

On the product of derivatives

by

Richard J. Fleissner (Milwaukee, Wis.)

Abstract. In this note it is shown that the product of a continuous function of bounded variation with a derivative is a derivative. An example is then given of a discontinuous function whose product with every derivative is a derivative.

Introduction. Let \mathcal{A} denote the class of real-valued functions defined on the closed interval $[0, 1]$ whose product with every derivative is a derivative. James Foran [1] has shown that every absolutely continuous function belongs to \mathcal{A} . In the present note, we show that \mathcal{A} includes all continuous functions of bounded variation. An example of a discontinuous function which belongs to \mathcal{A} is also presented.

We recall that if $-\infty < F'(x) = f(x) < +\infty$ for each point $x \in [a, b]$, then $f(x)$ is Denjoy-integrable on $[a, b]$ in both the wide and the restricted sense. For a proof of this, see Theorem (10.5), Saks [2, p. 235], and the descriptive definitions of the D and D_* integrals, Saks [2, p. 241]. (In this note I will use the wide sense D -integral, although the restricted sense D_* -integral may be used throughout.) Noting then that a function is a derivative if, and only if, it is the derivative of its indefinite D -integral, we are ready to proceed.

LEMMA 1. *If $F(x)$ is a continuous function of bounded variation on $[a, b]$ and $g(x)$ is D -integrable on $[a, b]$, then $F(x)g(x)$ is D -integrable on $[a, b]$ and*

$$(1) \quad (D) \int_a^b F(x)g(x) dx = G(b)F(b) - G(a)F(a) - \int_a^b G(x) dF(x)$$

where $G(x) = (D) \int_a^x g(t) dt$ and $\int_a^b G(x) dF(x)$ denotes the Lebesgue-Stieltjes integral of $G(x)$ with respect to $F(x)$.

Proof. This is a special case of Theorem (2.5), Saks [2, p. 246].

THEOREM. *If $F(x)$ is a continuous function of bounded variation on $[0, 1]$ and $G'(x) = g(x)$ for each x in $[0, 1]$, then $F(x)g(x)$ is the derivative of its indefinite Denjoy integral on $[0, 1]$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove the theorem in the case where $F(x)$ is a continuous increasing function on $[0, 1]$. Given x_0 in $[0, 1]$, we shall show that

$$L = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} (x - x_0)^{-1} \left(G(x)F(x) - G(x_0)F(x_0) - \int_{x_0}^x G(t) dF(t) \right) - F(x_0)g(x_0)$$

exists and equals 0. It follows from this and (1) that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} (x - x_0)^{-1} (D) \int_{x_0}^x F(t)g(t) dt = F(x_0)g(x_0).$$

Adding and subtracting $F(x)G(x_0)(x - x_0)^{-1}$ yields

$$L = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} (x - x_0)^{-1} \left(F(x)G(x) - F(x)G(x_0) \right) - F(x_0)g(x_0) + \\ + \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} (x - x_0)^{-1} \left([F(x) - F(x_0)]G(x_0) - \int_{x_0}^x G(t) dF(t) \right)$$

provided both limits exist. Since $F(x)$ is continuous and $G'(x_0) = g(x_0)$,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} (x - x_0)^{-1} (F(x)G(x) - F(x)G(x_0)) - F(x_0)g(x_0) = 0.$$

Hence, we need only show that

$$L^* = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} (x - x_0)^{-1} \left([F(x) - F(x_0)]G(x_0) - \int_{x_0}^x G(t) dF(t) \right)$$

exists and equals 0. Since $F(x)$ is continuous and increasing $F(x) - F(x_0) = \int_{x_0}^x dF(t)$. Therefore, L^* becomes

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} (x - x_0)^{-1} \int_{x_0}^x (G(x_0) - G(t)) dF(t) \\ = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} (x - x_0)^{-1} \int_{x_0}^x (G(x_0) - G(t))(x_0 - t)^{-1} (x_0 - t) dF(t).$$

We note that $(G(x_0) - G(t))(x_0 - t)^{-1} = g(x_0) + \varepsilon(t)$, where $\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow x_0$. For $x \neq x_0$, let $\hat{\varepsilon}(x) = \sup_t |\varepsilon(t)|$, where $0 < |t - x_0| \leq |x - x_0|$. Then $\hat{\varepsilon}(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow x_0$ and if t is in the interval from x_0 to x , $|G(x_0) - G(t)| |x_0 - t|^{-1} \leq |g(x_0)| + \hat{\varepsilon}(x)$. Hence,

$$\overline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow x_0} |x - x_0|^{-1} \left| \int_{x_0}^x |G(x_0) - G(t)| |x_0 - t|^{-1} |x_0 - t| dF(t) \right| \\ \leq \overline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow x_0} |x - x_0|^{-1} |x - x_0| (|g(x_0)| + \hat{\varepsilon}(x)) \left| \int_{x_0}^x dF(t) \right| \\ = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} (|g(x_0)| + \hat{\varepsilon}(x)) |F(x) - F(x_0)| = 0. \quad \text{Q.E.D.}$$

If $F(x)$ has a bounded derivative on $[0, 1]$, then $F(x)$ is of bounded variation and, consequently, belongs to \mathcal{A} . To show that differentiability is not a sufficient condition, we give the following example. For $x \in (0, 1]$, let

$$F(x) = x^2 \sin(x^{-4}), \quad g(x) = x^{-2} \sin(x^{-4}),$$

$$G(x) = \frac{1}{4} x^8 \cos(x^{-4}) - \frac{3}{8} \int_0^x t^2 \cos(t^{-4}) dt,$$

$$J(x) = x^5 \sin(x^{-4}) \cos(x^{-4})$$

and

$$k(x) = 5x^4 \sin(x^{-4}) \cos(x^{-4}) - 4.$$

Let $F(0) = G(0) = g(0) = F(0)g(0) = J(0) = 0$ and let $k(0) = -4$. It is easily verified that $F(x)$, $G(x)$ and $J(x)$ are differentiable, that $g(x)$ is the derivative of $G(x)$, that $k(x)$ is continuous and is, therefore, a derivative, and that $J'(x) - k(x) - 8F(x)g(x) = 0$ for $x \in (0, 1]$. However, $J'(0) - k(0) - 8F(0)g(0) = 4$. Because this function does not possess the Darboux property, and since $J'(x)$ and $k(x)$ are derivatives, it follows that $F(x)g(x)$ cannot be a derivative.

The example of a discontinuous function which belongs to \mathcal{A} requires two lemmas.

LEMMA 2. For an interval $I = [a, b]$, let $c = \frac{1}{2}(a + b)$ and let $h_I(x) = 2(b - a)^{-1}(x - a)$ if $x \in [a, c]$ and $h_I(x) = -2(b - a)^{-1}(x - b)$ if $x \in [c, b]$. (Geometrically, the graph of $h_I(x)$ consists of the two equal sides of an isosceles triangle whose base is I and whose altitude is 1.) If $g(x)$ is D -integrable, then $g(x)h_I(x)$ is D -integrable by Lemma 1. Moreover, letting $G(x) = (D) \int_a^x g(t) dt$ and $H(x) = (D) \int_a^x g(t)h_I(t) dt$, we have

$$(2) \quad O(H, I) \leq 4O(G, I), \quad \text{where} \quad O(F, I) = \sup_{\alpha, \beta \in I} F(\alpha) - F(\beta).$$

Proof. If x_0 and x_1 are in $[a, c]$, it follows from (1) that

$$\left| (D) \int_{x_0}^{x_1} g(x)h_I(x) dx \right| = \left| G(x_1)h_I(x_1) - G(x_0)h_I(x_0) - \int_{x_0}^{x_1} G(x) dh_I(x) \right| \\ = \left| G(x_1)h_I(x_1) - \int_a^{x_1} G(x) dh_I(x) + \int_a^{x_0} G(x) dh_I(x) - G(x_0)h_I(x_0) \right| \\ \leq \left| G(x_1)h_I(x_1) - \int_a^{x_1} 2(b - a)^{-1} G(x) dx \right| + \\ + \left| \int_a^{x_0} 2(b - a)^{-1} G(x) dx - G(x_0)h_I(x_0) \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= |G(x_1)h_I(x_1) - 2(b-a)^{-1}(x_1-a)G(\xi)| + \\
 &\quad + |2(b-a)^{-1}(x_0-a)G(\xi') - G(x_0)h_I(x_0)| \\
 &= |G(x_1) - G(\xi)| |h_I(x_1)| + |G(\xi') - G(x_0)| |h_I(x_0)| \\
 &\leq 2O(G, [a, c])
 \end{aligned}$$

since x_0, x_1, ξ and ξ' are in $[a, c]$ and $0 \leq h_I(x) \leq 1$. The demonstration that $O(H, [c, b]) \leq 2O(G, [c, b])$ is identical and, since H and G are continuous on I , $O(H, I) \leq 4O(G, I)$.

LEMMA 3. Let $I_n = [a_n, b_n]$ be a sequence of closed intervals contained in $(0, 1]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{(i)} \quad & a_{n+1} < b_{n+1} < a_n < b_n, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots, \\
 \text{(ii)} \quad & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = 0, \\
 \text{(iii)} \quad & \frac{b_n - a_n}{a_n b_n} < R, \quad R > 0, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $G(x)$ be a continuous function defined on $(0, 1]$ such that $G(0) = 0$ and $G'(0)$ exists. Let $O(G, I_n) b_n^{-1} = \varepsilon_n$. Then

$$\text{(3)} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, $G'(0) = 0$. For if $G'(0) = h$, letting $F(x) = G(x) - hx$, we have that $F(x)$ is continuous, $F(0) = F'(0) = 0$ and $O(G, I_n) \leq O(F, I_n) + O(hx, I_n)$. But condition (iii) implies that the lemma is true for the function $f(x) = hx$. Therefore, proving the result for $F(x)$ would give the result for $G(x)$ and we may assume that $G'(0) = 0$.

Since $G(x)$ is continuous on $[a_n, b_n]$, $O(G, I_n) = G(r_n) - G(s_n)$, where $r_n, s_n \in I_n$. Since

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \left| \frac{G(x)}{x} \right| = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{G(x)}{b_n} \right| \leq \left| \frac{G(x)}{x} \right| \quad \text{for} \quad x \leq b_n,$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G(r_n)}{b_n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G(s_n)}{b_n} = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G(r_n) - G(s_n)}{b_n} = 0.$$

EXAMPLE. There exists a discontinuous function which belongs to A .

Construction. Let $[a_n, b_n]$ be a sequence of intervals which satisfy conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) of Lemma 3 and in addition satisfy

$$\text{(iv)} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_k^{-1} \sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} b_i = 0.$$

(For example, we could let $[a_n, b_n] = [1/(2n)!, 1/(2n)! + 1/(4n)!]$.)

Let $f(x) = h_{I_n}(x)$ if $x \in I_n$ and let $f(x) = 0$ if $x \in [0, 1] - \bigcup_n I_n$. Then $f(x)$ is discontinuous at $x = 0$ since $f(0) = 0$ and $f(a_n + b_n/2) = 1$.

Let $g(x)$ be a derivative and $G(x) = (D) \int_0^x g(t) dt$. Since $G'(x) = g(x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$, $G(x)$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.

On any interval $[\delta, 1]$ where $\delta > 0$, $f(x)$ is a continuous function of bounded variation and, by our theorem, $f(x)g(x)$ is the derivative of its indefinite D -integral on $[\delta, 1]$. Therefore, it suffices to show that $(D) \int_0^1 f(x)g(x) dx$ exists and that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h^{-1}(D) \int_0^h f(x)g(x) dx = f(0)g(0) = 0.$$

Let $Q = [0, 1] - \bigcup_n (a_n, b_n)$. Then Q is a closed set and $f(x)g(x) = 0$ for every $x \in Q$. It follows that

$$\text{(4)} \quad (D) \int_Q f(x)g(x) dx = 0.$$

It follows from condition (iv) that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n < \infty$. By (2), $|(D) \int_{a_n}^{b_n} f(x)g(x) dx| \leq 4O(G, I_n)$. Letting $\varepsilon_n = O(G, I_n) b_n^{-1}$, we have by (3), that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$ and

$$\text{(5)} \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| (D) \int_{a_n}^{b_n} f(x)g(x) dx \right| \leq 4 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_n b_n < +\infty.$$

Letting $H_n(x) = (D) \int_{a_n}^x f(t)g(t) dt$, (2) implies

$$\text{(6)} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} O(H_n, I_n) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 4O(G, I_n) = 0.$$

By (5), (6), (7) and Theorem (5.1), Saks [2, p. 257], $f(x)g(x)$ is D -integrable on $[0, 1]$ and

$$\text{(7)} \quad (D) \int_0^1 f(x)g(x) dx = (D) \int_Q f(x)g(x) dx + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (D) \int_{a_n}^{b_n} f(x)g(x) dx.$$

To show that $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h^{-1}(D) \int_0^h f(x)g(x) dx = 0$, we first note that if $h \in [b_N, a_{N-1}]$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left| h^{-1}(D) \int_0^h f(x)g(x) dx \right| &= \left| h^{-1}(D) \int_0^{b_N} f(x)g(x) dx \right| \\
 &\leq \left| b_N^{-1} \int_0^{b_N} f(x)g(x) dx \right|
 \end{aligned}$$

since $f(x)g(x) = 0$ on $[b_N, a_{N-1}]$ and $b_N \leq h$. It suffices to consider $h \in [a_N, b_N]$. By (7),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| h^{-1}(D) \int_0^h f(x)g(x) dx \right| \\ &= \left| h^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} (D) \int_{a_k}^{b_k} f(x)g(x) dx \right) + h^{-1}(D) \int_{a_N}^h f(x)g(x) dx \right| \\ &\leq \left| h^{-1} \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} 4O(G, I_k) \right| + |4h^{-1}O(G, I_N)| \quad \text{by (2)} \\ &= \left| h^{-1} \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} 4b_k \varepsilon_k \right| + |4h^{-1}b_N \varepsilon_N| \\ &\leq \left| a_N^{-1} \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} 4b_k \varepsilon_k \right| + |4a_N^{-1}b_N \varepsilon_N| \quad \text{since } a_N \leq h. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$, $4\varepsilon_n$ is eventually less than 1 and $|a_N^{-1} \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} 4b_k \varepsilon_k| \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by condition (iv). By condition (iii), $(b_N - a_N)(b_N a_N)^{-1} < R$. Therefore, $b_N a_N^{-1} - 1 < b_N R$ and $b_N a_N^{-1} \rightarrow 1$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, $|4a_N^{-1}b_N \varepsilon_N| \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. This completes the proof.

It is easy to show that conditions (iii) and (iv) in the definition of the I_n imply that $x = 0$ is a point of dispersion for the set $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n$. Thus, any function constructed in this fashion will be approximately continuous. This is in agreement with the following result. If $f(x)$ is a bounded function, a necessary and sufficient condition that $f(x)g(x)$ be a derivative for every bounded derivative $g(x)$, is that $f(x)$ be approximately continuous. This theorem is proved in Iosifescu [3]. The example, $F(x) = x^2 \sin(x^{-4})$, given earlier shows that this condition is not sufficient for a function to be in A .

References

- [1] J. Foran, *On the product of derivatives*, Fund. Math. 80 (1973), pp. 293-294.
- [2] S. Saks, *Theory of the Integral*, Monografie Matematyczne 7, Warszawa-Lwów, 1937, (English translation by L. C. Young).
- [3] M. Iosifescu, *Conditions that the product of two derivatives be a derivative*, Rev. Math. Pures Appl. 4 (1959), pp. 641-649. (In Russian).

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
Milwaukee

Accepté par la Rédaction le 15. 2. 1974