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#### Abstract

In this paper, we establish some existence results for boundary and periodic value problems for systems of nonlinear differential equations with right-hand side satisfying a Berntein-Nagumo growth condition. Hartman's condition $\left(|f| \leq 2 k\left(\langle x, f\rangle+\left|x^{\prime}\right|^{2}\right)+K\right)$ is not assumed. This assumption is replaced by one which is automatically satisfied in the scalar case.


## 1. Introduction

In this paper, we consider the boundary and periodic value problem for systems of nonlinear differential equations

$$
(\star)\left\{\begin{aligned}
x^{\prime \prime}(t) & =f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right) \text { a.e. } t \in[0,1] \\
x & \in B C
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

where $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is a Carathéodory function and $B C$ denotes a boundary condition such as non-homogeneous Dirichlet, Neumann, Sturm-Liouville conditions, or the periodic condition that we write

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (S L)\left\{\begin{array}{l}
A_{0} x(0)-\beta_{0} x^{\prime}(0)=r_{0}, \\
A_{1} x(1)+\beta_{1} x^{\prime}(1)=r_{1} ;
\end{array}\right. \\
& (P)\left\{\begin{array}{l}
x(0)=x(1), \\
x^{\prime}(0)=x^{\prime}(1) ;
\end{array}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

where $A_{i}$ is a $n \times n$ matrix (possibly nonsymmetric) for which there exists $\alpha_{i} \geq 0$ such that $\left\langle x, A_{i} x\right\rangle \geq \alpha_{i}\|x\|^{2}$ for all $x$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n} ; \beta_{i}=0,1 ; \alpha_{i}+\beta_{i}>0 ; i=0,1$.

The literature on this problem is voluminous, and we refer to $[1,2,4-6,9-14]$ and the references therein. Among those results, let us mention the following well known result of Hartman [11], and a result in the scalar case $(n=1)$.

Theorem 1.1. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a continuous function. Assume
(1.1) there exists a constant $M>0$ such that $\langle x, f(t, x, p)\rangle+\|p\|^{2} \geq 0$ for $\|x\|=M$ and $\langle x, p\rangle=0$;
(1.2) there exist $k, K \geq 0$ such that $\|f(t, x, p)\| \leq 2 k\left(\langle x, f(t, x, p)\rangle+\|p\|^{2}\right)+K$ for $\|x\| \leq M$
(1.3) there exists a continuous function $\psi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow(0, \infty)$ such that $\|f(t, x, p)\| \leq \psi(\|p\|)$ for $\|x\| \leq M$, and $\int^{\infty} s d s / \psi(s)=\infty$.
Let $\left\|r_{0}\right\|,\left\|r_{1}\right\| \leq M$, then the problem

$$
\begin{align*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t) & =f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right) \text { a.e. } t \in[0,1] \\
x(0) & =r_{0}, x(1)=r_{1} \tag{1.4}
\end{align*}
$$

has a solution.
Theorem 1.2. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. Assume
(1.5) there exist $\alpha \leq \beta \in C^{2}([0,1], \mathbb{R})$ respectively lower and upper solutions of $(\star)$;
(1.6) there exists a continuous function $\psi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow(0, \infty)$ such that $|f(t, x, p)| \leq \psi(|p|)$ for $\alpha(t) \leq x \leq \beta(t)$, and $\int^{\infty} s d s / \psi(s)=\infty$.
Then the problem $(\star)$ has a solution.
Observe that in the scalar case, if (1.1) and (1.3) are satisfied and $\left|r_{0}\right|,\left|r_{1}\right| \leq M$, Theorem 1.2 gives the existence of a solution to (1.4) while Theorem 1.1 could not be applied since conditon (1.2) is not necessarily satisfied.

Also, Theorem 1.1 does not give the existence of a solution to very simple problems such as

$$
\begin{align*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t) & =\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\| x^{\prime}(t)-c \\
x(0) & =x(1)=(0, \cdots, 0) \tag{1.7}
\end{align*}
$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $\|c\|=1$.
In this paper, we give theorems of existence of solution to ( $\star$ ) containing, as a particular case, Theorem 1.2 (see Theorem 4.1), and which could be applied to problems such as (1.7). Our existence results are obtained under an assumption of existence of solution-tube. This notion generalizes in a natural way conditions (1.1) and (1.5) and is slightly more general than the notion of Nagumo pair (see $[6,9]$ ). Also, condition (1.2) is not assumed. This condition is replaced by one ((H3) or (H5)) which is automatically satisfied in the scalar case. Let us mention that our condition (H3) generalizes a condition of Gaprindashvili [9, condition (1.4)] while his Nagumo growth condition is weaker than ours.

This paper is divided in five sections. Section 2 contains notations, definitions and results which will be used throughout this paper. In section 3, theorems of existence are established under a Bernstein-type growth condition, while in section 4 , results are obtained under a Nagumo-type growth condition. In section 5, very simple examples of the previous results are given. Proofs are obtained via the theory of topological transversality for continuous, compact operators in $\S 3$, and for upper semi-continuous, compact, multivalued operators in $\S 4$.

## 2. Preliminaries

In this section, we establish notations, definitions, and results which are used throughout this paper. We denote $\langle$,$\rangle the scalar product, and \|\cdot\|$ the Euclidian
norm in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. The Banach space of $k$-times continuously differentiable functions $x$ is denoted by $C^{k}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ with the norm: $\|x\|_{k}=\max \left\{\|x\|_{0},\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|_{0}, \ldots,\left\|x^{(k)}\right\|_{0}\right\}$, where $\|x\|_{0}=\max \{\|x(t)\|: t \in[0,1]\}$. The Sobolev space of functions in $C^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ with the derivative being absolutely continuous is denoted by $W^{2,1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$. We define $C_{0}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)=\left\{x \in C\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right): x(0)=0\right\}$, and $C_{B}^{k}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, (resp. $\left.W_{B}^{2,1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)\right)$ the set of functions $x \in C^{k}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ (resp. $W^{2,1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ ) satisfying the boundary condition $x \in B C$. Let $L^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ denote the space of integrable functions, with the usual norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^{1}}$.

We say that a function $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ (resp. $G:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}^{n}}$ a multivalued function with non-empty, closed, convex values) is a Carathéodory function if, (i) for every $(x, p)$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2 n}$, the function $t \mapsto f(t, x, p)$ (resp. $t \mapsto G(t, x, p)$ ) is measurable; (ii) the function $(x, p) \mapsto f(t, x, p)$ (resp. ( $x, p) \mapsto G(t, x, p)$ ) is continuous (resp. upper semi-continuous) for almost every $t$ in [0, 1]; (iii) for every $k>0$, there exists a function $h_{k}$ in $L^{1}([0,1],[0, \infty))$ such that $\|f(t, x, p)\| \leq h_{k}(t)$ (resp. $\|G(t, x, p)\| \leq h_{k}(t)$ i.e. $\|v\| \leq h_{k}(t)$ for all $v \in G(t, x, p)$ ) a.e. $t \in[0,1]$, and for all $\|x\| \leq k$ and $\|p\| \leq k$. Observe that if $G(t, x, p)=\{f(t, x, p)\}$ then $G$ is Carathéodory if and only if $f$ is Carathéodory. A function $F: C^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \rightarrow$ $L^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ (resp. $\mathcal{G}: C^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \rightarrow 2^{L^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}$ ) is said integrably bounded on bounded if for every bounded set $B \subset C^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, there exists an integrable function $h_{B}$ in $L^{1}([0,1],[0, \infty))$ such that for every $x \in B,\|F(x)(t)\| \leq h_{B}(t)$ a.e. $t \in[0,1]$ (resp. $\|u(t)\| \leq h_{B}(t)$ a.e. $t \in[0,1]$ and for all $u \in \mathcal{G}(x)$ ). We associate to $F$ (resp. $\mathcal{G}$ ) an operator $N_{F}: C^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \rightarrow C_{0}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ (resp. $\left.N_{\mathcal{G}}: C^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \rightarrow 2^{C_{0}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}\right)$ defined by

$$
\begin{gathered}
N_{F}(x)(t)=\int_{0}^{t} F(x)(s) d s \\
\text { (resp. } \left.\quad N_{\mathcal{G}}(x)=\left\{w(t)=\int_{0}^{t} u(s) d s: u \in \mathcal{G}(x)\right\}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

We recall the following result (see for example $[7,10]$ ).

## Lemma 2.1.

(i) Let $G:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}^{n}}$ be a Carathéodory multivalued function with non-empty, closed, convex values then the operator $\mathcal{G}: C^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \rightarrow$ $2^{L^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}$ defined by $\mathcal{G}(x)=\left\{u: u(t) \in G\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right.$ a.e. $\left.t \in[0,1]\right\}$ is upper semi-continuous, integrably bounded on bounded, with non-empty, closed, convex values.
(ii) Let $\mathcal{F}: C^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \rightarrow 2^{L^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}$ be an upper semi-continuous multivalued function, integrably bounded on bounded, with non-empty, closed, convex values, then the associated operator $N_{\mathcal{F}}$ is upper semi-continuous and completely continuous, with non-empty, compact, convex values.

Let us give some notions of the theory of topological transversality; for more details and generality, see [3].

Let $U$ be a bounded open set in $C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$. By $\mathcal{K}_{\partial U}\left(\bar{U}, 2^{C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}\right)$, we denote the set of upper semi-continuous and compact operators with non-empty, compact, convex values $T: \bar{U} \rightarrow 2^{C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}$ fixed point free on $\partial U$. We say that $T \in \mathcal{K}_{\partial U}\left(\bar{U}, 2^{C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}\right)$ is essential if for every $R \in \mathcal{K}_{\partial U}\left(\bar{U}, 2^{C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}\right)$
such that $\left.T\right|_{\partial U}=\left.R\right|_{\partial U}, R$ has a fixed point. Let $T, R \in \mathcal{K}_{\partial U}\left(\bar{U}, 2^{C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}\right)$, $T$ is homotopic to $R(T \approx R)$ if there exists $H:[0,1] \times \bar{U} \rightarrow 2^{C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}$ upper semi-continuous and compact with non-empty, compact, convex values such that $H(\lambda, \cdot) \in \mathcal{K}_{\partial U}\left(\bar{U}, 2^{C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}\right)$ for every $\lambda \in[0,1] ; T=H(1, \cdot)$ and $R=H(0, \cdot)$. We have similar definitions for $\mathcal{K}_{\partial U}\left(\bar{U}, C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)\right)$, the set of continuous, compact operators fixed point free on $\partial U$.

Theorem 2.2. (Topological Transversality). Let $T$ and $R$ be homotopic operators in $\mathcal{K}_{\partial U}\left(\bar{U}, C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)\right.$ (resp. $\mathcal{K}_{\partial U}\left(\bar{U}, 2^{C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}\right)$ ), then $T$ is essential if and only if $R$ is essential.

Let us consider the problem $(\star)$ where $B C$ denotes $(P)$ or $(S L)$. A solution to $(\star)$ is a function $x \in W_{B}^{2,1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ satisfying $(\star)$.

Now, we give the definition of solution-tube to the problem ( $\star$ ) which was introduced in [6] and which is slightly more general than the definition of Nagumo pair given by Gaprindashvili [9]. This notion will play an essential role in our existence results.

Definition 2.3. A solution-tube to the problem $(\star)$ is a couple $(v, M)$ where $M$ is a non-negative function in $W^{2,1}([0,1], \mathbb{R})$, and $v \in W^{2,1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ such that
(i) $\left\langle x-v(t), f(t, x, p)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2} \geq M(t) M^{\prime \prime}(t)+\left(M^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}$
a.e. $t \in[0,1]$ and for all $(x, p) \in \mathbb{R}^{2 n}$ such that $\|x-v(t)\|=M(t)$, and $\left\langle x-v(t), p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle=M(t) M^{\prime}(t) ;$
and $v^{\prime \prime}(t)=f\left(t, v(t), v^{\prime}(t)\right)$ a.e. on $\{t \in[0,1]: M(t)=0\}$;
(ii) if $B C$ denotes $(S L),\left\|r_{0}-\left(A_{0} v(0)-\beta_{0} v^{\prime}(0)\right)\right\| \leq \alpha_{0} M(0)-\beta_{0} M^{\prime}(0)$, $\left\|r_{1}-\left(A_{1} v(1)+\beta_{1} v^{\prime}(1)\right)\right\| \leq \alpha_{1} M(1)+\beta_{1} M^{\prime}(1)$; and if $B C$ denotes $(P), \quad v(0)=v(1),\left\|v^{\prime}(1)-v^{\prime}(0)\right\| \leq M^{\prime}(1)-M^{\prime}(0)$, and $M(0)=M(1)$.

Observe that it is assumed in Theorem 1.1 that $(0, M)$ is a solution-tube to (1.4). In fact, many results were obtained under an assumption of existence of a solution-tube of the form $(0, M)$ with $M$ being a positive constant, see for example [1,4,11,14].

Remark also that in the scalar case, the notion of upper and lower solutions is equivalent to the notion of solution-tube.

For sake of completeness, we state the following results which will be used later in this paper.

Lemma 2.4. Let $u:[0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be an absolutely continuous function and let $E$ be a negligeable set in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, then meas $\left\{t \in[0,1]: u(t) \in E\right.$ and $\left.u^{\prime}(t) \neq 0\right\}=0$.

Lemma 2.5. Let $u \in W^{2,1}([0,1], \mathbb{R})$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Assume one of the following properties is satisfied:
(i) $u^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon u(t) \geq 0$ a.e. $t \in[0,1] ; a_{0} u(0)-b_{0} u^{\prime}(0) \leq 0, a_{1} u(1)+b_{1} u^{\prime}(1) \leq 0$, where $a_{i}, b_{i} \geq 0, \max \left\{a_{i}, b_{i}\right\}>0, \max \left\{a_{0}, a_{1}, \varepsilon\right\}>0$;
(ii) $u^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon u(t) \geq 0$ a.e. $t \in[0,1]$; $\varepsilon>0, \quad u(0)=u(1), u^{\prime}(1)-u^{\prime}(0) \leq 0$;
(iii) $u^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon u(t) \geq 0$ a.e. $t \in\left[0, t_{1}\right] \cup\left[t_{2}, 1\right] ; \quad \varepsilon>0, u(0)=u(1), u^{\prime}(1)-u^{\prime}(0) \leq$ 0 , and $u(t) \leq 0$ for $t \in\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right]$.
Then $u(t) \leq 0$ for all $t \in[0,1]$.

## 3. Bernstein-type growth condition

The following theorem gives the existence of solution when the function $f$ satisfies a Bernstein-type growth condition.
Theorem 3.1. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a Carathéodory function. Assume
(H1) there exists $(v, M)$ a solution-tube to $(\star)$;
(H2) there exist $C, D>0$ and a function $h \in L^{1}([0,1])$ such that
$|\langle p, f(t, x, p)\rangle| \leq\left(C\|p\|^{2}+D\right)(h(t)+\|p\|)$ a.e. $t \in[0,1]$ and for all $(x, p) \in$ $\mathbb{R}^{2 n}$ with $\|x-v(t)\| \leq M(t) ;$
(H3) there exist $k, \theta, \gamma>0, m \geq 0, h_{1}, h_{2} \in L^{1}([0,1])$ such that for a.e. $t \in[0,1]$ and for all $(x, p) \in \mathbb{R}^{2 n}$ with $\|x-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ and $\|p\| \geq k$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (i) } \frac{\langle x, f(t, x, p)\rangle+\|p\|^{2}}{\|p\|}-\frac{\langle p, f(t, x, p)\rangle\langle\bar{x}, p\rangle}{\|p\|^{3}} \geq \theta\|p\|-m|\langle x, p\rangle|-h_{1}(t) \text {; } \\
& \text { (ii) }\|x\|\left(\frac{\langle x, f(t, x, p)\rangle+\|p\|^{2}}{\|p\|}-\frac{\langle p, f(t, x, p)\rangle\langle x, p\rangle}{\|p\|^{3}}\right)+\frac{\langle x, p\rangle^{2}}{\|x\|\|p\|} \\
& \geq \gamma|\langle x, p\rangle|-h_{2}(t) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then the problem $(\star)$ has a solution such that $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ for all $t \in[0,1]$.
To prove this theorem, we need the following three lemmas.
Fix $\varepsilon \geq 0$ such that the operator $L_{\varepsilon}: C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \rightarrow C_{0}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ defined by

$$
L_{\varepsilon}(x)(t)=x^{\prime}(t)-x^{\prime}(0)-\varepsilon \int_{0}^{t} x(s) d s
$$

is invertible. In particular, if $B C$ denotes $(S L)$ with $\max \left\{\alpha_{0}, \alpha_{1}\right\}>0$, we can take $\varepsilon=0($ see $[8])$.
Lemma 3.2. Let $(v, M)$ be a solution-tube to ( $\star$ ). If $x \in W_{B}^{2,1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\left\langle x(t)-v(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|}-\frac{\left\langle x(t)-v(t), x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle^{2}}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|^{3}} \\
&-\varepsilon\|x(t)-v(t)\| \geq M^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon M(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

a.e. on $\{t \in[0,1]:\|x(t)-v(t)\|>M(t)\}$. Then $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ for every $t \in[0,1]$.
Proof. Let $E_{\delta}=\{t \in[0,1]:\|x(t)-v(t)\|>M(t)+\delta\}$ with $\delta>0$. If, $E_{\delta} \neq \emptyset$ for some $\delta>0$, then, for every interval $\left(t_{0}, t_{1}\right) \subset E_{\delta}$ such that $\left\|x\left(t_{0}\right)-v\left(t_{0}\right)\right\|=$ $M\left(t_{0}\right)+\delta$ or $t_{0}=0$, and $\left\|x\left(t_{1}\right)-v\left(t_{1}\right)\right\|=M\left(t_{1}\right)+\delta$ or $t_{1}=1$, the function $\|x(t)-v(t)\|$ belongs to the space $W^{2,1}\left(\left[t_{0}, t_{1}\right], \mathbb{R}\right)$ and we have

$$
\|x(t)-v(t)\|^{\prime}=\frac{\left\langle x(t)-v(t), x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|}
$$

which exists for all $t \in\left[t_{0}, t_{1}\right]$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|x(t)-v(t)\|^{\prime \prime}=\frac{\left\langle x(t)-v(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|} \\
&-\frac{\left\langle x(t)-v(t), x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle^{2}}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|^{3}}
\end{aligned}
$$

a.e. $t \in\left[t_{0}, t_{1}\right]$.

Denote $w(t)=\|x(t)-v(t)\|-(M(t)+\delta)$. By assumption, we have a.e. on $\left[t_{0}, t_{1}\right]$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
w^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon w(t) & =\|x(t)-v(t)\|^{\prime \prime}-\varepsilon\|x(t)-v(t)\|-M^{\prime \prime}(t)+\varepsilon(M(t)+\delta) \\
& \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

In order to apply the maximum principle (Lemma 2.5), we need to verify some boundary conditions. If $B C$ denotes $(S L)$ then, either

$$
w\left(t_{0}\right) \leq 0, \quad \text { or } \quad t_{0}=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \alpha_{0} w(0)-\beta_{0} w^{\prime}(0) \leq 0 .
$$

Indeed,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|x(0)-v(0)\|\left(\alpha_{0} \| x(0)\right. & \left.-v(0)\left\|-\beta_{0}\right\| x(0)-v(0) \|^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq\left\langle x(0)-v(0), A_{0}(x(0)-v(0))-\beta_{0}\left(x^{\prime}(0)-v^{\prime}(0)\right)\right\rangle \\
& \leq\|x(0)-v(0)\|\left\|r_{0}-\left(A_{0} v(0)-\beta_{0} v^{\prime}(0)\right)\right\| \\
& \leq\|x(0)-v(0)\|\left(\alpha_{0} M(0)-\beta_{0} M^{\prime}(0)\right) \\
& \leq\|x(0)-v(0)\|\left(\alpha_{0}(M(0)+\delta)-\beta_{0}(M+\delta)^{\prime}(0)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, either

$$
w\left(t_{1}\right) \leq 0, \quad \text { or } \quad t_{1}=1 \quad \text { and } \quad \alpha_{1} w(1)+\beta_{1} w^{\prime}(1) \leq 0 .
$$

On the other hand, when $B C$ denotes the periodic boundary condition $(P)$, if $w\left(t_{0}\right) \leq 0$ and $w\left(t_{1}\right) \leq 0$, we argue as in the previous case. Otherwise, $\left[t_{0}, t_{1}\right]=$ $[0,1]$, or $\left(t_{0}, t_{1}\right) \subset\left(0, t_{2}\right) \cup\left(t_{3}, 1\right) \subset E_{\delta}$ and $w\left(t_{2}\right)=w\left(t_{3}\right)=0$, and we have

$$
\|x(0)-v(0)\|=\|x(1)-v(1)\|, \quad M(0)=M(1), \quad \text { and } \quad w^{\prime}(1)-w^{\prime}(0) \leq 0 .
$$

Indeed,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \|x(1)-v(1)\|^{\prime}-\|x(0)-v(0)\|^{\prime}=\frac{\left\langle x(0)-v(0), v^{\prime}(0)-v^{\prime}(1)\right\rangle}{\|x(0)-v(0)\|} \\
& \leq\left\|v^{\prime}(1)-v^{\prime}(0)\right\| \leq M^{\prime}(1)-M^{\prime}(0)
\end{aligned}
$$

By Lemma 2.5 applied to $w$, we deduce that $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)+\delta$. But this inequality holds for every $\delta>0$; therefore, $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ for all $t \in[0,1]$. This completes the proof.

Lemma 3.3. Let $u \in W^{2,1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right), l_{1}, l_{2} \in L^{1}([0,1]), \theta_{1}, \gamma_{1}, k_{1}>0, m_{1} \geq 0$. If $x \in W^{2,1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ satisfies a.e. on $\left\{t \in[0,1]:\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\| \geq k_{1}\right\}$,
(i) $\frac{\left\langle x(t)-u(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)-u^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\|}$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
-\frac{\left\langle x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)-u^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\left\langle x(t)-u(t), x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{3}} \\
\geq \theta_{1}\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\|-m_{1}\left|\left\langle x(t)-u(t), x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|-l_{1}(t) ;
\end{array}
$$

(ii) $\|x(t)-u(t)\|\left(\frac{\left\langle x(t)-u(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)-u^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\|}\right)$ $-\|x(t)-u(t)\|\left(\frac{\left\langle x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)-u^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\left\langle x(t)-u(t), x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{3}}\right)$ $+\frac{\left\langle x(t)-u(t), x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle^{2}}{\|x(t)-u(t)\|\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\|}$ $\geq \gamma_{1}\left|\left\langle x(t)-u(t), x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|-l_{2}(t)$.

Then there exists $K_{1}\left(\|x-u\|_{0}\right)$ such that for any interval $[a, b]$ on which $\| x^{\prime}(t)-$ $u^{\prime}(t) \| \geq k_{1}$ we have $\left\|x^{\prime}-u^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{1}[a, b]} \leq K_{1}\left(\|x-u\|_{0}\right)$. Moreover, there exists $t \in[0,1]$ such that $\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\| \leq \max \left\{k_{1}, K_{1}\left(\|x-u\|_{0}\right)\right\}$.
Proof. Assume $\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\| \geq k_{1}$ on $[a, b]$. Then, by (ii),

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{a}^{b} \mid\langle x(t) & \left.-u(t), x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle \mid d t \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\gamma_{1}} \int_{a}^{b} l_{2}(t)+\frac{d}{d t} \frac{\|x(t)-u(t)\|\left\langle x(t)-u(t), x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\|} d t \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\gamma_{1}}\left(\left\|l_{2}\right\|_{L^{1}[0,1]}+2\left(\|x-u\|_{0}\right)^{2}\right)=K_{2}\left(\|x-u\|_{0}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, (i) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{a}^{b}\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\| d t \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\theta_{1}} \int_{a}^{b} l_{1}(t)+m_{1}\left|\left\langle x(t)-u(t), x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|+\frac{d}{d t} \frac{\left\langle x(t)-u(t), x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\|} d t \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\theta_{1}}\left(\left\|l_{1}\right\|_{L^{1}[0,1]}+m_{1} K_{2}\left(\|x-u\|_{0}\right)+2\|x-u\|_{0}\right)=K_{1}\left(\|x-u\|_{0}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover, there exists $t \in[0,1]$ such that $\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\| \leq \max \left\{k_{1}, K_{1}\left(\|x-u\|_{0}\right)\right\}$ since, either $\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-u^{\prime}(t)\right\| \leq k_{1}$ for some $t \in[0,1]$, or $\left\|x^{\prime}-u^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{1}[0,1]} \leq K_{1}\left(\|x-u\|_{0}\right)$.

Lemma 3.4. Let $k_{0}, K_{0} \geq 0, l \in L^{1}([0,1])$ and $\psi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow(0, \infty)$ be a Borel measurable function such that

$$
\int_{k_{0}}^{\infty} \frac{s d s}{\psi(s)}>\|l\|_{L^{1}}+K_{0} .
$$

If $x \in W^{2,1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ satisfies
(i) there exists $t \in[0,1]$ such that $\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\| \leq k_{0}$;
(ii) $\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{1}[a, b]} \leq K_{0}$ if $\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\| \geq k_{0}$ on $[a, b]$;
(iii) $\left|\left\langle x^{\prime}(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\right| \leq \psi\left(\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|\right)\left(l(t)+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|\right)$ a.e. on $\left\{t:\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\| \geq k_{0}\right\}$.

Then there exists $K=K\left(\psi, l, k_{0}, K_{0}\right)$ such that $\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|_{0}<K$.
Proof. Fix $K>k_{0}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{k_{0}}^{K} \frac{s d s}{\psi(s)}>\|l\|_{L^{1}}+K_{0} . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We claim that $\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|<K$ for all $t \in[0,1]$. If not, there exist $a, b \in[0,1]$ such that $\left\|x^{\prime}(a)\right\|=k_{0},\left\|x^{\prime}(b)\right\|=K$, and $k_{0}<\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\| \leq K$ for all $t$ between $a$ and $b$. Without loss of generality, assume that $a<b$, then

$$
\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{\prime}=\frac{\left\langle x^{\prime}(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|}
$$

exists for all $t \in(a, b]$. Thus,

$$
\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{\prime} \leq \psi\left(\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|\right)\left(l(t)+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|\right)
$$

a.e. $t \in(a, b)$. Dividing by $\psi\left(\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|\right)$, integrating from $a$ to $b$, we obtain

$$
\int_{a}^{b} \frac{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{\prime}}{\psi\left(\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|\right)} d t \leq\|l\|_{L^{1}}+K_{0}
$$

By the inequality (3.1) and the change of variables formula (see [7]), we get a contradiction.

To prove Theorem 3.1, we will modify the function $f$. To this modified function, we will associate a problem for which we will deduce the existence of a solution. Finally, we will observe that this solution is in fact a solution to our original problem ( $\star$ ).

Let $\lambda \in[0,1]$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$ be as before. We define the function $f_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}(t, x, p) \\
& \quad= \begin{cases}\lambda\left(\frac{M(t)}{\|x-v(t)\|} f(t, \widetilde{x}, \widehat{p})-\varepsilon \widetilde{x}\right)-\varepsilon(1-\lambda) v(t)+ \\
\left(1-\frac{\lambda M(t)}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)\left(v^{\prime \prime}(t)+\frac{M^{\prime \prime}(t)}{\|x-v(t)\|}(x-v(t))\right), & \text { if }\|x-v(t)\|>M(t), \\
\lambda(f(t, x, p)-\varepsilon x)-\varepsilon(1-\lambda) v(t)+ & \\
(1-\lambda)\left(v^{\prime \prime}(t)+\frac{M^{\prime \prime}(t)}{M(t)}(x-v(t))\right), & \text { otherwise; }\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $(v, M)$ is the solution-tube to $(\star)$ given in (H1), $\widetilde{x}=\frac{M(t)}{\|x-v(t)\|}(x-v(t))+v(t)$, $\widehat{p}=p+\left(M^{\prime}(t)-\frac{\left\langle x-v(t), p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)\left(\frac{x-v(t)}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)$, and where we mean $\frac{M^{\prime \prime}(t)}{M(t)}(x-v(t))=$ 0 on $\{t \in[0,1]: M(t)=0\}$.

To the function $f_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$, we associate the operator $F_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}: C^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \rightarrow L^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ defined by

$$
F_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}(x)(t)=f_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)
$$

The function $f_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ is not necessarily a Carathéodory function, but we have the following result.

Proposition 3.5. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a Carathéodory function and let $(v, M)$ be a solution-tube to ( $\star$ ). Then the previously defined operator $F_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ is continuous and integrably bounded on bounded.

Proof. Obviously, $F_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ is integrably bounded on bounded independently of $\lambda \in[0,1]$. Therefore, it is sufficient to show that if $x_{n} \rightarrow x$ in $C^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}\left(t, x_{n}(t), x^{\prime}{ }_{n}(t)\right) \rightarrow f_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right) \quad \text { a.e. } t \in[0,1] . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The conclusion follows from the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem.
Since $f$ is a Carathéodory function, it is clear from the definition of $f_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ that the relation (3.2) holds almost everywhere on $\{t \in[0,1]:\|x(t)-v(t)\| \neq M(t)\}$. On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that $\left\langle x(t)-v(t), x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle=M(t) M^{\prime}(t)$
a.e. on $\{t \in[0,1]:\|x(t)-v(t)\|=M(t)>0\}$. Therefore, it is easy to verify that almost everywhere on that set,

$$
\widehat{x_{n}^{\prime}(t)} \rightarrow \widehat{x^{\prime}(t)}
$$

hence, the relation (3.2) is satisfied.
Finally, on $\{t \in[0,1]:\|x(t)-v(t)\|=0=M(t)\}, x(t)=v(t), x^{\prime}(t)=v^{\prime}(t)$, $M^{\prime}(t)=0, M^{\prime \prime}(t)=0$ a.e. So,

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right) & =\lambda\left(f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)-\varepsilon x(t)\right)+(1-\lambda)\left(v^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon v(t)\right) \\
& =\lambda\left(f\left(t, v(t), v^{\prime}(t)\right)-\varepsilon x(t)\right)+(1-\lambda)\left(v^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon v(t)\right) \\
& =\lambda\left(v^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon x(t)\right)+(1-\lambda)\left(v^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon v(t)\right) \\
& =v^{\prime \prime}(t)-\lambda \varepsilon x(t)-(1-\lambda) \varepsilon v(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

a.e. on that set. This completes the proof.

Let us consider the associated problems

$$
(\star)_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}\left\{\begin{array}{l}
x^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon x(t)=f_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right) \quad \text { a.e. } t \in[0,1] \\
x \in B C
\end{array}\right.
$$

Now, we can prove Theorem 3.1.
Proof of Theorem 3.1. We will show that the problem $(\star)_{1}^{\varepsilon}$ has a solution satisfying $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$. By the definition of $f_{1}^{\varepsilon}$, this solution will be a solution to our original problem $(\star)$.

Let $x$ be a solution to $(\star)_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$. On $\{t \in[0,1]:\|x-v(t)\|>M(t)\}$, we have $\|\widetilde{x}(t)-v(t)\|=M(t),\left\langle\widetilde{x}(t)-v(t), \widehat{x^{\prime}(t)}-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle=M(t) M^{\prime}(t)$, and $\left\|\widehat{x^{\prime}(t)}-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}=$ $\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}+\left(M^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\frac{\left\langle x(t)-v(t), x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle^{2}}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|^{2}}$. Thus, by using (H1), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left.\frac{\langle x(t)-}{} v(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2} \\
&\|x(t)-v(t)\| \\
&-\varepsilon\|x(t)-v(t)\| \\
&= \frac{\lambda\left(\left\langle\widetilde{x}-v(t)-v(t), f\left(t, \widetilde{x}(t), \widehat{x^{\prime}(t)}\right)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|\widehat{x^{\prime}(t)}-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}\right)-M^{\prime}(t)^{2}}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|^{3}} \\
&\|x(t)-v(t)\| \\
& \quad+\frac{(1-\lambda)\left\|\widehat{x^{\prime}(t)}-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|}+\left(1-\frac{\lambda M(t)}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|}\right) M^{\prime \prime}(t)-\lambda \varepsilon M(t) \\
& \geq M^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon M(t)+\frac{(1-\lambda)\left(\left\|\widehat{x^{\prime}(t)}-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}-M^{\prime}(t)^{2}\right)}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|} \\
& \geq M^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon M(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

a.e. on $\{t \in[0,1]:\|x-v(t)\|>M(t)\}$. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that every solution to $(\star)_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ satisfies $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ for all $t \in[0,1]$.

On the other hand, (H3) implies the existence of $\theta_{1}, \gamma_{1}>0, l_{1}, l_{2} \in L^{1}([0,1])$ such that for every solution $x$ of $(\star)_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ we have a.e. on $\left\{t \in[0,1]:\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\| \geq k\right\}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|}-\frac{\left\langle x^{\prime}(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{3}} \\
& \geq \theta_{1}\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|-m\left|\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|-l_{1}(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\|x(t)\|\left(\frac{\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|}-\frac{\left\langle x^{\prime}(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{3}}\right)+\frac{\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle^{2}}{\|x(t)\|\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|} \\
\geq \gamma_{1}\left|\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|-l_{2}(t)
\end{array}
$$

Indeed,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|}-\frac{\left\langle x^{\prime}(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{3}} \\
& =\lambda\left(\frac{\left\langle x(t), f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|}-\frac{\left\langle x^{\prime}(t), f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right\rangle\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{3}}\right) \\
& \quad+(1-\lambda)\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|+\frac{(1-\lambda)\left\langle x(t), v^{\prime \prime}(t)+\left(\varepsilon+M^{\prime \prime}(t) / M(t)\right)(x(t)-v(t))\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|} \\
& \quad-\frac{(1-\lambda)\left\langle x^{\prime}(t), v^{\prime \prime}(t)+\left(\varepsilon+M^{\prime \prime}(t) / M(t)\right)(x(t)-v(t))\right\rangle\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{3}} \\
& \geq \lambda \theta\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|-m\left|\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|+(1-\lambda)\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|-l_{1}(t) \\
& \geq \theta_{1}\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|-m\left|\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|-l_{1}(t) ;
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|x(t)\|\left(\frac{\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|}\right. & \left.-\frac{\left\langle x^{\prime}(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{3}}\right)+\frac{\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle^{2}}{\|x(t)\|\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|} \\
& \geq(1-\lambda)\|x(t)\|\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|+\lambda \gamma\left|\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|-l_{2}(t) \\
& \geq \gamma_{1}\left|\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|-l_{2}(t) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 3.3 applied with $u=0$ gives the existence of $K_{1}=K_{1}\left(\|M\|_{0}+\|v\|_{0}\right)>0$ such that $\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{1}[a, b]} \leq K_{1}$ for any interval $[a, b]$ on which $\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\| \geq k$; and $\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\| \leq$ $\max \left\{k, K_{1}\right\}$ for some $t \in[0,1]$.

By (H2) and the definition of $f_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$, there exist $C_{1}, D_{1}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\left\langle x^{\prime}(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\right| \leq & (1-\lambda)\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|\left\|v^{\prime \prime}(t)+\left(\varepsilon+M^{\prime \prime}(t) / M(t)\right)(x(t)-v(t))\right\| \\
& \quad+\lambda\left(C\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}+D\right)\left(h(t)+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|\right) \\
\leq & \left(C_{1}\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}+D_{1}\right)\left(h(t)+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|+\left\|\varepsilon M(t)+M^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|+\left\|v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

a.e. $t \in[0,1]$. It follows from Lemma 3.4 that there exists $K$ such that $\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|_{0}<K$.

A solution to $(\star)_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ is a fixed point of the operator $L_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \circ N_{F_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}}: \bar{U} \rightarrow C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, where $U=\left\{x \in C_{B}^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right):\|x\|_{0}<\|v\|_{0}+\|M\|_{0}+1,\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|_{0}<K\right\}$, and $L_{\varepsilon}$ and $N_{F_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}}$ are previously defined. From Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 3.5, we deduce the continuity and the compactness of this operator. We showed that $L_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \circ N_{F_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}}$ has no fixed point on $\partial U$. Also, it is easy to show that $L_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \circ N_{F_{0}^{\varepsilon}}$ is essential. The topological transversality Theorem (Theorem 2.2) gives the existence of a fixed point to $L_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \circ N_{F_{1}^{\varepsilon}}$, and then a solution to $(\star)_{1}^{\varepsilon}$ satisfying $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$. The conclusion follows from the definition of $f_{1}^{\varepsilon}$.

Remark. The assumption (H2) can we weaken. In fact, we need:
there exist a Borel measurable function $\psi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow(0, \infty)$ and a function $h \in$
$L^{1}([0,1])$ such that $\mid\left\langle p, \lambda f(t, x, p)+(1-\lambda)\left(v^{\prime \prime}+\left(\varepsilon+\left(M^{\prime \prime}(t)\right)^{+} / M(t)\right)(x-v(t))\right\rangle\right| \leq$ $\psi(\|p\|)(h(t)+\|p\|)$ a.e. $t$ and for all $\lambda \in[0,1], p \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $x$ with $\|x-v(t)\| \leq$ $M(t)$;
and $\int_{\max \left\{k, K_{1}\right\}}^{\infty} \frac{s d s}{\psi(s)}>\|h\|_{L^{1}}+K_{1}$,
where $K_{1}$ is the constant given in the proof of Theorem 3.1.
Gaprindashvili [9] obtained a similar result to the next one for the problem with Dirichlet boundary condition. Here, assumption (H2) is stronger while (H1) is weaker than his assumptions.

Corollary 3.6. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a Carathéodory function. Assume (H1), (H2) and
(H4) there exist $k, \theta>0, h_{1} \in L^{1}([0,1])$ such that for a.e. $t$ and for all $(x, p)$ with $\|x-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ and $\|p\| \geq k$,

$$
\frac{\langle x, f(t, x, p)\rangle+\|p\|^{2}}{\|p\|}-\frac{\langle p, f(t, x, p)\rangle\langle x, p\rangle}{\|p\|^{3}} \geq \theta\|p\|-h_{1}(t) .
$$

Then the problem $(\star)$ has a solution such that $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ for all $t \in[0,1]$.
Remark. In the scalar case, (H4) is satisfied with $\theta=1, h_{1} \equiv 0$ and any $k>0$.
The following theorem is similar to Theorem 3.1.
Theorem 3.7. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a Carathéodory function. Assume (H1), (H2) and
(H5) there exist $k, \theta, \gamma>0, m \geq 0, h_{1}, h_{2} \in L^{1}([0,1])$ such that for a.e. $t$ and for all $(x, p)$ with $\|x-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ and $\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\| \geq k$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (i) } \frac{\left\langle x-v(t), f(t, x, p)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|} \\
& \quad-\frac{\left\langle p-v^{\prime}(t), f(t, x, p)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\left\langle x-v(t), p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{3}} \\
& \geq \theta\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|-m\left|\left\langle x-v(t), p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|-h_{1}(t) ; \\
& \text { (ii) }\|x-v(t)\|\left(\frac{\left\langle x-v(t), f(t, x, p)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|}\right) \\
& -\|x-v(t)\|\left(\frac{\left\langle p-v^{\prime}(t), f(t, x, p)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\left\langle x-v(t), p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{3}}\right) \\
& \quad+\frac{\left\langle x-v(t), p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle^{2}}{\|x-v(t)\|\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|} \\
& \geq \gamma\left|\left\langle x-v(t), p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|-h_{2}(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

Then the problem $(\star)$ has a solution such that $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ for all $t \in[0,1]$.

## 4. Nagumo-type growth condition

Theorem 4.1. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a Carathéodory function. Assume (H1), (H5) and
(H6) there exist a Borel measurable function $\phi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow(0, \infty)$ and a function $h \in L^{1}([0,1])$ such that $\|f(t, x, p)\| \leq \phi(\|p\|)(h(t)+\|p\|)$ a.e. $t \in[0,1]$ and for all $(x, p) \in \mathbb{R}^{2 n}$ with $\|x-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$;
and $\int^{\infty} \frac{d s}{\phi(s)}=\infty$.

Then the problem $(\star)$ has a solution such that $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ for all $t \in[0,1]$.
First of all, observe that $\phi$ is not necessarily continuous, and $v^{\prime \prime}$ and $M^{\prime \prime}$ could be not essentially bounded. To prove this theorem, we can not use the problems $(\star)_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ as we did for Theorem 3.1, since an assumption like (H6) is not necessarily satisfied by $f_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$. In fact, to prove this theorem, we will use the theory of differential inclusions. We will construct a multivalued mapping and we will deduce the existence of a solution of the differential inclusion associated. Finally, we will observe that this solution is in fact a solution to our original problem ( $\star$ ).

For $\varepsilon \geq 0, \lambda \in[0,1]$, we define the multivalued fonction $T_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}^{n}}$ by $T_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}(t, x, p)=\widehat{f}_{\lambda}^{\widehat{\varepsilon}}(t, x, p)+G_{\lambda}(t, x, p)$ where $\widehat{f}_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ is the function defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \widehat{f}_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}(t, x, p)= \\
& \begin{cases}\lambda\left(\frac{M(t)}{\|x-v(t)\|} f(t, \widetilde{x}, \widehat{p})-\varepsilon \widetilde{x}\right)-\varepsilon(1-\lambda) v(t), & \text { if }\|x-v(t)\|>M(t)>0 \\
\lambda(f(t, x, p)-\varepsilon x)-\varepsilon(1-\lambda) v(t), & \text { if }\|x-v(t)\| \leq M(t), M(t)>0, \\
v^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon v(t), & \text { if } M(t)=0\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

and $G_{\lambda}$ is the multivalued function defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G_{\lambda}(t, x, p)= \\
& \begin{cases}\left(1-\frac{\lambda M(t)}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)\left(M^{\prime \prime}(t)+\frac{\left\langle x-v(t), v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)+ \\
\left.(1-\lambda)\left(\frac{M^{\prime}(t)^{2}-\left\|\widehat{p}-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)\right)^{+} \frac{(x-v(t))}{\|x-v(t)\|}, & \text { if }\|x-v(t)\|>M(t)>0, \\
{[0,(1-\lambda)]\left(M^{\prime \prime}(t)+\frac{\left\langle x-v(t), v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\|x-v(t)\|}+\right.} & \\
\left.\frac{M^{\prime}(t)^{2}-\left\|\widehat{p}-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)^{+} \frac{(x-v(t))}{\|x-v(t)\|}, & \text { if }\|x-v(t)\|=M(t)>0 \\
0, & \text { if }\|x-v(t)\|<M(t) \\
& \text { or } M(t)=0\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

where, as before, $(v, M)$ is the solution-tube to $(\star)$ given in (H1), $\widetilde{x}=v(t)+$ $\frac{M(t)}{\|x-v(t)\|}(x-v(t))$ and $\hat{p}=p+\left(M^{\prime}(t)-\frac{\left\langle x-v(t), p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)\left(\frac{x-v(t) \|}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)$.

To the function $T_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$, we associate the operator $\mathcal{T}_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}=\widehat{F}_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}+\mathcal{G}_{\lambda}: C^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right) \rightarrow$ $2^{L^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)}$, where $\widehat{F}_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda}$ are respectively defined by

$$
\begin{gathered}
\widehat{F}_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}(x)(t)=\widehat{f}_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right) \\
\mathcal{G}_{\lambda}(x)=\left\{u \in L^{1}\left([0,1], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right): u(t) \in G_{\lambda}\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right) \text { a.e. } t \in[0,1]\right\} .
\end{gathered}
$$

Proposition 4.2. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a Carathéodory function and let $(v, M)$ be a solution-tube to ( $\star$ ). Then the previously defined operator $\mathcal{T}_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ is upper semi-continuous, and integrably bounded on bounded, with non-empty, closed, convex values.
Proof. To show that $\widehat{F}_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ is continuous and integrably bounded on bounded independently of $\lambda \in[0,1]$, we argue as in Proposition 3.5.

On the other hand, it is clear that $G_{\lambda}(t, x, p)$ has non-empty, closed, convex values, $t \mapsto G_{\lambda}(t, x, p)$ is measurable for all $(x, p) \in \mathbb{R}^{2 n}$, and $(x, p) \mapsto G_{\lambda}(t, x, p)$ is upper semi-continuous for almost all $t \in[0,1]$. Observe that if $\|x-v(t)\| \geq M(t)>0$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\left(1-\frac{\lambda M(t)}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)\left(M^{\prime \prime}(t)+\frac{\left\langle x-v(t), v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)\right. \\
& \left.\quad+(1-\lambda)\left(\frac{M^{\prime}(t)^{2}-\left\|\widehat{p}-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)\right)^{+}>0
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \|\left(\left(1-\frac{\lambda M(t)}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)\left(M^{\prime \prime}(t)+\frac{\left\langle x-v(t), v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)\right. \\
& \left.\quad+(1-\lambda)\left(\frac{M^{\prime}(t)^{2}-\left\|\widehat{p}-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)\right)^{+} \frac{(x-v(t)) \|}{\|x-v(t)\|} \| \\
& =(1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\frac{\left\langle M(t)\left(x-v(t), v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\right.}{\|x-v(t)\|}+M^{\prime \prime}(t) M(t)+M^{\prime}(t)^{2}-\left\|\widehat{p}-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right) \\
& \quad+\left(1-\frac{M(t)}{\|x-v(t)\|}\right)\left(\frac{\left\langle x-v(t), v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\|x-v(t)\|}+M^{\prime \prime}(t)\right) \\
& \quad \\
& \quad \begin{array}{l}
\leq(1-\lambda) \frac{\langle M(t)(x-v(t)), f(t, \widetilde{x}, \widehat{p})\rangle}{\|x-v(t)\|^{2}}+\left\|v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|+\left|M^{\prime \prime}(t)\right| \\
\leq\|f(t, \widetilde{x}, \widehat{p})\|+\left\|v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|+\left|M^{\prime \prime}(t)\right| .
\end{array} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, $G_{\lambda}$ is Carathéodory. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda}$ is upper semi-continuous with non-empty, closed, convex values, and integrably bounded on bounded. This completes the proof.

Let us consider the associated problems

$$
(\star \star)_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}\left\{\begin{array}{l}
x^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon x(t) \in T_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right) \quad \text { a.e. } t \in[0,1] \\
x \in B C
\end{array}\right.
$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We will show that the problem $(\star \star)_{1}^{\varepsilon}$ has a solution satisfying $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$. By the definition of $T_{1}^{\varepsilon}$, this solution will be a solution to our original problem ( $\star$ ).

Let $x$ be a solution to $(\star \star)_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$. By Lemma $2.4, M^{\prime \prime}(t)=0$ a.e. on $\{t \in[0,1]$ : $M(t)=0\}$. This and (H1) imply that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\left\langle x(t)-v(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|}-\frac{\left\langle x(t)-v(t), x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle^{2}}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|^{3}} \\
& \quad-\varepsilon\|x(t)-v(t)\| \\
& \geq M^{\prime \prime}(t)-\varepsilon M(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

a.e. on $\{t \in[0,1]:\|x-v(t)\|>M(t)\}$. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that every solution to $(\star \star)_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$ satisfies $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ for all $t \in[0,1]$.

On the other hand, for every solution $x$ of $(\star \star)_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$, we have a.e. on $\{t \in[0,1]$ : $\left.\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\| \geq k\right\}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{\left\langle x(t)-v(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|} \\
& -\frac{\left\langle x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\left\langle x(t)-v(t), x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{3}} \\
& \geq \lambda \frac{\left\langle x(t)-v(t), f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|}  \tag{4.1}\\
& -\lambda \frac{\left\langle x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t), f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle\left\langle x(t)-v(t), x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{3}} \\
& +(1-\lambda)\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|-2 M(t)\left\|v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\| / k .
\end{align*}
$$

Inequality (4.1) and (H5) imply that the assumptions of Lemma 3.3 are satisfied. Thus, there exists $K_{1}=K_{1}\left(\|M\|_{0}\right)>0$ such that $\left\|x^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{1}[a, b]} \leq K_{1}$ for any interval $[a, b]$ on which $\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\| \geq k$; and $\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-v^{\prime}(t)\right\| \leq \max \left\{k, K_{1}\right\}$ for some $t \in[0,1]$.

By Lemma 2.4, $x^{\prime}(t)=\widehat{x^{\prime}(t)}$ a.e. on $\{t \in[0,1]:\|x-v(t)\|=M(t)>0\}$. Thus, it follows from (H1) that for almost all $t$ in that set and such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left(M^{\prime \prime}(t)+\frac{\left\langle x(t)-v(t), v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+M^{\prime}(t)^{2}-\left\|\widehat{x^{\prime}(t)}-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|}\right)^{+}>0 \\
\left\|\left(M^{\prime \prime}(t)+\frac{\left\langle x(t)-v(t), v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+M^{\prime}(t)^{2}-\left\|\widehat{x^{\prime}(t)}-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|}\right)^{+} \frac{(x-v(t))}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|}\right\| \\
\leq \frac{\left\langle(x-v(t)), f\left(t, x(t), \widehat{x^{\prime}(t)}\right)\right\rangle}{\|x(t)-v(t)\|} \\
\leq\left\|f\left(t, x(t), \widehat{x^{\prime}(t)}\right)\right\|=\left\|f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right\| .
\end{gathered}
$$

Hence,

$$
\left\|T_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)+\varepsilon x(t)\right\| \leq\left\|f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right\|+\varepsilon\|M\|_{0} .
$$

Fix $k_{0}=\max \left\{k, K_{1}\right\}+\left\|v^{\prime}\right\|_{0}$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$ such that the previously defined operator $L_{\varepsilon}$ is invertible, and

$$
\int_{k_{0}}^{\infty} \frac{d s}{\phi(s)+\varepsilon\|M\|_{0}}>\|h\|_{L^{1}}+1+K_{1}+\left\|v^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{1}}
$$

Lemma 3.4 applied with $\psi(s)=s\left(\phi(s)+\varepsilon\|M\|_{0}\right), l(t)=h(t)+1$ gives the existence of $K$ such that $\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|_{0}<K$.

By using the multivalued version of Theorem 2.2 with the homotopy given by the operators $L_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \circ N_{\mathcal{T}_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}}$, and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we deduce the existence of a solution to $(\star *)_{\lambda}^{\varepsilon}$. The conclusion follows from the definition of $T_{1}^{\varepsilon}$.

Corollary 4.3. Let $f:[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a Carathéodory function. Assume (H1), (H6) and
(H7) there exist $k, \theta>0, h_{1} \in L^{1}([0,1])$ such that for a.e. $t$ and for all $(x, p)$ with $\|x-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ and $\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\| \geq k$,

$$
\frac{\left\langle x-v(t), f(t, x, p)-v^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle+\left\|p-\overline{v^{\prime}}(t)\right\|^{2}}{\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|}
$$

$$
\geq \theta\left\|p-v^{\prime}(t)\right\|-h_{1}(t)
$$

Then the problem $(\star)$ has a solution such that $\|x(t)-v(t)\| \leq M(t)$ for all $t \in[0,1]$.

## 5. Examples

The following problems have a solution.

## Example 5.1.

$$
\begin{aligned}
x^{\prime \prime}(t) & =\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\| x^{\prime}(t)-c \\
x(0) & =x(1)=(0, \cdots, 0)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $\|c\|=1$. Verify that $v(t) \equiv 0, M(t)=t$, any $k>0, \theta=$ $1, h_{1}(t)=2 t / k, h \equiv 0, C=D=1$ satisfy the assumptions of Corollary 3.6. Consequently, this problem has a solution such that $\|x(t)\| \leq t$. Observe that there is no constant $M$ such that $(0, M)$ is a solution-tube to this problem and Hartman's condition (1.2) is not satisfied.

## Example 5.2.

$$
\begin{aligned}
x^{\prime \prime}(t) & =-4\left\langle x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle^{2} x(t)+x(t)+c \\
x(0) & =x(1)=(0, \cdots, 0)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ with $\|c\|=1$. Verify that $v \equiv 0, M \equiv 1, \gamma=1 / 4, \theta=1, m=4$, any $k>0, h_{1}=h_{2} \equiv 3 / k, h \equiv 0, C=4, D=2$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 3.1. Consequently, this problem has a solution such that $\|x(t)\| \leq 1$. Observe that Hartman's condition (1.2) and (H4) are not satisfied with this ( $v, M$ ).

## Example 5.3.

$$
\begin{aligned}
x^{\prime \prime}(t) & =\left\|x^{\prime}(t)-c t^{1 / 2}\right\|\left(x^{\prime}(t)-c t^{1 / 2}\right)+\left(c t^{-1 / 2}\right) / 2 \\
x(0) & =x(1)=(0, \cdots, 0)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$. Verify that $v(t)=\left(2 c t^{3 / 2}\right) / 3, M(t)=2\|c\| / 3, \theta=1$, any $k>0$, $h_{1} \equiv 0, h(t)=\|c\|\left(t^{-1 / 2}+2\right) / 2, \phi(s)=(s+\|c\|)$ satisfy the assumptions of Corollary 4.3.

## Example 5.4.

$$
\begin{aligned}
x^{\prime \prime}(t) & =\phi\left(\left\|x^{\prime}(t)\right\|\right) x^{\prime}(t) \\
x^{\prime}(0) & =(0, \cdots, 0), x^{\prime}(1)=c
\end{aligned}
$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, \phi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow(0, \infty)$ is continuous and $\int^{\infty} d s / \phi(s)=\infty$. Verify that $v(t) \equiv 0, M(t)=\|c\| t, \theta=1$, any $k>0, h=h_{1} \equiv 0$ satisfy the assumptions of Corollary 4.3. Consequently, this problem has a solution such that $\|x(t)\| \leq\|c\| t$.
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