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1. Introduction. In this paper we deal with the dependence on a parameter $\lambda$ of $T$-periodic solutions for the $T$-periodic quasilinear ordinary differential system:
(1)

$$
x^{\prime}=A(t, x, \lambda) x+\lambda F(t, x, \lambda)+f(t) .
$$

Here $A$ is a real $n \times n$ matrix and $F$ is an $\boldsymbol{R}^{n}$-valued function. We assume that $A$ and $F$ are defined on $\boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{R}^{n} \times\left[-\lambda_{0},+\lambda_{0}\right]$, continuous in $(t, x, \lambda)$ and $T$-periodic in $t$, where $\lambda_{0}>0$. We assume that $f$ is an $\boldsymbol{R}^{n}$-valued function continuous on $\boldsymbol{R}$ and $T$-periodic.

We consider the associated $T$-periodic linear system :

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime}=B(t) x+f(t), \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $B$ is a real $n \times n$ matrix continuous on $R$ and $T$-periodic.
Hypothesis 1. For every $f$ continuous on $\boldsymbol{R}$ and T-periodic, there exists one and only one T-periodic solution for (2).

The qualitative studies of solutions for the periodic quasilinear differential system have been made under Hypothesis 1 (see [1], [2]). When $\lambda$ is sufficiently small, Cronin [1] has discussed the existence of $T$-periodic solutions for
(3) $\quad x^{\prime}=B(t) x+\lambda F(t, x, \lambda)+f(t)$
by applying the implicit function theorem. When the Lipschitz conditions are satisfied, Hale [2] has dealt with the continuous dependence on $\lambda$ of the $T$-periodic solution for (3) under some additional assumptions.

Theorem 1 in the present paper is the existence theorem of periodic solutions for periodic linear systems which are close to (2) in some sense. Theorem 2 is a strict extension of the standard result (see [1]). Moreover we give an extent that shows how $A$ in (1) is close to $B$ in (2) as well as an extent that shows how small $\lambda$ is. In Theorem 3 we obtain sufficient conditions for some dependence on $\lambda$ of periodic solutions for (1). Explicit conditions in Theorem 4 ensure the continuous dependence on $\lambda$ of the periodic solution for (1).
2. Preliminaries. The symbol $\|\cdot\|$ will denote a norm in $R^{n}$ and the corresponding norm for $n \times n$ matrices. Let $C_{T}$ be the space of $\boldsymbol{R}^{n}$-valued functions continuous on $R$ and $T$-periodic with the supremum norm. Let $C[0, T]$ be the space of $R^{n}$-valued functions continuous on [0,T] with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$.

We define a bounded linear operator $\mathcal{L}: C[0, T] \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}^{n}$ by $\mathcal{L}(x(\cdot))=x(0)$ $-x(T)$ with the norm

$$
\|\mathcal{L}\|=\sup \left\{\|\mathcal{L}(x(\cdot))\| ;\|x\|_{\infty}=1\right\}
$$

Let $X_{B}$ be the fundamental matrix of solutions for the homogeneous system corresponding to (2) such that $X_{B}(0)=I$, where $I$ is the identity matrix. Put $U_{B}=I-X_{B}(T)$, we have $\mathcal{L}\left(X_{B}(\cdot) x_{0}\right)=U_{B} x_{0}$ for $x_{0} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{n}$.

The following lemmas are well known.
Lemma 1. Hypothesis 1 is equivalent to $\operatorname{det} U_{B} \neq 0$ (see [2]).
Lemma 2. If $\operatorname{det} U_{B} \neq 0$, then we can choose a positive constant $\rho(0<\rho<1)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|U_{B}^{-1}\right\| \leqq 1 / \rho \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose that Hypothesis 1 holds, and fix a positive number $\rho$ satisfying
(4). We put $r_{0}=M K(1+2 K / \rho)$, where

$$
M=\int_{0}^{T}\|f(s)\| d s \quad \text { and } \quad K=\exp \left(\int_{0}^{T}\|B(s)\| d s\right) .
$$

Let $S_{r}=\left\{x \in \boldsymbol{R}^{n} ;\|x\| \leqq r\right\}$ and let $C_{T, r}=\left\{y \in C_{T} ;\|y\|_{\infty} \leqq r\right\}$, where $r>r_{0}$. Now we assume that three positive numbers $\delta, \Delta$ and $\lambda_{1}\left(\lambda_{1} \leqq \lambda_{0}\right)$ satisfy the conditions (5)-(6) below.

$$
\begin{equation*}
K^{2} \delta \exp (K \delta) \leqq \rho /\left\{2\left\|U_{B}^{-1}\right\|\right\} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

(6)

$$
\left\{\lambda_{1} \Delta+M\right\} K \exp (\delta)[1+2 K \exp (\delta) /\{\rho(1-\rho)\}] \leqq r
$$

We assume that $A, F$ satisfy the conditions (7)-(8), respectively.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{0}^{T}\|A(s, x, \lambda)-B(s)\| d s \leqq \delta \quad \text { for } x \in S_{r}, \lambda \in \Lambda_{1}  \tag{7}\\
& \int_{0}^{T}\|F(s, x, \lambda)\| d s \leqq \Delta \quad \text { for } x \in S_{r}, \lambda \in \Lambda_{1} \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

Here $\Lambda_{1}=\left[-\lambda_{1},+\lambda_{1}\right]$.
3. Theorems. First, we consider the periodic linear non-homogeneous system:
(9) $\quad x^{\prime}=A(t, y(t), \lambda) x+\lambda F(t, y(t), \lambda)+f(t) \quad$ for $y \in C_{T, r}$ together with a boundary condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{L}(x)=0 \quad \text { for } x \in C[0, T] \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lambda \in \Lambda_{1}$. Put $U_{y}=I-X_{y}(T)$, where $X_{y}$ is the fundamental matrix of solutions for the linear homogeneous system corresponding to (9) such that $X_{y}(0)=I$, we have $\mathcal{L}\left(X_{y}(\cdot) x_{0}\right)=U_{y} x_{0}$ for $x_{0} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{n}$.

Theorem 1. Suppose that Hypothesis 1 holds and that the conditions (5)-(8) are satisfied. Then, for any $y \in C_{T, r}$ and any $\lambda \in \Lambda_{1}$, there exists the inverse of $U_{y}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|U_{y}^{-1}\right\| \leqq 1 /\{\rho(1-\rho)\} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and there exists one and only one solution $x_{v} \in C_{T, r}$ for ((9), (10)) such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{y}(t)= & -U_{y}^{-1}\left[\mathcal{L}\left(p_{y}(\cdot)\right)\right]+\int_{0}^{t} A(s, y(s), \lambda) x_{y}(s) d s \\
& +\lambda \int_{0}^{t} F(s, y(s), \lambda) d s+\int_{0}^{t} f(s) d s \quad \text { for } t \in \boldsymbol{R},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $p_{y}(t)=X_{y}(t) \int_{0}^{t} X_{y}^{-1}(s)\{\lambda F(s, y(s), \lambda)+f(s)\} d s$ for $t \in \boldsymbol{R}$.

This theorem is proved in the same manner as given in the proof of Theorem in [3].

From the above, we obtain the existence theorem of periodic solutions for (1).

Theorem 2. Suppose that Hypothesis 1 holds. If the conditions (5)-(8) are satisfied, then for any $\lambda \in \Lambda_{1}$ there exists at least one $T$-periodic solution for (1).

Sketch of the proof of Theorem 2. Choose $\lambda \in \Lambda_{1}$. From Theorem 1 we can define $\mathscr{F}: C_{T, r} \rightarrow C_{T, r}$ by $[\mathscr{F}(y)](t)=x_{y}(t)$ for $t \in \boldsymbol{R}$, where $x_{y}$ is the $T$ periodic solution for (9) in $C_{T, r}$. It can be easily seen that $\mathscr{F}$ is a compact continuous operator. By Schauder's fixed point theorem, $\mathscr{F}$ has at least one fixed point in $C_{T, r}$. Thus for $\lambda \in \Lambda_{1}$ there exists at least one $T$-periodic solution for (1).
Q.E.D.

Now we assume that the following hypothesis holds.
Hypothesis 2. There exists a continuous and strictly increasing function $\mu:\left[0, \lambda_{2}\right] \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}^{+}\left(0<\lambda_{2} \leqq \lambda_{1}\right)$ such that $\mu(0)=0$ and that

$$
\|A(t, x, \lambda)-B(t)\| \leqq \mu(|\lambda|) \quad \text { for }(t, x, \lambda) \in[0, T] \times S_{r} \times \Lambda_{2}
$$

where $\Lambda_{2}=\left[-\lambda_{2},+\lambda_{2}\right]$ and $\boldsymbol{R}^{+}=[0,+\infty)$.
Then we have the following theorem.
Theorem 3. If, under the assumption in Theorem 2, Hypothesis 2 holds, then for any $\varepsilon>0$ there exists an $\eta(\varepsilon)>0$ such that for all $\lambda,|\lambda| \leqq \eta(\varepsilon)$, there exists at least one T-periodic solution $x(\cdot ; \varepsilon, \lambda)$ for (1) satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|x(t ; \varepsilon, \lambda)-\pi(t)\| \leqq \varepsilon \quad \text { for } t \in \boldsymbol{R} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\pi$ is the T-periodic solution for (2).
Sketch of the proof of Theorem 3. Choose $\varepsilon$ such that $0<\varepsilon<r-r_{0}$. Let $\eta=\eta(\varepsilon)$ satisfy the following inequality:

$$
\left\{r_{0} T \mu(\eta)+\eta \Delta\right\} K \exp (\delta)[1+2 K \exp (\delta) /\{\rho(1-\rho)\}] \leqq \varepsilon
$$

and let $C_{T, \varepsilon}=\left\{y \in C_{T} ;\|y\|_{\infty} \leqq \varepsilon\right\}$. Choose $\lambda$ such that $|\lambda| \leqq \eta(\varepsilon)$.
We consider the following linear non-homogeneous system:

$$
\begin{equation*}
z^{\prime}=A_{1}(t, y(t), \lambda) z+\lambda F_{1}(t, y(t), \lambda)+f_{1}(t, y(t), \lambda) \quad \text { for } y \in C_{T, \varepsilon} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$ together with a boundary condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{L}(z)=0 \quad \text { for } z \in C[0, T] \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A_{1}(t, y(t), \lambda)=A(t, y(t)+\pi(t), \lambda), F_{1}(t, y(t), \lambda)=F(t, y(t)+\pi(t), \lambda)$, and $f_{1}(t, y(t), \lambda)=\{A(t, y(t)+\pi(t), \lambda)-B(t)\} \pi(t)$.

We denote $Z_{y}$ by the fundamental matrix solutions for the linear homogeneous system corresponding to (13) such that $Z_{y}(0)=I$. Put $V_{y}=I$ $-Z_{y}(T)$, we have $\mathcal{L}\left(Z_{y}(\cdot) x_{0}\right)=V_{y} x_{0}$ for $x_{0} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{n}$.

In the same argument as given in the proof of Theorem 1 it follows that for any $y \in C_{T, \varepsilon}$ and any $\lambda \in \Lambda_{2}$ there exists the inverse of $V_{y}$ such that

$$
\left\|V_{y}^{-1}\right\| \leqq 1 /\{\rho(1-\rho)\}
$$

Moreover there exists one and only one solution $z_{y} \in C_{T, 8}$ for ((13), (14)) such that

$$
z_{y}(t)=-V_{y}^{-1}\left[\mathcal{L}\left(q_{y}(\cdot)\right)\right]+\int_{0}^{t} A_{1}(s, y(s), \lambda) z_{y}(s) d s
$$

$$
+\lambda \int_{0}^{t} F_{1}(s, y(s), \lambda) d s+\int_{0}^{t} f_{1}(s, y(s), \lambda) d s \quad \text { for } t \in \boldsymbol{R}
$$

where

$$
q_{y}(t)=Z_{y}(t) \int_{0}^{t} Z_{y}^{-1}(s)\left\{\lambda F_{1}(s, y(s), \lambda)+f_{1}(s, y(s), \lambda)\right\} d s \quad \text { for } t \in \boldsymbol{R} .
$$

By the same argument used in the proof of Theorem 2, there exists at least one $T$-periodic solution $z(\cdot ; \varepsilon, \lambda) \in C_{T, \varepsilon}$ for (13). Put $x(\cdot ; \varepsilon, \lambda)=z(\cdot ; \varepsilon, \lambda)$ $+\pi(\cdot)$, we can see that there exists at least one $T$-periodic solution $x(\cdot ; \varepsilon, \lambda)$ for (1) satisfying (12). Q.E.D.

When $A, F$ satisfies the Lipschitz condition, respectively, we have the following theorem on the continuous dependence on $\lambda$ of periodic solutions for (1).

Hypothesis 3. There exists a positive constant $L$ such that

$$
\left\|A\left(t, x_{1}, \lambda\right)-A\left(t, x_{2}, \lambda\right)\right\| \leqq L\left\|x_{1}-x_{2}\right\|
$$

and that

$$
\left\|F\left(t, x_{1}, \lambda\right)-F\left(t, x_{2}, \lambda\right)\right\| \leqq L\left\|x_{1}-x_{2}\right\|
$$

for any $t \in[0, T], x_{i} \in S_{r}(i=1,2)$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda_{2}$.
Theorem 4. Suppose that the assumption in Theorem 3 and Hypothesis 3 hold. If $\lambda_{2} \leqq \lambda_{2} \Delta+M$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 r L T\left\{K \exp (\delta)+r /\left(\lambda_{2} \Delta+M\right)\right\}<1, \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

then for any $\lambda \in \Lambda_{2}$ there exists one and only one T-periodic solution $x(\cdot ; \lambda)$ for (1). Moreover

$$
x(t ; \lambda) \rightarrow \pi(t) \quad \text { as } \lambda \rightarrow 0
$$

uniformly in $t \in \boldsymbol{R}$.
Remark. From the second assertion of Theorem 4, the T-periodic solution for (1) is continuous in $\lambda \in \Lambda_{2}$.

Sketch of the proof of Theorem 4. Choose $\lambda \in \Lambda_{2}$. First, we consider the operator $\mathscr{F}: C_{T, r} \rightarrow C_{r, r}$ defined by $\mathscr{P}(y)=x_{y}$ for $y \in C_{r, r}$, where $x_{y}$ is the $T$-periodic solution for (9) in $C_{T, r}$. It is easy to show that

$$
[\mathscr{A}(y)](t)=-X_{y}(t) U_{y}^{-1}\left[\mathcal{L}\left(p_{y}(\cdot)\right)\right]+p_{y}(t) \quad \text { for } t \in \boldsymbol{R}
$$

We shall define $k$ by the left-hand side of (15). It follows that

$$
\left\|\mathscr{F}\left(y_{1}\right)-\mathscr{F}\left(y_{2}\right)\right\|_{\infty} \leqq k\left\|y_{1}-y_{2}\right\|_{\infty} \quad \text { for } y_{1}, y_{2} \in C_{T, r}
$$

From $0<k<1$, the first assertion of the theorem holds.
Choose $\varepsilon$ such that $0<\varepsilon<r-r_{0}$. Since the assumption of Theorem 3 holds, we can define the operator $\mathcal{G}: C_{T, \varepsilon} \rightarrow C_{T, \varepsilon}$ by $\mathcal{G}(y)=z_{y}$ for $y \in C_{T, \varepsilon}$, where $z_{y}$ is the $T$-periodic solution for (13) in $C_{T, s}$. In the same argument as the operator $\mathscr{P}, \mathcal{G}$ is a contraction. Therefore the second assertion holds.
Q.E.D.
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