

Jin Cai Wang

An inequality in Orlicz function spaces with Orlicz norm

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 44 (2003), No. 3, 507--514

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/119404>

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 2003

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>

An inequality in Orlicz function spaces with Orlicz norm

JINCAI WANG

Abstract. We use Simonenko quantitative indices of an \mathcal{N} -function Φ to estimate two parameters q_Φ and Q_Φ in Orlicz function spaces $L^\Phi[0, \infty)$ with Orlicz norm, and get the following inequality: $\frac{B_\Phi}{B_\Phi - 1} \leq q_\Phi \leq Q_\Phi \leq \frac{A_\Phi}{A_\Phi - 1}$, where A_Φ and B_Φ are Simonenko indices. A similar inequality is obtained in $L^\Phi[0, 1]$ with Orlicz norm.

Keywords: Orlicz spaces, Simonenko indices, Δ_2 -condition

Classification: 46B20, 46E30

1. Introduction

Definition 1.1. A function $M : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called an \mathcal{N} -function, if

- (i) M is continuous, convex and even;
- (ii) $M(u) > 0$ for $u \neq 0$, $M(0) = 0$;
- (iii) $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} M(u)/u = 0$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} M(u)/u = \infty$.

Let

$$\Phi(u) = \int_0^{|u|} \phi(t) dt \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi(v) = \int_0^{|v|} \psi(s) ds$$

be a pair of complementary \mathcal{N} -functions. The Orlicz function space is defined as follows: $L^\Phi[0, 1] = \{x(t) : x(t) \text{ is measurable on } [0, 1] \text{ and } \rho_\Phi(\lambda x(t)) dt < \infty \text{ for some } \lambda > 0\}$, where $\rho_\Phi(x(t)) = \int_{[0,1]} \Phi(x(t)) dt$; $L^\Phi[0, \infty) = \{x(t) : x(t) \text{ is measurable on } [0, \infty), \rho_\Phi(\lambda x(t)) dt < \infty \text{ for some } \lambda > 0\}$, and $\rho_\Phi(x(t)) = \int_{[0,\infty)} \Phi(x(t)) dt$. We define the Orlicz norm on the Orlicz space as

$$\|x\|_\Phi = \inf_{k>0} \frac{1}{k} [1 + \rho_\Phi(kx)].$$

An \mathcal{N} -function $\Phi(u)$ is said to satisfy the Δ_2 -condition for small u (in symbol $\Phi \in \Delta_2(0)$), if there exists $u_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$, such that $\Phi(2u) \leq C\Phi(u)$ for $0 \leq u \leq u_0$. $\Phi(u)$ is said to satisfy the Δ_2 -condition for large u (in symbol $\Phi \in \Delta_2(\infty)$), if there exists $u_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that $\Phi(2u) \leq C\Phi(u)$ for $u \geq u_0$. $\Phi(u)$ is said to satisfy the Δ_2 -condition for all $u \geq 0$ (in symbol $u \in \Delta_2$), if there exist $C > 0$ such that $\Phi(2u) \leq C\Phi(u)$ for $u \geq 0$. An \mathcal{N} -function

$\Phi(u)$ is said to satisfy the ∇_2 -condition for small u (for large u , for all $u \geq 0$), in symbol $\Phi \in \nabla_2(0)$ ($\Phi \in \nabla_2(\infty)$, $\Phi \in \nabla_2$), if its complementary \mathcal{N} -function $\Psi \in \Delta_2(0)$ ($\Psi \in \Delta_2(\infty)$, $\Psi \in \Delta_2$).

The basic results on Orlicz spaces can be found in Krasnosel'skii and Rutickii [2], Lindenstrauss and Tzafriri [3], Rao and Ren [6], Chen [1].

The Simonenko indices of an \mathcal{N} -function Φ are defined as

$$(1) \quad A_\Phi = \inf_{t>0} \frac{t\phi(t)}{\Phi(t)}, \quad B_\Phi = \sup_{t>0} \frac{t\phi(t)}{\Phi(t)}.$$

Simonenko introduced these indices in [9] and [8], and we can find a detailed description in Maligranda [4].

Clearly, $1 \leq A_\Phi \leq B_\Phi \leq \infty$.

Proposition 1.1. *Let Φ be an \mathcal{N} -function. Then*

$$\Phi \in \nabla_2 \iff 1 < A_\Phi; \quad \Phi \in \Delta_2 \iff B_\Phi < \infty.$$

The proof of the proposition can be found in Krasnosel'skii and Rutickii [2, p. 24–26].

Lemma 1.2. *Let Φ and Ψ be a pair of complementary \mathcal{N} -functions. Then*

$$(2) \quad \frac{1}{A_\Phi} + \frac{1}{B_\Psi} = 1.$$

The proof of Lemma 1.2 can be found in Simonenko [9] or Rao & Ren [6].

The next lemma can be found in [1], [10] or [5].

Lemma 1.3. *Let $\Phi(u) = \int_0^{|u|} \phi(t) dt$ and $\Psi(v) = \int_0^{|v|} \psi(s) ds$ be a pair of complementary \mathcal{N} -functions. We denote*

$$k_x^* = \inf\{k > 0 : \rho_\Psi[\phi(k|x)] \geq 1\}, \quad k_x^{**} = \sup\{k > 0 : \rho_\Psi[\phi(k|x)] \leq 1\}.$$

Then $k \in [k_x^*, k_x^{**}]$ if and only if

$$\|x\|_\Phi = \frac{1}{k}[1 + \rho_\Phi(kx)].$$

2. Main results

Y. Yan estimated the two parameters Q_Φ and q_Φ in the Orlicz sequence space l^Φ , and got the following result (see [11], [7] or [13]).

Proposition 2.1. *Let Φ and Ψ be a pair of complementary \mathcal{N} -functions. Then*

$$(3) \quad \frac{b_{\Phi}^*}{b_{\Phi}^* - 1} \leq q_{\Phi} \leq Q_{\Phi} \leq \frac{a_{\Phi}^*}{a_{\Phi}^* - 1},$$

where

$$a_{\Phi}^* = \inf \left\{ \frac{t\phi(t)}{\Phi(t)} : 0 < t \leq \psi[\Psi^{-1}(1)] \right\},$$

$$b_{\Phi}^* = \sup \left\{ \frac{t\phi(t)}{\Phi(t)} : 0 < t \leq \psi[\Psi^{-1}(1)] \right\}.$$

The upper estimate in (3) can also be found in [12]. Now we establish a similar inequality in the Orlicz function space with Orlicz norm. Firstly, we have

Theorem 2.1. *Let Φ, Ψ be a pair of complementary \mathcal{N} -functions. For $L^{\Phi}[0, \infty)$, we denote*

$$Q_{\Phi} = \sup_{\|x\|_{\Phi}=1} k_x^{**} = \sup_{\|x\|_{\Phi}=1} \left\{ k > 0 : \|x\|_{\Phi} = \frac{1}{k}(1 + \rho_{\Phi}(kx)) \right\},$$

$$q_{\Phi} = \inf_{\|x\|_{\Phi}=1} k_x^* = \inf_{\|x\|_{\Phi}=1} \left\{ k > 0 : \|x\|_{\Phi} = \frac{1}{k}(1 + \rho_{\Phi}(kx)) \right\}.$$

Then

$$(4) \quad A_{\Psi} = \frac{B_{\Phi}}{B_{\Phi} - 1} \leq q_{\Phi} \leq Q_{\Phi} \leq \frac{A_{\Phi}}{A_{\Phi} - 1} = B_{\Psi},$$

where $A_{\Phi}, B_{\Phi}, A_{\Psi}$ and B_{Ψ} are defined by (1).

PROOF: The left and right equations in (4) follow from Lemma 1.2. Now we prove

$$(5) \quad q_{\Phi} \geq \frac{B_{\Phi}}{B_{\Phi} - 1}.$$

For $\Phi \notin \Delta_2$, by Proposition 1.1, we have $B_{\Phi} = \infty$ or $A_{\Psi} = 1$. The result is obvious.

For $\Phi \in \Delta_2$, we only prove that for every $x \in L^{\Phi}[0, \infty)$ which satisfies $\|x\|_{\Phi} = 1$, we have $k_x^* \geq \frac{B_{\Phi}}{B_{\Phi}-1}$. Firstly, we have $\rho_{\Psi}(\phi(k_x^*|x(t)|)) \geq 1$. In fact, if $\Phi \in \Delta_2$, then $\rho_{\Phi}[(k_x^* + 1)x] < \infty$. So

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\Psi}(\phi((k_x^* + 1)|x(t)|)) &\leq \rho_{\Psi}(\phi((k_x^* + 1)|x(t)|)) + \rho_{\Phi}((k_x^* + 1)|x(t)|) \\ &= \int_G (k_x^* + 1)|x(t)| \cdot \phi((k_x^* + 1)|x(t)|) dt \\ &\leq B_{\Phi}\rho_{\Phi}((k_x^* + 1)|x(t)|) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $k_x^* < k_n < k_x^* + 1$ such that $k_n \searrow k_x^*$. By the right continuity of ϕ and Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\rho_\Psi(\phi(k_x^*|x(t)|)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_\Psi(\phi(k_n|x(t)|)) \geq 1.$$

For every $x \in L^\Phi[0, \infty)$ which satisfies $\|x\|_\Phi = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \rho_\Phi(k_x^*x) &\leq \rho_\Psi(\phi(k_x^*|x(t)|)) + \rho_\Phi(k_x^*|x(t)|) \\ &= \int_{[0, \infty)} \Psi\{\phi[(k_x^*|x(t)|)]\} dt + \int_{[0, \infty)} \Phi(k_x^*|x(t)|) dt \\ &= \int_{[0, \infty)} k_x^*|x(t)|\phi(k_x^*|x(t)|) dt \\ &\leq B_\Phi \int_{[0, \infty)} \Phi(k_x^*|x(t)|) dt = B_\Phi \rho_\Phi(k_x^*x). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$(6) \quad \rho_\Phi(k_x^*x) \geq \frac{1}{B_\Phi - 1}.$$

By Lemma 1.3, we get

$$1 = \|x\|_\Phi = \frac{1}{k_x^*} \{1 + \rho_\Phi(k_x^*x)\}.$$

So $\rho_\Phi(k_x^*x) = k_x^* - 1$. By (6)

$$k_x^* \geq \frac{B_\Phi}{B_\Phi - 1}.$$

Next, we prove

$$(7) \quad Q_\Phi \leq \frac{A_\Phi}{A_\Phi - 1}.$$

If $\Phi \notin \nabla_2$, then $A_\Phi = 1$ or $B_\Psi = \infty$. The result is obvious.

If $\Phi \in \nabla_2$, then $A_\Phi > 1$. For every $x \in L^\Phi[0, \infty)$ which satisfies $\|x\|_\Phi = 1$, and for any $k \in [k_x^*, k_x^{**}]$, we have

$$1 = \|x\|_\Phi = \frac{1}{k} [1 + \rho_\Phi(kx)].$$

For any $0 < \varepsilon < 1 < k$, we have

$$(8) \quad 1 = \|x\|_\Phi = \inf_{t>0} \frac{1}{t} [1 + \rho_\Phi(tx)] \leq \frac{1}{k - \varepsilon} [1 + \rho_\Phi((k - \varepsilon)x)].$$

By the definition of k_x^{**} and $k - \varepsilon < k_x^{**}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (9) \quad 1 + \rho_\Phi[(k - \varepsilon)x] &\geq \rho_\Psi\{\phi[(k - \varepsilon)x]\} + \rho_\Phi[(k - \varepsilon)x] \\
 &= \int_{[0, \infty)} (k - \varepsilon)x(t)\phi[(k - \varepsilon)x(t)] dt \\
 &\geq A_\Phi \rho_\Phi((k - \varepsilon)x(t)).
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by (8) and (9), we have

$$1 \geq (A_\Phi - 1)\rho_\Phi((k - \varepsilon)x(t)) \geq (A_\Phi - 1)(k - \varepsilon - 1)$$

or

$$k - \varepsilon \leq \frac{A_\Phi}{A_\Phi - 1}.$$

Since ε is arbitrary, we have

$$k \leq \frac{A_\Phi}{A_\Phi - 1}.$$

This implies (7) since x and k are arbitrary. □

Corollary 2.1. (i) If $\Phi \in \nabla_2$, then $Q_\Phi < \infty$; (ii) If $\Phi \in \Delta_2$, then $q_\Phi > 1$.

For $0 \neq x \in L^\Phi[0, 1]$, we still denote

$$\begin{aligned}
 k_x^* &= \inf\{k > 0 : \rho_\Psi[\phi(kx)] \geq 1\}, \\
 k_x^{**} &= \sup\{k > 0 : \rho_\Psi[\phi(kx)] \leq 1\}, \\
 Q_\Phi &= \sup_{\|x\|_\Phi=1} k_x^{**} = \sup_{\|x\|_\Phi=1} \left\{ k > 0 : \|x\|_\Phi = \frac{1}{k}(1 + \rho_\Phi(kx)) \right\}, \\
 q_\Phi &= \inf_{\|x\|_\Phi=1} k_x^* = \inf_{\|x\|_\Phi=1} \left\{ k > 0 : \|x\|_\Phi = \frac{1}{k}(1 + \rho_\Phi(kx)) \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $\varepsilon_0 = \min\{\frac{1}{2\phi(1)}, 1\}$. Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_\Phi^* &= \inf \left\{ \frac{t\phi(t)}{\Phi(t)} : t \in [\varepsilon_0, \infty) \right\}, \\
 B_\Phi^* &= \sup \left\{ \frac{t\phi(t)}{\Phi(t)} : t \in [\varepsilon_0, \infty) \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $\varepsilon_0\phi(\varepsilon_0) \leq \frac{\phi(\varepsilon_0)}{2\phi(1)} \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Theorem 2.2. *If Φ, Ψ is a pair of complementary \mathcal{N} -functions, then*

$$\frac{B_{\Phi}^* - \varepsilon_0 \phi(\varepsilon_0)}{B_{\Phi}^* - 1} \leq q_{\Phi} \leq Q_{\Phi} \leq \frac{A_{\Phi}^* + A_{\Phi}^* \Phi(\varepsilon_0)}{A_{\Phi}^* - 1}.$$

PROOF: Firstly, we prove $q_{\Phi} \geq \frac{B_{\Phi}^* - \varepsilon_0 \phi(\varepsilon_0)}{B_{\Phi}^* - 1}$. If $\Phi \notin \Delta_2(\infty)$, then $B_{\Phi}^* = \infty$, and the result is clear. If $\Phi \in \Delta_2(\infty)$, then $B_{\Phi}^* < \infty$. By the proof of Theorem 2.1, for $x \in L^{\Phi}[0, 1]$ with $\|x\|_{\Phi} = 1$, we have $\rho_{\Psi}(\phi(k_x^*x)) \geq 1$. So

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \rho_{\Phi}(k_x^*x) &\leq \rho_{\Psi}(\phi(k_x^*x)) + \rho_{\Phi}(k_x^*x) \\ &= \int_{[0,1]} k_x^*|x(t)|\phi(k_x^*|x(t)|) dt \\ &\leq \int_{G_1=\{t:k_x^*|x(t)|<\varepsilon_0\}} \varepsilon_0\phi(\varepsilon_0) dt + \int_{G \setminus G_1} k_x^*|x(t)|\phi(k_x^*|x(t)|) dt \\ &< \varepsilon_0\phi(\varepsilon_0) + B_{\Phi}^*\rho_{\Phi}(k_x^*x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$1 - \varepsilon_0\phi(\varepsilon_0) \leq (B_{\Phi}^* - 1)\rho_{\Phi}(k_x^*x).$$

Noting that $\rho_{\Phi}(k_x^*x) = k_x^* - 1$, we have

$$\frac{1 - \varepsilon_0\phi(\varepsilon_0)}{B_{\Phi}^* - 1} \leq k_x^* - 1,$$

i.e.

$$k_x^* \geq \frac{B_{\Phi}^* - \varepsilon_0\phi(\varepsilon_0)}{B_{\Phi}^* - 1}.$$

Since x is arbitrary,

$$q_{\Phi} \geq \frac{B_{\Phi}^* - \varepsilon_0\phi(\varepsilon_0)}{B_{\Phi}^* - 1}.$$

Next we prove $Q_{\Phi} \leq \frac{A_{\Phi}^*(1+\Phi(\varepsilon_0))}{A_{\Phi}^*-1}$. If $\Phi \notin \nabla_2(\infty)$, the result is obvious. If $\Phi \in \nabla_2(\infty)$, then $\forall x \in S(L^{\Phi}[0, 1])$, $\forall k \in [k_x^*, k_x^{**}]$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \rho_{\Phi}[(k - \varepsilon)x] &\geq \rho_{\Psi}\{\phi[(k - \varepsilon)|x]\} + \rho_{\Phi}[(k - \varepsilon)x] \\ &= \int_{[0,1]} (k - \varepsilon)|x(t)|\phi[(k - \varepsilon)|x(t)] dt \\ &\geq \int_{\{t \in [0,1]: (k - \varepsilon)|x(t)| \geq \varepsilon_0\}} (k - \varepsilon)|x(t)|\phi[(k - \varepsilon)|x(t)] dt \\ &\geq A_{\Phi}^* \int_{\{(k - \varepsilon)|x(t)| \geq \varepsilon_0\}} \Phi((k - \varepsilon)|x(t)|) dt \\ &= A_{\Phi}^* \{\rho_{\Phi}[(k - \varepsilon)x(t)] - \int_{\{t \in [0,1]: (k - \varepsilon)|x(t)| < \varepsilon_0\}} \Phi((k - \varepsilon)x(t)) dt\} \\ &\geq A_{\Phi}^* \{\rho_{\Phi}[(k - \varepsilon)x(t)] - \Phi(\varepsilon_0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

So

$$1 + A_{\Phi}^* \Phi(\varepsilon_0) \geq (A_{\Phi}^* - 1)\rho((k - \varepsilon)x(t)) \geq (A_{\Phi}^* - 1)(k - \varepsilon - 1),$$

i.e.

$$k \leq \frac{A_{\Phi}^*[1 + \Phi(\varepsilon_0)]}{A_{\Phi}^* - 1} + \varepsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$k \leq \frac{A_{\Phi}^*[1 + \Phi(\varepsilon_0)]}{A_{\Phi}^* - 1}.$$

Since $x \in S(L^{\Phi}[0, 1])$ is arbitrary,

$$Q_{\Phi} \leq \frac{A_{\Phi}^*(1 + \Phi(\varepsilon_0))}{A_{\Phi}^* - 1}.$$

□

Corollary 2.2 (S.T. Chen [1, p. 21]).

- (i) If $\Phi \in \Delta_2(\infty)$, then $q_{\Phi} > 1$.
- (ii) If $\Phi \in \nabla_2(\infty)$, then $Q_{\Phi} < \infty$.

From the proof of Theorem 2.2, we know Theorem 2.2 is true for any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$. Letting ε to tend to 0, we get

Corollary 2.3. Let Φ, Ψ be a pair of complementary \mathcal{N} -functions. Then

$$(10) \quad A_{\Psi} = \frac{B_{\Phi}}{B_{\Phi} - 1} \leq q_{\Phi} \leq Q_{\Phi} \leq \frac{A_{\Phi}}{A_{\Phi} - 1} = B_{\Psi},$$

where $A_{\Phi}, B_{\Phi}, A_{\Psi}$ and B_{Ψ} are defined by (1).

Example 1. For the \mathcal{N} -function $\Phi(u) = |u|^p$, which generates $L^p[0, \infty)$, we have $A_{\Phi} = B_{\Phi} = p$. By Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.3, we have $q_{\Phi} = Q_{\Phi} = \frac{p}{p-1}$.

Example 2. For the \mathcal{N} -function $\Phi(u) = e^{|u|} - |u| - 1$, we have

$$(11) \quad 1 \leq q_{\Phi} \leq Q_{\Phi} \leq 2.$$

Indeed, $F_{\Phi}(t) = \frac{t(e^t - 1)}{e^t - t - 1}$ is increasing in $(0, +\infty)$. So $A_{\Phi} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} F_{\Phi}(t) = 2$ and $B_{\Phi} = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} F_{\Phi}(t) = \infty$. Therefore (11) follows from Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.3.

Acknowledgment. The author would like to thank the referee for reading this paper carefully and for giving some suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Chen S.T., *Geometry of Orlicz spaces*, Dissertationes Mathematicae, Warszawa, 1996.
- [2] Krasnosel'skii M.A., Rutickii Ya.B., *Convex Functions and Orlicz Space*, Noordhoff Ltd., Groningen, 1961.
- [3] Lindenstrauss J., Tzafriri L., *Classical Banach Spaces*, I and II, Springer, Berlin, 1977 and 1979.
- [4] Maligranda L., *Indices and interpolation*, Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.) **234** (1985).
- [5] Orlicz W., *Linear Functional Analysis*, World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 1992.
- [6] Rao M.M., Ren Z.D., *Theory of Orlicz Spaces*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1991.
- [7] Rao M.M., Ren Z.D., *Applications of Orlicz Spaces*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 2002.
- [8] Simonenko I.B., *Interpolation and extrapolation of linear operators in Orlicz spaces*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **151** (1963), 1288–1291 (Russian).
- [9] Simonenko I.B., *Interpolation and extrapolation of linear operators in Orlicz spaces*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **63** (105) (1964), 536–553 (Russian).
- [10] Wu C.X., Zhao S.Z., Chen J.O., *Calculation of Orlicz norm and rotundity of Orlicz spaces*, J. Harbin Inst. Techn. **10** (1973), no. 2, 1–12 (Chinese).
- [11] Yan Y., *On a pair of geometric parameters of Orlicz norm*, Comment. Math. Prace Mat. **41** (2001), 257–263.
- [12] Yan Y., *Some results on packing in Orlicz sequence spaces*, Studia Math. **147** (1) (2001), 73–88.
- [13] Yan Y.Q., *Packing constants, weakly convergent sequence coefficients and Riesz angles in Orlicz sequence spaces*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Suzhou Univ., Suzhou, P. R. China, 2002.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SUZHOU UNIVERSITY, SUZHOU 215006, P.R. CHINA

(Received April 9, 2002, revised November 11, 2002)