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#### Abstract

We prove the local existence of solutions to the Cauchy problem $x^{\prime \prime} \in F\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)+f\left(t, x, x^{\prime}\right), x(0)=x_{0}, x^{\prime}(0)=y_{0}$, where $F$ is a set-valued map contained in the Fréchet subdifferential of a $\phi$-convex function of order two and $f$ is a Carathéodory single valued map. MSC 2000. 34A60. Key words. Differential inclusions, lower regular function, Clarke subdifferential.


## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider the Cauchy problem for second order differential inclusion

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime \prime} \in F\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)+f\left(t, x, x^{\prime}\right), \quad x(0)=x_{0}, \quad x^{\prime}(0)=y_{0}, \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $F(.,$.$) is a given set-valued map, f(., .,$.$) is a given Carathéodory map$ and $x_{0}, y_{0} \in R^{n}$.

Second order differential inclusions were studied by many authors, mainly in the case when the multifunction is convex valued. Several existence results may be found in [8], [10], [12], etc.

Recently, in [6], [7], [11], the situation when the multifunction is not convex valued is considered. More exactly, in [11] it is proved the existence of solutions of the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime \prime} \in F\left(x, x^{\prime}\right), \quad x(0)=x_{0}, x^{\prime}(0)=y_{0} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

when $F(.,$.$) is an upper semicontinuous compact valued multifunction con-$ tained in the subdifferential of a proper convex function. In [7] it is proved the existence of solutions of the problem (1.1) with $F$ as in [11] and $f(., .,$. is a Carathéodory map. In [6] the existence of solutions for problem (1.2) is obtained with $F(.,$.$) an upper semicontinuous compact valued multifunction$ contained in the Fréchet subdifferential of a $\phi$-convex function of order two.

The aim of this paper is to unify the results quoted above by proving the existence of local solutions of the problem (1.1) when $F(.,$.$) is an upper semi-$ continuous compact valued multifunction contained in the Fréchet subdifferential of a $\phi$-convex function of order two and $f(., .,$.$) is a Carathéodory map.$ Since the class of proper convex functions is strictly contained in the class of $\phi$-convex functions, our result generalizes the one in [7]. Our existence result
contains Peano's existence theorem (for second order differential equations) as a particular case. On the other hand, our result may be considered as an extension of the previous result of Ancona and Colombo ([1]) obtained for first order differential inclusions of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime} \in F(x)+f(t, x), \quad x(0)=x_{0}, \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $F$ a cyclically monotone set-valued map and $f$ a Carathéodory map. The proof of our main result follows the general ideas in [1], [6] and [11].

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we recall some preliminary facts that we need in the sequel and in Section 3 we prove our main result.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We denote by $\mathcal{P}\left(R^{n}\right)$ the set of all subsets of $R^{n}$ and by $R_{+}$the set of all positive real numbers. For $\epsilon>0$ we put $B_{\epsilon}(x)=\left\{y \in R^{n} ;\|y-x\|<\epsilon\right\}$. With $B$ we denote the unit ball in $R^{n}$. By $\operatorname{cl}(A)$ we denote the closure of the set $A \subset R^{n}$, by $\operatorname{co}(A)$ we denote the convex hull of $A$ and we put $\|A\|=$ $\sup \{\|a\| ; a \in A\}$.

Let $\Omega \subset R^{n}$ be an open set and let $V: \Omega \rightarrow R \cup\{+\infty\}$ be a function with domain $D(V)=\left\{x \in R^{n} ; V(x)<+\infty\right\}$.

Definition 2.1. The multifunction $\partial_{F} V: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\left(R^{n}\right)$, defined as:

$$
\partial_{F} V(x)=\left\{\alpha \in R^{n}, \liminf _{y \rightarrow x} \frac{V(y)-V(x)-<\alpha, y-x>}{\|y-x\|} \geq 0\right\} \text { if } V(x)<+\infty
$$

and $\partial_{F} V(x)=\emptyset$ if $V(x)=+\infty$ is called the Fréchet subdifferential of $V$.
We also put $D\left(\partial_{F} V\right)=\left\{x \in R^{n} ; \partial_{F} V(x) \neq \emptyset\right\}$.
According to [9] the values of $\partial_{F} V$ are closed and convex.
Definition 2.2. Let $V: \Omega \rightarrow R \cup\{+\infty\}$ be a lower semicontinuous function. We say that $V$ is a $\phi$-convex of order 2 if there exists a continuous $\operatorname{map} \phi_{V}:(D(V))^{2} \times R^{2} \rightarrow R_{+}$such that for every $x, y \in D\left(\partial_{F} V\right)$ and every $\alpha \in \partial_{F} V(x)$ we have

$$
V(y) \geq V(x)+<\alpha, x-y>-\phi_{V}(x, y, V(x), V(y))\left(1+\|\alpha\|^{2}\right)\|x-y\|^{2}
$$

In [9] there are several examples and properties of such maps.
In what follows, for $F: D \subset R^{n} \times R^{n} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\left(R^{n}\right), f: R \times D \rightarrow R^{n}$ and for any $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \in D$ we consider problem (1.1) under the following assumptions:

HYpOTHESIS 2.3. i) $D \subset R^{n} \times R^{n}$ is an open set and $F: D \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\left(R^{n}\right)$ is upper semicontinuous (i.e., $\forall z \in D, \forall \epsilon>0$ there exists $\delta>0$ such that $\left\|z-z^{\prime}\right\|<\delta$ implies $\left.F\left(z^{\prime}\right) \subset F(z)+\epsilon B\right)$ with compact values.
ii) There exists a proper lower semicontinuous $\phi$-convex function of order two $V: R^{n} \rightarrow R \cup\{+\infty\}$ such that

$$
F(x, y) \subset \partial_{F} V(y), \quad \forall(x, y) \in D
$$

iii) $f: R \times D \rightarrow R^{n}$ is Carathéodory, i.e. for every $(x, y) \in D, t \rightarrow f(t, x, y)$ is measurable, for a.e. $t \in R(x, y) \rightarrow f(t, x, y)$ is continuous and there exists $p(.) \in L^{2}\left(R, R_{+}\right)$such that

$$
\|f(t, x, y)\| \leq p(t) \quad \text { a.e. } t \in R, \quad \forall(x, y) \in D .
$$

Finally, by a solution of problem (1.1) we mean an absolutely continuous function $x():.[0, T] \rightarrow R^{n}$ with absolutely continuous derivative $x^{\prime}($.$) such$ that $x(0)=x_{0}, x^{\prime}(0)=y_{0}$ and

$$
x^{\prime \prime}(t) \in F\left(x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)+f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right) \quad \text { a.e. }[0, T] .
$$

## 3. THE MAIN RESULT

Our main result is the following.
Theorem 3.1. Consider $F: D \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\left(R^{n}\right)$ and $f: R \times D \rightarrow R^{n}$ that satisfies Hypothesis 2.3. Then, for every $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \in D$ there exist $T>0$ and $x():.[0, T] \rightarrow R^{n}$ solution to problem (1.1).

Proof. Consider $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \in D$. Since $D$ is open, there exists $R>0$ such that $\bar{B}_{R}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \subset D$. Moreover, by the upper semicontinuity of $F$ and by Proposition 1.1.3 in [2], the set $F\left(\bar{B}_{R}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\right)$ is compact, hence there exists $M>0$ such that

$$
\sup \left\{\|v\| ; v \in F(x, y) ;(x, y) \in \bar{B}_{R}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\right\} \leq M<+\infty .
$$

Let $\phi_{V}$ the continuous function appearing in Definition 2.2.
Since $V($.$) is continuous on D(V)$ (e.g. [9]), by possibly decreasing $R$ one can assume that for all $y \in B_{R}\left(y_{0}\right) \cap D(V)$

$$
\left|V(y)-V\left(y_{0}\right)\right| \leq 1 .
$$

Put

$$
S:=\sup \left\{\phi_{v}\left(y_{1}, y_{2}, z_{1}, z_{2}\right) ; y_{i} \in \bar{B}_{r}\left(y_{0}\right), z_{i} \in\left[V\left(y_{0}\right)-1, V\left(y_{0}\right)+1\right], i=1,2\right\},
$$

By Hypothesis 2.3 iii) there exists $T>0$ such that

$$
\max \left\{\int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t, T\left(\left\|y_{0}\right\|+2 \int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t\right)\right\}<\frac{R}{2} .
$$

We shall prove the existence of solution of the problem (1.1) on the interval $[0, T]$.

For each $m \geq 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$ we define

$$
t_{m}^{j}=\frac{j T}{m}, I_{m}^{j}=\left[t_{m}^{j-1}, t_{m}^{j}\right], x_{m}^{0}=x_{0}, y_{m}^{0}=y_{0}
$$

and for $t \in I_{m}^{j}$ we define

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{m}(t)=x_{m}^{j}+\left(t-t_{m}^{j}\right) y_{m}^{j}+\int_{t_{m}^{j}}^{t}(t-s)\left[f\left(s, x_{m}^{j}, y_{m}^{j}\right)+u_{m}^{j}\right] \mathrm{d} s, \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $u_{m}^{j} \in F\left(x_{m}^{j}, y_{m}^{j}\right), j=0,1, \ldots, m-1$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{m}^{j+1}=x_{m}^{j}+\frac{T}{m} y_{m}^{j}+\int_{t_{m}^{j}}^{t_{m}^{j+1}}\left(t_{m}^{j+1}-s\right)\left[f\left(s, x_{m}^{j}, y_{m}^{j}\right)+u_{m}^{j}\right] \mathrm{d} s \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{m}^{j+1}=y_{m}^{j}+\int_{t_{m}^{j}}^{t_{m}^{j+1}}\left[f\left(s, x_{m}^{j}, y_{m}^{j}\right)+u_{m}^{j}\right] \mathrm{d} s . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Obviously, from (3.1), if $t \in I_{m}^{j}$, we have

$$
\begin{gather*}
x_{m}^{\prime}(t)=y_{m}^{j}+\int_{t_{m}^{j}}^{t}\left[f\left(s, x_{m}^{j}, y_{m}^{j}\right)+u_{m}^{j}\right] \mathrm{d} s,  \tag{3.4}\\
x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t)=f\left(t, x_{m}^{j}, y_{m}^{j}\right)+u_{m}^{j} . \tag{3.5}
\end{gather*}
$$

For $t \in I_{m}^{j}$ we set $f_{m}(t)=f\left(t, x_{m}^{j}, y_{m}^{j}\right)$.
From (3.3), for any $j=0,1, \ldots, m-1$ one has

$$
\left\|y_{m}^{j}-y_{0}\right\| \leq \int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t<R
$$

and hence $\left\|y_{m}^{j}\right\| \leq\left\|y_{0}\right\|+\int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t$.
Therefore, from (3.4) and the choice of $T$, if $t \in I_{m}^{j}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|x_{m}^{\prime}(t)-y_{0}\right\| & \leq\left\|y_{m}^{j}-y_{0}\right\|+\int_{t_{m}^{j}}^{t}\left[f\left(s, x_{m}^{j}, y_{m}^{j}\right)+u_{m}^{j}\right] \mathrm{d} s \\
& \leq 2 \int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t<R .
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, since

$$
x_{m}^{j}=x_{0}+\frac{T}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} y_{m}^{k}+\sum_{k=0}^{j} \int_{t_{m}^{k}}^{t_{m}^{k+1}}\left(t_{m}^{k+1}-s\right)\left[f\left(s, x_{m}^{k}, y_{m}^{k}\right)+u_{m}^{k}\right] \mathrm{d} s
$$

we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\|x_{m}^{j}-x_{0}\right\| \leq \frac{T}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\left\|y_{m}^{k}\right\|+\sum_{k=0}^{j} \int_{t_{m}^{k}}^{t_{m}^{k+1}}\left|t_{m}^{k+1}-s\right|(p(s)+M) \mathrm{d} s \\
& \leq \frac{T}{m} j\left(\left\|y_{0}\right\|+\int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t\right)+\int_{0}^{t_{m}^{j+1}} T(p(s)+M) \mathrm{d} s \\
& \leq T\left\|y_{0}\right\|+2 T \int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t<R .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, from (3.1) and the choice of $T$, if $t \in I_{m}^{j}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|x_{m}(t)-x_{0}\right\| & \leq\left\|x_{m}^{j}-x_{0}\right\|+\left(t-t_{m}^{j}\right)\left\|y_{m}^{j}\right\| \\
& +\int_{t_{m}^{j}}^{t}|t-s|\left(\left\|f\left(s, x_{m}^{j}, y_{m}^{j}\right)\right\|+\left\|u_{m}^{j}\right\|\right) \mathrm{d} s \\
& \leq T\left\|y_{0}\right\|+2 T \int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t+T\left(\left\|y_{0}\right\|\right. \\
& +\int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t+T \int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t \\
& =2 T\left\|y_{0}\right\|+4 T \int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t<R .
\end{aligned}
$$

So from (3.1), (3.4) and (3.5) it follows that

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\left\|x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\| \leq p(t)+M & \forall t \in[0, T], \\
\left\|x_{m}^{\prime}(t)\right\| \leq\left\|y_{0}\right\|+R & \forall t \in[0, T], \\
\left\|x_{m}(t)\right\| \leq\left\|x_{0}\right\|+R & \forall t \in[0, T] . \tag{3.8}
\end{array}
$$

At the same time, since for all $t \in I_{m}^{j}$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left\|x_{m}^{\prime}(t)-y_{m}^{j}\right\| \leq \int_{t_{m}^{j}}^{t_{m}^{j+1}}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t \\
\left\|x_{m}(t)-x_{m}^{j}\right\| \leq \frac{T}{m}\left(\left\|y_{0}\right\|+\int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t\right)+\frac{T}{m} \int_{t_{m}^{j}}^{t_{m}^{j+1}}(p(t)+M) \mathrm{d} t
\end{gathered}
$$

using the absolute continuity of the Lebesgue integral we infer that for all $t \in[0, T]$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(x_{m}(t), x_{m}^{\prime}(t), x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t)-f_{m}(t)\right) \in \operatorname{graph} F+\epsilon(m)(B \times B \times B), \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\epsilon(m) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.
By (3.6)-(3.8) we obtain that $x_{m}^{\prime \prime}($.$) is bounded in L^{2}\left([0, T], R^{n}\right)$ and $x_{m}($.$) ,$ $x_{m}^{\prime}($.$) are bounded in C\left([0, T], R^{n}\right)$. Moreover, for all $t^{\prime}, t^{\prime \prime} \in[0, T]$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|x_{m}\left(t^{\prime}\right)-x_{m}\left(t^{\prime \prime}\right)\right\| \leq\left|\int_{t^{\prime}}^{t^{\prime \prime}}\left\|x_{m}^{\prime}(s)\right\| \mathrm{d} s\right| \leq\left(\left\|y_{0}\right\|+R\right)\left|t^{\prime}-t^{\prime \prime}\right| \\
& \left\|x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t^{\prime}\right)-x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t^{\prime \prime}\right)\right\| \leq\left|\int_{t^{\prime}}^{t^{\prime \prime}}\left\|x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(s)\right\| \mathrm{d} s\right| \leq\left|\int_{t^{\prime}}^{t^{\prime \prime}}(p(s)+M) \mathrm{d} s\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e. the sequence $x_{m}($.$) is equi lipschitzian and the sequence x_{m}^{\prime}($.$) is equi$ uniformly continuous.

Applying Theorem 0.3.4 in [2] we deduce the existence of a subsequence (again denoted by) $x_{m}($.$) and an absolutely continuous function x():.[0, T] \rightarrow$
$R^{n}$ such that $x_{m}($.$) converges uniformly to x(),. x_{m}^{\prime}($.$) converges uniformly to$ $x^{\prime}($.$) and x_{m}^{\prime \prime}($.$) converges weakly in L^{2}\left([0, T], R^{n}\right)$ to $x^{\prime \prime}($.$) .$

From Hypothesis 2.1 and Theorem 1.4.1 in [2] we find that

$$
x^{\prime \prime}(t)-f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right) \in \operatorname{coF}\left(x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right) \subset \partial_{F} V\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right) \quad \text { a.e. }[0, T] .
$$

Since the mappings $x^{\prime}($.$) is absolutely continuous and x^{\prime \prime}(t) \in \partial_{F} V\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)$ a.e. $([0, T])$ we apply Theorem 2.2 in [5] and we deduce that there exists $T_{1}>0$ such that the mapping $t \rightarrow V\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)$ is absolutely continuous on $\left[0, \min \left\{T, T_{1}\right\}\right]$ and

$$
\left(V\left(x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right)^{\prime}=<x^{\prime \prime}(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)-f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)>\quad \text { a.e. }\left[0, \min \left\{T, T_{1}\right\}\right]
$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that $T=\min \left\{T, T_{1}\right\}$.
Therefore

$$
\begin{align*}
V\left(x^{\prime}(T)\right)-V\left(y_{0}\right) & =\int_{0}^{T}\left\|x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|^{2} \mathrm{~d} t  \tag{3.10}\\
& -\int_{0}^{T}<x^{\prime \prime}(s), f\left(s, x(s), x^{\prime}(s)\right)>\mathrm{d} s
\end{align*}
$$

Since

$$
x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t)-f_{m}(t)=u_{m}^{j} \in F\left(x_{m}^{j}, y_{m}^{j}\right) \subset \partial_{F} V\left(y_{m}^{j}\right), \quad t \in I_{m}^{j}
$$

using the properties of the mapping $V($.$) and the definition of S$ we have for $j=1,2, \ldots, m$ and $m$ fixed

$$
\begin{aligned}
V\left(x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t_{m}^{j+1}\right)\right)- & V\left(x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t_{m}^{j}\right)\right) \geq<u_{m}^{j}, x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t_{m}^{j+1}\right)-x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t_{m}^{j}\right)> \\
- & \phi_{V}\left(x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t_{m}^{j+1}\right), x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t_{m}^{j}\right), V\left(x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t_{m}^{j+1}\right)\right), V\left(x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t_{m}^{j}\right)\right)\right) \\
& \left(1+\left\|u_{m}^{j}\right\|^{2}\right)\left\|x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t_{m}^{j+1}\right)-x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t_{m}^{j}\right)\right\|^{2} \\
\geq< & u_{m}^{j}, x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t_{m}^{j+1}\right)-x_{m}^{\prime}\left(t_{m}^{j}\right)> \\
- & S\left(1+\left\|u_{m}^{j}\right\|^{2}\right)\left\|\int_{t_{m}^{j}}^{t_{m}^{j+1}} x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(s) \mathrm{d} s\right\|^{2} \\
\geq & \int_{t_{m}^{j}}^{t_{m}^{j+1}}\left\|x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(s)\right\|^{2} \mathrm{~d} s-\int_{t_{m}^{j}}^{t_{m}^{j+1}}<f_{m}(s), x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(s)>\mathrm{d} s \\
- & S\left(1+M^{2}\right)\left\|\int_{t_{m}^{j}}^{t_{m}^{j+1}} x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(s) \mathrm{d} s\right\|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

By adding the last inequality for $j=1,2, \ldots, m$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
V\left(x_{m}^{\prime}(T)\right)-V\left(y_{0}\right) & \geq \int_{0}^{T}\left\|x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|^{2} \mathrm{~d} t-\int_{0}^{T}<f_{m}(t), x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t)>\mathrm{d} t \\
& -S\left(1+M^{2}\right) \frac{T}{m}\left\|x_{m}^{\prime}\right\|_{L^{2}}^{2} \\
& \geq \int_{0}^{T}\left\|x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|^{2} \mathrm{~d} t-\int_{0}^{T}<f_{m}(t), x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t)>\mathrm{d} t  \tag{3.11}\\
& -S\left(1+M^{2}\right) \frac{T}{m} \int_{0}^{T}(p(t)+M)^{2} \mathrm{~d} t .
\end{align*}
$$

The convergence of $f_{m}($.$) in L^{2}\left([0, T], R^{n}\right)$ and the convergence of $x_{m}^{\prime \prime}($.$) in$ the weak topology of $L^{2}\left([0, T], R^{n}\right)$ implies that

$$
\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{0}^{T}<f_{m}(t), x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t)>\mathrm{d} t=\int_{0}^{T}<f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right), x^{\prime \prime}(t)>\mathrm{d} t .
$$

Passing to the limit with $m \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.11) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
V\left(x^{\prime}(T)\right)-V\left(y_{0}\right) & \geq \limsup _{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{0}^{T}\left\|x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|^{2} \mathrm{~d} t \\
& -\int_{0}^{T}<f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right), x^{\prime \prime}(t)>\mathrm{d} t
\end{aligned}
$$

So, from (3.10) it follows that

$$
\limsup _{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{0}^{T}\left\|x_{m}^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2} \mathrm{~d} t \leq \int_{0}^{T}\left\|x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|^{2} \mathrm{~d} t
$$

and, since $\left\{x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(.)\right\}_{m}$ converges weakly in $L^{2}\left([0, T], R^{n}\right)$ to $x^{\prime \prime}($.$) , by the lower$ semicontinuity of the norm in $L^{2}\left([0, T], R^{n}\right)$ (e.g. Prop. III. 30 in [3]) we obtain that

$$
\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{0}^{T}\left\|x_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|^{2} \mathrm{~d} t=\int_{0}^{T}\left\|x^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\|^{2} \mathrm{~d} t
$$

i.e., $\left\{x_{m}^{\prime \prime}().\right\}$ converges strongly in $L^{2}\left([0, T], R^{n}\right)$. Hence, there exists a subsequence (still denoted) $x_{m}^{\prime \prime}($.$) that converges pointwise to x^{\prime \prime}($.$) . Since, by$ Hypothesis 2.3, $\operatorname{graph}(F)$ is closed (e.g. [2], p. 41) from (3.9) we infer that

$$
d\left(\left(x(t), x^{\prime}(t), x^{\prime \prime}(t)-f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)\right), \operatorname{graph}(F)\right)=0 \quad \text { a.e. }[0, T] .
$$

Thus

$$
x^{\prime \prime}(t) \in F\left(x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right)+f\left(t, x(t), x^{\prime}(t)\right), \quad \text { a.e. }[0, T] .
$$

Obviously, $x($.$) satisfies the initial conditions and the proof is complete.$
Remark 3.2. If $V():. R^{n} \rightarrow R$ is a proper lower semicontinuous convex function then (e.g. [9]) $\partial_{F} V(x)=\partial V(x)$, where $\partial V($.$) is the subdifferential in$ the sense of convex analysis of $V($.$) , and Theorem 3.1$ yields the result in [7]. If $f(t, x, y) \equiv 0$ then Theorem 3.1 yields the result in [6], which contains as a particular case (when $V($.$) is convex) the result in [11].$
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