

GLOBAL STRUCTURE OF POSITIVE SOLUTIONS
FOR SUPERLINEAR SECOND ORDER
 m -POINT BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS

RUYUN MA — YULIAN AN

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we consider the nonlinear eigenvalue problems

$$\begin{aligned} u'' + \lambda h(t)f(u) &= 0, \quad 0 < t < 1, \\ u(0) &= 0, \quad u(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i u(\eta_i), \end{aligned}$$

where $m \geq 3$, $\eta_i \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-2$, with $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i < 1$; $h \in C([0, 1], [0, \infty))$ and $h(t) \geq 0$ for $t \in [0, 1]$ and $h(t_0) > 0$ for $t_0 \in [0, 1]$; $f \in C([0, \infty), [0, \infty))$ and $f(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$, and $f_0 = \infty$, where $f_0 = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} f(s)/s$. We investigate the global structure of positive solutions by using the nonlinear Krein–Rutman Theorem.

1. Introduction

The existence and multiplicity of positive solutions of nonlinear multi-point boundary value problems have been extensively studied, see Webb [8], Kwong and Wong [4], Ma [5] and references therein. Recently, the global structure of positive solutions of nonlinear multi-point boundary value problems has also been

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 34B10, 34G20.

Key words and phrases. Multiplicity results, multi-point boundary value problem, eigenvalues, bifurcation methods, positive solutions.

The first named author supported by the NSFC(No.10671158), the NSF of Gansu Province (No. 3ZS051-A25-016), NWNKJJCXGC-03-18, the Spring-sun program (No. Z2004-1-62033), SRFDP (No. 20060736001), and the SRF for ROCS, SEM(2006[311]).

extensively investigated by several authors, see for example, Rynne [7], Ma and O'Regan [6]. However, these papers only dealt with the case that $f_0 \in (0, \infty)$, and relatively little is known about the global structure of solutions in the case that $f_0 = \infty$. Especially, very few global results were found in the available literature when $f_0 = \infty = f_\infty$. The likely reason is that the global bifurcation techniques can not be used directly in the case.

In this paper, we consider the nonlinear second order m -point boundary value problem of the form

$$(1.1) \quad u'' + \lambda h(t)f(u) = 0, \quad t \in (0, 1),$$

$$(1.2) \quad u(0) = 0, \quad u(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i u(\eta_i),$$

where $m \geq 3$, $\eta_i \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, m-2$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i < 1$; λ is a positive parameter; $h \in C([0, 1], [0, \infty))$ and $h(t_0) > 0$ for some $t_0 \in [0, 1]$ and $f \in C([0, \infty), [0, \infty))$. We obtain a complete description of the global structure of positive solutions of (1.1)–(1.2) under the assumptions:

(A1) $h: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is continuous and $h(t_0) > 0$ for some $t_0 \in [0, 1]$;

(A2) $f \in C([0, \infty), [0, \infty))$ and $f(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$;

(A3) $f_0 = \infty$, where $f_0 = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} f(s)/s$;

(A4) $f_\infty \in [0, \infty]$, where $f_\infty = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} f(s)/s$.

We will develop a bifurcation approach to treat the case $f_0 = \infty$. Crucial to this approach is to construct a sequence of functions $\{f^{[n]}\}$ which is asymptotic linear at 0 and satisfies

$$f^{[n]} \rightarrow f, \quad (f^{[n]})_0 \rightarrow \infty.$$

By means of the corresponding auxiliary equations, we obtain a sequence of unbounded components $\{C_+^{[n]}\}$ via nonlinear Krein–Rutman bifurcation theorem [4], and this enable us to find an unbounded components \mathcal{C} satisfying

$$(0, 0) \in \mathcal{C} \subset \limsup C_+^{[n]}.$$

The rest of the paper is arranged as follows: In Section 2, we prove some properties of *superior limit* of certain infinity collection of connected sets. Section 3 is devoted to the existence of the principal eigenvalue of linear eigenvalue problem

$$(1.3) \quad u'' + \lambda h(t)u = 0, \quad t \in (0, 1),$$

$$(1.4) \quad u(0) = 0, \quad u(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i u(\eta_i).$$

The approach of this section is based upon the well-known Krein–Rutman theorem and the order topology of a subspace of $C[0, 1]$. Finally, in Section 4, we state and prove our main results.

2. Superior limit and component

DEFINITION 2.1 ([9]). Let X be a Banach space and $\{C_n \mid n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ be a family of subsets of X . Then the the *superior limit* \mathcal{D} of $\{C_n\}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{D} := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_n = \{x \in X \mid \exists \{n_i\} \subset \mathbb{N} \text{ and } x_{n_i} \in C_{n_i}, \text{ such that } x_{n_i} \rightarrow x\}.$$

DEFINITION 2.2 ([9]). A *component* of a set M is meant a maximal connected subset of M .

LEMMA 2.3 ([9]). *Suppose that Y is a compact metric space, A and B are non-intersecting closed subsets of Y , and no component of Y intersects both A and B . Then there exist two disjoint compact subsets X_A and X_B , such that $Y = X_A \cup X_B$, $A \subset X_A$, $B \subset X_B$.*

LEMMA 2.4. *Let X be a Banach space, and let $\{C_n\}$ be a family of connected subsets of X . Assume that*

- (a) *there exist $z_n \in C_n$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, and $z^* \in X$, such that $z_n \rightarrow z^*$;*
- (b) *$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = \infty$, where $r_n = \sup\{\|x\| \mid x \in C_n\}$;*
- (c) *for every $R > 0$, $(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n) \cap B_R$ is a relatively compact set of X , where*

$$B_R = \{x \in X \mid \|x\| \leq R\}.$$

Then there exists an unbounded component \mathcal{C} in \mathcal{D} and $z^ \in \mathcal{C}$.*

PROOF. By the definition of \mathcal{D} , $z^* \in \mathcal{D}$. Suppose on the contrary that the component \mathcal{C} in \mathcal{D} , which contains z^* , is bounded. Note that \mathcal{D} is closed in X . It follows that \mathcal{C} is closed subset of \mathcal{D} , and subsequently \mathcal{C} is closed subset of X . It is easy to see that \mathcal{C} is a compact set of X by (c). Take $\delta > 0$, and let U_1 be δ -neighbourhood of \mathcal{C} in X .

We discuss in two cases.

Case 1. $\partial U_1 \cap \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$.

In this case, we have from (c) that $\overline{U_1} \cap \mathcal{D}$ is a compact metric space. Obviously, \mathcal{C} and $\partial U_1 \cap \mathcal{D}$ are two disjoint closed subsets of X . Because of the maximal connectedness of \mathcal{C} , there does not exist a component \mathcal{C}^* of $\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{U_1}$ such that $\mathcal{C}^* \cap \mathcal{C} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathcal{C}^* \cap (\partial U_1 \cap \mathcal{D}) \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 2.3, there exist two disjoint compact sets X_A and X_B of $\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{U_1}$, such that $\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{U_1} = X_A \cup X_B$, $\mathcal{C} \subset X_A$, $\partial U_1 \cap \mathcal{D} \subset X_B$. Evidently, $d(X_A, X_B) > 0$.

Let $\delta_1 = (1/3)d(X_A, X_B)$, and let U_2 be the $(\delta_1/3)$ -neighbourhood of X_A . Set $U = U_1 \cap U_2$, then

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{C} \subset U, \quad \partial U \cap \mathcal{D} = \emptyset.$$

Case 2. $\partial U_1 \cap \mathcal{D} = \emptyset$.

In this case, we take $U = U_1$. It is obvious that (2.1) holds.

Since $z_n \rightarrow z^*$, we may assume that $\{z_n\} \subset U$. By (b) and the connectedness of C_n , there exists $n_0 > 0$, such that for all $n \geq n_0$, $C_n \cap \partial U \neq \emptyset$. Take $y_n \in C_n \cap \partial U$, then $\{y_n \mid n \geq n_0\}$ is a relative compact subset of X , so there exists $y^* \in \partial U$ and a subsequence $\{y_{n_k}\}$ of $\{y_n \mid n \geq n_0\}$ such that $y_{n_k} \rightarrow y^*$. Obviously, $y^* \in \mathcal{D}$. Therefore, $y^* \in \partial U \cap \mathcal{D}$. However, this contradicts (2.1). \square

3. Eigenvalue with a positive eigenfunction

Let Y be the Banach space $C[0, 1]$ with the norm $\|u\|_0 = \max\{|u(t)| \mid t \in [0, 1]\}$. Let $K = \{u \in Y \mid u(t) \geq 0 \text{ for } t \in [0, 1]\}$. Then K is normal. Let E denote the Banach space defined by

$$E = \left\{ u \in C^1[0, 1] \mid u(0) = 0, u(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i u(\eta_i) \right\}$$

equipped with the norm $\|u\| = \max\{\|u\|_0, \|u'\|_0\}$.

Denote $e(t) = t$, $t \in [0, 1]$, and let

$$Y_e = \bigcup_{\rho > 0} \rho[-e, e] \text{ and } |x|_e = \inf\{\rho \mid \rho > 0, x \in \rho[-e, e]\} \text{ for } x \in Y_e.$$

Set

$$(3.1) \quad K_e = Y_e \cap K = \{x \in K \mid x \leq \rho e \text{ for some } \rho > 0\}.$$

Then we have from [9, Proposition 19.9] that

- (a) K_e is a normal cone of Y_e with nonempty interior;
- (b) $(Y_e, |\cdot|_e)$ is a Banach space and continuously imbedding in $(Y, \|\cdot\|_0)$.

Notice also that an $x \in Y_e$ is in $\text{int } K_e$, the interior of K_e in Y_e if and only if $x \geq \rho e$ for some $\rho > 0$.

Let us consider an operator $T: K \rightarrow Y$ defined by

$$(3.2) \quad Tu(t) = \int_0^1 H(t, s)h(s)u(s) ds, \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

where

$$H(t, s) = G(t, s) + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i G(\eta_i, s)}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i} t,$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad G(t, s) = \begin{cases} (1-t)s & \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1, \\ t(1-s) & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Set

$$\beta := \frac{\|h\|_0}{2} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i (1 - \eta_i)}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i} \|h\|_0.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 H(t, s)h(s) ds &= \frac{1}{2}t(1-t)\|h\|_0 + \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^1 G(\eta_i, s)h(s) ds}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i} \right] t \\ &\leq \left[\frac{1}{2}\|h\|_0 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i (1 - \eta_i)\|h\|_0}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i} \right] t = \beta t. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (3.2) imply that

$$-\beta\|x\|_0 e(t) \leq (Tx)(t) \leq \beta\|x\|_0 e(t), \quad x \in Y,$$

and accordingly $T(Y) \subset Y_e$. Combining the facts $(E, \|\cdot\|) \hookrightarrow (Y_e, |\cdot|_e)$ is closed and $T: (Y, \|\cdot\|_0) \rightarrow E$ is compact, we conclude that $T: (Y, \|\cdot\|_0) \rightarrow (Y_e, |\cdot|_e)$ is compact. Since Y_e sits continuously in Y , we also have $T: (Y_e, |\cdot|_e) \rightarrow (Y_e, |\cdot|_e)$ is compact.

We claim that $T: (K_e, |\cdot|_e) \rightarrow (K_e, |\cdot|_e)$ is strongly positive.

In fact, for $x \in K_e$, denote $y(t) = \int_0^1 H(t, s)h(s)x(s) ds$, $t \in [0, 1]$. Then $y(t) \geq 0$, $y''(t) = -h(t)x(t) \leq 0$ in $(0, 1)$, and

$$(3.4) \quad y(0) = 0, \quad y(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i y(\eta_i).$$

These imply that we cannot have $y(t_0) = y'(t_0) = 0$ for any $t_0 \in (0, 1)$, and therefore $y(t) > 0$ in $(0, 1)$ and $y'(0) > 0$. By the second relation in (3.4) and the fact $y(t) > 0$ in $(0, 1)$, we have that $y(1) > 0$. Thus, there exists $\rho > 0$ such that $y(t) \geq \rho t$ on $[0, 1]$.

Now [2, Theorem 19.3] is applicable to T in Y_e with K_e . We get

LEMMA 3.1. *Let (A1) hold, and let $r(T)$ be the spectral radius of T . Then $r(T) > 0$, and $r(T)$ is a simple eigenvalue with an eigenfunction $\varphi \in \text{int } K_e$ and there is no other eigenvalue with a positive eigenfunction.*

COROLLARY 3.2. *Let (A1) hold, and let $r(T)$ be the spectral radius of T . Then $\lambda_1 := 1/r(T)$ is a simple eigenvalue with an eigenfunction $\varphi \in \text{int } K_e$ and there is the unique eigenvalue with an eigenfunction $\varphi \in \text{int } K_e$ and there is no other eigenvalue with a positive eigenfunction.*

REMARK 3.3. In [6] and [7], spectral theory was developed for linear second order multi-point eigenvalue problems (1.3)–(1.4) with the stronger assumption $h(t) \equiv 1$ in $[0,1]$.

Let σ be a constant with $0 < \sigma < \min\{t_0, 1 - t_0\}$. Denote the cone P in Y by

$$P = \left\{ u \in Y \mid u(t) \geq 0 \text{ on } (0, 1), \text{ and } \min_{\sigma \leq t \leq 1-\sigma} u(t) \geq \sigma \|u\|_0 \right\},$$

and for $r > 0$, let $\Omega_r = \{u \in K \mid \|u\|_0 < r\}$.

Define an operator $T_\lambda: P \rightarrow Y$ by

$$T_\lambda u(t) = \lambda \int_0^1 H(t, s)h(s)f(u(s)) ds, \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

It is easy to show the following

LEMMA 3.4. *Assume that (A1)–(A2) hold. Then $T_\lambda: P \rightarrow P$ is completely continuous.*

LEMMA 3.5. *Let (A1)–(A2) hold. If $u \in \partial\Omega_r$, $r > 0$, then*

$$\|T_\lambda u\|_0 \leq \lambda \widehat{M}_r \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i} \right) \int_0^1 G(s, s)h(s) ds.$$

where $\widehat{M}_r = 1 + \max_{0 \leq s \leq r} \{f(s)\}$.

PROOF. Since $f(u(t)) \leq \widehat{M}_r$ for $t \in [0, 1]$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_\lambda u\|_0 &\leq \lambda \int_0^1 G(s, s)h(s)f(u(s)) ds \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i} \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^1 G(s, s)h(s)f(u(s)) ds \\ &\leq \lambda \widehat{M}_r \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i} \right) \int_0^1 G(s, s)h(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 3.6. *Let (A1)–(A2) hold. Assume that $\{(\mu_k, y_k)\} \subset (0, \infty) \times K$ is a sequence of positive solutions of (1.1)–(1.2). Assume that $|\mu_k| \leq C_0$ for some constant $C_0 > 0$, and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|y_k\| = \infty$. Then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|y_k\|_0 = \infty$.*

PROOF. From the relation

$$y_k(t) = \mu_k \int_0^1 H(t, s)h(s)f(y_k(s)) ds$$

and the fact that the graph of y_k is concave down on $[0, 1]$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|y'_k\|_0 &= \max\{y'_k(0), -y'_k(1)\} \\ &\leq C_0 \max \left\{ \int_0^1 (1-s)h(s)f(y_k(s)) ds \left(- \int_0^1 sh(s)f(y_k(s)) ds \right) \right\} \\ &\quad + C_0 \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \int_0^1 G(\eta_i, s)h(s)f(y_k(s)) ds}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i} \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\{\|y'_k\|_0\}$ is bounded whenever $\{\|y_k\|_0\}$ is bounded. □

4. The main results

Let Σ be the closure of the set of positive solutions for (1.1)–(1.2) in E . The main results of the paper are the following

THEOREM 4.1. *Let (A1)–(A3) hold.*

(a) *If $f_\infty = 0$, then there exists a sub-continuum ζ of Σ with $(0, 0) \in \zeta$ and*

$$\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}} \zeta = [0, \infty).$$

(b) *If $f_\infty \in (0, \infty)$, then there exists a sub-continuum ζ of Σ with*

$$(0, 0) \in \zeta, \quad \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}} \zeta \subseteq [0, \lambda_1/f_\infty).$$

(c) *If $f_\infty = 0$, then there exists a component ζ of Σ with $(0, 0) \in \zeta$, $\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}} \zeta$ is a bounded closed interval, and ζ approaches $(0, \infty)$ as $\|u\| \rightarrow \infty$.*

THEOREM 4.2. *Let (A1)–(A3) hold.*

(a) *If $f_\infty = 0$, then (1.1)–(1.2) has at least one positive solution for $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$.*

(b) *If $f_\infty \in (0, \infty)$, then (1.1)–(1.2) has at least one positive solution for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1/f_\infty)$.*

(c) *If $f_\infty = 0$, then there exists $\lambda_* > 0$ such that (1.1)–(1.2) has at least two positive solutions for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$.*

To prove above theorems, we define $f^{[n]}(s): [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by

$$f^{[n]}(s) = \begin{cases} f(s) & \text{if } s > (1/n, \infty), \\ nf(1/n) s & \text{if } s \in [0, 1/n]. \end{cases}$$

Then $f^{[n]} \in C([0, \infty), [0, \infty))$ with

$$f^{[n]}(s) > 0 \quad \text{for all } s \in (0, \infty) \quad \text{and} \quad (f^{[n]})_0 = nf(1/n) > 0.$$

By (A3), it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (f^{[n]})_0 = \infty$.

To apply the nonlinear Krein–Rutman Theorem [4], we extend f to an odd function $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$g(s) = \begin{cases} f(s) & \text{if } s \geq 0, \\ -f(-s) & \text{if } s < 0. \end{cases}$$

Similarly we may extend $f^{[n]}$ to an odd function $g^{[n]}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now let us consider the auxiliary family of the equations

$$\begin{aligned} u'' + \lambda h(t)g^{[n]}(u) &= 0, \quad t \in (0, 1), \\ u(0) = 0, \quad u(1) &= \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i u(\eta_i). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\zeta \in C(R)$ be such that

$$g^{[n]}(u) = (g^{[n]})_0 u + \zeta^{[n]}(u) = nf(1/n)u + \zeta^{[n]}(u).$$

Note that

$$\lim_{|s| \rightarrow 0} \frac{\zeta^{[n]}(s)}{s} = 0.$$

Let us consider

$$(4.1) \quad Lu - \lambda h(t)(g^{[n]})_0 u = \lambda h(t)\zeta^{[n]}(u)$$

as a bifurcation problem from the trivial solution $u \equiv 0$.

Equation (4.1) can be converted to the equivalent equation

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= \int_0^1 H(t, s)[\lambda h(s)(g^{[n]})_0 u(s) + \lambda h(s)\zeta^{[n]}(u(s))] ds \\ &:= (\lambda L^{-1}[h(\cdot)(g^{[n]})_0 u(\cdot)])(t) + \lambda L^{-1}[h(\cdot)\zeta^{[n]}(u(\cdot))](t). \end{aligned}$$

Further we note that $\|\lambda L^{-1}[h(\cdot)\zeta^{[n]}(u(\cdot))]\| = o(\|u\|)$ for u near 0 in E .

By Lemma 3.1 and the fact $(g^{[n]})_0 > 0$, the results of nonlinear Krein–Rutman Theorem (see Dancer [1] and Zeidler [10, Corollary 15.12]) for (4.1) can be stated as follows: there exists a continuum $C_+^{[n]}$ of positive solutions of (4.1) joining $(\lambda_1/(g^{[n]})_0, 0)$ to infinity in K . Moreover, $C_+^{[n]} \setminus \{(\lambda_1/(g^{[n]})_0, 0)\} \subset \text{int } K$ and $(\lambda_1/(g^{[n]})_0, 0)$ is the only positive bifurcation point of (4.1) lying on trivial solutions line $u \equiv 0$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let us verify that $\{C_+^{[n]}\}$ satisfies all of the conditions of Lemma 2.4. Since

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_1}{(g^{[n]})_0} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_1}{nf(1/n)} = 0,$$

Condition (a) in Lemma 2.4 is satisfied with $z^* = (0, 0)$. Obviously

$$r_n = \sup\{|\lambda| + \|y\|_0 \mid (\lambda, y) \in C_+^{[n]}\} = \infty,$$

and accordingly, (b) holds. (c) can be deduced directly from the Arzela–Ascoli Theorem and the definition of $g^{[n]}$. Therefore, the superior limit of $\{C_+^{[n]}\}$, i.e. \mathcal{D} , contains an unbounded connected component \mathcal{C} with $(0, 0) \in \mathcal{C}$.

(a) $f_\infty = 0$. In this case, we show that $\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{C} = [0, \infty)$.

Assume on the contrary that $\sup\{\lambda \mid (\lambda, y) \in \mathcal{C}\} < \infty$, then there exists a sequence $\{(\mu_k, y_k)\} \subset \mathcal{C}$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|y_k\| = \infty, \quad |\mu_k| \leq C_0,$$

for some positive constant C_0 depending not on k . From Lemma 3.4, we have that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|y_k\|_0 = \infty$. This together with the fact

$$\min_{\sigma \leq t \leq 1-\sigma} y_k(t) \geq \sigma \|y_k\|_0, \quad \text{for all } 0 < \sigma < \min\{t_0, 1 - t_0\}$$

implies that

$$(4.2) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_k(t) = \infty, \quad \text{uniformly for } t \in [\sigma, 1 - \sigma].$$

Since $(\mu_k, y_k) \in \mathcal{C}$, we have that

$$(4.3) \quad y_k''(t) + \mu_k h(t) g(y_k(t)) = 0, \quad t \in (0, 1),$$

$$(4.4) \quad y_k(0) = 0, \quad y_k(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i y_k(\eta_i).$$

Set $v_k(t) = y_k(t) / \|y_k\|_0$. Then $\|v_k\|_0 = 1$.

Now, choosing a subsequence and relabelling if necessary, it follows that there exists $(\mu_*, v_*) \in [0, C_0] \times E$ with

$$(4.5) \quad \|v_*\|_0 = 1,$$

such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\mu_k, v_k) = (\mu_*, v_*), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times E$$

Moreover, using (4.2)–(4.4) and the assumption $f_\infty = 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} v_*''(t) + \mu_* h(t) \cdot 0 &= 0, \quad t \in (0, 1), \\ v_*(0) = 0, \quad v_*(1) &= \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i v_*(\eta_i), \end{aligned}$$

and subsequently, $v_*(t) \equiv 0$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. This contradicts (4.5). Therefore

$$\sup\{\lambda \mid (\lambda, y) \in \mathcal{C}\} = \infty.$$

(b) $f_\infty \in (0, \infty)$. In this case, we show that $\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{C} \subseteq [0, \lambda_1 / f_\infty)$.

Let us rewrite (1.1)–(1.2) to the form

$$\begin{aligned} u'' + \lambda h(t)g_\infty u + \lambda h(t)\xi(u(t)) &= 0, \quad t \in (0, 1), \\ u(0) = 0, \quad u(1) &= \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i u(\eta_i), \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi(s) = g(s) - g_\infty s$. Obviously $\lim_{|s| \rightarrow \infty} \xi(s)/s = 0$. Now by the same method used to prove [6, Theorem 5.1], we may prove that \mathcal{C} joins $(0, 0)$ with $(\lambda_1/f_\infty, \infty)$.

(c) $f_\infty = \infty$. In this case, we show that \mathcal{C} joins $(0, 0)$ with $(0, \infty)$.

Let $\{(\mu_k, y_k)\} \subset \mathcal{C}$ be such that $|\mu_k| + \|y_k\| \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} y_k''(t) + \mu_k h(t)g(y_k(t)) &= 0, \quad t \in (0, 1), \\ y_k(0) = 0, \quad y_k(1) &= \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i y_k(\eta_i). \end{aligned}$$

If $\{\|y_k\|\}$ is bounded, say, $\|y_k\| \leq M_1$, for some M_1 depending not on k , then we may assume that

$$(4.6) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k = \infty.$$

Note that

$$\frac{g(y_k(t))}{y_k(t)} \geq \inf \left\{ \frac{g(s)}{s} \mid 0 < s \leq M_1 \right\} > 0.$$

By condition (A1), there exist some $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ such that $h(t) > 0$ for $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$. So, there exists a constant $M_2 > 0$, such that

$$(4.7) \quad h(t) \frac{g(y_k(t))}{y_k(t)} > M_2 > 0, \quad t \in [\alpha, \beta].$$

Combining (4.6) and (4.7) with the relation

$$(4.8) \quad y_k''(t) + \mu_k h(t) \frac{g(y_k(t))}{y_k(t)} y_k(t) = 0, \quad t \in (0, 1),$$

From [3, Theorem 6.1], we deduce that y_k must change its sign on $[\alpha, \beta]$ if k is large enough. This is a contradiction. Hence $\{\|y_k\|\}$ is unbounded.

Now, taking $\{(\mu_k, y_k)\} \subset \mathcal{C}$ be such that

$$(4.9) \quad \|y_k\| \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

We show that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k = 0$.

Suppose on the contrary that, choosing a subsequence and relabelling if necessary, $\mu_k \geq b_0$ for some constant $b_0 > 0$. Then we have from (4.9) $\|y_k\|_0 \rightarrow \infty$,

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This together with (4.2) and condition (A1) imply that there exist constants α_1, β_1 with $\sigma < \alpha_1 < \beta_1 < 1 - \sigma$, such that

$$h(t) > 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k \frac{g(y_k(t))}{y_k(t)} = \infty, \quad \text{for all } t \in [\alpha_1, \beta_1]$$

for every fixed constant $0 < \sigma < \min\{t_0, 1 - t_0\}$. Thus, we have from (4.8) and [3, Theorem 6.1] that y_k must change its sign on $[\alpha_1, \beta_1]$ if k is large enough. This is a contradiction. Therefore $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k = 0$. □

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.2. (a) and (b) are immediate consequences of Theorem 4.1(a) and (b), respectively.

To prove (c), we rewrite (1.1)–(1.2) to

$$u = \lambda \int_0^1 H(t, s)h(s)f(u(s)) ds =: T_\lambda u(t).$$

By Lemma 3.3, for every $r > 0$ and $u \in \partial\Omega_r$,

$$\|T_\lambda u\|_0 \leq \lambda \widehat{M}_r \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i} \right) \int_0^1 G(s, s)h(s) ds,$$

where $\widehat{M}_r = 1 + \max_{0 \leq s \leq r} \{f(s)\}$.

Let $\lambda_r > 0$ be such that

$$\lambda_r \widehat{M}_r \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} \alpha_i \eta_i} \right) \int_0^1 G(s, s)h(s) ds = r.$$

Then for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_r)$ and $u \in \partial\Omega_r$, $\|T_\lambda u\|_0 < \|u\|_0$. This means that

$$(4.10) \quad \Sigma \cap \{(\lambda, u) \in (0, \infty) \times K \mid 0 < \lambda < \lambda_r, u \in K : \|u\|_0 = r\} = \emptyset.$$

By Lemma 3.4 and Theorem 4.1, it follows that \mathcal{C} is also an unbounded component joining $(0, 0)$ and $(0, \infty)$ in $[0, \infty) \times Y$. Thus, (4.10) implies that for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_r)$, (1.1)–(1.2) has at least two positive solutions. □

Acknowledgements. The authors are very grateful to the anonymous referees for their valuable suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. DANCER, *Global solutions branches for positive maps*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **55** (1974), 207–213.
- [2] K. DEIMLING, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [3] Z. DENG, *Introduction to BVPs and Sturmian Comparison Theory for Ordinary Differential Equations*, Central China Normal University Press, 1987. (in Chinese)
- [4] M. K. KWONG AND J. S. W. WONG, *The shooting method and nonhomogeneous multi-point BVPs of second-order ODE*, Boundary Value Problems (2007), pp. 16.
- [5] R. MA, *Existence of positive solutions for superlinear semipositone m -point boundary value problems*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. **46** (2003), 279–292.

- [6] R. MA AND D. O'REGAN, *Nodal solutions for second-order m -point boundary value problems with nonlinearities across several eigenvalues*, *Nonlinear Anal.* **64** (2006), 1562–1577.
- [7] B. P. RYNNE, *Global bifurcation for $2m$ th-order boundary value problems and infinitely many solutions of superlinear problems*, *J. Differential Equations* **188** (2003), 461–472.
- [8] J. R. L. WEBB, *Positive solutions of some three point boundary value problems via fixed point index theory*, *Nonlinear Anal.* **47** (2001), 4319–4332.
- [9] G. T. WHYBURN, *Topological Analysis*, Princeton Math. Ser., vol. 23, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1958.
- [10] E. ZEIDLER, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and its Applications*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.

Manuscript received August 30, 2008

RUYUN MA
Department of Mathematics
Northwest Normal University
Lanzhou 730070, P.R. CHINA
E-mail address: mary@nwnu.edu.cn

YULIAN AN
Department of Mathematics
Northwest Normal University
Lanzhou 730070, P.R. CHINA
and
Department of Mathematics
Lanzhou Jiaotong University
Lanzhou 730070, P.R. CHINA
E-mail address: an.yulian@tom.com