

RESEARCH

Open Access

# Existence of solutions for weighted $p(r)$ -Laplacian impulsive system mixed type boundary value problems

Li Yin<sup>1</sup>, Yunrui Guo<sup>2</sup>, Guizhen Zhi<sup>1</sup> and Qihu Zhang<sup>1\*</sup>

\* Correspondence:

zhangqh1999@yahoo.com.cn

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics and Information Science, Zhengzhou University of Light Industry, Zhengzhou, Henan 450002, China  
 Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

## Abstract

This paper investigates the existence of solutions for weighted  $p(r)$ -Laplacian impulsive system mixed type boundary value problems. The proof of our main result is based upon Gaines and Mawhin's coincidence degree theory. Moreover, we obtain the existence of nonnegative solutions.

**Keywords:** Weighted  $p(r)$ -Laplacian, impulsive system, coincidence degree

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we mainly consider the existence of solutions for the weighted  $p(r)$ -Laplacian system

$$-(w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2}u'(r))' + f(r, u(r), (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}}u'(r)) = 0, \quad r \in (0, T), \quad r \neq r_i, \quad (1)$$

where  $u: [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ , with the following impulsive boundary conditions

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} u(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r) = A_i(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}}u'(r)), \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2}u'(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2}u'(r) \\ &= B_i(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}}u'(r)), \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$au(0) - b \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}}u'(r) = 0, \text{ and } cu(T) + d \lim_{r \rightarrow T^-} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2}u'(r) = 0, \quad (4)$$

where  $p \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$  and  $p(r) > 1$ ,  $-\Delta_{p(r)} u := -(w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2}u'(r))'$  is called weighted  $p(r)$ -Laplacian;  $0 < r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_k < T$ ;  $A_i, B_i \in C(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$ ;  $a, b, c, d \in [0, +\infty)$ ,  $ad + bc > 0$ .

Throughout the paper,  $o(1)$  means functions which uniformly convergent to 0 (as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ); for any  $v \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $v^j$  will denote the  $j$ -th component of  $v$ ; the inner product in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  will be denoted by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ ;  $|\cdot|$  will denote the absolute value and the Euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Denote  $J = [0, T]$ ,  $J' = [0, T] \setminus \{r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{k+1}\}$ ,  $J_0 = [r_0, r_1]$ ,  $J_i = (r_i, r_{i+1})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , where  $r_0 = 0$ ,  $r_{k+1} = T$ . Denote  $J_i^0$  the interior of  $J_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ . Let  $PC(J, \mathbb{R}^N) = \{x: J$

$\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N \mid x \in C(J_i, \mathbb{R}^N), i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ , and  $\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} x(r)$  exists for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ ;  $w \in PC(J, \mathbb{R})$  satisfies  $0 < w(r), \forall r \in J$ , and  $(w(\cdot))^{\frac{-1}{p(\cdot)-1}} \in L^1(0, T)$ ;  $\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} w(r)|x'|^{p(r)-2}x'(r), \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} w(r)|x'|^{p(r)-2}x'(r)$  and  $\lim_{r \rightarrow r_{i+1}^-} w(r)|x'|^{p(r)-2}x'(r)$  exists for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ . For any  $x = (x^1, \dots, x^N) \in PC(J, \mathbb{R}^N)$ , denote  $|x^i|_0 = \sup_{r \in J} |x^i(r)|$ . Obviously,  $PC(J, \mathbb{R}^N)$  is a Banach space with the norm  $\|x\|_0 = (\sum_{i=1}^N |x^i|_0^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, PC^1(J, \mathbb{R}^N)$  is a Banach space with the norm  $\|x\|_1 = \|x\|_0 + \|(w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}}x'\|_0$ . In the following,  $PC(J, \mathbb{R}^N)$  and  $PC^1(J, \mathbb{R}^N)$  will be simply denoted by  $PC$  and  $PC^1$ , respectively. Let  $L^1 = L^1(J, \mathbb{R}^N)$  with the norm  $\|x\|_{L^1} = (\sum_{i=1}^N |x^i|_{L^1}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \forall x \in L^1$ , where  $|x^i|_{L^1} = \int_0^T |x^i(r)|dr$ . We will denote

$$u(r_i^+) = \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} u(r), \quad u(r_i^-) = \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r),$$

$$w(0)|u'|^{p(0)-2}u'(0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2}u'(r),$$

$$w(T)|u'|^{p(T)-2}u'(T) = \lim_{r \rightarrow T^-} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2}u'(r).$$

The study of differential equations and variational problems with nonstandard  $p(r)$ -growth conditions is a new and interesting topic. It arises from nonlinear elasticity theory, electro-rheological fluids, image processing, etc. (see [1-4]). Many results have been obtained on this problems, for example [1-25]. If  $p(r) \equiv p$  (a constant), (1) is the well-known  $p$ -Laplacian system. If  $p(r)$  is a general function,  $-\Delta_{p(r)}$  represents a nonhomogeneity and possesses more nonlinearity, thus  $-\Delta_{p(r)}$  is more complicated than  $-\Delta_p$ ; for example, if  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  is a bounded domain, the Rayleigh quotient

$$\lambda_{p(\cdot)} = \inf_{u \in W_0^{1,p(\cdot)}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{p(x)} |\nabla u|^{p(x)} dx}{\int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{p(x)} |u|^{p(x)} dx}$$

is zero in general, and only under some special conditions  $\lambda_{p(\cdot)} > 0$  (see [8,17-19]), but the property of  $\lambda_p > 0$  is very important in the study of  $p$ -Laplacian problems.

Impulsive differential equations have been studied extensively in recent years. Such equations arise in many applications such as spacecraft control, impact mechanics, chemical engineering and inspection process in operations research (see [26-28] and the references therein). It is interesting to note that  $p(r)$ -Laplacian impulsive boundary problems are about comparatively new applications like ecological competition, respiratory dynamics and vaccination strategies. On the Laplacian impulsive differential equation boundary value problems, there are many results (see [29-37]). There are many methods to deal with this problem, e.g., subsupersolution method, fixed point theorem, monotone iterative method and coincidence degree. Because of the nonlinearity of  $-\Delta_p$ , results on the existence of solutions for  $p$ -Laplacian impulsive differential equation boundary value problems are rare (see [38,39]). On the Laplacian ( $p(x) \equiv 2$ ) impulsive differential equations mixed type boundary value problems, we refer to [30,32,34].

In [39], Tian and Ge have studied nonlinear IBVP

$$\begin{cases} -(\rho(t)\Phi_p(x'(t)))' + s(t)\Phi_p(x(t)) = f(t, x(t)), & t \neq t_i, a.e.t \in [a, b], \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow t_i^+} \rho(t)\Phi_p(x'(t)) - \lim_{t \rightarrow t_i^-} \rho(t)\Phi_p(x'(t)) = I_i(x(t_i)), & i = 1, \dots, l, \\ \alpha x'(a) - \beta x(a) = \sigma_1, \quad \gamma x'(b) + \sigma x(b) = \sigma_2, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where  $\Phi_p(x) = |x|^{p-2}x$ ,  $p > 1$ ,  $\rho, s \in L^\infty [a, b]$  with  $ess\ inf_{[a, b]} \rho > 0$ , and  $ess\ inf_{[a, b]} s > 0$ ,  $0 < \rho(a), \rho(b) < \infty$ ,  $\sigma_1 \leq 0$ ,  $\sigma_2 \geq 0$ ,  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \sigma > 0$ ,  $a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_l < t_{l+1} = b$ ,  $I_i \in C([0, +\infty), [0, \infty))$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, l$ ,  $f \in C([a, b] \times [0, +\infty), [0, \infty))$ ,  $f(\cdot, 0)$  is nontrivial. By using variational methods, the existence of at least two positive solutions was obtained.

In [24,25], the present author investigates the existence of solutions of  $p(r)$ -Laplacian impulsive differential equation (1-3) with periodic-like or multi-point boundary value conditions.

In this paper, we consider the existence of solutions for the weighted  $p(r)$ -Laplacian impulsive differential system mixed type boundary value condition problems, when  $p(r)$  is a general function. The proof of our main result is based upon Gaines and Mawhin's coincidence degree theory. Since the nonlinear term  $f$  in (5) is independent on the first-order derivative, and the impulsive conditions are simpler than (2), our main results partly generalized the results of [30,32,34,39]. Since the mixed type boundary value problems are different from periodic-like or multi-point boundary value conditions, and this paper gives two kinds of mixed type boundary value conditions (linear and nonlinear), our discussions are different from [24,25] and have more difficulties. Moreover, we obtain the existence of nonnegative solutions. This paper was motivated by [24-26,38,40].

Let  $N \geq 1$ , the function  $f: J \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  is assumed to be Caratheodory; by this, we mean:

- (i) for almost every  $t \in J$ , the function  $f(t, \cdot, \cdot)$  is continuous;
- (ii) for each  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$ , the function  $f(\cdot, x, y)$  is measurable on  $J$ ;
- (iii) for each  $R > 0$ , there is a  $\alpha_R \in L^1(J, \mathbb{R})$ , such that, for almost every  $t \in J$  and every  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$  with  $|x| \leq R$ ,  $|y| \leq R$ , one has

$$|f(t, x, y)| \leq \alpha_R(t).$$

We say a function  $u: J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  is a solution of (1) if  $u \in PC^1$  with  $w(\cdot) |u'|^{p(\cdot)-2} u'(\cdot)$  absolutely continuous on every  $J_i^0$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ , which satisfies (1) a.e. on  $J$ .

This paper is divided into three sections; in the second section, we present some preliminary. Finally, in the third section, we give the existence of solutions and nonnegative solutions of system (1)-(4).

## 2 Preliminary

Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be two Banach spaces and  $L: D(L) \subset X \rightarrow Y$  be a linear operator, where  $D(L)$  denotes the domain of  $L$ .  $L$  will be a Fredholm operator of index 0, i.e.,  $ImL$  is closed in  $Y$  and the linear spaces  $KerL$  and  $coImL$  have the same dimension which is finite. We define  $X_1 = KerL$  and  $Y_1 = coImL$ , so we have the decompositions  $X = X_1 \oplus coKerL$  and  $Y = Y_1 \oplus ImL$ . Now, we have the linear isomorphism  $\Lambda: X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$  and the

continuous linear projectors  $P: X \rightarrow X_1$  and  $Q: Y \rightarrow Y_1$  with  $\text{Ker}Q = \text{Im}L$  and  $\text{Im}P = X_1$ .

Let  $\Omega$  be an open bounded subset of  $X$  with  $\Omega \cap D(L) \neq \emptyset$ . Operator  $S: \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow Y$  be a continuous operator. In order to define the coincidence degree of  $(L, S)$  in  $\Omega$ , as in [40,41], denoted by  $d(L - S, \Omega)$ , we assume that

$$Lx \neq Sx \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial\Omega.$$

It is easy to see that the operator  $M: \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow X$ ,  $M = (L + \Lambda P)^{-1} (S + \Lambda P)$  is well defined, and

$$Lx^* = Sx^* \text{ if and only if } x^* = Mx^*.$$

If  $M$  is continuous and compact, then  $S$  is called  $L$ -compact, and the Leray-Schauder degree of  $I_X - M$  (where  $I_X$  is the identity mapping of  $X$ ) is well defined in  $\Omega$ , and we will denote it by  $d_{LS}(I_X - M, \Omega, 0)$ . This number is independent of the choice of  $P, Q$  and  $\Lambda$  (up to a sign) and we can define

$$d(L - S, \Omega) := d_{LS}(I_X - M, \Omega, 0).$$

**Definition 2.1.** (see [40,41]) The coincidence degree of  $(L, S)$  in  $\Omega$ , denoted by  $d(L - S, \Omega)$ , is defined as  $d(L - S, \Omega) = d_{LS}(I_X - M, \Omega, 0)$ .

There are many papers about coincidence degree and its applications (see [40-43]).

**Proposition 2.2.** (see [40]) (i) (Existence property). If  $d(L - S, \Omega) \neq 0$ , then there exists  $x \in \Omega$  such that  $Lx = Sx$ .

(ii) (Homotopy invariant property). If  $H: \overline{\Omega} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$  is continuous,  $L$ -compact and  $Lx \neq H(x, \lambda)$  for all  $x \in \partial\Omega$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , then  $d(L - H(\cdot, \lambda), \Omega)$  is independent of  $\lambda$ .

The effect of small perturbations is negligible, as is proved in the next Proposition (see [41] Theorem III.3, page 24).

**Proposition 2.3.** Assume that  $Lx \neq Sx$  for each  $x \in \partial\Omega$ . If  $S_\varepsilon$  is such that  $\sup_{x \in \partial\Omega} \|S_\varepsilon x\|_Y$  is sufficiently small, then  $Lx \neq Sx + S_\varepsilon x$  for all  $x \in \partial\Omega$  and  $d(L - S - S_\varepsilon, \Omega) = d(L - S, \Omega)$ .

For any  $(r, x) \in (J \times \mathbb{R}^N)$ , denote  $\phi_{p(r)}(x) = |x|^{p(r)-2}x$ . Obviously,  $\phi$  has the following properties

**Proposition 2.4** (see [41])  $\phi$  is a continuous function and satisfies

(i) For any  $r \in [0, T]$ ,  $\phi_{p(r)}(\cdot)$  is strictly monotone, i.e.,

$$\langle \phi_{p(r)}(x_1) - \phi_{p(r)}(x_2), x_1 - x_2 \rangle > 0, \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad x_1 \neq x_2;$$

(ii) There exists a function  $\eta: [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ ,  $\eta(s) \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $s \rightarrow +\infty$ , such that

$$\langle \phi_{p(r)}(x), x \rangle \geq \eta(|x|)|x|, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

It is well known that  $\phi_{p(r)}(\cdot)$  is a homeomorphism from  $\mathbb{R}^N$  to  $\mathbb{R}^N$  for any fixed  $r \in J$ . Denote

$$\varphi_{p(r)}^{-1}(x) = |x|^{\frac{2-p(r)}{p(r)-1}}x, \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}, \quad \varphi_{p(r)}^{-1}(0) = 0.$$

It is clear that  $\varphi_{p(r)}^{-1}(\cdot)$  is continuous and sends bounded sets to bounded sets, and  $\varphi_{p(r)}^{-1}(\cdot) = \varphi_{q(r)}(\cdot)$  where  $\frac{1}{p(r)} + \frac{1}{q(r)} \equiv 1$ . Let  $X = \{(x_1, x_2) \mid x_1 \in PC, x_2 \in PC\}$  with the norm  $\|(x_1, x_2)\|_X = \|x_1\|_0 + \|x_2\|_0$ ,  $Y = L^1 \times L^1 \times \mathbb{R}^{2(k+1)N}$ , and we define the norm on  $Y$  as

$$\|(y_1, y_2, z_1, \dots, z_{2(k+1)})\|_Y = \|y_1\|_{L^1} + \|y_2\|_{L^1} + \sum_{m=1}^{2(k+1)} |z_m|, \quad \forall (y_1, y_2, z_1, \dots, z_{2(k+1)}) \in Y,$$

where  $y_1, y_2 \in L^1, z_m \in \mathbb{R}^N, m = 1, \dots, 2(k+1)$ , then  $X$  and  $Y$  are Banach spaces.

Define  $L: D(L) \subset X \rightarrow Y$  and  $S: X \rightarrow Y$  as the following

$$Lx = (x'_1, x'_2, \Delta x_1(r_i), \Delta x_2(r_i), 0, 0),$$

$$Sx = (\varphi_{q(r)}(x_2/w(r)), f(r, x_1, \varphi_{q(r)}(x_2)), A_i, B_i, ax_1(0) - b\varphi_{q(0)}(x_2(0)), cx_1(T) + dx_2(T)),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta x_j(r_i) &= x_j(r_i^+) - x_j(r_i^-), \quad j = 1, 2, \quad i = 1, \dots, k; \\ A_i &= A_i(x_1(r_i^-), \varphi_{q(r_i)}(x_2(r_i^-))), \quad B_i = B_i(x_1(r_i^-), \varphi_{q(r_i)}(x_2(r_i^-))), \quad i = 1, \dots, k. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Obviously, the problem (1)-(4) can be written as  $Lx = Sx$ , where  $L: X \rightarrow Y$  is a linear operator,  $S: X \rightarrow Y$  is a nonlinear operator, and  $X$  and  $Y$  are Banach spaces.

Since

$$ImL = \{(y_1, y_2, a_i, b_i, 0, 0) \mid \forall y_1, y_2 \in L^1, \forall a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}^N, i = 1, \dots, k\},$$

we have  $\dim KerL = \dim(Y/ImL) = 2N < +\infty$  is even and  $ImL$  is closed in  $Y$ , then  $L$  is a Fredholm operator of index zero. Define

$$\begin{aligned} P: X &\rightarrow X, (x_1, x_2) \rightarrow (x_1(0), x_2(0)), \\ Q: Y &\rightarrow Y, (y_1, y_2, a_i, b_i, h_1, h_2) \rightarrow (0, 0, 0, 0, h_1, h_2), \forall y_1, y_2 \in L^1, \forall a_i, b_i, h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{R}^N, i = 1, \dots, k, \end{aligned}$$

at the same time the projectors  $P: X \rightarrow X$  and  $Q: Y \rightarrow Y$  satisfy

$$\dim(ImP) = \dim(KerL) = \dim(Y/ImL) = \dim(ImQ).$$

Since  $ImQ$  is isomorphic to  $KerL$ , there exists an isomorphism  $\Lambda: KerL \rightarrow ImQ$ . It is easy to see that  $L|_{D(L) \cap KerP}: D(L) \cap KerP \rightarrow ImL$  is invertible. We denote the inverse of that mapping by  $K_p$ , then  $K_p: ImL \rightarrow D(L) \cap KerP$  as

$$K_p z = \left( \int_0^t y_1(r) dr + \sum_{r_i < t} a_i, \int_0^t y_2(r) dr + \sum_{r_i < t} b_i \right), \quad \forall z = (y_1, y_2, a_i, b_i, 0, 0) \in ImL,$$

then

$$K_p(I - Q)Sx = \left( \int_0^t \varphi_{q(r)}((w(r))^{-1}x_2)dr + \sum_{r_i < t} A_i(x_1(r_i^-), \varphi_{q(r_i)}(x_2(r_i^-))), \right. \\ \left. \int_0^t f(r, x_1, \varphi_{q(r)}(x_2))dr + \sum_{r_i < t} B_i(x_1(r_i^-), \varphi_{q(r_i)}(x_2(r_i^-))) \right).$$

**Proposition 2.5** (i)  $K_p(\cdot)$  is continuous;  
 (ii)  $K_p(I - Q)S$  is continuous and compact.

**Proof.** (i) It is easy to see that  $K_p(\cdot)$  is continuous. Moreover, the operator  $\Psi(\gamma) = \int_0^t \gamma(r)dr$  sends equi-integrable set of  $L^1$  to relatively compact set of  $PC$ .

(ii) It is easy to see that  $K_p(I - Q)Sx \in X, \forall x \in X$ . Since  $(w(r))^{\frac{-1}{p(r)-1}} \in L^1$  and  $f$  is Caratheodory, it is easy to check that  $S$  is a continuous operator from  $X$  to  $Y$ , and the operators  $(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow \phi_{q(r)}((w(r))^{-1}x_2)$  and  $(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow f(r, x_1, \phi_{q(r)}((w(r))^{-1}x_2))$  both send bounded sets of  $X$  to equi-integrable set of  $L^1$ . Obviously,  $A_i, B_i$  and  $QS$  are compact continuous. Since  $f$  is Caratheodory, by using the Ascoli-Arzela theorem, we can show that the operator  $K_p(I - Q)S : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow X$  is continuous and compact. This completes the proof.

Denote

$$S(x, \lambda) = \left( \lambda \varphi_{q(r)}(x_2/w(r)), \lambda^{p(r)}f(r, x_1, \varphi_{q(r)}(x_2)), \lambda^2 A_i, \lambda^{p(r_i)} B_i, \right. \\ \left. ax_1(0) - b\varphi_{q(0)}(x_2(0)), cx_1(T) + dx_2(T) \right),$$

where  $A_i, B_i$  are defined in (6),  $i = 1, \dots, k$ .

Consider

$$Lx = S(x, \lambda).$$

Define  $M(\cdot, \cdot) : \overline{\Omega} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  as  $M(\cdot, \cdot) = (L + \Lambda P)^{-1}(S(\cdot, \cdot) + \Lambda P)$ , then

$$M(\cdot, \lambda) = (L + \Lambda P)^{-1}(S(\cdot, \lambda) + \Lambda P) \\ = (K_p + \Lambda^{-1})((I - Q)S(\cdot, \lambda) + QS(\cdot, \lambda) + \Lambda P) \\ = K_p(I - Q)S(\cdot, \lambda) + \Lambda^{-1}(QS(\cdot, \lambda) + \Lambda P) \\ = K_p(I - Q)S(\cdot, \lambda) + \Lambda^{-1}QS(\cdot, \lambda) + P.$$

Since  $(I - Q)S(\cdot, 0) = 0$  and  $K_p(0) = 0$ , we have

$$d(L - S(\cdot, 0), \Omega) = d_{LS}(I_X - M(\cdot, 0), \Omega, 0) = d_{LS}(I_X - \Lambda^{-1}QS(\cdot, 0) - P, \Omega, 0).$$

It is easy to see that all the solutions of  $Lx = S(x, 0)$  belong to  $KerL$ , then

$$d_{LS}(I_X - \Lambda^{-1}QS(\cdot, 0) - P, \Omega, 0) = d_B(I_{KerL} - \Lambda^{-1}QS(\cdot, 0) - P|_{KerL}, \Omega \cap KerL, 0).$$

Notice that  $P|_{KerL} = I_{KerL}$ , then

$$d(L - S(\cdot, 0), \Omega) = d_{LS}(I_X - M(\cdot, 0), \Omega, 0) = d_B(\Lambda^{-1}QS(\cdot, 0), \Omega \cap KerL, 0).$$

**Proposition 2.6** (continuation theorem) (see [40]). Suppose that  $L$  is a Fredholm operator of index zero and  $S$  is  $L$ -compact on  $\overline{\Omega}$ , where  $\Omega$  is an open bounded subset

of  $X$ . If the following conditions are satisfied,

(i) for each  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ , every solution  $x$  of

$$Lx = S(x, \lambda)$$

is such that  $x \notin \partial\Omega$ ;

(ii)  $QS(x, 0) \neq 0$  for  $x \in \partial\Omega \cap \text{Ker}L$  and  $d_B(\Lambda^{-1}QS(\cdot, 0), \Omega \cap \text{Ker}L, 0) \neq 0$ , then the operator equation  $Lx = S(x, 1)$  has one solution lying in  $\overline{\Omega}$ .

The importance of the above result is that it gives sufficient conditions for being able to calculate the coincidence degree as the Brouwer degree (denoted with  $d_B$ ) of a related finite dimensional mapping. It is known that the degree of finite dimensional mappings is easier to calculate. The idea of the proof is the use of the homotopy of the problem  $Lx = S(x, 1)$  with the finite dimensional one  $Lx = S(x, 0)$ .

Let us now consider the following simple impulsive problem

$$\left. \begin{aligned} (w(r)\varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)))' &= g(r), \quad r \in J', \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} u(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r) &= a_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} w(r)\varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} w(r)\varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) &= b_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \\ au(0) - b \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r) &= 0, \text{ and } cu(T) + d \lim_{r \rightarrow T^-} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2} u'(r) = 0, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (7)$$

where  $J = [0, T] \setminus \{r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{k+1}\}$ ,  $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ;  $g \in L^1$ .

If  $u$  is a solution of (7), then we have

$$w(r)\varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) = w(0)\varphi_{p(0)}(u'(0)) + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + \int_0^r g(t)dt, \quad \forall r \in J'. \quad (8)$$

Denote  $\rho_0 = w(0)\varphi_{p(0)}(u'(0))$ . Obviously,  $\rho_0$  is dependent on  $g, a_i, b_i$ . Define  $F: L^1 \rightarrow PC$  as

$$F(g)(r) = \int_0^r g(t)dt, \quad \forall r \in J, \quad \forall g \in L^1.$$

By (8), we have

$$u(r) = u(0) + \sum_{r_i < r} a_i + F \left\{ \varphi_{q(r)} \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \left( \rho_0 + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right) \right] \right\} (r), \quad \forall r \in J. \quad (9)$$

If  $a \neq 0$ , then the boundary condition  $au(0) - b \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r) = 0$  implies that

$$u(r) = \frac{b}{a} \varphi_{q(0)}(\rho_0) + \sum_{r_i < r} a_i + F \left\{ \varphi_{q(r)} \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \left( \rho_0 + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right) \right] \right\} (r), \quad \forall r \in J.$$

The boundary condition  $cu(T) + d \lim_{r \rightarrow T^-} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2}u'(r) = 0$  implies that

$$c \frac{b}{a} \varphi_q(0)(\rho_0) + c \sum_{i=1}^k a_i + cF \left\{ \varphi_q(r) \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \left( \rho_0 + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right) \right] \right\} (T) + d \left( \rho_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i + F(g)(T) \right) = 0.$$

Denote  $H = L^1 \times \mathbb{R}^{2kN}$  with the norm

$$\|h\|_H = \|g\|_{L^1} + \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i| + \sum_{i=1}^k |b_i|, \forall h = (g, a_i, b_i) \in H,$$

then  $H$  is a Banach space. For fixed  $h \in H$ , we denote

$$\Theta_h(\rho) = c \frac{b}{a} \varphi_q(0)(\rho) + c \sum_{i=1}^k a_i + cF \left\{ \varphi_q(r) \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \left( \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right) \right] \right\} (T) + d \left( \rho + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i + F(g)(T) \right).$$

**Lemma 2.7** The mapping  $\Theta_h(\cdot)$  has the following properties

(i) For any fixed  $h \in H$ , the equation

$$\Theta_h(\rho) = 0 \tag{10}$$

has a unique solution  $\rho(h) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ .

(ii) The mapping  $\rho: H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ , defined in (i), is continuous and sends bounded sets to bounded sets. Moreover,  $|\rho(h)| \leq 3N[(2N \frac{E+1}{E} \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i|)^{p^\#-1} + \sum_{i=1}^k |b_i| + \|g\|_{L^1}]$ , where  $h = (g, a_i, b_i) \in H$ ,  $E = \int_0^T (w(r))^{\frac{-1}{p(r)-1}} dr$ , the notation  $p^\#$  means

$$C^{p^\#-1} = \begin{cases} C^{p^+-1}, & C > 1 \\ C^{p^- -1}, & C \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** (i) From Proposition 2.4, it is immediate that

$$\langle \Theta_h(\rho_1) - \Theta_h(\rho_2), \rho_1 - \rho_2 \rangle > 0, \text{ for } \rho_1 \neq \rho_2,$$

and hence, if (10) has a solution, then it is unique.

Let  $R_0 = 3N[(2N \frac{E+1}{E} \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i|)^{p^\#-1} + \sum_{i=1}^k |b_i| + \|g\|_{L^1}]$ . Since  $(w(r))^{\frac{-1}{p(r)-1}} \in L^1(0, T)$  and  $F(g) \in PC$ , if  $|\rho| > R_0$ , it is easy to see that there exists a  $j_0$  such that, the  $j_0$ -th component  $\rho^{j_0}$  of  $\rho$  satisfies

$$|\rho^{j_0}| \geq \frac{1}{N} |\rho|. \tag{11}$$

Obviously,

$$\left| \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right| \leq \sum_{r_i < r} |b_i| + |F(g)(r)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |b_i| + \|g\|_{L^1}, \quad \forall r \in [0, T],$$

then

$$\left| \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |b_i| + \|g\|_{L^1} \leq \frac{R_0}{3N} < \frac{|\rho|}{3N}, \quad \forall r \in [0, T], \quad (12)$$

and

$$\left| \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right| \leq |\rho| + \left| \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right| < \frac{4|\rho|}{3}, \quad \forall r \in [0, T]. \quad (13)$$

By (11) and (12), the  $j_0$ -th component of  $\rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r)$  keeps the same sign of  $\rho^{j_0}$  on  $J$  and

$$\left| \rho^{j_0} + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i^{j_0} + F(g)^{j_0}(r) \right| \geq |\rho^{j_0}| - \left| \sum_{r_i < r} b_i^{j_0} + F(g)^{j_0}(r) \right| > \frac{2|\rho|}{3N}, \quad \forall r \in J. \quad (14)$$

Combining (13) and (14), the  $j_0$ -th component  $\varphi_{q(r)}^{j_0} \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \left( \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right) \right]$  of  $\varphi_{q(r)} \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \left( \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right) \right]$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \varphi_{q(r)}^{j_0} \left( \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right) \right| &= \left| \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right|^{q(r)-2} \left| \rho^{j_0} + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i^{j_0} + F(g)^{j_0}(r) \right| \\ &> \frac{2}{3N} \left| \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right|^{q(r)-2} |\rho| \\ &> \frac{1}{2N} \left| \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right|^{q(r)-1}. \end{aligned}$$

From the definition  $\varphi_{q(r)}(\cdot) = \varphi_{\rho(r)}^{-1}(\cdot)$ , we have  $\frac{1}{\rho(r)} + \frac{1}{q(r)} \equiv 1$ , then  $q(r) - 1 = \frac{1}{\rho(r)-1}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \varphi_{q(r)}^{j_0} \left( \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right) \right| &> \frac{1}{2N} \left| \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right|^{\frac{1}{\rho(r)-1}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2N} \left| |\rho| - \left| \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right| \right|^{\frac{1}{\rho(r)-1}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2N} \left| \left( 2N \frac{E+1}{E} \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i| \right)^{p\#-1} \right|^{\frac{1}{\rho(r)-1}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2N} 2N \frac{E+1}{E} \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i| = \frac{E+1}{E} \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i|. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\rho^{j_0} > 0$ , then we have

$$F^{j_0} \left\{ \varphi_{q(r)} \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \left( \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right) \right] \right\} (T) > (E+1) \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i| \geq \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^{j_0}.$$

Therefore, the  $j_0$ -th component of  $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i + F\{\varphi_{q(r)}[(w(r))^{-1}(\rho + \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r))]\}(T)$  keeps the same sign of  $\rho^{j_0}$ . Since the  $j_0$ -th component of  $\rho + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i + F(g)(T)$  keeps the same sign of  $\rho^{j_0}$ ,  $a, b, c, d \in [0, +\infty)$  and  $ad + bc > 0$ , we can easily see that the  $j_0$ -th component of  $\Theta_h(\rho)$  keeps the same sign of  $\rho^{j_0}$ , and thus

$$\Theta_h(\rho) \neq 0.$$

Let us consider the equation

$$\lambda \Theta_h(\rho) + (1 - \lambda)\rho = 0, \lambda \in [0, 1]. \tag{15}$$

According to the above discussion, all the solutions of (15) belong to  $b(R_0 + 1) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid |x| < R_0 + 1\}$ . So, we have

$$d_B[\Theta_h(\rho), b(R_0 + 1), 0] = d_B[I, b(R_0 + 1), 0] \neq 0.$$

It means the existence of solutions of  $\Theta_h(\rho) = 0$ .

In this way, we define a mapping  $\rho(h): H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ , which satisfies

$$\Theta_h(\rho(h)) = 0.$$

(ii) By the proof of (i), we also obtain  $\rho$  sends bounded set to bounded set, and

$$|\rho(h)| \leq 3N \left[ \left( 2N \frac{E+1}{E} \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i| \right)^{p^{\#}-1} + \sum_{i=1}^k |b_i| + \|g\|_{L^1} \right].$$

It only remains to prove the continuity of  $\rho$ . Let  $\{u_n\}$  is a convergent sequence in  $H$  and  $u_n \rightarrow u$ , as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ . Since  $\{\rho(u_n)\}$  is a bounded sequence, it contains a convergent subsequence  $\{\rho(u_{n_j})\}$  satisfies  $\rho(u_{n_j}) \rightarrow \rho_*$  as  $j \rightarrow +\infty$ . Since  $\Theta_h(\rho)$  consists of continuous functions, and

$$\Theta_{u_{n_j}}(\rho(u_{n_j})) = 0,$$

Letting  $j \rightarrow +\infty$ , we have

$$\Theta_u(\rho_*) = 0,$$

from (i) we get  $\rho_* = \rho(u)$ , it means that  $\rho$  is continuous.

This completes the proof.

If  $a = 0$ , the boundary condition  $au(0) - b \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r) = 0$  implies that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r) = 0.$$

Since  $ad + bc > 0$ , we have  $c > 0$ . Thus,

$$u(r) = u(0) + \sum_{r_i < r} a_i + F \left\{ \varphi_{q(r)} \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \left( \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right) \right] \right\} (r), \quad \forall r \in J,$$

the boundary condition  $cu(T) + d \lim_{r \rightarrow T^-} w(r) |u'|^{p(r)-2} u'(r) = 0$  implies that

$$u(0) + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i + F \left\{ \varphi_{q(r)} \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \left( \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right) \right] \right\} (T) + \frac{d}{c} \left( \sum_{i=1}^k b_i + F(g)(T) \right) = 0.$$

Denote  $G: H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  as

$$G(h) = - \sum_{i=1}^k a_i - F \left\{ \varphi_{q(r)} \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \left( \sum_{r_i < r} b_i + F(g)(r) \right) \right] \right\} (T) - \frac{d}{c} \left( \sum_{i=1}^k b_i + F(g)(T) \right).$$

It is easy to see that

**Lemma 2.8** The function  $G(\cdot)$  is continuous and sends bounded sets to bounded sets. Moreover,

$$|G(h)| \leq \frac{3N(c+d)}{c} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i| + E \left( \sum_{i=1}^k |b_i| + \|g\|_{L^1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^*-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^k k |b_i| + \|g\|_{L^1} \right] \quad \text{where}$$

$$E = \int_0^T (w(r))^{\frac{-1}{p(r)-1}} dr, \quad \text{the notation } p^* \text{ means } C^{\frac{1}{p^*-1}} = \begin{cases} C^{\frac{1}{p^*-1}}, & C \leq 1 \\ C^{\frac{1}{p^*-1}}, & C > 1 \end{cases}.$$

### 3 Main results and proofs

In this section, we will apply coincidence degree to deal with the existence of solutions for (1)-(4). In the following, we always use  $C$  and  $C_i$  to denote positive constants, if it cannot lead to confusion.

**Theorem 3.1** Assume that  $\Omega$  is an open bounded set in  $X$  such that the following conditions hold.

(1<sup>0</sup>) For each  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  the problem

$$Lx = S(x, \lambda) \tag{16}$$

has no solution on  $\partial\Omega$ .

(2<sup>0</sup>)  $(0, 0) \in \Omega$ .

Then, problem (1)-(4) has a solution  $u$  satisfies  $(u, v) \in \overline{\Omega}$ , where  $v = w(r)\phi_{p(r)}(u'(r))$ ,  $\forall r \in J$ .

**Proof.** Let us consider the following operator equation

$$Lx = S(x, \lambda). \tag{17}$$

It is easy to see that  $x = (x_1, x_2)$  is a solution of  $Lx = S(x, 1)$  if and only if  $x_1(r)$  is a solution of (1)-(4) and  $x_2(r) = w(r)\phi_{p(r)}(x_1'(r))$ ,  $\forall r \in J$ .

According to Proposition 2.5, we can conclude that  $S(\cdot, \cdot)$  is  $L$ -compact from  $X \times [0, 1]$  to  $Y$ . We assume that for  $\lambda = 1$ , (16) does not have a solution on  $\partial\Omega$ , otherwise we complete the proof. Now from hypothesis (1<sup>0</sup>), it follows that (16) has no solutions for  $(x, \lambda) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, 1]$ . For  $\lambda = 0$ , (17) is equivalent to  $Lx = S(x, 0)$ , namely the following usual problem

$$\left. \begin{aligned} x_1' &= 0, & r &\in (0, T), \\ x_2' &= 0, & r &\in (0, T), \\ ax_1(0) - b\varphi_{q(0)}(x_2(0)) &= 0, & cx_1(T) + dx_2(T) &= 0. \end{aligned} \right\}$$

The problem (??) is a usual differential equation. Hence,

$$x_1 \equiv c_1, \quad x_2 \equiv c_2,$$

where  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}^N$  are constants. The boundary value condition of (??) holds,

$$ac_1 - b\varphi_{q(0)}(c_2) = 0, \quad cc_1 + dc_2 = 0.$$

Since  $(ad + bc) > 0$ , we have

$$c_1 = 0, \quad c_2 = 0,$$

which together with hypothesis  $(2^0)$ , implies that  $(0, 0) \in \Omega$ . Thus, we have proved that (16) has no solution on  $\partial\Omega \times [0, 1]$ . It means that the coincidence degree  $d[L - S(\cdot, \lambda), \Omega]$  is well defined for each  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . From the homotopy invariant property of that degree, we have

$$d[L - S(\cdot, 1), \Omega] = d[L - S(\cdot, 0), \Omega]. \tag{18}$$

Now, it is clear that the following problem

$$Lx = S(x, 1) \tag{19}$$

is equivalent to problem (1)-(4), and (18) tells us that problem (19) will have a solution if we can show that

$$d[L - S(\cdot, 0), \Omega] \neq 0.$$

Since by hypothesis  $(2^0)$ , this last degree

$$d[L - S(\cdot, 0), \Omega] = d_B[\omega_*, \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}^{2N}, 0] \neq 0,$$

where  $\omega_*(c_1, c_2) = (ac_1 - b\phi_{q(0)}(c_2), cc_1 + dc_2)$ . This completes the proof.

Our next theorem is a consequence of Theorem 3.1. Denote

$$z^- = \min_{r \in J} z(r), \quad z^+ = \max_{r \in J} z(r), \quad \text{for } z \in C(J, \mathbb{R}).$$

**Theorem 3.2** Assume that the following conditions hold

$$(1^0) \quad a > 0;$$

$$(2^0) \quad \lim_{|u| + |v| \rightarrow +\infty} (f(r, u, v) / (|u| + |v|)^{\beta(r) - 1}) = 0, \quad \text{for } r \in J \text{ uniformly, where } \beta(r) \in C(J, \mathbb{R}), \text{ and } 1 < \beta^- \leq \beta^+ < p^-;$$

$$(3^0) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k |A_i(u, v)| \leq C_1(|u| + |v|)^\theta \text{ when } |u| + |v| \text{ is large enough, where } 0 < \theta < \frac{p^- - 1}{p^- - 1};$$

$$(4^0) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k |B_i(u, v)| \leq C_2(|u| + |v|)^\varepsilon \text{ when } |u| + |v| \text{ is large enough, where } 0 \leq \varepsilon < \beta^+ - 1.$$

Then, problem (1)-(4) has at least one solution.

**Proof.** Now, we consider the following operator equation

$$Lx = S(x, \lambda). \tag{20}$$

For any  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ ,  $x = (x_1, x_2) = (u, v)$  is a solution of (20) if and only if  $v(r) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{p(r)-1}} w(r) \varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) (\forall r \in J)$  and  $u(r)$  is a solution of the following

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\lambda^{p(r)-1}} w(r) \varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r))' = \lambda^{p(r)} f(r, u, \frac{1}{\lambda} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u') \quad r \in (0, T), \quad r \neq r_i, \\ & \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} u(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r) = \lambda^2 A_i \left( \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \frac{1}{\lambda} \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r) \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \\ & \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} \frac{1}{\lambda^{p(r)-1}} w(r) \varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} \frac{1}{\lambda^{p(r)-1}} w(r) \varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) \\ & = \lambda^{p(r_i)} B_i \left( \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \frac{1}{\lambda} \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r) \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \\ & au(0) - b \frac{1}{\lambda} (w(0))^{\frac{1}{p(0)-1}} u'(0) = 0, \text{ and } cu(T) + d \frac{1}{\lambda^{p(T)-1}} w(T) |u'|^{p(T)-2} u'(T) = 0. \end{aligned} \right\} \tag{21}$$

We claim that all the solutions of (21) are uniformly bounded for  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ . In fact, if it is false, we can find a sequence  $(u_n, \lambda_n)$  of solutions for (21), such that  $\|u_n\|_1 > 1$  and  $\|u_n\|_1 \rightarrow +\infty$  when  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $\lambda_n \in (0, 1]$ . Since  $(u_n, \lambda_n)$  are solutions of (21), we have

$$w(r)|u'_n|^{p(r)-2}u'_n(r) = \lambda_n^{\rho(r)-1} \left[ \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\rho(0)-1}}\rho_n + \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^{\rho(r_i)} B_i + \int_0^r \lambda_n^{\rho(t)} f \left( t, u_n, \frac{1}{\lambda_n} (w(t))^{\frac{1}{p(t)-1}} u'_n \right) dt \right],$$

for any  $r \in J$ , where  $\rho_n = w(0)\varphi_p(0)(u'_n(0))$  and

$$A_i = A_i \left( \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u_n(r), \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'_n(r) \right), B_i = B_i \left( \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u_n(r), \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'_n(r) \right).$$

By computation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^2 A_i \right| &\leq C_1 \lambda_n^2 \left( \|u_n\|_0 + \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \|(w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'_n\|_0 \right)^\theta \leq \lambda_n C_3 \|u_n\|_1^\theta, \\ \left| \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^{\rho(r_i)} B_i \right| &\leq C_2 \lambda_n^{\rho(r_i)} \left( \|u_n\|_0 + \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \|(w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'_n\|_0 \right)^{\beta^*-1} \leq C_4 \|u_n\|_1^{\beta^*-1}, \\ \left| \int_0^r \lambda_n^{\rho(t)} f \left( t, u_n, \frac{1}{\lambda_n} (w(t))^{\frac{1}{p(t)-1}} u'_n \right) dt \right| &\leq C_5 \lambda_n^{\rho^-} \left( \|u_n\|_0 + \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \|(w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'_n\|_0 \right)^{\beta^*-1} \\ &\leq C_5 \|u_n\|_1^{\beta^*-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Denote

$$\Gamma_n(r) = \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\rho(0)-1}}\rho_n + \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^{\rho(r_i)} B_i + \int_0^r \lambda_n^{\rho(t)} f \left( t, u_n, \frac{1}{\lambda_n} (w(t))^{\frac{1}{p(t)-1}} u'_n \right) dt, \quad \forall r \in J.$$

We claim that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\rho(0)-1}}|\rho_n| \leq 3NC_6 \left[ \|u_n\|_1^{\theta_*(\rho^*-1)} + \|u_n\|_1^{\beta^*-1} \right], \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \text{ where } \theta_* \in \left( \theta, \frac{\rho^- - 1}{\rho^* - 1} \right). \tag{23}$$

If it is false, without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\rho(0)-1}}|\rho_n| > 3N(C_4 + C_5) \left[ \|u_n\|_1^{\theta_*(\rho^*-1)} + \|u_n\|_1^{\beta^*-1} \right], \quad n = 1, 2, \dots,$$

then for any  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , there is a  $j_n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  such that the  $j_n$ -th component  $\rho_n^{j_n}$  of  $\rho_n$  satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\rho(0)-1}}|\rho_n^{j_n}| > 3(C_4 + C_5) \left[ \|u_n\|_1^{\theta_*(\rho^*-1)} + \|u_n\|_1^{\beta^*-1} \right], \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Thus, when  $n$  is large enough, the  $j_n$ -th component  $\Gamma_n^{j_n}(r)$  of  $\Gamma_n(r)$  keeps the same sign as  $\rho_n^{j_n}$  and satisfies

$$\left| \Gamma_n^{j_n}(r) \right| > (C_4 + C_5) \left[ \|u_n\|_1^{\theta_*(\rho^*-1)} + \|u_n\|_1^{\beta^*-1} \right], \quad \forall r \in J', \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

When  $n$  is large enough, we can conclude that the  $j_n$ -th component  $F^{j_n}\{\varphi_{q(r)}[\Gamma_n(r)]\}(T)$  of  $F\{\varphi_{q(r)}[\Gamma_n(r)]\}(T)$  keeps the same sign as  $\rho_n^{j_n}$  and satisfies

$$|F^{jn}\{\varphi_{q(r)}[\Gamma_n(r)]\}| > C_7 \|u_n\|_1^{\theta_*}, \quad \forall r \in J. \tag{24}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} u_n(r) &= u_n(0) + \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^2 A_i + \lambda_n F\{\varphi_{q(r)}[(w(r))^{-1} \Gamma_n(r)]\} \\ &= \frac{b}{a} \varphi_{q(0)} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\beta(0)-1} \rho_n} \right) + \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^2 A_i + \lambda_n F\{\varphi_{q(r)}[(w(r))^{-1} \Gamma_n(r)]\}, \quad \forall r \in J, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \end{aligned}$$

from (22) and (24), we can see that  $u_n^{jn}(r) (\forall r \in J)$  keeps the same sign as  $\rho_n^{jn}$ , when  $n$  is large enough.

But the boundary value conditions (4) mean that

$$cu_n(T) + d \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\beta(T)-1}} \lim_{r \rightarrow T^-} w(r) |u_n'|^{p(r)-2} u_n'(r) = cu_n(T) + d \Gamma_n(T) = 0, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

It is a contradiction. Thus (23) is valid. Therefore,

$$w(r) |u_n'(r)|^{p(r)-1} \leq C_7 \left( \|u_n\|_1^{\theta_*(p^*-1)} + \|u_n\|_1^{\beta^*-1} \right), \quad \forall r \in J'.$$

It means that

$$\|(w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u_n'\|_0 \leq o(1) \|u_n\|_1, \quad \text{where } o(1) \text{ tends to } 0 \text{ uniformly as } n \rightarrow \infty. \tag{25}$$

From (22), (23) and (25), for any  $r \in J$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |u_n(r)| &= \left| u_n(0) + \int_0^r u_n'(t) dt + \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^2 A_i \right| \leq |u_n(0)| + \left| \int_0^r u_n'(t) dt \right| + \left| \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^2 A_i \right| \\ &\leq |u_n(0)| + \int_0^r (w(t))^{\frac{-1}{p(t)-1}} \left| (w(t))^{\frac{1}{p(t)-1}} u_n'(t) \right| dt + C_3 \|u_n\|_1^\theta \\ &\leq \frac{b}{a} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n} (w(0))^{\frac{1}{\beta(0)-1}} u_n'(0) \right| + E \| (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u_n'(r) \|_0 + C_3 \|u_n\|_1^\theta \\ &\leq o(1) \|u_n\|_1, \quad \text{where } o(1) \text{ tends to } 0 \text{ uniformly as } n \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\|u_n\|_0 \leq o(1) \|u_n\|_1, \quad \text{where } o(1) \text{ tends to } 0 \text{ uniformly as } n \rightarrow \infty. \tag{26}$$

From (25) and (26), we get that all the solutions of (20) are uniformly bounded for any  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ .

When  $\lambda = 0$ , if  $(x_1, x_2)$  is a solution of (20), then  $(x_1, x_2)$  is a solution of the following usual equation

$$\begin{cases} x_1' = 0, & r \in (0, T), \\ x_2' = 0, & r \in (0, T), \\ ax_1(0) - b\varphi_{q(0)}(x_2(0)) = 0, & cx_1(T) + dx_2(T) = 0, \end{cases}$$

we have

$$(x_1, x_2) = (0, 0).$$

Thus, there exists a large enough  $R_0 > 0$  such that all the solutions of (20) belong to  $B(R_0) = \{x \in X \mid \|x\|_X < R_0\}$ . Thus, (20) has no solution on  $\partial B(R_0)$ . From theorem 3.1, we obtain that (1)-(4) has at least one solution. This completes the proof.

**Theorem 3.3** Assume that the following conditions hold

- (1<sup>0</sup>)  $a = 0$ ;
- (2<sup>0</sup>)  $\lim_{|u| + |v| \rightarrow +\infty} f(r, u, v) / (|u| + |v|)^\varepsilon = 0$  for  $r \in J$  uniformly, where  $0 \leq \varepsilon < \min(1, p^- - 1)$ ;
- (3<sup>0</sup>)  $\sum_{i=1}^k |A_i(u, v)| \leq C_1(|u| + |v|)^\theta$  when  $|u| + |v|$  is large enough, where  $0 < \theta < 1$ ;
- (4<sup>0</sup>)  $\sum_{i=1}^k |B_i(u, v)| \leq C_2(|u| + |v|)^\varepsilon$  when  $|u| + |v|$  is large enough, where  $0 \leq \varepsilon < \min(1, p^- - 1)$ .

Then, problem (1)-(4) has at least one solution.

**Proof** Now, we consider the following operator equation

$$Lx = S(x, \lambda). \tag{27}$$

If  $(x_1, x_2)$  is a solution of (27) when  $\lambda = 0$ , then  $(x_1, x_2)$  is a solution of the following usual equation

$$\begin{cases} x'_1 = 0, & r \in (0, T), \\ x'_2 = 0, & r \in (0, T), \\ ax_1(0) - b\varphi_{q(0)}(x_2(0)) = 0, & cx_1(T) + dx_2(T) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then, we have

$$(x_1, x_2) = (0, 0).$$

For any  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ ,  $x = (x_1, x_2) = (u, v)$  is a solution of (27) if and only if  $v(r) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{p(r)-1}} w(r) \varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) (\forall r \in J')$  and  $u(r)$  is a solution of the following

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{1}{\lambda^{p(r)-1}} w(r) \varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) \right)' = \lambda^{p(r)} f\left(r, u, \frac{1}{\lambda} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'\right), r \in (0, T), r \neq r_i, \\ & \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} u(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r) = \lambda^2 A_i\left(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \frac{1}{\lambda} \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)\right), i = 1, \dots, k, \\ & \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} \frac{1}{\lambda^{p(r)-1}} w(r) \varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} \frac{1}{\lambda^{p(r)-1}} w(r) \varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) \\ & = \lambda^{p(r_i)} B_i\left(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \frac{1}{\lambda} \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)\right), i = 1, \dots, k, \\ & \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r) = 0, \text{ and } cu(T) + d \frac{1}{\lambda^{p(T)-1}} \lim_{r \rightarrow T^-} w(r) |u'|^{p(r)-2} u'(r) = 0. \end{aligned} \right\} \tag{28}$$

We only need to prove that all the solutions of (28) are uniformly bounded for  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ .

In fact, if it is false, we can find a sequence  $(u_n, \lambda_n)$  of solutions for (28), such that  $\|u_n\|_1 > 1$  and  $\|u_n\|_1 \rightarrow +\infty$  when  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ . Since  $(u_n, \lambda_n)$  are solutions of (28), we have

$$w(r) |u_n'|^{p(r)-2} u_n'(r) = \lambda_n^{p(r)-1} \left[ \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^{p(r_i)} B_i + \int_0^r \lambda_n^{p(t)} f\left(t, u_n, \frac{1}{\lambda_n} (w(t))^{\frac{1}{p(t)-1}} u_n'\right) dt \right], \quad \forall r \in J',$$

where  $B_i = B_i\left(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u_n(r), \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u_n'(r)\right)$ .

From conditions (2<sup>0</sup>) and (4<sup>0</sup>), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^{\beta(r_i)} B_i \right| &\leq C_2 \lambda_n^{\beta^-} \left( \|u_n\|_0 + \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \|(w(r))^{\frac{1}{\beta(r)-1}} u'_n\|_0 \right)^\varepsilon \leq C_4 \|u_n\|_1^\varepsilon, \\ \left| \int_0^T \lambda_n^{\beta(r)} f(r, u_n(r), \frac{1}{\lambda_n} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{\beta(r)-1}} u'_n(r)) dr \right| &\leq C_5 \lambda_n^{\beta^-} \left( \|u_n\|_0 + \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \|(w(r))^{\frac{1}{\beta(r)-1}} u'_n\|_0 \right)^\varepsilon \\ &\leq C_5 \|u_n\|_1^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} w(r) |u'_n(r)|^{\beta(r)-1} &\leq C_6 \|u_n\|_1^\varepsilon, \quad \forall r \in J', \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \\ \|(w(r))^{\frac{1}{\beta(r)-1}} u'_n\|_0 &\leq o(1) \|u_n\|_1, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Denote

$$\Upsilon_n(r) = \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^{\beta(r_i)} B_i + F \left( \lambda_n^{\beta(r)} f(r, u_n(r), \frac{1}{\lambda_n} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{\beta(r)-1}} u'_n(r)) \right) (r), \quad \forall r \in J, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

By solving  $u_n(r)$ , we have

$$u_n(r) = u_n(0) + \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^2 A_i + \lambda_n F \left\{ \varphi_q(r) \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \Upsilon_n(r) \right] \right\}, \quad \forall r \in J, x \tag{30}$$

where  $A_i = A_i(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u_n(r), \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{\beta(r)-1}} u'_n(r))$ .

From condition (3<sup>0</sup>), we have

$$\left| \sum_{r_i < r} \lambda_n^2 A_i \right| \leq C_1 \lambda_n^2 \left( \|u_n\|_0 + \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \|(w(r))^{\frac{1}{\beta(r)-1}} u'_n\|_0 \right)^\theta \leq \lambda_n C_3 \|u_n\|_1^\theta.$$

The boundary value condition implies

$$u_n(0) + \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_n^2 A_i + \lambda_n F \left\{ \varphi_q(r) \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \Upsilon_n(r) \right] \right\} (T) = -\frac{d}{c} \Upsilon_n(T). \tag{31}$$

From (31) and conditions (2<sup>0</sup>), (3<sup>0</sup>) and (4<sup>0</sup>), we have

$$|u_n(0)| \leq o(1) \|u_n\|_1, \text{ where } o(1) \text{ tends to } 0 \text{ uniformly as } n \rightarrow \infty. \tag{32}$$

From (30) and (32), we have

$$\|u_n\|_0 \leq o(1) \|u_n\|_1, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \tag{33}$$

From (29) and (33), we can conclude that  $\{\|u_n\|_1\}$  is uniformly bounded for  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ . This completes the proof.

Now, let us consider the following mixed type boundary value condition

$$au(0) - b \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{\beta(r)-1}} u'(r) = 0, \text{ and } cu(T) + d \lim_{r \rightarrow T^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{\beta(r)-1}} u'(r) = 0. \tag{34}$$

**Theorem 3.4** Assume that the following conditions hold

(1<sup>0</sup>)  $\lim_{|u|+|v| \rightarrow +\infty} (f(r, u, v) / (|u| + |v|)^{\beta(r)-1}) = 0$ , for  $r \in J$  uniformly, where  $\beta(r) \in C(J, \mathbb{R})$ , and  $1 < \beta^- \leq \beta^+ < p^-$ ;

$$(2^0) \sum_{i=1}^k |A_i(u, v)| \leq C_1(|u| + |v|)^\theta \text{ when } |u| + |v| \text{ is large enough, where } 0 < \theta < \frac{\rho^- - 1}{\rho^+ - 1};$$

$$(3^0) \sum_{i=1}^k |B_i(u, v)| \leq C_2(|u| + |v|)^\varepsilon \text{ when } |u| + |v| \text{ is large enough, where } 0 \leq \varepsilon < \beta^+ - 1.$$

Then, problem (1) with (2), (3) and (34) has at least one solution.

**Proof.** It is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3, we omit it.

Denote

$$f_\delta(r, u, v) = f(r, u, v) + \delta f_*(r, u, v),$$

where  $f_*(r, u, v)$  is Caratheodory.

Let us consider

$$-(w(r)|u'|^{\rho(r)-2}u'(r))' + f_\delta(r, u(r), (w(r))^{\frac{1}{\rho(r)-1}}u'(r)) = 0, \quad \forall r \in J'. \tag{35}$$

**Theorem 3.5** Under the conditions of Theorem 3.2, Theorem 3.3 or Theorem 3.4, then (35) with (2), (3) and (4) or (34) has at least a solution when  $\delta$  is small enough.

**Proof** We only need to prove the existence of solutions under the conditions of Theorem 3.2, the rest is similar. If  $\delta = 0$ , the proof of Theorem 3.2 means that all the solutions of (35) with (2), (3) and (4) are bounded and belong to  $U(R_0) = \{u \in PC^1 \mid \|u\|_1 < R_0\}$ . Define  $S_\delta : X \rightarrow Y$  as

$$S_\delta x = \left( \varphi_{q(r)} \left( \frac{x_2}{w(r)} \right), f_\delta(r, x_1, \varphi_{q(r)}(x_2)), A_i, B_i, ax_1(0) - b\varphi_{q(0)}(x_2(0)), cx_1(T) + dx_2(T) \right),$$

where  $A_i = A_i(x_1(r_i^-), \varphi_{q(r_i)}(x_2(r_i^-)))$ ,  $B_i = B_i(x_1(r_i^-), \varphi_{q(r_i)}(x_2(r_i^-)))$ .

Since  $f_*(r, u, v)$  is a Caratheodory function, we have  $\|S_\delta x - S_0 x\|_Y \rightarrow 0$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , for  $x \in \overline{U(R_0)}$  uniformly. According to Proposition 2.3, we get the existence of solutions.

In the following, we will consider the existence of nonnegative solutions. For any  $x = (x^1, \dots, x^N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , the notation  $x \geq 0$  means  $x^i \geq 0$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .

**Theorem 3.6** We assume

- (i)  $f(r, u, v) \leq 0, \forall (r, u, v) \in J \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$ ;
- (ii) for any  $i = 1, \dots, k, B_i(u, v) \leq 0, \forall (u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$ ;
- (iii) for any  $i = 1, \dots, k, j = 1, \dots, N, A_i^j(u, v)v^j \geq 0 \forall (u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$ .

Then, the solution  $u$  in Theorem 3.2, Theorem 3.3 or Theorem 3.4 is nonnegative.

**Proof** We only need to prove that the solution  $u$  in Theorem 3.2 is nonnegative, and the rest is similar. Denote

$$N_f(u) = f(r, u(r), (w(r))^{\frac{1}{\rho(r)-1}}u'(r)),$$

$$D = c \frac{b}{a} \varphi_{q(0)}(\rho) + c \sum_{i=1}^k A_i + cF \left\{ \varphi_{q(r)} \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \left( \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} B_i + F(N_f(u))(r) \right) \right] \right\} (T)$$

$$+ d \left[ \rho + \sum_{i=1}^k B_i + F(N_f(u))(T) \right],$$

where

$$A_i = A_i(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)), \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

$$B_i = B_i(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)), \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

Similar to (8) and (9), we have

$$w(r)\varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) = \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} B_i + F(N_f(u))(r), \quad \forall r \in J',$$

$$u(r) = u(0) + \sum_{r_i < r} A_i + F \left\{ \varphi_{q(r)} \left[ (w(r))^{-1} \left( \rho + \sum_{r_i < r} B_i + F(N_f(u))(r) \right) \right] \right\} (r), \quad \forall r \in J, \tag{36}$$

where

$$u(0) = \frac{b}{a} \varphi_{q(0)}(\rho),$$

and  $\rho$  is the solution (unique) of

$$D = 0. \tag{37}$$

Denote

$$\Phi(r) = w(r)\varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)), \quad \forall r \in J'.$$

From (i), (ii) and (36), we can see that  $\Phi(r)$  is decreasing, namely

$$\Phi(t_2) - \Phi(t_1) \leq 0, \quad \forall t_2, t_1 \in J', \quad t_2 > t_1. \tag{38}$$

We claim that

$$\rho \geq 0. \tag{39}$$

If it is false, then there exists some  $j_0 \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , such that the  $j_0$ -th component  $\rho^{j_0}$  of  $\rho$  satisfies

$$\rho^{j_0} < 0. \tag{40}$$

Combining (i), (ii), (iii) and (40), we can see that the  $j_0$ -th component  $D^{j_0}$  of  $D$  is negative. It is a contradiction to (37). Thus, (39) is valid. So, we have

$$u(0) = \frac{b}{a} \varphi_{q(0)}(\rho) \geq 0.$$

We claim that

$$\Phi(T) \leq 0. \tag{41}$$

If it is false. Then, there exists some  $j_1 \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , such that the  $j_1$ -th component  $\Phi^{j_1}(T)$  of  $\Phi(T)$  satisfies

$$\Phi^{j_1}(T) > 0. \tag{42}$$

From (38) and (42), we have

$$\Phi^{j_1}(t) > 0, \quad \forall t \in J'.$$

Combining (i), (ii), (iii) and (42), we can see that the  $j_1$ -th component  $D^{j_1}$  of  $D$  is positive. It is a contradiction to (37). Thus, (41) is valid.

If  $c > 0$ . We have

$$u(T) = -\frac{d}{c}\Phi(T) \geq 0.$$

Since  $\Phi(r)$  is decreasing,  $\Phi(0) = \rho \geq 0$  and  $\Phi(T) \leq 0$ , for any  $j = 1, \dots, N$ , there exists  $\xi_j \in J$  such that

$$\Phi^j(r) \geq 0, \forall r \in (0, \xi_j) \text{ and } \Phi^j(r) \leq 0, \quad \forall r \in (\xi_j, T).$$

Combining condition (iii), we can conclude that  $u^j(r)$  is increasing on  $[0, \xi_j]$ , and  $u^j(r)$  is decreasing on  $(\xi_j, T]$ . Notice that  $u(0) \geq 0$  and  $u(T) \geq 0$ , then we have  $u(r) \geq 0, \forall r \in [0, T]$ .

If  $c = 0$ , boundary condition (4) means that  $\Phi(T) = 0$ . Since  $\Phi(r)$  is decreasing, we get that  $\Phi(r) \geq 0$ . Combining condition (iii), we can conclude that  $u(r)$  is increasing on  $J$ , namely  $u(t_2) - u(t_1) \geq 0, \forall t_2, t_1 \in J, t_2 > t_1$ . Notice that  $u(0) \geq 0$ , then we have  $u(r) \geq 0, \forall t \in J$ . This completes the proof.

**Corollary 3.7** We assume

- (i)  $f(r, u, v) \leq 0, \forall (r, u, v) \in J \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$  with  $u \geq 0$ ;
- (ii) for any  $i = 1, \dots, k, B_i(u, v) \leq 0, \forall (u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$  with  $u \geq 0$ ;
- (iii) for any  $i = 1, \dots, k, j = 1, \dots, N, A_i^j(u, v)v^j \geq 0, \forall (u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$  with  $u \geq 0$ .

Then, we have

(1<sub>0</sub>) Under the conditions of Theorem 3.2 or Theorem 3.3, (1)-(4) has a nonnegative solution.

(2<sub>0</sub>) Under the conditions of Theorem 3.4, (1) with (2), (3) and (34) has a nonnegative solution.

**Proof** We only need to prove that (1)-(4) has a nonnegative solution under the conditions of Theorem 3.2, and the rest is similar. Define

$$\phi(u) = (\phi_*(u^1), \dots, \phi_*(u^N)),$$

where

$$\phi_*(t) = \begin{cases} t, & t \geq 0 \\ 0, & t < 0 \end{cases}.$$

Denote

$$\tilde{f}(r, u, v) = f(r, \phi(u), v), \quad \forall (r, u, v) \in J \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N,$$

then  $\tilde{f}(r, u, v)$  satisfies Caratheodory condition, and  $\tilde{f}(r, u, v) \leq 0$  for any  $(r, u, v) \in J \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$ .

For any  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , we denote

$$\tilde{A}_i(u, v) = A_i(\phi(u), v), \tilde{B}_i(u, v) = B_i(\phi(u), v), \forall (u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N,$$

then  $\tilde{A}_i$  and  $\tilde{B}_i$  are continuous and satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i(u, v) &\leq 0, \forall (u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \quad \text{for any } i = 1, \dots, k, \\ \tilde{A}_i^j(u, v)^j &\geq 0, \forall (u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N, \quad \text{for any } i = 1, \dots, k, \quad j = 1, \dots, N. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, we have

$$(2^0)' \lim_{|u|+|v| \rightarrow +\infty} (\tilde{f}(r, u, v)/(|u| + |v|)^{\beta(r)-1}) = 0, \text{ for } r \in J \text{ uniformly, where } \beta(r) \in C(J, \mathbb{R}),$$

and  $1 < \beta^- \leq \beta^+ < p^-$ ;

$$(3^0)' \sum_{i=1}^k |\tilde{A}_i(u, v)| \leq C_1(|u| + |v|)^\theta \text{ when } |u| + |v| \text{ is large enough, where } 0 < \theta < \frac{p^- - 1}{p^- - 1};$$

$$(4^0)' \sum_{i=1}^k |\tilde{B}_i(u, v)| \leq C_2(|u| + |v|)^\varepsilon \text{ when } |u| + |v| \text{ is large enough, where } 0 \leq \varepsilon < \beta^+ - 1.$$

Let us consider

$$\left. \begin{aligned} (w(r)\varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)))' &= \tilde{f}(r, u(r), (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)), r \in J', \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} u(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r) &= \tilde{A}_i(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)), \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} w(r)\varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} w(r)\varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)) \\ &= \tilde{B}_i(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)), \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \\ au(0) - b \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r) &= 0, \text{ and } cu(T) + d \lim_{r \rightarrow T^-} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2} u'(r) = 0. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (43)$$

From Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.6, we can see that (43) has a nonnegative solution  $u$ . Since  $u \geq 0$ , we have  $\varphi(u) = u$ , and then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(r, u(r), (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)) &= f(r, u(r), (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)), \\ \tilde{A}_i(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)) &= A_i(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)), \\ \tilde{B}_i(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)) &= B_i(\lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r), \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $u$  is a nonnegative solution of (1)-(4). This completes the proof.

#### 4 Examples

**Example 4.1.** Consider the following problem

$$(P_1) \left\{ \begin{aligned} (w(r)\varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)))' &= -g(r) - |u|^{q(r)-2} u - \sigma w(r)|u'|^{q(r)-2} u' - \delta u e^{|u| + |(w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'|}, r \in J', \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} u(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r) &= \sigma \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} |u(r)|^{\frac{-1}{2}} u(r) + \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} \left| (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r) \right|^{\frac{-1}{2}} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r), \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2} u'(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2} u'(r) \\ &= \sigma \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{3}{p(r)-1}} |u'(r)|^2 u'(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} |u(r)|^2 u(r), \\ u(0) - \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r) &= 0, \text{ and } u(T) + \lim_{r \rightarrow T^-} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2} u'(r) = 0, \end{aligned} \right.$$

where  $p(r) = 5 + \cos 3r$ ,  $q(r) = 3 + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2r$ ,  $0 \leq g(r) \in L^1$ ,  $e_0, e_1 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $w(r) = 3 + \sin r$ ,  $\sigma$  is a nonnegative parameter.

Obviously,  $g(r) + |u|^{q(r)-2}u + \sigma w(r)|u'|^{q(r)-2}u' + \delta ue \left| (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u' \right|$  is Caratheodory,  $q(r) \leq 3.5 < 4 \leq p(r) \leq 6$ , then the conditions of Theorem 3.5 are satisfied, then  $(P_1)$  has a solution when  $\delta > 0$  is small enough. Moreover, when  $\sigma = 0$ , the conditions of Corollary 3.7 are satisfied, then  $(P_1)$  has a nonnegative solution.

**Example 4.2.** Consider the following problem

$$(P_2) \begin{cases} (w(r)\varphi_{p(r)}(u'(r)))' = -g(r) - |u|^{q(r)-2}u - \sigma w(r)|u'|^{q(r)-2}u' - \delta ue \left| (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u' \right|, & r \in J', \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} u(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} u(r) = \sigma \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} |u(r)|^{\frac{-1}{2}} u(r) + \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} \left| (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r) \right|^{\frac{-1}{2}} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r), \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^+} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2}u'(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2}u'(r) \\ = \sigma \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} (w(r))^{\frac{3}{p(r)-1}} |u'(r)|^{\frac{-1}{3}} u'(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow r_i^-} |u(r)|^{\frac{-1}{3}} u(r), \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u'(r) = 0, \text{ and } u(T) + \lim_{r \rightarrow T^-} w(r)|u'|^{p(r)-2}u'(r) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where  $p(r) = 5 + \cos 3r$ ,  $q(r) = \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \sin 2r$ ,  $0 \leq g(r) \in L^1$ ,  $e_0, e_1 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $w(r) = 3 + \sin r$ ,  $\sigma$  is a nonnegative parameter.

Obviously,  $g(r) + |u|^{q(r)-2}u + \sigma w(r)|u'|^{q(r)-2}u' + \delta ue \left| (w(r))^{\frac{1}{p(r)-1}} u' \right|$  is Caratheodory,  $1 < q(r) < 2 < 4 \leq p(r) \leq 6$ , then conditions of Theorem 3.5 are satisfied, then  $(P_2)$  has a solution when  $\delta > 0$  is small enough. Moreover, when  $\sigma = 0$ , the conditions of Corollary 3.7 are satisfied, and  $(P_2)$  has a nonnegative solution.

**Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank the referees very much for their helpful comments and suggestions. This study was partly supported by the National Science Foundation of China (10701066 & 10926075 & 10971087) and China Postdoctoral Science Foundation funded project (20090460969) and the Natural Science Foundation of Henan Education Committee (2008-755-65).

**Author details**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics and Information Science, Zhengzhou University of Light Industry, Zhengzhou, Henan 450002, China <sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, Henan Institute of Science and Technology, Xinxiang, Henan 453003, China

**Authors' contributions**

All authors typed, read and approved the final manuscript.

**Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Received: 1 July 2011 Accepted: 1 November 2011 Published: 1 November 2011

**References**

1. Acerbi, E, Mingione, G: Regularity results for a class of functionals with nonstandard growth. *Arch Ration Mech Anal.* **156**, 121–140 (2001). doi:10.1007/s002050100117
2. Chen, Y, Levine, S, Rao, M: Variable exponent, linear growth functionals in image restoration. *SIAM J Math Anal.* **66**(4), 1383–1406 (2006). doi:10.1137/050624522
3. Růžička, M: Electrorheological fluids: modeling and mathematical theory. *Lecture Notes in Math* 1748. Springer Berlin (2000)
4. Zhikov, VV: Averaging of functionals of the calculus of variations and elasticity theory. *Math USSR Izv.* **29**, 33–36 (1987). doi:10.1070/IM1987v029n01ABEH000958
5. Allegretto, W: Form estimates for the  $p(x)$ -Laplacean. *Proc Am Math Soc.* **135**(7):2177–2185 (2007). doi:10.1090/S0002-9939-07-08718-7
6. Diening, L, Harjulehto, P, Hästö, P, Růžička, M: Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces with variable exponents. In *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 2017, Springer, Berlin (2011)
7. Fan, XL: Global  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity for variable exponent elliptic equations in divergence form. *J Diff Equ.* **235**, 397–417 (2007). doi:10.1016/j.jde.2007.01.008

8. Fan, XL, Zhang, QH, Zhao, D: Eigenvalues of  $p(x)$ -Laplacian Dirichlet problem. *J Math Anal Appl.* **302**, 306–317 (2005). doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2003.11.020
9. Fan, XL, Wu, HQ, Wang, FZ: Hartman-type results for  $p(t)$ -Laplacian systems. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **52**, 585–594 (2003). doi:10.1016/S0362-546X(02)00124-4
10. Fan, XL, Zhang, QH: Existence of solutions for  $p(x)$ -Laplacian Dirichlet problem. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **52**, 1843–1852 (2003). doi:10.1016/S0362-546X(02)00150-5
11. Fan, XL, Zhao, D: On the spaces  $L^{p(x)}(\Omega)$  and  $W^{m,p(x)}(\Omega)$ . *J Math Anal Appl.* **263**, 424–446 (2001). doi:10.1006/jmaa.2000.7617
12. El Hamidim, A: Existence results to elliptic systems with nonstandard growth conditions. *J Math Anal Appl.* **300**, 30–42 (2004). doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2004.05.041
13. Harjulehto, P, Hästö, P, Lê, ÚV, Nuortio, M: Overview of differential equations with non-standard growth. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **72**, 4551–4574 (2010). doi:10.1016/j.na.2010.02.033
14. Kováčik, O, Rákosník, J: On the spaces  $L^{p(x)}(\Omega)$  and  $W^{k,p(x)}(\Omega)$ . *Czechoslovak Math J.* **41**, 592–618 (1991)
15. Mihăilescu, M, Rădulescu, V: Spectrum in an unbounded interval for a class of nonhomogeneous differential operators. *Bull London Math Soc.* **40**(6):972–984 (2008). doi:10.1112/blms/bdn079
16. Mihăilescu, M, Rădulescu, V: Continuous spectrum for a class of nonhomogeneous differential operators. *Manuscripta Math.* **125**, 157–167 (2008). doi:10.1007/s00229-007-0137-8
17. Mihăilescu, M, Rădulescu, V: On a nonhomogeneous quasilinear eigenvalue problem in Sobolev spaces with variable exponent. *Proc Amer Math Soc.* **135**(9):2929–2937 (2007). doi:10.1090/S0002-9939-07-08815-6
18. Mihăilescu, M, Rădulescu, V, Stancu-Dumitru, D: On a Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg type inequality in bounded domains involving variable exponent growth conditions and applications to PDE's. *Comp Vari Ellipt Equ.* (in press)
19. Mihăilescu, M, Moroşanu, G, Stancu-Dumitru, D: Equations involving a variable exponent Grushin-type operator. *Nonlinearity.* (in press)
20. Musielak, J: Orlicz spaces and modular spaces. *Lecture Notes in Math 1034.* Springer, Berlin (1983)
21. Samko, SG: Densness of  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$  in the generalized Sobolev spaces  $W^{m,p(x)}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ . *Dokl Ross Akad Nauk.* **369**(4):451–454 (1999)
22. Zhang, QH: Existence of solutions for weighted  $p(r)$ -Laplacian system boundary value problems. *J Math Anal Appl.* **327**(1):127–141 (2007). doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2006.03.087
23. Zhang, QH: A strong maximum principle for differential equations with nonstandard  $p(x)$ -growth conditions. *J Math Anal Appl.* **312**(1):24–32 (2005). doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2005.03.013
24. Zhang, QH, Liu, XP, Qiu, ZM: Existence of solutions for weighted  $p(r)$ -Laplacian impulsive system periodic-like boundary value problems. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **71**(9):3596–3611 (2009). doi:10.1016/j.na.2009.02.043
25. Zhang, QH, Qiu, ZM, Liu, XP: Existence of solutions and nonnegative solutions for weighted  $p(r)$ -Laplacian impulsive system multi-point boundary value problems. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **71**(9):3814–3825 (2009). doi:10.1016/j.na.2009.02.040
26. Bainov, D, Simeonov, P: *Systems with Impulse Effect.* Ellis Horwood, Chichester (1989)
27. Fu, X, Yan, B, Liu, Y: *Introduction of Impulsive Differential Systems.* Science Press, Beijing (2005)
28. Lee, YH, Liu, XZ: Study of singular boundary value problems for second order impulsive differential equations. *J Math Anal Appl.* **331**(1):159–176 (2007). doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2006.07.106
29. Dong, YJ: Periodic solutions for second order impulsive differential systems. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **27**(7):811–820 (1996). doi:10.1016/0362-546X(95)00068-7
30. Guo, DJ, Liu, XZ: Multiple positive solutions of boundary value problems for impulsive differential equations. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **25**(4):327–337 (1995). doi:10.1016/0362-546X(94)00175-H
31. Jiao, JJ, Chen, LS, Li, LM: Asymptotic behavior of solutions of second-order nonlinear impulsive differential equations. *J Math Anal Appl.* **337**, 458–463 (2008). doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2007.04.021
32. Kaufmann, ER, Kosmatov, ER, Raffoul, YN: A second-order boundary value problem with impulsive effects on an unbounded domain. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **69**(9):2924–2929 (2008). doi:10.1016/j.na.2007.08.061
33. Liu, LS, Hu, LL, Wu, YH: Positive solutions of two-point boundary value problems for systems of nonlinear second-order singular and impulsive differential equations. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **69**(11):3774–3789 (2008). doi:10.1016/j.na.2007.10.012
34. Wei, ZL: Extremal solutions of boundary value problems for second order impulsive integrodifferential equations of mixed type. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **28**(10):1681–1688 (1997). doi:10.1016/S0362-546X(96)00013-2
35. Yang, T: *Impulsive Systems and Control: Theory and Applications.* Nova Science Publishers, Inc, Huntington, NY (2001)
36. Yao, MP, Zhao, AM, Yan, JR: Periodic boundary value problems of second-order impulsive differential equations. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **70**(1):262–273 (2009). doi:10.1016/j.na.2007.11.050
37. Zavalishchin, ST, Sesekin, AN: *Dynamic Impulse Systems: Theory and Applications.* Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht (1997)
38. Cabada, A, Tomeček, J: Extremal solutions for nonlinear functional  $\square$ -Laplacian impulsive equations. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **67**, 827–841 (2007). doi:10.1016/j.na.2006.06.043
39. Tian, Y, Ge, WG: Applications of variational methods to boundary value problem for impulsive differential equations. *Proc Edinburgh Math Soc.* **51**, 509–527 (2008)
40. Buică, A: Contributions to coincidence degree theory of asymptotically homogeneous operators. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **68**, 1603–1610 (2008)
41. Gaines, RE, Mawhin, J: *The coincidence degree and nonlinear differential equations.* In *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 568, Springer, Berlin (1977)
42. Han, ZQ: Coincidence degree and nontrivial solutions of elliptic boundary value problems at resonance. *Nonlinear Anal TMA.* **56**, 739–750 (2004). doi:10.1016/j.na.2003.10.011
43. Lloyd, NG: *Degree Theory.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1978)

doi:10.1186/1687-2770-2011-42

**Cite this article as:** Yin et al.: Existence of solutions for weighted  $p(r)$ -Laplacian impulsive system mixed type boundary value problems. *Boundary Value Problems* 2011 **2011**:42.