JOURNAL OF THE
CHUNGCHEONG MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
Volume **30**, No. 2, May 2017
http://dx.doi.org/10.14403/jcms.2017.30.2.273

UNIFORMLY LIPSCHITZ STABILITY OF PERTURBED NONLINEAR DIFFERENTIAL SYSTEMS

Sang Il Choi*, Ji Yeon Lee**, and Yoon Hoe Goo***

Abstract. In this paper, we study that the solutions to perturbed differential system

$$y' = f(t, y) + \int_{t_0}^{t} g(s, y(s), T_1 y(s))ds + h(t, y(t), T_2 y(t))$$

have uniformly Lipschitz stability by imposing conditions on the perturbed part $\int_{t_0}^{t} g(s, y(s), T_1 y(s))ds, h(t, y(t), T_2 y(t))$, and on the fundamental matrix of the unperturbed system $y' = f(t, y)$ using integral inequalities.

1. Introduction and Preliminaries

It is well known that one of the important techniques for investigating the stability properties of solutions of nonlinear differential systems[7-9, 13-15] is through the use of the corresponding linear variational systems. Dannan and Elaydi introduced a notion of uniformly Lipschitz stability (ULS) [9]. This notion of ULS lies somewhere between uniformly stability on one side and the notions of asymptotic stability in variation of Brauer [4] and uniformly stability in variation of Brauer and Strauss [3] on the other side. An important feature of ULS is that for linear systems, the notion of uniformly Lipschitz stability and that of uniformly stability are equivalent, but for nonlinear systems, the two notions are quite distinct. Pachpatte [14, 15] studied the stability and asymptotic behavior of the solutions of perturbed nonlinear systems under some suitable conditions on the perturbation term. Choi *et al.* [7, 8] examined Lipschitz and exponential asymptotic stability for nonlinear functional systems.

Received March 13, 2017; Accepted April 26, 2017.
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 34D10, 34D20.
Key words and phrases: variational systems, perturbed differential systems, uniformly Lipschitz stability, uniformly Lipschitz stability in variation.
Correspondence should be addressed to Yoon Hoe Goo, yhgoo@hanseo.ac.kr.

Also, Goo [10, 11] and Goo *et al.* [5, 6, 12] investigated Lipschitz and asymptotic stability for perturbed differential systems.

In the current paper, we study ULS for solutions of perturbed nonlinear systems using integral inequalities.

We consider the unperturbed nonlinear system

$$x'(t) = f(t, x(t)), \quad x(t_0) = x_0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $f \in C(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $\mathbb{R}^+ = [0, \infty)$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the Euclidean n-space. We suppose that the Jacobian matrix $f_x = \partial f / \partial x$ exists and is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f(t, 0) = 0$. Also, we consider the perturbed functional differential system of (1.1)

$$y' = f(t, y) + \int_{t_0}^{t} g(s, y(s), T_1 y(s)) ds + h(t, y(t), T_2 y(t)),\ y(t_0) = y_0, \tag{1.2}$$

where $g, h \in C(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $g(t, 0, 0) = h(t, 0, 0) = 0$, and $T_1, T_2 : C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^n) \to C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^n)$ are continuous operators. The symbol $|\cdot|$ will be used to denote any convenient vector norm in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For an $n \times n$ matrix A, define the norm $|A|$ of A by $|A| = \sup_{|x| \leq 1} |Ax|$.

Let $x(t, t_0, x_0)$ denote the unique solution of (1.1) with $x(t_0, t_0, x_0) = x_0$, existing on $[t_0, \infty)$. Then we can consider the associated variational systems around the zero solution of (1.1) and around $x(t)$, respectively,

$$v'(t) = f_x(t, 0) v(t),\ v(t_0) = v_0 \tag{1.3}$$

and

$$z'(t) = f_x(t, x(t, t_0, x_0)) z(t),\ z(t_0) = z_0. \tag{1.4}$$

The fundamental matrix $\Phi(t, t_0, x_0)$ of (1.4) is given by

$$\Phi(t, t_0, x_0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_0} x(t, t_0, x_0),$$

and $\Phi(t, t_0, 0)$ is the fundamental matrix of (1.3).

This connection between the stability of the zoro solution of (1.1) and the zero solutions of (1.3) and (1.4) has been extensively studied in [2-4, 6, 7, 14, 15].

The following definition is due to Dannan and Elaydi [9].

Definition 1.1. The system (1.1) (the zero solution $x = 0$ of (1.1)) is called

(S) *stable* if for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $t_0 \geq 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(t_0, \epsilon) > 0$ such that if $|x_0| < \delta$, then $|x(t)| < \epsilon$ for all $t \geq t_0 \geq 0$,
(US) *uniformly stable* if the δ in (S) is independent of the time t_0,

(ULS) *uniformly Lipschitz stable* if there exist $M > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $|x(t)| \leq M|x_0|$ whenever $|x_0| \leq \delta$ and $t \geq t_0 \geq 0$,
(ULSV) *uniformly Lipschitz stable in variation* if there exist $M > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $|\Phi(t, t_0, x_0)| \leq M$ for $|x_0| \leq \delta$ and $t \geq t_0 \geq 0$.

Let us recall some results that will be used throughout this work.

We need Alekseev formula to compare between the solutions of (1.1) and the solutions of perturbed nonlinear system

$$y' = f(t, y) + g(t, y), \ y(t_0) = y_0, \tag{1.5}$$

where $g \in C(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $g(t, 0) = 0$. Let $y(t) = y(t, t_0, y_0)$ denote the solution of (1.5) passing through the point (t_0, y_0) in $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

The following is a generalization to nonlinear system of the variation of constants formula due to Alekseev [1].

Lemma 1.2. [2] *Let x and y be solutions of (1.1) and (1.5), respectively. If $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then for all $t \geq t_0$ such that $x(t, t_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $y(t, t_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$y(t, t_0, y_0) = x(t, t_0, y_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \Phi(t, s, y(s))\, g(s, y(s))\, ds.$$

Lemma 1.3. *(Bihari-type inequality) Let $u, \lambda \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0, \infty))$ and $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u. Suppose that, for some $c > 0$,*

$$u(t) \leq c + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda(s) w(u(s)) ds, \ t \geq t_0 \geq 0.$$

Then

$$u(t) \leq W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda(s) ds\Big],$$

where $t_0 \leq t < b_1$, $W(u) = \int_{u_0}^{u} \frac{ds}{w(s)}$, $W^{-1}(u)$ *is the inverse of* $W(u)$, *and*

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \geq t_0 : W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda(s) ds \in \mathrm{domW}^{-1}\Big\}.$$

Lemma 1.4. [6] *Let $u, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6, \lambda_7, \lambda_8, \lambda_9, \lambda_{10} \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0, \infty))$, and $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u, $u \leq w(u)$. Suppose that for some $c > 0$ and $0 \leq t_0 \leq t$,*

$$
\begin{aligned}
u(t) \leq & c+\int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_1(s)u(s)ds+\int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_2(s)w(u(s))ds+\int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_3(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\Big(\lambda_4(\tau)u(\tau) \\
& +\lambda_5(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \lambda_6(r)u(r)dr+\lambda_7(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \lambda_8(r)w(u(r))dr\Big)d\tau ds \\
& +\int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda_9(s)\int_{t_0}^{s} \lambda_{10}(\tau)w(u(\tau))d\tau ds.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
u(t) \leq & W^{-1}\Big[W(c)+\int_{t_0}^{t}\Big(\lambda_1(s)+\lambda_2(s)+\lambda_3(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(\lambda_4(\tau)+\lambda_5(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}\lambda_6(r)dr \\
& +\lambda_7(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}\lambda_8(r)dr)d\tau+\lambda_9(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\lambda_{10}(\tau)d\tau\Big)ds\Big],
\end{aligned}
$$

where $t_0 \leq t < b_1$, W, W^{-1} *are the same functions as in Lemma 1.3, and*

$$
\begin{aligned}
b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \geq t_0 : & W(c)+\int_{t_0}^{t}\Big(\lambda_1(s)+\lambda_2(s)+\lambda_3(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(\lambda_4(\tau)+ \\
& \lambda_5(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}\lambda_6(r)dr+\lambda_7(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}\lambda_8(r)dr)d\tau+ \\
& \lambda_9(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\lambda_{10}(\tau)d\tau\Big)ds \in \mathrm{domW^{-1}}\Big\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

For the proof we need the following two corollaries.

Corollary 1.5. *Let* $u, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6, \lambda_7, \lambda_8, \lambda_9 \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$, *and* $w(u)$ *be nondecreasing in* u, $u \leq w(u)$. *Suppose that for some* $c > 0$ *and* $0 \leq t_0 \leq t$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
u(t) \leq c & +\int_{t_0}^{t}\lambda_1(s)u(s)ds+\int_{t_0}^{t}\lambda_2(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\Big(\lambda_3(\tau)u(\tau) \\
& +\lambda_4(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}\lambda_5(r)u(r)dr+\lambda_6(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}\lambda_7(r)w(u(r))dr\Big)d\tau ds \\
& +\int_{t_0}^{t}\lambda_8(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\lambda_9(\tau)w(u(\tau))d\tau ds.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then

$$u(t) \le W^{-1}\Big[W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t}\Big(\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(\lambda_3(\tau) + \lambda_4(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}\lambda_5(r)dr + \lambda_6(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}\lambda_7(r)dr)d\tau + \lambda_8(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\lambda_9(\tau)d\tau\Big)ds\Big],$$

where $t_0 \le t < b_1$, W, W^{-1} *are the same functions as in Lemma 1.3, and*

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \ge t_0 : W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t}\Big(\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(\lambda_3(\tau) + \lambda_4(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}\lambda_5(r)dr + \lambda_6(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}\lambda_7(r)dr)d\tau + \lambda_8(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\lambda_9(\tau)d\tau\Big)ds \in \mathrm{domW}^{-1}\Big\}.$$

Corollary 1.6. *Let* $u, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6 \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$ *and* $w(u)$ *be nondecreasing in* u, $u \le w(u)$. *Suppose that for some* $c > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) \le c &+ \int_{t_0}^{t}\lambda_1(s)u(s)ds + \int_{t_0}^{t}\lambda_2(s)w(u(s))ds \\ &+ \int_{t_0}^{t}\lambda_3(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\lambda_4(\tau)u(\tau)d\tau ds \\ &+ \int_{t_0}^{t}\lambda_5(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\lambda_6(\tau)w(u(\tau))d\tau ds, \quad 0 \le t_0 \le t. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$u(t) \le W^{-1}\Big[W(c) \quad + \int_{t_0}^{t}\Big(\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s) + \lambda_3(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\lambda_4(\tau)d\tau + \lambda_5(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\lambda_6(\tau)d\tau\Big)ds\Big],$$

where $t_0 \le t < b_1$, W, W^{-1} *are the same functions as in Lemma 1.3, and*

$$b_1 = \sup\Big\{t \ge t_0 : W(c) + \int_{t_0}^{t}\Big(\lambda_1(s) + \lambda_2(s) + \lambda_3(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\lambda_4(\tau)d\tau + \lambda_5(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}\lambda_6(\tau)d\tau\Big)ds \in \mathrm{domW}^{-1}\Big\}.$$

2. Main Results

In this section, we investigate ULS for solutions of the perturbed functional differential systems.

To obtain ULS, the following assumptions are needed:

(H1) The solution $x = 0$ of (1.1) is ULSV.

(H2) $w(u)$ be nondecreasing in u such that $u \leq w(u)$ and $\frac{1}{v}w(u) \leq w(\frac{u}{v})$ for some $v > 0$.

THEOREM 2.1. *Suppose that (H1), (H2), and that the perturbing term g in (1.2) satisfies*

$$|g(t, y, T_1 y)| \leq a(t)|y(t)| + b(t)w(|y(t)|) + |T_1 y(t)|, \tag{2.1}$$

$$|T_1 y(t)| \leq b(t)\int_{t_0}^{t} k(s)|y(s)|ds + m(t)\int_{t_0}^{t} p(s)w(|y(s)|)ds, \tag{2.2}$$

$$|h(t, y(t), T_2 y(t))| \leq \int_{t_0}^{t} c(s)|y(s)|ds + |T_2 y(t)|, \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$|T_2 y(t)| \leq d(t)|y(t)| + n(t)w(|y(t)|), \tag{2.4}$$

where $a, b, c, d, k, m, n, p \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $a, b, c, d, k, m, n, p \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0, \infty))$, T_1, T_2 *are continuous operators, and*

$$\begin{aligned} M(t_0) =& W^{-1}\Big[W(M) + M\int_{t_0}^{\infty}\Big(d(s) + n(s) + \int_{t_0}^{s}(a(\tau) + b(\tau) + c(\tau) \\ &+ b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r)dr + m(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau} p(r)dr)d\tau\Big)ds\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $M(t_0) < \infty$, $b_1 = \infty$, $t_0 \leq t < b_1$, *and* W, W^{-1} *are the same functions as in Lemma 1.3. Then the zero solution of (1.2) is ULS.*

Proof. Let $x(t) = x(t, t_0, y_0)$ and $y(t) = y(t, t_0, y_0)$ be solutions of (1.1) and (1.2), respectively. By the assumption (H1), it is ULS([9], Theorem 3.3). Applying the nonlinear variation of constants formula due to Lemma 1.2, together with (H2), (2.1), (2.2), (2.3), and (2.4), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
|y(t)| &\le |x(t)| \\
&\quad + \int_{t_0}^{t} |\Phi(t,s,y(s))| \Big(\int_{t_0}^{s} |g(\tau, y(\tau), T_1 y(s))| d\tau + |h(s, y(s), T_2 y(s))| \Big) ds \\
&\le M|y_0| + \int_{t_0}^{t} M|y_0| \Big(\int_{t_0}^{s} ((a(\tau)+c(\tau)) \frac{|y(\tau)|}{|y_0|} + b(\tau) w(\frac{|y(\tau)|}{|y_0|}) \\
&\quad + b(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r) \frac{|y(r)|}{|y_0|} dr + m(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} p(r) w(\frac{|y(r)|}{|y_0|}) dr) d\tau \\
&\quad + d(s) \frac{|y(s)|}{|y_0|} + n(s) w(\frac{|y(s)|}{|y_0|}) \Big) ds.
\end{aligned}
$$

Set $u(t) = |y(t)||y_0|^{-1}$. Then, an application of Lemma 1.4 yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
|y(t)| \le |y_0| W^{-1} \Big[W(M) + M \int_{t_0}^{t} \Big(d(s) + n(s) + \int_{t_0}^{s} (a(\tau) + b(\tau) \\
+ c(\tau) + b(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} k(r) dr + m(\tau) \int_{t_0}^{\tau} p(r) dr) d\tau \Big) ds \Big],
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, by (2.5), we have $|y(t)| \le M(t_0)|y_0|$ for some $M(t_0) > 0$ whenever $|y_0| < \delta$. Hence the proof is complete. □

Remark 2.2. Letting $c(t) = d(t) = k(t) = n(t) = 0$ in Theorem 2.1, we obtain the same result as that of Theorem 3.1 in [5].

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that (H1), (H2), and that the perturbing term g in (1.2) satisfies*

$$
\int_{t_0}^{t} |g(s, y(s), T_1 y(s))| ds \le a(t)|y(t)| + b(t) w(|y(t)|) + |T_1 y(t)|, \tag{2.6}
$$

$$
|T_1 y(t)| \le b(t) \int_{t_0}^{t} k(s)|y(s)| ds + m(t) \int_{t_0}^{t} p(s) w(|y(s)|) ds, \tag{2.7}
$$

$$
|h(t, y(t), T_2 y(t))| \le m(t) \int_{t_0}^{t} c(s) w(|y(s)|) ds + |T_2 y(t)|, \tag{2.8}
$$

and

$$
|T_2 y(t)| \le b(t) \int_{t_0}^{t} q(s)|y(s)| ds + d(t)|y(t)|, \tag{2.9}
$$

where $a, b, c, d, k, m, p, q \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $a, b, c, d, k, m, p, q \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$, T_1, T_2 are continuous operators, and

(2.10)

$$M(t_0) = W^{-1}\Big[W(M) + M\int_{t_0}^{\infty}\Big(a(s)+b(s)+d(s) + b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(k(\tau)+q(\tau))d\tau + m(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(c(\tau)+p(\tau))d\tau\Big)ds\Big],$$

where $M(t_0) < \infty$ and $b_1 = \infty$, $t_0 \le t < b_1$, and W, W^{-1} are the same functions as in Lemma 1.3. Then the zero solution of (1.2) is ULS.

Proof. Let $x(t) = x(t, t_0, y_0)$ and $y(t) = y(t, t_0, y_0)$ be solutions of (1.1) and (1.2), respectively. By the assumption (H1), it is ULS. Using Lemma 1.2, together with (H2), (2.6), (2.7), (2.8), and (2.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|y(t)| \le M|y_0| + \int_{t_0}^{t} M|y_0|\Big(&(a(s)+d(s))\frac{|y(s)|}{|y_0|} + b(s)w(\frac{|y(s)|}{|y_0|})\\ &+ b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(k(\tau)+q(\tau))\frac{|y(\tau)|}{|y_0|}d\tau\\ &+ m(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(c(\tau)+p(\tau))w(\frac{|y(\tau)|}{|y_0|})d\tau\Big)ds.\end{aligned}$$

Set $u(t) = |y(t)||y_0|^{-1}$. Then, an application of Corollary 1.6 yields

$$|y(t)| \le |y_0|W^{-1}\Big[W(M) + M\int_{t_0}^{t}\Big(a(s)+b(s)+d(s) + b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(k(\tau)+q(\tau))d\tau + m(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(c(\tau)+p(\tau))d\tau\Big)ds\Big].$$

Hence, by (2.10), we have $|y(t)| \le M(t_0)|y_0|$ for some $M(t_0) > 0$ whenever $|y_0| < \delta$, and so the proof is complete. $\square$

Remark 2.4. Letting $c(t) = d(t) = k(t) = q(t) = 0$ in Theorem 2.3, we obtain the same result as that of Theorem 3.3 in [5].

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that (H1), (H2), and that the perturbing term g in (1.2) satisfies*

$$|g(t, y, T_1y)| \le a(t)|y(t)| + b(t)w(|y(t)|) + |T_1y(t)|, \tag{2.11}$$

$$|T_1y(t)| \le b(t)\int_{t_0}^{t} k(s)|y(s)|ds + m(t)\int_{t_0}^{t} p(s)w(|y(s)|)ds, \tag{2.12}$$

$$|h(t, y(t), T_2y(t))| \le \int_{t_0}^{t} c(s)w(|y(s)|)ds + |T_2y(t)|, \tag{2.13}$$

and

$$|T_2y(t)| \le \int_{t_0}^{t} d(s)|y(s)|ds + n(t)|y(t)|, \tag{2.14}$$

where $a, b, c, d, k, m, n, p \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $a, b, c, d, k, m, n, p \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$, T_1, T_2 *are continuous operators, and*
(2.15)

$$\begin{aligned} M(t_0) =&W^{-1}\Big[W(M) + M\int_{t_0}^{\infty}\Big(n(s) + \int_{t_0}^{s}(a(\tau)+b(\tau)+c(\tau)+d(\tau)\\ &+ b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}k(r)dr + m(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}p(r)dr)d\tau\Big)ds\Big], \end{aligned}$$

where $M(t_0) < \infty$ *and* $b_1 = \infty$, $t_0 \le t < b_1$, *and* W, W^{-1} *are the same functions as in Lemma 1.3. Then the zero solution of (1.2) is ULS.*

Proof. Let $x(t) = x(t, t_0, y_0)$ and $y(t) = y(t, t_0, y_0)$ be solutions of (1.1) and (1.2), respectively. By the assumption (H1), it is ULS. Applying the nonlinear variation of constants formula due to Lemma 1.2, together with (H2), (2.11), (2.12), (2.13), and (2.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |y(t)| \le M|y_0| + &\int_{t_0}^{t} M|y_0|\Big(\int_{t_0}^{s}((a(\tau)+d(\tau))\frac{|y(\tau)|}{|y_0|} + (b(\tau)+\\ &c(\tau)w(\frac{|y(\tau)|}{|y_0|}) + b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}k(r)\frac{|y(r)|}{|y_0|}dr+\\ &m(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}p(r)w(\frac{|y(r)|}{|y_0|})dr)d\tau + n(s)\frac{|y(s)|}{|y_0|}\Big)ds. \end{aligned}$$

Set $u(t) = |y(t)||y_0|^{-1}$. Then, an application of Corollary 1.5 yields

$$\begin{aligned} |y(t)| \le |y_0|W^{-1}\Big[&W(M) + M\int_{t_0}^{t}\Big(n(s) + \int_{t_0}^{s}(a(\tau)+b(\tau)+c(\tau)\\ &+d(\tau) + b(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}k(r)dr + m(\tau)\int_{t_0}^{\tau}p(r)dr)d\tau\Big)ds\Big], \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (2.15), we have $|y(t)| \le M(t_0)|y_0|$ for some $M(t_0) > 0$ whenever $|y_0| < \delta$. This completes the proof. □

Remark 2.6. Letting $c(t) = d(t) = k(t) = n(t) = 0$ in Theorem 2.5, we obtain the same result as that of Theorem 3.1 in [5].

Theorem 2.7. *Suppose that (H1), (H2), and that the perturbing term* g *in (1.2) satisfies*

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} |g(s, y(s), T_1y(s))|ds \le a(t)|y(t)| + b(t)w(|y(t)|) + |T_1y(t)|, \tag{2.16}$$

$$|T_1y(t)| \leq b(t)\int_{t_0}^{t} k(s)|y(s)|ds + m(t)\int_{t_0}^{t} p(s)w(|y(s)|)ds, \tag{2.17}$$

$$|h(t,y(t),T_2y(t))| \leq m(t)\int_{t_0}^{t} c(s)w(|y(s)|)ds + |T_2y(t)|, \tag{2.18}$$

and

$$|T_2y(t)| \leq b(t)\int_{t_0}^{t} q(s)|y(s)|ds + d(t)w(|y(t)|), \tag{2.19}$$

where $a,b,c,d,k,m,p,q \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $a,b,c,d,k,m,p,q \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $w \in C((0,\infty))$, T_1, T_2 *are continuous operators, and*
(2.20)

$$\begin{aligned} M(t_0) =& W^{-1}\Big[W(M) + M\int_{t_0}^{\infty}\Big(a(s)+b(s)+d(s) \\ &+ b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(k(\tau)+q(\tau))d\tau + m(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(c(\tau)+p(\tau))d\tau\Big)ds\Big], \end{aligned}$$

where $M(t_0) < \infty$ *and* $b_1 = \infty$, $t_0 \leq t < b_1$, *and* W, W^{-1} *are the same functions as in Lemma 1.3. Then the zero solution of (1.2) is ULS.*

Proof. Let $x(t) = x(t,t_0,y_0)$ and $y(t) = y(t,t_0,y_0)$ be solutions of (1.1) and (1.2), respectively. By the assumption (H1), it is ULS. Using Lemma 1.2, together with (H2), (2.16), (2.17), (2.18), and (2.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |y(t)| \leq M|y_0| + \int_{t_0}^{t} & M|y_0|\Big(a(s)\frac{|y(s)|}{|y_0|} + (b(s)+d(s))w(\frac{|y(s)|}{|y_0|}) \\ &+ b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(k(\tau)+q(\tau))\frac{|y(\tau)|}{|y_0|}d\tau \\ &+ m(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(c(\tau)+p(\tau))w(\frac{|y(\tau)|}{|y_0|})d\tau\Big)ds. \end{aligned}$$

Set $u(t) = |y(t)||y_0|^{-1}$. Then, an application of Corollary 1.6 yields

$$\begin{aligned} |y(t)| \leq |y_0| & W^{-1}\Big[W(M) + M\int_{t_0}^{t}\Big(a(s)+b(s)+d(s) \\ &+ b(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(k(\tau)+q(\tau))d\tau + m(s)\int_{t_0}^{s}(c(\tau)+p(\tau))d\tau\Big)ds\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (2.20), we have $|y(t)| \leq M(t_0)|y_0|$ for some $M(t_0) > 0$ whenever $|y_0| < \delta$. Thus the theorem is proved. $\square$

Remark 2.8. Letting $c(t) = d(t) = k(t) = q(t) = 0$ in Theorem 2.7, we obtain the same result as that of Theorem 3.3 in [5].

Acknowledgement

The authors are very grateful for the referee's valuable comments.

References

[1] V. M. Alekseev, *An estimate for the perturbations of the solutions of ordinary differential equations*, Vestn. Mosk. Univ. Ser. I. Math. Mekh. **2** (1961), 28-36 (Russian, with English summary).

[2] F. Brauer, *Perturbations of nonlinear systems of differential equations,* J. Math. Anal. Appl. **14** (1966), 198-206.

[3] F. Brauer and A. Strauss, *Perturbations of nonlinear systems of differential equations, III,* J. Math. Anal. Appl. **31** (1970), 37-48.

[4] F. Brauer, *Perturbations of nonlinear systems of differential equations, IV,* J. Math. Anal. Appl. **37** (1972), 214-222.

[5] S. I. Choi and Y. H. Goo, *Uniformly Lipschitz stability and asymptotic behavior of perturbed differential systems,* J. Chungcheong Math. Soc. **29** (2016), 429-442.

[6] S. I. Choi and Y. H. Goo, *Uniform Lipschitz stability of perturbed differential systems,* Far East J. Math. Sci(FJMS) **101** (2017), 721-735.

[7] S. K. Choi, Y. H. Goo, and N. J. Koo, *Lipschitz and exponential asymptotic stability for nonlinear functional systems,* Dynamic Systems and Applications **6** (1997), 397-410.

[8] S. K. Choi, N. J. Koo, and S. M. Song, *Lipschitz stability for nonlinear functional differential systems,* Far East J. Math. Sci(FJMS) **5** (1999), 689-708.

[9] F. M. Dannan and S. Elaydi, *Lipschitz stability of nonlinear systems of differential systems,* J. Math. Anal. Appl. **113** (1986), 562-577.

[10] Y. H. Goo, *Lipschitz and asymptotic stability for perturbed nonlinear differential systems,* J. Korean Soc. Math. Educ. Ser. B: Pure Appl. Math. **21** (2014), 11-21.

[11] Y. H. Goo, *Uniform Lipschitz stability and asymptotic behavior for perturbed differential systems,* Far East J. Math. Sciences, **99** (2016), 393-412.

[12] D. M. Im and Y. H. Goo, *Uniformly Lipschitz stability and asymptotic property of perturbed functional differential systems,* Korean J. Math. **24** (2016), 1-13.

[13] V. Lakshmikantham and S. Leela, *Differential and Integral Inequalities: Theory and Applications Vol. I,* Academic Press, New York and London, 1969.

[14] B.G. Pachpatte, *Stability and asymptotic behavior of perturbed nonlinear systems,* J. diff. equations, **16** (1974), 14-25.

[15] B.G. Pachpatte, *Perturbations of nonlinear systems of differential equations,* J. Math. Anal. Appl. **51** (1975), 550-556.

*

Department of Mathematics
Hanseo University
Seosan 31962, Republic of Korea
E-mail: schoi@hanseo.ac.kr

**

Department of Information Security
Daejeon University
Daejeon 34520, Republic of Korea
E-mail: happywld@dju.ac.kr

***

Department of Mathematics
Hanseo University
Seosan 31962, Republic of Korea
E-mail: yhgoo@hanseo.ac.kr