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1. Problem. We shall solve the following problem.

Problem (P). (Rolewicz). Find all nonnegative and differentiable functions $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t)-f(s)-f^{\prime}(s)(t-s) \geq f(t-s), \quad t, s \in \mathbb{R} \tag{P}
\end{equation*}
$$

(cf. [2] and [4], where the problem was originally stated, under the additional assumption that $f$ be even).

It turns out that the assumption is not needed; every solution of Problem (P) is automatically a quadratic function (and therefore even).

We also find all pairs $(f, g), f, g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, satisfying the functional inequality obtained from (P) by replacing $f^{\prime}(s)$ by $g(s)$ as well as those which satisfy the related functional equation (without any regularity assumptions on $f$ and $g$ ).
2. Solution. We are going to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1. The only solutions $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of problem $(P)$ are given by the formula

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x)=C x^{2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R} \tag{S}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C$ is a nonnegative constant.
Proof. If a function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a solution to ( P ), then

$$
f(0)=f^{\prime}(0)=0
$$

(put $t=s=0$ in (P) to get $f(0)=0$ and then $s=0$ in (P) to obtain $f^{\prime}(0) t \leq 0, t \in \mathbb{R}$, yielding $\left.f^{\prime}(0)=0\right)$. Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(s)}{s}=0 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denote $h:=t-s \in \mathbb{R}$ and rewrite (P) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}(s) \cdot h \leq f(s+h)-f(s)-f(h), \quad s, h \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now assume $s>0$ to get that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{f^{\prime}(s)}{s} h \leq \frac{f(s+h)-f(h)}{s}-\frac{f(s)}{s}, \quad h \in \mathbb{R}, s>0 . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thanks to (1), when $s \rightarrow 0+$, the RHS tends to $f^{\prime}(h)$. Thus, the LHS is bounded from above, and

$$
2 C:=\limsup _{s \rightarrow 0+} \frac{f^{\prime}(s)}{s}
$$

exists. From (3) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 C h \leq f^{\prime}(h), \quad h \in \mathbb{R} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now assume that $s<0$ in (2), which gives us

$$
\frac{f^{\prime}(s)}{s} h \geq \frac{f(s+h)-f(h)}{s}-\frac{f(s)}{s}, \quad h \in \mathbb{R}, s<0 .
$$

As before, this implies that

$$
2 D:=\liminf _{s \rightarrow 0-} \frac{f^{\prime}(s)}{s}
$$

exists and that

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 D h \geq f^{\prime}(h), \quad h \in \mathbb{R} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Inequalities (4) and (5) together now imply that $C h \leq D h$ for all $h \in \mathbb{R}$, and thus $C=D$. Now using (4) and (5) once more, we have $f^{\prime}(h)=2 C h$ for all $h \in \mathbb{R}$, and taking $f(0)=0$ into account we get (S), which was to be proved.

Remark. The proof of Theorem 1 is due to the second author. Earlier the other authors had proved ( S ) with the aid of the following proposition.

Proposition 1. Let $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an even, nonnegative, and differentiable function with $f(1)=1$, satisfying inequality $(P)$. Then we have the following assertions.
(a) Either $f$ is given by (S) with $C=1$ or there are an $\varepsilon>0$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}, \frac{1}{2}<a<b$, such that $f^{\prime}(x)>2 x+\varepsilon, x \in[a, b]$.
(b) If there exists a sequence $\left(x_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to zero, $x_{n}>0, n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $f^{\prime}\left(x_{n}\right) \geq$ $2 x_{n}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $f$ is given by ( $S$ ) with $C=1$.

The first author was able to derive ( S ) from ( P ) having additionally assumed that $f$ is even, twice differentiable in a neighborhood of the origin, and it satisfies an initial condition; cf. [1].
3. Pexider-type functional inequality. In connection with ( P ) let us consider the following inequality:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t)-f(s)-g(s)(t-s) \geq f(t-s), \quad t, s \in \mathbb{R} \tag{Q}
\end{equation*}
$$

We start with a simple lemma.
Lemma 1. A pair $(f, g)$ of functions, each mapping $\mathbb{R}$ into $\mathbb{R}$, where $f$ is differentiable in $\mathbb{R}, f(0)=0$, and $g$ is arbitrary, satisfies inequality $(Q)$ if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(t)=f^{\prime}(t)-f^{\prime}(0), \quad t \in \mathbb{R} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $f$ satisfies the inequality

$$
f(t)-f(s)-\left[f^{\prime}(s)-f^{\prime}(0)\right](t-s) \geq f(t-s), \quad t, s \in \mathbb{R}
$$

Proof. Let $f$ and $g$, regular as required, satisfy (Q). For $t>s$ inequality (Q) may be written in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{f(t)-f(s)}{t-s}-g(s) \geq \frac{f(t-s)}{t-s} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

whereas for $t<s$ we have the inequality opposite to (7). Since $f$ is differentiable, we get $f^{\prime}(s)-g(s)=f^{\prime}(0)$, which is $(6)$, and $f$ satisfies $\left(\mathrm{P}^{\prime}\right)$. The converse implication is obvious.

Theorem 1 and Lemma 1 together yield the following result.
Theorem 2. If $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a nonnegative and differentiable function with $f^{\prime}(0)=0$, $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is arbitrary, and they both satisfy inequality $(Q)$, then there is a $C \geq 0$ such that

$$
f(t)=C t^{2}, \quad g(t)=2 C t, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}
$$

In the case where $f$ in $(\mathrm{Q})$ is an odd function we have the following theorem.
Theorem 3. A pair $(f, g)$ of functions, each mapping $\mathbb{R}$ into $\mathbb{R}$, where $f$ is differentiable in $\mathbb{R}$ and odd, and $g$ is arbitrary, satisfies inequality $(Q)$ if and only if there is a $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t)=C t, \quad g(t)=0, \quad t \in \mathbb{R} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. We have $f(0)=0$ as $f$ is odd. Thus the lemma works. Since now $f^{\prime}$ in $\left(\mathrm{P}^{\prime}\right)$ is even, on putting $-s$ in place of $s$ in $\left(\mathrm{P}^{\prime}\right)$ we get

$$
f(t)+f(s)-\left[f^{\prime}(s)-f^{\prime}(0)\right](t+s) \geq f(t+s), \quad s, t \in \mathbb{R}
$$

With $t=0$ here we arrive at $\left[f^{\prime}(s)-f^{\prime}(0)\right] \cdot s \leq 0, s \in \mathbb{R}$.
On the other hand, with $-t$ in place of $t$ in $\left(\mathrm{P}^{\prime}\right)$ we obtain

$$
\left[f^{\prime}(s)-f^{\prime}(0)\right](t+s) \geq f(t)+f(s)-f(t+s), \quad t, s \in \mathbb{R}
$$

Letting $t=0$ here yields $\left[f^{\prime}(s)-f^{\prime}(0)\right] \cdot s \geq 0, s \in \mathbb{R}$.
Consequently, $f^{\prime}(s)=f^{\prime}(0)$, in turn $f(s)=f^{\prime}(0) s+B$. But $B=0$ as $f$ is odd. Finally, by (6), $g(s)=0, s \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus (8) holds with $C=f^{\prime}(0)$. The converse implication is obvious.
4. Pexider-type functional equation. For the functional equation (cf. inequality (Q))

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t)-f(s)-g(s)(t-s)=f(t-s), \quad t, s \in \mathbb{R} \tag{E}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have the following result.
Theorem 4. Let $f, g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be functions fulfilling equation (E). Then there exist a real constant $C$ and an additive function $a: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x)=a(x)+C x^{2}, \quad g(x)=2 C x, \quad x \in \mathbb{R} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Conversely, the system of functions defined by (9), where $a$ is an additive function and $C \in \mathbb{R}$, is a solution of $(E)$.

Proof. Setting $s=0$ in (E) we get

$$
f(0)=g(0)=0 .
$$

Put $t+s$ instead of $t$ in (E). We have

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t+s)-f(t)-f(s)=g(s) t, \quad t, s \in \mathbb{R} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since the LHS of this equality is symmetric with respect to $t$ and $s$, so is its RHS. Thus

$$
g(s) t=g(t) s, \quad t, s \in \mathbb{R}
$$

Therefore there exists a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(x)=2 C x, x \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, now (10) has the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t+s)-f(t)-f(s)=2 C t s, \quad t, s \in \mathbb{R} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

We define the function $a: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by the formula

$$
a(x):=f(x)-C x^{2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R} .
$$

According to (11) we obtain $a(t+s)-a(t)-a(s)=2 C t s-C(t+s)^{2}+C s^{2}+C t^{2}=0$ for all $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$, which means that $a$ is an additive function. The other part of the proof is evident.

Since every Lebesgue measurable additive function $a: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is linear (cf. [3], for example), Theorem 4 has the following corollary.

Corollary 1. Let $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lebesgue measurable function, and let $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary function. Then the pair of function $(f, g)$ is a solution of functional equation ( $E$ ) if and only if there exist a real constants $C$ and $b$ such that

$$
f(x)=C x^{2}+b x, \quad g(x)=2 C x, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}
$$
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