

INTERVAL CRITERIA FOR OSCILLATION OF SECOND ORDER NON-LINEAR NEUTRAL DELAY DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

Vidhya.M¹ Kavitha. S²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Mathematics

²Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics

Vivekanandha College of Arts and Sciences For Women (Autonomous), Tamilnadu, India.

Abstract

Oscillation criteria are established in this paper for the second order non-linear neutral delay differential equations $[w(t)(x(t) + m(t)x(t - \tau))]' + n(t)f(x(t - \delta)) = 0$

Where τ and δ are nonnegative constants, $w, m, n \in C([t_0, \infty), R)$, and $f \in C(R, R)$. These results are different from known one in the sense that they are based on the information only on a sequence of subintervals of $[t_0, \infty)$

Keywords –Neutral differential equations, Oscillation, Criteria, Delay differential equations.

INTRODUCTION

Consider the second order neutral delay differential equation

$$[w(t)(x(t) + m(t)x(t - \tau))]' + n(t)f(x(t - \delta)) = 0 \quad \dots \dots [A]$$

Where $t \geq t_0, \tau$ and δ are nonnegative constants $w,$

$m, n \in C([t_0, \infty), R)$, and $f \in C(R, R)$. Let us assume the following as[a]

$$q(t) \geq 0, w(t) > 0, \int_{t_0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{w(s)}\right) ds = \infty,$$

$$\frac{f(x)}{x} \geq \gamma > 0 \quad \text{for } x \neq 0.$$

THEOREM- 1

If (a) $n(t) \geq 0, w(t) > 0, \int_{t_0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{w(s)}\right) ds = \infty, \frac{f(x)}{x} \geq \gamma > 0$ [a]

For $x \neq 0$.

Holds and $x(t)$ eventually positive solution of equation (A), then $z(t) \geq 0, z'(t) \geq 0,$

$$(w(t)z'(t))' \leq 0 \text{ on interval } [T_0, \infty)$$

For some $T_0 \geq t_0$ sufficiently large.

Moreover,

(i). If $0 \leq m(t) \leq 1,$ then

$$(w(t)z'(t))' + \gamma n(t)[1 - m(t - \delta)]z(t - \delta) \leq 0 \quad \dots \dots \dots [1.1]$$

(ii). if $-1 < \alpha \leq m(t) \leq 0$ then

$$(w(t)z'(t))' + \gamma n(t)z(t - \delta) \leq 0 \quad \dots \dots \dots [1.2]$$

PROOF:

Without loss of generality assume that $x(t) > 0$ for all $t \geq T_0 - \tau - \delta.$ since $x(t) \geq 0$ equation (A) implies that $(w(t)z'(t))' \leq 0$ and $(w(t)z'(t))'$ is decreasing.

It follows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} w(t)z'(t) = 1$$

Let as prove that

$$w(t)z'(t) \geq 0$$

And [1.1] and [1.2] holds.

(i) If $0 \leq m(t) \leq 1,$ then prove that $w(t)z'(t) \geq 0$

Otherwise there exist $t_1 \geq T_0$ Such that $z'(t_1) < 0.$

From $(w(t)z'(t))' \leq 0.$ It follows that

$$z(t) \leq z(t_1) + w(t_1)z'(t_1) \int_{t_1}^t \frac{1}{r(s)} ds.$$

Hence by condition (a) we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} z(t) = -\infty$ which contradict that $z(t) > 0$ for $t \geq t_0.$

Now observe that from (A) we have

$$[w(t)z'(t)]' + n(t)f(x(t - \delta)) = 0. \quad \dots \dots \dots [1.3]$$

From the condition

$$n(t) \geq 0, w(t) > 0, \int_{t_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{w(s)} ds = \infty, \frac{f(x)}{x} \geq \gamma > 0$$

for $x \neq 0.$

And by [1.3] we get

$$[w(t)z'(t)]' + \gamma n(t)[z(t - \delta) - m(t - \delta)x(t - \tau - \delta)] \leq 0$$

Which in view of the fact that $z(t) \geq x(t)$ and

If $z(t)$ is increasing we get

$$(w(t)z'(t))' + \gamma n(t)[1 - m(t - \delta)]z(t - \delta) \leq 0$$

(ii) If $-1 < \alpha \leq m(t) \leq 0$ then prove that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} w(t)z'(t) = 1 \geq 0.$$

Otherwise $l < 0$ then it we get $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} z(t) = -\infty$ which clime that $z(t)$ cannot be eventually negative on $[T_0, \infty)$

If that is the case it can consider two mutually exclusive cases.

CASE 1:

$x(t)$ is unbounded then there exist an increasing sequence $\{t_k\}, t_k \rightarrow \infty k \rightarrow \infty$

Such that

$$x(t) = \sup_{t \leq t_k} x(t) \text{ and } x(t_k) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } t_k \rightarrow \infty$$

$$\text{We find that } z(t_k) = x(t_k) + m(t_k)x(t_k - \tau) \geq x(t_k)(1 + m(t_k)) \geq 0$$

Contradicts the fact that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} z(t) = -\infty$

CASE 2:

$x(t)$ is bounded then there exist an sequence $\{t_k\}$ Such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x(t_k) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t).$$

Since the sequence $\{x(t_k - \tau)\}$ and $\{m(t_k)\}$ and bounded, there exist convergent subsequences. Therefore, without loss of generality, we may suppose that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x(t_k - \tau)$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} m(t_k)$ exist.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 > \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} z(t_k) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [x(t_k) + m(t_k)x(t_k - \tau)] \\ &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [x(t_k) + m(t_k)x(t_k)] \\ &\geq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) \left[1 + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} m(t_k) \right] \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This is also a contradiction.

Thus we must have $l \geq 0$, which implies that $z(t)$ must be eventually positive.

i.e.) there exist $t_* \geq t_0$ such that $z(t) > 0$ for all $t \geq t_*$. Otherwise since $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} w(t)z'(t) = 1 \geq 0$, and $w(t)z'(t)$ is nonincreasing, we must have $z(t) < 0$ for some $t \geq t_0$,

We therefore have

$$z(t) < 0, z'(t) \geq 0, (w(t)z'(t))' \leq 0$$

on $[T_0, \infty)$ for some $T_0 \geq t_0$ sufficiently large.

From condition (a), we have $f(x(t - \delta)) \geq \gamma x(t - \delta) \geq \gamma z(t - \delta)$ for $t \geq t_* + \delta$ sufficiently large. And we find equation (A) implies the equation for $z(t)$.

$$0 = [w(t)z'(t)]' + n(t)f(x(t - \delta)) \geq [w(t)z'(t)]' + \gamma n(t)z(t - \delta) \text{ at } t \in [t_0, \infty).$$

Hence proved.

RESULT:

In theorem 1 if $x(t)$ is an eventually negative solution of (A), then the relevant result hold.

In the sequence we say that a function $H = H(t, s)$ belongs to function class K, denoted $H \in K$, if $H \in C(D, R_+ = (0, \infty))$ and $k \in C^1(D, R_+)$

Where $D = \{(t, s): -\infty < s < t < \infty\}$ which satisfies

$$H(t, t) = 0, H(t, s) > 0, \quad \text{for } t > s, \quad \dots\dots (B1)$$

And has partial derivatives

$$\frac{\partial H(t, s)}{\partial t} \text{ and } \frac{\partial H(t, s)}{\partial s} \text{ on } D \text{ such that}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s} (H(t, s)k(t)) = h_1(t, s)\sqrt{(H(t, s)k(t))},$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s} (H(t, s)k(t)) = -h_2(t, s)\sqrt{(H(t, s)k(t))}, \quad \dots\dots\dots (B2)$$

Where $h_1, h_2 \in C(D, R)$.

THEOREM- 2

If (a)

$$n(t) \geq \sigma, w(t) > 0, \quad = \left(1/w(s)\right) ds = \infty, f(x)/x \geq \gamma > 0$$

For $x \neq 0$, holds and $x(t)$ be a solution of (A) such that $x(t) \neq 0$ $[T_0 - \tau - \delta, \infty)$ for some $T_0 \geq t_0$. For any $g \in C^1([t_0, \infty), R)$, let

$$r(t) = -v(t) \left\{ \frac{w(t)z'(t)}{z(t - \delta)} + w(t - \delta)g(t) \right\}, \quad \dots\dots [2.1]$$

Where $t \in [T_0, \infty)$. Then for any $H \in K$,

(i). If $0 \leq m(t) \leq 1$ and $t \in [c, b) \subset [T_0, \infty)$ then

$$\int_c^b H(b, s)\phi_1(s) ds \leq -H(b, c)k(c)w(c) + \frac{1}{4} \int_c^b w(s - \delta)v(s)h_2^2(t, s) ds.$$

(ii). If $-1 < \alpha \leq m(t) \leq 0$ and $t \in [c, b) \subset [T_0, \infty)$ then

$$\int_c^b H(b, s)\phi_2(s) ds \leq -H(b, c)k(c)r(c) + \frac{1}{4} \int_c^b w(s - \delta)v(s)h_2^2(t, s) ds.$$

PROOF

CASE (i)

Without loss of generality assume that $x(t) > 0$ for all $t \geq T_0 - \tau - \delta$

Differentiating [2.1] and make use of (A) and by theorem (1.) Case: (i). we get that for $s \in [c, b)$

$$r'(s) = 2g(s)r(s) - v(s) \left\{ \frac{(w(s)z'(s))'}{z(s-\delta)} - \frac{w(s)z'(s)z'(s-\delta)}{z^2(s-\delta)} + [w(s-\delta)g(s)]' \right\}$$

$$\geq 2g(s)r(s) + v(s) \left\{ \gamma n(s)[1 - m(s-\delta)] + \frac{w(s)z'(s)z'(s-\delta)}{z^2(s-\delta)} - [w(s-\delta)g(s)]' \right\}$$

From the fact that $w(s)z'(s)$ is decreasing, we get

$$w(s)z'(s) \leq w(s-\delta)z'(s-\delta)$$

For $s \geq T_0$

From the above we know that

$$r'(s) \geq 2g(s)r(s) + v(s) \left\{ \gamma n(s)[1 - m(s-\delta)] + \frac{1}{w(s-\delta)} \left(\frac{w(s)z'(s)}{z(s-\delta)} \right)^2 - [w(s-\delta)g(s)]' \right\}$$

$$= 2g(s)r(s) + v(s)[w(s-\delta)g(s)]' + v(s) \left\{ \gamma n(s)[1 - m(s-\delta)] + \frac{1}{w(s-\delta)} \left(\frac{w(s)}{v(s)} - w(s-\delta)g(s) \right)^2 \right\}$$

$$= \phi_1(s) + \frac{1}{w(s-\delta)v(s)} r^2(s).$$

It follows that

$$\phi_1(s) \leq r'(s) - \frac{1}{w(s-\delta)v(s)} r^2(s), \quad \dots \dots [2.2]$$

Multiplying [2.2] by $H(t, s)k(s)$,

And integrating it with respect to s from c to t for $t \in [c, b)$, and using the result of (B1) and (B2), one can get

$$\int_c^t H(t, s)k(s)\phi_1(s) ds \leq \int_c^t H(t, s)k(s)r'(s) ds - \int_c^t \frac{1}{w(s-\delta)v(s)} H(t, s)k(s)r^2(s) ds$$

$$= -H(t, c)k(c)r(c) + \int_c^t h_2(t, s)\sqrt{H(t, s)k(s)}r(s) ds - \int_c^t \frac{H(t, s)k(s)}{w(s-\delta)v(s)} r^2(s) ds$$

$$= -H(t, c)k(c)r(c) - \int_c^t \left[\sqrt{\frac{H(t, s)k(s)}{w(s-\delta)v(s)}} r(s) - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{w(s-\delta)v(s)} h_2(t, s) \right]^2 ds + \frac{1}{4} \int_c^t w(s-\delta)v(s) h_2^2(t, s) ds$$

$$\leq -H(t, c)k(c)r(c) + \frac{1}{4} \int_c^t w(s-\delta)v(s) h_2^2(t, s) ds.$$

Letting $t \rightarrow b^-$ in the above (i) is proved.

$$\int_c^b H(b, s) \phi_1(s) ds \leq -H(b, c)k(c)r(c) + \frac{1}{4} \int_c^b w(s - \delta)v(s)h_2^2(t, s) ds.$$

CASE (ii)

Without loss of generality assume that $x(t) > 0$ for all $t \geq T_0 - \tau - \delta$

Differentiating [2.1] and make use of (A) and by theorem (1)

Case: (ii) we get that for $s \in [c, b)$

$$\begin{aligned} r'(s) &= 2g(s)r(s) - v(s) \left\{ \frac{(w(s)z'(s))'}{z(s-\delta)} - \frac{w(s)z'(s)z'(s-\delta)}{z^2(s-\delta)} + [w(s-\delta)g(s)]' \right\} \\ &\geq 2g(s)r(s) + v(s) \left\{ \gamma n(s) + \frac{1}{w(s-\delta)} \frac{w(s)z'(s)w(s-\delta)z'(s-\delta)}{z^2(s-\delta)} - [w(s-\delta)g(s)]' \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of theorem (1) we can show the following inequality:

$$\phi_2(s) \leq r'(s) - \frac{1}{w(s-\delta)v(s)} r^2(s). \quad \dots \dots [2.3]$$

Multiplying [2.3] by $H(t, s)k(s)$,

And integrating it with respect to s from c to t for $t \in [c, b)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_c^t H(t, s)k(s)\phi_2(s) ds &\leq \int_c^t H(t, s)k(s)r'(s) ds - \int_c^t \frac{1}{w(s-\delta)v(s)} H(t, s)k(s)r^2(s) ds \\ &= -H(t, c)k(c)r(c) + \int_c^t h_2(t, s)\sqrt{H(t, s)k(s)}r(s) ds - \int_c^t \frac{H(t, s)k(s)}{w(s-\delta)v(s)} r^2(s) ds \\ &= -H(t, c)k(c)r(c) \\ &\quad - \int_c^t \left[\sqrt{\frac{H(t, s)k(s)}{w(s-\delta)v(s)}} r(s) - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{w(s-\delta)v(s)}h_2(t, s) \right]^2 ds + \frac{1}{4} \int_c^t w(s-\delta)v(s)h_2^2(t, s) ds \\ &\leq -H(t, c)k(c)r(c) + \frac{1}{4} \int_c^t w(s-\delta)v(s)h_2^2(t, s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $t \rightarrow b^-$ in the above (ii) is proved.

$$\int_c^b H(b, s)\phi_2(s) ds \leq -H(b, c)k(c)r(c) + \frac{1}{4} \int_c^b w(s-\delta)v(s)h_2^2(t, s) ds.$$

Hence proved.

CONCLUSION:

Throughout this work, we discussed some definition and theorems on Interval criteria for oscillation of second order non-linear neutral delay differential equations and then we discussed for the oscillation of second order non-linear neutral delay differential equations with non-negative constants on the interval $[t_0, \infty)$. finally we establish that, when the co-efficient of neutral delay differential equations is zero so that the solution of the second order non-linear equation is oscillatory

REFERENCE:

J.Jiang, X.Li :: oscillation of second order nonlinear neutral differential equations. Appl.Math. Comput. 135 (2003)1301-1314.

G.Ladas, E.C.Partheniadis and Y.G.Sficas: Necessary and sufficient condition for oscillation of second order nonlinear neutral differential equations. Math. Anal. Appl. 138 (1989) 214-231.

J.S.W.Wong :: Necessary and sufficient condition for oscillation of second order neutral differential equations. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 252 (2000) 342-352.

J.Yan: oscillation of second order neutral functional differential equations. Appl.Math. Comput. 83 (1997) 27-41.

Y.Sahiner :On oscillation of second order neutral type delay differential equations. Appl.Math. Comput. 150 (2004) 697-706.

