G. G. Hamedani Some remarks on a recent third order nonlinear oscillation result

Časopis pro pěstování matematiky, Vol. 110 (1985), No. 3, 237--240

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/118230

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1985

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* http://project.dml.cz

SOME REMARKS ON A RECENT THIRD ORDER NONLINEAR OSCILLATION RESULT

G. G. HAMEDANI, Milwaukee (Received October 11, 1983)

In a recent paper [2], Mehri considers the problem of oscillation of the solutions of the nonlinear third order differential equation

(1)
$$x''' + f(t, x) = 0$$
,

where f(t, x) is a continuous function of the variables $t \ge t_0$ and $|x| < \infty$, satisfying the following sign and monotonicity conditions:

(2)
$$x f(t, x) > 0, \quad x \neq 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad t \geq t_0,$$

(3)
$$|f(t, x_1)| \leq |f(t, x_2)|$$
 if $|x_1| \leq |x_2|$, $x_1x_2 \geq 0$.

Mehri shows ([2], Theorem 1) that for equation (1) to be oscillatory (i.e., all non-trivial solutions of (1) to be oscillatory) it is necessary that conditions

(4)
$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} t^2 |f(t, C)| dt = \infty, \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(t, Ct^2)| dt = \infty$$

be satisfied for any number $C \neq 0$.

Then he gives the following theorem ([2], Theorem 2) about the sufficiency condition for equation (1) to be oscillatory.

Theorem M. If the condition

(5)
$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(t, C)| dt = \infty$$

is satisfied for every constant $C \neq 0$, then (1) is oscillatory.

Mehri also gives the following corollary for the special case of (1), namely

(6)
$$x''' + a(t)f(x) = 0$$
.

Corollary M. Let $a(t) \ge 0$, f(x) be continuous functions satisfying the conditions

(7)
$$x f(x) > 0, x \neq 0$$

237

$$|f(x_1)| \leq |f(x_2)|$$
 when $|x_1| \leq |x_2|$, $x_1x_2 \geq 0$,

and

(8)
$$\sup |f(x)| < \infty$$

Then (6) is oscillatory if and only if

(9)
$$\int^{\infty} a(t) \, \mathrm{d}t = \infty \; .$$

The argument given in the second part of the proof of Theorem M is incorrect and the falsity of Theorem M and Corollary M can be shown by the following examples.

Example 1.
$$f(t, x) = x^3 e^{2t}, t \ge 0$$
, $|x| < \infty$.
Example 2. Let $f_1(x) = \begin{cases} x^3, |x| \le 1 \\ 2 - \frac{1}{x}, x > 1 \\ -2 - \frac{1}{x}, x < -1, \end{cases}$
 $a(t) = e^{2t}$ for $t \ge 0$ and $f(t, x) = a(t) f_1(x)$.

Remarks.

(i) f(t, x) in Example 1 (or Example 2) satisfies the conditions (2)-(5), and $x(t) = e^{-t}$ is a bounded nonoscillatory solution of (1). Hence Theorems 2 and 3 of [2] are false*); and condition (4) (though a necessary condition), is not a sufficient condition.

(ii) f(t, x) in Example 2 satisfies (7)-(9), and $x(t) = e^{-t}$ is a bounded nonoscillatory solution of (6). Hence the sufficiency part of Corollary M is false and the necessary part follows from Theorem 1 of [2] which does not require (8).

(iii) For f(t, x) in Example 2 we have:

(a) for each $\delta > 0$,

(10)
$$\left| \int_{\delta \leq |x| < \infty}^{\infty} \inf f(t, x) dt \right| = \infty ;$$

(b) f(t, x) is strongly lower semi-continuous from the left for x > 0, upper semi-continuous from the right for x < 0, smooth at infinity and also

^{*)} Theorem 3 of [2]. If for any nonzero constant C we can find constants $\lambda \neq 0$ and M > 0, depending on C, such that the inequality $|f(t, C)| \ge M|f(t, \lambda t^2)|$ is satisfied for t sufficiently large, then for every solution of equation (1) to be oscillary condition (5) is necessary and sufficient.

(11)
$$\left|\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t, x) dt\right| = \infty \quad \text{for each} \quad x \neq 0,$$

and

(12)
$$|f(t, x)| \ge 1$$
 for all t and all $|x| \ge 1$;
(c)

(13)
$$\liminf_{|x|\to\infty} |f_1(x)| > 0,$$

(d)

(14)
$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty}\int_0^x f_1(u)\,\mathrm{d} u = \infty \;.$$

Therefore various sufficiency conditions similar to those given in Theorem 1 and Corollaries 2 and 3 of [3] for second order nonlinear equations will not be adequate for (1) or (6).

(iv) The following result in the frame-work of [2] is possible.

Under conditions (2), (3) and (5) every solution x of (1) is oscillatory or such that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} x(t) = \lim_{t\to\infty} x'(t) = \lim_{t\to\infty} x''(t) = 0 \quad monotonically \ .$$

Proof. Assume the contrary and let x(t) be a nonoscillatory solution which may be assumed to be positive for $t \ge t_0$. Then x'''(t) < 0; hence x''(t) is non-increasing and x'(t) is concave and consequently x''(t) > 0 for $t \ge t_0 > 0$. Now, if x'(t) > 0for $t \ge t_0$, then x(t) is non-decreasing and

$$x''(t) = x''(t_0) - \int_{t_0}^t f(s, x(s)) \, \mathrm{d}s \leq x''(t_0) - \int_{t_0}^t f(s, x(t_0)) \, \mathrm{d}s \, .$$

This implies $\lim_{t \to \infty} x''(t) = -\infty$ which is a contradiction. If x'(t) < 0 for $t \ge t_0$, then x(t) is non-increasing. Here we consider two cases:

Case 1. $\lim_{t \to \infty} x(t) = \alpha > 0$. Then $x(t) \ge \alpha$ for $t \ge t_1$. From the identity

$$t_1 x''(t_1) - x'(t_1) = t x''(t) - x'(t) + \int_{t_1}^t sf(s, x(s)) \, \mathrm{d}s \, ,$$

it follows that

$$A = \frac{t_1 x''(t_1) - x'(t_1)}{t_1} \ge \int_{t_1}^t f(s, \alpha) \, \mathrm{d}s \; ,$$

which is a contradiction.

Case 2.
$$\lim_{t \to \infty} x(t) = 0$$
. From the fact that $x(t) > 0$, $x''(t) > 0$ for $t \ge t_0$ it follows

239

that x'(t) is non-decreasing and $\lim_{t \to \infty} x'(t) = \beta$ where $-\infty < \beta \le 0$. This implies that $x'(t) \le \beta$ or f all $t \ge t_0$, and hence $x(t_0) \ge x(t) - \beta(t - t_0)$ which is impossible for $\beta < 0$. Therefore $\lim_{t \to \infty} x'(t) = 0$. Now x'(t) < 0, x'''(t) < 0 for $t \ge t_0$ imply that x''(t) is non-increasing and $\lim_{t \to \infty} x''(t) = \gamma$ where $0 \le \gamma < \infty$. This implies that

$$x'(t_0) \leq x'(t) - \gamma(t - t_0)$$
 for $t \geq t_0$

which again is impossible for $\gamma > 0$, and hence $\gamma = 0$. (v) Conclusions of (iv) hold for equation (6) under (7) and (9).

Acknowledgement. The author is very grateful to Professor V. Durikovič for his valuable comments and suggestions.

References

- D. V. Izymova: On the conditions of oscillation and nonoscillation of solutions of nonlinear second order differential equations, Дифференциальные уравнения, 2 (1966), 1572-1586.
- [2] B. Mehri: On the conditions for the oscillation of solutions of nonlinear third order differential equations, Čas. pěst. mat. 101 (1976), 124-129.
- [3] J. S. W. Wang: On second order nonlinear oscillation, Math. Research Center, University of Wisconsin Technical Report No. 836, Also Funkcial Eknoc. 11 (1969), 207-23.

Author's address: Department of Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233.