



INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY  
UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION



INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS  
34100 TRIESTE (ITALY) - P.O.B. 586 - MIRAMARE - STRADA COSTIERA 11 - TELEPHONE: 2240-1  
CABLE: CENTRATOM - TELEX 460892-1

SMR 281/11

COLLEGE ON VARIATIONAL PROBLEMS IN ANALYSIS

(11 January - 5 February 1988)

AN INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL POINT THEORY  
( PART II )

M. WILLEM  
Universite Catholique de Louvain  
Institut de Mathematique Pure et Applique  
2 Chemin du Cyclotron  
B.1348 Louvain La Neuve  
BELGIUM

## II - Minimax theorems

Consider the following intuition situation.

If  $\varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$ , we can view  $\varphi(x, y)$

as the altitude of the point of the graph  
of  $\varphi$  having  $(x, y)$  as projection on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

Assume that there exists a bounded  
open neighborhood  $\Omega$  of  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega$   
such that  $\varphi(a) > \max\{\varphi(x_0), \varphi(a_0)\}$  whenever  
 $a \in \partial\Omega$ . We can thus consider the point  
 $[x_0, \varphi(x_0)]$  as located in a valley  
surrounded by a ring of mountains  
pictured by the set  $\{[x, \varphi(x)] : x \in \partial\Omega\}$ ,  
the point  $[a_0, \varphi(a_0)]$  being located  
outside the ring. To go from  $[x_0, \varphi(x_0)]$   
to  $[a_0, \varphi(a_0)]$  in a way which minimizes  
the highest altitude of the path, we must  
cross the mountain ring through the lowest  
mountain pass. The projection on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  of  
the top of this mountain pass will provide  
a critical point of  $\varphi$ .

More generally, we have the following  
result.

Theorem 3. (Ambrosetti-Rabinowitz mountain  
pass theorem). Assume that  $\varphi \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$  satisfies  
(PS). If there exist  $x_0, a_0 \in X \setminus \partial\Omega$ , where  
 $\Omega$  is a bounded open neighborhood of  $x_0$ ,  
such that, for some  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$\varphi(a) > \alpha > \max\{\varphi(x_0), \varphi(a_0)\}$   
whenever  $a \in \partial\Omega$ , then  $\varphi$  has a  
critical value  $c > \alpha$ .

Proof. Let us define

$$\Gamma = \{ \gamma \in C([0,1], X) : \gamma(0) = u_0, \gamma(1) = u_1 \}$$

$$c = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} g(\gamma(t)).$$

Since every curve  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  crosses  $\partial S_2$ ,  $\max_{t \in [0,1]} g(\gamma(t)) \geq \alpha$ .

Hence  $c \geq \alpha$  and there exists  $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$  such that  
 $c - \bar{\varepsilon} \geq \max \{ g(u_0), g(u_1) \}$ .

Assume that  $K_c = \emptyset$ . Let  $\varepsilon \in ]0, \bar{\varepsilon}]$  and  
 $\tilde{\gamma} \in C([0,1] \times X, X)$  be given by lemma 1  
when  $U = \emptyset$ . The definition of  $c$  implies  
the existence of  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  such that  $\max_{t \in [0,1]} g(\gamma(t)) \leq c - \varepsilon$

Let us now consider the continuous path  
 $\tilde{\gamma}$  defined by  $\tilde{\gamma}(t) = \tilde{\gamma}(1, \gamma(t))$ . Since  
 $g(u_0) \leq c - \varepsilon$ , we have

$$\tilde{\gamma}(0) = \tilde{\gamma}(1, \gamma(0)) = \gamma(1, u_0) = u_0.$$

Similarly  $\tilde{\gamma}(1) = u_1$ . Thus  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ . But  
 $\tilde{\gamma}([0,1]) \subset g^{c-\varepsilon}$ , so that  $\tilde{\gamma}(1, \tilde{\gamma}([0,1])) \subset g^{c-\varepsilon}$  and  
 $c \leq \max_{t \in [0,1]} g(\tilde{\gamma}(t)) \leq c - \varepsilon$ ,

a contradiction. Hence  $K_c \neq \emptyset$  and the  
proof is complete.  $\square$

Let us now consider an other  
geometric situation. (Rabinowitz saddle  
point theorem).

12

Theorem 4. Assume that  $\varphi \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$  satisfying (P5), and that  $X = Y \oplus Z$  with  $Y$  finite-dimensional. If there exists constants  $b_1 < b_2$  and a neighborhood  $\Omega$  of  $0$  in  $Y$  bounded such that

$$\varphi|_Z \geq b_2$$

$$\varphi|_{\partial\Omega} \leq b_1$$

then  $\varphi$  has a critical point.

Proof. Let us define

$$\Gamma = \{ \gamma \in C(\bar{\Omega}, X) : \gamma(y) = y \text{ if } y \in \partial\Omega \},$$

$$c = \inf_{Y \in \Gamma} \max_{y \in \bar{\Omega}} \varphi(\gamma(y)).$$

If  $P$  denotes the projector on  $Y$  with kernel  $Z$ , then  $P\gamma \in C(\bar{\Omega}, Y)$  and  $P\gamma(y) = y$  when ever  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and  $y \in \partial\Omega$ . By a topological degree argument,  $P\gamma$  has a zero inside  $\Omega$ , i.e. there exists  $y \in \Omega$  such that  $\gamma(y) \in Z$ . (In the easy case when  $\dim Y = 1$ , the intermediate value theorem suffices.) In particular

$$\max_{y \in \bar{\Omega}} \varphi(\gamma(y)) \geq \inf_{Z \in \Gamma} \varphi(z) \geq b_2.$$

Hence  $c \geq b_2$  and we find  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $c - \varepsilon \geq b_2$ . Assume that  $\kappa_c = \emptyset$ . Let  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon]$  and  $\beta \in C([0, 1] \times X, X)$  be given by lemma 1 when  $U = \emptyset$ . Then exists  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  such that

$$\max_{y \in \bar{\Omega}} \varphi(\gamma(y)) \leq c + \varepsilon.$$

Set  $\tilde{\gamma} = \beta(1, \gamma(\cdot))$ . If  $y \in \partial\Omega$ , then  $\varphi(y) \leq b_1$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}(y) = \beta(1, \gamma(y)) = \beta(1, y) = y$ . Thus  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ .

Since  $\varphi(\tilde{x}) < \varphi^{c-\varepsilon}$ , we have that  
 $\exists (t, \varphi(t)) < \varphi^{c-\varepsilon}$  and  
 $c < \max_{y \in \tilde{A}} \varphi(\tilde{\gamma}(y)) \leq c-\varepsilon$ ,

18

a. contradiction. Hence  $\kappa_c \neq \emptyset$ .  $\square$

The following application is essentially to Pham, Lazer and Paul.

Theorem 5. Assume that  $V$  and  $D_2 V$  are continuous on  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N$  and that there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such

$$\begin{aligned} D_2 V(t, x) &\leq c \\ \text{on } [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N. \quad \text{If} \\ \text{to, } \int_0^T V(t, x) dt &\rightarrow +\infty, \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

the problem (6) has at least one solution.

Proof. We shall apply theorem 4 to  
 $\varphi(u) = \int_0^T [\frac{1}{2} u'(t)^2 - V(t, u(t))] dt$  with  $X = H_T^1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= \{y : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N : y \text{ is constant}\} \\ Z &= \{\bar{y} \in H_T^1 : \int_0^T \bar{y}(t) dt = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

1)  $\varphi$  is bounded from below in  $Z$ .

For  $\bar{y} \in Z$  we have, using Sobolev inequality,  
 $\varphi(\bar{y}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\dot{\bar{y}}\|_{L^2}^2 - \int_0^T V(t, \bar{y}(t)) dt - \int_0^T \int_0^t (D_2 V(t, \bar{y}(t)), \bar{y}'(s)) ds dt$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\dot{\bar{y}}\|_{L^2}^2 - c_1 - T \alpha \|\bar{y}\|_{L^\infty}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\dot{\bar{y}}\|_{L^2}^2 - c_1 - c_2 \|\dot{\bar{y}}\|_{L^2},$$

Thus  $b_2 = \inf_Z \varphi > -\infty$ .

2)  $\varphi$  satisfies the (PS) condition.

[3]

Let  $(u_k)$  be a sequence in  $H_T^1$  such that  $\varphi(u_k)$  is bounded and  $\varphi'(u_k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . As in theorem 2, it suffices to prove that  $(u_k)$  is bounded in  $H_T^1$ . There is some  $k_0$  such that, for  $k \geq k_0$ ,

$$|\langle \varphi'(u_k), h \rangle| \leq \|h\|, \quad \forall h \in H_T^1.$$

In particular, by Sobolev inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \|u_k\|_{L^2} &\geq \|\tilde{u}_k\| = \|\langle \varphi'(u_k), \tilde{u}_k \rangle\| = \\ &= \int_0^T [(\tilde{u}_k(t))^2 - (\nabla F(t, u_k(t), \tilde{u}_k(t))] dt \\ &\geq \|\tilde{u}_k\|_{L^2}^2 - c_1 T \|\tilde{u}_k\|_\infty \\ &\geq \|\tilde{u}_k\|_{L^2}^2 - c_2 \|u_k\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\tilde{u}_k$  is bounded in  $L^2$  and  $\tilde{u}_k$  is bounded in  $H_T^1$ . Finally

$$\begin{aligned} c_3 \leq \varphi(u_k) &= \int_0^T [(\frac{\tilde{u}_k(t)}{2})^2 + V(t, \tilde{u}_k(t)) - V(t, u_k(t)) - b(t, \tilde{u}_k(t))] dt \\ &\leq c_4 - \int_0^T V(t, \tilde{u}_k) dt \end{aligned}$$

and  $\tilde{u}_k$  is bounded by assumption (a).

3) End of the proof.

If  $y \in Y$  then  $\varphi(y) = - \int_0^1 V(t, y) dt$ . By assumption (a) there exists  $R > 0$  such that

$$\|y\| \geq R \Rightarrow \varphi(y) \leq \log - 1 = \log.$$

It suffices then to apply theorem 4 to get a critical point of  $\varphi$  and, consequently, a solution of problem (a).  $\square$

### III - Matsumoto-Schauderian Theory.

A basic method in critical point theory is to obtain the existence of multiple critical points by using invariance properties of the functional. In this section, we consider the case of a "periodic" functional defined on a Banach space  $X$ .

We shall need the following definitions.

A subset  $C$  of a topological space  $Y$  is contractible in  $Y$  if there exists  $h \in C([0,1], C(Y))$  and  $y \in Y$  such that

$$h(0, u) = u, \quad h(1, u) = y, \quad \forall u \in C.$$

A subset  $R$  of a topological space  $Y$  has category k in  $Y$  if  $k$  is the least integer such that  $R$  can be covered by  $k$  closed sets contractible in  $Y$ . The category of  $R$  in  $Y$  is denoted by  $\text{cat}_Y(R)$ .

A metric space  $Y$  is an absolute neighborhood extensor, shortly an A.N.E., if for every metric space  $E$ , every closed subset  $F$  of  $E$  and every  $f \in C(F, Y)$  there exists a continuous extension of  $f$  defined on a neighborhood of  $F$  in  $E$ .

Example. [GJ]

a)  $\text{cat}_{S^n}(S^n) = 2, \quad \text{cat}_{T^n}(T^n) = n+1.$

b) A finite product of A.N.E. is an A.N.E.

A convex subset of a normed space is an A.N.E.

A circle is an A.N.E.

Proposition 4. Let  $\gamma, \zeta$  be topological spaces. 21  
 and let  $A, B \subset Y$ .

- (i) If  $A \subset B$ , then  $\text{cat}_Y(A) \leq \text{cat}_Y(B)$  (monotonicity),
- (ii)  $\text{cat}_Y(A \cup B) \leq \text{cat}_Y(A) + \text{cat}_Y(B)$  (subadditivity),
- (iii) If  $A$  is closed and  $B = \gamma(\lambda, A)$ , where  
 $\lambda \in C([0, 1] \times A, Y)$  is such that  $\gamma(0, u) = u$   
 for every  $u \in A$ , then  $\text{cat}_Y(A) \leq \text{cat}_Y(B)$ .
- (iv) If  $A$  is a closed subset of an ANE,  
 $Y$  then there exists a closed neighborhood  
 $U$  of  $A$  such that  $\text{cat}_Y(A) = \text{cat}_Y(U)$  (continuity).

Proof. see [4].  $\square$

Let  $G$  be a discrete subgroup of  
 a Banach space  $X$  and let  $\pi: X \rightarrow X/G$   
 be the canonical surjection. A subset  
 $A$  of  $X$  is  $G$ -invariant if  $\pi^{-1}(\pi(A)) = A$ .  
 A function  $f$  defined on  $X$  is  $G$ -invariant  
 if  $f(u+g) = f(u)$  for every  $u \in X$  and  
 every  $g \in G$ . If a differentiable  
 functional  $\varphi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $G$ -invariant,  
 then  $\varphi'$  is also  $G$ -invariant. Consequently,  
 if  $u$  is a critical point of such a  $\varphi$ ,  
 then  $\pi^{-1}(\pi(u))$  is a set of critical points of  
 $\varphi$ , and is called a critical orbit of  $\varphi$ .

A  $G$ -invariant differentiable function  
 $\varphi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies the  $(\pm S)$  condition if,  
 for every sequence  $(u_k)$  in  $X$  such that  
 $\varphi(u_k)$  is bounded and  $\varphi'(u_k) \rightarrow \sigma$ , the  
 sequence  $(\pi(u_k))$  contains a convergent  
 subsequence.

Theorem 6. Let  $\varphi \in C^1(\lambda, \mathbb{R})$  be a G-invariant function satisfying the  $(PS)_c$  condition. If  $\varphi$  is bounded from below and if the dimension  $N$  of the space generated by  $G$  is finite, then  $\varphi$  has at least  $N+1$  critical points.

Lemma 2. Under the assumption of theorem 5, if  $U$  is an open invariant neighborhood of  $k_0$  then, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists an  $\varepsilon' \in (0, \varepsilon]$  and  $\gamma \in C([t_0, t_0 + \varepsilon] \times X, X)$  satisfying properties (a), (b) of lemma 1. Moreover (d)  $\gamma(t, u + g) = \gamma(t, u + g, t + \varepsilon\omega, \omega)$ ,  $\forall u \in X, \forall g \in G$ .

Proof. We consider the special case of  $X$  Hilbert space and  $\varphi \in C^2(\lambda, \mathbb{R})$ . It is easy to construct the vector field  $f$  as in lemma 1. Moreover the invariance of  $U$  and  $\nabla \varphi$  implies the invariance of  $f$ . A solution to the Cauchy problem

$$\dot{\sigma} = f(\sigma)$$

$$\sigma(t_0) = u + g \quad (g \in G)$$

is given by  $\sigma(t_0 + t) + g$ . By uniqueness  $\sigma(t, u + g) = \sigma(t, u) + g$ . Since  $\gamma(t, u) = \sigma(\sqrt{\varepsilon}t, u)$  the proof is complete.  $\square$

Lemma 3. Under the assumption of theorem 6, there exists a closed invariant subset  $\Omega$  of  $X$  such that  $\text{cat}_{\pi(x)} \Omega = N+1$ .

Proof. Let  $V$  be the space generated by  $G$ . Then  $X$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{Z}$ , where  $\mathbb{Z}$  is a complement of  $V$ ,  $G$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}^N$  and  $\pi(x)$  is isomorphic to  $T_x^* \mathbb{Z}$ .

Setting  $R = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{\alpha\}$ , we obtain

$$\text{ct}_{\pi(x)}(\pi(R)) = \text{ct}_{T^n \times X}(T^n \times \{\alpha\}) = \text{ct}_{T^n}(T^n) = N+1. \square$$

By lemma 3, for  $1 \leq i \leq N+1$ , the following set is non-empty:

$\mathcal{C}_j = \{A \in X : A \text{ is closed, invariant and } \text{ct}_{\pi(x)}(\pi(A)) \geq j\}$ .  
Define

$$c_j = \inf_{A \in \mathcal{C}_j} \sup_{x \in A} g.$$

Since  $c_j < c_{j+1}$ , we have

$$-\infty < \inf_x g \leq c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_{N+1} < +\infty.$$

Lemma 4. Under the assumptions of theorem 6,  
if  $c_k = c_j = c$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq k \leq N+1$  then

$$\text{ct}_{\pi(x)}(\pi(K_c)) \geq k-j+1.$$

Proof. Since  $\pi(x) = T^n \times X$  is an ANE and since  $\pi(K_c)$  is compact by (PS)<sub>C</sub>, then exists, by proposition 4, a closed neighborhood  $N$  of  $\pi(K_c)$  such that  $\text{ct}_{\pi(x)}(N) = \text{ct}_{T^n}(T^n)$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given by lemma 2 applied to  $\tilde{\varepsilon} = 1$  and  $U = \text{int } \pi^{-1}(N)$ . By definition of  $c_k$ , there exists  $R \in \mathcal{O}_k$  such that

$$\max_{x \in R} g \leq c_k + \varepsilon = c + \varepsilon.$$

Proposition 4 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad k &\leq \text{ct}_{\pi(x)}(\pi(R)) \leq \text{ct}_{\pi(x)}(\pi(R \setminus U) \cup \pi(U)) \\ &\leq \text{ct}_{T^n}(T^n) + \text{ct}_{\pi(x)}(N) \\ &= \text{ct}_{T^n}(T^n) + \text{ct}_{\pi(x)}(\pi(K_c)). \end{aligned}$$

By lemma 2,  $\text{ct}_{\pi(x)}(1, R \setminus U) \leq g^{c-\varepsilon}$  and  $\gamma$  induces

11

a deformation from  $\pi(A \setminus U)$  to  $\pi(C)$ .

But  $\max_C g \leq c - \varepsilon = c_j - \varepsilon$ . By the definition

of  $c_j$ ,  $\text{cut}_{\pi(X)}(\pi(C)) \leq j-1$ , so that, by proposition 4,  $\text{cut}_{\pi(X)}(\pi(A \setminus U)) \leq j-1$ .

Hence (14) implies that  $k \leq j-1 + \text{cut}_{\pi(X)}\pi(K_c)$ .  $\square$

Proof of theorem 6: If  $c_j < c_k$  whenever  $1 \leq j < k \leq N+1$ , then  $g$  has at least  $N+1$  critical values.

If  $c_j = c_k = c$  for some  $1 \leq j < k \leq N+1$  then  $\text{cut}_{\pi(X)}(\pi(K_c)) \geq 2$  and  $K_c$

contains infinitely many critical orbits.  $\square$

Theorem 6 generalizes a recent result of S. Li (ITCP Rep. IC-85-191) and was also motivated by a recent result due independently to J. Moser and P. Rabinowitz which is the following:

Consider the classical Lagrangian

$$L(t, x, y) = \frac{1}{2} M(t, x) y^2 - V(t, x) + f(x),$$

where

(P<sub>1</sub>)  $M \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N, \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^N))$  is a symmetric matrix which is  $T$ -periodic in  $t$  and  $x_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , (for simplicity).

(P<sub>2</sub>) There exists  $\alpha > 0$  such that

$$(M(t, x)y, y) \geq \alpha |y|^2, \forall [t, x, y] \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N.$$

(R<sub>3</sub>)  $V \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R})$  is  $T$ -periodic in  $t$  and  $\eta_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ .

(R<sub>4</sub>)  $f \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N)$  is  $T$ -periodic in  $t$  and  $\int_0^T f(t) dt = 0$ .

Then the Lagrangian system

$$\frac{d}{dt} D_y L(t, u(t), \dot{u}(t)) = D_x L(t, u(t), \dot{u}(t))$$

has at least  $N+1$  geometrically distinct periodic solutions.

In particular, when the mean value of the forcing term is 0, a simple forced pendulum has at least 2 geometrically distinct periodic solutions and a double forced pendulum has at least 3 geometrically distinct periodic solutions.

The above result follows easily from theorem 6. In particular, if  $(e_i)$  denotes the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , the functional

$$\varphi(u) = \int_0^T L(t, u(t), \dot{u}(t)) dt$$

satisfies the following periodicity property on  $H_T^1$ :

$$\varphi(u + T e_i) = \varphi(u), \quad 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

Remark. Using Ekeland principle it is possible to extend Lusternik-Schnirelman theory to  $C^1$  Finsler-manifolds (Szulkin, 1987).

#### IV - Banach-Vlasov theorems and index theories.

In this section we consider functionals which are invariant under the action of a compact topological group.

Let  $G$  be a topological group.

A representation of  $G$  over a Banach space  $X$  is a family  $\{T(g)\}_{g \in G}$  of linear operators  $T(g) : X \rightarrow X$  such that

$$T(\sigma) = \text{id}$$

$$T(g_1 \cdot g_2) = T(g_1) \circ T(g_2)$$

$(g, u) \mapsto T(g)u$  is continuous.

A subset  $R$  of  $X$  is invariant under the representation if  $\{T(g)R = R\}$  for all  $g \in G$ .

A representation is unitary if  $\|T(g)u\| = \|u\|$  for all  $g \in G$  and all  $u \in X$ .

Examples. 1)  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ ,  $T(\sigma) = \text{id}$ ,  $T(\delta) = -\text{id}$ .

2)  $G = S^1 \cong \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $X = W^{1,2}_{\mathbb{R}}$ ,  $T(\delta)$  is given by  $(T(\delta)u)(t) = u(t + \delta)$ .

Let  $G$  be a compact topological group and let  $\{T(g)\}_{g \in G}$  be an invariant representation of  $G$  over a Banach space  $X$ .

A mapping  $R$  between two invariant subsets of  $X$  is equivariant if

$$R \circ T(g) = T(g) \circ R, \forall g \in G.$$

A real function  $\varphi$  defined on an invariant subset of  $X$  is invariant if

$$\varphi \circ T(g) = \varphi, \forall g \in G.$$

An index (for  $\{T(g)\}_{g \in G}$ ) is a mapping from the closed invariant subsets of  $X$  into  $\mathbb{W} \cup \{\infty\}$  such that

- $\text{ind } A = 0 \Leftrightarrow A = \emptyset$
- if  $R: A_1 \rightarrow A_2$  is equivariant and continuous, then  $\text{ind } A_1 \leq \text{ind } A_2$ .
- if  $A$  is compact and invariant, then exists a closed invariant neighborhood  $N$  of  $A$  such that  $\text{ind } N = \text{ind } A$ .
- $\text{ind } (A_1 \cup A_2) \leq \text{ind } A_1 + \text{ind } A_2$  for invariant subsets  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ .

### Example.

i) (Krasnosel'skiĭ) Let  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ ,  $T(0) = \text{id}$ ,  $T(1) = -\text{id}$ . The  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -index of a closed invariant subset  $A$  of  $X$  is the smallest integer  $k$  such that there exists an odd mapping  $\Phi \in C(A, \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{0\})$ . If such a mapping does not exist, we define  $\text{ind } A = +\infty$ . Finally  $\text{ind } \emptyset = 0$ .

ii) (Benci). Let  $\{T(\theta)\}_{\theta \in S^1}$  be an isometric representation of  $S^1$  over  $X$ .

The  $S^1$ -index of a closed invariant subset  $A$  of  $X$  is the smallest integer  $k$  such that there exists a  $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  and a  $\Phi \in C(A, \mathbb{C}^{nk} \setminus \{0\})$  satisfying the following equivalence property:

$$\Phi(T(\theta)u) = e^{in\theta} \Phi(u), \quad \theta \in S^1, u \in A.$$

If such a mapping does not exist, we define  $\text{ind } A = +\infty$ . Finally  $\text{ind } \emptyset = 0$ .

The verification of properties (i) to (iv) is left to the reader (see [47], [57]).

The following deep results are formulation  
of Borel - Weil - theorem.

Let us recall that

$$\text{Fix}(G) = \{u \in X : T(g)u = u, \forall g \in G\}.$$

Theorem 7. The  $S^1$ -index of the sphere  $S^{k-1}$  is  $k$ .

Theorem 8. Let  $\{T(\theta)\}_{\theta \in S^1}$  be an isometric representation of  $S^1$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{2k}$  such that  $\text{Fix}(G) = \{0\}$ . Then the  $S^1$ -index of the sphere  $S^{2k-2}$  is  $k$ .

A proof using transversality and degree theory  
is contained in [4].

Let us now consider the nonlinear eigenvalue problem

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi'(u) &= \mu \chi'(u), & \chi(u) &= a, \\ \text{where } \varphi, \chi &\in C^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) \text{, } \Omega \text{ open subset of } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned}$$

From that

$$\chi(u) = a \Rightarrow \chi'(u) \neq 0$$

so that

$$Z_a = \{u \in \Omega : \chi(u) = a\}$$

is a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  of codimension 1.  
Equation (12) is equivalent to

$$\text{Ker } \chi'(u) \subset \text{Ker } \varphi'(u).$$

Since the tangent space to  $Z_a$  at  $u$ ,  $T_u Z_a$   
is given by  $\text{Ker } \chi'(u)$ , equation (12) is  
equivalent to

$$T_u Z_a \subset \text{Ker } \varphi'(u)$$

so that  $u$  is a solution of (12) if and only  
if  $u$  is a critical point of  $\varphi$  restricted to  $Z_a$ .

?]

By the Lagrange multipliers rule, a maximum or a minimum of  $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  is a critical point of  $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ .

Now assume that  $\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  are invariant under an isometric representation of the compact group  $G$  over  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . It is then easy to verify that  $\nabla \mathcal{F}$  is equivariant, i.e.

$$\nabla \varphi \circ T(g) = T(g) \circ \nabla \varphi, \quad \forall g \in G$$

Consider the minimax eigenvalue problem

$$\mathcal{F}'(u) = \mu u \quad [u]_G^2 = 1$$

If  $u$  is a critical point of  $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}}$ , then  $\{T(g)u : g \in G\}$  is a set of critical points of  $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}}$  and is called a critical orbit of  $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}}$ .

Lauterbach and Schmidbauer showed that if  $\varphi$  is  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -invariant (i.e. even), then  $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathbb{S}^{N-1}}$  has at least  $N$  distinct pairs

$\{u, -u\}$  of critical points. This generalizes the classical result on the existence of  $N$  linearly independent eigenvectors for every linear symmetric mapping  $L : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ .

In the case of  $S^1$ -invariant functionals, we have the following result due to Krasnoselski.

Theorem 3. Let  $T(S)$  be an immediate representation of  $S^1$  over  $\mathbb{R}^{2k}$  such that  $\text{Fix}(S^1) = \{0\}$ . Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be open and invariant, let  $\varphi \in C^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$  be invariant. If  $S^{2k-1} \subset \Omega$  then  $\varphi|_{S^{2k-1}}$  has at least  $k$  critical orbits.

Proof. 1) Let us define

$$\mathcal{O}_j = \{A \subset S^{2k-1} : A \text{ is closed, invariant and } \text{ind } A_j\}$$

By theorem 8,  $\mathcal{O}_j \neq \emptyset$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . Let

$$c_j = \inf_{A \in \mathcal{O}_j} \max_{u \in A} |\varphi|$$

so that  $\min \varphi|_{S^{2k-1}} \leq c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_k \leq \max \varphi|_{S^{2k-1}}$ .

3)

$$K_c = \{u \in S^{2k-1} : u \text{ is a critical point of } \varphi|_{S^{2k-1}}\}$$

then it suffices to prove that

$$c_i + c_j = c, \quad 1 \leq i \leq j \leq k \Rightarrow \text{ind } K_c \geq i - j + 1,$$

since the index of a finite number of  $S^1$ -orbits is 1.

2) Consider the vector field defined on  $S^{2k-1}$  by

$$\omega(u) = -\nabla \varphi(u) - (\nabla \varphi(u), u) u.$$

Clearly  $\omega$  is equivariant and

$$(u, \omega(u)) = 0$$

$$(\nabla \varphi(u), \omega(u)) = -(\omega(u), \omega(u)) = -|\omega(u)|^2 \leq 0,$$

for every  $u \in S^{2k-1}$ . Knowing that

$\varphi \in C^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ , it is then easy to construct, as in lemma 1, a deformation  $\gamma \in C([0, 1] \times S^{2k-1}, S^{2k-1})$  satisfying the usual properties and such that

$$\gamma(t, T(\theta)u) = T(\theta)\gamma(t, u)$$

for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\theta \in S^1$ ,  $u \in S^{2k-1}$ .

The end of the proof is similar to the proof of lemma 4 and is left to the reader.  $\square$

• Remarks. 1. In the  $C^1$  case, it suffices to replace  $\sigma$  by an appropriate pseudo-gradient vector field.

2. Remember that  $\chi \in C^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$  is invariant and that

$Z_a = \{u \in \mathcal{S}^2 : \chi|_{\mathcal{S}^1} = a\}$   
is diffeomorphic to  $S^{2k-2}$ . If the corresponding diffeomorphism is equivariant, then theorem 3 implies the existence of  $k$  critical orbits for  $g|_{Z_a}$ .

3. Since  $S^{2k-2}/S^1$  is not, in general, a manifold, it is impossible to deduce theorem 3 from Lusternik-Schnirelmann theory.

V. Bifurcation Theory and periodic solutions of hamiltonian systems near an equilibrium.

Consider the nonlinear eigenvalue problem

$$(13) \quad \nabla \alpha(u) + \lambda \nabla \beta(u) = 0$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are  $C^2$  functionals defined on a Hilbert space  $X$ . We shall assume that

$$\nabla \alpha(0) = \nabla \beta(0) = 0.$$

Thus  $R_{\alpha}\{0\}$  is a branch of trivial solutions of (13). Using Lippmann-Schwinger method and an elementary variational argument, we shall construct two distinct one parameter families of non-trivial solutions of (13). We shall also prove a stronger multiplicity result when  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are  $S^1$ -invariant.

Our basic assumptions are

$$(H_1) \nabla \alpha(0) = 0, \nabla \beta(0) = 0$$

(H<sub>2</sub>)  $L = \alpha''(0)$  is Fredholm, i.e.  $\dim \text{Ker } L < +\infty$ ,  $\text{codim } R(L) < +\infty$ .

(H<sub>3</sub>)  $\dim \text{Ker } L \geq 2$  and  $M = \beta''(0)$  is positive definite —  $\text{Ker } L$ .

Remarks. 1. Since  $L$  is Fredholm,  $R(L)$  is closed.

The symmetry of  $L$  implies then that  $X$  is the orthogonal sum of  $R(L)$  and  $\text{Ker } L$ .

2. Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\alpha(0) = \beta(0) = 0$ .

3. Let  $P$  resp.  $Q$  be the orthogonal projector on  $\text{Ker } L$  resp.  $R(L)$ . Clearly  $Q = I - P$ .

We shall use the following notations:

$$R = \nabla \alpha, B = \nabla \beta, R = R - L, S = B - M.$$

Theorem 10. (C. Stuart). Under the assumptions (H<sub>1,2,3</sub>), for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough, there exists at least two solutions  $[\lambda(\varepsilon), u(\varepsilon)]$  of (13) such that  $\beta(u_2) = \varepsilon$ . Moreover  $\lambda(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

Proof. 1) (Laplace-Schmidt reduction).

Equation (13) is equivalent to the system

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} P[R(v+w) + \lambda B(v+w)] &= 0 \\ Lw + Q[R(v+w) + \lambda B(v+w)] &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $v = Pv$ ,  $w = Qw$ .

Since  $L: R(L) \rightarrow R(L)$  is invertible, it follows from the implicit function theorem that equation (14) defines near  $\lambda = 0$ ,  $v = 0$ ,  $w = 0$  a  $C^1$  function  $w = w^*(\lambda, v)$ . Since  $R \times \{0\}$  is a branch of solutions,  $w^*(0, 0) = 0$ . Differentiating  $Lw^*(\lambda, v) + Q[R(v+w^*, \lambda, v) + \lambda B(v+w^*, \lambda, v)] = 0$  with respect to  $v$  at  $[0, 0]$  and using the fact that  $R'(0) = 0$ , we obtain

$$L D_v w^*(0, 0) = 0,$$

i.e.  $D_v w^*(0, 0) = 0$ . Thus

$$\|w^*(\lambda, v)\|/\|v\| \rightarrow 0, \|v\| \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly for  $\lambda$  near 0.

Near  $\lambda = 0$ ,  $v = 0$ ,  $w = 0$ , equation (13) is now equivalent to

$$(14) \quad P[R(v+w^*(\lambda, v)) + \lambda B(v+w^*(\lambda, v))] = 0.$$

2) Desingularization. Taking the inner product of (14) with  $v$ , we obtain

$$(15) \quad (R(v+w^*(\lambda, v)), v) + \lambda (B(v+w^*(\lambda, v)), v) = 0.$$

It follows from a careful application of the implicit function theorem that equation (15) defines, near 0, for  $v \neq 0$ , a  $C^1$  function

$\lambda = \lambda^*(\omega)$ . Moreover  $\lambda^*$  is extended continuously at  $0$  by setting  $\lambda^*(0) = 0$ . Let us define, near  $0$ ,

$$f(\omega) = \omega^* + \lambda^*(\omega), \quad (\omega)$$

so that

$$\|f(\omega)\|/\|\omega\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \|\omega\| \rightarrow 0.$$

Equation (13) is now equivalent to

$$(15) \quad P[R(\omega + f(\omega)) + \lambda^*(\omega) B(\omega + f(\omega))] = 0.$$

3) Constrained extemization. For  $\rho > 0$  small enough, the function

$$\chi(\omega) = \beta(\omega + f(\omega))$$

is continuous on  $B(0, \rho)$  and  $C^1$  on  $B(0, \rho) \setminus \{\omega\}$ .

It follows from (13) and some careful estimates (see [4]), that for  $\rho > 0$  small enough

$$(17) \quad \chi(\omega) \geq c\|\omega\|^2, \quad \text{if } \omega \in B(0, \rho)$$

$$(\nabla \chi(\omega), \omega) \geq c\|\omega\|^2, \quad \text{if } \omega \in B(0, \rho) \setminus \{\omega\}$$

where  $c > 0$  is a constant. Hence, for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough,

$$Z_\varepsilon = \{\omega \in \text{Ker } L : \chi(\omega) = \varepsilon\}$$

is a compact subset of  $B(0, \rho) \setminus \{\omega\}$  and

$$(18) \quad \omega \in Z_\varepsilon \Rightarrow (\nabla \chi(\omega), \omega) > 0.$$

The function

$$\varphi(\omega) = \alpha(\omega + f(\omega)) + \lambda^*(\omega)(\chi(\omega) - \varepsilon)$$

restricted to  $Z_\varepsilon$  achieves its minimum at a point  $\omega_\varepsilon$ . Since  $\nabla \chi(\omega_\varepsilon) \neq 0$ , the Lagrange multiplier rule implies the existence of  $\mu$  such that

$$\nabla \varphi(\omega_\varepsilon) = \mu \nabla \chi(\omega_\varepsilon),$$

i.e.

$$(R(\omega_\varepsilon + f(\omega_\varepsilon)) + \lambda^*(\omega_\varepsilon) B(\omega_\varepsilon + f(\omega_\varepsilon)), h + f'(\omega_\varepsilon) h) = \mu (\nabla \chi(\omega_\varepsilon), h),$$

for every  $h \in \text{Ker } L$ . Since  $f'(\omega_\varepsilon) h \in R(\varphi)$ , the

definition of  $f(v_2) \circ w^*(\lambda^*(v_2), v_2)$  implies that

$$(R(v_2) + f(v_2)) + \lambda^*(v_2) B(v_2 + f(v_2)), h = 0.$$

Using the fact that  $PA = PR$ , we have, for  $h \in \text{Ker}L$ ,

$$(R(v_2) + f(v_2)) + \lambda^*(v_2) B(v_2 + f(v_2), h) = \mu(\nabla \chi(v_2), h).$$

It follows from the definition of  $\lambda^*$  that

$$0 = (R(v_2) + f(v_2)) + \lambda^*(v_2) B(v_2 + f(v_2), v_2) = \mu(\nabla \chi(v_2), v_2).$$

We obtain from (18) that  $\mu = 0$ . Finally

$$(R(v_2) + f(v_2)) + \lambda^*(v_2) B(v_2 + f(v_2), h) = 0$$

for every  $h \in \text{Ker}L$ , i.e.  $v_2$  is a solution of (16). Thus

$$[\lambda(z) = \lambda^*(v_2), u_z = v_2 + f(v_2)]$$

is a solution of (13) such that

$$B(u_z) = \chi(v_2) = \varepsilon.$$

By (17),  $v_2 \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , so that  
 $\lambda(z) = \lambda^*(v_2) \rightarrow \lambda^*(0) = 0$  as  $z \rightarrow 0$ . The other  
solution is obtained by maximizing  
 $\varphi - z_2$ .  $\square$

Let now  $T(\beta)$  be an isometric  
representation of  $S^+$  over the Hilbert space  $X$   
such that

(H4)  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are  $S^\pm$ -invariant and

$$\text{Ker } L \cap \text{Fix}(S^\pm) = \{0\}.$$

Remark. By (H4),  $P, B, L, M, R, S, P$  and  $Q$   
are equivariant,  $R(L)$  and  $\text{Ker}L$  are invariant.  
Since  $\text{Ker } L \cap \text{Fix}(S^\pm) = \{0\}$ , the dimension  
of  $\text{Ker}L$  is even.

Theorem 11. Under the assumptions of theorem 10 and (H4), for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough, there exists at least  $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \dim_{\text{Kah}} S^1$  orbits of  $\{E(\varepsilon), T(\delta) u_\varepsilon\}$ :  $\delta \in S^1$

of solutions of (13) such that Brzile-E. Marceron  $\lambda_\varepsilon(\delta) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

Proof. It is easy to verify that the invariance of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  implies the invariance of  $\phi$  and  $\chi$ . By (17), for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough,

$$Z_\varepsilon = \{u \in \text{Kah}: \chi(u) = \varepsilon\}$$

is diffeomorphic to  $S^{2k-1}$  when  $2k = \dim_{\text{Kah}}$ . Moreover the corresponding diffeomorphism is equivariant. Hence theorem J implies the existence of  $k$  critical orbits for  $\phi|_{Z_\varepsilon}$ .

It is then easy to complete the proof as in theorem 10.  $\square$

Let  $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R})$  be such that  $H(0) = 0$ ,  $\nabla H(0) = 0$ . We consider the existence of periodic orbits of the Hamiltonian system

$$(18) \quad J\dot{u}(t) + \nabla H(u(t)) = 0$$

on the energy surface  $H^{-1}(\varepsilon)$  for small  $\varepsilon$ .

After the classical results of Liapunov (1900), depending on a non resonance condition, a significant progress was made by Weinstein around 1976. We shall deduce Weinstein's theorem from a generalization due to Hofer.

Theorem 12. (Moser). Assume that the linearized system

$$(20) \quad J\dot{v}(t) + H''(0)v(t) = 0$$

has  $2k$  linearly independent  $T$ -periodic solutions and that, if  $v \neq 0$  is a  $T$ -periodic solution of (20), then

$$(H''(0)v(t), v(t)) = (H''(0)v(0), v(0)) > 0.$$

Then, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough, there exists at least  $k$  periodic orbits of (19) on  $H^{-1}(\varepsilon)$  whose period are near  $T$ .

Remarks. 1. By assumption  $H''(0)$  is non singular.

2. The period  $T$  is not necessarily the minimal period of the corresponding solutions of (19) and (20).

Proof. We normalize the problem by fixing the period at 1. After the change of variable  $s = \tau^{-1}t$ , (19) becomes

$$(21) \quad J\dot{g}(s) + \tau \nabla H(g(s)) = 0.$$

Any 1-periodic solution of (21) corresponds to a  $\tau$ -periodic solution of (19). Setting  $\tau = T+1$  we obtain the bifurcation problem

$$\nabla \alpha(g) + \lambda \nabla \beta(g) = 0$$

where the functionals

$$\alpha(g) = \int_0^T [(\dot{J}\dot{g}(t), g(t))_{L^2} + TH(g(t))] dt$$

$$\beta(g) = \int_0^1 H(g(t)) dt,$$

are defined on the Hilbert space  $X = W_1^{1,2} = H^1_1$ . The functionals  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are  $C^2$  and invariant

representation of  $S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  defined on  $X$  by the translations in time.

Let  $L = \omega''(\alpha)$ . Then  $\bar{z} \in \text{Ker } L$  if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} J\bar{z}(s) + TH''(d)\bar{z}(s) &= 0 \\ \bar{z}(s) &= \bar{z}(s) \end{aligned}$$

By assumption,  $\dim \text{Ker } L = 2k$  and  $H = \beta''(\alpha)$  is positive definite on  $\text{Ker } L$ . Since  $H''(\alpha)$  is more singular,  $\text{Ker } L \cap \text{Fix}(S^1) = \{0\}$ . It suffices then to apply theorem 11.  $\square$

Corollary ( Weinstein ). Assume  $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R})$ , with  $H(\alpha) = 0$ ,  $\nabla H(\alpha) = 0$  and  $H''(\alpha)$  positive definite. For every  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough, there exists at least  $N$  periodic orbits of (19) on  $H^{-1}(\varepsilon)$ .

Proof. By assumption (20) has  $2N$  linearly independent periodic solutions. The periodic solutions of (20) split into  $M$  families with incommensurable periods  $T_1, \dots, T_M$  and dimensions  $k_1, \dots, k_M$ . We note that  $k_1 + \dots + k_M = 2N$ . Theorem 12, applied to each of these families, implies the existence of  $k_1/2 + \dots + k_M/2 = N$  periodic orbits of  $H^{-1}(\varepsilon)$  for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough. These periodic orbits are distinct within the same family and from one family to another, because they have no common period for  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough.  $\square$

Example.

1) Linear case. Assume that the  $\alpha_i$ 's are positive and incommensurable. Then each energy surface of the quadratic Hamiltonian

$$H(u) = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i (u_i^2 + u_{i+1}^2)$$

contains exactly  $N$  periodic orbits.

2) Hamilton-Hamiltonian. The following Hamiltonian appears in astrophysics:

$$H(u) = u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2 + u_4^2 / 2 + u_1^2 u_2 - u_2^2 / 3.$$

For  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough,  $H^{-\varepsilon}(z)$  contains at least 2 periodic orbits.

3) Moser example: The only periodic solution corresponding to the following Hamiltonian is the equilibrium:

$$H(u) = (u_1^2 + u_3^2 - u_2^2 - u_4^2) + (u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2 + u_4^2)(u_3 u_4 - u_1 u_2)$$

(It suffices to differentiate  $u_1 u_4 + u_2 u_3$ .) But all the orbits of the linearization at 0 are periodic.

Remark. See [27], [47], [55] for other aspects of variational methods in bifurcation theory.

Proposition. Let  $X$  be a Banach space and let  $\varphi \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ . If  $\varphi$  satisfies (P.S.) and is bounded from below, then  $\varphi$  is coercive, i.e.  $\varphi(u) \rightarrow -\infty$ ,  $\|u\| \rightarrow \infty$ .

Proof. If  $\varphi$  is not coercive, then  $c = \sup \{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} : \varphi^\alpha \text{ is bounded}\}$  is a real number. Let  $U$  be an open bounded neighborhood of the compact set  $K_c$  and let  $\varepsilon > 0, \varepsilon < c$  and  $\beta$  be given by the deformation lemma. It follows from the definition of  $c$  that  $\varphi^{c+\varepsilon} \setminus U$  is unbounded and that  $\varphi^{c-\varepsilon}$  is bounded. On the other hand  $\beta(1, \varphi^{c+\varepsilon}(U)) < \varphi^{c-\varepsilon}$  and  $\beta(1, \cdot) : X \rightarrow X$  maps unbounded sets into unbounded sets. This is a contradiction.  $\square$

Remark. The converse is valid in finite dimension only.

I thank Mr. G. Arana for suggesting  
this question.

