

A NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITION ON THE EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF 2π - PERIODIC SOLUTION OF DUFFING EQUATION

LI WEIGU (李伟固)*

Abstract

This paper gives a necessary and sufficient condition on the existence and uniqueness of 2π -periodic solution of Duffing equation

$$d^2x/dt^2 + g(x) = P(t) \quad (=P(t+2\pi)).$$

1. In this paper, we study the existence and uniqueness problem of 2π -periodic solution for Duffing equation

$$d^2x/dt^2 + g(x) = P(t), \quad (*)$$

where $g(x) \in C^1(R, R)$, and there exists u_0 such that $g'(u_0) > 0$, $P(t) \in C(R, R)$, $P(t) = P(t+2\pi)$, for all $t \in R^1$.

D. E. Leach^[1] proved the existence and uniqueness of 2π -periodic solution of (*) under the Lond condition.

$$m^2 < \lambda \leq g'(x) \leq \mu < (m+1)^2 \quad (g(0) = 0), \quad (1.1)$$

with a given integer $m \geq 0$ and two such constants λ and μ . R. Reissing^[2] proved the existence of periodic solution of (*) under a weaker condition.

$$m^2 < \lambda \leq g(x)/x \leq \mu < (m+1)^2 \quad |x| \geq C > 0. \quad (1.2)$$

Tung-Ren Ding^[3] resolved the existence problem of (*) under a weakened version of (1.1)

$$m^2 \leq g'(x) \leq (m+1)^2, \quad (1.3)$$

and in this paper, by using a theorem due to T. R. Ding, we improve the result of D. E. Leach^[1].

2. We need the following hypotheses.

$$(H_1) \quad m^2 \leq g'(x) \leq (m+1)^2,$$

$$(H_2) \quad H(g) = \min \left\{ \sup_{x \in R} |g(x) - m^2 x|, \sup_{x \in R} |g(x) - (m+1)^2 x| \right\} = +\infty,$$

$$(H_3) \quad \text{int } A = \emptyset, \text{ where } A = \{x | g'(x) = m^2, (m+1)^2\},$$

where $m \geq 0$ is an integer.

The main purpose of this paper is to show

Theorem. For every 2π -periodic function $P(t)$, (*) has one and only one 2π -

periodic solution if and only if $(H_1)-(H_3)$ hold.

To prove the theorem, we need two lemmas.

Lemma 1. For any $x, y, x \neq y$, we assume that

$$m^2 < (g(x) - g(y)) / (x - y) < (m+1)^2,$$

where $m \geq 0$ is a given integer. Then (*) has at most one 2π -periodic solution.

Proof Assuming both $x(t), y(t)$ are the 2π -periodic solution of (*) and $x(t) \neq y(t)$, for some $t \in R^1$, we get

$$x''(t) - y''(t) + g(x(t)) - g(y(t)) = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Let

$$x(t) - y(t) = r(t) \cos \theta(t), \quad x'(t) - y'(t) = r(t) \sin \theta(t). \quad (2.2)$$

We can prove easily that $r(t)$ is a 2π -periodic function, $r(t) \neq 0$ and

$$\cos \theta(2\pi) = \cos \theta(0), \quad \sin \theta(2\pi) = \sin \theta(0). \quad (2.3)$$

By applying (2.2) to (2.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} -d\theta/dt &= \sin^2 \theta(t) + \cos \theta(t) (g(x(t)) - g(y(t))) / r(t) \\ &= \begin{cases} \sin^2 \theta(t) + \cos^2 \theta(t) (g(x(t)) - g(y(t))) / (x(t) - y(t)), & x \neq y, \\ 1, & x = y. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that $d\theta/dt < 0$. Let T_i denote the time in which $\theta(t)$ decreases from θ_0 to $\theta_0 - 2(m+i)\pi$, ($i=0, 1$). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_0 &= \int_0^{T_0} dt = \int_{\theta_0 - 2m\pi}^{\theta_0} \frac{d\theta}{\sin^2 \theta + \cos \theta (g(x) - g(y)) / r} \\ &< \int_{\theta_0 - 2m\pi}^{\theta_0} \frac{d\theta}{\sin^2 \theta + m^2 \cos^2 \theta} = 2\pi. \end{aligned}$$

In the similar way, we have $T_1 > 2\pi$. So we get

$$2m\pi < \theta(2\pi) - \theta(0) < 2(m+1)\pi.$$

This is a contradiction with (2.3).

Lemma 2. Let $f(x) \in C(R, R)$. Suppose that there exist $x_0, x_1, x_0 < x_1$, such that $f(x_1) > 0 (< 0)$, $f(x_0) < 0 (> 0)$ and $\text{int } B = \emptyset$, where $B = \{x | f(x) = 0\}$. Then there exists $y \in [x_0, x_1]$ such that $f(y) = 0$ and for every neighbourhood $\delta(y)$ of y , there are y_1 and $y_2 \in \delta(y)$ satisfying that $f(y_1) \cdot f(y_2) < 0$.

Proof Assume the result is not true, so for every point $y \in [x_0, x_1]$, we can get an open neighbourhood $\delta(y)$ of y , such that any two points $z_1, z_2 \in \delta(y)$ satisfy $f(z_1) \cdot f(z_2) \geq 0$. By using Heine-Borel Theorem, we can get $y_1 (=x_0) < y_2 < \dots < y_{n-1} < y_n (=x_1)$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \delta(y_i) \supset [x_0, x_1]$ and $\delta(y_i) \cap \delta(y_{i+1}) \neq \emptyset$. From $\text{int } B = \emptyset$, we can get $l_i \in \delta(y_i) \cap \delta(y_{i+1})$ such that $f(l_i) \neq 0$. By the fact $l_i, l_{i+1} \in \delta(y_{i+1})$, we have

$$f(l_i) \cdot f(l_{i+1}) > 0 \quad (i=1, \dots, n-1).$$

So we have

$$f(x_0) \cdot f(x_1) > 0.$$

This is a contradiction.

3. The proof of the theorem.

1) The proof of "sufficient" part.

By using the result of [3], under the conditions (H_1) , (H_2) , we can prove the existence of 2π -periodic solution of $(*)$.

Under conditions (H_1) , (H_3) , for any $x, y, x \neq y$, we can prove easily that

$$m^2 < (g(x) - g(y)) / (x - y) < (m+1)^2.$$

Using Lemma 1, we get the uniqueness of 2π -periodic solution of $(*)$.

2) The proof of "necessary" part.

At first, we prove that $g(x)$ satisfies (H_3) .

Assume that it is not true. Let $x_0 \in \text{int } A$, so there is a neighbourhood $\delta(x_0)$ of x_0 such that for every $x \in \delta(x_0)$, $g'(x) = m^2$. We consider equation

$$x'' + g(x) = g(x_0). \quad (3.1)$$

We know that $x = x_0 + L \cos mt$ ($L \ll 1$) are solutions of (3.1). This is a contradiction with uniqueness.

Now we want to prove $g'(x) \geq 0$ ($x \in R^1$).

Assume it is not true. Then there exists y_0 such that $g'(y_0) < 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume $y_0 < u_0$. From $g'(u_0) > 0$, we can get two points $z_1, z_2 \in [y_0, u_0]$ such that $g(z_1) = g(z_2)$. We consider equation

$$x'' + g(x) = g(z_1). \quad (3.2)$$

It is obvious that both $x = z_1, x = z_2$ are 2π -periodic solutions of (3.2). This contradicts with the uniqueness.

Now we prove that (H_1) holds.

Let $I = \text{im}(g'(x))$. Suppose that $n^2 \in \text{int } I$, n is an integer. From $g'(x) \geq 0$ we know $n^2 \geq 1$. Considering the function $f(x) = g'(x) - n^2$, we can see that $f(x)$ satisfies the condition of Lemma 2. So we can get a point x_0 and two sequences y_i, w_i such that $w_i, y_i \rightarrow x_0$ ($i \rightarrow +\infty$) with $f(w_i) > 0, f(y_i) < 0$. Thus $g'(y_i) < n^2, g'(w_i) > n^2$. Let us consider equation

$$x'' + g(x) = g(x_0). \quad (3.3)$$

(3.3) has a center at point $(x_0, 0)$, and all orbits are closed orbits around the center. Let Γ denote the orbit which passes through the point $(x_0 + 1, 0)$ and whose period is $\tau(\Gamma)$; from the uniqueness, we know $\tau(\Gamma) \neq 2\pi/n$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\tau(\Gamma) - 2\pi/n \geq \delta > 0$. Now we consider the family of equations

$$x'' + g(x) = g(w_i), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots. \quad (3.4)_i$$

Let Γ_i denote the orbit of (3.4)_i which passes through $(x_0 + 1, 0)$ and whose period is $\tau(\Gamma_i)$. From $w_i \rightarrow x_0$, we have $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \tau(\Gamma_i) = \tau(\Gamma)$. so if k is large enough, we have

$$\tau(\Gamma_k) > 2\pi/n. \quad (3.5)$$

The period of any orbit near center $(w_k, 0)$ is about

$$2/(g'(w_k))^{1/2} < 2\pi/n \quad (k \gg 1). \quad (3.6)$$

From (3.5) and (3.6), we know that, between center $(w_k, 0)$ and Γ_k , there exists a closed orbit H_k whose period is $2\pi/n$. We obtain two 2π -periodic solutions of (3.4)_k: $x = w_k$ and H_k for any $k \gg 1$. This contradicts the uniqueness too. So $n^2 \in \text{int } I$. Then (H_1) holds.

At last we prove (E_2) holds.

Assume it is not true, i. e., $H(g) = M < +\infty$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $H(g) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |g(x) - m^2 x|$. Let $h(x) = g(x) - m^2 x$. Then we consider equation

$$x'' + g(x) = 3M \cos mt. \quad (3.7)$$

Let $x = \varphi(t)$ be a 2π -periodic solution of (3.7). So $\varphi(t)$ is a 2π -periodic solution of equation

$$x'' + m^2 x = 3M \cos mt - h(\varphi(t)). \quad (3.8)$$

From (3.8), we get

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \cos mt (3M \cos mt - h(\varphi(t))) dt = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

From (3.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 3M\pi &= \int_0^{2\pi} 3M \cos^2 mt dt = \int_0^{2\pi} \cos mt (h(\varphi(t))) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^{2\pi} |\cos mt (h(\varphi(t)))| dt \leq M \int_0^{2\pi} dt = 2M\pi. \end{aligned}$$

But (H_3) implies that $H(g) = M \neq 0$. Hence we obtain a contradiction.

The proof of the theorem is thus completed.

Finally, I am very grateful to Professor Tung-Ren Ding for his advice and instruction.

References

- [1] Leach, D. E., On Poincaré's perturbation theorem and a theorem of W. S. Loud, *J. Differential Equation*, **7** (1970), 34—53.
- [2] Reissing, R., Contractive mappings and periodically perturbed, nonconservative systems, *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur.*, **58** (1975), 696—702.
- [3] Ding, T. R., Nonlinear oscillations at a point of resonance, *Sci. Sinica* (in Chinese), Series A, **1** (1982), 1—12.