

LOCALIZED RADIAL SOLUTIONS FOR A NONLINEAR P-LAPLACIAN EQUATION IN \mathbb{R}^N

SRIDEVI PUDIPEDDI

ABSTRACT. We establish the existence of radial solutions to the p -Laplacian equation $\Delta_p u + f(u) = 0$ in \mathbb{R}^N , where f behaves like $|u|^{q-1}u$ when u is large and $f(u) < 0$ for small positive u . We show that for each nonnegative integer n , there is a localized solution u which has exactly n zeros.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we look for solutions $u : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the nonlinear partial differential equation

$$(1.1) \quad \nabla \cdot (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) + f(u) = 0,$$

$$(1.2) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} u(x) = 0,$$

with $1 < p < N$. We also assume $f(u)$ behaves like $|u|^{q-1}u$ where u is large and $f(u) < 0$ for small positive u .

Motivation: When $p = 2$ then (1.1) is

$$\Delta u + f(u) = 0.$$

McLeod, Troy and Weissler studied the radial solutions of the above mentioned equation in [5]. In this paper they made a remark that their result could be extended to the p -Laplacian. In this paper we show that their conjecture is true. Also, Castro and Kurepa studied

$$\Delta u + g(u) = q(x),$$

subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions on a ball in \mathbb{R}^N , where g is superlinear and $q \in \mathbb{L}^2$ in [1]. The p -Laplacian equation has been studied in different settings. Gazzola, Serrin and Tang [9] have proved existence of radial solutions to a p -Laplacian equation with Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions. Calzolari, Filippucci and Pucci [8] have proved existence of radial solutions for the p -Laplacian with weights.

We assume that the function f satisfies the following hypotheses:

(H1) f is an odd locally Lipschitz continuous function,

(H2) $f(u) < 0$ for $0 < u < \epsilon_1$ for some $\epsilon_1 > 0$,

(H3) $f(u) = |u|^{q-1}u + g(u)$ with $\frac{g(|u|)}{|u|^q} \rightarrow 0$ as $|u| \rightarrow \infty$ where $1 < p < q + 1 < \frac{Np}{N-p}$.

From **(H2)** and **(H3)** we see that $f(u)$ has at least one positive zero.

(H4) Let α be the least positive zero of f and β be the greatest positive zero of f ,

(H5) Let $F(u) \equiv \int_0^u f(s)ds$ with exactly one positive zero γ , with $\gamma > \beta$,

(H6) If $p > 2$ we also assume for some $\epsilon_2 > 0$

$$\int_0^{\epsilon_2} \frac{1}{\sqrt[p]{|F(u)|}} du = \infty.$$

We assume that $u(x) = u(|x|)$ and let $r = |x|$. In this case (1.1)-(1.2) becomes the nonlinear ordinary differential equation

$$(1.3) \quad \frac{1}{r^{N-1}} (r^{N-1} |u'|^{p-2} u')' + f(u) = |u'|^{p-2} \left((p-1)u'' + \frac{N-1}{r} u' \right) + f(u) = 0$$

for $0 < r < \infty$, with

$$(1.4) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u(r) = 0, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} u'(r) = 0.$$

We would like to find \mathcal{C}^2 solutions of (1.3)-(1.4) but we will see later that this is not always possible (see the proof of Lemma 2.1). However multiplying (1.3) by r^{N-1} and integrating gives

$$(1.5) \quad r^{N-1}|u'|^{p-2}u' = - \int_0^r t^{N-1}f(u)dt.$$

Instead of looking for solutions of (1.3)-(1.4) in \mathcal{C}^2 we look for solutions of (1.4)-(1.5) in \mathcal{C}^1 .

Our Main Theorem is

*Let the nonlinearity f have the properties **(H1)**-**(H6)**, and let n be a nonnegative integer. Then there is a solution $u \in \mathcal{C}^1[0, \infty)$ of (1.4)-(1.5) such that u has exactly n zeros.*

The technique used to solve (1.4)-(1.5) is the shooting method. That is, we first solve the initial value problem

$$r^{N-1}|u'|^{p-2}u' = - \int_0^r s^{N-1}f(u(s))ds$$

$$u(0) = d \geq 0.$$

By varying d appropriately, we attempt to find a d such that $u(r, d)$ has exactly n zeros and u satisfies (1.4). In section 2, we establish the existence of solutions of this initial value problem by the contraction mapping principle. In section 3, we see that after a rescaling of u we get a family of functions $\{u_\lambda\}$, which converges to the solution of

$$-r^{N-1}|v'|^{p-2}v' = \int_0^r s^{N-1}|v|^{q-1}v ds,$$

$$v(0) = 1, \quad v'(0) = 0,$$

where $1 < p < q + 1 < \frac{Np}{N-p}$. We will then show that v has infinitely many zeros which will imply that there are solutions, u , with any given number of zeros. In section 4, we prove our Main Theorem.

Note: From **(H3)** and **(H5)** we see that

$$(1.6) \quad F(u) = \frac{1}{q+1}|u|^{q+1} + G(u),$$

where $G(u) = \int_0^u g(s)ds$. Dividing both sides by $|u|^{q+1}$ and taking the limit as $|u| \rightarrow \infty$ gives

$$(1.7) \quad \lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(u)}{|u|^{q+1}} = \lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{q+1} + \frac{G(u)}{|u|^{q+1}} \right).$$

Using L'Hopital's rule and **(H3)** we see that

$$(1.8) \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G(u)}{|u|^{q+1}} = 0.$$

Thus, we have

$$\lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(u)}{|u|^{q+1}} = \frac{1}{q+1}.$$

This implies that $F(u) \geq 0$ for $|u|$ sufficiently large, so $F(u) \geq 0$ for $|u| \geq M$. Also since F is continuous on the compact set $[-M, M]$ we see that F is bounded below and there is a $-L < 0$ such that

$$(1.9) \quad F(u) \geq -L$$

for all u .

Note: When $1 < p \leq 2$, then assumption **(H6)** also holds. This follows from **(H1)**. The details of this are as follows: since f is locally Lipschitz and since $f(0) = 0$ we have

$$|f(u)| = |f(u) - f(0)| \leq c|u - 0| = c|u|$$

for $|u| < \epsilon_2$ for some $\epsilon_2 > 0$, and where $c > 0$ is a Lipschitz constant for f . Integrating on $(0, u)$ where $0 \leq u \leq \epsilon_2$ gives:

$$-\int_0^u c t dt \leq \int_0^u f(t) dt \leq \int_0^u c t dt.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{-cu^2}{2} \leq F(u) \leq \frac{cu^2}{2}$$

for $|u| < \epsilon_2$. So, $|F(u)| \leq \frac{cu^2}{2}$ for $|u| \leq \epsilon_2$. Thus, $|F(u)|^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(\frac{c}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} u^{\frac{2}{p}}$ for $|u| < \epsilon_2$. Hence,

$$\int_0^{\epsilon_2} \frac{1}{|F(u)|^{\frac{1}{p}}} du \geq \left(\frac{2}{c}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\epsilon_2} \frac{1}{u^{\frac{2}{p}}} du = \infty, \text{ if } 1 < p \leq 2.$$

2. EXISTENCE OF SOLUTIONS OF THE INITIAL VALUE PROBLEM

Now let us consider the initial value problem

$$(2.1) \quad r^{N-1}|u'|^{p-2}u' = -\int_0^r s^{N-1}f(u(s))ds,$$

with

$$(2.2) \quad u(0) = d \geq 0.$$

The local existence of solutions of (2.1) and (2.2) is well known, see [6] and [7], so $u \in C^1[0, \epsilon]$ for $\epsilon > 0$ and small.

We define $\Phi_p(x) = |x|^{p-2}x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p > 1$. Note that the inverse of $\Phi_p(x)$ is $\Phi_{p'}(x)$ where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$, that is $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$. Note that both Φ_p and $\Phi_{p'}$ are odd for every p . Now dividing (2.1) by r^{N-1} , gives

$$(2.3) \quad |u'|^{p-2}u' = \frac{-1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r s^{N-1}f(u(s))ds.$$

Using the definition of Φ_p , we get

$$\Phi_p(u') = \frac{-1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r s^{N-1}f(u(s))ds.$$

Now applying $\Phi_{p'}$ on both sides, leads to

$$(2.4) \quad u' = -\Phi_{p'}\left(\frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r s^{N-1}f(u(s))ds\right).$$

Note that if $f(d) = 0$, then $u \equiv d$ is a solution of (2.1)-(2.2). So, we now assume that

$$(2.5) \quad f(d) \neq 0.$$

Now we explain why we aim at solutions of (1.4)-(1.5) instead of solutions of (1.3)-(1.4).

Lemma 2.1.

$$u \in C^2[0, \epsilon)$$

if $1 < p \leq 2$ and

$$u \in C^2\{r \in [0, \epsilon) \mid u'(r) \neq 0\}$$

if $p > 2$.

Proof. Now let us consider equation (2.4) which is

$$-u' = \Phi_{p'} \left(\frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt \right).$$

Since $\Phi_{p'}(x) = |x|^{p'-2}x$, so $\Phi'_{p'} = (p' - 1)|x|^{p'-2}$. Since $p' - 2 = \frac{2-p}{p-1}$, we see that $\Phi'_{p'}$ is continuous for all x , if $1 < p \leq 2$ and $\Phi'_{p'}$ is continuous at all $x \neq 0$, if $p > 2$.

Let

$$k(r) = \frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt.$$

Then using the fact that f is bounded, it is straight forward to show that k is continuous on $[0, \epsilon)$. Now,

$$k'(r) = \left[\frac{-(N-1)}{r^N} \int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt + f(u) \right]$$

so k' continuous on $(0, \epsilon)$.

Claim: k' is continuous on $[0, \epsilon)$.

Proof of the Claim: We do this in two steps:

Step 1: We show $k'(0) = \frac{f(d)}{N}$.

By definition

$$\begin{aligned} k'(0) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{k(r) - k(0)}{r - 0} \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt - 0}{r - 0} \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt}{r^N}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying L'Hopital's rule gives $k'(0) = \frac{f(d)}{N}$.

Step 2: We show $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} k'(r) = k'(0) = \frac{f(d)}{N}$.

Differentiating $k(r)$ and taking the limit as $r \rightarrow 0$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} k'(r) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{-(N-1)}{r^N} \int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt + f(u) \\ &= \frac{-(N-1)}{N} f(d) + f(d) \\ &= \frac{f(d)}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

We get the second equality by using L'Hopital's rule.

Steps 1 and 2 imply that k' is continuous on $[0, \epsilon)$.

Finally, by the chain rule and (2.1) we see u' is differentiable and that

$$\begin{aligned} -u'' &= \Phi'_{p'} \left(\frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt \right) k'(r) \\ &= (p' - 1) \left| \frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt \right|^{p'-2} \left[\frac{-(N-1)}{r^N} \int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt + f(u) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{p-1} \left| \frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt \right|^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}} \left[\frac{-(N-1)}{r^N} \int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt + f(u) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{p-1} |u'|^{2-p} \left[\frac{-(N-1)}{r^N} \int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt + f(u) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the previous claim, k' is continuous. Note that $|u'|^{2-p}$ is continuous for $1 < p \leq 2$ and $|u'|^{2-p}$ is continuous at all points where $u' \neq 0$ for $p > 2$ and hence the lemma follows. \square

Remark: If $p > 2$, $u'(r_0) = 0$, and $f(u(r_0)) \neq 0$, then $u''(r_0)$ is undefined.

To see this, suppose on the contrary that $u''(r_0)$ is defined. Using the fact that $u'(r_0) = 0$, (2.1) becomes

$$-r^{N-1} |u'|^{p-2} u' = \int_{r_0}^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt.$$

Dividing by $(r - r_0)$ and taking the limit as $r \rightarrow r_0$ gives

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow r_0} -r^{N-1} |u'|^{p-2} \left(\frac{u'}{r - r_0} \right) = \lim_{r \rightarrow r_0} \frac{\int_{r_0}^r t^{N-1} f(u(t)) dt}{(r - r_0)}.$$

Using L' Hopital's rule we obtain

$$0 = -|u'(r_0)|^{p-2} u''(r_0) = f(u(r_0)).$$

Thus, $|f(u(r_0))| = 0$ which is a contradiction to our assumption that $f(u(r_0)) \neq 0$. Thus, $u''(r_0)$ is undefined.

Remark: If $p > 2$, $u'(r_0) = 0$, and $f(u(r_0)) = 0$, then it is not clear whether u is C^2 in a neighborhood of r_0 when $u'(r_0) = 0$. However, for the purposes of this paper a more detailed analysis of this situation is not needed.

To prove the following two lemmas, let $[0, R)$ be the maximal interval of existence for which u is a solution for (2.1)-(2.2).

Our goal is to show that u solves (2.1)-(2.2) on $[0, \infty)$. So, we aim at proving $R = \infty$, and we will do this in two lemmas. In the first lemma we show that if $R < \infty$ then the limits of u and u' as $r \rightarrow R^-$ are defined. Once the limits exist then in the second lemma, we establish that $R = \infty$.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose u solves (2.1)-(2.2) on $[0, R)$ with $R < \infty$, then there exists $u_0, u'_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{r \rightarrow R^-} u(r) &= u_0, \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow R^-} u'(r) &= u'_0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The following is the energy equation for (2.1)-(2.2)

$$(2.6) \quad E(r) = \frac{(p-1)|u'|^p}{p} + F(u).$$

Using (2.1) we see that

$$(2.7) \quad E'(r) = \frac{-(N-1)|u'|^p}{r} \leq 0.$$

Note that $E'(r) \leq 0$, so E is decreasing, and so $E(r) \leq E(0)$ which is

$$\frac{(p-1)|u'|^p}{p} + F(u) \leq E(0) = F(d).$$

Then by (1.9)

$$\frac{(p-1)|u'|^p}{p} - L \leq F(d).$$

Further simplification gives

$$|u'|^p \leq \frac{p(F(d) + L)}{p-1}.$$

Then $|u'| \leq \mathbf{M}$ where $\mathbf{M} = \left[\frac{p(F(d)+L)}{p-1} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}$. So, by the mean value theorem we have

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq \mathbf{M}|x - y|$$

for all $x, y \in [0, R)$. This implies that u has a limit as $x \rightarrow R^-$. So, there exists a $u_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow R^-} u(r) = u_0$. Taking the limit as $r \rightarrow R^-$ on both sides of (2.1), we see that $\lim_{r \rightarrow R^-} u'(r)$ exists, and we call it u'_0 . \square

Lemma 2.3. *A solution exists for (2.1)-(2.2) on $[0, \infty)$.*

Proof. If $R = \infty$, we are done. Suppose $R < \infty$.

Case(i): If $u'(R) \neq 0$, then by Lemma 2.1, $u \in \mathcal{C}^2$ in a neighborhood of R , so differentiating (1.5) and then dividing by $|u'|^{p-2}$, we have

$$(p-1)u'' + \frac{N-1}{r}u' + |u'|^{2-p}f(u) = 0.$$

Since $u'(R) \neq 0$, then by the standard existence theorem for ordinary differential equations there exists a solution for the differential equation on $[R, R + \epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ with $u(R) = u_0$ and $u'(R) = u'_0$. This contradicts the definition of R , hence, $R = \infty$.

Case(ii): If $u'(R) = 0$ and $f(u(R)) \neq 0$, then we can use the contraction mapping principle and extend our solution u to $[R, R + \epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. This contradicts the definition of R .

Case(iii): If $u'(R) = 0$ and $f(u(R)) = 0$ we can extend $u \equiv u(R)$ for $r > R$. Again this contradicts the definition of R . \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let $d > \beta$, then $|u(r)| < d$ for $0 < r < \infty$ and $f(d) \neq 0$.*

Proof. From (2.6)-(2.7) it follows that

$$\frac{(p-1)|u'|^p}{p} + F(u) + \int_0^r \frac{N-1}{t}|u'|^p dt = F(d).$$

If there exists a $r_0 > 0$ such that $|u(r_0)| = d$, then

$$\int_0^{r_0} \frac{N-1}{t}|u'|^p dt = 0.$$

This implies $|u'| = 0$ on $[0, r_0]$. Hence, $u(r) \equiv d$ on $[0, r_0]$. Then by (1.5), $f(d) = 0$, but this contradicts our assumption that $f(d) \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 2.5. *If $z_1 < z_2$, with $u(z_1) = u(z_2) = 0$, and $|u| > 0$ on (z_1, z_2) , then there is exactly one extremum, m , between (z_1, z_2) and also $|u(m)| > \gamma$.*

Proof. Suppose without loss of generality that $u > 0$ on (z_1, z_2) . Then there exists an extremum, m , such that $u'(m) = 0$. And

$$F(u(m)) = E(m) \geq E(z_2) = \frac{p-1}{p}|u'(z_2)|^p \geq 0.$$

Thus $|u(m)| \geq \gamma$ for any extremum. Suppose there exists consecutive extrema $m_1 < m_2 < m_3$ such that at m_1 and m_3 we have local maxima and m_2 is a local minimum with $u' < 0$ on (m_1, m_2) and $u' > 0$ on (m_2, m_3) . We have $z_1 < m_1 < m_2 < m_3 < z_2$ and since the energy is decreasing we obtain $E(m_2) \geq E(m_3) \geq E(z_2)$. Since $u'(m_2) = u'(m_3) = 0$ and since $F(u(z_2)) = 0$ this gives

$$(2.8) \quad F(u(m_2)) \geq F(u(m_3)) \geq \frac{p-1}{p}|u'(z_2)|^p \geq 0.$$

And by **(H5)** it follows that $u(m_2) \geq \gamma$ and $u(m_3) \geq \gamma$. Also, since m_2 is a local minimum and m_3 is a local maximum we have $\gamma \leq u(m_2) < u(m_3)$. But by **(H5)**, F is increasing for $u > \gamma$ and this implies $F(u(m_2)) < F(u(m_3))$ which is a contradiction to (2.8). \square

Lemma 2.6. *If $u(r_0) = u'(r_0) = 0$ then $u \equiv 0$.*

Proof. Suppose $u(r_0) = 0$ and $u'(r_0) = 0$. First we will do the easy case, and show that $u \equiv 0$ on (r_0, ∞) . Since $E' \leq 0$ and $E(r_0) = 0$ then either $E < 0$ for $r > r_0$ or $E \equiv 0$ on $(r_0, r_0 + \epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. We will show $E \equiv 0$ on $(r_0, r_0 + \epsilon)$. For suppose $E < 0$ for $r > r_0$. Then we see that $|u| > 0$ for $r > r_0$, for if there exists an $r_1 > r_0$ such that $u(r_1) = 0$ then

$$0 \leq \frac{p-1}{p}|u'(r_1)|^p = E(r_1) < 0.$$

This is a contradiction. So suppose without loss of generality that $u > 0$ for $r > r_0$. Then for $r > r_0$ and r close to r_0 and by **(H2)**, $f(u) < 0$ so

$$-r^{N-1}|u'|^{p-2}u' = \int_{r_0}^r t^{N-1}f(u)dt < 0.$$

Thus u is increasing on $(r_0, r_0 + \epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Now since $E(r) < 0$ on $(r_0, r_0 + \epsilon)$ therefore

$$\frac{p-1}{p}|u'|^p + F(u) < 0,$$

and so

$$|u'| < \left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} |F(u)|^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\infty = \int_0^{u(r_0+\epsilon)} \frac{ds}{\sqrt[p]{|F(s)|}} = \int_{r_0}^{r_0+\epsilon} \frac{|u'|}{|F(u)|^{\frac{1}{p}}} dt < \int_{r_0}^{r_0+\epsilon} \left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} dt < \infty.$$

This is a contradiction to **(H6)** and to the note at the end of the introduction. Then $E \equiv 0$ on $[r_0, r_0 + \epsilon)$ and so

$$\frac{-(N-1)}{r}|u'|^p = E' \equiv 0$$

on $[r_0, r_0 + \epsilon)$ and thus $u \equiv 0$ on $[r_0, r_0 + \epsilon)$. Denote $[r_0, r_1)$ as the maximal half open interval for which $u \equiv 0$. If $r_1 < \infty$, again we can show that $u \equiv 0$ on $[r_1, r_1 + \epsilon)$, but this will contradict the definition of r_1 . Thus, $E \equiv 0$ on (r_0, ∞) . Hence $u \equiv 0$ on $[r_0, \infty)$.

Now we will prove that $u \equiv 0$ on $(0, r_0)$. To prove this we use the idea from [2] and do the required modifications to fit our case. We will use hypothesis **(H6)**. Let

$$r_1 = \inf_{r>0} \{r \mid u(r) = 0, u'(r) = 0\}.$$

If $r_1 = 0$ then $u \equiv 0$ on $(0, \infty)$ and then by continuity $u \equiv 0$ on $[0, \infty)$ and we are done. So suppose by the way of contradiction that $r_1 > 0$. Let $\frac{r_1}{2} < r < r_1$, so $\frac{2}{r_1} > \frac{1}{r}$. Now consider the derivative of the energy function given in equation (2.7) and then integrate it between r and r_1 to obtain

$$E(r_1, d) - E(r, d) = - \int_r^{r_1} \frac{(N-1)|u'|^p}{r} dt.$$

Since $u(r_1) = 0$, so $F(u(r_1)) = 0$ and $u'(r_1) = 0$, we get

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{(p-1)|u'|^p}{p} + F(u) = \int_r^{r_1} \frac{(N-1)|u'|^p}{t} dt.$$

Now let

$$w = \int_r^{r_1} \frac{(N-1)|u'|^p}{t} dt.$$

Differentiating we get

$$w' = - \frac{(N-1)|u'(r)|^p}{r}.$$

Solving this for $|u'|^p$, gives

$$|u'(r)|^p = \frac{-rw'}{N-1}.$$

Substituting this in (2.9) gives

$$(2.10) \quad \frac{-(p-1)rw'}{p(N-1)} + F(u) = w$$

and rearranging terms, we get

$$\frac{(p-1)rw'}{p(N-1)} + w = F(u).$$

Letting $\eta = \frac{(N-1)p}{p-1}$ then we have

$$w' + \frac{\eta w}{r} = \frac{\eta F(u)}{r}.$$

Multiplying both sides by r^η , gives

$$(r^\eta w)' = \eta r^{\eta-1} F(u).$$

Integrating between r and r_1 for r sufficiently close to r_1 , gives

$$r_1^\eta w(r_1) - r^\eta w = \int_r^{r_1} \eta t^{\eta-1} F(u) dt.$$

Since $w(r_1) = 0$, and by **(H2)**, $F(u(t)) \leq 0$ for t sufficiently close to r_1 we obtain

$$w = \frac{-\eta}{r^\eta} \int_r^{r_1} t^{\eta-1} F(u(t)) dt = \frac{\eta}{r^\eta} \int_r^{r_1} t^{\eta-1} |F(u(t))| dt.$$

Now plugging w and w' in (2.10) we have

$$\frac{(p-1)|u'|^p}{p} + F(u) = \frac{\eta}{r^\eta} \int_r^{r_1} t^{\eta-1} |F(u(t))| dt.$$

Solving this for $|u'|^p$ gives (for r close to r_1)

$$(2.11) \quad |u'|^p = \frac{p}{p-1} \left[\frac{\eta}{r^\eta} \int_r^{r_1} t^{\eta-1} |F(u(t))| dt + |F(u(r))| \right].$$

Observe next that for $r < r_1$ and r sufficiently close to r_1 that $u'(r) \neq 0$; for if there exists $r_2 < r_1$ such that $u'(r_2) = 0$ then from (2.11), $u \equiv 0$ on (r_2, r_1) , this contradicts the definition of r_1 . Hence without loss of generality assume that $u'(r) < 0$ for $r < r_1$ and r sufficiently close to r_1 . Now for $r < t < r_1$, u

is decreasing so $u(r) > u(t) > 0$ which implies $F(u(r)) < F(u(t)) < 0$ and so $|F(u(r))| > |F(u(t))| > 0$, which leads to the following

$$\begin{aligned} |u'|^p &\leq \frac{p}{p-1} \left[|F(u(r))| + \frac{\eta}{r^\eta} |F(u(r))| \int_r^{r_1} t^{\eta-1} dt \right] \\ &= \frac{p}{p-1} \left[|F(u(r))| + \frac{\eta}{r^\eta} \frac{|F(u(r))|}{\eta} (r_1^\eta - r^\eta) \right] \\ &= \frac{p|F(u(r))| r_1^\eta}{(p-1)r^\eta} \\ &\leq \frac{p2^\eta |F(u(r))|}{p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows as $\frac{2}{r_1} > \frac{1}{r}$, so

$$|u'|^p \leq \frac{p2^\eta |F(u(r))|}{p-1}.$$

Solving this for $|u'|$, we get

$$|u'| \leq \sqrt[p]{\frac{p2^\eta}{p-1}} \sqrt[p]{|F(u(r))|}.$$

Dividing by $\sqrt[p]{|F(u(r))|}$, integrating on (r, r_1) and using **(H6)** and the remark following **(H6)** we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \infty &= \int_0^{u(r)} \frac{1}{\sqrt[p]{|F(s)|}} ds = \int_r^{r_1} \frac{|u'|}{\sqrt[p]{|F(u)|}} dt \\ &\leq \sqrt[p]{\frac{p2^\eta}{p-1}} \int_r^{r_1} dt \\ &= \sqrt[p]{\frac{p2^\eta}{p-1}} (r_1 - r) \\ &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get a contradiction and so $r_1 = 0$ and hence $u \equiv 0$. □

3. SOLUTIONS WITH A PRESCRIBED NUMBER OF ZEROS

In this section we show that there are solutions for (2.1)-(2.2) with a large number of zeros. For this we study the behavior of solutions as d grows large. We consider the idea from [5], page 371 and we do the required modifications to fit our case. Given $\lambda > 0$, let $u(r)$ be the solution of (2.1)-(2.2) with $d = \lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}}$. Define

$$(3.1) \quad u_\lambda = \lambda^{\frac{-p}{q-p+1}} u\left(\frac{r}{\lambda}\right).$$

Then u_λ satisfies

$$(3.2) \quad r^{N-1} |u'_\lambda|^{p-2} u'_\lambda = - \int_0^r s^{N-1} \lambda^{\frac{-pq}{q-p+1}} f(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}} u_\lambda(s)) ds,$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad u_\lambda(0) = 1.$$

Lemma 3.1. As $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, $u_\lambda \rightarrow v$, uniformly on compact subsets of $[0, \infty)$, where v is a solution of

$$(3.4) \quad r^{N-1}|v'|^{p-2}v' = - \int_0^r s^{N-1}|v(s)|^{q-1}v(s)ds,$$

$$(3.5) \quad v(0) = 1.$$

Proof. Let

$$E(r, \lambda) = \frac{(p-1)|u'_\lambda|^p}{p} + \lambda^{\frac{-pq}{q-p+1}} F(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}} u_\lambda)$$

then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} E(r, \lambda) \equiv E'(r, \lambda) = - \frac{(N-1)|u'_\lambda|^p}{r}.$$

This implies $E(r, \lambda)$ is decreasing in r . So for $\lambda > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} E(r, \lambda) &\leq E(0, \lambda) \\ &= \lambda^{\frac{-pq}{q-p+1}} F(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}}) \end{aligned}$$

Using (1.6) to simplify the right hand side, gives the following:

$$\lambda^{\frac{-p(q+1)}{q-p+1}} F(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}}) = \lambda^{\frac{-p(q+1)}{q-p+1}} \frac{\lambda^{\frac{p(q+1)}{q-p+1}}}{q+1} + \lambda^{\frac{-p(q+1)}{q-p+1}} G(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}})$$

$$(3.6) \quad \lambda^{\frac{-p(q+1)}{q-p+1}} F(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}}) = \frac{1}{q+1} + \lambda^{\frac{-p(q+1)}{q-p+1}} G(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}}).$$

Then by (1.8)

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{G(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}})}{(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}})^{q+1}} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, $E(r, \lambda) < \frac{2}{q+1}$ for large λ . Moreover $E(r, \lambda)$ is bounded above independently of r and for large λ .

The usual trick to show the convergence of u_λ is to use Arzela-Ascoli's Theorem. For this it suffices to show u_λ and u'_λ are bounded.

Claim: $u_\lambda(r)$ and $u'_\lambda(r)$ are bounded.

Proof of Claim: By Lemma 2.4, $|u(r)| \leq d = \lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}}$. Thus, by (3.1), $|u_\lambda(r)| \leq 1$. Also, since $E(r, \lambda) \leq E(0, \lambda)$ we have

$$\frac{(p-1)|u'_\lambda|^p}{p} + \lambda^{\frac{-pq}{q-p+1}} F(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}} u_\lambda) \leq \lambda^{\frac{-pq}{q-p+1}} F(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}}).$$

Since $F(u) \geq -L$ (proved in introduction) then we get

$$\frac{(p-1)|u'_\lambda|^p}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q+1} + \lambda^{\frac{-p(q+1)}{q-p+1}} G(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}}) + L\lambda^{\frac{-pq}{q-p+1}}.$$

By (3.7) we see that

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{(p-1)|u'_\lambda|^p}{p} \leq \frac{2}{q+1}$$

for large λ . Hence, $|u'_\lambda|$ is bounded independent of r and for large λ . By Arzela-Ascoli's theorem and by a standard diagonal argument there is a subsequence of $u_\lambda(r)$, denoted by $u_{\lambda_k}(r)$, such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_{\lambda_k}(r) = v(r)$$

uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{R} and v is continuous. **End of proof of Claim.**

We have

$$(3.9) \quad r^{N-1}|u'_\lambda|^{p-2}u'_\lambda = - \int_0^r s^{N-1} \lambda^{\frac{-pq}{q-p+1}} f(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}} u_\lambda(s)) ds$$

$$r^{N-1}|u'_\lambda|^{p-2}u'_\lambda = - \int_0^r s^{N-1} \left[|u_\lambda|^{q-1} u_\lambda + \lambda^{\frac{-pq}{q-p+1}} g(\lambda^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}} u_\lambda(s)) \right] ds$$

also,

$$(3.10) \quad u'_{\lambda_k} = -\Phi_{p'} \left(\frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r s^{N-1} \left[|u_{\lambda_k}|^{q-1} u_{\lambda_k} + \lambda_k^{\frac{-pq}{q-p+1}} g(\lambda_k^{\frac{p}{q-p+1}} u_{\lambda_k}) \right] ds \right).$$

Since $u_{\lambda_k}(r) \rightarrow v(r)$ uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{R} and using **(H3)**, gives

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u'_{\lambda_k} = -\Phi_{p'} \left(\frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r s^{N-1} |v|^{q-1} v ds \right)$$

$$\equiv \phi.$$

Hence, $u'_{\lambda_k} \rightarrow \phi$ (pointwise) and since v is continuous it follows that ϕ is continuous. We also have

$$u_{\lambda_k} = 1 + \int_0^r u'_{\lambda_k} ds.$$

Since $u_{\lambda_k} \rightarrow v$ uniformly, and $u'_{\lambda_k} \rightarrow \phi$ pointwise, and by (3.8), u'_{λ_k} is uniformly bounded say by, M , applying dominated convergence theorem we get

$$v(r) = 1 + \int_0^r \phi(s) ds.$$

So,

$$v' = \phi.$$

Thus, from (3.10) we see that

$$v' = -\Phi_{p'} \left(\frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r s^{N-1} |v|^{q-1} v ds \right).$$

Hence,

$$-r^{N-1}|v'|^{p-2}v' = \int_0^r s^{N-1}|v|^{q-1}v ds.$$

Note that $v(0) = 1, v'(0) = 0$. Hence, $v \in \mathcal{C}^1[0, \infty)$ and v satisfies (3.4)-(3.5) for $1 < p < q + 1 < \frac{Np}{N-p}$. \square

As u_{λ_k} converges to v uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{R} , so now we look for zeros of v . This is done in two steps. In step one we show v has a zero and in step two we show v has infinitely many zeros. The following lemma is technical and we use the result in the subsequent lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Let v solve (3.4)-(3.5). If $1 < p < q + 1 < \frac{Np}{N-p}$ and if $v > 0$, then*

$$\int_0^\infty s^{N-1} v^{q+1} ds < \infty.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, we know that v is continuous and hence bounded on any compact set so to prove this lemma it is sufficient to show $\int_1^\infty s^{N-1}v^{q+1}ds < \infty$. We have

$$-r^{N-1}|v'|^{p-2}v' = \int_0^r s^{N-1}|v|^{q-1}v ds$$

and $v > 0$. So $v' < 0$ and so v is decreasing. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} r^{N-1}|v'|^{p-1} &= \int_0^r s^{N-1}v^q ds \\ &\geq v(r)^q \int_0^r s^{N-1} ds \\ &= \frac{v^q r^N}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |v'|^{p-1} &\geq \frac{v^q r}{N} \\ -v' = |v'| &\geq \frac{r^{\frac{1}{p-1}} v^{\frac{q}{p-1}}}{N^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} \\ \frac{-v'}{v^{\frac{q}{p-1}}} &\geq \frac{r^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{N^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating this on $(0, r)$, gives

$$\left[\frac{-v^{\frac{-q}{p-1}+1}}{\frac{-q}{p-1}+1} \right]_0^r \geq \int_0^r \frac{s^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{N^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} ds$$

further simplification gives

$$\left[\frac{(p-1)v^{\frac{p-q-1}{p-1}}}{q-p+1} \right]_0^r \geq \frac{(p-1)r^{\frac{p}{p-1}}}{pN^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}.$$

Since by assumption $\frac{q-p+1}{p-1} > 0$, multiplying both sides with $\frac{q-p+1}{p-1}$ leads to

$$[v^{\frac{p-1-q}{p-1}}]_0^r \geq \frac{(q-p+1)r^{\frac{p}{p-1}}}{pN^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}.$$

Thus,

$$v(r)^{\frac{p-1-q}{p-1}} - 1 \geq C r^{\frac{p}{p-1}},$$

where $C = \frac{q-p+1}{pN^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}$. So,

$$\frac{1}{v^{\frac{q+1-p}{p-1}}} = v^{\frac{p-1-q}{p-1}} \geq 1 + C r^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \geq C r^{\frac{p}{p-1}}.$$

Thus,

$$v^{\frac{q+1-p}{p-1}} \leq C_1 r^{\frac{-p}{p-1}}.$$

So,

$$v \leq C_1 r^{\frac{-p}{q+1-p}}.$$

Thus we see that

$$\int_1^\infty s^{N-1}v^{q+1} ds \leq C_1^{q+1} \int_1^\infty s^{N-1-\frac{p(q+1)}{q+1-p}} ds < \infty.$$

The last inequality is due to our assumption that $1 < p < q+1 < \frac{Np}{N-p}$. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let v be a solution of (3.4)-(3.5). Then v has a zero.*

Proof. To prove this lemma, we use an idea of paper [3]. Suppose $v > 0$ for all r , and consider integrating

$$(r^{N-1}vv'|v'|^{p-2})' = r^{N-1}|v'|^p - r^{N-1}v^{q+1}$$

on $(0, r)$, which leads to

$$r^{N-1}vv'|v'|^{p-2} = \int_0^r s^{N-1}|v'|^p ds - \int_0^r s^{N-1}v^{q+1} ds.$$

After rearranging terms, we have

$$(3.11) \quad -r^{N-1}vv'|v'|^{p-2} + \int_0^r s^{N-1}|v'|^p ds = \int_0^r s^{N-1}v^{q+1} ds.$$

Since $v > 0, v' < 0$, and since $p < q + 1$, it follows from (3.11) and Lemma 3.2 that

$$(3.12) \quad \int_0^\infty s^{N-1}|v'|^p \leq \int_0^\infty s^{N-1}v^{q+1} ds < \infty.$$

Then using (3.12) in (3.11) and taking the limit as $r \rightarrow \infty$, gives

$$(3.13) \quad -\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{N-1}vv'|v'|^{p-2} \text{ exists and is finite.}$$

Now integrating the following identity

$$\left(\frac{(p-1)r^N|v'|^p}{p} + \frac{r^N v^{q+1}}{q+1} \right)' = \frac{-(N-p)|v'|^p r^{N-1}}{p} + \frac{Nr^{N-1}v^{q+1}}{q+1}$$

on $(0, r)$, gives

$$(3.14) \quad \left(\frac{(p-1)r^N|v'|^p}{p} + \frac{r^N v^{q+1}}{q+1} \right) = \int_0^r \frac{-(N-p)|v'|^p s^{N-1}}{p} ds + \int_0^r \frac{Ns^{N-1}v^{q+1}}{q+1} ds.$$

Then by (3.12), both the integrals on the right hand side of (3.14) converge, hence

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(p-1)r^N|v'|^p}{p} + \frac{r^N v^{q+1}}{q+1}$$

exists. Denote

$$h(r) = \frac{(p-1)r^N|v'|^p}{p} + \frac{r^N v^{q+1}}{q+1}.$$

We have shown that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} h(r) = l$ for some $l \geq 0$. Then by (3.12),

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{h(s)}{s} ds < \infty.$$

Thus, it follows that $l = 0$, so that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(p-1)r^N|v'|^p}{p} + \frac{r^N v^{q+1}}{q+1} = 0.$$

Then taking the limit as $r \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.14) gives

$$0 = \int_0^\infty \frac{-(N-p)|v'|^p s^{N-1}}{p} ds + \int_0^\infty \frac{Ns^{N-1}v^{q+1}}{q+1} ds.$$

So,

$$\int_0^\infty s^{N-1}|v'|^p ds = \frac{Np}{(N-p)(q+1)} \int_0^\infty s^{N-1}v^{q+1} ds.$$

But by (3.12) we have

$$\int_0^\infty s^{N-1}|v'|^p \leq \int_0^\infty s^{N-1}v^{q+1} ds.$$

So it follows that

$$\frac{Np}{(N-p)(q+1)} \leq 1.$$

This contradicts our assumption that $q+1 < \frac{Np}{N-p}$. So, v is not positive for all r . Hence, v has a zero. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let v be the solution of (3.4)-(3.5). Then v has infinitely many zeros.*

Proof. We have from the above lemma that there exists a z_1 such that $v > 0$ on $[0, z_1]$ and $v(z_1) = 0$. So after z_1 we have two cases, **Case(i)**: v has a first local minimum call it $m_1 > z_1$, or **Case (ii)**: $v' < 0$ for all $r > z_1$. We want to show that the **Case(ii)** is not possible. Suppose $v' < 0$ for all $r > 0$. Then

$$E \equiv \frac{(p-1)|v'|^p}{p} + \frac{1}{q+1}|v|^{q+1} \geq 0$$

and $E' \leq 0$ so

$$\frac{1}{q+1}|v|^{q+1} \leq E(r, d) \leq E(0, d) = \frac{1}{q+1}.$$

Thus $|v| \leq 1$. So v is bounded and $v' < 0$ and thus $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} v = J$. Also since E is bounded and since $E' \leq 0$, so $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} E(r, d)$ exists and thus $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} v'(r)$ exists.

Claim: $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} v'(r) = 0$.

Proof of Claim: Suppose not, which means $-v'(r) > m > 0$ for large r . Then integrating from $(0, r)$, gives

$$-v(r) + v(0) > mr.$$

Taking the limit as $r \rightarrow \infty$, we see that $-v$ is unbounded, which contradicts our assumption that v is bounded. So, we have the claim. **End of proof of Claim.**

Consider dividing (3.4) by r^N and then taking the limit as $r \rightarrow \infty$ and using the above claim, gives

$$0 = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\int_0^r t^{N-1}|v|^{q-1}v \, dt}{r^N}.$$

Applying L'Hopital's rule on right hand side and using $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} v(r) = J < 0$ gives

$$0 = \frac{-|J|^{q-1}J}{N}.$$

This contradicts our assumption that $J < 0$. So **Case(ii)** is not possible.

Hence, v has a first local minimum call it m_1 , where $m_1 > z_1$, and let $v_1 = v(m_1) < 0$. Now v satisfies

$$r^{N-1}|v'|^{p-2}v' = -\int_{m_1}^r t^{N-1}|v|^{q-1}v \, dt$$

and

$$v(m_1) = v_1.$$

We may now use the same argument as in Lemma 3.3 to show that v has a second zero at $z_2 > z_1$. Proceeding inductively, we can show that v has infinitely many zeros. \square

As $u_\lambda \rightarrow v$ on any fixed compact set when λ is large, this means that the graph of u_λ is uniformly close to the graph of v . Since v has infinitely many zeros, suppose the first ρ zeros of v are on $[0, K]$ for $K > 0$. By uniform convergence on compact subsets u_λ will have at least ρ zeros on $[0, K+1]$ for large λ . By (3.1), $u_\lambda(r) = \lambda^{\frac{-p}{q-p+1}}u\left(\frac{r}{\lambda}\right)$, so u will have at least ρ zeros on $[0, \infty)$. So now we are ready to shift gears from v to u .

The following lemma is technical and we mimic the idea from [4] and we do necessary changes to fit our case.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $u(r, d)$ be the solution of (2.1)-(2.2). Let us suppose that $u(r, d^*)$ has exactly k zeros and $u(r, d^*) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. If $|d - d^*|$ is sufficiently small, then $u(r, d)$ has at most $k + 1$ zeros on $[0, \infty)$.*

Proof. Our goal is to show that for d close to d^* , $u(\cdot, d)$ has at most $(k + 1)$ zeros in $[0, \infty)$. So we suppose there is a sequence of values d_j converging to d^* and such that $u(\cdot, d_j)$ has at least $(k + 1)$ zeros on $[0, \infty)$ (if there is no such sequence, we are done). We write $u_j(r) = u(r, d_j)$ and we denote by z_j the $(k + 1)$ st zero of u_j , counting from the smallest. We will show that if u_j has a $(k + 2)$ nd zero, then $u(r, d^*)$ is going to have a $(k + 1)$ st zero, which is a contradiction.

First we show that $u(r, d_j) \rightarrow u(r, d^*)$ and $u'(r, d_j) \rightarrow u'(r, d^*)$ on compact subsets of $[0, \infty)$ as $d_j \rightarrow d^*$ and $j \rightarrow \infty$. We prove this in two claims.

Claim 1: If $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} d_j = d^*$, then $|u(r, d_j)| \leq M_1$ and $|u'(r, d_j)| \leq M_2$ for some $M_1, M_2 > 0$ for all j .

Proof of Claim 1: We use the fact from (2.6) and (2.7) that energy is decreasing and hence E is bounded by $E(0, d_j) = F(d_j)$, we can write the energy at r as the following

$$E(r, d_j) = \frac{(p-1)|u'(r, d_j)|^p}{p} + F(u(r, d_j)) \leq F(d_j) \leq F(d^*) + 1$$

for large j . Also, by (1.9), $F(u) \geq -L$ thus

$$\frac{(p-1)|u'(r, d_j)|^p}{p} \leq F(d^*) + 1 + L \leq C$$

for large j and for some $C > 0$. Thus, for j large, $|u'(r, d_j)| \leq M_2$ for some $M_2 > 0$. Also, note that since $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} E(r, d^*)$ exists and since $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u(r, d^*) = 0$ it follows that

$$F(d^*) = E(0, d^*) > \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} E(r, d^*) \geq 0.$$

Thus, $F(d^*) > 0$. Hence by **(H4)** and **(H5)**, $d^* > \gamma$. By lemma 2.4, $|u(r, d_j)| \leq d_j$ and since $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} d_j = d^*$ we have $|u(r, d_j)| \leq d^* + 1 = M_1$ for large j . **End of proof of Claim 1.**

Claim 2: $u(r, d_j) \rightarrow u(r, d^*)$ and $u'(r, d_j) \rightarrow u'(r, d^*)$ uniformly on compact subsets of $[0, \infty)$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof of Claim 2: By Claim 1, $|u(r, d_j)| \leq M_1$ and $|u'(r, d_j)| \leq M_2$. So the $u(r, d_j)$ are bounded and equicontinuous. Then by Arzela-Ascoli's theorem we have a subsequence (still denoted by d_j) such that $u(r, d_j) \rightarrow u(r, d^*)$ uniformly on compact subsets of $[0, \infty)$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Then by (2.1) and since $u_j \rightarrow u$ uniformly on compact subsets of $[0, \infty)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |u'_j|^{p-2} u'_j &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r s^{N-1} f(u_j) ds \\ &= \frac{-1}{r^{N-1}} \int_0^r s^{N-1} f(u) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $|u'_j|^{p-2} u'_j$ converges uniformly on compact subsets of $[0, \infty)$. Thus, $u'_j(r)$ converges uniformly say to $g(r)$. We now show that $g(r) = u'(r, d^*)$. Integrating on $(0, r)$, gives

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^r u'_j(t) dt &= \int_0^r g(t) dt \\ \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (u_j(r) - u_j(0)) &= \int_0^r g(t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since $u_j(r, d_j) \rightarrow u(r, d^*)$, we get

$$u(r, d^*) - u(0, d^*) = \int_0^r g(t) dt.$$

Differentiating this we get $u'(r, d^*) = g(r) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} u'_j$. **End of proof of Claim 2.**

Let t_j be the $(k+2)$ nd zero of u_j . Then there exists an l_j such that $z_j < l_j < t_j$ and l_j is a local extremum. So by Lemma 2.6

$$F(u(l_j)) = E(l_j, d_j) \geq E(t_j, d_j) = \frac{p-1}{p} |u'(t_j)|^p > 0.$$

Then by **(H5)**, $|u(l_j)| > \gamma$. Now let b_j be the smallest number greater than z_j such that $|u_j(b_j)| = \alpha$. Let a_j be the smallest number greater than z_j such that $|u_j(a_j)| = \frac{\alpha}{2}$. Let m_j be the local extrema between the k th and $(k+1)$ st zeros of u_j . So we have $m_j < z_j < a_j < b_j$. Since the energy is decreasing we have $E(z_j, d_j) \leq E(m_j, d_j)$. Since $u'_j(m_j) = 0$, $u_j(z_j) = 0$, $F(u_j(z_j)) = 0$, and by Lemma 2.6, we have

$$0 < \frac{(p-1)|u'_j(z_j)|^p}{p} \leq F(u_j(m_j)).$$

Thus, $|u_j(m_j)| > \gamma$. So there exists a largest number q_j less than z_j such that $|u_j(q_j)| = \gamma$. Note $m_j < q_j < z_j < a_j < b_j < l_j < t_j$.

Claim 3: $b_j - a_j \geq K_1 > 0$, where K_1 is independent of j for sufficiently large j . Also, $\xi_2 - \xi_1 \geq K_2 > 0$ where ξ_1 and ξ_2 are two consecutive zeros of u_j .

Proof of Claim 3: Since the energy is decreasing and since $d_j \rightarrow d^*$ for j large we have

$$\frac{p-1}{p} |u'_j|^p + F(u_j) \leq F(d_j) \leq F(d^*) + 1$$

for large j . Rewriting this inequality gives

$$(3.15) \quad \frac{|u'_j|}{(F(d^*) + 1 - F(u_j))^{\frac{1}{p}}} \leq \left(\frac{p}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

So integrate (3.15) on (a_j, b_j) to get

$$\int_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}^{\alpha} \frac{dt}{(F(d^*) + 1 - F(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}} = \int_{a_j}^{b_j} \frac{|u'_j|}{(F(d^*) + 1 - F(u_j))^{\frac{1}{p}}} ds \leq \left(\frac{p}{p-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} (b_j - a_j).$$

So letting

$$(3.16) \quad K_1 \equiv \left(\frac{p-1}{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \int_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}^{\alpha} \frac{dt}{(F(d^*) + 1 - F(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}}$$

we see that $K_1 \leq b_j - a_j$ for all j .

Turning to the second part of the claim, using Lemma 2.5, let m be the extremum between ξ_1 and ξ_2 . Let us integrate (3.15) on (ξ_1, m) and using (3.15) and that $|u(m)| > \gamma$ (by Lemma 2.5) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{p-1}{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\gamma} \frac{dt}{(F(d^*) + 1 - F(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}} &\leq \left(\frac{p-1}{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{|u(m)|} \frac{dt}{(F(d^*) + 1 - F(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}} \\ &= \left(\frac{p-1}{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \int_{\xi_1}^m \frac{|u'_j|}{(F(d^*) + 1 - F(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}} ds \\ &\leq m - \xi_1. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly on $[m, \xi_2]$ we have,

$$\left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^\gamma \frac{dt}{(F(d^*) + 1 - F(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}} \leq \xi_2 - m.$$

So,

$$(3.17) \quad K_2 \equiv 2 \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^\gamma \frac{dt}{(F(d^*) + 1 - F(t))^{\frac{1}{p}}} \leq \xi_2 - \xi_1.$$

End of proof of Claim 3.

In particular $u_j \rightarrow u$ uniformly on $\left[0, y^* + \frac{K_2}{2}\right]$ where y^* is the k th zero of $u(r, d^*)$. Along with Lemma 2.6 and the previous claim, it follows that for large j , u_j has exactly k zeros on $\left[0, y^* + \frac{K_2}{2}\right]$. Let y_j be the k th zero of u_j , then by Claim 2, $u_j(r, d_j) \rightarrow u(r, d^*)$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ on $\left[0, y^* + \frac{K_2}{2}\right]$, so $y_j \rightarrow y^*$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

Claim 4: $z_j \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof of Claim 4: Suppose not, that is if $|z_j| \leq A$ then there exists a subsequence j_k such that $z_{j_k} \rightarrow z$ and $u(r, d_{j_k}) \rightarrow u(r, d^*)$ on $[0, A]$ which in turn implies

$$0 = u(z_{j_k}, d_{j_k}) \rightarrow u(z, d^*).$$

Since $z_{j_k} > y_{j_k}$ and $y_{j_k} \rightarrow y^*$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, then $z \geq y^*$. On the other hand, $u(r, d^*)$ has exactly k zeros, therefore $z = y^*$. Thus $u_j(y_j) = 0 = u_j(z_j)$. By the mean value theorem, $u'_j(w_j) = 0$ for some w_j with $y_j \leq w_j \leq z_j$. Since $u_j \rightarrow u$ uniformly on $[0, A]$ and $y_j \rightarrow y^* \leftarrow z_j$, so taking the limit gives $u'(y^*) = 0$, but by Lemma 2.6, this implies $u \equiv 0$. This is a contradiction to our assumption that u has exactly k zeros. **End of Claim 4.**

Now let us show that the q_j are bounded as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Since $u_j \rightarrow u$ and $u'_j \rightarrow u'$ uniformly on compact subsets of $[y^*, m^* + 1]$, where m^* is the local extremum of $u(r, d^*)$ that occurs after y^* , we see that u'_j must be zero on $[y^*, m^* + 1]$ for j large. Thus there exists an m_j with $y_j < m_j < m^* + 1$ such that $u'_j(m_j) = 0$.

Next, we estimate $q_j - m_j$ on $[m_j, q_j]$, since $u \geq \gamma > \beta$ on $[m_j, q_j]$ so we have $f(u) \geq C > 0$. So

$$-r^{N-1}|u'_j|^{p-2}u'_j = - \int_{m_j}^r (r^{n-1}|u'_j|^{p-2}u'_j)' dt = \int_{m_j}^r r^{N-1}f(u_j) dt \geq \frac{C(r^N - m_j^N)}{N} \geq \frac{C}{N}(r - m_j)r^{N-1}.$$

So we have

$$-|u'_j|^{p-2}u'_j \geq \frac{C}{N}(r - m_j).$$

Further simplification and integrating on $[m_j, q_j]$ gives

$$d_j - \gamma \geq u(m_j) - \gamma = \int_{m_j}^{q_j} u'_j dt \geq \left(\frac{C}{N}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \int_{m_j}^{q_j} (r - m_j)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} dt.$$

Now using Lemma 2.4 and the fact that j is large gives

$$d^* + 1 \geq d_j - \gamma \geq \left(\frac{C}{N}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \left(\frac{p-1}{p}\right) (q_j - m_j)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}$$

for large j . As we saw in a previous paragraph that m_j are bounded by $m^* + 1$, it follows that q_j are bounded.

Claim 5: For sufficiently large j , $|u_j(r)| < \gamma$ for all $r > z_j$.

Proof of Claim 5: Suppose on the contrary that there is a smallest $c_j > z_j$ such that $|u_j(c_j)| = \gamma$. Thus, on (z_j, c_j) we have $0 < |u_j| < \gamma$. Hence, $F(u_j) \leq 0$ on (z_j, c_j) . So there exists an a_j and a b_j such that $z_j < a_j < b_j < c_j$ with $|u_j(a_j)| = \frac{\alpha}{2}$, $|u_j(b_j)| = \alpha$. Also, F is decreasing on $[\frac{\alpha}{2}, \alpha]$, so that $F(\frac{\alpha}{2}) \geq F(u_j)$ for all $\frac{\alpha}{2} \leq u_j \leq \alpha$.

Now integrating the following identity on (q_j, c_j)

$$(r^{\frac{p(N-1)}{p-1}} E)' = \frac{p(N-1)F(u_j(r))r^{\frac{Np-2p+1}{p-1}}}{p-1}$$

and since $|u_j(q_j)| = |u_j(c_j)| = \gamma$ and $F(u_j(q_j)) = 0 = F(u_j(c_j))$, gives

$$(3.18) \quad 0 \leq \frac{c_j^{\frac{p(N-1)}{p-1}} |u'_j(c_j)|^p (p-1)}{p} = \frac{q_j^{\frac{p(N-1)}{p-1}} |u'_j(q_j)|^p (p-1)}{p} + \int_{q_j}^{c_j} \frac{p(N-1)F(u_j(r))t^{\frac{Np-2p+1}{p-1}}}{p-1} dt.$$

Since q_j is bounded, for an appropriate subsequence $q_j \rightarrow q^*$ where $u(q^*, d^*) = \gamma$ and since $u'_j \rightarrow u'$ uniformly on $[0, q^* + 1]$, then $u'_j(q_j) \rightarrow u'(q^*, d^*)$. Hence

$$(3.19) \quad \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{q_j}^{c_j} t^{\frac{(N-2)p+1}{p-1}} F(u_j(r)) dt \geq - \frac{(q^*)^{\frac{p(N-1)}{p-1}} |u'(q^*, d^*)|^p (p-1)}{p} > -\infty.$$

Also, since $z_j \rightarrow \infty$ and since $z_j < a_j < b_j$, so $a_j \rightarrow \infty$.

On other hand, by Claim 3

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{q_j}^{c_j} t^{\frac{(N-2)p+1}{p-1}} F(u_j(t)) dt &\leq \int_{a_j}^{b_j} t^{\frac{(N-2)p+1}{p-1}} F(u_j(t)) dt \\ &\leq F\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) (b_j^{\frac{(N-1)p}{p-1}} - a_j^{\frac{(N-1)p}{p-1}}) \left(\frac{p-1}{(N-1)p}\right) \\ &\leq F\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) a_j^{\frac{(N-1)p}{p-1}-1} (b_j - a_j) \left(\frac{p-1}{(N-1)p}\right) \\ &\leq K_1 F\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) a_j^{\frac{(N-1)p}{p-1}-1} \left(\frac{p-1}{(N-1)p}\right) \rightarrow -\infty \end{aligned}$$

as $j \rightarrow \infty$. (We obtain the last inequality by using $K_1 \leq (b_j - a_j)$ from Claim 3 and also $F(\frac{\alpha}{2}) < 0$.) Thus,

$$\int_{q_j}^{c_j} t^{\frac{(N-2)p+1}{p-1}} F(u_j(t)) dt \rightarrow -\infty,$$

but this is a contradiction to (3.19). Hence, $|u_j(r)| < \gamma$ for large j and for $r > z_j$. **End of proof of Claim 5.**

Now suppose u_j has another zero, call it $t_j > z_j$. Then there is a local extrema for u_j at a value s_j such that $z_j < s_j < t_j$. Since the energy is decreasing, we have $E(t_j) \leq E(s_j)$. By Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6 we have

$$0 < \frac{(p-1)|u'_j(t_j)|^p}{p} \leq F(u_j(s_j)).$$

Thus $|u_j(s_j)| > \gamma$ (by **(H5)**). By Claim 5, for sufficiently large j and for all $r > z_j$ we have $|u_j(r)| < \gamma$. In particular $|u_j(s_j)| < \gamma$, a contradiction. Hence, there is no zero of u_j larger than z_j . \square

4. PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM

To prove the **Main Theorem** we construct the following sets such that u has any prescribed number of zeros.

Let $\mathcal{S}_k = \{d \geq \gamma \mid u(r, d) \text{ has exactly } k \text{ zeros for } r \geq 0\}$ and let $d_k = \sup \mathcal{S}_k$.

We will then show that \mathcal{S}_k for $k \geq 0$ is nonempty and bounded above.

Let $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{d \geq \gamma \mid u(r, d) > 0 \text{ for all } r \geq 0\}$.

Claim: $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}_0$.

Proof of Claim: If $d = \gamma$, then $u(0) = \gamma > 0$. So the energy at $r = 0$ is

$$E(0, \gamma) = \frac{p-1}{p} |u'(0)|^p + F(u(0)) = 0.$$

So $E < 0$ for $r > 0$; for if there is an $r_1 > 0$ such that $E(r_1, \gamma) = 0$ then $E \equiv 0$ on $[0, r_1]$, this implies $u \equiv 0$ on $[0, r_1]$, but $u(0) = \gamma > 0$. Thus $E < 0$ for $r > 0$. If there exists an r_2 such that $u(r_2) = 0$ then

$$E(r_2, d) = \frac{p-1}{p} |u'(r_2)|^p \geq 0$$

contradicting $E < 0$ for all $r > 0$. Therefore, $u(r, \gamma) > 0$ for all $r \geq 0$. Hence $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}_0$. **End of proof of Claim.**

Lemma 4.1. $\mathcal{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$ and \mathcal{S}_0 is bounded above.

Proof. \mathcal{S}_0 is nonempty by the above Claim and \mathcal{S}_0 is bounded above by the Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3. \square

Let $d_0 = \sup \mathcal{S}_0$. Since $d > \gamma$ for all $d \in \mathcal{S}_0$ so $d_0 > \gamma > 0$.

Now our goal is to show that $u(r, d_0) > 0$ and that $u(r, d_0)$ satisfies (1.4). As d_0 is the supremum of \mathcal{S}_0 we expect $u(r, d_0) > 0$. We prove this in two lemmas. In the first lemma we show $u(r, d_0) \geq 0$ and in the second lemma we show $u(r, d_0) > 0$.

Lemma 4.2. $u(r, d_0) \geq 0$ for all $r \geq 0$.

Proof. If $u(r_0, d_0) < 0$ for some r_0 , then by continuity with respect to initial conditions on compact sets for d close to d_0 and $d < d_0$, we have $u(r_0, d) < 0$. This contradicts the definition of \mathcal{S}_0 . \square

Lemma 4.3. $u(r, d_0) > 0$.

Proof. Suppose there exists an r_1 such that $u(r_1, d_0) = 0$. By Lemma 4.2, we know $u(r, d_0) \geq 0$. So $u(r, d_0)$ has a minimum at r_1 and also since $u \in C^1[0, \infty)$, this implies $u'(r_1) = 0$. Then by Lemma 2.6, $u \equiv 0$ which is a contradiction to $u(0) = d_0 \neq 0$. \square

Let $d > d_0$. Then $u(r, d)$ has at least one zero, otherwise d would be in \mathcal{S}_0 which it is not. Moreover, as d approaches d_0 from above, we expect that the first zero of u , $z_1(d)$, should go to infinity. This is shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4. $\lim_{d \rightarrow d_0^+} z_1(d) = \infty$.

Proof. Suppose $\lim_{d \rightarrow d_0^+} z_1(d) = z_{d_0} < \infty$. Since $u(r, d) \rightarrow u(r, d_0)$ uniformly on compact subsets as $d \rightarrow d_0$, this implies $u(z_{d_0}) = \lim_{d \rightarrow d_0} u(z_1(d), d)$, and which in turn implies $u(z_{d_0}, d_0) = 0$. However, by Lemma 4.3, $u(r, d_0) > 0$, which is a contradiction. \square

Next we want to show the energy $E(r, d_0) \geq 0$. This is crucial, as if $E(r, d_0) < 0$ at some point, say n_1 , then u will not have any zeros after n_1 , and also u will not decay as $r \rightarrow \infty$. So we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. $E(r, d_0) \geq 0$ for all $r \geq 0$.

Proof. If $E(r_0, d_0) < 0$ then by continuity $E(r_0, d) < 0$ for $d > d_0$ and d close to d_0 . On other hand, since $d > d_0$ then $u(r, d)$ has a first zero, $z_1(d)$, ($F(u(z_1(d))) = 0$) so the energy is

$$E(z_1(d), d) = \frac{p-1}{p}|u'|^p \geq 0.$$

But since $E' \leq 0$, we must have that $z_1(d) \leq r_0$. This contradicts Lemma 4.4. Hence the result follows. \square

Lemma 4.6. $u'(r, d_0) < 0$ on $(0, \infty)$.

Proof. Since $u(0) = d$ and $u'(0) = 0$, first we want to show that u is decreasing on $(0, \epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Dividing both sides of (2.1) by r^N and then taking the limit as $r \rightarrow 0$, and applying L'Hopital's rule, gives

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} |u'|^{p-2} \left(\frac{u'}{r} \right) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{-f(u(r))}{N} = \frac{-f(u(0))}{N} = \frac{-f(d_0)}{N} < 0.$$

The last inequality is true since by the definition of S_0 , we have that $d_0 > \gamma$ and then by **(H5)**, $\gamma > \beta$ where β is the largest zero of f . Thus, $f(d_0) > 0$. So, $u' < 0$ on $(0, \epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$.

Let $[0, R_{d_0}]$ be the maximal interval so that $u' < 0$ on $(0, R_{d_0})$. If $R_{d_0} = \infty$, then $u' < 0$ on $(0, \infty)$ and we are done. Otherwise $R_{d_0} < \infty$ and $u'(R_{d_0}) = 0$.

Claim: $0 < u(R_{d_0}) \leq \beta$.

Proof of Claim: Suppose $f(u(R_{d_0})) > 0$ and let us look at the following identity:

$$- \int_r^{R_{d_0}} (r^{N-1}|u'|^{p-2}u')' = \int_r^{R_{d_0}} t^{N-1}f(u)dt.$$

Using $u'(R_{d_0}) = 0$, this gives

$$r^{N-1}|u'|^{p-2}u' = \int_r^{R_{d_0}} t^{N-1}f(u)dt > 0$$

for $r < R_{d_0}$ and r close to R_{d_0} . We get the last inequality since $f(u(R_{d_0})) > 0$, and by continuity, $f(u) > 0$ for r near R_{d_0} . This implies $u' > 0$ on (r, R_{d_0}) for r close to R_{d_0} . But by assumption $u' < 0$ on $(0, R_{d_0})$. Hence, $f(u(R_{d_0})) \leq 0$ and since we also know $u(R_{d_0}) > 0$, this implies $0 < u(R_{d_0}) \leq \beta$.

End of proof of Claim.

The previous claim implies $F(u(R_{d_0})) < 0$. Since $u'(R_{d_0}) = 0$ we obtain

$$E(R_{d_0}, d_0) = F(u(R_{d_0})) < 0,$$

which is a contradiction to Lemma 4.5. Hence, $u'(r, d_0) < 0$ for all $r > 0$. \square

Since we now know that $u(r, d_0) > 0$ and $u'(r, d_0) < 0$, it follows that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u(r, d_0)$ exists.

Lemma 4.7. $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u(r, d_0) = U \geq 0$ where U is some nonnegative zero of f .

Proof. Since E is decreasing and bounded below we see that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} E(r, d_0) = E$. Rewriting (2.6) we obtain:

$$\frac{p-1}{p}|u'|^p = E(r, d_0) - F(u(r, d_0)).$$

The limit of both terms on the right exists and so we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(p-1)|u'|^p}{p} = E - F(U).$$

Thus, $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |u'|$ exists.

Claim 1: $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |u'| = 0$.

Proof of Claim 1: Suppose not, then $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |u'| = \mathcal{L} > 0$. So $|u'(r)| > \frac{\mathcal{L}}{2} > 0$ if $r \geq R$. Suppose $|u'(r)| = -u'(r)$, now integrating $|u'(r)| > \frac{\mathcal{L}}{2} > 0$, gives

$$\int_R^r -u'(r)dt > \int_R^r \frac{\mathcal{L}}{2}dt$$

for $r \geq R$, this implies

$$d_0 \geq u(R) \geq u(R) - u(r) \geq \frac{\mathcal{L}}{2}(r - R) \rightarrow \infty,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |u'| = 0$ and so $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u' = 0$. **End of proof of Claim 1.**

Dividing both sides of (2.1) by r^N gives

$$|u'|^{p-2} \frac{u'}{r} = \frac{-\int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u) dt}{r^N}.$$

Taking the limit as $r \rightarrow \infty$, and then doing simplification on right hand side by L'Hopital's rule, gives

$$0 = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |u'|^{p-2} \left(\frac{u'}{r} \right) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\int_0^r t^{N-1} f(u(t)) dt}{r^N} = -f(U).$$

So, $f(U) = 0$. □

Lemma 4.8. $U = 0$.

Proof. Taking the limit as $r \rightarrow \infty$ in (2.1), gives $E = F(U)$. By Lemma 4.4, $E \geq 0$. Hence $F(U) \geq 0$. Also by Lemma 4.7, $f(U) = 0$. Thus by **(H5)** and **(H6)**, $U \equiv 0$. □

Let $S_1 = \{ d > d_0 \mid u(r, d) \text{ has exactly one zero for all } r \geq 0 \}$.

Lemma 4.9. $S_1 \neq \emptyset$ and S_1 is bounded above.

Proof. By Lemma 3.5, if $d > d_0$ and d close to d_0 then $u(r, d)$ has at most one zero. Also, if $d > d_0$ then $d \notin S_0$ so $u(r, d)$ has at least one zero. Therefore, for $d > d_0$ and d close to d_0 , $u(r, d)$ has exactly one zero. Hence S_1 is nonempty. Also by Lemmas 3.1 - 3.4, S_1 is bounded above. □

Define $d_1 = \sup S_1$.


As above we can show that $u(r, d_1)$ has exactly one zero and $u(r, d_1) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

Proceeding inductively, we can find solutions that tend to zero at infinity and with any prescribed number of zeros. Hence, we complete the proof of the main theorem.


Here is an example of a u that satisfies the hypotheses **(H1)**-**(H6)**:

$$(4.1) \quad u'' + \frac{2}{r}u' + u^3 - u = 0$$

where $p = 2$, $N = 3$, and $f(u) = u^3 - u$. The graph of $f(u)$ is




As F is the anti derivative of f , the graph of F is The only positive zero of F occurs at $\gamma = \sqrt{2}$.




Here are some graphs of solutions of (4.1) for different values of d , all graphs are generated numerically using Mathematica:


(a) Solution that remains positive when $d = 1.4 < \gamma = \sqrt{2}$:



(b) Solution with exactly one zero when $d = 4.7 > \gamma = \sqrt{2}$:



(c) Solution with exactly two zeros when $d = 15.1 > \gamma = \sqrt{2}$:



□

Acknowledgments

I thank my advisor, J. Iaia who suggested this problem to me and guided me in writing up this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. CASTRO and A. KUREPA, Infinitely Many Radially Symmetric Solutions to a Superlinear Dirichlet Problem in a Ball, Proceedings of American Mathematical Society, Volume 101, Number 1, Sept 1987.
- [2] B. FRANCHI, E. LANCONELLI, and J. SERRIN, Existence and Uniqueness of Non-negative Solutions of Quasilinear Equations in \mathbb{R}^n , Advances in Mathematics 118,177-243(1996), Article No. 0021.
- [3] A. HARAUX and F.B. WEISSLER, Non-uniqueness for a Semilinear Initial Value Problem, Indiana University Mathematics Journal, Vol. 31, No. 2(1982).
- [4] J. IAIA, and H. WARCHALL, Nonradial Solutions of a Semilinear Elliptic Equation in Two Dimensions, Journal of Differential Equations 119, No.2, 533-558(1995).
- [5] K. McLEOD, W.C.TROY, AND F.B. WEISSLER, Radial solutions of $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$ with Prescribed Numbers of Zeros, Journal of Differential Equations 83,368-378(1990).
- [6] W.M. NI and J. SERRIN, Nonexistence Theorems for Quasilinear Partial Differential Equations, Rend. Circolo Mat. Palermo, Series II, No. 8, 171-185(1985).
- [7] W.M. NI and J. SERRIN, Existence and Nonexistence Theorems for Ground States for Quasilinear Partial Differential Equations, The anomalous case, Rome, Accad. Naz. dei Lincei, Atti dei Convegni, No. 77, 181-197(1986).
- [8] E. CALZOLARI, R. FILIPPUCCI, and P. PUCCI, Existence of Radial Solutions for the p -Laplacian Elliptic Equations With Weights, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems, Volume 15, 447-479(2006)
- [9] F. GAZZOLA and J. SERRIN and M. TANG, Existence of Ground States And Free Boundary Problems For Quasilinear Elliptic Operators, Advances in Differential Equations, Volume 5, 1-30(2000)

(Received August 10, 2007)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS, DENTON, TEXAS-76203-1430
E-mail address: sridevi@unt.edu, sridevi.pudipeddi@gmail.com