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## 1. Introduction

Let us consider the system

$$
\begin{equation*}
\overline{\mathbf{X}}^{\prime}=A(t) \overline{\mathbf{X}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\overline{\mathbf{X}}=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right)$ and $A(t)$ is a $3 \times 3$ matrix given by

$$
A(t)=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0 & 1 & 0  \tag{2}\\
\alpha & 0 & 1 \\
\beta & \gamma & 0
\end{array}\right]_{(t)}
$$

The coefficients $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ are real valued bounded functions defined on the ray $[0, \infty)$ such that $\alpha$ and $\gamma$ are $C^{1}$ and $\beta$ is continuous.

System (1) is equivalent to the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime \prime}=(\alpha+\gamma) y^{\prime}+\left(\alpha^{\prime}+\beta\right) y, \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

in the sense that the correspondence $y \rightarrow \overline{\mathrm{X}}=\left(y, y^{\prime}, y^{\prime \prime}-\alpha y\right)$ establishes an isomorphism between the solution space of (3) and that of (1).

We denote by $S$ the solution space of (1). For each $\ddot{\mathbf{X}} \in S$ we define $V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t)=x_{2}^{2}-2 x_{1} x_{3}+(\gamma(t)-\alpha(t)) x_{1}^{2} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We write $l(\overline{\mathbf{X}})=\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t)$ when this limit exists. The following sets will be important in this work:

[^0]\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{0} & =\left\{\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S \mid \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\|\overline{\mathbf{X}}(t)\|=0\right\}, \\
S_{+} & =\left\{\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S \mid V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t) \geqslant 0, \forall t \geqslant 0\right\}, \\
S_{-} & =\left\{\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S \mid V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t) \leqslant 0, \forall t \geqslant 0\right\}, \\
S_{\mathbf{2}} & =\left\{\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S \mid\|\overline{\mathbf{X}}\| \in L^{2}\right\} . .^{1}
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

In Section 2 we will derive some propositions concerning $S_{0}, S_{2}, S_{+}, S_{-}$and the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of (1). From these propositions Theorems 1 and 2 (see Section 2) will be proved. In Section 3 we will apply these theorems to the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime \prime}=p y^{\prime}+q y, \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

to obtain Theorem 3 of this paper. Theorem 3 was motivated by Theorems 2.3 and 3.3 of [2]. We point out that as a difference with [2] we do not impose any sign restriction on $p$, and the condition $q$ bounded has been weakened (see Theorem 3 below). (We note that $p$ and $q$ of (5) are the negatives of those in [2].) In Section 4 we derive some oscillatory properties of (5).
In the sequel we will need the following lemmas which we establish here without proof:

Lemma 1. In Equation (1) let us assume that $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ are continuous and bounded for $t \geqslant 0$; then if $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right) \in S$ is such that $x_{1}(t)$ is bounded on $[0, \infty)$, then $x_{2}(t)$ and $x_{3}(t)$ are also bounded on $[0, \infty)$.

Lemma 2. Under the assumptions of Lemma 1, if now $x_{1} \in L^{2}$ then $x_{2} \in L^{2}$ and $x_{3} \in L^{2}$.

Lemma 3. Let $f \in C[0, \infty)$. If $f \in L^{2}$ and $f^{\prime}$ is bounded then $f(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 3 is elementary. For a proof of Lemmas 1 and 2 see, for instance, [1].

## 2

We begin this section with the following:
Proposition 1. If $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \geqslant k>0(\leqslant-k<0), k \in \mathbb{R}$, then $V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t)$ is a strictly decreasing (strictly increasing) function of $t \in[0, \infty)$ for each nontrivial $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S$. From here $l(\mathbf{X})$ exists and $-\infty \leqslant l(\overline{\mathbf{X}})<+\infty(-\infty<l(\overline{\mathbf{X}}) \leqslant+\infty)$.
${ }^{1}$ In what follows $f \in L^{p}, p \geqslant 1$ means $f \in L^{p}[0, \infty), p \geqslant 1$.

Proof. It follows from the fact that for each $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t)-V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}\left(t_{0}\right)=-\int_{t_{0}}^{t}\left[(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta\right] x_{1}^{2} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proposition 2. If $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \geqslant k>0(\leqslant-k<0)$ and if $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S$ is such that $l(\overline{\mathbf{X}})>-\infty(<+\infty)$, then $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{2}$.

Proof. If $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \geqslant k>0$, then from (6) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
k \int_{0}^{t} x_{1}^{2}(s) d s \leqslant V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(0)-V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $l(\overline{\mathbf{X}})>-\infty$ it follows that $x_{1} \in L^{2}$. Similarly if $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \leqslant-k<0$ from (6) and $l(\overline{\mathbf{X}})<+\infty$, it follows that $x_{1} \in L^{2}$. For both cases from Lemma 2 it follows that $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{2}$.

Proposition 3. If $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{2}$ then $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{0}$.
Proof. Assume $\overline{\mathbf{X}}=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right) \in S_{2}$, that is, $x_{i}(t) \in L^{2}, i=1,2,3$. From (1) it follows that $x_{i}^{\prime} \in I^{2}$, and then $x_{i} x_{i}^{\prime} \in L^{1}, i=1,2,3$. Next from $\left.x_{i}{ }^{2}\right|_{0} ^{t}=$ $2 \int_{0}^{t} x_{i} x_{i}^{\prime}$ we obtain that $x_{i}(t)$ is bounded on $[0, \infty), i=1,2,3$. Again from (1) it follows that $x_{i}^{\prime}$ is bounded on $[0, \infty), i=1,2,3$. Finally from Lemma 3 if $x_{i} \in L^{2}$ and $x_{i}^{\prime}$ is bounded, then $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} x_{i}(t)=0, i=1,2,3$. Thus $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{0}$.

From Propositions 2 and 3 the following proposition follows immediately.
Proposition 4. If $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \geqslant k>0(\leqslant-k<0)$ then for $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S$ we have $l(\overline{\mathbf{X}})>-\infty(l(\overline{\mathbf{X}})<+\infty) \Leftrightarrow \overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{2} \Leftrightarrow \overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{0} \Leftrightarrow l(\overline{\mathbf{X}})=0$.

Proposition 5. If $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \geqslant k>0 \quad(\leqslant-k<0)$ then $S_{0}=S_{+}$ ( $S_{0}=S_{-}$). Then from Proposition 4 it follows that $S_{0}=S_{2}=S_{+}\left(S_{0}=S_{2}=S_{-}\right)$.

Proof. We assume $\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ nontrivial. Then if $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \geqslant k>0$ $(\leqslant-k<0), V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t)$ is strictly decreasing (strictly increasing). If now $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{\mathbf{0}}$ then $l(\overline{\mathbf{X}})=0$, and we must have $V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t)>0\left(V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t)<0\right) \forall t \in[0, \infty)$. Then $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{+}\left(S_{-}\right)$. Assume next that $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{+}\left(S_{-}\right)$; then $V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t) \geqslant 0\left(V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t) \leqslant 0\right)$. Since $l(\mathbf{X})$ exists we must have $l(\overline{\mathbf{X}}) \geqslant 0(l(\mathbf{X}) \leqslant 0)$. From Proposition 4 we then have $l(\overline{\mathbf{X}})=0$. Thus $S_{+}\left(S_{-}\right) \subset S_{\mathbf{0}}$. This finishes the proof.

Proposition 6. If $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \geqslant k>0$ and if $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S-S_{0}$, then there exists a $t_{0} \geqslant 0$ such that $x_{1}(t) \neq 0 \forall t \geqslant t_{0}$. If $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \leqslant-k<0$ and if $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{\mathbf{0}}-\mathbf{O}$, then $x_{\mathbf{1}}(t) \neq 0 \forall t \in[0, \infty)$.

Proof. Let $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \geqslant k>0$ and $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S-S_{0}=S-S_{+}$. Then there exists a $t_{0} \geqslant 0$ such that $V_{\overline{\mathbf{X}}}\left(t_{0}\right)<0$. Since $V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t)$ is strictly decreasing we
have that $V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t)<0 \forall t \in\left[t_{0}, \infty\right)$. Then $x_{1}(t) \neq 0 \forall t \in\left[t_{0}, \infty\right)$, since if $x_{1}\left(t^{*}\right)=0$ for some $t^{*} \in\left(t_{0}, \infty\right)$ we would have $0 \leqslant x_{2}^{2}\left(t^{*}\right)=V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}\left(t^{*}\right)<0$, which is a contradiction. Assume now that $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \leqslant-k<0$ and that $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{\mathbf{0}}-\mathbf{O} \subset S_{\ldots}$. Thus $V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(t)<0 \forall t \in[0, \infty)$. Then if there exists a $t^{*}$ such that $x_{1}\left(t^{*}\right)=0$, we have $V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}\left(t^{*}\right)=x_{2}{ }^{2}\left(t^{*}\right) \geqslant 0$. Contradiction, and $x_{1}(t) \neq 0 \forall t \in[0, \infty)$.

Next we note that for a function $\phi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3}$ either $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\|\phi(t)\|=+\infty$ or $\phi$ has a limit point, that is, there exists a sequence $\{t n\}, t n \rightarrow+\infty n \rightarrow \infty$, such that $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}(t n)=p \in \mathbb{R}^{3}$.

Proposition 7. If $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \geqslant k>0(\leqslant-k<0)$, then (i) $\mathbf{X} \in S_{0} \Leftrightarrow \overline{\mathbf{X}}$ is bounded $\Leftrightarrow \overline{\mathbf{X}}$ has a limit point; (ii) $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S-S_{0} \Leftrightarrow \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\|\overline{\mathbf{X}}(t)\|=+\infty$.

Proof. (i) We only prove that if $\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ has a limit point then $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{0}$. If $\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ has a limit point then $l(\overline{\mathbf{X}})>-\infty(<+\infty)$ and from Proposition $4, \overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{0}$. (ii) It follows from (i).

Proposition 8. (i) If $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \geqslant k>0$ then $\operatorname{dim} S_{0}=2$; (ii) If $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \leqslant-k<0$ then $\operatorname{dim} S_{0}=1$.

Proof. (i) Let $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{1}, \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{2}, \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{3}$ be a basis for $S$ such that $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{3}(0)=(0,0,1)$. From $V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{3}}(0)=0$ it follows that $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{3} \notin S_{+}=S_{0}$. Thus $S-S_{0} \neq \phi$ and $\operatorname{dim} S_{0} \leqslant 2$. Next we show the existence of two linearly independent elements in $S_{0}$. Let us denote by $H \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ the hyperplane $x_{1}=0$. We note that if $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S$ is such that $\overline{\mathbf{X}}\left(t_{0}\right) \in H$ then $V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}\left(t_{0}\right)=x_{2}^{2}\left(t_{0}\right) \geqslant 0$. Now for each integer $m \geqslant 1$ it is easy to see the existence of $\alpha_{m 1}, \alpha_{m 3}, \beta_{m 2}, \beta_{m 3} \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha_{m 1}^{2} \dashv \alpha_{m 3}^{2}=\beta_{m 2}^{2}+\beta_{m 3}^{2}=1$ and such that the elements $Z_{m 1}, Z_{m 2} \in S$ defined by $Z_{m 1}=\alpha_{m 1} \mathbf{X}_{1}+\alpha_{m 3} \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{3}$, $Z_{m 2}=\beta_{m 2} \overleftarrow{\mathbf{X}}_{2}+\beta_{m 3} \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{3}$ satisfy $Z_{m 1}(m), Z_{m 2}(m) \in H$. Then $V_{Z_{m i}}(m) \geqslant 0$, for $m=1,2, \ldots$, and $i=1,2$. Since $V_{\overline{\mathbf{X}}}$ is strictly decreasing for $\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ nontrivial, it follows that $V_{Z_{m i}}(t)>0$ for $t \in[0, m), m=1,2, \ldots, i=1,2$. From a classical argument we can assume that $Z_{m i}(t) \rightarrow Z_{i}(t)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty, i=1,2, t \geqslant 0$, where $Z_{1}$ and $Z_{2}$ are two nontrivial elements of $S$. Then $V_{Z_{i}}(t) \geqslant 0, t \geqslant 0, i=1,2$, and since $V_{Z_{1}}, V_{Z_{2}}$ are strictly decreasing, we obtain $V_{Z_{i}}(t)>0$ for $t \geqslant 0, i=1,2$. We claim that $Z_{1}$ and $Z_{2}$ are linearly independent. Assume they are not. Then $Z_{i}= \pm \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{3}, i=1,2$. This implies $V_{Z_{i}}(t)=V_{ \pm \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{3}}(t)=V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{3}}(t)<0, \forall t \geqslant 0$. Contradiction. This finishes the proof of (i).
(ii) Wc first prove that $\operatorname{dim} S_{0} \leqslant 1$. Let us define by $P=$ $\left\{\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S \mid x_{\mathbf{1}}(0)=0\right\}$; then $P$ is a two-dimensional subspace of $S$, such that if $\overline{\mathbf{X}}=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right) \in P$, then $V_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}(0)=x_{2}{ }^{2}(0) \geqslant 0$. Since $S_{0}=S_{-}$we have that $P \cap S_{0}=\{0\}$. Then $\operatorname{dim} S_{0} \leqslant 1$. Next let $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{1}, \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{2}, \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{3}$ be a basis for $S$ such that $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{2}, \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{3}$ are also a basis for $P$. For each integer $m \geqslant 1$ let $\alpha_{m 1}, \alpha_{m 2}, \alpha_{m 3}$ be numbers such that $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \alpha_{m i}^{2}=1$ and such that $Z_{m}=\sum_{i=1}^{3} \alpha_{m i} \mathbf{X}_{i} \in S$ satisfies $Z_{m}(m) \in\left\{\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{3} \mid x_{1}=x_{2}=0\right\}$. Then $V_{Z_{m}}(m)=0$ and hence
$V_{Z_{m}}(t)<0$ for $t \in[0, m)$. Again from a classical argument we can assume that $Z_{m}(t) \rightarrow Z(t)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty, t \geqslant 0$, where $Z \in S$ and is nontrivial. Then $Z \in S_{-}=S_{0}$ and $\operatorname{dim} S_{0} \geqslant 1$. We conclude $\operatorname{dim} S_{0}=1$.

The next two theorems follow from the propositions we have proved.
Theorem 1. If $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \geqslant k>0$ in Equation (1), then
(i) $S_{2}=S_{+}=S_{0}$.
(ii) If $\overline{\mathbf{X}}=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right) \in S-S_{0}$, then there exists a $t_{0} \geqslant 0$ such that $x_{1}(t) \neq 0, \forall t \geqslant t_{0}$.
(iii) $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{0}$ if and only if $x_{1}(t)$ is bounded, $t \in[0, \infty)$.
(iv) If $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \notin S_{0}$ then $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\left(x_{1}{ }^{2}+x_{2}{ }^{2}+x_{3}{ }^{2}\right)=+\infty$.
(v) $\operatorname{dim} S_{0}=2$.

Theorem 2. If $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \leqslant-k<0$ in Equation (1), then
(i) $S_{0}=S_{2}=S_{-}$.
(ii) If $\overline{\mathbf{X}}=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right) \in S_{0}, \overline{\mathbf{X}}$ nontrivial, then $x_{1}(t) \neq 0 \forall t \in[0, \infty)$.
(iii) $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \in S_{0}$ if and only if $x_{1}(t)$ is bounded, $t \in[0, \infty)$.
(iv) If $\overline{\mathbf{X}} \notin S_{0}$ then $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\left(x_{1}{ }^{2}+x_{2}{ }^{2}+x_{3}{ }^{2}\right)=+\infty$.
(v) $\operatorname{dim} S_{0}=1$.

## 3. Application to Equation (5)

In this section we will apply Theorems 1 and 2 to Equation (5). For this equation we assume that $q$ is continuous and that $p$ is $C^{\mathbf{1}}$ and bounded on $[0, \infty)$. We denote by $T$ the solution space of (5) and by

$$
T_{0}=\left\{y \in T \mid \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} y^{(i)}(t)=0, i=0,1,2\right\}
$$

From Theorems 1 and 2 the following theorem can be deduced for Equation (5),
'Theorem 3. Assume there exist bounded functions $\alpha, \beta, \gamma:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \beta$ continuous, $\alpha$ and $\gamma$ of class $C^{1}$ such that $\alpha+\gamma=p, \alpha^{\prime}+\beta=q$. Then if $2 q-p^{\prime} \geqslant k>0$ we have
(i) $\operatorname{dim} T_{0}=2$,
(ii) if $y \notin T_{0}$ then there exists $a t_{0} \geqslant 0$ such that $y(t) \neq 0 \forall t \geqslant t_{0}$.

If $p^{\prime}-2 q \geqslant k>0$ we have
(iii) $\operatorname{dim} T_{0}=1$,
(iv) if $y \in T_{0}, y$ nontrivial, then $y(t) \neq 0 \forall t \geqslant 0$.

If now $2 q \quad p^{\prime} \geqslant k>0$ or $p^{\prime}-2 q \geqslant k>0$ we have
(v) $T_{0}=\left\{y \in T \mid y^{(i)} \in L^{2}, i=0,1,2\right\}$,
(vi) $y \in T_{0}$ if and only if $y(t)$ is bounded, $t \in[0, \infty)$,
(vii) if $y \notin T_{0}$ then $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\left[y^{2}+y^{\prime 2}+\left(y^{\prime \prime}-\alpha y\right)^{2}\right]=+\infty$.

Proof. From the hypothesis of the theorem it follows that if $2 q-p^{\prime} \geqslant$ $k>0\left(p^{\prime}-2 q \geqslant k>0\right)$, then $(\alpha-\gamma)^{\prime}+2 \beta \geqslant k>0(\leqslant-k<0)$. Then the proof follows from the fact that the spaces $T$ and $S$ are isomorphic under the transformation $y \rightarrow\left(y, y^{\prime}, y^{\prime \prime}-\alpha y\right)$ and from Theorems 1 and 2.

Note 1. We point out that the hypothesis on the functions $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ of Theorem 3 are satisfied, for instance, for each of the following (nonidentical) cases:
(1) $q$ bounded $(\alpha=0, \gamma=p, \beta=q)$,
(2) $q-p^{\prime}$ bounded ( $\alpha=p, \gamma=0, \beta-q-p^{\prime}$ ),
(3) $2 q-p^{\prime}$ bounded $\left(\alpha=\gamma=p / 2,2 \beta=2 q-p^{\prime}\right)$.

## 4. Application to the Oscillatory Behavior of Equation (5)

In this section we study the oscillatory behavior of Equation (5), assuming that $p, q:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy, $p$ is $C^{1}$ and bounded, and $q$ is continuous. Together with (5) we consider its formal adjoint,

$$
\begin{equation*}
z^{\prime \prime \prime}-p^{*} z^{\prime}+q^{*} z, \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $p^{*}=p$ and $q^{*}==p^{\prime}-q$. We also assume the hypothesis of Theorem 3, that is, there exist bounded functions $\alpha, \beta, \gamma:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \beta$ continuous, $\alpha, \gamma$ of class $C^{1}$, such that $\alpha+\gamma=p, \alpha^{\prime}+\beta=q$ is satisfied by Equation (5). We note that this is equivalent to saying the hypothesis is satisfied by Equation (8). In fact we just take $\alpha^{*}=\gamma, \gamma^{*}=\alpha$, and $\beta^{*}=-\beta$.

We define by $T^{*}$ the solution space of (8) and by $T_{0}^{*}$ the subspace, $T_{0}^{*}=$ $\left\{z \in T^{*} \mid \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} z^{(i)}(t)=0, i=0,1,2\right\}$. Thus $T^{*}$ and $T_{0}^{*}$ play for (8) the same role as $T$ and $T_{0}$ do for (5).

We recall here that $f:[a, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f$ nontrivial, is said to be oscillatory if $\sup \{t \geqslant a \mid f(t)=0\}=+\infty$. We denote by $\theta\left(\theta^{*}\right)$ the subset of $T\left(T^{*}\right)$ formed by all the oscillatory solutions of (5) ((8)).

For $y \in T$ and $w \in T^{*}$ we define

$$
\begin{equation*}
[y, w]=w y^{\prime \prime}-w^{\prime} y^{\prime}+\left(w^{\prime \prime}-p w\right) y . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is clear that $[y, w]$ is $\mathbb{R}$-bilinear and that $[y, w]$ is constant.
For each $w \in T^{*}$ we consider the linear operator $L_{w}: T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $L_{w}(y)=[y, w]$, clearly $L_{w} \neq \mathbf{O}$ if $w$ is nontrivial.

For $w \in T^{*}$, nontrivial, we define

$$
\begin{equation*}
H(w)=\operatorname{Ker} L_{w}=\{y \in T \mid[y, w]=0\} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $H(w)$ is a two-dimensional subspace of $T$. Also if $w_{1}$ and $w_{2}$ are two nontrivial elements of $T^{*}$, then $H\left(w_{1}\right)=H\left(w_{2}\right)$ if and only if $w_{2}=\lambda w_{1}$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. If now $w \in T^{*}$ is such that $w(t) \neq 0, \forall t \geqslant t_{0}$, then clearly $H(w)$ coincides with the solution space of the following sccond-order O.D.E.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}-\frac{w^{\prime}}{w^{\prime}} y^{\prime}+\frac{\left(w^{\prime \prime}-p w\right)}{w} y=0, \quad \forall t \geqslant t_{0} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next we will consider separately the two cases: (1) $2 q-p^{\prime} \geqslant k>0$ and (2) $p^{\prime}-2 q \geqslant k>0$.
(1) $2 q-p^{\prime} \geqslant k>0$

In this case Equation (5) satisfies (i), (ii), (v), (vi), and (vii) of Theorem 3, and Equation (8) satisfies (iii), (iv), (v), (vi) and (vii) of Theorem 3.

Proposition 9. If $\theta \neq \phi$ then $\theta+\{0\}=T_{0}$.
Proof. From Theorem 3(ii) we have $\theta \subset T_{0}$. To show that $T_{0}-\{0\} \subset \theta$ let $u_{0}, v_{0}$ be a basis for $T_{0}$. Then $w_{0}=u_{0} v_{0}^{\prime}-u_{0}^{\prime} v_{0} \in T^{*}$ and satisfies $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} w_{0}^{(i)}(t)=0, i=0,1,2$. Thus $w_{0}$ is a basis for $T_{0}^{*}$ and $w_{0}(t) \neq 0 \forall t \geqslant 0$. Then since $u_{0}$ and $v_{v}$ satisfy $\left[y, w_{v}\right]-0$, we have that $T_{0}$ coincides with the solution space of (11), for $w=w_{0}$ and $t \geqslant 0$. Finally since $\theta \neq \phi, \theta \subset T_{0}$, we conclude that all the elements of $T_{0}-\{0\}$ are oscillatory, that is, $T_{0}-\{0\} \subset \theta$.

Note 2. We note that from the proof of Proposition 9 it follows that $T_{0}$ coincides with the solution space of an O.D.E. of second order.

Proposition 10. If $\theta=T_{0}-\{0\}$ then $\theta^{*}=T^{*}-T_{0}^{*}$.
Proof. Let $w \in T^{*}-T_{0}^{*}$. Then $H(w) \cap T_{0}$ is a line of $T$ (otherwise $w \in T_{0}^{*}$ ). Assume next that $w$ is not oscillatory, that is, $w(t) \neq 0 \forall t \geqslant t_{0}$. Then the elements of $H(w)$ will satisfy (11) for $t \geqslant t_{0}$. Let $u \in H(w) \cap T_{0}$, $u$ nontrivial. Then $u \in \theta$ and hence all the elements of the solution space of (11) are oscillatory.

It follows that $H(w) \subset \theta+\{0\}=T_{0}$. But then $H(w) \cap T_{0}$ cannot be a line of $T$. Contradiction. Thus $T^{*}-T_{0}^{*} \subset \theta^{*}$. On the other hand, from Theorem 3(iv) we have $\theta^{*} \subset T^{*}-T_{0}^{*}$. We conclude that $\theta^{*}=I^{*}-T_{0}^{*}$.

Proposition 11. If $\theta^{*} \neq \phi$ then $\theta \neq \phi$.
Proof. Let $w \in \theta^{*}$; then $H(w) \cap T_{0}$ is a line of $T$. We will show that if $u \in H(w) \cap\left(T_{0}-\{0\}\right)$, then $u$ is oscillatory. Let us define by

$$
\begin{equation*}
H^{*}(u)=\left\{z \in T^{*} \mid[u, z]=0\right\} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $H^{*}(u)$ is a two-dimensional subspace of $T^{*}$ and $w \in H^{*}(u)$.
Next let $w_{0} \in T_{0}^{*}-\{0\}$, then $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} w_{0}^{(i)}(t)=0, i=0,1,2$ and $w_{0}(t) \neq 0$ $\forall t \geqslant 0$. Also since $u \in T_{0}$ we have that $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} u^{(i)}(t)=0, i=0,1,2$. From here and since $\left[u, w_{0}\right]=$ constant, we have $\left[u, w_{0}\right]=0$. Then $w_{0} \in H^{*}(u)$. If we now assume that $u$ is not oscillatory, say $u(t) \neq 0$ for $t \geqslant t_{0}, t_{0} \geqslant 0$, then the elements of $H^{*}(u)$ would be solutions of the second-order O.D.E.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{u}[u, z]=z^{\prime \prime}-\frac{u^{\prime}}{u} z^{\prime}+\frac{u^{\prime \prime}-p u}{u} z=0, \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $t \geqslant t_{0}$. Since $w(t)$ is an oscillatory solution of (13), for $t \geqslant t_{0}$ then all the solutions of (13) should be oscillatory. But this is a contradiction, since $w_{0}(t)$ is also a solution of (13), for $t \geqslant t_{0}$ and is not oscillatory. Then $u$ is oscillatory. This finishes the proof.

From Propositions 9, 10, 11 we have

Theorem 4. Let us consider Equation (5) where $p, q:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are such that $p$ is $C^{1}$ and bounded and $q$ is continuous. Assume there exist bounded functions $\alpha, \beta, \gamma:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \beta$ continuous, $\alpha, \gamma$ of class $C^{1}$ such that $\alpha+\gamma=p, \alpha^{\prime}+\beta=q ;$ then if $2 q-p^{\prime} \geqslant k>0$, the following propositions are equivalent: (a) $\theta \neq \phi$; (b) $\theta+\{0\}=T_{0}$; (c) $\theta^{*}=T^{*}-T_{0}^{*}$; (d) $\theta^{*} \neq \phi$.

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) by Proposition 9; (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c) by Proposition 10; (c) $\Rightarrow$ (d) trivially since $T_{0}^{*} \neq T^{*}$; and (d) $\Rightarrow$ (a) by Proposition 11.

$$
\begin{equation*}
p^{\prime}-2 q \geqslant k>0 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In this case we have the following:

Theorem 5. If in Theorem 4 we have $p^{\prime}-2 q \geqslant k>0$ instead of $2 q-p^{\prime} \geqslant$ $k>0$, then the following propositions are equivalent: (a) $\theta \neq \phi$; (b) $\theta=T-T_{0}$; (c) $\theta^{*}+\{0\}=T_{0}^{*}$; (d) $\theta^{*} \neq \phi$.

Proof. We have that $p^{\prime}-2 q \geqslant k>0$ implies $2 q^{*}-p^{*^{\prime}} \geqslant k>0$. Thus Equation (8) satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4 and the proof follows from this fact.
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