

ON THE FUNCTIONAL–INTEGRAL EQUATION OF VOLTERRA TYPE WITH WEAKLY SINGULAR KERNEL

Aldona Dutkiewicz

Communicated by Stevan Pilipović

ABSTRACT. We give sufficient conditions for the existence of L^p -solution of a Volterra functional–integral equation in a Banach space. Our assumptions and proofs are expressed in terms of measures of noncompactness.

1. Introduction

Let E, F be Banach spaces, $D = [0, d_1] \times \cdots \times [0, d_m]$ and

$$D(t) = \{s = (s_1, \dots, s_m) \in R^m : 0 \leq s_i \leq t_i, i = 1, \dots, m\}$$

for $t = (t_1, \dots, t_m) \in D$. Denote by $L^p(D, E)$ ($p > 1$) the space of all strongly measurable functions $x : D \mapsto E$ with $\int_D \|x(t)\|^p dt < \infty$, provided with the norm $\|x\|_p = (\int_D \|x(t)\|^p dt)^{1/p}$.

We consider the following functional–integral equation of Volterra type

$$(1) \quad x(t) = \phi \left(t, \int_{D(t)} K(t, s) g(s, x(s)) ds \right)$$

with the kernel $K(t, s) = \frac{A(t, s)}{|t-s|^r}$, $0 < r < n$ ($t, s \in D, t \neq s$). We give sufficient conditions for the existence of a solution $x \in L^p(D, E)$ of (1). Moreover, for $r < 1$ we present one-dimensional result involving a generalized Osgood condition. Our considerations are inspired by a paper of Darwish [5] concerning the functional–integral equation of Hammerstein type. The existence of L^1 -solution of functional–integral equation of Hammerstein type was studied in [4] and when $g(s, x) = x$ we get an equation considered in [3]. In [15] Szufła has established the existence of L^p -solution of Hammerstein integral equation with weakly singular kernel.

Throughout this paper we shall assume that:

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 45N05.

Key words and phrases: Functional–integral equation, L^p -solutions, measure of noncompactness.

1° $(t, x) \mapsto \phi(t, x)$ is a function from $D \times E$ into E such that

- (i) ϕ is strongly measurable in t and continuous in x ;
- (ii) $\|\phi(t, x) - \phi(\tau, y)\| \leq |a_1(t) - a_1(\tau)| + b_1\|x - y\|$ for $t, \tau \in D$ and $x, y \in E$, where $a_1 \in L^p(D, R)$ and $b_1 \geq 0$;
- (iii) $\phi(0, 0) = 0$;

2° A is a bounded strongly measurable function from $D \times D$ into the space of continuous linear mappings $F \mapsto E$;

3° $(t, x) \mapsto g(t, x)$ is a function from $D \times E$ into F such that

- (i) g is strongly measurable in t and continuous in x ;
- (ii) $\|g(t, x)\| \leq a_2(t) + b_2\|x\|$ for $s \in D$ and $x \in E$, where $a_2 \in L^p(D, R)$ and $b_2 \geq 0$.

In what follows we shall need the following lemmas:

LEMMA 1. *The linear integral operator*

$$(Sx)(t) = \int_D K(t, s) x(s) ds \quad (x \in L^p(D, E), t \in D)$$

maps $L^p(D, E)$ into itself continuously. Moreover,

$$\|S\| \leq aQ, \quad \text{where } a = \sup\{\|A(t, s)\| : t, s \in D\}$$

and

$$(2) \quad \frac{2\pi^{n/2}(\text{diam } D)^{n-r}}{(n-r)\Gamma(n/2)} = Q \geq \int_D \frac{ds}{|t-s|^r} \quad \text{for all } t \in D.$$

LEMMA 2. *Put $G(x)(t) = g(t, x(t))$ for $x \in L^p(D, E)$ and $t \in D$. Then G is a continuous mapping of $L^p(D, E)$ into itself.*

For the proofs we refer for example to [15].

Denote by α and α_1 the Kuratowski measures of noncompactness in E and $L^1(D, E)$, respectively. For any set V of functions belonging to $L^1(D, E)$ denote by v the function defined by $v(t) = \alpha(V(t))$ for $t \in D$ (under the convention that $\alpha(X) = \infty$ if X is unbounded), where $V(t) = \{x(t) : x \in V\}$. The next lemma clarifies the relation between α and α_1 .

LEMMA 3. ([7, Th.2.1]; and [16, Th.1]) *Assume that V is a countable set of strongly measurable functions $D \mapsto E$ and there exists an integrable function μ such that $\|x(t)\| \leq \mu(t)$ for all $x \in V$ and $t \in D$. Then the corresponding function v is integrable on D and*

$$\alpha\left(\left\{\int_D x(t) dt : x \in V\right\}\right) \leq 2 \int_D v(t) dt.$$

If, in addition $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in V} \int_D \|x(t+h) - x(t)\| dt = 0$, then

$$\alpha_1(V) \leq 2 \int_D v(t) dt.$$

2. The main results

Let $H : D \mapsto R_+$ be a measurable function such that the function $(t, s) \mapsto \|A(t, s)\|H(s)$ is bounded on $D \times D$.

THEOREM 1. *Let 1° – 3° hold and $0 < r < n$. If*

$$(3) \quad \alpha(g(s, X)) \leq H(s)\alpha(X)$$

for any $s \in D$ and for any bounded subset X of E , then the equation (1) has a solution $x \in L^p(D, E)$.

In the case, when $r < 1$, we can apply the famous Mydlarczyk theorem [12, Th.3.1], and consequently we obtain a stronger theorem if we replace (3) by the condition (5) given below.

THEOREM 2. *Let $\omega : R_+ \mapsto R_+$ be a continuous nondecreasing function such that $\omega(0) = 0$, $\omega(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$ and*

$$(4) \quad \int_0^\delta \frac{1}{s} \left[\frac{s}{\omega(s)} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-r}} ds = \infty \quad (\delta > 0). \quad (\text{cf. [12]})$$

Let 1°–3° hold, $0 < r < 1$ and $J = [0, d]$ be a compact interval in R . If

$$(5) \quad \alpha(g(s, X)) \leq \omega(\alpha(X))$$

for any $s \in J$ and for any bounded subset X of E , then the equation (1) has a solution $x \in L^p(J, E)$.

PROOF. By the theory of scalar linear Volterra integral equations it follows that there exists a nonnegative solution $u(t)$ of the equation

$$u(t) = a_1(t) + b_1 \int_{D(t)} \|K(t, s)\| a_2(s) ds + b_1 b_2 \int_{D(t)} \|K(t, s)\| u(s) ds.$$

More precisely, as the spectral radius $r(\mathcal{K})$ of the Volterra integral operator

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{K}u(t) = \int_{D(t)} \|K(t, s)\| u(s) ds$$

is equal to 0, by Theorem 2.2 from [10] the sequence of successive approximations $u_n(t)$ for (6) is convergent; obviously all $u_n(t)$ are nonnegative.

Put $B = \{x \in L^p(D, E) : \|x(t)\| \leq u(t) \text{ for a.e. } t \in D\}$. Define $F : B \mapsto L^p(D, E)$ by

$$(Fx)(t) = \phi \left(t, \int_{D(t)} K(t, s) g(s, x(s)) ds \right) \text{ for } x \in B \text{ and } t \in D.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(Fx)(t)\| &= \|\phi(t, SGx(t))\| \leq a_1(t) + b_1 \|SGx(t)\| \\
&\leq a_1(t) + b_1 \left\| \int_{D(t)} K(t, s) g(s, x(s)) ds \right\| \\
&\leq a_1(t) + b_1 \int_{D(t)} \|K(t, s)\| (a_2(s) + b_2 \|x(s)\|) ds \\
&\leq a_1(t) + b_1 \int_{D(t)} \|K(t, s)\| a_2(s) ds + b_1 b_2 \int_{D(t)} \|K(t, s)\| u(s) ds = u(t)
\end{aligned}$$

for $x \in B$ and $t \in D$, Lemmas 1 and 2 prove that F is a continuous mapping $B \mapsto B$.

Without loss of generality we shall always assume that all functions from $L^p(D, E)$ are extended to R^n by putting $x(t) = 0$ outside D . Moreover, by 1°(ii) we obtain

$$\|F(x)(t+h) - F(x)(t)\| \leq d(t, h) \quad \text{for } x \in B, t \in D \text{ and small } |h|,$$

where

$$d(t, h) = \begin{cases} u(t) & \text{if } t \in D \text{ and } t+h \notin D \\ \|a_1(t+h) - a_1(t)\| \\ \quad + b_1 \int_D \|K(t+h, s) - K(t, s)\| (a_2(s) + b_2 u(s)) ds & \text{if } t, t+h \in D. \end{cases}$$

From (2) it follows that for each $z \in L^1(D, R)$ we have

$$(7) \quad \iint_{D \times D} \frac{|z(s)|}{|t-s|^r} ds dt = \int_D \left(\int_D \frac{dt}{|t-s|^r} \right) |z(s)| ds \leq Q \int_D |z(s)| ds.$$

In view of (7) the function $(t, s) \mapsto W(t, s) = K(t, s)(a_2(s) + b_2 u(s))$ is integrable on $D \times D$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_D d(t, h) dt &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_D \left(\int_D \|K(t+h, s) - K(t, s)\| (a_2(s) + b_2 u(s)) ds \right) dt \\
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_D \int_D \|W(t+h, s) - W(t, s)\| ds dt = 0
\end{aligned}$$

for $t \in D$. Hence

$$(8) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{x \in B} \int_{D(t)} \|(Fx)(t+h) - (Fx)(t)\| dt = 0.$$

Next, let V be a countable subset of B such that

$$(9) \quad V \subset \overline{\text{conv}}(F(V) \cup \{0\}).$$

Then $V(t) \subset \overline{\text{conv}}(F(V)(t) \cup \{0\})$ for a.e. $t \in D$, so that

$$(10) \quad \alpha(V(t)) \leq \alpha(F(V)(t)) \text{ for a.e. } t \in D.$$

Put $v(t) = \alpha(V(t))$ for $t \in D$. From (8) and (9) we deduce that

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{x \in V} \int_D \|x(t+h) - x(t)\| dt = 0.$$

Moreover, $\|x(t)\| \leq u(t)$ for all $x \in V$ and a.e. $t \in D$. Consequently, by Lemma 3, $v \in L^p(D, R)$ and

$$(11) \quad \alpha_1(V) \leq 2 \int_D v(t) dt.$$

According to 1°(ii), we have $\|\phi(t, x) - \phi(t, y)\| \leq b_1 \|x - y\|$ for $t \in D$ and $x, y \in E$. Then $\alpha(\phi(t, X)) \leq b_1 \alpha(X)$ for any bounded subset X of E .

From (7) it is clear that

$$(12) \quad \int_D \frac{a_2(s) + b_2 u(s)}{|t-s|^r} ds < \infty \text{ for a.e. } t \in D.$$

Fix $t \in D$ such that the integral (12) is finite. Next, we have

$$\|K(t, s)g(s, x(s))\| \leq a \frac{a_2(s) + b_2 u(s)}{|t-s|^r} \text{ for } x \in B \text{ and } s \in D.$$

Case 1. Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold. Thus, by (10), (3) and Lemma 3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(V(t)) &\leq \alpha((FV)(t)) = \alpha(\phi(t, SGV(t))) \\ &\leq b_1 \alpha \left(\left\{ \int_{D(t)} K(t, s) g(s, x(s)) ds : x \in V \right\} \right) \\ &\leq 2b_1 \int_{D(t)} \alpha(\{K(t, s) g(s, x(s)) ds : x \in V\}) ds \\ &\leq 2b_1 \int_{D(t)} \|K(t, s)\| \alpha(g(s, V(s))) ds \leq 2b_1 \int_{D(t)} \|K(t, s)\| H(s) \alpha(V(s)) ds \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$v(t) \leq 2b_1 \int_{D(t)} \|K(t, s)\| H(s) v(s) ds.$$

Putting

$$w(t) = 2b_1 c \int_{D(t)} \frac{v(s)}{|t-s|^r} ds,$$

where $c = \sup\{\|A(t, s)\| H(s) : t, s \in D\}$, we see that $w(t)$ is a continuous function such that $v(t) \leq w(t)$ for $t \in D$. Hence

$$(13) \quad w(t) \leq 2b_1c \int_{D(t)} \frac{w(s)}{|t-s|^r} ds.$$

Arguing similarly as in [8; p. 134–135] we can prove that $w(t) = 0$ for $t \in D$. Since $v(t) \leq w(t)$, we have $v(t) = 0$ for $t \in D$.

Case 2. Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 2 hold. Thus, by (10), (5) and Lemma 3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(V(t)) &\leq \alpha((FV)(t)) = \alpha\left(\phi(t, SGV(t))\right) \\ &\leq b_1\alpha\left(\left\{\int_0^t K(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds : x \in V\right\}\right) \\ &\leq 2b_1 \int_0^t \alpha(\{K(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds : x \in V\}) ds \\ &\leq 2b_1 \int_0^t \|K(t,s)\| \alpha(g(s,V(s))) ds \leq 2b_1 \int_0^t \|K(t,s)\| \omega(\alpha(V(s))) ds, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$v(t) \leq 2b_1a \int_0^t \frac{\omega(v(s))}{(t-s)^r} ds \quad \text{for } t \in J.$$

Putting

$$w(t) = 2b_1a \int_0^t \frac{\omega(v(s))}{(t-s)^r} ds \quad \text{for } t \in J$$

we see that w is a continuous function such that $v(t) \leq w(t)$ for $t \in J$. Hence

$$(14) \quad w(t) \leq 2b_1a \int_0^t \frac{\omega(w(s))}{(t-s)^r} ds \quad \text{for } t \in J.$$

By the Mydlarczyk theorem [12, Th. 3.1] and assumption (4), the integral equation

$$z(t) = 2b_1a \int_0^t \frac{\omega(z(s))}{(t-s)^r} ds \quad \text{for } t \in J$$

has the unique continuous solution $z(t) \equiv 0$. Applying now theorem on integral inequalities [1, Th. 2], from (14) we deduce that $w(t) \equiv 0$. Thus $v(t) = 0$ for $t \in J$.

In view of (11) this shows that $\alpha_1(V) = 0$, so that V is relatively compact in $L^1(D, E)$. On the other hand, the set B has equiabsolutely continuous norms in $L^p(D, E)$ and $V \subset B$. Consequently, V is relatively compact in $L^p(D, E)$.

Applying now the following Mönch fixed point theorem [11]:

THEOREM 3. *Let B be a closed, convex, and bounded subset of a Banach space such that $0 \in B$. If $F : B \mapsto B$ is a continuous mapping such that for each countable subset V of B the following implication holds*

$$V \subset \overline{\text{conv}}(F(V) \cup 0) \implies V \text{ is relatively compact,}$$

then F has a fixed point.

we conclude that there exists $x \in B$ such that $x = F(x)$. Obviously x is a solution of (1). \square

References

- [1] N. V. Azbieliev, Z. B. Caliuk, *Ob integralnykh nieravenstvach*, Matem. Sbornik **56** (1962), 325–342.
- [2] J. Banaś, K. Goebel, *Measure of noncompactness in Banach spaces*, Marcel Dekker, New York – Basel, 1980.
- [3] J. Banaś, Z. Knap, *Integrable solutions of a functional-integral equation*, Rev. Mat. Univ. Complutense Madr. **2(1)** (1989), 31–38.
- [4] G. Emmanuele, *Existence of solutions of a functional-integral equation in infinite dimensional Banach spaces*, Czech. Math. J. **44(4)** (1994), 603–609.
- [5] M. A. Darwish, *Weakly singular functional-integral equation in infinite dimensional Banach spaces*, Appl. Math. Comp. **136** (2003), 123–129.
- [6] G. Gripenberg, *Unique solutions of some Volterra integral equations*, Math. Scand. **48** (1981), 59–67.
- [7] H. P. Heinz, *On the behaviour of measures of noncompactness with respect to differentiation and integration of vector-valued functions*, Nonlinear Anal. **7** (1983), 1351–1371.
- [8] J. Januszewski, *On Volterra integral equations with weakly sigular kernel in Banach spaces*, Demonstr. Math. **26** (1993), 131–136.
- [9] W. Kolodziej, *Wybrane rozdziały analizy matematycznej*, PWN, Warszawa 1982.
- [10] M. A. Krasnoselskii, *Približennoe resenie operatornykh uravnenij*, Nauka, Moskva 1969.
- [11] H. Mönch, *Boundary value problems for nonlinear ordinary differential equations of second order in Banach spaces*, Nonlinear Anal. **4** (1980), 985–999.
- [12] W. Mydlarczyk, *The existence of nontrivial solutions of Volterra equations*, Math. Scand. **68** (1991), 83–88.
- [13] D. O'Regan, M. Meehan, *Existence Theory for Nonlinear Integral and Integrodifferential Equations*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1998.
- [14] B. Sadovskii, *Limit-compact and condensing mappings*, Russian Math. Surveys **27** (1972), 85–155.
- [15] S. Szuffla, *On the Hammerstein integral equation with weakly singular kernel*, Funkcialaj Ekvacioj **34 (2)** (1991), 279–285.
- [16] S. Szuffla, *Appendix to the paper "An existence theorem for the Urysohn integral equation in Banach spaces"*, Comm. Math. Univ. Carolinae **25** (1984), 763–764.
- [17] S. Szuffla, *On the Volterra integral equation with weakly singular kernel*, Mathem. Bohem. **131(3)** (2006), 225–231.

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science
 Adam Mickiewicz University
 Umultowska 87
 61-614 Poznań
 Poland
 szukala@amu.edu.pl

(Received 30 01 2007)

(Revised 08 09 2008)