

# Existence of a periodic solution for superlinear second order ODEs

PAOLO GIDONI

*Institute of Information Theory and Automation, Czech Academy of Sciences,  
Pod vodárenskou věží 4, CZ-182 08 Prague, Czech Republic, gidoni@utia.cas.cz*

## Abstract

We prove a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a  $T$ -periodic solution for the time-periodic second order differential equation  $\ddot{x} + f(t, x) + p(t, x, \dot{x}) = 0$ , where  $f$  grows superlinearly in  $x$  uniformly in time, while  $p$  is bounded. Our method is based on a fixed-point theorem which uses the rotational properties of the dynamics.

**Keywords:** periodic solutions, superlinear differential equations, rotation number.

**MSC 2020:** primary 34C25, secondary 37C25, 37E45.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we discuss the existence of a periodic solution for the second order superlinear equation

$$\ddot{x} + f(t, x) + p(t, x, \dot{x}) = 0 \quad (1.1)$$

where  $f$  and  $p$  are Carathéodory functions  $T$ -periodic in time, and the uniqueness of solution for the associated Cauchy problems is assumed. The function  $f$  satisfies the superlinear growth condition

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(t, x)}{x} = +\infty \quad \text{uniformly in } t \in [0, T],$$

whereas  $|p(t, x, y)| < \gamma_p(t) + C_p |x|$  for some positive constant  $C_p$  and integrable function  $\gamma_p$ .

In the case of an autonomous superlinear term  $f = f(x)$ , the existence of a  $T$ -periodic solution for (1.1) has been extensively studied. The first contributions to the topic are due to Morris (e.g., [22, 23]) and Ehrmann [9]. The first focused, in a series of papers, on Duffing's equation  $f = x^3$  and  $p = p(t)$ , while the second studied the problem for  $p = p(t)$  under some additional symmetry conditions. After various contribution to the problem by several authors (cf. the survey in [4]), a

key step forward is due to Fučík and Lovicar [14], who proved the existence of a periodic solution in the general case  $f = f(x)$ ,  $p = p(t)$ . Their strategy was later improved by Struwe [25], allowing a generic term  $p = p(t, x, \dot{x})$ . We also mention [4] for an alternative proof of this last result based on a continuation method, with generalizations to planar and higher dimensional systems.

If the superlinear term  $f(t, x)$  is nonautonomous, the situation is much more problematic and unexplored. The key issue is the global existence of solutions, which provides the well-posedness of the Poincaré time-map for any initial data, thus facilitating a fixed-point approach.

In the autonomous case  $f = f(x)$ , global existence of solutions can be obtained via an a priori estimate of the energy  $\dot{x}^2/2 + V(x)$ , where  $V$  is a primitive of  $f$ . Such strategy cannot be applied, in general, to the nonautonomous case  $f(t, x)$ , where global existence may possibly not hold true. An example for which a solution of (1.1) explodes to infinity in finite time is presented in [5]. The aim of this paper is to deal with this issue, developing a topological approach compatible with the possible non-continuability in  $[0, T]$  of some solutions of (1.1).

Our main result (Theorem 4) is the existence of a  $T$ -periodic solution for (1.1), under the only additional assumption (A5), requiring that for every  $\bar{t} \in [0, T]$  the solution of the Cauchy problem  $x(\bar{t}) = \dot{x}(\bar{t}) = 0$  can be continued to  $[0, T]$ . We notice that (A5) does not imply global existence of solutions: for instance, it is satisfied also by the counterexample to global existence in [5], since this admits the constant solution  $x = 0$ . Indeed, as pointed out in Remark 1, (A5) can be verified, for instance, by a growth condition on  $f$  valid only in a suitable bounded region.

In Corollary 5, we show that (A5) can be weakened to a *necessary and sufficient* condition (A5\*) for the existence of a  $T$ -periodic solution. More precisely, the Cauchy condition for which we require continuability can be generalized to  $x(\bar{t}) = a(\bar{t})$ ,  $\dot{x}(\bar{t}) = \dot{a}(\bar{t})$  for some smooth,  $T$ -periodic function  $a$ . As we will discuss in Remark 2, such condition has a clear topological meaning in light of the desirable rotational properties of the dynamics. We are not aware whether a counterexample to (A5\*) is possible for (1.1), although, if it exists, we expect it to be rare and pathological, cf. Remark 3.

In the Hamiltonian case  $p \equiv 0$ , the existence of a (first) periodic solution implies the existence of infinitely many additional  $T$ -periodic solutions, as we show in Theorem 6. This fact was first noticed by Hartman [17] and Jacobowitz [19]. They considered the case  $f(t, 0) = 0$ , hence assuming  $x \equiv 0$  as a first periodic solution, and obtained infinitely many others, rotating around the first one, by iterate applications of the Poincaré–Birkhoff Theorem. We refer to [7, 2] for generalizations on the plane and to [3, 13, 12] for the extension to systems of differential equations. Outside the Hamiltonian case, such results are in general no longer true, since the constant null solution may be the unique  $T$ -periodic solution, cf. e.g. [17, Eq. (1.13)].

To conclude, we observe that the existence of a periodic solution is entangled with the more general issue concerning boundedness, or lack thereof, of solutions for (1.1). The problem was first considered by Littlewood [20] for Duffing’s equation

with a general bounded forcing  $p(t)$ , and has inspired an ample literature. For a periodic forcing, the boundedness of all solutions have been proved for polynomial generalizations of Duffing's equation [6]. However, also for this issue, the situation is more complex and unexplored in the case of a general non-autonomous  $f = f(t, x)$ . Clearly, boundedness of all solutions cannot be expected, as shown by the non-continuability example in [5] previously mentioned. On the other hand, in [26] the existence of infinite bounded solutions has been proved for  $p \equiv 0$  and without the periodicity assumption in  $t$ . Since periodic solutions are obviously bounded, our main result could be seen also as a tiny contribution in this direction.

## 2 Notation and preliminary results

We denote with  $\overline{U}$  the closure of a set  $U$  and with  $\partial U$  its boundary. Open intervals are denoted with  $(a, b)$ , closed ones with  $[a, b]$ , and the mixed case  $(a, b]$  is defined accordingly.

Most of our analysis will be performed on the plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . We denote with  $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{R}^2}$  the identity map in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and with  $0_{\mathbb{R}^2}$  the origin  $(0, 0)$ . We introduce clockwise polar coordinates  $(\vartheta, r)$ , according to the change of coordinates  $\Phi: \overline{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$

$$(x, y) = \Psi(\vartheta, r) = (r \cos \vartheta, -r \sin \vartheta), \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R} \times (0, +\infty)$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{H}} = \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty)$  denote the open and closed halfplanes, respectively. We denote with  $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  the open ball with radius  $R > 0$  centred in the origin  $0_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ , namely  $B_R = \Psi(\mathbb{R} \times [0, R))$ . For any vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $|v|$  denotes its Euclidean norm.

Let us consider two sets  $E \subseteq D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  and the evolution described by a continuous function  $\varphi: [0, T] \times D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ , such that  $\varphi(0, z) = z$  for every  $z \in D$ . Let us suppose that

$$\varphi(t, z) \neq 0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \quad \text{for every } (t, x) \in [0, T] \times E \quad (2.2)$$

namely that each  $\varphi$ -orbit of the points in  $E$  does not cross the origin of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . For convenience's sake, we introduce the set  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  as

$$\mathcal{N} := \{x \in D : \varphi(t, x) = 0 \text{ for some } t \in [0, T]\}, \quad (2.3)$$

so that the assumption (2.2) can be written as  $E \cap \mathcal{N} = \emptyset$ .

Let us write  $\mathcal{E} = \Psi^{-1}(E) \subset \mathcal{H}$ . Since  $(\Psi, \mathcal{H})$  is a covering space of  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ , by the *homotopy lifting property* (cf. e.g. [18, Chapter 1.3]) we define  $\Phi: [0, T] \times \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  as the unique continuous lift in clockwise polar coordinates of the map  $\varphi$ . Namely,  $\Phi = \Phi(t, (\vartheta, r))$  is the unique continuous map such that for every  $\eta \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $t \in [0, T]$  holds:

$$\Phi(0, \eta) = \eta \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi(\Phi(t, \eta)) = \varphi(t, \Psi(\eta)). \quad (2.4)$$

As a consequence of the periodicity of  $\Psi$  in  $\vartheta$ , for every  $(t, (\vartheta, r)) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{E}$  we have

$$\Phi(t, (\vartheta + 2\pi, r)) = \Phi(t, (\vartheta, r)) + (2\pi, 0). \quad (2.5)$$

We denote the two components of  $\Phi$  as  $\Phi = (\Phi^\vartheta, \Phi^r)$ .

Always assuming (2.2), we define the rotation associated to the point  $z \in E$  during the interval  $[0, T]$  as

$$\text{rot}_\varphi(z) := \frac{\Phi^\vartheta(T, \eta_z) - \Phi^\vartheta(0, \eta_z)}{2\pi} \quad (2.6)$$

for any  $\eta_z \in \Psi^{-1}(z)$ . The definition is well-posed by (2.5). Accordingly, we write  $\text{rot}_\varphi(E) := \{\text{rot}_\varphi(z) : z \in E\}$ .

Our main result is based on the following fixed-point theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be an open bounded set with  $0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \in U$ . Assume that  $\varphi: [0, T] \times \overline{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is a continuous map such that  $\varphi(0, z) = z$  for every  $z \in \overline{U}$  and  $\mathcal{N} \cap \partial U = \emptyset$ . If*

$$\text{rot}_\varphi(\partial U) \cap \mathbb{Z} = \emptyset \quad (2.7)$$

*then  $\deg(\varphi(T, \cdot) - \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{R}^2}, U, 0) = 1$ , and in particular  $\varphi(T, \cdot)$  has a fixed point in  $U$ .*

Theorem 1 can be obtained, as we show below, as a corollary of the Poincaré–Bohl fixed-point Theorem, cf. for instance [11]. We refer to [15] for an alternative proof of Theorem 1 within a more general framework connecting rotational properties and Brouwer’s degree.

**Theorem 2** (Poincaré–Bohl). *Let  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be an open bounded set with  $0_{\mathbb{R}^d} \in U$ . Assume that  $P: \overline{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is a continuous map such that*

$$P(z) \neq \lambda z \quad \text{for every } z \in \partial U \text{ and every } \lambda \in [1, +\infty). \quad (2.8)$$

*Then  $\deg(P - \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{R}^d}, U, 0) = (-1)^d$ , and in particular  $P$  has a fixed point in  $U$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, we notice that  $\varphi(T, z) = \lambda z$  for some  $\lambda > 0$  if and only if  $\text{rot}_\varphi(z) \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Hence (2.7) implies (2.8) and therefore Theorem 1 follows straightforwardly by the Poincaré–Bohl Theorem for  $d = 2$ .  $\square$

To conclude this section, we state a result on continuous dependence of solutions for ordinary differential equations, cf. for instance [10, Ch. 1, §1, Th. 6]. As usual, the dot  $\dot{\cdot}$  denotes the derivative with respect to the time variable  $t$ .

First, we recall that a function  $F = F(t, x): \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfies the *Carathéodory property* if the following conditions hold:

- for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  the function  $F(\cdot, x)$  is measurable in  $t$ ;
- for almost every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  the function  $F(t, \cdot)$  is continuous in  $x$ ;

- for every compact set  $D \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$  there exists a Lebesgue integrable function  $m_D(t)$  such that  $|F(t, x)| \leq m_D(t)$  for every  $(t, x) \in D$ .

Given a function  $F(t, z)$  satisfying the Carathéodory property, solutions of the differential equation  $\dot{z} = F(t, z)$  are intended in the usual weaker sense [10, 16].

**Theorem 3** (Continuous dependence). *Let  $h = h(t, z): \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  satisfy the Carathéodory property. Assume that the solution  $z(t; t_0, z_0)$  of the problem*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{z} = h(t, z) \\ z(t_0) = z_0 \end{cases}$$

*exists on the interval  $[t_a, t_b]$  and is unique. Then there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that, for every  $(\bar{t}, \bar{z})$  such that  $|t_0 - \bar{t}| + |z_0 - \bar{z}| < \delta$ , the solution  $z(t; \bar{t}, \bar{z})$  of the Cauchy problem defined by  $z(\bar{t}) = \bar{z}$  exists on the interval  $[t_a, t_b]$ . Moreover,  $z(s; \bar{t}, \bar{z})$  is a continuous function of  $(s; \bar{t}, \bar{z})$  at  $(t; t_0, z_0)$ .*

### 3 Statement of the main result

We study the second order ordinary differential equation

$$\ddot{x} + f(t, x) + p(t, x, \dot{x}) = 0 \tag{3.1}$$

under the following assumptions:

- (A1) the functions  $f: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $p: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  both satisfy the Carathéodory property and are  $T$ -periodic in the first variable  $t$ ;
- (A2) For every  $(t_0, x_0, y_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2$  there is uniqueness of solution for the Cauchy problem  $x(t_0) = x_0, \dot{x}(t_0) = y_0$  associated to (3.1);
- (A3)  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(t, x)}{x} = +\infty$  uniformly in  $t \in [0, T]$ ;
- (A4) there exist a positive constant  $C_p$  and a positive function  $\gamma_p \in L^1([0, T], \mathbb{R})$  such that

$$|p(t, x, y)| < \gamma_p(t) + C_p |x| \quad \text{for every } (t, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^3;$$

- (A5) for every  $\bar{t} \in [0, T]$ , the solution of the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{x} + f(t, x) + p(t, x, \dot{x}) = 0 \\ x(\bar{t}) = \dot{x}(\bar{t}) = 0 \end{cases}$$

can be continued to the whole interval  $[0, T]$ .

The main result of the paper is the following.

**Theorem 4.** *If assumptions (A1),(A2),(A3),(A4) and (A5) hold, then Equation (3.1) admits at least one  $T$ -periodic solution.*

Notice that, as a corollary of Theorem 4, it is actually possible to weaken assumption (A5), obtaining a necessary and sufficient condition, as follows.

**Corollary 5.** *Suppose that (A1),(A2),(A3),(A4) hold. Then*

(A5\*) *there exists a  $T$ -periodic function  $a: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , with absolutely continuous derivative  $\dot{a}(t)$ , such that for every  $\bar{t} \in [0, T]$ , the Cauchy problem*

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{x} + f(t, x) + p(t, x, \dot{x}) = 0 \\ x(\bar{t}) = a(\bar{t}), \quad \dot{x}(\bar{t}) = \dot{a}(\bar{t}) \end{cases}$$

*admits a solution continuable to the whole interval  $[0, T]$ ;*

*is a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a  $T$ -periodic solution for Equation (3.1).*

*Proof.* To see that (A5\*) is sufficient, we consider the time-dependent change of variable  $\tilde{x}(t) = x(t) - a(t)$ . Setting  $\tilde{f}(t, u) = f(t, u + a(t))$  and  $\tilde{p}(t, u, w) = p(t, u + a(t), w + \dot{a}(t))$  we can apply Theorem 4 to

$$\ddot{\tilde{x}} + \tilde{f}(t, \tilde{x}) + \tilde{p}(t, \tilde{x}, \dot{\tilde{x}}) = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

The  $T$ -periodic solution  $\tilde{x}^*$  of (3.2) thus obtained corresponds to a  $T$ -periodic solution  $x^* = \tilde{x}^* + a(t)$  of (3.1).

On the other hand, if (3.1) admits a  $T$ -periodic solution  $\bar{x}(t)$ , condition (A5\*) is trivially satisfied for  $a(t) = \bar{x}(t)$ .  $\square$

In the unperturbed case  $p \equiv 0$ , Equation (4.1) define an Hamiltonian structure on the phase plane, and the existence of a (first) periodic solution leads to the existence of infinitely many additional  $T$ -periodic solutions. We present now such a result, assuming for simplicity a slightly more regular framework than above.

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $f: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be continuous,  $T$ -periodic in the first variable  $t$  and continuously differentiable in the second variable  $x$ ; moreover, set  $p \equiv 0$ . If (A2),(A3) and (A5\*) hold, then Equation (3.1) has infinitely many  $T$ -periodic solutions.*

*Proof.* By Corollary 5, we deduce that (3.1) admits a  $T$ -periodic solution  $\bar{x}(t)$ . We now consider the differential equation

$$\ddot{w} + f(t, w + \bar{x}(t)) + \ddot{\bar{x}}(t) = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

We notice that  $w \equiv 0$  is a solution of (3.3). Moreover,  $\hat{w}$  is a  $T$ -periodic solution of (3.3) if and only if  $\hat{w} + \bar{x}$  is a  $T$ -periodic solution of (3.1). The existence of infinitely many  $T$ -periodic solutions for (3.3) is provided by [17, Theorem 1.1] (in alternative, see [13, Theorem 1]), thus concluding the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** We presented (A5) in a general abstract form; we notice however that it can be obtained by mild bounds on the radial component of (4.1) on a bounded region. For instance, a sufficient condition for (A5) is the following:

*there exists  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $y(x - f(t, x, y) - p(t, x, y)) < \alpha |(x, y)|$  for every  $(t, x, y) \in [0, T] \times B_{\alpha T}$ .*

Other sufficient conditions can be obtained analogously, for instance, replacing the uniform bound on the radial component with a suitable growth condition, or the parameter  $\alpha$  with an integrable function  $\alpha(t)$ . We emphasise that (A5) is much weaker than the existence on  $[0, T]$  of all the solutions of (4.1) (which is equivalent global existence of solution), since it involves only a bounded region. In this sense, we observe that the counterexample to global existence in [5] trivially satisfies (A5), since the origin is a fixed point for the dynamics. A counterexample to (A5\*), if it exists, looks much harder to obtain.

**Remark 2.** The nature of conditions (A5) and (A5\*) becomes clearer if we consider how rotational properties are normally used to recover periodic solutions. A key step in classical approaches is to consider rotation, defined as in (2.6), for all the solutions starting from a closed curve surrounding the origin (i.e. the point around which rotation is defined). This is well illustrated, for instance, by Theorem 1, where such a curve is provided by (a suitable part of)  $\partial U$ . The Poincaré–Birkhoff Theorem is another example, considering two of such curves. This however implies that the solutions passing through the origin  $0_{\mathbb{R}^2}$  during  $[0, T]$  are “trapped inside” the orbit of such closed curve, therefore each of them exists on the whole interval, and thus (A5) holds. On the other hand, if the origin is not “trapped” by  $\partial U$ , the topological structure changes drastically and, in general, the fixed-point may be lost. For instance, if in Theorem 1 we consider instead the case  $0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \notin \overline{U}$ , we obtain  $\deg(\varphi(T, \cdot) - \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{R}^2}, U, 0) = 0$ , which is not useful to our aims.

**Remark 3.** Corollary 5 leaves open the question whether (A5\*) is always satisfied, or under which conditions on  $f$  and  $p$ . We observe, however, that possible counterexamples would be pathological, with noncontinuability of solutions widespread everywhere on the phase plane. Several results in literature illustrate encouraging continuability properties for (1.1), although none is sufficient for (A5). In addition to the discussion at the end of the introduction on bounded (and therefore global) solutions, we mention for instance [8], where the existence of a global solution for (1.1) is obtained under very general assumptions.

Finally, we observe that the situation may be more favourable in the Hamiltonian case  $p \equiv 0$ , due to the additionally available variational structure, which could possibly be helpful to verify or replace (A5\*). Indeed, in such a case the existence of multiple periodic solutions can be obtained also by variational methods, cf. [1, 24, 21] which studied the case of an autonomous  $f = f(x)$ . Noncontinuability still poses a severe issue also for variational methods, yet the structural role of (A5\*) discussed in Remark 2 might be less pivotal following an alternative approach.

## 4 Proof of Theorem 4

We begin by recalling that (3.1) is equivalent to a planar first order system: more precisely, we introduce the associated Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = y \\ \dot{y} = G(t, x, y) := -f(t, x) - p(t, x, y) \\ x(t_0) = x_0, \quad y(t_0) = y_0 \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

By (A1) and (A2) there is local existence and uniqueness of solution for the problem (4.1) for every initial value  $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . On the other hand, global existence of a solution, hence in particular its existence on  $[0, T]$ , may fail, see [5] for a counterexample.

We define the set  $\Delta \subset [0, T]$  as

$$\Delta := \{(t, t_0) \in [0, T]^2 \text{ such that } t \geq t_0\}. \quad (4.2)$$

We then introduce the evolution map  $\zeta: \Delta \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \cup \{\infty\}$  of (4.1), defined as follows

$$\zeta(t; t_0, x_0, y_0) = \begin{cases} (x(t), y(t)) & \text{if the solution } (x(s), y(s)) \text{ of (4.1) exists on } [t_0, t]; \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

As a consequence of Theorem 3, the function  $\zeta: \Delta \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \cup \{\infty\}$  is continuous, where, as usual, a base of neighbourhoods for  $\infty$  is given by the sets  $\mathbb{R}^2 \cup \{\infty\} \setminus B_r$ , for  $r > 0$ .

The case  $t_0 = 0$  is the most relevant on our analysis, so we write

$$\varphi(t, x_0, y_0) := \zeta(t; 0, x_0, y_0): [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \cup \{\infty\}. \quad (4.4)$$

Our plan is to apply Theorem 1 to  $\varphi(T, \cdot)$ , since fixed-points of  $\varphi(T, \cdot)$  correspond to  $T$ -periodic solutions of (4.1).

Our approach is based on estimates of the rotation  $\rho$  around the origin performed by a solution in given time interval. Such notion can be defined only if the solution does not cross the origin during such interval. To identify such situations, we define, for  $t \in [0, T]$ , the family of sets  $\mathcal{N}_t \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  as

$$\mathcal{N}_t = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ such that } \zeta(s; t, x, y) = 0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \text{ for some } s \in [t, T]\}. \quad (4.5)$$

Notice that  $0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \in \mathcal{N}_t$  and that  $\mathcal{N}_t$  is a compact set by (A5) and Theorem 3. We also write  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_0$ , in accordance with (2.3). Moreover, as a consequence of Theorem 3, using also (A5) and the compactness of  $\mathcal{N}$ , we observe that

- (i) there exists an open set  $U_0$  such that  $\mathcal{N} \subset U_0$  and for every  $(x_0, y_0) \in U_0$  the solution of (4.1) is defined on the whole interval  $[0, T]$ .



Setting

$$\Omega = \{(s; t, \vartheta, r) \in \Delta \times \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } \zeta(s; t, \Psi(\vartheta, r)) \neq \infty \text{ and } \Psi(\vartheta, r) \notin \mathcal{N}_t\},$$

by the homotopy lifting property and Theorem 3 we deduce that there exists a unique continuous map  $Z: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that  $Z(t; t, \vartheta, r) = (\vartheta, r)$  and

$$\Psi(Z(s; t, \vartheta, r)) = \zeta(s; t, \Psi(\vartheta, r)) \quad \text{for every } (s, t, \vartheta, r) \in \Omega.$$

Let us identify the two components of  $Z$  as  $Z = (Z^\vartheta, Z^r)$ . We are now ready to introduce a generalized notion of rotation for the solutions of (4.1). Writing

$$\Gamma = \{(s, t, x, y) \text{ such that } (s, t) \in \Delta \text{ and } (x, y) \in (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{N}_t)\}$$

we define the function  $\rho(s; t, x, y): \Gamma \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  as

$$\rho(s; t, \Psi(\vartheta, r)) = \begin{cases} \frac{Z^\vartheta(s; t, \vartheta, r) - \vartheta}{2\pi} & \text{if } (s, t, \vartheta, r) \in \Omega; \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

Notice that  $\rho$  is well-defined, since, fixed any  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{N}_t$  with  $\zeta(s; t, x, y) \neq \infty$ , the value of  $Z^\vartheta(s; t, \vartheta, r) - \vartheta$  does not depend on the choice of  $(\vartheta, r) \in \Psi^{-1}(x, y)$ . We also remark that, with the notation of Section 2, if  $\rho(T; 0, x, y) < +\infty$  then  $\rho(T; 0, x, y) = \text{rot}_\varphi((x, y))$ .

Our plan now is to prove that  $\rho$  is continuous and that  $\rho(T; 0, x, y) \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $|(x, y)| \rightarrow +\infty$ . We begin with some preliminary properties.

**Proposition 7.** *The following statements are true:*

- (ii) if  $\rho(t; t_0, x_0, y_0) = a$ , then  $\rho(s; t_0, x_0, y_0) \geq a - \frac{1}{2}$  for every  $s > t$ ;
- (iii) if  $\rho(\bar{t}; t_0, x_0, y_0) = +\infty$ , let us define

$$t_{\max} := \sup\{t \in [t_0, T] : \rho(t; t_0, x_0, y_0) < +\infty\}.$$

$$\text{Then } \lim_{t \rightarrow t_{\max}} \rho(t; t_0, x_0, y_0) = +\infty.$$

Notice that  $t_{\max} > 0$  in (iii) is well defined, since  $\rho(t_0; t_0, x_0, y_0) = 0$ . Also, let us denote for simplicity the orbit of the solution associated to the initial values  $(t_0, x_0, y_0)$  as  $\zeta(\cdot; t_0, x_0, y_0) =: \zeta^0(\cdot) = (\zeta_x^0, \zeta_y^0)(\cdot)$ , where the last decomposition applies only when  $\zeta^0$  has finite value.

*Proof.* We prove first (ii). In order to have  $\rho(s; t_0, x_0, y_0) < a - \frac{1}{2}$  for some  $s > t$ , then the orbit  $\zeta^0(\cdot)$  would have to cross the  $y$ -axis counter-clockwise. This is not possible, since from the first equation in (4.1) it is clear that the  $y$ -axis can be crossed only clockwise. Observe that since  $(x_0, y_0) \notin \mathcal{N}_{t_0}$  the orbit  $\zeta^0(\cdot)$  cannot cross the origin

$0_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ . Moreover, by construction, if  $\rho(s; t_0, x_0, y_0) = +\infty$  then  $\rho(\tilde{s}; t_0, x_0, y_0) = +\infty$  for every  $\tilde{s} \in [s, T]$ . Hence, the statement (ii) is true.

Suppose now by contradiction that (iii) is false. Then, since the  $y$ -axis can be crossed only clockwise outside the origin, it has to be crossed only a finite number of times by the orbit  $\zeta^0(\cdot)$ . Let us therefore take  $\tilde{t} \in [t_0, t_{\max})$  such that  $\zeta_x^0(t) \neq 0$  for every  $t \geq \tilde{t}$ . We discuss only the case  $\zeta_x^0(\tilde{t}) > 0$ , since the case  $\zeta_x^0(\tilde{t}) < 0$  is symmetric.

Let us notice that by (A1),(A3) and (A4) there exists a positive function  $\gamma_1 \in L^1([0, T], \mathbb{R})$  such that

$$G(t, x, y) < \gamma_1(t) \quad \text{for every } (t, x, y) \in [0, T] \times [0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Precisely, we use (A3) to obtain the existence of  $x^* > 0$  such that  $-f(t, x) + C^p x < 0$  for every  $x > x^*$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ . We conclude setting  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_p + m_D$ , where  $m_D$  is given by the third condition of the Carathéodory property for  $f$  with respect to the compact set  $D = [0, T] \times [0, x^*]$ . It follows that

$$\zeta_y^0(t) < \zeta_y^0(\tilde{t}) + \int_{\tilde{t}}^{t_{\max}} \gamma_1(\tau) d\tau := y_{\max} \quad \text{for every } t \in [\tilde{t}, t_{\max}).$$

This, consequently, implies that  $\zeta_x^0(t) < \zeta_x^0(\tilde{t}) + y_{\max}(t_{\max} - \tilde{t}) =: x_{\max}$  for every  $t \in [\tilde{t}, t_{\max})$ . Reasoning as above, by (A1),(A3) and (A4) there exists a positive function  $\gamma_2 \in L^1([0, T], \mathbb{R})$  such that

$$G(t, x, y) > -\gamma_2(t) \quad \text{for every } (t, x, y) \in [0, T] \times [0, x_{\max}] \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Hence,  $\zeta_y^0(t) > \zeta_y^0(\tilde{t}) - \int_{\tilde{t}}^{t_{\max}} \gamma_2(\tau) d\tau =: y_{\min}$  for every  $t \in [\tilde{t}, t_{\max})$ .

Since we have shown that  $\zeta^0(t)$  remains within the compact set  $[0, x_{\max}] \times [y_{\min}, y_{\max}]$  for every  $t \in [\tilde{t}, t_{\max})$ , we deduce that the solution of (4.1) has a continuation to an interval  $[0, t_{\max} + \varepsilon)$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$  (cf. for instance [16, Ch. I, Th. 5.2]), reaching the desired contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** *The function  $\rho$  is continuous.*

*Proof.* First of all, let us notice that  $\rho$  is continuous at each point  $(s, t, x, y)$  such that  $\zeta(s; t, x, y) \neq \infty$ . This follows from Theorem 3 and the fact that the restriction of  $\Psi$  to  $\mathcal{H}$  is a local homeomorphism.

It remains to show that  $\rho$  is continuous where its value is  $+\infty$ . Let us consider  $(t, t_0, x_0, y_0) \in \Gamma$  such that  $\rho(t; t_0, x_0, y_0) = +\infty$ . We now show that for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a neighbourhood  $[t_j, T] \times V_0 \subset \Gamma$ , with  $t_j < t \leq T$ , such that  $\rho(s; t, x, y) > j$  for every  $(s, t, x, y) \in [t_j, T] \times V_0$ .

By (iii), there exist  $t_j < t$  such that  $\rho(t_j; t_0, x_0, y_0) = a > j + 1$  with  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, by the continuity of  $\rho$  in  $(t_j, t_0, x_0, y_0)$ , which we have by the first part of the proof, we know that there exists a neighbourhood  $V_0$  of  $(t_0, x_0, y_0)$  such that  $\rho(t_j, t, x, y) > j + 1$  for every  $(t, x, y) \in V_0$ . By (ii), we deduce that  $\rho(s, t, x, y) > j + \frac{1}{2}$  for every  $(s, t, x, y) \in [t_j, T] \times V_0$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.** *For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a radius  $\tilde{R}_n > 0$  such that, if  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{N}$  and  $\tilde{R}_n < |\varphi(t, x, y)| \neq \infty$  for every  $t \in [0, T]$ , then  $\rho(T; 0, x, y) > n$ .*

*Proof.* Let us take  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{N}$  such that  $\tilde{R}_n < \varphi(t, x, y) \neq \infty$  for every  $t \in [0, T]$  and a value  $\tilde{R}_n$  yet to be assigned. As a consequence of (A1), (A3) and (A4), for every  $\alpha > 1$  there exist a positive function  $\gamma_\alpha \in L^1([0, T], \mathbb{R})$  such that

$$(f(t, x) + p(t, x, y))x > \alpha x^2 - \gamma_\alpha(t) |x| \quad \text{for every } (t, x, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2 \quad (4.7)$$

We set  $b_\alpha = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \gamma_\alpha(\tau) d\tau \geq 0$ .

Let us fix any  $(\vartheta, r) \in \Psi^{-1}(x, y)$ . For the computation in this proof, we write  $\tilde{\vartheta}(t) := Z^\vartheta(t; 0, \vartheta, r)$  and  $(\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{y}(t)) := \zeta(t; 0, x, y)$ . Since we are using the polar coordinates (2.1), which are a local diffeomorphism outside the origin, (4.7) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{\vartheta}}(t) &= \frac{[f(t, \tilde{x}(t)) + p(t, \tilde{x}(t), \tilde{y}(t))] \tilde{x}(t) + \tilde{y}^2(t)}{\tilde{x}^2(t) + \tilde{y}^2(t)} \\ &> \frac{\alpha \tilde{x}^2(t) + \tilde{y}^2(t)}{\tilde{x}^2(t) + \tilde{y}^2(t)} - \frac{\gamma_\alpha(t) |\tilde{x}(t)|}{\tilde{x}^2(t) + \tilde{y}^2(t)} \geq \alpha \cos^2 \tilde{\vartheta}(t) + \sin^2 \tilde{\vartheta}(t) - \frac{\gamma_\alpha(t)}{\tilde{R}_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us take  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $2\pi(k+1) \geq \tilde{\vartheta}(T) - \tilde{\vartheta}(0) > 2\pi k$ ; by definition we have

$$\rho(T; 0, x, y) = \frac{\tilde{\vartheta}(T) - \tilde{\vartheta}(0)}{2\pi} > k. \quad (4.8)$$

Writing for  $\alpha > 1$

$$L_\alpha := \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\beta}{\alpha \cos^2 \beta + \sin^2 \beta} = \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{\alpha}}, \quad (4.9)$$

we have

$$2\pi(k+1)L_\alpha \geq \int_{\tilde{\vartheta}(0)}^{\tilde{\vartheta}(T)} \frac{d\beta}{\alpha \cos^2 \beta + \sin^2 \beta} = \int_0^T \frac{\dot{\tilde{\vartheta}}(t) dt}{\alpha \cos^2 \tilde{\vartheta}(t) + \sin^2 \tilde{\vartheta}(t)} > T \left(1 - \frac{b_\alpha}{\tilde{R}_n}\right)$$

where in the estimate of the last term we have used that  $\alpha \cos^2 \beta + \sin^2 \beta \geq 1$  for every  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ , since  $\alpha > 1$ . Thus

$$k > \frac{T}{2\pi L_\alpha} \left(1 - \frac{b_\alpha}{\tilde{R}_n}\right) - 1 = \frac{T\sqrt{\alpha}}{4\pi^2} \left(1 - \frac{b_\alpha}{\tilde{R}_n}\right) - 1. \quad (4.10)$$

Fixing now  $\alpha > 1$  and  $\tilde{R}_n > 0$  such that

$$\sqrt{\alpha} > \frac{8\pi^2 n}{T} \quad \tilde{R}_n > 2b_\alpha \quad (4.11)$$

we obtain that  $k > n - 1$ ; since  $k$  and  $n$  are both integers, it follows that  $k \geq n$  and therefore  $\rho(T; 0, x, y) > n$ . Notice also that the requirements (4.11) depend on  $n, g, p$ , but not on the specific choice of  $(x, y)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 10.** *For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a radius  $R_n > 0$  such that, for every  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  with  $|(x, y)| > R_n$ , we have  $\rho(T; 0, x, y) > n$ .*

*Proof.* Let us set

$$R_{\mathcal{N}} = 1 + \max \{ |\varphi(t, x, y)| \text{ such that } (t, x, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{N} \} < +\infty.$$

Notice that  $R_{\mathcal{N}}$  is well defined thanks to (A5). We take  $\tilde{R}_n$  from Lemma 9 and, without loss of generality, assume  $\tilde{R}_n > R_{\mathcal{N}}$ . We make the following claim:

*There exists  $R_n > \tilde{R}_n$  such that each point  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  with  $|(x, y)| > R_n$  satisfies one of the two following alternative properties:*

- $|\varphi(t, x, y)| > \tilde{R}_n$  for every  $t \in [0, T]$  (including the case  $\varphi(t, x, y) = \infty$ )
- there exists  $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $\varphi(\bar{t}, x, y) = (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ ,  $|(\bar{x}, \bar{y})| < \tilde{R}_n$  and

$$\rho(\bar{t}; 0, x, y) > n + 1. \quad (4.12)$$

Please notice that  $\rho(\cdot; \cdot, x, y)$  is well defined since  $(x, y) \notin \mathcal{N}$  due to  $R_n > \tilde{R}_n > R_{\mathcal{N}}$ .

If the claim is true, then Lemma 10 follows straightforwardly. Indeed, in the first case either  $\varphi(T, x, y) = \infty$ , hence  $\rho(T; 0, x, y) = +\infty$ , or  $\varphi(T, x, y) \neq \infty$ , thus  $\rho(T; 0, x, y) > n$  follows from Lemma 9. If instead the second option holds, then  $\rho(T; 0, x, y) > n$  follows from (4.12) and (ii).

Thus, it remains to show that the claim is true. Let us take any  $(x, y)$  with  $|(x, y)| > R_n$ . We observe that either the first option of the claim holds, or there exists  $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $\varphi(\bar{t}, x, y) = (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  and  $|(\bar{x}, \bar{y})| < \tilde{R}_n$ . Hence, we just have to prove that, in the latter case, for a suitable choice of  $R_n$  the estimate (4.12) holds.

Let us consider the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\hat{x}}{d\hat{t}} = \hat{y} \\ \frac{d\hat{y}}{d\hat{t}} = -G(T - \hat{t}, -\hat{x}, \hat{y}) =: \hat{G}(\hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}) \\ \hat{x}(\hat{t}_0) = \hat{x}_0, \quad \hat{y}(\hat{t}_0) = \hat{y}_0 \end{cases} \quad (4.13)$$

Firstly, we notice that the solution of (4.13) for any choice of the Cauchy condition corresponds to the solution of (4.1) through the change of variables

$$\begin{array}{lll} \hat{x} = -x & \hat{y} = y & \hat{t} = T - t \\ \hat{x}_0 = -x_0 & \hat{y}_0 = y_0 & \hat{t}_0 = T - t_0 \end{array}$$

Secondly, we observe that, writing accordingly  $\hat{f}(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) := -f(T - \hat{t}, -\hat{x})$  and  $\hat{p}(\hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}) := -p(T - \hat{t}, -\hat{x}, \hat{y})$ , the assumptions (A1), (A2), (A3), (A4) and (A5) are satisfied also by

the new dynamics (4.13). Hence, we can define analogously  $\widehat{\zeta}$ ,  $\widehat{\mathcal{N}}_{\hat{t}}$  and  $\widehat{\rho}$  for system (4.13) and apply the related results proved above.

In particular, we notice that

$$\rho(t; 0, x, y) = \widehat{\rho}(T; T - t, -x^*, y^*) \quad \text{where } (x^*, y^*) = \varphi(t, x, y). \quad (4.14)$$

As a consequence of Theorem 3, (A5) and Lemma 8 applied to the dynamics (4.13), for every  $(\hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in [0, T] \times \overline{B_{\widetilde{R}_n}}$  we are in one of the following cases

- a)  $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{N}}_{\hat{t}}$  or  $\widehat{\rho}(T; \hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}) \leq n + 1$ . In both situations there exists a neighbourhood  $V_{\hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}}$  of  $(\hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y})$  and a constant  $C_{\hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}}$  such that  $|\widehat{\zeta}(T; s, u, w)| < C_{\hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}}$  for every  $(s, u, w) \in V_{\hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}}$ ;
- b)  $\widehat{\rho}(T; \hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}) > n + 1$ . Hence, there exists a neighbourhood  $V_{\hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}}$  of  $(\hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y})$  such that  $\widehat{\rho}(T; s, u, w) > n + 1$  for every  $(s, u, w) \in V_{\hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}}$ . In this case we set the constant  $C_{\hat{t}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}} = 1$ .

By the compactness of  $[0, T] \times \overline{B_{\widetilde{R}_n}}$ , there exists a finite collection  $V_{\hat{t}_k, \hat{x}_k, \hat{y}_k}$ , with  $k = 0, \dots, K$  which is a finite cover of  $[0, T] \times \overline{B_{\widetilde{R}_n}}$ .

Let us set

$$R_n := \max\{\widetilde{R}_n + 1, C_{\hat{t}_0, \hat{x}_0, \hat{y}_0}, C_{\hat{t}_1, \hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1}, \dots, C_{\hat{t}_K, \hat{x}_K, \hat{y}_K}\}. \quad (4.15)$$

We now consider  $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}, \bar{y})$  as in the second point of the claim and show that for this choice of  $R_n$  the estimate (4.12) holds. Indeed, by (4.14) we have

$$\rho(\bar{t}; 0, x, y) = \widehat{\rho}(T; T - \bar{t}, -\bar{x}, \bar{y}). \quad (4.16)$$

Since  $|(-\bar{x}, \bar{y})| < \widetilde{R}_n$  and

$$|\widehat{\zeta}(T; T - \bar{t}, -\bar{x}, \bar{y})| = |(x, y)| > R_n,$$

we deduce that the triplet  $(T - \bar{t}, -\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  is included in case b) above, hence  $\widehat{\rho}(T; T - \bar{t}, -\bar{x}, \bar{y}) > n + 1$  and by (4.16) we deduce (4.12), concluding the proof.  $\square$

Notice that, if we had global existence of solution, Lemma 10 would follow more easily from Lemma 9. More precisely, in the claim within the proof of Lemma 10 we could consider only the first option: such simplified version of the claim is sometimes referred as *elastic property* of the dynamics.

We are now ready to complete the proof of the main theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 4.* First of all, notice that the thesis is equivalent to the existence of a  $T$ -periodic solution for the planar system introduced in the Cauchy problem (4.1). For such planar dynamics, we consider the function  $\varphi$  as in (4.4); our aim is to find a fixed point of  $\varphi(T, \cdot)$ .

By (i) there exists a bounded open set  $U_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  such that

$$0 \in \mathcal{N} \subset U_1 \subset \overline{U_1} \subset U_0. \quad (4.17)$$

In particular, we notice that  $\varphi(T, z) \neq \infty$  for every  $z \in \partial U_1$ , hence  $\text{rot}_\varphi(z) = \rho(T; 0, z)$  is well-defined and finite for every  $z = (x, y) \in \partial U_1$ . By Lemma 8 and the compactness of  $\partial U_1$ , we deduce that there exists  $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\text{rot}_\varphi(\partial U_1) < \bar{n}. \quad (4.18)$$

We now define

$$U = U_1 \cup \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{N} \text{ such that } \rho(T; 0, z) < \bar{n} + \frac{1}{2} \right\}. \quad (4.19)$$

By Lemma 8 we deduce that  $U$  is open and by Lemma 10 that it is bounded. Moreover, by Lemma 8 and since  $\mathcal{N} \cap \partial U = \emptyset$ , we have

$$\text{rot}_\varphi(\partial U) = \left\{ \bar{n} + \frac{1}{2} \right\}, \quad \text{hence} \quad \text{rot}_\varphi(\partial U) \cap \mathbb{Z} = \emptyset. \quad (4.20)$$

By Theorem 1 we deduce that  $\deg(f_T, U, 0) = 1$  and, in particular, that  $\varphi(T, \cdot)$  has a fixed point in  $U$ , which corresponds to a  $T$ -periodic solution of (3.1).  $\square$

**Acknowledgements.** The Author is grateful to A. Fonda and A. Boscaggin for the valuable discussions on the topic. The Author is partially supported by the GAČR Junior Star Grant 21-09732M.

## References

- [1] A. Bahri and H. Berestycki, Forced vibrations of superquadratic Hamiltonian systems. *Acta Math.* 152 (1984), 143–197.
- [2] A. Boscaggin, Periodic solutions to superlinear planar Hamiltonian systems, *Port. Math.* 69 (2012), 127–140.
- [3] A. Boscaggin and R. Ortega, Monotone twist maps and periodic solutions of systems of Duffing type, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 157 (2014), 279–296.
- [4] A. Capietto, J. Mawhin, and F. Zanolin, A continuation approach to superlinear periodic boundary value problems. *J. Differential Equations* 88 (1990), 347–395.
- [5] C.V. Coffman and D.F. Ullrich, On the continuation of solutions of a certain non-linear differential equation, *Monatsh. Math.* 71 (1967), 385–392.
- [6] R. Dieckerhoff and E. Zehnder, Boundedness of solutions via the twist-theorem. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* 14 (1987), 79–95.
- [7] T.R. Ding and F. Zanolin, Periodic solutions of Duffing’s equations with superquadratic potential. *J. Differential Equations* 97 (1992), no. 2, 328–378.
- [8] U. Elias, Existence of global solutions of some ordinary differential equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 340 (2008), 739–745.
- [9] H. Ehrmann, Nachweis periodischer Lösungen bei gewissen nichtlinearen Schwingungsdifferentialgleichungen. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 1 (1957), 124–138.

- [10] A.F. Filippov, Differential equations with discontinuous righthand sides. Translated from the Russian. Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series), 18. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1988.
- [11] A. Fonda and P. Gidoni, Generalizing the Poincaré–Miranda Theorem: the avoiding cones condition, *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata* 195 (2016), 1347–1371.
- [12] A. Fonda and P. Gidoni, Coupling linearity and twist: an extension of the Poincaré–Birkhoff Theorem for Hamiltonian systems, *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.* 27 (2020), art. 55.
- [13] A. Fonda and A. Sfecci, Periodic solutions of weakly coupled superlinear systems. *J. Differential Equations* 260 (2016), 2150–2162.
- [14] S. Fučík and V. Lovicar, Periodic solutions of the equation  $x'' + g(x(t)) = p(t)$ , *Čas. Pěst. Mat.* 100 (1975) 160–175.
- [15] P. Gidoni, A topological degree theory for rotating solutions of planar systems, in preparation.
- [16] J.K. Hale, Ordinary differential equations. Second edition. Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co., Inc., Huntington, N.Y., 1980.
- [17] P. Hartman, On boundary value problems for superlinear second order differential equations. *J. Differential Equations* 26 (1977), 37–53.
- [18] A. Hatcher, Algebraic Topology. Cambridge University Press (2002)
- [19] H. Jacobowitz, Periodic solutions of  $x'' + f(x, t) = 0$  via the Poincaré–Birkhoff theorem. *J. Differential Equations* 20 (1976), 37–52; The existence of the second fixed point: A correction to "Periodic solutions of  $x'' + f(x, t) = 0$  via the Poincaré–Birkhoff theorem", *J. Differ. Equations* 25 (1977), 148–149.
- [20] J.E. Littlewood, Unbounded solutions of  $\ddot{y} + g(y) = p(t)$ . *J. London Math. Soc.* 41 (1966), 491–496.
- [21] Y.M. Long, Multiple solutions of perturbed superquadratic second order Hamiltonian systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 311 (1989), 749–780.
- [22] G.R. Morris, A differential equation for undamped forced non-linear oscillations. I. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 51 (1955), 297–312.
- [23] G.R. Morris, A differential equation for undamped forced non-linear oscillations. III. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 61 (1965), 133–155.
- [24] P.H. Rabinowitz, Multiple critical points of perturbed symmetric functionals, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 272 (1982), 753–769.
- [25] M. Struwe, Multiple solutions of anticoercive boundary value problems for a class of ordinary differential equations of second order. *J. Differential Equations* 37 (1980), 285–295.
- [26] G. Verzini, Bounded solutions to superlinear ODEs: a variational approach. *Nonlinearity* 16 (2003), 2013–2028.