

## On the convergence of approximate iterations for an abstract equation

by M. KWAPISZ (Gdańsk)

**1.** The purpose of the present paper is to discuss the conditions ensuring the convergence of the sequence of approximate solutions  $\{y_n\}$  to a solution of an abstract equation  $x = f(x)$ . The most simple approximate solutions of this equation are the simple iterations  $x_{n+1} = f(x_n)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ . Because of rounding error or error in the evaluation of  $f(x)$  an approximate sequence is in general produced in place of the exact sequence  $\{x_n\}$ . It is very important for numerical analysis to know the effect of this error.

This problem has been investigated in recent years by several authors (for more detailed discussion and bibliography see [3]).

The present paper is related to the general idea of Ważewski [4]. The results stated here are an extension of the paper [1].

**2. Preliminaries and lemmas.** Following Ważewski [4] we introduce

ASSUMPTION  $H_1$ .

1°  $G$  is a partially ordered set (an ordering relation is denoted by  $<$ , we write  $u \leq v$  iff  $u < v$  or  $u = v$ ), in  $G$  there exists an element  $0$  such that  $0 \leq u$  for any  $u \in G$ ;

2° for any  $u, v \in G$  a relation  $u + v$  is defined and has the following properties:

(a) if  $u, v, w \in G$ , then  $u + v \in G$ ,  $u + v = v + u$ ,  $(u + v) + w = u + (v + w)$ ,  $u + 0 = u$ ,

(b) if  $u, v, w \in G$  and  $u \leq v$ , then  $u + w \leq v + w$ ,

(c) if  $u, v, w \in G$  and  $u + v \leq w$ , then  $u \leq w$ ;

3° for any non-increasing sequence  $\{u_n\}$ ,  $u_n \in G$ ,  $u_{n+1} \leq u_n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , there exists a unique element  $u \in G$  called the limit of the sequence  $\{u_n\}$  (we write  $u = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n$  or  $u_n \searrow u$ ).

The limit has the following properties:

(a)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n$  is invariant with respect to the change of a finite number of elements of the sequence  $\{u_n\}$ ,

(b) if  $u_n = u$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n = u$ ,

(c) if  $u_n \searrow u$ ,  $v_n \searrow v$  and  $u_n \leq v_n$ , then  $u \leq v$ ,

(d) if  $u_n \searrow u$ ,  $v_n \searrow v$ , then  $u_n + v_n \searrow u + v$ .

ASSUMPTION  $H_2$ . The function  $a(u)$  is defined for  $u \in \Delta \subset G$  and has the following properties:

1°  $0 \in \Delta$  and if  $k \in \Delta$ , then  $u \in \Delta$  for any  $u \leq k$ ;

2°  $a(\Delta) \subset G$  ( $a(\Delta)$  is the set of the values of the function  $a(u)$  for  $u \in \Delta$ );

3° if  $u, v \in \Delta$  and  $u \leq v$ , then  $a(u) \leq a(v)$ ;

4° if  $u_n \in \Delta$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , and  $u_n \searrow u$ , then  $a(u_n) \searrow a(u)$ ;

5°  $u = 0$  is the only solution in  $\Delta$  of the equation  $u = a(u)$ .

DEFINITION. For any  $u \in \Delta$  we define the sequence  $\{a_n(u)\}$  of the iterations of the element  $u$  by the recurrent formula

$$a_0(u) = u, \quad a_{n+1}(u) = a(a_n(u)), \quad \text{if } a_n(u) \in \Delta, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

We state the following

LEMMA 1 (see [4]). If Assumption  $H_2$  is fulfilled and there exists a  $c \in \Delta$  such that  $a(c) \leq c$ , then all iterations  $a_n(c)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , of the element  $c$  exist and

$$a_{n+1}(c) \leq a_n(c) \leq c, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, \quad \text{and } a_n(c) \searrow 0.$$

LEMMA 2 (see [4]). If Assumption  $H_2$  is fulfilled and there exist  $q \in \Delta$  and  $b \in \Delta$  such that

$$q + a(b) \leq b,$$

then the equation

$$(1) \quad u = a(u) + q$$

has the solution  $u = m(b, q) \leq b$ , which has the following properties:

1°  $m(b, q) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n(b, q)$ , where  $b_0(b, q) = b$ ,  $b_{n+1}(b, q) = q + a(b_n(b, q))$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ;

if  $p \leq b$  and  $p \leq q + a(p)$ , then  $p \leq m(b, q)$ .

From Lemmas 1, 2 and Lemmas 3, 4 of the paper [1] we have

LEMMA 3. If Assumption  $H_2$  is fulfilled and there exist  $q_n, b_k \in \Delta$ ,  $q_{n+1} \leq q_n$ ,  $b_{k+1} \leq b_k$ ,  $k, n = 0, 1, \dots$ , such that

$$q_n + a(b_k) \leq b_k,$$

then the equation

$$u = a(u) + q_n$$

has a solution  $u = m(b_k, q_n) \leq b_k$  being the non-decreasing function of both variables  $b_k, q_n$ , i.e.  $m(b_k, q_{n+1}) \leq m(b_k, q_n)$  and  $m(b_{k+1}, q_n) \leq m(b_k, q_n)$ ,  $k, n = 0, 1, \dots$

Moreover, if  $q_n \searrow q$  and  $b_k \searrow b$ , then  $m(b_k, q_n) \searrow m(b_k, q)$ ,  $m(b_k, q_n) \searrow m(b, q_n)$  and, consequently, if  $q_n \searrow 0$ , then  $m(b_k, q_n) \searrow 0$ .

DEFINITION.  $m(q)$  is called the maximal solution of equation (1) if it satisfies this equation and for any solution  $u(q)$  of (1) the inequality  $u(q) \leq m(q)$  holds true.

LEMMA 4 (see Lemma 5 of [1]). If Assumption  $H_2$  is fulfilled,  $\Delta = G$ , and for any  $q \in G$  equation (1) has a maximal solution  $m(q)$ ,  $p \in G$ , and  $p \leq a(p) + q$ , then  $p \leq m(q)$ .

Moreover, if  $q_n \searrow q$ ,  $q_{n+1} \leq q_n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , then  $m(q_{n+1}) \leq m(q_n)$ ,  $m(q_n) \searrow m(q)$ , and, consequently, if  $q_n \searrow 0$ , then  $m(q_n) \searrow 0$ .

ASSUMPTION  $H_3$ . The function  $A(u, v)$  is defined for  $u, v \in \Delta$  and has the following properties:

- 1°  $A(\Delta \times \Delta) \subset G$ ;
- 2° if  $u, \bar{u}, v, \bar{v} \in \Delta$  and  $u \leq \bar{u}$ ,  $v \leq \bar{v}$ , then  $A(u, v) \leq A(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$ ;
- 3° if  $u_n, v_n \in \Delta$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , and  $u_n \searrow u$ ,  $v_n \searrow v$ , then  $A(u_n, v_n) \searrow A(u, v)$ ;
- 4°  $u = 0$  is the only solution in  $\Delta$  of the equation  $u = A(u, u)$ .

LEMMA 5. If Assumption  $H_3$  is fulfilled and there exist  $q \in \Delta$ ,  $b \in \Delta$ , such that  $q + A(b, b) \leq b$ , then for any  $v \leq b$  there exists a solution  $m_v(b, q) \leq b$  of the equation

$$u = A(u, v) + q.$$

Moreover, if  $w \leq b$  and  $w \leq A(w, v) + q$ , then

$$w \leq m_v(b, q) \leq b.$$

Proof. Put

$$u_0 = b, \quad u_{n+1} = A(u_n, v) + q, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots;$$

we have

$$u_n \searrow m_v(b, q) \leq b, \quad w \leq u_n, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots,$$

whence we get the assertion of Lemma 5.

LEMMA 6. If the assumptions of Lemma 5 are fulfilled,  $q_{n+1} \leq q_n \leq q$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ,  $q_n \searrow 0$  and  $m_{n+1}(b, q_{n+1})$  is a solution of the equation

$$u = A(u, m_n(b, q_n)) + q_{n+1}, \quad m_0(b, q_0) = b, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots,$$

then  $m_n(b, q_n) \searrow 0$ .

Moreover, if  $w_{n+1} \leq A(w_{n+1}, w_n) + q_{n+1}$  and  $w_n \leq b$ , then  $w_n \leq m_n(b, q_n)$ , and, consequently,  $w_n \searrow 0$  (if  $w_{n+1} \leq w_n$ ).

Proof. This lemma is the simple consequence of the previous one.

LEMMA 7. If Assumption  $H_3$  is fulfilled,  $\Delta = G$  and if for any  $v, q \in G$  there exist the maximal solutions  $m(q)$ ,  $m_v(q)$  of the equations

$$u = A(u, u) + q, \quad u = A(u, v) + q,$$

and

$$d \leq A(d, v) + q, \quad d \in G,$$

then  $d \leq m_v(q)$ .

Moreover, if  $q_n \searrow 0$  and  $m_{n+1}(q_{n+1})$  is the maximal solution of the equation

$$u = A(u, m_n(q_n)) + q_{n+1}, \quad m_0 = m(q_0), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots,$$

and  $w_{n+1} \leq A(w_{n+1}, w_n) + q_{n+1}$ ,  $w_0 \leq m_0$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , then  $m_n(q_n) \searrow 0$  and  $w_n \leq m_n(q_n)$  and, consequently,  $w_n \searrow 0$  (if  $w_{n+1} \leq w_n$ ).

**Proof.** Let  $u_0$  be a solution of the equation

$$u = A(u, v) + q + d;$$

then  $u_0 \geq A(u_0, v) + q$  and  $u_0 \geq d$ .

Put  $u_{n+1} = A(u_n, v) + q$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ; we see that  $u_{n+1} \leq u_n$ , whence  $u_n \searrow m_v(q)$ . By induction we get  $d \leq u_n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , and consequently  $d \leq m_v(q)$ .

Further, by induction we obtain  $m_{n+1}(q_{n+1}) \leq m_n(q_n)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , hence  $m_n(q_n)$  converges to an element  $m$  which satisfies the equation  $u = A(u, u)$ . By Assumption  $H_3$ ,  $m = 0$ .

By virtue of induction we get  $w_n \leq m_n(q_n)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ . The last assertion of lemma is obvious.

**LEMMA 8.** *If Assumption  $H_2$  is fulfilled and the sequence  $\{\varepsilon_n\}$  is such that  $\varepsilon_n \in G$ ,  $\varepsilon_n \searrow 0$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ,  $\varepsilon_0 + a(b) \leq b$ , and the sequence  $\{z_n(\varepsilon)\}$  is defined by the relation*

$$z_{n+1}(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon_n + a(z_n(\varepsilon)), \quad z_0(\varepsilon) = b, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots,$$

then  $z_{n+1}(\varepsilon) \leq z_n(\varepsilon)$  and  $z_n(\varepsilon) \searrow 0$ .

More general, if  $\varepsilon_n \searrow \eta$ , then  $z_n(\varepsilon) \searrow z$ , where  $z$  is the maximal solution of the equation  $u = \eta + a(u)$ .

**Proof.** We have  $z_1(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon_0 + a(b) \leq b = z_0(\varepsilon)$ . By induction we get  $z_{n+1}(\varepsilon) \leq z_n(\varepsilon)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ . According to Assumption  $H_2$ , we obtain the assertion of the lemma.

**Remark 1.** Lemma 8 is a generalization of Lemma 1, if  $\varepsilon_n = 0$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , then  $z_n(0) = a_n(b)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$

### 3. The main space $R$ . We make

**ASSUMPTION  $H_4$ .**  *$R$  is an abstract space such that*

1° *for some sequences  $\{x_n\}$ ,  $x_n \in R$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , there exists a uniquely determined limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$ ,  $x \in R$ ;  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$  is invariant with respect to the change of a finite number of elements of  $\{x_n\}$  (the relation  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$  will also be written  $x_n \rightarrow x$ );*

2° if  $x_n = s \in R$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = s$ ;

3° the function  $r(x, y)$  is defined on the product  $R \times R$  and has the following properties:

- (a)  $r(x, y) \in G$ ,
- (b)  $r(x, y) = 0$  iff  $x = y$ ,
- (c) for any  $x, y, z \in R$ ,

$$r(x, y) \leq r(x, z) + r(y, z);$$

4° for any  $x^* \in R$  and  $b \in G$  the sphere

$$S(x^*, b) = [x: x \in R, r(x, x^*) \leq b]$$

is a closed set;

5° the space  $R$  is complete in the following sense: if  $c_n \in G$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ,  $c_n \searrow 0$  and for  $x_n \in R$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , the Cauchy condition

$$r(x_n, x_{n+m}) \leq c_n, \quad n, m = 0, 1, \dots,$$

is satisfied, then there exists a limit  $y \in R$  of sequence  $\{x_n\}$ .

ASSUMPTION  $H_5$ . The function  $f(x)$  is defined on the sphere  $S(x^*, b) \subset R$ ,  $x^* \in R$ ,  $b \in \Delta$ , and has the following properties:

- 1°  $f(x) \in R$ ;
- 2° for any  $x, y \in S(x^*, b)$ ,

$$r(f(x), f(y)) \leq a(r(x, y)),$$

where the function  $a(u)$  satisfies Assumption  $H_2$  and  $b + b \stackrel{\text{df}}{=} 2b \in \Delta$ ;

3° there exists a  $q \in \Delta$  such that

$$r(x^*, f(x^*)) \leq q \quad \text{and} \quad q + a(b) \leq b.$$

ASSUMPTION  $H_6$ . Suppose that

- 1° the function  $f(x)$  is defined for  $x \in R$ ,  $f(x) \in R$ ;
- 2° for any  $x, y \in R$ ,

$$r(f(x), f(y)) \leq a(r(x, y)),$$

where the function  $a(u)$  satisfies Assumption  $H_2$  with  $\Delta = G$ ;

3° for any  $q \in G$  the equation

$$u = a(u) + q$$

has a maximal solution  $m(q)$ .

ASSUMPTION  $H_7$ . Assume that

1° the functions  $f_n(x, y)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , are defined on the product  $S(x^*, b) \times S(x^*, b)$ ;  $f_n(x, y) \in R$ ;

2° for any  $x, y, s, t \in S(x^*, b)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , we have

$$r(f_n(x, y), f_n(s, t)) \leq A(r(x, s), r(y, t)),$$

where the function  $A(u, v)$  satisfies Assumption  $H_3$ ,  $2b \in \Delta$ ;

3° there exists  $q \in \Delta$  such that for any  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ,

$$r(x^*, f_n(x^*, x^*)) \leq q \quad \text{and} \quad q + A(b, b) \leq b.$$

**ASSUMPTION  $H_8$ .** Suppose that

1° the functions  $f_n(x, y)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , are defined on the product  $R \times R$ ,  $f_n(x, y) \in R$ ;

2° for any  $x, y, s, t \in R$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ,

$$r(f_n(x, y), f_n(s, t)) \leq A(r(x, s), r(y, t)),$$

where the function  $A(u, v)$  satisfies Assumption  $H_3$ ,  $\Delta = G$ ;

3° for any  $q \in G$  there exists a maximal solution of the equation

$$u = A(u, u) + q.$$

**4. Approximate iterations, local theorems.** Now we are going to formulate some basic theorems.

**THEOREM 1.** If Assumption  $H_5$  is fulfilled and the sequence  $\{y_n\}$  has the properties

1°  $y_n \in S(x^*, b)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ,  $y_0 = x^*$ ,

2°  $r(y_{n+1}, f(y_n)) \leq \varepsilon_n$ ,  $\varepsilon_n \searrow 0$  and  $\varepsilon_0 \leq q$ ,

then there exists in  $S(x^*, b)$  a unique solution  $\bar{x}$  of the equation

$$(2) \quad x = f(x)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \bar{x}, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = \bar{x},$$

where

$$x_{n+1} = f(x_n), \quad x_0 = x^*.$$

Moreover

$$r(\bar{x}, x_n) \leq a_n(b), \quad r(\bar{x}, y_n) \leq z_n(\varepsilon), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots,$$

$a_n(b)$  and  $z_n(\varepsilon)$  are defined in Lemmas 1 and 8.

**Proof.** At first we prove the convergence of the sequence  $\{x_n\}$ . Observe that  $x_n \in S(x^*, b)$  and  $r(x_n, x_{n+m}) \leq a_n(b)$ ,  $n, m = 0, 1, \dots$ . Indeed, we have  $r(x_0, x^*) \leq b$  and further, by induction, we get

$$\begin{aligned} r(x_n, x^*) &= r(f(x_{n-1}), f(x^*)) + r(f(x^*), x^*) \leq a(r(x_{n-1}, x^*)) + q \\ &\leq a(b) + q \leq b. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have  $r(x_0, x_m) \leq b$  and by induction we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r(x_n, x_{n+m}) &\leq r(f(x_{n-1}), f(x_{n-1+m})) \leq a(r(x_{n-1}, x_{n-1+m})) \\ &\leq a(a_{n-1}(b)) = a_n(b). \end{aligned}$$

Because of Lemma 1,  $a_n(b) \searrow 0$ . Therefore, according to Assumption  $H_4$ , there exists a limit  $\bar{x}$  of the sequence  $\{x_n\}$ ,  $\bar{x} \in S(x^*, b)$ .  $\bar{x}$  is the solution of equation (2). In fact, we have  $r(\bar{x}, f(\bar{x})) \leq r(\bar{x}, x_n) + r(f(x_{n-1}), f(\bar{x})) \leq a_n(b) + a(a_{n-1}(b)) = 2a_n(b)$ . Thus, if  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain  $r(\bar{x}, f(\bar{x})) = 0$ , i.e.  $\bar{x} = f(\bar{x})$ .  $\bar{x}$  is the unique solution of equation (2). Indeed, if there exists another solution  $x' \in S(x^*, b)$  of equation (2), then we get  $r(x', x_n) \leq a_n(b)$  and  $r(x', \bar{x}) \leq r(x', x_n) + r(x_n, \bar{x}) \leq 2a_n(b)$ . For  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we obtain  $r(x', \bar{x}) = 0$ , i.e.  $x' = \bar{x}$ .

Now we shall prove the relation  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = \bar{x}$ . We have

$$r(y_{n+1}, \bar{x}) \leq r(y_{n+1}, f(y_n)) + r(f(y_n), f(\bar{x})) \leq \varepsilon_n + a(r(y_n, \bar{x})).$$

Put  $r_n = r(y_n, \bar{x})$ . Now we get

$$r_{n+1} \leq \varepsilon_n + a(r_n), \quad r_0 = r(y_0, \bar{x}) = r(x^*, \bar{x}) \leq b = z_0(\varepsilon).$$

By induction, we easily infer that  $r_n \leq z_n(\varepsilon)$ , i.e.

$$r(y_{n+1}, \bar{x}) \leq z_{n+1}(\varepsilon).$$

Moreover,

$$r(y_n, y_{n+m}) \leq r(y_n, \bar{x}) + r(y_{n+m}, \bar{x}) \leq z_n(\varepsilon) + z_{n+m}(\varepsilon) \leq 2z_n(\varepsilon).$$

Because of Lemma 8,  $z_n(\varepsilon) \searrow 0$ , therefore, according to Assumption  $H_4$ , there exists a limit  $\bar{y}$  of the sequence  $\{y_n\}$ ,  $\bar{y} \in S(x^*, b)$ . We also have  $r(\bar{y}, \bar{x}) \leq r(\bar{y}, y_n) + r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq 2z_n(\varepsilon)$ . Hence, if  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain  $r(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = 0$ , i.e.  $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$ . Thus Theorem 1 is completely proved.

**Remark 2.** Instead of Assumption 2° in Theorem 1 one can assume  $r(y_n, f(y_n)) \leq \varepsilon_n \searrow 0$ ,  $\varepsilon_0 \leq q$  and  $r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq b$ .

Indeed, we get

$$r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq r(y_n, f(y_n)) + r(f(y_n), f(\bar{x})) \leq \varepsilon_n + a(r(y_n, \bar{x})),$$

whence, by Lemma 3 we obtain

$$r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq m(b, \varepsilon_n) \searrow 0.$$

However, it is obvious that condition 2° in Theorem 1 is more convenient for applications than that mentioned above; in 2° there is no requirement  $r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq b$ .

**Remark 3.** If the assumptions of Theorem 1 are fulfilled and

$$\varepsilon_n + a(r(y_n, y_{n+1})) \leq q_n \leq q, \quad q_n \searrow 0,$$

then

$$r(y_{n+1}, \bar{x}) \leq m(b, q_n).$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(y_{n+1}, \bar{x}) &\leq r(y_{n+1}, f(y_n)) + r(f(y_n), f(y_{n+1})) + r(f(y_{n+1}), f(\bar{x})) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_n + a(r(y_n, y_{n+1})) + a(r(y_{n+1}, \bar{x})), \end{aligned}$$

now by Lemma 2 we get our assertion.

The sequence  $\{y_n\}$  may be generated in a variety of ways, e.g. one may define  $y_n = f_{n-1}(y_{n-1})$  or  $y_n$  to be a fixed point of the function  $f_n(x)$ . The functions  $f_n(x)$  may also be defined in a different manner, for instance, one can assume that  $f_n(x) = f(x)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  (then  $y_n = x_n$ ), or  $f_n(x)$  may be equal to the sum of the first  $n$  terms of a power series expansion for  $f(x)$  (in some particular spaces).

**THEOREM 2.** *If Assumption  $H_5$  is fulfilled and*

1°  $f_n(x)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , *are functions defined on  $S(x^*, b)$ , with values in  $S(x^*, b)$ ,*

2°  $y_{n+1} = f_n(y_n)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ,  $y_0 = x^*$ ,

3°  $r(f_n(y_n), f(y_n)) \leq \varepsilon_n$ ,  $\varepsilon_n \searrow \varepsilon$ ,  $\varepsilon_0 \leq q$  *or*

3°'  $r(f_n(x), f(x)) \leq \varepsilon_n(x) \searrow \varepsilon(x)$ ,  $\varepsilon_0(x) \leq q$  *and Assumption  $H_5$  holds for any  $f_n(x)$ ,*

*then there exists in  $S(x^*, b)$  a unique solution  $\bar{x}$  of equation (2) and*

$$r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq z_n(\varepsilon) \quad \text{or} \quad r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq \bar{z}_n(\bar{\varepsilon}),$$

*where  $z_n(\varepsilon)$  and  $\bar{z}_n(\bar{\varepsilon})$  are defined in Lemma 8.*

*If, furthermore,  $\varepsilon_n + a(r(y_n, y_{n+1})) \leq q_n \leq q$ , then  $r(y_{n+1}, \bar{x}) \leq m(b, q_n)$ .*

*Moreover, if  $\varepsilon = 0$  or  $\varepsilon(\bar{x}) = 0$ , then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = \bar{x}.$$

**Proof.** If 3° is fulfilled, then the assertion of the theorem is a simple consequence of Theorem 1. We prove the theorem in the case when 3°' holds. We define

$$\bar{z}_{n+1}(\bar{\varepsilon}) = a(\bar{z}_n(\bar{\varepsilon})) + \bar{\varepsilon}_n, \quad \bar{z}_0(\bar{\varepsilon}) = b, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots,$$

where

$$\bar{\varepsilon}_n = \varepsilon_n(\bar{x}) \geq r(f_n(\bar{x}), f(\bar{x})).$$

By Lemma 8 we have  $\bar{z}_n(\bar{\varepsilon}) \searrow 0$ . Now

$$r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq r(f_{n-1}(y_{n-1}), f_{n-1}(\bar{x})) + r(f_{n-1}(\bar{x}), f(\bar{x})) \leq a(r(y_{n-1}, \bar{x})) + \varepsilon_{n-1}.$$

We get, by induction,

$$\cdot \quad r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq \bar{z}_n(\bar{\varepsilon}), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots$$



Since of  $\bar{\varepsilon}_n \searrow 0$ ,  $\bar{z}_n(\bar{\varepsilon}) \searrow 0$  and consequently  $y_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ .

**Remark 4.** In practice it is more convenient if  $\varepsilon_n(x)$  is independent of  $x$ .

**THEOREM 3.** *If the assumptions of Theorem 2 are fulfilled and Assumption  $H_5$  holds for any  $f_n(x)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , and if the fixed point  $\tilde{y}_n$  of the function  $f_n(x)$  ( $\tilde{y}_n$ 's are uniquely determined) satisfies the condition  $r(\bar{x}, \tilde{y}_n) \leq b$ , then  $\tilde{y}_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ .*

**Proof.** Since  $\tilde{y}_n = f_n(\tilde{y}_n)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(\tilde{y}_n, \bar{x}) &\leq r(f_n(\tilde{y}_n), f_n(\bar{x})) + r(f_n(\bar{x}), f_n(y_n)) + r(y_{n+1}, \bar{x}) \\ &\leq a(r(\tilde{y}_n, \bar{x})) + a(r(y_n, \bar{x})) + r(y_{n+1}, \bar{x}). \end{aligned}$$

According to Theorem 2 we get

$$r(\tilde{y}_n, \bar{x}) \leq a(r(\tilde{y}_n, \bar{x})) + z_n(\varepsilon) + z_{n+1}(\varepsilon).$$

From the relation  $z_n(\varepsilon) \searrow 0$  it follows that there exists  $n_0$  such that  $a(z_n(\varepsilon)) + z_{n+1}(\varepsilon) = q_n \leq q$  for  $n \geq n_0$ . Now, by Lemma 2 we obtain

$$r(\tilde{y}_n, \bar{x}) \leq m(b, q_n) \quad \text{for } n \geq n_0.$$

If  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $m(b, q_n) \searrow 0$  and consequently  $\tilde{y}_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ .

**Remark 5.** If it is not assumed that all the  $f_n(x)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , satisfy Assumption  $H_5$  but only that there exists fixed point  $\tilde{y}_n$  of  $f_n(x)$  (in general not necessarily unique) and if  $r(\tilde{y}_n, \bar{x}) \leq b$  and  $r(\tilde{y}_n, f(\tilde{y}_n)) \leq \varepsilon_n \searrow 0$ ,  $\varepsilon_n \leq q$ , then  $\tilde{y}_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$  (see [1]).

**Remark 6.** If assumptions 1°, 2°, 3° of Theorem 2 are fulfilled and Assumption  $H_5$  is satisfied for any  $f_n(x)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , then the assertion of Theorem 2 holds true.

Indeed, from the relations

$$\begin{aligned} r(f(x), f(x')) &\leq r(f(x), f_n(x)) + r(f_n(x), f_n(x')) + r(f_n(x'), f(x')) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_n(x) + \varepsilon_n(x') + a(r(x, x')), \end{aligned}$$

together with 3°, it follows that Assumption  $H_5$  for  $f(x)$  is fulfilled.

The following theorem is a generalization of the results of papers [2] and [5]:

**THEOREM 4.** *If functions  $f_n(x)$  are defined on  $S(x^*, b)$  with values in  $S(x^*, b)$  and*

- 1° Assumption  $H_5$  for any  $f_n(x)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , is fulfilled,
- 2°  $\tilde{y}_n$  is a fixed point of  $f_n(x)$  and

$$r(f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_n), f(\tilde{y}_n)) \leq \varrho_n \searrow 0,$$

- 3°  $r(\tilde{y}_n, \bar{x}) \leq b$ ,  $r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \tilde{y}_n) \leq p_0 \leq b$ ,  $p_0 \geq 3a(p_0) + q$ ,  
 4°  $p = 0$  is the only solution of the equation  $p = 3a(p)$ ,

then

$$r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, f(\tilde{y}_n)) \leq \varepsilon_n$$

and there exists  $n_0$  such that  $\varepsilon_n \leq q$  for  $n \geq n_0$ .

Consequently,  $\tilde{y}_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ , where  $\bar{x}$  is a unique solution of the equation  $x = f(x)$  in  $S(x^*, b)$ .

**Proof.** At first we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, f(\tilde{y}_n)) &\leq r(f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_{n+1}), f(\tilde{y}_n)) \\ &\leq r(f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_{n+1}), f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_n)) + r(f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_n), f(\tilde{y}_n)) \\ &\leq a(r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \tilde{y}_n)) + \varrho_n. \end{aligned}$$

Further, we get

$$\begin{aligned} r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \tilde{y}_n) &\leq r(f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_{n+1}), f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_n)) + r(f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_n), f(\tilde{y}_n)) + \\ &\quad + r(f(\tilde{y}_n), f(\tilde{y}_{n-1})) + r(f(\tilde{y}_{n-1}), f_n(\tilde{y}_{n-1})) + r(f_n(\tilde{y}_{n-1}), f_n(\tilde{y}_n)) \\ &\leq a(r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \tilde{y}_n)) + \varrho_n + \varrho_{n-1} + 2a(r(\tilde{y}_n, \tilde{y}_{n-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Put

$$p_n = m(p_0, q_n), \quad q_n = \varrho_n + \varrho_{n-1} + 2a(p_{n-1}), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

By assumption 3° we get  $p_1 \leq p_0$  and further by induction and according to Lemma 3 we obtain the inequality  $p_{n+1} \leq p_n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$  Now  $p_n \searrow p$  and the limit  $p$  is a solution of the equation

$$p = m(p_0, 2a(p)), \quad \text{i.e. } p = 3 \cdot a(p).$$

By assumption 4°,  $p = 0$ , i.e.  $p_n \searrow 0$ .

Now according to Lemma 2, by induction, we obtain

$$r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \tilde{y}_n) \leq m(p_0, q_n) = p_n, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots$$

Finally, we get

$$r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, f(\tilde{y}_n)) \leq a(p_n) + \varrho_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon_n \searrow 0.$$

It is evident that there exists  $n_0$  such that  $\varepsilon_n \leq q$  for  $n \geq n_0$ . Now the relation  $\tilde{y}_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$  follows immediately from Theorem 1.

**Remark 7.** If Assumption  $H_5$  is fulfilled for any  $f_n(x)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , and

$$r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, f(\tilde{y}_n)) \leq \varepsilon_n \searrow 0,$$

then

$$r(f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_n), f(\tilde{y}_n)) \leq \delta_n \searrow 0.$$

Indeed, we have  $\tilde{y}_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$  and, consequently,  $r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \tilde{y}_n) \searrow 0$ . Finally we get

$$\begin{aligned} r(f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_n), f(\tilde{y}_n)) &\leq r(f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_n), f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_{n+1})) + r(f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_{n+1}), f(\tilde{y}_n)) \\ &\leq a(r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \tilde{y}_n)) + \varepsilon_n \stackrel{\text{df}}{=} \delta_n \searrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

**THEOREM 5.** *If*

1° *the function  $f(x)$  is defined in  $S(x^*, b)$ ,  $f(x) \in R$ ,*

2° *Assumption  $H_7$  is fulfilled,*

3°  *$r(f_n(x, x), f(x)) \leq \varepsilon_n(x) \searrow 0$ ,  $x \in S(x^*, b)$ ,  $\varepsilon_n(x) \leq q$ ,*

*then there exists in  $S(x^*, b)$  a unique solution  $\bar{x}$  of equation (2). The sequence  $\{y_n\}$  is well-defined by the relation*

$$y_n = f_n(y_n, y_{n-1}), \quad y_0 = x^*, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots;$$

*moreover, if  $r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq b$ , then  $y_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ .*

**Proof.** First of all we prove that Assumption  $H_5$  with  $a(u) = A(u, u)$  holds true.

In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(f(x), f(y)) &\leq r(f(x), f_n(x, x)) + r(f_n(x, x), f_n(y, y)) + r(f_n(y, y), f(y)) \\ &\leq A(r(x, y), r(x, y)) + \varepsilon_n(x) + \varepsilon_n(y), \\ r(x^*, f(x^*)) &\leq r(x^*, f_n(x^*, x^*)) + r(f_n(x^*, x^*), f(x^*)) \leq q + \varepsilon_n(x^*). \end{aligned}$$

Now if  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we get our assertion. According to Theorem 1 we infer the existence and uniqueness of the solution  $\bar{x}$  of equation (2).

Now we prove that  $y_n$  exists and  $y_n \in S(x^*, b)$  for  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ;  $y_n$  can be constructed by an ordinary iteration procedure. Put

$$y_n^{k+1} = f_n(y_n^k, v), \quad y_n^0 = x^*, \quad v \in S(x^*, b), \quad k = 0, 1, \dots$$

By induction with respect to  $k$ , we get  $y_n^k \in S(x^*, b)$ . Indeed  $y_n^0 \in S(x^*, b)$  and if  $y_n^k \in S(x^*, b)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} r(x^*, y_n^{k+1}) &= r(x^*, f_n(y_n^k, v)) \leq r(x^*, f_n(x^*, x^*)) + r(f_n(x^*, x^*), f_n(y_n^k, v)) \\ &\leq A(r(x^*, y_n^k), r(x^*, v)) + r(x^*, f_n(x^*, x^*)) \leq A(b, b) + q \leq b. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$A_k(b) = A(A_{k-1}(b), 0), \quad A_0(b) = b.$$

It is easy to see that  $A_k(b) \searrow 0$ . By induction we obtain

$$r(y_n^k, y_n^{k+p}) \leq A_k(b).$$

In fact, we have  $r(y_n^0, y_n^p) \leq b$  and if  $r(y_n^k, y_n^{k+p}) \leq A_k(b)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} r(y_n^{k+1}, y_n^{k+1+p}) &\leq r(f_n(y_n^k, v), f_n(y_n^{k+p}, v)) \leq A(r(y_n^k, y_n^{k+p}), 0) \\ &\leq A(A_k(b), 0) = A_{k+1}(b). \end{aligned}$$

Now we conclude that  $y_n^k \rightarrow y_n$  for  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . We find that the equation

$$y = f_n(y, v), \quad v \in \mathcal{S}(x^*, b)$$

has a unique solution  $y_n, y_n \in \mathcal{S}(x^*, b)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ . From this it is obvious that the sequence  $\{y_n\}$  occurring in the assertion of our theorem is well-defined and  $y_n \in \mathcal{S}(x^*, b)$ .

Now we show that  $y_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} r(y_n, \bar{x}) &\leq r(f_n(y_n, y_{n-1}), f_n(\bar{x}, \bar{x})) + r(f_n(\bar{x}, \bar{x}), f(\bar{x})) \\ &\leq A(r(y_n, \bar{x}), r(y_{n-1}, \bar{x})) + \varepsilon_n(\bar{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Putting  $r(y_n, \bar{x}) = d_n \leq b$  we see that

$$d_n \leq A(d_n, d_{n-1}) + \varepsilon_n(\bar{x}), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots$$

By Lemma 6 we have  $d_n \searrow 0$  and, consequently,  $y_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ .

**Remark 8.** If Assumption  $H_5$  is fulfilled, then assumption 3° in Theorem 5 can be replaced by the following one:

$$r(f_n(y_n, y_{n-1}), f(y_n)) \leq \varepsilon_n \searrow 0, \quad \varepsilon_n \leq q.$$

Indeed, now we get

$$r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq r(f_n(y_n, y_{n-1}), f(y_n)) + r(f(y_n), f(\bar{x})) \leq \varepsilon_n + a(r(y_n, \bar{x})).$$

Finally, if  $r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq b$ , then  $r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq m(b, \varepsilon_n) \searrow 0$ , i.e.  $y_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ .

**Remark 9.** In our considerations we have assumed that  $r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq b$ . It may occur that this relation is difficult to be verified. In order to avoid this difficulty it is sufficient to make the following assumption:

$$b \geq q + a(b) \quad \text{and} \quad 2b \geq q + a(2b).$$

Under this condition our lemmas also for  $b$  replaced by  $2b$  hold true and therefore the relation  $r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq b$  is not required.

**5. Approximate iterations. Non-local theorems.** Now we are going to formulate some theorems having non-local character.

**THEOREM 6.** *If Assumption  $H_6$  is fulfilled and the sequence  $\{y_n\}$  is such that*

$$r(y_{n+1}, f(y_n)) \leq \varepsilon_n \searrow 0,$$

then there exists a unique solution  $\bar{x} \in R$  of equation (2) and  $\bar{x} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$ ,  $\bar{x} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n$ , where  $x_{n+1} = f(x_n)$ ,  $x_0 = x^*$ ,  $x^*$  being arbitrarily fixed element in  $R$ .

**Proof.** Put  $b = m(q)$ ,  $q = r(x^*, f(x^*))$ . Now, if  $x$  is a solution of equation (2), then

$$r(x, x^*) \leq r(f(x), f(x^*)) + r(f(x^*), x^*) \leq a(r(x, x^*)) + q.$$

By Lemma 4 we get  $r(x, x^*) \leq b$ . Clearly, all the assumptions of Theorem 1 are fulfilled for the sphere  $S(x^*, b)$  and, consequently, there exists a unique solution  $\bar{x}$  of equation (2).

Put  $k_0 = m(r(y_0, f(y_0)))$ . Let  $w_0$  be the maximal solution of the equation

$$u = a(u) + \max(\varepsilon_0, k_0),$$

where

$$\max(\varepsilon_0, k_0) \stackrel{\text{df}}{=} \begin{cases} \varepsilon_0 & \text{if } \varepsilon_0 \geq k_0, \\ k_0 & \text{if } k_0 > \varepsilon_0, \\ \varepsilon_0 + k_0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Defining  $w_{n+1} = a(w_n) + \varepsilon_n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , we see that  $w_n \searrow 0$ . We have

$$r(y_0, \bar{x}) \leq r(y_0, f(y_0)) + r(f(y_0), f(\bar{x})) \leq r(y_0, f(y_0)) + a(r(y_0, \bar{x})),$$

whence

$$r(y_0, \bar{x}) \leq m(r(y_0, f(y_0))) = k_0 \leq w_0.$$

Further, by induction, we get

$$\begin{aligned} r(y_n, \bar{x}) &\leq r(f(y_{n-1}), f(\bar{x})) + r(f(y_{n-1}), y_n) \leq a(r(y_{n-1}, \bar{x})) + \varepsilon_{n-1} \\ &\leq a(w_{n-1}) + \varepsilon_{n-1} = w_n, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.  $r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq w_n$  for  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , and the second assertion of the theorem follows.

**THEOREM 7.** *If Assumption  $\mathbf{H}_6$  is fulfilled and*

1° *the functions  $f_n(x)$  are defined on  $R$  with values in  $R$ ,*

2°  $y_{n+1} \stackrel{\text{df}}{=} f_n(y_n)$ , *where  $y_0$  is arbitrarily fixed element of  $R$ ,*

3°  $r(f_n(y_n), f(y_n)) \leq \varepsilon_n$ ,

*then  $r(y_n, \bar{x}) \leq w_n \searrow 0$  ( $w_n$  is defined in the proof of Theorem 6), i.e.  $y_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ . Moreover, if Assumption  $\mathbf{H}_6$  is fulfilled for any  $f_n(x)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , and  $\tilde{y}_n$  are fixed points of  $f_n(x)$ , then  $\tilde{y}_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ .*

**Proof.** The first part of the assertion of the theorem is the simple consequence of Theorem 6. It only remains to prove that  $\tilde{y}_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} r(\tilde{y}_n, \bar{x}) &\leq r(f_n(\tilde{y}_n), f_n(\bar{x})) + r(f_n(\bar{x}), f_n(y_n)) + r(y_{n+1}, \bar{x}) \\ &\leq a(r(\tilde{y}_n, \bar{x})) + a(r(y_n, \bar{x})) + r(y_{n+1}, \bar{x}) \\ &\leq a(r(\tilde{y}_n, \bar{x})) + a(w_n) + w_{n+1}, \end{aligned}$$

whence, by Lemma 4, we obtain

$$r(\tilde{y}_n, \bar{x}) \leq m(a(w_n) + w_{n+1}) \searrow 0, \quad \text{i.e. } \tilde{y}_n \rightarrow \bar{x}.$$

**THEOREM 8.** *If Assumption  $H_8$  is fulfilled and*

$$r(f_n(x, x), f(x)) \leq \varepsilon_n(x) \searrow 0,$$

*then there exists a unique solution  $\bar{x}$  of the equation*

$$x = f(x).$$

*The sequence  $\{y_n\}$  is well-defined by the relation  $y_n = f_n(y_n, y_{n-1})$ ,  $y_0 = x^*$ , where  $x^*$  is an arbitrarily fixed element of  $R$ , and  $y_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ .*

**Proof.** The proof of the existence of  $\bar{x}$  and  $y_n$  is essentially the same as that of Theorem 5 (see also the first part of the proof of Theorem 6).

Put  $q_n = \varepsilon_n(\bar{x})$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ . Suppose that  $q \leq q_0$ , where  $q \geq r(x^*, f_n(x^*, x^*))$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , and  $m_n(q_n)$  is defined in Lemma 7. Put  $u_n = r(y_n, \bar{x})$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_0 &= r(y_0, \bar{x}) = r(x^*, \bar{x}) \leq m(q) \leq m(q_0) = m_0, \\ r(y_n, \bar{x}) &\leq r(f_n(y_n, y_{n-1}), f_n(\bar{x}, \bar{x})) + r(f_n(\bar{x}, \bar{x}), f(\bar{x})) \\ &\leq A(r(y_n, \bar{x}), r(y_{n-1}, \bar{x})) + \varepsilon_n(\bar{x}), \\ u_n &\leq A(u_n, u_{n-1}) + q_n, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 7 we obtain  $u_n \leq m_n(q_n) \searrow 0$ , and consequently  $y_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ .

**THEOREM 9.** *If Assumption  $H_8$  is fulfilled for  $f(x)$  and  $f_n(x)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , and if*

1°  $r(f_{n+1}(\tilde{y}_n), f(\tilde{y}_n)) \leq \varrho_n$ , where  $\tilde{y}_n$  is the fixed point of  $f_n(x)$ ,

2° there exists a solution  $p_0 \in G$  of the equation

$$u = 3a(u) + \varrho_1 + \varrho_0 + r(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{y}_1),$$

3°  $u = 0$  is the only solution of the equation  $u = 3a(u)$ ,

*then there exists the sequence  $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ ,  $\varepsilon_n \searrow 0$ , such that  $r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, f(\tilde{y}_n)) \leq \varepsilon_n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , and consequently  $\tilde{y}_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ .*

**Proof.** Put  $p_n = m(\varrho_n + \varrho_{n-1} + 2a(p_{n-1}))$ . From the definition of  $p_0$  we get

$$p_0 \geq m(\varrho_1 + \varrho_0 + 2a(p_0)) = p_1,$$

and by induction we obtain  $p_n \searrow 0$ .

Now (cf. the proof of Theorem 4),

$$r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, f(\tilde{y}_n)) \leq a(r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \tilde{y}_n)) + \varrho_n,$$

$$r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \tilde{y}_n) \leq a(r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \tilde{y}_n)) + \varrho_n + \varrho_{n-1} + 2a(r(\tilde{y}_n, \tilde{y}_{n-1})),$$

whence, by Lemma 4, we find

$$r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \tilde{y}_n) \leq m(\varrho_n + \varrho_{n-1} + 2a(r(\tilde{y}_n, \tilde{y}_{n-1}))).$$

Observe that  $r(\tilde{y}_1, \tilde{y}_0) \leq p_0$ . This is a simple consequence of the definition of  $p_0$ . Now by induction we have

$$r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, \tilde{y}_n) \leq p_n, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots$$

Finally, we conclude

$$r(\tilde{y}_{n+1}, f(\tilde{y}_n)) \leq a(p_n) + \varrho_n.$$

Put  $\varepsilon_n = a(p_n) + \varrho_n$ . It is easy to see that  $\varepsilon_n \searrow 0$ .

Now the relation  $\tilde{y}_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$  follows from Theorem 6.

**Remark 10.** Theorem 9 is a generalization of the results of papers [2] and [5].

#### References

- [1] M. Kwapisz, *On the approximate solutions of an abstract equation*, Ann. Polon. Math. 19 (1967), pp. 47-60.
- [2] — *Uwagi o pewnym algorytmie rozwiązywania równań różniczkowych zwyczajnych*, Zastosow. Mat. 9 (1968), pp. 275-287.
- [3] J. M. Ortega and W. C. Rheinboldt, *On a class of approximate iterative processes*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 23, No. 5 (1967), pp. 352-365.
- [4] T. Ważewski, *Sur un procédé de prouver la convergence des approximations successives sans utilisation des séries de comparaison*, Bull. Acad. Sci., sér. sci. math. astr. et phys., 8, No. 1 (1960), pp. 45-52.
- [5] R. Zuber, *O pewnym algorytmie rozwiązywania równań różniczkowych zwyczajnych pierwszego rzędu (I)*, Zastosow. Mat. 8 (1966), pp. 351-363.

Reçu par la Rédaction le 26. 10. 1967