J. Korean Soc. Math. Educ. Ser. B: Pure Appl. Math. ISSN(Print) 1226-0657
http://dx.doi.org/10.7468/jksmeb.2015.22.2.101 ISSN(Online) 2287-6081
Volume 22, Number 2 (May 2015), Pages 101–112

BOUNDEDNESS IN THE FUNCTIONAL NONLINEAR PERTURBED DIFFERENTIAL SYSTEMS

Yoon Hoe Goo

Abstract. Alexseev's formula generalizes the variation of constants formula and permits the study of a nonlinear perturbation of a system with certain stability properties. In this paper, we investigate bounds for solutions of the functional nonlinear perturbed differential systems using the two notion of h-stability and t_∞-similarity.

1. Introduction

The behavior of solutions of a perturbed system is determined in terms of the behavior of solutions of an unperturbed system. There are three useful methods for showing the qualitative behavior of the solutions of perturbed nonlinear system : the use of integral inequalities, the method of variation of constants formula, and Lyapunov's second method.

The notion of h-stability (hS) was introduced by Pinto [15, 16] with the intention of obtaining results about stability for a weakly stable system (at least, weaker than those given exponential asymptotic stability) under some perturbations. That is, Pinto extended the study of exponential asymptotic stability to a variety of reasonable systems called h-systems. Also, he studied some general results about asymptotic integration and gave some important examples in [15]. Choi and Koo [2], Choi and Ryu [3], and Choi et al. [4,5,6] investigated h-stability and bounds of solutions for the perturbed functional differential systems. Also, Goo [8,9,10] studied the boundedness of solutions for the perturbed differential systems.

The main conclusion to be drawn from this paper is that the use of inequalities provides a powerful tool for obtaining bounds for solutions.

Received by the editors October 09, 2014. Revised November 20, 2014. Accepted Nov. 27, 2014.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 34D10.
Key words and phrases. h-stability, t_∞-similarity, functional differential systems.

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 functional nonlinear perturbed differential systems of (2.1)

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

where $g \in C(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $h \in C[\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n]$, $g(t, 0) = 0$, $h(t, 0, 0) = 0$, 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).

We recall some notions of h-stability [15].

Definition 2.1. The system (2.1) (the zero solution $x = 0$ of (2.1)) is called (hS)*h-stable* if there exist a constant $c \ge 1$, and a positive bounded continuous function h on $\mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$|x(t)| \le c\, |x_0|\, h(t)\, h(t_0)^{-1}$$

for $t \ge t_0 \ge 0$ and $|x_0| \le \delta$ (here $h(t)^{-1} = \frac{1}{h(t)}$).

Let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the set of all $n \times n$ continuous matrices $A(t)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^+$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be the subset of $\mathcal{M}$ consisting of those nonsingular matrices $S(t)$ that are of class C^1 with the property that $S(t)$ and $S^{-1}(t)$ are bounded. The notion of t_∞-similarity in $\mathcal{M}$ was introduced by Conti [7].

Definition 2.2. A matrix $A(t) \in \mathcal{M}$ is t_∞-*similar* to a matrix $B(t) \in \mathcal{M}$ if there exists an $n \times n$ matrix $F(t)$ absolutely integrable over $\mathbb{R}^+$, i.e.,

$$\int_0^\infty |F(t)|dt < \infty$$

such that

$$\dot{S}(t) + S(t)B(t) - A(t)S(t) = F(t) \tag{2.5}$$

for some $S(t) \in \mathcal{N}$.

The notion of t_∞-similarity is an equivalence relation in the set of all $n \times n$ continuous matrices on $\mathbb{R}^+$, and it preserves some stability concepts [4, 12].

In this paper, we investigate bounds for solutions of the nonlinear differential systems using the notion of t_∞-similarity.

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

Lemma 2.3 ([16]). *The linear system*

$$x' = A(t)x, \; x(t_0) = x_0, \tag{2.6}$$

where $A(t)$ is an $n \times n$ continuous matrix, is an h-system (respectively h-stable) if and only if there exist $c \geq 1$ and a positive and continuous (respectively bounded) function h defined on $\mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$|\phi(t, t_0)| \leq c\, h(t)\, h(t_0)^{-1} \tag{2.7}$$

for $t \geq t_0 \geq 0$, where $\phi(t, t_0)$ is a fundamental matrix of (2.6).

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

$$y' = f(t, y) + g(t, y), \; y(t_0) = y_0, \tag{2.8}$$

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 (2.8) 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 2.4. *Let $x(t) = x(t, t_0, y_0)$ and $y(t) = y(t, t_0, y_0)$ be solutions of (2.1) and (2.8), respectively. If $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then for all t such that $x(t, t_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

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

Theorem 2.5 ([3])**.** *If the zero solution of (2.1) is hS, then the zero solution of (2.3) is hS.*

Theorem 2.6 ([4])**.** *Suppose that $f_x(t, 0)$ is t_∞-similar to $f_x(t, x(t, t_0, x_0))$ for $t \geq t_0 \geq 0$ and $|x_0| \leq \delta$ for some constant $\delta > 0$. If the solution $v = 0$ of (2.3) is hS, then the solution $z = 0$ of (2.4) is hS.*

Lemma 2.7 ([6])**.** (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 $c > 0$,*

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

Then

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

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

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

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 $c > 0$,*

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

Then

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

where W, W^{-1} are the same functions as in Lemma 2.7, and

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

Lemma 2.9 ([9])**.** *Let $u, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4 \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0, \infty))$ and $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u, $u \leq w(u)$. Suppose that for some $c > 0$ and $0 \leq t_0 \leq t$,*

$$u(t) \leq c + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_1(s) u(s) ds + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_2(s) w(u(s)) ds + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_3(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_4(\tau) w(u(\tau)) d\tau ds,$$

Then

$$u(t) \leq W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t}(\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s) + \lambda_3(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\lambda_4(\tau)d\tau)ds\Big],\ t_0 \leq t < b_1,$$

where W, W^{-1} *are the same functions as in Lemma 2.7, and*

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

3. Main Results

In this section, we investigate boundedness for solutions of the functional nonlinear perturbed differential systems via t_∞-similarity.

Theorem 3.1. *Let* $a, b, c, k, u, w \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w(u)$ *be nondecreasing in* u *such that* $\frac{1}{v}w(u) \leq w(\frac{u}{v})$ *for some* $v > 0$. *Suppose that* $f_x(t, 0)$ *is* t_∞*-similar to* $f_x(t, x(t, t_0, x_0))$ *for* $t \geq t_0 \geq 0$ *and* $|x_0| \leq \delta$ *for some constant* $\delta > 0$, *the solution* $x = 0$ *of (2.1) is* hS *with the increasing function* h, *and* g *in (2.2) satisfies*

$$\int_{t_0}^{s}|g(\tau, y(\tau))|d\tau \leq a(s)w(|y(s))| + b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}k(\tau)w(|y(\tau)|)d\tau,\ t \geq t_0 \geq 0, \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$|h(s, y(s), Ty(s))| \leq c(s)w(|y(s)|), \tag{3.2}$$

where $\int_{t_0}^{\infty}a(s)ds < \infty$, $\int_{t_0}^{\infty}b(s)ds < \infty$, $\int_{t_0}^{\infty}c(s)ds < \infty$, *and* $\int_{t_0}^{\infty}k(s)ds < \infty$. *Then, any solution* $y(t) = y(t, t_0, y_0)$ *of (2.2) is bounded on* $[t_0, \infty)$ *and it satisfies*

$$|y(t)| \leq h(t)W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + c_2\int_{t_0}^{t}(a(s) + c(s) + b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}k(\tau)d\tau)ds\Big],\ t_0 \leq t < b_1,$$

where $c = c_1|y_0|\,h(t_0)^{-1}$, W, W^{-1} *are the same functions as in Lemma 2.7, and*

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \geq t_0 : W(c) + c_2\int_{t_0}^{t}(a(s) + c(s) + b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}k(\tau)d\tau)ds \in \mathrm{domW}^{-1}\Big\}.$$

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. By Theorem 2.5, since the solution $x = 0$ of (2.1) is hS, the solution $v = 0$ of (2.3) is hS. Therefore, by Theorem 2.6, the solution $z = 0$ of (2.4) is hS. Applying Lemmma 2.3, Lemma 2.4, the increasing property of the function h, (3.1), and (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|y(t)| &\le |x(t)| + \int_{t_0}^{t} |\Phi(t,s,y(s))|(\int_{t_0}^{s} |g(\tau,y(\tau))|d\tau + |h(s,y(s),Ty(s))|)ds \\ &\le c_1|y_0|h(t)\,h(t_0)^{-1} + \int_{t_0}^{t} c_2 h(t)h(s)^{-1}\Big((a(s)+c(s))w(|y(s)|) \\ &\quad + b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)w(|y(\tau)|)d\tau\Big)ds \\ &\le c_1|y_0|h(t)\,h(t_0)^{-1} + \int_{t_0}^{t} c_2 h(t)(a(s)+c(s))w(\frac{|y(s)|}{h(s)})ds \\ &\quad + \int_{t_0}^{t} c_2 h(t)b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)w(\frac{|y(\tau)|}{h(\tau)})d\tau ds.\end{aligned}$$

Defining $u(t) = |y(t)||h(t)|^{-1}$, then, by Lemma 2.8, we have

$$|y(t)| \le h(t)W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + c_2\int_{t_0}^{t}(a(s)+c(s)+b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)d\tau)ds\Big],$$

$t_0 \le t < b_1$, where $c = c_1|y_0|\,h(t_0)^{-1}$. Thus, any solution $y(t) = y(t,t_0,y_0)$ of (2.2) is bounded on $[t_0,\infty)$. This completes the proof. □

Remark 3.2. Letting $c(t) = 0$ in Theorem 3.1, we obtain the same result as that of Theorem 3.2 in [10].

Theorem 3.3. *Let $a, b, c, k, u, w \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u such that $u \le w(u)$ and $\frac{1}{v}w(u) \le w(\frac{u}{v})$ for some $v > 0$. Suppose that $f_x(t,0)$ is t_∞-similar to $f_x(t,x(t,t_0,x_0))$ for $t \ge t_0 \ge 0$ and $|x_0| \le \delta$ for some constant $\delta > 0$, the solution $x = 0$ of (2.1) is hS with the increasing function h, and g in (2.2) satisfies*

$$\int_{t_0}^{s} |g(\tau,y(\tau))|d\tau \le a(s)|y(s)| + b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)w(|y(\tau)|)d\tau,\ s \ge t_0 \ge 0, \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$|h(s,y(s),Ty(s))| \le c(s)w(|y(s)|), \tag{3.4}$$

where $\int_{t_0}^{\infty} a(s)ds < \infty$, $\int_{t_0}^{\infty} b(s)ds < \infty$, $\int_{t_0}^{\infty} c(s)ds < \infty$, and $\int_{t_0}^{\infty} k(s)ds < \infty$. Then, any solution $y(t) = y(t,t_0,y_0)$ of (2.2) is bounded on $[t_0,\infty)$ and it satisfies

$$|y(t)| \le h(t)W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + c_2\int_{t_0}^{t}(a(s)+c(s)+b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)d\tau)ds\Big],\ t_0 \le t < b_1,$$

where $c = c_1|y_0|\,h(t_0)^{-1}$, W, W^{-1} are the same functions as in Lemma 2.7, and

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \ge t_0 : W(c) + c_2\int_{t_0}^{t}(a(s)+c(s)+b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)d\tau)ds \in \mathrm{domW^{-1}}\Big\}.$$

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. By Theorem 2.5, since the solution $x = 0$ of (2.1) is hS, the solution $v = 0$ of (2.3) is hS. Therefore, by Theorem 2.6, the solution $z = 0$ of (2.4) is hS. Using the nonlinear variation of constants formula and the hS condition of $x = 0$ of (2.1), (3.3), and (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|y(t)| &\le |x(t)| + \int_{t_0}^{t} |\Phi(t,s,y(s))|(\int_{t_0}^{s} |g(\tau, y(\tau))|d\tau + |h(s, y(s), Ty(s))|)ds \\
&\le c_1|y_0|h(t)\, h(t_0)^{-1} + \int_{t_0}^{t} c_2 h(t)h(s)^{-1}\Big(a(s)|y(s)| \\
&\quad + b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)w(|y(\tau)|)d\tau + c(s)w(|y(s)|)\Big)ds \\
&\le c_1|y_0|h(t)\, h(t_0)^{-1} + \int_{t_0}^{t} c_2 h(t)(a(s)\frac{|y(s)|}{h(s)} + c(s)w(\frac{|y(s)|}{h(s)})ds \\
&\quad + \int_{t_0}^{t} c_2 h(t)b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)w(\frac{|y(\tau)|}{h(\tau)})d\tau ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Set $u(t) = |y(t)||h(t)|^{-1}$. Then, an application of Lemma 2.9 yields

$$|y(t)| \le h(t)W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + c_2\int_{t_0}^{t}(a(s) + c(s) + b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)d\tau)ds\Big],$$

$t_0 \le t < b_1$, where $c = c_1|y_0|\, h(t_0)^{-1}$. The above estimation yields the desired result since the function h is bounded. Thus, the theorem is proved. □

Remark 3.4. Letting $w(u) = u$ and $b(s) = c(s) = 0$ in Theorem 3.3, we obtain the same result as that of Theorem 3.3 in [11].

Lemma 3.5. *Let $u, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5 \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$ and $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u. Suppose that for some $c > 0$ and $0 \le t_0 \le t$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
u(t) \le c &+ \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_1(s)w(u(s))ds + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_2(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(\lambda_3(\tau)w(u(\tau)) \\
&+ \lambda_4(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \lambda_5(r)w(u(r))dr)d\tau ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
u(t) \le& W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t}(\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(\lambda_3(\tau) + \lambda_4(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \lambda_5(r)dr)d\tau)ds\Big], \\
&t_0 \le t < b_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where W, W^{-1} are the same functions as in Lemma 2.7, and

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \geq t_0 : W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} (\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} (\lambda_3(\tau) + \lambda_4(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \lambda_5(r)dr)d\tau)ds \in \mathrm{domW}^{-1}\Big\}.$$

Proof. Setting

$$z(t) = c + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_1(s)w(u(s))ds + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_2(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} (\lambda_3(\tau)w(u(\tau)) + \lambda_4(\tau) \textstyle\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \lambda_5(r)w(u(r))dr)d\tau ds,$$

then we have $z(t_0) = c$ and

$$\begin{aligned} z'(t) &= \lambda_1(t)w(u(t)) + \lambda_2(t) \int_{t_0}^{t} (\lambda_3(s)w(u(s)) + \lambda_4(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_5(\tau)w(u(\tau))d\tau)ds \\ &\leq (\lambda_1(t) + \lambda_2(t) \int_{t_0}^{t} (\lambda_3(s) + \lambda_4(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_5(\tau)d\tau)ds)w(z(t)),\ t \geq t_0, \end{aligned}$$

since $z(t)$ and $w(u)$ are nondecreasing and $u(t) \leq z(t)$. Therefore, by integrating on $[t_0, t]$, the function z satisfies

$$z(t) \leq c + \int_{t_0}^{t} (\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} (\lambda_3(\tau) + \lambda_4(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} \lambda_5(r)dr)d\tau)w(z(s)))ds. \quad (3.6)$$

It follows from Lemma 2.7 that (3.6) yields the estimate (3.5). □

Theorem 3.6. *Let $a, b, c, k, u, w \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u such that $\frac{1}{v}w(u) \leq w(\frac{u}{v})$ for some $v > 0$. Suppose that $f_x(t, 0)$ is t_∞-similar to $f_x(t, x(t, t_0, x_0))$ for $t \geq t_0 \geq 0$ and $|x_0| \leq \delta$ for some constant $\delta > 0$, the solution $x = 0$ of (2.1) is hS with the increasing function h, and g in (2.2) satisfies*

$$\Big|g(s, y(s))\Big| \leq a(s)w(|y(s)|) + b(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau)w(|y(\tau)|)d\tau \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$|h(s, y(s), Ty(s))| \leq c(s)w(|y(s)|), \quad (3.8)$$

where $\int_{t_0}^{\infty} a(s)ds < \infty$, $\int_{t_0}^{\infty} b(s)ds < \infty$, $\int_{t_0}^{\infty} c(s)ds < \infty$, and $\int_{t_0}^{\infty} k(s)ds < \infty$. Then, any solution $y(t) = y(t, t_0, y_0)$ of (2.2) is bounded on $[t_0, \infty)$ and

$$|y(t)| \leq h(t)W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + c_2 \int_{t_0}^{t} (c(s) + \int_{t_0}^{s} (a(\tau) + b(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r)dr)d\tau)ds\Big],$$

$t_0 \le t < b_1$, *where* $c = c_1|y_0|\, h(t_0)^{-1}$, W, W^{-1} *are the same functions as in Lemma 2.7, and*

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \ge t_0 : W(c)+c_2\int_{t_0}^{t}(c(s)+\int_{t_0}^{s}(a(\tau)+b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r)dr)d\tau)ds \in \mathrm{domW}^{-1}\Big\}.$$

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. By Theorem 2.5, since the solution $x = 0$ of (2.1) is hS, the solution $v = 0$ of (2.3) is hS. Therefore, by Theorem 2.6, the solution $z = 0$ of (2.4) is hS. By Lemma 2.3, Lemma 2.4, the increasing property of the function h, (3.7), and (3.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|y(t)| &\le |x(t)| + \int_{t_0}^{t} |\Phi(t, s, y(s))|(\int_{t_0}^{s} |g(\tau, y(\tau))|d\tau + |h(s, y(s), Ty(s))|)ds \\
&\le c_1|y_0|h(t)\, h(t_0)^{-1} + \int_{t_0}^{t} c_2 h(t)h(s)^{-1}\Big(\int_{t_0}^{s}(a(\tau)w(|y(\tau)|) \\
&\quad +b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r)w(|y(r)|)dr)d\tau + c(s)w(|y(s)|)\Big)ds \\
&\le c_1|y_0|h(t)\, h(t_0)^{-1} + \int_{t_0}^{t} c_2 h(t)\Big(c(s)w(\frac{|y(s)|}{h(s)}) \\
&\quad + \int_{t_0}^{s}(a(\tau)w(\frac{|y(\tau)|}{h(\tau)}) + b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r)w(\frac{|y(r)|}{h(r)})dr)d\tau\Big)ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Set $u(t) = |y(t)||h(t)|^{-1}$. Then, Lemma 3.5, we obtain

$$|y(t)| \le h(t)W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + c_2\int_{t_0}^{t}(c(s) + \int_{t_0}^{s}(a(\tau) + b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r)dr)d\tau)ds\Big],$$

$t_0 \le t < b_1$, where $c = c_1|y_0|\, h(t_0)^{-1}$. Thus, any solution $y(t) = y(t, t_0, y_0)$ of (2.2) is bounded on $[t_0, \infty)$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.7. *Let* $u, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5 \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0, \infty))$ *and* $w(u)$ *be nondecreasing in* u, $u \le w(u)$. *Suppose that for some* $c > 0$ *and* $t_0 \le t < b_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
u(t) \le c &+ \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_1(s)w(u(s))ds + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_2(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_3(\tau)u(\tau)d\tau \\
&+ \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_4(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_5(\tau)w(u(\tau))d\tau ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
u(t) \le W^{-1}\Big[W(c) +&\int_{t_0}^{t}(\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_3(\tau)d\tau \\
&+ \lambda_4(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_5(\tau)d\tau)ds\Big],\ t_0 \le t < b_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where W, W^{-1} are the same functions as in Lemma 2.7, and

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \geq t_0 : W(c) + \int_{t_0}^t (\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s)\int_{t_0}^s \lambda_3(\tau)d\tau + \lambda_4(s)\int_{t_0}^s \lambda_5(\tau)d\tau)ds \in \mathrm{domW}^{-1}\Big\}.$$

Proof. Define a function $v(t)$ by the right member of (3.9) . Then

$$v'(t) = \lambda_1(t)w(u(t)) + \lambda_2(t)\int_{t_0}^t \lambda_3(s)u(s)ds + \lambda_4(t)\int_{t_0}^t \lambda_5(s)w(u(s))ds,$$

which implies

$$v'(t) \leq \Big[\lambda_1(t) + \lambda_2(t)\int_{t_0}^t \lambda_3(s)ds + \lambda_4(t)\int_{t_0}^t \lambda_5(s)ds\Big]w(v(t)),$$

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

$$v(t) \leq c + \int_{t_0}^t \Big(\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s)\int_{t_0}^s \lambda_3(\tau)d\tau + \lambda_4(s)\int_{t_0}^s \lambda_5(\tau)d\tau\Big)w(v(s))ds. \tag{3.11}$$

Then, by the well-known Bihari-type inequality, (3.11) yields the estimate (3.10). □

Theorem 3.8. *Let $a, b, c, k, u, w \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u such that $u \leq w(u)$ and $\frac{1}{v}w(u) \leq w(\frac{u}{v})$ for some $v > 0$. Suppose that $f_x(t, 0)$ is t_∞-similar to $f_x(t, x(t, t_0, x_0))$ for $t \geq t_0 \geq 0$ and $|x_0| \leq \delta$ for some constant $\delta > 0$, the solution $x = 0$ of (2.1) is hS with the increasing function h, and g in (2.2) satisfies*

$$\Big|g(s, y(s))\Big| \leq a(s)w(|y(s)|) \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$|h(s, y(s), Ty(s))| \leq b(s)w(|y(s)|) + c(s)\int_{t_0}^s k(\tau)|y(\tau)|d\tau, \tag{3.13}$$

where $\int_{t_0}^\infty a(s)ds < \infty$, $\int_{t_0}^\infty b(s)ds < \infty$, $\int_{t_0}^\infty c(s)ds < \infty$, and $\int_{t_0}^\infty k(s)ds < \infty$. Then, any solution $y(t) = y(t, t_0, y_0)$ of (2.2) is bounded on $[t_0, \infty)$ and

$$|y(t)| \leq h(t)W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + c_2\int_{t_0}^t (b(s) + c(s)\int_{t_0}^s k(\tau)d\tau + \int_{t_0}^s a(\tau)d\tau)ds\Big],$$

$t_0 \leq t < b_1$, where $c = c_1|y_0|\,h(t_0)^{-1}$, W, W^{-1} are the same functions as in Lemma 2.7, and

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \geq t_0 : W(c) + c_2\int_{t_0}^t (b(s) + c(s)\int_{t_0}^s k(\tau)d\tau + \int_{t_0}^s a(\tau)d\tau)ds \in \mathrm{domW}^{-1}\Big\}.$$

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. By Theorem 2.5, since the solution $x = 0$ of (2.1) is hS, the solution $v = 0$ of (2.3) is hS. Therefore, by Theorem 2.6, the solution $z = 0$ of (2.4) is hS. Using two Lemma 2.3, Lemma 2.4, the hS condition of $x = 0$ of (2.1), (3.12), and (3.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|y(t)| &\leq |x(t)| + \int_{t_0}^{t} |\Phi(t,s,y(s))| (\int_{t_0}^{s} |g(\tau, y(\tau))| d\tau + |h(s, y(s), Ty(s))|) ds \\ &\leq c_1 |y_0| h(t)\, h(t_0)^{-1} + \int_{t_0}^{t} c_2 h(t) h(s)^{-1} \Big(\int_{t_0}^{s} a(\tau) w(|y(\tau)|) d\tau \\ &\quad + b(s) w(|y(s)|) + c(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau) |y(\tau)| d\tau \Big) ds \\ &\leq c_1 |y_0| h(t)\, h(t_0)^{-1} + \int_{t_0}^{t} c_2 h(t) \Big(b(s) w(\frac{|y(s)|}{h(s)}) \\ &\quad + c(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau) \frac{|y(\tau)|}{h(\tau)} d\tau + \int_{t_0}^{s} a(\tau) w(\frac{|y(\tau)|}{h(\tau)}) d\tau \Big) ds.\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 3.7 with $u(t) = |y(t)||h(t)|^{-1}$, we have

$$|y(t)| \leq h(t) W^{-1} \Big[W(c) + c_2 \int_{t_0}^{t} (b(s) + c(s) \int_{t_0}^{s} k(\tau) d\tau + \int_{t_0}^{s} a(\tau) d\tau) ds \Big],$$

$t_0 \leq t < b_1$, where $c = c_1 |y_0|\, h(t_0)^{-1}$. The above estimation implies the boundedness of $y(t)$, and so the proof is complete. □

Remark 3.9. Letting $b(t)w(u(t)) = b(t)u(t)$ in Theorem 3.8, we obtain the same result as that of Theorem 2.4 in [9].

Acknowledgement. The author is 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.* **2** (1961), 28-36(Russian).
2. S.K. Choi & N.J. Koo: $h-$stability for nonlinear perturbed systems. *Ann. of Diff. Eqs.* **11** (1995), 1-9.
3. S.K. Choi & H.S. Ryu: $h-$stability in differential systems. *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sinica* **21** (1993), 245-262.
4. S.K. Choi, N.J. Koo & H.S. Ryu: h-stability of differential systems via t_∞-similarity. *Bull. Korean. Math. Soc.* **34** (1997), 371-383.

5. S.K. Choi, Y.H. Goo & N.J. Koo: Lipschitz exponential asymptotic stability for nonlinear functional systems. *Dynamic Systems and Applications* **6** (1997), 397-410.
6. 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.
7. R. Conti, Sulla: t_∞-similitudine tra matricie l'equivalenza asintotica dei sistemi differenziali lineari. *Rivista di Mat. Univ. Parma* **8** (1957), 43-47.
8. Y.H. Goo: Boundedness in the perturbed differential systems. *J. Korean Soc. Math. Edu. Ser.B: Pure Appl. Math.* **20** (2013), 223-232.
9. ______: Boundedness in nonlinear functional perturbed differential systems. *submitted.*
10. ______: Boundedness in perturbed nonlinear differential systems. *J. Chungcheong Math. Soc.* **26** (2013), 605-613.
11. Y.H. Goo & D.H. Ry: h-stability of the nonlinear perturbed differential systems. *J. Chungcheong Math. Soc.* **23** (2010), 827-834.
12. G.A. Hewer: Stability properties of the equation by t_∞-similarity. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **41** (1973), 336-344.
13. V. Lakshmikantham & S. Leela: *Differential and Integral Inequalities: Theory and Applications Vol.*. Academic Press, New York and London, 1969.
14. B.G. Pachpatte: On some retarded inequalities and applications *J. Ineq. Pure Appl. Math.* **3** (2002) 1-7.
15. M. Pinto: Perturbations of asymptotically stable differential systems. *Analysis* **4** (1984), 161-175.
16. ______: Stability of nonlinear differential systems. *Applicable Analysis* **43** (1992), 1-20.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HANSEO UNIVERSITY, SEOSAN, CHUNGNAM, 356-706, REPUBLIC OF KOREA
Email address: yhgoo@hanseo.ac.kr