

A construction of patterns with many critical points on topological tori [‡]

Putri Zahra Kamalia^{*†} and Shigeru Sakaguchi[†]

Abstract

We consider reaction-diffusion equations on closed surfaces in \mathbb{R}^3 having genus 1. Stable nonconstant stationary solutions are often called patterns. The purpose of this paper is to construct closed surfaces together with patterns having as many critical points as one wants.

Key words. stable solution; pattern; semilinear elliptic equation; reaction-diffusion equation; closed surface having genus 1; torus; critical points;

AMS subject classifications. Primary 35B35 ; Secondary 35K57, 35K58, 35J61, 35P15, 35B38, 35K15, 35K20, 35B20

1 Introduction

In this paper, we deal with reaction-diffusion problems on closed surfaces properly embedded in \mathbb{R}^3 . We will address the existence of stable nonconstant stationary solutions having critical points as many as possible. For a closed surface M properly embedded in \mathbb{R}^3 with a Riemannian metric g , we consider the following reaction-diffusion problem for $u = u(x, t)$ on M

$$\partial_t u = \Delta_g u + f(u) \quad \text{in } M \times (0, \infty), \quad (1.1)$$

where $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ is a function of u and Δ_g denotes the Laplace-Beltrami operator on M ,

$$\Delta_g u = \operatorname{div}(\nabla_g u) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \left(\sqrt{|g|} (\nabla_g u)^i \right). \quad (1.2)$$

[‡]This research was partially supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) (# 18H01126) of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

^{*}Corresponding author.

[†]Research Center for Pure and Applied Mathematics, Graduate School of Information Sciences, Tohoku University, Sendai, 980-8579, Japan (putrizahrakamalia@gmail.com^{*}, sigersak@tohoku.ac.jp).

Stable nonconstant stationary solutions of (1.1) are often called patterns. The stability of stationary solutions of (1.1) is discussed in the sense of Lyapunov. We say that a stationary solution U is stable if, for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that, for every initial data u_0 with $\|u_0 - U\|_\infty < \delta$ we have

$$\|u(\cdot, t) - U\|_\infty < \epsilon \text{ for every } t > 0.$$

The existence and nonexistence of patterns on compact d -dimensional Riemannian manifolds have been studied in [BPT, FSV, J, NG, RW]. Among these, in [J, Theorem 2] Jimbo has introduced manifolds and nonlinearities f having complex patterns whose construction is analogous to that in [M]. To be precise, Jimbo introduced a finite number of compact Riemannian manifolds connected by thin channels, and he used the singular perturbation method as all the thin channels shrink to line segments. The resulting patterns are close to each given constant on each compact Riemannian manifold.

In this paper, by using the patterns constructed in [BPT] together with the implicit function theorem, we introduce a different and simple way to construct closed surfaces having genus 1 together with patterns having as many critical points as one wants. Both our closed surfaces and our patterns are different from those obtained in [J, Theorem 2]. We will explain their construction below.

For a surface of revolution D in \mathbb{R}^3 with boundary ∂D , there are several studies on the existence of patterns of (1.1) where M is replaced with D under various boundary conditions on ∂D . In [BPT] Bandle, Punzo and Tesei constructed a class of surfaces of revolution D with non-empty boundary and nonlinear terms f having patterns with the Neumann boundary condition by solving some ordinary differential equations with the aid of an idea introduced by Yanagida in [Y] to construct the nonlinear terms f . Recently, in [S] Sonogo obtained patterns with the Dirichlet boundary condition on ∂D . On the other hand, in [P] Punzo considered the case where $\partial D = \emptyset$, that is, D is a closed surface of genus 0, and shows the existence of patterns on D .

On the surface of revolution D , the reaction-diffusion problem with the Neumann boundary condition reads as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = \Delta_g u + f(u) & \text{in } D \times (0, \infty), \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial D \times (0, \infty), \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where ν denotes the outward unit normal vector to ∂D . We prove in this paper that the patterns of problem (1.3) still exist even if the domain D dealt with in [BPT] is slightly

perturbed. The perturbation is done by deforming its axis of rotation into a circular arc. We start with the patterns constructed in [BPT] and examine the existence of patterns with the Neumann boundary condition on the perturbed domain by using the implicit function theorem. Furthermore, we manage to construct patterns together with surfaces of genus 1 by attaching a finite number of copies of the perturbed domain together with the perturbed pattern. This construction comes from an idea of Below and Lubary in [BL, Theorem 4.2, p.177] which introduces patterns on a *disjoint union* of graphs. As a consequence of this construction, the Neumann boundary condition on the boundary of each copy of the perturbed domain yields the critical points of the resulting patterns. We summarize our result in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *There exist a nonlinearity f and a number $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for each $n \geq N$, a closed surface M of genus 1 properly embedded in \mathbb{R}^3 together with a pattern U of (1.1) on M , is constructed in such a way that U has at least $4n$ critical points.*

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce the patterns on surfaces of revolution D constructed in [BPT]. Then, we reparameterize the domain in order to adjust it to our problem. In section 3 we give a detail of construction of surfaces of genus 1. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1.

2 Preliminary

As in [BPT, subsection 2.2 (p. 36) and Theorem 3.6 (p. 40)], let C be a regular plane curve parameterized by

$$\begin{cases} x_1 = \psi(r), \\ x_2 = 0, \\ x_3 = \chi(r), \end{cases} \quad (r \in [0, L])$$

where $\psi, \chi \in C^3([0, L])$, $\psi > 0$ in $[0, L]$ and $(\psi')^2 + (\chi')^2 = 1$. Then by revolving the curve C about the x_3 -axis, it admits a surface of revolution D in \mathbb{R}^3 parameterized by

$$\begin{cases} x_1 = \psi(r) \cos \theta, \\ x_2 = \psi(r) \sin \theta, \\ x_3 = \chi(r) \end{cases} \quad ((r, \theta) \in [0, L] \times (0, 2\pi]) \quad (2.1)$$

with local coordinates $x^1 = r, x^2 = \theta$. For $r \in [0, L]$, set

$$C_r = \{(\psi(r) \cos \theta, \psi(r) \sin \theta, \chi(r)) : \theta \in (0, 2\pi]\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Then, $\partial D = C_0 \cup C_L$.

The Riemannian metric $g = (g_{ij})$ on D is given by

$$(g_{ij})_{i,j=1,2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \psi^2(r) \end{pmatrix},$$

the area element on D is $dV_g = \sqrt{|g|}drd\theta = \psi drd\theta$, and the Riemannian gradient $\nabla_g u$ of u with respect to g on D is given by

$$\nabla_g u = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_r u \\ \frac{1}{\psi^2(r)} \partial_\theta u \end{pmatrix}.$$

The study of existence and nonexistence of patterns of the reaction-diffusion problem (1.3) has already been done by [BPT]. Indeed, it is shown in [BPT, Theorem 4.1, p. 41] that the existence of an interior point $\hat{R} \in (0, L)$ with $\left(\frac{\psi'}{\psi}\right)'(\hat{R}) > 0$ leads to the existence of a nonlinear term $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ admitting patterns. First, they consider the Cauchy problem that fulfills the above criteria to construct f as a C^1 -function. The nonlinear term $f = f(Z)$ is defined by [BPT, (4.10), p. 43] in such way, that for any $r \in (0, L)$,

$$f[Z(r)] = -\frac{(\psi Z')'}{\psi}(r),$$

where $Z(r)$ is a stationary nonconstant solution of problem (1.3) [BPT, Lemma 4.4 and (4.13), p. 43]. Moreover, $Z(r)$ is positive and strictly increasing in $(0, L)$. Then, the stability of $Z(r)$ is established by [BPT, Lemma 4.2, p. 41]. Hence, problem (1.3) with the nonlinear term f admits a pattern $Z(r)$ on D .

In particular we choose D to have

$$\chi'(r) > 0 \text{ for } r \in [0, L], \tag{2.3}$$

$$\frac{d^i \psi}{dr^i}(r) = 0 \text{ for } r \in \{0, L\} \text{ and } i = 1, 3. \tag{2.4}$$

Let us introduce the change of variables

$$\Psi(s) = \psi(\chi^{-1}(s)), \quad s = \chi(r),$$

where

$$r = \int_0^s \sqrt{1 + (\Psi'(t))^2} dt, \quad s \in [0, l].$$

Notice in particular that

$$\chi'(r) = \frac{ds}{dr} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (\Psi'(s))^2}}. \quad (2.5)$$

Then, we reparameterize D as

$$\begin{cases} x_1 = \Psi(s) \cos \theta, \\ x_2 = \Psi(s) \sin \theta, \\ x_3 = s. \end{cases} \quad ((s, \theta) \in I := [0, l] \times S^1) \quad (2.6)$$

The corresponding new Riemannian metric $g = (g_{ij})$ on D is given by

$$(g_{ij})_{i,j=1,2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + (\Psi'(s))^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \Psi^2(s) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.7)$$

Hence, the new Riemannian gradient $\nabla_g u$ of u with respect to g is

$$\nabla_g u = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{1 + (\Psi'(s))^2} \partial_s u \\ \frac{1}{\Psi^2(s)} \partial_\theta u \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.8)$$

and the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_g on D is given by

$$\Delta_g u = \frac{1}{1 + (\Psi')^2} u_{ss} + \frac{1}{\Psi^2} u_{\theta\theta} + \frac{[1 + (\Psi')^2 - \Psi''\Psi]\Psi'}{[1 + (\Psi')^2]^2 \Psi} u_s. \quad (2.9)$$

Under this reparametrization, stability criteria in [BPT] can be rewritten as follows:

Theorem 2.1 ([BPT], Theorem 4.1, p. 41). *Suppose that for some $s_0 \in (0, l)$*

$$\Psi''\Psi - (\Psi')^2 [1 + (\Psi')^2] > 0 \quad \text{at } s = s_0. \quad (2.10)$$

Then, there exists $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ such that problem (1.3) admits a pattern $U = U_g(s)$.

If we set $Z(r) = U_g(\chi(r))$, the function $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ of problem (1.3) is given by

$$f[U_g(s)] = -\frac{\Psi'U'_g + \Psi U''_g}{\Psi[1 + (\Psi')^2]} + \frac{\Psi'\Psi''U'_g}{[1 + (\Psi')^2]^2}. \quad (2.11)$$

3 Construction of closed surfaces having genus 1

Let us introduce a circular arc $C(\kappa)$ for sufficiently small $|\kappa|$.

$$C(\kappa) = \left\{ (x_1, 0, x_3) = p(s) := \left(\frac{1}{\kappa}(1 - \cos \kappa s), 0, \frac{1}{\kappa} \sin \kappa s \right) : 0 \leq s \leq l \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$




Figure 1: $C(\kappa)$ is bounded by two circles congruent with C_0 and C_L .

The above parameterization shows that the $C(\kappa)$ is pliable by controlling the value of κ . If $\kappa = 0$, we recognize that $C(\kappa)$ is congruent with the segment $[0, l]$ in the x_3 -axis.

For sufficiently small $|\kappa|$, let us introduce a Riemannian surface M_κ as follows. While bending the line segment $[0, l]$ into $C(\kappa)$, we preserve the value of $\Psi(s)$ by using Frenet trihedron of the curve $C(\kappa)$ (see [DO, p. 20]). Let $(\mathfrak{t}(s), \mathfrak{n}(s), \mathfrak{b}(s))$ be the Frenet trihedron of $C(\kappa)$ where

$$\mathfrak{t}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} \sin \kappa s \\ 0 \\ \cos \kappa s \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathfrak{n}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \kappa s \\ 0 \\ -\sin \kappa s \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathfrak{b}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.2)$$

Then, we define a parametrization $x = x(s, \theta) \in M_\kappa$ by

$$x(s, \theta) = p(s) + \Psi(s) \cos \theta \cdot \mathfrak{n}(s) + \Psi(s) \sin \theta \cdot \mathfrak{b}(s) \quad \text{for } (s, \theta) \in [0, l] \times S^1,$$

where $p(s)$ is given by (3.1). Hence M_κ is parameterized by

$$\begin{cases} x_1 = \frac{1}{\kappa}(1 - \cos \kappa s) + \Psi(s) \cos \theta \cos \kappa s, \\ x_2 = \Psi(s) \sin \theta, \\ x_3 = \frac{1}{\kappa} \sin \kappa s - \Psi(s) \cos \theta \sin \kappa s. \end{cases} \quad ((s, \theta) \in [0, l] \times S^1) \quad (3.3)$$

Thus, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that, if $|\kappa| \leq \delta_0$, then M_κ is a properly embedded Riemannian surface in \mathbb{R}^3 parameterized in local coordinates: $x^1 = s$ and $x^2 = \theta$. Let us call $C(\kappa)$ the *center curve* of M_κ . The corresponding Riemannian metric $g^\kappa = (g_{ij}^\kappa)$ for M_κ is




Figure 2: A modification of a surface of revolution M_κ with $\kappa \neq 0$.

given by

$$(g^\kappa_{ij})_{i,j=1,2} = \begin{pmatrix} (\Psi'(s))^2 + (\kappa\Psi(s)\cos\theta - 1)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \Psi^2(s) \end{pmatrix},$$

the area element on M_κ is $dV_{g^\kappa} = \sqrt{|g^\kappa|}drd\theta$, and the Riemannian gradient $\nabla_{g^\kappa}u$ of u with respect to g^κ is

$$\nabla_{g^\kappa}u = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{(\Psi'(s))^2 + (\kappa\Psi(s)\cos\theta - 1)^2} \partial_s u \\ \frac{1}{\Psi^2(s)} \partial_\theta u \end{pmatrix}.$$

The Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_{g^κ} on M_κ is given by

$$\Delta_{g^\kappa}u = \frac{1}{\Phi^2}u_{ss} + \frac{1}{\Psi^2}u_{\theta\theta} + \frac{\Psi'\Phi - \Phi_s\Psi}{\Phi^3\Psi}u_s + \frac{\Phi_\theta}{\Phi\Psi^2}u_\theta, \quad (3.4)$$

where we put $\Phi = \Phi(s, \theta) = \sqrt{(\Psi'(s))^2 + (\kappa\Psi(s)\cos\theta - 1)^2}$. Note that $g^0 = g$. We observe from (2.3), (2.4) and (3.3) that if $|\kappa| < \delta_0$, then

- (1) The boundary of M_κ consists of two circles congruent with C_0 and C_L ,
- (2) $\Psi(0) > 0$, $\Psi(l) > 0$,
- (3) $\frac{d^i\Psi}{ds^i}(s) = 0$, $i = 1, 3$ at $s \in \{0, l\}$.

Moreover, by choosing δ_0 smaller if necessary, we are allowed to form a closed surface by attaching a finite number of copies of M_κ , as follows:

Step 1. Choose a component congruent with C_0 of the boundary ∂M_κ .

Step 2. Take two copies M^1 and M^2 of M_κ .

Step 3. Attach the component of the boundary, which is congruent with C_0 , of M^1 to that of M^2 in such way that a new surface $M_* = M^1 \cup M^2$ is symmetric with respect to the hyperplane containing the circle congruent with C_0 . The boundary of M_* consists of two components both of which are congruent with C_L and the center curve of M_* is just a circular arc. C^3 smoothness of M_* is guaranteed by (3).




Figure 3: A new surface M_* composed of two M_κ .

Step 4. Take two copies M_*^1 and M_*^2 of M_* and attach one of the boundary components of M_*^1 to that of M_*^2 in such way that the center curve of a new surface $M_{2*} = M_*^1 \cup M_*^2$ is just a circular arc. C^3 smoothness of M_{2*} is guaranteed by (3).

Step 5. Take a copy M_*^3 of M_* and attach one of the boundary components of M_*^3 to that of M_{2*} to form a new surface $M_{3*} = M_*^3 \cup M_{2*}$ in such way that the center curve of M_{3*} is just a circular arc. Also, C^3 smoothness of M_{3*} is guaranteed by (3). Repeat this step until i -th iteration and update M_{2*} by $M_{(i-1)*}$ for each iteration. It will form a new C^3 surface M_{i*} which eventually consists of i copies of M_* . By choosing an appropriate sufficiently small $|\kappa| \in (0, \delta_0)$, after n -th iteration, we will have a closed C^3 surface M of genus 1, composed of n copies of M_* , and the center curve of M is just a whole circle. We notice that the resulting surface M is symmetric with respect to each hyperplane containing a component of the boundary of each M_κ .

4 Stability

In this section, our goal is to present the full proof of Theorem 1.1. Consider the eigenvalue problem for a linearized problem at a stationary solution U_g of (1.3),

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g q + f'(U_g)q = -\lambda q & \text{in } D, \\ \frac{\partial q}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial D. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

The principal eigenvalue is characterized by Rayleigh quotient

$$\lambda_1 = \inf_{\substack{q \neq 0 \\ q \in H^1(D)}} \frac{\int_D (|\nabla_g q|^2 - f'(U_g)q^2) dV_g}{\int_D q^2 dV_g}. \quad (4.2)$$

Let ϕ be the eigenfunction of (1.3) that corresponds to the principal eigenvalue λ_1 satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g \phi + f'(U_g)\phi = -\lambda_1 \phi & \text{in } D, \\ \|\phi\|_{L^2(D)} = 1, \quad \phi > 0 & \text{in } D, \text{ and } \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial D. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

It is well known that the principal eigenvalue determines the stability of a stationary solution. The negative principal eigenvalue will lead to the instability of stationary solution U_g while the positive one will assure the stability of U_g (see [H] for instance). If $\lambda_1 = 0$, then the stability of U_g is undetermined.

4.1 Existence of Patterns

Theorem 4.1. *Let U_g be the patterns of (1.3) on D given by Theorem 2.1. Then, there exist $\kappa_0 \in (0, \delta_0)$ and a family of patterns U_κ of (1.3) on M_κ for all $|\kappa| \in (0, \kappa_0)$.*

Let us start with a lemma concerning the existence of a stationary solution of (1.3) on M_κ for sufficiently small $|\kappa| > 0$. Functions on D or on M_κ are considered as those on $I = [0, l] \times S^1$ given in (2.6). Conversely, functions on I are considered as those on D or M_κ . Therefore, we may deal with functions on I instead of those on D or on M_κ .

Lemma 4.2. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$. There exists $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta_0)$ such that for every $|\kappa| \in (0, \delta_1)$ a stationary solution U_κ of (1.3) on M_κ and $\epsilon_1(\kappa)$ with $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \epsilon_1(\kappa) = 0$ exist and satisfy*

$$\|U_\kappa - U_g\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(I)} < \epsilon_1(\kappa) \text{ if } |\kappa| \in (0, \delta_1).$$

Proof. Let X be a closed linear subspace of $C^{2,\alpha}(I)$ with $I = [0, l] \times S^1$ given by

$$X = \{v \in C^{2,\alpha}(I) : \frac{\partial v}{\partial s} = 0 \text{ at } s = 0, s = l\}.$$

Define for (κ, v) in $[-\delta_0, \delta_0] \times X$ the mapping $F : [-\delta_0, \delta_0] \times X \rightarrow C^\alpha(I)$ by

$$F(\kappa, v) = \Delta_{g^\kappa}(U_g + v) + f(U_g + v).$$

We notice that $F(0, 0) = 0$ and F is of class C^1 in a neighbourhood of $(0, 0)$.

The partial Fréchet derivative of mapping $F(\kappa, v)$ with respect to v at $(0, 0)$ is given by

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial v}(0, 0)q = \Delta_g q + f'(U_g)q \quad \text{for } q \in X.$$

Let us show that operator $\frac{\partial F}{\partial v}(0, 0)$ is invertible. Indeed, for each $h \in C^\alpha(I)$, we consider the following boundary value problem for q :

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g q + f'(U_g)q = h & \text{in } D, \\ \frac{\partial q}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial D. \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

Since $\lambda_1 > 0$, for every $h \in C^\alpha(I)$, by the standard theory of elliptic partial differential equations of second order, we see that there exist a unique solution $q \in X$ of (4.4) and a constant $C > 0$ independent of q and h satisfying

$$\left\| \frac{\partial F^{-1}}{\partial v}(0, 0)h \right\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(I)} = \|q\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(I)} \leq C\|h\|_{C^\alpha(I)}.$$

Thus by the implicit function theorem (see [N, Theorema 2.7.2, p. 34] or [D, Theorema 15.1, p. 148]), there exist a number $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta_0)$ with $\mathcal{N} = (-\delta_1, \delta_1)$ and a unique continuous map $\rho : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow X$ such that $\rho(0) = 0$ and for every $\kappa \in \mathcal{N}$

$$F(\kappa, \rho(\kappa)) = \Delta_{g^\kappa} U_\kappa + f(U_\kappa) = 0,$$

where we set $U_\kappa = U_g + \rho(\kappa)$. Hence, the result follows. \square

Next, we will determine the stability of the stationary solution U_κ of (1.3) on M_κ by using the principal eigenvalue. Let λ_1^κ be the principal eigenvalue with the corresponding eigenfunction $\phi^\kappa \in H^1(I)$ of (1.3) on M_κ which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa + f'(U_\kappa) \phi^\kappa = -\lambda_1^\kappa \phi^\kappa & \text{in } M_\kappa, \\ \|\phi^\kappa\|_{L^2(M_\kappa)} = 1, \phi^\kappa > 0 & \text{in } M_\kappa, \text{ and } \frac{\partial \phi^\kappa}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial M_\kappa, \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$\lambda_1^\kappa = \inf_{\substack{q \neq 0 \\ q \in H^1(M_\kappa)}} \frac{\int_{M_\kappa} (|\nabla_{g^\kappa} q|^2 - f'(U_{g^\kappa})q^2) dV_{g^\kappa}}{\int_{M_\kappa} q^2 dV_{g^\kappa}}. \quad (4.6)$$

The existence of eigenfunction ϕ^κ of (4.5) that corresponds to λ_1^κ can be confirmed in the way similar to that in [GT, Chapter 8.12].

Lemma 4.3. *For every $|\kappa| \in (0, \delta_1)$, there exists $\epsilon_2(\kappa)$ with $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \epsilon_2(\kappa) = 0$ such that*

$$(i) \|f'(U_\kappa) - f'(U_g)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_2(\kappa).$$

$$(ii) (1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa))dV_g \leq dV_{g^\kappa} \leq (1 + \epsilon_2(\kappa))dV_g.$$

$$(iii) (1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa))|\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 \leq |\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon_2(\kappa))|\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2.$$

Proof. Lemma 4.2 and the continuity of f' yield assertion (i), for some $\epsilon_2(\kappa) > 0$ with $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \epsilon_2(\kappa) = 0$. Next, represent dV_{g^κ} by using Taylor expansion with respect to κ at $\kappa = 0$.

Since $\frac{\partial(\sqrt{|g^\kappa|})}{\partial \kappa}$ is continuous on $I \times [-\delta_1, \delta_1]$, there exists a constant $m_1 > 0$ satisfying $\left| \frac{\partial(\sqrt{|g^\kappa|})}{\partial \kappa} \right| \leq m_1$. Then, we obtain

$$(1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa))dV_g \leq \left(\sqrt{|g|} - m_1|\kappa| \right) dsd\theta \leq dV_{g^\kappa} \leq \left(\sqrt{|g|} + m_1|\kappa| \right) dsd\theta \leq (1 + \epsilon_2(\kappa))dV_g,$$

if we choose $\epsilon_2(\kappa) \geq \frac{m_1|\kappa|}{\min_D \sqrt{|g|}}$. Thus, this chain of inequalities gives assertion (ii).

It remains to show assertion (iii). We have that

$$|\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2 = \frac{1}{(\Psi'(s))^2 + (\kappa\Psi(s) \cos \theta - 1)^2} (\partial_s \phi^\kappa)^2 + \frac{1}{\Psi^2} (\partial_\theta \phi^\kappa)^2.$$

For $(g_{11}^\kappa)^{-1} = \frac{1}{(\Psi'(s))^2 + (\kappa\Psi(s) \cos \theta - 1)^2}$, $\frac{\partial(g_{11}^\kappa)^{-1}}{\partial \kappa}$ is continuous on $I \times [-\delta_1, \delta_1]$. Hence, there exists a constant $m_2 > 0$ satisfying $\left| \frac{\partial(g_{11}^\kappa)^{-1}}{\partial \kappa} \right| \leq m_2$. Also, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $(\partial_s \phi^\kappa)^2 \leq C|\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2$. Then, we get

$$\left| |\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2 - |\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 \right| \leq m_2|\kappa| |\partial_s \phi^\kappa|^2 \leq m_2|\kappa|C|\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2.$$

This shows (iii), if we choose $\epsilon_2(\kappa) \geq \max \left\{ \frac{m_1|\kappa|}{\min_D \sqrt{|g|}}, m_2|\kappa|C \right\}$. \square

Lemma 4.4. *There exists a constant $C^* > 0$ such that if $|\kappa| < \delta_1$ then*

$$\int_{M_\kappa} |\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \leq C^*.$$

Proof. We have from (4.5) that

$$\int_{M_\kappa} |\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_{g^\kappa} = \lambda_1^\kappa + \int_{M_\kappa} f'(U_\kappa)(\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa}. \quad (4.7)$$

Since λ_1^κ is the principal eigenvalue (see (4.6)), for every $q \in H^1(I)$

$$\lambda_1^\kappa \leq \frac{\int_{M_\kappa} (|\nabla_{g^\kappa} q|^2 - f'(U_\kappa)q^2) dV_{g^\kappa}}{\int_{M_\kappa} q^2 dV_{g^\kappa}}.$$

Take $q \equiv 1$ and use (i) and (ii) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1^\kappa &\leq \frac{-\int_{M_\kappa} f'(U_\kappa) dV_{g^\kappa}}{\int_{M_\kappa} dV_{g^\kappa}} = \frac{-\int_{M_\kappa} (f'(U_\kappa) - f'(U_g)) dV_{g^\kappa} - \int_{M_\kappa} f'(U_g) dV_{g^\kappa}}{\int_{M_\kappa} dV_{g^\kappa}} \\ &\leq \epsilon_2(\kappa) + \frac{\left| \int_{M_\kappa} f'(U_g) dV_{g^\kappa} \right|}{\int_{M_\kappa} dV_{g^\kappa}} \\ &\leq \epsilon_2(\kappa) + \frac{(1 + \epsilon_2(\kappa)) \int_D |f'(U_g)| dV_g}{(1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)) \int_D dV_g} \\ &\leq \epsilon_2(\kappa) + \frac{1 + \epsilon_2(\kappa)}{1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)} \max_D |f'(U_g)|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, λ_1^κ is bounded from above.

Next, we estimate $\int_{M_\kappa} f'(U_\kappa)(\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M_\kappa} f'(U_\kappa)(\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} &= \int_{M_\kappa} (f'(U_\kappa) - f'(U_g)) (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} + \int_{M_\kappa} f'(U_g)(\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \\ &\leq \epsilon_2(\kappa) \int_{M_\kappa} (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} + \int_{M_\kappa} |f'(U_g)| (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \\ &\leq \epsilon_2(\kappa) + \max_D |f'(U_g)|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, (4.7) yields the conclusion. \square

Lemma 4.5. $\lambda_1^\kappa \rightarrow \lambda_1$ as $\kappa \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Since λ_1 is the principal eigenvalue (see (4.2)), we have

$$\lambda_1 \leq \frac{\int_D (|\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 - f'(U_g)(\phi^\kappa)^2) dV_g}{\int_D (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_g}.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_D f'(U_g)(\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_g - \int_{M_\kappa} f'(U_\kappa)(\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_D (f'(U_g) - f'(U_\kappa)) (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_g \right| + \left| \int_D f'(U_\kappa)(\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_g - \int_{M_\kappa} f'(U_\kappa)(\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Then, by using (i) and (ii) in Lemma 4.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_D (f'(U_g) - f'(U_\kappa)) (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_g \right| & \leq \epsilon_2(\kappa) \int_D (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_g \\ & \leq \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)} \int_{M_\kappa} (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} = \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Since $|dV_{g^\kappa} - dV_g| \leq \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)} dV_{g^\kappa}$ by (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_D f'(U_\kappa)(\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_g - \int_{M_\kappa} f'(U_\kappa)(\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \right| & \leq \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)} \int_{M_\kappa} |f'(U_\kappa)| (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \\ & \leq \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)} (\epsilon_2(\kappa) + \|f'(U_g)\|_\infty), \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where we used (i) in the last inequality. Thus, combining (4.9) and (4.10) with (4.8) yields

$$\left| \int_D f'(U_g)(\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_g - \int_{M_\kappa} f'(U_\kappa)(\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)} (1 + \epsilon_2(\kappa) + \|f'(U_g)\|_\infty). \quad (4.11)$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_D |\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_g - \int_{M_\kappa} |\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_D |\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_g - \int_{M_\kappa} |\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \right| + \left| \int_{M_\kappa} |\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_{g^\kappa} - \int_{M_\kappa} |\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Then, by using (ii) and (iii) in Lemma 4.3, and Lemma 4.4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_D |\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_g - \int_{M_\kappa} |\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \right| & \leq \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)} \int_{M_\kappa} |\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \\ & \leq \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{(1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa))^2} \int_{M_\kappa} |\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \\ & \leq \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{(1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa))^2} C^*. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

By using (iii), we have

$$\left| |\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 - |\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2 \right| \leq \epsilon_2(\kappa) |\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 \leq \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)} |\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2.$$

Hence, we obtain from Lemma 4.4 that

$$\left| \int_{M_\kappa} |\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_{g^\kappa} - \int_{M_\kappa} |\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)} C^*. \quad (4.14)$$

Thus, combining (4.13) and (4.14) with (4.12) yields

$$\left| \int_D |\nabla_g \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_g - \int_{M_\kappa} |\nabla_{g^\kappa} \phi^\kappa|^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa) C^* (2 - \epsilon_2(\kappa))}{(1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa))^2}. \quad (4.15)$$

By (ii) in Lemma 4.3, the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_D (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_g - 1 \right| &= \left| \int_D (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_g - \int_{M_\kappa} (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)} \int_{M_\kappa} (\phi^\kappa)^2 dV_{g^\kappa} = \frac{\epsilon_2(\kappa)}{1 - \epsilon_2(\kappa)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

By using (4.11), (4.15) and (4.16), we conclude that there exists $\epsilon_3(\kappa) > 0$ with $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \epsilon_3(\kappa) = 0$ such that

$$\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_1^\kappa + \epsilon_3(\kappa). \quad (4.17)$$

Since λ_1^κ is the principal eigenvalue (see (4.5)), we have

$$\lambda_1^\kappa \leq \frac{\int_{M_\kappa} (|\nabla_g \phi|^2 - f'(U_\kappa)(\phi)^2) dV_{g^\kappa}}{\int_{M_\kappa} (\phi)^2 dV_{g^\kappa}}.$$

By the same argument as above, we can show that there exists $\epsilon_4(\kappa) > 0$ with $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} \epsilon_4(\kappa) = 0$ satisfying

$$\lambda_1^\kappa \leq \lambda_1 + \epsilon_4(\kappa). \quad (4.18)$$

Combining (4.17) and (4.18) yields the conclusion. \square

Now we are in position to prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Theorem 4.1 is a consequence of Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.5. According to Lemma 4.2, the stationary solution U_κ exists in the neighborhood of $\kappa = 0$. By Lemma 4.5, for sufficiently small $|\kappa|$ we have that $\lambda_1^\kappa > 0$ which leads to the stability of U_κ . \square

4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Theorem 4.1 yields that for $|\kappa| \in (0, \kappa_0)$ there exists a pattern U_κ of (1.3) on M_κ . Moreover, by the construction in section 3, there exist closed surfaces M having genus 1 for every appropriate $|\kappa| \in (0, \kappa_0)$. For such a M , let us define the stationary solution U of (1.1) by

$$U(x) = U_\kappa(x) \quad \text{for } x \in M_\kappa,$$

since each U_κ satisfies the Neumann boundary condition on each ∂M_κ . We notice that U is also symmetric with respect to each component of each ∂M_κ .

Lemma 4.6. *U is stable on M .*

Proof. Choose $\epsilon > 0$. Then, since U_κ is stable on M_κ , there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for each initial data $u_\kappa(\cdot, 0) \in L^\infty(M_\kappa)$ with

$$\|u_\kappa(\cdot, 0) - U_\kappa\|_{\infty, M_\kappa} < 2\delta,$$

the solution $u_\kappa \in C^{2,1}(M_{g^\kappa} \times (0, \infty)) \cap C([0, \infty], L^1(M_\kappa))$ of (1.3) satisfies

$$\|u_\kappa(\cdot, t) - U_\kappa\|_{\infty, M_\kappa} < \epsilon \quad \text{for every } t > 0. \quad (4.19)$$

Let $u_0 \in L^\infty(M)$ satisfies $\|u_0 - U\|_{\infty, M} < \delta$. Set $u_0^+ := U + \delta$ and $u_0^- := U - \delta$ on M so that the following inequalities hold:

$$u_0^- < u_0 < u_0^+ \quad \text{on } M_\kappa,$$

$$\|u_0^+ - U\|_{\infty, M} = \delta < 2\delta, \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_0^- - U\|_{\infty, M} = \delta < 2\delta.$$

Let $u^+, u^- \in C(M \times [0, \infty)) \cap C^{2,1}(M \times (0, \infty))$ be the solutions of (1.1) on M with initial data u_0^+, u_0^- , respectively. Since both u_0^+ and u_0^- are symmetric with respect to each component of each ∂M_κ , both u^+ and u^- are also symmetric in the same manner for every $t > 0$. Hence both u^+ and u^- satisfy (1.3) where D is replaced with each M_κ . Thus, by (4.19),

$$\|u^+(\cdot, t) - U\|_{\infty, M} < \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|u^-(\cdot, t) - U\|_{\infty, M} < \epsilon \quad \text{for every } t > 0. \quad (4.20)$$

Since $u_0^- < u_0 < u_0^+$ on M , by the comparison principle there exists a unique solution $u \in C^{2,1}(M \times (0, \infty)) \cap C([0, \infty), L^1(M))$ of (1.1) on M with initial data u_0 and it satisfies $u^- < u < u^+$ on $M \times [0, \infty)$. Therefore it follows from (4.20) that

$$\|u(\cdot, t) - U\|_{\infty, M} < \epsilon \quad \text{for every } t > 0,$$

which shows that U is stable on M . \square

Recall that $\frac{\partial U_\kappa}{\partial \nu} = 0$ on ∂M_κ . Then there exist at least two critical points of U on each component of each ∂M_κ . Therefore we infer that U has at least $4n$ critical points with $n > \frac{\pi}{\gamma \kappa_0}$ where γ is the length of $C(\kappa)$, since U is symmetric with respect to each hyperplane containing each component of each ∂M_κ . This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

References

- [BPT] C. Bandle, F. Punzo and A. Tesei, Existence and nonexistence of patterns on Riemannian manifolds, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 387 (2012), 33–47.
- [BL] J. V. Below and J. A. Lubary, Instability of stationary solutions of reaction-diffusion-equations on graphs, *Results. Math.* 68 (2015), 171–201.
- [D] K. Deimling, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Dover Publications, 2010.
- [DO] Manfredo P. do Carmo, *Differential Geometry of Curves and Surfaces*, Dover Publications, 2016.
- [FSV] A. Farina, Y. Sire and E. Valdinoci, Stable solutions of elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds, *J. Geometric Analysis* 23 (2013), 1158–1172.
- [GT] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order* (2nd ed.). Springer, New York, 1983.
- [H] D. Henry, *Geometric Theory of Semilinear Parabolic Equations*, Springer Lect. Notes Math., vol. 840, Springer, 1981.
- [J] S. Jimbo, On a semilinear diffusion equation on a Riemannian manifold and its stable equilibrium solutions, *Proc. Japan Acad.*, 60, Ser. A (1984), 349–352.
- [M] H. Matano, Asymptotic behavior and stability of solutions of semilinear diffusion equations, *Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ.*, 15 (1979), 401–454.
- [NG] A. S. Nascimento and A. C. Gonçalves, Instability of elliptic equations on compact Riemannian manifolds with non-negative Ricci curvature, *Electron. J. Differential Equations* 67 (2010), 1–18.

- [N] L. Nirenberg, *Topics in Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Revised reprint of the 1974 original, Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 6, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [P] F. Punzo, The existence of patterns on surfaces of revolution without boundary, *Nonlinear Anal.* 77 (2013), 94–102.
- [RW] J. Rubinstein and G. Wolansky, Instability results for reaction diffusion equations over surfaces of revolutions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 187 (1994), 485–489.
- [S] M. Sonogo, Stability result of a reaction-diffusion problem with mixed boundary conditions and applications to some symmetric cases, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 466 (2018), 1190–1210.
- [Y] E. Yanagida, Stability of stationary distributions in a space-dependent population growth process, *J. Math. Biology*, 15 (1982), 37–50.