

An equation $\dot{z} = z^2 + p(t)$ with no 2π -periodic solutions

Dariusz Miklaszewski

Abstract

The Mawhin conjecture - that there exists a 2π -periodic $p : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ such that $\dot{z} = z^2 + p(t)$ has no 2π -periodic solutions - is confirmed by the use of Fourier expansions.

In 1992 R.Srzednicki [4], [5] proved that for any 2π -periodic continuous $p : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ the equation $\dot{z} = \bar{z}^2 + p(t)$ has a 2π -periodic solution. J.Mawhin [3] conjectured that the similarly looking problem $\dot{z} = z^2 + p(t)$ could have no 2π -periodic solutions for some p . The first example of such p was constructed by J.Campos and R.Ortega [1]. This work was intended as an attempt to provide with another example by the use of a quite different method. During the preparation of this paper J.Campos [2] determined all the possible dynamics of this equation and found other examples.

Conjecture 1 *There exists $R_0 \in [1, 2]$ such that the equation*

$$\dot{z} = z^2 + Re^{it} \quad (1)$$

has no 2π -periodic solutions for $R = R_0$.

Let us define the sequence

$$a_1 = 1, \quad a_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k a_{n-k}. \quad (2)$$

Received by the editors July 1995.

Communicated by J. Mawhin.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification* : 34, 40, 42.

Key words and phrases : Riccati equations, periodic solutions, Fourier series, power series, complex plane, inequalities.

Conjecture 2 $\forall_n > 1 \ a_n^2 < a_{n-1}a_{n+1}$.

The main result of this paper is the following

Theorem 1 *Conjecture 2 implies Conjecture 1.*

The proof of this theorem will follow after two lemmas. It is easily seen that equation (1) is formally solved by

$$z_R(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k i e^{ikt} a_k R^k. \tag{3}$$

Lemma 1 *Let R_0 denote the radius of convergence of (3).*

Then (i) $R_0 \in [1, 2]$,

(ii) $\forall_{R \in (-R_0, R_0)}$ z_R is a 2π -periodic solution of (1),

(iii) $\lim_{R \rightarrow R_0} i^{-1} z_R(\pi) = +\infty$.

Lemma 2 *If Conjecture 2 is true then*

(i) there is a sequence $R_n \in (0, R_0)$ convergent to R_0 such that the sequence $z_{R_n}(0)$ is convergent,

(ii) there exists $\lim_{R \rightarrow R_0-} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{1}{k} a_k R^k$.

The lemmas will be proved later, now we use them to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. To obtain a contradiction, suppose that there exists $s : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ which is a 2π -periodic solution of equation (1) for $R = R_0$. A standard argument shows that for R sufficiently close to R_0 there exists the solution $s_R : [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ of (1) with initial condition $s_R(0) = s(0)$. Moreover, $\lim_{R \rightarrow R_0} s_R(t) = s(t)$, uniformly in $[0, 2\pi]$. Let R_n be the sequence from Lemma 2 and $\omega = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_{R_n}(0)$. If $s(0) = \omega$ then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_{R_n}(t) = s(t)$, uniformly in $[0, 2\pi]$, contrary to Lemma 1 (iii). Thus $s(0) \neq \omega$ and $s_{R_n}(0) \neq z_{R_n}(0)$ for $n > n_0$. Functions s_{R_n}, z_{R_n} are two different solutions of Riccati equation (1). The standard computation shows that the function $u_n = \frac{1}{s_{R_n} - z_{R_n}}$ is a solution of the linear equation $\dot{u} = -2z_{R_n}u - 1$, so

$$u_n(2\pi) = \left[u_n(0) - \int_0^{2\pi} e^{2 \int_0^t z_{R_n}(\tau) d\tau} dt \right] e^{-2 \int_0^{2\pi} z_{R_n}(\tau) d\tau}.$$

From (3) we obtain

$$\int_0^{2\pi} z_{R_n}(\tau) d\tau = 0, \quad \int_0^t z_{R_n}(\tau) d\tau = c_{0,n} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_{k,n} e^{ikt},$$

where $c_{0,n} = -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_{k,n}$, $c_{k,n} = (-1)^k \frac{1}{k} a_k R_n^k$. Thus

$$u_n(0) - u_n(2\pi) = 2\pi e^{2c_{0,n}}.$$

According to Lemma 2 (ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2\pi e^{2c_{0,n}} > 0$, but $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (u_n(0) - u_n(2\pi)) = \frac{1}{s(0) - \omega} - \frac{1}{s(2\pi) - \omega} = 0$, a contradiction.

Proof of Lemma 1. Taking $b_n(R) = a_n R^n$ we can rewrite (2) as

$$b_1(R) = R, \quad b_n(R) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k(R) b_{n-k}(R).$$

Consider numbers $R > 0, n > 1$ and suppose that

$$\exists_{C(R)} \quad \forall_{k < n} \quad b_k(R) \leq \frac{C(R)}{k}. \tag{4}$$

Hence $b_n(R) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{C(R)}{k} \frac{C(R)}{n-k} = \frac{(C(R))^2}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{n-k} \right),$

$$b_n(R) \leq 2 \cdot C(R)^2 \cdot \frac{\ln(n-1) + 1}{n^2}, \tag{5}$$

$$b_n(R) \leq \frac{C(R)}{n}, \quad \text{if only} \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{\ln(n-1) + 1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{2C(R)}. \tag{7}$$

Consider $R = 1$ and take $C(1) = 1$. In this case we have (7) for every $n \geq 5$, (4) for $n = 5$ and (5), (6) for every $n > 1$, by induction. Consequently the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n(1)$ is convergent and $R_0 \geq 1$. The easy induction shows that $b_n(2) \geq 2$ for every n , so $R_0 \leq 2$, which gives (i). Since (ii) is evident, it remains to prove (iii) -that $\lim_{R \rightarrow R_0} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k R^k = +\infty$. It suffices to show that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k(R_0) = +\infty$, because $a_k > 0$. Conversely, suppose that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k(R_0) < +\infty$. It follows that $(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k(R_0))^2 = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k(R_0) b_{n-k}(R_0) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n \cdot b_n(R_0) < +\infty$. Hence $\exists_C \forall_n b_n(R_0) < \frac{C}{n}$. Choose n_0 such that $\frac{\ln(n-1)+1}{n} < \frac{1}{2C}$ for $n \geq n_0$. Take $R_1 > R_0$ satisfying $b_k(R_1) < \frac{C}{k}$ for every $k < n_0$. Let $C(R_1) = C$. Then (7) holds for every $n \geq n_0$, (4) - for $n = n_0$ and (5),(6) hold for every $n > 1$. This shows that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n(R_1)$ is convergent, which contradicts the fact that R_0 is the radius of convergence.

Proof of Lemma 2. By Conjecture 2, the sequence $\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}$ is increasing. Therefore $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} = \frac{1}{R_0}, a_{n+1} R_0^{n+1} < a_n R_0^n$. If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n R_0^n = 0$ then according to the Abel theorem, we have

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow R_0^-} z_R(0) = i \cdot \lim_{R \rightarrow R_0^-} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k a_k R^k = i \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k a_k R_0^k.$$

The same argument shows (ii). Now assume that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n R_0^n > 0$. Let

$$x = -a_1 R_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_{2n} R_0^{2n} - a_{2n+1} R_0^{2n+1}),$$

$$y = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-a_{2n-1} R_0^{2n-1} + a_{2n} R_0^{2n}),$$

$$x_R = -a_1 R + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_{2n} - a_{2n+1} R_0) R^{2n},$$

$$y_R = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-a_{2n-1} + a_{2n}R_0) R^{2n-1}.$$

By Abel theorem, $\lim_{R \rightarrow R_0-} x_R = x$ and $\lim_{R \rightarrow R_0-} y_R = y$. Moreover, $x_R \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k a_k R^k \leq y_R$ for $R \in (0, R_0)$, which gives (i).

Remark 1 $R_0 = 1.445796\dots$

Remark 2 Using a new variable $s = \frac{i}{z+i\sqrt{R}}$ one can prove that (1) has a 2π -periodic solution for some $R > R_0$.

References

- [1] J.Campos and R.Ortega, *Nonexistence of periodic solutions of a complex Riccati equation*, Differential and Integral Equations 9 (1996), 247-249.
- [2] J.Campos, *Möbius transformations and periodic solutions of complex Riccati equations*, Preprint.
- [3] J.Mawhin, *Periodic solutions of some planar nonautonomous polynomial differential equations*, Differential and Integral Equations 7 (1994), 1055 - 1061.
- [4] R.Srzednicki, *A Geometric Method for the Periodic Problem in Ordinary Differential Equations*, Séminaire d'analyse moderne No.22, Université de Sherbrooke, 1992.
- [5] R.Srzednicki, *On periodic solutions of planar polynomial differential equations with periodic coefficients*, J.Diff.Eq. 114 (1994), 77 - 100.

Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics,
 Nicholas Copernicus University,
 ul.Chopina 12/18, 87-100
 Toruń, POLAND