

**OSCILLATION IN NEUTRAL EQUATIONS WITH AN  
"INTEGRALLY SMALL" COEFFICIENT**

**J. S. YU**

Department of Applied Mathematics  
Hunan University  
Changsha, Hunan 410082, China  
and

**MING-PO CHEN**

Institute of Mathematics, Academia Sinica,  
Taipei 11529, Taiwan, China

(Received March 17, 1992 and in revised form September 14, 1992)

ABSTRACT. Consider the neutral delay differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}[x(t) - P(t)x(t - \tau)] + Q(t)x(t - \delta) = 0, t \geq t_0 \quad (*)$$

Where  $P, Q \in C([t_0, \infty), R^+)$ ,  $\tau \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\delta \in R^+$ . We obtain several sufficient conditions for the oscillation of all solutions of Eq. (\*) without the restriction

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} Q(s)ds = \infty.$$

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES. Neutral equations, "integrally small" coefficient, oscillation.

1991 AMS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODES. 34K15, 34C10.

1. INTRODUCTION.

In this paper we consider the first order neutral delay differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}[x(t) - P(t)x(t - \tau)] + Q(t)x(t - \sigma) = 0, t \geq t_0 \quad (1)$$

where

$$\tau \in (0, \infty), \sigma \in R^+ \text{ and } P, Q \in C([t_0, \infty), R^+) \quad (2)$$

Our aim in this paper is to establish some sufficient conditions for the oscillation of all solutions of Eq. (1) which does not require that

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} Q(s)ds = \infty \quad (3)$$

The oscillatory behavior of Eq. (1) has been investigated by many authors, see for example [1-2] and [4-7]. For a recent survey, we can see [3]. The most of the papers in the literature, however, concern the equation (1) under the hypothesis (3).

Moreover, (3) is also a sufficient condition for the oscillation of Eq. (1) with  $P(t) \equiv 1$ . Therefore, Chuanxi and Ladas put forward the following open problem in [1].

OPEN PROBLEM A [1]. Is condition (3) a necessary condition for the oscillation of all solutions of Eq. (1) with  $P(t) \equiv 1$ ?

Recently, Yu, Wang and Chuanxi [6] answered the above problem and proved the following result in [6].

THEOREM B [6]. Assume that (2) holds with  $P(t) \equiv 1$ . Suppose also

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} sQ(s) \left[ \int_s^{\infty} Q(t) dt \right] ds = \infty. \tag{4}$$

Then every solution of Eq. (1) oscillates.

Clearly, condition (4) is better than (3). Therefore, the answer to open problem A is negative.

In [8], Zhang and Yu prove the following theorem

THEOREM C [8]. Assume that (2) holds with  $P(t) \equiv 1$ . Then every bounded solution of Eq. (1) oscillates if and only if

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} sQ(s) ds = \infty \tag{5}$$

In this paper we will establish several further oscillation results for Eq. (1) when condition (3) does not satisfy, that is, when  $Q(t)$  is "integrally small". This is done by using Lemmas 1 and 2 given in section 2. These lemmas are interesting in their own right.

In the sequel, for the sake of convenience, we define

$$H_0(t) = \int_t^{\infty} Q(s) ds$$

Let  $\rho = \max\{\tau, \delta\}$ . By a solution of Eq. (1) we mean a function  $x \in C([t_1 - \rho, \infty), R)$ , for some  $t_1 \geq t_0$ , such that  $x(t) - P(t)x(t - \tau)$  is continuously differentiable on  $[t_1, \infty)$  and satisfies Eq. (1) for  $t \geq t_1$ .

Assume that (2) holds,  $t_1 \geq t_0$  and let  $\varphi \in C([t_1 - \rho, t_1], R)$  be a given initial function. Then we can easily see by the method of steps that Eq. (1) has a unique solution  $x \in C([t_1 - \rho, \infty), R)$  such that

$$x(t) = \varphi(t) \text{ for } t_1 - \rho \leq t \leq t_1.$$

As is customary, a solution of Eq. (1) is said to oscillate if it has arbitrarily large zeros. Otherwise, the solution is called nonoscillatory.

## 2. TWO IMPORTANT LEMMAS

At first, we assume

(Y<sub>1</sub>) There exists a  $t^* \geq t_0$  such that

$$P(t^* + i\tau) \leq 1 \text{ for } i = 0, 1, 2, \dots \tag{7}$$

and

(Y<sub>2</sub>) There exists a nonnegative integer  $k$  such that the functions

$$H_m(t) = \int_t^{\infty} sQ(s)H_{m-1}(s) ds, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots, k \tag{8}$$

exist and

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} sQ(s)H_k(s)ds = \infty \tag{9}$$

The main results in this section are Lemmas 1 and 2 which enable us to establish some new type of oscillation criteria for Eq. (1).

LEMMA 1. Assume that (2) and (Y<sub>1</sub>) hold. Suppose also that Q(t) is not identically zero on any half infinite interval [T, ∞), T ≥ t<sub>0</sub>. Let x(t) be an eventually positive solution of the differential inequality

$$\frac{d}{dt}[x(t) - P(t)x(t - \tau)] + Q(t)x(t - \sigma) \leq 0 \tag{10}$$

and set

$$y(t) = x(t) - P(t)x(t - \tau). \tag{11}$$

Then we have eventually

$$y(t) > 0. \tag{12}$$

PROOF. Let t<sub>1</sub> ≥ t<sub>0</sub> be such that

$$x(t - \rho) > 0 \text{ for } t \geq t_1$$

where ρ = max{τ, δ}. Then by (10) and (11) we have

$$y'(t) \leq -Q(t)x(t - \delta) \leq 0 \text{ for } t \geq t_1,$$

which implies that y(t) is nonincreasing on [t<sub>1</sub>, ∞). Hence, if (12) does not hold, then eventually

$$y(t) < 0.$$

Therefore, there exist t<sub>2</sub> > t<sub>1</sub> and α > 0 such that

$$y(t) \leq -\alpha \text{ for } t \geq t_2$$

That is,

$$x(t) \leq -\alpha + P(t)x(t - \tau) \text{ for } t \geq t_2 \tag{13}$$

Now choose a positive integer n\* such that t\* + n\*τ ≥ t<sub>2</sub>. Then by (Y<sub>1</sub>) and (13) we get

$$\begin{aligned} x(t^* + n^*\tau + j\tau) &\leq -j\alpha + x(t^* + n^*\tau) \\ &\rightarrow -\infty \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the positivity of x(t). And this proof is complete.

REMARK 1. Lemma 1 is an improvement of Lemma 1 in [2] since the condition Q(t) ≥ q > 0 for t ≥ t<sub>0</sub> is relaxed.

LEMMA 2. Assume that (2) and (Y<sub>2</sub>) hold and that

$$P(t) \geq 1 \text{ for } t \geq t_0 \tag{14}$$

Let x(t) be an eventually positive solution of inequality (10) and let y(t) be defined by (11). Then eventually

$$y(t) < 0. \tag{15}$$

PROOF. From (1) we have eventually

$$y'(t) \leq -Q(t)x(t - \delta) \leq 0 \tag{16}$$

Therefore, if (15) does not hold, then eventually

$$y(t) > 0 \tag{17}$$

In this case, we note that  $x(t) > x(t - \tau)$  eventually. This implies that there exist  $M > 0$  and  $t_1 \geq t_0$  such that  $x(t - \rho) \geq M$  for  $t \geq t_1$ , where  $\rho = \max\{\tau, \delta\}$ . Then by (16), it follows that

$$y'(t) \leq -MQ(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_1$$

and so

$$y(t) \geq M \int_t^\infty Q(s) ds = MH_0(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_1,$$

which, together with (11) and (14), yields

$$x(t) \geq x(t - \tau) + MH_0(t) \text{ for } t \geq t_1 \tag{18}$$

Let  $m(t)$  denote the greatest integer part of  $\frac{t-t_1}{\tau}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &\geq M[H_0(t) + H_0(t - \tau) + \dots + H_0(t - (m(t) - 1)\tau)] \\ &\quad + x(t - m(t)\tau) \\ &> M[H_0(t) + H_0(t - \tau) + \dots + H_0(t - (m(t) - 1)\tau)], \\ &\text{for } t \geq t_1 + \tau. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that  $H_0(t)$  is decreasing, we get

$$x(t) > Mm(t)H_0(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_1 + \tau$$

Substituting this into (16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} y'(t) &\leq -MQ(t)m(t - \delta)H_0(t - \delta) \\ &\leq -Mm(t - \delta)Q(t)H_0(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_1 + \tau + \delta \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

By noting that  $t/m(t - \delta) \rightarrow \tau$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , we see that

$$\frac{Mm(t - \delta)Q(t)H_0(t)}{tQ(t)H_0(t)} \rightarrow \frac{M}{\tau} \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

It follows that there exists  $t_2 > t_1 + \tau + \delta$  such that

$$Mm(t - \delta)Q(t)H_0(t) \geq \frac{M}{2\tau} tQ(t)H_0(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_2$$

and so

$$y'(t) \leq -\frac{M}{2\tau} tQ(t)H_0(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_2. \tag{20}$$

If  $k = 0$ , then a contradiction can be easily derived by directly integrating (20). Therefore, it suffices to show that another contradiction is also derived in the case  $k \neq 0$ . Indeed, by directly integrating (20) from  $t \geq t_2$  to  $\infty$ , we find

$$y(t) \geq \frac{M}{2\tau} H_1(t)$$

which, together with (11) and (14), yields

$$x(t) \geq x(t - \tau) + \frac{M}{2\tau} H_1(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_2 \tag{21}$$

Now, if we let  $m(t)$  denote the greatest integer part of  $\frac{t-t_2}{\tau}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &\geq \frac{M}{2\tau} [H_1(t) + H_1(t - \tau) + \dots + H_1(t - (m(t) - 1)\tau)] \\ &\quad + x(t - m(t)\tau) \\ &> \frac{M}{2\tau} [H_1(t) + H_1(t - \tau) + \dots + H_1(t - (m(t) - 1)\tau)], \\ &\text{ for } t \geq t_2 + \tau \end{aligned}$$

Also as  $H_1(t)$  is nonincreasing, it follows that

$$x(t) \geq \frac{M}{2\tau} m(t)H_1(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_2 + \tau$$

By a direct substitution, we get

$$\begin{aligned} y'(t) &\leq -\frac{M}{2\tau} m(t - \delta)Q(t)H_1(t - \delta) \\ &\leq -\frac{M}{2\tau} m(t - \delta)Q(t)H_1(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_2 + \tau + \delta \end{aligned}$$

From the fact that  $m(t - \delta)/t \rightarrow \frac{1}{\tau}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , we see that there exists  $t_3 \geq t_2 + \tau + \delta$  such that

$$m(t - \delta) \geq \frac{t}{2\tau} \text{ for } t \geq t_3$$

Hence

$$y'(t) \leq -\frac{M}{2^2\tau^2} tQ(t)H_1(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_3$$

which implies

$$y(t) \geq \frac{M}{4\tau^2} H_2(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_3.$$

This, together with (11) and (14), implies

$$x(t) \geq x(t - \tau) + \frac{M}{2^2\tau^2} H_2(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_3. \tag{22}$$

Thus, by using induction, we can get, for some sufficiently large  $t_{k+2}$ ,

$$y'(t) \leq -\frac{M}{2^{k+1}\tau^{k+1}} t Q(t) H_k(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_{k+2}$$

which, together with  $(Y_2)$ , yields

$$y(t) \rightarrow -\infty \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

which contradicts the hypothesis that  $y(t)$  is eventually positive. Therefore, (15) holds and the proof is complete.

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

In this section we will apply the lemmas in section 2 to establish several new oscillation criteria for Eq. (1) without (3). The following Theorem 1 is an immediate corollary of Lemmas 1 and 2, which contains theorem 1 in [6] as a special case when  $k = 0$ .

**THEOREM 1.** Assume that (2) and  $(Y_2)$  hold with  $P(t) \equiv 1$ . Then every solution of Eq. (1) oscillates.

**EXAMPLE 1.** Consider the neutral delay differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}[x(t) - x(t - \tau)] + \frac{1}{t^\alpha} x(t - \delta) = 0 \tag{23}$$

Where  $1 < \alpha < 2$ . Since

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2k + 3}{k + 2} = 2 > \alpha$$

it follows that there exists a least positive integer  $k$  such that

$$\frac{2k + 3}{k + 2} \geq \alpha$$

Since

$$H_m(t) = \frac{1}{(\alpha - 1)(2\alpha - 3) \cdots ((m + 1)\alpha - (2m + 1))} \cdot \frac{1}{t^{(m+1)\alpha - (2m+1)}},$$

$m = 0, 1, \dots, k$

exist, we find that  $(Y_2)$  holds. Therefore, by Theorem 1, every solution of Eq. (23) oscillates. But, condition (4) is not satisfied when  $\frac{3}{2} < \alpha < 2$ . On the other hand, by Theorem C, we see that Eq. (23) has a bounded nonoscillatory solution if and only if  $\alpha > 2$ . Now we do not know how to handle the case  $\alpha = 2$ . Therefore, it remains an open problem to determine the oscillation of all solutions of Eq. (23) with  $\alpha = 2$ .

**THEOREM 2.** Assume that (2),  $(Y_1)$  and  $(Y_2)$  hold. Suppose also that

$$P(t - \delta)Q(t) \geq Q(t - \tau) \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0 + \rho \tag{24}$$

Then every solution of Eq. (1) oscillates.

PROOF. Otherwise, Eq. (1) has an eventually positive solution  $x(t)$ . Let  $y(t)$  be defined by (11). Then by Lemma 1 we have for some  $t_1 \geq t_0$ ,

$$y(t) > 0 \quad \text{for } t \geq t_1$$

By direct substitution one can see that

$$y'(t) = -Q(t)x(t - \delta) \leq 0, \text{ for } t \geq t_1 + \delta$$

which, together with (11) and (24), implies

$$\begin{aligned} y'(t) &= -Q(t)[y(t - \delta) + P(t - \delta)x(t - \delta - \tau)] \\ &\leq -Q(t)y(t - \delta) - Q(t - \tau)x(t - \delta - \tau) \\ &= -Q(t)y(t - \delta) + y'(t - \tau), \text{ for } t \geq t_1 + \delta + \tau \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$y'(t) - y'(t - \tau) + Q(t)y(t - \delta) \leq 0, \text{ for } t \geq t_1 + \delta + \tau \tag{25}$$

By Lemma 1 and 2, we see that  $(Y_2)$  implies that (25) has no eventually positive solutions. This is a contradiction and so the proof is complete.

The following result is an immediate corollary of Theorem 2.

COROLLARY 1. Assume that (2) and (24) hold and that

$$0 \leq P(t) \leq 1 \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0 \tag{26}$$

Suppose also that  $Q(t)$  is not identically zero on any half interval  $[T, \infty)$ ,  $T \geq t_0$ .

Then every solution of Eq. (1) oscillates.

This is because (24) and (26) imply

$$Q(t) \geq Q(t - \tau), \text{ for } t \geq t_0 + \rho$$

which, together with the fact that  $Q(t)$  is not identically zero eventually, yields

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} Q(s) ds = \infty.$$

Thus,  $(Y_2)$  holds. Therefore, by Theorem 2, every solution of Eq. (1) oscillates.

THEOREM 3. Assume that (2),  $(Y_2)$  and (14) hold. Suppose also that

$$P(t - \delta)Q(t) \leq Q(t - \tau), \text{ for } t \geq t_0 + \tau + \delta \tag{27}$$

Then every solution of Eq. (1) oscillates.

PROOF. Otherwise, Eq. (1) has an eventually positive solution  $x(t)$ . Now we set  $y(t)$  as in (11). Then by Lemma 2 we have for some  $t_1 \geq t_0$ ,

$$y(t) < 0, \text{ for } t \geq t_1 \tag{28}$$

Clearly, by (11) and (27) we have

$$\begin{aligned} y'(t) &= -Q(t)x(t - \delta) \\ &= -Q(t)[y(t - \delta) + P(t - \delta)x(t - \delta - \tau)] \\ &\geq -Q(t)y(t - \delta) - Q(t - \tau)x(t - \delta - \tau) \\ &= -Q(t)y(t - \delta) + y'(t - \tau), \text{ for } t \geq t_1 + \tau + \delta \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $-y(t)$  is a positive solution of the inequality

$$z'(t) - z'(t - \tau) + Q(t)z(t - \delta) \leq 0$$

Thus, by directly using Lemma 1 and 2, we may obtain a contradiction and so the

proof of this theorem is complete.

EXAMPLE 2. The neutral delay differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}[x(t) - \frac{t+1}{t}x(t-1)] + \frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{t^5}}x(t-1) = 0, t \geq 1 \quad (29)$$

satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3. Therefore every solution of Eq. (29) oscillates.

The following theorem can be easily proved by directly applying Lemma 1 and 2.

THEOREM 4. Assume that (2),  $(Y_1) - (Y_2)$  and (14) hold. Then every solution of Eq. (1) oscillates.

EXAMPLE 3. The neutral delay differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}[x(t) - (2 + \sin t)x(t - 2\pi)] + \frac{1}{t^\alpha}x(t) = 0, t \geq 1$$

satisfies the all hypotheses of Theorem 4 when  $\alpha < 2$ . Therefore, every solution of this equation oscillates when  $\alpha < 2$ .

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of P. R. China.

## REFERENCES

1. CHUANXI, Q. and LADAS, G. Oscillations of neutral differential equations with variable coefficients, Appl. Anal., 32(1989), 215–228.
2. CHUANXI, Q. et al. Sufficient conditions for oscillation and existence of positive solutions, Appl. Anal., 35(1990), 187–194.
3. GYÖRI, I. And LADAS, G. Oscillation Theory of Delay Differential Equations with Applications, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1991).
4. LADAS, G. and SFICAS, Y. G. Oscillations of neutral delay differential equations, Canad. Math. Bull., 29(1986), 438–445.
5. LALLI, B. S. and ZHANG, B. G. Oscillation of first order neutral differential equations, Appl. Anal., 39(1990), 265–274.
6. YU, J. S. et al. Oscillation of neutral differential equations, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc., 45(1992), 195–200.
7. YU YUAN—HONG, Oscillation of solutions of neutral delay differential equations, Acta. Math. Appl. Sinica., 14(1991), 404–410.
8. ZHANG B. G. and YU, J. S. On the existence of positive solutions of neutral delay differential equations, Scientia Sinica (Series A), 8(1992), 785–790.