

## MULTIPLICITY OF POSITIVE SOLUTIONS FOR A MIXED BOUNDARY ELLIPTIC SYSTEM

CLAUDIANOR O. ALVES

ABSTRACT. In this paper we are concerned with the existence and multiplicity of positive solutions for the following class of elliptic system

$$\begin{cases} -\varepsilon^2 \Delta u + u = Q_u(u, v), & -\varepsilon^2 \Delta v + v = Q_v(u, v) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = v = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma & \text{and } \partial u / \partial \eta = \partial v / \partial \eta = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \end{cases}$$

where  $\Omega$  is a bounded domain in  $\mathbf{R}^N$ ,  $Q$  is a  $p$ -homogeneous function with  $2 < p < 2N/(N - 2)$  for  $N \geq 3$ . The main tool used in this paper is the variational method combined with the Ljusternick-Schnirelman category of  $\Sigma$  in itself.

**1. Introduction.** In this paper we are concerned with the existence of positive solutions for the following class of elliptic system

$$(S) \quad \begin{cases} -\varepsilon^2 \Delta u + u = Q_u(u, v) & \text{in } \Omega \\ -\varepsilon^2 \Delta v + v = Q_v(u, v) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = v = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma \\ \partial u / \partial \eta = \partial v / \partial \eta = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \end{cases}$$

where  $\Omega$  is a bounded domain in  $\mathbf{R}^N$  with smooth boundary  $\partial\Omega = \bar{\Gamma} \cup \bar{\Sigma}$ , where  $\Gamma$  and  $\Sigma$  are smooth  $(N - 1)$ -dimensional submanifolds of  $\partial\Omega$  with positive measures such that  $\Gamma \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$ ,  $Q \in C^1(\Theta, \mathbf{R})$  is a homogeneous function of degree  $p$ , with  $2 < p < 2N/(N - 2)$  and  $\Theta = [0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty)$ . Let us state the hypotheses on the nonlinearity  $Q$ :

( $Q_1$ ) There exists a  $C > 0$  such that

$$\begin{cases} |Q_u(u, v)| \leq C(u^{p-1} + v^{p-1}) & \text{for all } (u, v) \in \Theta \\ |Q_v(u, v)| \leq C(u^{p-1} + v^{p-1}) & \text{for all } (u, v) \in \Theta. \end{cases}$$

---

2000 AMS *Mathematics subject classification.* Primary 35A15, 35B30, 35J50.  
*Keywords and phrases.* Elliptic systems, variational methods, Ljusternick-Schnirelman category.

Research supported by IM-AGIMB and CNPq/PADCT 620017/2004-0.  
 Received by the editors on April 7, 2005, and in revised form on September 28, 2005.

$$(Q_2) \quad Q_u(0, 1) = Q_v(1, 0) = 0;$$

$$(Q_3) \quad Q_u(1, 0) = Q_v(0, 1) = 0;$$

$$(Q_4) \quad Q(u, v) > 0 \text{ for all } u, v > 0;$$

$$(Q_5) \quad Q_u(u, v), Q_v(u, v) \geq 0 \text{ for all } u, v \geq 0.$$

Since  $Q$  is a  $C^2$  homogeneous function of degree  $p > 2$ , then

1.  $pQ(u, v) = uQ_u(u, v) + vQ_v(u, v)$ ;

2.  $\nabla Q$  is a homogeneous function of degree  $p - 1$ .

Some examples of this type of homogeneous function can be found in [9, 12].

Following a well-known device used to obtain a solution of (S), let us extend function  $Q$  to the whole plane as a  $C^1$ -function as

$$Q(s, t) = \begin{cases} Q(s, t) & s, t \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In the last years, many papers have considered the scalar equation

$$(P_\varepsilon) \quad -\varepsilon^2 \Delta u + u = |u|^{p-2}u, \quad \Omega$$

with Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions. The main points considered by these papers were the following:

- Existence and multiplicity of solutions.
- The concentration of the maximum points of the solutions, which is strongly related to the boundary conditions considered in the problem.
- The relation between the geometry of domain with the multiplicity of solution using the Ljusternick-Schnirelman category of  $\Omega$  or  $\partial\Omega$  in itself.

An important point when we are working with the problem  $(P_\varepsilon)$  is the properties of the limit problem, which in general involves the following equation

$$(P_\infty) \quad -\Delta u + u = |u|^{p-2}u$$

in  $\mathbf{R}^N$  or  $\mathbf{R}_+^N$ . We cite the works [2, 6, 13, 16–22 and references therein] to the reader interested in getting more information about

problem  $(P_\varepsilon)$ . For elliptic systems of the gradient or Hamiltonian type, we cite the papers [4, 5, 7].

In relation to the mixed boundary condition, there are a lot of interesting questions to study; we cite the papers [3, 10, 11, 15, 22, 23] and references therein.

Motivated by the works [4, 10, 11], we use the Ljusternick-Schnirelman category of  $\Sigma$  in itself to obtain multiplicity results for system (S). The main difficulties found in this paper were to make a careful study among the minimizing sequences associated to the system when we are considering the domains  $\Omega$ ,  $\mathbf{R}^N$  and  $\mathbf{R}_+^N$  and to get some relations involving the limits of these sequences. Adapting some arguments found in [14, 19, 22] for the scalar case, we prove that similar results of those proved in [10] also hold for system (S).

Our main result is the following

**Theorem 1.** *There exists  $\varepsilon^* > 0$  such that for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*)$ , system (S) has at least  $\text{cat}(\Sigma)$  positive solutions. Moreover, if  $\Sigma$  is not contractible in itself, then (S) admits at least  $\text{cat}(\Sigma) + 1$  positive solutions.*

We recall that  $\text{cat}(\Sigma)$  is the Ljusternick-Schnirelman category of  $\Sigma$  in itself, that is, the least number of closed and contractible sets in  $\Sigma$  which cover  $\Sigma$ .

This paper is divided in the following way: In Section 2, we make some definitions and prove some technical results and in Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.

**2. Notations and preliminary results.** In this section, we fix some notations and show technical results. Hereafter, Let us denote by  $\mathbf{R}_+^N$  the half-space,

$$\mathbf{R}_+^N = \left\{ x = (x^1, \dots, x^N) \in \mathbf{R}^N; \quad x^N > 0 \right\}$$

and by  $m(\mathbf{R}^N)$  and  $m(\mathbf{R}_+^N)$  the following numbers

$$m(\mathbf{R}^N) = \inf_{\substack{(u,v) \in H_\infty \\ \int_\Omega Q(u,v) dx \neq 0}} \frac{\int_{\mathbf{R}^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + u^2 + v^2) dx}{\left( \int_{\mathbf{R}^N} Q(u,v) dx \right)^{2/p}}$$

and

$$m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) = \inf_{(u,v) \in H_{\infty,+}} \int_{\Omega} Q(u,v) dx \neq 0 \frac{\int_{\mathbf{R}_+^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + u^2 + v^2) dx}{(\int_{\mathbf{R}_+^N} Q(u,v) dx)^{2/p}},$$

where  $H_{\infty} = H^1(\mathbf{R}^N) \times H^1(\mathbf{R}^N)$  and  $H_{\infty,+} = H^1(\mathbf{R}_+^N) \times H^1(\mathbf{R}_+^N)$ .

Using standard arguments, more precisely a result by Lions [14], we can prove that the numbers  $m(\mathbf{R}^N)$  and  $m(\mathbf{R}_+^N)$  are reached with

$$(2.1) \quad m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) = 2^{(2/p)-1} m(\mathbf{R}^N).$$

An important point is the fact that  $m(\mathbf{R}^N)$  is reached by a vector  $(w_1, w_2) \in H_{\infty}$  such that both  $w_1, w_2$  are positive radially symmetric functions at the origin. Moreover, the vector  $(\widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{w}_2) = (2^{(1/p)} w_1, 2^{1/p} w_2) \in H_{\infty,+}$  reaches the number  $m(\mathbf{R}_+^N)$ .

Now we remark upon the solutions of system (S) when  $\Omega$  is a smooth bounded domain.

In what follows, let us denote by  $m(\varepsilon, \Omega)$  and  $m(1, \Omega_{\varepsilon})$  the following numbers

$$m(\varepsilon, \Omega) = \inf_{\substack{(u,v) \in H \\ \int_{\Omega} Q(u,v) dx \neq 0}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} (\varepsilon^2 [|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2] + u^2 + v^2) dx}{(\int_{\Omega} Q(u,v) dx)^{2/p}}$$

and

$$m(1, \Omega_{\varepsilon}) = \inf_{\substack{(u,v) \in H_{\varepsilon} \\ \int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon}} Q(u,v) dx \neq 0}} \frac{\int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon}} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + u^2 + v^2) dx}{(\int_{\Omega_{\varepsilon}} Q(u,v) dx)^{2/p}}$$

where  $\Omega_{\varepsilon} = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^N; \varepsilon x \in \Omega\}$ ,  $H = E(\Omega) \times E(\Omega)$ ,  $H_{\varepsilon} = E(\Omega_{\varepsilon}) \times E(\Omega_{\varepsilon})$ ,

$$E(\Omega) = \{u \in H^1(\Omega); u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma\}$$

and

$$E(\Omega_{\varepsilon}) = \{u \in H^1(\Omega_{\varepsilon}); u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{\varepsilon}\}$$

where  $\Gamma_{\varepsilon} = \Gamma/\varepsilon$ .

From Sobolev imbeddings, it is easy to prove that the numbers  $m(\varepsilon, \Omega)$  and  $m(1, \Omega_\varepsilon)$  are reached. Moreover, for example, if  $m(\varepsilon, \Omega)$  is reached by  $(u_o, v_o)$ , the functions  $u_1 = m(\varepsilon, \Omega)^{1/(p-2)}u_o$  and  $v_1 = m(\varepsilon, \Omega)^{1/(p-2)}v_o$  are solutions of (S).

Another important result involving the numbers  $m(\varepsilon, \Omega)$  and  $m(1, \Omega_\varepsilon)$  is the following identity

$$\varepsilon^{-2\alpha}m(\varepsilon, \Omega) = m(1, \Omega_\varepsilon), \quad \alpha = N\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right).$$

Other notations that we will use in this paper are the following:

$$J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} (\varepsilon^2[|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2] + u^2 + v^2) dx, \quad \text{for all } (u, v) \in V(\Omega)$$

where

$$V(\Omega) = \left\{ (u, v) \in H; \int_{\Omega} Q(u, v) dx = 1 \right\}.$$

Let  $r > \rho > 0$  be such that both the sets

$$\Sigma^- = \{x \in \Sigma; \text{dist}(x, \Gamma) \geq r\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma^+ = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^N; \text{dist}(x, \Sigma) < r\}$$

are homotopically equivalent to  $\Sigma$ . Moreover, without loss generality, we assume that  $0 \in \Sigma^-$ .

Let  $\eta \in C^\infty([0, \infty), \mathbf{R})$  verifying:

$$\begin{aligned} &0 \leq \eta(t) \leq 1, \eta(t) = 1 \\ &\text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}, \eta(t) = 0 \quad \text{if } t \geq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad |\eta'| \leq C \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant  $C$ . For any  $y \in \Sigma^-$  and for  $x \in \Omega$ , we set  $\phi_\varepsilon(y)(x) = (\phi_\varepsilon^1(y)(x), \phi_\varepsilon^2(y)(x))$ , where

$$\phi_\varepsilon^i(y)(x) = \eta\left(\frac{|x-y|}{\rho}\right) w_i\left(\frac{x-y}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Moreover, we define  $\Phi_\varepsilon(y)(x) = (\Phi_\varepsilon^1(y)(x), \Phi_\varepsilon^2(y)(x))$  with

$$\Phi_\varepsilon^i(y)(x) = \frac{\phi_\varepsilon^i(y)(x)}{(\int_{\Omega} Q(\phi_\varepsilon^1, \phi_\varepsilon^2) dx)^{1/p}}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

By construction,  $\Phi_\varepsilon$  is a continuous map from  $\Sigma^-$  to  $H$ .

**Lemma 1.** *For any  $y \in \Sigma^-$ , we have  $\Phi_\varepsilon(y) \in V(\Omega)$ . Moreover,*

$$(2.2) \quad J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}(\Phi_\varepsilon(y)) = \varepsilon^{2\alpha} [m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) + o(1)] \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly for  $y \in \Sigma^-$ .

*Proof.* It is easy to see that  $\Phi_\varepsilon^i(y) \geq 0$  for all  $y \in \Sigma^-$  and  $\int_\Omega Q(\Phi_\varepsilon^1, \Phi_\varepsilon^2) dx = 1$ . Moreover, since  $\text{dist}(B_\rho(y), \Gamma) > 0$ , then  $\text{spt}(\Phi_\varepsilon^i) \subset \subset \Omega \cup \Sigma$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

Using the fact that  $\Omega$  is a smooth bounded domain, for each  $y \in \Sigma^-$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$ , an open neighborhood  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $y$  and a diffeomorphism  $\Psi : B_\delta(y) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$  which has the Jacobian determinant at  $y$  verifying  $\Psi'(y) = I$  and  $\Psi(B_\delta^+) = \mathcal{N} \cap \Omega$  where  $B_\delta^+ = B_\delta \cap \mathbf{R}_+^N$ , see [1] for more details.

For each  $n$ , let us choose a unitary matrix  $T_n$  such that  $\tilde{\Omega}_n = T_n(\Omega_n - y_n)$  has  $y^N$  as the inner normal vector of  $\partial\tilde{\Omega}_n$  at the origin. Using the same arguments explored in [19, 22], for any  $R > 0$ , if  $\{y_n\} \subset \Sigma^-$  is a convergent sequence to  $y \in \Sigma^-$ , we have

$$\left| B_R^+(0) \setminus \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n}(\tilde{\Omega}_n) \cap \{x : |x| \leq R\} \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

where  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $|A|$  denotes the Lebesgue measure of a measurable set  $A \subset \mathbf{R}^N$ . The last limit together with the change of variable theorem and Lebesgue theorem imply that

$$(2.3) \quad \varepsilon_n^{-2\alpha} J_{\varepsilon_n, \Omega}(\Phi_{\varepsilon_n}(y_n)) = m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) + o_n(1).$$

The uniform estimate mentioned in (2.2) follows from (2.3).  $\square$

Hereafter, let us denote by  $Y_\varepsilon$  the Banach space  $Y_\varepsilon = H^1(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega)$  endowed with the norm

$$\|(u, v)\|_\varepsilon = \left( \int_\Omega (\varepsilon^2[|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2] + u^2 + v^2) dx \right)^{1/2}$$

and by  $m^*(\varepsilon, \Omega)$  the following number

$$m^*(\varepsilon, \Omega) = \inf_{\substack{(u,v) \in Y_\varepsilon \\ \int_\Omega Q(u,v) dx \neq 0}} \frac{\|(u,v)\|_\varepsilon^2}{\left(\int_\Omega Q(u,v) dx\right)^{2/p}}.$$

**Corollary 1.** *The numbers  $m^*(\varepsilon, \Omega)$  and  $m(\mathbf{R}_+^N)$  satisfy the following equality*

$$\varepsilon^{-2\alpha} m^*(\varepsilon, \Omega) = m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) + o_\varepsilon(1).$$

*Proof.* From the definitions of  $m^*(\varepsilon, \Omega)$  and  $m(\varepsilon, \Omega)$ , we have

$$m^*(\varepsilon, \Omega) \leq m(\varepsilon, \Omega) \leq J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}(\Phi_\varepsilon(0));$$

consequently,

$$\varepsilon^{-2\alpha} m^*(\varepsilon, \Omega) \leq \varepsilon^{-2\alpha} m(\varepsilon, \Omega) \leq \varepsilon^{-2\alpha} J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}(\Phi_\varepsilon(0)).$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 1,

$$\varepsilon^{-2\alpha} J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}(\Phi_\varepsilon(0)) = m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) + o_\varepsilon(1);$$

then,

$$(2.4) \quad m^*(1, \Omega_\varepsilon) \leq m(1, \Omega_\varepsilon) \leq m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) + o_\varepsilon(1).$$

Now, we will prove the following claim.

**Claim 1.** *Denoting  $\Omega_n = \Omega_{\varepsilon_n}$ , we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m^*(1, \Omega_n) = m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0.$$

In fact, first of all, if  $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$  satisfies

$$m^*(1, \Omega_n) = \int_{\Omega_n} (|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2 + |u_n|^2 + |v_n|^2) dx,$$

using the fact that  $\Omega_n$  verifies the uniform cone condition for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , there exists  $c > 0$  satisfying

$$|u|_{L^p(\Omega_n)} \leq c \|u\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_n)} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbf{N} \text{ (see [22])}.$$

The last inequality together with Lions [14] imply that there exist  $R, \tau > 0$  and  $\{y_n\} \subset \partial\Omega_n$  such that

$$(2.5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R(y_n) \cap \Omega_n} Q(u_n, v_n) dx \geq \tau.$$

For each  $n$ , denoting again by  $T_n$  a unitary matrix such that  $\tilde{\Omega}_n = T_n(\Omega_n - y_n)$  has  $y^N$  as inner normal vector of  $\partial\tilde{\Omega}_n$  at origin, we get by a direct calculus

$$\chi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n} \rightarrow \chi_{\mathbf{R}_+^N} \quad \text{a.e in } \mathbf{R}^N,$$

where  $\chi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}$  and  $\chi_{\mathbf{R}_+^N}$  are the characteristic functions of  $\tilde{\Omega}_n$  and  $\mathbf{R}_+^N$ , respectively. Defining the sequences  $\hat{u}_n(x) = u_n(T_n^{-1}(x) + y_n)$  and  $\hat{v}_n(x) = v_n(T_n^{-1}(x) + y_n)$ , it is easy to check that

$$m^*(1, \Omega_n) = m^*(1, \tilde{\Omega}_n)$$

with  $(\hat{u}_n, \hat{v}_n)$  satisfying the equality

$$m^*(1, \tilde{\Omega}_n) = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_n} (|\nabla \hat{u}_n|^2 + |\nabla \hat{v}_n|^2 + |\hat{u}_n|^2 + |\hat{v}_n|^2) dx$$

and  $\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_n} Q(\hat{u}_n, \hat{v}_n) dx = 1$ . Moreover, there exist nonnegative functions  $u, v \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbf{R}_+^N) \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $\hat{u}_n \rightarrow u$  and  $\hat{v}_n \rightarrow v$  in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbf{R}_+^N)$ . Thus, if  $w_n = \hat{u}_n - u$  and  $z_n = \hat{v}_n - v$ , we have

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_n} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbf{R}_+^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_n} |\nabla \hat{u}_n|^2 dx + o_n(1)$$

and

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_n} |\nabla z_n|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbf{R}_+^N} |\nabla v|^2 dx = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_n} |\nabla \hat{v}_n|^2 dx + o_n(1);$$



hence,

$$\begin{aligned} m^*(1, \tilde{\Omega}_n) &= \int_{\mathbf{R}_+^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + |u|^2 + |v|^2) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_n} (|\nabla w_n|^2 + |\nabla z_n|^2 + |w_n|^2 + |z_n|^2) dx + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

Denoting  $\lambda = \int_{\mathbf{R}_+^N} Q(u, v) dx$ , it follows that

$$m^*(1, \tilde{\Omega}_n) \geq m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) \lambda^{2/p} + (1 - \lambda)^{2/p} m^*(1, \tilde{\Omega}_n) + o_n(1)$$

and, from (2.4),

$$m^*(1, \tilde{\Omega}_n) \geq (\lambda^{2/p} + (1 - \lambda)^{2/p}) m^*(1, \tilde{\Omega}_n) + o_n(1).$$

Since there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$m^*(1, \tilde{\Omega}_n) \geq \delta \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbf{N},$$

we have

$$1 \geq \lambda^{2/p} + (1 - \lambda)^{2/p} + o_n(1);$$

then, passing the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , it follows that

$$1 \geq \lambda^{2/p} + (1 - \lambda)^{2/p}.$$

If  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\lambda^{\frac{2}{p}} + (1 - \lambda)^{\frac{2}{p}} > 1$$

which is absurd with the above inequality, and we can conclude that  $\lambda \in \{0, 1\}$ . Once that  $\lambda \neq 0$  by (2.5), we have  $\lambda = 1$  and so

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}_+^N} Q(u, v) dx = 1.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbf{R}_+^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + |u|^2 + |v|^2) dx \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_n} (|\nabla \hat{u}_n|^2 + |\nabla \hat{v}_n|^2 + |\hat{u}_n|^2 + |\hat{v}_n|^2) dx, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) \leq \int_{\mathbf{R}_+^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + |u|^2 + |v|^2) dx \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} m^*(1, \tilde{\Omega}_n).$$

By (2.4),

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} m^*(1, \tilde{\Omega}_n) \leq m(\mathbf{R}_+^N)$$

so, from the last two inequalities, it follows

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m^*(1, \tilde{\Omega}_n) = m(\mathbf{R}_+^N),$$

consequently

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m^*(1, \Omega_n) = m(\mathbf{R}_+^N).$$

The last limit implies that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-2\alpha} m^*(\varepsilon, \Omega) = m(\mathbf{R}_+^N). \quad \square$$

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $(u_n, v_n)$  be a sequence satisfying*

$$\int_{\Omega_n} [|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2 + |u_n|^2 + |v_n|^2] dx = m(1, \Omega_n) + o_n(1)$$

and

$$(u_n, v_n) \in V(\Omega_n)$$

where  $\Omega_n = \Omega_{\varepsilon_n}$  and  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, for some subsequence, there exists  $y_n \in \partial\Omega$  such that: For each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is an  $R > 0$  with the property that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R(y_n) \cap \Omega_n} Q(u_n, v_n) dx \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* In what follows, we will show that sequence  $\{\chi_n Q(u_n, v_n)\}$  satisfies the condition of compactness mentioned in the concentration-compactness lemma due to Lions [14], where  $\chi_n$  is the characteristic function of  $\Omega_n$ . To this end, we will divide our arguments in two steps:

*Step 1.* Vanishing does not hold. Hereafter, let us denote by  $m_Q$  and  $M_Q$  two positive constants verifying

$$(2.6) \quad m_Q[|u|^p + |v|^p] \leq Q(u, v) \leq M_Q[|u|^p + |v|^p] \quad \text{for all } (u, v) \in \mathbf{R}^2.$$

Assuming by contradiction that

$$(2.7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sup_{y \in \mathbf{R}^N} \int_{B_R(y) \cap \Omega_n} \chi_n Q(u_n, v_n) dx \right) = 0,$$

from (2.6)–(2.7) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sup_{y \in \mathbf{R}^N} \int_{B_R(y) \cap \Omega_n} |u_n|^p dx \right) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sup_{y \in \mathbf{R}^N} \int_{B_R(y) \cap \Omega_n} |v_n|^p dx \right) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

hence by [22, Lemma 2.2], we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbf{R}^N} \chi_n |u_n|^p dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbf{R}^N} \chi_n |v_n|^p dx = 0.$$

The last limits together with (2.6) imply that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_n} Q(u_n, v_n) dx = 0$$

which is absurd, because  $(u_n, v_n) \in V(\Omega_n)$ . Therefore, we can conclude that vanishing does not hold.

*Step 2.* Dichotomy does not hold. Adapting again the arguments explored in [22], there exists  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ , such that: For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $R_0 > 0$  and  $\{z_n\} \subset \mathbf{R}^N$  satisfying

$$(2.8) \quad \int_{B_{R_0}(z_n) \cap \Omega_n} Q(u_n, v_n) dx \geq \gamma - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

and

$$(2.9) \quad \int_{B_{2R_0}(z_n) \cap \Omega_n} Q(u_n, v_n) dx \leq \gamma + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

for some subsequence, still denoted by  $(u_n, v_n)$ .

Let  $\eta$  be a smooth nonincreasing function defined on  $[0, +\infty)$  such that  $\eta(t) = 1$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ ;  $\eta(t) = 0$ ,  $t \geq 2$  and  $|\eta'| \leq 2$ . Also define  $\xi(t) = 1 - \eta(t)$  which is a nondecreasing function on  $[0, \infty)$ . Let

$$u_n^1(x) = \chi_n(x) \eta\left(\frac{|x - z_n|}{R_0}\right) u_n(x)$$

and

$$v_n^1(x) = \chi_n(x) \eta\left(\frac{|x - z_n|}{R_0}\right) v_n(x)$$

and

$$u_n^2(x) = \chi_n(x) \xi\left(\frac{|x - z_n|}{2R_0}\right) u_n(x)$$

and

$$v_n^2(x) = \chi_n(x) \xi\left(\frac{|x - z_n|}{2R_0}\right) v_n(x).$$

From the above definitions, we have

$$(2.10) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbf{R}^N} Q(u_n^1, v_n^1) dx - \gamma \right| \leq 2\varepsilon$$

$$(2.11) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbf{R}^N} Q(u_n^2, v_n^2) dx - (1 - \gamma) \right| \leq 2\varepsilon$$

$$(2.12) \quad \int_{\Omega_n} (|\nabla u_n|^2 + |u_n|^2) dx - \int_{\Omega_n} (|\nabla u_n^1|^2 + |u_n^1|^2) dx \\ - \int_{\Omega_n} (|\nabla u_n^2|^2 + |u_n^2|^2) dx \geq -2\varepsilon$$

and

$$(2.13) \quad \int_{\Omega_n} (|\nabla v_n|^2 + |v_n|^2) dx - \int_{\Omega_n} (|\nabla v_n^1|^2 + |v_n^1|^2) dx \\ - \int_{\Omega_n} (|\nabla v_n^2|^2 + |v_n^2|^2) dx \geq -2\varepsilon.$$

From (2.10)–(2.13),

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} m(1, \Omega_n) + o_n(1) &\geq \left( \int_{\Omega_n} Q(u_n^1, v_n^1) dx \right)^{2/p} m(1, \Omega_n) \\ &\quad + \left( \int_{\Omega_n} Q(u_n^2, v_n^2) dx \right)^{2/p} m(1, \Omega_n) - 4\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that there exists  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that

$$m(1, \Omega_n) \geq \delta_0 \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbf{N}$$

from (2.14),

$$1 + o_n(1) \geq \left( \int_{\Omega_n} Q(u_n^1, v_n^1) dx \right)^{2/p} + \left( \int_{\Omega_n} Q(u_n^2, v_n^2) dx \right)^{2/p} - C\varepsilon$$

for some positive constant  $C$ . From (2.10)–(2.11),

$$1 \geq (\gamma - 2\varepsilon)^{2/p} + (1 - \gamma - 2\varepsilon)^{2/p} - C\varepsilon;$$

thus, passing to the limit when  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  in the last inequality and using the fact that  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ , it follows that

$$1 \geq \gamma^{2/p} + (1 - \gamma)^{2/p} > 1$$

which is absurd. Therefore, dichotomy does not hold.

From the above steps, we can conclude that compactness holds, so there exists  $\{z_n\} \subset \mathbf{R}^N$  such that for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  fixed, there exists  $R_1 > 0$  satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{R_1}(z_n) \cap \Omega_n} Q(u_n, v_n) \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

**Claim 2.** *There exists  $\overline{C} > 0$  such that*

$$\text{dist}(z_n, \partial\Omega_n) \leq \overline{C}.$$

If the claim is not true, then for some subsequence, still denoted by  $\{z_n\}$ , we have

$$\text{dist}(z_n, \partial\Omega_n) \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, we can conclude that there exists  $R_n \in (0, +\infty)$  with  $R_n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $B_{R_n}(z_n) \subset \Omega_n$ .

Defining

$$w_n^1(x) = \eta\left(\frac{|x - z_n|}{R_n}\right) u_n(x) \quad \text{and} \quad w_n^2(x) = \eta\left(\frac{|x - z_n|}{R_n}\right) v_n(x),$$

it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{R}^N} Q(w_n^1, w_n^2) dx &= \int_{B_{2R_n}(z_n)} Q(w_n^1, w_n^2) dx \\ &\geq \int_{B_{R_1}(z_n)} Q(w_n^1, w_n^2) dx, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$(2.15) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R}^N} Q(w_n^1, w_n^2) dx \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbf{N}.$$

Once that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_n} |\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2 + |u_n|^2 + |v_n|^2 \\ - \int_{\Omega_n} |\nabla w_n^1|^2 + |\nabla w_n^2|^2 + |w_n^1|^2 + |w_n^2|^2 \geq -2\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$m(1, \Omega_n) + o_n(1) \geq \left( \int_{\Omega_n} Q(w_n^1, w_n^2) dx \right)^{2/p} m(\mathbf{R}^N) - 2\varepsilon,$$

and by (2.15),

$$(2.16) \quad m(1, \Omega_n) + o_n(1) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^{2/p} m(\mathbf{R}^N) - 2\varepsilon.$$

Recalling that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(1, \Omega_n) \leq m(\mathbf{R}_+^N)$$

from (2.16), it follows that

$$m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^{2/p} m(\mathbf{R}^N) - 2\varepsilon,$$

and taking the limit of  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we get

$$m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) \geq m(\mathbf{R}^N),$$

which is a contradiction with (2.1), and the claim is proved.

From Claim 2, there exists  $y_n \in \partial\Omega_n$  verifying the inequality  $|z_n - y_n| \leq \overline{C}$ , which implies  $B_{R_1}(z_n) \subset B_R(y_n)$  where  $R = R_1 + \overline{C}$ . Therefore,

$$\int_{B_R(y_n) \cap \Omega_n} Q(u_n, v_n) dx \geq \int_{B_{R_1}(z_n) \cap \Omega_n} Q(u_n, v_n) dx \geq 1 - \varepsilon. \quad \square$$

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\varepsilon_n \downarrow 0$  and  $(u_n, v_n)$  satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 2. Then, there exists  $C > 0$  such that*

$$\text{dist}(y_n, \Sigma_n) \leq C,$$

where  $\{y_n\} \in \partial\Omega_n$  is the sequence given in Lemma 2.

*Proof.* Assume by contradiction that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(y_n, \Sigma_n) = +\infty.$$

Then, there exists  $\{R_n\} \subset (0, +\infty)$  with  $R_n \rightarrow \infty$  such that

$$\text{dist}(y_n, \Sigma_n) \geq 2R_n.$$

Defining

$$w_n^1(x) = \eta \left( \frac{|x - y_n|}{2R_n} \right) u_n(x) \quad \text{and} \quad w_n^2(x) = \eta \left( \frac{|x - y_n|}{2R_n} \right) v_n(x),$$

$$x \in \Omega_n,$$

where  $\eta$  was given in the above lemma and repeating the same type of arguments used in that lemma, we may obtain again

$$m(\mathbf{R}_+^N) \geq m(\mathbf{R}^N),$$

which is absurd.  $\square$

In what follows, let us denote by  $\beta : V(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^N$  the continuous map

$$\beta(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} Q(u, v) x \, dx.$$

From the definitions of  $\Phi_\varepsilon$  and  $\beta$ , we have that

$$\beta(\Phi_\varepsilon(y)) = y \quad \text{for all } y \in \Sigma^-.$$

**Proposition 1.** *For each  $\theta > 0$  there exists  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$  such that for all  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$  and  $(u, v) \in V(\Omega)$ , we have*

$$J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}(u, v) \leq m(\varepsilon, \Omega) + \theta \varepsilon^{2\alpha} \implies \beta(u, v) \in \Sigma^+.$$

*Proof.* Assume that there exist  $\theta_n, \varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ ,  $(u_n, v_n) \in V(\Omega)$  such that

$$J_{\varepsilon_n, \Omega}(u_n, v_n) \leq m(\varepsilon_n, \Omega) + \theta_n \varepsilon_n^{2\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(u_n, v_n) \notin \Sigma^+;$$

consequently,

$$(2.17) \quad \varepsilon_n^{-2\alpha} J_{\varepsilon_n, \Omega}(u_n, v_n) \leq m(1, \Omega_n) + \theta_n.$$

Defining

$$w_n(x) = \varepsilon_n^{N/p} u_n(\varepsilon_n x) \quad \text{and} \quad z_n(x) = \varepsilon_n^{N/p} v_n(\varepsilon_n x),$$

from (2.17) and Corollary 1, we have

$$(w_n, z_n) \in V(\Omega_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_{1, \Omega_{\varepsilon_n}}(w_n, z_n) \leq m(\mathbf{R}_+^N).$$



From Lemmas 2 and 3, there exist  $y_n \in \partial\Omega$ ,  $C > 0$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $R > 0$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_R(y_n) \cap \Omega_n} Q(w_n, z_n) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist}(y_n, \Sigma_n) \leq C.$$

Thus, there exists  $x_n \in \Sigma$  such that

$$\left| y_n - \frac{x_n}{\varepsilon_n} \right| \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{\varepsilon_n R_1}(x_n) \cap \Omega} Q(u_n, v_n) dx \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

where  $R_1 = R + C$ . Since  $\Sigma$  is bounded, we can assume that, for some subsequence,  $x_n \rightarrow x_0 \in \bar{\Sigma}$ . Then, for  $i = 1, \dots, N$

$$|\beta^i(u_n, v_n) - x_0^i| = \left| \int_{\Omega} Q(u_n, v_n)(x^i - x_0^i) dx \right|,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta^i(u_n, v_n) - x_0^i| &\leq \int_{\Omega \cap B_{\varepsilon_n R_1}(x_n)} Q(u_n, v_n) |x^i - x_0^i| dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega \setminus B_{\varepsilon_n R_1}(x_n)} Q(u_n, v_n) |x^i - x_0^i| dx; \end{aligned}$$

hence,

$$|\beta^i(u_n, v_n) - x_0^i| \leq \varepsilon_n R_1 + |x_n^i - x_0^i| + \varepsilon \max_{x \in \Omega} |x - x_0|,$$

so,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\beta(u_n, v_n) - x_0| = 0,$$

showing that  $\beta(u_n, v_n) \in \Sigma^+$  for  $n$  sufficiently large, leading to an absurdity.  $\square$

**3. Proof of main theorem.** In this section we will prove Theorem 1. Hereafter, let us denote by  $\theta$  the number obtained in Proposition 1,  $m^*(\varepsilon) = m(\varepsilon, \Omega) + \theta\varepsilon^{2\alpha}$ , and by  $J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}^{m^*(\varepsilon)}$  the following set

$$J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}^{m^*(\varepsilon)} = \left\{ (u, v) \in H; J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}(u, v) \leq m^*(\varepsilon) \right\}.$$

**Lemma 4.** *There exists  $\varepsilon^* > 0$  such that for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*)$ ,*

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(\Sigma^-) \subset V^{m^*(\varepsilon)} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(V^{m^*(\varepsilon)}) \subset \Sigma^+,$$

where  $V^{m^*(\varepsilon)} = J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}^{m^*(\varepsilon)} \cap V(\Omega)$ .

*Proof.* First of all, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-2\alpha} J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}(\Phi_\varepsilon(y)) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-2\alpha} m(\varepsilon, \Omega) = m(\mathbf{R}_+^N)$$

uniformly for  $y \in \Sigma^-$ . Thus,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-2\alpha} \left( J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}(\Phi_\varepsilon(y)) - m(\varepsilon, \Omega) \right) = 0$$

uniformly in  $\Sigma^-$ . Then, there exists an  $\varepsilon_2 > 0$  such that

$$\varepsilon^{-2\alpha} \left( J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}(\Phi_\varepsilon(y)) - m(\varepsilon, \Omega) \right) \leq \theta, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall y \in \Sigma^-;$$

that is,

$$J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}(\Phi_\varepsilon(y)) \leq m(\varepsilon, \Omega) + \theta \varepsilon^{2\alpha}, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall y \in \Sigma^-.$$

Considering  $\varepsilon^* = \min\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$ , we have  $\Phi_\varepsilon(\Sigma^-) \subset V^{m^*(\varepsilon)}$  and, by Proposition 1,

$$\beta(V^{m^*(\varepsilon)}) \subset \Sigma^+ \quad \text{for all} \quad \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*). \quad \square$$

In the proof of the next result, we use similar arguments developed by Benci and Cerami [8].

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $\varepsilon^* > 0$  be given by Lemma 4. Then*

$$\text{cat}(V^{m^*(\varepsilon)}) \geq \text{cat}(\Sigma) \quad \text{for all} \quad \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*).$$

*Proof.* Assume that

$$V^{m^*(\varepsilon)} = A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n$$

where  $A_j, j = 1, \dots, n$  is closed and contractible in  $V^{m^*(\varepsilon)}$ , that is, there exists

$$h_j \in C([0, 1] \times A_j, V^{m^*(\varepsilon)}),$$

such that

$$h_j(0, u) = u, \quad h_j(1, u) = h_j(1, v) \quad \text{for all } u, v \in A_j.$$

Consider  $B_j = \Phi_\varepsilon^{-1}(A_j)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . The sets  $B_j$  are closed and

$$\Sigma^- = B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_n.$$

Using the deformation

$$g_j(t, y) = \beta(h_j(t, \Phi_\varepsilon(y))),$$

we have

$$g_j(0, y) = \beta(h_j(0, \Phi_\varepsilon(y))) = \beta(\Phi_\varepsilon(y)) = y \quad \text{for all } y \in \Sigma^-$$

and

$$g_j(1, y) = \beta(h_j(1, \Phi_\varepsilon(y))) = \beta(z) \quad \text{for all } y \in B_j;$$

thus,  $B_j$  is contractible in  $\Sigma^+$ , and

$$\text{cat}(V^{m^*(\varepsilon)}) \geq \text{cat}_{\Sigma^+}(\Sigma^-) = \text{cat}(\Sigma). \quad \square$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Let  $\varepsilon^*$  be as in Lemma 4 and  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*)$ . Using well known Ljusternik-Schirelman arguments, it follows that the existence of at least  $\text{cat}(\Sigma)$  distinct critical points of  $J_{\varepsilon, \Omega}$  on  $V(\Omega)$ . For the case where  $\Sigma$  is not contractible in itself, we fix  $(u^*, v^*) \in V(\Omega) \setminus \overline{\Phi_\varepsilon(\Sigma^-)}$  and  $F : [0, 1] \times \overline{\Phi_\varepsilon(\Sigma^-)} \rightarrow V(\Omega)$  by setting

$$F(t, u) = \frac{t(u^*, v^*) + (1-t)(u, v)}{\left(Q((u^*, v^*) + (1-t)(u, v))\right)^{1/p}}.$$

Repeating the same arguments as found in Candela and Lazzo [10], we find one more critical point.

## REFERENCES

1. Adimurthi, F. Pacella and S.L. Yadava, *Interaction between the geometry of the boundary and positive solutions of a semilinear Neumann problem with critical nonlinearity*, J. Functional Anal. **111** (1993), 318–350.
2. C.O. Alves, J.M. do Ó and M.A.S. Souto, *Local mountain pass for a class of elliptic problems involving critical growth*, Nonlinear Anal. **46** (2001), 495–510.
3. C.O. Alves and A. El Hamidi, *Nehari manifolds and existence of positive solutions to a class of quasilinear problems*, Nonlinear Anal. **60** (2005), 611–624.
4. C.O. Alves and S.H.M. Soares, *Existence and concentration of positive solutions for a class gradient systems*, NoDEA, to appear.
5. C.O. Alves, S.H.M. Soares and J. Yang, *On the existence and concentration of solutions for a class of Hamiltonian systems in  $\mathbf{R}^N$* , Advanced Nonlinear Stud. **2** (2003), 161–180.
6. C.O. Alves and M.A.S. Souto, *On the existence and concentration behavior of ground state solutions for a class of problems with critical growth*, Comm. Pure Appl. Anal. **3** (2002), 417–431.
7. A.I. Ávila and J. Yang, *On the existence and shape of least energy solutions for some elliptic systems*, J. Differential Equations **191** (2003), 348–376.
8. V. Benci and G. Cerami, *The effect of the domain topology on the number of solutions of nonlinear elliptic problem*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **114** (1991), 79–93.
9. L. Boccardo and D.G. de Figueiredo, *Some remarks on a system of quasilinear elliptic equations*, NoDEA **9** (2002), 309–323.
10. A.M. Candela and M. Lazzo, *Positive solutions for a mixed boundary problem*, Nonlinear Anal. **24** (1995), 1109–1117.
11. E. Colorado and I. Peral, *Semilinear elliptic problems with mixed Dirichlet-Neumann boundary conditions*, J. Functional Anal. **199** (2003), 468–507.
12. D.C. de Moraes Filho and M.A.S. Souto, *Systems of  $p$ -Laplacean equations involving homogeneous nonlinearities with critical Sobolev exponent degrees*, Comm. Partial Diff. Equations **24** (1999), 1537–1553.
13. M. del Pino and P.L. Felmer, *Local mountain pass for semilinear elliptic problems in unbounded domains*, Calc. Var. **121** (1996), 121–137.
14. P.L. Lions, *The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations, The locally compact case*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Nonlin. **1** (1984), Part 1, 109–145; Part 2, 223–283.
15. P.L. Lions, F. Pacella and M. Tricarico, *Best constants in Sobolev inequalities for functions vanishing on some part of the boundary and related questions*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **37** (1988), 301–324.
16. E.S. Noussair and J. Wei, *On the effect of domain geometry on the existence of nodal solutions in singular perturbations problems*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **46** (1997), 1255–1271.
17. ———, *On the location of spikes and profile of nodal solutions for a singularly perturbed Neumann problem*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **13** (1998), 793–816.

**18.** Y.J. Oh, Existence of semi-classical bound states of nonlinear Schrodinger equations with potentials on the class  $(V)_a$ , *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **14** (1988), 1499–1519.

**19.** N. Qiao and Z.-Q Wang, *Multiplicity results for positive solutions to non-autonomous elliptic problems*, *EJDE*, **1999** (1999), 1–28.

**20.** P.H. Rabinowitz, *On a class of nonlinear Schrodinger equations*, *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.* **43** (1992), 270–291.

**21.** X. Wang, *On concentration of positive bound states of nonlinear Schrodinger equations*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **53** (1993), 229–244.

**22.** Z.-Q Wang, *The effect of the domain geometry on the number of positive solutions of Neumann problems with critical exponents*, *Differential Int. Equations* **8** (1995), 1533–1554.

**23.** ———, *On the existence of multiple, single-peaked solutions of a semilinear Neumann problem*, *Archive Rational Mech. Anal.* **120** (1992), 375–399.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMATICA E ESTATISTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE  
CAMPINA GRANDE, CEP:58109-970, CAMPINA GRANDE-PB, BRAZIL  
**Email address:** coalves@dme.ufcg.edu.br