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#### Abstract

Our first result is a change of variables which transforms radial $k$ Hessian equations into radial $p$-Laplace equations. Then we generalize the classical results of D.D. Joseph and T.S. Lundgren [9] by using the method we developed in [12] and [13]. We provide a considerably simpler approach, which yields additional information on the Morse index of solutions.
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## 1 Introduction

J. Jacobsen and K. Schmitt [8] considered a class of radial quasilinear elliptic equations on the unit ball

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(r^{\alpha}\left|u^{\prime}(r)\right|^{\beta} u^{\prime}(r)\right)^{\prime}+r^{\gamma} f(u)=0, \quad u^{\prime}(0)=u(1)=0 \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with parameters $\alpha, \beta$ and $\gamma$. This class of equations includes: the Laplacian, in case $\alpha=n-1, \beta=0, \gamma=n-1, p$-Laplacian $(p>1)$, for $\alpha=n-1$, $\beta=p-2, \gamma=n-1$, and $k$-Hessian in case $\alpha=n-k, \beta=k-1, \gamma=n-1$, where $n$ is the dimension of the space, and $1 \leq k \leq n$ is an integer. Recall that the $k$-Hessian is defined as the sum of all principal $k \times k$ minors of the Hessian matrix $D^{2} u$. So that 1-Hessian is $\Delta u$, and $n$-Hessian is $\operatorname{det} D^{2} u$, the Monge-Ampere operator. The paper of J. Sánchez and V. Vergara [20] has a detailed exposition of $k$-Hessian equations, and the previous contributions
include L. Caffarelli et al [2], N.S. Trudinger and X.-J. Wang [21], J. Jacobsen [7], and J. Jacobsen and K. Schmitt [8].

Our first result is a change of variables which transforms the problem (1.2) into a Dirichlet problem for a $p$-Laplacian, with $p=\beta+2$, in $\frac{\theta}{q+1}+1$ dimensions, on another ball around the origin, of radius $(q+1)^{\frac{1}{q+1}}$, where $\theta$ and $q$ are defined below. In particular, one can reduce any $k$-Hessian equation to a $p$-Laplacian, and a class of non-autonomous $p$-Laplace equations to autonomous $p$-Laplace equations. This extends our previous result in [14].

Then we present exhaustive results on multiplicity of positive solutions, and global solution curves for ( $p>1, \alpha \geq 0$ )

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{r} u^{\prime}+\lambda r^{\alpha}(1+u)^{p}=0, \quad 0<r<1, u^{\prime}(0)=0, u(1)=0 \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

generalizing the classical results of D.D. Joseph and T.S. Lundgren [9], who considered the case $\alpha=0$. The approach in [9] was rather involved, and it relied on the old results of E. Hopf [6], and S. Chandrasekhar [3] (see p. 261 in [9]). We use a considerably simpler method, involving generating and guiding solutions, that we developed in [12] and [13]. In the present paper we further simplify and improve this method, particularly in the case when the solution curve is monotone, see Theorem 3.2 below. Our approach uses the self-similar nature of the problem (1.2), which allows parameterization of the entire solution curve, see [12] for the discussion. Singular solutions, arising as limits of the regular solutions, are easy to understand for selfsimilar problems, while for other equations with polynomial nonlinearities this issue is rather involved, see e.g., F. Merle and L.A. Peletier [16].

In the last section we use the generating and guiding solutions to show that all turning points of the problem are non-degenerate, and that the Morse index of solutions increases by one at each turning point, when one follows the solution curve of (1.2) in the direction of increasing $u(0)$. For the Gelfand problem, where $f(u)=e^{u}$, such a result was first proved in K. Nagasaki and T. Suzuki [17], and then in P. Korman [13], by using the generating and guiding solutions.

## 2 Reduction of $k$-Hessian equation to $p$-Laplacian

Similarly to J. Jacobsen and K. Schmitt [8], we consider the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(r^{\alpha}\left|u^{\prime}(r)\right|^{\beta} u^{\prime}(r)\right)^{\prime}+r^{\gamma} f(u)=0, u^{\prime}(0)=0 \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with parameters $\alpha, \beta$ and $\gamma$. We make a change of variables

$$
\begin{equation*}
t=\frac{r^{q+1}}{q+1} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $q$ to be chosen shortly. Clearly, $u_{r}=u_{t} r^{q}$, and we have

$$
\left(r^{\alpha+q(\beta+1)}\left|u_{t}\right|^{\beta} u_{t}\right)^{\prime}+r^{\gamma-q} f(u)=0 .
$$

We now choose $q$ to equalize the powers of $r$ :

$$
\begin{gather*}
\alpha+q(\beta+1)=\gamma-q \equiv \theta, \\
q=\frac{\gamma-\alpha}{\beta+2} . \tag{2.3}
\end{gather*}
$$

The common power $\theta$ is then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\theta=\frac{(\beta+1) \gamma+\alpha}{\beta+2} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(r^{\theta}\left|u_{t}\right|^{\beta} u_{t}\right)^{\prime}+r^{\theta} f(u)=0 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Theorem 2.1. Assume that $f(u(0))>0, \beta+1>0$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma>\alpha-\beta-2 . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The change of variables (2.2), with $q$ given by (2.3), transforms the problem (2.1) into

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(t^{\frac{\theta}{q+1}}\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right|^{\beta} u^{\prime}(t)\right)^{\prime}+t^{\frac{\theta}{q+1}} f(u)=0, u^{\prime}(0)=0 \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

i.e., into $(\beta+2)$-Laplacian in $\frac{\theta}{q+1}+1$ dimensions.

Proof: Replacing in (2.5), $r=(q+1)^{\frac{1}{q+1}} t^{\frac{1}{q+1}}$, and using primes to denote the derivatives in $t$, we obtain the equation in (2.7).

Since $u^{\prime}(r)<0$ for small $r>0$, and $\beta+1>0$, we express from (2.1)

$$
\left(-u^{\prime}(r)\right)^{\beta+1}=\frac{1}{r^{\alpha}} \int_{0}^{r} z^{\gamma} f(u(z)) d z
$$

Using again that $\beta+1>0$, we have (observe that $r \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, since $q+1>0$, by (2.6))

$$
-\frac{d u}{d t}(0)=\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{-u^{\prime}(r)}{r^{q}}=\lim _{r \rightarrow 0}\left[\frac{\left(-u^{\prime}(r)\right)^{\beta+1}}{r^{q(\beta+1)}}\right]^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}}
$$

and

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\left(-u^{\prime}(r)\right)^{\beta+1}}{r^{q(\beta+1)}}=\lim _{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{r^{\alpha+q(\beta+1)}} \int_{0}^{r} z^{\gamma} f(u(z)) d z=0,
$$

since $\gamma>\alpha+q(\beta+1)-1$, by (2.6).
In particular the $k$-Hessian equation is transformed into (2.7), with $\beta=$ $k-1$, and $\frac{\theta}{q+1}=\frac{k(n-2)+n}{2 k}$, i.e., into a $p$-Laplace equation, with $p=\beta+2=$ $k+1$, in $\frac{\theta}{q+1}+1=\frac{k n+n}{2 k}$ dimensions.

Radial solutions of (here $s>-1$ is a real parameter)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta u+r^{s} f(u)=0, u^{\prime}(0)=0 \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

in $n$ dimensions satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(r^{n-1} u^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}+r^{n+s-1} f(u)=0, \quad u^{\prime}(0)=0 . \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

The change of variables (2.2) becomes $t=\frac{r^{s / 2+1}}{s / 2+1}$, and it transforms (2.9) into

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(t^{m-1} u^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}+t^{m-1} f(u)=0, \frac{d u}{d t}(0)=0 \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $m=\frac{n+s}{s / 2+1}$. This corresponds to $\Delta u+f(u)=0$ in $m$ dimensions. So that the non-autonomous term $r^{s}$ in (2.8) got removed (with the dimension changing to $m$ ). We first proved this result in [14].

## 3 A generalization of a result of Joseph and Lundgren

By the classical theorem of B. Gidas, W.-M. Ni and L. Nirenberg [5], all positive solutions of the Dirichlet problem (here $u=u(x), x \in R^{n}$ )

$$
\Delta u+\lambda(1+u)^{p}=0 \text { for }|x|<1, \quad u=0 \text { when }|x|=1
$$

are radially symmetric, i.e., $u=u(r), r=|x|$, and they satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{r} u^{\prime}+\lambda(1+u)^{p}=0 \text { for } 0<r<1, u^{\prime}(0)=0, u(1)=0 . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $\lambda$ is a positive parameter, $p>1$ a constant. Similarly to J.A. Pelesko [19], we set $v=1+u$, followed by $v=a w$, and $t=b r$, where $a=v(0)=$ $1+u(0)$. The constants $a$ and $b$ are assumed to satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda=\frac{b^{2}}{a^{p-1}} . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then (3.1) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{t} w^{\prime}+w^{p}=0, \quad w(0)=1, \quad w^{\prime}(0)=0 . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The solution of this problem is easily seen to be a decreasing function, going to zero. In case of sub-critical $p, 1<p<\frac{n+2}{n-2}$, it is known that $w(t)$ vanishes at some $t_{0}>0$, since the Dirichlet problem for the equation in (3.3) has a (unique) solution on any ball (as follows by the mountain pass lemma). If $p \geq \frac{n+2}{n-2}$, then $w(t)$ has no roots on $(0, \infty)$, which follows by Pohozhaev's identity (also a well known fact). Once we compute $w(t)$ from (3.3), $u(r)=-1+a w(b r)$, and since $u(1)=0$, we have

$$
1=a w(b),
$$

so that $a=\frac{1}{w(b)}$, and then $\lambda=b^{2} w^{p-1}(b)$. The global solution curve is

$$
(\lambda, u(0))=\left(b^{2} w^{p-1}(b),-1+\frac{1}{w(b)}\right),
$$

parameterized by $b \in\left(0, t_{0}\right)$ in the sub-critical case, and $b \in(0, \infty)$ for the super-critical and critical cases. The solution of (3.1) at the parameter value of $b$ is

$$
u(r)=a w(b r)-1=\frac{w(b r)}{w(b)}-1
$$

It will be convenient to use the letter $t$ instead of $b$ as the parameter. So that the global solution curve for $p \geq \frac{n+2}{n-2}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\lambda, u(0))=\left(t^{2} w^{p-1}(t),-1+\frac{1}{w(t)}\right), \quad t \in[0, \infty), \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the solution of (3.1) at the parameter value of $t$ is $u(r)=\frac{w(t r)}{w(t)}-1$, where $w(t)$ is the solution of (3.3).

In particular, $\lambda=\lambda(t)=t^{2} w^{p-1}(t)$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda^{\prime}(t)=t w^{p-2}\left[2 w+(p-1) t w^{\prime}\right], \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that the solution curve travels to the right (left) in the $(\lambda, u(0))$ plane if $2 w+(p-1) t w^{\prime}>0(<0)$. The turning points correspond to the roots of the function $2 w+(p-1) t w^{\prime}$. If we set this function to zero

$$
2 w+(p-1) t w^{\prime}=0,
$$

then the general solution of this equation is

$$
w(t)=c t^{-\beta}, \quad \text { with } \beta=\frac{2}{p-1} .
$$

If we choose

$$
c=c_{0}=[\beta(n-1)-\beta(\beta+1)]^{\frac{1}{p-1}},
$$

then $w_{0}(t)=c_{0} t^{-\beta}$ is also a solution of the equation in (3.3), and the issue turns out to be how many times $w(t)$ and $w_{0}(t)$ cross as $t \rightarrow \infty$, as the following lemma shows.

Lemma 3.1. Assume that $w(t)$ and $w_{0}(t)$ intersect infinitely many times. Then the solution curve of (3.1) makes infinitely many turns.

Proof: Let $\left\{t_{n}\right\}$ denote the points of intersection. At $\left\{t_{n}\right\}$ 's, $w(t)$ and $w_{0}(t)$ have different slopes (by uniqueness for initial value problems). Since $2 w_{0}\left(t_{n}\right)+(p-1) t_{n} w_{0}^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)=0$, it follows that $2 w\left(t_{n}\right)+(p-1) t_{n} w^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)>0$ $(<0)$ if $w(t)$ intersects $w_{0}(t)$ from below (above) at $t_{n}$. Hence, on any interval $\left(t_{n}, t_{n+1}\right)$ there is a point $t_{0}$, where $2 w\left(t_{0}\right)+(p-1) t_{0} w^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=0$, i.e., $\lambda^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=0$, and $t_{0}$ is a critical point. Since $\lambda^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)$ and $\lambda^{\prime}\left(t_{n+1}\right)$ have different signs, the solution curve changes its direction over $\left(t_{n}, t_{n+1}\right)$.

Using the terminology from [12], $w(t)$ is called the generating solution, while $w_{0}(t)$ is the guiding solution.

The linearized equation for (3.3) is

$$
z^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{t} z^{\prime}+p w^{p-1} z=0 .
$$

At $w=w_{0}(t)$, the linearized equation becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
z^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{t} z^{\prime}+p \gamma \frac{1}{t^{2}} z=0, \text { with } \gamma=\beta(n-1)-\beta(\beta+1) . \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is Euler's equation. The roots of its characteristic equation are

$$
r=\frac{-(n-2) \pm \sqrt{(n-2)^{2}-4 p \gamma}}{2} .
$$

If $(n-2)^{2}-4 p \gamma<0$, the roots are complex, the fundamental solution set of (3.6) consists of $t^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \cos (\omega \ln t)$ and $t^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \sin (\omega \ln t)$, with $(n-2)^{2}-4 p \gamma \equiv$ $-4 \omega^{2}$, and it is natural to expect that $w(t)-w_{0}(t)$ changes sign infinitely many times, and then the solution curve makes infinitely many turns. By the result of P. Korman [10], this may happen only if $p>\frac{n+2}{n-2}$.

Lemma 3.2. Assume that $p>\frac{n+2}{n-2}$. Then $(n-2)^{2}-4 p \gamma<0$ if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{4 p}{p-1}+4 \sqrt{\frac{p}{p-1}}>n-2 . \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof: We have

$$
(n-2)^{2}-4 p \gamma=(n-2)^{2}-4 p \beta(n-2)+4 p \beta^{2}<0
$$

provided that $n-2$ lies between the roots of this quadratic, i.e.,

$$
\frac{4 p}{p-1}-4 \sqrt{\frac{p}{p-1}}<n-2<\frac{4 p}{p-1}+4 \sqrt{\frac{p}{p-1}} .
$$

The condition $p>\frac{n+2}{n-2}$ implies that $n>\frac{2 p+2}{p-1}$. Then

$$
n-2>\frac{4}{p-1}>\frac{4 p}{p-1}-4 \sqrt{\frac{p}{p-1}},
$$

completing the proof.
Observe that the left hand side of (3.7) is a decreasing function, tending to 8 as $p \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that in dimensions $2<n \leq 10$ the condition (3.7) holds for all $p>1$.

The following result is known as Bihari's inequality.
Lemma 3.3. Assume that the functions $a(t) \geq 0$, and $u(t) \geq 0$ are continuous for $t \geq t_{0}$, and we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(t) \leq C+\int_{t_{0}}^{t} a(s) u^{m}(s) d s, \text { for } t \geq t_{0} \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

with some constants $C>0$ and $m>1$. Assume also that

$$
C^{1-m}-(m-1) \int_{t_{0}}^{t} a(s) d s>0, \text { for } t \geq t_{0}
$$

Then

$$
u(t) \leq \frac{1}{\left[C^{1-m}-(m-1) \int_{t_{0}}^{t} a(s) d s\right]^{\frac{1}{m-1}}}, \text { for } t \geq t_{0}
$$

Proof: Denote the right hand side of (3.8) by $w(t)$. Then $w\left(t_{0}\right)=C$, and

$$
w^{\prime}=a(t) u^{m} \leq a(t) w^{m}
$$

Divide by $w^{m}$, and integrate over $\left(t_{0}, t\right)$.

Lemma 3.4. Assume that $p>\frac{n+2}{n-2}, n \geq 3$, and in case $n>10$ assume additionally that (3.7) holds. The general solution of

$$
y^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{t} y^{\prime}+\frac{p \gamma}{t^{2}} y=f(t)
$$

is

$$
y(t)=C t^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \sin (\omega \ln t+D)+\frac{1}{\omega} t^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \int_{t_{0}}^{t} \sin \left(\omega \ln \frac{t}{s}\right) s^{\frac{n}{2}} f(s) d s
$$

with $(n-2)^{2}-4 p \gamma \equiv-4 \omega^{2}$, for any constant $t_{0}$ fixed, and arbitrary constants $C$ and $D$.

Proof: By Lemma 3.2, the fundamental set of the corresponding homogeneous equation consists of $y_{1}(t)=t^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \cos (\omega \ln t)$ and $y_{2}(t)=t^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \sin (\omega \ln t)$. Compute their Wronskian $W\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)=\omega t^{1-n}$, and apply the method of variation of parameters.

The following result is known, see e.g., J. Dávila et al [4]. Our proof is a little different from the usual one, in that we avoid the language of heteroclinic connections.

Lemma 3.5. Assume that $p>\frac{n+2}{n-2}$, and let $w(r)$ and $w_{0}(r)$ be as above.
Then $\lim _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{w(r)}{w_{0}(r)}=1$.
Proof: In the initial value problem determining $w(r)$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{r} y^{\prime}+y^{p}=0, \quad y(0)=1, y^{\prime}(0)=0, \quad r>0 \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

we make a change of variables $y(r)=w_{0}(r) v(r)$, followed by $r=e^{t}$. Then $v(t)$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
v^{\prime \prime}+a v^{\prime}-\gamma\left(v-v^{p}\right)=0, \quad v(-\infty)=v^{\prime}(-\infty)=0, \quad t \in(-\infty, \infty), \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $a=-2 \beta+n-2>0$, and as above $\gamma=\beta(n-\beta-2)>0$. (Since $v=$ $\frac{1}{c_{0}} r^{\beta} y$, we have $\left.\frac{d v}{d t}\right|_{t=-\infty}=\left.\frac{d v}{d r} \frac{d r}{d t}\right|_{t=-\infty}=\left.\frac{1}{c_{0}}\left[\beta r^{\beta-1} y(r)+r^{\beta} y^{\prime}(r)\right] r\right|_{r=0}=$ 0 .) We need to show that $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} v(t)=1$. Since the energy

$$
E(t)=\frac{1}{2} v^{\prime 2}-\gamma\left(\frac{v^{2}}{2}-\frac{v^{p+1}}{p+1}\right)
$$

is decreasing along the solution of (3.10), it follows that $v(t)$ is bounded, and it cannot tend to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. (Observe that $E(-\infty)=0$, and hence $E(t)<0$ for all $t$.) From the equation (3.10), $v(t)>0$ can have local minimums only if $0<v<1$, and local maximums only if $v>1$, and it can tend only to 1 , as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, either $v(t)$ tends to 1 monotonously, or it oscillates infinitely often around 1 . We show next that in the latter case $v(t)$ also tends to 1 .

Let $v-1=z$. By our assumption, $z(t)$ has infinitely many roots, $-1<z<z_{0}$, for some $z_{0}>0$, and it satisfies

$$
z^{\prime \prime}+a z^{\prime}+\gamma f(z)=0
$$

where $f(z)$ behaves like $z+z^{2}$ on $\left(-1, z_{0}\right)$, to which $f(z)$ is equal in case $p=2$. The energy $\bar{E}(t)=\frac{1}{2} z^{\prime 2}+\gamma F(z)$, where $F(z)=\int_{0}^{z} f(t) d t$, is positive for $z>-1$, and decreasing, since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{E}^{\prime}(t)=-a z^{\prime 2} \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $E_{0}=\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{E}(t) \geq 0$. Assume that $E_{0}>0$. If $t_{k}$ are the roots of $z(t)$, then $\left|z^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right)\right|$ get arbitrarily close to $\sqrt{2 E_{0}}$, for $k$ large. From the equation (3.10), we get a bound on $\left|z^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{k}\right)\right|$. Hence, $\left|z^{\prime}(t)\right|$ cannot change fast, so that we can find an interval of fixed length $\left(t_{k}, t_{k}+\theta\right)$ on which $\left|z^{\prime}(t)\right|>\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2 E_{0}}$, independently of $k$. Integrating (3.11), we conclude that $\bar{E}(t)$ drops by at least $\frac{\theta}{2} \sqrt{2 E_{0}}$ for each $k$, and eventually $E(t)$ drops below $E_{0}$, a contradiction. Hence, $E_{0}=0$.

Let $\tau_{k}$ be the point of maximum (minimum) of $z(t)$ on $\left(t_{k}, t_{k+1}\right)$. Then $F\left(z\left(\tau_{k}\right)\right)=\bar{E}\left(\tau_{k}\right) \rightarrow 0$, proving that $z(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

## Remarks

1. For $p=\frac{n+2}{n-2}$, the lemma does not hold (the proof breaks down since $a=0$ in (3.10)). In that case, the generating solution, i.e., the solution of (3.3) is well-known to be $w(r)=\frac{1}{\left(1+\frac{1}{n(n-2)} r^{2}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}}$. In standard terminology, $w(r)$ has slow decay for $p>\frac{n+2}{n-2}$, and fast decay at $p=$ $\frac{n+2}{n-2}$.
2. The transformation $y=w_{0} v$ is equivalent to the classical Fowler transformation $w=t^{-\frac{2}{p-1}} v$. So that the Fowler transformation can be seen as the extension of the elementary "reduction of order" method, when one of the solutions (here $w_{0}(t)$ ) is known.

Theorem 3.1. Assume that $p>\frac{n+2}{n-2}, n \geq 3$, and in case $n>10$ assume additionally that (3.7) holds. Then the solution curve of (3.1) makes infinitely many turns. Moreover, the problem (3.1) has infinitely many solutions at $\lambda=\gamma=\beta(n-1)-\beta(\beta+1)$, with $\beta=\frac{2}{p-1}$, and at most finitely many solutions at other $\lambda$ 's. As $u(0) \rightarrow \infty$, the solutions of (3.1) tend to $r^{-\beta}-1$, for $r \neq 0$, which is a singular solution of (3.1).

Proof: By Lemma 3.2, the roots of the characteristic equation of (3.6) are $-\frac{n-2}{2} \pm i \omega$, with $(n-2)^{2}-4 p \gamma=-4 \omega^{2}$. We will show that $y(t) \equiv w(t)-w_{0}(t)$ has infinitely many roots. This will follow from the following asymptotic formula

$$
\begin{equation*}
t^{\frac{n-2}{2}} y(t)=C \sin (\omega \ln t+D)+O\left(t^{-n / 2+3-\beta(p-2)}\right), \quad \text { as } t \rightarrow \infty, \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

with some constants $C \neq 0$ and $D$, and with $-n / 2+3-\beta(p-2)<0$.
The function $y(t)$ satisfies

$$
y^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{t} y^{\prime}+p w_{0}^{p-1} y=f(t),
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{t} y^{\prime}+\frac{p \gamma}{t^{2}} y=f(t), \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f(t)=-\left[\left(y(t)+w_{0}(t)\right)^{p}-w_{0}^{p}(t)-p w_{0}^{p-1}(t) y(t)\right]$. Using Lemma 3.4, the general solution of (3.13) is

$$
\begin{equation*}
y(t)=C t^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \sin (\omega \ln t+D)+\frac{1}{\omega} t^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \int_{t_{0}}^{t} \sin \left(\omega \ln \frac{t}{s}\right) s^{\frac{n}{2}} f(s) d s . \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

We claim that for large $t$

$$
\begin{equation*}
|f(t)| \leq c_{1} \omega t^{-\beta(p-2)} y^{2}, \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

with some constant $c_{1}>0$. Indeed, by the two-term Taylor's formula with a remainder term

$$
-f(t)=\frac{p(p-1)}{2}\left[\theta w(t)+(1-\theta) w_{0}(t)\right]^{p-2} y^{2} \leq \hat{c} w_{0}^{p-2} y^{2},
$$

with some $\theta \in(0,1)$ and $\hat{c}>0$, giving (3.15). (We estimated $w(t)$ by a multiple of $w_{0}$ from above (below), in case $p \geq 2$ ( $p<2$ ), using Lemma 3.5.)

Setting $v(t) \equiv t^{\frac{n-2}{2}}|y(t)|$, we estimate from (3.14)

$$
\begin{equation*}
v(t) \leq|C|+c_{1} \int_{t_{0}}^{t} s^{-n / 2+2-\beta(p-2)} v^{2}(s) d s . \tag{3.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $p>\frac{n+2}{n-2}$, it follows that

$$
-n / 2+2-\beta(p-2)<-1 .
$$

By Bihari's inequality (Lemma 3.3)

$$
\begin{equation*}
v(t) \leq \frac{1}{|C|^{-1}-c_{1} \int_{t_{0}}^{t} s^{-n / 2+2-\beta(p-2)} d s} \leq \frac{1}{c_{2}}, \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $t_{0}$ chosen large enough, so that $|C|^{-1}-c_{1} \int_{t_{0}}^{t} s^{-n / 2+2-\beta(p-2)} d s>c_{2}>0$ for all $t>t_{0}$, and some constant $c_{2}$. By (3.14),

$$
y(t)=C t^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \sin (\omega \ln t+D)-\frac{1}{\omega} t^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \int_{t}^{t_{1}} \sin \left(\omega \ln \frac{t}{s}\right) s^{\frac{n}{2}} f(s) d s
$$

gives for $t<t_{1}$, with $t_{1}$ large and fixed, the unique solution of (3.13), which satisfies the appropriate initial conditions at $t_{1}$ (equal to the right hand side and its derivative evaluated at $t_{1}$ ). This solution is written using an integral of itself. Then

$$
t^{\frac{n-2}{2}} y(t)=C \sin (\omega \ln t+D)-\frac{1}{\omega} \int_{t}^{t_{1}} \sin \left(\omega \ln \frac{t}{s}\right) s^{\frac{n}{2}} f(s) d s
$$

and using (3.17) we estimate, for $t$ large,

$$
\left|-\int_{t}^{t_{1}} \sin \left(\omega \ln \frac{t}{s}\right) s^{\frac{n}{2}} f(s) d s\right| \leq c_{1} \int_{t}^{t_{1}} s^{-n / 2+2-\beta(p-2)} v^{2}(s) d s
$$

$$
\leq \frac{c_{1}}{c_{2}^{2}} \int_{t}^{t_{1}} s^{-n / 2+2-\beta(p-2)} d s=O\left(t^{-n / 2+3-\beta(p-2)}\right)=o(1)
$$

proving (3.12). Hence, $w(t)$ and $w_{0}(t)$ have infinitely many points of intersection, and by Lemma 3.1, the solution curve makes infinitely many turns.

Turning to the other claims, for large $t$, we have, by Lemma 3.5, $u(r)=$ $\frac{w(t r)}{w(t)}-1 \sim \frac{w_{0}(t r)}{w_{0}(t)}-1=r^{-\beta}-1$, which is the singular solution of (3.1), and $\lambda=t^{2} w^{p-1} \sim t^{2} w_{0}^{p-1}=\gamma$, gives the vertical asymptote of the solution curve of (3.1).
Remark In case $n \geq 11$, define $p_{0}$ as the solution of

$$
f(p) \equiv \frac{4 p}{p-1}+4 \sqrt{\frac{p}{p-1}}=n-2 .
$$

The function $f(p)$ is decreasing, $f\left(\frac{n+2}{n-2}\right)>n-2$, so that $\frac{n+2}{n-2}<p_{0}$, and the theorem requires that

$$
\frac{n+2}{n-2}<p<p_{0} .
$$

To treat the case when the condition (3.7) fails, we need the following elementary lemmas.

Lemma 3.6. Let the functions $y(r)$ and $z(r)$ of class $C^{2}[0, \infty)$ satisfy

$$
\begin{gather*}
y^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{r} y^{\prime}+a(r) y=0  \tag{3.18}\\
z^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{r} z^{\prime}+a(r) z>0  \tag{3.19}\\
0<y\left(r_{0}\right)=z\left(r_{0}\right), y^{\prime}\left(r_{0}\right)=z^{\prime}\left(r_{0}\right) \text { at some } r_{0}>0 \tag{3.20}
\end{gather*}
$$

for some $a(r) \in C[0, \infty)$. Assume that $y(r)>0$ on $\left(r_{0}, \infty\right)$. Then $z(r)>0$ on $\left(r_{0}, \infty\right)$.
Proof: Assuming the contrary, let $r_{1}>r_{0}$ be the first root of $z(r)$. From (3.18) and (3.19) we get

$$
\left[r^{n-1}\left(z^{\prime} y-z y^{\prime}\right)\right]^{\prime}>0 \text { on }\left(r_{0}, r_{1}\right) .
$$

Integrating over $\left(r_{0}, r_{1}\right)$, we get

$$
r_{1}^{n-1} z^{\prime}\left(r_{1}\right) y\left(r_{1}\right)>0,
$$

which is a contradiction.

Lemma 3.7. Consider the function $y(r)=\alpha r^{s_{1}}+\beta r^{s_{2}}$, with constants $s_{1}<$ $s_{2}<0$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that at some $r_{0}>0$ we have $y\left(r_{0}\right)=A>0$, $y^{\prime}\left(r_{0}\right)=B<0$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
B-A \frac{s_{1}}{r_{0}}>0 \tag{3.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $y(r)>0$ for $r>r_{0}$.
Proof: Write

$$
y(r)=c_{1}\left(\frac{r}{r_{0}}\right)^{s_{1}}+c_{2}\left(\frac{r}{r_{0}}\right)^{s_{2}}=\left(\frac{r}{r_{0}}\right)^{s_{1}}\left[c_{1}+c_{2}\left(\frac{r}{r_{0}}\right)^{s_{2}-s_{1}}\right]
$$

with $c_{1}=\alpha r_{0}^{s_{1}}$ and $c_{2}=\beta r_{0}^{s_{2}}$. We have $s_{2}-s_{1}>0$, and the proof will follow if $c_{2}>0$. (We have $y\left(r_{0}\right)>0$, and if $y(r)$ has a root, it lies to the left of $r_{0}$.) Since

$$
\begin{gathered}
y\left(r_{0}\right)=c_{1}+c_{2}=A \\
y^{\prime}\left(r_{0}\right)=\frac{s_{1}}{r_{0}} c_{1}+\frac{s_{2}}{r_{0}} c_{2}=B
\end{gathered}
$$

it follows that

$$
c_{2}=\left(B-A \frac{s_{1}}{r_{0}}\right) \frac{r_{0}}{s_{2}-s_{1}}>0
$$

in view of (3.21).
Theorem 3.2. Assume that $p>\frac{n+2}{n-2}, n \geq 11$, and assume that (3.7) fails, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{4 p}{p-1}+4 \sqrt{\frac{p}{p-1}} \leq n-2 \tag{3.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then the solution curve of (3.1) is monotone increasing in the $(\lambda, u(0))$ plane, i.e., $\lambda^{\prime}(t)>0$ for all $t>0$. Moreover, $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(t)=\gamma=\beta(n-$ 1) $-\beta(\beta+1)$, with $\beta=\frac{2}{p-1}$. It follows that that the problem (3.1) has a unique positive solution for $\lambda<\gamma$, and no positive solution for $\lambda \geq \gamma$. As $u(0) \rightarrow \infty$, the solutions of (3.1) tend to $r^{-\beta}-1$, for $r \neq 0$, which is $a$ singular solution of (3.1).
Proof: Assume that the inequality in (3.22) is strict, the case of equality is similar. The roots of the characteristic equation of (3.6) are now real and negative

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{1}=\frac{-(n-2)-\sqrt{(n-2)^{2}-4 p \gamma}}{2}<s_{2}=\frac{-(n-2)+\sqrt{(n-2)^{2}-4 p \gamma}}{2} \tag{3.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

We claim that the generating and guiding solutions satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
w(r)<w_{0}(r) \text { for all } r>0 . \tag{3.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $z(r)=w_{0}(r)-w(r)$. We wish to show that $z(r)>0$ for all $r>0$. We have

$$
z^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{r} z^{\prime}+p w_{0}^{p-1} z=w^{p}-w_{0}^{p}-p w_{0}^{p-1}\left(w-w_{0}\right)>0 .
$$

Denote $A=A\left(r_{0}\right)=w_{0}\left(r_{0}\right)-w\left(r_{0}\right)$, and $B=B\left(r_{0}\right)=w_{0}^{\prime}\left(r_{0}\right)-w^{\prime}\left(r_{0}\right)$. Let $y(r)$ be the solution of

$$
y^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{r} y^{\prime}+p w_{0}^{p-1} y=0, \quad y\left(r_{0}\right)=A, \quad y^{\prime}\left(r_{0}\right)=B,
$$

so that $y(r)=\alpha r^{s_{1}}+\beta r^{s_{2}}$, with some constants $\alpha, \beta$, and $s_{1}<s_{2}<0$ as in (3.23). To apply Lemma 3.7, we shall find $r_{0}>0$ small, so that $A>0$, $B<0$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{r_{0} B\left(r_{0}\right)}{A\left(r_{0}\right)}>s_{1} \tag{3.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recalling that $w_{0}(r)=c_{0} r^{-\beta}$, with $\beta=\frac{2}{p-1}$, and $c_{0}$ as above, we rewrite (3.25) as

$$
\frac{-c_{0} \beta-r_{0}^{\beta+1} w^{\prime}\left(r_{0}\right)}{c_{0}-r_{0}^{\beta} w\left(r_{0}\right)}>s_{1} .
$$

This will hold for sufficiently small $r_{0}$, provided that

$$
\frac{-c_{0} \beta}{c_{0}}>s_{1}=\frac{-(n-2)-\sqrt{(n-2)^{2}-4 p \gamma}}{2} .
$$

The last inequality follows from $\beta=\frac{2}{p-1}<\frac{n-2}{2}$, which is in turn equivalent to $p>\frac{n+2}{n-2}$. By Lemma 3.7, $y(r)>0$ for $r>r_{0}$, and then by Lemma 3.6, $w(r)<w_{0}(r)$ for $r>r_{0}$, and since $r_{0}$ can be chosen arbitrarily small, (3.24) is justified.

By (3.5) we have $\lambda^{\prime}(t)>0$ for all $t>0$, provided that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2}{p-1}+\frac{t w^{\prime}(t)}{w(t)}>0, \quad \text { for all } t>0 \tag{3.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recall that $w(t)$ and $w_{0}(t)$ are both solutions of $w^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{t} w^{\prime}+w^{p}=0$. Writing this equation at $w(t)$ and at $w_{0}(t)$, we conclude, in view of (3.24),

$$
\left[t^{n-1}\left(w_{0}^{\prime} w-w_{0} w^{\prime}\right)\right]^{\prime}=w_{0} w\left(w^{p-1}-w_{0}^{p-1}\right)<0, \quad \text { for all } t>0 .
$$

The function $q(t) \equiv t^{n-1}\left(w_{0}^{\prime} w-w_{0} w^{\prime}\right)$ satisfies $q(0)=0$ (observe that $n-$ $1>\beta+1$ ), and $q^{\prime}(t)<0$. It follows that $q(t)<0$, or that $\frac{w^{\prime}(t)}{w(t)}>\frac{w_{0}^{\prime}(t)}{w_{0}(t)}$ for all $t>0$. Then

$$
\frac{2}{p-1}+\frac{t w^{\prime}(t)}{w(t)}>\frac{2}{p-1}+\frac{t w_{0}^{\prime}(t)}{w_{0}(t)}=0
$$

justifying (3.26), and so the solution curve is monotone.
Turning to the other claims, for large $t$, we have, by Lemma 3.5, $u(r)=$ $\frac{w(t r)}{w(t)}-1 \sim \frac{w_{0}(t r)}{w_{0}(t)}-1=r^{-\beta}-1$, and $\lambda=t^{2} w^{p-1} \sim t^{2} w_{0}^{p-1}=\gamma$, while using (3.24), $\lambda(t)=t^{2} w^{p-1}<t^{2} w_{0}^{p-1}=\gamma$, for all $t>0$.

We now consider the problem (3.1) for the critical and sub-critical cases, $p \leq \frac{n+2}{n-2}$. For $p=\frac{n+2}{n-2}$, the generating solution, i.e., the solution of (3.3) is well-known:

$$
w(t)=\frac{1}{\left(1+\frac{1}{n(n-2)} t^{2}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}},
$$

see e.g., [14] for the references. In view of (3.4), the global solution curve of

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{r} u^{\prime}+\lambda(1+u)^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}=0 \text { for } 0<r<1, u^{\prime}(0)=0, u(1)=0
$$

is given explicitly by

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\lambda, u(0))=\left(\frac{t^{2}}{\left(1+\frac{1}{n(n-2)} t^{2}\right)^{2}},\left(1+\frac{1}{n(n-2)} t^{2}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}-1\right) \tag{3.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $t \in[0, \infty)$ (observe that here $p-1=\frac{4}{n-2}$ ).
Theorem 3.3. Consider the problem

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{r} u^{\prime}+\lambda(1+u)^{p}=0 \quad \text { for } 0<r<1, u^{\prime}(0)=0, \quad u(1)=0,
$$

with $p \leq \frac{n+2}{n-2}$. All positive solutions lie on a single smooth solution curve, which begins at $(\lambda=0, u=0)$, and makes exactly one turn to the left at some $\lambda_{0}>0$, tending to infinity as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.
Proof: In case $p<\frac{n+2}{n-2}$, this is Theorem 2.20 in [11]. For $p=\frac{n+2}{n-2}$, the result follows from the representation (3.27), particularly from

$$
\lambda(t)=\left[\frac{t}{1+\frac{1}{n(n-2)} t^{2}}\right]^{2},
$$

which shows that $\lambda(t)$ has a unique point of maximum, and tends to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. One can explicitly compute $\lambda_{0}=\frac{n(n-2)}{4}$.

We now consider the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{r} u^{\prime}+\lambda r^{s}(1+u)^{p}=0, \quad 0<r<1, u^{\prime}(0)=0, u(1)=0 . \tag{3.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

We shall assume that the constant $p>0$, while the case $p<0$ we considered in [12] and [13], in the context of so called MEMS problems. Our result will allow $s<0$, under some conditions, i.e., singular problems. The following is the main result of this section, which for $s=0$ was proved in D.D. Joseph and T.S. Lundgren [9].

Theorem 3.4. Assume that $n \geq 1$. Define $m=\frac{n+s}{s / 2+1}, f(p)=\frac{4 p}{p-1}+$ $4 \sqrt{\frac{p}{p-1}}$, and assume that $m \geq 1$.
(i) If $0<p<1$, the problem (3.28) has a unique positive solution for any $0<\lambda<\infty$.
(ii) If $1<p \leq \frac{m+2}{m-2}$, then there is a critical $\lambda_{0}>0$ so that the problem (3.28) has exactly two positive solutions for $\lambda \in\left(0, \lambda_{0}\right)$, exactly one positive solution at $\lambda=\lambda_{0}$, and no solutions for $\lambda>\lambda_{0}$.
(iii) If $p>\frac{m+2}{m-2}$ and $f(p)>m-2$, then the solution curve of (3.28) makes infinitely many turns. Moreover, the problem (3.28) has infinitely many solutions at $\lambda=\bar{\gamma} \equiv(s / 2+1)^{-2}[\beta(m-1)-\beta(\beta+1)]$, with $\beta=\frac{2}{p-1}$, and at most finitely many solutions at other $\lambda$ 's.
(iv) If $p>\frac{m+2}{m-2}$ and $f(p) \leq m-2$, then the solution curve of (3.28) is monotone increasing in the $(\lambda, u(0))$ plane. Moreover, $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(t)=\bar{\gamma}$, $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} u(0)=\infty$. It follows that the problem (3.28) has a unique positive solution for $\lambda<\bar{\gamma}$, and no positive solution for $\lambda \geq \bar{\gamma}$.
Proof: By above, see (2.9) and (2.10), the change of variables $t=\frac{r^{s / 2+1}}{s / 2+1}$, followed by $\tau=(s / 2+1) t$, and $\mu=(s / 2+1)^{2} \lambda$, transforms (3.28) into

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+\frac{m-1}{\tau} u^{\prime}+\mu(1+u)^{p}=0, \quad 0<\tau<1, u^{\prime}(0)=0, \quad u(1)=0,
$$

with $m=\frac{n+s}{s / 2+1}$. Then the result follows by the Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, while the case $0<p<1$ is well-known.

## 4 Morse index of solutions

We now use the generating and guiding solutions to show that all turning points of the problem (3.1) are non-degenerate, and that the Morse index of solutions increases by one at each turning point. We address the nondegeneracy first.

Theorem 4.1. Let $u\left(t_{n}\right)$ be a singular solution of (3.1), i.e., $\lambda^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)=0$. Then $u\left(t_{n}\right)$ is non-degenerate, i.e., $\lambda^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right) \neq 0$.

Proof: Recall that

$$
\lambda^{\prime}(t)=t w^{p-2}\left[2 w+(p-1) t w^{\prime}\right]
$$

Since $\lambda^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)=0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 w\left(t_{n}\right)+(p-1) t_{n} w^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)=0 \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right)=t_{n} w^{p-2}\left(t_{n}\right)\left[(p+1) w^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)+(p-1) t_{n} w^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right)\right], \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we need to show that

$$
S \equiv(p+1) w^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)+(p-1) t_{n} w^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right) \neq 0,
$$

to conclude that $\lambda^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right) \neq 0$. Using the equation (3.3), and then (4.1), we express

$$
\begin{align*}
& S=[p+1-(n-1)(p-1)] w^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)-(p-1) t_{n} w^{p}\left(t_{n}\right) \\
= & w\left(t_{n}\right)\left[-\frac{2[p+1-(n-1)(p-1)]}{(p-1) t_{n}}-(p-1) t_{n} w^{p-1}\left(t_{n}\right)\right] . \tag{4.3}
\end{align*}
$$

For the guiding solution $w_{0}(t)=c_{0} t^{-\beta}$, with $\beta=\frac{2}{p-1}$ and $c_{0}=[\beta(n-1)-\beta(\beta+1)]^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$, we have by a direct computation

$$
-\frac{2[p+1-(n-1)(p-1)]}{(p-1) t_{n}}-(p-1) t_{n} w_{0}^{p-1}\left(t_{n}\right)=0
$$

Observing that the quantity in the square bracket in (4.3) is a decreasing function of $w\left(t_{n}\right)$, we conclude that $S \neq 0$, once we show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
w\left(t_{n}\right) \neq w_{0}\left(t_{n}\right) \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

If, on the contrary, $w\left(t_{n}\right)=w_{0}\left(t_{n}\right)$, we conclude from (4.1) and the identity

$$
2 w_{0}\left(t_{n}\right)+(p-1) t_{n} w_{0}^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)=0
$$

that $w^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)=w_{0}^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)$, and then by the uniqueness for initial value problems $w(t)=w_{0}(t)$, a contradiction.

By C.S. Lin and W.-M. Ni [15], any solution of the linearized problem for (3.1) is radially symmetric, and hence it satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega^{\prime \prime}+\frac{n-1}{r} \omega^{\prime}+\lambda p(1+u)^{p-1} \omega=0,0<r<1, \quad \omega^{\prime}(0)=\omega(1)=0 . \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We call $u(r)$ a singular solution of (3.1) if the problem (4.5) has a non-trivial solution. (Differentiating (3.1) in $t$, and setting $t=t_{n}$, it is easy to see that a solution is singular if and only if $\lambda^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)=0$.) The following lemma gives explicitly any non-trivial solution of (4.5).

Lemma 4.1. Let $u(r)$ be a singular solution of (3.1). Then

$$
\omega(r)=r u^{\prime}(r)+\frac{2}{p-1} u(r)+\frac{2}{p-1} .
$$

gives a solution of (4.5).
Proof: The function $v(r) \equiv r u^{\prime}(r)+\frac{2}{p-1} u(r)+\frac{2}{p-1}$ solves the equation in (4.5), and we have $v^{\prime}(0)=\omega^{\prime}(0)=0, v(0)>0$. By scaling of $\omega(r)$, we may assume that $\omega(0)=v(0)$, and then by the uniqueness result for this type of initial value problems (see [18]), it follows that $\omega(r) \equiv v(r)$.

We now present the main result of this section for positive solutions of the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta u+\lambda(1+u)^{p}=0, \text { for }|x|<1, \quad u=0, \text { when }|x|=1 \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Theorem 4.2. Let $u\left(t_{n}\right)>0$ be a singular solution of (4.6), which means that the corresponding linearized problem (4.5) has non-trivial solutions, or that $\lambda^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)=0$. Then $u\left(t_{n}\right)$ is non-degenerate, i.e., $\lambda^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right) \neq 0$. Moreover, when one follows the solution curve of (4.6) in the direction of increasing $u(0)$, the Morse index of solution increases by one at each turn.

Proof: By [5] positive solutions of (4.6) are radially symmetric, and hence they satisfy (3.1). The Morse index of solution is the number of negative eigenvalues $\mu$ of

$$
\Delta \omega+\lambda p(1+u)^{p-1} \omega+\mu \omega=0, \text { for }|x|<1, \omega=0, \text { when }|x|=1 .
$$

By [15] solutions of this problem are radially symmetric. At a singular solution $\mu=0$, and then $\omega(r)=r u^{\prime}(r)+\frac{2}{p-1} u(r)+\frac{2}{p-1}$ by Lemma 4.1. Assume that at a singular solution $u\left(t_{n}\right), \mu\left(t_{n}\right)=0$ is the $k$-th eigenvalue. Following [17], we will show that $\mu^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)<0$, which means that for $t<t_{n}$ ( $t>t_{n}$ ) the $k$-th eigenvalue is positive (negative), i.e., the Morse index increases by one through $t=t_{n}$. We shall show that the sign of $\mu^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)$ is the same as that of $-\left(\lambda^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right)\right)^{2}$, which is negative by the Theorem 4.1. Denoting $f(u)=(1+u)^{p}$, recall the following known formulas, which also hold for general $f(u)$ (here $u=u\left(t_{n}\right), \omega$ is a solution of (4.5), and $B$ is the unit ball around the origin in $R^{n}$ ):

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mu^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right) \int_{B} \omega^{2} d x=-\lambda\left(t_{n}\right) \int_{B} f^{\prime \prime}(u) \omega^{3} d x \text { (p. } 11 \text { in [11]), } \\
\left.-\lambda\left(t_{n}\right) \int_{B} f^{\prime \prime}(u) \omega^{3} d x=\lambda^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right) \int_{B} f(u) \omega d x \text { (p. } 3 \text { in }[11]\right), \\
\int_{B} f(u) \omega d x=\frac{1}{2 \lambda\left(t_{n}\right)} u^{\prime}(1) \omega^{\prime}(1)(\text { p. } 5 \text { in }[11]) .
\end{gathered}
$$

Putting them together, we conclude

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right) \int_{B} \omega^{2} d x=\frac{\lambda^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right)}{2 \lambda\left(t_{n}\right)} u^{\prime}(1) \omega^{\prime}(1) \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

By Lemma 4.1,

$$
\omega^{\prime}(1)=\frac{p+1}{p-1} u^{\prime}(1)+u^{\prime \prime}(1) .
$$

Recall that $u(r)=\frac{w\left(r t_{n}\right)}{w\left(t_{n}\right)}-1$, so that $u^{\prime}(1)=\frac{w^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right) t_{n}}{w\left(t_{n}\right)}$ and $u^{\prime \prime}(1)=\frac{w^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right) t_{n}^{2}}{w\left(t_{n}\right)}$. Using these expressions and (4.2), we have

$$
\omega^{\prime}(1)=\frac{\lambda^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right)}{(p-1) t_{n} w^{p-1}\left(t_{n}\right)},
$$

and finally, from (4.7),

$$
\mu^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right) \int_{B} \omega^{2} d x=\frac{\left(\lambda^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right)\right)^{2} u^{\prime}(1)}{2 \lambda\left(t_{n}\right)(p-1) t_{n} w^{p-1}\left(t_{n}\right)}<0
$$

because $u^{\prime}(1)<0$ and $\lambda^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{n}\right) \neq 0$. We conclude that $\mu^{\prime}\left(t_{n}\right)<0$, completing the proof.
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