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Summary. We construct nonconstant lower and upper functions for the periodic boundary value problem $u^{\prime \prime}=f(t, u), u(0)=u(2 \pi), u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(2 \pi)$ and find their estimates. By means of these results we prove existence criteria for the problems $u^{\prime \prime} \pm g(u)=e(t), u(0)=u(2 \pi), u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(2 \pi)$, where $\lim \sup _{x \rightarrow 0+} g(x)=\infty$ is allowed and $e \in \mathbb{L}[0,2 \pi]$ need not be essentially bounded.
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## 1. Introduction

In this paper we construct lower and upper functions to the periodic boundary value problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}=f(t, u), \quad u(0)=u(2 \pi), \quad u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(2 \pi) . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

By means of these results we prove existence criteria for the problems

$$
u^{\prime \prime} \pm g(u)=e(t), \quad u(0)=u(2 \pi), \quad u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(2 \pi)
$$

where $\lim \sup _{x \rightarrow 0+} g(x)=\infty$ is allowed and $e \in \mathbb{L}[0,2 \pi]$ need not be essentially bounded. We assume that $f:[0,2 \pi] \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ fulfils the Carathéodory conditions on $[0,2 \pi] \times \mathbb{R}$, i.e. $f$ has the following properties: (i) for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ the function $f(., x)$ is measurable on $[0,2 \pi]$; (ii) for almost every $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ the function $f(t,$.$) is continuous$ on $\mathbb{R}$; (iii) for each compact set $\mathrm{K} \subset \mathbb{R}$ the function $m_{\mathrm{K}}(t)=\sup _{x \in \mathrm{~K}}|f(t, x)|$ is Lebesgue integrable on $[0,2 \pi]$.

[^0]For a given subinterval $J$ of $\mathbb{R}$ (possibly unbounded) $\mathbb{C}(J)$ denotes the set of functions continuous on $J$. Furthermore, $\mathbb{L}[0,2 \pi]$ stands for the set of functions Lebesgue integrable on $[0,2 \pi], \mathbb{L}_{2}[0,2 \pi]$ is the set of functions square Lebesgue integrable on $[0,2 \pi]$ and $\mathbb{A C}[0,2 \pi]$ denotes the set of functions absolutely continuous on $[0,2 \pi]$. For $x$ bounded on $[0,2 \pi], y \in \mathbb{L}[0,2 \pi]$ and $z \in \mathbb{L}_{2}[0,2 \pi]$ we denote

$$
\begin{gathered}
\|x\|_{\mathbb{C}}=\sup _{t \in[0,2 \pi]}|x(t)|, \quad \bar{y}=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} y(s) \mathrm{d} s \\
\|y\|_{1}=\int_{0}^{2 \pi}|y(t)| \mathrm{d} t \quad \text { and } \quad\|z\|_{2}=\left(\int_{0}^{2 \pi} z^{2}(t) \mathrm{d} t\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} .
\end{gathered}
$$

By a solution of (1.1) we mean a function $u:[0,2 \pi] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that $u^{\prime} \in$ $\mathbb{A C}[0,2 \pi], u(0)=u(2 \pi), u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(2 \pi)$ and

$$
u^{\prime \prime}(t)=f(t, u(t)) \quad \text { for a.e. } t \in[0,2 \pi] .
$$

1.1. Definition. A function $\sigma_{1} \in \mathbb{A} \mathbb{C}[0,2 \pi]$ is said to be a lower function of the problem (1.1) if $\sigma_{1}^{\prime} \in \mathbb{A} \mathbb{C}[0,2 \pi]$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\sigma_{1}^{\prime \prime}(t) \geq f\left(t, \sigma_{1}(t)\right) \quad \text { for a.e. } t \in[0,2 \pi], \\
\sigma_{1}(0)=\sigma_{1}(2 \pi), \quad \sigma_{1}^{\prime}(0) \geq \sigma_{1}^{\prime}(2 \pi) .
\end{gathered}
$$

Similarly, a function $\sigma_{2} \in \mathbb{A} \mathbb{C}[0,2 \pi]$ is said to be an upper functions of the problem (1.1) if $\sigma_{2}^{\prime} \in \mathbb{A} \mathbb{C}[0,2 \pi]$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\sigma_{2}^{\prime \prime}(t) \leq f\left(t, \sigma_{2}(t)\right) \quad \text { for a.e. } t \in[0,2 \pi] \\
\sigma_{2}(0)=\sigma_{2}(2 \pi), \quad \sigma_{2}^{\prime}(0) \leq \sigma_{2}^{\prime}(2 \pi) .
\end{gathered}
$$

The lower and upper functions approach we will use here is based on the following theorem which is contained in [8, Theorems 4.1 and 4.2].
1.2. Theorem. Let $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$ be respectively a lower and an upper function of the problem (1.1).
(I) Suppose $\sigma_{1}(t) \leq \sigma_{2}(t)$ on $[0,2 \pi]$. Then there is a solution $u$ of the problem (1.1) such that $\sigma_{1}(t) \leq u(t) \leq \sigma_{2}(t)$ on $[0,2 \pi]$.
(II) Suppose $\sigma_{1}(t) \geq \sigma_{2}(t)$ on $[0,2 \pi]$ and there is $m \in \mathbb{L}[0,2 \pi]$ such that $f(t, x) \geq m(t)($ or $f(t, x) \leq m(t))$ for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then there is a solution $u$ of the problem (1.1) such that $\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}} \leq\|m\|_{1}$ and

$$
\sigma_{2}\left(t_{u}\right) \leq u\left(t_{u}\right) \leq \sigma_{1}\left(t_{u}\right) \quad \text { for some } t_{u} \in[0,2 \pi]
$$

## 2. Construction of lower and upper functions

2.1. Proposition. Assume that there are $A \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b \in \mathbb{L}[0,2 \pi]$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \bar{b}=0  \tag{2.1}\\
& f(t, x) \leq b(t) \text { for a.e. } t \in[0,2 \pi] \text { and all } x \in[A, B] \tag{2.2}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
B=A+\frac{\pi}{3}\|b\|_{1} . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then there exist a lower function $\sigma$ of the problem (1.1) such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
A \leq \sigma(t) \leq B \text { on }[0,2 \pi] . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Define

$$
\sigma_{0}(t)=c_{0}+\int_{0}^{2 \pi} g(t, s) b(s) \mathrm{d} s \quad \text { for } t \in[0,2 \pi]
$$

where

$$
g(t, s)= \begin{cases}\frac{t(s-2 \pi)}{2 \pi} & \text { if } 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 2 \pi \\ \frac{(t-2 \pi) s}{2 \pi} & \text { if } 0 \leq s<t \leq 2 \pi\end{cases}
$$

and

$$
c_{0}=-\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(\int_{0}^{2 \pi} g(t, s) b(s) \mathrm{d} s\right) \mathrm{d} t
$$

As $g$ is the Green function of the problem $v^{\prime \prime}=0, v(0)=v(2 \pi), v^{\prime}(0)=v^{\prime}(2 \pi)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{0}^{\prime \prime}(t)=b(t) \quad \text { a.e. on }[0,2 \pi] \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{0}(0)=\sigma_{0}(2 \pi), \quad \sigma_{0}^{\prime}(0)=\sigma_{0}^{\prime}(2 \pi) \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying the relation (2.5) by $\sigma_{0}$, integrating it over [ $0,2 \pi$ ] and using the Hölder inequality we get

$$
\left\|\sigma_{0}^{\prime}\right\|_{2}^{2} \leq\|b\|_{1}\left\|\sigma_{0}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}}
$$

Further, as $\overline{\sigma_{0}}=0$, the Sobolev inequality (see [5, Proposition 1.3]) yields

$$
\left\|\sigma_{0}^{\prime}\right\|_{2}^{2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{6}}\|b\|_{1}\left\|\sigma_{0}^{\prime}\right\|_{2}
$$

and so

$$
\left\|\sigma_{0}^{\prime}\right\|_{2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{6}}\|b\|_{1},
$$

wherefrom using again the Sobolev inequality we get

$$
\left\|\sigma_{0}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}} \leq \frac{\pi}{6}\|b\|_{1} .
$$

Thus, the function $\sigma$ given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma(t)=\frac{\pi}{6}\|b\|_{1}+A+\sigma_{0}(t) \quad \text { for } t \in[0,2 \pi] \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

satisfies (2.4). Furthermore, according to (2.1),(2.2) and (2.6), (2.7) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma^{\prime \prime}(t)=\sigma_{0}^{\prime \prime}(t)=b(t) \geq f(t, \sigma(t)) \text { for a.e. } t \in[0,2 \pi] \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma(0)=\sigma(2 \pi), \quad \sigma^{\prime}(0)=\sigma^{\prime}(2 \pi) \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

i.e. $\sigma$ is the lower function of (1.1).

The following assertion is dual to Proposition 2.1 and its proof can be omitted.
2.2. Proposition. Assume that there are $A \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b \in \mathbb{L}[0,2 \pi]$ such that

$$
\bar{b}=0
$$

and

$$
f(t, x) \geq a+b(t) \text { for a.e. } t \in[0,2 \pi] \text { and all } x \in[A, B]
$$

where $B$ is given by (2.3). Then there exist an upper function $\sigma$ of the problem (1.1) with the property (2.4).

## 3 . Applications to Lazer-Solimini singular problems

In this section we will consider possibly singular problems of the attractive type

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+g(u)=e(t), \quad u(0)=u(2 \pi), \quad u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(2 \pi) \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and of the repulsive type

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}-g(u)=e(t), \quad u(0)=u(2 \pi), \quad u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(2 \pi) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
g \in \mathbb{C}(0, \infty) \quad \text { and } \quad e \in \mathbb{L}[0,2 \pi] \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and it is allowed that $\lim \sup _{x \rightarrow 0+} g(x)=\infty$.
The problem (3.1) has been studied by Lazer and Solimini in [6] for $e \in \mathbb{C}[0,2 \pi]$ and $g$ positive. In [9, Corollary 3.3], their existence result has been extended to $e \in \mathbb{L}[0,2 \pi]$ essentially bounded from above. Here, we bring conditions for the existence of solutions to (3.1) without boundedness of $e$.
3.1. Theorem. Assume (3.3) and let there exist $A_{1}, A_{2} \in(0, \infty)$ such that

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
g(x) \geq \bar{e} & \text { for all } & x \in\left[A_{1}, B_{1}\right] \\
g(x) \leq \bar{e} & \text { for all } & x \in\left[A_{2}, B_{2}\right] \tag{3.5}
\end{array}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{1}-A_{1}=B_{2}-A_{2}=\frac{\pi}{3}\|e-\bar{e}\|_{1} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $A_{2} \geq B_{1}$.
Then the problem (3.1) has a solution $u$ such that $A_{1} \leq u(t) \leq B_{2}$ on $[0,2 \pi]$.
Proof. Define for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$,

$$
f(t, x)=e(t)-\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
g\left(A_{1}\right) & \text { if } x<A_{1} \\
g(x) & \text { if } x \geq A_{1}
\end{array}\right.
$$

Then $f$ satisfies the Carathéodory conditions on $[0,2 \pi] \times \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, by (3.4) and (3.6), $f$ satisfies $(2.1)-(2.3)$ with $b(t)=e(t)-\bar{e}$ a.e. on $[0,2 \pi]$ and $[A, B]=$ [ $A_{1}, B_{1}$ ]. Hence, by Proposition 2.1 there exists a lower function $\sigma_{1}$ of (1.1) such that $\sigma_{1}(t) \in\left[A_{1}, B_{1}\right]$ for all $t \in[0,2 \pi]$. Similarly, (3.5), (3.6) and Proposition 2.2 yield the existence of an upper function $\sigma_{2}$ of (1.1) such that $\sigma_{2}(t) \in\left[A_{2}, B_{2}\right]$ on $[0,2 \pi]$. Now, since $A_{2} \geq B_{1}$, we have $\sigma_{1}(t) \leq \sigma_{2}(t)$ on $[0,2 \pi]$ and the assertion (I) of Theorem 1.2 gives the existence of a desired solution $u$ to (1.1) which is also a solution to (3.1), of course.

Classical Lazer and Solimini's considerations [6] of the repulsive problem (3.2) have been extended by several authors (see e.g. [1], [2], [3], [4], [7] and [11]). Here we present a related result, where $e$ need not be essentially bounded.
3.2. Theorem. Assume (3.3),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{x \rightarrow 0+} \int_{x}^{1} g(\xi) \mathrm{d} \xi=\infty \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{*}:=\inf _{x \in(0, \infty)} g(x)>-\infty . \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, let there exist $A_{1}, A_{2} \in(0, \infty)$ such that

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
g(x) \leq-\bar{e} & \text { for all } x \in\left[A_{1}, B_{1}\right] \\
g(x) \geq-\bar{e} & \text { for all } x \in\left[A_{2}, B_{2}\right] \tag{3.10}
\end{array}
$$

where (3.6) is true and $A_{1} \geq B_{2}$.
Then the problem (3.2) has a positive solution.
Proof. Denote

$$
K=\|e\|_{1}+\left|g_{*}\right|, \quad B=B_{1}+2 \pi K \quad \text { and } \quad K^{*}=K\|e\|_{1}+\int_{A_{2}}^{B}|g(x)| \mathrm{d} x .
$$

It follows from (3.7) that $\lim \sup _{x \rightarrow 0+} g(x)=\infty$ and there exists $\varepsilon \in\left(0, A_{2}\right)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\varepsilon}^{A_{2}} g(x) \mathrm{d} x>K^{*} \quad \text { and } \quad g(\varepsilon)>0 \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define

$$
\tilde{g}(x)= \begin{cases}g(x) & \text { if } \quad x \geq \varepsilon \\ g(\varepsilon) & \text { if } \quad x<\varepsilon\end{cases}
$$

and

$$
f(t, x)=e(t)+\widetilde{g}(x) \text { for a.e. } t \in[0,2 \pi] \text { and all } x \in \mathbb{R} .
$$

Now, we can argue as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 and get a lower function $\sigma_{1}$ and an upper function $\sigma_{2}$ of (1.1) such that $\sigma_{1}(t) \geq \sigma_{2}(t)$ on [ $\left.0,2 \pi\right]$. The assertion (II) of Theorem 1.2 (with $m(t)=g_{*}+e(t)$ a.e. on $[0,2 \pi]$ ) implies that (1.1) has a solution $u$ such that $u\left(t_{u}\right) \in\left[A_{2}, B_{1}\right]$ for some $t_{u} \in[0,2 \pi]$ and $\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}} \leq K$. It remains to show that $u(t) \geq \varepsilon$ holds on $[0,2 \pi]$.

Let $t_{0}$ and $t_{1} \in[0,2 \pi]$ be such that

$$
u\left(t_{0}\right)=\min _{t \in[0,2 \pi]} u(t) \quad \text { and } \quad u\left(t_{1}\right)=\max _{t \in[0,2 \pi]} u(t) .
$$

Clearly, $A_{2} \leq u\left(t_{1}\right) \leq B$. With respect to the periodic boundary conditions we have $u^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=u^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)=0$. Now, multiplying the differential relation $u^{\prime \prime}(t)=e(t)+\widetilde{g}(u(t))$ by $u^{\prime}(t)$ and integrating over $\left[t_{0}, t_{1}\right]$, we get

$$
0=\int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} u^{\prime \prime}(t) u^{\prime}(t) \mathrm{d} t=\int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} e(t) u^{\prime}(t) \mathrm{d} t+\int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} \widetilde{g}(u(t)) u^{\prime}(t) \mathrm{d} t
$$

i.e.

$$
\int_{u\left(t_{0}\right)}^{u\left(t_{1}\right)} \widetilde{g}(x) \mathrm{d} x=-\int_{t_{0}}^{t_{1}} e(t) u^{\prime}(t) \mathrm{d} t \leq K\|e\|_{1} .
$$

Further,

$$
\int_{u\left(t_{0}\right)}^{A_{2}} \widetilde{g}(x) \mathrm{d} x \leq K\|e\|_{1}+\int_{A_{2}}^{B}|\widetilde{g}(x)| \mathrm{d} x=K^{*}
$$

which, with respect to (3.11), is possible only if $u\left(t_{0}\right) \geq \varepsilon$. Thus, $u$ is a solution to (3.2).
3.3. Example. Let $g(x)=\frac{1}{x^{\gamma}}$ on $(0, \infty)$. If $\gamma>0$, then Theorem 3.1 ensures the existence of a positive solution to (3.1) for any $e \in \mathbb{L}[0,2 \pi]$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{e}>0 \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{\pi}{3} \bar{e}^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}\|e-\bar{e}\|_{\mathbb{L}}<1 \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The function $e(t)=c+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi t}}-\frac{1}{\pi}$ with $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is not essentially bounded from above on $[0,2 \pi]$. However, it satisfies (3.12) if

$$
0<c<\left(\frac{3}{\pi}\right)^{\gamma}
$$

We should mention that provided $e \in \mathbb{C}[0,2 \pi]$ or $e$ is essentially bounded from above, the condition $\bar{e}>0$ is sufficient for the existence of a solution to (3.1) (cf. [6] or [9], respectively.
3.4. Example. Let $e \in \mathbb{L}[0,2 \pi]$ be essentially unbounded from below and let

$$
g(x)=\frac{1+\sin \left(\frac{\pi}{x}\right)}{x}-\arctan (x), \quad x \in(0, \infty)
$$

Then $g$ verifies the assumptions (3.3), (3.7) and (3.8) of Theorem 3.2. Let us suppose that $\bar{e}=-5$. Then the equation $g(x)=5$ has exactly 5 roots in the interval $[0.125, \infty)$. In particular, we have (see Figures 1 and 2)

$$
\begin{gathered}
x_{1} \approx 0.126804, x_{2} \approx 0.141071, x_{3} \approx 0.167853, x_{4} \approx 0.200541, x_{5} \approx 0.244461 \\
g(x)>5 \text { on }\left(x_{2}, x_{3}\right) \cup\left(x_{4}, x_{5}\right) \quad \text { and } g(x)<5 \text { on }\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \cup\left(x_{3}, x_{4}\right) \cup\left(x_{5}, \infty\right) .
\end{gathered}
$$

Therefore, by Theorem 3.2, if

$$
\|e-\bar{e}\|_{\mathbb{L}} \leq \frac{3}{\pi}\left(x_{5}-x_{4}\right) \approx 0.0419392
$$

the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}=\frac{1+\sin \left(\frac{\pi}{u}\right)}{u}-\arctan (u)+e(t), \quad u(0)=u(2 \pi), \quad u^{\prime}(0)=u^{\prime}(2 \pi) \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$
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Figure 5
has a solution $u_{1}$ such that $u_{1}\left(t^{*}\right) \in\left[x_{4}, x_{5}+d_{1}\right]$ for some $t^{*} \in[0,2 \pi]$, where $d_{1}=$ $x_{5}-x_{4}$ (see Figure 3).

Similarly, by Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, if

$$
\|e-\bar{e}\|_{\mathbb{L}}<\frac{3}{2 \pi}\left(x_{5}-x_{4}\right) \approx 0.0209699
$$

the problem (3.13) has at least 2 different solutions $u_{1}$ and $u_{2}$, where $u_{1}\left(t^{*}\right) \in$ $\left(x_{5}-d_{2}, x_{5}+d_{2}\right)$ for some $t^{*} \in[0,2 \pi]$ and $u_{2}(t) \in\left(x_{4}-d_{2}, x_{4}+d_{2}\right)$ for all $t \in[0,2 \pi]$, where $d_{2}=\frac{1}{2}\left(x_{5}-x_{4}\right)$ (see Figure 4).

Finally, if

$$
\|e-\bar{e}\|_{\mathbb{L}} \leq \frac{3}{\pi}\left(x_{2}-x_{1}\right) \approx 0.0136238
$$

the problem (3.13) has at least 3 different solutions $u_{1}, u_{2}$ and $u_{3}$, where $u_{1}\left(t^{*}\right) \in$ $\left[x_{5}-d_{3}, x_{5}+d_{3}\right]$ for some $t^{*} \in[0,2 \pi], u_{2}(t) \in\left[x_{4}-d_{3}, x_{4}+d_{3}\right]$ for all $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and $u_{3}(t) \in\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]$ for all $t \in[0,2 \pi]$, where $d_{3}=x_{2}-x_{1}$ (see Figure 5).
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