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# ORDINARY DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS WITH NONLINEAR BOUNDARY CONDITIONS 
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#### Abstract

The method of lower and upper solutions combined with the monotone iterative technique is used for ordinary differential equations with nonlinear boundary conditions. Some existence results are formulated for such problems.
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## 1. Introduction

In this paper, we shall consider the following differential problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
x^{\prime}(t)=f(t, x(t)), \quad t \in J=[0, T], \quad T>0  \tag{1}\\
x(0)=g(x(T))
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $f \in C(J \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), g \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$.
It is well known that the monotone iterative technique is a powerful method used to approximate solutions of several problems (see, for example [5]). The purpose of this paper is to show that it can be applied successfully to problems of type (1). Assuming one-sided Lipschitz condition on $f$ (with respect to the second variable) combined with the corresponding monotonicity conditions on $g$, it is shown that linear iterations converge to a solution of problem (1). Some comparison results are also formulated.

In many papers, the monotone iterative technique was applied to problem (1) when $g(u)=\lambda u+k$. If $\lambda=0$, then (1) reduces to the initial value problem for differential equations and this case is considered, for example, in [6], [7], [9], [10]. If $\lambda=1$ and $k=0$, then we have a periodic boundary problem considered, for example, in [8], [10], while if $\lambda=-1$ and $k=0$, then we have an antiperiodic boundary problem, see [10], [11], [12]. A general case where $\lambda, k \in \mathbb{R}$ is discussed in [1]. Nonlinear problems, more general than (1), are studied, for example, in [2], [3], [4].

## 2. Some General Facts

From Theorem 1.1 proven in [2] follows

Theorem 1. Let $f \in C(J \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), g \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$. Moreover, we assume that there exist functions $y_{0}, z_{0} \in C^{1}(J, \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
y_{0}(t) \leq z_{0}(t), \quad y_{0}^{\prime}(t) \leq f\left(t, y_{0}(t)\right), \quad z_{0}^{\prime}(t) \geq f\left(t, z_{0}(t)\right), \quad t \in J \\
y_{0}(0) \leq g(s) \leq z_{0}(0) \text { for } y_{0}(T) \leq s \leq z_{0}(T)
\end{gathered}
$$

Then problem (1) has at least one solution in $\Delta=\left\{w \in C^{1}(J, \mathbb{R}): y_{0}(t) \leq\right.$ $\left.w(t) \leq z_{0}(t), t \in J\right\}$.

On the basis of Theorem 1 one can easily prove
Theorem 2. Let the conditions of Theorem 1 be satisfied and, moreover, let the function $g$ be nondecreasing. Then problem (1) has, in the set $\Delta$, the minimal and the maximal solution.

As for the uniqueness of the solution of problem (1), the following result holds.

Theorem 3 (Kiguradze). Let the conditions of Theorem 1 be fulfilled and, moreover,

$$
\begin{gather*}
f(t, v)-f(t, u) \leq h(t)(v-u) \text { for } t \in J, \quad y_{0}(t) \leq u \leq v \leq z_{0}(t)  \tag{2}\\
g(v)-g(u) \leq L(v-u) \text { for } y_{0}(T) \leq u \leq v \leq z_{0}(T) \tag{3}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $h: J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an integrable function and $L$ is a nonnegative constant such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
L \exp \left(\int_{0}^{T} h(s) d s\right)<1 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then problem (1) has, in the set $\Delta$, a unique solution.
Proof. The existence of a solution of (1) follows from Theorem 1. Thus it remains to prove the uniqueness. Let $x, \bar{x} \in \Delta$ be arbitrary two solutions of (1). We distinguish two cases.

Case 1. $x(t) \neq \bar{x}(t)$ for all $t \in J$. Indeed, without the loss of generality, we can assume that $p(t)=x(t)-\bar{x}(t)>0$ for $t \in J$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
p^{\prime}(t) & =f(t, x(t))-f(t, \bar{x}(t)) \leq h(t) p(t), \quad t \in J, \\
p(0) & =g(x(T))-g(\bar{x}(T)) \leq L p(T),
\end{aligned}
$$

by assumptions (2) and (3). Therefore,

$$
0<p(0) \leq L p(T) \leq L \exp \left(\int_{0}^{T} h(s) d s\right) p(0)
$$

By condition (4), this inequality yields $p(0)=0$ and thus $p(t)=0$ on $J$, which is a contradiction.

Case 2. There exists $t_{0} \in J$ such that $x\left(t_{0}\right)=\bar{x}\left(t_{0}\right)$. If $t_{0}=T$ or $t_{0}=0$, then

$$
x(0)=g(x(T))=g(\bar{x}(T))=\bar{x}(0) .
$$

This and condition (2) prove that $x(t)=\bar{x}(t)$ on $J$, which is a contradiction. If $t_{0} \in(0, T)$, then $x(t)=\bar{x}(t)$ on $\left[t_{0}, T\right]$. Hence $x(T)=\bar{x}(T)$, so $x(0)=\bar{x}(0)$ showing that $x(t)=\bar{x}(t)$ on $J$. It is a contradiction. This proves that problem (1) has, in $\Delta$, a unique solution. It ends the proof.

In the next two sections we are going to construct the solution of problem (1).

## 3. Case where $g$ is Nondecreasing

A function $u \in C^{1}(J, \mathbb{R})$ is said to be a lower solution of problem (1) if

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
u^{\prime}(t) \leq f(t, u(t)), \quad t \in J \\
u(0) \leq g(u(T))
\end{array}\right.
$$

and an upper solution of (1) if the inequalities are reversed.
Let $\Omega=\left\{u: y_{0}(t) \leq u \leq z_{0}(t), t \in J\right\}$ be a nonempty set.
We introduce the following assumptions for later use.
$\left(H_{1}\right) f \in C(J \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), g \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$;
$\left(H_{2}\right) y_{0}, z_{0} \in C^{1}(J, \mathbb{R})$ are a lower and an upper solution of (1), respectively, such that $y_{0}(t) \leq z_{0}(t), t \in J ;$
$\left(H_{3}\right)$ there exists $M \geq 0$ such that $f(t, u)-f(t, v) \leq M[v-u]$ for $t \in J, y_{0}(t) \leq$ $u \leq v \leq z_{0}(t) ;$
$\left(H_{4}\right) g$ is nondecreasing on the interval $\left[y_{0}(T), z_{0}(T)\right]$.
Lemma 1. Let Assumption $H_{1}$ hold. Assume that $u, v \in \Delta$ are a lower and an upper solution of problem (1), respectively, and $u(t) \leq v(t)$ on J. Let Assumptions $H_{3}, H_{4}$ hold. Let $y, z \in C^{1}(J, \mathbb{R})$ and

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
y^{\prime}(t)=\tilde{f}(t, y(t)) \equiv f(t, u(t))-M[y(t)-u(t)], & t \in J, \\
z^{\prime}(t)=\bar{f}(t, z(t)) \equiv f(t, v(t))-M[z(t)-v(t)], & t \in J,  \tag{6}\\
z(0)=g(v(T))
\end{array}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(t) \leq y(t) \leq z(t) \leq v(t), \quad t \in J \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $y, z$ are a lower and an upper solution of problem (1), respectively.
Proof. It is easy to see that problems (5) and (6) have their unique solutions $y, z \in C^{1}(J, \mathbb{R})$. Put $p=u-y$, so $p(0) \leq g(u(T))-g(u(T))=0$, and $p^{\prime}(t) \leq f(t, u(t))-\widetilde{f}(t, y(t))=-M p(t)$. It gives $p(t) \leq 0$ on $J$ so $u(t) \leq y(t)$, $t \in J$. Similarly, we get $z(t) \leq v(t), t \in J$. Now let $q=y-z$. Then $q(0)=g(u(T))-g(v(T)) \leq 0$, by Assumption $H_{4}$. Moreover, Assumption $H_{3}$ yields

$$
q^{\prime}(t)=f(t, u(t))-f(t, v(t))-M[q(t)-u(t)+v(t)] \leq-M q(t)
$$

This and the condition for $q(0)$ prove that $q(t) \leq 0$ on $J$, so (7) holds.
Now we need to show that $y, z$ are a lower and an upper solution of (1), respectively. Indeed, in view of Assumptions $H_{3}$ and $H_{4}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
y^{\prime}(t) & =\widetilde{f}(t, y(t))-f(t, y(t))+f(t, y(t)) \\
& \leq f(t, y(t))+M[y(t)-u(t)]-M[y(t)-u(t)]=f(t, y(t)), \\
z^{\prime}(t) & =\bar{f}(t, z(t))-f(t, z(t))+f(t, z(t)) \\
& \geq f(t, z(t))-M[v(t)-z(t)]-M[z(t)-v(t)]=f(t, z(t))
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
y(0)=g(u(T)) \leq g(y(T)), \quad z(0)=g(v(t)) \geq g(z(T)) .
$$

This ends the proof.
Note that if Assumptions $H_{1}$ to $H_{4}$ are satisfied, then by Lemma 1 the sequences $y_{n}, z_{n} \in C^{1}(J, \mathbb{R})(n=0,1, \cdots)$ are defined uniquely so that for every natural $n$ we have

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
y_{n+1}^{\prime}(t)=f\left(t, y_{n}(t)\right)-M\left[y_{n+1}(t)-y_{n}(t)\right], & t \in J, & y_{n+1}(0)=g\left(y_{n}(T)\right), \\
z_{n+1}^{\prime}(t)=f\left(t, z_{n}(t)\right)-M\left[z_{n+1}(t)-z_{n}(t)\right], & t \in J, & z_{n+1}(0)=g\left(z_{n}(T)\right) .
\end{array}\right.
$$

Theorem 4. Assume that Assumptions $H_{1}, H_{2}, H_{3}$ and $H_{4}$ hold. Then

$$
\begin{array}{r}
y_{0}(t) \leq y_{1}(t) \leq \cdots \leq y_{n}(t) \leq z_{n}(t) \leq \cdots \leq z_{1}(t) \leq z_{0}(t)  \tag{8}\\
\\
t \in J, \quad n=0,1, \ldots
\end{array}
$$

and uniformly on $J$ we have

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} y_{n}(t)=y(t), \quad \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} z_{n}(t)=z(t)
$$

where $y$ and $z$ are the minimal and the maximal solution of problem (1) in $\Delta$.
Proof. Using Lemma 1, by mathematical induction we can get (8). Indeed, the limits of sequences $\left\{y_{n}\right\},\left\{z_{n}\right\}$ are solutions of problem (1). By Theorem 2, problem (1) has, in $\Delta$, extremal solutions. To finish the proof, it is enough to show that $y$ and $z$ are the minimal and the maximal solution of (1). To do it, we need to show that if $w$ is any solution of (1) such that $y_{0}(t) \leq w(t) \leq z_{0}(t)$, $t \in J$, then $y_{0}(t) \leq y(t) \leq w(t) \leq z(t) \leq z_{0}(t), t \in J$. Assume that for some $k, y_{k}(t) \leq w(t) \leq z_{k}(t), t \in J$. Put $p=y_{k+1}-w, q=w-z_{k+1}$, so $p(0)=g\left(y_{k}(T)\right)-g(w(T)) \leq 0, q(0)=g(w(T))-g\left(z_{k}(T)\right) \leq 0$. Moreover,

$$
\begin{aligned}
p^{\prime}(t) & =f\left(t, y_{k}(t)\right)-M\left[y_{k+1}(t)-y_{k}(t)\right]-f(t, w(t)) \\
& \leq M\left[w(t)-y_{k}(t)\right]-M\left[y_{k+1}(t)-y_{k}(t)\right]=-M p(t), \\
q^{\prime}(t) & =f(t, w(t))-f\left(t, z_{k}(t)\right)+M\left[z_{k+1}(t)-z_{k}(t)\right] \leq-M q(t),
\end{aligned}
$$

by Assumptions $H_{3}$. It shows $p(t) \leq 0, q(t) \leq 0$ on $J$, so $y_{k+1}(t) \leq w(t) \leq$ $z_{k+1}(t)$ on $J$. Hence, by the method of mathematical induction, we have that $y_{n}(t) \leq w(t) \leq z_{n}(t)$ for $t \in J$ and for all natural $n$. Taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get the assertion of Theorem 4.

## 4. Case where $g$ is Nonincreasing

Functions $u, v \in C^{1}(J, \mathbb{R})$ are called weakly coupled (w.c.) lower and upper solutions of problem (1) if

$$
\begin{cases}u^{\prime}(t) \leq f(t, u(t)), & t \in J, \quad u(0) \leq g(v(T)) \\ v^{\prime}(t) \geq f(t, v(t)), & t \in J, \quad v(0) \geq g(u(T))\end{cases}
$$

Let us introduce the following assumptions.
$\left(H_{5}\right) y_{0}, z_{0} \in C^{1}(J, \mathbb{R})$ are w.c. lower and upper solutions of problem (1) and $y_{0}(t) \leq z_{0}(t), t \in J ;$
$\left(H_{6}\right) g$ is nonincreasing on the interval $\left[y_{0}(T), z_{0}(T)\right]$;
$\left(H_{7}\right)$ there exist nonnegative constants $A, M$ and an integrable function $K$ : $J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
-M[v-u] \leq f(t, v)-f(t, u) \leq K(t)[v-u] \text { for } t \in J, \\
y_{0}(t) \leq u \leq v \leq z_{0}(t) \\
-A[v-u] \leq g(v)-g(u) \leq 0 \text { for } y_{0}(T) \leq u \leq v \leq z_{0}(T) \tag{10}
\end{array}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
A \exp \left(\int_{0}^{T} K(s) d s\right)<1 \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 2. Assume that Assumption $H_{1}$ is satisfied. Let $u, v \in \Delta$ be w.c. lower and upper solutions of (1) and $u(t) \leq v(t), t \in J$. Let Assumptions $H_{3}$, $H_{6}$ hold. Let $y, z \in C^{1}(J, \mathbb{R})$ and

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
y^{\prime}(t)=f(t, u(t))-M[y(t)-u(t)], & t \in J, & y(0)=g(v(T)), \\
z^{\prime}(t)=f(t, v(t))-M[z(t)-v(t)], & t \in J, & z(0)=g(u(T)) .
\end{array}\right.
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(t) \leq y(t) \leq z(t) \leq v(t), \quad t \in J \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $y, z$ are w.c. lower and upper solutions of problem (1).
Proof. Note that $y$ and $z$ are well defined. Put $p=u-y, q=z-v$. Then $p(0) \leq g(v(T))-g(v(T))=0, q(0) \leq g(u(T))-g(u(T))=0$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
p^{\prime}(t) & \leq f(t, u(t))-f(t, u(t))+M[y(t)-u(t)]=-M p(t), \\
q^{\prime}(t) & \leq f(t, v(t))-M[z(t)-v(t)]-f(t, v(t))=-M q(t), \quad t \in J .
\end{aligned}
$$

It yields $p(t) \leq 0, q(t) \leq 0, t \in J$, so $u(t) \leq y(t), z(t) \leq v(t), t \in J$. Now let $p=y-z$, so $p(0)=g(v(T))-g(u(T)) \leq 0$, by Assumption $H_{6}$. In view of Assumption $H_{3}$, we see that

$$
p^{\prime}(t)=f(t, u(t))-f(t, v(t))-M[y(t)-u(t)-z(t)+v(t)] \leq-M p(t)
$$

Hence $p(t) \leq 0$ on $J$, so (12) holds.

By Assumptions $H_{3}$ and $H_{6}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
y^{\prime}(t) & =f(t, u(t))-M[y(t)-u(t)]-f(t, y(t))+f(t, y(t)) \\
& \leq f(t, y(t))+M[y(t)-u(t)]-M[y(t)-u(t)]=f(t, y(t)) \\
z^{\prime}(t) & =f(t, v(t))-M[z(t)-v(t)]-f(t, z(t))+f(t, z(t)) \geq f(t, z(t))
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
y(0)=g(v(T)) \leq g(z(T)), \quad z(0)=g(u(T)) \geq g(y(T))
$$

It proves that $y, z$ are w.c. lower and upper solutions of problem (1).
The proof is complete.
We see that if the assumptions of Lemma 2 are satisfied then the sequences $y_{n}, z_{n} \in C^{1}(J, \mathbb{R})(n=0,1, \cdots)$ are defined uniquely so that for every natural $n$ we have

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
y_{n+1}^{\prime}(t)=f\left(t, y_{n}(t)\right)-M\left[y_{n+1}(t)-y_{n}(t)\right], & t \in J, & y_{n+1}(0)=g\left(z_{n}(T)\right) \\
z_{n+1}^{\prime}(t)=f\left(t, z_{n}(t)\right)-M\left[z_{n+1}(t)-z_{n}(t)\right], & t \in J, & z_{n+1}(0)=g\left(y_{n}(T)\right)
\end{array}\right.
$$

Theorem 5. Assume that Assumptions $H_{1}, H_{5}, H_{7}$ hold. Then problem (1) has a unique solution $x \in \Delta$,

$$
\begin{array}{r}
y_{0}(t) \leq y_{1}(t) \leq \cdots \leq y_{n}(t) \leq z_{n}(t) \leq \cdots \leq z_{1}(t) \leq z_{0}(t)  \tag{13}\\
\\
t \in J, \quad n=0,1, \ldots
\end{array}
$$

and uniformly on $J$ we have

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} y_{n}(t)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} z_{n}(t)=x(t)
$$

Proof. It is easy to verify that all assumptions of Theorem 3 are satisfied, so problem (1) has a unique solution $x \in \Delta$. To finish the proof, it is enough to show that the sequences $y_{n}, z_{n}$ converge to $x$. Using Lemma 2, we can prove (13), by mathematical induction. It follows from the standard argument that $\left\{y_{n}\right\},\left\{z_{n}\right\}$ converge uniformly to their respective limit functions. Let $y(t)=$ $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} y_{n}(t), z(t)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} z_{n}(t)$. Then

$$
\begin{cases}y^{\prime}(t)=f(t, y(t)), & t \in J,  \tag{14}\\ z^{\prime}(t)=f(t, z(t)), & t \in J, \\ z(0)=g(z(T)) \\ \end{cases}
$$

and $y_{0}(t) \leq y(t) \leq z(t) \leq z_{0}(t), t \in J$. Put $p=z-y$, so $p(t) \geq 0$ on $J$. Hence $p(0)=g(y(T))-g(z(T)) \leq A p(T)$, by Assumption $H_{6}$. Moreover,

$$
p^{\prime}(t)=f(t, z(t))-f(t, y(t)) \leq K(t) p(t), \quad t \in J
$$

This inequality yields

$$
0 \leq p(0) \leq A p(T) \leq A p(0) \exp \left(\int_{0}^{T} K(s) d s\right)
$$

since

$$
0 \leq p(t) \leq p(0) \exp \left(\int_{0}^{t} K(s) d s\right), t \in J
$$

By condition (11), $p(0)=0$, and thus $p(t)=0, t \in J$. This proves that $y(t)=z(t)$ on $J$, so $y$ and $z$ are solutions of problem (1). Since problem (1) has a unique solution $x$, we have $y=z=x$.

It ends the proof.
Remark. The results of this paper remain true if the constant $-M$ is replaced by an integrable on $J$ function $M$.
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