# NON-SINGULAR SOLUTIONS OF TWO-POINT PROBLEMS, WITH MULTIPLE CHANGES OF SIGN IN THE NONLINEARITY 
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Abstract. We prove that positive solutions of the two-point boundary value problem

$$
u^{\prime \prime}(x)+\lambda f(u(x))=0, \text { for }-1<x<1, \quad u(-1)=u(1)=0,
$$

satisfying max $u=u(0)>\gamma$, are non-singular, provided that $f(u)$ is predominantly negative for $u \in(0, \gamma]$, and superlinear for $u>\gamma$. This result adds a solution curve without turns to whatever is known about the solution set for $u(0) \in(0, \gamma)$. In particular, we combine it with the well-known cases of parabola-like, or $S$-shaped solution curves.

## 1. Introduction

We study global solution curves, and the exact multiplicity of positive solutions of the Dirichlet problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}(x)+\lambda f(u(x))=0, \text { for }-1<x<1, \quad u(-1)=u(1)=0, \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lambda$ is a positive parameter. Since positive solutions are symmetric with respect to the midpoint of the interval, it is convenient to pose the problem on the interval $(-1,1)$. Our problem is autonomous, and so this does not restrict the generality. Any positive solution $u(x)$ is an even function, and $u^{\prime}(x)<0$ for $x \in(0,1)$, so that $u^{\prime}(0)=0$, and $u(0)=\max _{[-1,1]} u(x)$. This follows immediately by observing that any solution is symmetric with respect to any of its critical points (of course, the theorem of B. Gidas, W.-M. Ni, and L. Nirenberg [1] is also applicable here). We shall need the corresponding linearized problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{\prime \prime}+\lambda f^{\prime}(u(x)) w=0, \quad \text { for }-1<x<1, \quad w(-1)=w(1)=0 . \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following lemma is known; see, e.g., P. Korman [3] or (4). We include its proof for completeness.

Lemma 1.1. Assume $f(u) \in C^{1}\left(\bar{R}_{+}\right)$. Let $u(x)$ be a positive solution of (1.1), with

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime}(1)<0 . \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

If the problem (1.2) admits a non-trivial solution, then this solution does not change sign, i.e., we may assume that $w(x)>0$ on $(-1,1)$.

[^0]Proof. The function $u^{\prime}(x)$ also satisfies the linear differential equation in (1.2). By the condition (1.3), $u^{\prime}(x)$ is not a constant multiple of $w(x)$. Hence, by Sturm's comparison theorem, the roots of $u^{\prime}(x)$ are interlaced with those of $w(x)$. If $w(x)$ had a root $\xi$ inside the right half-interval $(0,1)$, then $u^{\prime}(x)$ would have to vanish on $(\xi, 1)$, which is impossible.

We remark that the condition (1.3) holds automatically if $f(0) \geq 0$, as follows by Hopf's boundary lemma.

There are some standard conditions for solutions of (1.1) to be non-singular, which means that the problem (1.2) has only the trivial solution. (Non-singular solutions of (1.1) can be continued in $\lambda$, in view of the implicit function theorem.) Namely, if $f(0) \geq 0$, and

$$
f^{\prime}(u)>\frac{f(u)}{u}\left(\text { or if } f^{\prime}(u)<\frac{f(u)}{u}\right), \text { for all } u>0
$$

then the problem (1.2) has only the trivial solution. Indeed, writing the equation (1.1) in the form $u^{\prime \prime}+\frac{f(u)}{u} u=0$, we conclude by Sturm's comparison theorem that there is a root of $w(x) \not \equiv 0$ between the roots $\pm 1$ of $u(x)$, which is impossible, since $w(x)$ is positive. In [3] we proved the following result (a similar result was previously given by R. Schaaf [8]).
Theorem 1.1. Assume that $f(u) \in C^{1}\left(\bar{R}_{+}\right), f(u)<0$ on $(0, \gamma)$, while $f(u)>0$ on $(\gamma, \infty)$, for some $\gamma>0$. Assume also that

$$
f^{\prime}(u)>\frac{f(u)}{u}, \quad \text { for all } u>\gamma .
$$

Then any positive solution of (1.1), satisfying (1.3), is non-singular, i.e., the problem (1.2) admits only the trivial solution.

Recall that the solution set of of (1.1) can be faithfully represented by curves in the $(\lambda, u(0))$ plane, with $u(0)$ being the maximum value of the solution $u(x)$; see e.g., 3], or [4]. The above theorem implies that there are no turns on the solution curves, once $u(0)>\gamma$. What is remarkable here is that no additional assumptions are imposed on $f(u)$ on the interval where it is negative. In this note we present a much stronger result, replacing the condition $f(u)<0$ on $(0, \gamma)$ by an integral condition. The new result adds a solution curve without turns to whatever is known about the solution set for $u(0) \in(0, \gamma)$, thus providing exact multiplicity results in cases where there are exactly three or exactly four solutions; see the bifurcation diagrams for Theorems 3.2 3.3 and 3.4. Such exact multiplicity results are rare.

## 2. The main result

As usual, we denote $F(u)=\int_{0}^{u} f(t) d t$.
Theorem 2.1. Assume that $f(u) \in C^{1}\left(\bar{R}_{+}\right)$, and for some $\gamma>0$, it satisfies

$$
\begin{gather*}
f(\gamma)=0, \text { and } f(u)>0 \text { on }(\gamma, \infty),  \tag{2.1}\\
f^{\prime}(u)>\frac{f(u)}{u}, \text { for } u>\gamma,  \tag{2.2}\\
F(\gamma)-F(u)=\int_{u}^{\gamma} f(t) d t<0, \text { for } u \in(0, \gamma) . \tag{2.3}
\end{gather*}
$$

Then any positive solution of (1.1), satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(0)>\gamma, \text { and } u^{\prime}(1)<0 \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

is non-singular, which means that the problem (1.2) admits only the trivial solution.
Proof. Assume, on the contrary, that the problem (1.2) admits a non-trivial solution $w(x)>0$. Let $x_{0} \in(0,1)$ denote the point where $u\left(x_{0}\right)=\gamma$, so that the condition (2.2) holds for $0 \leq x<x_{0}$. From the equations (1.1) and (1.2), we get

$$
\left(w^{\prime} u-w u^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}=-\left[f^{\prime}(u)-\frac{f(u)}{u}\right] u w<0, \text { for } 0 \leq x<x_{0}
$$

Integrating this over $\left(0, x_{0}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right) u\left(x_{0}\right)-w\left(x_{0}\right) u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)<0 . \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(x_{0}-1\right) u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)-u\left(x_{0}\right)>0 . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, denoting $q(x) \equiv(x-1) u^{\prime}(x)-u(x)$, we see that $q(1)=0$, while

$$
q^{\prime}(x)=(x-1) u^{\prime \prime}(x)=(x-1)\left[u^{\prime}(x)-u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)\right]^{\prime} .
$$

We integrate this formula over $\left(x_{0}, 1\right)$, and perform integration by parts

$$
-q\left(x_{0}\right)=\int_{x_{0}}^{1}(x-1)\left[u^{\prime}(x)-u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)\right]^{\prime} d x=-\int_{x_{0}}^{1}\left[u^{\prime}(x)-u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)\right] d x,
$$

so that

$$
q\left(x_{0}\right)=\int_{x_{0}}^{1}\left[u^{\prime}(x)-u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)\right] d x>0
$$

which is the same as the desired inequality (2.6), provided we can prove that

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime}(x)-u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)>0, \text { for } x \in\left(x_{0}, 1\right) \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

The "energy" $E(x)=\frac{1}{2} u^{\prime 2}(x)+F(u(x))$ is easily seen to be constant, so that $E(x)=E\left(x_{0}\right)$, or

$$
\frac{1}{2} u^{\prime 2}(x)+F(u(x))=\frac{1}{2} u^{\prime 2}\left(x_{0}\right)+F(\gamma) .
$$

By the assumption (2.3),

$$
\frac{1}{2}\left[{u^{\prime}}^{2}(x)-u^{\prime 2}\left(x_{0}\right)\right]=F(\gamma)-F(u(x))<0, \text { for } x \in\left(x_{0}, 1\right)
$$

It follows that $u^{\prime 2}(x)<u^{\prime 2}\left(x_{0}\right)$, justifying (2.7), and then giving (2.6).
Next, we observe that the function $u^{\prime \prime}(x) w(x)-u^{\prime}(x) w^{\prime}(x)$ is constant over $[0,1]$. (Just differentiate this function, and use the corresponding equations.) Evaluating this function at $x=x_{0}$, and at $x=1$, and observing that $u^{\prime \prime}\left(x_{0}\right)=-f\left(u\left(x_{0}\right)\right)=$ $-f(\gamma)=0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
-u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right) w^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)=-u^{\prime}(1) w^{\prime}(1), \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies, in particular, that

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)<0 . \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the assumption (2.4), we also have

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime}(x) w^{\prime}(x)-u^{\prime \prime}(x) w(x)=u^{\prime}(1) w^{\prime}(1)>0, \quad \text { for all } x \in(0,1) \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

The function $z(x) \equiv x u^{\prime}(x)$ is easily seen to satisfy

$$
z^{\prime \prime}+f^{\prime}(u) z=-2 f .
$$

Combining this equation with (1.2), we express

$$
\left(z^{\prime} w-w^{\prime} z\right)^{\prime}=-2 f w=-2[F(u(x))-F(\gamma)]^{\prime} \frac{w(x)}{u^{\prime}(x)}
$$

Integrating this over $\left(x_{0}, 1\right)$, we get (observe that $z^{\prime}=u^{\prime}+x u^{\prime \prime}, z^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)=u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)$ )

$$
\begin{gathered}
M \equiv-u^{\prime}(1) w^{\prime}(1)-u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right) w\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0} u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right) w^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right) \\
=-2 \int_{x_{0}}^{1}[F(u(x))-F(\gamma)]^{\prime} \frac{w(x)}{u^{\prime}(x)} d x \\
=2 \int_{x_{0}}^{1}[F(u(x))-F(\gamma)] \frac{w^{\prime}(x) u^{\prime}(x)-w(x) u^{\prime \prime}(x)}{{u^{\prime 2}}^{2}(x)} d x>0,
\end{gathered}
$$

in view of (2.3) and (2.10).
On the other hand, using (2.8) and (2.5), and then (2.6) and (2.9), we have

$$
\begin{gather*}
M<-u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right) w^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)-w^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right) u\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0} u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right) w^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)  \tag{2.11}\\
=w^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)\left[\left(x_{0}-1\right) u^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)-u\left(x_{0}\right)\right]<0,
\end{gather*}
$$

a contradiction.
Observe that we only needed $\int_{u}^{\gamma} f(t) d t \leq 0$ for $u \in(0, \gamma)$, with the inequality being strict on a set of positive measure.

## 3. Applications

Our condition (2.3) implies that $F(\gamma) \leq 0$. Let $\gamma_{1} \geq \gamma$ be defined by

$$
F\left(\gamma_{1}\right)=0 .
$$

(In case $F(\gamma)=0$, we have $\gamma_{1}=\gamma$.) Our condition (2.2) implies that $\frac{f(u)}{u}$ is increasing for $u>\gamma$, and so the limit $L=\lim _{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(u)}{u} \leq \infty$ exists.

We consider positive solutions of the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}(x)+\lambda f(u(x))=0, \text { for }-1<x<1, \quad u(-1)=u(1)=0 \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lambda$ is a positive parameter. Recall that $u(0)$ gives the maximum value of any solution. Moreover, the value of $u(0)$ gives the global parameter on the solution curves, uniquely identifying the solution pair $(\lambda, u(x))$; see e.g., 3]. Hence, the set of positive solutions of (3.1) can be represented by curves in the $(\lambda, u(0))$ plane, giving us the solution curves.

Theorem 3.1. Assume that $f(u) \in C^{1}\left(\bar{R}_{+}\right)$; satisfies the conditions (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3). Then all positive solutions of (3.1), satisfying $u(0)>\gamma$, lie on a unique solution curve joining $(\delta, \infty)$ to $\left(\delta_{1}, \gamma_{1}\right)$ in the $(\lambda, u(0))$ plane, with some $0 \leq \delta<$ $\delta_{1} \leq \infty$. If $L=\infty$, then $\delta=0$, and in case $L<\infty$, we have $\delta>0$. If $F(u)<$ 0 for all $u \in(0, \gamma)$, then $\delta_{1}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\int_{0}^{\gamma_{1}} \frac{d u}{\sqrt{-F(u)}}\right)^{2}<\infty$, and $\delta_{1}=\infty$ in case $\max _{u \in(0, \gamma)} F(u) \geq 0$.

Proof. We begin by showing the existence of positive solutions, with $u(0)>\gamma$. We use "shooting", considering for $x>0$ the solutions of

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}(x)+f(u(x))=0, \quad u(0)=u_{0}, \quad u^{\prime}(0)=0 \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The "energy" $\frac{1}{2} u^{\prime 2}(x)+F(u(x))$ is constant, and so

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2} u^{\prime 2}(x)+F(u(x))=F\left(u_{0}\right), \quad \text { for all } x \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $u_{0}>\gamma$ be such that $F\left(u_{0}\right)>F(u)$ for all $u \in\left(0, u_{0}\right)$. Then the solution of (3.2) is decreasing, and $u^{\prime}(x)$ cannot become zero, or tend to zero, by (3.3). It follows that $u(x)$ becomes zero at some $x_{0}$, and then by rescaling we get a solution of (3.1) at some value of $\lambda$.

This solution is non-singular by Theorem 2.1. We now continue this solution in $\lambda$, using the implicit function theorem. For decreasing $\lambda$, the solution curve goes to infinity, as described in the statement of the theorem, by standard results; see e.g., [3. For increasing $\lambda$, the solution curve either continues for all $\lambda$, or at some $\lambda=\delta_{1}$, and the corresponding $u=\bar{u}(x)$, we have $\bar{u}^{\prime}(1)=0$, and the solutions become sign-changing for $\lambda>\delta_{1}$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2} \bar{u}^{\prime 2}(x)+\delta_{1} F(\bar{u}(x))=0 . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows that $F(\bar{u}(0))=0$, and so $\bar{u}(0)=\gamma_{1}$, and $F(u)<0$ for $u \in\left(0, \gamma_{1}\right)$. We conclude that in case $\max _{u \in(0, \gamma)} F(u) \geq 0$, the solution $\bar{u}(x)$ with $\bar{u}^{\prime}(1)=0$ is not possible, and therefore the curve of positive solutions continues for all $\lambda$. In case $F(u)<0$ for all $u \in(0, \gamma)$, the existence of $\bar{u}(x)$ follows by shooting and scaling, as above (with $u_{0}=\gamma_{1}$ ), and the value of $\delta_{1}$ is computed by integration of (3.4).

This result can be used in many situations. It adds a solution curve, which has no turns, to whatever is known about the solution set for $u(0) \in(0, \gamma)$. In particular, it can be used with the well-known cases of parabola-like (see P. Korman, Y. Li, and T. Ouyang [7], or S.-H. Wang [10), or $S$-shaped solution curves (see P. Korman and Y. Li [5], or S.-H. Wang [11), giving the following results.

Theorem 3.2. Assume that the function $f(u) \in C^{2}\left(\bar{R}_{+}\right)$has three positive roots $0<a<b<\gamma$, and

$$
\begin{gathered}
f(0)=0, \quad f(u)<0 \text { on }(0, a) \cup(b, \gamma), \quad f(u)>0 \text { on }(a, b) \cup(\gamma, \infty), \\
F(b)=\int_{0}^{b} f(u) d u>0 .
\end{gathered}
$$

Assume that there is an $\alpha \in(a, b)$, so that

$$
f^{\prime \prime}(u)>0 \text { for } u \in(0, \alpha), \quad f^{\prime \prime}(u)<0 \text { for } u \in(\alpha, b)
$$

Assume, finally, that $f(u)$ satisfies the conditions (2.2) and (2.3). Also, assume for definiteness that $\lim _{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(u)}{u}=\infty$. Then the set of positive solutions of (3.1) consists of two solution curves. The lower curve is parabola-like, opening to the right, and the upper one is given by Theorem 3.1, with $\delta=0$, and $\delta_{1}=\infty$. In particular, there is a critical $\lambda_{0}$, so that the problem (3.1) has exactly one positive solution for $\lambda \in\left(0, \lambda_{0}\right)$, exactly two positive solutions at $\lambda=\lambda_{0}$, and exactly three positive solutions for $\lambda>\lambda_{0}$.


Bifurcation diagram for Theorem 3.2

Theorem 3.3. Assume that the function $f(u) \in C^{2}\left(\bar{R}_{+}\right)$has two positive roots $0<a<\gamma$, and

$$
f(u)>0 \text { on }[0, a) \cup(\gamma, \infty), \quad f(u)<0 \text { on }(a, b) .
$$

Assume that there is an $\alpha \in(0, a)$, so that

$$
f^{\prime \prime}(u)>0 \text { for } u \in(0, \alpha), \quad f^{\prime \prime}(u)<0 \text { for } u \in(\alpha, a) .
$$

Defining $h(u)=2 F(u)-u f(u)$, we assume that

$$
h(\alpha)<0 .
$$

Assume, finally, that $f(u)$ satisfies the conditions (2.2) and (2.3). Also, assume for definiteness that $\lim _{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(u)}{u}=\infty$. Then the set of positive solutions of (3.1) consists of two solution curves. The lower curve is $S$-shaped, and the upper one is given by Theorem 3.1, with $\delta=0$, and $\delta_{1}=\infty$. In particular, there are two critical numbers $\lambda_{0}<\lambda_{1}$, so that the problem (3.1) has exactly two positive solutions for $\lambda \in\left(0, \lambda_{0}\right)$, exactly three positive solutions at $\lambda=\lambda_{0}$ and $\lambda=\lambda_{1}$, exactly four positive solutions for $\lambda \in\left(\lambda_{0}, \lambda_{1}\right)$, and exactly two positive solutions for $\lambda>\lambda_{0}$.


Bifurcation diagram for Theorem 3.3
Finally, we consider the case of broken reverse $S$-shaped curves, considered previously by J. Shi and R. Shivaji [9, and K.-C. Hung [2]. We have the following result.

Theorem 3.4. Assume that the function $f(u) \in C^{2}\left(\bar{R}_{+}\right)$has three positive roots $0<a<b<\gamma$, and

$$
\begin{gather*}
f(u)<0 \text { on }[0, a) \cup(b, \gamma), \quad f(u)>0 \text { on }(a, b) \cup(\gamma, \infty), \\
\int_{0}^{b} f(u) d u>0, \quad \int_{a}^{\gamma} f(u) d u<0 . \tag{3.5}
\end{gather*}
$$

Assume that

$$
f^{\prime \prime}(u)<0 \text { for } u \in(0, b)
$$

Assume, finally, that $f(u)$ satisfies the condition (2.2). Also, assume for definiteness that $\lim _{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(u)}{u}=\infty$. Then the set of positive solutions of (3.1) consists of two solution curves. The lower curve is parabola-like, opening to the right, and the upper one is without any turns, and it joins $(0, \infty)$ to $\left(\infty, \gamma_{1}\right)$ in the $(\lambda, u(0))$ plane. The lower branch of the lower curve terminates at some finite $\bar{\lambda}$ (at $\bar{\lambda}, u^{\prime}(1)=0$, and the solutions are sign-changing for $\lambda>\bar{\lambda}$ ).


Bifurcation diagram for Theorem 3.4
Proof. Observe that (3.5) implies that (2.3) holds. Theorem 3.1 applies, and provides us with the upper curve. For $u(0) \in(a, b)$, only turns to the right are possible on the solution curve, see [3], and since $f(0)<0$, arguing as above, we see that the lower branch terminates at some finite $\bar{\lambda}$.

Let us compare this result with Theorem 2.2 in K.-C. Hung [2]. We do not impose any concavity assumptions on $f(u)$ for $u \in(b, \infty)$, and we dropped several technical assumptions. However, we added an extra condition $\int_{a}^{\gamma} f(u) d u<0$, which K.-C. Hung [2] does not have. For the cubic $f(u)=(u-a)(u-b)(u-c), 0<a<b<c$, K.-C. Hung's theorem produces the optimal result (i.e., the bification diagram is the same as for Theorem (3.4), requiring only that $\int_{0}^{b} f(u) d u>0$, while our result requires that in addition, $\int_{a}^{c} f(u) d u<0$. On the other hand, our result allows many changes in convexity on $(b, \infty)$.
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