

Singularity of the Extremal Solution for Supercritical Biharmonic Equations with Power-Type Nonlinearity*

Baishun LAI¹ Zhengxiang YAN² Yinghui ZHANG³

Abstract Let $\mathbb{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be the unit ball centered at the origin. The authors consider the following biharmonic equation:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 u = \lambda(1+u)^p & \text{in } \mathbb{B}, \\ u = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{B}, \end{cases}$$

where $p > \frac{n+4}{n-4}$ and ν is the outward unit normal vector. It is well-known that there exists a $\lambda^* > 0$ such that the biharmonic equation has a solution for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$ and has a unique weak solution u^* with parameter $\lambda = \lambda^*$, called the extremal solution. It is proved that u^* is singular when $n \geq 13$ for p large enough and satisfies $u^* \leq r^{-\frac{4}{p-1}} - 1$ on the unit ball, which actually solve a part of the open problem left in [Dávila, J., Flores, I., Guerra, I., Multiplicity of solutions for a fourth order equation with power-type nonlinearity, *Math. Ann.*, **348**(1), 2009, 143–193].

Keywords Minimal solutions, Regularity, Stability, Fourth order
2000 MR Subject Classification 35B45, 35J40

1 Introduction

In the previous two decades, positive solutions to the second order semilinear elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda g(u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

have attracted a lot of interest (see [1–5] and references therein). Here, we only mention the work by Joseph and Lundgren [2]. In their well known work, Joseph and Lundgren gave a complete characterization of all positive solutions of (1.1) in the case $g(u) = e^u$ or $g(u) = (1+au)^p$, $ap > 0$, $\lambda > 0$ and Ω being a unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n . In particular, they found a remarkable phenomenon for $g(u) = e^u$ and $n > 2$: Either (1.1) has at most one solution for each λ or there is a value of λ for which infinitely many solutions exist. In the case of a power nonlinearity the same alternative is valid if $n \geq 3$ and $p > \frac{n+2}{n-2}$. As a subsequent step, Lions (see [3, Section 4.2

Manuscript received September 24, 2014. Revised October 23, 2015.

¹Institute of Contemporary Mathematics, Henan University, Kaifeng 475004, Henan, China.
E-mail: laibaishun@henu.edu.cn

²Xinyang Vocational and Technical College, Xinyang 464000, Henan, China.
E-mail: zhxyang10@gmail.com

³Department of Mathematics, Hunan Institute of Science and Technology, Yueyang 414006, Hunan, China. E-mail: zhangyinghui0910@126.com

*This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos.11201119, 11471099), the International Cultivation of Henan Advanced Talents and the Research Foundation of Henan University (No. yqpy20140043).

(c)] suggested to study positive solutions to systems of semilinear elliptic equations. So it is an important task to gain a deeper understanding for related higher order problems.

In this paper, we study a semilinear equation involving the bilaplacian operator and a power type nonlinearity

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 u = \lambda(1 + u)^p & \text{in } \mathbb{B}, \\ u = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{B}, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where $\mathbb{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is the unit ball, $\lambda > 0$ is an eigenvalue parameter, $n \geq 5$ and $p \geq \frac{n+4}{n-4}$. The subcritical case $p < \frac{n+4}{n-4}$ is by now folklore, where existence and multiplicity results are easily established by means of variational methods. For the critical case $p = \frac{n+4}{n-4}$ (under Navier boundary conditions), we refer to [6]. Recently, a lot of research on supercritical case, i.e., $p > \frac{n+4}{n-4}$, has been done and many beautiful important results have been proved. In what follows, we will summarize some of the results obtained by [7-8]. For convenience, we introduce the following notions.

Definition 1.1 We say that $u \in L^p(\mathbb{B})$ is a solution of (1.2) if $u \geq 0$ and if for all $\varphi \in C^4(\overline{\mathbb{B}})$ with $\varphi|_{\partial\mathbb{B}} = |\nabla\varphi|_{\partial\mathbb{B}} = 0$, one has

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}} u \Delta^2 \varphi dx = \lambda \int_{\mathbb{B}} (1 + u)^p \varphi dx.$$

We call u singular if $u \notin L^\infty(\mathbb{B})$, and regular if $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{B})$. A radial singular solution $u = u(r)$ of (1.2) is called weakly singular if $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{\frac{4}{p-1}} u(r) \in (0, \infty]$ exists.

Note that by standard regularity theory for the biharmonic operator, any regular solution u of (1.2) satisfies $u \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{B}})$. Note also that by the positivity preserving property of Δ^2 in the ball (see [10]) any solution of (1.2) is positive, see also [11] for a generalized statement. This property is known to fail in general domains. For this reason, we restrict ourselves to the ball. Hence, the sub- and super-solution method applies as well as monotone iterative procedures.

Definition 1.2 We call a solution u of (1.2) minimal if $u \leq v$ a.e. in \mathbb{B} for any other solution v of (1.2).

We also denote by $\lambda_1 > 0$ the first eigenvalue for the biharmonic operator with Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 \varphi_1 = \lambda_1 \varphi_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{B}, \\ \varphi_1 = \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{B}. \end{cases}$$

It is known from the positivity preserving property and Jentzsch's (or Krein-Rutman's) theorem that λ_1 is isolated and simple and the corresponding eigenfunction φ_1 does not change sign.

Definition 1.3 We say a weak solution of (1.2) is stable (resp. semi-stable) if

$$\mu_1(u) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{B}} (\Delta\varphi)^2 dx - p\lambda \int_{\mathbb{B}} \varphi^2 (1 + u)^{p-1} dx : \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{B}), \|\varphi\|_{L^2} = 1 \right\}$$

is positive (resp. non-negative).

To illuminate the motivations, we need the following notations which will be used throughout the paper. Set

$$K_0 = \frac{4}{p-1} \left(\frac{4}{p-1} + 2 \right) \left(N - 2 - \frac{4}{p-1} \right) \left(N - 4 - \frac{4}{p-1} \right)$$

and

$$p_c = \frac{n+2 - \sqrt{4+n^2 - 4\sqrt{n^2 + H_n}}}{n-6 - \sqrt{4+n^2 - 4\sqrt{n^2 + H_n}}} \quad \text{for } n \geq 3,$$

with $H_n = \left(\frac{n(n-4)}{4}\right)^2$ and the number p_c such that when $p = p_c$

$$\left(\frac{4}{p-1} + 4 \right) \left(\frac{4}{p-1} + 2 \right) \left(n - 2 - \frac{4}{p-1} \right) \left(n - 4 - \frac{4}{p-1} \right) = H_n.$$

Now we summarize some of the well-known results as follows.

Theorem 1.1 (see [7–8]) *There exists $\lambda^* \in [K_0, \frac{\lambda_1}{p})$ such that the following terms hold:*

- (i) *For $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$, (1.2) admits a minimal stable regular solution, denoted by u_λ . This solution is radially symmetric and strictly decreasing in $r = |x|$.*
- (ii) *For $\lambda = \lambda^*$, (1.2) admits at least one not necessarily bounded solution, which is called extremal solution u^* .*
- (iii) *For $\lambda > \lambda^*$, (1.2) admits no (not even singular) solutions.*

Theorem 1.2 (see [9]) *Assume that*

$$\frac{n+4}{n-4} < p < p_c, \quad \text{if } n \geq 13; \quad \frac{n+4}{n-4} < p < \infty, \quad \text{if } 5 \leq n \leq 12.$$

Then u^ is regular.*

From Theorem 1.2, we know that the extremal solution of (1.2) is regular for a certain range of p and n . At the same time, they left an open problem: If

$$n \geq 13 \quad \text{and} \quad p \geq p_c,$$

is u^* singular?

In this paper, by constructing a semi-stable singular $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak sub-solution of (1.2), we prove that, if p is large enough, the extremal solution is singular for dimensions $n \geq 13$ and complete part of the above open problem. Our result is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.3 *There exists $p_0(n) > 1$ large enough such that for $p \geq p_0(n)$, the unique extremal solution of (1.2) is singular for dimensions $n \geq 13$, in which case $u^* \leq |x|^{-\frac{4}{p-1}} - 1$ on the unit ball \mathbb{B} .*

From the technical point of view, one of the obstacle is the well-known difficulty of extracting energy estimates for solutions of fourth order problems from their stability properties. Besides, for the corresponding second order problem (1.1), the starting point was an explicit singular solution for a suitable eigenvalue parameter λ which turned out to play a fundamental role for the shape of the corresponding bifurcation diagram (see [12]). When turning to the biharmonic problem (1.2) the second boundary condition $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0$ prevents to find an explicit singular

solution. This means that the method used to analyze the regularity of the extremal solution for second order problem could not carry to the corresponding problem for (1.2). In this paper, in order to overcome the second obstacle, we use improved and non-standard Hardy-Rellich inequalities recently established by Ghoussoub-Moradifam in [13] to construct a semi-stable singular $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak sub-solution of (1.2).

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, some preliminaries are reviewed. In Section 3, we will show that the extremal solution u^* in dimensions $n \geq 13$ is singular by constructing a semi-stable singular $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak sub-solution of (1.2).

2 Preliminaries

First we give some comparison principles which will be used throughout this paper.

Lemma 2.1 (see [10]) *If $u \in C^4(\overline{\mathbb{B}}_R)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 u \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{B}_R, \\ u = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{B}_R, \end{cases}$$

then $u \geq 0$ in \mathbb{B}_R . Here and in what follows, \mathbb{B}_R is denoted by the ball of radius R centered at 0.

Lemma 2.2 *Let $u \in L^1(\mathbb{B}_R)$ and suppose that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_R} u \Delta^2 \varphi dx \geq 0$$

for all $\varphi \in C^4(\overline{\mathbb{B}}_R)$ such that $\varphi \geq 0$ in \mathbb{B}_R , $\varphi|_{\partial \mathbb{B}_R} = \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial \mathbb{B}_R} = 0$. Then $u \geq 0$ in \mathbb{B}_R . Moreover, $u \equiv 0$ or $u > 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{B}_R .

For a proof, see Lemma 17 in [11].

Lemma 2.3 *If $u \in H^2(\mathbb{B}_R)$ is radial, $\Delta^2 u \geq 0$ in \mathbb{B}_R in the weak sense, that is*

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_R} \Delta u \Delta \varphi dx \geq 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{B}_R), \quad \varphi \geq 0$$

and $u|_{\partial \mathbb{B}_R} \geq 0, \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial \mathbb{B}_R} \leq 0$, then $u \geq 0$ in \mathbb{B}_R .

Proof For the sake of completeness, we include a brief proof here. We only deal with the case $R = 1$ for simplicity. Solve

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 u_1 = \Delta^2 u & \text{in } \mathbb{B}, \\ u_1 = \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{B} \end{cases}$$

in the sense $u_1 \in H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ and $\int_{\mathbb{B}} \Delta u_1 \Delta \varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{B}} \Delta u \Delta \varphi dx$ for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{B})$. Then $u_1 \geq 0$ in \mathbb{B} by Lemma 2.2.

Let $u_2 = u - u_1$ so that $\Delta^2 u_2 = 0$ in \mathbb{B} . Define $f = \Delta u_2$. Then $\Delta f = 0$ in \mathbb{B} and since f is radial, we find that f is a constant. It follows that $u_2 = ar^2 + b$. Using the boundary conditions, we deduce $a + b \geq 0$ and $a \leq 0$, which imply $u_2 \geq 0$.

Now we give a notion of $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak solutions, which is an intermediate class between classical and weak solutions.

Definition 2.1 We say that u is an $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak solution of (1.2) if $(1 + u)^p \in L^1(\mathbb{B})$ and if

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}} \Delta u \Delta \phi dx = \lambda \int_{\mathbb{B}} \phi (1 + u)^p dx, \quad \forall \phi \in C^4(\overline{\mathbb{B}}) \cap H_0^2(\mathbb{B}).$$

We say that u is an $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak super-solution (resp. $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak sub-solution) of (1.2) if for $\phi \geq 0$ the equality is replaced with \geq (resp. \leq) and $u \geq 0$ (resp. \leq), $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} \leq 0$ (resp. \geq) on $\partial \mathbb{B}$.

We also need the following comparison principle.

Lemma 2.4 Let $u_1, u_2 \in H^2(\mathbb{B}_R)$ with $(1 + u_1)^p, (1 + u_2)^p \in L^1(\mathbb{B}_R)$. Assume that u_1 is stable and

$$\Delta^2 u_1 \leq \lambda (1 + u_1)^p \quad \text{in } \mathbb{B}_R$$

in the $H^2(\mathbb{B}_R)$ -weak sense, i.e.,

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_R} \Delta u_1 \Delta \phi dx \leq \lambda \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (1 + u_1)^p \phi dx, \quad \forall \phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{B}_R), \phi \geq 0 \tag{2.1}$$

and $\Delta^2 u_2 \geq \lambda (1 + u_2)^p$ in \mathbb{B}_R in the similar weak sense. Suppose also

$$u_1|_{\partial \mathbb{B}_R} = u_2|_{\partial \mathbb{B}_R}, \quad \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial \mathbb{B}_R} = \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial \mathbb{B}_R}.$$

Then

$$u_1 \leq u_2 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{B}_R.$$

Proof Define $\omega := u_1 - u_2$. Then by the Moreau decomposition (see [14]) for the biharmonic operator, there exist $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in H_0^2(\mathbb{B}_R)$, with $\omega = \omega_1 + \omega_2$, $\omega_1 \geq 0$ a.e., $\Delta^2 \omega_2 \leq 0$ in the $H_0^2(\mathbb{B}_R)$ -weak sense and

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_R} \Delta \omega_1 \Delta \omega_2 dx = 0.$$

By Lemma 2.3, we have that $\omega_2 \leq 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{B}_R .

Given now $0 \leq \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{B}_R)$, we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_R} \Delta \omega \Delta \varphi dx \leq \lambda \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (f(u_1) - f(u_2)) \varphi dx,$$

where $f(u) = (1 + u)^p$. Since u_1 is semi-stable and by density, one has

$$\lambda \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} f'(u_1) \omega_1^2 dx \leq \lambda \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (\Delta \omega_1)^2 dx = \lambda \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} \Delta \omega \Delta \omega_1 dx \leq \lambda \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (f(u_1) - f(u_2)) \omega_1 dx.$$

Since $\omega_1 \geq \omega$, one also has

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_R} f'(u_1) \omega \omega_1 dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} (f(u_1) - f(u_2)) \omega_1 dx$$

which once re-arrange gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_R} \tilde{f} \omega_1 dx \geq 0,$$

where $\tilde{f} = f(u_1) - f(u_2) - f'(u_1)(u_1 - u_2)$. The strict convexity of f gives $\tilde{f} \leq 0$ and $\tilde{f} < 0$ whenever $u_1 \neq u_2$. Since $\omega_1 \geq 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{B}_R , one sees that $\omega \leq 0$ a.e. in \mathbb{B}_R . The inequality $u_1 \leq u_2$ a.e. in \mathbb{B}_R is then established.

The following variant of Lemma 2.4 also holds.

Lemma 2.5 *Let $u_1, u_2 \in H^2(\mathbb{B}_R)$ be radial with $(1 + u_1)^p, (1 + u_2)^p \in L^1(\mathbb{B}_R)$. Assume $\Delta^2 u_1 \leq \lambda(1 + u_1)^p$ in \mathbb{B}_R in the sense of (2.1) and $\Delta^2 u_2 \geq \lambda(1 + u_2)^p$ in \mathbb{B}_R in the same weak sense. Suppose $u_1|_{\partial\mathbb{B}_R} \leq u_2|_{\partial\mathbb{B}_R}$ and $\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n}|_{\partial\mathbb{B}_R} \geq \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n}|_{\partial\mathbb{B}_R}$ and suppose also that u_1 is semi-stable. Then $u_1 \leq u_2$ in \mathbb{B}_R .*

Proof We solve for $\hat{u} \in H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_R} \Delta \hat{u} \Delta \phi dx = \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} \Delta(u_1 - u_2) \Delta \phi dx, \quad \forall \phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{B}_R).$$

By Lemma 2.3 it follows that $\hat{u} \geq u_1 - u_2$. Next we apply the Moreau decomposition to \hat{u} , that is $\hat{u} = w + v$ with $w, v \in H_0^2(\mathbb{B}_R)$, $w \geq 0$, $\Delta^2 v \leq 0$ in \mathbb{B}_R and $\int_{\mathbb{B}_R} \Delta w \Delta v dx = 0$. Then the argument follows that of Lemma 2.4.

Lemma 2.6 *Let u be a semi-stable $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak solution of (1.2) and U be an $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -super-solution of (1.2). Then if u is a classical solution and $\mu_1(u) = 0$, we have $u = U$.*

Proof Since u is a classical solution, it is easy to see that the infimum in $\mu_1(u)$ is attained at some φ . The function φ is then the first eigenfunction of $\Delta^2 - \lambda f'(u)$ in $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$, where $f(u) = (1 + u)^p$. Now we show that ϕ is of fixed sign. Using the Moreau decomposition, one has

$$\phi = \phi_1 + \phi_2,$$

where $\phi_i \in H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ for $i = 1, 2$, and

$$\phi_1 \geq 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{B}} \Delta \phi_1 \Delta \phi_2 dx = 0, \quad \Delta^2 \phi_2 \leq 0$$

in the $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak sense. If ϕ changes sign, then $\phi_1 \not\equiv 0$ and $\phi_2 < 0$ in \mathbb{B} . We can write now

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mu_1(u) &\leq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{B}} \{(\Delta(\phi_1 - \phi_2))^2 - \lambda f'(u)(\phi_1 - \phi_2)^2\} dx}{\int_{\mathbb{B}} (\phi_1 - \phi_2)^2 dx} \\ &< \frac{\int_{\mathbb{B}} \{(\Delta \phi)^2 - \lambda f'(u)\phi^2\} dx}{\int_{\mathbb{B}} \phi^2 dx} = \mu_1(u) \end{aligned}$$

in view of $\phi_1 \phi_2 < -\phi_1 \phi_2$ in a set of positive measure, leading to a contradiction.

So we can assume $\phi \geq 0$, and by the Boggio's principle, we have $\phi > 0$ in \mathbb{B} . For $0 \leq t \leq 1$, define

$$g(t) = \int_{\mathbb{B}} \Delta(tU + (1 - t)u) \Delta \phi dx - \lambda \int_{\mathbb{B}} f(tU + (1 - t)u) \phi dx,$$

where ϕ is the above first eigenfunction. Since f is convex, one sees that

$$g(t) \geq \lambda \int_{\mathbb{B}} [tf(U) + (1 - t)f(u) - f(tU + (1 - t)u)] \phi dx \geq 0$$

for every $t \geq 0$. Since $g(0) = 0$ and

$$g'(0) = \int_{\mathbb{B}} [\Delta(U - u)\Delta\phi - \lambda f'(u)(U - u)]\phi dx = 0,$$

we get that

$$g''(0) = -\lambda \int_{\mathbb{B}} f''(u)(U - u)^2\phi dx \geq 0.$$

Since $f''(u)\phi > 0$ in \mathbb{B} , we finally get that $U = u$ a.e. in \mathbb{B} .

From this lemma, we immediately obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.1 (i) *When u^* is a classical solution, then $\mu_1(u^*) = 0$ and u^* is the unique $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak solution of (1.2);*

(ii) *If v is a singular semi-stable $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak solution of (1.2), then $v = u^*$ and $\lambda = \lambda^*$.*

Proof (i) Since the function u^* is a classical solution, and by the implicit function theorem, we have that $\mu_1(u^*) = 0$ to prevent the continuation of the minimal branch beyond λ^* . By Lemma 2.4, u^* is then the unique $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak solution of (1.2).

(ii) Assume now that v is a singular semi-stable $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak solution of (1.2). If $\lambda < \lambda^*$, then by the uniqueness of the semi-stable solution, we have $v = u_\lambda$. So v is not singular and a contradiction arises. By Theorem A(iii) we have that $\lambda = \lambda^*$. Since v is a semi-stable $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak solution of (1.2) and u^* is an $H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$ -weak super-solution of (1.2), we can apply Lemma 2.4 to get $v \leq u^*$ a.e. in \mathbb{B} . Since u^* is also a semi-stable solution, we can reverse the roles of v and u^* in Lemma 2.4 to see that $v \geq u^*$ a.e. in \mathbb{B} . So equality $v = u^*$ holds and the proof is complete.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Inspired by the work of [16], we will first show the following upper bound on u^* .

Lemma 3.1 *If $n \geq 13$ and $p > p_c$, then $u^* \leq |x|^{-\frac{4}{p-1}} - 1$ for $x \in \mathbb{B}$.*

Proof Recall from Theorem 1.1 that $K_0 \leq \lambda^*$. We now claim that $u_\lambda \leq \tilde{u} := |x|^{-\frac{4}{p-1}} - 1$ for all $\lambda \in (K_0, \lambda^*)$. Indeed, fix such a λ and assume by contradiction that

$$R_1 := \inf\{0 \leq R \leq 1 : u_\lambda > \tilde{u} \text{ in the interval } (R, 1)\} > 0.$$

From the boundary conditions, one has

$$u_\lambda(r) < \tilde{u}(r) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 1^-.$$

Hence,

$$0 < R_1 < 1, \quad u_\lambda(R_1) = \tilde{u}(R_1), \quad u'_\lambda(R_1) \leq \tilde{u}'(R_1).$$

Now consider the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 u = K_0(1 + u)^p & \text{in } \mathbb{B}_{R_1}, \\ u = u_\lambda(R_1) & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{B}_{R_1}, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = u'_\lambda(R_1) & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{B}_{R_1}. \end{cases}$$

Then u_λ is a super-solution to above problem while \tilde{u} is a sub-solution to the same problem. Moreover for $n \geq 13$, we have

$$pK_0 \leq H_n := \frac{n^2(n-4)^2}{16}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_{R_1}} (\Delta\phi)^2 dx \geq H_n \int_{\mathbb{B}_{R_1}} \frac{\phi^2}{|x|^4} dx \geq pK_0 \int_{\mathbb{B}_{R_1}} (1 + \tilde{u})^{p-1} dx.$$

So \tilde{u} is semi-stable and we deduce that $u_\lambda > \tilde{u}$ by Lemma 2.4, and a contradiction arises in view of the fact

$$|u_\lambda|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{B}_{R_1})} < \infty, \quad |\tilde{u}|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{B}_{R_1})} = \infty.$$

The proof is done.

In order to prove Theorem 1.3, we need a suitable Hardy-Rellich type inequality which was established by Ghoussoub-Moradifam in [13]. It is stated as follows.

Lemma 3.2 *Let $n \geq 5$ and \mathbb{B} be the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n . Then there exists $C > 0$, such that the following improved Hardy-Rellich inequality holds for all $\varphi \in H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$:*

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}} (\Delta\varphi)^2 dx \geq \frac{n^2(n-4)^2}{16} \int_{\mathbb{B}} \frac{\varphi^2}{|x|^4} dx + C \int_{\mathbb{B}} \varphi^2 dx.$$

Lemma 3.3 *Let $n \geq 5$ and \mathbb{B} be the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n . Then the following improved Hardy-Rellich inequality holds for all $\varphi \in H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}} (\Delta\varphi)^2 dx &\geq \frac{(n-2)^2(n-4)^2}{16} \int_{\mathbb{B}} \frac{\varphi^2 dx}{(|x|^2 - 0.9|x|^{\frac{n}{2}+1})(|x|^2 - |x|^{\frac{n}{2}})} \\ &+ \frac{(n-1)(n-4)^2}{4} \int_{\mathbb{B}} \frac{\varphi^2 dx}{|x|^2(|x|^2 - |x|^{\frac{n}{2}})}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

As a consequence, the following improvement of the classical Hardy-Rellich inequality holds:

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}} (\Delta\varphi)^2 dx \geq \frac{n^2(n-4)^2}{16} \int_{\mathbb{B}} \frac{\varphi^2 dx}{|x|^2(|x|^2 - |x|^{\frac{n}{2}})}.$$

We now give the following lemma which is crucial for the proof of the Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 3.4 *Suppose there exist $\lambda' > 0$ and a radial function $u \in H^2(\mathbb{B}) \cap W_{loc}^{4,\infty}(\mathbb{B} \setminus \{0\})$ such that $u \notin L^\infty(\mathbb{B})$ and*

$$\Delta^2 u \leq \lambda'(1+u)^p \quad \text{for } 0 < r < 1, \quad u(1) = u'(1) = 0$$

and

$$p\beta \int_{\mathbb{B}} \varphi^2 (1+u)^{p-1} dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{B}} (\Delta\varphi)^2 dx \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in H_0^2(\mathbb{B})$$

for either $\beta > \lambda'$ or $\beta = \lambda' = \frac{H_n}{p}$. Then u^* is singular and

$$\lambda^* \leq \lambda'. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof First, we prove $\lambda^* \leq \lambda'$. Noting that the stability inequality (set $\varphi = u$) and $u \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{B} \setminus \{0\})$ yield $(1 + u)^p \in L^1(\mathbb{B})$, we easily see that u is a weak sub-solution of (1.2). If now $\lambda' < \lambda^*$, by Lemma 2.5, u would necessarily be below the minimal solution $u_{\lambda'}$, which is a contraction since u is singular while $u_{\lambda'}$ is regular.

Suppose first that $\beta = \lambda' = \frac{H_n}{p}$ and that $n \geq 13$. From the above we have $\lambda^* \leq \frac{H_n}{p}$. We get from Lemma 3.1 and the improved Hardy-Rellich inequality that there exists $C > 0$ so that for all $\phi \in H^2_0(\mathbb{B})$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}} (\Delta\phi)^2 dx - p\lambda^* \int_{\mathbb{B}} \phi^2 (1 + u^*)^{p-1} dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{B}} (\Delta\phi)^2 dx - H_n \int_{\mathbb{B}} \frac{\phi^2}{|x|^4} dx \geq C \int_{\mathbb{B}} \phi^2 dx.$$

It follows that $\mu_1(u^*) > 0$ and u^* must therefore be singular since otherwise, one could use the implicit function theorem to continue the minimal branch beyond λ^* .

Suppose now that $\beta > \lambda'$. Let $\frac{\lambda'}{\beta_1} < \gamma < 1$ and $\alpha := \left(\frac{\gamma\lambda^*}{\lambda'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p+1}}$. Define $\bar{u} := \alpha^{-1}(1 + u) - 1$. We claim that

$$u^* \leq \bar{u} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{B}. \tag{3.3}$$

To prove this, we shall show that for every $\lambda < \lambda^*$,

$$u_\lambda \leq \bar{u} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{B}. \tag{3.4}$$

Indeed, we have

$$\Delta^2 \bar{u} = \alpha \Delta^2 u \leq \alpha \lambda' (1 + u)^p = \alpha^{p+1} \lambda' (1 + \bar{u})^p.$$

Now by the choice of α , we have $\alpha^{p+1} \lambda' < \lambda^*$. To prove (3.4), it suffices to prove it for $\alpha^{p+1} \lambda' < \lambda < \lambda^*$. Fix such λ and assume that (3.4) is not true. Then

$$\Lambda = \{0 \leq R \leq 1 \mid u_\lambda(R) > \bar{u}(R)\}$$

is non-empty. Since $\bar{u}(1) = \alpha^{-1} - 1 > 0 = u_\lambda(1)$, we have

$$0 < R_1 < 1, \quad u_\lambda(R_1) = \bar{u}(R_1),$$

and $u'_\lambda(R_1) \leq \bar{u}'(R_1)$. Now consider the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta^2 u = \lambda(1 + u)^p & \text{in } \mathbb{B}_{R_1}, \\ u = u_\lambda(R_1) & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{B}_{R_1}, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = u'_\lambda(R_1) & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{B}_{R_1}. \end{cases}$$

Then u_λ is a solution to above problem while \bar{u} is a sub-solution to the same problem. Moreover, \bar{u} is stable since $\lambda < \lambda^*$ and

$$p\lambda(1 + \bar{u})^{p-1} \leq p\lambda^* \alpha^{-(p-1)} (1 + u)^{p-1} = p\lambda' \gamma^{-1} (1 + u)^{p-1} < p\beta_1 (1 + u)^{p-1},$$

we deduce $\bar{u} \leq u_\lambda$ in \mathbb{B}_{R_1} , which is impossible, since \bar{u} is singular while u_λ is smooth. This establishes (3.3). From (3.3) and the above inequalities, we have

$$p\lambda^* (1 + u^*)^{p-1} \leq p\lambda' \gamma^{-1} (1 + u)^{p-1} < p\beta_1 (1 + u)^{p-1}.$$

Thus

$$\inf_{\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{B})} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{B}} \{(\Delta\varphi)^2 - p\lambda^*\varphi^2(1+u^*)^{p-1}\} dx}{\int_{\mathbb{B}} \varphi^2 dx} > 0.$$

This is not possible if u^* is a smooth function by the implicit function theorem.

Proof Theorem 1.3 Uniqueness and the upper bound estimate of the extremal solution u^* have been proven by Corollary 2.1 and Lemma 3.1. Now we only prove that u^* is a singular solution of (1.1) for $n \geq 13$. In order to achieve this, we shall find a singular H -weak sub-solution of (1.1), denoted by $\omega_m(r)$, which is stable, according to the Lemma 3.4.

Choosing

$$\omega_m = a_1 r^{-\frac{4}{p-1}} + a_2 r^m - 1, \quad K_0 = \frac{8(p+1)}{p-1} \left[n - \frac{2(p+1)}{p-1} \right] \left[n - \frac{4p}{p-1} \right],$$

since $\omega_m(1) = \omega'_m(1) = 0$, we have

$$a_1 = \frac{m}{m + \frac{4}{p-1}}, \quad a_2 = \frac{\frac{4}{p-1}}{m + \frac{4}{p-1}}.$$

For any m fixed, when $p \rightarrow +\infty$, we have

$$a_1 = 1 - \frac{4}{(p-1)m} + o(p^{-1}), \quad a_2 = 1 - a_1 = \frac{4}{(p-1)m} + o(p^{-1})$$

and

$$K_0 = \frac{8(n-2)(n-4)}{p} + o(p^{-1}).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda' K_0 (1 + \omega_m(r))^p - \Delta^2 \omega_m(r) = \lambda' K_0 (1 + \omega_m(r))^p - a_1 K_0 r^{-\frac{4p}{p-1}} - a_2 K_1 r^{m-4} \\ &= \lambda' K_0 (a_1 r^{-\frac{4}{p-1}} + a_2 r^m)^p - a_1 K_0 r^{-\frac{4p}{p-1}} - a_2 K_1 r^{m-4} \\ &= K_0 r^{-\frac{4p}{p-1}} [\lambda' (a_1 + a_2 r^{m+\frac{4}{p-1}})^p - a_1 - a_2 K_1 K_0^{-1} r^{\frac{4p}{p-1} + m - 4}] \\ &= K_0 r^{-\frac{4p}{p-1}} [\lambda' (a_1 + a_2 r^{m+\frac{4}{p-1}})^p - a_1 - a_2 K_1 K_0^{-1} r^{m - \frac{4}{p-1}}] \\ &= K_0 r^{-\frac{4p}{p-1}} (a_1 + a_2 r^{m+\frac{4}{p-1}})^p [\lambda' - H(r^{m+\frac{4}{p-1}})] \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

with

$$H(x) = (a_1 + a_2 x)^p [a_1 + a_2 K_1 K_0^{-1} x], \quad K_1 = m(m-2)(m+n-2)(m+n-4). \tag{3.6}$$

(1) Let $m = 2$ and $n \geq 32$, then we can prove that

$$\sup_{[0,1]} H(x) = H(0) = a_1^{1-p} \rightarrow e^2, \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow +\infty.$$

So (3.5) ≥ 0 is valid as long as

$$\lambda' = e^2.$$

At the same time, we have (since $a_1 + a_2 r^{m+\frac{4}{p-1}} \leq a_1 + a_2 \leq 1$ in $[0, 1]$)

$$\frac{n^2(n-4)^2}{16} \frac{1}{r^4} - p\beta_n r^{-4} (a_1 + a_2 r^{2+\frac{4}{p-1}})^{p-1} \geq r^{-4} \left[\frac{n^2(n-4)^2}{16} - p\beta \right]. \tag{3.7}$$

Let $\beta = (\lambda' + \varepsilon)K_0$, where ε is arbitrary sufficiently small. We need finally here

$$\frac{n^2(n-4)^2}{16} - p\beta = \frac{n^2(n-4)^2}{16} - p(\lambda' + \varepsilon)K_0 > 0.$$

For that, it is sufficient to have for $p \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\frac{n^2(n-4)^2}{16} - 8(e^2 + \varepsilon)(n-2)(n-4) + o\left(\frac{1}{p}\right) > 0.$$

So (3.7) ≥ 0 holds only for $n \geq 32$ when $p \rightarrow +\infty$. Moreover, for p large enough

$$8e^2(n-2)(n-4) \int_{\mathbb{B}} \varphi^2(1 + \omega_2)^{p-1} dx \leq H_n \int_{\mathbb{B}} \frac{\varphi^2}{|x|^4} dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{B}} |\Delta\varphi|^2 dx.$$

Thus it follows from Lemma 3.4 that u^* is singular with $\lambda' = e^2K_0$, $\beta = (e^2K_0 + \varepsilon(n, p))$ and $\lambda^* \leq e^2K_0$.

(2) Assume $13 \leq n \leq 31$. We shall show that $u = \omega_{3,5}$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.4 for each dimension $13 \leq n \leq 31$. Using Maple, for each dimension $13 \leq n \leq 31$, one can verify that inequality (3.5) ≥ 0 holds for λ' given by Table 1. Then, by using Maple again, we show that there exists $\beta > \lambda'$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(n-2)^2(n-4)^2}{16} \frac{1}{(|x|^2 - 0.9|x|^{\frac{n}{2}+1})(|x|^2 - |x|^{\frac{n}{2}})} + \frac{(n-1)(n-4)^2}{4} \frac{1}{|x|^2(|x|^2 - |x|^{\frac{n}{2}})} \\ & \geq p\beta(1 + w_{3,5})^{p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality and the improved Hardy-Rellich inequality (3.1) guarantee that the stability condition holds for $\beta > \lambda'$. Hence by Lemma 3.4 the extremal solution is singular for $13 \leq n \leq 31$, where the value of λ' and β are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

n	λ'	β
31	$3.06K_0$	$4.05K_0$
30-19	$4.6K_0$	$10K_0$
18	$3.5K_0$	$3.78K_0$
17	$3.26K_0$	$3.60K_0$
16	$3.13K_0$	$3.78K_0$
15	$2.76K_0$	$3.12K_0$
14	$2.34K_0$	$2.96K_0$
13	$2.03K_0$	$2.15K_0$

Remark 3.1 The improved Hardy-Rellich inequality (3.1) is crucial to prove that u^* is singular in dimensions $n \geq 13$. Indeed by the classical Hardy-Rellich inequality and $u := w_2$, Lemma 3.4 only implies that u^* is singular n dimensions ($n \geq 32$).

Acknowledgement The first author would like to thank his advisor Prof. Yi Li for his constant support and encouragement.

References

- [1] Crandall, M. G. and Rabinowitz, P. H., Some continuation and variational methods for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic eigenvalue problems, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **58**(3), 1975, 207–218.
- [2] Joseph, D. D. and Lundgren, T. S., Quasilinear Dirichlet problems driven by positive sources, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **49**(4), 1973, 241–268.
- [3] Lions, P. L., On the existence of positive solutions of semilinear elliptic equations, *SIAM Rev.*, **24**(4), 1982, 441–467.
- [4] Martel, Y., Uniqueness of weak extremal solutions for nonlinear elliptic problems, *Houston J. Math.*, **23**, 1997, 161–168.
- [5] Mignot, F. and Puel, J. P., Solution radiale singulière de $-\Delta u = \lambda e^u$, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I*, **307**, 1988, 379–382.
- [6] Berchio, E. and Gazzola, F., Some remarks on biharmonic elliptic problems with positive, increasing and convex nonlinearities, *Electronic J. Differ. Equ.*, **2005**(34), 2005, 1–20.
- [7] Ferrero, A. and Grunau, H. C., The Dirichlet problem for supercritical biharmonic equations with power-type nonlinearity, *J. Differ. Equ.*, **234**(2), 2007, 582–606.
- [8] Ferrero, A., Grunau, H. C. and Karageorgis, P., Supercritical biharmonic equations with power-type nonlinearity, *Annali di Matematica*, **188**(1), 2009, 171–185.
- [9] Dàvila, J., Flores, I. and Guerra, I., Multiplicity of solutions for a fourth order equation with power-type nonlinearity, *Math. Ann.*, **348**(1), 2009, 143–193.
- [10] Boggio, T., Sulle funzioni di Freen d'ordine m , *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo*, **20**, 1905, 97–135.
- [11] Arioli, G., Gazzola, F., Grunau, H. C. and Mitidieri, E., A semilinear fourth order elliptic problem with exponential nonlinearity, *Siam J. Math. Anal.*, **36**(4), 2005, 1226–1258.
- [12] Brezis, H. and Vazquez, J. L., Blow up solutions of some nonlinear elliptic problems, *Rev. Mat. Univ. Complutense Madrid*, **10**(2), 1997, 443–469.
- [13] Ghoussoub, N. and Moradifam, A., Bessel pairs and optimal Hardy and Hardy-Rellich inequalities, *Math. Ann.*, **349**(1), 2011, 1–57.
- [14] Moreau, J. J., Décomposition orthogonale d'un espace hilbertien selon deux cones mutuellement polaires, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, **255**, 1962, 238–240.
- [15] Cown, C., Esposito, P., Ghoussoub, N. and Moradifam, A., The critical dimension for a fourth order elliptic problem with singular nonlinearity, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **198**(3), 2010, 763–787.
- [16] Moradifam, A., The singular extremal solutions of the bi-laplacian with exponential nonlinearity, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **138**(4), 2010, 1287–1293.
- [17] Dàvila, J., Dupaigne, L., Guerra, I. and Montenegro, M., Stable solutions for the bilaplacian with exponential nonlinearity, *Siam J. Math. Anal.*, **39**(2), 2007, 565–592.