



The Existence and Uniqueness of Periodic Solutions for A Kind of Forced Rayleigh Equation

Omer ACAN^{*}

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Arts and Science, Siirt University, Siirt, Turkey

Received:04/08/2015

Accepted: 16/12/2015

ABSTRACT

In this study, the coincidence degree theory has been used to determine new results on the existence and uniqueness of T -periodic solutions for a type of Rayleigh equation as follows

$$u''(t) + f(t, u'(t))u'(t) + g(t, u(t)) = p(t).$$

Keywords: Rayleigh equation; Periodic solutions; existence; uniqueness; coincidence degree

1. INTRODUCTION

The dynamic behaviors of Rayleigh-type equations with and without deviating arguments have been extensively studied. It is still being studied because of its applications in many disciplines such as mechanics, physics, engineering and various other technical fields. In the recent past, the Rayleigh equation and Rayleigh type equations have been studied. These studies were focused on existence and uniqueness of periodic solutions with and without deviating arguments. (see [1-10]).

Recently, in 2008, Li and Huang [4] studied the Rayleigh equation of the form

$$u''(t) + f(t, u'(t)) + g(t, u(t)) = p(t). \quad (1.1)$$

They established sufficient conditions for the existence and uniqueness of T -periodic solutions of this equation.

The aim of this work is to determine sufficient conditions for existence and uniqueness of T -periodic solutions of the Rayleigh equation of the following form

$$u''(t) + f(t, u'(t))u'(t) + g(t, u(t)) = p(t)$$

or an equivalent system

$$\begin{cases} \frac{du}{dt} = v(t) \\ \frac{dv}{dt} = -f(t, v(t))v(t) - g(t, u(t)) + p(t) \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where $p: R \rightarrow R$ and $f, g: R \times R \rightarrow R$ are continuous functions, p is T -periodic, f and g are T -periodic in the first argument with period $T > 0$.

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

First, assume an operator equation in a Banach space X as follows

$$Lz = \lambda Nz, \quad \lambda \in (0,1) \quad (2.1)$$

where $L: DomL \cap X \rightarrow X$ is a linear operator and λ is a parameter. P and Q represent two projectors,

$$P: DomL \cap X \rightarrow X \text{ and } Q: X \rightarrow X/ImL.$$

For easy understanding, the continuation theorem [1, p.40] has been explained as follows.

Lemma 2.1. *Let X be a Banach space. Suppose that $L: DomL \subset X \rightarrow X$ is a Fredholm operator with index*

^{*}Corresponding author, e-mail: omeracan@yahoo.com

zero and $N: \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow X$ is L -compact on $\bar{\Omega}$ with Ω open bounded in X . Moreover, assume that all the following conditions are satisfied.

- (i) $Lz \neq \lambda Nz$, for all $z \in \partial \Omega \cap \text{Dom}L, \lambda \in (0,1)$;
- (ii) $QNz \neq 0$, for all $z \in \partial \Omega \cap \text{Ker}L$;
- (iii) The Brower degree $d[QN, \Omega \cap \text{Ker}L, 0] \neq 0$.

Then equation $Lz = Nz$ has at least one solution in $\bar{\Omega}$.

Second, the Brousk theorem has been described as follows:

Lemma 2.2. ([2]). Suppose $\Omega \subset R^n$ is an open bounded set which including the origin and symmetric with respect to the origin, if $A: \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow R^n$ is a continuous mapping, and

$$Az = -A(-z) \neq 0, \quad z \in \partial \Omega,$$

then $d[A, \Omega, 0] \neq 0$.

For ease of exposition, throughout this paper we will adopt the following notations:

$$|u|_k = \left(\int_0^T (|u(t)|^k dt) \right)^{\frac{1}{k}},$$

$$|u|_\infty = \max_{t \in [0,T]} |u(t)|.$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} u'(t) \\ v'(t) \end{pmatrix} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} v(t) \\ -f(t, v(t))v(t) - g(t, u(t)) + p(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda \in (0,1) \tag{2.4}$$

Again from (2.2) and (2.3), we can get

$$\text{Ker}L = R^2,$$

and

$$\text{Im}L = \left\{ z \in X: \int_0^T z(s) ds = 0 \right\}.$$

Hence, the linear operator L is Fredholm operator with index zero.

Define the continuous projectors $P: X \rightarrow \text{Ker}L$ and $Q: X \rightarrow X/\text{Im}L$ by setting

$$Pz(t) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T z(s) ds$$

and

$$Qz(t) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T z(s) ds.$$

Thus, $\text{Im}P = \text{Ker}L$ and $\text{Ker}Q = \text{Im}L$. Moreover, the generalized inverse (of L) $K_p: \text{Im}L \rightarrow \text{Dom}L \cap \text{Ker}P$ is described as

$$(K_p z)(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \int_0^t u(s) ds - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_0^t u(s) ds dt \\ \int_0^t v(s) ds - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_0^t v(s) ds dt \end{pmatrix}, \quad z(t) = \begin{pmatrix} u(t) \\ v(t) \end{pmatrix} \in \text{Im}L. \tag{2.5}$$

Therefore, from (2.3) and (2.5) it is easy to see that N is L -compact on $\bar{\Omega}$, where Ω is any open bounded set in X .

Let us denote

$$X = \left\{ z = (u(t), v(t))^T \in C(R, R^2): z \text{ is } T\text{-periodic} \right\},$$

which is a Banach space endowed with the norm $\| \cdot \|$ defined by

$$\|z\| = |u|_\infty + |v|_\infty, \quad \text{for all } z \in X.$$

We define a linear operator $L: \text{Dom}L \subset X \rightarrow X$ by setting

$$\text{Dom}L = \left\{ z = (u(t), v(t))^T \in C^1(R, R^2): z \text{ is } T\text{-periodic} \right\}$$

and $z \in \text{Dom}L$

$$Lz = z' = (u'(t), v'(t))^T. \tag{2.2}$$

Also define a nonlinear operator $N: X \rightarrow X$ by setting

$$Nz = (v(t), -f(t, v(t))v(t) - g(t, u(t)) + p(t))^T. \tag{2.3}$$

In the context of (2.2) and (2.3), the operator equation

$$Lz = \lambda Nz$$

is equivalent to the following system

Lemma 2.3. ([4]). Assume that the following condition holds.

$$(H_1) \quad (g(t, u_1) - g(t, u_2))(u_1 - u_2) < 0, \text{ for all } t \in R, u_1, u_2 \in R \text{ and } u_1 \neq u_2.$$

Then system (1.2) has at most one T -periodic solution.

3. MAIN RESULTS

Theorem 3.1. Let (H_1) hold. Furthermore, assume that the following conditions ensure.

(H_2) There exists a positive constant d^* such that

$$u(g(t, u) - p(t)) < 0 \text{ for all } t \in R, |u| \geq d^*.$$

(H_3) There exists nonnegative constants r and K such that

$$r < \frac{1}{T}, \quad |f(t, u)| \leq 2r + \frac{K}{|u|}, \quad \text{for all } t \in R, u \in R \setminus \{0\}$$

Then system (1.2) has a unique T -periodic solution.

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, along with (H_1) , it can be easily seen that system (1.2) has at most one T -periodic solution. Therefore, to prove theorem 3.1, it is enough to show that system (1.2) has at least one T -periodic solution. For it, we shall apply Lemma 2.1. Firstly, we shall claim that set of all possible T -periodic solutions of (2.4) are bounded.

Let $z = (u(t), v(t))^T \in X$ be an arbitrary T -periodic solution of (2.4). From (2.4), we get

$$u'' + \lambda f\left(t, \frac{1}{\lambda}u'(t)\right)u'(t) + \lambda^2[g(t, u(t)) - p(t)] = 0, \quad \lambda \in (0,1), \tag{3.1}$$

Set

$$u(t_1) = \max_{t \in R} u(t), \quad u(t_2) = \min_{t \in R} u(t), \text{ where } t_1, t_2 \in R.$$

Then, we get

$$u'(t_1) = u'(t_2) = 0, \quad u''(t_1) \leq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad u''(t_2) \geq 0.$$

It is follows from (3.1) that

$$g(t_1, u(t_1)) - p(t_1) \geq 0 \text{ and } g(t_2, u(t_2)) - p(t_2) \leq 0.$$

In the context of (H_2) , we obtain

$$u(t_1) < d^* \text{ and } u(t_2) > -d^*.$$

Since $u(t)$ is continuous function on R , for the following inequality there exists a constant $\xi \in R$

$$|u(\xi)| \leq d^*. \tag{3.2}$$

Let $\xi = mT + \bar{\xi}$, where $\bar{\xi} \in [0, T]$, and m is an integer. Then, we have

$$|u(t)| = \left| u(\bar{\xi}) + \int_{\bar{\xi}}^t u'(s) ds \right| \leq d^* + \int_{\bar{\xi}}^t |u'(s)| ds, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and

$$|u(t)| = |u(t - T)| = \left| u(\bar{\xi}) - \int_{t-T}^{\bar{\xi}} |u'(s)| ds \right| \leq d^* + \int_{t-T}^{\bar{\xi}} |u'(s)| ds, \quad t \in [\bar{\xi}, \bar{\xi} + T].$$

Bringing together the above two inequalities we ascertain

$$\begin{aligned} |u|_\infty &= \max_{t \in [0, T]} |u(t)| = \max_{t \in [\bar{\xi}, \bar{\xi} + T]} |u(t)| \\ &\leq \max_{t \in [\bar{\xi}, \bar{\xi} + T]} \left\{ d^* + \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{\bar{\xi}}^t |u'(s)| ds + \int_{t-T}^{\bar{\xi}} |u'(s)| ds \right) \right\} \\ &\leq d^* + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |u'(s)| ds \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq d^* + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{T}|u'|_2. \tag{3.3}$$

Set

$$\Omega_1 = \{t: t \in [0, T], |u(t)| > d^*\}, \Omega_2 = \{t: t \in [0, T], |u(t)| \leq d^*\}.$$

Multiplying $u(t)$ and Eq. (3.1) and then integrating it from 0 to T , by (H_2) , (H_3) , (3.3) and schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |u'|_2^2 &= - \int_0^T u''(t)u(t)dt \\ &= \int_0^T \left\{ \lambda f \left(t, \frac{1}{\lambda} u'(t) \right) u'(t) + \lambda^2 [g(t, u(t)) - p(t)] \right\} u(t)dt \\ &= \int_0^T \lambda f \left(t, \frac{1}{\lambda} u'(t) \right) u'(t)u(t)dt + \lambda^2 \int_{\Omega_1} [g(t, u(t)) - p(t)]u(t)dt \\ &\quad + \lambda^2 \int_{\Omega_2} [g(t, u(t)) - p(t)]u(t)dt \\ &\leq \int_0^T \lambda \left[2r + \frac{\lambda K}{|u'(t)|} \right] |u'(t)||u(t)|dt \\ &\quad + \lambda^2 \int_{\Omega_2} |g(t, u(t)) - p(t)||u(t)|dt \\ &\leq 2r|u|_\infty \int_0^T |u'(t)|dt + |u|_\infty T(\max\{|g(t, u) - p(t)|: t \in R, |u| \leq d^*\} + K) \\ &\leq r(\sqrt{T}|u'|_2 + 2d^*)\sqrt{T}|u'|_2 \\ &\quad + T(\max\{|g(t, u) - p(t)|: t \in R, |u| \leq d^*\} + K) \left(\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{T}|u'|_2 + d^* \right) \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Since $0 \leq r < \frac{1}{T}$, (3.4) signifies that there exists a positive constant D_1 such that

$$|u'|_2 \leq D_1 \text{ and } |u|_\infty \leq D_1. \tag{3.5}$$

Set $t_1 \in [0, T]$ such that $|u(t_1)| = \max_{t \in [0, T]} |u(t)|$, then $u'(t_1) = 0$. In the context of the first equation of (2.4), we have

$$v(t_1) = 0.$$

Then we can choose a positive constant D_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned} |v(t)| &= \left| v(t_1) + \int_{t_1}^t v'(s)ds \right| \\ &\leq |v(t_1)| + \int_{t_1}^t |v'(s)|ds \\ &\leq \int_0^T |v'(s)|ds \\ &\leq \int_0^T \left| \lambda f \left(t, \frac{1}{\lambda} u'(t) \right) u'(t) + \lambda^2 [g(t, u(t)) - p(t)] \right| dt \\ &\leq \int_0^T \lambda \left[2r + \frac{\lambda K}{|u'(t)|} \right] |u'(t)|dt + \int_0^T |\lambda^2 [g(t, u(t)) - p(t)]|dt \\ &\leq 2r \int_0^T |u'(t)|dt + T[K + \max\{|g(t, u) - p(t)|: t \in R, |u| \leq D_1 \}] \\ &\leq 2r\sqrt{T}|u'(t)|_2 + T[K + \max\{|g(t, u) - p(t)|: t \in R, |x| \leq D_1 \}] \\ &\leq D_2 \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where $t \in [t_1, t_1 + T]$.

Set

$$\Omega = \{z = (u, v)^T \in X: |u|_\infty + |v|_\infty < D_1 + D_2 + d^* + 1 = D\},$$

It is known that the system (2.4) has no solution on $\partial\Omega$ as $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Let $z = (u, v)^T \in \partial\Omega \cap \text{Ker}L = \partial\Omega \cap R^2$. z is a constant vector in R^2 with $\|z\| = D$. From (H_2) , if $v = 0$, we get

$$|u|_\infty = D > d^* + 1$$

and

$$-\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (f(t, v)v + g(t, u) - p(t))dt = -\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (g(t, u) - p(t))dt \neq 0.$$

Thus, in any case

$$QNz = (v, -\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (f(t, v)v + g(t, u) - p(t))dt)^T \neq 0, \quad z \in \partial\Omega \cap \text{Ker}L. \quad (3.7)$$

Define a continuous mapping $A: \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow R^2$ by

$$Az = (v, u)^T, \quad \text{for all } z = (u, v)^T \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

Clearly, Ω is symmetric with regard to the origin and

$$Az = -A(-z) \neq 0, \quad \text{for all } z \in \partial\Omega \cap \text{Ker}L$$

by applying Lemma 2.2, we have

$$d[A, \Omega \cap \text{Ker}L, 0] \neq 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Like the proof of (3.7), it is easy to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(z, \lambda) &= \lambda Az + (1 - \lambda)QNz \\ &= \left(\lambda v + (1 - \lambda)v, \lambda u - (1 - \lambda)\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (f(t, v)v + g(t, u) - p(t))dt \right)^T \end{aligned}$$

is homotopy mapping such that $\phi(z, \lambda) \neq 0$ on $(\partial\Omega \cap \text{Ker}L) \times [0, 1]$.

Hence, by using the homotopy invariance theorem, we have

$$d[QN, \Omega \cap \text{Ker}L, 0] = d[A, \Omega \cap \text{Ker}L, 0] \neq 0.$$

It is now known that Ω satisfies all the requirement in Lemma 2.1, and then $Lz = Nz$ has at least one solution in the Banach space X , therefore, it is proved that system (1.2) has a unique T -periodic solution. Hence, the proof is completed. \square

4. AN EXAMPLE

In this section, an example is provided to demonstrate the above ascertained outcomes.

Example 4.1. Let us consider the following forced Rayleigh equations:

$$\begin{aligned} u''(t) + \frac{1}{2014\pi} \left[\sin(u'(t)) e^{\cos(u'(t))} + e^{\sin(u'(t))} \cos\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right) \right] u'(t) - \left(13 + \cos^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right) \right) u^{2013}(t) \\ = \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

The equivalent system of (4.1) can be constructed as follows

$$\begin{cases} \frac{du}{dt} = v(t) \\ \frac{dv}{dt} = -\frac{1}{2014\pi} \left[\sin(v(t)) e^{\cos(v(t))} + e^{\sin(v(t))} \cos\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right) \right] v(t) \\ \quad + \left(13 + \cos^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right) \right) u^{2013}(t) + \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right). \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

Since

$$f(t, u) = \frac{1}{2014\pi} \left(\sin(u) e^{\cos(u)} + e^{\sin(u)} \cos\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right) \right),$$

$$g(t, u) = -\left(13 + \cos^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right)\right)u^{2013},$$

$$p(t) = \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right),$$

One can easily check that the conditions (H_1) and (H_3) are provided. Now let show that (H_2) holds. Choose $d^* = 1$. For all $t \in R$ and $|u| \geq d^* = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(g(t, u) - p(t)) &= u\left(-\left(13 + \cos^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right)\right)u^{2013} - \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right)\right) \\ &= -13u^{2014} - \cos^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right)u^{2014} - \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right)u \\ &= \left(-12 - \cos^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right)\right)u^{2014} - \left(u^{2014} + \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right)u\right) \end{aligned}$$

Since $|u| \geq 1$ and $\sin^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right) \leq 1$, automatically $\left(u^{2014} + \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{4}t\right)u\right) \geq 0$. As a result

$$u(g(t, u) - p(t)) < 0.$$

So (H_2) holds. Since (H_1) , (H_2) and (H_3) holds, by Theorem 3.1, system (4.2) has a unique 8π -periodic solution. Therefore, Rayleigh Eq. (4.1) has a unique 8π -periodic solution.

5. CONCLUSION

Since $f(t, u) = \frac{1}{2014\pi}(\sin(u) e^{\cos(u)} + e^{\sin(u)} \cos(\frac{1}{4}t))$, it can be easily seen that all the results in [1-10] and the references therein cannot be applicable to Eq. (4.1) to obtain the existence and uniqueness of 8π -periodic solution. This implies that the results of this paper are essentially new.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest was declared by the authors.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. E. Gaines, J. Mawhin, Coincidence Degree and Nonlinear Differential Equations, in: Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 568, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1977.
- [2] K. Deimling, Nonlinear Functional Analysis, Springer, Berlin, 1985.
- [3] T. A. Burton, Stability and Periodic Solutions of Ordinary and Functional Differential Equations, Academic Press, Orland, FL, 1985.
- [4] Y. Li, L. Huang, New results of periodic solutions for forced Rayleigh-type equations, J.Comput. Appl. Math. 221 (1) (2008) 98-105.
- [5] L. Wang, J. Shao, New results of periodic solutions for a kind of forced Rayleigh-type equations, Nonlinear Anal. 11 (2010) 99-105
- [6] C. Huang, Y. He, L. Huang, W. Tan, New results on the periodic solutions for a kind of Rayleigh equation with two deviating arguments, Math. Comput. Modelling 46 (5-6) (2007) 604-611.
- [7] Y. Zhou, X. Tang, Periodic solutions for a kind of Rayleigh equation with a deviating argument, Comput. Math. Appl. 53 (2007) 825-830.
- [8] B. Liu, L. Huang, Periodic solutions for a kind of Rayleigh equation with a deviating argument, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 321 (2006) 491-500.
- [9] Y. Zhou, X. Tang, On existence of periodic solutions of a kind of Rayleigh equation with a deviating argument, Nonlinear Anal. 69 (2008) 2355-2361.
- [10] Y. Zhou, X. Tang, On existence of periodic solutions of Rayleigh equation of retarded type, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 203 (2007) 1-5