



A multiplicity result for periodic solutions of second order differential equations with a singularity

Alberto Boscaggin^a, Alessandro Fonda^{b,*}, Maurizio Garrione^a

^a SISSA - International School for Advanced Studies, Via Bonomea 265, I-34136 Trieste, Italy

^b Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università di Trieste, P.le Europa 1, I-34127 Trieste, Italy

ARTICLE INFO

Communicated by S. Ahmad

Dedicated to Professor Lakshmikantham

MSC:
34C25
34B16
37J10

Keywords:
Multiple periodic solutions
Repulsive singularity
Poincaré–Birkhoff theorem

ABSTRACT

By the use of the Poincaré–Birkhoff fixed point theorem, we prove a multiplicity result for periodic solutions of a second order differential equation, where the nonlinearity exhibits a singularity of repulsive type at the origin and has linear growth at infinity. Our main theorem is related to previous results by Rebelo (1996, 1997) [4,5] and Rebelo and Zanolin (1996) [6,7], in connection with a problem raised by del Pino et al. (1992) [1].

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In [1], del Pino, Manásevich and Montero considered an equation like

$$x'' - \frac{1}{x^\nu} + \beta x = p(t), \quad (1.1)$$

where $p: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and T -periodic, $\nu \geq 1$, and $\beta > 0$. They proved that, if

$$\beta \neq \left(\frac{k\pi}{T} \right)^2, \quad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1.2)$$

then there exists at least one positive T -periodic solution to (1.1). Their result followed the path opened by Lazer and Solimini in [2], where the case $\beta = 0$ was analyzed. It was shown there that, in this case, a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a positive T -periodic solution is that $\int_0^T p(t) dt < 0$.

In general, condition (1.2) is not eliminable. Indeed, if $\beta = \left(\frac{k\pi}{T} \right)^2$ for some positive integer k , some kind of resonance can occur: as shown in [3, Theorem 3], taking $p(t) = \epsilon \sin\left(\frac{2\pi k}{T}t\right)$, with $|\epsilon|$ sufficiently small, no T -periodic solutions to (1.1) can exist.

Quoting the last sentence in [1],

“...the solution we are predicting in our “Fredholm alternative” for (1.1) is not necessarily unique, so the multiplicity problem for this simple equation is raised as an open question”.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: boscaggi@sissa.it (A. Boscaggin), a.fonda@units.it (A. Fonda), garrione@sissa.it (M. Garrione).

In [4–7], Rebelo and Zanolin analyzed the multiplicity problem assuming the forcing term to be of the form $p(t) = s + e(t)$, being s a real parameter. By the use of the Poincaré–Birkhoff fixed point theorem, they proved that, for $|s|$ large enough, Eq. (1.1) may have a large number of T -periodic solutions. Their results apply to the wider class of T -periodic problems of the type

$$\begin{cases} x'' + h(x) = s + e(t) \\ x(0) = x(T), \quad x'(0) = x'(T), \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where $h :]0, +\infty[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuously differentiable function, with a suitable singularity of repulsive type at the origin, and linear growth at $+\infty$.

In this paper, similarly as in [8,9], we consider the more general problem

$$\begin{cases} x'' + g(t, x) = sw(t) \\ x(0) = x(T), \quad x'(0) = x'(T), \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

where $g : [0, T] \times]0, +\infty[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies some kind of Carathéodory conditions, with locally Lipschitz continuity in its second variable, and $w \in L^\infty(0, T)$. We will prove the following result.

Theorem 1.1. Assume that:

- there exist $\delta > 0$ and a continuous function $f :]0, \delta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$g(t, x) \leq f(x), \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in [0, T], \text{ and every } x \in]0, \delta],$$

and

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} f(x) = -\infty, \quad \int_0^\delta f(x) dx = -\infty;$$

- there exist a function $a \in L^\infty(0, T)$ and a positive integer m such that
 - uniformly for almost every $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{g(t, x)}{x} = a(t); \quad (1.5)$$

- for almost every $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\left(\frac{m\pi}{T} \right)^2 < a_- \leq a(t) \leq a_+ < \left(\frac{(m+1)\pi}{T} \right)^2, \quad (1.6)$$

for suitable real constants a_- , a_+ ;

- the unique solution $\hat{x}(t)$ to

$$\begin{cases} x'' + a(t)x = w(t) \\ x(0) = x(T), \quad x'(0) = x'(T) \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

is strictly positive, i.e., $\hat{x}(t) > 0$ for every $t \in [0, T]$.

Then, there exists $s^* > 0$ such that, for every $s \geq s^*$, problem (1.4) has at least

$$\begin{cases} m+2 \text{ solutions} & \text{if } m \text{ is odd,} \\ m+1 \text{ solutions} & \text{if } m \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that (1.6) is a nonresonance assumption with respect to the set

$$\Sigma^D = \left\{ \left(\frac{k\pi}{T} \right)^2 \mid k = 1, 2, \dots \right\},$$

which is the spectrum of the differential operator $x \mapsto -x''$, with Dirichlet boundary conditions on $[0, T]$. This implies that we also have nonresonance with respect to the T -periodic problem, so that the Fredholm alternative ensures the uniqueness of the solution to (1.7).

Recall that, as shown in [8, Remark 6], condition (1.6) is not enough to ensure that the solution $\hat{x}(t)$ is positive; in the case when $w(t) \equiv 1$, some sufficient conditions (in terms of some L^p -norm of $a(t)$) to guarantee this fact have been introduced in [10, Corollary 2.3].

We emphasize that, in comparison with the results obtained in [4–7], besides the introduction of a possibly nonconstant function $w(t)$, we do not assume any differentiability hypothesis on the function $g(t, x)$, and the nonresonance assumption at $+\infty$ relies only on the asymptotic behavior of the quotient $g(t, x)/x$.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/840589>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/840589>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)