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1. Introduction. This paper is devoted to the study of the periodic boundary value problem for the Lienard differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t)+f(x(t)) x^{\prime}(t)+g(t, x(t))=0 \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and its special case, the Duffing equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t)+c x^{\prime}(t)+g(t, x(t))=0 \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that the boundary conditions are taken on the interval $[0,2 \pi]$, namely,

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(0)-x(2 \pi)=x^{\prime}(0)-x^{\prime}(2 \pi)=0 \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Our results are only significant for the so-called forced case, i.e., when $g(t, 0) \not \equiv 0$.

There is a vast literature dealing with problems (1.1-1.3) and (1.2-1.3) and we refer to [10] and its bibliography for further references. For $f$ continuous and $g$ of the form $g(t, x)=h(x)-e(t)$ with $h$ and $e$ continuous and $e 2 \pi$-periodic, Reissig [9] has proved that problem (1.1-1.3) has at least one solution if

$$
0<\liminf _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(x)}{x} \leqq \lim _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \sup \frac{h(x)}{x}<1
$$

On the other hand, Amaral and Pera [1] have proved that problem (1.2-1.3) has at least one solution for the case where $c=0, g$ is $2 \pi$ periodic in $t$ and continuous,

$$
\alpha \leqq \gamma_{-}(t)=\liminf _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(t, x)}{x} \leqq \limsup _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(t, x)}{x}=\gamma_{+}(t) \leqq \beta<1
$$

uniformly in $t \in[0,2 \pi]$, for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$, and $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \gamma_{-}(t) d t>0$.

Both results are based on Leray-Schauder's type techniques and differ in the way of getting the required a priori estimates for the possible solutions. The aim of this paper is to adapt the approach introduced in [8] for semi-linear elliptic Dirichlet problems to prove existence theorems for (1.1-1.3) and (1.2-1.3) which unify the results of Reissig and of Amaral and Pera and extend them in various directions. Theorem 1 in $\S 3$ will prove the existence of a solution for (1.1-1.3) when $f$ is continuous, $g$ satisfies the Caratheodory conditions (see §3), and when the inequalities

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma(t) \leqq \liminf _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(t, x)}{x} \leqq \limsup _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(t, x)}{x} \leqq \Gamma(t) \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

hold uniformly a.e. in $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and $\gamma$ and $\Gamma$ are measurable functions such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi), \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \gamma(t) d t>0, \Gamma(t) \leqq 1 \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$, with the strict inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Gamma(t)<1 \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

on a subset of $[0,2 \pi]$ of positive measure.
Theorem 2 in $\S 4$ will show that the existence result still holds for problem (1.2-1.3) with arbitrary $c \in \mathbf{R}$ when one has $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \gamma(t) d t=0$ as soon as $\gamma(t) \neq 0$ on a subset of $[0,2 \pi]$ of positive measure, or, equivalently, as soon as $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \gamma^{+}(t) d t>0$, where we define, as usual, $\gamma^{+}$by $\max (\gamma, 0)$ and $\gamma^{-}$by $\max (-\gamma, 0)$. All the conditions are in particular satisfied for $\gamma(t)=\sin t$.

The approach used in this paper requires a preliminary study of problems of the form $x^{\prime \prime}(t)+f(x(t)) x^{\prime}(t)+p(t) x(t)=0$ or $x^{\prime \prime}(t)+c x^{\prime}(t)+$ $p(t) x(t)=0$ together with the boundary conditions (1.3). Results in this line are given in Lemmas 1 to 4 of $\S 2$ and $\S 4$, which can be of independent interest because the obtained results seem to be new even for the linear case.

The conditions (1.5)-(1.6) relate the asymptotic behavior of $g(t, x) / x$ to the two first eigenvalues 0 and 1 of the periodic boundary value problem on $[0,2 \pi]$ for the linear operator $-\left(d^{2} / d t^{2}\right)$. One shall notice that a crossing of the zero eigenvalue is allowed on subsets of $[0,2 \pi]$ of positive measure. Of course other results for (1.1)-(1.3) or (1.2)-(1.3) have been obtained or can be obtained when $g(t, x) / x$ is compared for $|x|$ large with other eigenvalues. In particular, it has been shown in [6] (see also [7]) that problem (1.1)-(1.3) has a solution for every continuous $f$ and Caratheodory $g$ if

$$
\gamma_{+}(t)=\limsup _{\mid x_{i} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(t, x)}{x} \leqq 0
$$

uniformly a.e. in $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma_{+} \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi), \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \gamma_{+}(t) d t<0 \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

More generally, it is proved in [4] for (1.2)-(1.3) with $c=0$ (but the result is easily extended to (1.1)-(1.3)), that existence still holds if (1.7) is replaced by

$$
\begin{gathered}
\gamma_{+} \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi), \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(\gamma_{+}\right)^{+}(t) d t<3 / 2 \pi \\
\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(\gamma_{+}\right)^{+}(t) d t-\left[1-\left((2 \pi / 3) \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(\gamma_{+}\right)^{+}(u) d u\right)^{1 / 2}\right]^{2} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(\gamma_{+}\right)^{-}(t) d t<0
\end{gathered}
$$

Those results, in which $g(t, x) / x$ is compared for large $|x|$ with the first eigenvalue 0 can also be obtained by the approach of the present paper. For problem (1.2-1.3), an easy adaptation of the method used in [8] furnishes the existence of at least one solution if for some $k \in \mathbf{N}^{*}$ the functions $\gamma_{-}$and $\gamma_{+}$defined in (1.4), are such that, for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$, one has $k^{2} \leqq \gamma_{-}(t), \gamma_{+}(t) \leqq(k+1)^{2}$, where in each relation, the strict inequality holds on a subset of $[0,2 \pi]$ of positive measure.

We also mention that, in contrast with the techniques used for getting a priori bounds in [1] and [9], our approach allows the study of similar problems for some systems of Lienard and Duffing equations to which a future paper will be devoted.

We end this introduction by mentioning that besides the classical spaces $C([0,2 \pi]), C^{k}([0,2 \pi])$ and $L^{k}(0,2 \pi)$ of continuous, $k$-times continuously differentiable or measurable real functions whose $k$-th power of the absolute value is Lebesgue integrable, we shall make use in what follows of the Sobolev spaces $W^{2,1}(0,2 \pi)$ and $H^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ respectively defined by $W^{2,1}(0,2 \pi)=\left\{x:[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \mid x\right.$ and $x^{\prime}$ are absolutely continuous on $[0,2 \pi]\}$, with norm

$$
|x|_{W^{2,1}}=\int_{0}^{2 \pi}|x(t)| d t+\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right| d t+\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right| d t
$$

and $H^{1}(0,2 \pi)=\{x:[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \mid x$ is absolutely continuous on $[0,2 \pi]$ and $\left.x^{\prime} \in L^{2}(0,2 \pi)\right\}$, with norm

$$
|x|_{H^{1}}=\left[\left((2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} x(t) d t\right)^{2}+(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} x^{\prime 2}(t) d t\right]^{1 / 2}
$$

In any used normed space, the strong and the weak convergence of sequences will be denoted respectively by $\rightarrow$ and $\rightarrow$, and we shall use the fact (see, e.g., [2]) that $H^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ is compactly imbedded into $C([0,2 \pi])$ and is a Hilbert space with inner product defined by

$$
(x, y)_{H^{1}}=\left((2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} x(t) d t\right)\left((2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} y(t) d t\right)+(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} x^{\prime}(t) y^{\prime}(t) d t
$$

2. An inequality for some Lienard operators with periodic boundary conditions. If $x \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$, we shall write $\bar{x}=(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} x(t) d t, \tilde{x}(t)=$ $x(t)-\bar{x}$, so that, $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \tilde{x}(t) d t=0$.

Lemma 1. Let $\gamma \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ and $\Gamma \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ be such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{\gamma}=(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \gamma(t) d t>0 \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and such that for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$, one has

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Gamma(t) \leqq 1 \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the strict inequality on a subset of $[0,2 \pi]$ of positive measure. Then there exists $\delta=\delta(\bar{\gamma}, \Gamma)>0$ such that for all $x \in H^{1}(0,2 \pi)$, one has

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{r, \Gamma}(x)=\bar{\gamma}^{2}+(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left[\left(\tilde{x}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\Gamma(t) \tilde{x}^{2}(t)\right] d t \geqq \delta|x|_{H^{1}}^{2} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. We first show that $B_{r, \Gamma}(x)=0$ if and only if $x=0$, the first part being trivial. Using (2.2) and Wirtinger's inequality [7], we see that, for all $x \in H^{1}(0,2 \pi)$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left[\left(\tilde{x}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\right. & \left.\Gamma(t) \tilde{x}^{2}(t)\right] d t  \tag{2.4}\\
& \geqq(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left[\left(\tilde{x}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\tilde{x}^{2}(t)\right] d t \geqq 0
\end{align*}
$$

with moreover $\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left[\left(\tilde{x}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\tilde{x}^{2}(t)\right] d t=0$ it and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{x}(t)=A \sin (t+\phi) \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $A \geqq 0$ and $\phi \in \mathbf{R}$. Thus both terms in the definition (2.3) of $B_{\gamma, I^{\prime}}(x)$ are nonnegative, so that, for all $x \in H^{1}(0,2 \pi)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{r, \Gamma}(x) \geqq 0 \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, if $B_{\gamma, \Gamma}(x)$ vanishes, then, by (2.1), we must have $\bar{x}=0$ and by (2.4), we must have

$$
\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left[\left(\tilde{x}^{\prime 2}(t)\right)^{2}-\Gamma(t) \tilde{x}^{2}(t)\right] d t=\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left[\left(\tilde{x}^{\prime}(t)\right]^{2}-\tilde{x}^{2}(t)\right] d t=0 .
$$

Consequently, $\tilde{x}$ is of the form (2.5) and

$$
0=\int_{0}^{2 \pi}(1-\Gamma(t)) \tilde{x}^{2}(t) d t=A^{2} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}(1-\Gamma(t)) \sin ^{2}(t+\phi) d t
$$

which implies $A=0$, hence $\tilde{x}=0$ and thus $x=0$. Assume now that the conclusion of the lemma is not true. We can then find a sequence $\left(x_{n}\right)$ in $H^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ and $x \in H^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ such that (see, e.g., [2]),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|x_{n}\right|_{H^{1}}=1, x_{n} \rightarrow x \text { in } C([0,2 \pi]), x_{n} \rightarrow x \text { in } H^{1}(0,2 \pi) \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leqq B_{r, \Gamma}\left(x_{n}\right) \leqq 1 / n, n \in \mathbf{N}^{*} \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the Schwarz inequality in $H^{1}(0,2 \pi)$, we have

$$
\left(\tilde{x}_{n}, \tilde{x}\right)_{H^{1}}^{2} \leqq\left|\tilde{x}_{n}\right|_{H^{1}}^{2}|\tilde{x}|_{H^{1}}^{2}, n \in \mathbf{N}^{*}
$$

and hence

$$
|\tilde{x}|_{H^{1}}^{2} \leqq \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\tilde{x}_{n}\right|_{H^{1}}^{2}
$$

By (2.7) and (2.8), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\tilde{x}_{n}\right|_{H^{1}}^{2}=-\bar{\gamma}^{2}+(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \Gamma(t) \tilde{x}^{2}(t) d t \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence

$$
|\tilde{x}|_{H^{1}}^{2} \leqq-\bar{\gamma}^{2}+(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \Gamma(t) \tilde{x}^{2}(t) d t
$$

i.e., $B_{\gamma, \Gamma}(x) \leqq 0$. By (2.6) and the first part of the proof, this implies that $x=0$ and hence, by (2.7) and (2.9), $\bar{x}_{n} \rightarrow 0,\left|\tilde{x}_{n}\right|_{H^{1}} \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., $\left|x_{n}\right|_{H^{1}} \rightarrow 0$, a contradiction with the first equality in (2.7), which completes the proof.

Lemma 2. Let $\gamma$ and $\Gamma$ be as in Lemma 1, let $\delta>0$ be associated to $\gamma$ and $\Gamma$ by that lemma and let $\varepsilon>0$. Then for all measurable real functions $p$ on $[0,2 \pi]$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma(t)-\varepsilon \leqq p(t) \leqq \Gamma(t)+\varepsilon \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

a.e. on $[0,2 \pi]$, all continuous functions $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and all $x \in W^{2,1}(0,2 \pi)$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(0)-x(2 \pi)=x^{\prime}(0)-x^{\prime}(2 \pi)=0 \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

one has

$$
(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}(\bar{x}-\tilde{x}(t))\left(x^{\prime \prime}(t)+f(x(t)) x^{\prime}(t)+p(t) x(t) d t \geqq(\delta-\varepsilon)|x|_{H^{1}}^{2}\right.
$$

Proof. If $x \in W^{2,1}(0,2 \pi)$ and satisfies (2.11), then we obtain easily, using integration by parts and Lemma 1,

$$
\begin{gathered}
(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}(\bar{x}-\tilde{x}(t))\left(x^{\prime \prime}(t)+f(x(t)) x^{\prime}(t)+p(t) x(t)\right) d t \\
\left.\quad=\bar{p} \bar{x}^{2}+(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left[\tilde{x}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}-p(t) \tilde{x}^{2}(t)\right] d t \\
\geqq \geqq \bar{\gamma}^{2} \bar{x}^{2}+(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left[\left(\tilde{x}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\Gamma(t) \tilde{x}^{2}(t)\right] d t \\
\quad \quad-\varepsilon\left(\bar{x}^{2}+(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \tilde{x}^{2}(t) d t\right) \\
\geqq B_{r, \Gamma}(x)-\varepsilon|x|_{H^{1}}^{2} \geqq(\delta-\varepsilon)|x|_{H^{1}}^{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

and the proof is complete.
3. Existence of periodic solutions for some forced Lienard equations. Let $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be continuous and let $g:[0,2 \pi] \times \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R},(t, x) \mapsto g(t, x)$ be such that $g(\cdot, x)$ is measurable on $[0,2 \pi]$ for each $x \in \mathbf{R}$ and $g(t, \cdot)$ is continuous on $\mathbf{R}$ for almost each $t \in[0,2 \pi]$. Assume moreover that for each $r>0$ there exists $\gamma_{r} \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ such that $|g(t, x)| \leqq \gamma_{r}(t)$ for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and all $x \in[-r, r]$. Such a function $g$ will be said to satisfy the Caratheodory conditions. Consider the following periodic boundaryvalue problem for the Lienard equation

$$
\begin{gather*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t)+f(x(t)) x^{\prime}(t)+g(t, x(t))=0, t \in[0,2 \pi]  \tag{3.1}\\
x(0)-x(2 \pi)=x^{\prime}(0)-x^{\prime}(2 \pi)=0
\end{gather*}
$$

We prove the following existence result for (3.1).
Theorem 1. Assume that the inequalities

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma(t) \leqq \liminf _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} x^{-1} g(t, x) \leqq \limsup _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} x^{-1} g(t, x) \leqq \Gamma(t) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

hold uniformly a.e. in $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and that $\gamma$ and $\Gamma$ satisfy the following conditions:
a. $\gamma \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ and $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \gamma(t) d t>0$; and
b. $\Gamma(t) \leqq 1$ with the strict inequality on a subset of $[0,2 \pi]$ of positive measure.
Then problem (3.1) has at least one solution.
Proof. We shall first write the equation in an equivalent more suitable form. Let $\delta>0$ be associated to $\gamma$ and $\Gamma$ by Lemma 2; then, by (3.2) we can find $r>0$ such that for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and all $x$ with $|x| \geqq r$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma(t)-(\delta / 2) \leqq x^{-1} g(t, x) \leqq \Gamma(t)+(\delta / 2) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define $\tilde{g}$ on $[0,2 \pi] \times \mathbf{R}$ by $\tilde{g}(t, x)=\tilde{\gamma}(t, x) x$, where

$$
\tilde{\gamma}(t, x)= \begin{cases}x^{-1} g(t, x) & \text { if }|x| \geqq r \\ r^{-1} g(t, r) & \text { if } 0<x<r \\ -r^{-1} g(t,-r) & \text { if }-r<x<0 \\ \Gamma(t) & \text { if } x=0\end{cases}
$$

By construction, $\tilde{g}$ satisfies the Caratheodory conditions and, by (3.3), one has

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma(t)-(\delta / 2) \leqq \tilde{\gamma}(t, x) \leqq \Gamma(t)+(\delta / 2) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and all $x \in \mathbf{R}$. Moreover, if $h:[0,2 \pi] \times \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is defined by $h(t, x)=g(t, x)-\tilde{g}(t, x)$, then, for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and all $t \in \mathbf{R}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
|h(t, x)| \leqq \sup _{|x| \leqq r}|g(t, x)-\tilde{g}(t, x)| \leqq \alpha(t) \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ only depends on $\gamma, \Gamma$ and $\gamma_{r}$. The equation in (3.1) is thus equivalent to

$$
x^{\prime \prime}(t)+f(x(t)) x^{\prime}(t)+\tilde{\gamma}(t, x(t)) x(t)+h(t, x(t))=0
$$

to which we shall apply coincidence degree theory [3, 7]. (Leray-Schauder's degree [5], could also be used at the expense of a reformulation as an integral equation). Let $X=C^{1}([0,2 \pi]), Z=L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$, $\operatorname{dom} L=\{x \in X$ : $x(0)-x(2 \pi)=x^{\prime}(0)-x^{\prime}(2 \pi)=0$ and $x^{\prime}$ is absolutely continuous on $[0,2 \pi]\}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L: \operatorname{dom} L \subset X \rightarrow Z, x \mapsto x^{\prime \prime} \\
& F: X \rightarrow Z, x \mapsto f(x(\cdot)) x^{\prime}(\cdot) \\
& G: X \rightarrow Z, x \mapsto \tilde{\gamma}(\cdot, x(\cdot)) x(\cdot) \\
& H: X \rightarrow Z, x \mapsto h(\cdot, x(\cdot)) \\
& A: X \mapsto Z, x \mapsto \tilde{\gamma}(\cdot, 0) x(\cdot)=\Gamma(\cdot) x(\cdot)
\end{aligned}
$$

It is routine to check that $F, G, H$ and $A$ are well defined and $L$-compact on bounded subsets of $X$, and that $L$ is a linear Fredholm mapping of index zero. We consider the homotopy $\Phi$ : dom $L \times[0,1] \rightarrow Z$ defined by $\Phi(x, \lambda) \equiv L x+\lambda F x+(1-\lambda) A x+\lambda G x+\lambda H x, \lambda \in[0,1], x \in \operatorname{dom} L$, and, in order to apply Theorem IV. 5 of [7] with $\Omega=\left\{x \in X:|x|_{C^{1}}<R\right\}$, we have only to show that there exists $R>0$ for which $\Phi(x, \lambda) \neq 0$ when $\lambda \in[0,1]$ and $x \in \operatorname{dom} L$ with $|x| \geqq R$. By construction, we have, for all $x \in \operatorname{dom} L$,

$$
\gamma(t)-(\delta / 2) \leqq(1-\lambda) \Gamma(t)+\lambda \tilde{\gamma}(t, x(t)) \leqq \Gamma(t)+(\delta / 2)
$$

and hence, by Lemma 2 , denoting by $\langle$,$\rangle the inner product in L^{2}(0,2 \pi)$ defined by

$$
\langle u, v\rangle=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} u(t) v(t) d t
$$

we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle\bar{x}-\tilde{x}, L x+\lambda F x+(1-\lambda) A x+\lambda G x\rangle \geqq(\delta / 2)|x|_{H^{1}}^{2} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $x \in \operatorname{dom} L$ and $\lambda \in[0,1]$. Consequently, by (3.5) and the continuous imbedding of $H^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ into $C([0,2 \pi])$, we get, for all $x \in \operatorname{dom} L$ and $\lambda \in[0,1]$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle\bar{x}-\tilde{x}, \Phi(x, \lambda)\rangle & \geqq(\delta / 2)|x|_{H^{1}}^{2}-\lambda|\langle\bar{x}-\tilde{x}, H x\rangle| \\
& \geqq(\delta / 2)|x|_{H^{1}}^{2}-|\alpha|_{L^{1}} \bar{x}-\left.\tilde{x}\right|_{C} \\
& \geqq(\delta / 2)|x|_{H^{1}}^{2}-\beta|x|_{H^{1}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, if $\Phi(x, \lambda)=0$ for some $(x, \lambda) \in \operatorname{dom} L \times[0,1]$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
|x|_{H^{1}} \leqq 2 \beta / \delta=\delta_{1} \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
|x|_{C} \leqq \delta_{2} \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $\delta_{2}>0$. From the relation

$$
x^{\prime \prime}+\lambda f(x) x^{\prime}+(1-\lambda) \Gamma x+\lambda \tilde{\gamma}(t, x) x+\lambda h(t, x)=0
$$

this implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|x^{\prime \prime}\right|_{L^{1}} \leqq \delta_{3} \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\delta_{3}$ depends only on $\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}, \gamma, \Gamma$ and $\alpha$. By (3.7), (3.8) and (3.9) there exists $R>0$ such that $|x|_{C^{1}}<R$ for every $\lambda \in[0,1]$ and every $x \in \operatorname{dom} L$ for which $\Phi(x, \lambda)=0$, and the proof is complete.
4. A further result in the case of a Duffing equation. An existence result for the periodic boundary value problem (3.1) with $f$ constant can be given in the case where $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \gamma(t) d t=0$. Its proof depends upon the following lemma for the linear periodic problem

$$
\begin{gather*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t)+c x^{\prime}(t)+p(t) x(t)=0  \tag{4.1}\\
x(0)-x(2 \pi)=x^{\prime}(0)-x^{\prime}(2 \pi)=0
\end{gather*}
$$

where $p \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ and $c \in \mathbf{R}$ is arbitrary.
Lemma 3. Assume that $p$ satisfies the following conditions:

1. $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} p(t) d t=0$,
2. $p(t) \neq 0$ on a subset of $[0,2 \pi]$ of positive measure, and
3. $p(t) \leqq 1$ for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$, with strict inequality on a set of positive measure.
Then problem (4.1) has only the trivial solution.
Proof. Let $x$ be a solution of (4.1). Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & =(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(x^{\prime \prime}(t)+c x^{\prime}(t)+p(t) x(t)\right)(\bar{x}-\tilde{x}(t)) d t \\
& =(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left[\left(\tilde{x}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}-p(t) \tilde{x}^{2}(t)\right] d t
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used assumption 1. By condition 3, this implies, using Wirtinger's inequality,

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \leqq(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left[\left(\tilde{x}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}-\tilde{x}^{2}(t)\right] d t \\
& \leqq(2 \pi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left[\left(\tilde{x}^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2}-p(t) \tilde{x}^{2}(t)\right] d t=0
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently, $\tilde{x}(t)=A \sin (t+\phi)$ and

$$
A^{2} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}[1-p(t)] \sin ^{2}(t+\phi) d t=0
$$

Using the second part of assumption 3, this implies $A=0$, and hence $x(t)=\bar{x}$. Introducing this expression in the equation (4.1), this gives $p(t) \bar{x}=0$ and then, by condition $2, \bar{x}=0$, which completes the proof.

Remark 1. Assumptions 1 and 2 of Lemma 3 are clearly equivalent to $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} p(t) d t=0$ and $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} p^{+}(t) d t>0$

Lemma 4. Let $\gamma \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ and $\Gamma \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ be such that $\gamma(t) \leqq \Gamma(t)$ $\leqq 1$ a.e. in $[0,2 \pi], \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \gamma(t) d t \geqq 0, \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \gamma^{+}(t) d t>0$, and $\Gamma(t)<1$ on a subset of $[0,2 \pi]$ of positive measure. Then there exist $\varepsilon>0$ and $\eta>0$ such that for all measurable $p$ satisfying $\gamma(t)-\varepsilon \leqq p(t) \leqq \Gamma(t)+\varepsilon$ a.e. on $[0,2 \pi]$ and for all $x \in W^{2,1}(0,2 \pi)$ such that $x(0)-x(2 \pi)=x^{\prime}(0)-x^{\prime}(2 \pi)=0$, one has

$$
\left|x^{\prime \prime}+c x^{\prime}+p x\right|_{L^{1}} \geqq \eta|x|_{C^{1}}
$$

Proof. Suppose that $\varepsilon$ and $\eta$ do not exist. Then there will be a sequence $\left(x_{n}\right)$ in $W^{2,1}(0,2 \pi)$ with $\left|x_{n}\right|_{C^{1}}=1$ and $x_{n}(0)-x_{n}(2 \pi)=x_{n}^{\prime}(0)-x_{n}^{\prime}(2 \pi)=$ 0 and a sequence $\left(p_{n}\right)$ in $L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$ with $\gamma(t)-1 / n \leqq p_{n}(t) \leqq \Gamma(t)+1 / n$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}^{*}$ and a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|x_{n}^{\prime \prime}+c x_{n}^{\prime}+p_{n} x_{n}\right|_{L^{1}}<1 / n \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The boundedness of $\left(x_{n}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ in $L^{1}$-norm, of $\left(x_{n}\right)$ in $C^{1}$-norm and the fact that, for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$,

$$
\left|p_{n}(t)\right| \leqq \max \left[2,1+\gamma^{-}(t)\right]=\beta(t)
$$

with $\beta \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$, imply that, by going to subsequences if necessary, we can assume (see, e.g., [2]) $x_{n} \rightarrow x$ in $C\left([0,2 \pi], x_{n}^{\prime} \rightarrow x^{\prime}\right.$ in $C\left([0,2 \pi], p_{n} \rightarrow p\right.$ in $L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$, where $|x|_{C^{1}}=1$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma(t) \leqq p(t) \leqq \Gamma(t) \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$. On the other hand, for every $\phi \in L^{\infty}(0,2 \pi)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(p_{n}(t) x_{n}(t)-p(t) x(t)\right) \varphi(t) d t\right| \\
\leqq & \left|\int_{0}^{2 \pi} p_{n}(t)\left(x_{n}(t)-x(t)\right) \phi(t) d t\right|+\left|\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(p_{n}(t)-p(t)\right) x(t) \phi(t) d t\right| \\
\leqq & |\phi|_{L^{\infty}}\left|x_{n}-x\right|_{C}|\beta|_{L^{1}}+\left|\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left(p_{n}(t)-p(t)\right) x(t) \phi(t) d t\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence $p_{n} x_{n} \rightharpoonup p x$ in $L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$. By (4.2) we deduce that $x_{n}^{\prime \prime} \rightharpoonup-c x^{\prime}-$ $p x$ in $L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$, and the weak closedness of the graph of the linear operator $d^{2} / d t^{2}$ implies that $x \in W^{2,1}(0,2 \pi), x(0)-x(2 \pi)=x^{\prime}(0)-x^{\prime}(2 \pi)=0$ and $x^{\prime \prime}(t)+c x^{\prime}(t)+p(t) x(t)=0$ for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$.

Using (4.3), we then see that $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} p(t) d t \geqq 0, \int_{0}^{2 \pi} p^{+}(t) d t>0$ and $p(t) \leqq 1$ a.e. in $[0,2 \pi]$ with strict inequality on a set of positive measure. Consequently, Lemma 1 or Lemma 3 according to $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} p(t) d t>0$ or $\int_{0}^{2 \pi} p(t) d t=$ 0 imply that $x=0$, a contradiction which completes the proof.

Remark 2. One shall notice that the equation $x^{\prime \prime}(t)+(\sin t) x(t)=0$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.

Consider now the periodic boundary-value problem for the Duffing euqation with arbitrary $c \in \mathbf{R}$

$$
\begin{gather*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t)+c x^{\prime}(t)+g(t, x(t))=0  \tag{4.4}\\
x(0)-x(2 \pi)=x^{\prime}(0)-x^{\prime}(2 \pi)=0
\end{gather*}
$$

where $g:[0,2 \pi] \times \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ verifies the Caratheodory conditions.
Theorem 2. Assume that the inequalities

$$
\gamma(t)=\liminf _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} x^{-1} g(t, x) \leqq \limsup _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} x^{-1} g(t, x) \leqq \Gamma(t)
$$

hold uniformly a.e. in $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ where $\gamma$ and $\Gamma$ satisfy the following conditions:
a. $\gamma \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi) ; \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \gamma(t) d t \geqq 0 ; \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \gamma^{+}(t) d t>0$; and
b. $\Gamma(t) \leqq 1$ with strict inequality on a subset of $[0,2 \pi]$ of positive measure.

Then problem (4.4) has at least one solution.
Proof. Let $\varepsilon>0$ be associated to $\gamma$ and $\Gamma$ by Lemma 4. Then, using the
approach and notations of the proof of Theorem 1, we can write the equation in (4.4) in the equivalent form

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t)+c x^{\prime}(t)+\tilde{\gamma}(t, x(t)) x(t)+h(t, x(t))=0 \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma(t)-\varepsilon \leqq \tilde{\gamma}(t, x) \leqq \Gamma(t)+\varepsilon \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
|h(t, x)| \leqq \alpha(t) \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and all $x \in \mathbf{R}$, where $\alpha \in L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$.
To apply coincidence degree theory to (4.4) written in the form (4.5), we set $X=C([0,2 \pi]), Z=L^{1}(0,2 \pi)$, $\operatorname{dom} L=\{x \in X: x$ is absolutely continuous together with $x^{\prime}$ on $[0,2 \pi]$, and $x(0)-x(2 \pi)=x^{\prime}(0)-$ $\left.x^{\prime}(2 \pi)=0\right\}$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L: \operatorname{dom} L \subset X \rightarrow Z, x \mapsto x^{\prime \prime}+c x^{\prime} \\
& G: X \rightarrow Z, x \mapsto \tilde{\gamma}(\cdot, x(\cdot)) x(\cdot), \\
& H: X \rightarrow Z, x \mapsto h(\cdot, x(\cdot)) \\
& A: X \rightarrow Z, x \mapsto \tilde{\gamma}(\cdot, 0) x(\cdot)=\Gamma(\cdot) x(\cdot) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Again, all those mappings are well defined and such that $L$ is a Fredholm mapping of index zero, $G, H$ and $A$ are $L$-compact on bounded subsets of $X$. Moreover, problem (4.4) is equivalent to solving the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
L x+G x+H x=0 \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

in dom $L$. By Theorem IV. 5 in [7] with $\Omega=B(R)=\{x \in C([0,2 \pi])$ : $\left.|x|_{c}<R\right\}$, equation (4.8) will have a solution if we can show that for each $\lambda \in[0,1]$ and each $x \in \operatorname{dom} L$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
L x+(1-\lambda) A x+\lambda G x+\lambda H x=0 \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

one has $|x|_{c}<R$. Now, if $x \in \operatorname{dom} L$ satisfies (4.9) for some $\lambda \in[0,1]$, then

$$
x^{\prime \prime}(t)+c x^{\prime}(t)+[(1-\lambda) \Gamma(t)+\lambda \tilde{r}(t, x(t))] x(t)+\lambda h(t, x(t))=0
$$

and, by (4.6),

$$
\gamma(t)-\varepsilon \leqq(1-\lambda) \Gamma(t)+\lambda \tilde{\gamma}(t, x(t)) \leqq \Gamma(t)+\varepsilon .
$$

Therefore, using Lemma 4 and (4.7), we get

$$
\begin{gather*}
0=\left|x^{\prime \prime}+c x^{\prime}+[(1-\lambda) \Gamma+\lambda \tilde{r}(\cdot, x(\cdot))] x+\lambda h(\cdot, x(\cdot))\right|_{L^{1}}  \tag{4.10}\\
\geqq \eta|x|_{C^{1}}-|\alpha|_{L^{1}},
\end{gather*}
$$

and hence $|x|_{C^{0}} \leqq|x|_{C^{1}} \leqq|\alpha|_{L^{1}} / \eta$. Thus it suffices to take any $R>|\alpha|_{L^{1}} / \eta$ to complete the proof.

Remark 3. It follows easily from Lemma 4 and Theorem 2 that problem (4.4) will have a unique solution if $g$ satisfies the Caratheodory conditions and is such that

$$
\gamma(t) \leqq \frac{g(t, x)-g(t, y)}{x-y} \leqq \Gamma(t)
$$

for a.e. $t \in[0,2 \pi]$ and all $x \neq y$ in $\mathbf{R}$, where $\gamma$ and $\Gamma$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 4.
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