

Andrzej Pelczar

On Some Equations in Partially Ordered Spaces

In the present paper we consider some method of successive approximations in partially ordered spaces. By a partially ordered space we shall mean an abstract space with a relation " \leq " satisfying the axioms introduced in [1].

1. Let Z be a topological, partially ordered space, such that for each non-empty subset P , upperly bounded in Z , there exists in Z $\sup P$ (cf. [1], [2], [3]). The convergence (the limit) of an arbitrary sequence $\{x_n\}$, $x_n \in Z$, and the continuity of mappings, we shall mean as the convergence (the limit) and continuity in the topology given in Z . This topology is such that if $u_n \in Z$, $u_n \leq u_{n+1}$, $u_n \leq u$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$), then $\sup_n \{u_n\} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n$. In the product $Z \times Z$ we introduce the partial ordering in such a way that $(u, v) \leq (w, z)$ if $u \leq w$ and $v \leq z$; the topology in $Z \times Z$ is introduced in the ordinary way as the topology defined by the use of the topology in Z .

Let $A = A(u, v)$ be a mapping of $Z \times Z$ into Z , such that

- (1.1) if $(u_n, v_n) \leq (u_{n+1}, v_{n+1})$ and $(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (u, v)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $A(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow A(u, v)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,
- (1.2) if $v \leq z$, then $A(u, v) \leq A(u, z)$ for each $u \in Z$,
- (1.3) there exists $B = B(u)$ ($B: Z \rightarrow Z$), such that
- (a) $A(u, v) \leq B(u)$ for $u, v \in Z$,
- (b) if $u_n \leq u_{n+1}$ and $u_{n+1} \leq B(u_{n+1})$ or $u_{n+1} \leq B(u_n)$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots$, then there exists $u \in Z$, such that $u_n \leq u$.
- (1.4) for each $v \in Z$, there exists $u \in Z$, $u \geq v$, such that $u = A(u, v)$.

2. Theorem 1. *If the space Z and the mapping A satisfy the conditions mentioned in § 1, then there exists a solution u of the equation*

$$(2.1) \quad u = A(u, u).$$

This solution is given as the limit of a sequence of successive approximations.

Proof. Let u_0 be an arbitrary element of Z . In view of (1.4), there exists $u_1 \in Z$, $u_1 \geq u_0$, such that

$$(2.2) \quad u_1 = A(u_1, u_0).$$

From (1.2) it follows that

$$(2.3) \quad u_1 \leq A(u_1, u_1).$$

From the assumptions concerning Z in A (in particular from (1.3)), it follows that there exists the maximal solution u_2 of the equation

$$(2.4) \quad u = A(u_1, u)$$

satisfying $u_2 \geq u_1$ (cf. [2], [3]).

Hence we have

$$(2.5) \quad u_2 = A(u_1, u_2).$$

For u_2 there exists u_3 , $u_3 \geq u_2$, such that

$$(2.6) \quad u_3 = A(u_3, u_2).$$

In that way we construct a sequence $\{u_n\}$, such that

$$(2.7) \quad u_{2n+1} = A(u_{2n+1}, u_{2n}) \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots)$$

$$(2.8) \quad u_{2n} = A(u_{2n-1}, u_{2n}) \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots).$$

Obviously, the sequence $\{u_n\}$ is nondecreasing, and moreover it is bounded, because:

$$u_{2n+1} \leq B(u_{2n+1}), \quad u_{2n} \leq B(u_{2n-1}) \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots).$$

Hence $\{u_n\}$ is convergent to some $u \in Z$. Of course $\lim u_n = \lim u_{2n} = \lim u_{2n+1} = u$. By (1.1) we can write:

$$u = \lim u_{2n+1} = \lim A(u_{2n+1}, u_{2n}) = A(\lim u_{2n+1}, \lim u_{2n}) = A(u, u),$$

$$u = \lim u_{2n} = \lim A(u_{2n-1}, u_{2n}) = A(\lim u_{2n-1}, \lim u_{2n}) = A(u, u).$$

Hence u is a solution of (2.1).

3. Remark 1. It is easy to observe, that in the preceding section, we proved that each sequence $\{u_n\}$ which has been constructed by the above procedure introduced in § 2, with an arbitrary initial u_0 , is convergent to a solution of (2.1). Notice, that for u_0 we can choose u_1 (for u_2 we can choose u_3 , etc.) in a way, which (generally) is not uniquely determined; if we have u_{2n} , then we can choose u_{2n+1} in an arbitrary way, from the set of all u satisfying the condition $u = A(u, u_{2n})$ (cf. (1.4)).

Remark 2. If $B = B(u)$ is a decreasing function, then each nondecreasing sequence satisfying the condition (1.3)-(b) is bounded.

4. Let us consider an example from the theory of functional equations. In this section the relation " $<$ " in the set of functions defined in the interval $[a, b]$ or in $[a, b] \times (-\infty, \infty)$ is understood in such a way that: $u < v$ if $u(x) \leq v(x)$ for all x and there exists y such that $u(y) < v(y)$.

Let us consider $F = F(x, u)$, $G = G(x, u)$ defined in $[a, b] \times (-\infty, \infty)$, continuous with respect to u , such that F is strictly decreasing and G is strictly increasing with respect to u . Let us consider moreover a function $f = f(x)$, $f: [a, b] \rightarrow [a, b]$. Assume that

- (I) $0 \leq G(x, u) \leq M(x)$, M is a function defined in $[a, b]$,
 (II) for each function $u = u(x)$ satisfying

$$0 \leq u < M + \max_x F(x, 0),$$

there exists $y = y(x)$, such that

$$(4.1) \quad y(x) = F(x, y(f(x))) + G(x, u(x))$$

and

$$(4.2) \quad u \leq y < M + \max_x F(x, 0).$$

From Theorem 1, in view of Remark 2, it follows directly the following

Theorem 2. *If the functions F , G and f fulfill the above assumptions, then there exists in $[a, b]$ a solution $y = y(x)$ of the equation*

$$(4.3) \quad y(x) = F(x, y(f(x))) + G(x, y(x)).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Birkhoff, *Lattice Theory*, New York 1948.
 [2] A. Pelczar, *On the invariant points of a transformation*, Ann. Polon. Math. 11 (1961), 199-202.
 [3] A. Pelczar, *On invariant points of monotone transformations in partially ordered spaces*, Ann. Polon. Math. 17 (1965), 49-53.