

Nonnegative solutions of an indefinite sublinear Robin problem II: local and global exactness results ^{*†}

Uriel Kaufmann[‡], Humberto Ramos Quoirin[§], Kenichiro Umezū[¶]

March 13, 2024

Abstract

We go further in the investigation of the Robin problem

$$(P_\alpha) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = a(x)u^q & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u = \alpha u & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

on a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, with a sign-changing and $0 < q < 1$. Assuming the existence of a positive solution for $\alpha = 0$ (which holds if q is close enough to 1), we sharpen the description of the nontrivial solution set of (P_α) for $\alpha > 0$. Moreover, strengthening the assumptions on a and q we provide a global (i.e. for *every* $\alpha > 0$) exactness result on the number of solutions of (P_α) . Our approach also applies to the problem

$$(S_\alpha) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \alpha u + a(x)u^q & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

1 Introduction

In this article we proceed with the study of the indefinite problem

$$(P_\alpha) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = a(x)u^q & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u = \alpha u & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

^{*}2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J15, 35J25, 35J61.

[†]*Key words and phrases.* elliptic problem, indefinite, sublinear, positive solution, Robin boundary condition, exact multiplicity.

[‡]FaMAF-CIEM (CONICET), Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Medina Allende s/n, Ciudad Universitaria, 5000 Córdoba, Argentina. *E-mail address:* kaufmann@mate.uncor.edu

[§]CIEM-FaMAF, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, (5000) Córdoba, Argentina. *E-mail address:* humbertorq@gmail.com

[¶]Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Education, Ibaraki University, Mito 310-8512, Japan. *E-mail address:* kenichiro.umezu.math@vc.ibaraki.ac.jp

Here $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 1$) is a smooth bounded domain, $\partial_\nu := \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$, ν is the unit outward normal to $\partial\Omega$, $a \in C^\theta(\overline{\Omega})$ ($0 < \theta < 1$) changes sign, $0 < q < 1$ and $\alpha \geq 0$.

In [12] we have studied the structure of the nontrivial nonnegative solutions set of this problem, considered with respect to $\alpha \in [-\infty, \infty)$. Let us recall that the case $\alpha = -\infty$ is understood as the Dirichlet boundary condition $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. We shall go deeper in this analysis, giving a more precise description of the solutions set of (P_α) in the region $\alpha > 0$ and weakening some of the assumptions in [12].

By a *solution* of (P_α) we mean a classical nonnegative solution $u \in C^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega})$, for some $r \in (0, 1)$. We say that u is *nontrivial* if $u \not\equiv 0$. In particular, we are interested in solutions lying in

$$\mathcal{P}^\circ := \{u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) : u > 0 \text{ on } \overline{\Omega}\}.$$

Note that since $q \in (0, 1)$ and a changes sign in Ω , this problem may have solutions that do not belong to \mathcal{P}° , see e.g. [12, Remark 3.7].

The following condition on a , which is known to be necessary for the existence of solutions in \mathcal{P}° when $\alpha \geq 0$, shall be assumed throughout this paper:

$$(A.0) \quad \int_{\Omega} a < 0.$$

In addition, we shall assume a technical condition on the set

$$\Omega_+^a := \{x \in \Omega : a(x) > 0\},$$

namely:

$$(A.1) \quad \Omega_+^a \text{ has finitely many connected components, which are all smooth.}$$

Our results in [12] for $\alpha > 0$ have been established when $q \in \mathcal{A}_N := \mathcal{A}_0$, where

$$\mathcal{A}_\alpha = \mathcal{A}_\alpha(a) := \{q \in (0, 1) : \text{any nontrivial solution of } (P_\alpha) \text{ lies in } \mathcal{P}^\circ\}.$$

We recall that, under (A.0) and (A.1), we have $\mathcal{A}_N = (q_N, 1)$ for some $q_N = q_N(a) \in [0, 1)$. Moreover, if $q \in \mathcal{A}_N$ then (P_0) has a *unique* nontrivial solution u_N , which satisfies $u_N \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ [10, Theorem 1.9], and every nontrivial solution of (P_α) belongs to \mathcal{P}° if $0 < \alpha < \alpha_+$, for some $\alpha_+ > 0$ [12, Proposition 2.3].

In the present paper, most of our results shall be proved under the weaker assumption $q \in \mathcal{I}_N$, where

$$\mathcal{I}_N = \mathcal{I}_N(a) := \{q \in (0, 1) : (P_0) \text{ has a solution in } \mathcal{P}^\circ\}.$$

Under (A.0), it is known that (P_0) has at least one nontrivial solution for any $q \in (0, 1)$, see e.g. [6, Theorem 2.1], so $\mathcal{A}_N \subseteq \mathcal{I}_N$. In general, we may have $\mathcal{A}_N \neq \mathcal{I}_N$; however when Ω_+^a is connected and smooth, it holds that $\mathcal{A}_N = \mathcal{I}_N$, see [11, Theorem 1.4]. Also, by [6, Theorem 3.1] we know that (P_0) has at most

one solution which is positive in Ω_+^a . Thus, whenever $q \in \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{N}$ we denote by $u_\mathcal{N}(a)$ (or simply $u_\mathcal{N}$ if no confusion arises) the unique solution in \mathcal{P}° of (P_0) (or $(P_{0,a})$ if we need to stress the dependence on a).

To the best of our knowledge, prior to [12] the only work dealing with (P_α) for $\alpha > 0$ is [7], where Chabrowski and Tintarev established a *local* multiplicity result for the related problem

$$(R_\alpha) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta w = \alpha a(x)w^q & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu w = \alpha w & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

with $\alpha > 0$ small (note that (R_α) is equivalent to (P_α) , after the change of variables $w = \alpha^{\frac{1}{1-q}}u$). More precisely, by variational methods it was proved in [7, Propositions 7.4 and 7.7] that under (A.0), (R_α) has at least two nontrivial solutions $w_{1,\alpha}, w_{2,\alpha}$ such that $w_{1,\alpha} < w_{2,\alpha}$ on $\overline{\Omega}$ for $\alpha > 0$ small enough. Moreover, if

$$c_a := \left(\frac{-\int_\Omega a}{|\partial\Omega|} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}, \quad (1.1)$$

the following asymptotic profiles of $w_{1,\alpha}, w_{2,\alpha}$ hold as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$:

$$w_{2,\alpha} \rightarrow c_a \quad \text{and} \quad w_{1,\alpha} \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } H^1(\Omega) \quad \text{as} \quad \alpha \rightarrow 0^+, \quad (1.2)$$

and every sequence $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ has a subsequence (still denoted by the same notation) satisfying

$$\alpha_n^{-\frac{1}{1-q}} w_{1,\alpha_n} \rightarrow u_0 \text{ in } H^1(\Omega), \quad (1.3)$$

where u_0 is a nontrivial solution of (P_0) .

In particular, we see that under (A.0) the problem (P_α) has, for any $q \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha > 0$ small enough, a solution in \mathcal{P}° , namely, $\alpha^{-\frac{1}{1-q}} w_{2,\alpha}$. Our first result asserts that (A.0) is also *necessary* for the existence of solutions of (P_α) that are positive in Ω_+^a (for any $\alpha \geq 0$ and $0 < q < 1$) and gives a sufficient condition for such solutions to be in \mathcal{P}° :

Theorem 1.1. *If (P_α) has a solution u such that $u > 0$ in Ω_a^+ for some $\alpha \geq 0$ and $q \in (0, 1)$, then (A.0) holds. If we assume in addition (A.1) and $q \in \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{N}$, then every such solution belongs to \mathcal{P}° .*

Assuming additionally (A.1) and $q \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{N}$, we proved in [12, Corollary 3.13] that $w_{1,\alpha}, w_{2,\alpha}$ are the only nontrivial solutions of (R_α) for $\alpha > 0$ small, and in [12, Theorem 4.4] that (R_α) has a maximal closed, connected subset of nontrivial solutions containing $\{(\alpha, w_{1,\alpha}), (\alpha, w_{2,\alpha})\}$ under some further assumptions on a . We remark that the solutions set $\{(\alpha, u)\}$ of (P_α) corresponds to $\{(\alpha, w)\}$ of (R_α) by the change of variables $u = \alpha^{-\frac{1}{1-q}}w$ for $\alpha > 0$.

Let us set

$$\alpha_s = \alpha_s(a, q) := \sup\{\alpha \geq 0 : (P_\alpha) \text{ has a solution in } \mathcal{P}^\circ\}. \quad (1.4)$$

Proceeding as in [12, Proposition 3.4] we can prove that $\alpha_s < \infty$ if $q \in \mathcal{I}_N$. We shall analyze the solution set of (P_α) in neighborhoods of 0 and α_s . This investigation provides us with a global description of the solutions set structure of (P_α) for $\alpha \geq 0$. A more precise version of Theorem 1.2 will be provided in Section 3, see Theorem 3.4.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume (A.0), (A.1), and $q \in \mathcal{I}_N$. Then:*

- (i) (P_α) has a solution curve $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{(\alpha, u_{1,\alpha}); 0 \leq \alpha \leq \alpha_s\}$ such that $\alpha \mapsto u_{1,\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is continuous and increasing on $[0, \alpha_s]$ and C^∞ in $[0, \alpha_s)$, with $u_{1,0} = u_N$, and u_{1,α_s} is the unique solution of (P_{α_s}) in \mathcal{P}° . Moreover, \mathcal{C}_1 is extended to a C^∞ curve, say \mathcal{C}'_1 ($\supset \mathcal{C}_1$), bending to the left in a neighborhood of $(\alpha_s, u_{1,\alpha_s})$.
- (ii) (P_α) has a solution curve $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{(\alpha, u_{2,\alpha}); 0 < \alpha \leq \bar{\alpha}\}$ for some $\bar{\alpha} \in (0, \alpha_s]$, such that $\alpha \mapsto u_{2,\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is continuous and decreasing on $(0, \bar{\alpha}]$ and C^∞ in $(0, \bar{\alpha})$, with $\min_{\bar{\Omega}} u_{2,\alpha} \rightarrow \infty$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$. Moreover:
 - (a) for any interior point $(\alpha, u) \in \mathcal{C}'_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$, the solutions set of (P_α) in a neighborhood of (α, u) is given exactly by $\mathcal{C}'_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$;
 - (b) for every $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha})$ the solutions $u_{1,\alpha}, u_{2,\alpha}$ are strictly ordered by $u_{2,\alpha} - u_{1,\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$, and these ones are the only solutions of (P_α) in \mathcal{P}° for $\alpha > 0$ small.
- (iii) Assume additionally that $0 \neq a \geq 0$ in some smooth domain $D \subset \Omega$ such that $|\partial D \cap \partial \Omega| > 0$. Then \mathcal{C}'_1 is connected to \mathcal{C}_2 by a component (i.e., a maximal closed, connected subset) \mathcal{C}_* of solutions of (P_α) in $[0, \alpha_s] \times \mathcal{P}^\circ$, see Figure 1(i).




Figure 1: (i) The component \mathcal{C}_* . (ii) The exact solution curve \mathcal{C}'_1 . The full curve represents asymptotically stable solutions in \mathcal{P}° , whereas the dotted curve represents unstable solutions in \mathcal{P}° .

Under different conditions to those in Theorem 1.2(iii) we shall establish a *global exactness* result. Let us denote by $\alpha_2 = \alpha_2(\Omega)$ the second (and first nontrivial) eigenvalue of the Steklov problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\phi = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu\phi = \alpha\phi & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

When Ω is a ball of radius R , we know that $\alpha_2(\Omega) = \frac{1}{R}$. Also, if Ω is star shaped, several lower bounds for α_2 are known, see e.g. [18, Section 1] and references therein.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume (A.0), (A.1), $q \in \mathcal{I}_N$ and*

$$\frac{-\int_\Omega a}{\int_{\partial\Omega} u_N^{1-q}} \leq \alpha_2. \quad (1.6)$$

Then the following two assertions hold:

- (i) *The solutions set in \mathcal{P}° of (P_α) with $\alpha \geq 0$ consists of \mathcal{C}'_1 , which contains \mathcal{C}_2 in its upper part. In particular, (P_α) has exactly two solutions in \mathcal{P}° for all $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_s)$, see Figure 1(ii).*
- (ii) *Assume in addition that $\partial\Omega \subseteq \partial\Omega_+^a$ and $q \in \mathcal{A}_N$. Then the nontrivial solutions set of (P_α) with $\alpha > 0$ is given exactly by \mathcal{C}'_1 ,*

Let us note that several examples of weights a satisfying (1.6) are discussed in Section 2.

Remark 1.4.

- (i) As one can see from its proof, Theorem 1.3 holds more generally under the condition $\alpha_s < \alpha_2$, instead of (1.6).
- (ii) In Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, if we assume $q \in \mathcal{A}_N$ instead of $q \in \mathcal{I}_N$, then (A.1) is no longer needed, cf. Remark 3.3.

To conclude the study of (P_α) , we carry out a bifurcation analysis, with q as parameter, and obtain solutions in \mathcal{P}° for $\alpha > 0$ fixed and $q \rightarrow 1^-$. As a consequence, we provide the limiting behavior as $q \rightarrow 1^-$ of $\alpha_s(a, q)$ and $u_{i,\alpha}(q)$, $i = 1, 2$, whenever these are the only solutions in \mathcal{P}° , see Theorem 5.2 and Corollary 5.3.

Finally, let us mention that (P_α) has many similarities with the Neumann problem

$$(S_\alpha) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \alpha u + a(x)u^q & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

As a matter of fact, one may see that the linear term αu in the equation above acts very similarly as in the boundary condition of (P_α) , as far as the methods

used in this article (and in [12]) are concerned. In this way, we complement the results established for (S_α) by Alama in [2].

The rest of this article is organized as follows. In the next section we give some examples of a and q satisfying our assumptions. Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are proved in Section 3, whereas Theorem 1.3 is proved in Section 4. In Section 5 we follow a bifurcation approach for (P_α) with $q \rightarrow 1^-$. Finally, in Section 6 we state some results on (S_α) . We also include an Appendix containing some necessary facts related to some of the stability results in [3, Chapter II] .

2 Examples

Before proving our results we discuss some examples of a and q satisfying our assumptions.

2.1 On the condition (1.6)

Let $\sigma_1^{\mathcal{D}}(a)$ and $\sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}(a)$ be the unique positive principal eigenvalues with respect to the weight a , under homogeneous Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions, respectively. First note that, for q close to 1, by [11, Theorem 1.2], we have

$$u_{\mathcal{N}}^{1-q} \simeq \frac{(t_* \phi_1)^{1-q}}{\sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}(a)}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\phi_1 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is the eigenfunction associated to $\sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}(a)$, normalized by $\|\phi_1\|_2 = 1$, and

$$t_* := \exp \left[- \frac{\int_{\Omega} a(x) \phi_1^2 \log \phi_1}{\int_{\Omega} a(x) \phi_1^2} \right].$$

In particular, t_* and ϕ_1 do not depend on q , and both are away from 0. So, for q close enough to 1 we have that $u_{\mathcal{N}}^{1-q} \simeq \frac{1}{\sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}(a)}$. Thus, for such q , (1.6) is satisfied if

$$-\sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}(a) \int_{\Omega} a < |\partial\Omega| \alpha_2. \quad (2.2)$$

Recall also that $q \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{N}}$ whenever q is sufficiently close to 1. Let us show now examples of a satisfying (2.2):

- (i) Choose any $a \in C^\theta(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfying (A.0) and (A.1). Taking into account (A.0), we may fix k such that

$$\max \left\{ C_a - \frac{|\partial\Omega| \alpha_2}{\sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}(a) \int_{\Omega} a^+}, 1 \right\} < k < C_a, \quad \text{with} \quad C_a := \frac{\int_{\Omega} a^-}{\int_{\Omega} a^+}, \quad (2.3)$$

where, as usual, $a^\pm := \max\{\pm a, 0\}$. We set $a_k := ka^+ - a^-$. Then (A.1) holds for a_k , and the second inequality in (2.3) shows that (A.0) is also true for a_k . Moreover, the first inequality in (2.3) gives that $-\sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}(a) \int_{\Omega} a_k < |\partial\Omega| \alpha_2$, and so, since $k \geq 1$, by the monotonicity of the principal eigenvalue with respect to the weight (e.g. [9, Proposition 4.7]) we deduce that a_k satisfies (2.2).

- (ii) One can argue similarly if $a \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ is such that $\int_{\Omega} a = 0$ and $\{a_j\} \subset C^{\theta}(\overline{\Omega})$ is a sequence satisfying (A.0), (A.1), and $a_j \rightarrow a$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. Then, since $\sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}(a) = 0$ and $a \mapsto \sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}(a)$ is continuous from $L^1(\Omega)$ into \mathbb{R} (cf. [14, Lemma 2.4], which also holds if $\int_{\Omega} a = 0$), we see that (2.2) is fulfilled by a_j with j large enough.
- (iii) Another class of weights a satisfying (2.2) is the following one: denote by B_R the ball of radius R centered at 0 in \mathbb{R}^N . Let $a \in C^{\theta}(\overline{B_1})$ satisfy (A.0) and (A.1), and $a_R \in C^{\theta}(\overline{B_R})$ be an extension of a to B_R such that (A.1) holds and $\int_{B_1} a < \int_{B_R} a_R < 0$. We claim that for $N \geq 3$ and R large enough a_R fulfills (2.2). To this end, note that $\sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}(a_R) < \sigma_1^{\mathcal{D}}(a)$ for every $R > 1$. Recall also that $|\partial B_R| = NR^{N-1}\omega_N$, where ω_N is the volume of B_1 . Thus

$$-\sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}(a_R) \int_{B_R} a_R < -\sigma_1^{\mathcal{D}}(a) \int_{B_1} a < NR^{N-2}\omega_N = |\partial B_R|\alpha_2(B_R)$$

if $N \geq 3$ and R is large enough, which yields (2.2).

We next modify the construction of the preceeding examples and we prove (1.6) directly, not by way of (2.2).

- (iv) Let a, a_j be as in (ii), and satisfying in addition that $a_j \rightarrow a$ in $L^{\infty}(\Omega)$. Choose $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and set $b_{\varepsilon} := (1 - \varepsilon)a^{+} - a^{-}$. Then b_{ε} changes sign in Ω and b_{ε} fulfills (A.0). Let us show that, for any $q \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{N}}(b_{\varepsilon})$, a_j satisfies (2.2) for all j large enough. Indeed, let $q \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{N}}(b_{\varepsilon})$, and let us stress the dependence of (P_0) on the weight a by writing $(P_{0,a})$. We note first that $b_{\varepsilon} \leq a_j$ if j is large enough, and thus $u_{\mathcal{N}}(b_{\varepsilon})$ is a subsolution of (P_{0,a_j}) for such j . Now, by [6, Lemma 2.4], this problem has arbitrarily large supersolutions (because a_j satisfies (A.0)), so we deduce that $u_{\mathcal{N}}(a_j)$ exists and $u_{\mathcal{N}}(a_j) \geq u_{\mathcal{N}}(b_{\varepsilon})$. In particular, $q \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{N}}(a_j)$. Hence, since $\int_{\Omega} a_j \rightarrow 0$, enlarging j if necessary,

$$\frac{-\int_{\Omega} a_j}{\int_{\partial\Omega} u_{\mathcal{N}}(a_j)^{1-q}} \leq \frac{-\int_{\Omega} a_j}{\int_{\partial\Omega} u_{\mathcal{N}}(b_{\varepsilon})^{1-q}} \leq \alpha_2,$$

as claimed.

- (v) As a particular case of (iv) we see that a_k in (i) satisfies (1.6) also for any $q \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{N}}(a)$ and $k \approx C_a$. Indeed, for a as in (i), define $\tilde{a} := C_a a^{+} - a^{-}$, $\varepsilon := 1 - 1/C_a$ and $\tilde{b}_{\varepsilon} := (1 - \varepsilon)C_a a^{+} - a^{-}$. Note that $\int_{\Omega} \tilde{a} = 0$ and $\tilde{b}_{\varepsilon} = a$. Also, for any $\{k_j\}$ with $0 < k_j \nearrow C_a$, let $\tilde{a}_j := k_j a^{+} - a^{-}$. Then, item (iv) with \tilde{a}, \tilde{a}_j and b_{ε} in place of a, a_j and b_{ε} , respectively, yields the desired assertion.

2.2 On the condition $q \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{N}}$

As already mentioned, under (A.0) and (A.1), we have $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{N}} = (q_{\mathcal{N}}, 1)$ for some $q_{\mathcal{N}} = q_{\mathcal{N}}(a) \geq 0$. However, a useful *upper* estimate (i.e. < 1) on $q_{\mathcal{N}}$ is hard

to obtain in general, since q_N can be arbitrarily close to 1 (see [11, Theorem 1.4(ii)]). Let us show a situation where this can be done. Take $0 < R_0 < R$, $\Omega := B_R$, and $a \in C^\theta(\overline{\Omega})$ a radial function satisfying (A.0), $a \leq 0$ in $\overline{B_{R_0}}$ and $a > 0$ in $A_{R_0} := \Omega \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}}$ (note that a fulfills (A.1) and $\partial\Omega \subseteq \partial\Omega_+^a$). Then, as a consequence of [11, Corollary 4.4] we have that

$$q_N \leq \frac{1-K}{1-K+2KN^{-1}} := \underline{q}, \quad \text{where} \quad K = K(a) := \frac{\int_{A_{R_0}} a^+}{|B_{R_0}| \|a^-\|_{L^\infty(B_{R_0})}}.$$

Let us observe that, by (A.0), $K < 1$. A similar result holds in the one-dimensional case without requiring any evenness assumptions, see [11, Remark 3.4].

Also, an inspection of the proof of [11, Theorem 1.8 and Corollary 4.4] shows that, for a as above and $q \in (\underline{q}, 1)$, we have

$$u_N^{1-q} \geq \frac{1-q}{|\partial B_R|} \int_{R_0}^R \left(\int_{A_t} a^+ \right) dt \quad \text{on } \partial B_R.$$

Thus, (1.6) holds whenever

$$\frac{\int_{B_{R_0}} a^- - \int_{A_{R_0}} a^+}{\int_{R_0}^R \left(\int_{A_t} a^+ \right) dt} \leq \frac{1-q}{R}.$$

In particular, it follows that given *any* $q \in (0, 1)$, we can find a weight a such that $q \in \mathcal{A}_N(a)$ and (1.6) holds, choosing suitably a so that $\int_{B_R} a \approx 0$ and $K \approx 1$.

3 Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is a direct consequence of Propositions 3.1 and 3.2(i) below.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\alpha \geq 0$ and $0 < q < 1$. If u is a supersolution of (P_α) such that $u > 0$ in Ω_+^a then $\int_{\text{supp } u} a < 0$. In particular (A.0) holds.*

Proof. We argue as in [2, Proposition 2.3], which is inspired by [6, Lemma 2.1]. Take $(u + \varepsilon)^{-q}$ as test function in (P_α) to get

$$-q \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{(u + \varepsilon)^{q+1}} \geq \int_{\Omega} a \left(\frac{u}{u + \varepsilon} \right)^q + \alpha \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{u}{(u + \varepsilon)^q} \geq \int_{\Omega} a \left(\frac{u}{u + \varepsilon} \right)^q.$$

Following the argument in [2, Proposition 2.3] we deduce that $\int_{\text{supp } u} a < 0$. Since $a \leq 0$ on the region where u possibly vanishes, we find that $\int_{\Omega} a \leq \int_{\text{supp } u} a < 0$. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Assume (A.0), (A.1) and $q \in \mathcal{I}_N$.*

- (i) If u is a supersolution of (P_α) for $\alpha > 0$ and $u > 0$ in Ω_+^a , then $u \geq u_{\mathcal{N}}$.
- (ii) For $\alpha > 0$ small enough (P_α) has, in \mathcal{P}° , exactly two solutions $u_{1,\alpha}, u_{2,\alpha}$. Moreover:
- (a) $u_{1,\alpha} = u_{\mathcal{N}}$ at $\alpha = 0$, and there exists some $\alpha_* > 0$ such that the map $\alpha \mapsto u_{1,\alpha}$ is C^∞ from $[0, \alpha_*)$ to $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, increasing, $\gamma_1(\alpha, u_{1,\alpha}) > 0$, and $\gamma_1(\alpha_*, u_{1,\alpha_*}) = 0$. Moreover, for every $\beta \in (0, \alpha_s)$ the solutions set of (P_α) in a neighborhood of $(\beta, u_{1,\beta})$ is given exactly by $(\alpha, u_{1,\alpha})$.
 - (b) there exists some $\overline{\alpha} > 0$ such that the map $\alpha \mapsto u_{2,\alpha}$ is C^∞ from $(0, \overline{\alpha})$ to $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, and $\min_{\overline{\Omega}} u_{2,\alpha} \rightarrow \infty$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$. Moreover, for every $\beta \in (0, \overline{\alpha})$ the solutions set in a neighborhood of $(\beta, u_{1,\beta})$ is given exactly by $(\alpha, u_{2,\alpha})$.

Proof.

- (i) First of all, it is clear that u is a supersolution of (P_0) . Now, by (A.1) we have that $\Omega_+^a = \cup_{k=1}^n \Omega_k$, where Ω_k are smooth, open and connected. For each k , we take a ball $B_k \Subset \Omega_k$ and consider the Dirichlet eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \phi = \lambda a(x) \phi & \text{in } B_k, \\ \phi = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_k. \end{cases}$$

By ϕ_k we denote a positive eigenfunction associated with the first eigenvalue of this problem, and extended by 0 outside B_k . If $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k > 0$ is small enough then $\varepsilon \phi_k$ is a subsolution of (P_0) smaller than u , since $u > 0$ in every Ω_k . Hence $\hat{\phi} := \max_k \{\varepsilon_k \phi_k\}$ is a (weak) subsolution of (P_0) and $\hat{\phi} > 0$ in B_k for all k . By the sub and supersolutions method, we have a solution v of (P_0) such that $\hat{\phi} \leq v \leq u$. In particular, $v > 0$ in B_k for all k . By the strong maximum principle, we deduce that $v > 0$ in Ω_k for all k , i.e. $v > 0$ in Ω_+^a . Now, under (A.1), there is at most one solution of (P_0) which is positive in Ω_+^a [6, Theorem 3.1]. Therefore, $v = u_{\mathcal{N}}$, and so $u_{\mathcal{N}} \leq u$, as claimed.

- (ii) Since $\gamma_1(0, u_{\mathcal{N}}) > 0$ (see [12, Lemma 2.5]), the IFT provides the existence of a C^∞ (and increasing, by [13, Theorem 7.10]) solution curve $\alpha \mapsto u_{1,\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ for $\alpha > 0$ small. Let $\alpha_* > 0$ be the maximal α of this curve. Recalling that $\alpha_s < \infty$ we have that $\alpha_* < \infty$. Furthermore, taking into account the fact that $u_{1,\alpha}$ is increasing and the *a priori* upper bound of nontrivial solutions of (P_α) for a compact interval in $(0, \infty)$ (see [12, Proposition 3.2]), letting $\alpha \nearrow \alpha_*$ we see that there exists $u_{\alpha_*} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ solution of (P_{α_*}) . Moreover $\gamma_1(\alpha_*, u_{1,\alpha_*}) = 0$ by the maximality of α_* (otherwise we use the IFT to extend the curve beyond α_*).

On the other hand, let $w(\alpha) := t(\alpha) + \psi(\alpha, t(\alpha))$, where $t(\alpha)$ and $\psi(\alpha, t(\alpha))$ are as in [12, Proposition 3.11]. By this proposition, for all $\alpha > 0$ small

enough $w(\alpha) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is a solution of the problem

$$(R_\alpha) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta w = \alpha a(x)w^q & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu w = \alpha w & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

satisfying $t(0) = c_a$ and $\psi(0, c_a) = 0$, where c_a is the positive constant introduced by (1.1). In particular, $w(0) = c_a > 0$, and still by [12, Proposition 3.11] we know that $\alpha \mapsto w(\alpha)$ is a C^∞ mapping from $(-\alpha_0, \alpha_0)$ to $W^{2,s}(\Omega)$, $s > N$, for some $\alpha_0 > 0$ small. Moreover, it is easy to see that $u_{2,\alpha} := \alpha^{-\frac{1}{1-q}} w(\alpha)$ is a solution of (P_α) with $\min_{\overline{\Omega}} u_{2,\alpha} \rightarrow \infty$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$. Let us show the exactness assertion. From [12, Propositions 3.2, 3.10, 3.11(ii)] and the change of variables $u = \alpha^{-\frac{1}{1-q}} w$, we deduce that $u_{2,\alpha}$ is the only solution which blows up as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$. More precisely, there exists $C > 0$ such that, except for $u_{2,\alpha}$, we have $\|u\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C$ for all nontrivial solutions of (P_α) for α close to 0. Assume $u_j \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is a solution of (P_{α_j}) with $\alpha_j \rightarrow 0^+$ and u_j is not on the curve $(\alpha, u_{2,\alpha})$. By (i) we know that $u_{\mathcal{N}} \leq u_j \leq C$ on $\overline{\Omega}$. Up to a subsequence, we have $u_j \rightarrow u_0$, $u_0 \geq u_{\mathcal{N}}$, and u_0 is a solution of (P_0) . Since $u_{\mathcal{N}}$ is unique we get $u_0 = u_{\mathcal{N}}$, and by the IFT, we conclude that u_j is on the curve $(\alpha, u_{1,\alpha})$ for j large enough. The remaining assertions follow directly from the IFT. \square

Remark 3.3. As an alternative to Proposition 3.2(i), one can show that if $q \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{N}}$ and u is a supersolution of (P_α) with $\alpha > 0$ and $u \not\equiv 0$ in Ω_+^a then $u \geq u_{\mathcal{N}}$. Indeed, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 3.2(i) we may construct a nontrivial solution v of (P_0) with $v \leq u$. Since $q \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{N}}$ we must have $v \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$. Using the uniqueness result in [6, Lemma 3.1] we deduce that $v = u_{\mathcal{N}}$, and the conclusion follows.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Theorem 1.2 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.4 below. Before stating this result, we recall in the next paragraph some facts concerning the stability of the solutions $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ of (P_α) .

Given a solution $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ of (P_α) , let us consider the linearized eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(\alpha, u)\phi := -\Delta\phi - qa(x)u^{q-1}\phi = \gamma(\alpha, u)\phi & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{B}(\alpha, u)\phi := \partial_\nu\phi - \alpha\phi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

We denote by $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(\alpha, u)$ the smallest eigenvalue of (3.1) and by $\phi_1 = \phi_1(\alpha, u)$ a positive eigenfunction associated with γ_1 . We remark that γ_1 is simple, and $\phi_1 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$. Also, if $\alpha \mapsto u(\alpha)$ is continuous in $C^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $r \in (0, 1)$, then so is $\alpha \mapsto \gamma_1(\alpha, u(\alpha))$. In fact, with computations as those in [17, p. 1155] one can see that this map inherits the regularity of the map $\alpha \mapsto u = u(\alpha)$, by the implicit function theorem (in short, IFT). Recall that $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is said to be

- asymptotically stable if $\gamma_1(\alpha, u) > 0$,
- weakly stable if $\gamma_1(\alpha, u) \geq 0$,
- unstable if $\gamma_1(\alpha, u) < 0$.

Theorem 3.4. Assume (A.0), (A.1), and $q \in \mathcal{I}_N$. Then:

- (i) (P_α) has a solution curve $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{(\alpha, u_{1,\alpha}); 0 \leq \alpha \leq \alpha_s\}$ such that $\alpha \mapsto u_{1,\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is continuous and increasing on $[0, \alpha_s]$ and C^∞ in $[0, \alpha_s)$, and $u_{1,0} = u_N$. Moreover,
- (a) u_{1,α_s} is the unique solution of (P_{α_s}) in \mathcal{P}° ;
 - (b) $u_{1,\alpha}$ is minimal in \mathcal{P}° for $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_s)$;
 - (c) for every $\beta \in (0, \alpha_s)$ the solutions set of (P_α) in a neighborhood of $(\beta, u_{1,\beta})$ is given exactly by \mathcal{C}_1 .
 - (d) $u_{1,\alpha}$ is asymptotically stable for $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_s)$, and weakly stable but not asymptotically stable for $\alpha = \alpha_s$. Furthermore, $u_{1,\alpha}$ is the only stable solution of (P_α) for $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_s]$.
- (ii) (P_α) has a solution curve $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{(\alpha, u_{2,\alpha}); 0 < \alpha \leq \bar{\alpha}\}$ for some $\bar{\alpha} \in (0, \alpha_s]$, such that $\alpha \mapsto u_{2,\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is continuous and decreasing on $(0, \bar{\alpha}]$ and C^∞ in $(0, \bar{\alpha})$. In addition, $u_{2,\alpha}$ is unstable for $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha})$ and $\min_{\bar{\alpha}} u_{2,\alpha} \rightarrow \infty$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$. Moreover:
- (a) for every $\beta \in (0, \bar{\alpha})$ the solutions set of (P_α) in a neighborhood of $(\beta, u_{2,\beta})$ is given exactly by \mathcal{C}_2 ;
 - (b) for every $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha})$ the solutions $u_{1,\alpha}, u_{2,\alpha}$ are strictly ordered as follows: $u_{2,\alpha} - u_{1,\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$;
 - (c) $u_{1,\alpha}$ and $u_{2,\alpha}$ are the only solutions of (P_α) in \mathcal{P}° for $\alpha > 0$ small.
- (iii) (P_α) has a C^∞ solution curve $\mathcal{C}_3 = \{(\alpha(t), u(t)); -t_0 < t < t_0\}$ for some $t_0 > 0$ small, such that $u(t) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$, $(\alpha(0), u(0)) = (\alpha_s, u_{1,\alpha_s})$, $\alpha'(0) = 0 > \alpha''(0)$ and $u'(0) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$, i.e., the solution curve bends to the left in a neighborhood of $(\alpha_s, u_{1,\alpha_s})$. In addition:
- (a) $\{(\alpha(t), u(t)); -t_0 < t < 0\}$ represents the lower branch of \mathcal{C}_3 satisfying $u(t) = u_{1,\alpha(t)}$, whereas $\{(\alpha(t), u(t)); 0 < t < t_0\}$ represents the upper one; these branches are increasing and decreasing, respectively.
 - (b) in a neighborhood of $(\alpha_s, u_{1,\alpha_s})$ the solutions set of (P_α) is given exactly by \mathcal{C}_3 .

Furthermore, (P_α) has exactly two solutions in \mathcal{P}° for α in a left neighborhood of α_s .

(iv) Assume additionally that $0 \neq a \geq 0$ in some smooth domain $D \subset \Omega$ such that $|\partial D \cap \partial \Omega| > 0$. Then (P_α) has a component (i.e., a maximal closed, connected subset) \mathcal{C}_* of solutions in $[0, \alpha_s] \times \mathcal{P}^\circ$ which includes \mathcal{C}_1 , \mathcal{C}_2 and \mathcal{C}_3 , and satisfies

$$\mathcal{C}_* \cap \{(\alpha, 0), (\alpha, \infty), (0, u)\} = \{(0, \infty), (0, u_{\mathcal{N}})\}. \quad (3.2)$$

In particular, (P_α) has at least two solutions in \mathcal{P}° for every $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_s)$, see Figure 1(i).

The rest of this subsection is devoted to the proof of the above theorem. In order to prove it, we start with two further results on $u_{2,\alpha}$.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume (A.0). Then:*

- (i) $u_{2,\alpha} > u_{2,\beta}$ on $\overline{\Omega}$ if $0 < \alpha < \beta$ are small enough.
- (ii) $u_{2,\alpha}$ is unstable if $\alpha > 0$ is small enough.

Proof.

- (i) Let $w(\alpha)$ be as in the proof of Proposition 3.2(ii). Since $u_{2,\alpha} = \alpha^{-\frac{1}{1-q}} w(\alpha)$, differentiating $u_{2,\alpha}$ with respect to α provides

$$\frac{du_{2,\alpha}}{d\alpha} = -\frac{1}{1-q} \alpha^{-\frac{1}{1-q}-1} w(\alpha) + \alpha^{-\frac{1}{1-q}} w'(\alpha).$$

Set

$$\eta(\alpha) := \alpha^{\frac{2-q}{1-q}} \frac{du_{2,\alpha}}{d\alpha} = -\frac{1}{1-q} w(\alpha) + \alpha w'(\alpha). \quad (3.3)$$

Recalling that $w(0) = c_a$ we see that

$$\eta(0) = -\frac{1}{1-q} w(0) = -\frac{c_a}{1-q} < 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover, we know that $w(\alpha) \rightarrow w(0)$ in $C(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$, and also that $\|w'(\alpha)\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}$ is bounded as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$, since $w'(\alpha) \rightarrow w'(0)$ in $C(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$. Hence, we deduce from (3.3) and (3.4) that

$$\eta(\alpha) \rightarrow \eta(0) = -\frac{c_a}{1-q} < 0 \quad \text{in } C(\overline{\Omega}) \text{ as } \alpha \rightarrow 0^+,$$

and then,

$$\alpha^{\frac{2-q}{1-q}} \frac{du_{2,\alpha}}{d\alpha} \longrightarrow -\frac{c_a}{1-q} \quad \text{in } C(\overline{\Omega}) \text{ as } \alpha \rightarrow 0^+.$$

In particular, there exists $\underline{\alpha} > 0$ such that

$$\frac{du_{2,\alpha}}{d\alpha} < -\frac{c_a}{2(1-q)} \alpha^{-\frac{2-q}{1-q}} \quad \text{on } \overline{\Omega} \text{ for } 0 < \alpha < \underline{\alpha},$$

which yields the conclusion.

(ii) As mentioned in the proof of Proposition 3.2(ii),

$$\alpha^{\frac{1}{1-q}} u_{2,\alpha} = w(\alpha) \rightarrow c_a > 0 \quad \text{in } C^1(\overline{\Omega}), \quad \text{as } \alpha \rightarrow 0^+. \quad (3.5)$$

Taking $\frac{1}{\phi_1}$ as test function in (3.1) we see that

$$0 > \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi_1 \nabla \left(\frac{1}{\phi_1} \right) = \alpha |\partial \Omega| + \gamma_1 |\Omega| + q \int_{\Omega} a u_{2,\alpha}^{q-1},$$

so that

$$-\frac{\gamma_1 |\Omega|}{\alpha} > q \int_{\Omega} a \left(\alpha^{\frac{1}{1-q}} u_{2,\alpha} \right)^{q-1} + |\partial \Omega|,$$

and (3.5) provides

$$\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\gamma_1}{\alpha} \leq -\frac{(1-q) |\partial \Omega|}{|\Omega|} < 0.$$

The desired conclusion follows. \square

We shall employ the following result to study the solutions set of (P_α) in a neighborhood of $(\alpha_*, u_{1,\alpha_*})$, where α_* is as in Proposition 3.2(ii-a).

Proposition 3.6. *Let $u_0 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ be a solution of (P_{α_0}) for $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that $\gamma_1(\alpha_0, u_0) = 0$. Then, in a neighborhood of (α_0, u_0) the solutions set of (P_α) is given exactly by a C^∞ curve $(\alpha, u) = (\alpha(t), u(t))$, parametrized by $t \in (-t_0, t_0)$ for some $t_0 > 0$, and such that $(\alpha(0), u(0)) = (\alpha_0, u_0)$. Moreover:*

- (i) $(\alpha(t), u(t)) = (\alpha_0 + \beta(t), u_0 + t\phi_1 + z(t))$ with $\phi_1 = \phi_1(\alpha_0, u_0)$ and some C^∞ functions $\beta(\cdot), z(\cdot)$, satisfying $\beta(0) = \beta'(0) = 0$ and $z(0) = z'(0) = 0$ (implying $u'(0) = \phi_1 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$);
- (ii) $\beta''(0) < 0$, i.e., the curve $(\alpha(t), u(t))$ bends to the left in a neighborhood of (α_0, u_0) , see Figure 1(i);
- (iii) $u(t)$ is asymptotically stable for $t < 0$ and unstable for $t > 0$.

Proof. We apply [8, Theorems 3.2 and 3.6] to prove this proposition.

- (i) For some suitable $r = r(q, \theta) \in (0, 1)$ we consider the mapping

$$F: U_0 \longrightarrow C^r(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1+r}(\partial \Omega); \quad (\alpha, u) \longmapsto (-\Delta u - au^q, \partial_\nu u - \alpha u),$$

where U_0 is an open neighborhood of (α_0, u_0) in $\mathbb{R} \times C^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $\alpha > 0$ and $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ for $(\alpha, u) \in U_0$. We see that for a given $(\alpha, u) \in U_0$, $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ solves (P_α) if and only if $F(\alpha, u) = (0, 0)$. The Fréchet derivatives F_α and F_u are given by

$$F_\alpha(\alpha_0, u_0) = (0, -u_0), \quad F_u(\alpha, u)\phi = (\mathcal{L}(\alpha, u)\phi, \mathcal{B}(\alpha, u)\phi),$$

where we recall that \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{B} are given by (3.1). Since $\gamma_1(\alpha_0, u_0) = 0$, we deduce that $\text{Ker}(F_u(\alpha_0, u_0)) = \text{span}\{\phi_1\}$, where $\phi_1 = \phi_1(\alpha_0, u_0) \in$

\mathcal{P}° . To verify that $F_\alpha(\alpha_0, u_0) \notin \text{Im}(F_u(\alpha_0, u_0))$, we shall check that the problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(\alpha_0, u_0)v = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{B}(\alpha_0, u_0)v = -u_0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

has no solution. Indeed, if v solves this problem then

$$0 = \int_{\Omega} (\phi_1 \mathcal{L}v - v \mathcal{L}\phi_1) = \int_{\partial\Omega} (-\phi_1 \mathcal{B}v + v \mathcal{B}\phi_1) = \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 \phi_1 > 0, \quad (3.6)$$

a contradiction. By [8, Theorem 3.2] we infer that, in a neighborhood of (α_0, u_0) , the solutions of $F(\alpha, u) = (0, 0)$ are given exactly by the curve

$$\{(\alpha(t), u(t)) = (\alpha_0 + \beta(t), u_0 + t\phi_1 + z(t)) : -t_0 < t < t_0\} \quad (3.7)$$

for some $\beta(\cdot), z(\cdot)$ which are C^∞ and satisfy $\beta(0) = \beta'(0) = 0$, and $z(0) = z'(0) = 0$. Assertion (i) has been verified.

- (ii) Based on the regularity assertion for the curve, we shall differentiate $F(\alpha(t), u(t)) = (0, 0)$ with respect to t twice at $t = 0$. From (3.7) we see that $\alpha'(0) = 0$ and $u'(0) = \phi_1$. Thus, after some computations we find that

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(\alpha_0, u_0)u''(0) = aq(q-1)u_0^{q-2}\phi_1^2 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{B}(\alpha_0, u_0)u''(0) = \alpha''(0)u_0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

We now use Green's formula to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (\phi_1 \mathcal{L}(\alpha_0, u_0)u''(0) - u''(0) \mathcal{L}(\alpha_0, u_0)\phi_1) \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega} (u''(0) \mathcal{B}(\alpha_0, u_0)\phi_1 - \phi_1 \mathcal{B}(\alpha_0, u_0)u''(0)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{L}(\alpha_0, u_0)\phi_1 = 0$ and $\mathcal{B}(\alpha_0, u_0)\phi_1 = 0$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (\phi_1 \mathcal{L}(\alpha_0, u_0)u''(0) - u''(0) \mathcal{L}(\alpha_0, u_0)\phi_1) = q(q-1) \int_{\Omega} au_0^{q-2}\phi_1^3, \\ & \int_{\partial\Omega} (u''(0) \mathcal{B}(\alpha_0, u_0)\phi_1 - \phi_1 \mathcal{B}(\alpha_0, u_0)u''(0)) = -\alpha''(0) \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 \phi_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we deduce that

$$\beta''(0) = \alpha''(0) = \frac{q(1-q) \int_{\Omega} au_0^{q-2}\phi_1^3}{\int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 \phi_1} < 0 \iff \int_{\Omega} au_0^{q-2}\phi_1^3 < 0.$$

Let us show that $\int_{\Omega} au_0^{q-2}\phi_1^3 < 0$. Employing $\frac{\phi_1^3}{u_0^2}$ and $\frac{\phi_1^2}{u_0}$ as test functions in the weak forms of (P_{α_0}) and (3.1), respectively, and recalling that $\gamma_1(\alpha_0, u_0) = 0$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} (1-q) \int_{\Omega} au_0^{q-2}\phi_1^3 &= \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_0 \nabla \left(\frac{\phi_1^3}{u_0^2} \right) - \nabla \phi_1 \nabla \left(\frac{\phi_1^2}{u_0} \right) \\ &= -2 \int_{\Omega} \frac{\phi_1}{u_0^3} |u_0 \nabla \phi_1 - \phi_1 \nabla u_0|^2 < 0, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. Assertion (ii) has been verified.

(iii) This assertion is a direct consequence of the previous one, using [8, Theorem 3.6]. Indeed, if we define $Kw := (w, 0)$, we can check in the same way as (3.6) that $K\phi_1 \notin \text{Im}(F_u(\alpha_0, u_0))$, i.e., 0 is a K -simple eigenvalue of $F_u(\alpha_0, u_0)$ in the sense of [8, Definition 1.2]. Put $\gamma(t) := \gamma_1(\alpha(t), u(t))$ and $\phi(t) := \phi_1(\alpha(t), u(t))$ to get

$$F_u(\alpha(t), u(t))\phi(t) = \gamma(t)K\phi(t) \iff \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(\alpha(t), u(t))\phi(t) = \gamma(t)\phi(t) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{B}(\alpha(t), u(t))\phi(t) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

see [8, (3.5)]. Lastly, using ϕ_1 , we set l as the continuous functional on $C^r(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1+r}(\partial\Omega)$ given by

$$\langle l, (f, g) \rangle := \int_{\Omega} f\phi_1 + \int_{\partial\Omega} g\phi_1,$$

which satisfies $\text{Ker}(l) = \text{Im}(F_u(\alpha_0, u_0))$ (note that $\langle l, K\phi_1 \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \phi_1^2 \neq 0$). We are now ready to apply [8, Theorem 3.6] to obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\gamma(t)}{\alpha'(t)} = - \frac{\langle l, F_u(\alpha_0, u_0) \rangle}{\langle l, K\phi_1 \rangle} = \frac{\int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 \phi_1}{\int_{\Omega} \phi_1^2} > 0.$$

This implies that $\gamma(t)$ and $\alpha'(t)$ have the same sign when t is close to 0, which combined with assertion (ii) provides the desired conclusion. \square

Now, with the aid of Proposition 3.5(ii), we have the following instability result.

Proposition 3.7. *Assume (A.0), (A.1) and $q \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{N}}$. Then $u_{1,\alpha}$ is the only weakly stable solution of (P_{α}) in \mathcal{P}° for $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_*]$.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that for some $\alpha_0 > 0$, $u_0 \in \mathcal{P}^{\circ}$ is a weakly stable solution of (P_{α_0}) and $u_0 \notin \mathcal{C}_1$. We remark that (α_0, u_0) has a positive distance to the set $\{(\alpha, u_{1,\alpha}) : \alpha \in (0, \alpha_*]\}$. Then, thanks to Proposition 3.6, we can assume that u_0 is asymptotically stable, i.e., $\gamma_1(\alpha_0, u_0) > 0$, and $(\alpha_0, u_0) \notin \{(\alpha, u_{1,\alpha}) : \alpha \in (0, \alpha_*]\}$.

Now, by the IFT, we obtain a solution curve $(\alpha, v(\alpha))$ with $v(\alpha_0) = u_0$, $v(\alpha) \in \mathcal{P}^{\circ}$ and $\gamma_1(\alpha, v(\alpha)) > 0$, parametrized by $\alpha \in (\alpha_0 - \delta_0, \alpha_0]$ for some $\delta_0 > 0$. Note that such curve can be extended to $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$. Indeed, otherwise there exists some $\underline{\alpha} \in (0, \alpha_0)$ such that either $v(\underline{\alpha}) \notin \mathcal{P}^{\circ}$ (which contradicts Proposition 3.2(i)) or $\gamma_1(\underline{\alpha}, v(\underline{\alpha})) = 0$ (which contradicts the exactness assertion in Proposition 3.6).

However, this curve never meets $\{(\alpha, u_{1,\alpha}) : \alpha \in (0, \alpha_*]\}$ (if so we reach a contradiction using the IFT). Consequently, Proposition 3.2(ii) implies that $v(\alpha) = u_{2,\alpha}$ for all $\alpha > 0$ small. But, by Proposition 3.5(ii), $u_{2,\alpha}$ is unstable if α is small enough, so we reach a contradiction. \square

Proposition 3.8. *Assume (A.0), (A.1) and $q \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{N}}$. Then $\alpha_* = \alpha_s$ and u_{1,α_s} is the unique solution of (P_{α_s}) in \mathcal{P}° .*

Proof. First we verify that u_{1,α_*} is the unique solution in \mathcal{P}° of (P_{α_*}) , using the sub and supersolutions method [3, Proposition 7.8] for a fixed point equation which (P_α) is reduced to (see Appendix A). Assume to the contrary that v_0 is a solution in \mathcal{P}° of (P_{α_*}) such that $v_0 \not\equiv u_* := u_{1,\alpha_*}$.

The argument is divided into two cases.

- (I) Assume that $v_0 \geq u_*$. In this case, using the strong maximum principle and Hopf's lemma, we deduce $v_0 - u_* > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$. So, from Proposition 3.6 we can take a solution $u(t) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ of $(P_{\alpha(t)})$, satisfying $\alpha(t) < \alpha_*$, $u_* < u(t) < v_0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ if $t > 0$ small. We see $u(t)$ is a subsolution of (P_{α_*}) . Using [3, Proposition 7.8] and taking into account (A) in Appendix A, we have a weakly stable solution $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ of (P_{α_*}) such that $u(t) \leq u \leq v_0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$. However, this is contradictory to Proposition 3.7, since $u \not\equiv u_*$.
- (II) Assume that $v_0 \not\geq u_*$. Let $v_0 \wedge u_* := \min(v_0, u_*)$. Observe that $v_0 \not\geq u_*$ implies that $v_0 \wedge u_* < u_*$ somewhere, i.e., $v_0 \wedge u_* \leq u_*$ and $v_0 \wedge u_* \not\equiv u_*$. So, $v_0 \wedge u_* \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is a supersolution of (P_{α_*}) in the sense mentioned in Appendix A. Moreover, by Proposition 3.2(i) we have that $u_{\mathcal{N}} \leq v_0 \wedge u_*$. Since $u_{\mathcal{N}}$ is a subsolution of (P_{α_*}) , we infer that (P_{α_*}) has a weakly stable solution $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ such that $u_{\mathcal{N}} \leq u \leq v_0 \wedge u_*$ and $u \not\equiv u_*$. But, this is impossible by Proposition 3.7.

The uniqueness of u_{1,α_*} has been verified.

Now, we can prove in the same way that (P_α) has no solutions in \mathcal{P}° for any $\alpha > \alpha_*$. Indeed, if $v_0 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is a solution of (P_α) for some $\alpha > \alpha_*$, then $v_0 \not\equiv u_*$. Moreover, the above arguments in (I), (II) remain valid for this v_0 . We have now proved that $\alpha_* = \alpha_s$. \square

Remark 3.9. Arguing as in the proof of Proposition 3.8 we see that, under the assumptions of the aforementioned proposition, $u_{1,\alpha}$ is minimal among the solutions in \mathcal{P}° of (P_α) for $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_s]$. Indeed, if for some $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_s]$ there exists a solution $v_0 \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ of (P_α) with $u_{1,\alpha} \not\leq v_0$, then reasoning as in (II) above, with u_* replaced by $u_{1,\alpha}$, we reach a contradiction.

Let us call $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ and \mathcal{C}_3 the solutions curves of (P_α) given by Propositions 3.2(iia), 3.2(iib) and 3.6, respectively.

Proposition 3.10. *Assume (A.0), (A.1), $q \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{N}}$, and $0 \not\equiv a \geq 0$ in some smooth domain $D \subset \Omega$ such that $|\partial D \cap \partial \Omega| > 0$. Then (P_α) has a component \mathcal{C}_* of solutions in $[0, \alpha_s] \times \mathcal{P}^\circ$ which includes $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ and \mathcal{C}_3 , satisfying (3.2).*

Proof. Arguing as in the proof of [12, Theorem 4.4], we have a subcontinuum γ_0 in $[0, \infty) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ of solutions of (R_α) for $\alpha > 0$, satisfying $\gamma_0 \cap \{(\alpha, w) = (0, c) : c \geq 0 \text{ is a constant}\} = \{(0, 0), (0, c_a)\}$.

Now we see that $\gamma_0^+ := \gamma_0 \setminus \{(0, 0), (0, c_a)\}$ is connected. By the change of variables $u = \alpha^{-\frac{1}{1-q}} w$, we convert γ_0^+ to a connected set \mathcal{C}_+ of solutions of (P_α) , which contains $(\alpha, u_{2,\alpha})$ with $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha})$ by construction (see [12, Proposition 3.11], Proposition 3.2(iib)). We assert here that \mathcal{C}_+ consists of solutions in \mathcal{P}° . Indeed, set

$$E := \{(\alpha, u) \in \mathcal{C}_+ : u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ\}.$$

Note that $E \neq \emptyset$ since $u_{2,\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$. Then, we shall show that E is open and closed in \mathcal{C}_+ with respect to the norm in $\mathbb{R} \times C^1(\bar{\Omega})$. Once this holds, we deduce that $E = \mathcal{C}_+$, as desired.

First, from the definition of E , we see that E is open in \mathcal{C}_+ . Next we verify that E is closed in \mathcal{C}_+ . Assume that $(\alpha_i, u_i) \in E$ converges to some $(\alpha_\infty, u_\infty) \in \mathcal{C}_+$. Then, from Proposition 3.2(i) we deduce that $u_i \geq u_N$ for all i . It follows, by passing to the limit, that $u_\infty \geq u_N$, so $(\alpha_\infty, u_\infty) \in E$, as desired.

Finally, let \mathcal{C}_* be the component of solutions in \mathcal{P}° of (P_α) in the space $[0, \infty) \times C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\mathcal{C}_* \supset \mathcal{C}_+$. Then, we can check that \mathcal{C}_* satisfies (3.2) and includes $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ and \mathcal{C}_3 , combining the following results: Proposition 3.2(ii), Proposition 3.6, Proposition 3.8 and [12, Proposition 3.2]. \square

From the above results we now prove Theorem 3.4, which leads us to Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 3.4: Item (i) follows from Propositions 3.2(ii), 3.7, 3.8 and Remark 3.9. Item (ii) is a consequence of Propositions 3.2(ii) and 3.5, while item (iii) follows from Propositions 3.6 and 3.8 where the exactness follows from Proposition 3.8. Finally, the last item follows from Proposition 3.10. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Let us recall some results on the following *two* eigenvalue problems, considered for a generic sign-changing $m \in C(\bar{\Omega})$:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \varphi = \lambda m(x) \varphi & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \varphi = \alpha \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where $\lambda = \lambda(\alpha, m)$ is an eigenvalue; and, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ fixed,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \phi = \lambda m(x) \phi + \mu \phi & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \phi = \alpha \phi & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

where $\mu = \mu(\lambda, \alpha, m)$ is an eigenvalue. It is well known that (4.2) has a sequence of eigenvalues

$$\mu_1 < \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 \leq \dots$$

It is easy to see that, for every α ,

$$\mu_k(\lambda, \alpha, m) = 0 \text{ for some } k \geq 1 \iff \lambda \text{ is an eigenvalue of (4.1).}$$

Moreover, the mapping $\lambda \mapsto \mu_1(\lambda, \cdot, \cdot)$ is concave, and the mapping $\lambda \mapsto \mu_2(\lambda, \cdot, \cdot)$ is continuous and satisfies $\mu_2(\lambda, \alpha, u) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty$ (see e.g. [15, Lemmas 3.3 and 7.2, Theorem 5.1]).

Recall that an eigenvalue of (4.1) or (4.2) is *principal* if it possesses a positive eigenfunction (which is in \mathcal{P}° by the strong maximum principle and Hopf's lemma). It is well known that μ_1 is principal and simple, and any other μ_k ($k \neq 1$) is not principal. So, the principal eigenvalues of (4.1) appear if and only if $\mu_1(\lambda, \alpha, m) = 0$.

In [1, Theorem 5] the authors proved that under (A.0) there exists $\beta_0 = \beta_0(m) > 0$ such that (4.1) has a principal eigenvalue if and only if $\alpha \leq \beta_0$. Additionally if $\alpha < \beta_0$ then the principal eigenvalues of this problem are given exactly by

$$\lambda_{\pm 1} = \lambda_{\pm 1}(m, \alpha) = \pm \inf \left\{ \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 - \alpha \int_{\partial\Omega} \phi^2}{\int_{\Omega} m(x) \phi^2} : \phi \in H^1(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} m(x) \phi^2 \geq 0 \right\}. \quad (4.3)$$

These infima are achieved by $\phi_{\pm 1} = \phi_{\pm 1}(m, \alpha)$, normalized as $\int_{\Omega} (\phi_{\pm 1})^2 = 1$, which in particular satisfy

$$\int_{\Omega} m(x) (\phi_{\pm 1})^2 \geq 0. \quad (4.4)$$

In addition, $0 < \lambda_{-1}(m, \alpha) < \lambda_{+1}(m, \alpha)$ for $0 < \alpha < \beta_0$.

Let $\mu_k(\alpha) := \mu_k(0, \alpha, m)$ (note that μ_k does not depend on m when $\lambda = 0$). It is well known that $\mu_1(\alpha), \mu_2(\alpha)$ are characterized by the following variational formulas, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(\alpha) &= \min_{\substack{\phi \in H^1(\Omega) \\ \|\phi\|_2 = 1}} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 - \alpha \int_{\partial\Omega} \phi^2 \right), \\ \mu_2(\alpha) &= \min_{\substack{E \subset H^1(\Omega) \\ \dim(E)=2}} \max_{\substack{\phi \in E \\ \|\phi\|_2 = 1}} \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 - \alpha \int_{\partial\Omega} \phi^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Let us denote by $\{\alpha_j\}$ the sequence of eigenvalues of the Steklov problem (1.5). We note that α_j is an eigenvalue of (1.5) if and only if $\mu_k(\alpha_j) = 0$ for some $k \geq 1$. Note also that $\alpha_1 = 0$ is the only principal eigenvalue of (1.5).

We prove some useful results on $\mu_2(\alpha)$ and $\lambda_2^-(\alpha, m)$:

Proposition 4.1. *The following three assertions hold:*

(i) $\alpha \mapsto \mu_2(\alpha)$ is non-increasing for $\alpha \geq 0$, i.e., $\mu_2(\alpha) \geq \mu_2(\beta)$ for $0 \leq \alpha < \beta$.

(ii) We have

$$\begin{cases} \mu_2(\alpha) > 0, & \text{for } \alpha \in (0, \alpha_2), \\ \mu_2(\alpha) = 0, & \text{for } \alpha = \alpha_2, \\ \mu_2(\alpha) < 0, & \text{for } \alpha \in (\alpha_2, \infty). \end{cases}$$

(iii) $\lambda_2^-(\alpha, m) < 0$ for $0 < \alpha < \alpha_2$ and any sign-changing $m \in C(\overline{\Omega})$.

Proof.

- (i) By (4.5) it is clear that $\mu_2(\alpha) \geq \mu_2(\beta)$ for $0 \leq \alpha < \beta$.
- (ii) First of all, it is clear that $\mu_2(\alpha_2) = 0$. Assume now that $\mu_2(\alpha) \leq 0$ for some $0 < \alpha < \alpha_2$. Since $\mu_2(0) > 0$ and $\alpha \mapsto \mu_2(\alpha)$ is continuous, we infer that there exists $0 < \beta \leq \alpha$ such that $\mu_2(\beta) = 0$. Thus β is a non-principal eigenvalue of (1.5), which contradicts $\beta < \alpha_2$. Finally, let $\alpha > \alpha_2$. By the previous item we have $\mu_2(\alpha) \leq 0$ for $\alpha > \alpha_2$. However, if $\mu_2(\alpha) = 0$ then μ_2 vanishes in (α_2, α) , which contradicts the discreteness of the spectrum of (1.5).
- (iii) By the previous item, it suffices to prove that $\lambda_2^-(\alpha, m) < 0$ (which is equivalent to $\lambda_2^+(\alpha, -m) > 0$) if $\mu_2(\alpha) > 0$. To do so, we shall use a formulation of second eigenvalues that goes back at least to [19] (see also [16]):

$$\mu_2(\alpha) = \min_{(A,B) \in \mathcal{J}} \max(\mu^+(A), \mu^+(B)),$$

where, for any open set $A \subset \Omega$,

$$\mu^+(A) := \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 - \alpha \int_{\partial\Omega} u^2 : u \in H_A^1(\Omega), \|u\|_2 = 1 \right\},$$

$$H_A^1(\Omega) := \{u \in H^1(\Omega), u = 0 \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \setminus \overline{A}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{J} := \{(A, B) : A, B \text{ are disjoint nonempty open subsets of } \Omega\}.$$

In a similar way,

$$\lambda_2^+(\alpha, -m) = \min_{(A,B) \in \mathcal{J}} \max(\lambda^+(A), \lambda^+(B)) \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$\lambda^+(A) := \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 - \alpha \int_{\partial\Omega} u^2 : u \in H_A^1(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} m(x)u^2 = -1 \right\}.$$

We set $\lambda^+(A) = \infty$ if there is no u satisfying the above constraints. Note that $\lambda^+(A)$ is achieved whenever it is finite. From the formula above we see that $\lambda_2^+(\alpha, -m) > 0$ if, and only if, given $(A, B) \in \mathcal{J}$, we have either $\lambda^+(A) > 0$ or $\lambda^+(B) > 0$. Now, if $\mu_2(\alpha) > 0$ then, for such a pair (A, B) , we have either $\mu^+(A) > 0$ or $\mu^+(B) > 0$. If $\mu^+(A) > 0$ then $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 - \alpha \int_{\partial\Omega} u^2 > 0$ for every nontrivial $u \in H_A^1(\Omega)$. In particular, this inequality holds if, in addition, $\int_{\Omega} m(x)u^2 = -1$, which shows that $\lambda^+(A) > 0$. Similarly, we see that $\mu^+(B) > 0$ implies $\lambda^+(B) > 0$. Therefore the minimum in (4.6) is positive, which yields the conclusion. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3:

Let us prove (i). We proceed in several steps. The first one is to show that the IFT can be applied at (α, u) , where $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_s)$ and $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is a solution of (P_α) . Since the IFT can be applied at $u_{1,\alpha}$ and this is the only stable solution for $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_s)$, cf. Propositions 3.7 and 3.8, we may assume without loss of generality that $\gamma_1(\alpha, u) < 0$. We consider (4.1) with $m = au^{q-1}$. Note that $\lambda = 1$ is a principal eigenvalue of this problem (associated with $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$). Moreover, since $\int_\Omega au^{q-1} < 0$ we have $0 < \lambda_1^- \leq 1 \leq \lambda_1^+$.

By [12, Proposition 3.4] (which clearly holds if $q \in \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{N}$) and (1.6) we have

$$\alpha < \alpha_s \leq \frac{-\int_\Omega a}{\int_{\partial\Omega} u_{\mathcal{N}}^{1-q}} \leq \alpha_2.$$

So, from Proposition 4.1(iii), we deduce that $\lambda_2^- = \lambda_2^-(\alpha, m) < 0$. Summing up, the eigenvalue sequence of (4.1) satisfies

$$\cdots \leq \lambda_3^- \leq \lambda_2^- < 0 < \lambda_1^- \leq 1 \leq \lambda_1^+ < \lambda_2^+ \leq \lambda_3^+ \leq \cdots.$$

We now observe that the IFT can be applied at (α, u) . Indeed, assume by contradiction that $0 = \gamma_k(\alpha, u)$, for some $k \geq 2$. Then $q \in (0, 1)$ is an eigenvalue of (4.1). Moreover, since $k \neq 1$, ϕ changes sign in Ω , and so $q \notin \{\lambda_1^-, \lambda_1^+\}$. So, since $\lambda_2^- < 0$, we have $q = \lambda_j^+$ for some $j \geq 2$, and then $1 \leq \lambda_1^+ < \lambda_2^+ \leq q$, which is not possible. Therefore, for $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_s)$ and a solution $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ of (P_α) , we see that the IFT can be applied at (α, u) , as claimed.

The next step is to prove that the curve \mathcal{C}_2 can be extended to all $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_s)$. Indeed, take the maximal α of this curve, say α_{max} , and suppose $\alpha_{max} < \alpha_s$. As $\alpha \nearrow \alpha_{max}$, the family of solutions $\{u_\alpha\}$ is bounded [12, Proposition 3.2] and away from 0 in $C(\overline{\Omega})$ by Proposition 3.2(i). So, going to the limit we find a nontrivial solution $u_{\alpha_{max}}$ of $(P_{\alpha_{max}})$. Moreover, $u_{\alpha_{max}} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$, and recalling Propositions 3.7 and 3.8 we get that $\gamma_1(\alpha_{max}, u_{\alpha_{max}}) < 0$. We thus apply the IFT at $(\alpha_{max}, u_{\alpha_{max}})$ and we get a contradiction with the maximality of α_{max} . Thus, \mathcal{C}_2 can be extended to $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_s)$, as asserted.

The final step is to show that any solution v of (P_α) , $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_s)$, must be either $u_{1,\alpha}$ or $u_{2,\alpha}$. In order to see this, we argue as above (also similarly as in the proof of Proposition 3.7). Assume that $(\alpha, v) \notin \mathcal{C}_1$. Then, we deduce that $\gamma_1(\alpha, v) < 0$. Applying the IFT at (α, v) we obtain a curve of $\mathcal{C}_3 : v = v_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ of solutions of (P_α) . Take the minimal α of this curve, say α_{min} , and suppose $\alpha_{min} > 0$. Reasoning as before we obtain some solution $v_{\alpha_{min}} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ of $(P_{\alpha_{min}})$. We must have $\gamma_1(\alpha_{min}, v_{\alpha_{min}}) < 0$, but, in this case, applying again the IFT we get a contradiction. So, $\alpha_{min} = 0$. Now, by the exactness results for $\alpha > 0$ small and the condition $\gamma_1(\alpha, v_\alpha) < 0$, we have $v_\alpha = u_{2,\alpha}$ for such α , implying $(\alpha, v) = (\alpha, u_{2,\alpha}) \in \mathcal{C}_2$.

To conclude the proof we note that, if $\partial\Omega \subseteq \partial\Omega_+^a$ and $q \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{N}$, then from [12, Lemma 2.1(i) and Proposition 2.3] we have that $q \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$ for all $\alpha > 0$. In other words, any nontrivial solution of (P_α) is in \mathcal{P}° for every $\alpha > 0$, and (ii) follows. \square

5 Bifurcation analysis as $q \rightarrow 1^-$

This section is devoted to further analysis of the solutions set in \mathcal{P}° of (P_α) as $q \rightarrow 1^-$ for $\alpha \in (0, \beta_0)$ fixed, by recalling the critical value $\beta_0 > 0$ from Section 4. Moreover, we show how to deduce the asymptotic behavior of $\alpha_s(a, q)$ (given by (1.4)) as $q \rightarrow 1^-$.

Throughout this section it will be convenient to rename (P_α) as $(P_{a,q,\alpha})$ or simply (P_q) if no confusion arises. We shall handle the eigenvalue problem (4.1) with $m = a$. Assume (A.0), $q \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha \in (0, \beta_0)$. We look at q as a bifurcation parameter in (P_q) , assuming that

$$\lambda_{+1}(a, \alpha) = 1 \quad (5.1)$$

to obtain solutions of (P_q) bifurcating from the line $(q, u) = (1, t\phi_{+1})$ where λ_{+1} and ϕ_{+1} are from (4.3) and (4.4), respectively. A similar procedure can be applied when $\lambda_{-1}(a, \alpha) = 1$.

Recall that λ_{+1} is simple, so that setting

$$A := -\Delta - \lambda_{+1}a(x), \quad C_\alpha^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega}) := \left\{ u \in C^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega}) : B_\alpha u := \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} - \alpha u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\},$$

we have that $\text{Ker} A = \langle \phi_{+1} \rangle := \{t\phi_{+1} : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Condition (5.1) implies that (P_q) possesses the trivial line $\Gamma_1 := \{(1, t\phi_{+1}), t > 0\}$. As in the Neumann case $\alpha = 0$ (see [11, Section 2]), we employ the Lyapunov-Schmidt type reduction to analyze the bifurcating solutions in \mathcal{P}° from Γ_1 . The usual decomposition of $C_\alpha^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega})$ is given by the formula $C_\alpha^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega}) = \langle \phi_{+1} \rangle + X_2$; $u = t\phi_{+1} + w$, where $t = \int_\Omega u\phi_{+1}$, and $w = u - (\int_\Omega u\phi_{+1})\phi_{+1}$. So, X_2 is characterized as $X_2 = \{w \in C_\alpha^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega}) : \int_\Omega w\phi_{+1} = 0\}$. On the other hand, put $C^r(\overline{\Omega}) = Y_1 + \text{Im}(A)$, where $Y_1 = \langle \phi_{+1} \rangle$, and $\text{Im}(A) := \{f \in C^r(\overline{\Omega}) : \int_\Omega f\phi_{+1} = 0\}$. Let Q be the projection of Y to $\text{Im}(A)$, given by $Q[f] := f - (\int_\Omega f\phi_{+1})\phi_{+1}$. Using Q , we reduce (P_q) to the following coupled equations:

$$\begin{aligned} Q[Au] &= Q[a(x)(u^q - u)], \\ (1 - Q)[Au] &= (1 - Q)[a(x)(u^q - u)]. \end{aligned}$$

For $u = t\phi_{+1} + w$ the first equation yields

$$-\Delta w - a(x)w = Q[a(x)\{(t\phi_{+1} + w)^q - (t\phi_{+1} + w)\}]. \quad (5.2)$$

The second equation yields that

$$\int_\Omega a(x)\{(t\phi_{+1} + w)^q - (t\phi_{+1} + w)\}\phi_{+1} = 0. \quad (5.3)$$

Now, we see that $(q, t, w) = (1, t_0, 0)$ solves (5.2) and (5.3) for any $t_0 > 0$. The IFT is applicable to (5.2) at $(1, t_0, 0)$ (as in [11, Section 2]), and then, (5.2) is solved exactly by $w = w(q, t)$ around this point such that $w(1, t_0) = 0$. We plug $w(q, t)$ into (5.3) to get the following bifurcation equation in \mathbb{R}^2 :

$$\Phi(q, t) := \int_\Omega a(x)\{(t\phi_{+1} + w(q, t))^q - (t\phi_{+1} + w(q, t))\}\phi_{+1} = 0, \quad (q, t) \simeq (1, t_0).$$

Set now

$$t_{\pm} = t_{\pm}(a, \alpha) := \exp \left[-\frac{\int_{\Omega} a(x) (\phi_{\pm 1})^2 \log \phi_{\pm 1}}{\int_{\Omega} a(x) (\phi_{\pm 1})^2} \right], \quad (5.4)$$

and we are in position to state the next result.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume (A.0), $\alpha \in (0, \beta_0)$ and (5.1). Then the following assertions hold:*

- (i) *Assume that $(q_n, u_n) \in (0, 1) \times \mathcal{P}^\circ$ are solutions of (P_{q_n}) such that $(q_n, u_n) \rightarrow (1, t\phi_{+1}) \in \Gamma_1$ in $\mathbb{R} \times C^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $t > 0$. Then, we have $t = t_+$, where t_+ is given by (5.4).*
- (ii) *The set of solutions in \mathcal{P}° of (P_q) consists of $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ in a neighborhood of $(q, u) = (1, t_+ \phi_{+1})$ in $\mathbb{R} \times C^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega})$, where*

$$\Gamma_2 := \{(q, t(q)\phi_{+1} + w(q, t(q))) : |q - 1| < \delta_*\} \quad \text{for some } \delta_* > 0.$$

Here $t(q)$ and $w(q, t(q))$ are smooth with respect to q and satisfy $t(1) = t_+$ and $w(1, t_+) = 0$.

Proposition 5.1 can be proved in the same way as [11, Theorem 2.2]. We only have to note that condition (4.4) for ϕ_{+1} is used essentially in the proof of (ii) for applying the IFT to $\hat{\Phi}(q, t) = \frac{\Phi(q, t)}{q-1}$ at $(1, t_+)$.

As a consequence of the previous result, we obtain the following:

Theorem 5.2. *Assume (A.0). Then:*

- (i) *For any $\alpha \in (0, \beta_0)$ the problem (P_α) has at least two solutions $U_{1,q} = U_{1,q}(a, \alpha), U_{2,q} = U_{2,q}(a, \alpha)$ in \mathcal{P}° for q close to 1. These solutions satisfy $U_{2,q} - U_{1,q} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$, and*

$$U_{1,q} \sim \lambda_{+1}^{-\frac{1}{1-q}} t_+ \phi_{+1}, \quad U_{2,q} \sim \lambda_{-1}^{-\frac{1}{1-q}} t_- \phi_{-1} \quad \text{for } q \sim 1,$$

i.e.

$$\lambda_{+1}(a, \alpha)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} U_{1,q} \rightarrow t_+ \phi_{+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{-1}(a, \alpha)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} U_{2,q} \rightarrow t_- \phi_{-1}$$

in $C^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $q \rightarrow 1^-$ for some $r \in (0, 1)$. More precisely:

- (a) *If $\lambda_{+1} = 1$, then $U_{1,q} \rightarrow t_+ \phi_{+1}$ in $C^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $q \rightarrow 1^-$;*
- (b) *If $\lambda_{+1} > 1$, then $U_{1,q} \rightarrow 0$ in $C^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $q \rightarrow 1^-$;*
- (c) *If $\lambda_{+1} < 1$, then $\min_{\overline{\Omega}} U_{1,q} \rightarrow \infty$ as $q \rightarrow 1^-$;*

and a similar result holds for $U_{2,q}$.

- (ii) *Assume in addition (A.1). Then $\alpha_s(a, q) \rightarrow \beta_0$ as $q \rightarrow 1^-$.*

Proof.

- (i) Set $v := \lambda_{+1}(a, \alpha)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} u$. Note that if u solves (P_q) then v solves (P_q) with a replaced by $\tilde{a} := \lambda_{+1}(a, \alpha)a$. Indeed,

$$-\Delta v = \lambda_{+1}(a, \alpha)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} a(x) u^q = \lambda_{+1}(a, \alpha) a(x) v^q = \tilde{a}(x) v^q.$$

Moreover, we easily see that $\lambda_{+1}(\tilde{a}, \alpha) = 1$. By Proposition 5.1, we get a solution $v_{1,q} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ of (P_q) with \tilde{a} such that $v_{1,q} \rightarrow t_+(\tilde{a})\phi_{+1}(\tilde{a})$ as $q \rightarrow 1^-$. But it is easily seen that $\phi_{+1}(\tilde{a}) = \phi_{+1}(a)$ and $t_+(\tilde{a}) = t_+(a)$. Thus we obtain a solution $U_{1,q} = \lambda_{+1}(a, \alpha)^{\frac{1}{q-1}} v_{1,q} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ of (P_q) for q close to 1 such that

$$\lambda_{+1}(a, \alpha)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} U_{1,q} \longrightarrow t_+(a)\phi_{+1}(a) \quad \text{as } q \rightarrow 1^-.$$

In particular, we see that if $\lambda_{+1}(a, \alpha) > 1$ then $\lambda_{+1}(a, \alpha)^{\frac{1}{q-1}} \rightarrow 0$, so that $U_{1,q} \rightarrow 0$ in $C^{2+r}(\overline{\Omega})$ as $q \rightarrow 1^-$. On the other hand, if $\lambda_{+1}(a, \alpha) < 1$, then $\lambda_{+1}(a, \alpha)^{\frac{1}{q-1}} \rightarrow \infty$, so that $\min_{\overline{\Omega}} U_{1,q} \rightarrow \infty$ when $q \rightarrow 1^-$. A similar argument with λ_{-1} instead of λ_{+1} provides a solution $U_{2,q} = \lambda_{-1}(a, \alpha)^{\frac{1}{q-1}} v_{2,q} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ with $v_{2,q} \rightarrow t_-(a)\phi_{-1}(a)$.

- (ii) Take a ball $B \Subset \Omega_+^a$, and choose $c > 0$ large enough so that $\sigma_1^{\mathcal{D}}(ca) < 1$, where $\sigma_1^{\mathcal{D}}(a)$ denotes the unique positive principal eigenvalue with respect to the weight a in B , under homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. Note that $\beta_0(ca) = \beta_0(a)$ and, by a rescaling argument, $\alpha_s(q, ca) = \alpha_s(q, a)$ for any $c > 0$. So, we may assume that $\sigma_1^{\mathcal{D}}(a) < 1$. Since $q \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{N}}$ for q close to 1, we note from [12, Proposition 3.4] and (2.1) that $\alpha_s(q) < \frac{-2\sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}(a) \int_{\Omega} a}{|\partial\Omega|}$ as $q \rightarrow 1^-$, so $\overline{\lim}_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \alpha_s(q) < \infty$. First we prove that

$$\beta_0 \leq \varliminf_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \alpha_s(q).$$

Assume by contradiction that $\varliminf_q \alpha_s(q) < \beta_0$. Then there exist $q_n \nearrow 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\alpha_s(q_n) < \beta_0 - \varepsilon$. By item (i), we can choose $q_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $(P_{a,q,\beta_0-\varepsilon})$ has a solution in \mathcal{P}° for every $q \in (q_0, 1)$. In particular, this remains valid for q_n , which contradicts the definition of $\alpha_s(q_n)$. Next we prove that

$$\overline{\lim}_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \alpha_s(q) \leq \beta_0. \tag{5.5}$$

Assume by contradiction that $\beta_0 < \overline{\lim}_q \alpha_s(q)$. Then, there exist $q_n \nearrow 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\beta_0 + \varepsilon \leq \alpha_s(q_n)$. Put $\alpha_n := \alpha_s(q_n)$, and fix n . Let us verify that (P_{a,q_n,α_n}) has a solution $u_n \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$. By the definition of α_n , there exist $\alpha_{i,n} \nearrow \alpha_n$ and $u_{i,n} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ such that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_{i,n} = a(x)u_{i,n}^{q_n} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u_{i,n} = \alpha_{i,n}u_{i,n} & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

In view of the fact that (for all n large) $q_n \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{N}}$, Proposition 3.2(i) is applicable to $u_{i,n}$, and then, $u_{i,n} \geq u_{\mathcal{N}}$. So, using [12, Proposition 3.2], we may deduce the existence of $u_n \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ such that $u_{i,n} \rightarrow u_n$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ and $u_n \geq u_{\mathcal{N}}$, and thus, u_n is a desired solution. We assert that $\|u_n\| := \|u_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ is bounded. Assume to the contrary that $\|u_n\| \rightarrow \infty$ and set $v_n := \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|}$. Then $\|v_n\| = 1$ and, up to a subsequence, we get some $\hat{v} \in H^1(\Omega)$ such that $v_n \rightharpoonup \hat{v}$ in $H^1(\Omega)$, $v_n \rightarrow \hat{v}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ and in $L^2(\partial\Omega)$, and $v_n \rightarrow \hat{v}$ a.e. From

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla v_n \nabla w = \left(\int_{\Omega} a v_n^{q_n} w \right) \|u_n\|^{q_n-1} + \alpha_n \int_{\partial\Omega} v_n w, \quad \forall w \in H^1(\Omega), \quad (5.6)$$

it follows by passing to the limit that

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla \hat{v} \nabla w = \hat{b} \int_{\Omega} a \hat{v} w + \hat{\alpha} \int_{\partial\Omega} \hat{v} w, \quad (5.7)$$

where $\hat{b} := \lim \|u_n\|^{q_n-1} \in [0, 1]$ and $\hat{\alpha} := \lim \alpha_n \in [\beta_0 + \varepsilon, \infty)$ (taking a suitable subsequence, since α_n has an upper bound). In addition, we note that $\int_{\Omega} a v_n^{q_n} w \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} a \hat{v} w$ by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. Assertion (5.7) means that, in weak sense,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \hat{v} = \hat{b} a(x) \hat{v} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_{\nu} \hat{v} = \hat{\alpha} \hat{v} & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

Moreover, $\hat{v} \not\equiv 0$. Indeed, using (5.6) and (5.7), we deduce that $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla(v_n - \hat{v})|^2 \rightarrow 0$, so $v_n \rightarrow \hat{v}$ in $H^1(\Omega)$. Consequently, $\|\hat{v}\| = 1$, as desired. Hence, \hat{b} is a principal eigenvalue of (5.8), but this problem has no principal eigenvalue since $\beta_0 + \varepsilon \leq \hat{\alpha}$. Therefore $\|u_n\|$ is bounded and we may assume that $u_n \rightharpoonup \hat{u}$ in $H^1(\Omega)$, $u_n \rightarrow \hat{u}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ and in $L^2(\partial\Omega)$, and $u_n \rightarrow \hat{u}$ a.e. From

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla u_n \nabla w = \int_{\Omega} a u_n^{q_n} w + \alpha_n \int_{\partial\Omega} u_n w, \quad \forall w \in H^1(\Omega),$$

it follows that

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla \hat{u} \nabla w = \int_{\Omega} a \hat{u} w + \hat{\alpha} \int_{\partial\Omega} \hat{u} w,$$

meaning that \hat{u} is a weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \hat{u} = a \hat{u} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_{\nu} \hat{u} = \hat{\alpha} \hat{u} & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.9)$$

Moreover, we can deduce $\hat{u} \not\equiv 0$. Indeed, since $u_n > 0$ in B and $\sigma_1^{\mathcal{D}}(a) < 1$, [10, Lemma 2.5] provides us with a ball $B' \Subset B$ and $M > 0$ such that $u_n > M$ in B' for all n . The condition $u_n \rightarrow \hat{u}$ a.e. gives the desired assertion as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, 1 is a principal eigenvalue of (5.9), and we reach once again a contradiction with $\beta_0 + \varepsilon \leq \hat{\alpha}$. We have proved (5.5), which concludes the proof.

□

Corollary 5.3. *Whenever $u_{1,\alpha}$ and $u_{2,\alpha}$ are the only solutions in \mathcal{P}° for $\alpha \in (0, \beta_0)$ and q close to 1, we have $u_{1,\alpha} = U_{1,q}$ and $u_{2,\alpha} = U_{2,q}$, i.e.*

$$u_{1,\alpha}(q) \sim \lambda_{+1}^{-\frac{1}{1-q}} t_+ \phi_{+1}, \quad u_{2,\alpha}(q) \sim \lambda_{-1}^{-\frac{1}{1-q}} t_- \phi_{-1} \quad \text{for } q \sim 1.$$

In particular, this holds for the weights a built in Section 2.

Remark 5.4.

- (i) In view of Remark 1.4(i), we infer from Theorem 5.2(ii) that Theorem 1.3 holds also if, instead of (1.6), we assume that $\beta_0(a) < \alpha_2$ and q is close enough to 1.
- (ii) The following characterization can be established:

$$\beta_0(a) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 : \phi \in H^1(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} a(x) \phi^2 = 0, \int_{\partial\Omega} \phi^2 = 1 \right\}.$$

One can easily show that this infimum is achieved. In addition, if $\{a_k\}$ is a sequence of sign-changing weights satisfying (A.1) and $a_k \rightarrow a$ in $C^\theta(\overline{\Omega})$, where a is a negative weight such that $a < 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, then $\beta_0(a_k) \rightarrow \infty$. This result, combined with Theorem 5.2(ii), shows that $\alpha_s(a_k, q)$ can be made arbitrarily large by letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $q \rightarrow 1^-$.

6 The solution set structure of (S_α)

Next we provide a description of the nontrivial solution set of (S_α) with $\alpha \geq 0$, which can be established proceeding in a similar way as for (P_α) . We note that (S_α) was mainly investigated by Alama [2], under some conditions on a very similar to (A.0) and (A.1), which are assumed in this Section.

The notion of stability for solutions of (S_α) in \mathcal{P}° can be easily adapted from the one introduced in Section 3 by considering, instead of $\gamma_1(\alpha, u)$, the first eigenvalue of the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \phi - (\alpha + qa(x)u^{q-1})\phi = \gamma(\alpha, u)\phi & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \phi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Let us set

$$\tilde{\alpha}_s = \tilde{\alpha}_s(a, q) := \sup\{\alpha \geq 0 : (S_\alpha) \text{ has a solution in } \mathcal{P}^\circ\}.$$

Arguing as in [2, Proposition 2.2], one may find some $C > 0$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}_s(a, q) < C$ for any $q \in (0, 1)$. This result contrasts with the corresponding one for (P_α) , where the condition ‘ $0 \not\equiv a \geq 0$ in some smooth domain $D \subset \Omega$ such that $|\partial D \cap \partial\Omega| > 0$ ’ is assumed, cf. [12, Proposition 3.6]. Thus this assumption is *not* needed in item (iv) of the following result:

Theorem 6.1. *Assume (A.0), (A.1), and $q \in \mathcal{I}_N$. Then:*

- (i) (S_α) has a solution curve $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{(\alpha, u_{1,\alpha}); 0 \leq \alpha \leq \tilde{\alpha}_s\}$ such that $\alpha \mapsto u_{1,\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is continuous and increasing on $[0, \tilde{\alpha}_s]$ and C^∞ in $[0, \tilde{\alpha}_s)$, with $u_{1,0} = u_N$, and $u_{1,\tilde{\alpha}_s}$ is the unique solution of $(S_{\tilde{\alpha}_s})$ in \mathcal{P}° . Moreover, \mathcal{C}_1 is extended to a C^∞ curve, say $\mathcal{C}'_1 (\supset \mathcal{C}_1)$, bending to the left in a neighborhood of $(\tilde{\alpha}_s, u_{1,\tilde{\alpha}_s})$.
- (ii) (S_α) has a solution curve $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{(\alpha, u_{2,\alpha}); 0 < \alpha \leq \bar{\alpha}\}$ for some $\bar{\alpha} \in (0, \tilde{\alpha}_s]$, such that $\alpha \mapsto u_{2,\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is continuous and decreasing on $(0, \bar{\alpha}]$ and C^∞ in $(0, \bar{\alpha})$, with $\min_{\bar{\Omega}} u_{2,\alpha} \rightarrow \infty$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$. Moreover:
 - (a) for any interior point $(\alpha, u) \in \mathcal{C}'_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$, the solutions set of (S_α) in a neighborhood of (α, u) is given exactly by $\mathcal{C}'_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$;
 - (b) for every $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha})$ the solutions $u_{1,\alpha}, u_{2,\alpha}$ are strictly ordered by $u_{2,\alpha} - u_{1,\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$, and these ones are the only solutions of (S_α) in \mathcal{P}° for $\alpha > 0$ small.
- (iii) \mathcal{C}'_1 is connected to \mathcal{C}_2 by a component (i.e., a maximal closed, connected subset) \mathcal{C}_* of solutions of (S_α) in $[0, \tilde{\alpha}_s] \times \mathcal{P}^\circ$, see Figure 1(i).

We turn now to the analogue of Theorem 1.3. We denote by $\tilde{\alpha}_2 = \tilde{\alpha}_2(\Omega)$ the second (and first nontrivial) eigenvalue of the Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\phi = \alpha\phi & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu\phi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 6.2. *Assume (A.0), (A.1), $q \in \mathcal{I}_N$ and*

$$\frac{-\int_\Omega a}{\int_\Omega u_N^{1-q}} \leq \tilde{\alpha}_2. \quad (6.1)$$

Then the solutions set in \mathcal{P}° of (S_α) with $\alpha \geq 0$ consists of \mathcal{C}'_1 , where the upper curve of \mathcal{C}'_1 is given exactly by \mathcal{C}_2 with $\bar{\alpha} = \tilde{\alpha}_s$. In particular, (S_α) has exactly two solutions in \mathcal{P}° for all $\alpha \in (0, \tilde{\alpha}_s)$.

Note that the quotient in the left-hand side of (6.1) arises exactly as the one in (1.6) in the proof of [12, Proposition 3.4]. Furthermore, the quotient in (6.1) is easier to handle (i.e. to make it small) since the integral of u_N^{1-q} is computed over Ω , whereas in (1.6) it is taken over $\partial\Omega$ in (1.6). Examples of a satisfying (6.1) can be found proceeding as in subsection 2.1.

A Reduction to a fixed point equation in $C(\bar{\Omega})$

Let us formulate (P_α) as a fixed point equation to which the sub and supersolutions method [3, Proposition 7.8] applies. Note that $C(\bar{\Omega})$ is equipped with the positive cone $\mathcal{P} := \{u \in C(\bar{\Omega}) : u \geq 0 \text{ on } \bar{\Omega}\}$, whose interior is given by \mathcal{P}° .

First we introduce the solution operators of some linear boundary value problems associated with (P_α) . Let $c > 0$ be a constant and $\mathcal{K}_\Omega : C^\theta(\overline{\Omega}) \rightarrow C^{2+\theta}(\overline{\Omega})$ be the *solution operator* of the problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta + c)u = g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

i.e., \mathcal{K}_Ω is a homeomorphism, and given $g \in C^\theta(\overline{\Omega})$, $\mathcal{K}_\Omega g$ is the unique solution of the problem above. It is well known [3] that \mathcal{K}_Ω is uniquely extendable to a compact linear mapping from $C(\overline{\Omega})$ into $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, and moreover, it is *strongly positive*, i.e., $\mathcal{K}_\Omega g \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ for any $g \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}$. In a similar way, we denote by $\mathcal{K}_{\partial\Omega} : C^{1+\theta}(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow C^{2+\theta}(\overline{\Omega})$ the *solution operator* of the problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta + c)u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u = h & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

i.e., $\mathcal{K}_{\partial\Omega}$ is a homeomorphism, and given $h \in C^{1+\theta}(\partial\Omega)$, $\mathcal{K}_{\partial\Omega} h$ is the unique solution of this problem. It is well known [4] that $\mathcal{K}_{\partial\Omega}$ is uniquely extendable to a bounded linear mapping from $C(\partial\Omega)$ into $C^\theta(\overline{\Omega})$, which is nonnegative. Using the usual trace $\tau : C(\overline{\Omega}) \rightarrow C(\partial\Omega)$, it follows that $\mathcal{K}_{\partial\Omega} \circ \tau : C(\overline{\Omega}) \rightarrow C(\overline{\Omega})$ is compact and nonnegative. In the sequel, $\mathcal{K}_{\partial\Omega} \circ \tau$ is still denoted by $\mathcal{K}_{\partial\Omega}$.

Summing up, given $a \in C^\theta(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $u \in C^{2+\theta}(\overline{\Omega}) \cap \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is a solution of (P_α) if and only if $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ solves the fixed point equation

$$u = \mathcal{F}_c(u) := \mathcal{K}_\Omega(cu + a(x)u^q) + \mathcal{K}_{\partial\Omega}(\alpha u) \quad \text{in } C(\overline{\Omega}).$$

Next we explain how to apply [3, Proposition 7.8] to our setting. Let $v, w \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ be such that $w - v \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$, and assume that $v \leq \mathcal{F}_c(v)$ and $w \geq \mathcal{F}_c(w)$. In view of these inequalities and the above formulation, v and w are still called a *subsolution* and a *supersolution* of (P_α) , respectively. In particular, let us choose $c > 0$ large such that

$$m_c(\xi) := c + qa(x)\xi^{q-1} > 0 \quad \text{on } \overline{\Omega} \quad \text{for } \xi \in [\min_{\overline{\Omega}} v, \max_{\overline{\Omega}} w] \text{ and } x \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

Set the order interval

$$[v, w] := \{u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) : v \leq u \leq w \text{ on } \overline{\Omega}\},$$

and then, under the condition above \mathcal{F}_c is *strongly increasing* in $[v, w]$, i.e., if $u_1, u_2 \in [v, w]$ and $u_2 - u_1 \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}$, then $\mathcal{F}_c(u_2) - \mathcal{F}_c(u_1) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$. We apply [3, Proposition 7.8] to the mapping $\mathcal{F}_c : [v, w] \rightarrow C(\overline{\Omega})$ to deduce that the equation above has at least one solution u such that $u \in [v, w]$. So $u \in C^{2+\theta}(\overline{\Omega}) \cap \mathcal{P}^\circ$ is a solution of (P_α) .

For such solution u , we note that $m_c(u) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ in view of the inequality above, so the eigenvalue problem

$$\mathcal{F}'_c(u)\psi = \mathcal{K}_\Omega(m_c(u)\psi) + \mathcal{K}_{\partial\Omega}(\alpha\psi) = \sigma\psi$$

has a largest eigenvalue $\sigma_1 > 0$, which is simple and is the only principal eigenvalue (with a corresponding eigenfunction $\psi_1 \in C^{2+\theta}(\overline{\Omega}) \cap \mathcal{P}^\circ$), cf. [3, Section 3, Chapter 1]. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_1(-\Delta + c)\psi_1 = m_c(u)\psi_1 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \sigma_1\partial_\nu\psi_1 = \alpha\psi_1 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

To apply the stability results in [3, Proposition 7.8], we finally compare the relation between σ_1 and γ_1 , where we recall γ_1 is the smallest eigenvalue of (3.1). More precisely, we shall verify that

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_1 > 1 \iff \gamma_1 < 0, \\ \sigma_1 < 1 \iff \gamma_1 > 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A})$$

Recalling (3.1) and using Green's formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (-\Delta + c)\phi_1 \cdot \psi_1 - \phi_1 \cdot (-\Delta + c)\psi_1 &= \int_{\partial\Omega} -\partial_\nu\phi_1 \cdot \psi_1 + \phi_1 \cdot \partial_\nu\psi_1 \\ &= \alpha \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_1} - 1 \right) \int_{\partial\Omega} \phi_1\psi_1. \end{aligned}$$

A direct computation shows

$$\int_{\Omega} (-\Delta + c)\phi_1 \cdot \psi_1 - \phi_1 \cdot (-\Delta + c)\psi_1 = \gamma_1 \int_{\Omega} \phi_1\psi_1 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma}\right) \int_{\Omega} m_c(u) \phi_1\psi_1.$$

Combining them provides

$$\gamma_1 \int_{\Omega} \phi_1\psi_1 = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_1} - 1 \right) \left(\int_{\Omega} m_c(u) \phi_1\psi_1 + \alpha \int_{\partial\Omega} \phi_1\psi_1 \right),$$

showing (A).

References

- [1] G. A. Afrouzi, K. J. Brown, *On principal eigenvalues for boundary value problems with indefinite weight and Robin boundary conditions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **127** (1999), 125–130.
- [2] S. Alama, *Semilinear elliptic equations with sublinear indefinite nonlinearities*, Adv. Differential Equations **4** (1999), 813–842.
- [3] H. Amann, *Fixed point equations and nonlinear eigenvalue problems in ordered Banach spaces*, SIAM Rev. **18** (1976), 620–709.
- [4] H. Amann, *Nonlinear elliptic equations with nonlinear boundary conditions*, New developments in differential equations (Proc. 2nd Scheveningen Conf., Scheveningen, 1975), pp. 43–63. North-Holland Math. Studies, Vol. 21, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1976.

- [5] C. Bandle, M. Pozio, A. Tesei, *The asymptotic behavior of the solutions of degenerate parabolic equations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **303** (1987), 487–501.
- [6] C. Bandle, M. A. Pozio, A. Tesei, *Existence and uniqueness of solutions of nonlinear Neumann problems*, Math. Z. **199** (1988), 257–278.
- [7] J. Chabrowski, C. Tintarev, *An elliptic problem with an indefinite nonlinearity and a parameter in the boundary condition*, NoDEA Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. **21** (2014), 519–540.
- [8] M. G. Crandall, P. H. Rabinowitz, *Bifurcation, perturbation of simple eigenvalues and linearized stability*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **52** (1973), 161–180.
- [9] S. El Habib, N. Tsouli, *On the spectrum of the p -Laplacian operator for Neumann eigenvalue problems with weights*, Electron. J. Differential Equations, Conf. 14 (2005), 181–190.
- [10] U. Kaufmann, H. Ramos Quoirin, K. Umezu, *Positivity results for indefinite sublinear elliptic problems via a continuity argument*, J. Differential Equations **263** (2017), 4481–4502.
- [11] U. Kaufmann, H. Ramos Quoirin, K. Umezu, *Positive solutions of an elliptic Neumann problem with a sublinear indefinite nonlinearity*, NoDEA Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. **25** (2018), Art. 12, 34 pp.
- [12] U. Kaufmann, H. Ramos Quoirin, K. Umezu, *Nonnegative solutions of an indefinite sublinear Robin problem I: positivity, exact multiplicity, and existence of a subcontinuum*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (2020), to appear.
- [13] J. López-Gómez, *Linear second order elliptic operators*, World Scientific, Hackensack, NJ, 2013.
- [14] Y. Lou, E. Yanagida, *Minimization of the principal eigenvalue for an elliptic boundary value problem with indefinite weight, and applications to population dynamics*, Japan J. Indust. Appl. Math. **23** (2006), 275–292.
- [15] M.A. Rivas, S.B. Robinson, *Eigencurves for linear elliptic equations*, ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations **25** (2019), No. 45, 25 pp.
- [16] O. Torné, *Steklov problem with an indefinite weight for the p -Laplacian*, Electron. J. Differential Equations **2005** (2005), No. 87, 8 pp.
- [17] K. Umezu, *Bifurcation approach to a logistic elliptic equation with a homogeneous incoming flux boundary condition*, J. Differential Equations **252** (2012), 1146–1168.
- [18] S. Verma, *Bounds for the Steklov eigenvalues*, Arch. Math. **111** (2018), 657–668.
- [19] L. Véron, *Première valeur propre non nulle du p -Laplacien et équations quasilinéaires elliptiques sur une variété riemannienne compacte*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris **314** (1992), 271–276.

- [20] E. Zeidler, Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications I Fixed-point theorems, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.