

GROUND STATES FOR THE NONLINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION ON OPEN BOOKS AND DIMENSIONAL REDUCTION TO METRIC GRAPHS

STEFAN LE COZ AND BORIS SHAKAROV

ABSTRACT. In this work, we study the dimensional reduction of stationary states in the shrinking limit for a broad class of two-dimensional domains, called open books, to their counterparts on metric graphs. An open book is a two-dimensional structure formed by rectangular domains sharing common boundaries. We first develop a functional-analytic framework suited to variational problems on open books and establish the existence of solutions as constrained action minimizers.

For graph-based open books (i.e., those isomorphic to the product of a graph with an interval) we prove the existence of a sharp transition in the dimensionality of ground states. Specifically, there exists a critical transverse width: below this threshold, all ground states coincide with the ground states on the underlying graph trivially extended in the transverse direction; above it, ground states become genuinely two-dimensional.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the nonlinear Schrödinger equation set on a structure \mathcal{L} , which we will refer to as an *open book*. Open books are popular structures in various areas of mathematics such as in contact topology or algebraic geometry (see e.g. [19, 21]). They appear naturally in various areas of physics, e.g. in metamaterial designs (see [27]). They can also be considered as a form of generalized waveguides. A prototypical example of the type of structure that we want to be able to treat is represented in Figure 1. We will use the following definition.

Definition 1.1. An *open book* \mathcal{L} is a collection of 1-d manifolds called *bindings* $\mathcal{B} = (B_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J} \subset \mathbb{N}}$ and 2-d manifolds called *pages* $\mathcal{P} = (P_k)_{k \in \mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{N}}$. A binding $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$ is characterized by a length $L_j \in (0, \infty]$ and is isometric to the interval $[0, L_j]$ ($[0, \infty)$ if $L_j = \infty$). A page $P_k \in \mathcal{P}$ is characterized by two lengths $L_k^1, L_k^2 \in (0, \infty]$ and is isometric to the rectangle $[0, L_k^1] \times [0, L_k^2]$ (replacing $[0, L_k^{1,2}]$ by $[0, \infty)$ whenever $L_k^{1,2} = \infty$). For each page P_k , there exist bindings $(B_k^j)_{j \in \{0, \dots, J\}} \subset \mathcal{B}$, with $B_j \neq B_k$ if $j \neq k$, such that the boundary ∂P_k of P_k verifies

$$\partial P_k = \bigcup_{j \in \{0, \dots, J\}} B_k^j.$$

Here, $J = 3$ if $L_k^1 + L_k^2 < \infty$, $J = 2$ if $L_k^1 = \infty$ or $L_k^2 = \infty$, $J = 1$ if $L_k^1 = L_k^2 = \infty$. We use the notation $P \sim B$ to express the fact that P is one of the pages incident to the binding B .

Date: December 30, 2025.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q55 (35A15, 35R02).

Key words and phrases. nonlinear Schrödinger equation, standing waves, ground state, nonlinear quantum graphs, open books.

The work of S. L. C. and B. S. is partially supported by ANR-11-LABX-0040-CIMI and the ANR project NQG ANR-23-CE40-0005.




FIGURE 1. An open-book with seven pages

Remark 1.2. *With the above definition, where the bindings of a page are all different, every single page can be embedded in \mathbb{R}^2 . The definition can be relaxed to allow for cylindrical pages (i.e., pages having two identical non-consecutive bindings), toroidal pages (i.e., pages having two by two non-consecutive bindings identical), or even Möbius strip-type pages. Indeed, these cases can be included in our definition by the introduction of artificial bindings, cutting the page into two (or four) new pages, and having all bindings different. On the other hand, we cannot relax the definition to allow for conical pages (i.e., two consecutive bindings are identical). Observe that an infinite strip (such as the one considered in [28]) is formed of two pages with one infinite length connected by their (transversal) finite length binding. Similarly, a half-plane is made of two quarter-plane pages.*

Various non-equivalent definitions of open books or stratified structures are used depending on the context. The definition that we adopt in this work is tailored to our purposes. On the one hand, it is more restrictive than definitions used in other contexts, such as contact geometry (see e.g. [19]), as we are working only with 2-d pages isometric to rectangles. On the other hand, the fact that we do not embed our books in \mathbb{R}^d (as is done e.g. in the context of stratified sets in [33] or for the spectral analysis in [4, 11, 12]) allows for extra flexibility in the analysis, as we do not have to take into consideration geometric features of the pages such as curvature. That flexibility is reminiscent of the flexibility allowed by quantum graphs by concentrating the main features of the structure at the vertices while considering a “simple” behavior on the edges (see [8] for an introduction to quantum graphs).

Our aim in this work is to study variational problems on open books and connections with their quantum graph counterparts. For functions $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ (we refer to Section 2.1 for the precise functional setting), we define the *action* and the *Nehari* functionals by

$$\begin{aligned} S_\omega(u) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 + \frac{\omega}{2} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 - \frac{1}{p+1} \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1}, \\ I_\omega(u) &= \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 + \omega \|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 - \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1}. \end{aligned}$$

We consider the following variational problem:

$$(1.1) \quad \tilde{s}_\omega = \inf \left\{ S_\omega(u) : u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \{0\}, I_\omega(u) = 0 \right\},$$

that is, we minimize the action over the Nehari manifold. The tilde $\tilde{\cdot}$ in the notation reflects the fact that we will typically work with an equivalent formulation of the problem, denoted without the tilde (see Lemma 3.1):

$$s_\omega = \frac{p-1}{2(p+1)} \inf \left\{ \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1}, u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \{0\}, I_\omega(u) \leq 0 \right\}.$$

Minimizers of (1.1) will be referred to as *(action) ground states*. Such minimization problems are classical in the study of nonlinear Schrödinger equations on \mathbb{R}^d and on quantum graphs. Ground states correspond to standing waves of the evolution equation and are expected to play a fundamental role in the long-time dynamics. Alternative variational approaches also exist, most notably the minimization of the Schrödinger energy under a prescribed L^2 -norm constraint. We refer to [13, 18, 23] for a detailed comparison between these two variational frameworks.

In the present work, we focus on action ground states. Note that any such minimizer solves, on the book \mathcal{L} , the stationary nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$(1.2) \quad Hu + \omega u - |u|^{p-1}u = 0,$$

where H denotes the Laplacian operator on \mathcal{L} (see Section 2.1 for its precise definition).

Our first main result establishes a general existence theory. Let $\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ be the bottom of the spectrum of H , defined in (2.5).

Theorem 1.3. *Let \mathcal{L} be a connected book, either finite or periodic, and let $\omega > -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$. If \mathcal{L} is finite, assume additionally that $s_\omega < s_\omega^\infty$, where the action level at infinity s_ω^∞ is defined in (3.3). Then $s_\omega > 0$ and there exists an action ground state, i.e., a nontrivial minimizer for s_ω .*

As mentioned above, minimizing the action on the Nehari manifold is a classical method, going back to [32], for constructing solutions to (1.2). In our setting, the main difficulty lies in the lack of translation invariance whenever the book is neither compact nor periodic. Because books may exhibit highly general geometries, one cannot directly apply the classical concentration-compactness principle of [31], which is typically used to recover compactness of minimizing sequences. Instead, one encounters a specific loss of compactness known as *runaway behavior*, first identified in the context of quantum graphs in [1]. This phenomenon motivates the additional condition $s_\omega < s_\omega^\infty$, in analogy with the corresponding requirement in the graph setting [13, 14].

Another widely used approach to obtaining solutions of (1.2) is the minimization of the energy under a fixed L^2 -norm constraint (see, for example, [28]). In contrast, our analysis focuses on action ground states. One reason for this choice is that action minimizers exist for every $p > 1$, whereas the existence of energy ground states is usually restricted to the subcritical regime $p \in (1, 3)$ [5, 10].

We now present our second main result. We begin with the following definition.

Definition 1.4. An open book \mathcal{L} is said to be *graph-based* if there exists a connected graph \mathcal{G} and $L > 0$ such that \mathcal{L} is isomorphic to the product $\mathcal{G} \times [0, L]$. In this case, we write $\mathcal{L}_L = \mathcal{G} \times [0, L]$.

We are interested in the limiting behavior of graph-based books as the transverse thickness L tends to zero. In this regime, the natural limiting structure is the graph \mathcal{G} . For $\mathcal{L}_L = \mathcal{G} \times [0, L]$, the minimization problem (1.1) depends on L , and we denote the corresponding infimum by $\tilde{s}_{\omega, L}$. As before, we work with an equivalent formulation without the tilde, see (4.4).

Our second main result shows that the dimensionality of action ground states undergoes a sharp transition as L varies.

Theorem 1.5. *Let \mathcal{G} be a finite or periodic graph. Let $\mathcal{L}_L = \mathcal{G} \times [0, L]$ be graph-based, and let $\omega > -\omega_{\mathcal{G}}$. Let $s_{\omega, L}$ be the minimization problem defined in (4.4). Then:*

- (1) *The map $L \mapsto s_{\omega, L}$ is continuous on $[0, \infty)$. Moreover, there exists $L_{\min} \geq 0$ such that $s_{\omega, L}$ is constant on $[0, L_{\min}]$ and strictly decreasing on (L_{\min}, ∞) .*
- (2) *Let $s_{\omega, \mathcal{G}}$ and $s_{\omega, \mathcal{G}}^\infty$ be defined in (3.3) and (3.4). If $s_{\omega, \mathcal{G}} < s_{\omega, \mathcal{G}}^\infty$, then $L_{\min} > 0$. Moreover, for any $L \in [0, L_{\min}]$, minimizers of $s_{\omega, L}$ exist and every minimizer u_L satisfies*

$$\partial_y u_L \equiv 0.$$

- (3) *If, for some $L > L_{\min}$, $s_{\omega, L}$ admits a minimizer u_L , then $\partial_y u_L \not\equiv 0$.*

We now comment on the above result and compare it with the existing literature.

Point (2) provides a rigorous justification for the use of quantum graphs as effective one-dimensional models for thin, two-dimensional network-shaped structures. While the correspondence between graphs and higher-dimensional domains is well understood in the linear setting (see, e.g., [8, 20, 35]), rigorous nonlinear counterparts remain scarce. Notable exceptions include [25, 26], which treat compact domains and general solutions to (1.2), and [28], which derives a line with a delta potential as the limiting object associated with a fractured strip in the shrinking limit for energy minimizers.

The condition $s_{\omega, \mathcal{G}} < s_{\omega, \mathcal{G}}^\infty$ guarantees the existence of ground states on the graph \mathcal{G} , see [13, 14]. In the present work, we prove that this condition is sufficient not only to ensure the existence of ground states on the book \mathcal{L}_L , but also to show that these ground states coincide with the graph ground states extended trivially in the transverse variable for $L \leq L_{\min}$. Furthermore, point (3) shows that L_{\min} is a sharp threshold: when $L > L_{\min}$, one-dimensional solitons cease to minimize the action, and genuinely two-dimensional ground states emerge. This behavior parallels the transverse stability/instability phenomena of line solitons known for strips of the form $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}$; see, for example, [3, 6, 36, 38, 39]. Our setting includes books isomorphic to strips $\mathbb{R} \times [0, L]$ with either Neumann or periodic boundary conditions, allowing us to recover the dimensional transition for ground states in a unified manner.

It is also worth pointing out that in [37], the case of a product space $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{M}$ with \mathcal{M} compact is studied in the context of energy ground states. There it is shown that, for sufficiently small L^2 -norm, energy minimizers depend trivially on the compact variable, relying on a scaling property of the ground state in \mathbb{R}^d .

Similarly, in [28], a fractured strip $\mathbb{R} \times [0, L]$ is considered, and it is proven that energy ground states remain independent of the transverse variable for sufficiently small L . A crucial ingredient in that analysis is the existence of an explicit and unique positive ground state on \mathbb{R} .

Our approach differs from both works in several ways. We study *action* rather than energy ground states; no explicit or unique minimizer is available on graphs; and the scaling acts

solely on the transverse variable (for non-uniqueness, see the recent works [16, 17]). To the best of our knowledge, action ground states have not previously been examined from this standpoint. This novelty, combined with the broader scope of applicability, forms a key motivation for our focus on action minimizers. We believe that the methods developed here can be extended to other classes of product spaces, beyond the setting of open books.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we begin with a collection of preliminaries. We start in Section 2.1 by describing the precise functional setting in which we are going to work. The key point is the definition of Sobolev spaces on books, along with the description of the matching conditions at the bindings. Some notation is collected in Section 2.2. In Section 2.3, we define a metric structure on the book by constructing a suitable distance, and we introduce the concepts of connected, finite and compact books. Section 2.4 is devoted to the proof that critical points of the action functional on books are exponentially decaying on semi-infinite pages. Section 2.5 presents several relevant examples.

Section 3 is devoted to the question of the existence of an action minimizer. We begin by reformulating the problem into an equivalent one, which corresponds to minimizing the L^{p+1} -norm over a side of the Nehari manifold, see the definition of s_ω in (3.1). We then study the so-called problem at infinity (Section 3.1) in the case of finite books and we show that the level at infinity is the same as the level of the widest semi-infinite strip. Existence of an action ground state for finite (Section 3.2) and periodic (Section 3.3) books is then established. For finite books, the escaping at infinity of minimizing sequences is avoided by assuming that the Nehari level s_ω is below the level at infinity s_ω^∞ . For periodic books, we use in a key manner the monotonicity properties of the function $\omega \rightarrow s_\omega$ to establish the convergence of minimizing sequences.

In Section 4, we study the shrinking limit of graph-based books of the type $\mathcal{G} \times [0, L]$ when the length L tends to 0. We first introduce a rescaling of the problem (Section 4.1), converting the book $\mathcal{G} \times [0, L]$ into the book $\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1]$ and transferring the dependency in L to the Nehari functionals. We then study the rescaled minimization level function $L \rightarrow s_{\omega, L}$: we prove that the function is continuous, constant on an interval $[0, L_{\min}]$ (with possibly $L_{\min} = 0$), then strictly decreasing towards 0. The rigidity of minimizers at small length is then established in Section 4.3, where the properties of the levels function are combined with the properties of the minimizers' equations to show that the dependency in the transverse variable is necessarily trivial when L is small.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Functional setting. Given an open book $\mathcal{L} = \{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P}\}$, a function $u : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a collection of functions $u_k : P_k \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on each of the pages $P_k \in \mathcal{P}$.

As in the case of quantum graphs (see e.g. [8]), we define the Lebesgue spaces for $p \in [1, \infty]$ and Sobolev spaces for $s \geq 0$ on the open book \mathcal{L} by

$$L^p(\mathcal{L}) := \bigoplus_{P \in \mathcal{P}} L^p(P), \quad H^s(\mathcal{L}) := \bigoplus_{P \in \mathcal{P}} H^s(P).$$

Here no compatibility condition is imposed on the bindings, i.e., functions on the open book might be multi-valued at the bindings. From their definition, Sobolev spaces on books inherit most of the properties of Sobolev spaces on individual pages (Sobolev continuous and compact injections, Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities, etc.). For instance, if the book \mathcal{L} is either finite or periodic, then for any $2 \leq q < \infty$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any

$u \in H^1(\mathcal{L})$ we have

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{L})} \leq C\|u\|_{L^q(\mathcal{L})}.$$

The pages of \mathcal{L} are rectangles and therefore contain corners. While Sobolev spaces are typically introduced for smooth domains, they have also been extensively studied on polygonal domains; see, in particular, the reference monograph [22]. We recall here the results that will be used throughout the sequel.

Let $u \in H^s(\mathcal{L})$ with $s > 1/2$. By the trace theorem on polygonal domains in \mathbb{R}^2 (see [22, Theorem 1.5.2.3]), one may define traces of u on the bindings of the pages. More precisely, let $u_k : P_k \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ denote the restriction of u to the page P_k , and let $\{B_j\}_{j=0,\dots,J}$ denote the boundary edges (bindings) of P_k . If $u_k \in W^{s,p}(P_k)$ for some $p > 1$ and $s > 1/p$, then the trace operator

$$u_k \rightarrow \{u_{kj} := u_{k|B_j}\}_{j=0,\dots,J}$$

is well defined and continuous from $W^{s,p}(P_k)$ into the product space $\prod_{j=0}^J W^{s-\frac{1}{p},p}(B_j)$.

We now describe the compatibility conditions between traces at the corners.

When $s = 1$, additional conditions arise depending on the value of p . Let $j, l \in \{0, \dots, J\}$, and assume that the edges B_j and B_l meet at a corner. Let

$$\mathbf{v} \in B_j \cap B_l$$

be this corner point, which we call a *vertex*. For $\sigma > 0$ sufficiently small, let

$$\mathbf{v} - \sigma \in B_j, \quad \mathbf{v} + \sigma \in B_l$$

denote the points obtained by moving a distance σ away from the vertex along B_j and B_l , respectively. Then the following conditions hold:

$$u_{kj}(\mathbf{v}) = u_{kl}(\mathbf{v}) \quad \text{when } p > 2,$$

$$\int_0^\delta \frac{1}{\sigma} |u_{kj}(\mathbf{v} - \sigma) - u_{kl}(\mathbf{v} + \sigma)|^2 d\sigma < \infty \quad \text{when } p = 2.$$

No compatibility condition is required when $1 < p < 2$. The difficulty at the endpoint $p = 2$ comes from the fact that $W^{1-1/p,p}(B_j) = W^{1/2,2}(B_j)$ is exactly the threshold at which functions may fail to possess a continuous representative.

For $u \in H^2(P_k)$ and $v \in H^1(P_k)$, we have the following (half)-Green's formula on the page P_k (see [22, Lemma 1.5.3.8]):

$$\int_{P_k} (\Delta u)v dx = - \int_{P_k} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v dx + \sum_{j=0,\dots,J} \int_{B_j} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu_j} \Big|_{B_j} v|_{B_j} d\sigma.$$

To analyze variational problems on the open books, we should specify how our pages are connected, i.e., we specify compatibility conditions for the functions at the bindings. It is natural to require functions to coincide on the bindings. We will be working with $H^1(\mathcal{L})$ functions, which are not continuous, nor even pointwise defined. The fact that they coincide at the bindings is understood in the sense of traces. We introduce the notation $H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ (where D stands for Dirichlet) for the set of $H^1(\mathcal{L})$ functions which coincides at the bindings, i.e.

$$H_D^1(\mathcal{L}) = \{u \in H^1(\mathcal{L}) : u_{P|B} = u_{P'|B}, \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{B}, \text{ for all } P, P' \sim B\}.$$

We define the quadratic form $Q : L^2(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with domain $H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ by

$$Q(u) = \int_{\mathcal{L}} |\nabla u|^2 dx = \sum_{k \in K} \int_{P_k} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx.$$

The quadratic form Q is non-negative and there exists a unique self-adjoint operator $H : D(H) \subset L^2(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{L})$ such that for any $u \in D(H)$ and $v \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ we have

$$(2.1) \quad (Hu, v)_{L^2(\mathcal{L})} = Q(u, v),$$

where, by abuse of notation, we have also denoted by Q the associated bilinear form $(Q(u, v) = Q(u + v)/2 - Q(u) - Q(v))$. By definition of H , we have

$$Hu_k = -\Delta u_k,$$

for $u = (u_k)_{k \in K} \in D(H)$, hence $D(H) \subset H^2(\mathcal{L}) \cap H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$. Here, we have implicitly used the fact that $\{u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L}) : \Delta u \in L^2(\mathcal{L})\} = H^2(\mathcal{L}) \cap H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$, see [22, Chapter 3] for the case of a regular domain, and [22, Remark 3.2.4.6] for the case of a domain with polygonal boundary. Moreover, functions in $D(H)$ should satisfy the following binding conditions. Let B be a binding and (P_k) be the pages incident to the binding B . Any function $u \in D(H)$ verifies for any $x \in B$ the condition

$$(2.2) \quad \sum_k \left. \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial \nu_k} \right|_B (x) = 0.$$

Indeed, let $v \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ be supported on the pages (P_k) incident to B and let $u \in D(H)$. By Green's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (Hu, v)_{L^2(\mathcal{L})} &= -\operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathcal{L}} \Delta u \bar{v} dx = -\sum_k \operatorname{Re} \int_{P_k} \Delta u_k \bar{v}_k dx \\ &= \sum_k \operatorname{Re} \int_{P_k} \nabla u_k \nabla \bar{v}_k dx - \operatorname{Re} \int_B \sum_k \left. \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial \nu_k} \right|_B \bar{v}_k d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Since H should verify (2.1) and v is arbitrary, this implies (2.2).

In summary, the domain of H is given by

$$(2.3) \quad D(H) = \{u \in H^2(\mathcal{L}) \cap H_D^1(\mathcal{L}) : u \text{ verifies (2.2) for each binding } B \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Observe that the binding conditions verified by functions on the domain of H are reminiscent of Kirchhoff-Neumann conditions in the context of quantum graphs. The results presented in the present paper could be generalized to more generic functionals, or, equivalently, more generic binding conditions. For example, one may introduce a Dirac-type condition, as in the case of the fractured strip studied in [28].

2.2. Notation. For a book $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B})$, we define the following lower bound on the binding lengths:

$$(2.4) \quad L_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{1}{2} \min \left(\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} l_B, 1 \right),$$

where by l_B we denote the length of the binding B . This quantity is well defined, and we always have $L_{\mathcal{L}} \leq 1/2$. If the number of bindings is finite, then $L_{\mathcal{L}} > 0$.

We denote by $\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ the infimum of the spectrum of H , which is given by

$$(2.5) \quad \omega_{\mathcal{L}} = \inf_{u \in D(Q)} \frac{Q(u)}{\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2}.$$

Since we assumed Kirchhoff-type conditions at the bindings, we have $\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$. In the sequel, we chose to keep the notation $\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, as most of our statements would be valid for operators with more generic boundary conditions (and thus potentially non-zero $\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$).

For any $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \{0\}$ and $\omega > -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, we define

$$(2.6) \quad \pi_{\omega}(u) = \left(1 + \frac{I_{\omega}(u)}{\|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}.$$

It is the scaling factor used to shift u on the Nehari manifold, i.e., $I_{\omega}(\pi_{\omega}(u)u) = 0$.

2.3. Metric structure.

Open books can be endowed with a metric structure. The distance between two points lying within the same page is simply the Euclidean distance inherited from the page. This includes points lying on a binding, whose distance with respect to any point belonging to the pages incident to the binding is therefore defined. This is sufficient to define a notion of continuity of a curve. To define the distance between two points belonging to different pages not sharing a common binding, we proceed in the following way.

Let \mathcal{L} be a book. Let $x, y \in \mathcal{L}$. A path γ on \mathcal{L} between x and y is a continuous piecewise C^1 application $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ such that $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(1) = y$. The length of the path on \mathcal{L} is the sum of the lengths of $\gamma([0, 1])$ restricted to each of the pages of \mathcal{L} (counting the length on common bindings only once). We denote it by ℓ_{γ} . The distance between x and y on \mathcal{L} is then defined by

$$d(x, y) = \inf \{ \ell_{\gamma} : \gamma \in PC^1([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}), \gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = y \}.$$

A book \mathcal{L} is said to be *connected* if each binding has at least one incident page, and if for any two pages $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}$, there exist a sequence of pages $(P_j)_{j=0, \dots, J+1}$ and of bindings $(B_j)_{j=0, \dots, J}$ such that $P_0 = P$, $P_{J+1} = P'$ and $P_j, P_{j+1} \sim B_j$. In this paper, all books will be assumed to be connected.

We say that a book is *finite* if it has a finite number of pages and bindings.

We say that a book is *compact* if it is finite and each of the bindings has a finite length. Otherwise, we say that the book is *non-compact*. When a book is finite but non-compact, we define its *compact core* as the sub-book built with the collection of pages such that the associated bindings all have a finite length.

2.4. Exponential decay.

In this section, we show that the solutions of (1.2) are exponentially decaying.

One of the main references for exponential decay in elliptic linear equations is by Agmon [2]. In our case, we do not really need to have a precise estimate on the decay rate of solutions to (1.2), and we can settle for a slightly weaker estimate (still giving an exponential decay rate, though not the optimal one). We follow the strategy of proof of [7, Theorem 3.2].

Proposition 2.1. *Let \mathcal{L} be a book and let $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ be a solution of (1.2). For any page $P_k \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $L_k^1 = \infty$ (resp. $L_k^2 = \infty$), there exists $M_k > 0$ such that for any*

$(x, y) \in [0, L_k^1] \times [0, L_k^2]$ the component u_k of u on P_k verifies

$$|u_k(x, y)| \leq M_k e^{-\frac{\sqrt{\omega}}{2}|x|} \quad (\text{resp. } |u_k(x, y)| \leq M_k e^{-\frac{\sqrt{\omega}}{2}|y|}).$$

Proof. Let $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ be a solution of (1.2). Consider a page $P_k \sim [0, L_k^1] \times [0, L_k^2]$ of \mathcal{L} and assume that $L_k^1 = \infty$ (the case $L_k^2 = \infty$ being perfectly similar). Let $u_k : P_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the component of u on P_k . Define $\psi : [0, \infty) \times [0, L_k^2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\psi = |u_k|^2 - Mg_0, \quad g_0(x, y) = e^{-\sqrt{\omega}x},$$

where $M > 0$ is a constant to be chosen and g_0 has been chosen so that on $[0, \infty) \times [0, L_k^2]$ it verifies

$$-\Delta g_0 + \omega g_0 = 0.$$

Let $R > 0$ to be chosen large enough later, and fix M large enough so that when $x = R$ we have

$$\psi(R, y) < 0.$$

We will prove that in fact, for any $x > R$ and $y \in [0, L_k^2]$, we have

$$\psi(x, y) < 0,$$

thereby proving the claim. On the strip $(0, \infty) \times (0, L_k^2)$, u_k verifies

$$-\Delta u_k + \omega u_k - |u_k|^{p-1}u_k = 0.$$

Therefore, $u_k \in \mathcal{C}^2((0, \infty) \times (0, L_k^2)) \cap H^2((0, \infty) \times (0, L_k^2))$ and $|u_k|^2$ verifies

$$-\Delta|u_k|^2 = -2 \operatorname{Re} (u_k \Delta \bar{u}_k + |\nabla u_k|^2) = -2 (\omega|u_k|^2 - |u_k|^{p+1} + |\nabla u_k|^2).$$

We rewrite this equation in the form

$$(2.7) \quad -\Delta|u_k|^2 + \omega|u_k|^2 = (-\omega + 2|u_k|^{p-1})|u_k|^2 - 2|\nabla u_k|^2,$$

in such a way that the right-hand side is negative for small $|u_k|$. Since $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} u_k(x, y) = 0$, we may choose R large enough so that the right hand side of (2.7) is negative on $[R, \infty) \times [0, L_k^2]$.

By construction, the function ψ also verifies

$$-\Delta\psi + \omega\psi = (-\omega + 2|u_k|^{p-1})|u_k|^2 - 2|\nabla u_k|^2.$$

Recall that, from the maximum principle, if $-\Delta\psi + \omega\psi \leq 0$ on a domain Ω , then ψ cannot have a positive maximum in Ω . Let $\rho > R$ and $\Omega = [R, \rho] \times [0, L_k^2]$. By the maximum principle, ψ can achieve a positive maximum only on $\partial\Omega$. By construction, it cannot be on the part $\{R\} \times [0, L_k^2]$ of $\partial\Omega$. Moreover, it also cannot be on $[R, \rho] \times \{0, L_k^2\}$. Indeed, assume by contradiction that ψ achieves a positive maximum at $(x, 0)$ for $x \in (R, \rho)$ and consider the symmetrized function $\tilde{\psi}$ given by $\psi(x, y)$ for $(x, y) \in \Omega$ and $\psi(x, -y)$ for $(x, y) \in [R, \rho] \times [-L_k^2, 0]$. Then $\tilde{\psi}$ also verifies $-\Delta\psi + \omega\psi \leq 0$ on $[R, \rho] \times [-L_k^2, L_k^2]$ and achieves a positive maximum at the interior point $(x, 0)$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, ψ can achieve a positive maximum only on $\{\rho\} \times [0, L_k^2]$. Define $m(\rho)$ by

$$m(\rho) = \max_{y \in [0, L_k^2]} |\psi(\rho, y)|.$$

Then any $(x, y) \in \Omega$ we have

$$\psi(x, y) \leq m(\rho).$$

As $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, we have $m(\rho) \rightarrow 0$, therefore on $[R, \infty) \times [0, L_k^2]$ we have

$$\psi(x, y) \leq 0.$$

As a consequence, for any $(x, y) \in [R, \infty) \times [0, L_k^2]$ we have

$$|u_k(x, y)|^2 \leq Mg_0(x) = Me^{-\sqrt{\omega}|x|},$$

which is the desired result. \square

2.5. Examples. We now present several examples of open books. Note that while we might visually represent the open-book structures as submanifolds of the space \mathbb{R}^3 , the geometry of the representation is not taken into account in the open-book object: a curved binding or page is identical to a straight one (in the same way that in the representation of metric graphs, one can use either curved or straight edges for the sake of visualization to represent the same structure).

The notion of open books allows for a wide variety of constructions. Our primary motivation for the introduction of this notion was to study how quantum graphs, which are 1-d structures, could be used as approximations of more complicated 2-d structures. For any given quantum graph, it turns out to be elementary to consider its open book equivalent, simply by giving a dimension to the vertices and edges, i.e. by considering the product space $\mathcal{G} \times [0, L]$. More precisely, given a graph \mathcal{G} formed by edges $e \in \mathcal{E}$ of length l_e and vertices $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we construct an open book \mathcal{L} as follows. Let $L > 0$. Given an edge $e \sim [0, l_e]$ attached at two vertices v_1 and v_2 (at respectively 0 and l_e), we define a page P_e as $P_e \sim [0, l_e] \times [0, L]$ and binding $(B_j)_{j=0,1,2,3}$ as $B_1, B_3 \sim [0, L]$, $B_0, B_2 \sim [0, l_e]$, thereby forming the boundary of P_e in such a way that the vertices v_1 and v_2 become respectively the bindings B_3, B_1 . This process can be extended, mutatis mutandis, for edges of infinite length or loop edges. Obviously, there would be many other ways to construct an open book starting from a given quantum graph.

Our first example is the one whose graphical representation justifies the name *open books*, and can be thought of as a generalized star graph. We give ourselves a binding $B_0 \sim [0, L]$, and for $k = 0, \dots, K$ we define bindings $B_1^k, B_2^k \sim [0, \infty)$. Then the K pages attached to the common binding B_0 are isomorphic to $[0, L] \times [0, \infty)$ and their boundary are formed with the bindings in the following way

$$\partial P_k = B_1^k \cup B_0 \cup B_2^k.$$

An open book with three pages is represented in Figure 2 (left).




FIGURE 2. Open book versions of classical graphs: star-graph, tadpole and dumbbell (from left to right)

Following the same procedure, we construct a generalized tadpole. Take bindings $B_0 \sim [0, L]$, $B_1^\pm = [0, \infty)$, $B_2^\pm = [0, 2\pi]$, and let two pages P_1 and P_2 be such that P_1 is isomorphic to $[0, L] \times [0, \infty)$ and P_2 is isomorphic to $[0, L] \times [0, 2\pi]$, and their boundaries are described in the following way. For P_1 we have

$$[0, L] \times \{0\} \sim B_0, \quad \{0\} \times [0, \infty) \sim B_1^-, \quad \{L\} \times [0, \infty) \sim B_1^+$$




FIGURE 3. The open-book versions of the 2-d grid and the torus

and for P_2 we have

$$[0, L] \times \{0\} \sim [0, L] \times \{2\pi\} \sim B_0, \quad \{0\} \times [0, 2\pi] \sim B_2^-, \quad \{L\} \times [0, 2\pi] \sim B_2^+.$$

A generalized tapdole is represented in Figure 2 (middle).

The procedure can be repeated for any example of a quantum graph. We have included in Figure 2 (right) the open-book version of the dumbbell graph. Figure 3 presents the open book version of the grid. This example served as a base for the quantum graph approach to metamaterial design presented in [27].

Not all open books can be thought of as extensions of metric graphs. For example, there is no natural way to obtain the open book of Figure 1 from a graph.

We present a last example of an open book: the torus. It is constructed from a single page P_1 for which the boundary bindings are two by two identical, i.e., $P_1^N = P_1^S = B_0$ and $P_1^W = P_1^E = B_1$. The torus open book with solid lines for the bindings is represented on Figure 3.

3. EXISTENCE OF AN ACTION MINIMIZER

In this section, we prove the existence of an action minimizer on finite non-compact books and on periodic books. We start by reformulating the minimization problem into an equivalent problem more amenable to analysis.

Lemma 3.1. *Let \mathcal{L} be a book. Assume that $\omega > -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$. The minimization problem (1.1) is equivalent to*

$$(3.1) \quad s_{\omega} = c_p \inf \left\{ \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1}, u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \{0\}, I_{\omega}(u) \leq 0 \right\},$$

where

$$(3.2) \quad c_p = \frac{p-1}{2(p+1)}.$$

Proof. Notice that

$$c_p \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} = S_{\omega}(u) - \frac{1}{2} I_{\omega}(u),$$

therefore problem (1.1) is equivalent to

$$\hat{s}_{\omega} = c_p \inf \left\{ \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1}, u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \{0\}, I_{\omega}(u) = 0 \right\}.$$

On the one hand, we clearly have $s_\omega \leq \hat{s}_\omega$. On the other hand, suppose that $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \{0\}$ verifies $I_\omega(u) < 0$. By definition of $\pi_\omega(u)$ (see (2.6)), we have

$$I_\omega(\pi_\omega(u)u) = 0$$

while, since $I_\omega(u) < 0$, we have $\pi_\omega(u) < 1$ and therefore

$$\|\pi_\omega(u)u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} < \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1}.$$

This implies that $s_\omega \geq \hat{s}_\omega$. Since the reverse inequality is also true, this implies that $s_\omega = \hat{s}_\omega$ and therefore, as stated, s_ω is equivalent to \tilde{s}_ω . \square

We then show that $\omega \geq -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a necessary condition for the existence of non-trivial action ground states.

Lemma 3.2. *Let \mathcal{L} be a book. If $\omega < -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ then $s_\omega = 0$ and a non-trivial minimizer to (3.1) does not exist.*

Proof. When $\omega \leq -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, the Nehari manifold is not bounded away from 0; it is the key point that we are going to exploit. Assume that $\omega < -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$. Then there exists $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 + \omega\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 = \left(\frac{\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2}{\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2} - \omega_{\mathcal{L}} + (\omega + \omega_{\mathcal{L}}) \right) \|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 \leq 0.$$

Let $(\lambda_n) \in (0, \infty)$ be such that $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$, and define $(u_n) \subset H_D^1(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \{0\}$ by $u_n = \lambda_n u$. Then $I_\omega(u_n) < 0$ and $c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that $s_\omega = 0$. \square

The next two Lemmas are used in Section 3.3 for periodic books but apply generically.

Lemma 3.3. *Let \mathcal{L} be a book. Assume that \mathcal{L} is either finite or periodic. Then the function $\omega \mapsto s_\omega$ is 0 for $\omega \in (-\infty, \omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ and is strictly increasing for $\omega \in (\omega_{\mathcal{L}}, \infty)$.*

Proof. We already proved in Lemma 3.2 that the function $\omega \mapsto s_\omega$ is 0 for $\omega < -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$. For $\omega > \omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, we have $s_\omega > 0$ as a consequence of Sobolev inequalities (we assumed that \mathcal{L} is either finite or periodic to ensure the validity of Sobolev inequalities). Indeed, let $\omega > \omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $I_\omega(u) = 0$. Then, by Sobolev embeddings, there exists $C > 0$ independent of u such that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 + \omega\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 = \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} \leq C(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 + \omega\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2)^{\frac{p+1}{2}}.$$

Therefore, there exists $c > 0$ independent of u such that

$$c \leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 + \omega\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2.$$

Therefore, functions on the Nehari manifold are uniformly bounded away from 0 in $H^1(\mathcal{L})$ and in $L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})$. As a consequence, we have $s_\omega > 0$.

We now prove that the function $\omega \mapsto s_\omega$ is increasing. Let $\omega_1 < \omega_2$, $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in (-\omega_{\mathcal{L}}, \infty)$. Let $(u_n) \subset H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ be such that $I_{\omega_2}(u_n) = 0$ and $s_{\omega_2} \leq c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} < s_{\omega_2} + \frac{1}{n}$. Then $I_{\omega_1}(u_n) = -(\omega_2 - \omega_1) \|u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 < 0$, $\pi_{\omega_1}(u_n) < 1$ (where π_{ω_1} is defined in (2.6)) and

$$s_{\omega_1} \leq c_p \|\pi_{\omega_1}(u_n)u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} < c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} = s_{\omega_2} + \frac{1}{n}.$$

Passing to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ leads to $s_{\omega_1} \leq s_{\omega_2}$.

We now prove that the function is strictly increasing. Assume by contradiction that $s_{\omega_1} = s_{\omega_2}$. Then $\pi_{\omega_1}(u_n) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which, by definition of π_{ω_1} and since $s_{\omega_1} > 0$, implies that $\|u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $q > p+1$. By interpolation, there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that we have

$$\|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})} \leq C \|u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^\alpha \|u_n\|_{L^q(\mathcal{L})}^{1-\alpha}.$$

From Sobolev embeddings, we have

$$\|u_n\|_{L^q(\mathcal{L})} \leq C \|u_n\|_{H^1(\mathcal{L})}.$$

Moreover, since $I_{\omega_2}(u_n) = 0$ and $c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} \rightarrow s_{\omega_2}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the sequence (u_n) is bounded in $H^1(\mathcal{L})$ and we have

$$0 < s_{\omega_2} \leq C \|u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^\alpha \|u_n\|_{H^1(\mathcal{L})}^{1-\alpha}.$$

Since $\|u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, this gives a contradiction. Therefore, $s_{\omega_1} < s_{\omega_2}$, which concludes the proof. \square

The following lemma is the book version of a lemma often used in concentration compactness arguments (see [29, 30]).

Lemma 3.4. *Let \mathcal{L} be a book. Assume that \mathcal{L} is either finite or periodic. Let $r \in (0, L_{\mathcal{L}}/2)$. Let (u_n) be a sequence bounded in $H^1(\mathcal{L})$. If*

$$\sup_{y \in \mathcal{L}} \int_{B(y, r)} |u_n|^2 dx \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty$$

then $u_n \rightarrow 0$ in $L^q(\mathcal{L})$ for $2 < q < \infty$.

Proof. Observe first that we have defined a distance on books, and that the balls $B(y, r)$ are defined with respect to this distance. By the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have

$$\|u\|_{L^q(B(y, r))}^q \lesssim \|u\|_{L^2(B(y, r))}^2 \left(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B(y, r))}^{q-2}\right)$$

for any $u \in H^1(\mathcal{L})$, $y \in \mathcal{L}$ and $q \in [2, \infty)$. Note that the above Gagliardo-Nirenberg is valid since we have assumed that the book \mathcal{L} is either finite or periodic. It would be possible to relax this assumption and still have a valid Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, but for the sake of simplicity, we refrained from optimizing. By covering \mathcal{L} with balls of radius r in such a way that any point is contained in at most $N \geq 1$ balls, we obtain

$$\|u\|_{L^q(\mathcal{L})}^q \lesssim N \sup_{y \in \mathcal{L}} \|u\|_{L^2(B(y, r))}^2 \left(1 + \|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{L})}^{q-2}\right).$$

Thus, under the assumptions of the lemma, we have $u_n \rightarrow 0$ in $L^p(\mathcal{L})$. \square

3.1. The problem at infinity. In many situations, the so-called *problem at infinity* plays a special role in the analysis of the existence of minimizers, in connection with concentration-compactness arguments (see e.g. [24, 30]). In the present setting, it is defined by

$$(3.3) \quad s_{\omega}^{\infty} = \inf \left\{ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} : u_n \rightharpoonup 0 \text{ in } H^1(\mathcal{L}), u_n \not\equiv 0, I_{\omega}(u_n) \leq 0 \right\}.$$

Observe that it always holds that $s_{\omega} \leq s_{\omega}^{\infty}$.

Given a graph \mathcal{G} , for notational convenience, we introduce the Nehari functional on the graph:

$$I_{\omega, \mathcal{G}}(u) = \|\partial_x u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}^2 + \omega \|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}^2 - \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G})}^{p+1},$$

and the corresponding minimization problem

$$(3.4) \quad s_{\omega, \mathcal{G}} = \inf \{c_p \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G})}^{p+1} : u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G}) \setminus \{0\}, I_{\omega, \mathcal{G}}(u) \leq 0\}.$$

We denote by $s_{\omega, \mathcal{G}}^\infty$ the level at infinity on the graph, defined equivalently as s_ω^∞ in (3.3).

In this section, $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ will be assumed to be such that $\omega > -\omega_{\mathcal{L}} \geq 0$ or $\omega > -\omega_{\mathcal{G}} \geq 0$, where \mathcal{L} or \mathcal{G} is the underlying book or graph.

We will link with the minimal action levels on the line and on the strip of width L , defined by

$$\begin{aligned} s_\omega^{\text{line}} &= c_p \inf \left\{ \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R})}^{p+1} : u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \setminus \{0\}, I_\omega^{\text{line}}(u) \leq 0 \right\}, \\ s_\omega^{\text{strip}_L} &= c_p \inf \left\{ \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R} \times [0, L])}^{p+1} : u \in H^1(\mathbb{R} \times [0, L]) \setminus \{0\}, I_\omega^{\text{strip}_L}(u) \leq 0 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where, by I_ω^{line} and $I_\omega^{\text{strip}_L}$ we denote the Nehari functionals on the line and on the strip of width L , i.e, for $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$,

$$I_\omega^{\text{line}}(u) = \|\partial_x u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \omega \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 - \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R})}^{p+1},$$

and for $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R} \times [0, L])$,

$$I_\omega^{\text{strip}_L}(u) = \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times [0, L])}^2 + \omega \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times [0, L])}^2 - \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R} \times [0, L])}^{p+1}.$$

We start by showing that the level of the problem at infinity for non-compact finite books is the same as the action level on a strip. Similar arguments also show that the level of the problem at infinity on non-compact finite graphs is the same as the action level on a line. The reason is that the best escaping sequences minimizing the action on the Nehari constraint for books reduce to the simple escaping of strip-ground states on a single page isomorphic to a half-strip (or on a semi-infinite edge in the case of graphs).

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B})$ be a non-compact finite book. Assume that for any page $P_k \in \mathcal{P}$, we have either $L_k^1 < \infty$ or $L_k^2 < \infty$. Then*

$$s_\omega^\infty = s_\omega^{\text{strip}_L^\vee}, \quad L^\vee = \max\{L_k^j : L_k^{3-j} = \infty\}.$$

Let \mathcal{G} be a non-compact finite graph. Then

$$s_{\omega, \mathcal{G}}^\infty = s_\omega^{\text{line}}.$$

Proof. We provide the proof for books, the proof for graphs being similar and easier. Let $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B})$ be a non-compact finite book such that for any page $P_k \in \mathcal{P}$, we have either $L_k^1 < \infty$ or $L_k^2 < \infty$. We first observe that

$$(3.5) \quad s_\omega^\infty \leq s_\omega^{\text{strip}_L^\vee}.$$

Indeed, let $(w_n) \subset H^1(\mathbb{R} \times [0, L^\vee])$ be a minimizing sequence for $s_\omega^{\text{strip}_L^\vee}$, i.e. $w_n \neq 0$, $I_\omega^{\text{strip}_L^\vee}(w_n) = 0$ and $c_p \|w_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R} \times [0, L^\vee])}^{p+1} \rightarrow s_\omega^{\text{strip}_L^\vee}$. Let $\chi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth cut-off function verifying $\chi(x) = 0$ for $x \in (-\infty, 0]$ and $\chi(x) = 1$ for $x \in [1, \infty)$. Let $(x_n) \subset \mathbb{R}$ be such that $x_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and \tilde{w}_n defined by $\tilde{w}_n(x, y) = \chi(x)w_n(x - x_n, y)$. The sequence (x_n) is chosen such that \tilde{w}_n verifies $I_\omega^{\text{strip}_L^\vee}(\tilde{w}_n) \leq 1/n$. Moreover, $\|\tilde{w}_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R} \times [0, L^\vee])}^{p+1} \leq \|w_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R} \times [0, L^\vee])}^{p+1}$. Define $\pi_n > 0$ by $I_\omega^{\text{strip}_L^\vee}(\pi_n \tilde{w}_n) = 0$. Then $\pi_n \rightarrow 1$ and $(\pi_n \tilde{w}_n)$ is also a minimizing sequence of $s_\omega^{\text{strip}_L^\vee}$, which moreover verifies $\pi_n \tilde{w}_n \rightarrow 0$ in $H^1([0, \infty) \times [0, L^\vee])$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Up to renumbering, we may assume that the page $P_1 \in \mathcal{P}$ is such that $P_1 \sim$

$[0, \infty) \times [0, L^\vee]$. Let $v_n = (v_n^k) \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ be defined by $v_n^1 = \pi_n \tilde{w}_n$ (restricted to P_1) and $v_n^k \equiv 0$ for $k \geq 2$. Then $v_n \rightharpoonup 0$ weakly in $H^1(\mathcal{L})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $I_\omega(v_n) = 0$ and

$$s_\omega^\infty \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p \|v_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p \|\pi_n \tilde{w}_n\|_{L^{p+1}([0, \infty) \times [0, L^\vee])}^{p+1} = s_\omega^{\text{strip}_{L^\vee}}.$$

We now show that the reverse inequality also holds. Let $u_n \rightharpoonup 0$ in $H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ be a minimizing sequence for s_ω^∞ , that is $c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} \rightarrow s_\omega^\infty$ and $I_\omega(u_n) = 0$. Let \mathcal{K} be the compact core of \mathcal{L} . Let ϕ be a smooth cut-off function outside of \mathcal{K} , that is $\phi \equiv 1$ on $\mathcal{K}^c \setminus \mathcal{B}$, $\phi \equiv 0$ on \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{B} a compact transition region, $\phi \in [0, 1]$ on \mathcal{B} . Let $v_n = \phi u_n$. Since $u_n \rightharpoonup 0$, it follows that $\|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})} = \|v_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})} + \varepsilon_n$, where $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, we have $c_p \|v_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} \rightarrow s_\omega^\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In the same way, we have

$$(3.6) \quad I_\omega(v_n) = I_\omega(u_n) + \varepsilon'_n$$

where $\varepsilon'_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $w_n = \pi_\omega(v_n)v_n$ where $\pi_\omega(v_n)v_n$ is the projection on the Nehari manifold defined in (2.6) (in particular $I_\omega(w_n) = 0$). From (3.6), we obtain that $\pi_\omega(v_n) \rightarrow 1$, thus

$$c_p \|w_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} = c_p \pi_\omega(v_n)^{p+1} \|v_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} \rightarrow s_\omega^\infty$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, there exists $(\delta_n) \subset (0, \infty)$, with $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$(3.7) \quad c_p \|w_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} = s_\omega^\infty + \delta_n.$$

Now observe that w_n is a collection of K disjoint pieces, where K is the number of semi-infinite pages of the book \mathcal{L} . Indeed, by construction, w_n vanishes on the compact core \mathcal{K} of the book. Writing each semi-infinite page P_k of \mathcal{L} as $[0, \infty) \times [0, L_k]$, we have

$$w_n = (w_n^k), \quad w_n^k \subset H^1([0, \infty) \times [0, L_k]), \quad k = 1, \dots, K.$$

Since $0 = I_\omega(w_n) = \sum_k I_\omega^{\text{strip}_{L_k}}(w_n^k)$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $I_\omega^{\text{strip}_{L_k}}(w_n^k) \leq 0$. Therefore

$$s_\omega^{\text{strip}_{L_k}} \leq c_p \|w_n^k\|_{L^{p+1}([0, \infty) \times [0, L_k])}^{p+1} \leq c_p \|w_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1}.$$

Passing to the limit, we obtain

$$s_\omega^{\text{strip}_{L_k}} \leq s_\omega^\infty.$$

As $L \rightarrow s_\omega^{\text{strip}_L}$ is decreasing in L (this is proved in a general case in Proposition 4.1), this implies that

$$(3.8) \quad s_\omega^{\text{strip}_{L^\vee}} \leq s_\omega^\infty.$$

Combining the inequalities (3.5) and (3.8) gives the desired result. \square

3.2. Finite books. In this section, we consider the existence of ground states on finite books.

The following result is valid for compact books, for which the existence of a minimizer is a direct consequence of Sobolev embeddings and boundedness of the minimizing sequences. However, it takes all its sense for non-compact books, for which convergence of minimizing sequences is more delicate to obtain.

Lemma 3.6. *Let \mathcal{L} be a finite book. If*

$$(3.9) \quad \omega > -\omega_{\mathcal{L}},$$

$$(3.10) \quad s_\omega < s_\omega^\infty,$$

then there exists a minimizer for (3.1).

Remark 3.7. We have seen in Lemma 3.2 that $\omega \geq -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a necessary condition for the existence of action ground states. The existence in the limit case $\omega = -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ depends on the considered graph, this is why it is excluded from (3.9). The condition (3.10) is not necessary for existence. Indeed, even when $s_{\omega} = s_{\omega}^{\infty}$, there may still exist a profile $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ such that $S_{\omega}(u) = s_{\omega}$ and $I_{\omega}(u) = 0$.

The *run-away behavior* is a situation where the minimizing sequences of a problem tend to escape towards the infinite directions of the underlying physical space. Such situations are not problematic for homogeneous problems, where the minimizing sequences can simply be shifted back to a compact area thanks to translation invariance. In non-homogeneous situations such as in the presence of a potential, or, as in the present case, for open books, a non-escaping condition such as (3.10) prevents the runaway behavior. In contrast, the condition (3.9) is required to establish a non-trivial lower bound for S_{ω} .

Proof of Lemma 3.6. Let (u_n) be a minimizing sequence for (3.1). Without loss of generality, we may assume that $I_{\omega}(u_n) = 0$. From $I_{\omega}(u_n) = 0$, we obtain

$$(3.11) \quad \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 + \omega \|u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 = \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} \rightarrow s_{\omega}/c_p < \infty.$$

Thus, (u_n) is bounded in $H^1(\mathcal{L})$, and, up to a subsequence, there exists $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $H^1(\mathcal{L})$. By the non-escaping condition (3.10), we have $u \not\equiv 0$.

We now prove that $I_{\omega}(u) \leq 0$. By the Brezis-Lieb lemma [9], we obtain

$$I_{\omega}(u_n) - I_{\omega}(u_n - u) - I_{\omega}(u) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Assume by contradiction that $I_{\omega}(u) > 0$. It follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{\omega}(u_n - u) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{\omega}(u_n) - I_{\omega}(u) = -I_{\omega}(u) < 0.$$

Thus, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n > N$, we have $I_{\omega}(u_n - u) < 0$. Consequently, for $n > N$, we obtain

$$(3.12) \quad s_{\omega} < c_p \|u_n - u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1}.$$

Since $u \not\equiv 0$, the Brezis-Lieb lemma gives

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p \|u_n - u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} - c_p \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} < s_{\omega}$$

which contradicts (3.12). Consequently, we have $I_{\omega}(u) \leq 0$ and $s_{\omega} \leq S_{\omega}(u)$. On the other hand, by weak lower semicontinuity, we get

$$c_p \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} = s_{\omega},$$

implying that

$$c_p \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} = s_{\omega}.$$

Hence u is a non-trivial minimizer for (3.1), completing the proof. \square

3.3. Periodic Books. Periodic books are another important example of possible book designs, e.g in metamaterials. Rigorously, a periodic book can be defined by mimicking one of the definitions used for periodic metric graphs (see [8, 34] and the discussion in [15]). Let $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B})$ be a book, and consider an action of the group \mathbb{Z}^n (to which we reduce the definition for simplicity):

$$(g, x) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow g \cdot x \in \mathcal{L},$$

which maps pages to pages, bindings to bindings, and preserves the distance. We say that \mathcal{L} is *periodic* if the action is

- (1) *free*, i.e. if there exists $x \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $g.x = x$, then $g = 0$;
- (2) *discrete*, i.e. for every $x \in \mathcal{L}$, there exists a neighborhood U of x such that $g.x \notin U$ for any $g \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}$;
- (3) *co-compact*, i.e. there exists a compact set \mathcal{Q} such that $\mathcal{L} = \bigcup_{g \in \mathbb{Z}^n} g.\mathcal{Q}$.

We will call \mathcal{Q} the *fundamental quire* of the periodic book \mathcal{L} . In particular, given any $x \in \mathcal{L}$, there exists $g \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $g.x \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Lemma 3.8. *Let \mathcal{L} be a periodic book. Assume that*

$$\omega > -\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$$

Then $s_{\omega} > 0$ and (3.1) admits a non-trivial minimum.

Proof. Let (u_n) be a minimizing sequence for (3.1). We may assume without loss of generality that $I_{\omega}(u_n) = 0$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.6 (see (3.11)) we know that (u_n) is bounded in $H^1(\mathcal{L})$. Therefore there exists $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{L})$ such that, up to a subsequence, $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $H^1(\mathcal{L})$. By Sobolev embedding and Nehari identity, we obtain

$$(3.13) \quad \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^2 \lesssim \|u_n\|_{H^1(\mathcal{L})}^2 \lesssim \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 + \omega \|u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 = \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} \lesssim \|u_n\|_{H^1(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1}.$$

From this, we deduce that there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of n , such that

$$(3.14) \quad 0 < C \leq \min\{\|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}, \|u_n\|_{H^1(\mathcal{L})}\}.$$

This implies in particular that $u_n \not\rightarrow 0$ in $L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.4, there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and $z_n \in \mathcal{L}$ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$\int_{B(z_n, L_{\mathcal{L}}/4)} |u_n|^2 dx \geq \varepsilon.$$

Denote by \mathcal{Q} the fundamental quire of the periodic book \mathcal{L} . By translating u_n if necessary (i.e. replacing $u_n(\cdot)$ by $u_n(g \cdot)$ for some $g \in \mathbb{Z}^n$), we may assume that $(z_n) \in \mathcal{Q}$, and since the quire \mathcal{Q} is compact, (z_n) is bounded. Consequently, $u_n|_{\mathcal{Q}} \rightarrow u|_{\mathcal{Q}} \not\equiv 0$ in $L^2(\mathcal{Q})$ by the compact embedding $H^1(\mathcal{Q}) \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathcal{Q})$.

Now we show that $u_n \rightarrow u$ strongly in $L^2(\mathcal{L})$. By contradiction, suppose that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 > 0.$$

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(\omega_n) \subset \mathbb{R}$ be such that $I_{\theta}(u) = 0$ and $I_{\omega_n}(u_n - u) = 0$ for every n . By the Brezis–Lieb lemma, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega_n &= \frac{\|u_n - u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} - \|\nabla u_n - \nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2}{\|u_n - u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2} \\ &= \frac{\|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} - \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 - \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 + o(1)}{\|u_n - u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2} \\ &= \frac{\omega \|u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 - \theta \|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2 + o(1)}{\|u_n - u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2} = \omega + (\omega - \theta) \frac{\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2}{\|u_n - u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{L})}^2} + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Brezis–Lieb lemma again, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} s_\omega &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p (\|u_n - u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1} + \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})}^{p+1}) \\ (3.16) \quad &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{\omega_n} + s_\theta. \end{aligned}$$

We are going to show a contradiction with Lemma 3.3 by discussing the cases $\theta > \omega$, $\theta < \omega$ and $\theta = \omega$. If $\theta > \omega$, the contradiction with Lemma 3.3 is clear. If $\theta < \omega$, then from (3.15), we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega_n > \omega,$$

which implies by Lemma 3.3 that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{\omega_n} > s_\omega$, giving again a contradiction. Finally, if $\theta = \omega$, then from (3.15) we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega_n = \omega$. In particular, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{\omega_n} > 0$, and (3.16) enters again in contradiction with Lemma 3.3.

Thus $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^2(\mathcal{L})$ and $L^{p+1}(\mathcal{L})$ by interpolation. From the lower semi-continuity, we obtain $S_\omega(u) \leq s_\omega$. On the other hand, we can prove that $I_\omega(u) \leq 0$ in the same way as in the second part of the proof of Lemma 3.6 by using the Brezis–Lieb lemma again. Hence, we obtain $S_\omega(u) = s_\omega$ and u is a non-trivial minimizer for (3.1), completing the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Theorem 1.3 is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.8. \square

4. SHRINKING LIMIT FOR GRAPH-BASED BOOKS

In this section, \mathcal{G} will denote a finite or periodic book. We analyze the limiting behavior of graph-based books, see Definition 1.4. Observe that when $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{G} \times [0, L]$, then $\omega_{\mathcal{G}} \geq \omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ (with equality in most of the cases that we are considering). We remark that this class includes a wide variety of physically and mathematically relevant examples, such as those illustrated in Figures 2 and 3.

The main outcome of this section is the proof of Theorem 1.5.

4.1. The rescaled problem. It is more convenient to work with functions belonging to the same space and to transfer the dependency in L to the Nehari functionals. This is achieved through a rescaling in the second variable. For any $u \in H^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, L])$ we define $v \in H^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])$ by

$$(4.1) \quad v(x, y) = u(x, Ly).$$

The minimization problem s_ω becomes

$$s_\omega = \inf \{c_p L \|v\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^{p+1} : v \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1]) \setminus \{0\}, LI_{\omega, L}(v) \leq 0\},$$

where the rescaled Nehari functional $I_{\omega, L}$ is defined on $H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])$ by

$$(4.2) \quad I_{\omega, L}(v) = \|\partial_x v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 + L^{-2} \|\partial_y v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 + \omega \|v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 - \|v\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^{p+1}.$$

For future reference, we also introduce here the limit version of this functional

$$(4.3) \quad I_{\omega, 0}(v) = I_{\omega, \infty}(v) = \|\partial_x v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 + \omega \|v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 - \|v\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^{p+1},$$

where it is understood that when we use the notation $I_{\omega, 0}(v)$, the function $v \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])$ also verifies $\partial_y v \equiv 0$. We will work with the following rescaled minimization problem:

$$(4.4) \quad s_{\omega, L} = \inf \{c_p \|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^{p+1} : u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1]) \setminus \{0\}, I_{\omega, L}(u) \leq 0\}.$$

As L tends to 0 or ∞ we consider the limit versions of $s_{\omega,L}$, which are given by

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\omega,0} &= \inf\{c_p\|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} : u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]) \setminus \{0\}, \partial_y u \equiv 0, I_{\omega,0}(u) \leq 0\}. \\ s_{\omega,\infty} &= \inf\{c_p\|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} : u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]) \setminus \{0\}, I_{\omega,\infty}(u) \leq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The problem $s_{\omega,\infty}$ is the problem when $L \rightarrow \infty$ and is not to be confused with the problem at infinity s_{ω}^{∞} defined in (3.3).

Observe that we clearly have $s_{\omega,\mathcal{G}} = s_{\omega,0}$, where the Nehari level on the graph was defined in (3.4). The Nehari sets corresponding to the previously defined minimization problems will be defined by

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{N}_L = \{u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]) \setminus \{0\} : I_{\omega,L}(u) \leq 0\},$$

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{N}_0 = \{u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]) \setminus \{0\} : \|\partial_y u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])} = 0, I_{\omega,0}(u) \leq 0\},$$

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{N}_{\infty} = \{u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]) \setminus \{0\} : I_{\omega,\infty}(u) \leq 0\},$$

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}} = \{u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G}) \setminus \{0\} : I_{\omega,\mathcal{G}}(u) \leq 0\}.$$

Given a function $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])$, we will want to scale it so that it belongs to various Nehari manifolds. This will be achieved using a scaling factor (similar to π_{ω} defined in (2.6)). For $\omega > \omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $L \in [0, \infty]$, we define

$$(4.9) \quad \pi_{\omega,L}(u) = \left(1 + \frac{I_{\omega,L}(u)}{\|u\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}.$$

In particular, we have $I_{\omega,L}(\pi_{\omega,L}(u)u) = 0$ for any $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]) \setminus \{0\}$.

4.2. The action level function. We now give the key properties of the energy levels $s_{\omega,L}$ previously defined.

Proposition 4.1. *The following assertions hold.*

- The function $L \mapsto s_{\omega,L}$ is continuous on $[0, \infty)$.
- There exists $L_{\min} \geq 0$ such that the function $L \mapsto s_{\omega,L}$ is constant on $[0, L_{\min}]$, strictly decreasing on (L_{\min}, ∞) and $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} s_{\omega,L} = s_{\omega,\infty} = 0$.

We will later prove that if $s_{\omega,0} < s_{\omega,0}^{\infty}$ (where $s_{\omega,0}^{\infty}$ is the rescaled problem at infinity, defined in (4.21)), then $L_{\min} > 0$.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We first prove that $s_{\omega,L}$ is continuous at $L = 0$. Since $\mathcal{N}_0 \subset \mathcal{N}_L$ for any $L > 0$, we have $s_{\omega,L} \leq s_{\omega,0}$. For any $0 < L < 1$, let $u_L \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]) \setminus \{0\}$ be such that $I_{\omega,L}(u_L) = 0$ and $s_{\omega,L} \leq c_p\|u_L\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} < s_{\omega,L} + L$. We have

$$\|\partial_x u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 + \frac{1}{L^2}\|\partial_y u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 + \omega\|u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 = \|u_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} \leq \frac{1}{c_p}(s_{\omega,0} + 1),$$

therefore (u_L) is bounded in $H^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])$ by a constant which depends only on $s_{\omega,0}$ (and p). Moreover, we have

$$(4.10) \quad \|\partial_y u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 \leq \frac{1}{c_p}(s_{\omega,0} + 1)L^2.$$

Consider $\tilde{u}_L \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])$, the averaged version of u_L along the transverse variable, defined for $(x, y) \in \mathcal{G} \times [0, 1]$ by

$$(4.11) \quad \tilde{u}_L(x, y) = \int_0^1 u_L(x, z) dz.$$

By construction, we have $\partial_y \tilde{u}_L \equiv 0$. In what follows, the calculations will be performed assuming sufficient regularity. The end result will be valid by density. Let $(x, y) \in \mathcal{G} \times [0, 1]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{u}_L(x, y) - u_L(x, y)| &\leq \int_0^1 |u_L(x, z) - u_L(x, y)| dz \\ &= \int_0^1 \left| \int_y^z \partial_y u_L(x, t) dt \right| dz \leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 |\partial_y u_L(x, t)| dt dz \leq \|\partial_y u_L(x)\|_{L_y^2(0,1)}. \end{aligned}$$

We get the following Poincaré type estimate

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tilde{u}_L - u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 &= \int_{\mathcal{G}} \|\tilde{u}_L(x) - u_L(x)\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 dx \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{G}} \|\partial_y u_L(x)\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 dx = \|\partial_y u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Jensen inequality that

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\partial_x \tilde{u}_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 &= \int_{\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1]} |\partial_x \tilde{u}_L(x, y)|^2 dy dx \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{G}} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 |\partial_x u_L(x, z)|^2 dz dy dx = \int_{\mathcal{G}} \int_0^1 |\partial_x u_L(x, z)|^2 dz dx = \|\partial_x u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similar calculations also give

$$(4.14) \quad \|\tilde{u}_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 \leq \|u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2, \quad \|\tilde{u}_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^{p+1} \leq \|u_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^{p+1}.$$

In particular $(\tilde{u}_L - u_L)$ is bounded in $H^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])$, and by interpolation we have

$$(4.15) \quad \lim_{L \rightarrow 0} \|\tilde{u}_L - u_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])} = 0.$$

We have

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} I_{\omega, 0}(\tilde{u}_L) &= \|\partial_x \tilde{u}_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 + \omega \|\tilde{u}_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 - \|\tilde{u}_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^{p+1} \\ &\leq \|\partial_x u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 + \omega \|u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 - \|u_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^{p+1} \\ &\quad + \left(\|u_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^{p+1} - \|\tilde{u}_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^{p+1} \right) \\ &\leq I_{\omega, L}(u_L) - \frac{1}{L^2} \|\partial_y u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 + \left(\|u_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^{p+1} - \|\tilde{u}_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^{p+1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here we obtain that

$$(4.17) \quad \lim_{L \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{L^2} \|\partial_y u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 = 0.$$

Indeed, assume by contradiction that there exist $\delta > 0$ and $(L_n) \subset (0, \infty)$ such that $L_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\frac{1}{L_n^2} \|\partial_y u_{L_n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 > \delta.$$

Since $\lim_{L \rightarrow 0} \left(\|u_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} - \|\tilde{u}_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} \right) = 0$, for n large enough we would have

$$I_{\omega,0}(\tilde{u}_{L_n}) < -\frac{\delta}{2}.$$

This would imply that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{\omega,0}(\tilde{u}_{L_n}) < 1.$$

Moreover, we would have

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\omega,0} &\leq c_p \|\pi_{\omega,0}(\tilde{u}_{L_n})\tilde{u}_{L_n}\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} \\ &\leq c_p \pi_{\omega,0}(\tilde{u}_{L_n})^{p+1} \|u_{L_n}\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} \leq \pi_{\omega,0}(\tilde{u}_{L_n})^{p+1} (s_{\omega,L_n} + L_n). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit in the previous inequality would give

$$s_{\omega,0} < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{\omega,L_n}$$

which is a contradiction with $s_{\omega,0} \geq s_{\omega,L}$ for any $L > 0$. Hence (4.17) holds. This implies that

$$(4.18) \quad \lim_{L \rightarrow 0} I_{\omega,0}(\tilde{u}_L) = 0$$

Therefore, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{\omega,0}(\tilde{u}_{L_n}) = 1$ and we have

$$s_{\omega,0} \leq \lim_{L \rightarrow 0} c_p \|u_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} = \lim_{L \rightarrow 0} s_{\omega,L}.$$

As we always have $s_{\omega,0} \geq s_{\omega,L}$, the above inequality is in fact an equality, and the function $L \rightarrow s_{\omega,L}$ is continuous at $L = 0$.

Now, we prove that the function $L \rightarrow s_{\omega,L}$ is continuous on $(0, \infty)$. Let $L \in (0, \infty)$ and $(L_n) \subset (0, \infty)$ such that $L_n \rightarrow L$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By definition of s_{ω,L_n} , for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $u_n \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])$ such that $I_{\omega,L_n}(u_n) = 0$ and $s_{\omega,L_n} \leq c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} < s_{\omega,L_n} + |L - L_n|$. We claim that $I_{\omega,L}(u_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Observe first that (u_n) is bounded in $H^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])$ by construction. Observe also that

$$I_{\omega,L_n}(u_n) = 0 = I_{\omega,L}(u_n) + \frac{L^2 - L_n^2}{L^2 L_n^2} \|\partial_y u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2,$$

which proves the claim by passing to the limit. As a consequence, we have $\pi_{\omega,L}(u_n) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore,

$$s_{\omega,L} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p \|\pi_{\omega,L}(u_n)u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{\omega,L_n}.$$

On the other hand, let $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists $u_\varepsilon \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])$ such that $I_{\omega,L}(u_\varepsilon) = 0$ and $s_{\omega,L} \leq c_p \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} < s_{\omega,L} + \varepsilon$. We have $I_{\omega,L_n}(u_\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and therefore

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{\omega,L_n} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p \|\pi_{\omega,L_n}(u_\varepsilon)u_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} \leq s_{\omega,L} + \varepsilon.$$

Since ε is arbitrary, this implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{\omega,L_n} = s_{\omega,L},$$

and the function $L \rightarrow s_{\omega,L}$ is continuous on $(0, \infty)$.

Let L_{min} be defined by

$$L_{min} = \sup\{L_* \geq 0 : \forall L \in [0, L_*], s_{\omega,L} = s_{\omega,0}\}.$$

We now prove that the function is strictly decreasing on (L_{min}, ∞) . We first prove that it is decreasing. Let $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, L])$. For any $0 < J < K$ we have

$$(4.19) \quad I_{\omega,J}(u) = I_{\omega,K}(u) + \frac{K^2 - J^2}{K^2 J^2} \|\partial_y u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 \geq I_{\omega,K}(u),$$

with strict inequality if $\|\partial_y u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 \neq 0$. Let $(u_n) \subset H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, L])$ be a minimizing sequence for $s_{\omega,J}$. Then $I_K(u_n) \leq I_J(u_n) \leq 0$. By defining $v_n = \pi_{\omega,K}(u_n)u_n$ (so that $I_K(v_n) = 0$), we have $\pi_{\omega,K}(u_n) \leq 1$ and

$$(4.20) \quad s_{\omega,K} \leq c_p \|v_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} = c_p \pi_{\omega,K}(u_n)^{p+1} \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} \leq c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1}$$

Passing to the limit, we obtain $s_{\omega,K} \leq s_{\omega,J}$ and the function $L \rightarrow s_{\omega,L}$ is indeed decreasing on $[0, \infty)$.

To prove that it is strictly decreasing, we proceed as follows. Assume by contradiction that there exist $L_{min} < J < K$ such that $L \rightarrow s_{\omega,L}$ is constant on $[J, K]$. Let $(u_n) \subset H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])$ be a minimizing sequence for $s_{\omega,J}$. From (4.19), we infer that (u_n) will also be a minimizing sequence for $s_{\omega,K}$. Moreover, we will have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{\omega,J}(u_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{\omega,K}(u_n) = 0$, which combined with (4.19) gives

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\partial_y u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])} = 0.$$

We consider the averaged version (\tilde{u}_n) of (u_n) as defined in (4.11). We have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{\omega,0}(\tilde{u}_n) = 0$. This implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{\omega,0}(\tilde{u}_n) = 1$. Therefore, we have

$$s_{\omega,0} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p \|\pi_{\omega,0}(\tilde{u}_n)\tilde{u}_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} = s_{\omega,J} = s_{\omega,K}.$$

Since we have proved that $L \rightarrow s_{\omega,L}$ is decreasing, this implies that $s_{\omega,L}$ is constant on $[0, K]$. This enters in contradiction with the definition of L_{min} . Therefore $L \rightarrow s_{\omega,L}$ is strictly decreasing on (L_{min}, ∞) .

To analyse what happens when $L \rightarrow \infty$, we construct a family of test functions $u_{\lambda,\gamma}$ which will allow us to estimate $s_{\omega,L}$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$ and will also serve as a minimizing sequence for $s_{\omega,\infty}$.

Let $v \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G}) \setminus \{0\}$ and $w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\text{supp}(w) \subset [0, 1]$. For $\lambda, \gamma > 1$, we define $u_{\lambda,\gamma} \in H_D^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])$ by

$$u_{\lambda,\gamma}(x, y) = \lambda v(x)w(\gamma y).$$

Let $L > 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\omega,L}(u_{\lambda,\gamma}) &= \frac{\lambda^2}{\gamma} \|v_x\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}^2 \|w\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \frac{\gamma \lambda^2}{L^2} \|v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}^2 \|w_y\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda^2}{\gamma} \omega \|v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G})}^2 \|w\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 - \frac{\lambda^{p+1}}{\gamma} \|v\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G})}^{p+1} \|w\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R})}^{p+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\gamma = L$ and $\lambda = L^{\frac{1}{2(p+1)}}$, there exists $L_0 > 0$ such that if $L > L_0$, then

$$I_{\omega,L} \left(u_{L^{\frac{1}{2(p+1)}}, L} \right) < 0,$$

and therefore

$$s_{\omega,L} \leq c_p \left\| u_{L^{\frac{1}{2(p+1)}}, L} \right\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} = \frac{c_p}{\sqrt{L}} \|v\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G})}^{p+1} \|w\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R})}^{p+1}.$$

Therefore, $s_{\omega,\infty} = 0$ and $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} s_{\omega,L} = 0$. \square

4.3. Minimizers rigidity. We denote by $s_{\omega,L}^\infty$ the rescaled problem at infinity

$$(4.21) \quad s_{\omega,L}^\infty = \inf \left\{ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_p \|u_n\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} : u_n \rightharpoonup 0 \text{ in } H^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]), u_n \not\equiv 0, I_{\omega,L}(u_n) \leq 0 \right\}.$$

When $L = 0$, the sequences (u_n) are in addition required to satisfy $\partial_y u_n \equiv 0$, so that $s_{\omega,0}^\infty = s_{\omega,\mathcal{G}}^\infty$.

We now prove that if the minimal action level on the graph, $s_{\omega,\mathcal{G}}$, is strictly smaller than the corresponding level at infinity $s_{\omega,\mathcal{G}}^\infty$, then for sufficiently small $L \geq 0$, there exist minimizers of $s_{\omega,L}$ on the book $\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1]$, and these minimizers are independent of the transverse variable y .

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\omega > -\omega_{\mathcal{G}}$ and assume that $s_{\omega,\mathcal{G}} < s_{\omega,\mathcal{G}}^\infty$. Then L_{\min} given by Proposition 4.1 satisfies $L_{\min} > 0$. Moreover, for every $0 \leq L \leq L_{\min}$, there exist minimizers of $s_{\omega,L}$, and any minimizer $v_L \in \mathcal{N}_L$ satisfies*

$$\partial_y v_L \equiv 0.$$

Proof. By Proposition 4.1, the map $L \mapsto s_{\omega,L}$ is continuous and decreasing on $[0, \infty)$. Analogously, one can show that $L \mapsto s_{\omega,L}^\infty$ is continuous. Since by assumption $s_{\omega,0} < s_{\omega,0}^\infty$, there exists $L_\infty > 0$ such that

$$s_{\omega,L} < s_{\omega,L}^\infty \quad \text{for all } L \in [0, L_\infty).$$

Consequently, by Theorem 1.3, for each $0 < L < L_\infty$, there exists a minimizer $u_L \in \mathcal{N}_L$ of $s_{\omega,L}$, with $u_L \in D(H)$ (see (2.3)). Inside each page, u_L satisfies

$$-\partial_{xx} u_L - \frac{1}{L^2} \partial_{yy} u_L + \omega u_L - |u_L|^{p-1} u_L = 0.$$

By classical elliptic regularity theory, $u_L \in W^{3,q}(P)$ for any $q > 2$ and for every page P of $\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1]$. We take the duality product with $\partial_{yy} \bar{u}_L$ and integrate by parts. Integration can be performed page by page, ensuring that boundary terms cancel appropriately. The main subtlety arises from the term $\partial_{xx} u_L$, as the other terms can be handled using the Neumann boundary conditions on u_L .

To analyze this, consider

$$\langle \partial_{xx} u_L, \partial_{yy} u_L \rangle.$$

On a page $P = B \times [0, 1]$, where the binding B is parametrized as $[a, b]$ (the case $[a, \infty)$ being similar), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} \int_P \partial_{xx} u_L \partial_{yy} \bar{u}_L \, dx \, dy &= \|\partial_{xy} u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 \\ &+ \operatorname{Re} \int_0^1 \partial_x u_L(b, y) \partial_{yy} \bar{u}_L(b, y) - \partial_x u_L(a, y) \partial_{yy} \bar{u}_L(a, y) \, dy \\ &- \operatorname{Re} \int_a^b \partial_x u_L(x, 1) \partial_{xy} \bar{u}_L(x, 1) - \partial_x u_L(x, 0) \partial_{xy} \bar{u}_L(x, 0) \, dx, \end{aligned}$$

where we first integrated by parts in x and then in y .

Observe that the trace operator maps $W^{3,q}(P)$ into $W^{3-\frac{1}{q},q}(B)$ for any $q \geq 2$. By the one-dimensional Sobolev embedding for $q > 2$, this implies $u_L \in C^2(B)$, so that both $\partial_{yy} u_L$ and $\partial_{xy} u_L$ are well defined on the bindings.

For the second boundary term, we integrate by parts once more to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^b \partial_x u_L(x, 1) \partial_{xy} \bar{u}_L(x, 1) dx \\ &= \partial_x u_L(b, 1) \partial_y \bar{u}_L(b, 1) - \partial_x u_L(a, 1) \partial_y \bar{u}_L(a, 1) - \int_a^b \partial_{xx} u_L(x, 1) \partial_y \bar{u}_L(x, 1) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $u_L \in C^2(B)$, we have $\partial_y u_L \equiv 0$ on $B \times \{0, 1\}$ by continuity, and therefore this term vanishes, as does

$$\operatorname{Re} \int_a^b \partial_x u_L(x, 0) \partial_{xy} \bar{u}_L(x, 0) dx = 0.$$

Similarly, for the first boundary term we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \partial_x u_L(b, y) \partial_{yy} \bar{u}_L(b, y) dy \\ &= \partial_x u_L(b, 1) \partial_y \bar{u}_L(b, 1) - \partial_x u_L(b, 0) \partial_y \bar{u}_L(b, 0) - \int_0^1 \partial_{xy} u_L(b, y) \partial_y \bar{u}_L(b, y) dy, \end{aligned}$$

which also vanishes since $\partial_y u_L \equiv 0$. By the same argument,

$$\operatorname{Re} \int_0^1 \partial_x u_L(a, y) \partial_{yy} \bar{u}_L(a, y) dy = 0.$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \|\partial_{xy} u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 + \frac{1}{L^2} \|\partial_{yy} u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 + \omega \|\partial_y u_L\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])}^2 \\ (4.22) \quad & - \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1]} \partial_y (|u_L|^{p-1} u_L) \partial_y \bar{u}_L dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Now, fix a sequence $(L_n) \subset (0, L_\infty)$ with $L_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since (u_{L_n}) is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1])$, we may extract a subsequence (still denoted (u_{L_n})) such that

$$u_{L_n} \rightharpoonup u_0 \quad \text{weakly in } H^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1]),$$

for some limit u_0 . We shall show that

$$u_{L_n} \rightarrow u_0 \quad \text{strongly in } L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1]),$$

and that u_0 is a minimizer of $s_{\omega, 0}$.

To this end, we adopt the notation from the proof of Proposition 4.1. Let \tilde{u}_{L_n} denote the averaged function associated with u_{L_n} as in (4.11). In view of (4.15), it suffices to show that

$$\tilde{u}_{L_n} \rightarrow u_0 \quad \text{in } L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0, 1]).$$

From (4.18), we know that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{\omega, 0}(\tilde{u}_{L_n}) = 0,$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{\omega, 0}(\tilde{u}_{L_n}) = 1.$$

Hence, the sequence $\pi_{\omega, 0}(\tilde{u}_{L_n}) \tilde{u}_{L_n}$ is minimizing $s_{\omega, 0}$ in the limit $L_n \rightarrow 0$.

Repeating the compactness argument in the proof of Lemma 3.6 (for finite books) or Lemma 3.8 (for periodic books), we obtain, possibly after passing to a subsequence and translating, that

$$\pi_{\omega,0}(\tilde{u}_{L_n})\tilde{u}_{L_n} \rightarrow u_0 \quad \text{strongly in } H^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]).$$

Next, using (4.22), we show that

$$\partial_y u_{L_n} \equiv 0$$

for all n sufficiently large. We estimate the last term on the right-hand side of (4.22) as

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]} \partial_y (|u_{L_n}|^{p-1} u_{L_n}) \partial_y \bar{u}_{L_n} dx dy \right| &\leq p \int_{\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]} |u_{L_n}|^{p-1} |\partial_y u_{L_n}|^2 dx dy \\ &\leq p \int_{\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]} |u_0|^{p-1} |\partial_y u_{L_n}|^2 dx dy + p \int_{\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]} | |u_0|^{p-1} - |u_{L_n}|^{p-1} | |\partial_y u_{L_n}|^2 dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

The first term may be estimated by

$$\int_{\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]} |u_0|^{p-1} |\partial_y u_{L_n}|^2 dx dy \leq \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p-1} \|\partial_y u_{L_n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2.$$

For the second term, recall that, given $s, t > 0$, we have

$$|s^{p-1} - t^{p-1}| \lesssim \begin{cases} |s - t|(s^{p-2} + t^{p-2}), & \text{when } p \geq 2, \\ |s - t|^{p-1}, & \text{when } 1 < p < 2. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, using Hölder inequality, when $1 < p < 2$ we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]} | |u_0|^{p-1} - |u_{L_n}|^{p-1} | |\partial_y u_{L_n}|^2 dx dy \leq \|u_0 - u_{L_n}\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p-1} \|\partial_y u_{L_n}\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2.$$

When $p \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]} | |u_0|^{p-1} - |u_{L_n}|^{p-1} | |\partial_y u_{L_n}|^2 dx dy \\ &\leq \|u_0 - u_{L_n}\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])} \left(\|u_0\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p-2} + \|u_{L_n}\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p-2} \right) \|\partial_y u_{L_n}\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing, we have established that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]} \partial_y (|u_{L_n}|^{p-1} u_{L_n}) \partial_y \bar{u}_{L_n} dx dy \right| \\ &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p-1} \|\partial_y u_{L_n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 + \|u_0 - u_{L_n}\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{\min(p-1,1)} \|\partial_y u_{L_n}\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By construction, for each $x \in \mathcal{G}$, the function $\partial_y u_{L_n}(x, \cdot)$ verifies Dirichlet conditions on $[0, 1]$. Therefore, by the Poincaré inequality, we have

$$\|\partial_y u_{L_n}(x)\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \lesssim \|\partial_{yy} u_{L_n}(x)\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2.$$

Integrating in x gives

$$\|\partial_y u_{L_n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])} \lesssim \|\partial_{yy} u_{L_n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}$$

we have

$$\|\partial_y u_{L_n}\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 \leq C \left(\|\partial_{yx} u_{L_n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 + \|\partial_{yy} u_{L_n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 \right).$$

Thus, inserting these estimates into (4.22), we get for some $C > 0$

$$(4.23) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \left(\frac{1}{L_n^2} - C \right) \|\partial_{yy} u_{L_n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \|u_0 - u_{L_n}\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{\min(p-1,1)} \right) \|\partial_{xy} u_{L_n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This also implies that

$$\pi_{\omega,0}(\tilde{u}_{L_n}) \tilde{u}_{L_n} \longrightarrow u_0 \quad \text{in } H^1(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1]),$$

and therefore, by (4.23), there exists $N > 0$ such that for all $n \geq N$,

$$\|\partial_{yy} u_{L_n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])} + \|\partial_{xy} u_{L_n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])} = 0.$$

Consequently, for all $n \geq N$, since $\partial_y u_{L_n}$ satisfies Dirichlet boundary conditions, we infer that

$$\partial_y u_{L_n} \equiv 0.$$

We now show that this property persists for every L in the whole interval

$$0 \leq L \leq L_N.$$

Indeed, by Proposition 4.1 we have

$$s_{\omega,L_N} \leq s_{\omega,L} \quad \text{for all } L \in [0, L_N],$$

while, by the definition of $s_{\omega,0}$ and the fact that $\partial_y u_{L_N} \equiv 0$, we also have

$$s_{\omega,L_N} = s_{\omega,L} = s_{\omega,0}.$$

Suppose by contradiction that there exists some $\tilde{L} \in (0, L_N)$ such that $s_{\omega,\tilde{L}}$ admits a minimizer $v_{\tilde{L}}$ with

$$\partial_y v_{\tilde{L}} \not\equiv 0.$$

Let $K \in (\tilde{L}, L_N)$. Then $s_{\omega,K} = s_{\omega,\tilde{L}}$ and

$$I_{\omega,K}(v_{\tilde{L}}) = I_{\omega,\tilde{L}}(v_{\tilde{L}}) + \left(\frac{1}{K^2} - \frac{1}{\tilde{L}^2} \right) \|\partial_y v_{\tilde{L}}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^2 < 0.$$

Hence,

$$s_{\omega,K} \leq c_p \|\pi_{\omega,K}(v_{\tilde{L}}) v_{\tilde{L}}\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} < c_p \|v_{\tilde{L}}\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} = s_{\omega,\tilde{L}},$$

a contradiction.

To conclude, observe first that under the present assumptions, a minimizer for $s_{\omega,L}$ exists for every $L \in [0, L_{\min}]$. Indeed, this is immediate if $L_{\infty} \geq L_{\min}$. If instead $L_{\infty} < L_{\min}$, then for any $L \in (L_{\infty}, L_{\min})$ we have

$$s_{\omega,L} = s_{\omega,0} = s_{\omega,L}^{\infty},$$

since $L \rightarrow s_{\omega,L}^{\infty}$ is decreasing and bounded below by $s_{\omega,L}$. Therefore, any minimizer of $s_{\omega,0}$ (which exists by assumption) is also a minimizer of $s_{\omega,L}$ for all such L .

It remains to show that $L_{\min} = L_N$. We clearly have $L_N \leq L_{\min}$. Assume by contradiction that $L_N < L_{\min}$. Let $L \in (L_N, L_{\min})$ and let $u_L \in \mathcal{N}_L$ be such that

$$s_{\omega,L} \leq c_p \|u_L\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathcal{G} \times [0,1])}^{p+1} \leq s_{\omega,L} + \varepsilon$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ to be chosen later. $s_{\omega,L}$ such that $\partial_y u_L \not\equiv 0$. This implies (see e.g. (4.19)-(4.20)) that

$$I_{\omega,L_{\min}}(u_L) < 0, \quad s_{\omega,L_{\min}} < s_{\omega,L},$$

which is a contradiction with the definition of L_{min} . \square

Finally, we observe that the threshold L_{min} is sharp as it separates the one-dimensional ground states from purely two-dimensional ones.

Proposition 4.3. *If there exists a minimizer v_L of $s_{\omega,L}$ for $L > L_{min}$, then it verifies $\partial_y v_L \not\equiv 0$.*

Proof. The proof follows from Proposition 4.1. Indeed, suppose by contradiction that there exists $L > L_{min}$ such a minimizer v_L of $s_{\omega,L}$ exists and $\partial_y v_L \equiv 0$. Then we get that $s_{\omega,L} < s_{\omega,L_{min}}$ and $I_{\omega,L_{min}}(v_L) = 0$ which contradicts the definition of $s_{\omega,L_{min}}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Theorem 1.5 is a direct consequence of Propositions 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Adami, C. Cacciapuoti, D. Finco, and D. Noja. Constrained energy minimization and orbital stability for the NLS equation on a star graph. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Anal. Non Linéaire*, 31(6):1289–1310, 2014.
- [2] S. Agmon. *Lectures on exponential decay of solutions of second-order elliptic equations: bounds on eigenfunctions of N -body Schrödinger operators*, volume 29 of *Mathematical Notes*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1982.
- [3] T. Akahori, Y. Bahri, S. Ibrahim, and H. Kikuchi. Pitchfork bifurcation at line solitons for nonlinear Schrödinger equations on the product space $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}$. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 25(7):3467–3497, 2024.
- [4] S. Akduman and P. Kuchment. On open book analogs of quantum graphs. Preprint, arXiv:2406.16190 [math-ph] (2024), 2024.
- [5] H. Berestycki and T. Cazenave. Instabilité des états stationnaires dans les équations de Schrödinger et de Klein-Gordon non linéaires. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 293(9):489–492, 1981.
- [6] H. Berestycki and J. Wei. On least energy solutions to a semilinear elliptic equation in a strip. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-A*, 28(3):1083–1099, 2010.
- [7] F. A. Berezin and M. A. Shubin. *The Schrödinger equation*, volume 66 of *Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series)*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1991.
- [8] G. Berkolaiko and P. Kuchment. *Introduction to quantum graphs*, volume 186 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2013.
- [9] H. Brézis and E. Lieb. A relation between pointwise convergence of functions and convergence of functionals. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 88(3):486–490, 1983.
- [10] T. Cazenave and P.-L. Lions. Orbital stability of standing waves for some nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 85:549–561, 1982.
- [11] J. E. Corbin. Convergence of spectra of uniformly fattened open book structures. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 489(2):32, 2020. Id/No 124181.
- [12] J. E. Corbin and P. Kuchment. Spectra of “fattened” open book structures. In *The mathematical legacy of Victor Lomonosov. Operator theory*, pages 99–108. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020.
- [13] C. De Coster, S. Dovetta, D. Galant, and E. Serra. On the notion of ground state for nonlinear Schrödinger equations on metric graphs. *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 62(5):28, 2023. Id/No 159.
- [14] C. De Coster, S. Dovetta, D. Galant, E. Serra, and C. Troestler. Constant sign and sign changing NLS ground states on noncompact metric graphs. Preprint, arXiv:2306.12121 [math.AP] (2023), 2023.
- [15] S. Dovetta. Mass-constrained ground states of the stationary NLSE on periodic metric graphs. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 26(5):Paper No. 30, 30, 2019.
- [16] S. Dovetta. Nonuniqueness of normalized ground states for nonlinear Schrödinger equations on metric graphs. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 130(2):33, 2025. Id/No e70025.
- [17] S. Dovetta, E. Serra, and L. Tentarelli. Non-uniqueness of normalized nls ground states on polygons with homogeneous neumann boundary conditions. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 2025.
- [18] S. Dovetta, E. Serra, and P. Tilli. Action versus energy ground states in nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Math. Ann.*, 385(3-4):1545–1576, 2023.

- [19] J. B. Etnyre. Lectures on open book decompositions and contact structures. In *Floer homology, gauge theory, and low-dimensional topology*, volume 5 of *Clay Math. Proc.*, pages 103–141. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.
- [20] P. Exner and O. Post. Quantum networks modelled by graphs. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 998(1):1–17, 2008.
- [21] E. Giroux. What is . . . an Open Book? *Notices Am. Math. Soc.*, 52(1):42–47, 2005.
- [22] P. Grisvard. *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, volume 69 of *Class. Appl. Math.* Philadelphia, PA: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), reprint of the 1985 hardback ed. edition, 2011.
- [23] L. Jeanjean and S.-S. Lu. On global minimizers for a mass constrained problem. *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 61(6):18, 2022. Id/No 214.
- [24] L. Jeanjean and K. Tanaka. A positive solution for an asymptotically linear elliptic problem on \mathbb{R}^N autonomous at infinity. *ESAIM, Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 7:597–614, 2002.
- [25] S. Kosugi. A semilinear elliptic equation in a thin network-shaped domain. *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan*, 52(3):673–697, 2000.
- [26] S. Kosugi. Semilinear elliptic equations on thin network-shaped domains with variable thickness. *J. Differ. Equations*, 183(1):165–188, 2002.
- [27] T. Lawrie, G. Tanner, and D. Chronopoulos. A quantum graph approach to metamaterial design. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):18006, 2022.
- [28] S. Le Coz and B. Shakarov. Ground states on a fractured strip and one dimensional reduction. Preprint, arXiv:2411.18187 [math.AP] (2024), 2024.
- [29] P.-L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case. I. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 1(2):109–145, 1984.
- [30] P.-L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case. II. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 1(4):223–283, 1984.
- [31] P.-L. Lions. The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The limit case. I. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 1(1):145–201, 1985.
- [32] Z. Nehari. On a class of nonlinear second-order differential equations. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 95:101–123, 1960.
- [33] S. Nicaise and O. M. Penkin. Poincaré-Perron’s method for the Dirichlet problem on stratified sets. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 296(2):504–520, 2004.
- [34] A. Pankov. Nonlinear Schrödinger equations on periodic metric graphs. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 38(2):697–714, 2018.
- [35] O. Post. *Spectral analysis on graph-like spaces*, volume 2039 of *Lect. Notes Math.* Berlin: Springer, 2012.
- [36] F. Rousset and N. Tzvetkov. Transverse nonlinear instability for two-dimensional dispersive models. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Anal. Non Linéaire*, 26(2):477–496, 2009.
- [37] S. Terracini, N. Tzvetkov, and N. Visciglia. The nonlinear Schrödinger equation ground states on product spaces. *Analysis & PDE*, 7(1):73–96, 2014.
- [38] Y. Yamazaki. Transverse instability for a system of nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., Ser. B*, 19(2):565–588, 2014.
- [39] Y. Yamazaki. Stability of line standing waves near the bifurcation point for nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Kodai Math. J.*, 38(1):65–96, 2015.

STEFAN LE COZ AND BORIS SHAKAROV, UNIV TOULOUSE, INUC, UT2J, INSA TOULOUSE, TSE, CNRS, IMT, TOULOUSE, FRANCE.

Email address: stefan.le-coz@math.univ-toulouse.fr

Email address: boris.shakarov@math.univ-toulouse.fr