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In the foregoing paper [2] we have discussed the boundedness and the ultimate boundedness of solutions of a system of differential equations. Now we consider a system of differential equations,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d x}{d t}=F(t, x), \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $x$ denotes an $n$-dimensional vector and $F(t, x)$ is a given vector field which is defined and continuous in the domain

$$
\Delta: \quad 0 \leqq t<\infty, \quad|x|<\infty .
$$

$|x|$ represents the sum of the squares of its components. And let

$$
x=x\left(t ; x_{0}, t_{0}\right)
$$

be a solution through the initial point ( $t_{0}, x_{0}$ ). Except otherwise stated, we adopt the symbols and the promises in [2].

At first, we will discuss the boundedness of solutions under perturbations. Corresponding to the differential equation (1), we consider an equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d x}{d t}=F(t, x)+H(t, x), \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $H(t, x)$ is a continuous vector field defined in $\Delta$. Here we give a definition for the boundedness which corresponds to the stability under constantly acting perturbations.

Definition. The solutions of (1) are said to be totally bounded (or bounded under constantly acting perturbations), if for any $\alpha>0$, there exist two positive numbers $\beta$ and $\gamma$ such that, if $\left|x_{0}\right| \leqq \alpha$, then we have $\left|x\left(t ; x_{0}, t_{0}\right)\right|<\beta$ for any $t \geqq t_{0}$ ( $t_{0}$, arbitrary), where $x=x\left(t ; x_{0}, t_{0}\right)$ is the solution of the equation (2) in which we have
$|H(t, x)|<\gamma$, provided $\alpha<|x|<\beta$.
Therefore if the solutions of (1) are totally bounded, they are naturally uniformly bounded.

Theorem 1. If the solutions of a linear system,

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime}=A(t) \cdot x, \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

are totally bounded, they are uniformly ultimately bounded. In fact we have $|x(t)| \rightarrow 0$ when $t \rightarrow \infty . A(t)$ is a square matrix and the dot represents matrix multiplication with the column vector $x$.

Proof. Let

$$
x_{1}=B_{i 1}(t), x_{2}=B_{i 2}(t), \cdots \cdots, x_{n}=B_{i n}(t)
$$

be the solution of (3) such as $x_{1}=\cdots=x_{i-1}=x_{i+1}=\cdots=x_{n}=0, x_{i}=1$ for $t=0$. For $i=1,2, \cdots, n$, we have $n$ solutions which are linearly independednt. Then the general solution is of the form

$$
x=B(t) \cdot C
$$

where $C$ is a column vector of constant elements and $B(t)$ is the matrix

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
B_{11}(t) & B_{21}(t) & \cdots & B_{n 1}(t) \\
B_{12}(t) & B_{92}(t) & \cdots & B_{n 2}(t) \\
\cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots & \cdots \cdots \\
B_{1 n}(t) & B_{1 n}(t) & \cdots & B_{n n}(t)
\end{array}\right)
$$

Since $B(t)$ is non-singular, there exists $B^{-1}(t)$. Hence the solution such as $x=x_{0}$ at $t=t_{0}$ is of the form

$$
x=B(t) \cdot B^{-1}\left(t_{0}\right) \cdot x_{0} .
$$

On the other hand, the solution of the equation,

$$
x^{\prime}=A(t) \cdot x+o \cdot x \quad(o>0: \text { sufficiently small constant }),
$$

such as $x=x_{0}$ at $t=t_{0}$ is of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
x=B(t) \cdot B^{-1}\left(t_{0}\right) \cdot x_{0} \cdot e^{\delta t-\delta t_{0}} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since the solutions of (3) are totally bounded, if $\left|x_{0}\right| \leqq \alpha$, there exists $\beta(\alpha)$ and we have

$$
\left|B(t) \cdot B^{-1}\left(t_{0}\right) \cdot x_{i}\right| e^{2(\delta t-\delta(0)}<\beta(\alpha),
$$

where the absolute value means the sum of the squares of its elements. Hence we have
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$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|B(t) \cdot B^{-1}\left(t_{0}\right) \cdot x_{0}\right|<\beta(\alpha) e^{-2 \delta t+2 \delta t_{0}} . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

And for any $\varepsilon>0$, if $t>t_{0}+\frac{1}{2 \delta} \log \frac{\beta(\alpha)}{\varepsilon}$, we have

$$
\beta(\alpha) e^{-2 \delta t+2 \delta t_{0}}<\varepsilon .
$$

Therefore if $t>t_{0}+\frac{1}{2{ }^{\delta}} \log \frac{\beta(\alpha)}{\varepsilon}$, we have

$$
\left|B(t) \cdot B^{-1}\left(t_{0}\right) \cdot x_{0}\right|<\varepsilon .
$$

Namely the solutions of (3) are uniformly ultimately bounded, since $\frac{1}{2 \partial} \log \frac{\beta(\alpha)}{\varepsilon}$ depends only on $\alpha$. From (5) clearly we have $|x(t)| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 2. Let $R$ be a positive constant which may be sufficiently great and let $\Delta^{*}$ be the domain such as

$$
O \leqq t<\infty, \quad|x| \geqq R .
$$

Suppose that there exists a positive continuous function $\varphi(t, x)$ satisfying the following conditions in $\mathrm{d}^{*}$; namely
$1^{\circ} \varphi(t, x)$ has the property $A$ (cf. p. 279 in [2]),
$2^{\circ} \varphi(t, x)$ tends to infinity uniformly for $|x| \rightarrow \infty$,
$3^{\circ} \varphi(t, x)$ satisfies locally the Lipschitz condition with regard to $x$, that is,

$$
|\varphi(t, x)-\varphi(t, \bar{x})| \leqq K^{\sqrt{ }} \mid \overline{|x-\bar{x}|},
$$

where $K$ is a positive constant depending only on $L$ for $|x| \leqq L,|\bar{x}| \leqq L \quad(L:$ arbitrary $)$,
$4^{\circ} \varlimsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h}\{\varphi(t+h, x+h F(t, x))-\varphi(t, x)\}$, i.e., $D_{F} \varphi$ has the property $B$ (cf. p. 279 in [2]).
Then the solutions of (1) are totally bounded.
Proof. It is sufficient to see that there exists $\gamma$ such as $|H(t, x)|<\gamma$ and we have

$$
\left.\varlimsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h}: \varphi(t+h, x+h F+h H)-\varphi(t, x)\right\} \leqq 0 .
$$

By the conditions $1^{\circ}$ and $2^{\circ}$, we determine $\beta$ suitably for $\alpha$. In $\alpha \leqq|x| \leqq \beta$, using the conditions $3^{\circ}$ and $4^{\circ}$, we have

$$
D_{F+H} \varphi \leqq \varlimsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h}\left\{\varphi(t+h, x+h F)+K h^{\sqrt{ }} \overline{|H(t, x)|}-\varphi(t, x)\right\}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \leqq D_{r} \varphi+K^{\sqrt{ }} \overline{|H(t, x)|} \\
& \leqq-\lambda+K^{\sqrt{ } \sqrt{|H(t, x)|}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\lambda$ is determined by the property $B$. Hence, if $|H(t, x)| \leqslant$ $\lambda^{2} / K^{2}$, we have

$$
D_{F \div H} \varphi \leqq 0 .
$$

Thus we can see that the solutions of (2) such as $\left|x_{0}\right| \leqq \alpha$ are bounded by $\beta$. Since $\lambda$ and $K$ are determined depending only on $\alpha$, the solutions of (1) are totally bounded.

Theorem 3. We assume that $F(t, x)$ in the system (1) has continuous partial derivatives of the first order with respect to $x$. If $F(t, x)$ is periodic of $t$ and the solutions issuing from $t=0$ are equibounded and the solutions are ultimately bounded, then they are totally bounded.

Proof. By Theorem 12 in [2], when (1) satisfies the assumptions of the theorem, there exists a positive function $\varphi(t, x)$ defined in $J^{*}$ ( $R$ be sufficiently great) which is continuous with its partial derivatives of the first order and tends to infinity uniformly as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ and satisfies the following conditions;
$1^{\circ} \varphi(t, x)$ has the property $A$,
$2^{\circ} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}+\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x} \cdot F(t, x)$ has the property $B$.
Moreover observing the construction of $\varphi(t, x)$, clearly we see that $\varphi(t, x)$ is periodic of $t$ and hence $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}$ is so also. Therefore $\left|\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}\right|$ is bounded, if $|x|$ is bounded. From

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\varphi(t, x)-\varphi(t, \bar{x})| & \leqq \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_{i}}(t, x+\theta(x-\bar{x}))\right|\left|x_{i}-\bar{x}_{i}\right| \\
& \leqq K^{\sqrt{ }} \overline{|x-\bar{x}|}
\end{aligned}
$$

we see that $\varphi(t, x)$ satisfies all the conditions in Theorem 2. Hence the solutions of (1) are totally bounded.

Now we assume that $F(t, x)$ and $\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_{i}}$ are bounded when $|x|$ is bounded and $\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_{i}}$ is continuous and that the solutions are uniformly bounded and uniformly ultimately bounded. Then we can obtain a similar function $\varphi(t, x)$ (cf. p. 290 in [2]). In this case, we can prove the boundedness of $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}$ by using the boundedness of
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$$
\left|\frac{\partial|x(t+\tau ; x, t)|}{\partial x_{i}}\right|<a e^{\mu \tau}
$$

where $a$ and $\mu$ are constants determined depending only on $|x|$. By the symbol in the foregoing paper (p. 288 in [2]),

$$
\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_{i}}=\int_{t}^{\infty} G^{\prime}(|x(\tau ; x, t)|) \frac{\partial|x(\tau ; x, t)|}{\partial x_{i}} d \tau
$$

and hence considering the property of $G^{\prime}$ and taking $X$ suitably, we have

$$
\left|\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_{i}}\right| \leqq a G^{\prime}(X) \int_{t}^{t+r} e^{\mu(\tau-t)} d \tau=\frac{a G^{\prime}(X)}{\mu}\left[e^{\mu T}-1\right] .
$$

Since $a, T, \mu$ and $G^{\prime}(X)$ are determined depending only on $|x|$, for a suitable number $A(|x|)$ depending only on $|x|$ we have

$$
\left|\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_{i}}\right| \leqq A(|x|) .
$$

Thus our $\varphi(t, x)$ satisfies also all the conditions in Theorem 2 and hence the solutions are totally bounded.

Next we will discuss the ultimate boundedness of solutions under perturbations which have a given order when $|x|$ is great.

Definition. For a given positive function $f(|x|)$, the solutions of (1) are said to be ultimately bounded under constantly acting perturbations of order $f(|x|)$, if there exist two positive constants $B$ and $\alpha$ so that $|H(t, x)|<\alpha f(|x|)$ for $|x| \geqq B$, and then we have

$$
\varlimsup_{t \rightarrow \infty}\left|x\left(t ; x_{0}, t_{0}\right)\right|<B,
$$

where $x=x\left(t ; x_{0}, t_{0}\right)$ is any solution of (2).
Theorem 4. We suppose that there exists a positive continuous function $\varphi(t, x)$ satisfying the following conditions in $J^{*}$; namely
$1^{\circ} \varphi(t, x)$ has the property $A$,
$2^{\circ} \varphi(t, x)$ tends to infinity uniformly as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$,
$3^{\circ}|\varphi(t, x)-\varphi(t, \bar{x})| \leqq K^{\sqrt{ }|x-\bar{x}|}$, where $\bar{x}$ may be sufficiently near $x$ and $K$ is a constant depending only on $|x|$,
$4^{\circ} \quad D_{F} \varphi \leqq-G(|x|)$, where $G(\eta)$ is a positive continuous function for $n \geqq R$,
$5^{\circ} \quad K^{2}(|x|) f(|x|)=O\left(G^{2}(|x|)\right) \quad(|x| \rightarrow \infty)$.
Then the solutions of (1) are ultimately bounded under constantly acting perturbations of order $f(|x|)$.

Proof. It is sufficient to show that $\alpha$ is determined in $J^{*}$ and if $|H(t, x)|<\alpha f(|x|)$, then $D_{F+H} \varphi$ has the property $B$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_{F+H} \varphi & \leqq D_{F} \varphi+K^{\sqrt{ }} \overline{|H(t, x)|} \\
& \leqq-G(|x|)+K(|x|)^{\sqrt{ }} \overline{|H(t, x)|}
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, by $5^{\circ}$, we can take an $\alpha$ such as

$$
\alpha \leqq \frac{G^{2}(|x|)}{4 K^{2}(|x|) f(|x|)}
$$

Since, for such an $\alpha$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_{F+H} \varphi & \leqq-G(|x|)+K(|x|) \sqrt{\alpha f(|x|)} \\
& \leqq-G(|x|)+K(|x|)^{\sqrt{f( }(|x|)} \frac{G(|x|)}{2 K(|x|)^{\sqrt{f( }(|x|)}} \\
& \leqq-\frac{1}{2} G(|x|)
\end{aligned}
$$

hence $D_{F+H} \varphi$ has the property $B$.
When (1) satisfies the conditions in Theorem 3, there exists $\varphi(t, x)$ satisfying the conditions $1^{\circ}, 2^{\circ}$ and $3^{\circ}$ in Theorem 4. And in place of $4^{\circ}$ we have

$$
\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}+\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x} \cdot F(t, x) \leqq-G(|x|)
$$

where $G(|x|)$ is monotone and $G(|x|) \rightarrow \infty$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore if we have $\left|\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}\right| \cdot f(|x|)=O\left(G^{2}(|x|)\right)$, then the solutions of (2) are ultimately bounded.

Thus when $x$ is a 2-dimensional vector in (1) and (2), it is seen that there exists a periodic solution also, even if we give such perturbations as in the above.

This time we consider a system of differential equations of Carathéodory's type. We suppose that in a system,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d x}{d t}=F(t, x) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

$F(t, x)$ is finite and it is a measurable function of $t$ when $x$ is fixed and it is a continuous function of $x$ when $t$ is fixed, and
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that, if $|x| \leqq L$ ( $L$ : arbitrary), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sqrt{|F(t, x)|} \leqq M(t) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $M(t)$ is summable for $0 \leqq t \leqq \tau$ ( $\tau$ : arbitrary) and of course, it may depend on $L$. Remark again that $|F(t, x)|=$ $\sum_{i=1}^{n} F_{i}(t, x)^{2}$. Then we can obtain similar results as those in the foregoing paper [2].

In the paper [1] we have proved a theorem analogous to the following one. Namely if there exists a function $\varphi(t, x)$ satisfying the following conditions in $J^{*}$;
$1^{\circ} \varphi(t, x)$ is positive continuous and it has the property $A$,
$2^{\circ} \varphi(t, x)$ tends to infinity uniformly as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$,
$3^{\circ} \varphi(t, x)$ has the property a.c.u. (cf. p. 253 in [1]),
$4^{\circ} \varphi(t, x)$ satisfies locally the Lipschitz condition with regard to $x$,
$5^{\circ} \quad D_{\Gamma} \varphi \leqq-\kappa$ a.e. (for $|x| \leqq L, \kappa>0$ is a constant and it may depend on $L$ ),
then the solutions of (6) are uniformly ultimately bounded.
Now we will show that its reciprocal problem holds good for a certain equation.

Theorem 5. We suppose that $F(t, x)$ in the system (6) satisfies locally the generalized Lipschitz condition with regard to $x$, i.e., for $|x| \leqq L,|\bar{x}| \leqq L \quad(L:$ arbitrary)

$$
\sqrt{|F(t, x)-F(t, \bar{x})|} \leqq K(t) \sqrt{|x-\bar{x}|},
$$

where $K(t)$ is a summable function and it may depend on $L$. If $F(t, x)$ is periodic of $t$ and the solutions issuing from $t=0$ to the right are equi-bounded and the solutions are ultimately bounded, then there exists such a function $\varphi(t, x)$ as the above-mentioned.

Proof. Without the loss of generality, we can assume that the period of $F(t, x)$ is 1 . We can see that now the solutions are uniformly bounded and uniformly ultimately bounded just as in the case where $F(t, x)$ is continuous. Hence we assume that the solutions are uniformly ultimately bounded for the bound $B$. Namely if $\left|x_{0}\right| \leqq \alpha$, there is $T$ depending only on $\alpha$ such as if $t>t_{0}+T$, then $\left|x\left(t ; x_{0}, t_{0}\right)\right|<B$. Such $T$ is infinite in number; so we take the infimum of such $T$, denoted by $T(\alpha)$. Then $T(\alpha)$ is non-decreasing with respect to $\alpha$. At first we put

$$
\sup _{\substack{1, r_{0} \leqslant \eta \\ t_{0} \leq t_{n} \\ o \leq t_{0}<\infty}}\left|x\left(t ; x_{0}, t_{0}\right)\right|=f(\eta)
$$

$f(\eta)$ is uniquely determined and it is non-decreasing with respect to $\eta$. If we put

$$
\sup _{\left|x_{0}\right| s_{f}(\eta)} \sqrt{\left|F\left(t, x_{0}\right)\right|}=g(t, \eta)
$$

then $g(t, \eta)$ is a measurable function of $t$ and it is a non-decreasing function of $\eta$ and clearly it is periodic of $t$. Moreover $g(t, n)$ is summable with respect to $t$, since it is bounded by a summable function $M(t)$. Let $h(t, \eta)$ and $k(t, r)$ be

$$
\int_{\eta}^{n+1} g(t, s) d s=h(t, r)
$$

and

$$
\int_{\eta}^{\eta+1} h(t, s) d s=k(t, r)
$$

respectively. Then we have clearly $g(t, \eta) \leqq h(t, \eta) \leqq k\left(t, r_{)}\right)$. For fixed $\eta, k(t, \eta)$ is a measurable function of $t$, for fixed $t$ it is continuous with its derivative with respect to $\eta$ and it is nondecreasing with respect to $\eta$ and moreover it is periodic of $t$. If we put

$$
\tilde{k}(t, r)=k(t, n)+n
$$

then $\widetilde{k}(t, \eta)$ has the same properties as those of $k\left(t, r_{1}\right)$. Now we consider a function of $(t, r)$ for $0 \leqq t<\infty, \eta \geqq 0$ as follows; namely

$$
G(t, \eta)= \begin{cases}{[\tilde{k}(t, 4 \eta)-\tilde{k}(t, 4 B)](\eta-B)} & (\eta \geqq B) \\ 0 & (0 \leqq \eta<B)\end{cases}
$$

Then for fixed $t$, this function has the same properties as those of $G(\eta)$ which we have used in the foregoing paper (p. 288 in [2]). Clearly this is a measurable function of $t$ for fixed $\eta$ and this is periodic of $t$. Since we have

$$
G(t, \eta) \leqq \tilde{k}(t, 4 \eta) \eta
$$

we have for $\eta \leqq L$

$$
G(t, \eta) \leqq L \tilde{k}(t, 4 L)
$$

while $\widetilde{k}(t, 4 L)$ is summable and hence $G(t, \eta)$ is bounded by a periodic summable function. Similarly if $\eta \leqq L, G_{\eta}(t, \eta)$ is bounded
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by a periodic summable function. Here $L$ is arbitrary.
Now we put

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi(t, x)=\int_{t}^{\infty} G(\tau,|x(\tau ; x, t)|) d \tau \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $\varphi(t, x)$ is positive when $|x|>B$. It is seen easily that it has the property $A$, since if $|x| \leqq \alpha$, we have

$$
\varphi(t, x) \leqq \int_{t}^{t+\gamma} G(\tau, f(\alpha)) d \tau
$$

Next we will show that $\varphi(t, x)$ satisfies the condition $2^{\circ}$. Since $\tilde{k}(t, r) \geqq r$, we can choose $\because$ such as

$$
\int_{t}^{t+\dot{k}}(s,|x|) d s=\frac{\sqrt{|x|}}{2^{\sqrt{ } n}} .
$$

From the equality

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{t}^{t+\varphi} \tilde{k}(s,|x|) d s & =\int_{t}^{t+p}[k(s,|x|)+|x|] d s \\
& =\int_{t}^{t+p} k(s,|x|) d s+\left.|x|\right|^{\prime},
\end{aligned}
$$

it follows that we have

$$
\prime \leqq \frac{1}{2^{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{|x|}}
$$

Therefore if $|x|$ is sufficiently great, we have $i<1$. On the other hand, we have for $t \leqq \tau \leqq t+{ }^{\prime \prime}$

$$
\left|x_{i}(\tau ; x, t)-x_{i}\right| \leqq \int_{t}^{\tau} g(s,|x|) d s \leqq \int_{t}^{t+\stackrel{p}{k}} \stackrel{\pi}{k}(s,|x|) d s=\frac{\sqrt{|x|}}{2^{\sqrt{n}}}
$$

and from this we have

$$
|x(\tau ; x, t)| \geqq \frac{|x|}{4} .
$$

Hence for sufficiently great $|x|$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi(t, x) & \geqq \int_{t}^{t+\rho} G\left(\tau, \frac{|x|}{4}\right) d \tau \\
& \geqq\left(\frac{|x|}{4}-B\right)\left\{\int_{t}^{t+\rho} \tilde{k}(\tau,|x|) d \tau-\int_{t}^{t+\rho} \tilde{\kappa}(\tau, 4 B) d \tau\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\geqq\left(\frac{|x|}{4}-B\right)\left\{\frac{\sqrt{|x|}}{2^{\sqrt{n}}}-\int_{t}^{t+\rho} \tilde{k}(\tau, 4 B) d \tau\right\},
$$

while we have

$$
\int_{t}^{t+\dot{p}} \tilde{k}(\tau, 4 B) d \tau \leqq \int_{t}^{t+1} \tilde{k}(\tau, 4 B) d \tau=\int_{0}^{1} \tilde{k}(\tau, 4 B) d \tau=\text { const. }
$$

Thus we can see that $\varphi(t, x)$ tends to infinity uniformly as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$.
To prove the condition $3^{\circ}$, we consider at first

$$
\left|\varphi(t, x)-\varphi\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq \int_{t}^{t+r^{\prime}}\left|G(\tau,|x(\tau ; x, t)|)-G\left(\tau,\left|x\left(\tau ; x^{\prime}, t\right)\right|\right)\right| d \tau
$$

Since $G(t, r)$ is differentiable with respect to $r$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|G(\tau,|x(\tau ; x, t)|)-G\left(\tau,\left|x\left(\tau ; x^{\prime}, t\right)\right|\right)\right| \\
= & \left||x(\tau ; x, t)|-\left|x\left(\tau ; x^{\prime}, t\right)\right|\right| \\
\times & G_{r_{r}}\left(\tau,|x(\tau ; x, t)|+\theta\left(|x(\tau ; x, t)|-\left|x\left(\tau ; x^{\prime}, t\right)\right|\right)\right) \\
\leqq & C \sqrt{\left|x-x^{\prime}\right|} \cdot M(\tau){ }^{(1)}
\end{aligned}
$$

(1) In general, we consider a system of Carathéodory's type, $x^{\prime}=F(t, x)$, where $F(t, x)$ is defined for $x \leqq t \leqq \beta,|x| \leqq \gamma$. Now to simplify the statement, let $|x|$ be $\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}{ }^{2}}$. We assume that $|F(t, x)-F(t, \bar{x})| \leqq K(t)|x-\bar{x}|$, where $K(t)$ is summable for $\alpha \leqq t \leqq \beta$. Let $x=x(t)$ and $x=\bar{x}(t)$ be two solutions, then if $x(\alpha)=\bar{x}(\alpha)$, we have $x(t)=\bar{x}(t)$ by the Lipschitz condition. Now we assume that $|x(\alpha)-\bar{x}(\alpha)| \neq O$ and hence if we put $x_{i}(t)-\bar{x}_{i}(t)=\eta_{i}(t)$, we have $|\eta(t)| \neq O$, where $|\eta(t)|=\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \eta_{i}(t)^{2}}$. For almost all $t$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \eta_{i}(t) \eta_{i}{ }^{\prime}(t) & =\sum_{i=1}^{n} \eta_{i}(t)\left\{F_{i}(t, x(t))-F_{i}(t, \bar{x}(t))\right\} \\
& \leqq|\eta(t)||F(t, x(t))-F(t, \bar{x}(t))| \quad \text { (by Cauchy's inequality) } \\
& \leqq|\eta(t)|^{2} K(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence we have

$$
\int_{a}^{t}|\eta(t)|^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_{i}(t) \gamma_{i}^{\prime}(t) d t \leqq \int_{\alpha}^{t} K(t) d t
$$

Since $|\eta(t)|^{2}$ is absolutely continuous, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log |\eta(t)|^{2}-\log |\eta(\alpha)|^{2} & =\int_{\left|r_{1}(\alpha)\right|^{2}}^{|\eta(t)|^{2}} \frac{1}{t} d t=\int_{\alpha}^{t}|\eta(t)|^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} 2 \eta_{i}(t) \eta_{i}^{\prime}(t) d t \\
& \leqq 2 \int_{\alpha}^{t} K(t) d t .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore we have

$$
|\eta(t)| \leqq|\eta(\alpha)| e^{\int_{\alpha}^{t} K(s) d s},
$$
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where $C$ is a suitable constant and $M(\tau)$ is a periodic summable function. Then we have

$$
\left|\varphi(t, x)-\varphi\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq C \sqrt{\left|x-x^{\prime}\right|} \int_{\iota}^{t+\pi} M(\tau) d \tau
$$

i.e., we have

$$
\left|\varphi(t, x)-\varphi\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq \bar{C} \sqrt{\left|x-x^{\prime}\right|} .
$$

Next if we assume $t<t^{\prime}$, then from

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi(t, x)- & \varphi\left(t^{\prime}, x\right)=\int_{t}^{t^{\prime}} G(\tau,|x(\tau ; x, t)|) d \tau \\
& +\int_{t^{\prime}}^{\infty}\left[G(\tau,|x(\tau ; x, t)|)-G\left(\tau,\left|x\left(\tau ; x, t^{\prime}\right)\right|\right)\right] d \tau
\end{aligned}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mid \varphi(t, x)- & \varphi\left(t^{\prime}, x\right) \mid \leqq \int_{t}^{t^{\prime \prime}} G(\tau,|x(\tau ; x, t)|) d \tau \\
& +\int_{t^{\prime}}^{t^{\prime}+\tau} G(\tau,|x(\tau ; x, t)|)-G\left(\tau,\left|x\left(\tau ; x, t^{\prime}\right)\right|\right) \mid d \tau
\end{aligned}
$$

that is, we obtain an inequality

$$
\left.|x(t)-\bar{x}(t)| \leqq|x(\alpha)-\bar{x}(x)| c c_{\alpha}^{\int_{\alpha}} K^{(x)}\right) d s .
$$

In our case, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \| x(\tau ; x, t)\left|-\left|x\left(\tau ; x^{\prime}, t\right)\right|\right| \leqq \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|x_{i}(\tau ; x, t)+x_{i}\left(\tau ; x^{\prime}, t\right)\right|\left|x_{i}(\tau ; x, t)-x_{i}\left(\tau ; x^{\prime}, t\right)\right| \\
& \leqq A \sqrt{\left|x(\tau ; x, t)-x\left(\tau ; x^{\prime}, t\right)\right|} \\
& \text { (A be a suitable constant). }
\end{aligned}
$$

From the above-mentioned, we have

$$
\sqrt{\left|x(\tau ; x, t)-x\left(\tau ; x^{\prime}, t\right)\right|} \leqq \sqrt{\left|x-x^{\prime}\right|} e_{t}^{\int_{t}^{\tau} K(s) d s}
$$

while for $t \leqq \tau \leqq t+T$

$$
e^{\int_{t}^{\tau} K(s) d s} \leqq e_{t}^{\int_{t}^{\tau+T} K(s) d s} \leqq \bar{A} .
$$

Here $\bar{A}$ is a suitable constant and it depends on $|x|$, but it is independent of $t$, because we can assume that $K(s)$ is periodic. Consequently we have

$$
\sqrt{\left|x(\tau ; x, t)-x\left(\tau ; x^{\prime}, t\right)\right|} \leqq \bar{A} \sqrt{\left|x-x^{\prime}\right|}
$$

and hence we obtain

$$
\left\|x(\tau ; x, t)|-| x\left(\tau ; x^{\prime}, t\right)\right\| \leqq C \sqrt{\left|x-x^{\prime}\right|} .
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \leqq \int_{t}^{t^{\prime}} G(\tau, \beta) d \tau+\int_{t^{\prime}}^{t^{\prime}+r}|x(\tau ; x, t)|-\left|x\left(\tau ; x, t^{\prime}\right)\right| \mid \\
& \quad \times G_{\eta}\left(\tau,|x(\tau ; x, t)|+\theta\left(|x(\tau ; x, t)|-\left|x\left(\tau ; x, t^{\prime}\right)\right|\right)\right) d \tau \\
& \leqq \int_{t}^{\iota^{\prime}} G(\tau, \beta) d \tau+\int_{t^{\prime}}^{\iota^{\prime}+\tau}| | x(\tau ; x, t)\left|-\left|x\left(\tau ; x, t^{\prime}\right)\right|\right| \bar{M}(\tau) d \tau \\
& \leqq \int_{t}^{t^{\prime}} G(\tau, \beta) d \tau+\int_{\iota^{\prime}}^{t^{\prime}+r} 2 \beta \bar{M}(\tau) \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|x_{i}(\tau ; x, t)-x_{i}\left(\tau ; x, t^{\prime}\right)\right| d \tau
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\beta=f(|x|)$ and $\bar{M}(\tau)$ is a suitable periodic summable function. Now we consider the case $t^{\prime} \leqq t \leqq t^{\prime}+T$. Since the solution is unique by the Lipschitz condition, if we put

$$
x_{i}\left(t^{\prime} ; x, t\right)=X_{i},
$$

we have

$$
x_{i}\left(\tau ; X, t^{\prime}\right)=x_{i}(\tau ; x, t)
$$

On the other hand, from the equality

$$
x_{i}\left(t^{\prime} ; x, t\right)=x_{i}+\int_{l}^{t^{\prime}} F_{i}(s, x(s ; x, t)) d s
$$

we obtain

$$
X_{i}-x_{i}=\int_{t}^{t^{\prime}} F_{i}(s, x(s ; x, t)) d s
$$

Hence we have

$$
\left|X_{i}-x_{i}\right| \leqq \int_{t}^{t^{\prime}}\left|F_{i}(s, x(s ; x, t))\right| d s \leqq \int_{t}^{t^{\prime}} \widetilde{M}(s) d s
$$

where $\widetilde{M}(s)$ is a summable function determined by $g(s,|x|)$. Since we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|x_{i}(\tau ; x, t)-x_{i}\left(\tau ; x, t^{\prime}\right)\right|=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|x_{i}\left(\tau ; X, t^{\prime}\right)-x_{i}\left(\tau ; x, t^{\prime}\right)\right| \\
& \leqq \sqrt{n} \sqrt{\left|x\left(\tau ; X, t^{\prime}\right)-x\left(\tau ; x, t^{\prime}\right)\right|} \\
& \leqq \sqrt{n} \bar{A} \sqrt{ }|\overline{X-x \mid}|(\because) \\
& \leqq \sqrt{n} \bar{A} \sqrt{ } \bar{n} \int_{t}^{\prime \prime} \widetilde{M}(s) d s=n \bar{A} \int_{t}^{t^{\prime}} \bar{M}(s) d s
\end{aligned}
$$

we obtain
(2) cf. (1).
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$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\varphi(t, x)-\varphi\left(t^{\prime}, x\right)\right| & \leqq \int_{t}^{t^{\prime \prime}} G(\tau, \beta) d \tau+\int_{t^{\prime}}^{t^{\prime}+\gamma}\left[2 \beta \bar{M}(\tau) n \bar{A} \int_{t}^{t^{\prime}} \widetilde{M}(s) d s\right] d \tau \\
& \leqq \int_{t}^{\prime^{\prime \prime}}[G(\tau, \beta)+2 \beta ; n \bar{A} \tilde{M}(\tau)] d \tau
\end{aligned}
$$

where $r$ is a suitable constant such that $\int_{t^{\prime}}^{t^{\prime+\tau}} \bar{M}(\tau) d \tau<\gamma$. That is to say, we have

$$
\left|\varphi(t, x)-\varphi\left(t^{\prime}, x\right)\right| \leqq \int_{t}^{t^{\prime}} N(s) d s
$$

where $N(s)$ is summable and of course, it depends on the region of $|x|$. Therefore we obtain the inequality

$$
\left|\varphi(t, x)-\varphi\left(t^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq \int_{t}^{t^{\prime}} N(s) d s+\bar{K}^{\sqrt{ }} \overline{\left|x-x^{\prime}\right|}
$$

From this it is seen that $\varphi(t, x)$ has the property a.c.u. (cf. 253254 in [1]). At the same time the condition $4^{\circ}$ is proved.

If the point $(t, x)$ moves along a fixed solution, say the solution through ( $t_{11}, x_{0}$ ), we have

$$
\varphi(t, x(t))=\int_{t}^{\infty} G\left(\tau,\left|x\left(\tau ; x_{0}, t_{0}\right)\right|\right) d \tau
$$

so that for almost all $t$

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\frac{d}{d t} \varphi(t, x(t)) & =-G\left(t,\left|x\left(t ; x_{0}, t_{0}\right)\right|\right) & & \text { a.e. } \\
& =-G(t,|x|) & & \text { a.e. } \\
& \leqq-4(|x|-B)^{2} & & \text { a.e. }
\end{aligned}
$$

whence we can prove the condition $5^{\circ}$ easily.
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