

DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS WITH PULSES: EXISTENCE AND STABILITY OF PERIODIC SOLUTIONS

ALEXANDRE A. P. RODRIGUES
LISBON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT
RUA DO QUELHAS, 6, 1200-781 LISBOA
CENTRO DE MATEMÁTICA DA UNIV. DO PORTO
RUA DO CAMPO ALEGRE, 687, 4169-007 PORTO, PORTUGAL

ABSTRACT. We consider generic differential equations in \mathbb{R} with a finite number of hyperbolic equilibria, which are subject to ω -periodic instantaneous perturbative pulses ($\omega > 0$). Using the time- ω map of the original system (without perturbation), we are able to find all periodic solutions of the perturbed system and study their stability. In this article, we establish an algorithm to locate ω -periodic solutions of impulsive systems of frequency ω , to study their stability and to locate Saddle-node bifurcations. With our technique, we are able to fully characterise the asymptotic dynamics of the system under consideration.

1. INTRODUCTION

Differential equations can be used to model the dynamics of many real-world phenomena. Several evolutionary processes are characterised by the fact that, at certain moments of time, they experience an abrupt change of state (for instance a forest fire or harvesting can abruptly change a landscape [15], medication [8], vaccination [5, 14, 16]). These processes are subject to short-term perturbations whose duration is negligible in comparison with the duration of the process. Thus, it is natural to assume that these perturbations are instantaneous. Such systems can be studied with dynamical systems with discontinuous trajectories [13, 18].

We refer to these systems as *impulsive differential equations* or *differential equations with pulses*: systems of differential equations coupled with a discrete map to capture the change in state, the so called “impulse”. The impulsive condition can be either time or state dependent [7, 12]. The theory of impulsive differential equations has been introduced in the sixties by Mil’man and Mishkis [12], had a fast development in the eighties and nineties [2, 3, 9, 13, 17, 18] and gives a good description for some real-world processes involving abrupt changes at a given sequence of times.

Impulsive equations play an important role in epidemic models with periodic vaccination [5, 14, 16] and may arise in macroeconomics – for example, the Solow differential equation [6] becomes an impulsive differential equation when shocks to capital intensity are modelled with jumps.

The most common types of impulsive differential equations found in the mathematical literature are:

Date: February 7, 2023.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 34A37; 34D23; 37C75; 34C25; 37G15

Keywords: Differential equation with pulses, Instantaneous impulses, periodic solutions, stability.

AR was partially supported by CMUP, which is financed by national funds through FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia, I.P., under the project with reference UIDB/00144/2020.

- (1) *Instantaneous impulses*: the duration of these changes is relatively short compared to the overall duration of the whole process. The sequence of times where the impulse occurs may be state dependent [3, 13];
- (2) *Non-instantaneous impulses*: it is also an impulsive action, which starts at an arbitrary fixed point and remains active on a finite time interval. The authors of [7] introduced this new class of abstract differential equations where the impulses are not instantaneous and explored the existence of solutions under mild conditions;
- (3) *Autonomous impulsive equations*: the solution of a differential equation $\varphi(t)$ evolves until it hits a point within a compact subset M of the phase space (if it does at all), at which the operator $I(x), x \in M$, instantaneously transfers $\varphi(t)$ to another point of the phase space [18].

In the present article, motivated by impulsive SI/SIR epidemic models [5, 14, 16], we are interested in differential equations in \mathbb{R} under the effect of instantaneous impulses occurring at a periodic sequence of times. In [5, 16], the impulse plays the role of vaccination effects in the class of Susceptibles.

Novelty and structure. In this article, we are going to consider non-linear differential equations in \mathbb{R} with ω -periodic moments of impulsive effect. We are going to present an (easy) algorithm to find ω -periodic solutions of the differential equation and classify their stability. This algorithm is useful because in \mathbb{R} we do not need the formalism of a Lyapunov map for impulsive differential equations discussed in Theorem 3.1 of [10] to deduce about their stability¹.

After the introduction of some basic results on impulsive differential equations in Section 2, we describe and motivate the system under consideration in Section 3, where we state the main results of the paper. In Section 4 we state useful results to locate ω -periodic solutions through the time- ω map associated to the unperturbed system. These results are valid for more general instantaneous impulsive differential equations. The only periodic solutions of the system under consideration are ω -periodic.

In Section 5 we derive technical results to study the stability of periodic solutions for impulsive systems. The proof of the main result is performed in Section 6. Section 7 concludes this article. We have endeavoured to make a self contained exposition bringing together all topics related to the proofs. We have drawn illustrative figures to make the paper easily readable.

2. PRELIMINARIES

The following section contains some useful information on instantaneous impulsive differential equations may be found in [4, 9]. See also Chapter 1 of [1].

2.1. Instantaneous impulsive differential equations. An impulsive differential equation is given by an ordinary differential equation coupled with a discrete map defining the “jump” condition. The law of evolution of the process is described by the differential equation

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = f(t, x)$$

¹Observe that the theory developed by [10] is valid when the periodic solution is unique.




FIGURE 1. The “jump” at $t = T_k$ is defined by $\Delta x(T_k) := \lim_{t \rightarrow T_k^+} \varphi(t, x) - \lim_{t \rightarrow T_k^-} \varphi(t, x)$, with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_0^+$.

where $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ is C^1 . The instantaneous impulse at time t is defined by the map $I(t, x) : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ given by

$$I(t, x) = x + I(t, x).$$

Throughout this article, we focus on the Initial Value Problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx}{dt} &= f(t, x) & t \neq T_k \\ \Delta x(T_k) &= I_k(x) & t = T_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ x(0) &= x_0 \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $x \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$, the impulse is fixed at a sequence $(T_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ such that $T_0 = 0$,

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad T_k < T_{k+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \in \mathbb{N}} T_k = +\infty,$$

and, as depicted in Figure 1, the instantaneous “jump” at $t = T_k$ is defined by:

$$\Delta x(T_k) := \lim_{t \rightarrow T_k^+} \varphi(t, x) - \lim_{t \rightarrow T_k^-} \varphi(t, x).$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [T_k, T_{k+1})$ the solution $\varphi(t)$ of equation (2.1) satisfies the equation $\frac{dx}{dt} = f(t, x)$ and for $t \geq T_k$, $\varphi(t)$ satisfies the equality

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow T_k^+} \varphi(t, x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow T_k^-} \varphi(t, x) + I_k \left(\lim_{t \rightarrow T_k^-} \varphi(t, x) \right),$$

where $x \in \Omega$. The next result concerns the existence of a unique solution for (2.1).

Theorem 2.1 ([2, 9], adapted). *Let the function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be continuous in the sets $[T_k, T_{k+1}[\times \Omega$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \Omega$, suppose there exists (and is finite) the limit of $f(t, y)$ as $(t, y) \rightarrow (T_k, x)$, where $t > T_k$. Then, for each $(t_0, x_0) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Omega$ there exist $\beta > t_0$ and a solution $\varphi :]t_0, \beta[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the initial value problem (2.1). If f is C^1 with respect to x in $\mathbb{R} \times \Omega$, the solution is unique.*

The following theorem imposes conditions where the solution φ may be extendable.

Theorem 2.2 ([2, 9], adapted). *Let the function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be continuous in the sets $[T_k, T_{k+1}[\times \Omega$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \Omega$, suppose there exists (and is finite) the limit of $f(t, y)$ as $(t, y) \rightarrow (T_k, x)$, where $t > T_k$. If $\varphi :]\alpha, \beta[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a solution of (2.1), then the solution is extendable to the right of β if $\beta \neq T_k$ if and only if*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \beta^-} \varphi(t) = \eta$$

and one of the following conditions holds:

- (1) $\beta \neq T_k$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\eta \in \Omega$;
- (2) $\beta = T_k$, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\eta + I_k(T_k, \eta) \in \Omega$.

Under the conditions of the Theorem 2.2, for each $(t_0, x_0) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Omega$, there exists a unique solution $\varphi(t, x_0)$ of (2.1) defined in \mathbb{R} ([2, 9]) which may be written as:

$$\varphi(t, x_0) = \begin{cases} x_0 + \int_0^t f(s, \varphi(s, x_0)) ds + \sum_{0 < T_k < t} I_k(\varphi(T_k, x_0)) & \text{for } t \in [0, b[\\ x_0 + \int_0^t f(s, \varphi(s, x_0)) ds + \sum_{t < T_k < 0} I_k(\varphi(T_k, x_0)) & \text{for } t \in (a, 0] \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

2.2. Periodic solutions and stability. The following definitions have been adapted from [11, 17, 18]. For $\omega > 0$, we say that φ is a ω -periodic solution of (2.1) if and only if there exists $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \varphi(t, x_0) = \varphi(t + \omega, x_0). \quad (2.3)$$

We disregard constant solutions and we consider ω as the smallest positive value for which (2.3) holds. Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ be such that $\varphi(t, x_0)$ is a ω -periodic solution of (2.1). We say that $\varphi(t, x_0)$ is:

- (1) *stable* if for any neighbourhood V of x_0 , there is another neighbourhood $W \subset V$ of x_0 such that for all $y_0 \in W$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varphi(k\omega, y_0) \in V$;
- (2) *asymptotically stable* if it is stable and there exists a neighbourhood V of x_0 such that for any $y_0 \in V$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \varphi(k\omega, y_0) = x_0$;
- (3) *unstable* if it is not stable.

3. SETTING AND MAIN RESULT

In this section, we enumerate the main assumptions concerning the impulsive differential equation under consideration and we state the main result of this article.

3.1. Object of study. Consider the following Initial Value Problem in \mathbb{R}_0^+ :

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = h(x) \\ \varphi(0) = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}_0^+ \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$




FIGURE 2. (a): Possible vector field h of (3.1), where $A < 0$, $k = 5$ and $n = 3$ (see **(P1)**–**(P2)**). (b): Sketch of the graph of the solutions of (3.1) as function of $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$.

whose flow is given by $\varphi(t, x)$ with $x \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The vector field $h : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+$:

(P1) is C^2 –smooth and may be written as $h(x) = Ax + H(x)$ with $A = dh(0) \neq 0$ (linear part) and $0 \neq H(x) = \mathcal{O}(x^2)$, where \mathcal{O} represents the usual Landau notation;

(P2) has k zeros, $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Without loss of generality, we are going to consider $A = dh(0) < 0$ and an odd number of equilibria ($k = 2n - 1$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$) – see Figure 2. Let us denote and order the equilibria whose existence is guaranteed by **(P2)**, in the following way:

$$0 = X_1^s < X_1^u < X_2^s < X_2^u < \dots < X_n^s.$$

For $\omega > 0$ fixed (once and for all), define $T_k = k\omega$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and the following Initial Value Problem (motivated by [5, 16]):

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = h(x) \\ \varphi(T_k, x) = (1 + \lambda) \lim_{t \rightarrow T_k^-} \varphi(t, x) \quad (\text{pulse}) \\ \varphi(0, x_0) = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}_0^+ \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

where

(P3) $\lambda \in]-1, +\infty[$.

The flow associated to the differential equation (3.2) is given by $\varphi_\lambda(t, x)$ where $\varphi_0(t, x) \equiv \varphi(t, x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. As depicted in Figure 3(a), let us denote by $R_\omega(x)$ the time- ω map associated to (3.1):

$$R_\omega(x) = \varphi_0(\omega, x).$$




FIGURE 3. (a) Sketch of the map R_ω for $A < 0$, $k = 5$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$. (b) Illustration of the intersection points of R_ω and ℓ (Item (1) of Theorem A). Each intersection point, marked with \star , corresponds to an equilibrium of (3.2).

We also assume that:

- (P4)** For all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the map R_ω is convex for $x \in]X_j^s, X_j^u[$ and concave for $x \in]X_j^u, X_{j+1}^s[$.

The following hypothesis, although not essential to prove the main result, simplifies the proof of our main result. See the discussion at Section 7.

- (P5)** For all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, there exist a unique pair (m_j, M_j) such that $m_j, M_j \in [X_j^s, X_{j+1}^s]$ and

$$\frac{R_\omega(m_j)}{m_j} = \min_{x \in [X_j^s, X_{j+1}^s]} \frac{R_\omega(x)}{x} = \beta_j < 1, \quad \frac{R_\omega(M_j)}{M_j} = \max_{x \in [X_j^s, X_{j+1}^s]} \frac{R_\omega(x)}{x} = \gamma_j > 1.$$

For $\lambda > -1$, the impulse map $x_0 \mapsto (1 + \lambda)x_0$ is injective and increasing, which means that two solutions cannot cross/overlap after a pulse. There exists a unique global solution $\varphi_\lambda(t, x_0)$ of (3.2) such that the operator

$$(x_0, \lambda) \mapsto \varphi_\lambda(t, x_0)$$

is continuous with respect to x_0 and λ (see Section 1 of [4]) and may be written explicitly by (see (2.2)):

$$\varphi_\lambda(t, x_0) = x_0 + \int_0^t h(\varphi_0(s, x_0)) ds + \sum_{0 < T_k \leq t} \lambda \left(\lim_{t \rightarrow T_k^-} \varphi_\lambda(t, x_0) \right), \quad t \geq 0.$$

3.2. Main result.

Theorem A. *Consider the system (3.2) satisfying Properties (P1)–(P5). The following assertions hold:*

- (1) *The number of ω -periodic orbits varies with λ and corresponds to the number of the intersection points of the graphs of R_ω and $\ell(x) := \frac{x}{(\lambda + 1)}$.*
- (2) *The λ -values for which we may find ω -periodic solutions depend on $x \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ and are given using the map $\lambda = g(x)$ where*

$$g(x) := \frac{x}{R_\omega(x)} - 1, \quad x > 0. \quad (3.3)$$

- (3) *For each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$, it is possible to find $\lambda > -1$ for which (3.2) has a ω -periodic solution associated to x_0 .*
- (4) *Let φ_λ be a ω -periodic point of (3.2) associated to the initial condition $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.*
 - (a) *If $g'(x_0) > 0$, then $\varphi_\lambda(t, x_0)$ is asymptotically stable.*
 - (b) *If $g'(x_0) < 0$, then $\varphi_\lambda(t, x_0)$ is unstable.*

An illustration of Item (1) of Theorem A may be seen in Figure 3(b) for $A < 0$ and $k = 5$. This result can be considered as a *cinematic technique* to locate ω -periodic solutions of (3.2) as function of λ and ω . For $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, solutions of (3.2) are denoted by Y_j^s or Y_j^u according to their stability, s for stable and u for unstable, where $X_1^s = Y_1^s = 0$. The proof of Theorem A is done in Section 6.

The following corollary follows from a combination of Theorem A and the analysis of R_ω for different values of $\omega > 0$, and may be useful in several applications (for instance, in epidemic models when we want to make disappear an endemic attracting periodic solution).

Corollary 3.1. *Let $\omega_1 > 0$ and $\lambda \neq 0$. If $Y^* \neq 0$ is a ω_1 -periodic solution of (3.2) associated to $x_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, then there exists $\omega_2 \in]0, \omega_1[$ for which Y^* no longer belong to a periodic solution. In addition, for this ω_2 -value, $\varphi_\lambda(t, Y^*)$ either converges to $X_1^s \equiv 0$ or diverges.*

For the sake of completeness, we perform a short proof of Corollary 3.1 in Subsection 6.2.

3.3. Digestive remarks. We point out some remarks on the dynamics of (3.2) and we discuss the geometrical meaning of some hypotheses.

- (1) First of all, note that (3.2) may be seen as a non-smooth perturbation of (3.1) associated to the parameter $\lambda > -1$. If $\lambda = 0$, then the differential equation (3.2) does not have pulses and all solutions are smooth.
- (2) For all $\lambda \geq -1$, $x_0 = 0$ is an equilibrium of (3.2).

- (3) If $\lambda = -1$, then all solutions converge to the equilibrium $x_0 = 0$.
- (4) Property **(P4)** may be rephrased as: for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the map R'_ω is increasing for $x \in]X_j^s, X_j^u[$ and decreasing for $x \in]X_j^u, X_{j+1}^s[$.
- (5) The geometrical meaning of Property **(P5)** is the following: on each interval of the type $]X_j^s, X_{j+1}^u[$, the graph of R_ω lies between the graphs of the linear maps $\beta_j x$ and $\gamma_j x$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Hypothesis **(P5)** just asks for **unicity** of m_j and M_j ; their existence is ensured by Lemma 5.3 in Section 5.
- (6) If **(P5)** does not hold, then the proof of Theorem A increases its complexity but its statement remains qualitatively the same.
- (7) The case where the vector field h is a linear map has been studied by Milev and Bainov [11]. It is proved that stability is easily destroyed under small perturbations of the impulsive coefficients. In [18] the authors proved an analogue of the Andronov-Witt Theorem for periodic solutions with an impulsive effect, applied to an oscillator (Example 1) and to a two-dimensional electronic system (Example 2).

4. PERIODIC SOLUTIONS OF AN IMPULSIVE SYSTEM

The following result states a useful technique to locate ω -periodic orbits in impulsive differential equations in \mathbb{R} .

Proposition 4.1. *If $\omega > 0$, the following sentences hold for (3.2):*

- (1) *For all $x \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ $\varphi_\lambda(\omega, x) = x$ if and only if $\varphi_\lambda(t, x)$ is ω -periodic.*
- (2) *If, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ $\varphi_\lambda(\omega, x) > x$ then the sequence $(\varphi_\lambda(T_k, x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is monotonic increasing.*
- (3) *If, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ $\varphi_\lambda(\omega, x) < x$ then the sequence $(\varphi_\lambda(T_k, x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is monotonic decreasing.*
- (4) *If Ψ is a periodic solution of (3.2), then Ψ has period ω .*

Proof. (1) Suppose that $\varphi_\lambda(\omega, x) = x$, for some $x \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$. Hence, for $t \in [0, \omega[$ the solution exists and is well defined:

$$\varphi_\lambda(t + \omega, x) = \varphi_\lambda(t, x).$$

Using the impulse map, this implies that

$$\varphi_\lambda(2\omega, x) = \varphi_\lambda(\omega, x).$$

Repeating the argument for all intervals of the form $[k\omega, (k+1)\omega)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\varphi_\lambda(t, x) = \varphi_\lambda(\omega + t, x)$ and therefore φ_λ is periodic.

- (2) Suppose that, for a given $x \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$, we have $\varphi_\lambda(\omega, x) > x$. We want to prove, by induction over $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, that:

$$\varphi_\lambda(T_{k+1}, x) = \varphi_\lambda((k+1)\omega, x) > \varphi_\lambda(k\omega, x) = \varphi_\lambda(T_k, x). \quad (4.1)$$

For $k = 0$, by hypothesis, we have $\varphi_\lambda(\omega, x) > x$, which is equivalent to:

$$\varphi_\lambda(T_1, x) > \varphi_\lambda(0, x).$$

Assuming formula (4.1) is valid for k , then:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\lambda(T_{k+2}, x) &\stackrel{\text{Def. of } T_k}{=} \varphi_\lambda((k+2)\omega, x) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow (k+2)\omega^-} (1 + \lambda) \varphi_\lambda(t, x) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Hypothesis}}{>} \lim_{t \rightarrow (k+1)\omega^-} (1 + \lambda) \varphi_\lambda(t, x) \\ &= \varphi_\lambda((k+1)\omega, x) \\ &= \varphi_\lambda(T_{k+1}, x) \end{aligned}$$

and we get the result.

- (3) Similar to (2).
 (4) Suppose that φ_λ is a periodic solution of period $P > 0$ associated to the initial condition $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. By definition, we have:

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \varphi_\lambda(\omega, x_0) = \varphi_\lambda(\omega + P, x_0). \quad (4.2)$$

Therefore, we may conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\lambda(\omega, x_0) &\stackrel{\text{Def.}}{=} (1 + \lambda) \lim_{t \rightarrow \omega^-} \varphi_\lambda(t, x_0) \\ &\stackrel{\text{(P3)}}{\neq} \lim_{t \rightarrow \omega^-} \varphi_\lambda(t, x_0) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow (P+\omega)^-} \varphi_\lambda(t, x_0) \end{aligned}$$

from where we deduce that:

$$\varphi_\lambda(\omega + P, x_0) \neq \lim_{t \rightarrow (P+\omega)^-} \varphi_\lambda(t, x_0),$$

and thus $P + \omega$ is a positive multiple of ω because it should be an impulsive time. This means that P is a positive multiple of ω .

□

If the trajectory associate to x is not constant, then either $\varphi_\lambda(\omega, x) > x$ or $\varphi_\lambda(\omega, x) < x$. In both cases, the sequence $(\varphi_\lambda(T_k, x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is monotonic. If it is bounded, then it converges either to a fixed point or to a periodic orbit. In summary, either a non-constant solution of (3.2) converges to a ω -periodic solution or it diverges.

5. STUDY OF STABILITY USING THE TIME- ω MAP

The goal of this section is to state preparatory results that are going to be needed in the proof of Theorem A. These auxiliary results characterise the maps R_ω and g . Before going further, it is important to observe that for $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ and $\lambda > -1$, we have:

$$R_\omega(x_0) \stackrel{\text{Def.}}{=} \varphi_0(\omega, x_0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \omega^-} \varphi_\lambda(t, x_0) = \frac{\varphi_\lambda(\omega, x_0)}{1 + \lambda}. \quad (5.1)$$

Furthermore, the following properties are valid for $R_\omega : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+$:

- (1) It has k fixed points by **(P2)**;
- (2) It is increasing in \mathbb{R}_0^+ , bijective and continuous.
- (3) If $R_\omega(x) \geq x$ then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $R_\omega^k(x) \geq R_\omega^{k-1}(x)$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 5.1. *Under Hypotheses **(P1)**–**(P3)**, if $A = dh(0) < 0$, then the following properties are valid for (3.2):*

- (1) g is continuous in \mathbb{R}^+ ;
- (2) $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{R_\omega(x)}{x} = \exp(A\omega)$;
- (3) $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} g(x) = \exp(-A\omega) - 1 > 0$;
- (4) if H is bounded then $\lim_{x_0 \rightarrow +\infty} g(x_0) = \exp(-A\omega) - 1$.

Proof. (1) It follows immediately from the expression of g (see (3.3)), smoothness of R_ω and $R_\omega(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

- (2) By **(P1)**, the vector field h may be written as $h(x) = Ax + H(x)$ where $H(x) = \mathcal{O}(x^2)$. Therefore, for $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we may integrate (3.2) and we get:

$$R_\omega(x_0) \stackrel{\text{Def.}}{=} \varphi_0(\omega, x_0) = x_0 \exp(A\omega) + \exp(A\omega) \int_0^\omega \exp(-At) H(\varphi_\lambda(t, x_0)) dt$$

from where we deduce that (for $x_0 \neq 0$):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0} &= \frac{\varphi_0(\omega, x_0)}{x_0} \\ &= \exp(A\omega) + \exp(A\omega) \int_0^\omega \exp(-At) \frac{H(\varphi_\lambda(t, x_0))}{x_0} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Again by **(P1)**, since $\frac{H(x)}{x} = \mathcal{O}(x)$, we may conclude that:

$$\exp(A\omega) \int_0^\omega \exp(-As) \frac{H(\varphi_\lambda(t, x_0))}{x_0} dt = \mathcal{O}(x_0).$$

Applying this conclusion to (5.2) we get

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{R_\omega(x)}{x} = \exp(A\omega).$$

(3) From item (2) and the expression of g (see 3.3), it is easy to check that:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} g(x) = \exp(-A\omega) - 1.$$

(4) Assuming that H is bounded by $M > 0$ and since²

$$\forall t \in [0, \omega], \quad \exp(At) \leq \exp(A\omega),$$

from (5.2) we may conclude the existence of $k > 0$ such that:

$$0 \leq \exp(A\omega) \int_0^\omega \exp(-As) \frac{H(\varphi(t, x_0))}{x_0} dt \leq \frac{kM}{x_0}$$

$$\text{and thus } \lim_{x_0 \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0} = \exp(A\omega).$$

□

The following corollary is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.1, after the change of coordinates $x \mapsto x - X_j^s$, where $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Corollary 5.2. *Under Hypotheses **(P1)**–**(P3)** on the equation (3.2), the following assertions hold for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$:*

- (1) $\lim_{x \rightarrow X_j^s} \frac{R_\omega(x)}{x} = \exp(dh(X_j^s)\omega);$
- (2) $\lim_{x \rightarrow X_j^s} g(x) = \exp(-dh(X_j^s)\omega) - 1 > 0.$

Corollary 5.2 provides the numerical value of the slope of the tangent line to R_ω at X_j^s . As shown in Figure 4, the next result says the graph of R_ω , when restricted to $[X_j^s, X_{j+1}^s]$, lies between the graph of two linear maps.

Lemma 5.3. *Under Hypotheses **(P1)**–**(P3)**, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ there exist $\beta_j \leq 1 \leq \gamma_j$ such that*

$$\forall x \in [X_j^s, X_{j+1}^s], \quad \beta_j x \leq R_\omega(x) \leq \gamma_j x.$$

²Remind that $A = dh(0) < 0$.




FIGURE 4. Illustration of Lemma 5.3: the graph of R_ω , when restricted to $[X_j^s, X_{j+1}^s]$, lies between the graph of two linear maps, where $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. (a): $j = 1$. (b): $j = 2$.

Proof. Let us fix $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The map

$$x \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{R_\omega(x)}{x} & \text{if } x \neq 0 \\ \exp(A\omega) & \text{if } x = 0 \end{cases}$$

is continuous on the compact set $[X_j^s, X_{j+1}^s]$ as a consequence of Lemma 5.1. In particular, by Weierstrass' Theorem, there exist $\beta_j \leq 1 \leq \gamma_j$ (see Figure 4) such that

$$\forall x \in [X_j^s, X_{j+1}^s], \quad \beta_j \leq \frac{R_\omega(x)}{x} \leq \gamma_j,$$

where

$$\beta_j = \min_{x \in [X_j^s, X_{j+1}^s],} \frac{R_\omega(x)}{x} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_j = \max_{x \in [X_j^s, X_{j+1}^s],} \frac{R_\omega(x)}{x}.$$

Now the lemma follows. \square

First of all, as a consequence of the geometry of the graph of R_ω stated in **(P4)** and **(P5)**, observe that

$$m_1 = X_1^s \equiv 0, \quad M_j \in [X_j^u, X_{j+1}^s[\quad \text{and} \quad m_j \in [X_j^s, X_j^u[.$$

Lemma 5.4. *Under Hypotheses **(P1)**–**(P5)**, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the following assertions hold:*

- (1) $R'_\omega(x) > R_\omega(x)/x$ for $x \in]m_j, X_j^u[$;
- (2) $R'_\omega(x) > R_\omega(x)/x$ for $x \in]X_j^u, M_j[$;

- (3) $R'_\omega(x) < R_\omega(x)/x$ for $x \in]M_j, m_{j+1}[$;
- (4) $R'_\omega(m_j) = \frac{R_\omega(m_j)}{m_j}$ and $R'_\omega(M_j) = \frac{R_\omega(M_j)}{M_j}$.

Proof. We perform the proof for $j = 1$. For $j > 0$, the proof is analogous (with the necessary adaptations).

- (1) For $x \in]m_1^s, X_1^u[$, the map R_ω is convex (by **(P4)**) and $R_\omega(0) = R_\omega(X_1^s) = 0$. It is easy to check that:

$$R'_\omega(x) \geq \frac{R_\omega(x) - R_\omega(0)}{x - 0} = \frac{R_\omega(x)}{x}$$

We want to show that, for all $x \in]m_1^s, X_1^u[$, we have:

$$R'_\omega(x) > \frac{R_\omega(x)}{x}. \quad (5.3)$$

Suppose, by contradiction, there exists $x_0 \in]m_1^s, X_1^u[$ such that

$$R'_\omega(x_0) = \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0}. \quad (5.4)$$

Since R_ω is increasing as a consequence of **(P4)**, then for all $x \in [m_1, x_0[$, we get:

$$\frac{R_\omega(x)}{x} \stackrel{\text{convexity}}{\leq} R'_\omega(x) \stackrel{R_\omega \text{ is decreasing}}{\leq} R'_\omega(x_0) \stackrel{(5.4)}{=} \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0}. \quad (5.5)$$

Claim 5.1. For all $x \in [m_1, x_0[$, the following equality holds:

$$\frac{R_\omega(x)}{x} = \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0} \quad (5.6)$$

Proof of Claim 5.1: Suppose, by contradiction, that Claim 5.1 is false, *i.e.* there exists $z \in [m_1, x_0[$ such that $\frac{R_\omega(z)}{z} < \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0}$. By the Mean Value Theorem, there exists $y_0 \in]z, x_0[$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} R'_\omega(y_0) &= \frac{R_\omega(x_0) - R_\omega(z)}{x_0 - z} \\ &> \frac{R_\omega(x_0) - \frac{R_\omega(x_0)z}{x_0}}{x_0 - z} \\ &= R_\omega(x_0) \left(\frac{1 - \frac{z}{x_0}}{x_0 - z} \right) \\ &= \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0}, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting (5.5) (note that $m_1 \leq z < y_0 < x_0$). Therefore, Claim 5.1 is proved.

Equality (5.6) is equivalent to $R_\omega(x) = \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0}x$, for $x \in [m_1, x_0[$. In particular, near $x = 0$, we may write:

$$R_\omega(x) = \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0}x \stackrel{\text{Lemma 5.1}}{=} \exp(A\omega)x$$

which is the time- ω of the solution of the Malthus Law ($A = dh(X_1^s) = dh(0)$):

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = Ax \\ \varphi(0, x) = x \in \mathbb{R}_0^+ \end{cases}$$

However, φ_λ is the solution of (3.2) which is not linear (by **(P1)** we have $H(x) \neq 0$). This is a contradiction. Therefore, Equality (5.3) is shown.

- (2) Suppose by contradiction that $R'_\omega(x_0) \leq R_\omega(x_0)/x_0$ for a given $x_0 \in]X_1^u, M_1[$. Since R_ω is concave ($\Leftrightarrow R'_\omega$ is decreasing by **(P4)**), we may write that, for $x > x_0$:

$$R'_\omega(x) \stackrel{R'_\omega \text{ is decreasing}}{\leq} R'_\omega(x_0) \stackrel{\text{contradiction}}{\leq} R_\omega(x_0)/x_0.$$

In particular, for $y \in]x_0, M_1]$, we may use the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus and we conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} R_\omega(y) &= R_\omega(x_0) + \int_{x_0}^y R'_\omega(x) dx \\ &\leq R_\omega(x_0) + \int_{x_0}^y \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0} dx \\ &= R_\omega(x_0) + \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0}y - \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0}x_0 \\ &= \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0}y \end{aligned}$$

yielding $R_\omega(M_1) \leq \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0}M_1$. Since $R_\omega(M_1) = \gamma_1 M_1$ (remind the meaning of γ_1 in Lemma 5.3) we get

$$\gamma_1 \leq \frac{R_\omega(x_0)}{x_0}$$

which means (using **(P5)**) that $x_0 = M_1$, which is a contradiction because $x_0 < M_1$.

- (3) Similar to (2).
 (4) It follows from the definition of m_j and M_j in the proof of Lemma 5.3.

□

6. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

6.1. Proof of Theorem A.

Proof. (1) Suppose that $\varphi(t, x_0) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is a ω -periodic solution of (3.2). On the one hand, we have

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \varphi_\lambda(t + \omega, x_0) = \varphi_\lambda(t, x_0),$$

which means that

$$\varphi_\lambda(\omega, x_0) = \varphi_\lambda(0, x_0) = x_0.$$

On the other hand, we may write (see (5.1)):

$$R_\omega(x_0) \stackrel{\text{Def.}}{=} \varphi_0(\omega, x_0) = \frac{\varphi_\lambda(\omega, x_0)}{1 + \lambda} \stackrel{\varphi_\lambda \text{ is periodic}}{=} \frac{x_0}{1 + \lambda}.$$

Hence, the number of ω -periodic orbits is the number of the intersection points of graphs of R_ω and $\ell(x) = \frac{x}{\lambda + 1}$.

(2) If $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is such that $\varphi_\lambda(t, x_0)$ is a ω -periodic solution of (3.2), then

$$R_\omega(x_0) = \frac{x_0}{1 + \lambda}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\lambda = \frac{x_0}{R_\omega(x_0)} - 1 =: g(x).$$

(3) It is a consequence of the way the map g has been constructed in (2).

(4) We prove the first case; the other is analogous. If $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ corresponds to a ω -periodic solution associated to $\lambda^* > -1$ then :

$$\lambda^* = \frac{x_0}{R_\omega(x_0)} - 1. \tag{6.1}$$

Differentiating g at $x_0 \neq 0$ we get:

$$g'(x_0) = \frac{R_\omega(x_0) - x_0 R'_\omega(x_0)}{R_\omega^2(x_0)}, \tag{6.2}$$

whose sign only depends on the sign of the numerator $R_\omega(x_0) - x_0 R'_\omega(x_0)$ fully characterised in Lemma 5.4.

Suppose that x_0 is such that $g'(x_0) > 0$. This means that g is increasing near x_0 and $R'_\omega(x_0) < R_\omega(x_0)/x_0$. By Lemma 5.4 it means that $x \in]M_j, m_{j+1}[$, for some

$j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. In particular for $x > x_0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
g(x) > g(x_0) &\Leftrightarrow \frac{x}{R_\omega(x)} - 1 > \frac{x_0}{R_\omega(x_0)} - 1 \\
&\stackrel{(6.1)}{\Leftrightarrow} \frac{x}{R_\omega(x)} - 1 > \lambda^* \\
&\Leftrightarrow \frac{x}{R_\omega(x)} > 1 + \lambda^* \\
&\Leftrightarrow R_\omega(x) < \frac{x}{1 + \lambda^*} \\
&\Leftrightarrow (1 + \lambda^*)R_\omega(x) < x \\
&\Leftrightarrow \varphi_\lambda(\omega, x) < \varphi_\lambda(0, x)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{\text{Lemma 4.1}}{\Leftrightarrow} (\varphi_\lambda(T_k, x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is monotonically decreasing}$$

Since the sequence $(\varphi_\lambda(T_k, x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is monotonic decreasing with lower boundary x_0 , then $\varphi_\lambda(T_k, x)$ should converge to the ω -periodic solution associated to x_0 ($\Leftrightarrow \varphi_\lambda(t, x_0)$ is asymptotically stable, by definition of Subsection 2.2). The case where $g'(x_0) < 0$ has a similar proof. \square

6.2. Proof of Corollary 3.1. In the space of C^1 -maps endowed with the C^1 -Whitney topology, the map R_ω is diffeotopic to the Identity. In other words, we have $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} R_\omega =_{C^1} Id$ where Id denotes the Identity map in \mathbb{R} . Therefore if $Y^* \neq 0$ is a ω_1 -periodic solution of (3.2) associated to $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$, then it corresponds to an intersection of the graphs of ℓ and R_ω (different from the origin). Since $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{x}{R_\omega(x)} - 1 = 0$, then the graph of g converges to the null map 0 , ruling out λ -values for possible intersection. Corollary 3.1 is proved.

7. DISCUSSION AND FINAL REMARK

In this article, we have considered non-linear differential equations in \mathbb{R} with a finite number of hyperbolic equilibria, which are subject to ω -periodic instantaneous impulses ($\omega > 0$). The only non-constant recurrent solutions of our system are ω -periodic ones. We present a cinematic algorithm to find the ω -periodic solutions of the perturbed system by intersecting the graphs of two real valued maps: ℓ and R_ω , where the latter is the time- ω map of the unperturbed system.

In almost all cases, the map R_ω cannot be obtained explicitly. Nonetheless, it is a solvable numerical problem, from where we may derive the auxiliary map g ; then we are able to study the stability of the periodic solutions as a consequence of Theorem A. Furthermore, it suffices to determine the initial values of the periodic solutions and their stability to conclude about the asymptotic behaviour of all solutions of (3.2), as noticed in Table 1 for $k = 5$, $A < 0$, $\gamma_1 > \gamma_2$ and $\beta_2 > \exp(-A\omega) - 1$.




FIGURE 5. Sketch of three ω -periodic solutions for the scenarios 2 and 4 of Table 1: two stable (blue) and one unstable (red).

As a consequence of the proof of Theorem A, we get that if $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is such that $g'(x_0) = 0$, then $\varphi_\lambda(t, x_0)$ is a *saddle-node bifurcation*: slight smooth perturbations on λ give rise either to zero or two periodic solutions of different stability. In the case under consideration in Table 1 ($A < 0, k = 5$), this occurs when

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{\gamma_1} - 1, \quad \lambda = \frac{1}{\beta_2} - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = \frac{1}{\gamma_2} - 1.$$

Moreover, at $\lambda = \exp(-A\omega) - 1$, the origin undergoes a *transcritical bifurcation*: there is an exchange of stabilities between two equilibria. The analysis of these bifurcations come directly from Table 1 and Figure 6.

Hypotheses **(P1)**–**(P5)** hold for a generic system of differential equations in \mathbb{R} , in the sense that they are valid in a *residual* within the set of C^2 maps. Hypotheses **(P4)**–**(P5)** simplify the proof and can be relaxed in the following way:

- For each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the change of sign of R'_ω should occur (at least once) within $[X_j^s, X_{j+1}^s]$. Hypothesis **(P4)** states that it happens at $X = X_j^u$, which is not a loss of generality; another value would be possible and the proof would run along the same lines (up to the necessary changes in Lemma 5.4);
- Hypothesis **(P5)** simplifies the proof of Theorem A and may be relaxed. If **(P5)** is removed, then the graph of g will have some intervals where it is constant.

The natural problem about differential equations with instantaneous pulses is the generalisation the two-dimensional results of Example 2 of [18] using the techniques of [10, 15], a task deferred to a future work.




FIGURE 6. Geometrical interpretation of Theorem A. Possible intersections of ℓ and R_ω ; for each intersection point, we may decide about its stability by observing the monotony of g . For $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, the line j is the graph of $\frac{x}{1 + \lambda_j}$, where $-1 < \lambda_j < \lambda_{j+1}$. The value of λ_3 is 0 (its dynamics corresponds to that of (3.1)). Arrows in the lower scheme indicate the stability of the periodic solutions. Compare the values with those of Table 1.

Line Reference in Figure 6	Interval of λ	Number of equilibria of (3.2)	Stability of Equilibria of (3.2) (ordered)
1	$\lambda < \frac{1}{\gamma_1} - 1$	1	$0 = Y_1^s$
2	$\frac{1}{\gamma_2} - 1 < \lambda < \frac{1}{\gamma_1} - 1$	3	$0 = Y_1^s, Y_1^u, Y_2^s$ See Figure 5
3	$\frac{1}{\gamma_1} - 1 < \lambda < \frac{1}{\beta_2} - 1$	5	$0 = Y_1^s, Y_1^u, Y_2^s, Y_2^u, Y_3^s$
4	$\frac{1}{\gamma_1} - 1 < \lambda < \exp(-A\omega) - 1$	3	$0 = Y_1^s, Y_1^u, Y_2^s$ See Figure 5
5	$\lambda > \exp(-A\omega) - 1$	2	$0 = Y_1^u, Y_1^s$

TABLE 1. Qualitative dynamics of (3.2) for $k = 5$, $n = 3$, $A < 0$, $\gamma_1 > \gamma_2$ and $\beta_2 > \exp(-A\omega) - 1$, where $A = dh(0) = dh(X_1^s)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Agarwal, H. Snezhana, D. O'Regan, *Non-instantaneous impulses in differential equations* Springer, Cham. 1–72, 2017.
- [2] D. Bainov, P. Simeonov, *Impulsive differential equations: periodic solutions and applications*. Vol. 66. CRC Press, 1993.
- [3] D. D. Bainov, E. Minchev, K. Nakagawa, *Asymptotic behaviour of solutions of impulsive semilinear parabolic equations*, Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications, 30(5), 2725–2734, 1997.
- [4] A. Dishliev, K. Dishlieva, S. Nenov, *Specific asymptotic properties of the solutions of impulsive differential equations. Methods and applications*. Academic Publication, 2012.
- [5] A. d'Onofrio, *Stability properties of pulse vaccination strategy in SEIR epidemic model*, Mathematical biosciences, 179(1), 57–72, 2002.
- [6] G. F. Emmenegger, I. M. Stamova, *Shocks to capital intensity make the Solow equation an impulsive differential equation*, International Journal of Differential Equations and Applications, 6(1), 93–110, 2002.
- [7] E. Hernández, D. O'Regan, *On a new class of abstract impulsive differential equations*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, 141(5), 1641–1649, 2013.
- [8] M. Huang, J. Li, X. Song, H. Guo, *Modeling impulsive injections of insulin: towards artificial pancreas*, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics, 72(5), 1524–1548, 2012.
- [9] V. Lakshmikantham, P. S. Simeonov, *Theory of impulsive differential equations* (Vol. 6). World Scientific, 1989.

- [10] X. Li, M. Bohner, C.-K. Wang, *Impulsive differential equations: periodic solutions and applications*, Automatica 52, 173–178, 2015.
- [11] N. Milev, D. Bainov, *Stability of linear impulsive differential equations*, Computers & Mathematics with Applications, 21(11), 2217–2224, 1990.
- [12] V. D. Milman, A. D. Myshkis, *On the stability of motion in the presence of impulses*, Sib. Math. J. 1(2), 233–237, 1960.
- [13] A. M. Samoilenko, A. A. Perestyuk, *Impulsive differential equations*. World Scientific, 1995.
- [14] R. Shi, L. Chen, *Stage-structured impulsive SI model for pest management*, Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society, 2007.
- [15] Z. Shuai, L. Bai, K. Wang, *Optimization problems for general simple population with n -impulsive harvest*, J. Math. Anal. Applications, 329(1), 634–646, 2007.
- [16] B. Shulgin, L. Stone, Z. Agur, *Pulse Vaccination Strategy in the SIR Epidemic Model*, Bull. Math. Biol. 60(6), 1123–1148, 1998.
- [17] P. Simeonov, D. Bainov, *Stability with respect to part of the variables in systems with impulse effect*, J. Math. Anal. Applications, 117(1), 247–263, 1986.
- [18] P. Simeonov, D. Bainov, *Orbital stability of periodic solutions of autonomous systems with impulse effect*, Int. J. Systems Sci., 19(2), 2561–2585, 1988.
- [19] L. Qian, Q. Lu, Q. Meng, Z. Feng, *Dynamical behaviors of a prey-predator system with impulsive control*, J. Math. Anal. Applications, 363(1), 345–356, 2010.

ALEXANDRE RODRIGUES, CENTRO DE MATEMÁTICA DA UNIV. DO PORTO, RUA DO CAMPO ALEGRE, 687, 4169-007 PORTO, LISBON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT, RUA DO QUELHAS, 6, 1200-781 LISBOA, PORTUGAL

Email address: alexandre.rodrigues@fc.up.pt