

MSC 34D20

Comparison criteria for first order polynomial differential equations

G. A. Grigorian

0019 Armenia c. Yerevan, str. M. Bagramian 24/5

Institute of Mathematics of NAS of Armenia

E - mail: mathphys2@instmath.sci.am, phone: 098 62 03 05, 010 35 48 61

Abstract. In this paper we use the comparison method for investigation of first order polynomial differential equations. We prove two comparison criteria for these equations. The proved criteria we use to obtain some global solvability criteria for first order polynomial differential equations. On the basis of these criteria we prove some criteria for existence of a closed solution (of closed solutions) of for first order polynomial differential equations. The results obtained we compare with some known results.

Key words: comparison criteria, global solvability, Friedman model, Hilbert's 16th problem, the Riccati equation, the Abel equation of first kind, closed solutions.

1. Introduction. Let $a_k(t)$, $k = \overline{1, n}$ be real-valued continuous functions on $[t_0, \tau_0)$ ($t_0 < \tau_0 \leq +\infty$). Consider the first order polynomial differential equation

$$y' + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(t)y^k = 0, \quad t_0 \leq t \leq \tau_0. \quad (1.1)$$

According to the general theory of normal systems of differential equations for every $t_1 \geq t_0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and for any solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_1) = \gamma$ there exists $t_2 > t_1$ such that $y(t)$ is continuable on $[t_1, t_2)$. From the point of view of qualitative theory of differential equations an important interest represents the case $t_2 = +\infty$. One of effective ways to study the conditions, under which the case $t_2 = +\infty$ holds, is the comparison method. This method has been used in [1,2] to obtain some comparison criteria for Eq. (1.1) in the case $n = 2$ (the case of Riccati equations), which were used for qualitative study of different types of equations (see e. g. [3–13]). In the general case Eq. (1.1) attracts the attention of mathematicians in the connection with a relation of the problem of existence of closed solutions of Eq. (1.1) with the problem of existence of closed paths to planar dynamical systems (see the 16th problem of Hilbert [recall that a solution $y(t)$ of

Eq. (1.1), existing on any interval $[t_0, T]$, is called closed on that interval, if $y(t_0) = y(T)$ and many works are devoted to it (see [14–16] and cited works therein). Significant results in this direction have been obtained in [17]. Among them we point out the following result.

Theorem 1.1. ([17, p.3, Theorem 1]). *Let us assume that $a_0(t) \equiv 0$, $\int_{t_0}^T a_1(t)dt > 0$. Let us assume that there exists some $j = 2, \dots, n$ such that $(-1)^k a_k(t) \geq 0$ and $\sum_{k=j}^n a_k(t) > 0$ for all $k = j, \dots, n$ and $t \in [t_0, T]$. Then there exists a negative isolated closed solution of Eq. (1.1) on $[t_0, T]$.*

■

This and other theorems of work [17] were obtained by the use of a perturbation method and the contracting mapping principle. In this paper we use the comparison method for investigation of Eq. (1.1) for the case $n \geq 3$. In section 3 we prove two comparison criteria for Eq. (1.1). These criteria we use in section 4 to obtain some global solvability criteria for Eq. (1.1). On the basis of these criteria in section 5 we prove some criteria for existence of a closed solution (of closed solutions) of Eq. (1.1). The results obtained we compare with results of work [17].

2. Auxiliary propositions. Denote

$$D(t, u, v) \equiv \sum_{k=1}^n a_k(t) S_k(u, v),$$

where $S_k(u, v) \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} u^j v^{k-j-1}$, $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$, $k = \overline{1, n}$, $t \geq t_0$. Let $b_k(t)$, $k = \overline{0, n}$ be real-valued continuous functions on $[t_0, +\infty)$. Consider the equation

$$y' + \sum_{k=0}^n b_k(t) y^k = 0, \quad t \geq t_0. \quad (2.1)$$

Let $y_0(t)$ and $y_1(t)$ be solutions of the equations (1.1) and (2.1) respectively on $[t_1, t_2] \subset [t_0, +\infty)$. Then

$$[y_0(t) - y_1(t)]' + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(t) [y_0^k(t) - y_1^k(t)] + \sum_{k=0}^n [a_k(t) - b_k(t)] y_1^k(t) = 0, \quad t \in [t_1, t_2].$$

It follows from here and from the obvious equalities $y_0^k(t) - y_1^k(t) = [y_0(t) - y_1(t)] S_k(y_0(t), y_1(t))$,

$k = \overline{1, n}$, that

$$[y_0(t) - y_1(t)]' + D(t, y_0(t), y_1(t))[y_0(t) - y_1(t)] + \sum_{k=0}^n [a_k(t) - b_k(t)]y_1^k(t) = 0, \quad t \in [t_1, t_2].$$

It is clear from here that $y_0(t) - y_1(t)$ is a solution of the linear equation

$$x' + D(t, y_0(t), y_1(t))x + \sum_{k=0}^n [a_k(t) - b_k(t)]y_1^k(t) = 0, \quad t \in [t_1, t_2].$$

Then by the Cauchy formula we have

$$\begin{aligned} y_0(t) - y_1(t) = \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_1}^t D(\tau, y_0(\tau), y_1(\tau)) d\tau \right\} & \left[y_0(t_1) - y_1(t_1) - \right. \\ & \left. - \int_{t_1}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_1}^{\tau} D(s, y_0(s), y_1(s)) ds \right\} \left(\sum_{k=0}^n [a_k(\tau) - b_k(\tau)] \right) d\tau \right], \quad t \in [t_1, t_2]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Consider the differential inequality

$$\eta' + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(t)\eta^k \geq 0, \quad t_0 \leq t < \tau_0. \quad (2.3)$$

Definition 2.1. A continuous on $[t_0, \tau_0)$ ($\tau_0 \leq +\infty$) function $\eta^*(t)$ is called a sub solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, \tau_0)$ if for every $t_1 \in [t_0, \tau_0)$ there exists a solution $\eta_{t_1}(t)$ of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, t_1]$ such that $\eta_{t_1}(t_0) \geq \eta^*(t_0)$, $\eta_{t_1}(t_1) = \eta^*(t_1)$.

In a similar way is defined a sub solution $\zeta^*(t)$ of the inequality

$$\zeta' + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(t)\zeta^k \leq 0, \quad t_0 \leq t < \tau_0. \quad (2.4)$$

Obviously any solution $\eta(t)$ ($\zeta(t)$) of the inequality (2.3) ((2.4)) on $[t_0, \tau_0)$ is also a sub solution of that equation on $[t_0, \tau_0)$.

Lemma 2.1. Let $y(t)$ be a solution of Eq. (1.1) on $[t_0, \tau_0)$ and Let $\eta^*(t)$ be a sub solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, \tau_0)$ such that $y(t_0) \leq \eta^*(t_0)$. Then $y(t) \leq \eta^*(t)$, $t \in [t_0, \tau_0)$, and if $y(t_0) < \eta^*(t_0)$, then $y(t) < \eta^*(t)$, $t \in [t_0, t_1)$.

Proof. It is enough to show that if $\eta(t)$ is a solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, \tau_0)$ with $y(t_0) \leq \eta(t_0)$, then

$$y(t) \leq \eta(t), \quad t \in [t_0, \tau_0). \quad (2.5)$$

and if $y(t_0) < \eta(t_0)$, then

$$y(t) < \eta(t), \quad t \in [t_0, \tau_0). \quad (2.6)$$

We set $\tilde{a}_0(t) \equiv -\eta'(t) - \sum_{k=1}^n a_k(t)\eta^k(t)$, $t \in [t_0, \tau_0)$. By (2.3) we have

$$\tilde{a}_0(t) \leq a_0(t), \quad t \in [t_0, \tau_0). \quad (2.7)$$

Obviously $\eta(t)$ is a solution of the equation

$$y' + \sum_{k=1}^n a_k(t)y^k + \tilde{a}_0(t) = 0, \quad t \in [t_0, \tau_0)$$

on $[t_0, \tau_0)$. Then in virtue of (2.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} y_0(t) - \eta(t) = \exp\left\{-\int_{t_0}^t D(\tau, y(\tau), \eta(\tau))d\tau\right\} & \left[y(t_0) - \eta(t_0) + \right. \\ & \left. + \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left\{\int_{t_0}^s D(s, y(s), \eta(s))ds\right\} \left(\tilde{a}_0(s) - a_0(s) \right) ds \right], \quad t \in [t_0, \tau_0). \end{aligned}$$

This together with (2.7) implies that if $y(t_0) \leq \eta(t_0)$ ($y(t_0) < \eta(t_0)$), then (2.6) ((2.7)) is valid. The lemma is proved.

By analogy with the proof of Lemma 2.1 one can prove the following lemma

Lemma 2.2. *Let $y(t)$ be a solution of Eq. (1.1) on $[t_0, \tau_0)$ and let $\zeta^*(t)$ be a sub solution of the inequality (2.4) on $[t_0, \tau_0)$ such that $\zeta^*(t_0) \leq y(t_0)$. Then $\zeta^*(t) \leq y(t)$, $t \in [t_0, \tau_0)$, and if $\zeta(t_0) < y(t_0)$, then $\zeta(t) < y(t)$, $t \in [t_0, \tau_0)$.*

■

Remark 2.1. *It is clear that Lemma 2.1 (Lemma 2.2) remains valid if in the case $\tau_0 < +\infty$ the interval $[t_0, \tau_0)$ is replaced by $[t_0, \tau_0]$ in it.*

For any $T > t_0$ and $j = 2, \dots, n$ we set

$$M_{T,j} \equiv \max\left\{1, \max_{\tau \in [t_0, T]} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} |a_k(\tau)| / \sum_{k=j}^n a_k(\tau) \right\}\right\}, \quad M_{T,j}^*(t) \equiv \begin{cases} M_{T,j}, & t \in [t_0, T], \\ M_{t,j}, & t > T. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.3. *Let for some $j = 2, \dots, n$ the inequalities $a_k(t) \geq 0$, $k = \overline{j, n}$, $\sum_{k=j}^n a_k(t) > 0$, $t \geq t_0$ be satisfied. Then $M_{T,j}^*(t)$ is a sub solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, +\infty)$.*

Proof. It is obvious that $M_{T,j}^*(t)$ is a nondecreasing and continuous function on $[t_0, +\infty)$. Let $t_1 > t_0$ be fixed. To prove the lemma it is enough to show that $\eta_{t_1}(t) \equiv M_{t,j}$, $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ is a solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, t_1]$. Since $a_k(t) \geq 0$, $k = \overline{j, n}$, $t \geq t_0$ we have $\sum_{k=j}^n a_k(t)\eta^k \geq \left[\sum_{k=j}^n a_k(t)\right]\eta^j$ for all $\eta \geq 1$, and $t \geq t_0$. Then under the restriction $A_j(t) \equiv \sum_{k=j}^n a_k(t) > 0$, $t \geq t_0$ we get

$$\sum_{k=0}^n a_k(t)\eta^k \geq A_j(t)\eta^j \left[1 - \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} |a_k(t)|/A_j(t)\eta\right]$$

for all $\eta \geq 1$, $t \geq t_0$. It follows from here that $\eta_{t_1}(t)$ is solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, t_1]$. The lemma is proved.

For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t_1 \geq t_0$ we set

$$\eta_{\gamma, t_1}(t) \equiv \gamma + \exp\left\{-\int_{t_0}^t a_1(\tau)d\tau\right\} \left[c(t_1) - \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left\{\int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s)ds\right\} a_0(\tau)d\tau\right], \quad t \in [t_0, t_1],$$

where $c_1(t_1) \equiv \max_{\xi \in [t_0, t_1]} \int_{t_0}^{\xi} \exp\left\{\int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s)ds\right\} a_0(\tau)d\tau$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let the following conditions be satisfied.*

- (1) $a_n(t) \geq 0$, $t \geq t_0$.
- (2) $a_k(t) = a_n(t)c_k(t) + d_k(t)$, $k = \overline{2, n-1}$, $t \geq t_0$, where $c_k(t)$, $k = \overline{2, n-1}$ are bounded functions on $[t_0, t_1]$ for every $t_1 \geq t_0$ and
- (3) $\sum_{k=2}^{n-1} d_k(t)u^k \geq 0$, $u \geq N_T$, $t \geq t_0$, where

$$N_{t_1} \equiv \max\left\{1, \sup_{t \in [t_0, t_1]} \sum_{k=2}^n |c_k(t)|\right\}, \quad t_1 \geq T, \quad \text{for some } T \geq t_0.$$

Then

$$\eta_T^*(t) \equiv \begin{cases} \eta_{N_T, T}(t), & t \in [t_0, T], \\ \eta_{N_t, t}(t), & t \geq T \end{cases}$$

is a sub solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, +\infty)$.

Proof. Obviously, $\eta_T^*(t) \in C([t_0, +\infty))$. Therefore, to prove the lemma it is enough to show that for every $t_1 \geq T$ the function $\eta_{N_1, t_1}(t)$ is a solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, t_1]$ and $\eta_{N_1, t_1}(t_0) \geq \eta_T^*(t_0)$. The last inequality follows immediately from the definition of $\eta_{N_1, t_1}(t)$. Consider the function

$$F(t, u) \equiv 1 + \frac{c_{n-1}(t)}{u} + \dots + \frac{c_2(t)}{u^{n-2}}, \quad t \in [t_0, t_1], \quad u \geq 1 \quad (t_1 \geq T).$$

Obviously $F(t, u) \geq 1 - \frac{\sum_{k=2}^{n-1} |c_k(t)|}{u} \geq 0$ for all $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ and for all $u \geq N_{t_1}$. Moreover, $\eta_{N_{t_1}, t_1}(t) \geq N_{t_1}$, $t \in [t_0, t_1]$. Hence,

$$F(t, \eta_{N_{t_1}, t_1}(t)) \geq 0, \quad t \in [t_0, t_1]. \quad (2.8)$$

It is clear that $\eta_{N_{t_1}, t_1}(t) \in C^1([t_0, t_1])$ and $\eta'_{N_{t_1}, t_1}(t) + a_1(t)\eta_{N_{t_1}, t_1}(t) + a_0(t) = 0$, $t \in [t_0, t_1]$. it follows from here and from the condition (2) that

$$\eta'_{N_{t_1}, t_1}(t) + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(t)\eta_{N_{t_1}, t_1}^k(t) = a_n(t)\eta_{N_{t_1}, t_1}^n(t)F(t, \eta_{N_{t_1}, t_1}(t)) + \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} d_k(t)\eta_{N_{t_1}, t_1}^k(t),$$

$t \in [t_0, t_1]$. This together with the conditions (1), (2) and with the inequality (2.8) implies that $\eta_{N_{t_1}, t_1}(t)$ is a solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, t_1]$. The lemma is proved.

We set

$$\eta_c(t) \equiv \exp\left\{-\int_{t_0}^t a_1(\tau)d\tau\right\} \left[c - \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left\{\int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s)ds\right\} a_0(\tau)d\tau \right], \quad t \geq t_0, \quad c \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Lemma 2.5. *Let the following conditions be satisfied.*

(4) $a_2(t) > 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$,

(5) for some $c \geq \max_{t \in [t_0, T]} \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left\{\int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s)ds\right\} a_0(\tau)d\tau$ the inequality

$$\sum_{k=3}^n |a_k(t)|\eta_c^{k-2}(t) \leq a_2(t), \quad t \in [t_0, T] \text{ is valid.}$$

Then the function $\eta_c(t)$ is a nonnegative solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, T]$.

Proof. Obviously

$$\eta_c(t) \geq 0, \quad t \in [t_0, T] \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$\eta'_c(t) + a_1(t)\eta_c(t) + a_0(t) = 0, \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (2.10)$$

It follows from the conditions (4), (5) and from the inequality (2.9) that

$$\sum_{k=2}^n a_k(t)\eta_c^k(t) = a_2(t)\eta_c^2(t) \left[1 + \frac{\sum_{k=3}^n a_k(t)\eta_c^{k-2}(t)}{a_2(t)} \right] \geq a_2(t)\eta_c^2(t) \left[1 - \frac{\sum_{k=3}^n a_k(t)\eta_c^{k-2}(t)}{a_2(t)} \right] \geq 0,$$

$t \in [t_0, T]$. This together with (2.9) and (2.10) implies that $\eta_c(t)$ is a nonnegative solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, T]$. The lemma is proved.

We set

$$\alpha(t) \equiv \sum_{k=2}^n |a_k(t)| - a_1(t), \quad \theta_c(t) \equiv \exp \left\{ t_0 t \alpha(\tau) d\tau \right\} \left[c - \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau \right],$$

$t \geq t_0$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let for some $c \geq \max_{t \in [t_0, T]} \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau$ the inequality $\theta_c(t) \leq 1$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ be satisfied. Then $\theta_c(t)$ is a nonnegative solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, T]$.*

Proof. It is obvious that

$$\theta_c(t) \geq 0, \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (2.11)$$

Show that $\theta_c(t)$ satisfies (2.3) on $[t_0, T]$. We have

$$\sum_{k=0}^n a_k(t)\theta_c^k(t) = \left(\sum_{k=2}^n |a_k(t)| \right) \theta_c(t) + \sum_{k=2}^n a_k(t)\theta_c^k(t) + a_0(t) - \alpha(t)\theta_c(t), \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (2.12)$$

Obviously,

$$\theta_c'(t) + a_0(t) - \alpha(t)\theta_c(t) = 0, \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (2.13)$$

It follows from here and from (2.12) that if $\sum_{k=2}^n |a_k(t)| = 0$ for some fixed $t \in [t_0, T]$, then $\theta_c(t)$ satisfies (2.3) in t . Assume $\sum_{k=2}^n |a_k(t)| \neq 0$ for a fixed $t \in [t_0, T]$. Then it follows from the condition $\theta_c(t) \leq 1$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ of the lemma and from (2.11) that

$$\left(\sum_{k=2}^n |a_k(t)| \right) \theta_c(t) + \sum_{k=2}^n a_k(t)\theta_c^k(t) \geq \left(\sum_{k=2}^n |a_k(t)| \right) \theta_c(t) \left[1 - \frac{\sum_{k=2}^n |a_k(t)|\theta_c^2(t)}{\sum_{k=2}^n |a_k(t)|\theta_c(t)} \right] \geq 0$$

for that fixed t . This together with (2.12) and (2.13) implies that $\theta_c(t)$ satisfies (2.3) in that fixed t . Hence, $\theta_c(t)$ satisfies (2.3) for all $t \in [t_0, T]$. The lemma is proved.

Let $F(t, Y)$ be a continuous in t and continuously differentiable in Y vector function on $[t_0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^m$. Consider the nonlinear system

$$Y' = F(t, Y), \quad t \geq t_0. \quad (2.14)$$

Every solution $Y(t) = Y(t, t_0, Y_0)$ of this system exists either only a finite interval $[t_0, T)$ or is continuable on $[t_0, +\infty)$

Lemma 2.7([18, p. 204, Lemma]). *If a solution $Y(t)$ of the system (2.14) exists only on a finite interval $[t_0, T)$, then*

$$\|Y(t)\| \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } t \rightarrow T - 0,$$

where $\|Y(t)\|$ is any euclidian norm of $Y(t)$ for every fixed $t \in [t_0, T)$. ■

Lemma 2.8. *For k odd the inequality*

$$S_k(u, v) \geq 0, \quad u, v \in \mathbb{R} \text{ is valid.}$$

Proof. If $u = 0$, then

$$S_k(u, v) = v^{k-1} = v^{2m} \geq 0, \quad v \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (m \in \mathbb{Z}_+). \quad (2.15)$$

For $u \neq 0$ we have

$$S_k(u, v) = u^{2m} P_k(x), \quad x \equiv \frac{v}{u}, \quad P_k(x) \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} x^j, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.16)$$

Since $k - 1$ is even all roots of $P_k(x)$ are complex (not real). Besides $P_k(9) = 1 > 0$. Hence, $P_k(x) > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}$. This together with (2.15) and (2.16) implies that $S_k(u, v) \geq 0$ for all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 2.9 *For k even the inequality*

$$\frac{\partial S_k(u, v)}{\partial u} \geq 0, \quad u, v \in \mathbb{R} \text{ is valid.}$$

Proof. Since $\frac{\partial S_k(u, v)}{\partial u} = (k - 1)u^{k-2} + \dots + 2uv^{k-3} + v^{k-2}, u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ and k is even, we have

$$\left. \frac{\partial S_k(u, v)}{\partial u} \right|_{u=0} = (k - 1)u^{2m} \geq 0, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (m \in \mathbb{Z}_+). \quad (2.17)$$

For $u \neq 0$ the following equality is valid

$$\frac{\partial S_k(u, v)}{\partial u} = u^{2m} Q_k(x), \quad x \equiv \frac{v}{u}, \quad Q_k(x) \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (j+1)x^j, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.18)$$

Consider the polynomials $q_j(x) = (j+1)x^{2j}(1+x^2)$, $j = 0, 1, \dots$. Obviously,

$$q_j(x) \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (2.19)$$

and

$$q_0(x) + (k-1)x^{2m} \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (2.20)$$

It is not difficult to verify that

$$Q_k(x) = q_0(x) + \dots + q_{2(m-1)}(x) + (k-1)x^{2m}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

This together with (2.17)-(2.20) implies that $\frac{\partial S_k(u, v)}{\partial u} \geq 0$, $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $y_1(t)$ and $y_2(t)$ be solutions of Eq. (1.1) on $[t_0, T]$ such that*

$$y_1(t_0) < y_2(t_0), \quad y_1(t_0) \leq y_1(t), \quad y_2(t_0) \geq y_2(T).$$

Then Eq. (1.1) has a closed solution $y(t)$ on $[t_0, T]$ such that

$$y_1(t) \leq y(t) \leq y_2(t), \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (2.21)$$

Proof. Let us define the sequences $\{\xi_n(t)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\{\eta_n(t)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ by induction on n as follow. We put $\xi_1(t) = y_1(t)$, $\eta_1(t) = y_2(t)$. let $x_1(t)$ be a solution of Eq. (1.1) with $x_1(t_0) = \frac{\xi_1(t_0) + \eta_1(t_0)}{2}$. By virtue of Lemma 2.7 and by the uniqueness theorem $x_1(t)$ exists on $[t_0, T]$ and $\xi_1(t), x_1(t) < \eta_1(t)$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ (since $y_1(t_0) < y_2(t_0)$). Then two cases are possible

$$(a) \ x_1(t_0) \leq x_1(T), \quad (b) \ x_1(t_0) > x_1(T).$$

In the case (a) we put $\xi_2(t) = x_1(t)$, $\eta_2(t) = \eta_1(t)$, $t \in [t_0, T]$, and in the case (b) we put $\xi_2(t) = \xi_1(t)$, $\eta_2(t) = x_1(t)$, $t \in [t_0, T]$. Then it follows from the conditions of the lemma that

$$\xi_2(t_0) \leq \xi_2(T), \quad \eta_2(t_0) \geq \eta_2(T). \quad (2.22)$$

$$\eta_2(t_0) - \xi_2(t_0) = \frac{\eta_1(t_0) - \xi_1(t_0)}{2}. \quad (2.23)$$

Hence,

$$[\xi_2(T), \eta_2(T)] \subset [\xi_2(t_0), \eta_2(t_0)]. \quad (2.24)$$

Assume $\xi_1(t), \dots, \xi_n(t)$ and $\eta_1(t), \dots, \eta_n(t)$ are already defined. By induction on n from (2.22)-(2.224) we have

$$\xi_n(t_0) < \eta_n(t_0), \quad (2.25)$$

$$\xi_n(t_0) \leq \xi_n(T), \quad \eta_n(t_0) \geq \eta_n(T). \quad (2.26)$$

$$\eta_n(t_0) - \xi_n(t_0) = \frac{\eta_1(t_0) - \xi_1(t_0)}{2^{n-1}}. \quad (2.27)$$

$$[\xi_n(T), \eta_n(T)] \subset [\xi_n(t_0), \eta_n(t_0)]. \quad (2.28)$$

Then we define $\xi_{n+1}(t)$ and $\eta_{n+1}(t)$ as follow. Let $x_n(t)$ be a solution of Eq. (1.1) with $x_n(t_0) = \frac{\xi_n(t_0) + \eta_n(t_0)}{2}$. By Lemma 2.7 and by the uniqueness theorem it follows from (2.25) that $x_n(t)$ exists on $[t_0, T]$ and

$$\xi_n(t) \leq x_n(t) \leq \eta_n(t), \quad t \in [t_0, T].$$

Then two cases are possible

$$(c) \ x_n(t_0) \leq x_n(T), \quad (d) \ x_n(t_0) > x_n(T).$$

In the case (c) we put $\xi_{n+1}(t) = x_n(t)$, $\eta_{n+1}(t) = \eta_n(t)$, $t \in [t_0, T]$. In the case (d) we put $\xi_{n+1}(t) = \xi_n(t)$, $\eta_{n+1}(t) = x_n(t)$, $t \in [t_0, T]$. It is clear from here that the relations (2.25)-(2.28) remain valid if we replace n by $n+1$ in them. Hence, (2.25)-(2.28) are valid for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$. By virtue of the theorem of nested balls from (2.27) and (2.28) we obtain

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [\xi_n(t_0), \eta_n(t_0)] = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [\xi_n(T), \eta_n(T)] \stackrel{def}{=} \{y_*\}. \quad (2.29)$$

Let $y(t)$ be a solution of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) = y_*$. Show that $y(t)$ is the required closed solution. Since $y(t_0) = y_* \in [\xi_n(t_0), \eta_n(t_0)]$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$, by virtue of Lemma 2.7 and by the uniqueness theorem $y(t)$ exists on $[t_0, T]$ and $y(T) \in [\xi_n(T), \eta_n(T)]$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. It follows from here and from (2.29) that $y(t) \in [y_*, y_*]$ and (2.21) is valid. The lemma is proved.

3. Comparison criteria. In this section we prove two comparison criteria for Eq. (1.1). These criteria with the aid of section 2 we use in section 4 to obtain some global solvability criteria for Eq. (1.1).

Theorem 3.1. *Let $y_1(t)$ be a solution of Eq. (2.1) on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and let $\eta^*(t)$ be a sub solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, +\infty)$ such that $y_1(t_0) < \eta^*(t_0)$. Moreover, let the following conditions be satisfied*

(I) $D(t, u, y_1(t)) \leq D_1(t, u, y_1(t))$, $u \geq y_1(t)$, $t \geq t_0$, where $D_1(t, u, y_1(t))$ is a nondecreasing in $u \geq y_1(t)$ function for every $t \geq t_0$.

$\gamma - y_1(t) + \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} D_1(s, \eta^*(s), y_1(s)) ds \right\} \left(\sum_{k=0}^n [b_k(\tau) - a_k(\tau)] y_1^K(\tau) \right) d\tau \geq 0$, $t \geq t_0$ for some $\gamma \in [y_1(t_0), \eta^*(t_0)]$.

Then for every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\gamma, \eta^*(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and

$$y_1(t) \leq y(t) \leq \eta^*(t), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Furthermore, if $y_1(t_0) < y(t_0)$ ($y(t_0) < \eta^*(t_0)$), then

$$y_1(t) < y(t) \quad (y(t) < \eta^*(t)), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Proof. Let $y(t)$ be a solution of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\gamma, \eta^*(t_0)]$ and let $[t_0, t_1)$ be its maximum existence interval. Then by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$y(t) \leq \eta^*(t), \quad t \in [t_0, t_1), \quad (3.1)$$

and if $y(t_0) < \eta^*(t_0)$, then

$$y(t) < \eta^*(t), \quad t \in [t_0, t_1). \quad (3.2)$$

In virtue of (2.2) we have

$$y(t) - y_1(t) = \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^t D(\tau, y(\tau), y_1(\tau)) d\tau \right\} \left[y(t_0) - y_1(t_0) - \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} D(s, y(s), y_1(s)) ds \right\} \left(\sum_{k=0}^n [a_k(\tau) - b_k(\tau)] y_1^k(\tau) \right) d\tau \right], \quad t \in [t_0, t_1). \quad (3.3)$$

Let us show that

$$y_1(t) \leq y(t), \quad t \in [t_0, t_1). \quad (3.4)$$

At first we consider the case $y(t_0) > y_1(t_0)$. Sow that in this case

$$y_1(t) < y(t), \quad t \in [t_0, t_1). \quad (3.5)$$

Suppose it is not true. Then there exists $t_2 \in (t_0, t_1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} y_1(t) &< y(t), \quad t \in [t_0, t_2). \\ y_1(t_2) &= y(t_2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

It follows from here, from (3.1) and from the condition (I) that

$$D(t, y(t), y_1(t)) \leq D_1(t, \eta^*(t), y_1(t)), \quad t \in [t_0, t_2).$$

Hence, the function

$$H(\tau) \equiv \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} [D(s, y(s), y_1(s)) - D_1(s, \eta^*(s), y_1(s))] ds \right\}, \quad \tau \in [t_0, t_2)$$

is positive and nondecreasing on $[t_0, t_2)$. By mean value theorem for integrals (see [19, p. 869]) it follows from here that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} D(s, y(s), y_1(s)) ds \right\} \left(\sum_{k=0}^n [a_k(\tau) - b_k(\tau)] y_1^k(\tau) \right) d\tau = \\ = \int_{t_0}^{\kappa(t)} \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} D_1(s, \eta^*(s), y_1(s)) ds \right\} \left(\sum_{k=0}^n [a_k(\tau) - b_k(\tau)] y_1^k(\tau) \right) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

for some $\kappa(t) \in [t_0, t)$, $t \in [t_0, t_2)$. This together with (3.3) and with the condition (II) implies that $y_1(t_2) < y(t_2)$, which contradicts (3.6). The obtained contradiction proves (3.5), hence proves (3.4). Let us show that (3.4) is also valid in the case $y(t_0) = y_1(t_0)$. Suppose, for some $t_3 \in (t_0, t_1)$

$$y(t_3) < y_1(t_3). \tag{3.7}$$

Let $\tilde{y}_\delta(t)$ be a solution of Eq. (1.1) with $\tilde{y}_\delta(t_0) > y_1(t_0)$. Then by already proven (3.5) we have $\tilde{y}_\delta(t_3) > y_1(t_3)$. As far as the solutions of Eq. (1.1) continuously depend on their initial values we chose $\delta > 0$ so small that $\tilde{y}_\delta(t_3) - y_1(t_3) < \frac{y_1(t_3) - y(t_3)}{2}$. Since, $\tilde{y}_\delta(t_3) > y_1(t_3)$ it follows from the last inequality that

$$y_1(t_0) - y(t_3) < \tilde{y}_\delta(t_3) - y_1(t_3) < \frac{y_1(t_3) - y(t_3)}{2},$$

which contradicts (3.7). The obtained contradiction proves that (3.4) is also valid for $y(t_0) = y_1(t_0)$. Note that the proof of (3.3) and (3.4) in the general case $y(t_0) \geq y_1(t_0)$

repeats the proof of them for the case $y(t) > y_1(t_0)$. Therefore, due to (3.1), (3.2), (3.4) and (3.5) to complete the proof of the theorem it remains to show that

$$t_1 = +\infty. \quad (3.8)$$

Suppose $t_1, +\infty$. Then it follows from (3.1) and (3.4) that $y(t)$ is bounded on $[t_0, t_1)$. By lemma 2.7 it follows from here that $[t_0, t_1)$ is not the maximum existence interval for $y(t)$, which contradicts our supposition. The obtained contradiction proves (3.8). The proof of the theorem is completed.

Note that every function $y_1(t) \equiv \zeta(t) \in C^1([t_0, +\infty))$ is a solution of Eq. (2.1) with $b_0(t) = -\zeta'(t)$, $b_1(t) = \dots = b_n(t) \equiv 0$, $t \geq t_0$. Then

$$\sum_{k=0}^n [b_k(t) - a_k(t)] y_1^k(t) = - \left[\zeta'(t) + \sum_{k=0}^n [b_k(t) - a_k(t)] \zeta^k(t) \right] \quad t \geq t_0.$$

From here and from Theorem 3.1 we obtain immediately

Corollary 3.1. *Let $\eta^*(t)$ be a sub solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and let for some $y_1(t) \equiv \zeta(t) \in C^1([t_0, +\infty))$ with $\zeta(t_0) < \eta(t_0)$ the condition (I) of Theorem 3.1 and the following condition be satisfied*

$$\zeta(t_0) - \gamma + \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} D_1(s, \eta^*(s), \zeta(s)) ds \right\} \left(\zeta'(\tau) + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(\tau) \zeta^k(\tau) \right) d\tau \leq 0, \quad t \geq t_0,$$

for some $\gamma \in [\zeta(t_0), \eta^*(t_0)]$.

Then every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\gamma, \eta^*(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and

$$\zeta(t) \leq y(t) \leq \eta^*(t), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Furthermore, if $\zeta(t_0) < y(t_0)$ ($y(t_0) < \eta^*(t_0)$), then

$$\zeta(t) < y(t) \quad (y(t) < \eta^*(t)), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

■

Let $e_k(t)$, $k = \overline{0, n}$ be real-valued continuous functions on $[t_0, +\infty)$. Consider the equation

$$y' + \sum_{k=0}^n e_k(t) y^k = 0, \quad t \geq t_0. \quad (3.9)$$

Theorem 3.2 Let $y_1(t)$ and $y_2(t)$ be solutions of the equations (2.1) and (3.9) respectively on $[t_0, +\infty)$ such that $y_1(t_0) \leq y_2(t_0)$ and let the following conditions be satisfied.

$$(III) \quad \sum_{k=0}^n (b_k(t) - a_k(t))y_1^k(t) \geq 0, \quad t \geq t_0,$$

$$(IV) \quad \sum_{k=0}^n (e_k(t) - a_k(t))y_2^k(t) \leq 0, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Then every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [y_1(t_0), y_2(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and

$$y_1(t) \leq y(t) \leq y_2(t), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Furthermore, if $y_1(t_0) < y(t_0) < y_2(t_0)$, then

$$y_1(t) < y(t) < y_2(t), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Proof. Let $y(t)$ be a solution of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [y_1(t_0), y_2(t_0)]$ and let $[t_0, t_1)$ be its maximum existence interval. Then by (2.2) the following equations are valid

$$y(t) - y_1(t) = \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^t D(\tau, y(\tau), y_1(\tau)) d\tau \right\} \left[y(t_0) - y_1(t_0) - \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} D(s, y(s), y_1(s)) ds \right\} \left(\sum_{k=0}^n [a_k(\tau) - b_k(\tau)] y_1^k(\tau) \right) d\tau, \quad t \in [t_0, t_1), \right.$$

$$\left. y(t) - y_2(t) = \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^t D(\tau, y(\tau), y_2(\tau)) d\tau \right\} \left[y(t_0) - y_2(t_0) - \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} D(s, y(s), y_2(s)) ds \right\} \left(\sum_{k=0}^n [a_k(\tau) - e_k(\tau)] y_2^k(\tau) \right) d\tau, \quad t \in [t_0, t_1). \right.$$

It follows from here and from the conditions (III) and (IV) of the theorem that

$$y_1(t) \leq y(t) \leq y_2(t), \quad t \in [t_0, t_1). \quad (3.10)$$

and if $y_1(t_0) < y(t_0) < y_2(t_0)$, then

$$y_1(t) < y(t) < y_2(t), \quad t \in [t_0, t_1).$$

Therefore, to complete the proof of the theorem it remains to show that

$$t_1 = +\infty. \quad (3.11)$$

Suppose $t_1 < +\infty$. Then by Lemma 2.7 it follows from (3.10) that $[t_0, t_1)$ is not the maximum existence interval for $y(t)$, which contradicts our supposition. The obtained contradiction proves (3.11). The proof of the theorem is completed.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\eta^*(t)$ and $\zeta^*(t)$ be sub solutions of the inequalities (2.3) and (2.4) respectively on $[t_0, +\infty)$ such that $\zeta^*(t) \leq \eta^*(t)$. Then every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\zeta^*(t_0), \eta^*(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and*

$$\zeta^*(t) \leq y(t) \leq \eta^*(t), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Furthermore, if $\zeta^*(t_0) < y(t_0)$ ($y(t_0) < \eta^*(t_0)$), then

$$\zeta^*(t) < y(t) \quad (y(t) < \eta^*(t)), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Proof. To prove the corollary it is enough to show that for every $\tau_0 > t_0$ and solutions $\zeta(t)$ and $\eta(t)$ of the inequalities (2.4) and (2.3) respectively on $[t_0, \tau_0]$ with $\zeta(t_0) \leq \eta(t_0)$ any solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\zeta(t_0), \eta(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, \tau_0]$ and

$$\zeta(t) \leq y(t) \leq \eta(t), \quad t \in [t_0, \tau_0], \quad (3.12)$$

and if $\zeta(t_0) < y(t_0)$ ($y(t_0) < \eta(t_0)$), that

$$\zeta(t) < y(t) \quad (y(t) < \eta(t)), \quad [t_0, \tau_0]. \quad (3.13)$$

The function $y_1(t) \equiv \zeta(t)$ is a solution of Eq. (2.1) on $[t_0, \tau_0]$ $b_0(t) \equiv -\zeta'(t)$, $b_1(t) = \dots = b_n(t) \equiv 0$, and $y_2(t) \equiv \eta(t)$ is a solution of the equation (3.9) on $[t_0, \tau_0]$ with $e_0(t) \equiv -\eta'(t)$, $e_1(t) = \dots = e_n(t) \equiv 0$. Then the condition (III) gives us

$$\zeta'(t) + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(t)\zeta^k(t) \leq 0, \quad t \geq t_0$$

and the condition (IV) gives us

$$\eta'(t) + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(t)\eta^k(t) \geq 0, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Therefore by Theorem 3.2 (note that Theorem 3.2 remains valid if we replace $[t_0, +\infty)$ by $[t_0, \tau_0]$ in it) then the inequalities (3.12) and (3.13) are valid. The corollary is proved.

4. Global solvability criteria. Denote $a_k^+(t) \equiv \max\{0, a_k(t)\}$, $k = \overline{2, n}$, $t \geq t_0$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let the condition of Lemma 2.3 and the following condition be satisfied (A) for a nonnegative $\zeta'(t) \in C^1([t_0, +\infty))$ with $\zeta(t_0) < M_{\gamma, T}^*(t_0)$ and for some $\nu \in [\zeta(t_0), M_{\gamma, T}^*(t_0)]$*

$$\zeta(t_0) - \nu + \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} [a_K^+(s) S_K(M_{\gamma, T}(s), \zeta(s)) + a_1(s)] ds \right\} \times \\ \times \left(\zeta'(\tau) + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(\tau) \zeta^k(\tau) \right) d\tau \leq 0, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Then every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\nu, M_{\gamma, T}^*(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and

$$\zeta(t) \leq y(t) \leq M_{\gamma, T}^*(t), \quad t \geq t_0. \quad (4.1)$$

Furthermore, if $\zeta(t_0) < y(t_0)$ ($y(t_0) < M_{\gamma, T}^*(t_0)$), then

$$\zeta(t) < y(t) \quad (y(t) < M_{\gamma, T}^*(t)), \quad t \geq t_0. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.1 $M_{\gamma, T}^*(t)$ is a solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, +\infty)$. Note that $y_1(t) \equiv \zeta(t)$ is a solution of Eq. (2.1) on $[t_0, +\infty)$ for $b_0(t) \equiv -\zeta'(t)$, $b_1(t) = \dots = b_n(t) \equiv 0$. Then since $\zeta(t)$ is nonnegative we have

$$D(t, u, v) \leq \sum_{k=2}^n a_k^+(t) S_k(u, \zeta(t)) + a_1(t), \quad \text{for all } u \geq \zeta(t), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Moreover, $\sum_{k=2}^n a_k^+(t) S_k(u, \zeta(t))$ is nondecreasing in $u \geq \zeta(t) \geq 0$, for all $t \geq t_0$. It follows from here and from (A) that the conditions of Corollary 3.1 are satisfied. Hence, every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\nu, M_{\gamma, T}^*(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and the inequalities (4.1) and (4.2) are valid. The theorem is proved.

By analogy with the proof of Theorem 4.1 it can be proved the following theorem

Theorem 4.2. *Let the conditions of Lemma 2.4 and the condition (B) for a nonnegative $\zeta(t) \in C^1([t_0, +\infty))$ with $\zeta(t_0) < \eta_T^*(t_0)$ and for some $\nu \in [\zeta(t_0), \eta_T^*(t_0)]$*

$$\zeta(t_0) - \nu + \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \left[\sum_{k=2}^n a_k^+(s) S_k(\eta_T^*(s), \zeta(s)) + a_1(s) \right] ds \right\} \times$$

$$\times \left(\zeta'(\tau) + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(\tau) \zeta^k(\tau) \right) d\tau \leq 0, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

be satisfied.

Then every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\nu, \eta_T^*(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and

$$\zeta(t) \leq y(t) \leq \eta_T^*(t), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Furthermore, if $\zeta(t_0) < y(t_0)$ ($y(t_0) < \eta_T^*(t_0)$), then

$$\zeta(t) < y(t) \quad (y(t) < \eta_T^*(t)), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

■

Corollary 4.1. *Let the conditions of Lemma 2.3 or Lemma 2.4 be satisfied. If $a_0(t) \leq 0$, $t \geq t_0$, then every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \geq 0$ exists on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and is nonnegative*

Proof. Let $y(t)$ be a solution of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \geq 0$. Under the conditions of Lemma 2.3 (of Lemma 2.4) we can take $M_T^*(t)$ ($\eta_T^*(t)$) so that $y(t_0) \leq M_T^*(t)$ ($y(t_0) \leq \eta_T^*(t)$). Then the condition $a_0(t) \leq 0$, $t \geq t_0$ provides the satisfiability of the condition (A) of Theorem 4.1 (of the condition (B) of Theorem 4.2) for $\nu = 0$, $\zeta(t) \equiv 0$. Hence, the assertion of the corollary is valid. The corollary is proved.

We set $\sigma_k^\pm \equiv \frac{1 \pm (-1)^k}{2}$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Obviously,

$$\sigma_k^+ = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } k \text{ even,} \\ 0, & \text{for } k \text{ odd,} \end{cases} \quad \sigma_k^- = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for } k \text{ even,} \\ 1, & \text{for } k \text{ odd,} \end{cases} \quad k = 0, 1, \dots$$

Theorem 4.3. *Let the conditions of Lemma 2.4 and the following conditions be satisfied.*

(C) $(-1)^k a_k(t) \geq 0$, $k = \overline{2, n}$, $t \geq t_0$,

(D) for some $\zeta(t) \in C^1([t_0, +\infty))$ with $\zeta(t_0) < \eta_T^*(t_0)$ and for some $\nu \in [\zeta(t_0), \eta_T^*(t_0)]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \zeta(t_0) - \nu + \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \left[\sum_{k=2}^n \sigma_k^+ a_k^+(s) S_k(\eta_T^*(s), \zeta(s)) + a_1(s) \right] ds \right\} \times \\ & \times \left(\zeta'(\tau) + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(\tau) \zeta^k(\tau) \right) d\tau \leq 0, \quad t \geq t_0. \end{aligned}$$

Then every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\nu, \eta_T^*(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and

$$\zeta(t) \leq y(t) \leq \eta_T^*(t), \quad t \geq t_0. \quad (4.3)$$

Furthermore, if $\zeta(t_0) < y(t_0)$ ($y(t_0) < \eta_T^*(t_0)$), then

$$\zeta(t) < y(t) \quad (y(t) < \eta_T^*(t)), \quad t \geq t_0. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. By virtue of Lemma 2.4 $\eta_T^*(t)$ is a sub solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, +\infty)$. Since

$$D(t, u, v) = \sum_{k=2}^n \sigma_k^+ a_k(t) S_k(u, v) + \sum_{k=2}^n \sigma_k^- a_k(t) S_k(u, v) + a_1(t), \quad u, v \in \mathbb{R}, \quad t \geq t_0$$

By Lemmas 2.8 and 2.9 it follows from (C) that $\sum_{k=2}^n \sigma_k^+ a_k(t) S_k(u, v) + a_1(t)$ is nondecreasing in $u \geq \zeta(t)$ for all t and $\sum_{k=2}^n \sigma_k^- a_k(t) S_k(u, v) \leq 0$, $t \geq t_0$. Hence, $D(t, u, \zeta(t)) \leq \sum_{k=2}^n \sigma_k^+ a_k(t) S_k(u, \zeta(t)) + a_1(t)$, $u \geq \zeta(t)$, $t \geq t_0$. It follows from here and from (D) that the condition (II) of Theorem 3.1 is satisfied for the case $b_0(t) = -\zeta'(t)$, $b_1(t) = \dots = b_n(t) \equiv 0$. Thus, all conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied. Therefore, every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\nu, \eta_T^*(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and the inequalities (4.3) and (4.4) are satisfied. The theorem is proved.

Theorem 4.4. *Let the conditions of Lemma 2.5 and the following condition be satisfied.*

(E) *for a nonnegative $\zeta(t) \in C^1([t_0, T])$ with $\zeta(t_0) < \eta_c(t_0)$ and for some $\nu \in [\zeta(t_0), \eta_c(t_0)]$*

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(t_0) - \nu + \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \left[\sum_{k=2}^n a_k^+(s) S_k(\eta_c(s), \zeta(s)) + a_1(s) \right] ds \right\} \times \\ \times \left(\zeta'(\tau) + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(\tau) \eta_c^k(\tau) \right) d\tau \leq 0, \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

Then every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\nu, \eta_c(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, T]$ and

$$\zeta(t) \leq y(t) \leq \eta_c(t), \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (4.5)$$

Furthermore, if $\zeta(t_0) < y(t_0)$ ($y(t_0) < \eta_c(t_0)$), then

$$\zeta(t) < y(t) \quad (y(t) < \eta_c(t)), \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. By virtue of Lemma 2.5 $\eta_c(t)$ is a solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, T]$. Since $\zeta(t)$ is nonnegative we have

$$D(t, u, \zeta(t)) \leq \sum_{k=2}^n a_k^+(t) S_k(u, \zeta(t)) + a_1(t), \quad t \in [t_0, T].$$

It follows from here and from the condition (E) that the condition (II) of Theorem 3.1 for $[t_0, T]$ and for the case $b_0(t) \equiv -\zeta'(t)$, $b_1(t) = \dots = b_n(t) \equiv 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ is satisfied. Thus all conditions of Theorem 3.1 for $[t_0, T]$ are satisfied. Therefore, every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\nu, \eta_c(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, T]$ and the inequalities (4.5) and (4.6) are satisfied. The theorem is proved.

By analogy with the proof of Theorem 4.4 it can be proved the following theorem

Theorem 4.5. *Let the condition of lemma 2.6 and the following condition be satisfied (F) for a nonnegative $\zeta(t) \in C^1([t_0, T])$ with $\zeta(t_0) < \theta_c(t_0)$ and for some $\nu \in [\zeta(t_0), \theta_c(t_0)]$*

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(t_0) - \nu + \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \left[\sum_{k=2}^n a_k^+(s) S_k(\theta_c(s), \zeta(s)) + a_1(s) \right] ds \right\} \times \\ \times \left(\zeta'(\tau) + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k(\tau) \theta_c^k(\tau) \right) d\tau \leq 0, \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

Then every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\nu, \theta_c(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, T]$ and

$$\zeta(t) \leq y(t) \leq \theta_c(t), \quad t \in [t_0, T].$$

Furthermore, if $\zeta(t_0) < y(t_0)$, ($y(t_0) < \theta_c(t_0)$), then

$$\zeta(t) < y(t), \quad (y(t) < \theta_c(t)), \quad t \in [t_0, T].$$

■

Corollary 4.1. *Let the conditions of Lemma 2.5 and the following conditions be satisfied*

(G) $a_1(t) < 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$,

(H) for some $\zeta_0 \in (0, \eta_c(t_0))$ and for some $\nu \in [\zeta(t_0), \eta_c(t)]$

$$\zeta(t_0) - \nu + \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \left[\sum_{k=2}^n a_k^+(s) S_k(\eta_c(s), \zeta(s)) + a_1(s) \right] ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau \leq 0, \quad t \in [t_0, T].$$

Then every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\nu, \eta_c(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, T]$ and

$$\zeta_0 \leq y(t) \leq \eta_c(t), \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (4.7)$$

Furthermore, if $\zeta_0 < y(t_0)$, ($y(t_0) < \eta_c(t_0)$), then

$$\zeta_0 < y(t), \quad (y(t) < \eta_c(t)), \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. It follows from the condition (G) that for some enough small $\zeta_0 \in (0, \eta_c(t_0))$ the inequality $\sum_{k=2}^n a_k(t) \zeta_0^k \leq 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ is satisfied. This together with the condition (H) implies (E) of Theorem 4.4. Thus all conditions of Theorem 4.4 are satisfied. Therefore, every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\nu, \eta_c(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, T]$ and the inequalities (4.7) and (4.8) are satisfied. The corollary is proved.

For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $t_1 \geq t_0$ we set

$$\zeta_{\gamma, t_1}(t) \equiv -\gamma - \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^t a_1(\tau) d\tau \right\} \left[c(t_1) + \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau \right], \quad t \in [t_0, t_1],$$

where $c(t_1) \equiv \max_{\xi \in [t_0, t_1]} \left(- \int_{t_0}^{\xi} \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau \right)$.

Theorem 4.6. Let the conditions of Lemma 2.4 and the following conditions be satisfied.

(G) $\sum_{k=2}^n (-1)^{k+1} d_k(t) u^k \geq 0$, for all $u \geq N_T$ and $t \geq t_0$.

(H) n is odd.

Then every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\zeta_T^*(t_0), \eta_T^*(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and

$$\zeta_T^*(t) \leq y(t) \leq \eta_T^*(t), \quad t \geq t_0, \quad (4.9)$$

where $\eta_T^*(t)$ is defined in Lemma 2.4 and $\zeta_T^*(t) \equiv \begin{cases} \zeta_{N_T, T}(t), & t \in [t_0, T], \\ \zeta_{N_T, t_1}(t), & t \geq T, \end{cases}$ such that $\zeta_T^*(t_0) \leq \eta_T^*(t_0)$. furthermore, if $\zeta_T^*(t_0) < y(t_0)$ ($y(t_0) < \eta_T^*(t_0)$), then

$$\zeta_T^*(t) < y(t) \quad (y(t) < \eta_T^*(t)), \quad t \geq t_0. \quad (4.10)$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.4 $\eta_T^*(t)$ is a sub solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, +\infty)$. Show that $\zeta_T^*(t)$ is a sub solution of the inequality (2.4) on $[t_0, +\infty)$. Consider the differential inequality

$$\eta' + \sum_{k=0}^n \tilde{a}_k(t)\eta^k \geq 0, \quad t \geq t_0, \quad (4.11)$$

where $\tilde{a}_k(t) = (-1)^{k+1}a_k(t)$, $k = \overline{0, n}$, $t \geq t_0$. It follows from (H0 and from the condition (1) of Lemma 2.4 that

$$(1) \quad \tilde{a}_n(t) \geq 0, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

it follows from the condition (2) of Lemma 2.4 that

$$(2) \quad \tilde{a}_k(t) = \tilde{a}_n(t)\tilde{c}_k(t) + \tilde{d}_k(t), \quad k = \overline{2, n-1}, \quad t \geq t_0, \quad \text{where } \tilde{c}_k(t) = (-1)^{k+1}c_k(t), \quad k = \overline{2, n-1}, \quad t \geq t_0 \text{ are bounded function on } [t_0, t_1] \text{ for every } t_1 \geq t_0, \quad \tilde{d}_k(t) = (-1)^{k+1}d_k(t), \quad k = \overline{2, n-1}, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

It follows from the condition (G), that

$$(3) \quad \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \tilde{d}_k(t)u^k \geq 0 \text{ for all } u \geq N_T, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

We see that all conditions of Lemma 2.4 for the inequality (4.11) are satisfied. Hence, by lemma 2.4 $\tilde{\eta}_T^*(t) \equiv -\zeta_T^*(t)$ is a sub solution of the inequality (4.11) on $[t_0, +\infty)$. Then $\zeta_T^*(t)$ is a sub solution of the inequality (2.4) on $[t_0, +\infty)$. By Corollary 3.2 it follows from here that every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\zeta_T^*(t_0), \eta_T^*(t_0)]$ (note that always $\zeta_T^*(t_0) \leq \eta_T^*(t_0)$) exists on $[t_0, +\infty)$ and the inequalities (4.9) and (4.10) are satisfied. The theorem is proved.

We set

$$\theta_c^-(t) \equiv -\exp\left\{-\int_{t_0}^t \alpha(\tau)d\tau\right\} \left[c + \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left\{-\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(s)ds\right\} a_0(\tau)d\tau \right], \quad t \geq t_0, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Theorem 4.7. Assume for some $c^+ \geq \max_{t \in [t_0, T]} \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left\{-\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(s)ds\right\} a_0(\tau)d\tau$, $c^- \geq -\max_{t \in [t_0, T]} \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left\{-\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(s)ds\right\} a_0(\tau)d\tau$ the inequalities

$$\theta_{c^+}(t) \leq 1, \quad |\theta_{c^-}^-(t)| \leq 1, \quad t \in [t_0, T]$$

are valid. Then every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\theta_{c^-}^-(t_0), \theta_{c^+}(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, T]$ and

$$\theta_{c^-}^-(t) \leq y(t) \leq \theta_{c^+}(t), \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (4.12)$$

Furthermore, if $\theta_{c^-}^-(t_0) < y(t_0)$ ($y(t_0) < \theta_{c^+}(t_0)$), then

$$\theta_{c^-}^-(t) < y(t) \quad (y(t) < \theta_{c^+}(t)), \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (4.13)$$

Proof. We have

$$\theta_{c^-}^-(t_0) \leq \min_{t \in [t_0, T]} \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau \leq \max_{t \in [t_0, T]} \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau \leq \theta_{c^+}(t_0).$$

Therefore, the relation $y(t_0) \in [\theta_{c^-}^-(t_0), \theta_{c^+}(t_0)]$ is correct. By lemma 2.6 $\theta_{c^+}(t)$ is a solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, T]$, and $-\theta_{c^-}^-(t)$ is a solution of the inequality (4.11) on $[t_0, T]$. Then, since $\theta_{c^-}^-(t) \leq \theta_{c^+}(t)$, by Corollary 3.2 every solution $y(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y(t_0) \in [\theta_{c^-}^-(t_0), \theta_{c^+}(t_0)]$ exists on $[t_0, T]$ and the inequalities (4.12) and (4.13) are valid. The theorem is proved.

5. Closed solutions.

Theorem 5.1. *Let the following conditions be satisfied.*

1⁰) for some $j = 2, \dots, n$ the inequalities $a_k(t) \geq 0$, $k = \overline{j, n}$, $\sum_{k=j}^n a_k(t) \geq 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ are valid,

2⁰) $\int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \left[\sum_{k=2}^n a_k^+(s) M_{T+\gamma}^{k-1} + a_1(s) \right] ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau \leq 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ for some $\gamma \geq 0$.

Then Eq. (1.1) has a closed solution on $[t_0, T]$.

Proof. It follows from the conditions of the theorem that for $\zeta(t) \equiv 0$ the conditions of Theorem 4.1 are satisfied. Then By Theorem 4.1 the solutions $y_1(t)$ and $y_2(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y_1(t_0) = 0$ and $y_2(t_0) = 0$ and $y_2(t_0) = M_{T+\gamma}$ exist on $[t_0, T]$ and $y_1(t) \geq 0$, $y_2(T) \leq M_{\gamma, T}^*(T) = M_{\gamma, T}^*(t_0)$. By Lemma 2.10 it follows from here that Eq(1.1) has a nonnegative closed solution on $[t_0, T]$. The theorem is proved.

Corollary 5.1. *Let for some $j = 2, \dots, n$ the inequalities $(-1)^k a_k(t) \geq 0$, $k = \overline{j, n}$, $\sum_{k=j}^n (-1)^k a_k(t) > 0$, $a_0(t) \leq 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ be satisfied.*

Then Eq. (1.1) has a non positive closed solution on $[t_0, T]$.

Proof. In Eq. (1.1) we substitute

$$y = -z, \quad t \rightarrow -t. \quad (5.1)$$

We obtain

$$z' + \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k a_k(-t) z^k = 0, \quad t \leq -t_0.$$

Then by Theorem 5.1 it follows from the conditions of the corollary that the transformed (last) equation has a nonnegative closed solution on $[-T, -t_0]$. It follows from here and from (5.1) that $y(t) \equiv -z(-t)$ is a nonnegative closed solution of Eq. (1.1) on $[t_0, T]$. The corollary is proved.

Note that despite of Theorem 1.1 in Corollary 5.1 the condition $a_0(t) \equiv 0$ is weakened up to $a_0(t) \leq 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ and the condition $\int_{t_0}^t a_1(\tau) d\tau > 0$ is omitted. Therefore, Corollary 5.1 is a complement of Theorem 1.1. Note that Corollary 5.1 is a generalization of Theorem 1.1 up to the isolation condition.

Theorem 5.2. *Let the following conditions be satisfied.*

$$3^0) a_n(t) \geq 0, \quad t \in [t_0, T],$$

$$4^0) a_k(t) = a_n(t)c_k(t) + d_k(t), \quad k = \overline{2, n-1}, \text{ where } c_k(t), \quad k = \overline{2, n-1} \text{ are bounded functions on } [t_0, T],$$

$$5^0) \sum_{k=2}^n d_k(t)u^k \geq 0, \quad u \geq N_T, \quad t \in [t_0, T],$$

$$6^0) \max_{t \in [t_0, T]} \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau \left[1 - \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^T a_1(\tau) d\tau \right\} \right] \leq \int_{t_0}^T \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau.$$

$$7^0) \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \left[\sum_{k=2}^n a_k^+(s) \eta_{\gamma, T}^{k-1}(s) + a_1(s) \right] ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau \leq 0, \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \text{ for some } \gamma \geq 0,$$

Then Eq. (1.1) has a nonnegative closed solution on $[t_0, T]$.

Proof. By virtue of Lemma 2.4 it follows from the conditions $3^0) - 5^0)$ that $\eta_{\gamma, T}(t)$ is a solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, T]$. Then it follows from the condition $7^0)$ that the conditions of Theorem 4.2 with $\zeta(t) \equiv 0$ are satisfied. Hence, according to Theorem 4.2 the solutions $y_1(t)$ and $y_2(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y_1(t_0) = 0$, $y_2(t_0) = \eta_{\gamma, T}(t_0) = c(T)$ exist on $[t_0, T]$ and $y_1(T) \geq 0$, $y_2(T) \leq \eta_{\gamma, T}(T)$. It follows from the condition $6^0)$ that $\eta_{\gamma, T}(T) \leq \eta_{\gamma, T}(t_0)$. Therefore $y_2(T) \leq y_2(t_0)$. By Lemma 2.10 it follows from here that Eq. (1.1) has a nonnegative closed solution on $[t_0, T]$. The theorem is proved.

Example 5.1. *Consider the equation*

$$y' + \sum_{k=0}^6 a_k(t)y^k = 0, \quad t \geq t_0, \quad (5.2)$$

where, $a_0(t) \equiv -\sin 10t$, $a_1(t)$ is any continuous function, $a_2(t) = \cos^4 t$, $a_3(t) = -2|\sin t \cos^3 t|$, $a_4(t) = \sin^2 t \cos^2 t$, $a_5(t) = -\sin^2 t |\cos \pi t|$, $a_6(t) = \sin^2 t$, $[t_0, T]$. Obviously, the conditions of Corollary 5.1 for Eq. (5.2) are satisfied. It is not difficult to verify that the conditions of Theorem 5.2 with $c_2(t) = c_3(t) = c_4(t) \equiv 0$, $c_5(t) =$

$-|\cos \pi t|$, $d_2(t) = \cos^4 t$, $d_3(t) = -2|\sin t \cos^3 t|$, $d_4(t) = \sin^2 t \cos^2 t$, $d_5(t) \equiv 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ for Eq. (5.2) are satisfied. Therefore Eq. (5.2) has at least a nonnegative closed solution $y_+(t)$ on $[t_0, T]$ and at least a non positive closed solution $y_-(t)$ on $[t_0, T]$ (for every $T > t_0$). Since $a_0(t) \not\equiv 0$ we have $y_+(t) \neq y_-(t)$, $t \in [t_0, T]$.

Theorem 5.3. *Let the following conditions be satisfied.*

8⁰) $a_2(t) > 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$,

9⁰) for some $c \geq \max_{t \in [t_0, T]} \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau$, the inequality $\sum_{k=3}^n |a_k(t)| \eta_c^{k-2}(t) \leq a_2(t)$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ is valid and

10⁰) $\int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \left[\sum_{k=2}^n a_k^+(s) \eta_c^{k-1}(s) + a_1(s) \right] ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau \leq 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$,

11⁰) $c \left(1 - \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^T a_1(\tau) d\tau \right\} \right) \leq \int_{t_0}^T \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau$.

Then Eq. (1.1) has a nonnegative closed solution on $[t_0, T]$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.5 it follows from the conditions 8⁰) and 9⁰) that $\eta_c(t)$ is a solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, T]$. It follows from the condition 10⁰) that the condition (E) with $\zeta(t) \equiv 0$ of Theorem 4.4 is satisfied. It follows from the condition 11⁰) that $\eta_c(t_0) \geq \eta_c(T)$. Then by Theorem 4.4 Eq. (1.1) has a nonnegative closed solution on $[t_0, T]$. The theorem is proved.

Let us write $a_2(t) = \lambda p(t)$, $p(t) > 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$. Then for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0 \equiv \max_{t \in [t_0, T]} \left\{ \left(\sum_{k=3}^n |a_k(t)| \eta_c^{k-2}(t) \right) / p(t) \right\}$ the condition 9⁰) of Theorem 5.3 will be satisfied. If we

write $a_2(t) = \lambda + p(t)$, $p(t) \in C([t_0, T])$, then for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0 \equiv \max_{t \in [t_0, T]} \left\{ \left(\sum_{k=3}^n |a_k(t)| \eta_c^{k-2}(t) \right) - p(t) \right\}$ the condition 9⁰) of Theorem 5.3 will be satisfied as well. Despite of this in Theorems 2 and 3 of work [17] the parameter λ_0 is undetermined. Moreover, for $a_0(t) \equiv 0$, $c = 0$ the conditions 10⁰) and 11⁰) of Theorem 5.3 are satisfied. Therefore, Theorem 5.3 is a complement of both Theorems 2 and 3.

Theorem 5.4. *Let the following conditions be satisfied.*

12⁰) $a_n(t) \geq 0$, $t \in [t_0, T]$,

13⁰) $a_k(t) = a_n(t) c_k(t) = d_k(t)$, $k = \overline{2, n-1}$, $t \in [t_0, T]$, where $a_k(t)$, $k = \overline{2, n-1}$ are bounded functions on $[t_0, T]$ and

14⁰) $\sum_{k=2}^n d_k(t) u^n \geq 0$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$

15⁰) $\sum_{k=2}^n (-1)^{k+1} d_k(t) u^n \geq 0$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$

16⁰) n is odd,

$$17^0) \quad c(T) \left[1 - \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^T a_1(\tau) d\tau \right\} \right] \leq \int_{t_0}^T \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau,$$

$$18^0) \quad \min_{\xi \in [t_0, T]} \left(\int_{t_0}^{\xi} \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau \right) \left(1 - \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^T a_1(\tau) d\tau \right\} \right) \geq \\ \geq \int_{t_0}^T \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{\tau} a_1(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau.$$

Then Eq. (1.1) has a closed solution on $[t_0, T]$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.4 it follows from 12⁰) – 14⁰) that $\eta_{N_T, T}(t)$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ is a solution of the inequality (2.3) on $[t_0, T]$ and it follows from the conditions, 12⁰), 13⁰), 15⁰), 16⁰) that $\zeta_{N_T, T}(t)$, $t \in [t_0, T]$ is a solution of the inequality (2.4) on $[t_0, T]$. It follows from the condition 17⁰) that $\eta_{N_T, T}(t_0) \geq \eta_{N_T, T}(T)$, and it follows from the condition 18⁰) that $\zeta_{N_T, T}(t_0) \leq \zeta_{N_T, T}(T)$. Therefore, by virtue of Lemma 2.10 Eq. (1.1) has a closed solution on $[t_0, T]$. The theorem is proved.

Theorem 5.5. *Let the following conditions be satisfied*

19⁰) *for some*

$$c^+ \geq \max_{t \in [t_0, T]} \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau, \quad c^- \geq - \min_{t \in [t_0, T]} \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau$$

the inequalities

$$\theta_{c^+}(t) \leq 1, \quad \theta_{c^-}(t) \leq 1, \quad t \in [t_0, T]$$

are valid,

$$20^0) \quad c^+ \left(1 - \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(\tau) d\tau \right\} \right) \leq \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau, \\ c^- \left(1 - \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(\tau) d\tau \right\} \right) \geq \int_{t_0}^t \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \alpha(s) ds \right\} a_0(\tau) d\tau,$$

Then Eq. (1.1) has a closed solution $y_*(t)$ on $[t_0, T]$ such that

$$\theta_{c^-}(t) \leq y_*(t) \leq \theta_{c^+}(t), \quad t \in [t_0, T],$$

and if $\theta_{c^-}(t_0) \leq y_*(t_0)$ ($y_*(t_0) \leq \theta_{c^+}(t_0)$), then

$$\theta_{c^-}(t) \leq y_*(t) \leq \theta_{c^+}(t), \quad t \in [t_0, T].$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.6 it follows from the condition 19⁰) that $\theta_{z^+}(t)$ and $\theta_{c^-}(t)$ are solutions of the inequalities (2.3) and (2.4) respectively on $[t_0, T]$. It is not difficult to verify that the conditions 20⁰) imply that

$$\theta_{c^+}(t_0) \geq \theta_{c^+}(T), \quad \theta_{c^-}(t_0) \leq \theta_{c^-}(T)$$

By Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 it follows from here that the solutions $y_1(t)$ and $y_2(t)$ of Eq. (1.1) with $y_1(t_0) = \theta_{c^-}^-(t_0)$, $y_2(t_0) = \theta_{c^+}(t_0)$ exist on $[t_0, T]$ and

$$y_1(t_0) \leq y_1(T), \quad y_2(t_0) \geq y_2(T).$$

By Lemma 2.10 it follows from here that Eq. (1.1) has a closed solution $y_*(t)$ on $[t_0, T]$ such that

$$\theta_{c^-}^-(t) \leq y_*(t) \leq \theta_{c^+}(t), \quad t \in [t_0, T],$$

and if $\theta_{c^-}^-(t_0) \leq y_*(t_0)$ ($y_*(t_0) \leq \theta_{c^+}(t_0)$), then

$$\theta_{c^-}^-(t) \leq y_*(t) \quad (y_*(t) \leq \theta_{c^+}(t)), \quad t \in [t_0, T].$$

The theorem is proved.

References

1. G. A. Grigorian, On two comparison tests for second-order linear ordinary differential equations, *Diff. Uravn.*, vol 47, (2011), 1225–1240 (in Russian), *Diff. Eq.*, vol. 47, (2011), 1237–1252 (in English).
2. G. A. Grigorian, Two comparison criteria for scalar Riccati equations and some of their applications *Izv. Vissh. Uchebn. Zaved. Mat.* (2012), no 11, 20-25. *Russian Math. (Iz. VUZ)* 56 (2.12), no. 11, 17-30.
3. G. A. Grigorian, Interval oscillation criteria for linear matrix Hamiltonian systems. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* 50 (2000), no. 6, 2047-2057.
4. G. A. Grigorian, New reducibility criteria for systems of two linear first-order ordinary differential equations. *Monatsh. Math.* 198 (2022), no. 2. 311-322.
5. G. A. Grigorian, Oscillation and non-oscillation criteria for linear nonhomogeneous systems of two first-order ordinary differential equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 507 (2022), no. 1, Paper No. 125734, 10 pp.
6. G. A. Grigorian, Oscillatory and non-oscillatory criteria for linear four-dimensional Hamiltonian systems *Math. Bohem.* 146 (2021), no. 3, 289-304.
7. G. A. Grigorian, On the reducibility of systems of two linear first-order ordinary differential equations. *Monatsh. Math.* 195 (2021), no. 1, 107-117.
8. G. A. Grigorian, Oscillation criteria for linear matrix Hamiltonian systems. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 148 (2020), no. 8, 3407-3415.
9. G. A. Grigorian, Oscillatory and non oscillatory criteria for the systems of two linear first order two by two dimensional matrix ordinary differential equations. *Arch. Math. (Brno)* 54 (2018), no. 4, 169-203.

10. G. A. Grigorian, Stability criterion for systems of two first-order linear ordinary differential equations. *Mat. Zametki* 103 (2018), no. 6, 831-840. *Math. Notes* 103 (2018), no. 5-6, 892-900.
11. G. A. Grigorian, Oscillatory criteria for the systems of two first-order linear differential equations. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* 47 (2017), no. 5. 1497-1524.
12. G. A. Grigorian, Some properties of the solutions of third order linear ordinary differential equations *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* 46 (2016), no. 1, 147-168.
13. G. A. Grigorian, Stability criteria for systems of two first-order linear ordinary differential equations. *Math. Slovaca* 72 (2022), no. 4, 935-944.
14. M. Briskin and Y. Yumdin, Tangential version of Hilbert 16th problem for the Abel equation. *Moscow Mathematical Journal*, vol. 5, No. 1, 2005, 23–53.
15. A. Gassull, J. Libre, Limit cycles for a class of Abel equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 21 (1990), 1235–1244.
16. A. Gassull, R. Prohens, J. Torregrossa, Limit cycles for rigid cubic systems. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 303 (2005), 391–404.
17. P. J. Torres, Existence of closed solutions for a polynomial first order differential equation. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 328 (2007) 1108–1116.
18. B. P. Demidovich, *Lectures on the mathematical theory of stability*. Moskow, "Nauka", 1967.
19. R. E. Edwards, *A formal background to mathematics* (Springer-Verlag, New York, Heidelberg, Berlin, 1980).