

Janusz Matkowski

### Note on a Functional Equation

The object of the present note is the discussion of the functional equation

$$(1) \quad \psi(x) = \psi'(y) + \psi(y)\psi(x),$$

where  $\psi(x)$  is the unknown function and  $\psi'(y)$  and  $\psi(y)$ ,  $\psi(x)$  are complementary functions of complex variables.

We assume that  $\psi$  is analytic at  $x=0$  and

$$(2) \quad \psi(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n, \quad |x| < \rho,$$

$$(3) \quad |a_n| \leq 1, \quad n=0, 1, 2, \dots$$

$\psi'(y)$  is an analytic function of two complex variables  $(y, x)$  at the point  $(0, 0)$  and  $\psi'(0, 0) = 0$ .

Obviously, the necessary condition of the existence of an analytic solution of equation (1) is the existence of a formal solution.

In [1] the following theorem has been proved.

*Theory of formal solution*

$$(4) \quad \psi(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n x^n$$

is a solution of (1) iff a positive number  $q^2$  converges

to the present case we give a proof of this theorem, stronger than that in [1].

Suppose that (4) is a formal solution of equation (1). It follows from (2) that there exists a positive integer  $p$  such that

$$(5) \quad |b_{2p}|, |b_{4p}|, |b_{6p}| \leq 1.$$

We may write

$$(6) \quad \psi(x) = \psi'(x) + \psi(x)^2$$

where

$$\psi'(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n, \quad \psi(x)^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n x^n.$$

We define the function

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{A}(z, \eta) = \frac{\mathcal{A}(z, \mathcal{F}(z, \eta)) + (\mathcal{A}(z, \eta) - \mathcal{F}(z, \eta))}{\eta}.$$

We shall prove that  $\mathcal{A}(z, \eta)$  is analytic in  $(z, \eta)$  for arbitrary  $z$ . Suppose that

$$\mathcal{A}(z, \eta) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j(z) \eta^j \quad (|z| < r_1, |\eta| < R_1).$$

Let us fix  $z_0 \in (0, R_1)$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}(z_0, \eta) \equiv 0$  and  $\mathcal{A}(z_0, \eta) \equiv 0$ , there exist  $\rho_1 > 0$  such that for  $|z| < \rho_1$  and  $|\eta| < R_1$  we have

$$\mathcal{F}(z, \eta) + \mathcal{A}(z, \eta) \equiv 0.$$

Obviously,  $\mathcal{A}(z, \eta) = \frac{\mathcal{A}(z, \eta)}{1}$  is analytic for  $|z| < \rho_1$  and for  $|\eta| < R_1$ ,  $|\eta| < R_1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(z, \mathcal{F}(z, \eta) + \mathcal{A}(z, \eta)) - \mathcal{A}(z, \eta) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j(z) (\mathcal{F}(z, \eta) + \mathcal{A}(z, \eta))^j - \mathcal{A}(z, \eta) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j(z) \eta^{j+1} = \eta \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j(z) \eta^j = \eta \mathcal{A}(z, \eta), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{A}(z, \eta)$  are expressed by (6). It is,  $\mathcal{A}(z, \eta) \equiv 0$  and  $\mathcal{F}(z, \eta) \equiv 0$ . Thus the formal series (6) formally satisfies the equation

$$\mathcal{A}(z, \eta) = \eta \mathcal{A}(z, \eta) \quad \text{or} \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j(z) \eta^{j+1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j(z) \eta^j.$$

It holds that  $a_j(z) = a^{(j)}(z)$  where  $a^{(j)}(z)$  is analytic for  $|z| < \rho_1$ . Thus  $\mathcal{A}(z, \eta)$  is analytic for  $|z| < \rho_1$  and  $|\eta| < R_1$ .

$$(7) \quad \mathcal{A}(z, \eta) \equiv 0.$$

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{A}(z, \eta) = \mathcal{A}(z, \mathcal{F}(z, \eta) + \mathcal{A}(z, \eta)) = \frac{\mathcal{A}(z, \eta)^2}{1 - \mathcal{F}(z, \eta)}.$$

Moreover, (8) formally satisfies the equation

$$(9) \quad \mathcal{A}(z, \eta) = \frac{\mathcal{A}(z, \eta)^2}{1 - \mathcal{F}(z, \eta)}$$

and consequently

$$(10) \quad \mathcal{A}(z, \eta) = \mathcal{A}(z, \eta).$$

Equation (8) together with (9) is equivalent to (10). From (10) we obtain

$$\mathcal{A}(z, \eta) = \mathcal{A}(z, \mathcal{A}(z, \eta)).$$

Since and from (9) there exist  $\rho_2 > 0$ ,  $\rho_2 > 0$  and  $R_2 > 0$  such that for  $|z| < \rho_2$  and  $|\eta - \mathcal{A}(z, \eta)| < R_2$ ,  $|\eta - \mathcal{A}(z, \eta)| < R_2$  we have

$$(11) \quad \mathcal{A}(z, \eta) = \mathcal{A}(z, \mathcal{A}(z, \eta)) \quad (|z| < \rho_2).$$

Let us fix  $\delta < \epsilon < \delta_0$ . By the continuity of  $f(x, y)$  there exists a number  $\eta_1 > 0$  such that for (1)–(3), we have

$$(1') \quad |f(x, y) - f(x, y_0)| < \delta_0 \quad (x, y) \in D_1.$$

Similarly, there exists an  $\eta_2 > 0$  such that for (1)–(3), we have

$$(2') \quad |f'(x, y)| < \eta_2.$$

Let  $\eta = \min\{\eta_1, \eta_2\}$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{A}$  the set of all analytic functions  $\varphi(x, y)$  which fulfil the condition

$$(3') \quad |\varphi(x, y) - \varphi_0(x, y)| < \delta_0 \quad (x, y) \in D_1.$$

This set includes the pair  $\varphi_0(x, y) = \exp\{i\alpha(x) - i\beta(y)\}$  and  $\varphi(x, y) = \varphi_0(x, y)$  is a complete metric space.

Now we consider the transformation  $\varphi \rightarrow T(\varphi)$  defined by the formula

$$(4') \quad T(\varphi) = i(\varphi_x - \varphi_y^2).$$

We shall prove that  $T(\varphi) \in \mathcal{A}$ , if  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}$ , that is, that  $T(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathcal{A}$ . If  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}$ , (3') and (2') are obvious for (1)–(3)

$$\begin{aligned} |T(\varphi) - \varphi_0| &= |i(\varphi_x - \varphi_y^2) - i(\varphi_{0x} - \varphi_{0y}^2)| < i(\eta_2 - \eta_2^2) + \delta_0 \\ &+ i(\eta_2 - \eta_2^2) < i(\eta_2 - \eta_2^2) + \delta_0 + \delta_0 = i\delta_0 + \delta_0 < \delta_0. \end{aligned}$$

From (4') we get  $T(\varphi) \in \mathcal{A}$ , as was to be proved.

Let  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\varphi_1 \neq T(\varphi_2)$ ,  $\varphi_2 \neq T(\varphi_1)$ . From (4') we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_1(x, y) - \varphi_2(x, y)| &= \left| \frac{\exp\{i(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)\} - \exp\{i(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1)\}}{i(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) - i(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1)} \right| \\ &< \frac{\exp\{i(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)\} + \exp\{i(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1)\}}{2i(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)} < \delta_0. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently  $T$  is a contraction. Hence, on account of the Banach contraction principle, it follows that there exists exactly one analytic solution  $\varphi(x, y)$  of equation (5). Thus (3) is an analytic solution of equation (1).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] H. Lewy, On the non-vanishing of the Jacobian of one-to-one mappings, *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.* 42 (1936), 689–692.