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#### Abstract

We find a sign-changing solution for a class of Schrödinger-Poisson systems in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ as an existence result by minimization in a closed subset containing all the signchanging solutions of the equation. The proof is based on variational methods in association with the deformation lemma and Miranda's theorem.


1. Introduction. The interaction of a charge particle with an electromagnetic field can be described by a system of a nonlinear Schrödinger equations coupled with a Poisson equation of the type
(NLSP)

$$
\begin{cases}-\Delta u+V(x) u+\phi u=|u|^{p-2} u & \text { in } \Omega \\ -\Delta \phi=u^{2} & \text { in } \Omega\end{cases}
$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ is a domain, $V: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $2<p<2^{*}=6$. Many recent studies of (NLSP) have focused on existence and nonexistence of solutions, multiplicity of solutions, ground states, radial and non-radial solutions, semiclassical limit and concentrations of solutions (see, for instance, $[1,2,3,4,7,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,22,23$, 24, 25, 26]).

In [7], Benci and Fortunato deal with the existence of eigensolutions of a linear version of (NLSP), under a Dirichlet condition in a bounded domain $\Omega$ in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$, and the potential $V$ is constant. The system (NLSP)

[^0]in a bounded domain has also been considered in the papers of Siciliano [26], Ruiz and Siciliano [24] and Pisani and Siciliano [22].

For $\Omega=\mathbb{R}^{3}$, D'Aprile and Mugnai proved [11] the existence of a nontrivial radial solution of (NLSP) for $4 \leq p<6$, and $V$ is a positive constant. In [12], using a Pohozaev-type identity, D'Aprile and Mugnai proved that (NLSP) has no nontrivial solution when $p \leq 2$ or $p \geq 6$. This result was completed in [23], where Ruiz showed that, if $p \leq 3$, then problem (NLSP) does not admit any nontrivial solution, and, if $3<p<6$, then there exists a nontrivial radial solution of (NLSP). In [4], Azzollini and Pomponio proved the existence of ground state solutions of (NLSP) when $3<p<6$ and $V$ is a positive constant. The case of the non-constant potential was also treated [4] for $4<p<6$ and $V$ possibly unbounded below.

All of these papers concern positive solutions to (NLSP). There are few results about sign-changing solutions to (NLSP). The best references are $[\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1 4}, \mathbf{1 7}]$. Ianni [14] employed a dynamical (not variational) approach in order to show the existence of radial solutions to (NLSP) for $V$ constant and $p \in[4,6)$ with a prescribed number of nodal domains. To obtain this result, she first studied the existence of sign changing radial solutions for the corresponding (NLSP) in balls of $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Kim and Seok [17] obtained results similar to [14] for $p \in(4,6)$ by using an extension of the Nehari variational method [21, 27]. Alves and Souto [1] considered the problem (NLSP) in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ and $V \equiv 0$ and proved the existence of least energy sign-changing solutions for (NLSP) to change signs exactly once in $\Omega$. The proof is based on variational methods. More precisely, it was proved that the associated energy functional assumes a minimum value on the nodal set, see definition in Section 2.

Motivated by the results just described, we are interested in finding sign-changing solutions for (NLSP) in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$, where potential $V$ is not necessarily a radially symmetric function. The result will be stated for a class of more general problems:

$$
\begin{cases}-\Delta u+V(x) u+\phi u=f(u) & \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3}  \tag{SP}\\ -\Delta \phi=u^{2} & \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3}\end{cases}
$$

where $f$ belongs to $C^{1}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ and satisfies:
$\left(f_{1}\right)$

$$
\lim _{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(s)}{s}=0
$$

( $f_{2}$ )

$$
\lim _{|s| \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{f(s)}{|s|^{5}}=0
$$

$\left(f_{3}\right)$

$$
\lim _{|s| \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{F(s)}{s^{4}}=+\infty, \quad \text { where } F(s)=\int_{0}^{s} f(t) d t
$$

$\left(f_{4}\right)$

$$
\frac{f(s)}{s^{3}} \text { is non-decreasing in }|s|>0
$$

Remark 1.1. We observe that $\left(f_{2}\right)$ is weaker than the usual subcritical condition. Conditions $\left(f_{1}\right)$ and $\left(f_{4}\right)$ imply that

$$
H(s)=s f(s)-4 F(s)
$$

is a non-negative and non-decreasing function in $|s|$.

Here,

$$
V: \mathbb{R}^{3} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}
$$

is locally Hölder continuous and satisfies the following assumptions:
( $V_{1}$ ) there exists $\alpha>0$ such that $V(x) \geq \alpha>0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$;

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{\infty}=\sup \left\{V(x): x \in \mathbb{R}^{3}\right\}, \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\lim _{|x| \rightarrow+\infty} V(x)=V_{\infty} ;
$$

$\left(V_{3}\right)$ there exist $R_{0}>0$ and

$$
\rho:\left(R_{0}, \infty\right) \longrightarrow(0, \infty)
$$

a non-increasing function such that

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \rho(r) e^{\delta r}=\infty
$$

for all $\delta>0$, and

$$
V(x) \leq V_{\infty}-\rho(|x|), \quad \text { for all }|x| \geq R_{0}
$$

As an example, given $V_{\infty}>1$ and $0<\theta<1$, let $V(x)=V_{\infty}-e^{-|x|^{\theta}}$.
Our main result is the next theorem.

Theorem 1.2. Suppose that $f$ satisfies $\left(f_{1}\right)-\left(f_{4}\right)$ and $V$ satisfies $\left(V_{1}\right)-$ $\left(V_{3}\right)$. Then problem ( SP ) possesses a least energy sign-changing solution, which changes sign exactly once in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$.

Theorem 1.2 can be seen as a similar version for $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ of the result due to [1]. However, the reader is invited to observe that, in Sections 3,4 and 5 , we did a careful study involving some levels which do not appear in [1] because, in that paper, the problems were considered on a bounded domain. Here, we need to overcome the lack compactness involving the Sobolev imbedding in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$, which implies that energy functionals do not verify the well known Palais-Smale condition or Cerami condition.

As observed in $[\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{6}]$, the general procedure to find sign-changing solutions of an equation with a nonlinear term stalls upon the fact that the nodal set is not a submanifold of $H^{1}$ because the map $u \mapsto u^{ \pm}$ lacks differentiability; thus, it is not evident that a minimizer of the associated energy functional on the nodal set is a solution of the equation. Furthermore, there is a worsening in the case considered here: since the associated energy functional has a nonlocal term, it follows that, even if $u$ is a sign-changing solution of the problem, the functions $u^{ \pm}$do not both belong to the Nehari manifold, and so some arguments used to prove the existence of nodal solutions for semilinear local problems cannot be used in our arguments.

Our approach is based on some arguments presented in $[\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{6}]$ in association with the deformation lemma and Miranda's theorem. The contributions of our work are twofold: on one hand, it applies the construction of [1] in an unbounded domain like $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ and consequently deals with the difficulties it brings; on the other hand, it faces the subtle peculiarities of a nonlocal term.

We begin by establishing some estimates involving functions that change sign. We find a sign-changing solution as an existence result
by minimization in a closed subset containing all the sign-changing solutions of the equation. At first, this may resemble the ideas found in $[5,6]$. However, we need to choose a suitable minimizing sequence for the nodal level. This choice involves the corresponding equation in bounded domains (balls) and the problem is then to prove that the minimum of the energy on the corresponding closed subset containing all the sign-changing solutions of the equation in bounded domains is achieved by some function in the subset. In order to overcome the possible lack of regularity of this subset, it is crucial to apply a deformation lemma and detailed use of Miranda's theorem [20].
2. The variational framework and technical lemmas. In this section, we present the variational framework for dealing with problem (SP). The key observation is that equation (SP) can be transformed into a Schrödinger equation with a nonlocal term, see, for instance, [4, 23, 26]. This permits the use of variational methods. Effectively, by the Lax-Milgram theorem, given $u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$, there exists a unique

$$
\phi=\phi_{u} \in D^{1,2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)
$$

such that

$$
-\Delta \phi=u^{2} .
$$

Using standard arguments, we have that $\phi_{u}$ verifies the following properties (for a proof, see $[\mathbf{1 1}, \mathbf{2 3}]$ ):

Lemma 2.1. For any $u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$, we have:
(i) there exists $C>0$ such that

$$
\left\|\phi_{u}\right\|_{D^{1,2}} \leq C\|u\|_{H^{1}}^{2}
$$

and
$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left|\nabla \phi_{u}\right|^{2} d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u} u^{2} d x \leq C\|u\|_{H^{1}}^{4} \quad$ for all $u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$,
where

$$
\|u\|_{H^{1}}^{2}=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(|\nabla u|^{2}+u^{2}\right) d x
$$

and

$$
\|w\|_{D^{1,2}}^{2}=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}|\nabla w|^{2} d x
$$

(ii) $\phi_{u} \geq 0$ for all $u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$;
(iii) $\phi_{t u}=t^{2} \phi_{u}$ for all $t>0$ and $u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$;
(iv) if $a \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$ and $u_{a}(x)=u(x-a)$, then

$$
\phi_{u_{a}}(x)=\phi_{u}(x-a)
$$

and

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{a}} u_{a}^{2} d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u} u^{2} d x
$$

(v) if $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$, then

$$
\phi_{u_{n}} \rightharpoonup \phi_{u} \quad \text { in } H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)
$$

and

$$
\liminf _{n \rightarrow+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}} u_{n}^{2} d x \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u} u^{2} d x
$$

Therefore, $(u, \phi) \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \times D^{1,2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ is a solution of (SP) if, and only if, $\phi=\phi_{u}$ and $u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ is a weak solution of the nonlocal problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\Delta u+V(x) u+\phi_{u} u=f(u) \quad \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3}  \tag{P}\\
u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)
\end{array}\right.
$$

Combining $\left(f_{1}\right)-\left(f_{2}\right)$ with Lemma 2.1, the functional

$$
J: H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}
$$

given by

$$
J(u)=\frac{1}{2}\|u\|^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u} u^{2} d x-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} F(u) d x
$$

where

$$
\|u\|^{2}=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(|\nabla u|^{2}+V(x) u^{2}\right) d x, \quad F(s)=\int_{0}^{s} f(t) d t
$$

belongs to $C^{1}\left(H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right), \mathbb{R}\right)$, and

$$
J^{\prime}(u) v=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}(\nabla u \nabla v+V(x) u v) d x+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u} u v d x-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f(u) v d x
$$

for all $u$ and $v$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$. Hence, critical points of $J$ are the weak solutions for nonlocal problem (P).

In what follows, we denote the Nehari manifold associated with $J$ by $\mathcal{N}$, that is,

$$
\mathcal{N}=\left\{u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \backslash\{0\}: J^{\prime}(u) u=0\right\}
$$

A nontrivial critical point $u$ of $J$ is a ground state of $(\mathrm{P})$ if

$$
J(u)=c \doteq \inf _{\mathcal{N}} J
$$

Since we are searching for sign-changing solutions, our goal is to prove the existence of a critical point for $J$ in the set

$$
\mathcal{M}=\left\{u \in \mathcal{N}: J^{\prime}(u) u^{+}=J^{\prime}(u) u^{-}=0 \text { and } u^{ \pm} \neq 0\right\}
$$

where $u^{+}=\max \{u(x), 0\}$ and $u^{-}(x)=\min \{u(x), 0\}$. More precisely, our goal is to prove that there is a critical point of $J, w \in \mathcal{M}$, such that

$$
J(w)=c_{0} \doteq \inf _{u \in \mathcal{M}} J(u)
$$

Since $J$ has the nonlocal term

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u} u^{2} d x
$$

if $u$ is a sign-changing solution for ( P ), we have that

$$
J^{\prime}\left(u^{+}\right) u^{+}=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u^{-}}\left(u^{+}\right)^{2}<0
$$

and

$$
J^{\prime}\left(u^{-}\right) u^{-}=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u^{+}}\left(u^{-}\right)^{2}<0 .
$$

Consequently, although $u$ was a sign-changing solution for ( P ), the functions $u^{ \pm}$do not belong both to $\mathcal{N}$. Hence, some arguments used
to prove the existence of sign-changing solutions for a problem like

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\Delta u+u=f(u) \quad \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3}  \tag{1}\\
u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)
\end{array}\right.
$$

cannot be applied; thus, a careful analysis is necessary in many estimates.

Consider the Sobolev space $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ endowed with the norm

$$
\|u\|_{*}^{2}=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(|\nabla u|^{2}+V_{\infty} u^{2}\right) d x
$$

Let

$$
J_{\infty}: H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}
$$

be the functional given by

$$
J_{\infty}(u)=\frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{*}^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u} u^{2} d x-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} F(u) d x
$$

and consider

$$
\mathcal{N}_{\infty}=\left\{u \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) \backslash\{0\}: J_{\infty}^{\prime}(u) u=0\right\}, \quad c_{\infty}=\inf _{\mathcal{N}_{\infty}} J_{\infty}
$$

The next lemma establishes that $c_{0}$ is a positive level. A similar result holds for $c_{\infty}$.

Lemma 2.2. There exists $\rho>0$ such that
(i) $J(u) \geq\|u\|^{2} / 4$ and $\|u\| \geq \rho$ for all $u \in \mathcal{N}$;
(ii) $\left\|w^{ \pm}\right\| \geq \rho$ for all $w \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. From Remark 1.1, for every $u \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
4 J(u) & =4 J(u)-J^{\prime}(u) u \\
& =\|u\|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}(f(u) u-4 F(u)) d x \geq\|u\|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

and (i) follows. For $\alpha>0$ given by $\left(V_{1}\right)$, we set $\epsilon \in(0, \alpha)$. Since $f$ satisfies $\left(f_{1}\right)-\left(f_{2}\right)$, there exists a $C=C(\epsilon)>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(s) s \leq \epsilon s^{2}+C s^{6} \quad \text { for all } s \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For every $w \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $J^{\prime}\left(w^{ \pm}\right) w^{ \pm}<0$, which gives

$$
\left\|w^{ \pm}\right\|^{2} \leq\left\|w^{ \pm}\right\|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{w^{ \pm}}\left(w^{ \pm}\right)^{2} d x<\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(w^{ \pm}\right) w^{ \pm} d x
$$

From equation (2.1), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|w^{ \pm}\right\|^{2} & \leq \epsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(w^{ \pm}\right)^{2} d x+C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(w^{ \pm}\right)^{6} d x \\
& \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(x)\left(w^{ \pm}\right)^{2} d x+C \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(w^{ \pm}\right)^{6} d x \\
& \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha}\left\|w^{ \pm}\right\|^{2}+C\left\|w^{ \pm}\right\|^{6}
\end{aligned}
$$

and (ii) is proved.

The next lemma is a consequence of Miranda's theorem. Since the idea of the proof follows the same type of arguments explored in [1, Section 2], we will omit its proof.

Lemma 2.3. Let $v \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ satisfy $v^{ \pm} \neq 0$. Then, there are $t, s>0$ such that

$$
J^{\prime}\left(t v^{+}+s v^{-}\right) v^{+}=0
$$

and

$$
J^{\prime}\left(t v^{+}+s v^{-}\right) v^{-}=0
$$

Moreover, if $J^{\prime}(v)\left(v^{ \pm}\right) \leq 0$, we have $s, t \leq 1$.
3. The choice of the minimizing sequence. Given $R>0$, let $B_{R}$ be the ball of radius $R$ centered at 0 . Consider the problem:

$$
\left(\mathrm{AP}_{R}\right) \quad \begin{cases}-\Delta u+V(x) u+\phi u=f(u) & \text { in } B_{R} \\ -\Delta \phi=\widetilde{u}^{2} & \text { in } \mathbb{R}^{3} \\ \phi \in D^{1,2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right) & u \in H_{0}^{1}\left(B_{R}\right)\end{cases}
$$

where

$$
\widetilde{u}(x)= \begin{cases}u(x) & \text { if } x \in B_{R} \\ 0 & \text { if } x \in \mathbb{R}^{3} \backslash B_{R}\end{cases}
$$

By similar reasoning as used in [1], we can prove that, for each $R>0$, there exists a sign-changing solution $u=u_{R}$ of $\left(\mathrm{AP}_{R}\right)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{R}=\inf _{u \in \mathcal{M}_{R}} J_{R}(u)=J_{R}\left(u_{R}\right) \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
J_{R}: H_{0}^{1}\left(B_{R}\right) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}
$$

is the energy functional given by

$$
J_{R}(u)=\frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{R}}|\nabla u|^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{B_{R}} \phi_{u} u^{2} d x-\int_{B_{R}} F(u) d x
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{M}_{R}=\left\{u \in H_{0}^{1}\left(B_{R}\right): J_{R}^{\prime}(u) u^{+}=0=J_{R}^{\prime}(u) u^{-}=0, u^{ \pm} \neq 0\right\} .
$$

Lemma 3.1. Let $c_{0}$ be the nodal level of $J$. Then

$$
\lim _{R \rightarrow+\infty} c_{R}=c_{0}
$$

Proof. Since $R \mapsto c_{R}$ is a non-increasing function and $c_{R} \geq c_{0}$ for all $R>0$, if

$$
\lim _{R \rightarrow+\infty} c_{R}=\widehat{c}>c_{0}
$$

then there exists a $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $J(\varphi)<\widehat{c}$. From $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}, \varphi^{ \pm} \neq 0$. Let $\varphi_{n} \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ be such that $\varphi_{n} \rightarrow \varphi$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$. We may assume that $\varphi_{n}^{ \pm} \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.3, there exist $t_{n}, s_{n}>0$ such that

$$
J^{\prime}\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right) \varphi_{n}^{+}=0
$$

and

$$
J^{\prime}\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right) \varphi_{n}^{-}=0
$$

In particular,

$$
J^{\prime}\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right)\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right)=0
$$

Using

$$
\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right)^{+}=t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+} \neq 0
$$

and

$$
\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right)^{-}=s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-} \neq 0
$$

we find that

$$
t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-} \in \mathcal{M} \cap C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)
$$

We claim that there exists a subsequence, still denoted by

$$
\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right)
$$

such that

$$
J\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right) \longrightarrow J(\varphi) .
$$

Suppose for the moment that the limit holds. Let $n$ and $R>0$ be such that

$$
t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-} \in \mathcal{M}_{R}
$$

and

$$
J\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right)<\widehat{c}
$$

Hence,

$$
c_{R} \leq J\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right)<\widehat{c}
$$

and finally,

$$
\widehat{c}=\lim _{R \rightarrow+\infty} c_{R} \leq J\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right)<\widehat{c}
$$

which is impossible. To establish the last claim we begin with the observation that there exist subsequences (not renamed) such that $t_{n} \rightarrow 1$ and $s_{n} \rightarrow 1$. In fact, suppose, by contradiction, that $\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} t_{n}>1$. Given $\delta>0$, there exists a subsequence, still denoted by $t_{n}$, such that $t_{n} \geq \sigma$ for every $n$, for some $\sigma>1$. Since

$$
J^{\prime}\left(\varphi_{n}\right) \longrightarrow J^{\prime}(\varphi)=0 \quad \text { and the function } \quad u \longmapsto u^{+}
$$

is continuous, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\varphi_{n}^{+}\right\|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{\varphi_{n}^{+}}\left(\varphi_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(\varphi_{n}^{+}\right) \varphi_{n}^{+} d x+o_{n}(1) . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

However,

$$
J^{\prime}\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right) t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}=0
$$

that is,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{t_{n}^{2}}\left\|\varphi_{n}^{+}\right\|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{\varphi_{n}^{+}}\left(\varphi_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{f\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}\right) t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}}{t_{n}^{4}} d x \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining equation (3.2) with equation (3.3) gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(1-\frac{1}{t_{n}^{2}}\right)\left\|\varphi_{n}^{+}\right\|^{2} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left[\frac{f\left(\varphi_{n}^{+}\right) \varphi_{n}^{+}}{\left(\varphi_{n}^{+}\right)^{4}}-\frac{f\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}\right) t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}}{\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}\right)^{4}}\right]\left(\varphi_{n}^{+}\right)^{4} d x+o_{n}(1) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

From $\left(f_{4}\right)$ and Fatou's lemma, we have

$$
0 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left[\frac{f\left(\sigma \varphi^{+}\right) \sigma \varphi^{+}}{\left(\sigma \varphi^{+}\right)^{4}}-\frac{f\left(\varphi^{+}\right) \varphi^{+}}{\left(\varphi^{+}\right)^{4}}\right]\left(\varphi^{+}\right)^{4} d x \leq\left(\frac{1}{\sigma^{2}}-1\right)\left\|\varphi^{+}\right\|^{2}<0
$$

which is impossible. Hence, $\lim \sup _{n \rightarrow \infty} t_{n} \leq 1$. Consequently, there exists a subsequence (not renamed) such that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} t_{n}=t_{0}$. Taking to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in equation (3.4) and using $\left(f_{4}\right)$ again, we get $t_{0}=1$. In exactly a similar way, there exists a subsequence (not renamed) such that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{n}=1$. Finally, considering that

$$
\begin{aligned}
J\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right)= & \frac{t_{n}^{2}}{2}\left\|\varphi_{n}^{+}\right\|^{2}+\frac{s_{n}^{2}}{2}\left\|\varphi_{n}^{-}\right\|^{2}+\frac{t_{n}^{4}}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{\varphi_{n}^{+}}\left(\varphi_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x \\
& +\frac{s_{n}^{4}}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{\varphi_{n}^{-}}\left(\varphi_{n}^{-}\right)^{2} d x-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} F\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right) d x
\end{aligned}
$$

we obtain that

$$
J\left(t_{n} \varphi_{n}^{+}+s_{n} \varphi_{n}^{-}\right) \longrightarrow J(\varphi)
$$

by Lemma 2.1 and the convergence $\varphi_{n} \rightarrow \varphi$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$.
4. The minimum level is achieved on $\mathcal{M}$. In this section, our main goal is to prove that the infimum $c_{0}$ of $J$ on $\mathcal{M}$ is achieved. From Lemma 2.2 (i), we deduce that $c_{0}>0$. We begin with the next lemma.

Lemma 4.1. Suppose that $\left(u_{n}\right)$ is a sequence in $\mathcal{M}$ such that

$$
\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} J\left(u_{n}\right)<c+c_{\infty}
$$

Then $\left(u_{n}\right)$ has a subsequence which converges weakly to some $w \in$ $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ such that $w^{ \pm} \neq 0$.

Proof. From Lemma 2.2 (i), $\left(u_{n}\right)$ is a bounded sequence. Hence, without loss of generality, we may suppose that there is a $w \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ verifying $u_{n} \rightharpoonup w$ in $H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ and $u_{n}(x) \rightarrow w(x)$ almost everywhere in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. Observing that

$$
J\left(u_{n}\right)=J\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)+J\left(u_{n}^{-}\right)+\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{-}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x
$$

and

$$
J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right) u_{n}^{+}=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{-}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x=J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}^{-}\right) u_{n}^{-}
$$

we can suppose that

$$
J\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{-}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x=\theta+o_{n}(1)
$$

and

$$
J\left(u_{n}^{-}\right)+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{-}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x=\sigma+o_{n}(1)
$$

where $\theta+\sigma<c+c_{\infty}$. We claim that $w^{+} \neq 0$. Suppose, by contradiction, that $w^{+} \equiv 0$. From condition $\left(V_{2}\right)$ and the Sobolev compact imbedding, we obtain

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V(x)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} V_{\infty}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x+o_{n}(1)
$$

which implies

$$
J_{\infty}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)=J\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)+o_{n}(1)
$$

and

$$
J_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right) u_{n}^{+}=J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right) u_{n}^{+}+o_{n}(1) .
$$

Hence,

$$
J_{\infty}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{-}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x=\theta+o_{n}(1)
$$

and

$$
J_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right) u_{n}^{+}=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{-}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x+o_{n}(1)
$$

We observe that $\theta \geq c_{\infty}$. In fact, let $t_{n}>0$ be such that

$$
J_{\infty}\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right) \geq J_{\infty}\left(t u_{n}^{+}\right)
$$

for all $t>0$. We have three possibilities for $\left(t_{n}\right)$ :
(i) $\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} t_{n}>1$,
(ii) $\limsup t_{n}=1$,
(iii) $\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} t_{n}<1$.

We now show that (i) cannot occur and (ii) or (iii) imply $\theta \geq c_{\infty}$. From

$$
J_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right) t_{n} u_{n}^{+}=0
$$

we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{n}^{2}\left\|u_{n}^{+}\right\|_{\infty}^{2}+t_{n}^{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{+}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right) t_{n} u_{n}^{+} d x \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and from $J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{+}=0$, it follows that

$$
\left\|u_{n}^{+}\right\|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{+}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{-}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(u_{n}^{+}\right) u_{n}^{+} d x
$$

which implies

$$
\begin{align*}
&\left\|u_{n}^{+}\right\|_{\infty}^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{+}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{-}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x  \tag{4.2}\\
&=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(u_{n}^{+}\right) u_{n}^{+} d x+o_{n}(1)
\end{align*}
$$

Combining equations (4.1) and (4.2), we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\left(1-\frac{1}{t_{n}^{2}}\right)\left\|u_{n}^{+}\right\|_{\infty}^{2} & +\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{-}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x  \tag{4.3}\\
& =\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left[\frac{f\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)}{\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{3}}-\frac{f\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right)}{\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right)^{3}}\right]\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{4} d x+o_{n}(1)
\end{align*}
$$

If (i) holds, there exists an $a>1$ such that $t_{n} \geq a$ for infinitely many $n$. By Lemma 2.2 (ii), the left hand side in equation (4.3) is bounded from below by a positive number. On the other hand, by $\left(f_{4}\right)$, the integral on the right hand side of equation (4.3) is non-positive. This yields a contradiction. Hence, (i) does not hold. Suppose that (iii) holds.

Then, $t_{n} \leq 1$ and Remark 1.1 imply

$$
\begin{aligned}
4 c_{\infty} & \leq 4 J_{\infty}\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right) \\
& =4 J_{\infty}\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right)-J_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right)\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right) \\
& =t_{n}^{2}\left\|u_{n}^{+}\right\|_{*}^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left[f\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right) t_{n} u_{n}^{+}-4 F\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right)\right] d x \\
& \leq\left\|u_{n}^{+}\right\|_{*}^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left[f\left(u_{n}^{+}\right) u_{n}^{+}-4 F\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)\right] d x \\
& =4 J_{\infty}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)-J_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right) \\
& =4 J_{\infty}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{-}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x+o_{n}(1) \\
& =4 \theta+o_{n}(1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, we find $\theta \geq c_{\infty}$. If (ii) occurs, there exists a subsequence (still denoted by $t_{n}$ ) such that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} t_{n}=1$. As a consequence,

$$
4 J_{\infty}\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right)-J_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right)\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right)=4 J_{\infty}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)-J_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)+o_{n}(1)
$$

Thus,

$$
\begin{aligned}
4 c_{\infty} & \leq 4 J_{\infty}\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right) \\
& =4 J_{\infty}\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right)-J_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right)\left(t_{n} u_{n}^{+}\right) \\
& =4 J_{\infty}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)-J_{\infty}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)+o_{n}(1) \\
& =4 J_{\infty}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{-}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x+o_{n}(1) \\
& =4 \theta+o_{n}(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, we also obtain $\theta \geq c_{\infty}$. Since $\theta+\sigma<c+c_{\infty}$ and $\theta \geq c_{\infty}$, we have $\sigma<c$. Let $s_{n}>0$ be such that $J\left(s_{n} u_{n}^{-}\right) \geq J\left(t u_{n}^{-}\right)$ for all $t>0$. Using that $J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}^{-}\right)\left(u_{n}^{-}\right)<0$, we get $s_{n}<1$. Hence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
4 c & \leq 4 J\left(s_{n} u_{n}^{-}\right) \\
& =4 J\left(s_{n} u_{n}^{-}\right)-J^{\prime}\left(s_{n} u_{n}^{-}\right)\left(s_{n} u_{n}^{-}\right) \\
& =s_{n}^{2}\left\|u_{n}^{-}\right\|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left[f\left(s_{n} u_{n}^{-}\right) s_{n} u_{n}^{-}-4 F\left(s_{n} u_{n}^{-}\right)\right] d x \\
& \leq\left\|u_{n}^{-}\right\|^{2}+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left[f\left(u_{n}^{-}\right) u_{n}^{-}-4 F\left(u_{n}^{-}\right)\right] d x
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =4 J\left(u_{n}^{-}\right)-J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}^{-}\right)\left(u_{n}^{-}\right) \\
& =4 J\left(u_{n}^{-}\right)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u_{n}^{-}}\left(u_{n}^{+}\right)^{2} d x \\
& =4 \sigma+o_{n}(1)
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies $c \leq \sigma$, contrary to $\sigma<c$. Hence, $w^{+} \neq 0$, as claimed. Similar arguments to those above show that $w^{-} \neq 0$, and the proof is complete.

Lemma 4.2. If $c_{0}<c+c_{\infty}$, there exists a $w \in \mathcal{M}$ which minimizes $J$ on $\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. We begin by recalling (equation (3.1)) that there exists a least energy sign-changing solution $u_{n}$ to $\left(\mathrm{AP}_{R}\right)$ for $R=n$, that is,

$$
J\left(u_{n}\right)=c_{n}=\inf _{\mathcal{M}_{n}} J
$$

where $c_{n}=c_{R}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{n}=\mathcal{M}_{R}$. By Lemma $3.1, c_{n} \rightarrow c_{0}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, $J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) v=0$ for all $v \in H_{0}^{1}\left(B_{n}\right)$. Since $c_{0}<c+c_{\infty}$, $u_{n}$ converges weakly to some $w \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ such that $w^{ \pm} \neq 0$ by Lemma 4.1. Using $J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) v=0$ for all $v \in H_{0}^{1}\left(B_{n}\right)$, we get $J^{\prime}(w)=0$, and consequently, $w \in \mathcal{M}$.

We claim that $J(w)=c_{0}$. In fact, combining Fatou's lemma with Remark 1.1, we have

$$
c_{0} \leq J(w)-\frac{1}{4} J^{\prime}(w) w \leq \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(J\left(u_{n}\right)-\frac{1}{4} J^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) u_{n}\right)=c_{0}
$$

which implies that $c_{0}=J(w)$.
Up until now, we have proved that, under condition $c_{0}<c+c_{\infty}$, there exists a $w \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $J(w)=c_{0}$ and $J^{\prime}(w)=0$.
5. Estimate on the level $c_{0}$. This section is devoted to showing that $c_{0}<c+c_{\infty}$. The proofs herein are based upon ideas found in [18]. From now on, set $u, v \in H^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)$ to be ground state solutions of $(\mathrm{P})$ and $\left(P_{\infty}\right)$ given by [2, Theorems 1.3 and 1.5], respectively. We know that $u$ and $v$ should have defined signs. Without loss of generality, we will suppose that $u$ and $v$ are positive functions in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$, $J(u)=c, J_{\infty}(v)=c_{\infty}, J^{\prime}(u)=0$ and $J_{\infty}^{\prime}(v)=0$. Using Moser's
and De Giorgi's iterations, we can show that $u$ and $v$ have exponential decay, and consequently, $\phi_{v}$ and $\phi_{u}$ have the same behavior. Using this information, a direct computation gives the next result:

Lemma 5.1. There exist $C>0$ and $\delta>0$ such that, for all $R>0$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\int_{|x| \geq R}\left(|\nabla u|^{2}+u^{2}\right) d x \leq C e^{-\delta R}, \\
\int_{|x| \geq R}\left(|\nabla v|^{2}+v^{2}\right) d x \leq C e^{-\delta R} \\
\int_{|x| \geq R}(F(u)+u f(u)+F(v)+v f(v)) d x \leq C e^{-\delta R}, \\
\int_{|x| \geq R} \phi_{u} v^{2} d x+\int_{|x| \geq R} \phi_{v} u^{2} d x \leq C e^{-\delta R} .
\end{gathered}
$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set $v_{n}(x)=v\left(x+n e_{1}\right)$, where $e_{1}=(1,0,0) \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$. The same conclusion for Lemma 5.1 is satisfied by function $v_{n}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{u} v_{n}^{2} d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{v_{n}} u^{2} d x=O\left(e^{-n \delta}\right) . \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 5.2. Suppose that $V$ satisfies $\left(V_{2}\right)-\left(V_{3}\right)$ and $f$ satisfies $\left(f_{2}\right)$ and $\left(f_{5}\right)$. Then,

$$
\sup _{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^{2}} J\left(\alpha u+\beta v_{n}\right)<c+c_{\infty}
$$

provided $n$ is sufficiently large.

Proof. We begin by proving that there is an $r_{0}>0$ such that

$$
J\left(\alpha u+\beta v_{n}\right) \leq 0 \quad \text { for all }(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^{2}
$$

such that $\alpha^{2}+\beta^{2} \geq r_{0}$ and $n \geq r_{0}$. Since $J(v) \leq J_{\infty}(v)$ for all $v$, it is sufficient to show that

$$
J_{\infty}\left(\alpha u+\beta v_{n}\right) \leq 0 \quad \text { for all } \alpha^{2}+\beta^{2} \geq r_{0}, \quad n \geq r_{0}
$$

In fact, suppose that $J_{\infty}$ does not satisfy this claim. Thus, for each $n$, there are $\left(\alpha_{n}, \beta_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{2}$ such that $J_{\infty}\left(\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right)>0$ and
$\alpha_{n}^{2}+\beta_{n}^{2} \rightarrow \infty$, that is,

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{2}\left\|\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right\|_{*}^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{\left(\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right)} & \left(\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right)^{2} d x  \tag{5.2}\\
& \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} F\left(\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right) d x
\end{align*}
$$

We have $\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{*}=\|v\|_{*}$, and from Lemma 5.1,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla u \nabla v_{n}+V_{\infty} u v_{n}\right) d x=O\left(e^{-n \delta}\right) \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right\|_{*}^{2}=\alpha_{n}^{2}\|u\|_{*}^{2}+\beta_{n}^{2}\|v\|_{*}^{2}+O\left(e^{-n \delta}\right) \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and then $\sigma_{n}=\left\|\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right\|_{*} \rightarrow+\infty$. Set

$$
z_{n}=\frac{\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}}{\left\|\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right\|_{*}}
$$

and suppose that $z_{n} \rightharpoonup z$. Dividing (5.2) by $\sigma_{n}^{4}$, we have

$$
\frac{1}{2 \sigma_{n}^{2}}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{z_{n}} z_{n}^{2} d x \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \frac{F\left(\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right)}{\left(\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right)^{4}} z_{n}^{4} d x
$$

The boundedness of $\left(z_{n}\right)$ together with the above inequality and $\left(f_{3}\right)$ shows that $z \equiv 0$. Passing to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the equality,

$$
\begin{aligned}
o_{n}(1)= & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla u \nabla z_{n}+V_{\infty} u z_{n}\right) d x \\
= & \alpha_{n}\left\|\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right\|_{*}^{-1}\|u\|_{*}^{2} \\
& +\beta_{n}\left\|\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right\|_{*}^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(\nabla u \nabla v_{n}+V_{\infty} u v_{n}\right) d x
\end{aligned}
$$

we obtain from equations (5.3) and (5.4) that $\alpha_{n}\left\|\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right\|_{*}^{-1}$ converges to 0. By Lemma 2.1 (iv),

$$
J_{\infty}\left(\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right)=J_{\infty}\left(\alpha_{n} u_{n}+\beta_{n} v\right)
$$

where $u_{n}(x)=u\left(x-n e_{1}\right)$. Proceeding exactly as in the previous argument we can show that $\beta_{n}\left\|\alpha_{n} u+\beta_{n} v_{n}\right\|_{*}^{-1}$ converges to 0 . From equation (5.4), $z_{n} \rightarrow 0$, which contradicts $\left\|z_{n}\right\|_{*}=1$. Hence, the claim holds for $J_{\infty}$, and, in consequence, for $J$.

We now consider $n \geq r_{o}, \alpha^{2}+\beta^{2} \leq r_{0}$. From equation (5.1) and Lemma 5.1, there are $\delta>0$ and $C=C\left(u, v, r_{0}\right)$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left[F\left(\alpha u+\beta v_{n}\right)-F(\alpha u)-F\left(\beta v_{n}\right)\right] d x\right| & \leq C e^{-n \delta}, \\
\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left[\phi_{\left(\alpha u+\beta v_{n}\right)}\left(\alpha u+\beta v_{n}\right)^{2}-\alpha^{4} \phi_{u} u^{2}-\beta^{4} \phi_{v_{n}} v_{n}^{2}\right] d x\right| & \leq C e^{-n \delta}, \\
\left|\left\|\alpha u+\beta v_{n}\right\|^{2}-\alpha^{2}\|u\|^{2}-\beta^{2}\left\|v_{n}\right\|^{2}\right| & \leq C e^{-n \delta}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence,

$$
\begin{equation*}
J\left(\alpha u+\beta v_{n}\right) \leq J(\alpha u)+J\left(\beta v_{n}\right)+C e^{-n \delta} \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $t_{n}>0$ be such that

$$
J\left(t_{n} v_{n}\right)=\max _{t \geq 0} J\left(t v_{n}\right)
$$

We observe that

$$
J\left(t_{n} v_{n}\right)=J_{\infty}\left(t_{n} v_{n}\right)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(V(x)-V_{\infty}\right) t_{n}^{2} v_{n}^{2} d x
$$

and

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(V(x)-V_{\infty}\right) t_{n}^{2} v_{n}^{2} d x \leq \int_{\left|x-n e_{1}\right| \leq 1}\left(V(x)-V_{\infty}\right) t_{n}^{2} v_{n}^{2} d x .
$$

For $R_{0}>0$ and $\rho$, the non-increasing function given by $\left(V_{3}\right)$, we have

$$
\int_{\left|x-n e_{1}\right| \leq 1}\left(V(x)-V_{\infty}\right) t_{n}^{2} v_{n}^{2} d x \leq-\rho(n+1) \int_{\left|x-n e_{1}\right| \leq 1} t_{n}^{2} v_{n}^{2} d x
$$

for every $n \geq R_{0}+1$. Hence,

$$
\begin{equation*}
J\left(\beta v_{n}\right) \leq J\left(t_{n} v_{n}\right) \leq J_{\infty}\left(t_{n} v_{n}\right)-\rho(n+1) t_{n}^{2}|v|_{L^{2}\left(B_{1}(0)\right)}^{2} \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every $n \geq R_{0}+1$. By the definition of $t_{n}$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{n}\left\|v_{n}\right\|^{2}+t_{n}^{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{v_{n}} v_{n}^{2} d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(t_{n} v_{n}\right) v_{n} d x=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(t_{n} v\right) v d x \tag{5.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining equation (5.7) with the fact

$$
\left\|v_{n}\right\|^{2}=\left\|v_{n}\right\|_{*}^{2}+o_{n}(1)=\|v\|_{*}^{2}+o_{n}(1),
$$

by $\left(V_{2}\right)-\left(V_{3}\right)$, and using Lemma 2.1 (iv) and equation (2.1), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
t_{n}^{2}\left(\|v\|_{*}^{2}+o_{n}(1)\right) & \leq t_{n}^{2}\left(\|v\|_{*}^{2}+o_{n}(1)\right)+t_{n}^{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{v} v^{2} d x \\
& =t_{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} f\left(t_{n} v\right) v d x \\
& \leq \epsilon t_{n}^{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v^{2} d x+C t_{n}^{6} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} v^{6} d x
\end{aligned}
$$

for some positive constant $C$. Therefore, there exists $\tau>0$ such that $t_{n}^{2} \geq \tau$ for every $n$. Using equations (5.5), (5.6) and the fact that

$$
J_{\infty}\left(t_{n} v_{n}\right)=J_{\infty}\left(t_{n} v\right) \leq J_{\infty}(v)=c_{\infty}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
J\left(\alpha u+\beta v_{n}\right) & \leq J(\alpha u)+J_{\infty}\left(t_{n} v_{n}\right)+C e^{-n \delta}-t_{n}^{2} \rho(n+1)|v|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)}^{2} \\
& \leq c+c_{\infty}+e^{-n \delta}\left(C-\tau|v|_{L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{3}\right)}^{2} e^{n \delta} \rho(n+1)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and the proof follows by the limit condition on $\rho$ in $\left(V_{3}\right)$.

We now have the next lemma.

Lemma 5.3. The number $c_{0}$ verifies the inequality:

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{0}<c+c_{\infty} \tag{5.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $u$ and $v_{n}$ be functions as in the proof of Lemma 5.2. Let

$$
D=\left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\right] \times\left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\right]
$$

and
$\Psi(\xi, \tau)=\left(J^{\prime}\left(\left(\xi u-\tau v_{n}\right)^{+}\right)\left(\xi u-\tau v_{n}\right)^{+}, J^{\prime}\left(\left(\xi u-\tau v_{n}\right)^{-}\right)\left(\xi u-\tau v_{n}\right)^{-}\right)$.
Using $J^{\prime}(u) u=0$ and $\left(f_{4}\right)$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
J^{\prime}\left(\frac{1}{2} u\right) \frac{1}{2} u>0 \quad \text { and } \quad J^{\prime}\left(\frac{3}{2} u\right) \frac{3}{2} u<0 \tag{5.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 2.1 (iv), condition $\left(V_{2}\right)$ and $J_{\infty}^{\prime}(v) v=0$ imply that there exists $n_{0} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
J^{\prime}\left(\frac{1}{2} v_{n}\right) \frac{1}{2} v_{n}>0 \quad \text { and } \quad J^{\prime}\left(\frac{3}{2} v_{n}\right) \frac{3}{2} v_{n}<0 \tag{5.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $n \geq n_{0}$. Since $v(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, it follows from (5.9)-(5.10), by increasing $n_{0}$ if necessary, that

$$
\begin{align*}
& J^{\prime}\left(\left(\frac{1}{2} u-\tau v_{n}\right)^{+}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2} u-\tau v_{n}\right)^{+}>0  \tag{5.11}\\
& J^{\prime}\left(\left(\frac{3}{2} u-\tau v_{n}\right)^{+}\right)\left(\frac{3}{2} u-\tau v_{n}\right)^{+}<0 \tag{5.12}
\end{align*}
$$

for every $n \geq n_{0}$ and $\tau \in[1 / 2,3 / 2]$, and

$$
\begin{align*}
& J^{\prime}\left(\left(\xi u-\frac{1}{2} v_{n}\right)^{-}\right)\left(\xi u-\frac{1}{2} v_{n}\right)^{-}>0  \tag{5.13}\\
& J^{\prime}\left(\left(\xi u-\frac{3}{2} v_{n}\right)^{-}\right)\left(\xi u-\frac{3}{2} v_{n}\right)^{-}<0 \tag{5.14}
\end{align*}
$$

for every $n \geq n_{0}$ and $\xi \in[1 / 2,3 / 2]$. Noting that the function $\Psi$ is continuous in $D$ and considering inequalities (5.11)-(5.14), we can apply Miranda's theorem [20] and conclude that there exists $\left(\xi_{0}, \tau_{0}\right) \in D$ such that $\Psi\left(\xi_{0}, \tau_{0}\right)=(0,0)$. This gives $\xi_{0} u-\tau_{0} v_{n} \in \mathcal{M}$ for every $n \geq n_{0}$. Consequently,

$$
c_{0} \leq J\left(\xi_{0} u-\tau_{0} v_{n}\right)
$$

which implies

$$
c_{0} \leq \sup _{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^{2}} J\left(\alpha u+\beta \omega_{n}\right)
$$

The lemma follows by combining the last inequality with Lemma 5.2.
6. Proof of Theorem 1.2. In this section we establish a proof of Theorem 1.2. From Sections 5 and 6 , there exists a critical point $w$ of $J$, which is a sign-changing solution for problem (SP). The proof is completed by showing that $w$ has exactly two nodal domains. Arguing
by contradiction, we suppose that

$$
w=u_{1}+u_{2}+u_{3}, \quad \text { with } u_{i} \neq 0, u_{1} \geq 0, u_{2} \leq 0
$$

and

$$
\operatorname{supp}\left(u_{i}\right) \cap \operatorname{supp}\left(u_{j}\right)=\emptyset \quad \text { for } i \neq j, i, j=1,2,3,
$$

with $\operatorname{supp}\left(u_{i}\right)$ denoting the support of $u_{i}$. Setting $v=u_{1}+u_{2}$, we see that $v^{ \pm} \neq 0$. Moreover, using the fact that $J^{\prime}(w)=0$, it follows that

$$
J^{\prime}(v)\left(v^{ \pm}\right) \leq 0
$$

By Lemma 2.3, there are $t, s \in(0,1]$ such that $t v^{+}+s v^{-} \in \mathcal{M}$, or equivalently, $t u_{1}+s u_{2} \in \mathcal{M}$, and so,

$$
\begin{equation*}
J\left(t u_{1}+s u_{2}\right) \geq c_{0} \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $w=v+u_{3}$, we have $w^{2}=v^{2}+u_{3}^{2}$ and $\phi_{w}=\phi_{v}+\phi_{u_{3}}$. Hence,

$$
\begin{equation*}
J(w)=J(v)+J\left(u_{3}\right)+\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{v} u_{3}^{2} d x \tag{6.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Supposing that $u_{3} \neq 0$, we claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
J\left(u_{3}\right)+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{v} u_{3}^{2} d x>0 \tag{6.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact, by Remark 1.1 and using $J^{\prime}(w) u_{3}=0$ combined with $u_{3} \neq 0$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
J\left(u_{3}\right)+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{v} u_{3}^{2} d x & =J\left(u_{3}\right)+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{v} u_{3}^{2} d x-\frac{1}{4} J^{\prime}(w) u_{3} \\
& =\frac{1}{4}\left\|u_{3}\right\|^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left(f\left(u_{3}\right) u_{3}-4 F\left(u_{3}\right)\right) d x>0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Similar arguments to those above show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
J(v)+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{v} u_{3}^{2} d x=\frac{1}{4}\|v\|^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}(f(v) v-4 F(v)) d x \tag{6.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (6.1)-(6.4), for every $t, s \in(0,1]$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_{0} & \leq J\left(t u_{1}+s u_{2}\right) \\
& =J\left(t u_{1}+s u_{2}\right)-\frac{1}{4} J^{\prime}\left(t u_{1}+s u_{2}\right)\left(t u_{1}+s u_{2}\right) \\
& =\frac{t^{2}}{4}\left\|u_{1}\right\|^{2}+\frac{s^{2}}{4}\left\|u_{2}\right\|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left[f\left(t u_{1}+s u_{2}\right)\left(t u_{1}+s u_{2}\right)-4 F\left(t u_{1}+s u_{2}\right)\right] d x \\
\leq & \frac{1}{4}\left\|u_{1}\right\|^{2}+\frac{1}{4}\left\|u_{2}\right\|^{2} \\
& +\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}}\left[f\left(u_{1}+u_{2}\right)\left(u_{1}+u_{2}\right)-4 F\left(u_{1}+u_{2}\right)\right] d x \\
= & J(v)+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{v} u_{3}^{2} d x \\
< & J(v)+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{v} u_{3}^{2} d x+J\left(u_{3}\right)+\frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{v} u_{3}^{2} d x \\
= & J(v)+J\left(u_{3}\right)+\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3}} \phi_{v} u_{3}^{2} d x \\
= & J(w)=c_{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, $u_{3}=0$ and $w$ has exactly two nodal domains.
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