J. Korean Soc. Math. Educ. Ser. B: Pure Appl. Math. ISSN(Print) 1226-0657
http://dx.doi.org/10.7468/jksmeb.2015.22.1.1 ISSN(Online) 2287-6081
Volume 22, Number 1 (February 2015), Pages 1–11

LIPSCHITZ AND ASYMPTOTIC STABILITY OF PERTURBED FUNCTIONAL DIFFERENTIAL SYSTEMS

Sang Il Choi [a] and Yoon Hoe Goo [b,*]

Abstract. The present paper is concerned with the notions of Lipschitz and asymptotic for perturbed functional differential system knowing the corresponding stability of functional differential system. We investigate Lipschitz and asymptotic stability for perturbed functional differential systems. The main tool used is integral inequalities of the Bihari-type, and all that sort of things.

1. Introduction

Dannan and Elaydi introduced a new notion of uniformly Lipschitz stability (ULS)[8]. This notion of ULS lies somewhere between uniformly stability on one side and the notions of asymptotic stability in variation of Brauer[4] and uniformly stability in variation of Brauer and Strauss[3] on the other side. An important feature of ULS is that for linear systems, the notion of uniformly Lipschitz stability and that of uniformly stability are equivalent. However, for nonlinear systems, the two notions are quite distinct. Also, Elaydi and Farran[9] introduced the notion of exponential asymptotic stability(EAS) which is a stronger notion than that of ULS. They investigated some analytic criteria for an autonomous differential system and its perturbed systems to be EAS. Gonzalez and Pinto[10] proved theorems which relate the asymptotic behavior and boundedness of the solutions of nonlinear differential systems. Choi et al.[6, 7] examined Lipschitz and exponential asymptotic stability for nonlinear functional systems. Also, Goo et al.[11, 13] investigated Lipschitz and asymptotic stability for perturbed differential systems.

In this paper, we investigate Lipschitz and asymptotic stability for solutions of the functional differential systems using integral inequalities. The method incorporating

Received by the editors July 10, 2014. Revised November 06, 2014. Accepted November 13, 2014.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 34D10.
Key words and phrases. uniformly Lipschitz stability, uniformly Lipschitz stability in variation, exponentially asymptotic stability, exponentially asymptotic stability in variation.
*Corresponding author.

integral inequalities takes an important place among the methods developed for the qualitative analysis of solutions to linear and nonlinear system of differential equations. In the presence the method of integral inequalities is as efficient as the direct Lyapunov's method.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We consider the nonlinear nonautonomous differential system

$$x'(t) = f(t, x(t)), \quad x(t_0) = x_0, \tag{2.1}$$

where $f \in C(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $\mathbb{R}^+ = [0, \infty)$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the Euclidean n-space. We assume that the Jacobian matrix $f_x = \partial f / \partial x$ exists and is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f(t, 0) = 0$. Also, consider the perturbed functional differential system of (2.1)

$$y' = f(t, y) + \int_{t_0}^{t} g(s, y(s), Ty(s))ds + h(t, y(t), Ty(t)),\ y(t_0) = y_0, \tag{2.2}$$

where $g, h \in C(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $g(t, 0, 0) = h(t, 0, 0) = 0$ and $T : C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^n) \to C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is a continuous operator .

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $|x| = (\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2)^{1/2}$. For an $n \times n$ matrix A, define the norm $|A|$ of A by $|A| = \sup_{|x| \le 1} |Ax|$.

Let $x(t, t_0, x_0)$ denote the unique solution of (2.1) with $x(t_0, t_0, x_0) = x_0$, existing on $[t_0, \infty)$. Then we can consider the associated variational systems around the zero solution of (2.1) and around $x(t)$, respectively,

$$v'(t) = f_x(t, 0)v(t),\ v(t_0) = v_0 \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$z'(t) = f_x(t, x(t, t_0, x_0))z(t),\ z(t_0) = z_0. \tag{2.4}$$

The fundamental matrix $\Phi(t, t_0, x_0)$ of (2.4) is given by

$$\Phi(t, t_0, x_0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_0} x(t, t_0, x_0),$$

and $\Phi(t, t_0, 0)$ is the fundamental matrix of (2.3).

Before giving further details, we give some of the main definitions that we need in the sequel[8].

Definition 2.1. The system (2.1) (the zero solution $x = 0$ of (2.1)) is called (S)*stable* if for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $t_0 \ge 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(t_0, \epsilon) > 0$ such that if $|x_0| < \delta$, then $|x(t)| < \epsilon$ for all $t \ge t_0 \ge 0$,

(US)*uniformly stable* if the δ in (S) is independent of the time t_0,
(ULS) *uniformly Lipschitz stable* if there exist $M > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $|x(t)| \leq M|x_0|$ whenever $|x_0| \leq \delta$ and $t \geq t_0 \geq 0$
(ULSV) *uniformly Lipschitz stable in variation* if there exist $M > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $|\Phi(t, t_0, x_0)| \leq M$ for $|x_0| \leq \delta$ and $t \geq t_0 \geq 0$,
(EAS) *exponentially asymptotically stable* if there exist constants $K > 0$, $c > 0$, and $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|x(t)| \leq K\,|x_0|e^{-c(t-t_0)}, 0 \leq t_0 \leq t$$

provided that $|x_0| < \delta$,
(EASV) *exponentially asymptotically stable in variation* if there exist constants $K > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that

$$|\Phi(t, t_0, x_0)| \leq K\,e^{-c(t-t_0)}, 0 \leq t_0 \leq t$$

provided that $|x_0| < \infty$.

Remark 2.2 ([10])**.** The last definition implies that for $|x_0| \leq \delta$

$$|x(t)| \leq K\,|x_0|e^{-c(t-t_0)}, 0 \leq t_0 \leq t.$$

We give some related properties that we need in the sequel.

We need Alekseev formula to compare between the solutions of (2.1) and the solutions of perturbed nonlinear system

$$y' = f(t, y) + g(t, y),\ \ y(t_0) = y_0, \tag{2.5}$$

where $g \in C(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $g(t, 0) = 0$. Let $y(t) = y(t, t_0, y_0)$ denote the solution of (2.5) passing through the point (t_0, y_0) in $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

The following is a generalization to nonlinear system of the variation of constants formula due to Alekseev [1].

Lemma 2.3. *Let x and y be a solution of (2.1) and (2.5), respectively. If $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then for all t such that $x(t, t_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$y(t, t_0, y_0) = x(t, t_0, y_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \Phi(t, s, y(s))\, g(s, y(s))\, ds,$$

where $\Phi(t, s, y(s))$ is a fundamental matrix of (2.4).

Lemma 2.4 ([14])**.** *Let $u, p, q, w,$ and $r \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and suppose that, for some $c \geq 0$, we have*

$$u(t) \le c + \int_{t_0}^{t} p(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} [q(\tau)u(\tau) + w(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} r(a)u(a)da] d\tau ds, \ t \ge t_0.$$

Then

$$u(t) \le c \exp(\int_{t_0}^{t} p(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} [q(\tau) + w(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} r(a)da] d\tau ds), \ t \ge t_0.$$

Lemma 2.5 ([7])**.** (Bihari − type Inequality) *Let $u, \lambda \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$ and $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u. Suppose that, for some $c > 0$,*

$$u(t) \le c + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda(s) w(u(s)) ds, \ t \ge t_0 \ge 0.$$

Then

$$u(t) \le W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda(s) ds\Big], \ t_0 \le t < b_1,$$

where $W(u) = \int_{u_0}^{u} \frac{ds}{w(s)}$, $W^{-1}(u)$ is the inverse of $W(u)$, and

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \ge t_0 : W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda(s) ds \in \mathrm{domW}^{-1}\Big\}.$$

Lemma 2.6 ([12])**.** *Let $u, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$ and $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u, $u \le w(u)$. Suppose that for some $c > 0$,*

$$u(t) \le c + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_1(s) w(u(s)) ds + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_2(s) (\int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_3(\tau) u(\tau) d\tau) ds, \ \ 0 \le t_0 \le t.$$

Then

$$u(t) \le W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} (\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_3(\tau)) ds\Big], \ t_0 \le t < b_1,$$

where W, W^{-1} are the same functions as in Lemma 2.5, and

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \ge t_0 : W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} (\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_3(\tau)) ds \in \mathrm{domW}^{-1}\Big\}.$$

Lemma 2.7 ([12])**.** *Let $u, p, q, v, r \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$ and $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u, $u \le w(u)$. Suppose that for some $c \ge 0$,*

$$u(t) \le c + \int_{t_0}^{t} p(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} (q(\tau) w(u(\tau)) + v(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} r(a) u(a) da) d\tau ds, \ t \ge t_0.$$

Then

$$u(t) \le W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} (p(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} (q(\tau) + v(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} r(a) da) d\tau) ds\Big], \ t_0 \le t < b_1,$$

where W, W^{-1} are the same functions as in Lemma 2.5, and

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \ge t_0 : W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} (p(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} (q(\tau) + v(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} r(a) da) d\tau) ds \in \mathrm{domW}^{-1}\Big\}.$$

Lemma 2.8 ([5]). *Let $u, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$ and $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u. Suppose that for some $c > 0$,*

$$u(t) \le c + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_1(s) w(u(s)) ds + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_2(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_3(\tau) w(u(\tau)) d\tau ds, \ \ 0 \le t_0 \le t.$$

Then

$$u(t) \le W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} (\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_3(\tau)) ds\Big], \ \ t_0 \le t < b_1,$$

where W, W^{-1} are the same functions as in Lemma 2.5, and

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \ge t_0 : W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} (\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_3(\tau)) ds \in \mathrm{domW^{-1}}\Big\}.$$

3. Main Results

In this section, we investigate Lipschitz and asymptotic stability for solutions of the perturbed functional differential systems.

We need the lemma to prove the following theorem.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $u, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, w \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$, and $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u, $u \le w(u)$. Suppose that for some $c \ge 0$,*

(3.1)
$$u(t) \le c + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_1(s) \Big[\int_{t_0}^{s} (\lambda_2(\tau) w(u(\tau)) + \lambda_3(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r) u(r) dr) d\tau + \lambda_4(s) w(u(s)) \Big] ds,$$

for $t \ge t_0 \ge 0$ and for some $c \ge 0$. Then

$$u(t) \le W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_1(s) \Big(\int_{t_0}^{s} (\lambda_2(\tau) + \lambda_3(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r) dr) d\tau + \lambda_4(s) \Big) ds\Big], \tag{3.2}$$

for $t_0 \le t < b_1$, where W, W^{-1} are the same functions as in Lemma 2.5, and

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \ge t_0 : W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_1(s) \Big(\int_{t_0}^{s} (\lambda_2(\tau) \\ + \lambda_3(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r) dr) d\tau + \lambda_4(s) \Big) ds \in \mathrm{domW^{-1}}\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Define a function $v(t)$ by the right member of (3.1) . Then

$$v'(t) = \lambda_1(t) \Big[\int_{t_0}^{t} (\lambda_2(s) w(u(s)) + \lambda_3(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau) u(\tau) d\tau) ds + \lambda_4(t) w(u(t)) \Big],$$

which implies

$$v'(t) \quad \leq \lambda_1(t)\Big[\int_{t_0}^{t}(\lambda_2(s)+\lambda_3(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}k(\tau)d\tau)ds+\lambda_4(t)\Big]w(v(t)),$$

since v and w are nondecreasing, $u \leq w(u)$, and $u(t) \leq v(t)$. Now, by integrating the above inequality on $[t_0, t]$ and $v(t_0) = c$, we have

$$v(t) \leq c+\int_{t_0}^{t}\lambda_1(s)\Big[\int_{t_0}^{s}(\lambda_2(\tau)+\lambda_3(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}k(r)dr)d\tau+\lambda_4(s)\Big]w(v(s))ds. \tag{3.3}$$

Then, by the well-known Bihari-type inequality, (3.3) yields the estimate (3.2). □

Theorem 3.2. *For the perturbed (2.2), we assume that*

$$|g(t,y,Ty)| \leq a(t)w(|y(t)|)+|Ty(t)| \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$|Ty(t)| \leq b(t)\int_{t_0}^{t}k(s)|y(s)|ds,\ \ |h(t,y(t),Ty(t))| \leq c(t)w(|y|), \tag{3.5}$$

where $a, b, c, k \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$*,* $a, b, c, k \in L_1(\mathbb{R}^+)$*,* $w \in C((0,\infty))$*, and* $w(u)$ *is nondecreasing in* u*,* $u \leq w(u)$*, and* $\frac{1}{v}w(u) \leq w(\frac{u}{v})$ *for some* $v > 0$*,*

$$M(t_0) = W^{-1}\Big[W(M)+M\int_{t_0}^{\infty}(\int_{t_0}^{s}(a(\tau)+b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}k(r)dr)d\tau)+c(s))ds\Big], \tag{3.6}$$

where $M(t_0) < \infty$ *and* $b_1 = \infty$*. Then the zero solution of (2.2) is ULS whenever the zero solution of (2.1) is ULSV.*

Proof. Using the nonlinear variation of constants formula of Alekseev[1], the solutions of (2.1) and (2.2) with the same initial value are related by

$$y(t,t_0,y_0)=x(t,t_0,y_0)+\int_{t_0}^{t}\Phi(t,s,y(s))\Big(\int_{t_0}^{s}g(\tau,y(\tau),Ty(\tau))d\tau+h(s,y(s),Ty(s))\Big)ds.$$

Since $x = 0$ of (2.1) is ULSV, it is ULS([8],Theorem 3.3) . Using the ULSV condition of $x = 0$ of (2.1), (3.4), and (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|y(t)| &\leq |x(t)|+\int_{t_0}^{t}|\Phi(t,s,y(s))|(\int_{t_0}^{s}|g(\tau,y(\tau),Ty(\tau))|d\tau+|h(s,y(s),Ty(s))|)ds\\ &\leq M|y_0|+\int_{t_0}^{t}M|y_0|\Big[(\int_{t_0}^{s}[a(\tau)w(\frac{|y(\tau)|}{|y_0|})+b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}k(r)\frac{|y(r)|}{|y_0|}dr]d\tau)\\ &\quad +c(s)w(\frac{|y(s)|}{|y_0|})\Big]ds.\end{aligned}$$

Set $u(t) = |y(t)||y_0|^{-1}$. Now an application of Lemma 3.1 yields

$$|y(t)| \leq |y_0|W^{-1}\Big[W(M)+M\int_{t_0}^{t}(\int_{t_0}^{s}(a(\tau)+b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}k(r)dr)d\tau+c(s))ds\Big],$$

Thus, by (3.6), we have $|y(t)| \le M(t_0)|y_0|$ for some $M(t_0) > 0$ whenever $|y_0| < \delta$. So, the proof is complete. □

Remark 3.3. Letting $c(t) = 0$ in Theorem 3.2, we obtain the same result as that of Theorem 3.6 in [13].

Theorem 3.4. *For the perturbed (2.2), we assume that*

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} |g(s, y(s), Ty(s))|ds \le a(t)w(|y(t)|) + |Ty(t)| \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$|Ty(t)| \le b(t)\int_{t_0}^{t} k(s)|y(s)|ds, \;\; |h(t, y(t), Ty(t))| \le c(t)w(|y|), \tag{3.8}$$

where $a, b, c, k \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $a, b, c, k \in L_1(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$, *and* $w(u)$ *is nondecreasing in* u, $u \le w(u)$, *and* $\frac{1}{v}w(u) \le w(\frac{u}{v})$ *for some* $v > 0$,

$$M(t_0) = W^{-1}\Big[W(M) + M\int_{t_0}^{\infty}(a(s) + c(s) + b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)d\tau)ds\Big], \tag{3.9}$$

where $M(t_0) < \infty$ *and* $b_1 = \infty$. *Then the zero solution of (2.2) is ULS whenever the zero solution of (2.1) is ULSV.*

Proof. Let $x(t) = x(t, t_0, y_0)$ and $y(t) = y(t, t_0, y_0)$ be solutions of (2.1) and (2.2), respectively. Since $x = 0$ of (2.1) is ULSV, it is ULS . Applying Lemma 2.3, (3.7), and (3.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |y(t)| &\le |x(t)| + \int_{t_0}^{t} |\Phi(t, s, y(s))(\Big|\int_{t_0}^{s} g(\tau, y(\tau), Ty(\tau))d\tau\Big| + |h(s, y(s), Ty(s))|ds \\ &\le M|y_0| + \int_{t_0}^{t} M|y_0|(a(s) + c(s))w(\frac{|y(s)|}{|y_0|})ds \\ &\quad + \int_{t_0}^{t} M|y_0|b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)\frac{|y(\tau)|}{|y_0|}d\tau ds. \end{aligned}$$

Set $u(t) = |y(t)||y_0|^{-1}$. Now an application of Lemma 2.6 yields

$$|y(t)| \le |y_0|W^{-1}\Big[W(M) + M\int_{t_0}^{t}(a(s) + c(s) + b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)d\tau)ds\Big].$$

Hence, by (3.9), we have $|y(t)| \le M(t_0)|y_0|$ for some $M(t_0) > 0$ whenever $|y_0| < \delta$. This completes the proof. □

Remark 3.5. Letting $c(t) = 0$ in Theorem 3.4, we obtain the same result as that of Theorem 3.5 in [13].

Theorem 3.6. *For the perturbed (2.2), we assume that*

$$|g(t,y,Ty)| \le a(t)w(|y(t)|) + |Ty(t)| \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$|Ty(t)| \le b(t)\int_{t_0}^t k(s)|y(s)|ds,\ \ |h(t,y(t),Ty(t))| \le \int_{t_0}^t c(s)w(|y(s)|)ds, \tag{3.11}$$

where $a,b,c,k \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $a,b,c,k \in L_1(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$, *and* $w(u)$ *is nondecreasing in* u, $u \le w(u)$, *and* $\frac{1}{v}w(u) \le w(\frac{u}{v})$ *for some* $v > 0$,

$$M(t_0) = W^{-1}\Big[W(M) + M\int_{t_0}^{\infty}\int_{t_0}^{s}(a(\tau)+c(\tau)+b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}k(r)dr)d\tau ds\Big], \tag{3.12}$$

where $M(t_0) < \infty$ *and* $b_1 = \infty$. *Then the zero solution of (2.2) is ULS whenever the zero solution of (2.1) is ULSV.*

Proof. Let $x(t) = x(t,t_0,y_0)$ and $y(t) = y(t,t_0,y_0)$ be solutions of (2.1) and (2.2), respectively. Since $x = 0$ of (2.1) is ULSV, it is ULS. Using the nonlinear variation of constants formula and the ULSV condition of $x = 0$ of (2.1), (3.10), and (3.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|y(t)| &\le |x(t)| + \int_{t_0}^t |\Phi(t,s,y(s))|(\int_{t_0}^s |g(\tau,y(\tau),Ty(\tau))|d\tau + |h(s,y(s),Ty(s))|)ds \\ &\le M|y_0| + \int_{t_0}^t M|y_0|\int_{t_0}^s (a(\tau)+c(\tau))w(\frac{|y(\tau)|}{|y_0|})d\tau ds \\ &\quad + \int_{t_0}^t M|y_0|\int_{t_0}^s b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r)\frac{|y(r)|}{|y_0|}drd\tau ds.\end{aligned}$$

Set $u(t) = |y(t)||y_0|^{-1}$. Now an application of Lemma 2.7 and (3.12) yield

$$|y(t)| \le |y_0|W^{-1}\Big[W(M) + M\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{t_0}^{s}(a(\tau)+c(\tau)+b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}k(r)dr)d\tau ds\Big],$$

Thus we have $|y(t)| \le M(t_0)|y_0|$ for some $M(t_0) > 0$ whenever $|y_0| < \delta$, and so the proof is complete. □

Remark 3.7. Letting $c(t) = 0$ in Theorem 3.6, we obtain the same result as that of Theorem 3.6 in [13].

Theorem 3.8. *Let the solution* $x = 0$ *of (2.1) be EASV. Suppose that the perturbing term* $g(t,y,Ty)$ *satisfies*

$$|g(t,y(t),Ty(t))| \le e^{-\alpha t}\Big(a(t)|y(t)| + |Ty(t)|\Big) \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$|Ty(t)| \le b(t)\int_{t_0}^{t} k(s)|y(s)|ds,\ \ |h(t,y(t),Ty(t))| \le \int_{t_0}^{t} e^{-\alpha s}c(s)|y(s)|ds, \tag{3.14}$$

where $\alpha > 0,\ a,b,c,k \in C(\mathbb{R}^+),\ a,b,c,k \in L_1(\mathbb{R}^+)$. *If*

$$M(t_0) = c\exp(\int_{t_0}^{\infty} Me^{\alpha s}\int_{t_0}^{s}[a(\tau)+c(\tau)+b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r)dr]d\tau ds) < \infty,\ t \ge t_0, \tag{3.15}$$

where $c = |y_0|Me^{\alpha t_0}$, *then all solutions of (2.2) approch zero as* $t \to \infty$

Proof. Let $x(t) = x(t,t_0,y_0)$ and $y(t) = y(t,t_0,y_0)$ be solutions of (2.1) and (2.2), respectively. Since the solution $x = 0$ of (2.1) is EASV, it is EAS by remark 2.2. Using Lemma 2.3, (3.13), and (3.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|y(t)| &\le |x(t)| + \int_{t_0}^{t} |\Phi(t,s,y(s))|(\left|\int_{t_0}^{s} g(\tau,y(\tau),Ty(\tau))d\tau\right| + |h(s,y(s),Ty(s))|)ds\\
&\le M|y_0|e^{-\alpha(t-t_0)} + \int_{t_0}^{t} Me^{-\alpha(t-s)}\int_{t_0}^{s}[e^{-\alpha\tau}(a(\tau)+c(\tau))|y(\tau)|\\
&\quad + e^{-\alpha\tau}b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r)|y(r)|dr]d\tau ds\\
&\le M|y_0|e^{-\alpha(t-t_0)} + \int_{t_0}^{t} Me^{-\alpha(t-s)}\int_{t_0}^{s}[(a(\tau)+c(\tau))|y(\tau)|e^{\alpha\tau}\\
&\quad + b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r)|y(r)|e^{\alpha r}dr]d\tau ds.\end{aligned}$$

Set $u(t) = |y(t)|e^{\alpha t}$. An application of Lemma 2.4 and (3.15) obtain

$$|y(t)| \le ce^{-\alpha t}\exp(\int_{t_0}^{t} Me^{\alpha s}\int_{t_0}^{s}[a(\tau)+c(\tau)+b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r)dr]d\tau ds) \le ce^{-\alpha t}M(t_0),$$

$t \ge t_0$, where $c = M|y_0|e^{\alpha t_0}$. Hence, all solutions of (2.2) approch zero as $t \to \infty$. □

Theorem 3.9. *Let the solution* $x = 0$ *of (2.1) be EASV. Suppose that the perturbed term* $g(t,y,Ty)$ *satisfies*

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} |g(s,y(s),Ty(s))|ds \le e^{-\alpha t}\Big(a(t)w(|y(t)|) + |Ty(t)|\Big) \tag{3.16}$$

and

$$|Ty(t)| \le b(t)\int_{t_0}^{t} k(s)w(|y(s)|)ds,\ \ |h(t,y(t),Ty(t))| \le e^{-\alpha t}c(t)w(|y|), \tag{3.17}$$

where $\alpha > 0,\ a,b,c,k,w \in C(\mathbb{R}^+),\ a,b,c,k \in L_1(\mathbb{R}^+)$ *and* $w(u)$ *is nondecreasing in* u, *and* $\frac{1}{v}w(u) \le w(\frac{u}{v})$ *for some* $v > 0$. *If*

(3.18) $M(t_0) = W^{-1}\Big[W(c)+M\int_{t_0}^{\infty}(a(s)+c(s)+b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}k(\tau)d\tau)ds\Big] < \infty, b_1 = \infty,$

where $c = M|y_0|e^{\alpha t_0}$, *then all solutions of (2.2) approch zero as* $t \to \infty$

Proof. Let $x(t) = x(t, t_0, y_0)$ and $y(t) = y(t, t_0, y_0)$ be solutions of (2.1) and (2.2), respectively. Since the solution $x = 0$ of (2.1) is EASV, it is EAS. Using Lemma 2.3, (3.16), and (3.17), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|y(t)| &\le |x(t)| + \int_{t_0}^{t}|\Phi(t,s,y(s))|\Big(\Big|\int_{t_0}^{s}g(\tau,y(\tau),Ty(\tau))d\tau\Big| + |h(s,y(s),Ty(s))|\Big)ds \\
&\le M|y_0|e^{-\alpha(t-t_0)} + \int_{t_0}^{t}Me^{-\alpha(t-s)}[e^{-\alpha s}a(s)w(|y(s)|) \\
&\quad + e^{-\alpha s}b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}k(\tau)w(|y(\tau)|)d\tau + e^{-\alpha s}c(s)w(|y(s)|)]ds \\
&\le M|y_0|e^{-\alpha(t-t_0)} + \int_{t_0}^{t}Me^{-\alpha t}(a(s)+c(s))w(|y(s)|e^{\alpha s})ds \\
&\quad + \int_{t_0}^{t}Me^{-\alpha t}b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}k(\tau)w(|y(\tau)|e^{\alpha\tau})d\tau]ds.
\end{aligned}
$$

Set $u(t) = |y(t)|e^{\alpha t}$. Since $w(u)$ is nondecreasing, an application of Lemma 2.8 and (3.18) obtain

$$|y(t)| \le e^{-\alpha t}W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + M\int_{t_0}^{t}(a(s)+c(s)+b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}k(\tau)d\tau)ds\Big] \le e^{-\alpha t}M(t_0),$$

where $c = M|y_0|e^{\alpha t_0}$. Therefore, all solutions of (2.2) approch zero as $t \to \infty$. □

Acknowledgement. The authors are very grateful for the referee's valuable comments.

REFERENCES

1. V.M. Alekseev: An estimate for the perturbations of the solutions of ordinary differential equations. *Vestn. Mosk. Univ. Ser. I. Math. Mekh.* (Russian) **2** (1961), 28-36.
2. F. Brauer: Perturbations of nonlinear systems of differential equations, II. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **17** (1967), 418-434.
3. F. Brauer & A. Strauss: Perturbations of nonlinear systems of differential equations, III. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **31** (1970), 37-48.
4. F. Brauer: Perturbations of nonlinear systems of differential equations, IV. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **37** (1972), 214-222.

5. S.K. Choi & N.J. Koo: h-stability for nonlinear perturbed systems. *Ann. of Diff. Eqs.* **11** (1995), 1-9.
6. S.K. Choi, Y.H. Goo & N.J. Koo: Lipschitz and exponential asymptotic stability for nonlinear functional systems. *Dynamic Systems and Applications* **6** (1997), 397-410.
7. S.K. Choi, N.J. Koo & S.M. Song: Lipschitz stability for nonlinear functional differential systems. *Far East J. Math. Sci(FJMS)I* **5** (1999), 689-708.
8. F.M. Dannan & S. Elaydi: Lipschitz stability of nonlinear systems of differential systems. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **113** (1986), 562-577.
9. S. Elaydi & H.R. Farran: Exponentially asymptotically stable dynamical systems. *Appl. Anal.* **25** (1987), 243-252.
10. P. Gonzalez & M. Pinto: Stability properties of the solutions of the nonlinear functional differential systems. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **181** (1994), 562-573.
11. Y.H. Goo: Lipschitz and asymptotic stability for perturbed nonlinear differential systems. *J. Korean Soc. Math. Educ. Ser. B: Pure Appl. Math.* **21** (2014), 11-21.
12. ______: Boundedness in the perturbed differential systems. *J. Korean Soc. Math. Educ. Ser. B: Pure Appl. Math.* **20** (2013), 223-232.
13. Y.H. Goo & Y. Cui: Uniform Lipschitz and asymptotic stability for perturbed differential systems. *J. Chungcheong Math. Soc.* **26** (2013), 831-842.
14. Y.H. Goo & S.B. Yang: h-stability of the nonlinear perturbed differential systems via t_∞-similarity. *J. Chungcheong Math. Soc.* **24** (2011), 695-702.
15. V. Lakshmikantham & S. Leela: *Differential and Integral Inequalities: Theory and Applications Vol.I.* Academic Press, New York and London, 1969.
16. B.G. Pachpatte: A note on Gronwall-Bellman inequality. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **44** (1973), 758-762.

[a]Department of Mathematics, Hanseo University, Seosan, Chungnam, 356-706, Republic of Korea
Email address: schoi@hanseo.ac.kr

[b]Department of Mathematics, Hanseo University, Seosan, Chungnam, 356-706, Republic of Korea
Email address: yhgoo@hanseo.ac.kr