Period function's convexity for Hamiltonian centers with separable variables

M. Sabatini

Abstract

A convexity theorem for the period function T of Hamiltonian systems with separable variables is proved. We are intersted in systems with a non-monotone T. The result is applied to prove the uniqueness of critical orbits in second order ODE's. [0]

1 Introduction

Let us consider a planar Hamiltonian system with separable variables,

$$x' = F'(y), \qquad y' = -G'(x), \tag{1}$$

defined on a open connected set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. If its Hamiltonian $H(x,y) = F(y) + G(x)$ has an extremum at the origin O, then O has a punctured neighbourhood covered with non-trivial cycles. We denote by N_O the largest connected punctured neighbourhood of O covered with non-trivial cycles, not assuming O to belong to N_O. We define the *period function* $T : N_O \to \mathbb{R}$ of (1) as the function assigning to every point $(x,y) \in N_O$ the minimal period of the cycle passing through (x,y). We say that the period function T is *increasing* if, for every couple of cycles γ_1, γ_2, with γ_1 enclosed by γ_2, one has $T(\gamma_1) \le T(\gamma_2)$. When T is constant, we say that O is *isochronous.* Let $\delta(s)$, $s \in (\sigma_*, \sigma^*)$, be a curve of class C^1 meeting transversally the cycles of N_O. Assume that $\lim_{s\to\sigma_*^+} \delta(s) = O$. We can consider the function $T(s) \equiv T(\delta(s))$. Then T is increasing if and only if $T(s)$ is one-variable increasing function. Let $\gamma_{\bar{s}}$ be the unique cycle met by δ at the point $\delta(\bar{s})$. We say that T has an extremum at $\gamma_{\bar{s}}$ if $T(s)$ has an extremum at $s = \bar{s}$. We say that γ is a *critical cycle* if $\left[\frac{d}{ds}T(s)\right]_{s=\bar{s}} = 0$. It is possible to prove that such a definition does not depend on the particular transversal curve δ chosen.

Studying the period function is essential in some stability, bifurcation, boundary value problems related to Hamiltonian systems, or to systems reducible to Hamiltonian ones, as Lotka-Volterra systems. The period function's monotonicity for systems of type (1) was studied by several authors ([1], [4]–[6], [8]–[11], [13]), not considering here papers devoted to isochronicity. In some cases the monotonicity was proved together with the convexity of T ([10]). Systems with a non-monotone period function were studied in [2] and [3].

---

[0]Key words and phrases: center, period function, convexity.
This work has been partially supported by the COFIN group "Equazioni differenziali ordinarie e applicazioni", and by the intergroup project "Dinamica anolonoma, perturbazioni e orbite periodiche".

The monotonicity ensures that a typical boundary value problem, $x(0) = x(T)$, has a unique solution for T belonging to some interval. Similarly, when $F'(y) = y$,

$$x' = y, \qquad y' = -G'(x),$$

the uniqueness of Neumann-like problems, $x'(0) = x'(T)$, may be reduced to the study of T's monotonicity, as in [1].

A different situation has to be taken into account, when looking for multiple solutions of boundary value problems. If $x(0) = x(T)$ has more than a single solution, then $T(s)$ has different monotonicity properties in distinct intervals. Such intervals, corresponding to distinct subsets of N_O, are separated by values of s where T reaches a local extremum. The problem of counting the exact number of solutions to $x(0) = x(T)$ is related to the problem of counting such local extrema. The simplest way to estimate the number of such extrema consists in studying the convexity of $T(s)$, which ensures the uniqueness of the extremum. If $T(s)$ is convex, there exists an interval $[T_1, T_2]$ such that the BVP $x(0) = x(T)$ has exactly two solutions, for $T \in [T_1, T_2]$.

In this paper we give sufficient conditions for the existence of a transversal curve $\delta(s)$ such that $T(\delta(s))$ be convex on some interval. The main tool applied is a theorem proved in [6], where T was studied by means of a suitable auxiliary system,

$$x' = \frac{G(x)}{G'(x)}, \qquad y' = \frac{F(y)}{F'(y)}. \tag{2}$$

Such a system is a *normalizer* of (1), that is a system whose local flow takes orbits of (1) into orbits of (1). Denoting by $V(x, y)$ the vector field of (1), and by $W(x, y)$ the vector field of (2), this is equivalent to say that there exists a function $\mu : N_O \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$[V, W] = \mu V.$$

If $\delta(s)$ is a solution to (2), then one has, as proved in [6],

$$T'(s) = \frac{d}{ds} T(\delta(s)) = \int_0^{T(s)} \mu(\gamma_s(t))\, dt. \tag{3}$$

In the case of the couple of systems (1) and (2), one has

$$\mu(x, y) = \left(\frac{G(x)}{G'(x)}\right)' + \left(\frac{F(y)}{F'(y)}\right)' - 1.$$

Hence, proving the convexity of $T(s)$ reduces to proving that the integral in (3) has larger values on outer cycles. This can be done, on a suitable subset A of N_O, by adapting a technique used to study the uniqueness of limit cycles in Liénard systems (see [7], [12], [14]).

In theorem (1) we show that under suitable assumptions on the sign of some functions depeding on F, G, and their derivatives up to the third order, $T'(s)$ is increasing on A, hence $T(s)$ is convex on A. As a consequence, (1) has at most one critical orbit in A. Conditions for the existence and uniqueness of critical orbits are given for some classes of second order conservative O.D.E.'s. It is maybe noticeable that the function $N(x)$ introduced in [1],

$$N(x) = 6G(x)G''^2(x) - 3G'(x)^2 G''(x) - 2G(x)G'(x)G'''(x).$$

plays a role also in the study of convexity. On the other hand, we find an example of degenerate planar center with T strictly decreasing at the origin, such that $N(x) \geq 0$ in a neighbourhood of O. This shows that theorem A in [1] cannot be extended to degenerate centers.

2 Results

Let $G \in C^3(I, \mathbb{R})$, $F \in C^3(J, \mathbb{R})$, I, J open intervals containing 0, possibly unbounded. We consider the system (1), assuming F and G to have minima at the origin. We do not assume such minima to be non-degenerate, because the results proved in [6] hold under the only assumption that $H(x,y) = G(x) + F(y)$ has a minimum at O. Also, we assume $xG'(x) > 0$ on $I \setminus \{0\}$, $yF'(y) > 0$ on $J \setminus \{0\}$.

We say that (1) satisfies the conditions (L) if there exist $\alpha \in C^0(I, \mathbb{R})$, $\beta \in C^0(J, \mathbb{R})$ and $a, b \in I$, $a \leq 0 \leq b$, $c, d \in J$, $c \leq 0 \leq d$, such that:

$L_1)$ $\alpha(x) + \beta(y) = \left(\frac{G(x)}{G'(x)}\right)' + \left(\frac{F(y)}{F'(y)}\right)' - 1$,

$L_2)$ $\alpha(x) \geq 0$ for $x \notin [a, b]$, $\alpha(x)F''(y) \leq 0$ for $x \in [a, b]$, $y \notin [c, d]$;

$L_3)$ $\beta(y) \geq 0$ for $y \notin [c, d]$, $G''(x)\beta(y) \leq 0$ for $x \notin [a, b]$, $y \in [c, d]$;

$L_4)$ $\left(\frac{\alpha(x)}{G'(x)}\right)' \geq 0$ for $x \notin [a, b]$,

$L_5)$ $\left(\frac{\beta(y)}{F'(y)}\right)' \geq 0$ for $y \notin [c, d]$.

The above conditions are considered even in the case of intervals reducing to a single point, as it occurs when $a = 0 = b$.

We denote by $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$ the family of cycles contained in N_O, enclosing the rectangle $[a, b] \times [c, d]$, by $\mathcal{O}^i_{abcd}$ the family of cycles contained in $N_O \cap [a, b] \times [c, d]$. In general, $N_O \neq \mathcal{O}^i_{abcd} \cup \mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$. If $c = 0 = d$, $a < 0 < b$, we denote by $\mathcal{O}^e_{ab00}$ the family of cycles meeting both the lines $x = a$ and $x = b$; by $\mathcal{O}^i_{ab00}$ the family of cycles contained in the strip $a < x < b$. Similarly for $a = 0 = b$, $c < 0 < d$.

Convexity is not necessarily strict. Since there is one-to-one correspondence between the parameters s and the orbits γ_s, we say equivalently that T is (strictly) convex at s or at γ_s. Similarly, we say that T is (strictly) convex on $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$, or on $\mathcal{O}^i_{abcd}$.

The main result of this paper is the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *Assume that (1) satisfies the conditions* (L). *Then the function* T *is convex on* $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that $T'(s)$ is increasing $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$. By lemma 7 in [6], the derivative of $T(s)$ is given by the formula (3), where

$$\mu(x, y) = \left(\frac{G(x)}{G'(x)}\right)' + \left(\frac{F(y)}{F'(y)}\right)' - 1 = \alpha(x) + \beta(y).$$

Let us consider two cycles, γ_{s_1}, γ_{s_2}, with $s_1 < s_2$. γ_{s_1} is contained in the bounded region having γ_{s_2} as boundary. In order to prove that $T'(s_1) \leq T'(s_2)$, we have to show that

$$\int_0^{T(s_1)} \mu(\gamma_{s_1}(t))\ dt \le \int_0^{T(s_2)} \mu(\gamma_{s_2}(t))\ dt.$$

The orbits will be decomposed into arcs over which the integration will be performed with respect to x or y.

Let us first compare only the terms $\int_0^{T(s_1)} \alpha(\gamma_{s_1}(t))\ dt$ and $\int_0^{T(s_2)} \alpha(\gamma_{s_2}(t))\ dt$.

Since γ_1 encloses the rectangle $[a,b]\times[c,d]$, it meets the line $x=b$ at points (b,c'), (b,d'), with $c' \le 0 \le d'$. Also, it meets the line $x=a$ at points (a,c''), (a,d''), with $c'' \le 0 \le d''$.

The curve γ_1 is the union of four arcs, γ_1^1, contained in $\{a \le x \le b, y>0\}$, γ_1^2, contained in $\{x \ge b\}$, γ_1^3, contained in $\{a \le x \le b, y<0\}$, γ_1^4, contained in $\{x \le a\}$. The curve γ_2 is the union of eight arcs, γ_2^1, contained in $\{a \le x \le b, y>0\}$, γ_2^2, contained in $\{x \ge b\}$, γ_2^3, contained in $\{a \le x \le b, y<0\}$, γ_2^4, contained in $\{x \le a\}$; γ_2^I, contained in $\{x \ge b, y \ge d'\}$, γ_2^{II}, contained in $\{x \ge b, , y \le c'\}$, γ_2^{III}, contained in $\{x \le a, y \le c''\}$, γ_2^{IV}, contained in $\{x \le a, y \ge d''\}$ (see figure 1).

Since $\alpha \ge 0$ out of $[a,b]$, one has

$$\int_{\gamma_2^I} \alpha \ge 0, \qquad \int_{\gamma_2^{II}} \alpha \ge 0, \qquad \int_{\gamma_2^{III}} \alpha \ge 0, \qquad \int_{\gamma_2^{IV}} \alpha \ge 0.$$

In order to prove that $\int_0^{T(s_1)} \alpha(\gamma_{s_1}(t))\ dt \le \int_0^{T(s_2)} \alpha(\gamma_{s_2}(t))\ dt$, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\int_{\gamma_1^j} \alpha \le \int_{\gamma_2^j} \alpha, \qquad j=1,\dots,4.$$

We write details only for the arcs γ_1^1, γ_1^2, γ_2^1, γ_2^2, since the other four arcs can be treated in a similar way. Since for $a \le x \le b$ one has $\frac{dx}{dt} = F'(y) > 0$, along $\gamma_1^1(t)$ one can express t as a function of x and integrate with respect to x. Writing $F(y)$ for $F(y(t(x)))$, one has

$$\int_{\gamma_1^1} \alpha(\gamma_{s_1}(t))\ dt = \left[\int_a^b \frac{\alpha(x)dx}{F'(y)}\right]_{\gamma_1^1}.$$

Since $\alpha(x) \le 0$ on $[a,b]$, $F''(y) \ge 0$ out of (c,d), then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\frac{\alpha(x)}{F'(y)} = -\frac{\alpha(x)F''(y)}{F'(y)^2} \ge 0,$$

so that $\frac{\alpha(x)}{F'(y)}$ is an increasing function of y. γ_2 is external with respect to γ_1, hence

$$\int_{\gamma_1^1} \alpha(\gamma_{s_1}(t))\ dt = \left[\int_a^b \frac{\alpha(x)dx}{F'(y)}\right]_{\gamma_1^1} \le \left[\int_a^b \frac{\alpha(x)dx}{F'(y)}\right]_{\gamma_2^1} = \int_{\gamma_2^1} \alpha(\gamma_{s_2}(t))\ dt.$$

Now let us consider the arcs γ_1^2, γ_2^2, along which one has $\frac{dy}{dt} = -G'(x) < 0$, so that one can express t as a function of y, and integrate with respect to y,

$$\int_{\gamma_1^2} \alpha(\gamma_{s_1}(t))\ dt = \left[\int_{d'}^{c'} \frac{\alpha(x)dy}{-G'(x)}\right]_{\gamma_1^2} = \left[\int_{c'}^{d'} \frac{\alpha(x)dy}{G'(x)}\right]_{\gamma_1^2}.$$

By L_4, one has

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{\alpha(x)}{G'(x)}\right) \geq 0,$$

hence $\frac{\alpha(x)}{G'(x)}$ is an increasing function, and as above

$$\int_{\gamma_1^2} \alpha(\gamma_{s_1}(t))\; dt = \left[\int_{d'}^{c'} \frac{\alpha(x)dy}{-G'(x)}\right]_{\gamma_1^2} \leq \left[\left[\int_{d'}^{c'} \frac{\alpha(x)dy}{-G'(x)}\right]_{\gamma_1^2}\right]_{\gamma_2^2} = \int_{\gamma_2^2} \alpha(\gamma_{s_2}(t))\; dt.$$

The same argument, works as well for the arcs γ_1^3, γ_1^4, γ_2^3, γ_2^4. Summing up, one has

$$\int_0^{T(s_1)} \alpha(\gamma_{s_1}(t))\; dt \leq \int_0^{T(s_2)} \alpha(\gamma_{s_2}(t))\; dt.$$

Now let us consider the integrals involving β. We can work as we did for α, with the lines $y = c$, $y = d$ playing the role of the lines $x = a$, $x = b$. Computations are similar, and lead to a similar conclusion,

$$\int_0^{T(s_1)} \beta(\gamma_{s_1}(t))\; dt \leq \int_0^{T(s_2)} \beta(\gamma_{s_2}(t))\; dt.$$

♣

The term -1 appearing in μ can be adsorbed in different ways by α and β. In general, for a given $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$, we may write

$$\mu(x,y) = \left[\left(\frac{G(x)}{G'(x)}\right)' + \kappa\right] + \left[\left(\frac{F(y)}{F'(y)}\right)' - 1 - \kappa\right] = \alpha(x) + \beta(y).$$

Let us denote by $-L_j$, $j = 2, \ldots, 5$, the conditions obtained from L_j, $j = 1, \ldots, 5$, by reversing the inequalities. We have the following analogue of theorem 1 for the concavity of the period function.

Theorem 2 *Assume that (1) satisfies the conditions L_1, $-L_j$, $j = 2, \ldots, 5$. Then the function T is concave on $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$.*

Proof. As in theorem 1, reversing the integral inequalities. ♣

Next four corollaries are concerned with the strict convexity on $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$. Such a property implies the uniqueness of critical orbits on $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$, if they exist.

Corollary 1 *Assume that the hypotheses of theorem 1 hold. If the cycle $\bar\gamma$ passes through a point $(\bar x, \bar y)$ such that at least one of the inequalities contained in L_j, $j = 2, \ldots, 5$ holds strictly. Then T is strictly convex in a neighbourhood of $\bar\gamma$.*

Proof. At least one of the integral inequalities of the proof of theorem 1 is strict at $(\bar x, \bar y)$. By continuity, this holds in a neighbourhood of $(\bar x, \bar y)$, hence $T'(s)$ is strictly increasing in a neighbourhood of $\bar\gamma$. ♣

For instance, if there exists $\bar x > b$ such that $\alpha(\bar x) > 0$, then T is strictly convex at every orbit cutting the line $x = \bar x$. As a consequence, one has at most one critical orbit cutting the line $x = \bar x$. A similar statement can be proved about strict concavity.

Corollary 2 *Assume that the hypotheses of theorem 1 hold. If one of the following holds*

i) there exist x_n, $x_n > b$, $\lim_{n\to+\infty} x_n = b$, such that $\alpha(x_n) > 0$ ($x_n < a$, $\lim_{n\to+\infty} x_n = a$, such that $\alpha(x_n) > 0$);

ii) there exist y_n, $y_n > d$, $\lim_{n\to+\infty} y_n = d$, such that $\beta(y_n) > 0$ ($y_n < c$, $\lim_{n\to+\infty} y_n = c$, such that $\beta(y_n) > 0$);

then the function T is strictly convex on $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$.

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of corollary 1, since every cycle in $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$ has to meet at least one of the lines $x = x_n$ ($y = y_n$). ♣

Corollary 3 *Assume that the hypotheses of theorem 1 hold. If one of the following holds*

i) there exists $\bar x \in [a, b]$, such that $\alpha(\bar x) < 0$, $F''(y) > 0$ for $y > d$ ($F''(y) > 0$ for $y < c$);

ii) there exists $\bar{y} \in [c,d]$, such that $\beta(\bar{y}) < 0$, $G''(x) > 0$ for $x > b$ ($G''(x) > 0$ for $x < a$);

then the function T is strictly convex on $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$.

Proof. *i*). It is an immediate consequence of corollary 1, since every cycle in $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$ has to meet the half-line $x = \bar{x}$, $y > d$ ($x = \bar{x}$, $y < c$). Point *ii*) can be proved similarly. ♣

Strict convexity (concavity) can be also proved for analytic systems. We recall that monotonicity is not strict monotonicity, so that a constant period function is monotone.

Corollary 4 *Assume that the hypotheses of theorem 1 hold. If F and G are analytic functions, and T is not monotone on $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$, then T is strictly convex on $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$.*

Proof. $T(s) = T(\delta(s))$ is an analytic function. By theorem 1, T is convex on $\mathcal{O}^e_{abcd}$, hence $T''(s) \geq 0$. Moreover, $T''(s)$ is not identically zero, otherwise there would exist $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $T(s) = \kappa_1 s + \kappa_2$, that would imply monotonicity. By the analyticity, the zeroes of $T''(s)$ are isolated, so that $T'(s)$ is strictly increasing, that gives the strictly convexity of T. ♣

Next corollary is concerned with conservative second order differential equations,

$$x'' + G'(x) = 0. \tag{4}$$

As in [1], we set

$$N(x) = 6G(x)G''^2(x) - 3G'(x)^2G''(x) - 2G(x)G'(x)G'''(x).$$

In what follows, we choose $c = 0 = d$.

Corollary 5 *Let $G \in C^3(I, \mathbb{R})$, $xG'(x) > 0$ for $x \neq 0$. If there exist $a, b \in I$, $a \leq 0 \leq b$, such that*

i) $G'(x)^2 - 2G(x)G''(x) \leq 0$ for $x \in [a,b]$, $G'(x)^2 - 2G(x)G''(x) \geq 0$ for $x \notin [a,b]$,

ii) $N(x) \geq 0$ for $x \notin [a,b]$,

then the period function $T(s)$ is convex on $\mathcal{O}^e_{ab00}$.

Reversing the above inequalities implies the concavity of $T(s)$ on $\mathcal{O}^e_{ab00}$.

Proof. The equation (4) is a special case of (1), taking $F(y) = \frac{y^2}{2}$, $c = 0 = d$, $\beta(y) = 0$. Then one has $\alpha(x) = \frac{G'^2 - 2GG''}{2G'^2}$, and

$$\left(\frac{\alpha}{G'}\right)' = \frac{6GG''^2 - 3G'^2G'' - 2GG'G'''}{2G'^4} = \frac{N}{2G'^4}.$$

The conditions i), ii), ensure that the hypotheses of theorem 1 hold. ♣

A simple additional condition allows to prove the uniqueness of critical orbits of (4) on all of N_O. In the situation considered in next corollary, one has $N_O = \mathcal{O}^i_{ab00} \cup \mathcal{O}^e_{ab00}$.

Corollary 6 *Let (4) be a non-linear equation. Under the hypotheses of corollary 5, assume additionally that $G(a) = G(b)$. If the hypotheses of one of the corollaries 2 or 4 hold, then (4) has at most a critical orbit in N_O, contained in the set $G(x) + \frac{y^2}{2} > G(a)$.*

Proof. The cycles are contained in level sets of the first integral $G(x) + \frac{y^2}{2}$. If $G(a) = G(b)$, then there exists a cycle γ_{ab} passing through $(a,0)$ and $(b,0)$. All the other cycles either meet both the lines $x = a$ and $x = b$, or are contained in the strip $a < x < b$, hence $N_O = \mathcal{O}^i_{ab00} \cup \mathcal{O}^e_{ab00}$. One has $T'(s) \leq 0$ for every cycle $\gamma_s \in \mathcal{O}^i_{ab00}$, because $\alpha(x) \leq 0$ on $[a,b]$. We claim that actually $T'(s) < 0$ on $\mathcal{O}^i_{ab00}$. In fact, assume by absurd that $\alpha \equiv 0$ on $[a,b]$. Then $G'^2 - 2GG'' \equiv 0$ on $[a,b]$, so that, on the interval $(0,b)$, where both G and G' are positive, one has

$$\frac{G'}{G} = 2\frac{G''}{G'}.$$

Integrating, this gives $\ln G = 2 \ln G' + \kappa_0$, $\kappa_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, hence $G = \kappa_1 G'^2$, $\kappa_1 > 0$. Integrating the equation $G = \kappa_1 G'^2$ gives $G(x) = (\kappa_2 x + \kappa_3)^2$. Since $G(x)$ vanishes at 0, one has $\kappa_3 = 0$, so that $G(x) = (\kappa_2 x)^2$, contradicting the non-linearity of (4). This proves that $\alpha(x)$ cannot vanish identically on any interval $[0, b_1)$ contained in $[0,b)$. As a consequence, T' is strictly negative on $\mathcal{O}^i_{ab00}$. In particular, T' is strictly negative on the orbit γ_{ab}, and, by continuity, on a neighbourhood of γ_{ab}. Hence a critical orbit cannot be contained in the sublevel set $G(x) + \frac{y^2}{2} \leq G(a)$, but, if it exists, it has to belong to $\mathcal{O}^e_{ab00}$, where T is strictly convex, by corollary 2 or 4. This gives the uniqueness. ♣

Example 1 The potential $G(x) = x^2 + x^4 - x^6$ generates the system

$$x' = y, \qquad y' = -2x - 4x^3 + 6x^5, \tag{5}$$

We take $I = [-1,1]$, $J = \mathbb{R}$. The system (5) has a center at the origin, with central region contained in the rectangle $[-1,1] \times [-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}]$.

One has

$$G'^2 - 2GG'' = -4x^4(3 - 8x^2 - 9x^4 + 6x^6)$$
$$N = -24x^4(1 - 18x^2 + 34x^4 - 52x^6 - 59x^8 + 30x^{10}).$$

Applying Sturm procedure, one can show that in the interval $[-1,1]$, $G'^2 - 2GG''$ has exactly two zeroes $-x_1 < 0 < x_1$, as well as N, which vanishes at $-x_2 < 0 < x_2$. One has $-x_1 < -x_2 < 0 < x_2 < x_1$, so that taking $a = -x_1$, $b = x_1$, the system (5) satisfies all the hypotheses of corollary 6. Its period function is strictly decreasing in a neighbourhood of the origin, it is strictly convex on $\mathcal{O}_{-x_1 x_1 00}$, it tends to $+\infty$ approaching the boundary ∂N_O and there exists exactly one critical orbit. A numerical approximation shows that x_1 is approximatively 0.544, while x_2 is approximatively 0.249.

Example 2 The potential $G(x) = \frac{x^4}{x^4+1}$ generates the system

$$x' = y, \qquad y' = -\frac{4x^3}{(x^4+1)^2}. \tag{6}$$

We take $I = \mathbb{R}$, $J = (-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2})$. The system (6) has a center at the origin, with central region contained in the strip $I \times J$. One has

$$G'^2 - 2GG'' = \frac{8x^6(5x^4-1)}{(x^4+1)^4}.$$

Such a function is negative for $x \in \left(-\frac{1}{5^{1/4}}, \frac{1}{5^{1/4}}\right)$, positive for $x \notin \left[-\frac{1}{5^{1/4}}, \frac{1}{5^{1/4}}\right]$. Moreover, one has

$$N = 96x^8(15x^8+1)/((x^4+1)^7),$$

which is positive for $x \neq 0$. Also in this example $T'(s) < 0$ on the cycles contained in the strip $x \in \left[-\frac{1}{5^{1/4}}, \frac{1}{5^{1/4}}\right]$. T is strictly convex on the cycles meeting both the lines $x = \pm\frac{1}{5^{1/4}}$. As a consequence, the system (6) has exactly one critical cycle, meeting both the lines $x = \pm\frac{1}{5^{1/4}}$.

Remark 1 *The previous example shows that the theorem A in [1] cannot be extended to non-degenerate centers. In fact, the function $N(x)$ is positive everywhere but at* 0 *xhile T is strictly decreasing in a neighbourhood of the origin. The proof of theorem A in [1] does not apply because the center of (6) is degenerate, and the change of variables on which the proof is based cannot be defined.*

References

[1] C. Chicone, *The monotonicity of the period function for planar Hamiltonian vector fields*, J. Differential Equations, **69** (1987), 310–321.

[2] C. Chicone, F. Dumortier, *A quadratic system with a nonmonotonic period function*, Proc. Amer. math. Soc., **102, 3** (1988), 706–710.

[3] C. Chicone, M. Jacobs, *Bifurcation of critical periods for plane vector fields*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **102, 3** (1988), 706–710.

[4] A. Cima, A. Gasull, F. Mañosas, *Period function for a class of Hamiltonian systems*, Jour. Diff. Eq. , **168** (2000), 180–199.

[5] S. N. Chow, D. Wang, *On the monotonicity of the period function of some second order equations*, Ćasopis Pést. Math, **111** (1986), 14–25.

[6] E. Freire, A. Gasull, A. Guillamon, *First derivative of the period function with applications*, to appear on J. Differential Equations.

[7] A. Gasull, A. Guillamon, *Non-existence, uniqueness of limit cycles and center problem in a system that includes predator-prey systems and generalized Liénard equations*, Diff. Eq. Dyn. Syst., **3** (1995), 345–366.

[8] A. Gasull, A. Guillamon, J. Villadelprat, *The period function for second-order quadratic ODEs is monotone*, preprint, Univ. Aut. de Barcelona, 2003.

[9] F. Rothe, *The periods of the Lotka-Volterra systems*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **355** (1985), 129–138.

[10] F. Rothe, *Remarks on the periods of planar Hamiltonian systems*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **24** (1993), 129–154.

[11] R. Schaaf, *A class of Hamiltonian systems with increasing periods*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **363** (1985), 96–109.

[12] G. Villari, *Some remarks on the uniqueness of the periodic solutions for Liénard equation*, Bollettino U.M.I., Serie VI, **IV** (1985), 173–182.

[13] D. Wang, *The critical points of the period function of* $x'' - x^2(x-\alpha)(x-1)$, $(0 \leq \alpha < 1)$, Nonlinear Anal., **11** (1987), 1029–1050.

[14] D. Xiao, Z. Zhang, *On the uniqueness and nonexistence of limit cycles for predator-prey systems*, Nonlinearity **16** (2003), 1185–1201.

Marco Sabatini
Dip. di Matematica, Univ. di Trento, I-38050 Povo, (TN) - Italy.
E-mail: sabatini@science.unitn.it
Phone: ++39(0461)881670, Fax: ++39(0461)881624