

DIFFERENTIABLE SOLUTIONS OF AN EQUATION WITH PRODUCT OF ITERATES

CHAITANYA GOPALAKRISHNA

ABSTRACT. In the previous work [2], we considered continuous solutions of an iterative equation involving the multiplication of iterates. In this paper, we continue to investigate this equation for differentiable solutions. Similar to continuous solutions until [2], there is no obtained result on differentiable solutions of such an equation on non-compact intervals of \mathbb{R} . Although our strategy here is to use conjugation to reduce the equation to the well-known polynomial-like iterative equation as in [2], all known results on differentiable solutions of the latter are given on compact intervals. We re-explore polynomial-like iterative equation on the whole of \mathbb{R} and prove the existence and uniqueness of differentiable solutions of our equation on \mathbb{R}_+ and \mathbb{R}_- .

1. INTRODUCTION

The n -th order iterates of a map $f : X \rightarrow X$ on a nonempty set X , denoted by f^n , are defined recursively by $f^0 = \text{id}$, the identity map, and $f^{n+1} = f \circ f^n$. The iteration operation, being an essential operation having applications to numerical computations and computer loop programs, is being investigated for its many interesting and complicated properties and, in particular a lot of attention (see [1, 5] for example) is paid to the so-called *iterative equations*, which have the general form

$$(1.1) \quad \Phi(f(x), f^2(x), \dots, f^n(x)) = F(x),$$

where F and Φ are given, and f is unknown. Some special cases of this equation, for example, iterative root problem ([4, 10]), which is a special case of the invariant curve problem [5], and dynamics of a quadratic map ([3]) are interesting topics in dynamical systems.

Although there are plentiful results (see [6, 9, 11] for example) on the solutions of (1.1) when Φ is a Lipschitzian, the basic form

$$(1.2) \quad \lambda_1 f(x) + \lambda_2 f^2(x) + \dots + \lambda_n f^n(x) = F(x)$$

with Φ in a linear combination, called the *polynomial-like iterative equation*, is still being considered for deeper investigation. Continuous solutions, differentiable solutions, convex solutions and decreasing solutions, and equivariant solutions of (1.2) are discussed in [14, 15, 18, 19], respectively. It is also interesting to discuss Φ of nonlinear combination. In 2007 Zdun and Zhang [16] discussed (1.1) for continuous solutions on the compact space S^1 , the unit circle in \mathbb{C} ,

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 39B12; Secondary 47J05.

Key words and phrases. Functional equation, iteration, nonlinear combination, contraction principle.

The author is supported by Indian Statistical Institute, Bangalore in the form of a Visiting Scientist position through the J. C. Bose Fellowship of Prof. B. V. Rajarama Bhat.

and recently Gopalakrishna et al. [2] investigated (1.1) in the special case $\Phi(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) = \prod_{k=1}^n u_k^{\lambda_k}$, i.e., an iterative equation involving product of iterates

$$(1.3) \quad (g(x))^{\lambda_1} (g^2(x))^{\lambda_2} \dots (g^n(x))^{\lambda_n} = G(x),$$

for continuous solutions on the non-compact spaces $\mathbb{R}_+ := (0, \infty)$ and $\mathbb{R}_- := (-\infty, 0)$.

In this paper, we continue to investigate (1.3) considering its differentiable solutions. Unlike those [6, 11, 13, 17, 18] on compact intervals, our work to (1.3) is focused on investigating (1.2) on the whole \mathbb{R} as done in [2]. Our approach is to restrict the discussion of (1.3) on \mathbb{R}_+ and use an exponential function to reduce in conjugation to the well-known form of polynomial-like iterative equation (1.2) on the whole \mathbb{R} . Note that all found results on (1.2) are given on a compact interval, none of which are applicable to our case. In this paper, using Banach's contraction principle, we generally discuss (1.2) on the whole \mathbb{R} and use obtained result to give sufficient conditions for existence and uniqueness of differentiable solutions for (1.3) on \mathbb{R}_+ and \mathbb{R}_- . The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give preliminaries. In Section 3 we discuss the existence and uniqueness of differentiable solutions of (1.3). Finally, in Section 4 we illustrate our result with an example and indicate some problems for future discussion.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_+)$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R})$) denote the set of all bounded continuous self-maps of \mathbb{R}_+ (resp. \mathbb{R}), $\mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R})$) the set of all continuously differentiable maps in $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_+)$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R})$), and $\mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathbb{R})$ the set of all maps in $\mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R})$ with bounded derivatives. Then $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R})$ is a Banach space in the uniform norm $\|f\|_\infty := \sup\{|f(x)| : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$, and $\mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathbb{R})$ is a normed linear space in the norm $\|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^1} := \|f\|_\infty + \|f'\|_\infty$, where f' denotes the derivative of f .

Consider g on \mathbb{R}_+ . We can use the exponential map $\psi(x) = e^x$ to conjugate g to get a self-map $f(x) := \log g(e^x)$ on the whole \mathbb{R} and reduce (1.3) to the polynomial-like one (1.2) on \mathbb{R} , where $F(x) := \log G(e^x)$.

The following two propositions shows that it suffices to prove existence (resp. uniqueness) for (1.2) on the whole \mathbb{R} in order to prove the existence (resp. uniqueness) of solution for (1.3) on \mathbb{R}_+ and \mathbb{R}_- .

Proposition 2.1. *A map g is a solution (resp. unique solution) of (1.3) in $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ if and only if $f(x) := \psi^{-1}(g(\psi(x)))$ is a solution (resp. unique solution) of (1.2) in $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R})$, where $\psi(x) = e^x$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{\psi^{-1} \circ g \circ \psi : g \in \mathcal{X}\}$.*

Proof. Let g be a solution of (1.3) in \mathcal{X} . Since ψ is a diffeomorphism of \mathbb{R} onto \mathbb{R}_+ , clearly $f \in \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R})$. Also,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k f^k(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k \log g^k(e^x) = \log \left(\prod_{k=1}^n (g^k(x))^{\lambda_k} \right) = \log(G(e^x)) = F(x)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, implying that f is a solution of (1.2) on \mathbb{R} . The converse follows similarly. To prove the uniqueness, assume that (1.3) has a unique solution in \mathcal{X} and suppose that $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$ are any two solutions of (1.2). Then, by "if" part of what we have proved above, there exist solutions $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ of (1.3) such that $f_1 = \psi^{-1} \circ g_1 \circ \psi$ and $f_2 = \psi^{-1} \circ g_2 \circ \psi$. By our assumption, we have $g_1 = g_2$ and therefore $f_1 = f_2$. The proof of converse is similar. \square

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k$ is odd. Then a map g is a solution (resp. unique solution) of (1.3) in $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_-)$ if and only if $h(x) := \psi^{-1}(g(\psi(x)))$ is a solution (resp. unique solution) of the equation*

$$(2.1) \quad \prod_{k=1}^n (h^k(x))^{\lambda_k} = H(x)$$

in $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$, where $\psi(x) = -x$, $H(x) = \psi^{-1}(G(\psi(x)))$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{\psi^{-1} \circ g \circ \psi : g \in \mathcal{X}\}$.

Proof. Let g be a solution of (1.3) in \mathcal{X} . Since ψ is a diffeomorphism of \mathbb{R}_+ onto \mathbb{R}_- , clearly $h \in \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Also, for each $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we have $H(x) = -G(-x)$ and $h^k(x) = -g^k(-x)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{k=1}^n (h^k(x))^{\lambda_k} &= \prod_{k=1}^n (-g^k(-x))^{\lambda_k} = (-1)^{\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k} \prod_{k=1}^n (g^k(-x))^{\lambda_k} \\ &= - \prod_{k=1}^n (g^k(-x))^{\lambda_k} = -G(-x) = H(x) \end{aligned}$$

for each $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, because $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k$ is odd, implying that h is a solution of (2.1) on \mathbb{R}_+ . The converse follows similarly. Further, the proof of uniqueness is similar to that of Proposition 2.1. \square

Let $J = [c, d]$ and $I = [a, b]$ be compact intervals in \mathbb{R}_+ and \mathbb{R} , respectively with non-empty interiors. Let $\mathcal{C}(J)$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}^1(J)$) be the set of all continuous (resp. continuously differentiable) self-maps of J . Similarly we define $\mathcal{C}(I)$ and $\mathcal{C}^1(I)$. For each $g \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}_+)$ (resp. $f \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R})$) and subinterval J' of \mathbb{R}_+ (resp. I' of \mathbb{R}), let $\|g\|_{\infty}^{J'} := \sup\{|g(x)| : x \in J'\}$ (resp. $\|f\|_{\infty}^{I'} := \sup\{|f(x)| : x \in I'\}$). Similarly, for $g \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ (resp. $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathbb{R})$), let $\|g\|_{\mathcal{C}^1}^{J'} := \|g\|_{\infty}^{J'} + \|g'\|_{\infty}^{J'}$ (resp. $\|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^1}^{I'} := \|f\|_{\infty}^{I'} + \|f'\|_{\infty}^{I'}$). Also, for any map f and point x , let $\mathcal{R}(f)$ denote the range of f and $f'(x)$ (or $(f(x))'$) the derivative $\frac{df(x)}{dx}$. For $M, M^*, \delta \geq 0$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_J(\delta, M, M^*) &:= \{g \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+) : \mathcal{R}(g) = J, g(c) = c, g(d) = d, \text{ and (2.2), (2.3), (2.5) hold}\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_I(\delta, M, M^*) &:= \{f \in \mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathbb{R}) : \mathcal{R}(f) = I, f(a) = a, f(b) = b, \text{ and (2.6), (2.7), (2.9) hold}\}, \\ \mathcal{B}_J(\delta, M, M^*) &:= \{g \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+) : \mathcal{R}(g) = J, g(c) = c, g(d) = d, \text{ and (2.4), (2.5) hold}\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, M^*) &:= \{f \in \mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathbb{R}) : \mathcal{R}(f) = I, f(a) = a, f(b) = b, \text{ and (2.8), (2.9) hold}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(2.2) \quad \delta \leq \frac{xg'(x)}{g(x)} \leq M, \quad \forall x \in J,$$

$$(2.3) \quad \left| \frac{xg'(x)}{g(x)} \right| \leq M, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus J,$$

$$(2.4) \quad 0 \leq \frac{xg'(x)}{g(x)} \leq M, \quad \forall x \in J,$$

$$(2.5) \quad \left| \frac{xg'(x)}{g(x)} - \frac{yg'(y)}{g(y)} \right| \leq M^* \left| \log \left(\frac{x}{y} \right) \right|, \quad \forall x, y \in J,$$

$$(2.6) \quad \delta \leq f'(x) \leq M, \quad \forall x \in I,$$

$$(2.7) \quad |f'(x)| \leq M, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus I,$$

$$(2.8) \quad 0 \leq f'(x) \leq M, \quad \forall x \in I,$$

$$(2.9) \quad |f'(x) - f'(y)| \leq M^*|x - y|, \quad \forall x, y \in I.$$

Then it can be seen that $\mathcal{G}_J(\delta, M, M^*) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_J(\delta_1, M_1, M_1^*)$, $\mathcal{F}_I(\delta, M, M^*) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_I(\delta_1, M_1, M_1^*)$, $\mathcal{B}_J(\delta, M, M^*) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_J(\delta_1, M_1, M_1^*)$ and $\mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, M^*) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_I(\delta_1, M_1, M_1^*)$ whenever $0 \leq \delta_1 \leq \delta$, $0 \leq M \leq M_1$ and $0 \leq M^* \leq M_1^*$.

Proposition 2.3. *The following assertions are true for $M, M^*, \delta \geq 0$.*

- (i): $g \in \mathcal{G}_J(\delta, M, M^*)$ if and only if $f = \psi^{-1} \circ g \circ \psi \in \mathcal{F}_I(\delta, M, M^*)$, where $\psi(x) = e^x$ and $I = \log J := \{\log x : x \in J\}$.
- (ii): If $f \in \mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, M^*)$, then $g = \psi \circ f \circ \psi^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}_J(\delta, M, M^*)$, where $\psi(x) = e^x$ and $J = e^I := \{e^x : x \in I\}$.

Proof. Given $g \in \mathcal{G}_J(\delta, M, M^*)$, let $a := \log c$ and $b := \log d$. Then we obtain the interval $I = [a, b]$ with $a < b$, which satisfies $I = \log J$. Clearly, $f := \psi^{-1} \circ g \circ \psi \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R})$. Also, we have $f(a) = \log g(e^a) = \log g(c) = \log c = a$, and similarly $f(b) = b$. So, $I \subseteq \mathcal{R}(f)$. The reverse inclusion follows by the definitions of f and I , because $\mathcal{R}(g) = J$. Therefore $\mathcal{R}(f) = I$.

Now, let $x \in I$ and $y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus I$. Then there exist $u \in J$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus J$ such that $x = \log u$ and $y = \log v$. So, by (2.2) and (2.3), we have

$$\delta \leq \frac{ug'(u)}{g(u)} \leq M \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{vg'(v)}{g(v)} \right| \leq M,$$

implying that

$$\delta \leq \frac{e^x g'(e^x)}{g(e^x)} \leq M \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{e^y g'(e^y)}{g(e^y)} \right| \leq M,$$

respectively. i.e., $\delta \leq f'(x) \leq M$ and $|f'(y)| \leq M$, proving that f satisfy (2.6) and (2.7), respectively.

Next, let $x, y \in I$. Then there exist $u, v \in J$ such that $x = \log u$ and $y = \log v$. So, by (2.5), we have

$$\left| \frac{ug'(u)}{g(u)} - \frac{vg'(v)}{g(v)} \right| \leq M^* \left| \log \left(\frac{u}{v} \right) \right|,$$

implying that

$$\left| \frac{e^x g'(e^x)}{g(e^x)} - \frac{e^y g'(e^y)}{g(e^y)} \right| \leq M^* \left| \log \left(\frac{e^x}{e^y} \right) \right|.$$

i.e., $|f'(x) - f'(y)| \leq M^*|x - y|$, proving that f satisfies (2.9). Therefore $f \in \mathcal{F}_I(\delta, M, M^*)$. The proof of converse and that of result (ii) are similar. \square

Proposition 2.4. *If $M < 1$ or $\delta > 1$, then $\mathcal{G}_J(\delta, M, M^*) = \emptyset$. If $M = 1$ or $\delta = 1$, then $\mathcal{G}_J(\delta, M, M^*) = \{g \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+) : g|_J = \text{id}\}$.*

Proof. Let $g \in \mathcal{G}_J(\delta, M, M^*)$. Then by result (i) of Proposition 2.3, $f := \psi^{-1} \circ g \circ \psi \in \mathcal{F}_I(\delta, M, M^*)$, where $\psi(x) = e^x$ and $I = \log J$. So, by using (2.6) we get

$$(2.10) \quad f(x) - f(y) \leq M(x - y), \quad \forall x, y \in I \text{ with } x \geq y.$$

If $M < 1$, then by setting $y = a$ in (2.10), we have $f(x) < x$ for all $x \in I$ with $x > a$. This is a contradiction to the fact that $f(b) = b$, because $b > a$. So, $\mathcal{F}_I(\delta, M, M^*) = \emptyset$, and hence $\mathcal{G}_J(\delta, M, M^*) = \emptyset$ whenever $M < 1$. A similar argument holds when $\delta > 1$.

If $M = 1$, then from (2.10) we have

$$(2.11) \quad f(x) - f(y) \leq x - y, \quad \forall x, y \in I \text{ with } x \geq y.$$

For $x = b$, (2.11) implies that $f(y) \geq y$ for all $y \in I$ with $y < b$. Moreover, setting $y = a$ in (2.11), we have $f(x) \leq x$ for all $x \in I$ with $x > a$. Thus $f(x) = x$ for all $x \in I$, and therefore $f|_I = \text{id}$. This implies that $g|_J = \text{id}$. The reverse inclusion is trivial. So, $\mathcal{G}_J(\delta, M, M^*) = \{g \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+) : g|_J = \text{id}\}$. A similar argument holds when $\delta = 1$. \square

In view of the above proposition, we cannot seek solutions of (1.3) without imposing conditions on M and δ . So, henceforth we assume that $0 < \delta \leq 1 \leq M$ and $M^* > 0$.

Proposition 2.5. *The set $\mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, M^*)$ is a complete metric space under the metric induced by $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{C}^1}$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, M^*)$ is a closed subset of $\mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathbb{R})$. Therefore, to prove the result, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathbb{R})$ is complete with respect to the metric induced by $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{C}^1}$. So, consider an arbitrary Cauchy sequence $(f_k)_{k \geq 1}$ in the normed linear space $(\mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathbb{R}), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{C}^1})$. Then, by the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{C}^1}$, it follows that $(f_k)_{k \geq 1}$ and $(f'_k)_{k \geq 1}$ are Cauchy sequences in $(\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$, which is a Banach space. So, there exist $f, f_0 \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R})$ such that $f_k \rightarrow f$ and $f'_k \rightarrow f_0$ uniformly on \mathbb{R} as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Also, since $(f'_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is a bounded sequence in $(\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$, there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that $\|f'_k\|_\infty < \kappa$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, implying that $|f_0(x)| \leq \kappa$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We now claim that $f' = f_0$ on \mathbb{R} .

Consider an arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $I_x := [u_x, v_x]$, where $u_x, v_x \in \mathbb{R}$ are chosen such that $u_x < x < v_x$. Since $f_k \rightarrow f$ uniformly on I_x , by using fundamental theorem of calculus, we have

$$\int_{u_x}^t f'_k(y) dy = f_k(t) - f_k(u_x) \rightarrow f(t) - f(u_x)$$

for all $t \in I_x$. Also, since $f'_k \rightarrow f_0$ uniformly on I_x , we have

$$\int_{u_x}^t f'_k(y) dy \rightarrow \int_{u_x}^t f_0(y) dy$$

for all $t \in I_x$. Therefore

$$\int_{u_x}^t f_0(y) dy = f(t) - f(u_x),$$

implying by fundamental theorem of calculus that $f'(t) = f_0(t)$ for all $t \in I_x$. Thus the claim holds and it follows that $f_k \rightarrow f$ in $(\mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathbb{R}), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{C}^1})$. The proof is completed. \square

In addition to the above proposition, we need the following seven technical lemmas to prove our main result.

Lemma 2.6. (Lemma 2.1 of [18]) *If $f \in \mathcal{C}^1(I)$ satisfy (2.8) and (2.9), then*

$$|(f^k(x))' - (f^k(y))'| \leq M^* \left(\sum_{j=k-1}^{2k-2} M^j \right) |x - y|, \quad \forall x, y \in I \text{ and } k \geq 1.$$

Lemma 2.7. (Lemma 2.2 of [18]) *Let $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{C}(I)$ satisfy $|f_1(x) - f_1(y)| \leq M|x - y|$ and $|f_2(x) - f_2(y)| \leq M|x - y|$ for all $x, y \in I$. Then*

$$(2.12) \quad \|f_1^k - f_2^k\|_\infty^I \leq \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} M^j \right) \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I \text{ for } k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Lemma 2.8. (Lemma 2.3 of [18]) *Let $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{C}^1(I)$ satisfy (2.8) and (2.9). Then*

$$\|(f_1^{k+1})' - (f_2^{k+1})'\|_\infty^I \leq (k+1)M^k \|f_1' - f_2'\|_\infty^I + Q(k+1)M^* \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (k-j+1)M^{k+j-1} \right) \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I$$

for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where

$$(2.13) \quad Q(s) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s = 1, \\ 1 & \text{if } s = 2, 3, \dots \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.9. (Lemma 2.4 of [18]) *Let $f \in \mathcal{C}^1(I)$ satisfies (2.9) and let $\delta \leq f'(x)$ for all $x \in I$. Then*

$$|(f^{-1}(x))' - (f^{-1}(y))'| \leq \frac{M^*}{\delta^3} |x - y|, \quad \forall x, y \in I.$$

Lemma 2.10. (Lemma 2.5 of [18]) *Let f_1, f_2 be homeomorphisms of I onto itself such that*

$$|f_j(x) - f_j(y)| \leq M^* |x - y|, \quad \forall x, y \in I \text{ and } j = 1, 2.$$

Then

$$\|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I \leq M^* \|f_1^{-1} - f_2^{-1}\|_\infty^I.$$

For $\lambda_k \in [0, 1]$, $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k = 1$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_I(\delta, M, M^*)$, define $L_f : I \rightarrow I$ by

$$L_f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k f^{k-1}(x), \quad x \in I.$$

Lemma 2.11. *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}_I(\delta, M, M^*)$ and $\lambda_k \in [0, 1]$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k = 1$. Then*

- (i): $L_f(a) = a$, $L_f(b) = b$ and $\mathcal{R}(L_f) = I$,
- (ii): $\lambda_1 \leq L_f'(x) \leq K_1$, $\forall x \in I$,
- (iii): $0 < \frac{1}{K_1} \leq (L_f^{-1}(x))' \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1}$, $\forall x \in I$,
- (iv): $|L_f^{-1}(x) - L_f^{-1}(y)| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} |x - y|$, $\forall x, y \in I$,
- (v): $|L_f'(x) - L_f'(y)| \leq M^* K_0 |x - y|$, $\forall x, y \in I$,
- (vi): $|(L_f^{-1}(x))' - (L_f^{-1}(y))'| \leq \frac{M^* K_0}{\lambda_1^3} |x - y|$, $\forall x, y \in I$,

where

$$(2.14) \quad K_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_{k+1} \left(\sum_{j=k-1}^{2k-2} M^j \right) \quad \text{and} \quad K_1 = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k M^{k-1}.$$

Proof. Since $0 \leq \lambda_k \leq 1$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k = 1$, it can be easily seen that $L_f(a) = a$, $L_f(b) = b$ and $a \leq L_f(x) \leq b$ for all $x \in I$. So, $\mathcal{R}(L_f) = I$, proving result **(i)**.

For each $x \in I$, by using (2.6), we have

$$L'_f(x) = \lambda_1 + \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k-2} f'(f^j(x)) \right) \leq \lambda_1 + \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k M^{k-1} = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k M^{k-1} = K_1$$

and

$$L'_f(x) = \lambda_1 + \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k-2} f'(f^j(x)) \right) \geq \lambda_1 + \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k \delta^{k-1} \geq \lambda_1.$$

This proves result **(ii)**.

Since L_f is strictly increasing map of I onto itself, clearly L_f^{-1} is a well defined map on I such that $L_f^{-1}(a) = a$ and $L_f^{-1}(b) = b$. Also, as $L'_f(x) > 0$ for all $x \in I$ by result **(ii)**, using inverse function theorem it follows that L_f^{-1} is differentiable on I and $(L_f^{-1})'(x) = (L_f(x))^{-1}$. Therefore, by result **(ii)**, we have

$$0 < \frac{1}{K_1} \leq (L_f(x))^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1},$$

proving result **(iii)**. Result **(iv)** follows from result **(iii)** and the mean value theorem.

Since f satisfy (2.6) and (2.9), by using Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |L'_f(x) - L'_f(y)| &= \left| \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_{k+1} (f^k(x))' - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_{k+1} (f^k(y))' \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_{k+1} |(f^k(x))' - (f^k(y))'| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_{k+1} M^* \left(\sum_{j=k-1}^{2k-2} M^j \right) |x - y| = M^* K_0 |x - y| \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in I$, proving result **(v)**. Also, since results **(ii)** and **(iv)** are true for L_f , result **(vi)** follows by Lemma 2.9. \square

Lemma 2.12. *Let $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_I(\delta, M, M^*)$ and $\lambda_k \in [0, 1]$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k = 1$. Then*

- (i):** $\|L_{f_1} - L_{f_2}\|_{\infty}^I \leq K_2 \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\infty}^I,$
- (ii):** $\|L_{f_1}^{-1} - L_{f_2}^{-1}\|_{\infty}^I \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \|L_{f_1} - L_{f_2}\|_{\infty}^I,$
- (iii):** $\|L_{f_1}^{-1} - L_{f_2}^{-1}\|_{\infty}^I \leq \frac{K_2}{\lambda_1} \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\infty}^I,$
- (iv):** $\|L'_{f_1} - L'_{f_2}\|_{\infty}^I \leq K_3 \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\infty}^I + K_4 \|f'_1 - f'_2\|_{\infty}^I,$

$$\text{(v): } \|(L_{f_1}^{-1})' - (L_{f_2}^{-1})'\|_\infty^I \leq K_5 \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I + K_6 \|f_1' - f_2'\|_\infty^I,$$

where

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{aligned} K_2 &= \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} M^j \right), \\ K_3 &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \lambda_{k+2} Q(k+1) M^* \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (k-j+1) M^{k+j-1} \right), \\ K_5 &= \frac{K_3}{\lambda_1^2} + \frac{M^* K_0 K_2}{\lambda_1^3}, \\ (2.16) \quad K_4 &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \lambda_{k+2} (k+1) M^k, \quad \text{and} \quad K_6 = \frac{K_4}{\lambda_1^2} \end{aligned}$$

with Q defined as in (2.13).

Proof. For each $x \in I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |L_{f_1}(x) - L_{f_2}(x)| &\leq \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k |f_1^{k-1}(x) - f_2^{k-1}(x)| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k \|f_1^{k-1} - f_2^{k-1}\|_\infty^I \\ &\leq \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} M^j \right) \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I \quad (\text{by using Lemma 2.7}) \\ &= K_2 \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I, \end{aligned}$$

proving result (i). By using result (iv) of Lemma 2.11 for f_1, f_2 and Lemma 2.10 for $L_{f_1}^{-1}, L_{f_2}^{-1}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_{f_1}^{-1} - L_{f_2}^{-1}\|_\infty^I &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \|L_{f_1} - L_{f_2}\|_\infty^I \\ &\leq \frac{K_2}{\lambda_1} \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I \quad (\text{by using result (i)}), \end{aligned}$$

proving results (ii) and (iii). For each $x \in I$, by using Lemma 2.8 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |L'_{f_1}(x) - L'_{f_2}(x)| &\leq \left| \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k (f_1^{k-1}(x))' - \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k (f_2^{k-1}(x))' \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k |(f_1^{k-1}(x))' - (f_2^{k-1}(x))'| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=2}^n \lambda_k \|(f_1^{k-1})' - (f_2^{k-1})'\|_\infty^I \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \lambda_{k+2} \|(f_1^{k+1})' - (f_2^{k+1})'\|_\infty^I \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \lambda_{k+2} \left\{ (k+1)M^k \|f_1' - f_2'\|_\infty^I + Q(k+1)M^* \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (k-j+1)M^{k+j-1} \right) \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I \right\} \\
&= K_3 \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I + K_4 \|f_1' - f_2'\|_\infty^I,
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore result **(iv)** is proved. Also, for each $x \in I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|(L_{f_1}^{-1}(x))' - (L_{f_2}^{-1}(x))'| \\
&= \left| \frac{1}{L'_{f_1}(L_{f_1}^{-1}(x))} - \frac{1}{L'_{f_2}(L_{f_2}^{-1}(x))} \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} |L'_{f_1}(L_{f_1}^{-1}(x)) - L'_{f_2}(L_{f_2}^{-1}(x))| \quad (\text{using result (ii) of Lemma 2.11}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \left\{ |L'_{f_1}(L_{f_1}^{-1}(x)) - L'_{f_2}(L_{f_1}^{-1}(x))| + |L'_{f_2}(L_{f_1}^{-1}(x)) - L'_{f_2}(L_{f_2}^{-1}(x))| \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \left\{ \|L'_{f_1} - L'_{f_2}\|_\infty^I + M^* K_0 |L_{f_1}^{-1}(x) - L_{f_2}^{-1}(x)| \right\} \quad (\text{using result (v) of Lemma 2.11}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \left\{ K_3 \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I + K_4 \|f_1' - f_2'\|_\infty^I + M^* K_0 \|L_{f_1}^{-1} - L_{f_2}^{-1}\|_\infty^I \right\} \quad (\text{using result (iv)}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \left\{ K_3 \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I + K_4 \|f_1' - f_2'\|_\infty^I + \frac{M^* K_0 K_2}{\lambda_1} \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I \right\} \quad (\text{using result (iii)}) \\
&= K_5 \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I + K_6 \|f_1' - f_2'\|_\infty^I,
\end{aligned}$$

proving result **(v)**. □

3. THE RESULT

We now prove our intended result on the existence and uniqueness of differentiable solutions of (1.3).

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_k \in [0, 1]$ for $2 \leq k \leq n$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k = 1$. Let K_0, K_2, K_4 and K_6 be as defined in Lemmas 2.11 and 2.12. Then for arbitrary $G \in \mathcal{G}_J(\delta, \lambda_1 M, M^*)$ there exists a unique solution g of (1.3) in $\mathcal{B}_J(\delta, M, M')$ provided $\lambda_1 > K_0 M^2 > 0$ and $0 < K < 1$, where*

$$(3.1) \quad M' = \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1 - K_0 M^2} \quad \text{and} \quad K = \max \left\{ \frac{K_2}{\lambda_1} + \lambda_1 M K'_5, \lambda_1 M K_6 \right\}$$

with

$$(3.2) \quad K'_5 = \frac{K'_3}{\lambda_1^2} + \frac{M' K_0 K_2}{\lambda_1^3},$$

$$(3.3) \quad K'_3 = \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \lambda_{k+2} Q(k+1) M' \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (k-j+1) M^{k+j-1} \right).$$

Proof. Let $G \in \mathcal{G}_J(\delta, \lambda_1 M, M^*)$. Then by result **(i)** of Proposition 2.3, we have $F = \psi^{-1} \circ G \circ \psi \in \mathcal{F}_I(\delta, \lambda_1 M, M^*)$, where $\psi(x) = e^x$ and $I = \log J$. Let $\log c = a$ and $\log d = b$. Then $I = [a, b]$ such that $a < b$.

Define $T : \mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1 - K_0 M^2}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_b^1(\mathbb{R})$ by

$$Tf(x) = L_f^{-1}(F(x)), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

By definitions of F and L_f , we have $Tf(a) = a$ and $Tf(b) = b$. This implies that $I \subseteq \mathcal{R}(Tf)$. Also, since $L_f^{-1} : I \rightarrow I$, we have $\mathcal{R}(L_f^{-1}) \subseteq I$, and therefore $\mathcal{R}(Tf) \subseteq I$. So, $\mathcal{R}(Tf) = I$. Further, from result **(iii)** of Lemma 2.11, we have

$$0 < \frac{\delta}{K_1} \leq (Tf)'(x) = (L_f^{-1})'(F(x))F'(x) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \lambda_1 M = M, \quad \forall x \in I.$$

Moreover, since $F \in \mathcal{F}_I(\delta, \lambda_1 M, M^*)$, for each $x, y \in I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |(Tf)'(x) - (Tf)'(y)| \\ &= |(L_f^{-1})'(F(x))F'(x) - (L_f^{-1})'(F(y))F'(y)| \\ &= |(L_f^{-1})'(F(x))F'(x) - (L_f^{-1})'(F(x))F'(y) + (L_f^{-1})'(F(x))F'(y) - (L_f^{-1})'(F(y))F'(y)| \\ &\leq |(L_f^{-1})'(F(x))||F'(x) - F'(y)| + |(L_f^{-1})'(F(x)) - (L_f^{-1})'(F(y))||F'(y)| \\ &\leq \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1} |x - y| + \frac{K_0 M M'}{\lambda_1^2} |F(x) - F(y)| \quad (\text{using results **(iii)** and **(vi)** of Lemma 2.11}) \\ &\leq \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1} |x - y| + \frac{K_0 M M'}{\lambda_1^2} \lambda_1 M |x - y| \\ &= \left(\frac{M^*}{\lambda_1} + \frac{K_0 M^2 M'}{\lambda_1} \right) |x - y| \\ &= \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1 - K_0 M^2} |x - y|. \end{aligned}$$

So, $Tf \in \mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1 - K_0 M^2})$, which proves that T is a self-map on $\mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1 - K_0 M^2})$. In order to prove that T is a contraction, consider any $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1 - K_0 M^2})$. Then for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Tf_1(x) - Tf_2(x)| &= |L_{f_1}^{-1}(F(x)) - L_{f_2}^{-1}(F(x))| \\ &\leq \|L_{f_1}^{-1} - L_{f_2}^{-1}\|_\infty^I \quad (\text{since } F(x) \in I) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \|L_{f_1} - L_{f_2}\|_\infty^I \quad (\text{using result **(ii)** of Lemma 2.12}) \\ &\leq \frac{K_2}{\lambda_1} \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I \quad (\text{using result **(i)** of Lemma 2.12}) \\ &\leq \frac{K_2}{\lambda_1} \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

implying that

$$(3.4) \quad \|Tf_1 - Tf_2\|_\infty \leq \frac{K_2}{\lambda_1} \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty.$$

Also, for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(Tf_1)'(x) - (Tf_2)'(x)| \\
&= |(L_{f_1}^{-1})'(F(x))F'(x) - (L_{f_2}^{-1})'(F(x))F'(x)| \\
&= |F'(x)| |(L_{f_1}^{-1})'(F(x)) - (L_{f_2}^{-1})'(F(x))| \\
&\leq \lambda_1 M \| (L_{f_1}^{-1})' - (L_{f_2}^{-1})' \|_\infty^I \quad (\text{since } F(x) \in I) \\
&\leq \lambda_1 M K'_5 \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty^I + \lambda_1 M K_6 \|f'_1 - f'_2\|_\infty^I \quad (\text{using result (v) of Lemma 2.12}) \\
&\leq \lambda_1 M K'_5 \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty + \lambda_1 M K_6 \|f'_1 - f'_2\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$(3.5) \quad \|(Tf_1)' - (Tf_2)'\|_\infty \leq \lambda_1 M K'_5 \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty + \lambda_1 M K_6 \|f'_1 - f'_2\|_\infty.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Tf_1 - Tf_2\|_{C^1} &= \|Tf_1 - Tf_2\|_\infty + \|(Tf_1)' - (Tf_2)'\|_\infty \\
&\leq \frac{K_2}{\lambda_1} \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty + \lambda_1 M K'_5 \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty + \lambda_1 M K_6 \|f'_1 - f'_2\|_\infty \\
&\quad (\text{using (3.4) and (3.5)}) \\
&= \left(\frac{K_2}{\lambda_1} + \lambda_1 M K'_5 \right) \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty + \lambda_1 M K_6 \|f'_1 - f'_2\|_\infty \\
&\leq K \|f_1 - f_2\|_{C^1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $0 < K < 1$, it follows that T is a contraction. By Proposition 2.5, $\mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1 - K_0 M^2})$ is complete, and hence by Banach's contraction principle, T has a unique fixed point in $\mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1 - K_0 M^2})$. That is, there exists unique $f \in \mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1 - K_0 M^2})$ such that $L_f^{-1}(F(x)) = f(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, which proves that f is the unique solution of (1.2) in $\mathcal{A}_I(\delta, M, \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1 - K_0 M^2})$. This implies by Propositions 2.1 and result (ii) of Proposition 2.3 that $g = \psi \circ f \circ \psi^{-1}$ is the unique solution of (1.3) in $\mathcal{B}_J(\delta, M, \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1 - K_0 M^2})$. \square

4. EXAMPLE AND REMARKS

The following example illustrates Theorem 3.1.

Example 4.1. Consider the equation

$$(4.1) \quad (g(x))^{\lambda_1} (g^2(x))^{\lambda_2} = G(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where $\lambda_1 = \frac{9}{10}$, $\lambda_2 = \frac{1}{10}$ and

$$G(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in (0, 1], \\ 2^{x-1} & \text{if } x \in [1, 2], \\ 2^{\frac{\log 2}{\log x}} & \text{if } x \in [2, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Let $f(x) := \log g(e^x)$ and $F(x) := \log G(e^x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then (4.1) reduces to the polynomial-like equation $\lambda_1 f(x) + \lambda_2 f^2(x) = F(x)$, where $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq 0, \\ (e^x - 1) \log 2 & \text{if } x \in [0, \log 2], \\ \frac{(\log 2)^2}{x} & \text{if } x \geq \log 2. \end{cases}$$

Choose $\delta = \log 2$, $M = \frac{20 \log 2}{9}$ and $M^* = 2 \log 2$. Then, clearly $F(0) = 0$, $F(\log 2) = \log 2$, $F(x) \in I$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\delta \leq F'(x) \leq \lambda_1 M$ for all $x \in I$, $|F'(x)| \leq \lambda_1 M$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus I$, and $|F''(x)| \leq M^*$ for all $x \in I$, where $I = [0, \log 2]$. Therefore $F \in \mathcal{F}_I(\delta, \lambda_1 M, M^*)$, implying by result (i) of Proposition 2.3 that $G \in \mathcal{G}_J(\delta, \lambda_1 M, M^*)$, where $J = [1, 2]$. Also, from (2.14)-(3.3), we have $K_0 = K_2 = K_4 = \lambda_2$, $K'_3 = 0$, $K'_5 = \frac{M^* \lambda_2^2}{\lambda_1^3 (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 M^2)}$ and $K_6 = \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1^2}$, and therefore

$$K = \max \left\{ \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} + \frac{MM^* \lambda_2^2}{\lambda_1^2 (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 M^2)}, \frac{M \lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right\} = \max\{0.15089, 0.17115\} = 0.17115 \in (0, 1).$$

Further, $K_0 M^2 = \lambda_2 M^2 = 0.23726 \in (0, \lambda_1)$. Thus, all the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied. Hence (4.1) has a unique solution g in $\mathcal{G}_J(\delta, M, M')$, where $M' = \frac{M^*}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 M^2} = 2.09176$.

Since we have assumed in Theorem 3.1 that $\lambda_1 > 0$ for a technical reason, we cannot solve the iterative root problem $g^n = G$ on \mathbb{R}_+ using this result. Further, the assumption that $K > 0$ made in Theorem 3.1 implies that $\lambda_k \neq 0$ for some $2 \leq k \leq n$. However, if $\lambda_k = 0$ for all $2 \leq k \leq n$, then $g = G$ is the unique solution of (1.3) on \mathbb{R}_+ . Additionally, the assumption that $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k = 1$ is not severe. In fact, if $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k > 1$, then we can divide each of the exponents in (1.3) by $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k$ to get the normalized equation, but the assumptions on G have to be modified suitably.

Moreover, by using the above observation, Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 2.2, we can indeed solve (1.3) on \mathbb{R}_- whenever $\lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k$ is odd. On the other hand, if $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ for some $1 \leq k \leq n$, then for any $G, g \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_-)$, $x \mapsto \prod_{k=1}^n (g^k(x))^{\lambda_k}$ is a multi-valued complex map, whereas $x \mapsto G(x)$ is a single valued real map. So, to obtain the equality (1.3), we have to choose branches of the complex logarithm suitably, which depends both on x and each term of the product $\prod_{k=1}^n (g^k(x))^{\lambda_k}$. Therefore, solving (1.3) on \mathbb{R}_- in this case is very difficult.

REFERENCES

1. K. Baron and W. Jarczyk, *Recent results on functional equations in a single variable, perspectives and open problems*, Aequationes Math., **61** (2001), 1-48.
2. C. Gopalakrishna, M. Veerapazham, S. Wang, W. Zhang, *Continuous solutions of an iterative equation with multiplication*, arXiv:2105.03385.
3. S. J. Greenfield, R. D. Nussbaum, *Dynamics of a quadratic map in two complex variables*, J. Differential Equations, **169** (2001), No.1, 57-141.
4. M. Kuczma, *Functional Equations in a Single Variable*, Monografie Matematyczne Tom. **46**, PWN, Warsaw, 1968.
5. M. Kuczma, B. Choczewski and R. Ger, *Iterative Functional Equations*, Encycl. Math. Appl. Vol. **32**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990.
6. V. Murugan, P.V. Subrahmanyam, *Special solutions of a general iterative functional equation*, Aequationes Math., **72** (2006), 269-287.
7. V. Murugan, P.V. Subrahmanyam, *Existence of continuous solutions for an iterative functional series equation with variable coefficients*, Aequationes Math., **78** (2009), 167-176.
8. L. Li, W. Zhang, *Construction of usc solutions for a multivalued iterative equation of order n* , Result. Math., **62** (2012), 203-216.
9. J. Si, *Continuous solutions of iterative equation $G(f(x), f^{n_2}(x), \dots, f^{n_k}(x)) = F(x)$* , J. Math. Res. Exp., **15** (1995), 149-150, in Chinese.
10. G. Targonski, *Topics in Iteration Theory*, Studia Mathematica Skript Vol. **6**, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Gottingen, 1981.

11. X. Wang and J. Si, *Differentiable solutions of an iterated functional equation*, Aequationes Math., **61** (2001), 79-96.
12. J. Si, X. Wang, *Differentiable solutions of a polynomial-like iterative equation with variable coefficients*, Publ. Math. Debrecen, **58** (2001), 57-72.
13. J. Si, W. Zhang, *C^2 solutions of a functional equations*, Acta Math. Sinica, **41** (1998), 1061-1064.
14. B. Xu, W. Zhang, *Construction of continuous solutions and stability for the polynomial-like iterative equation*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **325** (2007), 1160-1170.
15. B. Xu, and W. Zhang, *Decreasing solutions and convex solutions of the polynomial-like iterative equation*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **329** (2007), 483-497.
16. M. C. Zdun and W. Zhang, *A general class of iterative equations on the unit circle*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, **57** (132) (2007), 809-829.
17. W. Zhang, *On the differentiable solutions of the iterated equation $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f^i(x) = F(x)$* , Acta Math. Sinica, **32** (1989), 98-109, in Chinese.
18. W. Zhang, *Discussion on the differentiable solutions of the iterated equation $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f^i(x) = F(x)$* , Nonlinear Anal., **15** (1990), 387-398.
19. W. Zhang, *Solutions of equivariance for a polynomial-like iterative equation*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinb. A, **130** (2000), No.5, 1153-1163.

STATISTICS AND MATHEMATICS UNIT, INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, R.V. COLLEGE POST, BANGALORE-560059, INDIA

Email address: cberbalaje@gmail.com, chaitanya_vs@isibang.ac.in