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By employing a well-known fixed point theorem, we establish the existence of multiple positive solutions for the following fourth-order singular differential equation

\[ Lu = p(t)f(t, u(t), u''(t)) - g(t, u(t), u''(t)), 0 < t < 1, \]

\[ \alpha_i u(0) - \beta_i u'(0) = 0, \quad \gamma_i u(1) + \delta_i u'(1) = 0, \]

where \( L \) denotes the linear operator \( Lu := (ru''')' - q u', r \in C^1([0,1], (0, +\infty)), \) and \( q \in C([0,1], [0, +\infty]) \). This equation is viewed as a perturbation of the fourth-order Sturm-Liouville problem, where the perturbed term \( g : (0,1) \times [0, +\infty) \times (-\infty, +\infty) \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty) \) only satisfies the global Carathéodory conditions, which implies that the perturbed effect of \( g \) on \( f \) is quite large so that the nonlinearity can tend to negative infinity at some singular points.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we consider the existence of multiple positive solutions for the following fourth-order singular Sturm-Liouville boundary value problem involving a perturbed term

\[ Lu = p(t)f(t, u(t), u''(t)) - g(t, u(t), u''(t)), \quad 0 < t < 1, \]

\[ \alpha_1 u(0) - \beta_1 u'(0) = 0, \]

\[ \gamma_1 u(1) + \delta_1 u'(1) = 0, \]

\[ \alpha_2 u''(0) - \beta_2 u'''(0) = 0, \]

\[ \gamma_2 u''(1) + \delta_2 u'''(1) = 0, \]

(1.1)
where \( a_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i, \delta_i \geq 0 \) and \( \beta_i \gamma_i + a_i \delta_i > 0, \) \( i = 1, 2, \) and \( L \) denotes the linear operator \( Lu := (ru^{\prime\prime})^\prime - qu^{\prime\prime}, r \in C^1([0,1], (0, +\infty)) \) and \( q \in C([0,1], [0, +\infty)) \) and \( q \in C((0,1], [0, +\infty)) \). The perturbed term, \( g : (0,1) \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty) \), satisfies global Carathéodory’s conditions.

Equation (1.1) arises from many branches of applied mathematics and physics; for details, see [1–16]. It mainly describes the deformation of an elastic beam for \( g(t,u,u^{\prime\prime}) \equiv 0 \); for example, under the Lidstone boundary condition,

\[
\begin{align*}
u(0) &= u(1) = u^{\prime\prime}(0) = u^{\prime\prime}(1) = 0,
\end{align*}
\]

problem (1.1) is used to model such phenomena as the deflection of an elastic beam simply supported at the endpoints; see [1, 3, 5, 7–11]. Also, if the boundary condition of (1.1) is a Focal boundary condition, then it describes the deflection of an elastic beam having both end-points fixed, or having one end simply supported and the other end clamped with sliding clamps. In addition, the derivative \( u^{\prime\prime} \) in \( f \) is the bending moment term which represents the bending effect, see [1, 3, 5, 7–11, 13, 14, 16]. A brief discussion of the physical interpretation under some boundary conditions associated with the linear beam equation can be found in Zill and Cullen [17].

Recently, for the case where the nonlinearity \( f \) does not contain the bending moment term \( u^{\prime\prime} \), Ma and Wang [1] studied the existence of positive solutions for (1.1) subject to boundary conditions \( u(0) = u(1) = u^{\prime\prime}(0) = u^{\prime\prime}(1) = 0 \) and \( u(0) = u^{\prime}(1) = u^{\prime}(0) = u^{\prime\prime}(1) = 0 \) if \( f \) is superlinear or sublinear. In the case where \( f \) contains the bending moment term \( u^{\prime\prime} \) and under the particular boundary conditions, the authors of papers [9, 12] studied the existence of positive solutions for (1.1) when \( f \) satisfies the following growth condition:

\[
|f(t,x,y) - (ax - \beta y)| \leq a|x| + b|y| + c,
\]

where \( a, \beta \in \mathbb{R}, a, b, c > 0, a, b \) is enough small. But most of the above works were done on base of the assumptions that the nonlinearity is nonnegative and has no any singularity. In recent years, one found that the fourth-order changing-sign nonlinear problems also occur to the classical model for the elastic beam fixed at both ends, especially in the medium span or large span bridge constructions, this implies that it is necessary and quite natural to study fourth-order changing-sign boundary value problems.

In this paper, we focus on the particularly difficult and interesting situation, when (1.1) is singularly perturbed, so that the nonlinearity is allowed to change sign, even may tend to negative infinity. This problem has essential difference from those unperturbed problems of [1–16]. We quote in the sequel some papers from the relevant bibliography devoted to this subject. In [18], Loud considered the existence of \( T \)-periodic solutions for a first-order perturbed system of ordinary differential equations by employing the so-called bifurcation function

\[
f_0(\theta) = \int_0^T \langle z_0(\tau), \phi(\tau - \theta, x_0(\tau), 0) \rangle d\tau.
\]

Moreover, the author of [18] also considered the case when \( \theta_0 \) is not a simple zero of \( f_0 \), and the existence of \( T \)-periodic solutions of the above problem is associated with the existence of
the roots of a certain quadratic equation. Recently, by using the exponential dichotomies and contraction mapping principle, Xia et al. [19] established some sufficient conditions of the existence and uniqueness of almost periodic solution for a forced perturbed system with piecewise constant argument. The other works, such as Khanmamedov [20], Wu and Gan [21], Makarenkov and Nistri [22], Liu and Yang [23], Clavero et al. [24], and Cui and Geng [25], are rich sources for application of perturbed problems.

Our main tool used for the analysis here is known as Guo-Krasnoselskii’s fixed point theorem, for the convenience of the reader, we now state it as follows.

**Lemma 1.1** (see, [26]). Let $E$ be a real Banach space, $P \subset E$ a cone. Assume $\Omega_1, \Omega_2$ are two bounded open subsets of $E$ with $\theta \in \Omega_1, \overline{\Omega}_1 \subset \Omega_2$, and let $T : P \cap (\overline{\Omega}_2 \setminus \Omega_1) \rightarrow P$ be a completely continuous operator such that either

1. $\|Tx\| \leq \|x\|, x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_1$, and $\|Tx\| \geq \|x\|, x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_2$, or
2. $\|Tx\| \geq \|x\|, x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_1$, and $\|Tx\| \leq \|x\|, x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_2$.

Then, $T$ has a fixed point in $P \cap (\overline{\Omega}_2 \setminus \Omega_1)$.

### 2. Preliminaries and Lemmas

The following definition introduces global Carathéodory’s conditions imposed on a map.

**Definition 2.1.** A map $g : (t, x, y) \mapsto g(t, x, y)$ is said to satisfy global Carathéodory’s conditions if the following conditions hold:

(i) for each $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, the mapping $t \mapsto g(t, x, y)$ is Lebesgue measurable;
(ii) for a.e. $t \in [0, 1]$, the mapping $(x, y) \mapsto g(t, x, y)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$;
(iii) there exists a $\rho \in L^1[0, 1]$ such that, for a.e. $t \in [0, 1]$ and $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$|g(t, x, y)| \leq \rho(t). \quad (2.1)$$

The following lemmas play an important role in proving our main results.

**Lemma 2.2** (see, [27]). Let $q_2$ and $\phi_2$ be the solutions of the linear problems

$$-(r(t)\phi_2'(t))' + q(t)\phi_2(t) = 0, \quad 0 < t < 1, \quad \phi_2(0) = \beta_2, \phi_2'(0) = \alpha_2,$$

$$-(r(t)q_2'(t))' + q(t)q_2(t) = 0, \quad 0 < t < 1, \quad q_2(0) = \delta_2, q_2'(0) = -\gamma_2,$$

respectively. Then,

(i) $\phi_2$ is strictly increasing on $[0, 1]$ and $\phi_2(t) > 0$ on $(0, 1]$;
(ii) $q_2$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, 1]$ and $q_2(t) > 0$ on $[0, 1)$. 

Lemma 2.3. For any \(w_2\), then we have the following lemma.

Proof. It follows from the monotonicity of \(u(t)\) and \(w_2\) that the right-hand side of (2.6) holds. For the left hand side, by the monotonicity of \(w_2\) and \(w_2\), we have

\[
G_2(t, s) = \frac{1}{w_2} \begin{cases} 
\phi_2(t) \psi_2(s), & 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1, \\
\phi_2(s) \psi_2(t), & 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1,
\end{cases} 
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{w_2} \begin{cases} 
\phi_2(t) \psi_2(s) \frac{\phi_2(s) \psi_2(t)}{\phi_2(1) \psi_2(0)}, & 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1, \\
\phi_2(s) \psi_2(t) \frac{\phi_2(t) \psi_2(s)}{\phi_2(1) \psi_2(0)}, & 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1,
\end{cases} 
\]

\[
= \frac{w_2}{\phi_2(1) \psi_2(0)} G_2(t, t) G_2(s, s), 
\]

\[
= \theta_2 G_2(t, t) G_2(s, s). 
\]

The proof is completed. \(\square\)
Also, it is well known the Green function for the boundary value problem

\[-u'' = 0, \quad 0 < t < 1,\]
\[\alpha_1 u(0) - \beta_1 u'(0) = 0, \quad \gamma_1 u(1) + \delta_1 u'(1) = 0,\] (2.9)
is

\[G_1(t, s) = \frac{1}{w_1} \begin{cases} 
(\beta_1 + \alpha_1 s) (\gamma_1 + \delta_1 (1 - t)), & 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1, \\
(\beta_1 + \alpha_1 t) (\gamma_1 + \delta_1 (1 - s)), & 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1,
\end{cases}\] (2.10)

where \(w_1 = \beta_1 \gamma_1 + \alpha_1 \gamma_1 + \alpha_1 \delta_1\). Let

\[e(t) = \frac{1}{w_1} (\beta_1 + \alpha_1 t) (\gamma_1 + \delta_1 (1 - t)),\] (2.11)
clearly,

\[e(t)e(s) \leq G_1(t, s) \leq e(s).\] (2.12)

Now, we define an integral operator \(S : C[0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]\) by

\[Sv(t) = \int_0^1 G_1(t, \tau)v(\tau)d\tau,\] (2.13)

and, then, by (2.9), we have

\[(Sv)''(t) = -v(t), \quad 0 < t < 1,\]
\[\alpha_1 (Sv)(0) - \beta_1 (Sv)'(0) = 0, \quad \gamma_1 (Sv)(1) + \delta_1 (Sv)'(1) = 0.\] (2.14)

In order to obtain existence of positive solutions to problem (1.1), we will consider the existence of positive solutions to the following modified problem

\[-(rv')'(t) + qv(t) = p(t)f(t, Sv(t), -v(t)) - g(t, Sv(t), -v(t)), \quad 0 < t < 1,\]
\[\alpha_2 v(0) - \beta_2 v'(0) = 0, \quad \gamma_2 v(1) + \delta_2 v'(1) = 0.\] (2.15)

**Lemma 2.4.** Let \(u(t) = Sv(t), v(t) \in C[0, 1]\). Then, we can transform (1.1) into (2.15). Moreover, if \(v \in C([0, 1], [0, +\infty))\) is a solution of problem (2.15), then the function \(u(t) = Sv(t)\) is a positive solution of problem (1.1).

**Proof.** It follows from (2.9) that \(u''(t) = -v(t)\), put \(u''(t) = -v(t)\) and \(u(t) = Sv(t)\) into (1.1), we can transform (1.1) into (2.15).
Conversely, if \( v \in C([0,1],[0,\infty)) \) is a solution of (2.15), let \( u(t) = Sv(t) \), we have \( u''(t) = -v(t) \), thus \( u = Sv \) is a solution of (1.1). The proof of Lemma 2.4 is completed. \( \square \)

In the rest of the paper, we always suppose that the following assumptions hold.

(B1) \( p : (0, 1) \to [0, +\infty) \) is continuous and satisfies

\[
0 < \int_0^1 G_2(s, s)p(s)ds < +\infty. \tag{2.16}
\]

(B2) \( f : [0, 1] \times [0, +\infty) \times (-\infty, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty) \) is continuous.

(B3) \( g : [0, 1] \times [0, +\infty) \times (-\infty, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty) \) satisfies global Crathédory’s condition and

\[
\int_0^1 \rho(s)ds > 0. \tag{2.17}
\]

**Remark 2.5.** It follows from (B1), (B3) and from the monotonicity of \( \phi_2(t), \psi_2(t) \) that there exists \( (a, b) \subset (0, 1) \) such that

\[
0 < \int_a^b G_2(s, s)p(s)ds \leq \int_a^b G_2(s, s)\left[p(s) + \rho(s)\right]ds \\
\leq \int_0^1 G_2(s, s)\left[p(s) + \rho(s)\right]ds \\
\leq \int_0^1 G_2(s, s)p(s)ds + \frac{\phi_2(1)\psi_2(0)}{\psi_2}\int_0^1 \rho(s)ds \\
< +\infty. \tag{2.18}
\]

So for convenience, in the rest of this paper, we define several constants as follows:

\[
K = \int_0^1 G_2(s, s)\left[p(s) + \rho(s)\right]ds, \quad \mu_2 = \frac{\phi_2(a)\psi_2(b)}{\phi_2(1)\psi_2(0)}, \quad l = \mu_2 \int_a^b G_2(s, s)p(s)ds,
\mu_1 = \frac{(\beta_1 + \alpha_1 a)(\gamma_1 + \delta_1(1 - b))}{\omega_1} \int_0^1 G_1(s, s)G_2(s, s)ds. \tag{2.19}
\]

**Lemma 2.6.** Assume (B3) is satisfied. Then, the boundary value problem

\[
-(r(t)y')'(t) + q(t)y(t) = \rho(t), \quad 0 < t < 1,
\]

\[
\alpha_2 y(0) - \beta_2 y'(0) = 0, \quad \gamma_2 y(1) + \delta_2 y'(1) = 0, \tag{2.20}
\]

is satisfied by a solution \( y \) of (2.15).
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has a unique solution

\[ y(t) = \int_0^1 G_2(t, s)\rho(s)ds, \tag{2.21} \]

which satisfies

\[ y(t) \leq G_2(t, t) \int_0^1 \rho(s)ds. \tag{2.22} \]

**Proof.** First, \( y(t) = \int_0^1 G_2(t, s)\rho(s)ds \) solves the BVP (2.20), and it is the unique solution of the BVP (2.20), since \(- (r(t)y')' + q(t)y = 0\) with boundary conditions

\[ \alpha_2 y(0) - \beta_2 y'(0) = 0, \quad \gamma_2 y(1) + \delta_2 y'(1) = 0 \tag{2.23} \]

only has a trivial solution. Finally, it follows from (2.6) and (B3) that (2.22) holds. \( \square \)

Define a modified function \([\cdot]^*\) for any \( z \in C[0,1] \) by

\[ [z(t)]^* = \begin{cases} 
  z(t), & z(t) \geq 0, \\
  0, & z(t) < 0. 
\end{cases} \tag{2.24} \]

We consider the following approximating problem

\[ -(r(t)x')' + \frac{q(t)x}{g(t, S(x(t) - y(t)))} - [x(t) - y(t)]^* + \rho(t), \quad 0 < t < 1, \tag{2.25} \]

\[ \alpha_2 x(0) - \beta_2 x'(0) = 0, \quad \gamma_2 x(1) + \delta_2 x'(1) = 0. \]

**Lemma 2.7.** If \( x(t) \geq y(t) \) for any \( t \in [0,1] \) is a positive solution of the BVP (2.25), then \( S(x - y) \) is a positive solution of the singular perturbed differential equation (1.1).

**Proof.** In fact, if \( x \) is a positive solution of the BVP (2.25) such that \( x(t) \geq y(t) \) for any \( t \in [0,1] \), then, from (2.25) and the definition of \([z(t)]^*\), we have

\[ -(r(t)x')' + \frac{q(t)x}{g(t, S(x(t) - y(t)))} - (x(t) - y(t))^* + \rho(t), \quad 0 < t < 1, \]

\[ \alpha_2 x(0) - \beta_2 x'(0) = 0, \quad \gamma_2 x(1) + \delta_2 x'(1) = 0. \tag{2.26} \]

Let \( v = x - y \), then \(- (r(t)v')' + q(t)v = -(r\alpha x')' + q(x) + (r\gamma y')(t) - qy(t)\), which implies that

\[ -(r(t)x')' + \frac{q(t)x}{g(t, S(x(t) - y(t)))} - (r(t)y')' + q(t)y(t) \]

\[ = -(r(t)v')' + q(t)v + \rho(t), \]

\[ \alpha_2 x(0) - \beta_2 x'(0) = 0, \quad \gamma_2 x(1) + \delta_2 x'(1) = 0. \tag{2.27} \]
Thus, (2.26) becomes (2.15), that is, \( x - y \) is a positive solution of the differential equation (2.15). By Lemma 2.4, \( u = S(x - y) \) is a positive solution of the singular perturbed differential equation (1.1). This completes the proof of Lemma 2.7.

Thus, the BVP (2.25) is equivalent to the integral equation

\[
x(t) = \int_0^1 G_2(t,s) \left[ p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) \right] ds - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, [x(s) - y(s)]^*) + \rho(s) ds.
\]

(2.28)

Hence, we will look for fixed points \( x(t) \geq y(t), t \in [0,1] \), for the mapping \( T \) defined on \( E := C([0,1], [0,+\infty)) \) by

\[
(Tx)(t) = \int_0^1 G_2(t,s) \left[ p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) \right] ds - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, [x(s) - y(s)]^*) + \rho(s) ds.
\]

(2.29)

The basic space used in this paper is \( E = C([0,1]; \mathbb{R}) \), where \( \mathbb{R} \) is a real number set. Obviously, the space \( E \) is a Banach space if it is endowed with the norm as follows:

\[
\|u\| = \max_{t\in[0,1]} |u(t)|,
\]

(2.30)

for any \( u \in E \). Let

\[
P = \{ x \in E : x(t) \geq \theta_2 G_2(t,t) \|x\| \},
\]

(2.31)

where \( \theta_2 \) is defined by (2.7), then \( P \) is a cone of \( E \).

**Lemma 2.8.** Assume that (B1)–(B3) hold. Then, \( T : P \to P \) is well defined. Furthermore, \( T : P \to P \) is a completely continuous operator.

**Proof.** For any fixed \( x \in P \), there exists a constant \( L > 0 \) such that \( \|x\| \leq L \). And then,

\[
[x(s) - y(s)]^* \leq x(s) \leq \|x\| \leq L,
\]

\[
|S[x(s) - y(s)]^*| \leq L \int_0^1 G_1(t,s) ds \leq \frac{(\beta_1 + \alpha_1)(y_1 + \delta_1)}{\omega_1} L.
\]

(2.32)
On the other hand, since $g$ satisfies global Carathéodory’s condition, we have $g(\cdot, u(\cdot), v(\cdot)) \in L^1(0, 1)$. Accordingly, $Tx$ in (2.29) is continuous on $[0, 1]$, and, by (2.32),

$$
(Tx)(t) = \int_0^1 G_2(t, s) [p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) + \rho(s)] ds
$$

$$
\leq \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) [p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) + 2\rho(s)] ds
$$

$$
\leq N \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) [p(s) + \rho(s)] ds < +\infty,
$$

where

$$
N = \max_{(t, u, v) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1]} f(t, u, v) + 2.
$$

This implies that the operator $T : P \to E$ is well defined.

Next, for any $x \in P$, by (2.6), we have

$$
||Tx|| = \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \int_0^1 G_2(t, s) [p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) + \rho(s)] ds
$$

$$
\leq \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) [p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) + \rho(s)] ds.
$$

On the other hand, from (2.6), we also have

$$
(Tx)(t) = \int_0^1 G_2(t, s) [p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) + \rho(s)] ds
$$

$$
\geq \theta_2 G_2(t, t) \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) [p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) + \rho(s)] ds.
$$

So

$$
(Tx)(t) \geq \theta_2 G(t, t)||Tx||, \quad t \in [0, 1],
$$

which yields that $T(P) \subset P$. 

At the end, according to the Ascoli-Arzela Theorem, using standard arguments, one can show $T : P \rightarrow P$ is a completely continuous operator.

\section{Main Results}

**Theorem 3.1.** Suppose (B1)-(B3) hold. In addition, assume that the following conditions are satisfied.

\begin{enumerate}[(S1)]
    \item There exists a constant $r > \max\left(2K, \frac{\int_0^1 \rho(s)ds}{\theta_2}\right)$ (3.1)
    
    such that for any $(t,u,v) \in [0,1] \times [0,((\beta_1 + \alpha_1)(\gamma_1 + \delta_1)/\omega_1)r] \times [-r,0]$, $f(t,u,v) \leq (r/K) - 2$, where $\theta_2$ and $K$ are defined by (2.7) and (2.19), respectively.

    \item There exists a constant $R > 2r$ such that, for any $(t,u,v) \in [0,1] \times [(1/2)\mu_1 R,((\beta_1 + \alpha_1)(\gamma_1 + \delta_1)/\omega_1)R] \times [-R,-(1/2)\mu_2 R]$,
    
    \[ f(t,u,v) \geq \frac{R}{T}, \] 

    where $\mu_1, \mu_2, l$ are defined by (2.19).

    \item $\lim_{|u|+|v| \rightarrow +\infty \text{ for } [0,1]} \frac{f(t,u,v)}{|u| + |v|} = 0.$ (3.3)
\end{enumerate}

Then, the singular perturbed differential equation (1.1) has at least two positive solutions $u_1, u_2$, and there exist two positive constants $n_1, n_2$ such that $u_1(t) \geq n_1 e(t), u_2(t) \geq n_2 e(t)$, for any $t \in [0,1]$.

**Proof.** Let $\Omega_1 = \{x \in P : ||x|| < r\}$. Then, for any $x \in \partial \Omega_1, s \in [0,1]$, we have

\begin{align*}
[x(s) - y(s)]^* &\leq x(s) \leq ||x|| \leq r, \\
|S[x(s) - y(s)]^*| &\leq r \int_0^1 G_1(t,s)dt \leq \frac{(\beta_1 + \alpha_1)(\gamma_1 + \delta_1)}{\omega_1} r. \tag{3.4}
\end{align*}
It follows from (S1) that
\[
||Tx|| = \max_{t \in [0,1]} (Tx)(t)
\]
\[
= \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \int_0^1 G_2(t,s) \left[ p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) + \rho(s) \right] ds
\]
\[
\leq \int_0^1 G_2(s,s) \left[ \left( \frac{r}{K} - 2 \right)p(s) + 2\rho(s) \right] ds
\]
\[
\leq \frac{r}{K} \int_0^1 G_2(s,s) [p(s) + \rho(s)] ds
\]
\[
= r = ||x||.
\]
Therefore,
\[
||Tx|| \leq ||x||, \quad x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_1. \tag{3.6}
\]

On the other hand, let \( \Omega_2 = \{ x \in P : ||x|| < R \} \) and \( \partial \Omega_2 = \{ x \in P : ||x|| = R \} \). Then, for any \( x \in \partial \Omega_2, t \in [0,1] \), noticing \( R > 2r \) and (2.22), we have
\[
x(t) - y(t) \geq x(t) - G_2(t,t) \int_0^1 \rho(s) ds
\]
\[
\geq x(t) - \frac{x(t)}{\theta_2} R \int_0^1 \rho(s) ds
\]
\[
\geq x(t) - \frac{r}{R} x(t) \geq \frac{1}{2} x(t)
\]
\[
\geq \frac{1}{2} \theta_2 G_2(t,t) R. \tag{3.7}
\]
So by (3.7), for any \( x \in \partial \Omega_2, t \in [a, b] \), we have
\[
\frac{1}{2} \mu_2 R = \frac{\phi_2(a) \psi_2(b)}{2w_2} \theta_2 R \leq x(t) - y(t) \leq R,
\]
\[
\frac{1}{2} \mu_1 R = \frac{(\beta_1 + \alpha_1 a) (\gamma_1 + \delta_1 (1 - b)) \theta_2 R}{2w_1} \int_0^1 e(s) G_2(s,s) ds
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \theta_2 R \int_0^1 G_1(t,s) G_2(s,s) ds \leq S(x(t) - y(t))
\]
\[
\leq \frac{(\beta_1 + \alpha_1) (\gamma_1 + \delta_1)}{w_1} R. \tag{3.8}
\]
It follows from (S2), (3.8), and (2.6) that, for any \( x \in \partial \Omega_2, t \in [a, b] \),

\[
\|Tx\| \geq \int_0^1 G_2(t, s) \left[ p(s) f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) + \rho(s) \right] ds
\]

\[
\geq \theta_2 G_2(t, t) \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) p(s) f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) ds
\]

\[
\geq \theta_2 G_2(t, t) \int_a^b G_2(s, s) p(s) f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)], x(s) - y(s)) ds
\]

\[
\geq \frac{\phi(t) \eta(t)}{\omega_2} \int_a^b G_2(s, s) p(s) ds \frac{R}{1} = \mu_2 \int_a^b G_2(s, s) p(s) ds \frac{R}{1}
\]

\[
= R = \|x\|.
\]

So we have

\[
\|Tx\| \geq \|x\|, \quad x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_2. \tag{3.10}
\]

Next, let us choose \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that

\[
\varepsilon \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) p(s) ds < 1. \tag{3.11}
\]

Then, for the above \( \varepsilon \), by (S3), there exists \( N > R > 0 \) such that, for any \( t \in [0, 1] \) and for any \( |u| + |v| \geq N \),

\[
f(t, u, v) \leq \varepsilon (|u| + |v|). \tag{3.12}
\]

Let

\[
\sigma = \max_{(t, u, v) \in [0, 1] \times [0, \left( (\beta_1 + \alpha_1) / (\gamma_1 + \delta_1) / \omega_1 \right) N] \times [-N, 0]} f(t, u, v) + 2, \tag{3.13}
\]

take

\[
R^* = \frac{\sigma \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) [p(s) + \rho(s)] ds + 2 \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) \rho(s) ds}{1 - \varepsilon \left( 1 + ((\beta_1 + \alpha_1) (\gamma_1 + \delta_1) / \omega_1) \right) \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) \rho(s) ds} + N, \tag{3.14}
\]

then \( R^* > N > R \).
Now let \( \Omega_3 = \{ x \in P : \| x \| < R^* \} \) and \( \partial \Omega_3 = \{ x \in P : \| x \| = R^* \} \). Then, for any \( x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_3 \), we have

\[
\| Tx \| = \max_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \int_0^1 G_2(t, s) \left[ p(s) f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)] ^*, -[x(s) - y(s)] ^*) - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)] ^*, -[x(s) - y(s)] ^*) + \rho(s) \right] ds \\
\leq \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) \left[ p(s) f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)] ^*, [x(s) - y(s)] ^*) + 2\rho(s) \right] ds \\
\leq \left( \max_{(t, u, v) \in [0,1] \times [0, \min(\beta_1 + \alpha_1, \gamma_1 + \delta_1, \gamma_1, \delta_1)]} f(t, u, v) + 2 \right) \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) [p(s) + \rho(s)] ds \\
+ \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) [p(s) \varepsilon(S[x(s) - y(s)] ^*, [x(s) - y(s)] ^*) + 2\rho(s)] ds \\
\leq \sigma \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) [p(s) + \rho(s)] ds + \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) \left[ p(s) \varepsilon \left( 1 + \frac{\beta_1 + \alpha_1}{\gamma_1 + \delta_1} \right) \right] ds \\
+ 2\rho(s) ds \\
= \sigma \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) [p(s) + \rho(s)] ds + 2 \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) \rho(s) ds + \varepsilon \left( 1 + \frac{\beta_1 + \alpha_1}{\gamma_1 + \delta_1} \right) \\
\times \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) p(s) ds \| x \| \\
< R^* = \| x \|, \quad \text{(3.15)}
\]

which implies that

\[
\| Tx \| \leq \| x \|, \quad x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_3. \quad \text{(3.16)}
\]

By Lemma 1.1, \( T \) has two fixed points \( x_1, x_2 \) such that \( r \leq \| x_1 \| \leq R \leq \| x_2 \| \).

It follows from

\[
r > \frac{\int_0^1 \rho(s) ds}{\theta_2} \quad \text{(3.17)}
\]

that

\[
x_1(t) - y(t) \geq x_1(t) - G_2(t, t) \int_0^1 \rho(s) ds \\
\geq x_1(t) - \frac{x_1(t)}{\theta_2 r} \int_0^1 \rho(s) ds
\]
Theorem 3.2. Suppose there exist two positive solutions \( u_1, u_2 \) satisfying

\[
1 - \int_0^1 \frac{\rho(s)ds}{\theta_2 r} x_1(t) \geq \theta_2 r \left( 1 - \int_0^1 \frac{\rho(s)ds}{\theta_2 r} \right) G_2(t,t) = m_1 G_2(t,t) > 0, \quad t \in (0,1).
\]

(3.18)

As for (3.18), we also find a positive constant \( m_2 \) such that

\[
x_2(t) - y(t) \geq m_2 G_2(t,t) > 0, \quad t \in (0,1).
\]

(3.19)

Let \( u_i(t) = S(x_i - y)(t), (i = 1, 2) \), then

\[
u_i(t) > 0, \quad t \in (0,1) (i = 1, 2),
\]

\[
u_i(t) = S(x_i - y)(t) \geq m_i \int_0^1 G_1(t,s)G_2(s,s)ds \\
\geq m_i \int_0^1 e(s)G_2(s,s)dse(t) = n_i e(t).
\]

(3.20)

By Lemma 2.7, we know that the singular perturbed differential equation (1.1) has at least two positive solutions \( u_1, u_2 \) satisfying

\[
u_1(t) \geq n_1 e(t), \quad u_1(t) \geq n_2 e(t), \quad t \in [0,1],
\]

(3.21)

for some positive constants \( n_1, n_2 \). The proof of Theorem 3.1 is completed.

\[\square\]

**Theorem 3.2.** Suppose (B1)–(B3) hold. In addition, assume that the following conditions are satisfied.

(S4) There exists a constant

\[
r > \frac{2 \int_0^1 \rho(s)ds}{\theta_2}
\]

(3.22)

such that, for any \( (t,u,v) \in [0,1] \times [(1/2)\mu_1 r, ((\beta_1 + \alpha_1)/(\gamma_1 + \beta_1)/\omega_1)/r] \times [-r, -(1/2)\mu_2 r] \),

\[
f(t,u,v) \geq \frac{r}{T},
\]

(3.23)

where \( \theta_2 \) and \( \mu_1, \mu_2, l \) are defined by (2.7) and (2.19), respectively.
(S5) There exists a constant \( R > \max \{ r, (r/l + 2)K \} \) such that, for any \((t, u, v) \in [0, 1] \times [0, ((\beta_1 + \alpha_1)(\gamma_1 + \delta_1)/w_1)R] \times [-R, 0],\)

\[
f(t, u, v) \leq \frac{R}{K} - 2, \tag{3.24}
\]

where \( K, I \) are defined by (2.19) and \( r \) is defined by (S4).

(S6)

\[
\lim_{|u| + |v| \to \infty} \min_{t \in [a, b]} \frac{f(t, u, v)}{|u| + |v|} = +\infty. \tag{3.25}
\]

Then, the singular perturbed differential equation (1.1) has at least two positive solutions \( u_1, u_2, \) and there exist two positive constants \( n_1, n_2 \) such that \( u_1(t) \geq n_1 e(t), u_2(t) \geq n_2 e(t), \) for any \( t \in [0, 1]. \)

Proof. Firstly, let \( \Omega_1 = \{ x \in P : \| x \| < r \}. \) Then, for any \( x \in \partial \Omega_1, t \in [0, 1], \) by (2.22), we have

\[
x(t) - y(t) \geq x(t) - G_2(t, t) \int_0^1 \rho(s) ds
\]

\[
\geq x(t) - \frac{x(t)}{\theta_2 r} \int_0^1 \rho(s) ds
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{2} x(t) \geq \frac{1}{2} \theta_2 G_2(t, t) r. \tag{3.26}
\]

So, by (3.26), for any \( x \in \partial \Omega_1, t \in [a, b], \) we have

\[
\frac{1}{2} \mu_2 r = \frac{\phi_2(a) \psi_2(b)}{2w_2} \theta_2 r \leq x(t) - y(t) \leq r,
\]

\[
\frac{1}{2} \mu_1 r = \frac{(\beta_1 + \alpha_1 a)(\gamma_1 + \delta_1(1 - b)) \theta_2 r}{2w_1} \int_0^1 e(s) G_2(s, s) ds
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \theta_2 r \int_0^1 G_1(t, s) G_2(s, s) ds \leq S(x(t) - y(t))
\]

\[
\leq \frac{\beta_1 + \alpha_1}{w_1} (\gamma_1 + \delta_1) r. \tag{3.27}
\]
It follows from (S4), (3.27), and (2.6) that, for any \( x \in \partial \Omega_2, t \in [a, b] \),

\[
\|Tx\| \geq \int_0^1 G_2(t, s) [p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)])^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)])^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) + \rho(s)] ds
\]

\[
\geq \theta_2 G_2(t, t) \int_0^1 G_2(s, s)p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)])^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) ds
\]

\[
\geq \theta_2 G_2(t, t) \int_a^b G_2(s, s)p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)], x(s) - y(s)) ds
\]

\[
\geq \theta_2 \frac{\phi_2(a)\phi_2(b)}{w_2} \int_a^b G_2(s, s)p(s)ds \frac{r}{t} = \mu_2 \int_a^b G_2(s, s)p(s)ds \frac{r}{t}
\]

\[
= R = \|x\|.
\]

(3.28)

Therefore, we have

\[
\|Tx\| \geq \|x\|, \quad x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_1.
\]

(3.29)

Next, by (S5), we have \( R > r \) and

\[
\frac{R}{K} - 2 > \frac{r}{l} > 0.
\]

(3.30)

Let \( \Omega_2 = \{ x \in P : \|x\| < R \} \). Then, for any \( x \in \partial \Omega_2, s \in [0, 1] \), we have

\[
[x(s) - y(s)]^* \leq x(s) \leq \|x\| \leq R,
\]

\[
|S[x(s) - y(s)]^*| \leq R \int_0^1 G_1(t, s) ds \leq \frac{(\beta_1 + \alpha_1)(\gamma_1 + \delta_1)}{w_1} R.
\]

(3.31)

It follows from (S5) that

\[
\|Tx\| = \max_{t \in [0,1]} (Tx)(t)
\]

\[
= \max_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \int_0^1 G_2(t, s) [p(s)f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)])^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)])^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) + \rho(s)] ds
\]
\[
\leq \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) \left[ \left( \frac{R}{K} - 2 \right) p(s) + 2 \rho(s) \right] ds \\
\leq \frac{R}{K} \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) \left[ p(s) + \rho(s) \right] ds \\
= R = \|x\|.
\] (3.32)

Therefore,

\[
\|Tx\| \leq \|x\|, \quad x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_2.
\] (3.33)

On the other hand, choose a large enough real number \(M > 0\) such that

\[
\frac{1}{2} \mu_2^2 M \int_a^b G_2(s, s) p(s) ds \geq 1.
\] (3.34)

From (S6), there exists \(N > R\) such that, for any \(t \in [a, b]\),

\[
f(t, u, v) \geq M(|u| + |v|), \quad |u| + |v| \geq N.
\] (3.35)

Take

\[
R^* > \max \left\{ \frac{2N}{\mu_2^2}, R \right\},
\] (3.36)

then \(R^* > R > r\). Let \(\Omega_3 = \{ x \in P : \|x\| \leq R^* \}\), for any \(x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_3\) and for any \(t \in [a, b]\), we have

\[
x(t) - y(t) \geq x(t) - G_2(t, t) \int_0^1 \rho(s) ds \\
\geq x(t) - \frac{\int_0^1 \rho(s) ds}{\theta_2 R^*} x(t) \\
\geq \frac{1}{2} x(t) \geq \frac{\theta_2 G_2(t, t)}{2} R^* \\
\geq \frac{1}{2} \mu_2 R^* \geq N > 0.
\] (3.37)
So, for any $x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_3$, $t \in [a, b]$, by (3.35), (3.37), we have

$$
\|Tx\| \geq \int_0^1 G_2(t, s) \left[ p(s) f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) - g(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) + \rho(s) \right] ds \\
\geq \theta_2 \int_a^b G_2(s) p(s) f(s, S[x(s) - y(s)]^*, -[x(s) - y(s)]^*) ds \\
\geq \theta_2 \frac{\phi_2(a) q_2(b)}{w_2} \int_a^b G_2(s) p(s) M \left[ |S(x(s) - y(s))| + |(x(s) - y(s))| \right] ds \\
\geq \frac{\theta_2 \phi_2(a) q_2(b)}{w_2} \int_a^b G_2(s) p(s) M (|x(s) - y(s)|) ds \\
= \mu_2 M \int_a^b G_2(s) p(s) ds \times \frac{1}{2} \mu_2 R^{s} \\
= \frac{1}{2} \mu^2 R \int_a^b G_2(s) p(s) ds \times R^{s} \\
\geq R^* = \|x\|.
$$

Thus,

$$
\|Tx\| \geq \|x\|, \quad x \in P \cap \partial \Omega_3.
$$

By Lemma 1.1, $T$ has two fixed points $x_1, x_2$ such that $r \leq \|x_1\| \leq R \leq \|x_2\|$. Noticing that

$$
r > \frac{2 \int_0^1 \rho(s) ds}{\theta_2},
$$

we have

$$
x_1(t) - y(t) \geq x_1(t) - G_2(t, t) \int_0^1 \rho(s) ds \\
\geq x_1(t) - \frac{x_1(t)}{\theta_2 r} \int_0^1 \rho(s) ds \\
= \left( 1 - \frac{\int_0^1 \rho(s) ds}{\theta_2 r} \right) x_1(t)
$$
Two positive solutions 

By Lemma 2.7, we know that the singular perturbed differential equation (3.41) has at least two positive solutions $u_1, u_2$ satisfying

As for (3.41), we also can find a positive constant $m_2$ such that

Let $u_i(t) = S(x_i - y)(t), (i = 1, 2)$, then

By Lemma 2.7, we know that the singular perturbed differential equation (1.1) has at least two positive solutions $u_1, u_2$ satisfying

for some positive constants $n_1, n_2$. The proof of Theorem 3.2 is completed.  

An example Consider the following singular perturbed boundary value problem

where

\[ f(t, x, y) = \begin{cases} 
  tx + \frac{y^2}{100}, & (t, x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 10] \times [-10, 0], \\
  41.88x + 4.075y, & (t, x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [10, 13.93] \times [-100, -10], \\
  200(1 + t^2)e^{x/13.93} + \sin y, & (t, x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [13.93, 100] \times [-100, -422.89], \\
  23.2469(x + |y|)^{1/2}, & (t, x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [100, +\infty) \times (-\infty, -422.89].
\]
Then, the BVP (3.45) has at least two positive solutions $u_1(t)$ and $u_2(t)$ such that

$$ u_1(t) \geq 2.3924t(1-t), \quad t \in [0,1], \quad u_2(t) \geq 24.833t(1-t), \quad t \in [0,1]. \quad (3.47) $$

**Proof.** In fact, let

$$ r(t) \equiv e^t, \quad q(t) \equiv 2e^t, \quad p(t) = \frac{1}{t(1-t)}, \quad p(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}, \quad g(t, x, y) = \frac{\sin x + \arctan y}{(1 + (\pi/2)) \sqrt{t}}, $$

then

$$ |g(t, x, y)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}. \quad (3.49) $$

The corresponding Green's functions can be written by

$$ G_1(t, s) = \begin{cases} s(1-t), & 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1, \\ t(1-s), & 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1, \end{cases} $$

$$ G_2(t, s) = \frac{1}{3e} \begin{cases} \left( \frac{5}{3} e^s + \frac{1}{3} e^{-2s} \right) \left( \frac{1}{3} e^t + \frac{2}{3} e^{-2t} \right), & 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1, \\ \left( \frac{5}{3} e^t + \frac{1}{3} e^{-2t} \right) \left( \frac{1}{3} e^s + \frac{2}{3} e^{-2s} \right), & 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (3.50) $$

and, for $(t, s) \in [0,1] \times [0,1]$, we have $t(1-t)s(1-s) \leq G_1(t, s) \leq s(1-s)$ and

$$ \frac{1}{5e^2 + e^{-1}} G_2(s, s) G_2(t, t) \leq G_2(t, s) \leq G_2(s, s) \quad (or \ G_2(t, t)). \quad (3.51) $$

Now, take $[1/4, 3/4] \subset [0,1]$, then we have

$$ K = \int_0^1 G_2(s, s) \left[ p(s) + p(s) \right] ds $$

$$ = \int_0^1 \frac{(5/3) e^s + (1/3) e^{-2s}) ((1/3) e^s + (2/3) e^{-2s})}{3e} \left[ \frac{1}{s(1-s)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \right] ds \approx 0.6206, $$

$$ \mu_2 = \frac{\phi_2(a) \psi_2(b)}{\phi_2(1/4) \psi_2(3/4)} = \frac{\phi_2(1/4) \psi_2(3/4)}{\phi_2(1) \psi_2(0)} = \frac{(5/3) e^{1/4} + (1/3) e^{-1/2}) ((1/3) e^{3/4} + (2/3) e^{-3/2})}{(5/3) e + (1/3) e^{-2}} $$

$$ \approx 0.4374, $$

$$ l = \mu_2 \int_a^b G_2(s, s) p(s) ds = 0.4374 \int_{1/4}^{3/4} \frac{(5/3) e^s + (1/3) e^{-2s}) ((1/3) e^s + (2/3) e^{-2s})}{3es(1-s)} ds $$
\[
\mu_1 = \frac{(\beta_1 + \alpha_1 a)(\gamma_1 + \delta_1 (1 - b))}{w_1} \int_0^1 G_1(s, s) G_2(s, s) ds = \frac{1}{16(5e^2 - e^{-2})} \int_0^1 s(1-s) \frac{(5/3)e^s + (1/3)e^{-2s})((1/3)e^s + (2/3)e^{-2s})}{3e} ds \approx 8.4578, \\
\theta_2 = \frac{w_2}{\phi_2(1)\eta_2(0)} = \frac{p(0)[\eta_2(0)\phi_2'(0) - \eta_2'(0)\phi_2(0)]}{\phi_2(1)\eta_2(0)} \approx 4.938.
\]

On the other hand, since
\[
\int_0^1 \rho(s) ds = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} ds = 2,
\]
then (B1)–(B3) are satisfied.

Choose \( r = 10 \), then
\[
10 = r > \max \left\{ 2K, \frac{\int_0^1 \rho(s) ds}{\theta_2} \right\} = \{1.2412, 0.4050\},
\]
and, for any \((t, x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 10] \times [-10, 0]\),
\[
f(t, x, y) \leq 11 \leq \frac{r}{K} - 2 = 14.1134.
\]
So the condition \((S1)\) is satisfied.

On the other hand, we take \( R = 100 \), then \( R > 2r = 20 \), and, for any \((t, x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [(1/2)\mu_1 R, ((\beta_1 + \alpha_1) (\gamma_1 + \delta_1)/w_1) R] \times [-R, -(1/2)\mu_2 R] = [0, 1] \times [13.93, 100] \times [-100, -422.89],\) we have
\[
f(t, x, y) \geq 542.65 \geq \frac{R}{I} \approx 358.93,
\]
this implies that the condition \((S2)\) holds. Next, we have
\[
\lim_{|x| + |y| \to +\infty} \max_{t \in [0, 1]} \frac{f(t, x, y)}{|x| + |y|} = \lim_{|x| + |y| \to +\infty} 23.2469 (|x| + |y|)^{-1/2} = 0.
\]
Thus, (S3) also holds. By Theorem 3.1, the BVP (3.45) has at least two positive solutions $u_1(t)$ and $u_2(t)$. Since

$$n_1 = \frac{1}{3e} \left( \theta_2 r - \int_0^1 \rho(s) ds \right) \int_0^1 s(1-s) \left( \frac{5}{3} e^s + \frac{1}{3} e^{-2s} \right) \left( \frac{1}{3} e^s + \frac{2}{3} e^{-2s} \right) ds \approx 2.3924,$$

$$n_2 = \frac{1}{3e} \left( \theta_2 R - \int_0^1 \rho(s) ds \right) \int_0^1 s(1-s) \left( \frac{5}{3} e^s + \frac{1}{3} e^{-2s} \right) \left( \frac{1}{3} e^s + \frac{2}{3} e^{-2s} \right) ds \approx 24.833,$$

thus

$$u_1(t) \geq 2.3924t(1-t), \quad t \in [0,1], \quad u_2(t) \geq 24.833t(1-t), \quad t \in [0,1]. \quad (3.59)$$

**Acknowledgment**

The authors were supported financially by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (11071141) and the Natural Science Foundation of Shandong Province of China (ZR2010AM017).

**References**


