Lecture 7-

we prove a basic existence and uniqueness theorem for the ODE y'=f(x,y),  $y(x,0)=y_0-(1)$ Theorem (Picard). Let R = [a,b] x [c,d] be a closed rectangle in 122. Let f:R->R be a continuous function Such that of (xij) exists at each (xiy) & R° = interior of R and and dyf(x1y) extends as a continuous function to the whole of R. If (xo) yo) e Ro Hen Here exists hoo with the property that the initial value problem (1) has a unique Solution y = y(x) on the interval [xo-h, xoth] c [a,b]. Remark By a solution y=y(x) of (1) we mean a continuous function

y: [xo-h, xoth] -> R that ( satisfies the integral equation  $y(x) = f_0 + \int_{\infty}^{\infty} f(t, y(t)) dt - (2)$ for x G [xo-h, xo+h]. Proof of Theorem. Let  $y(x) = y_0$ + x & [e1b]. Then for n7/1 we define iteratively x  $y(x) := y_0 + \int f(t, y_0(t)) dt$   $y_0(x) := y_0 + \int f(t, y_0(t)) dt$ The sequence  $\{y_0\}$  is a sequence of Continuous functions on [a16]. We want to show the existence of a limit  $y(\alpha) = \int_{n \to \infty}^{\infty} f_n(x)$  in some inter - Val around 20. To do this we write  $(4) - y(x) = y(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} (y_k(x) - y_{k-1}(x))$ It follows that the convergence of

of the sequence {y(x)} is equivalent to the convergence of the series  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (y_{k}(x) - y_{k-1}(x)) - (5)$ It then follows that y(x) is given by  $y(x) = f_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (g_k(x) - g_{k-1}(x))$ . To show convergence of the series (5), it suffices to show, by the Weierstrass M-fest that I h 70 and a sequence {Mk3 with } Mk < 00 (Mx704 k) and such that  $|y_{k}(x) - y_{k-1}(x)| \leq M_{k} - (7)$ for & E [xo-h, xo+h]. The convergence in (5) will in fact be uniform. Since Y(x) are continuous functions, and since the uniform limit of continu-

- ous functions is continuous, the (4) limit y(x) will be a continuerus function. We first determine the number 170 as follows: Since f(x,y) and Dyf(x,y) are continuous on the closed rectargle R, 7 constants Mand K (both positive) such that  $(7a) - |f(x_1y)| \le M$  and  $|\partial_y f(x_1y)| \le K$ for every (xiy) e R. Next, note that if (x, y,) and (x, y) belong to R, then by the mean value theorem,  $|f(x_3y_1)-f(x_1y_2)|=|\partial_y f(x_1y_1)||y_2-y_1|$ for some y in the interval between y, and fz. In particular it follows for all y, y2 lying on a vertical line in R.

We now choose hyo such that (5). Kh < 1. and such that the rectangle  $R' = [x_0 - h, x_0 + h] \times [y_0 - Mh, y_0 + Mh]$ CR. This is possible because (Xo140) E R°. To prove the estimate in (7) we first observe that  $|\mathcal{J}_{k}(x) - \mathcal{J}_{0}| = |\mathcal{J}_{k-1}(t)\mathcal{J}_{k-1}(t)|$ < [ | f(t) ] | dt < M(x-x0) < Mh for  $x \in [x_0 - h, x_0 + h]$ . It follows that y(x) has a graph lying in R' ie. (x) y(x)) e R' fox xe[x-h,x+h]. Suppose  $\sup_{x \in [x_5h, x_5th]} |y_i(x) - y_5| = a$ |f(t, y(t)) - f(t, y(t)) | < k | y(t) - y = | Then < ka

 $|f(x) - f(x)| < \int |f(t, f(t)) - f(t, f(t))| dt$ Hence, < Kah. L Note: we are using the fact that if osfa) & g(t), then Stephen & Squat ] More generally, if 17(x)-9(x)  $\alpha(Kh)^{K-1}$ for x E [x-h, xoth], then [f(E)](6))-f(E)+(6)) < K/9(6)-y(E) {ak(kh)k-1 and hence < SIF(E, 7(E)) - f(E, 7(6) | dE 1 / (x) - y (x) (a (Kh)  $M_k = (Kh)^k$  and Hence taking

noting that by our choice of (7) h, Kh < 1 and herce \( \frac{1}{k} \) M\_K =  $\sum_{k} (Kh)^{k} < \infty \cdot Hence$   $y_{n}(x) = y_{0}(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} (y_{0}(x) - y_{k-1}(x))$   $y_{n}(x) = y_{0}(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} (y_{0}(x) - y_{k-1}(x))$ Converges uniformly to some contin-uous function y(x) on the interval [xo-h, xoth]. (Note: A sequence of functions fra)  $x \in [aib]$  converges to f(x) uniformly

If f(x) = f(x) uniformly f(x) = f(x) such that  $|f_n(x)-f(x)|<\varepsilon$ for all x & [a16] and + n 7, no.) We need to show that the limit function y(x) satisfies our integral equation. To see this, note that we have x  $f(t, y_n(t))dt$   $y(x) = y_0 + x_0$  $Tor x \in [x_5h, x_5th], y(x) \rightarrow y(x)$ 

Since f:R -> IR is continuous, (8) we have f(t, f, (t)) -> f(t, g(t)) for every te [xoh, xoth]. Note that Egraph of Yntige R'CR. In fact f(t, yn, st)) -> f(t, y(t)) uniformly for te [x=h, xoth] This can be seen from the estimate [f(t,y(b))-f(t,y(b))] < K |y(b)-y(b)] for every t & [xoh, xoth]. Exerscise. Let R C 1R2 be a vectcongle viz R = [a1b] x [c1d] and yn: [a1b] -> [c,a]. Let f: R -> R be a continuous function. If yn(2) -> y(2) uniformly on [arb] show that f(t, y(6)) converges lo f(tiy(t)) uniformly on Back to the proof: Since f(tign-1)

Converges to f(t, y(t)) uniformly we (9) have sf(E, y, CE)) dE -> ff(E, y(E))dE Hence taking limits in the equation Z<sub>o</sub> y(1x) = yo + (E, y(t)) dt we get that y(t) satisfies our integral equation. This proves existence of a solution to our one (1). We now show uniqueness of solutions of equation (1) ie we need to show that if y(x) is any other solution of (1) on  $[x_0-h,x_0+h]$ , then  $y(\alpha)=\overline{y}(\alpha)$ y x ∈ [x₀-h, x₀+h]. To see this we first claim that 1 {(x, y(x): x=h < x < x,+h} = R Recall that R':= [xoh, xoth] x [yoMh, yoth] 1f6,401 & M, Kh < 1.

Once the claim is proved, we can (10) complete the proof of uniqueness as follows:  $y(x) - \overline{y}(x) = \int_{x_0}^{x} (f(t, y(t)) - f(t, \overline{y}(t))) dt$  $\Rightarrow$   $|y(Ge)-\overline{y(Ge)}| < \int^{\infty} |f(t,y(Ge))-f(t,\overline{y}(Ge))| dt$ < Kh Sup 19(6) - 9(6) 1 te [36h, 26th] Since x & [xoh, xoth]. Hence we get Sup |y(x)-y(x)|  $\langle Kh Sup |y(x)-y(x)|$   $\chi \in [x_0 h, x_0 th]$ But  $|Y(x)-y(x)| = y(x_0)$  for all  $x \in [x_0 - h, x_0 + h]$ proof of claim: The claim is proved by showing that there does not exist any point  $x_1 \in (x_0 h, x_0 + h)$  such that y(x,) = yot Mh. For, if such a

a point exists, Ehen for a point (11) X such that |x-xo| < |x,-xo] we 1 y (x1 - x01 = Mh - Mh - M. have 1x1-x01 On the other hand for a point or such that 1x-x01 & 1x1-x01,  $\frac{|\overline{y}(x) - \overline{y}_0|}{|x - x_0|} = \frac{|\overline{y}(x) - \overline{y}(x_0)|}{|x - x_0|}$  $|\overline{y}'(\overline{x})| = |f(\overline{x}, \overline{y}(\overline{x}))|$ where I is in the interval between on and Xo. This contradiction shows that  $X_1 \notin (x_0 - h, x_1 + h)$ . This proves our claim.