Research Journal of Pure Algebra -1(5), August - 2011, Page: 111-114
Available online through www.rjpa.info ISSN 2248–9037

A NOTE ON SYSTEMS OF SUMMATION INEQUALITIES

Dr. K. L. Bondar*

P. G. Dept. of Mathematics, N. E. S. Science College, Nanded - 431 605 (M.S.) India

E-mail: klbondar_75@rediffmail.com

(Received on: 13-08-11; Accepted on: 23-08-11)

ABSTRACT

In this paper we discuss some systems of summation inequalities. We also discuss the under and over functions of systems of summation equations.

Keywords: *Difference Equation, Summation Equation, Summation Inequality, Under and Over Function.*

---

1. INTRODUCTION:

Agarwal [1], Kelley and Peterson [9] developed the theory of difference equations and difference inequalities. Some difference inequalities and comparison results are obtained by K. L. Bondar [2, 3]. Some summation and difference inequalities are obtained in K. L. Bondar [4, 5]. K. L. Bondar, V. C. Borkar, S. T. Patil [6, 7] and Dang H., Oppenheimer S.F.[8] obtained the existence and uniqueness results for difference equations. Some differential and integral inequalities are given in [10]. In this paper we discuss about systems of summation inequalities. We also discuss the under and over functions of systems of summation equations.

2. PRELIMINARY NOTES

Let $J = \{t_0, t_0 + 1\ldots\ t_0 + a\}$, $t_0 \geq 0$, $t_0 \in R$, and E be an open subset of R^n, consider the difference equations with an initial condition,

$$\Delta u(t) = g(t, u(t)),\ u(t_0) = u_0 \tag{1}$$

where $u_0 \in E$, $u: J \rightarrow E$, $g : J \times E \rightarrow R^n$.

The function $\phi : J \rightarrow R^n$ is said to be a solution of initial value problem (1), if it satisfies

$$\Delta \phi(t) = g(t, \phi(t));\quad \phi(t_0) = u_0.$$

The initial value problem is equivalent to the problem

$$u(t) = u_0 + \sum_{s=t_0}^{t-1} g(s, u(s)).$$

By summation convention $\sum_{s=t_0}^{t_0-1} g(s, u(s)) = 0$ and so $u(t)$ given above is the solution of (1).

3. MAIN RESULTS:

Theorem: 3.1 *Assume that*

(i) *$K : J \times J \times R^n \rightarrow R^n$ and $K(t, s, x)$ is nondecreasing in x for each fixed (t, s) and one of the inequalities*

$$x(t) \leq h(t) + \sum_{s=t_0}^{t-1} K(t, s, x(s)), \tag{2}$$

$$y(t) \geq h(t) + \sum_{s=t_0}^{t-1} K(t, s, y(s)) \tag{3}$$

is strict where $x, y : J \rightarrow R^n$;

Corresponding author: Dr. K. L. Bondar, *E-mail: klbondar_75@rediffmail.com

(ii) $x(t_0) < y(t_0)$. *Then*

$$x(t) < y(t), \quad t \geq t_0. \tag{4}$$

Proof: Assume that the conclusion (4) is false. Then the set

$$Z = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} [t \in [t_0, \infty) : x_i(t) \geq y_i(t)]$$

is nonempty. Let $t_1 = \inf Z$. By (ii), it is clear $t_1 > t_0$. Furthermore, since Z is closed, $t_1 \in Z$, and consequently there exists an index j such that

$$x_j(t_1) = y_j(t_1),$$

$$x_j(t) < y_j(t), \quad t_0 \leq t < t_1,$$

$$x_i(t) \leq y_i(t), \quad t_0 \leq t < t_1, \quad i \neq j.$$

Since K is monotone nondecreasing in x, it follows that

$$K_j(t_1, s, x(s)) \leq K_j(t_1, s, y(s)).$$

Hence, using (2) and (3), we arrive at the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} x_j(t_1) &\leq h_j(t_1) + \sum_{s=t_0}^{t_1-1} K_j(t_1, s, x(s)) \\ &\leq h_j(t_1) + \sum_{s=t_0}^{t_1-1} K_j(t_1, s, y(s)) \\ &< y_j(t_1). \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction to the fact that $x_j(t_1) = y_j(t_1)$. Hence Z is empty and the theorem is proved.

Let us now consider the summation operator defined by

$$K\phi = \sum_{s=t_0}^{t_1-1} K\ (t, s, \phi(s)). \tag{5}$$

Definition: 3.2 *We shall say that the operator K is monotone nondecreasing if, for any* ϕ_1, ϕ_2 $: J \to R^n$ *such that, for any* $t_1 > t_0$,

$$\phi_1(t) < \phi_2(t), \quad t_0 \leq t < t_1,$$

implies

$$K\phi_1(t_1) \leq K\phi_2(t_1).$$

Theorem: 3.3 *Let the operator K defined by (5) be monotone nondecreasing. Suppose further that, for* $t > t_0$,

$$x - Kx < y - Ky, \tag{6}$$

where $x, y : J \times R^n$. *Then* $x(t_0) < y(t_0)$ *implies*

$$x(t) < y(t), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Proof: Assume that the conclusion of theorem is false. Then set

$$Z = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} [t \in [t_0, \infty) : x_i(t) \geq y_i(t)]$$

is nonempty. Let $t_1 = \inf Z$. By (ii), it is clear that $t_1 > t_0$. Furthermore, since Z is closed, $t_1 \in Z$, and consequently there exists an index j such that

$$x_j(t_1) = y_j(t_1),$$

$$x_j(t) < y_j(t), \quad t_0 \leq t < t_1,$$

$$x_i(t) \le y_i(t), \quad t_0 \le t < t_1, \quad i \ne j.$$

Since K is monotone nondecreasing in x and using above inequalities, it follows that,

$$K_jx_j(t_1) \le K_jy_j(t_1). \tag{7}$$

As a result, (6) and (7) yield

$$\begin{aligned} x_j(t_1) &= x_j(t_1) - K_jx_j(t_1) + K_jx_j(t_1) \\ &< y_j(t_1) - K_jy_j(t_1) + K_jy_j(t_1) \\ &\le y_j(t_1). \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the fact that, at $t = t_1$, $x_j(t_1) = y_j(t_1)$, and hence the proof is complete.

Definition: 3.4 *A function $u : J \to R^n$ is said to be an under function of the system of summation equation*

$$x = j + Kx \tag{8}$$

if it satisfies the inequality

$$u < h + Ku.$$

Similarly u is said to be an over function of (8) if verifies the system of inequality

$$u > h + Ku,$$

whereas if u satisfies equation (8), it is said to be a solution of (8).

Theorem: 3.5 Let *the operator K defined by (5) be monotone nondecreasing. Suppose that x, y, z: $J \to R^n$ be an under function, a solution and an over function of (8), respectively on J. Then*

$$x(t_0) < y(t_0) < z(t_0)$$

implies

$$x(t) < y(t) < z(t), \quad t \ge t_0.$$

Proof: As $x(t)$ is an under function and $y(t)$ is a solution of (8) respectively, we have

$$x(t) < h(t) + \sum_{s=t_0}^{t-1} K(t, s, x(s)) \text{ and}$$

$$y(t) = h(t) + \sum_{s=t_0}^{t-1} K(t, s, y(s)).$$

Also if $x(t_0) < y(t_0)$, they by Theorem 3.1, we have

$$x(t) < y(t), \quad t \ge t_0.$$

Similarly using definition of solution, an over function of (8) and by Theorem 3.1 again we obtain

$$y(t) < z(t), \quad t \ge t_0.$$

Hence

$$x(t) < y(t) < z(t), \quad t \ge t_0.$$

REFERENCES:

[1] R. Agarwal, Difference Equations and Inequalities, *Morkel Dekkar, New York* (1991).

[2] K. L. Bondar, Some scalar difference inequalities, *Applied Mathematical Sciences,* 5, No. 60, (2011), 2951 – 2956.

[3] K. L. Bondar, Some comparison results for first order difference equation, *International Journal of Contemporary Mathematical Sciences,* 6, No. 38, (2011), 1855 – 1860.

[4] K. L. Bondar, Infinite systems of difference inequalities, *Vishwabharati,* 2, Issue 2, (2011), 71-75.

© 2011, RJPA. All Rights Reserved

[5] K. L. Bondar, Some summation inequalities reducible to difference inequalities, *International Journal of Contemporary Mathematical Sciences,* 2, No. 1, (2011).

[6] K. L. Bondar, V. C. Borkar and S. T. Patil, Existence and uniqueness results for difference phi Laplacian, boundary value problems, *ITB Journal of Science,* 43(A), No.1, (2011), 51 – 58.

[7] K. L. Bondar, V. C. Borkar and S. T. Patil, Some existence and uniqueness results for difference boundary value problems, *Bulletin of pure and applied sciences,* 29(F), No. 2, (2010), 295 – 301.

[8] Dang H. and Oppenheimer S. F., Existence and uniqueness results for some nonlinear boundary value problems. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 198, (1996), 35 – 48.

[9] Kelley and Peterson, Difference equations, *Academic Press* (2001).

[10] V. Laxmikantham and S. Leela, Differential and Integral inequalities Theory and application, *Academic Press* (1969).

****

© 2011, RJPA. All Rights Reserved