

# WAVEFRONT SOLUTIONS FOR REACTION-DIFFUSION-CONVECTION MODELS WITH ACCUMULATION TERM AND AGGREGATIVE MOVEMENTS

MARCO CANTARINI<sup>A</sup>, CRISTINA MARCELLI<sup>B</sup>, FRANCESCA PAPALINI<sup>B</sup>

<sup>A</sup>*Dipartimento di Matematica ed Informatica, Università degli Studi di Perugia, Via Vanvitelli 1, Perugia I-06123, Italy.*

<sup>B</sup>*Dipartimento di Ingegneria Industriale e Scienze Matematiche, Università Politecnica delle Marche, Via Breccie Bianche 12, Ancona I-60131, Italy.*

*email: marco.cantarini@unipg.it, c.marcelli@staff.univpm.it, f.papalini@staff.univpm.it*

ABSTRACT. In this paper we analyze the wavefront solutions of parabolic partial differential equations of the type

$$g(u)u_\tau + f(u)u_x = (D(u)u_x)_x + \rho(u), \quad u(\tau, x) \in [0, 1]$$

where the reaction term  $\rho$  is of monostable-type. We allow the diffusivity  $D$  and the accumulation term  $g$  to have a finite number of changes of sign.

We provide an existence result of travelling wave solutions (t.w.s.) together with an estimate of the threshold wave speed. Finally, we classify the t.w.s. between classical and sharp ones.

AMS Subject Classifications: 35K57, 35K65, 35C07, 35K55, 34B40, 34B16, 92D25

**Keywords:** reaction-diffusion-convection equations, travelling wave solutions, speed of propagation, degenerate parabolic equation, singular boundary value problems, aggregative movements.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study the existence and the properties of travelling wave solutions (t.w.s.) for the following reaction-diffusion-convection equation

$$(1) \quad g(v)v_\tau + f(v)v_x = (D(v)v_x)_x + \rho(v), \quad v(\tau, x) \in [0, 1]$$

where

$$(2) \quad g, f, \rho, D \in C([0, 1]), \quad D \in C^1(0, 1),$$

$$(3) \quad \rho(v) > 0, \quad \text{for every } v \in (0, 1), \quad \rho(0) = \rho(1) = 0,$$

arising in several physical and biological phenomena. Owing to the various applications, the study of reaction-diffusion-convection equations has been widely developed, but in general for equations in which  $g(v) \equiv 1$ .

On the other hand, the presence of the accumulation term  $g$  allows to consider relevant physical phenomena, such as thermal processes when the heat capacity of the medium depends on temperature and in the theory of filtration of a fluid in a porous media (see [6, 9]).

Our interest is addressed to the investigation of t.w.s., that is solutions of the type  $v(\tau, x) := u(x - c\tau)$ , where  $c$  is the wave speed. Such functions represent a relevant class of solutions of the equation (1), since at least in simple models the solution of initial-boundary value problem for the differential equations converges, for large times and in a some specific sense, to a profile of a t.w.s. (see, e.g. [2, 10, 15]).

Notice that a t.w.s. of (1) in an interval  $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$  is a solution of the following second-order (possibly singular) equation

$$(4) \quad (D(u(t))u'(t))' + (cg(u(t)) - f(u(t)))u'(t) + \rho(u(t)) = 0 \quad \text{for every } t \in (a, b)$$

where  $'$  means that we differentiate with respect  $t := x - c\tau$ , connecting the zeros of the reaction term  $\rho$ , that is the equilibria of the equation; hence  $u$  satisfies the boundary conditions  $u(a^+) = 1$  and  $u(b^-) = 0$ .

The literature concerning t.w.s. for reaction-diffusion-convection equations is very wide. In the case  $g(u) \equiv 1$ , that is, the accumulation term  $g$  is not significant in the model, and the reaction term is such that  $\rho(u) > 0$ ,  $u \in (0, 1)$  (the so-called monostable case), it is well known that there exists a threshold minimal speed  $c^*$ , which can be explicitly estimated, such that if  $c \geq c^*$ , then the model (1) admits t.w.s., and also the converse implication holds true.

In general, if  $c > c^*$ , the t.w.s. are defined and continuously differentiable on the whole real line. Instead, if  $c = c^*$ , the situation is more delicate: the t.w.s. is again smooth on the real line if the diffusion  $D$  does not vanish at the equilibria  $0, 1$  (non degenerate case). Otherwise, the t.w.s. with  $c = c^*$  can reach one/both the equilibria in a finite time with a non-zero slope and the dynamic is said to exhibit the phenomenon of finite speed of propagation and/or finite speed of saturation. For some references to these facts and more informations see, e.g., [1, 11, 16, 17, 19].

In the recent paper [7], we proved that such a type of the aforementioned results can be achieved also if the accumulation  $g$  is a continuous function not necessarily constant neither positive, so that the equation presents various types of degeneracies, since both  $D$  and  $g$  can vanish, even simultaneously. Nevertheless, also in this case there exists a threshold minimum wave speed and it is possible to classify the emerging t.w.s. (see [7, Theorem 14 and 16]).

In recent years, an increasing interest has been addressed to the investigation of aggregative-diffusive models, in which the term  $D$  can have changes of sign (see [4, 5, 12, 13, 17, 18]). Of course, the sign of  $D$  can influence the existence of t.w.s. and their regularity at the points where  $D$  vanishes. Therefore, the natural question arises is if it is possible to extend the results obtained in [7] in the case of positive diffusive terms (but with a non-constant accumulation term) to the more general framework of functions  $D$  having, at the most, a finite number of changes of sign. This is just the aim of this paper, in which we deal with equation (4) under the assumptions (2), (3) and

$$(5) \quad D_0 := \{u \in (0, 1) : D(u) = 0\} \quad \text{if finite, possibly empty.}$$

Equations as (1) with changing-sign  $g$  and  $D$  arise, for instance, in the study of t.w.s. for the telegraph equation (see [14]).

Our main result is Theorem 12 which asserts that under certain assumptions on the sign on the integral function of  $g$ , there exists a threshold value  $\hat{c}$  such that if  $c > \hat{c}$  equation (4) admits t.w.s., whereas they do not exist for  $c < \hat{c}$ . Moreover, we also provide an estimate for the value  $\hat{c}$  which generalizes the known results for equations that are particular cases of (4). Finally, Proposition 19 concerns the classification of the t.w.s.

We underline that this context includes also the case in which  $D$  does not change sign, but it may vanish somewhere in  $(0, 1)$  (see Example 3).

Finally, we point out that in the case of changing-sign diffusivities, the existence of t.w.s. which are smooth when they assume values between the equilibria is no more ensured when  $c = \hat{c}$ . We discuss this fact in Remarks 11 and 16. However, in the particular case in which  $D$  has an unique change of sign, from positive to negative, this phenomenon does not occur and we can state the existence of t.w.s. for  $c = \hat{c}$  too (see Corollary 17).

The general technique we adopt consists in using the results of [7] in the intervals where  $D$  does not change sign and then to find conditions ensuring that the solutions found in each interval can be glued together in a regular way. This will have consequences on the admissible wave speeds.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall some preliminary definitions and results; in Section 3 we show how the existence of t.w.s. is equivalent to the solvability of a first order singular problem which is investigated in Section 4. Section 5 is devoted to the existence/non-existence of t.w.s. and in Section 6 we provide the classification of t.w.s. Finally, we provide some simple examples of equations (1), discussing the existence of t.w.s, the estimate of  $\hat{c}$  and the classification of the t.w.s.

## 2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Troughout the paper, we always assume the validity of conditions (2), (3) and (5).

First of all, we give the definition of t.w.s.

**Definition 1.** A travelling wave solution (t.w.s. for short) of (1) is a function  $u \in C^1(a, b)$ , with  $(a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , such that  $u(t) \in [0, 1]$ ,  $D(u(\cdot))u'(\cdot) \in C^1(a, b)$ , satisfying equation (4) in  $(a, b)$  and such that

$$(6) \quad u(a^+) = 1, u(b^-) = 0$$

$$(7) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow a^+} D(u(t))u'(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow b^-} D(u(t))u'(t) = 0.$$

In what follows, we assume, without restriction, that the t.w.s. are always defined in their maximal existence interval, that is the maximal interval  $(a, b)$ , bounded or unbounded, in which the previous conditions are satisfied.

When  $(a, b) = \mathbb{R}$  then condition (7) is automatically satisfied, as the following result states.

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $u$  be a solution of (4) for some  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , satisfying (6). Then, if  $a = -\infty$  we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} D(u(t))u'(t) = 0$  and if  $b = +\infty$  we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} D(u(t))u'(t) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $D_0 := \{u \in (0, 1) : D(u) = 0\}$ . If  $D_0 = \emptyset$  then the result has been proved in [7, Proposition 3]. So, assume now  $D_0$  is nonempty, but finite, say  $D_0 = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ .

Let us consider the case  $b = +\infty$  (the case  $a = -\infty$  is analogous).

Assume  $b = +\infty$ . Put  $T := \inf \{\xi : u(s) \leq u_1, \forall s \in (\xi, +\infty)\}$ , we have  $T > -\infty$  and  $u(T) = u_1$ , so  $D(u(T)) = 0$ . For any  $t > T$ , integrating (4) in  $[T, t]$  we obtain

$$D(u(t))u'(t) = \int_{u_1}^{u(t)} (f(s) - cg(s))ds - \int_T^t \rho(u(s)) ds.$$

Since  $\rho$  is a positive function, there exists (finite or not) the limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_T^t \rho(u(s)) ds$ , hence there exists also the limit

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} D(u(t)) u'(t) =: \lambda \in [-\infty, +\infty).$$

Since  $D$  is bounded and has constant sign in  $[T, +\infty)$ , if  $\lambda \neq 0$  then there exists (finite or not) also the limit

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u'(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{D(u(t)) u'(t)}{D(u(t))} \neq 0,$$

in contradiction with the boundedness of  $u$ . So, we derive that  $\lambda = 0$ .  $\square$

The next Lemma provides a necessary condition for the admissible wave speeds, which will be used in the following proposition.

**Lemma 3.** *If there exists a t.w.s.  $u$  in  $(a, b)$ , then*

$$(8) \quad \int_0^1 [cg(s) - f(s)] ds > 0.$$

*Proof.* Integrating (4) in  $(a, b)$ , by (7), we get

$$0 < \int_a^b \rho(u(t)) dt = - \int_a^b [cg(u(t)) - f(u(t))] u'(t) dt = \int_0^1 [cg(s) - f(s)] ds.$$

$\square$

The following result concerns the monotonicity property of the t.w.s., which is the key tool in order to reduce (4) to a first order equation.

**Proposition 4.** *If  $u$  is a t.w.s. in  $(a, b)$ . Then, the set*

$$I_u := \{t \in (a, b) : 0 < u(t) < 1\}$$

*is an interval and  $u'(t) < 0$  whenever  $t \in I_u$ .*

*Proof.* We divide the proof into some steps.

*Claim 1:* if  $u(t_0) = 0$  for some  $t_0 \in (a, b)$ , then  $u(t) = 0$  for every  $t \in (t_0, b)$ ; similarly, if  $u(t_0) = 1$  for some  $t_0 \in (a, b)$ , then  $u(t) = 1$  for every  $t \in (a, t_0)$ .

Indeed, if there exists some  $t_0 \in (a, b)$  such that  $u(t_0) = 0$  then  $u'(t_0) = 0$  and so, integrating (4) in  $(t_0, b)$  we get

$$\int_{t_0}^b (D(u(t)) u'(t))' dt + \int_{t_0}^b [cg(u(t)) - f(u(t))] u'(t) dt + \int_{t_0}^b \rho(u(t)) dt = 0.$$

Due to conditions (6) and (7), the first and the second integral are null. So, since  $\rho$  is positive in  $(0, 1)$ , we derive  $u(t) = 0$  for every  $t \in (t_0, b)$ . The second statement of the claim is analogous.

*Claim 2:* if  $0 < u(t_0) < 1$ ,  $u'(t_0) = 0$  and  $D(u(t_0)) > 0$  [resp.  $D(u(t_0)) < 0$ ], then  $t_0$  is a point of proper local maximum [resp. minimum]. for the function  $u$ .

Let  $t_0$  be such that  $0 < u(t_0) < 1$ ,  $u'(t_0) = 0$  and  $D(u(t_0)) > 0$  (the case  $D(u(t_0)) < 0$  is analogous). From equation (4) we get

$$(D(u(t)) u'(t))' \Big|_{t=t_0} = -\rho(u(t_0)) < 0$$

so the function  $(D \circ u) u'$  is strictly decreasing in a neighborhood of  $t_0$  and it vanishes at  $t_0$ . From the sign of  $D$  we deduce that  $t_0$  is a proper local maximum point for the function  $u$ .

*Claim 3:* if  $0 < u(t) < 1$  and  $u'(t) = 0$ , then  $D(u(t)) = 0$ .

Assume, by contradiction, that for some  $t_0$  we have  $0 < u(t_0) < 1$ ,  $u'(t_0) = 0$  and  $D(u(t_0)) > 0$ . By Claim 2 the function  $u$  has a proper maximum at  $t_0$ , so taking account of the boundary datum  $u(a^+) = 1$ , we deduce the existence of a point  $\tau_0 < t_0$  such that  $u(t) \geq u(\tau_0)$  for every  $t \leq t_0$ , with  $u(\tau_0) < u(t_0)$ . Again by Claim 2 we infer  $D(u(\tau_0)) \leq 0$ . Hence, by the continuity of the function  $D$  in  $[u(\tau_0), u(t_0)]$ , a value  $u^*$  exists in  $[u(\tau_0), u(t_0))$  such that  $D(u^*) = 0$ . Moreover, by the continuity of the function  $u$  in  $[\tau_0, t_0]$  there exists a point  $t^* \in [\tau_0, t_0)$  such that  $u(t^*) = u^* < u(t_0)$ . Finally, taking account of the boundary datum  $u(b^-) = 0$  we get the existence of a point  $T^* > t_0$  such that  $u(T^*) = u(t^*) = u^*$ . Therefore, integrating (4) in  $[t^*, T^*]$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{t^*}^{T^*} (D(u(t)) u'(t))' dt + \int_{t^*}^{T^*} [cg(u(t)) - f(u(t))] u'(t) dt + \int_{t^*}^{T^*} \rho(u(t)) dt \\ &= \int_{t^*}^{T^*} \rho(u(t)) dt > 0, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

*Claim 4:*  $u'(t) \leq 0$  for every  $t \in (a, b)$ .

Assume by contradiction that  $u'(t_0) > 0$  for some  $t_0 \in (a, b)$ . Let  $(t_1, t_2)$  be the largest interval containing  $t_0$  such that  $u'(t) > 0$  for every  $t \in (t_1, t_2)$ . Of course,  $a < t_1 < t_2 < b$ , hence  $u'(t_1) = u'(t_2) = 0$ . Let us now prove that  $u(t_1) = 0$  and  $u(t_2) = 1$ . Indeed, if  $u(t_1) > 0$ , by virtue of Claim 3 we get  $D(u(t_1)) = 0$ ; moreover, by the boundary datum  $u(b^+) = 0$  we get the existence of a point  $\tau_1 > t_1$  such that  $u(\tau_1) = u(t_1)$ . Therefore, integrating equation (4) in  $[t_1, \tau_1]$  we again obtain the contradiction  $\int_{t_1}^{\tau_1} \rho(u(t)) dt = 0$ . Then, necessarily  $u(t_1) = 0$ . Similarly we can prove that  $u(t_2) = 1$ .

Finally, integrating again equation (4) in  $[t_1, t_2]$  we get

$$0 = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} [cg(u(t)) - f(u(t))] u'(t) dt + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \rho(u(t)) dt = \int_0^1 [cg(s) - f(s)] ds + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \rho(u(t)) dt,$$

which is a contradiction by (8), since both the last two integrals are positive. So Claim 4 is proved and  $u$  is a decreasing function.

*Claim 5:*  $I_u$  is an interval and  $u$  is strictly decreasing in  $I_u$ .

By Claim 4 it is immediate to deduce that  $I_u$  is an open interval. Moreover, if there exists an interval  $[t_1, t_2] \subset I_u$  in which  $u$  is constant, then integrating equation (4) we obtain

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \rho(u(t)) dt = 0$$

which is a contradiction since  $\rho$  is positive on  $(0, 1)$ .

*Claim 6:*  $u'(t) < 0$  for every  $t \in I_u$ .


Assume, by contradiction,  $u'(t_0) = 0$  for some  $t \in I_u$ . Hence, by Claim 3, we have  $D(u(t_0)) = 0$ . Put  $\psi(t) := D(u(t))u'(t)$ . By equation (4) we derive  $\psi'(t_0) = \rho(u(t_0)) < 0$ . On the other hand,

$$\frac{\psi(t) - \psi(t_0)}{t - t_0} = \frac{\psi(t)}{t - t_0} = \frac{D(u(t)) - D(u(t_0))}{u(t) - u(t_0)} \frac{u(t) - u(t_0)}{t - t_0} u'(t)$$

so, passing to the limit as  $t \rightarrow t_0$  we infer  $\psi'(t_0) = 0$ , a contradiction. □

In view of Proposition 4, the following cases can occur:

- $(a, b) = \mathbb{R}$ ; in this case we have a classical solution in  $C^1(\mathbb{R})$ . The solution can be strictly decreasing in  $\mathbb{R}$ , hence the equilibria 0 and 1 are not reached in a finite time, or the solution can assume the value 0 and/or 1 at some  $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and hence it is constant in a half-line. The latter case does not occur when the Cauchy problem for equation (4) with initial conditions  $u(t_0) = u'(t_0) = 0$  or  $u(t_0) = 1, u'(t_0) = 0$  has a unique solution.
- $(a, b)$  is a half-line; in this case we have a so-called sharp solution of type 1 or type 2. One of the equilibria is reached at a finite time and  $u$  does not admit a  $C^1$ -continuation.
- $(a, b)$  is a bounded interval; in this case we have a so-called sharp t.w.s. of type 3. Both the equilibria are reached at finite times, and  $u$  does not admit a  $C^1$ -continuation.



We will delve deeper into this classification in the last section of the paper.

Finally, observe that if  $u$  is a t.w.s, then each traslation  $u(t - t_0)$  is a t.w.s. too; so the t.w.s. are defined up to shifts.

### 3. REDUCTION TO A FIRST ORDER SINGULAR PROBLEM

Thanks to the monotonicity property proved in Proposition 4 we now introduce a suitable singular boundary value problem (b.v.p.) of the first order, whose solvability is equivalent to the existence of t.w.s. for equation (4).

More in detail, consider the following b.v.p. (here the dot denotes differentiation with respect to  $u$ )

$$(9) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{z}(u) = f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{\rho(u)D(u)}{z(u)}, & u \in (0, 1) \setminus D_0 \\ z(u)D(u) < 0, & u \in (0, 1) \setminus D_0 \\ z(0^+) = z(1^-) = 0. \end{cases}$$

For *solution* of (9) we mean a continuous function  $z$  defined in  $(0, 1)$ , such that  $z \in C^1((0, 1) \setminus D_0)$  and  $z$  satisfies the equalities and inequalities given in (9). Of course, any solution  $z$  vanishes exactly at the points of  $D_0$ .

We now prove the equivalence between the existence of t.w.s. for equation (4) and the existence of solutions of problem (9).

**Theorem 5.** *If  $u$  is a t.w.s. of equation (4), then the function  $z(u) := D(u)u'(t(u))$  is a solution of problem (9), where  $u \mapsto t(u)$  denotes the inverse function of  $u$ , defined on  $(0, 1)$ . Moreover, the function  $z(u)/D(u)$  defined in  $(0, 1) \setminus D_0$  admits a continuous extension  $\phi$  defined in  $(0, 1)$ . Vice versa, if  $z \in C(0, 1)$  is a solution of (9), such that the function  $z(u)/D(u)$ ,  $u \in (0, 1) \setminus D_0$ , admits a continuous extension  $\phi$  defined in  $(0, 1)$ , then fixed a value  $u^* \notin D_0$ , the Cauchy problem*

$$(10) \quad \begin{cases} u' = \phi(u) \\ u(0) = u^* \end{cases}$$

*admits a solution  $u$ , such that in its maximal existence interval  $(a, b)$  it is a t.w.s. of (4).*

*Proof.* Let  $u$  be a t.w.s. to equation (4) in  $(a, b)$ , and put  $I_u := \{t : 0 < u(t) < 1\}$ . Let  $u \mapsto t(u)$  be the inverse function, defined in  $(0, 1)$  and taking values in  $I_u$ , whose existence is guaranteed by Proposition 4. Notice that  $u \mapsto t(u)$  actually is a  $C^1$ -function, since  $u$  is  $C^1$  with  $u'(t) \neq 0$  for every  $t \in I_u$ . Put  $\psi(t) := D(u(t))u'(t)$ , define  $z(u) := \psi(t(u)) = D(u)u'(t(u))$ . Hence  $z$  is a  $C^1$ -function defined in  $(0, 1)$ , satisfying  $z(0^+) = z(1^-) = 0$  by conditions (7). Moreover, for every  $u \in (0, 1) \setminus D_0$  we have

$$\dot{z}(u) = \frac{\psi'(t(u))}{u'(t(u))} = f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{\rho(u)}{u'(t(u))} = f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{\rho(u)D(u)}{z(u)}.$$

Furthermore, since  $u'(t(u)) < 0$  for every  $u \in (0, 1)$ , we get  $z(u)D(u) < 0$  for every  $u \in (0, 1) \setminus D_0$ . Finally, since  $z(u)/D(u) = u'(t(u))$  for every  $u \in (0, 1) \setminus D_0$ , we have that the function  $\phi(u) := u'(t(u))$  is a continuous extension in  $(0, 1)$ .

Vice versa, let  $z \in C(0, 1)$  be a solution of (9) such that the function  $z/D$  admits a continuous extension  $\phi$  defined in  $(0, 1)$ . Then, problem (10) admits at least a solution  $u$ , defined in its maximal existence interval  $(a, b)$ , with  $-\infty \leq a < b \leq +\infty$ .

First of all, notice that  $u$  is a decreasing function, since  $\phi(u) \leq 0$  for every  $u \in (0, 1)$ . Moreover, we have  $u'(t) < 0$  whenever  $u(t) \notin D_0$ . So, if  $u$  is constant in some interval  $[c, d] \subset (a, b)$ , then  $u(t) \in D_0$  for every  $t \in [c, d]$  and it is immediate to verify that the cut function

$$\tilde{u}(t) := \begin{cases} u(t), & t \in (a, c] \\ u(t - c + d), & t \in [c, c + b - d) \end{cases}$$

is again a  $C^1$  solution of problem (10). Since  $D_0$  is finite, there exists at the most a finite number of intervals in which  $u$  is constant and so we deduce that problem (10) admits at least a strictly decreasing solution. Therefore, we can assume, without restriction, that the solution  $u$  is strictly decreasing, so that put  $T_0 := \{t : u(t) \in D_0\}$ , we have that  $T_0$  is finite and  $(a, b) \setminus T_0$  is disjoint union of a finite number of open intervals (bounded or unbounded), say  $(a, b) \setminus T_0 = \bigcup_{j=1}^m (a_j, b_j)$ .

Notice that the function  $t \mapsto D(u(t))u'(t)$  is  $C^1$  in each interval  $(a_j, b_j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , with

$$(D(u(t))u'(t))' = (z(u(t)))' = \dot{z}(u(t))u'(t) = (f(u(t)) - cg(u(t)))u'(t) - \rho(u(t))$$

so  $u$  satisfies the differential equation in (10) in each interval  $(a_j, b_j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . On the other hand, for every  $t_0 \in T_0$  we have that there exists the limit

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0} (D(u(t))u'(t))' = (f(u(t_0)) - cg(u(t_0)))u'(t_0) - \rho(u(t_0))$$

and this implies that the function  $(D \circ u)u'$  is  $C^1$  in the whole interval  $(a, b)$ , where it satisfies the differential equation of problem (10).

The boundary conditions  $z(0^+) = z(1^-) = 1$  in problem (9) imply the validity of conditions (7). Finally, let us prove the validity of boundary conditions (6). Since  $u$  is monotone and  $(a, b)$  is the maximal existence interval, there exists  $u(a^+) \leq 1$  and  $u(b^-) \geq 0$ . If  $u(b^-) = u_0 \in (0, 1)$ , then necessarily  $b = +\infty$ . Moreover,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u'(t) = \lim_{u \rightarrow u_0} \phi(u) = \phi(u_0)$ , hence, necessarily  $\phi(u_0) = 0$ .

But

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (D(u(t))u'(t))' = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \dot{z}(u(t))u'(t) = \lim_{u \rightarrow u_0} \dot{z}(u)u'(t(u)) = \lim_{u \rightarrow u_0} \dot{z}(u_0)\phi(u_0) = 0$$

and this is in contrast with equation (4), since  $\rho(u_0) \neq 0$ .

The proof concerning the value  $u(a^+)$  is analogous.

Summarizing,  $u$  satisfies all the requirements of Definition 1 and is a t.w.s. of (4).  $\square$

We conclude this section by discussing the uniqueness of the solutions of problem (9) and of the t.w.s. (up to shifts). To this aim, we need the following preliminary lemma, which is just a remark concerning a change of variable, whose proof is immediate. We will refer to it several times later in the paper.

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $f, g, h$  be continuous functions defined in a given interval  $(\alpha, \beta) \subset (0, 1)$  and assume that  $h(u) < 0$  in  $(\alpha, \beta)$  with  $h(\alpha) = h(\beta) = 0$ .*

*Then, a function  $z \in C^1(\alpha, \beta)$  is a positive solution of the equation*

$$(11) \quad \dot{z}(u) = f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{h(u)}{z(u)}$$



if and only if the function  $\zeta(u) := -z(\alpha + \beta - u)$  is a negative solution of the equation

$$\dot{\zeta}(u) = \tilde{f}(u) - c\tilde{g}(u) - \frac{\tilde{h}(u)}{\zeta(u)}$$

where

$$\tilde{f}(u) := f(\alpha + \beta - u), \quad \tilde{g}(u) := g(\alpha + \beta - u), \quad \tilde{h}(u) := -h(\alpha + \beta - u)$$

with  $\tilde{h}(u) > 0$  in  $(\alpha, \beta)$  and  $\tilde{h}(\alpha) = \tilde{h}(\beta) = 0$ .

**Proposition 7.** *For every fixed  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  problem (9) can admit, at the most, one solution. Moreover, for every fixed  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  equation (4) can admit, at the most, one t.w.s. (up to shifts).*

*Proof.* Assume, by contradiction, that for some  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  there exists a pair  $z_1, z_2$  of different solutions of problem (9). Since  $z_1(u_0) = z_2(u_0)$  for every  $u_0 \in D_0$ , there exists an interval  $(\alpha, \beta) \subset (0, 1)$ , with  $\alpha, \beta \in D_0 \cup \{0, 1\}$  such that  $D$  does not change sign in  $(\alpha, \beta)$  and both the functions  $z_1, z_2$  are solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{z}(u) = f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{\rho(u)D(u)}{z(u)}, & u \in (\alpha, \beta) \\ z(u)D(u) < 0, & u \in (\alpha, \beta) \\ z(\alpha^-) = z(\beta^+) = 0 \end{cases}$$

If  $D(u) > 0$  in  $(\alpha, \beta)$  this is in contradiction with the uniqueness result [7, Proposition 13]. The proof in the case  $D(u) < 0$  in  $(\alpha, \beta)$  follows from Lemma 6.

Let us now assume that equation (4) admits two different t.w.s.  $u_1$  defined in  $(a_1, b_1)$  and  $u_2$  defined in  $(a_2, b_2)$ . Let  $t_1 : (0, 1) \rightarrow (a_1, b_1)$  and  $t_2 : (0, 1) \rightarrow (a_2, b_2)$  be the inverse functions of  $u_1, u_2$  respectively. Since  $u_i(t_i(u)) \equiv u$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , we get

$$(12) \quad u'_1(t_1(u)) \cdot \dot{t}_1(u) = 1, \quad u'_2(t_2(u)) \cdot \dot{t}_2(u) = 1$$

By Theorem (5) the functions  $z_1(u) := D(u)u'_1(t_1(u))$ ,  $z_2(u) := D(u)u'_2(t_2(u))$ , are both solutions of problem (9). So, by the uniqueness just proved, we have  $z_1(u) = z_2(u)$ . Hence, for every  $u \in (0, 1) \setminus D_0$  we have  $u'_1(t_1(u)) = u'_2(t_2(u))$ . Therefore, by (12) we deduce  $\dot{t}_1(u) = \dot{t}_2(u)$  for every  $u \in (0, 1)$ . Then, since  $D_0$  is finite, by the continuity of the inverse functions  $t_1, t_2$  we infer the existence of a constant  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $t_2(u) = t_1(u) + k$  for every  $u \in (0, 1)$ . So,  $u_2(t) = u_1(t - k)$ , that is  $u_2$  is a shift of  $u_1$ . □

#### 4. SOLVABILITY OF THE FIRST ORDER SINGULAR PROBLEM

In view of Theorem 5, we now investigate the solvability of problem (9). For the sake of simplicity, along this section we consider a generic function  $h \in C([0, 1])$ , instead of the product  $\rho(u)D(u)$ , such that put

$$H_0 := \{u \in [0, 1] : h(u) = 0\}$$

we have

$$(13) \quad H_0 \text{ is finite and } 0, 1 \in H_0.$$

We study the solvability of the following boundary value problem

$$(14) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{z}(u) = f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{h(u)}{z(u)}, & u \in (0, 1) \setminus H_0 \\ z(u)h(u) < 0, & u \in (0, 1) \setminus H_0 \\ z(0^+) = z(1^-) = 0. \end{cases}$$

The existence and non-existence of solutions of problem (14) has been investigated in [7] in the case  $h$  is a positive function in  $(0, 1)$ .

The following results summarizes some statements of Theorem 12, 14 and 15 in [7].

**Theorem 8.** *Let  $f, g, h$  be continuous functions defined in  $[\alpha, \beta]$  such that  $h$  is positive on  $(\alpha, \beta)$  with  $h(\alpha) = h(\beta) = 0$  and differentiable at  $\alpha, \beta$ .*

*Suppose that*

$$g(\alpha) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\alpha}^u g(s) ds > 0 \quad \text{for every } u \in (\alpha, \beta].$$

*Then, there exists a value  $c^*$  such that problem*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{z}(u) = f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{h(u)}{z(u)}, & u \in (\alpha, \beta) \\ z(u) < 0, & u \in (\alpha, \beta) \\ z(\alpha^+) = z(\beta^-) = 0 \end{cases}$$

*admits solution if and only if  $c \geq c^*$ .*

*Moreover, for every  $c \geq c^*$  the solution  $z_c$  is differentiable at  $\alpha, \beta$ , with*

$$(15) \quad \dot{z}(\alpha) = \begin{cases} r_+(c, \alpha) & \text{if } c > c^* \\ r_-(c, \alpha) & \text{if } c = c^* \end{cases}; \quad \dot{z}(\beta) = r_+(c, \beta)$$

*where*

$$(16) \quad r_{\pm}(c, u) := \frac{1}{2} \left( f(u) - cg(u) \pm \sqrt{(f(u) - cg(u))^2 - 4\dot{h}(u)} \right), \quad u \in \{\alpha, \beta\}.$$

*Finally, put*

$$m_g := \inf_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_{\alpha}^u g(s) ds; \quad M_f := \sup_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_{\alpha}^u f(s) ds \quad M_h := \sup_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_{\alpha}^u \frac{h(s)}{s - \alpha} ds$$

*we have that  $m_g > 0$ ;  $M_f, M_h < +\infty$  and  $c^*$  satisfies*

$$(17) \quad \frac{2\sqrt{\dot{h}(\alpha) + f(\alpha)}}{g(\alpha)} \leq c^* \leq \frac{2\sqrt{M_h} + M_f}{m_g}.$$

*Proof.* First of all, note that  $m_g > 0$  and  $M_f, M_h$  are finite.

Indeed, put  $G(u) := \int_{\alpha}^u g(s) ds$ , we have that  $G$  is a positive continuous function in  $(\alpha, \beta]$  such

that  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \alpha^+} G(u) = g(\alpha) > 0$ . So,  $m_g > 0$ . Similarly, put  $F(u) := \int_{\alpha}^u f(s) ds$ , we have that  $F$  is a continuous function in  $(\alpha, \beta]$  such that  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \alpha^+} F(u) = f(\alpha)$ . So,  $M_f$  is finite. Finally, also

$H(u) := \int_{\alpha}^u \frac{h(s)}{s-\alpha} ds$ , is a positive continuous function in  $(\alpha, \beta]$  with  $\lim_{u \rightarrow \alpha^+} H(u) = \dot{h}(\alpha)$ . Hence,  $M_h$  is finite too.

Let us fix a positive value  $c > \frac{2\sqrt{M_h} + M_f}{m_g}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_{\alpha}^u (cg(s) - f(s)) ds &\geq c \inf_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_{\alpha}^u g(s) ds + \inf_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_{\alpha}^u -f(s) ds \\ &= cm_g - \sup_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_{\alpha}^u f(s) ds \\ &= cm_g - M_f > 2\sqrt{M_h} = 2\sqrt{\sup_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_{\alpha}^u \frac{h(s)}{s-\alpha} ds}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, assumption (26) in [7, Theorem 12] is satisfied and problem (9) admits a solution. Moreover, by [7, Theorem 14] we deduce the existence of a value  $c^*$  such that problem (9) admits a solution if and only if  $c \geq c^*$ .

Since  $c^*$  is the minimal wave speed, by what we have just proved, necessarily  $c^* \leq \frac{2\sqrt{M_h} + M_f}{m_g}$ .

Finally, the inequality  $c^* \geq \frac{2\sqrt{\dot{h}(\alpha) + f(\alpha)}}{g(\alpha)}$  follows from assertion (27) in [7, Theorem 14].  $\square$

By using the change of variable given in Lemma 6 we obtain the following result in the case  $h$  is negative in  $(\alpha, \beta)$ .

**Theorem 9.** *Let  $f, g, h$  be continuous functions defined in  $[\alpha, \beta]$  such that  $h$  is negative on  $(\alpha, \beta)$  with  $h(\alpha) = h(\beta) = 0$  and differentiable at  $\alpha, \beta$ .*

*Suppose that*

$$g(\beta) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_u^{\beta} g(s) ds > 0 \quad \text{for every } u \in [\alpha, \beta).$$

*Then, there exists a value  $c^*$  such that such that problem*

$$(18) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{z}(u) = f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{h(u)}{z(u)}, & u \in (\alpha, \beta) \\ z(u) > 0, & u \in (\alpha, \beta) \\ z(\alpha^+) = z(\beta^-) = 0 \end{cases}$$

*admits solution if and only if  $c \geq c^*$ .*

*Moreover, for every  $c \geq c^*$  the solution  $z_c$  is differentiable at  $\alpha, \beta$ , with (see (16))*

$$(19) \quad \dot{z}(\alpha) = r_+(c, \alpha), \quad \dot{z}(\beta) = \begin{cases} r_+(c, \beta) & \text{if } c > c^* \\ r_-(c, \beta) & \text{if } c = c^*. \end{cases}$$

*Finally, put*

$$m_g^* := \inf_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_u^{\beta} g(s) ds; \quad M_f^* := \sup_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_u^{\beta} f(s) ds \quad M_h^* := \sup_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_u^{\beta} \frac{h(s)}{s-\beta} ds$$

we have that  $m_g^* > 0$ ;  $M_f^*, M_h^* < +\infty$  and  $c^*$  satisfies

$$(20) \quad \frac{2\sqrt{\dot{h}(\beta)} + f(\beta)}{g(\beta)} \leq c^* \leq \frac{2\sqrt{M_h^*} + M_f^*}{m_g^*}.$$

*Proof.* The proof follows from Theorem 8 and Lemma 6. Indeed, by Lemma 6 we get that  $z$  is a solution of problem (18) for some  $c$  if and only if the function  $\zeta(u) := -z(\alpha + \beta - u)$  is a solution of the associated problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\zeta}(u) = \tilde{f}(u) - c\tilde{g}(u) - \frac{\tilde{h}(u)}{\zeta(u)}, & u \in (\alpha, \beta) \\ \zeta(u) < 0, & u \in (\alpha, \beta) \\ \zeta(\alpha^+) = \zeta(\beta^-) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Notice that  $\dot{\zeta}(\alpha) = \dot{z}(\beta)$  and  $\dot{\zeta}(\beta) = \dot{z}(\alpha)$ , so (19) holds.

Moreover, observe that if  $\gamma$  is a continuous function in  $(\alpha, \beta)$ , then put  $\tilde{\gamma}(u) := \gamma(\alpha + \beta - u)$  we have

$$\int_u^\beta \gamma(s) \, ds = \int_\alpha^{\alpha+\beta-u} \tilde{\gamma}(t) \, dt$$

so

$$\inf_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_u^\beta \gamma(s) \, ds = \inf_{v \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_\alpha^v \tilde{\gamma}(t) \, dt$$

and the same argument holds when taking the supremum of the mean value. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_u^\beta \frac{h(s)}{s - \beta} \, ds &= \sup_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \frac{\int_u^\beta \frac{-\tilde{h}(\alpha + \beta - s)}{s - \beta} \, ds}{\beta - u} \\ &= \sup_{u \in (\alpha, \beta)} \frac{\int_\alpha^{\alpha+\beta-u} \frac{\tilde{h}(t)}{t - \alpha} \, dt}{\beta - u} = \sup_{v \in (\alpha, \beta)} \int_\alpha^v \frac{\tilde{h}(t)}{t - \alpha} \, dt. \end{aligned}$$

So, estimate (20) is the same as (17) for the problem (18).  $\square$

We now consider problem (14) with a changing-sign function  $h$ .

Of course, the open set  $(0, 1) \setminus H_0$  is union of a finite number of disjoint intervals (see (13))

$$(21) \quad (0, 1) \setminus H_0 = \bigcup_{k=1}^n (\alpha_k, \beta_k).$$

In what follows it will be convenient to distinguish the indexes  $k$  such that  $h$  is positive in  $(\alpha_k, \beta_k)$  from those such that  $h$  is negative in  $(\alpha_k, \beta_k)$ . Hence, we set

$$(22) \quad \begin{aligned} K^+ &:= \{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} : h(u) > 0 \text{ in } (\alpha_k, \beta_k)\}; \\ K^- &:= \{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} : h(u) < 0 \text{ in } (\alpha_k, \beta_k)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let us define the following constants:

$$\begin{aligned}
(23) \quad G_k^+ &:= \inf_{u \in (\alpha_k, \beta_k)} \int_{\alpha_k}^u g(s) ds, & G_k^- &:= \inf_{u \in (\alpha_k, \beta_k)} \int_u^{\beta_k} g(s) ds \\
F_k^+ &:= \sup_{u \in (\alpha_k, \beta_k)} \int_{\alpha_k}^u f(s) ds, & F_k^- &:= \sup_{u \in (\alpha_k, \beta_k)} \int_u^{\beta_k} f(s) ds \\
H_k^+ &:= \sup_{u \in (\alpha_k, \beta_k)} \int_{\alpha_k}^u \frac{h(s)}{s - \alpha_k} ds, & H_k^- &:= \sup_{u \in (\alpha_k, \beta_k)} \int_u^{\beta_k} \frac{h(s)}{s - \beta_k} ds
\end{aligned}$$

We can now prove the following existence result for the general problem (14).

**Theorem 10.** *Let  $f, g, h$  be continuous functions defined in  $[0, 1]$  such that condition (13) holds true. Assume that  $h$  is differentiable at each point  $u_0 \in H_0 \cap (0, 1)$ . Moreover, suppose that (see (22)):*

$$(24) \quad g(\alpha_k) > 0 \text{ and } \int_{\alpha_k}^u g(s) ds > 0, \text{ for every } u \in (\alpha_k, \beta_k], \text{ whenever } k \in K^+;$$

$$(25) \quad g(\beta_k) > 0 \text{ and } \int_u^{\beta_k} g(s) ds > 0, \text{ for every } u \in [\alpha_k, \beta_k), \text{ whenever } k \in K^-.$$

Then, there exists a value  $c^* \in \mathbb{R}$  such that problem (14) admits a solution  $z_c$  if and only if  $c \geq c^*$  and it is not solvable for every  $c < c^*$ .

Moreover, with the notations given in (22) and (23), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(26) \quad & \max \left\{ \max_{k \in K^+} \frac{2\sqrt{\dot{h}(\alpha_k)} + f(\alpha_k)}{g(\alpha_k)}, \max_{k \in K^-} \frac{2\sqrt{\dot{h}(\beta_k)} + f(\beta_k)}{g(\beta_k)} \right\} \leq \\
& \leq c^* \leq \max \left\{ \max_{k \in K^+} \frac{2\sqrt{H_k^+} + F_k^+}{G_k^+}, \max_{k \in K^-} \frac{2\sqrt{H_k^-} + F_k^-}{G_k^-} \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

(where the maxima involved in (26) have to be intended as  $-\infty$  if the set to which they refer is empty).

Finally, for every  $c > c^*$  the solution  $z_c$  is differentiable at every point  $u_0 \in H_0$  with

$$(27) \quad \dot{z}(u_0) = \frac{1}{2} \left( f(u_0) - cg(u_0) + \sqrt{(f(u_0) - cg(u_0))^2 - 4\dot{h}(u_0)} \right).$$

*Proof.* In each interval  $(\alpha_k, \beta_k)$  we can apply Theorem 8 or Theorem 9 according to the sign of  $h$ . Hence, we can deduce that for every  $k = 1, \dots, n$  there exists a value  $c_k^*$  such that for every  $c \geq c_k^*$  there exists a function  $z_{k,c} \in C^1(\alpha_k, \beta_k)$ , satisfying the differential equation of (14) in the same interval and such that  $z_{k,c}(u)h(u) < 0$  for every  $u \in (\alpha_k, \beta_k)$ , with  $z_{k,c}(\alpha_k^+) = z_{k,c}(\beta_k^-) = 0$ .

Put  $c^* := \max\{c_1^*, \dots, c_n^*\}$ . For every  $c \geq c^*$  let us define  $z_c : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by setting

$$z_c(u) = \begin{cases} z_{k,c}(u) & \text{if } u \in (\alpha_k, \beta_k), k = 1, \dots, n \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases}$$

Of course,  $z_c$  is continuous in  $[0, 1]$ , continuously differentiable on  $(0, 1) \setminus H_0$ , and it satisfies the differential equation of problem (14) in  $(0, 1) \setminus H_0$ . Moreover  $z_c(u)h(u) < 0$  for every  $u \in (0, 1) \setminus H_0$  and  $z_c(0^+) = z_c(1^-) = 0$ . So,  $z_c$  is a solution of problem (14).

Instead, if we fix  $c < c^*$ , then  $c < c_k^*$  for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , hence there is no function  $z \in C^1((\alpha_k, \beta_k))$  satisfying the differential equation of (14), such that  $z(u)h(u) < 0$  in  $(\alpha_k, \beta_k)$  and vanishing at  $\alpha_k, \beta_k$ . This implies that problem (14) does not admit solutions.

Moreover, since  $c^* = c_k^*$  for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , estimate (26) follows from (17) and (20).

Finally, the validity of (27) for  $c > c^*$  is a consequence of (15) and (19).  $\square$

**Remark 11.** Taking into account (15) and (19), when  $c = c^*$  we can not state anything about the differentiability of the solution  $z_{c^*}$  at the points of  $H_0$ . Indeed, if  $c^* = c_j^*$  for some  $j \in K^+$ , with  $\alpha_j \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\alpha_j = \beta_{j-1}$  with  $j-1 \in K^-$ , then by (15) and (19) we obtain

$$\dot{z}_{c^*}(\alpha_j^+) = \dot{z}_{j,c_j^*}(\alpha_j) = r_-(c_j^*, \alpha_j)$$

$$\dot{z}_{c^*}(\beta_{j-1}^-) = \dot{z}_{j-1,c_j^*}(\beta_{j-1}) = \begin{cases} r_-(c_j^*, \alpha_j) & \text{if } c_j^* = c_{j-1}^* \\ r_+(c_j^*, \alpha_j) & \text{if } c_j^* > c_{j-1}^*. \end{cases}$$

So, if  $c_j^* > c_{j-1}^*$  the gluing  $z_{c^*}$  is not differentiable at  $\alpha_j$ . Recalling that the threshold values  $c_j^*, c_{j-1}^*$  are unknown in general, it is unknown also the existence of a solution for  $c = c^*$ . However, if such a solution  $z_{c^*}$  exists for  $c = c^*$  then it satisfy (see (15) and (19))

$$\dot{z}_{c^*}(\alpha_j) = \frac{1}{2} \left( f(\alpha_j) - c^*g(\alpha_j) - \sqrt{(f(\alpha_j) - c^*g(\alpha_j))^2 - 4\dot{h}(\alpha_j)} \right).$$

On the other hand, if  $K^+ \subset \{1\}$ , that is if  $h(u) < 0$  for every  $u \in (0, 1)$  or  $h(u)(u - u_0) < 0$  for every  $u \neq u_0$ , for some  $u_0 \in (0, 1)$ , then this situation does not occur and we can state that there exists a solution also for  $c = c^*$ . We will treat this case in Corollary 17.

## 5. EXISTENCE OF T.W.S.

In this Section we combine the results of the previous sections in order to derive the existence and non-existence results for the t.w.s. of equation (4).

In what follows we will adopt the same notation introduced in the previous section in (21), (22) and (23), where in this case the function  $h$  is replaced by  $D(u)\rho(u)$ , so

$$(28) \quad D_0 = H_0 \setminus \{0, 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad (0, 1) \setminus D_0 = \bigcup_{k=1}^n (\alpha_k, \beta_k).$$

Moreover, we put

$$D_{00} := \{u \in (0, 1) : D(u) = \dot{D}(u) = 0\}.$$

Of course,  $D_{00}$  can be empty.

The main result of this section is the following.

**Theorem 12.** *Suppose that (24) and (25) are satisfied. Moreover, assume that*

$$(29) \quad g(u) > 0 \quad \text{for every } u \in D_{00}.$$

*Then, there exists a value  $\hat{c}$  such that equation (4) admits t.w.s. for every  $c > \hat{c}$ , whereas no t.w.s. exists for  $c < \hat{c}$ . Finally, put*

$$K_0^- := \{k = 2, \dots, n : k \in K^- \text{ and } \dot{D}(\alpha_k) = 0\}$$

*and considered the quantities defined in (23), we have that  $\hat{c}$  satisfies the estimate*

$$(30) \quad \max \left\{ \max_{k \in K^+} \frac{2\sqrt{\dot{h}(\alpha_k)} + f(\alpha_k)}{g(\alpha_k)}, \max_{k \in K^-} \frac{2\sqrt{\dot{h}(\beta_k)} + f(\beta_k)}{g(\beta_k)}, \max_{k \in K_0^-} \frac{f(\alpha_k)}{g(\alpha_k)} \right\} \leq \\ \leq \hat{c} \leq \max \left\{ \max_{k \in K^+} \frac{2\sqrt{H_k^+} + F_k^+}{G_k^+}, \max_{k \in K^-} \frac{2\sqrt{H_k^-} + F_k^-}{G_k^-}, \max_{k \in K_0^-} \frac{f(\alpha_k)}{g(\alpha_k)} \right\}.$$

*(where the maxima involved in (30) have to be intended as  $-\infty$  if the set to which they refer is empty).*

The proof of the previous theorem needs some auxiliary results. Indeed, as it is clear by Theorems (5) and (10), the existence of t.w.s. depends on the solvability of problem (14) by a solution  $z$  such that the ratio  $z/D$  has a continuous extension in  $(0, 1)$ . This is trivial when  $\dot{D}(u) \neq 0$  for every  $u \in D_0$ , whereas it requires an accurate study when  $D_{00}$  is nonempty.

Let us first recall the main tool of the upper and lower-solution technique, which is a simple consequence of Gronwall's Lemma. Recall that a lower-solution [resp. upper-solution] of equation (11) is a function  $\xi \in C^1(\alpha, \beta)$  such that

$$\dot{\xi}(u) \leq [\geq] f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{h(u)}{\xi(u)} \quad \text{for every } u \in (\alpha, \beta).$$

When the above inequality is strict, then the function  $\xi$  is said to be a strict lower-solution [upper-solution].

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $z, \zeta$  respectively be a solution and an upper-solution of equation (11) in an interval  $I \subset (\alpha, \beta)$  and let  $u_0 \in I$  be fixed. Then,*

- *if  $z(u_0) \leq \zeta(u_0)$ , then  $z(u) \leq \zeta(u)$  for every  $u \geq u_0$*
- *if  $z(u_0) \geq \zeta(u_0)$ , then  $z(u) \geq \zeta(u)$  for every  $u \leq u_0$ .*

*Instead, if  $\zeta$  is a lower-solution, then*

- *if  $z(u_0) \geq \zeta(u_0)$ , then  $z(u) \geq \zeta(u)$  for every  $u \geq u_0$*
- *if  $z(u_0) \leq \zeta(u_0)$ , then  $z(u) \leq \zeta(u)$  for every  $u \leq u_0$ .*

The next result regards the behaviour of  $z/D$  near the points of  $D_{00}$ . The proof follows arguments developed in similar contexts in [8, Theorem 2.5] and [3, Lemma 9.1].

**Proposition 14.** *Let all the assumptions of Theorem 10 be satisfied, for  $h(u) := D(u)\rho(u)$ . Let  $z$  be a solution of problem (14) for some  $c \geq c^*$  and let  $u_0 \in D_{00}$ . Let us denote by  $\dot{z}_+(u_0)$  and  $\dot{z}_-(u_0)$  the right and the left derivative of  $z$  at  $u_0$ .*

Then, if  $\dot{z}_+(u_0) = 0$  [resp.  $\dot{z}_-(u_0) = 0$ ] we necessarily have  $f(u_0) - cg(u_0) \leq 0$  and moreover

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow u_0^+} [\lim_{u \rightarrow u_0^-}] \frac{D(u)}{z(u)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } f(u_0) - cg(u_0) = 0 \\ \frac{f(u_0) - cg(u_0)}{\rho(u_0)} & \text{if } f(u_0) - cg(u_0) < 0. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We limit ourselves to give the proof for the limit as  $u \rightarrow u_0^+$ , since the limit as  $u \rightarrow u_0^-$  can be treated by using the change of variable  $\zeta(u) := -z(\alpha + \beta - u)$  considered in Lemma 6, for  $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 1)$ . Indeed, in this case the limit  $\lim_{u \rightarrow u_0^-} \frac{D(u)}{z(u)}$  is replaced by the limit  $\lim_{u \rightarrow v_0^+} \frac{\tilde{D}(u)}{\zeta(u)}$ , where  $v_0 := 1 - u_0$ ,  $\tilde{D}(u) = -D(1 - u)$  and  $\zeta(u) = -z(1 - u)$ .

Let  $u_0 \in D_{00}$  be fixed and assume that  $\dot{z}_+(u_0) = 0$ . Let  $(u_n)_n$  be a decreasing sequence converging to  $u_0$  such that  $\dot{z}(u_n) \rightarrow 0$ .

Notice that by the differential equation in (14) we have

$$(31) \quad \frac{f(u) - cg(u) - \dot{z}(u)}{\rho(u)} = \frac{D(u)}{z(u)} < 0 \quad \text{for every } u \in (0, 1) \setminus D_0.$$

Therefore, since  $\dot{z}(u_n) \rightarrow 0$ , we deduce that  $f(u_0) - cg(u_0) \leq 0$ .

**Case 1:**  $f(u_0) - cg(u_0) = 0$ .

Fixed a value  $\epsilon > 0$ , put

$$\omega_\epsilon(u) := -\frac{D(u)}{\epsilon}.$$

Since  $\dot{\omega}_\epsilon(u_0) = 0$  and  $\lim_{u \rightarrow u_0^+} f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{h(u)}{\omega_\epsilon(u)} = \epsilon \rho(u_0) > 0$ , for some positive  $\delta^* = \delta^*(\epsilon)$  we have

$$\dot{\omega}_\epsilon(u) < f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{h(u)}{\omega_\epsilon(u)} \quad \text{for every } u \in (u_0, u_0 + \delta^*)$$

that is  $\omega_\epsilon$  is a strict lower-solution for equation in (14).

From (31) we deduce that  $D(u_n)/z(u_n) \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore, for every  $n$  sufficiently large we have  $D(u_n)/z(u_n) > -\epsilon$ , that is

$$(32) \quad \frac{\omega_\epsilon(u_n)}{z(u_n)} < 1 \quad \text{for every } n \text{ large enough.}$$

Then, if  $D$  is positive in a right neighborhood of  $u_0$ , then  $z$  is negative in the same neighborhood and we get  $z(\bar{u}) < \omega_\epsilon(\bar{u})$  for some  $\bar{u} > u_0$  and recalling that  $\omega_\epsilon$  is a lower-solution we conclude that  $z(u) < \omega_\epsilon(u)$  for every  $u \in (0, \bar{u})$ , that is

$$-\epsilon < \frac{D(u)}{z(u)} < 0 \quad \text{for every } u \in (u_0, \bar{u}).$$

Instead, if  $D$  is negative in a right neighborhood of  $u_0$ , then  $z$  is positive in the same neighborhood and by (32) we get the existence of a natural  $\bar{n}$  such that

$$z(u_n) > \omega_\epsilon(u_n) \quad \text{for every } n \geq \bar{n}.$$

This implies that for every  $n \geq \bar{n}$  we have  $z(u) \geq \omega_\epsilon(u)$  for every  $u \in (u_{n+1}, u_n)$ . Indeed, if  $z(\bar{u}) < \omega_\epsilon(\bar{u})$  for some  $\bar{u} \in (u_{n+1}, u_n)$  and  $n \geq \bar{n}$ , then there exists a value  $u^* \in (u_{n+1}, \bar{u})$  such that  $z(u^*) = \omega_\epsilon(u^*)$  and  $\omega_\epsilon(u) > z(u)$  in a right neighborhood of  $u^*$ , in contradiction with Lemma 13.



Summarizing, whatever it is the sign of  $D$  in a right neighborhood of  $u_0$  we have

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow u_0^+} \frac{D(u)}{z(u)} = 0.$$

**Case 2:**  $f(u_0) - cg(u_0) < 0$ .

Taking account of (31) we get

$$(33) \quad \frac{D(u_n)}{z(u_n)} \rightarrow \frac{f(u_0) - cg(u_0)}{\rho(u_0)} < 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Fixed a positive  $\varepsilon < (cg(u_0) - f(u_0))/\rho(u_0)$ , let us define

$$\eta_\varepsilon(u) := -\frac{\rho(u_0)}{cg(u_0) - f(u_0) - \varepsilon\rho(u_0)} D(u).$$

Since  $\dot{\eta}_\varepsilon(u_0) = 0$  and  $\lim_{u \rightarrow u_0^+} f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{h(u)}{\eta_\varepsilon(u)} = -\varepsilon\rho(u_0) < 0$ , we get that  $\eta_\varepsilon$  is a strict

upper-solution for the equation in (14) in  $(u_0, u_0 + \delta)$  for some  $\delta > 0$ .

On the other hand, from (33) we derive

$$(34) \quad \frac{\eta_\varepsilon(u_n)}{z(u_n)} \rightarrow \frac{cg(u_0) - f(u_0)}{cg(u_0) - f(u_0) - \varepsilon\rho(u_0)} > 1 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Therefore, if  $D$  is positive in a right neighborhood of  $u_0$  (hence  $z$  is negative) we infer that  $\eta_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}) < z(\tilde{u})$  for some  $\tilde{u} \in (u_0, u_0 + \delta)$  and by applying Lemma 13 we achieve that  $\eta_\varepsilon(u) < z(u)$  in  $(u_0, \tilde{u})$ , that is

$$\frac{D(u)}{z(u)} < \frac{f(u_0) - cg(u_0)}{\rho(u_0)} + \varepsilon \quad \text{for every } u \in (u_0, \tilde{u}).$$

Instead, if  $D$  is negative in a right neighborhood of  $u_0$  (hence  $z$  is positive), by (34) we derive that  $\eta_\varepsilon(u_n) > z(u_n)$  for every  $n$  large enough. So, by a similar argument to that used above, we get that for every  $n$  sufficiently large we have  $z(u) \leq \eta_\varepsilon(u)$  for every  $u \in (u_{n+1}, u_n)$ . Therefore, again we derive for some  $\tilde{\delta} > 0$

$$\frac{D(u)}{z(u)} \leq \frac{f(u_0) - cg(u_0)}{\rho(u_0)} + \varepsilon \quad \text{for every } u \in (u_0, u_0 + \tilde{\delta}).$$

Summarizing, whatever it is the sign of  $D$  in a right neighborhood of  $u_0$  we have

$$(35) \quad \limsup_{u \rightarrow u_0^+} \frac{D(u)}{z(u)} \leq \frac{f(u_0) - cg(u_0)}{\rho(u_0)}.$$

Let us now study the liminf. In order to do this, replace  $\varepsilon$  with  $-\varepsilon$  in the definition of  $\eta_\varepsilon$ , that is consider now the function

$$\eta_{-\varepsilon}(u) = -\frac{\rho(u_0)}{cg(u_0) - f(u_0) + \varepsilon\rho(u_0)} D(u).$$

By arguing in a similar manner as in the previous case, we can show that  $\eta_{-\varepsilon}(u)$  is a strict lower-solution for the equation in (14) and we have

$$\frac{\eta_{-\varepsilon}(u_n)}{z(u_n)} \rightarrow \frac{cg(u_0) - f(u_0)}{cg(u_0) - f(u_0) + \varepsilon\rho(u_0)} < 1 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

instead of (34). Following the same reasoning above developed we achieve that

$$\frac{\eta_{-\varepsilon}(u)}{z(u)} < 1 \quad \text{for every } u \in (u_0, u_0 + \sigma)$$

for some  $\sigma > 0$ , whatever it is the sign of  $D$  in a right neighborhood of  $u_0$ . Therefore

$$\frac{D(u)}{z_c(u)} > \frac{f(u_0) - cg(u_0)}{\rho(u_0)} - \varepsilon \quad \text{for every } u \in (u_0, u_0 + \sigma).$$

Thus,

$$\liminf_{u \rightarrow u_0^+} \frac{D(u)}{z(u)} \geq \frac{f(u_0) - cg(u_0)}{\rho(u_0)}$$

which jointly with (35) implies that

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow u_0^+} \frac{D(u)}{z(u)} = \frac{f(u_0) - cg(u_0)}{\rho(u_0)}.$$

□

**Remark 15.** Taking account of Proposition 14 and the differential equation of problem (14), we have that if  $z$  is differentiable at some point  $u_0 \in D_0$  then there exists the limit  $\lim_{u \rightarrow u_0} \dot{z}(u)$ . So, if  $z$  is a solution of problem (9) with  $\dot{z}_+(u) = \dot{z}_-(u)$  for every  $u \in D_0$ , then it is a  $C^1$  function in  $(0, 1)$ .

We are now ready to prove Theorem 12.

*Proof of Theorem 12.* By virtue of Theorem 10, there exists a value  $c^*$  satisfying (26) such that problem (9) admits a solution  $z_c$  if and only if  $c \geq c^*$ . Recalling that  $(0, 1) \setminus D_0 = \bigcup_{k=1}^n (\alpha_k, \beta_k)$ , put

$$(36) \quad \hat{c} := \max \left\{ c^*, \max_{k \in K_0^-} \frac{f(\alpha_k)}{g(\alpha_k)} \right\}$$

(with  $\hat{c} = c^*$  if  $K_0^- = \emptyset$ ).

Let us fix  $c > \hat{c}$  and let  $z_c$  be a solution of problem (9) given by Theorem 10. In force of Theorem 5 we have to show that the function  $z_c/D$  admits a continuous extension on  $(0, 1)$ , that is there exists finite the limit

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow \alpha_k} \frac{z_c(u)}{D(u)} \quad \text{for every } k = 2, \dots, n.$$

Let us fix an index  $k \geq 2$ . If  $\dot{D}(\alpha_k) \neq 0$ , then there exists the limit

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow \alpha_k} \frac{z_c(u)}{D(u)} = \frac{\dot{z}_c(\alpha_k)}{\dot{D}(\alpha_k)}.$$

Instead, if  $\dot{D}(\alpha_k) = 0$ , we have  $\dot{h}(\alpha_k) = 0$  and then by (29), (36) and (26) we deduce that  $f(\alpha_k) - cg(\alpha_k) < 0$ . Therefore, from (27) we have  $\dot{z}_c(\alpha_k) = 0$ . Then, by applying Proposition 14 we derive

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow \alpha_k} \frac{z_c(u)}{D(u)} = \frac{\rho(\alpha_k)}{f(\alpha_k) - cg(\alpha_k)}.$$

Therefore, for every  $c > \hat{c}$  there exist t.w.s.

Let us now take  $c < \hat{c}$ . If  $c < c^*$  then the first order singular problem (9) has no solution, hence, a fortiori, no t.w.s. exists by Theorem 5. Instead, if  $c^* \leq c < \hat{c}$ , let  $z_c$  be a solution of problem (9) given by Theorem 10. By (36) we get  $f(\alpha_k) - cg(\alpha_k) > 0$  for some  $k \in K_0^-$ . Then, by Proposition 14 we infer  $\dot{z}(\alpha_k) \neq 0$  and so

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow \alpha_k} \left| \frac{z_c(u)}{D(u)} \right| = +\infty.$$

Then, the function  $z/D$  has not a continuous extension in  $(0, 1)$  and by virtue of Theorem 5 we get that no t.w.s. exists. □

**Remark 16.** In view of what we observed in Remark 11, the existence of t.w.s. is not ensured when  $c = \hat{c}$ . Indeed, since  $z_{\hat{c}}$  is always right- and left-differentiable at  $u_0$ , when  $\dot{D}(u_0) \neq 0$ , the limit of  $z_{\hat{c}}(u)/D(u)$  as  $u \rightarrow u_0$  exists finite if and only if there exists  $\dot{z}_{\hat{c}}(u_0^+) = \dot{z}_{\hat{c}}(u_0^-)$ . However, if one allows the equation to admit weak t.w.s. (see [8]), then by similar techniques to those used in [8] it is possible to show that weak t.w.s. exist also for  $c = \hat{c}$ .

Observe now that when  $K^+ = \{1\}$ , that is when  $D$  has an unique change of sign, from positive to negative, we can state the existence of t.w.s. also for  $c = \hat{c}$ , as in the following result.

**Corollary 17.** Put  $h(u) := D(u)\rho(u)$ , suppose that  $h$  is differentiable at  $0, 1$ . Moreover, assume that for some  $u_0 \in (0, 1)$  we have  $D(u)(u - u_0) < 0$  for every  $u \in (0, 1) \setminus \{u_0\}$ . Moreover, suppose  $g(0) > 0$ ,  $g(1) > 0$  and

$$\int_0^u g(s)ds > 0, \quad \text{for any } 0 < u \leq u_0; \quad \int_u^1 g(s)ds > 0, \quad \text{for any } u_0 \leq u < 1.$$

Finally, in the case  $\dot{D}(u_0) = 0$  suppose also that  $g(u_0) > 0$  and one of the following assumptions are satisfied:

$$(37) \quad \frac{f(u_0)}{g(u_0)} < \max \left\{ \frac{f(0)}{g(0)}, \frac{f(1)}{g(1)} \right\}$$

or

$$(38) \quad f(u) \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } (0, u_0) \quad \text{or} \quad f(u) \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } (u_0, 1).$$

Then, there exists a value  $\hat{c}$  such that equation (4) admits t.w.s. if and only if  $c \geq \hat{c}$ .

Moreover, we have

$$\max \left\{ \frac{2\sqrt{\dot{h}(0)} + f(0)}{g(0)}, \frac{2\sqrt{\dot{h}(1)} + f(1)}{g(1)} \right\} \leq \hat{c} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{2\sqrt{H^+} + F^+}{G^+}, \frac{2\sqrt{H^-} + F^-}{G^-} \right\}.$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G^+ &:= \inf_{u \in (0, u_0)} \int_0^u g(s)ds, & G^- &:= \inf_{u \in (u_0, 1)} \int_u^1 g(s)ds \\ F^+ &:= \sup_{u \in (0, u_0)} \int_0^u f(s)ds, & F^- &:= \sup_{u \in (u_0, 1)} \int_u^1 f(s)ds \\ H^+ &:= \sup_{u \in (0, u_0)} \int_0^u \frac{h(s)}{s} ds, & H^- &:= \sup_{u \in (u_0, 1)} \int_u^1 \frac{h(s)}{s-1} ds. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* In view of Theorem 12, we have only to prove that there exists a t.w.s. also for  $c = \hat{c}$ , that is the limit  $\lim_{u \rightarrow u_0} \frac{z_{\hat{c}}(u)}{D(u)}$  exists finite.

Observe that by (15) and (19) we have  $\dot{z}_{\hat{c}}(u_0) = r_+(\hat{c}, u_0)$ . So, if  $\dot{D}(u_0) \neq 0$  we get

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow u_0} \frac{z_{\hat{c}}(u)}{D(u)} = \frac{\dot{z}_{\hat{c}}(u_0)}{\dot{D}(u_0)} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Otherwise, if  $\dot{D}(u_0) = 0$  then  $K_0^- \neq \emptyset$  so  $\hat{c} = \max\{c^*, f(u_0)/g(u_0)\}$ . Therefore, since  $\dot{h}(u_0) = 0$ , by (15) and (19) we have  $\dot{z}_{\hat{c}}(u_0) = 0$ .

If (37) is satisfied, then by (26) we have  $f(u_0) - \hat{c}g(u_0) < 0$ , so by applying Proposition 14 we get

$$(39) \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow u_0} \frac{z_{\hat{c}}(u)}{D(u)} = \frac{\rho(u_0)}{f(u_0) - \hat{c}g(u_0)} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Otherwise, if (38) holds, then necessarily  $\hat{c} > 0$ . Indeed, if  $\hat{c} = 0$  and  $f(u) \equiv 0$  in  $(0, u_0) \cup (u_0, 1]$ , then by the differential equation in (9) we obtain

$$\dot{z}_{\hat{c}}(u) = -\frac{\rho(u)D(u)}{z(u)} > 0 \quad \text{for every } u \in (0, u_0) \cup (u_0, 1]$$

in contradiction with the prescribed sign of  $z_{\hat{c}}$  and the boundary condition  $z(0^+) = 0$  [ $z(1^-) = 0$ ]. Therefore, also in this case we have  $f(u_0) - \hat{c}g(u_0) = -\hat{c}g(u_0) < 0$  and we can apply again Proposition 14 and achieve (39).

Summarizing, the function  $z_{\hat{c}}/D$  admits a continuous extension in  $(0, 1)$  and there exists t.w.s. also for  $c = \hat{c}$ .

Finally, as for estimate of  $\hat{c}$ , note that if  $\dot{D}(u_0) \neq 0$ , then  $K_0^- = \emptyset$  and (30) becomes the present estimate. Instead, if  $\dot{D}(u_0) = 0$  and (37) or (38) hold, then again (30) becomes the present one.  $\square$

## 6. CLASSIFICATION OF THE T.W.S.

In this Section we provide a classification of the t.w.s. distinguishing between classical t.w.s. and sharp ones. Recall that the classification can be done considering the maximal existence interval  $(a, b)$ : the t.w.s. are classical if  $a = -\infty$ ,  $b = +\infty$ ; sharp of type 1 if  $a = -\infty$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ , sharp of type 2 if  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $b = +\infty$ , and finally sharp of type 3 if both  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  (see Section 2). Moreover, the extrema  $a, b$  are finite or infinite according to the values  $u'(a^+)$  and  $u'(b^-)$ , that is if these are negative or null. Therefore, in view of Theorem 5, we need to know the behavior of the function  $z_c(u)/D(u)$  as  $u \rightarrow 0$  and  $u \rightarrow 1$ . This is not trivial when  $D(0) = \dot{D}(0) = \dot{z}(0) = 0$  or  $D(1) = \dot{D}(1) = \dot{z}(1) = 0$ . The following result concerns just this topic.

**Proposition 18.** *Let all the assumptions of Theorem 10 be satisfied, for  $h(u) := D(u)\rho(u)$ . Let  $z$  be a solution of problem (9) for some  $c \geq c^*$ .*

*Then, if  $\dot{z}(0) = D(0) = \dot{D}(0) = 0$  we necessarily have  $f(0) - cg(0) \leq 0$ .*

*Moreover, if  $f(0) - cg(0) < 0$  then*

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{z(u)}{D(u)} = 0.$$

*Similarly, if  $\dot{z}(1) = D(1) = \dot{D}(1) = 0$  we necessarily have  $f(1) - cg(1) \leq 0$ .*

Moreover, if  $f(1) - cg(1) < 0$  then

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{z(u)}{D(u)} = 0.$$

*Proof.* Let us prove the assertion concerning the limit as  $u \rightarrow 0^+$ .

Let us first consider the case  $D(u) > 0$  in a right neighborhood 0. Then, necessarily  $f(0) - cg(0) \leq 0$ . Indeed, otherwise, from the differential equation in (9) we would have  $\dot{z}(u) > 0$  in  $(0, \delta)$  for some  $\delta > 0$ , in contradiction with the prescribed negative sign of  $z$  in a right neighborhood of 0. So, assume now  $f(0) - cg(0) < 0$ . Let us fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and put  $\psi_\varepsilon(u) := -\varepsilon D(u)$ . Then, we have

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \left( f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{D(u)\rho(u)}{\psi_\varepsilon(u)} \right) = f(0) - cg(0) < 0.$$

Moreover, since  $\dot{\psi}_\varepsilon(u) = -\varepsilon \dot{D}(u) \rightarrow 0$  as  $u \rightarrow 0^+$ , there exists a value  $\delta = \delta_\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$(40) \quad \dot{\psi}_\varepsilon(u) > f(u) - cg(u) - \frac{D(u)\rho(u)}{\psi_\varepsilon(u)} \quad \text{whenever } 0 < u < \delta$$

So,  $\psi_\varepsilon$  is an upper-solution.

Since  $\dot{z}(0) = 0$ , we can choose a sequence  $u_n \rightarrow 0^+$  such that  $\dot{z}(u_n) \rightarrow 0$ , so

$$\frac{z(u_n)}{D(u_n)} = \frac{\rho(u_n)}{f(u_n) - cg(u_n) - \dot{z}(u_n)} \rightarrow 0$$

and then for a natural  $n^*$  sufficiently large we have

$$z(u_{n^*}) > \psi_\varepsilon(u_{n^*}).$$

Therefore, taking (40) into account, we derive  $z(u) > \psi_\varepsilon(u) = -\varepsilon D(u)$  for every  $u \in (0, u_{n^*}]$  (see Lemma 13) and then

$$-\varepsilon < \frac{z(u)}{D(u)} < 0 \quad \text{for every } u \in (0, u_{n^*}].$$

that is the assertion.

Assume now  $D(u) < 0$  in a right neighborhood of 0. In this case, by (19) we have (see also (16))  $\dot{z}(0) = \max\{f(0) - cg(0), 0\}$ , so being  $\dot{z}(0) = 0$ , we again infer  $f(0) - cg(0) \leq 0$ .

Moreover, if  $f(0) - cg(0) < 0$ , the function  $\psi_\varepsilon$  above defined is again a strict upper-solution in a right neighborhood of 0. So, being  $z(0) = \psi_\varepsilon(0) = 0$  we can apply again Lemma 13 to obtain  $z(u) < \psi_\varepsilon(u)$ , that is  $\frac{z(u)}{D(u)} > -\varepsilon$  in the same right neighborhood and again we deduce the assertion.

The proof regarding the limit as  $u \rightarrow 1^-$  can be derived by the change of variable considered in Lemma 6. □

We now have all the tools to classify the t.w.s. From now on we will assume there exist, finite or not, the limits

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \dot{D}(u) := \dot{D}(0^+), \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow 1^-} \dot{D}(u) := \dot{D}(1^-).$$

Moreover, assume there exist finite

$$(41) \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{D(u)\rho(u)}{u} := \ell_0, \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{D(u)\rho(u)}{u-1} := \ell_1.$$

The following result provides a classification for the t.w.s. having speed  $c > \hat{c}$ .

**Proposition 19.** *Under the same assumptions of Theorem 12, let  $u$  be a t.w.s. of equation*

$$(D(u(t))u'(t))' + (cg(u(t)) - f(u(t)))u'(t) + \rho(u(t)) = 0$$

*defined in its maximal existence interval  $(a, b)$ , for some  $c > \hat{c}$ , where  $\hat{c}$  is the threshold wave speed given by Theorem 12.*

*Then,*

- *if  $D(u) > 0$  in  $(0, \delta)$  for some  $\delta > 0$ , then  $b = +\infty$ ;*
- *if  $D(u) < 0$  in  $(0, \delta)$  for some  $\delta > 0$  and the three values  $f(0) - cg(0)$ ,  $D(0)$ ,  $\dot{D}(0)$  do not vanish simultaneously, then*

$$b \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad D(0) = 0, \quad \dot{D}(0^+) > -\infty \quad \text{and} \quad f(0) - cg(0) > 0.$$

*Moreover,*

- *if  $D(u) < 0$  in  $(1 - \delta, 1)$  for some  $\delta > 0$ , then  $a = -\infty$ ;*
- *if  $D(u) > 0$  in  $(1 - \delta, 1)$  for some  $\delta > 0$  and the three values  $f(1) - cg(1)$ ,  $D(1)$ ,  $\dot{D}(1)$  do not vanish simultaneously,*

$$a \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad D(1) = 0, \quad \dot{D}(1^-) > -\infty \quad \text{and} \quad f(1) - cg(1) > 0.$$

*Proof.* First of all, notice that by (41) we have that  $z$  is differentiable at 0 and 1 as a consequence of Theorems 8 and 9. Moreover, by (26) for every  $c > c^*$  we have

$$(42) \quad f(\alpha_k) + 2\sqrt{\dot{h}(\alpha_k)} - cg(\alpha_k) < 0 \quad \text{for every } k \in K^+$$

and

$$f(\beta_k) + 2\sqrt{\dot{h}(\beta_k)} - cg(\beta_k) < 0 \quad \text{for every } k \in K^-.$$

Of course, if  $D(0) \neq 0$  then  $z(u)/D(u) \rightarrow 0$  as  $u \rightarrow 0^+$  and this is true also when  $D(0) = 0$  and  $\dot{D}(0^+) = \pm\infty$ , owing to the differentiability of  $z$ . So, from now on let us assume  $D(0) = 0$  and  $\dot{D}(0^+)$  is finite (hence  $\dot{D}(0^+) = \dot{D}(0)$ ). In this case, in (41) we have  $\ell_0 = 0$  and from (27) we deduce

$$(43) \quad \dot{z}(0) = \max\{0, f(0) - cg(0)\}.$$

We now split the proof into two cases.

- *Case 1:  $D$  is positive in a right neighborhood of 0.*

In this case, by (42) we have

$$(44) \quad f(0) - cg(0) < 0.$$

Then, by (43) we have  $\dot{z}(0) = 0$ .

Hence, if  $\dot{D}(0) \neq 0$  there exists the limit  $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{z(u)}{D(u)} = \frac{\dot{z}(0)}{\dot{D}(0)} = 0$ . Instead, if  $\dot{D}(0) = 0$  then by

$$(44) \quad \text{we can apply Proposition 18 to infer } \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{z(u)}{D(u)} = 0.$$

Summarizing, when  $D$  is positive in a right neighborhood of 0 and  $c > \hat{c}$  we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow b^-} u'(t) =$

$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{z(u)}{D(u)} = 0$  and this means that  $b = +\infty$  (since  $(a, b)$  is the maximal existence interval of the solution).

- *Case 2:*  $D$  is negative in a right neighborhood of 0.

First consider the case  $f(0) - cg(0) > 0$ . By (43) we have  $\dot{z}(0) = f(0) - cg(0)$ . Then we have

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{z(u)}{D(u)} = \begin{cases} \frac{f(0) - cg(0)}{\dot{D}(0)} & \text{if } \dot{D}(0) \neq 0 \\ -\infty & \text{if } \dot{D}(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, when  $f(0) - cg(0) > 0$  we have  $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{z(u)}{D(u)} < 0$ , implying that  $b < +\infty$ .

Instead, if  $f(0) - cg(0) \leq 0$  then  $\dot{z}(0) = 0$  and

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{z(u)}{D(u)} = 0 \quad \text{whenever } \dot{D}(0) \neq 0.$$

So, we get  $b = +\infty$  if  $f(0) - cg(0) \leq 0$  and  $\dot{D}(0) \neq 0$ .

Finally, let us consider the last case  $f(0) - cg(0) < 0$  and  $\dot{D}(0) = 0$ . By (43) we infer that  $\dot{z}(0) = 0$  and by applying Proposition (18) we achieve  $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{z(u)}{D(u)} = 0$ , implying again that  $b = +\infty$ .

This concludes the proof of the statement regarding the extremum  $b$ .

The proof concerning the extremum  $a$  can be derived by means of the change of variable given by Lemma 6. □

**Remark 20.** If equation (4) admits t.w.s. for  $c = \hat{c}$  (see Remarks 11, 16 and Corollary 17), then it is possible to classify the t.w.s. also for  $c = \hat{c}$ . We avoid to give here a complete classification for  $c = \hat{c}$  since it involves the subdivision into many different cases. However, it is possible to classify the t.w.s. (according to the specific situation under investigation), reasoning as in Proposition 19 by applying Proposition (18) when  $D(0) = \dot{D}(0) = \dot{z}(0) = 0$ , which is the only non-trivial case.

**Remark 21.** Similarly to what we observed in [7, Remark 4], if  $g$  is "predominantly" negative, we can verify if the opposite function  $-g$  satisfies the assumptions of the present results. If it does, then we can replace  $c$  with  $-c$  and obtain the existence of a threshold value  $c^{**}$  such that the t.w.s. exists for  $c < c^{**}$  and they do not exist for  $c > c^{**}$  and deduce all the other results too.

## 7. EXAMPLES

In this section we present some examples to which our general results can be applied.

**Example 1.** Consider the equation

$$(u^2 - u + \mathcal{K}) u_\tau = \left( (3/4 - u) \sqrt{u - u^2} u_x \right)_x + \sqrt{u - u^2}$$

in which

$$g(u) := u^2 - u + \mathcal{K}, \quad f(u) \equiv 0$$

$$D(u) := (3/4 - u) \sqrt{u - u^2}, \quad \rho(u) := \sqrt{u - u^2}$$

where  $\mathcal{K} > 3/16$  is a fixed number. Of course, assumptions (2), (3) and (5) are satisfied. Moreover, taking  $h(u) := D(u)\rho(u) = u(1 - u)(\frac{3}{4} - u)$ , it is continuous in  $[0, 1]$  and differentiable at 0, 1. Moreover,  $h(u)$  is positive if  $0 < u < 3/4$ , negative if  $3/4 < u < 1$ .

Note that  $g(0) = g(1) = \mathcal{K} > 0$  and

$$\int_0^u g(s)ds = \frac{1}{6}u(2u^2 - 3u + 6\mathcal{K}) > 0 \quad \text{for all } u \in [0, 3/4]$$

since  $\mathcal{K} > \frac{3}{16}$ . Moreover,  $\int_u^1 g(s)ds > 0$  for all  $u \in [3/4, 1]$ , since  $g$  is positive in this interval. However, when  $\frac{3}{16} < \mathcal{K} < \frac{1}{4}$ ,  $g$  assumes also negative values.

Finally, we observe that  $D_{00}$  and  $K_0^-$  are empty.

So, by Corollary 17, we can conclude that there exists  $\hat{c}$  such that equation (4) admits t.w.s. if and only if  $c \geq \hat{c}$ . Furthermore, we have  $\dot{h}(0) = \frac{3}{4}$ ,  $\dot{h}(1) = \frac{1}{4}$ , and by simple computations one can verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u \in (3/4, 1)} \int_u^1 \frac{h(s)}{s-1} ds &= \frac{1}{4}, & \sup_{u \in (0, 3/4)} \int_0^u \frac{h(s)}{s} ds &= \frac{3}{4}, \\ \inf_{u \in (3/4, 1)} \int_u^1 g(s)ds &= \mathcal{K} - \frac{5}{48}, & \inf_{u \in (0, 3/4)} \int_0^u g(s)ds &= \mathcal{K} - \frac{3}{16}. \end{aligned}$$

So, we achieve the following estimate for  $\hat{c}$ :

$$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{\mathcal{K}} \leq \hat{c} \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\mathcal{K} - \frac{3}{16}}.$$

Finally, concerning to the classification of the t.w.s. we have that they are classical for every  $c > \hat{c}$  by Proposition 19 and they are classical also for  $c = \hat{c}$  since  $\dot{D}(0) = \dot{D}(1) = +\infty$  (see Remark 20).

**Example 2.** Consider the equation

$$(u^2 - u + \mathcal{K}) u_\tau = ((1/2 - u)(u - u^2)^\alpha u_x)_x + (u - u^2)^\beta$$

where  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  with  $\alpha + \beta \geq 1$ ,  $\mathcal{K} > \frac{1}{6}$ , in which

$$\begin{aligned} g(u) &:= u^2 - u + \mathcal{K}, & f(u) &\equiv 0 \\ D(u) &:= (1/2 - u)(u - u^2)^\alpha, & \rho(u) &:= (u - u^2)^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Also in this case one can easily verify that all the assumptions of Corollary 17 are satisfied, so there exists a threshold value  $\hat{c}$  such that t.w.s. exist if and only if  $c \geq \hat{c}$  and they are classical for every  $c > \hat{c}$ .

Instead, regarding the classification of the t.w.s. for  $c = \hat{c}$ , note that since  $K_0^- = \emptyset$ , by (36) we have  $\hat{c} = \max\{c_1^*, c_2^*\}$  where  $c_1^*$  [resp.  $c_2^*$ ] is the threshold value of the admissible wave speeds in the interval  $(0, \frac{1}{2})$  [ $(\frac{1}{2}, u)$ ] given by Theorem 8 [Theorem 9]. So, if  $\hat{c} = c_1^*$  we have  $\dot{z}(0) = -\hat{c}g(0) = -\mathcal{K}\hat{c} < 0$  and consequently the corresponding t.w.s. reaches the equilibrium 0 at a finite time (t.w.s. sharp of type (1) or type (3)). Similarly, if  $\hat{c} = c_2^*$  we have  $\dot{z}(1) = -\hat{c}g(1) = -\mathcal{K}\hat{c} < 0$  and consequently the corresponding t.w.s. attains the value of the equilibrium 1 at a finite time (t.w.s. sharp of type (2) or type (3)).

Hence, the t.w.s. for  $c = \hat{c}$  is sharp, but since the values  $c_1^*$  and  $c_2^*$  are unknown in general, we can not determine what kind of sharp t.w.s. it is.

**Example 3.** Consider the equation

$$u_\tau + u_x = \left( (1/2 - u)^2 u_x \right)_x + (u - u^2)$$

in which

$$g(u) \equiv 1, \quad f(u) \equiv 1$$



$$D(u) := (1/2 - u)^2, \quad \rho(u) := (u - u^2).$$

In this case we have  $D(u) \geq 0$  for every  $u \in (0, 1)$ , but  $D(\frac{1}{2}) = 0$ . So, we have  $K^+ = \{1, 2\}$ ,  $K^- = \emptyset$ . Then, by Theorem 12 we have that there exists a value  $\hat{c}$  such that the equation admits t.w.s. for every  $c > \hat{c}$ , and no t.w.s. exists for  $c < \hat{c}$ . Moreover, by Proposition 19 we have that the t.w.s are classical for every  $c > \hat{c}$ .

Furthermore, note that in this case we can obtain a precise value for  $\hat{c}$ . Indeed,  $\dot{h}(0) = \frac{1}{4}$ ,  $\dot{h}(\frac{1}{2}) = 0$ ,  $H_1^+ = \frac{1}{4}$  and  $H_2^+ = \frac{1}{12\sqrt{6}}$ . So, by (30) we obtain  $\hat{c} = 2$ .

Finally, no t.w.s. exists for  $c = \hat{c}$ , since  $\dot{D}(\frac{1}{2}) = 0$  but by (15) we have  $\dot{z}(\frac{1}{2}^-) = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\dot{z}(\frac{1}{2}^+) = -\frac{3}{2}$ . So, the function  $z/D$  has not a continuous extension in the interval  $(0, 1)$ .

**Funding Information.** This article was supported by PRIN 2022 – Progetti di Ricerca di rilevante Interesse Nazionale, “Nonlinear differential problems with applications to real phenomena” (2022ZXZTN2). The third author is partially supported by INdAM–GNAMPA project “Problemi ellittici e sub-ellittici: non linearità, singolarità e crescita critica” CUP: E53C23001670001.

**Acknowledgements.** All three authors are members of the Gruppo Nazionale per l’Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Arias, J. Campos, C. Marcelli, Fastness and continuous dependence in front propagation in Fisher–KPP equations, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., Ser. B* 11(1) (2009) 11–30. DOI: 10.3934/dcdsb.2009.11.11
- [2] A. Audrito, J.L. Vazquez, The Fisher–KPP problem with doubly nonlinear diffusion, *J. Diff. Equ.* 263 (2017) 7647–7708. DOI: 10.1016/j.jde.2017.08.025
- [3] D. Berti, A. Corli and L. Malaguti, Uniqueness and non-uniqueness of fronts for degenerate diffusion-convection reaction equations, *Electron. J. Qual. Theory Differ. Equ.* 2020, No. 66, 1-34. DOI: 10.14232/ejqtde.2020.1.66
- [4] D. Berti, A. Corli, L. Malaguti, Diffusion–convection reaction equations with sign–changing diffusivity and bistable reaction term. *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 67 (2022), DOI: 10.1016/j.nonrwa.2022.103579
- [5] D. Berti, A. Corli, L. Malaguti, The role of convection in the existence of wavefronts for biased movements. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 47(1) (2024), 491–515. DOI: 10.1002/mma.9667
- [6] N. Calvo, J.I. Diaz, J. Durany, E. Schiavi, C. Vázquez, On a doubly nonlinear parabolic obstacle problem modelling ice sheet dynamics, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 63(2) (2002) 683–707. DOI: 10.1137/S0036139901385345
- [7] M. Cantarini, C. Marcelli, F. Papalini, Wavefront solutions for a class of nonlinear highly degenerate parabolic equations, *J. Diff. Eqs.* 332(2022), 278-305. DOI: 10.1016/j.jde.2022.05.019
- [8] A. Corli, L. Malaguti, *Semi-wavefront solutions in models of collective movements with density-dependent diffusivity*, *Dynamics of PDE*, **13** (4), 2016, 297-331. DOI: 10.4310/DPDE.2016.v13.n4.a2
- [9] J.I. Diaz, Qualitative study of nonlinear parabolic equations: an introduction, *Extr. Math.* 16(3) (2001) 303–341.
- [10] P. Drábek, P. Takáč, Travelling waves in the Fisher–KPP equation with nonlinear degenerate or singular diffusion, *Appl. Math. Optim.* 84 (2021) 1185–1208. DOI: 10.1007/s00245-020-09674-3
- [11] M. Garrione, M. Strani, Heteroclinic traveling fronts for reaction–convection–diffusion equations with a saturating diffusive term, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 68(6) (2019) 1767–1799. DOI: 10.1512/iumj.2019.68.7806
- [12] B. H. Gilding, R. Kersner, *Travelling Waves in Nonlinear Diffusion–Convection Reaction*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, Birkhäuser, Basel, Switzerland, 2004. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-0348-7964-4

- [13] B. H. Gilding and R. Kersner, A Fisher/KPP-type equation with density-dependent diffusion and convection: travelling-wave solutions, *Journal of Physics A*, vol. 38, no. 15, pp. 3367–3379, 2005. DOI: 10.1088/0305-4470/38/15/009
- [14] B. H. Gilding and R. Kersner, Wavefront solutions of a nonlinear telegraph equation, *J. Diff. Eqs.*, vol. 254 (2) (2013), 599-636. DOI: 10.1016/j.jde.2012.09.007
- [15] S. Kamin, P. Rosenau, Convergence to the travelling wave solution for a nonlinear reaction–diffusion equation, *Rend. Mat. Accad. Lincei* 15(3–4) (2004) 271–280.
- [16] J. Lenells, Classification of traveling waves for a class of nonlinear wave equations, *J. Dyn. Differ. Equ.* 18 (2006) 381–391. DOI: 10.1007/s10884-006-9009-2
- [17] L. Malaguti, C. Marcelli, Finite speed of propagation in monostable degenerate reaction–diffusion–convection equations, *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.* 5(2) (2005) 223–252. DOI: 10.1515/ans-2005-0204
- [18] L. Malaguti, C. Marcelli, S. Matucci, Continuous Dependence in Front Propagation for Convective Reaction–Diffusion Models with Aggregative Movements, *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, vol. 2011, Article ID 986738, 22 pages, 2011. DOI: 10.1155/2011/986738
- [19] F. Sánchez-Garduno, P.K. Maini, An approximation to a sharp type solution of a density–dependent reaction–diffusion equation, *Appl. Math. Lett.* 7(1) (1994) 47–51. DOI: 10.1016/0893-9659(94)90051-5