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#### Abstract

We formulate nonuniform nonresonance criteria for certain third order differential systems of the form $X^{\prime \prime \prime}+A X^{\prime \prime}+G\left(t, X^{\prime}\right)+C X=P(t)$, which further improves upon our recent results in [12], given under sharp nonresonance considerations. The work also provides extensions and generalisations to the results of Ezeilo and Omari [5], and Minhós [9] from the scalar to the vector situations.
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## 1 Introduction

An investigation of the solvability circumstances for the nonlinear differential system

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime \prime \prime}+A X^{\prime \prime}+G\left(t, X^{\prime}\right)+C X=P(t) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

subject to the $T$-periodic boundary conditions

$$
\begin{equation*}
X(0)-X(T)=X^{\prime}(0)-X^{\prime}(T)=X^{\prime \prime}(0)-X^{\prime \prime}(T)=0 \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]on $[0, T]$ with $T>0$, was initiated in our recent paper [12]. Our basic motivation has been to provide vector analogues to some existing results in the literature for several scalar prototypes such as those contained in [1], [2], [4] and [5]. For instance, Ezeilo and Omari [5] studied firstly the $2 \pi$-periodic solutions associated with the scalar version of (1.1), with $g=g\left(x^{\prime}\right)$, satisfying the sharp nonresonance conditions
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
k^{2}+\alpha^{-}(|y|)<\frac{g(y)}{y}<(k+1)^{2}-\alpha^{+}(|y|), \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

where $\alpha^{ \pm}:(0,+\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are two nonincreasing functions such that

$$
\lim _{|y| \rightarrow+\infty}|y| \alpha^{ \pm}(|y|)=+\infty
$$

This result has been improved by Minhós [9] by weakening the condition on the oscillation of $g$, with the condition $\left(g_{1}\right)$ replaced by the two conditions

$$
\begin{equation*}
k^{2} \leq \liminf _{|y| \rightarrow \pm \infty} \frac{g(y)}{y} \leq \limsup _{|y| \rightarrow \pm \infty} \frac{g(y)}{y} \leq(k+1)^{2} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.k^{2}<\limsup _{y \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{2 \mathcal{G}(y)}{y^{2}}, \quad \liminf _{y \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{2 \mathcal{G}(y)}{y^{2}}<(k+1)^{2}\right) \tag{G}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathcal{G}$ denotes the primitive of the nonlinear function $g$, that is,

$$
\mathcal{G}(y)=\int_{0}^{y} g(\tau) d \tau
$$

Here, the ratio $\frac{g(y)}{y}$ may interact with the spectrum $\left\{k^{2}, k \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$, although $(\mathcal{G})$ imposes some 'density' control given by the asymptotic behaviour of the primitive of $g$.

Moreover, when $g=g\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)$, nonuniform assumptions

$$
\left(g_{3}\right) \quad k^{2} \leq \gamma^{-}(t) \leq \liminf _{|y| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(t, y)}{y} \leq \limsup _{|y| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(t, y)}{y} \leq \gamma^{+}(t) \leq(k+1)^{2}
$$

uniformly in $y \in \mathbb{R}$ for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$, where $\gamma^{ \pm} \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ such that strict inequalities hold on subsets of $[0,2 \pi]$ of positive measure; were also established in [5] for the existence of $2 \pi$-periodic solutions, with accompanying uniqueness results given by appropriate modification of these conditions.

Our earlier objective, in [12], to generalise some of these results has been partially addressed with the generation of the sharp nonresonance hypotheses

$$
\begin{equation*}
k^{2} \omega^{2}+\alpha^{-}(\|Y\|) \leq \frac{\langle G(t, Y), Y\rangle}{\|Y\|^{2}} \leq(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}-\alpha^{+}(\|Y\|) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

uniformly in $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $\|Y\| \geq r>0$, and a.e. $t \in[0, T]$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\omega=\frac{2 \pi}{T}$, and $\alpha^{ \pm}: \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are two functions which are such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\|Y\| \rightarrow+\infty}\|Y\| \alpha^{ \pm}(\|Y\|)=+\infty \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the existence of $T$-periodic solutions to (1.1)-(1.2). These relations clearly generalise the sharp nonresonance conditions prescribed in [5].

There are however, certain equations of type (1.1) with $G$ not satisfying $\left(\mathcal{G}_{1}\right)-\left(\mathcal{G}_{2}\right)$, for which, nevertheless, $T$-periodic solvability results appear to be provable, subject to some other generalisations on $G$. An example is the system

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime \prime \prime}+A X^{\prime \prime}+\frac{1}{2}\left((k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}+k^{2} \omega^{2}+(2 k+1) \omega^{2} \cos t\right) X^{\prime}+C X=P(t) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the ratio

$$
\frac{\langle G(t, Y), Y\rangle}{\|Y\|^{2}}=\frac{1}{2}\left((k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}+k^{2} \omega^{2}+(2 k+1) \omega^{2} \cos t\right)
$$

lying in the open interval $\left(k^{2} \omega^{2},(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}\right)$ for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$, but for which there do not exist functions $\alpha^{ \pm}$satisfying $\left(\mathcal{G}_{2}\right)$ for which $\left(\mathcal{G}_{1}\right)$ holds (since the ratio touches both (possible) eigenvalues as $\left.(k+1)^{2}-k^{2}=2 k+1\right)$. This justifies a further treatment of (1.1) incorporating $g_{2}$ and $g_{3}$ along the lines of [3], [7], [8] and [10], which clearly specifies the growth pattern and asymptotic conditions on $G$, unlike the rather arbitrary assumptions employed in [11]. This article proposes some generalisations in this direction.

Note also that condition $\left(\mathcal{G}_{2}\right)$ cannot be dropped as shown by the nonlinear system

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime \prime \prime}+A X^{\prime \prime}+k^{2} \omega^{2} X^{\prime}+\tan ^{-1}\left(X^{\prime}\right)+C X=P(t) \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here, the ratio

$$
\frac{\langle G(t, Y), Y\rangle}{\|Y\|^{2}}=k^{2} \omega^{2}+\|Y\|^{-1} \tan ^{-1}(Y)
$$

with

$$
\alpha^{-}(\|Y\|)=\|Y\|^{-1} \tan ^{-1}(Y) \quad \text { and } \quad \alpha^{+}(\|Y\|)=2 k \omega^{2}
$$

but

$$
\lim _{\|Y\| \rightarrow \infty}\|Y\| \alpha^{-}(\|Y\|)=\frac{\pi}{2} \neq+\infty
$$

so that $\left(\mathcal{G}_{2}\right)$ is not fulfilled by $\alpha^{-}$and therefore, the system has no $T$-periodic solution.

Accordingly, $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, A$ and $C$ are constant real $n \times n$ nonsingular matrices, and $G:[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $P:[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ are $n$-vectors, which are $T$-periodic in $t$. We shall assume further that $G$ satisfies the Carathéodory conditions, that is, $G\left(\cdot, X^{\prime}\right)$ is measurable for every $X^{\prime} \in \mathbb{R}^{n} ; G(t, \cdot)$ is continuous for a.e. $t \in$ $[0, T]$, and for each $r>0$, there exists an integrable function $\gamma_{r} \in L^{1}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ such that $\left\|G\left(t, X^{\prime}\right)\right\| \leq \gamma_{r}(t)$, for $\left\|X^{\prime}\right\| \leq r$ and a.e. $t \in[0, T]$.

Let $X$ be a point of the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ equipped with the usual norm $\|X\|$. For any pair $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, we shall write $\langle X, Y\rangle$ for the usual scalar product of $X$ and $Y$ so that in particular, $\langle X, X\rangle=\|X\|^{2}$.

It is standard result that if $D$ is a real $n \times n$ symmetric matrix, then for any $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta_{d}\|X\|^{2} \leq\langle D X, X\rangle \leq \Delta_{d}\|X\|^{2} \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\delta_{d}$ and $\Delta_{d}$ are respectively the least and greatest eigenvalues of $D$. In general, $\lambda_{i}(D)$ shall denote the eigenvalues of any matrix $D$, and $\|D\|_{2}$ its spectral norm.

The following Banach spaces will also be frequently refered to:
(i) the classical spaces of $k$ times continuously differentiable functions
$C^{k}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right), k \geq 0$ an integer, where $C^{0}=C$ and $C^{\infty}=\cap_{k \geq 0} C^{k}$ with norms $\|X\|_{C^{k}}$ and $\|X\|_{\infty}$ respectively;
(ii) the space of $T$-periodic functions $C_{T}^{k}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ defined by

$$
C_{T}^{k}=\left\{X:[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}: X \in C^{k} \text { and } X \text { is } T \text {-periodic }\right\}
$$

with the norm on $C^{k}$;
(iii) $L^{p}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right), 1 \leq p<+\infty$, the usual Lebesgue spaces with the norms $\|X\|_{L^{p}}$ and $\|X\|_{\infty}$ for $p=+\infty$;
(iv) the Sobolev space $W_{T}^{k, p}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, of $T$-periodic functions of order $k$, defined by

$$
\begin{array}{r}
W_{T}^{k, p}=\left\{X:[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}: X, X^{\prime}, \ldots, X^{(k-1)}\right. \text { are absolutely continuous } \\
\text { on }[0, T], X^{(k)} \in L^{p}(0, T) \text { and } X^{(i)}(0)-X^{(i)}(T)=0, \\
i=0,1,2, \ldots, k-1, k \in \mathbb{N}\}
\end{array}
$$

with corresponding norm $\|X\|_{W_{T}^{k, p}}$;
(v) The Hilbert space $H^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ defined by

$$
\begin{array}{r}
H^{1}(0, T)=\left\{X:[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}: X, \text { is absolutely continuous on }[0, T]\right. \\
\left.X^{\prime} \in L^{2}(0, T) \text { and } X^{(i)}(0)-X^{(i)}(T)=0, i=0,1\right\}
\end{array}
$$

with norm

$$
\|X\|_{H^{1}}=\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\left(\frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} x_{i}(t) d t\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T}\left(x_{i}(t)\right)^{2} d t+\frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T}\left(x_{i}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2} d t\right]\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

Let

$$
\widetilde{H}^{1}(0, T)=\left\{X \in H^{1}(0, T) \left\lvert\, \frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} X(t) d t=0\right.\right\}
$$

## 2 Previous investigations and some preliminary results

Consider the eigenvalue problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime \prime \prime}+A X^{\prime \prime}+C X=-\lambda X^{\prime} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

together with (1.2), with $A, C$ nonsingular, and $\lambda$ a real parameter. It has been shown in [5] that
(i) any $\lambda \neq k^{2} \omega^{2}$, for each $k=1,2, \ldots$, is not an eigenvalue; and
(ii) $\lambda=k^{2} \omega^{2}$, for some $k=1,2, \ldots$, is an eigenvalue if and only if $C=k^{2} \omega^{2} A$.

Let $\mathcal{E}_{k}$ be the eigenspace corresponding to the unique eigenvalue $k^{2} \omega^{2}$, when it exists. Then we deduce from [9] the following result:

For every $X \in W_{T}^{3,2}(0,2 \pi)$, we have
$\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle X^{\prime \prime \prime}+A X^{\prime \prime}+k^{2} \omega^{2} X^{\prime}+C X, X^{\prime \prime \prime}+A X^{\prime \prime}+(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2} X^{\prime}+C X\right\rangle d t \geq 0$,
and the equality holds if and only if $X=0$ or either $k^{2} \omega^{2}$ or $(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}$ is an eigenvalue of (2.1) and $X \in \mathcal{E}_{k}$ or $X \in \mathcal{E}_{k+1}$, respectively.

Each of the statements (i) or (ii) has an important bearing on the solvability of the PBVP for the non-autonomous system

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime \prime \prime}+A X^{\prime \prime}+\lambda X^{\prime}+C X=P(t) \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $P \in L^{1}$.
It is clear for instance, from (i) and the Fredholm alternative, that a solution for (1.1)-(1.2) can be expected if the ratio $\left\langle G\left(t, X^{\prime}\right), X^{\prime}\right\rangle /\left\|X^{\prime}\right\|^{2}$ is such that

$$
k^{2} \omega^{2}<\frac{\left\langle G\left(t, X^{\prime}\right), X^{\prime}\right\rangle}{\left\|X^{\prime}\right\|^{2}}<(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}
$$

for $\left\|X^{\prime}\right\|$ sufficiently large, and a.e. $t \in[0, T]$, provided that some control is put on the closeness of the ratio to $k^{2} \omega^{2}$ and $(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}$. This expectation has resulted in the evolution of conditions $\left(\mathcal{G}_{1}\right)-\left(\mathcal{G}_{2}\right)$.

The main role of statement (ii) is to provide an adequate background against which the sharpness of our conditions on $G$ can be tested. Observe that $\alpha^{ \pm}$ considered in $\left(\mathcal{G}_{1}\right)$ can be infinitesimal as $\|Y\| \rightarrow+\infty$, but by $\left(\mathcal{G}_{2}\right)$ their order must be less than one. This implies that the ratio can approach the (possible) eigenvalues $k^{2} \omega^{2}$ and $(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}$, provided that the approach is not too fast. For instance, conditions $\left(\mathcal{G}_{1}\right)-\left(\mathcal{G}_{2}\right)$ admit functions $G$ such as

$$
G(Y)=k^{2} Y-\|Y\|^{\alpha} \operatorname{sgn}(Y), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}, 0<\alpha<1
$$

satisfying

$$
\lim _{\|Y\| \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{\langle G(Y), Y\rangle}{\|Y\|^{2}}=k^{2}
$$

and yet by the statement (ii), (2.3)-(1.2) with $\lambda=k^{2}$, does not have a solution in general, that is, for unrestricted $A$ and $C$ nonsingular. Thus for (1.1), we seek conditions on $G(t, Y)$ allowing $\lim _{\|Y\| \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{\langle G(t, Y), Y\rangle}{\|Y\|^{2}}$ (if it exists) to touch $k^{2}, k \in \mathbb{N}$, for many values of $t$.

In the sequel, we shall require some preliminary lemmas.
Lemma 2.1 Consider the linear homogeneous system

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime \prime \prime}(t)+A X^{\prime \prime}(t)+B(t) X^{\prime}(t)+C X(t)=0 \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A$ is an arbitrary matrix, $C$ is a nonsingular matrix and $B(t) \equiv\left(b_{i j}(t)\right)$ is such that $b_{i j} \in L^{1}(0, T)$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
k^{2} \omega^{2} \leq \lambda_{i}(B(t)) \leq(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0, T], i=1, \ldots, n, k \in \mathbb{N}$, with the strict inequality holding on subsets of $[0, T]$ of positive measure.

Then, (2.4)-(1.2) has no non-trivial solution.
Proof Let the solution $X(t)=\bar{X}(t)+\widetilde{X}(t)$ have the Fourier expansion

$$
X(t) \sim \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(c_{0, i}+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left(c_{k, i} \cos k \omega t+d_{k, i} \sin k \omega t\right)\right)
$$

such that

$$
\bar{X}=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(c_{0, i}+\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(c_{k, i} \cos k \omega t+d_{k, i} \sin k \omega t\right)\right)
$$

and

$$
\tilde{X}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty}\left(c_{k, i} \cos k \omega t+d_{k, i} \sin k \omega t\right)
$$

for some integer $N>0$ with $N^{2} \omega^{2}<\lambda<(N+1)^{2} \omega^{2}$, where $\omega=\frac{2 \pi}{T}$.
Then, multiplying (2.4) by $\bar{X}^{\prime}(t)-\widetilde{X}^{\prime}(t)$ and integrating over $[0 . T]$ gives,

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{0}^{T} & \left(\left(\widetilde{X}^{\prime \prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\left\langle B(t) \widetilde{X}^{\prime}(t), \widetilde{X}^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right) d t \\
& -\int_{0}^{T}\left(\left(\bar{X}^{\prime \prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\left\langle B(t) \bar{X}^{\prime}(t), \bar{X}^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right) d t=0 \tag{2.5}
\end{align*}
$$

Let $\delta$ be a constant defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta=\frac{1}{2}\left(\min \lambda_{i}(B(t))+\max \lambda_{i}(B(t))\right) \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$. Then in fact,
$k^{2} \omega^{2} \leq \delta \leq(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}$, for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$, and $k^{2} \omega^{2}<\delta<(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}$, on subsets of [0,T] of positive measure.

Thus, combining $\left(\mathcal{B}_{1}\right),(2.6)$ and (2.7), (2.5) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq \int_{0}^{T}\left[\left(\widetilde{X}^{\prime \prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\delta\left(\widetilde{X}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}\right] d t-\int_{0}^{T}\left[\left(\bar{X}^{\prime \prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\delta\left(\bar{X}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}\right] d t=0 \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

By Parseval's identity given by

$$
\int_{0}^{T}\|X\|^{2} d t=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(c_{0, i}^{2} T+\frac{T}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left(c_{k, i}^{2}+d_{k, i}^{2}\right)\right)
$$

(2.8) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{T}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} k^{2} \omega^{2}\left(k^{2} \omega^{2}-\delta\right)\left(c_{k, i}^{2}+d_{k, i}^{2}\right)+\sum_{k=1}^{N} k^{2} \omega^{2}\left(\delta-k^{2} \omega^{2}\right)\left(c_{k, i}^{2}+d_{k, i}^{2}\right)\right]=0 \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows from (2.7) that $c_{k, i}=0(k=0,1,2, \ldots)$ and $d_{k, i}=0(k=1,2, \ldots)$, for all $i=1, \ldots, n$. Thus, $X \equiv 0$, and the lemma follows.

Lemma 2.2 Let $C$ be nonsingular, and assume that $M, N \in L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n^{2}}\right)$ are nonsingular matrices which satisfy the following conditions

$$
\begin{equation*}
k^{2} \omega^{2}\|Y\|^{2} \leq\langle M(t) Y, Y\rangle \leq\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle \leq(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}\|Y\|^{2} \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

uniformly in $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, for a.e. $t \in[0, T], k \in \mathbb{N}, \omega=\frac{2 \pi}{T}$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
k^{2} \omega^{2}\|Y\|^{2}<\langle M(t) Y, Y\rangle, \quad\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle<(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}\|Y\|^{2} \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

on subsets of $[0, T]$ of positive measure.
Then, there exists constants $\epsilon=\epsilon(M, N, C)>0$ and $\delta_{0}=\delta_{0}(M, N, C)>0$ uniformly a.e. on $[0, T]$, such that for all $B(t) \equiv\left(b_{i j}(t)\right)$ with $b_{i j} \in L^{1}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle M(t) Y, Y\rangle-\epsilon\|Y\|^{2} \leq\langle B(t) Y, Y\rangle \leq\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle+\epsilon\|Y\|^{2} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

uniformly in $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, a.e. on $[0, T]$, and all $X \in W_{T}^{3,1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, one has

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|X^{\prime \prime \prime}+A X^{\prime \prime}+B(\cdot) X^{\prime}+C X\right\|_{L^{1}} \geq \delta_{0}\|X\|_{W_{T}^{3,1}} \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof Let us assume that the conclusion of the Lemma does not hold, that is, $\epsilon$ and $\delta_{0}$ do not exist. Then, there exists a sequence $\left(X_{n}\right) \in W^{3,1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ with $\left\|X_{n}\right\|_{W^{3,1}}=1$, and a sequence $\left(B_{n}\right) \in L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n^{2}}\right)$ of nonsingular matrices with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle M(t) Y, Y\rangle-\frac{1}{n}\|Y\|^{2} \leq\left\langle B_{n}(t) Y, Y\right\rangle \leq\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle+\frac{1}{n}\|Y\|^{2}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

uniformly in $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$, such that for all $X \in W^{3,1}$, one has

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left\|X_{n}^{\prime \prime \prime}(t)+A X_{n}^{\prime \prime}(t)+B_{n}(t) X_{n}^{\prime}(t)+C X_{n}\right\| d t<\frac{1}{n} \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\left\|B_{n}\right\|$ denote the norm of $B_{n}$. Then, by (2.13), there exists some $\beta \in$ $L^{1}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|B_{n}(t)\right\| \leq \beta(t), \quad n=1,2, \ldots \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0, T], n \in \mathbb{N}$. For example, one can take

$$
\beta(t) \equiv \frac{1}{\|Y\|^{2}}[\|\langle M(t) Y, Y\rangle-\langle Y, Y\rangle\|+\|\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle+\langle Y, Y\rangle\|]
$$

Now, by the compact embedding of $W^{3,1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ into $W^{2,1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ and the continuous embedding of $W^{2,1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ into $C^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ imply that by going to subsequences if neccessary, we can assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{n} \rightarrow X \text { in } C^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right), \quad X_{n}^{\prime \prime} \rightarrow X^{\prime \prime} \text { in } L^{\infty}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \subset L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, by (2.15), we deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{n} \rightharpoonup B \text { in } L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n^{2}}\right) \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that by (2.13),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle M(t) Y, Y\rangle \leq\langle B(t) Y, Y\rangle \leq\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$.
On the other hand, for every $\Phi \in L^{\infty}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, we have by Schwarz inequality

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left\|\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle B_{n}(t) X_{n}^{\prime}(t)-B(t) X^{\prime}(t), \Phi(t)\right\rangle d t\right\| \\
\leq\left\|\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle B_{n}(t)\left(X_{n}^{\prime}(t)-X^{\prime}(t)\right), \Phi(t)\right\rangle d t\right\|+\left\|\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle\left(B_{n}(t)-B(t)\right) X^{\prime}(t), \Phi(t)\right\rangle d t\right\| \\
\leq\|\Phi\|_{\infty}\|\beta\|_{L^{1}}\left\|X_{n}^{\prime}-X^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}+\left\|\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle\left(B_{n}(t)-B(t)\right) X^{\prime}(t), \Phi(t)\right\rangle d t\right\| \cdot \quad \text { (2.19) } \tag{2.19}
\end{gather*}
$$

The right hand side of (2.19) tends to zero by (2.16) and (2.17), and we deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{n} X_{n}^{\prime} \rightharpoonup B X^{\prime} \text { in } L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (2.14), (2.16) and (2.20), it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{n}^{\prime \prime \prime}=-A X_{n}^{\prime \prime}-B_{n}(\cdot) X_{n}^{\prime}-C X_{n} \rightharpoonup-A X^{\prime \prime}-B(\cdot) X^{\prime}-C X \text { in } L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \tag{2.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since the operator

$$
\frac{d^{3}}{d t^{3}}: W^{3,1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \subset L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \rightarrow L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)
$$

is weakly closed, this implies (by (2.16) and (2.21)) that $X \in W_{T}^{3,1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, and $X^{\prime \prime \prime}=-A X^{\prime \prime}-B(\cdot) X^{\prime}-C X$, that is,

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime \prime \prime}(t)+A X^{\prime \prime}(t)+B(t) X^{\prime}(t)+C X(t)=0 \tag{2.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$ and $X \in W^{3,1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$.
It follows from (2.9), (2.10), (2.18), (2.22) and Lemma 2.1 that $X \equiv 0$, that is, $X_{n} \rightarrow 0$ in $W^{3,1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. But this clearly contradicts the initial assumption that $\left\|X_{n}\right\|_{W^{3,1}}=1$ for all $n$, and the proof is complete.

Lemma 2.3 Let $D \in L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n^{2}}\right)$ be a nonsingular matrix such that $0 \leq$ $\lambda_{i}(D(t)) \leq \omega^{2}$ a.e. on $[0, T]$, with the strict inequality holding on a subset of $[0, T]$ of positive measure. Then, there exists a constant $\eta=\eta(D)>0$ such that for all $\widetilde{X} \in \widetilde{H}^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T}\left[\left(\tilde{X}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\langle D(t) \widetilde{X}(t), \widetilde{X}(t)\rangle\right] d t \geq \eta\|\widetilde{X}\|_{H^{1}}^{2} \tag{2.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof This is clearly the same as in the proof of Lemma 1 of [8] by setting $\lambda_{i}(D(t)) \equiv \Gamma_{i}(t), i=1,2, \ldots, n$, where $\Gamma_{i} \in L^{1}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\Gamma_{i}(t) \leq \omega^{2}$ a.e. on $[0, T]$, with the strict inequality holding on a subset of $[0, T]$ of positive measure, and replacing the period $2 \pi$ by $T$.

## 3 The main results

We now present our main results:
Theorem 3.1 Let $C$ be a nonsingular matrix. Suppose that $G$ is $L^{1}$-Carathéodory and satisfies

$$
\begin{gather*}
k^{2} \omega^{2} \leq \frac{\langle M(t) Y, Y\rangle}{\|Y\|^{2}} \leq \liminf _{\|Y\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle G(t, Y), Y\rangle}{\|Y\|^{2}} \leq \limsup _{\|Y\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle G(t, Y), Y\rangle}{\|Y\|^{2}}  \tag{3}\\
\leq \frac{\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle}{\|Y\|^{2}} \leq(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}
\end{gather*}
$$

uniformly in $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ for a.e. $t \in[0, T], k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M, N \in L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n^{2}}\right)$ are such that $k^{2} \omega^{2}\|Y\|^{2}<\langle M(t) Y, Y\rangle,\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle<(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}\|Y\|^{2}$ on subsets of $[0, T]$ of positive measure. Then, for any arbitrary matrix $A$, the system (1.1)-(1.2) has at least one solution for every $P \in L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$.

Proof Let $\epsilon>0$ be as in Lemma 2.2. Then, by $\left(\mathcal{G}_{3}\right)$, we can fix a constant vector $\rho=\rho(\epsilon)$ with each $\rho_{i}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle M(t) Y, Y\rangle-\epsilon\|Y\|^{2} \leq\langle G(t, Y), Y\rangle \leq\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle+\epsilon\|Y\|^{2} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$ and all $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $\left|y_{i}\right| \geq \rho_{i}$.

Now define $\nu(t, Y) \equiv\left(\nu_{i}(t, Y)\right)_{1 \leq i \leq n}:[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ by

$$
\nu_{i}(t, Y)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
y_{i}^{-1} g_{i}(t, Y), \text { if }\left|y_{i}\right| \geq \rho_{i} ; \\
y_{i} \rho_{i}^{-2} g_{i}\left(t, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{i-1}, \rho_{i}, y_{i+1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)+\left(1-\frac{y_{i}}{\rho_{i}}\right) \beta(t) \\
\text { if } 0 \leq y_{i}<\rho_{i} ; \\
y_{i} \rho_{i}^{-2} g_{i}\left(t, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{i-1},-\rho_{i}, y_{i+1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)+\left(1+\frac{y_{i}}{\rho_{i}}\right) \beta(t) \\
\text { if }-\rho_{i} \leq y_{i}<0
\end{array}\right.
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$, where $\beta$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta(t) \equiv \frac{1}{\|Y\|^{2}}[\|\langle M(t) Y, Y\rangle-\langle Y, Y\rangle\|+\|\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle+\langle Y, Y\rangle\|] \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that by construction and (3.1), we deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle M(t) Y, Y\rangle-\epsilon\|Y\|^{2} \leq\langle\nu(t, Y), Y\rangle \leq\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle+\epsilon\|Y\|^{2} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$.
The function $\tilde{G} \equiv\left(\tilde{g}_{i}(t, Y)\right)_{1 \leq i \leq n}[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ defined by $\tilde{g}_{i}(t, Y)=$ $\nu_{i}(t, Y) y_{i}$ satisfies the Carathéodory conditions, by construction. Hence, setting $\Psi(t, Y)=G(t, Y)-\tilde{G}(t, Y)$, then $\Psi(t, Y)$ is also $L^{1}$-Carathéodory with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\Psi(t, Y)\| \leq \sup _{\left|y_{i}\right| \leq \rho_{i}}\|G(t, Y)-\tilde{G}(t, Y)\| \leq \varphi(t) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, for some $\varphi \in L^{1}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ depending only on $M, N$ and $\gamma_{r}$ mentioned at the beginning in association with $G$. Then, the problem (1.1) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime \prime \prime}(t)+A X^{\prime \prime}(t)+\tilde{G}\left(t, X^{\prime}(t)\right)+\Psi\left(t, X^{\prime}(t)\right)+C X(t)=P(t) \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the Leray-Schauder technique (see Mawhin [6]), the proof of the Theorem now follows by showing that there is a constant $K>0$, independent of $\lambda \in(0,1)$, such that $\|X\|_{C^{2}}<K$, for all possible solutions $X$ of the homotopy

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime \prime \prime}+A X^{\prime \prime}+(1-\lambda) N(t) X^{\prime}+\lambda \tilde{G}\left(t, X^{\prime}\right)+\lambda \Psi\left(t, X^{\prime}\right)+C X=\lambda P(t) \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We observe from (3.3) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle M(t) Y, Y\rangle-\epsilon\|Y\|^{2} \leq\langle(1-\lambda) N(t) Y+\lambda \tilde{G}(t, Y), Y\rangle \leq\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle+\epsilon\|Y\|^{2} \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0, T], Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $\lambda \in[0,1]$.
Thus, we may set $(1-\lambda) N(t) X^{\prime}+\lambda \tilde{G}\left(t, X^{\prime}\right) \equiv B(t) X^{\prime}$, for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$, $X^{\prime} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $\lambda \in[0,1]$, where, by (3.7), $B(t)$ is such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle M(t) X^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right\rangle-\epsilon\left\|X^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leq\left\langle B(t) X^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right\rangle \leq\left\langle N(t) X^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right\rangle+\epsilon\left\|X^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0, T], X^{\prime} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $\lambda \in[0,1]$.

Thus (3.6) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq\left\|X^{\prime \prime \prime}+A X^{\prime \prime}+B(\cdot) X^{\prime}+C X\right\|_{L^{1}}-\left\|\Psi\left(\cdot, X^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{L^{1}}-\|P(\cdot)\|_{L^{1}} \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using Lemma 2.2 and (3.4) finally gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq \delta_{0}\|X\|_{W^{3,1}}-\|\delta\|_{L^{1}}-\|P\|_{L^{1}} \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

which yields a constant $K_{0}>0$ such that $\|X\|_{W^{3,1}} \leq K_{0}$. Hence, we obtain the required constant $K>0$ such that $\|X\|_{C^{2}}<K$, following a standard procedure just as in [2], and the conclusion follows.

Remark 3.1 The result of Theorem 3.1 can be extended to nonlinear systems of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime \prime \prime}+\frac{d}{d t} \operatorname{grad} f\left(X^{\prime}\right)+G\left(t, X^{\prime}\right)+H(X)=P(t) \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

under suitable assumptions on $G$ satisfying some requirements in respect of the first (possible) eigenvalue $\lambda=\omega^{2}$ of (2.1)-(1.2).

Here, $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a $C^{2}$-function, $H: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is continuous and satisfies a sign condition, while $G$ and $P$ are as specified earlier.

Theorem 3.2 Assume that $G$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\|Y\| \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{\langle G(t, Y), Y\rangle}{\|Y\|^{2}} \leq \frac{\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle}{\|Y\|^{2}} \leq \omega^{2} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

uniformly in $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$, where $N \in L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n^{2}}\right)$ is such that $\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle<\omega^{2}\|Y\|^{2}$ on subsets of $[0, T]$ of positive measure.

Moreover, suppose that $H$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\|X\| \rightarrow+\infty} \operatorname{sgn}(X) H(X)=+\infty \tag{H}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, (3.11)-(1.2) has at least one solution for every $P \in L^{1}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$.
Proof As in the preceding proof, for each $\epsilon>0$, there exists $\rho=\rho(\epsilon)>0$ such that

$$
\langle G(t, Y), Y\rangle \leq\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle+\epsilon\|Y\|^{2}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$ and all $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $\left|y_{i}\right| \geq \rho_{i}$.
Then, define $\tilde{G}(t, Y)$ and $\Psi(t, Y)$ as before, so that the relations

$$
\langle(1-\lambda) N(t) Y+\lambda \tilde{G}(t, Y), Y\rangle \leq\langle N(t) Y, Y\rangle+\epsilon\|Y\|^{2}, \quad \lambda \in[0,1]
$$

and

$$
\|\Psi(t, Y)\| \leq \varphi(t)
$$

hold, for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$ and every $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$.

It suffices to establish the neccessary (or appropriate) a-priori bounds for the $\lambda$-dependent family of systems

$$
\begin{gather*}
X^{\prime \prime \prime}+\lambda \frac{d}{d t} \operatorname{grad} f\left(X^{\prime}\right)+(1-\lambda) N(t) X^{\prime}+\lambda \tilde{G}\left(t, X^{\prime}\right)+\lambda \Psi\left(t, X^{\prime}\right) \\
+(1-\lambda) C X+\lambda H(X)=\lambda P(t) \tag{3.12}
\end{gather*}
$$

for $\lambda \in[0,1]$, where $C$ is a fixed nonsingular and positive definite matrix.
Let $X$ be a solution of (3.12)-(1.2). Taking the scalar product of (3.12) with $X^{\prime}(t)$ and integrating over $[0, T]$ using (1.2) gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left\|X^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2} d t=\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle(1-\lambda) N(t) X^{\prime}+\lambda \tilde{G}\left(t, X^{\prime}\right), X^{\prime}\right\rangle d t+\left\langle\Psi\left(\cdot, X^{\prime}\right)-P(\cdot), X^{\prime}\right\rangle_{L^{2}} \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

That is, from above

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|X^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \leq \int_{0}^{T}\left\langle N(t) X^{\prime}(t), X^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle d t+\epsilon\left\|X^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\left(\|\varphi\|_{L^{1}}+\|P\|_{L^{1}}\right)\left\|X^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty} \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Noting that by Lemma 2.3,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left\|X^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}-\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle N(t) X^{\prime}(t), X^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle d t= \\
=\int_{0}^{T}\left(\left(X^{\prime \prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\left\langle N(t) X^{\prime}(t), X^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right) d t \geq \eta\left\|X^{\prime}\right\|_{H^{1}}^{2}=\frac{\eta}{T}\left\|X^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

for some constant $\eta=\eta(\Gamma)>0$, we obtain from (3.14)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta\left\|X^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \leq \frac{\epsilon T}{\omega^{2}}\left\|X^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}+\left(\|\varphi\|_{L^{1}}+\|P\|_{L^{1}}\right) T^{\frac{3}{2}}\left\|X^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{L^{2}} \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

by the Wirtinger and other standard inequalities. Hence, taking $0<\epsilon T<\omega^{2} \eta$, we deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|X^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{L^{2}} \leq c_{1} \tag{3.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $c_{1}>0$. Thus, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|X^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty} \leq \sqrt{T}\left\|X^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{L^{2}} \leq \sqrt{T} c_{1} \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

This implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|X-X\left(t_{0}\right)\right\| \leq T\left\|X^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty} \leq T^{\frac{3}{2}} c_{1} \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $t_{0} \in[0, T]$ is arbitrarily fixed.
Now observe that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}(1-\lambda) N(t) X^{\prime}+\lambda \tilde{G}\left(t, X^{\prime}\right) d t \leq \int_{0}^{T}\left(N(t) X^{\prime}+\epsilon X^{\prime}\right) d t=0 \tag{3.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, taking the average of (3.12) on $[0, T]$, we obtain by the Mean Value Theorem,

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left\|(1-\lambda) X\left(t^{\star}\right)+\lambda C^{-1} H\left(X\left(t^{\star}\right)\right)\right\|= \\
=\left\|(1-\lambda)\left(\frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} X(t) d t\right)+\lambda\left(\frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} C^{-1} H(X(t)) d t\right)\right\| \\
\leq\left\|C^{-1}\right\|\left(\frac{1}{T}\|\delta\|_{L^{1}}+\frac{1}{T}\|P\|_{L^{1}}\right):=c_{2} \tag{3.20}
\end{gather*}
$$

for some $t^{\star} \in[0, T]$.
Now by hypothesis $(\mathcal{H})$, it follows that for any $k>0$, there exists a $q=$ $q(k)>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|C^{-1} H(X)\right\|=\|\tilde{H}(X)\|=\operatorname{sgn}(X) \widetilde{H}(X)>k \tag{3.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every $\|X\|>\max \{k, q\}$, and all positive definite $C$. Hence, for any $\lambda \in(0,1]$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|(1-\lambda) X+\lambda C^{-1} H(X)\right\|=\operatorname{sgn}(X)\left((1-\lambda) X+\lambda C^{-1} H(X)\right) \geq(1-\lambda) k+\lambda k=k \tag{3.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every $\|X\|>\max \{k, q\}$. Thus, choosing $k>c_{2}$, it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|X\left(t^{\star}\right)\right\| \leq \max \{k, q\}:=c_{3} \tag{3.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining (3.18) and (3.23) with $t_{0}=t^{\star}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|X\|_{\infty} \leq T^{\frac{3}{2}} c_{1}+c_{3}:=c_{4} \tag{3.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lastly, integrating (3.12) and using the continuity of $H$ and (3.24), we deduce the existence of a constant $c_{5}>0$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|X^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|_{L^{1}} \leq c_{5} \tag{3.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|X^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty} \leq T\left\|X^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|_{L^{1}}=T c_{5} \tag{3.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, by (3.17), (3.24) and (3.26),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|X\|_{C^{2}}=\|X\|_{\infty}+\left\|X^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}+\left\|X^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty} \leq c_{6} \tag{3.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $c_{6}>0$, and we are done.
As pointed out earlier, Theorem 3.2 admits solutions for periodic systems associated with

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime \prime \prime}+\frac{d}{d t} \operatorname{grad} f\left(X^{\prime}\right)+\frac{\omega^{2}}{2}(1+\sin t) X^{\prime}+H(X)=P(t) \tag{3.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, we conclude this study with a uniqueness criterion for the system (1.1)-(1.2). The following result holds:

Theorem 3.3 Let $C$ be nonsingular and suppose that $G$ satisfies, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$,
$\left(\mathcal{G}_{5}\right) \quad k^{2} \omega^{2} \leq \frac{\left\langle M(t)\left(Y_{1}-Y_{2}\right), Y_{1}-Y_{2}\right\rangle}{\left\|Y_{1}-Y_{2}\right\|^{2}} \leq \frac{\left\langle G\left(t, Y_{1}\right)-G\left(t, Y_{2}\right), Y_{1}-Y_{2}\right\rangle}{\left\|Y_{1}-Y_{2}\right\|^{2}}$

$$
\leq \frac{\left\langle N(t)\left(Y_{1}-Y_{2}\right), Y_{1}-Y_{2}\right\rangle}{\left\|Y_{1}-Y_{2}\right\|^{2}} \leq(k+1)^{2} \omega^{2}
$$

or
$\left(\mathcal{G}_{6}\right)$

$$
\frac{\left\langle G\left(t, Y_{1}\right)-G\left(t, Y_{2}\right), Y_{1}-Y_{2}\right\rangle}{\left\|Y_{1}-Y_{2}\right\|^{2}}<\omega^{2}
$$

uniformly for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$ and $Y_{1}, Y_{2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $Y_{1} \neq Y_{2}$.
Then, (1.1)-(1.2) has at most one solution.
Proof Case (i) $G$ subject to $\left(\mathcal{G}_{5}\right)$ : The PBVP satisfied by $V=Y_{1}-Y_{2}$, for any two solutions $Y_{1}, Y_{2}$ of (1.1)-(1.2) is of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
V^{\prime \prime \prime}(t)+A V^{\prime \prime}(t)+B^{\star}\left(t, V^{\prime}\right) V^{\prime}(t)+C V(t)=0 \tag{3.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
V(0)-V(T)=V^{\prime}(0)-V^{\prime}(T)=V^{\prime \prime}(0)-V^{\prime \prime}(T) \tag{3.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the matrix $B^{\star} \in L^{1}(0, T)$ is defined by

$$
B^{\star}(t, V(t)) V(t)= \begin{cases}G\left(t, V+Y_{2}\right)-G\left(t, Y_{2}\right), & \text { if } V \neq 0 \\ M(t), & \text { if } V=0\end{cases}
$$

and by $\left(\mathcal{G}_{5}\right)$ satisfies

$$
\lambda_{i}(M(t)) \leq \lambda_{i}\left(B^{\star}(t, V(t))\right) \leq \lambda_{i}(N(t))
$$

uniformly in $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ for a.e. $t \in[0, T]$.
Hence, using the arguments of Lemma 2.1, we see that $V \equiv 0$, and the uniqueness, subject to ( $\mathcal{G}_{5}$ ), is thus proved.

Case (ii) $G$ subject to $\left(\mathcal{G}_{6}\right)$ : We consider the PBVP (3.28)-(3.29) as before except that this time $B^{\star}$ is defined by

$$
B^{\star}(t, V(t)) V(t)= \begin{cases}G\left(t, V+Y_{2}\right)-G\left(t, Y_{2}\right), & \text { if } V \neq 0 \\ 0, & \text { if } V=0\end{cases}
$$

so that by $\left(\mathcal{G}_{6}\right), \lambda_{i}\left(B^{\star}(t, V(t))\right)<\omega^{2}$ uniformly in $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ for $t \in[0, T]$.
Multiply now (3.28) scalarly by $V^{\prime}(t)$ and integrate over $[0, T]$ using (3.29) and we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left\|V^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|^{2} d t=\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle B^{\star}(t, V(t)) V^{\prime}(t), V^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle d t \leq \int_{0}^{T}\left\langle\widetilde{B}(t) V^{\prime}(t), V^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle d t \tag{3.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we set $\lambda_{i}(\widetilde{B}(t))=\max \left\{0, \lambda_{i}\left(B^{\star}(t, V(t))\right)\right\}$ uniformly in $V$ for a.e. $t \in$ $[0, T]$.

Clearly then, $\widetilde{B}(t) \in L^{1}(0, T)$ is such that $0 \leq \lambda_{i}(\widetilde{B}(t))<\omega^{2}$ for a.e. $t \in$ $[0, T]$. Thus using Lemma 2.3 setting $\widetilde{X}=V^{\prime},(3.30)$ becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq \int_{0}^{T}\left\|V^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|^{2} d t-\int_{0}^{T}\left\langle\widetilde{B}(t) V^{\prime}(t), V^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle d t \geq \eta\left\|V^{\prime}\right\|_{H^{1}}^{2} \tag{3.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

from which we deduce that $V^{\prime} \equiv 0$, leading to $V \equiv 0$, and the proof is complete.
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