

Hana Petzeltová; Pavla Vrbová
A remark on small divisors problems

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 28 (1978), No. 1, 1–12

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/101509>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1978

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://dml.cz>

A REMARK ON SMALL DIVISORS PROBLEMS

HANA PETZELTOVÁ and PAVLA VRBOVÁ, Praha

(Received October 13, 1975)

1. Introduction. In a recent series of investigations [4]–[8], V. Pták has developed a new theory of iterative existence proofs, the so called method of nondiscrete mathematical induction. The method is based on a simple abstract theorem about complete metric spaces, the induction theorem, and consists in reducing the problem to a system of functional inequalities to be satisfied by a certain function, called the rate of convergence.

In the present remark we apply this method to small divisors problems obtaining thereby an improvement of conditions and a considerable simplification of proofs. Problems of this type have been investigated previously by V. I. ARNOLD [1], J. MOSER [3], I. N. BLINOV [2] and E. ZEHNDER [9], [10]. The authors owe a debt of gratitude to V. PTÁK and E. ZEHNDER for the permission to use unpublished manuscripts [7], [10].

Let f be a mapping defined on a subset D of a Banach space Y with values in a normed space Z . Suppose that $u \in D$ and that the Fréchet derivative $f'(u)$ exists. It is natural to approximate the solution of $f(x) = 0$ by the element $u - (f'(u))^{-1}f(u)$ provided $f'(u)$ has a bounded inverse. In applications, this is not always the case so that it is necessary to replace $(f'(u))^{-1}$ by an approximate right inverse which maps, in general, the space Z into a larger space $Y' \supset Y$.

2. Preliminaries. We repeat here, for the reader's convenience, the essential facts about the method of nondiscrete induction (see [7]).

Definitions. Let T be an interval of the form $T = \{t; 0 < t < t_0\}$ for a positive t_0 . A rate of convergence on T is a function ω defined on T which maps T into itself and

$$\sigma(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \omega^n(t) < \infty$$

(here $\omega^n = \omega \circ \omega^{n-1}$, ω^0 is the identity function). As usual, given a metric space (E, d) , a subset M of E and a positive number r , we denote $U(M, r) = \{x \in E; d(x, M) < r\}$. If we are given, for small t , a set $A(t) \subset E$, we define the limit $A(0)$ of the family $A(\cdot)$ as

$$A(0) = \bigcap_{s>0} \left(\bigcup_{t \leq s} A(t) \right)^-.$$

Now we may state the induction theorem.

2.1. Theorem. *Let (E, d) be a complete metric space, let ω be a rate of convergence on $T = (0, t_0)$. For each $t \in T$ let $Z(t)$ be a subset of E . Suppose that*

$$W(t) \subset U(W(\omega(t)), t)$$

for each $t \in T$. Then

$$W(t) \subset U(W(0), \sigma(t))$$

for each $t \in T$.

Sometimes, it is more convenient to use the induction theorem in the following equivalent form.

2.2. Theorem. *Let (E, d) be a complete metric space, let ω be a positive function which maps $T = (0, t_0)$ into itself and such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega^n(t) = 0$ for each $t \in T$. Let τ be a positive function defined on T such that $\sigma_\tau(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\tau \circ \omega^n)(t) < \infty$ for each $t \in T$. For each $t \in T$ let $W(t)$ be a subset of E . Suppose that*

$$W(t) \subset U(W(\omega(t)), \tau(t))$$

for each $t \in T$. Then

$$W(t) \subset U(W(0), \sigma_\tau(t)).$$

This modification is obtained by setting $Z(t) = W(\tau^{-1}(t))$ and applying the induction theorem to the family $Z(\cdot)$ and the rate of convergence $\tilde{\omega} = \tau \circ \omega \circ \tau^{-1}$ under the assumption that the inverse τ^{-1} exists and is defined on an interval $T_1 = (0, t_1)$ for a positive t_1 .

3.1. The main theorem. *For each number σ , $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1$, we are given a Banach space $(Y_\sigma, \|\cdot\|_\sigma)$ and a normed space $(Z_\sigma, \|\cdot\|_\sigma)$ with the following properties:*

1° $Y_{\sigma'} \supset Y_\sigma, Z_{\sigma'} \supset Z_\sigma$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\sigma'} \leq \|\cdot\|_\sigma$ for $\sigma' \leq \sigma$;

2° each Y_σ is equipped with another norm $\|\cdot\|_\sigma$ such that $\|\cdot\|_{\sigma'} \leq \|\cdot\|_\sigma$ for $\sigma' \leq \sigma$ and $\|\cdot\|_\sigma \leq \|\cdot\|_\sigma$.

Let R be a positive number and set

$$R_\sigma = \{u \in Y_\sigma, \|u\|_\sigma < R\}, \quad \hat{R}_\sigma = \{u \in Y_\sigma, \|u\|_\sigma < R\}$$

so that $\hat{R}_\sigma \subset R_\sigma$.

Let f be a mapping defined on R_0 with values in Z_0 such that f maps each R_σ into Z_σ . Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:

3° f is continuous as a mapping from $(R_\sigma, | \cdot |_\sigma)$ into $(Z_0, | \cdot |_0)$ for each $\sigma \in [0, 1]$;

4° for each $u \in \bigcup_{0 < \sigma} \hat{R}_\sigma$ there exists a mapping $f'(u) : \bigcup_{\sigma > 0} Y_\sigma \rightarrow \bigcup_{\sigma > 0} Z_\sigma$ such that, for each $\sigma' < \sigma$, $u \in \hat{R}_{\sigma'}$ implies $f'(u) Y_{\sigma'} \subset Z_{\sigma'}$, and

$$|f(u + v) - f(u) - f'(u)v|_{\sigma'} \leq K_1(\sigma - \sigma') \cdot |v|_\sigma^2$$

whenever u and $u + v$ belong to $\hat{R}_{\sigma'}$;

5° if $u \in \hat{R}_\sigma$, there exists $v \in \bigcap_{\sigma' < \sigma} Y_{\sigma'}$ such that, for each $\sigma' < \sigma$,

$$(1) \quad |f'(u)v - f(u)|_\sigma \leq K_2(\sigma - \sigma') |f(u)|_\sigma^2, \quad |v|_{\sigma'} \leq K_3(\sigma - \sigma') |f(u)|_\sigma, \\ \|v\|_{\sigma'} \leq K_4(\sigma - \sigma') |f(u)|_\sigma$$

where K_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) are positive nonincreasing functions defined on the interval $(0, 1]$, $\inf K_4 > 0$.

Let K be any function defined on $(0, 1]$ such that $K \geq \max(K_1 K_3^2 + K_2, K_4)$. Suppose that there exist positive increasing functions ω , φ and g defined on $[0, 1]$ such that $\varphi \leq 1$, $\omega, g < 1$ and

$$(2) \quad (K \circ \alpha)(r)^{-1} (K \circ \alpha \circ \omega)(r) \leq g(r)^{-2} (g \circ \omega)(r)$$

for each $r \in (0, t)$, $0 < t \leq 1$ (here $\alpha = 2^{-1}(\varphi - \varphi \circ \omega)$). Then there exists $u \in \hat{R}_{\varphi(0)}$ such that $f(u) = 0$, whenever $0 \leq r_0 < t$, $u_0 \in \hat{R}_{\varphi(r_0)}$,

$$(3) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (g \circ \omega^n)(r) (K_4 \circ \alpha \circ \omega^n)(r) (K \circ \alpha \circ \omega^n)(r)^{-1} < R - \|u_0\|_{\varphi(r_0)}$$

for $r \leq r_0$

and

$$(4) \quad |f(u_0)|_{\varphi(r_0)} \leq g(r_0) (K \circ \alpha)(r_0)^{-1}.$$

Proof. We set, for a fixed $u_0 \in \hat{R}_{\varphi(r_0)}$, $W(r) = \{u \in \hat{R}_{\varphi(r)}, |f(u)|_{\varphi(r)} \leq S(r), \|u - u_0\|_{\varphi(r)} < R - \|u_0\|_{\varphi(r_0)} - k(r)\}$ for $0 < r < t$ and suitable positive increasing functions S, k defined on $(0, t)$ and such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} S(r) = 0$.

Now let $u \in W(r)$. According to 5° there exists $v \in \bigcap_{\sigma < \varphi(r)} Y_\sigma$ such that, for each $\sigma < \varphi(r)$,

$$(5) \quad |f'(u)v - f(u)|_\sigma \leq K_2(\varphi(r) - \sigma) |f(u)|_{\varphi(r)}^2, \\ |v|_\sigma \leq K_3(\varphi(r) - \sigma) |f(u)|_{\varphi(r)}, \quad \|v\|_\sigma \leq K_4(\varphi(r) - \sigma) |f(u)|_{\varphi(r)}.$$

Set now $u' = u - v$. Given σ, τ such that $\sigma < \tau < \varphi(r)$, we have the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} R - \|u_0\|_{\varphi(r_0)} - \|u' - u_0\|_{\sigma} &\geq R - \|u_0\|_{\varphi(r_0)} - \|u - u_0\|_{\sigma} - \|v\|_{\sigma} \geq \\ &\geq R - \|u_0\|_{\varphi(r_0)} - \|u - u_0\|_{\varphi(r)} - \|v\|_{\tau} \geq \\ &\geq k(r) - K_4(\varphi(r) - \tau) |f(u)|_{\varphi(r)} \geq k(r) - K_4(\varphi(r) - \tau) S(r). \end{aligned}$$

Assume for a moment that $k(r) - K_4(\varphi(r) - \tau) S(r)$ is positive. Then $u' \in \hat{R}_{\sigma}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |f(u')|_{\sigma} &\leq |f(u') - f(u) + f'(u)v|_{\sigma} + |f'(u)v - f(u)|_{\sigma} \leq \\ &\leq K_1(\tau - \sigma) |v|_{\tau}^2 + |f'(u)v - f(u)|_{\tau} \leq \\ &\leq K_1(\tau - \sigma) (K_3(\varphi(r) - \tau))^2 |f(u)|_{\varphi(r)}^2 + K_2(\varphi(r) - \tau) |f(u)|_{\varphi(r)}^2 \leq \\ &\leq [K_1(\tau - \sigma) (K_3(\varphi(r) - \tau))^2 + K_2(\varphi(r) - \tau)] S(r)^2. \end{aligned}$$

It is natural to take τ so that $\tau - \sigma = \varphi(r) - \tau$. Then

$$|f(u')|_{\sigma} \leq (K_1 K_3^2 + K_2) (2^{-1}(\varphi(r) - \sigma)) S(r)^2.$$

Clearly, it is desirable to find functions ω, k and S so that, for $\sigma = (\varphi \circ \omega)(r)$ and $\alpha = 2^{-1}(\varphi(r) - (\varphi \circ \omega)(r))$,

$$(6) \quad k(r) - (K_4 \circ \alpha)(r) S(r) \geq (k \circ \omega)(r)$$

and

$$(7) \quad ((K_1 K_3^2 + K_2) \circ \alpha)(r) S(r)^2 \leq (S \circ \omega)(r).$$

The inequality (7) is equivalent to

$$(8) \quad ((K_1 K_3^2 + K_2) \circ \alpha)(r) S(r)^2 (S \circ \omega)(r)^{-1} \leq 1.$$

Since $S(r) (S \circ \omega)(r)^{-1} > 1$ it follows that S should be majorized by $1/((K_1 K_3^2 + K_2) \circ \alpha)$. As the inequality (6) is obviously satisfied for $k(r) = \sum (K_4 \circ \alpha \circ \omega^n)(r) \cdot (S \circ \omega^n)(r)$ if the series converges, it is convenient to set $S(r) = g(r) (K \circ \alpha)(r)^{-1}$ for a positive $g, g < 1$. If g satisfies (2) then (8) is fulfilled. Moreover, if g satisfies also (3) then $k(r) < R - \|u_0\|_{\varphi(r_0)}$.

It follows from (5) that

$$(8,1) \quad W(r) \subset U(W(\omega(r)), S(r) (K_3 \circ \alpha)(r))$$

in the space $(Y_{(\varphi \circ \omega)(r)}, |_{(\varphi \circ \omega)(r)})$ and, obviously, in the space $(Y_{\varphi(0)}, |_{\varphi(0)})$ as well.

If $|f(u_0)|_{\varphi(r_0)} \leq g(r_0) (K \circ \alpha)(r_0)^{-1}$ then the set $W(r_0)$ as well as $W(0)$ is nonempty. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S \circ \omega^n)(r) = 0$ for each $r \leq r_0$ it follows from 3° that each $u \in W(0)$ satisfies $f(u) = 0$. The proof is complete. *

3.2. Remark. We can also estimate the distance between the initial point $u_0 \in \hat{R}_{\varphi(r_0)}$ we are starting with and a solution. Assume that (3) and (4) are fulfilled. Then there exists a solution of $f(u) = 0$ in the space $Y_{\varphi(0)}$ satisfying

$$(9) \quad |u - u_0|_{\varphi(0)} \leq |f(u_0)|_{\varphi(r_0)} g(r_0)^{-1} (K \circ \alpha)(r_0) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (K_3 \circ \alpha \circ \omega^n)(r_0) \cdot (g \circ \omega^n)(r_0) (K \circ \alpha \circ \omega^n)(r_0)^{-1}$$

and

$$(10) \quad \|u - u_0\|_{\varphi(0)} \leq |f(u_0)|_{\varphi(r_0)} g(r_0)^{-1} (K \circ \alpha)(r_0) \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (K_4 \circ \alpha \circ \omega^n)(r_0) (g \circ \omega^n)(r_0) (K \circ \alpha \circ \omega^n)(r_0)^{-1}.$$

Proof. The reasoning in the preceding proof remains valid if g is replaced by any function of the form $v \cdot g$, $0 < v \leq 1$. Denote $S' = vS$ and

$$W'(r) = \{u \in \hat{R}_{\varphi(r)}, |f(u)|_{\varphi(r)} \leq S'(r), \|u\|_{\varphi(r)} < R - \|u_0\|_{\varphi(r_0)} - k(r)\}.$$

Then the inclusion (8.1) has the form $W'(r) \subset U(W'(\omega(r)), S'(r)(K_3 \circ \alpha)(r))$ in the space $(Y_{\varphi(0)}, \| \cdot \|_{\varphi(0)})$ and, in virtue of (5), $W'(r) \subset U(W'(\omega(r)), S'(r)(K_4 \circ \alpha)(r))$ in the space $(Y_{\varphi(0)}, \| \cdot \|_{\varphi(0)})$.

Suppose that $u_0 \in W(r_0)$ and take v so that $|f(u_0)|_{\varphi(r_0)} = vS(r_0)$. Then $u_0 \in W'(r_0)$ as well. It follows from the induction theorem that there exists $u \in \hat{R}_{\varphi(0)}$ satisfying (9), (10) and $f(u) = 0$.

4. Remarks and applications. The above theorem generalizes the results of [2] and [9]. First, we shall show how to find functions ω , φ and g under certain growth conditions on the functions K_i .

4.1. Lemma. *Suppose that K from Theorem 2.1 is a decreasing continuous function defined on the interval $(0, 1)$ such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} K(r) = \infty$. Suppose further that there exist numbers $1 < a \leq 2$, $0 < d < 1$, $b, w > 0$ and a positive decreasing continuous function h defined on the interval $(0, 1)$ such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} h(r) = \infty$,*

$$(11) \quad h(r^a) h(r)^{-1} \leq b r^{w(a-2)}$$

$$(12) \quad (K^{-1} \circ h)(r^a) \leq d(K^{-1} \circ h)(r)$$

for each $r \in (0, 1)$.

Then the functions

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(r) &= r^a, \\ \alpha(r) &= K^{-1}(h(r)), \\ \varphi(r) &= \sigma_0 + 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha \circ \omega^n)(r) \quad \text{with a fixed } \sigma_0 \in [0, 1), \\ g(r) &= b^{-1} r^w \end{aligned}$$

satisfy (2) for small r .

Proof. If $\omega(r) = r^a$, we are to find $\varphi, \alpha = 2^{-1}(\varphi - \varphi \circ \omega)$ and g so that (2) be satisfied.

It is natural to take $\alpha = K^{-1} \circ h$ for a positive decreasing function h such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} h(r) = \infty$. As h satisfies (11) we have

$$\alpha(r^a) = (K^{-1} \circ h)(r^a) \leq d(K^{-1} \circ h)(r) = d \cdot \alpha(r)$$

and

$$(13) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha \circ \omega^n)(r) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (K^{-1} \circ h)(r^{a^n}) \leq (1-d)^{-1} (K^{-1} \circ h)(r).$$

With respect to the equality $\alpha = 2^{-1}(\varphi - \varphi \circ \omega)$ one possible choice of φ is to set $\varphi(r) = \sigma_0 + 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha \circ \omega^n)(r)$ for some $\sigma_0, 0 \leq \sigma_0 < 1$. Because of continuity of α and with respect to $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} h(r) = \infty$ there exists r_0 such that $\varphi \leq 1$ for $r \leq r_0$.

The condition (2) of Theorem 3.1 turns out to be

$$h(r^a) h(r)^{-1} \leq g(r^a) g(r)^{-2}$$

for small r .

It is convenient to have g commuting with ω in the sense of superposition, so we set $g(r) = b^{-1} r^w$ for some positive b, w .

4.2. Lemma. *Suppose that the assumptions of 4.1 are satisfied and replace the inequality (12) by*

$$(12') \quad (K^{-1} \circ h)(r^a) = d(K^{-1} \circ h)(r)$$

for each $r \in (0, 1)$.

Let $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ and $u_0 \in \hat{R}_\sigma$ be given. Denote by q_σ the solution of the equation $(1-q)b(R - \|u_0\|_\sigma) = q^{1/(a-1)}$.

If

$$(14) \quad q^{1/(a-1)w} > (h^{-1} \circ K)(\sigma(1-d)/4)$$

and

$$(15) \quad |f(u_0)|_\sigma < \frac{(h^{-1} \circ K)(\sigma(1-d)/4)^w}{bK(\sigma(1-d)/4)}$$

then there exists $u \in \hat{R}_{\sigma/2}$ such that $f(u) = 0$.

Proof. Given $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, we set $\varphi(r) = \sigma/2 + 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha \circ \omega^n)(r) = \sigma/2 + 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (K^{-1} \circ h)(r^{a^n}) = \sigma/2 + 2(1-d)^{-1} (K^{-1} \circ h)(r)$ according to (12'). For $r_\sigma = (h^{-1} \circ K)(\sigma(1-d)/4)$ we have $\varphi(r_\sigma) = \sigma$.

As $K_4 \leq K$, the inequality (3) will be satisfied if $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (g \circ \omega^n)(r_\sigma) = b^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^{a^n} < R - \|u_0\|_\sigma$. The last series is majorized by the geometric series $r_\sigma^w \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q^n < b(R - \|u_0\|_\sigma)$ for $r_\sigma < \min((1 - q)b(R - \|u_0\|_\sigma), q^{1/(a-1)})^{1/w}$. In order to ensure the best estimate for r_σ we shall suppose that q_a is taken so that $(1 - q_a) \cdot b(R - \|u_0\|_\sigma) = q_a^{1/(a-1)}$.

Finally, the initial condition (4) has the form

$$\begin{aligned} g(r_\sigma)(K \circ \alpha)(r_\sigma)^{-1} &= g(r_\sigma)h(r_\sigma)^{-1} = b^{-1}r_\sigma^w h(r_\sigma)^{-1} = \\ &= ((h^{-1} \circ K)(\sigma(1 - d)/4))^w (bK(\sigma(1 - d)/4))^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

4.3. Corollary. (Theorem 1 of [9].) *Consider the same situation as in Theorem 3.1 with $K_1(r) = K_1 r^{-\alpha}$, $K_2(r) = K_2 r^{-(\alpha+\gamma)}$, $K_3(r) = K_3 r^{-\gamma}$, $K_4(r) = K_3 r^{-(\gamma+\beta)}$ for $r \in (0, 1]$, $K_1, K_2, K_3, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$ being positive numbers. Denote $\delta = \max(\alpha + 2\gamma, \gamma + \beta)$.*

Then there exists a constant c depending on $K_i, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$ such that, whenever

$$(16) \quad |f(u_0)|_\sigma \leq c \frac{(R - \|u_0\|_\sigma)}{1 + 2(R - \|u_0\|_\sigma)} \sigma^\delta$$

for some $u_0 \in \hat{R}_\sigma$ and some $0 < \sigma \leq 1$, then there exists $u \in Y_{\sigma/2}$ such that

$$1^\circ \quad f(u) = 0,$$

$$2^\circ \quad \|u - u_0\|_{\sigma/2} \leq c^{-1} |f(u_0)|_\sigma (1 + 2(R - \|u_0\|_\sigma)) \sigma^{-\gamma} \leq (R - \|u_0\|_\sigma) \sigma^{\delta-\gamma},$$

$$3^\circ \quad \|u - u_0\|_{\sigma/2} \leq c^{-1} |f(u_0)|_\sigma (1 + 2(R - \|u_0\|_\sigma)) \sigma^{-\gamma-\beta} \leq (R - \|u_0\|_\sigma) \sigma^{\delta-\gamma-\beta}.$$

Proof. Set $K(r) = Mr^{-\delta}$ where $M = \max(K_3, K_1 K_3^2 + K_2)$, then $K^{-1}(r) = (M^{-1}r)^{-1/\delta}$.

Given $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ and $u_0 \in \hat{R}_\sigma$, we are to find, according to 4.1 and 4.2, $1 < a \leq 2$, $0 < d < 1$, $b > 0$, $w > 0$ and a function h satisfying

$$h(r^a)h(r)^{-1} \leq br^{w(a-2)}$$

and

$$(M^{-1}h(r^a))^{-1/\delta} = d(M^{-1}h(r))^{-1/\delta}$$

for small r , or equivalently,

$$(17) \quad d^{-\delta} = h(r^a)h(r)^{-1} \leq br^{w(a-2)}.$$

Further, the function h should satisfy

$$(h^{-1} \circ K)(\sigma(1 - d)/4) < q_a^{1/(a-1)w}.$$

Since the function $q_a^{1/(a-1)}$ increases in the interval $(1, 2]$ the best choice, with respect to the initial condition, is $a = 2$; then $q_2 = b(R - \|u_0\|_\sigma)(1 + b(R - \|u_0\|_\sigma))^{-1}$.

Going back to the inequality (17) we see that $h(r^2)h(r)^{-1}$ is to be a bounded function, so we set $d = 2^{-1/\delta}$, $b = 2$, $w = 1$, $h(r) = -N_\sigma \log r$ for $0 < r < 1$ with N_σ such that

$$r_\sigma = (h^{-1} \circ K)(\sigma(1-d)/4) = \exp(-N_\sigma^{-1} M \sigma^{-\delta} (1-d)^{-\delta} 4^\delta) = \eta q_2$$

for arbitrary fixed $0 < \eta < 1$.

Finally, set c to satisfy $cK(\sigma(1-d)/4) = \sigma^{-\delta}$. According to what has been said above and according to 4.2 it follows that the following implication holds: whenever

$$|f(u_0)|_\sigma < c \frac{R - \|u_0\|_\sigma}{1 + 2(R - \|u_0\|_\sigma)} \sigma^\delta$$

for some $u_0 \in \hat{R}_\sigma$ then there exists an element $u \in \hat{R}_{\sigma/2}$ with $f(u) = 0$.

The proof of the first part is complete.

Using the inequalities (9) and (10) of Remark 3.2, the relations $r_\sigma = (h^{-1} \circ K)(\sigma(1-d)/4) < q_2$ and $cK(\sigma(1-d)/4) = \sigma^{-\delta}$, we can estimate the distance between a solution u and the initial point $u_0 \in Y_\sigma$ satisfying (16) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_0\|_{\sigma/2} &\leq |f(u_0)|_\sigma r_\sigma^{-1} h(r_\sigma) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} K_3 M^{-1} (K^{-1} \circ h)(r_\sigma^{2^n})^{\delta-\gamma} r_\sigma^{2^n} \leq \\ &\leq |f(u_0)|_\sigma r_\sigma^{-1} h(r_\sigma) K_3 M^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (K^{-1} \circ h)(r_\sigma)^{\delta-\gamma} r_\sigma^{2^n} \leq \\ &\leq |f(u_0)|_\sigma r_\sigma^{-1} h(r_\sigma) (K^{-1} \circ h)(r_\sigma)^{\delta-\gamma} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_\sigma^{2^n} \leq \\ &\leq |f(u_0)|_\sigma r_\sigma^{-1} M^{1-\gamma/\delta} h(r_\sigma)^{\gamma/\delta} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_\sigma q_2^n = \\ &= |f(u_0)|_\sigma M^{1-\gamma/\delta} K(\sigma(1-d)/4)^{\gamma/\delta} (1-q_2)^{-1} \leq \\ &\leq |f(u_0)|_\sigma K(\sigma(1-d)/4) \sigma^{\delta-\gamma} (1+2(R-\|u_0\|_\sigma)) = \\ &= |f(u_0)|_\sigma c^{-1} (1+2(R-\|u_0\|_\sigma)) \sigma^{-\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

and, using the substitution $\gamma + \beta$ for γ ,

$$\|u - u_0\|_{\sigma/2} \leq c^{-1} |f(u_0)|_\sigma (1+2(R-\|u_0\|_\sigma)) \sigma^{-\gamma-\beta} \leq (R-\|u_0\|_\sigma) \sigma^{\delta-\gamma-\beta}.$$

Remark. We intend now to estimate the rate of convergence $\tilde{\omega}$ associated by the induction theorem with the above mentioned process. According to (8,1) the function τ of 2.2 has the form

$$\tau(r) = (K_3 \circ \alpha)(r) g(r) (K \circ \alpha)(r)^{-1}.$$

In our case $g(r) = 2^{-1}r$, $K_3(r) = K_3 r^{-\gamma}$, $K(r) = M r^{-\delta}$ and $\alpha = (K^{-1} \circ h)(r) = M^{1/\delta} h(r)^{-1/\delta} = M^{1/\delta} (-N_\sigma \log r)^{-1/\delta}$ so that

$$\tau(r) = 2^{-1} K_3 M^{-\gamma/\delta} r h(r)^{\gamma/\delta-1}.$$

We have, for $s = \tau^{-1}(r)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\omega}(r) &= (\tau \circ \omega)(s) = \tau(s^2) = 2^{-1}K_3M^{-\gamma/\delta}s^2 h(s^2)^{\gamma/\delta-1} = \\ &= 2K_3^{-1}M^{\gamma/\delta}2^{\gamma/\delta-1}r^2 h(s)^{1-\gamma/\delta}.\end{aligned}$$

We intend to show that there exists, for each $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, a constant Q_σ such that

$$\tilde{\omega}(r) \leq Q_\sigma(-\log r)^{1-\gamma/\delta} r^2$$

for $r \in (0, r_\sigma]$.

Obviously, it suffices to show that $h(s) \leq B_\sigma(-\log r)$ for suitable positive B_σ and $r \in (0, r_\sigma]$, or equivalently, that there exists a constant C_σ such that $\tau^{-1}(r) = s \geq r^{C_\sigma}$ for $r \leq r_\sigma$. Since $\tau(r) \leq K_\sigma r$ in $(0, r_\sigma]$ it suffices to take C_σ so that $\tau(r^{C_\sigma}) \leq K_\sigma r^{C_\sigma} \leq r = \tau(s)$ for $r \leq r_\sigma$.

We shall turn now our attention to the paper [2]. It is not difficult to prove that the main theorem of the above mentioned paper is a discrete case of our Theorem 3.1. More interesting is the illustrative example in which the author proves the existence of solutions of a nonlinear differential equation with odd quasi-periodic coefficients. In this case there exists an exact right inverse, however, its growth is of exponential type.

Consider the Banach space E_σ of all compositions $x = f \circ q$ where f is a 2π -periodic scalar function of n complex variables, bounded for $|\operatorname{Im} z| \leq \sigma$ ($|z| = \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i|$) and holomorphic inside, and q is an n -tuple (q_1, \dots, q_n) , $q_j = i\alpha_j + \omega_j t$ (ω_j are linearly independent real algebraic numbers of degree ν and $|\alpha| < \sigma$, $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$), equipped with the norm $\|x\|_\sigma = \sup_{|\operatorname{Im} z| \leq \sigma} |f(z)|$.

It follows that $f(z) = \sum_k f_k e^{i(k,z)}$ for $|\operatorname{Im} z| < \sigma$ and $|f_k| \leq \sup_{|\operatorname{Im} z| \leq \sigma} |f(z)| e^{-|k|\sigma}$. On the other hand, any sequence (f_k) such that $|f_k| \leq M e^{-|k|\sigma}$ defines a holomorphic function f for $|\operatorname{Im} z| < \sigma$ and $\sup_{|\operatorname{Im} z| \leq \sigma'} |f(z)| \leq (4/(\sigma - \sigma'))^n M$ for each $0 < \sigma' < \sigma$ (see [1], p. 168).

Let F_σ be the subspace of E_σ consisting of all functions $x = f \circ q \in E_\sigma$ such that $\dot{x} \in E_\sigma$ as well ($\dot{x} = d(f \circ q)(t)/dt$) with the norm $\|x\|_\sigma = \|x\|_\sigma + \|\dot{x}\|_\sigma$.

Consider the operator

$$P(x) = \dot{x} + F(x, q(\cdot)) + f \circ q$$

where $F(x, z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k(z) x^k$, $f_k \circ q$, $f \circ q \in E_\sigma$, $x \in \hat{R}_\sigma = \{u \in F_\sigma, \|u\|_\sigma < R\}$ and $\sum |f_k \circ q|_\sigma |u|^k < \infty$ for $|u| \leq R + \varepsilon$ ($\varepsilon > 0$).

The operator P maps each F_σ into E_σ and has bounded first and second derivatives

$$P'(u)x = \dot{x} + \frac{\partial F(u, q(\cdot))}{\partial u} x, \quad P''(u)(x, z) = \frac{\partial^2 F(u, q(\cdot))}{\partial u^2} xz$$

for $u \in \hat{R}_\sigma$, $x, z \in F_\sigma$. Note that $P'(u)$ maps each F_σ into E_σ for all $0 < \sigma \leq 1$.

The boundedness of P'' yields

$$|P(u+v) - P(u) - P'(u)v|_\sigma \leq M_1 |v|_\sigma^2$$

whenever $u, u+v \in R_\sigma$.

Take $u \in \hat{R}_\sigma$. We shall show that there exists an exact right inverse to $P'(u)$, i.e. we can find, for each $x = f \circ q \in E_\sigma$, an element $v \in F_\sigma$, ($\sigma/2 < \sigma' < \sigma$) such that $P'(u)v = x$.

Indeed, denote $a(u, z) = \partial F(u, z)/\partial u$. Then the function v defined by the formula

$$(18) \quad v(t) = \exp\left(-\int_0^t a(u, q(y)) dy\right) \int_0^t (f \circ q)(w) \exp\left(\int_0^w a(u, q(y)) dy\right) dw$$

satisfies $\dot{v}(t) = -a(u, q(t))v(t) + (f \circ q)(t)$ for each t .

To prove that $v \in F_\sigma$, ($\sigma/2 < \sigma' < \sigma$) we shall use Lemma 2 from [2]:

There exists a constant $b(v, n)$ such that, given a function $g \circ q \in E_\sigma$ with $g(z) = \sum_{k \neq 0} g_k e^{i(k, z)}$, the function h defined by

$$h(t) = \int_0^t (g \circ q)(y) dy = \sum_{k \neq 0} \frac{g_k}{i(k, \omega)} e^{i(k, q(t))} \Big|_0^t$$

belongs to F_σ , and $|h|_{\sigma'} \leq |g \circ q|_\sigma b(v, n) (\sigma - \sigma')^{-(n+v)}$.

It follows that we have the estimate

$$(19) \quad |v|_{\sigma'} \leq \exp(2|a(u, q)|_\sigma b(v, n) (\sigma - \sigma')^{-(n+v)}) |f \circ q|_\sigma b(v, n) \cdot (\sigma - \sigma')^{-(n+v)} \leq M(v, n)^{(\sigma - \sigma')^{-(v+n)}} |f \circ q|_\sigma$$

for any function v defined by (18) such that

$$(20) \quad \int_0^{2\pi} a(u, q(y)) dy = 0$$

and

$$\int_0^{2\pi} (f \circ q)(w) \exp\left(\int_0^w a(u, q(y)) dy\right) dw = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{\sigma'} &= |v|_{\sigma'} + |\dot{v}|_{\sigma'} \leq (|a(u)|_{\sigma'} + 1) |v|_{\sigma'} + |f|_{\sigma'} \leq \\ &\leq ((|a(u)|_{\sigma'} + 1) M(v, n)^{(\sigma - \sigma')^{-(v+n)}} + 1) |f|_{\sigma'} \leq M_2^{(\sigma - \sigma')^{-v}} |f|_{\sigma'} \end{aligned}$$

where $p = v + n$.

The conditions (20) are fulfilled if u is even and all $f_k \circ q, f \circ g$ odd functions.

We are led to the following definitions:

Let Y_σ be the Banach space consisting of all even functions from F_σ and let Z_σ be the Banach space consisting of all odd functions from E_σ .

Then the operator P maps Y_σ into Z_σ and satisfies $1^\circ - 5^\circ$ of Theorem 3.1 (here norms on Y_σ coincide). Hence we shall apply Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 with

$$K_1(r) = M_1 \geq 1, \quad K_2(r) = 0, \quad K_3(r) = K_4(r) = M_2^{r^{-p}}$$

for $0 < r \leq 1$.

4.3. Corollary. *Let $u_0 \in \hat{R}_\sigma$ be given, $0 < \sigma \leq 1$. There exists a positive m depending on M_2 , p and $R - \|u_0\|_\sigma$ such that $|P(u_0)|_\sigma < M_1^{-1} m^{-\sigma-p}$ implies the existence of an element $u \in \hat{R}_{\sigma/2}$ such that $P(u) = 0$.*

Proof. Set $K(r) = M_1 M_2^{2r^{-p}}$ for $0 < r < 1$. Then $K^{-1}(s) = (2^{-1} \log_{M_2} M_1^{-1} s)^{-1/p}$ for $s > M_1 M_2^2$. Let $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, $u_0 \in \hat{R}_\sigma$ be given. According to 4.1 it is sufficient to find constants $w > 0$, $b > 0$, $0 < d < 1$, $1 < a \leq 2$ and a function h such that

$$h(r^a) \leq b r^{w(a-2)} h(r)$$

and

$$(2^{-1} \log_{M_2} M_1^{-1} h(r^a))^{-1/p} \leq d (2^{-1} \log_{M_2} M_1^{-1} h(r))^{-1/p}$$

or equivalently,

$$(21) \quad M_1^{-1-d-p} h(r)^{d-p} \leq h(r^a) \leq b r^{w(a-2)} h(r).$$

Since $d^{-p} > 1$ we set $h(r) = M_1 r^{-z}$ for a positive z . To satisfy (21) it is sufficient to take $1 < a < 2$, $w = z(a-1)(2-a)^{-1}$, $d = a^{-1/p}$ and $b = 1$. As $(h^{-1} \circ K)(r) = M_2^{-2r^{-p}z^{-1}}$ the condition (14) has the form

$$(22) \quad M_2^{-2(a-1)(2-a)^{-1}(1-a^{-1/p})^{-p}d^p\sigma^{-p}} < q_a^{1/(a-1)}$$

where q_a is the solution of the equation

$$(1-q)(R - \|u_0\|_\sigma) = q^{1/(a-1)}.$$

Since $\lim_{a \rightarrow 2^-} q_a^{1/(a-1)} > 0$ it follows that there exists $a_0 \in (1, 2)$ such that the inequality (22) holds for each $\sigma \in (0, 1]$.

Finally, if

$$|P(u_0)|_\sigma < \frac{(h^{-1} \circ K)(\sigma(1-d)/4)^w}{bK(\sigma(1-d)/4)} = \frac{1}{M_1} M_2^{-2(2-a_0)^{-1}(1-a_0^{-1/p})^{-p}d^p\sigma^{-p}}$$

then, according to 4.2, there exists $u \in \hat{R}_{\sigma/2}$ such that $P(u) = 0$.

References

- [1] В. И. Арнольд: Малые знаменатели и проблемы устойчивости движения в классической и небесной механике, УМН 18, вып. 6 (1963), 91—192.

- [2] *И. Н. Блотов*: Об одном итерационном процессе Ньютона, Изв. АН, сер. мат. 33 (1969), 3—14.
- [3] *J. Moser*: A new technique for the construction of solutions of nonlinear differential equations, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. 47 (1961), 1824—1831.
- [4] *V. Pták*: Deux théorèmes de factorisation, Comptes Rendus Ac. Sci. Paris 278 (1974), 1091—1094.
- [5] *V. Pták*: A theorem of the closed graph type, Manuscripta Math. 13 (1974), 109—130.
- [6] *V. Pták*: A quantitative refinement of the closed graph theorem, Czech. Math. Journal 99 (1974), 503—506.
- [7] *V. Pták*: Nondiscrete mathematical induction and iterative existence proofs, Linear Algebra and its Applications 13 (1976), 223—238.
- [8] *V. Pták*: A modification of Newton's method, Čas. přest. mat. 101 (1976), 188—194.
- [9] *E. Zehnder*: An implicit function theorem for small divisor problems, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 80 (1974), 174—179.
- [10] *E. Zehnder*: Generalized implicit function theorems with applications to some small divisor problems (preprint).

Authors' address: 115 67 Praha 1, Žitná 25, ČSSR (Matematický ústav ČSAV).