



Available at
www.ElsevierMathematics.com

POWERED BY SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

J. Math. Anal. Appl. 287 (2003) 522–539

Journal of
 MATHEMATICAL
 ANALYSIS AND
 APPLICATIONS

www.elsevier.com/locate/jmaa

On the existence of m -point boundary value problem at resonance for higher order differential equation [☆]

Shiping Lu ^{a,b,*} and Weigao Ge ^b

^a Department of Mathematics, Anhui Normal University, Wuhu 241000, Anhui, People's Republic of China

^b Department of Applied Mathematics, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing 100081, People's Republic of China

Received 17 April 2003

Submitted by J. Henderson

Abstract

By means of Mawhin's continuation theorem, we study m -point boundary value problem at resonance in the following form:

$$\begin{cases} x^{(k)}(t) = f(t, x(t), x'(t), \dots, x^{(k-1)}(t)) + e(t), & t \in (0, 1), \\ x'(0) = 0, x''(0) = 0, \dots, x^{(k-1)}(0) = 0, & x(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i x(\xi_i), \end{cases}$$

where $m \geq 3, k \geq 2$ are two integers, $a_i \in \mathbb{R}, \xi_i \in (0, 1) (i = 1, 2, \dots, m-2)$ are constants satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} a_i = 1$ and $0 < \xi_1 < \xi_2 < \dots < \xi_{m-2}$. A new result on the existence of solutions is obtained. The interesting is that we do not need all the a_i 's ($1 \leq i \leq m-2$) have the same sign, and also the degrees of some variables among x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} in the function $f(t, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})$ are allowable to be greater than 1. Meanwhile, we give some examples to demonstrate our result.

© 2003 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: m -point boundary value problem; Mawhin's continuation theorem; Higher order differential equation

[☆] Sponsored by the National Natural Science Foundation (19871005) and The Natural Science Foundation of Anhui Province of China (2002kj133).

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: lushiping26@sohu.com (S. Lu).

1. Introduction

The multi-point boundary value problem for second order ordinary differential equations has been extensively studied in papers [1–14]. For instance, Feng and Webb studied the boundary value problem in [11] as follows:

$$\begin{cases} x''(t) = f(t, x(t), x'(t)) + e(t), & t \in (0, 1), \\ x'(0) = 0, & x(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i x(\eta_i), \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $f \in C([0, 1] \times R^2, R)$, $e \in L^1[0, 1]$ and $a_i \geq 0$, $\eta_i \in (0, 1)$ are constants with $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i = 1$. However, the linear growth condition

$$|f(t, x, y)| \leq a(t)|x| + b(t)|y| + r(t), \quad \forall (t, x, y) \in [0, 1] \times R^2, \quad (1.3)$$

imposed on $f(t, x, y)$ is needed, where $a, b, r \in L^1[0, 1]$. In [12], Feng and Webb again investigated the solvability of three-point BVP

$$\begin{cases} x''(t) = f(t, x(t), x'(t)) + e(t), & t \in (0, 1), \\ x'(0) = 0, & x(1) = x(\eta), \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

$$x(1) = x(\eta), \quad (1.5)$$

where f and e are defined as above, $\eta \in (0, 1)$ is a constant. By assuming that f has the decomposition

$$f(t, x, p) = g(t, x, p) + h(t, x, p), \quad (1.6)$$

where g and $h: [0, 1] \times R^2 \rightarrow R$ are two continuous functions satisfying the conditions

$$pg(t, x, p) \leq 0, \quad \forall (t, x, p) \in [0, 1] \times [-M, M] \times R,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |h(t, x, p)| &\leq a(t)|x| + b(t)|p| + u(t)|x|^r + v(t)|p|^k + c(t), \\ \forall (t, x, p) &\in [0, 1] \times [-M, M] \times R, \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

where $0 \leq r, k < 1$ are constants and $a, b, u, v, c \in L^1[0, 1]$ with $|b|_1 < 1/2$, the authors obtain an existence result [3, Theorem 3.2]. But the problem corresponding to (1.1)–(1.2) subject to the case of all the a_i 's ($1 \leq i \leq m - 2$) not having the same sign, as far as we know, has been studied far less often. The reason for this is that if all the a_i 's ($1 \leq i \leq m - 2$) have the same sign, then BVP (1.1)–(1.2) can be studied via the existence of a solution for the following three-point BVP [13,14]:

$$\begin{cases} x''(t) = f(t, x(t), x'(t)) + e(t), & t \in (0, 1), \\ x'(0) = 0, & x(1) = x(\eta), \end{cases}$$

which is crucial to estimate a priori bound of solution. When all the a_i 's ($1 \leq i \leq m - 2$) have no same sign, Liu studied BVP (1.1)–(1.2) in [15]. But the growth condition

$$|f(t, x, y)| \leq a(t)|x| + b(t)|y| + c(t)|y|^\theta \quad (1.8)$$

is imposed on f , where $\theta \in [0, 1)$ is a constant.

In this paper, we consider m -point boundary value problem for higher order differential equation in the following form:

$$\begin{cases} x^{(k)}(t) = f(t, x(t), x'(t), \dots, x^{(k-1)}(t)) + e(t), & t \in (0, 1) \\ x'(0) = 0, x''(0) = 0, \dots, x^{(k-1)}(0) = 0, & x(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i x(\xi_i), \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

where $f: [0, 1] \times R^k \rightarrow R$ and $e: [0, 1] \rightarrow R$ are two continuous functions, $m \geq 3$, $k \geq 2$ are two integers, $a_i \in R$, $\xi_i \in (0, 1)$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, m-2$) are constants satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} a_i = 1$ and $0 < \xi_1 < \xi_2 < \dots < \xi_{m-2}$. As $\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} a_i = 1$, it is well known from [9, 10] that BVP (1.9)–(1.10) is at resonance. By using Mawhin's continuation theorem, we obtain a new result on the existence of solutions to BVP (1.9)–(1.10). Even if for the case of $k = 2$ and $a_i \geq 0$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, m-2$), the conditions imposed on f and the approaches to estimate a priori bound of the solutions to BVP (1.9)–(1.10) are different from the corresponding ones of the past work [11,12]. For example, we allow that the degrees of some variables among x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} in the function $f(t, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})$ are greater than 1. Meanwhile, we give some examples in Section 3 to demonstrate our result.

2. Some preliminaries

In order to use Mawhin's continuation theorem, first we recall this theorem.

Let X and Z be real Banach Spaces and let $L: D(L) \subset X \rightarrow Z$ be a Fredholm operator with index zero. This means that $X = \ker L \oplus X_1$ and $Z = \text{Im } L \oplus Z_1$. Furthermore, let $P: X \rightarrow \ker L$ and $Q: Z \rightarrow Z_1$ be the corresponding natural projections. Clearly, $\ker L \cap (D(L) \cap X_1) = \{0\}$, thus the restriction $L_P := L|_{D(L) \cap X_1}$ is invertible. Denote by K the inverse of L_P .

Now, let Ω be an open bounded subset of X with $D(L) \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$. A map $N: \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow Z$ is said to be L -compact in $\bar{\Omega}$, if $QN(\bar{\Omega})$ bounded and the operator $K(I - Q)N: \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow X$ is compact.

Lemma 2.1 [16,17]. *Assume that X, Z are two Banach spaces, L is a Fredholm operator with index zero and N is L -compact on $\bar{\Omega}$. Moreover assume that*

- (1) $Lx \neq \lambda Nx$, $\forall \lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $x \in D(L) \cap \partial\Omega$.
- (2) $Nx \notin \text{Im } L$, $\forall x \in \ker L \cap \partial\Omega$.
- (3) $\deg\{QN|_{\ker L}, \Omega \cap \ker L, 0\} \neq 0$.

Then the equation $Lx = Nx$ admits at least one solution in $D(L) \cap \bar{\Omega}$.

Next, let $C[0, 1] = \{x: x \in C([0, 1], R)\}$ with the norm $|x|_0 = \max_{t \in [0, 1]} |x(t)|$; $C^i[0, 1] = \{x: x \in C^i([0, 1], R)\}$ with the norm $\|x\|_i = \max\{|x|_0, |x'|_0, \dots, |x^{(i)}|_0\}$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, k$). Clearly, $C[0, 1]$ and $C^i[0, 1]$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, k$) are Banach spaces.

3. Main result

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that there is a positive integer $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m-2\}$ such that $a_i > 0$, $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, j\}$, and $a_i < 0$, $\forall i \in \{j+1, j+2, \dots, m-2\}$. Furthermore, we assume that the following conditions are satisfied:*

(H₁) $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i \xi_i^k \neq 1$.

(H₂) There is a constant $D > 0$ such that

$$f(t, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-2}, 0) + e(t) > 0, \\ \forall t \in [0, 1], x_0 > D, \text{ and } x_1 \geq 0, \dots, x_{k-2} \geq 0,$$

and

$$f(t, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-2}, 0) + e(t) < 0, \\ \forall t \in [0, 1], x_0 < -D, \text{ and } x_1 \leq 0, \dots, x_{k-2} \leq 0.$$

(H₃) The function f has the decomposition

$$f(t, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) = u(t, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) + g(t, x_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} h_i(t, x_i)$$

such that

$$x_{k-1}u(t, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) \leq -\beta|x_{k-1}|^{n+1}, \\ \forall (t, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) \in [0, 1] \times R^k, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{|g(t, x)|}{|x|^n} = r_0, \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{|h_i(t, x)|}{|x|^n} = r_i, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}, \tag{3.3}$$

where $n > 0, r_i \geq 0, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$, are all constants, $g(t, x)$ and $h_i(t, y), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$, are continuous on $[0, 1] \times R$.

Then BVP (1.9)–(1.10) has at least one solution, if

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-2} \frac{r_i}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} + r_{k-1} < \beta.$$

Proof. Let $X = C^{k-1}[0, 1]$ and $Z = C[0, 1]$. Considering the equation

$$Lx = \lambda Nx, \quad \lambda \in (0, 1), \tag{3.4}$$

where $L : D(L) \subset X \rightarrow Z$ defined by

$$Lx = x^{(k)}, \\ D(L) := \left\{ x : x \in C^k[0, 1], x'(0) = 0, \dots, x^{(k-1)}(0) = 0, x(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i x(\xi_i) \right\},$$

and

$$N : X \rightarrow Z, \quad (Nx)(t) = f(t, x(t), x'(t), \dots, x^{(k-1)}(t)) + e(t), \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

Clearly, $\ker L = \{c: c \in R\}$ and $\text{Im } L = \{y: y \in C[0, 1], \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i \int_{\xi_i}^1 \int_0^{s_1} \dots \int_0^{s_{k-1}} y(s_k) \times ds_k \dots ds_1 = 0\}$. So L is a Fredholm operator with index zero. Let

$$P: X \rightarrow \ker L, \quad Px = x(0),$$

$$Q: Z \rightarrow Z_1, \quad Qy = \frac{k! \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i \int_{\xi_i}^1 \int_0^{s_1} \dots \int_0^{s_{k-1}} y(s_k) ds_k \dots ds_1}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i \xi_i^k},$$

and $L_P = L|_{\ker P \cap D(L)}$. Then L_P has a unique inverse $K: \text{Im } L \rightarrow \ker P \cap D(L)$ defined by

$$(Ky)(t) = \frac{\int_0^t (t-s)^{k-1} y(s) ds}{(k-1)!}. \quad (3.5)$$

It is easy to see from the definition of N and (3.5) that N is L -compact on $\bar{\Omega}$, where Ω is any bounded open subset of X .

Suppose $x \in D(L)$ is an arbitrary solution of Eq. (3.4) for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Then

$$x^{(k)}(t) = \lambda f(t, x(t), x'(t), \dots, x^{(k-1)}(t)) + \lambda e(t), \quad t \in (0, 1). \quad (3.6)$$

First we will prove that

$$|x(0)| \leq D. \quad (3.7)$$

Suppose the contrary. Then $|x(0)| > D$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x(0) > D$. In view of $x'(0) = 0, x''(0) = 0, \dots, x^{(k-1)}(0) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(k)}(0) &= \lambda [f(t, x(0), x'(0), \dots, x^{(k-1)}(0)) + e(0)] \\ &= \lambda [f(t, x(0), 0, \dots, 0) + e(0)], \end{aligned}$$

we see from the first part of assumption (H_2) that $x^{(k)}(0) > 0$. By the continuity of $x^{(k)}(t)$ on $[0, 1]$, one can find that there is $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that $x^{(k)}(t) > 0$ for $t \in (0, \delta)$, and then $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(i)}(t) &= x^{(i)}(0) + x^{(i+1)}(0)t + \dots + \frac{1}{(k-1-i)!} \int_0^t (t-s)^{(k-1-i)} x^{(k)}(s) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{(k-1-i)!} \int_0^t (t-s)^{(k-1-i)} x^{(k)}(s) ds > 0 \quad \text{for } t \in (0, \delta] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= x(0) + x'(0)t + \dots + \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \int_0^t (t-s)^{(k-1)} x^{(k)}(s) ds \\ &= x(0) + \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \int_0^t (t-s)^{(k-1)} x^{(k)}(s) ds > x(0) > D \quad \text{for } t \in (0, \delta]. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we will prove that

$$x^{(k-1)}(t) > 0, \quad \forall t \in (0, 1). \quad (3.8)$$

Otherwise, there must be a constant $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$x^{(k-1)}(t) > 0 \quad \text{for } t \in (0, t_0), \quad (3.9)$$

and $x^{(k-1)}(t_0) = 0$, which deduce that $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-2\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(i)}(t) &= x^{(i)}(0) + x^{(i+1)}(0)t + \dots + \frac{1}{(k-2-i)!} \int_0^t (t-s)^{(k-2-i)} x^{(k-1)}(s) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{(k-2-i)!} \int_0^t (t-s)^{(k-2-i)} x^{(k-1)}(s) ds > 0 \quad \text{for } t \in (0, t_0] \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= x(0) + x'(0)t + \dots + \frac{1}{(k-2)!} \int_0^t (t-s)^{(k-2)} x^{(k-1)}(s) ds \\ &= x(0) + \frac{1}{(k-2)!} \int_0^t (t-s)^{(k-2)} x^{(k-1)}(s) ds > x(0) > D \quad \text{for } t \in (0, t_0], \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

and also

$$x^{(k)}(t_0) \leq 0. \quad (3.12)$$

But by (3.10), (3.11) and the first part of assumption (H₂) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(k)}(t_0) &= \lambda [f(t_0, x(t_0), x'(t_0), \dots, x^{(k-1)}(t_0)) + e(t_0)] \\ &= \lambda [f(t_0, x(t_0), x'(t_0), \dots, x^{(k-2)}(t_0), 0) + e(t_0)] > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (3.12). So (3.8) holds. However, as

$$x(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i x(\xi_i) = \sum_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, j\}} a_i x(\xi_i) + \sum_{i \in \{j+1, j+2, \dots, m-2\}} a_i x(\xi_i),$$

it follows from (3.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} x(1) &< \sum_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, j\}} a_i x(\xi_j) + \sum_{i \in \{j+1, j+2, \dots, m-2\}} a_i x(\xi_j) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i x(\xi_j) = x(\xi_j) < x(1), \end{aligned}$$

which is also a contradiction. This contradiction implies that (3.7) holds. Thus

$$|x(t)| \leq |x(0)| + \frac{\int_0^t (t-s)^{(k-2)} |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2)!} \leq D + \frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2)!}$$

and

$$|x^{(i)}(t)| \leq \frac{\int_0^t (t-s)^{(k-2-i)} |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2-i)!} \leq \frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2-i)!},$$

that is

$$|x|_0 \leq D + \frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2)!} \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$|x^{(i)}|_0 \leq \frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2-i)!} \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, k-2). \quad (3.14)$$

On the other hand, multiplying the two sides of (3.6) by $x^{(k-1)}(t)$ and integrating them over $[0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}(x^{(k-1)}(1))^2 &= \lambda \int_0^1 u(s, x(s), x'(s), \dots, x^{(k-1)}(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s) ds \\ &\quad + \lambda \int_0^1 g(s, x(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s) ds + \lambda \int_0^1 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} h_i(s, x^{(i)}(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s) ds \\ &\quad + \lambda \int_0^1 e(s) x^{(k-1)}(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

So by (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \beta \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt &\leq -\lambda \int_0^1 u(t, x(t), x'(t), \dots, x^{(k-1)}(t)) x^{(k-1)}(t) dt \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}(x^{(k-1)}(1))^2 + \lambda \int_0^1 g(s, x(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s) ds \\ &\quad + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \int_0^1 h_i(t, x^{(i)}(t)) x^{(k-1)}(t) dt + \lambda \int_0^1 e(t) x^{(k-1)}(t) dt, \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \beta \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \\
& \leq \int_0^1 g(s, x(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s) ds + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \int_0^1 h_i(t, x^{(i)}(t)) x^{(k-1)}(t) dt \\
& \quad + \int_0^1 e(t) x^{(k-1)}(t) dt \\
& \leq \int_0^1 |g(s, x(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \int_0^1 |h_i(t, x^{(i)}(t)) x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt \\
& \quad + \int_0^1 |e(t) x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt. \tag{3.15}
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\varepsilon = \frac{\beta - \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} \frac{r_i}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} - r_{k-1}}{2k}.$$

We see from

$$\beta > \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} \frac{r_i}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} + r_{k-1}$$

that $\varepsilon > 0$. For such a positive ε , we find from (3.2) and (3.3) that there must be a constant $\rho > D$ such that $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$,

$$\frac{|h_i(t, y)|}{|y|^n} < (r_i + \varepsilon) \quad \text{uniformly for } t \in [0, 1], |y| > \rho,$$

and

$$\frac{|g(t, x)|}{|x|^n} < (r_0 + \varepsilon) \quad \text{uniformly for } t \in [0, 1], |x| > \rho,$$

i.e., $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$,

$$|h_i(t, y)| < (r_i + \varepsilon) |y|^n \quad \text{uniformly for } t \in [0, 1], |y| > \rho, \tag{3.16}$$

and

$$|g(t, x)| < (r_0 + \varepsilon) |x|^n \quad \text{uniformly for } t \in [0, 1], |x| > \rho. \tag{3.17}$$

Let $\Delta_{1,i} = \{t: t \in [0, 1], |x^{(i)}(t)| \leq \rho\}$, $\Delta_{2,i} = \{t: t \in [0, 1], |x^{(i)}(t)| > \rho\}$, $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$, $\Delta_3 = \{t: t \in [0, 1], |x(t)| \leq \rho\}$, $\Delta_4 = \{t: t \in [0, 1], |x(t)| > \rho\}$. Then we have from (3.15) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \beta \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \\
& \leq \int_{\Delta_3} |g(s, x(s))x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds + \int_{\Delta_4} |g(s, x(s))x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \int_{\Delta_{1,i}} |h_i(s, x^{(i)}(s))x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \int_{\Delta_{2,i}} |h_i(s, x^{(i)}(s))x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds + \int_0^1 |e(t)x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt. \tag{3.18}
\end{aligned}$$

As we from (3.16) and (3.17) find that

$$\int_{\Delta_3} |g(s, x(s))x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \leq g_\rho \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds, \tag{3.19}$$

$$\int_{\Delta_4} |g(s, x(s))x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \leq (r_0 + \varepsilon) |x|_0^n \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds, \tag{3.20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Delta_{2,i}} |h_i(s, x^{(i)}(s))x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \leq (r_i + \varepsilon) |x^{(i)}|_0^n \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \\
& \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, k-2), \tag{3.21}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Delta_{1,i}} |h_i(s, x^{(i)}(s))x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \leq h_{i,\rho} \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \\
& \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, k-2), \tag{3.22}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\int_{\Delta_{2,k-1}} |h_{k-1}(s, x^{(k-1)}(s))x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \leq (r_{k-1} + \varepsilon) \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)|^{n+1} ds, \tag{3.23}$$

and

$$\int_{\Delta_{1,k-1}} |h_{k-1}(s, x^{(k-1)}(s))x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \leq h_{k-1,\rho} \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds, \tag{3.24}$$

where $g_\rho = \max_{t \in [0,1], |x| \leq \rho} |g(t, x)|$, $h_{i,\rho} = \max_{t \in [0,1], |y| \leq \rho} |h_i(t, y)|$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$. Substituting (3.13) and (3.14) into (3.20) and (3.21), respectively, we have

$$\int_{\Delta_4} |g(s, x(s))x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \leq (r_0 + \varepsilon) \left[D + \frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2)!} \right]^n \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \tag{3.25}$$

and

$$\int_{\Delta_{2,i}} |h_i(s, x^{(i)}(s))x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \leq \frac{r_i + \varepsilon}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \right)^{n+1},$$

$$i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-2\}. \tag{3.26}$$

Substituting (3.19) and (3.22)–(3.26) into (3.17), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \\ & \leq (r_0 + \varepsilon) \left[D + \frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2)!} \right]^n \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt \\ & \quad + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} \frac{r_i + \varepsilon}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt \right)^{n+1} + (r_{k-1} + \varepsilon) \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \\ & \quad + \left[g_\rho + |e|_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} h_{i,\rho} \right] \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt. \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

From the knowledge of mathematical analysis, we know that there must be a constant $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ (independent of λ) such that

$$(1 + x)^n < 1 + (n + 1)x, \quad \forall x \in (0, \sigma]. \tag{3.28}$$

Thus, we have the following cases.

Case 1. If $\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt = 0$ or $\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt \neq 0$ with

$$\frac{D(k-2)!}{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt} \geq \sigma,$$

then

$$\frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2)!} \leq \frac{D}{\sigma}.$$

So from (3.28),

$$\left[D + \frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2)!} \right]^n \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt \leq D^n (1 + \sigma^{-1})^n \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds. \tag{3.29}$$

Substituting (3.29) and Hölder's inequalities

$$\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \leq \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)|^{n+1} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}},$$

$$\left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \right)^{n+1} \leq \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)|^{n+1} ds$$

into (3.27), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \\ & \leq \left[(r_0 + \varepsilon) D^n (1 + \sigma^{-1})^n + g_\rho + |e|_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} h_{i,\rho} \right] \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)|^{n+1} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \\ & \quad + \left[\sum_{i=1}^{k-2} \frac{r_i + \varepsilon}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} + (r_{k-1} + \varepsilon) \right] \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

Since $1/(n+1) < 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} r_{k-1} + \varepsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} \frac{r_i + \varepsilon}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} & < r_{k-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} \frac{r_i}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} + k\varepsilon \\ & = \frac{r_{k-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} \frac{r_i}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} + \beta}{2} < \beta, \end{aligned}$$

it follows from (3.30) that there is a constant $M_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{1+n} dt < M_1. \quad (3.31)$$

Case 2. If

$$\frac{D(k-2)!}{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt} < \sigma,$$

then from (3.28) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left[D + \frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2)!} \right]^n & = \left(\frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2)!} \right)^n \left[1 + \frac{D(k-2)!}{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt} \right]^n \\ & \leq \left(\frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2)!} \right)^n \left[1 + \frac{(n+1)D(k-2)!}{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$= \left(\frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2)!} \right)^n + \frac{(n+1)D}{[(k-2)!]^{n-1}} \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \right)^{n-1}. \quad (3.32)$$

Substituting (3.32) into (3.27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \\ & \leq (r_0 + \varepsilon) \left(\frac{\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds}{(k-2)!} \right)^n \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \\ & \quad + \frac{(n+1)D}{[(k-2)!]^{n-1}} \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \right)^n \\ & \quad + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} \frac{r_i + \varepsilon}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt \right)^{n+1} + (r_{k-1} + \varepsilon) \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \\ & \quad + \left[g_\rho + |e|_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} h_{i,\rho} \right] \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt \\ & = \frac{r_0 + \varepsilon}{[(k-2)!]^n} \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \right)^{n+1} + \frac{(n+1)D}{[(k-2)!]^{n-1}} \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \right)^n \\ & \quad + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} \frac{r_i + \varepsilon}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt \right)^{n+1} + (r_{k-1} + \varepsilon) \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \\ & \quad + \left[g_\rho + |e|_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} h_{i,\rho} \right] \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)| dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

By using inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds & \leq \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)|^{n+1} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}, \\ \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \right)^{n+1} & \leq \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)|^{n+1} ds \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \right)^n \leq \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)|^{n+1} ds \right)^{\frac{n}{n+1}},$$

we get from (3.33) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \\ & \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} \frac{r_i + \varepsilon}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt + (r_{k-1} + \varepsilon) \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \\ & \quad + \frac{(n+1)D}{[(k-2)!]^{n-1}} \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)|^{n+1} ds \right)^{\frac{n}{n+1}} \\ & \quad + \left[g_\rho + |e|_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} h_{i,\rho} \right] \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$r_{k-1} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} \frac{r_i + \varepsilon}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} \leq \frac{\beta + r_0 + r_{k-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} \frac{r_i}{[(k-2-i)!]^n}}{2} < \beta,$$

$n/(n+1) < 1$ and $1/(n+1) < 1$, it follows from the above formula that there is a constant $M_2 > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^1 |x'(t)|^{n+1} dt \leq M_2.$$

Thus, in either Case 1 or 2, we obtain that

$$\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \leq \max\{M_2, M_1\} := M, \quad (3.34)$$

which together with (3.13) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |x|_0 & \leq D + \frac{1}{(k-2)!} \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \\ & \leq D + \frac{1}{(k-2)!} M^{\frac{1}{n+1}} := A_0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

and

$$|x^{(i)}|_0 \leq \frac{1}{(k-2-i)!} \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \leq \frac{1}{(k-2-i)!} M^{\frac{1}{n+1}} := A_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k-2. \tag{3.36}$$

Multiplying the two sides of Eq. (3.6) by $x^{(k-1)}(t)$ again and integrating them over $[0, t]$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^2 \\ &= \lambda \int_0^t u(s, x(s), x'(s), \dots, x^{(k-1)}(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s) ds + \lambda \int_0^t g(s, x(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s) ds \\ & \quad + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \int_0^t h_i(s, x^{(i)}(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s) ds + \lambda \int_0^t e(s) x^{(k-1)}(s) ds \\ & \leq \int_0^1 |g(s, x(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \int_0^1 |h_i(s, x^{(i)}(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^1 |e(s) x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \\ &= \int_0^1 |g(s, x(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} \int_0^1 |h_i(s, x^{(i)}(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^1 |e(s) x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds + \int_{\Delta_{1,k-1}} |h_{k-1}(s, x^{(k-1)}(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \\ & \quad + \int_{\Delta_{2,k-1}} |h_{k-1}(s, x^{(k-1)}(s)) x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \\ & \leq \left[g_{A_0} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} h_{i,A_i} + |e|_0 \right] \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds + (r_{k-1} + \varepsilon) \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt \\ & \quad + h_{k-1,\rho} \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)| ds \\ & \leq \left[g_{A_0} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} h_{i,A_i} + h_{k-1,\rho} + |e|_0 \right] \left(\int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(s)|^{n+1} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \end{aligned}$$

$$+ (r_{k-1} + \varepsilon) \int_0^1 |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^{n+1} dt, \quad (3.37)$$

where $\Delta_{1,k-1}$ and $\Delta_{2,k-1}$ are defined by the explanation preceding (3.18),

$$g_{A_0} := \max_{t \in [0,1], |x| \leq A_0} |g(t, x)|, \quad h_{i,A_i} := \max_{t \in [0,1], |x| \leq A_i} |h_i(t, x)| \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, k-2)$$

and

$$h_{k-1,\rho} := \max_{t \in [0,1], |x| \leq \rho} |h_{k-1}(t, x)|.$$

Substituting (3.34) into (3.37) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |x^{(k-1)}(t)|^2 &\leq 2 \left[h_\rho + g_{A_0} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} h_{i,A_i} + h_{k-1,\rho} + |e|_0 \right] M^{1/(n+1)} + 2(r_{k-1} + \varepsilon)M \\ &:= M_3, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1], \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$|x^{(k-1)}|_0 \leq M_3. \quad (3.38)$$

If $c > D$, then by assumption (H₂) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i \int_{\xi_i}^1 \int_0^{s_1} \dots \int_0^{s_{k-1}} [f(s_k, c, 0, \dots, 0) + e(s_k)] ds_k \dots ds_1 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^j a_i \int_{\xi_i}^1 \int_0^{s_1} \dots \int_0^{s_{k-1}} [f(s_k, c, 0, \dots, 0) + e(s_k)] ds_k \dots ds_1 \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=j+1}^{m-2} a_i \int_{\xi_i}^1 \int_0^{s_1} \dots \int_0^{s_{k-1}} [f(s_k, c, 0, \dots, 0) + e(s_k)] ds_k \dots ds_1 \\ &> \sum_{i=1}^j a_i \int_{\xi_j}^1 \int_0^{s_1} \dots \int_0^{s_{k-1}} [f(s_k, c, 0, \dots, 0) + e(s_k)] ds_k \dots ds_1 \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=j+1}^{m-2} a_i \int_{\xi_j}^1 \int_0^{s_1} \dots \int_0^{s_{k-1}} [f(s_k, c, 0, \dots, 0) + e(s_k)] ds_k \dots ds_1 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i \int_{\xi_j}^1 \int_0^{s_1} \dots \int_0^{s_{k-1}} [f(s_k, c, 0, \dots, 0) + e(s_k)] ds_k \dots ds_1 \\ &= \int_{\xi_j}^1 \int_0^{s_1} \dots \int_0^{s_{k-1}} [f(s_k, c, 0, \dots, 0) + e(s_k)] ds_k \dots ds_1 > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

Similarly, if $c < -D$, then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i \int_{\xi_i}^1 \int_0^{s_1} \dots \int_0^{s_{k-1}} [f(s_k, c, 0, \dots, 0) + e(s_k)] ds_k \dots ds_1 < 0. \tag{3.40}$$

Now, if $Nx \in \text{Im } L, x \in \ker L$, then $x = c, c \in R$, satisfying $Q Nx = 0$, that is

$$\frac{k! \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i \int_{\xi_i}^1 \int_0^{s_1} \dots \int_0^{s_{k-1}} [f(s_k, c, 0, \dots, 0) + e(s_k)] ds_k \dots ds_1}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i \xi_i^k} = 0.$$

So by (3.39) and (3.40) we see that $|c| \leq D$. Let $M_4 = \max\{A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{k-2}, M_3\} + 1$ and $\Omega = \{x: x \in X, \|x\|_{k-1} < M_4\}$, and also set

$$H(x, \mu) = \mu \operatorname{sgn} \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i \xi_i^k \right) x + (1 - \mu) Q Nx, \quad (x, \mu) \in \bar{\Omega} \times [0, 1].$$

It is to see from (3.39) and (3.40) that $H(x, \mu) \neq 0, (x, \mu) \in (\partial \Omega \cap \ker L) \times [0, 1]$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \deg\{Q N|_{\ker L}, \ker L \cap \Omega, 0\} &= \deg\{H(x, 0), \ker L \cap \Omega, 0\}, \\ \deg\{H(x, 1), \ker L \cap \Omega, 0\} &= \deg\left\{ \operatorname{sgn} \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_i \xi_i^k \right) I, \ker L \cap \Omega, 0 \right\} \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by applying Lemma 2.1, we get BVP (1.9)–(1.10) has at least one solution. \square

Remark 3.1. If $a_i \geq 0, \forall i \in \{1, 1, \dots, m - 2\}$, then the positive integer j of Theorem 3.1 can be chosen as $j = m - 2$, and then assumption (H_1) of Theorem 3.1 holds. So we have the following result.

Corollary 3.1. Suppose $a_i \geq 0, \forall i \in \{1, 1, \dots, m - 2\}$, and assume that conditions (H_2) and (H_3) of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied. Then BVP (1.9)–(1.10) has at least one solution if

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-2} \frac{r_i}{[(k - 2 - i)!]^n} + r_{k-1} < \beta.$$

Example 3.1. Let us consider the boundary value problem as follows:

$$\begin{cases} x''(t) = -(2 + x^2(t))x'^3(t) + x^3(t) + x'^{8/3}(t) + t^2, & t \in (0, 1), \\ x'(0) = 0, & x(1) = \frac{1}{4}x(1/2) + \frac{3}{4}x(2/3). \end{cases} \tag{3.41}$$

$$\tag{3.42}$$

Corresponding to BVP (1.9)–(1.10), we have $a_1 = 1/4 > 0$ and $a_2 = 3/4 > 0$ with $a_1 + a_2 = 1, f(t, x_0, x_1) = -(2 + x_0^2)x_1^3 + x_0^3 + x_1^{8/3} + t^2$ and $e(t) \equiv 0$. So we can chose $D = 2$ such that assumption (H_2) of Theorem 3.1 is satisfied, and also we can chose $u(t, x_0, x_1) = -(2 + x_0^2)x_1^3, g(t, x) = x^3 + t^2$ and $h_1(t, y) = y^{8/3}$ such that $f(t, x_0, x_1) = u(t, x_0, x_1) + g(t, x_0) + h_1(t, x_1)$. Then $n = 3, \beta = k = 2$,

$$r_0 = \lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{|g(t, x)|}{|x|^3} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad r_1 = \lim_{|y| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{|h_1(t, y)|}{|y|^3} = 0,$$

that is

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-2} \frac{r_i}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} + r_{k-1} = r_0 + r_1 = 1 < \beta = 2.$$

Hence, BVP (3.41)–(3.42) has at least one solution by applying Corollary 3.1.

Remark 3.2. From the above example, we see $a_1 = 1/4 > 0$, $a_2 = 3/4 > 0$. But the degrees of the second variable x_0 and the third variable x_1 in $f(t, x_0, x_1)$ are all equal to 3, which is different from the growth condition (1.3) assumed by [11]; and also the degree of variable y in the function $h_1(t, y)$ is equal to $8/3$, which is different from the corresponding condition of (1.7) assumed by [12].

Example 3.2. Let us consider the following boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} x''(t) = -(2 + x^2(t))x'^5(t) + x^5(t) + x'^4(t) + t^2, & t \in (0, 1), \\ x'(0) = 0, & x(1) = \frac{5}{4}x(1/2) - \frac{1}{4}x(2/3). \end{cases} \quad (3.43)$$

Corresponding to BVP (1.9)–(1.10), we have $a_1 = 5/4 > 0$ and $a_2 = -1/4 < 0$ with $a_1 + a_2 = 1$, $f(t, x_0, x_1) = -(2 + x_0^2)x_1^5 + x_0^5 + x_1^4 + t^2$ and $e(t) \equiv 0$. So assumption (H₁) of Theorem 3.1 holds, and we can choose $D = 2$ such that assumption (H₂) of Theorem 3.1 is satisfied, and also we can choose $u(t, x_0, x_1) = -(2 + x_0^2)x_1^5$, $g(t, x) = x^5 + t^2$ and $h_1(t, y) = y^4$ such that $f(t, x_0, x_1) = u(t, x_0, x_1) + g(t, x_0) + h_1(t, x_1)$. Then $n = 5$, $\beta = k = 2$,

$$r_0 = \lim_{|x| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{|g(t, x)|}{|x|^5} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad r_1 = \lim_{|y| \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{|h_1(t, y)|}{|y|^5} = 0,$$

that is

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-2} \frac{r_i}{[(k-2-i)!]^n} + r_{k-1} = r_0 + r_1 = 1 < \beta = 2.$$

Hence, BVP (3.43)–(3.44) has at least one solution by applying Theorem 3.1.

Remark 3.3. From the above example, we see $a_1 = -1/4 < 0$. So the above result cannot be obtained by [1–14]. Also, the degrees of the second variable x_0 and the third variable x_1 in the function $f(t, x_0, x_1)$ are all equal to 5, which is different from the growth condition (1.8) assumed by [15].

References

- [1] V.A. Il'in, E.I. Moiseev, Nonlocal boundary value problem of the first kind for a Sturm–Liouville operator, J. Differential Equations 23 (1987) 803–810.
- [2] V.A. Il'in, E.I. Moiseev, Nonlocal boundary value problems of the second kind for a Sturm–Liouville operator, J. Differential Equations 23 (1987) 979–987.
- [3] C.P. Gupta, A second order m -point boundary value problem at resonance, Nonlinear Anal. 24 (1995) 1483–1489.

- [4] C.P. Gupta, Solvability of a multiple boundary value problem at resonance, *Results Math.* 28 (1995) 270–276.
- [5] C.P. Gupta, Existence theorems for a second order m -point boundary value problem at resonance, *Internat. J. Math. Sci.* 18 (1995) 705–710.
- [6] D. O'Regan, *Existence Theory for Nonlinear Ordinary Differential Equations*, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1997.
- [7] R.Y. Ma, Existence theorems for second order m -point boundary value problems, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 211 (1997) 545–555.
- [8] C.P. Gupta, A Dirichlet type multi point boundary value problem for second order ordinary differential equations, *Nonlinear Anal.* 26 (1996) 925–931.
- [9] G.L. Karakostas, P.Ch. Tsamatos, On a nonlocal boundary value problem at resonance, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 259 (2001) 209–218.
- [10] B. Przeradzki, R. Stańczy, Solvability of m -point boundary value problems at resonance, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 264 (2001) 253–261.
- [11] W. Feng, J.R.L. Webb, Solvability of three-point boundary value problems at resonance, *Nonlinear Anal.* 30 (1997) 3227–3238.
- [12] W. Feng, J.R.L. Webb, Solvability of m -point boundary value problems with nonlinear growth, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 212 (1997) 467–480.
- [13] C.P. Gupta, S.K. Ntouyas, P.Ch. Tsamatos, Solvability of an m -point boundary value problem for second order ordinary differential equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 189 (1995) 575–584.
- [14] C.P. Gupta, S.K. Ntouyas, P.Ch. Tsamatos, On an m -point boundary value problem for second order ordinary differential equations, *Nonlinear Anal.* 23 (1994) 1427–1436.
- [15] B. Liu, J. Yu, Solvability of multiple point boundary value problem at resonance, *Appl. Math. Comput.* 136 (2003) 353–377.
- [16] J. Mawhin, *Topological Degree Methods in Nonlinear Boundary Value Problems*, in: NSF-CBMS Regional Conference Series in Math., Vol. 40, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1979.
- [17] J. Mawhin, Topological degree and boundary value problems for nonlinear differential equations, in: *Topological Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations*, in: *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Vol. 1537, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991, pp. 74–142.