

# ON EXISTENCE AND PROPERTIES OF ROOTS OF THIRD PAINLEVÉ' TRANSCENDENTS

S.I. TERTYCHNIY

ABSTRACT. A closed proof of existence of solutions to third Painlevé' equation (Painlevé' transcendents) vanishing at arbitrary given point except zero is presented. The structure of the set of Painlevé' transcendents with common parameters vanishing at a given point is described. The approximate explicit representation of a Painlevé' transcendent in vicinity of its non-zero root is given.

## 1. PRELIMINARIES

The name *third Painlevé' equation* refers to a certain subfamily of the family of nonlinear second order ordinary differential equations called Painlevé' equations which possess the so called Painlevé property. This property means that for all solutions of the corresponding equations all the movable singularities (i.e. singularities whose location depends on what a solution is considered) are poles. Equivalent manifestation of the Painlevé property is the independence of locations of multi-valued singularities (branch points) of the choice of a solution; in other words, all they are determined by the equation itself [1].

The generic third Painlevé' equation can be represented in the following form

$$\ddot{\lambda} = \frac{\dot{\lambda}^2}{\lambda} - \frac{\dot{\lambda}}{t} - \frac{\chi_\infty \lambda^2}{t^2} + \frac{\lambda^3}{t^2} + \frac{\chi_0}{t} - \frac{1}{\lambda} \quad (1.1)$$

(see [3], Eq. (4.30)). Here  $t$  is the free variable, either real or complex valued,  $\chi_0$  and  $\chi_\infty$  are the arbitrary constant parameters,  $\lambda \Leftarrow \lambda(t)$  is the unknown function which is assumed to be sufficiently smooth in case of real  $t$  and holomorphic if  $t$  varies in a complex domain. The dots '·' and '··' denote the first and second order derivatives with respect to  $t$ .

There also exists an earlier alternative representation of the above equation still widely used. It reads

$$\ddot{\underline{\lambda}} = \frac{\dot{\underline{\lambda}}^2}{\underline{\lambda}} - \frac{\dot{\underline{\lambda}}}{\underline{t}} + \frac{\alpha \underline{\lambda}^2 + \beta}{\underline{t}} + \gamma \underline{\lambda}^3 + \frac{\delta}{\underline{\lambda}} \quad (1.2)$$

(cf. [1], Eq. (1.3); [2], §29, Eq. ( $P_3$ )). Here the underlining of symbols  $t$  and  $\lambda$  (implying underlining of dots which denote now derivatives with respect to  $\underline{t}$ ) is the adaptation of notations designated to make clear the distinction of the underlined ones from the original  $t$  and  $\lambda$  used in Eq. (1.1). Notice also the difference

in the sets of constant parameters now comprising *four* quantities denoted by the symbols  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$  (for them, the underlining can perhaps seem asking but would definitely be redundant).

The equivalence of the equations (1.2) and (1.1), taking place although not always but still on a subset of the parameter values of a full measure, is established by means of the transition from the function and variable  $\lambda(t)$  and  $t$  to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{the function } \underline{\lambda}(\underline{t}) &= (-\gamma \delta)^{-1/4} (-\delta)^{1/2} t^{-1/2} \lambda(t) \\ \text{of the variable } \underline{t} &= 2(-\gamma \delta)^{-1/4} t^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

This transformation takes Eq. (1.1) to Eq. (1.2), provided the constant parameters are related as follows:

$$\alpha = 2(-\delta)^{-1/2} (-\gamma \delta)^{1/2} \chi_\infty, \quad \beta = -2(-\delta)^{1/2} \chi_0.$$

The parameters  $\gamma, \delta$  may be arbitrary non-zero.

The above interrelation fails if  $\gamma = 0$  or  $\delta = 0$ . In these particular cases Eq. (1.2) is still as valid as its generic version but Eq. (1.1) cannot be derived from it. In the opposite case, i.e. if  $\gamma \neq 0 \neq \delta$ , a pair of parameters among the quaternary  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$  is redundant since the replacements in accordance with Eq.s (1.3) converts Eq. (1.2) to Eq. (1.1) with only two decoupled constant parameters, the inversely directed transition preserving the amount of the latter being also available. Since our current goal is the analysis of generic cases, in what follows, we may consider only the first representation (1.1). It is worth noting that, in the literature, its name is often marked by the prime, e.g. Painlevé' 3' equation, instead of Painlevé' 3 for Eq. (1.2). It is also customary to refer to solutions to the equations in question as third Painlevé' transcendents. The quantities  $\chi_0, \chi_\infty$  can be named the parameters of the latter.

## 2. THIRD PAINLEVÉ' EQUATION FROM VIEWPOINT OF HAMILTONIAN FORMALISM

It is well known that the third Painlevé' equation (as well as other equations from the Painlevé' family) can play role of the evolution equation for some Hamiltonian dynamical systems. See, e.g. [4], Eq.s (32), (33). In particular, the following function

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\lambda, \mu, t) = t^{-1} (\lambda^2 \mu^2 - (\lambda^2 - \lambda + \epsilon (\chi_0 \lambda - t)) \mu + \frac{1}{2} (\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1) \lambda), \tag{2.1}$$

when treated as a Hamiltonian, is able to produce Eq. (1.1) as a consequence of the associated Hamilton' equations. Moreover, as a matter of fact, there are *two* Hamiltonians which are embodied in Eq. (2.1) and they are distinguished by the values  $\epsilon = 1$  and  $\epsilon = -1$  of 'the sign switch'  $\epsilon$ . Thus  $\epsilon$  may not be arbitrary and it has to be required of  $\epsilon$  to obey the constraint

$$\epsilon^2 = 1. \tag{2.2}$$

### ON $\langle \dots \rangle$ ROOTS OF THIRD PAINLEVÉ' TRANSCENDENTS

As to the other symbols, the problem posing considers the variable  $\lambda$  as the generalized coordinate,  $\mu$  is the conjugate generalized momentum associated with  $\lambda$ , and  $t$  plays role of the evolution time. The residuary symbols  $\chi_0, \chi_\infty$ , not included in the shown list of arguments of the function (2.1), represent, as above, arbitrary constant parameters.

For simplicity of references, despite the combining of two distinct Hamilton functions in the above expression for  $\mathcal{H}$ , we will name the latter Hamiltonian itself.

The Hamilton' equations

$$\dot{\lambda}(t) = \left[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \mu}, \right]_{\lambda \Leftarrow \lambda(t), \mu \Leftarrow \mu(t)}, \quad \dot{\mu}(t) = - \left[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \lambda}, \right]_{\lambda \Leftarrow \lambda(t), \mu \Leftarrow \mu(t)}$$

for the Hamiltonian (2.1) have the following explicit representations

$$\dot{\lambda} = t^{-1} (\epsilon t - (\epsilon \chi_0 - 1) \lambda + (2\mu - 1) \lambda^2), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\dot{\mu} = t^{-1} \left( -\frac{1}{2}(\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1) + (\epsilon \chi_0 - 1 + 2\lambda) \mu - 2\lambda \mu^2 \right). \quad (2.4)$$

Eq. (2.3) is linear in  $\mu$  and, when resolved with respect to it, reads

$$\mu = (2\lambda^2)^{-1} ((\epsilon \chi_0 - 1) \lambda + \lambda^2 + (\dot{\lambda} - \epsilon) t). \quad (2.5)$$

It can easily be shown that the subsequent elimination of  $\mu$  from Eq. (2.4) by means of the plain substitutions leads to the equation equivalent to Eq. (1.1), provided Eq. (2.2) is fulfilled.

### 3. PARTICULARITY OF ROOTS OF THIRD PAINLEVÉ' TRANSCENDENTS

We discuss below the basic issues concerning the existence of regular zeros in solutions to Eq. (1.1). As opposed to many other famous ordinary differential equations, Eq. (1.1) does not allow, in the case we are interested in, a straightforward application of the corresponding classical theory (e.g. Peano' theorem) since its right hand side (RHS) is not even continuous in vicinity of the section  $\lambda = 0$  of its phase space; in particular, it is not bounded, in general, as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ .

More precisely, it is easy to see that in case of smooth  $\lambda(t)$  which vanishes at a point  $t = t_0 \neq 0$  the finiteness of RHS of Eq. (1.1) can be ensured by means of the imposing the constraint

$$\dot{\lambda}(t_0)^2 = 1. \quad (3.1)$$

However, then, when trying to construct a solution to Eq. (1.1) in frameworks of the initial value problem (Cauchy problem), and having assigned zero value to the unknown function  $\lambda(t)$  at  $t_0$ , the derivative  $\dot{\lambda}(t)$  cannot be freely specified thereat as the standard theory of second order differential equations assumes. This means the failure of the approach based on the classical treatment of the Cauchy problem when it is posed at roots (if there are any) of smooth solutions to Eq. (1.1). Speaking informally, one is not able to construct its solution in a standard way merely requiring of  $\lambda(t_0)$  to be equal to zero.

To make the picture somewhat more clear, let us pass from the second order equation (1.1) to the equivalent system of the first order equations (2.3), (2.4). Supposing that a smooth solution  $\lambda(t)$  vanishing at  $t = t_0$  (and then obeying the restriction (3.1)) still exists, it proves to be crucial to have an understanding of the regularity properties of the function (2.5). The first evident observation is as follows.

**Proposition 3.1.** *If  $\dot{\lambda}(t_0) \neq \epsilon$  at a root  $t_0$  of solution  $\lambda(t)$  to Eq. (1.1) or, that is the same, if  $\dot{\lambda}(t_0) = -\epsilon$ , then the function  $\mu(t)$  obeying Eq. (2.5) possesses the pole of the second order at  $t = t_0$  and hence is unbounded on any its neighborhood.*

We would like, however, to have a regular ‘conjugate momentum’  $\mu$  at our disposal. To that end, we may require of the selection among the two available systems (2.3), (2.4) distinguished by the values  $+1$  and  $-1$  of the parameter  $\epsilon$  to be complementary to the case leading to a priori irregularity of the RHS of Eq. (2.5). In other words, considering a root of a regular solution  $\lambda(t)$  to Eq. (1.1) situated at  $t = t_0$  (assuming that it exists), we assign the value

$$\epsilon = \dot{\lambda}(t_0) \tag{3.2}$$

to the earlier arbitrary ‘binary switch’  $\epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}$ . Notice that this is always possible (i.e. consistent with Eq. (2.2)) in view of Eq. (3.1). Although it is not obvious at once, we will show that under this choice of the value of  $\epsilon$  the function  $\mu(t)$  turns out to be regular at  $t = t_0$ .

Let us consider the case of generic values of constant parameters in Eq. (1.1) and suppose there exists its solution vanishing at some  $t = t_0 \neq 0$  and analytic thereat. Then there exists a positive integer  $k$  and a function  $\lambda_*(t)$  analytic and non-zero at  $t_0$  such that

$$\lambda(t) = (t - t_0)^k \lambda_*(t). \tag{3.3}$$

Substituting this into Eq. (1.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \begin{array}{l} \lambda(-\ddot{\lambda} + \text{RHS}[\text{Eq.}(1.1)]) \equiv 1 - (t/t_0)(t - t_0)^{2(k-1)} k \lambda_*^2 \\ \lambda \Leftarrow (t - t_0)^k \lambda_*(t) \end{array} \right] & \tag{3.4} \\ & - (t - t_0)^k \chi_0 \lambda_* / t \\ & + (t - t_0)^{2k} (\lambda_*(\dot{\lambda}_*/t + \ddot{\lambda}_*) - \dot{\lambda}_*^2) \\ & + (t - t_0)^{3k} \chi_\infty \lambda_*^3 / t^2 - (t - t_0)^{4k} \lambda_*^4 / t^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{RHS}[\dots]$  stands for the right hand side expression of the equation referred to in the square brackets. If the function (3.3) verifies Eq. (1.1) then the left hand side of (3.4) vanishes identically at least in some vicinity of the point  $t = t_0$ . This makes the right hand side to vanish therein as well. Notice that since the integer  $k \geq 1$  is positive the terms on the right in the second, third, and fourth lines necessarily vanish at  $t_0$ . On the other hand, in order to compensate the unit in the first line and yield finally the null sum, the second term on the right must (being the only one which can) not vanish thereat. Obviously, this is only possible if the positive integer  $k = 1$ . We see therefore from (3.3) that all the non-zero

$(t_0 \neq 0)$  roots of an analytic solution to Eq. (1.1), if there are any, are simple. It is also worth mentioning that the same conclusion had followed already from Eq. (3.1).

Now we are endowed with a more definite version of Eq. (3.3)

$$\lambda(t) = (t - t_0) \lambda^I(t) \quad (3.5)$$

in which the function  $\lambda^I(t)$  is analytic and  $\lambda^I(t_0) \neq 0$ . Then, instead of (3.4), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \begin{array}{l} \lambda(-\ddot{\lambda} + \text{RHS}[\text{Eq.}(1.1)]) \\ \lambda \Leftarrow (t - t_0) \lambda^I(t) \end{array} \right] &\equiv 1 - (t/t_0)^2 \lambda^{I2} & (3.6) \\ &+ (t - t_0)^2 (\lambda^I \ddot{\lambda}^I + \dot{\lambda}^I/t) - \dot{\lambda}^{I2} \\ &- (t - t_0)^4 \lambda^{I4}/t^2 + (t - t_0)^3 \chi_\infty \lambda^{I3}/t^2 \\ &- (t - t_0) t_0 \lambda^{I2}/t^2 - (t - t_0) \chi_0 \lambda^I/t. \end{aligned}$$

If Eq. (1.1) is fulfilled then the left hand side is the identically zero function. To obtain zero on the right as  $t \rightarrow t_0 \neq 0$ , the constraint

$$\lambda^I(t_0)^2 = 1$$

must be fulfilled, evidently. But this is equivalent to Eq. (3.1) and we obtain therefore the following equivalent

$$\epsilon = \lambda^I(t_0) (= \dot{\lambda}(t_0)) \quad (3.7)$$

to Eq. (3.2). We will assume below that it is always fulfilled.

Notice that if  $\lambda^I(t)$  is an arbitrary function satisfying (3.7) and  $\epsilon^2 = 1$  then the right hand side of Eq. (3.6) behaves like  $O(t - t_0)$  as  $t \rightarrow t_0$ . At the same time, its left hand side contains the factor of  $\lambda = O(t - t_0)$  of analogous behavior near  $t_0$ . Hence even if  $\lambda(t)$  is distinct from solutions to Eq. (1.1) near its simple root the value of the expression of (1.1) behaves like  $O(1)$  (i.e. remains bounded).

Let us now consider the form of the formula (2.5) arising in case of fulfillment of Eq. (3.5). Upon elimination of denominators, we obtain

$$2(t - t_0)^2 \lambda^{I2} \mu = t_0 \lambda^I - \epsilon t + (t - t_0)(t \dot{\lambda}^I + \epsilon \chi_0 \lambda^I) + (t - t_0)^2 \lambda^{I2}. \quad (3.8)$$

If  $\mu(t)$  is bounded in vicinity of  $t_0$  then the left hand side vanishes at  $t = t_0$ . In accordance with (3.7) the right hand side does the same but the rate of convergence to zero still has to be inspected (it must be not less than two).

Accordingly, let us work on a more detailed representation of the the solution to Eq. (1.1) expanding it as follows

$$\lambda(t) = (t - t_0) \epsilon + (t - t_0)^2 \lambda^{II} + (t - t_0)^3 \lambda^{III}(t). \quad (3.9)$$

Here  $\lambda^{II}$  is some constant and the function  $\lambda^{III}(t)$  is analytic. Eq. (3.9) agrees with Eq. (3.5) and represents an analytic function with simple root at  $t_0$ .

The result of substitution of the ansatz (3.9) into Eq. (1.1) is a fairly bulky expression. We do not display it here but consider only its leading (minimal

order in  $t - t_0$ ) contribution. In particular, one can show that for  $\lambda$  admitting expansion (3.9) it holds

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0} t^2 (t_0(t - t_0))^{-1} \left[ \lambda(-\ddot{\lambda} + \text{RHS}[\text{Eq.}(1.1)]) \Big|_{\lambda \Leftarrow \text{RHS}[\text{Eq.}(3.9)]} \right] = -\epsilon(\chi_0 - \epsilon + 2t_0 \lambda^{II}). \quad (3.10)$$

We see that it is possible to eliminate this (currently of the leading order) ‘obstruction’ to fulfilling of Eq. (1.1) assigning  $\lambda^{II} = \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon - \chi_0)/t_0$  in which case Eq. (3.9) takes the form

$$\lambda(t) = (t - t_0)\epsilon + \frac{1}{2}(t - t_0)^2(\epsilon - \chi_0)/t_0 + (t - t_0)^3 \lambda^{III}(t). \quad (3.11)$$

For such  $\lambda$  Eq. (3.10) reduces to indication of the equality of zeros. As to Eq. (1.1), the substitution of the expansion with ‘correct’ second order contribution, i.e. addition of a *single* term to decomposition of the unknown function, makes the order of its residual discrepancy *two* degrees higher<sup>1</sup> at once. Its leading term can be obtained from the limit

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0} (t - t_0)^{-2} \left[ (-\ddot{\lambda} + \text{RHS}[\text{Eq.}(1.1)]) \Big|_{\lambda \Leftarrow \text{RHS}[\text{Eq.}(3.11)]} \right] = \chi_\infty/t_0^2 + (\epsilon \chi_0 + 2)\lambda^{III}(t_0)/t_0 + 4\dot{\lambda}^{III}(t_0).$$

This quantity is well defined and, generally speaking, non-zero.

Let us examine now the regularity of the function  $\mu$  in case of  $\lambda$  admitting representation of the form (3.11). Substituting the latter into Eq. (2.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(t) = 2^{-1} & (\epsilon t_0 + \delta t (\epsilon - \chi_0)/2 + \delta t^2 t_0 \lambda^{III}(t))^{-2} \times \\ & \left( t_0 (t_0 + \epsilon(1 - \chi_0^2)/2 + 3t_0^2 \lambda^{III}(t)) \right. \\ & + \delta t \epsilon t_0 ((\epsilon - \chi_0) + (2\epsilon + \chi_0) t_0 \lambda^{III}(t) + \epsilon t_0^2 \dot{\lambda}^{III}(t)) \\ & + \delta t^2 ((\epsilon - \chi_0)^2/4 + t_0^2 (2\epsilon \lambda^{III}(t) + \dot{\lambda}^{III}(t))) \\ & \left. + \delta t^3 t_0 ((\epsilon - \chi_0) + \delta t t_0 \lambda^{III}(t)) \lambda^{III}(t) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where  $\delta t = t - t_0$ .

In some vicinity of the point  $t = t_0$  (to be more exact, as long as the right hand side denominator situated in the first line of (3.12) is non-zero) this function is obviously as regular as the function  $\dot{\lambda}^{III}(t)$ .

Let us notice that linear and quadratic contributions to the analytic solution  $\lambda(t)$  to Eq. (1.1), which is represented by Eq. (3.11), turn out to be fully determined by the constant parameters specifying the equation instance itself. In other words, they are not related to any ‘initial data’ which are expected to be associated with concrete solutions to ordinary differential equations (apart from the very existence of regular zero at  $t = t_0$  and the sign of the first derivative).

---

<sup>1</sup>This point seems to be the principal one for identification of the way of appropriate posing of the initial value problem at a root of third Painlevé transcendent. However, its origin has not been clarified yet.

Indeed, their computation does not reveal any point allowing appearance of additional free parameters.

Such a uniqueness of coefficients characterizing solutions does not take place for terms of higher orders in which an additional “degree of freedom” proves to appear. To demonstrate how it works, let us some more develop the decomposition (3.11) adding an additional term of the next order. Thus let us set

$$\lambda(t) = (t - t_0)\epsilon + \frac{1}{2}(t - t_0)^2(\epsilon - \chi_0)/t_0 + (t - t_0)^3\lambda^{III} + (t - t_0)^4\lambda^V(t) \quad (3.13)$$

for some constant  $\lambda^{III}$  (equal to the particular value  $\lambda^{III}(t_0)$  of the function  $\lambda^{III}(t)$  considered before) and some new analytic function  $\lambda^V(t)$ . This is still a particularization of (3.9) and for such  $\lambda$  the expression of Eq. (1.1) also goes to zero as  $t \rightarrow t_0$ . Then it holds

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0} \left( (t - t_0)t_0 \right)^{-2} t^2 \left[ \begin{array}{l} -\ddot{\lambda} + \text{RHS}[\text{Eq.}(1.1)] \\ \lambda \Leftarrow \text{RHS}[\text{Eq.}(3.13)] \end{array} \right] = \chi_\infty/t_0^2 + (\epsilon\chi_0 + 2)\lambda^{III}/t_0 + 4\lambda^V(t_0). \quad (3.14)$$

We may require the vanishing of the right hand side of this equality that would further increase the rate of the vanishing of the expression of Eq. (1.1) taking place as  $t \rightarrow t_0$  (i.e., heuristically, increase the accuracy of approximating of the solution  $\lambda$  by a truncated power series). However, as opposed to the preceding constraints each fixing a single series coefficient, the *two* currently uncertain quantities turn out to be now involved. Then, in particular, the condition of the vanishing of (3.14) is equivalent to the equation

$$\lambda^V(t_0) = -\frac{1}{4}(\chi_\infty/t_0 + (\epsilon\chi_0 + 2)\lambda^{III})/t_0 \quad (3.15)$$

fixing “the initial value” of the function  $\lambda^V$  but still leaving indefinite (freely specifiable) the constant  $\lambda^{III}$  which affects, among the others, the above initial value of  $\lambda^V$ .

Proceeding in the same way, we may further set

$$\lambda^V(t) = -\frac{1}{4}(\chi_\infty/t_0 + (\epsilon\chi_0 + 2)\lambda^{III})/t_0 + (t - t_0)\lambda^V(t) \quad (3.16)$$

introducing yet another analytic function  $\lambda^V$ . Eq. (3.14) is then fulfilled and its role passes to the following identity

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0} t^2 (t - t_0)^{-3} \left[ \begin{array}{l} -\ddot{\lambda} + \text{RHS}[\text{Eq.}(1.1)] \\ \lambda \Leftarrow \langle \dots \rangle \end{array} \right] \equiv 10t_0^2\lambda^V(t_0) - \epsilon - \frac{3}{2}(\epsilon\chi_0 + 1)/t_0\chi_\infty - \frac{1}{2}(5\epsilon\chi_0 + 7)\lambda^{III} - 3\epsilon t_0^2(\lambda^{III})^2.$$

where ‘ $\langle \dots \rangle$ ’ stands for the right hand side of Eq. (3.13) in which  $\lambda^V(t)$  is replaced by the right hand side of Eq. (3.16).

As compared to Eq. (3.14), the order of smallness of the residual discrepancy characterising fulfillment of Eq. (1.1) has here been incremented by the unit. As above, we may make it greater by means of the appropriate fixing of  $\lambda^V(t_0)$  whose value then becomes a definite (polynomial) function of the constant parameter



$\lambda^{III}$ , still remaining unrestricted. This procedure can be continued by means of the increasing of the number of terms of the series explicitly involved. At each step a new indefinite coefficient appears and it is restricted by (and can be determined from) a single constraint which claims the vanishing of the corresponding (currently leading) contribution to the difference of the left and right sides of Eq. (1.1). At the same time no restriction to the constant  $\lambda^{III}$  arises and it continues to play role of a free parameter identifying the solution to be constructed.

#### 4. SYSTEMS OF DIFFERENTIAL AND INTEGRAL EQUATIONS GOVERNING THIRD PAINLEVÉ' TRANSCENDENT NEAR ITS ROOT

We will not directly apply here infinite power series in our considerations of roots of third Painlevé' transcendents. It is the representation of a solution to Eq. (1.1) consisting of three terms of gradual orders in the deviation of argument from the root, i.e. the one defined by the formula (3.11), which will be used. Thus the basic unknown function of the problem in our interpretation is  $\lambda^{III}(t)$  assumed to be regular (sufficiently smooth or analytic). It proves also to be convenient to consider it in pair with the subsidiary function  $\mu(t)$  introduced above. Accordingly, we have to single out the coupled differential equations of the first order for functions  $\lambda^{III}$  and  $\mu$ .

The following simple statement is verified by straightforward computation.

**Proposition 4.1.** *If a solution  $\lambda(t)$  to Eq. (1.1) is sufficiently smooth (in particular, analytic) at the point  $t = t_0 \neq 0$  where  $\lambda(t_0) = 0$  then Eq. (1.1) is equivalent to the following system of the first order ordinary differential equations*

$$t \dot{\lambda}^{III}(t) = W_\lambda[\lambda^{III}, \mu](t - t_0, t), \quad (4.1)$$

$$t \dot{\mu}(t) = W_\mu[\lambda^{III}, \mu](t - t_0, t), \quad (4.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\delta t, t) = & \delta t^{-1} (\epsilon (\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2\mu(t) - 3t_0 \lambda(t)) \\ & + t_0^{-1} (1 - \epsilon \chi_0) (2\mu(t) - 1) - (2 + \epsilon \chi_0) \lambda(t) \\ & + \delta t (2\mu(t) - 1) \left( 2\epsilon \lambda(t) + ((\epsilon - \chi_0)/(2t_0) + \delta t \lambda(t))^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} W_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\delta t, t) = & -\frac{1}{2} (\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1) - (1 - \epsilon \chi_0) \mu(t) \\ & - 2\delta t (\mu(t) - 1) \mu(t) \left( \epsilon + \delta t (\epsilon - \chi_0)/(2t_0) + \delta t^2 \lambda(t) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

provided the constraint  $\epsilon^2 = 1$  is fulfilled.

The relation between the functions  $\lambda(t)$  and  $\lambda^{III}(t)$  is described by Eq. (3.11).

It has to be mentioned that the usage of brackets of both types, square and round, in the records of  $W$ -functions in the above formulas aims to remind a specialty of the meaning of symbols they enclose, that is, either each of the latter refer to a function (for square brackets) or represents an "ordinary" argument (for round ones) such as a free variable which can also be replaced by some combined



expression or assume a numerical value. Such replacements are not allowed for symbolic arguments singled out by square brackets.

It is worth noting that the both above equations would belong to the family of Riccati equations, provided the corresponding ‘complementary’ unknown. i.e.  $\mu$  in Eq. (4.1) and  $\lambda^{III}$  in Eq. (4.2), is regarded as a known function. Since they are actually unknowns to be found, there are no genuine Riccati equations here but, anyway, one still may name the system of Eq.s (4.1), (4.2) “the coupled Riccati equations”. It is also of interest to mention that their right hand sides are linear in a ‘complementary’ unknown.

It is important to keep in mind that the function  $W_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](t - t_0, t)$  can (and usually does) diverge as  $t \rightarrow t_0$ . This complication, directly concerning Eq. (4.1), embodies the peculiarity of the problem of constructing solutions to Eq. (1.1) vanishing for a given value of the free variable.

The way to overcome the above obstacle is as follows: it is evident that in case of smooth  $\lambda^{III}$  and  $\mu$  the right hand side of Eq. (4.1) is bounded as  $t \rightarrow t_0$  if and only if

$$0 = \epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2\mu(t_0) - 3t_0 \lambda^{III}(t_0). \quad (4.5)$$

The equations (4.1), (4.2), (4.5) in conjunction with the requirement of regularity of  $\lambda^{III}(t)$  and  $\mu(t)$  at  $t = t_0$  ensure us the basic point of the posing of the problem of existence of regular roots of solutions to Eq. (1.1).

It is well known that, constructing solutions to generic differential equations, it is usually more efficient to consider their representations in the form of integral equations. In our case the mentioned representation can be realized in the form of a pair of the following coupled ones

$$\lambda(t) = -t_0^{-1}(t - t_0)\lambda(t) + t_0^{-1} \int_0^1 d\sigma \sigma^2 \Omega_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, t - t_0), \quad (4.6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(t) = & \frac{1}{2}(1 - \epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) + 3t_0 \lambda(t_0)) \\ & + (t - t_0) t_0^{-1} \left( -\frac{1}{2}(\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1) - \mu(t) \right. \\ & \left. + \int_0^1 d\sigma \Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, t - t_0) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

The kernel functions  $\Omega_\lambda, \Omega_\mu$  here involved are defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t) = & \epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2\mu(\tau) \\ & - \delta t \epsilon \sigma \left( (\chi_0 - 2\epsilon)\lambda(\tau) + t_0^{-1}(\chi_0 - \epsilon)(2\mu(\tau) - 1) \right) \\ & + \delta t^2 \sigma^2 (2\mu(\tau) - 1) \times \\ & \left( 2\epsilon \lambda(\tau) + ((2t_0)^{-1}(\chi_0 - \epsilon) - \delta t \sigma \lambda(\tau))^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t) = & \mu(\tau) \left( \epsilon \chi_0 + 2\delta t \sigma (1 - \mu(\tau)) \times \right. \\ & \left. (\epsilon - \delta t \sigma (\chi_0 - \epsilon) + \delta t^2 \sigma^2 \lambda(\tau)) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Here the symbol  $\tau$  has to be replaced by the expression  $t_0 + \delta t \sigma$  (representing  $t$  shifted towards  $t_0$ , provided  $\delta t = t - t_0$  and  $0 < \sigma < 1$ ) when expanding  $\Omega_\lambda$  and  $\Omega_\mu$  definitions including their development in formulas (4.6), (4.7).

Let us note that the above  $\Omega$ -functions are polynomial in  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ , the corresponding degrees amounting to either 1 or 2. Besides, as opposed to  $W$ -functions involved in the differential equations (more exactly, this concerns only  $W_\lambda$  which is able to diverge as  $\delta t \rightarrow 0$ ),  $\Omega$ -functions are regular (in particular, bounded) everywhere including the section  $t = t_0$  on which  $\delta t = 0$ . In particular, it is allowed to simply replace  $t \Leftarrow t_0$  within Eq.s (4.6) and (4.7). Then the latter reduces, obviously, to the equality  $\mu(t_0) = (1 - \epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) + 3t_0\lambda(t_0))/2$  (cf Eq. (4.5)) while the former yields an equivalent result.

The important relation which has to be proven first is the equivalence of representations of the problem we consider in terms of differential and integral equations (the latter have not been endowed with a proper substantiation yet). The following assertion expresses the most easily provable relation.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let smooth functions  $\lambda(t)$  and  $\mu(t)$  fulfill the differential equations*

$$t \dot{\lambda}(t) = W_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](t - t_0, t) \quad (4.10)$$

$$t \dot{\mu}(t) = W_\mu[\lambda, \mu](t - t_0, t), \quad (4.11)$$

in vicinity of the point  $t = t_0$ . Then

$$2\mu(t_0) = 1 + \epsilon(1 - \chi_0^2)/(2t_0) + 3t_0\lambda(t_0) \quad (4.12)$$

and the integral equations (4.6), (4.7) are also fulfilled.

*Proof.* First of all, Eq. (4.12) is derived in the same way as the equivalent Eq. (4.5): it must be fulfilled because otherwise the right hand side of Eq. (4.10) would be unbounded in vicinity of  $t = t_0$  (see definition (4.3) of the function  $W_\lambda$ ) that would contradict the regularity (in particular, continuity) of  $\lambda(t)$ .

Next, let us consider the following two identities

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma^3 \lambda(\tau) &\equiv - \frac{\delta t}{t_0} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma^4 \lambda(\tau) \right) + t_0^{-1} \sigma^2 \Omega_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t) \\ &+ t_0^{-1} \delta t \sigma^3 \left( \tau \dot{\lambda}(\tau) - W_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\delta t \sigma, \tau) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \mu(\tau) &\equiv \frac{\delta t}{t_0} \left( - \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma \left( \frac{1}{2}(\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1) + \mu(\tau) \right) \right) + \Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t) \right. \\ &\left. + \left( \tau \dot{\mu}(\tau) - W_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\delta t \sigma, \tau) \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

in which the symbol  $\tau$  plays role of an abbreviation introduced for convenience and shortening of records. Namely, it has to be everywhere replaced by  $t_0 + \sigma \delta t$ .

Straightforward computation shows that the above equalities are valid for arbitrary smooth functions  $\lambda, \mu$ .

Notice that the differences in parentheses in the last lines of the both above equalities coincide with the differences of the left and right sides of Eq.s (4.10) and (4.11), respectively, modified by the replacements of the variable  $t$  by the symbol  $\tau$  encoding the shifted argument equal to  $t_0 + \delta t \sigma$  (that also implies the concurrent replacement  $\delta t \Leftarrow \delta t \sigma$  observed in first arguments within parentheses of the functions  $\Omega_\lambda$  and  $\Omega_\mu$ ). Hence if the equations (4.10),(4.11) are fulfilled then the last (second) lines in the both formulas (4.13) and (4.14) can be discarded.

Keeping this simplification in mind, let us carry out everywhere the replacements  $\delta t \Leftarrow t - t_0$  and integrate the resulting equalities with respect to the variable  $\sigma$  through the unit segment  $(0, 1)$ . Obviously, the integrals of the  $\sigma$ -derivatives on the left amount to  $\lambda(t)$  and  $\mu(t) - \mu(t_0)$ , respectively. The first summands on the right, containing the operator  $-(\delta t/t_0)(\partial/\partial\sigma)$ , are reduced in a similar way yielding explicit expressions. Finally, the terms with integrals of  $\Omega_\lambda$  and  $\Omega_\mu$  are kept unchanged. Then it is easy to see that the result of the above transformations is just the equations (4.6), (4.7), provided Eq. (4.12) is taken into account. The lemma is proven.  $\square$

Having derived integral equations from the differential ones, we need to carry out the inverse transition. For the function  $\mu$  such a relation is easily obtainable.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let smooth functions  $\lambda(t)$  and  $\mu(t)$  obey Eq. (4.7) in vicinity of  $t = t_0 \neq 0$ . Then Eq. (4.11) and the constraint (4.12) ('the initial condition' for its solutions) are also fulfilled.*

It is of interest to mention that the second integral equation (4.6) is not even touched here.

*Proof.* The following identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial\sigma} \sigma \left( \tau \dot{\mu}(\tau) - W_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\sigma \delta t, \tau) \right) \equiv \\ & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial\sigma} (\tau \mu(\tau) + \sigma \delta t (\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1)/2) \right] - \delta t \Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t) \right) \quad (4.15) \\ & \text{assuming replacements } \tau \Leftarrow t_0 + (t - t_0)\sigma, \delta t \Leftarrow t - t_0, \end{aligned}$$

holds true for arbitrary smooth functions  $\lambda(t), \mu(t)$ .

Let us integrate (4.15) with respect to the variable  $\sigma$  through the segment  $(0, 1)$ . On the right, having interchanged the positions of the operator  $\partial/\partial t$  and the integral, we obtain the derivative of the difference of the left and right sides of Eq. (4.7) times  $t_0$ . It vanishes since the latter equation is fulfilled in accordance with lemma condition leading to the vanishing of the whole result (i.e. the integrated right hand side).

On the other hand, the integral of the left hand side is obviously equal just to the difference of the left and right sides of Eq. (4.11), as it stands. This equation is, therefore, also fulfilled.

The fulfillment of Eq. (4.12) follows immediately from the same equation (4.7); it is sufficient to set  $t = t_0$  therein.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.4.** *If smooth functions  $\lambda(t)$  and  $\mu(t)$  obey Eq. (4.7) then the ratio*

$$\frac{\epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2\mu(t) - 3t_0\lambda(t)}{t - t_0} \quad (4.16)$$

*is regular everywhere within their common domain including  $t = t_0$ .*

Indeed, then, in accordance with lemma, Eq. (4.12) holds true implying the vanishing of the numerator in the above fraction as  $t \rightarrow t_0$ . This suffices for its continuity, at least. It is also obvious that if the degree of smoothness of  $\lambda(t)$  and  $\mu(t)$  is finite and greater than the unity then the fraction is also smooth of the smoothness degree, at  $t_0$ , no more than one unit less. Moreover, we will show below that the smoothness does not actually degrade here at all (corollary 4.8), it is thus of infinite order.

The proof of a statement, establishing fulfillment of the differential equation (4.10) as implication of fulfillment of the integral equations, requires some preliminary considerations.

First of all, let us assume the continuous functions  $\lambda(t), \mu(t)$  to be given and introduce the function

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(t) = & -t_0^{-1}((\chi_\infty + \epsilon\chi_0 - 1)/4 + 2\mu(t) - 3t_0\lambda(t)) \\ & - t_0^{-1} \int_0^1 d\sigma \sigma^3 \Omega_\xi[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, t - t_0), \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

where the integral transformation kernel  $\Omega_\xi$  is defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_\xi[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t) = & \epsilon(3(\chi_0 - \epsilon) - 8\chi_0\mu(\tau) - 3(\chi_0 - 2\epsilon)t_0\lambda(\tau)) \\ & + 3\delta t \sigma t_0(2\mu(\tau) - 1) \left( 2\epsilon\lambda(\tau) + ((\chi_0 - \epsilon)/(2t_0) - \delta t \sigma \lambda(\tau))^2 \right) \\ & + 4\delta t \sigma (\mu(\tau) - 1) \mu(\tau) \left( \epsilon - \delta t \sigma (\chi_0 - \epsilon)/(2t_0) + \epsilon \delta t^2 \sigma^2 \lambda(\tau) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

in which  $\tau$  is assumed to be replaced by  $t_0 + (t - t_0)\sigma$ .

One can see that it is quadratic in both  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ . The regularity (e.g. smoothness) of  $\xi$  is obviously not weaker than the ones of the functions  $\lambda, \mu$ .

Next, let us assume that the integral equations (4.6), (4.7) are fulfilled. Then the operator  $\int_0^1 d\sigma \times$  which can be named ‘the  $\sigma$ -averaging’ when applied to the

following three expressions

$$\bullet - \frac{\delta t}{t_0} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma^4 \lambda(\tau) \right) + \frac{\sigma^2}{t_0} \Omega_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t), \quad (4.19)$$

$$\bullet \frac{\delta t}{t_0} \left( - \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma ((\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1)/2 + \mu(\tau)) \right) + \Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t) \right), \quad (4.20)$$

$$\bullet - \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \frac{\sigma^4}{t_0} ((\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1)/4 + 2\mu(\tau) - 3t_0 \lambda(\tau)) \right) - \frac{\sigma^3}{t_0} \Omega_\xi[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t), \quad (4.21)$$

in which the replacements  $\tau \Leftarrow t_0 + (t - t_0)\sigma$ ,  $\delta t \Leftarrow t - t_0$  are assumed,

yields the values

- $\lambda(t)$ ,
- $\mu(t) - \mu(t_0)$ ,
- $\xi(t)$ ,

respectively.

Indeed, the integrating of the expression (4.19) produces the right hand side of Eq. (4.6) (assumed to be fulfilled) and  $\lambda(t)$  is its left hand side equal, finally, to the value of the integral. Integrating the expression (4.20), we obtain the right hand side of Eq. (4.7) without the first summand independent of  $t$  and equal just to  $\mu(t_0)$ . This is equal to the left hand side minus a constant such that for  $t = t_0$  the result vanishes, i.e. to the difference given above. Besides, the subtrahend is here expressed by the formula (4.12) as the consequence of the same equation (4.7). Lastly, the integral of the expression (4.21) obviously coincides with the right hand side of the definition (4.17) of the function  $\xi(t)$ .

Let us introduce now the following linear combination of the above three expressions:

$$\mathcal{V} = -3t_0 \text{Expr.}(4.19) + 2 \text{Expr.}(4.20) - (t - t_0) \text{Expr.}(4.21). \quad (4.22)$$

The aforementioned observations concerning their  $\sigma$ -averaging directly imply the following

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let the integral equations (4.6) and (4.7) be fulfilled. Then*

$$\int_0^1 \mathcal{V} d\sigma = -3t_0 \lambda(t) + 2\mu(t) - 2\mu(t_0) - (t - t_0)\xi(t). \quad (4.23)$$

On the other hand, it should be noted that Eq. (4.22) is rather an indication of the origin of the expression  $\mathcal{V}$ . But as long as one concerns its optimal form (an explicit definition), the expanding of the expressions defining the functions  $\Omega_\lambda, \Omega_\nu, \Omega_\xi$  in the contributions (4.19)-(4.21) and the appropriate reduction of the resulting sum aggregated in Eq. (4.22) have to be carried out. In this way it can

be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V} = & -\frac{t-t_0}{4t_0} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma \left( 3(\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1) + (1 - \sigma^3)((\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1) + 8\mu(\tau)) \right) \right) \\ & - 3\sigma^2 \left( \epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2t_0^{-1} \tau \mu(\tau) \right) \\ & + 2(1 - \sigma^3)t_0^{-1}(t - t_0) \Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, t - t_0), \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

where the replacement  $\tau \Leftarrow t_0 + (t - t_0)\sigma$  is assumed.

We can use this representation in the proof of the following

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let the functions  $\lambda(t), \mu(t)$  be smooth and the integral equation (4.7) be fulfilled in some vicinity of  $t = t_0 \neq 0$ . Then the integral  $\int_0^1 \mathcal{V} d\sigma$  ( $\sigma$ -average of  $\mathcal{V}$ ) does not depend on  $t$ .*

*Proof.* The lemma assertion is equivalent to the claim of the vanishing of  $t$ -derivative of the value of the integral in question. In turn, this is equivalent to the vanishing of the ‘ $\sigma$ -averaging’  $\int_0^1 d\sigma \times$  of the  $t$ -derivative of the subintegral expression. One may get the latter in the form of the expression (4.24). The necessary rearrangement of its  $t$ -derivative is ensured by the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( -\frac{t-t_0}{4t_0} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma \left( 3(\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1) + (1 - \sigma^3)((\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1) + 8\mu(\tau)) \right) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - 3\sigma^2 \left( \epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2t_0^{-1} \tau \mu(\tau) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 2(1 - \sigma^3)t_0^{-1}(t - t_0) \Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, t - t_0) \right) \\ \equiv & - \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} 2(1 - \sigma^3) \frac{t-t_0}{t_0} (\tau \dot{\mu}(\tau) - W_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\tau - t_0, \tau)) \right) \\ & + \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} 2(1 - \sigma^3) \sigma \dot{\mu}(\tau) \right) \text{ assuming the replacement } \tau \Leftarrow t_0 + (t - t_0)\sigma, \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

verifiable by straightforward computation and taking place for arbitrary smooth functions  $\lambda, \mu$ . It solves the problem, in fact.

Indeed,  $\sigma$ -average of the second summand on the right obviously vanishes (since the product  $\sigma$ -derivative acts to vanishes at the boundary points  $\sigma = 0$  and  $\sigma = 1$  of the integration interval). In the first summand, the difference  $\tau \dot{\mu} - W_\mu$  within the last parentheses coincides with the difference of the left and right sizes of the second of Eq.s (4.2) evaluated at the point  $\tau = t_0 + (t - t_0)\sigma$  instead of the original  $t$  (i.e. at a point of the segment connecting  $t_0$  and  $t$ ). But in accordance with lemma 4.3 Eq. (4.2) is fulfilled in vicinity of  $t_0$  as a consequence of fulfillment of the integral equation (4.7) assumed by the lemma conditions. Thus the first summand on the right in Eq. (4.25) represents the derivative of the identical zero function and vanishes even point-wise. In total,  $\sigma$ -average of the right hand side of (4.25) proves to be equal to zero. The lemma is thus proven.  $\square$

Although the integral from the lemma 4.6 does not depend on  $t$  it still is a non-trivial function of the constant parameters. It can be found by means of

computation for any particular value of  $t$  such that an explicit result can be deduced. The point distinguished in this respect is, of course,  $t = t_0$ . Indeed, one easily finds that  $\left[ \mathcal{V} = -3\sigma^2(\epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2\mu(t_0)) \right]_{t \Leftarrow t_0}$  in which case the explicit integrating is quite feasible. We obtain therefore the following

**Corollary 4.7.** *Under conditions of the proposition (4.5) and the lemma 4.6 it holds*

$$\int_0^1 \mathcal{V} d\sigma = -(\epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2\mu(t_0)). \quad (4.26)$$

Now, collating Eq.s (4.26) and (4.23), we also obtain that

$$0 = \epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2\mu(t) - 3t_0 \lambda(t) - (t - t_0)\xi(t). \quad (4.27)$$

**Corollary 4.8.** *Under conditions of the proposition (4.5) and the lemma 4.6 the fraction (4.16) is equal to  $\xi(t)$ , i.e. it can be represented by the right hand side of Eq. (4.17). As a consequence, it possesses the same regularity properties (continuity and smoothness) as the functions  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ , at least, everywhere including the point  $t = t_0$ .*

Regularity of the expression (4.16) is important because it is just the first summand in the right hand side  $W_\lambda$  of the equation (4.10) which is the only one able to be singular at the point  $t = t_0$ . The corollary says that there is actually no irregularity thereat, provided the functions  $\lambda, \mu$  are smooth and the integral equation (4.7) is fulfilled. It is worth noting that the coupled integral equation (4.6) does not participate in this relation.

Now let us consider the following identity

$$\begin{aligned} & 3\sigma^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma (\tau \dot{\lambda}(\tau) - W_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\tau - t_0, \tau)) \equiv \\ & - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( (t - t_0) \left( \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma^4 (\xi(\tau) + t_0^{-1} (\frac{1}{4}(\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1) + 2\mu(\tau) - 3t_0 \lambda(\tau))) \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + t_0^{-1} \sigma^3 \Omega_\xi[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, t - t_0) \right) \right) \\ & - 2\sigma^3 t_0^{-1} (t - t_0) (\tau \dot{\mu}(\tau) - W_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\tau - t_0, \tau)) \\ & + \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma^3 (\epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2\mu(\tau) - 3t_0 \lambda(\tau) - (t - t_0)\sigma \xi(\tau)) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

assuming the replacement  $\tau \Leftarrow t_0 + \sigma(t - t_0)$ .

As it can be verified by straightforward computation it holds for arbitrary smooth functions  $\lambda, \mu, \xi$ . In particular case of fulfillment of the integral equations (4.6) and (4.7) the lemma (4.3) ensures fulfillment of Eq. (4.11) implying point-wise vanishing of the last but one line therein. Additionally, if  $\xi$  obeys Eq. (4.27) then the last line of Eq. (4.28) vanishes point-wise as well. We are left therefore with the version of the equality (4.28) retaining only its three topmost lines.



Now let us apply to it the linear differential operator  $(\partial/\partial t)(t - t_0)^4 \times \dots$  and, afterwards, the  $\sigma$ -averaging  $\int_0^1 d\sigma \times \dots$ . We claim that the identical zero function arises on the right.

To that end, let us act by the operator  $\int_0^1 d\sigma (\partial/\partial t)(t - t_0)^4 (\partial/\partial t)(t - t_0) \times \dots$  to the expression in large parentheses situated in the second and third lines in Eq.(4.28) (as it has been noted, the next two lines are point-wise null). Obviously, the integral and  $t$ -derivative commute (all the functions here involved are sufficiently smooth) and we may use the equivalent operator  $(\partial/\partial t)(t - t_0)^4 (\partial/\partial t)(t - t_0) \int_0^1 d\sigma \times \dots$ . For it, the identical zero arises already at the step of integrating. Indeed, applying it, the derivative  $\partial/\partial \sigma$  in the second line is annihilated and the  $\sigma$ -averaging reduces to the replacements  $\sigma \Leftarrow 1, \tau \Leftarrow t$ . The result of the  $\sigma$ -averaging of the contribution from the third line is kept unchanged. The subsequent comparison of what was obtained with the equality (definition) (4.17) shows that the former coincides with the difference of the left and right sides of the latter. Hence they are equal to zero. This is also the result of subsequent application of the differential operator given above.

Thus we have shown that under the conditions assumed the application of the operator  $\int_0^1 d\sigma (\partial/\partial t)(t - t_0)^4 \times \dots$  to the right hand side of the equality (4.28) yields the identically zero function. The same is to take place for the left hand side, i.e. it holds

$$0 = \int_0^1 d\sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (t - t_0)^4 \sigma^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma (\tau \dot{\lambda}(\tau) - W_\lambda[\lambda, \nu](\tau - t_0, \tau)), \quad (4.29)$$

where  $\tau$  has to be replaced by  $t_0 + \sigma(t - t_0)$ .

We can apply here the following

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let the function  $f(t)$  be smooth at and near  $t = t_0$ . Then the constraint*

$$0 = \int_0^1 d\sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (t - t_0)^4 \sigma^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma f(\tau) \quad (4.30)$$

*in which the replacement  $\tau \Leftarrow t_0 + \sigma(t - t_0)$  is assumed, is fulfilled near  $t = t_0$  if and only if  $f(t) \equiv 0$ .*

*Proof.* The identity developing commutator of the differential operators  $\sigma^3(\partial/\partial t)(t - t_0)$  and  $(t - t_0)^3(\partial/\partial \sigma)\sigma$  reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (t - t_0)^4 \sigma^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma \times \right) - \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} (t - t_0)^3 \sigma^4 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (t - t_0) \times \right) \\ & \equiv 3(t - t_0)^3 \sigma^3 \left( \sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} - (t - t_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \times . \end{aligned}$$

When applied to a smooth function  $f(\tau)$  of the argument  $\tau = t_0 + \sigma(t - t_0)$ , the identically zero function arises on the right. Hence it holds

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (t - t_0)^4 \sigma^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma f(\tau) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} (t - t_0)^3 \sigma^4 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (t - t_0) f(\tau), \text{ provided } \tau = t_0 + (t - t_0)\sigma.$$

Let us apply  $\sigma$ -averaging  $\int_0^1 d\sigma \times$  to the above equality. On the left, one recognizes the right hand side of Eq. (4.30). Hence, in accordance with lemma conditions, it reduces to the identically zero function which then represents also  $\sigma$ -averaging of the right hand side. At the same time, the 'outer'  $\sigma$ -derivative is there annihilated by the integrating whose result arises in explicit form after the replacement  $\sigma \Leftarrow 1$  (assuming the subsidiary replacement  $\tau \Leftarrow t$ ) everywhere in the part of the expression situated to the right. In other words, the above identity and Eq. (4.30) lead to the equality

$$0 = (t - t_0)^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (t - t_0) f(t).$$

But this is nothing else but the claim of the constancy of the product  $(t - t_0)f(t)$ . Thus we have  $f(t) = \text{const}/(t - t_0)$ . This function is, however, unbounded on vicinity of  $t = t_0$  and cannot be smooth (even continuous) thereat — unless the constant numerator vanishes. The latter implies that  $f(t) \equiv 0$  and this is the only possibility to avoid contradiction to the lemma conditions. The assertion of the latter is therefore proven.  $\square$

Let us collate now the equations (4.29) and (4.30). Obviously, the former is a particular instance of the latter. The expression  $t\dot{\lambda}(t) - W_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](t - t_0, t)$ , playing role of the function  $f(t)$ , is the smooth function, see the comment following corollary 4.8. Then in case of fulfillment of Eq. (4.29) lemma (4.9) establishes its identical vanishing. In other words, Eq. (4.10) is then fulfilled. The fulfillment of the equation (4.11) coupled to it has been established in the lemma 4.3. We have therefore the following.

**Corollary 4.10.** *If smooth functions  $\lambda(t), \mu(t)$  obey the integral equations (4.6), (4.7) then the differential equations (4.10), (4.11) are also fulfilled.*

Jointly with lemma 4.2, this conclusion means that we have established the equivalence of systems of differential and integral equations describing regular solution to Eq. (1.1) in vicinity of its root (provided the latter exists).

## 5. REFINEMENT OF THE FIRST INTEGRAL EQUATION

It has to be noted that there exists a distinction between the integral equations (4.6) and (4.7) in the ways they determine the 'initial values'  $\lambda(t_0), \mu(t_0)$  necessary for the posing of the Cauchy problem for the differential equations (4.10), (4.11). Namely, the value of  $\mu(t_0)$  (just the one defined by Eq. (4.12)), appears instantly from Eq. (4.7) without computation of the integral it involves. This is not the case for Eq. (4.6) although for  $t = t_0$  the corresponding integral still can be calculated in explicit form. Its contribution is non-trivial even though the overall result is equivalent to the same constraint (4.12). But for all that, it is desirable to have versions of the integral equations which would produce the values of  $\lambda(t_0), \mu(t_0)$  (or the relation binding them) already by their general structures. The equation

(4.6) is the only one requiring a modification. Its alternative version possessing the desirable property reads

$$\lambda(t) = \lambda(t_0) - \frac{t-t_0}{t_0} \left( (\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1)/(4t_0) + \lambda(t) - (3t_0)^{-1} \int_0^1 d\sigma \widehat{\Omega}_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, t-t_0) \right), \quad (5.1)$$

$$\text{where } \widehat{\Omega}_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t) = 2\Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t) + \sigma^3 \Omega_\xi[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t). \quad (5.2)$$

As compared to Eq. (4.6), it involves a distinct kernel which is constructed on the base of the kernel  $\Omega_\xi$  introduced by Eq. (4.18). As a matter of fact, this is the major (if not the only) actual benefit from introduction of the function  $\xi(t)$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let smooth functions  $\lambda(t), \mu(t)$  obey the integral equations (4.6), (4.7) in some vicinity of  $t = t_0 \neq 0$ . Then the integral equation (5.1) is also fulfilled.*

*Proof.* The lemma assertion can be inferred from the following identity

$$\begin{aligned} & (t-t_0) \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \left( \sigma^3 \left( \lambda(\tau) + \sigma \frac{t-t_0}{t_0} ((\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1)/(4t_0) + \lambda(\tau)) \right) \right) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{t-t_0}{t_0} (3t_0)^{-1} \widehat{\Omega}_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, t-t_0) \right] \\ & \equiv \frac{1}{(t-t_0)^2} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (t-t_0)^3 \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \left( \sigma^3 \left( \lambda(\tau) + \sigma \frac{t-t_0}{t_0} \lambda(\tau) \right) \right) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{\sigma^2}{t_0} \Omega_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, t-t_0) \right] \\ & + \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \left( \frac{\sigma^3}{t_0} (\epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2\mu(\tau) - 3t_0\lambda(\tau) - (\tau-t_0)\xi(\tau)) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{2}{3}(1-\sigma^3) \sigma \frac{t-t_0}{t_0^2} \Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, t-t_0) \right] \\ & + \frac{t-t_0}{t_0} \left( \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma^4 \left( \xi(\tau) + t_0^{-1} ((\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1)/4 + 2\mu(\tau) - 3t_0\lambda(\tau)) \right) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + t_0^{-1} \sigma^3 \Omega_\xi[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, t-t_0) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

assuming the replacement  $\tau \Leftarrow t_0 + (t-t_0)\sigma$ ,

which is valid for arbitrary sufficiently smooth functions  $\lambda, \mu, \xi$ . More exactly, the result of its  $\sigma$ -averaging (application of the integral operator  $\int_0^1 d\sigma \times \dots$ ) will be utilized. Specifically, it can be proven that under the lemma conditions  $\sigma$ -average of the right hand side of (5.3) is the identical zero. We will do this ‘summand by summand’. In total, three ones have to be processed of which the second summand is combined, in turn, from two.

First of all, let us consider the summand with ‘overall’  $\sigma$ -derivative (the fifth and sixth lines of Eq. (5.3)). The derivative is eliminated by  $\sigma$ -averaging and the result appears as the difference of the expression on the right evaluated at  $\sigma = 1$  and at  $\sigma = 0$ . Then the (sub-)summand including  $\Omega_\mu$  disappears due to the factor of  $(1 - \sigma^2)\sigma$ . The (sub-)summand situated in the fifth line converts, up to the overall factor of  $t_0^{-1}$ , to the right hand side of the Eq. (4.27). Under the conditions of the lemma, the latter is fulfilled and thus we obtain the identical zero again. In total,  $\sigma$ -average of the second summand of the right hand side of (5.3) vanishes.

The  $\sigma$ -averaging of the third summand of the right hand side of (5.3) (its last and last but one lines) commutes with multiplication by  $(t - t_0)/t_0$ . Acting to the factor on the right of it,  $\sigma$ -derivative it involves is eliminated and the substitution  $\sigma \Leftarrow 1$  has to be applied to its target.  $\sigma$ -average of the term involving  $\Omega_\xi$  is kept in its original form. As a result, we obtain precisely the difference of the left and right sides of the definition (4.17) of the function  $\xi(t)$ . It is thus equal to zero for all values of  $t$ .

Finally, we have to show the vanishing of  $\sigma$ -average of the summand situated in the third and fourth lines of (5.3)). The integrating commutes with the differential operator  $(t - t_0)^{-2}(\partial/\partial t)(t - t_0)^3$ . Acting thus to the target of the latter, we obtain a sum of two terms. In the first of them,  $\sigma$ -averaging removes the  $\sigma$ -derivative and the result arises upon the replacement  $\sigma \Leftarrow 1$  (whereas the dual replacement  $\sigma \Leftarrow 0$  yields zero). The form of the  $\sigma$ -average of the second term involving  $\Omega_\lambda$  is kept without modification. The result of the computation coincides with the difference of the left and right sides of the integral equation (4.6) which is assumed to be fulfilled. Thus the  $\sigma$ -average of the term in question also vanishes.

It has been shown therefore that the  $\sigma$ -averaging of the right hand side of the equality (5.3) yields the identically zero function of  $t$ . Then the  $\sigma$ -averaging of the left hand side is throughout equal to zero as well.  $\sigma$ -averaging commutes with the differential operator  $(t - t_0)\partial/\partial t$  and we can consider its action to the target of the latter. In it, the  $\sigma$ -derivative is removed and the computation of the term from the first line reduces to the replacements  $\sigma \Leftarrow 1$ ,  $\tau \Leftarrow t$ . The form of  $\sigma$ -average of the term involving  $\widehat{\Omega}_\lambda$  is retained unchanged. It is easy to see that the result thus obtained coincides with the difference of the left and right sides of the Eq. (5.1) without the constant summand  $\lambda(t_0)$ . The vanishing of the right hand side of Eq. (5.3) established above says that its  $t$ -derivative is equal to zero, i.e. it does not depend on  $t$ . The value of this ‘constant’ can be found by means of straightforward computation in the case  $t = t_0$ . It is trivial and yields  $\lambda(t_0)$ . The resulting equality of the above  $t$ -independent expression and  $\lambda(t_0)$  is equivalent to the equation Eq. (5.1). The lemma is proven.  $\square$

We have proven that the fulfillment of the differential equations (4.10), (4.11) with the initial values of  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  at  $t = t_0$  obeying the constraint (4.12) leads to

fulfillment of the integral equations (4.6), (4.7), (5.1) (lemmas 4.2, 5.1) although the latter three ones are not independent. We have also proven that, conversely, the fulfillment of Eq.s (4.6), (4.7) leads to fulfillment of Eq.s (4.10), (4.11) (lemma 4.2, corollary 4.10). To establish the exhaustive equivalence, it remains to derive both differential equations from the integral equations (4.7) and (5.1).

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let smooth functions  $\lambda(t), \mu(t)$  obey the integral equations (4.7), (5.1) in some vicinity of  $t = t_0 \neq 0$ . Then the differential equations (4.10), (4.11) are also fulfilled.*

*Proof.* Let us note again the specific role of the equation (4.7). Namely, when considered with  $t = t_0$ , it reduces to the equation (4.12) constraining the values of  $\lambda(t_0)$  and  $\mu(t_0)$  ('the initial values'). The last relation implies, in turn, the regularity (the smoothness weaker by one degree, though, provided it is finite) of the function  $W_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](t - t_0, t)$  involved in Eq. (4.10). Indeed, there is its term, the ratio  $(t - t_0)^{-1}(\epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2\mu(t) - 3t_0\lambda(t))$ , which is singular at  $t = t_0$  unless the equality (4.12) takes place. Thus if Eq. (4.7) is fulfilled then the expressions of the equations (4.10), (4.11) are the regular functions regardless of their fulfillment. Moreover, in accordance with lemma 4.3, we have even stronger statement, namely, that the fulfillment of the integral equation (4.7) is sufficient itself for fulfillment of one of the differential equations we consider — namely, Eq. (4.11). Thus it remains to prove the fulfillment of Eq. (4.10) that requires of course to engage the second integral equation (5.1).

To that end, let us consider the identity akin Eq. (5.3) which reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \left( \sigma \left( \tau \dot{\lambda}(\tau) - W_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\tau - t_0, \tau) \right) \right) \equiv \\ & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \left( \sigma^3 \left( \tau \lambda(\tau) + \sigma(t - t_0)(\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1)/(4t_0) \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \left. - (\epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1)/3 \right. \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \left. + \frac{2}{3}(1 - \sigma^3) \mu(\tau) \right) \right) - \frac{t - t_0}{3t_0} \widehat{\Omega}_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, t - t_0) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{2}{3}(1 - \sigma^3) \frac{t - t_0}{t_0} \left( \tau \dot{\mu}(\tau) - W_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\tau - t_0, \tau) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \left( \frac{2}{3}(1 - \sigma^3) \sigma \frac{t - t_0}{t_0} \left( (\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1)/2 + \mu(\tau) \right) \right) \right] \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

assuming the replacement  $\tau \Leftarrow t_0 + (t - t_0)\sigma$ .

First of all, we have to show that under the conditions assumed by the lemma  $\sigma$ -average of its right hand side vanishes. Since this operation (i.e. the integrating  $\int_0^1 d\sigma \times$ ) commutes with the derivative  $\partial/\partial t$  we may apply it directly to the expression to which this derivative acts.

The expression consists of three summands.

The last of them is a derivative itself, this time with respect to  $\sigma$ . It is annihilated by the  $\sigma$ -averaging yielding zero due to the multiplier  $(1 - \sigma^3)\sigma$  vanishing at the boundary points of the integration interval  $(0, 1)$ .

The next in order from below is the summand containing the multiplier  $(\tau \dot{\mu}(\tau) - W_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\tau - t_0, \tau))$  (the fifth line of (5.4)). The mentioned factor coincides with the difference of the left and right sides of Eq. (4.11) in which the variable  $t$  is replaced by the expression  $t_0 + (t - t_0)\sigma$ . It has been noted that this equation is fulfilled in vicinity of  $t = t_0$ . Clearly, the aforementioned difference vanishes not only for 'original' argument  $t$  but also for its value  $t_0 + (t - t_0)\sigma$  dependent on the additional parameter  $\sigma \in [0, 1]$  and belonging to a line contained in the admissible domain. The product containing the aforementioned multiplier is equals to zero point-wise and, so to say, yields zero already 'prior to  $\sigma$ -averaging'.

It remains to consider contribution of the first summand situated in the lines number two, three, and four. It consists, in turn, of the two sub-summands.

The second one contains the function (integral transformation kernel)  $\widehat{\Omega}_\lambda$ . We leave it without modification except for 'the ascent' of the factor of  $(t - t_0)/(3t_0)$  independent of  $\sigma$  through the symbol of  $\sigma$ -averaging .

The first sub-summand is the result of action of the derivative  $\partial/\partial\sigma$  to the explicit expression shown in the formula. The derivative is annihilated by the the  $\sigma$ -averaging and the quantity we search for arises as the difference of the results of replacements  $\sigma \Leftarrow 1$  and  $\sigma \Leftarrow 0$  in the  $\sigma$ -derivative target. A simple computation shows that it is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & t_0 \lambda(t) - t_0 \lambda(t_0) + (t - t_0)((\chi_\infty + \epsilon\chi_0 - 1)/(4t_0) + \lambda(t)) \\ & - \frac{1}{3}(\epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) - 1 + 2\mu(t_0) - 3t_0 \lambda(t_0)). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

But the second line here vanishes in view of Eq. (4.12). The residual expression (the first line in (5.5)), when incorporated with the integral ( $\sigma$ -average) of the term containing the function  $\widehat{\Omega}_\lambda$ , proves to be equal, up to the overall factor of  $t_0$ , to the difference of the left and right sides of the integral equation (5.1). But this equation is assumed to be fulfilled. Hence the contribution of the second, third, and fourth lines of (5.4) vanishes. Since  $\sigma$ -averaging of the other two summands also yields zero, the 'overall' derivative in the right hand side of (5.4) acts to zero and results in the identically zero function of  $t$ . This is the first conclusion we had intended to come to.

Now we are able to obtain the result asserted by the lemma acting to the identity (5.4) by the linear operator

$$\int_0^1 d\sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (t - t_0)^4 \times \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (t - t_0)^4 \int_0^1 d\sigma \times \quad (5.6)$$

Let its second version is applied to the right hand side of (5.4). It carries out, firstly,  $\sigma$ -averaging,  $\int_0^1 d\sigma \times$ , which, as we know, yields the null result. Accordingly, the operator (5.6) takes the right hand side of (5.4) to the identically zero

function. We have to consider what the corresponding vanishing of the left hand side means.

Thus let the first operator among the pair (5.6) act to the left hand side of Eq. (5.4). The result reads

$$0 = \int_0^1 d\sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (t - t_0)^4 \sigma^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \sigma (\tau \dot{\lambda}(\tau) - W_\lambda[\lambda, \nu](\tau - t_0, \tau)).$$

Now let us note that there is an obvious identification which makes the record of the above equality a particular instance of Eq. (4.30). Besides, we have shown that the corresponding substitute for the function  $f(\tau)$  from the latter is the regular function. Then lemma 4.9 applies. It says that the current  $f$  vanishes identically in vicinity of  $t_0$ , at least, i.e. that  $t \dot{\lambda}(t) - W_\lambda[\lambda, \nu](t - t_0, t) = 0$ . This means that Eq. (4.10) is fulfilled. The lemma is thus proven.  $\square$

Summarising the relations proven above we have the following.

**Corollary 5.3.** *On the set of regular functions the system of differential equations (4.10), (4.11) combined with the constraint (4.12), considered in vicinity of any given  $t_0 \neq 0$ , is equivalent to the system of integral equations (5.1), (4.7).*

## 6. EXISTENCE OF ROOT OF THIRD PAINLEVÉ' TRANSCENDENT

The above discussion can be considered meaningful only taking for granted the existence of regular functions  $\lambda, \mu$  verifying Eq.s (4.1), (4.2) or Eq.s (5.1), (4.7). Here we intend to show that such functions actually exist. This will also mean the existence of roots of analytic solutions to Eq. (1.1).

To that end, we will consider Eq.s (5.1), (4.7) as the base for an iterative algorithm enabling one to construct the sequences of regular functions  $\lambda_n(t), \mu_n(t)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  which can be expected to be converging to regular functions. The provenance of the latter then ensures the fulfillment of the equations in question. The starting elements of the above sequences can be arbitrary; for example, one may get  $\lambda_0 \equiv 0 \equiv \mu_0$ . Subsequent sequence elements are then computed by means of repetition of the pair of subsequent transformations

$$\mu_{n+1}(t) = \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{RHS[Eq.(4.7)]} \\ \lambda \Leftarrow \lambda_n, \mu \Leftarrow \mu_n \end{array} \right], \quad \lambda_{n+1}(t) = \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{RHS[Eq.(5.1)]} \\ \lambda \Leftarrow \lambda_n, \mu \Leftarrow \mu_{n+1} \end{array} \right], \quad (6.1)$$

producing functions  $\lambda_{n+1}(t), \mu_{n+1}(t)$  from the functions  $\lambda_n(t), \mu_n(t)$ .

It has also to be noted that, as long as the issue of convergence is pursued, it is more convenient to operate with the sequences of 'the per step increments'

$$\delta\lambda_n(t) = \lambda_n(t) - \lambda_{n-1}(t), \delta\mu_n(t) = \mu_n(t) - \mu_{n-1}(t)$$

rather than with the very functions  $\lambda_n, \mu_n$ . The convergence of sequences  $\lambda_n, \mu_n$  is then equivalent to the convergence of the series  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \delta\lambda_n, \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \delta\mu_n$ . The iterative



maps for  $\delta\lambda, \delta\mu$  are derived directly from the iterative maps for  $\lambda, \mu$ . Specifically, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\mu_{n+1}(t) &= -\frac{\delta t}{t_0}\delta\mu_n(t) + \frac{\delta t}{t_0} \int_0^1 d\sigma \delta\Omega_\mu[\lambda_{n-1}, \mu_{n-1}, \delta\lambda_n, \delta\mu_n](\eta), \\ \delta\lambda_{n+1}(t) &= -\frac{\delta t}{t_0}\delta\lambda_n(t) - \frac{\delta t}{3t_0^2} \int_0^1 d\sigma \delta\widehat{\Omega}_\lambda[\lambda_{n-1}, \mu_n, \delta\lambda_n, \delta\mu_{n+1}](\sigma, \eta),\end{aligned}\tag{6.2}$$

where  $\eta = \sigma\delta t, t = t_0 + \delta t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu, \delta\lambda, \delta\mu](\eta) &\asymp \Omega_\mu[\lambda + \delta\lambda, \mu + \delta\mu](\sigma, \delta t) - \Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t), \\ \text{and} \quad \delta\widehat{\Omega}_\lambda[\lambda, \mu, \delta\lambda, \delta\mu](\sigma, \eta) &\asymp \widehat{\Omega}_\lambda[\lambda + \delta\lambda, \mu + \delta\mu](\sigma, \delta t) - \widehat{\Omega}_\lambda[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t).\end{aligned}\tag{6.3}$$

The modification of the lists of function arguments in the above transition denoted ‘ $\asymp$ ’ from  $\Omega$ -functions to  $\delta\Omega$ -functions is explained as follows. In the integral transformation involved in Eq. (4.7) the expression to be integrated is actually a function of the product  $\eta = \sigma\delta t = (t - t_0)\sigma$ . It is this form of the function  $\Omega_\mu$  which gives rise to the kernel  $\delta\Omega_\mu$  of the integral transform from the first of Eq.s (6.2). Hence a single argument on the left in the first line of (6.3).

The case of the function  $\delta\widehat{\Omega}_\lambda$  is similar but we have to take into account that  $\widehat{\Omega}_\lambda$  is introduced as a linear combination of the functions  $\Omega_\mu$  and  $\Omega_\xi$  with coefficient  $\sigma^3$  (see Eq. (5.2)). In particular, there exists a more detailed representation of  $\delta\widehat{\Omega}_\lambda$  alternative to (6.3). It follows from definition of  $\widehat{\Omega}_\lambda$  that

$$\delta\widehat{\Omega}_\lambda[\lambda, \mu, \delta\lambda, \delta\mu](\sigma, \eta) = 2\delta\Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu, \delta\lambda, \delta\mu](\eta) + \sigma^3\delta\Omega_\xi[\lambda, \mu, \delta\lambda, \delta\mu](\eta)\tag{6.4}$$

The decomposition refers to the function  $\delta\Omega_\mu$  defined above but also involves the difference

$$\delta\Omega_\xi[\lambda, \mu, \delta\lambda, \delta\mu](\eta) \asymp \Omega_\xi[\lambda + \delta\lambda, \mu + \delta\mu](\sigma, \delta t) - \Omega_\xi[\lambda, \mu](\sigma, \delta t).\tag{6.5}$$

Here, again, “inside integral”, all functions on the right depends in fact on the only argument equal to the product  $(t - t_0)\sigma$  denoted  $\eta$  but there is also the “direct” dependence of  $\delta\widehat{\Omega}_\lambda$  on  $\sigma$  (associated with its first argument) which is embodied in the factor of  $\sigma^3$  in Eq. (6.4).

Explicit computations using definitions show that the functions  $\delta\Omega_\mu, \delta\Omega_\xi$  can also be represented in the form looking like linear homogeneous combinations of  $\delta\mu$  and  $\delta\lambda$  whose coefficients are however not constants but some regular functions with equivalent or shorter lists of arguments. Specifically, one can obtain the decompositions

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\Omega_\mu[\lambda, \mu, \delta\lambda, \delta\mu](\eta) &= \delta\lambda(\tau) \delta\Omega_\mu^{(\lambda)}[\hat{\mu}, \delta\mu](\eta) + \delta\mu(\tau) \delta\Omega_\mu^{(\mu)}[\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\mu}](\eta), \\ \delta\Omega_\xi[\lambda, \mu, \delta\lambda, \delta\mu](\eta) &= \delta\lambda(\tau) \delta\Omega_\xi^{(\lambda)}[\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\mu}, \delta\mu](\eta) \\ &\quad + \delta\mu(\tau) \delta\Omega_\xi^{(\mu)}[\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\mu}, \delta\lambda](\eta),\end{aligned}\tag{6.6}$$

$$\text{where } \tau = t_0 + \eta, \hat{\lambda}(\tau) = \lambda(\tau) + \delta\lambda(\tau)/2, \hat{\mu}(\tau) = \mu(\tau) + \delta\mu(\tau)/2,\tag{6.7}$$

and

$$\delta\Omega_\mu^{(\lambda)}[\hat{\mu}, \delta\mu](\eta) = -\frac{1}{2}\eta^3 \left( (2\hat{\mu}(\tau) - 1)^2 - 1 + \delta\mu(\tau)^2 \right), \quad (6.8)$$

$$\delta\Omega_\mu^{(\mu)}[\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\mu}](\eta) = \epsilon\chi_0 - 2\eta(2\hat{\mu}(\tau) - 1) \left( \epsilon - \eta(\chi_0 - \epsilon)/(2t_0) + \eta^2\hat{\lambda}(\tau) \right), \quad (6.9)$$

$$\delta\Omega_\xi^{(\lambda)}[\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\mu}, \delta\mu](\eta) = -3\epsilon t_0(\chi_0 - 2\epsilon) \quad (6.10)$$

$$+6t_0\eta(2\hat{\mu}(\tau) - 1) \times \\ (\epsilon - \eta(\chi_0 - \epsilon)/(2t_0) + \eta^2\hat{\lambda}(\tau)) \\ +4\eta^3(\hat{\mu}(\tau)(\hat{\mu}(\tau) - 1) + \delta\mu(\tau)^2/4),$$

$$\delta\Omega_\xi^{(\mu)}[\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\mu}, \delta\lambda](\eta) = -8\epsilon\chi_0 + 3\eta(\chi_0 - \epsilon)^2/(2t_0) \quad (6.11)$$

$$+4\eta(2\hat{\mu}(\tau) - 1 + 3t_0\hat{\lambda}(\tau)) \times \\ (\epsilon - \eta(\chi_0 - \epsilon)/(2t_0) + \eta^2\hat{\lambda}(\tau)) \\ -6\eta^3t_0(\hat{\lambda}(\tau)^2 - \delta\lambda(\tau)^2/4).$$

We are now able to manifest in a comprehensive form *the step of iterative procedure* corresponding to the transformations (6.1). Namely, its **Algorithm** can be formulated as follows:

Let  $n$  be a positive integer and

let the four functions  $\lambda_{n-1}(t), \mu_{n-1}(t), \delta\lambda_n(t), \delta\mu_n(t)$  which are regular in an open domain containing  $t = t_0 \neq 0$  be given.

**The step of the iteration algorithm** comprises the following *substeps*:

(1) The functions  $\lambda_n(t), \mu_n(t)$  are constructed as follows:

$$\lambda_n(t) = \lambda_{n-1}(t) + \delta\lambda_n(t), \quad \mu_n(t) = \mu_{n-1}(t) + \delta\mu_n(t), \quad (6.12)$$

(2) The function  $\delta\mu_{n+1}(t)$  is constructed by means of the following integral transform:

$$\delta\mu_{n+1}(t) = \overset{\circ}{\delta}t \left( -\delta\mu_n(t) + \int_0^1 d\sigma (\delta\mu_n(\tau) \delta\Omega_\mu^{(\mu)}[\lambda_{n-1/2}, \mu_{n-1/2}](\eta) \right. \\ \left. + \delta\lambda_n(\tau) \delta\Omega_\mu^{(\lambda)}[\mu_{n-1/2}, \delta\mu_n](\eta) \right), \quad (6.13)$$

where  $\overset{\circ}{\delta}t = \delta t/t_0 = (t - t_0)/t_0$ ,  $\tau = t_0 + \eta$ ,  $\eta = (t - t_0)\sigma$ ,

$$\lambda_{n-1/2}(t) = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_n(t) + \lambda_{n-1}(t)) = \lambda_{n-1}(t) + \delta\mu_n(t)/2, \quad (6.14)$$

$$\mu_{n-1/2}(t) = \frac{1}{2}(\mu_n(t) + \mu_{n-1}(t)) = \mu_{n-1}(t) + \delta\mu_n(t)/2.$$

(3) The function  $\mu_{n+1}(t)$  is constructed as follows

$$\mu_{n+1}(t) = \mu_n(t) + \delta\mu_{n+1}(t). \quad (6.15)$$

- (4) The function  $\delta\lambda_{n+1}(t)$  is constructed by means of the following integral transform:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\lambda_{n+1}(t) = \mathring{\delta}t \left( -\delta\lambda_n(t) - 2(3t_0)^{-1} \int_0^1 d\sigma \left( \delta\mu_{n+1}(\tau) \delta\Omega_\mu^{(\mu)}[\lambda_{n-1/2}, \mu_{n+1/2}](\eta) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \delta\lambda_n(\tau) \delta\Omega_\mu^{(\lambda)}[\mu_{n+1/2}, \delta\mu_{n+1}](\eta) \right) \right. \\ \left. - (3t_0)^{-1} \int_0^1 d\sigma \sigma^3 \left( \delta\mu_{n+1}(\tau) \delta\Omega_\xi^{(\mu)}[\lambda_{n-1/2}, \mu_{n+1/2}, \delta\lambda_n](\eta) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \delta\lambda_n(\tau) \delta\Omega_\xi^{(\lambda)}[\lambda_{n-1/2}, \mu_{n+1/2}, \delta\mu_{n+1}](\eta) \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.16)$$

where  $\mathring{\delta}t$ ,  $\tau$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\lambda_{n-1/2}(t)$ ,  $\delta\mu_{n+1}(t)$  have been defined above and

$$\mu_{n+1/2}(t) = \frac{1}{2}(\mu_{n+1}(t) + \mu_n(t)) = \mu_n(t) + \delta\mu_{n+1}(t)/2. \quad (6.17)$$

- (5) The function  $\lambda_{n+1}(t)$  is constructed as follows

$$\lambda_{n+1}(t) = \lambda_n(t) + \delta\lambda_{n+1}(t). \quad (6.18)$$

Having managed to make the above substeps, we gain the collection  $\lambda_n(t)$ ,  $\mu_n(t)$ ,  $\delta\lambda_{n+1}(t)$ ,  $\delta\mu_{n+1}(t)$  of four functions similar to the initial quadruplet with coinciding kernel symbols but with enumerating indices incremented by the unit.

Repeating for them the above substeps with  $n$  replaced by  $n+1$ , we can obtain the next function quadruplet, etc.

The above algorithm specification remains, however, inoperative until it is pointed out what data have to be taken as input for the starting iteration. To that end, let us assume to start with  $n=0$ . To begin with, we need also to set, one way or another, the functions  $\lambda_0, \mu_0, \delta\lambda_1, \delta\mu_1$  or, equivalently,  $\lambda_0, \mu_0, \lambda_1, \mu_1$ . It is of interest to attempt to refuse specification of “the genuine initial data”, getting a simplest one and inspecting what a result the above algorithm then produce.

To that end, let us assign

$$\lambda_0(t) \equiv 0, \mu_0(t) \equiv 0. \quad (6.19)$$

However, the next pair  $\lambda_1(t), \mu_1(t)$  cannot be obtained from Eq.s (6.2) or equivalent equations (6.13), (6.16). Indeed, otherwise, the result would not depend on the parameter  $\chi_\infty$  in any way (on their own, Eq.s (6.13), (6.16) *do not contain*  $\chi_\infty$ ). Of course, some functions  $\lambda_n(t), \mu_n(t)$  will be generated but they are not related to solutions to Eq.s (4.1), (4.2). The point is that it is necessary here, i.e. one-time at the very beginning, to apply the transformations (6.1) with  $n=0$  with null  $\lambda = \lambda_0, \mu = \mu_0$ . They obviously yield

$$\mu_1(t) = \delta\mu_1(t) = (1 - \epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) + 3t_0 \lambda^{III})/2 - \mathring{\delta}t(\chi_\infty + \epsilon\chi_0 - 1)/2, \quad (6.20)$$

and, less obviously,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_1(t) = \delta\lambda_1(t) = & \lambda^{III} - \overset{\circ}{\delta}t \chi_\infty / (4t_0) \\
& + \overset{\circ}{\delta}t^2 \epsilon \left( 1 - (\epsilon \chi_0 (\chi_0 - \epsilon) / t_0 - 3t_0 \lambda^{III}) \times \right. \\
& \quad \left. (\epsilon (\chi_0^2 - 1) / (2t_0) - 3t_0 \lambda^{III}) \right) / 10 \\
& + \overset{\circ}{\delta}t^2 (\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1) \times \\
& \quad \left( \epsilon \chi_0 / (10t_0) \right. \\
& \quad - \overset{\circ}{\delta}t ((\chi_0 - \epsilon)^2 / (4t_0) + (\chi_0^2 - 1) / (3t_0) - 2\epsilon t_0 \lambda^{III}) / 6 \\
& \quad \left. + \overset{\circ}{\delta}t^2 (\chi_0 - \epsilon) (\epsilon (\chi_0^2 - 1) / (2t_0) - 3t_0 \lambda^{III}) / 28 \right) \\
& + \overset{\circ}{\delta}t^3 (\chi_0 - \epsilon) \left( (\epsilon (\chi_0^2 - 1) / (2t_0) - 3t_0 \lambda^{III})^2 - 1 \right) / 36 \\
& - \overset{\circ}{\delta}t^4 (\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1)^2 (\epsilon / 7 - \overset{\circ}{\delta}t (\chi_0 - \epsilon) / 20) / 4,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.21}$$

where  $\overset{\circ}{\delta}t = (t - t_0) / t_0$ . The functions  $\lambda_1(t), \mu_1(t)$  are polynomials in  $(t - t_0)$  of the degrees 5 and 1, respectively. Their ‘‘initial values’’ at  $t_0$ , which the above equations imply, agree with Eq. (4.12). It also holds

$$\lambda_1(t_0) = \lambda^{III} \tag{6.22}$$

for the given constant  $\lambda^{III}$  which can be arbitrary. This parameter identifies the whole solution which we hope to finally construct.

It is important to note that if the function sequences  $\lambda_n(t), \mu_n(t)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  converge in appropriate way (e.g. uniformly on a connected domain with compact closure) to some regular functions  $\lambda(t), \mu(t)$ , then the fulfillment of the equations (6.12)—(6.18), together with ‘the provenance’ (the relation to Eq.s (6.1)) of the above choice of  $\lambda_1(t), \mu_1(t)$ , is equivalent to the fulfillment of the integral equations (4.7), (5.1).

Turning to proof of convergence, let us constrain the variation of  $t$  to vicinity of the point  $t = t_0$  assuming that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\overset{\circ}{\delta}t| < \alpha & \Leftrightarrow |t - t_0| < |t_0| \alpha \\
& \text{for some positive } \alpha < 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.23}$$

We will represent this constraint by the relation of inclusion  $t \in U$ , where the open connected subdomain  $U$  should be regarded as a bounded one with compact closure.

We have derived explicit representations for the regular functions  $\lambda_1(t), \mu_1(t)$  which will be used as the initial data allowing one to start computation of the sequence of functions in accordance with the above Algorithm. Their definition ensures feasibility of determination (if needed, by explicit though somewhat bulky formulas which we do not display) of the quantities  $M^{(\lambda)}, M^{(\mu)}$  as the *positive* real

numbers such that

$$\sup_{t \in U} |\lambda_1(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2}M^{(\lambda)}, \quad \sup_{t \in U} |\mu_1(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2}M^{(\mu)}. \quad (6.24)$$

Let also  $B_\mu^{(\lambda)}, B_\mu^{(\mu)}, B_\xi^{(\lambda)}, B_\xi^{(\mu)}$  be the real positive numbers such that

$$\sup \left| \Omega_{\ddagger}^{(*)}[\dots](t) \right| \leq B_{\ddagger}^{(*)} \quad (6.25)$$

for  $\ddagger \in \{\mu, \xi\}$  and  $\ast \in \{\lambda, \mu\}$  denoting indices represented by one of the listed symbols, where  $[\dots]$  stands for the list of functions serving the  $\Omega$ -function arguments which depends on the concretization of  $\ddagger$  and  $\ast$  and has to be get from the corresponding definition among the ones given by Eq.s (6.8)-(6.10).

The domain over which the suprema in inequalities (6.25) are to be evaluated is as follows.

- The set of  $t \in U$  is taken into account;
- the regular functions  $\hat{\lambda}(t), \hat{\mu}(t)$  are arbitrary ones obeying the inequalities  $|\hat{\lambda}(t)| \leq M^{(\lambda)}, |\hat{\mu}(t)| \leq M^{(\mu)}$  for all  $t \in U$ ;
- the regular functions  $\delta\lambda(t), \delta\mu(t)$  are arbitrary ones obeying the inequalities  $|\delta\lambda(t)| \leq 2M^{(\lambda)}, |\delta\mu(t)| \leq 2M^{(\mu)}$  for all  $t \in U$ .

**Remark 6.1.** The values of the above boundaries  $M^{(\ast)}, B_{\ddagger}^{(\ast)}$  involved in *inequalities* are clearly non-unique since, for example, they can be increased without impediment. Besides, such changes can naturally follow variation of the parameter  $\alpha$  which also can be changed (at least, decreased). Nevertheless, it is always possible to set them in such a way that, considered as functions of  $\alpha$  with other parameters fixed, they were *non-decreasing* ones. In the other words, we can claim that *as  $\alpha$  is decreasing* (remaining positive), *neither of them is increasing*. We assume below that such a requirement is always met. The latter means, in particular, that for any positive  $\alpha' < \alpha$  the ‘original’ quantities  $M^{(\ast)}, B_{\ddagger}^{(\ast)}$  continue to fulfill the above set of inequalities involving them in which  $\alpha$  is replaced with  $\alpha'$  and the domain  $U$  is replaced with  $U' \ni t : |t - t_0| \leq t_0 \alpha'$ . Obviously, the above requirement is coherent in view of the inclusion  $U' \subset U$ .

Now let  $N$  be any positive integer greater than one. Let also the finite sequences of functions  $\lambda_{n-1}(t), \mu_{n-1}(t), \delta\lambda_n(t), \delta\mu_n(t)$  indexed by  $n = 1, \dots, N$  be given which start with  $\lambda_0, \mu_0, \delta\lambda_1, \delta\mu_1$  defined by Eq.s (6.19), (6.21), (6.20), where  $\delta t = (t - t_0)/t_0$ , and which conforms to the Algorithm specified above for  $n = 2, \dots, N$ .

It is easy to see that since  $\lambda_0, \mu_0, \delta\lambda_1, \delta\mu_1$  are either zero or polynomial in  $t$ , all the functions of higher levels, i.e. the indexed with greater  $n$ , are polynomial in  $t$  as well (transformations realizing iteration map polynomials to polynomials). They are therefore regular everywhere including the domain  $U$ .

Additionally, we assume the fulfillment of the inequalities

$$|\delta\lambda_n(t)| < \frac{1}{2}M^{(\lambda)}|\beta\delta t|^{n-1}, \quad |\delta\mu_n(t)| < \frac{1}{2}M^{(\mu)}|\beta\delta t|^{n-1} \quad (6.26)$$

with some real positive  $\beta$  and all  $t \in U$  by all the functions from the noted finite sequences, i.e. for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . It has to be mentioned that  $\delta\lambda_1, \delta\mu_1$  agree with these constraints for any  $\beta \geq 1$  in view of the very definitions (6.24) of  $M^{(\lambda)}$  and  $M^{(\mu)}$ . The set of finite sequences of polynomials satisfying the declared requirements is thus non-empty.

The formula (6.12) holds true for the functions  $\mu_n(t)$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  that in conjunction with the choice of the starting  $\mu_1(t) = \delta\mu_1(t)$  leads to decompositions  $\mu_n(t) = \sum_{k=1}^n \delta\mu_k(t)$ . Then the estimates (6.26) imply that

$$|\mu_n(t)| < \sum_{k'=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{2} M^{(\mu)} |\beta \overset{\circ}{\delta} t|^{k'} = \frac{1}{2} M^{(\mu)} (1 - \beta |\overset{\circ}{\delta} t|)^{-1} (1 - |\beta \overset{\circ}{\delta} t|^n) \quad (6.27)$$

for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ .

In accordance with definition of the adopted domain of variation of  $t$  it holds  $\beta |\overset{\circ}{\delta} t| \leq \beta\alpha$ . Decreasing, if necessary,  $\alpha$ , we ensure the following additional constraint to the admissible values of these (positive) parameters:

$$\beta\alpha < 1/2. \quad (6.28)$$

Then for  $t \in U$  it holds  $\beta |\overset{\circ}{\delta} t| < 1/2$  and all the factors in the right hand side of (6.27) are positive. Moreover, this inequality implies that

$$|\mu_n(t)| < \frac{1}{2} M^{(\mu)} (1 - \beta\alpha)^{-1} < M^{(\mu)}. \quad (6.29)$$

As a consequence, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu_{n-1/2}(t)| &= \frac{1}{2} |\mu_n(t) + \mu_{n-1}(t)| < M^{(\mu)}, \\ |\delta\mu_n(t)| &= |\mu_n(t) - \mu_{n-1}(t)| \leq |\mu_n(t)| + |\mu_{n-1}(t)| < 2M^{(\mu)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.30)$$

The inequalities

$$|\lambda_n(t)| < M^{(\lambda)}, |\lambda_{n-1/2}(t)| < M^{(\lambda)}, |\delta\lambda_n(t)| < 2M^{(\lambda)} \quad (6.31)$$

are derived in a similar way from Eq.s (6.12), (6.18), (6.17), (6.28) (as long as no references to integral transforms are required, the formulas for  $\lambda, \delta\lambda$  and  $\mu, \delta\mu$  are analogous).

The homogeneous bounds imposed to the functions  $\lambda_{n-1/2}, \mu_{n-1/2}, \delta\mu_n$  ensured by the above inequalities conform to the conditions of validity of inequalities (6.25) in case of  $\Omega$ -functions taken in the forms used in Eq. (6.13). Using them and applying Cauchy-Bunyakovsky-Schwarz (in what follows, CBS) inequality, we obtain the bound from above for the right hand side of the noted equation which then yields the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta\mu_{n+1}(t)| &\leq |\overset{\circ}{\delta} t| \left( |\delta\mu_n(t)| + B_{\mu}^{(\mu)} \left( \int_0^1 d\sigma |\delta\mu_n(\tau)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + B_{\mu}^{(\lambda)} \left( \int_0^1 d\sigma |\delta\lambda_n(\tau)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.32)$$

The upper bounds for the remaining integrals can be deduced from the upper bounds (6.26) for  $|\delta\lambda_n|, |\delta\mu_n|$ . One easily finds that the necessary replacement of  $t$  with  $\tau = t_0 + (t - t_0)\sigma$  in inequalities (6.26) reduces to the multiplication of their right hand sides by  $\sigma^{n-1}$ . This means that the operator  $\int_0^1 d\sigma \dots$  when applied to upper bounds of  $|\delta\lambda_n|^2$  and  $|\delta\mu_n|^2$  integrates in fact the power function  $\sigma^{2n-2}$  and yields  $(2n-1)^{-1}$  adding thus, finally, to summands the overall factors of  $(2n-1)^{-1/2} \leq 1$ . Thus, taking into account (6.26), we obtain the following consequences of inequality (6.32)

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta\mu_{n+1}(t)| &\leq \frac{\delta t}{2} \left( (1 + (2n-1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_\mu^{(\mu)}) M^{(\mu)} + (2n-1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_\mu^{(\lambda)} M^{(\lambda)} \right) |\beta \delta t|^{n-1} \\ &< \frac{1}{2} \beta^{-1} \left( (1 + B_\mu^{(\mu)}) M^{(\mu)} + B_\mu^{(\lambda)} M^{(\lambda)} \right) |\beta \delta t|^n. \end{aligned} \quad (6.33)$$

Now let us introduce yet another constraint to admissible values of  $\beta$ . Namely, we require fulfillment of the inequality

$$\beta \geq Q_1 := 1 + B_\mu^{(\mu)} + B_\mu^{(\lambda)} M^{(\lambda)} / M^{(\mu)} \quad (6.34)$$

(implying  $\beta > 1$ , automatically). If this holds true then one may replace the product of the second and third multipliers by the unit and obtain that

$$|\delta\mu_{n+1}(t)| < \frac{1}{2} M^{(\mu)} |\beta \delta t|^n. \quad (6.35)$$

Here  $n = 1, \dots, N$  and, thus, as compared to the original set of such kind inequalities (6.26), the next member indexed with  $n = N + 1$  has been added to it. Besides, as a subsequent consequence, the next member of the sequence of functions  $\mu_n(t)$  defined by the formula (6.15) obeys the inequality (6.27) and, in view of (6.28), the inequality (6.29) for  $n = N + 1$ .

Inequalities (6.30) with  $n = N + 1$  are the extra bounding estimates following from the above computation.

All these enables us to estimate from above  $\Omega$ -functions from the integrals involved in Eq. (6.16) with the help of the inequalities (6.25). Applying CBS inequality and replacing  $\Omega$ -functions by the (positive) constants  $B_{\ddagger}^{(*)}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta\lambda_{n+1}(t)| &\leq |\delta t| \left( |\delta\lambda_n(t)| + 2(3|t_0|)^{-1} \left( B_\mu^{(\mu)} \left( \int_0^1 d\sigma |\delta\mu_{n+1}(\tau)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + B_\mu^{(\lambda)} \left( \int_0^1 d\sigma |\delta\lambda_n(\tau)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (3|t_0|)^{-1} \left( B_\xi^{(\mu)} \left( \int_0^1 d\sigma \sigma^6 |\delta\mu_{n+1}(t)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + B_\xi^{(\lambda)} \left( \int_0^1 d\sigma \sigma^6 |\delta\lambda_n(t)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.36)$$

In the same way as above, the inequalities (6.26), (6.35) enable us to reduce determination of the upper bounds for the residual integrals in the right hand



side of (6.36) to the integrating of the power functions  $\sigma^{2n}$  and  $\sigma^{2n-2}$  in the first and second lines and the power functions  $\sigma^{2n+6}$  and  $\sigma^{2n+4}$  in the third and fourth lines, respectively. The effect of such replacements, somewhat increasing the whole right hand side, is the division of the multipliers associated with integrals by the quantities  $\sqrt{2n+1}$ ,  $\sqrt{2n-1}$ ,  $\sqrt{2n+7}$ ,  $\sqrt{2n+5}$ , respectively. We obtain therefore from (6.36), (6.26), (6.35) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\delta\lambda_{n+1}(t)| &\leq |\mathring{\delta}t| \left( \frac{1}{2} M^{(\lambda)} |\beta \mathring{\delta}t|^{n-1} \right. \\
 &\quad + (3|t_0|)^{-1} \left( \frac{B_\mu^{(\mu)} M^{(\mu)}}{\sqrt{2n+1}} |\beta \mathring{\delta}t|^n + \frac{B_\mu^{(\lambda)} M^{(\lambda)}}{\sqrt{2n-1}} |\beta \mathring{\delta}t|^{n-1} \right) \\
 &\quad \left. + (6|t_0|)^{-1} \left( \frac{B_\xi^{(\mu)} M^{(\mu)}}{\sqrt{2n+7}} |\beta \mathring{\delta}t|^n + \frac{B_\xi^{(\lambda)} M^{(\lambda)}}{\sqrt{2n+5}} |\beta \mathring{\delta}t|^{n-1} \right) \right) \quad (6.37) \\
 &= (2\beta)^{-1} \left( \left( 1 + \frac{2B_\mu^{(\lambda)}}{3t_0\sqrt{2n-1}} + \frac{B_\xi^{(\lambda)}}{3t_0\sqrt{2n+5}} \right) M^{(\lambda)} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \frac{\beta |\mathring{\delta}t|}{3t_0} \left( \frac{2B_\mu^{(\mu)}}{\sqrt{2n+1}} + \frac{B_\xi^{(\mu)}}{\sqrt{2n+7}} \right) M^{(\mu)} \right) |\beta \mathring{\delta}t|^n
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|\mathring{\delta}t| < \alpha$  and in view of (6.28) it holds  $\beta |\mathring{\delta}t| < 1/2$ . Taking also into account that  $n \geq 1$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\delta\lambda_{n+1}(t)| &< (2\beta)^{-1} \left( \left( 1 + (3t_0)^{-1} (2B_\mu^{(\lambda)} + B_\xi^{(\lambda)}/\sqrt{7}) \right) M^{(\lambda)} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + (6t_0)^{-1} (2B_\mu^{(\mu)}/\sqrt{3} + B_\xi^{(\mu)}/3) M^{(\mu)} \right) |\beta \mathring{\delta}t|^n. \quad (6.38)
 \end{aligned}$$

We need to impose now yet another constraint to the auxiliary quantity  $\beta$ . Namely we claim of it to obey also the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta &\geq Q_2 := 1 + (3t_0)^{-1} (2B_\mu^{(\lambda)} + B_\xi^{(\lambda)}/\sqrt{7}) \\
 &\quad + (6t_0)^{-1} (2B_\mu^{(\mu)}/\sqrt{3} + B_\xi^{(\mu)}/3) M^{(\mu)}/M^{(\lambda)} \quad (6.39)
 \end{aligned}$$

(here the right hand side is equal to the factor within the large parentheses in (6.38) divided by  $M^{(\lambda)} > 0$ ). With such  $\beta$  the inequalities (6.38) give rise to the weaker ones which reads

$$|\delta\lambda_{n+1}(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2} M^{(\lambda)} |\beta \mathring{\delta}t|^n \quad (6.40)$$

and, in the case  $n = N$ , represent the next member of the sequence of similar inequalities (6.26) already assumed to be fulfilled.

Eq.s (6.18) show that  $\lambda_{n+1}$  can be represented as the finite series  $\lambda_{n+1}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \delta\lambda_k(t)$  that together with inequalities (6.26), (6.40), (6.28) leads to the

inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda_{n+1}(t)| &\leq \frac{1}{2}M^{(\lambda)}(1 - \beta|\mathring{\delta}t|)^{-1}(1 - |\beta\mathring{\delta}t|^{n+1}) < \frac{1}{2}M^{(\lambda)}(1 - \beta|\mathring{\delta}t|)^{-1} \\ &< \frac{1}{2}M^{(\lambda)}(1 - \beta\alpha)^{-1} < M^{(\lambda)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.41)$$

Their instance arising in case of maximal  $n = N$  represents then the new member of the first sequence of inequalities (6.31). The elongation by one element of the second sequences from the triplet (6.31) then happens as well.

It could be stated that we have established the concordance of the Algorithm of constructing of the functions  $\lambda_n(t), \mu_n(t), \delta\lambda_{n+1}(t), \delta\mu_{n+1}(t)$  from the functions  $\lambda_{n-1}(t), \mu_{n-1}(t), \delta\lambda_n(t), \delta\mu_n(t)$  with the constraints (6.26), (6.29), (6.41). However, one point still remains to be clarified. It concerns the ‘technical’ restrictions imposed in the course of the above derivations to the parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

As to  $\beta$  itself, the fulfillment of inequalities (6.34), (6.39) has to be ensured, at least. Hence we has to write down the constraint

$$\beta \geq \max(Q_1, Q_2). \quad (6.42)$$

It allows  $\beta$  to be arbitrarily large. On the other hand, the inequality (6.28) looks like the constraint of the opposite meaning bounding  $\beta$  from above. A priori, one can encounter here a contradiction in the form of its incompatibility with the lower bound (6.42).

To settle such a potential obstruction, it suffices to note that its origin lies in fact in the unnecessary tacit assumption of the self-sufficient role of the parameter  $\alpha$ . Indeed, we considered  $\alpha$  as a quantity which has been chosen and fixed at the beginning while all the subsequent ones such as  $M^{(*)}, B_{\ddagger}^{(*)}, Q_1, Q_2$  arose as certain its functions. Then, indeed, it may finally turn out that the inequalities (6.28) and (6.42) are inconsistent. However, alternatively, we might proceed as follows.

Let us define the positive  $\tilde{\alpha}$  which obey the inequality similar to (6.42) with positive  $\beta$  obeying (6.42). More precisely, given such  $\beta$ , let

$$0 < \tilde{\alpha} \leq \min(\alpha, (2\beta)^{-1}). \quad (6.43)$$

We use  $\tilde{\alpha}$  for the imposing of a potentially stronger than before limitation to admissible values of  $t$  assuming in what follows that

$$|\mathring{\delta}t| < \tilde{\alpha} \Leftrightarrow |t - t_0| < |t_0| \tilde{\alpha} \Leftrightarrow t \in \tilde{U}. \quad (6.44)$$

Then we repeat all the derivations introduced above (namely, see the text situated between inequalities (6.24) and (6.41)) but *do not assign new values* to the quantities  $M^{(*)}, B_{\ddagger}^{(*)}, Q_1, Q_2$  using instead the ‘old’ ones corresponding to the original choice of  $\alpha$ . As it has been noted in Remark 6.1, since  $\tilde{\alpha} \leq \alpha$  this is always admissible and all the inequalities involving the aforementioned ‘constants’ remain fulfilled. But now, additionally, the inequality  $\beta\tilde{\alpha} \leq 1/2$ , playing role of the inequality (6.28), also holds true simply due to the definition of  $\tilde{\alpha}$ . Incompatibility of the inequalities our reasoning is now based upon cannot appear.

**Theorem 6.2.**

Let the functions  $\lambda_1(t), \mu_1(t)$  be defined by the formulas (6.21), (6.20), where  $\overset{\circ}{\delta}t$  denotes ‘the normalized deviation’  $(t - t_0)/t_0$ ;

— let an arbitrary  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  be chosen and fixed and let the inclusion relation  $t \in U$  means the fulfillment of the inequality  $|\overset{\circ}{\delta}t| < \alpha$ ;

— let the positive numbers  $M^{(\lambda)}, M^{(\mu)}$  be defined as follows:

$$M^{(\lambda)} = \max(1, 2 \sup_{t \in U} |\lambda_1(t)|), \quad M^{(\mu)} = \max(1, 2 \sup_{t \in U} |\mu_1(t)|); \quad (6.45)$$

— let the positive numbers  $B_\mu^{(\lambda)}, B_\mu^{(\mu)}, B_\xi^{(\lambda)}, B_\xi^{(\mu)}$  be defined by the formulas:

$$B_{\ast}^{(\ast)} = \max(1, \sup |\Omega_{\ast}^{(\ast)}[\cdot \cdot \cdot](t)|), \quad (6.46)$$

where the symbols  $\ast \in \{\mu, \xi\}$  and  $\ast \in \{\lambda, \mu\}$  stand for the symbolic ‘indices’ which label the four functions  $\Omega_{\ast}^{(\ast)}[\cdot \cdot \cdot]$  defined by the formulas (6.9)–(6.10) displaying also the lists  $[\cdot \cdot \cdot]$  of their ‘functional arguments’, and where the domain on which the suprema are determined is singled out by the constraints  $t \in U$ ,  $|\hat{\lambda}| \leq M^{(\lambda)}, |\hat{\mu}| \leq M^{(\mu)}, |\delta\lambda| \leq 2M^{(\lambda)}, |\delta\mu| \leq 2M^{(\mu)}$ ;

— let the positive numbers  $Q_1, Q_2$  coincide with ones used in the formulas (6.34) and (6.39), respectively;

— let the positive numbers  $\beta, \tilde{\alpha}$  be defined as follows:

$$\beta = \max(Q_1, Q_2), \quad \tilde{\alpha} = \min(\alpha, (2\beta)^{-1}); \quad (6.47)$$

— let the sequences  $\lambda_n(t), \mu_n(t), \delta\lambda_n(t), \delta\mu_n(t)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  of polynomials in  $t$ , starting from  $\lambda_1(t), \mu_1(t)$  specified above and  $\delta\lambda_1(t) = \lambda_1(t), \delta\mu_1(t) = \mu_1(t)$ , be constructed using the iterative transformations (6.12)–(6.18).

Then the sequences  $\{\lambda_n(t)\}, \{\mu_n(t)\}$  uniformly converges on the domain  $\tilde{U} \ni t : |t - t_0| < |t_0|\tilde{\alpha}$  to regular functions  $\lambda(t), \mu(t)$  which verify the integral equations (4.7), (5.1).

*Proof.* In accordance with inequalities (6.26) geometric series serves a majorant for the series  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \delta\lambda(t), \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \delta\mu(t)$  determining functions  $\lambda(t)$  and  $\mu(t)$ , respectively. The former absolutely converge if  $\overset{\circ}{\delta}t < \beta^{-1}$  and converge absolutely and homogeneously if, in particular,  $\overset{\circ}{\delta}t < (2\beta)^{-1}$ . This is just one of the restrictions to the domain of variation of  $t$  assumed by the theorem conditions. Hence the above series converge therein to holomorphic functions. The fulfillment of the integral equations follows from their direct relations to the transformations (6.12)–(6.18) and continuity of the maps determined by the integrals they involve.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.3.** For any given  $t_0 \neq 0$  and any constant parameter  $\lambda^{III}$  there exists a solution to integral equations (4.7), (5.1) holomorphic in some vicinity of  $t = t_0$  which verifies also the differential equations (4.10), (4.11) with the initial values

$$\lambda(t_0) = \lambda^{III}, \quad \mu(t_0) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \epsilon(1 - \chi_0^2)/(2t_0) + 3t_0 \lambda^{III}).$$

Let us remind that the noted Eq.s (4.10), (4.11) coincide, up to notations, with Eq.s (4.1), (4.2)<sup>2</sup> and so  $\lambda(t)$  is simply an instance of the function  $\lambda^{III}(t)$  from the decomposition (3.11). Knowing their solution, one can construct a holomorphic solution to Eq.(1.1) vanishing at  $t = t_0$  by means of the formula (3.11). Eq.s (2.3) and (4.12) are then also fulfilled.

## 7. SUMMARY

The above reasoning can be summarized as follows.

### Theorem 7.1.

*Let arbitrary  $t_0 \neq 0$  be chosen. Then there exist two families of solutions  $\lambda(t)$  to Eq. (1.1) each of which vanishes at  $t = t_0$  and is analytic thereat. These families are distinguished by the values of the derivative  $\dot{\lambda}(t_0)$  which is equal to  $+1$  for one of them and to  $-1$  for another. Within a single family, a solution is identified by the value of the third derivative  $\ddot{\lambda}(t_0)$  which can be arbitrary. The values of the second derivatives at  $t_0$  are common for all the members of the family amounting to  $(\dot{\lambda}(t_0) - \chi_0)/t_0$ .  $\square$*

There exists therefore a third Painlevé' transcendent vanishing at any given point distinct from zero.

## APPENDIX A. APPROXIMATE SOLUTIONS TO THIRD PAINLEVÉ' EQUATION VANISHING AT A GIVEN POINT

### A.1. Outline of derivation.

We have derived the system of two coupled integral equations (5.1), (4.7) which can be recast to the iterative scheme implemented in the Algorithm (see page 24) which enables one, in principle, to construct the sequence of functions  $\lambda_n, \mu_n$  converging to functions  $\lambda_\infty = \lambda, \mu_\infty = \mu$  fulfilling the equations to be solved. The overall procedure is convenient, maybe even optimal, for the proving of their existence and regularity. On the other hand, it does not suit well for the constructing approximate solutions represented by explicit 'expressions of a finite length', provided not a purely numerical problem treatment is assumed. What is here meant is that, dealing with approximate solutions, it is preferable to use the 'original' equation (4.6) for the function  $\lambda$  rather than its modified form (5.1) involving more complicated kernel function. In other words, it is the application

---

<sup>2</sup>The distinction of symbols  $\lambda$  (Eq. (3.11)) and  $\lambda$  (Eq. (4.10)) should not be ignored.

of the iterative transformations

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{m_1+1}(t_0 + \delta t) &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - \epsilon(\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) + 3t_0 \lambda^{III}) \\ &\quad + \delta t t_0^{-1} \left( -\frac{1}{2}(\chi_\infty + \epsilon \chi_0 - 1) - \mu_{m_1}(t_0 + \delta t) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^1 d\sigma \Omega_\mu[\lambda_{m_2}, \mu_{m_1}](\sigma, \delta t) \right), \tag{A.1} \\ \lambda_{n_1+1}(t_0 + \delta t) &= -\delta t t_0^{-1} \lambda_{n_1}(t_0 + \delta t) + t_0^{-1} \int_0^1 d\sigma \sigma^2 \Omega_\lambda[\lambda_{n_1}, \mu_{n_2}](\sigma, \delta t), \end{aligned}$$

where either  $\epsilon = 1$ , or  $\epsilon = -1$ ,  $\lambda^{III} = \text{const}$ , and  $m_1, m_2, n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ , which should be used for constructing of a truncated power series verifying Eq. (1.1) up to residual discrepancy of a desirable order in the argument deviation  $\delta t = t - t_0$ . We intend to outline below some details of the corresponding computational procedure. It could be arranged to a rigorous algorithm but we prefer here to give its somewhat informal less tedious description seeming nevertheless quite sufficient for application in practice.

First of all, we need to determine from what data we start. Our choice is as plain as possible: namely, it confirms that, at the beginning, *we know nothing about solution we plan to obtain*. Such a position is formalized by adopting the following assignments:

$$\mu_0(t) = 0, \lambda_0(t) = 0.$$

We have to treat these formulas as *containing no genuine information* about the limiting functions for the sequence conformal to the rules (A.1) which we endeavour to approximate.

Nevertheless, we venture to substitute this ‘‘void approximation’’ into the right hand sides in the formulas (A.1) endowed with indices  $m_1 = m_2 = n_1 = n_2 = 0$ . The result is

$$\mu_1(t) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - (\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) + 3t_0 \lambda^{III}), \lambda_1(t) = \lambda^{III}.$$

As opposed to the void ‘slice of zeroth order’, now we have already some true data. Specifically, as we will see, the above quantities coincide with values of the corresponding limiting functions (exact solutions) at the point  $t = t_0$ .

But we still do not know how  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  vary in response to the varying of  $t$ . Since we intend to represent the subsequent more developed approximations via truncated series in powers of the small quantity  $\delta t = t - t_0$ , we may recast the above equalities as follows

$$\mu_1(t_0 + \delta t) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - (\chi_0^2 - 1)/(2t_0) + 3t_0 \lambda^{III}) + O(\delta t), \lambda_1(t_0 + \delta t) = \lambda^{III} + O(\delta t). \tag{A.2}$$

Here  $O$ -terms are regarded as contributions of a one unit higher order (here equal to 1) which are considered as *existing but currently unknown*. Accordingly, a contribution of the same or higher order generated by any algebraic operation involving a quantity declared unknown *has to be declared unknown as well* (in

fact, this is the heuristic basic rule which must be adhered to in operations with truncated series including those which will be carried out below).

It is now pertinent to mention that the kernels  $\Omega_\mu, \Omega_\lambda$  in integrals in formulas (A.1) are polynomials in  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$ , as well as in all other explicit and suppressed arguments except of the fixed constant  $t_0$  which appears somewhere as a multiplier in denominators of fractions. See definitions (4.8), (4.9). This means that if  $\mu_*(t)$  and  $\lambda_*(t)$ ,  $*$   $\in \mathbb{N}$ , are polynomial in  $t$  (or, equivalently, in  $\delta t$ ) then the expressions in (A.1) to be integrated are also polynomial in both  $\delta t$  and  $\sigma$ . Accordingly, the integrating over  $\sigma$  appears to be elementary and preserving the polynomial dependence on  $\delta t$ . We may thus document this essentially obvious observation as follows:

**Proposition A.1.** *If the functions  $\mu_{m_1}, \lambda_{m_2}, \mu_{n_1}, \lambda_{n_2}$  are polynomial in  $t$  then the functions  $\mu_{m_1+1}, \lambda_{n_1+1}$  determined by the integral transformations (A.1) are also polynomial in  $t$ .*

This simple relation directly applies to our computations since the functions (A.2) (their 'known' parts) are constants, i.e. a particular case of polynomials. It means that the iterations (A.1) have also to produce polynomials in all the subsequent iteration steps. Considered as functions of  $\delta t$ , they can also be regarded as truncated power series without any additional transformation.

Another useful observation concerns some specialty of the kernel function  $\Omega_\mu$  which can be easily inferred from its explicit representation (definition) by Eq.(4.9). It shows explicitly the distinct 'degrees of influence' of the functions  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$  to the kernel value.

The former function  $\mu$  acts as the overall factor and hence affects that value without any suppressing.

On the contrary, the latter functional argument,  $\lambda$ , is suppressed by the third order factor of  $\delta t^3$ . Hence, when computing the functions  $\mu_n$  with the required degree of accuracy of the order  $n$  (i.e. up to an 'unknown' contribution of order  $n+1$ ) by means of the transformation (4.7), one must use on the right  $\mu$ -function given with accuracy of the order  $n-1$ , i.e.  $\mu_{n-1}$ . At the same time it is enough for  $\lambda$ -functions *to be three orders less accurate*, i.e. of order equal to  $n-4$  — but not less than that.

The above remarks apply to the following initial steps of our computations:

$$\{\mu_1, \lambda_1\} \models \mu_2, \{\mu_2, \lambda_1\} \models \mu_3, \{\mu_3, \lambda_1\} \models \mu_4, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Here the symbol ' $\models$ ' denotes the map applying the formula (4.7) which does not output, however, the 'rough' result 'as is' but interprets the 'input' functions shown in braces as combined expressions incorporating certain 'known' part and some 'unknown' one, the latter being of a higher order in variable  $\delta t$  than all the terms from the former. Accordingly, in the exhaustive formal result (which is easily computable in explicit form by means of partial expanding of products) all the contributions depending on 'unknown' things has to be combined to a single term

and declared as ‘unknown’ contribution to  $\mu$ -function to be computed. It should be of a higher order in  $\delta t$  than all the other (‘known’) terms — otherwise, the accuracy of the initial data used in computation is to be declared inappropriate assuming that it has, probably, to be increased. In particular, this is, formally, the reason why we include exactly three transformations in the sequence (A.3). The point is that already the next (fourth) one, namely, the transition  $\{\mu_4, \lambda_1\} \models \mu_5$ , fails due to insufficient accuracy of the approximation  $\lambda_1$ .

At the same time, as to the transformations (A.3), their results comprise ‘the genuine contributions’ bound with the  $\delta t$ -powers up to  $\delta t, \delta t^2$  and  $\delta t^3$  inclusively, respectively.

Now, to proceed, we need to obtain more accurate (and marked by greater indices) approximations  $\lambda_n$ . Their determinations is carried out by means of the formula (4.6). It involves the kernel function  $\Omega_\lambda$  defined in (4.8) and it is useful, first, to inspect the accuracy associated with its contribution. One sees that  $\mu$ -function is situated now in the expression of  $\Omega_\lambda$  on the topmost level. Accordingly, it has to be specified with accuracy not less than the planned accuracy of the result. On the other hand, the leading contribution of  $\lambda$ -function is ‘scaled’ by a multiplier containing the factor of  $\delta t$ . Hence one unit lower degree of accuracy is here enough (that, by the way, is necessary for making an iteration step meaningful at all).

Our current fund of  $\mu$ -functions containing, in particular,  $\mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4$ , ensure us feasibility of the producing of  $\lambda$ -functions with the same range of indices. This is realised by means of the transformations

$$\{\lambda_1, \mu_2\} \models \lambda_2, \{\lambda_2, \mu_3\} \models \lambda_3, \{\lambda_3, \mu_4\} \models \lambda_4, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where the symbol ‘ $\models$ ’ denotes the map which applies the transformation in accordance with formula (4.6) and then re-organizes its result in the way outlined above in the description of the map ‘ $\models$ ’. ‘The genuine parts’ of contributions to the functions  $\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4$  thus obtained are bound with the  $\delta t$  powers up to  $\delta t, \delta t^2$  and  $\delta t^3$  inclusively, respectively.

Now we are in position similar to the one existed at the beginning of the computation. There we had had the  $\lambda, \mu$ -functions  $\lambda_1, \mu_1$ . We managed further to construct several such type functions with greater indices, up to  $\lambda_4, \mu_4$ , inclusively.

We can now assign the role of  $\lambda_1, \mu_1$  to the functions  $\lambda_4, \mu_4$  and carry out computation differed in notations from the above ones only in values of indices of  $\lambda, \mu$ -functions which will be simply incremented by 3.

Six new functions will then result. Basing on the latest pair of them, the algorithm can be run once more. There is no obstruction, theoretically, to repeat such step more and more without limitation. In practice, the limit, of course, arises in view of finiteness of the available computational resources, at least.

To tentatively characterize the performance of the above computational scheme, we display below the result of its work endowed with the index equal to 6. It is of major interest to inspect a  $\lambda$ -function now named  $\lambda_6$ . It is displayed as



$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda_6(t) = & \lambda^{III} - \frac{\delta t}{4t_0^2} \left( \chi_\infty + (\epsilon \chi_0 + 2) t_0 \lambda^{III} \right) \\
 & + \frac{\delta t^2}{20t_0^2} \epsilon \left( 2 + 3\chi_\infty (\chi_0 + \epsilon)/t_0 + (5\chi_0 + 7\epsilon)\lambda^{III} + 6t_0^2 \lambda^{III^2} \right) \\
 & - \frac{\delta t^3}{360t_0^3} \left( \chi_\infty \left( (\chi_0 + \epsilon)(9\chi_0 + 46\epsilon)/t_0 + 90\epsilon t_0 \lambda^{III} \right) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + 2(18\chi_0 + 7\epsilon) + 9\epsilon(9\chi_0 + 11\epsilon)\lambda^{III} + 18(\chi_0 + 9\epsilon)t_0^2 \lambda^{III^2} \right) \\
 & + \frac{\delta t^4}{2520t_0^5} \left( 90\epsilon t_0 \chi_\infty^2 \right. \\
 & \quad + \chi_\infty \left( (\chi_0 + \epsilon)(91\chi_0 + 284\epsilon) + 18(18\chi_0 + 53\epsilon) t_0^2 \lambda^{III} \right) \\
 & \quad + 2(97\chi_0 + \epsilon(45\chi_0^2 + 53)) t_0 \\
 & \quad + 36(11t_0^2 + 14\epsilon \chi_0 + 16)t_0 \lambda^{III} \\
 & \quad \left. + 18(14\chi_0 + 73\epsilon) t_0^3 \lambda^{III^2} + 108t_0^5 \lambda^{III^3} \right) \\
 & - \frac{\delta t^5}{20160t_0^6} \left( 18(33\chi_0 + 65\epsilon) t_0 \chi_\infty^2 \right. \\
 & \quad + \chi_\infty \left( (\chi_0 + \epsilon)(830\chi_0 + 2047\epsilon) + 756t_0^2 \right. \\
 & \quad \quad \left. + 36\epsilon(9\chi_0^2 + 140\epsilon \chi_0 + 257)t_0^2 \lambda^{III} + 2268t_0^4 \lambda^{III^2} \right) \\
 & \quad + 2(45\chi_0^3 + 423\epsilon \chi_0^2 + 761\chi_0 + 388\epsilon) t_0 \\
 & \quad + 36(100\epsilon \chi_0 + 110 + 27(3\epsilon \chi_0 + 4) t_0^2) t_0 \lambda^{III} \\
 & \quad + 18(157\chi_0 + 620\epsilon) t_0^3 \lambda^{III^2} \\
 & \quad \left. + 108(\chi_0 \epsilon + 20) t_0^5 \lambda^{III^3} \right) + \text{unknown } O(\delta t^6),
 \end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

assuming replacement  $\delta t \Leftarrow t - t_0$ .

Explicit formula for the fifth order approximation to the function  $\lambda(t)$ .

Eq. (A.5) in page 37. It can be mentioned that the above expression proves to be considerably less bulky than one might anticipate looking at formulas used for its derivation.

$\lambda$ -function is however not a final result. Let us remind that its role is to represent (being exactly equal to!) the function  $\lambda^{III}(t)$ , *cf.* Eq.s (4.1), (4.2) with Eq.s (4.10), (4.11). Thus, taking into account Eq. (3.11), we can introduce the function to be proposed as *the approximate solution to the third Painlevé' equation (1.1), vanishing at  $t = t_0$* , which is accurate up to terms proportional to  $\delta t^8$ , inclusively, by the following definition

$$\lambda(t) = (t - t_0)\epsilon + \frac{1}{2}(t - t_0)^2(\epsilon - \chi_0)/t_0 + (t - t_0)^3 \lambda_6(t).$$

Indeed, the verification is here, in principle, straightforward and, substituting the above  $\lambda$  into Eq. (1.1), one finds by means of a standard simplification<sup>3</sup> that the arising residual discrepancy is proportional to  $\delta t^7$  (one order is lost due to the presence of vanishing  $\lambda$  in denominators of fractions from the equation right hand side).

Removing one or more higher order terms from the expression (A.5), one obtains less accurate approximate solutions which verify Eq. (1.1) up to residual discrepancies going to zero as  $t \rightarrow t_0$  with rates of the corresponding lower degrees.

## A.2. An example of application.

It seems worthwhile to demonstrate here a lucid example confirming relevance of the approximation (A.5) and illustrating its capability. A collation of a numerical ‘apparently exact’ solution to Eq. (1.1) with results produced by the former formula seems to be a reasonable form of such an example. Certainly, there are too many free parameters here to achieve in this way any notable degree of generality. Nevertheless, even isolated attempts, if successful, should conduce accruing reliance to the background of these computations discussed above.

Anyway, a full concreteness is here mandatory. To that end, we assume all the constant parameters, free variable, and functions we will use to be real valued. We set the constants fixing the equation (1.1) as follows:

$$\chi_0 = -0.811597\dots, \chi_\infty = -0.0550042\dots$$

Next we has to construct its solution. This is carried out by means of the numerical solving the Cauchy problem for this equation. We select (originally random) point  $t = t_C$  and the values of the function to be found and its derivative (also originally random and then fixes after a number of unsuccessful attempts) at that point as follows

$$t_C = 0.833651\dots, \lambda(t_C) = 0.288298\dots, \dot{\lambda}(t_C) = 0.374531\dots$$

Then Eq. (1.1) can be integrated numerically on the interval  $(0.01, 2)$ . The result is displayed in Fig. 1 (is arranged dynamically, currently in page 39). The quality of the solution can be indirectly overseen evaluating the residual discrepancy  $\ddot{\lambda} - \text{RHS}[\text{Eq.}(1.1)]$ , where the derivative  $\ddot{\lambda} = \ddot{\lambda}(t)$  is determined numerically using a finite difference scheme. The corresponding graph exhibiting chaotic noise caused by uncontrollable small deviations of the numerical solution from the exact one as well as other numerical effects is shown in Fig. 2 (is arranged dynamically, currently in page 39). It indicates a satisfactory accuracy level<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>3</sup>This seems unlikely to be feasible without application of the computer algebra tools, though.

<sup>4</sup>The numerical integration of the differential equation (1.1) was carried out making use of the tools implemented in the proprietary software MATHEMATICA activated after invoking the routine called `NDSolve`. It must be kept in mind that, in most cases, these operate in a black box style. In particular, although it is possible to specify the desirable level of accuracy of the result, whether such a requirement is finally met or not is often unclear. Accordingly, an




FIGURE 1. The result of numerical integrating of Eq. (1.1) on the segment  $(0.01, 2)$  (vertical direction;  $t$  is plotted against the horizontal one). The solution is fixed by the values  $\lambda = 0.288298\dots$ ,  $\dot{\lambda} = 0.374531\dots$  assumed at the point  $t = t_C = 0.833651\dots$ , the constant parameters fixing the equation were set as follows:  $\chi_0 = -0.811598\dots$ ,  $\chi_\infty = -0.055004\dots$




FIGURE 2. Auxiliary data. The difference of the left and right hand sides of Eq. (1.1) (its residual discrepancy) evaluated on the function  $\lambda = \lambda(t)$  shown in Fig. 1 (the vertical direction;  $t$  is plotted against the horizontal one). Positions of roots of  $\lambda(t)$  are indicated.

Six zeros are observed on the plot shown in Fig. 1. They are computed numerically from the “already known” function  $\lambda(t)$ . The values thus obtained are as follows: 0.0159082..., 0.0427774..., 0.0901638..., 0.242530..., 0.511115..., 1.38175... On this 6-point grid our solution  $\lambda(t)$  produces the following values:  $-1.7 \cdot 10^{-18}$ ,  $3.5 \cdot 10^{-18}$ ,  $6.3 \cdot 10^{-19}$ ,  $6.5 \cdot 10^{-18}$ ,  $9.1 \cdot 10^{-17}$ ,  $3.3 \cdot 10^{-17}$ . We see that the root approximations may be considered satisfactory — of course, up to degree of accuracy of the solution  $\lambda$  in itself.

We will consider here only the two maximal ones from the above collection of roots which are marked by small circles on the horizontal axis in Fig. 1. At the left root from this pair,  $t_{0_1} = 0.511115...$ , the curve slope is positive with derivative equal to  $+1$ . At the right one,  $t_{0_2} = 1.38175...$ , it amounts to  $-1$ . Thus both available opportunities  $\epsilon = \pm 1$  are realised. We intend to inspect capability of the approximated solution (A.5) in cases when it is anchored at each of these points, separately. The simplest way to do this is to collate its plots with the plot of the “almost exact” numerical solution  $\lambda(t)$ .

However, there is an additional problem which must be here solved in advance. The point is that computations with formula (A.5) require the knowledge of one more parameter denoted  $\lambda'''$ .

From a general point of view  $\lambda'''$  is related to what a concrete solution we deal with while in a narrow sense it is defined by the third order derivative of the solution determined at the root which is considered. See, e.g., Eq. (3.13). Thus originally this is a numerical computation but at the same time the problem of determination of the relevant  $\lambda'''$  can be lifted to a partially analytic level if we take for granted that the function to be thrice differentiated verifies the second order differential equation. Then one can obtain the third derivative by means of differentiating of this equation, i.e. differentiating Eq. (1.1). Using it once more, the second derivative is eliminated from the result and one obtains an explicit formula representing the third derivative as a rational function of the solution itself and its first order derivative. Both these functions have become known as the result of numerical integration of the original equation.

It is not possible, however, to obtain the desirable value of the third order derivative simply substituting the value of the root  $t_{0_1}$  or  $t_{0_2}$  to the derived formula mentioned above since it inherits from Eq. (3.13). the 0/0-kind indeterminate behavior just at values of  $t$  where the solution vanishes. This effect is really happening and the corresponding simple test computations yield obviously meaningless results.

---

independent verification is here advisable. On the other hand, the behaviour of the numerical solution displayed in Fig. 1 near its roots proves to be perfectly regular. At the same time, the right hand side of the equation to be solved experiences thereat a 0/0-kind indeterminate behavior which, in case of a naïve numerical treatment, might lead to a catastrophic loss of accuracy. It is unclear whether the apparent absence of the latter is a mere happy coincidence and the passage across singularity did not accidentally cause any notable aftermath, or some preventive actions were taken by the smart algorithm of `NDSolve`.

ON  $\langle \dots \rangle$  ROOTS OF THIRD PAINLEVÉ' TRANSCENDENTS




FIGURE 3. The third order derivative of the function displayed in Fig. 1 is plotted. The positions of its two selected roots indicated therein are marked.

The difficulty is resolved by using not the derived exact formula but the numerical function obtained by means of its interpolation. The point is that the numerical solution we have available is actually represented by a set of its values (and values of its derivative) determined at nodes of some finite inhomogeneous grid. For any point distinct from all the grid nodes (but inside the segment the latter span) the determination of the solution value is realized by means of interpolation (by defaults, by splines). Working with the third order derivative, we may proceed in the same way: first of all, its values are determined at nodes of the noted grid by means of the exact formula using the stored values of the solution and its derivative at the same nodes. Some ‘bad nodes’ can be removed but in the case we consider no such a necessity arises. These values are stored. After that, the third order derivative is determined at an arbitrary point, which, in particular, may coincide with a solution root, by means of the interpolating between the nearby grid nodes. The result of application of such an approach is displayed in Fig. 3.

Using the numerical function approximating the third order derivative of the solution, we can easily find that  $\lambda^{III}_1 = \ddot{\lambda}(t_{0_1})/6 \approx -9.01149$ ,  $\lambda^{III}_2 = \ddot{\lambda}(t_{0_2})/6 \approx 1.24246$ . Now we have all the data necessary for computations using the formula (A.5). The results are displayed in Fig. 4, where the interval of variation of  $t$  is chosen to be some widening of the segment  $(t_{0_1}, t_{0_2})$ .




FIGURE 4. Overlapping between the two graphs imaging the approximations defined by the formula (A.5) which are centered at  $t_{0_1} = 0.5111\dots$  and  $t_{0_2} = 1.3818\dots$ , respectively, (dashed lines) and the plot of numerical solution to Eq. (1.1) vanishing at  $t_{0_1}$  and  $t_{0_2}$  (gray solid line in background) also displayed on a greater domain in Fig. 1.

One can see that the plot of the approximation of the solution we consider by a truncated series of the order 8 centered at the root  $t_{0_1} = 0.5111\dots$  looks indistinguishable from the plot of the numerical solution up to the right boundary close to 0.85 (that corresponds to  $\delta t/t_{0_1} < 0.66$ ). The left boundary of the similar coincidence for the approximation centered at the greater root  $t_{0_2} = 1.3818\dots$  is about 0.7 (corresponding to  $\delta t/t_{0_2} > -0.49$ ). Therefore it is situated to the left of the above right boundary. Accordingly, the combination of these two approximations applied on domains ensuring their satisfactory accuracies covers the whole segment bounded by the roots  $t_{0_1}$  and  $t_{0_2}$  where they are centered at and also extends somewhat beyond.

The considered example can be regarded as a numerical validation of the analytical method discussed above and the approximate formula it leads to.

#### APPENDIX B. APPLICATION TO DESCRIPTION OF POLES OF THIRD PAINLEVÉ' TRANSCENDENT

The third subfamily of the family of Painlevé' equations possesses some interesting symmetries of which one seems quite remarkable. It can be revealed through the both their representations, (1.1) (1.2). Specifically, it is easy to show

that the replacement

$$\underline{\lambda}(\underline{t}) \Leftarrow \underline{\lambda}(\underline{t})^{-1} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

of the unknown function  $\underline{\lambda}$  preserves the fulfillment of Eq. (1.2), provided the constant parameters are concurrently undergone the replacements

$$\alpha \Leftarrow -\beta, \beta \Leftarrow -\alpha; \gamma \Leftarrow -\delta, \delta \Leftarrow -\gamma \quad (\text{B.2})$$

(pairwise interchange combined with the inverting of signs).

The dual property of the equation (1.1) reads: the replacement

$$\lambda(t) \Leftarrow t \lambda(t)^{-1} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

of the unknown function  $\lambda$  retains its fulfillment in case of concurrent interchange

$$\chi_0 \Leftarrow \chi_\infty \quad (\text{B.4})$$

of the values of the parameters  $\chi_0$  and  $\chi_\infty$ . We restrict ourselves to consideration of the latter transformation.

Applying the above transformation to relations captioned by Theorem 7.1 one obtains the following their consequences:

**Corollary B.1.** *There exist two families of meromorphic solutions to Eq. (1.1) each of which possesses simple pole at a given arbitrarily chosen point  $t_0 \neq 0$ . These families are distinguished by the values of residue which is equal to  $t_0$  for one of them and to  $-t_0$  for another. Within a single family, a solution can be identified by the value of the derivative*

$$\left[ \frac{d}{dt} \left( \lambda(t) - \frac{\text{Res}_{t_0}(\lambda)}{t - t_0} \right) \right]_{t \Leftarrow t_0}$$

*evaluated at  $t_0$  which is well defined and, depending on solution, may manifest any value.*

The invariance of Eq. (1.1) with respect to replacements (B.3), (B.4) enables one use the explicit formula (A.5) for the making of approximate representation of third Painlevé' transcendent near its pole. The only thing that needs to be here done is, essentially, the computation of the reciprocal to this truncated power series. There are neither principal nor technical obstacles to such a transformation. However, its result proves to possess a notably more bulky representation and it seems unlikely to be useful to display it here in full. As a compromise, we provide less accurate (or, more precisely, two orders less accurate) version of the same



formula which reads

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda(t_0 + \delta t) &= \frac{\epsilon t_0}{\delta t} + (\epsilon + \chi_\infty)/2 - \delta t \left( \epsilon (1 - \chi_\infty^2)/(4t_0) + t_0 \lambda^{III} \right) & (B.5) \\
&+ \delta t^2/(4t_0) \left( ((\epsilon - \chi_\infty)(1 - \chi_\infty^2)/(2t_0) + \chi_0) + (2 - 3\epsilon \chi_\infty)t_0 \lambda^{III} \right) \\
&- \delta t^3/(10t_0) \times \\
&\quad \left( \epsilon + (3 - 2\epsilon \chi_\infty)/(2t_0) \chi_0 + 5(\epsilon (1 + \chi_\infty^2) - 2\chi_\infty)(1 - \chi_\infty^2)/(8t_0^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1 - 5(3\epsilon - 2\chi_\infty)\chi_\infty/2) \lambda^{III} - 7\epsilon t_0^2 \lambda^{III^2} \right) \\
&+ \delta t^4/(20t_0^2) \times \\
&\quad \left( 7\epsilon/9 + 5(1 - \chi_\infty^2)(\epsilon (1 + 3\chi_\infty^2) - (3 + \chi_\infty^2)\chi_\infty)/(8t_0^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (47 + 45\chi_\infty^2 - 88\epsilon \chi_\infty)\chi_0/(36t_0) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - ((2 - 15\chi_\infty^2) + 5\epsilon (7 + 5\chi_\infty^2)\chi_\infty/4 + 5\epsilon t_0 \chi_0) \lambda^{III} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 3(7\epsilon - 5\chi_\infty)t_0^2 \lambda^{III^2} \right) + O(\delta t^5).
\end{aligned}$$

The expression is correct but, perhaps, its representation could be made simpler by means of the replacement of the constant parameter  $\lambda^{III}$ , which is not here endowed with a clear interpretation, by another, desirably more natural one.

Anyway, upon substitution of the approximate solution (B.5) into Eq. (1.1), the resulting residual discrepancy proves to be scaled by the small factor of  $\delta t^3$ . It could be added that making use of the more accurate expression, embodying all the information ensured by Eq. (A.5), imposes on the residual discrepancy the overall factor of  $\delta t^5$ . Thus a producing of such an approximation is quite feasible.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Peter A. Clarkson *Painlevé equations—nonlinear special functions*. J. Comp. Appl. Math., **153** (2003) 127-140
- [2] Gromak, Valerii I., Laine, Ilpo and Shimomura, Shun. *Painlevé Differential Equations in the Complex Plane*, Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2002
- [3] Jan Dereziński, Artur Ishkhanyan, and Adam Latosiński *From Heun Class Equations to Painlevé' Equations*. Symmetry, Integrability and Geometry: Methods and Applications (SIGMA) **17** (2021), 056
- [4] Slavyanov S. *Painlevé equations as classical analogues of Heun equations*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen., **29** (1996) 7329-7335