

ON THE SIMPLICITY AND UNIQUENESS
 OF POSITIVE EIGENVALUES ADMITTING
 POSITIVE EIGENFUNCTIONS FOR WEAKLY
 COUPLED ELLIPTIC SYSTEMS

ROBERT STEPHEN CANTRELL

1. Introduction and preliminaries. Throughout this paper, we shall assume that Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbf{R}^N , $N \geq 1$, with $\partial\Omega$ of class $C^{2+\alpha}$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$, let L^k denote the formally self-adjoint operator on Ω given by

$$L^k w(x) = - \sum_{i,j=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} (A_{ij}^k(x) \frac{\partial w}{\partial x_i}(x)) + A^k(x)w(x).$$

The coefficients A_{ij}^k and A^k are assumed to satisfy

- (i) $(A_{ij}^k(x))_{i,j=1}^N$ is symmetric and uniformly positive definite on $\bar{\Omega}$;
- (ii) $A^k(x) \geq 0$;
- (iii) $A_{ij}^k \in C^{1+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$, $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N$, $0 < \alpha < 1$; and
- (iv) $A^k \in C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$, $0 < \alpha < 1$.

L will then denote the diagonal matrix

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} L^1 & & & \\ & L^2 & 0 & \\ & 0 & \ddots & \\ & & & L^r \end{bmatrix}.$$

In addition, the matrix $M(x) = (m_{k\ell}(x))_{k,\ell=1}^r$, $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ will be assumed to satisfy

- (i) $m_{k\ell} \in C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$, $k, \ell = 1, 2, \dots, r$, $0 < \alpha < 1$;
- (ii) $m_{k\ell} \geq 0$ on $\bar{\Omega}$ if $k \neq \ell$; and
- (iii) $m_{k\ell} = m_{\ell k}$ for $k, \ell = 1, 2, \dots, r$.

Received by the editors on April 19, 1986.

We will now consider the linear boundary value problem

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} Lu &= PMu \text{ in } \Omega \\ u &\equiv 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $u = (u^1, u^2, \dots, u^r)^t$ is viewed as an r -tuple of functions on $\bar{\Omega}$ and P is a nonnegative $r \times r$ scalar matrix with $p_{kk} > 0$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$. We are mainly interested in choices of P which admit classical solutions of (1.3) for which $u^k(x) \geq 0$ on $\bar{\Omega}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$.

This problem has been addressed in [1] and [2], in case $P = \lambda I$, $\lambda > 0$ and without the assumptions of formal self-adjointness for L and symmetry for M . The principal result of Hess [2] is that if $m_{kk}(x_0) > 0$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and some $x_0 \in \Omega$, (1.3) has such a solution for at least one $\lambda > 0$. Some partial results on the simplicity and uniqueness of such eigenvalues are given in [1]. In particular, if the Hess result holds, and if $(M + \mu I)(\bar{x})$ is a nonnegative irreducible matrix for some $\bar{x} \in \Omega$, then $u^k(x)$ may be chosen *strictly positive* inside Ω for $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$. Moreover, $\dim(\ker((L - \lambda M)^2)) = \dim(\ker(L - \lambda M)) = 1$.

However, for purposes of applications to associated nonlinear problems (as, for example, in bifurcation theory) a more relevant question is the algebraic simplicity of an eigenvalue λ of

$$(1.4) \quad u = \lambda L^{-1}Mu.$$

As described in [1] and [2], (1.4) is equivalent to (1.3) in case $P = \lambda I$ by standard a priori estimates and embedding theorems for second-order elliptic partial differential equations. In particular, $L^{-1}M$ may be viewed as a compact linear operator on either of the Banach spaces $[C_0^{1+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})]^r$ or $[C_0^0(\bar{\Omega})]^r$ (the choice of $[C_0^0(\bar{\Omega})]^r$ being made when it is desirable to exploit the monotone nature of the cone of positive functions in this space). To this end, it is shown in [1] that, in case $L^{-1}M = ML^{-1}$ and $(M + \mu I)(x_0)$ is irreducible for some $\mu > 0$ and $x_0 \in \Omega$, (1.4) has a unique algebraically simple eigenvalue admitting an eigenfunction with $u^k(x) \geq 0$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$, provided $m_{k_0 k_0} > 0$ for at least one $k_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. It should be noted that the commutativity assumption essentially requires that $L^1 = L^2 = \dots = L^r$ and that M is a constant matrix, although L^1 need not be formally self-adjoint and m_{kk} can be negative for $k \neq k_0$. Partial results are given in [1] in case the commutativity assumption is dropped.

In this article we shall show that the simplicity and uniqueness results obtain as above without the commutativity assumption provided that L is formally self-adjoint and M is symmetric. (These results extend to systems the results of [3].) To this end, in §2, we prove a basic simplicity theorem, which covers a number of cases, including $P = \lambda I$. Corresponding uniqueness results are presented in §3, making strong use of the results of [1].

2. Simplicity results.

THEOREM 2.1. *Consider (1.4), where L, M , and P are as described in §1. In addition, invertible matrix;*

- (i) P is a symmetric, invertible matrix
- (ii) $P^{-1}L = LP^{-1}$;
- (iii) If $A = PM$ and $A = (a_{k\ell})_{k,\ell=1}^r$, then $a_{k\ell} \geq 0$ if $k \neq \ell$ and $(A + \delta I)(\bar{x})$ is nonnegative irreducible, for some $x \in \Omega$ and some $\delta > 0$;
- (iv) The map $Q : [C_0^2(\bar{\Omega})]^r \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ given by

$$Q(w) = \langle w, P^{-1}Lw \rangle$$

is positive definite, where \langle, \rangle is the inner product for $[L^2(\bar{\Omega})]^r$.

Then, if (1.4) has a nontrivial solution u in $[C_0^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})]^r$ with $u^k \geq 0$ on $\bar{\Omega}$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$, $u^k(x) > 0$ for $x \in \Omega$ and $\frac{\partial u^k}{\partial \nu}(x) < 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, where $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ denotes the outward normal derivative. Moreover, $N((I - PL^{-1}M)^2) = N(I - PL^{-1}M) = \text{span}(u)$.

PROOF. That u^k is as described for $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and that $N(I - PL^{-1}M) = \text{span}(u)$ follow from (iii) as in [1; §3]. Suppose now that $(I - PL^{-1}M)^2x = 0$. Then $(I - PL^{-1}M)x = cu$, where $c \in \mathbf{R}$. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle (I - PL^{-1}M)^2x, y \rangle \\ &= \langle (I - PL^{-1}M)x, (I - PL^{-1}M)^*y \rangle \\ &= c\langle u, (I - ML^{-1}P)y \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for any $y \in [C_0^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})]^r$. In particular, if $y = P^{-1}Lx$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= c\langle u, (I - ML^{-1}P)(P^{-1}Lx) \rangle \\ &= c\langle u, P^{-1}Lx - Mx \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

But now $x = PL^{-1}Mx + cu$ and $PL^{-1} = L^{-1}P$ imply $P^{-1}Lx - Mx = cP^{-1}Lu$. Hence

$$0 = c^2 \langle u, P^{-1}Lu \rangle.$$

Since $u^k > 0$ on Ω for $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$, (iv) implies $c^2 = 0$.

REMARK. Hypothesis (iv) of Theorem 2.1 may be omitted provided it is known that $\langle u, P^{-1}Lu \rangle = \langle u, Mu \rangle \neq 0$. However, we have chosen to present the result with hypothesis (iv) included, as there are two important cases in which the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1 may be verified.

COROLLARY 2.2. *Suppose that L, M , and P are as in §1. In addition, assume that $p_{k\ell} = 0$ if $k \neq \ell$ and that $(M + \delta I)(\bar{x})$ is nonnegative irreducible for some $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ and some $\delta > 0$. Then the conclusion of Theorem 2.1 obtains.*

PROOF. That hypotheses (i)-(iii) of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied is immediate. Suppose now that $w \in [C_0^2(\bar{\Omega})]^r$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} Q(w) &= \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{1}{p_{kk}} \int_{\Omega} w^k L^k w^k \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{1}{p_{kk}} \left[\int_{\Omega} \sum_{i,j=1}^N A_{ij}^k(x) \frac{\partial w^k}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial w^k}{\partial x_j} dx + \int_{\Omega} A^k(x) [w^k]^2 dx \right] \end{aligned}$$

by the formal self-adjointness of L^k , $k = 1, \dots, r$. Consequently, $Q(w) > 0$ unless $w \equiv 0$.

REMARK. In particular, Corollary 2.2 includes, of course, the case $P = \lambda I$.

COROLLARY 2.3. *Suppose that L, M , and P are as in §1. In addition, assume that P and M satisfy hypotheses (i) and (iii) of Theorem 2.1 and that P is positive definite. Then if $L^1 = L^2 = \dots = L^r$, the conclusion of Theorem 2.1 obtains.*

PROOF. Again, we need only verify hypothesis (iv). Since P^{-1} is a symmetric positive definite matrix, it is well-known that there is a symmetric matrix C such that $C^2 = P^{-1}$. So if $w \in [C_0^2(\bar{\Omega})]^r$,

$$\begin{aligned} Q(w) &= \langle w, P^{-1}Lw \rangle \\ &= \langle w, c^2Lw \rangle \\ &= \langle Cw, LCw \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The hypotheses on L guarantee that $Q(w) > 0$ unless $Cw \equiv 0$ on $\bar{\Omega}$. But if such is the case $\langle w, P^{-1}w \rangle = \langle Cw, Cw \rangle = 0$. Consequently, since P^{-1} is positive definite, $w \equiv 0$, and (iv) is verified.

3. Uniqueness results. Let us now assume that $P = \Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & \lambda_r \end{pmatrix}$, with $\lambda_k > 0$ fixed for $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$, that L and M are as in Corollary 2.2, and that

$$(3.1) \quad m_{kk}(x_0) > 0$$

for some $x_0 \in \Omega$ and some $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. We may now obtain the following

THEOREM 3.1. *Suppose that Λ, L , and M are as above. Then there is a unique $s_0 > 0$ such that*

$$(3.2) \quad Lu = s_0 \Lambda M u \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

$$u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

has a nontrivial solution u_0 with $u_0^k \geq 0$, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$.

REMARK. The proof of Theorem 3.1 is a special case of the proof of our Theorem 3.8 in [1], and, consequently, a fully detailed exposition of the proof is unnecessary. However, in order that this present article be somewhat self-contained, we will give a brief sketch of the main ideas of the proof. A reader seeking further details is referred to [1].

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1. First of all, there is no loss of generality in the additional assumption that

$$(3.3) \quad -\frac{1}{2r} < m_{kk}(x) < \frac{1}{2r}$$

for $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$, and that

$$(3.4) \quad 0 \leq m_{k\ell}(x) \leq \frac{1}{r}$$

for $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, $k \neq \ell$, $k, \ell = 1, 2, \dots, r$. Now consider the family of problems

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} Lu &= s\Lambda(M - t)u \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

which contains (3.2). It is easy to see that (3.5) is equivalent to

$$(3.6) \quad u = s\Lambda(L + s\Lambda)^{-1}(M - t + 1)u.$$

Notice that if $t < 1 - \frac{1}{2r}$, $M - t + 1$ is nonnegative and, for some $\bar{x} \in \Omega$, irreducible as well. Consequently, the right hand side of (3.6) may be viewed as a compact positive operator on $[C_0^0(\bar{\Omega})]^r$ if $s > 0$ and $t < 1 - \frac{1}{2r}$. It follows as in §3 of [1] that, for such s and t , that the existence of a positive solution to (3.6) is equivalent to $r(s\Lambda(L + s\Lambda)^{-1}(M - t + 1)) = 1$, where $r(A)$ is the spectral radius of A . Moreover, if (\bar{s}, \bar{t}) is such a point there is a smooth function $t(s) : (\bar{s} - \delta, \bar{s} + \delta) \rightarrow (-\infty, 1 - \frac{1}{2r})$, where $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small, such that $t(\bar{s}) = \bar{t}$ and such that $r(s\Lambda(L + s\Lambda)^{-1}(M - t + 1)) = 1$ exactly when $t = t(s)$ if $|(s, t) - (\bar{s}, \bar{t})|$ is sufficiently small.

It follows from (3.3)-(3.4) and [4, pp. 188-192] that there is a $t_0 \in (0, 1 - \frac{1}{2r})$ such that (3.6) has no positive solution with $s > 0$ and $t \geq t_0$. Let $t_0^* = \inf\{t : t < 1 - \frac{1}{2r} \text{ and (3.6) has no positive solution with } s > 0 \text{ at } t\}$. Then it follows from (3.1) that $0 < t_0^* \leq t_0$. We may define a function $f : (-\infty, t_0^*] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by $f(t) = 1/s$ where s is the smallest positive number for which (3.6) has a positive solution at t provided $t < t_0^*$ and 0 if $t = t_0^*$. That $M - t + 1$ is monotonic in t will imply that f is a decreasing function. Now if $t < t_0^*$ and $s = 1/f(t)$, Corollary 2.2 implies that

$$\dim(N([I - s\Lambda L^{-1}(M - t)]^2)) = \dim(N(I - s\Lambda L^{-1}(M - t))) = 1.$$

A degree theoretic argument, as in [1; §3], may now be made to show that f is continuous.

Now suppose there is $\tilde{s} > s_0$ such that (3.6) has a positive solution. Since $0 < 1/\tilde{s} < 1/s_0 = f(0)$, there is a $\tilde{t} \in (0, t_0)$ such that $f(\tilde{t}) = 1/\tilde{s}$. Consequently, $r(\tilde{s}\Lambda(L + \tilde{s}\Lambda)^{-1}(M - 0)) = 1 = r(\tilde{s}\Lambda(L + \tilde{s}\Lambda)^{-1}(M - \tilde{t}))$. So $r(\tilde{s}\Lambda(L + \tilde{s}\Lambda)^{-1}(M - t)) = 1$ for $t \in [0, \tilde{t}]$, a contradiction to the solvability of t in terms of s at (\tilde{s}, \tilde{t}) .

Theorem 3.1 has an immediate consequence which is of substantial interest in the geometric study of generalized spectra of systems of second order elliptic partial differential equations [5].

COROLLARY 3.2. *Suppose that L and M satisfy the hypotheses of Corollary 2.2 and in addition that (3.1) holds. Then the set $\{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_r) : \lambda_k > 0, \text{ for } k = 1, 2, \dots, r, \text{ and } Lu = \Lambda Mu \text{ has a positive solution in } \Omega \text{ with } u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$ is homeomorphic to $S = \{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_r) : \lambda_k > 0 \text{ and } \sum_{k=1}^r \lambda_k^2 = 1\}$. In particular, if $(\lambda_1^0, \lambda_2^0, \dots, \lambda_r^0) \in S$ and ψ denotes the homeomorphism, $\psi((\lambda_1^0, \lambda_2^0, \dots, \lambda_r^0)) = \alpha(\lambda_1^0, \lambda_2^0, \dots, \lambda_r^0)$, where $\alpha > 0$.*

REFERENCES

1. R.S. Cantrell and K. Schmitt, *On the eigenvalue problem for coupled elliptic systems*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **17** (1986), 850-862.
2. P. Hess, *On the eigenvalue problem for weakly-coupled elliptic systems*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **81** (1983), 151-159.
3. A. Manes and A.M. Micheletti, *Un'estensione della teoria variazionale classica degli autovalori per operatori ellittici del secondo ordine*, Boll. U.M.I. **7** (1973), 185-301.
4. M.H. Protter and H.F. Weinberger, *Maximum Principles in Differential Equations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1967.
5. ———, *The generalized spectrum of second order elliptic systems*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **9** (1979), 503-518.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI, CORAL GABLES, FL 33124.

18
19
20
21

22
23
24