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# BIFURCATION OF POSITIVE SOLUTIONS FOR A SEMILINEAR EQUATION WITH CRITICAL SOBOLEV EXPONENT 

YUANJI CHENG


#### Abstract

In this note we consider bifurcation of positive solutions to the semilinear elliptic boundary-value problem with critical Sobolev exponent $$
\begin{gathered} -\Delta u=\lambda u-\alpha u^{p}+u^{2^{*}-1}, \quad u>0, \quad \text { in } \Omega, \\ u=0, \quad \text { on } \partial \Omega . \end{gathered}
$$ where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}, n \geq 3$ is a bounded $C^{2}$-domain $\lambda>\lambda_{1}, 1<p<2^{*}-1=$ $\frac{n+2}{n-2}$ and $\alpha>0$ is a bifurcation parameter. Brezis and Nirenberg [2] showed that a lower order (non-negative) perturbation can contribute to regain the compactness and whence yields existence of solutions. We study the equation with an indefinite perturbation and prove a bifurcation result of two solutions for this equation.


## 1. Introduction and main result

It is well known that the following equation with a critical exponent has no solution on the star-shaped domains, [12],

$$
\begin{gather*}
-\Delta u=u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \quad \text { in } \Omega \\
u=0, \quad \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{1.1}
\end{gather*}
$$

due to the lack of compactness in the embedding $H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L_{\frac{2 n}{n-2}}(\Omega)$. In their seminal work [2, Brezis and Nirenberg show that perturbation by a lower order term suffices to regain the compactness and hence existence of a solution. Consider particularly for the following equation

$$
\begin{gather*}
-\Delta u=\lambda u+u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \quad u>0 \quad \text { in } \Omega  \tag{1.2}\\
u=0, \quad \text { on } \partial \Omega
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\lambda$ is considered as a bifurcation parameter, let $\lambda_{1}>0$ be the first eigenvalue of Laplacian with a Dirichlet boundary, then they show the following result.

Theorem $1.1\left([2)\right.$. There is a constant $\lambda^{*} \in\left[0, \lambda_{1}\right)$, such that $\sqrt{1.2}$ has a solution if $\lambda \in\left(\lambda^{*}, \lambda_{1}\right)$ and has no solution, if $\lambda \geq \lambda_{1}$.

[^0]Thereafter, there are many papers devoted to study of problems with critical Sobolev exponent (see [9, 14] and references therein). Effects of concave and convex combination on bifurcation have been studied in [1, 4, 5, 6, 15]. In this paper we consider the equation with an indefinite lower order perturbation. For simplicity consider the prototype equation

$$
\begin{gather*}
-\Delta u=\lambda u-\alpha u^{p}+u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \quad u>0, \quad \text { in } \Omega,  \tag{1.3}\\
u=0, \quad \text { on } \partial \Omega,
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\lambda$ is a fixed positive constant, and $\alpha>0$ is considered as a bifurcation parameter. The main result of this note is the the following theorem showing the existence of two solutions.

Theorem 1.2. If $\lambda>\lambda_{1}$ and $3 \leq n \leq 5,1<p<4 /(n-2)$, then there is $a$ constant $\alpha_{0}>0$ such that (1.3) has at least two solutions for $\alpha>\alpha_{0}$ and has no solution if $\alpha<\alpha_{0}$


Figure 1. Bifurcation diagram of (1.3)

## 2. Auxiliary lemmas

In this section we establish some estimates which are needed in the proof of Theorem 1.2 Without loss of generality, we assume that the domain $\Omega$ contains the origin and choose $R>0$ small enough so that $\{x:|x| \leq 2 R\} \subset \Omega$. Let $\psi(x)$ be a cut-off function such that

$$
\psi(x) \equiv \begin{cases}1, & |x| \leq R \\ 0, & |x| \geq 2 R\end{cases}
$$

and $N=\sqrt{n(n-2)}$. Also let

$$
u_{\varepsilon}(x)=\psi(x) u_{0 \varepsilon}(x), \quad u_{0 \varepsilon}(x)=\left(\frac{N \varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{2}+|x|^{2}}\right)^{(n-2) / 2}
$$

Then $\left\|\nabla u_{0 \varepsilon}\right\|_{2}^{2}=S^{n / 2}=\left\|u_{0 \varepsilon}\right\|_{2^{*}}^{2^{*}}$ for all $\varepsilon>0$. The following estimates will be needed in the proof of Theorem 1.2.
Lemma 2.1. The following estimates hold for some constant $K=K(q)>0$
(a) $\left\|\nabla u_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{2}^{2}=S^{n / 2}+O\left(\varepsilon^{n-2}\right)$
(b) $\left\|u_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{2^{*}}^{2^{*}}=S^{n / 2}+O\left(\varepsilon^{n}\right)$
(c) $1 \leq q<2^{*}$,

$$
\left\|u_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{q}^{q} \begin{cases}=K \varepsilon^{\frac{2 n-(n-2) q}{2}}+O\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{(n-2) q}{2}}\right), & q>n /(n-2) \\ =\varepsilon^{n / 2}(K|\ln \varepsilon|+O(1)), & \\ \approx=n /(n-2) \\ \approx \varepsilon^{(n-2) q / 2}, & \\ (n<n /(n-2) .\end{cases}
$$

Proof. The estimate in (a) and (b) are known. Estimate (c) can be shown similarly as in [9, 14].
Lemma 2.2. There are constants $\beta, \beta_{1}, \beta_{2}>0$ such that the following inequalities hold for all $a, b \geq 0$
(1) $p \geq 2, \beta_{1}\left(a^{p-1} b+a b^{p-1}\right) \geq(a+b)^{p}-a^{p}-b^{p} \geq \beta_{2}\left(a^{p-1} b+a b^{p-1}\right)$.
(2) $p \in(1,2),(a+b)^{p}-a^{p}-b^{p} \leq \beta a^{p-1} b$.

Proof. The inequalities follow from the facts that $h(t)=\frac{(1+t)^{p}-1-t^{p}}{t+t^{p-1}} \rightarrow p$ as either $t \rightarrow 0+$ or $t \rightarrow+\infty ; h_{0}(t)=\frac{(1+t)^{p}-1-t^{p}}{t} \rightarrow p$ as $t \rightarrow 0+$ and $h_{0}(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow+\infty$.

We would like to point out here that if $1<p<2$ then there is no constant $\beta>0$ such that the following estimate holds for all $a, b \geq 0$,

$$
(a+b)^{p} \geq a^{p}+b^{p}+\beta a^{p-1} b
$$

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Now we consider

$$
\begin{gather*}
-\Delta u=\lambda u-\alpha u^{p}+u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \quad u>0, \quad \text { in } \Omega  \tag{3.1}\\
u=0, \quad \text { on } \partial \Omega
\end{gather*}
$$

We first observe that for small $\alpha>0$ there is no solution for (3.1) by comparison, because $f(u):=\lambda u-\alpha u^{p}+u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}$ satisfies the inequality $f(u)>\lambda_{1} u$ on $(0, \infty)$. On the other hand, if $\alpha$ is big enough, then $f(u)$ vanishes somewhere on $(0, \infty)$ and whence a constant $u_{+}(x)=M$ suffices for a super-solution. To find a sub-solution, we can take $u_{-}(x)=t \phi_{1}(x)>0$, where $\phi_{1}(x)>0$ is the normalized eigenfunction associated to $\lambda_{1}$, because
$-\Delta\left(t \phi_{1}\right)-\lambda\left(t \phi_{1}\right)+\alpha\left(t \phi_{1}\right)^{p}-\left(t \phi_{1}\right)^{2^{*}-1}=t\left(\lambda_{1}-\lambda\right) \phi_{1}+\alpha\left(t \phi_{1}\right)^{p}-\left(t \phi_{1}\right)^{2^{*}-1}<0$.
Thus by the sub- and super-solution method, there is a solution for (3.1). Furthermore for given $\alpha_{0}>0$ if the problem (3.1) has a solution $u_{\alpha_{0}}$, we shall show then for any $\alpha>\alpha_{0}$ the problem (3.1) has also a solution. Clearly $u_{\alpha_{0}}$ is a super-solution for (3.1), because

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\Delta u_{\alpha_{0}}-\lambda u_{\alpha_{0}}+\alpha u_{\alpha_{0}}^{p}-u_{\alpha_{0}}^{2^{*}-1}=\left(\alpha-\alpha_{0}\right) u_{\alpha_{0}}^{p}>0 \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and moreover $t \phi_{1}(x)$ still suffices as a sub-solution. Further, by the Hopf's lemma $\frac{\partial u_{\alpha_{0}}}{\partial \nu}>0$ on $\partial \Omega$, we deduce that $t \phi_{1}(x)<u_{\alpha_{0}}(x)$ on the whole domain $\Omega$ and
thus again via sub- and super-solution method we obtain a solution $u_{\alpha}(x)$ for (3.1), where $u_{\alpha}(x)$ is a minimizer of

$$
J(u)=\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^{2}-\frac{\lambda}{2} u^{2}+\frac{\alpha}{p+1}|u|^{p+1}+\frac{1}{2^{*}}|u|^{2^{*}} d x
$$

over the convex set $K=\left\{u \in H_{0}^{1}(\Omega): t \phi_{1}(x) \leq u(x) \leq u_{\alpha_{0}}(x)\right.$ a. e. in $\left.\Omega\right\}$. Furthermore, since $t \phi_{1}, u_{\alpha_{0}}$ are not solutions of $(3)_{\alpha}$, we deduce that $t \phi_{1}(x)<$ $u(x)<u_{\alpha_{0}}(x)$ on $\Omega$. If we choose $k>0$ large then $(\lambda+k) u-\alpha u^{p}+u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}$ will be increasing on $(0, \infty)$ and whence we deduce from [3, Theorem 2] that $u_{\alpha}$ is a local minimizer for $J$ in $H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$-topology.

We now define $\alpha_{0}$ to be the infimum of all $\alpha>0$ such that (3.1) has a solution, then we infer that $\alpha_{0}>0$ is an finite number, and it remains to show that for all $\alpha>\alpha_{0}$ there are two solutions for (3.1).

Let $\alpha>\alpha_{0}$ be given, and $u_{\alpha}$ be the solution of (3.1) obtained by the sub- and super-solution method. To establish the second solution we exploit the truncation and translation technique and define $v=u-u_{\alpha}$ and

$$
g(x, v)= \begin{cases}\lambda v-\alpha\left(\left(v+u_{\alpha}\right)^{p}-u_{\alpha}^{p}\right)+\left(v+u_{\alpha}\right)^{2^{*}-1}-u_{\alpha}^{2^{*}-1} & v \geq 0 \\ 0 & v<0\end{cases}
$$

In the sequel we shall study the boundary-value problem

$$
\begin{align*}
-\Delta v & =g(x, v) \quad \text { in } \Omega \\
v & =0 \quad \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{3.4}
\end{align*}
$$

First we notice that any nontrivial solution $v$ of (3.4 must be non-negative and then by the strong maximal principle it should be strictly positive on $\Omega$. Whence if $v \neq 0$ is a solution of $(3.4)$, then $u=v+u_{\alpha}$ will be a positive solution to the problem (3.1), which is bigger than $u_{\alpha}$.

We will exploit the critical point method and whence will study the associated functional to the problem (3.4),

$$
E(v)=\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2}|\nabla v|^{2}-G(x, v), \quad G(x, v)=\int_{0}^{v} g(x, t) d x .
$$

Given any $v \in H$, decomposed into positive part $v_{+}$, and negative part $v_{-}$, then we test the equation (3.1) for the solution $u_{\alpha}$ by $v_{+}$and obtain

$$
\int_{\Omega} \nabla u_{\alpha} \cdot \nabla v_{+}=\int_{\Omega}\left(\lambda u_{\alpha}-\alpha u_{\alpha}^{p}+u_{\alpha}^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}\right) v_{+} .
$$

Furthermore we obtain the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
E(v)=J\left(v_{+}+u_{\alpha}\right)-J\left(u_{\alpha}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left\|v_{-}\right\|^{2} \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which shows that zero is even a local minimizer for $E$.
Lemma 3.1. The equation (3.4) satisfies the Palais-Smale condition (P.S.) c for any $c \in\left(0, \frac{1}{n} S^{n / 2}\right)$.

Proof. Arguments in [14, Lemma 2.3] works also here.
By the min-max principle, if we can find $v>0$ such that

$$
c=\inf _{\phi \in \Gamma} \max \{E(\phi(t)): t \in[0,1]\}
$$

is finite and $E$ satisfies the local Palais-Smale condition (P.S.) ${ }_{c}$, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Gamma=\{\phi \in C([0,1], H): \phi(0)=0, \phi(1)=v\} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

then there is a critical point $u$ of $E$ at level $c$. It follows from (3.5) that $c \geq 0$. If $c>0$, then we will have a nontrivial solution $u$. If $c=0$, then by [7, Theorem 5.10], see also [8, 10], we deduce that there is a continua of minimizers $u^{\varepsilon}(x), \varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right)$ such that $E\left(u^{\varepsilon}\right)=E\left(u_{\alpha}\right)$. So we are also done even in this case.

To find the function $v$ in (3.6), we shall test $v=t u_{\varepsilon}$. For $n=3$, we may assume $p \in(2,3)$ then we have $2^{*}=6, \frac{n}{n-2}=3$ and by Lemma 2.2 we obtain

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left(v+u_{\alpha}\right)^{2^{*}-1}-u_{\alpha}^{2^{*}-1} \geq v^{5}+4 v^{4} u_{\alpha} \\
\left(v+u_{\alpha}\right)^{p}-u_{\alpha}^{p} \leq v^{p}+\beta_{1}\left(v^{p-1} u_{\alpha}+v u_{\alpha}^{p-1}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

and consequently

$$
G(x, v) \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} v^{2}-\alpha\left(\frac{1}{p+1} v^{p+1}+\beta\left(\frac{1}{2} v^{2} u_{\alpha}^{p-1}+\frac{1}{p} v^{p} u_{\alpha}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{6} v^{6}+\frac{\beta_{2}}{5} v^{5} u_{\alpha}
$$

Since $u_{\alpha}$ is strictly positive on $\Omega$, so there are constants $C_{1} \geq C_{2}>0$ such that $C_{1} \geq u_{\alpha}(x) \geq C_{2}$, for all $x \in \Omega,|x| \leq 2 R$. We deduce that for some constants $C_{3}, C_{4}>0$,

$$
E\left(t u_{\varepsilon}\right) \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{t^{2}}{2}\left|\nabla u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}+C_{4}\left(t^{2} u_{\varepsilon}^{2}+t^{p} u_{\varepsilon}^{p}+t^{p+1} u_{\varepsilon}^{p+1}\right)-C_{3} t^{5} u_{\varepsilon}^{5}-\frac{t^{6}}{6} u_{\varepsilon}^{6}
$$

In view of lemma 2.1 , we obtain

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left\|u_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{2}^{2} \leq A \varepsilon, \quad\left\|u_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{p}^{p} \leq A \varepsilon^{p / 2}, \quad\left\|u_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{p+1}^{p+1}=K(p+1) \varepsilon^{(5-p) / 2}+O\left(\varepsilon^{(p+1) / 2}\right) \\
\left\|u_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{5}^{5}=K(3.3) \sqrt{\varepsilon}+O\left(\varepsilon^{5 / 2}\right), \quad\left\|u_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{6}^{6}=S^{3 / 2}+O\left(\varepsilon^{3}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left(t u_{\varepsilon}\right) \leq & \frac{t^{2}}{2}\left(S^{3 / 2}+O(\varepsilon)\right)+C_{4}\left(t^{2} A \varepsilon+t^{p} A \varepsilon^{p / 2}+t^{p+1}\left(K(p+1) \varepsilon^{\frac{5-p}{2}}+O\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{p+1}{2}}\right)\right)\right) \\
& -t^{5} C_{3}\left(K(5) \sqrt{\varepsilon}+O\left(\varepsilon^{5 / 2}\right)\right)-\frac{t^{6}}{6}\left(S^{3 / 2}+O\left(\varepsilon^{3}\right)\right):=h_{3}(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

The function $h_{3}(t)$ attains its maximum on $(0, \infty)$ at $t_{\max 3}:=1-\frac{5 K(3.3) C_{3}}{4 S^{3 / 2}} \sqrt{\varepsilon}+$ $o(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. Moreover $h_{3}\left(t_{\max 3}\right)=\frac{1}{3} S^{3 / 2}-C_{3} K(3.3) \sqrt{\varepsilon}+o(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. Therefore, we deduce that for $\varepsilon>0$ enough small

$$
c=\inf _{\phi \in \Gamma} \max \{E(\phi(t)): t \in[0,1]\} \leq h_{3}\left(t_{\max 3}\right)<\frac{1}{3} S^{3 / 2}
$$

and obtain via the mountain pass theorem that (3.4) admits a positive solution $u$. The proof is complete for the case of dimension 3.

If $n=4$ or 5 , then by the assumption $p<4 /(n-2) \leq 2$ and thus it follows from the lemma 2.2 that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left(v+u_{\alpha}\right)^{p}-u_{\alpha}^{p} \leq v^{p}+\beta v u_{\alpha} ; \quad\left(v+u_{\alpha}\right)^{2^{*}-1}-u_{\alpha}^{2^{*}-1} \geq v^{2^{*}-1}+\beta_{2} v^{2^{*}-2} u_{\alpha}, \\
g(x, v) \geq \lambda v-\alpha\left(v^{p}+\beta v u_{\alpha}^{p-1}\right)+v^{2^{*}-1}+\beta_{2} v^{2^{*}-2} u_{\alpha}
\end{gathered}
$$

and consequently

$$
\begin{gathered}
G(x, v) \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} v^{2}-\alpha\left(\frac{1}{p+1} v^{p+1}+\frac{\beta}{2} v^{2} u_{\alpha}^{p-1}\right)+\frac{1}{2^{*}} v^{2^{*}}+\frac{\beta_{2}}{2^{*}-1} v^{2^{*}-1} u_{\alpha} \\
E(v) \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2}|\nabla v|^{2}-\left(\frac{\lambda}{2} v^{2}-\alpha\left(\frac{1}{p+1} v^{p+1}+\frac{\beta}{2} v^{2} u_{\alpha}^{p-1}\right)+\frac{1}{2^{*}} v^{2^{*}}+\frac{\beta_{2}}{2^{*}-1} v^{2^{*}-1} u_{\alpha}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

In analogy as the case $n=3$, we deduce that for some constants $C_{3}, C_{4}>0$.

$$
E\left(t u_{\varepsilon}\right) \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{t^{2}}{2}\left|\nabla u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}+C_{4}\left(t^{2} u_{\varepsilon}^{2}+t^{p+1} u_{\varepsilon}^{p+1}\right)-C_{3} t^{2^{*}-1} u_{\varepsilon}^{2^{*}-1}-\frac{t^{2^{*}}}{2^{*}} u_{\varepsilon}^{2^{*}}
$$

For $n=4$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left(t u_{\varepsilon}\right) \leq & \frac{t^{2}}{2}\left(S^{2}+0\left(\varepsilon^{2}\right)\right)+C_{4}\left(t ^ { 2 } \left(\varepsilon^{2}(K(2)|\ln \varepsilon|+O(1))+t^{p+1}\left(K(p+1) \varepsilon^{3-p}\right.\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.+O\left(\varepsilon^{p+1}\right)\right)\right)-t^{3} C_{3}\left(K(3) \varepsilon+O\left(\varepsilon^{3}\right)\right)-\frac{t^{4}}{4}\left(S^{2}+O\left(\varepsilon^{4}\right)\right):=h_{4}(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $h_{4}(t)$ attains its maximum on $(0, \infty)$ at $t_{\max 4}:=1-\frac{3 K(3) C_{3}}{2 S^{2}} \varepsilon+o(\varepsilon)$, which satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S^{2}+O\left(\varepsilon^{2}\right)+C_{4}\left(2 \varepsilon^{2}(K(2)|\ln \varepsilon|+O(1))+t^{p-1}(p+1)\left(K(p+1) \varepsilon^{3-p}+O\left(\varepsilon^{p+1}\right)\right)\right) \\
& =t 3 C_{3}\left(K(3) \varepsilon+O\left(\varepsilon^{3}\right)\right)+t^{2}\left(S^{2}+O\left(\varepsilon^{4}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and moreover $h_{4}\left(t_{\max 4}\right)=\frac{1}{4} S^{2}-C_{3} K(3) \varepsilon+o(\varepsilon)<\frac{1}{4} S^{2}$, for sufficient small $\varepsilon>0$. So we are done in this case.

If $n=5$, we obtain in a similar way that

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left(t u_{\varepsilon}\right) \leq & \frac{t^{2}}{2}\left(S^{5 / 2}+O\left(\varepsilon^{3}\right)\right)+C_{4}\left(t^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{2} K(2)+O\left(\varepsilon^{3}\right)\right)+t^{p+1}\left(K(p+1) \varepsilon^{(7-3 p) / 2}\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.+O\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{3(p+1)}{2}}\right)\right)\right)-t^{\frac{7}{3}} C_{3}\left(K\left(\frac{7}{3}\right) \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}+O\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{7}{2}}\right)\right)-\frac{3 t^{\frac{10}{3}}}{10}\left(S^{\frac{5}{2}}+O\left(\varepsilon^{5}\right)\right):=h_{5}(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

Because $p<4 / 3$, we see that $(7-3 p) / 2>3 / 2$ and whence $h_{5}(t)$ attends its maximum on $(0, \infty)$ at $t_{\max 5}:=1-\frac{7 K(7 / 3) C_{3}}{4 S^{5 / 2}} \varepsilon^{3 / 2}+o\left(\varepsilon^{3 / 2}\right)$, which satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S^{5 / 2}+C_{4}\left(2 \varepsilon^{2} K(2)+O\left(\varepsilon^{3}\right)+(p+1) t^{p-1}\left(K(p+1) \varepsilon^{3-p}+O\left(\varepsilon^{p+1}\right)\right)\right) \\
& =\frac{7}{3} C_{3} t^{1 / 3}\left(K(7 / 3) \varepsilon^{3 / 2}+O\left(\varepsilon^{7 / 2}\right)\right)+t^{4 / 3}\left(S^{5 / 2}+O\left(\varepsilon^{5}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover $h_{5}\left(t_{\max 5}\right)=\frac{1}{5} S^{5 / 2}-C_{3} K(7 / 3) \varepsilon^{3 / 2}+o\left(\varepsilon^{3 / 2}\right)<\frac{1}{5} S^{5 / 2}$, for sufficient small $\varepsilon>0$. So the proof is complete in this case.

## 4. An example

In this part we show a numerical result of solutions for an equation on the the unite ball in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. we consider an equation with a critical exponent $\Omega=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{3}\right.$ : $\|x\|<1\}$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
-\Delta u(x)=4 \pi u(x)-\alpha u^{2}(x)+u^{5}(x), \quad\|x\|<1 \\
u(x)=0, \quad\|x\|=1
\end{gathered}
$$

By Gidas, Ni and Nirenberg [11], any positive solution must be radial symmetric, i.e. $u(x)=u(r), r=\|x\|$ and thus satisfies ordinary differential equation

$$
\begin{gathered}
-\left(r^{2} u^{\prime}(r)\right)^{\prime}=r^{2}\left(4 \pi u(r)-\alpha u^{2}(r)+u^{5}(r)\right), \quad r \in(0,1), \\
u^{\prime}(0)=0, \quad u(1)=0 .
\end{gathered}
$$

By a numerical simulation for $\alpha=7.5$, we find two positive solutions, where their maxima of the solutions are $u_{1}(0)=0.575$ and $u_{2}(0)=3.44$.


Figure 2. Numerical simulation of solutions on unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$
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