Seminar on Fixed Point Theory Cluj-Napoca, Volume 3, 2002, 375-380 http://www.math.ubbcluj.ro/~nodeacj/journal.htm

# FUNCTIONAL-DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS THAT APPEAR IN PRICE THEORY

#### ALEXANDRINA-ALINA TARŢA

Babeş-Bolyai University Str. Kogălniceanu nr.1 Cluj-Napoca

Abstract. Sufficient conditions are obtained for all positive solutions of:

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = [f(x(t)) - g(x(t-\tau))]x(t)$$

to converges as  $t \to \infty$  to a positive equilibrium solution. Keywords: coincidence point, equilibrium solution. AMS Subject Classification: 54H25.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In considering the dynamics of price, productions and consumption commodity, Bélair and Mackey [2] have studied the model

$$p'(t) = p(t)f(p_d, p_s)$$

where p(t) is the function which means the price of commodity at the moment t, and  $p_d, p_s$  are the demand price respectively the supply price of this commodity.

Our purpose here is to study the following model:

(1) 
$$x'(t) = [f(x(t)) - g(x(t-\tau))]x(t), \quad t \in R_+$$

(2) 
$$x(t) = \varphi(t), \quad t \in [-\tau, 0]$$

where  $\tau > 0, f, g \in C(R_+, R_+)$  and  $\varphi \in C([-\tau, 0], R_+^*)$ .

## 2. Coincidence points and equilibrium solutions

We consider the equation (1), where f and  $g \in C(R_+, R_+)$ . Let E be the set of equilibrium solutions of (1) and  $E_+ = \{r \in E | r > 0\}$ . We also denote:

$$\begin{split} C(f,g) &:= \{t \in R_+ | \ f(t) = g(t)\} \\ C_+(f,g) &:= \{t \in C(f,g) | \ t > 0\} \end{split}$$

We remark that:

$$E_+ = C_+(f,g)$$

We need the following well-known result: Lemma. (Goebel's theorem) *Suppose that:* 

<sup>375</sup> 

(i) there exists  $a \in ]0,1[$  such that:

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \le a|g(x) - g(y)|$$
 for all  $x, y \in R_+$ 

(ii) g is bijective. Then

$$E_+ = \{r^*\}$$

For more information see [1], [8].

#### 3. A model in case of naive consumer

We consider the problem (1)+(2). The next result establishes sufficient conditions for every positive solution of equation (1) to oscillate about  $r^*$ .

We have:

**Theorem 1.**  $f, g \in C(R_+, R_+)$  and  $\varphi \in C([-\tau, 0], R_+^*)$ . We suppose that:

(i) there exists  $a \in ]0,1[$  such that

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \le a|g(x) - g(y)|$$
 for all  $x, y \in R_+$ 

(ii) g is bijective

(iii) f is strictly decreasing

*(iv)* g is strictly increasing

(v) there exists f' and g' and |f'| is bounded

(vi) 
$$\tau(f(0) + g(M)) \le 1$$
 and  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(n\tau)$  converges.

Then

(a) the equation (1) has a unique positive equilibrium solution,  $r^*$ 

(b) if  $x^*$  is a solution of the problem (1)+(2) then there exists  $m, M \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,

0 < m < M, such that  $m \le x^*(t) \le M$  for all  $t \in R_+$ 

(c) there exists a unique solution  $x^*(t)$  of the problem (1)+(2)

(d) if  $x^*$  is  $r^*$ -nonoscillatory, then

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} x(t) = r^*.$$

**Proof.** (a) follows from Lemma.

(b) We shall first show x(t) is bounded from above. For the sake of contradiction, suppose this is not the case. Then there exists  $T \in (0, 1]$ , and a sequence  $t_j \to T$  such that  $x(t_j) \to \infty$  and  $x'(t_j) \ge 0$ . The contradiction will come from the consideration of following two cases:

(1a) Suppose

$$\liminf_{j \to \infty} x(t_j - \tau) > 0$$

Then there exists k > 0 such that  $x(t_j - \tau) \ge k$  for large j. This implies that

$$g(x(t_j - \tau)) \ge g(k)$$

376

and  $f(x(t_j))$  is bounded. It follows from eq. (1) with t replaced by  $t_j$  that:

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} x'(t_j) = -\infty$$

This is impossible because  $x'(t_j - \tau) \ge 0$ . (1b) Suppose

$$\liminf_{j \to \infty} x(t_j - \tau) = 0$$

By passing to a sequence, if necessary, we may assume

(3) 
$$\lim_{j \to \infty} x(t_j - \tau) = 0$$

Note that because  $\varphi(t) > 0$  for  $t \in [-\tau, 0]$ , it follows by (3) that  $T > \tau$ . Integrate eq. (1) from  $t_j - \tau$  to obtain

$$x(t_{j}) - x(t_{j} - \tau) = \int_{t_{j} - \tau}^{t_{j}} f(x(t))x(t)dt - \int_{t_{j} - \tau}^{t_{j}} g(x(t - \tau))x(t)dt \le \int_{t_{j} - \tau}^{t_{j}} f(x(t))x(t)dt$$

$$(4) \qquad \qquad x(t_{j}) \le x(t_{j} - \tau) + \int_{t_{j} - \tau}^{t_{j}} f(x(t))x(t)dt$$

An application of Gronwall's lemma to (4) leads to:

$$x(t_j) \le x(t_j - \tau) \exp \int_{t_j - \tau}^{t_j} f(x(t)) dt$$

This is impossible because

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} x(t_j) = \infty$$

Next we claim

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty} x(t) \neq 0$$

Suppose that is not the case. Then, there exists a sequence  $t_j \to \infty$  such that

$$x(t_i) \to 0 \text{ and } x'(t_i) \leq 0$$

It follows from eq. (1) that

$$g(x(t_j - \tau)) \ge f(x(t_j)) \to f(0) \text{ as } j \to \infty$$

and so there exists k > 0 such that  $x(t_j - \tau) \ge k$  for all large j. By integrating eq. (1) from  $t_j - \tau$  to  $t_j$ , we obtain:

(5) 
$$\ln \frac{x(t_j)}{x(t_j - \tau)} = \int_{t_j - \tau}^{t_j} [f(x(t)) - g(x(t - \tau))] dt$$

This is impossible because

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \ln \frac{x(t_j)}{x(t_j - \tau)} = -\infty$$

while the right hand side of eq. (5) is bounded.

(c) An application of method of steps to equation (1) leads to:

$$A(x)(t) = \begin{cases} \varphi(t), & t \in [-\tau, 0] \\ \varphi(0) + \int_0^t [f(x(s)) - g(\varphi(s - \tau))]x(s)ds, & t \in [0, \tau] \\ A : B(\widetilde{\varphi}(t); M) \to C([-\tau, \tau], R_+) \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{split} \widetilde{\varphi}(t) &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \varphi(t), & t \in [-\tau, 0] \\ \varphi(0), & t \in [0, \tau] \end{array} \right. \\ M &= \max_{[-\tau, 0]} \varphi(t) \exp\left(\tau \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(n\tau)\right) \end{split}$$

We show that  $B(\widetilde{\varphi}(t); M) \in I(A)$ 

$$|A(x)(t) - \varphi(0)| = \left| \int_0^t [f(x(s)) - g(\varphi(s - \tau))] x(s) ds \right| \le M \int_0^t \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in \mathcal{O}} \varphi(t) \right) \right) ds \le M$$

$$\leq M \int_0^t \left( f(0) + g\left(\max_{t \in [-\tau,0]} \varphi(t)\right) \right) ds \leq M \tau \left( f(0) + g\left(\max_{t \in [-\tau,0]} \varphi(t)\right) \right)$$

From (vi) we have that

$$\tau\left(f(0) + g\left(\max_{t\in[-\tau,0]}\varphi(t)\right)\right) \le 1$$

Now we can consider the operator:

$$A: B(\widetilde{\varphi}(t); M) \to B(\widetilde{\varphi}(t); M)$$

From (v) we have that the operator A is contraction with respect to Bieletscki norm, satisfactory chosen. From Contraction Principle we have:

$$A(x)(t) = \begin{cases} x_1(t) & t \in [0,\tau] \\ x_1(\tau) + \int_{\tau}^{t} [f(x(s)) - g(x_1(s-\tau))]x(s)ds & x \in [\tau, 2\tau] \\ A : B(\widehat{\varphi}(t); M) \to C([-\tau, 2\tau], R_+) \\ |A(x)(t) - x_1(\tau)| = \left| \int_{\tau}^{t} [f(x(s)) - g(x_1(s-\tau))]x(s)ds \right| \le \\ \le M\tau \left( f(0) + g\left( \max_{t \in [0,\tau]} x_1(t) \right) \right) \end{cases}$$

But

$$\tau\left(f(0) + g\left(\max_{t \in [0,\tau]} x_1(t)\right)\right) \le 1$$

In this conditions we have that the operator:

$$A: B(\widehat{\varphi}(t); M) \to M(\widehat{\varphi}(t); M)$$

has a unique fixed point  $x_2$ .

378

For  $t \in [(n-1)\tau, n\tau]$  we have:

$$A(x)(t) = \begin{cases} x_{n-1}(t) & t \in [(n-2)\tau, (n-1)\tau] \\ x_{n-1}((n-1)\tau) + \int_{(n-1)\tau}^{t} [f(x(s)) - g(x_{n-1}(s-\tau))]x(s)ds \\ t \in [(n-1)\tau, n\tau] \end{cases}$$

But

$$\tau\left(f(0) + g\left(\max_{t \in [(n-2)\tau, (n-1)\tau]} x_{n-1}(t)\right)\right) \le 1$$

and we have that the operator A has a unique fixed point  $x_n$ .

From (v) we have that the operator A is contraction with respect to Bieletscki norm, satisfactory chosen. From the Contraction Principle we have:

$$A: B(\breve{\varphi}(t); M) \to B(\breve{\varphi}(t); M)$$

where

$$\breve{\varphi}(t) = \begin{cases} \varphi(t) & t \in [-\tau, 0] \\ \varphi(0) & t \in [0, \tau] \\ \dots \\ x_{n-1}((n-1)\tau) & t \in [(n-1)\tau, n\tau] \\ \dots \end{cases}$$

has a unique fixed point  $x^*$ .

(d) We rewrite (1) in the form

(6) 
$$\frac{dy(t)}{dt} = F(y(t), y(t-\tau)) - F(0,0)$$

where  $F(y(t), y(t-\tau)) = [f(y(t)+r^*) - g(y(t-\tau)+r^*)](y(t)+r^*)$  and  $y(t) = x(t)-r^*$ . It is now sufficient to show that  $y(t) \to 0$  as  $t \to \infty$ . An application of mean-value theorem to (6) leads to

(7) 
$$\frac{dy(t)}{dt} = -a(t)y(t) - b(t)y(t-\tau)$$

where

$$-a(t) = \frac{\partial F}{\partial y(t)}(u(t), v(t))$$
$$-b(t) = \frac{\partial F}{\partial y(t-\tau)}(u(t), v(t))$$

and (u(t), v(t)) lies on the line segment joining (0,0) and  $(y(t), y(t-\tau))$ . It is found that

$$a(t) = g(y(t - \tau) + r^*) - f(y(t) + r^*) - f'(y(t) + r^*)(y(t) + r^*)$$
$$b(t) = g'(y(t - \tau) + r^*)(y(t) + r^*)$$

Note that a(t) and b(t) are positive and are bounded away from zero. The existence of solutions of (7) for all  $t \ge 0$  is a consequence of boundedness of x(t) for all  $t \ge 0$ . Is nonoscillatory then |y(t)| > 0 for t > T. If y(t) > 0 for t > T then we have from

(7) that y'(t) < 0 and so  $\lim_{t \to \infty} y(t)$  exists. Since y(t) > 0 eventually,  $\lim_{t \to \infty} y(t) = l \ge 0$ . We claim that I = 0. Then there exists  $t_0 > 0$  such that

$$y(t) \ge \frac{l}{2}$$
 for  $t \ge t_0$ 

We have directly from (7) that

$$\frac{dy(t)}{dt} \leq -a(t)\frac{l}{2}$$

leading to

$$y(t) - y(t_0) \le -\frac{l}{2} \int_{t_0}^t a(s) ds$$

which implies that  $y(t) \to \infty$  as  $t \to \infty$ ; but this contradicts the eventual positivity of y. Thus  $\lim_{t\to\infty} y(t) = l = 0$ .

If y(t) < 0 for t > T, the arguments are again similar. Thus the result follows from

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} y(t) = 0$$

**Remark.** In the case of the model studied by A.M. Farahani and E.A. Grove [3] where  $f(t) = \frac{a}{b+t^n}$ ,  $n \in [1, \infty]$  we remark that  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(n\tau)$  converges.

#### References

- M. Altman, Dilating mappings, implicit functions and fixed point theorems in finite dimensional spaces, Fund. Math. 1970, 129-141.
- [2] J. Bélair, M.C. Mackey, Consumer memory and price fluctuations in commodity markets: An integrodifferential model, J. Dynamics Diff. Equations, 3, 1980, 299-325.
- [3] A.M. Farahani, E.A. Grove, A simple model for price fluctuations in a single commodity market, Contemporary Mathematics, Vol.129, 1992, 97-103.
- [4] K. Gopalsamy, On an equation modelling haematopoiesis, Automedica vol.15, 1993, 251-257.
- M.C. Mackey, Commodity price fluctuations: price dependent delays and nonlinearities as explanatory factors, Journal of Economic Theory, Vol.48, Nr.2, 1989, 497-509.
- [6] A.S. Mureşan, On some models of price fluctuation in a market economy, Studia Univ. Babeş-Bolyai, Mathematica, XXXVIII, 2, 1993.
- [7] Ioan A. Rus, Crăciun Iancu, A functional-differential model for price fluctuations in single commodity market, Studia Univ. Babeş-Bolyai, Mathematica, XXXVIII, 2, 1993.
- [8] Ioan A. Rus, Some remarks on coincidence theory, Pure Math. Manuscript, Vol.9, 1990-1991, 137-148.

380