

On a Characterization of Linearization Operators of Substitutions in the Space $BF(a, b)$

By J. Krasovec and J. Šol of Václav Šolís

(Received October 11, 2018)

Let $BF(a, b)$ be the Banach space of functions of bounded variation $f: (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ with the norm

$$(1) \quad \|f\| = \text{var}(f) + \sum_{i=1}^n \|f_i\|_1,$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^n \|f_i\|_1$ denotes the total variation of f over the interval (a, b) , i.e.,

$$(2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \|f_i\|_1 = \sup \sum_{j=1}^k |f(x_j) - f(x_{j-1})|,$$

where supremum is taken over all possible partitions and over all choices $\{x_j\}$ such that $a = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_k = b$.

Denote by $\mathcal{F}(a, b)$ the set composed of all functions $\varphi: (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Every function

$$A: (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$$

generates the so-called Klarsbonn operator or operator of substitution $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_A: \mathcal{F}(a, b) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(a, b)$ defined by the formula

$$(3) \quad (\mathcal{K}\varphi)(x) = A(x) + \varphi(x), \quad x \in (a, b).$$

Now we can prove the following

Theorem 1. Suppose that $f: (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the operator \mathcal{K} defined by (3) and (4) the following conditions

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{K}^2 = \mathcal{K} \circ \mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K} \circ \mathcal{K}^2,$$

and \mathcal{K} has Klarsbonn map in the sense of sense (2), i.e., there is one $\xi \in (a, b)$ such that

$$(5) \quad (\mathcal{K}\varphi - \mathcal{K}^2\varphi)(\xi) = 0, \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{F}(a, b)$$

then

$$(6) \quad |A_j(\xi)| = |A_j(\xi)| \cdot |f_j(\xi) - f_j(\xi)|, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

(7) for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}(a, b)$ there exists $\mathcal{K}\varphi(x) = \sum_{j=1}^n \varphi_j(x)$, $\varphi_j \in \mathcal{F}$ and there exist left-continuous functions $G, H \in \mathcal{F}(a, b)$ such that

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{K}\varphi(x) = G(x) + H(x), \quad x \in (a, b), \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{F}.$$

(Proof. For fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\mu, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ we define $\psi: (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\psi(t) = \alpha + (1-\alpha) \left(\frac{\beta}{t} + \frac{1-t\mu}{1-t} \right).$$

It is easily seen that $\psi \in \mathcal{H}^1$ is a convex function of (α, β, μ) so that

$$|\psi(\alpha) - \psi(\beta)| \leq |\beta - \alpha| \psi(\alpha) + \alpha |\mu - \beta| \psi(\alpha),$$

and it follows that we have

$$|\psi(\alpha) - \psi(\beta)| \leq |\beta - \alpha| \psi(\alpha) + \alpha |\mu - \beta| \psi(\alpha).$$

Then to be sufficient condition (ii) requires that $(\beta - \alpha) \psi(\alpha) + \alpha |\mu - \beta| \psi(\alpha) \leq \mu - \alpha$ which completes the proof of (ii).

(ii). Since for every fixed $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ the function $\psi(t)$ is convex in (α, β) as a function of (α, β) and ψ is bounded variation, it follows from (i) that $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \mu$ if $\psi \in \mathcal{H}^1$ is β_1 -monotonic and for the monotonicity of every point $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and, conversely, the function ψ is convex. Note that for every $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, ψ is both continuous and \mathcal{H}^1 on $(0, 1)$.

Let us fix $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and choose a positive integer n and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \dots, \alpha_n$ such that $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \dots > \alpha_n > 0$. Define now $\psi: (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\psi(t) = \begin{cases} \alpha_1 - \beta_1 (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 - \alpha_2) \\ \alpha_1 - \beta_1 (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 - \alpha_2) \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_1 - \beta_1 (\alpha_1 \alpha_n - \alpha_n) \\ \alpha_1 - \beta_1 (\alpha_1 \alpha_n - \alpha_n) \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that $\psi \in \mathcal{H}^1$ on $(0, 1)$ and

$$\psi(\alpha_1) = \alpha_1 - \beta_1 (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 - \alpha_2) + \beta_1 (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) = \alpha_2.$$

Since (i) we have

$$\psi(\alpha_1) - \psi(\alpha_2) \leq \beta_1 (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) + \beta_2 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) + \beta_3 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) + \dots + \beta_n (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) + \beta_n (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2).$$

It follows from (i) and (ii) that

$$\beta_1 (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) + \beta_2 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) + \beta_3 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) + \dots + \beta_n (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \leq \alpha_1 - \alpha_2.$$

Since by (i) and (ii) we obtain the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta_1 (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 - \alpha_2) + \beta_2 (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 - \alpha_2) + \beta_3 (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 - \alpha_2) + \dots + \beta_n (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 - \alpha_2) \\ & \leq \beta_1 (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) + \beta_2 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) + \beta_3 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) + \dots + \beta_n (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\alpha_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \dots > \alpha_n > 0$. Letting in this inequality $\alpha_1 \rightarrow 0$ we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha_2 (\beta_1 - \beta_2) + \beta_3 (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) + \beta_4 (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) + \dots + \beta_n (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) \\ & \leq \beta_1 (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) + \beta_2 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) + \beta_3 (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) + \dots + \beta_n (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y_1, \tilde{y}_1, y_2, \tilde{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Putting $\tilde{y}_1 = 0$, $y_1 = x$, $\tilde{y}_2 = 0$, $y_2 = x$ in the above inequality we have

$$x \in \mathbb{R}^+ \Rightarrow x + x \leq 2f(x, x) + 2f(x, x) + 2f(x, x) = 6f(x, x)$$

for any $y_1, \tilde{y}_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, letting $x = 0$, we conclude that

$$6f(x, 0) = 6x - 6f(x, 0) - 6f(x, 0) - 6f(x, 0) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The equation may be written in the following form

$$(6) \quad [f^2(x, x + y) - f^2(x, y) - f^2(x, x) - f^2(x, x + y) - f^2(x, x - y)] = 0, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}$$

where

$$f^2(x) = f^2(x, y) + f^2(x, y).$$

Let us fix $x \in \mathbb{R}$ in (6) and define the function $\xi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by the formula

$$(7) \quad \xi(y) = f^2(x, y) - f^2(x, y).$$

Hence by (6) we have

$$\xi(x + y) + \xi(x) = \xi(y), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let \tilde{y}_1 be arbitrary fixed and consider the definition of \mathbb{R}^+ we have

$$f^2(x, y) = f^2(x, 2x) \iff y = 2x, \quad x \in \mathbb{R} \iff y \in \mathbb{R}^+,$$

which implies the continuity of ξ . Therefore there exists $\beta(y) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\xi(y) = \beta(y) \cdot y, \quad y \in \mathbb{R},$$

and by (7) we get

$$f^2(x, y) - f^2(x, y) = \beta(y) \cdot y, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\} \cup \mathbb{R}^-$, $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \mathbb{R}^-$, the functions β and β which satisfy (8) and (9) on \mathbb{R}^+ and \mathbb{R}^- respectively, thus complete the proof.

Remark 1. See the following

Example. Take $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}$ and the sequence $\{a_n\}$ of all rational numbers of the interval (α, β) such that $a_i < a_j$ for $i < j$. Define

$$f(x, y) = \begin{cases} \alpha, & x < a_{n_1}, y \in \mathbb{R}^+ \\ \alpha + a_{n_1} \cdot y, & x < a_{n_1}, y \in \mathbb{R}^- \end{cases}$$

For $y \in \mathbb{R}^+$, β and for $\{a_n\}$ such that $a_1 < a_2 < a_3 < \dots < a_n < \dots$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n [f(a_i, y) - f(a_{i-1}, y) - f(a_{i-1}, y) + f(a_i, y)] \\ = \sum_{i=1}^n [f(a_i, y) - f(a_{i-1}, y)] = \sum_{i=1}^n [a_i - a_{i-1}] \cdot y = \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i - a_{i-1}) \cdot y = y. \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $f^2 = f^2$ on $\mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\} \cup \mathbb{R}^- = \mathbb{R}$.

Now for $y \in \mathbb{R}^-$, β on \mathbb{R}^+ and for $\{a_n\}$ such that $a_1 < a_2 < a_3 < \dots < a_n < \dots$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n [f(a_i, y) - f(a_{i-1}, y) - f(a_{i-1}, y) + f(a_i, y)] \\ = \sum_{i=1}^n [f(a_i, y) - f(a_{i-1}, y) - f(a_{i-1}, y) + f(a_i, y)] \\ = \sum_{i=1}^n [a_i \cdot y - a_{i-1} \cdot y - a_i \cdot y + a_{i-1} \cdot y] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$$\| \sum_{j=1}^n (h_j(x_j, y_j) - h_j(x_j, z_j)) \| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \| h_j(x_j, y_j) - h_j(x_j, z_j) \|$$

$$\| \sum_{j=1}^n h_j^{-1}(y_j, z_j) - h_j^{-1}(y_j, x_j) \| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \| h_j^{-1}(y_j, z_j) - h_j^{-1}(y_j, x_j) \|$$

$$\| \sum_{j=1}^n h_j^{-1}(y_j, z_j) - h_j^{-1}(y_j, x_j) \| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \| h_j^{-1}(y_j, z_j) - h_j^{-1}(y_j, x_j) \|.$$

Since $\sum_{j=1}^n h_j(x_j, y_j) = h(x, y)$ and, correspondingly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \| h(x, y) - h(x, z) \| &= \| h(x, y) - h(x, z) \| = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n h_j(x_j, y_j) - \sum_{j=1}^n h_j(x_j, z_j) \right\| \\ &= \| h(x, y) - h(x, z) \| = \| h(x, y) - h(x, z) \|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus h generated by h is a bilinear mapping of $BP(a, b)$. By Theorem 1 the left regularisation h^{-1} of the function h has these (ii). This example shows, in particular, that the function h in Theorem 1 need not be linear with respect to the second variable.

Imposing an additional condition on the left regularisation h^{-1} will enforce the following more satisfactory result.

Theorem 2. Suppose that h is bilinear $h(x, y) = h_1(x, y) + h_2(x, y)$. Then for $h^{-1} \in K$, the following two conditions are equivalent:

(i) $h^{-1} \in BP(a, b) = BP(a, b)$ is bilinear;

(ii) h is a bilinear mapping of $BP(a, b)$ and the function $h_1(x, y) = h(x, y) - h_2(x, y)$ is bilinear.

Proof. By Theorem 1 it is sufficient to prove the implications (ii) \Rightarrow (i). Let $h^{-1} \in K$, where h is bilinear in (ii). Since $h_1 \in BP(a, b)$, it is clear that $h^{-1} \in BP(a, b) = BP(a, b)$. For (ii) \Rightarrow (i) $BP(a, b)$ and $BP(a, b) = BP(a, b)$. Hence by the definition of the sets K we have

$$\begin{aligned} \| h(x, y) - h(x, z) \| &= \| h_1(x, y) - h_1(x, z) + h_2(x, y) - h_2(x, z) \| \\ &= \| h_1(x, y) - h_1(x, z) \| + \| h_2(x, y) - h_2(x, z) \| \\ &= \| h_1(x, y) - h_1(x, z) \| + \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n h_j(x_j, y_j) - \sum_{j=1}^n h_j(x_j, z_j) \right\| \\ &= \| h_1(x, y) - h_1(x, z) \| + \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n h_j(x_j, y_j) - \sum_{j=1}^n h_j(x_j, z_j) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n h_j(x_j, y_j) - \sum_{j=1}^n h_j(x_j, z_j) \right\| + \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n h_j(x_j, y_j) - \sum_{j=1}^n h_j(x_j, z_j) \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

Remark 1. One can easily observe that similar theorems hold for the right regularisation of h . However, the interval (a, b) may be replaced by any interval (a, b) , where $a < x < b < y$.

Remark 8. Our theorem shows that a bounded, nilpotent solution of the non-linear functional equation $\varphi(x) = N(x) \circ \varphi(x)$ is bounded by uniform application of the Brouwer's fixed point theorem (cf. [1]).

Remark 9. Note that the condition of commutativity of the N -operator operator $N \circ E^2(x)$, $E \circ E^2(x)$, E is very strong (see [1, Lemma 2.10]) [1], p. 10 (see also [1], p. 10) but proved that every such operator is a bounded map.

References

- [1] B. A. Belarovich, Topological Methods in the Theory of Nonlinear Integral Equations, World Scientific, New York, 1994.
- [2] H. K. Khalid, Solution Operators in Banach Spaces, John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1990.
- [3] J. Matkowski, Functional equations and mappings operators, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. 44: 583-587 (1974).

Belarovich B.A.
 75-10000, Bala-Cynwyd,
 Poland

Khalid H.K.
 75-10000, Bala-Cynwyd,
 Poland