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# NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF PERIODIC SOLUTION TO SINGULAR PROBLEMS WITH IMPULSES 

JUNTAO SUN, JIFENG CHU


#### Abstract

In this article we give a necessary sufficient conditions for the existence of periodic solutions to impulsive periodic solution for a singular differential equation. The proof is based on the variational method.


## 1. Introduction

In this article we discuss the $T$-periodic solution for the second-order singular problem with impulsive effects

$$
\begin{gather*}
u^{\prime \prime}(t)-\frac{1}{u^{\alpha}(t)}=e(t), \quad \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T)  \tag{1.1}\\
\Delta u^{\prime}\left(t_{j}\right)=b_{j}, \quad j=1,2, \ldots, p-1
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\alpha \geq 1, e \in L^{1}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ is $T$-periodic, $\Delta u^{\prime}\left(t_{j}\right)=u^{\prime}\left(t_{j}^{+}\right)-u^{\prime}\left(t_{j}^{-}\right)$with $u^{\prime}\left(t_{j}^{ \pm}\right)=$ $\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{j}^{ \pm}} u^{\prime}(t) ; t_{j}, j=1,2, \ldots, p-1$, are the instants where the impulses occur and $0=t_{0}<t_{1}<t_{2}<\cdots<t_{p-1}<t_{p}=T, t_{j+p}=t_{j}+T$; and $b_{j}(j=1,2, \ldots, p-1)$ are constants.

Impulsive effects occur widely in many evolution processes in which their states are changed abruptly at certain moments of time. In the past few decades, impulsive differential equations have been extensively studied by many researchers [6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. In particular, In 2008, Tian and Ge [17] studied the existence of solutions for impulsive differential equations by using a variational method. Later, Nieto and O'Regan [11] further developed the variational framework for impulsive problems and established existence results for a class of impulsive differential equations with Dirichlet boundary conditions. From then on, the variational method has been a powerful tool in the study of impulsive differential equations. On the other hand, singular differential equations with different kinds of boundary conditions have also been investigated widely in the literature by using either topological methods or variational methods; see [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and the references therein.

[^0]In 1987, Lazer and Solimini 10 considered a the second order singular problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}(t)-\frac{1}{u^{\alpha}(t)}=e(t), \quad t \in(0, T) \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

By using the method of upper and lower solutions, they obtained a famous sufficient and necessary condition on positive $T$-periodic solution for Problem $\sqrt{1.2}$ as follows
Theorem $1.1([10])$. Assume that $e \in L^{1}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ is $T$-periodic. Then Problem (1.2) has a positive $T$-periodic weak solution if and only if $\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t<0$.

Motivated by the above fact, in the present paper we shall consider Problem 1.2 with impulsive effects, i.e., Problem (1.1), and also obtain a sufficient and necessary condition on $T$-periodic solution. It is worth emphasizing that the method used by us is a variational method, which is different from that in Theorem 1.1. Furthermore, we also point out the dynamical differences between singular problems and singular problems with impulses.

Our results are presented as follows.
Theorem 1.2. Assume that $e \in L^{1}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ is T-periodic. Then Problem 1.1) has a positive $T$-periodic weak solution $u \in H_{T}^{1}$ if and only if $\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}+\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t<$ 0.

Remark 1.3. From Theorem 1.2 we can see that if $\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t \geq 0$, but $\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}+$ $\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t<0$, then Problem 1.1 still admits a positive $T$-periodic solution. This shows that the existence of positive $T$-periodic solution for Problem (1.1) depends on the forced term $e$ and impulsive functions $b_{j}$ together, not single one.

## 2. Preliminaries

Set

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{T}^{1}= & \left\{u: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid u \text { is absolutely continuous, } u^{\prime} \in L^{2}((0, T), \mathbb{R})\right. \\
& \text { and } u(t)=u(t+T) \text { for } t \in \mathbb{R}\}
\end{aligned}
$$

with the inner product

$$
(u, v)=\int_{0}^{T} u(t) v(t) d t+\int_{0}^{T} u^{\prime}(t) v^{\prime}(t) d t, \quad \forall u, v \in H_{T}^{1}
$$

The corresponding norm is defined by

$$
\|u\|_{H_{T}^{1}}=\left(\int_{0}^{T}|u(t)|^{2} d t+\int_{0}^{T}\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} d t\right)^{1 / 2}, \quad \forall u \in H_{T}^{1}
$$

Then $H_{T}^{1}$ is a Banach space (in fact it is a Hilbert space).
To study Problem (1.1), for any $\lambda \in(0,1)$ we consider the following modified problem

$$
\begin{gather*}
u^{\prime \prime}(t)+f_{\lambda}(u(t))=e(t), \quad \text { a.e. } t \in(0, T),  \tag{2.1}\\
\Delta u^{\prime}\left(t_{j}\right)=b_{j}, \quad j=1,2, \ldots, p-1,
\end{gather*}
$$

where $f_{\lambda}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$
f_{\lambda}(s)= \begin{cases}-\frac{1}{s^{\alpha}}, & s \geq \lambda \\ -\frac{1}{\lambda^{\alpha}}, & s<\lambda\end{cases}
$$

Now we introduce the following concept of a weak solution for Problem 2.1.

Definition 2.1. We say that a function $u \in H_{T}^{1}$ is a weak solution of Problem (2.1) if

$$
\int_{0}^{T} u^{\prime}(t) v^{\prime}(t) d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} v\left(t_{j}\right)-\int_{0}^{T} f_{\lambda}(u(t)) v(t) d t+\int_{0}^{T} e(t) v(t) d t=0
$$

holds for any $v \in H_{T}^{1}$.
Let $F_{\lambda} \in C^{1}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ be defined by

$$
F_{\lambda}(s)=\int_{1}^{s} f_{\lambda}(t) d t
$$

and consider the functional $\Phi_{\lambda}: H_{T}^{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi_{\lambda}(u):=\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{T}\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} u\left(t_{j}\right)-\int_{0}^{T} F_{\lambda}(u(t)) d t+\int_{0}^{T} e(t) u(t) d t \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Clearly, $\Phi_{\lambda}$ is well defined on $H_{T}^{1}$, continuously Gâteaux differentiable functional whose derivative is

$$
\Phi_{\lambda}^{\prime}(u) v=\int_{0}^{T} u^{\prime}(t) v^{\prime}(t) d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} v\left(t_{j}\right)-\int_{0}^{T} f_{\lambda}(u(t)) v(t) d t+\int_{0}^{T} e(t) v(t) d t
$$

for any $v \in H_{T}^{1}$. Moreover, it is easy to verify that $\Phi_{\lambda}$ is weakly lower semicontinuous. Furthermore, by the standard discussion, the critical points of $\Phi_{\lambda}$ are the weak solutions of Problem 2.1.

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Proof. First we show that if $u \in H_{T}^{1}$ is a positive $T$-periodic weak solution of Problem (1.1), then $\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}+\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t<0$.

Integrating the first equation of Problem 1.1) from 0 to $T$, one has

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T} u^{\prime \prime}(t) d t-\int_{0}^{T} \frac{1}{u^{\alpha}(t)} d t=\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The first term one the left-hand side satisfies

$$
\int_{0}^{T} u^{\prime \prime}(t) d t=\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \int_{t_{j}}^{t_{j+1}} u^{\prime \prime}(t) d t
$$

and

$$
\int_{t_{j}}^{t_{j+1}} u^{\prime \prime}(t) d t=u^{\prime}\left(t_{j+1}^{-}\right)-u^{\prime}\left(t_{j}^{+}\right)
$$

Thus,

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{0}^{T} u^{\prime \prime}(t) d t & =\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\left(u^{\prime}\left(t_{j+1}^{-}\right)-u^{\prime}\left(t_{j}^{+}\right)\right) \\
& =-\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \Delta u^{\prime}\left(t_{j}\right)+u^{\prime}(T)-u^{\prime}(0)  \tag{3.2}\\
& =-\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}
\end{align*}
$$

By (3.1) and (3.2) we have

$$
0>-\int_{0}^{T} \frac{1}{u^{\alpha}(t)} d t=\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}+\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t
$$

Now we prove that if $\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}+\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t<0$, then Problem 1.1) has a positive $T$-periodic weak solution $u \in H_{T}^{1}$. The proof is based on the mountain pass theorem, see [12. We divide it into four steps.

Step 1. Let a sequence $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ in $H_{T}^{1}$ satisfy $\Phi_{\lambda}\left(u_{n}\right)$ be bounded and $\Phi_{\lambda}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow 0$, i.e., there exist a constant $c_{1}>0$ and a sequence $\left\{\epsilon_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{+}$with $\epsilon_{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$ such that for all $n$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\int_{0}^{T}\left[\frac{1}{2}\left|u_{n}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}-F_{\lambda}\left(u_{n}(t)\right)+e(t) u_{n}(t)\right] d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} u_{n}\left(t_{j}\right)\right| \leq c_{1} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and for every $v \in H_{T}^{1}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\mid \int_{0}^{T}\left[u_{n}^{\prime}(t) v^{\prime}(t)\right)-f_{\lambda}\left(u_{n}(t)\right) v(t)+e(t) v(t)\right] d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} v\left(t_{j}\right) \mid \leq \epsilon_{n}\|v\|_{H_{T}^{1}} \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we show that $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is bounded in $H_{T}^{1}$. Taking $v(t) \equiv-1$ in 3.4 one has

$$
\left|\int_{0}^{T}\left[f_{\lambda}\left(u_{n}(t)\right)-e(t)\right] d t-\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}\right| \leq \epsilon_{n} \sqrt{T} \quad \text { for all } n
$$

which implies

$$
\left|\int_{0}^{T} f_{\lambda}\left(u_{n}(t)\right) d t\right| \leq \epsilon_{n} \sqrt{T}+\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left|b_{j}\right|:=c_{2}
$$

Note that for any $t \in[0, T], f_{\lambda}\left(u_{n}(t)\right)<0$. Thus

$$
\int_{0}^{T}\left|f_{\lambda}\left(u_{n}(t)\right)\right| d t=\left|\int_{0}^{T} f_{\lambda}\left(u_{n}(t)\right) d t\right| \leq c_{2}
$$

On the other hand, take, in 3.4, $v(t) \equiv w_{n}(t):=u_{n}(t)-\bar{u}_{n}$, where $\bar{u}_{n}=$ $\frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} u_{n}(t) d t$, by [12, Proposition 1.1] we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_{3}\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{H_{T}^{1}} & \geq \int_{0}^{T}\left[w_{n}^{\prime}(t)^{2}-f_{\lambda}\left(u_{n}(t)\right) w_{n}(t)+e(t) w_{n}(t)\right] d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} w_{n}\left(t_{j}\right) \\
& \geq\left\|w_{n}^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}-\left(c_{2}+\|e\|_{L^{1}}\right)\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{L^{\infty}}-\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left|b_{j}\right|\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \\
& =\left\|w_{n}^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}-\left(c_{2}+\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left|b_{j}\right|\right)\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \\
& \geq\left\|w_{n}^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}-c_{4}\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{H_{T}^{1}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $c_{3}$ and $c_{4}$ are two positive constants. Thus,

$$
\left\|w_{n}^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \leq\left(c_{3}+c_{4}\right)\left\|w_{n}\right\|_{H_{T}^{1}}
$$

Consequently, using the Wirtinger inequality, we obtain the existence of a positive constant $c_{5}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u_{n}^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \leq c_{5} \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, suppose that $\left\|u_{n}\right\|_{H_{T}^{1}} \rightarrow+\infty$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$. Since 3.5 holds, we have, passing to subsequence if necessary, that either

$$
\begin{gathered}
M_{n}:=\max u_{n} \rightarrow+\infty \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow+\infty, \quad \text { or } \\
m_{n}:=\min u_{n} \rightarrow-\infty \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow+\infty
\end{gathered}
$$

(i) Assume that the first possibility occurs. In view to the fact that $f_{\lambda}<0$, one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{0}^{T}\left[F_{\lambda}\left(u_{n}(t)\right)-e(t) u_{n}(t)\right] d t-\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} u_{n}\left(t_{j}\right) \\
&= \int_{0}^{T}\left[\left(\int_{1}^{M_{n}} f_{\lambda}(s) d s-\int_{u_{n}(t)}^{M_{n}} f_{\lambda}(s) d s\right)-e(t) u_{n}(t)\right] d t-M_{n} \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} \\
&-\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}\left(u_{n}\left(t_{j}\right)-M_{n}\right) \\
& \geq \int_{0}^{T} F_{\lambda}\left(M_{n}\right) d t-\int_{0}^{T} M_{n} e(t) d t-\max _{t \in[0, T]}\left|M_{n}-u_{n}(t)\right| \int_{0}^{T}|e(t)| d t-M_{n} \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} \\
&-\max _{t \in[0, T]}\left|M_{n}-u_{n}(t)\right| \sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left|b_{j}\right| \\
& \geq T F_{\lambda}\left(M_{n}\right)-M_{n}\left(\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}\right)-\left(\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left|b_{j}\right|\right)\left|M_{n}-m_{n}\right| \\
&= T F_{\lambda}\left(M_{n}\right)-M_{n}\left(\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}\right)-\left(\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left|b_{j}\right|\right)\left|\int_{\bar{t}_{n}}^{\hat{t}_{n}} u_{n}^{\prime}(t) d t\right| \\
& \geq T F_{\lambda}\left(M_{n}\right)-M_{n}\left(\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}\right)-\left(\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left|b_{j}\right|\right) \int_{\bar{t}_{n}}^{\hat{t}_{n}}\left|u_{n}^{\prime}(t)\right| d t,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $u_{n}\left(\hat{t}_{n}\right)=M_{n}$ and $u_{n}\left(\bar{t}_{n}\right)=m_{n}$. Thus, using the Hölder inequality, one has

$$
\begin{align*}
& -M_{n}\left(\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}\right)+T F_{\lambda}\left(M_{n}\right) \\
& \leq \int_{0}^{T}\left[F_{\lambda}\left(u_{n}(t)\right)-e(t) u_{n}(t)\right] d t-\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} u_{n}\left(t_{j}\right)+\sqrt{T}\left(\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left|b_{j}\right|\right)\left\|u_{n}^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}} . \tag{3.6}
\end{align*}
$$

If $\alpha=1$, then $F_{\lambda}\left(M_{n}\right)=-\ln M_{n}$. By $(3.6)$ one has

$$
-M_{n}\left(\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}\right)-T \ln M_{n} \rightarrow+\infty \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow+\infty
$$

If $\alpha>1$, then $F_{\lambda}\left(M_{n}\right)=-\frac{1}{\alpha-1}\left(\frac{1}{M_{n}^{\alpha-1}}-1\right)$. By 3.6) we obtain

$$
-M_{n}\left(\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}\right)-\frac{1}{\alpha-1}\left(\frac{1}{M_{n}^{\alpha-1}}-1\right) \rightarrow+\infty \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow+\infty
$$

From (3.3) and (3.5), we see that the right hand side of 3.6 is bounded, which is a contradiction.
(ii) Assume the second possibility occurs; i.e., $m_{n} \rightarrow-\infty$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$. We replace $M_{n}$ by $-m_{n}$ in the preceding arguments, and we also get a contradiction. So $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is bounded in $H_{T}^{1}$.

Since $H_{T}^{1}$ is a reflexive Banach space, there exists a subsequence of $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$, denoted again by $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ for simplicity, and $u \in H_{T}^{1}$ such that $u_{n} \rightharpoonup u$ in $H_{T}^{1}$; then, by the Sobolev embedding theorem, we get $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ in $C([0, T])$ and $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ in $L^{2}([0, T])$. So

$$
\begin{gather*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left(f_{\lambda}\left(u_{n}(t)\right)-f_{\lambda}(u(t))\right)\left(u_{n}(t)-u(t)\right) d t \rightarrow 0 \\
\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}\left(u_{n}\left(t_{j}\right)-u\left(t_{j}\right)\right) \rightarrow 0  \tag{3.7}\\
\int_{0}^{T} e(t)\left(u_{n}(t)-u(t)\right) d t \rightarrow 0 \\
\left(\Phi_{\lambda}^{\prime}\left(u_{n}\right)-\Phi_{\lambda}^{\prime}(u)\right)\left(u_{n}-u\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty
\end{gather*}
$$

By (3.6), 3.7) and the fact that $u_{n} \rightarrow u$ in $L^{2}([0, T])$, we have $\left\|u_{n}-u\right\|_{H_{T}^{1}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. That is, $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ strongly converges to $u$ in $H_{T}^{1}$, which means that the Palais-Smale condition holds for $\Phi_{\lambda}$.

Step 2. Let

$$
\Omega=\left\{u \in H_{T}^{1} \mid \min _{t \in[0, T]} u(t)>1\right\},
$$

and

$$
\partial \Omega=\left\{u \in H_{T}^{1} \mid u(t) \geq 1 \text { for all } t \in(0, T), \exists t_{u} \in(0, T): u\left(t_{u}\right)=1\right\}
$$

We show that there exists $d>0$ such that $\inf _{u \in \partial \Omega} \Phi_{\lambda}(u) \geq-d$ whenever $\lambda \in(0,1)$.
For any $u \in \partial \Omega$, there exists some $t_{u} \in(0, T)$ such that $\min _{t \in[0, T]} u(t)=u\left(t_{u}\right)=$ 1. By 2.2 , and extending the functions by $T$-periodicity, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{\lambda}(u)= & \int_{t_{u}}^{t_{u}+T}\left[\frac{1}{2}\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}-F_{\lambda}(u(t))+e(t) u(t)\right] d t+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} u\left(t_{j}\right) \\
\geq & \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_{u}}^{t_{u}+T}\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} d t+\int_{t_{u}}^{t_{u}+T} e(t)(u(t)-1) d t+\int_{t_{u}}^{t_{u}+T} e(t) d t \\
& +\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}\left(u\left(t_{j}\right)-1\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} \\
\geq & \frac{1}{2}\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}-\left(\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left|b_{j}\right|\right) \max _{t \in[0, T]}(u(t)-1)-\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} \\
= & \frac{1}{2}\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}-\left(\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left|b_{j}\right|\right) \int_{t_{u}}^{\check{t}_{u}} u^{\prime}(t) d t-\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\geq \frac{1}{2}\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}-\left(\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left|b_{j}\right|\right) \int_{t_{u}}^{t_{u}+T}\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right| d t-\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}
$$

where $\check{t}_{u} \in[0, T]$ and $\max _{t \in[0, T]} u(t)=u\left(\check{t}_{u}\right)$. Applying the Hölder inequality, we get

$$
\Phi_{\lambda}(u) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2}-\sqrt{T}\left(\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left|b_{j}\right|\right)\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}-\|e\|_{L^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} .
$$

The above inequality shows that

$$
\Phi_{\lambda}(u) \rightarrow+\infty \quad a s\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}} \rightarrow+\infty
$$

For any $u \in \partial \Omega$, it is easy to verify the fact that $\|u\|_{H_{T}^{1}} \rightarrow+\infty$ is equivalent to $\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}} \rightarrow+\infty$. Indeed, when $\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}} \rightarrow+\infty$, it is clear that $\|u\|_{H_{T}^{1}} \rightarrow+\infty$. When $\|u\|_{H_{T}^{1}} \rightarrow+\infty$. Assume that $\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}$ is bounded, then $\|u\|_{L^{2}} \rightarrow+\infty$. Since $\min _{t \in[0, T]} u(t)=1$, we have

$$
u(t)-1=\int_{t_{u}}^{t} u^{\prime}(s) d s \leq \int_{0}^{T}\left|u^{\prime}(s)\right| d s \leq \sqrt{T}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} d t\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

Therefore, $u$ is bounded in $L^{2}(0, T)$, which is a contradiction. Hence

$$
\Phi_{\lambda}(u) \rightarrow+\infty \quad \text { as }\|u\|_{H_{T}^{1}} \rightarrow+\infty, \forall u \in \partial \Omega
$$

which shows that $\Phi_{\lambda}$ is coercive. Thus it has a minimizing sequence. The weak lower semi-continuity of $\Phi_{\lambda}$ yields

$$
\inf _{u \in \partial \Omega} \Phi_{\lambda}(u)>-\infty
$$

It follows that there exists $d>0$ such that $\inf _{u \in \partial \Omega} \Phi_{\lambda}(u)>-d$ for all $\lambda \in(0,1)$.
Step 3. We prove that there exists $\lambda_{0} \in(0,1)$ with the property that for every $\lambda \in\left(0, \lambda_{0}\right)$, any solution $u$ of Problem (2.1) satisfying $\Phi_{\lambda}(u)>-d$ is such that $\min _{u \in[0, T]} u(t) \geq \lambda_{0}$, and hence $u$ is a solution of Problem (1.1).

Assume on the contrary that there are sequences $\left\{\lambda_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that
(i) $\lambda_{n} \leq \frac{1}{n}$;
(ii) $u_{n}$ is a solution of Problem 2.2 with $\lambda=\lambda_{n}$;
(iii) $\Phi_{\lambda_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right) \geq-d$;
(iv) $\min _{t \in[0, T]} u_{n}(t)<\frac{1}{n}$.

Since $f_{\lambda_{n}}<0$ and $\int_{0}^{T}\left[f_{\lambda_{n}}\left(u_{n}(t)\right)-e(t)\right] d t=0$, one has

$$
\left\|f_{\lambda_{n}}\left(u_{n}(\cdot)\right)\right\|_{L^{1}} \leq c_{7}, \quad \text { for some constant } c_{7}>0
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u_{n}^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \leq c_{8}, \quad \text { for some constant } c_{8}>0 \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

From $\Phi_{\lambda_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right) \geq-d$ it follows that there must exist two constants $l_{1}$ and $l_{2}$, with $0<l_{1}<l_{2}$ such that

$$
\max \left\{u_{n}(t) ; t \in[0, T]\right\} \subset\left[l_{1}, l_{2}\right] .
$$

If not, $u_{n}$ would tend uniformly to 0 or $+\infty$. In both cases, by 3.8, we have

$$
\Phi_{\lambda_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right) \rightarrow-\infty \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow+\infty,
$$

which contradicts $\Phi_{\lambda_{n}}\left(u_{n}\right) \geq-d$.

Let $\tau_{n}^{1}, \tau_{n}^{2}$ be such that, for $n$ large enough

$$
u_{n}\left(\tau_{n}^{1}\right)=\frac{1}{n}<l_{1}=u_{n}\left(\tau_{n}^{2}\right)
$$

Multiplying the differential equation in 2.1) by $u_{n}^{\prime}$ and integrating it on $\left[\tau_{n}^{1}, \tau_{n}^{2}\right]$, or on $\left[\tau_{n}^{2}, \tau_{n}^{1}\right]$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi:=\int_{\tau_{n}^{1}}^{\tau_{n}^{2}} u_{n}^{\prime \prime}(t) u_{n}^{\prime}(t) d t+\int_{\tau_{n}^{1}}^{\tau_{n}^{2}} f_{\lambda_{n}}\left(u_{n}(t)\right) u_{n}^{\prime}(t) d t=\int_{\tau_{n}^{1}}^{\tau_{n}^{2}} e(t) u_{n}^{\prime}(t) d t \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to verify that

$$
\Psi=\Psi_{1}+\frac{1}{2}\left[u_{n}^{\prime 2}\left(\tau_{n}^{2}\right)-u_{n}^{\prime 2}\left(\tau_{n}^{1}\right)\right]
$$

where

$$
\Psi_{1}=\int_{\tau_{n}^{1}}^{\tau_{n}^{2}} f_{\lambda_{n}}\left(u_{n}(t)\right) u_{n}^{\prime}(t) d t
$$

From (3.5) and (3.9) it follows that $\Psi$ is bounded, and consequently $\Psi_{1}$ is bounded.
On the other hand, it is easy to see that

$$
f_{\lambda_{n}}\left(u_{n}(t)\right) u_{n}^{\prime}(t)=\frac{d}{d t}\left[F_{\lambda_{n}}\left(u_{n}(t)\right)\right] .
$$

Thus, we have

$$
\Psi_{1}=F_{\lambda_{n}}\left(l_{1}\right)-F_{\lambda_{n}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)
$$

From the fact that $F_{\lambda_{n}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \rightarrow+\infty$ as $n \rightarrow+\infty$, we obtain $\Psi_{1} \rightarrow-\infty$, i.e., $\Psi_{1}$ is unbounded. This is a contradiction.

Step 4. $\Phi$ has a mountain-pass geometry for $\lambda \leq \lambda_{0}$. Fix $\lambda \in\left(0, \lambda_{0}\right]$, one has

$$
\begin{align*}
F_{\lambda}(0) & =\int_{1}^{0} f_{\lambda}(s) d s=-\int_{0}^{1} f_{\lambda}(s) d s \\
& =-\int_{0}^{\lambda} f_{\lambda}(s) d s-\int_{\lambda}^{1} f_{\lambda}(s) d s  \tag{3.10}\\
& =\frac{1}{\lambda^{\alpha-1}}-\int_{\lambda}^{1} f_{\lambda}(s) d s
\end{align*}
$$

which implies that

$$
F_{\lambda}(0)>-\int_{\lambda}^{1} f_{\lambda}(s) d s=\int_{1}^{\lambda} f_{\lambda}(s) d s=F_{\lambda}(\lambda)
$$

Thus we have

$$
\Phi_{\lambda}(0)=-T F_{\lambda}(0)<-T F_{\lambda}(\lambda)= \begin{cases}T \ln \lambda, & \text { if } \alpha=1  \tag{3.11}\\ -\frac{T}{\alpha-1}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda^{\alpha-1}}-1\right), & \text { if } \alpha>1\end{cases}
$$

We choose $\lambda \in\left(0, \lambda_{0}\right] \cap\left(0, e^{-d}\right) \cap\left(0,\left[\frac{T}{T+d(\alpha-1)}\right]^{1 /(\alpha-1)}\right)$, then it follows from 3.11) that $\Phi_{\lambda}(0)<-d$.

Also, we can choose a constant $R>1$ enough large such that

$$
-\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}+\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t\right) R-\frac{T}{\alpha-1}\left(1-\frac{1}{R^{\alpha-1}}\right)>d
$$

and

$$
-\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}+\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t\right) R-T \ln R>d
$$

Thus, $R \in H_{T}^{1}$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{\lambda}(R) & =R \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}-T F_{\lambda}(R)+R \int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t \\
& \leq \begin{cases}\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} R+T \ln R+R \int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t, & \text { if } \alpha=1 \\
\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j} R+\frac{T}{\alpha-1}\left(1-\frac{1}{R^{\alpha-1}}\right)+R \int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t, & \text { if } \alpha>1\end{cases} \\
& \leq \begin{cases}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}+\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t\right) R+T \ln R, & \text { if } \alpha=1 \\
\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_{j}+\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t\right) R+\frac{T}{\alpha-1}\left(1-\frac{1}{R^{\alpha-1}}\right), & \text { if } \alpha>1\end{cases} \\
& <-d .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\Omega$ is a neighborhood of $R, 0 \notin \Omega$ and

$$
\max \left\{\Phi_{\lambda}(0), \Phi_{\lambda}(R)\right\}<\inf _{x \in \partial \Omega} \Phi_{\lambda}(u)
$$

Step 1 and Step 2 imply that $\Phi_{\lambda}$ has a critical point $u_{\lambda}$ such that

$$
\Phi_{\lambda}\left(u_{\lambda}\right)=\inf _{h \in \Gamma} \max _{s \in[0,1]} \Phi_{\lambda}(h(s)) \geq \inf _{x \in \partial \Omega} \Phi_{\lambda}(u)
$$

where

$$
\Gamma=\left\{h \in C\left([0,1], H_{T}^{1}\right): h(0)=0, h(1)=R\right\}
$$

Since $\inf _{u \in \partial \Omega} \Phi_{\lambda}\left(u_{\lambda}\right) \geq-d$, it follows from Step 3 that $u_{\lambda}$ is a positive solution of Problem 1.1. The proof of the main result is complete.
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