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This paper is concerned with a second order nonlinear impulsive difference equation with continuous variable. By using a nonimpulsive inequality sufficient conditions for the oscillation of impulsive difference equation are obtained.
Розглянуто нелінійні імпульсні різницеві рівняння другого порядку з неперервним аргументом. Використовуючи неімпульсну нерівність, отримано достатні умови осциляцї імпульсних різницевих рівнянь.

1. Introduction In many applied mathematics problems, it is considered difference equations of the form

$$
x_{n}=f\left(n, x_{n-j}\right), \quad n=1,2, \ldots, \quad j \in \mathbb{N} \text {, }
$$

which is a discrete equation and it is a special case of the following difference equation with continuous variable

$$
x(t)=f(t, x(t-k)), \quad t \geq 0, \quad k \quad \text { is a constant. }
$$

Recently, there has been an increasing interest in the study of oscillation of difference equations with continuous variables [1-6]. On the other hand, it is well known that impulsive equations appear as a natural description of the observed evolution phenomena of several real world problems [7, 8]. There has been rich literature on the oscillation of impulsive differential equations. The monographs [9,10] and the survey papers [11, 12] include many results on the oscillation of impulsive differential equations. But, to the best of our knowledge there has been only a few works on the oscillation of impulsive difference equations with continuous variables [13, 14], and there is no paper on the second order nonlinear impulsive difference equations with continuous variables.

In this paper, our aim is to establish sufficient conditions for the oscillation of second order nonlinear impulsive difference equation with continuous variable. We shall construct a nonimpulsive inequality and using it we shall obtain sufficient conditions for the oscillation. This technique has been used in [15] and it can be applied to higher order impulsive difference equations with continuous variable.

Let $0<t_{1}<t_{2}<\ldots<t_{n}<t_{n+1}<\ldots$ be fixed points with $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} t_{n}=+\infty$.
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We consider second order nonlinear impulsive difference equations of the type

$$
\begin{gather*}
\Delta_{\tau}^{2} x(t)+\Delta_{\tau} x(t)+x(t)+f(x(t-\sigma))=0, \quad t \neq t_{n},  \tag{1}\\
x\left(t_{n}^{+}\right)-x\left(t_{n}^{-}\right)=g\left(x\left(t_{n}^{-}\right)\right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}=\{1,2, \ldots\}, \tag{2}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\Delta_{\tau} x(t)=x(t+\tau)-x(t), \tau, \sigma$ are positive constants; $x\left(t_{n}^{+}\right)=\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{n}^{+}} x(t)$, and $x\left(t_{n}^{-}\right)=$ $=\lim _{t \rightarrow t_{n}^{-}} x(t)$.

Throughout this paper we shall assume that the following conditions are satisfied:
(i) $f \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), f(u) / u \geq K, K>0$ is a constant, for $u \neq 0$;
(ii) $g \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), u g(u)>0$ for $u \neq 0$.

Definition 1. A function $x:[-\sigma, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a solution of (1), (2) if
(a) for $t \neq t_{n}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x$ is continuous and satisfies (1),
(b) for $t=t_{n}, x\left(t_{n}^{+}\right)$and $x\left(t_{n}^{-}\right)$exist and satisfy (2) with $x\left(t_{n}^{-}\right)=x\left(t_{n}\right)$.

Definition 2. If a function $x(t)$ is positive (negative) for all large values of $t$, then it is said that $x(t)$ is eventually positive (negative). A solution $x(t)$ of (1), (2) is called oscillatory if it is neither eventually positive nor eventually negative.
2. Main results. In this section, first we introduce some functions. Denote

$$
F(u)=\frac{u}{u+g(u)}, \quad u \in \mathbb{R} \backslash\{0\} .
$$

From the condition (ii) we have $u+g(u) \neq 0$ and $0<F(u)<1$ for $u \neq 0$.
Let $x(t)$ be a solution of (1), (2). Define

$$
z(t)=x(t) \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t} F\left(x\left(t_{m}\right)\right), \quad t \geq t_{0}>0 .
$$

As usual, the symbol $\prod_{a \leq t_{m}<b} a_{m}$ denotes the product of members of the sequence $\left\{a_{m}\right\}$ over $m$ such that $t_{m} \in[a, b) \cap\left\{t_{n}: n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$.

If $[a, b) \cap\left\{t_{n}: n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}=\varnothing$ or $a>b$, then we use the convention that $\prod_{a \leq t_{m}<b} a_{m}=1$.
It can be seen that the function $z(t)$ is continuous at $t_{k} \geq t_{0}$. Indeed,

$$
z\left(t_{k}^{-}\right)=x\left(t_{k}^{-}\right) \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t_{k}} F\left(x\left(t_{m}\right)\right)=z\left(t_{k}\right)
$$

and

$$
z\left(t_{k}^{+}\right)=x\left(t_{k}^{+}\right) \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t_{k}^{+}} F\left(x\left(t_{m}\right)\right)=x\left(t_{k}^{+}\right) \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t_{k}} F\left(x\left(t_{m}\right)\right) F\left(x\left(t_{k}\right)\right)=z\left(t_{k}\right),
$$

where we have used the impulse condition (2).
Define

$$
\begin{equation*}
v(t)=\frac{1}{\tau} \int_{t+\tau}^{t+2 \tau} z(u) d u, \quad t \geq t_{0} . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 1. Assume that hypotheses (i), (ii) hold. If $x(t)$ is an eventually positive solution of (1), (2), then $v(t)>0$, and $v^{\prime}(t) \leq 0$ eventually.

Proof. Let $x(t)>0, t \geq t_{0}$. Then it is clear that $v(t)>0$ for $t \geq t_{0}$. From (3) we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
v^{\prime}(t) & =\frac{1}{\tau}[z(t+2 \tau)-z(t+\tau)]= \\
& =\frac{1}{\tau} \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t+\tau} F\left(x\left(t_{m}\right)\right)\left[x(t+2 \tau) \prod_{t+\tau \leq t_{m}<t+2 \tau} F\left(x\left(t_{m}\right)\right)-x(t+\tau)\right] . \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

Now from Eq. (1), we have

$$
x(t+2 \tau)-x(t+\tau)<0
$$

Since $0<\prod_{t+\tau \leq t_{m}<t+2 \tau} F\left(x\left(t_{m}\right)\right) \leq 1$, we also have

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(t+2 \tau) \prod_{t+\tau \leq t_{m}<t+2 \tau} F\left(x\left(t_{m}\right)\right)<x(t+\tau) . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using (4) and (5), we obtain $v^{\prime}(t)<0$ for $t \geq t_{0}, t \neq t_{m}$. Since $v(t)$ is continuous, it follows that $v^{\prime}(t) \leq 0$ for $t \geq t_{0}$.

Lemma 1 is proved.
Remark 1. Assume that hypotheses (i), (ii) hold. If $x(t)$ is an eventually negative solution of (1), (2), then $v(t)<0$, and $v^{\prime}(t) \geq 0$ eventually.

Let $\sigma=k \tau+\theta, k \in \mathbb{N}, \theta \in[0, \tau)$.
Lemma 2. Let $x(t)$ be an eventually positive solution of Eqs. (1), (2). Assume that the following conditions hold:
$\left(H_{1}\right)$ assumptions (i), (ii) are fulfilled;
$\left(H_{2}\right) f(u)$ is convex for $u>0$, and concave for $u<0$;
$\left(H_{3}\right) u g(u) \leq L_{m} u^{2}$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}$, where $L_{m} \geq 0, m=1,2, \ldots$, are constants.
Then $v(t)$ defined by (3) eventually satisfies the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
v(t+2 \tau)-v(t+\tau) \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t+3 \tau}\left(1+L_{m}\right)+v(t)+f(v(t-k \tau)) \leq 0 . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $x(t)>0, t \geq t_{0}$. By using $\left(H_{1}\right)-\left(H_{3}\right)$ and employing the Jensen's inequality, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& v(t+2 \tau)-v(t+\tau) \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t+3 \tau}\left(1+L_{m}\right)+v(t)+f(v(t-\sigma)) \leq \\
& \quad \leq \frac{1}{\tau}\left\{\int_{t+\tau}^{t+2 \tau} x(u+2 \tau) d u-\int_{t+\tau}^{t+2 \tau} x(u+\tau) d u+\int_{t+\tau}^{t+2 \tau} x(u) d u+\int_{t+\tau}^{t+2 \tau} f(x(u-\sigma)) d u\right\}=0 . \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that from condition (i) and $\left(H_{2}\right) f$ is nondecreasing. On the other hand, in view of Lemma 1, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
v(t-\sigma) \geq v(t-k \tau) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using (8) and the fact that $f(u)$ is nondecreasing, we easily obtain (6) from (7).
Lemma 2 is proved.
Remark 2. Let $x(t)$ be an eventually negative solution of Eqs. (1), (2). Under the hypotheses of Lemma 2 it is shown that $v(t)$ defined by (3) eventually satisfies the inequality

$$
v(t+2 \tau)-v(t+\tau) \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t+3 \tau}\left(1+L_{m}\right)+v(t)+f(v(t-k \tau)) \geq 0
$$

Theorem 1. In addition to $\left(H_{1}\right)-\left(H_{3}\right)$, assume that
$\left(H_{4}\right) \limsup _{t \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t+3 \tau}\left(1+L_{m}\right)=L<\infty$.
If

$$
\begin{equation*}
K>L^{k+2} \frac{(k+1)^{k+1}}{(k+2)^{k+2}} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

then every solution of (1), (2) is oscillatory.
Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $x(t)$ is a nonoscillatory solution of (1), (2). We may assume without any loss of generality that $x(t)$ is eventually positive. From (6), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{v(t+2 \tau)}{v(t+\tau)}-\prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t+3 \tau}\left(1+L_{m}\right) \leq-\frac{f(v(t-k \tau))}{v(t+\tau)}=-\frac{f(v(t-k \tau))}{v(t-k \tau)} \prod_{j=0}^{k} \frac{v(t-j \tau)}{v(t-(j-1) \tau)} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define

$$
\alpha(t)=\frac{v(t)}{v(t+\tau)}, \quad t \geq t_{0} .
$$

Since $v^{\prime}(t) \leq 0$, it is clear that $\alpha(t) \geq 1$. From (ii) and (10), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\alpha(t+\tau)}+K \prod_{j=0}^{k} \alpha(t-j \tau) \leq \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t+3 \tau}\left(1+L_{m}\right) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

In view of $\left(\mathrm{H}_{4}\right)$ inequality (11) implies that $\alpha(t)$ is bounded. Let $\beta=\liminf _{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(t)$. Taking the inferior limit on both sides of (11), we obtain

$$
1+K \beta^{k+2} \leq \beta L
$$

This inequality implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta>\frac{1}{L} \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{K \beta^{k+2}}{\beta L-1} \leq 1 \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the fact that

$$
\min _{\beta>\frac{1}{L}} \frac{\beta^{k+2}}{\beta L-1}=\frac{1}{L^{k+2}} \frac{(k+2)^{k+2}}{(k+1)^{k+1}}
$$

we obtain from (12) that

$$
\frac{1}{L^{k+2}} \frac{(k+2)^{k+2}}{(k+1)^{k+1}} \leq \frac{1}{K}
$$

which however contradicts (9). If $x(t)$ is an eventually negative solution of Eqs. (1), (2), we are lead to a contradiction by a similar argument.

Theorem 1 is proved.
Theorem 2. In addition to $\left(H_{1}\right)-\left(H_{3}\right)$ assume that the following conditions are satisfied:
$\left(H_{5}\right) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} L_{m}<\infty$,
$\left(H_{6}\right) \lim \sup _{u \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(u)}{u}>1$.
Then every solution of Eqs. (1), (2) is oscillatory.
Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $x(t)$ is a nonoscillatory solution of (1), (2). We may assume without any loss of generality that $x(t)$ is eventually positive. From (6), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
v(t+2 \tau) \leq v(t+\tau) \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t+3 \tau}\left(1+L_{m}\right) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using (13) we obtain

$$
v(t+\tau) \leq v(t-k \tau) \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t-(i-3) \tau}\left(1+L_{m}\right)
$$

Now using the above inequality from (6), we get

$$
f(v(t-k \tau)) \leq v(t+\tau) \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t+3 \tau}\left(1+L_{m}\right) \leq v(t-k \tau) \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t+3 \tau}\left(1+L_{m}\right)^{k+2}
$$

From the last inequality, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{f(v(t-k \tau))}{v(t-k \tau)} \leq \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t+3 \tau}\left(1+L_{m}\right)^{k+2} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $v(t)>0$ is a continuous function and $v^{\prime}(t) \leq 0, \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} v(t)=v_{0} \geq 0$. We claim that $v_{0}=0$. If $v_{0}>0$, then from (4) we get

$$
v(t+2 \tau)+v(t)<v(t+\tau) \prod_{t_{0} \leq t_{m}<t+3 \tau}\left(1+L_{m}\right) .
$$

Taking the limit on both sides of last inequality we obtain $2 v_{0} \leq v_{0}$ which is a contradiction. So, $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} v(t)=0$.

Now, taking the superior limit on both sides of (14), we obtain

$$
\limsup _{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(v(t-k \tau))}{v(t-k \tau)} \leq 1
$$

which however contradicts $\left(H_{6}\right)$. If $x(t)$ is an eventually negative solution of Eqs. (1), (2), we are lead to a contradiction by a similar argument.

Theorem 2 is proved.
Remark 3. If $x\left(t_{n}^{+}\right)=x\left(t_{n}^{-}\right)$for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $L=1$ and the assertions of Theorems 1 and 2 are valid for nonimpulsive equation.

Corollary 1. Assume that $\left(H_{1}\right)-\left(H_{3}\right)$ and $\left(H_{5}\right)$ are satisfied. If

$$
\liminf _{u \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(u)}{u}>\frac{(k+1)^{k+1}}{(k+2)^{k+2}}
$$

then every solution of Eqs. (1), (2) is oscillatory.
Example 1. Consider the linear impulsive difference equation with continuous variable

$$
\begin{gather*}
\Delta_{1 / 2}^{2} x(t)+\Delta_{1 / 2} x(t)+x(t)+A x\left(t-\frac{3}{2}\right)=0, \quad t \neq t_{n}  \tag{15}\\
x\left(t_{n}^{+}\right)-x\left(t_{n}^{-}\right)=\frac{1}{n(n+1)} x\left(t_{n}\right), \quad t_{n}=n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\tau=1 / 2, \sigma=3 / 2, A>0$ is a constant, $L_{n}=\frac{1}{n(n+1)}, n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $A>\frac{4^{4}}{5^{5}}$, then by Corollary 1 every solution of equation (15) is oscillatory.

Example 2. Consider the nonlinear impulsive difference equation with continuous variable

$$
\begin{gather*}
x(t+2)-x(t+1)+x(t)+x(t-1)\left(1+x^{2}(t-1)\right)=0, \quad t \neq t_{n}  \tag{16}\\
x\left(t_{n}^{+}\right)-x\left(t_{n}^{-}\right)=\frac{1}{3^{n}} \frac{x\left(t_{n}\right)}{1+x^{2}\left(t_{n}\right)}, \quad t_{n}=n, \quad n=1,2, \ldots,
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\tau=\sigma=1, f(u)=u\left(1+u^{2}\right), g(u)=\frac{1}{3^{n}} \frac{u}{1+u^{2}}$. Equation (16) satisfy the conditions $\left(H_{1}\right)-\left(H_{3}\right),\left(H_{5}\right)$. Moreover, $\liminf _{u \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(u)}{u}>\frac{2^{2}}{3^{3}}$. So, by Corollary 1 , every solution of equation (16) is oscillatory.

1. Zhang B. G., Yan J., Choi S. K. Oscillation for difference equations with continuous variable // Comput. Math. Appl. - 1998. - 36, № 9. - P. 11-18.
2. Zhang B. G. Oscillation of a class of difference equations with continuous arguments // Appl. Math. Lett. 2001. - 14. - P. 557-561.
3. Zhang Z., Bi P., Chen J. Oscillation of a second order nonlinear difference equation with continuous variable // J. Math. Anal. and Appl. - 2001. - 255, № 1. - P. 349-357.
4. Wu S., Нои Z. Oscillation criteria for a class of neutral difference equations with continuous variable // J. Math. Anal. and Appl. - 2004. - 290, № 1. - P. 316-323.
5. Zhang B. G., Lian F. Y. Oscillation criteria for certain difference equations with continuous variables // Indian J. Pure and Appl. Math. - 2006. - 37, № 6. - P. 325-341.
6. Wang P., Wu M. Oscillation of certain second order nonlinear damped difference equations with continuous variable // Appl. Math. Lett. - 2007. - 20, № 6. - P. 637-644.
7. Samoilenko A. M., Perestyuk N. A. Impulsive differential equations. - Singapore: World Sci., 1995.
8. Bainov D. D., Simeonov P. S. Oscillation theory of impulsive differential equations. - Orlando: Int. Publ., 1998.
9. Lakshmikantham V., Bainov D. D., Simeonov P. S. Theory of impulsive differential equations. - Singapore: World Sci., 1998.
10. Agarwal R. P., Grace S. R., O'Regan D. Oscillation theory for second order dynamic equations. - New York: Taylor Francis, 2003.
11. Agarwal R. P., Karakoç F., Zafer A. A survey on oscillation of impulsive ordinary differential equations // Adv. Difference Equat. - 2010. - Article ID 354841. - 52 p.
12. Agarwal R. P., Karakoç F. A survey on oscillation of impulsive delay differential equations // Comput. Math. Appl. - 2010. - 60. - P. 1648-1685.
13. Wei G., Shen J. Oscillation of solutions of impulsive neutral difference equations with continuous variable // Dynam. Contin. Discrete Impuls. Syst. Ser. A. Math. Anal. - 2006. - 13, № 1. - P. 147-152.
14. Jiang Z., Xu Y., Lin L. Oscillation of solution of impulsive difference equation with continuous variable // Dynam. Contin. Discrete Impuls. Syst. Ser. A Math. Anal. - 2006. - 13, Pt 2, suppl. - P. 587-592.
15. Agarwal R. P., Karakoç F., Zafer A. Oscillation of nonlinear impulsive partial difference equations with continuous variables // J. Difference Equat. and Appl. - 2012. - 18, № 6. - P. 1101-1114.

Received 24.10.11,
after revision - 17.01.13

