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#### Abstract

In this paper, we concern with the oscillation of the forced second order nonlinear differential equations with delayed argument in the form $$
\left(r(t) x^{\prime}(t)\right)^{\prime}+p(t) f(x(\tau(t)))+\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}(t)|x|^{\lambda_{i}} \operatorname{sgn} x=e(t),
$$ where $r(t), p(t), q_{i}(t), e(t)$ are continuous functions defined on $[0, \infty)$, $r(t)$ is positive, $r^{\prime}(t) \geq 0$ and differentiable, $\lambda_{1}>\cdots>\lambda_{m}>1>\lambda_{m+1}$ $>\cdots>\lambda_{n}>0(n>m \geq 1)$. Our methodology is somewhat different


 from that of previous authors.2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 34C10.
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## 1. Introduction

In this paper, we study the oscillatory behavior of the forced nonlinear functional differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(r(t) x^{\prime}(t)\right)^{\prime}+p(t) f(x(\tau(t)))+\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}(t)|x|^{\lambda_{i}} \operatorname{sgn} x=e(t) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $r(t), p(t), q_{i}(t), e(t)$ are continuous functions defined on $[0, \infty), r(t)$ is positive, $r^{\prime}(t) \geq 0$ and differentiable, $\lambda_{1}>\cdots>\lambda_{m}>1>\lambda_{m+1}>\cdots>\lambda_{n}>0$ ( $n>m \geq 1$ ). As usual, a solution of equation (1.1) is called oscillatory if it is defined on some ray $[T, \infty)$ with $T \geq 0$ and has unbounded set of zeros. Equation (1.1) is called oscillatory if all its solutions on some ray are oscillatory.

Very recently, Sun et al. [2, 3] obtained some new oscillation criteria for the equations in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(r(t) x^{\prime}(t)\right)^{\prime}+p(t) x+\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}(t)|x|^{\lambda_{i}} \operatorname{sgn} x=0 \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(r(t) x^{\prime}(t)\right)^{\prime}+p(t) x+\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}(t)|x|^{\lambda_{i}} \operatorname{sgn} x=e(t) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lambda_{1}>\cdots>\lambda_{m}>1>\lambda_{m+1}>\cdots>\lambda_{n}>0(n>m \geq 1)$. They also established oscillation theorems when $n>1$.

The purpose of our paper is to further their investigation for equation (1.1), including the paper of Sun and Wong [2]. By using the similar method of Wong [4], we obtain some new oscillation criteria for equation (1.1). Our methodology is somewhat different from that of previous authors. We believe that our approach is simpler and more general than a recent result of Sun and Wong [2].

## 2. Main Results

We will need the following lemmas that have been proved in [2]:
Lemma 2.1 [2]. Let $\lambda_{i}, i=1,2, \ldots$, $n$, be n-tuple satisfying $\lambda_{1}>\cdots>\lambda_{m}>$ $1>\lambda_{m+1}>\cdots>\lambda_{n}>0$. Then there exists an n-tuple $\left(k_{1}, k_{2}, \ldots, k_{n}\right)$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} k_{i}=1 \tag{a}
\end{equation*}
$$

which also satisfies either

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_{i}<1, \quad 0<k_{i}<1 \tag{b}
\end{equation*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_{i}=1, \quad 0<k_{i}<1 \tag{c}
\end{equation*}
$$

Theorem 2.1. Let $f(x) \in C(R, R), \frac{f(x)}{x} \geq M>0, \quad x \neq 0$. Suppose that for any $T \geq 0$, there exist constants $a_{1}, b_{1}, a_{2}, b_{2}$ such that $T \leq a_{1}<b_{1} \leq a_{2}<b_{2}$, and

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
q_{i}(t) \geq 0, \quad t \in\left[\tau\left(a_{1}\right), b_{1}\right] \cup\left[\tau\left(a_{2}\right), b_{2}\right], \quad i=1, \ldots, n  \tag{2.1}\\
e(t) \leq 0, \quad t \in\left[\tau\left(a_{1}\right), b_{1}\right] \\
e(t) \geq 0, \quad t \in\left[\tau\left(a_{2}\right), b_{2}\right]
\end{array}\right.
$$

Let $D\left(a_{i}, b_{i}\right)=\left\{u \in C^{1}\left[a_{i}, b_{i}\right]: u^{v+1}>0, v>0\right.$ is a constant $t \in\left(a_{i}, b_{i}\right)$, and $\left.u\left(a_{i}\right)=u\left(b_{i}\right)=0\right\}$ for $i=1,2$. Assume that there exists a positive nondecreasing function $\rho \in C^{1}\left(\left[t_{0}, \infty\right), \mathbb{R}\right)$ such that, for some $H \in D\left(a_{i}, b_{i}\right)$ and for some $\theta \geq 1$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{a_{i}}^{b_{i}}\left[H^{v+1}(t) \rho(t) R(t)-\frac{\theta \rho(t) r(t) H^{v-1}(t) A^{2}(t)}{4}\right] d t>0 \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $i=1,2$, then equation (1.1) is oscillatory, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R(t)=M p(t) \frac{\tau(t)-\tau\left(a_{i}\right)}{t-\tau\left(a_{i}\right)}+a_{0}|e(t)|^{k_{0}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}^{k_{i}}(t) \\
& A(t)=H(t) \frac{\rho^{\prime}(t)}{\rho(t)}+(v+1) H^{\prime}(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

$a_{0}=\prod_{i=0}^{n} k_{i}^{-k_{i}}$, and $k_{0}, k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n}$ are positive constants satisfying (a) and (b) of Lemma 2.1.

Proof. Assume to the contrary that there exists a solution $x(t)$ of equation (1.1) such that $x(t)>0, x(\tau(t))>0$, when $t \geq t_{0}>0$, for some $t_{0}$ depending on the solution $x(t)$. When $x(t)$ is eventually negative, the proof follows the same argument using the interval $\left[\tau\left(a_{2}\right), b_{2}\right]$ instead of $\left[\tau\left(a_{1}\right), b_{1}\right]$. Define

$$
\begin{equation*}
w(t)=\rho(t) \frac{r(t) x^{\prime}(t)}{x(t)}, \quad t \geq t_{0} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows from equation (1.1) that $w(t)$ satisfies the following differential equality:

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{\prime}(t)=\frac{\rho^{\prime}(t)}{\rho(t)} w(t)-\rho(t) \frac{p(t) f(x(\tau(t)))}{x(t)}-\frac{w^{2}(t)}{\rho(t) r(t)}+\rho(t) \frac{e(t)}{x(t)}-\rho(t) \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}(t) x^{\lambda_{i}-1}(t) \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and by the condition $f(x) / x \geq M>0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{\prime}(t) \leq \frac{\rho^{\prime}(t)}{\rho(t)} w(t)-M \rho(t) p(t) \frac{x(\tau(t))}{x(t)}-\frac{w^{2}(t)}{\rho(t) r(t)}+\rho(t) \frac{e(t)}{x(t)}-\rho(t) \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}(t) x^{\lambda_{i}-1}(t) \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

By assumption, we can choose $a_{1}, b_{1} \geq t_{0}$, such that $b_{1} \geq \tau\left(a_{1}\right), \tau^{2}\left(a_{1}\right)=\tau\left(\tau\left(a_{1}\right)\right)$ $\geq t_{0}, \quad q_{i}(t) \geq 0$, for $t \in\left[\tau\left(a_{1}\right), b_{1}\right]$, and $e(t) \leq 0$, for $t \in\left[\tau\left(a_{1}\right), b_{1}\right]$ and $i=$ $1,2, \ldots, n$. Recall the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality see [1]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_{i} u_{i} \geq \prod_{i=1}^{n} u_{i}^{k_{i}}, \quad u_{i} \geq 0 \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $k_{0}=1-\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_{i}$ and $k_{i}>0, \quad i=1,2, \ldots, n$, are chosen according to given $\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}>0$ as in Lemma 2.1 satisfying (a) and (b). Now return to (2.5) and identify $u_{0}=k_{0}^{-1}|e(t)| x^{-1}(t)$ and $u_{i}=k_{i}^{-1} q_{i}(t) x^{\lambda_{i}-1}(t)$ in (2.6) to obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{\prime}(t) \leq \frac{\rho^{\prime}(t)}{\rho(t)} w(t)-M \rho(t) p(t) \frac{x(\tau(t))}{x(t)}-\frac{w^{2}(t)}{\rho(t) r(t)}-\rho(t) k_{0}^{-k_{0}}|e(t)|^{k_{0}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} k_{i}^{-k_{i}} q_{i}^{k_{i}}(t) \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

From equation (1.1), we can easily obtain that $x^{\prime \prime}(t) \leq 0$, for $t \in\left[\tau\left(a_{1}\right), b_{1}\right]$. Therefore, we have that for $t \in\left[\tau\left(a_{1}\right), b_{1}\right]$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(t)-x\left(\tau\left(a_{1}\right)\right)=x^{\prime}(s)\left(t-\tau\left(a_{1}\right)\right) \geq x^{\prime}(t)\left(t-\tau\left(a_{1}\right)\right) \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $s \in\left[\tau\left(a_{1}\right), b_{1}\right]$. Noting that $x(t)>0$ for $t \geq \tau\left(a_{1}\right)$, we get by (2.8) that

$$
x(t) \geq x^{\prime}(t)\left(t-\tau\left(a_{1}\right)\right), \quad t \in\left[\tau\left(a_{1}\right), b_{1}\right]
$$

i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{x^{\prime}(t)}{x(t)} \leq \frac{1}{t-\tau\left(a_{1}\right)}, \quad t \in\left[\tau\left(a_{1}\right), b_{1}\right] \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Integrating (2.9) from $\tau(t)$ to $t>a_{1}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{x(\tau(t))}{x(t)} \geq \frac{\tau(t)-\tau\left(a_{1}\right)}{t-\tau\left(a_{1}\right)}, \quad t \in\left(a_{1}, b_{1}\right] \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

By using (2.10) in (2.7), we have that for $t \in\left(a_{1}, b_{1}\right]$,

$$
\begin{align*}
w^{\prime}(t) \leq & \frac{\rho^{\prime}(t)}{\rho(t)} w(t)-M \rho(t) p(t) \frac{\tau(t)-\tau\left(a_{1}\right)}{t-\tau\left(a_{1}\right)}-\frac{w^{2}(t)}{\rho(t) r(t)} \\
& -\rho(t) k_{0}^{-k_{0}}|e(t)|^{k_{0}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} k_{i}^{-k_{i}} q_{i}^{k_{i}}(t) \\
= & \frac{\rho^{\prime}(t)}{\rho(t)} w(t)-\rho(t) R(t)-\frac{w^{2}(t)}{\rho(t) r(t)} \tag{2.11}
\end{align*}
$$

Multiplying both sides of (2.11) by $H^{v+1}(t)$ as given in the hypothesis of Theorem 2.1 and integrating (2.11) from $a_{1}$ to $b_{1}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} H^{v+1}(t) \rho(t) R(t) d t \\
\leq & \int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} H^{v+1}(t) \frac{\rho^{\prime}(t)}{\rho(t)} w(t) d t-\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} H^{v+1}(t) w^{\prime}(t) d t-\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} H^{v+1}(t) \frac{w^{2}(t)}{\rho(t) r(t)} d t \tag{2.12}
\end{align*}
$$

Using the integration by parts formula, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} H^{v+1}(t) w^{\prime}(t) d t & =\left.H^{v+1}(t) w(t)\right|_{a_{1}} ^{b_{1}}-\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}}(v+1) H^{v}(t) H^{\prime}(t) w(t) d t \\
& =-\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}}(v+1) H^{v}(t) H^{\prime}(t) w(t) d t \tag{2.13}
\end{align*}
$$

where $H\left(a_{1}\right)=H\left(b_{1}\right)=0$. Substituting (2.13) into (2.12), we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} H^{v+1}(t) \rho(t) R(t) d t \leq & \int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} H^{v+1}(t) \frac{\rho^{\prime}(t)}{\rho(t)} w(t) d t+\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}}(v+1) H^{v}(t) H^{\prime}(t) w(t) d t \\
& -\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} H^{v+1}(t) \frac{w^{2}(t)}{\rho(t) r(t)} d t \\
= & \int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} A(t) H^{v}(t) w(t) d t-\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} H^{v+1}(t) \frac{w^{2}(t)}{\rho(t) r(t)} d t \tag{2.14}
\end{align*}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} H^{v+1}(t) \rho(t) R(t) d t \\
\leq & -\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}}\left[-A(t) H^{v}(t) w(t)+H^{v+1}(t) \frac{w^{2}(t)}{\rho(t) r(t)}\right] d t \\
= & -\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}}\left[\sqrt{\frac{H^{v+1}(t)}{\theta \rho(t) r(t)}} w(t)-\left(\sqrt{\frac{\theta \rho(t) r(t)}{4 H^{v+1}(t)}} H^{v}(t) A(t)\right)\right]^{2} d t \\
& +\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}}\left[\sqrt{\frac{\theta \rho(t) r(t)}{4 H^{v+1}(t)}} H^{v}(t) A(t)\right]^{2} d t-\int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} \frac{(\theta-1) H^{v+1}(t)}{\theta \rho(t) r(t)} w^{2}(t) d t . \tag{2.15}
\end{align*}
$$

From the hypothesis of Theorem 2.1 and (2.15), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}}\left[H^{v+1}(t) \rho(t) R(t)-\left(\sqrt{\frac{\theta \rho(t) r(t)}{4 H^{v+1}(t)}} H^{v}(t) A(t)\right)^{2}\right] d t \\
= & \int_{a_{i}}^{b_{i}}\left[H^{v+1}(t) \rho(t) R(t)-\frac{\theta \rho(t) r(t) H^{v-1}(t) A^{2}(t)}{4}\right] d t \leq 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

which contradicts (2.2). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.
Remark 1. We note that it suffices to satisfy (2.2) in Theorem 2.1 for some $\theta \geq 1$, which ensures a certain flexibility in applications. Clearly, if (2.2) is satisfied for some $\theta_{0} \geq 1$, it shall also hold for any $\theta_{1}>\theta_{0}$.
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