{b}$ and $v(\cdot, T) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$. Finally, by definition, $v(\cdot,-y)=v(\cdot, y)$ and $v(\cdot, y+T)=v(\cdot, T-$ y) for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$.
(ii) $v \in \mathcal{H}$ and, by (v) of Remark 3.19, $V(v(\cdot, y))>b$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R} \backslash\{k T / k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.
(iii) By (v) of Lemma 3.20, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $\liminf _{y \rightarrow k T^{ \pm}}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}=0$.
(iv) By (iii) of Lemma 3.20, $v \in C^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)\right)$ satisfies $-\Delta v(x, y)+v(x, y)-f(v(x, y))=0$ for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \times$ $(0, T)$.

We have
Lemma 3.22. $v \in \mathcal{C}^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ is a solution of $(\mathrm{E})$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$. Moreover, $E_{v}(y)=\frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}-V(v(\cdot, y))=-b$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\partial_{y} v(\cdot, 0)=\partial_{y} v(\cdot, T)=0$. Finally $v>0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$.

Proof. First, let us prove that $v$ is a classical solution to (E). To this aim, we first note that by Remark 3.21(iii), there exist four sequences $\left(\varepsilon_{n}^{ \pm}\right),\left(\eta_{n}^{ \pm}\right)$, such that $\varepsilon_{n}^{-}<0<\varepsilon_{n}^{+}, \eta_{n}^{-}<0<\eta_{n}^{+}$for any $n \in \mathbb{N}, \varepsilon_{n}^{ \pm}, \eta_{n}^{ \pm} \rightarrow 0$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty}\left\|\partial_{y} v\left(\cdot, \varepsilon_{n}^{ \pm}\right)\right\|_{2}=\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty}\left\|\partial_{y} v\left(\cdot, T+\eta_{n}^{ \pm}\right)\right\|_{2}=0 \tag{3.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Fixed any $\psi \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$, by Remark 3.21(i)-(iv) we obtain that for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n$ sufficiently large we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
0= & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \int_{2 k T+\varepsilon_{n}^{+}}^{(2 k+1) T+\eta_{n}^{-}}-\Delta v \psi+v \psi-f(v) \psi d y d x \\
= & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \int_{2 k T+\varepsilon_{n}^{+}}^{(2 k+1) T+\eta_{n}^{-}} \nabla v \nabla \psi+v \psi-f(v) \psi d y d x+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \partial_{y} v\left(x, 2 k T+\varepsilon_{n}^{+}\right) \psi\left(x, 2 k T+\varepsilon_{n}^{+}\right) d x \\
& -\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \partial_{y} v\left(x,(2 k+1) T+\eta_{n}^{-}\right) \psi\left(x,(2 k+1) T+\eta_{n}^{-}\right) d x
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
0=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \int_{(2 k-1) T+\eta_{n}^{+}}^{2 k T+\varepsilon_{n}^{-}}-\Delta v \psi+v \psi-f(v) \psi d y d x
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \int_{(2 k-1) T+\eta_{n}^{+}}^{2 k T+\varepsilon_{n}^{-}} \nabla v \nabla \psi+v \psi-f(v) \psi d y d x-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \partial_{y} v\left(x, 2 k T+\varepsilon_{n}^{-}\right) \psi\left(x, 2 k T+\varepsilon_{n}^{-}\right) d x \\
& +\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \partial_{y} v\left(x,(2 k-1) T+\eta_{n}^{+}\right) \psi\left(x,(2 k-1) T+\eta_{n}^{+}\right) d x .
\end{aligned}
$$

By (3.20), in the limit for $n \rightarrow+\infty$, we obtain that for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$
0=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \int_{(2 k-1) T}^{2 k T} \nabla v \nabla \psi+v \psi-f(v) \psi d y d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N}} \int_{2 k T}^{(2 k+1) T} \nabla v \nabla \psi+v \psi-f(v) \psi d y d x
$$

Then, $v$ satisfies

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} \nabla v \nabla \psi+v \psi-f(v) \psi d x d y=0, \quad \forall \psi \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)
$$

and so $v$ is a classical solution to (E) on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ which is periodic of period $2 T$ in the variable $y$. Since by (v) of Corollary 3.18 we have $\|\bar{v}(\cdot, y)\|_{H^{1}\left(S_{(0, T)}\right)} \leqslant \hat{C}$ depending only on $T$, by definition of $v$ and using (E) we recover that $v \in H^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)\right)$ for any bounded interval $\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right) \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\|v\|_{H^{2}\left(S_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}\right)} \leqslant C$ with $C$ depending only on $y_{2}-y_{1}$. This implies in particular that the functions $y \in \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \partial_{y} v(\cdot, y) \in L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ and $y \in \mathbb{R} \rightarrow v(\cdot, y) \in$ $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ are uniformly continuous. Then $\lim _{y \rightarrow 0^{+}} V(v(\cdot, y))-b=\liminf _{y \rightarrow 0^{+}}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}=0$ and analogously $\lim _{y \rightarrow T^{-}} V(v(\cdot, y))-b=\lim _{y \rightarrow T^{-}}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}=0$. By continuity we derive that $\partial_{y} v(\cdot, 0)=\partial_{y} v(\cdot, T)=0$. By (v) of Lemma 3.20 and the definition of $v$ it then follows that $\frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|^{2}-V(v(\cdot, y))=-b$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$.

To complete the proof we have to show that $v>0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$. We know that $v \neq 0$ and since $v \in \mathcal{H}$ we have $v \geqslant 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$. Since $v$ solves ( E ) we have $-\Delta v+v=f(v) \geqslant 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ and $v>0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ follows from the strong maximum principle.

Lemma 3.23. We have $\partial_{y} v>0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)$ and $\partial_{x_{i}} v<0$ on $\left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \mid x_{i}>0\right\}$ for every $i=1, \ldots, N$.
Proof. To prove that $\partial_{y} v>0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)$ we first note that since $\partial_{y} v(\cdot, 0)=\partial_{y} v(\cdot, T)=0$ then $\partial_{y} v \in$ $H_{0}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)\right)$ and solves the linear elliptic equation $-\Delta \partial_{y} v+\partial_{y} v-f^{\prime}(v) \partial_{y} v=0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)$. Then $\partial_{y} v \in H_{0}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)\right) \cap H^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)\right)$ is an eigenfunction of the linear selfadjoint operator $\mathcal{L}_{v}: H_{0}^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\right.$ $(0, T)) \cap H^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)\right) \subset L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)\right) \rightarrow L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)\right)$ defined by $\mathcal{L}_{v} h=-\Delta h+h-f^{\prime}(v) h$ corresponding to the eigenvalue 0 .

The minimality property of $v$ proved in Lemma 3.20 (iii) implies $\left\langle\mathcal{L}_{v} h, h\right\rangle_{2} \geqslant 0$ for any $h \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)\right)$ and we deduce that 0 is the minimal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_{v}$. Then $\partial_{y} v$ has constant sign on $\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)$. Assume by contradiction that $\partial_{y} v<0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(0, T)$. Since, by construction, $v$ is even with respect to $T$, that implies that $v(x, T) \leqslant v(x, y)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ and $0<y<2 T$. We deduce that $\partial_{y, y}^{2} v(x, T) \geqslant 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ and so, multiplying (E) by $v$ and recalling that $v>0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ we deduce $-\Delta_{x} v(x, T) v(x, T)+v(x, T)^{2}-f(v) v \geqslant 0$. Integrating with respect to $x$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ we obtain $V^{\prime}(v(\cdot, T)) v(\cdot, T) \geqslant 0$ contrary to the fact that $v(\cdot, T) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{b}$. This shows that $\partial_{y} v>0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N} \times(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$. To prove that $\partial_{x_{i}} v<0$ on $\left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \mid x_{i}>0\right\}$ we note that since $v \in \mathcal{H} \cap C^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ we have $\partial_{|x|} v(x, y) \leqslant 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|x| \neq 0$. Then $\partial_{x_{i}} v \leqslant 0$ on $\left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \mid x_{i}>0\right\}$. Since $\partial_{x_{i}} v \leqslant 0$ solves the linear elliptic equation $-\Delta \partial_{x_{i}} v+\partial_{x_{i}} v=f^{\prime}(v) \partial_{x_{i}} v$ on $\left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \mid x_{i}>0\right\}$ we deduce $-\Delta \partial_{x_{i}} v+\partial_{x_{i}} v \leqslant$ $\left(f^{\prime}(v)\right)_{+} \partial_{x_{i}} v \leqslant 0$ on $\left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \mid x_{i}>0\right\}$ and since $\partial_{x_{i}} v \neq 0$, the strong maximum principle assures $\partial_{x_{i}} v<0$ on $\left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \mid x_{i}>0\right\}$.

### 3.5. The case $b=0$. The homoclinic type mountain pass solution

In the case $b=0$ Lemma 3.20 establishes that $\bar{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}$ but does not give information about $\bar{\sigma}$. We prove here below that in fact $\bar{\sigma}=-\infty$.

Lemma 3.24. If $b=0$ then $\bar{\sigma}=-\infty$.
Proof. Assume that $\bar{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, arguing as in the case $b>0$, by reflection and periodic continuation, we construct a solution $v \in C^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ of (E) which is $2(\bar{\tau}-\bar{\sigma})$-periodic in the variable $y$ with $v(\cdot, 0) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{0}$ and $\partial_{y} v(\cdot, 0)=0$. Since $\mathcal{V}_{-}^{0}=\{0\}$ we have $v(x, 0)=0$ and $\partial_{y} v(x, 0)=0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$. Defining $a(x, y)=1-f(v(x, y)) / v(x, y)$ when $v(x, y) \neq 0$ and $a(x, y)=1-f^{\prime}(0)=1$ when $v(x, y)=0$ we have that $a$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ and $v$ solves $-\Delta v+a(x, y) v=0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$. Defining the function $\tilde{v}(\cdot, y)=v(\cdot, y)$ for $y \in(0,2(\bar{\tau}-\bar{\sigma}))$, and $\tilde{v}(\cdot, y)=0$ for $y \leqslant 0$ or $y \geqslant 2(\bar{\tau}-\bar{\sigma})$, since $v(x, 0)=\partial_{y} v(x, 0)=v(x, 2(\bar{\tau}-\bar{\sigma}))=\partial_{y} v(x, 2(\bar{\tau}-\bar{\sigma}))=0$, we obtain that also $\tilde{v}$ satisfies $-\Delta v+a(x, y) v=0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$. But a local unique continuation theorem (see e.g. Theorem 5 in [24]) and a continuation argument imply that $\tilde{v}=0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ while, by definition of $\bar{\sigma}$ and $\bar{\tau}, \tilde{v}(\cdot, y)=v(\cdot, y)=\bar{v}(\cdot, y+\bar{\sigma}) \neq 0$ for $y \in(0, \bar{\tau}-\bar{\sigma})$.

By Lemma 3.24 we can define the function

$$
v(x, y)= \begin{cases}\bar{v}(x, y+\bar{\tau}) & \text { if } x \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \text { and } y \in(-\infty, 0], \\ \bar{v}(x, \bar{\tau}-y) & \text { if } x \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \text { and } y \in[0,+\infty)\end{cases}
$$

and the argument of the proof of Lemma 3.22 shows that $v$ is a classical solution to (E) in $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$.
Remark 3.25. Again by (v) of Corollary 3.18 and using (E) we recover that $v \in H^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N} \times\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)\right)$ for any bounded interval $\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right) \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\|v\|_{H^{2}\left(S_{\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)}\right)} \leqslant C$ with $C$ depending only on $y_{2}-y_{1}$. This implies in particular that the functions $y \in \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \partial_{y} v(\cdot, y) \in L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ and $y \in \mathbb{R} \rightarrow v(\cdot, y) \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ are uniformly continuous and so $\lim _{y \rightarrow-\infty} V(v(\cdot, y))=\liminf _{y \rightarrow+\infty} V(v(\cdot, y))=0, \lim _{y \rightarrow 0^{-}}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}=\liminf _{y \rightarrow 0^{+}}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}=0$, and $E_{v}(y)=\frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} v(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}-V(v(\cdot, y))=0$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Note finally that $v$ is radially symmetric with respect to $x$, not increasing with respect to $|x|$, and, by construction, even in the variable $y$.

In the case $b=0$ the functional $\varphi(u)=\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} u(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}+V(u(\cdot, y)) d y$ can be written, by Remark 2.6 , as $\varphi(u)=$ $\frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)}^{2}-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} F(u) d x d y=V_{N+1}(u)$ for all $u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ and in particular, denoting $c_{N+1}$ the mountain pass level of $\varphi$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$, Proposition 2.3 establishes that $\varphi$ has a positive radially symmetric critical point $w$ at the level $c_{N+1}$. We have

Lemma 3.26. $v \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ is a critical point of $\varphi$ on $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ with $\varphi(v)=c_{N+1}$. Moreover $v \in \mathcal{C}^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ is a positive solution of ( E ) on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ such that $v(x, y) \rightarrow 0$ as $|(x, y)| \rightarrow+\infty$, and, up to translations, $v$ is radially symmetric about the origin and $\partial_{r} v<0$ for $r=|(x, y)|>0$.

Proof. By Remark 3.25 we have $\lim _{y \rightarrow-\infty} V(v(\cdot, y))=0$ and so there exists $y_{0} \leqslant-L_{0}<0\left(L_{0}\right.$ as in Corollary 3.18) such that $V(v(\cdot, y)) \leqslant \beta$ for any $y \leqslant y_{0}$. Since by Corollary 3.18(ii) we know that $\operatorname{dist}\left(v(\cdot, y), \mathcal{V}_{+}^{\beta}\right) \geqslant 4 r_{0}$ for $y \leqslant-L_{0}$, we recognize that $v(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{V}_{-}^{\beta}$ for any $y \leqslant y_{0}$. Then $V^{\prime}(v(\cdot, y)) v(\cdot, y) \geqslant 0$ and by (2.2) we obtain that $V(v(\cdot, y)) \geqslant$ $\frac{\mu-2}{2 \mu}\|v(\cdot, y)\|^{2}$ for any $y \leqslant y_{0}$. Since $m_{0}=\varphi_{(-\infty, 0)}(\bar{v}) \geqslant \int_{\left(-\infty, y_{0}\right)} V(v(\cdot, y)) d y$, using Corollary 3.18(iv), we then obtain $\|v\|_{H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)}^{2}=2 \int_{-\infty}^{0}\|v(\cdot, y)\|^{2} d y \leqslant 2 \int_{-\infty}^{y_{0}} \frac{2 \mu}{\mu-2} V(v(\cdot, y)) d y+2 \bar{C}\left|y_{0}\right| \leqslant \frac{4 \mu}{\mu-2} m_{0}+2 \bar{C}\left|y_{0}\right|$, and $v \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ follows. Since $v \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ solves ( E ) on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$, we deduce $v(x, y) \rightarrow 0$ as $|(x, y)| \rightarrow+\infty$, it is a critical point of $\varphi$ on $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ and, by Remark 2.5, $\varphi(v)=2 m_{0} \geqslant c_{N+1}$.

We now show that $2 m_{0} \leqslant c_{N+1}$ proving that $v$ is a mountain pass critical point. The other properties stated in the lemma will then follows by standard arguments.

As recalled above, $\varphi$ admits on $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$ a positive, radially symmetric (in $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ ) critical point $w$ such that $\varphi(w)=c_{N+1}$ and $\partial_{r} w<0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1} \backslash\{0\}$ where $r=|(x, y)|$. In particular $w(x, y)$ is radially symmetric with respect to $x$ and monotone decreasing with respect to $|x|$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and so $w \in \mathcal{H}$. By Lemma 3.2 we know that the energy function $E_{w}(y)=\frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} w(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}-V(w(\cdot, y))$ is constant on $\mathbb{R}$. Since $w$ solves (E) we have $w \in H^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right) \cap C^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}\right)$. Then $\|w(\cdot, y)\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\left\|\partial_{y} w(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2} \rightarrow 0$ as $y \rightarrow \pm \infty$ and we deduce that $E_{w}(y)=0$, i.e., $\frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} w(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}=V(w(\cdot, y))$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $w$ is even with respect to $y$ we have $\partial_{y} w(\cdot, 0)=0$ and then $V(w(\cdot, 0))=0$. Since $w$ is radially symmetric we have $w(\cdot, 0) \neq 0$ and so $w(\cdot, 0) \in \mathcal{V}_{+}^{0}$. Finally, since $\partial_{r} w<0$ on
$\mathbb{R}^{N+1} \backslash\{0\}$ we derive that $\partial_{y} w(0, y)>0$ for any $y \in(-\infty, 0)$ and we conclude $V(w(\cdot, y))=\frac{1}{2}\left\|\partial_{y} w(\cdot, y)\right\|_{2}^{2}>0$ for any $y \in(-\infty, 0)$.

The above results tell us that $w$ satisfies the assumption of Lemma 3.8 on the interval $(-\infty, 0)$ and $\varphi_{(-\infty, 0)}(w) \geqslant$ $m_{0}$ follows. Hence $c_{N+1}=\varphi(w) \geqslant 2 m_{0}$ and we conclude that $c_{N+1}=2 m_{0}$.

To conclude the proof we note that since $v \geqslant 0$ and $-\Delta v+v=f(v) \geqslant 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$, the strong maximum principle establishes that $v>0$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ and so, by Theorem 1 in [19] we conclude that, up to translations, $v$ is radially symmetric about the origin and $\partial_{r} v<0$ for $r=|(x, y)|>0$
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