Qualitative behavior of a class of second order nonlinear differential equations on the halfline

by Svatoslav Staněk (Olomouc)

Abstract. A differential equation of the form \((q(t)k(u)u')' = F(t,u)u'\) is considered and solutions \(u\) with \(u(0) = 0\) are studied on the halfline \([0, \infty)\). Theorems about the existence, uniqueness, boundedness and dependence of solutions on a parameter are given.

1. Introduction. In [6] the differential equation
\[
(k(u)u')' = f(t)u',
\]
where \(k, f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+), \mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)\), was considered and the author gave sufficient conditions for the existence and uniqueness of nonnegative solutions \(u\) such that \(u(0) = 0, u(t) > 0\) for \(t > 0\). This problem is connected with the description of the mathematical model of the infiltration of water. For more details see e.g. [3]–[5]. Special cases of (1) were considered in [1], [2], [4] and [5]. In [7] the differential equation
\[
(q(t)k(u)u')' = f(t)h(u)u',
\]
where \(q, k, f, h \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+),\) was considered and sufficient conditions for the existence, uniqueness and boundedness of nonnegative solutions of (2) on \(\mathbb{R}_+\) were given. Simultaneously the dependence of solutions of the differential equation
\[
(q(t)k(u)u')' = \lambda f(t)h(u)u', \quad \lambda > 0,
\]
on the positive parameter \(\lambda\) was studied.

In this paper we consider the differential equation
\[
(q(t)k(u)u')' = F(t, u)u',
\]
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where \( q \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+), \ k \in C^0(\mathbb{R}), \ F \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}), \) which is a generalization of (2), and study solutions \( u \) of this equation on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) such that \( u(0) = 0. \)

We give assumptions under which any nontrivial solution of (4) is either strictly increasing or strictly decreasing on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) and discuss the existence, uniqueness and boundedness of solutions. In the last section we consider the dependence of solutions of the differential equation

\[
(4_\lambda) \quad (q(t)k(u)u')' = \lambda F(t, u)u', \quad \lambda > 0,
\]

on the positive parameter \( \lambda \) and study the boundary value problem \((4_\lambda), \lim_{t \to \infty} u(t, \lambda) = a \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})\). Our theorems imply all results of [6] and [7].

The proofs of existence theorems are based on the Tikhonov–Schauder fixed point theorem, on the iterative method and on the monotone behavior of some operators. The proofs of uniqueness are different from the ones in [6] and [7].

2. Notations, lemmas. Consider the differential equation (4), where \( q, k, F\) satisfy the following assumptions \((\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty), \mathbb{R}_- = (-\infty, 0]):\)

\((H_1)\) \( q \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+), \ q(t) > 0 \text{ for } t \in (0, \infty), \ \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{q(s)} < \infty; \)

\((H_2)\) \( k \in C^0(\mathbb{R}), \ k(u)u > 0 \text{ for } u \in \mathbb{R}, u \neq 0; \)

\((H_3)\) \( \int_0^\infty \frac{k(s)}{s} ds < \infty, \ \int_0^\infty \frac{k(s)}{s} ds < \infty, \)

\( \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{k(s)}{s} ds = \infty, \ \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{k(s)}{s} ds = \infty; \)

\((H_4)\) \( F \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}), \ f_1(t)h_1(u) \leq F(t, u) \leq f_2(t)h_2(u) \)

for \((t, u) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}, \) where \( f_i \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+), \ 0 < f_i(t) \) for \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \) \( f_i \) is decreasing on \( \mathbb{R}_+, \)

\( h_i \in C^0(\mathbb{R}), \ h_i(u)u \geq 0 \text{ for } u \in \mathbb{R} \) and

\( H_i(u) := \int_0^u h_i(x) \, dx \) is strictly increasing on \( \mathbb{R}_+, \)

\( T_i(u) := \int_0^u h_i(x) \, dx \) is strictly increasing on \( \mathbb{R}_- \) \((i = 1, 2); \)

\((H_5)\) \( \int_0^\infty \frac{k(x)}{H_i(x)} \, dx < \infty, \ \int_0^\infty \frac{k(x)}{T_i(x)} \, dx < \infty, \)

\( \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{k(x)}{H_i(x)} \, dx = \infty, \ \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{k(x)}{T_i(x)} \, dx = \infty \) \((i = 1, 2). \)
By a solution of (4) we mean a function \( u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+) \) which is continuously differentiable on \((0, \infty)\) and such that \( u(0)=0, \lim_{t \to \infty} q(t)k(u(t))u'(t) = 0, q(t)k(u(t))u'(t) \) is continuously differentiable on \((0, \infty)\) and (4) is satisfied on \((0, \infty)\).

Remark 1. It follows from \((H_2)\) and \((H_4)\) that \( k(0) = 0, h_i(0) = 0 \) \( (i = 1, 2), \) and \( F(t, 0) = 0 \) for \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \). Therefore \( u = 0 \) is a solution of (4).

Lemma 1. Let \( u(t) \) be a nontrivial solution of (4). Then either \( u'(t) > 0 \) on \((0, \infty)\) or \( u'(t) < 0 \) on \((0, \infty)\).

Proof. Let \( u \) be a solution of (4), \( u \neq 0 \). Then

\[
q(t)k(u(t))u'(t) = \int_0^t F(s, u(s))u'(s)\, ds \quad \text{for} \quad t \in (0, \infty).
\]

Assume there exist \( 0 < t_1 < t_2 \) such that \( u'(t_1) = u'(t_2) = 0, \) \( u'(t) \neq 0 \) for \( t \in (t_1, t_2) \). Suppose \( u'(t) > 0 \) on \((t_1, t_2)\). If \( u(t) > 0 \) (resp. \( < 0 \)) on \((t_1, t_2)\), then

\[
\int_{t_1}^{t_2} f_1(s)h_1(u(s))u'(s)\, ds \leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} F(s, u(s))u'(s)\, ds \quad (= 0)
\]

\[
\leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} f_2(s)h_2(u(s))u'(s)\, ds,
\]

which contradicts

\[
\int_{t_1}^{t_2} f_1(s)h_1(u(s))u'(s)\, ds \geq f_1(t_2) \int_{u(t_1)}^{u(t_2)} h_1(s) \, ds > 0
\]

(resp. \( \int_{t_1}^{t_2} f_2(s)h_2(u(s))u'(s)\, ds \leq f_2(t_2) \int_{u(t_1)}^{u(t_2)} h_2(s) \, ds < 0 \)).

Therefore \( u(\xi) = 0 \) for a \( \xi \in (t_1, t_2) \) and then \( u(t) < 0 \) on \([t_1, \xi)\) and

\[
\int_{t_1}^{\xi} F(s, u(s))u'(s)\, ds \leq \int_{t_1}^{\xi} f_2(s)h_2(u(s))u'(s)\, ds \leq f_2(\xi) \int_{u(t_1)}^{0} h_2(s) \, ds < 0,
\]

which contradicts \( 0 = \int_{t_1}^{\xi} F(s, u(s))u'(s)\, ds \). We can easily check that \( u'(t) < 0 \) on \((t_1, t_2)\) is also impossible.

Assume \( u'(\tau) = 0 \) for a \( \tau \in (0, \infty) \) and \( u'(t) \neq 0 \) for \( t \in (0, \tau) \). If \( u'(t) > 0 \) (resp. \( u'(t) < 0 \)) on \((0, \tau)\), then \( u(t) > 0 \) (resp. \( u(t) < 0 \)) on this interval and

\[
\int_0^{\tau} F(s, u(s))u'(s)\, ds \geq \int_0^{\tau} f_1(s)h_1(u(s))u'(s)\, ds \geq f_1(\tau) \int_0^{u(\tau)} h_1(s) \, ds > 0
\]
\begin{align*}
\left( \text{resp.} \int_0^\tau F(s, u(s))u'(s) \, ds \geq \int_0^\tau f_2(s)h_2(u(s))u'(s) \, ds \right. \\
\geq f_2(\tau) \int_0^u h_2(s) \, ds > 0,
\end{align*}

which contradicts \( 0 = \int_0^\tau F(s, u(s))u'(s) \, ds \).

This proves \( u'(t) \neq 0 \) on \((0, \infty)\) and since \( u \in C^1([0, \infty)) \) we have either \( u'(t) > 0 \) on \((0, \infty)\) or \( u'(t) < 0 \) on \((0, \infty)\). \small\( \blacksquare \)

Remark 2. It follows from Lemma 1 that \( u \in \mathcal{A}_+ \cup \mathcal{A}_- \) for any nontrivial solution \( u \) of \((4)\), where

\[ \mathcal{A}_+ = \{ u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^+) : u(0) = 0, \ u \text{ is strictly increasing on } \mathbb{R}^+ \}, \]
\[ \mathcal{A}_- = \{ u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^+) : u(0) = 0, \ u \text{ is strictly decreasing on } \mathbb{R}^+ \}. \]

Set
\[ W_+(u) = \int_0^u k(s) \, ds \quad \text{for } u \in \mathbb{R}^+, \quad W_-(u) = \int_0^u k(s) \, ds \quad \text{for } u \in \mathbb{R}^- . \]

Obviously, \( W_+ \) is strictly increasing on \( \mathbb{R}^+ \), and \( W_- \) is strictly decreasing on \( \mathbb{R}^- \).

Lemma 2. If \( u \) is a solution of \((4)\), \( u \neq 0 \), then \( u \) is a solution of the integral equation

\[ (6_+) \quad u(t) = W_+^{-1}\left( \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{u(s)} F(u^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds \right) \]

or the integral equation

\[ (6_-) \quad u(t) = W_-^{-1}\left( - \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{u(s)} F(u^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds \right) \]

in the set \( \mathcal{A}_+ \) or \( \mathcal{A}_- \), respectively. Conversely, if \( u \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon, \varepsilon \in \{ +, - \} \), is a solution of \((6_\varepsilon)\), then \( u \) is a solution of \((4)\) and \( u \neq 0 \). Here \( W_\varepsilon^{-1} \) and \( u^{-1} \) denote the inverse functions to \( W_\varepsilon \) and \( u \), respectively.

Proof. Let \( u \neq 0 \) be a solution of \((4)\). Then \( u \in \mathcal{A}_+ \cup \mathcal{A}_- \) by Remark 2 and \((5)\) holds. If \( u \in \mathcal{A}_+ \) (resp. \( u \in \mathcal{A}_- \)), then

\[ W_+(u(t)) = \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{u(s)} F(x, u(x))u'(x) \, dx \, ds \]
\[ = \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{u(s)} F(u^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds \]
\[
\left(\text{resp. } W_-(u(t)) = \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^s F(x, u(x)) u'(x) \, dx \, ds
\right.
\]
\[
= - \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^s F(u^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds
\]
for \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \) and \( u \) is a solution of \((6_+)\) or \((6_-)\) in \( A_+ \) or \( A_- \), respectively.

Conversely, let \( u \in A_\varepsilon, \varepsilon \in \{+, -\}, \) be a solution of \((6_\varepsilon)\). Then \( u(0) = 0, u \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+) \) is continuously differentiable on \((0, \infty)\),

\[
\left(7\right) \lim_{t \to 0^+} q(t) k(u(t)) u'(t) = \lim_{t \to 0^+} \int_0^t F(u^{-1}(s), s) \, ds = 0
\]
and \((q(t) k(u(t)) u'(t))' = F(t, u(t)) u'(t)\) for \( t > 0 \). Consequently, \( u \) is a solution of \( (4) \) and \( u \neq 0 \).

Remark 3. It follows from Lemma 2 that solving \((4)\) is equivalent to solving \((6_+)\) and \((6_-)\) in \( A_+ \) and \( A_- \), respectively.

Set

\[
K_j(u) = \int_0^u \frac{k(s)}{H_j(s)} \, ds \quad \text{for } u \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad V_j(u) = \int_u^0 \frac{k(s)}{T_j(s)} \, ds \quad \text{for } u \in \mathbb{R}_-, j = 1, 2,
\]
and

\[
k_1(t) = \int_0^t \frac{f_1(s)}{q(s)} \, ds, \quad k_2(t) = f_2(0) \int_0^t \frac{ds}{q(s)},
\]
\[
l_1(t) = f_1(0) \int_0^t \frac{ds}{q(s)}, \quad l_2(t) = \int_0^t \frac{f_2(s)}{q(s)} \, ds,
\]
\[
\varphi_+(t) = K_1^{-1}(k_1(t)), \quad \varphi_+(t) = K_2^{-1}(k_2(t)),
\]
\[
\varphi_-(t) = V_1^{-1}(l_1(t)), \quad \varphi_-(t) = V_2^{-1}(l_2(t)) \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}_+.
\]

Obviously, \( \lim_{u \to \infty} K_j(u) = \infty, \lim_{u \to -\infty} V_j(u) = \infty (j = 1, 2) \) by \((H_5)\).

Lemma 3. If \( u \in A_\varepsilon \) is a solution of \((6_\varepsilon), \varepsilon \in \{+, -\}, \) then

\[
\left(8_\varepsilon\right) \quad \varphi_\varepsilon(t) \leq u(t) \leq \varphi_\varepsilon(t) \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}_+
\]
and
\[
(9_+) \quad u(t_2) - u(t_1) \geq f_1(t_2)H_1(\varphi_+(t_1)) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{dt}{q(t)}
\times \left[ \max \{ k(x) : \varphi_+(t_1) \leq x \leq \varphi_+(t_2) \} \right]^{-1} \quad \text{for } u \in A_+ \text{ and } 0 < t_1 < t_2,
\]

\[
(9_-) \quad u(t_1) - u(t_2) \geq -f_2(t_2)(T_2(\varphi_-(t_1))) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{dt}{q(t)}
\times \left[ \max \{ -k(x) : \varphi_-(t_1) \leq x \leq \varphi_-(t_2) \} \right]^{-1} \quad \text{for } u \in A_- \text{ and } 0 < t_1 < t_2.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( u \in A_+ \) be a solution of \((6_+).\) Then (cf. \((H_4))\)

\[
f_1(t) \int_0^{u(t)} h_1(s) \, ds \leq q(t)k(u(t))u'(t) = \int_0^{u(t)} F(u^{-1}(s), s) \, ds
\]

\[
\leq f_2(0) \int_0^{u(t)} h_2(s) \, ds,
\]

hence

\[
f_1(t) \leq \left( \int_0^{u(t)} \frac{k(s)}{H_1(s)} \, ds \right) \cdot \frac{f_1(t)}{q(t)},
\]

\[
f_2(0) \geq \left( \int_0^{u(t)} \frac{k(s)}{H_2(s)} \, ds \right) \cdot \frac{f_2(0)}{q(t)} \quad \text{for } t \in (0, \infty),
\]

and integrating \((10)\) from 0 to \( t, \) we obtain

\[
\int_0^t \frac{f_1(s)}{q(s)} \, ds \leq \int_0^{u(t)} \frac{k(s)}{H_1(s)} \, ds = K_1(u(t)),
\]

\[
f_2(0) \int_0^t \frac{ds}{q(s)} \geq \int_0^{u(t)} \frac{k(s)}{H_2(s)} \, ds = K_2(u(t)).
\]

Consequently,

\[
\varphi_+(t) \leq u(t) \leq \varphi_+(t) \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}_+.
\]

Let \( 0 < t_1 < t_2. \) Then

\[
W_+(u(t_2)) - W_+(u(t_1)) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{u(s)} F(u^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds
\]

\[
\geq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{u(s)} f_1(u^{-1}(x))h_1(x) \, dx \, ds.
\]
Nonlinear equations on the halfline

\[ \geq f_1(t_2) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{ds}{q(s)} \int_{0}^{\phi(s)} h_1(s) ds \]

\[ = f_1(t_2)B_1(\phi_+(t_1)) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{ds}{q(s)} , \]

and since

\[ u(t_2) - u(t_1) = \frac{1}{k(\xi)} (W_+(u(t_2)) - W_+(u(t_1))), \]

where \( \xi \in (u(t_1), u(t_2)) \subset (\phi_+(t_1), \phi_+(t_2)) \), we see that (9+) is true.

Let \( u \in A_- \) be a solution of (6-). Then (cf. (H4))

\[ -f_2(t) \int_{u(t)}^{0} h_2(s) ds \leq q(t)k(u(t))u'(t) \quad \left( = \int_{0}^{u(t)} F(u^{-1}(s), s) ds \right) \]

\[ \leq -f_1(0) \int_{u(t)}^{0} h_1(s) ds , \]

hence

\[ \frac{f_2(t)}{q(t)} \leq \left( \int_{u(t)}^{0} \frac{k(s)}{T_2(s)} ds \right)' , \]

\[ \frac{f_1(0)}{q(t)} \geq \left( \int_{u(t)}^{0} \frac{k(s)}{T_1(s)} ds \right)' \quad \text{for} \ t \in (0, \infty) , \]

and integrating the last inequalities from 0 to \( t \), we obtain

\[ \int_{0}^{t} \frac{f_2(s)}{q(s)} ds \leq \int_{u(t)}^{0} \frac{k(s)}{T_2(s)} ds = V_2(u(t)) , \]

\[ f_1(0) \int_{0}^{t} \frac{ds}{q(s)} \geq \int_{u(t)}^{0} \frac{k(s)}{T_1(s)} ds = V_1(u(t)) . \]

Consequently,

\[ \phi_-(t) \leq u(t) \leq \phi_+(t) \quad \text{for} \ t \in \mathbb{R}_+ . \]

Let \( 0 < t_1 < t_2 \). Then

\[ W_-(u(t_2)) - W_-(u(t_1)) = -\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_{u(s)}^{0} F(u^{-1}(x), x) dx ds \]

\[ \geq -\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_{u(s)}^{0} f_2(u^{-1}(x))h_2(x) dx ds \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\geq & -f_2(t_2) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{ds}{q(s)} \int_0^s h_2(s) ds \\
& = -f_2(t_2) T_2(\varphi_-(t_1)) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{ds}{q(s)},
\end{align*}
\]

and since

\[
u(t_1) - u(t_2) = -\frac{1}{k(\xi)} (W_-(u(t_2)) - W_-(u(t_1))),
\]

where \( \xi \in (u(t_2), u(t_1)) \subseteq (\varphi_-(t_2), \varphi_-(t_1)) \), we see that \( (9_-) \) is true. \( \blacksquare \)

Set \( K_\varepsilon = \{ u \in A_\varepsilon : \varphi_-(t) \leq u(t) \leq \varphi_+(t) \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \} \), and define \( T_\varepsilon : K_\varepsilon \to C^0(\mathbb{R}_+) \) by

\[
(T_\varepsilon u)(t) = W_\varepsilon^{-1} \left( \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^s F(u^{-1}(x), x) dx ds \right) \quad \varepsilon \in \{+, -\}.
\]

**Lemma 4.** \( T_\varepsilon : K_\varepsilon \to K_\varepsilon \) for each \( \varepsilon \in \{+, -\} \).

**Proof.** We will prove \( T_+ : K_+ \to K_+ \) (the proof of \( T_- : K_- \to K_- \) is very similar and will be omitted). Let \( u \in K_+ \). Setting

\[
\alpha(t) = \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^s F(u^{-1}(x), x) dx ds - W_+(\varphi_+(t)),
\]

\[
\beta(t) = \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^s F(u^{-1}(x), x) dx ds - W_+(\varphi_+(t))
\]

for \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \), we have

\[
\alpha'(t) = \frac{1}{q(t)} \int_0^{u(t)} F(u^{-1}(x), x) dx - k(\varphi_+(t)) \varphi'_+(t)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{q(t)} \left[ \int_0^{u(t)} F(u^{-1}(x), x) dx - f_1(t) H_1(\varphi_+(t)) \right]
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{q(t)} \left[ \int_0^{u(t)} f_1(u^{-1}(x)) h_1(x) dx - f_1(t) \int_0^{\varphi_+(t)} h_1(x) dx \right]
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{q(t)} \int_0^{u(t)} (f_1(u^{-1}(x)) - f_1(t)) h_1(x) dx \geq 0,
\]
\[ \beta'(t) = \frac{1}{q(t)} \int_0^{u(t)} F(u^{-1}(x), x) \, dx - k(\varphi_+(t)) \varphi'_+(t) \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{q(t)} \int_0^{u(t)} \left( f_2(u^{-1}(x)) h_2(x) \right) \, dx \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{q(t)} \int_0^{u(t)} (f_2(u^{-1}(x)) - f_2(0)) h_2(x) \, dx \leq 0 \]

for \( t \in (0, \infty) \). Since \( \alpha(0) = \beta(0) = 0 \) and \( \alpha'(t) \geq 0, \beta'(t) \leq 0 \) on \( (0, \infty) \), we have \( \alpha(t) \geq 0, \beta(t) \leq 0 \) and consequently,

\[ \varphi_+(t) \leq (T_+ u)(t) \leq \varphi_+(t) \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \text{ and } u \in \mathcal{K}_+. \]

Let \( 0 < t_1 < t_2 \) and let \( u \in \mathcal{K}_+ \). Then

\[ W_+(T_+ u)(t_2)) - W_+(T_+ u)(t_1)) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{u(s)} F(u^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds \]
\[ \geq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{u(s)} f_1(u^{-1}(x)) h_1(x) \, dx \, ds \]
\[ \geq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{f_1(s)}{q(s)} H_1(u(s)) \, ds \]
\[ \geq f_1(t_2) H_1(\varphi_+(t_1))) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{ds}{q(s)} \]

and

\[ W_+((T_+ u)(t_2)) - W_+(T_+ u)(t_1)) = k(\xi)[(T_+ u)(t_2) - (T_+ u)(t_1)) \]
\[ \leq [(T_+)(t_2) - (T_+ u)(t_1)] \max\{k(u) : \varphi_+(t_1) \leq u \leq \varphi_+(t_2)\} \]

(\text{here } \xi \in ((T_+ u)(t_1), (T_+ u)(t_2)) \subset (\varphi_+(t_1), \varphi_+(t_2)))

hence

\[ (T_+ u)(t_2) - (T_+ u)(t_1) \geq f_1(t_2) H_1(\varphi_+(t_1))) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{ds}{q(s)} [\max\{k(u) : \varphi_+(t_1) \leq u \leq \varphi_+(t_2)\}]^{-1}. \]

From (11) and (12) it follows that \( T_+ u \in \mathcal{K}_+ \), therefore \( T_+: \mathcal{K}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_+ \).
3. Existence theorems

**Theorem 1.** Let assumptions \((H_1)\)–\((H_5)\) be satisfied. Then a solution \(u \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon\) of \((4)\) exists for each \(\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}\).

**Proof.** By Lemma 2, \(u \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon\) is a solution of \((4)\) if and only if \(u\) is a fixed point of the operator \(T_\varepsilon\). We will prove that under assumptions \((H_1)\)–\((H_5)\) a fixed point of \(T_+\) exists. The existence of a fixed point of \(T_-\) can be proved similarly.

Let \(X\) be the Fréchet space of \(C^0\)-functions on \(\mathbb{R}_+\) with the topology of uniform convergence on compact subintervals of \(\mathbb{R}_+\). Then \(K_+\) is a bounded closed convex subset of \(X\) and \(T_+ : K_+ \to K_+\) (see Lemma 4) is a continuous operator. It follows from the inequalities \((0 \leq t_1 < t_2, u \in K_+)\)

\[
0 \leq W_+((T_+u)(t_2)) - W_+((T_+u)(t_1)) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{u(s)} F(u^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds
\]

and from the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem that \(T_+(K_+)\) is a relatively compact subset of \(X\). According to the Tikhonov–Schauder fixed point theorem there exists a fixed point \(u_+\) of \(T_+\).

**Theorem 2.** Let assumptions \((H_1)\)–\((H_5)\) be satisfied and suppose that \((H_6)\)

\[F(\cdot, u) \text{ sign}(u)\] is decreasing on \(\mathbb{R}_+\) for each fixed \(u \in \mathbb{R}\).

Then there exist solutions \(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon\) of \((4)\) for each \(\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}\) such that \(u_\varepsilon(t) \leq v_\varepsilon(t)\) for \(t \in \mathbb{R}_+\). Moreover,

\[
u_\varepsilon(t) \leq u(t) \leq v_\varepsilon(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \varepsilon \in \{+, -\},
\]

for any solution \(u \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon\) of \((4)\) and

\[
u(t) \neq v(t), \quad t > 0,
\]

for any two different solutions \(u, v\) of \((4)\).

**Proof.** Let assumptions \((H_1)\)–\((H_6)\) be satisfied and let \(u \in \mathcal{A}_+\) be a solution of \((4)\). Define sequences \(\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{A}_+, \{v_n\} \subset \mathcal{A}_+\) by the recurrence formulas

\[
u_0 = \phi, \quad u_0 = T_+(u_0), \quad v_0 = \bar{\phi}_+, \quad v_0 = T_+(v_0),
\]

\[
u_{n+1} = \bar{T}_+(u_n), \quad v_{n+1} = T_+(v_n),
\]

for \(n \in \mathbb{N}\). Then \(u_0(t) \leq u(t) \leq \bar{v}_0(t)\) on \(\mathbb{R}_+\) by Lemma 3 and \(u_0(t) \leq u_1(t) \leq \bar{v}_0(t), \quad u_0(t) \leq \bar{v}_1(t) \leq v_0(t)\) on \(\mathbb{R}_+\) by Lemma 4. Since \(\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}\),
\( \mathcal{A}_+, \alpha(t) \leq \beta(t) \) for \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \) implies

\[
(T_+ \alpha)(t) = W_+^{-1} \left( \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{\alpha(t)} F(\alpha^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds \right)
\]

\[
\leq W_+^{-1} \left( \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{\beta(t)} F(\beta^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds \right) = (T_+ \beta)(t)
\]

on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) and \( T_+: \mathcal{K}_+ \to \mathcal{K}_+ \) by Lemma 4, we deduce

\[
u[0](t) \leq \nu[1](t) \leq \ldots \leq \nu[n](t)
\]

\[
\leq \ldots \leq u(t) \leq \ldots \leq v[n](t) \leq \ldots \leq v[1](t) \leq \nu[0](t)
\]

for \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Therefore the limits \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \nu[n](t) =: u_+(t) \), \( \lim_{n \to \infty} v[n](t) =: v_+(t) \) exist for all \( t \geq 0 \), \( u_+(t) \leq u(t) \leq v_+(t) \) on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) and using the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem we see that \( u_+, v_+ \in \mathcal{K}_+ \) are solutions of (6+) and thus also solutions of (4) by Lemma 2.

Let \( u, v \in \mathcal{A}_+ \) be different solutions of (4). First, suppose there exists a \( t_1 > 0 \) such that \( u(t) < v(t) \) for \( t \in (0, t_1) \) and \( u(t_1) = v(t_1) \). Then

\[
0 = W_+(v(t_1)) - W_+(u(t_1))
\]

\[
= \int_0^{t_1} \frac{1}{q(s)} \left[ \int_0^{v(s)} F(v^{-1}(x), x) \, dx - \int_0^{u(s)} F(u^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \right] \, ds
\]

\[
\geq \int_0^{t_1} \frac{1}{q(s)} \left[ \int_0^{u(s)} (F(v^{-1}(x), x) - F(u^{-1}(x), x)) \, dx \right] \, ds
\]

and since (cf. (H4)) \( F(v^{-1}(x), x) - F(u^{-1}(x), x) \geq 0 \) for \( x \in [0, u(t_1)] \) we have necessarily \( F(v^{-1}(x), x) = F(u^{-1}(x), x) = 0 \) for \( x \in [0, u(t_1)] \). Then

\[
W_+(v(t_1)) - W_+(u(t_1)) = \int_0^{t_1} \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{v(s)} F(v^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds > 0,
\]

which contradicts \( W_+(v(t_1)) - W_+(u(t_1)) = 0 \).

Secondly, assume there exist \( 0 < t_1 < t_2 \) such that \( u(t_1) = v(t_1), u(t_2) = v(t_2), u(t) \neq v(t) \) for \( t \in (t_1, t_2) \), for example assume

\[
u(t) > v(t) \quad \text{for} \quad t \in (t_1, t_2).
\]

Then \( u'(t_1) \geq v'(t_1), u'(t_2) \leq v'(t_2) \) and

\[
0 \leq q(t_1) k(u(t_1))(u'(t_1) - v'(t_1)) - q(t_2) k(u(t_2))(u'(t_2) - v'(t_2))
\]

\[
= \int_{u(t_2)}^{v(t_2)} [F(u^{-1}(x), x) - F(v^{-1}(x), x)] \, dx.
\]
On the other hand, since \( u(t_2) > u(t_1) \) and (cf. (H_0)) \( F(u^{-1}(x), x) - F(v^{-1}(x), x) \geq 0 \) on \([u(t_1), u(t_2)]\) we have
\[
\int_{u(t_1)}^{u(t_2)} [F(u^{-1}(x), x) - F(v^{-1}(x), x)] \, dx \leq 0,
\]
therefore in virtue of (15), \( u'(t_1) = v'(t_1), u'(t_2) = v'(t_2) \) and \( F(u^{-1}(x), x) - F(v^{-1}(x), x) = 0 \) for \( x \in [u(t_1), u(t_2)] \). Then
\[
0 = (W_+(u(t_2)) - W_+(u(t_1))) - (W_+(v(t_2)) - W_+(v(t_1)))
\]
and since \( H_1(u(t)) - H_1(v(t)) > 0 \) on \((t_1, t_2)\),
\[
\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_{v(s)}^{u(s)} F(u^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds \geq f_1(t_2) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_{v(s)}^{u(s)} h_1(x) \, dx \, ds
\]
\[
= f_1(t_2) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{q(s)} (H_1(u(s)) - H_1(v(s))) \, ds > 0,
\]
which contradicts (16). Hence \( u(t) \neq v(t) \) for \( t \in (0, \infty) \). For \( \varepsilon = - \) the proof is similar. \(
\)

4. Bounded solutions

**Theorem 3.** Let assumptions (H_1)–(H_5) be satisfied. Then

(i) any nontrivial solution of (4) is bounded (on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \)) if and only if \( \int_0^\infty ds/q(s) < \infty \),

(ii) any nontrivial solution of (4) is unbounded (on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \)) if and only if \( \int_0^\infty ds/q(s) = \infty \).

**Proof.** We will prove our theorem for \( \varepsilon = + \) (the case \( \varepsilon = - \) is similar). First observe that either \( \int_0^\infty ds/q(s) < \infty \) or \( \int_0^\infty ds/q(s) = \infty \).

(a) If \( \int_0^\infty ds/q(s) < \infty \) then by Lemma 3 any solution of (4) is bounded.

(b) Let \( \int_0^\infty ds/q(s) = \infty \) and \( u \in A_+ \) be a solution of (4). Then \( u \neq 0 \),
\[
W_+(u(t))
\]
\[
= \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{u(s)} F(u^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds \geq \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{u(s)} f_1(u^{-1}(x))h_1(x) \, dx \, ds
\]
and since \( 0 \neq (\int_0^{u(s)} f_1(u^{-1}(x))h_1(x)dx)' \geq 0 \) on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) we see \( \lim_{t \to \infty} W_+(u(t)) = \infty \), hence \( \lim_{t \to \infty} u(t) = \infty \).
Let \( u \in A_+ \) be a solution of (4). Since \( u \) is strictly increasing on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) (by Lemma 1), \( u \) is either bounded or unbounded on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \). Accordingly, either \( \int_0^\infty ds/q(s) < \infty \) or \( \int_0^\infty ds/q(s) = \infty \) by (b) and (a) above.

5. Uniqueness theorems. Let assumptions (H_1)–(H_5) be satisfied. By Theorem 1 equation (4) has at least one solution in \( A_+ \) and at least one solution in \( A_- \). Since \( u = 0 \) is also a solution of (4), we see that under assumptions (H_1)–(H_5) equation (4) admits at least three different solutions. In the next theorems we will give sufficient conditions for the existence of just three different solutions of (4).

**Theorem 4.** Let assumptions (H_1)–(H_5) be satisfied. Moreover, assume that

\[(H_7) \quad \text{There exists an } \epsilon > 0 \text{ such that:}
\]

(i) \( |F(t_1, u) - F(t_2, u)| \leq L|t_1 - t_2| \min\{|h_1(u)|, |h_2(u)|\} \) for \( (t_1, u) \in [0, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \) (i = 1, 2), where \( L > 0 \) is a constant,

(ii) the modulus of continuity \( \gamma(t) \) (\( := \sup\{|q(t_1) - q(t_2)| : t_1, t_2 \in [0, \epsilon], |t_1 - t_2| \leq t\} \)) of \( q \) on \( [0, \epsilon] \) satisfies

\[
\limsup_{t \to 0^+} \gamma(t)/t < \infty;
\]

\[(H_8) \quad \text{The function } F(t, u) \text{ locally satisfies a Lipschitz condition on } (0, \infty) \times (\mathbb{R} - \{0\}) \text{ with respect to } t.
\]

Then equation (4) admits just three different solutions.

**Proof.** Assume \( u_1, u_2 \in A_+ \) are solutions of (4) and assume on the contrary \( u_1 \neq u_2 \). First, we will prove \( u_1(t) = u_2(t) \) on an interval \([0, b]\), \( b > 0 \). Setting \( A_j = \lim_{t \to -\infty} u_j(t) \) and \( w_j = u_j^{-1} \) (\( j = 1, 2 \)), we see \( 0 < A_j \leq \infty \), \( w_j : [0, A_j) \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) are continuous strictly increasing functions and

\[
w_j'(x) = k(x)q(w_j(x))\left[ \int_0^x F(w_j(s), s) \, ds \right]^{-1} \text{ for } x \in (0, A_j), \ j = 1, 2.
\]

Hence

\[
w_j(x) = \int_0^x k(s)q(w_j(s))\left[ \int_0^s F(w_j(t), t) \, dt \right]^{-1} \, ds \text{ for } x \in (0, A_j), \ j = 1, 2,
\]

and thus for \( x \in [0, \min(A_1, A_2)] \) we have

\[(17) \quad w_1(x) - w_2(x) = \int_0^x (q(w_1(s)) - q(w_2(s)))k(s)\left[ \int_0^s F(w_2(t), t) \, dt \right]^{-1} \, ds
\]

\[+ \int_0^x \frac{q(w_1(s))k(s)}{F(w_1(t), t)} dt \int_0^s F(w_2(t), t) \, dt \int_0^s (F(w_2(t), t) - F(w_1(t), t)) \, dt \, ds.
\]
Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) be as in assumption (H7) and set \( a = \min\{u_1(\varepsilon), u_2(\varepsilon)\} \), \( X(x) = \max\{|w_1(s) - w_2(s)| : 0 \leq s \leq x\} \) for \( x \in [0, a] \). Suppose \( X(x) > 0 \) for \( x \in (0, a] \). Then (cf. (H7))

\[
|q(w_1(x)) - q(w_2(x))| \leq \gamma(X(x)) \quad \text{for } x \in [0, a]
\]

and using (H7) and (17) we have

\[
|w_1(x) - w_2(x)| \leq \int_0^x \frac{\gamma(X(s))k(s)}{\int_0^s f_1(w_2(t))h_1(t)dt} ds + L \int_0^x \frac{q(w_1(s))k(s)}{\int_0^s f_1(w_2(t))h_1(t)dt} + \int_0^x \frac{\gamma(X(s))}{f_1(\varepsilon)} K_1(x) + LX(x) \frac{K_1(x)}{f_1(\varepsilon)} \max\{q(t) : 0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon\}
\]

for \( 0 \leq x \leq a \). Hence

\[
X(x) \leq (B\gamma(X(x)) + CX(x))K_1(x), \quad x \in [0, a],
\]

where \( B = 1/f_1(\varepsilon), \ C = B^2L \max\{q(t) : 0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon\} \), and therefore

\[
\frac{\gamma(X(x))}{X(x)} K_1(x) \geq (1/B)(1 - CK_1(x)), \quad x \in (0, a].
\]

Then (cf. (H7))

\[
\lim_{x \to 0^+} \frac{\gamma(X(x))}{X(x)} K_1(x) = 0,
\]

which contradicts \( \lim_{x \to 0^+} (1/B)(1 - CK_1(x)) = 1/B > 0 \). This proves \( u_1(t) = u_2(t) \) for \( t \in [0, b] \) with a positive number \( b \).

Secondly, assume \([0, c]\) is the maximal interval where \( u_1(t) = u_2(t) \). Define \( Y(t) = \max\{u_2(s) - u_1(s) : c \leq s \leq t\}, \alpha(t) = \min\{u_1(t), u_2(t)\}, \beta(t) = \max\{u_1(t), u_2(t)\} \) for \( t \geq c \). Then \( Y(c) = 0, \alpha(c) = \beta(c), 0 \leq \beta(t) - \alpha(t) \leq Y(t) > 0 \) for \( t > c \). From the equality \( t \geq c \)

\[
W_+(u_2(t)) - W_+(u_1(t)) = \int_c^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \left[ \int_{u_1(c)}^{u_2(s)} F(u_2^{-1}(x), x) dx - \int_{u_2(c)}^{u_1(s)} F(u_1^{-1}(x), x) dx \right] ds
\]

it follows that

\[
W_+(u_2(t)) - W_+(u_1(t)) = \int_c^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \left[ \int_{u_1(c)}^{u_2(s)} (F(u_2^{-1}(x), x) - F(u_1^{-1}(x), x)) dx + \int_{u_1(c)}^{u_1(s)} F(u_1^{-1}(x), x) dx \right] ds \quad \text{for } t \in [c, \infty).
\]
By assumption (H₀) there exist positive numbers ɛ₀ and K such that

\[ |F(t₁, u) - F(t₂, u)| ≤ K|t₁ - t₂| \text{ for } (t₁, u) \in [c, c + ɛ₀] \times [u₁(c), u₁(c) + ɛ₀].\]

Set ɛ = min\{ɛ₀, β⁻¹(ɛ₀ + u₁(c)) - c\}, \(m = \min\{u₁(x) : c ≤ x ≤ α⁻¹(β(c + ɛ))\}\) (≥ 0 by Lemma 1), \(M = \max\{F(u₁⁻¹(x), x) : α(c) ≤ x ≤ β(c + ɛ)\}\). Then

\[ |F(u₂⁻¹(x), x) - F(u₁⁻¹(x), x)| ≤ K|u₂⁻¹(x) - u₁⁻¹(x)| \quad \text{for } x ∈ [α(c), α(c + ɛ)] \]

and for \(x ∈ [c, c + ɛ]\) we have

\[ |u₁⁻¹(u_2(x)) - x| = |u₁⁻¹(u_2(x)) - u₁⁻¹(u_1(x))| = |(u₁⁻¹)'(x)| |u_2(x) - u_1(x)| \]

\[ = (1/|u₁'(η)|) |u_2(x) - u_1(x)| ≤ (1/m) |u_2(x) - u_1(x)| \leq Y(x)/m,\]

where \(ξ ∈ (α(x), β(x))\) and \(η = u₁⁻¹(ξ) ∈ [u₁⁻¹(α(x)), u₁⁻¹(β(x))] \subset [c, α⁻¹(β(c + ɛ))]\). Consequently,

\[ |u₁⁻¹(x) - u₂⁻¹(x)| ≤ (1/m) Y(u₂⁻¹(x)) \quad \text{for } x ∈ [u₁(c), u₂(c + ɛ)].\]

Therefore \((r = \max\{u²(t) : c ≤ t ≤ c + ɛ\})\)

\[ |W⁺(u₂(t)) - W⁺(u₁(t))| \]

\[ ≤ \int_c^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \left[ K \int_{u₁(c)}^{u²(s)} |u₂⁻¹(x) - u₁⁻¹(x)|dx + \int_{α(s)}^{β(s)} F(u₁⁻¹(x), x)dx \right] ds \]

\[ ≤ \int_c^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \left[ K \int_{u₁(c)}^{u²(s)} (Y(u₂⁻¹(x))/m) dx + M(β(s) - α(s)) \right] ds \]

\[ ≤ \int_c^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \left[ (Kr(s - c)/m) + MY(s) \right] ds \]

\[ ≤ \int_c^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \left[ ((Kεr/m) + M)Y(s) ds ≤ ((Kεr/m) + M)Y(t) \int_c^t \frac{ds}{q(s)} \right] \]

for \(t ∈ [c, c + ɛ]\). Since \((t ∈ [c, c + ɛ])\)

\[ |W⁺(u₂(t)) - W⁺(u₁(t))| = k(ξ)|u₂(t) - u₁(t)|,\]

where \(ξ ∈ (α(t), β(t)) \subset [α(c), β(c + ɛ)]\), we have

\[ |u₂(t) - u₁(t)| ≤ [(Kεr/m) + M]Y(t)/p \int_c^t \frac{ds}{q(s)}, \]

with \(p = \min\{k(u) : α(c) ≤ u ≤ β(c + ɛ)\} > 0\), hence

\[ Y(t) ≤ [(Kεr/m) + M]Y(t)/p \int_c^t \frac{ds}{q(s)}, \quad t ∈ [c, c + ɛ].\]
Then
\[ 1 \leq [(K \varepsilon r/m) + M](1/p) \int_c^t \frac{ds}{q(s)}, \]
for \( c < t \leq c + \varepsilon \), which is impossible. This proves \( u_1(t) = u_2(t) \) for \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \).
The uniqueness of solutions of (4) in \( A_- \) can be treated quite analogously.

**Theorem 5.** Suppose that assumptions \((H_1)-(H_7)\) are satisfied. Then equation (4) admits just three different solutions.

**Proof.** It is sufficient to prove that under assumptions \((H_1)-(H_7)\), \( u_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon, \varepsilon = +, -, \) where \( u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon \) are defined in Theorem 2. If for example, \( u_+ \neq v_+ \) then \( u_+(t) < v_+(t) \) on \((0, \infty)\) by Theorem 2. Since assumptions \((H_1)-(H_5)\) and \((H_7)\) imply (see the first part of the proof of Theorem 4) \( u_+(t) = v_+(t) \) on an interval \([0, b]\) \((b > 0)\), we have a contradiction.

### 6. Dependence of solutions on a parameter

Consider the differential equation
\[(18_\lambda) \quad (q(t)k(u)u')' = \lambda F(t, u), \quad \lambda > 0, \]
depending on the positive parameter \( \lambda \).

**Theorem 6.** Suppose that assumptions \((H_1)-(H_6)\) are satisfied. Then for each \( \varepsilon \in \{+, -\} \) there exist solutions \( u_\varepsilon(t; \lambda), v_\varepsilon(t; \lambda) \) of \((18_\lambda)\) such that \( u_\varepsilon(t; \lambda) \leq v_\varepsilon(t; \lambda) \) for \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \). Moreover,
\[ u_\varepsilon(t; \lambda) \leq u(t; \lambda) \leq v_\varepsilon(t; \lambda), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \]
for any solution \( u(t; \lambda) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon \) of \((18_\lambda)\) and
\[ u_+(t; \lambda_1) < u_+(t; \lambda_2), \quad v_+(t; \lambda_1) < v_+(t; \lambda_2), \]
\[ u_-(t; \lambda_1) > u_-(t; \lambda_2), \quad v_-(t; \lambda_1) > v_-(t; \lambda_2), \]
for all \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \) and \( 0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \).

**Proof.** The first part of the statement follows from Theorem 2. Set
\[ \varphi_+(t; \lambda) = K_1^{-1}(\lambda k_1(t)), \quad \varphi_+(t; \lambda) = K_2^{-1}(\lambda k_2(t)), \]
\[ \varphi_-(t; \lambda) = V_1^{-1}(\lambda l_1(t)), \quad \varphi_-(t; \lambda) = V_2^{-1}(\lambda l_2(t)) \]
for \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \lambda > 0 \). Since \((18_\lambda)\) can be rewritten in the form
\[ \left( \frac{q(t)}{\lambda} k(u)u' \right) = F(t, u), \quad \lambda > 0, \]
we have (see Lemma 3)
\[ (21_+) \quad u(t_2) - u(t_1) \geq \lambda f_1(t_2) H_1(\varphi_+(t_1; \lambda)) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{dt}{q(t)} \]
\[ \times \left[ \max \{ k(x) : \varphi_+(t_1; \lambda) \leq x \leq \varphi_+(t_2; \lambda) \} \right]^{-1} \]
for any solution $u \in A_+$ of $(18\lambda)$ and $0 < t_1 < t_2$, and

$$
(21) \quad u(t_1) - u(t_2) \geq -\lambda f_2(t_2) T_2(\varphi_-(t_1; \lambda)) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \frac{d}{q(t)} \times [\max \{-k(x) : \varphi_-(t_2; \lambda) \leq x \leq \varphi_-(t_1; \lambda)\}]^{-1}
$$

for any solution $u \in A_-$ of $(18\lambda)$ and $0 < t_1 < t_2$.

Set $K_{\lambda, \varepsilon} = \{u \in A_+: \varphi_+(t; \lambda) \leq u(t) \leq \varphi_+(t; \lambda)\}$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $u$ satisfies $(21\varepsilon)$ and define $T_{\lambda, \varepsilon} : K_{\lambda, \varepsilon} \to C^0(\mathbb{R}_+)$ by

$$(T_{\lambda, \varepsilon}u)(t) = W_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \left( \lambda \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^s F(u^{-1}(x), x) dx ds \right),$$

where $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}, \lambda > 0$. Then (cf. Lemma 4) $T_{\lambda, \varepsilon} : K_{\lambda, \varepsilon} \to K_{\lambda, \varepsilon}$. Next set

$$
u_{\lambda, \varepsilon}^0(t) = \varphi_+(t; \lambda), \quad \nu_{\lambda, \varepsilon}^n(t) = (T_{\lambda, \varepsilon}u_{\lambda, \varepsilon}^{n-1})(t),$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+, n \in \mathbb{N}, \lambda > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$. Then the limits

$$
\lim_{n \to \infty} u_{\lambda, \varepsilon}^n(t) = u_\varepsilon(t; \lambda), \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} v_{\lambda, \varepsilon}^n(t) = v_\varepsilon(t; \lambda)
$$

exist for $t \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda > 0, \varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$.

Let $0 < t_1 < t_2$ and let for example $\varepsilon = +$ (for the case $\varepsilon = -$, the proof is similar). Then

$$
\varphi_+(t; \lambda_1) < \varphi_+(t; \lambda_2), \quad \varphi_+(t; \lambda_1) < \varphi_+(t; \lambda_2)
$$

and for each $\alpha, \beta \in A_+$ with $\alpha(t) < \beta(t)$ on $(0, \infty)$ we have

$$(T_{\lambda_1, +}\alpha)(t) = W_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \left( \lambda_1 \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^s F(\alpha^{-1}(x), x) dx ds \right),$$

$$< W_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \left( \lambda_2 \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^s F(\beta^{-1}(x), x) dx ds \right) = (T_{\lambda_2, +}\beta)(t),$$

and therefore

$$u_{\lambda_1, +}^n(t) < u_{\lambda_2, +}^n(t), \quad v_{\lambda_1, +}^n(t) < v_{\lambda_2, +}^n(t) \quad \text{for} \ t \in (0, \infty), \ n \in \mathbb{N}.$$ 

Hence

$$u_+(t; \lambda_1) \leq u_+(t; \lambda_2), \quad v_+(t; \lambda_1) \leq v_+(t; \lambda_2) \quad \text{for} \ t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

If $r(t_0; \lambda_1) = r(t_0; \lambda_2)$ for $t_0 > 0$, where $r$ is either $u_+$ or $v_+$, then $(r_j(t) = r(t; \lambda_j)$ on $\mathbb{R}_+, \ j = 1, 2)$.
Theorem 3. Define the finite limits \( \lim_{t \to \infty} A \) and a unique solution \( u(t; \lambda) \) for \( \lambda = \lambda_0 > 0 \) such that equation \((18\lambda)\) for \( \lambda = \lambda_0 \) has a (necessarily unique) solution \( u(t; \lambda_0) \) with \( \lim_{t \to \infty} u(t; \lambda_0) = a \).

Proof. By Theorem 5 equation \((18\lambda)\) has a unique solution \( u_+(t; \lambda) \in \mathcal{A}_+ \) and a unique solution \( u_-(t; \lambda) \in \mathcal{A}_- \) for each \( \lambda > 0 \) and moreover the finite limits \( \lim_{t \to \infty} u_+(t; \lambda) \) (\( > 0 \)) and \( \lim_{t \to -\infty} u_-(t; \lambda) \) (\( < 0 \)) exist by Theorem 3. Define
\[
g_+(\lambda) = \lim_{t \to -\infty} u_+(t; \lambda), \quad g_-(\lambda) = \lim_{t \to -\infty} u_-(t; \lambda) \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda > 0.
\]
Then \( g_+: (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty) \) and \( g_- : (0, \infty) \to (-\infty, 0) \). In view of Theorem 6, \( g_+ \) is increasing on \((0, \infty)\) and \( g_- \) is decreasing on \((0, \infty)\). If for example \( g_+(\lambda_1) = g_+(\lambda_2) \) for some \( 0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \), then setting \( r_1(t) = u_+(t; \lambda_1) \), \( r_2(t) = u_+(t; \lambda_2) \) for \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \) we have \( r_1(t) < r_2(t) \) on \((0, \infty)\), \( r_1^{-1}(t) > r_2^{-1}(t) \), \( F(r_1^{-1}(t), t) < F(r_2^{-1}(t), t) \) for \( t \in (0, g_+(\lambda_1)) \), hence
\[
g_+(\lambda_1) = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{r_1(s)} F(r_1^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds < \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{r_2(s)} F(r_2^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds = g_+(\lambda_2),
\]
a contradiction. Consequently, \( g_+ \) is strictly increasing, and \( g_- \) is strictly decreasing. To prove our theorem it is enough to show that \( g_+ \) and \( g_- \) map \((0, \infty)\) onto \((0, \infty)\) and \((-\infty, 0)\), respectively. We prove for example that \( g_+ \) maps \((0, \infty)\) onto itself. First, we see from \( \varphi_+(t; \lambda) \leq u_+(t; \lambda) \leq \varphi_+(t; \lambda) \), where \( \varphi_+, \varphi_- \) are defined by \((20)\), that \( \lim_{\lambda \to 0_+} g_+(\lambda) = 0 \) and \( \lim_{\lambda \to -\infty} g_+(\lambda) = \infty \). Secondly, assume, on the contrary, \( \lim_{\lambda \to \lambda_0} g_+(\lambda) < \lim_{\lambda \to \lambda_0} g_+(\lambda) \) for a \( \lambda_0 > 0 \). Setting \( v_1(t) = \lim_{\lambda \to \lambda_0} u_+(t; \lambda) \), \( v_2(t) = \lim_{\lambda \to \lambda_0} u_+(t; \lambda) \) for \( t \geq 0 \), we get \( v_1 \neq v_2 \). Using the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem as \( \lambda \to \lambda_0^- \) and \( \lambda \to \lambda_0^+ \) in the equality \( (r_\lambda(t) = u_+(t; \lambda) \text{ for } (t; \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \infty)) \).
\[ r_{\lambda}(t) = W_+ \left( \lambda \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{r_{\lambda}(s)} F(r_{\lambda}^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds \right) \]

we see that

\[ v_j(t) = W_+ \left( \lambda_0 \int_0^t \frac{1}{q(s)} \int_0^{v_j(s)} F(v_j^{-1}(x), x) \, dx \, ds \right) \quad \text{for} \quad t \geq 0, \ j = 1, 2. \]

Therefore \( v_1, v_2 \) are solutions of (18\( \lambda \)) for \( \lambda = \lambda_0 \), and consequently \( v_1 = v_2 \), a contradiction. □
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