



International Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Modelling

**(Formerly Journal of the Nigerian Society
for Mathematical Biology)**

Volume 7 Issue 2, 2024

ISSN (Print): 2682 - 5694

ISSN (Online): 2682 – 5708

www.tnsmb.org

On the vector Lyapunov functions and eventual stability of nonlinear impulsive differential equations

J.E. Ante^{*†}, A.B. Inyang[‡], E.J. Oduobuk^{†§}, and U.P. Akai^{**}

Abstract

In this paper, the eventual stability of nonlinear impulsive differential equations with fixed moments of impulse is examined using the vector Lyapunov functions which is generalized by a class of piecewise continuous functions. The novelty in the use of the vector form of the Lyapunov function lies in the fact that the "restrictions" encountered via the use of scalar Lyapunov function is safely handled especially for large scale dynamical systems, since it involves splitting the Lyapunov functions into components so that each of the components can easily describe the behaviour of the solution state. Together with comparison results, sufficient conditions for eventual stability are presented. Results obtained are extensions and improvements on existing results.

Keywords and phrases: eventual stability; impulsive differential equation; vector Lyapunov functions.

1 Introduction

One of the main properties of interest in the qualitative theory of differential equations is the stability of solutions. Stability enables us to compare the behaviour of solutions starting at different points [1].

Now, the stability of solutions of differential equations via Lyapunov method has been intensively investigated in the past, and in many real cases, it is obligatory to study the stability of such sets, which are invariant with respect to a given system of differential equation. This immediately excludes the stability in the sense of Lyapunov [23]. To allay the problem that will arise subsequently, [14] introduced a new concept called eventual stability, maintaining that, the set under consideration, despite not being invariant in the usual sense, is invariant in the asymptotic sense (See also [25]).

*Corresponding Author; E-mail: jackson.ante@topfaith.edu.ng

†Department of Mathematics, Topfaith University, Mkpatak, Nigeria.

‡Department of Business Administration, Topfaith University, Mkpatak, Nigeria E-mail: ab.inyang@topfaith.edu.ng

§Department of Physics, Topfaith University, Mkpatak, Nigeria. E-mail: cj.oduobuk@topfaith.edu.ng

**Department of Mathematics, Topfaith University, Mkpatak, Nigeria E-mail: up.akai@topfaith.edu.ng

The theory of impulsive differential equation (IDE) is richer than the corresponding theory of differential equations [11], as they constitute very important models for describing the true state of several real life processes and phenomena.

Of course, many evolution processes are characterized by the fact that at certain moments of time they undergo a change of state abruptly. These processes are subject to short term perturbations whose duration is negligible in comparison with the duration of the process. Consequently, it is natural to assume that these perturbations act instantaneously, that is, in the form of impulses. It is known, for example, that many biological phenomena involving thresholds, bursting rhythm models in medicine and biology, optimal control models in economics, pharmacokinetics and frequency modulated systems, do exhibit impulsive effects [11].

Now, the efficient applications of impulsive differential system require the finding of criteria for stability of their solutions [21], and one of the most versatile methods in the study of the stability properties of impulsive systems is the method of Lyapunov functions.

There are several approaches in the literature in the study of the stability of solutions, one of which is the Lyapunov's second method. The novelty of the method over other methods of examining stability properties like the Razumikhin technique, the use of matrix inequality, variational method, Banach fixed point theory, monotone iteration method, etc. stems from the fact that the method allows us to examine the stability of solutions without first solving the given differential system. It involves seeking an appropriate continuous Lyapunov function that is positive definite and whose time derivative along the solution path is negative semidefinite. The stability of the trivial solution of impulsive differential equations has been extensively studied in [3, 6, 20].

In this paper, eventual stability of the system of nonlinear impulsive differential equation is examined. By employing the vector Lyapunov functions, generalized by a class of piecewise continuous Lyapunov functions together with the comparison results, sufficient conditions for the eventual stability of the solution is established with illustrative example.

2 Preliminaries, Notations and Definitions

Let R^n be the n -dimensional Euclidean space with norm $\|\cdot\|$. Let Ω be a domain in R^n containing the origin; $R_+ = [0, \infty)$, $R = (-\infty, \infty)$, $t_0 \in R_+$, $t > 0$.

Let $J \subset R_+$. Define the following class of functions is a piecewise continuous function with points of discontinuity $t_k \in J$ at which $\alpha(t)$ exists.

Consider the impulsive differential system

$$\begin{aligned} x' &= f(t, x), t \neq t_k, t \geq t_0 \\ \Delta x &= I_k(x), t = t_k, k \in N \\ x(t_0^+) &= x_0 \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

under the following assumptions:

- A_0 (i) $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_k < \dots$, and $t_k \rightarrow \infty$ $k \rightarrow \infty$;
(ii) $f : R_+ \times R^n \rightarrow R^n$ is continuous in $(t_{k-1}, t_k] \times R^n$ and for each $x \in R^n$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\lim_{(t,y) \rightarrow (t_k^+, x)} f(t, y) = f(t_k^+, x) \text{ exists;}$$

$$(iii) I_k : R^n \rightarrow R^n$$

In this paper, we assume that the function f is Lipschitz continuous with respect to its second argument, and $f(t, 0) \equiv 0, I_k(0) \equiv 0$ for all k , so that we have the trivial solution for (2.1), and the points $t_k, k = 1, 2, \dots$ are fixed such that $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k = \infty$. The system (2.1) with initial condition $x(t_0) = x_0$ is assumed to have a solution $x(t; t_0, x_0) \in PC([t_0, \infty), R^n)$. Note that some sufficient conditions for the existence and uniqueness of the global solutions to (2.1) are considered in [9, 15-16, 18, 26].

Remark 2.1.

The second equation in (2.1) is called the impulsive condition, and the function $I_k(x(t_k))$ gives the amount of jump of the solution at the point t_k .

Let $V : R_+ \times R^n, R_+^N$. Then V is said to belong to class L if,

- (i) V is continuous in $(t_{k-1}, t_k] \times R^n$ and for each $x \in R^n$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, and $\lim_{(t,y) \rightarrow (t_k^+, x)} V(t, y) = V(t_k^+, x)$ exists;

- (ii) V is locally Lipschitz with respect to its second argument x . For $(t_{k-1}, t_k] \times R^n$, we define the upper right Dini derivative of V with respect to (2.1) as,

$$D^+V(t, x) = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [V(t+h, x+hf(t, x)) - V(t, x)] \quad (2.2)$$

Note that in (2.1), $D^+V(t, x)$ is a functional whereas V is a function.

Definition 2.1.

A function $g(t, u)$ is said to be quasimonotone nondecreasing in u , if $u \leq v$ and $u_i = v_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$ implies $g_i(t, u) \leq g_i(t, v)$ for all i .

Definition 2.2.

The set $x(t)$ of the trivial solution $x = 0$ of (2.1) is said to be

- (ES₁) eventually stable if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t_0 \in R_+$ there exist $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon, t_0) > 0$ such that for any $x_0 \in R^n$ the inequality $\|x_0\| < \delta$ implies $\|x(t, t_0, x_0)\| < \varepsilon$ for $t \geq t_0$;
- (ES₂) uniformly eventually stable if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t_0 \in R_+$ there exist $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for any $x_0 \in R^n$, the inequality $\|x_0\| < \delta$ implies $\|x(t, t_0, x_0)\| < \varepsilon$ for $t \geq t_0$;
- (ES₃) asymptotically eventually stable if it is stable and if for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t_0 \in R_+$ there exist positive numbers $\delta_0 = \delta_0(t_0) > 0$ and $T = T(t_0, \varepsilon)$ such that for $t \geq t_0 + T$ and $\|x_0\| \leq \delta_0$ we have $\|x(t, t_0, x_0)\| < \varepsilon$.
- (ES₄) uniformly asymptotically eventually stable if it is uniformly stable and $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon)$ and $T = T(\varepsilon)$ such that for $t \geq t_0 + T$, the inequality $\|x_0\| \leq \delta_0$ implies $\|x(t, t_0, x_0)\| < \varepsilon$.

Definition 2.3.

A function $a(r)$ is said to belong to the class K if $a \in C[[0, \rho), R_+]$, $a(0) = 0$, and $a(r)$ is strictly monotone increasing in r .

In this paper, we define the following sets:

$$\bar{S}_\psi = \{x \in R^N : \|x\| \leq \psi\}$$

$$S_\psi = \{x \in R^N : \|x\| < \psi\}$$

Remark 2.2.

The inequalities between vectors are understood to be component-wise inequalities.

Definition 2.4.

A function $b(r)$ is said to belong to a class L if $b \in C[J, R_+]$, $b(t)$ is monotone decreasing in t and $b(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 2.5.

A function $a(t, r)$ is said to belong to the class KK if $a \in C[[0, \rho), R_+]$, $a \in K$ for each $t \in J$, and a is monotone increasing in t for each $r > 0$ and $a(t, r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for each $r > 0$.

Definition 2.6.

A function $V(t, x)$ with $V(t, 0) = 0$ is said to be positive definite if there exists a function $a \in K$ such that the relation $V(t, x) \geq a(\|x\|)$ is satisfied for $(t, x) \in J \times S_\rho$.

Definition 2.7.

A function $V(t, x)$ with $V(t, 0) = 0$ is said to be negative definite if there exists a function $a \in K$ such that the relation $V(t, x) \leq -a(\|x\|)$ is satisfied for $(t, x) \in J \times S_\rho$.

Definition 2.8.

A function $V(t, x) \geq 0$ is said to be decrescent if there exists a function $a \in K$ such that the relation $V(t, x) \leq a(\|x\|)$ is satisfied for $(t, x) \in J \times S_\rho$.

Alongside (2.1), we shall consider a comparison system of the form

$$\begin{aligned} u' &= g(t, u), t \neq t_k, t \geq t_0, k = 1, 2, \dots \\ \Delta u &= \psi_k(u(t_k)), t = t_k, \\ u(t_0^+) &= u_0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

existing for $t \geq t_0$, where $u \in R^n$, relation $V(t, x) \leq a(\|x\|)$ is satisfied for $(t, x) \in J \times S_\rho$. existing for $t \geq t_0$, $u \in R^n$, $R_+ = [t_0, \infty)$, $g : R_+ \times R_+^n \rightarrow R^n$, $g(t, 0) \equiv 0$, where g is the continuous mapping of $R_+ \times R_+^n$ into R^n . The function $g \in PC[R_+ \times R_+^n, R^n]$ is such that for any initial data $(t_0, u_0) \in R_+ \times R^n$, the system (2.3) with initial condition $u(t_0) = u_0$ is assumed to have a solution $u(t, t_0, u_0) \in PC([t_0, \infty), R^n)$. Note that some sufficient conditions for the existence of solution of (2.3) has been examined in [9, 18, 24, 26].

Lemma 2.2. Assume that the hypotheses $A_0(i), (ii), (iii)$ hold, and that $f(t, 0) \equiv 0$ and that $I_k(0) \equiv 0$. Then the interval J can be extended to the maximal interval of existence $[t_0, \infty)$.

Proof. Since the conditions $A_0(i), (ii), (iii)$ hold, and that $f(t, 0) \equiv 0$ and that $I_k(0) \equiv 0$, then from the existence theorem for the equation $x' = f(t, x(t))$ [18] with impulses, it follows that the solution $x(t) = x(t, t_0, x_0)$ of the IVP (2.1) is defined on each of the intervals $(t_{k-1}, t_k]$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Again, since $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k = \infty$, then we conclude that the interval J can be continued to $[t_0, \infty)$ for t_0 .

3 Main results

In this section we begin by proving the comparison results, then proceed to established the necessary conditions for the eventual stability of the set $x=0$ of the impulsive differential systems with fixed moments of impulse.

Using (2.3), Definition 2.2 can be analogously defined as follows:

Definition 3.1.

The set $u(t)$ of the trivial solution $u=0$ of (2.3) is said to be

(ES₁^{*}) eventually stable if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t_0 \in R_+$ there exist $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon, t_0) > 0$ such that for any $x_0 \in R^n$ the inequality $\|u_0\| < \delta$ implies $\|u(t, t_0, u_0)\| < \varepsilon$ for $t \geq t_0$;

(ES₂^{*}) uniformly eventually stable if the δ in (ES₁^{*}) above is independent of t_0 i.e. for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t_0 \in R_+$ there exist $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that the inequality $\|u_0\| < \delta$ implies $\|u(t, t_0, u_0)\| < \varepsilon$ for $t \geq t_0$;

(ES₃^{*}) equiasymptotically eventually stable if ES₁^{*} is satisfied and given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t_0 \in R_+$ there exist positive numbers $\delta_0 = \delta_0(t_0) > 0$ and $T = T(t_0, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that for $t \geq t_0 + T$ and $\|u_0\| \leq \delta$ we have $\|u(t, t_0, u_0)\| < \varepsilon, t \geq t_0 + T$.

(ES₄^{*}) uniformly asymptotically eventually stable if (ES₂^{*}) is satisfied and (ES₃^{*}) is independent of t_0 .

THEOREM 3.1. (Comparison results) Assume that:

(i) $g \in C[J \times R_+^n, R^n]$, $g(t, 0) \equiv 0$, and $g(t, u)$ is quasimonotone nondecreasing in u for each

$$u \in R^n \text{ and } \lim_{(t,y) \rightarrow (t_k^+, u)} g(t, u) = g(t_k^+, u) \text{ exists;}$$

(ii) $r(t) = r(t, t_0, u_0) \in PC([t_0, T], R^n)$ is the maximal solution of (2.3) existing for $t \geq t_0$.

(iii) $V \in C[J \times S_\psi, R_+^N]$, $V \in L$ such that for $(t, x) \in J \times S_\psi$

$$D^+V(t, x) \leq g(t, V(t, x)), t \neq t_k$$

and

$V(t, x + I_k(x(t_k))) \leq \rho_k(V(t, x)), t = t_k, x \in S_\psi$ and the function $\rho_k : R_+^N \rightarrow R_+^N$ is nondecreasing for $k = 1, 2, \dots$

(iv) $x(t) = x(t, t_0, x_0) \in PC([t_0, T], R^N)$ is a solution of (2.1) such that

$$V(t_0, x_0) \leq u_0 \quad (3.1)$$

existing for $t \geq t_0$. Then

$$V(t, x(t)) \leq r(t) \quad (3.2)$$

Proof.

Let $x(t) = x(t, t_0, x_0)$ be any solution of (2.1) existing for $t \geq t_0$, such that $V(t_0, x_0) \leq u_0$.

Set $m(t) = V(t, x(t))$ for $t \neq t_k$ so that for small $h > 0$, using (2.2) we have

$$m(t+h) - m(t) = V(t+h, x(t+h)) - V(t+h, x(t) + hf(t, x(t))) + V(t+h, x(t) + hf(t, x(t))) - V(t, x)$$

Since $V(t, x)$ is locally Lipschitzian in x for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$, we have

$$m(t+h) - m(t) \leq k \|x(t+h) - (x(t) + hf(t, x(t)))\| + V(t+h, x(t) + hf(t, x(t))) - V(t, x)$$

Dividing through by $h > 0$, and taking the $\limsup$ as $h \rightarrow 0^+$ we have

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [m(t+h) - m(t)] \leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [k \|x(t+h) - x(t) - hf(t, x(t))\| e] + \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [V(t+h, x(t) + hf(t, x(t))) - V(t, x)]$$

where k is the local Lipschitz constant and $e = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T$

It follows that

$$D^+ m(t) = D^+ V(t, x(t)) \leq g(t, m(t))$$

and using condition (ii) of Theorem 3.1 we arrive at

$$V(t, x(t)) \leq r(t)$$

provided

$$V(t_0, x_0) \leq u_0$$

Also,

$$m(t_k^+) = V(t_k^+, x(t_k)) + I_k(x(t_k^+)) \leq \psi_k(m(t_k^+))$$

Hence, by Cor. 1.7.1 in [13], we obtain the desired estimate of (3.1).

Corollary 3.2. Assume that:

(i) $g \in C[J \times R_+^n, R^n]$, $g(t, 0) \equiv 0$, and $g(t, u)$ is quasimonotone nondecreasing in u for each

$u \in R^n$ and $\lim_{(t,y) \rightarrow (t_k^+, u)} g(t, u) = g(t_k^+, u)$ exists;

(ii) $p(t) = p(t, t_0, u_0) \in PC([t_0, T], R^n)$ is the minimal solution of (2.3) existing for $t \geq t_0$.

(iii) $V \in C[J \times S_\psi, R_+^N]$, $V \in L$ such that for $(t, x) \in J \times S_\psi$

$$D^+V(t, x) \geq g(t, V(t, x)), t \neq t_k$$

and

$$V(t, x + I_k(x(t_k))) \geq \rho_k(V(t, x)), t = t_k, x \in S_\psi \text{ and the function } \rho_k : R_+^N \rightarrow R_+^N \text{ is}$$

nondecreasing for $k = 1, 2, \dots$

(iv) $x(t) = x(t, t_0, x_0) \in PC([t_0, T], R^N)$ is a solution of (2.1) such that

$$V(t_0, x_0) \geq u_0 \tag{3.3}$$

existing for $t \geq t_0$. Then

$$V(t, x(t)) \geq p(t) \tag{3.4}$$

Proof.

Let $x(t) = x(t, t_0, x_0)$ be any solution of (2.1) existing for $t \geq t_0$, such that $V(t_0, x_0) \geq u_0$.

Set $m(t) = V(t, x(t))$ for $t \neq t_k$ so that for small $h > 0$, using (2.2) we have

$$m(t+h) - m(t) = V(t+h, x(t+h)) - V(t+h, x(t) + hf(t, x(t))) + V(t+h, x(t) + hf(t, x(t))) - V(t, x)$$

Since $V(t, x)$ is locally Lipschitzian in x for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$, we have

$$m(t+h) - m(t) \geq k \|x(t+h) - (x(t) + hf(t, x(t)))\| + V(t+h, x(t) + hf(t, x(t))) - V(t, x)$$

Dividing through by $h > 0$, and taking the $\limsup$ as $h \rightarrow 0^+$ we have

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [m(t+h) - m(t)] \geq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [k \|x(t+h) - x(t) - hf(t, x(t))\|] e + \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} [V(t+h, x(t) + hf(t, x(t))) - V(t, x)]$$

where k is the local Lipschitz constant and $e = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T$

It follows from condition (ii) of Cor 3.2 we arrive at the estimate

$$D^+ m(t) = D^+ V(t, x(t)) \geq g(t, m(t)), t \neq t_k, m(t_0^+) \geq u_0 \quad (3.5)$$

Also,

$$m(t_k^+) = V(t_k^+, x(t_k)) + I_k(x(t_k^+)) \geq \psi_k(m(t_k^+)) \quad (3.6)$$

Hence, by Cor. 1.7.1 in [13], we obtain the desired estimate of (3.5).

In what follows, we shall obtain sufficient conditions for the eventual stability of the system (2.3).

THEOREM 3.2. Assume that:

(i) $g \in C[J \times R_+^n, R^n]$, $g(t, 0) \equiv 0$, and $g(t, u)$ is quasimonotone nondecreasing in u for fixed $t \in J$.

(ii) $V \in C[J \times S_\rho, R_+^N]$, $V(t, x)$ is locally Lipschitzian in x and $\sum_{i=1}^N V_i(t, x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\|x\| \rightarrow 0$ for

each t and $(t, x) \in J \times S_\rho$,

$$D^+ V(t, x) \leq g(t, V(t, x)) \quad (3.7)$$

(iii) for $(t, x) \in J \times S_\rho$,

$$b(\|x\|) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N V_i(t, x) \leq a(t, \|x\|) \quad (3.8)$$

where $b \in K$, $a(t, \cdot) \in K$ whence $a \in C[J \times S_\rho, R_+]$

Then the eventual stability of the set of trivial solution $u = 0$ of the system (2.3) implies the eventual stability of the set of trivial solution $x = 0$ of the system (2.1).

Proof.

Let $0 < \varepsilon < \rho$ and $t_0 \in R_+$ be given.

Assume that the solution (2.3) is eventually stable. Then given $b(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $t_0 \in R_+$, there exists a positive function $\delta = \delta(t_0, \varepsilon) > 0$ which is continuous in t_0 for each ε such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N u_{i0} \leq \delta \text{ implies } \sum_{i=1}^N u_i(t, t_0, u_0) < b(\varepsilon), t \geq t_0 \quad (3.9)$$

Since $V(t, x)$ is continuous and mildly unbounded i.e. $V(t, 0) \rightarrow 0$ as $\|x\| \rightarrow 0$, then by the property of continuity, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a positive function $\delta_1 = \delta_1(t_0, \varepsilon) > 0$ that is continuous in t_0 for each ε such that the inequalities

$$\|x_0\| < \delta_1 \text{ and } V(t_0, x_0) < \delta \quad (3.10)$$

are satisfied simultaneously.

We claim that if $\|x_0\| < \delta_1$ then $\|x(t, t_0, x_0)\| < \varepsilon$ by the stability of $x(t)$.

Now suppose this claim is false, then there would exist a point $t_1 \in [t_0, t)$ and the solution $x(t, t_0, x_0)$ with $\|x_0\| < \delta_1$ such that

$$\|x(t_1)\| = \varepsilon \text{ and } \|x(t)\| < \varepsilon \text{ for } t \in [t_0, t_1) \quad (3.11)$$

So that using equation (3.11); (3.8) reduces to the form

$$b(\|x(t_1)\|) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N V_i(t_1, x(t_1)), \text{ implying} \quad (3.12)$$

$$b(\varepsilon) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N V_i(t_1, x(t_1))$$

This implies that $x(t) \in S_\psi$ for $t \in [t_0, t_1)$ and from Theorem 3.1,

$$V(t, x(t)) \leq r(t, t_0, u_0), \quad (3.13)$$

where $r(t, t_0, u_0)$ is the maximal solution of (2.3).

Then using (3.8), (3.11), (3.12) and (3.13) we arrive at the estimate

$$b(\varepsilon) \leq V_0(t_1, x(t_1)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N r_i(t, t_0, u_0) < b(\varepsilon)$$

which leads to a contradiction.

Hence, the eventual stability of the set of trivial solution $u = 0$ of (2.3) implies the eventual stability of the set of trivial solution $x = 0$ of (2.1).

4 Application

Consider the system of fractional differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} x_1'(t) &= -6x_1 + x_2 \cos x_1 + x_1 \sin x_2 + x_2 \tan x_1, \quad t \neq t_k \\ x_2'(t) &= 3x_1 - 2x_2 \sin x_1 + x_2 \sec x_1 + x_1 \cos x_2, \quad t \neq t_k \\ \Delta x_1 &= c_k(x(t_k)), \quad t = t_k \\ \Delta x_2 &= d_k(x(t_k)), \quad t = t_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

for $t \geq t_0$, with initial conditions

$$x_1(t_0^+) = \gamma_{10} \text{ and } x_2(t_0^+) = \gamma_{20}$$

where $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ are arbitrary functions.

Equation (4.1) is equivalent to (2.3) and $f = (f_1, f_2)$, where $f_1(t, x_1) = -6x_1 + x_2 \cos x_1 + x_1 \sin x_2 + x_2 \tan x_1$ and $f_2(t, x_2) = 3x_1 - 2x_2 \sin x_1 + x_2 \sec x_1 + x_1 \cos x_2$

Consider a vector Lyapunov function of the form $V = (V_1, V_2)^T$, where

$$V_1(t, x_1, x_2) = |x_1| \text{ and } V_2(t, x_1, x_2) = |x_2|$$

So that $V = (V_1, V_2)^T$ with $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, so its associated norm defined by $\|x\| = |x_1| + |x_2|$. Now,

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 V_i(t, x_1, x_2) = |x_1| + |x_2|$$

So that, the assumption,

$$b(\|x\|) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(x, y) \leq a(t, \|x\|) \text{ reduces to}$$

$$\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} \leq x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq 2\left(\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}\right)^2$$

with the proviso that $b(r) = r$, and $a(r) = 2r^2$.

Furthermore, we deduce that using equation (3.4) and $V_1(t, x_1, x_2) = |x_1|$

$$\begin{aligned} D^+V(t, x) &= \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} \{V(t+h, x+hf(t, x)) - V(t, x)\}, t \geq t_0 \\ D^+V_1(t, x_1) &= \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} \{|x_1 + hf_1(t, x_1)| - |x_1|\} \\ &= \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{h} \{hf_1(t, x_1)\} \\ &\leq f_1(t, x_1) \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

$$D^+V_1(t, x_1) = -6x_2 - x_2 \cos x_1 + x_1 \sin x_2 + x_2 \tan x_1$$

$$\begin{aligned} D^+V_1(t, x_1) &= x_1(-6 + \sin x_2) + x_2(\cos x_1 + \tan x_1) \\ &= x_1(-6 + \sin x_2) + x_2\left(\cos x_1 + \frac{\sin x_1}{\cos x_1}\right) \\ &\leq |x_1|(-6 + |\sin x_2|) + |x_2|(|\cos x_1| + \frac{|\sin x_1|}{|\cos x_1|}) \\ &\leq |x_1|(-6 + 1) + |x_2|(1 + \frac{1}{1}) \\ \therefore D^+V_1(t, x_1) &\leq -5V_1 + 2V_2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Also for $x_0 \in S_\psi$, for $t = t_k, k = 1, 2, \dots$ we have

$$V(t, x(t) + c_k) = |c_k + x(t)| \leq V(t, x(t))$$

Again for $V_2(t, x_1, x_2) = |x_2|$ and deducing from (4.2) we have

$$D^+V_2(t, x_1) \leq f_2(t, x_2)$$

$$D^+V_2(t, x_2) = 3x_1 - 2x_2 \sin x_1 - x_2 \sec x_1 - x_1 \cos x_2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= x_1(3 - \cos x_2) + x_2(-2 \sin x_1 - \sec x_2) \\
&\leq |x_1|(3 - |\cos x_2|) + |x_2|(-2|\sin x_1| - \frac{1}{|\cos x_1|}) \\
&\leq |x_1|(3 - 1) + |x_2|(-2 - 1)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore D^+V_2(t, x_1) \leq 2V_1 - 3V_2 \quad (4.4)$$

Also for $x_0 \in S_\psi$, for $t = t_k, k = 1, 2, \dots$ we have

$$V(t, x(t) + d_k) = |d_k + x(t)| \leq V(t, x(t))$$

Combining (4.3) and (4.4) gives

$$D^+V \leq \begin{pmatrix} -5 & 2 \\ 2 & -3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} V_1 \\ V_2 \end{pmatrix} = g(t, V) \quad (4.5)$$

$$u' = g(t, u) = Au$$

where $A = \begin{pmatrix} -5 & 2 \\ 2 & -3 \end{pmatrix}$.

Thus, the vectorial inequality (4.5) and all other conditions of Theorem 3.2 are satisfied since the eigenvalues of A are all negative real parts. Hence, the system (4.1) is eventually stable. Therefore, the set $x(t) = 0$ is eventually stable.

5 Conclusion

This research examined the eventual stability of nonlinear impulsive differential equations using the auxiliary Lyapunov functions which are analogues of vector Lyapunov functions. By splitting the Lyapunov function into components, each of the solution states or the solution vectors can be inserted into each of the components of the Lyapunov function rather than in the whole Lyapunov function. This way, it becomes easier for the Lyapunov function to adequately predicts the behavior of the solution vectors so that the “restrictions and difficulties” imposed on the Lyapunov function which is occasioned by the use of the scalar Lyapunov function is reduced. Together with the comparison results, sufficient conditions for the eventual stability of the impulsive differential systems are presented with an illustrative example.

References

- [1] R. Agarwal, D. O'Regan, & S. Hristova, (2015). Stability of Caputo fractional differential equations by Lyapunov functions. *Applications of Mathematics*, 60, 653-676.
- [2] R. Agarwal, S. Hristova and D. O'Regan, (2016). Stability of Solutions of Impulsive Caputo Fractional Differential Equations. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, Vol. 2016, No. 58, pp. 1-22.

- [3] Akpan, E. P. & O. Akinyele, (1992). On the ϕ_0 stability of comparison differential systems. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and applications*, 164(2), 307-324.
- [4] L. Arnold, and B. Schmalfuss, (2001). Lyapunov's Second Method for Random Dynamical systems. *Journal of differential equations*, 177 (1), 235-265.
- [5] D. Băleanu, D. & O. G. Mustafa, (2010). On the Global Existence of Solutions to a Class of Fractional Differential Equations. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 59(5), 1835-1841.
- [6] V. J. Devi, F. A. Mc Rae & Z. Drici. (2012). Variational Lyapunov method for Fractional Differential Equations. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, {64(10), 2982-2989.
- [7] J. Hale. (1977). *Theory of Functional Differential Equations*. Springer-Verlag, New York, Heidelberg, Berlin.
- [8] D. K. Igobi and M. P. Inch, (2024). Results on Existence and Uniqueness of Solutions of Dynamic Equation on Time Scale via Generalized Ordinary Differential Equations. *International Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 37, No. 1, 1-20,
- [9] D. K. Igobi and J. E. Ante, (2018). Results on Existence and Uniqueness of Solutions of Impulsive Neutral Integro-Differential System”. *Journal of Mathematics Research*, Vol 10, No. 4. <http://doi:10.5539/jmr.v10n4p165>.
- [10] V. Lakshmikantham, (1974). On the Method of vector Lyapunov Functions. Technical report No. 16.
- [11] V. Lakshmikantham, D. D. Bainov and P. S. Simeonov, (1989). *The Theory of Impulsive Differential Equations*. Series in Modern Applied Mathematics, No. 6, 1989, World Scientific Publishing C. Pte, Ltd.
- [12] V. Lakshmikantham and A. S. Vatsala. (2008). Basic Theory of Impulsive Differential Equations. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 69(8), 2677-2682.
- [13] V. Lakshmikantham and S. Leela, *Differential and Integral Inequalities, Theory and Application*, Vol. 1. Academic Press, Inc. New York and London, 1969.
- [14] V. Lakshmikantham, S. Leela and A. S. Martynyuk (1990). *Practical Stability Analysis of nonlinear Systems*, World Scientific, Singapore, New Jersey, London, Hong Kong.
- [15] V. Lakshmikantham, S. Leela and J. V. Devi (2009). *Theory of Fractional Dynamic Systems*. Cambridge Scientific Publishers.
- [16] V. Lakshmikantham and A. S. Vatsala, (2007). General Uniqueness and Monotone Iterative Technique for Fractional Differential Equations,” *Applied Mathematics Letters* 21, 828-834.
- [17] V. Lakshmikantham, S. Sivasundaram ((991) On Vector Lyapunov Functions and Stability Analysis of Nonlinear Systems. Springer Science-Business Media Dordrecht.

- [18] Z. Lipscey, J. A. Ugboh, I. M. Esuabana and I. O. Isaac, (2020). Existence Theorem for Impulsive Differential Equations with Measurable Right Side for Handling Delay Problems. Hindawi Journal of Mathematics, Vol. 2020, Article ID 7089313, 17 pages.
- [19] A. Ludwig, B. Pustal, D. M. Herlach, (2001). General Concept for a Stability Analysis of a Planar Interface under Rapid Solidification Conditions in Multi-Component Alloy Systems. Material Science and Engineering: A, 304, 277-280.
- [20] V. D. Milman and A. D. Myshkis, (1960). On Motion Stability with Shocks, Sibirsk. Mat Zh. 1 233-237, [in Russian].
- [21] Z. Qunli, (2014). A Class of Vector Lyapunov Functions for Stability Analysis of Nonlinear Impulsive Differential System, Hindawi Publishing Corporation. Mathematical Problems in Engineering, Article ID 649012, 9pages.
- [22] S. K. Srivastava, K. Amanpreet, (2009). A New Approach to Stability of Impulsive Differential Equations. Int. Journal of Math. Analysis, Vol. 3, no. 4, 179-185.
- [23] I. Stamova, (2011). Eventual Stability and Eventual Boundedness for Impulsive Differential Equations with “Supremum”. Mathematical Modelling and Analysis. Vol. 16, No. 2, 304-314.
- [24] J. A. Ugboh and I. M. Esuabana, (2018). Existence and Uniqueness Result for a Class of Impulsive Delay Differential Equations. International Journal of Chemistry, Mathematics and Physics, Vol. 2, Issue 4.
- [25] T. Yoshizawa, (1966). Stability Theory by Lyapunov’s Second Method. The Mathematical Society of Japan.
- [26] C. Wu, (2020). A General Comparison Principle for Caputo Fractional-Order Ordinary Differential Equations, Fractals, 28(04), 2050070.