

ON ONE NEUMANN TYPE PROBLEM FOR SECOND ORDER LINEAR DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

IVAN KIGURADZE

Dedicated to the Blessed Memory of Professor A. Kharadze

Abstract. Optimal in a certain sense conditions guaranteeing the existence of a unique solution of the differential equation

$$u'' = p(t)u + q(t),$$

satisfying the Neumann type boundary conditions

$$u'(a) = \ell_1 u(a) + c_1, \quad u'(b) = \ell_2 u(b) + c_2,$$

are established.

On a finite interval $[a, b]$, we consider the differential equation

$$u'' = p(t)u + q(t) \tag{1}$$

with the boundary conditions

$$u'(a) = \ell_1 u(a) + c_1, \quad u'(b) = \ell_2 u(b) + c_2, \tag{2}$$

where $p, q \in [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are Lebesgue integrable functions, $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ($i = 1, 2$),

$$\ell_1 \geq 0, \quad \ell_2 \leq 0.$$

For $\ell_i = 0$ ($i = 1, 2$), the boundary conditions (2) are the Neumann ones. In this case, problem (1), (2) is studied in detail (see, e.g., [1, 3–5] and the references therein). However, this problem in a general case remains still insufficiently studied. The present paper is devoted to fill up this gap.

Assume

$$p_+(t) \equiv (|p(t)| + p(t))/2, \quad p_-(t) \equiv (|p(t)| - p(t))/2,$$

$$\mathcal{P}_+ = \int_a^b p_+(t) dt, \quad \mathcal{P}_- = \int_a^b p_-(t) dt.$$

Theorem 1. Let $\ell_1 \geq 0$, $\ell_2 \leq 0$,

$$\ell_1 - \ell_2 + \text{mes} \{t \in [a, b] : p(t) \neq 0\} > 0, \tag{3}$$

$$\ell_1 - \ell_2 + \mathcal{P}_+ \leq \mathcal{P}_-, \tag{4}$$

and there exist a number $\lambda \geq 1$ such that

$$\int_a^b [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt \leq \frac{4}{b-a} \left(\frac{\pi}{b-a} \right)^{2\lambda-2}. \tag{5}$$

Then problem (1), (2) has one and only one solution.

To prove this theorem, we need the following

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 34B05.

Key words and phrases. Second order linear ordinary differential equation; The Neuman type problem; Unique solvability.

Lemma 1. *Let $\ell_1 \geq 0$, $\ell_2 \leq 0$, conditions (3), (4) be fulfilled and the homogeneous problem*

$$u'' = p(t)u, \quad (1_0)$$

$$u'(a) = \ell_1 u(a), \quad u'(b) = \ell_2 u(b) \quad (2_0)$$

have a nontrivial solution u . Then there exist points $t_0 \in]a, b[$, $t_1 \in [a, t_0[$, and $t_2 \in]t_0, b]$ such that

$$u(t_0) = 0, \quad u'(t_1) = 0, \quad u'(t_2) = 0. \quad (6)$$

Proof. In view of (2₀), it is obvious that

$$u(a) \neq 0, \quad u(b) \neq 0. \quad (7)$$

First, let us show that the solution u in the interval $]a, b[$ has at least one zero. Assume the contrary, i.e., $u(t) \neq 0$ for $a < t < b$. Then by virtue of inequality (7), we have

$$u(t) \neq 0 \quad \text{for } a \leq t \leq b.$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{u''(t)}{u(t)} + p(t) = 0 \quad \text{for almost all } t \in [a, b]. \quad (8)$$

Integrating this identity from a to b , and taking into account equality (2₀), we find

$$\int_a^b \frac{u'^2(t)}{u^2(t)} dt = \ell_1 - \ell_2 + \mathcal{P}_+ - \mathcal{P}_-,$$

whence, owing to conditions (2)–(4) and (8), it follows that $u'(t) \equiv 0$,

$$p(t) = 0 \quad \text{for almost all } t \in]a, b], \quad \ell_1 - \ell_2 > 0,$$

and either $u(a) = 0$, or $u(b) = 0$. But this contradicts condition (7). The obtained contradiction proves that for some $t_0 \in]a, b[$ the equality

$$u(t_0) = 0 \quad (9)$$

is fulfilled.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that

$$u'(t_0) > 0. \quad (10)$$

If $\ell_1 = 0$, then

$$u'(t_1) = 0, \quad (11)$$

where $t_1 = a$. Let us show that if $\ell_1 > 0$, then this equality is fulfilled for some $t_1 \in]a, t_0[$. Assume the contrary, i.e.,

$$u'(t) > 0 \quad \text{for } a < t \leq t_0.$$

Then, in view of (9), we have

$$u(t) < 0 \quad \text{for } a \leq t < t_0.$$

But this is impossible since

$$u(a) = u'(a)/\ell_1 \geq 0.$$

Thus we have proved that for some $t_1 \in [a, t_0[$ equality (11) is fulfilled.

Analogously we can show that for some $t_2 \in]t_0, b]$, the equality

$$u'(t_2) = 0$$

is fulfilled. □

Lemma 2 (T. Kiguradze [2]). *Let for some $a_0 \in [a, b[$ and $b_0 \in]a_0, b]$ the differential equation (1₀) have a nontrivial solution u satisfying either the boundary conditions*

$$u'(a_0) = 0, \quad u(b_0) = 0,$$

or the boundary conditions

$$u(a_0) = 0, \quad u'(b_0) = 0.$$

Then

$$(b_0 - a_0)^{2\lambda-1} \int_{a_0}^{b_0} [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt > \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{2\lambda-2} \text{ for } \lambda \geq 1.$$

This lemma is a corollary of Theorem 1.3 from [2].

Proof of Theorem 1. Assume that the theorem is not true. Then, owing to the Fredholmicity of problem (1), (2), the homogeneous problem (1₀), (2₀) has a nontrivial solution u .

According to Lemma 1, there exist points $t_0 \in]a, b[$, $t_1 \in [a, t_0[$ and $t_2 \in]t_0, b]$ such that the solution u satisfies equalities (6). Thus by Lemma 2, we have the inequalities

$$(t_0 - t_1)^{2\lambda-1} \int_{t_1}^{t_0} [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt > \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{2\lambda-2}, \quad (t_2 - t_0)^{2\lambda-1} \int_{t_0}^{t_2} [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt > \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{2\lambda-2}.$$

Consequently,

$$[(t_0 - t_1)(t_2 - t_0)]^{2\lambda-1} \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_0} [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt\right) \left(\int_{t_0}^{t_2} [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt\right) > \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{4\lambda-4}.$$

On the other hand,

$$(t_0 - t_1)(t_2 - t_0) \leq \frac{(t_2 - t_1)^2}{4} \leq \frac{(b - a)^2}{4},$$

$$\left(\int_{t_1}^{t_0} [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt\right) \left(\int_{t_0}^{t_2} [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt\right) \leq \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt\right)^2 / 4 \leq \left(\int_a^b [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt\right)^2 / 4.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{b - a}{2}\right)^{4\lambda-2} \left(\int_a^b [p(s)]_-^\lambda ds\right)^2 > \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{4\lambda-4}.$$

However, this inequality contradicts inequality (5). The obtained contradiction proves the theorem. \square

Remark 1. If $\ell_1 \geq 0$ and $\ell_2 \leq 0$, then for problem (1), (2) to be uniquely solvable, it is necessary that inequality (3) is fulfilled. Indeed, if the above-mentioned inequality is violated, then $p(t) = 0$ for almost all $t \in]a, b[$, $\ell_1 = \ell_2 = 0$ and, consequently, the homogeneous problem (1₀), (2₀) has an infinite set of solutions.

Remark 2. Examples 1 and 2 below show that conditions (4) and (5) in Theorem 1 are unimprovable and they cannot be replaced by the conditions

$$\ell_1 - \ell_2 + \mathcal{P}_+ < \mathcal{P}_- + \varepsilon, \tag{12}$$

$$\int_a^b [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt < \frac{4}{b - a} \left(\frac{\pi + \varepsilon}{b - a}\right)^{2\lambda-2} \tag{13}$$

no matter how small $\varepsilon > 0$ is.

Example 1. Let ε be an arbitrary positive constant,

$$p(t) \equiv -\left(\frac{2x}{b-a}\right)^2, \quad \ell_1 = \frac{2x}{b-a} \operatorname{tg}(x), \quad \ell_2 = -\frac{2x}{b-a} \operatorname{tg}(x), \quad (14)$$

and $x \in]0, 1[$ be so small that

$$\frac{4x}{b-a} \operatorname{tg}(x) < \frac{4x^2}{b-a} + \varepsilon.$$

Then $\ell_1 > 0$, $\ell_2 < 0$,

$$\ell_1 - \ell_2 + \mathcal{P}_+ = \frac{4x}{b-a} \operatorname{tg}(x) < \mathcal{P}_- + \varepsilon,$$

$$\int_a^b [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt = (b-a) \left(\frac{2x}{b-a}\right)^{2\lambda} < (b-a) \left(\frac{2}{b-a}\right)^{2\lambda} < \frac{4}{b-a} \left(\frac{\pi}{b-a}\right)^{2\lambda-2}.$$

Consequently, all the conditions of Theorem 1 are fulfilled, except inequality (4), instead of which inequality (12) holds. Nevertheless, in this case the homogeneous problem (1₀), (2₀) has the nontrivial solution

$$u(t) \equiv \cos\left(\frac{2x(t-a)}{b-a} - x\right).$$

Example 2. Let $\varepsilon \in]0, \frac{\pi}{4}[$, $x \in]0, \varepsilon[$,

$$p(t) \equiv -\left(\frac{\pi+x}{b-a}\right)^2, \quad \ell_1 = \frac{\pi+x}{b-a} \operatorname{tg}(x), \quad \ell_2 = 0,$$

and the number $\lambda \in [1, +\infty[$ be such that

$$\frac{\pi+x}{b-a} < \left(\frac{2}{b-a}\right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} \left(\frac{\pi+\varepsilon}{b-a}\right)^{1-\frac{1}{\lambda}}.$$

Then

$$\ell_1 - \ell_2 + \mathcal{P}_+ = \frac{\pi+x}{b-a} \operatorname{tg}(x) < \frac{\pi+x}{b-a} < \frac{(\pi+x)^2}{b-a} = \mathcal{P}_-,$$

$$\int_a^b [p(t)]_-^\lambda dt = (b-a) \left(\frac{\pi+x}{b-a}\right)^{2\lambda} < \frac{4}{b-a} \left(\frac{\pi+\varepsilon}{b-a}\right)^{2\lambda-2}.$$

Consequently, all the conditions of Theorem 1 are fulfilled, except inequality (5), instead of which inequality (13) holds. On the other hand, the homogeneous problem (1₀), (2₀) has the nontrivial solution

$$u(t) \equiv \cos\left(\frac{(\pi+x)(t-a)}{b-a} - x\right).$$

Theorem 2. If $\ell_1 \geq 0$, $\ell_2 \leq 0$, and

$$\mathcal{P}_- < \frac{\ell_1 - \ell_2 + \mathcal{P}_+}{1 + (b-a)(\ell_1 - \ell_2 + \mathcal{P}_+)}, \quad (15)$$

then problem (1), (2) has one and only one solution.

Proof. First note that inequality (15) yields the following inequalities

$$\delta = \ell_1 - \ell_2 + \mathcal{P}_+ - \mathcal{P}_- > 0, \quad (16)$$

$$r = 1 - (b-a)(\mathcal{P}_- + \delta^{-1}\mathcal{P}_-^2) > 0. \quad (17)$$

Assume that the theorem is not true. Then the homogeneous problem (1₀), (2₀) has a nontrivial solution u . Put

$$x = \min \{|u(t)| : a \leq t \leq b\}, \quad y = \left(\int_a^b u'^2(t) dt\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then

$$x^2 \leq u^2(t) \leq x^2 + 2(b - a)^{\frac{1}{2}}y + (b - a)y^2 \text{ for } a \leq t \leq b. \tag{18}$$

On the other hand, in view of inequality (16), it is obvious that

$$y > 0. \tag{19}$$

Integrating both sides of the identity

$$u''(t)u(t) = p(t)u^2(t) \text{ for almost all } t \in [a, b]$$

from a to b and taking into account the boundary conditions (2₀), we obtain

$$\ell_1 u^2(a) - \ell_2 u^2(b) + \int_a^b [p(t)]_+ u^2(t) dt + \int_a^b u'^2(t) dt = \int_a^b [p(t)]_- u^2(t) dt.$$

Thus, by inequality (18), it follows that

$$(\ell_1 - \ell_2 + \mathcal{P}_+)x^2 + y^2 \leq \mathcal{P}_-(x^2 + 2(b - a)^{\frac{1}{2}}xy + (b - a)y^2),$$

that is,

$$(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}x - (b - a)^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{P}_-y)^2 + ry^2 \leq 0.$$

However, this inequality contradicts inequalities (17) and (19). The obtained contradiction proves the theorem. □

Remark 3. Condition (15) is unimprovable and it cannot be replaced by the condition

$$\mathcal{P}_- < \frac{\ell_1 - \ell_2 + \mathcal{P}_+}{1 + (b - a)(\ell_1 - \ell_2 + \mathcal{P}_+)} + \varepsilon \tag{20}$$

no matter how small is $\varepsilon > 0$.

Indeed, if

$$0 < \varepsilon < \frac{4}{b - a}, \quad 0 < x < \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}(b - a)^{\frac{1}{2}}/2,$$

and the function p and numbers ℓ_i ($i = 1, 2$) are defined by equalities (14), then instead of (15) inequality (20) holds, but nevertheless, the homogeneous problem (1₀), (2₀) has the nontrivial solution

$$u(t) \equiv \cos\left(\frac{2x(t - a)}{b - a} - x\right).$$

REFERENCES

1. I. Kiguradze, The Neumann problem for the second order nonlinear ordinary differential equations at resonance. *Funct. Differ. Equ.* **16** (2009), no. 2, 353–371.
2. T. Kiguradze, On solvability and unique solvability of two-point singular boundary value problems. *Nonlinear Anal.* **71** (2009), no. 3-4, 789–798.
3. I. T. Kiguradze, T. I. Kiguradze, Conditions for the well-posedness of nonlocal problems for second-order linear differential equations. (Russian) *Differ. Uravn.* **47** (2011), no. 10, 1400–1411; translation in *Differ. Equ.* **47** (2011), no. 10, 1414–1425.
4. I. Kiguradze, N. Partsvania, Some optimal conditions for the solvability and unique solvability of the two-point Neumann problem. *Mem. Differ. Equ. Math. Phys.* **75** (2018), 115–128.
5. H. Zh. Wang, Y. Li, Neumann boundary value problems for second-order ordinary differential equations across resonance. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **33** (1995), no. 5, 1312–1325.

(Received 16.02.2020)

A. RAZMADZE MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE OF IVANE JAVAKHISHVILI TBILISI STATE UNIVERSITY, 6 TAMARASHVILI STR.,
 TBILISI 0177, GEORGIA
E-mail address: ivane.kiguradze@tsu.ge