

involve

a journal of mathematics

The multiplicity of solutions for
a system of second-order differential equations

Olivia Bennett, Daniel Brumley, Britney Hopkins,
Kristi Karber and Thomas Milligan



The multiplicity of solutions for a system of second-order differential equations

Olivia Bennett, Daniel Brumley, Britney Hopkins,
Kristi Karber and Thomas Milligan

(Communicated by John Baxley)

Making use of the Guo–Krasnosel’skiĭ fixed point theorem multiple times, we establish the existence of at least three positive solutions for the system of second-order differential equations $-u''(t) = g(t, u(t), u'(t), v(t), v'(t))$ and $-v''(t) = \lambda f(t, u(t), u'(t), v(t), v'(t))$ for $t \in (0, 1)$ with right focal boundary conditions $u(0) = v(0) = 0$, $u'(1) = a$, and $v'(1) = b$, where $f, g : [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)^4 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ are continuous, $a, b, \lambda \geq 0$, and $a + b > 0$. Our technique involves transforming the system of differential equations to a new system with homogeneous boundary conditions prior to applying the aforementioned fixed point theorem.

1. Introduction

Showing the existence of multiple positive solutions for boundary value problems is an active field of study due to the applications that arise in modeling real world phenomena. A classic example based on beam analysis, presented by Agarwal [1989], gives an existence and uniqueness result of the fourth-order problem $x^{(4)} = f(t, x, x', x'', x^{(3)})$. Additionally, do Ó, Lorca, and Ubilla [do Ó et al. 2008] studied the fourth-order nonhomogeneous boundary value problem,

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(4)} &= \lambda h(t, u, u''), & t \in (0, 1), \\ u(0) &= u''(0) = 0, \\ u(1) &= a, & u''(1) = b. \end{aligned}$$

Utilizing a technique of rewriting the fourth-order problem as a system of second-order differential equations, the authors guaranteed existence of multiple positive solutions by ultimately applying the Guo–Krasnosel’skiĭ fixed point theorem [Krasnosel’skiĭ 1964]. Hopkins [2015] extended this process to establish multiple solutions to the differential equation $u^{(2n)} = \lambda h(t, u, u'', \dots, u^{2(n-1)})$ satisfying

MSC2010: 34B18.

Keywords: differential equations, boundary value problem, multiple solutions, positive solutions.

right focal boundary conditions. Henderson and Hopkins [2010] applied this same technique to a similar fourth-order difference equation. In this work, we consider the system of second-order differential equations

$$-u''(t) = g(t, u(t), u'(t), v(t), v'(t)), \quad (1)$$

$$-v''(t) = \lambda f(t, u(t), u'(t), v(t), v'(t)), \quad (2)$$

$$u(0) = v(0) = 0, \quad (3)$$

$$u'(1) = a, \quad v'(1) = b, \quad (4)$$

where $f, g : [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)^4 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ are continuous, $\lambda, a, b \geq 0$ and $a + b > 0$. The novelty of our paper is that the functions f and g contain both even- and odd-order derivatives.

In Section 2 of this paper, we consider a transformation of (1)–(4) that satisfies homogeneous boundary conditions. We also introduce some preliminaries and the conditions under which we can eventually apply the Guo–Krasnosel'skiĭ fixed point theorem. In Section 3 we introduce and prove a sequence of lemmas giving bounds on a defined operator. This culminates in the main result, given in Section 4 where we apply the Guo–Krasnosel'skiĭ fixed point theorem multiple times, yielding at least three positive solutions.

2. Preliminaries

We will prove the existence of multiple solutions for the system of second-order differential equations (1)–(4) by applying the transformation $\bar{u}(t) = u(t) - at$ and $\bar{v}(t) = v(t) - bt$, which gives

$$-\bar{u}''(t) = g(t, \bar{u}(t) + ta, \bar{u}'(t) + a, \bar{v}(t) + tb, \bar{v}'(t) + b), \quad (5)$$

$$-\bar{v}''(t) = \lambda f(t, \bar{u}(t) + ta, \bar{u}'(t) + a, \bar{v}(t) + tb, \bar{v}'(t) + b), \quad (6)$$

$$\bar{u}(0) = \bar{v}(0) = 0, \quad (7)$$

$$\bar{u}'(1) = 0, \quad \bar{v}'(1) = 0, \quad (8)$$

where $a, b, \lambda \geq 0$ and $a + b > 0$. Notice that solutions to (5)–(8) are in one-to-one correspondence with (1)–(4). Furthermore, suppose the following hypotheses on f and g are satisfied.

(H0) The functions $f, g : [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)^4 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ are continuous and are nondecreasing in the second and fourth variables and nonincreasing in the third and fifth variables.

(H1) There exist $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha < \beta$, such that given $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in [0, \infty)^4$ with $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 \neq 0$, there exists $k > 0$ such that for $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$,

$$f(t, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) > k.$$

(H2) For $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lim_{x_1+x_2+x_3+x_4 \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(t, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)}{x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4} = 0$$

uniformly.

(H3) For $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lim_{x_1+x_2+x_3+x_4 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(t, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)}{x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4} = 0$$

uniformly.

(H4) There exist $\gamma \in (0, \frac{2}{3})$ and $q > 0$ such that for $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in [0, \infty)^4$ with $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 < q$,

$$g(t, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \leq \gamma(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4) \quad \text{for } t \in [0, 1].$$

(H5) There exist $\eta \in (0, \frac{2}{3})$ and $\hat{\rho} > 0$ such that for $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in [0, \infty)^4$ with $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 > \hat{\rho}$,

$$g(t, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \leq \eta(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4) \quad \text{for } t \in [0, 1].$$

Solutions to (5)–(8), provided they exist, are of the form

$$\bar{u}(t) = \int_0^1 G(t, s)g(s, \bar{u}(s) + as, \bar{u}'(s) + a, \bar{v}(s) + bs, \bar{v}'(s) + b) ds, \quad (9)$$

$$\bar{v}(t) = \lambda \int_0^1 G(t, s)f(s, \bar{u}(s) + as, \bar{u}'(s) + a, \bar{v}(s) + bs, \bar{v}'(s) + b) ds, \quad (10)$$

where $G(t, s)$ is the Green’s function

$$G(t, s) = \begin{cases} t & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1, \\ s & \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Since $G(t, s)$ is clearly nonnegative and f and g are nonnegative by assumption, it follows that solutions u and v are also nonnegative. Some other useful properties on $G(t, s)$ are that

$$\max_{t \in [0, 1]} \int_0^1 G(t, s) ds = \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{t \in [0, 1]} \int_0^1 \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} G(t, s) \right| ds = 1.$$

In order to make use of the Guo–Krasnosel’skiĭ fixed point theorem, we will need a Banach space and a cone, as well as an operator T . Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ denote the Banach space $X = C^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}) \times C^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ endowed with the norm

$$\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| = \|\bar{u}\|_\infty + \|\bar{u}'\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}'\|_\infty,$$

where $\|\bar{u}\|_\infty = \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\bar{u}(t)|$.

Recall that a cone, C , in X is a nonempty, closed, convex subset of X satisfying:

- (1) If $x \in C$, and $\lambda > 0$, then $\lambda x \in C$.
- (2) If $x \in C$ and $-x \in C$, then $x = 0$.

Define $C \subset X$ to be the cone

$$C = \{(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in X : (\bar{u}, \bar{v})(0) = (\bar{u}', \bar{v}')(1) = (0, 0) \text{ and } \bar{u}, \bar{v} \text{ are concave}\}.$$

The fact that C is a cone follows directly from the definition. Moreover, let Ω_p denote the open set $\Omega_p = \{(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in X : \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| < p\}$. Finally, define $T : X \rightarrow X$ to be the operator $T(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = (A_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v}), A_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v}))$, where

$$A_1 = \int_0^1 G(t, s)g(s, \bar{u}(s) + as, \bar{u}'(s) + a, \bar{v}(s) + bs, \bar{v}'(s) + b) ds$$

and

$$A_2 = \lambda \int_0^1 G(t, s)f(s, \bar{u}(s) + as, \bar{u}'(s) + a, \bar{v}(s) + bs, \bar{v}'(s) + b) ds.$$

Consider the following lemma, which provides a useful property of T .

Lemma 2.1. *The operator $T : C \rightarrow C$ is completely continuous.*

We note that one can use a standard Arzelà–Ascoli argument to show that T is completely continuous; see [Hopkins 2009].

In the next section, we will take advantage of the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\bar{u}(t)$ be a nonnegative concave function which is continuous on $[0, 1]$. Then for all $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$, with $\alpha < \beta$, we have*

$$\inf_{t \in [\alpha, \beta]} \bar{u}(t) \geq \alpha(1 - \beta)\|\bar{u}\|_\infty.$$

For a proof of Lemma 2.2, see [Hopkins 2009].

Since we will be using the Guo–Krasnosel’skiĭ fixed point theorem multiple times to acquire our main result, we end the section with the statement of this theorem.

Theorem 2.3 (Guo–Krasnosel’skiĭ fixed point theorem). *Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a Banach space and $C \subset X$ be a cone. Suppose Ω_1, Ω_2 are open subsets of X satisfying $0 \in \Omega_1 \subset \overline{\Omega_1} \subset \Omega_2$. If $T : C \cap (\overline{\Omega_2} \setminus \Omega_1) \rightarrow C$ is a completely continuous operator such that either*

- (1) $\|Tu\| \leq \|u\|$ for $u \in C \cap \partial\Omega_1$ and $\|Tu\| \geq \|u\|$ for $u \in C \cap \partial\Omega_2$, or
- (2) $\|Tu\| \geq \|u\|$ for $u \in C \cap \partial\Omega_1$ and $\|Tu\| \leq \|u\|$ for $u \in C \cap \partial\Omega_2$,

then T has a fixed point in $C \cap (\overline{\Omega_2} \setminus \Omega_1)$.

3. Technical results

In this section we give a sequence of four lemmas that allow us to obtain the estimates needed to apply the Guo–Krasnosel’skiĭ fixed point theorem.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose (H0) and (H1) hold and let $\rho^* > 0$. Then there is a $\Lambda > 0$ such that, for every $\lambda \geq \Lambda$ and $(a, b) \in [0, \infty)^2$,*

$$\|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \geq \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|$$

for $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_{\rho^*}$.

Proof. Let $\rho^* > 0$ and let $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_{\rho^*}$. Let $r = \alpha(1 - \beta)$, where α and β are as in (H1) and note $r \in (0, 1)$. Furthermore, choose $c \geq 1$ so that both $\bar{u}' + a \leq c\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty$ and $\bar{v}' + b \leq c\|\bar{v}'\|_\infty$ hold for $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$. Define

$$M = \inf \left\{ \frac{f(t, ra_1, ca_2, ra_3, ca_4)}{r(a_1 + a_3) + c(a_2 + a_4)} : t \in [\alpha, \beta], a_1, a_2, a_3 > 0, a_4 \geq 0, \right. \\ \left. \text{and } a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4 = p^* \right\}.$$

The existence of a positive M follows from (H1). Set $\Lambda \geq [Mr \int_\alpha^\beta G(1, s) ds]^{-1}$.

As $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C$, by Lemma 2.2, we have $\bar{u}(t) + at \geq \bar{u}(t) \geq r\|\bar{u}\|_\infty$. Moreover, due to the nondecreasing property of f in the second and fourth variables and its nonincreasing property in the third and fifth variables, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| &\geq \|A_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty \\ &\geq \lambda \int_0^1 G(1, s) f(s, \bar{u} + sa, \bar{u}' + a, \bar{v} + sb, \bar{v}' + b) ds \\ &\geq \lambda \int_\alpha^\beta G(1, s) f(s, r\|\bar{u}\|_\infty, c\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty, r\|\bar{v}\|_\infty, c\|\bar{v}'\|_\infty) ds \\ &\geq \lambda [r(\|\bar{u}\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}\|_\infty) + c(\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}'\|_\infty)] \\ &\quad \times \int_\alpha^\beta G(1, s) \frac{f(s, r\|\bar{u}\|_\infty, c\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty, r\|\bar{v}\|_\infty, c\|\bar{v}'\|_\infty)}{r(\|\bar{u}\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}\|_\infty) + c(\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}'\|_\infty)} ds \\ &\geq \lambda M [r(\|\bar{u}\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}\|_\infty) + c(\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}'\|_\infty)] \int_\alpha^\beta G(1, s) ds \\ &\geq \lambda Mr (\|\bar{u}\|_\infty + \|\bar{u}'\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}'\|_\infty) \int_\alpha^\beta G(1, s) ds \\ &\geq \lambda Mr \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \int_\alpha^\beta G(1, s) ds \\ &\geq \Lambda Mr \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \int_\alpha^\beta G(1, s) ds \\ &\geq \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.2. Fix $\Lambda > 0$. Suppose (H0) and (H1) hold. Then, for all $\lambda \geq \Lambda$ and for all $(a, b) \in [0, \infty)^2$, with $a + b > 0$, there exists a $\rho_1 = \rho_1(\Lambda, a, b)$ such that for every $\rho \in (0, \rho_1)$, we have

$$\|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \geq \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|$$

for all $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_\rho$.

Proof. Fix $\Lambda > 0$. By (H1) and the nonincreasing/nondecreasing properties of f , there exists $k > 0$ such that

$$f(t, \bar{u} + ta, \bar{u}' + a, \bar{v} + tb, \bar{v}' + b) \geq f(t, \alpha a, \|\bar{u}'\|_\infty + a, \alpha b, \|\bar{v}'\|_\infty + b) > k$$

for all $t \in (\alpha, \beta)$, where α and β are as in (H1). Take $\rho_1 = \Lambda k \int_\alpha^\beta G(1, s) ds$. Then, for $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_\rho$ where $\rho \leq \rho_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| &\geq \|A_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty \geq \lambda \int_0^1 G(1, s) f(s, \bar{u} + sa, \bar{u}' + a, \bar{v} + sb, \bar{v}' + b) ds \\ &\geq \lambda \int_\alpha^\beta G(1, s) f(s, \alpha a \|\bar{u}'\|_\infty + a, \alpha b, \|\bar{v}'\|_\infty + b) ds \\ &> \lambda k \int_\alpha^\beta G(1, s) ds \\ &= \lambda k \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \int_\alpha^\beta \frac{G(1, s)}{\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|} ds \\ &\geq \Lambda k \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \int_\alpha^\beta \frac{G(1, s)}{\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|} ds \\ &= \frac{\rho_1}{\rho} \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \\ &\geq \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.3. Suppose (H0), (H2) and (H4) hold and let $\rho^* > 0$ be fixed. Then given $\lambda > 0$, there is a $\rho_2 \in (0, \rho^*)$ and a $\delta > 0$ such that for every $(a, b) \in [0, \infty)^2$, with $0 < a + b < \delta$, we have

$$\|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \leq \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|$$

for $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_{\rho_2}$.

Proof. Let $\lambda > 0$. Pick $\epsilon > 0$ so that $\lambda\epsilon < \frac{1}{3}$. Then, by (H2), we can find a $\rho_2 \in (0, \rho^*)$ such that, for all $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in [0, \infty)^4$ with $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 = \rho_2$ and $a + b \leq \rho_2$ with $\rho_2 < \frac{1}{2}q$, where $q > 0$ is as in (H4), we have

$$f(t, x_1 + a, x_2, x_3 + b, x_4) < \epsilon [(x_1 + a) + x_2 + (x_3 + b) + x_4]$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$.

Take $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_{\rho_2}$, and suppose $a + b \leq \rho_2$. Notice that there exists $c \in (0, 1]$ such that $\bar{u}' + a \geq c\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty$ and $\bar{v}' + b \geq c\|\bar{v}'\|_\infty$. Then, for $t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})(t) &= \lambda \int_0^1 G(t, s) f(s, \bar{u} + sa, \bar{u}' + a, \bar{v} + sb, \bar{v}' + b) ds \\
 &\leq \lambda \int_0^1 G(t, s) f(s, \|\bar{u}\|_\infty + a, c\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty, \|\bar{v}\|_\infty + b, c\|\bar{v}'\|_\infty) ds \\
 &< \lambda\epsilon [\|\bar{u}\|_\infty + c\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}\|_\infty + c\|\bar{v}'\|_\infty + (a + b)] \int_0^1 G(t, s) ds \\
 &\leq \lambda\epsilon [\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| + (a + b)] \int_0^1 G(t, s) ds \\
 &\leq 2\lambda\epsilon \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \int_0^1 G(t, s) ds \\
 &\leq \lambda\epsilon \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using a similar argument to the one above, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 A'_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})(t) &= \lambda \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} G(t, s) f(s, \bar{u} + sa, \bar{u}' + a, \bar{v} + sb, \bar{v}' + b) ds \\
 &\leq 2\lambda\epsilon \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} G(t, s) ds \\
 &\leq 2\lambda\epsilon \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|.
 \end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$\|A_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty + \|A'_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty \leq 3\lambda\epsilon \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|.$$

By (H4), since $[(\|\bar{u}\|_\infty + a) + \|\bar{u}'\|_\infty + (\|\bar{v}\|_\infty + b) + \|\bar{v}'\|_\infty] \leq 2\rho_2 < q$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 g(t, \|\bar{u}\|_\infty + a, \|\bar{u}'\|_\infty, \|\bar{v}\|_\infty + b, \|\bar{v}'\|_\infty) \\
 \leq \gamma (\|\bar{u}\|_\infty + a + \|\bar{u}'\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}\|_\infty + b + \|\bar{v}'\|_\infty).
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $\delta' < 1$ and set $\delta = \delta'\rho_2$. Then for $a + b < \delta$, $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_{\rho_2}$, and $t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v})(t) &= \int_0^1 G(t, s) g(s, \bar{u} + sa, \bar{u}' + a, \bar{v} + sb, \bar{v}' + b) ds \\
 &\leq \int_0^1 G(t, s) g(s, \|\bar{u}\|_\infty + a, c\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty, \|\bar{v}\|_\infty + b, c\|\bar{v}'\|_\infty) ds \\
 &\leq \gamma [\|\bar{u}\|_\infty + c\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty + \|\bar{v}\|_\infty + c\|\bar{v}'\|_\infty + (a + b)] \int_0^1 G(t, s) ds \\
 &\leq \gamma [\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| + (a + b)] \int_0^1 G(t, s) ds
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &< \gamma(1+\delta')\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \int_0^1 G(t, s) ds \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\gamma(1+\delta')\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|, \end{aligned}$$

where c is as above. And similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} A'_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v})(t) &= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} G(t, s) g(s, \bar{u} + sa, \bar{u}' + a, \bar{v} + sb, \bar{v}' + b) ds \\ &< \gamma(1+\delta')\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} G(t, s) ds \\ &\leq \gamma(1+\delta')\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\|A_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty + \|A'_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty < \frac{3}{2}\gamma(1+\delta')\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|.$$

Thus, for $a + b < \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| &= \|A_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty + \|A'_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty + \|A_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty + \|A'_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty \\ &< \left[\frac{3}{2}\gamma(1+\delta') + 3\lambda\epsilon \right] \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|. \end{aligned}$$

For small enough ϵ and δ' , it follows that $\|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \leq \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|$. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\delta > 0$. Suppose $0 < a + b < \delta$ and (H0), (H3) and (H5) hold. Then, for every $\lambda > 0$, there is a $\rho_3 = \rho_3(\delta, \lambda)$ such that for all $\rho \geq \rho_3$,*

$$\|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \leq \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|,$$

where $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_\rho$.

Proof. Let $\delta > 0$, $0 < a + b < \delta$ and let $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in [0, \infty)^4$. By (H5) and the nondecreasing/nonincreasing properties of g as in (H0), given any $q_1 \geq \hat{\rho}$, we have

$$g(t, x_1 + a, x_2, x_3 + a, x_4) \leq \eta(x_1 + a + x_2 + x_3 + b + x_4)$$

for $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 \geq q_1$ and $t \in [0, 1]$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and pick $q_1 \geq \hat{\rho}$ large enough so that $\epsilon > \eta\delta/q_1$. Let $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 \geq q_1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} g(t, x_1 + a, x_2, x_3 + a, x_4) &\leq \eta(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4) + \eta(a + b) \\ &< \eta(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4) + \epsilon(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4) \\ &= (\eta + \epsilon)(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4). \end{aligned}$$

Let $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_{q_1}$. Pick $c \in (0, 1]$ such that $\bar{u}' + a \geq c\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty$ and $\bar{v}' + b \geq c\|\bar{v}'\|_\infty$. Then for $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v})(t) &= \int_0^1 G(t, s)g(s, \bar{u} + sa, \bar{u}' + a, \bar{v} + sb, \bar{v}' + b) ds \\ &\leq \int_0^1 G(t, s)g(s, \|\bar{u}\|_\infty + a, c\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty, \|\bar{v}\|_\infty + b, c\|\bar{v}'\|_\infty) ds \\ &< (\eta + \epsilon)\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \int_0^1 G(t, s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

A similar argument shows that

$$\begin{aligned} A'_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v})(t) &= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} G(t, s)g(s, \bar{u} + sa, \bar{u}' + a, \bar{v} + sb, \bar{v}' + b) ds \\ &< (\eta + \epsilon)\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} G(t, s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these inequalities, we see that

$$\|A_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty + \|A'_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty < \frac{3}{2}(\eta + \epsilon)\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|.$$

Now consider $A_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})(t)$. Let $\delta' > 0$. Then, by (H0) and (H3), there is a $q_2 > 0$ such that for all $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in [0, \infty)^4$ with $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 \geq q_2$, we have

$$f(t, x_1 + a, x_2, x_3 + b, x_4) \leq \delta'(x_1 + a + x_2 + x_3 + b + x_4)$$

for every $t \in [0, 1]$. Let $q_3 = \max\{\delta, q_2\}$. Noting that $a + b < \delta$, for $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in [0, \infty)^4$ with $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 \geq q_3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(t, x_1 + a, x_2, x_3 + b, x_4) &\leq \delta'[(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4) + q_3] \\ &\leq 2\delta'(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4). \end{aligned}$$

Then for $t \in [0, 1]$ and any $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_{q_3}$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) &= \lambda \int_0^1 G(t, s)f(s, \bar{u} + sa, \bar{u}' + a, \bar{v} + sb, \bar{v}' + b) ds \\ &\leq \lambda \int_0^1 G(t, s)f(s, \|\bar{u}\|_\infty + a, c\|\bar{u}'\|_\infty, \|\bar{v}\|_\infty + b, c\|\bar{v}'\|_\infty) ds \\ &< \lambda \cdot 2\delta'\|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \int_0^1 G(t, s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where c is as above. And similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} A_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) &= \lambda \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} G(t, s) f(s, \bar{u} + sa, \bar{u}' + a, \bar{v} + sb, \bar{v}' + b) ds \\ &< \lambda \cdot 2\delta' \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} G(t, s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these inequalities, we see that

$$\|A_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty + \|A_2'(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty < 3\lambda\delta' \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|.$$

Take $\rho_3 = \max\{q_1, q_3\}$ and let $\rho \geq \rho_3$. Then given $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_\rho$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| &= \|A_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty + \|A_1'(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty + \|A_2(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty + \|A_2'(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|_\infty \\ &< \left[\frac{1}{2}(6\lambda\delta' + 3(\eta + \epsilon)) \right] \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\|. \end{aligned}$$

Recall by (H5) that $\eta \in (0, \frac{2}{3})$. Pick ϵ and δ' small enough that $6\lambda\delta' + 3\epsilon \leq 2 - 3\eta$. Thus, we have the desired result. \square

4. The main result

Theorem 4.1. *Let continuous functions $f, g : [0, 1] \times [0, \infty)^4 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfy hypotheses (H0)–(H5). Then there exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that given $\lambda \geq \Lambda$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every $a, b \geq 0$ satisfying $0 < a + b < \delta$, the system (5)–(8) has at least three positive solutions.*

Proof. Suppose f, g satisfy hypotheses (H0)–(H5). Let $\rho^* > 0$ be fixed. By Lemma 3.1, there is $\Lambda > 0$ such that, for every $\lambda \geq \Lambda$ and $a, b \geq 0$,

$$\|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \geq \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \quad \text{for } (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_{\rho^*}.$$

Now, fix $\lambda \geq \Lambda$. Lemmas 3.2 through 3.4 give that there is $\delta > 0$ and $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 > 0$ satisfying $\rho_1 < \rho_2 < \rho^* < \rho_3$ such that for $(a, b) \in [0, \infty)^2$ with $0 < a + b < \delta$,

$$\|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \geq \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \quad \text{for } (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_{\rho_1},$$

$$\|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \leq \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \quad \text{for } (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_{\rho_2},$$

$$\|T(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \leq \|(\bar{u}, \bar{v})\| \quad \text{for } (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in C \cap \partial\Omega_{\rho_3}.$$

Applying the Guo–Krasnosel'skiĭ fixed point theorem three times, we get the existence of three positive solutions, $(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_1), (\bar{u}_2, \bar{v}_2), (\bar{u}_3, \bar{v}_3) \in C$ such that

$$\rho_1 < \|(\bar{u}_1, \bar{v}_1)\| < \rho_2 < \|(\bar{u}_2, \bar{v}_2)\| < \rho^* < \|(\bar{u}_3, \bar{v}_3)\| < \rho_3. \quad \square$$

Recall that solutions to the system (5)–(8) are in one-to-one correspondence with those of the system (1)–(4). Thus we have our desired result.

References

- [Agarwal 1989] R. P. Agarwal, “On fourth order boundary value problems arising in beam analysis”, *Differential Integral Equations* **2**:1 (1989), 91–110. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Henderson and Hopkins 2010] J. Henderson and B. Hopkins, “Multiple positive solutions for a discrete fourth order nonhomogeneous boundary value problem”, *Int. Electron. J. Pure Appl. Math.* **2**:2 (2010), 81–92.
- [Hopkins 2009] B. Hopkins, *Multiplicity of positive solutions of even-order nonhomogeneous boundary value problems*, thesis, Baylor University, Waco, TX, 2009, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304849906>. [MR](#)
- [Hopkins 2015] B. Hopkins, “Multiplicity of positive solutions for an even-order right focal boundary value problem”, *Adv. Dyn. Syst. Appl.* **10**:2 (2015), 189–200. [MR](#)
- [Krasnosel’skiĭ 1964] M. A. Krasnosel’skiĭ, *Positive solutions of operator equations*, P. Noordhoff Ltd., Groningen, 1964. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [do Ó et al. 2008] J. M. do Ó, S. Lorca, and P. Ubilla, “Multiplicity of solutions for a class of non-homogeneous fourth-order boundary value problems”, *Appl. Math. Lett.* **21**:3 (2008), 279–286. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)

Received: 2015-08-31 Accepted: 2016-01-14

oliviabennett15@gmail.com *Department of Mathematics and Statistics,
University of Central Oklahoma, 100 N. University Drive,
Edmond, OK 73034, United States*

dbrumley1@uco.edu *Department of Mathematics and Statistics,
University of Central Oklahoma, 100 N. University Drive,
Edmond, OK 73034, United States*

bhopkins3@uco.edu *Department of Mathematics and Statistics,
University of Central Oklahoma, 100 N. University Drive,
Edmond, OK 73034, United States*

kkarber1@uco.edu *Department of Mathematics and Statistics,
University of Central Oklahoma, 100 N. University Drive,
Edmond, OK 73034, United States*

tmilligan1@uco.edu *Department of Mathematics and Statistics,
University of Central Oklahoma, 100 N. University Drive,
Edmond, OK 73034, United States*

INVOLVE YOUR STUDENTS IN RESEARCH

Involve showcases and encourages high-quality mathematical research involving students from all academic levels. The editorial board consists of mathematical scientists committed to nurturing student participation in research. Bridging the gap between the extremes of purely undergraduate research journals and mainstream research journals, *Involve* provides a venue to mathematicians wishing to encourage the creative involvement of students.

MANAGING EDITOR

Kenneth S. Berenhaut Wake Forest University, USA

BOARD OF EDITORS

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| Colin Adams | Williams College, USA | Suzanne Lenhart | University of Tennessee, USA |
| John V. Baxley | Wake Forest University, NC, USA | Chi-Kwong Li | College of William and Mary, USA |
| Arthur T. Benjamin | Harvey Mudd College, USA | Robert B. Lund | Clemson University, USA |
| Martin Bohner | Missouri U of Science and Technology, USA | Gaven J. Martin | Massey University, New Zealand |
| Nigel Boston | University of Wisconsin, USA | Mary Meyer | Colorado State University, USA |
| Amarjit S. Budhiraja | U of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, USA | Emil Minchev | Ruse, Bulgaria |
| Pietro Cerone | La Trobe University, Australia | Frank Morgan | Williams College, USA |
| Scott Chapman | Sam Houston State University, USA | Mohammad Sal Moslehian | Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran |
| Joshua N. Cooper | University of South Carolina, USA | Zuhair Nashed | University of Central Florida, USA |
| Jem N. Corcoran | University of Colorado, USA | Ken Ono | Emory University, USA |
| Toka Diagana | Howard University, USA | Timothy E. O'Brien | Loyola University Chicago, USA |
| Michael Dorff | Brigham Young University, USA | Joseph O'Rourke | Smith College, USA |
| Sever S. Dragomir | Victoria University, Australia | Yuval Peres | Microsoft Research, USA |
| Behrouz Emamizadeh | The Petroleum Institute, UAE | Y.-F. S. Pétermann | Université de Genève, Switzerland |
| Joel Foisy | SUNY Potsdam, USA | Robert J. Plemmons | Wake Forest University, USA |
| Erin W. Fulp | Wake Forest University, USA | Carl B. Pomerance | Dartmouth College, USA |
| Joseph Gallian | University of Minnesota Duluth, USA | Vadim Ponomarenko | San Diego State University, USA |
| Stephan R. Garcia | Pomona College, USA | Bjorn Poonen | UC Berkeley, USA |
| Anant Godbole | East Tennessee State University, USA | James Propp | U Mass Lowell, USA |
| Ron Gould | Emory University, USA | József H. Przytycki | George Washington University, USA |
| Andrew Granville | Université Montréal, Canada | Richard Rebarber | University of Nebraska, USA |
| Jerrold Griggs | University of South Carolina, USA | Robert W. Robinson | University of Georgia, USA |
| Sat Gupta | U of North Carolina, Greensboro, USA | Filip Saidak | U of North Carolina, Greensboro, USA |
| Jim Haglund | University of Pennsylvania, USA | James A. Sellers | Penn State University, USA |
| Johnny Henderson | Baylor University, USA | Andrew J. Sterge | Honorary Editor |
| Jim Hoste | Pitzer College, USA | Ann Trenk | Wellesley College, USA |
| Natalia Hritonenko | Prairie View A&M University, USA | Ravi Vakil | Stanford University, USA |
| Glenn H. Hurlbert | Arizona State University, USA | Antonia Vecchio | Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Italy |
| Charles R. Johnson | College of William and Mary, USA | Ram U. Verma | University of Toledo, USA |
| K. B. Kulasekera | Clemson University, USA | John C. Wierman | Johns Hopkins University, USA |
| Gerry Ladas | University of Rhode Island, USA | Michael E. Zieve | University of Michigan, USA |

PRODUCTION

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor

Cover: Alex Scorpan

See inside back cover or msp.org/involve for submission instructions. The subscription price for 2017 is US \$175/year for the electronic version, and \$235/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® from Mathematical Sciences Publishers.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**
nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2017 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

involve

2017

vol. 10

no. 1

| | |
|--|-----|
| Intrinsically triple-linked graphs in $\mathbb{R}P^3$ | 1 |
| JARED FEDERMAN, JOEL FOISY, KRISTIN MCNAMARA AND EMILY STARK | |
| A modified wavelet method for identifying transient features in time signals with applications to bean beetle maturation | 21 |
| DAVID MCMORRIS, PAUL PEARSON AND BRIAN YURK | |
| A generalization of the matrix transpose map and its relationship to the twist of the polynomial ring by an automorphism | 43 |
| ANDREW MCGINNIS AND MICHAELA VANCLIFF | |
| Mixing times for the rook's walk via path coupling | 51 |
| CAM MCLEMAN, PETER T. OTTO, JOHN RAHMANI AND MATTHEW SUTTER | |
| The lifting of graphs to 3-uniform hypergraphs and some applications to hypergraph Ramsey theory | 65 |
| MARK BUDDEN, JOSH HILLER, JOSHUA LAMBERT AND CHRIS SANFORD | |
| The multiplicity of solutions for a system of second-order differential equations | 77 |
| OLIVIA BENNETT, DANIEL BRUMLEY, BRITNEY HOPKINS, KRISTI KARBER AND THOMAS MILLIGAN | |
| Factorization of Temperley–Lieb diagrams | 89 |
| DANA C. ERNST, MICHAEL G. HASTINGS AND SARAH K. SALMON | |
| Prime labelings of generalized Petersen graphs | 109 |
| STEVEN A. SCHLUCHTER, JUSTIN Z. SCHROEDER, KATHRYN COKUS, RYAN ELLINGSON, HAYLEY HARRIS, ETHAN RARITY AND THOMAS WILSON | |
| A generalization of Zeckendorf's theorem via circumscribed m -gons | 125 |
| ROBERT DORWARD, PARI L. FORD, EVA FOURAKIS, PAMELA E. HARRIS, STEVEN J. MILLER, EYVINDUR PALSSON AND HANNAH PAUGH | |
| Loewner deformations driven by the Weierstrass function | 151 |
| JOAN LIND AND JESSICA ROBINS | |
| Rank disequilibrium in multiple-criteria evaluation schemes | 165 |
| JONATHAN K. HODGE, FAYE SPRAGUE-WILLIAMS AND JAMIE WOELK | |