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By Leray-Schauder continuation theorem and the nonlinear alternative of Leray-Schauder type, the existence of a solution for an $m$-point boundary value problem with impulses is proved.
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## 1. Introduction

The main purpose of this paper is to get results on the solvability of the following boundary value problem (BVP):

$$
\begin{gather*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t)=f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right), \\
\Delta x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right)=b_{k} x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right), \quad \Delta x\left(t_{k}\right)=c_{k} x\left(t_{k}\right),  \tag{1.1}\\
x^{\prime}(0)=0, \quad x(1)=\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i} x\left(\xi_{i}\right),
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\xi_{i} \in(0,1), i=1,2, \ldots, m-2,0<\xi_{1}<\xi_{2}<\cdots<\xi_{m-2}<1, a_{i} \in R, i=1,2, \ldots, m-2$, $\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i} \neq 1,0=t_{0}<t_{1}<t_{2}<\cdots<t_{T}<t_{T+1}=1$.

Such problems without impulses effects have been solved before, for example, in [1-3]. But as far as we know the publication on the solvability of $m$-point problems with impulses is fewer [4]. Our main goal is to find condition for $f, b_{k}, c_{k}, 1 \leq k \leq T$, which guarantees the existence of at least one solution of problem (1.1). The proofs are based on the Leray-Schauder continuation theorem [5] and the nonlinear alternative of LeraySchauder type [6].

## 2 Boundary Value Problems

In order to define the concept of solution for BVP (1.1), we introduce the following spaces of functions:
(i) $P C[0,1]=\left\{u:[0,1] \rightarrow R, u\right.$ is continuous at $t \neq t_{k}, u\left(t_{k}^{+}\right), u\left(t_{k}^{-}\right)$exist, and $u\left(t_{k}^{-}\right)=$ $\left.u\left(t_{k}\right)\right\}$;
(ii) $P C^{1}[0,1]=\left\{u \in P C[0,1]: u\right.$ is continuously differentiable at $t \neq t_{k}, u^{\prime}\left(0^{+}\right)$, $u^{\prime}\left(t_{k}^{+}\right), u^{\prime}\left(t_{k}^{-}\right)$exist and $\left.u^{\prime}\left(t_{k}^{-}\right)=u^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right)\right\}$;
(iii) $P C^{2}[0,1]=\left\{u \in P C^{1}[0,1]: u\right.$ is twice continuously differentiable at $\left.t \neq t_{k}\right\}$. Note that $P C[0,1]$ and $P C^{1}[0,1]$ are Banach spaces with the norms

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{\infty}=\sup \{|u(t)|: t \in[0,1]\}, \quad\|u\|_{1}=\max \left\{\|u\|_{\infty},\left\|u^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}\right\}, \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

respectively.
Definition 1.1. The set $\mathscr{F}$ is said to be quasiequicontinuous in $[0, c]$ if for any $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $\delta>0$ such that if $x \in \mathscr{F}, k \in Z, t^{*}, t^{* *} \in\left(t_{k-1}, t_{k}\right] \cap[0, c]$, and $\left|t^{*}-t^{* *}\right|<\delta$, then $\left|x\left(t^{*}\right)-x\left(t^{* *}\right)\right|<\varepsilon$.

Lemma 1.2 (compactness criterion [7]). The set $\mathscr{F} \subset P C\left([0, c], R^{n}\right)$ is relatively compact if and only if one has the following:
(1) $\mathscr{F}$ is bounded;
(2) $\mathscr{F}$ is quasiequicontinuous in $[0, c]$.

Lemma 1.3 [7]. Let $s \in[0, T), c_{k} \geq 0, \alpha_{k}, k=1, \ldots, p$, are constants and let $p, q \in P C(J, R)$, $x \in P C^{1}(J, R)$. If

$$
\begin{align*}
& x^{\prime}(t) \leq p(t) x(t)+q(t), \quad t \in[s, T), t \neq t_{k}, \\
& x\left(t_{k}^{+}\right) \leq c_{k} x\left(t_{k}\right)+\alpha_{k}, \quad t_{k} \in[s, T), \tag{1.3}
\end{align*}
$$

then for $t \in[s, T]$,

$$
\begin{align*}
x(t) \leq & x\left(s^{+}\right)\left(\prod_{s<t_{k}<t} c_{k}\right) \exp \left(\int_{s}^{t} p(u) d u\right) \\
& +\int_{s}^{t}\left(\prod_{u<t_{k}<t} c_{k}\right) \exp \left(\int_{u}^{t} p(\tau) d \tau\right) q(u) d u  \tag{1.4}\\
& +\sum_{s<t_{k}<t}\left(\prod_{t_{k}<t_{i}<t} c_{i}\right) \exp \left(\int_{t_{k}}^{t} p(\tau) d \tau\right) \alpha_{k} .
\end{align*}
$$

The result also holds if the above inequalities are reversed.

## 2. Main results

Theorem 2.1. Let $f:[0,1] \times R^{2} \rightarrow R$ be a continuous function. Assume that there exist $p(t), q(t)$, and $r(t):[0,1] \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|f(t, u, v)| \leq p(t)|u|+q(t)|v|+r(t) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $t \in[0,1]$ and all $(u, v) \in R^{2}$. Then the BVP (1.1) has at least one solution in $P^{1}[0,1]$ provided

$$
\begin{gather*}
Q+B<1,  \tag{2.2}\\
\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)\left(\frac{P}{1-Q-B}+C\right)<1, \tag{2.3}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $P=\int_{0}^{1} p(t) d t, Q=\int_{0}^{1} q(t) d t, B=\sum_{k=1}^{T}\left|b_{k}\right|, C=\sum_{k=1}^{T}\left|c_{k}\right|$.
Proof. Let $Y=X=P C^{1}[0,1]$. Define a linear operator $L: D(L) \subset X \rightarrow Y$ by setting

$$
\begin{equation*}
D(L)=\left\{x \in P C^{2}[0,1], x^{\prime}(0)=0, x(1)=\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i} x\left(\xi_{i}\right)\right\}, \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and for $x \in D(L): L x=\left(x^{\prime \prime}, \Delta x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right), \Delta x\left(t_{k}\right)\right)$. We also define a nonlinear mapping $F: X \rightarrow$ $Y$ by setting

$$
\begin{equation*}
(F x)(t)=\left(f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right), b_{k} x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right), c_{k} x\left(t_{k}\right)\right) . \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the assumption on $f$, we see that $F$ is a bounded mapping from $X$ to $Y$. Next, it is easy to see that $L: D(L) \rightarrow Y$ is one-to-one mapping. Moreover, it follows easily using Lemma 1.2 that $L^{-1} F: X \rightarrow X$ is a compact mapping.

We note that $x \in P C^{1}[0,1]$ is a solution of (1.1) if and only if $x$ is a fixed point of the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
x=L^{-1} F x . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We apply the Leray-Schauder continuation theorem to obtain the existence of a solution for $x=L^{-1} F x$.

To do this, it suffices to verify that the set of all possible solutions of the family of equations:

$$
\begin{gather*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t)=\lambda f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right), \\
\Delta x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}^{+}\right)=\lambda b_{k} x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right), \quad \Delta x\left(t_{k}\right)=\lambda c_{k} x\left(t_{k}\right),  \tag{2.7}\\
x^{\prime}(0)=0, \quad x(1)=\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i} x\left(\xi_{i}\right) .
\end{gather*}
$$

Integrate (2.7) from 0 to $t$ to obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime}(t)=\lambda \int_{0}^{t} f\left(s, x(s), x^{\prime}(s)\right) d s+\lambda \sum_{0<t_{k}<t} b_{k} x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right) . \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

By condition (2.1), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right| & \leq \int_{0}^{t}\left[p(s)\|x\|+q(s)\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|+r(s)\right] d s+\sum_{k=1}^{T}\left|b_{k}\right|\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|  \tag{2.9}\\
& \leq(Q+B)\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|+P\|x\|+R_{1}
\end{align*}
$$

where $R_{1}=\int_{0}^{1} r(t) d t$. Thus,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|x^{\prime}\right\| \leq \frac{1}{1-Q-B}\left(P\|x\|+R_{1}\right) \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Integrate (2.8) from $t$ to 1 to obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& -x(t) \\
& =\lambda\left\{\int_{0}^{1} H(t, s) f\left(s, x(s), x^{\prime}(s)\right) d s+\int_{t}^{1} \sum_{0<t_{k}<s} b_{k} x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right) d s+\sum_{t<t_{k}<1} c_{k} x\left(t_{k}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+\frac{1}{1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\left[\int_{0}^{1} H\left(\xi_{i}, s\right) f\left(s, x(s), x^{\prime}(s)\right) d s \int_{\xi_{i}}^{1} \sum_{0<t_{k}<s} b_{k} x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right) d s+\sum_{\xi_{i}<t_{k}<1} c_{k} x\left(t_{k}\right)\right]\right\}, \tag{2.11}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
H(t, s)= \begin{cases}1-t, & 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1  \tag{2.12}\\ 1-s, & 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1\end{cases}
$$

So

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|x\| \leq\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)\left[(P+C)\|x\|+(Q+B)\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|+R_{1}\right] . \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equations (2.10) and (2.13) imply

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|x\| \leq\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)\left[\left(\frac{P}{1-Q-B}+C\right)\|x\|+R_{1}\right] . \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows from the assumption (2.3) that there is a constant $M_{1}$ in dependent of $\lambda \in$ $[0,1]$ such that $\|x\| \leq M_{1}$. Furthermore, by (2.10), there is a constant $M_{2}$ such that $\left\|x^{\prime}\right\| \leq$ $M_{2}$. It is now immediate that the set of solutions of the family of equations (2.7) is, a priori, bounded in $P C^{1}[0,1]$ by a constant independent of $\lambda \in[0,1]$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Theorem 2.2. Let $f:[0,1] \times R^{2} \rightarrow R$. Assume that the following conditions hold:
$\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right)|f(t, u, v)| \leq q(t) w(\max \{|u|,|v|\})$ on $[0,1] \times R^{2}$ with $w>0$ continuous and nondecreasing on $[0, \infty), q(t):[0,1] \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ is continuous;
$\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}\right) b_{k} \geq 0$, and

$$
\begin{gather*}
C\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)<1 \\
\sup _{r \geq 0} \frac{r}{w(r)}>M_{3}=\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)\left[1-C\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)\right]^{-1} Q \tag{2.15}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $Q=\int_{0}^{1} \prod_{0<t_{k}<1}\left(1+b_{k}\right) q(s) d s$.
Then (1.1) has at least one solution.
Choose $\widetilde{M}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\widetilde{M}}{w(\widetilde{M})}>M_{3} \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

To show that (1.1)) has at least one solution, we consider the operator

$$
\begin{equation*}
x=\lambda L^{-1} F x, \quad \lambda \in[0,1] \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is equivalent to (2.7). Let $x \in P C^{1}[0,1]$ be any solution of $(2.7)$, from $\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
-q(t) w\left(\|x\|_{1}\right) \leq x^{\prime \prime}(t) \leq q(t) w\left(\|x\|_{1}\right) . \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consider the inequalities

$$
\begin{align*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t) & \leq q(t) w\left(\|x\|_{1}\right), \\
x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right) & =\left(1+b_{k}\right) x\left(t_{k}\right), \\
x^{\prime}(0) & =0, \\
x^{\prime \prime}(t) & \geq-q(t) w\left(\|x\|_{1}\right),  \tag{2.19}\\
x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right) & =\left(1+b_{k}\right) x\left(t_{k}\right), \\
x^{\prime}(0) & =0 .
\end{align*}
$$

By Lemma 1.3, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
x^{\prime}(t) & \leq w\left(\|x\|_{1}\right) \int_{0}^{t} \prod_{0<t_{k}<t}\left(1+b_{k}\right) q(s) d s \\
& \leq Q w\left(\|x\|_{1}\right), \\
x^{\prime}(t) & \geq-w\left(\|x\|_{1}\right) \int_{0}^{t} \prod_{0<t_{k}<t}\left(1+b_{k}\right) q(s) d s  \tag{2.20}\\
& \geq-Q w\left(\|x\|_{1}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

From (2.20), we can deduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right| \leq Q w\left(\|x\|_{1}\right), \tag{2.21}
\end{equation*}
$$
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and so

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|x^{\prime}\right\| \leq \mathrm{Q} w\left(\|x\|_{1}\right) . \tag{2.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using $x(t)=x(1)-\int_{t}^{1} x^{\prime}(s) d s-\sum_{t<t_{k}<1} c_{k} x\left(t_{k}\right)$ and $x(1)=\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i} x\left(\xi_{i}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(t)=-\frac{1}{1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\left[\int_{\xi_{i}}^{1} x^{\prime}(s) d s+\sum_{\xi_{i}<t_{k}<1} c_{k} x\left(t_{k}\right)\right]-\int_{t}^{1} x^{\prime}(s) d s-\sum_{t<t_{k}<1} c_{k} x\left(t_{k}\right), \tag{2.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
|x(t)| \leq\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)\left(\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|+C\|x\|\right) \tag{2.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

and so

$$
\begin{align*}
\|x\| & \leq\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)\left[1-C\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)\right]^{-1}\left\|x^{\prime}\right\| \\
& \leq\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)\left[1-C\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)\right]^{-1} Q w\left(\|x\|_{1}\right) . \tag{2.25}
\end{align*}
$$

Now, (2.22) together with (2.25) imply $\|x\|_{1} \neq \widetilde{M}$. Set

$$
\begin{equation*}
U=\left\{u \in P C^{1}[0,1]:\|u\|_{1}<\widetilde{M}\right\}, \quad K=E=P C^{1}[0,1] \tag{2.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

then the nonlinear alternative of Leray-Schauder type [6] guarantees that $L^{-1} F$ has a fixed point, that is, (1.1) has a solution $x \in P C^{1}[0,1]$, which completes the proof.

## 3. Examples

Example 3.1. Consider the boundary value problem

$$
\begin{gather*}
x^{\prime \prime}=f\left(t, x, x^{\prime}\right), \quad t \in[0,1], t \neq \frac{1}{2}, \\
\Delta x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right)=\frac{1}{6} x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right), \quad \Delta x\left(t_{k}\right)=\frac{1}{4} x\left(t_{k}\right), \quad t_{k}=\frac{1}{2},  \tag{3.1}\\
x^{\prime}(0)=0, x(1)=\frac{1}{2} x\left(\frac{1}{3}\right)-\frac{1}{3} x\left(\frac{2}{3}\right),
\end{gather*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t, u, v)=t^{5} u+\frac{1}{2} t^{3} v+t^{2}\left[1+\cos \left(u^{200}+v^{30}\right)\right] \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|f(t, u, v)| \leq p(t)|u|+q(t)|v|+r(t) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $p(t)=t^{5}, q(t)=(1 / 2) t^{3}, r(t)=2 t^{2}$. Clearly, $P=1 / 6, Q=1 / 8, B=1 / 6, C=1 / 4$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q+B=\frac{7}{24}<1, \quad\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)\left(\frac{P}{1-Q-B}+C\right)=\frac{33}{34}<1 . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

By Theorem 2.1, (3.1) has at least one solution.
Example 3.2. Consider the boundary value problem

$$
\begin{align*}
x^{\prime \prime} & =f\left(t, x, x^{\prime}\right), \quad t \in[0,1], t \neq \frac{1}{2}, \\
\Delta x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right) & =x^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right), \quad \Delta x\left(t_{k}\right)=\frac{1}{3} x\left(t_{k}\right), \quad t_{k}=\frac{1}{2},  \tag{3.5}\\
x^{\prime}(0) & =0, \quad x(1)=\frac{1}{2} x\left(\frac{1}{3}\right)-\frac{1}{2} x\left(\frac{2}{3}\right),
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t, u, v)=e^{-t}\left(u^{\alpha}+v^{\beta}\right)+\mu e^{-t} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\alpha \in[0,1], \beta \in[0,1], \mu>0$. It is easy to see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|f(t, u, v)| \leq q(t) w(\max \{|u|,|v|\}) \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $q(t)=e^{-t}, w(s)=s^{\alpha}+s^{\beta}+\mu$. Clearly

$$
\begin{align*}
& C\left(1+\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-2}\left|a_{i}\right|}{\left|1-\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} a_{i}\right|}\right)=\frac{2}{3}<1,  \tag{3.8}\\
& \sup _{r \geq 0} \frac{r}{w(r)}=\sup _{r \geq 0} \frac{r}{r^{\alpha}+r^{\beta}+\mu}=\infty,
\end{align*}
$$

so $\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}\right)$ is true. Theorem 2.2 shows that (3.5) has at least one solution.
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