

GLOBAL BIFURCATION CURVE FOR FOURTH-ORDER MEMS/NEMS MODELS WITH CLAMPED BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

MANTING LIN AND HONGJING PAN*

*School of Mathematical Sciences, South China Normal University,
Guangzhou 510631, P. R. China*

ABSTRACT. Global solution curve and exact multiplicity of positive solutions for a class of fourth-order equations with doubly clamped boundary conditions are established. The results extend a theorem of P. Korman (2004) by allowing the presence of a singularity in the nonlinearity. The paper also provides a global a priori bound for C^3 -norm of positive solutions, which is optimal in terms of regularity. Examples arising in MEMS/NEMS models are presented to illustrate applications of the main results.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider the following fourth-order equation with the doubly clamped (Dirichlet) boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} u''''(x) = \lambda f(u(x)), & x \in (0, 1), \\ u(0) = u(1) = u'(0) = u'(1) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where λ is a positive parameter and $f(u)$ is a continuous function. Problem (1.1) arises in many physical models describing the deformation of elastic objects clamped at the endpoints. The nonlinearity f represents a nonlinear external force.

In this paper, we are concerned with the global structure of the solution set of (1.1), i.e., the structure of the global solution curve

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(\lambda, u) \mid \lambda > 0 \text{ and } u \text{ is a solution of (1.1)}_\lambda\}.$$

E-mail address: linmt@m.scnu.edu.cn & panhj@m.scnu.edu.cn.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 34B18, 34C23, 74G35, 74K10, 74H60.

Key words and phrases. Global bifurcation, Continuation method, Exact multiplicity, A priori estimate, MEMS/NEMS, Doubly clamped boundary conditions, Singularity, Turning point.

*Corresponding author.

By a *solution* we mean that $u \in C^4[0, 1]$ satisfies (1.1). For each given $\lambda > 0$, we denote the solutions of (1.1) by $u_\lambda(x)$ or $u(x)$ in short. Specifically, we focus on cases where the nonlinear term f exhibits a singularity. Such problems are practically significant, especially in models of Micro/Nano-Electro-Mechanical Systems (MEMS/NEMS). For instance, $f(u) = \frac{1}{(1-u)^2}$ models the Coulomb force in the 2-D parallel plate capacitors, following the inverse square law. The recent monograph [9] presents various 1-D beam-type MEMS/NEMS models that conform to the equation in (1.1). Notably, the singularity of function f is a critical characteristic, as demonstrated in examples following Theorem 1.2 below. These models have significantly stimulated our research interest.

In the past two decades, fourth-order MEMS/NEMS models have attracted significant attention, and various numerical and theoretical results have been established (cf. [2, 3, 5–9, 12–17]). However, to the best of the authors' knowledge, the presently known findings are still some distance away from characterizing the *complete* structure of the solution curve of problem (1.1) when $f(u)$ exhibits a singularity at a certain point $r > 0$. Significant progress in this direction was made in [12] for the following problem

$$\Delta^2 u - T\Delta u = \frac{\lambda}{(1-u)^2} \quad \text{in } B_1, \quad u = \partial_n u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_1, \quad (1.2)$$

where $T \geq 0$ and $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d = 1, 2$) is the unit ball. Specifically, a continuous global bifurcation curve has been derived in [12, Theorem 1.1] by the bifurcation theory of [1] for real analytic functions. Furthermore, the behaviors at the ends of the curve have been confirmed in [12]. However, the shape of the middle part as well as the exact multiplicity of solutions remains to be explored. In the present paper, we will focus on problem (1.1) — the 1-D case, $T = 0$, but with more general $f(u)$, which includes a variety of examples coming from [9].

This paper can be considered as a sequel of the work of Liu and the second author in [16], where they derived the complete global solution curve for the same equation in (1.1) with the doubly pinned (Navier) boundary conditions

$$u(0) = u(1) = u''(0) = u''(1) = 0.$$

However, the current problem is more challenging because it cannot be decomposed into a 'well' system of second order equations, to which the maximum principle can directly apply, and the concavity of positive solutions varies over the interval $(0, 1)$.

Rynne [18] studied $2m$ -th Dirichlet boundary value problem under various convexity or concavity type assumptions on f , showed that the problem has a smooth solution curve \mathcal{S}_0 emanating from $(\lambda, u) = (0, 0)$, and described the possible shapes and asymptotics of the curve. For problem (1.1) with convex increasing nonlinearity

f defined on $[0, \infty)$, Korman [10, Theorem 1.1] first proved the complete structure of the global solution curve, using a bifurcation approach.

Theorem 1.1 ([10]). *Assume that $f(u) \in C^2(0, \infty) \cap C^1[0, \infty)$ satisfies $f(u) > 0$ for $u \geq 0$, $f'(0) \geq 0$, $f''(u) > 0$ for $u > 0$, and*

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(u)}{u} = \infty, \quad (1.3)$$

Then all positive solutions of (1.1) lie on a unique smooth curve of solutions. This curve starts at $(\lambda, u) = (0, 0)$, it continues for $\lambda > 0$ until a critical λ_0 , where it bends back, and continues for decreasing λ without any more turns, tending to infinity when $\lambda \downarrow 0$. In other words, we have exactly two, one or no solutions, depending on whether $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$, $\lambda = \lambda_0$, or $\lambda > \lambda_0$. Moreover, all solutions are symmetric with respect to the midpoint $x = \frac{1}{2}$, and the maximum value of the solution, $u(\frac{1}{2})$, is strictly monotone on the curve.

The bifurcation diagram is depicted in Figure 1(i). This result extends a theorem for the second-order problem in [4, Example 4.1 & Theorem 4.8] (also contained in [11, Theorem 3.2]) to the fourth-order one. The typical examples of f satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 are the Gelfand nonlinearity $f(u) = e^u$ and the power nonlinearity $f(u) = (1 + u)^p$ ($p > 1$). However, if f is singular at some $r > 0$, for example, $f(u) = \frac{1}{(r-u)^p}$ ($p > 0$), then Theorem 1.1 is no longer applicable.

Our goal in this paper is to establish a global bifurcation result similar to Theorem 1.1 but dealing with the problems with a singular nonlinearity. To this end, we replace the superlinear condition (1.3) at infinity with a growth condition near singularity; see (1.7) below. Our main result of this paper is as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $r \in (0, \infty)$. Assume that $f(u) \in C^2(0, r) \cap C[0, r)$ satisfies*

$$f(u) > 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq u < r, \quad (1.4)$$

$$f'(u) > 0 \quad \text{for } 0 < u < r, \quad (1.5)$$

$$f''(u) > 0 \quad \text{for } 0 < u < r, \quad (1.6)$$

$$0 < \liminf_{u \rightarrow r^-} (r - u)f(u) \leq \infty. \quad (1.7)$$

Then all conclusions of Theorem 1.1 still hold, except that the solution curve finally tends to a singular solution w instead of infinity when $\lambda \downarrow 0$. Here, w is an explicitly given axisymmetric function with respect to $x = \frac{1}{2}$, which is also its unique maximum point, $w(\frac{1}{2}) = r$ and $w \in (C^{2+\alpha}[0, 1] \setminus C^3[0, 1]) \cap C^4([0, 1] \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\})$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

The bifurcation diagram is depicted in Figure 1(ii). The explicit expression of the singular solution w is present in Lemma 2.3 below.




FIGURE 1. Global bifurcation diagrams provided by Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. (i) $r = +\infty$ and $\lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(u)}{u} = +\infty$. (ii) $r < +\infty$ and $\liminf_{u \rightarrow r^-} (r - u)f(u) > 0$.

The method adopted in our study is the bifurcation approach to fourth-order Dirichlet problems, originally formulated by Korman [10]. However, the singularity of f poses new challenges due to the potential emergence of singular solutions. To address the substantial difficulties in applying Korman's method, we have established the crucial a priori bound $\|u\|_\infty < c < r$ for the solutions of (1.1). Consequently, the arguments put forward by Korman in [10] retain their validity for the present problem. An additional challenge concerns the characterization of the singular solutions. To overcome this, we adopt an idea from Laurençot and Walker [12, Theorem 2.20], where a singular solution for problem (1.2) is completely described. Combining the idea and our global a priori bound $\|u\|_{C^3} < C$, we also obtain an explicit singular solution of (1.1) with more general f , not limited to $f(u) = \frac{1}{(1-u)^2}$. The primary contribution of this paper lies in the derivation of the a priori estimates and the subsequent applications to some novel models arising from [9].

Examples. *Theorem 1.2 applies to many doubly-supported beam-type MEMS/NEMS models arising from the recent monograph [9, Chapter 2] when the boundary conditions are of the clamped-clamped type (cf. [9, (2.126)]). Some typical governing equations are present as follows.*

- (1) *Carbon-nanotube actuator in NEMS (cf. [9, (2.147)])*

$$u'''' = \frac{\beta_n}{(1-u)^n}.$$

- (2) *Size-dependent double-sided nanobridge with single nanowire (cf. [9, (2.202)])*

$$u'''' = \frac{\beta_{vdW}}{k(1+\delta)(1-u)^4} + \frac{\alpha}{(1+\delta)(1-u)\ln^2[2k(1-u)]}.$$

(3) *Size-dependent double-sided nanobridge with two nanowires (cf. [9, (2.269)])*

$$u'''' = \frac{\beta_{vdW}}{2(1+\delta)(1-2u)^{5/2}} + \frac{\alpha}{2(1+\delta)(1-2u)\ln^2[k(1-2u)]}.$$

(4) *Size-dependent nanoactuator (cf. [9, (2.103)])*

$$u'''' = \frac{\beta_{Cas}}{(1+\delta)(1-u)^4} + \frac{\alpha}{(1+\delta)(1-u)^2} + \frac{\alpha\gamma}{(1+\delta)(1-u)}.$$

Here, β_n/β_{vdW} , δ , α , and β_{Cas} are the dimensionless parameters of the van der Waals force, for incorporating the size effect, associated with the external voltage, of the Casimir force, respectively; k indicates the gap to nanowire radius ratio; γ is related to the gap-to-width ratio associated with the fringing field effect.

As the analysis on fulfillment of conditions for these examples is the same as in [16] for the hinged-hinged boundary conditions, we omit the details and refer the readers to [16, Section 2].

The subsequent sections of this paper are organized as follows. In Section 2, we enumerate some established facts and prove several pivotal lemmas, including the crucial a priori bounds. Section 3 offers the proof of the main theorem. Lastly, in Section 4, we provide concluding remarks and propose some open problems for further research.

2. LEMMAS

In this section, we prove a priori estimates which play crucial roles in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

First, we list several facts about problem (1.1) that have been proven in [10] for the case $u \in (0, +\infty)$, but clearly hold after modifying the range from $(0, +\infty)$ to $(0, r)$. Specifically, assuming $f(u) \in C^1(0, r) \cap C[0, r]$ satisfies (1.4) and (1.5), we derive the following facts:

(A) (Linearization) According to Korman [10, Corollary 2.2], the linear space of the non-trivial solutions of the linearized problem

$$\begin{cases} w''''(x) = \lambda f'(u)w, & x \in (0, 1), \\ w(0) = w'(0) = w(1) = w'(1) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

is either empty or one-dimensional. Furthermore, according to Korman [10, Theorem 2.13], $w(x)$ cannot vanish inside $(0, 1)$, i.e, the sign of any non-trivial solution of (2.1) does not change.

(B) (Convexity and inflection points) According to Korman [10, Lemma 2.3], any positive solution of (1.1) satisfies

$$u''(0) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u''(1) > 0. \quad (2.2)$$

Furthermore, according to [10, Lemma 2.7], $u(x)$ has exactly one local maximum and exactly two inflection points.

- (C) (Symmetry) According to Korman [10, Lemma 2.9], any positive solution of (1.1) is symmetric with respect to $x = \frac{1}{2}$. Moreover, $u'(x) > 0$ on $(0, \frac{1}{2})$.
- (D) (Global parameterization) According to Korman [10, Lemma 2.10], all positive solutions of (1.1) are globally parameterized by their maximum values $u_\lambda(\frac{1}{2})$. Precisely, for each $p > 0$, there is at most one $\lambda > 0$ and at most one solution $u_\lambda(x)$ of problem (1.1) such that $u_\lambda(\frac{1}{2}) = p$.

Next, we establish a priori estimates, which play key roles in the proof of the main theorem.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that $f(u) \in C^1(0, r) \cap C[0, r]$ satisfies (1.4), (1.5) and (1.7). If $I \subset [0, \infty)$ is a bound interval, then there exists a positive constant C such that any positive solution u_λ of (1.1) with $\lambda \in I$ satisfies*

$$\|u_\lambda(x)\|_{C^3[0,1]} \leq C. \quad (2.3)$$

If further $I \subset (0, \infty)$ is a compact interval, then there exist two positive constants c and C_1 such that any positive solution u_λ of (1.1) with $\lambda \in I$ satisfies

$$\|u_\lambda(x)\|_{C[0,1]} \leq c < r \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_\lambda(x)\|_{C^4[0,1]} \leq C_1. \quad (2.4)$$

Remark 2.2. *For problem (1.2), a priori bound for $C^{\frac{3}{2}}$ -norm of solutions has been established in [12, Lemma 2.11]. In term of regularity, the a priori bound (2.3) is optimal in the sense that for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exist a sequence of $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ and a function $w \in C^{2+\alpha}[0, 1] \setminus C^3[0, 1]$ such that $u_\lambda \rightarrow w$ in $C^{2+\alpha}[0, 1]$; see Lemma 2.4 below for details.*

Proof. For each given $\lambda > 0$, denote by u_λ positive solutions of (1.1) if exist. We claim that

$$u_\lambda(x) < r \quad \text{for all } x \in (0, 1). \quad (2.5)$$

Otherwise, there is an $x_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $u_\lambda(x_0) = r$ (Take x_0 to be the first such number from the left). Then, it follows from (1.7) that $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0^-} f(u_\lambda(x)) = \infty$. This contradicts the fact that $u_\lambda \in C^4(0, 1)$ satisfies the equation in (1.1).

From now on, we omit the subscript of u_λ for simplicity.

As mentioned in (C) above, since (1.4) and (1.5) hold, any positive solution $u(x)$ of (1.1) is symmetric with respect to $x = \frac{1}{2}$ and $u'(x) > 0$ on $(0, \frac{1}{2})$. Then $u(x)$ takes its maximum at $\frac{1}{2}$ and $u'(\frac{1}{2}) = 0 = u'''(\frac{1}{2})$. It follows from (1.4) that u'''' is increasing in $[0, 1]$ and $u''''(x) < 0$ on $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$. In what follows, it suffices to consider the problem on the interval $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

We next divide the proof into three steps.

Step 1. We claim that for any given $x \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $u''(x)$ is bounded for all $\lambda \in I$.

Without loss of generality, let $x = \frac{1}{4}$. We next prove that $u''(\frac{1}{4})$ is uniformly bounded for $\lambda \in I$. Assume on the contrary, that there exist a sequence of unbounded numbers $u''(\frac{1}{4})$ along some sequence of $\lambda_l \in I$.

On the one hand, if $u''(\frac{1}{4})$ is unbounded from above, we may assume that $u''(\frac{1}{4})$ is positive. Since $u'''(x) < 0$ on $(0, \frac{1}{2})$, we have

$$u'(x) = \int_0^x u''(t) dt + u'(0) = \int_0^x u''(t) dt > u''(\frac{1}{4})x \quad \text{for } x \in (0, \frac{1}{4}).$$

Furthermore, since $u'(x) > 0$ on $(0, \frac{1}{2})$, it follows that

$$u(x) = \int_0^x u'(t) dt + u(0) = \int_0^x u'(t) dt > \frac{1}{2}u''(\frac{1}{4})x^2 \quad \text{for } x \in (0, \frac{1}{4}),$$

which implies that $u(x)$ is positive and unbounded on $(\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{4})$, contradicting the boundedness (2.5). So $u''(\frac{1}{4})$ is bounded from above.

On the other hand, if $u''(\frac{1}{4})$ is unbounded from below, we may assume that $u''(\frac{1}{4})$ is negative. By the same way as above, we obtain that $u(x)$ is positive and unbounded on $(\frac{3}{8}, \frac{1}{2})$, contradicting the boundedness (2.5). So $u''(\frac{1}{4})$ is also bounded from below. The claim is true.

Step 2. We prove the a priori bound (2.3).

We claim that $u'''(0)$ is bounded for all $\lambda \in I$. Since $u'''(0) < 0$, it suffices to prove that $u'''(0)$ is bounded from below. Assume, on the contrary, that there exist a sequence of unbounded numbers $u'''(0)$ along some sequence of $\lambda_l \in I$. Since

$$(u''')''(x) = (u''''(x))' = \lambda f'(u(x))u'(x) \quad \text{on } (0, \frac{1}{2}),$$

it follows from (1.5) and (C) that $u'''(x)$ is convex on $(0, \frac{1}{2})$ and hence

$$u''' \left(0 + (1 - \theta) \frac{1}{2} \right) \leq \theta u'''(0) + (1 - \theta) u''' \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) = \theta u'''(0) < 0 \quad \text{for any } \theta \in (0, 1).$$

That is, for any given $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $u'''(\gamma)$ is negative and unbounded from below. Since $u'''(x)$ is increasing on $(0, \frac{1}{2})$, it follows that $u'''(x)$ is unbounded from below on any proper subinterval (β, γ) of $(0, \frac{1}{2})$. Therefore,

$$\int_{\beta}^{\gamma} u'''(t) dt < (\gamma - \beta)u'''(\gamma) < 0 \quad \text{is unbounded from below.} \quad (2.6)$$

But, the boundedness of $u''(\beta)$ and $u''(\gamma)$ for any $\lambda \in I$, as shown in Step 1, implies that

$$\int_{\beta}^{\gamma} u'''(t) dt = u''(\gamma) - u''(\beta) \quad \text{is bounded,} \quad (2.7)$$

contradicting (2.6). So the claim is true.

Due to the symmetry of u , $u'''(1)$ is also bounded for all $\lambda \in I$. Then the monotonicity of u''' on $[0, 1]$ yields the boundedness of $\|u'''\|_{C^0}$ for all $\lambda \in I$. Together

with the bound (2.5) and the boundary conditions, it follows that the bound (2.3) holds.

Step 3. We prove the a priori bounds in (2.4) provided that $I \subset (0, \infty)$ is compact.

Since f satisfies conditions (1.4) and (1.7), it follows that there exists a constant $a > 0$, such that

$$f(u) \geq \frac{a}{r-u} \quad \text{for all } u \in (0, r). \quad (2.8)$$

Indeed, set $a_1 := \liminf_{u \rightarrow r^-} (r-u)f(u)$. Then (1.7) implies that $0 < a_1 \leq \infty$. If $a_1 < \infty$, then for any given $\varepsilon \in (0, a_1)$, there exists a number $\delta \in (0, r)$ such that $(r-u)f(u) > a_1 - \varepsilon$ on $(r-\delta, r)$. Since $(r-u)f(u)$ is continuous in $[0, r-\delta]$, we define $a_2 := \min_{[0, r-\delta]} (r-u)f(u)$ and $a := \min\{a_1 - \varepsilon, a_2\}$. Then (1.4) implies that $a_2 > 0$ and hence $a > 0$. The case of $a_1 = \infty$ is similar by replacing $a_1 - \varepsilon$ with some $M > 0$. So (2.8) holds.

Multiplying the equation in (1.1) by u' and integrating over $(0, x)$ by parts, we derive the energy identity:

$$u'u''' - \frac{1}{2}u''^2 - \lambda F(u) = -\frac{1}{2}u''(0)^2 \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, 1],$$

where $F(u) = \int_0^u f(t) dt$.

By Step 3, we have the a priori bound $\|u_\lambda(x)\|_{C^3[0,1]} \leq C$. Combining the energy identity, we get that

$$\lambda F(u) = u'u''' - \frac{1}{2}u''^2 + \frac{1}{2}u''(0)^2 \leq M.$$

where M is a positive constant. Furthermore, it follows from (2.8) that

$$M \geq \lambda F(u) = \lambda \int_0^u f(t) dt \geq \lambda \int_0^u \frac{a}{r-t} dt = -\lambda a \ln(r-t)|_0^u,$$

which implies that

$$u \leq r(1 - e^{-\frac{M}{a\lambda_*}}).$$

Here, λ_* is the positive lower bound of the compact interval I . Letting $c = r(1 - e^{-\frac{M}{a\lambda_*}})$, we obtain that $u(x) \leq c < r$ on $(0, 1)$ uniformly for $\lambda \in I$.

Now, since $f(u)$ is a continuous function on the interval $[0, c]$ and $u'''' = \lambda f(u)$, it follows that u'''' is uniformly bounded on $[0, 1]$ for all $\lambda \in I$. Combining the boundedness of u and u'''' with the boundary conditions, we obtain that $\|u\|_{C^4}$ is bounded. \square

We next give an upper bound of λ for the existence of positive solutions of (1.1) with a singular nonlinearity.

Lemma 2.3. *Assume that $f(u) \in C[0, r)$ satisfies conditions (1.4) and (1.7). Then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that problem (1.1) has no positive solution for $\lambda > \lambda_0$.*

Proof. Since the line $y = \frac{4}{r^2}x$ passing through the origin is a tangent below the curve $y = \frac{1}{r-x}$, it follows from (2.8) that

$$f(u) \geq \frac{a}{r-u} \geq \frac{4a}{r^2}u \quad \text{for all } u \in (0, r). \quad (2.9)$$

With condition (2.9) in place, the process that follows is routine. Let $\mu_1 > 0$ and $\varphi_1(x) > 0$ on $(0, 1)$ be the principal eigenpair of the problem

$$\begin{cases} \varphi'''' = \mu\varphi & \text{in } (0, 1); \\ \varphi(0) = \varphi'(0) = 0 = \varphi(1) = \varphi'(1). \end{cases}$$

Let u be a positive solution of (1.1) with some λ . Multiplying the equation in (1.1) by φ_1 and integrating over $(0, 1)$, we obtain from (2.9) that

$$\mu_1 \int_0^1 u\varphi_1 dx = \int_0^1 u\varphi_1'''' dx = \int_0^1 u''''\varphi_1 dx = \lambda \int_0^1 f(u)\varphi_1 dx \geq \lambda \frac{4a}{r^2} \int_0^1 u\varphi_1 dx.$$

It follows that

$$\lambda \leq \frac{r^2}{4a}\mu_1.$$

Therefore, the λ that makes problem (1.1) has positive solutions is bounded. Letting λ_0 be the supremum of the λ s, we complete the proof. \square

The following result gives the existence and uniqueness of a singular solution at $\lambda = 0$ as well as the explicit expression.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that $f(u) \in C^1(0, r) \cap C[0, r]$ satisfies conditions (1.4), (1.5) and (1.7). Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and let $\{(\lambda_n, u_n)\}$ be a sequence of solutions of problem (1.1) with $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$. Then there exist a subsequence of $\{u_n\}$ (still denoted by u_n) and a function $w(x)$ such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - w\|_{C^{2+\alpha}[0,1]} = 0. \quad (2.10)$$

Moreover, either $w \equiv 0$ or $\max_{x \in [0,1]} w(x) = r$. In the latter case, $w \in (C^{2+\alpha}[0, 1] \setminus C^3[0, 1]) \cap C^4([0, 1] \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\})$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and w satisfies

$$\begin{cases} w''''(x) = 0, & x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1]; \\ w(0) = w'(0) = 0 = w(1) = w'(1); \\ w(\frac{1}{2}) - r = 0 = w'(\frac{1}{2}), \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

which is solved uniquely by

$$w(x) = \begin{cases} -16rx^3 + 12rx^2, & x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}); \\ -16r(1-x)^3 + 12r(1-x)^2, & x \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

Proof. The existence of $w \in C^{2+\alpha}[0, 1]$ and the convergence relation (2.10) follow directly from the a priori bound (2.3), due to the compact embedding $C^3[0, 1] \hookrightarrow C^{2+\alpha}[0, 1]$ for any $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. As a limit of $C^{2+\alpha}$ -convergence, w naturally satisfies that

$$w(0) = w'(0) = w(1) = w'(1) = 0 = w'(\tfrac{1}{2}), \quad (2.13)$$

since every solution satisfies the boundary conditions and the symmetric property.

In view of (2.5), we know $w(x) \leq r$. We analyze the problem below in two cases.

Case 1. If $\max_{x \in [0, 1]} w(x) < r$, we claim that $w \equiv 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$.

Since in this case $w(x) < r$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$, it follows from (2.10) that $f(u_n)$ is bounded on $[0, 1]$ and $\lambda_n f(u_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$. Since every solution (λ_n, u_n) of (1.1) admits the integral form

$$u_n''(x) = u_n''(0) + u_n'''(0)x + \int_0^x \lambda_n f(u_n(\xi))(x - \xi) d\xi, \quad x \in [0, 1]. \quad (2.14)$$

Passing to the limit as $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$, we conclude from (2.3) and (2.10) that

$$w''(x) = w''(0) + \vartheta x, \quad x \in [0, 1],$$

where ϑ is a constant. Clearly, $w(x) \in C^4[0, 1]$ and $w''''(x) \equiv 0$ on $[0, 1]$. It follows from (2.13) that the claim is true.

Case 2. If $\max_{x \in [0, 1]} w(x) = r$, we next prove that $x = \frac{1}{2}$ is the unique maximum point of w .

By the symmetry and the monotonicity of u_n as given in (C), it is clear that $w(x)$ is symmetric on $[0, 1]$, $w(\frac{1}{2}) = r$, $w(x)$ is non-decreasing on the interval $(0, \frac{1}{2})$ and non-increasing on $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. So there exists a number $a \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ such that $w(x) = r$ for all $x \in [a, 1 - a]$ and $w(x) < r$ for all $x \in [0, a) \cup (1 - a, 1]$. Moreover, $w(a) = r = w(1 - a)$ and $w'(a) = 0 = w'(1 - a)$.

For any $\rho \in (0, a)$, since $w(x) < r$ for all $x \in [0, \rho]$, it follows from (2.10) that $f(u_n)$ is bounded on $[0, \rho]$. Similar to Case 1 above, we have that

$$w(x) \in C^4([0, a) \cup (1 - a, 1]) \quad \text{and} \quad w''''(x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, a) \cup (1 - a, 1]. \quad (2.15)$$

We claim that $w(x) \in C^3([0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1])$. In fact, since $\|u_n\|_{C^3[0, 1]}$ is bounded and $u_n''''(x)$ is positive and increasing on $(0, 1)$, using the arguments as in (2.6) and (2.7) (Replace u'''' with u''''), we deduce that for any given $x \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, the sequence $u_n''''(x)$ is bounded and further for any closed subinterval $[\beta, \gamma] \subset [0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\|u_n''''\|_{C^0[\beta, \gamma]}$ is bounded. Together with (2.5), it follows that $\|u_n\|_{C^4[\beta, \gamma]}$ is bounded. This implies that $w(x) \in C^3[\beta, \gamma]$ by the compact embedding $C^4[\beta, \gamma] \hookrightarrow C^3[\beta, \gamma]$. Due to the arbitrariness of $[\beta, \gamma] \subset [0, \frac{1}{2})$, we conclude that $w(x) \in C^3[0, \frac{1}{2})$. Similarly, we have that $w(x) \in C^3(\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ and the claim is true.

Using an idea from Laurençot and Walker [12, (2.46)], we next show that $a = \frac{1}{2}$. Suppose on the contrary that $a < \frac{1}{2}$. By the claim above, we have

$$0 = w(a) - r = w'(a) = w''(a) = w'''(a). \quad (2.16)$$

Multiplying (2.15) by w , integrating over $(0, a)$ and using (2.16), we obtain that

$$0 = \int_0^a w \cdot w'''' dx = \int_0^a (w'')^2 dx,$$

which implies that $w''(x) \equiv 0$ on $[0, a]$ and hence $w(x) = k_1x + k_2$. Here, k_1, k_2 are constants. It follows from (2.13) that $w(x) \equiv 0$ for $x \in [0, a]$, contradicting (2.16). So $a = \frac{1}{2}$.

Consequently, from (2.15) we obtain that $w \in C^4([0, 1] \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\})$. Direct integration reveals that the explicit function $w(x)$ in (2.12) uniquely satisfies (2.11). Notably, $w'''(\frac{1}{2})$ is undefined and hence $w \notin C^3[0, 1]$. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2. Let us recall a well known local bifurcation theorem due to Crandall and Rabinowitz [4, Theorem 3.2].

Theorem 3.1 ([4]). *Let X and Y be Banach spaces. Let $(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times X$ and F be a continuously differentiable mapping of an open neighborhood of $(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{x})$ into Y . Let the null-space $N(F_x(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{x})) = \text{span}\{x_0\}$ be a one-dimensional and $\text{codim}R(F_x(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{x})) = 1$. Let $F_\lambda(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{x}) \notin R(F_x(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{x}))$. If Z is the complement of $\text{span}\{x_0\}$ in X , then the solution of $F(\lambda, x) = F(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{x})$ near $(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{x})$ forms a curve $(\lambda(s), x(s)) = (\lambda + \tau(s), \bar{x} + s x_0 + z(s))$, where $s \rightarrow (\tau(s), z(s)) \in \mathbb{R} \times X$ is a function that is continuously differentiable near $s = 0$ and $\tau(0) = \tau'(0) = 0, z(0) = z'(0) = 0$. Moreover, if F is k -times continuously differentiable, so are $\tau(s), z(s)$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Based on the facts (A)–(D) and the lemmas in Section 2, the proof closely follows Korman’s original proof of Theorem 1.1, utilizing the Implicit Function Theorem and the Crandall-Rabinowitz Theorem above. We omit repeating the argument and refer readers to [10] for details. The new result on the singular solution w is derived from Lemma 2.4.

For the convenience of the readers, we will briefly outline the main ideas and key points of the proof here. Consider the Banach spaces $X = \{u \in C^4[0, 1] \mid u(0) = u(1) = u'(0) = u'(1) = 0\}$ and $Y = C[0, 1]$. Define $F : \mathbb{R} \times X \rightarrow Y$ by $F(\lambda, u) = u'''' - \lambda f(u)$. Starting at the point of the trivial solution $(\lambda = 0, u = 0)$, we derive the desired solution curve \mathcal{S} by the continuation approach, relying on the Implicit Function Theorem (at regular points) and the Crandall-Rabinowitz theorem (at possible singular or turning points) to smoothly ‘continue’ the curve.

While Lemma 2.3 indicates that the solution curve cannot continue infinitely in the direction of increasing λ , a priori bounds (2.4) in Lemma 2.1 implies that this curve cannot stop at any $\lambda > 0$, nor can it have a vertical asymptote at any $\lambda > 0$. Furthermore, by the formula of the bifurcation direction at singular points, this curve must turn left at each possible singular point provided that f is convex. Therefore, the solution curve continues globally and admits exactly a turn at some critical point (λ_0, u_0) . After turning back at (λ_0, u_0) , Lemma 2.4 states that when $\lambda \downarrow 0$, there are two possible behaviors for the solution curve: it converges to either $(0, 0)$ or $(0, w)$. However, the uniqueness of solutions near the origin $(0, 0)$ excludes the convergence to $(0, 0)$, according to the Implicit Function Theorem. Here, $w(x)$ is explicitly given by (2.12) and its maximum value is r . According to (D), all positive solutions are globally parameterized by $p := u(\frac{1}{2}) = \|u\|_\infty$. From the solution curve \mathcal{S} , we immediately obtain a smooth global bifurcation curve, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{C} = \{(\lambda, \|u\|_\infty) \mid \lambda \text{ and } u \text{ satisfy (1.1)}\},$$

along which the parameter p monotonically increases; see Figure 1(ii). Moreover, the curve exhausts all solutions as p varies from 0 to r . \square

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we have established a global bifurcation result for the fourth-order equation with doubly clamped boundary conditions, assuming the nonlinearity f is increasing and convex. We have derived the complete structure of the solution set, revealing the exact multiplicity of positive solutions. The corresponding bifurcation diagram is depicted in Figure 1(ii). Examples of fourth-order MEMS models arising from the recent monograph [9] have been presented to illustrate applications of the main theorem. Additionally, we have built the a priori estimate $\|u\|_{C^3} < C$, which is optimal in term of regularity. Based on the crucial estimate, we have demonstrated that the regular solutions converges to an explicit singular solution in $C^{2+\alpha}[0, 1]$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ along the upper branch of the solution curve.

We list some interesting topics as follows for future research.

- (1) Consider a more general MEMS model than (1.1):

$$\begin{cases} u''''(x) - Tu''(x) = \lambda f(u(x)), & x \in (0, 1), T \geq 0; \\ u(0) = u'(0) = 0 = u(1) = u'(1). \end{cases}$$

Some interesting issues remain to be addressed in establishing analogous results to Theorem 1.2 for the cases when $T > 0$ (cf. problem (1.2)) and when the hypothesis of $f'(u) > 0$ is removed. Major difficulties include

establishing suitable a priori bounds and achieving global parametrization of solutions.

(2) Consider the fourth-order regularized MEMS model arising in [15, (3.13b)]:

$$\begin{cases} u''''(x) = \frac{\lambda}{(1-u)^2} - \frac{\lambda\varepsilon^{m-2}}{(1-u)^m}, & x \in (0, 1); \\ u(0) = u(1) = 0 = u'(0) = u'(1), \end{cases}$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ and $m > 2$. Compared to the known increasing and convex nonlinearity, $f(u) = \frac{1}{(1-u)^2} - \frac{\varepsilon^{m-2}}{(1-u)^m}$ here is a non-monotonic and convex-concave function. The study of global bifurcation curves becomes more challenging. In contrast to the \supset -shaped curve when $\varepsilon = 0$, numerically obtained bifurcation diagrams in [15, Figure 4] for $m = 4$ exhibit S -shaped curves appearing for small positive values of ε , but the strict proof remains to be provided.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The second author is partially supported by Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (Grant No.2022A1515011867), which is gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Buffoni, E. N. Dancer, and J. F. Toland, *The regularity and local bifurcation of steady periodic water waves*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., Vol.152 (2000), 207–240.
- [2] D. Cassani, J. M. do Ó, and N. Ghoussoub, *On a fourth order elliptic problem with a singular nonlinearity*, Advanced Nonlinear Studies, Vol.9 (2009), 177–197.
- [3] C. Cowan, P. Esposito, N. Ghoussoub, and A. Moradifam, *The critical dimension for a fourth-order elliptic problem with singular nonlinearity*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., Vol.198 (2010), 763–787.
- [4] M. G. Crandall and P. H. Rabinowitz, *Bifurcation, perturbation of simple eigenvalues, and linearized stability*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., Vol.52 (1973), 161–180.
- [5] P. Esposito, N. Ghoussoub, and Y. Guo, *Mathematical analysis of partial differential equations modeling electrostatic MEMS*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI; Courant Inst. Math. Sci., NY., 2010.
- [6] Z. Guo, B. Lai, and D. Ye, *Revisiting the biharmonic equation modelling electrostatic actuation in lower dimensions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol.142 (2014), 2027–2034.
- [7] Z. Guo and J. Wei, *Entire solutions and global bifurcations for a biharmonic equation with singular non-linearity in \mathbb{R}^3* , Adv. Differential Equations, Vol.13 (2008), 753–780.
- [8] Z. Guo and J. Wei, *On a fourth order nonlinear elliptic equation with negative exponent*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., Vol.40 (2009), 2034–2054.
- [9] A. Koochi and M. Abadyan, *Nonlinear Differential Equations in Micro/Nano Mechanics: Application in Micro/nano Structures and Electromechanical Systems*, Elsevier, 2020.
- [10] P. Korman, *Uniqueness and exact multiplicity of solutions for a class of fourth-order semi-linear problems*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, Vol.134 (2004), 179–190.

- [11] T. Laetsch, *The number of solutions of a nonlinear two point boundary value problem*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., Vol.20 (1970), 1–13.
- [12] P. Laurençot and C. Walker, *A fourth-order model for MEMS with clamped boundary conditions*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3), Vol.109 (2014), 1435–1464.
- [13] P. Laurençot and C. Walker, *Some singular equations modeling MEMS*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.), Vol.54 (2017), 437–479.
- [14] F. Lin and Y. Yang, *Nonlinear non-local elliptic equation modelling electrostatic actuation*, Proc. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. A, Math. Phys. Eng. Sci., Vol.463 (2007), 1323–1337.
- [15] A. E. Lindsay, J. Lega, and K. B. Glasner, *Regularized model of post-touchdown configurations in electrostatic MEMS: equilibrium analysis*, Physica D, Vols.280-281 (2014), 95–108.
- [16] T. Liu and H. Pan, *Global bifurcation curve for fourth-order MEMS/NEMS models*, Differ. Integral Equ., Vol.35 (2022), 437–450.
- [17] J. A. Pelesko and D. H. Bernstein, *Modeling MEMS and NEMS*, CRC Press, 2002.
- [18] B. P. Rynne, *Solution curves of $2m$ -th order boundary-value problems*, Electron. J. Differential Equations, vol.2004 (2004), no.32, 1–16.