

ON THE CRITICAL POINTS OF SOLUTIONS OF ROBIN BOUNDARY PROBLEMS

FABIO DE REGIBUS AND MASSIMO GROSSI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we prove the uniqueness of the critical point for *stable* solutions of the Robin problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f(u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ \partial_\nu u + \beta u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is a smooth and bounded domain with strictly positive curvature of the boundary, $f \geq 0$ is a smooth function and $\beta > 0$. Moreover, for β large the result fails as soon as the domain is no more convex, even if it is very close to be: indeed, in this case it is possible to find solutions with an arbitrary large number of critical points.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

Let Ω be a smooth, bounded and simply connected domain of \mathbb{R}^2 . We are interested on the number of critical points of the solutions u_β of the following semilinear elliptic problem with Robin boundary conditions

$$(P_\beta) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = f(u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \partial_\nu u + \beta u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function, ν denotes the other unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ is a positive parameter.

This is a classical problem in partial differential equations and it is well known that the shape of the solutions is strongly influenced by the geometry of the domain Ω and, of course, by the nonlinearity f .

A first interesting result linking the geometry and the topology of the domain with the geometry of the solution u can be deduced from the Poincaré-Hopf Theorem, for instance see [22]. In particular it follows that if u is a positive solution of $-\Delta u = f(u)$ such that $\partial_\nu u \neq 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, with isolated critical points x_1, \dots, x_k , then one can prove

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \text{ind}(\nabla u, x_i) = (-1)^N \chi(\Omega),$$

where $\chi(\Omega)$ is the Euler characteristic of Ω . Recall that if y is an isolated zero of a vector field T then we denote by $\text{ind}(T, y) := \text{deg}(T, B_r(y), \mathbf{0})$ the Browner degree of T in a ball centered in y of radius $r > 0$ small enough (let

This work was supported by INdAM-GNAMPA. F.D.R. has been supported by the Juan de la Cierva fellowship Grant JDC2022-048890-I funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by the “European Union NextGenerationEU/PRTR”.

us point out that the previous formula is general and does not depend on the fact that u is a solution of an elliptic equation). Furthermore, it is natural to ask when the sum reduces to a minimal number of elements. Hence, if Ω is a contractible domain we have $\chi(\Omega) = 1$ and then the question becomes to investigate under which conditions uniqueness of the critical point holds or not.

We start by recalling some result in the Dirichlet case. Here the literature is very wide and it is impossible to give a complete list of references, so we mainly focus on the results which are more strictly related to the rest of the paper.

A first important result has been proved by Makar-Limanov for the torsion problem, i.e. $f \equiv 1$. In [20], it is proved that if Ω is a convex domain in \mathbb{R}^2 , then the solution of the torsion problem has a unique nondegenerate critical point. Moreover, as mentioned in [19], the $1/2$ strict concavity of the solution is proved, i.e. $u^{1/2}$ is a concave function.

A similar result is true for the first Dirichlet eigenfunction, $f(u) = \lambda u$, as it was proved by Brascamp and Lieb [6] (see also the paper by Acker, Payne and Philippin [1]). In this case the solution turns out to be log-concave, that is $\log(u)$ is concave. In particular, in both cases we have that the superlevel sets $\{u > c\}$ are convex.

A very general result on the uniqueness of the critical point of solutions can be deduced from the seminal paper [13] by Gidas, Ni and Nirenberg. Indeed, if f is a Lipschitz continuous function and $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ is a smooth and bounded domain which is symmetric with respect to the hyperplanes $x_i = 0$ for any $i = 1, \dots, N$ and convex with respect to any direction x_1, \dots, x_N , then u has exactly one critical point and moreover the superlevel sets are star-shaped with respect to the origin (but in general they are not convex, see the work by Hamel, Nadirashvili and Sire [18]).

To remove the symmetry assumptions on Ω , keeping f very general is an hard task. A very interesting contribution in this direction is the result in [7] by Cabré and Chanillo, where the uniqueness of the critical point is proved for stable solutions in convex planar domains with strictly positive curvature of the boundary $\partial\Omega$. We recall that a solution u is said to be *stable* if the linearized operator at u is non negative definite. The theorem has been extended to the case of vanishing curvature in [12]. We point out that it is still an open problem to prove if the superlevel sets of stable solutions are convex or not, see [18] again. The preceding results had been extended also to the case of manifolds, see the recent paper [17].

All the results mentioned before hold in convex domains and it is well known that, in general, we cannot expect uniqueness of the critical point in non convex domains, as shown for example by the case of the torsion problem in a dumbbell domain (see for instance [24]). Sometimes, it is still possible to recover uniqueness of the critical point in non convex domain, under suitable assumptions, see for instance [5] and [16].

Also in the case Ω is "not far" from being convex and the minimum of the curvature of $\partial\Omega$ is very close to 0 the situation may change drastically: indeed, not only the uniqueness of the critical point is lost, but it is not

even possible to have a bound on the number of critical points, see [15].

In the case of Robin boundary conditions there are no many results, to our knowledge. The first one we want to mention is due to Sakaguchi in [23]. Here, uniqueness of the critical point is proved for solutions of (P_β) if one assumes that the nonlinearity f satisfies $f' \leq 0$ and $f(0) < 0$. As a particular case, the author also shows the result for the solution of the torsion problem $f \equiv 1$.

In this last case it is also possible to see that, if β is large enough (i.e. if we are close to the Dirichlet case), u_β is strictly $1/2$ -concave as proved by Crasta and Fragalà in [10]. They also show that the first Robin eigenfunction of the Laplacian is strictly log-concave, again for β large. In particular this implies¹ the uniqueness of the critical point for large values of β .

It is interesting to point out here that log-concavity of the first Robin eigenfunction of the Laplacian is no more true if β is close to 0, that is if we are close to the Neumann case. This has been proved by Andrews, Clutterbuck and Hauer in [2].

In this paper we want to study the number critical point of stable solutions of problem (P_β) , extending Cabré and Chanillo's result in [7] from the Dirichlet to the Robin case. Let us mention that in general there is no hope to cover also the Neumann case, see Remark 1.6.

Finally, we show that as soon as the domain is no more convex, even if very close to be, uniqueness of the critical point is lost for β large, as in the Dirichlet case.

Before stating our main result, let us recall the definition of stable solution for the case of Robin boundary conditions.

Definition 1.1. u_β solution of problem (P_β) is said to be *stable* if the linearized operator at u_β is nonnegative definite, i.e. if for all $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$ one has

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi^2 d\sigma - \int_{\Omega} f'(u_\beta) |\varphi|^2 dx \geq 0.$$

We can now state the main result of the paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ be a smooth and bounded domain such that the curvature κ of its boundary is strictly positive, i.e. $\kappa > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $f \geq 0$ not identically equal to 0. Assume that there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\beta > \beta_0$, problem (P_β) has a stable solution u_β that satisfies*

$$(1.1) \quad \|u_\beta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C,$$

for some $C := C(\beta_0) > 0$. Then, for all $\beta > \beta_0$, u_β has a unique critical point, which is a nondegenerate maximum.

¹note that with the notation in [10] log-concavity means that $\log(u_\beta)$ has positive definite Hessian matrix and in particular this implies uniqueness of the critical point for u_β .

Remark 1.2. We would like to emphasize that the previous result is not obtained by perturbing the corresponding Dirichlet problem when $\beta \rightarrow \infty$. On the contrary, it holds for every positive β as soon as (1.1) holds.

Next we state as a corollary some very important cases where the preceding theorem applies. Indeed, under the assumptions stated below, it is possible to show that for all $\beta_0 > 0$ there exists $C := C(\beta_0) > 0$ such that

$$\|u_\beta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C,$$

that is assumption (1.1) in Theorem 1.1 is satisfied.

Corollary 1.3. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ be a smooth and bounded domain such that the curvature κ of its boundary is strictly positive, i.e. $\kappa > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Assume f satisfies one of the following*

- (i) $f(t) = \lambda_\beta t$ where $\lambda_\beta := \lambda_\beta(\Omega)$ is the first Robin eigenvalue in Ω ;
- (ii) $f(t) \equiv 1$;
- (iii) $f(t) = \lambda g(t)$ where g is a smooth function that satisfies $g(0) > 0$, $g'(t) > 0$, for all $t \geq 0$, and $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_D^*)$, where $\lambda_D^* := \lambda_D^*(\Omega) > 0$ is a constant depending only on the domain Ω .

If (i) or (ii) hold true, then the solution u_β of problem (P_β) has a unique critical point, which is a nondegenerate maximum, for all $\beta > 0$. If (iii) is satisfied the same conclusion holds provided u_β is a minimal solution (see Theorem 3.3).

Remark 1.4. (i) We recall that in the case of the Robin torsion function the result is not new, since it follows from [23, Theorem 2].
(ii) Typical examples of f satisfying (iii) are the model nonlinearities $f(t) = \lambda e^t$ or $f(t) = \lambda(1+t)^p$, $p > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$. We refer to Section 3.4 for more details.

Remark 1.5. As can be deduced from Corollary 1.3, it is possible to see that uniqueness of the critical point can be verified for any value of $\beta > 0$: indeed in all of the cases (i)-(iii) in Corollary 1.3, the assumption (1.1) can be verified for all $\beta_0 > 0$, see Section 3 for the details.

Moreover, note that, if for instance $f \equiv 1$, (1.1) holds for all $\beta_0 > 0$, but it is easy to see that that $C(\beta_0) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\beta_0 \rightarrow 0$ as shown in [25, Theorem 1].

Remark 1.6. We would like to point out that even in the cases where uniqueness of the critical point holds for any $\beta > 0$, it is not possible to extend the result to the case of the Neumann boundary condition

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

that is $\beta = 0$ in (P_β) . Indeed it is a famous result of Casten and Holland [9] and Matano [21] that, in this case, non constant stable solutions do not exist in convex domains.

Remark 1.7. Finally, we remark that the claim of Corollary 1.3, and in turn the one of Theorem 1.1, is no longer true as soon as the domain is no more convex, even if it is very close to be. Indeed, in this case it is possible to find solutions with an arbitrary large number of critical points

for β large. We refer to Remarks 3.2 and 3.4 in Section 3 for further details. It remains to treat the case of general convex domains where the curvature could vanish somewhere.

The key point in the proof of Theorem 1.1 consists in proving that for any $\beta > \beta_0$ all the critical points of u_β are nondegenerate, see Corollary 2.10 and then by mean of a topological degree argument it is not hard to conclude that u_β has the same number of critical points of a solution of the corresponding Dirichlet problem, which, from the previous discussion, it is known to be exactly one.

Finally, to prove Corollary 1.3 we show that assumption (1.1) can be verified for all $\beta_0 > 0$ and then, as a consequence, it is possible to desume the uniqueness of the critical point for all $\beta > 0$.

The paper is organized as follows: in the next section we state and prove the convergence result to the solution of the corresponding Dirichlet problem, see Theorem 2.1, and then we prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 3 we deal with cases (i)-(iii) of Corollary 1.3.

2. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. To this end we firstly show that for $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$ the solutions u_β converge to the one of the corresponding Dirichlet problem. This is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, for $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$ one has*

$$u_\beta \rightarrow u_D, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}),$$

for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and where u_D is a positive and stable solution of the associated Dirichlet problem

$$(P_D) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_D = f(u_D) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u_D = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The proof of this result can be deduced as the one of [10, Theorem 2.1], up to small modifications. For the sake of completeness we report it here below.

Remark 2.2. As can be easily deduced from the proof, the theorem holds in a more general setting: indeed the convexity assumption on Ω does not play any role and it is possible to prove it in any dimension.

The rest of the section is organized as follows: we start by proving Theorem 2.1 and giving some preliminary result, finally in Subsection 2.2 we are able to prove Theorem 1.1.

2.1. Preliminary results. Let us start with the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. For all $\beta > \beta_0$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{\beta}|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |u_{\beta}|^2 dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{\beta}|^2 dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} |u_{\beta}|^2 d\sigma + \int_{\Omega} |u_{\beta}|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} f(u_{\beta}) u_{\beta} dx + \int_{\Omega} |u_{\beta}|^2 dx \\ &\leq C_{\beta_0} \max_{[0, C_{\beta_0}]} |f| |\Omega| + C_{\beta_0}^2 |\Omega|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can apply [10, Theorem 2.2] and in turn the classical Sobolev embedding theorems to obtain

$$(2.1) \quad \|u_{\beta}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C,$$

for some $C := C(\beta_0) > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Eventually up to consider a smaller α and to pass to a suitable subsequence, Ascoli-Arzelà Theorem gives

$$u_{\beta} \rightarrow u, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}) \text{ as } \beta \rightarrow +\infty.$$

It is then trivial to see that u satisfies the equation $-\Delta u = f(u)$ and that for all $x \in \partial\Omega$

$$u(x) = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} u_{\beta}(x) = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{\partial_{\nu} u_{\beta}(x)}{\beta} = 0.$$

To conclude the proof it is enough to observe that $u > 0$ in Ω by the Maximum Principle and that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^{\infty}(\Omega)$ one has

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi^2 d\sigma \geq \int_{\Omega} f'(u_{\beta}) |\varphi|^2 dx, \quad \forall \beta > \beta_0.$$

Then the stability of u is proved once we pass to the limit in the preceding equation. \square

Estimate (2.1) in the proof of Theorem 2.1 will be useful in the sequel so that we write it here as a different proposition.

Proposition 2.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 one has*

$$\|u_{\beta}\|_{\mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad \text{for all } \beta > \beta_0,$$

for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and some $C := C(\beta_0) > 0$.

The next lemma is nothing else than maximum principle and Hopf's boundary point lemma. The proof can be found for instance in [23], but we report it here for completeness.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ be a smooth and bounded domain and let $u \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$ be a solution of*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f(u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \partial_{\nu} u + \beta u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

for some smooth $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, $f \not\equiv 0$ and $\beta > 0$. Then $u > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ and $\partial_{\nu} u < 0$ on $\partial\Omega$.

Proof. Let $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ be such that

$$u(x) = \min_{\overline{\Omega}} u.$$

By the Maximum Principle we have that $x \in \partial\Omega$ and in particular $\partial_\nu u(x) < 0$. Hence, if we assume by contradiction that $u(x) \leq 0$ we get

$$\partial_\nu u(x) + \beta u(x) < 0,$$

which is in contrast with the Robin boundary condition. Then $u > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ and

$$\partial_\nu u = -\beta u < 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \quad \square$$

Lemma 2.5. *Under the same assumptions of Lemma 2.4, if the critical points of u are isolated, we have*

$$\deg(\Omega, \nabla u, \mathbf{0}) = 1,$$

where \deg stays for the topological degree of a vector field.

Proof. Since $\nabla u_\beta \cdot \nu = \partial_\nu u_\beta < 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ we can apply the Poincaré-Hopf Theorem - see for instance [22] - to the vector field ∇u_β and the claim follows being Ω simply connected. \square

From now up to the end of Section 2, let us assume that the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. In particular Ω is a smooth and bounded domain such that the curvature κ of its boundary is strictly positive, i.e. $\kappa > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\beta > \beta_0$, problem (P_β) admits a stable solution u_β that satisfies (1.1), that is $\|u_\beta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C$, for some $C := C(\beta_0) > 0$.

As in [7], we introduce the following notation: for every $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ we write $\mathbf{e}_\theta = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta) \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and we set

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\theta u_\beta &:= \frac{\partial u_\beta}{\partial \mathbf{e}_\theta} = \cos \theta \partial_{x_1} u_\beta + \sin \theta \partial_{x_2} u_\beta \\ N_\theta^\beta &:= \overline{\{x \in \Omega \mid \partial_\theta u_\beta(x) = 0\}}, \\ M_\theta^\beta &:= \{x \in N_\theta^\beta \mid \nabla(\partial_\theta u_\beta(x)) = \mathbf{0}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where u_β is always a stable solution of (P_β) .

Remark 2.6. As in the Dirichlet case (see [7]), for all $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ there is no nonempty domain $H \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\partial H \subseteq N_\theta^\beta$ (where the boundary of H is considered as a subset of \mathbb{R}^2). To show it, let us denote by $\lambda_D(-\Delta + q(x), \mathcal{U})$ the first eigenvalue of the operator $-\Delta + q(x)$ in a domain \mathcal{U} . Then, if it is not the case the function $\varphi := \partial_\theta u_\beta \chi_H$ satisfies

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx - \int_{\Omega} f'(u_\beta) \varphi^2 dx = 0,$$

and then by the monotonicity of the first Dirichlet eigenvalue with respect to domains inclusion

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \lambda_D(-\Delta - f'(u_\beta), H) \\ &> \lambda_D(-\Delta - f'(u_\beta), \Omega) \\ &\geq \inf_{\substack{\psi \in H^1(\Omega) \\ \|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1}} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \psi|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} \psi^2 d\sigma - \int_{\Omega} f'(u_\beta) \psi^2 dx \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction, where the last inequality follows from the stability of u_β , see Definition 1.1.

Now, we want to prove that all the critical points of u_β are nondegenerate. This will be the consequence of the stronger property

$$M_\theta^\beta \cap \Omega = \emptyset, \quad \text{for all } \theta \in [0, 2\pi).$$

We firstly show that M_θ^β has no point on $\partial\Omega$ and in a second time we show that it is empty also in the interior the domain. Here we exploit the fact that $\kappa > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$.

Lemma 2.7. *For all $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, it holds*

$$M_\theta^\beta \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset.$$

Before providing the proof of the lemma let us recall that the corresponding property in the Dirichlet case simply comes from the fact that $\kappa > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and Hopf's Lemma. Indeed, as explained with more details in [7], one has that $\partial_\theta u_D(x) = 0$ for some $x \in \partial\Omega$ if and only if $t(x) = \pm\theta$ (here and in the following $t(x)$ denotes the unit tangent vector to $\partial\Omega$ in x) and then it is easy to see that, since $\kappa > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\partial_\nu u_D(x) < 0$ by Hopf's Lemma, one has

$$\partial_{\theta\theta}^2 u_D(x) = \partial_{tt}^2 u_D(x) = \kappa(x) \partial_\nu u_D(x) < 0,$$

proving that $\nabla(\partial_\theta u_D) \neq \mathbf{0}$.

Proof of Lemma 2.7. Since the proof does not depend on β we omit to write it. To prove the claim, we need to divide the proof into two steps.

Step 1: Assume there exists $x \in M_\theta \cap \partial\Omega$ for some $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, then the tangent vector to $\partial\Omega$ in x is parallel to θ .

Without loss of generality, we can assume $x = \mathbf{0}$ and $\theta = (1, 0)$. Being $x = \mathbf{0} \in N_\theta^\beta$ it follows that $u_{x_1}(\mathbf{0}) = 0$. Lemma 2.4 tells us that $\partial_\nu u(\mathbf{0}) < 0$ and then the second component of $\nu(\mathbf{0})$ must be different from zero. In particular, up to a rotation, we can assume $\nu(\mathbf{0}) \cdot (0, 1) < 0$. Finally, $\mathbf{0} \in M_\theta^\beta$ means $u_{x_1 x_1}(\mathbf{0}) = u_{x_1 x_2}(\mathbf{0}) = 0$.

Now, since $\partial\Omega$ is of class \mathcal{C}^2 , there exists a local parametrization $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^2(-2\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon, \mathbb{R})$ of $\partial\Omega$ around $\mathbf{0}$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad \partial\Omega \cap B_\varepsilon(\mathbf{0}) = \{(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) : -\varepsilon < \tau < \varepsilon\}.$$

Let us point out that the convexity of Ω implies $\varphi''(0) \geq 0^2$. Then for all $\tau \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ we can write

$$t(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) = \frac{(1, \varphi'(\tau))}{A(\tau)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \nu(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) = \frac{(\varphi'(\tau), -1)}{A(\tau)},$$

with

$$(2.3) \quad A(\tau) := (1 + (\varphi'(\tau))^2)^{1/2} \geq 1.$$

and where we recall that $t(x)$ and $\nu(x)$ respectively denote the tangent and the normal unit vector to the boundary of Ω in a given point $x \in \partial\Omega$.

Then it is enough to prove that $\varphi'(0) = 0$; indeed we recall that our claim is to prove that the tangent vector $t(\mathbf{0})$ to the boundary of Ω is parallel to $\theta = (1, 0)$ which is equivalent to $\varphi'(0) = 0$. Assume instead $\varphi'(0) \neq 0$. The Robin boundary condition, multiplied by $A(\tau)$, can be rewritten as

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= A(\tau)\partial_\nu u(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) + \beta A(\tau)u(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) \\ &= u_{x_1}(\tau, \varphi(\tau))\varphi'(\tau) - u_{x_2}(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) + \beta A(\tau)u(\tau, \varphi(\tau)). \end{aligned}$$

Deriving in τ the preceding relation, evaluating it for $\tau = 0$ and recalling that $u_{x_1}(\mathbf{0}) = u_{x_1x_1}(\mathbf{0}) = u_{x_1x_2}(\mathbf{0}) = 0$, we get

$$-u_{x_2x_2}(\mathbf{0})\varphi'(0) + \beta A'(0)u(\mathbf{0}) + \beta A(0)u_{x_2}(\mathbf{0})\varphi'(0) = 0.$$

Now, taking into account that $A'(0) = (A(0))^{-1}\varphi'(0)\varphi''(0)$, $u_{x_2x_2}(\mathbf{0}) = -f(u(\mathbf{0})) < 0$ and that $\varphi'(0) \neq 0$ one has

$$\beta u_{x_2}(\mathbf{0})(A(0))^2 + f(u(\mathbf{0}))A(0) + \beta u(\mathbf{0})\varphi''(0) = 0.$$

Finally, since $(A(0))^{-1}u_{x_2}(\mathbf{0}) = -\partial_\nu u(\mathbf{0}) > 0$ and $\varphi''(0) \geq 0$ we deduce $A(0) \leq 0$, which is in contradiction with (2.3).

Step 2: Let $x \in \partial\Omega$ be such that the tangential derivative with respect to $\partial\Omega$ of u at x is zero, i.e. $\partial_t u(x) = 0$, then $x \notin M_\theta$, where $\mathbf{e}_\theta = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta) \in \mathbb{S}^1$ is parallel to the tangent vector to $\partial\Omega$ in x , for some $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$.

We argue again by contradiction and, similarly to the preceding step, we can assume $x = \mathbf{0}$, $\theta = t(\mathbf{0}) = (1, 0)$ and $\nu(\mathbf{0}) = (0, -1)$. Moreover, we get that the local parametrization (2.2) of $\partial\Omega$ satisfies $\varphi'(0) = 0$ and $\varphi''(0) > 0$, having Ω strictly positive curvature of the boundary. Being $x \in M_\theta$, $u_{x_1}(\mathbf{0}) = u_{x_1x_1}(\mathbf{0}) = u_{x_1x_2}(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_1, x_2) &= u(\mathbf{0}) + u_{x_2}(\mathbf{0})x_2 + \frac{1}{2}u_{x_2x_2}(\mathbf{0})x_2^2 + \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6}u_{x_1x_1x_1}(\mathbf{0})x_1^3 + \frac{1}{2}u_{x_1x_1x_2}(\mathbf{0})x_1^2x_2 + \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}u_{x_1x_2x_2}(\mathbf{0})x_1x_2^2 + \frac{1}{6}u_{x_2x_2x_2}(\mathbf{0})x_2^3 + \mathcal{O}(|x|^4). \end{aligned}$$

²since $\kappa > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ we have $\varphi''(0) > 0$, but the strict inequality is not needed here.

In particular, on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ one has $x_1 = \tau$, $x_2 = \varphi(\tau) = \frac{1}{2}\varphi''(0)\tau^2 + \mathcal{O}(\tau^3)$ and then

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.5) \quad & u(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) = u(\mathbf{0}) + \frac{1}{2}\varphi''(0)u_{x_2}(\mathbf{0})\tau^2 + \mathcal{O}(\tau^3), \\
& u_{x_1}(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) = \frac{1}{2}u_{x_1x_1x_1}(\mathbf{0})\tau^2 + \mathcal{O}(\tau^3), \\
& u_{x_2}(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) = u_{x_2}(\mathbf{0}) + \frac{1}{2}(\varphi''(0)u_{x_2x_2}(\mathbf{0}) + u_{x_1x_1x_2}(\mathbf{0}))\tau^2 + \mathcal{O}(\tau^3), \\
& u_{x_1x_1}(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) = u_{x_1x_1x_1}(\mathbf{0})\tau + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2), \\
& u_{x_1x_2}(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) = u_{x_1x_1x_2}(\mathbf{0})\tau + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2), \\
& u_{x_2x_2}(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) = u_{x_2x_2}(\mathbf{0}) + u_{x_1x_2x_2}(\mathbf{0})\tau + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting in (2.4) we obtain

$$u_{x_2}(\mathbf{0}) - \beta u(\mathbf{0}) + \frac{1}{2}(\varphi''(0)u_{x_2x_2}(\mathbf{0}) + u_{x_1x_1x_2}(\mathbf{0}) - \beta\varphi''(0)u_{x_2}(\mathbf{0}))\tau^2 + \mathcal{O}(\tau^3) = 0.$$

In particular, observing that $u_{x_2}(\mathbf{0}) - \beta u(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ by the Robin condition, it follows

$$(2.6) \quad u_{x_1x_1x_2}(\mathbf{0}) = (\beta u_{x_2}(\mathbf{0}) - u_{x_2x_2}(\mathbf{0}))\varphi''(0).$$

Deriving (2.4) in τ and substituting (2.5) we obtain

$$(-u_{x_1x_1x_2}(\mathbf{0}) - u_{x_2x_2}(\mathbf{0})\varphi''(0) + \beta u(\mathbf{0})(\varphi''(0))^2 + \beta u_{x_2}(\mathbf{0})\varphi''(0))\tau + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2) = 0,$$

and with (2.6) we conclude $\beta u(\mathbf{0})(\varphi''(0))^2 = 0$ which is a contradiction since $u > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\varphi''(0) > 0$. \square

As an easy consequence of the preceding lemma we observe that if for some point $x \in \partial\Omega$ the tangential derivative of u_β is 0, then the second tangential derivative must be different from zero.

Corollary 2.8. *If $x \in \partial\Omega$ satisfies $\partial_t u_\beta(x) = 0$, one has*

$$\partial_{tt}^2 u_\beta(x) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{tt}^2 u_\beta(x) \neq 0.$$

Proof. As in Step 2 of the proof of the preceding lemma, assume $x = \mathbf{0}$, $t(\mathbf{0}) = (1, 0)$, $\nu(\mathbf{0}) = (0, -1)$ and $\varphi'(0) = 0$ where φ is the local parametrization (2.2) of $\partial\Omega$. Then to obtain $\partial_{tt}^2 u_\beta(x) = 0$, it is enough to derive in τ equation (2.4) and to evaluate what you get for $\tau = 0$.

Finally, the fact that $x \notin M_\theta^\beta$ by Lemma 2.7 implies that $\partial_{tt}^2 u_\beta(x) \neq 0$. \square

We conclude this part by proving that the nodal lines of all the partial derivatives of u_β do not contain singular points, i.e. M_θ^β is empty for all $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$.

Lemma 2.9. *For all $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, it holds*

$$M_\theta^\beta = \emptyset.$$

Proof. By contradiction, let us assume that there exists $x_{\tilde{\beta}} \in M_\theta^{\tilde{\beta}}$, for some $\tilde{\beta} > \beta_0$ and for some $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. We know that $x_{\tilde{\beta}}$ lies in the interior of Ω by Lemma 2.7 and taking into account that $\partial_\theta u_\beta$ satisfies

$$-\Delta(\partial_\theta u_\beta) - f'(u_\beta)\partial_\theta u_\beta = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

it is a famous result by Caffarelli and Friedman in [8], that $\partial_\theta u_{\bar{\beta}}$ behaves as a homogeneous harmonic polynomial of degree $n \geq 2$, in a neighbourhood of $x_{\bar{\beta}}$. This means that in a neighbourhood of $x_{\bar{\beta}}$ the nodal set $N_\theta^{\bar{\beta}}$ consists of n smooth curves intersecting transversally in $x_{\bar{\beta}}$ and forming equal angles. By stability, there is no nonempty domain $H \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\partial H \subseteq N_\theta^{\bar{\beta}}$ (where the boundary of H is considered as a subset of \mathbb{R}^2), see Remark 2.6. It means that any of the $2n$ branches of curve where $\partial_\theta u_{\bar{\beta}} = 0$ and starting from $x_{\bar{\beta}}$ must intersect the boundary of Ω in a different point, that is

$$\sharp \{ \partial\Omega \cap N_\theta^{\bar{\beta}} \} \geq 4,$$

here \sharp denotes the counting measure. Furthermore, we know from [7, Step 1 of the Proof of Theorem 1] that for $i = 1, 2$

$$\sharp \{ \partial\Omega \cap N_\theta^D \} = 2,$$

where $N_\theta^D := \overline{\{x \in \Omega \mid \partial_\theta u_D(x) = 0\}}$. Taking into account that u_β varies smoothly thanks to Proposition 2.3 with Ascoli-Arzelà Theorem and to Theorem 2.1, we let β move from $\bar{\beta}$ to $+\infty$ and we infer that there exists a connected component of $\{\partial_\theta u_\beta > 0\}$ or $\{\partial_\theta u_\beta < 0\}$, let us call it ω_β , that disappears; more precisely there exists $x_0 \in \Omega$, or a single point $\bar{x} \in \partial\Omega$, or a connected component $\Gamma \subseteq \partial\Omega$, such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ one has $\bar{\omega}_\beta \subseteq B_\varepsilon(x_0)$, or $\bar{\omega}_\beta \subseteq B_\varepsilon(\bar{x})$, or $\bar{\omega}_\beta \subseteq \{x \in \bar{\Omega} : \text{dist}(x, \Gamma) < \varepsilon\}$ if β is close enough to $\bar{\beta}$. Note that $\bar{\omega}_\beta \subseteq B_\varepsilon(x_0)$ with $x_0 \in \Omega$ is excluded by the stability of u_β : indeed if this case occurs it means that $\partial\omega_\beta \subseteq N_\theta^{\bar{\beta}} \subseteq \Omega$, for some β close to $\bar{\beta}$ and again this is not possible for Remark 2.6. With the same argument we can exclude that $\bar{\omega}_\beta \subseteq B_\varepsilon(\bar{x})$ and it intersects the boundary $\partial\Omega$ in exactly one point. Moreover, note that of course $\bar{x} \in N_\theta^{\bar{\beta}}$ or $\Gamma \subseteq N_\theta^{\bar{\beta}}$.

Now, up to a rotation we can assume $\theta = 0$ we divide the proof into the cases $\bar{\beta} < +\infty$ and $\bar{\beta} = +\infty$.

Case $\bar{\beta} < +\infty$. Up to a translation $\bar{x} = \mathbf{0}$ or $\mathbf{0} \in \Gamma$ and Lemma 2.4 tells us that $\partial_\nu u_\beta(\mathbf{0}) < 0$ and then the second component of $\nu(\mathbf{0})$ must be different from zero. In particular, up to a rotation, we can assume $\nu(\mathbf{0}) \cdot (0, 1) < 0$. Let φ the local parametrization of $\partial\Omega$ around $\mathbf{0}$ as in (2.2). Moreover, Lemma 2.7 tell us that $\mathbf{0} \notin M_\theta^{\bar{\beta}}$ and then $\partial_{x_1} u_{\bar{\beta}} = \partial_\theta u_{\bar{\beta}} \neq 0$ in $\Omega \cap B_r(\mathbf{0})$ for some $r > 0$ small enough.

Now, if we are in the case ω_β reduces to the single point $\bar{x} = \mathbf{0}$, for all $\beta < \bar{\beta}$ close enough to $\bar{\beta}$ we know that there exist $\tau_1^\beta, \tau_2^\beta \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ with $\tau_i^\beta \rightarrow 0$ as $\beta \rightarrow \bar{\beta}$ for all $i = 1, 2$ such that

$$\partial_{x_1} u_\beta(\tau_1^\beta, \varphi(\tau_1^\beta)) = \partial_{x_1} u_\beta(\tau_2^\beta, \varphi(\tau_2^\beta)) = 0.$$

We claim that one has

$$(2.7) \quad \partial_t(\partial_{x_1} u_\beta(\tau_1^\beta, \varphi(\tau_1^\beta))) \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t(\partial_{x_1} u_\beta(\tau_2^\beta, \varphi(\tau_2^\beta))) \leq 0.$$

Indeed, if $\partial_t(\partial_{x_1} u_\beta(\tau_i^\beta, \varphi(\tau_i^\beta))) \neq 0$, for all $i = 1, 2$, by the Implicit Function Theorem, $N_\theta^{\bar{\beta}}$ intersects $\partial\Omega$ transversally, that is $\tau \mapsto \partial_{x_1} u_\beta(\tau, \varphi(\tau))$ changes sign around τ_i^β : in particular, for some $\delta > 0$, $\partial_{x_1} u_\beta(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) < 0$ for $\tau \in$




FIGURE 1. The situation in the proof of the inequalities in (2.7).

$(\tau_1^\beta - \delta, \tau_1^\beta)$ and $\partial_{x_1} u_\beta(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) > 0$ for $\tau \in (\tau_1^\beta, \tau_1^\beta + \delta)$ while $\partial_{x_1} u_\beta(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) > 0$ for $\tau \in (\tau_2^\beta - \delta, \tau_2^\beta)$ and $\partial_{x_1} u_\beta(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) < 0$ for $\tau \in (\tau_2^\beta, \tau_2^\beta + \delta)$, see Figure 1. It is then trivial to see that (2.7) is satisfied.

Hence, passing to the limit for $\beta \rightarrow \bar{\beta}$ in (2.7) we deduce

$$(2.8) \quad 0 = \partial_t(\partial_{x_1} u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0})) = \frac{\partial_{x_1 x_1}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) + \partial_{x_1 x_2}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) \varphi'(0)}{A(0)}.$$

Note that if we are in the case ω_β reduces to Γ the preceding equality is trivially satisfied being $\partial_\theta u_{\bar{\beta}} \equiv 0$ on Γ and $\mathbf{0} \in \Gamma$. We now distinguish between the case $\varphi'(0) \neq 0$ and $\varphi'(0) = 0$. Let $\varphi'(0) \neq 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\bar{\beta}}(x_1, x_2) &= u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) + \partial_{x_2} u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) x_2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{x_1 x_1}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) x_1^2 + \partial_{x_1 x_2}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) x_1 x_2 + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{x_2 x_2}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) x_2^2 + \mathcal{O}(|x|^3). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ one has $x_1 = \tau$, $x_2 = \varphi(\tau) = \varphi'(0)\tau + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2)$ and then

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} u_{\bar{\beta}}(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) &= u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) + \varphi'(0) \partial_{x_2} u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) \tau + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2), \\ \partial_{x_1} u_{\bar{\beta}}(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) &= \left(\partial_{x_1 x_1}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) + \varphi'(0) \partial_{x_1 x_2}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) \right) \tau + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2), \\ \partial_{x_2} u_{\bar{\beta}}(\tau, \varphi(\tau)) &= \partial_{x_2} u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) + \left(\partial_{x_1 x_2}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) + \varphi'(0) \partial_{x_2 x_2}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) \right) \tau + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting in (2.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= -\partial_{x_2} u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) + \bar{\beta} A(0) u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) + \varphi'(0) \left(\partial_{x_1 x_1}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) + \varphi'(0) \partial_{x_1 x_2}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) \right) \tau \\ &\quad + \left(-\partial_{x_1 x_2}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) - \varphi'(0) \partial_{x_2 x_2}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) + \bar{\beta} A(0) \varphi'(0) \partial_{x_2} u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) \right) \tau + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2), \end{aligned}$$

and taking into account (2.8) we get

$$(2.10) \quad \partial_{x_1 x_2}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) + \varphi'(0) \partial_{x_2 x_2}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) - \bar{\beta} A(0) \varphi'(0) \partial_{x_2} u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) = 0.$$

Finally, deriving (2.4), evaluating for $\tau = 0$ and taking into account (2.8) and (2.10) we conclude

$$\bar{\beta} \frac{\varphi'(0) \varphi''(0)}{A(0)} u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) = 0,$$

which is not possible since $\varphi'(0) \neq 0$ by assumption, $\varphi''(0) > 0$, being $\kappa(\mathbf{0}) > 0$, and $u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) > 0$.

The case $\varphi'(0) = 0$ is easier. First of all, observe that $\varphi'(0) = 0$ means that the tangent unit vector to $\partial\Omega$ in $\mathbf{0}$ is $t(\mathbf{0}) = (1, 0)$ and then (2.8) means $\partial_{x_1 x_1}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) = 0$. This means

$$\partial_t u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) = \partial_{tt}^2 u_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbf{0}) = 0,$$

but this is in contradiction with Corollary 2.8.

Case $\bar{\beta} = +\infty$. Arguing as in the preceding case we get $\partial_\theta u_D(\bar{x}) = \partial_t(\partial_\theta u_D(\bar{x})) = 0$. As explained in [7], the only possibility is $\theta = \pm t(\bar{x})$ and then $\partial_{tt}^2 u_D(x) = \kappa(x)\partial_\nu u_D(x) < 0$, a contradiction. \square

Thanks to this lemma we can immediately deduce that all the critical points of u_β are nondegenerate.

Corollary 2.10. *For all $x \in \Omega$ such that $\nabla u_\beta(x) = \mathbf{0}$, one has*

$$\det \text{Hess}_{u_\beta}(x) \neq 0.$$

Moreover, all the critical points are isolated.

In the next lemma we show that if u_β has more than a critical point, then it necessarily has at least a saddle point and viceversa.

Lemma 2.11. *The solution u_β has more than a critical point if and only if it has at least one nondegenerate saddle point.*

Proof. Since u_β has no minima inside Ω by the Maximum Principle, the claim follows combining Lemma 2.5 and Corollary 2.10. \square

2.2. Proof of Theorem 1.1. We can finally prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By contradiction, we assume

$$I := \{ \beta > \beta_0 : u_\beta \text{ has at least 2 critical points} \} \neq \emptyset,$$

and then we set

$$\bar{\beta} := \sup I > \beta_0.$$

We distinguish two cases. In the rest of the proof, convergences are to be intended up to a subsequence.

Case $\bar{\beta} < +\infty$. Take $(\beta_n)_n \subseteq I$ such that $\beta_n \rightarrow \bar{\beta}$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Thanks to Lemma 2.11 for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we can find $x_n \in \Omega$ such that

$$\nabla u_{\beta_n}(x_n) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \det \text{Hess}_{u_{\beta_n}}(x_n) < 0.$$

Letting n goes to $+\infty$ clearly $x_n \rightarrow x_{\bar{\beta}} \in \bar{\Omega}$ and moreover Proposition 2.3 with Ascoli-Arzelà Theorem imply that

$$u_{\beta_n} \rightarrow u_{\bar{\beta}}, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty,$$

for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then, since the critical points are nondegenerate by Lemma 2.5 we have

$$\nabla u_{\bar{\beta}}(x_{\bar{\beta}}) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \det \text{Hess}_{u_{\bar{\beta}}}(x_{\bar{\beta}}) < 0.$$

Moreover, $x_{\bar{\beta}} \in \Omega$ by Lemma 2.4. This implies that we can find $r > 0$ such that

$$\deg(B_r(x_{\bar{\beta}}), \nabla u_{\bar{\beta}}, \mathbf{0}) = -1.$$

Consider now another sequence $(\beta_k)_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $\beta_k > \bar{\beta}$ and $\beta_k \rightarrow \bar{\beta}$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Again Proposition 2.3, together with Ascoli-Arzelà Theorem and the properties of the topological degree imply

$$\deg(B_r(x_{\bar{\beta}}), \nabla u_{\beta_k}, \mathbf{0}) = -1,$$

for all k suitably large, where eventually r can be smaller than before. This means that u_{β_k} has at least one nondegenerate saddle point and in turn at least two critical points. Then $\beta_k \in I$, but this is clearly not possible since $\beta_k > \sup I$.

Case $\bar{\beta} = +\infty$. Take $(\beta_n)_n \subseteq I$ such that $\beta_n \rightarrow +\infty$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Thanks to Theorem 2.1 and arguing as in the preceding case we can find $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ such that

$$\nabla u_D(x) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \det \text{Hess}_{u_D}(x) \leq 0,$$

where u_D is a positive and stable solution of the corresponding Dirichlet problem (P_D) . However this is not possible since we know that u_D has exactly one nondegenerate critical point in $\bar{\Omega}$ and it is a maximum, see [7, Theorem 1]. \square

3. PARTICULAR CASES: THE PROOF OF COROLLARY 1.3

In this section we illustrate some important cases where it is possible to apply Theorem 1.1. In particular we cover all the cases (i)-(iii) of Corollary 1.3 providing its proof. To do it, we show that assumption (1.1) can be verified for all $\beta_0 > 0$.

Moreover, for β large, we also exhibit counterexamples to the main results as soon as the convexity assumption on the domain is no longer satisfied. In particular we show that the result is false even for domains very close to convex ones where it is possible to find solutions with an arbitrarily large number of critical points.

3.1. First eigenfunction. For all $\beta > 0$ let u_β be the first Robin eigenfunction, i.e. the positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_\beta = \lambda_\beta u_\beta & \text{in } \Omega \\ \partial_\nu u_\beta + \beta u_\beta = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

normalized in such a way that $\|u_\beta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 1$. Here $\lambda_\beta := \lambda_\beta(\Omega)$ is the first Robin eigenvalue in Ω which can be characterized as

$$\lambda_\beta = \inf_{\substack{\psi \in H^1(\Omega) \\ \|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1}} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \psi|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} \psi^2 d\sigma.$$

Taking into account that $\lambda_\beta \rightarrow \lambda_D := \lambda_1(-\Delta, \Omega)$, i.e. the first Dirichlet eigenvalue in Ω , as $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$ we can apply Theorem 1.1 to prove that u_β has exactly one critical point for all $\beta > 0$, that in particular is a nondegenerate maximum. To be precise, let us point out that in this case f depends on β , but $f(u_\beta) = \lambda_\beta u_\beta$ is uniformly bounded in β and then the proof of Theorem 1.1 can be easily adapted to this situation.

- Remark 3.1.** (1) Clearly, uniqueness of the critical point does not hold for $\beta = 0$, that is the case of Neumann boundary conditions. Indeed in this case the first eigenfunction is constant.
- (2) We recall that uniqueness of the critical point was yet known for large values of β as a consequence of [10, Theorem 1.1] on strictly convex domains in any dimension.
- (3) It is interesting to point out that uniqueness of the critical point holds true also for small values of $\beta > 0$, despite there exist convex domains where u_β is not log-concave for such small values of β , as shown by Andrews, Clutterbuck and Hauer in [2, Corollary 1.5].

3.2. Torsion problem. For $f \equiv 1$, let u_β be the Robin torsion function. We know from [25, Theorem 1] that

$$\|u_\beta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \frac{C_1}{\lambda_\beta} \log \left(C_2 \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_\beta}}{\beta} \right) \right),$$

for some dimensional constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ and where λ_β is the first Robin eigenvalue in Ω consistently with the previous section. Taking into account that $\lambda_\beta \rightarrow \lambda_D$ as $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$ and, as pointed out in [14]³, considering that

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_\beta}{\beta} = \frac{|\partial\Omega|}{|\Omega|},$$

it follows that for all $\beta_0 > 0$

$$\|u_\beta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad \text{for all } \beta \geq \beta_0,$$

for some $C = C(\beta_0) > 0$. Then we can apply Theorem 1.1 to prove that u_β has exactly one critical point for all $\beta > 0$.

Let us recall that this result is not new, since it was proved in [23, Theorem 2]. Moreover a stronger concavity property holds true for large values of β and in any dimension, provided the domain is strictly convex. Indeed in this case, [10, Theorem 1.2] shows that u_β is strictly 1/2-concave.

Remark 3.2. We conclude this part by pointing out that the result is no longer true if the domain is no more convex, even if very close to a convex one. In this case uniqueness of the critical point may be not true. Going into details, for all $\beta > 0$, given any integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a smooth and bounded domain $\Omega_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ such that if u_β^ε solves

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_\beta^\varepsilon = 1 & \text{in } \Omega_\varepsilon \\ \partial_\nu u_\beta^\varepsilon + \beta u_\beta^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_\varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

then

- i) Ω_ε is star-shaped with respect to an interior point,
- ii) u_β^ε has at least k maximum points,
- iii) Ω_ε locally converges to the strip $\mathcal{S} := \mathbb{R} \times (0, 1)$, i.e. for all compact sets $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ it holds $|\mathcal{K} \cap \Omega_\varepsilon| \rightarrow 0$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,
- iv) the curvature of $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$ changes sign, vanishes at exactly two points and its minimum goes to 0 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

³See equation (6) on page 604.

This fact comes from the corresponding situation in the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions, as proved in [15]. Indeed, let Ω_ε be the domain in [15, Theorem 1.1] and u_D^ε the Dirichlet torsion function on it with k non degenerate maxima (the nondegeneracy can be deduced as in [11, Lemma 3.3]). Hence, it is easy to see through degree arguments and thanks to Theorem 2.1 that there exists $\bar{\beta} > 0$ such that

$$(\bar{\beta}, +\infty) \subseteq \{ \beta > 0 : u_\beta^\varepsilon \text{ has at least } k \text{ non degenerate maxima} \},$$

since u_D^ε has at least k non degenerate maxima, in virtue of [15, Theorem 1.1].

3.3. Bounded nonlinearity f . As a consequence of the previous section we can observe that the assumption (1.1) in Theorem 1.1 is satisfied also if the nonlinearity f is bounded. Indeed, let $M := \max|f|$ and v_β be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v = M & \text{in } \Omega \\ \partial_\nu v + \beta v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then as a consequence of Lemma 2.4 $u_\beta \leq v_\beta$ where u_β is the solution of (P_β) for such a bounded f . From the discussion in the preceding section, for all $\beta_0 > 0$, there exists $C_M = C_M(\beta_0) > 0$ such that $\|v_\beta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_M$, for all $\beta \geq \beta_0$ and in turn

$$\|u_\beta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C_M, \quad \text{for all } \beta \geq \beta_0.$$

3.4. Minimal branch for nonlinear problems. It is not always possible to consider the case of a general nonlinearity f . Indeed stable solutions could not exist. We already mentioned that this is the case of the Neumann problem ($\beta = 0$) in convex domains, see [9, 21]. Furthermore, also for $\beta > 0$ stable solutions could not exist in general. For example, [4, Theorem 2.1] says that if

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\Omega} \beta^2 u_\beta^2 \left(\beta - \kappa + \frac{f(u_\beta)}{\beta u_\beta} \right) d\sigma < 0, \\ \beta + \min_{\partial\Omega} \kappa \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where κ is the curvature of the boundary of Ω , then the solutions of (P_β) are unstable.

That being said, let us assume $f := \lambda g$ where $\lambda > 0$ and g is a smooth function such that

$$(3.1) \quad g(0) > 0,$$

$$(3.2) \quad g'(t) > 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Classical examples are $g(t) = e^t$ or $g(t) = (1+t)^p$, $p > 0$. Fix any $\beta > 0$. Under this set of assumptions it is well known that there exists $\lambda_\beta^* := \lambda_\beta^*(\Omega) > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_\beta^*)$ the problem

$$(P_\beta^\lambda) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_\beta^\lambda = \lambda g(u_\beta^\lambda) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u_\beta^\lambda > 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ \partial_\nu u_\beta^\lambda + \beta u_\beta^\lambda = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

admits a minimal solution u_β^λ . Here minimal means that $u_\beta \leq U$ in Ω for any other solution U of (P_β^λ) . It is also known that for $\lambda > \lambda_\beta^*$ there are no solutions. Moreover u_β^λ turns out to be stable. The same result holds true for the corresponding Dirichlet problem. In this case we denote by $\lambda_D^* := \lambda_D^*(\Omega) > 0$ the critical threshold and for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_D^*)$ we write u_D^λ for the minimal stable solution. We refer, for instance, to the book [3] for the classical theory about this problem.

Following [3], let us recall that a function u is called an *upper solution* of problem (P_β^λ) if satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u \geq \lambda g(u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \partial_\nu u + \beta u \geq 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

We can now state the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ be a smooth and bounded domain such that the curvature κ of its boundary is strictly positive, i.e. $\kappa > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and assume $f = \lambda g$ where g is a smooth function that satisfies (3.1) and (3.2). Then for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_D^*)$ and for all $\beta > 0$ we have that the minimal solution u_β^λ of (P_β^λ) has a unique critical point. In particular it is a nondegenerate maximum.*

Proof. It is enough to observe that for all $\beta_2 \geq \beta_1 > 0$ one has

$$\lambda_D^* \leq \lambda_{\beta_2}^* \leq \lambda_{\beta_1}^*.$$

and for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_D^*)$

$$u_D^\lambda \leq u_{\beta_2}^\lambda \leq u_{\beta_1}^\lambda, \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Indeed it is easy to see that given $\lambda < \lambda_{\beta_1}^*$, then $u_{\beta_1}^\lambda$ is an upper solution for $(P_{\beta_2}^\lambda)$ and finally by the Picard iteration scheme one obtain the existence of $u_{\beta_2}^\lambda$ and the monotonicity property $u_{\beta_2}^\lambda \leq u_{\beta_1}^\lambda$. The same argument shows $\lambda_D^* \leq \lambda_{\beta_2}^*$ and $u_D^\lambda \leq u_{\beta_2}^\lambda$.

Thus all the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied and the claim follows. \square

Remark 3.4. As in the case of the torsion problem, the preceding Theorem 3.3 fails if the domain is close to be convex (but is not), in the sense that if g is increasing, convex and $g(0) > 0$, we can argue exactly as in Remark 3.2 to generalize [11, Theorem 1.1] to the case of Robin boundary conditions, with β large, for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_D^*(-1, 1))$, here $\lambda_D^*(-1, 1)$ is the threshold of the one dimensional Dirichlet problem. Then we can see that uniqueness of the critical point is, in general, no more verified as soon as the boundary of the domain contains points with negative curvature, despite the domain is close to be convex.

Here again to argue as in Remark 3.2 we need the nondegeneracy of the critical points of the corresponding solution of the Dirichlet problem u_D^ε , which is not explicitly stated in [11, Theorem 1.1]. Anyway, checking the proof of that theorem, it is easy to see that the critical points of u_D^ε are nondegenerate: indeed in any compact $K \subseteq \Omega_\varepsilon$, $\|u_D^\varepsilon - (v_0 + \varepsilon\varphi)\|_{L^\infty(K)} \leq$

$C(K)\varepsilon^2$ for some $C(K) > 0$, where v_0 and φ are fixed functions such that $v_0 + \varepsilon\varphi$ solves the linearized problem in a domain containing Ω_ε and has at least k nondegenerate critical points, contained in a fixed, i.e. independent from ε , compact subsets of Ω_ε . Moreover, such critical points satisfy $\det \text{Hess}[v_0 + \varepsilon\varphi] = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, see [11, Lemma 2.3]. It is then enough to use classical interior regularity estimate to obtain $\|u_D^\varepsilon - (v_0 + \varepsilon\varphi)\|_{C^2(K)} \leq C(K)\varepsilon^2$, where $C(K) > 0$ may be larger than before. This estimate, combined with the fact that the critical points of $v_0 + \varepsilon\varphi$ are nondegenerate, contained in fixed compact subsets and $\det \text{Hess}[v_0 + \varepsilon\varphi] = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, implies that u_D^ε admits at least k nondegenerate critical points, as claimed.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Acker, L. E. Payne, and G. Philippin. On the convexity of level lines of the fundamental mode in the clamped membrane problem, and the existence of convex solutions in a related free boundary problem. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, 32(6):683–694, 1981.
- [2] B. Andrews, J. Clutterbuck, and D. Hauer. Non-concavity of the Robin ground state. *Camb. J. Math.*, 8(2):243–310, 2020.
- [3] C. Bandle. *Isoperimetric inequalities and applications*, volume 7 of *Monographs and Studies in Mathematics*. Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, Mass.-London, 1980.
- [4] C. Bandle, P. Mastrolia, D. D. Monticelli, and F. Punzo. On the stability of solutions of semilinear elliptic equations with Robin boundary conditions on Riemannian manifolds. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 48(1):122–151, 2016.
- [5] L. Battaglia, F. D. Regibus, and M. Grossi. On the shape of solutions to elliptic equations in possibly non convex planar domains. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, pages 1269–1318, 2023.
- [6] H. J. Brascamp and E. H. Lieb. On extensions of the Brunn-Minkowski and Prékopa-Leindler theorems, including inequalities for log concave functions, and with an application to the diffusion equation. *J. Functional Analysis*, 22(4):366–389, 1976.
- [7] X. Cabré and S. Chanillo. Stable solutions of semilinear elliptic problems in convex domains. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 4(1):1–10, 1998.
- [8] L. A. Caffarelli and A. Friedman. Partial regularity of the zero-set of solutions of linear and superlinear elliptic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 60(3):420–433, 1985.
- [9] R. G. Casten and C. J. Holland. Instability results for reaction diffusion equations with Neumann boundary conditions. *J. Differential Equations*, 27(2):266–273, 1978.
- [10] G. Crasta and I. Fragalà. Concavity properties of solutions to Robin problems. *Camb. J. Math.*, 9(1):177–212, 2021.
- [11] F. De Regibus and M. Grossi. On the number of critical points of stable solutions in bounded strip-like domains. *J. Differential Equations*, 306:1–27, 2022.
- [12] F. De Regibus, M. Grossi, and D. Mukherjee. Uniqueness of the critical point for semi-stable solutions in \mathbb{R}^2 . *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 60(1):25, 2021.
- [13] B. Gidas, W. M. Ni, and L. Nirenberg. Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 68(3):209–243, 1979.
- [14] T. Giorgi and R. Smits. Bounds and monotonicity for the generalized Robin problem. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, 59(4):600–618, 2008.
- [15] F. Gladiali and M. Grossi. On the number of critical points of solutions of semilinear equations in \mathbb{R}^2 . *Amer. J. Math.*, 144(5):1221–1240, 2022.
- [16] F. Gladiali and M. Grossi. On the critical points of solutions of PDE in non-convex settings: The case of concentrating solutions. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 287(11):Paper No. 110620, 2024.

- [17] M. Grossi and L. Provenzano. On the critical points of semi-stable solutions on convex domains of riemannian surfaces. *Mathematische Annalen*, 2023.
- [18] F. Hamel, N. Nadirashvili, and Y. Sire. Convexity of level sets for elliptic problems in convex domains or convex rings: two counterexamples. *Amer. J. Math.*, 138(2):499–527, 2016.
- [19] B. Kawohl. *Rearrangements and convexity of level sets in PDE*, volume 1150 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [20] L. G. Makar-Limanov. The solution of the Dirichlet problem for the equation $\Delta u = -1$ in a convex region. *Mat. Zametki*, 9:89–92, 1971.
- [21] H. Matano. Asymptotic behavior and stability of solutions of semilinear diffusion equations. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 15(2):401–454, 1979.
- [22] J. W. Milnor. *Topology from the differentiable viewpoint*. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., 1965.
- [23] S. Sakaguchi. Uniqueness of the critical point of the solutions to some semilinear elliptic boundary value problems in \mathbb{R}^2 . *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 319(1):179–190, 1990.
- [24] R. P. Sperb. Extension of two theorems of Payne to some nonlinear Dirichlet problems. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, 26(6):721–726, 1975.
- [25] M. van den Berg and D. Bucur. On the torsion function with Robin or Dirichlet boundary conditions. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 266(3):1647–1666, 2014.

Fabio De Regibus

DEPARTAMENTO DE ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO, UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA, AVENIDA DE LA FUENTE NUEVA S/N, 18071, GRANADA, SPAIN.

Email address: `fabioderegibus@ugr.es`

Massimo Grossi

DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE DI BASE E APPLICATE PER L'INGEGNERIA, UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA "LA SAPIENZA", VIA ANTONIO SCARPA 14, 00161, ROMA, ITALY.

Email address: `massimo.grossi@uniroma1.it`