

# involve

a journal of mathematics

Harnack's inequality for second order linear  
ordinary differential inequalities

Ahmed Mohammed and Hannah Turner





# Harnack's inequality for second order linear ordinary differential inequalities

Ahmed Mohammed and Hannah Turner

(Communicated by Johnny Henderson)

We prove a Harnack-type inequality for nonnegative solutions of second order ordinary differential inequalities. Maximum principles are the main tools used, and to make the paper self-contained, we provide alternative proofs to those available in the literature.

## 1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to present a self-contained discussion of the Harnack and Harnack-type inequalities for nonnegative solutions of second order linear ordinary differential inequalities of the form

$$Lu \leq f(x), \quad x \in I := (A, B), \quad (1-1)$$

where, for  $u \in C^2(I)$ ,

$$Lu := u''(x) + p(x)u'(x) + q(x)u. \quad (1-2)$$

Here and in the sequel, the notation  $C^2(I)$  stands for the class of twice continuously differentiable real-valued functions on the open interval  $I$ . Likewise, we write  $C(I)$  for the class of continuous real-valued functions on  $I$ . Throughout, we will assume, without further mention, that  $p, q, f \in C(I)$ . In this case, (1-2) can be rewritten as

$$Lu = \frac{1}{r(x)}(r(x)u')' + q(x)u, \quad \text{where } r(x) := \exp\left(\int^x p(t) dt\right). \quad (1-3)$$

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a class of nonnegative and locally bounded functions in the open interval  $I = (A, B)$ . We say that Harnack's inequality holds for the class  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if given any closed interval  $[a, b] \subseteq I$ , there is a positive constant  $C$  such that

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} u(x) \leq C \inf_{x \in [a, b]} u(x) \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (1-4)$$

*MSC2010:* 34C11.

*Keywords:* Harnack's inequality, maximum principles, ordinary differential inequalities.

The important point here is that  $C$  is independent of  $u \in \mathcal{H}$ . The class  $\mathcal{H}$  is usually a collection of nonnegative (or nonpositive) solutions of some differential equations.

This type of inequality is named after Carl Gustav Axel von Harnack (1851–1888) who first derived the inequality for nonnegative harmonic functions in the plane. The inequality became a very important tool in the study of solutions to second order linear and nonlinear elliptic partial differential equations. We refer the interested reader to the article [Kassmann 2007] for a detailed account on some history and theoretical developments of this fascinating inequality, as well as an extensive bibliography of articles and monographs related to Harnack's inequality. We direct the reader to the paper [Berhanu and Mohammed 2005] for a simple application of Harnack's inequality to the ordinary differential equation  $Lu = f$ . The same paper also provides an example that shows the explicit dependence of the constant  $C$  in (1-4) on the differences  $a - A$  and  $B - b$ .

## 2. On maximum principles

To develop a version of Harnack's inequality for nonnegative solutions of (1-1), we need several results on maximum principles which can be found in [Protter and Weinberger 1984]. To make the paper self-contained and for the readers' convenience, we provide alternative proofs to these maximum principles under the assumption that  $p$  and  $q$  are continuous on  $I$ .

We first introduce an auxiliary function that will be used in our proof of a basic theorem on maximum principles. We use the notation  $J := (\alpha, \beta)$  for  $\alpha < \beta$ . Consider the following auxiliary function, with  $\sigma > 0$  to be chosen:

$$z(x) = \sigma(x - \alpha) - e^{\sigma(x-\alpha)}. \quad (2-1)$$

We observe that

$$z(\alpha) = -1 \quad \text{and} \quad z'(\alpha) = 0.$$

Direct computation shows

$$Lz = -\sigma^2 e^{\sigma(x-\alpha)} \left( 1 + \frac{p(x)}{\sigma} (1 - e^{-\sigma(x-\alpha)}) + \frac{q(x)}{\sigma} \left( \frac{1}{\sigma} - (x - \alpha) e^{-\sigma(x-\alpha)} \right) \right).$$

If  $p$  and  $q$  are bounded on  $[\alpha, \beta]$ , we see that

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{p(x)}{\sigma} (1 - e^{-\sigma(x-\alpha)}) + \frac{q(x)}{\sigma} \left( \frac{1}{\sigma} - (x - \alpha) e^{-\sigma(x-\alpha)} \right) \right) = 0,$$

uniformly on  $[\alpha, \beta]$ . Therefore, in this case we can choose  $\sigma > 0$  large enough such that

$$Lz \leq -c\sigma^2 e^{\sigma(x-\alpha)} \quad \text{in } J$$

for some constant  $c > 0$ .

Most of the theorems on maximum principles will be easy consequences of the following basic and useful result.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $p, q \in C(\bar{J})$  and  $q \leq 0$  in  $J$ . Let  $u \in C^2(J) \cap C(\bar{J})$  be a solution of  $Lu \leq 0$  in  $J$ . Suppose  $u$  has a nonpositive minimum at  $x_0 \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ . If  $u$  is differentiable at  $x_0$ , and  $u'(x_0) = 0$ , then  $u$  is a constant in  $J$ .*

*Proof.* We consider the case  $x_0 = \alpha$  first. Suppose  $u$  has a nonpositive minimum  $u(\alpha)$  at  $\alpha$ . Furthermore, assume that  $u$  is differentiable at  $\alpha$ , and  $u'(\alpha) = 0$ . We consider the auxiliary function  $z$  in (2-1) with  $\sigma > 0$  such that  $Lz \leq 0$  in  $\bar{J}$ . We note that  $z(\alpha) = -1$  and  $z'(\alpha) = 0$ . We fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and set  $w := u + \varepsilon z$ . We note that  $Lw = Lu + \varepsilon Lz = Lu \leq 0$ . On recalling that  $u(\alpha) \leq 0$ , we have  $w(\alpha) = u(\alpha) - \varepsilon < 0$ , and  $w'(\alpha) = 0$ . By continuity of  $w$  on  $[\alpha, \beta]$ , we see that  $w(x) < 0$  on  $[\alpha, \tau)$  for some  $\tau > 0$ . Let

$$\eta := \sup\{\rho \in [\alpha, \beta] : w(s) < 0 \ \forall 0 \leq s < \rho\}.$$

Then we note that

$$\begin{aligned} (r(x)w')' &= (r(x)w')' + r(x)q(x)w - r(x)q(x)w(x) \\ &= r(x)Lw - r(x)q(x)w \\ &\leq -r(x)q(x)w(x) \leq 0, \quad \alpha < x < \eta. \end{aligned} \tag{2-2}$$

Thus  $rw'$  is decreasing on  $[\alpha, \eta]$  so that  $r(x)w'(x) \leq r(\alpha)w'(\alpha) = 0$  on  $[\alpha, \eta]$ . In particular, this implies that  $w$  is decreasing on  $[\alpha, \eta]$ . Hence  $w(x) \leq w(\alpha) < 0$  for all  $\alpha \leq x \leq \eta$ . This and the continuity of  $w$  on  $[\alpha, \beta]$  would contradict the definition of  $\eta$  if  $\eta < \beta$ . Therefore we must have  $\eta = \beta$ , so that  $w$  is decreasing on  $[\alpha, \beta]$ . In particular, we have

$$u(x) + \varepsilon z(x) \leq u(\alpha) + \varepsilon z(\alpha), \quad \alpha \leq x \leq \beta.$$

Letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we find that  $u(x) \leq u(\alpha)$  on  $[\alpha, \beta]$ . This, together with the fact that  $u(x) \geq u(\alpha)$ , shows that  $u(x) = u(\alpha)$  on  $[\alpha, \beta]$ .

Now suppose  $u$  has a nonpositive minimum at  $\beta$  and  $u'(\beta) = 0$ . Let  $w(x) = u(2\beta - x)$  for  $x \in I := [\beta, 2\beta - \alpha]$ . Then clearly  $w \in C^2(I) \cap C(\bar{I})$ , and moreover,  $w$  is differentiable at  $\beta$  with  $w'(\beta) = -u'(\beta) = 0$ . Furthermore,  $w$  satisfies the inequality

$$\tilde{L}w = w'' + \tilde{p}(x)w' + \tilde{q}(x)w \leq 0, \quad x \in I,$$

where

$$\tilde{p}(x) = -p(2\beta - x) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{q}(x) = q(2\beta - x), \quad x \in I.$$

Finally we also note that  $w$  has a nonpositive minimum at  $\beta$ . Therefore, by the above result, we must have  $w(y) = w(\beta)$  for all  $y \in [\beta, 2\beta - \alpha]$ . Thus for any  $x \in [\alpha, \beta]$ , we have  $w(\beta) = w(2\beta - x) = u(x)$ , that is,  $u(x) = u(\beta)$ , as was to be shown.  $\square$

As consequences of Theorem 2.1, we have the following immediate and useful theorems on maximum principles.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $p, q \in C(\bar{J})$  and  $q \leq 0$  in  $J$ . Suppose  $u$  satisfies the differential inequality  $Lu \leq 0$  in an interval  $J$ . If  $u$  assumes a nonpositive minimum value at an interior point  $x_0$  of  $J$ , then  $u(x) \equiv u(x_0)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $u$  attains its nonpositive minimum at  $x_0 \in J = (\alpha, \beta)$ . Then  $u'(x_0) = 0$ . Consider the intervals  $[\alpha, x_0]$  and  $[x_0, \beta]$ . By Theorem 2.1, we see that  $u(x) = u(x_0)$  for all  $x \in [\alpha, x_0]$  and  $u(x_0) = u(x)$  for all  $x \in [x_0, \beta]$ . That is,  $u(x) = u(x_0)$  for all  $x \in [\alpha, \beta]$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $p, q \in C(\bar{J})$  and  $q \leq 0$  in  $J$ . Suppose  $u \in C^2(J) \cap C(\bar{J})$  satisfies the differential inequality  $Lu \leq 0$  in an interval  $J := (\alpha, \beta)$ . If  $u$  assumes a nonpositive minimum value at  $x_0 \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$  and  $u$  is differentiable at  $x_0$ , then  $u'(x_0) > 0$  if  $x_0 = \alpha$ , and  $u'(x_0) < 0$  if  $x_0 = \beta$  unless  $u$  is a constant on  $J$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $u$  satisfies  $Lu \leq 0$  in  $J$ , and  $u$  has a nonpositive minimum at  $x_0 \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ . By hypothesis,  $u$  is differentiable at  $x_0$ . Let us take the case  $x_0 = \alpha$ . Then clearly  $u'(\alpha) \geq 0$ . If  $u'(\alpha) = 0$ , then by Theorem 2.1, we conclude  $u$  is a constant. Therefore, if  $u$  is nonconstant, we must have  $u'(\alpha) > 0$ . If  $x_0 = \beta$ , here again we have  $u'(\beta) \leq 0$ . If  $u$  is nonconstant, then again by Theorem 2.1, we must have  $u'(\beta) < 0$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $p, q \in C(\bar{J})$  and  $q \leq 0$  in  $J$ . Suppose  $u \in C^2(J) \cap C(\bar{J})$  satisfies the differential inequality  $Lu \leq 0$  in an interval  $J := (\alpha, \beta)$ . Suppose  $u(\gamma) \leq 0$  for some  $\gamma \in \bar{J}$ . In case  $\gamma \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ , we assume that  $u$  is differentiable at  $\gamma$ :*

- (i) *If  $u'(\gamma) \leq 0$ , then  $u(x) \leq 0$  for all  $x \in [\gamma, \beta]$ .*
- (ii) *If  $u'(\gamma) \geq 0$ , then  $u(x) \leq 0$  for all  $x \in [\alpha, \gamma]$ .*
- (iii) *If  $u'(\gamma) = 0$ , then  $u(x) \leq 0$  for all  $x \in \bar{J}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $u'(\gamma) \leq 0$ . We assume that  $\gamma < \beta$ , for otherwise there is nothing to prove. Suppose that  $u(c) > 0$  for some  $c \in (\gamma, \beta]$ . Since  $u(\gamma) \leq 0$ , and  $u(c) > 0$ , we note that  $u$  has a nonpositive minimum on  $[\gamma, c]$  at some  $\gamma \leq d < c$ . If  $\gamma < d < c$ , then  $u'(d) = 0$  and we invoke Theorem 2.2 to conclude that  $u$  is a constant in  $[\gamma, c]$ . If  $d = \gamma$ , then the assumption  $u'(\gamma) \leq 0$  and Theorem 2.3 lead us to conclude that  $u$  is a constant on  $[\gamma, c]$ . In any case, we see that  $u(c) > 0$  for some  $c \in (\gamma, \beta]$  implies that  $u$  is a constant on  $[\gamma, c]$ . But then  $u(c) = u(\gamma) \leq 0$ , which contradicts the assumption that  $u(c) > 0$ . This proves statement (i).

To prove (ii), let us assume that  $u'(\gamma) \geq 0$ , and that  $\gamma > \alpha$ . Assume that  $u(c) > 0$  for some  $c \in [\alpha, \gamma)$ . Since  $u(\gamma) \leq 0$ , as in the previous case we note that  $u$  takes a nonpositive minimum on  $[c, \gamma]$  at some  $c < d \leq \gamma$ . If  $c < d < \gamma$ , then  $u'(d) = 0$ , and by Theorem 2.2, we see that  $u$  is a constant on  $[c, \gamma]$ . If, on the other hand,  $d = \gamma$ ,

then since  $u'(\gamma) \geq 0$ , we conclude that  $u$  is a constant on  $[c, \gamma]$  by Theorem 2.3. In either case, we conclude that  $u$  is a constant on  $[c, \gamma]$ . But this implies that  $u(c) = u(\gamma) \leq 0$ , which again contradicts the assumption that  $u(c) > 0$ . Therefore statement (ii) holds as well.

Finally statement (iii) follows from statements (i) and (ii). □

### 3. The Harnack and Harnack-type inequalities

We start with following existence and uniqueness theorem for solutions of  $Lu = f$  that satisfy initial conditions. This theorem is usually taught in a first course on ordinary differential equations in undergraduate curriculum (see [Boyce and DiPrima 1965] for instance), and will be needed in our proof of Harnack's inequality.

**Theorem E** (existence and uniqueness). *Suppose  $p, q, f \in C(I)$ . Let  $x_0 \in I$  and let  $c_0$  and  $c_1$  be arbitrary real constants. Then there exists a unique solution  $u \in C^2(I)$  of equation  $Lu = f$  such that  $u(x_0) = c_0$  and  $u'(x_0) = c_1$ .*

We now begin our considerations of Harnack's inequality with respect to the class of nonnegative solutions of the differential inequality

$$Lu \leq 0 \quad \text{in } I := (A, B). \tag{3-1}$$

To proceed further, we fix some notations, some of which are fairly standard. For any function  $h : (A, B) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we write

$$h^+(x) := \max\{h(x), 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad h^-(x) := \max\{-h(x), 0\}, \quad x \in (A, B).$$

Note that we have

$$h = h^+ - h^-.$$

In the sequel, we will also use the following notation repeatedly.

$$L_0u := u'' + p(x)u' - q^-(x)u, \quad x \in I.$$

**Remark 3.1.** We first make note of the following:

- (1) If  $u$  is a nonnegative solution of (3-1), then  $u$  is a solution of  $L_0u \leq 0$  in  $I$ .
- (2) If  $u$  is a nonnegative solution of (3-1) with  $u \not\equiv 0$  on  $I$ , then  $u > 0$  in  $I$ , for if  $u(x_0) = 0$  for some  $x_0 \in I$ , then  $u'(x_0) = 0$ . Since  $L_0u \leq 0$  in  $I$ , we invoke Theorem 2.2 and conclude that  $u(x) \equiv 0$  in  $I$ .

We start with the following theorem on Harnack's inequality for nonnegative solutions of (3-1).

**Theorem 3.2.** *Given  $[a, b] \subseteq I$ , there is a positive constant  $C$  that depends on the coefficients  $p, q$  and the constants  $A, B, a$  and  $b$  only, such that*

$$\max_{a \leq x \leq b} u(x) \leq C \min_{a \leq x \leq b} u(x) \tag{3-2}$$

for any nonnegative solution  $u$  of (3-1).

We break down the proof into two lemmas, each of which may be of independent interest. The proof closely follows the method in [Berhanu and Mohammed 2005].

**Lemma 3.3.** *Given  $[a, b] \subseteq I$ , there are constants  $C_a$  and  $C_b$  that depend on the coefficients  $p, q$  and the constants  $A, B, a$  and  $b$  only, such that*

$$\frac{u'(a)}{u(a)} \leq C_a \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{u'(b)}{u(b)} \geq C_b \quad (3-3)$$

for all positive solutions  $u$  of (3-1).

*Proof.* Let  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  be solutions of

$$L_0 w := w'' + p(x)w' - q^-(x)w = 0, \quad A < x < B,$$

such that  $w_1(a) = 1, w_1'(a) = 0$ , and  $w_2(a) = 0, w_2'(a) = 1$ .

We define

$$v(x) := u(x) - u(a)w_1(x) - u'(a)w_2(x), \quad A < x < B.$$

Then recalling that  $L_0 u \leq 0$ , and  $L_0 w_1 = 0 = L_0 w_2$  in  $(A, B)$ , we see that  $L_0 v \leq 0$  in  $(A, B)$ . Moreover, we have  $v(a) = 0$  and  $v'(a) = 0$ . By Theorem 2.4, we conclude that  $v \leq 0$  on  $(A, B)$ . Thus

$$0 \leq u(x) \leq u(a)w_1(x) + u'(a)w_2(x), \quad A < x < B,$$

whence

$$\frac{u'(a)}{u(a)} w_2(x) + w_1(x) \geq 0, \quad A < x < B. \quad (3-4)$$

Since  $w_2'(a) = 1$ , we note that there is a small interval centered at  $a$  on which  $w_2$  is increasing. So we fix  $a^*$  with  $a < a^* < a$  such that  $w_2(a^*) < 0$ . Therefore, on taking  $x = a^*$  in (3-4), we conclude that

$$\frac{u'(a)}{u(a)} \leq -\frac{w_1(a^*)}{w_2(a^*)} = C_a. \quad (3-5)$$

Next we establish the second estimate in (3-3). This is very similar to the previous case, and hence we will be brief. Let  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  be solutions of

$$L_0 z_1 = 0, \quad z_1(b) = 1, z_1'(b) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad L_0 z_2 = 0, \quad z_2(b) = 0, z_2'(b) = 1.$$

Let us consider the function

$$v(x) := u(x) - u(b)z_1(x) - u'(b)z_2(x), \quad A < x < B.$$

Then  $Lv \leq 0$  in  $(A, B)$  and  $v(b) = 0, v'(b) = 0$ . Arguing as before, we can show that  $v \leq 0$  on  $(A, B)$ , from which we conclude

$$\frac{u'(b)}{u(b)} z_2(x) + z_1(x) \geq 0, \quad A < x < B.$$



Since  $z_2$  is increasing in some interval centered at  $b$ , we can find  $b < b^* < B$  such that  $z_2(b^*) > 0$ . Thus we find that

$$\frac{u'(b)}{u(b)} \geq -\frac{z_1(b^*)}{z_2(b^*)} = C_b. \quad (3-6)$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Given  $[a, b] \subseteq I$ , there is a positive constant  $C$ , depending on the coefficients  $p, q$  and the constants  $A, B, a$  and  $b$  only, such that*

$$|u'(x)| \leq Cu(x), \quad a \leq x \leq b \quad (3-7)$$

for all nonnegative solutions  $u$  of (3-1) in  $I$ .

*Proof.* Let  $u$  be a nonnegative solution of (3-1) in  $I$  with  $u \not\equiv 0$  so that  $u > 0$  in  $I$ . Direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{u'}{u}\right)' &= \frac{u''}{u} - \left(\frac{u'}{u}\right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{u}(-p(x)u' - q(x)u) \\ &= -p(x)\left(\frac{u'}{u}\right) - q(x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\left(\frac{u'}{u}\right)' + p(x)\left(\frac{u'}{u}\right) \leq q^-(x).$$

This leads to

$$\left(\exp\left(\int_a^x p(t) dt\right)\frac{u'}{u}\right)' \leq q^- \exp\left(\int_a^x p(t) dt\right).$$

This gives

$$\left(r(x)\frac{u'}{u} - \int_a^x r(t)q^-(t) dt\right)' \leq 0, \quad x \in (a, b),$$

where we have set

$$r(x) := \exp\left(\int_a^x p(t) dt\right).$$

Thus for any  $a \leq x \leq b$ , we have

$$r(b)\frac{u'(b)}{u(b)} - \int_a^b r(t)q^-(t) dt \leq r(x)\frac{u'}{u} - \int_a^x r(t)q^-(t) dt \leq r(a)\frac{u'(a)}{u(a)}.$$

In conclusion, we have

$$r(b)\frac{u'(b)}{u(b)} - Q(b) \leq r(x)\frac{u'}{u} \leq \frac{u'(a)}{u(a)} + Q(b), \quad x \in (a, b), \quad (3-8)$$

where  $Q(b)$  denotes the constant

$$Q(b) := \int_a^b r(t)q^-(t) dt.$$

Using Lemma 3.3 in (3-8), we obtain

$$r(x) \left| \frac{u'(x)}{u(x)} \right| \leq C_0, \quad x \in [a, b],$$

for some positive constant  $C_0$ , independent of  $u$ . Since

$$\frac{1}{r(x)} = \exp\left(-\int_a^x p(t) dt\right) \leq \exp(\|p\|_\infty(b-a)), \quad x \in [a, b],$$

we conclude that

$$\left| \frac{u'(x)}{u(x)} \right| \leq C, \quad x \in [a, b], \quad (3-9)$$

for a constant  $C > 0$  that is independent of  $u$ . □

*Proof of Theorem 3.2.* For any  $x, y \in [a, b]$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \log\left(\frac{u(x)}{u(y)}\right) &= \int_y^x \frac{d}{dt} \log u(t) dt \\ &= \int_y^x \frac{u'(t)}{u(t)} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{u(x)}{u(y)} = \exp\left(\int_y^x \frac{u'(t)}{u(t)} dt\right).$$

It follows from this and Lemma 3.4 that

$$\exp(-C|x-y|) \leq \frac{u(x)}{u(y)} \leq \exp(C|x-y|), \quad x, y \in [a, b].$$

Therefore, we finally see that

$$\exp(-C(b-a)) \leq \frac{u(x)}{u(y)} \leq \exp(C(b-a)), \quad x, y \in [a, b],$$

which leads to the inequality stated in (3-2). □

**Remark 3.5.** The differential inequality (3-1) with the inequality reversed doesn't satisfy Harnack's inequality as can be seen from the following simple example. Fix  $x_0 \in [a, b]$ . Then  $u_k(x) = e^{k(x-x_0)}$  satisfies the inequality  $u'' \geq 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and note that

$$e^{k(b-x_0)} \leq \sup_{[a,b]} u_k(x) \leq C \inf_{[a,b]} u_k(x) \leq C u_k(x_0) = C.$$

But there is no single positive constant  $C$ , independent of  $u_k$  and hence  $k$ , such that

$$e^{k(b-x_0)} \leq C.$$

Next we study a Harnack-type inequality for nonnegative solutions of nonhomogeneous equations.

We will start by deriving a Harnack-type inequality for nonnegative solutions of the following equation, assuming that  $f \geq 0$  on  $I$ :

$$L_0 u = f \quad \text{in } I := (A, B). \quad (3-10)$$

However, it should be noted that Harnack's inequality (3-2) does not hold for nonnegative solutions of (3-10) for general  $f$ . This is to be expected as nonnegative solutions of (3-10) are not necessarily positive in  $(A, B)$ . In fact, the following simple example shows that the inequality (3-2) cannot hold even for positive solutions of (3-10).

**Example 3.6.** Consider the equation  $u'' = 1$  in the interval  $(A, B) := (-2, 2)$ . For any positive integer  $k$ ,

$$u_k = \frac{1}{2} \left( x - \frac{1}{k} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{k}$$

is a solution of  $u_k'' = 1$ , and  $u_k > 0$  in  $(-2, 2)$  for all  $k$ . Suppose there is a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\max_{[-1,1]} u \leq C \min_{[-1,1]} u \quad \forall u > 0, u'' = 1. \quad (3-11)$$

Then note that

$$u_k(1) = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{k} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{and} \quad u_k\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) = \frac{1}{k}.$$

If (3-11) were to hold, then

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{k} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{k} \leq C \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \quad \forall k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we arrive at a contradiction.

We now state the following theorem on a Harnack-type inequality for solutions of (3-10). For the remainder of our discussion, we will use the following notations.

$$\alpha := \frac{1}{2}(a + A) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \frac{1}{2}(b + B).$$

We will also find it convenient to use the notation  $\|g\|_\infty$  to denote the following number for any  $g$  bounded on an interval  $I$ :

$$\|g\|_{I,\infty} := \sup_{x \in I} |g(x)|,$$

or simply  $\|g\|_\infty$  if  $I$  is clear from the context.

**Theorem 3.7.** *Suppose  $f \geq 0$  in  $I$ . Given  $[a, b] \subseteq I$ , there is a positive constant  $C$  that depends on the coefficients  $p, q$  and the constants  $A, B, a$  and  $b$  such that*

$$\max_{a \leq x \leq b} u(x) \leq C \left( \min_{a \leq x \leq b} u(x) + \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} f(x) dx \right) \tag{3-12}$$

for all nonnegative solutions  $u$  of (3-10).

*Proof.* We prove the theorem in three steps. Suppose  $u \geq 0$  in  $(A, B)$  is a solution of (3-10).

**Step 1.** Let  $u(x_0) = \min\{u(x) : x \in [\alpha, \beta]\}$ . By Theorem E, we pick  $z_* \in C^2(I) \cap C(\bar{I})$  such that

$$L_0 z_* = f, \quad z_*(x_0) = 0 = z'_*(x_0). \tag{3-13}$$

By Theorem 2.4(iii), we note that  $z_* \geq 0$  in  $(A, B)$ . We claim that  $u \geq z_*$  in  $[\alpha, \beta]$ . To see this, we start by observing that

$$L_0(u - z_*) = 0 \quad \text{in } (A, B) \quad \text{and} \quad (u - z_*)(x_0) \geq 0.$$

Suppose first that  $\alpha < x_0 < \beta$ . Then  $u'(x_0) = 0$ , and therefore  $(u - z_*)'(x_0) = 0$ . Consequently, by Theorem 2.4(iii), we conclude that  $u - z_* \geq 0$  in  $[\alpha, \beta]$ , as desired. Suppose  $x_0 = \alpha$ . Then  $u'(x_0) = u'(\alpha) \geq 0$ , so that  $(u - z_*)'(x_0) \geq 0$ . By Theorem 2.4(i), we conclude that  $u - z_* \geq 0$  in  $[x_0, \beta] = [\alpha, \beta]$ . Finally, suppose that  $x_0 = \beta$ . Then  $u'(x_0) = u'(\beta) \leq 0$ , so that  $(u - z_*)'(x_0) \leq 0$ . Again, by Theorem 2.4(ii), we conclude that  $u - z_* \geq 0$  in  $[\alpha, x_0] = [\alpha, \beta]$ . Thus, in all cases, we have shown that  $u \geq z_*$  in  $[\alpha, \beta]$  as claimed.

**Step 2.** Let  $u(\zeta) := \min\{u(x) : a \leq x \leq b\}$ . Since  $u - z_*$  is a nonnegative solution of  $L_0 w = 0$  in  $(\alpha, \beta)$ , we invoke Theorem 3.2 to obtain a positive constant  $C$  that depends on  $p, q^-$  and the constants  $A, B, a$  and  $b$  only such that the following chain of inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{[a,b]} u &= \max_{[a,b]} (z_* + u - z_*) \\ &\leq \max_{[a,b]} z_* + \max_{[a,b]} (u - z_*) \\ &\leq \max_{[a,b]} z_* + C \min_{[a,b]} (u - z_*) \quad (\text{by Theorem 3.2}) \\ &\leq C(u - z_*)(\zeta) + \max_{[a,b]} z_* \\ &\leq C u(\zeta) + \max_{[a,b]} z_* \quad (\text{recall that } u(\zeta) = \min_{[a,b]} u) \\ &= C \min_{[a,b]} u + \max_{[a,b]} z_*. \end{aligned} \tag{3-14}$$

**Step 3.** We now estimate  $z_*$  on  $[a, b]$ . Recall the notation  $\|g\|_\infty := \max_{x \in [\alpha, \beta]} |g(x)|$  for any function  $g \in C([\alpha, \beta])$ . We recall that

$$f = L_0 z_* = \frac{1}{r(x)} (r(x) z_*') - q^-(x) z_*, \quad x \in I,$$

where

$$r(x) = \exp\left(\int_a^x p(s) ds\right).$$

For  $x \in (x_0, b)$ , we have

$$z_*(x) = \int_{x_0}^x \frac{1}{r(t)} \int_{x_0}^t r(s) (q^-(s) z_*(s) + f(s)) ds dt.$$

Therefore, for  $x \in (x_0, b)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} z_*(x) &\leq \exp((b-a)\|p\|_\infty) \int_{x_0}^x \int_{x_0}^t (q^-(s) z_*(s) + f(s)) ds dt \\ &\leq (b-a) \exp((b-a)\|p\|_\infty) \int_{x_0}^x (q^-(t) z_*(t) + f(t)) dt \\ &\leq P_0 \int_\alpha^\beta f(t) dt + P_0 \|q^-\|_\infty \int_{x_0}^x z_*(t) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where  $P_0 := (b-a) \exp((b-a)\|p\|_\infty)$ .

Denoting the right-hand side of the last inequality by  $\vartheta(x)$  for  $x_0 < x < b$ , and on noting that  $z_*(x) \leq \vartheta(x)$  on  $(x_0, b)$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta'(x) &= P_0 \|q^-\|_\infty z_*(x) \\ &\leq P_0 \|q^-\|_\infty \vartheta(x) \quad (\text{since } z_*(x) \leq \vartheta(x)), \quad x \in (x_0, b), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\frac{\vartheta'(x)}{\vartheta(x)} \leq P_0 \|q^-\|_\infty, \quad x \in (x_0, b).$$

Integrating on  $(x_0, x)$ , we find that

$$z_*(x) \leq \vartheta(x) \leq P_0 \exp(P_0 \|q^-\|_\infty (b-a)) \int_\alpha^\beta f(t) dt. \tag{3-15}$$

The same inequality holds if  $a < x < x_0$ .

Using (3-15) in (3-14) leads to the desired inequality (3-12). □

Finally we are ready to state and prove the following Harnack-type inequality for nonnegative solutions of the differential inequality (1-1) with the nonhomogeneous term  $f$  in  $C(I)$ , without any sign restrictions.

**Theorem 3.8.** *Given  $[a, b] \subseteq I$ , there is a positive constant  $C$ , that depends on the coefficients  $p, q$  and the constants  $A, B, a$  and  $b$  only such that the Harnack-type inequality (3-12), with  $f$  replaced by  $f^+$ , holds for all nonnegative solutions of (1-1).*

*Proof.* Let  $u$  be a nonnegative solution of (1-1) in  $(A, B)$ . Let  $u(x_0) = \min_{[a,b]} u$ , and consider the solution  $z$  of

$$L_0 z = f^+ \quad \text{in } (A, B) \quad \text{and} \quad z(x_0) = u(x_0), \quad z'(x_0) = u'(x_0).$$

Then  $L_0(u - z) = L_0 u - L_0 z \leq f - f^+ \leq 0$ , and  $(u - z)(x_0) = 0$  and  $(u - z)'(x_0) = 0$ . By Theorem 2.4(iii), we conclude that  $u - z \leq 0$  in  $(A, B)$ , so that  $0 \leq u \leq z$  in  $(A, B)$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x \in [a,b]} u(x) &\leq \max_{x \in [a,b]} z(x) \\ &\leq C \left( \min_{x \in [a,b]} z(x) + \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} f^+(x) dx \right) \quad (\text{by Theorem 3.7}) \\ &\leq C \left( z(x_0) + \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} f^+(x) dx \right) \\ &= C \left( u(x_0) + \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} f^+(x) dx \right) \\ &= C \left( \min_{x \in [a,b]} u(x) + \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} f^+(x) dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

This is the desired result. □

## References

- [Berhanu and Mohammed 2005] S. Berhanu and A. Mohammed, "A Harnack inequality for ordinary differential equations", *Amer. Math. Monthly* **112**:1 (2005), 32–41. MR 2005i:34039 Zbl 1127.34001
- [Boyce and DiPrima 1965] W. E. Boyce and R. C. DiPrima, *Elementary differential equations and boundary value problems*, Wiley, New York, 1965. MR 31 #3651 Zbl 0128.30601
- [Kassmann 2007] M. Kassmann, "Harnack inequalities: an introduction", *Bound. Value Probl.* (2007), Art. ID 81415. MR 2007j:35001 Zbl 1144.35002
- [Protter and Weinberger 1984] M. H. Protter and H. F. Weinberger, *Maximum principles in differential equations*, Springer, New York, 1984. MR 86f:35034 Zbl 0549.35002

Received: 2014-10-28

Revised: 2015-02-26

Accepted: 2015-03-04

amohammed@bsu.edu

*Department of Mathematical Sciences,  
Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, United States*

hannahturner@math.utexas.edu

*Department of Mathematical Sciences,  
Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, United States*

## MANAGING EDITOR

Kenneth S. Berenhaut, Wake Forest University, USA, berenhks@wfu.edu

## BOARD OF EDITORS

Colin Adams	Williams College, USA colin.c.adams@williams.edu	David Larson	Texas A&M University, USA larson@math.tamu.edu
John V. Baxley	Wake Forest University, NC, USA baxley@wfu.edu	Suzanne Lenhart	University of Tennessee, USA lenhart@math.utk.edu
Arthur T. Benjamin	Harvey Mudd College, USA benjamin@hmc.edu	Chi-Kwong Li	College of William and Mary, USA ckli@math.wm.edu
Martin Bohner	Missouri U of Science and Technology, USA bohner@mst.edu	Robert B. Lund	Clemson University, USA lund@clemson.edu
Nigel Boston	University of Wisconsin, USA boston@math.wisc.edu	Gaven J. Martin	Massey University, New Zealand g.j.martin@massey.ac.nz
Amarjit S. Budhiraja	U of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, USA budhiraj@email.unc.edu	Mary Meyer	Colorado State University, USA meyer@stat.colostate.edu
Pietro Cerone	La Trobe University, Australia P.Cerone@latrobe.edu.au	Emil Minchev	Ruse, Bulgaria eminchev@hotmail.com
Scott Chapman	Sam Houston State University, USA scott.chapman@shsu.edu	Frank Morgan	Williams College, USA frank.morgan@williams.edu
Joshua N. Cooper	University of South Carolina, USA cooper@math.sc.edu	Mohammad Sal Moselehian	Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran moslehian@ferdowsi.um.ac.ir
Jem N. Corcoran	University of Colorado, USA corcoran@colorado.edu	Zuhair Nashed	University of Central Florida, USA znashed@mail.ucf.edu
Toka Diagana	Howard University, USA tdiagana@howard.edu	Ken Ono	Emory University, USA ono@mathcs.emory.edu
Michael Dorff	Brigham Young University, USA mdorff@math.byu.edu	Timothy E. O'Brien	Loyola University Chicago, USA tobrie1@luc.edu
Sever S. Dragomir	Victoria University, Australia sever@matilda.vu.edu.au	Joseph O'Rourke	Smith College, USA orourke@cs.smith.edu
Behrouz Emamizadeh	The Petroleum Institute, UAE bemamizadeh@pi.ac.ae	Yuval Peres	Microsoft Research, USA peres@microsoft.com
Joel Foisy	SUNY Potsdam foisyjs@potsdam.edu	Y.-F. S. Pétermann	Université de Genève, Switzerland petermann@math.unige.ch
Errin W. Fulp	Wake Forest University, USA fulp@wfu.edu	Robert J. Plemmons	Wake Forest University, USA rplemmons@wfu.edu
Joseph Gallian	University of Minnesota Duluth, USA jgallian@d.umn.edu	Carl B. Pomerance	Dartmouth College, USA carl.pomerance@dartmouth.edu
Stephan R. Garcia	Pomona College, USA stephan.garcia@pomona.edu	Vadim Ponomarenko	San Diego State University, USA vadim@sciences.sdsu.edu
Anant Godbole	East Tennessee State University, USA godbole@etsu.edu	Bjorn Poonen	UC Berkeley, USA poonen@math.berkeley.edu
Ron Gould	Emory University, USA rg@mathcs.emory.edu	James Propp	U Mass Lowell, USA jpropp@cs.uml.edu
Andrew Granville	Université Montréal, Canada andrew@dms.umontreal.ca	József H. Przytycki	George Washington University, USA przytyck@gwu.edu
Jerrold Griggs	University of South Carolina, USA griggs@math.sc.edu	Richard Rebarber	University of Nebraska, USA rrebarbe@math.unl.edu
Sat Gupta	U of North Carolina, Greensboro, USA sngupta@uncg.edu	Robert W. Robinson	University of Georgia, USA rwr@cs.uga.edu
Jim Haglund	University of Pennsylvania, USA jhaglund@math.upenn.edu	Filip Saidak	U of North Carolina, Greensboro, USA f_saidak@uncg.edu
Johnny Henderson	Baylor University, USA johnny_henderson@baylor.edu	James A. Sellers	Penn State University, USA sellersj@math.psu.edu
Jim Hoste	Pitzer College jhoste@pitzer.edu	Andrew J. Sterge	Honorary Editor andy@ajsterge.com
Natalia Hritonenko	Prairie View A&M University, USA nahritonenko@pvamu.edu	Ann Trenk	Wellesley College, USA atrenk@wellesley.edu
Glenn H. Hurlbert	Arizona State University, USA hurlbert@asu.edu	Ravi Vakil	Stanford University, USA vakil@math.stanford.edu
Charles R. Johnson	College of William and Mary, USA crjohnso@math.wm.edu	Antonia Vecchio	Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Italy antonia.vecchio@cnr.it
K. B. Kulasekera	Clemson University, USA kk@ces.clemson.edu	Ram U. Verma	University of Toledo, USA verma99@msn.com
Gerry Ladas	University of Rhode Island, USA gladas@math.uri.edu	John C. Wierman	Johns Hopkins University, USA wierman@jhu.edu
		Michael E. Zieve	University of Michigan, USA zieve@umich.edu

## PRODUCTION

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor


Cover: Alex Scorpan

See inside back cover or [msp.org/involve](http://msp.org/involve) for submission instructions. The subscription price for 2016 is US \$160/year for the electronic version, and \$215/year (+\$35, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues from the last three years and changes of subscribers address should be sent to MSP.

Involve (ISSN 1944-4184 electronic, 1944-4176 printed) at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 798 Evans Hall #3840, c/o University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, is published continuously online. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices.

Involve peer review and production are managed by EditFLOW<sup>®</sup> from Mathematical Sciences Publishers.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**  
nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2016 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

# involve

2016

vol. 9

no. 2

On the independence and domination numbers of replacement product graphs JAY CUMMINGS AND CHRISTINE A. KELLEY	181
An optional unrelated question RRT model JEONG S. SIHM, ANU CHHABRA AND SAT N. GUPTA	195
On counting limited outdegree grid digraphs and greatest increase grid digraphs JOSHUA CHESTER, LINNEA EDLIN, JONAH GALEOTA-SPRUNG, BRADLEY ISOM, ALEXANDER MOORE, VIRGINIA PERKINS, A. MALCOLM CAMPBELL, TODD T. ECKDAHL, LAURIE J. HEYER AND JEFFREY L. POET	211
Polygonal dissections and reversions of series ALISON SCHUETZ AND GWYN WHIELDON	223
Factor posets of frames and dual frames in finite dimensions KILEEN BERRY, MARTIN S. COPENHAVER, ERIC EVERT, YEON HYANG KIM, TROY KLINGLER, SIVARAM K. NARAYAN AND SON T. NGHIEM	237
A variation on the game SET DAVID CLARK, GEORGE FISK AND NURULLAH GOREN	249
The kernel of the matrix $[ij \pmod n]$ when $n$ is prime MARIA I. BUENO, SUSANA FURTADO, JENNIFER KARKOSKA, KYANNE MAYFIELD, ROBERT SAMALIS AND ADAM TELATOVICH	265
Harnack's inequality for second order linear ordinary differential inequalities AHMED MOHAMMED AND HANNAH TURNER	281
The isoperimetric and Kazhdan constants associated to a Paley graph KEVIN CRAMER, MIKE KREBS, NICOLE SHABAZI, ANTHONY SHAHEEN AND EDWARD VOSKANIAN	293
Mutual estimates for the dyadic reverse Hölder and Muckenhoupt constants for the dyadically doubling weights OLEKSANDRA V. BEZNOVA AND TEMITOPE ODE	307
Radio number for fourth power paths MIN-LIN LO AND LINDA VICTORIA ALEGRIA	317
On closed graphs, II DAVID A. COX AND ANDREW ERSKINE	333
Klein links and related torus links ENRIQUE ALVARADO, STEVEN BERES, VESTA COUFAL, KAIA HLAVACEK, JOEL PEREIRA AND BRANDON REEVES	347



1944-4176(2016)9:2;1-3