

*A Correction to "Forced Oscillations in General Ordinary  
Differential Equations with Deviating Arguments"*

Bhagat SINGH

(Received February 14, 1978)

**1. Introduction**

In [1] this author presented conditions to ensure that all oscillatory solutions of the equation

$$(1) \quad (r(t)y'(t))^{(n-1)} + a(t)y_{\tau}(t) = f(t), \quad y_{\tau}(t) \equiv y(t - \tau(t))$$

approach zero as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . The proof of the main result (Lemma (1)) was based on the "truth" of the inequality

$$(2) \quad \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_s^p a(t) dt ds \right| \leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_t^{t_2} |a(s)| ds dt$$

where  $t_1 < p < t_2$  and  $a(t)$  continuous in  $[t_1, t_2]$ .

But this inequality (cf. Staikos and Philos [2]) is false as the following counter example (due to Prof. T. Kusano of Hiroshima University) shows:

$$\int_{\pi}^{5\pi} \int_s^{5\pi} |f(t)| dt ds = 3\pi \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \int_{\pi}^{5\pi} \int_s^{2\pi} f(t) dt ds \right| = 5\pi$$

where

$$f(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & (\pi \leq t < 2\pi) \\ \sin t & (2\pi \leq t \leq 3\pi) \\ 0 & (3\pi \leq t \leq 5\pi). \end{cases}$$

However the conclusion of this crucial lemma remains true with a very minor change. We shall consider the following more general equation

$$(3) \quad (r(t)y'(t))^{(n-1)} + a(t)h(y(g(t))) = f(t)$$

subject to similar assumptions. More precisely we assume

- (i)  $a(t), r(t), g(t), h(t), f(t)$  are real, continuous on the whole real line  $R$ ;
- (ii)  $r(t) > 0, g(t) \leq t, g(t) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ;
- (iii)  $0 \leq \frac{h(t)}{t} \leq m$ , for some:  $m > 0, t > 0$ .