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#### Abstract

Let $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$ be a sequence of numbers recursively defined by $$
f\left(\tau_{n}\right)+f\left(\tau_{n}+\tau_{n-1}\right)+\cdots+f\left(\tau_{n}+\tau_{n-1}+\cdots+\tau_{1}\right)=1,
$$ where $f$ is a continuous and strictly decreasing function on $(0, \infty)$ with $f\left(0^{+}\right) \geq 1$, and $f(\infty)=0$. Assume the convexity of $\log f$ or $\log \left|f^{\prime}\right|$. It can be shown that $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$ is increasing. Thus $\lim \tau_{n}$ exists in $(0, \infty]$.

The difference equation above is motivated by a heat conduction problem studied in Myshkis (1997) and Chen, Chow and Hsieh (2006).


## 1. Introduction

In this note we study the behaviour of a sequence $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$ which is recursively defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{n} f\left(\sum_{s=j}^{n} \tau_{s}\right)=1 ; n=1,2, \ldots \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f$ is a continuous and strictly decreasing function on $(0, \infty)$ with $f\left(0^{+}\right) \geq 1$, and $f(\infty)=0$. We will characterize the behaviour of the sequence $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$ by assuming the convexity of $\log f$ or $\log \left|f^{\prime}\right|$.

Theorem 1.1. Assume $f: \mathbb{R}^{+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{+}$satisfies the conditions in (1.1). If $(\log f)^{\prime \prime}$ or $\left(\log \left|f^{\prime}\right|\right)^{\prime \prime}$ is nonnegative (positive), then the sequence $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$ defined in (1.1) is (strictly) increasing. Moreover,

$$
\lim \tau_{n}=\beta<\infty \text { iff } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n)<\infty .
$$

[^0]In that case, $\beta$ is uniquely determined by the equation $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n \beta)=1$.
We remark that it is not difficult to check that

$$
\tau_{1}<\tau_{2}=\tau_{3}=\cdots=\tau_{n}=\cdots \text { in case } f(x)=c q^{x} \text { with } c>1>q>0
$$

It indicates that if $(\log f)^{\prime \prime}$ or $\left(\log \left|f^{\prime}\right|\right)^{\prime \prime}$ is nonnegative only, then $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$ may not be strictly increasing.

Also note that the condition $(\log f)^{\prime \prime}\left(\right.$ or $\left.\left(\log \left|f^{\prime}\right|\right)^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is nonnegative on $(0, \infty)$ can be replaced by $\log f\left(\right.$ or $\left.\log \left|f^{\prime}\right|\right)$ is convex on $(0, \infty)$, which is slightly weaker. By Proposition 5.17 in Royden (1988) [8], we may use any of the one-sided derivatives of $\log f\left(\right.$ or of $\left.\log \left|f^{\prime}\right|\right)$ to replace $(\log f)^{\prime}\left(\right.$ or $\left.\left(\log \left|f^{\prime}\right|\right)^{\prime}\right)$.

It is easy to verify that $f(x)=c x^{-\delta}$, where $c$ and $\delta$ are positive constants, satisfies the condition in Theorem 1.1. Hence we get the following.

Corollary 1.2. ([3-5]). Let $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$ be defined in (1.1) with $f(x)=c x^{-\delta}$ on $(0, \infty)$, then $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$ is strictly increasing. Moreover, $\lim \tau_{n}=\infty$ for $0<\delta \leq 1$ and $\lim \tau_{n}=(c \zeta(\delta))^{1 / \delta}$ for $\delta>1$. Here, $\zeta(s)=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-s}$ is the Riemann-Zeta function.

This research is motivated by a heat conduction problem studied by Myshkis (1997) [6]. Assume the initial temperature of an infinite homogeneous medium set in $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is 0 and at time 0 , a heat impulse of size $b$ is applied at the origin. When the temperature at the origin drops to a preset threshold $u_{0}>0$, another heat impulse of the same size is applied at the origin. The same procedure is repeated over and over. Let $t_{0}=0, t_{1}, t_{2}, \ldots, t_{n-1}$ be the heating times obtained in this way. By solving the heat equation

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\partial u / \partial t=a \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d} \partial^{2} u / \partial x_{i}^{2}  \tag{1.2}\\
u\left(\mathbf{x}, t_{n-1}^{+}\right)=u\left(\mathbf{x}, t_{n-1}\right)+b \cdot \delta(\mathbf{x})
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $a$ is the heat conduction coefficient of the medium and $\delta(\mathbf{x})$ the Dirac function at $\mathbf{x}=0$, it is not difficult to obtain from the superposition principle that for $t_{n-1}<t$,

$$
u(\mathbf{x}, t)=b \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\left(\frac{1}{4 \pi a\left(t-t_{j}\right)}\right)^{d / 2} \exp \left(-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} x_{i}^{2}}{4 a\left(t-t_{j}\right)}\right)
$$

The heating condition $u\left(0, t_{n}\right)=u_{0}$ then implies

$$
u_{0}=u\left(0, t_{n}\right)=b \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\left(\frac{1}{4 \pi a\left(t_{n}-t_{j}\right)}\right)^{d / 2}
$$

For $j \geq 1$, define $\tau_{j}=4 \pi a\left(t_{j}-t_{j-1}\right)\left(u_{0} / b\right)^{2 / d}$ as the normalized waiting time between two consecutive heating times $t_{j-1}$ and $t_{j}$. A simple computation shows

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau_{1}=1 \quad \text { and } \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\{\sum_{s=j}^{n} \tau_{s}\right\}^{-d / 2}=1 \quad \text { for } \quad n \geq 2 \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Corollary 1.2 can be applied to (1.3) if we take $c=1$ and $\delta=d / 2$. When the heat problem (1.2) is set in a general domain like a finite or semi-infinite region plus some boundary conditions, its fundamental solution becomes very complicated and can at most be expressed in sum of infinite series. This motivates us to study (1.1) as a generalization to (1.3).

Note that Chen, Chow and Hsieh (2000) [5] showed that for the heat problem (1.2), $\lim \tau_{n} / n=\pi^{2} / 2$ for $d=1$ as conjectured in Myshkis (1997). Then Chang, Chow and Wang (2003) [4] showed that $\lim \tau_{n} / \log n=1$ for $d=2$. These results are not covered by Theorem 1.1. It is interesting to see how to get some similar results for (1.1).

## 2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

First we study the increasing property of the sequence $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$. By (1.1), $f\left(\tau_{1}\right)=$ $1=f\left(\tau_{2}\right)+f\left(\tau_{2}+\tau_{1}\right)>f\left(\tau_{2}\right)$. Since $f(t)$ is strictly decreasing, we have $\tau_{2}>\tau_{1}$. By induction, it suffices to check $\tau_{n+1}>\tau_{n}$ under the hypothesis that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau_{n}>\tau_{n-1}>\cdots>\tau_{1} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define $\widetilde{T}_{j}^{k}=\sum_{s=j}^{k} \tau_{s}$ and $\Phi(t)=f(t)+\sum_{j=1}^{n} f\left(t+\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n}\right)$, which is strictly decreasing. Assume temporarily that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{n} f\left(\tau_{n}+\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n}\right)>\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} f\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n}\right) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Adding $f\left(\tau_{n}\right)$ to both sides above and using (1.1),

$$
\Phi\left(\tau_{n}\right)>f\left(\tau_{n}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} f\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n}\right)=1=\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} f\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n+1}\right)=\Phi\left(\tau_{n+1}\right)
$$

from which the desired inequality $\tau_{n+1}>\tau_{n}$ follows.
It remains to verify (2.2). First we show it under the assumption that $(\log f)^{\prime \prime}>$ 0 , which implies $f^{\prime} / f$ is strictly increasing.

Since both $\left\{\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n}\right\},\left\{\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n-1}\right\}$ are strictly decreasing in $j$ and $\widetilde{T}_{j+1}^{n}>\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n-1}$ for $1 \leq j \leq n-1$ under the induction hypothesis (2.1), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
f\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n-1}\right)>f\left(\widetilde{T}_{j+1}^{n}\right)>f\left(\widetilde{T}_{1}^{n}\right) \text { and } f\left(\tau_{n-1}\right)>f\left(\widetilde{T}_{j-1}^{n-1}\right) \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denote $q(t)=f\left(\tau_{n}+t\right) / f(t)$. Because $f^{\prime} / f$ is strictly increasing, $q^{\prime}(t)=$ $\left\{f\left(\tau_{n}+t\right) / f(t)\right\} \cdot\left(f^{\prime}\left(\tau_{n}+t\right) / f\left(\tau_{n}+t\right)-f^{\prime}(t) / f(t)\right)>0$. So $q$ is strictly increasing. Therefore for $2 \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq n-1$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
q\left(\widetilde{T}_{1}^{n}\right)>q\left(\widetilde{T}_{j+1}^{n}\right)>q\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n-1}\right) \text { and } q\left(\widetilde{T}_{j-1}^{n-1}\right)>q\left(\tau_{n-1}\right)>0 \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

For brevity, introduce $a_{j}=f\left(\widetilde{T}_{j+1}^{n}\right), \alpha_{j}=f\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n-1}\right), b_{j}=q\left(\widetilde{T}_{j+1}^{n}\right)$ and $\beta_{j}=$ $q\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n-1}\right)$. Note that $f\left(\tau_{n}+\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n}\right)=f\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n}\right) \cdot q\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n}\right)=a_{j-1} b_{j-1}$ and $f\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n}\right)=$ $f\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n-1}+\tau_{n}\right)=f\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n-1}\right) \cdot q\left(\widetilde{T}_{j}^{n-1}\right)=\alpha_{j} \beta_{j}$. By (2.3) and (2.4), we have $b_{0}>$ $b_{j}>\beta_{j}>0$ and $\alpha_{j}>a_{j}>0$ for $1 \leq j \leq n-1$ and $2 \leq n$. Using (1.1), the difference on both sides of (2.2) is

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_{j} b_{j}-\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \alpha_{j} \beta_{j}=a_{0} b_{0}+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left(a_{j}\left(b_{j}-\beta_{j}\right)+\beta_{j}\left(a_{j}-\alpha_{j}\right)\right)  \tag{2.5}\\
&>a_{0} b_{0}+b_{0} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left(a_{j}-\alpha_{j}\right)=b_{0}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_{j}-\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \alpha_{j}\right)=0
\end{align*}
$$

This verifies (2.2) and thus $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$ is strictly increasing under the assumption that $(\log f)^{\prime \prime}>0$. Under the weaker assumption that $(\log f)^{\prime \prime} \geq 0$, we have $f^{\prime} / f$ is increasing. It is easy to see that all the strictly inequality from (2.1) to (2.5) can be replaced by $\geq$. Hence $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$ is increasing.

Now we check (2.2) under the assumption that $\left(\log \left|f^{\prime}\right|\right)^{\prime \prime}>0$, which implies $f^{\prime \prime} / f^{\prime}$ is strictly increasing. For brevity, denote $\delta_{i}=\sum_{j=n-i}^{n-1} \tau_{j}$ and $\gamma_{i}=$ $\sum_{j=n-i+1}^{n} \tau_{j}$. By the induction hypothesis (2.1), $\delta_{i}<\gamma_{i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

Denote $g(t)=-f^{\prime}(t)$. Since $f$ is strictly decreasing with $f(\infty)=0$, it is easy to verify that $g(t)>0$ and $g(\infty)=0$. In terms of $g$, (1.1) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\delta_{1}}^{\gamma_{1}} g(t) d t+\int_{\delta_{2}}^{\gamma_{2}} g(t) d t+\cdots+\int_{\delta_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}} g(t) d t=\int_{\gamma_{n}}^{\infty} g(t) d t \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define $\phi_{k}(u)$ on $\left[\gamma_{n}, \infty\right)$ for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ in the following way :

$$
\int_{\delta_{k}}^{\phi_{k}(u)} g(t) d t=\left(\frac{\int_{\delta_{k}}^{\gamma_{k}} g(t) d t}{\int_{\gamma_{n}}^{\infty} g(t) d t}\right) \int_{u}^{\infty} g(t) d t
$$

Note that $\phi_{k}\left(\gamma_{n}\right)=\gamma_{k}$ and $\phi_{k}(\infty)=\delta_{k}$. Moreover, $\phi_{k}^{\prime}(u)<0$ and thus $\phi_{k}(u)$ is strictly decreasing on $\left[\gamma_{n}, \infty\right)$. Rewrite (2.6) as

$$
\int_{\delta_{1}}^{\phi_{1}(u)} g(t) d t+\int_{\delta_{2}}^{\phi_{2}(u)} g(t) d t+\cdots+\int_{\delta_{n-1}}^{\phi_{n-1}(u)} g(t) d t=\int_{u}^{\infty} g(t) d t
$$

Differentiating both sides of this equation, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(u)+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} g\left(\phi_{j}(u)\right) \phi_{j}^{\prime}(u)=0 \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $H(u)=-g(u)+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} g\left(\delta_{j}\right)-g\left(\phi_{j}(u)\right)$ on $\left[\gamma_{n}, \infty\right)$. Using $g=-f^{\prime}$ and thus $g^{\prime}=g \frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
H^{\prime}(u)=-\left(g \cdot \frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\right)(u)-\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left(g \cdot \frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\right)\left(\phi_{j}(u)\right) \cdot \phi_{j}^{\prime}(u) \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Because $f^{\prime \prime} / f^{\prime}$ is strictly increasing, $g>0$ and $\phi_{j}(u) \leq \gamma_{j}<\gamma_{n}, \phi_{j}^{\prime}(u)<0$ for $u \geq \gamma_{n}$ and $1 \leq j \leq n-1$, we have

$$
-\left(g \cdot \frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\right)\left(\phi_{j}(u)\right) \cdot \phi_{j}^{\prime}(u) \leq-\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}(u) \cdot g\left(\phi_{j}(u)\right) \cdot \phi_{j}^{\prime}(u)
$$

By (2.7),

$$
\begin{equation*}
H^{\prime}(u)<-\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}(u)\left(g(u)+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} g\left(\phi_{j}(u)\right) \phi_{j}^{\prime}(u)\right)=0 \text { for } u \geq \gamma_{n} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

which means $H(u)$ is strictly decreasing for $u \geq \gamma_{n}$. Since $H(\infty)=0$, we assert that $H(u)>0$ on $\left[\gamma_{n}, \infty\right)$. In particular,

$$
\begin{equation*}
H\left(\gamma_{n}\right)=\sum_{j=1}^{n} f^{\prime}\left(\gamma_{j}\right)-\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} f^{\prime}\left(\delta_{j}\right)>0 \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

By continuity and (1.1),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{n} f\left(\gamma_{j}+x\right)<\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} f\left(\delta_{j}+x\right) \text { for } x<0 \text { and small. } \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

We claim that $\sum_{j=1}^{n} f\left(\gamma_{j}+x\right)>\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} f\left(\delta_{j}+x\right)$ for all $x>0$. Then letting $x=\tau_{n}$, we obtain (2.2) and thus $\left\{\tau_{n}\right\}$ is strictly increasing as desired. Suppose the contrary. By (2.11), there exists a number $v>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{n} f\left(\gamma_{j}+x\right)>\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} f\left(\delta_{j}+x\right) \text { for } 0<x<v \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

but $\sum_{j=1}^{n} f\left(\gamma_{j}+v\right)=\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} f\left(\delta_{j}+v\right)$. Repeating the same reasoning from (2.6) on, but with $\delta_{j}$ and $\gamma_{j}$ replaced by $\delta_{j}+v$ and $\gamma_{j}+v$ respectively, we would obtain

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{n} f\left(\gamma_{j}+v+x\right) \gtrless \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} f\left(\delta_{j}+v+x\right) \text { for } x<0,
$$

which contradicts to (2.12). This verifies the claim and thus the conclusion.
If we assume the weaker condition that $\left(\log \left|f^{\prime}\right|\right)^{\prime \prime} \geq 0$, then $f^{\prime \prime} / f^{\prime}$ is increasing only. Equation (2.9) becomes $H^{\prime}(u) \leq 0$ in $\left(\gamma_{n}, \infty\right)$ and then it is possible that $H\left(\gamma_{n}\right)=0$ in (2.10). In that case, $H(u)=0$ for $u \geq \gamma_{n}$ due to $H^{\prime}(u) \leq 0$ and $H(\infty)=0$. Consequently, $H^{\prime}(u)=0$ on ( $\left.\gamma_{n}, \infty\right)$. In view of (2.8) and (2.9),

$$
-\left(g \cdot \frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\right)\left(\phi_{j}(u)\right) \cdot \phi_{j}^{\prime}(u)=-\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}(u) \cdot g\left(\phi_{j}(u)\right) \cdot \phi_{j}^{\prime}(u)
$$

for $1 \leq j \leq n-1$ and $u \in\left(\gamma_{n}, \infty\right)$. Since $g>0$ and $\phi_{j}^{\prime}<0$, we get

$$
\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\left(\phi_{j}(u)\right)=\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}(u)
$$

for $1 \leq j \leq n-1$ and $u \in\left(\gamma_{n}, \infty\right)$. Taking $j=1$ and $u=\infty$, we have $\left(f^{\prime \prime} / f^{\prime}\right)\left(\tau_{n-1}\right)=\left(f^{\prime \prime} / f^{\prime}\right)(\infty)$. This implies that $f^{\prime \prime} / f^{\prime}$ is a constant function on $\left[\tau_{n-1}, \infty\right)$ due to the monotone assumption of $f^{\prime \prime} / f^{\prime}$. Note that $f(\infty)=0$. A simple integration shows $f(x)=c q^{x}$ on $\left[\tau_{n-1}, \infty\right)$, where $c>0$ and $1>q>0$ are constants. It is then easy to check that

$$
\tau_{1}<\tau_{2}<\cdots<\tau_{n}=\tau_{n+1}=\tau_{n+2}=\cdots .
$$

So we can only claim that $\left\{\tau_{k} ; k \geq 1\right\}$ is increasing as remarked after Theorem 1.1.
Once we know $\left\{\tau_{k} ; k \geq 1\right\}$ is increasing. What remains is easy. Let $\lim \tau_{n}=$ $\beta \leq \infty$. If $\beta<\infty$, we get from applying Monotone Convergence Theorem to (1.1) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n \beta)=1 \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $f$ is strictly decreasing, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n)=\infty$ iff $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n x)=\infty$ for any $x>0$. In that case, it is not difficult to see that $\beta=\infty$ by contradiction. Otherwise, $\beta<\infty$ and is uniquely determined by (2.13).
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