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We establish a new existence result on homoclinic solutions for a second-order nonperiodic Hamiltonian systems. This homoclinic solution is obtained as a limit of solutions of a certain sequence of nil-boundary value problems which are obtained by the minimax methods. Some recent results in the literature are generalized and extended.

1. Introduction

Consider the following second-order Hamiltonian system:

\[ \ddot{u}(t) + \nabla V(t, u(t)) = 0, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{HS} \]

where \( u = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N \), \( V(t, u) = -K(t, u) + W(t, u) \), \( K, W : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R} \) are \( C^1 \) maps. We will say that a solution \( u : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^N \) of (HS) is homoclinic (to 0), if \( u(t) \to 0 \) as \( |t| \to \infty \). In addition, if \( u \not\equiv 0 \), then \( u \) is called a nontrivial homoclinic solution.

Inspired by the excellent monographs [1, 2], by now, the existence and multiplicity of homoclinic solutions for Hamiltonian systems have been extensively investigated in many papers via variational methods; see [3–7] for the first order systems and [8–19] for the second systems, and most of them treat the following system:

\[ \ddot{u}(t) - L(t)u(t) + \nabla W(t, u(t)) = 0, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1} \]

where \( L(t) \) is a symmetric matrix-valued function and \( W \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N) \).

For the periodic case, the periodicity is used to control the lack of compactness due to the fact that (1) is set on all \( \mathbb{R} \). In 1990, Rabinowitz [12] first proved that (1) has a \( 2kT \)-periodic solution \( u_k \), which is bounded uniformly for \( k \), and obtained a homoclinic solution for (1) as a limit of \( 2kT \)-periodic solution.

For the nonperiodic case, the problem is quite different from the one described in nature. Rabinowitz and Tanaka [13] introduced a type of coercive condition on the matrix \( L \):

\[ \text{(L_1)} \quad l(t) := \inf_{|x|=1} L(t)x \cdot x \to +\infty \text{ as } |t| \to \infty. \]

They first obtained the existence of homoclinic solution for the nonperiodic system (1) under the well-known (AR) growth condition by using Ekeland’s variational principle.

In 1995, Ding [8] strengthened condition (L_1) by

\[ \text{(L_2)} \quad \text{there exists a constant } \alpha > 0 \text{ such that} \]

\[ l(t)|t|^{-\alpha} \to +\infty \text{ as } |t| \to \infty. \tag{2} \]

Under the condition (L_2) and some subquadratic conditions on \( W(t, u) \), Ding proved the existence and multiplicity of homoclinic solutions for the system (1). From then on, the condition (L_1) or (L_2) is extensively used in nonperiodic second-order Hamiltonian systems. However, the assumption (L_1) or (L_2) is a rather restrictive and not very natural condition as it excludes, for example, the case of constant matrices \( I_N \).

In 2005, Izydorek and Janczewska [9] first presented the “pinching” condition (see the following (V_2)) and relaxed the conditions (L_1) and (L_2). They studied the general periodic Hamiltonian system

\[ \ddot{u}(t) + \nabla V(t, u(t)) = f(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{3} \]

where \( V(t, u) = -K(t, u) + W(t, u) \) and obtained the following result.
Theorem A (see [9]). Let the following conditions hold:

\((V_1)\) \( V(t, u) = -K(t, u) + W(t, u) \), where \( V \) is continuous and \( T \) periodic with respect to \( t, T > 0 \);
\((V_2)\) there exist \( b_1, b_2 > 0 \) such that
\[ b_1 |u|^2 \leq K(t, u) \leq b_2 |u|^2, \quad \forall (t, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N; \] (4)
\((V_3)\) \( K(t, u) \leq (u, \nabla K(t, u)) \leq 2K(t, u) \) for all \( (t, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \);
\((V_4)\) \( \nabla W(t, u) = o(|u|) \) as \( u \to 0 \) uniformly in \( t \);
\((V_5)\) there is a constant \( \mu > 2 \) such that
\[ 0 < \mu W(t, u) \leq (\nabla W(t, u), u), \quad \forall (t, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N; \] (5)
\((V_6)\) \( \bar{b}_1 := \min\{1, 2b_1\} > 2M \) and \( \|f\|_{L^2} < (\bar{b}_1 - 2M)/2C^* \), where \( M = \sup\{W(t, u) : t \in [0, T], |u| = 1\} \) and \( C^* \) is a positive constant depending on \( T \).

Then the system \((3)\) possesses a nontrivial homoclinic solution \( u \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N) \) such that \( u(t) \to 0 \) as \( t \to \pm \infty \).

From then on, following the idea of [9], some researchers are devoted to relaxing the conditions \((L_1)\) and \((L_2)\) and studying the existence of homoclinic solutions of system (HS) or \((3)\) under the periodicity assumption of the potential, such as [10, 11, 16, 19].

Very recently, Daouas [3] removed the periodicity condition and studied the existence of homoclinic solutions for the nonperiodic system (3), when \( W \) is superquadratic at the infinity. Motivated by [3], in this work, we will study the existence of homoclinic solutions of the nonperiodic system (HS), when \( W \) satisfies the asymptotically quadratic condition at the infinity. It is worth noticing that there are few works concerning this case for system (HS) or \((3)\) up to now.

Our result is presented as follows.

Theorem 1. Let \( A := \sup\{K(t, u) : t \in \mathbb{R}, |u| \leq 1\} < +\infty \) hold. Moreover, assume that the following conditions hold:

\((H_1)\) \( K(t, 0) \equiv 0, \) and there exists a constant \( a > 0 \) such that
\[ K(t, u) \geq a|u|^2, \quad \forall (t, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N; \] (6)
\((H_2)\) there exists \( \beta \in (1, 2) \) such that
\[ K(t, u) \leq (u, \nabla K(t, u)) \leq \beta K(t, u), \quad \forall (t, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N; \] (7)
\((H_3)\) \( W(t, 0) \equiv 0 \) and \( \nabla W(t, u) = o(|u|) \) as \( u \to 0 \) uniformly in \( t \), and there exist, \( M_0 > 0 \) such that
\[ \frac{|\nabla W(t, u)|}{|u|} \leq M_0, \quad \text{for any } t \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } u \in \mathbb{R}^N; \] (8)
\((H_4)\) \( W(t, u) - w(t)|u|^2 = o(|u|^3) \) as \( |u| \to \infty \) uniformly in \( t \), where \( w \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \) with \( w_\infty := \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} w(t) > 2A; \)
\((H_5)\) \( \overline{W}(t, u) := (1/2)(\nabla W(t, u), u) - W(t, u) \) \( \to +\infty \) as \( |u| \to +\infty \), and
\[ \inf \left\{ \overline{W}(t, u) : t \in \mathbb{R} \text{ with } c \leq |u| < d \right\} > 0, \quad \text{for any } c, d > 0. \] (9)

Then the system \((HS)\) possesses a nontrivial homoclinic solution \( u \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N) \) such that \( u(t) \to 0 \) as \( t \to \pm \infty \).

Remark 2. Theorem 1 treats the asymptotically quadratic case on \( W \). Consider the functions
\[ K(t, u) = \left(1 + e^{-|u|}\right)|u|^2, \] (10)
\[ W(t, u) = d(t)|u|^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{\ln(e + |u|)}\right), \]
where \( d \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \) and \( \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} d(t) > 4 + 32\pi^2 \).

A straightforward computation shows that \( K \) and \( W \) satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1, but \( K \) does not satisfy the conditions \((L_1)\) and \((L_2)\). Hence, Theorem 1 also extends the results in [8, 13].

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, some preliminary results are presented. In Section 3, we give the proof of Theorem 1.

2. Preliminaries

Following the similar idea of [20], consider the following nil-boundary value problems:

\[ \ddot{u}(t) + \nabla V(t, u(t)) = 0, \quad \forall t \in [-T, T], \]
\[ u(-T) = u(T) = 0. \] (11)

For each \( T > 0 \), let \( E_T = W^{1,2}([-T, T], \mathbb{R}^N) \), where
\[ W^{1,2}([-T, T], \mathbb{R}^N) = \{u : [-T, T] \to \mathbb{R}^N \text{ is an absolutely continuous function,} \]
\[ u(-T) = u(T) = 0 \text{ and } \dot{u} \in L^2([-T, T], \mathbb{R}^N)\}, \]
equipped with the norm
\[ \|u\| = \left(\int_{-T}^{T} |\dot{u}(t)|^2 + |u(t)|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \] (13)

Furthermore, for \( p > 1 \), let \( L^p_T = L^p([-T, T], \mathbb{R}^N) \) and \( L^{\infty}_T = L^{\infty}([-T, T], \mathbb{R}^N) \) under their habitual norms. We need the following result.

Proposition 3 (see [9]). There is a positive constant \( C \) such that for each \( T > 0 \) and \( u \in E_T \) the following inequality holds:
\[ \|u\|_{L^p_T} \leq C \|u\|. \] (14)
Note that the inequality (14) holds true with constant $C = \sqrt{2}$ if $T \geq 1/2$ (see [9]). Subsequently, we may assume this condition is fulfilled.

Consider a functional $I : E_T \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$I (u) = \int_{-T}^{T} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \dot{u} (t)^2 - V (t, u(t)) \right] dt$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-T}^{T} |\dot{u} (t)|^2 dt + \int_{-T}^{T} K (t, u(t)) dt$$

(15)

Then $I \in C^1 (E_T, \mathbb{R})$, and it is easy to show that for all $u, v \in E_T$, we have

$$I' (u) v = \int_{-T}^{T} \left[ (\dot{u} (t), \dot{v}(t)) - (W(t,u(t)), \nabla V(t,u(t)), v(t)) \right] dt$$

$$= \int_{-T}^{T} \left[ (\dot{u} (t), \dot{v}(t)) + (\nabla K(t,u(t)), v(t)) \right] dt$$

$$- (\nabla W(t,u(t)), v(t)) dt.$$  

(16)

It is well known that critical points of $I$ are classical solutions of the problem (11). We will obtain a critical point of $I$ by using an improved version of the Mountain Pass Theorem. For completeness, we give this theorem.

Recall that a sequence $\{u_j\}$ is a $(C)$-sequence for the functional $\varphi$ if $\varphi (u_j)$ is bounded and $(1 + \|u_j\|) \varphi' (u_j) \to 0$. A functional $\varphi$ satisfies the $(C)$-condition if and only if any $(C)$-sequence for $\varphi$ contains a convergent subsequence.

**Theorem 4** (see [21]). Let $E$ be a real Banach space, and let $\varphi \in C^1 (E, \mathbb{R})$ satisfy the $(C)$-condition and $\varphi(0) = 0$. If $\varphi$ satisfies the following conditions:

(A1) there exist constants $\rho, \alpha > 0$ such that $\varphi|_{\partial B_\rho (0)} \geq \alpha$;

(A2) there exists $c \in E \setminus \overline{B}_\rho (0)$ such that $\varphi(c) \leq 0$, then $\varphi$ possesses a critical value $c \geq \alpha$ given by

$$c = \inf_{g \in \Gamma, \|g\| = 1} \max_{s \in [0,1]} \varphi (g(s)),$$

(17)

where $B_\rho (0)$ is an open ball in $E$ of radius $\rho$ at about 0, and

$$\Gamma = \{ f \in C ([0,1], E) : f(0) = 0, f(1) = c \}.$$  

(18)

**Proof.** As shown in Bartolo et al. [22], a deformation lemma can be proved with the $(C)$-condition replacing the usual $(PS)$-condition, and it turns out that the standard version Mountain Pass Theorem (see Rabinowitz [21]) holds true under the $(C)$-condition. \qed

**Lemma 5.** Assume that $(H_2)$ holds, then

$$K(t,u) \leq K(t,\frac{u}{|u|})|u|^\beta, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \ |u| \geq 1.$$  

(19)

**Proof.** From $(H_2)$ it follows that for $u \neq 0$ a map given by

$$(0,\infty) \ni v \mapsto W(t,v^{-1}u)$$

is nondecreasing. Similar to the proof in [12], we can get the conclusion. \qed

**Lemma 6** (see [9]). Let $u : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ be a continuous map such that $u$ is locally square integrable. Then, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, one has

$$|u(t)| \leq \sqrt{2} \left( \int_{t-1/2}^{t+1/2} \left( |u(s)|^2 + |\dot{u}(s)|^2 \right) ds \right)^{1/2}.$$  

(21)

### 3. Proof of Theorem 1

**Lemma 7.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, the problem (11) possesses a nontrivial solution.

**Proof.** It suffices to prove that the functional $I$ satisfies all the assumptions of Theorem 4.

Step 1. We show that the functional $I$ satisfies the $(C)$-condition. Let

$$I (u_j) \text{ be bounded and } (1 + \|u_j\|) I'(u_j) \to 0.$$  

(22)

Observe that, for $j$ large, it follows from $(H_1)$ and $(H_2)$ that there exists a constant $C_0$ such that

$$C_0 \geq I (u_j) - \frac{1}{2} I'(u_j) u_j$$

$$= \int_{-T}^{T} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \nabla W(t,u_j), u_j \right] - W(t,u_j) \right] dt$$

$$+ \int_{-T}^{T} K(t,u_j) - \frac{1}{2} \nabla K(t,u_j), u_j \right] dt$$

$$\geq \int_{-T}^{T} \nabla W(t,u_j), u_j \right] dt.$$  

(23)

Arguing indirectly, assume as a contradiction that $\|u_j\| \to \infty$. Setting $v_j = u_j/\|u_j\|$, then $\|v_j\| = 1$, and by Proposition 3, one has

$$\|v_j\|_{L^2_T} \leq \sqrt{2} \|v_j\| = \sqrt{2}.$$  

(24)

Note that

$$I'(u_j) u_j = \|u_j\|_{L^2_T}^2 + \int_{-T}^{T} (\nabla K(t,u_j), u_j) dt$$

$$- \int_{-T}^{T} (\nabla W(t,u_j), u_j) dt$$

$$\geq \|u_j\|_{L^2_T}^2 + \int_{-T}^{T} K(t,u_j) dt$$

$$- \int_{-T}^{T} (\nabla W(t,u_j), u_j) dt$$

$$\geq C_1 \|u_j\|_{L^2_T}^2 - \int_{-T}^{T} \|\nabla W(t,u_j)\| \|u_j\| dt,$$  

(25)
where \( C_1 = \min\{1, a\} > 0 \). This implies that
\[
\int_{-T}^{T} \frac{\|\nabla W(t, u)\| |u|}{\|u\|} dt \leq \int_{-T}^{T} \frac{\|\nabla W(t, u)\| |u|^2}{\|u\|} dt \to C_1.
\]

(26)

Set for \( s \geq 0 \)
\[
h(s) := \inf \left\{ W(t, u) : t \in [-T, T], u \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ with } |u| \geq s \right\}.
\]

(27)

By (H2), \( h(s) \to \infty \) as \( s \to \infty \).

For \( 0 \leq l < m \), let
\[
\Omega_j(l, m) = \left\{ t \in [-T, T] : |u_j(t)| < m \right\}.
\]

(28)

Then by (H2), \( C^n_j > 0 \). One has
\[
\bar{W}(t, u_j) \geq C^n_j |u_j|^2, \quad \forall t \in \Omega_j(l, m).
\]

(29)

It follows from (23) that
\[
C_0 \geq \int_{\Omega_j(l, m)} \bar{W}(t, u_j) dt + \int_{\Omega_j(l, m)} \bar{W}(t, u_j) dt
+ \int_{\Omega_j(l, m)} \bar{W}(t, u_j) dt
\geq \int_{\Omega_j(l, m)} \bar{W}(t, u_j) dt + C^n_j \int_{\Omega_j(l, m)} |u_j|^2 dt
+ h(m) \left| \Omega_j(m, \infty) \right|
\]

(30)

which implies that
\[
|\Omega_j(m, \infty)| \leq \frac{C_0}{h(m)} \to 0
\]

(31)

as \( m \to \infty \) uniformly in \( j \), and for any fixed \( 0 < l < m \)
\[
\int_{\Omega_j(l, m)} |u_j|^2 dt = \frac{1}{\|u_j\|^2} \int_{\Omega_j(l, m)} |u_j|^2 dt \leq \frac{C_0}{C^n_j \|u_j\|^2} \to 0
\]

(32)

as \( j \to \infty \). Using (14) and (31), we have
\[
\int_{\Omega_j(m, \infty)} |u_j|^2 dt \leq \|u_j\|_{L^\infty}^2 \cdot |\Omega_j(m, \infty)| \leq 2 \left| \Omega_j(m, \infty) \right| \to 0
\]

(33)

as \( m \to \infty \) uniformly in \( j \).

Let \( 0 < \epsilon < C_j/3 \). By (H3) there is \( l_\epsilon > 0 \) such that
\[
|\nabla W(t, u)| < \frac{\epsilon}{4T} |u|
\]

(34)

for all \( |t| \leq l_\epsilon \). Consequently,
\[
\int_{\Omega_j(0, l_\epsilon)} \left| \frac{\nabla W(t, u)}{u} \right|^2 dt \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4T} \int_{\Omega_j(0, l_\epsilon)} |u_j|^2 dt
\]

(35)

\[
\leq \frac{\epsilon}{4T} \|u\|_{L^p}^2 < \epsilon
\]

for all \( j \).

By (31), we can take \( m_\epsilon \) large such that
\[
\int_{\Omega_j(m_\epsilon, \infty)} |u_j|^2 dt < \frac{\epsilon}{M_0}.
\]

(36)

Hence, by (H2) one has
\[
\int_{\Omega_j(l, m_\epsilon)} \left| \frac{\nabla W(t, u)}{u} \right|^2 dt \leq M_0 \int_{\Omega_j(l, m_\epsilon)} |u_j|^2 dt < \epsilon
\]

(37)

for all \( j \). By (32) there exists \( j_0 \) such that
\[
\int_{\Omega_j(l, m_\epsilon)} \left| \frac{\nabla W(t, u)}{u} \right|^2 dt \leq M_0 \int_{\Omega_j(l, m_\epsilon)} |u_j|^2 dt < \epsilon
\]

(38)

for all \( j \geq j_0 \). By (35)–(38), one has
\[
\limsup_{j \to \infty} \int_{-T}^{T} \left| \frac{\nabla W(t, u)}{u} \right|^2 dt \leq 3\epsilon < C_1
\]

which contradicts with (26). So \( \{u_j\} \) is bounded in \( E_T \). In a similar way to Proposition B. 35 in [21], we can prove that \( \{u_j\} \) has a convergent subsequence. Hence \( I \) satisfies the (C) condition.

Step 2. We show that the functional \( I \) satisfies the condition (A1) of Theorem 4.

Observe that, by (H3) and (H4), given \( 0 < \epsilon < a \), there exists some \( C_C > 0 \) such that
\[
|W(t, u)| \leq |u|^2 + C_C |u|^p
\]

(40)

for all \( u \in \mathbb{R}^N \) and \( t \in [-T, T] \), where \( p > 2 \). It follows from (H1), (40), and Proposition 3 that
\[
I(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-T}^{T} |\dot{u}(t)|^2 dt + \int_{-T}^{T} K(t, u(t)) dt
- \int_{-T}^{T} W(t, u(t)) dt
\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\dot{u}\|_{L^2_T}^2 + a \|u\|_{L^p_T}^2 - \epsilon \|u\|_{L^p_T}^2 - C_C \|u(t)\|^{p} dt
\]

(41)

\[
\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\dot{u}\|_{L^2_T}^2 + a \|u\|_{L^p_T}^2 - \epsilon \|u\|_{L^p_T}^2 - 2TC_C \|u\|_{L^p_T}^2
\geq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, a - \epsilon \right\} \|u\|^2 - 2^{p+1} TC_C\|u\|^p.
\]
Hence there exist $\alpha > 0$ and $\rho > 0$ such that $I(u) \geq \alpha$ for all $u \in E_T$ with $\|u\| = \rho$.

**Step 3.** We show that the functional $I$ satisfies the condition (A$_2$) of Theorem 4.

By (H$_2$), there exists $B > 0$ such that
\[
W(t, u) \geq w_{\text{loc}}|u|^2 - B, \quad \forall t \in [-T, T], \; u \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{42}
\]
Let
\[
e(t) = \frac{\zeta^2}{2} \int_{-T}^T |\cos(\omega t)|^2 dt + \int_{t \in [-T, T]; |\xi(t)| \leq 1} K(t, e(t)) dt
\]
\[
\quad + \int_{t \in [-T, T]; |\xi(t)| \geq 1} K(t, e(t)) dt - \int_{-T}^T W(t, e(t)) dt
\]
\[
\quad \leq \frac{T\zeta^2}{2} \omega^2 + 2TA + A \int_{t \in [-T, T]; |\xi(t)| \leq 1} |e(t)|^6 dt
\]
\[
\quad - w_{\text{loc}}\zeta^2 \int_{-T}^T |\sin(\omega t)|^2 dt + 2TB
\]
\[
= \frac{T\zeta^2}{2} \omega^2 + 2TA + A\zeta^2 \int_{-T}^T |\sin(\omega t)|^2 dt - Tw_{\text{loc}}\zeta^2
\]
\[
\quad + 2TB
\]
\[
= T\left(\frac{\omega^2}{2} + A - w_{\text{loc}}\zeta^2\right)^2 + 2T(A + B). \tag{44}
\]
Since $w_{\text{loc}} > 2A + 32\pi^2$ and $T > \sqrt{2A/\pi}$, then $\omega^2/2 + A - w_{\text{loc}} < 0$. So $I(e) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $|\xi| \rightarrow \infty$. So, we can choose large enough $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\xi| > \rho$ and $I(e) < 0$.

Clearly $I(0) = 0$; then, by application of Theorem 4, there exists a critical point $u_T \in E_T$ of $I$ such that $I(u_T) \geq \alpha$ for all $T > \sqrt{2A/\pi}$.

**Lemma 8.** $u_T$ is bounded uniformly in $T > \sqrt{2A/\pi}$.

**Proof.** Define the set of paths
\[
\Gamma_T = \{f \in C([0, 1], E_T) \mid |f(0)| = 0, f(1) = e\}. \tag{45}
\]
It follows from Lemma 7 that there exists a solution $u_T$ of problem (II) at which
\[
\inf_{f \in \Gamma_T} \max_{t \in [0, 1]} I(f(t)) = D_T \tag{46}
\]
is achieved. Let $\bar{T} > T$. Since any function in $E_T$ can be regarded as belonging to $E_{\bar{T}}$ if one extends it by zero in $[-\bar{T}, \bar{T}] \setminus [-T, T]$, then $\Gamma_T \subset \Gamma_{\bar{T}}$. Therefore, for any solution $u_T$ of problem (II), we obtain
\[
I(u_T) = D_T \leq D_{1/2} \text{ uniformly in } T > \sqrt{2A/\pi}. \tag{47}
\]
Notice that $I'(u_T) = 0$, and together with (47), one has
\[
I(u_T) \leq D_{1/2}, \quad (1 + u_T)\|I'(u_T)\| = 0. \tag{48}
\]
The rest of the proof is similar to that of Step 1 in Lemma 7. Hence there exists a constant $M_1 > 0$, independent of $T$ such that
\[
\|u_T\| \leq M_1, \quad \forall T > \sqrt{2A/\pi}. \tag{49}
\]
The proof is complete. \qed

Take a sequence $T_n \to \infty$, and consider the problem (II) on the interval $[-T_n, T_n]$. By Lemma 7, there exists a nontrivial solution $u_n := u_{T_n}$ of problem (II).

**Lemma 9.** Let $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence given above. Then there exists a subsequence $\{u_{n_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ convergent to $u_0$ in $C^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N)$.

**Proof.** First we prove that the sequences $\|u_n\|_{L_2}, \|\dot{u}_n\|_{L_2},$ and $\|\ddot{u}_n\|_{L_2}$ are bounded. From (14) and (49), for $n$ large enough, one has
\[
\|u_n\|_{L_2} \leq CM_1 := M_2. \tag{50}
\]
By (II) and (50), for all $t \in [-T_n, T_n]$, there exists $M_3 > 0$ independent of $n$ such that
\[
\|\dot{u}_n\|_{L_2} \leq M_3. \tag{51}
\]
It follows from the Mean Value Theorem that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $\tau_n \in [t - 1, t]$ such that
\[
\dot{u}_n(t_n) = \int_{t_1}^t \ddot{u}_n(s) ds = u_n(t) - u_n(t - 1). \tag{52}
\]
Combining the above with (50), and (51) we get
\[
\|u_n(t) - u_n(t - 1)\| \leq \int_{t_1}^t |\ddot{u}_n(s)| ds + \|u_n(t) - u_n(t - 1)\|
\]
\[
\leq M_3 + 2M_2 := M_4
\]
and hence for $n$ large enough
\[
\|\dot{u}_n\|_{L_2} \leq M_4. \tag{54}
\]
Second we show that the sequences $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\dot{u}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are equicontinuous. Indeed, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, by (54), we have
\[
|u_n(t_1) - u_n(t_2)| \leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\ddot{u}_n(s)| ds
\]
\[
\leq M_3 |t_1 - t_2|. \tag{55}
\]
Similarly, by (51), one gets
\[ |u_n(t_1) - u_n(t_2)| \leq M_2 |t_1 - t_2|. \]  
(56)
By using the Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem, we obtain the existence of a subsequence \( \{u_{n_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) and a function \( u_0 \) such that
\[ u_{n_j} \longrightarrow u_0, \quad \text{as} \quad j \longrightarrow \infty \quad \text{in} \quad C^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N). \]  
(57)
The proof is complete. \( \square \)

**Lemma 10.** Let \( u_0 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N \) be the function given by (57). Then \( u_0 \) is the homoclinic solution of (HS).

**Proof.** First we show that \( u_0 \) is a solution of (HS). Let \( \{u_{n_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) be the sequence given by Lemma 9, then
\[ \ddot{u}_{n_j}(t) + \nabla V(t, u_{n_j}(t)) = 0 \]  
(58)
for every \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( t \in [-T_n', T_n'] \). Take \( b, c \in \mathbb{R} \) with \( b < c \). There exists \( j_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for all \( j > j_0 \), we get \([b, c] \subset [-T_n', T_n'] \) and
\[ \ddot{u}_{n_j}(t) = -\nabla V(t, u_{n_j}(t)), \quad \forall t \in [b, c]. \]  
(59)
Integrating (59) from \( b \) to \( t \in [b, c] \), we have
\[ \dot{u}_{n_j}(t) - \dot{u}_{n_j}(b) = -\int_b^t \nabla V(s, u_{n_j}(s)) \, ds, \quad \forall t \in [b, c]. \]  
(60)
Since \( u_{n_j} \to u_0 \) uniformly on \([b, c]\) and \( \dot{u}_{n_j} \to \dot{u}_0 \) uniformly on \([b, c]\) as \( j \to \infty \), then, from (60), we obtain
\[ \dot{u}_0(t) - \dot{u}_0(b) = -\int_b^t \nabla V(s, u_0(s)) \, ds, \quad \forall t \in [b, c]. \]  
(61)
Because of the arbitrariness of \( b \) and \( c \), we conclude that \( u_0 \) satisfies (HS).

Second we prove that \( u_0(t) \to 0 \), as \( |t| \to \infty \). Note that, by (49), for \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), there exists \( j_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that, for all \( j > j_0 \), one has
\[ \int_{-T_j}^{T_j} \left[ |u_n(t)|^2 + |\dot{u}_n(t)|^2 \right] \, dt \leq M_1^2. \]  
(62)
Letting \( j \to \infty \), one gets
\[ \int_{-T_j}^{T_j} \left[ |u_0(t)|^2 + |\dot{u}_0(t)|^2 \right] \, dt \leq M_1^2 \]  
(63)
and letting \( j \to \infty \), we have
\[ \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[ |u_0(t)|^2 + |\dot{u}_0(t)|^2 \right] \, dt \leq M_1^2 \]  
(64)
and so
\[ \int_{|t| \geq r} \left[ |u_0(t)|^2 + |\dot{u}_0(t)|^2 \right] \, dt \to 0. \]  
(65)
From Lemma 6 and (65), we obtain \( u_0(t) \to 0 \) as \( |t| \to \infty \).

Next we show that \( \dot{u}_0(t) \to 0 \) as \( |t| \to \infty \). Indeed, applying again Lemma 6 to \( u_0 \), we obtain
\[ |\dot{u}_0(t)| \leq \sqrt{2} \left( \int_{-t_1/2}^{t_1/2} \left( |\dot{u}_0(s)|^2 + |\dot{u}_0(s)|^2 \right) \, ds \right)^{1/2}. \]  
(66)
Also, from (65), we get
\[ \int_{-1/2}^{t_1/2} |\dot{u}_0(s)|^2 \, ds \to 0, \quad \text{as} \quad |t| \to \infty. \]  
(67)
Hence, it is enough to prove that
\[ \int_{-1/2}^{t_1/2} \left| \dot{u}_0(s) \right|^2 \, ds \to 0, \quad \text{as} \quad |t| \to \infty. \]  
(68)
Since \( u_0 \) is a solution of (HS), one has
\[ \int_{-1/2}^{t_1/2} \left| \dot{u}_0(s) \right|^2 \, ds = \int_{-1/2}^{t_1/2} \left| \nabla V(s, u_0(s)) \right|^2 \, ds. \]  
(69)
Since \( \nabla V(t, 0) = 0 \) for all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( u_0(t) \to 0 \), as \( |t| \to \infty \), (68) follows from (69).

Finally, similar to the proof in [12], we can prove that \( u_0 \) is nontrivial, and we omit it here. The proof of Theorem 1 is complete. \( \square \)
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