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Synopsis. This paper establishes the existence of an infinite set $\left\{z_{n}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of zeros for the solution of a certain functional differential equation. The primary condition assuring this oscillatory behavior is expressed in terms of the magnitude of the delay.
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The equation to be considered is

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime}(t)+F\left(t, x_{t}\right)=0 . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In conjunction with (1), it is assumed that we are given two functions $g(t)$ and $r(t)$ continuous on the real half line $[0, \infty)$, and such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(t) \leq r(t) \leq t \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $t>0$ the initial time. Both $g(t)$ and $r(t)$ are to be monotonically increasing, in fact, we assume the existence of $g^{-1}(t)$ and $r^{-1}(t)$ their respective inverse functions. Given a value $t$, it is to be considered that $g(t)$ represents the maximum retardation and $r(t)$ the minimum retardation associated with the delay equation (1). For each fixed $t>0$, the symbol $x_{t}$ denotes a continuous function with domain $[-\infty, 0]$ such that its graph on $[g(t)-t, 0]$ coincides with the graph of $x(t)$ on the interval [ $g(t), t]$. Hence $z_{t} \in C=C[-\infty, 0]$ the family of all curves continuous on the interval $[-\infty, 0]$ and thus $F$ has as its domain the space $[0, \infty] \times C$. Due to the restrictions on $g(t)$ and $r(t), F$ effectively operates on a finite segment of the solution prior to $t$ although this segment is not bounded in length for all $t$. We assume that the functional $F$ is well enough behaved to guarantee the existence of a continuous solution for all $t>0$ when any continuous initial function is specified on the initial set $[g(0), 0]$. In addition, we assume the existence of a positive integrable function $h(t)$ and a time $T>0$ such that for all $t>T$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
F\left(t, y_{t}\right) \geq h(t) y(r(t)) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any continuous $y(t)$ such that $y(t)$ is positive and monotone decreasing on the domain $[g(t), r(t)]$. Similarly,

$$
\begin{equation*}
F\left(t, y_{t}\right) \leq h(t) y(r(t)) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]for any continuous $y(t)$ such that $y(t)$ is negative and monotone increasing on [ $g(t), r(t)]$. Finally,
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
F\left(t, y_{t}\right)=\left|F\left(t, y_{t}\right)\right|(s) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

where $(s)$ is +1 whenever $y(t)$ is positive on $[g(t), r(t)]$ and -1 whenever $y(t)$ is negative on $[g(t), r(t)]$.

Theorem 1. If the above conditions are satisfied and if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{r(t)}^{t} h(s) d s \geq 1 \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all large $t$, say $t \geq T$, then all solutions of (1) are oscillatory.
Proof. It can be demonstrated that for any $T_{0} \geq T$, a zero of $x(t)$ must occur in the interval $\left(T_{0}, r^{-1} g^{-1} g^{-1}\left(T_{0}\right)\right]$. Let $T_{1}=g^{-1}\left(T_{0}\right), T_{2}=g^{-1}\left(T_{1}\right)$ and $T_{3}=r^{-1}\left(T_{2}\right)$. We obtain a proof by contradiction by assuming that $x(t)>0$ for all $t \in\left(T_{0}, T_{3}\right.$ ] (a parallel demonstration holds for the case when $x(t)<0)$. This assumption implies that for $t \in\left(T_{1}, T_{3}\right.$ ], we have $x(t)>0$ on the domain [ $\left.g(t), r(t)\right]$ and hence by (5) $x^{\prime}(t)=-F\left(t, x_{t}\right) \leq 0$ indicating that $x(t)$ is monotone decreasing on $\left(T_{1}, T_{3}\right]$. Thus, for $t \in\left(T_{2}, T_{3}\right], x(t)$ is monotone decreasing on the domain $[g(t), r(t)]$. Hence $t \in\left(T_{2}, T_{3}\right]$ implies

$$
\dot{x}(t)=-F\left(t, x_{t}\right) \leq-h(t) x(r(t))
$$

by (3) and thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(t) \leq x\left(T_{2}\right)-\int_{T_{2}}^{t} h(s) x(r(s)) d s \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now for $s \in\left(T_{2}, T_{3}\right], r(s) \leq T_{2}$ and since $x(t)$ is monotone decreasing on $\left(T_{1}, T_{3}\right]$, we have $x(r(s)) \geq x\left(T_{2}\right)$ for $s \in\left(T_{2}, T_{3}\right]$. Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(t) \leq x\left(T_{2}\right)\left\{1-\int_{T_{2}}^{t} h(s) d s\right\} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Setting $t=T_{3}$ in (8) and considering (6), one may obtain $x\left(T_{3}\right) \leq 0$ in contradiction of the fact that $x(t)>0$ on $\left(T_{0}, T_{3}\right]$ and so the theorem is valid.

Corollary. There exists a sequence of zeros of $x(t),\left\{z_{n}\right\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ which satisfies the recursive inequality $z_{n+1} \leq r^{-1} g^{-1} g^{-1}\left(z_{n}\right)$ for $z_{0} \geq T$. It is possible that this set is part of a larger perhaps nondenumerable set of zeros.

Example. Consider

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime}(t)+\sum_{i=1}^{n} h_{i}(t) x\left(g_{i}(t)\right)=0 \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $h_{i}(t)$ is continuous and positive and $g_{i}(t)$ is a continuous monotone increasing retardation for any $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let us also assume there exists some $k>0$
such that $g_{i}(t) \leq t-k$ for all $t \geq T$ and $i=1,2, \ldots, n$. In this case, we may consider $r(t)=t-k$ and thus (3) and (4) are valid. Hence, if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{t-k}^{t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_{i}(s) d s=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{k} h_{i}(t-s) d s \geq 1 \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $t$ larger than some value $T$, then all solutions of (9) are oscillatory.
Oscillation theorems for linear differential-difference equations have also been presented by Lillo [1] and Myshkis [2]. In these cases, only one retardation was present and it was bounded. In [3] and [4], there are treatments of equations such as

$$
x^{\prime}(t)+A(t) x(g(t))=0
$$

where $0 \leq g(t) \leq t$ and hence the initial data is a point. Under the assumption that solutions are oscillatory, various properties of the zeros are presented. In [5], equation (9) is studied with $n=1$ and the criterion expressed in (10) has been extended to accommodate the consideration of differential-difference equations of higher order.

As a final comment, we present the following result.
Lemma. If condition (6) is replaced by the condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int^{\infty} h(s) d s=\infty \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

then nonoscillatory solutions of (1) tend to zero as tapproaches infinity.
Proof. If $x(t)$ is eventually of constant sign, say $x(t)>0$ for all $t \geq T_{0}$, then we may derive as in Theorem 1 the inequality (7). Since $x(t)$ is decreasing beyond $T_{2}$, we may write $x(t) \leq X\left(T_{2}\right)-x(t) \int_{T_{2}}^{t} h(s) d s$ and hence

$$
x(t) \leq \frac{x\left(T_{2}\right)}{1+\int_{T_{2}}^{t} h(s) d s}
$$

Thus, $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t)=0$ as required.
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