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Abstract. In this paper, we investigate the existence of periodic and subharmonic solutions for the first order Hamiltonian systems. By virtue of auxiliary functions, we obtain some kinds of new superquadratic growth conditions. Using the minimax methods in critical point theory, several new existence and multiplicity theorems are established.

1. Introduction and main results

In this paper, we are concerned with the following non-autonomous first order Hamiltonian systems

\[-J\dot{u} - B(t)u = \nabla H(t, u),\]

(1.1)

where \(B(t)\) is a symmetric \(2N \times 2N\) -matrix, continuous and \(T\)-periodic in \(t\), \(T > 0\), \(H \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}, \mathbb{R})\) is a \(T\)-periodic function in \(t\), \(J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I_N \\ I_N & 0 \end{pmatrix}\) is the standard \(2N \times 2N\) symplectic matrix.

In the celebrated paper [8], making use of critical point theory, Rabinowitz has established the existence of periodic solutions of the non-autonomous Hamiltonian systems with a classical superquadratic condition, namely,

\((S)\) there exist \(\mu > 2\) and \(L_1 > 0\) such that

\[0 < \mu H(t, z) \leq (\nabla H(t, z), z), \quad \forall (t, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2N} \text{ with } |z| \geq L_1,\]

where \((\cdot, \cdot)\) denotes the Euclid’s inner product and \(|\cdot|\) denotes the corresponding Euclid’s norm. For results on the existence of periodic and subharmonic solutions of Hamiltonian systems under condition \((S)\), we refer the reader to the book of Mawhin and Willem [6], where an extensive literature is given. After that, generalized superquadratic conditions covering condition \((S)\) were raised in many literature, such as [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. Particularly, for periodic solution, in [3], Li, Ou and Tang have proved the following theorem with the aid of the local linking theorem.

Mathematics subject classification (2020): 34C25, 58E05.

Keywords and phrases: Periodic solutions, subharmonic solutions, superquadratic, local linking theorem, generalized mountain pass theorem.

This work is partially supported by The National Natural Science Foundation of China (11571176, 11701289) and Jiangsu Province Science Foundation for Youths (BK20170936).
THEOREM A. (see [3]) Suppose that $H \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies the following conditions:

$(H_0)$ $H(t,z)$ is a $T$-periodic function in $t$;

$(H_1)$ $\lim_{|z| \to +\infty} \frac{H(t,z)}{|z|^2} = +\infty$ uniformly for all $t \in [0,T]$;

$(H_2)$ $\lim_{|z| \to 0} \frac{H(t,z)}{|z|^2} = 0$ uniformly for all $t \in [0,T]$;

$(H_3)$ there exist $\lambda > 2$ and $d_1 > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla H(t,z)| \leq d_1 (1 + |z|^{\lambda - 1}) \quad \text{for all } (t,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2N};$$

$(H_4)$ there exist $\beta > \lambda - 2$ such that

$$\liminf_{|z| \to +\infty} \frac{(\nabla H(t,z),z) - 2H(t,z)}{|z|^{\beta}} > 0, \quad \text{uniformly for all } t \in [0,T].$$

If 0 is an eigenvalue of $-J(\frac{d}{dt}) - B(t)$ (with periodic boundary conditions), assume also the condition:

$(H_5)$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

(i) $H(t,z) \geq 0, \quad \forall |z| \leq \delta, \forall t \in [0,T], \text{ or}$

(ii) $H(t,z) \leq 0, \quad \forall |z| \leq \delta, \forall t \in [0,T].$

Then problem (1.1) has at least one non-trivial $T$-periodic solution.

Instead hypothesis $(H_5)$ with the following condition:

$(H_6)$ $H(t,z) \geq 0, \quad \forall (t,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2N},$

they also have considered infinitely many subharmonic solutions of problem (1.1) by virtue of generalized mountain pass theorem. Specially, they have obtained the following results.

THEOREM B. (see [3]) Suppose that $H \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies $(H_0) - (H_2)$, $(H_6)$ and the following conditions:

$(H_7)$ there exist $L_2 > 0$ and $d_2 > 0$ such that

$$(\nabla H(t,z),z) - 2H(t,z) \geq d_2 |z|^2, \quad \forall |z| \geq L_2;$$

$(H_8)$ there exist $L_3 > 0$, $d_3 > 0$ and $\sigma > 1$ such that

$$(\nabla H(t,z),z) - 2H(t,z) \geq d_3 \frac{|\nabla H(t,z)|^\sigma}{|z|^\sigma}, \quad \forall |z| \geq L_3.$$

Then there exist infinitely many subharmonic solutions of problem (1.1).
Theorem C. (see [3]) Suppose that $H \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies $(H_0)-(H_4)$ and $(H_6)$. Then there exist infinitely many subharmonic solutions of problem (1.1).

Motivated by the results of [5, 13, 16, 17, 3, 15, 4], in present paper, introducing several auxiliary functions, we will present some existence and multiplicity theorems under new superquadratic growth conditions. For periodic solutions, we have the following theorems.

Theorem 1. Suppose that $H \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies $(H_0)-(H_2)$ and the following conditions:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item[$(H_9)$] there exist $d_4 > 0$, $d_5 > 0$, $\lambda > 2$ and $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^+)$ with $h(s)$ non-decreasing for all $s \in \mathbb{R}^+$, such that
  \[ |\nabla H(t,z)| \leq d_4[1 + h(|z|)] \quad \text{for all } (t,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}, \]
  \end{enumerate}

where $h$ satisfies the following condition:

\[ h(s) \leq d_5(1 + s^{\lambda - 1}) \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}^+. \]

\begin{enumerate}
  \item[$(H_{10})$] there exist $\sigma_1 > 1$, $M_1 > 0$, $\theta_1 \in C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^+)$ with $\lim_{s \to +\infty} \frac{h(s)}{\theta_1(s)s} = 0$, where $h(s)$ is defined in $(H_9)$, such that
  \[ (\nabla H(t,z),z) - 2H(t,z) \geq \theta_1^{\sigma_1}(|z|), \quad \forall|z| \geq M_1 \text{ and for all } t \in [0,T]. \]
\end{enumerate}

Also assume $(H_5)$ holds if 0 is an eigenvalue of $-J(d/dt) - B(t)$ (with periodic boundary conditions). Then problem (1.1) has at least one non-trivial $T$-periodic solution.

Remark 1. (1) We claim that there exists $d_6 > 0$ such that $h(s) \geq d_6s$ for $s$ large enough. To see this, by $(H_2)$, one has $H(t,0) = 0$. Then it follows from $(H_9)$ that there exists $\alpha \in (0,1)$, such that

\[ |H(t,z)| = |H(t,z) - H(t,0)| \leq |\nabla H(t,\alpha z)||z| \leq d_4[1 + h(|\alpha z|)] |z| \leq d_4h(|z|)|z| + d_4|z| \quad \text{for all } (t,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}. \]

Moreover, by $(H_1)$, we infer that there exist $d_7 > 0$ and $L_4 > 0$ such that

\[ d_7|z|^2 \leq H(t,z) \leq d_4h(|z|)|z| + d_4|z|, \quad \forall|z| \geq L_4 \text{ and for all } t \in [0,T], \]

which implies that the conclusion holds.

(2) We confirm that $\theta_1(s) \to +\infty$ as $s \to +\infty$. Indeed, taking account of $h(s) \geq d_6s$ for $s$ large enough and $\lim_{s \to +\infty} \frac{h(s)}{\theta_1(s)s} = 0$, then we can find that the assertion holds.

(3) We observe that $(H_3)$ and $(H_4)$ are special cases of $(H_9)$ and $(H_{10})$ when $\beta/\sigma_1 > \lambda - 2$. In fact, we only need to put $d_4 = d_1$, $h(s) = s^{\lambda - 1}$ and $\theta_1(s) = s^{\beta/\sigma_1}$, it
is not difficult to verify that 
\( h(s) \leq d_5(1 + s^{\lambda - 1}) \), \( \lim_{s \to +\infty} \frac{h(s)}{(1 + s^{\lambda - 1})} = 0 \), then \((H_9)\), \((H_{10})\) become \((H_3)\) and \((H_4)\). So, from this sense, Theorem 1 partly generalizes Theorem A.

(4) From \((H_{10})\), the above discussions of (1) and (2), there exist \( L_5 > M_1 > 0 \) such that
\[
\frac{\| \nabla H(t, z) \|}{|z|} \geq \frac{\| \nabla H(t, z) \|}{|z|^2} \geq \frac{2H(t, z)}{|z|^2}, \quad \forall |z| \geq L_5 \text{ and for all } t \in [0, T],
\]
which, by \((H_1)\), leads that
\[
\lim_{|z| \to +\infty} \frac{\| \nabla H(t, z) \|}{|z|} = +\infty \quad \text{uniformly for all } t \in [0, T].
\]
Hence, there exists \( d_8 > 0 \) such that
\[
\frac{|z|}{\| \nabla H(t, z) \|} \leq d_8 \quad \text{for all } (t, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}. \tag{1.2}
\]

(5) There exists function \( H(t, z) \) satisfying Theorem 1 and not satisfying the corresponding results in \([8, 5, 3, 15]\). For example, let
\[
H(t, z) := g(t)k(z), \quad \forall (t, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2N},
\]
where \( g(t) \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^+) \), \( g(t + T) = g(t) \), \( T > 0 \), \( \inf_{t \in [0, T]} g(t) > 0 \) and
\[
k(z) := |z|^2 \ln(1 + |z|^2) + \sin |z|^2 - \ln^2(1 + |z|^2) - |z|^2, \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^{2N}.
\]
Obviously, \( H(t, z) \) does not satisfy the condition (S). At the same time, \( \forall \nu > 0 \), we have
\[
\lim_{|z| \to +\infty} \frac{\| \nabla H(t, z) \| - 2H(t, z)}{|z|^{\nu}} = 0
\]
uniformly for all \( t \in [0, T] \), which means that \((H_4)\) and \((H_7)\) do not hold. Therefore, the results of Theorem A, Theorem B and Theorem C cannot be applied. Nevertheless, select \( h(s) = s \ln(1 + s^2), \theta_1(s) = \ln^3/2(1 + s^2), \sigma_1 = 10/9 \), it is easy to check that \( H(t, z) \) satisfies all conditions of Theorem 1. Then, by Theorem 1, problem (1.1) has at least one non-trivial \( T \)-periodic solution.

**Theorem 2.** Suppose that \( H \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}, \mathbb{R}) \) satisfies \((H_0)-(H_2)\) and the following condition:

\[(H_{11})\] there exist \( M_2 > 0 \), \( \sigma_2 > 1 \), \( \theta_2 \in C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^+) \) with \( \lim_{s \to +\infty} \theta_2(s) = +\infty \), such that
\[
\| \nabla H(t, z) \| - 2H(t, z) \geq \left( \theta_2(|z|) \left| \frac{\nabla H(t, z)}{|z|} \right| \right)^{\sigma_2}, \quad \forall |z| \geq M_2 \text{ and for all } t \in [0, T].
\]
Also assume \((H_5)\) holds if 0 is an eigenvalue of \(-J(d/dt) - B(t)\) (with periodic boundary conditions). Then problem (1.1) has at least one non-trivial \( T \)-periodic solution.
Remark 2. We see that assumptions (H3) and (H4) could imply (H11). As a matter of fact, by (H3), there exists $d_9 > 0$ and $L_8 > 0$ such that
\[
|\nabla H(t,z)| \leq d_9 |z|^\lambda - 1, \quad \forall |z| \geq L_8 \text{ and for all } t \in [0,T].
\] (1.3)

Let $\epsilon_1 := \frac{1}{2} (\beta - \lambda + 2)$. Note that we have $\beta > \lambda - 2$, hence $\epsilon_1 > 0$. Let $\theta_2(s) = \ln(1 + s), s \in \mathbb{R}^+, \sigma_2 = \frac{\beta - \epsilon_1}{\lambda - 2} > 1$, from (H4) and (1.3), we conclude that there exist $M_2 > L_8 > 0$ and $d_{10} > 0$ such that
\[
(\nabla H(t,z), z) - 2H(t,z)) \geq d_{10} |z|^{\beta} \geq d_9^{\sigma_2} \frac{\ln \sigma_2(1 + |z|)}{|z|^{\epsilon_1}} |z|^{\beta} \\
= d_9^{\sigma_2} \left( \ln(1 + |z|) |z|^{\lambda - 2} \right) \sigma_2 \\
\geq \left( \theta_2(|z|) \frac{|\nabla H(t,z)|}{|z|} \right)^{\sigma_2}, \quad \forall |z| \geq M_2 \text{ and for all } t \in [0,T],
\]
which implies (H11) is true. Hence, Theorem 2 greatly improves Theorem A.

Next, turn our attentions to the subharmonic solutions, we have

Theorem 3. Suppose that $H \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies (H0)–(H2), (H6), (H9) and (H10). Then there exist infinitely many subharmonic solutions of problem (1.1).

Remark 3. By Remark 1 (3), then Theorem 3 partially generalizes Theorem C.

Theorem 4. Suppose that $H \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies (H0)–(H2), (H6) and (H11). Then there exist infinitely many subharmonic solutions of problem (1.1).

Remark 4. Clearly, (H11) is stronger than condition (H8), however, Theorem 4 is a novel contribution that does not rely on assumption (H7) in Theorem B. As such, it can be regarded as a complementary extension of Theorem B. Furthermore, from Remark 2, we know Theorem 4 completely extends Theorem C.

Finally, we would like to point out that the idea of introducing auxiliary functions and obtaining new superquadratic conditions used here is essentially due to [16, 17], where the authors deal with the existence of periodic solutions to certain second order Hamiltonian systems. However, we cannot apply the methods of [16, 17] directly, because problem (1.1) is strongly indefinite, this causes some new difficulties, we need some crucial modifications for our proofs.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we set up the basic framework in which we study the variational problem associated to (1.1), and we also collect some elementary facts that will be used later. In Section 3, applying local linking theorem and generalized mountain pass theorem, we discuss the periodic and subharmonic solutions of problem (1.1) under different types of potential conditions.
2. Preliminaries

First of all, let \( S_T := \mathbb{R}/(T\mathbb{Z}) \), \( E := W^{1/2,2}(S_T, \mathbb{R}^{2N}) \) be the Sobolev space of \( T \)-periodic \( \mathbb{R}^{2N} \)-valued functions with the inner product \((\cdot, \cdot)_E\) and \( \| \cdot \|_E \) defined by

\[
(u, v)_E := Ta \bar{b} + T \sum_{k \neq 0} |k|a_k \bar{b}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_E := \left( T|a_0|^2 + T \sum_{k \neq 0} |k||a_k|^2 \right)^{1/2}
\]

for \( u, v \in E \), where

\[
u(t) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \exp \left( \frac{2k \pi t}{T} \right) \quad a_k, \quad a_k \in \mathbb{C}^{2N}, a_{-k} = \overline{a_k}
\]

and

\[
v(t) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \exp \left( \frac{2k \pi t}{T} \right) \quad b_k, \quad b_k \in \mathbb{C}^{2N}, b_{-k} = \overline{b_k}.
\]

Define two self-adjoint operators \( A, B \in L(E) \) by extending the bilinear forms

\[
(Au, v) = \int_0^T (-J \dot{u}, v)dt, \quad (Bu, v) = \int_0^T (B(t)u, v)dt, \quad \forall u, v \in E.
\]

Let \( E^+, E^- \) and \( E^0 \) be the positive, negative and null eigenspace of the linear operator \( A - B \), respectively. Then we can consider the splitting \( E = E^- \oplus E^0 \oplus E^+ \) and an equivalent inner product in \( E \), denoted by \((\cdot, \cdot)\), for \( u = u^- + u^0 + u^+ \) and \( v = v^- + v^0 + v^+ \in E = E^- \oplus E^0 \oplus E^+ \), defined by

\[
(u, v) = ((A-B)u^+, v^+)_E - ((A-B)u^-, v^-)_E + (u^0, v^0)_E.
\]

Then, we have

\[
\int_0^T (-J \dot{u} - B(t)u, u)dt = ((A-B)u, u)_E = \|u^+\|^2 - \|u^-\|^2.
\]

As we know, space \( E \) has the following important embedding property.

**Lemma 1.** \( E \) is compactly embedding in \( L^\gamma(S_T, \mathbb{R}^{2N}) \) for \( \gamma \in [1, +\infty) \) and there exists \( \tau_\gamma > 0 \) such that

\[
\|u\|_{L^\gamma} \leq \tau_\gamma \|u\|, \quad \forall u \in E, \tag{2.1}
\]

where \( \| \cdot \|_{L^\gamma} \) denotes the usual norm on \( L^\gamma \) for all \( 1 \leq \gamma < +\infty \).

Now we define a functional \( \varphi \) on \( E \) by

\[
\varphi(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (-J \dot{u} - B(t)u, u)dt - \int_0^T H(t, u)dt
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \left( \|u^+\|^2 - \|u^-\|^2 \right) - \int_0^T H(t, u)dt. \tag{2.2}
\]
It is well known that $T$-periodic solutions of problem (1.1) correspond to the critical points of $\varphi$, and

$$(\varphi'(u), v) = \int_0^T (-J\dot{u} - B(t)u, v) dt - \int_0^T (\nabla H(t, u), v) dt$$

$$= (u^+ - u^-, v) - \int_0^T (\nabla H(t, u), v) dt$$

for any $u, v \in E$.

3. Proofs of main results

In the following, we will denote various positive constants as $C_i, i = 1, 2, \cdots$. To prove Theorem 1, we shall use the following local linking theorem (Theorem 2.2 in [11]). Let $X$ be a real Banach space with $X = X^1 \oplus X^2$ and $X^j_0 \subset X^j_1 \subset \cdots \subset X^j$ such that $X^j = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X^j_n, j = 1, 2$. For every multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$. Let $X_\alpha = X^1_{\alpha_1} \oplus X^2_{\alpha_2}$. We say $\alpha \leq \beta \iff \alpha_1 \leq \beta_1, \alpha_2 \leq \beta_2$. A sequence $(\alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ is admissible if, for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2$ there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \geq m \Rightarrow \alpha_n \geq \alpha$.

**DEFINITION 1.** We say that $\varphi \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies the $(C)^*$ condition if every sequence $(u_{\alpha_n})$ such that $(\alpha_n)$ is admissible and satisfying

$$u_{\alpha_n} \in X_{\alpha_n}, \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \varphi (u_{\alpha_n}) < +\infty, \quad (1 + \|u_{\alpha_n}\|) \varphi'(u_{\alpha_n}) \to 0$$

contains a subsequence which converges to a critical point of $\varphi$.

**LEMMA 2.** (Luan and Mao [11]) Suppose that $\varphi \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies the following assumptions:

(a) $X^1 \neq \{0\}$ and $\varphi$ has a local linking at $0$, that is, for some $r > 0$,

$$\varphi(u) \geq 0, \quad \forall u \in X^1 \text{ with } \|u\| \leq r;$$

$$\varphi(u) \leq 0, \quad \forall u \in X^2 \text{ with } \|u\| \leq r;$$

(b) $\varphi$ satisfies $(C)^*$ condition;

(c) $\varphi$ maps bounded sets into bounded sets;

(d) For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varphi(u) \to -\infty$ as $\|u\| \to +\infty$ on $X^1_m \oplus X^2$.

Then $\varphi$ has at least one non-zero critical point.

The following lemmas give the basic compactness assumptions needed to use min-max methods.

**LEMMA 3.** Assume that $(H_9)$ and $(H_{10})$ hold. Then $\varphi$ satisfies $(C)^*$ condition.
Proof. Set \( X = E, X^1 = E^+ \oplus E^0 \) and \( X^2 = E^- \). Choose Hilbert basis \( \{e_n\}_{n \geq 1} \) for \( X^1 \) and \( \{e_n\}_{n \leq -1} \) for \( X^2 \), define

\[
X^1_n := \text{span}\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},
\]
\[
X^2_n := \text{span}\{e_{-1}, \cdots, e_{-n}\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},
\]
\[
X_j := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X^j_n, \quad j = 1, 2.
\]

Let \( \{u_{\alpha_n}\} \) be a sequence in \( E \) such that \( \{\alpha_n\} \) is admissible and satisfying

\[
u_{\alpha_n} \in X_{\alpha_n}, \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \phi(u_{\alpha_n}) < +\infty, \quad (1 + \|u_{\alpha_n}\|)\phi'(u_{\alpha_n}) \to 0.
\] (3.1)

By a standard argument, we only need to prove that \( \{u_{\alpha_n}\} \) is a bounded sequence in \( X \). Otherwise, going if necessary to a subsequence, we can assume that \( \|u_{\alpha_n}\| \to +\infty \) as \( n \to +\infty \).

Since \( \lim_{s \to +\infty} \frac{h(s)}{\theta_1(s)} = 0 \), then, \( \forall \varepsilon > 0 \), we can easily get that there exists \( M_3 \geq M_1 > 0 \) such that

\[
\frac{h(s)}{\theta_1(s)} \leq \varepsilon s, \quad \forall s \geq M_3.
\] (3.2)

Denote \( \Omega_{1n} := \{ t \in [0, T] | \|u_{\alpha_n}\| > M_3 \} \) and \( \Omega_{2n} := \{ t \in [0, T] | \|u_{\alpha_n}\| \leq M_3 \} \). Using (2.2), (2.3), (3.1) and (H10), for \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), we deduce that

\[
C_1 \geq 2\phi(u_{\alpha_n}) - (\phi'(u_{\alpha_n}), u_{\alpha_n})
\]
\[
= \int_0^T [(\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_n}), u_{\alpha_n}) - 2H(t, u_{\alpha_n})]dt
\]
\[
= \int_{\Omega_{1n}} [(\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_n}), u_{\alpha_n}) - 2H(t, u_{\alpha_n})]dt + \int_{\Omega_{2n}} [(\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_n}), u_{\alpha_n}) - 2H(t, u_{\alpha_n})]dt
\]
\[
\geq \int_{\Omega_{1n}} \theta_1^{\sigma_1}(\|u_{\alpha_n}\|)dt - C_0,
\] (3.3)

which implies that

\[
\int_{\Omega_{1n}} \theta_1^{\sigma_1}(\|u_{\alpha_n}\|)dt \leq C_2.
\] (3.4)

Applying Hölder’s inequality, (2.1), (3.2) and (3.4), it follows that

\[
\int_{\Omega_{1n}} h(\|u_{\alpha_n}\|)u^+_{\alpha_n} |dt = \int_{\Omega_{1n}} \theta_1(\|u_{\alpha_n}\|) \frac{h(\|u_{\alpha_n}\|)}{\theta_1(\|u_{\alpha_n}\|)} |u^+_{\alpha_n}| dt
\]
\[
\leq \left( \int_{\Omega_{1n}} \theta_1^{\sigma_1}(\|u_{\alpha_n}\|) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_1}} \left[ \int_{\Omega_{1n}} \left( \frac{h(\|u_{\alpha_n}\|)}{\theta_1(\|u_{\alpha_n}\|)} \|u^+_{\alpha_n}\|^{\frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_1 - 1}} \right)^{\frac{\sigma_1 - 1}{\sigma_1}} dt \right]^{\frac{\sigma_1 - 1}{\sigma_1}}
\]
\[
\leq C_2^{\frac{1}{\sigma_1}} \left[ \int_{\Omega_{1n}} \left( \frac{h(\|u_{\alpha_n}\|)}{\theta_1(\|u_{\alpha_n}\|)} \right)^{\frac{2\sigma_1}{\sigma_1 - 1}} dt \right]^{\frac{\sigma_1 - 1}{2\sigma_1}} \left( \int_{\Omega_{1n}} |u^+_{\alpha_n}|^{\frac{2\sigma_1}{\sigma_1 - 1}} dt \right)^{\frac{\sigma_1 - 1}{2\sigma_1}}
\]
\[
\leq \varepsilon_{2} \mathcal{C}_{2}^{\frac{1}{2\sigma_{1}} \frac{1}{1}} \|u_{\alpha_{n}}\| \frac{2\sigma_{1}}{\| u_{\alpha_{n}} \|^{2}} \frac{2\sigma_{1}}{\| u_{\alpha_{n}} \|^{2}} \\
\leq \varepsilon_{2} \mathcal{C}_{2}^{\frac{1}{2\sigma_{1}} \frac{1}{1}} \|u_{\alpha_{n}}\| \| u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+} \|
\]

(3.5)

for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Obviously, we have

\[
\int_{\Omega_{2n}} h(|u_{\alpha_{n}}|) u_{n}^{+} \, dt \leq C_{3} \|u_{n}^{+}\|_{L^{1}} \leq C_{3} \|u_{n}^{-}\|
\]

(3.6)

for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). As a consequence, for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), (2.1), (2.3), (3.1), (3.5), (3.6) and (H9) give that

\[
(\varphi'(u_{\alpha_{n}}), u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+}) = \|u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+}\|^{2} - \int_{0}^{T} (\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_{n}}), u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+}) \, dt \\
\geq \|u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+}\|^{2} - \int_{0}^{T} |\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_{n}})||u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+}| \, dt \\
\geq \|u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+}\|^{2} - d_{4} \int_{0}^{T} h(|u_{\alpha_{n}}|)|u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+}| \, dt - d_{4} \int_{0}^{T} |u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+}| \, dt \\
\geq \|u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+}\|^{2} - \varepsilon_{2} d_{4} C_{2}^{\frac{1}{2\sigma_{1}} \frac{1}{1}} \|u_{\alpha_{n}}\| \|u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+}\| - d_{4} C_{3} \|u_{\alpha_{n}}\| - d_{4} \tau_{1} \|u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+}\|
\]

which implies that

\[
\frac{\|u_{\alpha_{n}}^{+}\|}{\|u_{\alpha_{n}}\|} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow +\infty.
\]

(3.7)

Similarly for \( u_{\alpha_{n}}^{-} \), one has

\[
\frac{\|u_{\alpha_{n}}^{-}\|}{\|u_{\alpha_{n}}\|} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow +\infty.
\]

(3.8)

On the other hand, from (3.2) and Remark 1 (1), for \( \varepsilon_{2} > 0 \) mentioned above and \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), we conclude

\[
\int_{\Omega_{1n}} |u_{\alpha_{n}}|^{2} \, dt = \int_{\Omega_{1n}} \theta_{1}(\|u_{\alpha_{n}}\|) \frac{|u_{\alpha_{n}}|^{2}}{\theta_{1}(\|u_{\alpha_{n}}\|)} \, dt \\
\leq \left( \int_{\Omega_{1n}} \theta_{1}^{\sigma_{1}}(\|u_{\alpha_{n}}\|) \, dt \right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_{1}}} \left[ \int_{\Omega_{1n}} \left( \frac{|u_{\alpha_{n}}|^{2}}{\theta_{1}(\|u_{\alpha_{n}}\|)} \right)^{\sigma_{1} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\sigma_{1}} - 1}} \, dt \right]^{\frac{\frac{1}{\sigma_{1}}}{\frac{1}{\sigma_{1}} - 1}} \\
\leq \varepsilon_{2} d_{6} C_{2}^{\frac{1}{2\sigma_{1}} \frac{1}{1}} \|u_{\alpha_{n}}\|^{\frac{2\sigma_{1}}{L^{\sigma_{1} \frac{1}{\sigma_{1}} - 1}}} \\
\leq \varepsilon_{2} d_{6} C_{2}^{\frac{1}{2\sigma_{1}} \frac{1}{1}} \|u_{\alpha_{n}}\|^{2}.
\]

(3.9)
Moreover, we know, for \( n \in \mathbb{N} \),
\[
\int_{\Omega_{2n}} |u_{\alpha_n}|^2 dt \leq C_4. \tag{3.10}
\]

Then, noting \( \dim E^0 < +\infty \), for \( n \) large enough, (3.9) and (3.10) ensure that
\[
C_5 \|u^0_{\alpha_n}\|^2 \leq \int_0^T |u^0_{\alpha_n}|^2 dt \leq \int_0^T |u_{\alpha_n}|^2 dt \leq \frac{\varepsilon_2}{d_6} C_2^\frac{1}{\alpha_1} \varepsilon_2^2 \sigma_1 \|u_{\alpha_n}\|^2 + C_4,
\]
which implies that
\[
\frac{\|u^0_{\alpha_n}\|}{\|u_{\alpha_n}\|} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to +\infty. \tag{3.11}
\]

Consequently, together with (3.7), (3.8) and (3.11), we obtain
\[
1 = \frac{\|u_{\alpha_n}\|}{\|u_{\alpha_n}\|} \leq \frac{\|u^0_{\alpha_n}\| + \|u^-_{\alpha_n}\| + \|u^+_{\alpha_n}\|}{\|u_{\alpha_n}\|} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to +\infty,
\]
a contradiction. Therefore, \((u_{\alpha_n})\) is bounded. Then we conclude that the \((C)^*\) condition is satisfied. \(\square\)

**Lemma 4.** Assume that \((H_{11})\) holds. Then \(\varphi\) satisfies \((C)^*\) condition.

**Proof.** Let \((u_{\alpha_n})\) be a sequence in \(E\) such that \((\alpha_n)\) is admissible and satisfying (3.1). Now we will prove that \((u_{\alpha_n})\) is bounded. Otherwise, without loss of generality, we may assume that \(\|u_{\alpha_n}\| \to +\infty\) as \(n \to +\infty\). In view of \(\lim_{s \to +\infty} \theta_2(s) = +\infty\), then \(\forall \varepsilon_3 > 0\), there exists \(M_4 > 0\) such that
\[
\frac{1}{\theta_2(s)} < \varepsilon_3, \quad \forall s \geq M_4. \tag{3.12}
\]

Let \(\Omega^+_{1n} := \{ t \in [0, T] | |u_n(t)| > M_4 \} \), \(\Omega^+_{2n} := \{ t \in [0, T] | |u_n(t)| \leq M_4 \} \). Using the similar way of (3.3), by \((H_{11})\), one has
\[
\int_{\Omega^+_{1n}} \left( \theta_2(|u_{\alpha_n}|) \frac{\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_n})}{|u_{\alpha_n}|} \right)^{\sigma_2} dt \leq C_6, \tag{3.13}
\]
By (3.12), (3.13), (2.1) and Hölder’s inequality, for \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), we derive that

\[
\int_{\Omega^+_n} |\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_n})|u_{\alpha_n}^+|dt = \int_{\Omega^+_n} \theta_2(|u_{\alpha_n}|) \frac{|\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_n})|}{|u_{\alpha_n}|} \frac{|u_{\alpha_n}|}{\theta_2(|u_{\alpha_n}|)} |u_{\alpha_n}^+|dt \leq \int_{\Omega^+_n} \left( \theta_2(|u_{\alpha_n}|) \frac{|\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_n})|}{|u_{\alpha_n}|} \right)^{\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_2-1}} \frac{1}{\sigma_2-1} dt \leq C_5^{\frac{1}{\sigma_2}} \varepsilon_3 \left( \int_{\Omega^+_n} |u_{\alpha_n}|^{\frac{2\sigma_2}{\sigma_2-1}} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\Omega^+_n} |u_{\alpha_n}^+|^{\frac{2\sigma_2}{\sigma_2-1}} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_5^{\frac{1}{\sigma_2}} \varepsilon_3 \frac{\tau^2}{2\sigma_2-1} \|u_{\alpha_n}\| \|u_{\alpha_n}^+\|. \tag{3.14}
\]

In addition, we obtain

\[
\int_{\Omega^+_{2n}} |\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_n})|u_{\alpha_n}^+|dt \leq C_7 \|u_{\alpha_n}^+\|_{L^1} \leq C_7 \tau \|u_{\alpha_n}^+\| \tag{3.15}
\]

for \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). It follows (3.14), (3.15) and (2.3), for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), that

\[
(\varphi'(u_{\alpha_n}), u_{\alpha_n}^+) = \|u_{\alpha_n}^+\|^2 - \int_0^T (\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_n}), u_{\alpha_n}^+) dt \geq \|u_{\alpha_n}^+\|^2 - \int_0^T |\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_n})|u_{\alpha_n}^+|dt \geq \|u_{\alpha_n}^+\|^2 - C_5^{\frac{1}{\sigma_2}} \varepsilon_3 \frac{\tau^2}{2\sigma_2-1} \|u_{\alpha_n}\| \|u_{\alpha_n}^+\| - C_7 \tau \|u_{\alpha_n}^+\|, \tag{3.16}
\]

which implies that

\[
\|u_{\alpha_n}^+\| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to +\infty. \tag{3.17}
\]

Similarly for \( u_{\alpha_n}^- \), one has

\[
\|u_{\alpha_n}^-\| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to +\infty. \tag{3.18}
\]

Furthermore, by (1.2), (2.1), (3.12), (3.14) and Hölder’s inequality, for \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), we know

\[
\int_{\Omega^+_n} |u_{\alpha_n}|^2 dt = \int_{\Omega^+_n} \theta_2(|u_{\alpha_n}|) \frac{|\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_n})|}{|u_{\alpha_n}|} \frac{1}{\theta_2(|u_{\alpha_n}|)} \|u_{\alpha_n}\|^2 dt \leq \varepsilon_3 d_8 \left( \int_{\Omega^+_n} \theta_2(|u_{\alpha_n}|) \frac{|\nabla H(t, u_{\alpha_n})|}{|u_{\alpha_n}|} dt \right)^{\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_2}} \left( \int_{\Omega^+_n} |u_{\alpha_n}|^{\frac{2\sigma_2}{\sigma_2-1}} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon_3 d_8 \frac{\tau^2}{2\sigma_2-1} \|u_{\alpha_n}\|^2. \tag{3.19}
\]
Moreover, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, one has
\[
\int_{\Omega_{2n}} |u_{\alpha_n}|^2 dt \leq C_8. \tag{3.20}
\]
Combing (3.19) with (3.20), for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have
\[
C_5 \|u_{\alpha_n}^0\|^2 \leq \int_0^T |u_{\alpha_n}^0|^2 dt \leq \int_0^T |u_{\alpha_n}|^2 dt \leq \varepsilon_3 d_8 C_6^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\tau^2}{\sigma_2^{-r}} \|u_{\alpha_n}\|^2 + C_8,
\]
which implies that
\[
\frac{\|u_{\alpha_n}^0\|}{\|u_{\alpha_n}\|} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to +\infty. \tag{3.21}
\]
So, together with (3.17), (3.18) and (3.21), one has
\[
1 = \frac{\|u_{\alpha_n}\|}{\|u_{\alpha_n}\|} \leq \frac{\|u_{\alpha_n}^0\| + \|u_{\alpha_n}^-\| + \|u_{\alpha_n}^+\|}{\|u_{\alpha_n}\|} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to +\infty,
\]
a contradiction. Therefore, $(u_{\alpha_n})$ is bounded. Then $(C)^*$ condition holds. □

Now, we can prove our main results.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** From $(H_9)$, we can obtain there exists $d_{13} > 0$ such that
\[
|\nabla H(t,z)| \leq d_{13}(1 + |z|^{\lambda - 1}), \quad \forall (t,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2N}.
\]
Then, using the same arguments of Theorem 1 in [3], we know $\varphi$ satisfies conditions $(a)$, $(c)$ and $(d)$ of Lemma 2. What’s more, by Lemma 3, we see that condition $(b)$ of Lemma 2 is also satisfied. Thus, from Lemma 2, problem (1.1) has at least one non-trivial $T$-periodic solution. □

**Proof of Theorem 2.** Noting that $(H_{11})$ implies $(H_8)$, then, using Lemma 4 and the proof of Theorem 1, we infer that problem (1.1) has at least one non-trivial $T$-periodic solution. □

**Proof of Theorem 3.** For a given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, making the change of variables $\xi = k^{-1} t$, thus, if $u(t)$ is a $kT$-periodic solution of problem (1.1), $\eta(\xi) = u(k\xi)$ satisfies
\[
-J\dot{\eta}(\xi) - kB(k\xi)\eta = k\nabla H(k\xi, \eta). \tag{3.22}
\]
Hence, finding a $kT$-periodic solution of problem (1.1) is equivalent to finding a $T$-periodic solution of problem (3.22). Certainly, $kH(k\xi, \eta)$ satisfies the conditions of our Theorem 1, there is a solution $\eta_k(\xi)$ of problem (3.22), which is a critical point of
\[
\varphi_k(\eta) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (-J\dot{\eta} - kB(k\xi)\eta, \eta) d\xi - k \int_0^T H(k\xi, \eta) d\xi.
\]
Using Lemma 3, the arguments of [3] and the generalized mountain pass theorem in [9], we can easily get problem (3.22) has infinitely many $T$-periodic solution, that is, problem (1.1) has infinitely many subharmonic solutions. □
Proof of Theorem 4. From Lemma 4 and the proof of Theorem 3, we see that there exist infinitely many subharmonic solutions of problem (1.1). □
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