

Andrzej Drozdowicz; Janusz Migda

On asymptotic behaviour of solutions of some difference equation

Mathematica Slovaca, Vol. 52 (2002), No. 2, 207--214

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/136860>

Terms of use:

© Mathematical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 2002

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

ON ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR OF SOLUTIONS OF SOME DIFFERENCE EQUATION

ANDRZEJ DROZDOWICZ* — JANUSZ MIGDA**

(*Communicated by Lubica Holá*)

ABSTRACT. Asymptotic properties of solutions of difference equations of the form

$$\Delta^2 x_n = a_n \varphi(x_{n+p+1}, \dots, x_{n+p+k}) + b_n$$

are studied.

By \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{R} we denote the set of integers, positive integers and real numbers, respectively. Let $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The asymptotic behavior of solutions of a difference equation

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 x_n &= a_n \varphi(x_{n+p+1}, \dots, x_{n+p+k}) + b_n, \\ n, k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad a_n, b_n \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \varphi: \mathbb{R}^k &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \tag{E}$$

will be investigated.

The results presented here generalize some results of A. Drozdowicz, J. Popenda [2], [3], and J. Migda, M. Migda [4].

By a *solution of the equation (E)* we mean a sequence $x: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for which there exists $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the equation (E) is satisfied for all $n \geq q$.

The space of all sequences $x: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we denote by SQ . The Banach space of all bounded sequences $x \in \text{SQ}$ with the norm $\|x\| = \sup\{|x_n| : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ we denote by BS .

If $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, then B^k denotes the set $B \times B \times \dots \times B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$. Similarly, if $c \in \mathbb{R}$, then $c^k = (c, c, \dots, c) \in \mathbb{R}^k$. The standard (Euclidean) metric on \mathbb{R}^k will be denoted by d . We choose a constant $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$d(t, s) \leq \lambda \max\{|t_i - s_i| : i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$$

for every $t = (t_1, \dots, t_k)$, $s = (s_1, \dots, s_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

If $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$, then $\varphi|_X$ denotes the restriction of the function φ to the set X i.e. $\varphi|_X: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(\varphi|_X)(t) = \varphi(t)$ for any $t \in X$.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 39A10.

Keywords: difference equation, asymptotic behavior.

LEMMA. *If the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} na_n$ is absolutely convergent, $r_n = \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} a_i$, then the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_n$ is absolutely convergent and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_n = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} na_n$.*

THEOREM 1. *Assume that φ is continuous, and the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} na_n$ is absolutely convergent. Then for any bounded solution y of the equation $\Delta^2 y_n = b_n$, there exists a solution x of (E) which possesses the asymptotic behavior*

$$x_n = y_n + o(1).$$

Proof. Assume that y is a bounded solution of the equation $\Delta^2 y_n = b_n$, and Y is the set of values of the sequence y . Choose a number $a > 0$. Let

$$U = \{t \in \mathbb{R}^k : \text{there exists } s \in Y^k \text{ such that } d(s, t) < \lambda a\}.$$

Since Y^k is a bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^k , U is bounded, too. Hence the closure \bar{U} is compact. Therefore φ is uniformly continuous and bounded on \bar{U} . Choose $M > 0$ such that $|\varphi(t)| < M$ for any $t \in U$. Let $r_n = \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} |a_j|$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

From Lemma, it follows that the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_n$ is convergent. Let $\rho_n = \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} r_j$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n = 0$, there exists $q \geq \max\{1, -p\}$ such that $M\rho_n < a$ for any $n \geq q$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \{x \in \text{BS} : x_n = 0 \text{ for } n < q \text{ and } |x_n| \leq M\rho_n \text{ for } n \geq q\}, \\ S &= \{x \in \text{BS} : x_n = y_n \text{ for } n < q \text{ and } |x_n - y_n| \leq M\rho_n \text{ for } n \geq q\}. \end{aligned}$$

T is a convex and compact subset of the space BS. The mapping $F: T \rightarrow S$ defined by $F(x)(n) = x_n + y_n$ is an affine isometry of the set T onto S . Hence S is also convex and compact.

If $x \in S$, $n \geq \max\{1, -p\}$, then $(y_{n+p+1}, \dots, y_{n+p+k}) \in Y^k$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &d((x_{n+p+1}, \dots, x_{n+p+k}), (y_{n+p+1}, \dots, y_{n+p+k})) \\ &\leq \lambda \max\{|x_{n+p+i} - y_{n+p+i}| : i = 1, 2, \dots, k\} < \lambda a. \end{aligned}$$

It means that $(x_{n+p+1}, \dots, x_{n+p+k}) \in U$ for every $x \in S$ and any $n > \max\{1, -p\}$. Hence $|\varphi(x_{n+p+1}, \dots, x_{n+p+k})| < M$ for every $x \in S$ and any $n > \max\{1, -p\}$. Let $x \in S$. For $n \geq \max\{1, -p\}$ let $\tilde{x}_n = a_n \varphi(x_{n+p+1}, \dots, x_{n+p+k})$, $g_n = \sum_{j=-n}^{\infty} \tilde{x}_j$.

Then $|\tilde{x}_n| \leq M|a_n|$. Hence it follows that

$$|g_n| \leq \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} |\tilde{x}_j| \leq \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} M|a_j| = Mr_n.$$

Since the series $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} r_j$ is absolutely convergent, the series $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} g_j$ is absolutely convergent, too. Let us define the sequence $A(x)$ as follows

$$A(x)(n) = \begin{cases} y_n & \text{for } n < q, \\ y_n + \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} g_j & \text{for } n \geq q. \end{cases}$$

If $n \geq q$, then $|A(x)(n) - y_n| = \left| \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} g_j \right| \leq \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} |g_j|$. But $|g_j| \leq Mr_j$. Hence

$$|A(x)(n) - y_n| \leq M \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} r_j = M\rho_n.$$

It means that $A(x) \in S$. Hence $A(S) \subseteq S$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since the function φ is uniformly continuous on U , there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $s, t \in U$ and $d(s, t) < \lambda\delta$, then $|\varphi(t) - \varphi(s)| < \varepsilon$. Assume $x, z \in S$ and $\|x - z\| < \delta$. If $n \geq \max\{1, -p\}$, then

$$d((x_{n+p+1}, \dots, x_{n+p+k}), (z_{n+p+1}, \dots, z_{n+p+k})) \leq \lambda\delta.$$

Let $\tilde{z}_n = a_n\varphi(z_{n+p+1}, \dots, z_{n+p+k})$ and $h_n = \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} \tilde{z}_j$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Then

$$\|A(x) - A(z)\| = \sup_{n \geq p} \left| \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} g_j - \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} h_j \right| \leq \sum_{j=p}^{\infty} |g_j - h_j|.$$

But

$$|g_j - h_j| = \left| \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \tilde{x}_i - \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \tilde{z}_i \right| \leq \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} |\tilde{x}_i - \tilde{z}_i|$$

and

$$|\tilde{x}_i - \tilde{z}_i| = |a_i\varphi(x_{i+p+1}, \dots, x_{i+p+k}) - a_i\varphi(z_{i+p+1}, \dots, z_{i+p+k})| \leq \varepsilon|a_i|.$$

Hence $|g_j - h_j| \leq \varepsilon r_j$. Therefore, $\|A(x) - A(z)\| \leq \sum_{j=q}^{\infty} \varepsilon r_j = \varepsilon\rho_q$.

It means that A is continuous. By Schauder theorem there exists $x \in S$ such that $A(x) = x$. Then $x_n = y_n + \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} g_j$ for any $n \geq q$. Hence it follows that if $n \geq q$, then

$$\Delta x_n = y_{n+1} + \sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} g_j - y_n - \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} g_j = \Delta y_n - g_n.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 x_n &= \Delta^2 y_n - g_{n+1} + g_n = b_n - \sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} \tilde{x}_j + \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} \tilde{x}_j \\ &= b_n + \tilde{x}_n = a_n \varphi(x_{n+p+1}, \dots, x_{n+p+k}) + b_n \quad \text{for } n \geq q. \end{aligned}$$

From the convergence of the series $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} g_j$ it follows that $x_n = y_n + o(1)$. \square

COROLLARY 1. *If the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} na_n$, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nb_n$ are absolutely convergent, φ is continuous, then for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a solution of (E) which converges to c .*

PROOF. Let $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r_n = \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} b_i$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From Lemma, it follows that the series $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r_i$ is convergent. Let $t_n = \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} r_i$ and $y_n = c + t_n$.

Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = 0$, $\Delta t_n = -r_n$ and $\Delta^2 t_n = \Delta(\Delta t_n) = \Delta(-r_n) = b_n$.

Hence $\Delta^2 y_n = \Delta^2 c + \Delta^2 t_n = b_n$.

Therefore, y is a bounded solution of the equation $\Delta^2 y_n = b_n$. From Theorem 1 it follows that there exists a solution x of (E) such that $x_n = y_n + o(1)$. Obviously, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = c$. \square

THEOREM 2. *If the function φ is uniformly continuous and bounded and the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} na_n$ is absolutely convergent, then for any solution y of the equation $\Delta^2 y_n = b_n$ there exists a solution x of (E) such that*

$$x_n = y_n + o(1).$$

PROOF. Assume y is a solution of the equation $\Delta^2 y_n = b_n$. Choose $M > 0$ such that $|\varphi(t)| < M$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 1 we define $r_n = \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} |a_j|$ and $\rho_n = \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} r_j$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \{x \in BS : |x_n| \leq M\rho_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}, \\ S &= \{x \in SQ : |x_n - y_n| \leq M\rho_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us define the mapping $F: T \rightarrow S$ by $F(x)(n) = x_n + y_n$. Then the formula $\rho(x, z) = \sup\{|x_n - z_n| : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ defines a metric on the set S such that F is an isometry of T onto S . T is a convex and compact subset of the space BS. Since S is homeomorphic to T , it follows from Schauder theorem that any continuous mapping $A: S \rightarrow S$ possesses a fixed point.

For $x \in S$, $n \geq \max\{1, -p\}$, let $\tilde{x}_n = a_n \varphi(x_{n+p+1}, \dots, x_{n+p+k})$, $g_n = \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} \tilde{x}_j$ and $A(x)(n) = y_n + \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} g_j$.

The rest of the proof is analogous to the second part of the proof of Theorem 1. □

COROLLARY 2. *If the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} na_n$, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nb_n$ are absolutely convergent, φ is uniformly continuous and bounded, then for any numbers $c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a solution x of (E) such that*

$$x_n = cn + d + o(1).$$

Proof. Let $c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r_n = \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} b_i$, $u_n = \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} r_i$ and $y_n = cn + d + u_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\Delta^2(cn + d) = 0$, then, similarly as in the proof of Corollary 1, one can conclude that y is a solution of the equation $\Delta^2 y_n = b_n$. The assertion holds since $u_n = o(1)$ and by Theorem 2. □

EXAMPLE. Let $a_n = \frac{1}{n^2}$, $b_n = 0$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let φ be a constant function equal to 1. We will show the equation (E) has no solutions of the form $x_n = y_n + o(1)$, where y_n denotes a solution of the equation $\Delta^2 y_n = b_n$. Let $s_n = a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n$, $s = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i$ and $r_n = \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} a_i$.

Assume $x_n = y_n + o(1)$ is a solution of (E) and $\Delta^2 y_n = b_n = 0$. Then $y_n = bn + c$ for some $b, c \in \mathbb{R}$. It means that $x_n = bn + c + z_n$, $z_n = o(1)$. Since $\Delta^2 x_n = a_n$, $a_n = \Delta^2(bn + c + z_n) = \Delta^2 z_n$. Let $u_n = \Delta z_n$. Then $\Delta u_n = \Delta^2 z_n = a_n$. Hence $u_n = u_1 + a_1 + \dots + a_{n-1} = u_1 + s_{n-1}$. Since $z_n = o(1)$, $u_n = \Delta z_n = o(1)$. Hence $0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n = u_1 + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{n-1} = u_1 + s$, which implies $u_n = -s + s_{n-1} = -r_n$.

Since $u_n = \Delta z_n$, it holds that $z_n = z_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} u_i = z_1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} r_i$, and since $r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + \dots = a_1 + 2a_2 + 3a_3 + \dots = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots = \infty$, we obtain $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n = z_1 - \infty = -\infty$.

However, this contradicts the hypothesis $z_n = o(1)$.

THEOREM 3. *If the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} na_n$ is absolutely convergent and the function $\varphi|_{[a, \infty)^k}$ is uniformly continuous and bounded for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$, then for any solution y of the equation $\Delta^2 y_n = b_n$ which diverges to infinity there exists a solution x of (E) such that*

$$x_n = y_n + o(1).$$

Proof. Assume $\Delta^2 y_n = b_n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = \infty$. Choose $M > 0$ such that $|\varphi(t)| < M$ for any $t \in [a, \infty)^k$. Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 1 we define r_n and ρ_n . Choose $q \geq \max\{1, -p\}$ such that $y_n \geq a + M\rho_1$ for any $n \geq q$. Let

$$S = \{x \in \text{SQ} : x_n = y_n \text{ for } n < q \text{ and } |x_n - y_n| \leq M\rho_n \text{ for } n \geq q\}.$$

The set S possesses the fixed point property (as in the proof of Theorem 2).

If $x \in S$ and $n \geq q$, then $x_n \geq y_n - M\rho_n \geq a + M\rho_1 - M\rho_n \geq a$. Hence $(x_{n+p+1}, \dots, x_{n+p+k}) \in [a, \infty)^k$ for any $x \in S$, $n \geq q$. The rest of the proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 1. \square

COROLLARY 3. *If the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} na_n$, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nb_n$ are absolutely convergent, there exists such $a \in \mathbb{R}$ that the function $\varphi|_{[a, \infty)^k}$ is uniformly continuous and bounded, then for any $c > 0$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a solution x of (E) for which $x_n = cn + d + o(1)$.*

THEOREM 4. *If the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} na_n$ is absolutely convergent, the function $\varphi|_{(-\infty, a]^k}$ is uniformly continuous and bounded for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$, then for any solution y of the equation $\Delta^2 y_n = b_n$ which diverges to $-\infty$ there exists a solution x of (E) such that*

$$x_n = y_n + o(1).$$

Proof. One can prove this theorem similarly as Theorem 3. \square

The following corollary is a consequence of Theorem 4 and Corollary 3.

COROLLARY 4. *If the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} na_n$, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nb_n$ are absolutely convergent, $a > 0$, $H = (-\infty, -a]^k \cup [a, \infty)^k$, and the function $\varphi|_H$ is absolutely continuous and bounded, then for any nonzero $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $d \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a solution x of (E) for which $x_n = cn + d + o(1)$.*

THEOREM 5. Assume φ is bounded, the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ is absolutely convergent, a sequence (x_n) is a solution of (E) and $s_n = b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then:

- (1) if (s_n) is bounded from above, then (x_n/n) is bounded from above,
- (2) if (s_n) is bounded from below, then (x_n/n) is bounded from below,
- (3) if (s_n) is bounded, then (x_n/n) is bounded,
- (4) if (s_n) is convergent, then (x_n/n) is convergent,
- (5) if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \infty$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x_n/n) = \infty$,
- (6) if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = -\infty$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x_n/n) = -\infty$.

Proof. For $n \geq \max\{1, -p\}$ let $g_n = a_n\varphi(x_{n+p+1}, \dots, x_{n+p+k})$, $t_n = g_1 + g_2 + \dots + g_n$.

The function φ is bounded and the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ is absolutely convergent, so the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_n$ is absolutely convergent. Hence the sequence (t_n) is convergent. Since $\Delta^2 x_n = g_n + b_n$, we obtain

$$\Delta x_n - \Delta x_1 = \Delta^2 x_1 + \Delta^2 x_2 + \dots + \Delta^2 x_{n-1} = t_{n-1} + s_{n-1}. \quad (*)$$

Hence it follows that if (s_n) is bounded from above, then (Δx_n) is bounded from above. Assume $\Delta x_n \leq M$ for some $M > 0$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$x_n - x_1 = \Delta x_1 + \Delta x_2 + \dots + \Delta x_{n-1} \leq (n - 1)M \leq nM.$$

Hence (x_n/n) is bounded from above if (s_n) is bounded from above.

Similarly, one can show (2). Assertion (3) follows immediately from (1) and (2). Now, assume (s_n) is convergent. Then by (*) the sequence (Δx_n) is also convergent. If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta x_n = c$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\Delta x_n / \Delta n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta x_n = c$. Hence by Stolz theorem ([1; Theorem 1.7.9]), $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x_n/n) = c$. Similarly, if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \infty$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta x_n = \infty$ and by Stolz theorem $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x_n/n) = \infty$. Analogously, if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = -\infty$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x_n/n) = -\infty$. □

REFERENCES

- [1] AGARWAL, R. P.: *Difference Equations and Inequalities*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1992.
- [2] DROZDOWICZ, A.—POPENDA, J.: *Asymptotic behavior of the solutions of second order difference equation*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **99** (1987), 135–140.
- [3] DROZDOWICZ, A.—POPENDA, J.: *Asymptotic behavior of solutions of difference equations of second order*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **47** (1993), 141–149.

- [4] MIGDA, J.—MIGDA, M.: *Asymptotic properties of the solutions of the second order difference equation*, Arch. Math. (Brno) **34** (1998), 467–476.

Received June 7, 1999

Revised June 11, 2001

* *Institute of Mathematics*
Poznań University of Technology
ul. Piotrowo 3a
PL-60-965-Poznań
POLAND
E-mail: adroz dow@math.put.poznan.pl.

** *Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Sciences*
A. Mickiewicz University
Poznań
POLAND