

Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis. Facultas Rerum
Naturalium. Mathematica

Irena Rachůnková; Jan Tomeček

On nonlinear boundary value problem for systems of differential equations with impulses

Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis. Facultas Rerum Naturalium. Mathematica, Vol. 41 (2002), No. 1, 119--129

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/120445>

Terms of use:

© Palacký University Olomouc, Faculty of Science, 2002

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

On Nonlinear Boundary Value Problem for Systems of Differential Equations with Impulses^{*}

IRENA RACHŮNKOVÁ, JAN TOMEČEK

*Department of Mathematical Analysis and Applications of Mathematics
Faculty of Science, Palacký University
Tomkova 40, 779 00 Olomouc, Czech Republic
e-mail: rachunko@risc.upol.cz*

(Received January 24, 2002)

Abstract

This work deals with nonlinear boundary value problems for systems of differential equations with impulses. Using the lower and upper functions method we prove the existence of a solution of such a problem. We consider both problems having upper functions greater than lower ones and problems with opposite ordered upper and lower functions.

Key words: First order nonlinear ordinary systems of differential equations, lower and upper functions, nonlinear boundary value conditions, impulses.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 34B37, 34B15, 34C25

1 Introduction

In this paper we will study impulsive boundary value problems with nonlinear boundary conditions.

Boundary value problems with impulses have received a lot of attention in the literature. We can refer to the works [1]–[7]. Most of them deal with periodic

^{*}Supported by the grant No. 201/01/1451 of the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic and by the Council of Czech Government J14/98:153100011.

boundary conditions. The scalar case of impulsive problems with nonlinear conditions has been studied by E. Liz in [5] and by the authors in [7]. Here, we extend the lower and upper functions method on the vector case and prove the existence results both for upper functions which are greater than lower ones $\alpha \leq \beta$ and for the opposite case of their ordering $\alpha \geq \beta$. Our proofs are based on the Schauder fixed point theorem.

Let us consider the interval $J = [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$, where $a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_p < t_{p+1} = b$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. First, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $|\cdot| : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the Eukleidian norm. We will work with the Banach spaces $X_j = C_n[t_j, t_{j+1}]$ (the space of functions $x_{(j)} : [t_j, t_{j+1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ continuous on $[t_j, t_{j+1}]$ with the norm $\|x_{(j)}\|_C = \max_{t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]} |x_{(j)}(t)|$) for $j = 0, \dots, p$. Further with the Banach space X (the space of functions x of the following form

$$x(t) = \begin{cases} x_{(0)}(t) & \text{for } t \in [a, t_1] \\ x_{(1)}(t) & \text{for } t \in (t_1, t_2] \\ \dots\dots\dots \\ x_{(p)}(t) & \text{for } t \in (t_p, b] \end{cases},$$

where $x_{(j)} \in X_j$ for $j = 0, \dots, p$. Here we write $x = [x_{(0)}, \dots, x_{(p)}]_X$. X is endowed with the norm $\|x\| = \max_{j=0, \dots, p} \|x_{(j)}\|_C$. Similarly we will use the Banach space Y (the space of functions y of the following form

$$y(t) = \begin{cases} x_{(0)}(t) & \text{for } t \in [a, t_1) \\ x_{(1)}(t) & \text{for } t \in [t_1, t_2) \\ \dots\dots\dots \\ x_{(p)}(t) & \text{for } t \in [t_p, b] \end{cases},$$

where $x_{(j)} \in X_j$ for $j = 0, \dots, p$, with the norm $\|y\| = \max_{j=0, \dots, p} \|x_{(j)}\|_C$. We write $y = [x_{(0)}, \dots, x_{(p)}]_Y$. We say that $f : J \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ fulfils the Carathéodory conditions on $J \times \mathbb{R}^n$, if f has the following properties: (i) for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the function $f(\cdot, x)$ is measurable on J ; (ii) for almost each $t \in J$ the function $f(t, \cdot)$ is continuous on \mathbb{R}^n ; (iii) for each compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists Lebesgue integrable function $m_K : J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $|f(t, x)| \leq m_K(t)$ for a.e. $t \in J$ and all $x \in K$. For the set of functions satisfying the Carathéodory conditions on $J \times \mathbb{R}^n$ we write $Car(J \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. For a subset Ω of a Banach space, $\text{cl}(\Omega)$ and $\partial\Omega$ stand for the closure and the boundary of Ω , respectively.

2 Existence results provided $\alpha \leq \beta$

We will investigate the impulsive problem

$$x'(t) = f(t, x(t)) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in J, \tag{1}$$

$$x(t_j+) = I_j(x(t_j)), \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \tag{2}$$

$$h(x(a), x(b)) = 0, \tag{3}$$

where $f \in Car(J \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, $I_j \in C_n(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, and $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$.

Definition 1 A function $F(z, x) : D \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $F = (F_1, \dots, F_n)$ is called quasimonotonously nondecreasing (nonincreasing) in variable x , if for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and for every $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n), y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $x \leq y$ and $x_i = y_i$, the inequality $F_i(z, x) \leq F_i(z, y)$ ($F_i(z, x) \geq F_i(z, y)$) is valid for each $z \in D$.

Definition 2 By AC_n^- we mean a set of functions $x : J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, which are absolutely continuous on $(t_j, t_{j+1}), j = 0, \dots, p, x(t_j) = x(t_j-), j = 1, \dots, p+1, u(a) = u(a+)$. A function $x \in AC_n^-$, which satisfies conditions (1)–(3) is called a solution of problem (1)–(3).

Definition 3 A function $\sigma \in AC_n^-$ is called a lower (upper) function of problem (1)–(3) provided the conditions

$$[\sigma'(t) - f(t, \sigma(t))](-1)^k \geq 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in J, \tag{4}$$

$$[\sigma(t_j+) - I_j(\sigma(t_j))](-1)^k \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \tag{5}$$

$$h(\sigma(a), \sigma(b))(-1)^k \geq 0, \tag{6}$$

where $k = 1$ ($k = 2$), are satisfied.

Let α, β be lower and upper functions of problem (1)–(3) and

$$\alpha \leq \beta \quad \text{on } J. \tag{7}$$

Next, we define function $\gamma : J \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\gamma_i(t, x) = \begin{cases} \alpha_i(t) & \text{for } x_i < \alpha_i(t), \\ x_i & \text{for } \alpha_i(t) \leq x_i \leq \beta_i(t), \\ \beta_i(t) & \text{for } \beta_i(t) < x_i, \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

for $t \in J, x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, \dots, n$, where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n), \beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$, and function $\tilde{f} : J \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\tilde{f}(t, x) = f(t, \gamma(t, x)), \quad f \in \text{Car}(J \times \mathbb{R}^n). \tag{9}$$

Further, we assume that

$$h(x, y) \text{ is quasimonotonously nonincreasing in variable } x, \left. \begin{array}{l} \text{and nonincreasing in variable } y, \end{array} \right\} \tag{10}$$

$$I_{ji} \text{ are nondecreasing in all variables, for } j = 1, \dots, p \left. \begin{array}{l} \text{and } i = 1, \dots, n, I_j = (I_{j1}, \dots, I_{jn}) \end{array} \right\} \tag{11}$$

$$f(t, x) \text{ is quasimonotonously nondecreasing in variable } x \tag{12}$$

and consider an auxiliary problem

$$x'(t) = \tilde{f}(t, x(t)) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (t_j, t_{j+1}), \quad j = 0, \dots, p, \tag{13}$$

$$x(t_j+) - x(t_j) = I_j(\gamma(t_j, x(t_j))) - \gamma(t_j, x(t_j)), \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \tag{14}$$

$$x(a) = \gamma(a, x(a) - h(x(a), x(b))). \tag{15}$$

Proposition 1 *Let x be a solution of problem (13)–(15) and let α, β be lower and upper functions of problem (1)–(3). Let us suppose (7)–(12) hold. Then*

$$\alpha \leq x \leq \beta \quad \text{on } J, \quad (16)$$

and consequently x is a solution of (1)–(3).

Proof Let us put $z(t) = \alpha(t) - x(t)$ for each $t \in J$ (write $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$). Now, we take arbitrary $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. According to (15), we have $x_i(a) \in [\alpha_i(a), \beta_i(a)]$, which means that $z_i(a) \leq 0$. Suppose that there exists $q_1 \in (a, t_1)$ such that

$$z_i(q_1) > 0. \quad (17)$$

Since z_i is continuous on $[a, t_1]$, we can find $q_0 \in [a, q_1)$ such that

$$z_i(q_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad z_i > 0 \quad \text{on } (q_0, q_1]. \quad (18)$$

In view of (12), (13) and the fact that $\gamma_k(t, x(t)) \geq \alpha_k(t)$ for $t \in J$ and for $k = 1, \dots, n, k \neq i$, we have

$$x'_i(t) = \tilde{f}_i(t, x(t)) = f_i(t, \gamma_1(t, x(t)), \dots, \alpha_i(t), \dots, \gamma_n(t, x(t))) \geq f_i(t, \alpha(t))$$

for a.e. $t \in (q_0, q_1)$. According to (4), we have

$$z'_i(t) = \alpha'_i(t) - x'_i(t) \leq f_i(t, \alpha(t)) - \tilde{f}_i(t, x(t)) \leq 0, \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (q_0, q_1). \quad (19)$$

Therefore

$$0 \geq \int_{q_0}^{q_1} z'_i(t) dt = z_i(q_1) - z_i(q_0) = z_i(q_1),$$

which contradicts (17). Thus, we get

$$\alpha_i \leq x_i \quad \text{on } [a, t_1], \text{ for each } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

By this fact, (11) and (14), the inequalities

$$\alpha_i(t_1+) \leq I_{1i}(\alpha(t_1)) \leq I_{1i}(x(t_1)) = x_i(t_1+)$$

are true for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, so $z_i(t_1+) \leq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Now, we take arbitrary $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let us suppose that there exists $q_1 \in (t_1, t_2]$ such that (17) is true. Then we can find $q_0 \in [t_1, q_1)$ such that

$$z_i(q_0+) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad z_i > 0 \quad \text{on } (q_0, q_1]. \quad (20)$$

Then, by (19), it is valid

$$0 \geq \int_{q_0}^{q_1} z'_i(t) dt = z_i(q_1) - z_i(q_0+) = z_i(q_1)$$

and we get a contradiction to (17). We can prove the inequality $z_i \leq 0$ on $(t_1, t_2]$ similarly as in the previous paragraph. In such a way we can argue at

Clearly Ω is nonempty, convex, closed and bounded set in X . We can check that the operator $T : \Omega \rightarrow X$ given by

$$Tx(t) = \gamma(a, x(a) - h(x(a), x(b))) + \int_a^t \tilde{f}(s, x(s)) ds + \omega(t, x),$$

where ω is defined by (24), maps Ω to itself. Now, we prove that T is continuous. Let us take sequence $\{x_m\} \subset \Omega$ and $x \in \Omega$ such that x_m converges to x in X . Then $\tilde{f}(t, x_m(t))$ converges to $\tilde{f}(t, x(t))$ for a. e. $t \in J$. Since $\{x_m\}$ is convergent in X , it follows that we can find a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\{x_m(t)\} \subset K$ for each $m \in N$ and $t \in J$. So there exists a function $m_K(t)$, which is Lebesgue integrable on J , with a property

$$|\tilde{f}(t, x_m(t))| \leq m_K(t) \quad \text{for all } m \in N \text{ and a.e. } t \in J.$$

From the Lebesgue convergence theorem it follows that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^t \tilde{f}(s, x_m(s)) ds = \int_a^t \tilde{f}(s, x(s)) ds \quad \text{for each } t \in J. \quad (26)$$

Further,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tx_m - Tx\| &\leq \int_a^b |\tilde{f}(s, x_m(s)) - \tilde{f}(s, x(s))| ds \\ &+ |\gamma(a, x_m(a) - h(x_m(a), x_m(b))) - \gamma(a, x(a) - h(x(a), x(b)))| \\ &+ \max_{j=0, \dots, p} \max_{t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]} |\omega(t, x_m) - \omega(t, x)|. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

From (26) and continuity of functions γ , h and I_j ($j = 1, \dots, p$), it follows that the right side of the inequality (27) approaches zero as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore Tx_m converges to Tx in X .

Let us verify that $\text{cl}(T(\Omega))$ is a compact set. First, we define $\Gamma_j \subset X_j$, for $j = 0, \dots, p$ by

$$\Gamma_j = \{(Tx)_{(j)} : x \in X, \|x\|_C \leq M\},$$

where M is defined by (25). Obviously, if $y = [y_{(0)}, \dots, y_{(p)}]_X \in T(\Omega)$, then $y_{(j)} \in \Gamma_j$ for all $j = 0, \dots, p$. We can see that the functions of the set Γ_j are equicontinuous and uniformly bounded on compact interval $[t_j, t_{j+1}]$ for each $j = 0, \dots, p$. We take arbitrary sequence $\{Tx_m\} \subset T(\Omega)$ and write

$$Tx_m = [y_{m(0)}, \dots, y_{m(p)}]_X \quad \text{for each } m \in N.$$

From the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, it follows that there exists a subsequence of $\{y_{m(0)}\} \subset \Gamma_0$ (we write $\{y_{k_m(0)}\}$), which converges in X_0 to $y_{(0)} \in X_0$. Further, by applying this theorem on sequence $\{y_{k_m(1)}\} \subset \Gamma_1$, we get $\{y_{l_m(1)}\}$, which converges to $y_{(1)} \in X_1$ in X_1 . Then

$$\{y_{l_m(0)}\} \rightarrow y_{(0)} \text{ in } X_0 \text{ and } \{y_{l_m(1)}\} \rightarrow y_{(1)} \text{ in } X_1.$$

In the exactly same way, we proceed till the p -th component. Thus, there exists a subsequence of $\{Tx_m\}$, which converges in X to $[y_{(0)}, y_{(1)}, \dots, y_{(p)}]x \in \text{cl}(T(\Omega))$.

According to the Schauder fixed point theorem, there is a point $x \in \Omega$ such that

$$Tx = x,$$

which means that the function x is a solution of (23) and consequently a solution of (13)–(15). Proposition 1 implies that x is a solution of (1)–(3) and satisfies (22). \square

3 Existence results provided $\alpha \geq \beta$.

Now, we will investigate the impulsive problem (1),

$$x(t_j-) = I_j(x(t_j)), \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \tag{28}$$

and (3), where $f \in \text{Car}(J \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, $I_j \in C_n(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, and $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$.

Definition 4 By AC_n^+ we mean a set of functions $x : J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, which are absolutely continuous on (t_j, t_{j+1}) , $j = 0, \dots, p$, $x(t_j) = x(t_{j+})$, $j = 0, \dots, p$, $u(b) = u(b-)$. A function $x \in AC_n^+$, which satisfies conditions (1), (28), (3) is called a solution of problem (1), (28), (3).

Definition 5 A function $\sigma \in AC_n^+$ is called a lower (upper) function of problem (1), (28), (3) provided the conditions (4),

$$[I_j(\sigma(t_j)) - \sigma(t_j-)](-1)^k \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \tag{29}$$

and (6), where $k = 1$ ($k = 2$), are satisfied.

Let α, β be lower and upper functions of problem (1), (28), (3) and

$$\beta \leq \alpha \quad \text{on } J. \tag{30}$$

Next, we define function $\gamma : J \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\gamma_i(t, x) = \begin{cases} \beta_i(t) & \text{for } x_i < \beta_i(t) \\ x_i & \text{for } \beta_i(t) \leq x_i \leq \alpha_i(t) \text{ for each } t \in J, \\ \alpha_i(t) & \text{for } \alpha_i(t) < x_i \end{cases} \tag{31}$$

$x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$, $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$, and function $f : J \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by (9). Further, we assume that

$$\left. \begin{aligned} &h(x, y) \text{ is nondecreasing in variable } x, \\ &\text{and quasimonotonously nondecreasing in variable } y, \end{aligned} \right\} \tag{32}$$

$$f(t, x) \text{ is quasimonotonously nonincreasing in variable } x, \quad (33)$$

it is valid (11) and consider an auxiliary problem (13),

$$x(t_j-) - x(t_j) = I_j(\gamma(t_j, x(t_j))) - \gamma(t_j, x(t_j)), \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \quad (34)$$

$$x(b) = \gamma(b, x(b) + h(x(a), x(b))). \quad (35)$$

Proposition 2 *Let x be a solution of problem (13), (34), (35) and let α, β be lower and upper functions of problem (1), (28), (3). Let us suppose (30)–(33), (9), (11) hold. Then*

$$\beta \leq x \leq \alpha \quad \text{on } J, \quad (36)$$

and consequently x is a solution of (1), (28), (3).

Proof Let us put

$$z(t) = x(t) - \alpha(t) \quad \text{for each } t \in J$$

(write $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$). Now, we take arbitrary $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. According to (35), we have $x_i(b) \in [\beta_i(b), \alpha_i(b)]$, which means that $z_i(b) \leq 0$. Suppose that there exists $q_1 \in [t_p, b)$ such that

$$z_i(q_1) > 0. \quad (37)$$

Since z_i is continuous on $(t_p, b]$, we can find $q_0 \in (q_1, b]$ such that

$$z_i(q_0) = 0 \quad \text{and } z_i > 0 \text{ on } [q_1, q_0). \quad (38)$$

In view of (33), (13) and the fact that $\gamma_k(t, x(t)) \leq \alpha_k(t)$ for $t \in J$ and for $k = 1, \dots, n$, $k \neq i$, we have

$$x'_i(t) = \tilde{f}_i(t, x(t)) = f_i(t, \gamma_1(t, x(t)), \dots, \alpha_i(t), \dots, \gamma_n(t, x(t))) \geq f_i(t, \alpha(t))$$

for a.e. $t \in (q_1, q_0)$. According to (4), we have

$$z'_i(t) = x'_i(t) - \alpha'_i(t) \geq \tilde{f}_i(t, x(t)) - f_i(t, \alpha(t)) \geq 0, \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (q_1, q_0). \quad (39)$$

Therefore

$$0 \leq \int_{q_1}^{q_0} z'_i(t) dt = z_i(q_0) - z_i(q_1) = -z_i(q_1),$$

which contradicts (37). Thus, we get

$$x_i \leq \alpha_i \quad \text{on } [t_p, b], \text{ for each } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

By this fact, (11) and (34), the inequalities

$$\alpha_i(t_p-) \geq I_{pi}(\alpha(t_p)) \geq I_{pi}(x(t_p)) = x_i(t_p-)$$

are true for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, so $z_i(t_p-) \leq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Now, we take arbitrary $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let us suppose that there exists $q_1 \in (t_{p-1}, t_p)$ such that (37) is true. Then we can find $q_0 \in (q_1, t_p]$ such that

$$z_i(q_0-) = 0 \quad \text{and } z_i > 0 \text{ on } [q_1, q_0]. \tag{40}$$

Then, by (39), it is valid

$$0 \leq \int_{q_1}^{q_0} z'_i(t) dt = z_i(q_0-) - z_i(q_1) = -z_i(q_1)$$

and we get a contradiction to (37). We can prove the inequality $z_i \leq 0$ on $[t_{p-1}, t_p)$ similarly as in the previous paragraph. In such a way we can argue at each interval $[t_j, t_{j+1})$, $j = 0, \dots, p-1$, and we get $z_i \leq 0$ on J for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. It means that

$$x \leq \alpha \quad \text{on } J.$$

The second inequality in (36) can be proved similarly putting $z = \beta - x$ on J . Due to (36) we have

$$x'(t) = \tilde{f}(t, x(t)) = f(t, x(t)) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in J,$$

and (28) is true. It remains to prove that x fulfils (3). It is sufficient to show that

$$\beta(b) \leq x(b) + h(x(a), x(b)) \leq \alpha(b). \tag{41}$$

Let us suppose that the second inequality in (41) is not true. Then there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$\bar{\alpha}_i(b) < x_i(b) + h_i(x(a), x(b)).$$

In view to (35) we have $x_i(b) = \alpha_i(b)$, thus it follows from (32) that

$$0 < h_i(x(a), x(b)) \leq n_i(\alpha(a), \alpha(b))$$

which contradicts (6). We prove the second inequality in (41) similarly. □

Theorem 2 *Let α, β be lower and upper functions of problem (1), (28), (3). Further, suppose that $\beta \leq \alpha$ on J and (11), (32), (33) are true. Then there exists a solution x of problem (1), (28), (3) such that*

$$\beta \leq x \leq \alpha \quad \text{on } J. \tag{42}$$

Proof Consider the integral equation

$$x(t) = \gamma(b, x(b) + h(x(a), x(b))) + \int_b^t \tilde{f}(s, x(s)) ds + \tau(t, x) \quad \text{for all } t \in J, \tag{43}$$

We see that h , I_1 , I_2 and f fulfil conditions (10)–(12). We can take lower and upper functions as constant functions. That is

$$\alpha = (c_1, c_2), \quad \beta = (d_1, d_2), \quad (48)$$

where $c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ are suitable constants, such that $\alpha \leq \beta$ and the conditions (4)–(6) are satisfied. We can construct such functions easily, if we take $c_1, c_2 < 0$ sufficiently small and $d_1, d_2 > 0$ sufficiently large. Thus, we can use Theorem 1 and get that problem (1)–(3) has at least one solution. On the other hand Theorem 2 cannot be used for this problem.

Example 2 Let us consider problem (1), (28), (3), where $n = 2$, $f = (f_1, f_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(t, x_1, x_2) &= x_1^3 - x_2 + 10e^t, \\ f_2(t, x_1, x_2) &= -x_1 + x_2^5 + 15 \sin t, \end{aligned}$$

with impulsive functions (46) and boundary value conditions (47). Now, conditions (11), (32) and (33) are valid. We can again take lower and upper functions in the form (48). If we take $c_1, c_2 > 0$ sufficiently large and $d_1, d_2 < 0$ sufficiently small, we get that $\beta \leq \alpha$ and the conditions (4), (29), (6) are satisfied. Thus, according to Theorem 2, problem (1), (28), (3) has at least one solution. Let us note that Theorem 1 is not applicable for this problem.

References

- [1] D. D. Bainov, S. G. Hristova, S. Hu and V. Lakshmikantham, *Periodic boundary value problems for systems of first order impulsive differential equations*, Differential and Integral Equations **2** (1989), 37-43.
- [2] A. Cabada, E. Liz, *Boundary value problems for higher order ordinary differential equations with impulses*, Nonlinear Anal. **32** (1998), 775-786.
- [3] P. W. Eloe, J. Henderson, *A boundary value problem for a system of ordinary differential equations with impulse effects*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **27** (1997), 785-799.
- [4] V. Lakshmikantham, D. D. Bainov and P. S. Simeonov, *Theory of Impulsive Differential Equations*, World Scientific, Singapore 1989.
- [5] E. Liz, *Existence and approximation of solutions for impulsive first order problems with nonlinear boundary conditions*, Nonlin. Anal. TMA **25** (1995), 1191-1198.
- [6] J. J. Nieto, *Basic theory for nonresonance impulsive periodic problems of first order*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **205** (1997), 423-433.
- [7] I. Rachůnková, J. Tomeček, *On nonlinear boundary value problems with impulses*. Submitted.