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## 1. Introduction

Third-order boundary value problems have been discussed in many papers in recent years (see, for example, $[\mathbf{1}-\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{6}]$ ). But most of them considered linear boundary conditions. Recently, Grossinho [5] established an existence and location result for the nonlinear differential equation

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

with two types of boundary conditions:

$$
x(a)=A, \quad \phi\left(x^{\prime}(b), x^{\prime \prime}(b)\right)=0, \quad x^{\prime \prime}(a)=B,
$$

or

$$
x(a)=A, \quad \psi\left(x^{\prime}(a), x^{\prime \prime}(a)\right)=0, \quad x^{\prime \prime}(b)=C .
$$

In this work, we extend the study to a more general case, since we consider the third-order nonlinear differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime \prime \prime}=f\left(t, x, x^{\prime}, x^{\prime \prime}\right), \quad a<t<b \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with nonlinear boundary conditions

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(a)=A, \quad g\left(x^{\prime}(a)\right)-\left[x^{\prime \prime}(a)\right]^{p}=B, \quad \phi\left(x(b), x^{\prime}(b), x^{\prime \prime}(b)\right)=C \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(a)=A, \quad \psi\left(x(a), x^{\prime}(a), x^{\prime \prime}(a)\right)=B, \quad h\left(x^{\prime}(b)\right)+\left[x^{\prime \prime}(b)\right]^{q}=C . \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The function $f(t, x, y, z):[a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, $g, h: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, $\phi, \psi: \mathbb{R}^{3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous and monotone on the first and third variables, and $p$ and $q$ are odd numbers.

By the use of the upper and lower solutions method and Leray-Schauder degree theory, we show existence results with a sign-type Nagumo condition, which is weaker than the one in [5].

This work is organized as follows. In $\S 2$, some notation and preliminaries are introduced. The existence results are discussed in $\S 3$. As applications of our results, an example is given in the last section.

## 2. Preliminaries

Definition 2.1. Function $\alpha(t) \in C^{3}[a, b]$ is said to be a lower solution of the boundaryvalue problem (BVP) (1.1), (1.2) if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha^{\prime \prime \prime}(t) \geqslant f\left(t, \alpha(t), \alpha^{\prime}(t), \alpha^{\prime \prime}(t)\right), \quad t \in[a, b], \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha(a) \leqslant A, g\left(\alpha^{\prime}(a)\right)-\left[\alpha^{\prime \prime}(a)\right]^{p} \leqslant B, \quad \phi\left(\alpha(b), \alpha^{\prime}(b), \alpha^{\prime \prime}(b)\right) \leqslant C . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Function $\beta(t) \in C^{3}[a, b]$ is said to be an upper solution of the BVP (1.1), (1.2) if it satisfies the reversed inequalities.

Definition 2.2. Given a subset $D \subset[a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{3}$, a function $f: D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to satisfy the sign-type Nagumo condition $\left(N_{+}^{*}\right)$ in $D$ if there exists $\Phi \in C\left(\mathbb{R}_{0}^{+},(0,+\infty)\right)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t, x, y, z) \operatorname{sgn}(z) \leqslant \Phi(|z|) \quad \text { for all }(t, x, y, z) \in D \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{+\infty} \frac{s}{\Phi(s)} \mathrm{d} s=+\infty \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

If (2.3) is replaced by

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t, x, y, z) \operatorname{sgn}(z) \geqslant-\Phi(|z|) \quad \text { for all }(t, x, y, z) \in D \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

we say that $f$ satisfies the sign-type Nagumo condition ( $N_{-}^{*}$ ).
Lemma 2.3. Let $\alpha_{i}, \beta_{i} \in C[a, b]$ satisfy

$$
\alpha_{i}(t) \leqslant \beta_{i}(t), \quad i=0,1, t \in[a, b],
$$

and consider the set

$$
E=\left\{(t, x, y, z) \in[a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{3}: \alpha_{0}(t) \leqslant x \leqslant \beta_{0}(t), \alpha_{1}(t) \leqslant y \leqslant \beta_{1}(t)\right\} .
$$

Let $f:[a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function that satisfies the sign-type Nagumo condition $\left(N_{+}^{*}\right)$ in $E$. Then for every $\rho>0$ there exists $K>0$ (depending on $\alpha_{1}(t)$, $\beta_{1}(t), \Phi$ and $\left.\rho\right)$ such that, for every solution $x(t)$ of (1.1) verifying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|x^{\prime \prime}(a)\right| \leqslant \rho \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha_{0}(t) \leqslant x(t) \leqslant \beta_{0}(t), \quad \alpha_{1}(t) \leqslant x^{\prime}(t) \leqslant \beta_{1}(t) \quad \text { for all } t \in[a, b], \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have

$$
\left\|x^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty}<K
$$

Proof. This result can be easily proved by using the analogous technique of Lemma 2 from [5].

Remark 2.4. The above result still holds if we replace condition ( $N_{+}^{*}$ ) by ( $N_{-}^{*}$ ) and assumption (2.6) by $\left|x^{\prime \prime}(b)\right| \leqslant \rho$.

Lemma 2.5. The boundary-value problem

$$
\begin{align*}
& x^{\prime \prime \prime}=x^{\prime} \Phi\left(\left|x^{\prime \prime}\right|\right),  \tag{2.8}\\
& x(a)=0,  \tag{2.9}\\
& x^{\prime}(a)=\left[x^{\prime \prime}(a)\right]^{p}, \quad x^{\prime}(b)=0
\end{align*}
$$

has only the trivial solution, where $\Phi \in C\left(\mathbb{R}_{0}^{+},(0,+\infty)\right)$.
Proof. Assume, by contradiction, that $x_{0}(t)$ be a non-trivial solution of BVP (2.8), (2.9). Then there exists $t \in[a, b]$ such that $x_{0}^{\prime}(t)>0$ or $x_{0}^{\prime}(t)<0$. Suppose the first case holds. Define

$$
\max _{t \in[a, b]} x_{0}^{\prime}(t)=x_{0}^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)>0
$$

If $t_{1} \in(a, b)$, then $x_{0}^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)=0$ and $x_{0}^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right) \leqslant 0$. From (2.8) we have the following contradiction:

$$
0 \geqslant x_{0}^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)=x_{0}^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right) \Phi\left(\left|x_{0}^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)\right|\right)>0
$$

If $t_{1}=a$, then $x_{0}^{\prime}(a)>0$ and $x_{0}^{\prime \prime}(a) \leqslant 0$, which contradicts $(2.9)$.
If $t_{1}=b$, from (2.9) we can get the contradiction.
Thus, BVP (2.8), (2.9) has only the trivial solution.

## 3. Main results

Theorem 3.1. Assume that
(i) there exist lower and upper solutions of BVP (1.1), (1.2), $\alpha(t), \beta(t)$, such that

$$
\alpha^{\prime}(t) \leqslant \beta^{\prime}(t), \quad t \in[a, b],
$$

(ii) $f(t, x, y, z)$ is continuous on $[a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{3}$ and decreasing on $x$,
(iii) $f(t, x, y, z)$ satisfies the sign-type Nagumo condition ( $N_{+}^{*}$ ) in

$$
D_{*}=\left\{(t, x, y, z) \in[a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{3}: \alpha(t) \leqslant x \leqslant \beta(t), \alpha^{\prime}(t) \leqslant y \leqslant \beta^{\prime}(t)\right\},
$$

(iv) $g(y)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}, \phi(x, y, z)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^{3}$, decreasing on $x$ and increasing on $z$.
Then $B V P$ (1.1), (1.2) has at least one solution $x(t) \in C^{3}[a, b]$ such that

$$
\alpha(t) \leqslant x(t) \leqslant \beta(t), \quad \alpha^{\prime}(t) \leqslant x^{\prime}(t) \leqslant \beta^{\prime}(t), \quad t \in[a, b] .
$$

Proof. For $i=0,1$, define

$$
w_{i}\left(t, x_{i}\right)= \begin{cases}\beta^{(i)}(t), & x_{i}>\beta^{(i)}(t), \\ x_{i}, & \alpha^{(i)}(t) \leqslant x_{i} \leqslant \beta^{(i)}(t), \\ \alpha^{(i)}(t), & x_{i}<\alpha^{(i)}(t)\end{cases}
$$

For $\lambda \in[0,1]$, we consider the auxiliary equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime \prime \prime}(t)=\lambda f\left(t, w_{0}(t, x(t)), w_{1}\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right)+\left[x^{\prime}(t)-\lambda w_{1}\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right] \Phi\left(\left|x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right|\right), \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Phi$ is decided by the sign-type Nagumo condition $\left(N_{+}^{*}\right)$, with the boundary condition

$$
\begin{align*}
x(a) & =\lambda A,  \tag{3.2}\\
x^{\prime}(a) & =\lambda\left[B-g\left(w_{1}\left(a, x^{\prime}(a)\right)\right)+w_{1}\left(a, x^{\prime}(a)\right)\right]+\left[x^{\prime \prime}(a)\right]^{p},  \tag{3.3}\\
x^{\prime}(b) & =\lambda\left[C-\phi\left(w_{0}(b, x(b)), w_{1}\left(b, x^{\prime}(b)\right), x^{\prime \prime}(b)\right)+w_{1}\left(b, x^{\prime}(b)\right)\right] . \tag{3.4}
\end{align*}
$$

Then we can select $M_{1}>0$ such that for every $t \in[a, b]$,

$$
\begin{gather*}
-M_{1}<\alpha^{\prime}(t) \leqslant \beta^{\prime}(t)<M_{1},  \tag{3.5}\\
f\left(t, \alpha(t), \alpha^{\prime}(t), 0\right)-\left[M_{1}+\alpha^{\prime}(t)\right] \Phi(0)<0,  \tag{3.6}\\
f\left(t, \beta(t), \beta^{\prime}(t), 0\right)+\left[M_{1}-\beta^{\prime}(t)\right] \Phi(0)>0,  \tag{3.7}\\
B-g\left(\alpha^{\prime}(a)\right)+\alpha^{\prime}(a)>-M_{1}, \quad\left|C-\phi\left(\alpha(b), \alpha^{\prime}(b), 0\right)+\alpha^{\prime}(b)\right|<M_{1},  \tag{3.8}\\
B-g\left(\beta^{\prime}(a)\right)+\beta^{\prime}(a)<M_{1}, \quad\left|C-\phi\left(\beta(b), \beta^{\prime}(b), 0\right)+\beta^{\prime}(b)\right|<M_{1} . \tag{3.9}
\end{gather*}
$$

In the following, we shall complete the proof in four steps.
Step 1. Every solution $x(t)$ of BVP (3.1)-(3.4) satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|x^{\prime}(t)\right|<M_{1}, \quad t \in[a, b], \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

independently of $\lambda$.
We suppose that the estimate is not true. Then there exists some $t \in[a, b]$ such that $x^{\prime}(t) \geqslant M_{1}$ or $x^{\prime}(t) \leqslant-M_{1}$. Suppose the first case holds. Define

$$
\max _{t \in[a, b]} x^{\prime}(t):=x^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\left(\geqslant M_{1}>0\right) .
$$

If $t_{0} \in(a, b)$, then $x^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=0$ and $x^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(t_{0}\right) \leqslant 0$. For $\lambda \in(0,1]$, by condition (ii) and (3.7), we have the following contradiction

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \geqslant x^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(t_{0}\right) \\
& =\lambda f\left(t_{0}, w_{0}\left(t_{0}, x\left(t_{0}\right)\right), w_{1}\left(t_{0}, x^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right), x^{\prime \prime} t_{0}\right)+\left[x^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)-\lambda w_{1}\left(t_{0}, x^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)\right] \Phi\left(\left|x^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right|\right) \\
& =\lambda f\left(t_{0}, w_{0}\left(t_{0}, x\left(t_{0}\right)\right), w_{1}\left(t_{0}, x^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right), 0\right)+\left[x^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)-\lambda \beta^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right] \Phi(0) \\
& \geqslant \lambda\left\{f\left(t_{0}, \beta\left(t_{0}\right), \beta^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right), 0\right)+\left[M_{1}-\beta^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)\right] \Phi(0)\right\} \\
& >0
\end{aligned}
$$

and, for $\lambda=0$, we have

$$
0 \geqslant x^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=x^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right) \Phi(0) \geqslant M_{1} \Phi(0)>0
$$

If $t_{0}=a$, then

$$
\max _{t \in[a, b]} x^{\prime}(t)=x^{\prime}(a)\left(\geqslant M_{1}>0\right)
$$

and $x^{\prime \prime}(a) \leqslant 0$. For $\lambda=0$, by (3.3) we have the following contradiction:

$$
0<M_{1} \leqslant x^{\prime}(a)=\left[x^{\prime \prime}(a)\right]^{p} \leqslant 0
$$

For $\lambda \in(0,1]$, by (3.3) and (3.9) we can obtain the following contradiction:

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{1} & \leqslant x^{\prime}(a) \\
& =\lambda\left[B-g\left(w_{1}\left(a, x^{\prime}(a)\right)\right)+w_{1}\left(a, x^{\prime}(a)\right)\right]+\left[x^{\prime \prime}(a)\right]^{p} \\
& \leqslant \lambda\left[B-g\left(\beta^{\prime}(a)\right)+\beta^{\prime}(a)\right]<M_{1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $t_{0}=b$, then

$$
\max _{t \in[a, b]} x^{\prime}(t)=x^{\prime}(b)\left(\geqslant M_{1}>0\right)
$$

and $x^{\prime \prime}(b) \geqslant 0$. For $\lambda=0$, by (3.4) we have the following contradiction:

$$
0<M_{1} \leqslant x^{\prime}(b)=0
$$

For $\lambda \in(0,1]$, by $(3.4),(3.9)$ and condition (iv) we can obtain the following contradiction:

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{1} & \leqslant x^{\prime}(b) \\
& =\lambda\left[C-\phi\left(w_{0}(b, x(b)), w_{1}\left(b, x^{\prime}(b)\right), x^{\prime \prime}(b)\right)+w_{1}\left(b, x^{\prime}(b)\right)\right] \\
& \leqslant \lambda\left[C-\phi\left(\beta(b), \beta^{\prime}(b), 0\right)+\beta^{\prime}(b)\right]<M_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, $x^{\prime}(t)<M_{1}$ for $t \in[a, b]$. In a similar way, we prove that $x^{\prime}(t)>-M_{1}$ for $t \in[a, b]$. From (3.2) we have

$$
|x(t)|<M_{0}=(b-a) M_{1}+|A|, \quad t \in[a, b] .
$$

Step 2. There exists $M_{2}>0$ such that every solution $x(t)$ of BVP (3.1)-(3.4) satisfies

$$
\left|x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right|<M_{2}, \quad t \in[a, b]
$$

independently of $\lambda \in[0,1]$.
Consider the set

$$
D_{* *}=\left\{(t, x, y, z) \in[a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{3}:|x| \leqslant M_{0},|y| \leqslant M_{1}\right\}
$$

and the function $F_{\lambda}:[a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
F_{\lambda}(t, x, y, z)=\lambda f\left(t, w_{0}(t, x), w_{1}(t, y), z\right)+\left[y-\lambda w_{1}(t, y)\right] \Phi(|z|)
$$

In the following, we show that $F_{\lambda}$ satisfies the sign-type Nagumo condition in $D_{* *}$, independently of $\lambda \in[0,1]$. In fact, since $f$ satisfies the sign-type Nagumo condition in $D_{* *}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{\lambda}(t, x, y, z) \operatorname{sgn}(z) & =\lambda f\left(t, w_{0}(t, x), w_{1}(t, y), z\right) \operatorname{sgn}(z)+\left[y-\lambda w_{1}(t, y)\right] \Phi(|z|) \operatorname{sgn}(z) \\
& \leqslant\left[2 M_{1}+1\right] \Phi(|z|) \\
& :=\Phi^{*}(|z|)
\end{aligned}
$$

Furthermore, we obtain

$$
\int_{0}^{+\infty} \frac{s}{\Phi^{*}(s)} \mathrm{d} s=\int_{0}^{+\infty} \frac{s}{\left(2 M_{1}+1\right) \Phi(s)} \mathrm{d} s=+\infty
$$

Thus, $F_{\lambda}$ satisfies the sign-type Nagumo condition $\left(N_{+}^{*}\right)$ in $D_{* *}$, independently of $\lambda \in$ $[0,1]$.

Let

$$
\rho:=\left[|B|+G+2 M_{1}\right]^{1 / p},
$$

where

$$
G=\max _{y \in\left[-M_{1}, M_{1}\right]}|g(y)|
$$

From (3.3), every solution $x(t)$ of BVP (3.1)-(3.4) satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|x^{\prime \prime}(a)\right| & =\left|x^{\prime}(a)-\lambda\left[B-g\left(w_{1}\left(a, x^{\prime}(a)\right)\right)+w_{1}\left(a, x^{\prime}(a)\right)\right]\right|^{1 / p} \\
& \leqslant\left[|B|+G+2 M_{1}\right]^{1 / p} \\
& =\rho
\end{aligned}
$$

Define

$$
\alpha_{0}(t)=-M_{0}, \quad \beta_{0}(t)=M_{0}, \quad \alpha_{1}(t)=-M_{1}, \quad \beta_{1}(t)=M_{1}, \quad t \in[a, b]
$$

In view of Step 1 and applying Lemma 2.3, there then exists $M_{2}>0$ (independent of $\lambda$ ) such that $\left|x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right|<M_{2}, t \in[a, b]$.

Step 3. For $\lambda=1$, BVP (3.1)-(3.4) has at least one solution $x_{1}(t)$.
Define the operators

$$
L: C^{3}[a, b] \subset C^{2}[a, b] \rightarrow C[a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{3}
$$

by

$$
L x=\left(x^{\prime \prime \prime}, x(a), x^{\prime}(a), x^{\prime}(b)\right)
$$

and

$$
N_{\lambda}: C^{2}[a, b] \rightarrow C[a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{3}
$$

by
$N_{\lambda} x=\left(\lambda f\left(t, w_{0}(t, x(t)), w_{1}\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right)+\left[x^{\prime}(t)-\lambda w_{1}\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right] \Phi\left(\left|x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right|\right), A_{\lambda}, B_{\lambda}, C_{\lambda}\right)$
with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A_{\lambda}=\lambda A \\
& B_{\lambda}=\lambda\left[B-g\left(w_{0}(a, x(a)), w_{1}\left(a, x^{\prime}(a)\right)\right)+w_{1}\left(a, x^{\prime}(a)\right)\right]+\left[x^{\prime \prime}(a)\right]^{p}, \\
& C_{\lambda}=\lambda\left[C-\phi\left(w_{0}(b, x(b)), w_{1}\left(b, x^{\prime}(b)\right), x^{\prime \prime}(b)\right)+w_{1}\left(b, x^{\prime}(b)\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

As $L^{-1}$ is compact, we can define the completely continuous operator

$$
T_{\lambda}: C^{2}[a, b] \rightarrow C^{2}[a, b]
$$

by

$$
T_{\lambda}(x)=L^{-1} N_{\lambda}(x)
$$

Consider the set

$$
\Omega=\left\{x \in C^{2}[a, b]:\|x\|_{\infty}<M_{0},\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|_{\infty}<M_{1},\left\|x^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{\infty}<M_{2}\right\} .
$$

By Steps 1 and 2 , the degree $\operatorname{deg}\left(I-T_{\lambda}, \Omega, \theta\right)$ is well defined for every $\lambda \in[0,1]$ and, by homotopy invariance, we get

$$
\operatorname{deg}\left(I-T_{0}, \Omega, 0\right)=\operatorname{deg}\left(I-T_{1}, \Omega, 0\right)
$$

As the equation $x=T_{0}(x)$ has only the trivial solution from Lemma 2.5, by degree theory,

$$
\operatorname{deg}\left(I-T_{1}, \Omega, 0\right)=\operatorname{deg}\left(I-T_{0}, \Omega, 0\right)= \pm 1
$$

Hence, the equation $x=T_{1}(x)$ has at least one solution. That is, the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime \prime \prime}(t)=f\left(t, w_{0}(t, x(t)), w_{1}\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right), x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right)+\left[x^{\prime}(t)-w_{1}\left(t, x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right] \Phi\left(\left|x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right|\right) \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the boundary condition

$$
\begin{align*}
x(a) & =A  \tag{3.12}\\
x^{\prime}(a) & =\left[B-g\left(w_{1}\left(a, x^{\prime}(a)\right)\right)+w_{1}\left(a, x^{\prime}(a)\right)\right]+\left[x^{\prime \prime}(a)\right]^{p}  \tag{3.13}\\
x^{\prime}(b) & =\left[C-\phi\left(w_{0}(b, x(b)), w_{1}\left(b, x^{\prime}(b)\right), x^{\prime \prime}(b)\right)+w_{1}\left(b, x^{\prime}(b)\right)\right] \tag{3.14}
\end{align*}
$$

has at least one solution $x_{1}(t)$ in $\Omega$.

Step 4. In fact, the solution $x_{1}(t)$ of the above problem will also be a solution of BVP (1.1), (1.2) since it satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha(t) \leqslant x_{1}(t) \leqslant \beta(t), \quad \alpha^{\prime}(t) \leqslant x_{1}^{\prime}(t) \leqslant \beta^{\prime}(t), \quad t \in[a, b] \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose, by contradiction, that there exists $t \in[a, b]$ such that $x_{1}^{\prime}(t)>\beta^{\prime}(t)$ and define

$$
\max _{t \in[a, b]}\left[x_{1}^{\prime}(t)-\beta^{\prime}(t)\right]:=x_{1}^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)-\beta^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)>0
$$

If $t_{1} \in(a, b)$, then $x_{1}^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)=\beta^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)$ and $x_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right) \leqslant \beta^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)$. By condition (ii), we have the contradiction

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 \geqslant & x_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)-\beta^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right) \\
\geqslant & f\left(t_{1}, w_{0}\left(t_{1}, x_{1}\left(t_{1}\right)\right), w_{1}\left(t_{1}, x_{1}^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)\right), x_{1}^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)\right) \\
& \quad+\left[x_{1}^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)-w_{1}\left(t_{1}, x_{1}^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)\right)\right] \Phi\left(\left|x_{1}^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)\right|\right)-f\left(t_{1}, \beta\left(t_{1}\right), \beta^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right), \beta^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)\right) \\
\geqslant & f\left(t_{1}, \beta\left(t_{1}\right), \beta^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right), \beta^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)\right)+\left[x_{1}^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)-\beta^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)\right] \Phi\left(\left|x_{1}^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)\right|\right)-f\left(t_{1}, \beta\left(t_{1}\right), \beta^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right), \beta^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)\right) \\
= & {\left[x_{1}^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)-\beta^{\prime}\left(t_{1}\right)\right] \Phi\left(\left|x_{1}^{\prime \prime}\left(t_{1}\right)\right|\right) } \\
> & 0
\end{aligned}
$$

If $t_{1}=a$, we have

$$
\max _{t \in[a, b]}\left[x_{1}^{\prime}(t)-\beta^{\prime}(t)\right]:=x_{1}^{\prime}(a)-\beta^{\prime}(a)>0
$$

and

$$
x_{1}^{\prime \prime}(a)-\beta^{\prime \prime}(a) \leqslant 0 .
$$

By (3.13), Definition 2.1 and condition (iv), we have the contradiction

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta^{\prime}(a) & <x_{1}^{\prime}(a) \\
& =\left[B-g\left(w_{1}\left(a, x_{1}^{\prime}(a)\right)\right)+w_{1}\left(a, x_{1}^{\prime}(a)\right)\right]+\left[x_{1}^{\prime \prime}(a)\right]^{p} \\
& \leqslant B-g\left(\beta^{\prime}(a)\right)+\beta^{\prime}(a)+\left[\beta^{\prime \prime}(a)\right]^{p} \\
& \leqslant \beta^{\prime}(a) .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $t_{1}=b$, we have

$$
\max _{t \in[a, b]}\left[x_{1}^{\prime}(t)-\beta^{\prime}(t)\right]:=x_{1}^{\prime}(b)-\beta^{\prime}(b)>0
$$

and

$$
x_{1}^{\prime \prime}(b)-\beta^{\prime \prime}(b) \geqslant 0
$$

By (3.14), Definition 2.1 and condition (iv), we have the contradiction

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta^{\prime}(b) & <x_{1}^{\prime}(b) \\
& =\left[C-\phi\left(w_{0}\left(b, x_{1}(b)\right), w_{1}\left(b, x_{1}^{\prime}(b)\right), x_{1}^{\prime \prime}(b)\right)+w_{1}\left(b, x_{1}^{\prime}(b)\right)\right] \\
& \leqslant C-\phi\left(\beta(b), \beta^{\prime}(b), \beta^{\prime \prime}(b)\right)+\beta^{\prime}(b) \\
& \leqslant \beta^{\prime}(b)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus,

$$
x_{1}^{\prime}(t) \leqslant \beta^{\prime}(t), \quad t \in[a, b] .
$$

Using an analogous technique, we obtain that $\alpha^{\prime}(t) \leqslant x_{1}^{\prime}(t)$ for every $t \in[a, b]$. From

$$
\alpha(a) \leqslant A \leqslant \beta(a)
$$

and by integration we have

$$
\alpha(t) \leqslant x_{1}(t) \leqslant \beta(t), \quad t \in[a, b] .
$$

Therefore, $x_{1}(t)$ is in fact a solution of BVP (1.1), (1.2).
In the case of nonlinear boundary conditions (1.3) a similar existence result to Theorem 3.1 can be obtained for problem (1.1), (1.3).

## 4. Example

Example 4.1. Consider the boundary-value problem

$$
\begin{gather*}
x^{\prime \prime \prime}=-x\left(x^{\prime}\right)^{2}-t^{2}\left(x^{\prime \prime}\right)^{3}  \tag{4.1}\\
x(0)=0  \tag{4.2}\\
\left(x^{\prime}(0)\right)^{3}-\left(x^{\prime \prime}(0)\right)^{p}=1,  \tag{4.3}\\
-\frac{4}{\pi} \tan ^{-1} x(1)+2 x^{\prime}(1)+\left(x^{\prime \prime}(1)\right)^{3}=1, \tag{4.4}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $p$ is an odd number.
Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(t, x, y, z) & =-x y^{2}-t^{2} z^{3} \\
g(y) & =y^{3} \\
\phi(x, y, z) & =-\frac{4}{\pi} \tan ^{-1} x+2 y+z^{3} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Define

$$
\alpha(t)=-t, \quad \beta(t)=t, \quad t \in[0,1],
$$

then $\alpha(t), \beta(t)$ are lower and upper solutions of BVP (4.1)-(4.4). Furthermore, we find that $f$ satisfies the sign-type Nagumo condition $\left(N_{+}^{*}\right)$ in

$$
D=\left\{(t, x, y, z) \in[0,1] \times \mathbb{R}^{3}:-t \leqslant x \leqslant t,-1 \leqslant y \leqslant 1\right\}
$$

with $\Phi(z)=2$. It is easy to prove that all the conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied. Therefore, from Theorem 3.1, there exists a solution $x(t)$ for BVP (4.1)-(4.4) such that

$$
-t \leqslant x(t) \leqslant t, \quad-1 \leqslant x^{\prime}(t) \leqslant 1, \quad t \in[0,1]
$$

It is clear that the results of [5] do not apply to Example 4.1. It shows that the result in this paper is new and valuable.
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