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#### Abstract

In this paper,we study the existence and multiplicity of positive solutions of second-order three-point boundary value problems $$
\left\{\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{u}^{\prime \prime}(t)+a(t) f(u(t))=0, t \in(0,1) \\ u(0)=0, u(1)=\alpha(u(\eta)) u(\eta) \end{array}\right.
$$ where $f:[0, \infty) \rightarrow[0, \infty) \quad$ is continuous, $0<\eta<1$, $\alpha_{1} \leq \alpha \leq \alpha_{2}, \quad 0<\eta \alpha(s)<1, \quad \mathrm{~s} \in R^{+}, \quad \alpha_{1}, \quad \alpha_{2}$ is a constant. $\mathrm{a}:[0,1] \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ and $\exists x_{0} \in[\eta, 1]$ such that $a\left(x_{0}\right)>0$. The proof of the main results is based on the fixed point theorem in cones.
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## I. INTRODUCTION

The study of multi-point boundary-value problems for linear second-order ordinary differential equations was initiated by Il'in and Moiseev[7-8]. Then Gupta [5] studied three-point boundary value problems for nonlinear differential equations. Since then, the more general nonlinear multi-point boundary value problems have been studied by several authors by several authors by using the Leray-Schauder Continuation Theorem,Nonlinear Alternatives of Leray-Schauder, and coincidence degree theory .We refer the reader to [1-3,6,10-12]for some recent results of nonlinear multi-point boundary value problems.

In this paper, we consider the existence of positive solutions to the equation

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{u}^{\prime \prime}(t)+a(t) f(u(t))=0, t \in(0,1), \\
u(0)=0, u(1)=\alpha(u(\eta)) u(\eta),
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $0<\eta<1$, Our purpose here is to give some existence results for positive solutions to (1.1) , assuming that $\alpha \eta<1$ and $f$ is either superlinear or sublinear. Our proof is based upon the fixed point theorem in a cone.

From now on, we make the following assumptions:
(H1) $f:[0, \infty) \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ is continuous;
$(H 2)$ a : $[0,1] \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ and $\exists x_{0} \in[\eta, 1]$ such that $a\left(x_{0}\right)>0$. Set

$$
f_{0}=\lim _{u \rightarrow 0^{+}} \frac{f(u)}{u}, f_{\infty}=\lim _{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(u)}{u}
$$

then $f_{0}=0$ and $f_{\infty}=\infty$ correspond to the superlinear case, and $f_{\infty}=0$ correspond to the sublinear case. By the positive solution of (1.1) we understand a function $u(t)$ which is positive on $0<t<1$ and satisfies the differential equation (1.1) .

The main results of the present paper are as follows:
Theorem 1. Let $(H 1)-(H 2)$ hold. Then the problem (1.1) has at least one positive solution in the case
(i) $f_{0}=0$ and $f_{\infty}=\infty$ (superlinear)or
(ii) $f_{0}=\infty$ and $f_{\infty}=0$ (sublinear).

The proof of above theorem is based upon an application of the following well-known Guo's fixed point theorem[4]

Theorem 2. Let $E$ be a Banach space, and let $K \subset E$ be a cone. Assume $\Omega_{1}, \quad \Omega_{2}$ are open subsets of $E$ with $0 \in \Omega_{1}$, $\bar{\Omega}_{1} \subset \Omega_{2}$, and let

$$
A: K \cap\left(\bar{\Omega}_{2} \backslash \Omega_{1}\right) \rightarrow K
$$

be a completely continuous operator such that
(i) $\|A \mathrm{u}\| \leq\|\mathrm{u}\|, \quad u \in K \cap \partial \Omega_{1}, \quad$ and $\quad\|A \mathrm{u}\| \geq\|\mathrm{u}\|$, $u \in K \cap \partial \Omega_{2}$; or
(ii) $\|A \mathrm{u}\| \geq\|\mathrm{u}\|, \quad u \in K \cap \partial \Omega_{1}, \quad$ and $\quad\|A \mathrm{u}\| \leq\|\mathrm{u}\|$, $u \in K \cap \partial \Omega_{2}$.
Then $A$ has a fixed point in $K \cap\left(\bar{\Omega}_{2} \cap \Omega_{1}\right)$.

## II. Preliminaries

$C[0,1]$ is a Banach space. The norm in $C[0,1]$ is defined as follows

$$
|u|_{0}=\max _{t \in[0,1]}|u(t)| .
$$

Lemma1. Let $\alpha(u(\eta)) \eta \neq 1$ then for $y \in C[0,1]$, the problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{u}^{\prime \prime}(t)+y(t)=0, t \in(0,1)  \tag{2.1}\\
u(0)=0, u(1)=\alpha(u(\eta)) u(\eta)
\end{array}\right.
$$

has a unique solution

$$
\begin{aligned}
& u(t)=\int_{0}^{1} G(t, s) f(y(s)) d s \\
& +\frac{\alpha(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) f(y(s)) d s \\
& :=A \mathrm{u}(t), t \in(0,1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Where

$$
\begin{equation*}
H(t, s)=G(t, s)+\frac{\alpha(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha(u(\eta)) \eta} G(\eta, s) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

And

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G(t, s)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
t(1-s), 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1 \\
s(1-t), 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1
\end{array}\right. \\
& G(\eta, s)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\eta(1-s), \eta \leq s \leq 1 \\
s(1-\eta), 0 \leq s \leq \eta
\end{array}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 2. Let $0<\alpha(\mathrm{u}(\eta))<\frac{1}{\eta}$. If $y \in C[0,1]$ and $y \geq 0$,then the unique solution $u$ of the problem (1.1) satisfies

$$
u \geq 0, t \in[0,1] .
$$

Proof From the fact that $u^{\prime \prime}(x)=-y(x) \leq 0$, we know that the graph of $u(t)$ is concave down on $(0,1)$. So if $u(1) \geq 0$ then the concavity of $u$ and the boundary condition $u(0)=0$, imply that $u \geq 0$ for $t \in[0,1]$.

If $u(1)<0$,then we have that

$$
u(\eta)<0,(2.3)
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(1)=\alpha(u(\eta)) u(\eta)>\frac{1}{\eta} u(\eta) \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

This contradicts the concavity of $u$.
Lemma 3. Let $\alpha(u(\eta)) \eta>1$. If $y \in C[0,1]$ and for $y \geq 0$, then the problem (1.1) has no positive solution.

Proof Assume that has a positive solution $u$
If $u(1)>0$,then $u(\eta)>0$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{u(1)}{1}=\frac{\alpha(u(\eta)) u(\eta)}{1}>\frac{u(\eta)}{\eta} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

this contradicts the concavity of $u$.
If $u(1)=0$ and for some $\tau \in(0,1), u(\tau)>0$ then

$$
u(\eta)=u(1)=0, \tau \neq \eta
$$

If $\tau \in(0, \eta)$, then $u(\tau)>u(\eta)=u(1)$, which contradicts the concavity of $u$. If $\tau \in(\eta, 1)$, then $u(0)=u(\eta)<u(\tau)$, which contradicts the concavity of $u$ again.
In the rest of the paper, we assume that $\alpha(u(\eta)) \eta<1$.
Lemma 4. Let $0<\alpha(u(\eta))<\frac{1}{\eta}$.If $y \in C[0,1]$ and $y \geq 0$, then the unique solution of the problem (1.1) satisfies

$$
\min _{t \in[\eta, 1]} u(t) \geq \gamma\|u\|
$$

Where $\gamma=\min \left\{\alpha_{1} \eta, \frac{\alpha_{1}(1-\eta)}{1-\alpha_{1} \eta}, \eta\right\}$.
Proof We divide the proof into two steps.
Step1. We deal with the case $0<\alpha(u(\eta))<1$.
In this case, by Lemma 2 , we know that

$$
u(\eta) \geq u(1) .(2.7)
$$

Set

$$
u(\bar{t})=\|u\| \cdot(2.8)
$$

If $\bar{t} \leq \eta<1$, then

$$
\min _{t \in[\eta, 1]} u(t)=u(1),(2.9)
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
u(\bar{t}) & \leq u(1)+\frac{u(1)-u(\eta)}{1-\eta}(0-1) \\
& =u(1)\left[1-\frac{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}}{1-\eta}\right] \\
& =u(1) \frac{1-\alpha \eta}{\alpha(1-\eta)} \\
& \leq u(1) \frac{1-\alpha_{1} \eta}{\alpha_{1}(1-\eta)}
\end{aligned}
$$

This together with (2.9) implies that

$$
\min _{t \in[\eta, 1]} u(t) \geq \frac{\alpha_{1}(1-\eta)}{1-\alpha_{1} \eta}\|u\|(2.10)
$$

If $\eta<\bar{t}<1$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{t \in[\eta, 1]} u(t)=u(1) \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the concavity of $u$, we know that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{u(\eta)}{\eta} \geq \frac{u(\bar{t})}{\bar{t}} \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining (2.12) and boundary condition $\alpha(u(\eta)) u(\eta)=u(1)$, we conclude that

$$
\frac{u(1)}{\alpha(u(\eta)) \eta} \geq \frac{u(\bar{t})}{\bar{t}} \geq u(\bar{t})=\|u\|,
$$

This is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{t \in[\eta, 1]} u(t) \geq \alpha(u(\eta)) \eta\|u\| \geq \alpha_{1}(u(\eta)) \eta\|u\| . \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Step 2. We deal with the case $1 \leq \alpha(u(\eta))<\frac{1}{\eta}$. In this case, we have

$$
u(\eta) \leq u(1)
$$

Set

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(\bar{t})=\|u\| \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

then we can choose $\bar{t}$ such that

$$
\eta \leq \bar{t} \leq 1
$$

(we note that if $\bar{t} \in[0,1] \backslash[\eta, 1]$, then the point $(\eta, u(\eta))$
is below the straight line determined by $(1, u(1))$ and $(\bar{t}, u(\bar{t}))$. This contradicts the concavity of $u$ ). From (1.16) and the concavity of $u$, we know that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{t \in[\eta, 1]} u(t)=u(\eta) \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the concavity of $u$ and Lemma 2, we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{u(\eta)}{\eta} \leq \frac{u(\bar{t})}{\bar{t}} \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

This implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{t \in[\eta, 1]} u(t) \geq \eta\|u\| . \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

This completes the proof.

## III. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

Proof of Theorem 1 Superlinear case. Suppose then that $f_{0}=0$ and $f_{\infty}=\infty$. We wish to show the existence of a positive solution of (1.1) .Now (1.1) has a solution $y=y(t)$ if and only if $y$ solves the operator equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
y(t) & =\int_{0}^{1} G(t, s) f(y(s)) d s+\frac{\alpha(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) f(y(s)) d s \\
& :=A y(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

Denote

$$
\begin{equation*}
K=\left\{\mathrm{y} \mid \mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{C}[0,1], \mathrm{y} \leq 0, \min _{\eta \leq \mathrm{t} \leq 1} \mathrm{y}(\mathrm{t}) \geq \gamma\|\mathrm{y}\|\right\} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is obvious that $K$ is a cone in $C[0,1]$. Moreover, by Lemma 4, It is also easy to check that $A: K \rightarrow K$ is completely continuous.
Now since $f_{0}=0$, we may choose $H_{1}>0$ so that $f(y) \leq \varepsilon y$, for $0<y \leq H_{1}$ where $\varepsilon>0$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon\left[1+\frac{\alpha_{2}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{2}(u(\eta)) \eta}\right] \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) \mathrm{d} s \leq 1 \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, if $\quad y \in K \quad$ and $\quad\|y\|=H_{1} \quad$,then $\quad$ from (3.1) and (3.3),we get

$$
\begin{align*}
A y(t) & \leq \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) f(y(s)) d s+\frac{\alpha_{2}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{2}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) f(y(s)) d s \\
& \leq \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) \varepsilon y(s) d s+\frac{\alpha_{2}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{2}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) \varepsilon y(s) d s \\
& \leq \varepsilon \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s)\|y\| d s+\frac{\varepsilon \alpha_{2}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{2}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s)\|y\| d s \\
& \leq \varepsilon \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) d s H_{1}+\frac{\varepsilon \alpha_{2}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{2}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) d s H_{1} \\
& \leq \varepsilon\left[1+\frac{\alpha_{2}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{2}(u(\eta)) \eta}\right] \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) d s H_{1} \tag{3.4}
\end{align*}
$$

Now if we let

$$
\Omega_{1}=\left\{\mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{C}[0,1] \mid\|\mathrm{y}\|<\mathrm{H}_{1}\right\}
$$

then (3.4) show that $\|A y\| \leq\|y\|$, for $y \in K \cap \partial \Omega_{1}$.

Further, since $f_{\infty}=\infty$, there exists $\hat{H}_{2}>0$ such that $f(u) \geq \rho u$, for $u \geq \hat{H}_{2}$, where $\rho>0$ is chosen so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\rho \gamma \alpha_{1}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{1}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) d s\|y\| \geq 1 \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $H_{2}=\max \left\{2 H_{1}, \frac{\hat{H}_{2}}{\gamma}\right\}$ and $\Omega_{2}=\left\{y \in C[0,1] \mid\|y\|<H_{2}\right\}$, then $y \in K$ and $\|y\|=H_{2}$ implies

$$
\min _{\eta \leq t \leq 1} y(t) \geq \gamma\|y\| \geq \hat{H}_{2}
$$

and so
$A y(\eta)=\int_{0}^{\eta} G(\eta, s) f(y(s)) d t+\frac{\alpha(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) f(y(s)) d s$
$\geq-\frac{\alpha_{1}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{1}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) f(y(s)) d s$
$\geq \frac{\rho \alpha_{1}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{1}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) f(y(s)) d s$
$\geq \frac{\rho \gamma \alpha_{1}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{1}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) d s\|y\|(b y \eta<1) \quad$ (3.7)
Hence, for $y \in K \cap \partial \Omega_{2}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|A y\| & \geq \frac{\rho \gamma \alpha_{1}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha \alpha_{1}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) a(s) d s\|y\| \\
& \geq\|y\|
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, by the first part of the Fixed Point Theorem, it follows that $A$ has a fixed point in $K \cap\left(\bar{\Omega}_{2} \backslash \Omega_{1}\right)$, such that $H_{1} \leq\|u\| \leq H_{2}$. This completes the superlinear part of the theorem.

Sublinear case. Suppose next that $f_{0}=\infty$ and $f_{\infty}=0$. We first choose $H_{3}>0$ such that $f(y) \geq M y$ for $0<y<H_{3}$, where

$$
\frac{M \gamma \alpha_{1}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{1}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) d s \geq 1
$$

By using the method to get (3.7), we can get that
$A y(\eta)=\int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) f(y(s)) d s+\frac{\alpha(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) f(y(s)) d s$
$\geq \frac{\alpha_{1}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{1}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) f(y(s)) d s$
$\geq \frac{\alpha_{1}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{1}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) M(y(s)) d s$
$\geq \frac{\alpha_{1}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{1}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) d s\|y\|$
$\geq H_{3}$. (3.9)
Thus we may let $\Omega_{3}=\left\{y \in C[0,1] \mid\|y\|<H_{3}\right\}$ so that

$$
\|A y\| \geq\|y\|, y \in K \cap \partial \Omega_{3} .
$$

Now, since $f_{\infty}=0$, there exists $\hat{H}_{4}>0$ so that $f(y) \leq \lambda y$ for $y \geq \hat{H}_{4}$, where $\lambda>0$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda\left[1+\frac{\alpha_{2}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{2}(u(\eta)) \eta}\right] \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) d s \leq 1 \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

We consider two cases:
Case(i). Suppose $f$ is bounded, say $f(y) \leq N$ for all $y \in[0, \infty)$. In this case choose
$H_{4}=\max \left\{2 H_{3}, N\left[1+\frac{\alpha_{2}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{2}(u(\eta)) \eta}\right] \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) d s\right\}$,
so that for $y \in K$ with $\|y\|=H_{4}$ we have
$A y(\mathrm{t})=\int_{0}^{1} \mathrm{G}(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{s}) f(y(s)) d s+\frac{\alpha(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) f(y(s)) d s$
$\leq \int_{0}^{1} \mathrm{G}(\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{s}) N d s+\frac{\alpha_{2}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{2}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) N d s$
$\leq N\left[1+\frac{\alpha_{2}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{2}(u(\eta)) \eta}\right] \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) d s$
$\leq H_{4}$
and therefore $\|A y\| \leq\|y\|$.
Case(ii). If $f$ is unbounded, then we know from $(A 1)$ that there is $H_{4}: H_{4}>\max \left\{2 H_{3}, \frac{1}{\lambda} \hat{H}_{4}\right\}$ such that

$$
f(y) \leq f\left(H_{4}\right) \text { for } 0<y \leq H_{4} .
$$

(We are able to do this since $f$ is unbounded). Then for $y \in K$ and $\|y\|=H_{4}$ we have
$A y=\int_{0}^{1} G(t, s) f(y(s)) d s+\frac{\alpha(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(\eta, s) f(y(s)) d s$
$\leq \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) f(y(s)) d s+\frac{\alpha_{2}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{2}(u(\eta)) \eta} \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) f\left(H_{4}\right) d s$
$\leq \lambda H_{4}\left[1+\frac{\alpha_{2}(u(\eta))}{1-\alpha_{2}(u(\eta)) \eta}\right] \int_{0}^{1} G(s, s) d s$
$\leq H_{4}$,
Therefore, in either case we may put

$$
\Omega_{4}=\left\{y \in C[0,1] \mid\|y\|<H_{4}\right\}
$$

and for $y \in K \cap \partial \Omega_{4}$ we may have $\|A y\| \leq\|y\|$. By the second part of the Fixed Point Theorem, it follows that (1.1) has a positive solution. Therefore, we have completed the proof of Theorem 1.
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