SIAM J. MATH. ANAL.
Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 877–912

NONLOCAL DOUBLE PHASE IMPLICIT OBSTACLE PROBLEMS WITH MULTIVALUED BOUNDARY CONDITIONS*

SHENGDA ZENG†, VICENŢIU D. RĂDULESCU‡, AND PATRICK WINKERT§

Abstract. In this paper, we consider a mixed boundary value problem with a nonhomogeneous, nonlinear differential operator (called double phase operator), a nonlinear convection term (a reaction term depending on the gradient), three multivalued terms, and an implicit obstacle constraint. Under very general assumptions on the data, we prove that the solution set of such an implicit obstacle problem is nonempty (so there is at least one solution) and weakly compact. The proof of our main result uses the Kakutani–Ky Fan fixed point theorem for multivalued operators along with the theory of nonsmooth analysis and variational methods for pseudomonotone operators.

Key words. Clarke's generalized gradient, convection term, convex subdifferential, double phase problem, existence results, implicit obstacle, Kakutani–Ky Fan fixed point theorem, mixed boundary conditions, multivalued mapping

MSC codes. 35J20, 35J25, 35J60

DOI. 10.1137/22M1501040

1. Introduction.

This paper is concerned with the investigation of an elliptic inclusion problem with a nonlinear and nonhomogeneous partial differential operator (called a double phase differential operator), a nonlinear convection term (a reaction term depending on the gradient), an implicit obstacle constraint, three multivalued terms where two of them are appearing on the boundary and the other one is formulated in the domain, and three nonlocal operators in which two of them are described in the domain and the other one is appearing on the boundary. Assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary Γ such that Γ is divided into four disjoint measurable parts Γ_1, Γ_2, Γ_3, and Γ_4, with Γ_1 having positive measure,

*Received by the editors June 6, 2022; accepted for publication (in revised form) September 11, 2023; published electronically January 17, 2024.
https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1501040
Funding: This work was supported by Natural Science Foundation of Guangxi grants 2021GXNSFFA196004 and GKAD23026237, NNSF of China grants 12001478 and 12371312, China Postdoctoral Science Foundation funded project 2022M721560, Startup Project of Doctor Scientific Research of Yulin Normal University G2023ZK13, and the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement 823731 CONMECH. It was also supported by the project cooperation between Guangxi Normal University and Yulin Normal University. The research of the second author was supported by the grant "Nonlinear Differential Systems in Applied Sciences" of the Romanian Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitization, within PNRR-III-C9-2022-I8 (grant 22).
†Center for Applied Mathematics of Guangxi, Guangxi Colleges and Universities Key Laboratory of Complex System Optimization and Big Data Processing, Yulin Normal University, Yulin, 537000, Guangxi, People's Republic of China, and Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Jagiellonian University in Kraków, 30-348 Kraków, Poland (zengshengda@163.com).
‡Faculty of Applied Mathematics, AGH University of Kraków, 30-059 Kraków, Poland; Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Communication, Brno University of Technology, Brno, 61600, Czech Republic; Department of Mathematics, University of Craiova, 200585, Craiova, Romania; Simion Stoilow Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, 010702, Bucharest, Romania; and School of Mathematics, Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua, Zhejiang, 321004, China (radulescu@inf.ucv.ro, http://math.ucv.ro/∼radulescu/).
§Technische Universität Berlin, Institut für Mathematik, 10623, Berlin, Germany (winkert@math.tu-berlin.de).

$\mu\colon \Omega \to [0,+\infty)$, and $1 < p < q$. Also, we introduce the nonlinear and nonlocal partial differential operator D_M given by

$$D_M u := \operatorname{div}\left(M(u)|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u + \mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\right) \text{ for all } u \in W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} := \left(M(u)|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u + \mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\right)\cdot \nu,$$

with ν being the unit normal vector on Γ. More precisely, we consider the following nonlocal double phase implicit obstacle problem:

$$\begin{aligned} -D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u &\in U_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u,\nabla u) && \text{in } \Omega,\\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_1,\\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in U_2(x,u) && \text{on } \Gamma_2,\\ -\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in \partial_c \phi(x,u) && \text{on } \Gamma_3,\\ -\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &= G(u)(x) && \text{on } \Gamma_4,\\ L(u) &\leq J(u), \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $U_1\colon \Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ and $U_2\colon \Gamma_2\times\mathbb{R}\to 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ are two multivalued mappings, $M\colon L^{p^*}(\Omega)\to (0,+\infty)$, $N\colon L^{\zeta_1}(\Omega)\to L^{\zeta_1'}(\Omega)$, and $G\colon L^{\zeta_2}(\Gamma_4)\to L^{\zeta_2'}(\Gamma_4)$ are three continuous functions, $\partial_c\phi(x,u)$ is the convex subdifferential of $s\mapsto \phi(x,s)$, and $L, J\colon W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)\to\mathbb{R}$ are given functions defined on the Musielak–Orlicz Sobolev space $W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$; see section 2 for its precise definition.

Such a class of problems includes different interesting special cases which have not been studied largely in the literature. Initially, the treatment of obstacle problems goes back to the groundbreaking work by Stefan [46] in which the temperature distribution in a homogeneous medium undergoing a phase change, typically a body of ice at zero degrees centigrade submerged in water, was studied. We also mention the pioneering work of Lions [27], who studied the equilibrium position of an elastic membrane which lies above a given obstacle and which turns out as the unique minimizer of the Dirichlet energy functional.

It should be mentioned that if $M(u) = 1$, $N(u) = 0$ for all $u \in W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$, and $\Gamma_4 = \emptyset$, then problem (1.1) reduces to the following double phase implicit obstacle inclusion problem:

$$\begin{aligned} -D_\mu u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u &\in U_1(x,u) + f(x,u,\nabla u) && \text{in } \Omega,\\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_1,\\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_\mu} &\in U_2(x,u) && \text{on } \Gamma_2,\\ -\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_\mu} &\in \partial_c \phi(x,u) && \text{on } \Gamma_3,\\ L(u) &\leq J(u), \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

where D_μ is the well-known double phase differential operator

$$D_\mu u := \operatorname{div}\left(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u + \mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\right) \text{ for all } u \in W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \tag{1.3}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_\mu} := \left(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u + \mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\right)\cdot \nu.$$

In fact, this problem has been considered and studied by Zeng, Rădulescu, and Winkert [52], and they used the Kakutani–Ky Fan fixed point theorem in a multivalued version for examining the existence of a solution to problem (1.2) under the condition

$$(f(x,s,\xi) - f(x,t,\xi))(s-t) \le e_f|s-t|^p \tag{1.4}$$

for a.a. $x\in\Omega$, for all $s,t\in\mathbb{R}$, and for all $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^N$. Moreover, when $p=2$, it is not hard to see that the function $f\colon \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^N\to\mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$f(x,s,\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i\xi_i + \kappa_1 s^{\frac{1}{2}} + \omega(x)$$

for all $x\in\Omega$, for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$, and for all $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^N$ does not satisfy inequality (1.4), where $\omega\in L^2(\Omega)$, $\kappa_1>0$, and $\zeta=(\zeta_1,\ldots,\zeta_N)\in\mathbb{R}^N$ is a given vector. However, in the present paper, on the one hand, we remove the assumption (1.4) in order to extend the scope of applications to the theoretical results concerning the existence of weak solutions to double phase implicit obstacle problems; on the other hand, we develop a generalized framework to explore the existence of weak solutions as well as the compactness of the solution set to the nonlocal double phase implicit obstacle problem (1.1).

Note that the double phase operator defined in (1.3) is related to the energy functional

$$\omega \mapsto \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla\omega|^p + \mu(x)|\nabla\omega|^q\right)\mathrm{d}x. \tag{1.5}$$

Functionals of type (1.5) have first been studied by Zhikov [53] in order to provide models for strongly anisotropic materials. The main characteristic of the functional defined in (1.5) is the change of ellipticity on the set where the weight function is zero, that is, on the set $\{x\in\Omega : \mu(x)=0\}$. To be more precise, the energy density of (1.5) exhibits ellipticity in the gradient of order q on the points x where $\mu(x)$ is positive and of order p on the points x where $\mu(x)$ vanishes. Further results on regularity of minimizers of (1.5) can be found in the papers of Baroni, Colombo, and Mingione [3, 4], Colombo and Mingione [9, 10], De Filippis and Mingione (see [14, 15, 12, 13]), Marcellini [32, 31], and Ragusa and Tachikawa [44]. We also mention the overview articles of Rădulescu [43] about isotropic and anisotropic problems and of Mingione and Rădulescu [37] about recent developments for problems with nonstandard growth and nonuniform ellipticity.

The main objective of the paper is the development of a general framework for determining the existence of a weak solution to the nonlinear nonlocal implicit obstacle problems (1.1) via Tychonoff's fixed point theorem for multivalued operators, the theory of nonsmooth analysis, and variational methods for pseudomonotone operators. As far as we know, this is the first work for nonlocal implicit obstacle problems in the double phase setting with mixed boundary conditions.

It should be mentioned that the combination of an implicit obstacle effect with mixed boundary conditions along with multivalued mappings occurs in several engineering and economic models, such as Nash equilibrium problems with shared constraints and transport route optimization with feedback control. For more models related to nonsmooth mechanical problems, we refer the reader to the books of Panagiotopoulos [41, 40] and Naniewicz and Panagiotopoulos [39].

In the content of (implicit) obstacle effects involving Clarke's generalized gradient or general multivalued mappings but without nonlocal terms, there are several papers using different methods. We refer the reader to the works of Alleche and Rădulescu [1], Aussel, Sultana, and Vetrivel [2], Bonanno, Motreanu, and Winkert [5], Carl, Le, and Winkert [8], Iannizzotto and Papageorgiou [24], Zeng et al. [48, 49], Migórski, Khan, and Zeng [35, 34], and Zeng, Rădulescu, and Winkert [51, 50]; see also the recent monograph of Carl and Le [7] about multivalued variational inequalities and inclusions. In the single-valued case with gradient dependent right-hand sides (the so-called convection term), we mention the papers of Faraci, Motreanu, and Puglisi [16], Faraci and Puglisi [17], Figueiredo and Madeira [18], Gasiński and Papageorgiou [19], Gasiński and Winkert [20], Liu, Motreanu, and Zeng [29], Marano and Winkert [30], and Papageorgiou, Rădulescu, and Repovš [42]; see also the references therein.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents a detailed overview about Musielak–Orlicz Lebesgue and Musielak–Orlicz Sobolev spaces, and the p-Laplacian eigenvalue problem with a Steklov boundary condition, and we state some results from nonsmooth analysis, the properties of Clarke's generalized gradient, and Tychonoff's fixed point theorem for multivalued operators which will be used in the next sections to establish the existence theorems to various nonlocal double phase obstacle problems. In section 3, in order to establish the solvability of the nonlocal double phase implicit obstacle problem (1.1), we first introduce an auxiliary problem defined in (3.1), a variational mapping $\mathcal{S}$ driven by problem (3.1), and two multivalued mappings $\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$ which are exactly the Nemitskij operators of U_1 and U_2, respectively. After that, we prove the complete continuity of $\mathcal{S}$ and upper semicontinuity of $\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$, respectively. Finally, via employing Tychonoff's fixed point theorem for multivalued operators along with the theory of nonsmooth analysis, we establish the nonemptiness and compactness of the solution set of problem (1.1). However, in section 4, we move our attention to studying several special and interesting cases of our problem (1.1), and we deliver the corresponding existence results to these special cases. Also, we make further discussion to some particular problems of (1.1) and obtain several generalized existence theorems for various nonlocal double phase obstacle problems.

2. Mathematical background. In this section, we give some necessary notations and preliminary materials which will be used in the next sections from several places.

Throughout this paper, we suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary $\Gamma := \partial\Omega$ such that Γ is separated by four disjoint measurable parts Γ_1, Γ_2, Γ_3 and Γ_4, with Γ_1 having positive Lebesgue measure. Let $1 \le r < +\infty$, and let $D \subset \overline{\Omega}$ be a nonempty set. In what follows, we denote by $L^r(D) := L^r(D;\mathbb{R})$ the usual Lebesgue space equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{r,D}$ defined by

$$\|u\|_{r,D} := \left(\int_D |u|^r \,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \quad \text{for all } u \in L^r(D).$$

Also, we introduce the set $L^r(D)_+ := \{u \in L^r(D) : u(x) \ge 0 \text{ for a. a. } x \in D\}$. By $W^{1,r}(\Omega)$ we define the corresponding Sobolev space endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{1,r,\Omega}$ defined by

$$\|u\|_{1,r,\Omega} := \|u\|_{r,\Omega} + \|\nabla u\|_{r,\Omega} \quad \text{for all } u \in W^{1,r}(\Omega).$$

The conjugate of $r>1$ is denoted by $r'>1$, i.e., $\frac{1}{r}+\frac{1}{r'}=1$. Additionally, the critical exponents of $r>1$ in the domain and on the boundary, denoted by r^* and r_*, are defined by

$$r^*=\begin{cases}\frac{Nr}{N-r} & \text{if } r<N,\\ +\infty & \text{if } r\geq N\end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad r_*=\begin{cases}\frac{(N-1)r}{N-r} & \text{if } r<N,\\ +\infty & \text{if } r\geq N,\end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

respectively. For the sake of convenience, in the entire paper, the symbols "$\xrightarrow{w}$" and "$\to$" stand for the weak and the strong convergences, respectively, to various function spaces. Recalling that the measure of Γ_1 is positive, it follows from Korn's inequality that there exists a constant $\hat{\lambda}>0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{p,\Omega}^p\leq\hat{\lambda}\|\nabla u\|_{p,\Omega}^p \tag{2.2}$$

for all $u\in W$, where W is the subspace of $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ given by

$$W:=\left\{u\in W^{1,p}(\Omega): u=0 \text{ for a. a. } x\in\Gamma_1\right\}.$$

For any $r\geq 2$ fixed, from Simon [45, formula (2.2)], we are able to find a constant $k(r)>0$ such that the following inequality holds:

$$\left(|x|^{r-2}x-|y|^{r-2}y\right)\cdot(x-y)\geq k(r)|x-y|^r \tag{2.3}$$

for all $x,y\in\mathbb{R}^N$. Furthermore, we consider the eigenvalue problem of the r-Laplacian ($r>1$) with a Steklov boundary condition formulated by

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_r u &= -|u|^{r-2}u && \text{in } \Omega,\\ |u|^{r-2}u\cdot\nu &= \lambda|u|^{r-2}u && \text{on } \Gamma. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

From Lê [26], we know that the eigenvalue problem (2.4) has a smallest eigenvalue $\lambda_{1,r}^S>0$ which is isolated and simple. Also, it is easy to prove that the following variational identity holds:

$$\lambda_{1,r}^S=\inf_{u\in W^{1,r}(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}}\frac{\|\nabla u\|_{r,\Omega}^r+\|u\|_{r,\Omega}^r}{\|u\|_{r,\Gamma}^r}. \tag{2.5}$$

In the whole paper, we suppose that the following hypothesis holds.

H(1): $1<p<N$, $p<q<p^*$, and $0\leq\mu(\cdot)\in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

Under the above assumption, let us introduce the nonlinear function $\mathcal{H}\colon\Omega\times[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ described by the exponents p,q and weight-function μ defined by

$$\mathcal{H}(x,t)=t^p+\mu(x)t^q \quad \text{for all } (x,t)\in\Omega\times[0,\infty).$$

We are now in a position to recall the well-known Musielak–Orlicz Lebesgue space $L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ given by

$$L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)=\{u\colon\Omega\to\mathbb{R} \text{ is measurable } \mid \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(u)<+\infty\},$$

where the modular function $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}\colon L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)\to[0,+\infty)$ is formulated by

$$\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(u):=\int_\Omega\mathcal{H}(x,|u|)\,\mathrm{d}x=\int_\Omega\left(|u|^p+\mu(x)|u|^q\right)\mathrm{d}x \quad \text{for all } u\in L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega).$$

It follows from Liu and Dai [28] that Musielak–Orlicz Lebesgue space $L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ equipped with the Luxemburg norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \inf\left\{\tau > 0 \mid \rho_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\frac{u}{\tau}\right) \leq 1\right\} \quad \text{for all } u \in L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$$

becomes a reflexive Banach space, because it is uniformly convex. Moreover, we consider the seminormed space $L^q_\mu(\Omega)$:

$$L^q_\mu(\Omega) = \left\{u\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable } \mid \int_\Omega \mu(x)|u|^q \,\mathrm{d}x < +\infty\right\}$$

endowed with the seminorm

$$\|u\|_{q,\mu} = \left(\int_\Omega \mu(x)|u|^q \,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \quad \text{for all } u \in L^q_\mu(\Omega).$$

Because problem (1.1) has mixed boundary conditions, the basic function space in the present paper is considered by

$$V := \left\{u \in W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \mid u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_1\right\},$$

where $W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ is the well-known Musielak–Orlicz Sobolev space defined by

$$W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) = \left\{u \in L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \mid |\nabla u| \in L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)\right\}.$$

It is not difficult to prove that V endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_V$

$$\|u\|_V := \|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{for all } u \in V$$

is a reflexive Banach space, where $\|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|\,|\nabla u|\,\|_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Let us recall some embedding results for the spaces $L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ and $W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$; see Gasiński and Winkert [21] or Liu and Dai [28].

PROPOSITION 2.1. *Let* H(1) *be satisfied, and denote by* p^*, p_* *the critical exponents to* p *as given in* (2.1) *for* $s = p$. *Then we have the following:*

(i) $L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$ *and* $W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{1,r}(\Omega)$ *are continuous for all* $r \in [1,p]$;
(ii) $W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$ *is continuous for all* $r \in [1,p^*]$ *and compact for all* $r \in [1,p^*)$;
(iii) $W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^r(\partial\Omega)$ *is continuous for all* $r \in [1,p_*]$ *and compact for all* $r \in [1,p_*)$;
(iv) $L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^q_\mu(\Omega)$ *is continuous;*
(v) $L^q(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ *is continuous.*

It should be mentioned that when the space $W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ is replaced by V in Proposition 2.1, then the embeddings (ii) and (iii) remain valid.

The following proposition is due to Liu and Dai [28, Proposition 2.1].

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Let* H(1) *be satisfied, and let* $y \in L^{\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$. *Then the following hold:*

(i) *if* $y \neq 0$, *then* $\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \lambda$ *if and only if* $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\frac{y}{\lambda}\right) = 1$;
(ii) $\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} < 1$ *(resp.,* > 1 *and* $= 1$*) if and only if* $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(y) < 1$ *(resp.,* > 1 *and* $= 1$*);*
(iii) *if* $\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} < 1$, *then* $\|y\|^q_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(y) \leq \|y\|^p_{\mathcal{H}}$;
(iv) *if* $\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} > 1$, *then* $\|y\|^p_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(y) \leq \|y\|^q_{\mathcal{H}}$;
(v) $\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} \to 0$ *if and only if* $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(y) \to 0$;
(vi) $\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}} \to +\infty$ *if and only if* $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(y) \to +\infty$.

Let $w \in V$ be fixed, and let $M\colon V \to (0,+\infty)$. Next, we introduce the nonlinear operator $\mathcal{H}_w\colon V \to V^*$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{H}_w(u), v\rangle &:= \int_\Omega \big(M(w)|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u + \mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\big)\cdot \nabla v \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega \big(|u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u\big)\, v \,\mathrm{d}x \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

for $u, v \in V$, with $\langle \cdot,\cdot\rangle$ being the duality pairing between V and its dual space V^*. The following proposition states the main properties of $\mathcal{H}_w\colon V \to V^*$. We refer the reader to Crespo-Blanco et al. [11].

PROPOSITION 2.3. *Let the hypotheses* H(1) *be satisfied. Then, for each $w \in V$, the operator $\mathcal{H}_w$ defined by* (2.6) *is bounded, continuous, and monotone (hence maximal monotone) and of type* (S_+)*, that is,*

$$u_n \xrightarrow{w} u \quad \text{in } V \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{n\to\infty} \langle \mathcal{H}_w u_n, u_n - u\rangle \le 0$$

imply $u_n \to u$ in V.

In the last part of this section, we are going to recall some results from nonsmooth analysis and multivalued analysis. In the following, let E be real Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|_E$. A function $\varphi\colon E \to \overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R}\cup\{+\infty\}$ is said to be proper, convex, and lower semicontinuous if the following conditions are fulfilled:

- $D(\varphi) := \{u \in E : \varphi(u) < +\infty\} \neq \emptyset$;
- for any $u, v \in E$ and $t \in (0,1)$, it holds that $\varphi(tu+(1-t)v) \le t\varphi(u)+(1-t)\varphi(v)$;
- $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \varphi(u_n) \ge \varphi(u)$, where the sequence $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset E$ is such that $u_n \to u$ in E as $n \to \infty$ for some $u \in E$.

Let φ be a convex mapping. An element $x^* \in E^*$ is said to be a subgradient of φ at $u \in E$ if

$$\langle x^*, v-u\rangle \le \varphi(v) - \varphi(u) \tag{2.7}$$

holds for all $v \in E$. The set of all elements $x^* \in E^*$ which satisfies (2.7) is called the convex subdifferential of φ at u and is denoted by $\partial_c\varphi(u)$.

Moreover, a function $j\colon E \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be locally Lipschitz at $x \in E$ if there are a neighborhood $O(x)$ of x and a constant $L_x > 0$ such that

$$|j(y) - j(z)| \le L_x\|y-z\|_E \quad \text{for all } y, z \in O(x).$$

We denote by

$$j^\circ(x;y) := \limsup_{z\to x,\, \lambda\downarrow 0} \frac{j(z+\lambda y) - j(z)}{\lambda}$$

the generalized directional derivative of j at the point x in the direction y, and $\partial j\colon E \to 2^{E^*}$ given by

$$\partial j(x) := \{\, \xi \in E^* : j^\circ(x;y) \ge \langle \xi, y\rangle_{E^*\times E} \ \text{ for all } y \in E\} \quad \text{for all } x \in E$$

is the generalized gradient of j at x in the sense of Clarke.

The next proposition summarizes the properties of generalized gradients and generalized directional derivatives of a locally Lipschitz function. We refer the reader to Migórski, Ochal, and Sofonea [36, Proposition 3.23] for its proof.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $j\colon E \to \mathbb{R}$ be locally Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant $L_x > 0$ at $x \in E$. Then we have the following:*

(i) *The function $y \mapsto j^\circ(x;y)$ is positively homogeneous and subadditive and satisfies*
$$|j^\circ(x;y)| \le L_x \|y\|_E \quad \textit{for all } y \in E.$$
(ii) *The function $(x,y) \mapsto j^\circ(x;y)$ is upper semicontinuous.*
(iii) *For each $x \in E$, $\partial j(x)$ is a nonempty, convex, and weak* compact subset of E^* with $\|\xi\|_{E^*} \le L_x$ for all $\xi \in \partial j(x)$.*
(iv) *$j^\circ(x;y) = \max\{\langle \xi, y\rangle_{E^*\times E} \,|\, \xi \in \partial j(x)\}$ for all $y \in E$.*
(v) *The multivalued function $E \ni x \mapsto \partial j(x) \subset E^*$ is upper semicontinuous from E into the subsets of E^* with weak* topology.*

We end this section to recall Tychonoff's fixed point theorem for multivalued operators; its proof can be found in Granas and Dugundji [22, Theorem 8.6].

Theorem 2.5. *Let D be a bounded, closed, and convex subset of a reflexive Banach space E, and let $\Lambda\colon D \to 2^D$ be a multivalued map such that the following hold:*

(i) *Λ has bounded, closed, and convex values;*
(ii) *Λ is weakly-weakly upper semicontinuous.*

Then Λ has a fixed point in D.

3. Existence and compactness. This section is devoted to exploring the nonemptiness and compactness of the solution set to problem (1.1). As mentioned before, our method is based on the theory of multivalued analysis, Tychonoff's fixed point principle, and variational methods.

In order to state the existence and compactness results for problem (1.1), we first impose the following assumptions on the data of problem (1.1).

We assume that the nonlocal functions $M\colon L^{p^*}(\Omega) \to (0,+\infty)$, $N\colon L^{\zeta_1}(\Omega) \to L^{\zeta_1'}(\Omega)$, and $G\colon L^{\zeta_2}(\Gamma_4) \to L^{\zeta_2'}(\Gamma_4)$ satisfy the following conditions:

H(M): $M\colon L^{p^*}(\Omega) \to (0,+\infty)$ is such that M is weakly continuous in V; namely, for any sequence $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset V \subset L^{p^*}(\Omega)$ and $u \in V$ such that $u_n \xrightarrow{w} u$ in V as $n \to \infty$, we have
$$M(u) = \lim_{n\to\infty} M(u_n),$$
and there exists a constant $c_M > 0$ such that
$$M(u) \ge c_M \quad \text{for all } u \in V,$$
where p^* is the critical exponent p^* of p in the domain Ω given in (2.1) with $r = p$.

H(N): The function $N\colon L^{\zeta_1}(\Omega) \to L^{\zeta_1'}(\Omega)$ is continuous such that there exist constants $a_N, b_N \ge 0$ and $0 < \kappa_1 < p-1$ satisfying
$$\|N(w)\|_{\zeta_1',\Omega} \le a_N + b_N \|w\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}^{\kappa_1} \quad \text{for all } w \in L^{\zeta_1}(\Omega),$$
where $1 < \zeta_1 < p^*$.

H(G): The function $G\colon L^{\zeta_2}(\Gamma_4) \to L^{\zeta_2'}(\Gamma_4)$ is continuous such that there exist constants $a_G, b_G \ge 0$ and $0 < \kappa_2 < p-1$ satisfying
$$\|G(w)\|_{\zeta_2',\Gamma_4} \le a_G + b_G \|w\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}^{\kappa_2} \quad \text{for all } w \in L^{\zeta_2}(\Gamma_4),$$
where $1 < \zeta_2 < p_*$ and p_* is the critical exponent of p on the boundary Γ given in (2.1) with $r = p$.

For the convection term f, we suppose the following conditions:

H(f): $f\colon \Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^N\to\mathbb{R}$ is a Carathéodory function such that the following hold:

(i) there exist two constants $a_f, b_f \geq 0$ and a function $\alpha_f\in L^{p'}(\Omega)_+$ satisfying
$$|f(x,s,\xi)|\leq a_f|\xi|^{p-1}+b_f|s|^{p-1}+\alpha_f(x)$$
for a.a. $x\in\Omega$, for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$, and for all $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^N$;

(ii) there exists a constant $e_f\geq 0$ such that
$$|f(x,s,\xi_1)-f(x,s,\xi_2)|\leq e_f|\xi_1-\xi_2|^{p-1}$$
for a.a. $x\in\Omega$, for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$, and for all $\xi_1,\xi_2\in\mathbb{R}^N$.

The multivalued mappings $U_1\colon\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ and $U_2\colon\Gamma_2\times\mathbb{R}\to 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ are assumed to satisfy the following conditions:

H(U_1): The multivalued function $U_1\colon\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ is such that the following hold:

(i) $U_1(x,s)$ is a nonempty, bounded, closed, and convex set in $\mathbb{R}$ a. a. $x\in\Omega$ and all $s\in\mathbb{R}$;

(ii) $x\mapsto U_1(x,s)$ is measurable in Ω for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$;

(iii) $s\mapsto U_1(x,s)$ is upper semicontinuous for a.a. $x\in\Omega$;

(iv) there exist a function $\alpha_{U_1}\in L^{p'}(\Omega)_+$ and a constant $a_{U_1}\geq 0$ such that
$$|\eta|\leq\alpha_{U_1}(x)+a_{U_1}|s|^{p-1}$$
for all $\eta\in U_1(x,s)$, for a.a. $x\in\Omega$, and for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$.

H(U_2): The multivalued function $U_2\colon\Gamma_2\times\mathbb{R}\to 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ is such that the following hold:

(i) $U_2(x,s)$ is a nonempty, bounded, closed, and convex set in $\mathbb{R}$ a. a. $x\in\Gamma_2$ and all $s\in\mathbb{R}$;

(ii) $x\mapsto U_2(x,s)$ is measurable on Γ_2 for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$;

(iii) $s\mapsto U_2(x,s)$ is upper semicontinuous for a.a. $x\in\Gamma_2$;

(iv) there exist a function $\alpha_{U_2}\in L^{p'}(\Gamma_2)_+$ and a constant $a_{U_2}>0$ such that
$$|\xi|\leq\alpha_{U_2}(x)+a_{U_2}|s|^{p-1}$$
for all $\xi\in U_2(x,s)$, for a.a. $x\in\Gamma_2$, and for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$.

On the boundary Γ_3, the function $\phi\colon\Gamma_3\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ fulfills the following assumptions:

H(ϕ): The function $\phi\colon\Gamma_3\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is such that the following hold:

(i) $x\mapsto\phi(x,r)$ is measurable on Γ_3 for all $r\in\mathbb{R}$;

(ii) $r\mapsto\phi(x,r)$ is convex and lower semicontinuous for a.a. $x\in\Gamma_3$;

(iii) for each function $u\in L^{p_*}(\Gamma_3)$, the function $x\mapsto\phi(x,u(x))$ belongs to $L^1(\Gamma_3)$.

With respect to the nonlocal functions $L\colon V\to\mathbb{R}$ and $J\colon V\to(0,+\infty)$, we suppose the following:

H(L): $L\colon V\to\mathbb{R}$ is positively homogeneous and subadditive such that
$$L(u)\leq\limsup_{n\to\infty}L(u_n)$$
whenever $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\subset V$ is such that $u_n\xrightarrow{w}u$ in V for some $u\in V$.

H(J): $J\colon V\to(0,+\infty)$ is weakly continuous; that is, for any sequence $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\subset V$ such that $u_n\xrightarrow{w}u$ for some $u\in V$, we have
$$J(u_n)\to J(u).$$

Moreover, we state the following compatibility conditions:

H(2): The inequalities

$$0 < k(p)c_M - e_f \hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}},$$
$$0 < \min\{c_M - a_f \hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}, 1\} - (a_{U_1} + b_f)\, c_p(\Omega)^p - a_{U_2} c_p(\Gamma_2)^p$$

hold, where $k(p)$ and $\hat{\lambda} > 0$ are given in (2.3) and (2.2), and $c_p(\Omega) > 0$ and $c_p(\Gamma_2) > 0$ are the smallest constants satisfying the following inequalities (because of the continuity of the embeddings of V to $L^p(\Omega)$ and of V to $L^p(\Gamma_2)$):

$$\|u\|_{p,\Omega} \le c_p(\Omega)\|u\|_V \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{p,\Gamma_2} \le c_p(\Gamma_2)\|u\|_V \quad \text{for all } u \in V.$$

Remark 3.1. The compatibility inequalities in H(2) are usually called smallness conditions, which have been applied in much of the literature; see, for example, [23, 33] (nonsmooth contact mechanics problems) and [52, 35] (nonlinear partial differential equations). Essentially speaking, the compatibility inequalities in H(2) will play a critical role in guaranteeing that the variational selection $\mathcal{S}$ is a self-map on a bounded closed set (see (3.19) below), and revealing that the problem (1.1) has a coercive framework. The following functions fulfill assumptions H(M):

- $M(u) = c_M + r_1(\|u\|_{\pi_1,\Omega})$ for all $u \in V$, where $r_1\colon [0,+\infty) \to [0,+\infty)$ is a continuous function, $c_M > 0$, and $1 < \pi_1 < p^*$;
- $M(u) = a_M + r_2(\|u\|_{\pi_2,\Gamma})$ for all $u \in V$, where $r_2\colon [0,+\infty) \to [0,+\infty)$ is a continuous function, $c_M > 0$, and $1 < \pi_2 < p_*$.

It is not difficult to see that the following functions $N\colon L^{\zeta_1}(\Omega) \to L^{\zeta_1'}(\Omega)$ and $G\colon L^{\zeta_2}(\Gamma_4) \to L^{\zeta_2'}(\Gamma_4)$ satisfy the conditions H(N) and H(G), respectively:

$$N(u)(x) := \left(\int_\Omega \varpi_1(x)|u(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} + \varpi_2(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \text{ and all } u \in L^{\zeta_1}(\Omega)$$

and

$$G(w)(x) := \int_{\Gamma_4} \varpi_3(x)|w(x)|^{\zeta_1 - 1}\,\mathrm{d}x + \varpi_4(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Gamma_4 \text{ and } w \in L^{\zeta_2}(\Gamma_4),$$

where $\varpi_1 \in L^{\zeta_1'}(\Omega)_+$, $\varpi_2 \in L^p(\Omega)$, and $\varpi_3, \varpi_4 \in L^{\zeta_2}(\Gamma_4)$.

Let $p = 2$, and let $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$f(x, s, \xi) = \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta_i \xi_i - \kappa_1 s + \omega(x)$$

for all $x \in \Omega$, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where $\omega \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\kappa_1 > 0$, and $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is a given vector. Then f satisfies hypothesis H(f).

Let $\alpha_1 \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$ and $\alpha_2 \in L^{p'}(\Gamma_2)$. Then the multivalued functions defined by

$$U_1(x, s) = [-1, 1]\alpha_1(x) + s^{p-1} \text{ for all } x \in \Omega \text{ and all } s \in \mathbb{R},$$
$$U_2(x, s) = [0, 2]s^{p-1} + \alpha_2(x) \text{ for all } x \in \Gamma_2 \text{ and all } s \in \mathbb{R}$$

satisfy hypotheses H(U_1) and H(U_2), respectively.

Let $\varpi_5 \in L^{p'}(\Gamma_3)_+$. Then the function defined by

$$\varphi(x, s) := \varpi_5(x)|s| \text{ for all } x \in \Gamma_3 \text{ and } s \in \mathbb{R}$$

satisfies hypothesis H(ϕ).

It is obvious that the functions $L(u)=\|u\|_V$ and $J(u)=e^{1+\|u\|_{p,\Omega}}$ for all $u\in V$ fulfill hypotheses H(L) and H(J), respectively.

Let us consider the multivalued mapping $K\colon V\to 2^V$ defined by

$$K(u)=\{v\in V \mid L(v)\le J(u)\} \quad \text{for all } u\in V.$$

Under the hypotheses H(L) and H(J), we have the following important auxiliary result, which delivers several significant properties for the multivalued mapping $K\colon V\to 2^V$. More precisely, this lemma reveals an essential characteristic that K is Mosco continuous (see Mosco [38]), i.e., K is sequentially weakly-weakly closed and sequentially weakly-strongly lower semicontinuous. The detailed proof of this lemma can be found in Lemma 3.3 of Zeng, Rădulescu, and Winkert [52].

Lemma 3.2. *Let $J\colon V\to(0,+\infty)$ and $L\colon V\to\mathbb{R}$ be two functions such that* H(L) *and* H(J) *are satisfied. Then the following statements hold:*

(i) *For each $u\in V$, $K(u)$ is closed and convex in V such that $0\in K(u)$.*

(ii) *The graph $\operatorname{Gr}(K)$ of K is sequentially closed in $V_w\times V_w$; that is, K is sequentially closed from V with the weak topology into the subsets of V with the weak topology.*

(iii) *If $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\subset V$ is a sequence such that*

$$u_n \xrightarrow{w} u \quad \text{in } V$$

for some $u\in V$, then for each $v\in K(u)$ there exists a sequence $\{v_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\subset V$ such that

$$v_n\in K(u_n) \quad \text{and} \quad v_n\to v \quad \text{in } V.$$

We are now in a position to give the definition of weak solutions to problem (1.1) as follows.

Definition 3.3. *We say that a function $u\in V$ is a weak solution of problem (1.1) if $u\in K(u)$ and there exist functions $\eta\in L^{p'}(\Omega)$, $\xi\in L^{p'}(\Gamma_2)$ such that $\eta(x)\in U_1(x,u(x))$ for a.a. $x\in\Omega$, $\xi(x)\in U_2(x,u(x))$ for a.a. $x\in\Gamma_2$, and the inequality*

$$\begin{aligned}
M(u)&\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u\cdot\nabla(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega \mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\cdot\nabla(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&+\int_\Omega (|u|^{p-2}u+\mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega N(u)(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&+\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,v)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma-\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_{\Gamma_4}G(u)(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\\
&\ge\int_\Omega \eta(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{\Gamma_2}\xi(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_\Omega f(x,u,\nabla u)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x
\end{aligned}$$

holds for all $v\in K(u)$.

For the convenience of the reader, in what follows, we use the following notion:

$$X=L^p(\Omega),\quad Y=L^p(\Gamma_2),\quad X^*=L^{p'}(\Omega),\quad \text{and}\quad Y^*=L^{p'}(\Gamma_2).$$

For any $(w,\eta,\xi)\in V\times X^*\times Y^*$ fixed, let us consider the following auxiliary problem:

$$
\begin{aligned}
-D_{M(w)}u+|u|^{p-2}u+\mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u&=\eta(x)+N(w)(x)+f(x,w,\nabla u) && \text{in } \Omega,\\
u&=0 && \text{on } \Gamma_1,\\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_w}&=\xi(x) && \text{on } \Gamma_2,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_w}&\in \partial_c\phi(x,u) && \text{on } \Gamma_3,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_w}&=G(w)(x) && \text{on } \Gamma_4,\\
L(u)&\le J(w),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}
$$

where the differential operator $D_{M(w)}$ is defined by

$$D_{M(w)}u:=\operatorname{div}\left(M(w)|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u+\mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\right) \text{ for all } u\in W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega),$$

and $\frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial \nu_w}$ stands for

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_w}:=\left(M(w)|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u+\mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\right)\cdot\nu.$$

From Definition 3.3 we can see that $u\in V$ is a weak solution of problem (3.1) if $u\in K(w)$ and the following inequality is satisfied:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&M(w)\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u\cdot\nabla(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega \mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\cdot\nabla(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad+\int_\Omega(|u|^{p-2}u+\mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega N(w)(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad+\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,v)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma-\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_{\Gamma_4}G(w)(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\\
&\ge\int_\Omega\eta(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{\Gamma_2}\xi(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_\Omega f(x,w,\nabla u)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}
$$

for all $v\in K(w)$.

The following lemma shows that problem (3.1) is uniquely solvable.

PROPOSITION 3.4. *Let $p\ge 2$. Assume that* H(1), H(ϕ), H(f), H(L), *and* H(J) *hold. If $M(w)\ge c_M$ for each $w\in V$, $N(w)\in L^{\zeta_1'}(\Omega)$ with $1<\zeta_1<p^*$, $G(w)\in L^{\zeta_2'}(\Gamma_4)$ with $1<\zeta_2<p_*$, and the inequality $0<k(p)c_M-e_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}$ holds, then problem* (3.1) *admits a unique solution.*

Proof. First we introduce the following nonlinear mappings $\mathcal{G}_w\colon V\to V^*$, $\varphi\colon V\to\overline{\mathbb{R}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_w\colon V\subset L^p(\Omega)\to L^{p'}(\Omega)\subset V^*$ defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle\mathcal{G}_w(u),v\rangle:=&M(w)\int_\Omega|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u\cdot\nabla v\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega\mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\cdot\nabla v\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&+\int_\Omega(|u|^{p-2}u+\mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u)v\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega N(w)(x)v\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&+\int_{\Gamma_4}G(w)(x)v\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma-\int_\Omega\eta(x)v\,\mathrm{d}x-\int_{\Gamma_2}\xi(x)v\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $u,v\in V$,

$$\varphi(u):=\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma$$

for all $u \in V$, and

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_w u, v\rangle_{L^{p'}(\Omega)\times L^p(\Omega)} := \int_\Omega f(x,w,\nabla u) v\,\mathrm{d}x$$

for all $u \in V$ and $v \in L^p(\Omega)$. Using the notations above, it is not difficult to prove that inequality (3.2) can be equivalently rewritten by the following nonlinear variational inequality with constraint

$$\langle \mathcal{G}_w u, v-u\rangle + \varphi(v) - \varphi(u) \geq \langle i^* \mathcal{F}_w u, v-u\rangle$$

for all $v \in K(w)$, where $i\colon V \to L^p(\Omega)$ is the embedding operator of V into $L^p(\Omega)$ and $i^*\colon L^{p'}(\Omega) \to V^*$ is the dual operator of i. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 3.4 of Zeng, Bai, and Gasiński [47], we can show that problem (3.1) has at least one solution.

Next, we are going to prove the uniqueness of problem (3.1). Let $u_1, u_2 \in V$ be two weak solutions of problem (3.1). So, for every $i = 1, 2$, it holds that $u_i \in K(w)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} M(w)&\int_\Omega |\nabla u_i|^{p-2}\nabla u_i \cdot \nabla(v-u_i)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \mu(x)|\nabla u_i|^{q-2}\nabla u_i\cdot\nabla(v-u_i)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \int_\Omega (|u_i|^{p-2}u_i + \mu(x)|u_i|^{q-2}u_i)(v-u_i)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega N(w)(x)(v-u_i)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,v)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u_i)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_{\Gamma_4} G(w)(x)(v-u_i)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \\ &\geq \int_\Omega \eta(x)(v-u_i)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_2}\xi(x)(v-u_i)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_\Omega f(x,w,\nabla u_i)(v-u_i)\,\mathrm{d}x \end{aligned}$$

for all $v \in K(w)$. Putting $v = u_2$ and $v = u_1$ into the above inequalities with $i = 1$ and $i = 2$, respectively, we use the resulting inequalities to get

$$\begin{aligned} M(w)&\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla u_1|^{p-2}\nabla u_1 - |\nabla u_2|^{p-2}\nabla u_2\right)\cdot\nabla(u_1-u_2)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \int_\Omega \mu(x)\left(|\nabla u_1|^{q-2}\nabla u_1 - |\nabla u_2|^{q-2}\nabla u_2\right)\cdot\nabla(u_1-u_2)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \int_\Omega \left(|u_1|^{p-2}u_1 - |u_2|^{p-2}u_2\right)(u_1-u_2)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \int_\Omega \mu(x)\left(|u_1|^{q-2}u_1 - |u_2|^{q-2}u_2\right)(u_1-u_2)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \int_\Omega (f(x,w,\nabla u_1) - f(x,w,\nabla u_2))(u_1-u_2)\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

The latter combined with (2.3), hypothesis H(f)(ii), and Hölder's inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} k(p)&\left(c_M\|\nabla u_1 - \nabla u_2\|_{p,\Omega}^p + \|u_1-u_2\|_{p,\Omega}^p\right) \\ &\leq \int_\Omega e_f|\nabla u_1 - \nabla u_2|^{p-1}|u_1-u_2|\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq e_f\|\nabla u_1 - \nabla u_2\|_{p,\Omega}^{p-1}\|u_1-u_2\|_{p,\Omega} \\ &\leq e_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}\|\nabla u_1 - \nabla u_2\|_{p,\Omega}^p. \end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$\left(k(p)c_M - e_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)\|\nabla u_1 - \nabla u_2\|_{p,\Omega}^p + k(p)\|u_1-u_2\|_{p,\Omega}^p \le 0.$$

Employing the inequality $e_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}} < c_M k(p)$, we infer that $u_1 = u_2$.

Consequently, for every $(w,\eta,\xi)\in V\times X^*\times Y^*$ fixed, problem (3.1) is uniquely solvable. ∎

Proposition 3.4 allows us to introduce the solution mapping $\mathcal{S}\colon V\times X^*\times Y^*\to V$ of problem (3.1) formulated by

$$\mathcal{S}(w,\eta,\xi) = u_{w,\eta,\xi} \quad \text{for all } (w,\eta,\xi)\in V\times X^*\times Y^*,$$

where $u_{w,\eta,\xi}$ is the unique solution of problem (3.1) associated with $(w,\eta,\xi)\in V\times X^*\times Y^*$.

The following lemma says that $\mathcal{S}\colon V\times X^*\times Y^*\to V$ is a completely continuous operator.

Lemma 3.5. *Let* $p\ge 2$. *Assume that* H(1), H(2), H(M), H(N), H(G), H(ϕ), H(f), H(L), *and* H(J) *are fulfilled. Then the solution map* $\mathcal{S}\colon V\times X^*\times Y^*\to V$ *of problem* (3.1) *is completely continuous.*

Proof. Assume that $\{(w_n,\eta_n,\xi_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\subset V\times X^*\times Y^*$ and $(w,\eta,\xi)\in V\times X^*\times Y^*$ satisfy

$$(w_n,\eta_n,\xi_n) \xrightarrow{w} (w,\eta,\xi) \quad \text{in } V\times X^*\times Y^*.$$

Let $u_n := \mathcal{S}(w_n,\eta_n,\xi_n)$ for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$. So, for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, we have $u_n\in K(w_n)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&M(w_n)\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n\cdot\nabla(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \mu(x)|\nabla u_n|^{q-2}\nabla u_n\cdot\nabla(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad + \int_\Omega (|u_n|^{p-2}u_n + \mu(x)|u_n|^{q-2}u_n)(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega N(w_n)(x)(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,v)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_{\Gamma_4} G(w_n)(x)(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\\
&\ge \int_\Omega \eta_n(x)(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_2}\xi_n(x)(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_\Omega f(x,w_n,\nabla u_n)(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

for all $v\in K(w_n)$. Using hypothesis H(f)(i) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega f(x,w_n,\nabla u_n)u_n(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\le \int_\Omega \left(a_f|\nabla u_n|^{p-1} + b_f|w_n(x)|^{p-1} + \alpha_f(x)\right)|u_n(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\le a_f\|\nabla u_n\|_{p,\Omega}^{p-1}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega} + b_f\|w_n\|_{p,\Omega}^{p-1}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega} + \|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega}\\
&\le a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}\|\nabla u_n\|_{p,\Omega}^p + b_f\|w_n\|_{p,\Omega}^{p-1}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega} + \|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

From Brezis [6, Proposition 1.10] and Hölder's inequality, we can find two constants $\alpha_\varphi,\beta_\varphi\ge 0$ such that

$$\varphi(v)\ge -\alpha_\varphi\|v\|_V - \beta_\varphi \quad \text{for all } v\in V \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$
(3.6)\qquad \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_\Omega \eta_n(x)u_n\,\mathrm{d}x \le \|\eta_n\|_{p',\Omega}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega}, \\ \displaystyle\int_{\Gamma_2} \xi_n(x)u_n\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \le \|\xi_n\|_{p',\Gamma_2}\|u_n\|_{p,\Gamma_2}, \\ \displaystyle\left|\int_\Omega N(w_n)(x)u_n\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \le \left(a_N + b_N\|w_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}^{\kappa_1}\right)\|u_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}, \\ \displaystyle\left|\int_{\Gamma_4} G(w_n)(x)u_n\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \le \left(a_G + b_G\|w_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}^{\kappa_2}\right)\|u_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}. \end{cases}
$$

Letting $v=0$ in (3.3) and using the estimates (3.4), (3.5), and (3.6), it yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}\|\nabla u_n\|_{p,\Omega}^p + b_f\|w_n\|_{p,\Omega}^{p-1}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega} + \|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega} + \|\eta_n\|_{p',\Omega}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega} \\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \|\xi_n\|_{p',\Gamma_2}\|u_n\|_{p,\Gamma_2} + \left(a_N + b_N\|w_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}^{\kappa_1}\right)\|u_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega} \\
&\quad + \left(a_G + b_G\|w_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}^{\kappa_2}\right)\|u_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4} \\
&\ge -\int_\Omega N(w_n)(x)u_n\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_4} G(w_n)(x)u_n\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_\Omega \eta_n(x)u_n\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_2}\xi_n(x)u_n\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_\Omega f(x,w_n,\nabla u_n)u_n\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\ge \int_\Omega M(w_n)|\nabla u_n|^p + \mu(x)|\nabla u_n|^q + |u_n|^p + \mu(x)|u_n|^q\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \\
&\ge c_M\|\nabla u_n\|_{p,\Omega}^p + \|\nabla u_n\|_{q,\mu}^q + \|u_n\|_{p,\Omega}^p + \|u_n\|_{q,\mu}^q - \alpha_\varphi\|u_n\|_V - \beta_\varphi.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, from Proposition 2.2, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &\ge (c_M - a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}})\|\nabla u_n\|_{p,\Omega}^p + \|\nabla u_n\|_{q,\mu}^q + \|u_n\|_{p,\Omega}^p + \|u_n\|_{q,\mu}^q - b_f\|w_n\|_{p,\Omega}^{p-1}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega} \\
&\quad - \|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega} - \|\eta_n\|_{p',\Omega}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega} - \|\xi\|_{p',\Gamma_2}\|u_n\|_{p,\Gamma_2} - \beta_\varphi - \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \\
&\quad - \left(a_N + b_N\|w_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}^{\kappa_1}\right)\|u_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega} - \left(a_G + b_G\|w_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}^{\kappa_2}\right)\|u_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4} - \alpha_\varphi\|u_n\|_V \\
&\ge \min\{c_M - a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}, 1\}\min\{\|u_n\|_V^p, \|u_n\|_V^q\} - b_f\|w_n\|_{p,\Omega}^{p-1}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega} - \|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega} \\
&\quad - \|\eta_n\|_{p',\Omega}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega} - \|\xi_n\|_{p',\Gamma_2}\|u_n\|_{p,\Gamma_2} - \left(a_N + b_N\|w_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}^{\kappa_1}\right)\|u_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega} \\
&\quad - \left(a_G + b_G\|w_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}^{\kappa_2}\right)\|u_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4} - \alpha_\varphi\|u_n\|_V - \beta_\varphi - \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma.
\end{aligned}
$$

The latter combined with the boundedness of $\{w_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset V$, $\{\eta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset X^*$, and $\{\xi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset Y^*$ implies that solution sequence $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in V.

Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may find a function $u \in V$ satisfying

$$
u_n \xrightarrow{w} u \quad \text{in } V \text{ as } n \to \infty.
$$

We assert that $u = \mathcal{S}(w,\eta,\xi)$, i.e., u is the unique solution of problem (3.1) corresponding to $(w,\eta,\xi) \in V \times X^* \times Y^*$.

Recalling that $w_n \xrightarrow{w} w$ in V and $u_n \xrightarrow{w} u$ in V, we are now in a position to invoke Lemma 3.2(ii) to get that $u \in K(w)$. However, it follows from Lemma 3.2(iii) that there exists a sequence $\{v_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset V$ satisfying

$$v_n \in K(w_n) \quad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{and} \quad v_n \to u \quad \text{in } V.$$

Letting $v = v_n$ in (3.3), one has

$$\begin{aligned} &M(w_n)\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n \cdot \nabla(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega \mu(x)|\nabla u_n|^{q-2}\nabla u_n \cdot \nabla(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega (|u_n|^{p-2}u_n + \mu(x)|u_n|^{q-2}u_n)(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega N(w_n)(x)(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad + \int_{\Gamma_3} \phi(x, v_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_3} \phi(x, u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \\ &\quad + \int_{\Gamma_4} G(w_n)(x)(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \\ &\geq \int_\Omega \eta_n(x)(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_2} \xi_n(x)(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega f(x, w_n, \nabla u_n)(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

From the boundedness of $\{N(w_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\{G(w_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\{\eta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, and $\{\xi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, it can directly be obtained that

$$\begin{cases} \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \displaystyle\int_\Omega N(w_n)(x)(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0, \\ \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \displaystyle\int_{\Gamma_4} G(w_n)(x)(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma = 0, \\ \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \displaystyle\int_\Omega \eta_n(x)(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0, \\ \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \displaystyle\int_{\Gamma_2} \xi_n(x)(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma = 0, \end{cases} \tag{3.8}$$

where we have used the compactness of the embeddings of V into $L^{\zeta_1}(\Omega)$, of V into $L^{\zeta_2}(\Gamma_4)$, of V into $L^p(\Gamma_2)$, and of V into $L^p(\Omega)$. By hypothesis H(f)(i), we can see that sequence $\{f(\cdot, w_n, \nabla u_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^{p'}(\Omega)$. Hence, it holds that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega f(x, w_n, \nabla u_n)(v_n - u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0. \tag{3.9}$$

From hypothesis H(ϕ), it admits that $V \ni u \mapsto \varphi(u) := \int_{\Gamma_3} \phi(x, u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma$ is continuous and convex, and so it is weakly lower semicontinuous, because of $V \subset \operatorname{int} D(\varphi)$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{n\to\infty} \left[\int_{\Gamma_3} \phi(x, v_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_3} \phi(x, u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\right] \\ &\quad \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{\Gamma_3} \phi(x, v_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{\Gamma_3} \phi(x, u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Recalling that M is weakly continuous in V (see hypothesis H(M)), it yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\bigg[\int_\Omega \big(M(w_n)|\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n+\mu(x)|\nabla u_n|^{q-2}\nabla u_n\big)\cdot\nabla(u_n-v_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\qquad+\int_\Omega(|u_n|^{p-2}u_n+\mu(x)|u_n|^{q-2}u_n)(u_n-v_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\bigg]\\
&\quad\geq\limsup_{n\to\infty}\bigg[\int_\Omega \big(M(w)|\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n+\mu(x)|\nabla u_n|^{q-2}\nabla u_n\big)\cdot\nabla(u_n-u)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\qquad+\int_\Omega(|u_n|^{p-2}u_n+\mu(x)|u_n|^{q-2}u_n)(u_n-u)\,\mathrm{d}x\bigg]\\
&\qquad-\limsup_{n\to\infty}|M(w_n)-M(w)|\left|\int_\Omega|\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n\cdot\nabla(u_n-v_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\right|\\
&\qquad-\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left|\int_\Omega\mu(x)|\nabla u_n|^{q-2}\nabla u_n\cdot\nabla(u-v_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\right|\\
&\quad\geq\limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle\mathcal{H}_w(u),u_n-u\rangle-\limsup_{n\to\infty}|M(w_n)-M(w)|\,\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega}^{p-1}\|u_n-v_n\|_{p,\Omega}\\
&\qquad-\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|u_n\|_{q,\mu}^{q-1}\|u-v_n\|_{q,\mu}\\
&\quad=\limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle\mathcal{H}_w(u),u_n-u\rangle.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.11}$$

Passing to the upper limit as $n\to\infty$ to inequality (3.7) and using (3.8), (3.9), (3.10), (3.11), and (3.15), one has

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle\mathcal{H}_w(u),u_n-u\rangle\leq 0.$$

The latter combined with Proposition 2.3 (i.e., $\mathcal{H}_w$ is of type (S_+)) implies that $u_n\to u$ in V.

Let $z\in K(w)$ be arbitrary. By Lemma 3.2(iii), we are able to choose a sequence $\{z_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\subset V$ such that $z_n\in K(w_n)$ for any $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and $z_n\to z$ in V. Inserting $v=z_n$ into (3.3) and passing to the upper limit as $n\to\infty$ for the resulting inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&M(w)\int_\Omega|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u\cdot\nabla(z-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega\mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\cdot\nabla(z-u)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad+\int_\Omega(|u|^{p-2}u+\mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u)(z-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega N(w)(x)(z-u)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad+\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,z)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma-\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_{\Gamma_4}G(w)(x)(z-u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\\
&\geq\limsup_{n\to\infty}\bigg[M(w_n)\int_\Omega|\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n\cdot\nabla(z_n-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,z_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\\
&\quad-\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_\Omega\mu(x)|\nabla u_n|^{q-2}\nabla u_n\cdot\nabla(z_n-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad+\int_\Omega(|u_n|^{p-2}u_n+\mu(x)|u_n|^{q-2}u_n)(z_n-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega N(w_n)(x)(z_n-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad+\int_{\Gamma_4}G(w_n)(x)(z_n-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\bigg]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \limsup_{n\to\infty}\left[\int_\Omega \eta_n(x)(z_n-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{\Gamma_2}\xi_n(x)(z_n-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\right.\\
&\qquad\left.+\int_\Omega f(x,w_n,\nabla u_n)(z_n-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\right]\\
&=\int_\Omega \eta(x)(z-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{\Gamma_2}\xi(x)(z-u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_\Omega f(x,w,\nabla u)(z-u)\,\mathrm{d}x,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have applied the continuity of M, N, and G. Because $z\in K(w)$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $u\in K(w)$ is the unique solution of problem (3.1) corresponding to $(w,\eta,\xi)\in V\times X^*\times Y^*$, namely, $u=\mathcal{S}(w,\eta,\xi)$.

Since every convergent subsequence of $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to the same limit $u=\mathcal{S}(w,\eta,\xi)$, this implies that the whole sequence $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to u. Thus,

$$\mathcal{S}(w_n,\eta_n,\xi_n)=u_n\to u=\mathcal{S}(w,\eta,\xi).$$

Therefore, we have proved that the solution map $\mathcal{S}\colon V\times X^*\times Y^*\to V$ of problem (3.1) is completely continuous. ∎

With a view to hypotheses H(U_1) and H(U_2), it is now natural to introduce the following multivalued mappings $\mathcal{U}_1\colon X\to 2^{X^*}$ and $\mathcal{U}_2\colon Y\to 2^{Y^*}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_1(u)&:=\left\{\eta\in X^*\,:\,\eta(x)\in U_1(x,u(x))\text{ a.a. in }\Omega\right\},\\
\mathcal{U}_2(v)&:=\left\{\xi\in Y^*\,:\,\xi(x)\in U_2(x,v(x))\text{ a.a. on }\Gamma_2\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $(u,v)\in X\times Y$, respectively. As before, by $i\colon V\to X$ and $\gamma\colon V\to Y$, we denote the embedding operator of V to X and the trace operator from V to Y, respectively. It follows from Proposition 2.1 that the operators $i\colon V\to X$ and $\gamma\colon V\to Y$ are linear, bounded, and compact. Therefore, we can see that their dual operators $i^*\colon X^*\to V^*$ and $\gamma^*\colon Y^*\to V^*$ are linear, bounded, and compact as well. The following lemma is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.6 of Zeng, Rădulescu, and Winkert [52].

LEMMA 3.6. *Let* H(U_1) *and* H(U_2) *be satisfied. Then the following statements hold:*

(i) *$\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$ are well-defined, and for each $u\in X$ and $v\in Y$, the sets $\mathcal{U}_1(u)$ and $\mathcal{U}_2(v)$ are bounded, closed, and convex in X^* and Y^*, respectively;*
(ii) *$\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$ are strongly-weakly upper semicontinuous, i.e., $\mathcal{U}_1$ is upper semicontinuous from X with the strong topology to the subsets of X^* with the weak topology, and $\mathcal{U}_2$ is upper semicontinuous from Y with the strong topology to the subsets of Y^* with the weak topology.*

The following theorem states the main results of this section, which indicates that the set of weak solutions to problem (1.1) is nonempty and compact in V.

THEOREM 3.7. *Let $2\leq p$. Assume that* H(1), H(2), H(M), H(f), H(N), H(G), H(U_1), H(U_2), H(ϕ), H(L), *and* H(J) *are satisfied. Then the solution set of problem* (1.1), *denoted by $\coprod$, is nonempty and compact in V.*

Proof. First we prove the following claims.

Claim 1. The solution set $\coprod$ of problem (1.1) is bounded when $\coprod$ is nonempty.

Assume that $\coprod$ is nonempty, and let $u\in\coprod$ be arbitrary. Then we can find functions $(\eta,\xi)\in X^*\times Y^*$ satisfying $\eta(x)\in U_1(x,u(x))$ for a.a. $x\in\Omega$ and $\xi(x)\in U_2(x,u(x))$ for a.a. $x\in\Gamma_2$ and the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
&M(u)\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u\cdot\nabla(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega \mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\cdot\nabla(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad+\int_\Omega (|u|^{p-2}u+\mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega N(u)(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad+\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,v)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma-\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_{\Gamma_4}G(u)(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\\
&\ge \int_\Omega \eta(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{\Gamma_2}\xi(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_\Omega f(x,u,\nabla u)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x
\end{aligned}$$

for all $v\in K(u)$. Recall that $0\in K(u)$. So we can put $v=0$ into the above inequality in order to get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&M(u)\|\nabla u\|_{p,\Omega}^p+\|\nabla u\|_{q,\mu}^q+\|u\|_{p,\Omega}^p+\|u\|_{q,\mu}+\int_\Omega N(u)u\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{\Gamma_4}G(u)u\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\\
&\quad+\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma-\int_\Omega f(x,u,\nabla u)u\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\le \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_\Omega \eta(x)u\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{\Gamma_2}\xi(x)u\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.12}$$

From hypotheses H(U_1)(iv) and H(U_2)(iv) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega \eta(x)u(x)\,\mathrm{d}x&\le\int_\Omega |\eta(x)||u(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\le\int_\Omega\left(\alpha_{U_1}(x)+a_{U_1}|u(x)|^{p-1}\right)|u(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\le a_{U_1}\|u\|_{p,\Omega}^p+\|\alpha_{U_1}\|_{p',\Omega}\|u\|_{p,\Omega}\\
&\le a_{U_1}c_p(\Omega)^p\|u\|_V^p+\|\alpha_{U_1}\|_{p',\Omega}c_p(\Omega)\|u\|_V
\end{aligned}\tag{3.13}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Gamma_2}\xi(x)u(x)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma&\le\int_{\Gamma_2}|\xi(x)||u(x)|\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\\
&\le\int_{\Gamma_2}\left(\alpha_{U_2}(x)+a_{U_2}|u(x)|^{p-1}\right)|u(x)|\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\\
&\le a_{U_2}\|u\|_{p,\Gamma_2}^p+\|\alpha_{U_2}\|_{p',\Gamma_2}\|u\|_{p,\Gamma_2}\\
&\le a_{U_2}c_p(\Gamma_2)^p\|u\|_V^p+\|\alpha_{U_2}\|_{p',\Gamma_2}c_p(\Gamma_2)\|u\|_V.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.14}$$

By hypotheses H(f)(i), H(N), and H(G) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega f(x,u,\nabla u)u\,\mathrm{d}x&\le\int_\Omega\left(a_f|\nabla u|^{p-1}+b_f|u|^{p-1}+\alpha_f(x)\right)|u|\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\le a_f\|\nabla u\|_{p,\Omega}^{p-1}\|u\|_{p,\Omega}+b_f\|u\|_{p,\Omega}^p+\|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}\|u\|_{p,\Omega}\\
&\le a_f\hat\lambda^{\frac1p}\|\nabla u\|_{p,\Omega}^p+b_fc_p(\Omega)^p\|u\|_V^p+\|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}c_p(\Omega)\|u\|_V
\end{aligned}\tag{3.15}$$

and

$$\int_\Omega N(u)(x)u\,\mathrm{d}x\ge-\|N(u)\|_{\zeta_1',\Omega}\|u\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}\ge-(a_N+b_N\|u\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}^{\kappa_1})\|u\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}\tag{3.16}$$

and

$$\int_{\Gamma_4}G(u)(x)u\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\ge-\|G(u)\|_{\zeta_2',\Gamma_4}\|u\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}\ge-(a_G+b_G\|u\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}^{\kappa_2})\|u\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}.\tag{3.17}$$

Taking into account (3.12), (3.13), (3.14), (3.15), (3.16), and (3.17), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(c_M - a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)\|\nabla u\|_{p,\Omega}^p + \|\nabla u\|_{q,\mu}^q + \|u\|_{p,\Omega}^p + \|u\|_{q,\mu} - a_{U_1}c_p(\Omega)^p\|u\|_V^p\\
&\quad - a_{U_2}c_p(\Gamma_2)^p\|u\|_V^p - b_f c_p(\Omega)^p\|u\|_V^p\\
&\quad \le \left(a_N + b_N\|u\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}^{\kappa_1}\right)\|u\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega} + \left(a_G + b_G\|u\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}^{\kappa_2}\right)\|u\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4} + \|\alpha_{U_1}\|_{p',\Omega}c_p(\Omega)\|u\|_V\\
&\qquad + \|\alpha_{U_2}\|_{p',\Gamma_2}c_p(\Gamma_2)\|u\|_V + \|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}c_p(\Omega)\|u\|_V + \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \alpha_\varphi\|u\|_V + \beta_\varphi.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\|u\|_V > 1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\min\{c_M - a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}, 1\} - (a_{U_1}+b_f)c_p(\Omega)^p - a_{U_2}c_p(\Gamma_2)^p\right)\|u\|_V^p\\
&\quad \le m_0\left(1 + \|u\|_V + \|u\|_V^{\kappa_1+1} + \|u\|_V^{\kappa_2+1}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

with some $m_0 > 0$ which is independent of u, where we have used the continuity of embeddings of V to $L^{\zeta_1}(\Omega)$, of V to $L^p(\Omega)$, of V to $L^{\zeta_2}(\Gamma_4)$, and of V to $L^p(\Gamma_2)$. Using the inequalities

$$\begin{gathered}1 < \kappa_1 < p-1, \quad 1 < \kappa_2 < p-1,\\
\min\left\{c_M - a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}, 1\right\} - (a_{U_1}+b_f)c_p(\Omega)^p - a_{U_2}c_p(\Gamma_2)^p > 0,\end{gathered}$$

and (3.18), we conclude that the solution set $\coprod$ of problem (1.1) is bounded when $\coprod$ is nonempty.

Claim 2. Let $C > 0$, and let $\overline{B_V(0,C)} := \{u \in V : \|u\|_V \le C\}$. Then we can find a positive constant $\mathcal{C}^* > 0$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{S}(\overline{B_V(0,\mathcal{C}^*)},\ \mathcal{U}_1(i\overline{B_V(0,\mathcal{C}^*)}),\ \mathcal{U}_2(\gamma\overline{B_V(0,\mathcal{C}^*)})) \subset \overline{B_V(0,\mathcal{C}^*)}. \tag{3.19}$$

We prove it by contradiction. Suppose there is no such constant $\mathcal{C}^*$ to satisfy the inclusion (3.19). Therefore, for every $n > 1$, we are able to find elements $w_n, z_n, y_n \in \overline{B_V(0,n)}$ and $(\eta_n, \xi_n) \in X^* \times Y^*$ such that $\eta_n \in \mathcal{U}_1(iz_n)$, $\xi_n \in \mathcal{U}_2(\gamma y_n)$, and

$$u_n = \mathcal{S}(w_n, \eta_n, \xi_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_n\|_V > n.$$

By the definition of u_n we have

$$\begin{aligned}&M(w_n)\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n\cdot\nabla(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \mu(x)|\nabla u_n|^{q-2}\nabla u_n\cdot\nabla(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad + \int_\Omega (|u_n|^{p-2}u_n + \mu(x)|u_n|^{q-2}u_n)(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega N(w_n)(x)(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,v)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_{\Gamma_4} G(w_n)(x)(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\\
&\ge \int_\Omega \eta_n(x)(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_2}\xi_n(x)(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_\Omega f(x,w_n,\nabla u_n)(v-u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\end{aligned}$$

for all $v \in K(w_n)$. In the inequality above, we take $v = 0$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&M(w_n)\|\nabla u_n\|_{p,\Omega}^p + \|\nabla u_n\|_{q,\mu}^q + \|u_n\|_{p,\Omega}^p + \|u_n\|_{q,\mu} + \int_\Omega N(w_n)u_n\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_4} G(u_n)u_n\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u_n)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_\Omega f(x,w_n,\nabla u_n)u_n\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\le \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_\Omega \eta_n(x)u_n\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_2}\xi_n(x)u_n\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma.\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

It follows from hypotheses H(U_1)(iv) and H(U_2)(iv) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega \eta_n(x)u_n(x)\,\mathrm{d}x &\le \int_\Omega |\eta_n(x)||u_n(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\le \int_\Omega \left(\alpha_{U_1}(x)+a_{U_1}|z_n(x)|^{p-1}\right)|u_n(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\le \|\alpha_{U_1}\|_{p',\Omega}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega}+a_{U_1}\|z_n\|_{p,\Omega}^{p-1}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega}\\
&\le c_p(\Omega)\|\alpha_{U_1}\|_{p',\Omega}\|u_n\|_V+a_{U_1}c_p(\Omega)^p\|z_n\|_V^{p-1}\|u_n\|_V
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.21}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Gamma_2} \xi_n(x)u_n(x)\,\mathrm{d}x &\le \int_{\Gamma_2} |\xi_n(x)||u_n(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\le \int_{\Gamma_2} \left(\alpha_{U_2}(x)+a_{U_2}|y_n(x)|^{p-1}\right)|u_n(x)|\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\le \|\alpha_{U_2}\|_{p',\Gamma_2}\|u_n\|_{p,\Gamma_2}+a_{U_2}\|y_n\|_{p,\Gamma_2}^{p-1}\|u_n\|_{p,\Gamma_2}\\
&\le c_p(\Gamma_2)\|\alpha_{U_2}\|_{p',\Gamma_2}\|u_n\|_V+a_{U_2}c_p(\Gamma_2)^p\|y_n\|_V^{p-1}\|u_n\|_V.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.22}
$$

Moreover, hypotheses H(N) and H(G) imply that

$$
\int_\Omega N(w_n)u_n\,\mathrm{d}x \le \|N(w_n)\|_{\zeta_1',\Omega}\|u_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}\le (a_N+b_N\|w_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}^{\kappa_1})\|u_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}
\tag{3.23}
$$

and

$$
\int_{\Gamma_4} G(w_n)u_n\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \le \|G(w_n)\|_{\zeta_2',\Gamma_4}\|u_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}\le (a_G+b_G\|w_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}^{\kappa_2})\|u_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}.
\tag{3.24}
$$

Finally, by hypothesis H(f)(i), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega f(x,w_n,\nabla u_n)u_n\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad\le \int_\Omega \left(a_f|\nabla u_n|^{p-1}+b_f|w_n|^{p-1}+\alpha_f(x)\right)|u_n|\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\quad\le a_f\|\nabla u_n\|_{p,\Omega}^{p-1}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega}+b_f\|w_n\|_{p,\Omega}^{p-1}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega}+\|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}\|u_n\|_{p,\Omega}\\
&\quad\le a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}\|\nabla u_n\|_{p,\Omega}^{p}+b_fc_p(\Omega)^p\|w_n\|_V^{p-1}\|u_n\|_V+\|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}c_p(\Omega)\|u_n\|_V.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.25}
$$

Since $n>1$ and $\|y_n\|_V\le n<\|u_n\|_V$, we insert (3.21), (3.22), (3.23), (3.24), (3.25) into (3.20) to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\min\{c_M-a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}},1\}-(a_{U_1}+b_f)c_p(\Omega)^p-a_{U_2}c_p(\Gamma_2)^p\right)\|u_n\|_V^p\\
&\quad\le (a_N+b_N\|w_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}^{\kappa_1})\|u_n\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}+(a_G+b_G\|w_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}^{\kappa_2})\|u_n\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}\\
&\qquad+\|\alpha_{U_1}\|_{p',\Omega}c_p(\Omega)\|u_n\|_V+\|\alpha_{U_2}\|_{p',\Omega}c_p(\Gamma_2)\|u_n\|_V+\|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}c_p(\Omega)\|u_n\|_V\\
&\qquad+\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\alpha_\varphi\|u_n\|_V+\beta_\varphi,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used inequality (3.5). Passing to the limit as $n\to\infty$ to the inequality above, one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\infty\\
&\quad=\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\min\{c_M-a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}},1\}-(a_{U_1}+b_f)c_p(\Omega)^p-a_{U_2}c_p(\Gamma_2)^p\right)\|u_n\|_V^{p-\max\{\kappa_1,\kappa_2\}-1}\\
&\quad\le 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

a contradiction. Therefore, we conclude that there exists a positive constant $\mathcal{C}^* > 0$ such that (3.19) holds. This proves Claim 2.

As mentioned before, the main tool in the proof of the existence of a solution to problem (1.1) is Tychonoff's fixed point theorem for multivalued operators; see Theorem 2.5. For this purpose, let us consider the multivalued mapping $\Lambda\colon V \times X^* \times Y^* \to 2^{V\times X^*\times Y^*}$ defined by

$$\Lambda(u,\eta,\xi) := (\mathcal{S}(u,\eta,\xi), \mathcal{U}_1(iu), \mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u)).$$

Observe that if (u,η,ξ) is a fixed point of Λ, then we have $u = \mathcal{S}(u,\eta,\xi)$ and $(\eta,\xi) \in \mathcal{U}_1(iu) \times \mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u)$. It is obvious from the definitions of $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{U}_1$, and $\mathcal{U}_2$ that u is also a weak solution of problem (1.1). Therefore, we are going to examine the validity of the conditions of Theorem 2.5.

Invoking Proposition 3.4 and Lemma 3.5, we can see that for each $(w,\eta,\xi) \in V \times X^* \times Y^*$, the set $\Lambda(w,\eta,\xi)$ is a nonempty, bounded, closed, and convex subset of $V \times X^* \times Y^*$.

Employing hypotheses H(U_1)(iv) and H(U_2)(iv), it is not difficult to prove that $\mathcal{U}_1\colon X \to 2^{X^*}$ and $\mathcal{U}_2\colon Y \to 2^{Y^*}$ are two bounded operators, and there exist two constants $M_1 > 0$ and $M_2 > 0$ satisfying

$$\|\mathcal{U}_1(i\overline{B_V(0,\mathcal{C}^*)})\|_{X^*} \le M_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{U}_2(\gamma\overline{B_V(0,\mathcal{C}^*)})\|_{Y^*} \le M_2.$$

Additionally, we introduce a bounded, closed, and convex subset D of $V \times X^* \times Y^*$ defined by

$$D = \{(u,\eta,\xi) \in V \times X^* \times Y^* : \|u\|_V \le \mathcal{C}^*,\ \|\eta\|_{X^*} \le M_1, \text{ and } \|\xi\|_{Y^*} \le M_2\}.$$

From this and (3.19) we know that Λ maps D into itself.

Next, we are going to prove that the multivalued mapping Λ is weakly-weakly upper semicontinuous. For any weakly closed set E in $V \times X^* \times Y^*$ such that $\Lambda^-(E) \neq \emptyset$, let $\{(w_n,\eta_n,\xi_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \Lambda^-(E)$ be such that $(w_n,\eta_n,\xi_n) \xrightarrow{w} (w,\eta,\xi)$ in $V \times X^* \times Y^*$ for some $(w,\eta,\xi) \in V \times X^* \times Y^*$. Our goal is to show that $(w,\eta,\xi) \in \Lambda^-(E)$, namely that there exists $(u,\delta,\sigma) \in \Lambda(w,\eta,\xi) \cap E$. Indeed, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we are able to find $(u_n,\delta_n,\sigma_n) \in \Lambda(w_n,\eta_n,\xi_n) \cap E$, so $u_n = \mathcal{S}(w_n,\eta_n,\xi_n)$, $\delta_n \in \mathcal{U}_1(iw_n)$, and $\sigma_n \in \mathcal{U}_2(\gamma w_n)$. From the boundedness of $\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$ one has that the sequences $\{\delta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\sigma_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are bounded in X^* and Y^*, respectively. Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that

$$\delta_n \xrightarrow{w} \delta \quad \text{in } X^* \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_n \xrightarrow{w} \sigma \quad \text{in } Y^*$$

for some $(\delta,\sigma) \in X^* \times Y^*$. Recall that $\mathcal{S}$ is completely continuous. So, it holds that $u_n = \mathcal{S}(w_n,\eta_n,\xi_n) \to \mathcal{S}(w,\eta,\xi) := u$ in V. Note that i and γ are both compact. Hence, $iw_n \to iw$ in X and $\gamma w_n \to \gamma w$ in Y. Since $\mathcal{U}_1$ (resp., $\mathcal{U}_2$) is strongly-weakly upper semicontinuous and has nonempty, bounded, closed, and convex values, it follows from Theorem 1.1.4 of Kamenskii, Obukhovskii, and Zecca [25] that $\mathcal{U}_1$ (resp., $\mathcal{U}_2$) is strongly-weakly closed. The latter combined with the convergences above implies that $\delta \in \mathcal{U}_1(iw)$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{U}_2(\gamma w)$, namely that $(u,\delta,\sigma) \in \Lambda(w,\eta,\xi) \cap E$, because of the weak closedness of E. Therefore, we conclude that Λ is weakly-weakly upper semicontinuous.

Therefore, all conditions of Theorem 2.5 are satisfied. Using this theorem, we conclude that Λ has at least a fixed point, say $(u^*,\eta^*,\xi^*) \in V \times X^* \times Y^*$. Hence, $u^* \in V$ is a weak solution of problem (1.1).

Next, let us prove the compactness of the solution set $\coprod$. From Claim 1, we can see that the solution set $\coprod$ of problem (1.1) is bounded in V. By the definitions of a weak solution (see Definition 3.3) and of Λ, there exist $(\eta,\xi) \in X^* \times Y^*$ such that $u = \mathcal{S}(u,\eta,\xi)$, $\eta \in \mathcal{U}_1(iu)$, and $\xi \in \mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u)$, that is, $(u,\eta,\xi) \in \Lambda(u,\eta,\xi)$. Let $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be any sequence of solutions to problem (1.1). Then there are two sequences $\{\eta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset X^*$ and $\{\xi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset Y^*$ such that $\eta_n \in \mathcal{U}_1(iu_n)$, $\xi_n \in \mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u_n)$ such that $u_n = \mathcal{S}(u_n,\eta_n,\xi_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From the boundedness of $\coprod$ we may assume that

$$u_n \xrightarrow{w} u \quad \text{in } V$$

for some $u \in V$. This together with the boundedness of $\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$ deduces that $\{\eta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset X^*$ and $\{\xi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset Y^*$ are both bounded. So, passing to a subsequence if necessary, we suppose that

$$\eta_n \xrightarrow{w} \eta \quad \text{in } X^* \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_n \xrightarrow{w} \xi \quad \text{in } Y^*$$

for some $\eta \in \mathcal{U}_1(iu)$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u)$, owing to the compactness of i and γ as well as the strongly-weakly closedness of $\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$. Using the complete continuity of $\mathcal{S}$, we conclude that

$$u_n = \mathcal{S}(u_n,\eta_n,\xi_n) \to \mathcal{S}(u,\eta,\xi) = u.$$

This means that u is a solution to problem (1.1). Consequently, the solution set $\coprod$ of problem (1.1) is compact. ∎

4. Special cases of the original problem. In this section, we are going to study several special cases of problem (1.1) and discuss some particular situations.

First, we move our attention to consider the special case of problem (1.1) formed as follows:

(4.1)
$$\begin{aligned}
-D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u \in r_1(u)\partial j_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u,\nabla u) \qquad & \text{in } \Omega,\\
u = 0 \qquad & \text{on } \Gamma_1,\\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} \in r_2(u)\partial j_2(x,u) \qquad & \text{on } \Gamma_2,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} \in \partial_c \phi(x,u) \qquad & \text{on } \Gamma_3,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} = G(u)(x) \qquad & \text{on } \Gamma_4,\\
L(u) \le J(u), \qquad &
\end{aligned}$$

where the terms ∂j_1 and ∂j_2 stand for Clarke's generalized gradients of locally Lipschitz functions $s \mapsto j_1(x,s)$ and $s \mapsto j_2(x,s)$, respectively. Here the functions $j_1\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $j_2\colon \Gamma_2 \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are supposed to satisfy the following properties:

H(j_1): The functions $j_1\colon \Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ and $r_1\colon \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ are such that the following hold:
- (i) $x \mapsto j_1(x,s)$ is measurable in Ω for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, with $x \mapsto j_1(x,0)$ belonging to $L^1(\Omega)$;
- (ii) $s \mapsto j_1(x,s)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous for a.a. $x \in \Omega$, and the function $r_1\colon \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is continuous;
- (iii) there exist a function $\alpha_{j_1} \in L^{p'}(\Omega)_+$ and a constant $a_{j_1} \ge 0$ such that
$$|r_1(s)\eta| \le \alpha_{j_1}(x) + a_{j_1}|s|^{p-1}$$
for all $\eta \in \partial j_1(x,s)$, for a.a. $x \in \Omega$, and for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

H(j_2): The functions $j_2\colon \Gamma_2\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ and $r_2\colon \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ are such that the following hold:

(i) $x\mapsto j_2(x,s)$ is measurable on Γ_2 for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$, with $x\mapsto j_2(x,0)$ belonging to $L^1(\Gamma_2)$;

(ii) $s\mapsto j_2(x,s)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous for a.a. $x\in\Gamma_2$, and the function $r_2\colon \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is continuous;

(iii) there exist a function $\alpha_{j_2}\in L^{p'}(\Gamma_2)_+$ and a constant $a_{j_2}\geq 0$ such that

$$|r_2(s)\xi|\leq \alpha_{j_2}(x)+a_{j_2}|s|^{p-1}$$

for all $\xi\in\partial j_2(x,s)$, for a.a. $x\in\Gamma_2$ and for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$.

Using the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 3.11 of Zeng, Rădulescu, and Winkert [52], we have the following lemma.

LEMMA 4.1. *Assume that* H(j_1) *and* H(j_2) *are fulfilled. Then the multivalued mappings* $U_1\colon \Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ *and* $U_2\colon \Gamma_2\times\mathbb{R}\to 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ *defined by*

$$U_1(x,s):=r_1(s)\partial j_1(x,s)\quad\text{and}\quad U_2(y,s):=r_2(s)\partial j_2(y,s)$$

for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$*, for a.a.* $x\in\Omega$*, and for a.a.* $y\in\Gamma_2$ *satisfy* H(U_1) *and* H(U_2)*, respectively.*

By Theorem 3.7 and Lemma 4.1, we have the following existence theorem to problem (4.1).

THEOREM 4.2. *Let* $p\geq 2$*. Assume that* H(1), H(M), H(f), H(N), H(G), H(j_1), H(j_2), H(ϕ), H(L), H(J) *and the inequalities*

$$\begin{aligned}&0<k(p)c_M-e_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}},\\&0<\min\{c_M-a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}},1\}-(a_{j_1}+b_f)\,c_p(\Omega)^p-a_{j_2}c_p(\Gamma_2)^p\end{aligned}$$

are satisfied. Then the solution set of problem (4.1) *is nonempty and compact in* V*.*

When f is independent of the third variable (i.e., f is formulated by $f\colon\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$), problem (1.1) becomes to the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned}-D_Mu+|u|^{p-2}u+\mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u&\in U_1(x,u)+N(u)(x)+f(x,u) && \text{in } \Omega,\\ u&=0 && \text{on } \Gamma_1,\\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu_a}&\in U_2(x,u) && \text{on } \Gamma_2,\\ -\frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu_a}&\in\partial_c\phi(x,u) && \text{on } \Gamma_3,\\ -\frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu_a}&=G(u)(x) && \text{on } \Gamma_4,\\ L(u)&\leq J(u). &&\end{aligned}\tag{4.2}$$

A careful reading of the proofs in section 3 gives the following results to problem (4.2).

THEOREM 4.3. *Let* $p\geq 2$*. Assume that* H(1), H(M), H(N), H(G), H(U_1), H(U_2), H(ϕ), H(L), *and* H(J) *are satisfied. If, in addition,* f *satisfies the following condition,*

H(f'): $f\colon\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ *is a Carathéodory function such that there exist a constant* $b_f\geq 0$ *and a function* $\alpha_f\in L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\Omega)_+$ *satisfying*

$$|f(x,s)|\leq b_f|s|^{p-1}+\alpha_f(x)$$

for a.a. $x\in\Omega$ *and for all* $s\in\mathbb{R}$*,* *and the following inequality is satisfied,*

$$0 < \min\{c_M, 1\} - (a_{U_1} + b_f)\, c_p(\Omega)^p - a_{U_2} c_p(\Gamma_2)^p,$$

then the solution set of problem (4.2) *is nonempty and compact in* V*.*

Therefore, from Theorems 4.2 and 4.3, we can directly obtain the existence of a weak solution to the following implicit obstacle inclusion problem:

$$\begin{cases} -D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u \in r_1(u)\partial j_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_1, \\ \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} \in r_2(u)\partial j_2(x,u) & \text{on } \Gamma_2, \\ -\dfrac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} \in \partial_c \phi(x,u) & \text{on } \Gamma_3, \\ -\dfrac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} = G(u)(x) & \text{on } \Gamma_4, \\ L(u) \le J(u). \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

THEOREM 4.4. *Let* $p \ge 2$*. Assume that* H(1)*,* H(M)*,* H(N)*,* H(G)*,* H(j_1)*,* H(j_2)*,* H(ϕ)*,* H(L)*, and* H(J) *are satisfied. If, in addition,* H(f') *and the following inequality are satisfied,*

$$0 < \min\{c_M, 1\} - (a_{j_1} + b_f)\, c_p(\Omega)^p - a_{j_2} c_p(\Gamma_2)^p,$$

then the solution set of problem (4.3) *is nonempty and compact in* V*.*

Particularly, if $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_3 = \Gamma_4 = \emptyset$ (namely that $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma$), then problem (1.1) reduces to the following nonlocal implicit obstacle problem with Dirichlet boundary condition:

$$\begin{cases} -D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u \in U_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u,\nabla u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ L(u) \le J(u). \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

Obviously, the elementary function space considered in problem (4.4) is the closed subspace

$$W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) := \{u \in W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega) : u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma\}$$

of $W^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$. It is well known that $V_0 := W_0^{1,\mathcal{H}}(\Omega)$ endowed with the norm $\|u\|_{V_0} := \||\nabla u|\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ for all $u \in V_0$ becomes a reflexive Banach space. Therefore, we have the following existence theorem to problem (4.4).

THEOREM 4.5. *Let* $p \ge 2$*. Assume that* H(1)*,* H(M)*,* H(f)*,* H(N)*,* H(U_1)*,* H(L)*,* H(J) *and the inequalities*

$$0 < k(p)c_M - e_f \hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}},$$
$$0 < \min\{c_M - a_f \hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}, 1\} - (a_{U_1} + b_f)\, c_p(\Omega)^p$$

are satisfied. Then, the solution set of problem (4.4)*, denoted by* $\coprod$*, is nonempty and compact in* V_0*.*

More particularly, if f is independent of the third variable and U_1 is specialized by the formulation $U_1(x,s) = r_1(s)\partial j_1(x,s)$ for all $(x,s) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$, then problem (4.4) reduces to the following implicit obstacle problems, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} -D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u &\in U_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u) && \text{in } \Omega,\\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma,\\ L(u) &\le J(u) && \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u &\in r_1(u)\partial j_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u,\nabla u) && \text{in } \Omega,\\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma,\\ L(u) &\le J(u). && \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Therefore, we have the following existence theorems to problems (4.5) and (4.6), respectively.

THEOREM 4.6. *Let* $p \ge 2$. *Assume that* H(1), H(M), H(f'), H(N), H(U_1), H(L), H(J), *and the inequality*

$$0 < \min\{c_M, 1\} - (a_{U_1} + b_f)\, c_p(\Omega)^p$$

is satisfied. Then the solution set of problem (4.5), *denoted by* $\coprod$, *is nonempty and compact in* V_0.

THEOREM 4.7. *Let* $p \ge 2$. *Assume that* H(1), H(M), H(f), H(N), H(j_1), H(L), H(J), *and the inequalities*

$$\begin{aligned} &0 < k(p)c_M - e_f \hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}},\\ &0 < \min\{c_M - a_f \hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}, 1\} - (a_{j_1} + b_f)\, c_p(\Omega)^p \end{aligned}$$

are satisfied. Then the solution set of problem (4.6), *denoted by* $\coprod$, *is nonempty and compact in* V_0.

Let $c_J \ge 0$ be a given constant. When $J(u) = c_J$ for all $u \in V$, problem (1.1) can be rewritten as the following nonlocal elliptic system:

$$\begin{aligned} -D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u &\in U_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u,\nabla u) && \text{in } \Omega,\\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_1,\\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in U_2(x,u) && \text{on } \Gamma_2,\\ -\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in \partial_c \phi(x,u) && \text{on } \Gamma_3,\\ -\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &= G(u)(x) && \text{on } \Gamma_4,\\ L(u) &\le c_J. && \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

With respect to problem (4.7), the constraint set is denoted by the following one:

$$K := \{u \in V : L(u) \le c_J\}.$$

Observe that the condition

H(L'): $L\colon V\to\mathbb{R}$ is a lower semicontinuous and convex function
is weaker than hypothesis H(L). Without loss of generality, in what follows, we suppose that $L(0)\le c_J$. Therefore, it is not difficult to prove that if H(L') holds, then the constraint set K is a nonempty, closed, and convex subset of V with $0\in K$.

In Theorem 3.7, the inequalities given in H(2) play a critical role in proving the existence of weak solutions to problem (1.1). But, in some sense, such inequalities restrict the scope of applications to our theoretical results. A natural question arises whether we can drop hypothesis H(2). However, this is still an open problem for the equations with the implicit obstacle effect (for example, problem (1.1)). But, fortunately, if the obstacle constraint is formulated by the form $L(u)\le c_J$ and M is a coercive in V, i.e., $M(u)\to+\infty$ as $\|u\|_V\to\infty$, then hypothesis H(2) can be removed. More precisely, if the obstacle constraint is formulated by $L(u)\le c_J$, then hypothesis H(M) can be relaxed to the following condition:

H(M'): $M\colon L^{p^*}(\Omega)\to(0,+\infty)$ is bounded and continuous in V such that $\inf_{u\in V} M(u)>0$.

THEOREM 4.8. *Assume that H(1), H(f)(i), H(N), H(G), H(U_1), H(U_2), H(ϕ), H(M'), and H(L') are satisfied. If, moreover, $M\colon L^{p^*}(\Omega)\to(0,+\infty)$ is coercive in V, then the solution set of problem (4.7), denoted by $\coprod$, is nonempty and compact in V.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}\colon V\times V\to V^*$, $\mathcal{F}\colon V\to L^{p'}(\Omega)\subset V^*$, and $\mathcal{G}\colon V\to V^*$ be the functions defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\mathcal{A}(u,u),v\rangle &:= M(u)\int_\Omega\left(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u+\mu(x)|\nabla u|^{q-2}\nabla u\right)\cdot\nabla v\,\mathrm{d}x\\&\quad+\int_\Omega(|u|^{p-2}u+\mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u)v\,\mathrm{d}x,\\\langle\mathcal{F}u,v\rangle&:=\int_\Omega f(x,u,\nabla u)v\,\mathrm{d}x,\\\langle\mathcal{G}(u),v\rangle&:=\int_\Omega N(u)(x)(v-u)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{\Gamma_4}G(u)(x)v\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma\end{aligned}$$

for all $u,v\in V$. Applying a standard procedure, it is easily to show that $u\in V$ is a weak solution to problem (4.7) if and only if it solves the following inclusion problem:

$$\mathcal{A}(u,u)+\mathcal{G}(u)+\mathcal{F}(u)+i^*\mathcal{U}_1(iu)+\gamma^*\mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u)+\partial_c\varphi_K(u)\ni 0\quad\text{in } V^*,$$

where $\partial_c\varphi_K$ is the convex differential operator of $\varphi_K:=\varphi+I_K$ and I_K is the indicator function of K.

We assert that the multivalued mapping $V\ni u\mapsto\mathcal{A}(u,u)+\mathcal{G}(u)+\mathcal{F}(u)+i^*\mathcal{U}_1(u)+\gamma^*\mathcal{U}_2(u)+\partial_c\varphi_K(u)\subset V^*$ is coercive. Let $u\in K$, $\eta\in\mathcal{U}_1(iu)$, and $\xi\in\mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u)$ be arbitrary. A simple calculating gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega M(u)|\nabla u|^p+\mu(x)|\nabla u|^q+|u|^p+\mu(x)|u|^q\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_\Omega N(u)(x)u\,\mathrm{d}x\\&\quad+\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma-\int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_{\Gamma_4}G(u)(x)u\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_\Omega\eta(x)u\,\mathrm{d}x\\&\quad+\int_{\Gamma_2}\xi(x)u\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma+\int_\Omega f(x,u,\nabla u)u\,\mathrm{d}x\\&\ge M(u)\|\nabla u\|_{p,\Omega}^p+\|\nabla u\|_{q,\mu}^q+\|u\|_{p,\Omega}^p+\|u\|_{q,\mu}^q-a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}}\|\nabla u\|_{p,\Omega}^p-b_f\|u\|_{p,\Omega}^p\\&\quad-\|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}\|u\|_{p,\Omega}-\left(a_N+b_N\|u\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}^{\kappa_1}\right)\|u\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega}-\left(a_G+b_G\|u\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}^{\kappa_2}\right)\|u\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&- \alpha_\varphi \|v\|_V - \beta_\varphi - \int_{\Gamma_3} \phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \|\alpha_{U_1}\|_{p',\Omega}\|u\|_{p,\Omega} - a_{U_1}\|u\|^p_{p,\Omega} \\
&- \|\alpha_{U_2}\|_{p',\Gamma_2}\|u\|_{p,\Omega} - a_{U_2}\|u\|^p_{p,\Gamma_2} \\
\geq &\left(M(u) - a_f \hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}} - b_f\hat{\lambda} - a_{U_1}\hat{\lambda} - a_{U_2}\lambda^S_{1,p}(1+\hat{\lambda})\right)\|\nabla u\|^p_{p,\Omega} + \|\nabla u\|^q_{q,\mu} \\
&+ \|u\|^p_{p,\Omega} + \|u\|^q_{q,\mu} - \|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}\|u\|_{p,\Omega} - \left(a_N + b_N\|u\|^{\kappa_1}_{\zeta_1,\Omega}\right)\|u\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega} \\
&- \left(a_G + b_G\|u\|^{\kappa_2}_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}\right)\|u\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4} - \alpha_\varphi\|v\|_V - \beta_\varphi - \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used the variational identity (2.5). Hence, if $\|u\|_V > 1$ is such that

$$M(u) - a_f\hat{\lambda}^{\frac{1}{p}} - b_f\hat{\lambda} - a_{U_1}\hat{\lambda} - a_{U_2}\lambda^S_{1,p}(1+\hat{\lambda}) > 1,$$

then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega M(u)|\nabla u|^p + \mu(x)|\nabla u|^q + |u|^p + \mu(x)|u|^q\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega N(u)(x)u\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,u)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_{\Gamma_4} G(u)(x)u\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_\Omega \eta(x)u\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_2}\xi(x)u\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_\Omega f(x,u,\nabla u)u\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\geq \|u\|^p_V - \|\alpha_f\|_{p',\Omega}\|u\|_{p,\Omega} - \left(a_N + b_N\|u\|^{\kappa_1}_{\zeta_1,\Omega}\right)\|u\|_{\zeta_1,\Omega} \\
&\quad - \left(a_G + b_G\|u\|^{\kappa_2}_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4}\right)\|u\|_{\zeta_2,\Gamma_4} - \alpha_\varphi\|v\|_V - \beta_\varphi - \int_{\Gamma_3}\phi(x,0)\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma.
\end{aligned}
$$

Recall that $\kappa_1 + 1 < p$ and $\kappa_2 + 1 < p$. Therefore, we have

$$\frac{\langle \mathcal{A}(u,u) + \mathcal{G}(u) + \mathcal{F}(u) + i^*\mathcal{U}_1(u) + \gamma^*\mathcal{U}_2(u) + \partial_c\varphi_K(u), u\rangle}{\|u\|_V} \to \infty \quad \text{as } \|u\|_V \to \infty.$$

This means that the multivalued mapping $V \ni u \mapsto \mathcal{A}(u,u) + \mathcal{G}(u) + \mathcal{F}(u) + i^*\mathcal{U}_1(u) + \gamma^*\mathcal{U}_2(u) + \partial_c\varphi_K(u) \subset V^*$ is coercive.

From the proof of Theorem 3.4 of Zeng, Bai, and Gasiński [47] and Theorem 3.7, we can see that the weak continuity of M plays an important role in proving the pseudomonotonicity of $V \ni u \mapsto \mathcal{A}(u,u) + \mathcal{G}(u) + \mathcal{F}(u) + i^*\mathcal{U}_1(iu) + \gamma^*\mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u) \subset V^*$. More exactly, it directly effects the validity of the condition that

- if $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset V$ with $u_n \xrightarrow{w} u$ in V and $u_n^* \in \mathcal{A}(u_n,u_n) + \mathcal{G}(u_n) + \mathcal{F}(u_n) + i^*\mathcal{U}_1(iu_n) + \gamma^*\mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u_n)$ are such that

  $$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle u_n^*, u_n - u\rangle \leq 0, \tag{4.8}$$

  then to each element $v \in V$, there exists $u^*(v) \in \mathcal{A}(u,u) + \mathcal{G}(u) + \mathcal{F}(u) + i^*\mathcal{U}_1(iu) + \gamma^*\mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u)$, with

  $$\langle u^*(v), u - v\rangle \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty}\langle u_n^*, u_n - v\rangle. \tag{4.9}$$

Let $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset V$ and $\{u_n^*\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset V^*$ be sequences such that $u_n^* \in \mathcal{A}(u_n,u_n) + \mathcal{G}(u_n) + \mathcal{F}(u_n) + i^*\mathcal{U}_1(iu_n) + \gamma^*\mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u_n)$, and suppose inequality (4.8) holds. Then there exist sequences $\{\eta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset X^*$ and $\{\xi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset Y^*$ satisfying $\eta_n \in \mathcal{U}_1(iu_n)$, $\xi_n \in \mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u_n)$, and

$$u_n^* = \mathcal{A}(u_n,u_n) + \mathcal{G}(u_n) + \mathcal{F}(u_n) + i^*\eta_n + \gamma^*\xi_n \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Using hypotheses H(U_1) and H(U_2), we can observe that the sequences $\{\eta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset X^*$ and $\{\xi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset Y^*$ are both bounded. Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that

$$\eta_n \xrightarrow{w} \eta \quad \text{in } X^* \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_n \xrightarrow{w} \xi \quad \text{in } Y^* \tag{4.10}$$

for some $(\eta, \xi) \in X^* \times Y^*$. Besides, hypothesis H($f$)(i) reveals that the sequence $\{\mathcal{F}(u_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^{p'}(\Omega)$. Then we use the compactness of i and γ as well as of the embedding from V into $L^p(\Omega)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \langle u_n^*, u_n - u\rangle \\
&\geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \langle \mathcal{A}(u_n,u_n), u_n - u\rangle + \liminf_{n\to\infty}\langle \mathcal{G}(u_n), u_n-u\rangle + \liminf_{n\to\infty}\langle \mathcal{F}(u_n), u_n - u\rangle \\
&\quad - \limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle \eta_n, u_n - u\rangle_{L^{p'}(\Omega)\times L^p(\Omega)} - \limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle \xi_n, u_n-u\rangle_{L^{p'}(\Gamma_2)\times L^p(\Gamma_2)} \\
&\geq \limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle \mathcal{A}(u_n,u_n), u_n - u\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $c_M := \inf_{u\in V} M(u) > 0$, and let $0 < \varepsilon < c_M$ be arbitrary. Recalling that $u_n \xrightarrow{w} u$ in V and M is bounded in V, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \limsup_{n\to\infty}\langle \mathcal{A}(u_n,u_n), u_n-u\rangle \\
&= \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega \left(M(u_n)|\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n + \mu(x)|\nabla u_n|^{q-2}\nabla u_n\right)\cdot\nabla(u_n-u) \\
&\quad + \left(|u_n|^{p-2}u_n + \mu(x)|u_n|^{q-2}u_n\right)(u_n-u)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\geq \liminf_{n\to\infty}\,(M(u_n)-\varepsilon)\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n\cdot\nabla(u_n-u)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + \limsup_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega \left(\varepsilon|\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n + \mu(x)|\nabla u_n|^{q-2}\nabla u_n\right)\cdot\nabla(u_n-u) \\
&\quad + \left(|u_n|^{p-2}u_n + \mu(x)|u_n|^{q-2}u_n\right)(u_n-u)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\geq \liminf_{n\to\infty}\,(M(u_n)-\varepsilon)\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u\cdot\nabla(u_n-u)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + \limsup_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega \left(\varepsilon|\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n + \mu(x)|\nabla u_n|^{q-2}\nabla u_n\right)\cdot\nabla(u_n-u) \\
&\quad + \left(|u_n|^{p-2}u_n + \mu(x)|u_n|^{q-2}u_n\right)(u_n-u)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\geq \limsup_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega \left(\varepsilon|\nabla u_n|^{p-2}\nabla u_n + \mu(x)|\nabla u_n|^{q-2}\nabla u_n\right)\cdot\nabla(u_n-u) \\
&\quad + \left(|u_n|^{p-2}u_n + \mu(x)|u_n|^{q-2}u_n\right)(u_n-u)\,\mathrm{d}x.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us define the function $\mathscr{A}\colon V\to V^*$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathscr{A}w, v\rangle := \int_\Omega &\left(\varepsilon|\nabla w|^{p-2}\nabla w + \mu(x)|\nabla w|^{q-2}\nabla w\right)\cdot\nabla v \\
&+ \left(|w|^{p-2}w + \mu(x)|w|^{q-2}w\right)v\,\mathrm{d}x,
\end{aligned}$$

which is of type (S_+) (see Proposition 2.3). This implies that $u_n \to u$ in V.

Recall that $\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$ are strongly-weakly closed. Therefore, from (4.10) it follows that $\eta \in \mathcal{U}_1(iu)$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u)$. For any $v \in V$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle u_n^*, u_n - v\rangle = \langle \mathcal{A}(u,u) + \mathcal{G}(u) + \mathcal{F}(u) - i^*\eta - \gamma^*\xi, u - v\rangle.$$

The latter combined with the fact that $\eta \in \mathcal{U}_1(iu)$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u)$ implies that $u^* \in \mathcal{A}(u,u) + \mathcal{G}(u) + \mathcal{F}(u) + i^*\mathcal{U}_1(iu) + \gamma^*\mathcal{U}_2(\gamma u)$. Therefore, we conclude that (4.9) holds.

Using the same arguments as in the proof of Theorems 3.7 and 3.4 of Zeng, Bai, and Gasiński [47], it is not difficult to prove that the solution set of problem (4.7) is nonempty and compact in V. ∎

Remark 4.9. In fact, there are a several of functions which satisfy the hypothesis H(M') such that M is coercive in V. For example, the following functions are coercive in V and fulfill hypothesis H(M'):

$$M(u) = c_a + \|u\|_V, \quad M(u) = c_a + \ln(1 + \|u\|_V), \quad M(u) = c_a + \|u\|_V^{\|u\|_V},$$
$$\text{and } M(u) = e^{\|u\|_V}$$

for all $u \in V$ with $c_a > 0$.

Let $\mathcal{D} \subset \overline{\Omega}$ be a nonempty set with positive measure and $\Psi\colon \mathcal{D} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a given obstacle function. Furthermore, when $J(u) \equiv 0$ (i.e., $c_J = 0$) and L is formulated by

$$L(u) = \int_{\mathcal{D}} (u(x) - \Psi(x))^+ \,\mathrm{d}x \quad \text{for all } u \in V,$$

then problem (4.7) can be written by the following obstacle problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
&-D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u \in U_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u,\nabla u) && \text{in } \Omega,\\
&u = 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_1,\\
&\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} \in U_2(x,u) && \text{on } \Gamma_2,\\
&-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} \in \partial_c \phi(x,u) && \text{on } \Gamma_3,\\
&-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} = G(u)(x) && \text{on } \Gamma_4,\\
&u(x) \le \Psi(x) && \text{in } \mathcal{D}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Therefore, we have the following corollary.

COROLLARY 4.10. *Assume that* H(1), H(f)(i), H(N), H(G), H(U_1), H(U_2), H(ϕ), *and* H(M') *are satisfied. If, moreover, M is coercive in V and $\Phi\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function, then the solution set of problem* (4.11)*, denoted by $\coprod$, is nonempty and compact in V.*

Under the analysis above, we have the following theorems and corollaries.

THEOREM 4.11. *Assume that* H(1), H(f)(i), H(N), H(G), H(j_1), H(j_2), H(ϕ), H(M'), *and* H(L') *are satisfied. If, moreover, M is coercive in V, then the solution set of the nonlocal obstacle problem*

$$\begin{aligned}
-D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u &\in r_1(u)\partial j_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u,\nabla u) && \textit{in } \Omega,\\
u &= 0 && \textit{on } \Gamma_1,\\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in r_2(u)\partial j_2(x,u) && \textit{on } \Gamma_2,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in \partial_c \phi(x,u) && \textit{on } \Gamma_3,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &= G(u)(x) && \textit{on } \Gamma_4,\\
L(u) &\le c_J
\end{aligned}$$

is nonempty and compact in V.

Corollary 4.12. *Assume that* H(1), H(f)(i), H(N), H(G), H(j_1), H(j_2), H(M'), *and* H(ϕ) *are satisfied. If, moreover, M is coercive in V and $\Phi\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function, then the solution set of the obstacle problem*

$$\begin{aligned}
-D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u &\in r_1(u)\partial j_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u,\nabla u) && \textit{in } \Omega,\\
u &= 0 && \textit{on } \Gamma_1,\\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in r_2(u)\partial j_2(x,u) && \textit{on } \Gamma_2,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in \partial_c \phi(x,u) && \textit{on } \Gamma_3,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &= G(u)(x) && \textit{on } \Gamma_4,\\
u(x) &\le \Psi(x) && \textit{in } \mathcal{D}
\end{aligned}$$

is nonempty and compact in V.

Theorem 4.13. *Assume that* H(1), H(f'), H(N), H(G), H(U_1), H(U_2), H(ϕ), H(M'), *and* H(L') *are satisfied. If, moreover, M is coercive in V, then the solution set of the obstacle problem*

$$\begin{aligned}
-D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u &\in U_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u) && \textit{in } \Omega,\\
u &= 0 && \textit{on } \Gamma_1,\\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in U_2(x,u) && \textit{on } \Gamma_2,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in \partial_c \phi(x,u) && \textit{on } \Gamma_3,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &= G(u)(x) && \textit{on } \Gamma_4,\\
L(u) &\le c_J
\end{aligned}$$

is nonempty and compact in V.

Corollary 4.14. *Assume that* H(1), H(f'), H(N), H(G), H(U_1), H(U_2), H(M'), *and* H(ϕ) *are satisfied. If, moreover, M is coercive in V and $\Phi\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function, then the solution set of the obstacle problem*

$$\begin{aligned}
-D_M u+|u|^{p-2}u+\mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u &\in U_1(x,u)+N(u)(x)+f(x,u) && \textit{in } \Omega,\\
u &= 0 && \textit{on } \Gamma_1,\\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in U_2(x,u) && \textit{on } \Gamma_2,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in \partial_c\phi(x,u) && \textit{on } \Gamma_3,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &= G(u)(x) && \textit{on } \Gamma_4,\\
u(x) &\le \Psi(x) && \textit{in } \mathcal{D}
\end{aligned}$$

is nonempty and compact in V*.*

THEOREM 4.15. *Assume that* H(1), H(f'), H(N), H(G), H(j_1), H(j_2), H(ϕ), H(M'), *and* H(L') *are satisfied. If, moreover,* M *is coercive in* V*, then the solution set of the obstacle problem*

$$\begin{aligned}
-D_M u+|u|^{p-2}u+\mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u &\in r_1(u)\partial j_1(x,u)+N(u)(x)+f(x,u) && \textit{in } \Omega,\\
u &= 0 && \textit{on } \Gamma_1,\\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in r_2(u)\partial j_2(x,u) && \textit{on } \Gamma_2,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in \partial_c\phi(x,u) && \textit{on } \Gamma_3,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &= G(u)(x) && \textit{on } \Gamma_4,\\
L(u) &\le c_J
\end{aligned}$$

is nonempty and compact in V*.*

COROLLARY 4.16. *Assume that* H(1), H(f'), H(N), H(G), H(j_1), H(j_2), H(M'), *and* H(ϕ) *are satisfied. If, moreover,* M *is coercive in* V *and* $\Phi\colon \Omega\to\mathbb{R}$ *is a measurable function, then the solution set of the obstacle problem*

$$\begin{aligned}
-D_M u+|u|^{p-2}u+\mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u &\in r_1(u)\partial j_1(x,u)+N(u)(x)+f(x,u) && \textit{in } \Omega,\\
u &= 0 && \textit{on } \Gamma_1,\\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in r_2(u)\partial j_2(x,u) && \textit{on } \Gamma_2,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &\in \partial_c\phi(x,u) && \textit{on } \Gamma_3,\\
-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_a} &= G(u)(x) && \textit{on } \Gamma_4,\\
u(x) &\le \Psi(x) && \textit{in } \mathcal{D}
\end{aligned}$$

is nonempty and compact in V*.*

THEOREM 4.17. *Assume that* H(1), H(f)(i), H(N), H(U_1), H(M'), *and* H(L') *are satisfied. If, moreover,* M *is coercive in* V_0*, then the solution set of the obstacle problem*

$$\begin{aligned}
-D_M u+|u|^{p-2}u+\mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u &\in U_1(x,u)+N(u)(x)+f(x,u,\nabla u) && \textit{in } \Omega,\\
u &= 0 && \textit{on } \Gamma,\\
L(u) &\le c_J
\end{aligned}$$

is nonempty and compact in V_0*.*

COROLLARY 4.18. *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a nonempty and measurable subset of Ω. Assume that* H(1), H(f)(i), H(N), H(M'), *and* H(U_1) *are satisfied. If, moreover, M is coercive in V_0 and $\Phi\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function, then the solution set of the obstacle problem*

$$\begin{aligned} -D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u \in U_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u,\nabla u) \qquad & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \qquad & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ u(x) \le \Psi(x) \qquad & \text{in } \mathcal{D} \end{aligned}$$

is nonempty and compact in V_0.

THEOREM 4.19. *Assume that* H(1), H(f'), H(N), H(U_1), H(M'), *and* H(L') *are satisfied. If, moreover, M is coercive in V_0, then the solution set of the obstacle problem*

$$\begin{aligned} -D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u \in U_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u) \qquad & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \qquad & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ L(u) \le c_J \qquad & \end{aligned}$$

is nonempty and compact in V_0.

COROLLARY 4.20. *Assume that* H(1), H(f'), H(N), H(M'), *and* H(U_1) *are satisfied. If, moreover, M is coercive in V_0 and $\Phi\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function, then the solution set of the obstacle problem*

$$\begin{aligned} -D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u \in U_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u) \qquad & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \qquad & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ u(x) \le \Psi(x) \qquad & \text{in } \mathcal{D} \end{aligned}$$

is nonempty and compact in V_0.

THEOREM 4.21. *Assume that* H(1), H(f)(i), H(N), H(j_1), H(M'), *and* H(L') *are satisfied. If, moreover, M is coercive in V_0, then the solution set of the obstacle problem*

$$\begin{aligned} -D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u \in r_1(u)\partial j_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u,\nabla u) \qquad & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \qquad & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ L(u) \le c_J \qquad & \end{aligned}$$

is nonempty and compact in V_0.

COROLLARY 4.22. *Assume that* H(1), H(f), H(N), H(M'), *and* H(j_1) *are satisfied. If, moreover, M is coercive in V_0 and $\Phi\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function, then the solution set of the obstacle problem*

$$\begin{aligned} -D_M u + |u|^{p-2}u + \mu(x)|u|^{q-2}u \in r_1(u)\partial j_1(x,u) + N(u)(x) + f(x,u,\nabla u) \qquad & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \qquad & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ u(x) \le \Psi(x) \qquad & \text{in } \mathcal{D} \end{aligned}$$

is nonempty and compact in V_0.

Acknowledgment. The authors wish to thank the two knowledgeable referees for their constructive comments and remarks.

REFERENCES

[1] B. Alleche and V. D. Rădulescu, *Set-valued equilibrium problems with applications to Browder variational inclusions and to fixed point theory*, Nonlinear Anal., 28 (2016), pp. 251–268.

[2] D. Aussel, A. Sultana, and V. Vetrivel, *On the existence of projected solutions of quasi-variational inequalities and generalized Nash equilibrium problems*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 170 (2016), pp. 818–837.

[3] P. Baroni, M. Colombo, and G. Mingione, *Harnack inequalities for double phase functionals*, Nonlinear Anal., 121 (2015), pp. 206–222.

[4] P. Baroni, M. Colombo, and G. Mingione, *Regularity for general functionals with double phase*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 57 (2018), 62.

[5] G. Bonanno, D. Motreanu, and P. Winkert, *Variational-hemivariational inequalities with small perturbations of nonhomogeneous Neumann boundary conditions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 381 (2011), pp. 627–637.

[6] H. Brezis, *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*, Universitext, Springer, New York, 2011.

[7] S. Carl and V. K. Le, *Multi-valued Variational Inequalities and Inclusions*, Springer Monogr. Math., Springer, Cham, 2021.

[8] S. Carl, V. K. Le, and P. Winkert, *Multi-valued variational inequalities for variable exponent double phase problems: Comparison and extremality results*, Adv. Differential Equations, to appear.

[9] M. Colombo and G. Mingione, *Bounded minimisers of double phase variational integrals*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 218 (2015), pp. 219–273.

[10] M. Colombo and G. Mingione, *Regularity for double phase variational problems*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 215 (2015), pp. 443–496.

[11] Á. Crespo-Blanco, L. Gasiński, P. Harjulehto, and P. Winkert, *A new class of double phase variable exponent problems: Existence and uniqueness*, J. Differential Equations, 323 (2022), pp. 182–228.

[12] C. De Filippis and G. Mingione, *Manifold constrained non-uniformly elliptic problems*, J. Geom. Anal., 30 (2020), pp. 1661–1723.

[13] C. De Filippis and G. Mingione, *On the regularity of minima of non-autonomous functionals*, J. Geom. Anal., 30 (2020), pp. 1584–1626.

[14] C. De Filippis and G. Mingione, *Interpolative gap bounds for nonautonomous integrals*, Anal. Math. Phys., 11 (2021), 117.

[15] C. De Filippis and G. Mingione, *Lipschitz bounds and nonautonomous integrals*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 242 (2021), pp. 973–1057.

[16] F. Faraci, D. Motreanu, and D. Puglisi, *Positive solutions of quasi-linear elliptic equations with dependence on the gradient*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 54 (2015), pp. 525–538.

[17] F. Faraci and D. Puglisi, *A singular semilinear problem with dependence on the gradient*, J. Differential Equations, 260 (2016), pp. 3327–3349.

[18] G. M. Figueiredo and G. F. Madeira, *Positive maximal and minimal solutions for non-homogeneous elliptic equations depending on the gradient*, J. Differential Equations, 274 (2021), pp. 857–875.

[19] L. Gasiński and N. S. Papageorgiou, *Positive solutions for nonlinear elliptic problems with dependence on the gradient*, J. Differential Equations, 263 (2017), pp. 1451–1476.

[20] L. Gasiński and P. Winkert, *Existence and uniqueness results for double phase problems with convection term*, J. Differential Equations, 268 (2020), pp. 4183–4193.

[21] L. Gasiński and P. Winkert, *Sign changing solution for a double phase problem with non-linear boundary condition via the Nehari manifold*, J. Differential Equations, 274 (2021), pp. 1037–1066.

[22] A. Granas and J. Dugundji, *Fixed Point Theory*, Universitext, Springer, New York, 2003.

[23] W. Han, S. Migórski, and M. Sofonea, *A class of variational-hemivariational inequalities with applications to frictional contact problems*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 46 (2014), pp. 3891–3912, https://doi.org/10.1137/140963248.

[24] A. Iannizzotto and N. S. Papageorgiou, *Existence of three nontrivial solutions for nonlinear Neumann hemivariational inequalities*, Nonlinear Anal., 70 (2009), pp. 3285–3297.

[25] M. Kamenskii, V. Obukhovskii, and P. Zecca, *Condensing Multivalued Maps and Semilinear Differential Inclusions in Banach Spaces*, De Gruyter Ser. Nonlinear Anal. Appl. 7, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2001.

[26] A. Lê, *Eigenvalue problems for the p-Laplacian*, Nonlinear Anal., 64 (2006), pp. 1057–1099.

[27] J.-L. Lions, *Quelques méthodes de résolution des problèmes aux limites non linéaires*, Dunod/Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1969.

[28] W. Liu and G. Dai, *Existence and multiplicity results for double phase problem*, J. Differential Equations, 265 (2018), pp. 4311–4334.

[29] Z. Liu, D. Motreanu, and S. Zeng, *Positive solutions for nonlinear singular elliptic equations of p-Laplacian type with dependence on the gradient*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 58 (2019), 28.

[30] S. A. Marano and P. Winkert, *On a quasilinear elliptic problem with convection term and nonlinear boundary condition*, Nonlinear Anal., 187 (2019), pp. 159–169.

[31] P. Marcellini, *Regularity of minimizers of integrals of the calculus of variations with nonstandard growth conditions*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 105 (1989), pp. 267–284.

[32] P. Marcellini, *Regularity and existence of solutions of elliptic equations with p, q-growth conditions*, J. Differential Equations, 90 (1991), pp. 1–30.

[33] S. Migórski and A. Ochal, *Quasi-static hemivariational inequality via vanishing acceleration approach*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 41 (2009), pp. 1415–1435, https://doi.org/10.1137/080733231.

[34] S. Migórski, A. A. Khan, and S. Zeng, *Inverse problems for nonlinear quasi-variational inequalities with an application to implicit obstacle problems of p-Laplacian type*, Inverse Problems, 35 (2019), 035004.

[35] S. Migórski, A. A. Khan, and S. Zeng, *Inverse problems for nonlinear quasi-hemivariational inequalities with application to mixed boundary value problems*, Inverse Problems, 36 (2020), 024006.

[36] S. Migórski, A. Ochal, and M. Sofonea, *Nonlinear Inclusions and Hemivariational Inequalities*, Adv. Mech. Math. 26, Springer, New York, 2013.

[37] G. Mingione and V. Rădulescu, *Recent developments in problems with nonstandard growth and nonuniform ellipticity*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 501 (2021), 125197.

[38] U. Mosco, *Convergence of convex sets and of solutions of variational inequalities*, Adv. Math., 3 (1969), pp. 510–585.

[39] Z. Naniewicz and P. D. Panagiotopoulos, *Mathematical Theory of Hemivariational Inequalities and Applications*, Monogr. Textbooks Pure Appl. Math. 188, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1995.

[40] P. D. Panagiotopoulos, *Hemivariational Inequalities,* Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1993.

[41] P. D. Panagiotopoulos, *Nonconvex problems of semipermeable media and related topics*, Z. Angew. Math. Mech., 65 (1985), pp. 29–36.

[42] N. S. Papageorgiou, V. D. Rădulescu, and D. D. Repovš, *Positive solutions for nonlinear Neumann problems with singular terms and convection*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 136 (2020), pp. 1–21.

[43] V. D. Rădulescu, *Isotropic and anisotropic double-phase problems: Old and new*, Opuscula Math., 39 (2019), pp. 259–279.

[44] M. A. Ragusa and A. Tachikawa, *Regularity for minimizers for functionals of double phase with variable exponents*, Adv. Nonlinear Anal., 9 (2020), pp. 710–728.

[45] J. Simon, *Régularité de la solution d'une équation non linéaire dans* $\mathbf{R}^N$, in Journées d'Analyse Non Linéaire (Proc. Conf., Besançon, 1977), Lecture Notes in Math. 665, Springer, Berlin, 1978, pp. 205–227.

[46] J. Stefan, *Über einige Probleme der Theorie der Wärmeleitung*, Akad. Mat. Natur., 98 (1889), pp. 473–484.

[47] S. Zeng, Y. Bai, and L. Gasiński, *Nonlinear nonhomogeneous obstacle problems with multivalued convection term*, J. Geom. Anal., 32 (2022), 75.

[48] S. Zeng, Y. Bai, L. Gasiński, and P. Winkert, *Existence results for double phase implicit obstacle problems involving multivalued operators*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 59 (2020), 176.

[49] S. Zeng, L. Gasiński, P. Winkert, and Y. Bai, *Existence of solutions for double phase obstacle problems with multivalued convection term*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 501 (2021), 123997.

[50] S. Zeng, V. Rădulescu, and P. Winkert, *Double phase obstacle problems with variable exponent*, Adv. Differential Equations, 27 (2022), pp. 611–645.

[51] S. Zeng, V. Rădulescu, and P. Winkert, *Double phase obstacle problems with multivalued convection and mixed boundary value conditions*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B, 28 (2023), pp. 999–1023.

[52] S. Zeng, V. D. Rădulescu, and P. Winkert, *Double phase implicit obstacle problems with convection and multivalued mixed boundary value conditions*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 54 (2022), pp. 1898–1926, https://doi.org/10.1137/21M1441195.

[53] V. V. Zhikov, *Averaging of functionals of the calculus of variations and elasticity theory*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat., 50 (1986), pp. 675–710.