On the Uniformly Ultimate Boundedness of Solutions

Shoichi SEINO

(Received on 13 October, 1986)

1. Introduction

It is well-known that A. M. Liapunov has discussed the stability of solutions of the system of ordinary differential equations by utilizing a scalar function satisfying some conditions. For the boundedness as well as the stability, Liapunov's second method is very useful and powerful theory. Its usefulness and power lie in the fact that the criterion of the boundedness can be decided from the differential equations without any knowledge of their solutions.

However, it is great difficult to find the Liapunov function satisfying certain conditions. Therefore, it is important to obtain a weak sufficient condition for the boundedness theorem. Many authors have discussed the boundedness. (cf. [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8].)

In the previous papers [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], we obtained weak sufficient conditions for the various types of boundedness.

The purpose of this paper is to give some extension of the sufficient conditions for the uniformly ultimate boundedness of solutions of a system of ordinary differential equations.

2. Definitions and Notations

First, we summarize some basic definitions and notations we will need later on.

Let I denote the interval $0 \le t < \infty$ and R^n denote the Euclidean n-space. For $x \in R^n$ let $\|x\|$ be any norm of x. Let S_K denote the set of x such that $\|x\| < K$, K > 0, S_K be the closure of S_K , and S_K be the complement of S_K . We shall denote by $C(I \times R^n \times R^m, R^K)$ the set of all continuous functions defined on $I \times R^n \times R^m$ with values in R^K .

We consider a system of differential equations.

(1)
$$\frac{dx}{dt} = f(t, x),$$

where x is an n-vector and $f(t, x) \in C(I \times R^n, R^n)$ is an n-vector function.

Suppose that f(t, x) is smooth enough to ensure existence, uniqueness and continuous dependence of the solutions of the initial value problem associated with (1).

Throughout this paper a solution through a point $(t_0, x_0) \in I \times \mathbb{R}^n$ will be denoted by such a form as $x(t, t_0, x_0)$.

We introduce the following definitions.

(Definition 1)

The solutions of (1) are equi-bounded, if for any $\alpha > 0$ and any $t_o \in I$, there exists a $\beta(t_o, \alpha) > 0$ such that $\|x_o\| \le \alpha$ implies $\|x(t, t_o, x_o)\| < \beta(t_o, \alpha)$ for all $t \ge t_o$.

(Definition 2)

The solutions of (1) are uniformly bounded, if the β in Definition 1 is independent of t_0 .

(Definition 3)

The solutions of (1) are equi-ultimately bounded for bound B, if there exists a B>0 and if corresponding to any $\alpha > 0$ and $t_o \in I$, there exists a $T(t_o, \alpha) > 0$ such that $\|x_o\| \le \alpha$ implies that $\|x(t, t_o, x_o)\| < B$ for all $t \ge t_o + T(t_o, \alpha)$.

(Definition 4)

The solutions of (1) are uniformly ultimately bounded for bound B, if the T in Definition 3 is independent of t_{\circ} .

(Definition 5)

Corresponding to a continuous scalar function V(t, x) defined on an open set, we define the function.

$$\dot{V}_{(1)}(t, x) = \overline{\lim_{h \to 0+} \frac{1}{h}} \{ V(t+h, x+h f(t, x)) - V(t, x) \}.$$

In case V(t, x) has continuous partial derivatives of the first order, it is evident that

$$\dot{V}_{(1)}(t, x) = \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} \cdot f(t, x),$$

where "." denote a scalar product.

3. Preliminary Results

In some cases, the following theorem on boundedness is more convenient to apply. We consider a system.

(2)
$$\frac{dx}{dt} = f(t, x, y)$$
$$\frac{dy}{dt} = g(t, x, y),$$

where $f(t, x, y) \in C(I \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $g(t, x, y) \in C(I \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)$.

T. Yoshizawa gave a sufficient condition for the uniform boundedness and the uniformly ultimately boundedness. Here, we repeat those theorems.

[Theorem 3.1]

Suppose that there exists a Liapunov function V(t, x, y) defined on $0 \le t < \infty$, $\|x\| + \|y\| \ge K$, where K can be large, which satisfies the following conditions;

- (i) V(t, x, y) tends to infinity uniformly for (t, x) as $||y|| \rightarrow \infty$,
- (ii) $V(t, x, y) \le b(||x||, ||y||)$, where b(r, s) is continuous
- $(iii) V_{(2)}(t, x, y) \leq 0.$

Moreover, suppose that corresponding to each M>0 there exists a Liapunov function W(t,x,y) defined on $0 \le t < \infty$, $\|x\| \ge K_1(M)$, $\|y\| \le M$, where K_1 can be large, which satisfies the following conditions;

- (iv) W(t, x, y) tends to infinity uniformly for (t, y) as $||x|| \rightarrow \infty$,
- (v) $W(t, x, y) \le c(||x||)$, where c(r) is continuous,
- (vi) $W_{(2)}(t, x, y) \leq 0$.

Then the solutions of (2) are uniformly bounded.

[Theorem 3.2]

For the system (2), assume that there exists a Liapunov function V(t, x, y) defined on $0 \le t < \infty$, $||x|| < \infty$, $||y|| \ge K > 0$, which satsfies the following conditions;

- (i) $a(\|y\|) \le V(t, x, y) \le b(\|y\|)$, where a(r) and b(r) are continuous, increasing and $a(r) \to \infty$ as $r \to \infty$,
- (ii) $V_{(2)}(t, x, y) \le -c(\|y\|)$, where c(r) > 0 is continuous

Suppose that corresponding to each M, there exists a Liapunov function W(t, x, y) defined on $0 \le t < \infty$, $||x|| \ge K_1(M)$, $||y|| \le M$, which satisfies the following conditions;

- (iii) $a_1(\|x\|) \le W(t, x, y) \le b_1(\|x\|)$, where $a_1(r)$ and $b_1(r)$ are continuous and $a_1(r)$ $\to \infty$ as $r \to \infty$,
- (iv) $\dot{W}_{(2)}(t, x, y) \le 0$.

Moreover, assume that letting B be such that b(K) < a(B), there exists a Liapunov function U(t, x, y) defined on $T \le t < \infty$, $||x|| \ge K_2 \ge 0$, $||y|| \le B$, which satisfies the following conditions;

- (v) $a_2(\|x\|) \le U(t, x, y) \le b_2(\|x\|)$, where $a_2(r)$ and $b_2(r)$ are continuous and increasing,
- (vi) $U_{(2)}(t, x, y) \le -c_2(||x||)$, where $c_2(r) > 0$ is continuous

Then the solutions of (2) are uniformly ultimately bounded.

For the proof of these theorems, see [1].

4. Result

[Theorem 4.1]

For the system (2), assume that there exists a Liapunov function V(t, x, y) defined on $I \times \mathbb{R}^n \times S_K^c$, where K > 0 can be large, which satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) $a_1(t, ||y||) \le V(t, x, y) \le b_1(||y||)$, where $a_1(t, r)$ is continuous in (t, r), $a_1(t, r) > 0$ for any $r \succeq 0$, $a_1(t, r) \equiv 0$, nondecreasing with respect to t for each fixed t and $a_1(t, r) \longrightarrow \infty$ as $t \longrightarrow \infty$ uniformly in t, $b_1(r)$ is continuous and increasing,
- (ii) $V_{(2)}(t,x,y) \le -c_1(t,\|y\|)$, where $c_1(t,r) > 0$ is continuous in (t,r). Suppose that corresponding to each L > 0, there exists a Liapunov function W(t,x,y) defined on $I \times S_{L(L)}^{\mathfrak{C}} \times \overline{S}_{L}$, which satisfies the following conditions:
 - (iii) $a_2(t, ||x||) \le W(t, x, y) \le b_2(||x||)$, where $a_2(t, r)$ is continuous in (t, r), $a_2(t, r) > 0$ for any $r \ge 0$, $a_2(t, 0) = 0$, nondecreasing with respect to t for any fixed r and $a_2(t, r) \longrightarrow \infty$ as $r \longrightarrow \infty$ uniformly in t, $b_2(r)$ is continuous,
 - (iv) $W_{(2)}(t, x, y) \leq 0$.

Moreover, assume that C>0 be such that $b_1(K) < a_1(0,C)$, there exists a Liapunov function U(t,x,y) defined on $T \le t < \infty$, $||x|| \ge H^* > 0$, $||y|| \le C$, which satisfies the following conditions:

- (v) $a_3(t, ||x||) \le U(t, x, y) \le b_3(||x||)$, where $a_3(t, r)$ is continuous in (t, r), $a_3(t, r) > 0$ for any $r \ge 0$, $a_3(t, 0) \equiv 0$ and nondecreasing with respect to t and r, $b_3(r)$ is continuous and increasing,
- (vi) $\dot{\mathbf{U}}_{(2)}(t, x, y) \leq -c_3(t, ||x||)$, where $c_3(t, r) > 0$ is continuous in (t, r).

Then the solutions of (2) are uniformly ultimately bounded.

Proof. For any $\alpha > 0$ such that $K < \alpha$, consider a solution $\{x(t, t_0, x_0, y_0), y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\}$ of a system (2), where $t_0 \in I$, $\|x_0\| \le \alpha$ and $\|y_0\| \le \alpha$. Choose a $\beta(\alpha) > 0$ so large that $b_1(\alpha) < a_1(0, \beta(\alpha))$.

First of all, we prove that $\|y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| < \beta(\alpha)$ for all $t \ge t_0$. Suppose that this is not true, there is a t_1 such that $\|y(t_1, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| \le \beta(\alpha)$ and $t_1 > t_0$. Then there exist t_2 and t_3 , $t_0 \le t_2 < t_3 \le t_1$, such that $\|y(t_2, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| = \alpha$, $\|y(t_3, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| = \beta(\alpha)$ and $\alpha < \|y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| < \beta(\alpha)$ for $t_2 < t < t_3$. Consider the function

$$\begin{split} V(t,x(t,t_{o},x_{o},y_{o}),\ y(t,t_{o},x_{o},y_{o}))\ \ on\ \ t_{2} &\leq t \leq t_{3}.\ \ Then\ \ we\ have \\ a_{1}(0\,,\,\beta(\,\alpha\,)\,) &\leq a_{1}(t_{3},\|y(t_{3},t_{o},x_{o},y_{o})\|\,) \leq V(t_{3},x(t_{3}),\,y(t_{3})) \leq V(t_{2},x(t_{2}),\,y(t_{2})) \\ &\leq b_{1}(\|y(t_{2},t_{o},x_{o},y_{o})\|) \leq b_{1}(\,\alpha\,),\ \ where\ \ x(t_{K}) = x(t_{K},t_{o},x_{o},y_{o})\ \ and \\ y(t_{K}) &= y(t_{K},\,t_{o},\,x_{o},\,y_{o}),\ \ k = 2,\,3,\ \ \ which\ \ \ contradicts \ \ b_{1}(\,\alpha\,) < a_{1}(\,0\,,\,\beta(\,\alpha\,)). \ \ Therefore \\ \|y(t_{K},t_{o},x_{o},y_{o})\| &< \beta(\,\alpha\,)\ \ \ for\ \ all\ \ t \geq t_{o}. \end{split}$$

We put $\eta(\alpha) = \max\{\alpha, H(\beta(\alpha))\}$ and consider a Liapunov function W(t, x, y) defined on $I \times S^c_{H(\beta(\alpha))} \times \overline{S}_{\beta(\alpha)}$. Choose a $\beta^*(\alpha) > 0$ so large that $b_2(\eta(\alpha)) < a_2(0, \beta^*(\alpha))$. We shall show that $\|x(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| < \beta^*(\alpha)$ for all $t \ge t_0$. Suppose that it is not so, there is a t_1 such that $\|x(t_1, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| \ge \beta^*(\alpha)$ and $t_1 > t_0$. Then there exist t_2 and t_3 , $t_0 \le t_2 < t_3 \le t_1$, such that $\|x(t_2, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| = \eta(\alpha)$, $\|x(t_3, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| = \beta^*(\alpha)$ and $\eta(\alpha) < \|x(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| < \beta^*(\alpha)$ for $t_2 < t < t_3$.

Because $\|y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| < \beta(\alpha)$ for all $t \ge t_0$, we have $\|y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| < \beta(\alpha)$ for $t_2 \le t \le t_3$. Consider the function $W(t, x(t, t_0, x_0, y_0), y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0))$ on $t_2 \le t \le t_3$.

Because the function $W(t, x(t, t_0, x_0, y_0), y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0))$ is nondecreasing in t, $a_2(0, \beta^*(\alpha)) \le a_2(t_3, \|x(t_3, t_0, x_0, y_0)\|) \le W(t_3, x(t_3), y(t_3)) \le W(t_2, x(t_2), y(t_2)) \le b_2(\eta(\alpha))$, which contradicts $b_2(\eta(\alpha)) < a_2(0, \beta^*(\alpha))$.

Therefore, for any $\alpha > 0$ and $t_o \in I$, there exist $\beta^*(\alpha) > 0$ and $\beta(\alpha) > 0$ such that $\|x_o\| \le \alpha, \|y_o\| \le \alpha$ implies $\|x(t, t_o, x_o, y_o)\| < \beta^*(\alpha)$ and $\|y(t, t_o, x_o, y_o)\| < \beta(\alpha)$ for all $t \ge t_o$. This means that the solutions of (2) are uniformly bounded.

Next we shall prove that there is a $t_1 > t_0$ such that $\|y(t_1, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| < K$. In fact, if we assume that this is not true, then $\|y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| \ge K$ for all $t \ge t_0$. By (ii), there exists a $r(\alpha) > 0$ such that if $\|x\| < \infty$ and $K \le \|y\| \le \beta(\alpha)$, $\dot{V}_{(2)}(t, x, y) \le -r(\alpha)$. Therefore we have $V(t, x(t, t_0, x_0, y_0), y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)) \le V(t_0, x_0, y_0) - r(\alpha)(t - t_0)$.

If $t > t_0 + T_1(\alpha)$, where $T_1(\alpha) = (b_1(\alpha) - a_1(0, K)) / r(\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} a_1(0, K) &\leq V(t, x(t, t_o, x_o, y_o), y(t, t_o, x_o, y_o)) \leq V(t_o, x_o, y_o) - r(\alpha)(t - t_o) \\ &< b_1(\alpha) - b_1(\alpha) + a_1(0, K) \\ &= a_1(0, K), \end{aligned}$$

and hence there arise a contradiction. Consequently, there is a t_1 such that $\|y(t_1,\,t_0,\,x_0,\,y_0)\| < K$ and $t_0 \le t_1 < t_0 + T_1(\alpha)$. By the choice of C, we can see that $\|y(t,\,t_0,\,x_0,\,y_0)\| < C$ for all $t \ge t_1$. Thus, by the uniformly boundedness of solutions of (2), we have $\|y(t,\,t_0,\,x_0,\,y_0)\| < C$ for all $t \ge t_0 + T_1(\alpha)$.

Now we put $K^*=\max\{C, H^*\}$. Then, if $\|x_0^*\| \le K^*$ and $\|y_0^*\| \le K^*$.

(3) $\|x(t, t_0, x_0^*, y_0^*)\| < \beta^*(K^*) \text{ for all } t \ge t_0.$

As was seen above, $\|y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| < C$ for all $t \ge t_0 + T_1(\alpha)$, and consequently $\|y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| < C$ for all $t \ge t_0 + T_1(\alpha) + T$. Suppose that $\|x(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| \ge K^*$ for all $t \ge t_0 + T_1(\alpha) + T$. For $K^* \le \|x\| \le \beta^*(\alpha)$, $\|y\| \le C$ and $t \ge T$, by (vi), there exists a $r^*(\alpha) > 0$ such that $\mathring{U}_{(2)}(t, x, y) \le -r^*(\alpha)$, and hence

$$\begin{split} &U(t,\,x(t,\,t_{o},\,x_{o},\,y_{o}),\,\,y(t,\,t_{o},\,x_{o},\,y_{o}))\\ &\leq U(t_{o}+T_{1}(\alpha)+T,\,\,x(t_{o}+T_{1}(\alpha)+T,\,\,t_{o},\,\,x_{o},\,\,y_{o}),\,\,\,y(t_{o}+T_{1}(\alpha)+T,\,\,t_{o},\,\,x_{o},\,\,y_{o}))\\ &-\gamma*(\alpha)(t-t_{o}-T_{1}(\alpha)-T). \end{split}$$

If
$$t > t_0 + T_1(\alpha) + T + T_2(\alpha)$$
, where $T_2(\alpha) = \frac{1}{r^*(\alpha)} \{b_3(\beta^*(\alpha)) - a_3(0, K^*)\},$
 $a_3(0, K^*) \le U(t, x(t, t_0, x_0, y_0), y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)) < b_3(\beta^*(\alpha)) - b_3(\beta^*(\alpha)) + a_3(0, K^*)$
 $= a_3(0, K^*),$

we have a contradiction. Therefore, there exists a t* such that $\|\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{t}^*, \mathbf{t_o}, \mathbf{x_o}, \mathbf{y_o})\| < K^*$ and $\mathbf{t_o} + T_1(\alpha) + T \le \mathbf{t}^* < \mathbf{t_o} + T_1(\alpha) + T_2(\alpha) + T$, and hence, by (3), $\|\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t_o}, \mathbf{x_o}, \mathbf{y_o})\| < \beta^*(K^*)$

If we put $B = \beta^*(K^*)$ and $T^*(\alpha) = T_1(\alpha) + T_2(\alpha) + T$, clearly $C \le B$ and $T_1(\alpha) \le T^*(\alpha)$. Hence, for any $\alpha > 0$ and any $t_0 \in I$, if $\|x_0\| \le \alpha$, $\|y_0\| \le \alpha$, we have a B and a $T^*(\alpha)$ such that $\|x(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| < B$ and $\|y(t, t_0, x_0, y_0)\| < B$ for all $t \ge t_0 + T^*(\alpha)$, where B is clearly a positive constant independent of particular solutions and $T^*(\alpha)$ is a positive constant depending only on $\alpha > 0$. This proves that the solutions of (2) are uniformly ultimately bounded.

References

- [1] T. Yoshizawa: Stability theory and the existence of periodic solutions and almost periodic solutions, Springer, 1975.
- [2]T. Yoshizawa: Stability theory by Liapunov's second method, Math. Soc. Japan, 1966.
- [3]T. Yoshizawa: Liapunov's function and boundedness of solutions, Funkcial. Ekvac., 2, 1959, 95—142.
- [4] T. Yoshizawa: Stability and boundedness of systems, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 6, 1960, 409—421.
- [5] H. A. Antosiewicz: On non-linear differential equations of the second order with integrable forcing term, J. London Math. Soc., 30, 1955, 64-67.
- [6]G. E. H. Reuter: A boundedness theorem for non-linear differential equations of the second order, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., 47, 1951, 49-54.
- [7]G. E. H. Reuter: Boundedness theorems for non-linear differential equations of the second order (II), J. London Math. Soc., 27, 1952, 48-58.
- [8] J. O. C. Ezeilo: A note on a boundedness theorem for some third order differential equations, J. London Math. Soc., 36, 1961, 439—444.
- [9]S. Seino, M. Kudo and M. Aso: On stability and boundedness of solutions of a system of ordinary differential equations, Research Reports of Akita Technical College, 9, 1974, 93—98.
- [10]S. Seino, M. Kudo and M. Aso: On the total stability and the total boundedness of the perturbed systems, Research Reports of Akita Technical College, 11, 1976, 100—103.
- [11]S. Seino, M. Kudo and M. Aso: On partial boundedness of solutions of a system of ordinary differential equations, Research Reports of Akita Technical College, 16, 1981, 118—121.
- [12] M. Kudo, M. Aso and S. Seino: On the partially total stability and the partially total boundedness of a system of ordinary differential equations, Research Reports of Akita College of Technology, 20, 1985, 105—109.
- [13] M. Aso, M. Kudo and S. Seino: On boundedness and partial boundedness of solutions of a system of ordinary differential equations, Research Reports of Akita National College of Technology, 20, 1985, 102—104.