

## Positive Solution of Random Differential Equation in Banach Spaces

P.G. Swami <sup>a</sup>, D.S. Palimkar <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Mathematics, VES College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Chembur, Mumbai [MS] India

Email: prashantswami999@gmail.com

<sup>b</sup> Department of Mathematics, Vasant Rao Naik College, Nanded [MS] India

Email: dspalimkar@rediffmail.com

**Abstract** : Here, we investigate two point boundary value problem for the second order functional random differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} p''(t, \omega) + \lambda p'(t, \omega) + u(t, p(h_1(t, \omega)), p(h_2(t, \omega)), p(h_3(t, \omega)), \omega) &= 0, \\ ap(-1, \omega) - bp'(-1, \omega) &= 0, \\ cp(1, \omega) + dp'(1, \omega) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the function  $u$  takes values in a cone  $K$  of a Banach space  $E$ . For  $h_1(t, \omega) = (t, \omega)$  and  $h_2(t, \omega) = (-t, \omega)$  and  $h_3(t, \omega) = (t, \omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$  we obtain the boundary value problem with reflection of the argument. we prove the existence of positive solution in the space  $C([-1, 1], E, \Omega)$  using random fixed point theorem.

**Keywords:** Random differential equation, Boundary value problem, Banach space, positive solution, fixed point theorem.

**1991 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 34G20, 34F05, 47H40.

### 1. Introduction

Let  $K$  be a cone in a real Banach space  $E$ . We will assume that the norm  $\|\cdot\|_E$  in  $E$  is monotonic with respect to  $K$ , that is, if  $\theta < u < v$  then  $\|u\|_E \leq \|v\|_E$ , where  $<$  denotes the partial ordering defined by  $K$  and  $\theta$  stands for the zero element of  $E$ . Further, denote by  $C(I, E, \Omega)$  the space of all continuous functions defined on the interval  $[-1, 1]$  and taking values in  $E$ , equipped with the norm

$$\|u\| = \max_{\substack{t \in I \\ \omega \in \Omega}} \|u(t, \omega)\|_E.$$

Clearly,  $C(I, E, \Omega)$  is a Banach space.

Let  $Q(\omega) = \{x \in C(I, E, \Omega) : \theta < x(t, \omega) \text{ for } t \in I, \omega \in \Omega\}$

It is easy to prove that  $Q$  is a cone in  $C(I, E, \Omega)$ .

we will study two point boundary value problem for the second order functional random differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} p''(t, \omega) + \lambda p'(t, \omega) + u(t, p(h_1(t, \omega)), p(h_2(t, \omega)), p(h_3(t, \omega)), \omega) &= 0, \\ ap(-1, \omega) - bp'(-1, \omega) &= 0, \\ cp(1, \omega) + dp'(1, \omega) &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

Where  $t \in I, k \in R, a, b, c, d \geq 0$  and  $ad + bc + ac > 0, \omega \in \Omega$ .

we will assume that

1.  $u : I \times K \times K \times K \times \Omega \rightarrow K$  is a continuous function.
2.  $h_1, h_2, h_3 : I \times \Omega \rightarrow I$  are continuous functions mapping the interval  $I$  onto itself.

Notice that for  $h_1(t, \omega) = (t, \omega)$  and  $h_2(t, \omega) = (-t, \omega)$  and  $h_3(t, \omega) = (t, \omega)$  we obtain the boundary value problem involving reflection of the argument

$$\begin{aligned} p''(t, \omega) + \lambda p'(t, \omega) + u(t, p(h_1(t, \omega)), p(h_2(t, \omega)), p(h_3(t, \omega)), \omega) &= 0, \\ ap(-1, \omega) - bp'(-1, \omega) &= 0, \\ cp(1, \omega) + dp'(1, \omega) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Such problems have been considered in [5,9] for  $\lambda = 0$  and  $u : I \times K \times K \times K \times \Omega \rightarrow K$  and for  $f$  taking values in a real Hilbert space.

Our purpose is to discuss the existence of positive solution of (1.1). We will use the following fixed point theorem from [7] which is a modification of well-known Krasnoselskii theorem on operators compressing and expanding a cone.

**Proposition 1.1.** Let  $P$  be a cone of a real Banach space  $X$ , and let the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  in  $X$  be monotonic with respect to  $P$ . Let  $B_r = \{p \in X : \|p\| < r\}, B_R = \{p \in X : \|p\| < R\}, 0 < r < R$ .

Suppose that  $F : P \cap \overline{B}_R \rightarrow P$  is a strict set-contraction which satisfies one of the following conditions:

- (i).  $p \in P \cap \partial B_r \Rightarrow \|Fp\| \leq \|p\|$  and  $p \in P \cap \partial B_R \Rightarrow \|Fp\| \geq \|p\|$  or
- (ii).  $p \in P \cap \partial B_R \Rightarrow \|Fp\| \leq \|p\|$  and  $p \in P \cap \partial B_r \Rightarrow \|Fp\| \geq \|p\|$ .

Then  $F$  has a fixed point in  $P \cap (\overline{B}_R \setminus B_r)$ .

Recall that  $F : D \rightarrow X, D \subset X$ , is said to be a strict set-contraction if  $F$  is continuous and bounded and there exists  $0 \leq L < 1$  such that  $\alpha(F(S)) \leq L\alpha(S)$  for all bounded subsets  $S$  of  $D$ , where  $\alpha$  denotes the Kuratowski measure of noncompactness

### 2.Auxiliary Results

First we will study some properties of the functions

$$G(t, s) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\rho} e^{-kt} [e^{k(s-1)} \mu_1 + c] [e^{k(t+1)} \mu_2 - a], & -1 \leq t \leq s \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{\rho} e^{-kt} [e^{k(s+1)} \mu_2 - a] [e^{k(t-1)} \mu_1 + c], & -1 \leq s \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$k \neq 0, \mu_1 = dk - c, \mu_2 = bk + a \text{ and } \rho = \frac{1}{k} [ae^{-k} \mu_1 + ce^k \mu_2]$$

and

$$G^*(t, s) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\rho^*} (c + d - cs)(a + b + at), & -1 \leq t \leq s \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{\rho^*} (a + b + as)(c + d - ct), & -1 \leq s \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where  $\rho^* = 2ac + bc + ad$ . It is easy to show that the function (2.1) fulfils the following inequalities:

$$\bigwedge_{t,s \in I} G(t,s) \geq 0 \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$\bigwedge_{t,s \in I} G(t,s) \leq G(s,s) \tag{2.4}$$

Moreover, for any  $-1 \leq \gamma < \delta \leq 1$  and  $t \in [\gamma, \delta]$  we have

$$G(t,s) \geq mG(s,s) \tag{2.5}$$

where  $s \in I$  and

$$m = \min \left\{ \frac{e^k \mu_2 - ae^{-k\gamma}}{e^k \mu_2 - ae^{-k}}, \frac{e^{-k} \mu_1 + ce^{-k\delta}}{e^{-k} \mu_1 + ce^k} \right\} \tag{2.6}$$

It is easily seen that  $m < 1$ . The function  $G^*$  also satisfies the inequalities (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5) with  $m$  replaced by

$$m^* = \min \left\{ \frac{a+b+a\gamma}{2a+b}, \frac{c+d-c\delta}{2c+d} \right\} \tag{2.7}$$

Clearly,  $m^* < 1$ .

Next, consider the integral-functional operator

$$(Fp)(t, \omega) = \int_{-1}^1 G(t,s)u(s, p(h_1(s, \omega)), p(h_2(s, \omega), \omega), p(h_3(s, \omega), \omega)) ds \tag{2.8}$$

Where  $t \in I, p \in Q$ , the function  $G$  is defined by (2.1) and  $u, h_1, h_2$  and  $h_3$  satisfy 1 and 2.

Let

$$M = \max_{t,s \in I} G(t,s)$$

$$\overline{T}_r = \{p \in E : \|p\|_E \leq r\},$$

and

$$\overline{B}_r = \{p \in C(I, E, \Omega) : \|p\| \leq r\}$$

**Lemma 2.1**[6]. Assume that for any  $r > 0$ :

(3) the function  $f$  is uniformly continuous on  $I \times (K \cap \overline{T}_r) \times (K \cap \overline{T}_r)$

(4) there exists a non-negative constant  $L_r$ , such that  $4ML_r < 1$

$$\alpha(f(t, \Phi, \Phi)) \leq L_r \alpha(\Phi) \tag{2.9}$$

for all  $t \in I$  and  $\Phi \subset K \cap \overline{T}_r$ .

Then, for any  $r > 0$  the operator (9) is a strict set-contraction on  $\Phi \cap \overline{B}_r$ .

### 3.Main Result

Now we state and prove our results on positive solutions of (1.1). Consider the case  $k \neq 0$ .

**Theorem1.** Let  $G$  be given by (2.1) and let  $-1 \leq \gamma < \delta < \omega \leq 1$  be such that  $h_i : [\gamma, \delta, \omega] \rightarrow [\gamma, \delta, \omega]$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Suppose that the assumptions 1-4 are satisfied and

(5) there exists  $k \in K, k \neq \theta$ , such that

$$u(t, p, q, \omega) < \left[ \int_{-1}^1 G(s, s) ds \right]^{-1} k$$

for all  $t \in I$  and  $p, q \in K, \omega \in \Omega$  such that  $\|p\|_E, \|q\|_E \in [0, \|k\|_E]$ ,

(6) there exist  $\eta \in K, \eta \neq \theta, \|\eta\|_E \neq \|k\|_E$  and  $t_0 \in I$  such that

$$\left[ \int_{\gamma}^{\delta} G(t_0, s) ds \right]^{-1} \eta < u(t, p, q, \omega)$$

for all  $t \in I$  and  $p, q \in K$  such that  $\|p\|_E, \|q\|_E \in [m\|\eta\|_E, \|\eta\|_E]$ , where  $m$  is given by (2.6).

Then the problem (1.1) has at least one positive solution.

**Proof.** Notice that each positive solution of the problem (1.1) (with  $\neq 0$ ) is a fixed point of the integral-functional operator (2.8), that is

$$(Fp)(t, \omega) = \int_{-1}^1 G(t, s)u(s, p(h_1(s, \omega)), p(h_2(s, \omega), \omega), p(h_3(s, \omega), \omega)) ds$$

Where  $t \in I, p \in C(I, E, \Omega)$  and the function  $G$  is given by (2.1). On the other hand, if  $u$  belonging to  $Q$  is a fixed point of  $F$ , then  $p$  is a solution of (1.1). Thus, to prove our theorem it is enough to show that  $F$  has a fixed point in  $Q$ . In the space  $C(I, E, \Omega)$  consider the set

$$P = \left\{ p \in C(I, E, \Omega) : \theta < p(t, \omega) \text{ on } I \text{ and } \bigwedge_{t \in [\gamma, \delta]} \bigwedge_{s \in I} mp(s, \omega) < p(t, \omega) \right\}.$$

Clearly,  $P$  is a cone in  $C(I, E, \Omega)$  and the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  in  $C(I, E, \Omega)$  is monotonic with respect to  $P$ . Consider the operator (2.8) for  $t \in I$  and  $p \in P$ . We will show that  $F$  satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 1.1. First, we will prove that  $F(P) \subset P$ . To this end observe that by 1 and (4)  $\theta < (Fp)(t, \omega)$

$$(3.1)$$

for every  $t \in I$  and  $p \in P$ . Moreover, it follows from (2.5) that for any  $t \in [\gamma, \delta]$  and  $s \in I$

$$\begin{aligned} m(Fp)(s, \omega) &= m \int_{-1}^1 G(s, s)u(s, p(h_1(s, \omega)), p(h_2(s, \omega), \omega), p(h_3(s, \omega), \omega)) ds \\ &< \int_{-1}^1 G(t, s)u(s, p(h_1(s, \omega)), p(h_2(s, \omega), \omega), p(h_3(s, \omega), \omega)) ds \\ &= (Fp)(t, \omega) \end{aligned}$$

Combining it with (3.1) we conclude that  $F(P) \subset P$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\|k\|_E < \|\eta\|_E$ . Fix  $r = \|k\|_E$  and  $R = \|\eta\|_E$ .

By Lemma 2.1,  $F$  is a strict set-contraction on  $P \cap \overline{B_R}$ . Moreover, for  $p \in P \cap \partial B_r$  we have  $\theta < p(h_1(t, \omega))$  on  $I$  and  $\|p\| = \|k\|_E$ , hence

$$\bigwedge_{t \in I} \|p(h_1(t, \omega))\|_E \leq \|k\|_E$$

Analogously

$$\bigwedge_{t \in I} \|p(h_2(t, \omega))\|_E \leq \|k\|_E, \bigwedge_{t \in I} \|p(h_3(t, \omega))\|_E \leq \|k\|_E$$

Thus, by 5, for any  $t \in I$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (Fp)(t, \omega) &< \int_{-1}^1 G(s, s) u(s, p(h_1(s, \omega)), p(h_2(s, \omega)), p(h_2(s, \omega)), \omega) ds \\ &< \int_{-1}^1 G(s, s) \left( \int_{-1}^1 G(\tau, \tau) \right)^{-1} k ds = k \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in view of monotonicity of  $\|\cdot\|_E$  we get

$$\bigwedge_{t \in I} \|(Fp)(t, \omega)\|_E \leq \|k\|_E$$

and in consequence  $\|Fp\| \leq \|p\|$  on  $P \cap \partial B_r$ . Furthermore, for  $p \in P \cap \partial B_r$  we have

$$\bigwedge_{t \in [\gamma, \delta]} \bigwedge_{s \in I} \theta < mp(h_1(s, \omega)) < p(h_1(t, \omega))$$

Since the norm  $\|\cdot\|_E$  is monotonic we obtain

$$\bigwedge_{t \in [\gamma, \delta]} \bigwedge_{s \in I} \|mp(h_1(s, \omega))\|_E \leq \|p(h_1(t, \omega))\|_E$$

which gives

$$\bigwedge_{t \in [\gamma, \delta]} m \max_{s \in I} \|p(h_1(s, \omega))\|_E \leq \|p(h_1(t, \omega))\|_E$$

But  $h_1$  maps  $I$  onto itself, hence for  $\|p\| = \|\eta\|_E$

$$\bigwedge_{t \in [\gamma, \delta]} m \|\eta\|_E \leq \|p(h_1(t, \omega))\|_E \leq \|\eta\|_E$$

In the same manner we get

$$\bigwedge_{t \in [\gamma, \delta]} m \|\eta\|_E \leq \|p(h_2(t, \omega))\|_E \leq \|\eta\|_E, \bigwedge_{t \in [\gamma, \delta]} m \|\eta\|_E \leq \|p(h_3(t, \omega))\|_E \leq \|\eta\|_E$$

Thus in view of 6

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &= \int_{\gamma}^{\delta} G(t_0, s) \left( \int_{\gamma}^{\delta} G(t_0, \tau) d\tau \right)^{-1} \eta ds \\ &< \int_{\gamma}^{\delta} G(t_0, s) u(s, p(h_1(s, \omega)), p(h_2(s, \omega)), p(h_3(s, \omega)), \omega) ds \text{ so} \\ &< \int_{-1}^1 G(t_0, s) f(s, x(h_1(s, \omega)), x(h_2(s, \omega)), p(h_3(s, \omega)), \omega) ds \\ &= (Fp)(t_0) \end{aligned}$$

$$\|(Fp)(t_0)\|_E \geq \|\eta\|_E,$$

which implies  $\|Fp\| \geq \|p\|$  on  $P \cap \partial B_r$ . By Proposition 1.1 the operator  $F$  has a fixed point in the set  $P \cap (\overline{B_R} \setminus B_r)$ . This means that the problem (1.1) has at least one positive solution  $p \in P$  such that

$$\|\lambda\|_E \leq \|p\| \leq \|\eta\|_E. \text{ This ends the proof of Theorem (1.1).}$$

### References

- [1]. J. Banasand , K. Goebel, Measures of noncompactness in Banach spaces, Marcel Dekker, New York, Basel, 1980.
- [2]. N.G. Cac, J.A. Gatica, Fixed point theorems for mappings in ordered Banach spaces, J. Math. Anal. Appl.71(1971), 547-557.
- [3].D. Guo, V. Lakshmikantham, Multiple solutions of two-point boundary value problems of ordinary differential equations in Banach spaces, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 129(1988),211-222.
- [4].D. Guo, V. Lakshmikantham, Nonlinear Problems in Abstract Cones, Academic Press, New York, 1988.
- [5].C.P. Gupta, Existence and uniqueness theorems for boundary value problems involving reflection of the argument, Nonlinear Anal.11(1987),1075-1083.



- [6].M.A. Krasnoselskii, *Positive Solutions of Operator Equations*, Noordhoff, Groningen, 1964.
- [7].G. Li, A new fixed point theorem on demi-compact 1-set-contraction mappings, *Proc.Amer. Math. Soc.* 97(1986), 277-280.
- [8].R.H. Martin, *Nonlinear Operators and Differential Equations in Banach Spaces*, Wiley, New York, 1976.
- [9].J. Wiener, A.R. Aftabizadeh, Boundary value problems for differential equations with reflection of the argument, *Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci.* 8(1985), 151-163.