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#### Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to study a generalization of a D.V. Ionescu's problem. Existence, uniqueness and data dependence (monotony, continuity, differentiability with respect to parameter) results of solution for the Cauchy problem are obtained using weakly Picard operator theory.
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## 1. Introduction

We consider the system

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime}(t)=f(t, x(t), x(\omega(t))), t \in[a, b] \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{gathered}
x:=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{m}\right), \quad x(\omega):=\left(x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}\right), x_{2}\left(\omega_{2}\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}\right)\right), \\
f:=\left(f_{1}, f_{2}, \ldots, f_{m}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

with initial conditions

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}(a)=0  \tag{1.2}\\
x_{2}\left(t_{2}\right)=x_{1}\left(t_{2}\right) \\
\cdots \\
x_{m-1}\left(t_{m-1}\right)=x_{m-2}\left(t_{m-1}\right) \\
x_{m}(b)=0
\end{array}\right.
$$

This kind of problems has been the subject of many works, from which we quote here first of all Ch.J. de la Vallèe Poussin's memorial [15]. From the research upon the polylocal problem in relation with differential equations, research more related to the present approach, we mention the following: improved formulation of Ch.J. de la Vallèe Poussin's theorem regarding second order differential equations have been obtained by Ph. Hartman and A. Wintner [3] and later by D. Ripianu [9], evaluations of differentiable functions with applications on the study of the polylocal problem have been provided by O . Arama [1], the connection between the study of the polylocal problem and the theory of superior order convex functions has been provided by T. Popoviciu, in the case of linear systems of functions [8].
We suppose that:
(C $\left.\mathrm{C}_{1}\right) a=t_{1}<t_{2}<\ldots<t_{m-1}<t_{m}=b$;
$\left(\mathrm{C}_{2}\right) f \in C\left([a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 m}, \mathbb{R}^{m}\right), \omega_{i} \in C([a, b],[a, b]), i=\overline{1, m} ;$
$\left(\mathrm{C}_{3}\right)$ there exists $S_{i 1}, \ldots, S_{i, 2 m} \in M_{m, 2 m}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}\right)$such that

$$
\left|f_{i}\left(t, u_{1}, \ldots, u_{2 m}\right)-f_{i}\left(t, v_{1}, \ldots, v_{2 m}\right)\right| \leq S_{i 1}\left|u_{1}-v_{1}\right|+\ldots+S_{i, 2 m}\left|u_{2 m}-v_{2 m}\right|
$$

$$
\text { for all } t \in[a, b], u_{j}, v_{j} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 m}, i=\overline{1, m} .
$$

We consider the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime}(t)=g(t), t \in[a, b] \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the conditions (1.2), where $g:[a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m}, g:=\left(g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}\right)$. The unique solution of this problem has the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(t)=\int_{a}^{b}\left(K_{i j}\right)_{n}^{n}(t, s) g(s) d s . \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The problem (1.1)-(1.2) is equivalent with the fixed point problem (1.4) where $\mathbf{K}:=\left(K_{i j}\right)_{n}^{n}$ has the property that the operator defined by

$$
g \rightarrow \int_{a}^{(\cdot)} \mathbf{K}((\cdot), s) g(s) d s
$$

is from $C\left([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ to $C\left([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$.
$K_{i j}$ is given by the below relations

$$
\begin{gather*}
K_{11}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
1, t_{1} \leq s \leq t \leq t_{m} \\
0, \text { in the rest }
\end{array}\right.  \tag{1.5}\\
K_{12}(t, s)=\cdots=K_{1 m}(t, s)=0,  \tag{1.6}\\
K_{i 1}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
1, t_{1} \leq s \leq t_{2}, \text { for all } t, i=\overline{2, n-1}, \\
0, \text { in the rest, }
\end{array}\right.  \tag{1.7}\\
K_{i, i-1}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
1, t_{i-1} \leq s \leq t_{i}, \text { for all } t, i=\overline{2, n-1} \\
0, \text { in the rest, }
\end{array}\right.  \tag{1.8}\\
K_{i i}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
1, t_{i} \leq s \leq t \leq t_{n}, i=\overline{2, n-1}, \\
1, t_{1} \leq t \leq s \leq t_{i},
\end{array}\right.  \tag{1.9}\\
K_{i, i+1}(t, s)=\cdots=K_{i m}(t, s)=0,  \tag{1.10}\\
K_{m 1}(t, s)=\cdots=K_{m, m-1}(t, s)=0,  \tag{1.11}\\
K_{m m}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
1, t_{1} \leq t \leq s \leq t_{m}, \\
0, \text { in the rest. }
\end{array}\right. \tag{1.12}
\end{gather*}
$$

The problem (1.1)-(1.2) is equivalent with the system

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
x_{1}(t)  \tag{1.13}\\
\vdots \\
x_{m}(t)
\end{array}\right)=\int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left(\begin{array}{c}
f_{1}\left(s, x_{1}(s), \ldots, x_{m}(s), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s)\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s)\right)\right) \\
\vdots \\
f_{m}\left(s, x_{1}(s), \ldots, x_{m}(s), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s)\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s)\right)\right)
\end{array}\right) d s
$$

where $\mathbf{K}:=\left(K_{i j}\right)_{n}^{n}$ is given by the relations (1.5)-(1.12).

Consider the Banach space $X:=\left(C\left([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{m}\right),\|\cdot\|\right)$ where $\|\cdot\|$ is the generalized Chebyshev norm,

$$
\|u\|:=\left(\begin{array}{c}
\left\|u_{1}\right\| \\
\vdots \\
\left\|u_{m}\right\|
\end{array}\right), \text { where }\left\|u_{i}\right\|:=\max _{a \leq t \leq b}\left|u_{i}(t)\right|, i=\overline{1, m}
$$

and the operator

$$
B_{f}: C\left([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{m}\right) \rightarrow C\left([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)
$$

defined by

$$
B_{f}(x)(t):=\text { second part of }(1.13)
$$

In this paper we shall use the Perov's fixed point theorem and the weakly Picard operator theory in the study of existence and uniqueness and data dependence of the solution for the problem (1.1)-(1.2). For a better understanding we need some notions and results from WPO theory, see [10]-[14].

## 2. Picard and Weakly Picard operators

Let $(X, d)$ be a metric space and $A: X \rightarrow X$ an operator. We shall use the following notations:
$F_{A}:=\{x \in X \mid A(x)=x\}$ - the fixed point set of $A ;$
$I(A):=\{Y \subset X \mid A(Y) \subset Y, Y \neq \emptyset\}$ - the family of the nonempty invariant subset of $A$;
$A^{n+1}:=A \circ A^{n}, A^{0}=1_{X}, A^{1}=A, n \in \mathbb{N} ;$
Definition 2.1. Let $(X, d)$ be a metric space. An operator $A: X \rightarrow X$ is a Picard operator (PO) if there exists $x^{*} \in X$ such that:
(i) $F_{A}=\left\{x^{*}\right\}$;
(ii) the sequence $\left(A^{n}\left(x_{0}\right)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $x^{*}$ for all $x_{0} \in X$.

Definition 2.2. Let $(X, d)$ be a metric space. An operator $A: X \rightarrow X$ is a weakly Picard operator (WPO) if the sequence $\left(A^{n}(x)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges for all $x \in X$, and its limit (which may depend on $x$ ) is a fixed point of $A$.

Definition 2.3. If $A$ is weakly Picard operator then we consider the operator $A^{\infty}$ defined by

$$
A^{\infty}: X \rightarrow X, A^{\infty}(x):=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} A^{n}(x)
$$

Remark 2.4. It is clear that $A^{\infty}(X)=F_{A}$.
Lemma 2.5. Let $(X, d, \leq)$ be an ordered metric space and $A: X \rightarrow X$ an operator. We suppose that:
(i) $A$ is WPO;
(ii) $A$ is increasing.

Then, the operator $A^{\infty}$ is increasing.
Lemma 2.6. Let $(X, d, \leq)$ an ordered metric space and $A, B, C: X \rightarrow X$ be such that:
(i) the operator $A, B, C$ are $W P O s$;
(ii) $A \leq B \leq C$;
(iii) the operator $B$ is increasing.

Then $x \leq y \leq z$ implies that $A^{\infty}(x) \leq B^{\infty}(y) \leq C^{\infty}(z)$.
Theorem 2.7 (Perov's fixed point theorem). Let $(X, d)$ with $d(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$, be a complete generalized metric space and $A: X \rightarrow X$ an operator. We suppose that there exists a matrix $Q \in M_{m m}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}\right)$, such that
(i) $d(A(x), A(y)) \leq Q d(x, y)$, for all $x, y \in X$;
(ii) $Q^{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Then
(a) $F_{A}=\left\{x^{*}\right\}$,
(b) $A^{n}(x)=x^{*}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$
d\left(A^{n}(x), x^{*}\right) \leq(I-Q)^{-1} Q^{n} d\left(x_{0}, A\left(x_{0}\right)\right)
$$

Theorem 2.8 (Fibre contraction principle). Let $(X, d)$ and $(Y, \rho)$ be two metric spaces and $A: X \times Y \rightarrow X \times Y, A=(B, C), \quad(B: X \rightarrow X, C: X \times Y \rightarrow$ $Y$ ) a triangular operator. We suppose that
(i) $(Y, \rho)$ is a complete metric space;
(ii) the operator $B$ is Picard operator;
(iii) there exists $l \in[0,1)$ such that $C(x, \cdot): Y \rightarrow Y$ is a l-contraction, for all $x \in X$;
(iv) if $\left(x^{*}, y^{*}\right) \in F_{A}$, then $C\left(\cdot, y^{*}\right)$ is continuous in $x^{*}$.

Then the operator $A$ is Picard operator.
For more details on WPOs theory see [10], [12], [13].

## 3. Existence and uniqueness

In what follows we consider the problem (1.1)-(1.2) in the conditions $\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}\right)$ $\left(\mathrm{C}_{3}\right)$.

The problem (1.1)-(1.2) is equivalent with the fixed point equation

$$
B_{f}(x)=x, x \in C\left([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)
$$

where $B_{f}=$ the second part of (1.13).
From the condition $\left(C_{3}\right)$ we have, for $t \in[a, b]$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|B_{f}(x)(t)-B_{f}(y)(t)\right| \leq \\
& \leq \int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left[\left(\begin{array}{c}
\left|f_{1}\left(s, x_{1}(s), \ldots, x_{m}(s), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s)\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s)\right)\right)\right| \\
\vdots \\
\left|f_{m}\left(s, x_{1}(s), \ldots, x_{m}(s), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s)\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s)\right)\right)\right|
\end{array}\right)\right. \\
& \\
& \left.-\left(\begin{array}{c}
\left|f_{1}\left(s, y_{1}(s), \ldots, y_{m}(s), y_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s)\right), \ldots, y_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s)\right)\right)\right| \\
\vdots \\
\left|f_{m}\left(s, y_{1}(s), \ldots, y_{m}(s), y_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s)\right), \ldots, y_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s)\right)\right)\right|
\end{array}\right)\right] d s \\
& \\
& \quad \int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
S_{11}+S_{1, m+1} & S_{12}+S_{1, m+2} & \cdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & S_{1, m}+S_{1,2 m} \\
S_{m, 1}+S_{m, m+1} & S_{m, 2}+S_{m, m+2} & \cdots
\end{array} \quad \vdots\right. \\
& \quad \cdot\left(\begin{array}{c}
\left\|x_{1}-y_{1}\right\| \\
\vdots \\
\left\|x_{m}-y_{m}\right\|
\end{array}\right) d s \leq Q\left(\begin{array}{c}
\left\|x_{1}-y_{1}\right\| \\
\vdots \\
\left\|x_{m}-y_{m}\right\|
\end{array}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $x, y \in X$ and
$Q=\max _{a \leq t \leq b} \int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s) d s \cdot\left(\begin{array}{cccc}S_{11}+S_{1, m+1} & S_{12}+S_{1, m+2} & \cdots & S_{1, m}+S_{1,2 m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ S_{m, 1}+S_{m, m+1} & S_{m, 2}+S_{m, m+2} & \cdots & S_{m, m}+S_{m, 2 m}\end{array}\right)$.
Then

$$
\left\|B_{f}(x)-B_{f}(y)\right\| \leq Q\|x-y\|
$$

and if $Q^{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the operator $B_{f}$ is $Q$-contraction. From the Perov's fixed point theorem we have that the operator $B_{f}$ is PO and has a unique
fixed point

$$
\stackrel{*}{x}=\left(\stackrel{*}{x}_{1}, \ldots, \stackrel{*}{x}_{m}\right) \in X
$$

Since $f$ is continuous, we have that $\stackrel{*}{x} \in C\left([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ is the unique solution for the problem (1.1)-(1.2).

So, we have the following existence and uniqueness theorem

Theorem 3.1. We suppose that:
(i) the conditions $\left(C_{1}\right)-\left(C_{3}\right)$ are satisfied;
(ii) $Q^{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Then:
(a) the problem (1.1)-(1.2) has in $C\left([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ a unique solution $\stackrel{*}{x}=$ $\left(\stackrel{*}{x}_{1}, \ldots, \stackrel{*}{x}_{m}\right)$

$$
\in C\left([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)
$$

(b) for all $x^{0} \in C\left([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$, the sequence $\left(x^{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by

$$
x^{n+1}=B_{f}\left(x^{n}\right),
$$

converges uniformly to $\stackrel{*}{x}$, for all $t \in[a, b]$, and

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
\left\|x_{1}^{n}-\stackrel{*}{x}_{1}\right\| \\
\vdots \\
\left\|x_{m}^{n}-\stackrel{*}{x}_{m}\right\|
\end{array}\right) \leq(I-Q)^{-1} Q^{n}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\left\|x_{1}^{0}-x_{1}^{1}\right\| \\
\vdots \\
\left\|x_{m}^{0}-x_{m}^{1}\right\|
\end{array}\right)
$$

## 4. Inequalities of ČAplygin type

In this section we shall study the relation between the solution of the problem (1.1)-(1.2) and the subsolution of the same problem.

Let $\stackrel{*}{x}$ the unique solution of the problem (1.1)-(1.2) and $y$ the subsolution of the same problem, i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime}(t) \leq f(t, y(t), y(\omega(t))), t \in[a, b], \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $y:=\left(y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{m}\right), y(\omega):=\left(y_{1}\left(\omega_{1}\right), y_{2}\left(\omega_{2}\right), \ldots, y_{m}\left(\omega_{m}\right)\right)$ and $f:=$ $\left(f_{1}, f_{2}, \ldots\right.$,
$\left.f_{m}\right)$ ) satisfy the conditions $\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}\right)-\left(\mathrm{C}_{3}\right)$ and

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}(a)=0  \tag{4.2}\\
y_{2}\left(t_{2}\right)=y_{1}\left(t_{2}\right) \\
\cdots \\
y_{m-1}\left(t_{m-1}\right)=y_{m-2}\left(t_{m-1}\right) \\
y_{m}(b)=0
\end{array}\right.
$$

In this section we consider the operator $B_{f}=$ the second part of (1.13) on the ordered Banach space $X=\left(\left(C[a, b], \mathbb{R}^{m}\right),\|\cdot\|, \leq\right)$, where on $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ we have the ordered relation:

$$
x \leq y \Longleftrightarrow x_{i} \leq y_{i}, i=\overline{1, m} .
$$

We have the following theorem
Theorem 4.1. We suppose that:
(a) the conditions $\left(C_{1}\right)-\left(C_{3}\right)$ are satisfied;
(b) $Q^{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$;
(c) $f(t, \cdot, \cdot): \mathbb{R}^{2 m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m}$ is increasing, for all $t \in[a, b]$.

Let $x$ be a solution of the system (1.1) and $y$ be a solution of the inequality problem (4.1)-(4.2).

Then $y \leq x$ for all $t \in[a, b]$.
Proof. In terms of the operator $B_{f}$ defined by the relation (1.13), we have

$$
x=B_{f}(x) \text { and } y \leq B_{f}(y)
$$

On the other hand from condition $(c)$ and Lemma 2.5, we have that the operator $B_{f}^{\infty}$ is increasing. Hence
$y \leq B_{f}(y) \leq B_{f}^{2}(y) \leq \cdots \leq B_{f}^{\infty}(y) \leq B_{f}^{\infty}(x)=x$.
So, $y \leq x$.

## 5. Data dependence: monotony

In this section we study the monotony of the system (1.1)-(1.2) with respect to $f$. For this we use the abstract comparison Lemma from section 2.

Consider the following equations

$$
\begin{align*}
x^{\prime}(t) & =f\left(t, x_{1}(t), \ldots, x_{m}(t), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(t)\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(t)\right)\right),  \tag{5.1}\\
y^{\prime}(t) & =g\left(t, y_{1}(t), \ldots, y_{m}(t), y_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(t)\right), \ldots, y_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(t)\right)\right), \tag{5.2}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
z^{\prime}(t)=h\left(t, z_{1}(t), \ldots, z_{m}(t), z_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(t)\right), \ldots, z_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(t)\right)\right) \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the polylocal conditions (1.2) for each problem and let $\stackrel{*}{x}, \stackrel{*}{y}$ and $\stackrel{*}{z}$ the unique solutions of these problems. Then we need the operators $B_{f}, B_{g}$ and $B_{h}$ corresponding to the second part of the problems (5.1), (5.2) and (5.3).

Theorem 5.1. Let $f, g, h \in C\left([a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 m}, \mathbb{R}\right)$, that satisfy the conditions $\left(C_{1}\right)-\left(C_{3}\right)$ from section 1.

We suppose that we have
(i) $f \leq g \leq h$;
(ii) $g(t, \cdot, \cdot): \mathbb{R}^{2 m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is increasing.

Let $\stackrel{*}{x}, \stackrel{*}{y}$ and $\stackrel{*}{z}$ the solutions of the equations (5.1), (5.2) and (5.3).
Then $\stackrel{*}{x}(t) \leq \stackrel{*}{y}(t) \leq \stackrel{*}{z}(t)$ for all $t \in[a, b]$, meaning that the unique solution of the system (1.1)-(1.2) is increasing with respect to the right hand.

Proof. From Theorem 3.1 the operators $B_{f}, B_{g}, B_{h}$ are POs.
From the condition (ii) it follows that the operator $B_{g}$ is monotone increasing and from condition (i) we have $B_{f} \leq B_{g} \leq B_{h}$.

But $\stackrel{*}{x}=B_{f}{ }^{\infty}(\stackrel{*}{x}), \stackrel{*}{y}=B_{g}{ }^{\infty}(\stackrel{*}{y})$ and $\stackrel{*}{z}=B_{h}{ }^{\infty}(\stackrel{*}{z})$.
By applying the abstract comparison Lemma 2.6 follows that the unique solution of the problem (1.1)-(1.2) is increasing with respect to $B_{f}$.

## 6. Data dependence: CONTINUITY

Consider the problems (1.1)-(1.2) with the dates $f, g$ and suppose that the conditions from Theorem 3.1 are satisfied.

Let $f, g \in C\left([a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 m}, \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ and

$$
S_{i 1}^{f}, \ldots, S_{i, 2 m}^{f}, S_{i 1}^{g}, \ldots, S_{i, 2 m}^{g} \in M_{m, 2 m}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}\right), i=\overline{1, m}
$$

as in condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{3}\right)$.
Consider $S_{i j} \in M_{m, 2 m}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}\right), i=\overline{1, m}, j=\overline{1,2 m}$ with

$$
S_{i j}=\max \left(S_{i j}^{f}, S_{i j}^{g}\right), i=\overline{1, m}, j=\overline{1,2 m}
$$

Let
$Q_{f}=\max _{a \leq t \leq b} \int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s) d s\left(\begin{array}{cccc}S_{11}^{f}+S_{1, m+1}^{f} & S_{12}^{f}+S_{1, m+2}^{f} & \cdots & S_{1, m}^{f}+S_{1,2 m}^{f} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ S_{m, 1}^{f}+S_{m, m+1}^{f} & S_{m, 2}^{f}+S_{m, m+2}^{f} & \cdots & S_{m, m}^{f}+S_{m, 2 m}^{f}\end{array}\right)$,
$Q_{g}$ analogously and
$Q=\max _{a \leq \pm \leq} \int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s) d s \cdot\left(\begin{array}{cccc}S_{11}+S_{1, m+1} & S_{12}+S_{1, m+2} & \cdots & S_{1, m}+S_{1,2 m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ S_{m, 1}+S_{m, m+1} & S_{m, 2}+S_{m, m+2} & \cdots & S_{m, m}+S_{m, 2 m}\end{array}\right)$,
Denote by $\stackrel{*}{x}(\cdot ; f)$ the solution of the problem (1.1)-(1.2).
Theorem 6.1. Let $f, g$ satisfy the conditions $\left(C_{1}\right)-\left(C_{3}\right)$. Furthermore, we suppose that there exist $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{m}$ such that

$$
\left|f\left(t, x^{1}, x^{2}\right)-g\left(t, x^{1}, x^{2}\right)\right| \leq \eta \text {, for all } t \in C[a, b] \text { and } x^{1}, x^{2} \in \mathbb{R}^{m} .
$$

Then

$$
\|\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; f)-\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; g)\| \leq\left(I-Q_{f}\right)^{-1} \max _{a \leq s \leq b} \int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s) d s \cdot \eta,
$$

where ${ }_{x}^{*}(t ; f)$ and ${ }_{x}^{*}(t ; g)$ are the solution of the problem (1.1)-(1.2) with respect to $f$ and $g$.

Proof. Consider the operators $B_{f}$ and $B_{g}$. From Theorem 3.1 it follows that

$$
\left\|B_{f}(x)-B_{g}(y)\right\| \leq Q\|x-y\| \text { for all } x, y \in X .
$$

Additionally

$$
\left\|B_{f}(x)-B_{g}(x)\right\| \leq \max _{a \leq s \leq b} \int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s) d s \cdot \eta .
$$

We have now

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \|\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; f)-\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; g)\|=\left\|B_{f}(\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; f))-B_{g}(\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; g))\right\| \leq \\
& \leq\left\|B_{f}(\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; f))-B_{f}(\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; g))\right\|+\left\|B_{f}(\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; g))-B_{g}(\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; g))\right\| \leq \\
& \leq Q\|\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; f)-\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; g)\|+\max _{a \leq s \leq b} \int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s) d s \cdot \eta .
\end{aligned}
$$

Because $Q^{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ imply that

$$
(I-Q)^{-1} \in M_{m m}\left(\mathbb{R}^{+}\right),
$$

so we have

$$
\left\|\stackrel{*}{x}\left(t ; f^{1}\right)-\stackrel{*}{x}\left(t ; f^{2}\right)\right\| \leq\left(I-Q_{f}\right)^{-1} \max _{a \leq s \leq b} \int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s) d s \cdot \eta,
$$

## 7. Data dependence: differentiability

In this section we present the dependence by parameter $\lambda$ of the solution of the problem (1.1)-(1.2).

Consider the following differential system with parameter:

$$
\begin{align*}
& x^{\prime}(t)=f\left(t, x_{1}(t), \ldots, x_{m}(t), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(t)\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(t)\right) ; \lambda\right), t \in[a, b],  \tag{7.1}\\
& \left\{\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}(a)=0, \\
x_{2}\left(t_{2}\right)=x_{1}\left(t_{2}\right), \\
\cdots \\
x_{m-1}\left(t_{m-1}\right)=x_{m-2}\left(t_{m-1}\right), \\
x_{m}(b)=0,
\end{array}\right. \tag{7.2}
\end{align*}
$$

where $x:=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right)$ and $f:=\left(f_{1}, \ldots, f_{m}\right)$.
We suppose that:
( $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ ) $a=t_{1}<t_{2}<\ldots<t_{m-1}<t_{m}=b ; \lambda \in J \subset \mathbb{R}$ a compact interval;
(C2) $f \in C^{1}\left([a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{2 m} \times J, \mathbb{R}^{m}\right), \omega_{i} \in C([a, b],[a, b])$;
$\left(\mathrm{C}_{3}\right)$ there exists $S_{i j} \in M_{m, 2 m}\left(\mathbb{R}_{+}\right)$such that

$$
\left[\left(\left|\frac{\partial f_{i}\left(t, u_{1}, \ldots, u_{2 m} ; \lambda\right)}{\partial u_{j}}\right|\right)_{i, j=\overline{1, m}}\right]_{M_{m, 2 m}(\mathbb{R})} \leq S_{i j}
$$

for all $t \in[a, b], u_{j} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 m}, i=\overline{1, m}, j=\overline{1,2 m}$;
$\left(\mathrm{C}_{4}\right)$ for

$$
Q=\max _{a \leq \leq b} \int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s) d s \cdot\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
S_{11}+S_{1, m+1} & S_{12}+S_{1, m+2} & \cdots & S_{1, m}+S_{1,2 m} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
S_{m, 1}+S_{m, m+1} & S_{m, 2}+S_{m, m+2} & \cdots & S_{m, m}+S_{m, 2 m}
\end{array}\right)
$$

we have $Q^{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
In the above conditions, from Theorem 3.1 we have that the problem (1.1)(1.2) has a unique solution, $\stackrel{*}{x}(\cdot ; \lambda)$, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

We prove that $\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; \cdot) \in C^{1}\left(J, \mathbb{R}^{m}\right), \forall t \in[a, b]$.
For this we consider the system

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime}(t ; \lambda)=f\left(t, x_{1}(t ; \lambda), \ldots, x_{m}(t ; \lambda), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(t) ; \lambda\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(t) ; \lambda\right) ; \lambda\right), \tag{7.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

$t \in[a, b], \lambda \in J, x \in C\left([a, b] \times J, \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$.

The system (7.3) is equivalent with
$x_{i}(t ; \lambda)=\int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s) f_{i}\left(s, x_{1}(s ; \lambda), \ldots, x_{m}(s ; \lambda), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s) ; \lambda\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s) ; \lambda\right) ; \lambda\right) d s$,
where $i=\overline{1, m}$.
Let $X:=\left(C\left([a, b] \times J, \mathbb{R}^{m}\right),\|\cdot\|\right)$ with the Chebyshev norm,

$$
\|x\|_{C}:=\left(\begin{array}{c}
\left\|x_{1}\right\| \\
\vdots \\
\left\|x_{m}\right\|
\end{array}\right) \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{m}
$$

Now we consider the operator

$$
B: C\left([a, b] \times J, \mathbb{R}^{m}\right) \rightarrow C\left([a, b] \times J, \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)
$$

where

$$
B(x)(t ; \lambda):=\text { second part of (7.4). }
$$

It is clear, from the proof of the Theorem 3.1, that in the conditions $\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}\right)-\left(\mathrm{C}_{4}\right)$, the operator $B$ is Picard operator, since

$$
\|B(y)-B(z)\|_{C} \leq Q\|y-z\|_{C} .
$$

Let $\stackrel{*}{x}=\left(\stackrel{*}{x}_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}^{*}\right)$ be the unique fixed point of $B$.
We suppose that there exists $\frac{\partial \stackrel{*}{x}_{i}}{\partial \lambda}, i=\overline{1, m}$. From relation (7.4) and condition $\left(\mathrm{C}_{3}\right)$ we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{\partial x_{i}^{*}(t ; \lambda)}{\partial \lambda}= \\
=\int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left(\frac{\partial f_{i}\left(s, x_{1}(s ; \lambda), \ldots, x_{m}(s ; \lambda), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s) ; \lambda\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s) ; \lambda\right) ; \lambda\right)}{\partial u_{1}}\right)_{i, j} \\
+\int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left(\frac{\partial f_{i}\left(s, x_{1}(s ; \lambda), \ldots, x_{m}^{*}(s ; \lambda), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s) ; \lambda\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s) ; \lambda\right) ; \lambda\right)}{\partial u_{m}}\right)_{i, j} \\
+\int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left(\frac{\partial f_{i}\left(s, x_{1}(s ; \lambda), \ldots, x_{m}(s ; \lambda), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s) ; \lambda\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s) ; \lambda\right) ; \lambda\right)}{\partial u_{m+1}}\right)_{i, j}
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\cdot \frac{\partial_{x_{1}}^{*}\left(h_{1}(s) ; \lambda\right)}{\partial \lambda} d s+\cdots+ \\
+\int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left(\frac{\partial f_{i}\left(s, x_{1}(s ; \lambda), \ldots, x_{m}(s ; \lambda), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s) ; \lambda\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s) ; \lambda\right) ; \lambda\right)}{\partial u_{2 m}}\right)_{i, j} \\
+\int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left(\frac{f_{i}\left(s, x_{1}(s ; \lambda), \ldots, x_{m}(s ; \lambda), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s) ; \lambda\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s) ; \lambda\right) ; \lambda\right)}{\partial \lambda}\right)_{i, j} d s
\end{gathered}
$$

for $t \in[a, b], \lambda \in J, i=\overline{1, m}, j=\overline{1,2 m}$.
This relation suggest us to consider the following operator

$$
C: X \times X \rightarrow X,\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right) \rightarrow C\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& C\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)(t ; \lambda):= \\
& =\int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left(\frac{\partial f_{i}\left(s, x_{1}(s ; \lambda), \ldots, x_{m}(s ; \lambda), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s) ; \lambda\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s) ; \lambda\right) ; \lambda\right)}{\partial u_{1}}\right)_{i, j} \\
& \cdot y_{1}(s ; \lambda) d s+\cdots+ \\
& +\int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left(\frac{\partial f_{i}\left(s, x_{1}(s ; \lambda), \ldots, x_{m}(s ; \lambda), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s) ; \lambda\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s) ; \lambda\right) ; \lambda\right)}{\partial u_{m}}\right)_{i, j} \\
& \cdot y_{m}(s ; \lambda) d s+ \\
& +\int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left(\frac{\partial f_{i}\left(s, x_{1}(s ; \lambda), \ldots, x_{m}(s ; \lambda), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s) ; \lambda\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s) ; \lambda\right) ; \lambda\right)}{\partial u_{m+1}}\right)_{i, j} \\
& \cdot y_{1}\left(h_{1}(s) ; \lambda\right) d s+\cdots+ \\
& +\int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left(\frac{\partial f_{i}\left(s, x_{1}(s ; \lambda), \ldots, x_{m}(s ; \lambda), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s ; \lambda)\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s) ; \lambda\right) ; \lambda\right)}{\partial u_{2 m}}\right)_{i, j} \\
& \cdot y_{m}\left(h_{m}(s) ; \lambda\right) d s \\
& +\int_{a}^{b} \mathbf{K}(t, s)\left(\frac{\partial f_{i}\left(s, x_{1}(s ; \lambda), \ldots, x_{m}(s ; \lambda), x_{1}\left(\omega_{1}(s ; \lambda)\right), \ldots, x_{m}\left(\omega_{m}(s) ; \lambda\right) ; \lambda\right)}{\partial \lambda}\right)_{i, j} d s
\end{aligned}
$$

for $t \in\left[t_{0}, b\right], \lambda \in J, i=\overline{1, m}, j=\overline{1,2 m}$.
In this way we have the triangular operator

$$
\begin{gathered}
A: X \times X \rightarrow X \times X, \\
A\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right) \\
=\left(B\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right)(t ; \lambda), C\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)(t ; \lambda)\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

where $B$ is a Picard operator and $C\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}, \cdot\right): X \rightarrow X$ is $Q$-contraction.
Indeed we have

$$
\|C(\stackrel{*}{x}, u)(t ; \lambda)-C(\stackrel{*}{x}, v)(t ; \lambda)\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m}} \leq Q\|u-v\|_{C}, \forall t \in\left[t_{0}, b\right], \forall \lambda \in J
$$

which implies that

$$
\left\|C(\stackrel{*}{x}, u)-C\left({ }^{*}, v\right)\right\|_{C} \leq Q\|u-v\|_{C}, \forall u, v \in X
$$

Since $Q^{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, from the Theorem of fibre contraction (see [12], [13]) follows that the operator $A$ is Picard operator and has a unique fixed point $(\stackrel{*}{x}, \stackrel{*}{y}) \in X \times X$. So the sequences

$$
\left(x^{n+1}, y^{n+1}\right)=\left(B\left(x^{n}\right), C\left(x^{n}, y^{n}\right)\right), n \in \mathbb{N}
$$

converges uniformly (with respect to $t \in[a, b], \lambda \in J)$ to $(\stackrel{*}{x}, \stackrel{*}{y}) \in F_{A}$, for any $x^{0} \in X, y^{0} \in X$.

If we take

$$
x_{i}^{0}=0, y_{i}^{0}=\frac{\partial x_{i}^{0}}{\partial \lambda}=0, \text { then } y_{i}^{1}=\frac{\partial x_{i}^{1}}{\partial \lambda}, i=\overline{1, m} .
$$

By induction we prove that

$$
y_{i}^{n}=\frac{\partial x_{i}^{n}}{\partial \lambda}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, i=\overline{1, m}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{gathered}
x_{i}^{n} \xrightarrow{u n i f} \stackrel{*}{x}_{i}, \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty, i=\overline{1, m} \\
\frac{\partial x_{i}^{n}}{\partial \lambda} \xrightarrow{\text { unif }} \stackrel{*}{y_{i}}, \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty, i=\overline{1, m} .
\end{gathered}
$$

These imply that there exists $\frac{\partial \stackrel{*}{x}_{i}}{\partial \lambda}$ and

$$
\frac{\partial x_{i}(t ; \lambda)}{\partial \lambda}=\stackrel{*}{y}_{i}(t ; \lambda), \quad i=\overline{1, m}
$$

So, we have
Theorem 7.1. Suppose that conditions $\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}\right)-\left(\mathrm{C}_{3}\right)$ hold. Then,
(i) the problem (7.1)-(7.2) has a unique solution $\stackrel{*}{x}=\left(\stackrel{*}{x}_{1}, \ldots, \stackrel{*}{x}_{m}\right) \in$ $C\left([a, b] \times J, \mathbb{R}^{m}\right) ;$
(ii) $\stackrel{*}{x}(t ; \cdot) \in C^{1}\left(J, \mathbb{R}^{m}\right), \forall t \in[a, b]$.

## 8. REMARKS

Remark 8.1. The problem (1.1)-(1.2) is a generalization of a problem studied by D.V. Ionescu in [2].
D.V. Ionescu's problem. Let $t_{k} \in[a, b]$ with $t_{1}<t_{2}<\ldots<t_{n}(n \in$ $\mathbb{N}, n \geq 3)$ and $f=\left(f_{1}, \ldots, f_{n}\right) \in C\left([a, b] \times \mathbb{R}^{n}, \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$. We suppose that $t_{1}=a$ and $t_{n}=b$. The problem is to study the existence of $x=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \in$ $C^{1}\left([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ such that

$$
x^{\prime}(t)=f(t, x(t)), t \in[a, b]
$$

and

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}\left(t_{1}\right)=0 \\
x_{2}\left(t_{2}\right)=x_{1}\left(t_{2}\right) \\
\cdots \\
x_{n-1}\left(t_{n-1}\right)=x_{n-2}\left(t_{n-1}\right) \\
x_{n}\left(t_{n}\right)=0
\end{array}\right.
$$

D.V. Ionescu proved that if the interval $[a, b]$ is sufficiently small and the functions $f_{i}$ are Lipschitz with respect to $x$, then this problem has a unique solution, [7].

Remark 8.2. Some problems concerning equation (1.1) were study in the following particular cases (see [10], [11])

$$
\omega_{i}(t)=t-\tau_{i}, i=\overline{1, m}, \tau>0
$$

and

$$
\omega_{1}(t)=\lambda t, \omega_{2}(t)=\frac{1}{\lambda} t, 0<\lambda<1 \quad(\text { see }[4])
$$

For other considerations on the functional-differential equations we mention: [6], [12], [13], [14].
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