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Abstract—In this paper we investigate numerically positive solutions of the equation $-\Delta u = \lambda u^q + u^p$, where $\lambda > 0$, $0 < q < 1 < p < 2^*$, and $\lambda$ is a real parameter, $\Delta$ is the Laplace operator, and $\Omega$ is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$. We will compute and visualize the range of $\lambda$, this problem achieves a numerical solution.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we use pseudo-arclength method to obtain approximation solutions of the following concave-convex nonlinear problem:

\begin{align}
-\Delta u &= \lambda u^q + u^p, \quad x \in \Omega, \\
u(0) &= 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, \quad (1a)
\end{align}

where $\lambda > 0$ is a real parameter, $\Delta$ is the Laplace operator, and $0 < q < 1 < p < 2^*$, in which $2^* = \infty$ because $\Omega$ is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$. In this paper, the solutions will be solved are classical solutions, which satisfy Eq.(1) pointwise.

For the solution $u$ of Eq.(1), we consider the energy functional $I_\lambda(u)$, for each $u \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^1(\Omega)$,

\begin{align}
I_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{2} \|u\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{q+1} \|u\|^{q+1}_{q+1} - \frac{1}{p+1} \|u\|^{p+1}_{p+1} \quad (2)
\end{align}

where $\|u\| = (\int_\Omega \|u\|^2 dx)^{1/2}$, $\|u\|_{q+1} = (\int_\Omega |u|^{q+1} dx)^{1/2}$, $\|u\|_{p+1} = (\int_\Omega |u|^{p+1} dx)^{1/2}$.

If we consider $\lambda = 0$, Eq.(1) turns into Lane-Emden(-Fowler) equation,

\begin{align}
-\Delta u &= u^p, \quad x \in \Omega, \\
u(0) &= 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega. \quad (3)
\end{align}

The above equation was introduced by Lane in the mid-19th century, as a model of the distribution of clusters of stars in Astrophysics. It was in 1931 that Fowler [1] solved completely the problem of finding radially symmetric solutions $u = u(|x|)$. From then on, Eq.(3) has been extensively investigated, see for example [2,3] for a survey.

Under the assumption that $\lambda > 0$ is small enough, our Eq.(1) can be regarded as a perturbation problem of Eq.(3). To emphasize the dependence on $\lambda$, Eq.(1) is often regarded as Eq.(1) $\lambda$.

The existence of positive solutions of concave and convex nonlinearities have been studied by many researchers, we mention [4,5] to name a few.

**Theorem 1.1** For all $0 < q < 1 < p < 2^*$ there exists $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda > 0$, such that:

1. for all $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda)$ problem (1)$_\lambda$ has a minimal solution $u_\lambda$ such that $I_\lambda(u_\lambda) < 0$. Moreover $u_\lambda$ is increasing with respect to $\lambda$;
2. for all $\lambda = \Lambda$ problem (1)$_\lambda$ has at least one weak solution $u \in H \cap L^{p+1}$;
3. for all $\lambda > \Lambda$ problem (1)$_\lambda$ has no solution.

The above theorem is proved in [6]. We now provide sketch of the proof: The smallest eigenvalue of

\begin{align}
-\Delta \varphi &= \lambda \varphi, \quad x \in \Omega, \\
\varphi &= 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega. \quad (4)
\end{align}

is denoted by $\tilde{\lambda}$, $\varphi$ denotes the corresponding eigenfunction satisfying $\varphi > 0$ in $\Omega$ and $\|\varphi\|_2 = 1$.

1. Define $\Lambda = sup\{\lambda > 0 : (1)_\lambda has a solution\}$, we can prove $0 < \Lambda < \infty$ by sub-supersolution method. We can also show that, for all $0 < \lambda < \Lambda$ Eq.(1)$_\lambda$ has a solution $u_\lambda$, then we illustrate that the solution $u_\lambda$ is a minimal solution of (1)$_\lambda$.

In the end of the proof, we also use sub-supersolution method to show that

$u_{\lambda_3} < u_{\lambda_2}$, whenever $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$.

2. We can prove that for $\lambda_n$ being a sequence such that $\lambda_n \uparrow \Lambda$, and at the same time, for $u_n = u_{\lambda_n}$, there exists $u^* \in H$ and $u^* > 0$ such that $u_n \rightarrow u^*$ a.e. in $\Omega$ strongly in $L^{p+1}$ and weakly in $H$. Such a $u^*$ is thus a weak solution of (1)$_\Lambda$.

3. This follows from the definition of $\Lambda$ in the proof of 1.

**Theorem 1.2** Let $0 < q < 1 < p < 2^*$, Then for all $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda)$ problem (1)$_\lambda$ has a second solution $v_\lambda > u_\lambda$.

Proof C.f.[6].

Remark We will compute and visualize solutions of Eq.(1)$_\lambda$ to illustrate Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 in III.

II. NUMERICAL ALGORITHM

The method discussed in this section, which is used to find zeros of function $f$, is Newton’s method with the following equation:

\begin{align}
x^{n+1} = x^n - \frac{f(x^n)}{f'(x^n)} \quad (5)
\end{align}
The following theorem is used to show sufficient conditions under which Newton’s method converges to a solution (c.f. [7]).

**Theorem 2.1** Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and convex and let $f : D \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be continuously differentiable. Assume that for some norm $\| \cdot \|$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $x_0 \in D$ the following condition hold:

(a) $f$ satisfies

$$\|f'(x) - f'(y)\| \leq \gamma \|x - y\|$$

for all $x, y \in D$ and some constant $\gamma > 0$.

(b) The Jacobian matrix $f'(x)$ is nonsingular for all $x \in D$, and there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\|f'(x)^{-1}\| \leq \beta, \quad x \in D.$$

(c) For the constants

$$\alpha := \|f'(x_0)^{-1}f(x_0)\| \quad \text{and} \quad q := \alpha \beta \gamma$$

the inequality

$$q < \frac{1}{2}$$

is satisfied.

(d) For $r := 2\alpha$ the closed ball $B(x_0, r) := \{x : \|x - x_0\| \leq r\}$ is contained in $D$.

Then $f$ has a unique zero $x^*$ in $B(x_0, r)$. Starting with $x_0$ the Newton iteration

$$x^{n+1} = x^n - \frac{f(x^n)}{f'(x^n)}, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots$$

is well-defined. The sequence $\{x^n\}$ converges to the zero $x^*$ of $f$, and we have the error estimate

$$\|x^n - x^*\| \leq 2\alpha q^{2n-1}, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots$$

For Eq.(1a), we define

$$f(u) = \Delta u + \lambda u^3 + u^\tau$$

as function $f$ in (5). To keep the solution away from the trivial solution $u \equiv 0$, we choose $\bar{\omega}$ as initial value because $\bar{\omega} > 0$(this initial value is important to the convergence of Newton’s method). Besides, to keep the solution on the “right” way, we can’t directly regard Eq.(6) as iterative function. So we let

$$L = \Delta + \lambda,$$

$$X = \{u | u \in C^2(\Omega), u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\},$$

$$Y = \{u | u \in C^0(\Omega)\}.$$
parameterization by $s$ means that the solution of $f(u_{\lambda}, \lambda) = 0$
depends on $s$:

$$u = u(s), \quad \lambda = \lambda(s).$$

This means pulling the imaginary particle in the direction
tangent to the branch; turning point does not pose problems.
In [8] “pseudo arclength” was proposed, that is:

$$N(u, \lambda, s) = u^{*T}(u - u^{*}) + \lambda^{*}(\lambda - \lambda^{*}) - (s - s^{*}) = 0, \quad (11)$$

where $(u^{*}, \lambda^{*})$ is the solution previously calculated, and
$u^{*T}, \lambda^{*}$ can be calculated by

$$\dot{u}^{*T} = \beta v, \beta \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$\dot{\lambda}^{*} = \beta,$$

where $v, \beta$ satisfy

$$f_{u}^{*}v = -f_{\lambda}^{*},$$

$$\beta = \frac{\pm 1}{\sqrt{1 + \|v\|^{2}}}.$$  

From equation $f(u_{\lambda}, \lambda) = 0$ and Eq.(11), we get the system:

$$F(u, \lambda, s) = \begin{pmatrix} f(u(s), \lambda(s)) \\ N(u(s), \lambda(s), s) \end{pmatrix} = 0. \quad (12)$$

We can solve the solution branch by Theorem 2.1. By this
way, we can complete the proof of Theorem 1.2(we will visualize it with an example in III).

**Algorithm**

1. Define region $\Omega$ and step size $\delta s = (s - s^{*}).$
2. Let $(u_{1}, \lambda_{1})$ be the initial value(this initial value is important to convergence of Newton’s method).
   Begin loop $i = 0$ to $n$(decided by step size).
   Begin loop $j = 0$ to $m$.
   2.1 Calculate the derivative $F'(u, \lambda, s)$ of
   Equation (12).
   2.2 Using Eq.(5) to calculate $(u_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}).$
   Repeat step 2.2 until convergence criteria are met:
   $$\|u_{k+1} - u_{k}\| \rightarrow 0.$$  

   End loop $j$.

   End loop $i$.

**III. NUMERICAL RESULTS**

We consider Eq.(1) with $q = 0.5, p = 3$ and let $\Omega = [-1, 1] \times [-1, 1], we want to obtain a numerical solution of
the problem

$$\begin{cases}
-\Delta u = \lambda u^{1/2} + u^{3}, & x \in \Omega, \quad (13a) \\
u > 0, & x \in \Omega, \quad (13b) \\
u = 0, & x \in \partial \Omega. \quad (13c)
\end{cases}$$  

General domain $\Omega$ is divided on an equidistant mesh,
and then the five-point difference scheme is used to discrete
Laplace operator $\Delta$, where we choose $N = 50, h = 1/50$.
Using pseudo arclength method, we have solution branch of
Eq.(13).(See Fig.3)

From Fig.3, we can know that point $B$ is a turning point
of solution branch of (13). For $\lambda < x_{B} \approx 20.68$, Eq.(13) has two solutions which illustrates Theorem 1.2. We also know
that for $\lambda > x_{B} \approx 20.68$, Eq.(13) has no solution which agrees with (3) in Theorem 1.1. Take $\lambda = 5$ for example, we visualize the solutions of (13)(see Fig.4, Fig.5). Fig.4 denotes the solution $u$ of (13) on the branch $A$ to $B$(which is the minimal solution) and Fig.5 denotes the solution $u$ of (13) on the branch $B$ to $C$.

**Fig.3. solution branch of Eq.(13) with different $\lambda$.**

**Fig.4.** the solution $u$ with $\lambda = 5$ of (13) on the branch $A$ to $B$ in Fig.3 (which is the minimal solution).

**Fig.5.** the solution $u$ with $\lambda = 5$ of (13) on the branch $B$ to $C$ in Fig.3.

We present just some values of $u$ on the solution branch $A$
to $B$ of Fig.3 in following tables for different $\lambda$:
TABLE I
APPROXIMATION OF $u$ FOR $\lambda = 5$ WITH $I_\lambda(u) = -0.0335 < 0$ AND $\varepsilon = 10^{-10}$, WHERE $\varepsilon$ DENOTES THE RELATIVE CONVERGENCE ERROR $\varepsilon = \|u_{n+1} - u_n\|$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>$y$</th>
<th>-0.8</th>
<th>-0.4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td>0.0666</td>
<td>0.0794</td>
<td>0.0666</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0794</td>
<td>0.0948</td>
<td>0.0794</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td>0.0666</td>
<td>0.0794</td>
<td>0.0666</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II
APPROXIMATION OF $u$ FOR $\lambda = 10$ WITH $I_\lambda(u) = -0.5434 < 0$ AND $\varepsilon = 10^{-11}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>$y$</th>
<th>-0.8</th>
<th>-0.4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.0488</td>
<td>0.1132</td>
<td>0.1342</td>
<td>0.1132</td>
<td>0.0488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.1132</td>
<td>0.2684</td>
<td>0.3201</td>
<td>0.2684</td>
<td>0.1132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1342</td>
<td>0.3201</td>
<td>0.3826</td>
<td>0.3201</td>
<td>0.1342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1132</td>
<td>0.2684</td>
<td>0.3201</td>
<td>0.2684</td>
<td>0.1132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0488</td>
<td>0.1132</td>
<td>0.1342</td>
<td>0.1132</td>
<td>0.0488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III
APPROXIMATION OF $u$ FOR $\lambda = 15$ WITH $I_\lambda(u) = -2.3692 < 0$ AND $\varepsilon = 10^{-10}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>$y$</th>
<th>-0.8</th>
<th>-0.4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.0983</td>
<td>0.2285</td>
<td>0.2712</td>
<td>0.2285</td>
<td>0.0983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.2285</td>
<td>0.5436</td>
<td>0.6495</td>
<td>0.5436</td>
<td>0.2285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2712</td>
<td>0.6495</td>
<td>0.7777</td>
<td>0.6495</td>
<td>0.2712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2285</td>
<td>0.5436</td>
<td>0.6495</td>
<td>0.5436</td>
<td>0.2285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0983</td>
<td>0.2285</td>
<td>0.2712</td>
<td>0.2285</td>
<td>0.0983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparing Table I to Table II and Table III, we see that $u_\lambda$ is increasing with respect to $\lambda$, and find that $I_\lambda(u_\lambda) < 0$ for $\lambda = 5, 10, 15$. In fact, $I_\lambda(u_\lambda)$ of (13) computed are all negative on solution branch $C$ to $A$ except for point $A$, and $I_\lambda(u_\lambda)$ is increasing from $C$ to $A$ with $I_\lambda(u_{\lambda,C}) \approx -49.77$ and $I_\lambda(u_{\lambda,A}) = 0$.
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