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## 2 Elementary properties of integrals of the differential equation (q)

### 2.1 Relative positions of zeros of an integral and its derivative

Between two zeros of an integral $y$ of the differential equation (q) there always lies at least one zero of its derivative $y^{\prime}$. Between two zeros of the derivative $y^{\prime}$ there always lies at least one zero of $y$ or one zero of $q$. It follows that:

Between two neighbouring zeros of an integral y of the differential equation (q) lies precisely one zero of $y^{\prime}$, if $q$ does not vanish in this interval. Between two neighbouring zeros of the derivative $y^{\prime}$ lies precisely one zero of $y$ if $q \neq 0$ in this interval.

In this statement, the inequality $q \neq 0$ can without loss of generality be replaced by $q<0$, in consequence of the following theorem.

Theorem. If, between two neighbouring zeros of an integral $y$ of the differential equation (q), or between two zeros of its derivative $y^{\prime}$, or between a zero of $y$ and a zero of $y^{\prime}$, the function $q$ does not vanish then it must be negative, i.e. $q<0$.
Proof. Obviously, it is sufficient only to consider the third case. Let $t_{1}, x_{1} \in j$, with $t_{1}<x_{1}$, and assume, for example, that $y\left(t_{1}\right)=y^{\prime}\left(x_{1}\right)=0$, while $y(t)>0, y^{\prime}(t)>0$ for $t \in\left(t_{1}, x_{1}\right)$. If possible, let $q>0$ in the interval $\left(t_{1}, x_{1}\right)$. Then in this interval $y^{\prime \prime}>0$, the function $y^{\prime}$ is increasing and since $y^{\prime}\left(x_{1}\right)=0, y^{\prime}$ is negative, which contradicts our hypothesis and so proves the theorem.

### 2.2 Ratios of integrals and their derivatives

For two integrals $u, v$ of the differential equation ( q ) the following formulae hold in the interval $j$, with the exception, naturally, of points where the denominators vanish:

$$
\begin{align*}
\left(\frac{u}{v}\right)^{\prime}=-\frac{w}{v^{2}}, \quad\left(\frac{u^{\prime}}{v^{\prime}}\right)^{\prime} & =\frac{w q}{v^{\prime 2}}, \quad\left(\frac{u u^{\prime}}{v v^{\prime}}\right)^{\prime}=w \frac{q u v-u^{\prime} v^{\prime}}{v^{2} v^{\prime 2}}  \tag{2.1}\\
(w & \left.=u v^{\prime}-u^{\prime} v\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

We obtain from these the following results:
Let the integrals $u, v$ be linearly independent; then in every interval $i \subset j$ containing no zeros of $v$, the ratio $u / v$ is either an increasing or a decreasing function, according as $w<0$ or $w>0$. On the same assumption, in every interval $i \subset j$ which contains no zeros of $v^{\prime}$, the ratio $u^{\prime} / v^{\prime}$ is an increasing or decreasing function according as $w q>0$ or $w q<0$. A similar statement also holds for the function $u u^{\prime} \mid v v^{\prime}$.

By integration of the above formulae over an interval $(t, x) \subset j$, in which the denominators involved are not zero, we obtain

$$
\left.\begin{array}{c}
\frac{u(x)}{v(x)}-\frac{u(t)}{v(t)}=-w \int_{t}^{x} \frac{d \sigma}{v^{2}}, \quad \frac{u^{\prime}(x)}{v^{\prime}(x)}-\frac{u^{\prime}(t)}{v^{\prime}(t)}=w \int_{t}^{x} \frac{q d \sigma}{v^{2}},  \tag{2.2}\\
\frac{u(x) u^{\prime}(x)}{v(x) v^{\prime}(x)}-\frac{u(t) u^{\prime}(t)}{v(t) v^{\prime}(t)}=w \int_{t}^{x} \frac{q u v-u^{\prime} v^{\prime}}{v^{2} v^{\prime 2}} d \sigma .
\end{array}\right\}
$$

If the numbers $t, x$ are zeros of the function $u$ or of the function $u^{\prime}$, or if one of them is a zero of $u$ and the other a zero of $u^{\prime}$, then the integral on the right hand side of the corresponding formula is zero.

### 2.3 The ordering theorems

There are several important laws governing the location of zeros of two independent integrals of the differential equation ( $q$ ) and of their derivatives. These are described in the following four theorems, the so-called ordering theorems. Proofs follow from the formulae (2) above.

Let $u, v$ be independent integrals of the differential equation (q) and $t_{1}, x_{1}$ be numbers in the interval $j$ with $t_{1}<x_{1}$.
(1) Let $u\left(t_{1}\right)=u\left(x_{1}\right)=0, u(t) \neq 0$ for $t \in\left(t_{1}, x_{1}\right)$, then the integral $v$ has precisely one zero in the interval $\left(t_{1}, x_{1}\right)$.
We now make the additional assumption that $q \neq 0$ for $t \in j$.
(2) Let $u^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)=u^{\prime}\left(x_{1}\right)=0, u^{\prime}(t) \neq 0$ for $t \in\left(t_{1}, x_{1}\right)$, then the function $v^{\prime}$ has precisely one zero in the interval $\left(t_{1}, x_{1}\right)$.
(3) Let $u^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)=u\left(x_{1}\right)=0, u(t) \neq 0$ for $t \in\left(t_{1}, x_{1}\right)$. If $t_{2}<t_{1}$ and $v^{\prime}\left(t_{2}\right)=0$, then the integral $v$ has a zero $x_{2} \in\left(t_{2}, x_{1}\right)$. If $x_{2}>x_{1}$ and $v\left(x_{2}\right)=0$, then the function $v^{\prime}$ has a zero $t_{2} \in\left(t_{1}, x_{2}\right)$.
(4) Let $u\left(t_{1}\right)=u^{\prime}\left(x_{1}\right)=0, u(t) \neq 0$ for $t \in\left(t_{1}, x_{1}\right)$. If $t_{2}<t_{1}$ and $v\left(t_{2}\right)=0$, then the function $v^{\prime}$ has a zero $x_{2} \in\left(t_{2}, x_{1}\right)$. If $x_{2}>x_{1}$ and $v^{\prime}\left(x_{2}\right)=0$, then the function $v$ has $a$ zero $t_{2} \in\left(t_{1}, x_{2}\right)$.

Proof. We shall give only the proof of the first part of (3). Assuming the contrary, we suppose that $v(t) \neq 0$ for $t \in\left(t_{2}, x_{1}\right)$. Then $v(t) v^{\prime}(t) \neq 0$ for $t \in\left(t_{1}, x_{1}\right)$ and, indeed, even for $t \in\left[t_{1}, x_{1}\right]$. We can thus apply the last formula (2) to the integrals $u, v$ in the interval $\left[t_{1}, x_{1}\right]$ from which it follows that

$$
\int_{t_{1}}^{x_{1}} \frac{q u v-u^{\prime} v^{\prime}}{v^{2} v^{\prime 2}} d \sigma=0
$$

Obviously we can assume that $v^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)<0, u^{\prime}\left(x_{1}\right)<0$. Then in the interval $\left(t_{1}, x_{1}\right)$ we have $u>0, u^{\prime}<0, v>0, v^{1}<0$. This, however, is inconsistent with the above integral relationship, so our assumption is false and the proof is completed.
2.4 The (Riemann) integrals $\int_{x_{0}}^{x_{1}} \frac{d \sigma}{y^{2}(\sigma)}, \int_{x_{0}}^{x_{1}} \frac{q(\sigma)}{y^{\prime 2}(\sigma)} d \sigma$ in the neighbourhood of a singular point

Let $y$ be an integral of the differential equation $(\mathrm{q})$ with a zero at the point $c$. We consider a left or right neighbourhood $j_{-1}$ or $j_{0}$ of $c$, in which the integral $y$ does not vanish, and choose first a number $x_{0} \in j_{-1}$. We wish to study the behaviour of the integral $\int_{x_{0}}^{t} d \sigma / y^{2}(\sigma), t \in j_{-1}$, in the neighbourhood of the singular point $c$.

Obviously, for $\sigma \in j_{-1}$ we have the formula

$$
y(\sigma)=y^{\prime}(c)(\sigma-c)+\frac{(\sigma-c)^{2}}{2} y^{\prime \prime}(\tau)
$$

where $\sigma<\tau<c$. From this it follows that

$$
y^{2}(\sigma)=y^{\prime 2}(c)(\sigma-c)^{2}\left[1+\frac{\sigma-c}{2} \cdot \frac{y^{\prime \prime}(\tau)}{y^{\prime}(c)}\right]^{2}
$$

hence

$$
\frac{1}{y^{2}(\sigma)}=\frac{1}{y^{\prime 2}(c)(\sigma-c)^{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{\left[1+\frac{\sigma-c}{2} \cdot \frac{y^{\prime \prime}(\tau)}{y^{\prime}(c)}\right]^{2}}
$$

Now we apply the Taylor expansion formula to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\left[1+\frac{\sigma-c}{2} \cdot \frac{y^{\prime \prime}(\tau)}{y^{\prime}(c)}\right]^{2}}=1- & (\sigma-c) \frac{y^{\prime \prime}(\tau)}{y^{\prime}(c)} \\
& +\frac{(\sigma-c)^{2}}{4} \cdot \frac{y^{\prime \prime 2}(\tau)}{y^{\prime 2}(c)} \cdot \frac{3}{\left[1+\Theta \frac{\sigma-c}{2} \cdot \frac{y^{\prime \prime}(\tau)}{y^{\prime}(c)}\right]^{4}}
\end{aligned}
$$

with $0<\Theta<1$. Consequently

$$
\frac{1}{y^{2}(\sigma)}=\frac{1}{y^{\prime 2}(c)}\left[\frac{1}{(\sigma-c)^{2}}-\frac{q(\tau)}{y^{\prime}(c)} \cdot \frac{\tau-c}{\sigma-c} \cdot \frac{y(\tau)-y(c)}{\tau-c}\right]+O(1)
$$

in which the symbol $O$ naturally relates to the left neighbourhood of $c$. For $\sigma \in j_{-1}$, let

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(\sigma)=\frac{1}{y^{2}(\sigma)}-\frac{1}{y^{\prime 2}(c)} \cdot \frac{1}{(\sigma-c)^{2}} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

we then have

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(\sigma)=-\frac{q(\tau)}{y^{\prime 3}(c)} \cdot \frac{\tau-c}{\sigma-c} \cdot \frac{y(\tau)-y(c)}{\tau-c}+O(1) \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the formula (3) the function $g$ is continuous in the interval $j_{-1}$, while (4) shows that it is bounded there. From this follows the existence of the Riemann integral
$\int_{x_{5}}^{c} g(\sigma) d \sigma$. We now make use of the formula (3) to extend the definition of the function $g$ over the interval $j_{0}$. An argument similar to that used above shows that for every $x_{1} \in j_{0}$ the integral $\int_{c}^{x_{1}} g(\sigma) d \sigma$ exists.

For every two numbers $x_{0} \in j_{-1}, x_{1} \in j_{0}$, the integral

$$
\int_{x_{0}}^{x_{1}} g(\sigma) d \sigma=\int_{x_{0}}^{x_{1}}\left[\frac{1}{y^{2}(\sigma)}-\frac{1}{y^{\prime 2}(c)} \cdot \frac{1}{(\sigma-c)^{2}}\right] d \sigma
$$

exists. Now let $x_{0}, x_{m}\left(x_{0}<x_{m}\right)$ be arbitrary numbers in the interval $j$, which are not zeros of $y$ and between which lie precisely $m(\geqslant 1)$ zeros $c_{1}, \ldots, c_{m}$ of $y$, ordered so that $x_{0}<c_{1}<\ldots<c_{m}<x_{m}$.

Now we define the function $g_{m}$ as follows:

$$
g_{m}(\sigma)=\frac{1}{y^{2}(\sigma)}-\sum_{\mu=1}^{m} \frac{1}{y^{\prime 2}\left(c_{\mu}\right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\sigma-c_{\mu}\right)^{2}}
$$

this definition being valid in the interval $\left[x_{0}, x_{m}\right]$ with the exception of the points $c_{\mu}$. We choose a number $x_{\mu}$ in each interval $\left(c_{u}, c_{\mu+1}\right), \mu=1, \ldots, m-1$. From the above result, the following integral exists for $\nu=1, \ldots, m$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{x_{v-1}}^{x_{v}} g_{m}(\sigma) d \sigma=\int_{x_{v-1}}^{x_{v}}\left[\frac{1}{y^{2}(\sigma)}-\frac{1}{y^{\prime 2}\left(c_{v}\right)}\right. & \left.\cdot \frac{1}{\left(\sigma-c_{v}\right)^{2}}\right] d \sigma \\
& +\sum_{v \neq \mu=1}^{m} \frac{1}{y^{\prime 2}\left(c_{\mu}\right)}\left[\frac{1}{x_{v}-c_{u}}-\frac{1}{x_{v-1}-c_{\mu}}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Then by summation we obtain the formula

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{x_{0}}^{x_{m}} g_{m}(\sigma) d \sigma= & \sum_{v=1}^{m} \int_{x_{\nu-1}}^{x_{v}}\left[\frac{1}{y^{2}(\sigma)}-\frac{1}{y^{\prime 2}\left(c_{v}\right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\sigma-c_{v}\right)^{2}}\right] d \sigma \\
& -\sum_{\mu=1}^{m} \frac{1}{y^{\prime 2}\left(c_{\mu}\right)}\left[\frac{1}{c_{\mu}-x_{\mu-1}}+\frac{1}{x_{\mu}-c_{\mu}}\right] \\
& +\sum_{\mu=1}^{m} \frac{1}{y^{\prime 2}\left(c_{\mu}\right)}\left[\frac{1}{c_{\mu}-x_{0}}+\frac{1}{x_{m}-c_{\mu}}\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

### 2.5 Application to the associated equation

Now we assume that $q \in C_{2}$ and does not vanish in the interval $j$. Then we can apply the above results to the first associated differential equation $\left(\hat{q}_{1}\right)$ of $(\mathrm{q})(\S 1.9)$.

Let $y$ be an integral of (q) and $e \in j$ a zero of its derivative $y^{\prime}$. We define the function $h(\sigma)$ in a neighbourhood of $e, \sigma \neq e$, by

$$
h(\sigma)=\frac{q(\sigma)}{y^{\prime 2}(\sigma)}-\frac{1}{q(e) y^{2}(e)} \cdot \frac{1}{(\sigma-e)^{2}}
$$

then for every two numbers $x_{0}, x_{1} \in j$, which are not zeros of the derivative $y^{\prime}$ and between which lies precisely the one zero $e$ of $y^{\prime}$, there exists the integral

$$
\int_{x_{0}}^{x_{1}} h(\sigma) d \sigma=\int_{x_{0}}^{x_{1}}\left[\frac{q(\sigma)}{y^{\prime 2}(\sigma)}-\frac{1}{q(e) y^{2}(e)} \cdot \frac{1}{(\sigma-e)^{2}}\right] d \sigma
$$

More generally; let $x_{0}, x_{m}\left(x_{0}<x_{m}\right)$ be arbitrary numbers in the interval $j$ which are not zeros of the derivative $y^{\prime}$ and between which lie precisely $m(\geqslant 1)$ zeros $e_{1}, \ldots, e_{m}$ of $y^{\prime}$ ordered such that $x_{0}<e_{1}<\ldots<e_{m}<x_{m}$. In the interval $\left[x_{0}, x_{m}\right]$ with the exception of the numbers $e_{\mu}$ we define the function $h_{m}$ as:

$$
h_{m}(\sigma)=\frac{q(\sigma)}{y^{\prime 2}(\sigma)}-\sum_{\mu=1}^{m} \frac{1}{q\left(e_{\mu}\right) y^{2}\left(e_{\mu}\right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\sigma-e_{\mu}\right)^{2}}
$$

and in every interval $\left(e_{\mu}, e_{\mu+1}\right)$ we choose a number $x_{\mu}, \mu=1, \ldots, m-1$. Then the integral of the function $h_{m}$ exists between the limits $x_{0}, x_{m}$, and we have the following formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{x_{0}}^{x_{m}} h_{m}(\sigma) d \sigma= & \sum_{v=1}^{m} \int_{x_{v-1}}^{x_{v}}\left[\frac{q(\sigma)}{y^{\prime 2}(\sigma)}-\frac{1}{q\left(e_{v}\right) y^{2}\left(e_{v}\right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\sigma-e_{v}\right)^{2}}\right] d \sigma \\
& -\sum_{\mu=1}^{m} \frac{1}{q\left(e_{\mu}\right) y^{2}\left(e_{\mu}\right)}\left[\frac{1}{e_{\mu}-x_{\mu-1}}+\frac{1}{x_{\mu}-e_{\mu}}\right] \\
& +\sum_{\mu=1}^{m} \frac{1}{q\left(e_{\mu}\right) y^{2}\left(e_{\mu}\right)}\left[\frac{1}{e_{\mu}-x_{0}}+\frac{1}{x_{m}-e_{\mu}}\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

### 2.6 Basis functions

We now consider two differential equations

$$
\begin{align*}
& y^{\prime \prime}=q(t) y  \tag{q}\\
& \dot{Y}=Q(T) Y \tag{Q}
\end{align*}
$$

on the intervals $j, J$, i.e. $t \in j, T \in J$. We do not exclude the possibility that these two differential equations coincide.

Let $(u, v),(U, V)$ be an ordered pair of arbitrary bases for $(\mathrm{q}),(\mathrm{Q})$ respectively. By a basis function belonging to this ordered pair of bases we mean a function $F(t, T)$ defined on the region $j \times J$ by one of the following four formulae:

1. $u(t) V(T)-v(t) U(T)$,
2. $u^{\prime}(t) \dot{V}(T)-v^{\prime}(t) \dot{U}(T)$,
3. $u(t) \dot{V}(T)-v(t) \dot{U}(T)$,
4. $u^{\prime}(t) V(T)-v^{\prime}(t) U(T)$.

Thus there are four basis functions corresponding to the above basis pair for the differential equations (q), (Q) (and consequently to every such basis pair). If the differential equations $(\mathrm{q})$. (Q) coincide, then we speak of basis functions of the differential equation (q).

We consider a basis function $F(t, T)$. Let $t_{0} \in j, X_{0} \in J$ be arbitrary numbers for which $F\left(t_{0}, X_{0}\right)=0$ and in the cases 2 and 3 assume also that $Q\left(X_{0}\right) \neq 0$. We wish
to show that there is precisely one function $X(t)$ defined in a neighbourhood of $t_{0}$, which takes the value $X_{0}$ at the point $t_{0}$, is continuous in its interval of definition, and satisfies the equation $F[t, X(t)]=0$. This function $X$ has moreover, in its interval of definition, the continuous derivative

$$
X^{\prime}(t)=-\frac{F^{\prime}[t, X(t)]}{\dot{F}[t, X(t)]}
$$

In the individual cases the derivative $X^{\prime}(t)$ is therefore given by the following expressions

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1. }-\frac{u^{\prime}(t) V[X(t)]-v^{\prime}(t) U[X(t)]}{u(t) \dot{V}[X(t)]-v(t) \dot{U}[X(t)]} \\
& \text { 2. }-\frac{q(t)}{Q[X(t)]} \cdot \frac{u(t) \dot{V}[X(t)]-v(t) \dot{U}[X(t)]}{u^{\prime}(t) V[X(t)]-v^{\prime}(t) U[X(t)]} \\
& \text { 3. }-\frac{1}{Q[X(t)]} \cdot \frac{u^{\prime}(t) \dot{V}[X(t)]-v^{\prime}(t) \dot{U}[X(t)]}{u(t) V[X(t)]-v(t) U[X(t)]} \\
& \text { 4. - q(t) } \frac{u(t) V[X(t)]-v(t) U[X(t)]}{u^{\prime}(t) \dot{V}[X(t)]-v^{\prime}(t) \dot{U}[X(t)]}
\end{aligned}
$$

To illustrate the method of proof, take the function

$$
F(t, T)=u(t) V(T)-v(t) U(T)
$$

According to our assumption we have $F\left(t_{0}, X_{0}\right)=0$ and the function $F$ obviously possesses continuous partial derivatives

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{\prime}(t, T) & =u^{\prime}(t) V(T)-v^{\prime}(t) U(T) \\
\dot{F}(t, T) & =u(t) \dot{V}(T)-v(t) \dot{U}(T)
\end{aligned}
$$

at every point $(t, T) \in j \times J$.
Further, $\dot{F}\left(t_{0}, X_{0}\right) \neq 0$, for otherwise we would have

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\left(F\left(t_{0}, X_{0}\right)=\right) & u\left(t_{0}\right) V\left(X_{0}\right)-v\left(t_{0}\right) U\left(X_{0}\right)=0 \\
\left(\dot{F}\left(t_{0}, X_{0}\right)=\right) & u\left(t_{0}\right) \dot{V}\left(X_{0}\right)-v\left(t_{0}\right) \dot{U}\left(X_{0}\right)=0
\end{array}
$$

and these two relations (when we recall that $u^{2}\left(t_{0}\right)+v^{2}\left(t_{0}\right) \neq 0$ ) contradict the linear independence of the integrals $U, V$ of $(\mathrm{Q})$. Now we only need to apply the classic implicit function theorem, and the proof is complete.

We observe that: if two functions $(z=) x, X$ are continuous in an interval $i \subset j$, take the same value at a point of the interval $i$, and satisfy in this interval the equation $F(t, z)=0$, then they coincide in the interval $i$. For, if this were not so, there would be numbers $t_{1}<t_{2}$ in the interval $i$ such that, for instance, $x\left(t_{1}\right)=X\left(t_{1}\right)$ and $x(t) \neq$ $X(t)$ for $t_{1}<t \leqslant t_{2}$. This, however, contradicts the above theorem.

