PERIODIC SOLUTIONS OF SINGULAR INTEGRAL EQUATIONS

T. A. Burton
Northwest Research Institute
732 Caroline Street
Port Angeles, WA 98362
taburton@olypen.com

Bo Zhang
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
Fayetteville State University
Fayetteville, NC 28301
bzhang@uncfsu.edu

Abstract. We consider a scalar integral equation $x(t) = a(t) - \int_{-\infty}^{t} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds$ in which $C(t,s)$ has a singularity at $t = s$. There are periodic assumptions on a, C, and g. First we prove a fixed point theorem of the Krasnoselskii-Schaefer type. We then construct a Liapunov functional which allows us to satisfy the conditions of the fixed point theorem and to prove that there is a periodic solution.

1. Introduction

We consider a scalar integral equation

$$x(t) = a(t) - \int_{-\infty}^{t} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds \tag{1}$$

for which there is a $T > 0$ so that

$$a(t+T) = a(t),\ g(t+T,x) = g(t,x),\ C(t+T,s+T) = C(t,s) \tag{2}$$

for all $t \in \Re$ and $s < t$ with a and g continuous. We denote by $(\mathcal{P}_T, \|\cdot\|)$ the Banach space of continuous T-periodic functions.

If g is Lipschitz and if C is small enough then a contraction mapping will yield a periodic solution. If C is convex then Liapunov arguments will produce *a priori* bounds. Under compactness conditions, Schaefer's fixed point theorem will yield a periodic solution. A collection of such results are found in Burton [6]. A recent n-dimensional result is given in [16].

In this paper we ask that g satisfies

$$|g(t,x) - g(t,y)| \le K|x-y| \tag{3}$$

2000 Mathematics Subject classifications: 45D05, 45D20, 45M15
Key words: Integral Equations, Fixed Point Theorems, Boundedness, Periodic Solutions, Liapunov Functions

for all $x, y \in \Re$ and some $K > 0$, while C satisfies a truncated convexity condition, but has a significant singularity at $t = s$. We derive a set of conditions measuring the magnitude of the singularity that will still permit proof of the existence of a periodic solution using a combination Krasnoselskii-Schaefer fixed point theorem which we will prove in Section 2.

2. A Fixed Point Theorem

In this section, we will prove a fixed point theorem of Krasnoselskii-Schaefer type in which the mapping function has the form $Px = Bx + Ax$ with A being compact and $(I - B)^{-1}$ continuous on an appropriate subset M of a Banach space S. The theorem resembles that of Burton-Kirk [5] without having a λ term in B. See [7], [9], [10], [12], [13], [14] for work on Krasnoselskii and Schaefer theorems and their extended forms.

Since P is the sum of two operators, it is in general a non-self map; that is, P may not necessarily map a closed convex subset M of S into itself. To prove the existence of a fixed point of P, we apply topological degree theory or transversality method by constructing a homotopy U_λ on M with $U_1 = P$. It is assumed that $U_\lambda(\phi) = U(\lambda, \phi)$ is a continuous mapping of $[0, 1] \times M$ into a compact subset of S. In many applications, U_0 is a constant map sending M to a point $p \in M/\partial M$. In this case, U_0 is an "essential" map. If $U_\lambda(\phi)$ is fixed point free on ∂M for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, then $U_1(\phi)$ is essential having a fixed point property in M (Granas and Dugundji [8, p.120-123]). This fact is often written in the form of Leray-Schauder Principle or its nonlinear alternatives which states that either

(A_1) U_1 has a fixed point in M or

(A_2) there exists $x \in \partial M$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ with $x = U_\lambda(x)$

(see [1, p.48]), [8, p.123], [14, p.28], [15]).

Theorem 2.1. *Let $(S, \|\cdot\|)$ be a Banach space, A, $B : S \to S$ such that A is continuous with A mapping bounded sets into compact sets, $(I - B)^{-1}$ exists and is continuous on $(I - B)S$ with $\lambda A(M) \subset (I - B)S$ for each closed convex subset $M \subset S$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Then either*

(i) *$x = Bx + \lambda Ax$ has a solution in S for $\lambda = 1$, or*

(ii) *the set of all such solutions, $0 < \lambda < 1$, is unbounded.*

Proof. Since $\lambda A(M) \subset (I - B)S$, we have $0 \in (I - B)S$. If $x^* = (I - B)^{-1}(0)$, then x^* is the unique fixed point of B. For each positive integer n, define a closed and bounded set

$$M_n = \{x \in S : \|x\| \le n\}.$$

We choose n sufficiently large so that $x^* \in M_n/\partial M_n$. Now $(I - B)^{-1}$ exists and is continuous on $(I - B)S$. Since A is continuous with A mapping M_n into a compact set, so is $(I - B)^{-1}(\lambda A)$ for each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Define $U : [0, 1] \times M_n \to S$ by

$$U(\lambda, \phi) = (I - B)^{-1}(\lambda A\phi).$$

Then $U_\lambda(\phi) = U(\lambda, \phi)$ is a continuous mapping of $[0, 1] \times M_n$ into a compact subset of S. Indeed, set $\Gamma = \{\lambda A\phi : \lambda \in [0, 1],\ \phi \in M_n\}$ and let $\{(\lambda_k, \phi_k)\}$ be a sequence in $[0, 1] \times M_n$. We may assume that $\lambda_k \to \lambda_0 \in [0, 1]$ as $k \to \infty$. Since AM_n is contained in a compact subset of S, there exists a convergent subsequence $\{A\phi_{k_j}\}$

of $\{A\phi_k\}$. Now $\{\lambda_{k_j} A\phi_{k_j}\}$ converges in S. This implies that Γ is pre-compact, and so is $(I-B)^{-1}\Gamma$. Observe that for all $\phi \in M_n$,

$$U_0(\phi) = (I-B)^{-1}(0) = x^*$$

is a constant map. Moreover, $x^* \in M_n/\partial M_n$. By the statement of nonlinear alternatives (A$_1$) and (A$_2$) above, either U_1 has a fixed point in M_n or there exists $x_n \in \partial M_n$ such that $x_n = U_\lambda(x_n)$ for some $\lambda \in (0,1)$. This implies that either $x = Bx + Ax$ has a solution in M_n or there exists $x_n \in \partial M_n$ with $x_n = Bx_n + \lambda A x_n$ for some $\lambda \in (0,1)$. In the later case, we have $\|x_n\| = n$. Thus, if (i) does not hold, then $\|x_n\| \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ and (ii) must hold. This completes the proof. □

Remark 2.2. It is clear that if B is a contraction mapping with contraction constant $0 < \alpha < 1$, then $(I-B)^{-1}$ exists and is continuous on S. Many generalized or nonlinear contractions satisfy this condition (see [2], [3], [7], [10], [11], [12]).

3. TECHNICAL CONDITIONS

We now introduce the conditions which will produce the *a priori* bound needed in the fixed point theorem, as well as the required compactness. The kernel, $C(t,s)$, can have a singularity at $t = s$, but we ask that there exist a fixed $\epsilon > 0$ so that

$$C(t,s) \geq 0,\ C_s(t,s) \geq 0,\ C_t(t,s) \leq 0,\ C_{st}(t,s) \leq 0 \tag{4}$$

provided that

$$-\infty < s \leq t - \epsilon,\ t < \infty. \tag{5}$$

Moreover, if $x \in \mathcal{P}_T$, then

$$\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C(t,s) g(s,x(s))ds \text{ and } \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} C(t,s) g(s,x(s))ds \text{ are continuous.} \tag{6}$$

The ϵ will play a central role. First, assume that there is a $\eta < 1$ with

$$K\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} |C(t,s)|ds \leq \eta,\ t \in \Re. \tag{7}$$

Next, there are positive constants α and β with $2\alpha + \beta < 2$ so that both

$$\int_{s}^{s+\epsilon} [\epsilon C_s(u,u-\epsilon) + C(u,u-\epsilon) + |C(u,s)|]du < \alpha,\ s \in \Re \tag{8}$$

and

$$C(t,t-\epsilon)\epsilon + \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} |C(t,s)|ds < \beta,\ t \in \Re. \tag{9}$$

The work here is motivated by and is an extension of [4]. Relations (7)–(9) specify the strength of the singularity. For a "mild" singularity such as $C(t,s) = [t-s]^{-p}$, $0 < p < 1$, then (4), (5), (7)–(9) are satisfied for any $K > 0$ when it is allowed that ϵ can be taken sufficiently small. But (6) would fail. The following function satisfies (4)-(9) with $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ and an appropriate constant $k > 0$

$$C(t,s) = \frac{k}{(t-s)(1 + |\ln(t-s) - \ln\epsilon|)^2}.$$

We now define for $0 \le \lambda \le 1$ a companion equation to (1)

$$x(t) = \lambda\left[a(t) - \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds\right] - \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds. \tag{1_λ}$$

The mappings $A, B : \mathcal{P}_T \to \mathcal{P}_T$ mentioned in the theorem are defined by $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_T$ implies that

$$(A\phi)(t) := a(t) - \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C(t,s)g(s,\phi(s))ds \tag{10}$$

and

$$(B\phi)(t) := -\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} C(t,s)g(s,\phi(s))ds. \tag{11}$$

By (6), if $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_T$ then ϕ is continuous so these integrals are continuous functions. To see that $A\phi, B\phi \in \mathcal{P}_T$ we note that

$$\begin{aligned}(A\phi)(t+T) &= a(t+T) - \int_{-\infty}^{t+T-\epsilon} C(t+T,s)g(s,\phi(s))ds \\ &= a(t) - \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C(t+T,s+T)g(s+T,\phi(s+T))ds = (A\phi)(t)\end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned}(B\phi)(t+T) &= -\int_{t+T-\epsilon}^{t+T} C(t+T,s)g(s,\phi(s))ds \\ &= -\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} C(t+T,s+T)g(s+T,\phi(s+T))ds = (B\phi)(t).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by (3) and (7), B is a contraction.

4. A Liapunov Functional

We begin with the assumption that there is an $L > 0$ with

$$xg(t,x) \ge 0 \text{ for } |x| \ge L \tag{12}$$

and that

$$\lim_{s\to-\infty}(t-s)C(t,s) = 0 \text{ for fixed } t. \tag{13}$$

Then define a Liapunov functional by

$$V(t,\epsilon) = \lambda\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)\left(\int_s^t g(v,x(v))dv\right)^2 ds. \tag{14}$$

Lemma 4.1. *If $x \in \mathcal{P}_T$ solves (1_λ) then $V'(t,\epsilon)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}V'(t,\epsilon) &\le \lambda C_s(t,t-\epsilon)\left(\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} g(v,x(v))dv\right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2g(t,x)\left[\lambda C(t,t-\epsilon)\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} g(v,x(v))dv - \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds\right] \\ &\quad + 2g(t,x)[\lambda a(t) - x(t)].\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Proof. Taking into account that $C_{st} \leq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} V'(t,\epsilon) &\leq \lambda C_s(t,t-\epsilon)\bigg(\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} g(v,x(v))dv\bigg)^2 \\ &\quad + 2\lambda g(t,x)\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)\int_s^t g(v,x(v))dvds \end{aligned}$$

If we integrate the last term by parts and use (13) in the lower limiting evaluation, keeping in mind that x is bounded, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V'(t,\epsilon) &\leq \lambda C_s(t,t-\epsilon)\bigg(\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} g(v,x(v))dv\bigg)^2 \\ &\quad + 2\lambda g(t,x)\bigg[C(t,s)\int_s^t g(v,x(v))dv\bigg|_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} + \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds\bigg] \\ &= \lambda C_s(t,t-\epsilon)\bigg(\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} g(v,x(v))dv\bigg)^2 \\ &\quad + 2\lambda g(t,x)\bigg[C(t,t-\epsilon)\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} g(v,x(v))dv\bigg] \\ &\quad + 2g(t,x)\bigg[\lambda\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds + \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds\bigg] \\ &\quad - 2g(t,x)\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using (1_λ) in the next-to-last term yields (15). □

We will integrate (15) to relate $g(t,x(t))$ to $a(t)$ and then use that relation in a lower bound on the Liapunov functional to obtain the *a priori* bound. We now obtain that lower bound.

Lemma 4.2. *For any $q > 0$, if $x \in \mathcal{P}_T$ solves (1_λ), then*

$$\begin{aligned} (x(t)-\lambda a(t))^2 &\leq 2(1+q^{-1})\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)ds\, V(t,\epsilon) \\ &\quad + 2(1+q^{-1})\epsilon C^2(t,t-\epsilon)\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} g^2(s,x(s))ds \\ &\quad + (1+q)\bigg(\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t}|C(t,s)|ds\bigg)^2\bigg(K\|x\| + \sup_{0\leq u\leq T}|g(u,0)|\bigg)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Proof. Let $q > 0$ be fixed and define $H = (1+\lambda q)\Big(\displaystyle\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds\Big)^2$ so that from (1_λ) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&(x(t)-\lambda a(t))^2 = \Big(\lambda\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds + \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds\Big)^2\\
&\le \lambda(1+q^{-1})\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds\Big)^2 + H\\
&= \lambda(1+q^{-1})\Big(-C(t,s)\int_s^t g(u,x(u))du\Big|_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon}\\
&\quad + \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)\int_s^t g(u,x(u))duds\Big)^2 + H\\
&\text{(using (13) and } x\in\mathcal{P}_T)\\
&= \lambda(1+q^{-1})\Big(-C(t,t-\epsilon)\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} g(u,x(u))du\\
&\quad + \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)\int_s^t g(u,x(u))duds\Big)^2 + H\\
&\le 2\lambda(1+q^{-1})C^2(t,t-\epsilon)\Big(\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} g(u,x(u))du\Big)^2\\
&\quad + 2(1+q^{-1})\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)\int_s^t g(u,x(u))duds\Big)^2 + H\\
&\le 2\lambda(1+q^{-1})C^2(t,t-\epsilon)\epsilon\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} g^2(u,x(u))du + H\\
&\quad + 2(1+q^{-1})\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)ds\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)\Big(\int_s^t g(u,x(u))du\Big)^2 ds\\
&\le 2\lambda(1+q^{-1})C^2(t,t-\epsilon)\epsilon\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} g^2(u,x(u))du\\
&\quad + 2(1+q^{-1})\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)ds\; V(t,\epsilon)\\
&\quad + (1+q)\left(\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} |C(t,s)|ds\right)^2\left(K\|x\| + \sup_{0\le u\le T}|g(u,0)\|\right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

as required. ☐

Lemma 4.3. *If*

$$|g(t,x)| \le |x| \text{ for } |x| \ge L \tag{17}$$

where L is defined in (12), then for any $\gamma > 0$ there is an $M > 0$ such that for any solution of (1$_\lambda$)) in $\mathcal{P}_T$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V'(t,\epsilon) &\le Ma^2(t) + [\gamma+\beta-2]g^2(t,x(t)) + M\\
&\quad + \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} [|C(t,s)| + \epsilon C_s(t,t-\epsilon) + C(t,t-\epsilon)]g^2(s,x(s))ds.
\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

Proof. By Cauchy inequality, for any $\gamma > 0$, there is an $M > 0$ such that

$$2g(t,x)a(t) \leq \gamma g^2(t,x) + Ma^2(t).$$

By (17), we may choose M so large that

$$-2g(t,x)x \leq -2g^2(t,x) + M$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \Re$. Now from (15) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V'(t,\epsilon) &\leq \gamma g^2(t,x) + Ma^2(t) \\
&\quad - 2g^2(t,x) + M + C_s(t,t-\epsilon)\epsilon \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} g^2(v,x(v))dv \\
&\quad + C(t,t-\epsilon)\int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} [g^2(t,x(t)) + g^2(v,x(v))]dv \\
&\quad + \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} |C(t,s)|[g^2(t,x(t)) + g^2(s,x(s))]ds \\
&= Ma^2(t) + g^2(t,x)\left[\gamma - 2 + \epsilon C(t,t-\epsilon) + \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} |C(t,s)|ds\right] + M \\
&\quad + \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} [\epsilon C_s(t,t-\epsilon) + C(t,t-\epsilon) + |C(t,s)|]g^2(s,x(s))ds \\
&\text{by (9)} \\
&\leq Ma^2(t) + g^2(t,x)[\gamma + \beta - 2] + M \\
&\quad + \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} [\epsilon C_s(t,t-\epsilon) + C(t,t-\epsilon) + |C(t,s)|]g^2(s,x(s))ds,
\end{aligned}$$

as required. □

Lemma 4.4. *If (17) holds, if $\epsilon \leq T$, and if γ is small enough then there is a $\mu > 0$ so that if x solves (1_λ) and $x \in \mathcal{P}_T$ then*

$$\int_0^T g^2(s,x(s))ds \leq (M/\mu)\int_0^T a^2(s)ds + TM/\mu. \tag{19}$$

Proof. We are going to integrate (18) from 0 to T and note that $0 = V(T,\epsilon) - V(0,\epsilon)$. First, we estimate the integral of the last term in (18) as follows. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_{t-\epsilon}^{t} [|C(t,s)| + \epsilon C_s(t,t-\epsilon) + C(t,t-\epsilon)]g^2(s,x(s))dsdt \\
&\leq \int_{-\epsilon}^{T} \int_{s}^{s+\epsilon} [|C(t,s)| + \epsilon C_s(t,t-\epsilon) + C(t,t-\epsilon)]dt g^2(s,x(s))ds \\
&\text{by (8)} \\
&\leq \alpha \int_{-\epsilon}^{T} g^2(s,x(s))ds \leq 2\alpha \int_0^T g^2(s,x(s))ds.
\end{aligned}$$

With this information we now integrate (18) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}0 = V(T,\epsilon) - V(0,\epsilon) &\le M\int_0^T a^2(s)ds + TM \\ &+ \int_0^T [\gamma - 2 + \beta + 2\alpha]g^2(s, x(s)0ds \\ &\le M\int_0^T a^2(s)ds - \mu\int_0^T g^2(s,x(s))ds + TM\end{aligned}$$

since $\beta + 2\alpha < 2$ and γ can be made as small as we please. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let the conditions of Lemma 4.4 hold and suppose there is a $Q > 0$ with*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s))(t+T-s)^2 ds \le Q. \tag{20}$$

Then there is a $Q^* > 0$ with $V(t,\epsilon) \le Q^*$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}V(t,\epsilon) &= \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)\bigg(\int_s^t g(u,x(u))du\bigg)^2 ds \\ &\le \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)(t-s)\int_s^t g^2(u,x(u))duds \\ &\le \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)(t-s)\bigg[\int_s^{t+T}(M/\mu)a^2(u)du + (t-s+T)TM/\mu\bigg]ds \\ &\le \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)(t+T-s)^2 ds[(M/\mu)\|a^2\| + TM/\mu]\end{aligned}$$

from which the result follows. □

Lemma 4.6. *Let the conditions of Lemma 4.5 hold. Then there exists a constant $J > 0$ such that $\|x\| < J$ whenever x is T-periodic solution of (1$_\lambda$) for $0 < \lambda \le 1$.*

Proof. By (9) and (13), we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_s(t,s)ds = C(t,t-\epsilon) \le \beta/\epsilon.$$

If $x \in \mathcal{P}_T$ solves (1_λ), then (19) holds, and by Lemma 4.5, $V(t,\epsilon) \le Q^*$. Now taking into account that (7) holds with $\eta < 1$, we obtain from (16) that

$$\begin{aligned}(x(t) - \lambda a(t))^2 &\le 2(1+q^{-1})(\beta/\epsilon)Q^* \\ &+ 2(1+q^{-1})(\beta^2/\epsilon)TM(\|a^2\|+1)/\mu \\ &+ (1+q)(\eta\|x\| + \beta g^*)^2\end{aligned}$$

where $g^* = \|g(t,0\|$. Since $\eta < 1$, we may choose $q > 0$ small enough so that $(1+q)\eta^2 < 1$, and hence, there exists $J > 0$ such that $\|x\| < J$. The proof is complete. □

5. Continuity and Compactness

We select part of (10) and define the mapping $U : \mathcal{P}_T \to \mathcal{P}_T$ by $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_T$ implies that

$$(U\phi)(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C(t,s)g(s,\phi(s))ds. \tag{21}$$

Then U is well defined on P_T by (6). By a change of variable we have

$$(U\phi)(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} C(t,s-\epsilon)g(s-\epsilon,\phi(s-\epsilon))ds$$

with a fully convex kernel.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that* $\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon}[|C(t,s)| + |C_t(t,s)|]ds$ *is bounded for all* $t \in \Re$. *Then* U *is continuous on* P_T *and for each* $J > 0$, $\Gamma = \{U(\phi) : \phi \in \mathcal{P}_T|, \|\phi\| \leq J\}$ *is uniformly bounded and equicontinuous.*

Proof. First, there is a J^* such that $\phi \in \Gamma$ implies that $|g(t,\phi(t))| \leq J^*$ and there is a C^* with

$$\int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} [|C(t,s)| + |C_t(t,s)|]ds \leq C^*, \quad t \in \Re. \tag{22}$$

It is clear that $U\phi \in P_T$ by (6) and the argument following (10). We now show that U is continuous on P_T. If $\tilde{\phi}$, $\phi \in P_T$, then

$$|U(\phi)(t) - U(\tilde{\phi})(t)| = \left| \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C(t,s)g(s,\phi(s))ds - \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C(t,s)g(s,\tilde{\phi}(s))ds \right|$$

$$= \left| \int_{-\infty}^{t-s} C(t,s)\left[g(s,\phi(s)) - g(s,\tilde{\phi}(s))\right] ds \right|. \tag{23}$$

Since g is uniformly continuous on $[0,T] \times \{x \in R : |x| \leq \|\tilde{\phi}\| + 1\}$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $0 < \delta < 1$ such that $\|\phi - \tilde{\phi}\| < \delta$ implies $|g(s,\phi(s)) - g(s,\tilde{\phi}(s))| < \varepsilon$ for all $s \in [0,T]$. It follows from (23) that $\|U(\phi) - U(\tilde{\phi})\| \leq \epsilon C^*$. Thus, F is continuous on P_T.

Next, for an arbitrary $\phi \in \Gamma$ we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}(U\phi)(t) = C(t,t-\epsilon)g(t-\epsilon,\phi(t-\epsilon)) + \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} C_t(t,s)g(s,x(s))ds.$$

and this derivative is bounded by

$$C(t,t-\epsilon)J^* + J^* \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} |C_t(t,s)|ds \leq J^* \sup_{0\leq\leq T} \|C(t,t-\epsilon)\| + J^*C^*.$$

This implies that Γ is equicontinuous. The uniform boundedness of Γ follows from the inequality

$$|U(\phi)(t)| \leq \int_{-\infty}^{t-\epsilon} |C(t,s)||g(s,\phi(s))|ds \leq J^*C^*.$$

□

6. Periodic Solutions

We will show the existence of T-periodic solutions of (1) by applying Theorem 2.1. By (10) and (11), we see that $x \in P_T$ is a solution of (1_λ) if and only if it is a fixed point of $B + \lambda A$.

Theorem 6.1. *If (2)-(9), (12)-(13), (17), (20), and (22) hold with $\epsilon \leq T$, then (1) has a T-periodic solution.*

Proof. Let the mappings A and B be defined in (10) and (11) with $S = P_T$. Then B is a contraction mapping with contraction constant η, and hence, $(I - B)^{-1}$ exists and is continuous on $(I - B)S = S$. By Lemma 5.1 and the Ascoli-Arzela Theorem, we see that A is continuous and maps bounded sets into compact sets. It is also clear that $\lambda A(M) \subset (I - B)S$ for each closed convex subset $M \subset S$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Now by Lemma 4.6, the set of solutions to $x = Bx + \lambda Ax$ is bounded. Therefore, the alternative (i) of Theorem 2.1 must hold; that is, $B + A$ has a fixed point in P_T which is a T-periodic solution of (1). □

Remark 6.2. Observe that the continuity of $C(t, s)$ with respect to s for $t - \epsilon < s < t$ is not required for fixed t. One may readily verify that the function $C(t, s)$ defined by $C(t, s) = k(t - s)^{-p}$ for $t - s \geq \epsilon$ and $C(t, s) = (t - s)^{-q}$ for $0 < t - s < \epsilon$ with $p > 2, 0 < q < 1, 0 < \epsilon \leq 1, k > 0$ satisfy all conditions of Theorem 6.1 for an appropriately chosen constant k.

References

[1] R. Agarwal, M. Meehan, and D. O'Regan, Fixed Point Theory and Applications, Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[2] D. W. Boyd and J. S. W. Wong, On nonlinear contractions, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 20(1969), 458-464.

[3] T. A. Burton, Integral equations, implicit functions, and fixed points, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 124(1996), 2383-2389.

[4] T. A. Burton, A Liapunov functional for a singular integral equation, Nonlinear Analysis 73(2010), 3873-3882.

[5] T. A. Burton and C. Kirk, A fixed point theorem of Krasnoselskii-Schaefer type, Math. Nachr 189(1998), 23-31.

[6] T. A. Burton, Stability by Fixed Point Theory for Functional Differential Equations, Dover Publications, Mineola, New York, 2006.

[7] H. Gao, Y. Li, B. Zhang, A fixed point theorem of Krasnoselskii-Schaefer type and its applications in control and periodicity of integral equations, Fixed Point Theory, To appear.

[8] A. Granas and J. Dugundji, Fixed Point Theory, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.

[9] M. A. Krasnoselskii, Some problems of nonlinear analysis, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. 10(1958), 345-409.

[10] Y. Liu and Z. Li, Schaefer type theorem and periodic solutions of evolution equations, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 316(2006), 237-255.

[11] A. Meir and E. Keeler, A theorem on contractive mappings, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 28(1969), 326-329.

[12] S. Park, Generalizations of the Krasnoselkii fixed point theorem, Nonlinear Analysis 67(2007), 3401-3410.

[13] H. Schaefer, Über Die Methode Der a Priori Schranken, Math. Ann. 129(1955), 415-416.

[14] D. R. Smart, Fixed Point Theorems, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1980.

[15] J. Wu, H. Xia, and B. Zhang, Topological transversality and periodic solutions of neutral functional differential equations, Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, 129A(1999), 199-220.

[16] B. Zhang, Liapunov functionals and periodicity in a system of nonlinear integral equations, Electronic Journal of Qualitative Theory of Differential Equations, Spec. Ed. I, 2009 No. 1, 1-15.