iJRASET
International Journal For Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH
IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Volume: 14 Issue: V Month of publication: May 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2026.81903

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)
ISSN: 2321-9653; IC Value: 45.98; SJ Impact Factor: 7.538
Volume 14 Issue V May 2026- Available at www.ijraset.com

Qualitative Properties of Nonlinear ODE Solutions and Their Role in Certifiable AI-Driven Computational Science

Archana Kumari[1], Dr. Mukesh Kumar Madhukar[2]
[1]*Research Scholar, Dept. of Mathematics, A.N. College Patna*
[2]*Associate Professor, Dept. of Mathematics, College of Commerce, Arts and Science, Patliputra University, Patna 800020*

Abstract: The qualitative analysis of nonlinear ordinary differential equations (ODEs) — encompassing existence, uniqueness, non-negativity, and monotonicity of solutions — forms a critical mathematical prerequisite for the deployment of AI-driven computational solvers in scientific and engineering applications. This paper presents a rigorous and self-contained study of these qualitative properties for a general class of nonlinear scalar ODEs satisfying continuity, monotonicity, and Lipschitz conditions. Existence of a non-negative solution is established via the Schauder fixed-point theorem [5], uniqueness and continuous dependence via Gronwall's inequality [6], and monotonicity via a sign analysis of the governing equation. The theoretical results are anchored by three worked examples covering logistic growth [2], compartmental epidemic dynamics [1],[7], and power-law decay models. A dedicated section translates these analytical guarantees into certifiability criteria for AI-based solvers, including physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) [3], Bayesian neural ODEs [4],[8], and ensemble uncertainty quantification methods [9],[10]. The proposed framework provides a mathematically principled pathway toward trustworthy, certified AI-driven computational science.

Keywords: ***Nonlinear ODEs; Non-negative solutions; Monotonic solutions; Existence and uniqueness; Schauder fixed-point theorem; Gronwall inequality; Physics-informed neural networks; Uncertainty quantification; Certifiable AI; Scientific computing.***

I. INTRODUCTION

Nonlinear ordinary differential equations (ODEs) are the primary mathematical language through which the laws governing dynamical phenomena in physics, biology, engineering, and the social sciences are expressed and studied. From the logistic growth model of population ecology [2] to the compartmental models of infectious disease spread [1],[7], from chemical reaction kinetics to structural mechanics, nonlinear ODEs encode the causal relationships between a system's state and its rate of change. A prerequisite for the meaningful use of any such model — whether for analysis, prediction, or control — is a rigorous understanding of the qualitative properties of its solutions: Does a solution exist? Is it unique? Does it remain non-negative? Is it monotone?

These questions, collectively addressed under the umbrella of qualitative ODE theory [5],[6], have profound practical significance. Non-negativity is physically mandated whenever the state variable represents a quantity that cannot assume negative values — such as a population count, a chemical concentration, or a probability. Monotonicity encodes a structural property of the dynamics — growth without reversal, decay without oscillation — that constrains the admissible solution set and facilitates both analytical treatment and numerical approximation [6],[11]. Existence and uniqueness, established through the classical theory of Coddington and Levinson [5] and the integral inequality apparatus of Lakshmikantham and Leela [6], guarantee that the model is well-posed and that its solutions are well-defined objects amenable to computation.

In the contemporary landscape of scientific computing, these classical mathematical guarantees have acquired a new and urgent relevance. The past decade has witnessed the rapid rise of AI-based computational methods — most notably physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) [3] and neural ODEs [4] — as powerful alternatives or complements to traditional numerical solvers. PINNs [3] incorporate the governing differential equations directly into a neural network training objective, enabling mesh-free, data-augmented solution of ODEs and partial differential equations. Neural ODEs [4] parameterize the vector field of a dynamical system with a deep neural network and leverage adjoint-based sensitivity analysis for efficient gradient computation. Both paradigms have demonstrated impressive empirical performance across a range of scientific and engineering tasks.

However, the deployment of these AI-based solvers in high-stakes applications — clinical epidemic forecasting, safety-critical control systems, environmental modeling — demands more than empirical accuracy: it demands certifiability [8],[9]. A certifiable AI solver is one whose outputs can be accompanied by rigorous mathematical guarantees concerning their correctness, physical admissibility, and robustness to perturbations in inputs and model parameters. The absence of such guarantees is a well-recognized limitation of current AI-based scientific computing tools [3],[8]. Specifically, neither PINNs nor neural ODEs inherently guarantee that their learned solutions satisfy non-negativity or monotonicity — properties that are not only physically required but also essential for the stability and interpretability of downstream uncertainty quantification (UQ) pipelines [9],[10].

The present paper addresses this gap by developing a comprehensive qualitative theory for a general class of nonlinear scalar ODEs, and by systematically deriving from this theory a set of certifiability criteria for AI-based solvers. The paper makes the following original contributions:

1) A rigorous existence theorem for non-negative solutions via the Schauder fixed-point theorem [5], with an explicit a priori bound and a detailed constructive proof via the Picard operator in the space of continuous non-negative functions.
2) A uniqueness and continuous-dependence theorem via Gronwall's inequality [6], establishing Hadamard well-posedness and providing explicit sensitivity estimates that serve as the analytical foundation for error certification of AI solvers.
3) A monotonicity theorem with a full proof and a companion comparison principle for equations with sign-changing right-hand sides, extending the results of [5],[6] to the qualitative setting relevant to AI applications.
4) A priori error bounds and stability estimates that translate the qualitative solution properties into rigorous certification criteria for PINNs [3], Bayesian neural ODEs [4],[8], and ensemble-based uncertainty quantification methods [9],[10].
5) Three fully worked examples — a logistic growth equation [2], a reduced epidemic compartment model [1],[7], and a power-law decay ODE — demonstrating the explicit verification of assumptions and the numerical illustration of AI solver certification bounds.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II establishes the mathematical framework and key definitions. Section III proves existence of non-negative solutions. Section IV establishes uniqueness and continuous dependence. Section V analyses monotonicity and the comparison principle. Section VI derives a priori error and stability bounds. Section VII translates these results into certifiability criteria for AI-based solvers. Section VIII presents three worked examples. Section IX concludes with a discussion of future research directions.

II. MATHEMATICAL FRAMEWORK AND PRELIMINARIES

We study the qualitative properties of solutions to the following nonlinear scalar initial value problem (IVP), which represents a broad and important class of dynamical systems arising in science and engineering [5],[6]:

$$y'(x) = f(x, y(x)), \quad x \in [0, b], \qquad (1a)$$

$$y(0) = y_0 \geq 0, \qquad (1b)$$

where $y(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ is the unknown state variable, $x \in [0,b]$ is the independent variable (time or a spatial coordinate), $b > 0$ is a finite horizon, and $f : [0,b] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ is a nonlinear function encoding the system's dynamics. The domain $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0,+\infty)$ for the second argument of f reflects the requirement that the state y(x) remain physically admissible, i.e., non-negative.

The integral formulation of (1), which is equivalent to (1) for classical solutions and which forms the basis of the fixed-point analysis [5], is:

$$y(x) = y_0 + \int_0^x f(s, y(s))\, ds, \quad x \in [0, b]. \qquad (2)$$

A. Function Spaces and Norms

Let C([0,b]) denote the Banach space of real-valued continuous functions on [0,b] equipped with the supremum norm $\|y\| = \sup_{x \in [0,b]} |y(x)|$.

Define the cone of non-negative continuous functions:

$$C_+([0,b]) = \{ y \in C([0,b]) : y(x) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in [0,b] \}.$$

The cone $C_+([0,b])$ is a closed convex subset of C([0,b]) and is the natural solution space for problems with non-negativity constraints [6]. The Picard operator $T : C_+([0,b]) \to C([0,b])$ is defined by the right-hand side of the integral equation (2):

$$(Ty)(x) = y_0 + \int_0^x f(s, y(s))\, ds.$$

B. Key Definitions

Definition 2.1 (Classical Solution). A function $y : [0,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is a classical solution of (1) if $y \in C^1([0,b])$, $y(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [0,b]$, and equation (1a) holds pointwise together with the initial condition (1b) [5].

Definition 2.2 (Non-Negative Monotonic Solution). A classical solution y of (1) is called a non-negative monotonic solution if $y(x) \geq 0$ and $y'(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [0,b]$, i.e., y is simultaneously non-negative and non-decreasing on [0,b] [6].

Definition 2.3 (Certifiable AI Solver). An AI-based solver û_θ for (1) is said to be certifiable with tolerance (ε_r, ε_i) if |û_θ'(x) − f(x, û_θ(x))| ≤ ε_r for all $x \in [0,b]$ and |û_θ(0) − y_0| ≤ ε_i, and if û_θ(x) ≥ 0 for all $x \in [0,b]$ [3],[8].

C. Assumptions

The following assumptions are imposed on f throughout this paper. They are physically natural and mathematically standard [5],[6], and are satisfied by all models considered in Section VIII.

(H1) Continuity: f(x, y) is continuous on $[0,b] \times \mathbb{R}_+$.

(H2) Monotonicity: f(x, y) is non-decreasing in y for all $x \in [0,b]$ and $y \geq 0$.

(H3) Non-negativity at zero: $f(x, 0) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [0,b]$.

(H4) Lipschitz condition: There exists $L > 0$ such that $|f(x,y_1) - f(x,y_2)| \leq L|y_1 - y_2|$ for all $y_1, y_2 \geq 0$ and $x \in [0,b]$.

(H5) Sub-linear growth: There exist constants $a \geq 0$ and $c > 0$ such that $f(x, y) \leq a + cy$ for all $x \in [0,b]$ and $y \geq 0$.

Assumption (H1) ensures f is bounded on compact sets and the Picard operator T is well-defined on $C_+([0,b])$ [5]. Assumption (H2) encodes a cooperative or monotone structure, meaning larger state values produce no smaller rates of change — a property characteristic of transmission-driven epidemic models [1],[7] and autocatalytic chemical reactions. Assumption (H3) prevents the trivial state y = 0 from being a negative flux source, ensuring trajectories initialized at $y_0 \geq 0$ remain non-negative [6]. Assumption (H4) is the classical Lipschitz condition in y, uniformly in x, which is the minimal regularity for uniqueness theory [5],[6]. Assumption (H5) is a mild growth bound that ensures solutions do not exhibit finite-time blow-up and allows global existence results to be derived via Gronwall's inequality [6].

III. EXISTENCE OF NON-NEGATIVE SOLUTIONS

We first establish the existence of at least one non-negative classical solution of (1) under the minimal assumptions (H1)–(H3), without yet requiring the Lipschitz condition (H4). The proof employs Schauder's fixed-point theorem [5], applied to the Picard operator T in the Banach space C([0,b]).

Theorem 3.1 (Existence of a Non-Negative Solution). Suppose assumptions (H1)–(H3) hold. Then the initial value problem (1) possesses at least one non-negative classical solution $y \in C^1([0,b])$ satisfying $y(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [0,b]$.

Proof. We construct a closed convex invariant set for the Picard operator T and apply Schauder's theorem [5]. The proof proceeds in four steps.

Step 1 (Boundedness constant): Let $M = \sup\{|f(x,y)| : x \in [0,b], 0 \leq y \leq y_0 + Mb\}$. By (H1) and (H5), this supremum is finite. Set $R = y_0 + Mb > 0$.

Step 2 (Invariance): Define the closed convex set $K = \{y \in C([0,b]) : 0 \leq y(x) \leq R \text{ for all } x\}$. For any $y \in K$, since $y(x) \geq 0$ and (H2)–(H3) give $f(s,y(s)) \geq f(s,0) \geq 0$:

$$(Ty)(x) = y_0 + \int_0^x f(s,y(s))\, ds \geq y_0 \geq 0.$$

Moreover, $(Ty)(x) \leq y_0 + Mx \leq y_0 + Mb = R$. Thus T maps K into K.

Step 3 (Compactness): For any $y \in K$ and $x_1, x_2 \in [0,b]$ with $x_1 < x_2$:

$$|(Ty)(x_2) - (Ty)(x_1)| \leq M(x_2 - x_1).$$

The family T(K) is therefore uniformly bounded and equicontinuous on [0,b]. By the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem [5], T(K) is relatively compact in C([0,b]).

Step 4 (Schauder [5]): The operator $T : K \to K$ is continuous by (H1) and dominated convergence, and T(K) is relatively compact. Schauder's fixed-point theorem therefore guarantees the existence of $y^* \in K$ with $Ty^* = y^*$, which is a non-negative classical solution of (1).

Remark 3.1. The a priori bound $R = y_0 + Mb$ is explicit and computable. For AI solver certification, this bound provides a hard constraint that can be imposed on the neural network output: û_θ(x) ≤ R for all $x \in [0,b]$, serving as a physically motivated clipping criterion [3],[8].

Corollary 3.1 (Global Existence). If f additionally satisfies the sub-linear growth bound (H5) with constants a, c > 0, then the non-negative solution of (1) exists on $[0,+\infty)$. This follows from iterating Theorem 3.1 on successive intervals $[kb, (k+1)b]$ with the a priori estimate renewed at each step using Gronwall's inequality [6].

IV. UNIQUENESS AND CONTINUOUS DEPENDENCE

Under the additional Lipschitz assumption (H4), the non-negative solution guaranteed by Theorem 3.1 is unique. Moreover, solutions depend continuously on the initial datum y_0, a property that is fundamental to the certifiability of AI solvers [3],[8].

Theorem 4.1 (Uniqueness and Hadamard Well-Posedness). Suppose assumptions (H1)–(H4) hold. Then the non-negative solution of (1) is unique on [0,b]. Furthermore, if y and z are solutions with initial data y_0 and z_0 respectively, the following continuous-dependence estimate holds:

$$\|y - z\|_{C([0,b])} \leq |y_0 - z_0| \cdot e^{Lb}. \qquad (3)$$

Proof. Let y and z be two non-negative solutions of (1) with initial data y_0 and z_0. Using the integral representation (2) for each:

$$|y(x) - z(x)| \leq |y_0 - z_0| + \int_0^x |f(s,y(s)) - f(s,z(s))|\, ds.$$

Applying the Lipschitz condition (H4):

$$|y(x) - z(x)| \leq |y_0 - z_0| + L \int_0^x |y(s) - z(s)|\, ds.$$

The integral form of Gronwall's inequality [6] applied to the non-negative function $\varphi(x) = |y(x) - z(x)|$ yields:

$$|y(x) - z(x)| \leq |y_0 - z_0| \cdot e^{Lx} \leq |y_0 - z_0| \cdot e^{Lb},$$

for all $x \in [0,b]$. Setting $y_0 = z_0$ gives $|y(x) - z(x)| = 0$ for all x, establishing uniqueness. The general estimate gives (3), confirming Hadamard well-posedness [5].

□

Remark 4.1. Estimate (3) has direct significance for AI solver certification: it quantifies the maximum error in the learned solution due to error in specifying the initial condition. If the initial condition is known up to error $\delta_i = |y_0 - z_0|$, then the solution error is at most $\delta_i \cdot e^{Lb}$ — a computable, finite bound for any fixed horizon b and Lipschitz constant L [8],[9].

Theorem 4.2 (Continuous Dependence on f). Let y and z be solutions of $y' = f(x,y)$ and $z' = g(x,z)$ respectively, with the same initial datum $y_0 = z_0$. Suppose both f and g satisfy (H1)–(H4) and $\|f - g\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Then:

$$\|y - z\|_{C([0,b])} \leq (\varepsilon/L)(e^{Lb} - 1). \qquad (4)$$

Proof. The proof mirrors that of Theorem 4.1, with the perturbation ε replacing the initial data difference. The integral inequality yields $|y(x) - z(x)| \leq \varepsilon \cdot x + L \int_0^x |y(s) - z(s)|\, ds$, and Gronwall's inequality [6] gives (4).

□

Remark 4.2. Theorem 4.2 certifies the robustness of AI solvers to model misspecification [3],[8]. If the AI solver learns a vector field g that approximates the true f up to error ε in the supremum norm, estimate (4) guarantees that the resulting trajectory error is bounded by $(\varepsilon/L)(e^{Lb} - 1)$, which is small when ε is small relative to L [9],[10].

V. MONOTONICITY ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON PRINCIPLE

Monotonicity of solutions is a fundamental structural property with significant implications for both the mathematical analysis of ODEs and the physical interpretability of AI-based solvers [6],[11]. In this section, we establish conditions under which the unique non-negative solution of (1) is monotonically non-decreasing, and we derive a comparison principle for cases where monotonicity does not hold globally.

Theorem 5.1 (Non-Decreasing Monotonicity). Suppose (H1)–(H4) hold, $y_0 \geq 0$, and $f(x,y) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [0,b]$ and $y \geq 0$. Then the unique solution y of (1) satisfies $y'(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [0,b]$, i.e., y is monotonically non-decreasing.

Proof. Since y is the unique non-negative solution guaranteed by Theorems 3.1 and 4.1, $y(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [0,b]$. The governing equation (1a) gives:

$$y'(x) = f(x, y(x)) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in [0,b],$$

where the inequality follows from the hypothesis $f \geq 0$ on $[0,b] \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Since $y'(x) \geq 0$ everywhere on [0,b], y is non-decreasing.

□

Theorem 5.2 (Monotone Decreasing Solutions). If $f(x,y) \leq 0$ for all $x \in [0,b]$ and $y \geq 0$, and f satisfies (H1) and (H4), then the unique non-negative solution y of (1) with $y_0 > 0$ is monotonically non-increasing. If additionally $f(x,0) = 0$, then $y(x) > 0$ for all $x \in [0,b]$.

Proof. Under the stated hypotheses, $y'(x) = f(x, y(x)) \leq 0$ for all x, giving non-increasing behavior. Non-negativity follows from the Gronwall estimate (Theorem 4.1): since $y_0 > 0$ and $f(x,0) = 0$, the solution cannot reach zero in finite time, as that would require $f(x,0) < 0$, contradicting the hypothesis.

□

Theorem 5.3 (Comparison Principle). Suppose f satisfies (H1)–(H4). Let y and z be solutions of (1) with initial data y_0 and z_0 respectively, and suppose $y_0 \leq z_0$. Then $y(x) \leq z(x)$ for all $x \in [0,b]$.

Proof. Set $w(x) = z(x) - y(x)$. Then $w(0) = z_0 - y_0 \geq 0$ and:

$$w'(x) = f(x,z(x)) - f(x,y(x)).$$

By the Lipschitz condition (H4) and the representation (2):

$$|w(x)| \leq w(0) + L \int_0^x |w(s)|\, ds.$$

Gronwall's inequality [6] gives $w(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [0,b]$, since $w(0) \geq 0$ and the integral term preserves the sign. Thus $y(x) \leq z(x)$ for all x.

□

Remark 5.1. The comparison principle (Theorem 5.3) provides a powerful tool for bounding AI solver outputs from above and below [8],[9]. If a sub-solution y_- and a super-solution y_+ can be constructed analytically or numerically, then any certifiable AI solver output $\hat{u}_\theta$ satisfying the ODE residual condition of Definition 2.3 must satisfy $y_-(x) \leq \hat{u}_\theta(x) \leq y_+(x)$ for all $x \in [0,b]$, yielding a computable pointwise certificate on the solution [3],[10].

VI. A PRIORI ERROR BOUNDS AND STABILITY ESTIMATES

The qualitative results of Sections III–V translate directly into a priori error bounds and stability estimates for AI-based computational solvers [3],[8],[9]. In this section, we derive a hierarchy of such bounds, progressing from basic residual estimates to comprehensive certification inequalities.

A. Residual-Based Error Certificate

Let $\hat{u}_\theta : [0,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a candidate AI solver output — for example, the output of a trained PINN [3] or neural ODE [4] — and let $r(x) = \hat{u}_\theta'(x) - f(x, \hat{u}_\theta(x))$ denote the ODE residual at point x. Define the residual tolerance $\varepsilon_r = \|r\|_\infty$ and the initial condition error $\varepsilon_i = |\hat{u}_\theta(0) - y_0|$. The following theorem provides the fundamental error certificate.

Theorem 6.1 (Residual-Based Error Certificate). Let y be the unique solution of (1) under (H1)–(H4), and let $\hat{u}_\theta$ be a certifiable AI solver (Definition 2.3) with residual tolerance ε_r and initial condition error ε_i. Then for all $x \in [0,b]$:

$$|y(x) - \hat{u}_\theta(x)| \leq \varepsilon_i \cdot e^{Lx} + (\varepsilon_r/L)(e^{Lx} - 1). \quad (5)$$

Proof. Let $e(x) = y(x) - \hat{u}_\theta(x)$. Then $e(0) = y_0 - \hat{u}_\theta(0)$ with $|e(0)| \leq \varepsilon_i$. The error satisfies:

$$e'(x) = f(x,y(x)) - \hat{u}_\theta'(x) = f(x,y(x)) - f(x,\hat{u}_\theta(x)) - r(x).$$

Integrating and applying (H4):

$$|e(x)| \leq \varepsilon_i + L \int_0^x |e(s)|\, ds + \varepsilon_r \cdot x.$$

Gronwall's inequality [6] applied to this yields estimate (5).

□

Remark 6.1. Estimate (5) is the cornerstone of AI solver certification [3],[8]. It shows that the global solution error $\|y - \hat{u}_\theta\|$ is controlled by two independently verifiable quantities: the ODE residual ε_r, which can be evaluated at any set of collocation points, and the initial condition error ε_i, which is directly measurable [9],[10]. For a trained PINN with $\varepsilon_r = 10^{-3}$, $\varepsilon_i = 10^{-4}$, $L = 1$, and $b = 10$, the maximum solution error is bounded by approximately 2.2×10^{-2}.

B. Stability Under Parameter Perturbations

In practice, both the vector field f and the initial condition y_0 are subject to uncertainty — arising from measurement noise, model misspecification, or the stochastic nature of AI training [9],[10]. The following corollary combines Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 to provide a stability bound under simultaneous perturbations.

Corollary 6.1 (Combined Stability Bound). Suppose the true system has vector field f and initial datum y_0, and the AI solver approximates a perturbed system with vector field g (with $\|f - g\|_\infty \le \varepsilon_f$) and initial datum $\hat{y}_0$ (with $|y_0 - \hat{y}_0| \le \varepsilon_i$). Then the solution error satisfies:

$$\|y - \hat{y}\|_{C([0,b])} \le \varepsilon_i \cdot e^{Lb} + (\varepsilon_f/L)(e^{Lb} - 1). \quad (6)$$

C. Non-Negativity and Monotonicity Certificates

Beyond approximation accuracy, certified AI solvers must preserve the structural properties established in Sections III–V [8],[9]. The following proposition provides operational criteria for verifying these properties in practice.

Proposition 6.1 (Structural Certification). Let $\hat{u}_\theta$ be a certifiable AI solver with error bound (5). If $\varepsilon_i \cdot e^{Lb} + (\varepsilon_r/L)(e^{Lb} - 1) < y_{min}$, where $y_{min} = \min_{x \in [0,b]} y(x) > 0$, then $\hat{u}_\theta(x) > 0$ for all $x \in [0,b]$, i.e., $\hat{u}_\theta$ preserves non-negativity. Similarly, if $\varepsilon_r < \min_{x} f(x, y(x))$, then $\hat{u}_\theta'(x) > 0$ for all x, preserving monotonicity [3],[8].

VII. CERTIFIABLE AI-BASED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING

The qualitative theory and error bounds developed in Sections III–VI provide a comprehensive analytical foundation for certifiable AI-based scientific computing. In this section, we translate these results into concrete design principles and certification protocols for three classes of AI-based solvers: PINNs [3], Bayesian neural ODEs [4],[8], and ensemble-based uncertainty quantification methods [9],[10].

A. Certifiable Physics-Informed Neural Networks

A PINN for the IVP (1) constructs an approximation $\hat{u}_\theta : [0,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ by minimizing the composite loss function [3],[8]:

$$L(\theta) = \lambda_1 L_{res}(\theta) + \lambda_2 L_{ic}(\theta) + \lambda_3 L_{mon}(\theta) + \lambda_4 L_{nn}(\theta), \quad (7)$$

where the four loss components are:

$$L_{res}(\theta) = (1/N_c) \Sigma_i |\hat{u}_\theta'(x_i) - f(x_i, \hat{u}_\theta(x_i))|^2,$$
$$L_{ic}(\theta) = |\hat{u}_\theta(0) - y_0|^2,$$
$$L_{mon}(\theta) = (1/N_c) \Sigma_i \max(0, -\hat{u}_\theta'(x_i))^2,$$
$$L_{nn}(\theta) = (1/N_c) \Sigma_i \max(0, -\hat{u}_\theta(x_i))^2,$$

with $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{N_c}$ a set of collocation points, and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4 > 0$ tuning weights [3]. The loss components L_{res} and L_{ic} enforce satisfaction of the ODE and initial condition respectively, providing the residual ε_r and initial error ε_i for the certification bound (5). The additional terms L_{mon} and L_{nn} are novel regularization terms motivated by Theorems 5.1 and 3.1 respectively: L_{mon} penalizes violations of monotonicity and L_{nn} penalizes violations of non-negativity directly in the loss function [8],[9].

The certification protocol for PINNs proceeds as follows. After training, evaluate the residual $\varepsilon_r = \max_{i} |\hat{u}_\theta'(x_i) - f(x_i, \hat{u}_\theta(x_i))|$ and the initial error $\varepsilon_i = |\hat{u}_\theta(0) - y_0|$ on a dense test grid. Compute the error bound (5) using the known Lipschitz constant L (or an upper bound derived from the neural network architecture via spectral normalization [10]). If the resulting bound satisfies the Proposition 6.1 criteria, the PINN output is certified as a physically admissible, non-negative, monotone approximation to the true solution [3],[8].

B. Bayesian Neural ODEs and Epistemic Uncertainty

Bayesian neural ODEs [4],[8] extend the neural ODE framework by treating the network weights θ as random variables with a posterior distribution P(θ | D) conditioned on observed data D. The resulting predictive distribution over solutions is:

$$P(\hat{u} \mid x, D) = \int P(\hat{u} \mid x, \theta)\, P(\theta \mid D)\, d\theta,$$

which captures epistemic uncertainty arising from finite training data [8],[9]. The qualitative theory of Sections III–V provides constraints on this predictive distribution: since the true solution y(x) is non-negative and monotone (under the assumptions of Theorems 3.1 and 5.1), samples from the predictive distribution that violate these properties are physically inadmissible and should be assigned zero probability mass [9],[10]. Formally, the posterior should be conditioned on the event $A = \{\theta : \hat{u}_\theta(x) \ge 0$ and $\hat{u}_\theta'(x) \ge 0$ for all $x \in [0,b]\}$, using the characterization of this event provided by Proposition 6.1.

The continuous-dependence estimate (3) of Theorem 4.1 further constrains the predictive variance. If the initial condition y_0 is uncertain with variance σ^2_i, the solution variance at position x is bounded above by [6],[9]:

$$Var[y(x)] \le \sigma^2_i \cdot e^{2Lx}. \quad (8)$$

This bound provides a rigorous upper envelope on the epistemic uncertainty propagated through the Bayesian neural ODE, enabling calibrated confidence intervals for the AI solver output at any point $x \in [0,b]$ [9],[10].

C. Ensemble-Based Uncertainty Quantification

Ensemble UQ methods [9],[10] train multiple AI solver instances $\{\hat{u}^k_\theta\}_{k=1}^K$ with different random initializations or on different bootstrap samples of the training data, and estimate uncertainty from the resulting ensemble spread. The comparison principle (Theorem 5.3) provides the ensemble with a rigorous ordering guarantee: if $\hat{u}^k_\theta(0) \le \hat{u}^{k+1}_\theta(0)$ for all k, then $\hat{u}^k_\theta(x) \le \hat{u}^{k+1}_\theta(x)$ for all $x \in [0,b]$ and all k, provided each ensemble member satisfies the ODE residual condition of Definition 2.3 [3],[9]. Furthermore, the combined stability bound (6) of Corollary 6.1 provides a theoretical justification for the empirical observation that ensemble spread approximates predictive uncertainty: since each ensemble member $\hat{u}^k_\theta$ deviates from the true solution by at most the bound in (6), the ensemble spread $\|\hat{u}^k_\theta - \hat{u}^{k'}_\theta\|$ is at most twice the bound in (6), and is thus a valid — if conservative — proxy for the true approximation error [9],[10]. This provides a formal link between the empirical ensemble spread and the theoretical error certificates of the present framework.

VIII. WORKED EXAMPLES

We illustrate the theoretical framework through three worked examples. Each example explicitly verifies assumptions (H1)–(H5), applies the main theorems, and demonstrates the computation of AI solver certification bounds.

A. Example 1: Logistic Growth Equation

Example 8.1. Consider the logistic IVP: $y' = ry(1 - y/K)$, $y(0) = y_0$, with $r = 1$, $K = 10$, $y_0 = 1$, on $[0, 5]$.

Solution. Verification of assumptions: $f(x,y) = y(1 - y/10)$ is continuous on $[0,5] \times \mathbb{R}_+$ (H1). For $y \in [0,5]$, $\partial f/\partial y = 1 - y/5 \ge 0$, confirming (H2). $f(x,0) = 0 \ge 0$ (H3). The Lipschitz constant is $L = \max_{y \in [0,10]} |1 - y/5| = 1$ (H4). Sub-linear growth holds with $a = 0$, $c = 1$ (H5).

By Theorem 3.1, a non-negative solution exists. By Theorem 4.1, it is unique with continuous-dependence constant $e^{Lb} = e^5 \approx 148.4$. The exact solution is $y(x) = 10/(1 + 9e^{-x})$, which is non-negative and non-decreasing, confirming Theorem 5.1.

AI Certification: For a PINN with $\varepsilon_r = 10^{-3}$ and $\varepsilon_i = 10^{-4}$, bound (5) gives $\|y - \hat{u}_\theta\| \le 10^{-4} \cdot e^5 + 10^{-3}(e^5 - 1) \approx 0.163$. Applying Proposition 6.1 with $y_{min} = y_0 = 1 > 0.163$ certifies that $\hat{u}_\theta(x) > 0$ for all $x \in [0,5]$.

B. Example 2: Reduced Epidemic Compartment Model

Example 8.2. Consider the reduced infected compartment equation: $y' = (\beta S(x)/N - \gamma)y$, $y(0) = I_0$, where $\beta = 0.5$, $\gamma = 0.1$, $N = 1000$, $S(x) = 900e^{-0.01x}$, $I_0 = 10$, on $[0, 20]$.

Solution. Verification: $f(x,y) = (0.5 \cdot 900e^{-0.01x}/1000 - 0.1)y = (0.45e^{-0.01x} - 0.1)y$. Continuity (H1) holds since $S(x)$ is continuous. (H3) holds since $f(x,0) = 0$. (H2) holds since f is linear in y with a positive coefficient for $x < \ln(4.5)/0.01 \approx 150 > 20$. The Lipschitz constant is $L = \max_{x \in [0,20]} |0.45e^{-0.01x} - 0.1| \le 0.45$ (H4).

By Theorem 4.1, the unique solution satisfies the continuous-dependence bound $e^{0.45 \times 20} = e^9 \approx 8103$. By Theorem 5.1, $y'(x) \ge 0$ for all $x \in [0,20]$, confirming the epidemic growth phase. The basic reproduction number is $R_0 = \beta S(0)/(\gamma N) = 0.5 \times 900/(0.1 \times 1000) = 4.5 > 1$, consistent with monotone growth [1],[7].

AI Certification: For a Bayesian neural ODE with ensemble variance $\sigma^2_i = 4$ (corresponding to uncertainty of ± 2 in the initial infected count $I_0 = 10$), bound (8) gives $\mathrm{Var}[y(20)] \le 4 \cdot e^{2 \times 0.45 \times 20} = 4 \cdot e^{18} \approx 2.65 \times 10^8$. This large variance reflects the exponential amplification of initial uncertainty over the epidemic horizon, highlighting the importance of precise initial condition measurement in AI-based epidemic forecasting [9],[10].

C. Example 3: Power-Law Decay Model

Example 8.3. Consider the power-law decay ODE: $y' = -\alpha y^p$, $y(0) = y_0 = 2$, with $\alpha = 0.5$, $p = 0.5$ (square-root decay), on $[0, 4]$.

Solution. Verification: $f(x,y) = -0.5y^{0.5}$ is continuous on $[0,4] \times \mathbb{R}_+$ (H1). Since $f(x,y) \le 0$, Theorem 5.2 applies and the solution is non-increasing (not non-decreasing). $f(x,0) = 0 \ge 0$ (H3). The Lipschitz constant for $y \in [\varepsilon, 2]$ is $L = 0.5 \cdot 0.5 \cdot \varepsilon^{-0.5}$ (H4) for any $\varepsilon > 0$, reflecting the local Lipschitz nature of the square-root function. Sub-linear growth (H5) holds with $a = 0$, $c = 0.5$.

By Theorem 5.2, the solution is positive and non-increasing on $[0,4]$. The exact solution is $y(x) = (\sqrt{2} - 0.25x)^2$ for $x \in [0, 4\sqrt{2}]$, giving $y(4) \approx 0.343 > 0$. Proposition 6.1 applies with $y_{min} = y(4) \approx 0.343$.

AI Certification: This example illustrates the use of the comparison principle (Theorem 5.3). The sub-solution $y_-(x) = \max(0, y_0 - \alpha y_0^p \cdot x) = \max(0, 2 - 0.707x)$ and super-solution $y_+(x) = y_0 = 2$ provide simple analytical bounds that any certified AI solver output $\hat{u}_\theta$ must satisfy pointwise, regardless of the specific network architecture or training algorithm [3],[8].

IX. CONCLUSION

This paper has presented a rigorous and comprehensive study of the qualitative properties of non-negative monotonic solutions of nonlinear ordinary differential equations, with a systematic focus on their role in enabling trustworthy, certified AI-based scientific computing. The principal theoretical contributions are four main results: an existence theorem via Schauder's fixed-point theorem [5] with an explicit a priori solution bound (Theorem 3.1); a uniqueness and continuous-dependence theorem via Gronwall's inequality [6] establishing Hadamard well-posedness (Theorem 4.1); a robustness theorem quantifying solution sensitivity to perturbations in the vector field (Theorem 4.2); and monotonicity theorems encompassing non-decreasing solutions, non-increasing solutions, and a comparison principle (Theorems 5.1–5.3).

These analytical results were translated into a hierarchy of a priori error and stability bounds (Section VI), culminating in the fundamental residual-based error certificate (estimate (5)) which provides a computable, rigorous upper bound on the approximation error of any AI solver whose ODE residual and initial condition error can be measured. Three worked examples — logistic growth [2], epidemic compartment dynamics [1],[7], and power-law decay — demonstrated the explicit computation of these bounds and their practical significance for AI solver certification.

The implications for AI-based scientific computing were developed in Section VII across three solver paradigms. For PINNs [3], a novel loss function (7) incorporating monotonicity and non-negativity regularization terms was proposed, and a certification protocol based on estimate (5) was formulated. For Bayesian neural ODEs [4],[8], the qualitative theory provides constraints on the predictive distribution and a rigorous bound (estimate (8)) on solution variance propagated from initial condition uncertainty. For ensemble methods [9],[10], the comparison principle provides a rigorous ordering guarantee and a formal link between ensemble spread and theoretical error bounds.

The proposed framework opens several directions for future research. First, extension to systems of nonlinear ODEs [5],[6] — covering multi-compartment epidemic models, predator-prey systems, and multi-species population dynamics — requires vector-valued monotonicity theory and poses new challenges for AI solver architecture design [3],[4]. Second, the incorporation of fractional derivatives [6] would extend the framework to memory-dependent dynamical systems, an important class in anomalous diffusion and viscoelasticity modeling. Third, the development of adaptive PINN training algorithms that dynamically minimize the right-hand side of bound (5) — by redistributing collocation points toward regions of high residual — represents a promising direction for improving certification tightness [3],[8],[9]. Finally, the formal integration of the present framework with verified numerical computing standards [10] would provide a complete pipeline from mathematical analysis to certified AI-driven computational science.

REFERENCES

[1] H. W. Hethcote, "The mathematics of infectious diseases," SIAM Review, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 599–653, 2000.
[2] F. Brauer and C. Castillo-Chávez, Mathematical Models in Population Biology and Epidemiology, 2nd ed. New York, NY, USA: Springer, 2012.
[3] M. Raissi, P. Perdikaris, and G. E. Karniadakis, "Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations," J. Comput. Phys., vol. 378, pp. 686–707, 2019.
[4] R. T. Q. Chen, Y. Rubanova, J. Bettencourt, and D. Duvenaud, "Neural ordinary differential equations," in Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. (NeurIPS), vol. 31, 2018, pp. 6571–6583.
[5] E. A. Coddington and N. Levinson, Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations. New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill, 1955.
[6] V. Lakshmikantham and S. Leela, Differential and Integral Inequalities: Theory and Applications, vol. 1. New York, NY, USA: Academic Press, 1969.
[7] W. O. Kermack and A. G. McKendrick, "A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics," Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A, vol. 115, no. 772, pp. 700–721, 1927.
[8] M. Abdar, F. Pourpanah, S. Hussain, D. Rezazadegan, L. Liu, M. Ghavamzadeh, P. Fieguth, X. Cao, A. Khosravi, U. R. Acharya, V. Makarenkov, and S. Nahavandi, "A review of uncertainty quantification in deep learning: Techniques, applications and challenges," Inf. Fusion, vol. 76, pp. 243–297, 2021.
[9] E. Hüllermeier and W. Waegeman, "Aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty in machine learning: An introduction to concepts and methods," Mach. Learn., vol. 110, no. 3, pp. 457–506, 2021.
[10] L. Lu, X. Meng, Z. Mao, and G. E. Karniadakis, "DeepXDE: A library for solving differential equations using deep learning," SIAM Review, vol. 63, no. 1, pp. 208–228, 2021.
[11] P. Hartman, Ordinary Differential Equations, 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA, USA: SIAM, 2002.