

Asymptotically polynomial solutions of difference equations of neutral type

Janusz Migda

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science,
A. Mickiewicz University, Umultowska 87, 61-614 Poznań, Poland;
email: migda@amu.edu.pl

Abstract

Asymptotic properties of solutions of difference equation of the form

$$\Delta^m(x_n + u_n x_{n+k}) = a_n f(n, x_{\sigma(n)}) + b_n$$

are studied. We give sufficient conditions under which all solutions, or all solutions with polynomial growth, or all nonoscillatory solutions are asymptotically polynomial. We use a new technique which allows us to control the degree of approximation.

Key words: difference equation, neutral equation, asymptotic behavior, asymptotically polynomial solution, nonoscillatory solution.

AMS Subject Classification: 39A10

1 Introduction

Let \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{R} denote the set of positive integers, all integers and real numbers respectively. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. We consider asymptotic properties of solutions of difference equations of the form

$$\Delta^m(x_n + u_n x_{n+k}) = a_n f(n, x_{\sigma(n)}) + b_n \tag{E}$$

$$u_n, a_n, b_n \in \mathbb{R}, \quad f : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \sigma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \quad \sigma(n) \rightarrow \infty, \quad u_n \rightarrow c \in \mathbb{R}, \quad |c| \neq 1.$$

By a solution of (E) we mean a sequence $x : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (E) for all large n . Asymptotic properties of solutions of neutral difference equations were investigated by many authors. These studies tend in several directions. For example, the papers [3], [15], [17] and [25] are devoted to the classification of solutions. In [8], [9], [11] and [24] where studied solutions with prescribed asymptotic behavior. In [1], [2], [10], [20] were investigated oscillatory solutions. Asymptotically polynomial solutions were studied in [16], [18], [21], [22]. Asymptotically polynomial solutions were also studied

in continuous case, see for example [5], [7], [19].

Thandapani, Arul and Raja in [21] establish conditions under which for any nonoscillatory solution x of the equation

$$\Delta^2(x_n + px_{n+k}) = f(n, x_{n+l}) \quad (1)$$

there exists a constant a such that

$$x_n = an + o(n).$$

In [16], there are given conditions under which any nonoscillatory solution x of (1) has an asymptotic behavior

$$x_n = an + b + o(1).$$

M. Migda, in [18], establish conditions under which for any nonoscillatory solution x of (E) there exists a constant a such that

$$x_n = an^{m-1} + o(n^{m-1}).$$

In this paper, in Theorem 1, we extend these results in the following way. Let $s \in (-\infty, m-1]$ and let p be a nonnegative integer such that $s \leq p \leq m-1$. We establish conditions under which any solution, or any solution with polynomial growth, or any nonoscillatory solution x has an asymptotic behavior

$$x_n = a_{m-1}n^{m-1} + a_{m-2}n^{m-2} + \cdots + a_p n^p + o(n^s)$$

for some fixed real $a_{m-1}, a_{m-2}, \dots, a_p$.

The idea of the proof is as follows. Let z be a sequence defined by

$$z_n = x_n + u_n x_{n+k}. \quad (2)$$

Using z we can write equation (E) in the form

$$\Delta^m z_n = a_n f(n, x_{\sigma(n)}) + b_n. \quad (3)$$

Let s be a real number such that $s \leq m-1$. Assume that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{m-1-s} |a_n| < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{m-1-s} |b_n| < \infty.$$

Using a Bihari type lemma and some additional assumptions, we show that (3) implies

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{m-1-s} |\Delta^m z_n| < \infty. \quad (4)$$

Next we use the result from [12], which states that if $\Delta^m z$ is asymptotically zero, then z is asymptotically polynomial. More precisely, we show that (4) implies

$$z_n = \varphi(n) + o(n^s) \quad (5)$$

where φ is a polynomial sequence such that $\deg \varphi < m$. Finally, using our Lemma 3.5, we show that

$$x_n = \psi(n) + o(n^s) \quad (6)$$

for certain polynomial sequence ψ such that $\deg \psi < m$. In the last section we show, that if $s = q$ is a nonnegative integer, then (6) may be replaced by a stronger condition

$$x_n = \psi(n) + w_n, \quad \Delta^k w_n = o(n^{q-k}) \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, q.$$

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce notation and terminology. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Lemma 3.5. In Section 4, we obtain Theorem 1, which is the main result of this paper. The proof of Theorem 1 is based on three lemmas: Lemma 3.5, Lemma 4.1, and Lemma 4.2. In Section 5, we obtain a result analogous to Theorem 1, but we replace the spaces of asymptotically polynomial sequences by the spaces of regularly asymptotically polynomial sequences (see (7)).

2 Notation and terminology

By SQ we denote the space of all sequences $x : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If $p, k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $k \geq p$ then

$$\mathbb{N}(p, k) = \{p, p+1, \dots, k\}, \quad \mathbb{N}(p) = \{p, p+1, \dots\}.$$

For $m \in \mathbb{N}(0)$, we define

$$\text{Pol}(m-1) = \text{Ker } \Delta^m = \{x \in \text{SQ} : \Delta^m x = 0\}.$$

Then $\text{Pol}(m-1)$ is the space of all polynomial sequences of degree less than m . Note that

$$\text{Pol}(-1) = \text{Ker } \Delta^0 = 0$$

is the zero space. For $x, y \in \text{SQ}$, we define the product xy by $(xy)(n) = x_n y_n$ for any n . Moreover, $|x|$ denotes the sequence defined by $|x|(n) = |x_n|$ for any n .

We use the symbols "big O" and "small o" in the usual sense but for $a \in \text{SQ}$ we also regard $o(a)$ and $O(a)$ as subspaces of SQ . More precisely

$$\begin{aligned} o(1) &= \{x \in \text{SQ} : x_n \rightarrow 0\}, & O(1) &= \{x \in \text{SQ} : x \text{ is bounded}\} \\ o(a) &= ao(1) = \{ax : x \in o(1)\}, & O(a) &= aO(1) = \{ax : x \in O(1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

For a subset X of SQ , let

$$\Delta^m X = \{\Delta^m x : x \in X\}, \quad \Delta^{-m} X = \{z \in \text{SQ} : \Delta^m z \in X\}$$

denote respectively the image and the inverse image of X under the map $\Delta^m : \text{SQ} \rightarrow \text{SQ}$. Now, we can define spaces of asymptotically polynomial sequences and regularly asymptotically polynomial sequences

$$\text{Pol}(m-1) + o(n^s), \quad \text{Pol}(m-1) + \Delta^{-k} o(1), \quad (7)$$

where $s \in (-\infty, m-1]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}(0, m-1)$. Moreover, let

$$o(n^{-\infty}) = \bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{R}} o(n^s) = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} o(n^{-k}), \quad O(n^{\infty}) = \bigcup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} O(n^s) = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} O(n^k).$$

Note that the condition $\limsup \sqrt[n]{|a_n|} < 1$ or $\limsup \frac{|a_{n+1}|}{|a_n|} < 1$ implies $a \in o(n^{-\infty})$.

Let $x, u \in \text{SQ}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. We say that x is nonoscillatory if $x_n x_{n+1} \geq 0$ for large n . If $x_n x_{n+k} \geq 0$ for large n we say that x is k -nonoscillatory. If $x_n u_n x_{n+k} \geq 0$ for large n we say that x is (u, k) -nonoscillatory.

Remark 2.1. *If $\liminf u_n > 0$, then a sequence x is (u, k) -nonoscillatory if and only if it is k -nonoscillatory. If $\limsup u_n < 0$, then $x \in \text{SQ}$ is (u, k) -nonoscillatory if and only if $-x$ is k -nonoscillatory. Every nonoscillatory sequence x is also k -nonoscillatory for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Let X be a metric space. A function $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called locally bounded if for any $x \in X$ there exists a neighborhood U of x such that the restriction $g|_U$ is bounded.

Remark 2.2. *If X is a closed subset of \mathbb{R} , then a function $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is locally bounded if and only if it is bounded on every bounded subset of X . On the other hand if, for example, $h : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by $g(t) = t^{-1}$, then g is locally bounded and $g|(0, 1)$ is unbounded.*

Let $f : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $g : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, and $p \in \mathbb{R}$. We say that f is (g, p) -bounded if

$$|f(n, t)| \leq g\left(\frac{|t|}{n^p}\right)$$

for any $(n, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}$.

We say that a sequence x is of polynomial growth if $x \in O(n^{\infty})$.

3 Associated sequences

In this section we assume that $x, u, z \in \text{SQ}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\lim u_n = c \in \mathbb{R}$, $|c| \neq 1$ and

$$z_n = x_n + u_n x_{n+k}, \quad \text{for } n \geq \max(0, -k).$$

This section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 3.5. In this lemma, we establish conditions under which, for a given real α , the condition $z \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^{\alpha})$ implies

$$x \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^{\alpha}).$$

Lemma 3.5 extends [16, Lemma 4] and will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume x is bounded and z is convergent. Then x is convergent and*

$$(1 + c) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n.$$

Proof. See Lemma 1 in [16]. □

Remark 3.1. *Boundedness of x cannot be omitted in Lemma 3.1. For example, if $x_n = 2^n$, $u_n = -2^{-1}$ and $k = 1$, then $z_n = 0$ for any n and x is divergent. However, see the next lemma.*

Lemma 3.2. *Assume one of the following conditions is satisfied*

$$(a) \quad |c| < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad k \leq 0, \quad (b) \quad |c| > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad k \geq 0.$$

Then boundedness of the sequence z implies boundedness of x .

Proof. Assume (a) and the sequence z is bounded. Choose $b > 0$ such that $|z_n| \leq b$ for all n . Choose a number β such that $|c| < \beta < 1$. Let $r = -k$. Then $r \geq 0$ and there exists $n_0 \geq r$ such that $|u_n| < \beta$ for $n \geq n_0$. Let

$$K = \max(|x_0|, \dots, |x_{n_0}|), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}(n_0).$$

There exists $m \in \mathbb{N}(0)$ such that

$$0 \leq n - mr \leq n_0, \quad n - (m - 1)r > n_0.$$

Since $x_n = z_n - u_n x_{n-r}$, we obtain

$$|x_n| \leq b + |u_n| |x_{n-r}| < b + \beta |x_{n-r}|.$$

Similarly $|x_{n-r}| < b + \beta |x_{n-2r}|$. Hence

$$|x_n| < b + \beta b + \beta^2 |x_{n-2r}|$$

and so on. After m steps we obtain

$$|x_n| < b(1 + \beta + \beta^2 + \dots + \beta^{m-1}) + \beta^m |x_{n-mr}|.$$

Since $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $n - mr \leq n_0$, we have $\beta^m |x_{n-mr}| < K$. Hence

$$|x_n| < \frac{b}{1 - \beta} + K.$$

So, the sequence (x_n) is bounded.

Now, assume (b). Let

$$v_n = \frac{1}{u_n}, \quad c' = \frac{1}{c}, \quad y_n = u_n x_{n+k}.$$

Then $|c'| < 1$, $\lim v_n = c'$ and $y_n + v_n y_{n-k} = u_n x_{n+k} + x_n = z_n$. Hence, by first part of the proof, the sequence y is bounded. Therefore the sequence $x = z - y$ is bounded too. The proof is complete. □

Lemma 3.2 extends [16, Lemma 2].

Lemma 3.3. *If $x \in O(n^\infty)$ and z is bounded, then x is bounded.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, we can assume that one of the following conditions is satisfied

$$(a) \quad |c| < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad k > 0, \quad (b) \quad |c| > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad k < 0.$$

Assume (a) and choose $M > 1$ such that $|z_n| \leq M$ for all n . Choose a number ρ such that $|c| < \rho < 1$. There exists an index n_1 such that $|u_n| < \rho$ for $n \geq n_1$. Then

$$|z_n - x_n| = |u_n||x_{n+k}| < \rho|x_{n+k}| \quad (8)$$

for $n \geq n_1$. Let $r = \rho^{-1}$. Then $r > 1$ and, by (8),

$$|x_{n+k}| > r|z_n - x_n|$$

for $n \geq n_1$. Choose a constant N such that

$$N > \frac{1}{r-1}. \quad (9)$$

Assume the sequence (x_n) is unbounded. Then there exists $p \geq n_1$ such that

$$|x_p| \geq (N+1)M. \quad (10)$$

Since $|z_p| \leq M$, by (10), we have $|z_p - x_p| \geq NM$. Then

$$|x_{p+k}| > r|z_p - x_p| \geq rNM.$$

The condition $|z_{p+k}| \leq M$ implies

$$|z_{p+k} - x_{p+k}| \geq rNM - M = (rN - 1)M.$$

Hence

$$|x_{p+2k}| > r|z_{p+k} - x_{p+k}| \geq r(rN - 1)M. \quad (11)$$

Since $|z_{p+2k}| \leq M$, we obtain

$$|z_{p+2k} - x_{p+2k}| \geq r(rN - 1)M - M = (r(rN - 1) - 1)M.$$

If

$$a_1 = rN, \quad a_2 = r(a_1 - 1), \quad \dots, \quad a_{n+1} = r(a_n - 1),$$

then, as in (11), we have

$$|x_{p+nk}| \geq a_n M \quad (12)$$

for $n \geq 1$. Moreover,

$$a_2 = r(a_1 - 1) = r^2N - r, \quad a_3 = r(a_2 - 1) = r^3N - r^2 - r$$

and so on. Hence, for $n \geq 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} a_n &= r^n N - (r^{n-1} + r^{n-2} + \dots + r + 1) + 1 \\ &= r^n N - \frac{r^n - 1}{r - 1} + 1 = \left(N - \frac{1}{r - 1} \right) r^n + \frac{1}{r - 1} + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$a = N - \frac{1}{r - 1}, \quad b = \frac{1}{r - 1} + 1.$$

By (9), $a > 0$. Since $r > 1$, we have $b > 0$. Moreover, by (12),

$$|x_{p+nk}| \geq ar^n + b$$

for $n \geq 1$. Since $x \in O(n^\infty)$, there exists a number $\alpha > 1$ such that $x_n = O(n^\alpha)$. There exist $w \in (0, \infty)$ and $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}(0)$ such that

$$(p + nk)^\alpha < wn^\alpha$$

for $n \geq m_0$. Then

$$\frac{x_{p+nk}}{(p + nk)^\alpha} > \frac{ar^n + b}{(p + nk)^\alpha} > \frac{a r^n}{w n^\alpha}$$

for $n \geq m_0$. It is impossible since $r > 1$ and $x_n = O(n^\alpha)$. Hence, the sequence (x_n) is bounded. Now assume (b) and $x_n = O(n^\alpha)$. Let

$$v_n = \frac{1}{u_n}, \quad c' = \frac{1}{c}, \quad y_n = u_n x_{n+k}.$$

Then

$$|c'| < 1, \quad \lim v_n = c', \quad y_n = O(n^\alpha), \quad y_n + v_n y_{n-k} = u_n x_{n+k} + x_n = z_n$$

and by the first part of the proof the sequence (y_n) is bounded. Hence, the sequence $x_n = z_n - y_n$ is bounded too. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume $k(|c| - 1) \geq 0$ or $x \in O(n^\infty)$. Then*

- (1) *if $z_n = O(n^\alpha)$, then $x_n = O(n^\alpha)$,*
- (2) *if $z_n = o(n^\alpha)$, then $x_n = o(n^\alpha)$.*

Proof. Assume $\alpha = 0$. If $k(|c| - 1) \geq 0$, then the result follows from Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.1. If $x \in O(n^\infty)$, then by Lemma 3.3 boundedness of z implies boundedness of x . Moreover, by Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.1, convergence of z implies convergence of x . Now assume α is an arbitrary real number. By the equality

$$\frac{z_n}{n^\alpha} = \frac{x_n}{n^\alpha} + u_n \frac{(n+k)^\alpha}{n^\alpha} \frac{x_{n+k}}{(n+k)^\alpha} = \frac{x_n}{n^\alpha} + u_n \left(1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^\alpha \frac{x_{n+k}}{(n+k)^\alpha}$$

and the equality

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 + \frac{k}{n} \right)^\alpha = 1$$

we see that the result is a consequence of the first part of the proof. \square

Now, we are ready to state and prove the main result of this section.

Lemma 3.5. *Assume $k(|c| - 1) \geq 0$ or $x \in O(n^\infty)$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}(0)$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and*

$$u_n = c + o(n^{\alpha-m}).$$

Then the condition $z \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha)$ implies $x \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha)$.

Proof. If $\alpha > m$, then

$$\text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha) = o(n^\alpha)$$

and the assertion follows from Lemma 3.4. Assume $\alpha \leq m$. For $n \geq \max(0, -k)$, let

$$z'_n = x_n + cx_{n+k}.$$

We will show, by induction on m , that

$$z' \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha) \implies x \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha). \quad (13)$$

For $m = -1$ this assertion follows from Lemma 3.4. Assume it is true for certain $m \geq -1$ and let

$$z' \in \text{Pol}(m+1) + o(n^\alpha).$$

Then there exist $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $w \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha)$ such that

$$z'_n = an^{m+1} + w_n.$$

Since

$$a = \frac{a}{1+c} + \frac{ca}{1+c}, \quad (n+k)^{m+1} = n^{m+1} + r_n, \quad r \in \text{Pol}(m)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w_n &= z'_n - an^{m+1} = x_n - \frac{a}{1+c}n^{m+1} + cx_{n+k} - \frac{ca}{1+c}n^{m+1} \\ &= \left(x_n - \frac{a}{1+c}n^{m+1} \right) + c \left(x_{n+k} - \frac{a}{1+c}(n+k)^{m+1} + \frac{a}{1+c}r_n \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$v_n = x_n - \frac{a}{1+c}n^{m+1}.$$

Then

$$w_n - \frac{ca}{1+c}r_n = v_n + cv_{n+k}.$$

Since $r, w \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha)$ we obtain

$$\left(w - \frac{ca}{1+c}r \right) \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha).$$

The condition $z' \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha)$ implies $z' = O(n^m)$. Hence, by Lemma 3.4, $x_n = O(n^m)$. Therefore $v \in O(n^\infty)$ and, by inductive hypothesis,

$$v \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha).$$

By the equality

$$x_n = v_n + \frac{a}{1+c}n^{m+1},$$

we have

$$x \in \text{Pol}(m+1) + o(n^\alpha).$$

Now, assume

$$z \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha).$$

Since $\alpha \leq m$ we have $z_n = O(n^m)$ and, by Lemma 3.4, $x_n = O(n^m)$. Hence $x_{n+k} = O(n^m)$ and from the condition $u_n = c + o(n^{\alpha-m})$ we obtain

$$z'_n - z_n = (c - u_n)x_{n+k} = n^\alpha \frac{c - u_n}{n^{\alpha-m}} \frac{x_{n+k}}{n^m} = n^\alpha o(1)O(1) = o(n^\alpha).$$

Hence the condition $z \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha)$ implies

$$z'_n = z_n + (z'_n - z_n) \in \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha) + o(n^\alpha) = \text{Pol}(m) + o(n^\alpha)$$

and the result follows from the first part of the proof. \square

4 Asymptotically polynomial solutions 1

In this section, in Theorem 1, we obtain our main result. First, in Lemma 4.1, we obtain a certain discrete version of the Bihari's lemma. This version is similar to Theorem 1 in [4] but we do not assume the continuity of g .

Lemma 4.1. *Assume a, w are nonnegative sequences, $p \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$g : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty), \quad 0 \leq \lambda < M, \quad g(\lambda) > 0,$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k \leq \int_{\lambda}^M \frac{dt}{g(t)}, \tag{14}$$

$$w_n \leq \lambda + \sum_{k=p}^{n-1} a_k g(w_k)$$

for $n \geq p$ and g is nondecreasing. Then $w_n \leq M$ for $n \geq p$.

Proof. For $n \geq p$, let

$$s_n = \lambda + \sum_{k=p}^{n-1} a_k g(w_k).$$

Then, for $n \geq p$, we have $\Delta s_n = s_{n+1} - s_n = a_n g(w_n) \leq a_n g(s_n)$ and

$$\int_{s_n}^{s_{n+1}} \frac{dt}{g(t)} \leq \int_{s_n}^{s_{n+1}} \frac{dt}{g(s_n)} = \frac{\Delta s_n}{g(s_n)} \leq a_n.$$

Therefore, using (14), we have

$$\int_{\lambda}^{s_n} \frac{dt}{g(t)} = \sum_{k=p}^{n-1} \int_{s_k}^{s_{k+1}} \frac{dt}{g(t)} \leq \sum_{k=p}^{n-1} a_k \leq \int_{\lambda}^M \frac{dt}{g(t)}.$$

Since g is positive on $[\lambda, \infty)$, we obtain $s_n \leq M$. Hence

$$w_n \leq s_n \leq M$$

for $n \geq p$. The proof is complete. \square

In the proof of Theorem 1 we also use the following two lemmas.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume $m \in \mathbb{N}(1)$, $z \in \text{SQ}$, $s \in (-\infty, m-1]$ and*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{m-1-s} |\Delta^m z_n| < \infty.$$

Then $z \in \text{Pol}(m-1) + o(n^s)$.

Proof. The assertion follows from the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [12]. \square

Lemma 4.3. *If $x \in \text{SQ}$ and $m, n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, then there exists $L > 0$ such that*

$$|x_n| \leq n^{m-1} \left(L + \sum_{i=n_0}^{n-1} |\Delta^m x_i| \right) \quad \text{for } n \geq n_0.$$

Proof. See [13, Lemma 7.3]. \square

Now we are ready to prove our main result.

Theorem 1. *Assume $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $c, s, p \in \mathbb{R}$, $|c| \neq 1$, $s \leq m-1$, $a, b, u \in \text{SQ}$,*

$$f : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad g : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty), \quad \sigma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \quad \sigma(n) \rightarrow \infty,$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{m-1-s} |a_n| < \infty, \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{m-1-s} |b_n| < \infty, \quad u_n = c + o(n^{s+1-m}),$$

x is a solution of (E) and one of the following conditions is satisfied:

(a) *g is nondecreasing, f is $(g, m-1)$ -bounded, $\sigma(n) \leq n$ for large n ,*

$$\int_1^{\infty} \frac{dt}{g(t)} = \infty,$$

and x is (u, k) -nonoscillatory,

(b) *g is locally bounded, f is (g, p) -bounded, $x \circ \sigma = O(n^p)$ and the following alternative is satisfied: $k(|c| - 1) \geq 0$ or $x \in O(n^\infty)$ or x is (u, k) -nonoscillatory,*

(c) f is bounded and the following alternative is satisfied: $k(|c| - 1) \geq 0$ or $x \in O(n^\infty)$ or x is (u, k) -nonoscillatory.

Then

$$x \in \text{Pol}(m - 1) + o(n^s). \quad (15)$$

Proof. Let $z \in \text{SQ}$,

$$z_n = x_n + u_n x_{n+k}$$

for large n . Assume (b). Since $x \circ \sigma = O(n^p)$ and f is (g, p) -bounded, we see that the sequence $(f(n, x_{\sigma(n)}))$ is bounded. Hence

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{m-1-s} |\Delta^m z_n| < \infty$$

and, by Lemma 4.2, we have $z \in \text{Pol}(m - 1) + o(n^s)$. If x is (u, k) -nonoscillatory, then

$$|z_n| = |x_n + u_n x_{n+k}| = |x_n| + |u_n x_{n+k}|$$

for large n . Hence

$$|x_n| \leq |z_n| \quad (16)$$

for large n . Therefore $x \in O(n^\infty)$. Now, using Lemma 3.5, we obtain (15). The proof in the case (c) is analogous.

Assume (a). There exists an index n_0 such that

$$|x_n| \leq |z_n|, \quad \sigma(n) \geq 1, \quad \sigma(n) \leq n$$

and (E) is satisfied for $n \geq n_0$. Choose an index $n_1 \geq n_0$ such that $\sigma(n) \geq n_0$ for $n \geq n_1$. By Lemma 4.3, there exists a positive constant L such that

$$\frac{|z_n|}{n^{m-1}} \leq L + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} |\Delta^m z_j| \quad (17)$$

for any n . Let

$$L_1 = L + \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} |\Delta^m z_j|, \quad L_2 = L_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |b_j|.$$

If $n \geq n_1$, then, using (17), (E), $(g, m - 1)$ -boundedness of f , and (16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|z_{\sigma(n)}|}{n^{m-1}} &\leq \frac{|z_{\sigma(n)}|}{\sigma(n)^{m-1}} \leq L + \sum_{j=1}^{\sigma(n)-1} |\Delta^m z_j| \leq L + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} |\Delta^m z_j| \\ &\leq L_1 + \sum_{j=n_1}^{n-1} |\Delta^m z_j| \leq L_2 + \sum_{j=n_1}^{n-1} |a_j| g \left(\frac{|x_{\sigma(j)}|}{j^{m-1}} \right) \leq L_2 + \sum_{j=n_1}^{n-1} |a_j| g \left(\frac{|z_{\sigma(j)}|}{j^{m-1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.1, the sequence $(z_{\sigma(n)}/n^{m-1})$ is bounded. Hence, by (16),

$$x \circ \sigma = O(n^{m-1}).$$

Therefore, taking $p = m - 1$ in (b), we obtain (15). The proof is complete. \square

Remark 4.1. The condition $x \in O(n^\infty)$ is not a consequence of $x \circ \sigma \in O(n^\infty)$. For example, if $x_n = e^n$, $\sigma(n) = \lfloor \log n \rfloor$ (integer part of $\log n$), then $x \circ \sigma = O(n)$ and $x \notin O(n^\infty)$.

Remark 4.2. If the sequence u is nonnegative, then the class of (u, k) -nonoscillatory sequences is larger than the class of nonoscillatory sequences. Moreover, if

$$n_1 = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \sigma(i) \geq 1 \text{ for } i \geq n\}$$

and we define a full solution of (E) as a sequence x such that (E) is satisfied for all $n \geq \max(n_1, -k)$, then the set of full solutions is a subset of the set of all solutions. Hence Theorem 1 covers the case of full solutions and, assuming u is nonnegative, the case of nonoscillatory solutions.

Lemma 4.4. If $m \in \mathbb{N}(0)$, then

$$\text{Pol}(m-1) + o(n^{-\infty}) = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} (\text{Pol}(m-1) + o(n^{-k})).$$

Proof. Let $P = \text{Pol}(m-1)$ and

$$x \in \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} (P + o(n^{-k})).$$

Then $x \in P + o(1)$ and $x = \varphi + u$ for some $\varphi \in P$ and $u \in o(1)$. Since $P \cap o(1) = 0$, the sequences φ and u are unique. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $x \in P + o(n^{-k})$ and by uniqueness of $u \in o(1)$ we have $u \in o(n^{-k})$. Hence $u \in o(n^{-\infty})$ and we obtain

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} (P + o(n^{-k})) \subset P + o(n^{-\infty}).$$

The inverse inclusion is obvious. □

Corollary 4.1. Assume all conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied and $a, b \in o(n^{-\infty})$. Then

$$x \in \text{Pol}(m-1) + o(n^{-\infty}).$$

Proof. The assertion is a consequence of Theorem 1 and Lemma 4.4. □

5 Asymptotically polynomial solutions 2

In this section, in Theorem 2, we obtain a result analogous to Theorem 1. We replace the spaces of asymptotically polynomial sequences by the spaces of regularly asymptotically polynomial sequences. The study of regularly asymptotically polynomial sequences

$$\text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-q}o(1), \quad q \in \mathbb{N}(0, m)$$

is motivated by a special case $\text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-m}\mathfrak{o}(1)$. By Remark 5.2, the condition

$$z \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-m}\mathfrak{o}(1)$$

is equivalent to the convergence of the sequence $\Delta^m z$ and the condition

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta^m z_n = \lambda$$

is equivalent to the condition

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p! \Delta^{m-p} z_n}{n^p} = \lambda \quad \text{for any } p \in \mathbb{N}(0, m). \quad (18)$$

Convergence of the sequence $\Delta^m z_n$ is comparatively easy to verify and condition (18) appears in many papers, see for example [6], [14], [18], [23] or the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [22].

In the next lemma, we establish some basic properties of spaces of regularly asymptotically polynomial sequences.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}(0, m)$ and $x \in \text{SQ}$. Then*

- (a) $x \in \Delta^{-m}\mathfrak{o}(1) \iff \Delta^p x \in \mathfrak{o}(n^{m-p})$ for every $p \in \mathbb{N}(0, m)$,
- (b) $x \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-k}\mathfrak{o}(1) \iff \Delta^p x \in \text{Pol}(m-p) + \mathfrak{o}(n^{k-p})$ for any $p \in \mathbb{N}(0, k)$.
- (c) $\text{Pol}(m-1) \subset \Delta^{-m}\mathfrak{o}(1) \subset \mathfrak{o}(n^m)$, $\mathfrak{o}(n^m) \setminus \Delta^{-m}\mathfrak{o}(1) \neq \emptyset$.
- (d) $\Delta^{-m}\mathfrak{o}(1) = \{z \in \mathfrak{o}(n^m) : \Delta^p z \in \mathfrak{o}(n^{m-p}) \text{ for any } p \in \mathbb{N}(0, m)\}$.

Proof. (a) If $x \in \Delta^{-m}\mathfrak{o}(1)$, then $\Delta^m x = \mathfrak{o}(1)$ and

$$\frac{\Delta \Delta^{m-1} x_n}{\Delta n} = \Delta^m x_n = \mathfrak{o}(1).$$

By the Stolz-Cesaro theorem $\Delta^{m-1} x_n = \mathfrak{o}(n)$. Hence

$$\frac{\Delta \Delta^{m-2} x_n}{\Delta n^2} = \frac{n \Delta \Delta^{m-2} x_n}{n \Delta n^2} = \frac{\Delta^{m-1} x_n}{n} \frac{n}{\Delta n^2} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Again, by the Stolz-Cesaro theorem, $\Delta^{m-2} x_n = \mathfrak{o}(n^2)$. Analogously $\Delta^{m-3} x_n = \mathfrak{o}(n^3)$ and so on. Inverse implication is obvious.

(b) and (d) are consequences of (a).

(c) The inclusion

$$\text{Pol}(m-1) \subset \Delta^{-m}\mathfrak{o}(1)$$

is obvious. The inclusion

$$\Delta^{-m}\mathfrak{o}(1) \subset \mathfrak{o}(n^m)$$

is a consequence of (a). If $a_n = (-1)^n$, then

$$\Delta^m a_n = 2^m (-1)^{m+n} \notin \mathfrak{o}(1).$$

Hence $a \in \mathfrak{o}(n^m) \setminus \Delta^{-m}\mathfrak{o}(1)$. □

Remark 5.1. Assume $m \in \mathbb{N}(0)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}(0, m)$. If $\text{Pol}(m, k)$ denotes the subspace of $\text{Pol}(m)$ generated by sequences $(n^m), (n^{m-1}), \dots, (n^k)$, then

$$\text{Pol}(m) + \mathfrak{o}(n^k) = \text{Pol}(m, k) + \mathfrak{o}(n^k) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Pol}(m, k) \cap \mathfrak{o}(n^k) = 0.$$

Hence, $x \in \text{Pol}(m) + \mathfrak{o}(n^k)$ if and only if there exist constants c_m, \dots, c_k and a sequence $w \in \mathfrak{o}(n^k)$ such that

$$x_n = c_m n^m + c_{m-1} n^{m-1} + \dots + c_k n^k + w_n.$$

Moreover, the constants c_m, \dots, c_k and the sequence w are unique and

$$x \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-k} \mathfrak{o}(1) \iff \Delta^p w_n = \mathfrak{o}(n^{k-p}) \quad \text{for any } p \in \mathbb{N}(0, k).$$

If $P(m, k)$ and $D(m, k)$ denote the spaces defined by

$$P(m, k) = \text{Pol}(m) + \mathfrak{o}(n^k) \quad \text{and} \quad D(m, k) = \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-k} \mathfrak{o}(1).$$

respectively, then we obtain a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} P(m, 0) & \longrightarrow & P(m, 1) & \longrightarrow & P(m, 2) & \longrightarrow & \dots & \longrightarrow & P(m, m) & \longrightarrow & P(m, m+1) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ D(m, 0) & \longrightarrow & D(m, 1) & \longrightarrow & D(m, 2) & \longrightarrow & \dots & \longrightarrow & D(m, m) & \longrightarrow & D(m, m+1) \end{array}$$

where arrows denote inclusions. Note that

$$D(m, 0) = \text{Pol}(m) + \mathfrak{o}(1) = P(m, 0)$$

and for $k > m$ we have

$$P(m, k) = \mathfrak{o}(n^k), \quad D(m, k) = \Delta^{-k} \mathfrak{o}(1).$$

Remark 5.2. Assume $m \in \mathbb{N}(0)$ and $x \in \text{SQ}$. If

$$x \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-m} \mathfrak{o}(1), \tag{19}$$

then, by Lemma 5.1, the sequence $\Delta^m x$ is convergent. On the other hand, if $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\Delta^m x = \lambda + \mathfrak{o}(1), \tag{20}$$

then taking $w_n = \lambda n^m / m!$ we have $\Delta^m(x - w) = \lambda + \mathfrak{o}(1) - \lambda = \mathfrak{o}(1)$. Hence

$$x = w + (x - w) \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-m} \mathfrak{o}(1).$$

Using the Stolz-Cesaro theorem one can show that condition (20) is equivalent to the condition

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p! \Delta^{m-p} z_n}{n^p} = \lambda \quad \text{for any } p \in \mathbb{N}(0, m).$$

The next two lemmas are ‘regular’ versions of Lemmas 4.2 and 3.5.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}(0, m-1)$, $z \in \text{SQ}$ and*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{m-q-1} |\Delta^m z_n| < \infty.$$

Then $z \in \text{Pol}(m-1) + \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1)$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.3 in [12], there exists $w = \mathfrak{o}(1)$ such that $\Delta^m z = \Delta^{m-q}w$. Choose $x \in \text{SQ}$ such that $\Delta^q x = w$. Then $x \in \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1)$ and

$$\Delta^m z = \Delta^{m-q}w = \Delta^{m-q}\Delta^q x = \Delta^m x.$$

Hence $z - x \in \text{Pol}(m-1)$ and

$$z = z - x + x \in \text{Pol}(m-1) + \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1).$$

□

Lemma 5.3. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}(0)$, $q \in \mathbb{N}(0, m)$ and $u_n = c + \mathfrak{o}(n^{-m})$. Assume $k(|c| - 1) \geq 0$ or $x \in \mathcal{O}(n^\infty)$ and $z \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1)$. Then*

$$x \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1).$$

Proof. For $n \geq n_0$ let $z'_n = x_n + cx_{n+k}$. We will show, by induction on q , that

$$z' \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1) \implies x \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1).$$

For $q = 0$ this assertion follows from Lemma 3.5. Assume it is true for some $q \geq 0$. Let

$$z' \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-(q+1)}\mathfrak{o}(1), \quad z'' = \Delta z', \quad \text{and} \quad x'' = \Delta x.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} z''_n &= \Delta z'_n = \Delta(x_n + cx_{n+k}) = \Delta x_n + c\Delta x_{n+k} = x''_n + cx''_{n+k}, \\ z'' &= \Delta z' \in \Delta(\text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-(q+1)}\mathfrak{o}(1)) = \text{Pol}(m-1) + \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1). \end{aligned}$$

If $x \in \mathcal{O}(n^\infty)$, then $x'' = \Delta x \in \mathcal{O}(n^\infty)$. By inductive hypothesis

$$x'' \in \text{Pol}(m-1) + \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1).$$

By equality $x'' = \Delta x$ we obtain $x \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-(q+1)}\mathfrak{o}(1)$. Now, assume

$$z \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1).$$

Then $z_n = \mathcal{O}(n^m)$ and, by Lemma 3.4, $x_n = \mathcal{O}(n^m)$. Hence $x_{n+k} = \mathcal{O}(n^m)$. Since

$$u_n = c + \mathfrak{o}(n^{-m}),$$

we have

$$z'_n - z_n = (c - u_n)x_{n+k} = \frac{c - u_n}{n^{-m}} \frac{x_{n+k}}{n^m} = \mathfrak{o}(1).$$

Therefore

$$z' = z + (z' - z) \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1) + \mathfrak{o}(1) = \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1).$$

Hence, by the first part of the proof, we obtain $x \in \text{Pol}(m) + \Delta^{-q}\mathfrak{o}(1)$. □

Theorem 2. Assume all assumptions of Theorem 1 are satisfied and moreover let

$$s = q \in \mathbb{N}(0, m - 1] \quad \text{and} \quad u_n = c + o(n^{1-m}).$$

Then

$$x \in \text{Pol}(m - 1) + \Delta^{-q}o(1).$$

Proof. Repeat the proof of Theorem 1 replacing Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 3.5 by Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3, respectively. \square

References

- [1] R. P. Agarwal, M. M. S. Manuel, E. Thandapani, *Oscillatory and nonoscillatory behavior of second order neutral delay difference equations*, Math. Comput. Modelling 24(1996), 5-11.
- [2] Y. Bolat, O. Akyn, *Oscillatory behaviour of a higher order nonlinear neutral type functional difference equation with oscillating coefficients*, Appl. Math. Lett. 17 (2004), 1073-1078.
- [3] W. T. Li, S. S. Cheng, *Asymptotic trichotomy for positive solutions of a class of odd order nonlinear neutral difference equations*, Comput. Math. Appl. 35 (1998) no. 8, 101-108.
- [4] V. B. Demidovič, *A certain criterion for the stability of difference equations*, (Russian), Diff. Urav. 5 (1969), 1247-1255.
- [5] J. Džurina, *Asymptotic behavior of solutions of neutral nonlinear differential equations*, Archivum Mathematicum, 38 (4) (2002), 319-325.
- [6] A. Gleska, J. Werbowski, *Comparison theorems for the asymptotic behavior of solutions of nonlinear difference equations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 226 (1998), no. 2, 456-465.
- [7] M. Hasanbulli, Y. V. Rogovchenko, *Asymptotic behavior nonoscillatory solutions to n -th order nonlinear neutral differential equations*, Nonlinear Analysis, 69 (2008), 1208-1218.
- [8] X. Huang, Z. Xu, *Nonoscillatory Solutions of Certain Higher Order Neutral Difference Equations*, Southeast Asian Bulletin of Mathematics 32 (2008), 445-458.
- [9] Z. Liu, Y. Xu, S. M. Kang, *Global solvability for a second order nonlinear neutral delay difference equation*, Comput. Math. Appl. 57 (2009), no. 4, 587-595.
- [10] B. Karpuz, R. N. Rath, S. K. Rath, *On Oscillation and asymptotic behaviour of a higher order functional difference equation of neutral type*, Int. J. Difference Equ. 4(1) (2009), 69-96.

- [11] M. Liu, Z. Guo, *Solvability of a higher-order nonlinear neutral delay difference equation*, Adv. Difference Equ. (2010), Art. ID 767620, 14 pp.
- [12] J. Migda, *Asymptotically polynomial solutions of difference equations*, Adv. Difference Equ. (2013), 2013:92, 1-16.
- [13] J. Migda, *Approximative solutions of difference equations*, Electron. J. Qual. Theory Differ. Equ. 2014, No. 13, 1–26.
- [14] M. Migda, J. Migda, *On the asymptotic behavior of solutions of higher order nonlinear difference equations*, Nonlinear Anal. 47 (2001), 4687-4695.
- [15] M. Migda, J. Migda, *On a class of first order nonlinear difference equations of neutral type*, Math. Comput. Modelling 40 (2004), 297-306.
- [16] M. Migda, J. Migda, *Asymptotic properties of solutions of second-order neutral difference equations*, Nonlinear Anal. 63 (2005), e789-e799.
- [17] M. Migda, J. Migda, *Oscillatory and Asymptotic Properties of Solutions of Even Order Neutral Difference Equations*, J. Difference Equ. Appl. 15 (11-12) (2009), 1077-1084.
- [18] M. Migda, *Asymptotic properties of nonoscillatory solutions of higher order neutral difference equations*, Opuscula Math. 26 (2006), no. 26, 497-504.
- [19] M. Naito, *An asymptotic theorem for a class of nonlinear neutral differential equations*, Czechoslovak Math. J. 48 (1998), 419-432.
- [20] E. Thandapani, P. Sundaram, J. R. Graef, P. W. Spikes, *Asymptotic behaviour and oscillation of solutions of neutral delay difference equations of arbitrary order*, Math. Slovaca 47 (1997), no. 5, 539–551.
- [21] E. Thandapani, R. Arul, P. S. Raja, *The asymptotic behavior of nonoscillatory solutions of nonlinear neutral type difference equations*, Math. Comput. Modelling, 39, (2004), 1457-1465.
- [22] Z. Wang, J. Sun, *Asymptotic behavior of solutions of nonlinear higher-order neutral type difference equations*, J. Difference Equ. Appl. 12 (2006), 419-432.
- [23] A. Zafer, *Oscillatory and asymptotic behavior of higher order difference equations*, Math. Comput. Modelling 21, 4(1995), 43-50.
- [24] Y. Zhou, B. G. Zhang, *Existence of nonoscillatory solutions of higher-order neutral delay difference equations with variable coefficients*, Comput. Math. Appl. 45 (2003), no. 6-9, 991-1000.
- [25] Z. Q. Zhu, G. Q. Wang, S. S. Cheng, *A classification scheme for nonoscillatory solutions of a higher order neutral difference equation*, Adv. Difference Equ. (2006), Art. 47654, 1-19.