

ON FIRST SUBHARMONIC BIFURCATIONS IN A BRANCH OF STOKES WAVES.

VLADIMIR KOZLOV¹

ABSTRACT. Steady surface waves in a two-dimensional channel are considered. We study bifurcations, which occur on a branch of Stokes water waves starting from a uniform stream solution. Two types of bifurcations are considered: bifurcations in the class of Stokes waves (Stokes bifurcation) and bifurcations in a class of periodic waves with the period M times the period of the Stokes wave (M -subharmonic bifurcation). If we consider the first Stokes bifurcation point then there are no M -subharmonic bifurcations before this point and there exists M -subharmonic bifurcation points after the first Stokes bifurcation for sufficiently large M , which approach the Stokes bifurcation point when $M \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover the set of M -subharmonic bifurcating solutions is a closed connected continuum. We give also a more detailed description of this connected set in terms of the set of its limit points, which must contain extreme waves, or overhanging waves, or solitary waves or waves with stagnation on the bottom, or Stokes bifurcation points different from the initial one.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background. We consider steady surface waves in a two-dimensional channel bounded below by a flat, rigid bottom and above by a free surface. The main subject of this work is subharmonic bifurcations on the branches of Stokes waves.

Stokes and solitary waves (regular waves) were the main subject of study up to 1980. In 1980 (see Chen [4] and Saffman [22]) it was discovered numerically and in 2000 (see [1, 2]) this was supported theoretically for the ir-rotational case for a flow of infinite depth that there exist new types of periodic waves with several crests on the period (the Stokes wave has only one crest). These waves occur as a result of bifurcation on a branch of Stokes waves when they approach the wave of greatest amplitude.

Starting point of our study is a branch of Stokes waves starting from uniform stream solution and approaching an extreme wave. This branch is parameterized by a parameter t . One can study bifurcations of branches of Stokes waves of period $\Lambda(t)$ in one of the following settings:

- (i) in the class of $\Lambda(t)$ -periodic solutions (Stokes bifurcation);
- (ii) in the class of $M\Lambda(t)$ -periodic solutions (M -subharmonic bifurcation);
- (iii) in the class of bounded solutions.

In this paper we will deal mainly with (i) and (ii).

Let us denote by $\{\tilde{t}_j\}$, $j = 1, \dots, \infty$, the Stokes bifurcation points. The following theorem is proved in [9]

Theorem 1.1. (i) *There exists a sequence (\hat{t}_j, M_j) , where $\hat{t}_j \neq \tilde{t}_k$ for all j and k ; M_j are integers, and*

$$\hat{t}_j \rightarrow \infty, \quad M_j \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moreover, \hat{t}_j is a M_j -subharmonic bifurcation point.

(ii) *There exists a sequence (\hat{t}_j, M_j) , where $\hat{t}_j \neq \tilde{t}_k$ for all j and k , the sequence $\{\hat{t}_j\}$ is bounded and*

$$M_j \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Furthermore, \hat{t}_j is a M_j -subharmonic bifurcation point. The numbers \hat{t}_j are pairwise different in both cases.

The proof of this theorem is based on the fact that when the Stokes waves approach the extreme wave many new bifurcation points appear. The proof of this theorem involves a bifurcation theorem for potential operators with non-zero crossing number, which gives unfortunately

no information on the structure of the set of bifurcating solutions (see [24] for a discussion of this structure).

Here we study a mechanism of appearance of the first subharmonic bifurcations. The main result of this paper is the following

Theorem 1.2. *Let $t_0 > 0$ be the first Stokes bifurcation point, i.e. the condition (1.1) be valid. Then there exists (t_M, M) , where M is a large integer and*

$$t_M \rightarrow t_0 \quad \text{as } M \rightarrow \infty,$$

such that t_M is M -subharmonic bifurcation point. There are no subharmonic bifurcations for $t < t_0$.

We prove this theorem by using a bifurcation theorem with odd crossing number, which leads to existence of a closed connected continuum of $M\Lambda$ -periodic solutions containing the bifurcation point t_M (see Theorems 8.1, 9.1 and 9.2 for more details).

In the study of bifurcations the Frechet derivative plays important role. In our case it is a self-adjoint operator bounded from below. Certainly the Frechet derivatives are defined on different spaces in the cases (i)-(iii). In the study of the Stokes bifurcations this is a usual Frechet derivative defined on Λ -periodic, even solutions. If we denote by $\mu_0(t)$ and $\mu_1(t)$ the first and the second eigenvalue of the Frechet derivative, then $\mu_0(t) < 0$ for all t and $\mu_1(0) = 0$. We consider the case when

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(t) > 0 \quad \text{for small positive } t \text{ and assume that there exists } t_0 > 0 \\ \text{such that } \mu_1(t_0) = 0 \text{ and } \mu_1(t) < 0 \text{ for small positive } t - t_0. \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

We will call t_0 the first Stokes bifurcation.

In the case of M -subharmonic bifurcations we have the same expression for the Frechet derivative but now it is defined on $M\Lambda$ -periodic, even functions and finally in the case of bifurcations in a class of bounded solutions the Frechet derivative is defined on the even functions defined on the whole domain without periodicity condition. By introducing quasi-momentum τ we can give another equivalent definition of the Frechet derivative in the cases (ii) and (iii) which is defined on the space of Λ -periodic functions but depending on the real parameter τ . We denote by $\hat{\mu}_j(t, \tau)$, $j = 0, \dots$, the eigenvalues of this problem, which are numerated according to the increasing order:

$$\hat{\mu}_0(t, \tau) \leq \hat{\mu}_1(t, \tau) \leq \dots$$

The essential part of the paper is devoted to a study of properties of these eigenvalues. The eigenvalue $\hat{\mu}_0(t, \tau)$ is always less than 0 for all t and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. If the first Stokes bifurcation occurs at a certain $t = t_0$, then it is proved that the kernel of the Frechet derivative at this point is one-dimensional. Another important property concerning the Frechet derivative is the inequalities

$$\hat{\mu}_1(t, \tau) < 0 \quad \text{for } t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon) \text{ and } \tau \in \mathbb{R},$$

where ϵ is a small positive number, and

$$\hat{\mu}_2(t_0, \tau) > 0 \quad \text{for } \tau \in (0, \tau_*), \quad \tau_* = 2\pi/\Lambda.$$

These inequalities together with asymptotic properties of $\hat{\mu}_2$ in a neighborhood of the point $(t, \tau) = (t_0, 0)$ allows to perform analysis of subharmonic bifurcations near the point $t = t_0$. M -subharmonic bifurcation points t_M are bigger then t_0 and $t_M \rightarrow t_0$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, we show that the crossing number at t_M is odd and hence there is a closed connected continuum of M -subharmonic bifurcations started from the bifurcation point.

As is known one of the indication of bifurcation is the change of the Morse index, or changing of the number of negative eigenvalues of the Frechet derivatives, which depend on the parameter t . In the papers [16] and [9] it was proved that for the branch of Stokes waves approaching the extreme Stokes wave unlimited number of negative eigenvalues appears, which implies unlimited number of bifurcations, see [9]. The problem here is that all these bifurcations can be Stokes bifurcations and the above fact on negative eigenvalues does not directly imply existence of subharmonic bifurcations. More advance analysis is required.

Our aim is to study the first Stokes bifurcation and show that there are always accompanying M -subharmonic bifurcations with arbitrary large M . They generate by τ -roots of the equation $\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) = 0$. The main body of the paper is devoted to the study of this equation. This analysis is based on spectral analysis of different spectral problems and asymptotic analysis of eigenvalues for small τ .

1.2. Formulation of the problem. We consider steady surface waves in a two-dimensional channel bounded below by a flat, rigid bottom and above by a free surface that does not touch the bottom. The surface tension is neglected and the water motion can be rotational. In appropriate Cartesian coordinates (X, Y) , the bottom coincides with the x -axis and gravity acts in the negative y -direction. We choose the frame of reference so that the velocity field is time-independent as well as the free-surface profile which is supposed to be the graph of $Y = \xi(X)$, $X \in \mathbb{R}$, where ξ is a positive and continuous unknown function. Thus

$$\mathcal{D}_\xi = \{X \in \mathbb{R}, 0 < Y < \xi(X)\}, \quad \mathcal{S}_\xi = \{X \in \mathbb{R}, Y = \xi(X)\}$$

is the water domain and the free surface respectively. We will use the stream function Ψ , which is connected with the velocity vector (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) by $\mathbf{u} = -\Psi_Y$ and $\mathbf{v} = \Psi_X$.

We assume that ξ is a positive, periodic function having period $\Lambda > 0$ and that ξ is even and strongly decreasing on the interval $(0, \Lambda/2)$. Since the surface tension is neglected, Ψ and ξ satisfy, after a certain scaling, the following free-boundary problem (see for example [11]):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \Psi + \omega(\Psi) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_\xi, \\ \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \Psi|^2 + \xi &= R \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S}_\xi, \\ \Psi &= 1 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S}_\xi, \\ \Psi &= 0 \quad \text{for } Y = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

where $\omega \in C^{1,\alpha}$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, is a vorticity function and R is the Bernoulli constant. We assume that Ψ is even, Λ -periodic in x and

$$\Psi_Y > 0 \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathcal{D}_\xi}, \tag{1.3}$$

which means that the flow is unidirectional.

The Frechet derivative for the problem is evaluated for example in [16], [9], and the corresponding eigenvalue problem for the Frechet derivative has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w + \omega'(\Psi)w + \mu w &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_\xi, \\ \partial_\nu w - \rho w &= 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S}_\xi, \\ w &= 0 \quad \text{for } Y = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where ν is the unite outward normal to \mathcal{S}_ξ and

$$\rho = \rho(X) = \frac{(1 + \Psi_X \Psi_{XY} + \Psi_Y \Psi_{YY})}{\Psi_Y (\Psi_X^2 + \Psi_Y^2)^{1/2}} \Big|_{Y=\xi(X)}. \tag{1.5}$$

The function w in (1.4) is supposed also to be even and Λ -periodic.

Let us introduce several function spaces. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $k = 0, 1, \dots$. The space $C^{k,\alpha}(\mathcal{D})$ consists of bounded functions in \mathcal{D} such that the norms $C^{k,\alpha}(\overline{\mathcal{D}_{a,a+1}})$ are uniformly bounded with respect to $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Here

$$\mathcal{D}_{a,a+1} = \{(X, Y) \in \mathcal{D}, : a < x < a + 1\}.$$

The space $C_{0,\Lambda}^{k,\alpha}(\mathcal{D})$ ($C_{0,\Lambda,e}^{k,\alpha}(\mathcal{D})$) consists of Λ -periodic (Λ -periodic and even) functions, which belong to $C^{k,\alpha}(\mathcal{D})$ and vanish at $y = 0$.

Similarly we define the space $C_\Lambda^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ ($C_{\Lambda,e}^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$) consisting of functions in $C^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$, which are Λ -periodic (Λ -periodic and even).

We will consider a branch of Stokes water waves depending on a parameter $t \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e.

$$\xi = \xi(X, t), \quad \Psi = \Psi(X, Y; t), \quad \Lambda = \Lambda(t).$$

For each t the function $\xi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\Psi \in C^{3,\alpha}(\mathcal{D})$. This branch starts from a uniform stream solution for $t = 0$ and approach an extreme wave when $t \rightarrow \infty$. The dependence on t is analytic in the following sense: the functions

$$\xi(X\Lambda(0)/\Lambda(t), t) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow C_{\Lambda(0),\epsilon}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$$

are analytic with respect to t and the function Ψ can be found from the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\Psi + \omega(\Psi) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_\xi, \\ \Psi &= 1 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S}_\xi, \\ \Psi &= 0 \quad \text{for } Y = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Another equivalent description of the analytical property of functions ξ and Ψ is presented in Sect. 5.2.

The main assumption is given in terms of the second eigenvalue of the spectral problem (1.4). One can show that the first eigenvalue $\mu_0(t)$ is always negative and the second one $\mu_1(t)$ is zero for $t = 0$. Our main assumption is that

$$\mu_1(t) > 0 \quad \text{for small positive } t. \quad (1.6)$$

This property will be discussed in detail in forthcoming paper.

2. SPECTRAL PROBLEM (1.4), Λ -PERIODIC, EVEN FUNCTIONS

Let

$$D = D_\xi = \{(X, Y) : 0 < X < \Lambda/2, 0 < Y < \xi(X)\}$$

and

$$S = S_\xi = \{(X, Y) : 0 < X < \Lambda/2, Y = \xi(X)\}.$$

We introduce the form

$$a(u, v) = a_D(u, v) = \int_D (\nabla u \cdot \nabla \bar{v} - \omega'(\Psi)u\bar{v}) dX dY - \int_0^{\Lambda/2} \rho(X)u\bar{v} dS, \quad dS = \sqrt{1 + \xi'^2} dX, \quad (2.1)$$

which is defined on functions from $H^1(D)$ vanishing for $Y = 0$. This space will be denoted by $H_0^1(D)$.

The assumption (1.3) implies

$$a_D(u, u) > 0 \quad \text{for nonzero } u \in H_0^1(D) \text{ satisfying } u(X, \xi(X)) = 0 \text{ for } X \in (0, \Lambda/2). \quad (2.2)$$

Since $\partial_X w(0, Y) = \partial_X w(\Lambda/2, Y) = 0$ in (1.4), the spectral problem (1.4) admits the following variational formulation. A real number μ and a function $\phi \in H_0^1(D)$ satisfy (1.4), after natural extension on \mathcal{D}_ξ , if and only if

$$a(\phi, v) = \mu(\phi, v)_{L^2(D)}, \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1(D). \quad (2.3)$$

Here

$$(u, v)_{L^2(D)} = \int_D u\bar{v} dX dY.$$

We put also $\|u\|_{L^2(D)}^2 = (u, u)_{L^2(D)}$. We numerate the eigenvalues accounting their multiplicity as

$$\mu_0 \leq \mu_1 \leq \dots, \quad \mu_j \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty,$$

and denote by Φ_j , $j = 0, 1, \dots$, corresponding eigenfunctions. They can be chosen to be orthogonal to each other, real-valued and with the norm

$$\|\Phi_j\|_{L^2(D)} = 1.$$

Thus $\{\Phi_j\}$ forms an orthogonal basis in $L^2(D)$.

In what follows we shall use the function

$$u_*(X, Y) := \Psi_X(X, Y), \quad (2.4)$$

which is odd, Λ -periodic and belongs to $C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{D})$. It satisfies the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta u_* + \omega'(\Psi)u_* &= 0 \text{ in } D_\xi, \\ \partial_\nu u_* - \rho u_* &= 0 \text{ on } S_\xi, \\ u_* &= 0 \text{ for } X = 0, \\ u_*(0, Y) &= 0 \text{ for } Y \in (0, \xi(0)), \quad u_*(\Lambda/2, Y) = 0 \text{ for } Y \in (0, \xi(\Lambda/2)),\end{aligned}\tag{2.5}$$

and it has the following properties along branches of Stokes waves (see [10])

- (i) $u_* > 0$ for $(X, Y) \in D \cup S$;
- (ii) $(u_*)_X(0, Y) > 0$ for $0 < Y \leq \xi(0)$, $(u_*)_X(\Lambda/2, Y) < 0$ for $0 < Y \leq \xi(\Lambda/2)$;
and $(u_*)_Y(X, 0) > 0$ for $0 < X < \Lambda/2$;
- (iii) $(u_*)_{XY}(0, 0) > 0$, $(u_*)_{XY}(\Lambda/2, 0) < 0$.

The above properties of the function Ψ_x -the vertical component of the velocity vector, are found interesting application in study of branches of Stokes waves, see [5], [7], [27], [26] and [10]. It appears that they are also important in study of subharmonic bifurcations. They are used, in particular, in the proof of the following assertion.

Proposition 2.1. *Let ξ be not identically constant then the eigenvalue μ_0 is simple¹. Moreover $\mu_0 < 0$ and the corresponding eigenfunction (Φ_0) does not change sign inside D . If we assume that Φ_0 is positive inside D then Φ_0 is also positive for $Y = \xi(X)$ and for $X = 0$, $Y \in (0, \xi(0))$ and $X = \Lambda/2$, $Y \in (0, \xi(\Lambda/2))$.*

Proof. Let v_* be the restriction of the function (2.4) to the domain D . Clearly it is positive inside D , belongs to $H_0^1(D)$ and $a(v_*, v_*) = 0$. This implies that either $\mu_0 < 0$ or $\mu_0 = 0$ and the function v_* is an eigenfunction corresponding to μ_0 . The latest alternative is impossible. Indeed, if v_* is an eigenfunction then $(v_*)_X = 0$ for $X = 0$ and for $X = \Lambda/2$. So v_* has homogeneous Cauchy data and satisfies an elliptic equation. Hence v_* is identically zero inside D . Thus $\mu_0 < 0$.

Since

$$\mu_0 = \min_{w \in H_0^1(D), \|w\|_0=1} a(w, w)\tag{2.7}$$

the corresponding eigenfunction cannot change sign inside D . Indeed, if ϕ_0 changes sign then we introduce two functions $v_\pm(X, Y) = \max(0, \pm v(X, Y))$. One can verify that $a(v_\pm, v_\pm) = \mu_0 \|v_\pm\|_{L^2(D)}^2$. Therefore both functions v_\pm deliver minimum in (2.7) and hence they are also eigenfunctions corresponding to μ_0 but this is impossible because they are not smooth. So Φ_0 is positive or negative inside D .

Assume that $\Phi_0 > 0$ in D . Then it cannot vanish on the part of the boundary where $Y > 0$. Indeed if Φ is zero there then the normal derivative is also zero and this leads to a change of sign inside D . \square

The following Green's formula for the form a will be useful in the proof of the next proposition:

$$\begin{aligned}& - \int_D (\Delta u + \omega'(\Psi)u) \bar{v} dX dY + \int_0^{\Lambda/2} (\partial_\nu u - \rho(X)u) \bar{v} dS \\ &= a(u, v) + \int_0^{\xi(0)} u_X \bar{v}|_{X=0} dY - \int_0^{\xi(\Lambda/2)} u_X \bar{v}|_{X=\Lambda/2} dY.\end{aligned}\tag{2.8}$$

Here the function u belongs to the space $H_0^2(D)$ consisting of functions from $H^2(D)$ vanishing for $Y = 0$ and $v \in H_0^1(D)$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let ξ be not identically constant. If $\mu_1 = 0$ then $\mu_1 = 0$ is simple. Moreover the corresponding eigenfunction has exactly two nodal sets and the nodal line separating these nodal sets has one of its end points on the curve S .*

¹This implies in particular that $\mu_0 < \mu_1$.

Proof. Denote by \mathcal{X} the space of real eigenfunctions corresponding to the eigenvalue $\mu_1 = 0$. Since all eigenfunctions from \mathcal{X} orthogonal to Φ_0 , each eigenfunction must change sign inside D . Let us show that $\dim \mathcal{X} = 1$. The proof consists of several steps.

(a) First we show that every nonzero eigenfunction $w \in \mathcal{X}$ has exactly two nodal sets. Assume that there is an eigenfunction $w \in \mathcal{X}$ which has more than two nodal sets, say Y_j , $j = 1, \dots, N$, $N > 2$. Introduce the functions $u_j(X, Y) = w(X, Y)$ for $(X, Y) \in Y_j$ and zero otherwise. Then $u_j \in H_0^1(D)$ and

$$a(u_j, u_k) = 0 \text{ for all } k, j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (2.9)$$

We choose the constant α such that

$$(u_1 - \alpha u_2, \Phi_0)_{L^2(D)} = 0$$

and observe that $a(u_1 - \alpha u_2, u_1 - \alpha u_2) = 0$. Since

$$\mu_1 = \min a(w, w)$$

where min is taken over $w \in H_0^1(D)$ satisfying $(w, \Phi_0)_{L^2(D)} = 0$ and $\|w\|_{L^2(D)} = 1$, the minimum is attained on the function $(u_1 - \alpha u_2)/\|u_1 - \alpha u_2\|_{L^2(D)}$. So we conclude that $u_1 - \alpha u_2$ is an eigenfunction corresponding to the eigenvalue $\mu_1 = 0$, which is impossible since this function is zero on Y_j for $j > 2$.

(b) Second, let us prove that the nodal line is not closed and one of its end points lies on S . Consider an eigenfunction w with two nodal sets and let γ be the nodal line separating these two nodal sets. If this nodal line is closed then introduce the function w_1 which coincides with w inside the closed nodal line and vanishes outside. Then $a(w_1, w_1) = 0$ and $w_1 = 0$ on S which contradicts to the inequality (2.2). If both end points of γ lie outside S then introduce w_2 which coincides with w on the nodal set separated from S and vanishes otherwise. Then $a(w_2, w_2) = 0$ and $w_2 = 0$ on S which again contradicts to the inequality (2.2). Thus one of end points lies on S .

(c) Now we are in position to prove that $\dim \mathcal{X} = 1$. If $\dim \mathcal{X} > 1$ then there is an eigenfunction, say w_* which is zero at the point $z_1 = (0, \eta(0))$, which must be one of the end points of the nodal line separating two nodal sets. By b) another end-point z_2 of the nodal line lies on S . Denote by Y_1 the nodal set attached to the part of S between z_1 and z_2 . Let also Y_2 be the remaining nodal domain. We can assume that $w_* < 0$ in Y_1 and $w_* > 0$ in Y_2 .

Let v_* be the function introduced in Proposition 2.1. Using that both functions w_* and u_* satisfy the problem (1.4) but the first one satisfies $\partial_X w_* = 0$ for $X = 0, \Lambda/2$ and the second is subject to $v_* = 0$ for the same values of x , we have, by using (2.8),

$$\int_0^{\xi(0)} \partial_X v_*(0, Y) w_*(0, Y) dY = \int_0^{\xi(\Lambda/2)} \partial_X v_*(\Lambda/2, Y) w_*(\Lambda/2, Y) dY. \quad (2.10)$$

Consider the function

$$U = w_* + \beta v_*, \text{ where } \beta > 0.$$

Since v_* is a positive function inside D , for small β the function U has also two nodal sets \tilde{Y}_1 and \tilde{Y}_2 , separated by a nodal line $\tilde{\gamma}$ with end points $z_1 = (0, \eta(0))$ and $\tilde{z}_2 \in S$ which is close to z_2 . We assume that the nodal set \tilde{Y}_1 is attached to the part of S between the points z_1 and \tilde{z}_2 . Introduce the functions

$$\begin{aligned} U_1(X, Y) &= U(X, Y) \text{ if } (X, Y) \in \tilde{Y}_1 \text{ and zero otherwise,} \\ U_2(X, Y) &= U(X, Y) \text{ if } (X, Y) \in \tilde{Y}_2 \text{ and zero otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

We choose the constant θ such that

$$(U_1 + \theta U_2, \Phi_0)_{L^2(D)} = 0. \quad (2.11)$$

It is clear that $\theta \neq 0$ because of

$$a(U_1, \Phi_0) = \mu_0(U_1, \Phi_0)_{L^2(D)} \neq 0.$$

Here we have used that $\Phi_0 > 0$ inside D by Proposition 2.1. Furthermore due to (2.10) and the fact that w_* is an eigenfunction corresponding to $\mu_1 = 0$, we have

$$a(U_1 + \theta U_2, U_1 + \theta U_2) = 0.$$

This together with (2.11) implies that $U_1 + \theta U_2$ is an eigenfunction corresponding to the eigenvalues $\mu_1 = 0$ of the spectral problem (2.3). But this contradicts to the smoothness properties of the function $U_1 + \theta U_2$. (Compare with the argument used in a) and b)). \square

2.1. Auxiliary spectral problems. In this section we introduce and study eigenvalues of several eigenvalue problems, which will be used in subsequent sections to estimate eigenvalues of "generalized" eigenvalue problem introduced in the next section. Zeros of generalized eigenvalues will give us the subharmonic bifurcations in what follows.

Let us introduce the spaces

$$\begin{aligned} H_{00*}^1(D) &= \{u \in H_0^1(D) : u = 0 \text{ for } X = 0\}, \\ H_{0*0}^1(D) &= \{u \in H_0^1(D) : u = 0 \text{ for } X = \Lambda/2\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$H_{000}^1(D) = \{u \in H_0^1(D) : u = 0 \text{ for } X = 0 \text{ and } X = \Lambda/2\}.$$

The following spectral problems will play important role in what follows. Find ν^{0*} and $u \in H_{00*}^1(D)$ satisfying

$$a(u, v) = \nu^{0*}(u, v)_{L^2(D)} \text{ for all } v \in H_{00*}^1(D). \quad (2.12)$$

Find ν^{*0} and $u \in H_{0*0}^1(D)$ satisfying

$$a(u, v) = \nu^{*0}(u, v)_{L^2(D)} \text{ for all } v \in H_{0*0}^1(D). \quad (2.13)$$

Find ν^{00} and $u \in H_{000}^1(D)$ satisfying

$$a(u, v) = \nu^{00}(u, v)_{L^2(D)} \text{ for all } v \in H_{000}^1(D). \quad (2.14)$$

We denote the eigenvalues of these problems by

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_0^{0*} &\leq \nu_1^{0*} \leq \dots, \\ \nu_0^{*0} &\leq \nu_1^{*0} \leq \dots \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\nu_0^{00} \leq \nu_1^{00} \leq \dots,$$

where the multiplicity is taken into account. We note that the spectral problem considered in Sect. 2 represents the fourth problem in this list of spectral problems, where no restrictions for $X = 0$ and $X = \Lambda/2$ are given.

Proposition 2.3. *The following properties are valid:*

$$\nu_0^{0*} < 0, \quad \nu_0^{*0} < 0, \quad \nu_0^{00} = 0 \quad (2.15)$$

and

$$\nu_1^{0*} > \mu_1, \quad \nu_1^{*0} > \mu_1, \quad \nu_1^{00} > 0. \quad (2.16)$$

Proof. The function v_* from Proposition 2.1 satisfies the problem (2.14) with $\nu^{00} = 0$ and it is positive inside D . Therefore ν^{00} is the lowest eigenvalue of (2.14) and we arrive at the last relation in (2.15). Since

$$H_{000}^1(D) \subset H_{00*}^1(D) \text{ and } H_{000}^1(D) \subset H_{0*0}^1(D), \quad (2.17)$$

we obtain the first two inequalities in (2.15), compare with the proof of Proposition 2.1.

Inclusions

$$H_{00*}^1(D) \subset H_0^1(D) \text{ and } H_{0*0}^1(D) \subset H_0^1(D) \quad (2.18)$$

together with (2.17) implies the inequalities (2.16). \square

3. GENERALIZED EIGENVALUE PROBLEM

To study subharmonic and more general bifurcations a more general eigenvalue problem, which includes quasi momentum as a parameter, is needed. This section is devoted to this spectral problem.

As it is known (see, for example [19], [21]) all bounded solutions to the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w + \omega'(\Psi)w + \mu w &= 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{D}_\xi, \\ \partial_\nu w - \rho w &= 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{S}_\xi, \\ w &= 0 \text{ for } y = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

with real μ , are described by

$$w(X, Y) = \sum_j a_j e^{i\tau_j X} w_j(X, Y),$$

where $\tau_j \in [0, \tau_*)$ and w_j is a Λ -periodic solution to the problem

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_X + i\tau)^2 w + \partial_Y^2 w + \omega'(\Psi)w + \mu w &= 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{D}_\xi, \\ N(\tau)w - \rho w &= 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{S}_\xi, \\ w &= 0 \text{ for } Y = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$N(\tau)w = e^{-i\tau X} \partial_\nu(e^{i\tau X} w).$$

The number τ is called quasi momentum. It is not assumed in this consideration that w is even. By [23] the number of such τ_j is finite for a fixed μ . In this section we prove important estimates for eigenvalues of the generalized eigenvalue problem.

3.1. Variational formulation. The problem (3.2) is a spectral problem for a self-adjoint operator for every real τ . To give its variational formulation we introduce

$$\Omega = \{(X, Y) : -\Lambda/2 < X < \Lambda/2, 0 < Y < \xi(X)\}$$

and denote by $H_{0,p}^1(\Omega)$ the subspace of all function u in $H^1(\Omega)$, which satisfies $u(-\Lambda/2, Y) = u(\Lambda/2, Y)$ for $Y \in (0, \xi(\Lambda/2))$ and $u(X, 0) = 0$ for $X \in (-\Lambda/2, \Lambda/2)$. We put

$$\mathbf{a}(u, v; \tau) = \int_\Omega \left((\partial_X + i\tau)u \overline{(\partial_X + i\tau)v} + \partial_Y u \partial_Y \bar{v} - \omega'(\Psi)u\bar{v} \right) dXdY - \int_{-\Lambda/2}^{\Lambda/2} \rho(X)u\bar{v} dS, \tag{3.3}$$

which can be written also as

$$\mathbf{a}(u, v; \tau) = \mathbf{a}(u, v) + i\tau \mathbf{b}(u, v) + \tau^2 \mathbf{c}(u, v),$$

where

$$\mathbf{a}(u, v) = a_\Omega(u, v), \quad \mathbf{b}(u, v) = \int_\Omega (u \partial_X \bar{v} - \partial_X u \bar{v}) dXdY, \quad \mathbf{c}(u, v) = (u, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Consider the spectral problem: find $w \in H_{0,p}^1(\Omega)$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\mathbf{a}(w, V; \tau) = \widehat{\mu}(\tau)(\phi, V)_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for all } V \in H_{0,p}^1(\Omega). \tag{3.4}$$

This is a variational formulation of the spectral problem (3.2). Note that we do not suppose in this formulation the functions w and V are even or odd, both of them are only periodic. We will consider the form \mathbf{a} only for real τ . In this case the form is symmetric and the spectrum consists of isolated real eigenvalues of finite multiplicity.

Denote by $\widehat{\mu}_j(\tau)$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, the eigenvalues of the problem (3.2) (equivalently (3.4)) numerated according to the increasing order

$$\widehat{\mu}_0(\tau) \leq \widehat{\mu}_1(\tau) \leq \dots$$

Clearly

$$\widehat{\mu}_0(0) = \mu_0, \quad \widehat{\mu}_1(0) = \min(\mu_1, 0), \quad \widehat{\mu}_2(0) = \min(\max(\mu_1, 0), \mu_2, \nu_1^{00})$$

and

$$\widehat{\mu}_3(0) > 0 \text{ if } \mu_2 > 0. \tag{3.5}$$

Here we use that the first and second eigenvalues of the problem (1.4), considered for Λ -periodic odd functions coincide with ν_0^{00} and ν_1^{00} respectively.

There is another variational formulation. We put $w = e^{-i\tau X}\phi$ in (3.4) and $V = e^{-i\tau X}v$, $v \in H_0^1(\Omega, \tau)$, where

$$H_0^1(\Omega, \tau) = \{v \in H_0^1(\Omega) : v(-\Lambda/2, Y) = e^{-i\tau\Lambda}v(\Lambda/2, Y)\}.$$

Then the spectral problem (3.4) is equivalent to: find $\hat{\mu}(\tau)$ and $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega, \tau)$ satisfying

$$a(\phi, v) = \hat{\mu}(\tau)(\phi, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for all } v \in H_0^1(\Omega, \tau). \quad (3.6)$$

3.2. Estimates of the eigenvalues $\hat{\mu}_j$. We will need some estimate for the function $\hat{\mu}_j(\tau)$. For this purpose we introduce two auxiliary spectral problems. Let $H_{00}^1(\Omega)$ consists of functions from $H^1(\Omega)$ which vanish for $Y = 0$ and $x = \pm\Lambda/2$.

The first spectral problem is to find $\mu_D \in [0, \tau_*)$ and $\phi \in H_{00}^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$a(\phi, v) = \mu_D(\phi, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for all } v \in H_{00}^1(\Omega). \quad (3.7)$$

The second one is to find $\mu_N \in [0, \tau_*)$ and $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$a(\phi, v) = \mu_N(\phi, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for all } v \in H_0^1(\Omega). \quad (3.8)$$

We denote by $\{\mu_{Dj}\}$ and $\{\mu_{Nj}\}$, $j = 0, 1, \dots$, the eigenvalues of the problems (3.7) and (3.8) respectively numerated according to

$$\mu_{D0} \leq \mu_{D1} \leq \dots, \quad \mu_{N0} \leq \mu_{N1} \leq \dots,$$

where the multiplicity is taken into account. Since

$$H_{00}^1(\Omega) \subset H_0^1(\Omega, \tau) \subset H_0^1(\Omega), \quad (3.9)$$

we conclude

$$\mu_{Nj} \leq \hat{\mu}_j(\tau) \leq \mu_{Dj}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots \quad (3.10)$$

Note that both eigenvalues μ_{Dj} and μ_{Nj} do not depend on τ .

In the following lemma we show that all inequalities (3.10) are strong

Lemma 3.1. *Let ξ be not identically constant. Then the following inequalities hold:*

$$\mu_{Nj} < \hat{\mu}_j(\tau) < \mu_{Dj}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots \quad (3.11)$$

for $\tau \in (0, \tau_*)$.

Proof. First, we assume that n satisfies

$$\mu_{Dn} > \mu_{D(n-1)} \quad (3.12)$$

and prove the inequalities in right-hand side of (3.11). Let $\Phi_j \in H_{00}^1(\Omega)$ be the eigenfunction of (3.7) corresponding to μ_{Dj} , $j = 0, \dots$, and let X_n be the space of linear combinations of $\{\Phi_j\}_{j=0}^{n-1}$ and

$$\mathcal{X}_n = \{\Phi \in H_{00}^1(\Omega) : (\Phi, \Phi_j)_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0, j = 0, \dots, n-1\}.$$

Then

$$\mu_{Dn} = \min_{\Phi \in X_n} \frac{a(\Phi, \Phi)}{\|\Phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2}.$$

We assume here and in what follows that $\Phi \neq 0$ in similar relations.

Introduce the subspace

$$\mathcal{Y}_n = \mathcal{Y}_n(\tau) = \{\Phi \in H_0^1(\Omega, \tau) : a(\Phi, \Phi_j) - \mu(\Phi, \Phi_j) = 0, j = 0, \dots, n-1\},$$

where we use the short notation $\mu = \mu_{Dn}$. The relation $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{Y}_n$, follows from

$$a(\Phi, \Phi_j) - \mu(\Phi, \Phi_j)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\mu_{Dj} - \mu)(\Phi, \Phi_j)_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0 \text{ for } \Phi \in \mathcal{X}_n, j = 0, \dots, n-1.$$

To show that the codimension of \mathcal{Y}_n is n , we assume that there exists

$$\Phi_* = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} c_j \Phi_j$$

such that

$$a(\Phi, \Phi_*) - \mu(\Phi, \Phi_*)_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0 \text{ for all } \Phi \in H_0^1(\Omega, \tau).$$

Due to (3.12)

$$a(\Phi_*, \Phi_*) - \mu \|\Phi_*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 < 0$$

if one of coefficient c_j is non-zero and hence co-dimension of \mathcal{Y}_n is n . Let us also prove that every $u \in H_0^1(\Omega, \tau)$ admits the representation $u = \Phi + \phi$, where $\Phi \in \mathcal{Y}_n$ and $\phi \in X_n$. Indeed, we choose c_j and ϕ according to

$$c_j(\mu_{Dj} - \mu) \|\Phi_j\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = a(u, \Phi_j) - \mu(u, \Phi_j)_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \phi = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} c_j \Phi_j.$$

Then

$$a(\Phi, \Phi_j) - \mu(\Phi, \Phi_j)_{L^2(\Omega)} = a(u, \Phi_j) - \mu(u, \Phi_j)_{L^2(\Omega)} + a(\phi, \Phi_j) + \mu(\phi, \Phi_j)_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0.$$

Therefore $\Phi \in \mathcal{Y}_n$.

By the min-max principle for eigenvalues of (3.6):

$$\widehat{\mu}_n \leq \min_{\Phi \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \frac{a(\Phi, \Phi)}{\|\Phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2}, \quad (3.13)$$

If this inequality is strong then the right inequality in (3.11) is proved. Assume that

$$\widehat{\mu}_n = \min_{\Phi \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \frac{a(\Phi, \Phi)}{\|\Phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2}. \quad (3.14)$$

Then the minimum is attained at a certain function $\widehat{\Phi} \in \mathcal{Y}_n$ and

$$a(\widehat{\Phi}, v) = \mu(\widehat{\Phi}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for all } v \in \mathcal{Y}_n. \quad (3.15)$$

Using the definition of \mathcal{Y}_n , we conclude that

$$a(\widehat{\Phi}, v + g) - \mu(\widehat{\Phi}, v + g)_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0 \text{ for all } g \in X_n.$$

Therefore $\widehat{\Phi} \in \mathcal{Y}_n$ is an eigenfunction of (3.6) and (3.7) with $\mu = \mu_{Dn}$ considered in the space $H_0^1(\Omega, \tau)$ and $H_{00}^1(\Omega)$. Considering the functions $\widehat{\Phi}(X, Y) + \widehat{\Phi}(-X, Y)$ and $\widehat{\Phi}(X, Y) - \widehat{\Phi}(-X, Y)$, which are even and odd respectively and using that $\tau \in (0, \tau_*)$ (this implies that $\partial_X \widehat{\Phi} = 0$ for $X = \pm\Lambda/2$), we conclude that $\widehat{\Phi} = 0$, since there is a homogeneous Cauchy data at $X = \pm\Lambda/2$ for the function $\widehat{\Phi}$. Thus the right inequality in (3.11) is strong.

Consider the case when (3.12) is not valid. Then we choose l such that

$$\mu_{Dn} = \cdot = \mu_{D(n-l)} > \mu_{D(n-l-1)}.$$

By just proved, $\widehat{\mu}_{n-l}(\tau) < \mu_{D(n-l)}$, which implies $\widehat{\mu}_n(\tau) < \mu_{D(n)}$.

Let us turn to the left inequality in (3.11). Now, we assume that n satisfies

$$\widehat{\mu}_n > \widehat{\mu}_{n-1}. \quad (3.16)$$

We represent $H_0^1(\Omega)$ as

$$H_0^1(\Omega) = \mathcal{X} + \mathcal{Y},$$

where \mathcal{X} consists of even functions in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and \mathcal{Y} consists of odd functions in $H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Let $\Phi_j \in H_0^1(\Omega, \tau)$ be the eigenfunction of (3.7) corresponding to μ_{Dj} , $j = 0, \dots$, and let now X_n be the space of linear combinations of $\{\Phi_j\}_{j=0}^{n-1}$ and

$$\mathcal{X}_n(\tau) = \{\Phi \in H_0^1(\Omega, \tau) : (\Phi, \Phi_j)_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0, j = 0, \dots, n-1\}.$$

Then

$$\widehat{\mu}_n = \min_{\Phi \in X_n} \frac{a(\Phi, \Phi)}{\|\Phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2}.$$

Introduce the subspace

$$\mathcal{Y}_n = \{\Phi \in H_0^1(\Omega) : a(\Phi, \Phi_j) - \mu(\Phi, \Phi_j) = 0, j = 0, \dots, n-1\},$$

where we use the short notation $\mu = \mu_{Dn}$. The relation $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{Y}_n$, follows from

$$a(\Phi, \Phi_j) - \mu(\Phi, \Phi_j)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\mu_{Dj} - \mu)(\Phi, \Phi_j)_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0 \text{ for } \Phi \in \mathcal{X}_n, j = 0, \dots, n-1.$$

In the same way as before one can show that the codimension of \mathcal{Y}_n is equal to n and that every $u \in H_0^2(\Omega, \tau)$ admits the representation $u = \Phi + \phi$, where $\Phi \in \mathcal{Y}_n$ and $\phi \in X_n$.

By the min-max principle for eigenvalues of (3.6):

$$\widehat{\mu}_n \leq \min_{\Phi \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \frac{a(\Phi, \Phi)}{\|\Phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2}, \quad (3.17)$$

If this inequality is strong then the right inequality in (3.11) is proved. Assume that

$$\widehat{\mu}_n = \min_{\Phi \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \frac{a(\Phi, \Phi)}{\|\Phi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2}. \quad (3.18)$$

Then the minimum is attained at a certain function $\widehat{\Phi} \in \mathcal{Y}_n$ and

$$a(\widehat{\Phi}, v) = \mu(\widehat{\Phi}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for all } v \in \mathcal{Y}_n.$$

Using the definition of \mathcal{Y}_n , we conclude that

$$a(\widehat{\Phi}, v + g) - \mu(\widehat{\Phi}, v + g)_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0 \text{ for all } g \in X_n.$$

Therefore $\widehat{\Phi} \in \mathcal{Y}_n$ is an eigenfunction of (3.6) and (3.7) with $\mu = \widehat{\mu}_n$ considered in the space $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $H_0^1(\Omega, \tau)$. The same argument as before proves that the right inequality in (3.11) is strong. \square

The next lemma gives important estimates for $\widehat{\mu}_j$, which are essential for the proof our main theorem.

Lemma 3.2. *For all $\tau \in (0, \tau_*)$*

$$(i) \quad \mu_0 < \widehat{\mu}_0(\tau) < \nu_0^{*0}. \quad (3.19)$$

$$(ii) \text{ If } 0 < \nu_1^{*0} \text{ and } \nu_0^{0*} < \mu_1 \text{ then} \quad \nu_0^{0*} < \widehat{\mu}_1(\tau) < 0, \quad (3.20)$$

and

$$\mu_1 < \widehat{\mu}_2(\tau) < \nu_1^{*0} \quad (3.21)$$

$$(iii) \quad \nu_1^{0*} < \widehat{\mu}_3(\tau). \quad (3.22)$$

Proof. First let us prove the equalities

$$\mu_{D0} = \nu_0^{*0}, \quad \mu_{D1} = \nu_0^{00}, \quad \mu_{D2} = \nu_1^{*0} \quad (3.23)$$

assuming $\nu_0^{00} < \nu_1^{*0}$ (this is needed for the second and third relations above).

We represent $H_{00}^1(\Omega)$ as

$$H_{00}^1(\Omega) = \widehat{X} + \widehat{Y},$$

where \widehat{X} consists of even functions in $H_{00}^1(\Omega)$ and \widehat{Y} consists of odd functions in $H_{00}^1(\Omega)$. Then the spaces \widehat{X} and \widehat{Y} are invariant for this spectral problem.

Introduce two spectral problems

$$a_\Omega(u, v) = \mu(u, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for all } v \in \widehat{X}, \quad (3.24)$$

where $u \in \widehat{X}$, and

$$a_\Omega(u, v) = \mu(u, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for all } v \in \widehat{Y}, \quad (3.25)$$

where $u \in \widehat{Y}$. Then the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the problems (3.24) and (3.25) coincide with the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the problem (3.7). Furthermore, the eigenvalues of the problem (3.24) coincides with the eigenvalues of the problem (2.12) and the eigenvalues of

the problem (3.25) coincides with the eigenvalues of the problem (2.14). This implies (3.23) and due to Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 3.1 we get the right-hand inequalities in (3.19)-(3.21).

Let us turn to the estimates (3.19)-(3.21) and (3.22) from below. We start from proving

$$\mu_{N0} = \mu_0, \quad \mu_{N1} = \nu_0^{0*}, \quad \mu_{N2} = \mu_1, \quad \mu_{N3} = \nu_1^{0*} \quad (3.26)$$

assuming $\nu_0^{0*} < \mu_1$ (this is needed only for the second and third relations above).

We use the representation

$$H_0^1(\Omega) = \tilde{X} + \tilde{Y},$$

where \tilde{X} consists of even functions with respect to X in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and \tilde{Y} consists of odd functions in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Introduce two more spectral problem

$$a(u, v) = \mu(u, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } v \in \tilde{X}, \quad (3.27)$$

where $u \in \tilde{X}$, and

$$a(u, v) = \mu(u, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } v \in \tilde{Y}, \quad (3.28)$$

where $u \in \tilde{Y}$. Then the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the problems (3.27) and (3.28) coincides with of the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the problem (3.8). Furthermore, the eigenvalues of the problem (3.27) coincides with the eigenvalues of the problem (2.3) and the eigenvalues of the problem (3.28) coincides with the eigenvalues of the problem (2.13). This implies (3.26) and due to Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 3.1 we get the right-hand inequalities in (3.19)-(3.22). □

Corollary 3.3. *If $\mu_1 > 0$ then*

$$\hat{\mu}_1(\tau) < 0, \quad \hat{\mu}_2(\tau) > 0 \quad \text{for } \tau \in (0, \tau_*) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu}_2(0) = \mu_1 > 0, \quad \hat{\mu}_1 = 0.$$

Moreover the eigenvalue $\mu = 0$ is simple with the eigenfunction ψ_x .

3.3. Asymptotics of eigenvalues $\hat{\mu}_1(\tau)$ and $\hat{\mu}_2(\tau)$. In this section we assume that $\mu_1 = 0$. According to Proposition 2.2 this eigenvalue is simple in the space of periodic even function. Since 0 is always simple eigenvalue in the space of odd periodic functions, the multiplicity of the eigenvalue μ_1 is two in the space of periodic functions. One can check that if μ is an eigenvalue of (3.2) for a certain τ then μ is also the eigenvalue of the same multiplicity of the same problem for $-\tau$. Therefore

$$\hat{\mu}_1(-\tau) = \hat{\mu}_1(\tau), \quad \hat{\mu}_2(-\tau) = \hat{\mu}_2(\tau).$$

Furthermore due to Lemma 3.2

$$\hat{\mu}_1(\tau) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu}_2(\tau) > 0 \quad \text{for } \tau \in (0, \tau_*). \quad (3.29)$$

Since $\mu(-\tau)$, $\mu(\tau + \tau_*)$ are eigenvalues if $\mu(\tau)$ is an eigenvalue we have

$$\hat{\mu}_1(\tau_* - \tau) = \hat{\mu}_1(\tau) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu}_2(\tau_* - \tau) = \hat{\mu}_2(\tau).$$

Moreover if $\phi(X, Y; \tau)$ is an eigenfunction corresponding to $\mu(\tau)$ then $\phi(-X, Y; -\tau)$ is an eigenfunction corresponding to the eigenvalue $\mu(-\tau)$.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that $\mu_1 = 0$. Then one of the following two options is valid*

(i) *There exists an integer $n \geq 1$ such that*

$$\hat{\mu}_1(\tau) = -\kappa_n \tau^{2n-1} + O(\tau^{2n}), \quad \hat{\mu}_2(\tau) = \kappa_n \tau^{2n-1} + O(\tau^{2n}) \quad (3.30)$$

for small positive τ , where $\kappa_n > 0$.

(ii) *There exist integers $n, m \geq 1$ such that*

$$\hat{\mu}_1(\tau) = A\tau^{2n} + O(|\tau|^{2n+1}), \quad \hat{\mu}_2(\tau) = B\tau^{2m} + O(|\tau|^{2m+1}) \quad (3.31)$$

for small positive τ , where $A < 0$ and $B > 0$.

Proof. Since the multiplicity of the eigenvalue $\mu = 0$ of the problem (3.2) has multiplicity two for $\tau = 0$ there are two analytic in τ branches of eigenvalues of (3.2), denote them by $\theta_1(\tau)$ and $\theta_2(\tau)$ such that $\theta_1(0) = \theta_2(0) = 0$. Since $\theta_1(-\tau)$ and $\theta_2(-\tau)$ are also eigenvalues one of the following options is valid:

- (a) $\theta_1(\tau) = \theta_2(\tau)$ and the function θ_1 is even with respect to τ ;
- (b) $\theta_1(-\tau) = \theta_2(\tau)$;
- (c) $\theta_1(-\tau) = \theta_1(\tau)$ and $\theta_2(-\tau) = \theta_2(\tau)$.

Observing that the functions $\theta_j(\tau)$ coincides with one of functions $\widehat{\mu}_j$, $j = 1, 2$, for small positive τ , we conclude that only the options (b) and (c) may occur. This leads to the options (i) and (ii) in our lemma. The sign of κ_n , A and B follows from (3.29). \square

The asymptotics of the corresponding eigenfunctions is given in the following

Lemma 3.5. *Let $v_1(\tau)$ and $v_2(\tau)$ be eigenfunctions analytically depending on τ corresponding to the eigenvalues θ_1 and θ_2 in the proof of Lemma 3.4. In the case (3.30) the corresponding eigenfunctions satisfy*

$$v_2(0) = \phi_0 + i\beta\psi_0, \quad v_1(0) = \phi_0 - i\beta^{-1}\psi_0, \quad \text{with } \beta \neq 0. \quad (3.32)$$

In the case (3.31) the corresponding eigenfunctions satisfy

$$v_2(0) = \phi_0 \quad \text{and} \quad v_1(0) = \psi_0. \quad (3.33)$$

Proof. Introduce polynomials

$$\Phi(\tau) = \phi_0 + i\tau\phi_1 + \dots + (i\tau)^p\phi_p \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi(\tau) = \psi_0 + i\tau\psi_1 + \dots + (i\tau)^p\psi_p,$$

where ϕ_j, ψ_k are real-valued functions from $H_{p0}^1(\Omega)$ such that they are even when j is even and k is odd, and they are odd when j is odd and k is even. Let us construct the functions ϕ_j and ψ_k , $j, k = 1, \dots, p-1$, satisfying

$$\mathbf{a}(\Phi(\tau), v; \tau) = O(|\tau|^p), \quad \mathbf{a}(\Psi(\tau), v; \tau) = O(|\tau|^p) \quad \text{for all } v \in H_{p0}^1(\Omega).$$

Equating terms of the same power of τ in the first relation, we obtain

$$\mathbf{a}(\phi_1, v) + \mathbf{b}(\phi_0, v) = 0 \quad (3.34)$$

and

$$\mathbf{a}(\phi_{k+2}, v) + \mathbf{b}(\phi_{k+1}, v) + \mathbf{c}(\phi_k, v) = 0 \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, p-3 \quad \text{and } v \in H_0^1(\Omega). \quad (3.35)$$

Similar relations hold with ϕ replaced by ψ . Equations (3.34) and (3.35) are solvable if "the right-hand side is orthogonal to the kernel of the main operator corresponding to the form \mathbf{a} ", i.e.

$$\mathbf{b}(\phi_0, \psi_0) = 0, \quad (3.36)$$

$$\mathbf{b}(\phi_{k+1}, \phi_0) + \mathbf{c}(\phi_k, \phi_0) = 0, \quad \mathbf{b}(\phi_{k+1}, \psi_0) + \mathbf{c}(\phi_k, \psi_0) = 0, \quad (3.37)$$

and

$$\mathbf{b}(\psi_{k+1}, \phi_0) + \mathbf{c}(\psi_k, \phi_0) = 0, \quad \mathbf{b}(\psi_{k+1}, \psi_0) + \mathbf{c}(\psi_k, \psi_0) = 0. \quad (3.38)$$

Here we used that the form \mathbf{b} is anti-symmetric. In this case solutions are not unique and we choose the solutions orthogonal to the kernel, i.e.

$$\mathbf{c}(\phi_k, \phi_0) = 0, \quad \mathbf{c}(\phi_k, \psi_0) = 0, \quad \mathbf{c}(\psi_k, \phi_0) = 0, \quad \mathbf{c}(\psi_k, \psi_0) = 0, \quad (3.39)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, p-1$. We note that some terms in relations (3.39) vanish since some of functions are odd and some of them are even.

(i) Assume that (3.30) is valid and $p = 2n - 1$. In order to write equations similar to (3.34) and (3.35) for the next term we introduce the function

$$\Phi(\alpha, \beta, \tau) = \alpha\Phi(\tau) + \beta\Psi(\tau),$$

where α and β are unknown constants. The equation for finding α and β is

$$\mathbf{a}(\Phi(\alpha, \beta, \tau), v; \tau) = \kappa(\alpha\phi_0 + \beta\psi_0, v) + O(|\tau|^{p+1}) \quad \text{for all } v \in H_{p0}^1(\Omega).$$

as the result we obtain

$$\mathbf{a}(\alpha\phi_p + \beta\psi_p, v) + \mathbf{b}(\alpha\phi_{p-1} + \beta\psi_{p-1}, v) + \mathbf{c}(\alpha\phi_{p-2} + \beta\psi_{p-2}, v) = (-i)^p \kappa \mathbf{c}(\alpha\phi_0 + \beta\psi_0, v)$$

for all $v \in H_{p0}^1(\Omega)$. This problem is solvable if

$$\mathbf{b}(\alpha\phi_{p-1} + \beta\psi_{p-1}, \phi_0) + \mathbf{c}(\alpha\phi_{p-2} + \beta\psi_{p-2}, \phi_0) = (-i)^p \kappa \alpha \quad (3.40)$$

and

$$\mathbf{b}(\alpha\phi_{p-1} + \beta\psi_{p-1}, \psi_0) + \mathbf{c}(\alpha\phi_{p-2} + \beta\psi_{p-2}, \psi_0) = (-i)^p \kappa \beta, \quad (3.41)$$

From (3.40) and (3.41) it follows

$$\beta \mathbf{b}(\psi_{p-1}, \phi_0) = (-i)^p \kappa \alpha \quad (3.42)$$

and

$$\alpha \mathbf{b}(\phi_{p-1}, \psi_0) = (-i)^p \kappa \beta, \quad (3.43)$$

which implies

$$\kappa^2 = (-1)^p \mathbf{b}(\phi_{p-1}, \psi_0) \mathbf{b}(\psi_{p-1}, \phi_0). \quad (3.44)$$

This implies that the left-hand side in (3.44) is positive, κ and $-\kappa$ satisfy and

$$\alpha = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = (-i)^p \kappa^{-1} \mathbf{b}(\phi_{p-1}, \psi_0).$$

This implies that

$$(-1)^p \mathbf{b}(\phi_{p-1}, \psi_0) \mathbf{b}(\phi_{p-1}, \psi_0) = \alpha^2.$$

(ii) Let (3.31) be valid. The same calculation as above shows

$$\alpha \mathbf{b}(\phi_{p-1}, \phi_0) = (-1)^{p/2} \kappa \alpha,$$

and

$$\beta \mathbf{b}(\psi_{p-1}, \psi_0) = (-1)^{p/2} \kappa \beta.$$

So one of quantities $\mathbf{b}(\phi_{p-1}, \phi_0)$ or $\mathbf{b}(\psi_{p-1}, \psi_0)$ must be different from 0 and we arrive at (3.33). \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let the eigenvalue $\mu = 0$ is simple with the eigenfunction ψ_x . Then*

$$\mu(\tau) = c\tau^2 + O(\tau^4),$$

where c is negative.

Proof. We are looking for the eigenvalue and eigenfunction in the form

$$\mu(\tau) = c_1\tau + c_2\tau^2 + \dots \quad \text{and} \quad u(\tau) = u_0 + i\tau u_1 + (i\tau)^2 u_2 + \dots$$

then

$$\mathbf{a}(u_0, w) = 0 \quad \text{for all } w \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Therefore $u_0 = \psi_x$. Furthermore,

$$i\tau \mathbf{a}(u_1, w) + i\tau \mathbf{b}(u_0, w) = c_1(u_0, w)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } w \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Choosing $w = u_0$ we see that $c_1 = 0$. Taking $w = u_1$, we get

$$\mathbf{a}(u_1, u_1) + \mathbf{b}(u_0, u_1) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{b}(u_1, u_0) = \mathbf{a}(u_1, u_1). \quad (3.45)$$

Equation for u_2 is

$$\mathbf{a}(u_2, w) + \mathbf{b}(u_1, w) + (u_0, w)_{L^2(\Omega)} = -c_2(u_0, w)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } w \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Taking $w = u_0$ we get

$$\mathbf{b}(u_1, u_0) + (u_0, u_0)_{L^2(\Omega)} = -c_2(u_0, u_0)_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Using (3.45), we arrive at

$$c_2 \|u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = \|u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \mathbf{a}(u_1, u_1),$$

which proves positivity of c_2 . \square

4. SUBHARMONIC SPECTRAL PROBLEMS

Let M be a positive integer. As is known (see for example [21], [19]), $M\Lambda$ -periodic, even solutions to the problem (1.4) are linear combinations of functions

$$e^{i\tau_j X} w_j(X, Y) + e^{-i\tau_j X} w_j(-X, Y), \quad (4.1)$$

where only such $\tau = \tau_j = j\tau_*/M$ and $w = w_j$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, M-1$, are taken which solves the problem (3.2) with $\mu = 0$. Therefore the knowledge of the characteristic exponents τ_j helps to describe M -subharmonic solutions.

The spectral problem (1.4) can be considered on the functions w which are even and has period $M\Lambda$. We shall call this spectral problem M -subharmonic spectral problem. To give a variational formulation of this spectral problem we introduce

$$D_M = \{(X, Y) \in \mathcal{D} : 0 < X < M\Lambda/2\}, \quad S_M = \{(X, Y) \in \mathcal{S} : 0 < X < M\Lambda/2\},$$

and denote by $H_0^1(D_M)$ the space of functions in $H^1(D_M)$ which vanish for $Y = 0$. We put

$$a_M(u, v) = \int_{D_M} (\nabla u \cdot \nabla \bar{v} - \omega'(\Psi)u\bar{v}) dXdY - \int_0^{M\Lambda/2} \rho(X)u\bar{v}dS,$$

Using that $\partial_X w(0, Y) = 0$ and $\partial_X w(M\Lambda/2, Y) = 0$, we arrive at the following variational formulation for the spectral problem (1.4) on even $M\Lambda$ -periodic functions: find a function $\phi \in H_0^1(D_M)$ and the number $\mu = \mu^{(M)} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$a_M(\phi, v) = \mu^{(M)}(\phi, v)_{L^2(D_M)} \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1(D_M). \quad (4.2)$$

As it is known the pair $(\phi, \mu^{(M)})$ solves the problem (4.2) if and only if $\mu^{(M)}$ is an eigenvalue of the problem (1.4), considered on even, $M\Lambda$ -periodic functions, and ϕ , after a natural extension, is a corresponding eigenfunction. We numerate the eigenvalues accounting their multiplicity as

$$\mu_0^{(M)} \leq \mu_1^{(M)} \leq \dots, \quad \mu_j^{(M)} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Denote the number of eigenvalues of the problem (4.2) which are less than zero by $n_0(M)$ and by $n(M)$ if we include zero eigenvalues, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} n_0(M) &= \text{the number of } j \text{ such that } \mu_j^{(M)} < 0, \\ n(M) &= \text{the number of } j \text{ such that } \mu_j^{(M)} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\mu_1 = 0$. Then for every $M = 1, 2, \dots$*

$$n_0(M) = M \text{ when } M \text{ is odd and } n(M) = M + 1 \text{ when } M \text{ is even} \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$n(M) = M + 1 \text{ when } M \text{ is odd and } n(M) = M + 2 \text{ when } M \text{ is even.} \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. Using that

$$\widehat{\mu}_j(\tau) = \widehat{\mu}_j(-\tau) = \widehat{\mu}_j(\tau_* + \tau) \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, 2,$$

we conclude that $\widehat{\mu}_j(\tau) = \widehat{\mu}_j(\tau_* - \tau)$. Due to the description of even, $M\Lambda$ periodic solution given by (4.1), the number $n(M)$ is equal to the number of indexes k and m such that

$$\widehat{\mu}_0\left(\frac{k}{M}\right) \leq 0, \quad \widehat{\mu}_1\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) \leq 0, \quad (4.5)$$

where $0 \leq k, m \leq M/2$. Therefore

$$n(M) = M + 1 \text{ when } M \text{ is odd and } n(M) = M + 2 \text{ when } M \text{ is even,}$$

which proves (4.4).

Since the equality in (4.5) is reached only when $m = 0$, we get (4.3). \square

A necessary condition for M subharmonic bifurcation is the absence of zero eigenvalues of the Frechet derivative corresponding to M -subharmonic problem. The next proposition deals with this problem.

Proposition 4.2. *If $\mu_1 > 0$ then the numbers $\mu_j^{(M)}$ are different from 0.*

Proof. The proof of this proposition follows directly from Corollary 3.3 and from description of zero eigenvalues of the Frechet derivative for M -subharmonic problem given at the beginning of this section. □

5. BRANCHES OF STOKES WAVES

5.1. Uniform stream solution, dispersion equation. The uniform stream solution $\Psi = U(y)$ with the constant depth $\eta = d$ and $\lambda = 1$, satisfies the problem

$$\begin{aligned} U'' + \omega(U) &= 0 \quad \text{on } (0; d), \\ U(0) &= 0, \quad U(d) = 1, \\ \frac{1}{2}U'(d)^2 + d &= R. \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

Let $s = U'(0)$ and $s > s_0 := 2 \max_{\tau \in [0,1]} \Omega(\tau)$, where

$$\Omega(\tau) = \int_0^\tau \omega(p) dp.$$

Then the problem (5.1) has a solution (U, d) with a strongly monotone function U if

$$\mathcal{R}(s) := \frac{1}{2}s^2 + d(s) - \Omega(1) = R. \tag{5.2}$$

In this case (U, d) is found from the relations

$$y = \int_0^U \frac{d\tau}{\sqrt{s^2 - 2\Omega(\tau)}}, \quad d = d(s) = \int_0^1 \frac{d\tau}{\sqrt{s^2 - 2\Omega(\tau)}}. \tag{5.3}$$

The equation (5.2) is solvable if $R > R_c$,

$$R_c = \min_{s \geq s_0} \mathcal{R}(s). \tag{5.4}$$

We denote by s_c the point where the minimum in (5.4) is attained.

Existence of small amplitude Stokes waves is determined by the dispersion equation (see, for example, [11]). It is defined as follows. The strong monotonicity of U guarantees that the problem

$$\gamma'' + \omega'(U)\gamma - \tau^2\gamma = 0, \quad \gamma(0, \tau) = 0, \quad \gamma(d, \tau) = 1 \tag{5.5}$$

has a unique solution $\gamma = \gamma(y, \tau)$ for each $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, which is even with respect to τ and depends analytically on τ . Introduce the function

$$\sigma(\tau) = \kappa\gamma'(d, \tau) - \kappa^{-1} + \omega(1), \quad \kappa = \Psi'(d). \tag{5.6}$$

It depends also analytically on τ and it is strongly increasing with respect to $\tau > 0$. Moreover it is an even function. The dispersion equation (see, for example [11]) is the following

$$\sigma(\tau) = 0. \tag{5.7}$$

It has a positive solution if

$$\sigma(0) < 0. \tag{5.8}$$

By [11] this is equivalent to $s + d'(s) < 0$ or what is the same

$$1 < \int_0^d \frac{dy}{U'^2(y)}. \tag{5.9}$$

The left-hand side here is equal to $1/F^2$ where F is the Froude number (see [28]). Therefore (5.9) means that $F < 1$, which is well-known condition for existence of water waves of small amplitude. Another equivalent formulation is given by requirement (see, for example [13])

$$s \in (s_0, s_c) \quad \text{and satisfies (5.2)}. \tag{5.10}$$

The existence of such s is guaranteed by $R \in (R_c, R_0)$. Moreover in this case the equation $\mathcal{R}(s) = R$ has exactly two solutions s_- and s_+ , $s_0 < s_+ < s_c < s_-$. The corresponding solutions to (5.1) are given by (5.3) and we denote them by

$$(U_+, d_+) \text{ and } (U_-, d_-). \quad (5.11)$$

The function σ has the following asymptotic representation

$$\sigma(\tau) = \kappa\tau + O(1) \text{ for large } \tau$$

and equation (5.7) has a unique positive root, which will be denoted by τ_* . It is connected with Λ_0 by the relation

$$\tau_* = \frac{2\pi}{\Lambda_0}. \quad (5.12)$$

The function $\gamma(y, \tau)$ is positive in $(0, d]$ for $\tau > \tau_*$.

Let

$$\rho_0 = \frac{1 + \Psi'(d)\Psi''(d)}{\Psi'(d)^2}. \quad (5.13)$$

We note that

$$\frac{1 + \Psi'(d)\Psi''(d)}{\Psi'(d)^2} = \kappa^{-2} - \frac{\omega(1)}{\kappa}$$

and hence another form for (5.6) is

$$\sigma(\tau) = \kappa\gamma'(d, \tau) - \kappa\rho_0. \quad (5.14)$$

The spectral problem (1.4) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w + \omega'(U)w + \mu w &= 0 \text{ for } X \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } 0 < Y < d, \\ \partial_Y w - \rho_0 w &= 0 \text{ for } Y = d, \\ w &= 0 \text{ for } Y = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

where w is even, $\Lambda = 2\pi/\tau_*$ -function. One can verify that $\mu_0 < 0$ and corresponding eigenfunction does not depend on X , $\mu_1 = 0$ and corresponding eigenfunction is $\cos(\tau_* X)\gamma(Y; \tau_*)$ and $\mu_2 > 0$. For small t , $\mu_0 < 0$ and $\mu_2 > 0$. We assume that

$$\mu_1(t) > 0 \text{ for small positive } t. \quad (5.16)$$

The validity of this assumption will be discussed in forthcoming paper.

5.2. Partial hodograph transform. In what follows we will study branches of Stokes waves $(\Psi(X, Y; t), \xi(X; t))$ of period $\Lambda(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, started from the uniform stream at $t = 0$. It is convenient to make the following change of variables

$$x = \lambda X, \quad y = Y, \quad \lambda = \frac{\Lambda(0)}{\Lambda(t)} \quad (5.17)$$

in order to deal with the problem with a fixed period. As the result we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda^2 \partial_x^2 + \partial_y^2) \psi + \omega(\psi) &= 0 \text{ in } D_\eta, \\ \frac{1}{2} (\lambda^2 \psi_x^2 + \psi_y^2) + \eta &= R \text{ on } B_\eta, \\ \psi &= 1 \text{ on } B_\eta, \\ \psi &= 0 \text{ for } y = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

where

$$\psi(x, y; t) = \Psi(\lambda^{-1}x, y; t) \text{ and } \eta(x; t) = \xi(\lambda^{-1}x; t).$$

Here all functions have the same period $\Lambda_0 := \Lambda(0)$, D_η and B_η are the domain and the free surface after the change of variables (5.17).

Due to the assumption (1.3) we can introduce the variables

$$q = x, \quad p = \psi.$$

Then

$$q_x = 1, \quad q_y = 0, \quad p_x = \psi_x, \quad p_y = \psi_y,$$

and

$$\psi_x = -\frac{h_q}{h_p}, \quad \psi_y = \frac{1}{h_p}, \quad dx dy = h_p dq dp. \quad (5.19)$$

System (5.18) in the new variables takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1 + \lambda^2 h_q^2}{2h_p^2} + \Omega(p) \right)_p - \lambda^2 \left(\frac{h_q}{h_p} \right)_q &= 0 \text{ in } Q, \\ \frac{1 + \lambda^2 h_q^2}{2h_p^2} + h &= R \text{ for } p = 1, \\ h &= 0 \text{ for } p = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

Here

$$Q = \{(q, p) : q \in \mathbb{R}, \quad p \in (0, 1)\}.$$

The uniform stream solution corresponding to the solution U of (5.1) is

$$H(p) = \int_0^p \frac{d\tau}{\sqrt{s^2 - 2\Omega(\tau)}}, \quad s = U'(0) = H_p^{-1}(0). \quad (5.21)$$

One can check that

$$H_{pp} - H_p^3 \omega(p) = 0 \quad (5.22)$$

or equivalently

$$\left(\frac{1}{2H_p^2} \right)_p + \omega(p) = 0. \quad (5.23)$$

Moreover it satisfies the boundary conditions

$$\frac{1}{2H_p^2(1)} + H(1) = R, \quad H(0) = 0. \quad (5.24)$$

The problem (5.20) has a variational formulation (see [6]) and the potential is given by

$$f(h; \lambda) = \int_{-\Lambda_0/2}^{\Lambda_0/2} \int_0^1 \left(\frac{1 + \lambda^2 h_q^2}{2h_p^2} - h + R - (\Omega(p) - \Omega(1)) \right) h_p dq dp. \quad (5.25)$$

Then according to [15] there exists a branch of solutions to (5.20)

$$h = h(q, p; t) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow C_{pe}^{2,\alpha}(\overline{Q}), \quad \lambda = \lambda(t) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty), \quad (5.26)$$

which has a real analytic reparametrization locally around each t .

6. BIFURCATION ANALYSIS

Here we present two equations for finding bifurcation points in q, p variables. One of them is defined by a boundary value problem in a two-dimensional domain and another one including a Dirichlet-Neumann operator is defined on a part of one-dimensional boundary. It was proved in Sect. 6.4 that the Frechet derivatives of operators in these two formulations have the same number of negative eigenvalues and the same dimension of the kernels. So both of them can be used in analysis of the Morse index and the corresponding crossing number. The first bifurcation 2D problem is useful in analysis of the number of negative eigenvalues and the second one is more convenient for application of general bifurcation results.

Both formulations can be easily extended for study of subharmonic bifurcations, see Sect. 6.5. In Sect. 6.3 we give an explicit connection between the Frechet derivatives in (x, y) and (q, p) variables. This material is borrowed from [9], where all missing proofs can be found.

6.1. First formulation of the bifurcation equation. In order to find bifurcation points and bifurcating solutions we put $h + w$ instead of h in (5.20) and introduce the operators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(w; t) &= \left(\frac{1 + \lambda^2(h_q + w_q)^2}{2(h_p + w_p)^2} \right)_p - \left(\frac{1 + \lambda^2 h_q^2}{2h_p^2} \right)_q \\ &\quad - \lambda^2 \left(\frac{h_q + w_q}{h_p + w_p} \right)_q + \lambda^2 \left(\frac{h_q}{h_p} \right)_q \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(w; t) = \frac{1 + \lambda^2(h_q + w_q)^2}{2(h_p + w_p)^2} - \frac{1 + \lambda^2 h_q^2}{2h_p^2} + w$$

acting on Λ_0 -periodic, even functions w defined in Q . After some cancelations we get

$$\mathcal{F} = \left(\frac{\lambda^2 h_p^2 (2h_q + w_q) w_q - (2h_p + w_p)(1 + \lambda^2 h_q^2) w_p}{2h_p^2 (h_p + w_p)^2} \right)_p - \lambda^2 \left(\frac{h_p w_q - h_q w_p}{h_p (h_p + w_p)} \right)_q \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$\mathcal{G} = \frac{\lambda^2 h_p^2 (2h_q + w_q) w_q - (2h_p + w_p)(1 + \lambda^2 h_q^2) w_p}{2h_p^2 (h_p + w_p)^2} + w. \quad (6.2)$$

Both these functions are well defined for small w_p . Then the problem for finding solutions close to h is the following

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(w; t) &= 0 \quad \text{in } Q \\ \mathcal{G}(w; t) &= 0 \quad \text{for } p = 1 \\ w &= 0 \quad \text{for } p = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

Furthermore, the Frechet derivative (the linear approximation of the functions \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G}) is the following

$$Aw = A(t)w = \left(\frac{\lambda^2 h_q w_q}{h_p^2} - \frac{(1 + \lambda^2 h_q^2) w_p}{h_p^3} \right)_p - \lambda^2 \left(\frac{w_q}{h_p} - \frac{h_q w_p}{h_p^2} \right)_q \quad (6.4)$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}w = \mathcal{N}(t)w = (Nw - w)|_{p=1}, \quad (6.5)$$

where

$$Nw = N(t)w = \left(-\frac{\lambda^2 h_q w_q}{h_p^2} + \frac{(1 + \lambda^2 h_q^2) w_p}{h_p^3} \right) \Big|_{p=1}. \quad (6.6)$$

The eigenvalue problem for the Frechet derivative, which is important for the analysis of bifurcations of the problem (6.3), is the following

$$\begin{aligned} A(t)w &= \mu w \quad \text{in } Q, \\ \mathcal{N}(t)w &= 0 \quad \text{for } p = 1, \\ w &= 0 \quad \text{for } p = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

6.2. Second formulation of the bifurcation equation. There is another formulation for the bifurcating solutions, which is used the Dirichlet-Neumann operator. Let us consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(w; t) &= 0 \quad \text{in } Q, \\ w &= g \quad \text{for } p = 1, \\ w &= 0 \quad \text{for } p = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

We define the operator $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(g; h, t)$ by

$$\mathcal{S}(g; t) = \mathcal{G}(w; t)|_{p=1}, \quad (6.9)$$

where w is the solution of the problem (6.8). Then the equation for bifurcating solutions is

$$\mathcal{S}(g; t) = 0. \quad (6.10)$$

Here we note that spectral problem for the the Frechet derivative of the left-hand side in (6.10) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} A(t)w &= 0 \text{ in } Q, \\ N(t)w - w &= \theta w \text{ for } p = 1, \\ w &= 0 \text{ for } p = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

More exactly if we introduce the problem

$$\begin{aligned} A(t)w &= 0 \text{ in } Q, \\ w &= g \text{ for } p = 1, \\ w &= 0 \text{ for } p = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

then the operator

$$Sg = (Nw - w)|_{p=1} \tag{6.13}$$

is the Frechet derivative of the operator (6.10). The corresponding spectral problem is

$$Sg = \theta g. \tag{6.14}$$

To prove solvability of the problem (6.8) we consider first the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{aligned} Aw &= f, \\ w &= g, \text{ for } p = 1 \\ w &= 0 \text{ for } p = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

Let

$$a_1 = \min_Q h_p, \quad a_2 = \|h\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Q)}.$$

Proposition 6.1. (*Proposition 2.4, [9]*) *There exists a positive constant C depending on a_1 and a_2 such that if $g \in C_{pe}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ and $f \in C_{pe}^{0,\alpha}(Q)$, $\alpha \in (0, \gamma]$, then the problem (6.15) has a unique solution $w \in C_{pe}^{2,\alpha}(Q)$, which satisfies the estimate*

$$\|w\|_{C_{pe}^{2,\alpha}(Q)} \leq C(\|f\|_{C_{pe}^{0,\alpha}(Q)} + \|g\|_{C_{pe}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})}).$$

Next consider the nonlinear problem

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(w; t) &= f \text{ in } Q, \\ w &= g \text{ for } p = 1, \\ w &= 0 \text{ for } p = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

It can be considered as a small perturbation of the problem (6.15).

Proposition 6.2. (*Proposition 2.5, [9]*) *There exist positive number δ_* and a Constant C depending on a_1 and a_2 such that if*

$$\|f\|_{C_{pe}^{0,\gamma}(Q)} + \|g\|_{C_{pe}^{2,\gamma}(\mathbb{R})} \leq \delta \leq \delta_*,$$

then there exists a unique solution $w \in C_{pe}^{2,\gamma}(Q)$ such that

$$\|w\|_{C_{pe}^{2,\gamma}(Q)} \leq C\delta.$$

6.3. Spectral problems (9.4) and (6.11) in (x, y) variables. Let

$$F(q, p; \lambda) = \Gamma(q, h)h_p. \tag{6.17}$$

Then

$$AF = -\omega'(p)\Gamma - \lambda^2\Gamma_{xx} - \Gamma_{yy}. \tag{6.18}$$

and

$$-NF + F = \sqrt{\psi_x^2 + \psi_y^2}\rho\Gamma - \lambda^2\psi_x\Gamma_x - \psi_y\Gamma_y, \tag{6.19}$$

where

$$\rho = \rho(x; t) = \frac{(1 + \lambda^2\psi_x\psi_{xy} + \psi_y\psi_{yy})}{\psi_y(\psi_x^2 + \psi_y^2)^{1/2}} \Big|_{y=\eta(x;t)}.$$

Then the following assertion is proved in [9].

Lemma 6.3. *Let $a = a(x, y)$ be positive, continuous, Λ_0 -periodic function. If $\Gamma = \Gamma(x, y)$ satisfies the problem*

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda^2 \partial_x^2 + \partial_y^2) \Gamma + \omega'(\psi) \Gamma + \mu a \frac{1}{\psi_y} \Gamma &= 0 \text{ in } D_\eta, \\ (\lambda^2 \nu_x \Gamma_x + \nu_y \Gamma_y - \rho \Gamma)_{p=1} &= 0 \text{ on } B_\eta, \\ \Gamma &= 0 \text{ for } x = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} AF &= \mu a F, \\ NF - F &= 0 \text{ for } p = 1, \\ F &= 0 \text{ for } p = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.21}$$

6.4. Comparison of two spectral problems. Here we will compare the negative spectrum of the following spectral problems

$$\begin{aligned} A(t)u &= 0 \text{ in } Q \\ N(t)u - u &= \theta a u \text{ for } p = 1 \\ u &= 0 \text{ for } p = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A(t)u &= \mu b u \text{ in } Q \\ N(t)u - u &= 0 \text{ for } p = 1 \\ u &= 0 \text{ for } p = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{6.23}$$

where a and b are continuous, positive, Λ -periodic functions.

Proposition 6.4. *The spectral problems (6.22) and (6.23) have the same number of negative eigenvalues (accounting their multiplicities). Moreover, if we consider these spectral problems on $M\Lambda$ -periodic, even functions they have the same number of negative eigenvalues also.*

Proof. For $a = 1$ and $b = 1$ this assertion is proved in [9]. In general case the proof is literally the same. □

6.5. Equation for subharmonic bifurcations. For positive integer $M = 1, 2, \dots$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ let us introduce the subspaces $C_{M,e}^{k,\alpha}(\overline{Q})$ and $C_{M,e}^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ of $C^{k,\alpha}(\overline{Q})$ and $C^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ respectively consisting of even functions of period $M\Lambda_0$. A similar space for the domain \mathcal{D}_ξ we denote by $C_{M,e}^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\mathcal{D}_\xi})$.

Equation (6.10) can be considered also on functions of period $M\Lambda_0$. Having this in mind we write as before $h + w$ instead of h but now we assume that $w \in C_{M,e}^{2,\alpha}(\overline{Q})$. Now the operator $\mathcal{F}(w; h, t)$, $\mathcal{G}(w; h, t)$, $A(t)$ and $N(t)$ from Sect.6.1 are considered on functions from $C_{M,e}^{2,\alpha}(\overline{Q})$. To indicate this difference we will use the notations $\mathcal{F}_M(w; h, t)$, $\mathcal{G}_M(w; h, t)$, $A_M(t)$ and $N_M(t)$ for corresponding operators. Moreover we can define analogs of the operators \mathcal{S} and S and denote them by \mathcal{S}_M and S_M respectively. New operators are acting on functions from $C_{M,e}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$. The equation for subharmonic bifurcations is

$$\mathcal{S}_M(g; t) = 0, \tag{6.24}$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_M(g; t) : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow C_{M,e}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}). \tag{6.25}$$

Here \mathcal{U} is a neighborhood of 0 in the space $C_{M,e}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$. The operator S_M is also potential and for the definition of the potential the integration in (5.25) must be taken over the interval $(-M\Lambda_0/2, M\Lambda_0/2)$. The corresponding eigenvalue problem for the Frechet derivative $S_M(t)$ is

$$S_M(t)g = -\theta g, \quad (6.26)$$

where S_M is defined by the same formulas as S but now the functions g and w are $M\Lambda_0$ -periodic. Clearly,

$$S_M(t) : C_{M,e}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C_{M,e}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}). \quad (6.27)$$

7. SPECTRAL PROPERTIES OF THE FRECHET DERIVATIVE, t DEPENDENCE.

Since the Frechet derivatives now depends on $t \in [0, \infty)$, we introduce the notations $\mu_j(t)$ and $\hat{\mu}_j(t, \tau)$ in order to indicate the dependence of the eigenvalues on the variable t . Certainly we assume that

$$\mu_0(t) < \mu_1(t) \leq \mu_2(t) \leq \dots \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu}_0(t, \tau) < \hat{\mu}_1(t, \tau) \leq \hat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) \leq \dots$$

Clearly $\hat{\mu}_j(t, 0) = \mu_j(t)$. Using Proposition 2.1, we conclude $\mu_0(t) < 0$ for all t . In what follows we will assume that

$$\mu_1(t_0) = 0, \quad \mu_1(t) > 0 \quad \text{for } t \in (0, t_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_1(t) < 0 \quad \text{for } t \in (t_0, t_0 + \varepsilon),$$

where ε is a small positive number.

Lemma 7.1. *The functions*

$$\hat{\mu}_1(t, \tau) + \hat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu}_1(t, \tau)\hat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) \quad (7.1)$$

are analytic in a neighborhood of the point $t = t_0, \tau = 0$.

Proof. We introduce the domain

$$\mathcal{D} = \{u \in H_{0,p}^2(Q) : N(t)u - u = 0 \text{ for } p = 1\}$$

and consider the operator $A(t, \tau)$ defined on this domain. If $t = t_0$ and $\tau = 0$ then the spectrum of this operator in a neighborhood of $(t_0, 0)$ consists of the point 0 and its multiplicity is two. For (t, τ) close to $(t_0, 0)$ we introduce the spectral projector $P(t, \tau)$ of the operator $A(t, \tau)$ corresponding to the eigenvalues located close to the point 0. Its kernel has dimensions 2 and it depends analytically on (t, τ) in a neighborhood of $(t_0, 0)$. The operator $P(t, \tau)A(t, \tau)$ has finite rank and its trace is invariant with respect to the choice of orthogonal normalized basis. Therefore the functions (7.1) are analytical with respect to t and τ in a neighborhood of $(t_0, 0)$. \square

Corollary 7.2. *The functions $\hat{\mu}_1(t, \tau)$ and $\hat{\mu}_2(t, \tau)$ are Lipschitz continuous in a neighborhood of $(t_0, 0)$.*

Proof. Consider the equation

$$\mu^2 - B(t, \tau)\mu + A(t, \tau) = 0, \quad A = \hat{\mu}_1\hat{\mu}_2, \quad B = \hat{\mu}_1\hat{\mu}_2.$$

By Lemma 7.1 the coefficients A and B are analytic with respect to (t, τ) in a neighborhood of $(t_0, 0)$. Since $\mu = \hat{\mu}_1$ and $\mu = \hat{\mu}_2$ are roots of this equation the result follows from [20], for example. \square

7.1. Generalized spectral problem, $\mu = 0$. Here we study bounded solutions of the problem (3.1) with $\mu = 0$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w + \omega'(\psi)w &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_\eta, \\ \partial_\nu w - \rho w &= 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S}_\eta, \\ w &= 0 \quad \text{for } y = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

According to Lemma 6.3 this problem in q, p variables has the form

$$\begin{aligned} A(\tau, t)w &= 0 \text{ in } Q \\ N(\tau, t)w + w &= 0 \text{ for } p = 1 \\ w &= 0 \text{ for } p = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

where

$$A(\tau, t)w = e^{-i\tau q}A(t)(e^{i\tau q}w), \quad N(t, \tau)w = e^{-i\tau q}N(t)(e^{i\tau q}w)$$

We are interested in such real τ for which the problem (7.3) has non-trivial solutions when $|\tau|$ and $|t - t_0|$ are small.

Proposition 7.3. *Let $t_0 > 0$ be the first value of t when $\mu_1(t_0) = 0$ and $\mu_1(t) < 0$ for $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \varepsilon)$, where ε is a small positive number. Then there exist a small positive δ such that all τ eigenvalues of (7.3) subject to $|t - t_0| < \delta$ and $|\tau| < \delta$ are described by*

$$\widehat{\tau}_k(s) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_{kj} s^{j/n_k}, \quad k = 1, \dots, L, \tag{7.4}$$

where $s = t - t_0$. This formula gives all possible small τ -eigenvalues. Here L is the algebraic multiplicity of the τ eigenvalue $\tau = 0$ when $t = t_0$.

Proof. We can reduce (7.3) to a standard eigenvalue problem by introducing

$$v = \frac{(w_q + i\tau w)}{h_p} - \frac{h_q w_p}{h_p^2}.$$

Then

$$Aw = \left(\frac{\lambda^2 h_q}{h_p} v - \frac{w_p}{h_p^2} \right)_p - \lambda^2 (i\tau + \partial_q) v$$

and

$$Nw = \frac{\lambda^2 h_q}{h_p} v - \frac{w_p}{h_p^2}.$$

The problem (7.3) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} i\tau w &= \frac{h_q w_p}{h_p} - h_p v - w_q \\ i\tau v &= \lambda^{-2} \left(\frac{\lambda^2 h_q}{h_p} v - \frac{w_p}{h_p^2} \right)_p - \partial_q v \end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

with boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda^2 h_q}{h_p} v - \frac{w_p}{h_p^2} &= 0 \text{ for } p = 1 \\ w &= 0 \text{ for } p = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

We introduce the operator

$$\mathcal{A} \begin{pmatrix} w \\ u \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{h_q w_p}{h_p} - w_q & -h_p v \\ -\lambda^{-2} \left(\frac{w_p}{h_p^2} \right)_p - \partial_q v & \left(\frac{h_q}{h_p} v \right)_p - \partial_q v \end{pmatrix}$$

Then

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(t) : C^{2,\gamma} \times C^{1,\gamma} \rightarrow C^{1,\gamma} \times C^{0,\gamma}$$

We put

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(w, v) \in C^{2,\gamma} \times C^{1,\gamma} : (7.6) \text{ is satisfied}\}.$$

Then the operator

$$\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow C^{1,\gamma} \times C^{0,\gamma}$$

is Fredholm with zero index and its spectrum consists of isolated τ -eigenvalues of finite algebraic multiplicity. Denote by X_0 the kernel of this operator for $t = t_0$ and by $P(t)$ the spectral projector corresponding to the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}(t)$ located near 0. Let also $N_0 = \dim X_0$. Then

$P(t)$ is the spectral projector of rank N_0 depending analytically on t in a small neighborhood of t_0 . Since the characteristic equation for the operator $P(t)\mathcal{A}(t)$ is well defined and is invariant with respect of the choice of the basis, the coefficient of the characteristic equation analytically depends on t in a neighborhood of t_0 . Therefore the its coefficients analytically depend on t also. Therefore we obtain a polynomial equation for τ -eigenvalues located in a small neighborhood of 0 with coefficients analytically depending on t . According to [25] such equation has roots (7.4) which give all possible small τ -eigenvalues. \square

Assume that $t_0 > 0$ is the first Stokes bifurcation point, which means

$$\mu_1(t_0) = 0, \quad \mu_1(t) > 0 \text{ for } t \in (0, t_0) \text{ and } \mu_1(t) < 0 \text{ for } t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon), \quad (7.7)$$

where ϵ is a small positive number.

Since $\widehat{\mu}_0 \leq \nu_0^{*0}$ according to (3.19), we have

$$\widehat{\mu}_0(t, \tau) < 0 \text{ for all } t \geq 0, \tau \in \mathbb{R} \quad (7.8)$$

by (2.15). Using (3.22) and (3.5), we get

$$\widehat{\mu}_3(t, \tau) > 0 \text{ for all } t \geq 0, \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (7.9)$$

provided $\mu_2(t) > 0$ for $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon)$. Furthermore, by (3.21) and Proposition 2.3

$$\widehat{\mu}_1(t, \tau) < 0 \text{ for } t \in (0, t_0 + \epsilon) \text{ and } \tau \in (0, \tau_*), \quad (7.10)$$

where ϵ is chosen to satisfy $\nu_1^{*0}(t) > 0$ for $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon)$. Since $\nu_1^{*0}(t) > \mu_1(t)$, the inequality (7.10) is always valid for $t \leq t_0$ and its validity for $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon)$ requires a restriction on ϵ . Therefore all small τ eigenvalues of the problem (7.3) in the interval $(0, \tau_*)$ for $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon)$ are given by the equation $\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) = 0$, where $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon)$. Here we have used inequality (3.21), which implies

$$\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) > 0 \text{ for } t \leq t_0 \text{ and } \tau \in (0, \tau_*). \quad (7.11)$$

Since τ eigenvalues are roots of the equation $\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) = 0$, there are roots among (7.4) with real coefficients. Moreover if $\tau(t)$ is a real root then $-\tau(t)$ is also a real root. We numerate all positive real roots by $\widehat{\tau}_k(t)$, $k = 1, \dots, m$,

$$0 < \widehat{\tau}_1(t) < \dots < \widehat{\tau}_m(t), \text{ for } t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon). \quad (7.12)$$

We note that since all roots in (7.12) satisfies $\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau_j(t)) = 0$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, they are different and we have strong inequalities in (7.12). Since the leading term of functions $\widehat{\tau}_j$ is positive the sign of the derivativ is positive also in a small neighborhood of t_0 . So we will assume that ϵ is chosen to satisfy

$$\partial_t \widehat{\tau}_j(t) > 0 \text{ for } t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon). \quad (7.13)$$

Lemma 7.4. *Let (7.7) hold. For each $j = 1, \dots, m$ there exists an integer $n > 0$ and $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that*

$$\partial_t^k \widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) = 0 \text{ for } \tau = \widehat{\tau}_j(t) \text{ and for } t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon_1) \quad (7.14)$$

for $k < n$ and

$$\partial_t^n \widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) \neq 0 \text{ for } \tau = \widehat{\tau}_j(t) \text{ and for } t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon_1). \quad (7.15)$$

Proof. We note that by (7.8) the function $\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau)$ is analytic with respect to τ near a root $\tau = \widehat{\tau}_j$. Let $n = 1, 2, \dots$. If the equation

$$\partial_\tau^n \widehat{\mu}_2(t, \widehat{\tau}_j(t)) = 0 \quad (7.16)$$

has infinitely many roots in the interval $(t_0, t_0 + \epsilon)$ then the equation (7.16) is valid for all $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon)$. If (7.16) holds for a certain $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon)$ and all n then due to analyticity of $\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau)$ with respect to τ we get that $\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) = 0$ for all small τ in a neighborhood of $\widehat{\tau}_j(t)$, but this is not true by [23].

Let us choose the smallest n such that $\partial_\tau^n \widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau)|_{\tau=\widehat{\tau}_j(t)} \neq 0$ for certain t . Then we can choose ϵ_1 for which

$$\partial_\tau^n \widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau)|_{\tau=\widehat{\tau}_j(t)} \neq 0 \text{ for } t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon_1). \quad (7.17)$$

Differentiating $\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \widehat{\tau}_j(t)) = 0$ n times and using (7.13), we arrive at (7.15). \square

8. LOCAL SUBHARMONIC BIFURCATION THEOREM

In this section we assume that $\mu_1(t_0) = 0$ for certain $t_0 > 0$ and (7.7) holds.

Let

$$\widehat{a}_1 = \widehat{a}_1(t_0, \epsilon) = \min_{\overline{Q} \times [t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon]} h_p(p, q; t), \quad \widehat{a}_2 = \widehat{a}_2(t_0, \epsilon) = \sup_{[t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon]} \|h(\cdot, \cdot; t)\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Q)}.$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{A}_M = \{g \in C_{p, M\Lambda_0}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}) : \|g\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})} \leq \delta = \delta(\widehat{a}_1, \widehat{a}_2)\},$$

where M is a positive integer. Consider operator \mathcal{S}_M defined on the set \mathcal{A}_M for each $t \in (t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon)$, i.e

$$\mathcal{S}_M : \mathcal{A}_M \times (t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon) \rightarrow C_{p, M\Lambda_0}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Here we consider the equation (6.24) for subharmonic bifurcations. This operator satisfies

$$\mathcal{S}_M \in C(\mathcal{A}_M \times (t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon), C_{p, M\Lambda_0}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}))$$

and

$$S_M \in C(\mathcal{A}_M \times (t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon), L(C_{p, M\Lambda_0}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}), C_{p, M\Lambda_0}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}))).$$

Theorem 8.1. *Let $t_0 > 0$ satisfy (7.7). Then there exists an integer M_0 such that for every $M > M_0$ there exists $\epsilon_M > 0$ such that the branch (5.26) has M -subharmonic bifurcation at $t = t_0 + \epsilon_M$. Moreover the crossing number at these bifurcation point is 1 and $\epsilon_M \rightarrow 0$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$. The closure of the set of nontrivial solutions of*

$$\mathcal{S}_M(g; t) = 0$$

near $(0, t_0 + \epsilon_M)$ contains a connected component to which $(0, t_0 + \epsilon_M)$ belongs.

Proof. We use the bifurcation equation (6.24) in a neighborhood of $t = t_0$. First we observe that t_0 is a Stokes bifurcation point. We choose an integer M . In order to apply Theorem II,4,4 from [8], it is sufficient to verify the following spectral properties of the Frechet derivative $S_M(t)$:

- (i) find $t_M > t_0$ close to t_0 such that the kernel of the operator $S_M(t_M)$ is non-trivial;
- (ii) There exists a positive ϵ such that the kernel of $S_M(t)$ is trivial for $t \in (t_M, t_M - \epsilon) \cup (t_M, t_M + \epsilon)$. Furthermore

$$n_M(t_2) - n_M(t_1) = 1 \text{ for certain } t_2 \in (t_M, t_M + \epsilon) \text{ and } t_1 \in (t_M, t_M - \epsilon).$$

Due to Proposition 6.4 it is sufficient to verify properties (i) and (ii) for the branch of spectral problems (6.23) (or (6.20)) defined on $M\Lambda_0$ ($M\Lambda(t)$) periodic functions with eigenvalues μ^M . We choose a sufficiently large integer M_0 and a small $\delta_0 > 0$, and suppose that $M > M_0$ and $t_0 < t < t_0 + \delta_0$. The size of M_0 and δ_0 will be clarified below.

We may assume that $\delta_0 \leq \epsilon$ which guarantees the validity of (7.8)-(7.10). The inequalities (7.8) and (7.9) show that the the only τ eigenvalues which may contribute to the kernel of the operator $S_M(t)$ come from equations $\widehat{\mu}_1(t, \tau) = 0$ or $\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) = 0$. By (7.10) the equation $\widehat{\mu}_1(t, \tau) = 0$ has the only root $\tau = 0$ on the interval $[0, \tau_*)$ with the corresponding eigenfunction ψ_x . Since the function ψ_x is odd this equations does not contribute to the kernel also.

Let us consider the equation $\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) = 0$. We assume that δ_0 is chosen such that the eigenvalue $\mu = 0$ of the problem (3.2) for $\tau = 0$ and $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \delta_0)$ is simple ². By Lemma 3.6

$$\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) < 0 \text{ for all } t \in (t_0, t_0 + \delta_0) \text{ and small } |\tau|. \quad (8.1)$$

Applying (3.21) to the eigenvalue $\widehat{\mu}_2(t_0, \tau)$ we get $\widehat{\mu}_2(t_0, \tau) > 0$ for $\tau \in (0, \tau_*)$. Using Lemma 3.4, we may assume that δ_0 is chosen to guarantee

$$\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \tau) > 0 \text{ for } t \in (t_0, t_0 + \delta_0) \text{ and } \tau \in [\delta_1, \tau_*/2], \quad (8.2)$$

where δ_1 is a small positive number.

Second, consider the sequence of functions (7.12)

$$\widehat{\tau}_1(t) < \widehat{\tau}_2(t) < \cdots < \widehat{\tau}_m(t).$$

²We recall that this problem is considered on Λ -periodic solution and it is not a spectral point for $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \delta_0)$

By Lemma 7.4 some of them satisfy (7.15) with the inequality > 0 and some of them with the inequality < 0 . Let n_* be the largest index among $1, \dots, m$ for which the inequality < 0 is valid in (7.15) and hence for indexes $j = n_* + 1, \dots, m$ the inequality > 0 holds in (7.15). Such index exists otherwise $\widehat{\mu}_2(t, \widehat{\tau}_j) \geq 0$ for $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \epsilon)$, which contradicts to (8.1) and (8.2).

We choose $t_M = t_0 + \varepsilon_M$ satisfying the relation

$$\widehat{\tau}_{n_*}(t_M) = \tau_*/M. \quad (8.3)$$

Our requirement on M_0 is that the equation (8.3) is solvable for all $M > M_0$.

(i) Let us check (i). The kernel of the operator $A(t)$ consists of functions (4.1) with τ_j satisfying

$$\widehat{\tau}_k(t_M) = \tau_j := j\tau_*/M \text{ for certain } k = n_* + 1, \dots, m. \quad (8.4)$$

If we take $t \neq t_M$ in a small neighborhood of t_M then the kernel will be trivial since all functions $\widehat{\tau}_j$ are strongly increasing.

(ii) Since the functions $\widehat{\tau}_k$, $k = n_* + 1, \dots, m$, satisfy (7.15) with the inequality > 0 they do not contribute to the changing of the Morse index at t_M . Since the function $\widehat{\tau}_{n_*}$ satisfies (7.15) with < 0 instead of $\neq 0$ the eigenvalue $\widehat{\mu}_2(t_M, \tau)$ changes sign at the point $\tau = \widehat{\tau}_{n_*}(t_M)$. Hence $\widehat{\tau}_{n_*}$ contributes to the changing of the Morse index at t_M with $+1$. So the crossing number at t_M is 1. This proves properties (i) and (ii) and the theorem. \square

9. GLOBAL SUBHARMONIC BIFURCATION THEOREMS

Let

$$X = C_{0, M\Lambda, e}^{2, \alpha}(Q), \quad Y = Y_1 \times Y_2 = C_{0, M\Lambda, e}^{0, \alpha}(Q) \times C_{M\Lambda}^{1, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Introduce a subset in $\mathbb{R} \times X$:

$$\mathcal{O}_\delta = \{(t, w) \in \mathbb{R} \times X : (h + w)_p > \delta \text{ in } \overline{Q}, \delta < \lambda(t)\}.$$

Then the functional

$$\Gamma(w, t) = (\mathcal{F}(w, t), \mathcal{G}(w, t)) : \mathcal{O}_\delta \rightarrow Y = Y_1 \times Y_2,$$

where \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are defined by (6.24) and (6.26), is well defined and continuous.

The Frechet derivative at the point w has the form

$$A\xi = A(w; t)\xi = \left(\frac{\lambda^2(h + w)_q \xi_q}{(h + w)_p^2} - \frac{(1 + \lambda^2(h + w)_q^2) \xi_p}{(h + w)_p^3} \right)_p - \lambda^2 \left(\frac{\xi_q}{(h + w)_p} - \frac{(h + w)_q \xi_p}{(h + w)_p^2} \right)_q \quad (9.1)$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}\xi = \mathcal{N}(w; t)\xi = (N\xi - \xi)|_{p=1}, \quad (9.2)$$

where

$$N\xi = N(w; t)\xi = \left(-\frac{\lambda^2(h + w)_q \xi_q}{(h + \xi)_p^2} + \frac{(1 + \lambda^2(h + w)_q^2) \xi_p}{(h + w)_p^3} \right) \Big|_{p=1}. \quad (9.3)$$

The eigenvalue problem for the Frechet derivative, which is important for the analysis of bifurcations of the problem (6.3), is the following

$$\begin{aligned} A(w; t)\xi &= \mu\xi \text{ in } Q, \\ \mathcal{N}(w; t)\xi &= 0 \text{ for } p = 1, \\ \xi &= 0 \text{ for } p = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (9.4)$$

Introduce some sets:

$$\mathcal{S}_\delta = \text{closure in } \mathbb{R} \times X \text{ of } \{(t, w) \in \mathcal{O}_\delta : \Gamma(w, t) = 0, w \text{ is not identically zero}\}.$$

Let also \mathcal{C}'_δ be the connected component of \mathcal{S}_δ containing the point $(t_M, 0)$ together with the connected set from Theorem 8.1.

The following theorem is an analog of Theorem 4.2 [5].

Theorem 9.1. *Let $\delta > 0$. Then either*

- (i) \mathcal{C}'_δ is unbounded in $\mathbb{R} \times X$, or
- (ii) \mathcal{C}'_δ contains another trivial point $(t_1, 0)$ with $t_1 \neq t_M$, or
- (iii) \mathcal{C}'_δ contains a point $(t, w) \in \partial\mathcal{O}_\delta$.

In [15] it is proved an estimate $\Lambda(t) \geq c_0 > 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where the constant c_0 depends only on ω and r . This estimate implies

$$\lambda(t) \leq \frac{\Lambda(0)}{c_0}.$$

9.1. Proof of Theorem 9.1. The proof of the theorem is actually the same as that of Theorem 4.2 [5].

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} &= -\frac{1 + \lambda^2(h_q + w_q)^2}{(h_p + w_p)^3}(h_{pp} + w_{pp}) - \lambda^2 \frac{h_{qq} + w_{qq}}{h_p + w_p} + 2\lambda^2 \frac{(h_q + w_q)(h_{qp} + w_{qp})}{(h_p + w_p)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{(h_p + w_p)^3} F(w, t), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F(w, t) = -(1 + \lambda^2(h_q + w_q)^2)(h_{pp} + w_{pp}) - \lambda^2(h_p + w_p)^2(h_{qq} + w_{qq}) + 2\lambda^2(h_q + w_q)(h_p + w_p)(h_{qp} + w_{qp})$$

and

$$\mathcal{G} = \frac{1}{(h_p + w_p)^2} G(w, t),$$

where

$$G(w, t) = 1 + \lambda^2(h_q + w_q)^2 + 2(w + h - R)(h_p + w_p)^2.$$

Since the functions (5.26) solve (5.20) we have

$$F(0, t) = 0, \quad G(0, t) = 0 \quad \text{for all } t.$$

Therefore the system $\Gamma(w, t) = 0$ has the same solutions as the system $(F, G) = 0$ provided $h_p + w_p > 0$ inside \overline{Q} . Since the arguments in the proof of Theorem 4.2 [5] were based only on the periodicity of functions and ellipticity of the problem $(F, G) = 0$ the proof given in [5] can be used with small changes to prove Theorem 9.1.

9.2. Main Theorem on global subharmonic bifurcations. Let

$$\mathcal{C}' = \bigcup_{\delta} \mathcal{C}'_\delta$$

The sets \mathcal{C}'_δ increase as δ decreases.

Let

$$\widehat{\psi}(X, Y; t), \quad \widehat{\xi}(X; t), \quad \Lambda(t) \tag{9.5}$$

be the elements from \mathcal{C}' in (X, Y) -coordinates. We will denote the set of such functions also by \mathcal{C}' . Let

$$\widehat{\Psi}(X, Y; t) = \Psi(X, Y; t) + \widehat{\psi}(X, Y; t), \quad \Xi(X; t) = \xi(X; t) + \widehat{\xi}(X; t) \tag{9.6}$$

The main result of this section is the following

Theorem 9.2. *The following alternatives are valid for the set (9.5):*

- (i) $\sup_{\mathcal{C}'} \sup_{X \in \mathbb{R}} |\Xi'(X)| = \infty$, or
- (ii) $\sup_{\mathcal{C}'} \max_{X \in \mathbb{R}} (R - \Xi(X)) = 0$, or
- (iii) $\sup_{\mathcal{C}'} \sup_{X \in \mathbb{R}} |\widehat{\Psi}_Y(X, 0)| = 0$, or
- (iv) there exists $\delta > 0$ such that (ii) from Theorem 9.1 is valid.

9.3. Proof of Theorem 9.2. The proof will use the following assertion, which is proved in [15], Proposition 3.2.

Proposition 9.3. *Assume that $\omega \in C^{1,\alpha}([0, 1])$. Let $\delta > 0$ be given as well as a ball B of radius $\rho > 0$ and let $M = \sup_{(X, \xi(X)) \in B} |\xi'(X)|$. Then there exist constants $\hat{\alpha} \in (0, 1)$ and $C > 0$, depending only on R, δ, ρ and M such that any solution $(\Psi, \xi) \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{D_\xi}) \times C^{2,\gamma}(\mathbb{R})$ of (1.2) with $\inf_B \Psi_Y \geq \delta$ satisfies $\|\Psi\|_{C^{3,\hat{\alpha}}(D_\xi \cap \frac{1}{2}B)} \leq C$, where $\frac{1}{2}B$ is a ball with the same centre and radius $\frac{1}{2}\rho$.*

The next lemma contains the main step of the proof.

Lemma 9.4. *Let $\hat{\Psi}_Y(X, Y; t) \geq 0$ in \mathcal{D}_Ξ and let there exist positive constants C_1, C_2, δ_1 and $\hat{\delta}_1$ such that*

$$|\Xi'(X; t)| \leq C_1, \quad \Lambda(t) \leq C_2 \quad \text{and} \quad R - \Xi(X; t) \geq \delta_1 \quad \hat{\Psi}_Y(X, 0; t) \geq \hat{\delta}_1 \quad (9.7)$$

for functions from \mathcal{C}' . Then there exist $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\hat{\Psi}_Y(X, Y; t) \geq \delta \quad \text{for } (X, Y) \in \mathcal{D}_\Xi. \quad (9.8)$$

Proof. The proof consists of several steps.

1. (The first estimate of $\hat{\Psi}_Y$.) Differentiating $\hat{\Psi}(X, \Xi(X; t); t) = 1$ with respect to X , we get

$$\hat{\Psi}_X + \hat{\Psi}_Y \Xi' = 0.$$

Hence

$$|\hat{\Psi}_X| \leq C_1 |\hat{\Psi}_Y| \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S}_\Xi.$$

From the Bernoulli equation, we get

$$\delta_1 \leq R - \Xi(X) \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + C_1^2) \hat{\Psi}_Y^2.$$

Therefore

$$\hat{\Psi}_Y^2 \geq \delta_2^2 := \frac{2\delta_1}{(1 + C_1^2)}.$$

To estimate the function $\hat{\Psi}_Y$ on the whole domain \mathcal{D}_Ξ we consider the function

$$U = \hat{\Psi}_Y - a \sinh(\beta Y),$$

where a and β are positive constants. Then

$$-\Delta U - \omega(\hat{\Psi})U = a(\beta^2 + \omega') \sinh(\beta Y) \geq 0 \quad \text{if } \beta^2 \geq \max_{p \in [0, 1]} |\omega'(p)|.$$

Furthermore, $U(X, 0) = 0$ and

$$U(X, \Xi(X)) \geq \delta_2 - a \sinh(\beta d_-).$$

We choose a to satisfy

$$\delta_2 - a \sinh(\beta d_-) = 0.$$

By strong maximum principle we get $U \geq 0$ inside \mathcal{D}_Ξ . Thus

$$\hat{\Psi}_Y(X, Y) \geq a \sinh(\beta Y) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_\Xi. \quad (9.9)$$

2. (The estimate of $\hat{\Psi}$.) Let d_- be defined by (5.11). Then by Theorem 1.1 from [14],

$$\xi(X) \geq d_- \quad \text{for all } X \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and for all solutions to (1.2) from } \mathcal{C}'.$$

We split the domain \mathcal{D}_Ξ as follows

$$\mathcal{D}_\Xi = \hat{\mathcal{D}}_\Xi \cup \mathcal{Q}_{d_-},$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\Xi = \{(X, Y) : X \in \mathbb{R}, d_- \leq Y < \Xi(X)\}, \quad \mathcal{Q}_{d_-} = \mathbb{R} \times (0, d_-).$$

Using estimate (9.9) together with Proposition 9.3, we get

$$\|\hat{\Psi}\|_{C^{3,\hat{\alpha}}(\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\Xi)} \leq C \quad (9.10)$$

Since $\widehat{\Psi}(\cdot, d_-) \in C^{3, \widehat{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R})$ we have that $\widehat{\Psi} \in C^{3, \widehat{\alpha}}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}_{d_-}})$.

3. (The estimate of Ψ_Y from below on \mathcal{D}_{Ξ}) Let us show that $\widehat{\Psi}_Y \geq \delta_3$ in \mathcal{Q}_{d_-} , where δ_3 is a positive constant. Indeed, consider all solutions of

$$\Delta U + \omega'(\widehat{\Psi})U = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{Q}_{d_-}$$

satisfying (9.10), $U(X, d_-) \geq \delta_4$ and $U \geq 0$ inside \mathcal{Q}_{d_-} and

$$U(X, d_-) \geq \delta_2 \text{ and } U(X, 0) \geq \widehat{\delta}_1. \quad (9.11)$$

Since the functions from this set cannot be zero inside \mathcal{Q}_{d_-} we get that all functions must be positive in $\overline{\mathcal{Q}_{d_-}}$. Since the function $\widehat{\Psi}_Y$ also belongs to this set we get the inequality (9.8) on \mathcal{Q}_{d_-} . This together with (9.9) gives the proof of (9.8) on \mathcal{D}_{Ξ} . \square

Proof of Theorem Assume that the alternatives (i)-(iii) from Theorem 9.2 are not valid. Then the bifurcating solutions satisfy (9.8) and (9.10). This implies boundedness of solutions and that they belong to \mathcal{C}'_{δ} for certain positive delta. So we can apply Theorem 9.1 and it can be verified that only the alternative (ii) in Theorem 9.1 can be applied here. This proves the theorem.

Remark 9.5. In [15] it was shown that under the condition $R < d_0$, where

$$d_0 = d(s_0) = \int_0^1 \frac{d\tau}{\sqrt{s_0^2 - 2\Omega(\tau)}},$$

the condition (iii) in Theorem 9.2 can be omitted,

Acknowledgements. The author was supported by the Swedish Research Council (VR), 2017-03837. The author expresses also his appreciation to a anonymous reviewer for many useful comments and corrections.

Data availability statement Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

10. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

11. REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- [1] B Buffoni, EN Dancer, JF Toland, The Regularity and Local Bifurcation of Steady Periodic Water Waves, *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis* 152 (3), 207-240, 2000.
- [2] B Buffoni, EN Dancer, JF Toland, The sub-harmonic bifurcation of Stokes waves, *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis* 152 (3), 241-271, 2000.
- [3] B Buffoni, J Toland, *Analytic theory of global bifurcation: an introduction*, Princeton University Press, 2003.
- [4] Chen, B. and Saffman, P.G. Numerical evidence for the existence of new types of gravity waves on deep water. *Stud. Appl. Math.* 62, 1980.
- [5] A Constantin, W Strauss, Exact steady periodic water waves with vorticity, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 57 (4), 481-527, 2004.
- [6] A Constantin, D Sattinger, W Strauss, Variational formulations for steady water waves with vorticity, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 548, 151-163, 2006.
- [7] A Constantin, W Strauss, E Varvaruca, Global bifurcation of steady gravity water waves with critical layers, *Acta Mathematica* 217 (2), 195-262, 2016.
- [8] H Kielhöfer, *Bifurcation theory: An introduction with applications to PDEs*, Springer New York Dordrecht Heidelberg London, 2011.
- [9] V. Kozlov, The subharmonic bifurcation of Stokes waves on vorticity flow, *JDE*, 2023, arXiv:2204.10699.
- [10] V. Kozlov, On loops in water wave branches and monotonicity of water waves, *JMFM*, 2023.
- [11] V Kozlov, N Kuznetsov, Dispersion equation for water waves with vorticity and Stokes waves on flows with counter-currents, *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 214 (3), 971-1018, 2014.

- [12] V Kozlov, N Kuznetsov, E Lokharu, On bounds and non-existence in the problem of steady waves with vorticity, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 765, R1, 2015.
- [13] V Kozlov, N Kuznetsov, Steady free-surface vortical flows parallel to the horizontal bottom, *The Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics* 64 (3), 371-399, 2011.
- [14] V Kozlov, N Kuznetsov, Bounds for Solutions to the Problem of Steady Water Waves with Vorticity, *The Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics*, Volume 70, Issue 4, 2017, 497–518,
- [15] V Kozlov, E Lokharu, Global bifurcation and highest waves on water of finite depth, arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.14156, 2020.
- [16] V Kozlov, E Lokharu, On negative eigenvalues of the spectral problem for water waves of highest amplitude, *Journal of Differential Equations*, 342, 239-281, 2023.
- [17] V Kozlov, E Lokharu, On Rotational Waves of Limit Amplitude, *Functional Analysis and Its Applications* 55 (2), 165-169, 2021.
- [18] V Kozlov, E Lokharu, An asymptotic behaviour near the crest of waves of extreme form on water of finite depth, arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14451, 2021.
- [19] V Kozlov, J Taskinen, Floquet problem and center manifold reduction for ordinary differential operators with periodic coefficients in Hilbert spaces, *St. Petersburg Mathematical Journal* 32 (3), 531-550, 2021.
- [20] K Kurdyka, L Paunescu, Hyperbolic polynomials and multiparameter real-analytic perturbation theory, *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 2008.
- [21] SA Nazarov, Elliptic boundary value problems with periodic coefficients in a cylinder, *Mathematics of the USSR-Izvestiya*, v. 18, 1, 1982.
- [22] Saffman, P.G. Long wavelength bifurcation of gravity waves on deep water *J. Fluid Mech.* 101, 1980.
- [23] E Shargorodsky, AV Sobolev, Quasiconformal mappings and periodic spectral problems in dimension two, *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique*, **91**, pp. 67–103, 2003.
- [24] J. F. Toland, Path-connectedness in global bifurcation theory, *Electronic Research Archive* 2021, Volume 29, Issue 6: 4199-4213.
- [25] M. M. Vainberg and V. A. Trenogin, *Theory of branching of solutions of non-linear equations*, Monographs and Textbooks on Pure and Applied Mathematics, Noordhoff International Publishing, Leyden, 1974.
- [26] E Wahlén, J Weber, Large-amplitude steady gravity water waves with general vorticity and critical layers, 2022, arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.10071.
- [27] K. Varholm, Global bifurcation of waves with multiple critical layers, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 52(2020).
- [28] M. Wheeler, The Froude number for solitary water waves with vorticity, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 768, 91-112, 2015.

¹DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LINKÖPING UNIVERSITY, SE-581 83 LINKÖPING, SWEDEN