Existence and Asymptotic Behavior of Positive Solutions of a Non-Autonomous Food-Limited Model with Unbounded Delay

Yuji Liu and Weigao Ge

Abstract. Consider the non-autonomous logistic model

$$\Delta x_n = p_n x_n \quad \frac{1 - x_{n-k_n}}{1 + \lambda x_{n-k_n}} \quad r \qquad (n \ge 0)$$

where $\Delta x_n = x_{n+1} - x_n$, $\{p_n\}$ is a sequence of positive real numbers, $\{k_n\}$ is a sequence of non-negative integers such that $\{n - k_n\}$ is non-decreasing, $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, and r is the ratio of two odd integers. We obtain new sufficient conditions for the attractivity of the equilibrium x = 1 of the model and conditions that guarantee the solution to be positive, which improve and generalize some recent results established by Phios and by Zhou and Zhang.

Keywords: Global attractivity, difference equations, oscillation **AMS subject classification:** Primary 34K20, 39A10, 39A11, 34K45, secondary 92D25

1. Introduction

The asymptotic behavior of solutions of difference equations with unbounded delay was studied in [1 - 3]. In the present paper we consider the non-autonomous logistic model

$$\Delta x_n = p_n x_n \left(\frac{1 - x_{n-k_n}}{1 + \lambda x_{n-k_n}}\right)^r \qquad (n \ge 0) \tag{1}$$

where $\Delta x_n = x_{n+1} - x_n$, $\{p_n\}$ is a sequence of positive real numbers, $\{k_n\}$ is a sequence of non-negative integers such that $\{n - k_n\}$ is non-decreasing, $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and r is the ratio of two odd integers. Let

$$\gamma = -\min\{n - k_n : n \ge 0\} \ge 0$$

$$\sigma_0 = \max\{n : n - k_n < 0\} + 1$$

$$\sigma = \max\{n : n - k_n < \sigma_0\} + 1.$$

Yuji Liu: Yueyang Teacher's Univ., Dept. Math., Yueyang, Hunan 414000, and Beijing Inst. Techn., Dept. Math., Beijing 100081, P.R.China; liuyuji888@sohu.com Weigao Ge: Beijing Inst. Techn., Dept. Math., Beijing 100081, P.R. China; This work was supported by NNSF of China.

By a solution of equation (1) we mean a sequence $\{x_n\}$ which is defined for $n \ge -\gamma$, satisfies (1) for $n \ge 0$ and which satisfies for given numbers a_i $(-\gamma \le i \le 0)$ the initial condition $x_i = a_i > 0$ $(-\gamma \le i \le 0)$.

Equation (1) contains as special case the equation

$$\Delta x_n = p_n x_n (1 - x_{n-k_n}) \qquad (n \ge 0)$$

The global attractivity of the equilibrium x = 1 of this equation has been well studied in [2, 3]. In most results of these papers it is supposed that the solution $\{x_n\}$ satisfies $x_n > 0$, but we find that this does not always succeed. We give an example as follows: Let

$$\Delta x_n = 1.3x_n(1 - x_{n-1}) \qquad (n \ge 0)$$

where $p_n \equiv 1.3$, $k_n = 1$, $\lambda = 0$ and the initial condition is $x_{-1} = 0.23$ and $x_0 = 0.2$. Then

 $x_1 = 0.4002, \quad x_2 = 0.8164, \quad x_3 = 1.453, \quad x_4 = 1.7998, \quad x_5 = 0.7399$

are positive but $x_6 = -0.62938$... are negative.

Two problems appear naturally considering equation (1):

- **1.** Under what conditions every solution (x_n) satisfies $x_n > 0$?
- 2. Under what conditions every positive solution converges to 1?

In Section 2 we answer the first problem and in Section 3 the second problem is settled. Our results improve the theorems in [2, 3].

By the way, equation (1) is the discrete type of the differential equation

$$N'(t) = r(t)N(t)\left(\frac{1-N(t-\tau)}{1+\lambda N(t-\tau)}\right)^r \qquad (t \ge 0)$$

which was called *generalized Food-Limited model*, posed in [4] and studied by many authors (see [2 - 4] and the references cited therein). If r = 1, the above equation becomes the well-known Food-Limited ecology mathematical model

$$N'(t) = r(t)N(t)\frac{1 - N(t - \tau)}{1 + \lambda N(t - \tau)} \qquad (t \ge 0)$$

which together with its discrete type

$$x_{n+1} = x_n \exp\left(r_n \frac{1 - x_{n-k}}{1 + \lambda x_{n-k}}\right) \qquad (n \ge 0)$$

was studied in [4, 5]. However, to the best of our knowledge, its discrete analogue

$$\Delta x_n = r_n x_n \frac{1 - x_{n-k}}{1 + \lambda x_{n-k}} \qquad (n \ge 0)$$

has not been studied. We call equation (1) the generalized *difference* Food-Limited model.

2. Positivity of solutions

Remember that in equation (1) $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and that $x_i \quad (-\gamma \leq i \leq 0)$ is the initial condition. In this section, we prove the following

Theorem 1. Suppose there are numbers $\beta > 0$ and $\theta > 1$ such that:

(i) $\sum_{j=n-k_n}^n p_j \leq \alpha \quad (n \geq \sigma_0) \text{ and } p_n \leq \beta \quad (0 \leq n \leq \sigma) \text{ where } \alpha \text{ is a real root of the transcendental equation}$

$$e^{\alpha} \left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1+\lambda e^{-\alpha}}\right)^{-\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}} = \frac{\alpha^{1/r}+1}{\alpha^{1/r}-\lambda} \qquad (\lambda \in (0,1])$$
(2)

or for $\lambda = 0$ of the equation

$$e^{\alpha - 1 + e^{-\alpha}} = 1 + \frac{1}{\alpha^{1/r}}.$$
(3)

(ii) $\frac{\theta \alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\theta \alpha^{1/r} - \lambda} (1 + \beta)^{\sigma} < \frac{1 + \alpha^{1/r}}{-\lambda + \alpha^{1/r}}.$ (iii) $0 < x_i < \frac{\theta \alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\theta \alpha^{1/r} - \lambda} \quad (-\gamma \le i \le 0).$

Then every solution (x_n) of equation (1) satisfies

$$0 < x_n < \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}$$

for $n \geq 1$.

Proof. By (2) or (3) we see that $\alpha > 1$ and by (1) we get

$$x_{n+1} = x_n \left[1 + p_n \left(\frac{1 - x_{n-k_n}}{1 + \lambda x_{n-k_n}} \right)^r \right].$$

Since

$$0 < x_{-r}, x_{-r+1}, \dots, x_0 < \frac{\theta \alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\theta \alpha^{1/r} - \lambda} < \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda},$$

then by assumptions (ii) - (iii) we find

$$x_{1} = x_{0} \left(1 + p_{0} \left(\frac{1 - x_{-k_{0}}}{1 + \lambda x_{-k_{0}}} \right)^{r} \right)$$

$$\begin{cases} > x_{0} \left(1 + p_{0} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}}{1 + \lambda \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}} \right)^{r} \right) \ge x_{0} \left(1 + \alpha \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}}{1 + \lambda \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}} \right)^{r} \right) = 0$$

$$\leq \frac{\theta \alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\theta \alpha^{1/r} - \lambda} (1 + \beta) < \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}.$$

Similarly we obtain

$$x_{2} = x_{1} \left(1 + p_{1} \left(\frac{1 - x_{1-k_{1}}}{1 + \lambda x_{1-k_{1}}} \right)^{r} \right)$$

$$\begin{cases} > x_{1} \left(1 + p_{1} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}}{1 + \lambda \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}} \right)^{r} \right) \ge x_{1} \left(1 + \alpha \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}}{1 + \lambda \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}} \right)^{r} \right) = 0$$

$$\leq x_{1} (1 + p_{0}) \le \frac{\theta \alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\theta \alpha^{\frac{1}{r}} - \lambda} (1 + \beta)^{2} < \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{\frac{1}{r}} - \lambda} \end{cases}$$

and so on. Finally we get

$$x_{\sigma} = x_{\sigma-1} \left(1 + p_{\sigma-1} \left(\frac{1 - x_{\sigma-1 - k_{\sigma-1}}}{1 + \lambda x_{\sigma-1 - k_{\sigma-1}}} \right)^r \right) \\ \begin{cases} x_{\sigma-1} \left(1 + p_{\sigma-1} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}}{1 + \lambda \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}} \right)^r \right) \ge x_{\sigma-1} \left(1 + \alpha \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}}{1 + \lambda \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}} \right)^r \right) = 0 \\ \le \frac{\theta \alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\theta \alpha^{1/r} - \lambda} (1 + \beta)^\sigma < \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}. \end{cases}$$

Now it suffices to prove that if $n_0 \ge \sigma$ and

$$0 < x_n < \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda} \qquad (0 \le n \le n_0),$$

then

$$0 < x_{n_0+1} < \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}.$$
(4)

In fact,

$$x_{n_0+1} > x_{n_0} \left(1 + \alpha \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}}{1 + \lambda \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{1/r} - \lambda}} \right)^r \right) = 0,$$

which is the left inequality in (4). Next we prove the right inequality in (4). Assume that contrary $x_{n_0+1} \ge \frac{\alpha^{1/r}+1}{\alpha^{1/r}-\lambda}$, set $p(t) = p_n$ for $t \in [n, n+1)$ and $0 \le n \le n_0$ and

$$x(t) = \begin{cases} x_n & \text{if } t = n \\ x_n (\frac{x_{n+1}}{x_n})^{t-n} & \text{if } n \le t < n+1. \end{cases}$$

The function x is positive and continuous on the interval $[0, n_0+1]$, $x(n) = x_n$ $(n \ge 0)$ and x is monotone on [n, n + 1). Let $[\cdot]$ denote the maximum integer function and let x' stand for the left derivative of x. Then

$$x'(t) = x(t) \ln \left\{ 1 + p(t) \left(\frac{1 - x([t - k_{[t]}])}{1 + \lambda x([t - k_{[t]}])} \right)^r \right\}$$
(5)

for $0 \le t \le n_0 + 1$. Since $x([t - k_{[t]}]) > 0$ for these t, we get

$$x'(t) \le x(t)\ln(1+p(t)) \le p(t)x(t)$$
 a.e. on $[0, n_0 + 1)$. (6)

By $\Delta x_{n_0} = x_{n_0+1} - x_{n_0} > 0$ and (1) we have $x_{n_0-k_{n_0}} < 1$. Then there exists $\xi \in [n_0 - k_{n_0}, n_0 + 1)$ such that $x(\xi) = 1$ and x(t) > 1 for $t \in (\xi, n_0 + 1]$. When $0 \le t \le \xi$, integrating (6) from t to ξ we get

$$x(t) > \exp\left(-\int_t^{\xi} p(s) \, ds\right) \qquad (0 \le t \le \xi).$$

If $\xi \leq t < n_0 + 1$ and $[t - k_{[t]}] \leq \xi$, we obtain

$$x([t-k_{[t]}]) \ge \exp\left(-\int_{[t-k_{[t]}]}^{\xi} p(s) \, ds\right).$$

Substituting this into (5), it follows

$$x'(t) < x(t)p(t)\frac{1 - \exp\left(-\int_{[t-k_{[t]}]}^{\xi} p(s) \, ds\right)}{1 + \lambda \exp\left(-\int_{[t-k_{[t]}]}^{\xi} p(s) \, ds\right)}.$$
(7)

If $[t - k_{[t]}] > \xi$, since $[t] \le n_0$, then $n_0 - k_{n_0} \ge [t] - k_{[t]} = [t - k_{[t]}] > \xi$. But this contridicts $\xi \in [n_0 - k_{n_0}, n_0 + 1]$. Hence this case is impossible.

Integrating (7) from ξ to $n_0 + 1$, noting that $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $n_0 \geq \sigma$ implies $n_0 - k_{n_0} \geq \sigma_0$, thus $[t - k_{[t]}] \geq 0$ for $t \in [\xi, n_0 + 1]$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\ln x(n_{0}+1) \\ &< \int_{\xi}^{n_{0}+1} p(t) \frac{1 - \exp\left(-\int_{[t-k_{[t]}]}^{\xi} p(s) \, ds\right)}{1 + \lambda \exp\left(-\int_{[t-k_{[t]}]}^{\xi} p(s) \, ds\right)} \, dt \\ &\leq \int_{\xi}^{n_{0}+1} p(t) \frac{1 - e^{-\alpha} \exp\left(\int_{\xi}^{t} p(s) \, ds\right)}{1 + \lambda e^{-\alpha} \exp\left(\int_{\xi}^{t} p(s) \, ds\right)} \, dt \\ &= \int_{\xi}^{n_{0}+1} p(t) \, dt - (1+\lambda) \int_{\xi}^{n_{0}+1} p(t) \frac{e^{-\alpha} \exp\left(\int_{\xi}^{t} p(s) \, ds\right)}{1 + \lambda \exp\left(-\alpha + \int_{\xi}^{t} p(s) \, ds\right)} \, dt \\ &= \begin{cases} \int_{\xi}^{n_{0}+1} p(t) \, dt - \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda} \ln \frac{1 + \lambda \exp\left(-\alpha + \int_{\xi}^{n_{0}+1} p(s) \, ds\right)}{1 + \lambda e^{-\alpha}} & \text{if } \lambda \in (0,1] \\ \int_{\xi}^{n_{0}+1} p(t) \, dt - e^{-\alpha} \left[\exp\left(\int_{\xi}^{n_{0}} p(s) \, ds\right) - 1\right] & \text{if } \lambda = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\int_{\xi}^{n_0+1} p(t) \, dt \le \sum_{j=n_0-k_{n_0}}^{n_0} p_j \le \alpha,$$

the function

$$x - \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda} \ln \frac{1+\lambda e^{-\alpha+x}}{1+\lambda e^{-\alpha}}$$
 or $x - e^{-\alpha}(e^x - 1)$

is increasing in $[0, \alpha]$. Then

$$x_{n_0+1} = x(n_0+1)$$

$$< \begin{cases} \exp\left(\alpha - \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda} \ln \frac{1+\lambda}{1+\lambda e^{-\alpha}}\right) = \frac{\alpha^{1/r}+1}{\alpha^{1/r}-\lambda} & \text{if } \lambda \in (0,1] \\ \alpha - 1 + e^{-\alpha} = 1 + \frac{1}{\alpha^{1/r}} & \text{if } \lambda = 0 \end{cases}$$

which contradicts the assumption $x_{n_0+1} \ge \frac{\alpha^{1/r}+1}{\alpha^{1/r}-\lambda}$. This completes the proof

Remark 1. Since $1 < \frac{\theta \alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\theta \alpha^{1/r} - \lambda} < \frac{\alpha^{1/r} + 1}{\alpha^{\frac{1}{r}} - \lambda}$, Theorem 1 gives sufficient conditions which guarantee $x_n > 0$ for each solution $\{x_n\}$ of equation (1).

3. Global attractivity

In this section we give a sufficient condition that guarantees every positive solution of equation (1) to converge to 1 as $n \to +\infty$. Remember that in (1) $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem 2. Suppose there is a constant $\delta > 0$ such that:

(i)
$$\sum_{s=n-k_n}^{n} p_s \leq \delta(1+\lambda)$$
 for sufficiently large n
(ii) $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} p_n = +\infty$.
(ii) $\delta(1+\lambda) \left(\frac{e^{\delta^2(1+\lambda)^2/2}-1}{\lambda e^{\delta^2(1+\lambda)^2/2}+1}\right)^r \leq 1$.

Then every positive solution of equation (1) tends to 1 as $n \to +\infty$.

Proof. Suppose that $\{x_n\}$ is a positive solution of equation (1). The following proof of $x_n \to 1$ as $n \to +\infty$ will be given in three steps.

Step 1: If $\{x_n\}$ is eventually greater than 1, we will prove that $x_n \to 1$ as $n \to +\infty$. Choose N_1 such that $x_{n-k_n} > 1$ for $n \ge N_1$. By (1) we see that $\Delta x_n \le 0$ for $n \ge N_1$, hence $\lim_{n\to+\infty} x_n = \mu$ exists. We prove that $\mu = 1$. Assuming $\mu \ne 1$, we have $\mu > 1$. Then, for $n \ge N_1$,

$$\Delta x_n \le p_n x_n \left(\frac{1-\mu}{1+\lambda\mu}\right)^r$$

and

$$\ln \frac{x_{n+1}}{x_n} \le \ln \left[1 + p_n \left(\frac{1-\mu}{1+\lambda\mu} \right)^r \right] \le p_n \left(\frac{1-\mu}{1+\lambda\mu} \right)^r.$$

Hence

$$\ln \frac{x_{n+1}}{x_{N_1}} \le \left(\frac{1-\mu}{1+\lambda\mu}\right)^r \sum_{s=N_1}^n p_s.$$

Letting $n \to +\infty$ we get a contradiction.

Step 2: If $\{x_n\}$ is eventually less than 1, we will prove that $x_n \to 1$ as $n \to +\infty$. Choose N_2 such that $x_{n-k_n} < 1$ for $n \ge N_2$. Then $\Delta x_n \ge 0$, so $\lim_{n\to+\infty} x_n = \mu$ exists. We prove that $\mu = 1$. Assuming $\mu \ne 1$, we have $\mu < 1$. We choose $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ such that $\delta(1+\lambda)(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\lambda\varepsilon})^r \le 1$ and $x_{n-k_n} < \varepsilon$ for $n \ge N_2$. Again, we have

$$\frac{x_{n+1}}{x_n} \ge 1 + p_n \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\lambda\varepsilon}\right)^r \qquad (n \ge N_2).$$

Since $\ln(1+x) \ge \frac{1}{2}x$ for $x \in [0,1]$, then

$$\ln \frac{x_{n+1}}{x_n} \ge \frac{1}{2} p_n \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\lambda\varepsilon}\right)^r \qquad (n \ge N_2).$$

It is now easy to derive a contradiction to our assumption $\mu \neq 1$ but we omit the details.

Step 3: If $\{x_n\}$ is oscillatory about 1, we will also prove that $x_n \to 1$ as $n \to +\infty$. By a method similar to that in Theorem 1, we can prove that $\{x_n\}$ is bounded. Let $\ln x_n = y_n$ for $n \ge 0$. Then $\{y_n\}$ is oscillatory and bounded, and equation (1) becomes

$$\Delta y_n = \ln\left(1 + p_n \left(\frac{1 - e^{y_n - k_n}}{1 + \lambda e^{y_n - k_n}}\right)^r\right) \qquad (n \ge 0).$$
(8)

We will prove now that $\lim_{n\to+\infty} y_n = 0$. Let $u = \limsup_{n\to+\infty} y_n$ and $v = \liminf_{n\to+\infty} y_n$. Then $-\infty < v \le 0 \le u < +\infty$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is N_3 such that

$$v_1 = v - \varepsilon < y_{n-k_n} < u + \varepsilon = u_1 \qquad (n \ge N_3)$$

Then we get

$$\Delta y_n \begin{cases} \leq \ln(1 + p_n(\frac{1 - e^{v_1}}{1 + \lambda e^{v_1}})^r) \leq \ln(1 + p_n(1 - e^{v_1})) \\ \geq \ln(1 + p_n(\frac{1 - e^{u_1}}{1 + \lambda e^{u_1}})^r) \end{cases} \quad (n \geq N_3). \tag{9}$$

Choose two subsequence of $\{y_n\}$, denoted by $\{y_{n_i}\}$ and $\{y_{m_i}\}$ with $N_3 \leq n_i \uparrow, m_i \uparrow$ such that $0 < y_{n_i} \uparrow u$ and $0 > y_{m_i} \uparrow v$. By (8) one gets $y_{n_i-1-k_{n_i-1}} \leq 0$ and then there is n_i^* with $n_i - 1 - k_{n_i-1} \leq n_i^* \leq n_i - 1$ such that $y_{n_i^*} \leq 0$ and $y_n > 0$ for $n_i^* + 1 \leq n \leq n_i$. Choose a number $\xi_i \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$y_{n_i^*} + \xi_i (y_{n_i^*+1} - y_{n_i^*}) = 0.$$
⁽¹⁰⁾

By the inequality

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^{m} a_i^{\alpha_i}\right)^{1/\sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i} \le \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i}$$

we get

$$-y_{j-k_{j}} = -y_{n_{i}^{*}} + \sum_{s=j-k_{j}}^{n_{i}^{*}-1} (y_{s+1} - y_{s})$$

$$= \xi_{i}(y_{n_{i}^{*}+1} - y_{n_{i}^{*}}) + \sum_{s=j-k_{j}}^{n_{i}^{*}-1} \ln\left(1 + p_{s}\left(\frac{1 - e^{y_{s-k_{s}}}}{1 + \lambda e^{y_{s-k_{s}}}}\right)^{r}\right)$$

$$\leq \xi_{i} \ln\left(1 + p_{n_{i}^{*}}(1 - e^{v_{1}})\right) + \sum_{s=j-k_{j}}^{n_{i}^{*}-1} \ln\left(1 + p_{s}(1 - e^{v_{1}})\right)$$

$$\leq (n_{i}^{*} - j + k_{j} + \xi_{i}) \ln\left[1 + \frac{1 - e^{v_{1}}}{n_{i}^{*} - j + k_{j} + \xi_{i}}\left(\xi_{i}p_{n_{i}^{*}} + \sum_{s=j-k_{j}}^{n_{i}^{*}-1} p_{s}\right)\right]$$

Then

$$e^{y_{j-k_j}} \ge \left[1 + (1 - e^{v_1}) \frac{1}{n_i^* - j + k_j + \xi_i} \left(\xi_i p_{n_i^*} + \sum_{s=j-k_j}^{n_i^* - 1} p_s\right)\right]^{-(n_i^* - j + k_j + \xi_i)}$$

By $(1 + \frac{x}{n})^{-n} \ge 1 - x$ for n > 0 and $x \ge 0$ we get

$$e^{y_{j-k_j}} \ge 1 - (1 - e^{v_1}) \bigg(\xi_i p_{n_i^*} + \sum_{s=j-k_j}^{n_i^* - 1} p_s \bigg).$$
(11)

Thus by (9) - (11) we get

$$\begin{split} y_{n_{i}} &= y_{n_{i}^{*}+1} + \sum_{s=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n_{i}-1} (y_{s+1} - y_{s}) \\ &= (1 - \xi_{i})(y_{n_{i}^{*}+1} - y_{n_{i}^{*}}) + \sum_{n=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n_{i}-1} \ln\left(1 + p_{n}\left(\frac{1 - e^{y_{n} - k_{n}}}{1 + \lambda e^{y_{n} - k_{n}}}\right)^{r}\right) \\ &\leq (1 - \xi_{i})\ln\left(1 + p_{n_{i}^{*}}(1 - e^{y_{n_{i}^{*}-k_{n_{i}^{*}}})\right) + \sum_{n=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n_{i}-1}\ln\left(1 + p_{n}(1 - e^{y_{n} - k_{n}})\right) \\ &\leq (1 - \xi_{i})\ln\left[1 + p_{n_{i}^{*}}(1 - e^{v_{1}})\left(\xi_{i}p_{n_{i}^{*}} + \sum_{s=n_{i}^{*}-k_{n_{i}^{*}}}^{n_{i}^{*}-1}p_{s}\right)\right] \\ &+ \sum_{n=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n_{i}-1}\ln\left[1 + p_{n}(1 - e^{v_{1}})\left(\xi_{i}p_{n_{i}^{*}} + \sum_{s=n-k_{n}}^{n_{i}^{*}-1}p_{s}\right)\right]. \end{split}$$

By assumption (i) we get

$$\begin{split} y_{n_{i}} &\leq (1-\xi_{i}) \ln \left[1+p_{n_{i}^{*}}(1-e^{v_{1}}) \left(\delta(1+\lambda)-(1-\xi_{i})p_{n_{i}^{*}} \right) \right] \\ &+ \sum_{n=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n_{i}-1} \ln \left[1+p_{n}(1-e^{v_{1}}) \left(\delta(1+\lambda)-\sum_{s=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n} p_{s}-(1-\xi_{i})p_{n_{i}^{*}} \right) \right] \\ &\leq (n_{i}-n_{i}^{*}-\xi_{i}) \ln \left\{ 1+\frac{1}{n_{i}-n_{i}^{*}-\xi_{i}} (1-e^{v_{1}}) \right. \\ &\times \left[(1-\xi_{i})p_{n_{i}^{*}} \left(\delta(1+\lambda)-(1-\xi_{i})p_{n_{i}^{*}} \right) \right. \\ &+ \sum_{n=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n_{i}-1} p_{n} \left(\delta(1+\lambda)-\sum_{s=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n} p_{s}-(1-\xi_{i})p_{n_{i}^{*}} \right) \right] \right\}. \end{split}$$

Supposing $k_n \leq k$, since $n_i - n_i^* - \xi_i \leq k_{n_i-1} + 1 \leq k+1$ it results in

$$y_{n_{i}} \leq (k+1) \ln \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{k+1} (1-e^{v_{1}}) \left[(1-\xi_{i}) p_{n_{i}^{*}} \left(\delta(1+\lambda) - (1-\xi_{i}) p_{n_{i}^{*}} \right) + \sum_{n=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n_{i}-1} p_{n} \left(\delta(1+\lambda) - \sum_{s=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n} p_{s} - (1-\xi_{i}) p_{n_{i}^{*}} \right) \right] \right\}.$$

Let

$$d_i = \sum_{n=n_i^*+1}^{n_i-1} p_n + (1-\xi_i) p_{n_i^*}.$$

Then by the inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_s^2 \ge \frac{1}{m} \left(\sum_{s=1}^{m} x_s\right)^2$$

we get

$$\begin{split} y_{n_{i}} &\leq (k+1) \ln \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{k+1} \delta(1+\lambda) (1-e^{v_{1}}) d_{i} - \frac{1}{k+1} (1-e^{v_{1}}) \right. \\ & \times \left[(1-\xi_{i})^{2} p_{n_{i}^{*}}^{2} + (1-\xi_{i}) p_{n_{i}^{*}} \sum_{n=n_{i}^{*}-1}^{n_{i}-1} p_{n} + \sum_{n=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n_{i}-1} p_{n} \sum_{s=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n_{i}-1} p_{s} \right] \right\} \\ &= (k+1) \ln \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{k+1} \delta(1+\lambda) (1-e^{v_{1}}) d_{i} - \frac{1}{2(k+1)} (1-e^{v_{1}}) d_{i}^{2} \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{2(k+1)} (1-e^{v_{1}}) \left[\sum_{n=n_{i}^{*}+1}^{n_{i}-1} p_{n}^{2} + (1-\xi_{i})^{2} p_{n_{i}^{*}}^{2} \right] \right\} \\ &\leq (k+1) \ln \left\{ 1 + \frac{\delta(1+\lambda)}{k+1} (1-e^{v_{1}}) d_{i} - \frac{1}{2(k+1)} (1-e^{v_{1}}) d_{i}^{2} \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{2(k+1)} (1-e^{v_{1}}) \frac{1}{n_{i}-n_{i}^{*}} d_{i}^{2} \right\} \\ &\leq (k+1) \ln \left\{ 1 + \frac{\delta(1+\lambda)}{k+1} (1-e^{v_{1}}) d_{i} - \frac{k+2}{2(k+1)^{2}} (1-e^{v_{1}}) d_{i}^{2} \right\}. \end{split}$$

Since

$$\delta(1+\lambda)x - \frac{k+2}{2(k+1)}x^2 \uparrow$$
 when $x \le \frac{k+1}{k+2}\delta(1+\lambda)$,

the maximum point of the function is $x = \frac{k+1}{k+2}\delta(1+\lambda)$. Then

$$y_{n_i} \le (k+1) \ln \left(1 + \frac{\delta^2 (1+\lambda)^2}{2(k+2)} (1-e^{v_1}) \right).$$

It is easy to see that the function $x \ln(1 + \frac{\delta^2(1+\lambda^2)}{2(x+1)})$ is increasing on $(0, +\infty)$, hence

$$(k+1)\ln\left(1+\frac{\delta^2(1+\lambda)^2}{2(k+2)}\right)\uparrow\frac{\delta^2(1+\lambda)^2}{2}\qquad(k\to\infty).$$

Letting $i \to +\infty$ and $\varepsilon \to 0$ we get

$$u \le (k+1) \ln \left(1 + \frac{\delta^2 (1+\lambda)^2}{2(k+2)} (1-e^v) \right).$$
(12)

Now, let $y_{n_*} = \max\{0, y_n\}$. Again, since $\Delta y_{m_i-1} \leq 0$, by (8) we have $y_{m_i-1-k_{m_i-1}} \geq 0$. Then

$$y_{m_{i}} = y_{m_{i}-1-k_{m_{i}-1}} + \sum_{s=m_{i}-1-k_{m_{i}-1}}^{m_{i}-1} \ln\left(1+p_{s}\left(\frac{1-e^{y_{s}-k_{s}}}{1+\lambda e^{y_{s}-k_{s}}}\right)^{r}\right)$$

$$\geq \sum_{s=m_{i}-1-k_{m_{i}-1}}^{m_{i}-1} \ln\left(1+p_{s}\left(\frac{1-e^{y_{(s}-k_{s})*}}{1+\lambda e^{y_{(s}-k_{s})*}}\right)^{r}\right)$$

$$\geq \ln\left(1+\sum_{s=m_{i}-1-k_{m_{i}-1}}^{m_{i}-1} p_{s}\left(\frac{1-e^{y_{(s}-k_{s})*}}{1+\lambda e^{y_{(s}-k_{s})*}}\right)^{r}\right)$$

$$\geq \ln\left(1+\delta(1+\lambda)\left(\frac{1-e^{u_{1}}}{1+\lambda e^{u_{1}}}\right)^{r}\right)$$

and hence

$$e^{y_{m_i}} \ge 1 + \delta(1+\lambda) \Big(\frac{1-e^{u_1}}{1+\lambda e^{u_1}}\Big)^r.$$

Letting $i \to +\infty$ and $\varepsilon \to 0$, one gets

$$e^{v} \ge 1 + \delta(1+\lambda) \left(\frac{1-e^{u}}{1+\lambda e^{u}}\right)^{r}.$$
(13)

If $u \neq 0$, then u > 0. By (12) - (13) we get

$$u \le \ln\left(1 + \frac{\delta^3 (1+\lambda)^3}{2(k+2)} \left(\frac{e^u - 1}{1+\lambda e^u}\right)^r\right)^{k+1}$$

From (12),

$$u < \ln\left(1 + \frac{\delta^2 (1+\lambda)^2}{2(k+2)}\right)^{k+1} = u_0.$$
(14)

Let

$$f(u) = u - \ln\left(1 + \frac{\delta^3(1+\lambda)^3}{2(k+2)} \left(\frac{e^u - 1}{1+\lambda e^u}\right)^r\right)^{k+1}.$$

Clearly, $f(0) = 0, f''(u) \le 0, f(u)$ has at most two zero points in $[0, +\infty)$ and

$$f(u_0) = \ln\left(1 + \frac{\delta^2(1+\lambda)^2}{2(k+2)}\right)^{k+1} - \ln\left(1 + \frac{\delta^3(1+\lambda)^3}{2(k+2)}\left(\frac{e^{u_0}-1}{1+\lambda e^{u_0}}\right)^r\right)^{k+1}$$

By (14), $u_0 \uparrow \frac{\delta^2(1+\lambda)^2}{2}$, hence $e^{u_0} \leq e^{\delta^2(1+\lambda)^2/2}$. Using assumption (iii) we get $f(u_0) \geq 0$. We see that f(u) > 0 for $u \in (0, u_0)$ which contradicts (13). Then u = 0 and v = 0, which implies $\lim_{n \to +\infty} y_n = 0$. This completes the proof

Corollary 3. Suppose that assumption (ii) of Theorem 2 holds and that

s

$$\sum_{n=-k_n}^n p_s \le \frac{1}{2}(1+\lambda)$$

for sufficiently large n. Then every positive solution of equation (1) tends to 1 as $n \to +\infty$.

Acknowledgement. The authors are very thankful to one of the referees for his valuable suggestions.

References

- [1] Zhang, B. G. and C. J. Tian: Nonexistence and existence of positive solutions for difference equations with unbounded delay. Comp. Math. Applic. 36 (1998), 1 8.
- Philos, Ch. G.: Oscillations in a non-autonomous delay logistic difference equation. Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. 35 (1992), 121 – 131.
- [3] Zhou, Zh. and Q. Q. Zhang: Global attractivity of a non-autonomous logistic equation with delays. Comp. Math. Appl. 38 (1999), 57 - 64.
- [4] Gyori, I. and G. Ladas: Oscillation Theory of Delay Differential Equations with Applications. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1991.
- [5] Kocic, V. L. and G. Ladas: Global behavior of nonlinear difference equations of higher order with applications. Boston: Kluwer Acad. Publ. 1993, pp. 75-80.

Received 08.04.2002; in revised form 17.07.2002