

Vv256 Lecture 6

Dr Jing Liu

UM-SJTU Joint Institute

September 25, 2017

- Suppose we have two continuously differentiable functions

$$\phi_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2$$

Q: Can we conclude ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are linearly dependent if

$$W(\phi_1, \phi_2) = 0 \quad \text{for all } t.$$

Q: When ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are **linearly independent**, can we conclude

$$W(\phi_1, \phi_2) \neq 0 \quad \text{for some } t.$$

- Now suppose ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are two **linearly independent** solutions to

$$\alpha \ddot{y} + \beta \dot{y} + \gamma y = 0$$

Q: Can we conclude that

$$W(\phi_1, \phi_2) \neq 0 \quad \text{for some } t.$$

- When ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are solutions of the same second-order equation, then the next theorem leads to a necessary and sufficient condition for linear independence in terms of the Wronskian of ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 .

Abel's theorem

If ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are solutions of the differential equation

$$\ddot{y} + P\dot{y} + Qy = 0$$

where P and Q are continuous on an open interval \mathcal{I} , then the Wronskian is

$$W(\phi_1, \phi_2)(t) = C \exp \left[- \int P(t) dt \right],$$

where C is a constant that depends on ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , but not on t . Consequently,

When C is zero, $W(\phi_1, \phi_2)(t) = 0$, for all t in \mathcal{I} .

When C is nonzero, $W(\phi_1, \phi_2)(t) \neq 0$, for all t in \mathcal{I} .

Proof

- Since ϕ_1 is a solution,

$$\phi_1'' + P\phi_1' + Q\phi_1 = 0 \implies -\phi_2(\phi_1'' + P\phi_1' + Q\phi_1) = 0 \quad (1)$$

Proof

- Similarly, ϕ_2 is also a solution,

$$\phi_2'' + P\phi_2' + Q\phi_2 = 0 \implies \phi_1(\phi_2'' + P\phi_2' + Q\phi_2) = 0 \quad (2)$$

- Now consider (1)+(2),

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1(\phi_2'' + P\phi_2' + Q\phi_2) - \phi_2(\phi_1'' + P\phi_1' + Q\phi_1) &= 0 \\ (\phi_1\phi_2'' - \phi_2\phi_1'') + P(\phi_1\phi_2' - \phi_2\phi_1') &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

- The term is actually the Wronskian of ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 ,

$$W(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \phi_1\phi_2' - \phi_2\phi_1'$$

- Differentiate W , we have $W' = \phi_1'\phi_2' + \phi_1\phi_2'' - \phi_2'\phi_1' - \phi_2\phi_1''$
 $= (\phi_1\phi_2'' - \phi_2\phi_1'')$

Proof

- Therefore, (3) is a first-order linear equation

$$W' + P W = 0$$

- Solve it, we have

$$W = C \exp \left[- \int P dt \right]$$

- Note C is an arbitrary constant, it will be determined by initial condition

$$W(\phi_1, \phi_2)(t_0) = W_0$$

- Since the exponential function is never zero, so if W_0 is zero, then C is zero, and Wronskian is **identically zero**. If not, then C is not zero and so does W .
- So in this way Wronskian here depends only on the functions ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , not the actual values of t_0 . That completes the second part of the theorem \square

Theorem

Suppose $y = u(t)$ and $y = v(t)$ are solutions of the following initial-value problem

$$\ddot{y} + P\dot{y} + Qy = R, \quad y(t_0) = y_0, \quad \dot{y}(t_0) = y_1$$

where P , Q and R are continuous on an open interval \mathcal{I} which contains t_0 , then

$$u(t) = v(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Proof

- Suppose $y = w(t) = u(t) - v(t)$, then w must satisfy the following IVP

$$\ddot{w} + P\dot{w} + Qw = 0, \quad w(t_0) = \dot{w}(t_0) = 0$$

- Consider the following function

$$z(t) = (\dot{w})^2 + w^2 \implies z(t) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad z(t_0) = 0$$

$$\dot{z}(t) = 2\dot{w}\ddot{w} + 2w\dot{w} = 2\dot{w}(-P\dot{w} - Qw) + 2w\dot{w} = 2w\dot{w}(1 - Q) - 2P(\dot{w})^2$$

Proof

- Since P and Q are continuous on an open interval \mathcal{I} , for any finite closed subinterval $[t_1, t_2]$ of \mathcal{I} , there exists a constant M such that

$$|P| \leq M \quad \text{and} \quad |Q| \leq M \quad \text{for all } t \in [t_1, t_2].$$

- Hence, for $t \in [t_1, t_2]$, we have the following

$$\dot{z} = 2w\dot{w}(1 - Q) - 2P(\dot{w})^2$$

$$|\dot{z}| \leq |2w\dot{w}(1 - Q)| + \left| -2P(\dot{w})^2 \right|$$

$$\leq 2|w||\dot{w}|(1 + M) + 2M(\dot{w})^2$$

$$\leq (1 + M) \left((\dot{w})^2 + w^2 \right) + 2M \left((\dot{w})^2 + w^2 \right)$$

$$= (1 + 3M)z$$

Proof

- Thus, we have the following inequality for all $t \in [t_1, t_2]$

$$-kz \leq \dot{z} \leq kz \quad \text{where} \quad k = 1 + 3M$$

- Considering the following inequality for $t \in [t_0, t_2]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} \leq kz &\implies e^{-kt}\dot{z} - ke^{-kt}z \leq 0 \\ &\implies \frac{d}{dt}(e^{-kt}z) \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$e^{-kt}z \leq e^{-kt_0}z(t_0) = 0 \implies z(t) \leq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad t_0 \leq t \leq t_2$$

- Since $z(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [t_1, t_2]$,

$$z(t) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad t_0 \leq t \leq t_2.$$

Proof

- Similarly, considering the following inequality for $t \in [t_1, t_0]$, we obtain

$$\dot{z} \geq -kz \implies z(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } t_1 \leq t \leq t_0$$

which implies

$$z(t) = 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathcal{I}.$$

since t_1 and t_2 are arbitrary.

- Solving the following differential equation, we can conclude

$$0 = (\dot{w})^2 + w^2 \implies \dot{w} = \pm iw \implies w = Ce^{\pm it} \implies w(t) = 0$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{I}$, is the only real solution, which means

$$u(t) = v(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathcal{I}. \quad \square$$

Theorem

Suppose ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are two solutions to the homogeneous equation

$$\ddot{y} + P\dot{y} + Qy = 0$$

where P and Q are continuous on an open interval \mathcal{I} , then the Wronskian is

1. **identically zero** if and only if ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are linearly dependent.
2. **never zero** if and only if ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are linearly **independent**.

Proof

- Abel's theorem helped us to understand that $W(\phi_1, \phi_2)$ is either identically zero or nowhere zero in \mathcal{I} if ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are **solutions of the same equation**.
- We will prove statement 1., since statement 2. will follow immediately.
- Assume the two solutions ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are linearly dependent, we can invoke the theorem **L5P4**, which states W is identically zero.
- If assume $W(\phi_1, \phi_2)$ is identically zero, then the corresponding system has nontrivial solution for any $t_0 \in \mathcal{I}$.

Proof

- That is, we have a nontrivial solution α_1 and α_2 for a given $t = t_0$.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \phi_1 & \phi_2 \\ \dot{\phi}_1 & \dot{\phi}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \iff \begin{aligned} \alpha_1 \phi_1 + \alpha_2 \phi_2 &= 0 \\ \alpha_1 \dot{\phi}_1 + \alpha_2 \dot{\phi}_2 &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

- Consider the following IVP,

$$\ddot{y} + P\dot{y} + Qy = 0; \quad \dot{y}(t_0) = 0, \quad y(t_0) = 0$$

- The last theorem says $y = 0$ for all $t \in \mathcal{I}$ is the **only** solution to this IVP.
- However, setting $C_1 = \alpha_1$ and $C_2 = \alpha_2$, the following is a solution

$$y = C_1 \phi_1 + C_2 \phi_2 = \alpha_1 \phi_1 + \alpha_2 \phi_2$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{I}$. Thus for some nontrivial α_1 and α_2 , the following is true

$$\alpha_1 \phi_1 + \alpha_2 \phi_2 = 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathcal{I}.$$

- Therefore ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are linearly dependent. □

- There are two main virtues of Abel's theorem,
1. It was used to prove the last theorem, and reach the fact that we need two linearly independent solutions ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 for our general solution, that is

$$y = c_1\phi_1 + c_2\phi_2$$

is the general solution if and only if ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are linearly independent.

2. It gives us a second way to compute the Wronskian.
- A general rule in mathematics is that whenever you can compute something in two different ways, something good will happen. In this case, we know

$$W = C \exp \left[- \int P(t) dt \right],$$

On the other hand, by definition,

$$W = \det \begin{bmatrix} \phi_1 & \phi_2 \\ \phi_1' & \phi_2' \end{bmatrix} = \phi_1\phi_2' - \phi_1'\phi_2.$$

Exercise

- (a) Find the general solution to the equation using Abel's theorem.

$$\ddot{y} - 2r\dot{y} + r^2y = 0, \quad \text{where } r \text{ is a constant.}$$

- (b) Solve the Euler differential equation using Abel's theorem.

$$t^2\ddot{y} - 7t\dot{y} + 16y = 0$$