

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

STABILITY OF MEASURE DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

S. LEELA

STABILITY OF MEASURE DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

S. LEELA

The preservation of stability properties of perturbed differential equations when the perturbations are impulsive are discussed relative to asymptotically self invariant sets. The fact that the solutions of perturbed systems are discontinuous offers many difficulties in applying the usual methods of perturbation theory and thus makes the study interesting.

1. **Introduction.** Generally, in perturbation theory, we consider the perturbed system given by

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = f(t, x) + R(t, x) ,$$

where the perturbation term $R(t, x)$ is continuous and small in some sense. But it is of much importance to consider the case when the perturbation term is rather wildly impulsive in character and it is also natural to expect such a situation in pulse frequency modulation systems, models for biological neural nets and some automatic control problems. Thus the study of equations of the type

$$(1.1) \quad DX = f(t, x) + G(t, x)Du ,$$

where Du denotes the distributional derivative of the function u is important in itself. Equations of the form (1.1) are called measure differential equations. The existence of solutions of such equations has been studied by Schmaedeke, W. W. [6] and Das, P. C. and Sharma, R. R., (see [2], [3]).

Our interest here is to treat Eq. (1.1) as a perturbation of the ordinary differential system

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{dx}{dt} = f(t, x)$$

and to investigate the preservation of stability properties of solutions of (1.2) under the effect of impulsive perturbations. Some simple situations of the stability of such problems have been considered by Das, P. C. and Sharma, R. R. [3], Barbashin, E. A. [1] and Zabalishchin, S. T. [7].

The fact that the solutions of (1.1) are discontinuous (i.e., functions of bounded variation) offers many difficulties in applying the usual techniques of perturbation theory. It is known (see [4], [5]) that even in the case of ordinary differential systems, it is more general and natural to consider the stability of asymptotically self

invariant (ASI) sets rather than that of usual invariant sets. Thus, it seems more appropriate to consider ASI sets and their stability properties with respect to (1.1). In this paper, we study the effect of impulsive perturbations on the stability in variation of ASI sets, making use of the methods developed in our earlier work [5].

2. Notation and basic theorems. Let R^n and M denote the n -Euclidean space and the set of all $n \times m$ matrices of real numbers, with the norms $\|x\| = \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|$, $x \in R^n$ and $\|G\| = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m |g_{ij}|$, $(g_{ij}) = G \in M$, respectively. Let $Bv(R^+, R^m)$ denote the set of all vector functions defined on R^+ with values in R^m , whose components are scalar functions of bounded variation on R^+ .

Let us consider the measure differential equation

$$(2.1) \quad Dx = f(t, x) + G(t, x)Du, \quad x(t_0) = x_0, t_0 \geq 0,$$

where (i) the functions f and G are defined on $R^+ \times S(\rho)$, $S(\rho) = [x \in R^n: \|x\| < \rho]$, with values in R^n and M respectively; (ii) u is a right continuous function belonging to the set $Bv(R^+, R^m)$; and (iii) Dx , Du denote the distributional derivatives of functions x and u (identified with Stieltjes measure) respectively.

DEFINITION 1. A function $y(\cdot) = y(\cdot, t_0, x_0)$ is said to be a solution of Eq. (2.1) on R^+ if $y(\cdot)$ is a right continuous function $\in Bv(R^+, S(\rho))$ and the distributional derivative of $y(\cdot)$ on (t_0, T) , $T \in R^+$, satisfies the Eq. (2.1).

For the existence and uniqueness of solutions of Eq. (2.1) and for more details about equations of the type (2.1), refer [2], [3]. In the sequel, we shall assume that the solutions of Eq. (2.1) exist and are unique for $t \geq t_0$.

The following classes of functions will be used often in our discussion. So, we define

$$\begin{aligned} L &= [\sigma: \sigma \in C[R^+, R^+], \sigma(t) \text{ is decreasing in } t \text{ and } \sigma(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty]; \\ A &= [a: a \in C[R^+ \times [0, \rho), R^+], a(t, r) \text{ is decreasing in } t \text{ for each } r \\ &\quad \text{and increasing in } r \text{ for each } t \text{ such that } \lim_{\substack{t \rightarrow \infty \\ r \rightarrow 0}} a(t, r) = 0]; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \left[H: H \in C[R^+ \times R^+, R^+] \text{ and for some } \tau > 0, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \sup_{t_0 \geq \tau} H(t, t_0) \right\} = 0 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $C[Y, Z]$ denote the set of continuous functions on Y taking values in Z .

We shall now suppose that $f \in C[R^+ \times S(\rho), R^n]$, $f_x(t, x)$ exists and

is continuous on $R^+xS(\rho)$ and $x(t, t_0, x_0)$ is the solution of the unperturbed system

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{dx}{dt} = f(t, x), \quad x(t_0) = x_0.$$

Let $\Phi(t, t_0, x_0)$ denote the fundamental matrix solution of the variational system

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = f_x(t, x(t, t_0, x_0))z, \quad z(t_0) = 1 \text{ (identity matrix)}.$$

We use the following definitions for the characterization of the asymptotically self invariant (ASI) set with respect to the system (2.2) and the stability criteria of such sets.

DEFINITION 2. The set $x = 0$ is said to be ASI relative to (2.2) if every solution $x(t, t_0, 0)$ of (2.2) satisfies

$$\|x(t, t_0, 0)\| \leq \lambda(t_0), \quad t \geq t_0, \lambda \in L.$$

DEFINITION 3. The ASI set $x = 0$ is said to be

(i) uniformly stable in variation, if for each α , $0 < \alpha \leq \rho$, there exists a constant $M(\alpha) > 0$ such that

$$\|\Phi(t, t_0, x_0)\| \leq M(\alpha), \quad t \geq t_0,$$

provided $\|x_0\| \leq \alpha$;

(ii) uniformly asymptotically stable in variation, if for each α , $0 < \alpha \leq \rho$, there exists a function $\sigma_\alpha \in L$ such that whenever $\|x_0\| \leq \alpha$,

$$\|\Phi(t, t_0, x_0)\| \leq \sigma_\alpha(t - t_0), \quad t \geq t_0;$$

(iii) uniformly stable, if there exists a function $a \in A$ such that

$$\|x(t, t_0, x_0)\| \leq a(t_0, \|x_0\|), \quad t \geq t_0;$$

(iv) uniformly asymptotically stable, if there exist functions $a \in A$, $\eta \in L$, and $H \in B$ such that

$$\|x(t, t_0, x_0)\| \leq a(t_0, \|x_0\|)\eta(t - t_0) + H(t, t_0), \quad t \geq t_0;$$

(v) quasi-equi asymptotically stable if the estimate in (iv) is replaced by

$$\|x(t, t_0, x_0)\| \leq \{a(t_0, \|x_0\|) + \beta\}\eta(t - t_0) + H(t, t_0), \quad t \geq t_0,$$

where β is a constant > 0 and the functions a , η , and H are as in (iv);

(vi) exponentially asymptotically stable if, for $t \geq t_0$,

$$\|x(t, t_0, x_0)\| \leq \{a(t_0, \|x_0\|) + \beta\}e^{-\delta(t-t_0)} + H(t, t_0),$$

where the constant $\beta \geq 0$, $\delta > 0$, $a \in A$ and $H \in B$.

REMARK. If $f(t, 0) \equiv 0$ so that $x \equiv 0$ is the unique solution of (2.2), then the ASI set reduces to the usual invariant set.

We next state two known results [5] which are very useful in our investigation of stability properties of Eq. (2.1).

THEOREM 2.1. *Assume that the ASI set $x = 0$ with respect to (2.2) is uniformly stable in variation. Then, there exists a Lyapunov function $V(t, x)$ with the following properties:*

- (1) $V(t, x)$ is defined and continuous on $R^+ \times S(\alpha)$;
- (2) $\|x\| \leq V(t, x) \leq a(t, \|x\|)$, $(t, x) \in R^+ \times S(\alpha)$, $a \in A$;
- (3) $|V(t, x) - V(t, y)| \leq M(\alpha) \|x - y\|$, $(t, x), (t, y) \in R^+ \times S(\alpha)$;
- (4) $D^+ V_{(2.2)}(t, x) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \sup 1/h [V(t+h, x+hf(t, x)) - V(t, x)] \leq 0$, for $(t, x) \in R^+ \times S(\alpha)$.

THEOREM 2.2. *Suppose that the ASI set $x = 0$ relative to (2.2) is uniformly asymptotically stable in variation. Then, there exists a Lyapunov function $W(t, x)$ verifying the following properties:*

- (1') $W(t, x)$ is defined and continuous on $R^+ \times S(\alpha)$;
- (2') $\|x\| \leq W(t, x) \leq b(t, \|x\|)$, $(t, x) \in R^+ \times S(\alpha)$, $b \in A$;
- (3') $|W(t, x) - W(t, y)| \leq L(\alpha) \|x - y\|$, $(t, x), (t, y) \in R^+ \times S(\alpha)$;
- (4') $D^+ W_{(2.2)}(t, x) \leq -\delta W(t, x) + \lambda(t)$, $(t, x) \in R^+ \times S(\alpha)$, where $\delta > 0$ and $\lambda \in L$.

REMARK. It is important to note that the Lyapunov functions obtained in the foregoing theorems are Lipschitzian in x for a constant and this fact plays a crucial role in studying the effect of perturbations. The usefulness of the stability in variation notions lies in the above fact.

3. Main results. In this section, we shall assume that the set $x = 0$ is ASI relative to the unperturbed system (2.2) and give sufficient conditions for the stability criteria of the ASI set $x = 0$ with respect to the measure differential system (2.1). First we state the following hypotheses:

(H₁) $f(t, x)$ and $f_x(t, x)$ are defined and continuous on $R^+ \times S(\rho)$ and $f_x(t, x)$ is bounded on $R^+ \times S(\rho)$;

(H₂) the ASI set $x = 0$ relative to (2.2) is uniformly stable in variation;

(H₃) the ASI set $x = 0$ relative to (2.2) is uniformly asymptotically stable in variation;

(H₁) $\|G(t, x)\| \leq g(t) \|x\|$ on $R^+ \times S(\rho)$ where $G(t, x)$ is measurable in t for each x , continuous in x for each t and $g(t)$ is dv_u integrable function v_u being the total variation function of u ;

(H₂) $\int_0^\infty w(s)ds < \infty$ where

$$w(t) = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} \int_t^{t+h} g(s)dv_u(s)$$

is the upper right Dini derivative of the indefinite integral $\int^t g(s)dv_u(s)$;

(H₃) the function $w(t)$ in H₂ is such that

$$\int_t^{t+1} w(s)ds \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \longrightarrow \infty ;$$

(H₇) the discontinuities of u occur at isolated points $\{t_k\}$, $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_k < \dots$ and are such that

$$(3.1) \quad \|u(t_k) - u(t_k^-)\| \leq \lambda_k \exp\left(\int_{t_0}^{t_k} w(s)ds\right), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

and λ_k are constants ;

(H₈) $\sum_{k=1}^\infty g(t_k)\lambda_k$ converges.

We are now in a position to state our first main result which deals with the sufficient conditions for the uniform stability of the ASI set $x = 0$ with respect to the perturbed system (2.1).

THEOREM 3.1. *Assume that the hypotheses (H₁), (H₂), (H₄), (H₅), (H₇), and (H₈) are satisfied. Then, the set $x = 0$ is ASI with respect to (2.1) and is uniformly stable.*

Naturally, the proof depends on the construction of a Lyapunov function for the unperturbed system (2.2), obtaining the estimate of solutions of the perturbed system (2.1) in terms of that Lyapunov function and estimating the jumps of the solutions of (2.1) at the points of discontinuity. For convenience, we first state and prove the following lemmas.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let the hypotheses (H₁), (H₂), (H₄), and (H₅) hold. Then,*

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} D^+ m(t) = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [m(t+h) - m(t)] \\ \leq M(\alpha) \|y(t, t_0, x_0)\| w(t) + \underset{(2.2)}{D^+ V(t, x)}, \end{cases}$$

where $m(t) = V(t, y(t, t_0, x_0))$, $y(t, t_0, x_0)$ is the solution of (2.1), $V(t, x)$

is the Lyapunov function obtained in Theorem 2.1 and $M(\alpha)$ is the Lipschitz constant for the function $V(t, x)$.

Proof. Set $x = y(t, t_0, x_0)$ and note that $y(t+h, t_0, x_0) \equiv y(t+h, t, x)$, $h > 0$, in view of the assumed uniqueness of solutions of (2.1). Also, let $x(s, t, x)$ denote the solution of the system (2.2). Then, using the definition of $m(t)$, the Lipschitzian property of V , we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
 D^+m(t) &= \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [V(t+h, y(t+h, t_0, x_0)) - V(t, y(t, t_0, x_0))] \\
 &= \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [V(t+h, y(t+h, t, x)) - V(t, x)] \\
 &\leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [V(t+h, y(t+h, t, x)) - V(t+h, x(t+h, t, x))] \\
 &\quad + \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [V(t+h, x(t+h, t, x)) - V(t+h, x+h f(t, x))] \\
 &\quad + \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [V(t+h, x+h f(t, x)) - V(t, x)] \\
 &\leq M(\alpha) \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \left[\frac{1}{h} \|y(t+h, t, x) - x(t+h, t, x)\| \right] + D^+V(t, x) \\
 &\leq M(\alpha) \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} \left\{ \int_t^{t+h} \|f(s, y(s, t, x)) - f(s, x(s, t, x))\| ds \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \int_t^{t+h} \|G(s, y(s, t, x))\| dv_u(s) \right\} + D^+V(t, x),
 \end{aligned}$$

where v_u is the total variation function of u .

Since f is Lipschitzian in x ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \sup \frac{1}{h} \left[\int_t^{t+h} \|f(s, y(s, t, x)) - f(s, x(s, t, x))\| ds \right] \\
 \leq L \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \left[\sup_{t \leq s \leq t+h} (\|y(s, t, x) - x(s, t, x)\|) \right] = 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain, using (H_4) , $D^+m(t) \leq M(\alpha)w(t)\|y(t, t_0, x_0)\| + D^+V_{(2.2)}(t, x)$.

LEMMA 3.2. *Let the hypotheses (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_4) , and (H_5) hold. If $y(t, t_0, x_0)$ is a solution of (2.1), then, at the points of discontinuity $\{t_k\}$, we have*

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} |V(t_k, y(t_k, t_0, x_0)) - V(t_k, y(t_k^-, t_0, x_0))| \\ \leq M(\alpha)\rho g(t_k)\|u(t_k) - u(t_k^-)\|. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Following the arguments in [3], we get

$$\|y(t_k, t_0, x_0) - y(t_k^-, t_0, x_0)\| = \|G(t_k, y(t_k, t_0, x_0))[u(t_k) - u(t_k^-)]\|.$$

Hence, using the assumption (H₄),

$$\begin{aligned} & |V(t_k, y(t_k, t_0, x_0)) - V(t_k, y(t_k^-, t_0, x_0))| \\ & \leq M(\alpha) \|y(t_k, t_0, x_0) - y(t_k^-, t_0, x_0)\| \\ & \leq M(\alpha)g(t_k) \|y(t_k, t_0, x_0)\| \|u(t_k) - u(t_k^-)\|, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the estimate (3.3).

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Recalling that $D^+V_{(2,2)}(t, x) \leq 0$ and $\|x\| \leq V(t, x)$, we have from (3.2), the following differential inequality

$$(3.4) \quad D^+m(t) \leq M(\alpha)m(t)w(t).$$

Since $y(t, t_0, x_0)$ is continuous on $[t_{k-1}, t_k)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, the inequality (3.4) yields, for each $t \in [t_{k-1}, t_k)$,

$$(3.5) \quad V(t, y(t, t_0, x_0)) \leq V(t_{k-1}, y(t_{k-1}, t_0, x_0)) \exp\left(M(\alpha) \int_{t_{k-1}}^t w(s)ds\right).$$

In view of (3.3), (3.5), and (3.1), we now obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & V(t_k, y(t_k, t_0, x_0)) \\ & \leq V(t_k, y(t_k^-, t_0, x_0)) + M(\alpha)\rho g(t_k)\lambda_k \exp\left(M(\alpha) \int_{t_0}^{t_k} w(s)ds\right) \\ & \leq V(t_{k-1}, y(t_{k-1}, t_0, x_0)) \exp\left(M(\alpha) \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} w(s)ds\right) \\ & \quad + M(\alpha)\rho g(t_k)\lambda_k \exp\left(M(\alpha) \int_{t_0}^{t_k} w(s)ds\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $M(\alpha) \geq 1$ (without any loss of generality).

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & V(t, y(t, t_0, x_0)) \leq V(t_0, x_0) \exp\left(M(\alpha) \int_{t_0}^t w(s)ds\right), t \in [t_0, t_1); \\ & V(t, y(t, t_0, x_0)) \leq V(t_1, y(t_1, t_0, x_0)) \exp\left(M(\alpha) \int_{t_1}^t w(s)ds\right), t \in [t_1, t_2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $t \in [t_0, t_2)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & V(t, y(t, t_0, x_0)) \leq \left[V(t_0, x_0) \exp\left(M(\alpha) \int_{t_0}^{t_1} w(s)ds\right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + M(\alpha)\rho g(t_1)\lambda_1 \exp\left(M(\alpha) \int_{t_0}^{t_1} w(s)ds\right) \right] \exp\left(M(\alpha) \int_{t_1}^t w(s)ds\right) \\ & = [V(t_0, x_0) + M(\alpha)\rho g(t_1)\lambda_1] \exp\left(M(\alpha) \int_{t_0}^t w(s)ds\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in general, for $t \geq t_0$,

$$V(t, y(t, t_0, x_0)) \leq \left[V(t_0, x_0) + M(\alpha) \rho \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} g(t_k) \lambda_k \right] \exp \left(M(\alpha) \int_{t_0}^t w(s) ds \right).$$

Now, using the upper and lower estimates of V (see Theorem 2.1), we get

$$\|y(t, t_0, x_0)\| \leq \left[a(t_0, \|x_0\|) + M(\alpha) \rho \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} g(t_k) \lambda_k \right] N(t_0) \equiv \hat{a}(t_0, \|x_0\|),$$

where $N(t_0) = \exp \left(M(\alpha) \int_{t_0}^{\infty} w(s) ds \right)$. Clearly $\hat{a} \in A$ since $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} g(t_k) \lambda_k$ converges and the proof is complete.

THEOREM 3.2. *Let the hypotheses (H_1) , (H_3) , (H_4) , (H_6) , and (H_8) hold. Further, let*

$$(3.6) \quad \|u(t_k) - u(t_k^-)\| \leq \lambda_k \exp(-\delta(t_k - t_0)), \quad \delta > 0,$$

be satisfied in place of (3.1) in (H_7) . Then, the ASI set $x = 0$ is exponentially asymptotically stable with respect to (2.1).

Proof. We now employ the Theorem 2.2 and set $m(t) = W(t, y(t, t_0, x_0))$, where $W(t, x)$ is the Lyapunov function obtained in Theorem 2.2. Using the same arguments as in proof of Lemma 3.1 for this W , we get, in place of (3.2), the following inequality:

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{cases} D^+ m(t) \leq L(\alpha) \rho w(t) + \underset{(2.2)}{D^+ W(t, x)} \\ \leq L(\alpha) \rho w(t) + \lambda(t) - \delta m(t) \\ = \lambda_0(t) - \delta m(t), \quad \delta > 0 \end{cases}$$

with $\lambda_0(t) = L(\alpha) \rho w(t) + \lambda(t)$. Obviously, $\int_t^{t+1} \lambda_0(s) ds \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Since $y(t, t_0, x_0)$ is continuous on $[t_{k-1}, t_k]$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, the differential inequality (3.7) implies, for each $t \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$,

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{cases} W(t, y(t, t_0, x_0)) \leq W(t_{k-1}, y(t_{k-1}, t_0, x_0)) \exp(-\delta(t - t_{k-1})) \\ + H(t, t_{k-1}), \end{cases}$$

where $v(t, t_0, v_0) = v_0 \exp(-\delta(t - t_0)) + H(t, t_0)$ is the solution of the scalar differential equation

$$v' = -\delta v + \lambda_0(t), \quad v(t_0) = v_0,$$

and $H(t, t_0) \equiv \int_{t_0}^t \exp(-\delta(t - s)) \lambda_0(s) ds$. For the properties $H(t, t_0)$, see [4] and [5].

In view of (3.3) (which is true with W in place of V and $L(\alpha)$ instead of $M(\alpha)$), (3.8) and the estimate (3.6) for the jumps of u , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
W(t_k, y(t_k, t_0, x_0)) &\leq W(t_k, y(t_k^-, t_0, x_0)) + L(\alpha)\rho g(t_k) \|u(t_k) - u(t_k^-)\| \\
&\leq W(t_{k-1}, y(t_{k-1}, t_0, x_0)) \exp(-\delta(t_k - t_{k-1})) \\
&\quad + H(t_k, t_{k-1}) + L(\alpha)\rho g(t_k)\lambda_k \exp(-\delta(t_k - t_0)) .
\end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
W(t, y(t, t_0, x_0)) &\leq W(t_0, x_0) \exp(-\delta(t - t_0)) + H(t, t_0), t \in [t_0, t_1] ; \\
W(t, y(t, t_0, x_0)) &\leq W(t_1, y(t_1, t_0, x_0)) \exp(-\delta(t - t_1)) + H(t, t_1), t \in [t_1, t_2] .
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $t \in [t_0, t_2]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
W(t, y(t, t_0, x_0)) &\leq [W(t_0, x_0) + L(\alpha)\rho g(t_1)\lambda_1] \exp(-\delta(t_1 - t_0)) \\
&\quad + H(t_1, t_0) \exp(-\delta(t - t_1)) + H(t, t_1) \\
&= [L(\alpha)\rho g(t_1)\lambda_1 + W(t_0, x_0)] \exp(-\delta(t - t_0)) + H(t, t_0) ,
\end{aligned}$$

since, by the definition of $H(t, t_0)$, it is obvious that

$$H(t_1, t_0) \exp(-\delta(t - t_1)) + H(t, t_1) \equiv H(t, t_0) .$$

Hence, in general, it can be shown that, for $t \geq t_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
W(t, y(t, t_0, x_0)) \\
\leq [W(t_0, x_0) + L(\alpha)\rho \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} g(t_k)\lambda_k] \exp(-\delta(t - t_0)) + H(t, t_0) .
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by using the upper and lower estimates of $W(t, x)$ (see Theorem 2.2), we have

$$\|y(t, t_0, x_0)\| \leq [b(t_0, \|x_0\|) + \beta] \exp(-\delta(t - t_0)) + H(t, t_0) ,$$

where $\beta = L(\alpha)\rho \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} g(t_k)\lambda_k$. Further, using the facts that

(i) $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} [\sup_{t_0 \leq t} H(t, t_0)] = 0$ (see [4], p. 113),

(ii) $H(t, t_0) \leq \sigma(t_0)$, $\sigma \in L$ (see [4]) and

(iii) β can be made small by choosing k sufficiently large, we see that the set $x = 0$ is ASI relative to the perturbed system (2.1) and that the ASI set $x = 0$ is exponentially asymptotically stable with respect to (2.1). The proof is complete.

REMARK. If in the above proof, we do not take $t_0 \geq T_k$ (k sufficiently large enough to make β as small as we wish), we could still conclude that the solutions of (2.1) tend to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$, without the ASI set $x = 0$ being uniformly stable, i.e., we can conclude that the ASI set is quasi-equi asymptotically stable.

REFERENCES

1. E. A. Barbashin, *On stability with respect to impulsive perturbations*, Diff. Uravn. **2**, No. 7 (1966), 863-871.

2. P. C. Das and R. R. Sharma, *On optimal controls for measure delay differential equations*, J. SIAM Control, **9** (1971), 43-61.
3. ———, *Existence and stability of measure differential equations*, Czech. Math. J., **22** (97), (1972), 145-158.
4. V. Lakshmikantham and S. Leela, *Differential and Integral Inequalities*, Vol. 1, Academic Press, N. Y., 1969.
5. S. Leela, *Asymptotically self invariant sets and perturbed systems*, Annali Di Matematica pura ed applicata, No. 4, Vol. **XCII** (1972), 85-93.
6. W. W. Schmaedeke, *Optimal control theory for nonlinear vector differential equations, containing measures*, J. SIAM Control, **3** (1965), 231-280.
7. S. T. Zabalishchin, *Stability of generalized processes*, Diff. Uravn. **2**, No. 7 (1966), 872-881.

Received July 29, 1974.

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE-GENESEO

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

RICHARD ARENS (Managing Editor)
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

J. DUGUNDJI
Department of Mathematics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

R. A. BEAUMONT
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

D. GILBARG AND J. MILGRAM
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
OSAKA UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
* * *
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. Items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal, rather than by item number. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. **39**. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics expects the author's institution to pay page charges, and reserves the right to delay publication for nonpayment of charges in case of financial emergency.

100 reprints are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: \$72.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: \$36.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), 270, 3-chome Totsuka-cho, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

Copyright © 1973 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Manufactured and first issued in Japan

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 55, No. 2

October, 1974

Walter Allegretto, <i>On the equivalence of two types of oscillation for elliptic operators</i>	319
Edward Arthur Bertram, <i>A density theorem on the number of conjugacy classes in finite groups</i>	329
Arne Brøndsted, <i>On a lemma of Bishop and Phelps</i>	335
Jacob Burbea, <i>Total positivity and reproducing kernels</i>	343
Ed Dubinsky, <i>Linear Pincherle sequences</i>	361
Benny Dan Evans, <i>Cyclic amalgamations of residually finite groups</i>	371
Barry J. Gardner and Patrick Noble Stewart, <i>A “going down” theorem for certain reflected radicals</i>	381
Jonathan Light Gross and Thomas William Tucker, <i>Quotients of complete graphs: revisiting the Heawood map-coloring problem</i>	391
Sav Roman Harasymiv, <i>Groups of matrices acting on distribution spaces</i>	403
Robert Winship Heath and David John Lutzer, <i>Dugundji extension theorems for linearly ordered spaces</i>	419
Chung-Wu Ho, <i>Deforming p. l. homeomorphisms on a convex polygonal 2-disk</i>	427
Richard Earl Hodel, <i>Metrizability of topological spaces</i>	441
Wilfried Imrich and Mark E. Watkins, <i>On graphical regular representations of cyclic extensions of groups</i>	461
Jozef Krasinkiewicz, <i>Remark on mappings not raising dimension of curves</i>	479
Melven Robert Krom, <i>Infinite games and special Baire space extensions</i>	483
S. Leela, <i>Stability of measure differential equations</i>	489
M. H. Lim, <i>Linear transformations on symmetric spaces</i>	499
Teng-Sun Liu, Arnoud C. M. van Rooij and Ju-Kwei Wang, <i>On some group algebra modules related to Wiener’s algebra M_1</i>	507
Dale Wayne Myers, <i>The back-and-forth isomorphism construction</i>	521
Donovan Harold Van Osdol, <i>Extensions of sheaves of commutative algebras by nontrivial kernels</i>	531
Alan Rahilly, <i>Generalized Hall planes of even order</i>	543
Joylyn Newberry Reed, <i>On completeness and semicompleteness of first countable spaces</i>	553
Alan Schwartz, <i>Generalized convolutions and positive definite functions associated with general orthogonal series</i>	565
Thomas Jerome Scott, <i>Monotonic permutations of chains</i>	583
Eivind Stensholt, <i>An application of Steinberg’s construction of twisted groups</i>	595
Yasuji Takeuchi, <i>On strongly radical extensions</i>	619
William P. Ziemer, <i>Some remarks on harmonic measure in space</i>	629
John Grant, <i>Corrections to: “Automorphisms definable by formulas”</i>	639
Peter Michael Rosenthal, <i>Corrections to: “On an inversion for the general Mehler-Fock transform pair”</i>	640
Carl Clifton Faith, <i>Corrections to: “When are proper cyclics injective”</i>	640