

## Existence and Multiplicity of Periodic Solutions to Second-Order Differential Equations with Attractive Singularities

**José Godoy**

*Institute of Mathematics, Czech Academy of Sciences, Brno, Czech Republic;  
Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Concepción, Chile  
E-mail: jgodoy@ubiobio.cl*

**R. Hakl**

*Institute of Mathematics, Czech Academy of Sciences, Brno, Czech Republic  
E-mail: hakl@ipm.cz*

**Xingchen Yu**

*Institute of Mathematics, Czech Academy of Sciences, Brno, Czech Republic;  
School of Mathematics and Statistics, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology  
Nanjing, China  
E-mail: yuxingchen0@yeah.net*

Consider a second-order ordinary differential equation of the form

$$u'' + \frac{g(t)}{u^\lambda} = h(t)u^\delta + \mu f(t), \tag{1}$$

where  $g, h, f \in L(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z})$ ,  $g(t) \geq 0$  for a.e.  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\bar{g} > 0$ ,  $\bar{h} < 0$ ,  $\bar{f} > 0$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\mu \geq 0$  is a parameter.

Throughout we use the following notation.

- $C(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z})$  is a Banach space of  $T$ -periodic continuous functions  $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  endowed with a norm  $\|u\|_C = \max\{|u(t)| : t \in [0, T]\}$ .
- $AC^1(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z})$  is a set of  $T$ -periodic functions  $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $u$  and  $u'$  are absolutely continuous.
- $L^p(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z})$  ( $p \geq 1$ ) is a Banach space of  $T$ -periodic functions  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that are integrable with the  $p$ -th power on the interval  $[0, T]$  endowed with a norm

$$\|h\|_p = \left( \int_0^T |h(s)|^p ds \right)^{1/p}.$$

We write  $L(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z})$  instead of  $L^1(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z})$ .

- $[x]_+ = \frac{1}{2}(|x| + x)$ ,  $[x]_- = \frac{1}{2}(|x| - x)$ .
- If  $h \in L(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z})$  then  $\bar{h} = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(s) ds$ .

By a  $T$ -periodic solution to (1) we understand a function  $u \in AC^1(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z})$  which is positive and satisfies the equality (1) for almost every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Theorem 1.** Let  $[h]_+, [f]_+ \in L^p(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z})$  with  $p \geq 1$ . Let, moreover, there exist  $\varphi \in L^q(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z})$  ( $q \geq 1$ ) such that<sup>1</sup>

$$[h]_+(t) + [f]_+(t) \leq \varphi(t)g^{\frac{q-1}{q}}(t) \text{ for a.e. } t \in \mathbb{R}$$

and let

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow t_+} \int_x^{t+T/2} \frac{g(s)}{(s-t)^{\frac{\lambda(2p-1)q}{p}}} ds + \lim_{x \rightarrow t_-} \int_{t+T/2}^{x+T} \frac{g(s)}{(t+T-s)^{\frac{\lambda(2p-1)q}{p}}} ds = +\infty$$

be fulfilled for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then there exist  $\mu^* \geq \mu_* > 0$  such that

- Eq. (1) has at least two  $T$ -periodic solutions provided  $\mu > \mu^*$ ;
- Eq. (1) has at least one  $T$ -periodic solution provided  $\mu = \mu^*$ ;
- Eq. (1) has no  $T$ -periodic solution provided  $\mu \in [0, \mu_*)$ .

**Remark.** In the case when  $h(t) \leq 0$  for a. e.  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  it can be proved that the numbers  $\mu^*$  and  $\mu_*$  appearing in Theorem 1 coincide.

Before we pass to the proof of Theorem 1, we introduce some definitions and notation.

**Definition 1.** We say that  $\alpha, \beta \in AC^1(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z})$  are, respectively, lower and upper functions to the  $T$ -periodic problem for (1), if they are positive and

$$\alpha''(t) + \frac{g(t)}{\alpha^\lambda(t)} \geq h(t)\alpha^\delta(t) + \mu f(t) \text{ for a.e. } t \in \mathbb{R},$$

resp.

$$\beta''(t) + \frac{g(t)}{\beta^\lambda(t)} \leq h(t)\beta^\delta(t) + \mu f(t) \text{ for a.e. } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

**Definition 2.** We say that a lower function  $\alpha$  and an upper function  $\beta$  to the  $T$ -periodic problem for (1) are well-ordered if

$$\alpha(t) \leq \beta(t) \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

**Definition 3.** We say that a lower function  $\alpha$ , resp. an upper function  $\beta$  to the  $T$ -periodic problem for (1) is strict if the inequality

$$\alpha(t) \leq u(t), \text{ resp. } u(t) \leq \beta(t) \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}$$

implies

$$\alpha(t) < u(t), \text{ resp. } u(t) < \beta(t) \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}$$

provided  $u$  is a  $T$ -periodic solution to (1).

**Notation.** We will write  $\alpha(t; \mu)$ ,  $\beta(t; \mu)$ , or  $u(t; \mu)$  to emphasize that the lower function  $\alpha$ , the upper function  $\beta$ , or the solution  $u$  to the  $T$ -periodic problem for (1) corresponds to the particular parameter  $\mu$ .

*Sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.* First we show that every  $T$ -periodic solution  $u$  to (1) is bounded from above. In particular, the following assertion holds.

<sup>1</sup>If  $q = 1$  then we put  $g^{\frac{q-1}{q}}(t) = 1$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Lemma 1.** *There exists a non-decreasing function  $\rho : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for every  $\mu > 0$  we have*

$$u(t; \mu) < \rho(\mu)$$

*provided  $u$  is a  $T$ -periodic solution to (1).*

A condition  $\delta > 0$  is essential in the proof of Lemma 1. The next step is a construction of well-ordered strict lower and upper functions to the  $T$ -periodic problem for (1).

**Lemma 2.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1 be fulfilled. Then for every  $\mu > 0$  there exists a strict lower function  $\alpha$  to the  $T$ -periodic problem for (1). Moreover,*

$$\alpha(t; \mu) < u(t; \mu) \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}, \mu > 0$$

*whenever  $u$  is a  $T$ -periodic solution to (1).*

An important property of the lower functions  $\alpha(t; \mu)$  appearing in Lemma 2 is that they are constructed in such a way that

$$\alpha(t; \mu_1) \leq \alpha(t; \mu_2) \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R} \text{ whenever } \mu_1 \geq \mu_2.$$

**Lemma 3.** *For every  $\mu$  sufficiently large there exists a strict upper function  $\beta$  to the  $T$ -periodic problem for (1) such that*

$$\alpha(t; \mu) < \beta(t; \mu) < \rho(\mu) \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R},$$

*where  $\rho$ , resp.  $\alpha$  are functions appearing in Lemma 1, resp. Lemma 2.*

Now the condition  $\delta < 1$  is essential in construction of the upper functions  $\beta$  in Lemma 3.

The next step is obvious – for sufficiently large  $\mu$  we have constructed well-ordered lower and upper functions  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . Therefore there exists at least one  $T$ -periodic solution  $u$  to (1) between them. Moreover, since  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are strict, we have

$$\alpha(t; \mu) < u(t; \mu) < \beta(t; \mu) \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}, \mu \text{ sufficiently large.}$$

Furthermore, if we rewrite  $T$ -periodic problem for (1) in an equivalent operator form

$$u = M_\mu[u]$$

then it follows that the Leray-Schauder degree of the operator  $I - M_\mu$  over the set

$$\Omega_\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in C(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z}) : \alpha(t; \mu) < x(t) < \beta(t; \mu) \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

is different from zero. More precisley,

$$d_{LS}(I - M_\mu, \Omega_\mu, 0) = 1 \text{ for } \mu \text{ sufficiently large.} \tag{2}$$

Thus we have proved the existence of at least one  $T$ -periodic solution to (1) in  $\Omega_\mu$  (for every  $\mu$  sufficiently large), and have established the relation (2).

On the other hand, the following assertion holds.

**Lemma 4.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1 be fulfilled. Then there exists  $\mu_* > 0$  such that there is no  $T$ -periodic solution to (1) with  $\mu \in [0, \mu_*)$ .*

For every  $\mu > 0$  we define a set

$$\Psi_\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in C(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z}) : \alpha(t; \mu) < x(t) < \rho(\mu) \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Let  $\mu_0$  be arbitrary but fixed and let, moreover, it be sufficiently large such that

$$d_{LS}(I - M_{\mu_0}, \Omega_{\mu_0}, 0) = 1.$$

Then, according to Lemma 4 we have

$$d_{LS}(I - M_\mu, \Psi_{\mu_0}, 0) = 0 \text{ for } \mu \in [0, \mu_*).$$

Furthermore, due to the fact that  $\rho$  is non-decreasing and  $\alpha$  is non-increasing with respect to  $\mu$ , from Lemmas 1 and 2 it follows that there is no  $T$ -periodic solution to (1) on  $\partial\Psi_{\mu_0}$  for  $\mu \in [\mu_*, \mu_0]$ . Consequently,

$$d_{LS}(I - M_{\mu_0}, \Psi_{\mu_0}, 0) = 0.$$

Now, in view of Lemma 3 we have  $\Omega_{\mu_0} \subsetneq \Psi_{\mu_0}$ , and so the additive property of the Leray-Schauder degree results in

$$d_{LS}(I - M_{\mu_0}, \Psi_{\mu_0} \setminus \Omega_{\mu_0}, 0) = -1,$$

i.e., there is another  $T$ -periodic solution to (1) in  $\Psi_{\mu_0} \setminus \Omega_{\mu_0}$ .

Now define

$$A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\tau > 0 : \text{Eq. (1) has at least two } T\text{-periodic solutions for every } \mu \geq \tau\}.$$

Obviously, on account of the above-proven, the set  $A$  is nonempty. Moreover, according to Lemma 4, the set  $A$  is bounded from below by  $\mu_*$ . Put

$$\mu^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf A,$$

and let  $\{\mu_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$  be a sequence of parameters such that

$$\mu_n > \mu^* \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mu_n = \mu^*.$$

Obviously, there exist a sequence of  $T$ -periodic solutions  $\{u(\cdot; \mu_n)\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$  to (1) (with  $\mu = \mu_n$ ). In addition, with respect to Lemmas 1 and 2, this sequence of solutions is uniformly bounded and equicontinuous. Thus, by standard arguments one can prove that there exists also at least one  $T$ -periodic solution to (1) with  $\mu = \mu^*$ . Now the sketch of the proof of Theorem 1 is complete.