

# AN ITERATIVE SCHEME FOR SOLVING EQUATIONS WITH LOCALLY $\sigma$ -INVERSE MONOTONE OPERATORS

N. S. HOANG

ABSTRACT. An iterative scheme for solving ill-posed nonlinear equations with locally  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone operators is studied in this paper. A stopping rule of discrepancy type is proposed. The existence of  $u_{n_\delta}$  satisfying the proposed stopping rule is proved. The convergence of this element to the minimal-norm solution is justified mathematically.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study an iterative scheme for solving the equation

$$(1.1) \quad F(u) = f,$$

where  $F$  is a locally  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone operator in a Hilbert space  $H$ , and equation (1.1) is assumed solvable, possibly nonuniquely. An operator  $F$  is called locally  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone if for any  $R > 0$  there exists a constant  $\sigma_R > 0$  such that

$$(1.2) \quad \langle F(u) - F(v), u - v \rangle \geq \sigma_R \|F(u) - F(v)\|^2, \quad \forall u, v \in B(0, R) \subset H.$$

Here,  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the inner product in  $H$ . If the constant  $\sigma_R$  in (1.2) is independent of  $R$  then we call  $F$  a  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone operator.

A necessary condition for an operator  $F$  to be  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone is the following:

$$\|F(u) - F(v)\| \leq \sigma^{-1} \|u - v\|.$$

Indeed, inequality (1.2) and the Cauchy inequality imply the above estimate. If the  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone operator is a homeomorphism, then its inverse is strongly monotone:

$$\langle F^{-1}(u) - F^{-1}(v), u - v \rangle \geq \sigma \|u - v\|^2.$$

An example of  $\sigma$ -inverse operator is a linear selfadjoint compact nonnegative-definite operator  $A$ . Indeed, if  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$  are its eigenvalues and  $\phi_j$  are the corresponding normalized eigenvectors, then

$$\langle Au - Av, u - v \rangle = \sum_j \lambda_j |\langle u - v, \phi_j \rangle|^2 \geq \sigma \sum_j \lambda_j^2 |\langle u - v, \phi_j \rangle|^2 = \sigma \|Au - Av\|^2,$$

where  $\sigma = \lambda_1^{-1}$ . An example of locally  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone operator is a nonlinear Fréchet differentiable monotone operator  $F : H \rightarrow H$  provided that  $H$  is a complex Hilbert space and  $F'$  is locally bounded, i.e., for any  $R > 0$  there exists a constant  $M(R)$  such that

$$\|F'(u)\| \leq M(R), \quad \forall u \in B(0, R)$$

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 65R30; Secondary 47J05, 47J06, 47J35.

*Key words and phrases.* iterative methods, nonlinear operator equations, monotone operators, discrepancy principle.

(see Lemma 2.11 in Section 2). In Lemma 2.11 we also prove that if  $H$  is a real Hilbert space,  $F : H \rightarrow H$  is a Fréchet differentiable monotone operator and  $F'$  is a selfadjoint locally bounded operator, then  $F$  is also a locally  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone operator. If (1.2) holds, then the operator  $\sigma_R F$  satisfies (1.2) with  $\sigma_R = 1$ .

It is clear that if  $F$  is  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone, then it is monotone, i.e.,

$$(1.3) \quad \langle F(u) - F(v), u - v \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall u, v \in H.$$

It is known (see, e.g., [9]), that the set  $\mathcal{N} := \{u : F(u) = f\}$  is closed and convex if  $F$  is monotone and continuous. A closed and convex set in a Hilbert space has a unique minimal-norm element. This element in  $\mathcal{N}$  we denote by  $y$ ,  $F(y) = f$ , and call it the minimal-norm solution to equation (1). We assume that  $f = F(y)$  is not known but  $f_\delta$ , the noisy data, are known, and  $\|f_\delta - f\| \leq \delta$ . If  $F'(u)$  is not boundedly invertible then solving equation (1.1) for  $u$  given noisy data  $f_\delta$  is often (but not always) an ill-posed problem. When  $F$  is a linear bounded operator many methods were proposed for solving stably equation (1.1) (see [7]–[9] and the references therein). However, when  $F$  is nonlinear then the theory is less complete.

Methods for solving equation (1.1) were extensively studied in [3]–[6], [9]–[13]. In [9], [3], the following iterative scheme for solving equation (1.1) with monotone operators  $F$  was investigated:

$$(1.4) \quad u_{n+1} = u_n - (F'(u_n) + a_n I)^{-1} (F(u_n) + a_n u_n - f_\delta), \quad u_0 = \tilde{u}_0.$$

The convergence of this method was justified with an *a priori* and an *a posteriori* choice of stopping rules (see [3]). In [6] a continuous version of the regularized Newton method (1.4) with a stopping rule of discrepancy type is formulated and justified. Another iterative scheme with an *a posteriori* choice of stopping rule was formulated and justified in [4].

In this paper we consider the following iterative for a stable solution to equation (1.1):

$$(1.5) \quad u_{n+1} = u_n - \gamma_n [F(u_n) + a_n u_n - f_\delta], \quad u_0 = \tilde{u}_0,$$

where  $F$  is a locally  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone operator,  $\gamma_n \in (0, 1)$ ,  $n \geq 0$ , and  $\tilde{u}_0$  is a suitably chosen element in  $H$  which will be specified later.

The advantages of this iterative scheme compared with (1.4) are:

- (1) the absence of the inverse operator in the algorithm, which makes the algorithm (1.5) less expensive than (1.4)
- (2) one does not have to compute the Fréchet derivative of  $F$
- (3) the Fréchet differentiability of  $F$  is not required.

A more expensive algorithm (1.4) may converge faster than (1.5) in some cases.

The convergence of the method (1.5) for exact data was proved in [9]. For noisy data it was proved in [5] that the element  $u_{n_\delta}$ , defined by (1.5) and an *a posteriori* choice of stopping rule, converges to a solution to (1.1) when  $u_0$  and  $a_n$  are suitably chosen, provided that  $H$  is a complex Hilbert space and  $F$  is a Fréchet differentiable monotone operator. However, it is of interest to prove the convergence to the minimal-norm solution to (1.1). The minimal-norm solution in problems with a linear operator  $F$  is the solution orthogonal to the null-space of  $F$ . In linear algebra it is called the normal solution, and it is the solution that is of interest in many computational problems. In nonlinear problems the minimal-norm solution is also the solution of interest in many cases, because it is often the solution with minimal energy.

In this paper we investigate a stopping rule based on a *discrepancy principle* (DP) for the iterative scheme (1.5). Using the local  $\sigma$ -inverse monotonicity of  $F$ , we prove convergence of the method (1.5) to the minimal-norm solution to (1.1). The rate of decay of the regularizing sequence  $a_n$  in this paper is also faster than the one in [5]. This saves the computer time and results in a faster convergence of our method. The main results of this paper are Theorem 3.1, 3.3, and 3.5. In Theorem 3.1 a DP is formulated and the existence of a stopping time  $n_\delta$  is proved. The convergence of the iterative scheme with the proposed DP to a solution to (1.1) is proved in Theorem (3.3). In Theorem (3.5) sufficient conditions for the convergence of the iterative scheme with the proposed DP to the minimal-norm solution to (1.1) is justified mathematically.

## 2. AUXILIARY RESULTS

Let us consider the following equation:

$$(2.1) \quad F(\tilde{V}_{a,\delta}) + a\tilde{V}_{a,\delta} - f_\delta = 0, \quad a = \text{const} > 0.$$

It is known (see, e.g., [2] and [9]) that equation (2.1) with monotone continuous operator  $F$  has a unique solution for any fixed  $a > 0$  and any  $f_\delta \in H$ .

Lemmas 2.1, 2.3 and 2.5 can be found in [3]. We include the proofs for the convenience of the reader.

**Lemma 2.1.** *If (1.2) holds and  $F$  is continuous, then  $\|\tilde{V}_{a,\delta}\| = O(\frac{1}{a})$  as  $a \rightarrow \infty$ , and*

$$(2.2) \quad \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \|F(\tilde{V}_{a,\delta}) - f_\delta\| = \|F(0) - f_\delta\|.$$

*Proof.* Rewrite (2.1) as

$$F(\tilde{V}_{a,\delta}) - F(0) + a\tilde{V}_{a,\delta} + F(0) - f_\delta = 0.$$

Multiply this equation by  $\tilde{V}_{a,\delta}$ , use the inequality  $\langle F(\tilde{V}_{a,\delta}) - F(0), \tilde{V}_{a,\delta} - 0 \rangle \geq 0$ , which follows from (1.2), and get:

$$a\|\tilde{V}_{a,\delta}\|^2 \leq \langle a\tilde{V}_{a,\delta} + F(\tilde{V}_{a,\delta}) - F(0), \tilde{V}_{a,\delta} \rangle = \langle f_\delta - F(0), \tilde{V}_{a,\delta} \rangle \leq \|f_\delta - F(0)\| \|\tilde{V}_{a,\delta}\|.$$

Therefore,  $\|\tilde{V}_{a,\delta}\| = O(\frac{1}{a})$ . This and the continuity of  $F$  imply (2.2).  $\square$

Let us recall the following result (see Lemma 6.1.7 [9, p. 112]):

**Lemma 2.2.** *Assume that equation (1.1) is solvable. Let  $y$  be its minimal-norm solution. Assume that  $F : H \rightarrow H$  is a continuous monotone operator. Then*

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \|\tilde{V}_a - y\| = 0,$$

where  $\tilde{V}_a := \tilde{V}_{a,0}$  which solves (2.1) with  $\delta = 0$ .

Let us consider the following equation

$$(2.3) \quad F(V_{\delta,n}) + a_n V_{\delta,n} - f_\delta = 0, \quad a_n > 0,$$

For simplicity let us denote  $V_n := V_{\delta,n}$  when  $\delta \neq 0$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *Assume that  $0 < (a_n)_{n=0}^\infty \searrow 0$ . Then*

$$(2.4) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\| \leq \delta.$$

*Proof.* We have  $F(y) = f$ , and

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \langle F(V_n) + a_n V_n - f_\delta, F(V_n) - f_\delta \rangle \\
&= \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\|^2 + a_n \langle V_n - y, F(V_n) - f_\delta \rangle + a_n \langle y, F(V_n) - f_\delta \rangle \\
&= \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\|^2 + a_n \langle V_n - y, F(V_n) - F(y) \rangle + a_n \langle V_n - y, f - f_\delta \rangle \\
&\quad + a_n \langle y, F(V_n) - f_\delta \rangle \\
&\geq \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\|^2 + a_n \langle V_n - y, f - f_\delta \rangle + a_n \langle y, F(V_n) - f_\delta \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Here the inequality  $\langle V_n - y, F(V_n) - F(y) \rangle \geq 0$  was used. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.5) \quad \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\|^2 &\leq -a_n \langle V_n - y, f - f_\delta \rangle - a_n \langle y, F(V_n) - f_\delta \rangle \\
&\leq a_n \|V_n - y\| \|f - f_\delta\| + a_n \|y\| \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\| \\
&\leq a_n \delta \|V_n - y\| + a_n \|y\| \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\|.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, one has:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \langle F(V_n) - F(y) + a_n V_n + f - f_\delta, V_n - y \rangle \\
&= \langle F(V_n) - F(y), V_n - y \rangle + a_n \|V_n - y\|^2 + a_n \langle y, V_n - y \rangle + \langle f - f_\delta, V_n - y \rangle \\
&\geq a_n \|V_n - y\|^2 + a_n \langle y, V_n - y \rangle + \langle f - f_\delta, V_n - y \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality  $\langle V_n - y, F(V_n) - F(y) \rangle \geq 0$  was used. Therefore,

$$a_n \|V_n - y\|^2 \leq a_n \|y\| \|V_n - y\| + \delta \|V_n - y\|.$$

This implies

$$(2.6) \quad a_n \|V_n - y\| \leq a_n \|y\| + \delta.$$

From (2.5) and (2.6), and an elementary inequality  $ab \leq \epsilon a^2 + \frac{b^2}{4\epsilon}$ ,  $\forall \epsilon > 0$ , one gets:

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.7) \quad \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\|^2 &\leq \delta^2 + a_n \|y\| \delta + a_n \|y\| \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\| \\
&\leq \delta^2 + a_n \|y\| \delta + \epsilon \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\|^2 + \frac{1}{4\epsilon} a_n^2 \|y\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\epsilon > 0$  is fixed, independent of  $n$ , and can be chosen arbitrary small. Let  $n \rightarrow \infty$  so  $a_n \searrow 0$ . Then (2.7) implies  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \epsilon) \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\|^2 \leq \delta^2$ ,  $\forall \epsilon > 0$ . This implies  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\| \leq \delta$ .

Lemma 2.3 is proved.  $\square$

*Remark 2.4.* Let  $V_{0,n} := V_{\delta,n}|_{\delta=0}$ . Then  $F(V_{0,n}) + a_n V_{0,n} - f = 0$ . Note that

$$(2.8) \quad \|V_{\delta,n} - V_{0,n}\| \leq \frac{\delta}{a_n}.$$

Indeed, from (2.1) one gets

$$F(V_{\delta,n}) - F(V_{0,n}) + a_n (V_{\delta,n} - V_{0,n}) = f_\delta - f.$$

Multiply this equality with  $V_{\delta,n} - V_{0,n}$  and use (1.2) to get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \|V_{\delta,n} - V_{0,n}\| &\geq \langle f_\delta - f, V_{\delta,n} - V_{0,n} \rangle \\
&= \langle F(V_{\delta,n}) - F(V_{0,n}) + a_n (V_{\delta,n} - V_{0,n}), V_{\delta,n} - V_{0,n} \rangle \\
&\geq a_n \|V_{\delta,n} - V_{0,n}\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies (2.8). Similarly, from the equation

$$F(V_{0,n}) + a_n V_{0,n} - F(y) = 0,$$

one derives that

$$(2.9) \quad \|V_{0,n}\| \leq \|y\|.$$

Similar arguments one can find in [9].

From (2.8) and (2.9), one gets the following estimate:

$$(2.10) \quad \|V_n\| \leq \|V_{0,n}\| + \frac{\delta}{a_n} \leq \|y\| + \frac{\delta}{a_n}.$$

From equation (2.3) one gets

$$F(V_{n+1}) - F(V_n) = a_n V_n - a_{n+1} V_{n+1}.$$

This and the monotonicity of  $F$  imply

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \langle a_n V_n - a_{n+1} V_{n+1}, V_{n+1} - V_n \rangle \\ &= -a_n \|V_n - V_{n+1}\|^2 + (a_n - a_{n+1}) \langle V_{n+1}, V_{n+1} - V_n \rangle \\ &\leq -a_n \|V_n - V_{n+1}\|^2 + (a_n - a_{n+1}) \|V_{n+1}\| \|V_{n+1} - V_n\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, one gets

$$(2.12) \quad \|V_n - V_{n+1}\| \leq \frac{a_n - a_{n+1}}{a_n} \|V_{n+1}\|, \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

**Lemma 2.5.** *Assume  $\|F(0) - f_\delta\| > 0$ . Let  $0 < a_n \searrow 0$ ,  $F$  be monotone, and*

$$\ell_n := \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\|, \quad k_n := \|V_n\|, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots,$$

where  $V_n$  solves (2.3). Then  $\ell_n$  is decreasing and  $k_n$  is increasing.

*Proof.* Since  $\|F(0) - f_\delta\| > 0$ , it follows that  $k_n \neq 0, \forall n \geq 0$ . One has

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \langle F(V_n) - F(V_m), V_n - V_m \rangle \\ &= \langle -a_n V_n + a_m V_m, V_n - V_m \rangle \\ &= (a_n + a_m) \langle V_n, V_m \rangle - a_n \|V_n\|^2 - a_m \|V_m\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq (a_n + a_m) \langle V_n, V_m \rangle - a_n \|V_n\|^2 - a_m \|V_m\|^2 \\ &\leq (a_n + a_m) \|V_n\| \|V_m\| - a_n \|V_n\|^2 - a_m \|V_m\|^2 \\ &= (a_n \|V_n\| - a_m \|V_m\|) (\|V_m\| - \|V_n\|) \\ &= (\ell_n - \ell_m) (k_m - k_n). \end{aligned}$$

From (2.3) one gets

$$(2.15) \quad \ell_n = \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\| = a_n \|V_n\| = a_n k_n, \quad n \geq 0.$$

If  $k_m > k_n$  then (2.14) and (2.15) imply  $\ell_n \geq \ell_m$ , so

$$a_n k_n = \ell_n \geq \ell_m = a_m k_m > a_m k_n.$$

Thus, if  $k_m > k_n$  then  $a_m < a_n$  and, therefore,  $m > n$ , because  $a_n$  is decreasing.

Similarly, if  $k_m < k_n$  then  $\ell_n \leq \ell_m$ . This implies  $a_m > a_n$ , so  $m < n$ .

If  $k_m = k_n$  then (2.13) implies

$$\|V_m\|^2 \leq \langle V_m, V_n \rangle \leq \|V_m\| \|V_n\| = \|V_m\|^2.$$

This implies  $V_m = V_n$ , and then  $a_n = a_m$ . Hence,  $m = n$ , because  $a_n$  is decreasing.

Therefore  $\ell_n$  is decreasing and  $k_n$  is increasing. Lemma 2.5 is proved.  $\square$

*Remark 2.6.* From Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.5 one concludes that

$$(2.16) \quad a_n \|V_n\| = \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\| \leq \|F(0) - f_\delta\|, \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

Let  $0 < a(t) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  satisfy the following conditions:

$$(2.17) \quad 0 < a(t) \searrow 0, \quad \nu(t) := \frac{|\dot{a}(t)|}{a^2(t)} \searrow 0, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Let  $0 < h = \text{const}$  and

$$a_n := a(nh), \quad n \geq 0.$$

*Remark 2.7.* It follows from (2.17) that

$$(2.18) \quad 0 < \frac{1}{a_{n+1}} - \frac{1}{a_n} = - \int_{nh}^{(n+1)h} \frac{\dot{a}(s)}{a^2(s)} ds \leq h\nu(n) \leq h\nu(0).$$

Inequalities (2.18) imply

$$(2.19) \quad 1 < \frac{a_n}{a_{n+1}} \leq 1 + a_n h \nu(0).$$

From the relation  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$  and (2.19) one gets

$$(2.20) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n}{a_{n+1}} = 1.$$

From (2.17) and (2.18) one gets

$$(2.21) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n - a_{n+1}}{a_n a_{n+1}} = 0.$$

*Remark 2.8.* Let  $b \in (0, 1)$ ,  $c \geq 1$ ,  $d > 0$  and

$$a(t) = \frac{d}{(c+t)^b}.$$

Then  $a(t)$  satisfies (2.17).

**Lemma 2.9.** *Let  $0 < h = \text{const}$  and  $a(t)$  satisfy (2.17) and the following conditions*

$$(2.22) \quad a(0)h \leq 2, \quad \nu(0) = \frac{|\dot{a}(0)|}{a^2(0)} \leq \frac{1}{10}.$$

Let  $a_n := a(nh)$  and

$$(2.23) \quad \varphi_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i h}{2}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

Then the following inequality holds

$$(2.24) \quad e^{-\varphi_n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{\varphi_{i+1}} (a_i - a_{i+1}) \|V_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2} a_n \|V_n\|, \quad n \geq 1.$$

*Proof.* First, let us prove that

$$(2.25) \quad e^{\varphi_n} (a_{n-1} - a_n) \leq \frac{1}{2} (a_n e^{\varphi_n} - a_{n-1} e^{\varphi_{n-1}}), \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

Inequality (2.25) is equivalent to

$$(2.26) \quad \frac{3a_n}{a_{n-1}} \geq \frac{2e^{\varphi_n} + e^{\varphi_{n-1}}}{e^{\varphi_n}} = 2 + e^{-\frac{h a_n}{2}}, \quad n \geq 1.$$

This inequality is equivalent to

$$(2.27) \quad \frac{a_{n-1} - a_n}{a_{n-1}a_n} \leq \frac{1 - e^{-\frac{ha_n}{2}}}{3a_n}, \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

Let us prove (2.27). From (2.17) and (2.22) one gets

$$(2.28) \quad \frac{a_{n-1} - a_n}{a_{n-1}a_n} = \int_{(n-1)h}^{nh} \frac{|\dot{a}(s)|}{a^2(s)} ds \leq h\nu((n-1)h) \leq h\nu(0) \leq \frac{h}{10}.$$

Note that the function  $\tilde{f}(x) = \frac{1-e^{-x}}{x}$  is decreasing on  $(0, \infty)$ . Therefore, one gets

$$(2.29) \quad \frac{1 - e^{-\frac{ha_n}{2}}}{3a_n} = \frac{h\tilde{f}(\frac{ha_n}{2})}{6} \geq \frac{h\tilde{f}(\frac{ha_0}{2})}{6} \geq \frac{h\tilde{f}(1)}{6} \geq \frac{h\frac{6}{10}}{6} = \frac{h}{10}.$$

We have used the inequalities  $a_n h \leq a_0 h \leq 2$ ,  $\forall n \geq 1$ , and  $\tilde{f}(1) > \frac{6}{10}$  in (2.29). Inequality (2.27) follows from (2.28) and (2.29). Thus, (2.25) holds.

From inequality (2.25) one obtains

$$(2.30) \quad 2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{\varphi^{i+1}} (a_i - a_{i+1}) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (a_{i+1} e^{\varphi^{i+1}} - a_i e^{\varphi^i}) < e^{\varphi^n} a_n, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Multiplying (2.30) by  $\frac{1}{2} \|V_n\| e^{-\varphi^n}$  and recalling the fact that  $\|V_i\|$  is increasing (see Lemma 2.5), one gets inequality (2.24). Lemma 2.9 is proved.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.10.** *Let  $R$  and  $\sigma_R$  be positive constants and  $F$  be an operator in a Hilbert space  $H$  satisfying the following inequality:*

$$(2.31) \quad \langle F(u) - F(v), u - v \rangle \geq \sigma_R \|F(u) - F(v)\|^2, \quad \forall u, v \in B(0, R) \subset H.$$

Assume that

$$(2.32) \quad 0 < \gamma \leq \frac{2}{\sigma_R^{-1} + 2a}, \quad a = \text{const} \geq 0.$$

Then

$$(2.33) \quad \mu(u, v) := \|u - v - \frac{\gamma}{1 - \gamma a} [F(u) - F(v)]\| \leq \|u - v\|, \quad \forall u, v \in B(0, R).$$

*Proof.* Let us fix  $R > 0$  and denote  $\sigma := \sigma_R$  and  $w := u - v$ . From (2.31), one gets,  $\forall u, v \in B(0, R)$ , the following inequality:

$$(2.34) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu^2(u, v) &= \|w\|^2 - \frac{2\gamma}{1 - \gamma a} \langle w, F(u) - F(v) \rangle + \frac{\gamma^2}{(1 - \gamma a)^2} \|F(u) - F(v)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|w\|^2 - \frac{2\gamma}{1 - \gamma a} \sigma \|F(u) - F(v)\|^2 + \frac{\gamma^2}{(1 - \gamma a)^2} \|F(u) - F(v)\|^2 \\ &= \|w\|^2 - \left( \frac{2\gamma\sigma}{1 - \gamma a} - \frac{\gamma^2}{(1 - \gamma a)^2} \right) \|F(u) - F(v)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2.32) that

$$(2.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{2\gamma\sigma}{1 - \gamma a} - \frac{\gamma^2}{(1 - \gamma a)^2} &= \frac{\gamma\sigma}{(1 - \gamma a)^2} [2(1 - \gamma a) - \sigma^{-1}\gamma] \\ &= \frac{\gamma\sigma}{(1 - \gamma a)^2} (\sigma^{-1} + 2a) \left[ \frac{2}{\sigma^{-1} + 2a} - \gamma \right] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Inequality (2.33) follows from inequalities (2.34) and (2.35). Lemma 2.10 is proved.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.11.** *Let  $F : H \rightarrow H$  be a Fréchet differentiable monotone operator with locally bounded  $F'$ , i.e.,*

$$(2.36) \quad \|F'(u)\| \leq M(R), \quad \forall u \in B(u_0, R),$$

where  $H$  is a Hilbert space. Let one of the following assumptions hold:

- (1)  $H$  is a real Hilbert space and  $F'$  is selfadjoint,
- (2)  $H$  is a complex Hilbert space.

Then  $F$  is a locally  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone operator, i.e., for all  $R > 0$  there exists  $\sigma_R > 0$  such that

$$(2.37) \quad \langle F(u) - F(v), u - v \rangle \geq \sigma_R \|F(u) - F(v)\|^2, \quad \forall u, v \in B(0, R).$$

Moreover,

$$(2.38) \quad \sigma_R = \frac{1}{M(R)}, \quad R > 0.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $u, v \in B(0, R)$ . One has

$$(2.39) \quad F(u) - F(v) = J(u - v), \quad J := \int_0^1 F'(v + \xi(u - v)) d\xi.$$

By our assumption  $J$  is a selfadjoint operator and

$$(2.40) \quad 0 \leq J \leq M(R), \quad M(R) := \sup_{w \in B(0, R)} \|F'(w)\|.$$

This and the selfadjointness of  $J$  imply

$$(2.41) \quad 0 \leq J(I - \sigma_R J) = (I - \sigma_R J)J,$$

where  $I$  is the identity operator in  $H$  and  $\sigma_R$  is defined by (2.38). Thus,

$$(2.42) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle F(u) - F(v), u - v \rangle &= \langle J(u - v), u - v \rangle \\ &= \langle J(u - v), (I - \sigma_R J)(u - v) \rangle + \sigma_R \|J(u - v)\|^2 \\ &= \langle [(I - \sigma_R J)J](u - v), (u - v) \rangle + \sigma_R \|J(u - v)\|^2 \\ &\geq \sigma_R \|J(u - v)\|^2 = \sigma_R \|F(u) - F(v)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (2.37). Lemma 2.11 is proved.  $\square$

*Remark 2.12.* It follows from the proof of Lemma 2.11 that if  $F'(u)$  is self-adjoint and uniformly bounded, i.e., the constant  $M = M(R)$  in (2.36) is independent of  $R$ , then  $F$  is a  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone operator with  $\sigma = \frac{1}{M}$ .

**Lemma 2.13.** *Let  $0 < h = \text{const}$ ,  $a(t)$  satisfy (2.17),  $a_n := a(nh)$ , and*

$$(2.43) \quad \phi_n = h \sum_{i=0}^n a_i, \quad \phi(t) := \int_0^t a(s) ds.$$



Then

$$(2.44) \quad e^{-\phi_{n-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{\phi_i} (a_i - a_{i+1}) \leq e^{a(0)h} e^{-\phi(nh)} \int_0^{nh} e^{\phi(s)} |\dot{a}(s)| ds, \quad \forall n \geq 1,$$

$$(2.45) \quad e^{-\phi_{n-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{\phi_i} \frac{a_i - a_{i+1}}{a_i} \leq e^{a(0)h} e^{-\phi(nh)} \int_0^{nh} e^{\phi(s)} \frac{|\dot{a}(s)|}{a(s)} ds, \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

*Proof.* Let us prove (2.45). Inequality (2.44) is obtained similarly.

Since  $a_n = a(nh)$  and  $0 < a(t) \searrow 0$ , one gets

$$(2.46) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi_n - \phi_i &= \sum_{k=i+1}^n a_k h \geq \sum_{k=i+1}^n \int_{kh}^{(k+1)h} a(s) ds \\ &= \int_{(i+1)h}^{(n+1)h} a(s) ds = \phi((n+1)h) - \phi((i+1)h), \quad 0 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

This and the inequalities

$$\phi((i+1)h) - \phi(s) = \int_s^{(i+1)h} a(s) ds \leq \int_s^{(i+1)h} a(0) ds \leq a(0)h,$$

for all  $s \in [ih, (i+1)h]$ , imply

$$(2.47) \quad -\phi_{n-1} + \phi_i \leq -\phi(nh) + \phi(s) + a(0)h, \quad \forall s \in [ih, (i+1)h],$$

where  $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ .

Since  $0 < a_n \searrow 0$  and  $|\dot{a}(t)| = -a(t)$ , one obtains

$$(2.48) \quad \frac{a_i - a_{i+1}}{a_i} = \int_{ih}^{(i+1)h} \frac{|\dot{a}(s)|}{a_i} ds \leq \int_{ih}^{(i+1)h} \frac{|\dot{a}(s)|}{a(s)} ds.$$

It follows from (2.48) and (2.47) that

$$(2.49) \quad \begin{aligned} e^{-\phi_{n-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{\phi_i} \frac{a_i - a_{i+1}}{a_i} &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{ih}^{(i+1)h} e^{-\phi_{n-1} + \phi_i} \frac{|\dot{a}(s)|}{a(s)} ds \\ &\leq e^{a(0)h} e^{-\phi(nh)} \int_0^{nh} e^{\phi(s)} \frac{|\dot{a}(s)|}{a(s)} ds, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.13 is proved.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.14.** Let  $0 < h = \text{const}$ ,  $a(t)$  satisfy (2.17),  $a_n = a(nh)$  and  $\phi_n$  be as in (2.43). Then

$$(2.50) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{\phi_{n-1}} a_n = \infty,$$

and

$$(2.51) \quad M := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=0}^n e^{\phi_i} (a_i - a_{i+1})}{e^{\phi_n} a_{n+1}} = 0.$$

*Proof.* Let us first prove (2.50).

From (2.17) and (2.43), one gets

$$(2.52) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \geq \int_0^\infty a(s) ds \geq \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\nu(0)} \frac{-\dot{a}(s)}{a(s)} ds = \infty.$$

We claim that if  $n > 0$  is sufficiently large, then the following inequality holds:

$$(2.53) \quad \phi_{n-1} \geq \ln \frac{1}{a_n^2}.$$

Indeed, using a discrete analog of L'Hospital's rule, the relation  $\ln(1+x) = x+o(x)$ , and (2.21), one gets

$$(2.54) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi_{n-1}}{\ln \frac{1}{a_n^2}} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi_n - \phi_{n-1}}{\ln \frac{1}{a_{n+1}^2} - \ln \frac{1}{a_n^2}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n h}{4 \ln(1 + \frac{a_n - a_{n+1}}{a_{n+1}})} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h}{4 \frac{a_n - a_{n+1}}{a_{n+1} a_n}} = \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that (2.53) holds for all  $n \geq \tilde{N}$  provided that  $\tilde{N} > 0$  is sufficiently large. It follows from inequality (2.53) that

$$(2.55) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n e^{\phi_{n-1}} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n e^{\ln \frac{1}{a_n^2}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n}{a_n^2} = \infty.$$

*Let us prove (2.51).*

Since  $a_n e^{\phi_{n-1}} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , by (2.50), relation (2.51) holds if the numerator  $\sum_{i=0}^n e^{\phi_i} (a_i - a_{i+1})$  in (2.51) is bounded. Otherwise, a discrete analog of L'Hospital's rule yields:

$$(2.56) \quad \begin{aligned} M &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{\phi_n} (a_n - a_{n+1})}{e^{\phi_n} a_{n+1} - e^{\phi_{n-1}} a_n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n - a_{n+1}}{a_{n+1} - a_n e^{-h a_n}} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\frac{h a_n a_n}{(a_n - a_{n+1})} (1 - \frac{h a_n}{2}) - 1} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used (2.20), (2.21), relation  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$ , and the following inequality:

$$e^{-h a_n} \leq 1 - h a_n + \frac{(h a_n)^2}{2}, \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

Lemma 2.14 is proved.  $\square$

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

**3.1. An iterative scheme.** Let  $0 < a(t) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  satisfy the following conditions: (see also (2.17))

$$(3.1) \quad 0 < a(t) \searrow 0, \quad \nu(t) := \frac{|\dot{a}(t)|}{a^2(t)} \searrow 0, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Let  $0 < h = \text{const} \leq 1$  and  $a_n := a(nh), n \geq 0$ . Consider the following iterative scheme

$$(3.2) \quad u_{n+1} = u_n - \gamma_n [F(u_n) + a_n u_n - f_\delta], \quad u_0 = \tilde{u}_0,$$

where  $\tilde{u}_0 \in H$  and

$$(3.3) \quad 0 < h \leq \gamma_n \leq \frac{2}{\sigma_R^{-1} + 2a_n}, \quad n \geq 0,$$

where  $\sigma_R$  is the constant in (1.2) and  $0 < R = \text{const}$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $a(t)$  satisfy (3.1). Assume that  $F : H \rightarrow H$  is a locally  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone operator. Assume that equation  $F(u) = f$  has a solution, possibly nonunique. Let  $f_\delta$  be such that  $\|f_\delta - f\| \leq \delta$  and  $u_0$  be an element of  $H$  satisfying the inequality:*

$$(3.4) \quad \|F(u_0) - f_\delta\| > C\delta^\zeta,$$

where  $C > 0$  and  $\zeta \in (0, 1]$  are constants satisfying  $C\delta^\zeta > \delta$ . Let  $0 < R$  be sufficiently large and  $0 < h$  and  $0 < \gamma_n$  satisfy (3.3). Let  $u_n$  be defined by the iterative process (3.2). Then there exists a unique  $n_\delta$  such that

$$(3.5) \quad \|F(u_{n_\delta}) - f_\delta\| \leq C\delta^\zeta, \quad \|F(u_n) - f_\delta\| > C\delta^\zeta, \quad 0 \leq n < n_\delta,$$

where  $C$  and  $\zeta$  are constants from (3.4).

*Remark 3.2.* In [5] the existence of  $n_\delta$  was proved for the choice  $a_n = d/(c+n)^b$ , where  $b \in (0, 1/2)$  and  $d > 0$  is sufficiently large. However, it was not quantified in [5] how large  $d$  should be. In this paper the existence of  $n_\delta$  is proved for  $a_n = d/(c+nh)^b$ , for any  $d > 0$ ,  $c > 1$ ,  $b \in (0, 1)$ , and  $0 < h \leq \gamma_n$ . This guarantees the existence of  $n_\delta$  for small  $a(0)$  or  $d$ . Moreover, our condition on  $b$  allows  $a_n$  to decay faster than the corresponding sequence  $a_n$  in [5] decays. Having smaller  $a(0)$  and larger  $b$  reduces the cost of computations.

Inequality (3.4) is a very natural assumption. Indeed, if it does not hold and  $\|u_0\|$  is not "large", then  $u_0$  can be already considered as an approximate solution to (1.1).

In general, if  $R$  in (3.3) is large, then the stepsize  $h$  in the iterative scheme (3.2) is small. Consequently, the computation time will be large since the rate of decay of  $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is slow. However, if  $F$  is  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone, i.e.,  $\sigma_R$  is independent of  $R$ , then it is easy to choose  $h$  and  $\gamma_n$  to satisfy (3.3).

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Let us prove first that there exists  $R > 0$  such that the sequence  $(u_n)_{n=1}^{n_\delta}$  remains inside the ball  $B(0, R)$ .

We assume without loss of generality that  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ . It follows from (2.16) and the triangle inequality that

$$(3.6) \quad a_n \|V_n\| \leq \|F(0) - f_\delta\| \leq \|F(0) - f\| + \|f_\delta - f\| \leq \Gamma, \quad \forall n \geq 0, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, 1),$$

where

$$\Gamma := \|F(0) - f\| + 1.$$

From (3.6) one obtains

$$(3.7) \quad \|V_n\| \leq \frac{\Gamma}{a_n}, \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

Let  $\phi(t)$  be defined as follows (see also (2.43))

$$(3.8) \quad \phi(t) = \int_0^t a(s) ds.$$

From the last inequality in (2.52) one gets

$$(3.9) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi(t) = \infty.$$

We claim that

$$(3.10) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^t e^{\phi(s)} \frac{|\dot{a}(s)|}{a(s)} ds}{e^{\phi(t)}} = 0.$$

Indeed, if the denominator  $\int_0^t e^{\phi(s)} \frac{|\dot{a}(s)|}{a(s)} ds$  is bounded, then (3.10) is valid because  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi(t) = \infty$ . Otherwise L'Hospital's rule and (3.1) yield

$$(3.11) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^t e^{\phi(s)} \frac{|\dot{a}(s)|}{a(s)} ds}{e^{\phi(t)}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{\phi(t)} |\dot{a}(t)|}{e^{\phi(t)} a^2(t)} = 0.$$

Let

$$(3.12) \quad K = 1 + \sup_{t \geq 0} e^{a(0)} e^{-\phi(t)} \int_0^t e^{\phi(s)} \frac{|\dot{a}(s)|}{a(s)} ds.$$

It follows from (3.10) that  $K$  is bounded.

Let  $V_\delta(t)$  solves the equation

$$(3.13) \quad F(V_\delta(t)) + a(t)V_\delta(t) - f_\delta = 0.$$

It follows from Lemma 2.5 that

$$(3.14) \quad \|F(V_\delta(t)) - f_\delta\| \leq \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\|, \quad \forall t \geq nh.$$

Relation (3.10), Lemma 2.3 and (3.14) imply that there exists  $T > 0$  such that the following inequality holds  $\forall t \in [T, T+1]$ :

$$(3.15) \quad \|F(V_\delta(t)) - f_\delta\| + e^{-\phi(t)} \psi_0 + e^{a(0)} e^{-\phi(t)} \int_0^t e^{\phi(s)} |\dot{a}(s)| \left( \frac{\Gamma K}{a(s)} + w_0 \right) ds < C\delta^\zeta,$$

where

$$(3.16) \quad \psi_0 = \|F(u_0) + a_0 u_0 - f_\delta\|, \quad w_0 = \|u_0 - V_0\|.$$

Let

$$(3.17) \quad R := \|V_\delta(T)\| K + w_0.$$

Let

$$0 < h \leq \min\left(1, \frac{2}{\sigma_R^{-1} + 2a(0)}\right).$$

Let  $N$  be the largest integer such that  $Nh \leq T$ . Let us prove by induction that the sequence  $(u_n)_{n=1}^N$  stays in side the ball  $B(0, R)$ . To prove this it suffices to prove that

$$(3.18) \quad \|u_n - V_n\| \leq w_0 + \|V_n\|(K-1), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, N.$$

Inequality (3.18) holds for  $n = 0$ , by (3.16). Assume that (3.18) holds for  $0 \leq n < N$ . Let us prove that (3.18) also holds for  $n + 1$ .

It follows from equation (3.2) that

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} u_{n+1} - V_n &= u_n - V_n - \gamma_n \left[ F(u_n) + a_n u_n - F(V_n) - a_n V_n \right] \\ &= (1 - \gamma_n a_n) \left[ u_n - V_n - \frac{\gamma_n}{1 - \gamma_n a_n} (F(u_n) - F(V_n)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This and Lemma 2.10 imply

$$(3.20) \quad \|u_{n+1} - V_n\| \leq \|u_n - V_n\| (1 - \gamma_n a_n).$$

From (3.20), the triangle inequality and (2.12) one gets

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u_{n+1} - V_{n+1}\| &\leq \|u_n - V_n\|(1 - \gamma_n a_n) + \|V_{n+1} - V_n\| \\ &\leq \|u_n - V_n\|e^{-ha_n} + \frac{a_n - a_{n+1}}{a_n} \|V_{n+1}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the inequality:  $1 - \gamma_n a_n \leq e^{-ha_n}$  where  $0 < h \leq \gamma_n$  and  $n \geq 0$ . From (3.21) one gets by induction the following inequality:

$$(3.22) \quad \|u_{n+1} - V_{n+1}\| \leq w_0 e^{-\phi_n} + e^{-\phi_n} \sum_{i=1}^n e^{\phi_i} \frac{a_i - a_{i+1}}{a_i} \|V_{i+1}\|,$$

where

$$\phi_n = \sum_{i=0}^n ha_i, \quad n \geq 0.$$

From (3.22), Lemma 2.5, Lemma 2.13, and (3.12), one obtains

$$(3.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u_{n+1} - V_{n+1}\| &\leq w_0 + \|V_{n+1}\| e^{-\phi_n} \sum_{i=1}^n e^{\phi_i} \frac{a_i - a_{i+1}}{a_i} \\ &\leq w_0 + \|V_{n+1}\| e^{a(0)} e^{-\phi((n+1)h)} \int_0^{(n+1)h} e^{\phi(s)} \frac{|\dot{a}(s)|}{a(s)} ds \\ &\leq w_0 + \|V_{n+1}\|(K - 1), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\phi(t)$  is defined by (3.8).

Hence, (3.18) holds for  $n + 1$ . Thus, by induction (3.18) holds for  $0 \leq n \leq N$ . Inequalities (3.18), (3.17), and the inequality  $\|V_n\| \leq \|V_\delta(T)\|$ ,  $\forall n \leq N$  (see Lemma 2.5), imply that the sequence  $(u_n)_{n=1}^N$  remains inside the ball  $B(0, R)$

*Let us prove the existence of  $n_\delta$ .*

Denote  $g_n := g_{n,\delta} := F(u_n) + a_n u_n - f_\delta$ . Equation (3.2) can be rewritten as

$$(3.24) \quad u_{n+1} - u_n = -\gamma_n g_n, \quad n \geq 0.$$

This implies

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} g_{n+1} &= g_n + a_{n+1}(u_{n+1} - u_n) + F(u_{n+1}) - F(u_n) + (a_{n+1} - a_n)u_n \\ &= -\frac{u_{n+1} - u_n}{\gamma_n} + a_{n+1}(u_{n+1} - u_n) + F(u_{n+1}) - F(u_n) \\ &\quad + (a_{n+1} - a_n)u_n \\ &= -\frac{1 - \gamma_n a_{n+1}}{\gamma_n} \left[ (u_{n+1} - u_n) - \frac{\gamma_n}{1 - \gamma_n a_{n+1}} (F(u_{n+1}) - F(u_n)) \right] \\ &\quad + (a_{n+1} - a_n)u_n. \end{aligned}$$

Denote  $\psi_n = \|g_n\|$ . It follows from (3.25) that

$$(3.26) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_{n+1} &\leq \frac{1 - \gamma_n a_{n+1}}{\gamma_n} \left\| (u_{n+1} - u_n) - \frac{\gamma_n}{1 - \gamma_n a_{n+1}} (F(u_{n+1}) - F(u_n)) \right\| \\ &\quad + (a_n - a_{n+1}) \|u_n\|. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2.10 and (3.24) we get the following inequality:

$$(3.27) \quad \left\| (u_{n+1} - u_n) - \frac{\gamma_n}{1 - \gamma_n a_{n+1}} (F(u_{n+1}) - F(u_n)) \right\| \leq \|u_{n+1} - u_n\| = \gamma_n \psi_n,$$

for all  $0 \leq n \leq N - 1$ . From (3.27) and (3.26) one gets

$$(3.28) \quad \psi_{n+1} \leq (1 - \gamma_n a_{n+1})\psi_n + (a_n - a_{n+1})\|u_n\|.$$

Note that one has:  $1 - ha_{n+1} \leq e^{-a_{n+1}h}$ ,  $\forall n \geq 0$ . This, inequalities (3.28) and (3.18) imply

$$(3.29) \quad \psi_{n+1} \leq e^{-a_{n+1}h}\psi_n + (a_n - a_{n+1})(\|V_n\|K + w_0), \quad 0 \leq n \leq N - 1.$$

From inequality (3.29) one gets by induction the following inequality:

$$(3.30) \quad \psi_n \leq \psi_0 e^{-\phi_n} + e^{-\phi_n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{\phi_i} (a_i - a_{i+1})(\|V_i\|K + w_0), \quad 1 \leq n \leq N,$$

where  $\phi_n$  is defined by (3.8).

Since  $F(V_n) + a_n V_n - f_\delta = 0$ , one gets

$$(3.31) \quad g_n = F(u_n) - F(V_n) + a_n(u_n - V_n).$$

This and (1.3) imply

$$(3.32) \quad a_n \|u_n - V_n\|^2 \leq \langle g_n, u_n - V_n \rangle \leq \|u_n - V_n\| \psi_n,$$

and

$$(3.33) \quad \|F(u_n) - F(V_n)\|^2 \leq \langle g_n, F(u_n) - F(V_n) \rangle \leq \psi_n \|F(u_n) - F(V_n)\|.$$

Inequalities (3.32) and (3.33) imply

$$(3.34) \quad a_n \|u_n - V_n\| \leq \psi_n, \quad \|F(u_n) - F(V_n)\| \leq \psi_n.$$

From (3.30), and (3.34), one gets, for  $0 \leq n \leq N$ , the following inequality:

$$(3.35) \quad \|F(u_n) - F(V_n)\| \leq \psi_0 e^{-\phi_n} + e^{-\phi_n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{\phi_i} (a_i - a_{i+1})(\|V_i\|K + w_0).$$

This, the triangle inequality, and inequalities (3.7) imply

$$(3.36) \quad \begin{aligned} \|F(u_n) - f_\delta\| &\leq \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\| + \psi_0 e^{-\phi_n} \\ &+ e^{-\phi_n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{\phi_i} (a_i - a_{i+1}) \left( \frac{\Gamma K}{a_i} + w_0 \right), \quad 0 \leq n \leq N. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.8) and the fact that  $a(t)$  is decreasing one gets

$$(3.37) \quad \phi_{n-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} ha(ih) \geq \int_0^{nh} a(s) ds = \phi(nh), \quad n \geq 1.$$

Inequality (3.36) with  $n = N$ , equation (3.17), the inequality  $T - 1 < Nh \leq T$ , by the definition of  $N$ , and Lemma 2.13 imply

$$(3.38) \quad \begin{aligned} \|F(u_N) - f_\delta\| &\leq \|F(V_\delta(Nh)) - f_\delta\| + \psi_0 e^{-\phi(Nh)} \\ &+ e^{a(0)} e^{-\phi(Nh)} \int_0^{Nh} e^{\phi(s)} |\dot{a}(s)| \left( \frac{\Gamma K}{a(s)} + w_0 \right) ds < C\delta. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the existence of  $n_\delta$ .

The uniqueness of  $n_\delta$ , satisfying (3.5), follows from its definition (3.5).

Theorem 3.1 is proved.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $F, f, f_\delta$  and  $u_\delta$  be as in Theorem 3.1 and  $y$  be the minimal-norm solution to the equation  $F(u) = f$ . Let  $0 < (\delta_m)_{m=1}^\infty$  be a sequence such that  $\delta_m \rightarrow 0$ . If the sequence  $\{n_{\delta_m}\}_{m=1}^\infty$  is bounded, and  $\{n_{m_j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$  is a convergent subsequence, then*

$$(3.39) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} u_{n_{m_j}} = u^*,$$

where  $u^*$  is a solution to the equation  $F(u) = f$ . If

$$(3.40) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} n_m = \infty,$$

and  $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ , then

$$(3.41) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{n_m} - y\| = 0.$$

*Proof.* Let us first prove (3.41) assuming that (3.40) holds. For simplicity we will prove that

$$(3.42) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \|u_\delta - y\| = 0,$$

under the assumption that

$$(3.43) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} n_\delta = \infty,$$

From (3.43), Lemma 2.14, and the fact that the sequence  $(\|V_n\|)_{n=0}^\infty$  is increasing, one gets the following inequalities for sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ :

$$(3.44) \quad \psi_0 e^{-\phi_{n_\delta-2}} \leq \frac{1}{4} a_{n_\delta-1} \|V_0\| < \frac{1}{4} a_{n_\delta-1} \|V_{n_\delta-1}\|,$$

and

$$(3.45) \quad e^{-\phi_{n_\delta-2}} \sum_{i=0}^{n_\delta-2} e^{\phi_i} (a_i - a_{i+1}) (\|V_i\| + K) \leq \frac{1}{2} a_{n_\delta-1} \|V_{n_\delta-1}\|.$$

From (3.5), and (3.36) with  $n = n_\delta - 1$ , (3.44) and (3.45), one obtains

$$(3.46) \quad C\delta^\zeta < a_{n_\delta-1} \|V_{n_\delta-1}\| \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}\right) \leq \frac{7}{4} \left(a_{n_\delta-1} \|y\| + \delta\right),$$

for all  $0 < \delta$  sufficiently small. This and the relation  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\delta^\zeta}{\delta} = \infty$  for a fixed  $\zeta \in (0, 1)$  imply

$$(3.47) \quad \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\delta^\zeta}{a_{n_\delta}} \leq \frac{7\|y\|}{4C} < \frac{2\|y\|}{C}.$$

Inequalities (3.47),  $\delta < C\delta^\zeta$ , and (2.10) imply, for sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ , the following inequality

$$(3.48) \quad \|V_n\| \leq \|y\| + \frac{\delta}{a_{n_\delta}} < \tilde{C} := \|y\| + 2\|y\|, \quad 0 \leq n \leq n_\delta.$$

Using estimate (3.48), one obtains:

$$(3.49) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sum_0^{n_\delta-1} e^{\phi_i} (a_i - a_{i+1}) \|V_i\|}{e^{\phi_{n_\delta-1}} a_{n_\delta}} \leq \tilde{C} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sum_0^{n_\delta-1} e^{\phi_i} (a_i - a_{i+1})}{e^{\phi_{n_\delta-1}} a_{n_\delta}}.$$

It follows from (2.51) and (3.49) that

$$(3.50) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{n_\delta-1} e^{\phi_i} (a_i - a_{i+1}) \|V_i\|}{e^{\phi_{n_\delta-1}} a_{n_\delta}} = 0.$$

From (3.30) and (3.34) one gets

$$(3.51) \quad \|u_n - V_n\| \leq \frac{e^{-\phi_{n-1}}\psi_0}{a_n} + \frac{e^{-\phi_{n-1}}}{a_n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{-\phi_i} (a_i - a_{i+1}) (\|V_i\|K + w_0).$$

This, (3.43), and (3.50) one obtains:

$$(3.52) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \|u_{n_\delta} - V_{n_\delta}\| = 0.$$

It follows from (3.47) that

$$(3.53) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\delta}{a_{n_\delta}} = 0.$$

From the triangle inequality and inequality (2.8) one obtains:

$$(3.54) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u_{n_\delta} - y\| &\leq \|u_{n_\delta} - V_{n_\delta}\| + \|V_{n_\delta} - V_{0,n_\delta}\| + \|V_{0,n_\delta} - y\| \\ &\leq \|u_{n_\delta} - V_{n_\delta}\| + \frac{\delta}{a_{n_\delta}} + \|V_{0,n_\delta} - y\|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $V_{0,n_\delta} = \tilde{V}_{a(n_\delta),0}$  (cf. (2.1)). From (3.52)–(3.54), (3.43), and Lemma 2.2, one obtains (3.43).

Let us prove (3.39).

If  $n > 0$  is fixed, then  $u_n$  is a continuous function of  $f_\delta$ . Denote

$$(3.55) \quad u^* := u_N^* := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} u_{n_{\delta_{m_j}}},$$

where

$$(3.56) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} n_{m_j} = N.$$

From (3.55) and the continuity of  $F$ , one obtains:

$$(3.57) \quad \|F(u^*) - f\| = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|F(u_{n_{\delta_{m_j}}}) - f_{\delta_{m_j}}\| \leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} C\delta_{m_j}^\zeta = 0.$$

Thus,  $u^*$  is a solution to the equation  $F(u) = f$ , and (3.39) is proved.

Theorem 3.3 is proved.  $\square$

Let us assume in addition that  $a(t)$  satisfies the following inequalities

$$(3.58) \quad 2 \geq a(0), \quad \nu(0) = \frac{|\dot{a}(0)|}{a^2(0)} \leq \frac{1}{10}.$$

*Remark 3.4.* Let  $b \in (0, 1)$ ,  $c \geq 5$ ,  $d > 0$  and

$$a(t) = \frac{d}{(c+t)^b}, \quad \frac{10b}{c^{1-b}} \leq d \leq 2c^b.$$

Then  $a(t)$  satisfies (2.17) and (3.58).

We have the following result

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $a(t)$  satisfy (2.17) and (3.58). Let  $F, f, f_\delta$  and  $u_\delta$  be as in Theorem 3.1. Assume that  $u_0$  satisfies either*

$$(3.59) \quad \psi_0 = \|F(u_0) + a_0 u_0 - f_\delta\| \leq \theta \delta^\zeta, \quad 0 < \theta < C,$$

or

$$(3.60) \quad \|F(u_0) + a_0 u_0 - f_\delta\| \leq \frac{1}{8} a_0 \|V_0\|.$$



Assume  $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ . Then

$$(3.61) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} n_\delta = \infty.$$

*Remark 3.6.* The element  $u_0$  satisfying (3.59) can be obtained easily by the following fixed point iterations:

$$(3.62) \quad v_{n+1} = v_n - \gamma(F(v_n) + a_0 v_n - f_\delta), \quad n \geq 0,$$

where  $v_0 \in B(0, R)$ ,  $0 < R$  is sufficiently large, and  $\gamma$  is chosen so that

$$(3.63) \quad 0 < \gamma < \frac{2}{\sigma_R^{-1} + 2a_0}.$$

Note that the operator  $G(v) := v - \gamma(F(v) + a_0 v - f_\delta)$  is a contraction map by Lemma 2.10.

Inequality (3.60) is a sufficient condition for the following inequality to hold (see also (3.76) below)

$$(3.64) \quad e^{-\varphi_n} \psi_0 \leq \frac{1}{8} a_n \|V_n\|, \quad t \geq 0.$$

By similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 2.14 one can prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{\varphi_n} a_n = \infty.$$

In the proof of Theorem 3.5 inequality (3.64) (or (3.76)) is used at  $n = n_\delta$ . The stopping time  $n_\delta$  is often sufficiently large for the quantity  $e^{\varphi_{n_\delta}} a_{n_\delta}$  to be large. In this case inequality (3.76) with  $n = n_\delta$  is satisfied for a wide range of  $u_0$ .

It is an *open problem* to choose  $\zeta$  (see (3.4)) which is optimal in some sense. In practice it is *natural* to choose  $C$  and  $\zeta$  so that  $C\delta^\zeta$  is close to  $\delta$ . It is because if  $v$  is a solution to the equation  $F(u) = f$ , then  $\|F(v) - f_\delta\| = \|f - f_\delta\| \leq \delta$ .

Let us now prove Theorem 3.5.

*Proof of Theorem 3.5.* Let us prove (3.61) assuming that (3.60) holds. When (3.59) holds, instead of (3.60), the proof follows similarly.

It follows from (3.28), the triangle inequality, and (3.34) that

$$(3.65) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_{n+1} &\leq (1 - ha_{n+1})\psi_n + (a_n - a_{n+1})\|u_n - V_n\| + (a_n - a_{n+1})\|V_n\| \\ &\leq (1 - ha_{n+1})\psi_n + \frac{a_n - a_{n+1}}{a_n}\psi_n + (a_n - a_{n+1})\|V_n\|, \end{aligned}$$

for  $0 \leq n \leq n_\delta - 1$ . From (2.18) and (3.58) one gets

$$(3.66) \quad 1 - ha_{n+1} + \frac{a_n - a_{n+1}}{a_n} \leq 1 - \frac{ha_{n+1}}{2} \leq e^{-\frac{ha_{n+1}}{2}}.$$

From (3.65) and (3.66) one obtains

$$(3.67) \quad \psi_{n+1} \leq e^{-\frac{ha_{n+1}}{2}}\psi_n + (a_n - a_{n+1})\|V_n\|.$$

This implies

$$(3.68) \quad \psi_n \leq e^{-\varphi_n} \psi_0 + e^{-\varphi_n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{-\varphi_i} (a_i - a_{i+1}) \|V_i\|, \quad 1 \leq n \leq n_\delta.$$

where

$$(3.69) \quad \varphi_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{ha_i}{2}.$$

It follows from the triangle inequality, (2.15), (3.34), and (3.68) that

$$(3.70) \quad \begin{aligned} \|F(u_n) - f_\delta\| &\geq \|F(V_n) - f_\delta\| - \|F(V_n) - F(u_n)\| \\ &\geq a_n \|V_n\| - \psi_0 e^{-\varphi_n} - e^{-\varphi_n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{\varphi_{i+1}} (a_i - a_{i+1}) \|V_i\|. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2.9 one obtains

$$(3.71) \quad \frac{1}{2} a_n \|V_n\| \geq e^{-\varphi_n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{\varphi_{i+1}} (a_i - a_{i+1}) \|V_i\|.$$

From the relation  $\psi_n = \|F(u_n) + a_n u_n - f_\delta\|$  (cf. (3.31) and (3.60) one gets

$$(3.72) \quad \psi_0 e^{-\varphi_n} \leq \frac{1}{8} a_0 \|V_0\| e^{-\varphi_n}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

It follows from (2.17) that

$$(3.73) \quad a_1 \leq a_{n+1} e^{\varphi_n}, \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

Indeed, inequality  $a_1 \leq a_{n+1} e^{\varphi_n}$  is obviously true for  $n = 0$ , and  $a_{n+1} e^{\varphi_n}$  is an increasing sequence because

$$(3.74) \quad \begin{aligned} a_{n+1} e^{\varphi_n} - a_n e^{\varphi_{n-1}} &= e^{\varphi_{n-1}} (a_{n+1} e^{\frac{h a_n}{2}} - a_n) \\ &\geq e^{\varphi_{n-1}} (a_{n+1} + \frac{h a_n}{2} a_{n+1} - a_n) \\ &= e^{\varphi_{n-1}} a_n a_{n+1} \left( \frac{h}{2} - \frac{a_n - a_{n+1}}{a_n a_{n+1}} \right) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

by (2.18) and (3.58). From (3.73), (3.58) and (2.19) one gets

$$(3.75) \quad e^{-\varphi_n} a_0 \leq a_{n+1} \frac{a_0}{a_1} < 2a_{n+1}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Inequalities (3.72) and (3.75) imply

$$(3.76) \quad e^{-\varphi_n} \psi_0 \leq \frac{1}{4} a_{n+1} \|V_0\| \leq \frac{1}{4} a_n \|V_n\|, \quad n \geq 0,$$

where we have used the inequality  $\|V_{n'}\| \leq \|V_n\|$  for  $n' \leq n$ , established in Lemma 2.5. From (3.70), (3.71) and (3.76), one gets

$$\|F(u_{n_\delta}) - f_\delta\| \geq a_{n_\delta} \|V_{n_\delta}\| - \frac{1}{4} a_{n_\delta} \|V_{n_\delta}\| - \frac{1}{2} a_{n_\delta} \|V_{n_\delta}\| = \frac{1}{4} a_{n_\delta} \|V_{n_\delta}\|.$$

This and (3.5) imply

$$C\delta^\zeta \geq \|F(u_{n_\delta}) - f_\delta\| \geq \frac{1}{4} a_{n_\delta} \|V_{n_\delta}\|.$$

Thus,

$$(3.77) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} a_{n_\delta} \|V_{n_\delta}\| \leq \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} 4C\delta^\zeta = 0.$$

From (2.8) and the triangle inequality we obtain

$$(3.78) \quad a_{n_\delta} \|V_{0, n_\delta}\| \leq a_{n_\delta} \|V_{n_\delta}\| + a_{n_\delta} \|V_{n_\delta} - V_{0, n_\delta}\| \leq a_{n_\delta} \|V_{n_\delta}\| + \delta.$$

This and (3.77) imply

$$(3.79) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} a_{n_\delta} \|V_{0, n_\delta}\| = 0.$$

Since  $\|V_{0,n_\delta} \geq \|V_{0,0}\| > 0$ , relation (3.79) implies  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} a_{n_\delta} = 0$ . Since  $0 < a_n \searrow 0$ , it follows that (3.61) holds.

Theorem 3.5 is proved.  $\square$

Instead of using iterative scheme (3.2) one may use the following iterative scheme

$$(3.80) \quad u_{n+1} = u_n - \gamma_n[F(u_n) + a_n(u_n - \bar{u}) - f_\delta], \quad u_0 = \tilde{u}_0,$$

where  $\bar{u}, \tilde{u}_0 \in H$ . Denote  $\tilde{F}(u) := F(u + \bar{u})$ . If  $F$  is a locally  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone operator then so is  $\tilde{F}$ . Using Theorem 3.1 with  $F := \tilde{F}$ , one gets the following corollary:

**Corollary 3.7.** Let  $a(t)$  satisfy (2.17) and (3.58). Let  $0 < R = \text{const}$  be sufficiently large and  $h$  and  $\gamma_n$  satisfy (3.3). Assume that  $F : H \rightarrow H$  is a locally  $\sigma$ -inverse monotone operator, and  $u_0$  is an element of  $H$ , satisfying inequality

$$(3.81) \quad \|F(u_0) - f_\delta\| > C\delta^\zeta > \delta,$$

where  $C > 0$  and  $0 < \zeta \leq 1$  are constants. Assume also that  $u_0$  satisfy either

$$\|F(u_0) + a_0(u_0 - \bar{u}) - f_\delta\| \leq \frac{1}{8}a_0\|V_0\|,$$

or

$$\|F(u_0) + a_0(u_0 - \bar{u}) - f_\delta\| \leq \theta\delta^\gamma, \quad 0 < \theta = \text{const} < C.$$

Assume that equation  $F(u) = f$  has a solution, possibly nonunique, and  $z \in B(u_0, R)$  is the solution with minimal distance to  $\bar{u}$ . Let  $f_\delta$  be such that  $\|f_\delta - f\| \leq \delta$ . Let  $u_n$  be defined by (3.80). Then there exists a unique  $n_\delta$  such that

$$(3.82) \quad \|F(u_{n_\delta}) - f_\delta\| \leq C\delta^\zeta, \quad \|F(u_n) - f_\delta\| > C\delta^\zeta, \quad 0 \leq n < n_\delta,$$

where  $C$  and  $\zeta$  are constants from (3.4). If  $\zeta \in (0, 1)$  and  $n_\delta$  satisfies (3.5), then

$$(3.83) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \|u_{n_\delta} - z\| = 0.$$

**3.2. An algorithm for solving equations with  $\sigma$ -inverse operators.** Let us formulate an algorithm for solving equations with  $\sigma$ -inverse operators.

**Algorithm 1**

- (1) Estimate the constant  $\sigma = \sigma_R$  in (1.2).
- (2) Choose an  $a(t)$  satisfying (2.17).
- (3) Choose  $h = \frac{2}{\sigma^{-1} + 2a(0)}$  and  $\gamma_n$  to satisfy conditions (3.3).
- (4) Find an initial approximation  $u_0$  for  $y$  or simply set  $u_0 = 0$ .
- (5) Compute  $u_n$  by formula (2.21), use (3.5) to stop the iterations at  $n_\delta$  and use  $u_{n_\delta}$  as an approximate solution to the equation  $F(u) = f$ .

Theorem 3.3 guarantees the convergence of  $u_{n_\delta}$ , computed by **Algorithm 1**, to, at least, a solution to  $F(u) = f$ . If the equation  $F(u) = f$  has a unique solution, then  $u_{n_\delta}$  converges to this unique solution.

If one chooses  $a(t)$  to satisfy (3.58) in addition, and  $u_0$  to satisfy (3.59) or (3.60), then  $n_\delta \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  as proved in Theorem 3.5. Consequently,  $u_{n_\delta}$  converges to the minimal-norm solution  $y$  as stated by Theorem 3.3.

Note that the element  $u_0$  satisfying (3.59) can be found from iteration (3.62). Mover, in practice  $n_\delta$  is often large when  $\delta$  is sufficiently small. Thus, in practice one can also use  $u_0 = 0$  as pointed out in Remark 3.6.

**Algorithm 1** can also be implemented for solving equations with locally  $\sigma$ -inverse operators. Since the constant  $\sigma_R$  depends on  $R$ , one should choose  $R$  sufficiently large so that the sequence  $(u_n)_{n=1}^{n_\delta}$  remains in side the ball  $B(0, R)$ . However, if one chooses  $R$  too large then  $h$  and  $\gamma_n$  satisfying (3.3) are small. Consequently, the computation cost will be large. Thus,  $R$  should be chosen not too small so that the sequence  $(u_n)_{n=1}^{n_\delta}$  remains in side the ball  $B(0, R)$  and not too large so that the computation cost is not large. The choice of  $R$  varies from problems to problems.

#### 4. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

Let us do a numerical experiment solving nonlinear integral equation (1.1) with

$$(4.1) \quad F(u) := B(u) + \arctan^3(u) := \int_0^1 e^{-|x-y|} u(y) dy + \arctan^3(u).$$

The operator  $B$  is compact in  $H = L^2[0, 1]$ . One has

$$\langle \arctan^3 u - \arctan^3 v, u - v \rangle = \int_0^1 (\arctan^3 u - \arctan^3 v)(u - v) dx \geq 0,$$

and

$$e^{-|x|} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{i\lambda x}}{1 + \lambda^2} d\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \lambda^2} \right) (x),$$

where  $\mathcal{F}$  denotes the Fourier transform. Therefore,  $\langle B(u - v), u - v \rangle \geq 0$ , so

$$\langle F(u) - F(v), u - v \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall u, v \in H.$$

The Fréchet derivative of  $F$  is:

$$(4.2) \quad F'(u)h = \frac{3 \arctan^2 u}{1 + u^2} h + \int_0^1 e^{-|x-y|} h(y) dy.$$

It follows from (4.2) that  $F'$  is selfadjoint and uniformly bounded. Thus,  $F$  is a  $\sigma$ -inverse operator. Moreover, one can prove that

$$\|F'(u)\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} + \sup_{x \geq 0} \frac{3 \arctan^2 x}{1 + x^2} < 1 + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}, \quad \forall u \in H.$$

This and (2.38) imply that

$$\sigma_R^{-1} < 1 + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}, \quad \forall R > 0.$$

Thus, if  $a(0) < 1 - \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}$ , then (3.3) holds for  $\gamma_n = h = 1$ . Therefore, the existence of  $n_\delta$  is guaranteed with  $a_n = \frac{a(0)}{(5+n)^{0.99}}$  and  $\gamma_n = 1$  by Theorem 3.1. It follows from (4.1) that equation  $F(u) = f$  has not more than one solution for any  $f \in H$ . Thus if  $(\delta_m)_{m=1}^\infty$  is a sequence decaying to 0 and  $n_{\delta_{m_j}}$  is any convergent subsequence of  $n_{\delta_m}$ , then one gets  $u_{n_{\delta_{m_j}}} \rightarrow y$ , the unique solution to  $F(u) = f$ , by Theorem 3.3.

If  $u(x)$  vanishes on a set of positive Lebesgue's measure, then  $F'(u)$  is not boundedly invertible. If  $u \in C[0, 1]$  vanishes even at one point  $x_0$ , then  $F'(u)$  is not boundedly invertible in  $H$ . In this case equation  $F(u) = f$  cannot be solved by classical methods such as Newton's method or Gauss-Newton method.

Let us use the iterative process (3.2):

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} u_{n+1} &= u_n - \gamma_n [F(u_n) + a_n u_n - f_\delta], \\ u_0 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We stop iterations at  $n := n_\delta$  such that the following inequality holds

$$(4.4) \quad \|F(u_{n_\delta}) - f_\delta\| < C\delta^\zeta, \quad \|F(u_n) - f_\delta\| \geq C\delta^\zeta, \quad n < n_\delta, \quad C > 1, \quad \zeta \in (0, 1).$$

Integrals of the form  $\int_0^1 e^{-|x-y|} h(y) dy$  in (4.1) and (4.2) are computed by using the trapezoidal rule. The noisy function, used in the test, is

$$f_\delta(x) = f(x) + \kappa f_{noise}(x), \quad \kappa = \kappa(\delta) > 0.$$

The noise level  $\delta$  and the relative noise level are defined by

$$\delta = \kappa \|f_{noise}(x)\|, \quad \delta_{rel} := \frac{\delta}{\|f\|}.$$

The constant  $\kappa$  is computed in such a way that the relative noise level  $\delta_{rel}$  equals to some desired value, i.e.,

$$\kappa = \frac{\delta}{\|f_{noise}(x)\|} = \frac{\delta_{rel} \|f\|}{\|f_{noise}\|}.$$

We have used the relative noise level as an input parameter in the test.

In all figures the  $x$ -variable runs through the interval  $[0, 1]$ , and the graphs represent the numerical solutions  $u_{DSM}(x)$  and the exact solution  $u_{exact}(x)$ .

As we have proved, the iterative scheme converges to the minimal-norm solution when  $a_n = \frac{d}{(5+hn)^b}$ ,  $b \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\frac{10b}{5^b} \leq d \leq 2 \times 5^{1-b}$  and  $\gamma_n$  are "sufficiently" small. The choice of  $\gamma_n$  depends on the problem one wants to solve because  $\gamma_n$  depends on  $\sigma_R$  which varies from problems to problems. Note that if one chooses  $\gamma_n$  to be too small, then one needs many iterations in order to reach the stopping time  $n_\delta$  in (4.4). Consequently, the computation time will be large in this case. For  $\sigma$ -inverse problems where the constant  $\sigma = \sigma_R$  can be estimated then it is not difficult to choose  $\gamma_n$  satisfying (3.3).

In the numerical experiments we found that our method works well with  $a(0) \in [0.1, 1]$ . In the test we chose  $a_n$  by the formula  $a_n := \frac{a(0)}{(n+\delta)^\zeta}$  where  $a(0) = 0.1$  and  $\zeta = 0.99$ . We carried out the experiments with  $\gamma_n = h = const \in (0, 1]$ , and the method works well with this choice of  $\gamma_n$ . If one chooses  $h > 0$  too small, then it takes more computer time for the method to converge. The number of node points, used in computing integrals (4.1) and (4.2), was  $N = 100$ . In all the experiments, the exact solution is chosen as follows

$$u_{exact}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in [0, 0.5) \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in [0.5, 1]. \end{cases}$$

As we have mentioned above,  $F'(u)$  is not boundedly invertible in a neighborhood of  $u_{exact}$ . In particular,  $F'(u_{exact})$  is not boundedly invertible. Thus, one can not use classical methods such as Newton's method or Gauss-Newton method to solve for  $u_{exact}$ .

Numerical results for various values of  $\delta_{rel}$  are presented in Table 1. From Table 1 one can see that the number of iterations  $n_\delta$  tends to go to  $\infty$  as  $\delta$  goes to 0. Numerical experiments showed that  $n_\delta \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Note that our choice of  $a(t)$  in this experiment does not satisfy condition (3.4) which is a sufficient condition for having  $n_\delta \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Table 1 shows that the iterative scheme yields good numerical results.

Figure 1 plots the numerical results when relative noise levels are  $\delta_{rel} = 0.01$  and  $\delta_{rel} = 0.001$ . The noise function in this example is a normally distributed random

TABLE 1. Results when  $a(0) = 0.1$  and  $h = 1$ .

$\delta_{rel}$	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.003	0.001
Number of iterations	5	6	8	13	39	104
$\frac{\ u_{DSM} - u_{exact}\ }{\ u_{exact}\ }$	0.166	0.111	0.108	0.076	0.065	0.045

vector of length  $N$  with mean 0 and variance 1. Here  $N$  is the number of nodal points used in discretizing the interval  $[0, 1]$ .




FIGURE 1. Plots of solutions obtained by the iterative scheme when  $N = 100$ ,  $\delta_{rel} = 0.01$  (left) and  $\delta_{rel} = 0.001$  (right).

Figure 2 plots the numerical results when the noise levels are  $\delta_{rel} = 0.01$  and  $\delta_{rel} = 0.001$ . In this experiment we choose the noise function by the formula  $f_{noise}(x) = \sin(3\pi x)$ ,  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

In computations the functions  $u$ ,  $f$  and  $f_\delta$  are vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  where  $N$  is the number of nodal points. The norm used in computations is the Euclidean length or  $L^2$  norm of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

We have also carried out numerical experiments with  $a_n = \frac{10}{(5+n)^{0.99}}$ . For this choice of  $a_n$  the convergence of  $u_{n_\delta}$  to the unique solution of the problem is guaranteed by Theorem 3.1–3.5. However, the numerical experiment showed that using this choice of  $a_n$  does not bring any improvement in accuracy while requiring more time for computation. Experiments also showed that for this problem it is better to use  $a_n = \frac{a(0)}{(5+n)^{0.99}}$  with  $a(0) \in [0.1, 1]$ .

From the numerical results we conclude that the proposed stopping rule yields good results in this problem.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] A. Bakushinskii and A. Goncharskii, *Ill-Posed Problems: Theory and Applications*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 1994.
- [2] K. Deimling, *Nonlinear functional analysis*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.




FIGURE 2. Plots of solutions obtained by the iterative scheme when  $N = 100$ ,  $\delta_{\text{rel}} = 0.01$  (left) and  $\delta_{\text{rel}} = 0.001$  (right).

- [3] N. S. Hoang and A. G. Ramm, An iterative scheme for solving nonlinear equations with monotone operators. BIT, 48, N4, (2008), 725-741.
- [4] N. S. Hoang and A. G. Ramm, Dynamical Systems Gradient method for solving nonlinear equations with monotone operators, Acta Appl. Math., 106, (2009) , 473-499.
- [5] N. S. Hoang and A. G. Ramm, A new version of the Dynamical systems method (DSM) for solving nonlinear equations with monotone operators, Diff. Eq. Appl., 1, N1, (2009), 1-25.
- [6] Hoang, N.S. and Ramm, A. G., Dynamical systems method for solving nonlinear equations with monotone operators, Math. Comp., 79, (2010), 239-258.
- [7] V. Ivanov, V. Tanana and V. Vasin, Theory of ill-posed problems, VSP, Utrecht, 2002.
- [8] V. A. Morozov, Methods of solving incorrectly posed problems, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.
- [9] A. G. Ramm, Dynamical systems method for solving operator equations, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2007.
- [10] A. G. Ramm, Global convergence for ill-posed equations with monotone operators: the dynamical systems method, J. Phys A, 36, (2003), L249-L254.
- [11] A. G. Ramm, Dynamical systems method for solving nonlinear operator equations, International Jour. of Applied Math. Sci., 1, N1, (2004), 97-110.
- [12] A. G. Ramm, Dynamical systems method (DSM) and nonlinear problems, in the book: Spectral Theory and Nonlinear Analysis, World Scientific Publishers, Singapore, 2005, 201-228. (ed J. Lopez-Gomez).
- [13] A. G. Ramm, Dynamical systems method (DSM) for unbounded operators, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 134, N4, (2006), 1059-1063.
- [14] U. Tautenhahn, On the method of Lavrentiev regularization for nonlinear ill-posed problems, Inverse Problems 18 (2002) 191207.
- [15] V. V. Vasin and A. L. Ageev, Ill-Posed Problems with a Priori Information, Utrecht, VSP, 1995.

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, MANHATTAN, KS 66506-2602, USA  
*E-mail address:* nguyehs@math.ksu.edu