

OSTROWSKI-TYPE INEQUALITIES IN ABSTRACT DISTANCE SPACES

VLADYSLAV BABENKO, VIRI BABENKO, AND OLEG KOVALENKO

ABSTRACT. For non-empty sets X we define notions of distance and pseudo metric with values in a partially ordered set that has a smallest element θ . If h_X is a distance in X (respectively, a pseudo metric in X), then the pair (X, h_X) is called a distance (respectively, a pseudo metric) space. If (T, h_T) and (X, h_X) are pseudo metric spaces, (Y, h_Y) is a distance space, and $H(T, X)$ is a class of Lipschitz mappings $f: T \rightarrow X$, for a broad family of mappings $\Lambda: H(T, X) \rightarrow Y$, we obtain a sharp inequality that estimates the deviation $h_Y(\Lambda f(\cdot), \Lambda f(t))$ in terms of the function $h_T(\cdot, t)$. We also show that many known estimates of such kind are contained in our general result.

1. INTRODUCTION

Estimates for the deviation between the value of an operator Λ at a function f from some class \mathfrak{M} and the value of Λ at some depending on f constant function from \mathfrak{M} play an important role in approximation theory and numeric analysis. For example, estimates for the deviation of a value of a function $f \in \mathfrak{M}$ at some point from its mean value is of this kind. One of the first among such sharp estimates (where $\Lambda f = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^1 f(t) dt$) was obtained by Ostrowski [23]:

Theorem 1. *Let $f: [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a differentiable function and let for all $t \in (-1, 1)$, $|f'(t)| \leq 1$. Then for all $x \in [-1, 1]$ the following inequality holds*

$$(1) \quad \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^1 f(t) dt - f(x) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^1 |t - x| dt = \frac{1 + x^2}{2}.$$

The inequality is sharp in the sense that for each fixed $x \in [-1, 1]$, the upper bound $\frac{1+x^2}{2}$ cannot be reduced.

Note that inequality (1) holds for the wider class of functions that satisfy the Lipschitz condition

$$|f(t_1) - f(t_2)| \leq |t_1 - t_2| \quad \forall t_1, t_2 \in [-1, 1],$$

and becomes equality on the function $f_x(t) = |t - x|$, $t \in [-1, 1]$.

Inequalities that estimate the deviation of a value of a function at some point from its mean value using some characteristics of the function, are sometimes called Ostrowski-type inequalities. Such inequalities were intensively studied, see for example [12, 13].

Let two non-empty sets X and Y be given. The class $H(X, Y)$ of mappings $f: X \rightarrow Y$ that satisfy the Lipschitz condition can be defined in a standard way, if distances h_X and h_Y are somehow defined in X and Y :

$$H(X, Y) = \{f: X \rightarrow Y: h_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) \leq h_X(x_1, x_2) \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in X\}.$$

In this paper for a non-empty sets X we using a partially ordered set M that has a smallest element, we define (see Section 2) a concept of a distance and a concept of a pseudo metric h_X with values in M . Such distances (pseudo metrics) will be called abstract distances (abstract pseudo metrics) or M -distances (M -pseudo metrics). We define an M -distance space (an M -pseudo metric space) as a pair (X, h_X) where h_X is an M -distance on X (h_X is an M -pseudo metric on X respectively). If (T, h_T) and (X, h_X) are M -pseudo metric spaces, (Y, h_Y) is an M -distance space, for a broad family of mappings $\Lambda: H(T, X) \rightarrow Y$, we prove (see Section 3) the main result of the paper – a sharp inequality that estimates the deviation $h_Y(\Lambda f(\cdot), \Lambda f(t))$ (here $t \in T$ and $\Lambda f(t)$ is the value of Λ at the function $\tau \rightarrow f(t)$, $\tau \in T$) in terms of some characteristic of the function $h_T(\cdot, t)$. We also show that many known estimates as well as many new estimates of such kind are contained in our general result, which is natural to be called an abstract version of the Ostrowski-type inequalities. In Section 4 we introduce a general concept of a modulus of continuity as a function $\omega: M \rightarrow M$ that satisfies certain conditions, as well as the corresponding classes $H^\omega(T, X)$. For a broad family of mappings $\Lambda: H^\omega(T, X) \rightarrow Y$, we obtain a sharp inequality that estimates the deviation $h_Y(\Lambda f(\cdot), \Lambda f(t))$ in terms of the value $\omega(h_T(\cdot, t))$. Finally, in Section 5, we give rather general conditions for an M -distance space T to be an M -pseudo metric space.

2. NOTATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

The notion of a distance (in particular, a metric) plays an important role in many branches of mathematics. Definitions of numeric-valued distances or metrics and a detailed discussion of these notions can be found e.g., in monograph [18]. We refer to [5, 6, 16, 26] for metrics that take value in more general sets. We consider a rather general definition for this notion.

A set M with a reflexive, antisymmetric and transitive relation \leq is called partially ordered.

Definition 1. Let X be an arbitrary set and M be a partially ordered set that has a smallest element, which we denote by θ (i.e., $\theta \leq m$ for any $m \in M$). A function $h_X: X \times X \rightarrow M$ is called an M -distance in X , if for arbitrary $x, y \in X$

- (1) $h_X(x, x) = \theta$,
- (2) $h_X(x, y) = h_X(y, x)$.

The pair (X, h_X) will be called an M -distance space.

In [5, 6] the notion of M -distance was introduced for the case when M is a partially ordered monoid.

Everywhere below, speaking of a partially ordered set M , we assume that some M -distance h_M is defined in M .

Definition 2. We say that an M -distance h_X in X agrees with an M -distance h_M in M , if

$$(2) \quad h_M(h_X(x, x_1), h_X(x, x_2)) \leq h_X(x_1, x_2) \quad \forall x, x_1, x_2 \in X.$$

Note that inequality (2) holds (and is equivalent to the triangle inequality) if $M = \mathbb{R}_+$ with the usual metric, and (X, h_X) is a pseudo metric space (for a definition of a pseudo metric and a pseudo metric space see, for example [17, Chapter 4]). That is why we introduce the following definition.

Definition 3. An M -distance h_X on a set X will be called an M -pseudo metric, if it agrees with M -distance h_M i.e., inequality (2) holds. In this case the pair (X, h_X) will be called an M -pseudo metric space.

In Lemma 2 we will give a general sufficient condition that an M -metric h (see Section 5 for the definition of M -metric) agrees with h_M .

We need the following lemma.

Lemma 1. Let T, X, Y be M -distance spaces. Then

- (1) If $f \in H(T, X)$ and $g \in H(X, Y)$, then $g \circ f \in H(T, Y)$.
- (2) If $f \in H(T, X)$ and h_X is an M -pseudo metric, then one has $h_X(f(\cdot), f(t)) \in H(T, M)$ for any fixed $t \in T$. In particular, if $T = X$, then $h_T(\cdot, t) \in H(T, M)$.

Proof. The first statement of the lemma is obvious.

If $f \in H(T, X)$ and h_X is an M -pseudo metric, then for arbitrary $t_1, t_2 \in T$,

$$h_M(h_X[f(t_1), f(t)], h_X[f(t_2), f(t)]) \stackrel{(2)}{\leq} h_X(f(t_1), f(t_2)) \stackrel{f \in H(T, X)}{\leq} h_T(t_1, t_2).$$

Therefore $h_X(f(\cdot), f(t)) \in H(T, M)$. If $T = X$ and $f(\tau) = \tau$, $\tau \in T$, we obtain that $h_T(\cdot, t) \in H(T, M)$. \square

3. CLASSES OF OPERATORS AND AN OSTROWSKI-TYPE INEQUALITY

Definition 4. For an M -distance space X , an operator $\lambda: H(X, M) \rightarrow M$ will be called monotone, if for arbitrary $u, v \in H(X, M)$

$$(\forall x \in X \ u(x) \leq v(x)) \implies (\lambda(u) \leq \lambda(v)).$$

Definition 5. Let T, Y be M -distance spaces, X be an M -pseudo metric space, and $t \in T$ be fixed. We say that an operator $\Lambda: H(T, X) \rightarrow Y$ and a monotone operator $\lambda: H(T, M) \rightarrow M$ agree, if $\forall f \in H(T, X)$

$$(3) \quad h_Y(\Lambda f(\cdot), \Lambda f(t)) \leq \lambda(h_X(f(\cdot), f(t))).$$

Here and everywhere below $\Lambda f(t)$ means the value of the operator Λ on the constant function $\tau \mapsto f(t)$, $\tau \in T$ (the same notation will be used for other operators whose arguments are functions).

Theorem 2. Let (T, h_T) and (X, h_X) be M -pseudo metric spaces, (Y, h_Y) be an M -distance space, and $t \in T$ be fixed. Assume that an operator $\Lambda: H(T, X) \rightarrow Y$ and a monotone operator $\lambda: H(T, M) \rightarrow M$ agree. Then for arbitrary function $f \in H(T, X)$ the following Ostrowski-type inequality holds:

$$(4) \quad h_Y(\Lambda f(\cdot), \Lambda f(t)) \leq \lambda(h_T(\cdot, t)).$$

If

$$(5) \quad \lambda(\theta) = \theta,$$

and there exists an operator $\phi_X: H(T, M) \rightarrow H(T, X)$ and $\phi_Y \in H(M, Y)$ with the following property

$$(6) \quad h_Y(\phi_Y(m), \phi_Y(\theta)) = m, \text{ if } m = \lambda(h_T(\cdot, t)),$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H(T, X) & \xrightarrow{\Lambda} & Y \\ \phi_X \uparrow & & \uparrow \phi_Y \\ H(T, M) & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & M \end{array}$$

is commutative i.e.,

$$(7) \quad \Lambda \circ \phi_X = \phi_Y \circ \lambda,$$

then inequality (4) is sharp and becomes equality on the function

$$(8) \quad f_t(\cdot) = \phi_X(h_T(\cdot, t)).$$

Proof. Let $f \in H(T, X)$. Since (T, h_T) and (X, h_X) are M -pseudo metric spaces, we have due to Lemma 1 that $h_X(f(\cdot), f(t)) \in H(T, M)$ and $h_T(\cdot, t) \in H(T, M)$. So both of these functions belong to the domain of λ .

Since the operators Λ and λ agree, and the operator λ is monotone, for each $f \in H(T, X)$ one has

$$h_Y(\Lambda f(\cdot), \Lambda f(t)) \leq \lambda(h_X(f(\cdot), f(t))) \leq \lambda(h_T(\cdot, t)),$$

and inequality (4) is proved.

The function from (8) belongs to the class $H(T, X)$, since $h_T(\cdot, t) \in H(T, M)$ and $\phi_X: H(T, M) \rightarrow H(T, X)$. Using condition (7), one has

$$\begin{aligned} h_Y(\Lambda f_t(\cdot), \Lambda f_t(t)) &= h_Y(\Lambda(\phi_X(h_T(\cdot, t))), \Lambda(\phi_X(h_T(t, t)))) \\ &= h_Y((\Lambda \circ \phi_X)(h_T(\cdot, t)), (\Lambda \circ \phi_X)(h_T(t, t))) \\ &\stackrel{(7)}{=} h_Y((\phi_Y \circ \lambda)(h_T(\cdot, t)), (\phi_Y \circ \lambda)(\theta)) \\ &= h_Y(\phi_Y(\lambda(h_T(\cdot, t))), \phi_Y(\lambda(\theta))) \stackrel{(6),(5)}{=} \lambda(h_T(\cdot, t)). \end{aligned}$$

The theorem is proved. \square

Note that classes of operators that satisfy the properties analogues of the properties (3), (6) and (7) were considered in [8]. In order to explain the nature of these properties we give the following example. Condition (3) is a relaxed version of the following condition:

$$h_Y(\Lambda f, \Lambda g) \leq \lambda(h_X(f(\cdot), g(\cdot)))$$

for all f, g . If $M = \mathbb{R}_+$, $X = Y$ is a Banach space, $\Lambda f = \int_{-1}^1 f(t)dt$ is the Bochner integral of f , and λ is the Lebesgue integral on $[-1, 1]$, then this condition becomes

$$\left\| \int_{-1}^1 f(t)dt - \int_{-1}^1 g(t)dt \right\| \leq \int_{-1}^1 \|f(t) - g(t)\|dt.$$

Moreover, if α is an integrable real-valued function and $x \in X$, then

$$\int_{-1}^1 \alpha(t) \cdot x dt = \left(\int_{-1}^1 \alpha(t) dt \right) \cdot x,$$

i.e., condition (7) is satisfied with ϕ_X and ϕ_Y being multiplication by a fixed element $x \in X$. If the element x is such that $\|x\| = 1$, then the operator ϕ_X preserves the Lipschitz property, and condition (6) holds for arbitrary $m \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The function $h_T(\cdot, t) = |\cdot - t|$ is extremal in inequality (1) for the real-valued functions from $H([-1, 1], \mathbb{R})$. Therefore for any x such that $\|x\| = 1$ the function $f_t(\cdot) = |\cdot - t| \cdot x$ is extremal in the Ostrowski-type inequality for Banach space-valued functions.

In the majority results that we know (see e.g. [1, 2, 7, 8]) for extremal problems on classes of non-numeric-valued functions $f: T \rightarrow X$, extremal functions are built based on the real-valued extremal function for the extremal problem on the corresponding class of real-valued functions

$f: T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$: if $f_e: T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an extremal function in the real-valued case, then the function $f_e \cdot x$ usually becomes an extremal function in the non-numeric-valued situation for some specially chosen element $x \in X$. This corresponds to the described above approach in the case, when ϕ_X and ϕ_Y are operators of multiplication by some elements.

More generally, if for the operators $\lambda: H(T, M) \rightarrow M$ and $\Lambda = \lambda$, fixed $t \in T$ and $f \in H(T, M)$ inequality (3) holds, then

$$h_M(\lambda f(\cdot), \lambda f(t)) \leq \lambda(h_T(\cdot, t)).$$

If in addition, property (6) holds with $Y = M$ and ϕ_Y being the identity function, then the latter inequality become equality on the function $h_T(f(\cdot, t))$. Function (8) if obtained from this function as a result of applying to it the operator $\phi_X: H(T, M) \rightarrow H(T, X)$.

Recall that an operator $\phi: H(T, M) \rightarrow X$ can be considered as an operator $\phi: M \rightarrow X$ (if $m \in M$, then $\phi(m) := \phi(f)$, where $f(\cdot) \equiv m$ on T).

Corollary 1. *Assume that operators Λ, λ and ϕ_X and $\phi_Y = \phi_X$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2 with $X = Y$. Let also there exist an operator $P \in H(X, X)$ such that*

- (1) $\Lambda f = (\Lambda \circ P)f = (P \circ \Lambda)f \quad \forall f \in H(T, X)$;
- (2) $\Lambda f(t) = (\Lambda \circ P)f(t) = Pf(t) \quad \forall t \in T \forall f \in H(T, X)$;
- (3) For any $t \in T$

$$(9) \quad h_X((P \circ \phi_X)(m), (P \circ \phi_X)(\theta)) = m, \text{ if } m = \lambda(h_T(\cdot, t)).$$

Then for arbitrary $t \in T$ the following sharp inequality holds:

$$(10) \quad h_X(\Lambda f(\cdot), Pf(t)) \leq \lambda(h_T(\cdot, t)).$$

The inequality becomes equality for the function

$$\tilde{f}_t(\cdot) = (P \circ \phi_X)(h_X(\cdot, t)).$$

If $P = \text{Id}$ (the identity operator) satisfies the above conditions, then inequality (10) has the form

$$h_X(\Lambda f(\cdot), f(t)) \leq \lambda(h_T(\cdot, t)).$$

and becomes equality for function (8).

Proof. It is easy to check that operators Λ, λ and $\tilde{\phi}_X = P \circ \phi$ and $\tilde{\phi}_Y = \tilde{\phi}_X$ instead of ϕ_X and ϕ_Y satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2 with $X = Y$. Therefore for $h_X(\Lambda f(\cdot), \Lambda f(t))$ we obtain

$$h_X(\Lambda f(\cdot), \Lambda f(t)) \leq \lambda(h_T(\cdot, t)).$$

Due to the properties of P

$$h_X(\Lambda f(\cdot), Pf(t)) = h_X(\Lambda f(\cdot), \Lambda f(t)) \leq \lambda(h_T(\cdot, t)),$$

and the inequality (10) is proved.

For the function $\tilde{f}_t(\cdot) = (P \circ \phi_X)(h_X(\cdot, t))$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_X(\Lambda \tilde{f}_t(\cdot), \Lambda \tilde{f}_t(t)) &= h_X((\Lambda \circ (P \circ \phi_X))(h_T(\cdot, t)), (\Lambda \circ (P \circ \phi_X))(h_T(t, t))) \\ &\stackrel{(7)}{=} h_X(((P \circ \phi_X) \circ \lambda)(h_T(\cdot, t)), ((P \circ \phi_X) \circ \lambda)(\theta)) \\ &= h_X((P \circ \phi_X)(\lambda(h_T(\cdot, t))), (P \circ \phi_X)(\lambda(\theta))) \stackrel{(9)}{=} \lambda(h_T(\cdot, t)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore inequality (10) becomes equality for the function $\tilde{f}_t(\cdot)$.

The last statement of the Corollary is obvious. \square

The case when Λ is the integral operator and P is the convexifying operator for multi-valued (see e.g. [15]), L -space-valued (see e.g. [8, 25]), or quasilinear-space-valued functions (see e.g. [3]), is an important example of the operators that satisfy the conditions of Corollary 1. The case, when Λ is the integral operator, and P is the identity operator occurs in the case of real-valued functions and functions with values in Banach spaces. Thus in the case $M = \mathbb{R}_+$ many known Ostrowski-type inequalities for real-valued, multi-valued and fuzzy-valued functions, as well as for functions with values in Banach spaces (in particular, random processes) and in L -spaces follow from Theorem 2 and Corollary 1 with appropriately chosen spaces T, X and Y and operators $\Lambda, \lambda, P, \phi_X$ and ϕ_Y .

The only result that we know, where related questions were considered for $M \neq \mathbb{R}_+$, is article [21].

4. CLASSES $H^\omega(T, X)$ AND INEQUALITIES OF THE OSTROWSKI TYPE

Definition 6. Let h_M be an M -distance in a set M . A function $\omega: M \rightarrow M$ is called a modulus of continuity, if it satisfies the following properties:

- (1) $\omega(\theta) = \theta$;
- (2) ω is non-decreasing i.e., $\omega(m_1) \leq \omega(m_2)$, whenever $m_1 \leq m_2$;
- (3) ω is semi-additive in the following sense: for all $m_1, m_2 \in M$

$$h_M(\omega(m_1), \omega(m_2)) \leq \omega(h_M(m_1, m_2)).$$

In the case of $M = \mathbb{R}_+$ a modulus of continuity as an independent notion was introduced by Nikolsky [22].

Definition 7. Let a modulus of continuity ω and two M -distance spaces $(T, h_T), (X, h_X)$ be given. We consider the classes

$$H^\omega(T, X) = \{f: T \rightarrow X: h_X(f(t_1), f(t_2)) \leq \omega(h_T(t_1, t_2)) \quad \forall t_1, t_2 \in T\}.$$

Classes $H^\omega(T, X)$ play an important role in approximation theory. Many papers are devoted to solutions of different extremal problems for these classes. Some results for real-valued functions can be found e.g., in [11, 19, 24]. Some results regarding extremal problems for classes

$H^\omega(T, X)$ of functions with non-numeric values can be found in [7–10, 14, 20].

Observe that the class $H(T, X)$ is a partial case of the class $H^\omega(T, X)$ in the case, when $\omega = \text{Id}$, where $\text{Id}: M \rightarrow M$ is the identity mapping. On the other hand, as it is easy to see, the function $h_T^\omega: T \times T \rightarrow M$, given by the formula

$$h_T^\omega(t_1, t_2) = \omega(h_T(t_1, t_2))$$

is a new M -distance in T , which becomes a M -pseudo metric, if h_T is an M -pseudo metric. Consideration of the classes $H^\omega(T, X)$ with different ω and fixed distance h_T in T allows to appreciate the properties of the functions $f: T \rightarrow X$ in a more detailed manner. This makes the classes $H^\omega(T, X)$ important for approximation theory.

If in Theorem 2 the M -pseudo metric in T is understood as h_T^ω , then we obtain the following

Corollary 2. *For arbitrary modulus of continuity ω and arbitrary function $f \in H^\omega(T, X)$ the following inequality holds:*

$$h_Y(\Lambda f(\cdot), \Lambda f(t)) \leq \lambda(\omega(h_T(\cdot, t))),$$

which is sharp under the corresponding conditions and becomes equality on the function

$$f_{\omega, t}(\cdot) = \phi_X(\omega(h_T(\cdot, t))).$$

5. ON AGREEMENT OF M -DISTANCES

Definition 8. *A partially ordered set M with a smallest element θ will be called a partially ordered monoid, if an associative binary operation $+$ is defined in M and the following properties hold:*

- (1) *For all $m \in M$, $\theta + m = m = m + \theta$.*
- (2) *If $m, n \in M$ are such that $m \leq n$, then $m + p \leq n + p$ for all $p \in M$.*

Definition 9. *An element s in a partially ordered set M is called a supremum of two elements $m, n \in M$, if the following two conditions are satisfied*

- (1) *$s \geq m$ and $s \geq n$;*
- (2) *If $u \geq m$ and $u \geq n$, then $u \geq s$.*

If a supremum of $m, n \in M$ exists, then we denote it by $\sup\{m, n\}$.

Definition 10. *A mapping $h_X: X \times X \rightarrow M$ is called an M -metric, if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) *For all $x, y \in X$, $x = y$ if and only if $h_X(x, y) = \theta$;*
- (2) *For all $x, y \in X$, $h_X(x, y) = h_X(y, x)$;*
- (3) *For all $x, y, z \in X$, $h_X(x, y) \leq h_X(x, z) + h_X(z, y)$.*

In this section we give a sufficient condition on an M -metric h_M in a partially ordered monoid M to agree with an arbitrary M -metric h_X on a set X . Before doing so, we note that generally speaking M -metric h_X need not agree with h_M . For example, if $M = \mathbb{R}_+$, h_X is a metric such that $0 < h_X(\alpha, \beta) < 1$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in X$, and h_M is the discrete metric on \mathbb{R}_+ (i.e., $h_M(a, b) = 0$, if $a = b$ and $h_M(a, b) = 1$ for all $a \neq b$), then inequality (2) does not hold for $x = x_1 = \alpha$ and $x_2 = \beta$. Moreover, an M -metric h_M does not necessarily agree with itself. Consider for example $M = \mathbb{R}_+$, and let

$$h_M(a, b) = \begin{cases} 0, & a = b = 0, \\ \frac{3}{4}, & \text{exactly one of } a, b \text{ is } 0, \\ \min\{1, |\ln \frac{a}{b}|\}, & a \neq 0 \text{ and } b \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that it is actually a metric on M (the fact that this function satisfies the property $h_M(ra, rb) = h_M(a, b)$ for all $a, b \geq 0$ and $r > 0$ allows to reduce the number of different cases to consider during verification of the triangle inequality). Since $\ln 2 < \frac{3}{4}$, for $x = x_1 = 1$, $x_2 = 2$ inequality (2) with h_X substituted by h_M does not hold.

Lemma 2. *Let M be a partially ordered monoid and assume there is a function $e: M \times M \rightarrow M$ such that for all $x, y, z \in M$ the following properties hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} x \leq y &\iff e(x, y) = \theta; \\ e(x, \theta) &\leq x; \\ e(x, y) &\leq e(x, z) + e(z, y); \\ e(z + x, z + y) &\leq e(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

If for arbitrary $x, y \in M$ the supremum $\sup\{x, y\}$ exists, then

$$h_M(x, y) = \sup\{e(x, y), e(y, x)\}$$

is an M -metric. Moreover, arbitrary M -metric h agrees with h_M .

For example, if $M = \mathbb{R}_+$, the function $e(x, y) = \max\{x - y, 0\}$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+$, satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2. In this case $h_M(x, y) = |x - y|$.

Proof. We prove that h_M is an M -metric first. If $x \in M$, then

$$h_M(x, x) = \sup\{e(x, x), e(x, x)\} = \sup\{\theta, \theta\} = \theta.$$

Moreover, if $h_M(x, y) = \theta$, then $e(x, y) = e(y, x) = \theta$, hence $x \leq y$ and $y \leq x$, thus $x = y$. Since $\sup\{a, b\} = \sup\{b, a\}$ for all $a, b \in M$, we obtain that $h_M(x, y) = h_M(y, x)$ for all $x, y \in M$. Finally, for all $x, y, z \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} h_M(x, y) &= \sup\{e(x, y), e(y, x)\} \leq \sup\{e(x, z) + e(z, y), e(y, z) + e(z, x)\} \\ &\leq \sup\{e(x, z), e(z, x)\} + \sup\{e(z, y), e(y, z)\} = h_M(x, z) + h_M(z, y). \end{aligned}$$

Let $x \leq y$ and $z \in M$. Then $e(x, y) = \theta$, and

$$e(y, z) = e(x, y) + e(y, z) \geq e(x, z)$$

i.e., the function e is non-decreasing in its first variable.

Finally, if h is an M -metric on a set T , then for arbitrary $t, t_1, t_2 \in T$,

$$\begin{aligned} h_M(h(t, t_1), h(t, t_2)) &= \sup\{e[h(t, t_1), h(t, t_2)], e[h(t, t_2), h(t, t_1)]\} \\ &\leq \sup\{e[h(t, t_2) + h(t_2, t_1), h(t, t_2)], e[h(t, t_1) + h(t_1, t_2), h(t, t_1)]\} \\ &\leq \sup\{e[h(t_2, t_1), \theta], e[h(t_1, t_2), \theta]\} = e(h(t_1, t_2), \theta) \leq h(t_1, t_2). \end{aligned}$$

□

The idea to use an order-defining function e (with properties similar to the ones stated in the lemma) as a tool to define partially ordered metric spaces was introduced in [4].

REFERENCES

- [1] *G. A. Anastassiou*. Fuzzy Ostrowski type inequalities. *Comput. Appl. Math.*, 2003, 22(2): pp. 279–292. doi:10.1590/S0101-82052003000200007.
- [2] *G. A. Anastassiou*. Ostrowski and landau inequalities for Banach space valued functions. *Math. Comput. Model.*, 2012, 55: pp. 312–329. doi:10.1016/j.mcm.2011.08.003.
- [3] *S. M. Aseev*. Quasilinear operators and their application in the theory of multi-valued mappings. *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.*, 1986, 167: pp. 23–52.
- [4] *V. Babenko, V. Babenko, O. Kovalenko*. Optimal recovery of monotone operators in partially ordered L-spaces. *Numer. Func. Anal. Opt.*, 2020, 41(11): pp. 1373–1397. doi:10.1080/01630563.2020.1775251.
- [5] *V. Babenko, V. Babenko, O. Kovalenko*. Fixed point theorems in hausdorff M-distance spaces. arxiv.org/abs/HausdDistSpaces, 2021.
- [6] *V. Babenko, V. Babenko, O. Kovalenko*. Fixed point theorems in M-distance spaces. arxiv.org/abs/2103.13914, 2021.
- [7] *V. Babenko, V. Babenko, O. Kovalenko*. Korneichuk-Stechkin lemma, Ostrowski and Landau inequalities, and optimal recovery problems for L -space valued functions. *Numer. Func. Anal. Opt.*, 2023, 44(12): pp. 1309–1341. doi:10.1080/01630563.2023.2246540.
- [8] *V. Babenko, V. Babenko, O. Kovalenko, M. Polishchuk*. Optimal recovery of operators in function L-spaces. *Anal. Math.*, 2021, 47: pp. 13–32. doi:10.1007/s10476-021-0065-y.
- [9] *V. F. Babenko, V. V. Babenko, M. V. Polishchuk*. On the optimal recovery of integrals of set-valued functions. *Ukrainian Math. J.*, 2016, 67(9): pp. 1306–1315. doi:10.1007/s11253-016-1154-0.
- [10] *V.F. Babenko, V.V. Babenko, O.V. Kovalenko, N.V. Parfinovych*. General form of (λ, φ) -additive operators on spaces of L -space-valued functions. *Res. Math.*, 2022, 30(1): pp. 3–9. doi:10.15421/242201.
- [11] *S. Bagdasarov*. *Chebyshev Splines and Kolmogorov Inequalities*. Operator theory. Springer, 1998.
- [12] *S. S. Dragomir*. Ostrowski type inequalities for Lebesgue integral: a survey of recent results. *Australian J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 2017, 14(1): pp. 1–287.

- [13] S.S. Dragomir, Th.M. Rassias. *Ostrowski Type Inequalities and Applications in Numerical Integration*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht/Boston/London, 2002.
- [14] L. V. Drozhzhina. On quadrature formulas for random processes. *Dopovidi Akad. Nauk Ukrain. RSR, Ser. A*, 1975, 9: pp. 775–777. (in Ukrainian)
- [15] N. Dyn, E. Farkhi, A. Mokhov. *Approximation Of Set-valued Functions: Adaptation Of Classical Approximation Operators*. World Scientific Publishing Company, 2014.
- [16] S. Janković, Z. Kadelburg, S. Radenović. On cone metric spaces: A survey. *Nonlinear Anal Theory Methods Appl*, 2011, 74(7): pp. 2591 – 2601. doi:10.1016/j.na.2010.12.014.
- [17] J.L. Kelley. *General Topology*. The university series in higher Mathematics. D. Van Nortrand Company (Canada) Ltd, 1964.
- [18] W. Kirk, N. Shahzad. *Fixed Point Theory in Distance Spaces*. Springer New York, 2014.
- [19] N.P. Korneichuk. *Exact Constants in Approximation Theory*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [20] O. Kovalenko. On optimal recovery of integrals of random processes. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 2020, 487(1): pp. 123949. doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2020.123949.
- [21] O. Kovalenko. On a general approach to some problems of approximation of operators. *J. Math. Sci.*, 2024, 279: pp. 67–76. doi:10.1007/s10958-024-06987-4.
- [22] S. M. Nikolsky. Fourier series of functions with a given modulus of continuity. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 1946, 52(3): pp. 191–194.
- [23] A. Ostrowski. Über die Absolutabweichung einer differentienbaren Funktionen von ihren Integralmittelwert. *Comment. Math. Helv*, 1938, 10: pp. 226–227.
- [24] A. I. Stepanets. *Uniform Approximations by Trigonometric Polynomials*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG, 2018.
- [25] S. A. Vahrameev. *Applied Mathematics and Mathematical Software of Computers*. M.: MSU Publisher, 1980. (in Russian).
- [26] P. P. Zabrejko. K-metric and K-normed linear spaces: survey. *Collect. Math.*, 1997, 48(4-5-6): pp. 825–859.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS AND OPTIMIZATION, OLES HONCHAR DNIPRO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, DNIPRO, UKRAINE

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, DRAKE UNIVERSITY, DES MOINES, USA

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS AND OPTIMIZATION, OLES HONCHAR DNIPRO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, DNIPRO, UKRAINE