

Toposym 3

Julian Musielak

A contribution to the theory of modular spaces

In: Josef Novák (ed.): General Topology and its Relations to Modern Analysis and Algebra, Proceedings of the Third Prague Topological Symposium, 1971. Academia Publishing House of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Praha, 1972. pp. 315--319.

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/700740>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1972

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE THEORY OF MODULAR SPACES

J. MUSIELAK and A. WASZAK

Poznań

1. In this paper we introduce and investigate some modular spaces and connections between these spaces. In the first part the definition of a modular and a pseudomodular and of a modular space are given. Next, some examples of modular spaces depending on a parameter are given. In the second part of this paper a property of these spaces and connections between them are considered.

1.1. Let a real linear space X be given and let ϱ be a functional defined on X with values $-\infty < \varrho(x) \leq +\infty$. This functional will be called a *pseudomodular*, if it satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}\varrho(0) &= 0, \\ \varrho(-x) &= \varrho(x), \\ \varrho(\alpha x + \beta y) &\leq \varrho(x) + \varrho(y) \text{ for every } \alpha, \beta \geq 0, \alpha + \beta = 1.\end{aligned}$$

If ϱ satisfies the condition

$$\varrho(x) = 0 \text{ if and only if } x = 0$$

instead of condition one, then ϱ is called a *modular*. It is easily seen that if ϱ is a pseudomodular on X , then we have always $\varrho(x) \geq 0$. Now, we define the *modular space*

$$X_\varrho = \{x : \varrho(\lambda x) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow 0, x \in X\}.$$

It is quite obvious that defining modulars in different manners, we obtain various modular spaces (see [2]).

1.2. Let X be a real linear space, and let \mathcal{E} be an abstract set. Let \mathfrak{X} be a σ -algebra of subsets of the set \mathcal{E} , and let m be a nonnegative measure on \mathfrak{X} . We consider an extended real-valued function ϱ defined on $\mathcal{E} \times X$, satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\varrho(\xi, x)$ is a pseudomodular in X for almost every $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$,
2. if $\varrho(\xi, x) = 0$ for almost every $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$, then $x = 0$,
3. $\varrho(\xi, x)$ is measurable in \mathcal{E} for every $x \in X$.

By means of this function ϱ we define the following functionals in X :

$$\varrho(x) = \int_{\mathfrak{E}} p(\xi) \frac{\varrho(\xi, x)}{1 + \varrho(\xi, x)} dm,$$

where $p(\xi)$ is measurable, $0 < p(\xi) < \infty$, $\int_{\mathfrak{E}} p(\xi) dm = 1$,

$$\varrho_0(x) = \sup_{\xi} \varrho(\xi, x), \quad \varrho_u(x) = \sup_{\xi} \varrho(\xi, x).$$

Moreover, let $\mathfrak{M} = \{m_{\eta}\}$, $\eta \in \mathfrak{Y}$, be a family of nonnegative measures on \mathfrak{X} , where \mathfrak{Y} is a set of indices. Then we define

$$\varrho_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}(x) = \sup_{\eta} \int_{\mathfrak{E}} \varrho(\xi, x) dm_{\eta}.$$

In particular, if m_{η} are absolutely continuous with respect to m , then

$$\varrho_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}(x) = \sup_{\eta} \int_{\mathfrak{E}} a(\xi, \eta) \varrho(\xi, x) dm,$$

where the kernel $a(\xi, \eta) \geq 0$ is measurable in \mathfrak{E} for every $\eta \in \mathfrak{Y}$. Two special cases will be of importance. In the first one with $a(\xi, \eta) \equiv 1$ we shall write ϱ_s in place of $\varrho_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}$, i.e.,

$$\varrho_s(x) = \int_{\mathfrak{E}} \varrho(\xi, x) dm.$$

The second one is obtained taking $\mathfrak{E} = \langle 0, \infty \rangle$, $\mathfrak{Y} = \langle \eta^*, \infty \rangle$, where $\eta^* > 0$, m is the Lebesgue measure in \mathfrak{E} , and

$$a(\xi, \eta) = \begin{cases} 1/\eta & \text{for } \xi \leq \eta, \\ 0 & \text{for } \xi > \eta. \end{cases}$$

Then we shall write ϱ_{σ} in place of $\varrho_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}$, i.e.,

$$\varrho_{\sigma}(x) = \sup_{\eta \geq \eta^*} \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{\eta^*}^{\eta} \varrho(\xi, x) d\xi.$$

It is easily verified that ϱ , ϱ_0 , ϱ_s and ϱ_{σ} are modulars in X . If $\varrho(\xi, x)$ is a pseudo-modular in X for every $\xi \in \mathfrak{E}$, then ϱ_u is also a modular, and $\varrho_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}$ is in general a pseudomodular in X . The respective modular spaces will be denoted by X_{ϱ} , X_{ϱ_0} , X_{ϱ_s} , $X_{\varrho_{\sigma}}$, X_{ϱ_u} , and $X_{\varrho_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}}$. Let us remark, that taking \mathfrak{E} to be the set of positive integers, \mathfrak{X} the σ -algebra of all subsets of the set \mathfrak{E} , and mB the number of elements of the set $B \subset \mathfrak{E}$, $p(\xi) = (\frac{1}{2})^{\xi}$, then X_{ϱ} and $X_{\varrho_0} = X_{\varrho_u}$ are countably modular space and uniformly countably modular space, respectively (see [1]). Taking also \mathfrak{Y} to be the set of positive integers and defining m_{η} , $\eta \in \mathfrak{Y}$, by means of a matrix $A = (a_{ni})$, $a_{ni} \geq 0$, i.e., $m_{\eta}(i) = a_{ni}$, we obtain the space $X_{\varrho_{\sigma(A)}}$ defined in [3].

2. In this section we shall investigate some properties and connections between the above introduced spaces without any further assumptions on X . It is easily observed that

2.1. We have $X_{e_n} \subset X_{e_0} \subset X_e$.

2.2. If $m\Xi < \infty$, then $X_{e_0} \subset X_{e_a}$.

This follows from the inequality $\varrho_s(x) \leq m\Xi \cdot \varrho_0(x)$.

2.3. If Ξ consists of a countable number of pairwise disjoint atoms A_1, A_2, \dots with respect to the measure m , and $\inf m A_k > 0$, then $X_{e_n} \subset X_{e_a}$.

This is obtained from the inequality $\varrho_s(x) \geq \inf m A_k \cdot \varrho_0(x)$.

2.4. $X_{e_n} \subset X_e$.

To prove this inclusion, let us write $A_n = \{\xi : p(\xi) > n\}$. Then $m A_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let us choose an $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists an integer n such that $\int_{A_n} p(\xi) dm < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$, and so

$$\varrho(x) < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon + \int_{\Xi \setminus A_n} p(\xi) \cdot \varrho(\xi, x) dm \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon + n \cdot \varrho_s(x).$$

Let $x \in X_{e_n}$, then $\varrho_s(\lambda x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, and so there exists a $\lambda_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varrho_s(\lambda x) < \varepsilon/(2n)$ for $0 < \lambda < \lambda_\varepsilon$. Hence $\varrho(\lambda x) < \varepsilon$ for $0 < \lambda < \lambda_\varepsilon$, and thus $x \in X_e$.

2.5. An element $x \in X$ belongs to X_e , if and only if, $\varrho(\xi, \lambda x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere in Ξ .

Proof. Let $\lambda_k \downarrow 0$ and let us denote

$$h_k(\xi) = p(\xi) \frac{\varrho(\xi, \lambda_k x)}{1 + \varrho(\xi, \lambda_k x)}.$$

Now, let $\varrho(\xi, \lambda x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere in Ξ . Then $h_k(\xi) \leq p(\xi)$. $\varrho(\xi, \lambda_k x) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $h_k(\xi) \leq p(\xi)$. Hence, by Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, $\int_{\Xi} h_k(\xi) dm \rightarrow 0$, i.e., $\varrho(\lambda_k x) \rightarrow 0$. Thus $x \in X_e$.

Conversely, let $x \in X_e$, then $\int_{\Xi} h_k(\xi) dm \rightarrow 0$ and so $h_k(\xi) \rightarrow 0$ in measure m . By the well-known Riesz theorem, $h_{k_i}(\xi) \rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere in Ξ , where $\{k_i\}$ is a subsequence of indices. Hence $\varrho(\xi, \lambda_{k_i} x) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ almost everywhere in Ξ . Since $\varrho(\xi, \lambda x)$ is a nondecreasing function of $\lambda > 0$, it follows $\varrho(\xi, \lambda x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere in Ξ .

From 2.5 it follows immediately that

2.6. If $\varrho(\xi, \lambda x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ in measure m , then $x \in X_e$.

The converse statement is true under an additional assumption, namely

2.7. *If the measure m is absolutely continuous with respect to the measure n $nA = \int_A p(\xi) dm$, $A \in \mathfrak{X}$, and $x \in X_\rho$, then $\rho(\xi, \lambda x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ in measure m .*

Proof. Since $x \in X_\rho$, by 2.5 we get $\rho(\xi, \lambda x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere with respect to measure m . But the measure n is absolutely continuous with respect to m , and so $\rho(\xi, \lambda x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere with respect to measure n . Since the measure n is finite, this implies convergence $\rho(\xi, \lambda x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ in measure n . Since m is absolutely continuous with respect to n , this implies $\rho(\xi, \lambda x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ in measure m .

Let us remark that the assumption of absolute continuity of m with respect to n in 2.7 cannot be omitted in general. For example, taking \mathfrak{E} as the set of positive integers, mB as the number of elements of the set $B \subset \mathfrak{E}$, and $p(\xi) = (\frac{1}{2})^\xi$, the condition $\rho(\xi, \lambda x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ in measure m is equivalent to the condition $x \in X_{e_0}$, and not to the condition $x \in X_\rho$.

Now, we proceed to investigation of the space $X_{e_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}}$; it is convenient to assume absolute continuity of the measures m_η with respect to m , i.e., the modular $\rho_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}(x)$ is defined by means of a kernel $a(\xi, \eta) \geq 0$ (see 1).

2.8. *Suppose that a sequence of sets $A_k \in \mathfrak{X}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, a sequence of indices $\{\eta_k\}$ and a sequence of numbers $\{M_k\}$ are given such that $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k = \mathfrak{E}$ and $a(\xi, \eta_k) > M_k$ for every $\xi \in A_k$. Then $X_{e_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}} \subset X_\rho$.*

Proof. Let $x \in X_{e_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}}$, then $\int_{\mathfrak{E}} a(\xi, \eta) \cdot \rho(\xi, \lambda x) dm \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ uniformly in \mathfrak{M} . Taking $\lambda_i \downarrow 0$ and choosing an $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$M_k \int_{A_k} \rho(\xi, \lambda_i x) dm \leq \int_{A_k} a(\xi, \eta_k) \cdot \rho(\xi, \lambda_i x) dm < \varepsilon$$

for any k and for i sufficiently large. Hence $\rho(\xi, \lambda_i x) \rightarrow 0$ in measure in the set A_k . Since $\rho(\xi, \lambda x)$ is a nondecreasing function of $\lambda > 0$, the well-known Riesz theorem implies $\rho(\xi, \lambda_i x) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ almost everywhere in A_k . Thus $\rho(\xi, \lambda x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere in \mathfrak{E} , and so according to 2.5, $x \in X_\rho$.

2.9. *If $\sup_{\eta} \int_{\mathfrak{E}} a(\xi, \eta) dm < \infty$, then $X_{e_0} \subset X_{e_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}}$.*

This result follows from the inequality

$$\rho_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}(x) \leq \sup_{\eta} \int_{\mathfrak{E}} a(\xi, \eta) dm \cdot \rho_0(x).$$

2.10. If $\sup_{\eta} \sup_{\xi} a(\xi, \eta) < \infty$, then $X_{\varrho_s} \subset X_{\varrho_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}}$.

This follows from the inequality

$$\varrho_{\sigma(\mathfrak{M})}(x) \leq \sup_{\eta} \sup_{\xi} a(\xi, \eta) \cdot \varrho_s(x).$$

Remark. Let us note that the results obtained in this paper are generalizations of some results of [3], taking the set of natural numbers as \mathfrak{E} , the σ -algebra of all subsets of \mathfrak{E} as \mathfrak{X} , the measure mB defined as the number of elements of the set $B \subset \mathfrak{E}$, and $\rho(\xi) = (\frac{1}{2})^{\xi}$.

References

- [1] *J. Albrycht and J. Musielak*: Countably modular spaces. *Studia Math.* 31 (1968), 331—337.
- [2] *J. Musielak and W. Orlicz*: On modular space. *Studia Math.* 18 (1959), 49—65.
- [3] *J. Musielak and A. Waszak*: Some new countably modular spaces. *Comment. Math. Prace Mat.* 15 (1971), 209—215.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, A. MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY, POZNAŃ