

### 57. A note on generalized convex functions.

By Sitiro HANAI.

Nagaoka Technical College.

(Comm. by S. KAKEYA, M.I.A., July 12, 1945.)

§ 1. We are concerned with real finite functions  $f(x)$  defined on a closed interval  $a \leq x \leq b$ . E. F. Beckenbach<sup>1</sup> has given a generalization of the notion of a convex function as follows.

Let  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  be a two-parameter family of real finite functions defined on  $a \leq x \leq b$  and satisfying the following conditions:

(1) each  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  is a continuous function of  $x$ ;

(2) there is a unique member of the family which, at arbitrary  $x_1, x_2$  satisfying  $a \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq b$ , takes on arbitrary values  $y_1, y_2$ .

The members of the family  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  are denoted simply by  $F(x)$ , individual members being distinguished by subscripts. In particular,  $F_{ij}(x)$  denotes the member satisfying  $F_{ij}(x_i) = f(x_i)$ ,  $F_{ij}(x_j) = f(x_j)$ , ( $a \leq x_i < x_j \leq b$ ).

We call a function  $f(x)$  to be convex in Beckenbach's sense if

$$f(x) \leq F_{12}(x)$$

for all  $x_1, x_2, x$ , with  $a \leq x_1 < x < x_2 \leq b$ .

Now let the family  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  satisfy the following condition (3) in addition to (1) and (2):

(3) let  $F(x), F'(x)$  be the members of the family passing through arbitrary points  $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2); (x_1, y'_1), (x_2, y'_2)$  respectively, then, the member  $F_\lambda(x)$  ( $\lambda > 0$ ) which passes through  $(x_1, \lambda y_1), (x_2, \lambda y_2)$  is not less than  $\lambda F(x)$  for  $a \leq x_1 < x < x_2 \leq b$ , and the member passing through  $(x_1, y_1 + y'_1), (x_2, y_2 + y'_2)$  is not less than  $F(x) + F'(x)$  for  $a \leq x_1 < x < x_2 \leq b$ .

*Definition.* A function  $f(x)$  is called a generalized convex function if the family  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  satisfies the condition (1), (2), and (3), and  $f(x) \leq F_{12}(x)$  for all  $x_1, x_2, x$ , with  $a \leq x_1 < x < x_2 \leq b$ .

For instance, (a) when  $F(x; \alpha, \beta) \equiv \alpha x + \beta$ , then  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  satisfies the conditions (1), (2), and (3) and therefore the convex function in the usual sense is a generalized convex function, (b) when  $F(x; \alpha, \beta) \equiv \alpha \sin \rho x + \beta \cos \rho x$  where  $\rho$  is a constant and  $b - a < \frac{\pi}{\rho}$ , then  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  satisfies (1), (2), and (3) and

---

1) E. F. Beckenbach; Generalized convex functions, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. Vol. 43 (1937), 363-371.

therefore the Lindelöf-Phragmén's function<sup>2)</sup>  $h(x)$  is a generalized convex function.

The purpose of the present paper is to show that the set of all generalized convex functions is a semi-vector lattice<sup>3)</sup> and the set of all convex functions in Beckenbach's sense is not always a semi-vector lattice.

§ 2. It was shown by E. F. Beckenbach<sup>4)</sup> that the family  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  satisfying the conditions (1), (2) and the convex functions in Beckenbach's sense have several properties analogous to those of the family  $F(x; \alpha, \beta) \equiv \alpha x + \beta$  and the convex functions in the usual sense. These properties will be used to establish the following theorem.

*Theorem 1.* *The set of all generalized convex functions is a semi-vector lattice.*

*Proof.* Let  $F$  denote the set of all generalized convex functions and let  $f(x) \in F$ ,  $g(x) \in F$ . Then there exist two members  $F_{12}(x)$ ,  $F'_{12}(x)$  of the family  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  such that

$$f(x) \leq F_{12}(x), g(x) \leq F'_{12}(x)$$

for all  $x_1, x_2, x$ , with  $a \leq x_1 < x < x_2 \leq b$ .

Then we have

$$f(x) + g(x) \leq F_{12}(x) + F'_{12}(x)$$

for all  $x_1, x_2, x$ , with  $a \leq x_1 < x < x_2 \leq b$ .

On the other hand, it follows from (3) that there is a unique member  $F''_{12}(x)$  of the family  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  such that  $F_{12}(x) + F'_{12}(x) \leq F''_{12}(x)$  for all  $x_1, x_2, x$ , with  $a \leq x_1 < x < x_2 \leq b$  and  $F''_{12}(x_1) = f(x_1) + g(x_1)$ ,  $F''_{12}(x_2) = f(x_2) + g(x_2)$ .

Therefore  $f(x) + g(x) \in F$ .

From (3), it is easy to see that  $\lambda f(x) \in F$  for  $\lambda > 0$ .

Consequently, the set  $F$  is a semi-linear space.

In order to prove that the set  $F$  forms a lattice, it is sufficient to show that an arbitrary bounded subset  $E$  of elements of the set  $F$  has the supremum  $U(x) \equiv \text{l.u.b.}_{f \in E} f(x)$ .

Let  $P_1(x_1, y_1)$ ,  $P_2(x_2, y_2)$  be arbitrary two points on the curve  $y = U(x)$  such that  $x_1 < x_2$ , and let  $P_0(x_0, y_0)$  be any point on the arc of  $y = U(x)$  between the points  $P_1, P_2$ .

We need only consider the following two cases, on account of being able to prove

2) 辻正次; 解析雜論 (共立社), 20 頁.

3) G. Birkhoff; *Lattice Theory*, P. 107, there it is shown that the set of all convex functions in the usual sense forms a semi-vector lattice.

4) E. F. Beckenbach; loc. cit.

similarly in the other cases.

*Case 1.* All the points  $P_0, P_1, P_2$  lie on the curves of elements of  $E$ . Let  $P'_2(x_2, y'_2)$  be the point of intersection of an element of  $E$  passing through the point  $P_0$  with the line  $x=x_2$ . Then  $y'_2 \leq y_2$ .

Therefore we have

$$F'_{02}(x) \leq F_{02}(x) \text{ for all } x \text{ with } x_0 \leq x \leq x_2, \text{ } ^5)$$

where  $F'_{02}(x), F_{02}(x)$  denote the members of the family  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  which pass through the points  $P_0, P'_2; P_0, P_2$  respectively.

On the other hand, since  $F_{02}(x_1) < y_1$  <sup>6)</sup> and  $F_{12}(x_2) = F_{02}(x_2)$ , we have

$$F_{02}(x) < F_{12}(x) \text{ for all } x \text{ with } x_1 \leq x \leq x_2,$$

where  $F_{12}(x)$  denotes the member of the family  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  passing through the points  $P_1, P_2$ .

Therefore we have

$$F'_{02}(x) < F_{12}(x) \text{ for all } x \text{ with } x_0 \leq x \leq x_2.$$

Consequently we get

$$U(x_0) = F'_{02}(x_0) < F_{12}(x_0).$$

Since  $P_0$  is an arbitrary point on the arc of  $y=U(x)$  between the points  $P_1, P_2$ , we have

$$U(x) < F_{12}(x) \text{ for all } x \text{ with } x_1 \leq x \leq x_2.$$

Hence we have  $U(x) \in F$ .

*Case 2.* Both of the points  $P_1, P_2$  do not lie on the curves of elements of  $E$ .

Let  $\{P_{1n}\}, \{P_{2n}\}$  be monotone increasing sequences of points of intersection of the lines  $x=x_1, x=x_2$  with elements of  $E$  respectively such that  $P_{1n} \rightarrow P_1, P_{2n} \rightarrow P_2$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Then we have

$$F_{12n}(x) \rightarrow F_{12}(x) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \text{ } ^7)$$

where  $F_{12n}(x)$  denote the members of  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  passing through the points  $P_{1n}, P_{2n}$ .

Therefore, in virtue of the monotone increase of  $\{P_{1n}\}, \{P_{2n}\}$ , and by the same argument as in Case 1, we have

$$U(x) < F_{12}(x) \text{ for all } x \text{ with } x_1 \leq x \leq x_2.$$

Therefore in this case we have  $U(x) \in F$ .

From the proofs of the above two cases and the fact that  $F$  is a semi-linear space, we get the theorem.

Concerning the condition (3), we have the following theorem.

5), 6) 7) E. F. Beckenbach; loc. cit.

*Theorem 2.* *The set of all convex functions in Beckenbach's sense is not always a semi-vector lattice.*

*Proof.* For the proof, we consider an example which is not a semi-vector lattice.

Let  $F(x; \alpha, \beta) \equiv -x^2 + \alpha x + \beta$  defined on the closed interval  $-1 \leq x \leq 1$ , then it is easy to see that the family  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  satisfies (1), (2), but does not satisfy (3).

It is evident that the member  $F_{12}(x)$  of the family  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  passing through the points  $P_1(-1, 0)$ ,  $P_2(1, 0)$  is  $-x^2 + 1$  and  $F_{12}(x)$  is itself a convex function in Beckenbach's sense.

Since  $\lambda F_{12}(x)$  where  $\lambda > 1$  is greater than  $F_{12}(x)$  which is the member of the family  $F(x; \alpha, \beta)$  passing through  $P_1, P_2$ , so that  $\lambda F_{12}(x)$  is not a convex function in Beckenbach's sense.

Therefore the set of all convex functions in Beckenbach's sense corresponding to  $F(x; \alpha, \beta) \equiv -x^2 + \alpha x + \beta$  is not a semi-linear space.

Thus the proof of the theorem is completed.

*Remark.* From the proof of Theorem 1, we see that the set of all convex functions-in Beckenbach's sense is a conditionally complete lattice.