

## TWO PROPOSITIONS ON SLOWLY VARYING FUNCTIONS

Dušan D. Adamović

**Abstract.** The paper contains two statements which both assert that, under certain conditions, the function  $f(x) = F(R_1(x), \dots, R_m(x))$ , where  $F : (\mathbf{R}^+)^m \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$ ,  $R_k : \mathbf{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, m$ , is slowly varying.

1. Our first theme is the following:

**PROPOSITION 1.** Let  $L_k$  ( $k = 1, \dots, m$ ) be slowly varying functions and let the real function  $F$  be defined and continuous on the adherence (closure)  $D$  in  $(\mathbf{R}^+)^m$  of the set  $E = L_1(\mathbf{R}^+) \times \dots \times L_m(\mathbf{R}^+)$  and with the properties

$$m = \inf_{(t_1, \dots, t_m) \in E} F(t_1, \dots, t_m) > 0, \quad M = \sup_{(t_1, \dots, t_m) \in E} F(t_1, \dots, t_m) < +\infty.$$

Then the function

$$f(x) = F(L_1(x), \dots, L_m(x)) \quad (x > 0)$$

is slowly varying.

Here  $\mathbf{R}^+$  denotes the extended system (space) of real numbers,  $\mathbf{R}^+ = (0, +\infty)$  and the continuity on  $D$  means especially that, if  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in D$  and  $+\infty \in \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\}$ , then

$$\lim_{E \ni (t_1, \dots, t_m) \rightarrow (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)} F(t_1, \dots, t_m) = F(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$$

exists.

*Proof.* Under the conditions of the proposition, the function  $f$  is obviously defined and positive for  $x > 0$ , and also measurable on  $\mathbf{R}^+$  if the measurability

on  $\mathbf{R}^+$  of the functions  $L_k$  ( $k = 1, \dots, m$ ) is claimed (by the accepted definition of slowly varying function). Moreover,

$$0 < m \leq f(x) \leq M < +\infty \quad (x > 0). \quad (1)$$

Suppose that  $f$  is not slowly varying. This function cannot be regularly varying, because that would imply  $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x) = +\infty$  or  $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x) = 0$ , contradicting (1). Besides, (1) implies that for no  $\lambda \in (0, +\infty)$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(\lambda x)}{f(x)} = +\infty \vee \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(\lambda x)}{f(x)} = 0$$

is possible.

Hence, there exists  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $f(\lambda x)/f(x)$  oscillates as  $x \rightarrow +\infty$ , and consequently, for the same  $\lambda$ , there exist numbers  $A$  and  $B$  such that

$$0 < A < B < +\infty \quad (2)$$

and the sequences  $(x_n)$  and  $(y_n)$  of positive numbers, tending  $+\infty$ , for which

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(\lambda x_n)}{f(x_n)} = A, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(\lambda y_n)}{f(y_n)} = B. \quad (3)$$

But then there exist the elements  $\alpha, \beta \in D$ , the subsequence  $(\bar{x}_n)$  of  $(x_n)$  and the subsequence  $(\bar{y}_n)$  of  $(y_n)$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_k(\bar{x}_n) = \alpha_k, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_k(\bar{y}_n) = \beta_k \quad (k = 1, \dots, m),$$

where  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$ ,  $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ . By the definition of slowly varying function, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_k(\lambda \bar{x}_n) = \alpha_k, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_k(\lambda \bar{y}_n) = \beta_k \quad (k = 1, \dots, m),$$

and further

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(\lambda \bar{x}_n)}{f(\bar{x}_n)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(L_1(\lambda \bar{x}_n), \dots, L_m(\lambda \bar{x}_n))}{F(L_1(\bar{x}_n), \dots, L_m(\bar{x}_n))} = \frac{F(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)}{F(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)} = 1;$$

similarly,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(\lambda \bar{y}_n)}{f(\bar{y}_n)} = \frac{F(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)}{F(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)} = 1,$$

and two last conclusions contradict (2) and (3). This proves our statement.

We can remark that simple examples show that none of the conditions concerning the function  $F$  can be omitted. For example, if  $m = 1$ ,  $L_1(x) = \ln(x + 1)$ ,  $F(x) = 2 + \sin x$ , then the function  $F$  is not continuous on  $D = [0, +\infty]$  in the

previous sense, and the function  $f(x) = 2 + \sin \ln(x + 1)$  is not slowly varying. On the other hand, for  $m = 1$ ,  $L_1(x) = \ln(x + 1)$  and  $F(x) = e^x$ ,  $F$  is continuous on  $D$  ( $F$  can be considered as a function whose values belong to  $\mathbf{R}^*$ ), but (1) is not satisfied; in this case  $f(x) = x + 1$  is not a slowly varying function.

2. Besides the previous proposition, one can give the following one, in some sense similar, but really incomparable to it.

**PROPOSITION 2.** *Let  $R_k(x)$  ( $k = 1, \dots, m$ ) be regularly varying functions tending to infinity with  $x$ , and let the function  $F : (\mathbf{R}^+)^m \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$  be continuous and slowly varying, in Karamata-Bajšanski sense [1]. Then the function  $f(x) = F(R_1(x), \dots, R_m(x))$  ( $x > 0$ ) is slowly varying.*

*Proof.* First, recall that, by the definition given by Karamata and Bajšanski in [1], the function  $F : (\mathbf{R}^+)^m \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$  is slowly varying if

$$\lim_{\min\{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F(\lambda_1 x_1, \dots, \lambda_m x_m)}{F(x_1, \dots, x_m)} = 1 \quad \text{for each } \lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m) \in (\mathbf{R}^+)^m$$

and that the theorem on uniform convergence in [1] implies that, for such a function and for  $0 < \alpha_k < \beta_k < +\infty$  ( $k = 1, \dots, m$ ),

$$\lim_{\min\{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F(\lambda_1 x_1, \dots, \lambda_m x_m)}{F(x_1, \dots, x_m)} = 1$$

uniformly for  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m) \in \prod_{k=1}^m [\alpha_k, \beta_k]$

Under the hypotheses of the proposition, the function  $f(x)$  is defined and measurable on  $\mathbf{R}^+$ .

Let  $\lambda > 0$  be arbitrarily chosen. By hypothesis,

$$R_k(x) = x^{\rho_k} L_k(x), \quad \text{with } \rho_k \geq 0 \quad (k = 1, \dots, m),$$

where  $L_k(x)$  ( $k = 1, \dots, m$ ) are slowly varying functions. Then, for  $x$  large enough, we have

$$1/2 \leq L_k(\lambda x)/L_k(x) \leq 2 \quad (k = 1, \dots, m),$$

and hence, on account of what we have supposed on  $R_k$  and by the just mentioned uniform convergence property of  $F$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(\lambda x)}{f(x)} &= \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F(R_1(\lambda x), \dots, R_m(\lambda x))}{F(R_1(x), \dots, R_m(x))} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F\left(\frac{R_1(\lambda x)}{R_1(x)} \cdot R_1(x), \dots, \frac{R_m(\lambda x)}{R_m(x)} \cdot R_m(x)\right)}{F(R_1(x), \dots, R_m(x))} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F\left(\lambda^{p_1} \frac{L_1(\lambda x)}{L_1(x)} \cdot R_1(x), \dots, \lambda^{p_m} \frac{L_m(\lambda x)}{L_m(x)} \cdot R_m(x)\right)}{F(R_1(x), \dots, R_m(x))} = 1.$$

So the function  $f(x)$  is slowly varying.

Finally, we note that special cases of Propositions 1 and 2 were given in [2, Theorem II, 1°, 2°, 3°]).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] B. Bajšanski, J. Karamata, *Regularly varying functions and the principle of equicontinuity*, Publ. Ramanujan Inst, 1 (1968–1969), 235–242.
- [2] D. Adamović, *Sur quelques propriétés des fonctions à croissance lente de Karamata, I, II*, Mat. Vesnik 3 (1966), 123–136, 161–172.

Matematički fakultet  
Studentski trg 16  
11000 Beograd, Yugoslavia

(Received 10 10 1989)