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#### Abstract

In this paper, we consider a p-Laplacian singular Rayleigh equation with time-dependent deviating argument


$$
\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime}+f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)+g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))=e(t)
$$

where $g$ has an attractive singularity at $x=0$. Using the Manásevich-Mawhin continuation theorem, we prove that the equation has at least one $T$-periodic solution.
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## 1 Introduction

In the past years, researchers paid much attention to investigating the problem of periodic solutions for second-order equations with singularities (see [1-16]). Among those studies, the study of properties of repulsive singularities can be traced back to 1996. Zhang [1] discussed the existence of positive periodic solutions of the following Liénard equation with singularity:

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t)+f(x(t)) x^{\prime}(t)+g(t, x(t))=0 \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $g(t, x(t))$ may be unbounded as $x \rightarrow 0^{+}$. Equation (1.1) is of repulsive type (resp. attractive type) if $g(t, x(t)) \rightarrow-\infty$ (resp. $g(t, x(t)) \rightarrow+\infty)$ as $x \rightarrow 0^{+}$. Using Mawhin's continuation theorem, the author proved that Eq. (1.1) has at least one $T$-periodic solution.
Zhang's work has attracted much attention of many specialists in differential equations. In 2014, Wang [2] investigated the existence of positive periodic solutions of the following Liénard equation with singularity and deviating argument:

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime \prime}(t)+f(x(t)) x^{\prime}(t)+g(t, x(t-\sigma))=0, \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $g$ satisfies the same conditions as in Eq. (1.1), and $\sigma$ is a constant such that $0 \leq \sigma<T$. In 2017, Lu [3] considered the existence of positive periodic solutions of the following Liénard equation with singularity:

$$
x^{\prime \prime}(t)+f(x(t)) x^{\prime}(t)-g(x(t))+\varphi(t) x(t)=h(t),
$$

where $g(x)$ is singular at $x=0$, and $\varphi$ and $h$ are $T$-periodic functions. The authors found a new method for estimating a lower a priori bounds of the periodic solutions to the given equation. Besides, many articles have been published about Liénard equation with repulsive singularity (see [4-13]).
Recently, some good deal of works have been performed on the existence of periodic solutions of Rayleigh equations with singularity (see [14-16]). Wang and Ma [16] in 2015 studied the Rayleigh equation with repulsive singularity

$$
x^{\prime \prime}(t)+f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)+g(x(t))=p(t)
$$

where $g$ has a repulsive singularity at the origin. The authors obtained that the given equation has at least one $2 \pi$-periodic solution.

All the aforementioned results are related to equations with repulsive singularity or equations with time-independent deviating argument. Naturally, a new question arises: how the Rayleigh equation with attractive singularity works on time-dependent deviating argument? Besides practical interests, the topic has obvious intrinsic theoretical significance. To answer this question, in this paper, applying the Manásevich-Mawhin continuation theorem, we consider the existence of positive periodic solutions for the following Rayleigh equation with attractive singularity and time-dependent deviating argument:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime}+f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)+g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))=e(t) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\varphi_{p}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by $\varphi_{p}(s)=|s|^{p-2} s$ with constant $p>1, f \in C(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, $e \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)$ and $e(t)$ are $T$-periodic with respect to variable $t, \int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t=0$, $g(t, x)=g_{0}(x)+g_{1}(t, x)$ with $g_{0} \in C((0, \infty) ; \mathbb{R})$ and an $L^{2}$-Carathéodory function $g_{1}, g_{0}$ has an attractive singularity at $x=0$, that is,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{1} g_{0}(x) d x=+\infty \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\sigma \in C^{1}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ is a $T$-periodic function such that $\sigma^{\prime}(t)<1$. Obviously, the attractivity condition $\lim _{x \rightarrow 0^{+}} \int_{x}^{1} g_{0}(s) d s=+\infty$ contradicts the repulsive singularity. Therefore, the methods of $[1,2,16]$ are no longer applicable to prove the existence of periodic solutions for Eq. (1.3) with attractive singularity. So we need to find a new method to get over it.

In this paper, we give a new condition for $g(t, x)$ in Eq. (1.3) with attractive singularity, namely, $-g(t, x) \leq a x^{p-1}+b$, where $a, b$ are positive constants. Therefore, by estimating $a$ priori bounds of periodic solutions and the Manásevich-Mawhin continuation theorem we prove that Eq. (1.3) has at least one $T$-periodic solution.

## 2 Periodic solution for Eq. (1.3)

We consider the $T$-periodic boundary value problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime}=\tilde{f}\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right), \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\tilde{f}:[0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is assumed to be Carathéodory.

Lemma 2.1 (Manásevich-Mawhin [17]) Let $\Omega$ be an open bounded set in $C_{T}^{1}:=\{x \in$ $\left.C^{1}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}): x(t+T)-x(t) \equiv 0\right\}$. Suppose that:
(i) For each $\lambda \in(0,1)$, the problem

$$
\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime}=\lambda \tilde{f}\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right), \quad x(0)=x(T), \quad x^{\prime}(0)=x^{\prime}(T)
$$

has no solution on $\partial \Omega$.
(ii) The equation

$$
F(a):=\frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} \tilde{f}(t, a, 0) d t=0
$$

has no solution on $\partial \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}$.
(iii) The Brouwer degree

$$
\operatorname{deg}\{F, \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}, 0\} \neq 0
$$

Then the periodic boundary value problem (2.1) has at least one T-periodic solution on $\bar{\Omega}$.

Next, applying the Manśevich-Mawhin continuation theorem, we prove the following theorems. Define

$$
\|x\|:=\max _{t \in[0, T]}|x(t)|, \quad\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|:=\max _{t \in[0, T]}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right| .
$$

Theorem 2.1 Assume that the following conditions are satisfied:
$\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right) f(t, 0)=0$, and there exists a constant $K>0$ such that $|f(t, u)| \leq K$ for $(t, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$.
$\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}\right)$ There exists positive constants $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$ with $0<D_{2}<D_{1}$ such that $g(t, x)<-K$ for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times\left(D_{1},+\infty\right)$ and $g(t, x)>K$ for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times\left(0, D_{2}\right)$.
$\left(\mathrm{H}_{3}\right)$ There exist positive constants $a$ and $b$ such that

$$
-g(t, x) \leq a x^{p-1}+b \quad \text { for }(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times(0,+\infty) .
$$

Then Eq. (1.3) has at least one solution with period $T$ if $2 a T^{p}<1$.

Proof Consider the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime}+\lambda f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)+\lambda g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))=\lambda e(t) . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Firstly, we will claim that the set of all $T$-periodic solution of Eq. (2.2) is bounded. Let $x \in C_{T}:=\{x \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}): x(t+T)-x(t) \equiv 0\}$ be an arbitrary $T$-periodic solution of Eq. (2.2).

Integrating both sides of Eq. (2.2) over [ $0, T$ ], we have

$$
\int_{0}^{T}\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime} d t+\lambda \int_{0}^{T} f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right) d t+\lambda \int_{0}^{T} g(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) d t=\lambda \int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t
$$

Since $\int_{0}^{T}\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime} d t=0$ and $\int_{0}^{T} e(t) d t=0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left(f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)+g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))\right) d t=0 \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Eq. (2.3) and condition $\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right)$ we have

$$
-K T<\int_{0}^{T} g(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) d t<K T .
$$

Then by condition $\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}\right)$ we know that there exist two points $\xi_{1}, \eta_{1} \in[0, T]$ such that

$$
x\left(\xi_{1}\right) \leq D_{1}, x\left(\eta_{1}-\sigma\left(\eta_{1}\right)\right)>D_{2} .
$$

Since $\|x\| \leq x\left(\xi_{1}\right)+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|x\| \leq D_{1}+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying both sides of Eq. (2.2) by $x(t)$ and integrating over the interval $[0, T]$, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{0}^{T}\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime} x(t) d t+\lambda \int_{0}^{T} f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right) x(t) d t+\lambda \int_{0}^{T} g(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) x(t) d t \\
& \quad=\lambda \int_{0}^{T} e(t) x(t) d t \tag{2.5}
\end{align*}
$$

Substituting $\int_{0}^{T}\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime} x(t) d t=-\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t$ into Eq. (2.5), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t= & -\lambda \int_{0}^{T} f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right) x(t) d t-\lambda \int_{0}^{T} g(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) x(t) d t \\
& +\lambda \int_{0}^{T} e(t) x(t) d t
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t \leq & \lambda \int_{0}^{T}\left|f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right||x(t)| d t+\lambda \int_{0}^{T}|g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))||x(t)| d t \\
& +\lambda \int_{0}^{T}|e(t)||x(t)| d t \\
\leq & K T\|x\|+\|x\| \int_{0}^{T}|g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))| d t+\|x\| \int_{0}^{T}|e(t)| d t \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
$$

From Eq. (2.3) and condition $\left(\mathrm{H}_{3}\right)$ we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{0}^{T}|g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))| d t \\
& \quad=\int_{g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))>0} g^{+}(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) d t-\int_{g(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) \leq 0} g^{-}(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) d t \\
& \quad=-2 \int_{g(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) \leq 0} g^{-}(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) d t+\int_{0}^{T} f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right) d t \\
& \quad \leq 2 \int_{0}^{T}\left(a x^{p-1}(t)+b\right) d t+\int_{0}^{T}\left|f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right| d t \\
& \quad \leq 2 a T\|x\|^{p-1}+2 b T+K T \tag{2.7}
\end{align*}
$$

where $g^{-}:=\min \{g(t, x(t-\sigma(t))), 0\}$. Substituting Eq. (2.7) into Eq. (2.6), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t \leq 2 a T\|x\|^{p}+\|x\|(2 K T+2 b T+\|e\| T) . \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting Eq. (2.4) into Eq. (2.8), we get

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t \leq & 2 a T\left(D_{1}+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)^{p} \\
& +(2 b T+\|e\| T+2 K T)\left(D_{1}+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right) \\
\leq & 2 a T\left(T^{\frac{p}{q}} \int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t+(1+p) D_{1} T^{\frac{p-1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\right) \\
& +(2 b T+\|e\| T+2 K T) D_{1} \\
& +(2 b T+\|e\| T+2 K T) T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
= & 2 a T^{\frac{p+q}{q}} \int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t+2 a T^{\frac{p+q-1}{q}}(1+p) D_{1}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\
& +(2 b T+\|e\| T+2 K T) D_{1} \\
& +(2 b T+\|e\| T+2 K T) T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \tag{2.9}
\end{align*}
$$

since $(1+x)^{p} \leq 1+(1+p) x$ for $x \in[0, \delta]$, where $\delta$ is a given positive constant depending only on $p>0$. Thus we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(D_{1}+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)^{p} \\
& \quad \leq T^{\frac{p}{q}} \int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t+(1+p) D_{1} T^{\frac{p-1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=1$, we get $2 a T^{\frac{p+q}{q}}=2 a T^{p}<1$. It is easy to see that there exists a constant $M_{1}^{\prime}>0$ (independent of $\lambda$ ) such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t \leq M_{1}^{\prime} \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Eq. (2.4) and Eq. (2.10) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|x\| \leq D_{1}+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq D_{1}+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(M_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}:=M_{1} \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $x(t)$ is $T$-periodic, there exists a point $t_{0} \in(0, T)$ such that $x^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=0$, whereas $\varphi_{p}(0)=0$. Hence, from Eq. (2.7) and Eq. (2.11) we have that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right| & =\left|\int_{t_{0}}^{t}\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(s)\right)\right)^{\prime} d s\right| \\
& \leq \lambda \int_{0}^{T}\left|f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right| d t+\lambda \int_{0}^{T}|g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))| d t+\lambda \int_{0}^{T}|e(t)| d t \\
& \leq 2 K T+2 a T M_{1}^{p-1}+2 b T+T\|e\|:=M_{2}^{\prime} \tag{2.12}
\end{align*}
$$

Next, we claim that there exists a positive constant $M_{2}>M_{2}^{\prime}+1$ such that, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|x^{\prime}\right\| \leq M_{2} \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

In fact, if $x^{\prime}(t)$ is not bounded, then there exists a positive constant $M_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ such that $\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|>M_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ for some $x^{\prime}(t) \in \mathbb{R}$, and therefore we have $\left\|\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right\|=\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|^{p-1} \geq\left(M_{2}^{\prime \prime}\right)^{p-1}$, a contradiction, and so Eq. (2.13) holds.

From Eq. (2.3) and Eq. (2.13) we know that there is a point $t_{1} \in[0, T]$ such that $x\left(t_{1}-\right.$ $\left.\sigma\left(t_{1}\right)\right) \geq \gamma_{1}$. Let $\eta_{1}=t_{1}$, where $\eta_{1}$ is as in Eq. (2.3). Then we have

$$
x\left(\eta_{1}-\sigma\left(\eta_{1}\right)\right) \geq \gamma_{1}
$$

where $\gamma_{1}<M_{1}$ is a positive constant independent of $\lambda \in(0,1]$. Meanwhile, we show that for any $t \in[0, T]$, there exits a constant $\gamma_{1}^{\prime} \in\left(0, \gamma_{1}\right)$ such that each positive $T$-periodic solution of Eq. (1.3) satisfies

$$
x(t-\sigma(t))>\gamma_{1}^{\prime} .
$$

On the other hand, we consider the interval $\left[\eta_{1}, t\right] \subset[0, T]$ and $x\left(\eta_{1}-\sigma\left(\eta_{1}\right)\right)>D_{2}$. Multiplying both sides of Eq. (2.2) by $x^{\prime}(t-\sigma(t))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(t)\right)$ and integrating on $\left[\eta_{1}, t\right]$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\eta_{1}}^{t}\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(s)\right)\right)^{\prime} x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s \\
& \quad+\lambda \int_{\eta_{1}}^{t} f\left(s, x^{\prime}(s)\right) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +\lambda \int_{\eta_{1}}^{t} g_{0}(x(s-\sigma(s))) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s \\
& +\lambda \int_{\eta_{1}}^{t} g_{1}(s, x(s-\sigma(s))) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s \\
= & \lambda \int_{\eta_{1}}^{t} e(s) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s
\end{aligned}
$$

Furthermore, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\lambda \int_{x\left(\eta_{1}-\sigma\left(\eta_{1}\right)\right)}^{x(t-\sigma(t))} g_{0}(v) d v\right| \\
& =\lambda\left|\int_{\eta_{1}}^{t} g_{0}(x(s-\sigma(s))) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right| \\
& \leq \\
& \quad\left|\int_{\eta_{1}}^{t}\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(s)\right)\right)^{\prime} x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right| \\
& \quad+\lambda\left|\int_{\eta_{1}}^{t} f\left(s, x^{\prime}(s)\right) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right| \\
& \quad+\lambda\left|\int_{\eta_{1}}^{t} g_{1}(s, x(s-\sigma(s))) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right|  \tag{2.14}\\
& \quad+\lambda\left|\int_{\eta_{1}}^{t} e(s) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right| .
\end{align*}
$$

By Eq.(2.2) and condition $\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right)$ we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\int_{\eta_{1}}^{t}\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(s)\right)\right)^{\prime} x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right| \\
& \quad \leq \int_{\eta_{1}}^{t}\left|\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(s)\right)\right)^{\prime}\right|\left|x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\right|\left|\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right)\right| d s \\
& \quad \leq\left(1+\sigma_{0}^{1}\right)\left\|x^{\prime}\right\| \lambda \int_{0}^{T}\left|-f\left(s, x^{\prime}(s)\right)-g(s, x(s, s-\sigma(s)))+e(s)\right| d s \\
& \quad \leq \lambda\left(1+\sigma_{0}^{1}\right) M_{2}\left(2 K T+2 a T\left(M_{1}\right)^{p-1}+2 b T+\|e\| T\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\sigma_{0}^{1}:=\max _{t \in[0, T]}\left(-\sigma^{\prime}(t)\right)$. Meanwhile, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lambda\left|\int_{\eta_{1}}^{t} f\left(s, x^{\prime}(s)\right) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right| \leq \lambda\left(1+\sigma_{0}^{1}\right) M_{2} K T \\
& \lambda\left|\int_{\eta_{1}}^{t} g_{1}(s, x(s-\sigma(s))) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right| \leq \lambda\left(1+\sigma_{0}^{1}\right) M_{2}\left\|g_{1 M_{1}}\right\| T
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\left\|g_{1 M_{1}}\right\|:=\max _{0<x<M_{1}}\left|g_{1}(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))\right|$, and

$$
\lambda\left|\int_{\eta_{1}}^{t} e(s) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right| \leq \lambda\left(1+\sigma_{0}^{1}\right) M_{2}\|e\| T
$$

From these inequalities and Eq. (2.14) we derive

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\int_{x\left(\eta_{1}-\sigma\left(\eta_{1}\right)\right)}^{x(t-\sigma(t))} g_{0}(v) d v\right| & \leq\left(1+\sigma_{0}^{1}\right) M_{2}\left(3 K T+2 a T\left(M_{1}\right)^{p-1}+2 b T+2\|e\| T+\left\|g_{1 M_{1}}\right\| T\right) \\
& :=M_{3} . \tag{2.15}
\end{align*}
$$

In view of the attractive condition (1.4) and $x\left(\eta_{1}-\sigma\left(\eta_{1}\right)\right) \geq \gamma_{1}$, there exists $\gamma_{1}^{\prime} \in\left(0, \gamma_{1}\right)$ such that $\int_{\gamma_{1}^{\prime}}^{\gamma_{1}^{\prime}} g_{0}(v) d v>M_{3}$. Thus, if there is a point $\eta_{1}^{*} \in\left[\eta_{1}, t\right]$ such that $x\left(\eta_{1}^{*}-\sigma\left(\eta_{1}^{*}\right)\right) \leq \gamma_{1}^{\prime}$, then

$$
\left|\int_{x\left(\eta_{1}^{*}-\sigma\left(\eta_{1}^{*}\right)\right)}^{x\left(\eta_{1}-\sigma\left(\eta_{1}\right)\right)} g_{0}(v) d v\right| \geq \int_{\gamma_{1}^{\prime}}^{\gamma_{1}} g_{0}(v) d v>M_{3},
$$

which contradicts Eq. (2.15). Therefore, we obtain that $x(t-\sigma(t))>\gamma_{1}^{\prime}$ for all $t \in[0, T]$.
In the case $t \in\left[0, \eta_{1}\right]$ (i.e., $\left.x(t-\sigma(t)) \in\left[-\sigma(0), \eta_{1}-\sigma\left(\eta_{1}\right)\right]\right)$, we can handle similarly.
Define

$$
\Omega=\left\{x \in C_{T}^{1}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \mid E_{1} \leq x(t) \leq E_{2},\left\|x^{\prime}\right\| \leq M_{2}, \forall t \in[0, T]\right\},
$$

where $0<E_{1}<\min \left(D_{2}, \gamma_{1}^{\prime}\right), E_{2}>\max \left(M_{1}, D_{1}\right)$. We know that Eq. (2.2) has no solution on $\partial \Omega$ as $\lambda \in(0,1)$, and when $x(t) \in \partial \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}, x(t)=E_{2}$ or $x(t)=E_{1}$. From Eq. (2.4) we know that $E_{2}>D_{1}$ and $E_{1}<D_{2}$. So, from condition (ii) of Lemma 2.1 we see that

$$
\frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} g\left(t, E_{2}\right) d t<0
$$

and

$$
\frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} g\left(t, E_{1}\right) d t>0
$$

Obviously, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{deg}\{F, \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}, 0\} & =\operatorname{deg}\left\{\frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} g(t, x) d t, \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}, 0\right\} \\
& =\operatorname{deg}\{x, \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}, 0\} \neq 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

and so condition (iii) of Lemma 2.1 is satisfied. In view of Theorem 2.1, Eq. (1.3) has at least one $T$-periodic solution.

Theorem 2.2 Suppose that condition $\left(\mathrm{H}_{3}\right)$ holds. Assume that the following conditions are satisfied:
$\left(\mathrm{H}_{4}\right) f(t, 0)=0$, and there exist positive constants $m$, $n$ such that $0 \leq f(t, u) \leq m|u|^{p-1}+n$ for $(t, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$.
$\left(H_{5}\right)$ There exist constants $D_{3}$ and $D_{4}$ with $0<D_{4}<D_{3}$ such that $g(t, x)<-\|e\|$ for $(t, x) \in$ $\mathbb{R} \times\left(D_{3},+\infty\right)$ and $g(t, x)>\|e\|$ for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times\left(0, D_{4}\right)$.
Then Eq. (1.3) has at least one solution with period $T$ if $2 m T+2 a T^{p}<1$.

Proof Consider the homotopic equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime}+\lambda f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)+\lambda g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))=\lambda e(t) \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

We follow the same strategy and notation as in the proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $t^{*}$ and $t_{*}$ be the global maximum point and global minimum point. Since $x(t)$ is $T$-periodic, we get that $x^{\prime}\left(t^{*}\right)=0$ and $x^{\prime}\left(t_{*}\right)=0$. From $\int_{0}^{T}\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime} d t=0$ we obtain

$$
\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}\left(t^{*}\right)\right)\right)^{\prime} \leq 0 \quad \text { and } \quad\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}\left(t_{*}\right)\right)\right)^{\prime} \geq 0
$$

In fact, if $\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}\left(t_{*}\right)\right)\right)^{\prime} \geq 0$ does not hold, then there exists a constant $\varepsilon>0$ such that $\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}\left(t_{*}\right)\right)\right)^{\prime}<0$ for all $t \in\left(t_{*}-\varepsilon, t_{*}+\varepsilon\right)$. Therefore, $\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}\left(t_{*}\right)\right)$ is strictly decreasing for $\left(t_{*}-\varepsilon, t_{*}+\varepsilon\right)$, and we know that $x^{\prime}(t)$ is strictly decreasing for $\left(t_{*}-\varepsilon, t_{*}+\varepsilon\right)$. This contradicts the definition of $t_{*}$. Thus, we obtain that $\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}\left(t_{*}\right)\right)\right)^{\prime} \geq 0$ is true. From $f(t, 0)=0$ and Eq. (2.16) we have

$$
g\left(t_{*}, x\left(t_{*}-\sigma\left(t_{*}\right)\right)\right)-e\left(t_{*}\right) \leq 0
$$

Then, from condition $\left(\mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ we get that there exists a point $\eta_{2} \in[0, T]$ such that

$$
x\left(\eta_{2}-\sigma\left(\eta_{2}\right)\right) \geq D_{4} .
$$

Similarly, we have

$$
g\left(t^{*}, x\left(t^{*}-\sigma\left(t^{*}\right)\right)\right)-e\left(t^{*}\right) \geq 0
$$

Then we get that there exists a point $\xi_{2} \in[0, T]$ such that

$$
x\left(\xi_{2}\right) \leq D_{3} .
$$

Therefore, from $\|x\| \leq x\left(\xi_{2}\right)+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|x\| \leq D_{3}+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Eq. (2.3) and from conditions $\left(\mathrm{H}_{3}\right)$ and $\left(\mathrm{H}_{4}\right)$ we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{0}^{T}|g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))| d t \\
& \quad=\int_{g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))>0} g^{+}(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) d t-\int_{g(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) \leq 0} g^{-}(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) d t \\
& \quad=-2 \int_{g(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) \leq 0} g^{-}(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) d t+\int_{0}^{T} f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right) d t \\
& \quad \leq 2 \int_{0}^{T}\left(a x^{p-1}+b\right) d t+\int_{0}^{T}\left|f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right| d t \\
& \quad \leq 2 a T\|x\|^{p-1}+2 b T+m \int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p-1} d t+n T . \tag{2.18}
\end{align*}
$$

Then from the Hölder inequality, Eq. (2.6), and Eq. (2.18) we get

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t \leq & 2 a T\|x\|^{p}+2\|x\| m \int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p-1} d t+\|x\|(2 n T+2 b T+\|e\| T) \\
\leq & 2 a T\|x\|^{p}+2\|x\| m T^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\
& +\|x\|(2 n T+2 b T+\|e\| T) \tag{2.19}
\end{align*}
$$

Substituting Eq. (2.17) into Eq. (2.19), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t \leq & 2 a T\left(D_{3}+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)^{p} \\
& +\left(D_{3}+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)(2 n T+2 b T+\|e\| T) \\
& +2\left(D_{3}+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right) m T^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\
\leq & \left(2 m T+2 a T^{p}\right) \int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t \\
& +\left(2 m D_{3} T^{\frac{1}{p}}+2 a(1+p) D_{3} T^{\frac{p+q-1}{q}}\right)\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\
& +(2 b T+2 n T+\|e\| T) T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
& +(2 b T+2 n T+\|e\| T) D_{3} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $2 m T+2 a T^{p}<1$, it is easy to see that there exists a constant $N_{1}^{\prime}>0$ (independent of $\lambda$ ) such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t \leq N_{1}^{\prime} \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence from Eq. (2.20) we have

$$
\|x\| \leq D_{3}+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{0}^{T}\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|^{p} d t\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq D_{3}+T^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(N_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}:=N_{1}
$$

By condition $\left(\mathrm{H}_{4}\right)$ and Eq. (2.12) there exists a constant $N_{2}^{\prime}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right| & =\left|\int_{t_{0}}^{t}\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(s)\right)\right)^{\prime} d s\right| \\
& \leq \lambda \int_{0}^{T}\left|f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right| d t+\lambda \int_{0}^{T}|g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))| d t+\lambda \int_{0}^{T}|e(t)| d t \\
& \leq 2 m T^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(N_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}+2 n T+2 a T N_{1}^{p-1}+2 b T+T\|e\|:=N_{2}^{\prime} \tag{2.21}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus, we obtain that there exists a constant $N_{2}>0$ such that, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|x^{\prime}\right\| \leq N_{2} . \tag{2.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Eq. (2.3) and Eq. (2.22) we know that there is a point $t_{2} \in[0, T]$ such that $x\left(t_{2}-\right.$ $\left.\sigma\left(t_{2}\right)\right) \geq \gamma_{2}$. Letting $\eta_{2}=t_{2}$, we have

$$
x\left(\eta_{2}-\sigma\left(\eta_{2}\right)\right) \geq \gamma_{2}
$$

where $\gamma_{2}<N_{1}$ is a positive constant independent of $\lambda \in(0,1]$. Meanwhile, we show that, for any $t \in[0, T]$, there exits a constant $\gamma_{2}^{\prime} \in\left(0, \gamma_{2}\right)$ such that each positive $T$-periodic solution of Eq. (1.3) satisfies

$$
x(t-\sigma(t))>\gamma_{2}^{\prime} .
$$

On the other hand, by Eq. (2.2) and condition $\left(\mathrm{H}_{4}\right)$ we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\int_{\eta_{2}}^{t}\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(s)\right)\right)^{\prime} x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right| \\
& \quad \leq \int_{\eta_{2}}^{t}\left|\left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(s)\right)\right)^{\prime}\right|\left|x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\right|\left|\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right)\right| d s \\
& \quad \leq\left(1+\sigma_{0}^{1}\right)\left\|x^{\prime}\right\| \lambda \int_{0}^{T}\left|-f\left(s, x^{\prime}(s)\right)-g(s, x(s, s-\sigma(s)))+e(s)\right| d s \\
& \quad \leq \lambda\left(1+\sigma_{0}^{1}\right) N_{2}\left(2 m T^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(N_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}+2 n T+2 a T\left(N_{1}\right)^{p-1}+2 b T+\|e\| T\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Meanwhile, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lambda\left|\int_{\eta_{2}}^{t} f\left(s, x^{\prime}(s)\right) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right| \leq \lambda\left(1+\sigma_{0}^{1}\right) N_{2}\left(m T^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(N_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}+n T\right), \\
& \lambda\left|\int_{\eta_{2}}^{t} g_{1}(s, x(s-\sigma(s))) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right| \leq \lambda\left(1+\sigma_{0}^{1}\right) N_{2}\left\|g_{1 N_{1}}\right\| T
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\left\|g_{1 N_{1}}\right\|:=\max _{0<x<N_{1}}\left|g_{1}(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))\right|$, and

$$
\lambda\left|\int_{\eta_{2}}^{t} e(s) x^{\prime}(s-\sigma(s))\left(1-\sigma^{\prime}(s)\right) d s\right| \leq \lambda\left(1+\sigma_{0}^{1}\right) N_{2}\|e\| T
$$

From those inequalities and Eq. (2.14) we derive

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\int_{x\left(\eta_{2}-\sigma\left(\eta_{2}\right)\right)}^{x(t-\sigma(t))} g_{0}(v) d v\right| \leq & \left(1+\sigma_{0}^{1}\right) N_{2}\left(3 m T^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(N_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}+3 n T+2 a T\left(N_{1}\right)^{p-1}\right. \\
& \left.+2 b T+2\|e\| T+\left\|g_{1 N_{1}}\right\| T\right):=N_{3} . \tag{2.23}
\end{align*}
$$

In view of the attractive condition (1.4) and $x\left(\eta_{2}-\sigma\left(\eta_{2}\right)\right) \geq \gamma_{2}$, there exists $\gamma_{2}^{\prime} \in\left(0, \gamma_{2}\right)$ such that $\int_{\gamma_{2}^{\prime}}^{\gamma_{2}} g_{0}(v) d v>N_{3}$. Thus, if there is a point $\eta_{2}^{*} \in\left[\eta_{2}, t\right]$ such that $x\left(\eta_{2}^{*}-\sigma\left(\eta_{2}^{*}\right)\right) \leq \gamma_{2}^{\prime}$,
then

$$
\left|\int_{x\left(\eta_{2}^{*}-\sigma\left(\eta_{2}^{*}\right)\right)}^{x\left(\eta_{2}-\sigma\left(\eta_{2}\right)\right)} g_{0}(v) d v\right| \geq \int_{\gamma_{2}^{\prime}}^{\gamma_{2}} g_{0}(v) d v>N_{3},
$$

which contradicts Eq. (2.23). Therefore we obtain that $x(t-\sigma(t))>\gamma_{2}^{\prime}$ for all $t \in$ $[0, T]$.
In the case $t \in\left[0, \eta_{2}\right]$ (i.e., $x(t-\sigma(t)) \in\left[-\sigma(0), \eta_{2}-\sigma\left(\eta_{2}\right)\right]$ ), we can handle similarly.
This proves the claim, and the rest of the proof of the theorem is identical to that of Theorem 2.1.

Example 2.1 Consider the following $p$-Laplacian singular Rayleigh equation with attractive singularity and time-dependent deviating argument:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime}+\cos ^{2}(8 t) \sin \left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)-\left(\left(\frac{1}{2} \cos ^{2}(4 t)+\frac{1}{2}\right) x^{5}\left(t-\frac{\cos (8 t)}{11}\right)\right) \\
& \quad+\frac{1}{x^{\mu}\left(t-\frac{\cos (8 t)}{11}\right)}=\sin (8 t), \tag{2.24}
\end{align*}
$$

where $p=6$, and $\mu \geq 1$ is a constant.
Comparing Eq. (2.24) to Eq. (1.3), it is easy to see that $f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)=\cos ^{2}(8 t) \sin \left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)$, so there exists $K=1$ such that $\left|f\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right| \leq 1$, and it is obvious that condition $\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right)$ holds; $g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))=-\left(\left(\frac{1}{2} \cos ^{2}(4 t)+\frac{1}{2}\right) x^{5}\left(t-\frac{\cos (8 t)}{11}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{x^{\mu}\left(t-\frac{\cos (8 t)}{11}\right)}, \sigma(t)=\frac{\cos (8 t)}{11}, \sigma^{\prime}(t)=-\frac{8 \sin (8 t)}{11}<$ $1, T=\frac{\pi}{4}$. Since $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=1$, we have $q=\frac{6}{5}$. Consider $g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))=-\left(\left(\frac{1}{2} \cos ^{2}(4 t)+\frac{1}{2}\right) x^{5}(t-\right.$ $\left.\left.\frac{\cos (8 t)}{11}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{x^{\mu}\left(t-\frac{\cos (8 t)}{11}\right)}$. Then we have $\int_{0}^{1} \frac{1}{x^{\mu}} d x=+\infty$ and $-g(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) \leq x^{5}\left(t-\frac{\cos (8 t)}{11}\right)+1$, where $a=b=1$. So condition $\left(\mathrm{H}_{3}\right)$ is satisfied. Next, we consider the condition

$$
2 a T^{p}=2 \times 1 \times\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^{6} \approx 0.4694
$$

Therefore, by Theorem 2.1 we get that Eq. (2.24) has at least one positive $\frac{\pi}{4}$-periodic solution.

Example 2.2 Consider the following $p$-Laplacian singular Rayleigh equation with attractive singularity and time-dependent deviating argument:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\varphi_{p}\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime}+\frac{1}{7 \pi}(\sin (12 t)+1)\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)^{7}-\left(\left(\frac{1}{5} \sin ^{2}(6 t)+\frac{1}{5}\right) x^{7}\left(t-\frac{\sin (12 t)}{18}\right)\right) \\
& \quad+\frac{1}{x^{\mu}\left(t-\frac{\sin (12 t)}{18}\right)}=\cos (12 t), \tag{2.25}
\end{align*}
$$

where $p=8$, and $\mu \geq 1$ is a constant.
Comparing Eq. (2.25) to Eq. (1.3), it is easy to see that $f(t, u)=\frac{1}{7 \pi}(\sin (12 t)+1) u^{7}$, so we can choose $m=\frac{2}{7 \pi}$ and $n=1$, so that condition $\left(\mathrm{H}_{4}\right)$ holds; $g(t, x(t-\sigma(t)))=-\left(\left(\frac{1}{5} \sin ^{2}(6 t)+\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.\frac{1}{5}\right) x^{7}\left(t-\frac{\sin (12 t)}{18}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{x^{\mu}\left(t-\frac{\sin (12 t)}{18}\right)}, \sigma(t)=\frac{\sin (12 t)}{18}, \sigma^{\prime}(t)=\frac{2 \cos (12 t)}{3}<1, T=\frac{\pi}{6}$. Since $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=1$, we have $q=\frac{8}{7} ;-g(t, x(t-\sigma(t))) \leq \frac{2}{5} x^{7}\left(t-\frac{\sin (12 t)}{18}\right)+1$, where $a=\frac{2}{5}$ and $b=1$. So, condition $\left(\mathrm{H}_{3}\right)$
is satisfied. Next, we consider the condition

$$
2 a T^{p}+2 m T=2 \times \frac{2}{5} \times\left(\frac{\pi}{6}\right)^{8}+2 \times \frac{2}{7 \pi} \times \frac{\pi}{6}=\frac{4}{5} \times\left(\frac{\pi}{6}\right)^{8}+\frac{2}{21} \approx 0.1
$$

Therefore, by Theorem 2.2 we see that Eq.(2.25) has at least one positive $\frac{\pi}{6}$-periodic solution.

## 3 Conclusions

In Summary, by Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 we have certified that Eq. (1.3) has at least one $T$-periodic solution. Comparing Theorem 2.1 to Theorem 2.2, the condition $|f(t, u)| \leq$ $a|u|^{p-1}+b$ in Theorem 2.2 is weaker than the condition $|f(t, u)| \leq K$ in Theorem 2.1. Moreover, in view of the mathematical points, the results satisfying conditions of attractive singularity and time-dependent deviating argument are valuable to understand the periodic solutions for Rayleigh equations.
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