

involve

a journal of mathematics

Harnack's inequality for second order linear
ordinary differential inequalities

Ahmed Mohammed and Hannah Turner



Harnack's inequality for second order linear ordinary differential inequalities

Ahmed Mohammed and Hannah Turner

(Communicated by Johnny Henderson)

We prove a Harnack-type inequality for nonnegative solutions of second order ordinary differential inequalities. Maximum principles are the main tools used, and to make the paper self-contained, we provide alternative proofs to those available in the literature.

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to present a self-contained discussion of the Harnack and Harnack-type inequalities for nonnegative solutions of second order linear ordinary differential inequalities of the form

$$Lu \leq f(x), \quad x \in I := (A, B), \quad (1-1)$$

where, for $u \in C^2(I)$,

$$Lu := u''(x) + p(x)u'(x) + q(x)u. \quad (1-2)$$

Here and in the sequel, the notation $C^2(I)$ stands for the class of twice continuously differentiable real-valued functions on the open interval I . Likewise, we write $C(I)$ for the class of continuous real-valued functions on I . Throughout, we will assume, without further mention, that $p, q, f \in C(I)$. In this case, (1-2) can be rewritten as

$$Lu = \frac{1}{r(x)}(r(x)u')' + q(x)u, \quad \text{where } r(x) := \exp\left(\int^x p(t) dt\right). \quad (1-3)$$

Let \mathcal{H} be a class of nonnegative and locally bounded functions in the open interval $I = (A, B)$. We say that Harnack's inequality holds for the class \mathcal{H} if and only if given any closed interval $[a, b] \subseteq I$, there is a positive constant C such that

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} u(x) \leq C \inf_{x \in [a, b]} u(x) \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (1-4)$$

MSC2010: 34C11.

Keywords: Harnack's inequality, maximum principles, ordinary differential inequalities.

The important point here is that C is independent of $u \in \mathcal{H}$. The class \mathcal{H} is usually a collection of nonnegative (or nonpositive) solutions of some differential equations.

This type of inequality is named after Carl Gustav Axel von Harnack (1851–1888) who first derived the inequality for nonnegative harmonic functions in the plane. The inequality became a very important tool in the study of solutions to second order linear and nonlinear elliptic partial differential equations. We refer the interested reader to the article [Kassmann 2007] for a detailed account on some history and theoretical developments of this fascinating inequality, as well as an extensive bibliography of articles and monographs related to Harnack's inequality. We direct the reader to the paper [Berhanu and Mohammed 2005] for a simple application of Harnack's inequality to the ordinary differential equation $Lu = f$. The same paper also provides an example that shows the explicit dependence of the constant C in (1-4) on the differences $a - A$ and $B - b$.

2. On maximum principles

To develop a version of Harnack's inequality for nonnegative solutions of (1-1), we need several results on maximum principles which can be found in [Protter and Weinberger 1984]. To make the paper self-contained and for the readers' convenience, we provide alternative proofs to these maximum principles under the assumption that p and q are continuous on I .

We first introduce an auxiliary function that will be used in our proof of a basic theorem on maximum principles. We use the notation $J := (\alpha, \beta)$ for $\alpha < \beta$. Consider the following auxiliary function, with $\sigma > 0$ to be chosen:

$$z(x) = \sigma(x - \alpha) - e^{\sigma(x-\alpha)}. \quad (2-1)$$

We observe that

$$z(\alpha) = -1 \quad \text{and} \quad z'(\alpha) = 0.$$

Direct computation shows

$$Lz = -\sigma^2 e^{\sigma(x-\alpha)} \left(1 + \frac{p(x)}{\sigma} (1 - e^{-\sigma(x-\alpha)}) + \frac{q(x)}{\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - (x - \alpha) e^{-\sigma(x-\alpha)} \right) \right).$$

If p and q are bounded on $[\alpha, \beta]$, we see that

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{p(x)}{\sigma} (1 - e^{-\sigma(x-\alpha)}) + \frac{q(x)}{\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - (x - \alpha) e^{-\sigma(x-\alpha)} \right) \right) = 0,$$

uniformly on $[\alpha, \beta]$. Therefore, in this case we can choose $\sigma > 0$ large enough such that

$$Lz \leq -c\sigma^2 e^{\sigma(x-\alpha)} \quad \text{in } J$$

for some constant $c > 0$.

Most of the theorems on maximum principles will be easy consequences of the following basic and useful result.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $p, q \in C(\bar{J})$ and $q \leq 0$ in J . Let $u \in C^2(J) \cap C(\bar{J})$ be a solution of $Lu \leq 0$ in J . Suppose u has a nonpositive minimum at $x_0 \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$. If u is differentiable at x_0 , and $u'(x_0) = 0$, then u is a constant in J .*

Proof. We consider the case $x_0 = \alpha$ first. Suppose u has a nonpositive minimum $u(\alpha)$ at α . Furthermore, assume that u is differentiable at α , and $u'(\alpha) = 0$. We consider the auxiliary function z in (2-1) with $\sigma > 0$ such that $Lz \leq 0$ in \bar{J} . We note that $z(\alpha) = -1$ and $z'(\alpha) = 0$. We fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and set $w := u + \varepsilon z$. We note that $Lw = Lu + \varepsilon Lz = Lu \leq 0$. On recalling that $u(\alpha) \leq 0$, we have $w(\alpha) = u(\alpha) - \varepsilon < 0$, and $w'(\alpha) = 0$. By continuity of w on $[\alpha, \beta]$, we see that $w(x) < 0$ on $[\alpha, \tau]$ for some $\tau > 0$. Let

$$\eta := \sup\{\rho \in [\alpha, \beta] : w(s) < 0 \ \forall 0 \leq s < \rho\}.$$

Then we note that

$$\begin{aligned} (r(x)w')' &= (r(x)w')' + r(x)q(x)w - r(x)q(x)w(x) \\ &= r(x)Lw - r(x)q(x)w \\ &\leq -r(x)q(x)w(x) \leq 0, \quad \alpha < x < \eta. \end{aligned} \tag{2-2}$$

Thus rw' is decreasing on $[\alpha, \eta]$ so that $r(x)w'(x) \leq r(\alpha)w'(\alpha) = 0$ on $[\alpha, \eta]$. In particular, this implies that w is decreasing on $[\alpha, \eta]$. Hence $w(x) \leq w(\alpha) < 0$ for all $\alpha \leq x \leq \eta$. This and the continuity of w on $[\alpha, \beta]$ would contradict the definition of η if $\eta < \beta$. Therefore we must have $\eta = \beta$, so that w is decreasing on $[\alpha, \beta]$. In particular, we have

$$u(x) + \varepsilon z(x) \leq u(\alpha) + \varepsilon z(\alpha), \quad \alpha \leq x \leq \beta.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we find that $u(x) \leq u(\alpha)$ on $[\alpha, \beta]$. This, together with the fact that $u(x) \geq u(\alpha)$, shows that $u(x) = u(\alpha)$ on $[\alpha, \beta]$.

Now suppose u has a nonpositive minimum at β and $u'(\beta) = 0$. Let $w(x) = u(2\beta - x)$ for $x \in I := [\beta, 2\beta - \alpha]$. Then clearly $w \in C^2(I) \cap C(\bar{I})$, and moreover, w is differentiable at β with $w'(\beta) = -u'(\beta) = 0$. Furthermore, w satisfies the inequality

$$\tilde{L}w = w'' + \tilde{p}(x)w' + \tilde{q}(x)w \leq 0, \quad x \in I,$$

where

$$\tilde{p}(x) = -p(2\beta - x) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{q}(x) = q(2\beta - x), \quad x \in I.$$

Finally we also note that w has a nonpositive minimum at β . Therefore, by the above result, we must have $w(y) = w(\beta)$ for all $y \in [\beta, 2\beta - \alpha]$. Thus for any $x \in [\alpha, \beta]$, we have $w(\beta) = w(2\beta - x) = u(x)$, that is, $u(x) = u(\beta)$, as was to be shown. \square

As consequences of [Theorem 2.1](#), we have the following immediate and useful theorems on maximum principles.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $p, q \in C(\bar{J})$ and $q \leq 0$ in J . Suppose u satisfies the differential inequality $Lu \leq 0$ in an interval J . If u assumes a nonpositive minimum value at an interior point x_0 of J , then $u(x) \equiv u(x_0)$.*

Proof. Suppose u attains its nonpositive minimum at $x_0 \in J = (\alpha, \beta)$. Then $u'(x_0) = 0$. Consider the intervals $[\alpha, x_0]$ and $[x_0, \beta]$. By [Theorem 2.1](#), we see that $u(x) = u(x_0)$ for all $x \in [\alpha, x_0]$ and $u(x_0) = u(x)$ for all $x \in [x_0, \beta]$. That is, $u(x) = u(x_0)$ for all $x \in [\alpha, \beta]$. \square

Theorem 2.3. *Let $p, q \in C(\bar{J})$ and $q \leq 0$ in J . Suppose $u \in C^2(J) \cap C(\bar{J})$ satisfies the differential inequality $Lu \leq 0$ in an interval $J := (\alpha, \beta)$. If u assumes a nonpositive minimum value at $x_0 \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ and u is differentiable at x_0 , then $u'(x_0) > 0$ if $x_0 = \alpha$, and $u'(x_0) < 0$ if $x_0 = \beta$ unless u is a constant on J .*

Proof. Suppose u satisfies $Lu \leq 0$ in J , and u has a nonpositive minimum at $x_0 \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$. By hypothesis, u is differentiable at x_0 . Let us take the case $x_0 = \alpha$. Then clearly $u'(\alpha) \geq 0$. If $u'(\alpha) = 0$, then by [Theorem 2.1](#), we conclude u is a constant. Therefore, if u is nonconstant, we must have $u'(\alpha) > 0$. If $x_0 = \beta$, here again we have $u'(\beta) \leq 0$. If u is nonconstant, then again by [Theorem 2.1](#), we must have $u'(\beta) < 0$. \square

Theorem 2.4. *Let $p, q \in C(\bar{J})$ and $q \leq 0$ in J . Suppose $u \in C^2(J) \cap C(\bar{J})$ satisfies the differential inequality $Lu \leq 0$ in an interval $J := (\alpha, \beta)$. Suppose $u(\gamma) \leq 0$ for some $\gamma \in \bar{J}$. In case $\gamma \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$, we assume that u is differentiable at γ :*

- (i) *If $u'(\gamma) \leq 0$, then $u(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in [\gamma, \beta]$.*
- (ii) *If $u'(\gamma) \geq 0$, then $u(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in [\alpha, \gamma]$.*
- (iii) *If $u'(\gamma) = 0$, then $u(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in \bar{J}$.*

Proof. Suppose $u'(\gamma) \leq 0$. We assume that $\gamma < \beta$, for otherwise there is nothing to prove. Suppose that $u(c) > 0$ for some $c \in (\gamma, \beta)$. Since $u(\gamma) \leq 0$, and $u(c) > 0$, we note that u has a nonpositive minimum on $[\gamma, c]$ at some $\gamma \leq d < c$. If $\gamma < d < c$, then $u'(d) = 0$ and we invoke [Theorem 2.2](#) to conclude that u is a constant in $[\gamma, c]$. If $d = \gamma$, then the assumption $u'(\gamma) \leq 0$ and [Theorem 2.3](#) lead us to conclude that u is a constant on $[\gamma, c]$. In any case, we see that $u(c) > 0$ for some $c \in (\gamma, \beta]$ implies that u is a constant on $[\gamma, c]$. But then $u(c) = u(\gamma) \leq 0$, which contradicts the assumption that $u(c) > 0$. This proves statement (i).

To prove (ii), let us assume that $u'(\gamma) \geq 0$, and that $\gamma > \alpha$. Assume that $u(c) > 0$ for some $c \in [\alpha, \gamma)$. Since $u(\gamma) \leq 0$, as in the previous case we note that u takes a nonpositive minimum on $[c, \gamma]$ at some $c < d \leq \gamma$. If $c < d < \gamma$, then $u'(d) = 0$, and by [Theorem 2.2](#), we see that u is a constant on $[c, \gamma]$. If, on the other hand, $d = \gamma$,

then since $u'(\gamma) \geq 0$, we conclude that u is a constant on $[c, \gamma]$ by [Theorem 2.3](#). In either case, we conclude that u is a constant on $[c, \gamma]$. But this implies that $u(c) = u(\gamma) \leq 0$, which again contradicts the assumption that $u(c) > 0$. Therefore statement (ii) holds as well.

Finally statement (iii) follows from statements (i) and (ii). \square

3. The Harnack and Harnack-type inequalities

We start with following existence and uniqueness theorem for solutions of $Lu = f$ that satisfy initial conditions. This theorem is usually taught in a first course on ordinary differential equations in undergraduate curriculum (see [\[Boyce and DiPrima 1965\]](#) for instance), and will be needed in our proof of Harnack's inequality.

Theorem E (existence and uniqueness). *Suppose $p, q, f \in C(I)$. Let $x_0 \in I$ and let c_0 and c_1 be arbitrary real constants. Then there exists a unique solution $u \in C^2(I)$ of equation $Lu = f$ such that $u(x_0) = c_0$ and $u'(x_0) = c_1$.*

We now begin our considerations of Harnack's inequality with respect to the class of nonnegative solutions of the differential inequality

$$Lu \leq 0 \quad \text{in } I := (A, B). \quad (3-1)$$

To proceed further, we fix some notations, some of which are fairly standard. For any function $h : (A, B) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we write

$$h^+(x) := \max\{h(x), 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad h^-(x) := \max\{-h(x), 0\}, \quad x \in (A, B).$$

Note that we have

$$h = h^+ - h^-.$$

In the sequel, we will also use the following notation repeatedly.

$$L_0u := u'' + p(x)u' - q^-(x)u, \quad x \in I.$$

Remark 3.1. We first make note of the following:

- (1) If u is a nonnegative solution of (3-1), then u is a solution of $L_0u \leq 0$ in I .
- (2) If u is a nonnegative solution of (3-1) with $u \not\equiv 0$ on I , then $u > 0$ in I , for if $u(x_0) = 0$ for some $x_0 \in I$, then $u'(x_0) = 0$. Since $L_0u \leq 0$ in I , we invoke [Theorem 2.2](#) and conclude that $u(x) \equiv 0$ in I .

We start with the following theorem on Harnack's inequality for nonnegative solutions of (3-1).

Theorem 3.2. *Given $[a, b] \subseteq I$, there is a positive constant C that depends on the coefficients p, q and the constants A, B, a and b only, such that*

$$\max_{a \leq x \leq b} u(x) \leq C \min_{a \leq x \leq b} u(x) \quad (3-2)$$

for any nonnegative solution u of (3-1).

We break down the proof into two lemmas, each of which may be of independent interest. The proof closely follows the method in [Berhanu and Mohammed 2005].

Lemma 3.3. *Given $[a, b] \subseteq I$, there are constants C_a and C_b that depend on the coefficients p, q and the constants A, B, a and b only, such that*

$$\frac{u'(a)}{u(a)} \leq C_a \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{u'(b)}{u(b)} \geq C_b \quad (3-3)$$

for all positive solutions u of (3-1).

Proof. Let w_1 and w_2 be solutions of

$$L_0 w := w'' + p(x)w' - q^-(x)w = 0, \quad A < x < B,$$

such that $w_1(a) = 1, w_1'(a) = 0$, and $w_2(a) = 0, w_2'(a) = 1$.

We define

$$v(x) := u(x) - u(a)w_1(x) - u'(a)w_2(x), \quad A < x < B.$$

Then recalling that $L_0 u \leq 0$, and $L_0 w_1 = 0 = L_0 w_2$ in (A, B) , we see that $L_0 v \leq 0$ in (A, B) . Moreover, we have $v(a) = 0$ and $v'(a) = 0$. By Theorem 2.4, we conclude that $v \leq 0$ on (A, B) . Thus

$$0 \leq u(x) \leq u(a)w_1(x) + u'(a)w_2(x), \quad A < x < B,$$

whence

$$\frac{u'(a)}{u(a)} w_2(x) + w_1(x) \geq 0, \quad A < x < B. \quad (3-4)$$

Since $w_2'(a) = 1$, we note that there is a small interval centered at a on which w_2 is increasing. So we fix a^* with $\alpha < a^* < a$ such that $w_2(a^*) < 0$. Therefore, on taking $x = a^*$ in (3-4), we conclude that

$$\frac{u'(a)}{u(a)} \leq -\frac{w_1(a^*)}{w_2(a^*)} = C_a. \quad (3-5)$$

Next we establish the second estimate in (3-3). This is very similar to the previous case, and hence we will be brief. Let z_1 and z_2 be solutions of

$$L_0 z_1 = 0, \quad z_1(b) = 1, \quad z_1'(b) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad L_0 z_2 = 0, \quad z_2(b) = 0, \quad z_2'(b) = 1.$$

Let us consider the function

$$v(x) := u(x) - u(b)z_1(x) - u'(b)z_2(x), \quad A < x < B.$$

Then $Lv \leq 0$ in (A, B) and $v(b) = 0, v'(b) = 0$. Arguing as before, we can show that $v \leq 0$ on (A, B) , from which we conclude

$$\frac{u'(b)}{u(b)} z_2(x) + z_1(x) \geq 0, \quad A < x < B.$$

Since z_2 is increasing in some interval centered at b , we can find $b < b^* < B$ such that $z_2(b^*) > 0$. Thus we find that

$$\frac{u'(b)}{u(b)} \geq -\frac{z_1(b^*)}{z_2(b^*)} = C_b. \quad (3-6)$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Given $[a, b] \subseteq I$, there is a positive constant C , depending on the coefficients p, q and the constants A, B, a and b only, such that*

$$|u'(x)| \leq Cu(x), \quad a \leq x \leq b \quad (3-7)$$

for all nonnegative solutions u of (3-1) in I .

Proof. Let u be a nonnegative solution of (3-1) in I with $u \not\equiv 0$ so that $u > 0$ in I . Direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{u'}{u}\right)' &= \frac{u''}{u} - \left(\frac{u'}{u}\right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{u}(-p(x)u' - q(x)u) \\ &= -p(x)\left(\frac{u'}{u}\right) - q(x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\left(\frac{u'}{u}\right)' + p(x)\left(\frac{u'}{u}\right) \leq q^-(x).$$

This leads to

$$\left(\exp\left(\int_a^x p(t) dt\right)\frac{u'}{u}\right)' \leq q^- \exp\left(\int_a^x p(t) dt\right).$$

This gives

$$\left(r(x)\frac{u'}{u} - \int_a^x r(t)q^-(t) dt\right)' \leq 0, \quad x \in (a, b),$$

where we have set

$$r(x) := \exp\left(\int_a^x p(t) dt\right).$$

Thus for any $a \leq x \leq b$, we have

$$r(b)\frac{u'(b)}{u(b)} - \int_a^b r(t)q^-(t) dt \leq r(x)\frac{u'}{u} - \int_a^x r(t)q^-(t) dt \leq r(a)\frac{u'(a)}{u(a)}.$$

In conclusion, we have

$$r(b)\frac{u'(b)}{u(b)} - Q(b) \leq r(x)\frac{u'}{u} \leq \frac{u'(a)}{u(a)} + Q(b), \quad x \in (a, b), \quad (3-8)$$

where $Q(b)$ denotes the constant

$$Q(b) := \int_a^b r(t)q^-(t) dt.$$

Using Lemma 3.3 in (3-8), we obtain

$$r(x) \left| \frac{u'(x)}{u(x)} \right| \leq C_0, \quad x \in [a, b],$$

for some positive constant C_0 , independent of u . Since

$$\frac{1}{r(x)} = \exp\left(-\int_a^x p(t) dt\right) \leq \exp(\|p\|_\infty(b-a)), \quad x \in [a, b],$$

we conclude that

$$\left| \frac{u'(x)}{u(x)} \right| \leq C, \quad x \in [a, b], \tag{3-9}$$

for a constant $C > 0$ that is independent of u . □

Proof of Theorem 3.2. For any $x, y \in [a, b]$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \log\left(\frac{u(x)}{u(y)}\right) &= \int_y^x \frac{d}{dt} \log u(t) dt \\ &= \int_y^x \frac{u'(t)}{u(t)} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{u(x)}{u(y)} = \exp\left(\int_y^x \frac{u'(t)}{u(t)} dt\right).$$

It follows from this and Lemma 3.4 that

$$\exp(-C|x-y|) \leq \frac{u(x)}{u(y)} \leq \exp(C|x-y|), \quad x, y \in [a, b].$$

Therefore, we finally see that

$$\exp(-C(b-a)) \leq \frac{u(x)}{u(y)} \leq \exp(C(b-a)), \quad x, y \in [a, b],$$

which leads to the inequality stated in (3-2). □

Remark 3.5. The differential inequality (3-1) with the inequality reversed doesn't satisfy Harnack's inequality as can be seen from the following simple example. Fix $x_0 \in [a, b]$. Then $u_k(x) = e^{k(x-x_0)}$ satisfies the inequality $u'' \geq 0$ in \mathbb{R} , and note that

$$e^{k(b-x_0)} \leq \sup_{[a,b]} u_k(x) \leq C \inf_{[a,b]} u_k(x) \leq C u_k(x_0) = C.$$

But there is no single positive constant C , independent of u_k and hence k , such that

$$e^{k(b-x_0)} \leq C.$$

Next we study a Harnack-type inequality for nonnegative solutions of nonhomogeneous equations.

We will start by deriving a Harnack-type inequality for nonnegative solutions of the following equation, assuming that $f \geq 0$ on I :

$$L_0 u = f \quad \text{in } I := (A, B). \quad (3-10)$$

However, it should be noted that Harnack's inequality (3-2) does not hold for nonnegative solutions of (3-10) for general f . This is to be expected as nonnegative solutions of (3-10) are not necessarily positive in (A, B) . In fact, the following simple example shows that the inequality (3-2) cannot hold even for positive solutions of (3-10).

Example 3.6. Consider the equation $u'' = 1$ in the interval $(A, B) := (-2, 2)$. For any positive integer k ,

$$u_k = \frac{1}{2} \left(x - \frac{1}{k} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{k}$$

is a solution of $u_k'' = 1$, and $u_k > 0$ in $(-2, 2)$ for all k . Suppose there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\max_{[-1,1]} u \leq C \min_{[-1,1]} u \quad \forall u > 0, u'' = 1. \quad (3-11)$$

Then note that

$$u_k(1) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{and} \quad u_k \left(\frac{1}{k} \right) = \frac{1}{k}.$$

If (3-11) were to hold, then

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{k} \leq C \left(\frac{1}{k} \right) \quad \forall k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we arrive at a contradiction.

We now state the following theorem on a Harnack-type inequality for solutions of (3-10). For the remainder of our discussion, we will use the following notations.

$$\alpha := \frac{1}{2}(a + A) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \frac{1}{2}(b + B).$$

We will also find it convenient to use the notation $\|g\|_\infty$ to denote the following number for any g bounded on an interval I :

$$\|g\|_{I,\infty} := \sup_{x \in I} |g(x)|,$$

or simply $\|g\|_\infty$ if I is clear from the context.

Theorem 3.7. *Suppose $f \geq 0$ in I . Given $[a, b] \subseteq I$, there is a positive constant C that depends on the coefficients p, q and the constants A, B, a and b such that*

$$\max_{a \leq x \leq b} u(x) \leq C \left(\min_{a \leq x \leq b} u(x) + \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} f(x) dx \right) \quad (3-12)$$

for all nonnegative solutions u of (3-10).

Proof. We prove the theorem in three steps. Suppose $u \geq 0$ in (A, B) is a solution of (3-10).

Step 1. Let $u(x_0) = \min\{u(x) : x \in [\alpha, \beta]\}$. By [Theorem E](#), we pick $z_* \in C^2(I) \cap C(\bar{I})$ such that

$$L_0 z_* = f, \quad z_*(x_0) = 0 = z_*'(x_0). \quad (3-13)$$

By [Theorem 2.4\(iii\)](#), we note that $z_* \geq 0$ in (A, B) . We claim that $u \geq z_*$ in $[\alpha, \beta]$. To see this, we start by observing that

$$L_0(u - z_*) = 0 \quad \text{in } (A, B) \quad \text{and} \quad (u - z_*)(x_0) \geq 0.$$

Suppose first that $\alpha < x_0 < \beta$. Then $u'(x_0) = 0$, and therefore $(u - z_*)'(x_0) = 0$. Consequently, by [Theorem 2.4\(iii\)](#), we conclude that $u - z_* \geq 0$ in $[\alpha, \beta]$, as desired. Suppose $x_0 = \alpha$. Then $u'(x_0) = u'(\alpha) \geq 0$, so that $(u - z_*)'(x_0) \geq 0$. By [Theorem 2.4\(i\)](#), we conclude that $u - z_* \geq 0$ in $[x_0, \beta] = [\alpha, \beta]$. Finally, suppose that $x_0 = \beta$. Then $u'(x_0) = u'(\beta) \leq 0$, so that $(u - z_*)'(x_0) \leq 0$. Again, by [Theorem 2.4\(ii\)](#), we conclude that $u - z_* \geq 0$ in $[\alpha, x_0] = [\alpha, \beta]$. Thus, in all cases, we have shown that $u \geq z_*$ in $[\alpha, \beta]$ as claimed.

Step 2. Let $u(\zeta) := \min\{u(x) : a \leq x \leq b\}$. Since $u - z_*$ is a nonnegative solution of $L_0 w = 0$ in (α, β) , we invoke [Theorem 3.2](#) to obtain a positive constant C that depends on p, q^- and the constants A, B, a and b only such that the following chain of inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{[a,b]} u &= \max_{[a,b]} (z_* + u - z_*) \\ &\leq \max_{[a,b]} z_* + \max_{[a,b]} (u - z_*) \\ &\leq \max_{[a,b]} z_* + C \min_{[a,b]} (u - z_*) \quad (\text{by } \text{Theorem 3.2}) \\ &\leq C(u - z_*)(\zeta) + \max_{[a,b]} z_* \\ &\leq C u(\zeta) + \max_{[a,b]} z_* \quad (\text{recall that } u(\zeta) = \min_{[a,b]} u) \\ &= C \min_{[a,b]} u + \max_{[a,b]} z_*. \end{aligned} \quad (3-14)$$

Step 3. We now estimate z_* on $[a, b]$. Recall the notation $\|g\|_\infty := \max_{x \in [\alpha, \beta]} |g(x)|$ for any function $g \in C([\alpha, \beta])$. We recall that

$$f = L_0 z_* = \frac{1}{r(x)} (r(x) z_*') - q^-(x) z_*, \quad x \in I,$$

where

$$r(x) = \exp\left(\int_a^x p(s) ds\right).$$

For $x \in (x_0, b)$, we have

$$z_*(x) = \int_{x_0}^x \frac{1}{r(t)} \int_{x_0}^t r(s) (q^-(s) z_*(s) + f(s)) ds dt.$$

Therefore, for $x \in (x_0, b)$,

$$\begin{aligned} z_*(x) &\leq \exp((b-a)\|p\|_\infty) \int_{x_0}^x \int_{x_0}^t (q^-(s) z_*(s) + f(s)) ds dt \\ &\leq (b-a) \exp((b-a)\|p\|_\infty) \int_{x_0}^x (q^-(t) z_*(t) + f(t)) dt \\ &\leq P_0 \int_\alpha^\beta f(t) dt + P_0 \|q^-\|_\infty \int_{x_0}^x z_*(t) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $P_0 := (b-a) \exp((b-a)\|p\|_\infty)$.

Denoting the right-hand side of the last inequality by $\vartheta(x)$ for $x_0 < x < b$, and on noting that $z_*(x) \leq \vartheta(x)$ on (x_0, b) , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta'(x) &= P_0 \|q^-\|_\infty z_*(x) \\ &\leq P_0 \|q^-\|_\infty \vartheta(x) \quad (\text{since } z_*(x) \leq \vartheta(x)), \quad x \in (x_0, b), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\frac{\vartheta'(x)}{\vartheta(x)} \leq P_0 \|q^-\|_\infty, \quad x \in (x_0, b).$$

Integrating on (x_0, x) , we find that

$$z_*(x) \leq \vartheta(x) \leq P_0 \exp(P_0 \|q^-\|_\infty (b-a)) \int_\alpha^\beta f(t) dt. \quad (3-15)$$

The same inequality holds if $a < x < x_0$.

Using (3-15) in (3-14) leads to the desired inequality (3-12). \square

Finally we are ready to state and prove the following Harnack-type inequality for nonnegative solutions of the differential inequality (1-1) with the nonhomogeneous term f in $C(I)$, without any sign restrictions.

Theorem 3.8. *Given $[a, b] \subseteq I$, there is a positive constant C , that depends on the coefficients p, q and the constants A, B, a and b only such that the Harnack-type inequality (3-12), with f replaced by f^+ , holds for all nonnegative solutions of (1-1).*

Proof. Let u be a nonnegative solution of (1-1) in (A, B) . Let $u(x_0) = \min_{[a,b]} u$, and consider the solution z of

$$L_0 z = f^+ \quad \text{in } (A, B) \quad \text{and} \quad z(x_0) = u(x_0), \quad z'(x_0) = u'(x_0).$$

Then $L_0(u - z) = L_0 u - L_0 z \leq f - f^+ \leq 0$, and $(u - z)(x_0) = 0$ and $(u - z)'(x_0) = 0$. By Theorem 2.4(iii), we conclude that $u - z \leq 0$ in (A, B) , so that $0 \leq u \leq z$ in (A, B) . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x \in [a,b]} u(x) &\leq \max_{x \in [a,b]} z(x) \\ &\leq C \left(\min_{x \in [a,b]} z(x) + \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} f^+(x) dx \right) \quad (\text{by Theorem 3.7}) \\ &\leq C \left(z(x_0) + \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} f^+(x) dx \right) \\ &= C \left(u(x_0) + \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} f^+(x) dx \right) \\ &= C \left(\min_{x \in [a,b]} u(x) + \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} f^+(x) dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

This is the desired result. □

References

- [Berhanu and Mohammed 2005] S. Berhanu and A. Mohammed, “A Harnack inequality for ordinary differential equations”, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **112**:1 (2005), 32–41. [MR 2005i:34039](#) [Zbl 1127.34001](#)
- [Boyce and DiPrima 1965] W. E. Boyce and R. C. DiPrima, *Elementary differential equations and boundary value problems*, Wiley, New York, 1965. [MR 31 #3651](#) [Zbl 0128.30601](#)
- [Kassmann 2007] M. Kassmann, “Harnack inequalities: an introduction”, *Bound. Value Probl.* (2007), Art. ID 81415. [MR 2007j:35001](#) [Zbl 1144.35002](#)
- [Protter and Weinberger 1984] M. H. Protter and H. F. Weinberger, *Maximum principles in differential equations*, Springer, New York, 1984. [MR 86f:35034](#) [Zbl 0549.35002](#)

Received: 2014-10-28

Revised: 2015-02-26

Accepted: 2015-03-04

amohammed@bsu.edu

*Department of Mathematical Sciences,
Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, United States*

hannahturner@math.utexas.edu

*Department of Mathematical Sciences,
Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, United States*

MANAGING EDITOR

Kenneth S. Berenhaut, Wake Forest University, USA, berenhks@wfu.edu

BOARD OF EDITORS

| | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Colin Adams | Williams College, USA colin.c.adams@williams.edu | David Larson | Texas A&M University, USA larson@math.tamu.edu |
| John V. Baxley | Wake Forest University, NC, USA baxley@wfu.edu | Suzanne Lenhart | University of Tennessee, USA lenhart@math.utk.edu |
| Arthur T. Benjamin | Harvey Mudd College, USA benjamin@hmc.edu | Chi-Kwong Li | College of William and Mary, USA ckli@math.wm.edu |
| Martin Bohner | Missouri U of Science and Technology, USA bohner@mst.edu | Robert B. Lund | Clemson University, USA lund@clemson.edu |
| Nigel Boston | University of Wisconsin, USA boston@math.wisc.edu | Gaven J. Martin | Massey University, New Zealand g.j.martin@massey.ac.nz |
| Amarjit S. Budhiraja | U of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, USA budhiraj@email.unc.edu | Mary Meyer | Colorado State University, USA meyer@stat.colostate.edu |
| Pietro Cerone | La Trobe University, Australia P.Cerone@latrobe.edu.au | Emil Minchev | Ruse, Bulgaria eminchev@hotmail.com |
| Scott Chapman | Sam Houston State University, USA scott.chapman@shsu.edu | Frank Morgan | Williams College, USA frank.morgan@williams.edu |
| Joshua N. Cooper | University of South Carolina, USA cooper@math.sc.edu | Mohammad Sal Moselehian | Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran ferdowsi.um.ac.ir |
| Jem N. Corcoran | University of Colorado, USA corcoran@colorado.edu | Zuhair Nashed | University of Central Florida, USA znashed@mail.ucf.edu |
| Toka Diagana | Howard University, USA tdiagana@howard.edu | Ken Ono | Emory University, USA ono@mathcs.emory.edu |
| Michael Dorff | Brigham Young University, USA mdorff@math.byu.edu | Timothy E. O'Brien | Loyola University Chicago, USA tobrie1@luc.edu |
| Sever S. Dragomir | Victoria University, Australia sever@matilda.vu.edu.au | Joseph O'Rourke | Smith College, USA orourke@cs.smith.edu |
| Behrouz Emamizadeh | The Petroleum Institute, UAE bemamizadeh@pi.ac.ae | Yuval Peres | Microsoft Research, USA peres@microsoft.com |
| Joel Foisy | SUNY Potsdam foisyjs@potsdam.edu | Y.-F. S. Pétermann | Université de Genève, Switzerland petermann@math.unige.ch |
| Errin W. Fulp | Wake Forest University, USA fulp@wfu.edu | Robert J. Plemmons | Wake Forest University, USA rplemmons@wfu.edu |
| Joseph Gallian | University of Minnesota Duluth, USA kgallian@d.umn.edu | Carl B. Pomerance | Dartmouth College, USA carl.pomerance@dartmouth.edu |
| Stephan R. Garcia | Pomona College, USA stephan.garcia@pomona.edu | Vadim Pomomarenko | San Diego State University, USA vadim@sciences.sdsu.edu |
| Anant Godbole | East Tennessee State University, USA godbole@etsu.edu | Bjorn Poonen | UC Berkeley, USA poonen@math.berkeley.edu |
| Ron Gould | Emory University, USA rg@mathcs.emory.edu | James Propp | U Mass Lowell, USA jpropp@cs.uml.edu |
| Andrew Granville | Université Montréal, Canada andrew@dms.umontreal.ca | József H. Przytycki | George Washington University, USA przytyck@gwu.edu |
| Jerrold Griggs | University of South Carolina, USA griggs@math.sc.edu | Richard Rebarber | University of Nebraska, USA rrebarbe@math.unl.edu |
| Sat Gupta | U of North Carolina, Greensboro, USA sgupta@uncg.edu | Robert W. Robinson | University of Georgia, USA rwr@cs.uga.edu |
| Jim Haglund | University of Pennsylvania, USA jhaglund@math.upenn.edu | Filip Saidak | U of North Carolina, Greensboro, USA f_saidak@uncg.edu |
| Johnny Henderson | Baylor University, USA johnny_henderson@baylor.edu | James A. Sellers | Penn State University, USA sellersj@math.psu.edu |
| Jim Hoste | Pitzer College jhoste@pitzer.edu | Andrew J. Sterge | Honorary Editor andy@ajsterge.com |
| Natalia Hritonenko | Prairie View A&M University, USA nhritonenko@pvamu.edu | Ann Trenk | Wellesley College, USA atrenk@wellesley.edu |
| Glenn H. Hurlbert | Arizona State University, USA hurlbert@asu.edu | Ravi Vakil | Stanford University, USA vakil@math.stanford.edu |
| Charles R. Johnson | College of William and Mary, USA crjohnso@math.wm.edu | Antonia Vecchio | Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Italy antonia.vecchio@cnr.it |
| K. B. Kulasekera | Clemson University, USA kk@ces.clemson.edu | Ram U. Verma | University of Toledo, USA verma99@msn.com |
| Gerry Ladas | University of Rhode Island, USA gladas@math.uri.edu | John C. Wierman | Johns Hopkins University, USA wierman@jhu.edu |
| | | Michael E. Zieve | University of Michigan, USA zieve@umich.edu |

PRODUCTION

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor

Cover: Alex Scorpan

See inside back cover or msp.org/involve for submission instructions. The subscription price for 2016 is US \$160/year for the electronic version, and \$215/year (+\$35, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues from the last three years and changes of subscribers address should be sent to MSP.

Involve (ISSN 1944-4184 electronic, 1944-4176 printed) at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 798 Evans Hall #3840, c/o University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, is published continuously online. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices.

Involve peer review and production are managed by EditFlow[®] from Mathematical Sciences Publishers.

PUBLISHED BY



mathematical sciences publishers

nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2016 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

involve

2016

vol. 9

no. 2

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| On the independence and domination numbers of replacement product graphs | 181 |
| JAY CUMMINGS AND CHRISTINE A. KELLEY | |
| An optional unrelated question RRT model | 195 |
| JEONG S. SIHM, ANU CHHABRA AND SAT N. GUPTA | |
| On counting limited outdegree grid digraphs and greatest increase grid digraphs | 211 |
| JOSHUA CHESTER, LINNEA EDLIN, JONAH GALEOTA-SPRUNG, BRADLEY ISOM, ALEXANDER MOORE, VIRGINIA PERKINS, A. MALCOLM CAMPBELL, TODD T. ECKDAHL, LAURIE J. HEYER AND JEFFREY L. POET | |
| Polygonal dissections and reversions of series | 223 |
| ALISON SCHUETZ AND GWYN WHIELDON | |
| Factor posets of frames and dual frames in finite dimensions | 237 |
| KILEEN BERRY, MARTIN S. COPENHAVER, ERIC EVERT, YEON HYANG KIM, TROY KLINGLER, SIVARAM K. NARAYAN AND SON T. NGHIEM | |
| A variation on the game SET | 249 |
| DAVID CLARK, GEORGE FISK AND NURULLAH GOREN | |
| The kernel of the matrix $[ij \pmod n]$ when n is prime | 265 |
| MARIA I. BUENO, SUSANA FURTADO, JENNIFER KARKOSKA, KYANNE MAYFIELD, ROBERT SAMALIS AND ADAM TELATOVICH | |
| Harnack's inequality for second order linear ordinary differential inequalities | 281 |
| AHMED MOHAMMED AND HANNAH TURNER | |
| The isoperimetric and Kazhdan constants associated to a Paley graph | 293 |
| KEVIN CRAMER, MIKE KREBS, NICOLE SHABAZI, ANTHONY SHAHEEN AND EDWARD VOSKANIAN | |
| Mutual estimates for the dyadic reverse Hölder and Muckenhoupt constants for the dyadically doubling weights | 307 |
| OLEKSANDRA V. BEZNOSOVA AND TEMITOPE ODE | |
| Radio number for fourth power paths | 317 |
| MIN-LIN LO AND LINDA VICTORIA ALEGRIA | |
| On closed graphs, II | 333 |
| DAVID A. COX AND ANDREW ERSKINE | |
| Klein links and related torus links | 347 |
| ENRIQUE ALVARADO, STEVEN BERES, VESTA COUFAL, KAIA HLAVACEK, JOEL PEREIRA AND BRANDON REEVES | |