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#### Abstract

Summary. - Existence and uniqueness results are obtained for nonlinear periodio and Divichlet boundary value problems by using results about the corresponding linearized problems and a global inverse function theorem.


1.     - In this paper we establish existence and uniqueness results about nonlinear boundary value problems using the following global inverse function theorem to be found in Schwartz [11].

Propostition 1.1. - Let $X$ and $Y$ be Banach spaces and $\Phi: X \rightarrow Y$ a continuously Fréchet differentiable function and suppose $\Phi^{\prime}$ is invertible (as a linear operator) at every $x \in X$ and moreover $\left\|\Phi^{\prime}(x)^{-1}\right\| \leqslant K<\infty$ uniformly in $x$. Then $\Phi$ is a homeomorphism of $X$ onto $Y$.

We shall consider equations of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
L u+N u=F u \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $L$ is a linear differential expression, $N$ is a continuously Fréchet differentiable operator such that $L+N^{\prime}(u)$ has a uniformly bounded inverse and $F$ is an operator with bounded range. The plan of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we prove a version of proposition 1.1 where $\Phi=L+N$ and $L$ is unbounded since in applications we find it simpler to prove the existence of a uniform bound for $L+N^{\prime}(u)$ in spaces where $L$ is unbounded. In section 4 we prove existence and uniqueness results for periodic solutions of ordinary differential systems using the abstract results of section 2 and some elementary results about matrices proved in section 3 . Finally in section 5 we discuss the application of the results in section 2 to some Dirichlet boundary value problems.

Several other papers have been written about equation (1.1) and about the related equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
(L u)(x)+g\left(x, u(x), u^{\prime}(x)\right) u(x)=f\left(x, u(x), u^{\prime}(x)\right) \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $L$ is a linear second order differential expression, $g$ is bounded away from the eigenvalues of $L$ and $f$ is bounded. Dolph [3] studies equations analogous
(*) Entrata in Redazione il 26 luglio 1974.
to (1.1), (1.2) in the form of Hammerstein integral equations. Leach [9] obtains existence and uniqueness theorems for the periodic solutions of second order systems of ordinary differential equations which can be expressed in the form (1.1). Leach and Lazer [8] and Landesman and Lazer [7] study a Dirichlet boundary value problem of the form (1.2) when $L$ is a self adjoint operator corresponding to an ordinary and partial differential expression respectively. Williams [13] generalises these results to the case where $L$ is normal. In all these papers existence of solutions is a consequence of the Schauder fixed point theorem and the main technical effort of the papers is the establishing of a priori bounds to enable the Schauder theorem to be applied. Similarly, in the examples considered in the present paper the main difficulty is in proving that $\left[L+N^{\prime}(u)\right]^{-1}$ is uniformly bounded.
2. - Throughout this section $X$ and $Y$ will be Banach spaces with norms $\left\|\|_{X}\right.$ and $\left\|\|_{Y}\right.$ and $L$ will be a linear operator with domain $D(L)$ dense in $X$ and range contained in $Y$. \|\| will denote the operator norm of any bounded linear operator.

We recall that $L$ is closed if $\left\{u_{n}\right\} \subset D(L), u_{n} \rightarrow u$ in $X$ and $L u_{n} \rightarrow y$ in $Y$ implies that $u \in D(L)$ and $L u=y$. If $L$ is closed, it is well known that $D(L)$ is a Banach space with respect to the graph norm $\|\|u\|\|=\|u\|_{X}+\|L u\|_{Y}$.

Theorma 2.1. - Let $N: X \rightarrow Y$ be continuously Fréchet differentiable and let there exist $K>0$ such that $\left\|N^{\prime}(u)\right\| \leqslant K$ for all $u \in X$. If $L+N^{\prime}(u)$ has an everywhere defined inverse for all $u \in X$ and if $\left[L+N^{\prime}(u)\right]^{-1}: Y \rightarrow X$ is uniformly bounded, i.e. there exists $C>0$ such that $\left\|\left[L+N^{\prime}(u)\right]^{-1}\right\| \leqslant 0$ for all $u \in X$, then $L+N$ is a homeomorphism of the Banach space $D(L)$ onto $Y$.

Proof. - Since $N: X \rightarrow Y$ is continuously Fréchet differentiable, $N$ regarded as an operator from $D(L)$ to $Y$ is also continuously Fréchet differentiable. Since the derivatives coincide on $D(L)$, we denote both by $N^{\prime}(u)$.

We shall show that $\left[L+N^{\prime}(u)\right]^{-1}: Y \rightarrow D(L)$ is uniformly bounded in norm with respect to $u$. Let $u_{0} \in D(L)$. Suppose that $\left[L+N^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right)\right]^{-1} y=x$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|x\| & =\left\|\left[L+N^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right)\right]^{-1} y\right\|_{X}+\left\|L\left[L+N^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right)\right]^{-1} y\right\|_{Y} \\
& \leqslant C\|y\|_{Y}+\|y\|_{Y}+\left\|N^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right)\left[L+N^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right)\right]^{-1} y\right\|_{Y} \leqslant(C+1)\|y\|_{Y}+K C\|y\|_{Y}=C_{1}\|y\|_{Y}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence $\left\|\left[L+N^{\prime}(u)\right]^{-1}\right\| \leqslant C_{1}$ for all $u \in D(L)$ and so by proposition $1.1 L+N$ is an homeomorphism of $D(L)$ onto Y .

The next theorem gives more information about $(L+N)^{-1}: Y \rightarrow D(L)$.
Theorem 2.2. - Let $L$ and $N$ be as in theorem 2.1. $(L+N)^{-1}: Y \rightarrow D(L)$ is continuously Fréchet differentiable and Lipschitz.

Proof. - Let $(L+N)^{-1}=G$. Let $y \in Y$ and let $G y=x$. We shall prove that $G$ is continuously Fréchet differentiable by showing that $G^{\prime}(y)=\left[L+N^{\prime}(x)\right]^{-1}$.

Let $h \in Y$ and let $G(y+h)=x+k$. Then

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
\| G(y+h)-G(y)-\left[L+N^{\prime}(x)\right]^{-2} & h \| \\
& =\| \|\left[L+N^{\prime}(x)\right]^{-1}\left\{h-\left[L+N^{\prime}(x)\right][G(y+h)-G(y)]\right\} \| \\
& \leqslant C_{1}\left\|(L+N)(x+k)-(L+N)(x)-\left[L+N^{\prime}(x)\right](k)\right\|_{Y}
\end{array}
$$

using the bound obtained for $\left[L+N^{\prime}(x)\right]^{-1}: Y \rightarrow D(L)$ in theorem 2.1,
$=C_{1}\left\|N(x+k)-N x-N^{\prime}(x) k\right\|_{Y}$
$\rightarrow 0$ as $\|h\|_{Y} \rightarrow 0$ since, by theorem 2.1, $\|h\|_{Y} \rightarrow 0$ implies that $\|k\| \rightarrow 0$.
Hence $G^{\prime}(y)=\left[L+N^{\prime}(x)\right]^{-1}$.
Let $y_{1}, y_{2} \in Y$. Then

$$
G\left(y_{1}\right)-G\left(y_{2}\right)=\int_{0}^{1} G^{\prime}\left(y_{2}+t\left(y_{1}-y_{2}\right)\right)\left(y_{1}-y_{2}\right) d t
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\left\|G\left(y_{1}\right)-G\left(y_{2}\right)\right\|\right\| \leqslant & \int_{0}^{1}\left\|G^{\prime}\left(y_{2}+t\left(y_{1}-y_{2}\right)\right)\right\| d t\left\|y_{1}-y_{2}\right\| \\
& =\int_{0}^{1}\left\|\left[L+N^{\prime}(x(t))\right]^{-1}\right\| d t\left\|y_{1}-y_{2}\right\| \quad \text { where } x(t)=G\left(y_{2}+t\left(y_{1}-y_{2}\right)\right) \\
& \leqslant O_{1}\left\|y_{1}-y_{2}\right\|
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e. $G$ is Lipschitz.

We can now prove another existence theorem.
Theorem 2.3. Let $L$ and $N$ be as in theorem 2.1. If $F: D(L) \rightarrow Y$ is continuous, compact and has bounded range, then there exists at least one solution $u$ of $L(u)+N(u)=F(u)$.

Proof. - Choose $K_{1}>0$ such that $\|F u\|_{Y} \leqslant K_{1}$ for all $u \in D(L)$. Hence if $u \in D(L)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\left\|(L+N)^{-1} F(u)\right\|\right\| \leqslant\| \|(L+N)^{-1} F(u)-(L+ & N)^{-1}(0)\|+\|\left\|(L+N)^{-1}(0)\right\| \\
& \leqslant C_{1}\|F u\|_{\mathrm{Y}}+K_{2} \text { by theorem } 2.2 \\
& \leqslant C_{1} K_{1}+K_{2}=R
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $B_{R}=\{x \in D(L):\||x|\| \leqslant R\}$. If $T=(L+N)^{-1} F$, it is clear that $T$ maps $B_{R}$ into $B_{R}$. Since $F: D(L) \rightarrow Y$ is compact and continuous and $(L+N)^{-1}: Y \rightarrow D(L)$
is continuous, $T$ is compact and continuous. By the Schauder fixed point theorem $T$ has a fixed point $u$ in $B_{R}$ and clearly $L(u)+N(u)=F(u)$.
3. - In this section we introduce some notation and prove some simple results about matrices which we shall use in section 4.

Let $C^{n}$ denote the set of all $n$-tuples of complex numbers. If $x=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ and $y=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)$, we define an inner product on $O^{n}$ by $(x, y)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i} \bar{y}_{i}$ and the corresponding norm by $\|x\|=\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|x_{i}\right|^{2}\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Let $M_{n}$ denote the set of all complex $n \times n$ matrices and let $\left\|\|\right.$ denote the natural norm on $M_{n}$ corresponding to the norm $\left\|\|\right.$ on $C^{n}$, i.e. if $\left.A \in M_{n} ;\right\| A \|=\sup \left\{\|A x\|: x \in C^{n},\|x\|=1\right\}$. It can be shown (see Jomn [5]) that $\|A\|=\max \lambda_{\hat{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ where $\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}$ are the eigenvalues of the positive symmetric matrix $A^{*} A\left(A^{*}\right.$ denotes the adjoint of $A$ i.e. if $A=\left(a_{i j}\right), A^{*}=\left(\bar{a}_{j i}\right)$.)

Lemma 3.1. - If $A \in M_{n}$ and there exists $\delta>0$ such that $|\lambda|>\delta$ for all eigenvalues $\lambda$ of $A$, then $\left\|A^{-1}\right\| \leqslant \delta^{-n}\|A\|^{n-1}$.

Proof. - Let $\mu_{1}, \ldots, \mu_{n}$ be the eigenvalues of $A^{*} A$ and let $e_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n$ be any eigenvector corresponding to $\mu_{i}$ such that $\left\|e_{i}\right\|=1$. Since $\left\|A^{*} A e_{i}\right\|=\mu_{i}$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|A^{*} A\right\| \geqslant \mu_{i}, \quad i=1,2, \ldots, n . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}$ be the eigenvalues of $A$. By considering the characteristic polynomials of $A^{*} A$ and $A$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu_{1} \mu_{2} \ldots \mu_{n}=\operatorname{det} A^{*} A=|\operatorname{det} A|^{2}=\left|\lambda_{1}\right|^{2}\left|\lambda_{2}\right|^{2} \ldots\left|\lambda_{n}\right|^{2} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now $\left\|A^{-1}\right\|=\left[\min _{1 \leqslant k \leqslant n} \mu_{k}^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]^{-1}$ (JOHN [5], p. 14). Suppose that $\mu_{k_{0}}=\min _{1 \leqslant k \leqslant n} \mu_{k}$. Then, by (3.1) and (3.2),

$$
\mu_{k}\left\|A^{*} A\right\|^{n-1} \geqslant\left|\lambda_{1}\right|^{2}\left|\lambda_{2}\right|^{2} \ldots\left|\lambda_{n}\right|^{2} \geqslant \delta^{9 n} .
$$

Since $\left\|A^{*}\right\|=\|A\|$, it follows that $\mu_{k_{0}} \geqslant \delta^{2 n}\|A\|^{-2 n+2}$ and so $\left\|A^{-1}\right\| \leqslant \delta^{-n}\|A\|^{n-1}$.
If $A \in M_{n}$ define $\exp A=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A^{n} / n!$.
Lemina 3.2. - If $A \in M_{n}, \lambda$ is an eigenvalue of $A$ if and only if $\exp \lambda$ is an eigenvalue of $\exp A$.

Proof. - Let the eigenvalues of $A$ be $\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}$. There exists an invertible matrix $P$ such that $P A P^{-1}=J$ where $J$ is a Jordan canonical matrix i.e. $J$ is upper triangular and diag $J=\left\{\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}\right\}$. Clearly $\exp J$ is upper triangular with $\operatorname{diag}(\exp J)=\left\{\exp J, \ldots, \exp \lambda_{n}\right\}$ and so $\exp J$ has eigenvalues $\exp \lambda_{1}, \ldots, \exp \lambda_{n}$. Now $\exp J=P \exp A P^{-1}$. Let $\mu$ be an eigenvalue of $\exp A$ and $u$ a corresponding
eigenfunction. Then $(\exp J) P u=P(\exp A) u=\mu P u$ and so $\mu$ is also an eigenvalue of $\exp A$. Hence every eigenvalue of $\exp A$ is an eigenvalue of $\exp J$ and similarly, since $\exp A=P^{-1} \exp J P$, every eigenvalue of $\exp J$ is an eigenvalue of $\exp A$. Hence the eigenvalues of $\exp A$ are $\exp \lambda_{1}, \ldots, \exp \lambda_{n}$.

Lemma 3.3. - Let $\mathbb{S}=\left\{2 \pi n i: i^{2}=-1\right.$ and $n$ is an integer $\}$. If $A \in M_{n}$ has eigenvalues $\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}$ and there exists $\delta>0$ such that $\operatorname{dist}\left(\lambda_{i}, S\right) \geqslant \delta$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$, then there exists $O>0$, where $C$ depends only on $\delta$ and $\|A\|$, such that $|\mu| \geqslant C$ where $\mu$ is any eigenvalue of $I-\exp A$.

Proof, - Let $D=\{\lambda \in C: \operatorname{dist}(S, \lambda) \geqslant \delta$ and $|\lambda| \leqslant\|A\|\} . D$ is a compact subset of $O$ which contains all the eigenvalues of $A$. If $f(\lambda)=1-\exp \lambda,|f|$ is continuous on $D$, has no zeros on $D$ and so attains a positive minimum on $D$ i.e. there exists $C>0$, depending only on $\delta$ and $\|A\|$, such that $|f(\lambda)|>C$ if $\lambda \in D$. If $\mu$ is an eigenvalue of $I-\exp A$, by lemma 3.2 there exists on eigenvalue $\lambda$ of $A$ such that $\mu=1-\exp \lambda=f(\lambda)$. Hence $|\mu| \geqslant C$.
4. - In this section we shall study the existence and uniqueness of solutions of the systems of eqs. (4.1), (4.3) and (4.2), (4.3) where

$$
\begin{gather*}
u^{\prime}(t)=A(t, u(t))+f(t)  \tag{4.1}\\
u^{\prime}(t)=A(t, u(t))+h(t, u(t))  \tag{4.2}\\
u(0)=u(2 \pi) \tag{4.3}
\end{gather*}
$$

and $u:[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow C^{n}, A:[0,2 \pi] \times C^{n} \rightarrow C^{n}, f:[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow C^{n}$ and $h:[0,2 \pi] \times C^{n} \rightarrow C^{n}$ and $A, f$ and $h$ satisfy the conditions of theorem 4.1.

We shall use known results about the following linear periodic systems (4.4), (4.3) and (4.5), (4.3).

$$
\begin{align*}
& u^{\prime}(t)=B(t) u(t)  \tag{4.4}\\
& u^{\prime}(t)=B(t) u(t)+g(t) \tag{4.5}
\end{align*}
$$

where $B:[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow M_{n}$ and $g:[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow C^{n}$. If $Y(t)=\exp \left[\int_{0}^{t} B(s) d s\right]$, then $Y(t)$ is a fundamental solution for (4.4) with $Y(0)=I$ (the identity matrix). Hartman [4] p. 407-8 proves the following:

Proposimion 4.1. Let $B:[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow M_{n}$ be continuous. (4.5), (4.3) has a unique solution for every continuous $g$ if and only if $I-Y(2 \pi)$ is invertible. This solution is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
y(t)=\Psi(t)\left\{[I-Y(2 \pi)]^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} Y^{-1}(s) g(s) d s+\int_{0}^{i} Y^{-1}(s) g(s) d s\right\} \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $C[0,2 \pi]=\left\{u:[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow C^{n}\right.$ and $u$ is continuous $\} . ~ C[0,2 \pi]$ is a Banach space with respect to the norm $\|u\|=\sup \{\|u(x)\|: x \in[0,2 \pi]\}$. If $O_{p}[0,2 \pi]=\{u \in C[0,2 \pi]$ : $u(0)=u(2 \pi)\}, O_{p}[0,2 \pi]$ is a closed subspace of $O[0,2 \pi]$ and so is also a Banach space.

We can now state and prove our main theorem.
Theoreir 4.2. - Let the function $(t, x) \rightarrow A^{\prime}(t, x)$ be continuous on $[0,2 \pi] \times C^{n}$ where $A^{\prime}\left(t, x_{0}\right)$ denotes the Fréchet derivative of $x \rightarrow A(t, x)$ at $x_{0}$. If
(1) there exists $K>0$ such that $\left\|A^{\prime}(t, x)\right\| \leqslant K$ for all $x \in C^{n}$ and all $t \in[0,2 \pi]$;
(2) there exists $\delta>0$ such that dist $[\{2 \pi n i: n$ is an integer $\},\{\lambda: \lambda$ is an eigenvalue of $\left.\left.\int_{0}^{2 \pi} A^{\prime}(s, u(s)) d s\right\}\right]>\delta$ for all $u \in C_{D}[0,2 \pi] ;$
(3) $h$ is continuous with bounded range;
then
(a) (4.1), (4.3) has a unique solution for all $f \in C[0,2 \pi]$;
(b) (4.2), (4.3) has at least one solution.

Proof. - Define $L: D(L) \rightarrow C[0,2 \pi]$ by $L u=-u^{\prime}$ where $u \in D(L)$ if and only if $u \in O_{p}[0,2 \pi]$ and $u^{\prime}$ is continuous. $L$ is a densely defined operator in $O_{p}[0,2 \pi]$. If $\left\{u_{n}\right\} \subset D(L)$ such that $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ in $O_{p}[0,2 \pi]$ and $L u_{n}=-u_{n}^{\prime} \rightarrow v$ in $O[0,2 \pi]$, then by Rudin [10] $u$ is differentiable, i.e. $u \in D(L)$, and $u^{\prime}=-v$, i.e. $L u_{n} \rightarrow L u$. Hence $L$ is closed.

Define $N: C[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow O[0,2 \pi]$ by $(N u)(t)=A(t, u(t))$. A simple computation shows that, if $u, h \in O[0,2 \pi],\left(N^{\prime}(u) h\right)(t)=A^{\prime}(t, u(t)) h(t)$. Hence $N$ is continuously Fréchet differentiable and it follows easily from (1) that $\left\|N^{\prime}(u)\right\| \leqslant K$ for all $u \in C[0,2 \pi]$.

We now prove that $L+N^{\prime}(u)$ is invertible and that $\left\|\left[L+N^{\prime}(u)\right]^{-1}\right\|$ is uniformly bounded for $u \in O[0,2 \pi]$. Let $u_{0} \in C[0,2 \pi]$ and consider the linear problem (4.7), (4.3).

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime}(t)=A^{\prime}\left(t, u_{0}(t)\right) u(t)-f(t) \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f \in O[0,2 \pi]$. Olearly $u$ satisfies (4.7), (4.3) if and only if $\left[L+N^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right)\right] u=f$.
$Y(t)=\exp \left[\int_{0}^{t} A^{\prime}\left(s, u_{0}(s)\right) d s\right]$ is a fundamental matrix for (4.7). Since $\|\exp A\| \leqslant$ $\leqslant \exp \|A\|$ for all $A \in M_{n},\|Y(t)\| \leqslant \exp 2 K \pi$ and $\left\|Y^{-1}(t)\right\|=\left\|\exp \left[-\int_{0}^{t} A^{\prime}\left(s, u_{0}(s)\right) d s\right]\right\| \leqslant$ $\leqslant \exp 2 K \pi$ for $0 \leqslant t \leqslant 2 \pi$. If $V=I-Y(2 \pi),\|V\| \leqslant 1+\exp 2 K \pi$. By hypothesis (2) and lemma 3.3 there exists $C>0$, independent of $u_{0}$, such that $|\mu| \geqslant C$ for all eigenvalues $\mu$ of $V$. Hence $V$ is invertible and by lemma 3.1. $\left\|V^{-1}\right\|<O^{-n}[1+\exp 2 K \pi]^{n-1}$. Since $V$ is invertible, (4.7), (4.3) has a unique solution by proposition 4.1 i.e. $L+N^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right)$ has an everywhere defined inverse. Moreover, if $\left[L+N^{\prime}\left(u_{0}\right)\right] u=f$,
by (4.6) we have

$$
u(t)=Y(t)\left[V^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} Y^{-1}(s) f(s) d s-\int_{0}^{t} Y^{-1}(s) f(s) d s\right]
$$

Hence

$$
\|u(t)\| \leqslant \exp 2 K \pi\left[C^{-n}(1+\exp 2 K \pi)^{n-1} 2 \pi \exp 2 K \pi\right]\|f\|+2 \pi \exp 2 K \pi\|f\|
$$

and so $\|u\|<K_{1}\|f\|$ where $K_{1}$ depends only on $K$ and $C$. Therefore $\left\|\left[L+N^{\prime}(u)\right]^{-1}\right\| \leqslant K_{1}$ for all $u \in O[0,2 \pi]$. (a) now follows from theorem 2.1.

Define $F: D(L) \rightarrow O[0,2 \pi]$ by $(F u)(t)=h(t, u(t))$. Clearly $F$ has bounded range. Let $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ be any bounded sequence in $D(L)$. Since $\left\{u_{n}^{\prime}\right\}$ is bounded in $C[0,2 \pi],\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is equicontinuous and so by Ascoli's theorem there exists a subsequence $\left\{u_{m}\right\}$ of $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ such that $u_{m} \rightarrow u$ in $C[0,2 \pi]$. Choose $M>0$ such that $\left\|u_{m}\right\|<M$ for all $m$. Let $\varepsilon>0$. Since $h$ is uniformly continuous on the compact set $[0,2 \pi] \times\left\{x \in C^{n}\right.$ : $\|x\|<M\}$, there exists $\delta>0$ such that $\left\|h\left(t_{1}, x_{1}\right)-h\left(t_{2}, x_{2}\right)\right\|<\varepsilon$ if $\left|t_{1}-t_{2}\right|+$ $+\left\|x_{1}-x_{2}\right\| \leqslant \delta$. Choose $n_{0}$ such that $\left\|u_{m}-u\right\|<\delta$ if $m \geqslant n_{0}$. Hence, if $m>n_{0}$, $\left\|F u_{m}-F u\right\|<\varepsilon$. Therefore $F u_{m} \rightarrow F u$ in $C[0,2 \pi]$ and so we have proved that $F$ is compact. A similar, but simpler, argument shows that $F$ is continuous.
(b) now follows immediately from theorem 2.2.

We shall now discuss two alternative formulations of the rather cumbersome condition (2) of theorem 4.2.
(1) Firstly we study a system of second order equations similar to that studied by Leach in [9]. Consider

$$
\begin{gather*}
u_{j}^{\prime \prime}(t)+g_{j}\left(t, u_{j}(t)\right)=h_{j}\left(t, u_{1}(t), \ldots, u_{n}(t), u_{1}^{\prime}(t), \ldots, u_{n}^{\prime}(t)\right)  \tag{4.8}\\
u_{j}(0)=u_{j}(2 \pi) ; \quad u_{j}^{\prime}(0)=u_{j}^{\prime}(2 \pi) \tag{4.9}
\end{gather*}
$$

for $j=1, \ldots, n$ where $u_{j}:[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow R, g_{j}:[0,2 \pi] \times R \rightarrow R$ and $h_{j}:[0,2 \pi] \times R^{2 n} \rightarrow R$ and the following conditions are satisfied:
(i) the function $(t, x) \rightarrow\left(\partial g_{j} / \partial x\right)(t, x)$ is continuous; there exists $\delta>0$ and an integer $m_{j}$ such that $\left(m_{j}+\delta\right)^{2}<\left(\partial g_{j} / \partial x\right)(t, x)<\left(m_{j}+1-\delta\right)^{2}$, for all $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and all $x \in R$.
(ii) $h_{j}$ is continuous and has bounded range.

If we let $u_{k}=v_{k}$ and $u_{k}^{\prime}=w_{k}$, we see that (4.8), (4.9) is equivalent to the system

$$
\begin{align*}
& u^{\prime}(t)=A(t, u(t))+h(t, u(t))  \tag{4.10}\\
& u(0)=u(2 \pi)
\end{align*}
$$

where $u:[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow R^{2 n}$ such that $u(t)=\left(v_{1}(t), w_{1}(t), \ldots, v_{n}(t), w_{n}(t)\right), \quad A:[0,2 \pi] \times$
$\times R^{2 n} \rightarrow R^{2 n}$ such that

$$
A\left(t, x_{1}, y_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, y_{n}\right)=\left(y_{1},-g\left(t, x_{1}\right), \ldots, y_{n},-g\left(t, x_{n}\right)\right)
$$

and $h:[0,2 \pi] \times R^{2 n} \rightarrow R^{2 n}$ such that $h=\left(0, h_{1}, 0, h_{2}, \ldots, 0, h_{n}\right)$.
It is easily verified that $x \rightarrow A(t, x)$ is Fréchet differentiable with $A^{\prime}(t, x)=$ $=\operatorname{diag}\left(B_{1}, B_{2}, \ldots, B_{n}\right)$ where

$$
B_{j}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & 1 \\
-\frac{\partial g_{j}}{\partial x}\left(t, v_{j}(t)\right) & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

Hence, if $u \in O[0,2 \pi], \int_{0}^{2 \pi} A^{\prime}(s, u(s)) d s=\operatorname{diag}\left(C_{1}, \ldots, C_{n}\right)$ where

$$
O_{j}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & 2 \pi \\
k_{j} & 0
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad k_{j}=-\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \frac{\partial g_{j}}{\partial x}\left(s, v_{j}(s)\right) d s
$$

The eigenvalues of $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} A^{\prime}(s, u(s)) d s$ are $\pm \sqrt{-2 \pi k_{j}} i$. By (i) $2 \pi\left(m_{i}+\delta\right)^{2}<-k_{i}<$ $<2 \pi\left(m_{j}+1-\delta\right)^{2}$. Hence dist [\{2 $2 \pi n i: n$ is an integer $\},\{\lambda: \lambda$ is an eigenvalue of $\left.\left.\int_{0}^{2 \pi} A^{\prime}(s, u(s)) d s\right\}\right]>2 \pi \delta$.

It is now clear that (4.10) satisfies all the hypotheses of theorem 4.2 and so (4.8), (4.9) has at least one solution.
(2) We can replace condition (2) in theorem 4.2 by a condition on the numerical range of the Fréchet derivatives of $A$.

If $T \in M_{n}$, the numerical range of $T$, denoted by $\theta(T)$, is defined as $\{(T u, u)$ : $\left.u \in C^{n}\|u\|=1\right\}$. It can be shown that $\theta(T)$ is convex (Kato [6]).

Theorem 4.3. - If $\theta\left(A^{\prime}(t, x)\right)$ is contained in a closed convex set $K$ for all $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and all $x \in O^{n}$, then $\theta\left[\int_{0}^{2 z} A^{\prime}(s, u(s)) d s\right\}$ is contained in the convex set $K_{1}=\{2 \pi x: x \in K\}$ for all $u \in C[0,2 \pi]$.

Proof. - Let $u \in O[0,2 \pi]$ and $x \in C^{n}$ with $\|x\|=1$.

$$
\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(A^{\prime}(s, u(s)) x, x\right) d s
$$

is the limit of Riemann sums of the form

$$
\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\left(s_{i+1}-s_{i}\right)\left(A^{\prime}\left(s_{i}, u\left(s_{i}\right)\right) x, x\right) \quad \text { where } 0=s_{0}<s_{1}<\ldots<s_{n}=2 \pi
$$

Since $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(2 \pi)^{-1}\left(s_{i+1}-s_{i}\right)=1$ and $\left(A^{\prime}\left(s_{i}, u\left(s_{i}\right)\right) x, x\right) \in K$ for $i=0, \ldots, n-1$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(2 \pi)^{-1}\left(s_{i+1}-s_{i}\right)\left(A^{\prime}\left(s_{i}, u\left(s_{i}\right)\right) x, x\right) \in K \text { i.e. } \\
& \left.\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\left(s_{i+1}-s_{i}\right)\left(A^{\prime}\left(s_{i}\right)\right) x, x\right) \in K_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $K_{1}$ is closed, $\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(A^{\prime}(s, u(s)) x, x\right) d s \in K_{1}$. By considering Riemann sums it can easily be shown that

$$
\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(A^{\prime}(s, u(s)) x, x\right) d s=\left(\int_{0}^{2 \pi} A^{\prime}(s, u(s)) d s x, x\right) \in K_{1}
$$

and this completes the proof.
Since, for $T \in M_{n}, \theta(T)$ clearly contains all the eigenvalues of $T$, by theorem 4.3 we can replace condition (2) by
$\left(2^{\prime}\right)$ there exists a closed convex set $K$ and $\delta>0$ such that $\theta\left(A^{\prime}(t, x)\right) \subset K$ for all $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and all $x \in C^{n}$ and

$$
\operatorname{dist}\left[K_{1},\{n i: n \text { is an integer }\}\right]>\delta .
$$

5.     - In this section we shall apply the results of section 2 to obtain existence and uniqueness theorems for nonlinear boundary value problems associated with elliptic and ordinary differential expressions.

Let $\Omega$ be an open subset of $R^{n}$ with smooth boundary denoted by $b d(\Omega)$. We shall consider only linear differential operators generated by the Laplacian, $\Delta$, but it is easy to see how our results can be extended to higher order expressions or to elliptic expressions with variable coefficients. We shall apply theorem 2.2 where $X=Y=L_{2}(\Omega)$-the set of all real-valued Lebesgue square integrable functions on $\Omega$ with norm $\|u\|_{0}=\left\{\int_{\Omega}|u(x)|^{2} d x\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We shall also require the space $O_{2}^{0}(\bar{\Omega})=$ $=\{u: \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow R: u$ has continuous second order derivatives on $\bar{\Omega}$ and $u(x)=0$ for all $x \in b d(\Omega)\}$ and the space $N_{\Omega}(\Omega)=\{u: \Omega \rightarrow R$ : all generalized partial derivatives of $u$ of order $\leqslant 2$ are in $\left.L_{2}(\Omega)\right\}$ with norm $\|u\|_{2}=\left\{\sum_{\alpha \leqslant 2}\left\|D^{\alpha} u\right\|_{0}^{2}\right\}^{\frac{7}{2}}$.

Let $L: D(L) \rightarrow L_{2}(\Omega)$ be such that $L u=-\Delta u(x)+q(x) u(x)$ where $q: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ is measurable and $u \in D(L)$ if and only if $u \in C_{0}^{2}(\bar{\Omega})$ and $-\Delta u+q u \in L_{2}(\Omega)$. In the examples which we shall discuss $L$ is essentially self adjoint with closure $\bar{L}$. Moreover we shall have that $D(\bar{L})=H_{2}^{0}(\Omega)$-the closure of $C_{2}^{0}(\bar{\Omega})$ in $\left\|\|_{2}\right.$-and that the graph norm on $D(\bar{L})$ is equivalent to $\left\|\|_{2}\right.$. In this case we have as an immediate consequence of theorem 2.2 :

Theonem 5.1. - If
(1) $N: L_{2}(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{2}(\Omega)$ is continuously Fréchet differentiable and there exists $K>0$ such that $\left\|N^{\prime}(u)\right\| \leqslant K$ for all $u \in L_{2}(\Omega)$,
(2) $\bar{L}+N^{\prime}(u)$ has a bounded everywhere defined inverse on $L_{2}(\Omega)$ and there exists $\delta>0$ such that $\left\|\left[L+N^{\prime}(u)\right]^{-1}\right\| \leqslant \delta$ for all $u \in L_{2}(\Omega)$,
(3) $F: H_{2}^{0}(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{2}(\Omega)$ is compact, continuous and has bounded range, then there exists at least one solution of $\bar{L} u+N u=F u$.

We consider the case where $N$ is a Nemytskii operator i.e. there exists $g: R \rightarrow R$ such that $(N u)(x)=g(u(x))$. We shall give conditions on $\Omega$ and $g$ to ensure that the conditions of theorem 5.1 are satisfied.

Suppose that $g$ has a continuous derivative and that there exists $M>0$ such that $\left|g^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqslant M$ for all $x \in R$. Let $u \in L_{2}(\Omega)$. Then
$|(N u)(x)|=|g(u(x))| \leqslant|g(u(x))-g(0)|+|g(0)|=|u(x)|\left|g^{\prime}(\xi)\right|+|g(0)| \leqslant M|u(x)|+|g(0)|$.

Hence, if $g(0)=0$ or if $\Omega$ is bounded, $N: L_{2}(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{2}(\Omega)$. It follows from the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem that $N$ is continuously differentiable with $\left(N^{\prime}(u) h\right)(x)=g^{\prime}(u(x)) h(x)$. Hence $\left\|N^{\prime}(u)\right\| \leqslant M$.

The following lemma is useful for verifying that condition (2) is satisfied.
Lemma 5.2. Let $A$ be a densely defined self-adjoint operator on $L_{2}(\Omega)$ which is bounded below. Suppose that there exists $a \in R$ such that the essential spectrum of $A$ is contained in $[a, \infty)$ and $A$ has a finite or infinite number of eigenvalues $\lambda_{1}<\lambda_{2}<\ldots<a$. If there exists an integer $k, \delta>0$ and $p: \Omega \rightarrow R$ such that $\lambda_{k}+\delta<p(x)<\lambda_{k+1}-\delta$ for all $x \in \Omega$, then, if $A_{1} u=A u-p u, A_{1}$ has a bounded everywhere defined inverse and $\left\|A_{1}^{-1}\right\| \leqslant \delta^{-1}$.

Proof. - It is obvious that $A_{1}$ is self-adjoint. Let $F_{k}$ be the family of all $(k-1)$ dimensional subspaces of $L_{2}(\Omega)$ and, if $F \in F_{k}$, let $F^{\perp}$ denote the orthogonal complement of $F$. It is well known that

$$
\lambda_{k}=\sup _{F \in F_{k}} \inf \{(A u, u):\|u\|=1 \text { and } u \in F \perp\}
$$

Define

$$
\mu_{r}=\sup _{F \in F_{k}} \inf \left\{\left(A_{1} u, u\right):\|u\|=1 \text { and } u \in F^{\prime} \perp\right\}
$$

If $F \in F_{k}$,
$\inf \left\{\left(A_{1} u, u\right):\|u\|=1\right.$ and $\left.u \in F^{\perp}\right\}=\inf \left\{(A u, u)-(p u, u):\|u\|=1\right.$ and $\left.u \in F^{\perp}\right\} \leqslant$
$\leqslant \inf \left\{(A u, u):\|u\|=1\right.$ and $\left.u \in F^{\perp}\right\}-\left(\lambda_{k}+\delta\right) \leqslant \lambda_{k}-\left(\lambda_{k}+\delta\right)=-\delta$.

## Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu_{b} \leqslant-\delta \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\left\{w_{n}\right\}$ be an orthonormal sequence of eigenvectors of $A$ such that $A w_{i}=\lambda_{i} w_{i}$. Let $P=\left[w_{1}, \ldots, w_{k}\right] \in F_{k+1}$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu_{k+1} & \geq \inf \left\{\left(A_{1} u, u\right):\|u\|=1 \text { and } u \in P^{\perp}\right\} \\
& \geqslant \inf \left\{(A u, u):\|u\|=1 \text { and } u \in P^{\Lambda}\right\}-\left(\lambda_{k+1}-\delta\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\inf \left\{(A u, u):\|u\|=1\right.$ and $\left.u \in P^{\perp}\right\}=\lambda_{k_{+1}} ;$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu_{k+1} \geqslant \delta \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $A_{1}$ has essential spectrum in ( $-\infty, \delta-\varepsilon$ ), where $\varepsilon>0$ it is easy to see that $\mu_{j}<\delta-\varepsilon$ for all integers $j$. Since $\varepsilon$ is arbitrary, (5.2) shows that $A_{1}$ has only eigenvalues in $(-\infty, \delta)$ and that the dimension of the subspace spanned by eigenvectors corresponding to these eigenvalues is less than or equal to $k$. By (5.1) there is a subspace of dimension $k$ consisting of eigenvectors of $A_{1}$ corresponding to eigenvalues in $(-\infty,-\delta]$. Hence $(-\delta, \delta)$ contains no points in the spectrum of $A_{1}$ and so 0 is in the resolvent set of $A_{1}$. Therefore $A_{1}$ is invertible and, by Kato [6], V 3.16,

$$
\left\|A_{1}^{-1}\right\|=\operatorname{dist}\left[0, \text { spectrum of } A_{1}\right] \leqslant \delta^{-1}
$$

Suppose that $\Omega$ is bounded and $q$ is bounded and measurable. The following results can be found in Agmon [1]. $L$ is essentially self-adjoint, $\bar{L}$ is bounded below and the spectrum of $\bar{L}$ consists only of the eigenvalues $\lambda_{1} \leqslant \lambda_{2} \leqslant \lambda_{3} \leqslant \ldots$. The coerciveness inequality $\|u\|_{2}<C\left(\|L u\|_{0}+\|u\|_{0}\right)$ implies that $D(\bar{L})=H_{2}^{0}(\Omega)$ and that the graph norm of $\bar{L}$ is equivalent to $\|_{2}$.

If $g: R \rightarrow R$ has a continuous derivative and there exists an integer $k$ and $\delta>0$ such that $\lambda_{t c}+\delta<-g^{\prime}(t)<\lambda_{t+1}-\delta$ for all $t \in R$ it follows from lemma 5.2 that $\left\|\left[L+N^{\prime}(u)\right]^{-1}\right\|<\delta^{-1}$. Hence conditions (1) and (2) are satisfied.

If $(F u)(x)=f\left(x, u(x), u^{\prime}(x)\right)$ where $f: \Omega \times R \times R \rightarrow R$ is continuous and has bounded range, $F: H_{1}(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{2}(\Omega)$ is continuous by LANDESMAN and LAZER [7] proposition 3.1. Since the embedding from $H_{2}^{0}(\Omega)$ to $H_{1}(\Omega)$ is compact and continuous, $F: H_{2}^{0}(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{2}(\Omega)$ is compact and continuous. Olearly $P$ has bounded range and so condition (3) is satisfied.

The above results where $\Omega$ is bounded and $N$ and $F$ are Nemytskii operators are a special case of the results of Landesman and Lazer [7]. Because of the general nature of our theorems 2.2 and 5.1, however, we can easily extend our results to the case where $\Omega$ is unbounded.

Consider, for example, the case where $\Omega=(0, \infty)$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
(L u)(x)=-u^{\prime \prime}(x)-\frac{4}{x} u(x) \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We recall that $u \in D(L)$ only if $u^{\prime \prime}$ is continuous and $u(0)=0$. By Kato [6], V 4.4 and Stuart [12] $L$ is essentially self-adjoint, $D(\bar{L})=H_{0}^{2}[0, \infty]$ and there exists $K>0$ such that the graph norm of $\bar{L}+K I$ is equivalent to $\left\|\|_{2}\right.$. Moreover, the spectrum of $\widetilde{L}=\left\{-4 / n^{2}: n=1,2, \ldots\right\} \cup[0, \infty)$ and, for each positive integer $n,-4 / n^{2}$ is a simple (multiplicity one) eigenvalue.

Suppose that $g: R \rightarrow R$ has continuous derivative and there exists an integer $k$ and $\delta>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\frac{4}{k^{2}}+\delta<g^{\prime}(t)<-\frac{4}{(k+1)^{2}}-\delta \quad \text { for all } t \in R ; g(0)=0 \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $(N u)(x)=-g(u(x))-K u(x)$, then $\bar{L}+K I$ and $N$ satisfy conditions (1) and (2) of theorem 5.1.

Define $F: H_{2}^{0}[0, \infty] \rightarrow L_{2}[0, \infty]$ by $(F u)(x)=a(x) f\left(x, u(x), u^{\prime}(x)\right)$ where $f$ is continuous and has bounded range and $a$ is continuous and

$$
\begin{equation*}
a \in L_{2}[0, \infty] ; \quad \lim _{x \rightarrow \infty} a(x)=0 \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $|f(x, y, z)| \leqslant M$ for all $x, y, z \in R$ and $u \in L_{2}[0, \infty]$, then $\|F u\|_{0}<M\|a\|_{0}$ and so $F$ has bounded range. If $T>0, F: H_{2}^{0}[0, T] \rightarrow L_{2}[0, T]$ is compact and continuous by proposition 3.1 of Landesman and Lazer [7] as we proved above. Since $\lim _{x \rightarrow \infty} a(x)=0$, a simple subsequence argument, like that in Brown [2] section 10, shows that

$$
F: H_{2}^{0}[0, \infty] \rightarrow L_{2}[0, \infty] \quad \text { is compact and continuous. }
$$

Hence theorem 5.1 proves that there exists at least one solution of the equation

$$
(\bar{L} u)(x)-g(u(x))=a(x) f\left(x, u(x), u^{\prime}(x)\right)
$$

where $L$ is given by (5.3), $g$ has a continuous derivative and satisfies (5.4), $a$ and $f$ are continuous, $f$ has bounded range and $a$ satisfies (5.5).
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