

Jozef Rovder

A note on comparison theorems for third-order linear differential equations

*Mathematica Slovaca*, Vol. 26 (1976), No. 4, 323--327

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/128806>

## Terms of use:

© Mathematical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1976

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

## A NOTE ON COMPARISON THEOREMS FOR THIRD — ORDER LINEAR DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

JOZEF ROVDER

In this paper we prove some comparison theorems for the differential equation of the third-order

$$(a) \quad y''' + b(x)y' + c(x)y = 0,$$

where  $b(x)$ ,  $c(x)$  and  $b'(x)$  are continuous functions in  $(0, \infty)$ .

As usual, a solution of (a) is called nonoscillatory iff it has no zeros for arbitrarily large  $x$  and (a) is said to be nonoscillatory iff all its nontrivial solutions are nonoscillatory.

The following theorem is analogous to Theorem 2 in [4] for differential equations of class  $V_1$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose the coefficients of (a) satisfy the assumption  $2c(x) - b'(x) \geq 0$  in  $(0, \infty)$ . Let (a) be nonoscillatory. Then there exists a number  $\gamma > 0$  such that the equation (a) has no solution with more than two zeros in  $[\gamma, \infty)$ .*

*Proof.* Since the equation (a) is nonoscillatory, there exists a solution  $y(x)$  of (a) and a number  $\gamma > 0$  such that  $y(\gamma) = 0$ ,  $y(x) \neq 0$  for  $x > \gamma$ . Let  $z(x)$  be a solution of (a) with the properties  $z(\gamma) = z'(\gamma) = 0$ ,  $z''(\gamma) \neq 0$ . If  $y'(\gamma) \neq 0$ , then from Theorem 4 in [1] it follows  $z(x) \neq 0$  for  $x > \gamma$ . If  $y'(\gamma) = 0$ , then  $z(x) = cy(x)$  and so  $z(x) \neq 0$  for  $x > \gamma$ . Consequently, the equation (a) always has a solution  $z(x)$  such that  $z(\gamma) = z'(\gamma) = 0$ ,  $z(x) > 0$  in  $(\gamma, \infty)$ ,  $\gamma > 0$ .

Now we show that every solution of (a) has not more than two zeros in  $[\gamma, \infty)$ . At first, consider the solution of (a) with a zero at  $\gamma$ . Let  $u(x)$  be a solution of (a) such that  $u(\gamma) = u(x_1) = u(x_2) = 0$ ,  $\gamma \leq x_1 \leq x_2$ . If  $\gamma = x_1 < x_2$ , then  $u(x) = cz(x)$  and so  $u(x) \neq 0$  for  $x > \gamma$ . Also the case  $\gamma < x_1 = x_2$  leads to a contradiction with the identity

$$[yy'' - \frac{1}{2}y'^2 + \frac{1}{2}b(x)y^2]' = -\frac{1}{2}[2c(x) - b'(x)]y^2.$$

Now let  $\gamma < x_1 < x_2$ . Suppose  $u(x) > 0$  in  $(x_1, x_2)$ . Then there exist a number  $c > 0$  and  $\tau \in (x_1, x_2)$  such that the solution  $z(x) - cu(x)$  has a double zero at  $\tau$  and a simple zero at  $\gamma$ , which is in contradiction with the above identity. So every solution of (a) with a zero at  $\gamma$  has not more than two zeros in  $[\gamma, \infty)$ .

Finally we prove that every solution  $v(x)$  of (a) such that  $v(\gamma) \neq 0$  has not more than two zeros in  $[\gamma, \infty)$ . Suppose to the contrary that  $v(x_1) = v(x_2) = v(x_3) = 0$ ,  $\gamma < x_1 < x_2 < x_3$ . (As we have showed above, the case  $x_1 < x_2 = x_3$  leads to a contradiction.) Let  $v(x) > 0$  in  $(x_2, x_3)$ . Let  $w(x)$  be a solution of (a) such that  $w(\gamma) = w(x_1) = 0$ ,  $w(x) < 0$  in  $(\gamma, x_1)$ . Then  $w(x) > 0$  in  $(x_1, \infty)$ . Then by Lemma 2 in [1], there exist numbers  $c > 0$  and  $\tau \in (x_1, x_2)$  such that the solution  $w(x) - cv(x)$  of (a) has a double zero at  $\tau$  and a simple zero at  $x_1$  which contradicts the above identity. Theorem is proved completely.

**Corollary 1.** *Suppose the inequality  $2c(x) - b'(x) \geq 0$  ( $2c(x) - b'(x) \leq 0$ ) holds in  $(0, \infty)$ . Then (a) is nonoscillatory in  $(0, \infty)$  if and only if there exists a number  $\gamma > 0$  such that the equation (a) is disconjugate in  $[\gamma, \infty)$ , i.e. the equation (a) has no solution with more than two zeros in  $[\gamma, \infty)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $2c(x) - b'(x) \geq 0$ , then the assertion follows from Theorem 1. If  $2c(x) - b'(x) \leq 0$  and (a) is nonoscillatory, then, by Theorem 3 in [1], its adjoint equation is nonoscillatory. The coefficients of the adjoint equation, denoted by  $\bar{b}(x)$  and  $\bar{c}(x)$ , satisfy the assumption  $2\bar{c}(x) - \bar{b}'(x) \geq 0$ . Then the adjoint equation of (a) is disconjugate in  $[\gamma, \infty)$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ , and by Corollary 3 in [3] the equation (a) is disconjugate in  $[\gamma, \infty)$ . The sufficient conditions are obvious.

Theorems 6 and 7, Corollaries 1 and 2 in [1] yield the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** *Consider the differential equations*

$$(1_i) \quad y'' + b_i(x)y' + c_i(x)y = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

where  $b_i(x), c_i(x)$  are continuous functions in  $(0, \infty)$ . Let the coefficients of (1<sub>i</sub>) satisfy

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} & b_2(x) \leq b_1(x), \\ & 2c_1(x) - b_1'(x) \leq 0, \\ & 2c_1(x) - b_1'(x) \leq 2c_2(x) - b_2'(x) \leq 2c_3(x) - b_3'(x), \\ & b_2(x) \leq b_3(x), \\ & 2c_3(x) - b_3'(x) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Let the coefficients of (1<sub>2</sub>) satisfy the inequality  $2c_2(x) - b_2'(x) \geq 0$ , or  $2c_2(x) - b_2'(x) \leq 0$  in  $(0, \infty)$ , or the equation (1<sub>2</sub>) is of class  $V_1$ , or class  $V_2$ .

Then the equation (1<sub>2</sub>) is nonoscillatory if the equation (1<sub>1</sub>) and the equation (1<sub>3</sub>) are nonoscillatory.

*Proof.* Let, for instance,  $2c_2(x) - b_2'(x) \geq 0$ . Suppose to the contrary that (1<sub>2</sub>) is oscillatory, i.e. there exists a solution of (1<sub>2</sub>) which has zeros for arbitrarily large  $x$ . From the conditions (2) it follows

$$b_3(x) \geq b_2(x), \quad 2c_3(x) - b_3'(x) \geq 2c_2(x) - b_2'(x) \geq 0.$$

Then, by Theorem 6 in [1], the equation (1<sub>3</sub>) is oscillatory, which is a contradiction.

In the same way we can prove all cases included in this theorem. (The definitions of the class  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  see in [1] or [4].)

The main aim of this note is to show that Theorem 2 will be valid also, if we omit the assumptions  $2c_2(x) - b_2^i(x) \geq 0$  ( $2c_2(x) - b_2^i(x) \leq 0$ ), (1<sub>2</sub>) is of class  $V_1$  or class  $V_2$  in it. To prove it, we shall use the following theorem (see [2]).

**Theorem 3.** *Suppose the functions  $f(x)$ ,  $g_i(x)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$  are continuous in an interval  $I$ . Let for any  $x \in I$  be*

$$(3) \quad g_1(x) \leq g_2(x) \leq g_3(x) .$$

*If the differential equation*

$$(4) \quad y''' + f(x)y' + g_i(x)y = 0$$

*is disconjugate for  $i = 1, 3$ , then it is disconjugate for  $i = 2$  in  $I$ .*

**Theorem 4.** *Suppose the coefficients of (1<sub>i</sub>) satisfy (2). If the equations (1<sub>1</sub>) and (1<sub>3</sub>) are nonoscillatory, then the equation (1<sub>2</sub>) is nonoscillatory in  $(0, \infty)$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the differential equations

$$(5) \quad y''' + b_2(x)y' + \bar{c}(x)y = 0 ,$$

$$(6) \quad y''' + b_2(x)y' + \tilde{c}(x)y = 0 ,$$

where the functions  $\bar{c}(x)$ ,  $\tilde{c}(x)$  are defined as follows

$$\bar{c}(x) = \begin{cases} c_2(x) & \text{for all } x \in (0, \infty) \text{ such that } 2c_2(x) - b_2^i(x) \geq 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} b_2^i(x) & \text{for all } x \in (0, \infty) \text{ such that } 2c_2(x) - b_2^i(x) < 0, \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{c}(x) = \begin{cases} c_2(x) & \text{for all } x \in (0, \infty) \text{ such that } 2c_2(x) - b_2^i(x) \leq 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} b_2^i(x) & \text{for all } x \in (0, \infty) \text{ such that } 2c_2(x) - b_2^i(x) > 0. \end{cases}$$

The functions  $\bar{c}(x)$  and  $\tilde{c}(x)$  defined in this way are continuous in  $(0, \infty)$ . The coefficients of (5) satisfy the conditions

$$0 \leq 2\bar{c}(x) - b_2^i(x) = \max [0, 2c_2(x) - b_2^i(x)] \leq 2c_3(x) - b_3^i(x) , \\ b_2(x) \leq b_3(x) .$$

Since the equation (1<sub>3</sub>) is nonoscillatory, then the equation (5) is nonoscillatory by Theorem 2.

Likewise, the coefficients of (6) satisfy the conditions

$$0 \geq 2\tilde{c}(x) - b_2^i(x) = \min [0, 2c_2(x) - b_2^i(x)] \geq 2c_1(x) - b_1^i(x) , \\ b_2(x) \leq b_1(x) .$$

Then, by Theorem 2, the equation (6) is nonoscillatory since the equation (1<sub>1</sub>) is nonoscillatory.

From the definition of  $\bar{c}(x)$  and  $\tilde{c}(x)$  it follows

$$2\bar{c}(x) - b_2'(x) \leq 2c_2(x) - b_2'(x) \leq 2\tilde{c}(x) - b_2'(x),$$

i.e.

$$\tilde{c}(x) \leq c_2(x) \leq \bar{c}(x).$$

From the Corollary 1 it follows that the equations (5) and (6) are disconjugate in  $[\gamma, \infty)$  for a number  $\gamma > 0$ . Then the equation (1<sub>2</sub>) is disconjugate in  $[\gamma, \infty)$  by Theorem 3, and so (1<sub>2</sub>) is nonoscillatory in  $(0, \infty)$ .

Remark. From the conditions (2) it follows that if  $b_1(x) = b_2(x) = b_3(x)$ , i.e. if the equation (1<sub>i</sub>) has the same form as (4), then the conditions (2) imply the conditions (3) and hence Theorem 4 generalizes Theorem 3.

**Corollary 2.** *Let the coefficients of (a) satisfy assumptions*

$$b(x) \leq p \quad \text{and} \quad |2c(x) - b'(x)| \leq q,$$

where  $p \leq 0$  and  $q \leq 4/3 \sqrt{3}(-p)^{3/2}$ ,  $p, q$  are constants, or the assumptions

$$b(x) \leq \frac{p}{x^2} \quad \text{and} \quad |2c(x) - b'(x)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{x^3},$$

where  $p \leq 1$  and  $\varepsilon \leq 4/3 \sqrt{3}(1-p)^{3/2}$ ,  $p, \varepsilon$  are constants. Then the equation (a) is nonoscillatory.

**Corollary 3.** *Let in the equation (a) be  $b(x) \equiv 0$ . Then the equation (a) is nonoscillatory if*

$$|c(x)| \leq \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \cdot \frac{1}{x^3}.$$

Proof. These corollaries are consequences of Theorem 11 in [1].

#### REFERENCES

- [1] ROVDER, J.: Oscillation criteria for third-order linear differential equations. *Mat. Čas.* 25, 1975, 231—244.
- [2] ЛЕВИН, А. Ю.: Неосцилляция решений уравнения  $x^{(n)} + p_1(t)x^{(n-1)} + \dots + p_n(t)x = 0$ . *Успехи матем. наук*, XXIV, вып. 2 (146), 43—96, 1969.
- [3] GERA, M.: Nichtoszillatorische und oszillatorische Differentialgleichungen dritter Ordnung. *Čas. pro pěst. mat.* 96, 1971, 278—293.
- [4] ŠVEC, M.: Несколько замечаний о линейном дифференциальном уравнении третьего порядка. *Чех. мат. ж.* 15 (90) 1965, 42—49.

Received February 18, 1975

*Katedra matematiky a deskriptívnej geometrie  
Strojníckej fakulty SVŠT  
Gottwaldovo nám. 50  
880 31 Bratislava*

## ЗАМЕЧАНИЕ О ТЕОРЕМАХ СРАВНЕНИЯ ДЛЯ ДИФФЕРЕНЦИАЛЬНОГО УРАВНЕНИЯ ТРЕТЬЕГО ПОРЯДКА

Йосеф Ровдер

### Резюме

Решение уравнения  $(a)$  мы будем называть неколебательным, если существует число  $a$  такое, что это решение неимеет нулей в интервале  $(a, \infty)$ . Уравнение  $(a)$  мы будем называть неколебательным, если все его решения неколебательны, и мы будем называть его без сопряженных точек на  $I$ , если каждое его решение имеет на  $I$  не более двух нулей.

В работе доказано что если  $2c(x) - b'(x) \geq 0$  ( $\leq 0$ ) в интервале  $(0, \infty)$ , потом уравнение  $(a)$  является неколебательным на  $(0, \infty)$  тогда и только тогда, когда существует число  $\gamma > 0$  такое, что уравнение  $(a)$  является без сопряженных точек на интервале  $[\gamma, \infty)$ .

Главным результатом этой работы является

Теорема 4. Пусть коэффициенты уравнения  $(1_1)$  удовлетворяют свойствами  $(2)$  и пусть уравнения  $(1_1)$  и  $(1_3)$  являются неколебательными на интервале  $(0, \infty)$ . Тогда уравнение  $(1_2)$  является неколебательным на интервале  $(0, \infty)$ .