# TOPOLOGICAL DEGREE METHODS IN BVPS WITH NONLINEAR CONDITIONS 

Irena Rachưnková

Abstract. We consider the second order differential equation

$$
x^{\prime \prime}=f\left(t, x, x^{\prime}\right),
$$

where $f$ is a Carathéodory function. We prove the existence of at least one solution of the equation satisfying the nonlinear boundary conditions

$$
g_{1}\left(x(a), x^{\prime}(a)\right)=0, g_{2}\left(x(b), x^{\prime}(b)\right)=0
$$

Our methods of proofs are based on the topological degree arguments for auxiliary operator equation.

## 1. Introduction

We study the nonlinear BVP

$$
\begin{gather*}
x^{\prime \prime}=f\left(t, x, x^{\prime}\right)  \tag{1.1}\\
g_{1}\left(x(a), x^{\prime}(a)\right)=0, \quad g_{2}\left(x(b), x^{\prime}(b)\right)=0 \tag{1.2}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\mathbf{J}=[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}, f \in \mathbf{C a r}\left(\mathbf{J} \times \mathbb{R}^{2}\right), g_{1}, g_{2} \in \mathbf{C}\left(\mathbb{R}^{2}\right)$.
The existence principles for problem (1.1), (1.2) or for similar nonlinear problems were studied earlier in [1], [2], [3] or [6]. In the first three papers

Key words: second order ordinary differential equation, nonlinear boundary value conditions, existence, topological degree.
Supported by grant nr. 201 / 93 / 2311 of the Grant Agency of Czech Republic.
the authors require monotonicity of $g_{1}, g_{2}$ or growth conditions for $f$ or an appropriate linear part in (1.2). In [6] we need only sign conditions. Let us show the typical result of [6].

Theorem [6, Theorem 3.1]. Let $r, R \in(0, \infty)$ be such that for a.e. $t \in J$ and each $x \in[-r, r]$ the conditions

$$
\begin{gathered}
g_{1}(-r, 0) \cdot g_{1}(r, 0)<0, \quad g_{2}(-r, 0) \cdot g_{2}(r, 0)<0 \\
g_{2}(x, R) \cdot g_{2}(x,-R)<0 \\
f(t,-r, 0)<0, \quad f(t, r, 0)>0 \\
f(t, x, R)>0, \quad f(t, x,-R)<0
\end{gathered}
$$

are fulfilled.
Then problem (1.1), (1.2) has at least one solution $u$ satisfying

$$
-r \leq u(t) \leq r, \quad-R \leq u^{\prime}(t) \leq R \quad \text { for each } \quad t \in \mathbf{J}
$$

In this paper, our approach has been motivated by [1] and is close to [6]. We introduce auxiliary operators $L$ and $N$ and study the operator equation $L x=\lambda N x$ with a real parametr $\lambda$. It is important to find a proper form of $L$ and $N$ in this approach. Here, we define $L$ and $N$ by a different way than in [6] and we get $\operatorname{dim}$ ker $L=1$ in contrast to [6], where it was 2. Therefore the application of the Continuation Theorem (see below) is easier and we get results that can be used for differential equations which cannot be solved by the theorems of the above papers.

Continuation Theorem [1, p.40]. Let $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}$ be Banach spaces, $L$ : $\operatorname{dom} L \subset \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}$ a Fredholm map of index 0 and $\Omega \subset \mathbf{X}$ an open bounded set. Let $N: \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}$ be $L$-compact on $\bar{\Omega}, Q: Y \rightarrow Y$ a continuous projector with $\operatorname{Ker} Q=\operatorname{Im} L$ and $\mathcal{J}: \operatorname{Im} Q \rightarrow \operatorname{Ker} \dot{L}$ an isomorphism. Suppose
a) for each $\lambda \in(0,1)$ every solution $x$ of $L x=\lambda N x$ is such that $x \notin \partial \Omega$;
b) $Q N x \neq 0$ for each $x \in \operatorname{Ker} L \cap \partial \Omega$ and
c) the Brouwer degree $d\left[N_{0}, \Omega \cap \operatorname{Ker} L, 0\right] \neq 0$, where $N_{0}=\mathcal{J Q N}$ : $\operatorname{Ker} L \rightarrow \operatorname{Ker} L$.
Then the equation $L x=N x$ has at least one solution in $\operatorname{dom} L \cap \bar{\Omega}$.

## 2. Bounded nonlinearity

First we suppose that $f$ is bounded by an integrable function $\varphi$ and prove the existence of at least one solution.

Theorem 2.1. Let $r_{1}, r_{2} \in \mathbb{R}, r_{1} \leq r_{2},-R_{1}, R_{2} \in[0, \infty), \mu, \nu \in\{-1,1\}$ and $\varphi \in L(J)$ be such that for a.e. $t \in J$ and each $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mu g_{1}\left(r_{1}, 0\right) \leq 0, \quad \mu g_{1}\left(r_{2}, 0\right) \geq 0  \tag{2.1}\\
& \nu g_{2}\left(x, R_{1}\right) \leq 0, \quad \nu g_{2}\left(x, R_{2}\right) \geq 0
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
|f(t, x, y)| \leq \varphi(t) \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

are satisfied.
Then problem (1.1), (1.2) has a solution $u$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{1} \leq u(a) \leq r_{2}, \quad R_{1} \leq u^{\prime}(b) \leq R_{2} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof.

1. Auxiliary problems.

Let us set for $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \tilde{g}_{1 n}(x, y)= \\
& \left\{\begin{array}{lll}
g_{1}\left(r_{2}, 0\right)+\mu\left(x-r_{2}-1 / n\right) & \text { for } \quad x \geq r_{2}+1 / n \\
g_{1}\left(r_{2}, y\right) & & \\
+\left[g_{1}\left(r_{2}, 0\right)-g_{1}\left(r_{2}, y\right)\right] n\left(x-r_{2}\right) & \text { for } \quad r_{2}<x<r_{2}+1 / n \\
g_{1}(x, y) & \text { for } & r_{1} \leq x \leq r_{2} \\
g_{1}\left(r_{1}, y\right) & & \\
-\left[g_{1}\left(r_{1}, 0\right)-g_{1}\left(r_{1}, y\right)\right] n\left(x-r_{1}\right) & \text { for } \quad r_{1}-1 / n<x<r_{1} \\
g_{1}\left(r_{1}, 0\right)-\mu\left(r_{1}-1 / n-x\right) & \text { for } x \leq r_{1}-1 / n
\end{array}\right. \tag{2.5}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\tilde{g}_{2 n}(x, y)= \begin{cases}g_{2}\left(x, R_{2}\right) & \text { for } y>R_{2}  \tag{2.6}\\ g_{2}(x, y) & \text { for } R_{1} \leq y \leq R_{2} \\ g_{2}\left(x, R_{1}\right) & \text { for } y<R_{1}\end{cases}
$$

and, for fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}, n>1$, study auxiliary problems

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime \prime}=\lambda f\left(t, x, x^{\prime}\right), \quad \lambda \in[0,1] \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\left(2.8_{n}\right)_{\lambda} \quad \lambda \tilde{g}_{1 n}\left(x(a), x^{\prime}(a)\right)=0, \quad \lambda \tilde{g}_{2 n}\left(x(b), x^{\prime}(b)\right)=-\nu x^{\prime}(b) / n$.

If we set $\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{1}}(\mathbf{J}), \quad \mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{J}) \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{2}}, \operatorname{dom} L=\mathbf{A} \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{1}}(\mathbf{J})$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L: \operatorname{dom} L \longrightarrow \mathbf{Y}, \quad x \longmapsto\left(x^{\prime \prime}, 0,-\nu x^{\prime}(b) / n\right), \quad N: \mathbf{X} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Y}, \\
& x \longmapsto\left(f\left(\cdot, x(\cdot), x^{\prime}(\cdot)\right), \quad \tilde{g}_{1 n}\left(x(a), x^{\prime}(a)\right), \quad \tilde{g}_{2 n}\left(x(b), x^{\prime}(b)\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

we can write (2.7), $\left(2.8_{n}\right)_{\lambda}$ in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
L x=\lambda N x . \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

We can see that $L$ is a Fredholm map of index zero, because $\operatorname{Ker} L=\{x \in$ $X: x(t) \equiv c, c \in \mathbb{R}\}, \operatorname{Im} L=\mathbf{L}(J) \times\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$ is closed in $\mathbf{Y}$ and $\operatorname{dim} \operatorname{Ker}$ $L=\operatorname{codim} \operatorname{Im} L=1$.

Further, the maps

$$
P: \mathbf{X} \longrightarrow \mathbf{X}, \quad x \longrightarrow x(a), \quad Q: \mathbf{Y} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Y}, \quad(y, \alpha, \beta) \longmapsto(0, \alpha, 0)
$$

are continuous projectors and we can find the generalized inverse (to $L$ ) operator $K_{P}: \operatorname{Im} L \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ker} P \cap \operatorname{dom} L$ in the form

$$
K_{P}:(y, 0, \beta) \longmapsto-n \beta(t-a) / \nu-\int_{a}^{t} \int_{\tau}^{b} y(s) d s d \tau
$$

Then $Q N: X \longrightarrow \mathbf{X}, x \longrightarrow\left(0, \tilde{g}_{1 n}\left(x(a), x^{\prime}(a)\right), 0\right)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& K_{P}(I-Q) N: X \rightarrow X, \\
& x \longmapsto-n \tilde{g}_{2 n}\left(x(b), x^{\prime}(b)\right)(t-a) / \nu-\int_{a}^{t} \int_{\tau}^{b} f\left(s, x(s), x^{\prime}(s)\right) d s d \tau .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem we can show that for any open bounded set $\Omega \subset \mathbf{X}$, the sets $Q N(\bar{\Omega}) \subset \mathbf{Y}$ and $K_{P}(I-Q) N(\bar{\Omega}) \subset \mathbf{X}$ are relatively compact. This means that $N: \bar{\Omega} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Y}$ is $L$-compact. Therefore we can use the Continuation Theorem for problems (2.9) ${ }_{\lambda}$.
2. A priori estimates.

Before using the Continuation Theorem we need to find a priori estimates for solutions of $(2.9)_{\lambda}$. Thus, suppose that problem (1.7), $\left(1.8_{n}\right)_{\lambda}$ has a solution $u$ for some $\lambda \in(0,1]$ and some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $u^{\prime}(b)>R_{2}$. Then $\nu \lambda \tilde{g}_{2 n}\left(u(b), u^{\prime}(b)\right)=-u^{\prime}(b) / n<0$. But, by (2.2), $\nu \lambda \tilde{g}_{2 n}\left(u(b), u^{\prime}(b)\right)=$ $\nu \lambda g_{2}\left(u(b), R_{2}\right) \geq \theta$, a contradiction. Similarly, for $u^{\prime}(b)<R_{1}$, we get
$\nu \lambda \tilde{g}_{2 n}\left(u(b), u^{\prime}(b)\right)=-u^{\prime}(b) / n>0$, and according to (2.2),
$\nu \lambda \tilde{g}_{2 n}\left(u(b), u^{\prime}(b)\right)=\nu \lambda g_{2}\left(u(b), R_{1}\right) \leq 0$, a contradiction. Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{1} \leq u^{\prime}(b) \leq R_{2} . \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Further, let $u(a)>r_{2}+1 / n$. Then, by (2.2), (2.5), $\mu \lambda \tilde{g}_{1 n}\left(u(a), u^{\prime}(a)\right)=$ $\lambda \mu\left(g_{1}\left(r_{2}, 0\right)+\mu\left(u(a)-r_{2}-1 / n\right)\right)>0$, which contradicts $\left(2.8_{n}\right)_{\lambda}$. Similarly, if $u(a)<r_{1}-1 / n$, we get $\mu \lambda \tilde{g}_{1 n}\left(u(a), u^{\prime}(a)\right)=\lambda \mu\left(g_{1}\left(r_{1}, 0\right)-\mu\left(r_{1}-1 / n-\right.\right.$ $u(a))<0$, which also contradicts $\left(2.8_{n}\right)_{\lambda}$. Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{1}-1 / n \leq u(a) \leq r_{2}+1 / n \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, integrating (2.3) from $b$ to $t \in \mathbf{J}$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varrho_{1} \leq u^{\prime}(t) \leq \varrho_{2} \quad \text { for each } \quad t \in \mathbf{J}, \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\varrho_{1}=R_{1}-\int_{a}^{b} \varphi(t) d t, \varrho_{2}=R_{2}+\int_{a}^{b} \varphi(t) d t$. Finally, integrating (2.12) from $a$ to $t \in \mathbf{J}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{1}-1 / n \leq u(t) \leq c_{2}+1 / n \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c_{i}=r_{i}+\varrho_{i}(b-a), i=1,2$.
3. Application of the Continuation Theorem to problem (2.9) $\lambda_{\lambda}$.

Let us put $\Omega=\left\{x \in X: c_{1}-1<x(t)<c_{2}+1, \varrho_{1}-1<x^{\prime}(t)<\varrho_{2}+1\right.$ for each $t \in \mathbf{J}\}$. Then Ker $L \cap \delta \Omega=\left\{x \in \mathbf{X}: x(t) \equiv c, c=c_{1}-1\right.$ or $\left.c=c_{2}+1\right\}$. Estimates (2.12) and (2.13) ensure that condition (a) of the Continuation Theorem is valid.

Let us check condition (b). The equation $Q N x=0$ for $x \in \partial \Omega \cap$ Ker $L$ has the form $\tilde{g}_{1 n}\left(c_{1}-1,0\right)=0$ or $\tilde{g}_{1 n}\left(c_{2}+1,0\right)=0$. But $\mu \tilde{g}_{1 n}\left(c_{1}-1,0\right)=$ $\mu g_{1}\left(r_{1}, 0\right)-\left(r_{1}-1 / n-c_{1}+1\right)<0$ and $\mu \tilde{g}_{1 n}\left(c_{2}+1,0\right)=\mu g_{1}\left(r_{2}, 0\right)+\left(c_{2}+1-r_{2}-\right.$ $1 / n)>0$. Now put $\mathcal{J}: \operatorname{Im} Q \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ker} L,(0, \alpha, 0) \longmapsto \alpha$. Then $N_{0}=\mathcal{J Q N}:$ $\operatorname{Ker} L \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ker} L$ has the form $N_{0}(c)=\tilde{g}_{1 n}(c, 0), c \in\left(c_{1}-1, c_{2}+1\right)$. Since $\operatorname{sgn} \tilde{g}_{1 n}\left(c_{1}-1,0\right) \neq \operatorname{sgn} \tilde{g}_{1 n}\left(c_{2}+1,0\right)$, we have $\mathrm{d}\left[N_{0},\left(c_{1}-1, c_{2}+1\right), 0\right] \neq 0$ and (c) is valid. Therefore problem (2.9) ${ }_{1}$ has at least one solution in $\operatorname{dom} L \cap \bar{\Omega}$.

## 4. Limitting process

In order to complete the proof observe that for any $n \in \mathbb{N} n>1$, problem (2.7), (2.8n $)_{1}$ has a solution $u_{n}$ satisfying (2.10), (2.11), (2.12), (2.13). By the Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem and the integrated form of the equation one gets the existence of a uniformly converging subsequence of $\left(u_{n}\right)_{1}^{\infty}$ whose limit is a solution of (1.1), (1.2) satisfying (2.4). The proof is complete.

Conditions (2.1) and (2.2) can be modified in the following way:
Theorem 2.2. Let $r_{1}, r_{2} \in \mathbb{R}, r_{1} \leq r_{2},-R_{1}, R_{2} \in[0, \infty), \mu, \nu \in\{-1,1\}$ and $\varphi \in \mathbf{L}(\mathrm{J})$ be such that for a.e. $t \in \mathbf{J}$ and each $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ the conditions (2.3),

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mu g_{2}\left(r_{1}, 0\right) \leq 0, \quad \mu g_{2}\left(r_{2}, 0\right) \geq 0  \tag{2.14}\\
& \nu g_{1}\left(x, R_{1}\right) \leq 0, \quad \nu g_{1}\left(x, R_{2}\right) \geq 0 \tag{2.15}
\end{align*}
$$

are satisfied.
The problem (1.1), (1.2) has a solution $u$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{1} \leq u(b) \leq r_{2}, \quad R_{1} \leq u^{\prime}(a) \leq R_{2} . \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 3. Unbounded nonlinearity

Here, we replace the boundedness (1.5) in Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 by appropriate sign conditions.

Theorem 3.1. Let there exist $r_{1}, r_{2} \in \mathbb{R}, r_{1} \leq r_{2},-R_{1}, R_{2} \in[0, \infty)$, $\mu, \nu \in\{-1,1\}$ such that for a.e. $t \in \mathbf{J}$ and each $x \in\left[d_{1}, d_{2}\right]$ with $d_{i}=$ $r_{i}+R_{i}(b-a), i=1,2$, the conditions (2.1), (2.2) and

$$
\begin{equation*}
f\left(t, x, R_{2}\right) \geq 0, \quad f\left(t, x, R_{1}\right) \leq 0 \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

are fulfilled.
Then problem (1.1), (1.2) has a solution $u$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{1} \leq u(a) \leq r_{2}, \quad R_{1} \leq u^{\prime}(t) \leq R_{2} \quad \text { for each } \quad t \in \mathrm{~J} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let us set

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sigma(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
d_{2} & \text { for } & x>d_{2} \\
x & \text { for } & d_{1} \leq x \leq d_{2}, \\
d_{1} & \text { for } & x<d_{1}
\end{array}\right. \\
& \varrho(y)=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
R_{2} & \text { for } & y>R_{2} \\
y & \text { for } & R_{1} \leq y \leq R_{2}, \\
R_{1} & \text { for } & y<R_{1}
\end{array}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\tilde{f}(t, x, y)=f(t, \sigma(x), \varrho(y))+\frac{y-\varrho(y)}{|y-\varrho(y)|+1} \\
\tilde{g}_{1}(x, y)=g_{1}(\sigma(x), y), \quad i=1,2
\end{gathered}
$$

and consider the problem

$$
\begin{gather*}
x^{\prime \prime}=\tilde{f}\left(t, x, x^{\prime}\right)  \tag{3.3}\\
\tilde{g}_{1}\left(x(a), x^{\prime}(a)\right)=0, \quad \tilde{g}_{2}\left(x(b), x^{\prime}(b)\right)=0 \tag{3.4}
\end{gather*}
$$

The function $\tilde{f}$ fulfils (2.3) of Theorem 2.1 with $\varphi(t)=\sup \{|f(t, x, y)|: x \in$ $\left.\left[d_{1}, d_{2}\right], y \in\left[R_{1}, R_{2}\right]\right\}+1$ and $\tilde{g}_{1}, \tilde{g}_{2}$ fulfil (2.1), (2.2) respectively for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$. So, problem (3.3), (3.4) has a solution $u$ satisfying (2.4). Suppose $\max \left\{u^{\prime}(t): t \in \mathbf{J}\right\}=u^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)>R_{2}$. Then $t_{0} \in[a, b)$ and we can find $\delta>0$ such that $R_{2}<u^{\prime}(t) \leq u^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)$ for each $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta\right]$. On the other hand, by (3.1),

$$
\int_{t_{0}}^{t_{0}+\delta} u^{\prime \prime}(\tau) d \tau=\int_{t_{0}}^{t_{0}+\delta}\left[f\left(\tau, \sigma(u(\tau)), R_{2}\right)+\frac{u^{\prime}(\tau)-R_{2}}{u^{\prime}(\tau)-R_{2}+1}\right] d \tau>0
$$

a contradiction. The inequality $R_{1} \leq u^{\prime}(t)$ for each $t \in \mathbf{J}$ can be proved by similar arguments. Thus $R_{1} \leq u^{\prime}(t)^{\prime} \leq R_{2}$ for each $t \in \mathbf{J}$. Integrating the latter from $a$ to $t \in J$, we get $d_{1} \leq u(t) \leq d_{2}$ and we can see that $u$ is a solution of (1.1), (1.2) as well.

Theorem 3.2. Let there exist $r_{1}, r_{2} \in \mathbb{R}, r_{1} \leq r_{2},-R_{1}, R_{2} \in[0, \infty)$, $\mu, \nu \in\{-1,1\}$ such that for a.e. $t \in J$ and each $x \in\left[d_{1}, d_{2}\right]$ with $d_{i}=$ $r_{i}+R_{i}(b-a), i=1,2$, the conditions (2.14), (2.15) and

$$
f\left(t, x, R_{2}\right) \leq 0, \quad f\left(t, x, R_{1}\right) \geq 0
$$

are fulfilled.
Then problem (1.1), (1.2) has a solution $u$ satisfying

$$
r_{1} \leq u(b) \leq r_{2}, \quad R_{1} \leq u^{\prime}(t) \leq R_{2} \quad \text { for each } \quad t \in \mathbf{J}
$$

Proof. Using Theorem 2.2 instead of Theorem 2.1 and setting $\tilde{f}(t, x, y)=f(t, \sigma(x), \varrho(y))+(\varrho(y)-y) /(|y-\varrho(y)|+1)$, we can prove Theorem 3.2 similarly as Theorem 3.1.

Example. Let us show $f, g_{1}, \boldsymbol{g}_{2}$ satisfying the conditions of Theorem 3.1. Suppose $\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2} \in L(J) ; \varphi_{3} \in L^{\infty}(J), \varphi_{1} \geq 0, n \in \mathbb{N}$. We can choose both quickly growing functions, e.g.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(t, x, y)=\varphi_{1}(t) \cdot e^{x} \cdot y^{2 n-1}+\varphi_{3}(t) \\
& g_{1}(x, y)=x^{2} \cdot e^{y}+e^{x} \cdot y, \quad g_{2}(x, y)=y^{2 n} \cdot e^{x}-1,
\end{aligned}
$$

or oscillating functions, e.g.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(t, x, y)=\sin ^{2}\left(x+\varphi_{2}(t)\right) \cdot \cos y \\
& g_{1}(x, y)=\sin (x+y)+y+1, \quad i=1,2 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us note that the theorems of [6] cannot be used in this case.
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